OCT 18 1949

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

## VOLUME 95—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1949, TO FEBRUARY 17, 1949
(PAGES 1 TO 1412)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1949

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

OCT 1 0 1989



# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81ST CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 95—PART 1

JANUARY 3, 1949, TO FEBRUARY 17, 1949
(PAGES 1 TO 783)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1949

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 1949

The 3d day of January being the day prescribed by the Constitution of the United States for the annual meeting of Congress, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress commenced this day.

The Senate assembled in its Chamber at the Capitol.

ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, President pro tempore, called the Senate to order at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following

PRAYER

O Lord our God, look with favor upon the Members of the Senate, and bless each one of them according to his needs. May they be aware of a mandate higher than that of the ballot box, a mandate from Thee, to legislate wisely and well. We believe that Thou wilt accept these men as representatives of the people, and art willing to work in them and through them that they may become instruments of Thy will. Grant that they be willing to have it so, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who taught us to pray together:

*Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever.*

Amen.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first privileged order of business this morning is the administration of the oath to the 32 Senators-elect. Under the practice of the Senate they will proceed to the desk by fours, alphabetically, to take the oath of office. The clerk will call the names of the first four Senators-elect.

The Chief Clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) called the names of Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. HOEY, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. ELLENDER.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. MORSE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. LONG, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FREAR, Mr. GILLETTE, and Mr. GREEN.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. MCGRATH, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HUNT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. SMITH, Mr. THYE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. BARKLEY, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, and Mr. MAYBANK.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office prescribed by law was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. MURRAY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. ECTON, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. NEELY, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. RUSSELL, and Mr. SALTONSTALL.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. KILGORE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. GEORGE, and Mr. LODGE, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

The Chief Clerk called the names of Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WHERRY.

These Senators, escorted by Mr. REED, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. HILL, and Mr. BUTLER, respectively, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to them by the President pro tempore.

ALBEN W. BARKLEY

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair notes that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] rises and asks for recognition. Before the Chair recognizes the Senator from Kentucky he would like to assume that he has unanimous consent to say a word to him upon this first occasion when he has appeared in this Chamber since his recent election. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Assuming the unanimous consent of the Senate, the Chair would like to offer two or three observations.

As a result of the recent accident [laughter], the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky will soon lose his right to stand upon this floor and be recognized. He will soon lose his right of free speech within these walls. He will soon lose his vote. In fact, his civil liberties are disintegrating faster than in any other instance the Chair recalls. [Laughter.] But as a result of the same accident the senior Senator from Michigan is about to recognize the Senator from Kentucky, or any other Senator, for the last time. [Laughter.]

It seems to the Chair that this makes the occasion something of an event for both the senior Senator from Kentucky and the senior Senator from Michigan. Therefore, the President pro tempore, with great emphasis on the Latin part of that title, would like to say to the Senator from Kentucky—and he knows he speaks for the entire body—that though he may lack the right of recognition on the floor, many other recognitions can never be taken from him.

There will always be the recognition of the fact that he is one of the great Senators of his time and generation. [Applause.]

There will always be recognition of integrity without a blemish through more than three decades of public service beneath the dome of the Capitol of the Republic.

There will always be recognition of difficult achievements in successful leadership during critical times when his fidelity as a partisan was always matched by his faithfulness as a patriot and by his constant courtesy and good faith toward those of us in loyal opposition.

There will always be recognition of courage and eloquence. There will always be recognition of patience and humility. There will always be recognition of rare capacity for friendly fellowship. There will always be recognition of a great, human soul.

The Chair recognizes the next Vice President of the United States. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the generosity of the Chair and of my colleagues here has almost made me forget the purpose for which I rose. That was to submit a formal resolution following the ascertainment of a quorum of the Senate. I will not submit that resolution, however, until I have very feebly expressed my deep appreciation not only of what the President pro tempore has said but of the response made by my colleagues here without regard to politics upon this occasion.

There was one thing about the remarks of the President pro tempore which disturbed me a little, and that was the evident pleasure, if not hilarity, with which he announced that he was retiring from the chair. Inasmuch as I am to enter upon what Vice President Marshall called a 4-year period of silence when he took the oath of office as Vice President, I am somewhat disturbed about the pleasure with which the Chair retires from the position of President of the Senate.

I recognize the fact that by this transfer I shall lose a good many of my civil liberties; but I presume there are some liberties that the Chair may assume while occupying the chair that are equal to civil liberties—provided they are always civil. [Laughter.]

I do not know how I shall adjust myself to the role of Presiding Officer. I have been here in what I call the "bull pen" for so many years that I fear that some day I may walk down from the rostrum, roll up my sleeves, and begin to engage in debate, to be called down by whoever happens to be in the chair at the time.

I thank the Chair and my colleagues for their generous demonstration. I am not sure whether that demonstration and that evidence of favor and good will is due to the fact that I am getting out of the Senate, or that I am going to preside over it. Whatever may have prompted it—and I accept it in good faith—I greatly appreciate the good will which the Chair has shown, and the cordiality and respect with which we have dealt with one another here in the legislative process during the years of my membership in the Senate.

The Senate of the United States comes in for its share of criticism and denunciation, and it comes in now and then for what I think is an overplay of contemptuous asseverations with respect to its processes; but after all, with all its failings and shortcomings—and they are outstanding in some respects—it yet remains the one great forum for the debate of legislation and for the working out of the democratic process among the nations of the world. It will be a sad day in the history of this country if the United States Senate—or, for that matter, the House of Representatives—ceases to be the forum where men express their opinions and advocate whatever appeals to their judgment and their conscience in the process of making our Nation a greater example of democracy and self-government.

I leave this seat with sentiments of deep regret. I leave it with a sense of appreciation, not only, but with a sense of humility. I realize how far short I may fall in the performance of my duty as the Presiding Officer of this body. But with the cooperation and good will of Members on both sides, I hope I may discharge the duties acceptably to the Senate and to the country, and in fulfillment of our ideals of democracy.

Before I submit the resolution to which I have referred, I wish also to say a word in regard to the retiring Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States. Because of the death of President Roosevelt and the assumption of the Presidency by the then Vice President, Mr. Truman, the Senator from Michigan became, to all intents and purposes, Vice President of the United States, in the sense that he is President of the Senate.

During my membership in this body and during my observation of it, no man has ever occupied that position with greater dignity, greater force, or greater understanding of the proprieties of leadership, not only in the Senate, but as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, than has the Senator from Michigan, who is about to retire. We have all enjoyed his performance of the function of Presiding Officer of the Senate. We have respected his views in regard to decisions. Though sometimes disagreeing with them, we have always known that his decisions and rulings came out of a deep consciousness of his obligation to the Senate and to the country.

While I cannot say in all candor that I am sorry that the Senator from Michigan is retiring from the position of President pro tempore, because in the very nature of things, politics being what it is, we must have another President pro tempore, I will say that if we had not won the election last November, and if there were not to be a Vice President of the United States—as there has not been for now nearly 4 years—and we had to have a Republican President pro tempore, I would rather the Senator from Michigan would preside over the Senate than any other man. [Applause.]

Mr. President, I now submit the resolution, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Kentucky that it might be advisable to have a quorum call first.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I beg the Chair's pardon. I intended to suggest the absence of a quorum, but the eloquence of the Chair frustrated me.

I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Byrd | Eastland |
| Anderson | Cain | Ecton |
| Baldwin | Capehart | Ellender |
| Barkley | Chapman | Ferguson |
| Brewster | Connally | Flanders |
| Bricker | Cordon | Frear |
| Bridges | Donnell | Fulbright |
| Broughton | Douglas | George |
| Butler | Downey | Gillette |
| Green | Long | Reed |
| Gurney | Lucas | Robertson |
| Hayden | McCarran | Russell |
| Hendrickson | McCarthy | Saltonstall |
| Hickenlooper | McClellan | Schoeppel |
| Hill | McFarland | Smith, Maine |
| Hoey | McGrath | Smith, N. J. |
| Holland | McKellar | Sparkman |
| Humphrey | McMahon | Stennis |
| Hunt | Malone | Taft |
| Ives | Martin | Taylor |
| Jenner | Maybank | Thomas, Okla. |
| Johnson, Colo. | Miller | Thomas, Utah |
| Johnson, Tex. | Millikin | Thye |
| Johnston, S. C. | Morse | Tobey |
| Kefauver | Mundt | Tydings |
| Kem | Murray | Vandenberg |
| Kerr | Myers | Watkins |
| Kilgore | Neely | Wherry |
| Knowland | O'Conor | Wiley |
| Langer | O'Mahoney | Williams |
| Lodge | Pepper | Young |

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

LIST OF SENATORS BY STATES

*Alabama.*—Lister Hill and John Sparkman.

*Arizona.*—Carl Hayden and Ernest W. McFarland.

*Arkansas.*—John McClellan and J. William Fulbright.

*California.*—Sheridan Downey and William F. Knowland.

*Colorado.*—Edwin C. Johnson and Eugene D. Millikin.

*Connecticut.*—Brien McMahon and Raymond E. Baldwin.

*Delaware.*—John J. Williams and J. Allen Frear.

*Florida.*—Claude Pepper and Spessard L. Holland.

*Georgia.*—Walter F. George and Richard B. Russell.

*Idaho.*—Glen H. Taylor and Bert H. Miller.

*Illinois.*—Scott W. Lucas and Paul H. Douglas.

*Indiana.*—Homer E. Capehart and William E. Jenner.

*Iowa.*—Bourke B. Hickenlooper and Guy M. Gillette.

*Kansas.*—Clyde M. Reed and Andrew F. Schoeppel.

*Kentucky.*—Alben W. Barkley and Virgil Chapman.

*Louisiana.*—Allen J. Ellender and Russell B. Long.

*Maine.*—Owen Brewster and Margaret Chase Smith.

*Maryland.*—Millard E. Tydings and Herbert R. O'Conor.

*Massachusetts.*—Leverett Saltonstall and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.

*Michigan.*—Arthur H. Vandenberg and Homer Ferguson.

*Minnesota.*—Edward J. Thye and Hubert H. Humphrey.

*Mississippi.*—James O. Eastland and John C. Stennis.

*Missouri.*—Forrest C. Donnell and James P. Kem.

*Montana.*—James E. Murray and Zales N. Ecton.

*Nebraska.*—Hugh Butler and Kenneth S. Wherry.

*Nevada.*—Pat McCarran and George W. Malone.

*New Hampshire.*—Styles Bridges and Charles W. Tobey.

*New Jersey.*—H. Alexander Smith and Robert C. Hendrickson.

*New Mexico.*—Dennis Chavez and Clinton P. Anderson.

*New York.*—Robert F. Wagner and Irving M. Ives.

*North Carolina.*—Clyde R. Hoey and J. Melville Broughton.

*North Dakota.*—William Langer and Milton R. Young.

*Ohio.*—Robert A. Taft and John W. Bricker.

*Oklahoma.*—Elmer Thomas and Robert S. Kerr.

*Oregon.*—Guy Cordon and Wayne Morse.

*Pennsylvania.*—Francis J. Myers and Edward Martin.

*Rhode Island.*—Theodore Francis Green and J. Howard McGrath.

*South Carolina.*—Burnet R. Maybank and Olin D. Johnston.

*South Dakota.*—Chan Gurney and Karl E. Mundt.

*Tennessee.*—Kenneth McKellar and Estes Kefauver.

*Texas.*—Tom Connally and Lyndon B. Johnson.

*Utah.*—Elbert D. Thomas and Arthur V. Watkins.

*Vermont.*—George D. Aiken and Ralph E. Flanders.

*Virginia.*—Harry Flood Byrd and A. Willis Robertson.

*Washington.*—Warren G. Magnuson and Harry P. Cain.

*West Virginia.*—Harley M. Kilgore and Matthew M. Neely.

*Wisconsin.*—Alexander Wiley and Joseph R. McCarthy.

*Wyoming.*—Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved,* That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHERRY the committee on the part of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE

Mr. WHERRY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 2), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

HOUR OF DAILY MEETING

Mr. LUCAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 3), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

*Resolved,* That the hour of daily meeting of the Senate be 12 o'clock meridian, unless otherwise ordered.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now proceed to the election of its officers.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I sent to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. With full anticipation of its sinister purpose, the Chair orders the clerk to read the resolution.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 4), as follows:

*Resolved,* That Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, elected President of the Senate pro tempore, to hold office during the pleasure of the Senate, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate adopted on the 12th day of March 1890, on the subject.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the resolution.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish merely to suggest that there is nothing sinister at any time about the performance of one's duty. Therefore, I offer the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the resolution, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the words, "Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee," and insert the words, "Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, a Senator from the State of Michigan."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky stole my speech, earlier today, about my candidate. I wish to endorse everything he said about our candidate's qualifications and the respect in which he is held not only on this side of the aisle but on the other side of the aisle, as well. I wish to say that the Republican conference unanimously has asked me to present this name; and I can think of no higher tribute of love and affection which we hold for the senior Senator from Michigan who is, as he has said, about to retire, than to place his name in nomination.

I recommend to Senators on the other side of the aisle their worthy consideration of the unanimous choice of the Republican conference as President pro tempore.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is nothing sinister about that; is there?

Mr. WHERRY. There is nothing sinister about it, except I think we should have a yea-and-nay vote, if that meets with the approval of all Senators present. I think that is proper, at least. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska to the resolution offered by the Senator from Kentucky. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCKELLAR (when his name was called). Mr. President, as I am advised, I have a pecuniary interest in the result of this vote; I am so advised by the present President pro tempore of the Senate. Having a pecuniary interest, in the shape of a car that is assigned while I hold the office, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee will be noted as voting "present."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who are necessarily absent, would vote "nay" if present.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 50, answered "present" 2, as follows:

YEAS—40

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Saltonstall |
| Baldwin | Hickenlooper | Schoeppel |
| Brewster | Ives | Smith, Maine |
| Bricker | Jenner | Smith, N. J. |
| Bridges | Kem | Taft |
| Butler | Knowland | Thye |
| Cain | Lodge | Tobey |
| Capehart | McCarthy | Watkins |
| Cordon | Malone | Wherry |
| Donnell | Martin | Wiley |
| Ecton | Millikin | Williams |
| Ferguson | Morse | Young |
| Flanders | Mundt | |
| Gurney | Reed | |

NAYS—50

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hoey | Maybank |
| Barkley | Holland | Miller |
| Broughton | Humphrey | Murray |
| Byrd | Hunt | Myers |
| Chapman | Johnson, Colo. | Neely |
| Connally | Johnson, Tex. | O'Conor |
| Douglas | Johnston, S. C. | O'Mahoney |
| Downey | Kefauver | Pepper |
| Eastland | Kerr | Robertson |
| Ellender | Kilgore | Russell |
| Frear | Long | Sparkman |
| Fulbright | Lucas | Stennis |
| George | McCarran | Taylor |
| Gillette | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Green | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Hayden | McGrath | Tydings |
| Hill | McMahon | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

McKellar Vandenberg

NOT VOTING—4

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chavez | Magnuson | Wagner |
| Langer | | |

So Mr. WHERRY's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ordinarily the senior Senator from Michigan would be entitled to the privilege from the floor of escorting his long-time and very precious friend, the Senator from Tennessee, to the chair to assume his new responsibilities. Since he cannot perform that function, he asks the next senior Member on the Republican side of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], to escort the President pro tempore-elect to the chair, to receive the oath and take over.

Thereupon, Mr. McKELLAR, escorted by Mr. BRIDGES, advanced to the desk, and the oath was administered to him by the retiring President pro tempore.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Members of the Senate, I present the new President pro tempore. [Applause, Senators rising.]

ELECTION OF SECRETARY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it gives me peculiar pleasure to offer the resolution, which I now send to the desk and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk (Emery L. Frazier) read the resolution (S. Res. 5), and the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to its consideration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, be, and he is hereby, elected Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the resolution, to strike out the name "Leslie L. Biffle" and substitute "Carl A. Loeffler."

The amendment was rejected.

The resolution was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the retiring Secretary a committee of one to escort Mr. Biffle to the desk for the administration of the oath.

Mr. Biffle, escorted by Mr. Loeffler, advanced to the desk, and the oath of office was administered to him by the President pro tempore. [Applause on the floor.]

ELECTION OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 6), which was read and considered, by unanimous consent, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Joseph C. Duke, of Arizona, be, and he is hereby, elected Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out the name "Joseph C. Duke" and insert "Edward F. McGinnis."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the group of Senators on this side of the aisle, I am sure I speak the view of the entire Senate when I now express deep appreciation to Mr. McGinnis, who has served us so efficiently and faithfully during his term as Sergeant at Arms of the Senate. He has had a very brilliant record in and out of the Senate; he has a great record as a veteran of both World Wars, and he has demonstrated once again that when it comes to carrying out the rules of the Senate, be it against a Republican or Democrat, it is possible to enforce them fairly, impartially, and in a nonpartisan manner.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to say substantially what has already been so well said by my friend the Senator from Oregon. It has been my privilege to observe, as have all of us, the work of Mr. McGinnis as Sergeant at Arms of this body. As has been said, he served his country well in the capacity of a sergeant in the Army in the First World War, and in the capacity of commander in the Navy in the Second World War. He has distinguished himself in this body by his courtesy and attention to duty. Should the amendment which has been proposed with respect to him not be adopted he will retire with the respect, admiration, and affection of the Members of the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am opposed to the amendment, but I wish to say a word with respect to the life, character, and public service of Ed McGinnis. He is a veteran of both World Wars, and between them was one of the most active members of the American Legion in the Nation. I have met him at a number of national conventions of that organization. He is a loyal and patriotic American who has served his country well in war and in peace; and as he relinquishes his office of Sergeant at Arms, I am sure he carries with him the best wishes of all Senators on this side of the aisle, who appreciate his efficient and courteous service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before we vote on the amendment I wish to add just a word in expression of our appreciation of the courtesy with which not only Mr. McGinnis has performed the duties of Sergeant at Arms, but of the courtesy with which Mr. Carl Loeffler has performed the duties of Secretary of the Senate. I think Carl Loeffler has been an employee of the Senate for probably as long as anyone else connected with the Senate, if not longer. I had occasion to refer to that fact a year or two ago.

I did not know Mr. McGinnis until he became Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, but I have appreciated and have taken note frequently of his courtesy, his efficiency, and his devotion to the interests of the Senate.

I did not want this occasion to pass without expressing my appreciation, and, I am sure, that of all of us, regarding these two gentlemen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on the resolution as originally offered.

The resolution was agreed to.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 7), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States be notified of the election of Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

NOTIFICATION TO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 8), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MAJORITY

Mr. BARKLEY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 9), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Felton M. Johnston, of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the majority of the Senate.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY FOR THE MINORITY

Mr. BRIDGES submitted a resolution (S. Res. 10), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That J. Mark Trice, of Maryland, be, and he is hereby, elected secretary for the minority of the Senate.

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. HAYDEN submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 1), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate* (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 6th day of January, 1949, at 1 o'clock postmeridian, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all the certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to offer a suggestion as to a change in the language of the resolution as read. As I remember the reading of it, it says "in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A." Is it not a reflection on the Congress to suggest that the alphabet begin with any other letter than the letter A? [Laughter.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief statement with respect to the order of business. It is customary and is the precedent in the Senate that no bills, resolutions, or other documents of any kind are introduced until after the conclusion of the President's message on the state of the Union. I respectfully request that that precedent and custom be adhered to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Illinois that so far as a resolution which I intended to submit today is concerned, I shall not present it at this time. I shall be very glad to comply with the practice and custom of the Senate, and shall introduce my antifilibuster resolution at the session of the Senate held immediately after the President's state of the Union message.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there will be no session of the Senate tomorrow. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, January 5, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 1949

This being the day fixed by the twentieth amendment of the Constitution for the annual meeting of the Congress of the United States, the Members of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress met in their Hall, and at 12 o'clock noon were called to order by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, Hon. John Andrews.

The Chaplain of the Eightieth Congress, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following

PRAYER

Glory be to Thy name, O Lord God of hosts; let Thy work appear unto Thy servants. As we wait in this sacred stillness, we beseech Thee to bless abundantly our country. We pray for that guidance which enables us to weave characters which will stand the judgment of time, for the worth of life is measured not by the distance traveled but by the road taken.

Grant that these Thy servants may safeguard and advance the rights of all, free from discord and intolerance, and bind us together with an invincible purpose to labor for justice and freedom without compromise.

Let the Congress unite in praying the Lord's Prayer:

*Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever.*

Amen.

The CLERK. Representatives-elect, this is the day fixed by the Constitution for the meeting of the Eighty-first Congress. Certificates of election covering the 435 seats in the Eighty-first Congress have been received by the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, and the names of those persons whose credentials show that they were regularly elected as Representatives in accordance with the laws of their respective States or of the United States will be called. As the roll is called, following the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the State of Alabama, Representatives-elect will please answer to their names to determine whether a quorum is present.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll by States, and the following Representatives-elect answered to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

ALABAMA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Boykin | Hobbs | Elliott |
| Grant | Rains | Jones |
| Andrews | DeGraffenried | Battle |

ARIZONA

| | |
|---|---|
| Murdock | Patten |

ARKANSAS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Gathings | Tackett | Harris |
| Mills | Hays | |
| Trimble | Norrell | |

CALIFORNIA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Scudder | White | Doyle |
| Engle | Werdel | Holifield |
| Johnson | Bramblett | Hinshaw |
| Havenner | Nixon | Sheppard |
| Welch | Douglas | Phillips |
| Miller | McDonough | McKinnon |
| Allen | Jackson | |
| Anderson | King | |

COLORADO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Carroll | Marsalis | Aspinall |
| Hill | | |

CONNECTICUT

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ribicoff | McGuire | Patterson |
| Woodhouse | Lodge | Sadlak |

DELAWARE

| |
|---|
| Boggs |

FLORIDA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Peterson | Sikes | Herlong |
| Bennett | Smathers | Rogers |

GEORGIA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Preston | Davis | Wood |
| Cox | Vinson | Brown |
| Pace | Lanham | |
| Camp | Wheeler | |

IDAHO

| | |
|---|---|
| White | Sanborn |

ILLINOIS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dawson | Hoffman | Chiperfield |
| O'Hara | Chesney | Simpson |
| Linehan | Jonas | Mack |
| Buckley | Church | McMillen |
| Gorski | Reed | Vursell |
| O'Brien | Mason | Price |
| Sabath | Allen | Bishop |
| Gordon | Arends | |
| Yates | Velde | |

INDIANA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Madden | Walsh | Wilson |
| Halleck | Harden | Harvey |
| Crook | Noland | Jacobs |
| Kruse | Denton | |

IOWA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Martin | LeCompte | Jensen |
| Talle | Cunningham | Hoeven |
| Gross | Dolliver | |

KANSAS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cole | Meyer | Hope |
| Scrivner | Rees | Smith |

KENTUCKY

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Gregory | Chelf | Perkins |
| Whitaker | Spence | Bates |
| Morton | Underwood | Golden |

LOUISIANA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Hébert | Brooks | Larcade |
| Boggs | Passman | Allen |
| Willis | Morrison | |

MAINE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Hale | Nelson | Fellows |

MARYLAND

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Miller | Garmatz | Sasscer |
| Bolton | Fallon | Beall |

MASSACHUSETTS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Heselton | Bates | Kennedy |
| Furcolo | Lane | McCormack |
| Philbin | Goodwin | Wigglesworth |
| Donohue | Nicholson | Martin |
| Rogers | Herter | |

MICHIGAN

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sadowski | Blackney | O'Brien |
| Michener | Wolcott | Rabaut |
| Shafer | Engel | Dingell |
| Hoffman | Potter | Lesinski |
| Ford | Bennett | Dondero |

MINNESOTA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Andresen | McCarthy | Andersen |
| O'Hara | Judd | Blatnik |
| Wier | Marshall | Hagen |

MISSISSIPPI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rankin | Abernethy | Williams |
| Whitten | Winstead | |
| Whittington | Colmer | |

MISSOURI

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Magee | Christopher | Sullivan |
| Moulder | Short | Karst |
| Welch | Carnahan | Karsten |
| Irving | Cannon | |
| Bolling | Jones | |

MONTANA

| | |
|---|---|
| Mansfield | D'Ewart |

NEBRASKA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Curtis | Stefan | Miller |
| O'Sullivan | | |

NEVADA

| |
|---|
| Baring |

NEW HAMPSHIRE

| | |
|---|---|
| Merrow | Cotton |

NEW JERSEY

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Wolverton | Case | Addonizio |
| Hand | Thomas | Kean |
| Auchincloss | Canfield | Norton |
| Howell | Towe | Hart |
| Eaton | Rodino | |

NEW MEXICO

| | |
|---|---|
| Fernandez | Miles |

NEW YORK

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Macy | Celler | LeFevre |
| Hall, Leonard W. | Murphy | Kearney |
| | Coudert | Byrne |
| Latham | Marcantonio | Taylor |
| Clemente | Klein | Kilburn |
| Quinn | Bloom | Davies |
| Delaney | Javits | Riehlman |
| Pfeifer, Joseph L. | Powell | Hall, Edwin Arthur |
| | Lynch | |
| Keogh | Dollinger | Taber |
| Somers | Buckley | Keating |
| Heffernan | McGrath | Wadsworth |
| Rooney | Gwinn | Pfeiffer, William L. |
| O'Toole | Gamble | |
| Multer | St. George | Reed |

NORTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bonner | Chatham | Doughton |
| Kerr | Durham | Jones |
| Barden | Carlyle | Redden |
| Cooley | Deane | |

NORTH DAKOTA

| | |
|---|---|
| Lemke | Burdick |

OHIO

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Elston | Jenkins | McGregor |
| Wagner | Brehm | Hays |
| Breen | Vorys | Kirwan |
| McCulloch | Weichel | Feighan |
| Clevenger | Huber | Crosser |
| Polk | Secrest | Bolton |
| Brown | McSweeney | Young |

OKLAHOMA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Gilmer | Steed | Wickersham |
| Stigler | Monroney | Wilson |
| Albert | Morris | |

OREGON

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Stockman | Angell | Ellsworth |

PENNSYLVANIA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barrett | Fenton | Morgan |
| Granahan | Rhodes | Graham |
| Scott, Hardie | Gillette | Coffey |
| Chudoff | Rich | Kelley |
| Green | McConnell | Kearns |
| Scott, Hugh D., Jr. | Simpson | Davenport |
| James | Kunkel | Corbett |
| Lichtenwalter | Gavin | Fulton |
| Dague | Walter | Eberharter |
| O'Neill | Lind | Buchanan |
| Flood | Van Zandt | |
| | Cavalcante | |

RHODE ISLAND

| | |
|---|---|
| Forand | Fogarty |

SOUTH CAROLINA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Rivers | Hare | Richards |
| Sims | Bryson | McMillan |

SOUTH DAKOTA

| | |
|---|---|
| Lovre | Case |

TENNESSEE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Frazier | Priest | Cooper |
| Gore | Sutton | Davis |
| Evins | Murray | |

TEXAS

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Patman | Thomas | Bentsen |
| Combs | Thompson | Regan |
| Beckworth | Thornberry | Burleson |
| Rayburn | Poage | Worley |
| Wilson | Lucas | Mahon |
| Teague | Gossett | Kilday |
| Pickett | Lyle | Fisher |

UTAH

| | |
|---|---|
| Granger | Bosone |

VERMONT

Plumley

VIRGINIA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bland | Abbitt | Harrison |
| Hardy | Stanley | Smith |
| Gary | Burton | Fugate |

WASHINGTON

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mitchell | Mack | Horan |
| Jackson | Holmes | |

WEST VIRGINIA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ramsay | Bailey | Kee |
| Staggers | Burnside | Hedrick |

WISCONSIN

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Smith | Biemiller | Hull |
| Davis | Keefe | O'Konski |
| Withrow | Murray | |
| Zablocki | Byrnes | |

WYOMING

Barrett

The CLERK. The roll call discloses the presence of 420 Members. A quorum is present.

## STATEMENT REGARDING CERTAIN CREDENTIALS

The CLERK. A certificate of election is on file in the Clerk's office, showing the election of JOHN C. DAVIES as a Representative-elect to the Eighty-first Congress from the Thirty-fifth Congressional District of the State of New York.

Several communications have been received from the executive deputy secretary of state for the State of New York informing the Clerk that a case is pending before the supreme court, Albany County, N. Y., and that the said secretary of state is restrained from certifying the election of a Representative from this congressional district. However, in view of the fact that a certificate of election in due form has been filed with the Clerk by JOHN C. DAVIES, the Clerk has therefore placed his name on the roll.

The Clerk will state that credentials, regular in form, have been filed, showing the election of the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT as Delegate from the Territory of Alaska and the Honorable JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON as Delegate from the Territory of Hawaii.

The Clerk has also received a certification of election signed by the Governor of Puerto Rico, showing the election of the Honorable A. FERNÓS-ISERN, as Resident Commissioner for a term of 4 years beginning January 3, 1949.

Since the regular election of Representatives to the Eighty-first Congress one change has occurred as a result of which one vacancy now exists in the Seventh Congressional District of the State of New York, occasioned by the death of the late Honorable John J. Delaney.

## ELECTION OF SPEAKER

The CLERK. The next business in order is the election of a Speaker of the House. Nominations are now in order.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Clerk.

The CLERK. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. WALTER. As chairman of the Democratic caucus, I am directed by the unanimous vote of the caucus to present for election to the office of Speaker of the House of Representatives for the Eighty-first Congress the name of the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Representative-elect from the State of Texas.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Clerk.

The CLERK. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. EATON. By authority, by direction, and by unanimous vote of the Republican conference representing the minority of this House, I have the honor to nominate for Speaker of the House of Representatives the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts to the Eighty-first Congress.

The CLERK. The Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., a Representative-elect from the State of Massachusetts, have been placed in nomination. Are there further nominations? [After a pause.] There being no further nominations, the Clerk will appoint the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to act as tellers.

The roll will now be called and those responding will indicate by surname the nominee of their choice.

The tellers will please take their places at the desk in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The tellers having taken their places, the House proceeded to vote for Speaker.

The following is the result of the vote:

[Roll No. 2]

RAYBURN—255

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Aspinall | Battle |
| Abernethy | Bailey | Beckworth |
| Addonizio | Barden | Bennett, Fla. |
| Albert | Baring | Bentsen |
| Allen, La. | Barrett, Pa. | Biemiller |
| Andrews | Bates, Ky. | Bland |
| Blatnik | Grant | O'Toole |
| Bloom | Green | Pace |
| Boggs, La. | Gregory | Passman |
| Bolling | Hardy | Patman |
| Bolton, Md. | Hare | Patten |
| Bonner | Harris | Perkins |
| Bosone | Harrison | Peterson |
| Boykin | Hart | Pfeifer, Joseph L. |
| Breen | Havenner | Philbin |
| Brooks | Hays, Ark. | Pickett |
| Brown, Ga. | Hays, Ohio | Poage |
| Bryson | Hébert | Polk |
| Buchanan | Hedrick | Powell |
| Buckley, Ill. | Heffernan | Preston |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Herlong | Price |
| Burleson | Hobbs | Priest |
| Burnside | Holifield | Quinn |
| Burton | Howell | Rabaut |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Huber | Rains |
| Camp | Irving | Ramsay |
| Cannon | Jackson, Wash. | Rankin |
| Carlyle | Jacobs | Redden |
| Carnahan | Jones, Ala. | Regan |
| Carroll | Jones, Mo. | Rhodes |
| Cavalcante | Jones, N. C. | Ribicoff |
| Celler | Karst | Richards |
| Chatham | Karsten | Rivers |
| Chelf | Kee | Rodino |
| Chesney | Kelley | Rogers, Fla. |
| Christopher | Kennedy | Rooney |
| Chudoff | Keogh | Sabath |
| Clemente | Kerr | Sadowski |
| Coffey | Kilday | Sasscer |
| Colmer | King | Secrest |
| Combs | Kirwan | Sheppard |
| Cooley | Klein | Sikes |
| Cooper | Kruse | Sims |
| Cox | Lane | Smathers |
| Crook | Lanham | Smith, Va. |
| Crosser | Larcade | Spence |
| Davenport | Lesinski | Staggers |
| Davies, N. Y. | Lind | Stanley |
| Davis, Ga. | Linehan | Steed |
| Davis, Tenn. | Lucas | Stigler |
| Dawson | Lyle | Sullivan |
| Deane | Lynch | Sutton |
| DeGraffenried | McCarthy | Tackett |
| Delaney | McCormack | Teague |
| Denton | McGrath | Thomas, Tex. |
| Dingell | McGuire | Thompson |
| Dollinger | McKinnon | Thornberry |
| Donohue | McMillan, S. C. | Trimble |
| Doughton | McSweeney | Underwood |
| Douglas | Mack, Ill. | Vinson |
| Doyle | Madden | Wagner |
| Durham | Magee | Walsh |
| Eberharter | Mahon | Walter |
| Elliott | Mansfield | Welch, Mo. |
| Engle, Calif. | Marsalis | Wheeler |
| Evins | Marshall | Whitaker |
| Fallon | Miles | White, Calif. |
| Feighan | Miller, Calif. | White, Idaho |
| Fernandez | Mills | Whitten |
| Fisher | Mitchell | Whittington |
| Flood | Monroney | Wickersham |
| Fogarty | Morgan | Wier |
| Forand | Morris | Williams |
| Frazier | Morrison | Willis |
| Fugate | Moulder | Wilson, Okla. |
| Furcolo | Multer | Wilson, Tex. |
| Garmatz | Murdock | Winstead |
| Gary | Murphy | Wood |
| Gathings | Noland | Woodhouse |
| Gilmer | Norrell | Worley |
| Gordon | Norton | Yates |
| Gore | O'Brien, Ill. | Young |
| Gorski, Ill. | O'Brien, Mich. | Zablocki |
| Gossett | O'Hara, Ill. | |
| Granahan | O'Neill | |
| Granger | O'Sullivan | |

MARTIN—160

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Case, N. J. | Gamble |
| Allen, Ill. | Case, S. Dak. | Gavin |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Chiperfield | Gillette |
| | Church | Golden |
| Anderson, Calif. | Clevenger | Goodwin |
| Andresen, August H. | Cole, Kans. | Graham |
| | Corbett | Gross |
| Angell | Cotton | Gwinn |
| Arends | Coudert | Hagen |
| Auchincloss | Cunningham | Hale |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Curtis | Hall, Edwin Arthur |
| Bates, Mass. | Dague | |
| Beall | Davis, Wis. | Hall, Leonard W. |
| Bennett, Mich. | D'Ewart | |
| Bishop | Dolliver | Halleck |
| Blackney | Dondero | Hand |
| Boggs, Del. | Eaton | Harden |
| Bolton, Ohio | Ellsworth | Harvey |
| Bramblett | Elston | Herter |
| Brehm | Engel, Mich. | Heselton |
| Brown, Ohio | Fellows | Hill |
| Burdick | Fenton | Hinshaw |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Ford | Hoeven |
| Canfield | Fulton | Hoffman, Ill. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Hoffman, Mich. | Mack, Wash. | Scott, |
| Holmes | Macy | Hugh, D., Jr. |
| Hope | Martin, Iowa | Scrivner |
| Horan | Mason | Scudder |
| Hull | Merrow | Shafer |
| Jackson, Calif. | Meyer | Short |
| James | Michener | Simpson, Ill. |
| Javits | Miller, Md. | Simpson, Pa. |
| Jenkins | Miller, Nebr. | Smith, Kans. |
| Jensen | Morton | Smith, Wis. |
| Johnson | Murray, Wis. | Stefan |
| Jonas | Nelson | Stockman |
| Judd | Nicholson | Taber |
| Kean | Nixon | Talle |
| Kearney | O'Hara, Minn. | Taylor |
| Kearns | O'Konski | Thomas, N. J. |
| Keating | Patterson | Towe |
| Keefe | Pfeiffer, | Van Zandt |
| Kilburn | William L. | Velde |
| Kunkel | Phillips, Calif. | Vorys |
| Latham | Plumley | Vursell |
| LeCompte | Potter | Wadsworth |
| LeFevre | Reed, Ill | Weichel |
| Lemke | Reed, N. Y. | Welch, Calif. |
| Lichtenwalter | Rees | Werdel |
| Lodge | Rich | Wigglesworth |
| Lovre | Riehlman | Wilson, Ind. |
| McConnell | Rogers, Mass. | Withrow |
| McCulloch | Sadlak | Wolcott |
| McDonough | St. George | Wolverton |
| McGregor | Sanborn | |
| McMillen, Ill. | Scott, Hardie | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—16

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bulwinkle | Jennings | Somers |
| Burke | Murray, Tenn. | Tauriello |
| Cole, N. Y. | Norblad | Tollefson |
| Crawford | Phillips, Tenn. | Woodruff |
| Gorski, N. Y. | Poulson | |
| Jenison | Smith, Ohio | |

The CLERK. The tellers agree in their tally. The total number of votes cast is 416, of which the Honorable SAM RAYBURN has received 255, and the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., 160; 1 "present." Therefore the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, a Representative-elect from the State of Texas, having received the majority of all the votes cast, is duly elected Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] will please escort the Speaker-elect to the chair.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Ladies and gentlemen of the House, 2 years ago the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and I both were on this platform at the beginning of the session. At that time he paid a most glowing tribute to me. You know, at that time, Sam, I really thought you meant it. I did not think you were giving an "Indian gift" to be recalled within 2 years. Seriously, it is a pleasant duty that I have to perform this morning, if we had to have a Democratic Congress. Any regrets that I might have concerning the Speakership decision are mitigated by your splendid choice. You have elected a Member of the House as Speaker who has served for nearly a third of a century in this great debating Chamber. He is a man of great ability, of rare parliamentary acumen, and skillful in debate. He is devoted to his country and to upholding all the fine traditions of Congress. We are very fortunate that we have selected that type of man as Speaker of the House. He has been my friend for 25 years and that friendship has been highly cherished. It is one of the compensations of service, the true and loyal friends we make here. So it is a pleasant duty that I have today.

I am very happy to present to you a man who is a great Speaker, one who, when he completes this term, will have served longer than any other man as Speaker of the House. To achieve that goal one must have ability, fairness, integrity, and character, and our Speaker has all these sterling attributes. It is a privilege and pleasure for me to present your new Speaker of the House, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, of Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. MARTIN, and my colleagues in the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress, I would be less than human if I were not deeply touched by the tribute that my old friend JOE MARTIN has just paid me. One of the beautiful things about service in this House is that personal relationships and personal friendships are not divided by any center aisle. Some of the nearest and dearest friends I have ever had in the House of Representatives were on the left of the Speaker's stand. I hope it may always be so.

Especially to my Democratic colleagues, who have again conferred upon me this high honor, allow me to say that I and my family shall never cease to hold in grateful memory this gracious thing you have done for me and for them.

I am happy, of course, not only as a party man but personally, that this honor has come to me again, but I might say to you and all of you today that at this time I occupy the place that has been my supreme and only ambition in American politics since I began here many years ago as a very young man. I am charged with a great responsibility. The thrill of being elected to this office the second time does not quite compare with what it was the first time, but I have already expressed to you my gratitude for calling me to this place again. As I said to my colleagues in the Democratic caucus on last Saturday, I feel more that it is a call to duty, to hard work, and I am sure my friend who is retiring from this place will say that some of it approaches drudgery.

I want to work with you. I will be fair. I will try to be helpful to each and every Member of this House with his personal problems, and to all the Democrats with their political problems.

A call has come to us as Members of this House and as the Democratic Party, from the Chief Executive down, a call to duty and a tremendous and crushing responsibility.

We have the most prosperous country upon the face of the earth, more prosperous than this or any other nation ever was, from an economic standpoint as well as from a potential military standpoint. God forbid that our military might should ever be called into action again, but potentially, from a military standpoint, we are the most powerful nation that ever existed in the world. Not even the Caesars in the age in which they lived, when they thought they bestrode the world like colossi, were as powerful as the United States of America is capable of being now.

On matters of great national interest, national defense, the preservation of our liberty and keeping the leadership of the world that has been thrust upon us in recent years, I feel certain there will be little division at the center aisle. On great questions of international affairs on which we are again trying to assert and to keep, and to be of service by having, this world leadership, it has been gratifying to me in the past 2 years, and I feel certain I will be gratified in the next 2 years, that on those great questions of whether we live and remain free, whether there is a world that is fit to live in, we will not divide at the center aisle. I have that faith and confidence in the men and women with whom I shall have the pleasure and honor of working.

On many domestic issues we will divide. You, individually, were not called by the American people to solve such issues. The Democratic Party has been called upon to solve them, and we will miss our mark and fail in our duty if we do not live up to the expectation of the American people.

With as little division as possible, I trust, we could go far toward the accomplishment of these great purposes, doing great things for our own country, that it may remain the freest, the most prosperous, and the most powerful government upon the face of the earth.

Again allow me to thank you and to say that it shall be my unfailing purpose to serve you in this capacity in a fashion that will not be displeasing to you, and that in this position of responsibility I may accept the challenge to higher and better service. Again I thank you.

The Chair will ask the dean of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], to administer the oath of office.

Mr. SABATH then administered the oath of office to Mr. RAYBURN.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. When I first came here, it was the policy in administering the oath of office to Representatives-elect to call the States, and for the Representatives-elect to take the oath of office when their State was called. It was, I believe, during the time when Nicholas Longworth was Speaker that he inaugurated the policy of swearing in all of the Members at one time. Therefore, if the Members will rise, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

The Members and Delegates-elect rose and the Speaker administered to them the oath of office.

MAJORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I have been directed to report to the House that the Democratic caucus has unanimously selected as majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

MINORITY LEADER

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Dr. EATON.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican conference, I am directed by that conference to officially

notify the House that the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., has been selected minority leader.

ELECTION OF CLERK OF THE HOUSE, SERGEANT AT ARMS, DOORKEEPER, POSTMASTER, AND CHAPLAIN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 1), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That Ralph R. Roberts, of the State of Indiana, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That Joseph H. Callahan, of the State of Kentucky, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That W. Mosely Miller, of the State of Mississippi, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Finis E. Scott, of the State of Tennessee, be, and he is hereby, chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives;

That Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., of the District of Columbia, be, and he is hereby, chosen Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute resolution and ask for its consideration, with the exception of the office of Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the election of Dr. James Shera Montgomery as Chaplain of the House of Representatives.

The question was taken, and Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., was elected Chaplain.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the substitute resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That John Andrews, of the State of Massachusetts, be, and he is hereby, chosen Clerk of the House of Representatives;

That William F. Russell, of the State of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, chosen Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives;

That M. L. Meletio, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby, chosen Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives;

That Tom Kennamer, of the State of Missouri, be, and he is hereby chosen Postmaster of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the substitute resolution.

The question was taken, and the substitute resolution was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

The officers-elect presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NOTIFICATION TO SENATE OF ORGANIZATION OF HOUSE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That a message be sent to the Senate to inform that body that a quorum of the House of Representatives has assembled; that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, has been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 3) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That a committee of three Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, the following gentlemen: The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION OF SPEAKER AND CLERK

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 4) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Clerk be instructed to inform the President of the United States that the House of Representatives has elected SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, Speaker, and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADOPTION OF RULES FOR THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 5) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, together with all applicable provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, be, and they are hereby, adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress, with the following amendment included therein as a part thereof, to wit:

"Paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI is hereby amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Committee on Rules may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall adversely report, or fail to report within 21 calendar days after reference, any resolution pending before the committee providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution favorably reported by a committee of the House, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for the chairman of the committee which reported such bill or joint resolution to call up for consideration by the House the resolution which the Committee on Rules has so adversely reported or failed to report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported, or not reported, notwithstanding the adverse report, or the failure to report, of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege. Pending the consideration of said resolution the Speaker may entertain one motion that the House adjourn; but after the result is announced he shall not entertain any other dilatory motion until the said resolution shall have been fully disposed of.'"

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a substitute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has moved the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have a right to be heard.

The SPEAKER. The previous question is not debatable.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary inquiry is, If the previous question should be voted down, then would it be possible to offer other amendments to the rules than the one proposed in the pending motion?

The SPEAKER. It would be.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the previous question is voted down, then my substitute would be in order?

The SPEAKER. An amendment would be in order.

The question is on the motion ordering the previous question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 275, nays 143, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—275

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Bennett, Fla. | Brehm |
| Addonizio | Bennett, Mich. | Brooks |
| Albert | Bentsen | Brown, Ga. |
| Allen, La. | Biemiller | Buchanan |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Bland | Buckley, Ill. |
| | Blatnik | Buckley, N. Y. |
| Angell | Bloom | Burdick |
| Aspinall | Boggs, La. | Burleson |
| Bailey | Bolling | Burnside |
| Barden | Bolton, Md. | Burton |
| Baring | Bonner | Byrne, N. Y. |
| Barrett, Pa. | Bosone | Camp |
| Beckworth | Breen | Canfield |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Cannon | Herlong | O'Sullivan |
| Carlyle | Heselton | O'Toole |
| Carnahan | Holifield | Pace |
| Carroll | Holmes | Passman |
| Case, N. J. | Horan | Patman |
| Cavalcante | Howell | Patten |
| Celler | Huber | Patterson |
| Chatham | Hull | Perkins |
| Chelf | Irving | Peterson |
| Chesney | Jackson, Wash. | Pfeifer, |
| Christopher | Jacobs | Joseph L. |
| Chudoff | Javits | Philbin |
| Clemente | Jones, Ala. | Polk |
| Coffey | Jones, Mo. | Potter |
| Combs | Jones, N. C. | Powell |
| Cooley | Karst | Preston |
| Cooper | Karsten | Price |
| Corbett | Kean | Priest |
| Cotton | Kearney | Quinn |
| Crook | Kee | Rabaut |
| Crosser | Keefe | Rains |
| Davenport | Kelley | Ramsay |
| Davies, N. Y. | Kennedy | Redden |
| Davis, Tenn. | Keogh | Rhodes |
| Dawson | Kerr | Ribicoff |
| Deane | Kilday | Riehlman |
| DeGraffenried | King | Rodino |
| Delaney | Kirwan | Rogers, Fla. |
| Denton | Klein | Rooney |
| Dingell | Kruse | Sabath |
| Dollinger | Lane | Sadlak |
| Donohue | Lanham | Sadowski |
| Doughton | Lemke | Sasscer |
| Douglas | Lesinski | Secrest |
| Doyle | Lind | Sheppard |
| Durham | Linehan | Sikes |
| Eberharter | Lodge | Simpson, Ill. |
| Elliott | Lyle | Sims |
| Ellsworth | Lynch | Smathers |
| Engel, Mich. | McCarthy | Spence |
| Engle, Calif. | McCormack | Staggers |
| Evins | McCulloch | Stanley |
| Fallon | McDonough | Steed |
| Feighan | McGrath | Stigler |
| Fernandez | McGregor | Sullivan |
| Fisher | McGuire | Sutton |
| Flood | McKinnon | Tackett |
| Fogarty | McSweeney | Taylor |
| Forand | Mack, Ill. | Teague |
| Ford | Madden | Thomas, Tex. |
| Frazier | Magee | Thompson |
| Fugate | Mahon | Thornberry |
| Fulton | Mansfield | Towe |
| Furcolo | Marcantonio | Trimble |
| Garmatz | Marsalis | Underwood |
| Gary | Marshall | Van Zandt |
| Gilmer | Merrow | Vinson |
| Golden | Miles | Wagner |
| Gordon | Miller, Calif. | Walsh |
| Gore | Mills | Walter |
| Gorski, Ill. | Mitchell | Welch, Calif. |
| Granahan | Monroney | Welch, Mo. |
| Granger | Morgan | Whitaker |
| Grant | Morris | White, Calif. |
| Green | Morrison | White, Idaho |
| Gross | Morton | Whittington |
| Hagen | Moulder | Wickersham |
| Hall, | Multer | Wier |
| Edwin Arthur | Murdock | Willis |
| Hand | Murphy | Wilson, Okla. |
| Hardy | Murray, Wis. | Wilson, Tex. |
| Harris | Nelson | Withrow |
| Harrison | Noland | Wolcott |
| Hart | Norton | Wolverton |
| Havenner | O'Brien, Ill. | Woodhouse |
| Hays, Ark. | O'Brien, Mich. | Worley |
| Hays, Ohio | O'Hara, Ill. | Yates |
| Hébert | O'Hara, Minn. | Young |
| Hedrick | O'Konski | Zablocki |
| Heffernan | O'Neill | |

NAYS—143

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Case, S. Dak. | Gillette |
| Allen, Calif. | Chiperfield | Goodwin |
| Allen, Ill | Church | Gossett |
| Anderson, Calif. | Clevenger | Graham |
| Andresen, | Cole, Kans. | Gregory |
| August H. | Colmer | Gwinn |
| Andrews | Coudert | Hale |
| Arends | Cox | Hall, |
| Auchincloss | Cunningham | Leonard W. |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Curtis | Halleck |
| Bates, Ky. | Dague | Harden |
| Bates, Mass. | Davis, Ga. | Hare |
| Battle | Davis, Wis. | Harvey |
| Beall | D'Ewart | Herter |
| Bishop | Dolliver | Hill |
| Blackney | Dondero | Hinshaw |
| Boggs, Del. | Eaton | Hobbs |
| Bolton, Ohio | Elston | Hoeven |
| Boykin | Fellows | Hoffman, Ill. |
| Bramblett | Fenton | Hoffman, Mich. |
| Brown, Ohio | Gamble | Hope |
| Bryson | Gathings | Jackson, Calif. |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Gavin | James |
| Jenkins | Miller, Md. | Scrivner |
| Jensen | Miller, Nebr. | Scudder |
| Johnson | Murray, Tenn. | Shafer |
| Jonas | Nicholson | Short |
| Judd | Nixon | Simpson, Pa. |
| Kearns | Norrell | Smith, Kans. |
| Keating | Pfeiffer, | Smith, Va. |
| Kilburn | William L. | Smith, Wis. |
| Kunkel | Phillips, Calif. | Stefan |
| Larcade | Pickett | Stockman |
| Latham | Plumley | Taber |
| LeCompte | Poage | Talle |
| LeFevre | Rankin | Thomas, N. J. |
| Lichtenwalter | Reed, Ill | Velde |
| Lovre | Reed, N. Y. | Vorys |
| Lucas | Rees | Vursell |
| McConnell | Regan | Wadsworth |
| McMillan, S. C. | Rich | Weichel |
| McMillen, Ill. | Richards | Werdel |
| Mack, Wash. | Rivers | Wheeler |
| Macy | Rogers, Mass. | Whitten |
| Martin, Iowa | St. George | Wigglesworth |
| Martin, Mass. | Sanborn | Williams |
| Mason | Scott, Hardie | Wilson, Ind. |
| Meyer | Scott, | Winstead |
| Michener | Hugh D., Jr. | Wood |

NOT VOTING—15

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bulwinkle* | Jenison* | Smith, Ohio* |
| Burke* | Jennings* | Somers |
| Cole, N. Y.* | Norblad* | Tauriello* |
| Crawford* | Phillips, Tenn.* | Tollefson* |
| Gorski, N. Y.* | Poulson* | Woodruff* |

So the previous question was ordered.

Messrs. BENNETT of Florida, BREHM, COTTON, and ANGELL changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Messrs. HARE and BRYSON changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLERK AND ASSISTANT CLERK TO MINORITY LEADER

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 6) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective January 4, 1949, the positions of Clerk and Assistant Clerk to the minority leader of the House, at the basic salary rates of $3,180 and $2,100 per annum, respectively, shall be vacated and in lieu thereof there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, effective January 4, 1949, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic salary rate of $6,000 per annum for the employment of a secretary to the minority leader of the House.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty. The President of the United States requested that the committee state that he would communicate with the Congress in person on Wednesday, January 5, 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m.

*Not sworn.

JOINT SESSION OF THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 5th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m. for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 7) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That until otherwise ordered, the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives shall be at 12 o'clock meridian.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—AUTHORIZATION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 8) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittees thereof be authorized to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-first Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DECLARATION OF RECESS JANUARY 5 AND 6

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, January 5, and Thursday, January 6, 1949, it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Con. Res. 2) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 6th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m., pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The resolution was agreed to.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and remembering the terrific jams we have had upon the floor upon the occasion of appearances by the President of the United States at joint sessions of the Congress, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders the Chair announces that on Wednesday next the doors immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other.

No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

INTRODUCTION AND REFERENCE OF BILLS TODAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to make a statement concerning the introduction and reference of bills today.

As Members are aware, they have the privilege today of introducing bills. Heretofore on the opening day of a new Congress several thousand bills have been introduced. It will be readily apparent to all Members that it may be a physical impossibility for the Speaker to examine each bill for reference today. The Chair will do his best to refer as many bills as possible but he will ask the indulgence of Members if he is unable to refer all of them that may be introduced. Those bills which are not referred and do not appear in the daily RECORD as of today will be included in the next day's RECORD and printed with a date as of today. The Chair feels that he should make this statement at this time so Members may be aware of the difficulties that immediately present themselves.

HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 40, sections 175 and 176, United States Code, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. AUCHINCLOSS] members of the House Office Building Commission to serve with himself.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 1

*Resolved*, That a committee consisting of two Senators be appointed to join such committee as may be appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that a quorum of each House is assembled and that the Congress is ready to receive any communication he may be pleased to make.

Senate Resolution 2

*Resolved*, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that a quorum of the Senate is assembled and that the Senate is ready to proceed to business.

Senate Resolution 8

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be notified of the election of the Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, as President of the Senate pro tempore, and of Leslie L. Biffle, of Arkansas, as Secretary of the Senate.

THE LATE GEORGE CROMWELL SCOTT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce to the House of Representatives the death of a former Member, the Honorable George Cromwell Scott. Mr. Scott passed away at his home in Sioux City, Iowa, on October 6, 1948, at the age of 84 years.

Born on August 8, 1864, in Monroe County, N. Y., he was orphaned at an early age; and when he was 16, moved to Iowa, where he worked on a farm while studying law. Being admitted to the Iowa bar in 1887, the young lawyer began his practice in the city of Le Mars, and in 1901 he transferred his practice to Sioux City, which became his permanent home. He was elected as a Republican to the Sixty-second Congress from the Eleventh Congressional District to fill a vacancy caused by the death of Elbert H. Hubbard, and took his seat on December 12, 1912. He was subsequently reelected to the Sixty-third and Sixty-fifth Congresses, after which time he retired from political life. The Eleventh Congressional District was formerly a part of the present Eighth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Scott maintained a partnership with William Milchrist and Harry W. Pitkin of Sioux City until 1922, when he was nominated by President Harding as judge of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Iowa, in which capacity he served until his retirement. It was on the bench, perhaps, that he won his greatest distinction, his judgment on matters of law commanding wide consideration. With the possible exception of his ruling in a labor case, the case in his court that attracted the greatest national attention was that of Oscar M. Hartzell, promoter of the alleged Drake estate fraud.

Judge Scott was a man of high character. He was a man of sagacity and great ability, a conscientious legislator, and a patriotic American. Through his friendship, I know the high principles which have guided him throughout the years of his splendid service in the interest of his State and his country. I express my deep sorrow at his passing. As a fellow Iowan, I share in the feeling of pride toward his accomplishments. The State of Iowa has lost a truly great citizen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in nine instances and to include two brief newspaper editorials.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain brief excerpts.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Republican Responsibility" by the Honorable LAWRENCE H. SMITH.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, January 17, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by our former colleague, Mr. Bruce Barton, entitled "Are We Biting Off More Than We Can Chew?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Eva Conley.

Mr. BLATNIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. PRICE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include an article in each instance.

Mr. GORDON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a timely article which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and to include a telegram, a resolution, and an editorial.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SOMERS (at the request of Mr. O'TOOLE), on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned to Wednesday, January 5, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clase 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a report for the period from July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948, both inclusive, giving names of statutory and contingent-fund employees of the House and their respective compensations, including clerks to Members; the expenditures from the contingent fund and from certain specific appropriations; to the Committee on House Administration.

2. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting, in compliance with the requirements of rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House of Representatives, a list of reports which it is the duty of any officer or department to make to Congress (H. Doc. No. 32); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to Public Law 313, Eightieth Congress, as amended by Public Law 758, Eightieth Congress, a report setting forth the number of positions established pursuant to this act in the National Military Establishment during that calendar year, and the name, rate of compensation, and description of qualifications of each incumbent together with a statement of the functions performed by each, this report to be made to Congress as of December 31 of each year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the First Report of the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to the National Security Act of 1947; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the operation of the agricultural conservation program for the program year 1947, with a financial report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation's operations for 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations in Hawaii and Puerto Rico under the Hatch, Adams, Purnell, and supplementary acts; the Bankhead-Jones Act of June 29, 1935; and title I, section 9, of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the activities of, funds used by, and donations to the regional research laboratories established pursuant to section 202 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as required by paragraph (e) of the section; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act or 1946 to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from the following departments and independent establishments: Department of the Army, Federal Works Agency, General Accounting Office, Office of the Housing Expediter, Department of the Interior, the Panama Canal, The Tax Court of the United States, and the Tennessee Valley Authority (pursuant to sec. 5 of the act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 763)); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

11. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an itemized report covering transactions during the fiscal year 1948 for account of the Pershing Hall memorial fund (pursuant to the act of Congress approved June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 426, sec. 3)); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

12. A letter from the Director, Gorgas Memorial Laboratory, transmitting the Twenty-first Annual Report of the Work and Operation of the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory (pursuant to Public Law 350, 70th Cong.) (H. Doc. No. 10); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting a statement of all judgments rendered by the Court of Claims for the year ended December 3, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

14. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. A letter from the Chief Justice of the United States, transmitting a report of the proceedings of the regular annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States held in Washington, D. C., September 27, 29, 1948 (pursuant to the provisions of title 28, U. S. Code, sec. 331) (H. Doc. No. 31); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts (H. Doc. No. 30); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

17. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill to amend the second paragraph of section 7 of the Columbia Basin Project Act, an act approved March 10, 1943 (57 Stat. 14); to the Committee on Public Lands.

18. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

19. A letter from the Chairman, National Archives, transmitting the report of the National Archives Trust Fund Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

20. A letter from the Postmaster General, Chairman, Board of Trustees, transmitting the report of operations of the Postal Savings System for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 11); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1. A bill to provide an annuity of $25,000 per annum for former Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2. A bill to provide a residence for the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 3. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 4. A bill relating to the tax treatment of chain stores operated at a loss; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5. A bill relating to certain discriminatory pricing practices affecting commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6. A bill to create a commission to prepare a plan to enable selected students who are training or who desire to train for Government service to actually serve an internship within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 7. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a

prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 8. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 9. A bill to extend the time for filing applications for the payment of World War I adjusted service certificates under the provisions of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 10. A bill to facilitate the deportation of aliens from the United States, to provide for the supervision and detention pending eventual deportation of aliens whose deportation cannot be readily effectuated because of reasons beyond the control of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 11. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 12. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 13. A bill to establish the requirement that political statements concerning certain candidates for public office shall contain information relating to sponsorship and cost of publication or transmission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 14. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for patients in or at veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 15. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 16. A bill to safeguard the admission of evidence in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 17. A bill to provide for trials of and judgments upon the issue of good behavior in the case of certain judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 18. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the northern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 19. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 20. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 21. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 22. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 23. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 24. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public education, accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 25. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 26. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the Original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 27. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 28. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 29. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide parity for tung nuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 30. A bill to impose a duty on tung oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 31. A bill to repeal the war-tax rate on certain admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 32. A bill to provide for the deepening of the channel at Pascagoula Harbor and Horn Island Pass, Miss., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 33. A bill to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 34. A bill to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 35. A bill to amend section 327 of the Communication Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Coast Guard radio stations for the reception and transmission of commercial messages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 36. A bill authorizing the appointment of X-ray technicians as commissioned officers in the Medical Corps of the Army and the Medical Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 37. A bill to provide for the procurement and installation of mechanism for recording and counting votes in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 38. A bill to provide that the rate of interest charged veterans of World Wars I and II on loans secured by their Government life insurance shall not exceed 3 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 39. A bill to grant annual and sick leave to certain temporary rural carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 40. A bill to make permanent the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 41. A bill to restore the status quo as of June 13, 1948, in the matter of coverage under the social-security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 42. A bill to reimpose the excess-profits tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 43. A bill to reduce certain excise tax rates, to equalize Federal income taxes upon married persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 44. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 45. A bill to extend certain benefits under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, to husbands and widowers of insured wives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 46. A bill to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 47. A bill to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States during World War II from induction under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 48. A bill to incorporate United States Navy Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 49. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 50. A bill to extend section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 to cover travel of dependents in anticipation of orders of permanent change of station; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 51. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 52. A bill for the relief of Nevada County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 53. A bill to make the calendar fixed and perpetual; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 54. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 55. A bill to include certain lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 56. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner Irrigation District in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 57. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, so as to permit such federation to extend certain benefits to all its members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 58. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 59. A bill to authorize payment of certain personal-property claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army, or of the Navy

Department or of the Navy, in the case of death, to their survivors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 60. A bill to provide that beneficiaries of national service life insurance maturing prior to August 1, 1946, may elect to receive the proceeds of such insurance in a lump sum; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 61. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 62. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclercsis, and for other purposes:; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 63. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans of World War I and World War II with service-connected disabilities, who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 64. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 65. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the War With Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 66. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 67. A bill to remove certain restrictions on the acquisition and holding, or transportation, of gold coin, bullion, currency, certificates, or securities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 68. A bill to amend section 201 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 69. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 70. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 71. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 72. A bill to promote the American merchant marine by facilitating the effectuation of vessel-replacement programs and by eliminating certain discriminations against unsubsidized American shipowners; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 73. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 74. A bill to prescribe the procedures of committees of the House of Representatives and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 75. A bill to amend section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, so as to permit the transportation of coal to Ogdensburg, N. Y., in foreign vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 76. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 77. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 78. A bill to amend chapter 310 of the laws of the Sixty-ninth Congress, Public Law 713 of March 3, 1927 (44 U. S. Stat. 1356); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 79. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 80. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 81. A bill providing for an additional military academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 82. A bill providing for an additional naval academy in the southern district of the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 83. A bill to outlaw the Communist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 84. A bill making appropriations for and on behalf of the Department of the Air Force for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 85. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Navy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 86. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make such act applicable to the officers and employees of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 87. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 88. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, relating to the classification and compensation of postmasters and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 89. A bill to amend the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 so that the pay increase granted by such act shall apply to officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 90. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 91. A bill to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 92. A bill to extend the gratuitous insurance benefits granted by subsection 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased members of the armed forces without any requirement as to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 93. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 94. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 95. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 96. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 97. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 98. A bill to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents in the case of persons who served in the land or naval forces of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 99. A bill to provide for the assignment after the war of certain patent rights of the United States to the servicemen who made the inventions and discoveries patented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 100. A bill to amend the Declaratory Judgments Act of June 14, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 101. A bill relating to the performance by Federal judges of services for the United States not related to their judicial duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 102. A bill to amend the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 103. A bill to establish a Federal Traffic Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 104. A bill to repeal section 5a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, relating to exemption from the antitrust laws in the case of certain agreements between carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 105. A bill to amend the act of March 19, 1918, so as to provide that standard time shall be the measure of time for all purposes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 106. A bill to provide retirement pay and other benefits to certain disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 107. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 108. A bill to terminate certain wartime excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 109. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated after September 8, 1939, by a member of the armed forces who was separated from service by death before September 1, 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 110. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 111. A bill to provide for certain tax-exempt purchases for hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 112. A bill relating to the eligibility for pensions of certain widows and children of veterans of World War I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 113. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 114. A bill for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 115. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 116. A bill relating to the status of certain natives and inhabitants of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 117. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 118. A bill to amend section 58d of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 119. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal subdivision b of section 64 and subdivision h of section 70 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 120. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 121. A bill to amend title 11 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 122. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 123. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 124. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under such act from taxation; to the committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 125. A bill to authorize the incorporation of the Polish Legion of American Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 126. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley Irrigation Canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 127. A bill to amend Public Law 663, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to protect the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton, in 1949, shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 129. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 130. A bill to provide for compensation to blind persons for loss of earning power due to blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 131. A bill to amend sections 112 and 113 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 132. A bill to provide for certain payments to States and their political subdivisions as compensation for loss of revenues occasioned by the acquisition of real property by the United States for military purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 133. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 134. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 135. A bill to exempt admissions to certain charitable entertainments from the Federal admissions tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 136. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 137. A bill to make the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 available to the children of persons who died in active service or who died as a result of wounds received in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 138. A bill to increase the compensation of new employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 139. A bill to extend the coverage of Federal old-age and survivors insurance to self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 140. A bill relating to the furnishing of transportation and housing facilities for the immediate family of members of the armed forces on duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 141. A bill to provide for Federal participation in the financing of certain aeronautical developments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 142. A bill excepting certain persons from the requirement of paying fees for certain census data; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 143. A bill to amend section 6 (b) of the War Claims Act of 1948 with respect to compensation payable to individuals who, while held by the enemy as prisoners of war, were not furnished food in accordance with the terms of the Geneva Convention; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 144. A bill to amend section 5 of the War Claims Act of 1948, relating to detention benefits payable to civilian American citizens; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 145. A bill to authorize States and their political subdivisions and instrumentalities to elect coverage of the old-age and survivors' insurance benefit provisions of the Social Security Act for their employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 146. A bill relating to the computation of Federal grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 147. A bill granting pensions to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the World War equivalent to pensions granted to veterans, and the widows and dependent children of veterans, of the war with Spain; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 148. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to widows of veterans and to wives of certain totally and permanently disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 149. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Freedom National Historical Park in Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 150. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 151. A bill to provide for assistance by the Federal Government in the repair of damage caused by erosion by waves and currents to the shores of the United States and in the prevention of future damage to such shores; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 152. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Jules Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., and of channel connecting said creek with Nomini Creek; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 153. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities received by State, county, and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 154. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 155. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 156. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 157. A bill authorizing the Attorney General of the United States to recognize and to award to outstanding courageous young Americans a medal for heroism known as the Young American Medal for Bravery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF (by request):

H. R. 158. A bill to provide for the establishment in the city of Munfordville, Hart County, Ky., of a suitable memorial, "Community Center Building," to the late Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, Jr., and others who gave their lives in service to their country in World War II, Munfordville being the birthplace of General Buckner; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 159. A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power

Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 160. A bill to amend section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 161. A bill to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the national weather service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 162. A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 163. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 164. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 165. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 166. A bill to authorize the Postmaster General to provide air-mail service to Kalaupapa, county of Kalawao, T. H.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 167. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 168. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Japanese race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 169. A bill to increase the compensation of the members of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 170. A bill to increase the compensation of the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 171. A bill to amend the act approved December 28, 1945, entitled "An act to expedite the admission to the United States alien spouses and alien minor children of citizen members of the United States armed forces"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 172. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 173. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to prevent the loss of nationality, by reason of continuous residence for 5 years in a foreign state, of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under such act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 174. A bill to increase the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy allowed for Delegates in Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 175. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to reduce the residence qualification in divorce proceedings from 2 years to 1 year; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 176. A bill to amend section 83 of the Hawaiian Organic Act to provide that women may serve on juries in the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 177. A bill for the erection of a public building at Honolulu, T. H., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 178. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with respect to the apportionment of funds to Hawaii and Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 179. A bill to provide for the appointment of the adjutant general of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 180. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 181. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 182. A bill to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 183. A bill to exempt from tax tobacco sold to veterans' organizations for distribution, as gifts, to hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 184. A bill to create an executive department of the Government to be known as the Department of Health, Education, and Security; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 185. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 186. A bill to provide special priorities for former owners of surplus agricultural real property and veterans who intend to live on farms and to engage in farming as their principal occupation, to eliminate the priorities of tenants of former owners with respect to such property, to reduce from 90 to 30 days the priority period within which former owners of surplus real property may exercise their priorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Department.

H. R. 187. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 188. A bill to protect the United States against un-American and subversive totalitarian activities; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H. R. 189. A bill to raise the minimum wage rate; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 190. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 191. A bill to prescribe the procedures of investigating committees of the Congress and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 192. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 193. A bill to change the name of Eastern Avenue in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 194. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Hocking Valley coal region in the State of Ohio for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal and oil shale; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 195. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 196. A bill to exempt from the tax admissions and dues admissions to school entertainments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 197. A bill terminating issuance of immigration visas to natives of certain countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 198. A bill to clarify the definition of controlled housing accommodations in the Housing and Rent Act of 1940; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 199. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 200. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Randolph Field, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 201. A bill to amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 202. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (Public Law 346, 78th Cong.) by extending the benefits of titles II and III; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 203. A bill to guarantee that the civil liberties of labor shall not be adbridged; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 204. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations and on luggage, purses, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 205. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 206. A bill to terminate the war excise tax rate on theater tickets and other types of amusement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 207. A bill to repeal the tax on certain telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 208. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 209. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 210. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 211. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 212. A bill to amend section 3 of the act approved June 20, 1936, entitled "An act to extend the benefits of the Adams Act, the Purnell Act, and the Capper-Ketcham Act to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 213. A bill to provide for the abolition of the 80-rod reserved spaces between claims on shore waters in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 214. A bill to make the workmen's compensation laws of Alaska applicable to land and premises of the United States in such Territory; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 215. A bill to amend section 5 (a) of the Farm Credit Act of August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 703); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 216. A bill transferring the jurisdiction, supervision, administration, and control over the salmon and other fisheries of Alaska, except the fur-seal and sea-otter fisheries, from the Department of the Interior to the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 217. A bill to provide that judges of the district court for the Territory of Alaska shall hereafter be appointed to hold their offices during good behavior; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 218. A bill to forbid the appointment of any person but a resident of the Territory of Alaska to the office of Governor of said Territory; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 219. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 220. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301); to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 221. A bill to amend section 8 of the act of June 17, 1886, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 289), and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 883); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H R. 222. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national cemetery at Juneau, Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 223. A bill to provide that veterans may obtain copies of public records in the Territory of Alaska, without the payment of any fees, for use in presenting claims to the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 224. A bill to authorize a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 225. A bill authorizing the Legislature of Alaska to alter, amend, or repeal certain laws of Alaska imposing taxes for carrying on business and trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 226. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, to increase the penalties specified in such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 227. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Cubitt Creek, Northumberland County, Va., and the channel connecting with the Chesapeake Bay; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 228. A bill to authorize the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prepare estimates and plans for improvement of certain river and harbor projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 229. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of Pope Creek, Westmoreland County, Va., and of channel connecting said creek with Potomac River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 230. A bill to promote effectual utilization of the fishery resources of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 231. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 232. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 233. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on fermented malt liquors, provide for the establishment of brewery bottling house on brewery premises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 234. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 235. A bill to provide for the tenure of office of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 236. A bill to authorize the interservice transfers of officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 237. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 238. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 239. A bill to allow for income-tax purposes a deduction for depreciation and repairs on the residence of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 240. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 241. A bill to increase the salaries of Federal judges and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 242. A bill to provide for the conferring of the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 243. A bill to amend section 3761 of the Internal Revenue Code and section 3469 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 244. A bill to provide for the furnishing of the Congressional Record to members of the Federal judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 245. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 246. A bill to provide study periods for post-office clerks, terminal and transfer clerks; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 247. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b), paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 248. A bill granting leave of absence to postal employees on account of death in family; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 249. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 250. A bill to allow certain periods of service to be credited to certain employees of the postal service for purposes of promotion under the act of July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 251. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Federal district judge for the southern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 252. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 253. A bill to amend the act of June 25, 1938, relating to the appointment of postmasters under civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 254. A bill to amend section 1000 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to imposition of gift tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 255. A bill to amend title 18, Criminal Code, to declare certain papers, pamphlets, books, pictures, and writings nonmailable, to provide a penalty for mailing same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 256. A bill to limit grounds for exclusion from the United States in the case of certain classes of honorably discharged veterans who are aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 257. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. R. 258. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to the self-employed, employees of nonprofit institutions, and, under voluntary agreements, employees of State and local governments, increase the benefits payable under such system, lower the age requirements for female beneficiaries, and liberalize the eligibility provisions of the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 259. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and to reenact the National Labor Relations Act, 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 260. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 261. A bill to authorize the furnishing of especially equipped automobiles to amputees whose injury was incurred while on active service before World War II and who were not discharged until after December 7, 1941; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 262. A bill to permit the naturalization of certain persons whose sons and daughters have served with the land or naval forces or the maritime service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 263. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the County of Orange, Calif., a perpetual easement for the maintenance and operation of a public highway, and to grant to the Irvine Co., a corporation, a perpetual easement for the maintenance, operation, and use of a water-pipe line, in the vicinity of the naval air base, Santa Ana, Orange County, Calif.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 264. A bill to amend Public Law 521, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 626, second session; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 265. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water, or other liquids, elements, or substances in order to promote the general welfare of the Nation and to conserve and increase the national water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 266. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 7, 1924

(43 Stat. 653), as amended, to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 267. A bill to assist the States in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 268. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 269. A bill to make the Federal Bureau of Investigation an independent agency of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 270. A bill to amend chapter 311 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the parole of United States prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 271. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to recreation facilities and activities operated or conducted by the Federal Government, the several State governments, or political subdivisions thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 272. A bill to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 273. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 14 of the United States Code, entitled "Coast Guard"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 274. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 38 of the United States Code, entitled "Pensions and Veterans' Benefits"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 275. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 276. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 277. A bill to exempt certain religious, charitable, scientific, literary, and educational organizations from the requirement of withholding tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 278. A bill granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 279. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 280. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 281. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 282. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to permit the veteran to select his prosthetic appliance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 283. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 284. A bill to amend section 3413 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to tax on lubricating oils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 285. A bill to amend subparagraph (K) of paragraph II, part I, of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to authorize increased compensation for blindness of one eye with 5/200 visual acuity or less; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 286. A bill to amend subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part III of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 287. A bill to provide 4 years of college education, or the equivalent, to the children of persons whose death resulted from service in the armed forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 288. A bill to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 289. A bill to provide for a statutory award of 10 percent to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 290. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 291. A bill to provide veterans' benefits based upon service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 292. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 293. A bill to provide compensation or pension for the widows and children of deceased veterans of World War I or World War II who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 294. A bill to provide for an Administrator's Advisory Group in the Veterans' Administration to insure review by the Administrator of certain decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 295. A bill relating to the eligibility for pensions of certain widows and children of veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 296. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans at the birthplace of Booker T. Washington in Franklin County, Va.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 297. A bill for the admission to citizenship of aliens who came into this country prior to July 1, 1924; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 298. A bill relating to the admission into the United States, as nonquota immigrants, of certain individuals who have served in the Polish Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 299. A bill to provide free postage for gift packages of food and clothing mailed to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 300. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II who are 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 301. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 302. A bill to provide for the issue of a series of United States annuity bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 303. A bill to provide for capital-gain treatment with respect to income received on the redemption of certain United States savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 304. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 305. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 306. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 307. A bill making an additional appropriation to carry out the provisions of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, to provide for the construction of one steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 308. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 309. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 310. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 311. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 312. A bill to authorize the composition of the United States Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 313. A bill to amend title 26, United States Code, so as to make the provisions thereof applicable to service personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 314. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 315. A bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 316. A bill to require statutory authorization for certain ship construction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 317. A bill to amend sections 22 and 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 318. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 319. A bill to amend the act of June 7, 1939, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 320. A bill to provide for disregarding small amounts of compensation for labor performed by persons eligible for old-age assistance in determining need for such assistance until title I of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 321. A bill to promote more economical and efficient use of the Nation's resources by providing for a single supply catalog system for the National Military Establishment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 322. A bill to transfer funds to the town of Craig, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 323. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to amend section 624 of the Public Health Service Act so as to provide a minimum allotment of $100,000 to each State for the construction of hospitals" (Public Law 830, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 324. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of McKanes Bay, a branch of Rappahannock River; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 325. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, by providing for a hearing of claims of employees of the United States before the United States Employees' Compensation Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 326. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Pecks Creek, Richmond County, Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 327. A bill to amend the act approved August 24, 1935, as amended May 23, 1938, entitled "An act to authorize the erection of a suitable memorial to Maj. Gen. George W. Goethals within the Canal Zone"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 328. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 329. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least $2,500,000,000 during each fiscal year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 330. A bill to authorize the use of oleomargarine by the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 331. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 332. A bill to provide a pension for certain physically handicapped veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 333. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 334. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 335. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase the amounts of Federal contributions to the States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 336. A bill repealing certain taxes with respect to oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 337. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark honorary burial places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 338. A bill to exempt from admissions tax general admissions to agricultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 339. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish headstones to mark honorary burial places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 340. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 341. A bill relating to the rights of the several States in lands beneath inland navigable waters and to the recognition of equities in submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 342. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Indonesia, to make them racially elegible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 343. A bill to permit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 344. A bill to amend section 11F of the Immigration Act of 1924; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 345. A bill to provide a national health-insurance and public-health program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 346. A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 347. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, with respect to air transportation by marine transportation and shipping companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 348. A bill to provide increased Federal-aided public housing for families of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 349. A bill to amend the National Housing Act so as to provide increased limits on cost in the case of federally aided low-rent housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 350. A bill to amend chapter 16 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 351. A bill to provide for the appointment of public defenders in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 352. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 353. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 354. A bill to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 355. A bill to increase the guaranty by the Government of real-estate loans to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 356. A bill to amend section 211 of the Criminal Code, as amended (relating to certain nonmailable matter); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 357. A bill to repeal the special tax on retail dealers in oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 358. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law, and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 359. A bill to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 360. A bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act of 1934; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 361. A bill to repeal the act to extend the time within which the powers relating to the stabilization fund and alteration of the weight of the dollar may be exercised; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 362. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirements for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 60 in the case of men, and from 65 to 55 in the case of women; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 363. A bill to extend the benefits of title II of the Social Security Act to employees of certain nonprofit organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 364. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 365. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 366. A bill to aid in the naturalization of persons with wartime service in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 367. A bill to grant naturalization rights to all persons regardless of race, color, or national origin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 368. A bill to amend section 52 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 369. A bill to amend section 51, title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 370. A bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics for attorneys at law practicing before the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 371. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 372. A bill to repeal Public Law No. 252, an act to prevent pernicious political activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 373. A bill to amend certain provisions of the immigration laws which discriminate against women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 374. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States, under a quota for Koreans, persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 375. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 376. A bill for the relief of 29 Latvians who entered the United States on July 22, 1948, at Provincetown, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHER:

H. R. 377. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 378. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 379. A bill to provide increases in compensation for all officers and employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 380. A bill exempting from tax cigarettes sold to certain organizations for distribution, as gifts, to hospitalized veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 381. A bill to exempt admissions to religious, educational, and charitable entertainment and to certain concerts from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 382. A bill to assure to all persons within the District of Columbia full and equal privileges of places of public accommodation, resort, entertainment, and amusement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 383. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 384. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 385. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 386. A bill to incorporate the Moms of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 387. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 388. A bill to permit the mining, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of all public lands withdrawn or reserved for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 389. A bill for the relief of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 390. A bill for the relief of the county of Maui, T. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 391. A bill to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of the island of Guam; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 392. A bill to confer United States citizenship upon certain inhabitants of American Samoa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 393. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 394. A bill to provide for the retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 395. A bill to require the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to execute and deliver to present owners of real property quitclaim deeds to the interest in the minerals in or under such property reserved by the United States pursuant to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act in those cases in which such interest has only a nominal value; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 396. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 397. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 398. A bill to provide for a cash allowance for uniforms for employees of the United States Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 399. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 400. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 401. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the district of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 402. A bill to authorize a program for the construction of county agricultural buildings, through assistance in planning and financing such projects in counties where agriculture is a predominant industry, thereby providing centralized housing and facilities for Federal, State, and local offices engaged in administering agricultural and related programs concerned with the welfare of the farm population; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 403. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at La Canada, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 404. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at La Crescenta, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 405. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Tarzana, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 406. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Sunland, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 407. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Sierra Madre, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 408. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Altadena, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 409. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Roscoe, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 410. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Pacoima, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 411. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Montrose, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 412. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Reseda, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 413. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Encino, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 414. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Sepulveda, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 415. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Verdugo City, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 416. A bill to provide for the improvement of post-office facilities at Van Nuys, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 417. A bill to provide for the alteration, extension, and remodeling of the post-office building in Pasadena, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 418. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Tujunga, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 419. A bill to provide for a new post office at North Hollywood, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 420. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, so as to limit the power of the Securities and Exchange Commission to regulate transactions in exempted securities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 421. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 422. A bill to repeal an act granting certain public lands situated in Mono County in the State of California, to the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 423. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 424. A bill to exclude service performed by certain real-estate salesmen from the definition of "employment" under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 425. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 426. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age for veterans of World War I, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 427. A bill to establish a Columbia Valley Authority to provide for integrated water control and resource development on the Columbia River, its tributaries, and the surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the irrigation and reclamation of lands, the promotion of navigation, the providing of employment, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 428. A bill for the relief of the State of Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 429. A bill to increase the capital stock of the Inland Waterways Corporation and to extend the service of such Corporation to the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 430. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers for veterans in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 431. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 432. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prohibit the unauthorized wearing, manufacture, or sale of medals and badges awarded by the War Department," as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 433. A bill to grant a nonquota status to certain alien veterans and their wives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 434. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the four heroic chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Dorchester;* to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 435. A bill to assist local communities in financing the construction of low-cost houses; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 436. A bill to provide a plan for greater opportunities of employment, for distribution to management and to labor certain amounts of corporate income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 437. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 438. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for the alien parents of American citizens and to expedite admission of certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 439. A bill to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to equalize legal responsibilities of labor organizations and employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 440. A bill to provide for additional tax deductions from the gross income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 441. A bill to amend Public Law 368, Eightieth Congress, first session, approved August 5, 1947, so as to provide for allowances for private interment of repatriated war dead of World War II; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 442. A bill to amend section 23 of the Internal Revenue Code (26 U. S. C., sec. 23), as amended, to provide for deductions from gross income of the fair value of relief parcels sent to persons in foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 443. A bill to provide for the application and enforcement of provisions of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States and article 55 of the Charter of the United Nations and to assure the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 444. A bill to amend the Social Security Act (49 Stat. 620) to extend coverage therein provided, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 445. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real properties owned by the United States of America or its agencies; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 446. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 447. A bill to increase the benefits payable under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system, to liberalize the eligibility provisions of such system, to extend the coverage provisions of such system to agricultural labor, the self-employed, and, under a waiver of exemption, to employees of nonprofit institutions and, under voluntary compacts, to employees of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 448. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for cargo aircraft adaptable for both commercial and military service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 449. A bill to authorize the Attorney General and his assistants and United States attorneys and their assistants to act as notaries public; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 450. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed at Erie, Pa., the Carl Louis Mango Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 451. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for United States marshals and deputy marshals of the courts of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 452. A bill to amend section 3466 of the Revised Statutes to subordinate tax claims of the United States to wage claims in State insolvency proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 453. A bill to provide that a general assignment for benefit of creditors shall not constitute an act of bankruptcy unless connected with some other act of bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 454. A bill to prohibit the registration of trade-marks containing the words "White House"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 455. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 456. A bill to amend section 22, subdivision (b) paragraph (2), of subparagraph (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 457. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new courthouse building for the eastern district of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 458. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator and the Postmaster General to finance the construction or acquisition of post offices, in certain cases, by borrowing from local lending institutions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 459. A bill to authorize the payment of employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry for overtime duty performed at establishments which prepare virus, serum, toxin, or analogous products for use in the treatment of domestic animals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 460. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 the qualifying age for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 461. A bill to make the Smaller War Plants Corporation a peacetime agency of the Government with power to make loans to small-business concerns and to insure loans made to such concerns by banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 462. A bill to amend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of the Social Security Act by liberalizing benefits, by increasing amounts beneficiaries may earn without loss of benefits, and by lowering the age of eligibility of women beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 463. A bill to establish a Merrimack Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Merrimack River and surrounding region in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation and reclamation of the public lands, the promotion of family-type farming, the development of the recreational possibilities, and the promotion of the general welfare of the area, the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 464. A bill to amend the act of June 20, 1936, so as to broaden the application of laws governing the inspection of steam vessels to vessels propelled by internal-combustion engines; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 465. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 466. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide unemployment benefits for individuals who have been employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 467. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 468. A bill to amend the United States Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, so as to increase the maximum and minimum monthly compensation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 469. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 470. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 471. A bill to provide for the establishment of a United States Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 472. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration facility at West Roxbury, Mass., the William P. Connery, Jr., Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 473. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 474. A bill to provide retirement benefits for certain emergency officers of World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 475. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 476. A bill to amend the act of September 7, 1916, providing compensation for injuries to employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 477. A bill to amend the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide mustering-out payments for certain persons discharged or relieved from active service in the armed forces to accept employment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 478. A bill to further amend section 3 of the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 479. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of World War I under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 480. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 481. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 482. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 483. A bill to extend the time limit within which certain suits in admiralty may be brought against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 484. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 485. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at North Andover, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 486. A bill to establish a self-sustaining national pension system that will benefit retired citizens 60 years of age and over; to stabilize the economic structure of the Nation; and to induce a more equitable distribution of wealth through monetary circulation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 487. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration office building in Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 488. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian-employee status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 489. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to facilitate sustained progress in the attainment of such objective and to provide for the coordinated execution of such policy through a National Housing Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 490. A bill to impose a duty of 2 cents per pound on patna rice cleaned for use in the manufacture of canned soups and for other purposes, rice meal, and broken rice; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 491. A bill making an emergency authorization and appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Lake Charles, La., a post office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 492. A bill to amend section 421 of the Internal Revenue Code relating to income taxes of members of the armed forces dying in service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 493. A bill to make section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code applicable with respect to certain corporate liquidations in 1945; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 494. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to provide that the absorption of exchange and collection charges shall not be deemed the payment of interest on deposits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 495. A bill to authorize the acquisition of a site for a national cemetery in southwest Louisiana for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service, of former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in the United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 496. A bill to provide for the erection of a World War II memorial; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 497. A bill to extend the time for filing certain applications for insurance payments under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R 498. A bill to provide free mailing privileges for war-veteran patients in United States veterans' hospitals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 499. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 500. A bill to provide that veterans pursuing educational and training courses in public institutions shall receive the books, supplies, and other equipment they would receive if they pursued similar courses in private institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 501. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 502. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (2) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 503. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II who are 55 years of age or over; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 504. A bill to provide for the reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 505. A bill for the erection of a public building at Lake City, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 506. A bill for the erection of a public building at Loris, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 507. A bill for the erection of a public building at Timmonsville, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 508. A bill to grant service pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 509. A bill for the erection of a public building at Myrtle Beach, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 510. A bill for the erection of a public building at Florence, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 511. A bill for the erection of a public building at Andrews, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 512. A bill for the erection of a public building at Latta, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 513. A bill for the purpose of enlarging the post office at Hartsville, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 514. A bill to check inflation and aid in preserving a competitive economic system by requiring publicity on the pricing policies of certain large corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 515. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 516. A bill to define partnerships and partners for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 517. A bill to repeal certain excise-tax rates on watches and clocks and cases and movements therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 518. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of February 18, 1922, so as to transfer from the Secretary of Agriculture to the Attorney General jurisdiction for determination of undue enhancement of prices by cooperative associations monopolizing or restraining trade and proceedings in connection therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 519. A bill to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 520. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 521. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 522. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement, annuities, and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 523. A bill to exempt from income tax compensation and pensions paid by the United States to its employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 524. A bill to provide for the release of all the right, title, and interest of the United States in a certain portion of a tract of land conditionally granted by it to the county of Los Angeles; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 525. A bill to establish a national housing policy and provide for its execution; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 526. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948, approved July 3, 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 527. A bill to exempt from admissions tax admissions to concerts conducted by civic and community membership associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 528. A bill to authorize a preliminary examination and survey of the East Side Levee and Sanitary District of Madison County and St. Clair County, Ill., for run-off and water-flow retardation and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 529. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 530. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads, and to protect the public by requiring certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 531. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 532. A bill to extend to June 30, 1950, the time within which the unexpended balances of certain appropriations made for the purpose of assisting the States in making advance provision for construction of public works shall be available for such purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 533. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 534. A bill to exempt from admissions tax general admissions to agricultural fairs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 535. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 536. A bill to extend the coverage of the old-age and survivors insurance system, to increase certain benefits payable under such system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 537. A bill to extend capital gains treatment to certain distributions under employees trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 538. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 539. A bill to extend the franking privilege to persons receiving hospital treatment or domiciliary care furnished by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 540. A bill to provide terminal leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 541. A bill to authorize payment of benefits for injuries or death incurred by veterans as a result of training under part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 542. A bill to provide for the uniform administration of efficiency ratings; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 543. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt annuity payments under such act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 544. A bill to provide for terms of court to be held at West Palm Beach, and at Fort Myers, in the southern district of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 545. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 546. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, so as to provide a minimum wage of $1 an hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 547. A bill to amend section 8 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, to provide that the name of a veteran eligible is selected from and certification of eligibles by the Civil Service Commission; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 548. A bill to grant free postage to members of the armed forces who have been inducted into the service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law No. 759, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 549. A bill to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 550. A bill to provide nonquota immigration status for certain adopted children of American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 551. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 552. A bill to provide for the payment of a death gratuity to the dependents of officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army who died between October 5, 1917, and December 18, 1919; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 553. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 554. A bill to provide for the construction, extension, and improvement of school buildings in Hoopa, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 555. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 556. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 with respect to the eligibility for benefits of certain employees on furlough on the date of enactment of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 557. A bill to amend the sporting goods' section of the Internal Revenue Code to exempt children's sleds from the manufacturers' excise tax of 10 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 558. A bill to repeal the excise tax on electric, gas, and oil ranges; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 559. A bill for the relief of the city of Needles, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 560. A bill relating to the extension to transferors and transferees in nontaxable reorganization of unused excess-profits credit carry-overs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 561. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 562. A bill to amend section 801 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, in relation to exports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 563. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide certain exclusions from gross income with respect to the pay of military personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 564. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 565. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 566. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. R. 567. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 568. A bill to provide for payments to the States with respect to certain lands of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 569. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 570. A bill to provide for an Air Force capable of preserving and maintaining peace, the security of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Res. 1. Resolution electing various officers of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 2. Resolution to inform the Senate of the election of SAM RAYBURN as Speaker of the House and Ralph R. Roberts as Clerk.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 3. Resolution appointing a committee of three to notify the President the House is ready for business.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 4. Resolution instructing the Clerk to notify the President of the election of SAM RAYBURN as Speaker and Ralph R. Roberts as Clerk.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 5. Resolution adopting the rules of the Eightieth Congress as the rules of the Eighy-first Congress, with an amendment.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6. Resolution employing a secretary for the minority leader of the House.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Res. 7. Resolution fixing the daily hour of meeting of the House of Representatives.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Res. 8. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Appropriations and its subcommittees to sit during sessions and recesses of the Eighty-first Congress.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. Res. 9. Resolution for a survey of the San Francisco Bay; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. Res. 10. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as a whole or by subcommittee, to investigate the effect of cartels on commerce with foreign nations and among the several States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:
H. Res. 11. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the conduct of investigations and studies by committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARROLL:
H. Res. 12. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the conduct of investigations and studies by committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. Res. 13. Resolution to erect a monument to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:
H. Res. 14. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the conduct of investigations and studies by committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FULTON:
H. Res. 15. Resolution to create a select committee to conduct a continuing study with respect to executive agreements made by the United States with foreign nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:
H. Res. 16. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the conduct of investigations and studies by the committees of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:
H. Res. 17. Resolution to amend rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:
H. Res. 18. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) (s) 1 of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. Res. 19. Resolution to create a Select Committee on the Revision of the Laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANE:
H. Res. 20. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the decree of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland in re James B. Dunn; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MULTER:
H. Res. 21. Resolution to increase personal income-tax exemptions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:
H. Res. 22. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PHILBIN:
H. Res. 23. Resolution for the relief of Beatrice Kelley; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LANE:
H. Res. 24. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House Resolution 20; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution to amend the act to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSSETT:
H. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:
H. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:
H. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution requiring that notice be sent to the Members when the President convenes the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:
H. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor to report periodically on labor conditions in the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation for construction of buildings and facilities in or near the University of Alaska for research in Arctic health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATTLE:
H. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of Dr. William Crawford Gorgas, of Alabama, who achieved national distinction in the field of preventive medicine by conquering yellow fever, thus making possible the building of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:
H. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to redefine treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:
H. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:
H. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to fix the number of Justices of the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:
H. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution extending to January 1, 1950, certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON:
H. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution providing for membership by the United States in the International Trade Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GORDON:
H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:
H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:
H. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HUBER:
H. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the abolition of capital punishment in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution creating a Joint Committee on Civil Rights; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:
H. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Committee on National and International Movements; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JENKINS:
H. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of a part of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray the story of aviation; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HINSHAW:
H. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to establish a joint congressional committee on aviation policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:
H. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:
H. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution to create a Temporary Labor Relations Commission to make a study and recommendations concerning labor relations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. J. Res. 25. Joint resolution authorizing the creation of a Federal Memorial Commission to consider and formulate plans for the construction in the city of Washington, D. C., of a permanent memorial to the memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. REED of New York:
H. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:
H. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to removal of judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of foreign-born citizens of the United States to the office of President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to suspend the operation of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:
H. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to grant free postage to members of the armed forces, while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital, and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:
H. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office of Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:
H. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain Indian lands by the United States from the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1949, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of

Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to treaty ratification; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to authorize a sum, not to exceed $80,000,000, to provide adequate protection from flooding of the Minnesota River in the Minnesota River Valley; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as "Interfaith Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. J. Res. 41. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to a quorum in either House of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution granting additional allowance for military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the thirtieth anniversary of the founding of the American Legion in April 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim October 11, 1949, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1949, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the selection of the successors of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress who become unable to perform their duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution proposing an amendment the the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President and the Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution proposing an equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committion on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution relating to emergency crop, seed, and feed loans and to regional agricultural credit corporation loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. J. Res. 56. Joint resolution to designate payments to disabled veterans as partial repayment of debt owed, and not as gratuities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. J. Res. 58. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate December 7 for annual observance as Gold Star Mothers' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution to provide for the American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 5, 1949.

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 6, 1949, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States.

H. Con. Res. 3. Concurrent resolution relative to reform in procedure before congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 4. Concurrent resolution to establish fair hearing procedures for congressional investigating committees; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 5. Concurrent resolution recommending the revision of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the national interest demands that immediate and effective aid should be given the Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution providing for a 70-group Air Force and insuring air supremacy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 8. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by the action of the Government of Hungary in arresting and imprisoning Josef Cardinal Mindszenty should be referred to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. Con. Res. 9. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by the action of the Government of Yugoslavia in imprisoning Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac should be referred to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 571. A bill for the relief of Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 572. A bill for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 573. A bill for the relief of Harry G. Cole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 574. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles Stover; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 576. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 577. A bill to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 578. A bill for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 579. A bill to permit the motor vessel *FLB–5005* to engage in the fisheries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 580. A bill for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 581. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 582. A bill for the relief of John Picco, of Kimshan Cove, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 583. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 584. A bill for the relief of Mike Clipper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 585. A bill for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 586. A bill for the relief of Mildred K. Maynard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 587. A bill for the relief of Dick Walcok and Alfred L. Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 588. A bill for the relief of Col. David R. Wolverton, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 589. A bill for the relief of C. M. Smart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 590. A bill for the relief of William A. Hallett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 591. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 592. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 593. A bill for the relief of Hampton Institute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 594. A bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 595. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 596. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 597. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of J. T. Melson against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 598. A bill to provide for the readmission to citizenship of Mrs. Ruth Obre Dubonnet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 599. A bill for the relief of Victor R. Browning & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 600. A bill for the relief of Dorothy J. Souther; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 601. A bill for the relief of Kenelm E. Rucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 602. A bill for the relief of Fritz Busche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 603. A bill for the relief of Jeptha R. MacFarlane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 604. A bill for the relief of Vartan Chamsarian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 605. A bill for the relief of the estate of James B. Stirling, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 606. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 607. A bill for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 608. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Devine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 609. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 610. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 611. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 612. A bill for the relief of Col. W. M. Chubb; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 613. A bill for the relief of the alien Gheorge Ion Dimian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 614. A bill for the relief of Nicholas G. Niedermiller, Peter A. Beklemishev, and Nicholas M. Tikmenev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 615. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 616. A bill for the relief of W. T. Martin Luckett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 617. A bill for the relief of Mid-South Airways Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 618. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 619. A bill for the relief of Alice Randolph; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 620. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mary B. Buckley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 621. A bill for the relief of A. T. Steele and J. C. Corbitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 622. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 623. A bill for the relief of Sadako Takagi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 624. A bill to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of alien Man Hee Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 625. A bill for the relief of Edmondo Deli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 626. A bill for the relief of Pasquale Deli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 627. A bill for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 628. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Emmerling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 629. A bill for the relief of O'Connell & Sweeney, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 630. A bill for the relief of Wright H. Huntley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 631. A bill for relief of Mrs. Dorothy Vicencio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 632. A bill for the relief of John E. Burns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 633. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Victor V. Greg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 634. A bill for the relief of George J. Hiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 635. A bill for the relief of Stephen L. Carmalt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 636. A bill for the relief of B. G. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 638. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. John W. Baker, Medical Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 639. A bill for the relief of certain employees of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 640. A bill for the relief of Bianca Marie Bertolotti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 641. A bill for the relief of George Kedzierski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 642. A bill for the relief of Frank D. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 643. A bill for the relief of the aliens Harry Owen White and his sister-in-law, Cecilia M. B. de Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 644. A bill for the relief of Marino Bello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 645. A bill for the relief of Arundale Vrabec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 646. A bill to provide for the admission to citizenship of Arundale Vrabec; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 647. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Renzie Graham; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 648. A bill for the relief of Bertha Ebersbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 649. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice N. Kozma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 650. A bill for the relief of George A. Kirchberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 651. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Paul E. Queneau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 652. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 653. A bill for the relief of Antonio Valenti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 654. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Hawaiian Airlines, Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 655. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria V. Yosco and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 656. A bill for the relief of the Peerless Oil Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 657. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 658. A bill for the relief of Paul Rintrona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 659. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 660. A bill for the relief of Julia Busch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 661. A bill for the relief of Thomas A. Trulove, postmaster, and Nolen J. Salyards, assistant postmaster, at Inglewood, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 662. A bill for the relief of Ella Spielman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 663. A bill for the relief of George Geiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 664. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alfonsina M. Corradini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 665. A bill for the relief of Marie and Max Cassvan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 666. A bill for the relief of Antonio Sorotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 667. A bill for the relief of Benedict Kleitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 668. A bill for the relief of Alex Bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 670. A bill for the relief of Ricardo Garcia y Garcia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 671. A bill for the relief of Leonid Zankowsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 672. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 673. A bill for the relief of Alberta Manna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 674. A bill for the relief of Aron Rosendor, Sara Rosendor, Batia Rosendor, Sammy Rosendor, and Suzanne Rosendor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 675. A bill for the relief of Nandor Frieder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 676. A bill for the relief of Beno Demenyi and Margit Demenyi, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 677. A bill for the relief of Nicoletta and Guilia Pontrelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 678. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Locicero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 679. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 680. A bill to provide for the adjudication of certain tort claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 681. A bill for the relief of Mario Generazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 682. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harry E. Hewitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 684. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 685. A bill for the relief of Vincent or Vincenzo Tripoli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 686. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to William A. Sullivan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 687. A bill for the relief of Bartolo Rando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 688. A bill for the relief of John P. Reilly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 689. A bill for the relief of Nicholas Mortatos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 690. A bill for the relief of William W. Maddox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 691. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Fontenot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 692. A bill for the relief of Joseph Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 693. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to award a special Congressional Medal of Honor to Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 694. A bill for the relief of George H. Allen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 695. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary A. Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 696. A bill to provide for the extension of Patent No. 1,808,654, issued June 2, 1931, relating to poison or powder distributing machines; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 698. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak, Ekaterina Tirbak, and Igor Tirbak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 699. A bill for the relief of Zikmund Teba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 700. A bill for the relief of Egon Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 701. A bill for the relief of Dolan Calcutt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 702. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel N. Plunkett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 703. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Oteein Foxworth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 704. A bill for the relief of Mary Alice Keels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 705. A bill for the relief of Thomas W. Williamson, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 706. A bill to provide for the retirement with pay of Lt. Comdr. Harold Kaminski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 707. A bill for the relief of H. C. Biering; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 708. A bill for the relief of Rustom Bana, Adi Russie Bana, Nasli Russi Bana, and Narie Russi Bana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 709. A bill for the relief of the General Engineering & Dry Dock Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 710. A bill for the relief of C. T. Maddrix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 712. A bill for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son; W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; Royse R. Spring; and C. S. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 713. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of W. C. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 714. A bill for the relief of Pieter Cornelis ten Wolde and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 715. A bill for the relief of Manuel Uribe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 716. A bill for the relief of Mark H. Potter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 717. A bill for the relief of Groover O'Connell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 718. A bill for the relief of Gertrude O. Yerxa, Mrs. G. Olive Yerxa, and Dr. Charles W. Yerxa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 719. A bill for the relief of Urho Paavo Patokoski, his wife, and their three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 720. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Ioanou Golias, also known as James John Golias, also known as Demetrios Joana Golias, also known as Demetrios John Golias, also known as Demetrios Golias, also known as Lampros Lampropoulos or Lambros Lampropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 721. A bill for the relief of Mihran Moses Koeroghlian, also known as M. M. Koeroghlian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 722. A bill for the relief of Nagibe Chalhoub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 723. A bill for the relief of Clarence King; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 724. A bill for the relief of Tanios Elias Rahme; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 725. A bill for the relief of Mike A. Tsataronis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 726. A bill for the relief of Simon Broder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 727. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to posthumously award the Congressional Medal of Honor to Marc C. Dauber; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 728. A bill for the relief of Oliver F. LaTour and Marie L. LaTour; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 729. A bill for the relief of John J. O'Neil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 730. A bill for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 731. A bill for the relief of James Flynn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 732. A bill for the relief of Joaquin Faustino Justaniano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 733. A bill for the relief of Frank Haegele; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 734. A bill for the relief of Curtis R. Enos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 735. A bill for the relief of Phil H. Hubbard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 736. A bill authorizing the appointment and retirement of John Tomlingson as a second lieutenant, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 737. A bill for the relief of Sam Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 738. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 739. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 740. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Martha W. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 741. A bill for the relief of Frank Healy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 742. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleanor K. Savidge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret D. Surhan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 744. A bill for the relief of William Park Catchpole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of B. John Hanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 746. A bill for the relief of August Michela, infant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 747. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Vallone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 748. A bill for the relief of Louis Esposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 749. A bill for the relief of Morris Giannace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 750. A bill for the relief of Lee F. Bertuccioli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 751. A bill for the relief of Stanley John Rybczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 752. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Edward Gray, Sr.; Edward Gray, Jr.; Bertha Mae Gray; Bertha Patmon; and Lindsay Gardner, all of the city of Hamtramck, Wayne County, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 753. A bill for the relief of Alexander Polychroniu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 754. A bill for the relief of Michael Pirog; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 755. A bill for the relief of George Elly Vasu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 756. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo or James Bologna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 757. A bill for the relief of Orlando Portale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 758. A bill for the relief of Georgios Ecaterinis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDIE SCOTT:

H. R. 759. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cardella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 760. A bill for the relief of A. I. Lang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 761. A bill for the relief of Catherine S. Tremayne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 762. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fransiska V. C. Bugel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 763. A bill for the relief of Angela Siradakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 764. A bill for the relief of Elderina Janna Pols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 765. A bill for the relief of the California-Pacific Utilities Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 766. A bill for the relief of John F. Galvin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 767. A bill for the relief of Eugene Spitzer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 768. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Tsan Paing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 769. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Emanuel Frangescos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 770. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Mon Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 771. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Paul Hettasch; his wife, Ellen Marie Hettasch; and their daughter, Katie Ellen Margarete Hettasch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 772. A bill for the relief of Michele Francesco Fasolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Engelbert Axer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 774. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 92187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 775. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 54296 relating to the badge of the American Legion, by extending Public Law 230, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 2, 1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 776. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 55398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary, extending Public Law 231, Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# SENATE

## WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, give us the long view of our work and our world.

Help us to see that it is better to fail in a cause that will ultimately succeed than to succeed in a cause that will ultimately fail.

Guide us how to work and then teach us how to wait. O Lord, we pray in the name of Jesus, who was never in a hurry. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 3, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that a quorum of the House of Representatives had assembled, that SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas, had been elected Speaker; and Ralph R. Roberts, a citizen of the State of Indiana, had been elected Clerk of the House of Representatives of the Eighty-first Congress.

The message also informed the Senate that a committee of three Members had been appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House had assembled, and that Congress was ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The message announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 5th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them; and

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 6, 1949, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HAYDEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Capehart | Flanders |
| Anderson | Chapman | Frear |
| Baldwin | Connally | Fulbright |
| Barkley | Cordon | George |
| Brewster | Donnell | Gillette |
| Bricker | Douglas | Green |
| Bridges | Downey | Gurney |
| Broughton | Eastland | Hayden |
| Butler | Ecton | Hendrickson |
| Byrd | Ellender | Hickenlooper |
| Cain | Ferguson | Hill |
| Hoey | McClellan | Saltonstall |
| Holland | McFarland | Schoeppel |
| Humphrey | McGrath | Smith, Maine |
| Hunt | McKellar | Smith, N. J. |
| Ives | McMahon | Sparkman |
| Jenner | Malone | Stennis |
| Johnson, Colo. | Martin | Taft |
| Johnson, Tex. | Maybank | Taylor |
| Johnston, S. C. | Miller | Thomas, Okla. |
| Kefauver | Millikin | Thomas, Utah |
| Kem | Morse | Thye |
| Kerr | Mundt | Tobey |
| Kilgore | Murray | Tydings |
| Knowland | Myers | Vandenberg |
| Langer | Neely | Watkins |
| Lodge | O'Mahoney | Wherry |
| Long | Pepper | Wiley |
| Lucas | Reed | Williams |
| McCarran | Robertson | Young |
| McCarthy | Russell | |

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret to announce the death of the mother of our colleague, the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. The Senator from Maryland is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are also necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

### NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHERRY advanced to the center of the aisle, and Mr. BARKLEY said:

Mr. President, the committee on the part of the Senate appointed by the President pro tempore to act in conjunction with a similar committee on the part of the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the Congress has assembled and is ready to receive any communication he might be pleased to make to it, report that they have performed that duty and the President has indicated that he will address the two Houses of Congress in person today at 1 o'clock p. m.

### JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 1) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Wednesday, the 5th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I wish to announce that immediately upon the conclusion of the delivery of the President's message today the Senate will reassemble in order to give Senators an opportunity to introduce bills and resolutions as in the ordinary morning hour of business.

### THE COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution coming over from the

House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 2) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the two Houses of Congress shall meet in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, the 6th day of January 1949, at 1 o'clock p. m., pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States, and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be their presiding officer; that two tellers shall be previously appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate on the part of the Senate and two by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives, to whom shall be handed, as they are opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate, all certificates and papers purporting to be certificates of the electoral votes, which certificates and papers shall be opened, presented, and acted upon in the alphabetical order of the States, beginning with the letter A; and said tellers, having then read the same in the presence and hearing of the two Houses, shall make a list of the votes as they shall appear from the said certificates; and the votes having been ascertained and counted in the manner and according to the rules by law provided, the result of the same shall be delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, who shall thereupon announce the state of the vote, which announcement shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons, if any, elected President and Vice President of the United States, and, together with a list of the votes, be entered on the Journals of the two Houses.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under authority of House Concurrent Resolution 2, the Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] as the tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President at the joint session of the two Houses on tomorrow.

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-sixth report of operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

The attached "Report on Lend-Lease Fiscal Operations" was prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order No. 9726. The period covered is from March 11, 1941, through September 30, 1947.

Activities to complete fulfillment of the various "pipe line" agreements have continued since the issuance of the twenty-fifth report.

A final settlement agreement was signed with Norway on February 24, 1948. In March Haiti paid the balance due on its account. An arrangement was concluded with Brazil on April 15, 1948, fixing the terms of payment of the amount due under the original master agreement with Brazil.

As stated in chapter 4 of the Twenty-Third Lend-Lease Report, one of the important remaining lend-lease functions is the collection of payments due under various international agreements. Some of these agreements involve matters other than lend-lease, such as surplus property and claims. Recent payments arising out of agreements covering lend-lease, and in some cases other matters as well, are shown in the following list:

Brazil: $5,000,000 principal paid on July 15, 1948; installment on its remaining lend-lease obligations.

France: $13,000,000 interest paid in francs on July 1, 1948, under Settlement Agreement dated May 28, 1946.

Iran: $711,753.40 paid on April 29 and $711,753.40 on July 15, 1948, principal under Settlement Agreement dated December 21, 1945.

Netherlands: $960,000 interest paid in dollars on June 30, 1948, under Settlement Agreement dated May 28, 1947.

United Kingdom: $76,617.50 paid on March 31, $262,112.50 on April 30, $403,250 on May 28, and $403,250 on June 15, 1948 (paid in pounds), principal under Settlement Agreement dated December 6, 1945.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 15, 1948.*

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the first report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

This report is for the period April 3 to June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

SUPPLEMENT TO FIRST REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying supplement, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the Supplement to the First Report to Congress of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 21, 1948.*

REPORT ON ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Transmitted herewith in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 75 (80th Cong., 1st sess., 61 Stat. 103) is the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities in conjunction with the program for aid to Greece and Turkey.

This legislation was enacted at a critical juncture in the history of the struggle for peace, involving the right of small nations to self-determination of their future. The conspicuous success of this program in enabling the people of Greece to meet the military and economic crisis which confronted them, and in supporting the Turkish determination to remain independent in the face of external pressure, has contributed significantly toward stabilizing this strategic area of the world in the interest of world peace.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 4, 1948.*

REPORT ON MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Transmitted herewith is the fifth quarterly report—covering the first quarter of the fiscal year 1949—on United States military assistance to Greece and Turkey. Military aid to Greece and Turkey was inaugurated under the authority of Public Law 75, Eightieth Congress, and was continued under the authority of title III of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, known as the Greek-Turkish Assistance Act of 1948. Responsibility for United States assistance in the economic rehabilitation of Greece begun under Public Law 75 was, pursuant to Public Law 472, title I, transferred effective July 1, 1948, to the Economic Cooperation Administration, and results are reported to the Congress under that title.

The encouraging prospect for substantial elimination of the Greek guerrilla forces which existed at the time of the victory of the Greek National Army in the Grammos Mountains and which was referred to in the report for the period ending June 30, 1948, has unfortunately not materialized. A military stalemate has ensued which has prolonged the struggle. The United States is, of course, through the American Mission for Aid to Greece, continuing to deliver to the Greeks necessary military supplies and equipment and to advise and assist the Greek armed forces, in accordance with the assistance act.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 6, 1948.*

REPORTS ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN RELIEF PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following messages

from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying reports, were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947, to provide relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war. This report covers the quarter ending March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 1, 1948.*

---

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the fourth quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States foreign-relief program, authorized by Public Law 84 of the Eightieth Congress, approved May 31, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1, 1948, through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 4, 1948.*

REPORT ON UNITED STATES FOREIGN-AID PROGRAM

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the third quarterly report of expenditures and activities under the United States Foreign Aid Program authorized by Public Law 389 of the Eightieth Congress, approved December 17, 1947.

This report covers the period from April 1 through June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 8, 1948.*

REPORTS ON EXPENDITURES AND OPERATIONS UNDER THE UNITED NATIONS RELIEF AND REHABILITATION ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following messages from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying reports, were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the thirteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from July 1, 1947, through September 30, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of UNRRA's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited primarily to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of September 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the fourteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from October 1, 1947, through December 31, 1947.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of December 31, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

---

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the fifteenth quarterly report of expenditures and operations under the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Joint Resolution, Public Law 267, Seventy-eighth Congress, approved March 28, 1944. This report covers the period from January 1, 1948, through March 31, 1948.

As a consequence of the substantial closure of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration's activities on June 30, 1947, the present report is limited to a statement of the status of United States appropriations as of March 31, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 13, 1948.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the operations of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Two letters from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, United States and Mexico, for the months of July and August, 1948 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Two letters from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, United States and Mexico, for the months of June and September, 1948 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF FARM CREDT ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Farm Credit Administration covering its operations for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION (S. DOC. NO. 2)

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, president, National Forest Reservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

REPORT ON CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, for the month of October 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the receipts, expenditures, and work of the agricultural experiment stations, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON REGIONAL RESEARCH LABORATORIES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of, funds used by, and donations to, the regional research laboratories (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operation of the agricultural conservation program, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, his first annual report, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AND INDUSTRIAL MOBILIZATION BY THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing the contracts for research and development and industrial mobilization awarded by the Departments of the National Military Establishment, for the period May 19 through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON POSITIONS ESTABLISHED IN NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of positions established in the National Military Establishment, the name, rate of compensation, and description of qualifications of each incumbent, together with a statement of the functions performed by each, for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED GOVERNMENT AND OTHER PERSONNEL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on transportation furnished certain Government and other personnel, for the period July 1, 1947, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON REAL AND PERSONAL PROPERTY LEASED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of real and personal property leased by the Department of the Navy, for the period ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, information as to rank and age of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander in the Navy and major in the Marine Corps on duty involving flying, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6 months ended December 24, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF STEEL PONTOON BARGE TO JUNIOR MIDSHIPMEN OF AMERICA, NEW LONDON, CONN.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Junior Midshipmen of America, Inc., New London, Conn., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a steel pontoon barge for use by that organization in training boys and in the maintenance of equipment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON TRANSPORTATION FURNISHED TO CERTAIN NAVAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on adequate transportation to and from their places of employment for personnel attached to or employed by naval establishments and Navy contractors, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CREDITS AND DISBURSEMENTS, HELIUM-PRODUCTION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on moneys credited and disbursements made from the helium-production fund, Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report covering the contracts negotiated by that Committee, for the period May 19, 1948, through June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 1)

A letter from the clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on judgments rendered by that Court, for the year ended December 3, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS ON EXPORT CONTROL AND ALLOCATION POWERS

Two letters from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth and fifth quarterly reports on export control and allocation powers under the Second Decontrol Act of 1947 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VOLUNTARY PLAN COVERING ALLOCATION OF PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of petroleum products (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VOLUNTARY PLANS COVERING ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for factory-made steel houses, and copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for tank and oil field production equipment, together with copies of requests of compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency).

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section (2) (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for requirements of the Armed Forces, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products to the anthracite industry, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for construction, conversion, and repair of domestic freight-carrying barges and towing vessels, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for the construction, reconversion, and repair of merchant vessels, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for oil tankers, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter from the Acting Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), copies of the voluntary plan covering the allocation of steel products for the requirements of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, together with copies of requests for compliance therewith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of that Agency for the calendar year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the operations of that bank as of the close of business June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the year 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF COMMISSION ON LICENSURE HEALING ARTS PRACTICE ACT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the activities of the Commission on Licensure Healing Arts Practice Act, District of Columbia, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

A letter from the Chairman of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations and expenditures of that Agency since its inception in the spring of 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the year ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS ON PROPERTY EXEMPT FROM TAXATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of institutions or organizations whose properties were specifically exempted by special acts of Congress prior to the passage of the act of December 24, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to section 3 of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, copies of reports of every institution, organization, corporation, or association other than the United States Government, the Government of the District of Columbia, and foreign governments, owning property exempt from taxation under the provisions of said act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS COMPANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Virgin Islands Company, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORTS BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and Affiliated Companies, Metals Reserve Company, volume 6, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Defense Homes Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Inter-American Affairs Corporations, fiscal years ended June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1946, together with an audit report of the Inter-American Naviga-

tion Corporation, through February 25, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of Government Services, Inc., for the year ended December 31, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Tennessee Valley Authority, for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1946 and 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

PROGRESS REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly progress report of that Administration for the period July–September 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the financial statement of the American Legion up to and including October 31, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS TO HELENA (MONT.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON DISPOSAL OF SURPLUS PROPERTY IN FOREIGN AREAS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PAYMENT OF WAR DAMAGES TO SWITZERLAND

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONVENTION ON PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES OF UNITED NATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the Convention on Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, approved by a resolution of the General Assembly, adopted February 13, 1946 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

A letter from the director, Washington Office, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third semiannual report of that Commission for the period ended December 31, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the benefits of the Vocational Educational Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF COLUMBIA BASIN PROJECT ACT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to State lands (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF SNOWFLAKE PROJECT, ARIZONA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on a plan for the development of the Snowflake project, Arizona, together with related data (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF CHINO VALLEY PROJECT, ARIZONA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on a plan for the development of the Chino Valley project, Arizona, together with related data (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON CONDITIONS IN UNDERGROUND BITUMINOUS-COAL AND LIGNITE MINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report covering conditions in the underground bituminous-coal and lignite mines inspected by Federal coal-mine and inspectors for the year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON BUREAU OF MINES ANTHRACITE RESEARCH LABORATORY, SCHUYLKILL HAVEN, PA.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donations to, the Bureau of Mines Anthracite Research Laboratory, Schuylkill Haven, Pa.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLAN FOR DEVELOPMENT OF CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Central Arizona project (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACT OF MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an act of the municipal council of St. Croix, V. I. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACT BY MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy on an act enacted by the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with an accompanying pamphlet); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

LAWS OF LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the legislative assembly, the municipal council of St. Thomas and St. John, and the municipal council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ACTS OF LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of acts of the seventh special session of the sixteenth legislature of Puerto Rico, July 12 to 25, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOURNAL OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF LEGISLATURE OF HAWAII

A letter from the Governor of Hawaii, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the journal of the house of representatives of the legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1947 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, as chairman of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all tort claims paid by the Department of the Interior under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the fiscal year 1948, and up to and including October 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON LICENSED HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS AND PERSONNEL OF FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and information on licensed hydroelectric projects and on personnel of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION ON ALASKA OCEAN TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the fourth quarterly report outlining the activities of that Commission relating to ocean transportation to, from, and within Alaska (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities and transactions of the Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period July 1, 1948, through September 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY THE PANAMA CANAL

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Panama Canal under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY PANAMA RAILROAD COMPANY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Panama Railroad Company under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the period July 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of the Army under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by the Department of Commerce under the Federal Tort Claims Act, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventeenth report of the Treasury Department on war contract terminations and settlements, for the period July 1 through September 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report showing the names of all persons against whom claims in excess of $1,000 have been settled, the addresses of such persons, the nature of the claims, the amounts of the settlements, and the reasons therefor, in accordance with section 41 (g) 4, of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 35 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES ON CRIMINAL PROCEDURE FOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure for the United States District Courts (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, withdrawing the name of Victor Gama-Bermudez from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on April 15, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAME

A letter from the Attorney General, withdrawing the name of Costos Kolitses from a report relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, transmitted by him to the Senate on March 1, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of amendments to rules of civil procedure for the United States district courts, dated December 29, 1948 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON CLAIM SETTLED BY UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, that as of September 30, 1948, that Commission had settled the claim of the Corpus Christi Shipbuilding Corp. at Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the proceedings of the regular annual meeting of the Judicial Conference of the United States, September 27–29, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF TORT CLAIMS PAID BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the tort claims paid by that Administration during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SERVICEMEN'S READJUSTMENT ACT OF 1944

A letter from the Executive Assistant Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain institutions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PENALTY MAIL MATTER

A letter from the Postmaster General, reporting, pursuant to section 2 (b) of Public Law 364, approved June 28, 1944, the quantity of penalty inscribed material on hand and on order on June 30, 1947, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, balance on hand June 30, 1947, and estimated cost of handling for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON WITHIN-GRADE SALARY ADVANCEMENTS TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and supporting data covering additional within-grade salary advancements as rewards for superior accomplishment made by the several Government departments and agencies, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Two letters from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports of his determinations during the quarter ended June 30, 1948, and the quarter ended September 30, 1948, of the number of employees required for the proper and efficient exercise of the functions of the executive departments and agencies of the Government (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ARCHIVES TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Archives Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF RENTAL COLLECTIONS FROM CERTAIN UNDEVELOPED BUILDING SITES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of rental collections from undeveloped building sites under control of the Federal Works Agency, and Public Building Administration in the District of Columbia, for the year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF SECRETARY OF SENATE

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Secretary (Carl A. Loeffler) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN ELECTION CONTEST

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of Frank E. Hook contesting the election for United States Senator from Michigan for the term beginning January 3, 1949, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## INVESTIGATION OF DEMOCRATIC RUN-OFF PRIMARY ELECTION IN TEXAS—PETITIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Texas, praying an investigation of conditions affecting the Democratic run-off primary election in 1948 for Senator from that State, which were referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## RECESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the further pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is no business immediately to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 20 minutes to 1 o'clock, whereupon we will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.

At the expiration of the recess the Senate reassembled.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES—THE PRESIDENT'S ANNUAL MESSAGE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to listen to the delivery of the President's annual message, and that, immediately upon the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate reassemble in its Chamber and resume its session.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate, preceded by its Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle) and its Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint session of the two Houses and to receive such communication as the President of the United States might be pleased to make to them.

(The annual message this day delivered by the President of the United States to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress appears beginning on p. 74 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The joint meeting of the two Houses having been dissolved, the Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a very brief statement, of which I am sure most Senators will approve.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, last Monday the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] was sworn in for his third term as a Member of this body. The conference of Republican Senators did not end the meeting on that day until a few minutes before the convening of the Senate. As chairman of that conference, it was my duty to brief the press about the proceedings of the conference meeting. By the time that had been done, my distinguished colleague had taken the oath of office.

I doubt whether Senators of different political faiths from any State have a finer personal or official relationship than that which exists between the senior and junior Senators from Colorado. I make this statement so that there cannot be any possible misunderstanding as to why I had to forego the honor and privilege, which I had anticipated, of escorting my colleague to the desk on that occasion.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now proceed to the routine morning business. The first item is that of petitions and memorials.

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore, which were referred as indicated:

A resolution adopted by the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association, Inc., Saratoga Springs, N. Y., favoring continuation of Federal and State aid for school lunches in public schools; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from John A. Smith, of Cleveland, Ohio, relating to relief for the needy people of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the house of delegates of the American Dental Association, Chicago, Ill., commending the Congress on the enactment of legislation to provide additional inducements to physicians, surgeons, and dentists to make a career of the United States military, naval, and public health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by Local 3931, United Steelworkers of America (CIO), Louisville, Ky., favoring the enactment of legislation to restore price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from local 40 (ACA-CIO), New York City, N. Y., signed by Marie Murphy and C. Diebold, and sundry other members, praying for the enactment of legislation to restore price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by local 3931, United Steelworkers of America (CIO), Louisville, Ky., favoring the enactment of the so-called Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the council of the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, requesting the United States Housing Administrator to withhold evictions from public housing projects until additional housing can be provided to meet the existing critical shortage, and favoring the enactment of legislation providing for an adequate housing program; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Percy Bohlen Gifford, of Los Angeles, Calif., remonstrating against certain rules of the Housing Expediter; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from Mary Michalsky, of Garfield, N. J., remonstrating against continuation of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Rome, N. Y., favoring an appropriation of sufficient funds, in lieu of taxes, for the maintenance and ownership of Federal property in the city of Rome; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Fourth International Convention of United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, at Atlantic City, N. J., relating to the official recognition of the provisional government of the free and democratic state of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by members of the student body, faculty, and administration of the Juilliard School of Music, New York, N. Y., requesting the Eighty-first Congress to rededicate itself to the struggle for peace and security; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Municipality of Jimalalud, Province of Negros Oriental, Republic of the Philippines, expressing appreciation to the United States Government through the Philippine War Damage Commission for rehabilitating their damaged public buildings; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Telegrams and letters in the nature of petitions from O. Ventola Venerable Giusippe Mazzini Lodge, No. 1115, Order of the Sons of Italy in America, of Boston; Umberto Primo Lodge, No. 1069, Sons of Italy in America, of Newton; officers of Loggia Regina Margherita, No. 1402, of Waltham; and Mrs. Carmela Iorio and Mrs. Dominick Russo, of Pittsfield, all in the State of Massachusetts, relating to the return to Italy under United Nations trusteeship all the pre-Fascist Italian colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Miscamis Occidental Chapter, Philippine Veterans Legion, Mindanao, P. I., protesting against the resumption of Philippine-Japanese trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the National Plant Board, Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 2419, providing for the inspection of airplanes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, at Atlantic City, N. J., requesting an investigation and relief in the ruling of the Federal Trade Commission and the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the so-called basing-point or delivered-price system used by the cement industry in marketing their product; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting resolutions of the county chief and county council of Mauputasi County, and the district governor and district council of Manu'a District, American Samoa, favoring change in the government of American Samoa (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the delegates to the Lions International, Philadelphia, Pa., favoring statehood for Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Miscamis Occidental Chapter, Philippine Veterans' Legion, Mindanao, P. I., favoring return or refund to war veterans the equivalent of emergency notes which have been deducted from their back pay; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affair..

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Gertrude P. Jones, secretary, chapter 75, Blue Star Mothers of America, Detroit, Mich., favoring a national charter for the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from R. H. Meredith, of Chicago, Ill., relating to alleged violation of his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Lucie Trevor, New York, N. Y., relative to alleged violations of the election laws (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Matthew W. Pope, of Atlanta, Ga., relating to conditions at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Augusta, Ga.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Rome, N. Y., favoring sufficient funds to assist the city of Rome, N. Y., in a program of capital construction of school buildings; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the municipal council of Palo, Leyte, P. I., favoring the construction of a veterans' hospital at Palo, Leyte, P. I.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Department of Virginia, the American Legion, Richmond, Va., relating to on-the-job-training for veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Florida Trucking Association, Inc., Tampa, Fla., expressing gratitude and appreciation for the enactment by Congress of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from James G. Patton, president, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment

of legislation to insure the maintenance of full employment in the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Leslie Byington Post, No. 88, the American Legion, of Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, praying for the confirmation of the nomination of Arthur B. Peck, to be postmaster at Lava Hot Springs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## STATEMENT OF VIEWS AND RESOLUTIONS BY AMERICAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the American Municipal Association held its twenty-fifth annual conference here in Washington earlier this month. This association is the national federation of 42 State leagues and of 9,500 member city, town, borough, and village governments of all sizes.

During the conference this year six important statements of national municipal policy and several resolutions of broad national interest were adopted. These are the beliefs and the aims of the Nation's municipal governments. All of them are of considerable interest to the Members of the Congress.

I appreciate the privilege of having been asked by the national association to submit these statements to the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### HOUSING—WHAT IS THE MUNICIPAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HOUSING?

Municipalities are vitally concerned about the housing needs of their citizens.

To date those needs have not been adequately met.

Inadequate housing creates additional municipal problems and increases municipal expenditures.

We believe a solution can be found within the framework of our democratic institutions.

The responsibility of the municipality in that solution lies:

First. In adequate planning of our cities and neighborhoods;

Second. Through urban redevelopment statutes including exercise of power of eminent domain to assist in acquiring proper sites and regulations for construction of adequate housing;

Third. In the elimination of slums after provision has been made for rehousing occupants of the slums;

Fourth. In doing our reasonable share by way of subsidies or otherwise to make such housing possible;

Fifth. That the American Municipal Association urge Federal and State governments to undertake an intelligent and complete program of housing, including provision for research into lower-cost production techniques, using to the fullest extent the machinery of private enterprise, and using Federal credit for extension of mortgage loans and reducing interest payments, thereby expanding opportunities for private ownership.

Sixth. We urge the Eighty-first Congress to immediately pass housing legislation similar to the original T-E-W bill to begin again the basic urban task of our Nation's slum clearance. We feel that this legislation should provide sufficient funds for long-term Federal loans and subsidy contracts for slum clearance and construction of low-rent public housing for low-income groups including the construction of permanent low-rent housing projects to replace temporary war and veterans' housing projects.

We urge legislation to permit completion of previously authorized war-frozen housing projects by granting additional loans and raising per room limits in accordance with inflation trends.

Seventh. That any Federal action for disposal of temporary wartime housing should be carried out only after mutual understanding with local officials of the community where such units are situated, and that none of the temporary housing ever be sold to private interests except for the purpose of demolition.

### RESPECT AND RECOGNITION OF MUNICIPAL OFFICIALS

Municipal officials and employees must take the lead in creating respect and recognition for themselves and their public positions. In this effort they should seek the help of the press and radio and the cooperation of civic and industrial leaders. They cannot expect respect unless their personal conduct and the general quality of their administration warrants it. First, responsibility lies with the officials themselves.

Municipal employees should be selected, paid, and promoted on the basis of their individual competence and value to their governments. Appointive employees should be retained while their services are satisfactory. Adequate retirement allowances should be provided so that employees may leave when they are too old to be most effective and so that younger persons can succeed to places of responsibility. Municipal positions should pay the same compensation, job for job, as private employment, assuming all other conditions of employment are comparable.

A program of public relations is needed in each municipality to tell what the government and its employees do and why they deserve the respect and recognition of the people whom they serve from day to day.

A program of public relations must also keep the avenues of communication open so that appropriate municipal personnel may keep accurately informed concerning the desires and the attitudes of the citizens whom they serve, since that is equally stressed by personnel men with the function of interpretation.

### HOME RULE FOR AMERICAN CITIES

The people of an incorporated city should have the right to handle their own affairs under a constitutional grant of power from the State. Home rule would permit cities to amend their own charters by action of the local electors, to choose the activities they wish to perform, and to raise their revenue as they see fit. They should be free to choose their own form of government, not merely to operate a government given them by the State. They should have the right to decide for themselves what services they require without asking State permission for each new undertaking. They should have authority to raise revenues from any local sources without being required to beg for funds to pay for the services they need. The municipalities should not be required to support State projects, pay for State services, or carry financial burdens imposed on them by the State.

The principle of municipal independence carries with it the obligation of cities to face their own problems, to meet their own responsibilities, to finance their own enterprises, within the limits of local resources, and consistent with practical economic and social factors.

Local government in the United States should be autonomous so far as practical and consistent with public welfare. While the Federal Government and governments of the several States may invoke their broad powers and greater financial resources to make possible some local government services, still these powers and finances should be delegated for the purpose of administration to the municipal authorities in a manner consistent with responsible local self-government.

The American Municipal Association believes in and will work for effective governmental and administrative organization and practices in municipalities, seeking to preserve the representative character of municipal government, and to assure the people a high standard of municipal service, to the end that the greatest public benefit may result from the use of public funds. While no municipality can have complete autonomy, the cities should have the maximum local authority consistent with their position as constituent elements in a sovereign State.

### CIVILIAN DEFENSE

The matter of an American Municipal Association civil-defense policy shall be referred to the board of trustees with the understanding:

1. That the executive director seek maximum participation in the development of the ultimate Federal policy to be recommended by the President;

2. That at the earliest appropriate time the executive director advise the leagues and member cities of AMA of the details of any such civil-defense program in sufficient time for the expressions of opinions received to be used by the board of trustees in formulating a policy to be presented to the Congress and in this connection the trustees are requested to take into account the report of the civil-defense technical committee of AMA; and

3. That the AMA civil-defense policy and the technical committee be continued in existence not only for the purpose of making representations with regard to specific proposals presented to the Congress and to the States but also for much more careful study of the type of local civil-defense organization which should be created in the light of Federal action.

### PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES

The delegates and representatives of the 9,500 municipalities of the American Municipal Association at this twenty-fifth annual conference, favor and desire the enactment of Federal legislation authorizing the assessment and collection of local property taxes on Federal property or requiring the payment of annual sums in lieu of full taxes to municipalities by the Federal Government.

The American Municipal Association will cooperate with other organizations and with the Federal Congress in formulating legislation that will remove the burdens from localities with tax-exempt properties.

Within each State the organization of municipalities is urged to organize vigorous municipal support of such Federal legislation.

### FINANCE—HOW SHALL WE FINANCE MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT?

Municipal governments are entitled to sufficient revenue to finance the activities required of them by custom or by law. Where the local citizens demand a local service they must expect to pay for it. When a State imposes duties or standards of performance on a local government, the State should be responsible for providing the money necessary to carry out its mandates. Where social services require expenditures that cannot be financed appropriately from local revenues, then the State (or in some cases the Federal) Government must furnish the funds for equalization.

Within reasonable limits of their economic ability, and considering the funds withdrawn by State and Federal taxation, the municipalities should be permitted to raise as large a portion of their revenues as they can from locally imposed taxes.

The States cannot appropriately say that municipalities can solve their revenue problems alone if given the right to use a greater

number of local revenue sources. Such a theory is not sound because the State may take for its own use some easily collected highly productive sources such as sales, income, and gasoline taxes, while requiring local governments to finance from inadequate sources the cost of city streets, traffic control, education, social services, and many others.

But the municipalities should be permitted to adopt a larger number of taxes for local use. Unless the State provides adequate revenue by other measures, municipalities which can administer them should be authorized to use as local taxes the payroll-income tax, local sales taxes, license taxes based on volume of business, cigarette and tobacco taxes, amusement or admissions taxes, hotel taxes, liquor taxes, utility taxes, and various service charges.

Simplicity and directness of the entire local, State, and Federal tax system should be considered when new local taxes are imposed. If a single new tax can equitably provide additional needed funds, it would be preferable to use one tax instead of many. A logical and orderly tax system will not evolve without some leadership and direction. As far as the cities are concerned, the State-local tax system should be carefully planned by joint State and local action. Otherwise confusion for the taxpayers and municipal officials is bound to follow the search for new revenues.

In addition to the elements adopted in the above statements, the representatives of the 9,500 municipalities in the American Municipal Association at the twenty-fifth annual conference adopted resolutions which also are elements of the national municipal policy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I also ask that the several resolutions adopted at the conference be included at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MUNICIPAL POLICY

*Resolved,* That the convention endorse the democratic and representative procedure of ascertaining by means of open discussion and debate the will of the delegates on the various subjects appearing on the program, and that the final results of such discussion be adopted as a part of the national municipal program of the American Municipal Association, and that additional ways and means to insure further development and refinement of policy be used throughout the year.

CENSUS BUREAU RESEARCH

Whereas current Nation-wide statistics on the finances and employment of States and local governments are important for the planning and administration of city affairs; and the Government's Division of the United States Bureau of the Census is the only national source for such data; and the scope, timeliness, and analysis of such data have been substantially improved by the Bureau in recent years: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the American Muncipal Association commend the Secretary of Commerce for the work of the Bureau of the Census in reporting on public finances and employment and urge it to maintain and strengthen its compilation and reporting of such basic statistics.

FEDERAL ADMISSIONS TAX

Whereas it is increasingly recommended by tax authorities and study commissions that the Federal Government should reduce or eliminate those taxes which can be administered best by State and local governments; and

Whereas congressional committees, the Council of State Governments, and many State leagues of municipalities have suggested that admissions and amusement taxes, among others, should be specially considered for release for State and local government use; and

Whereas admissions and amusement taxes are peculiarly suited to municipal administration and justified as a municipal resource: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association recommend to Congress the elimination of the Federal excise taxes on admissions and amusements, and call upon State legislatures to make admission tax authority available to their municipalities.

SOCIAL SECURITY EXTENSION

Whereas the exclusion of local governmental employees from coverage under the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act is in a sense discriminatory against such employees; and

Whereas the continued lack of retirement provisions for a great many local governments is resulting in serious losses of personnel to private industry and other employments providing retirement and survivors' benefits; and

Whereas municipal officials and employees have repeatedly suggested, and the Advisory Council on Social Security of the Senate Committee on Finance in its report dated April 8, 1948, has recommended that the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act be extended to employees of local governments; and

Whereas municipal employees are clearly entitled to the protection offered by old-age and survivors' provisions of the Social Security Act to the same extent as other workers now covered by the said act: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States be petitioned by the American Municipal Association to amend the Social Security Act to include municipal employees thereunder according to a plan of permissive coverage whereby such inclusion shall be at the option of the duly constituted legislative body of each municipality by individual compacts made by the Federal Government direct with each municipality, that such permissive form of extension shall apply uniformly to all employees of a municipality regardless of their duties or occupational classification, whether such employees are performing services of a governmental or proprietary nature; that such extension shall include only the old-age and survivors' insurance provisions of the Social Security Act, and that supplementation of these provisions by local pension or retirement funds or systems shall not be prohibited nor precluded by any such amendment of the Social Security Act.

MUNICIPAL AIRPORTS ADMINISTRATION

*Be it resolved by the American Municipal Association in convention assembled:*

Whereas the development of aviation in the United States has been greatly fostered and encouraged by the municipally owned and operated airports of the various cities of the country; and

Whereas the Federal Airport Act of 1946 was designed to furnish financial Federal assistance to cities for airport purposes that they might effectively promote and expand aviation facilities to cooperate with the Federal Government in establishment of a Federal airport plan; and

Whereas the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, entirely on his own initiative and without any mandate from Congress, has sought to withhold Federal funds from municipalities unless municipalities would agree to various objectionable restrictions on the handling of aviation gasoline and oil; and

Whereas the operation of the economic and business administration of a municipally owned airport is a local responsibility and should not be determined arbitrarily by a Federal agency: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association in convention assembled most vigorously protest against any restrictions on the handling of aviation gasoline and oil at municipally owned airports imposed by the Civil Aeronautics Administration and we do respectfully request that all reference to aviation gasoline and oil be removed from the standard Civil Aeronautics grant agreement form; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the executive director of the American Municipal Association be directed to furnish a copy of this resolution to the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

PAYMENTS IN LIEU OF TAXES ON PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS

Whereas the Federal Government has modified its system of payments in lieu of taxes on certain housing projects where such payments were in excess of the amounts originally specified in the contracts between the various housing authorities and the Federal Government; and

Whereas later agreements between such housing authorities and the Federal Government have provided for payments in lieu of taxes more economically sound than those authorized in the original contracts; and

Whereas cities are unnecessarily embarrassed by being unable to secure the benefits of the larger sums which the housing authorities are able to pay in lieu of taxes: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association record its opposition to the Federal policy recently invoked which prevents municipalities from receiving increased payments in lieu of taxes; further

*Resolved,* That this organization support legislation and administrative measures which will permit the payment of the increased amount in lieu of taxes under prevailing contracts.

FWA APPROVAL OF LOCAL PLANS

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association request Congress for the amendment of applicable Federal statutes so as to provide for an extension of the time limit within which plans, specifications, and working drawings may be submitted for approval to the Federal Works Agency, to the end that municipalities and other local government units may receive the remainder of interest-free loans from the Government as provided under their respective contracts.

AIR-TRAFFIC CONTROL

Whereas the Federal Government is primarily responsible for air safety and has operated air-traffic-control towers on many municipal and other public airports throughout the country by annual appropriations to the Civil Aeronautics Administration; and

Whereas municipal airport operators generally wish the Federal Government to continue to operate such control towers in the interests of safety and economy: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association urge the Congress of the United States to continue appropriations to the Civil Aeronautics Administration for the operation of air-traffic-control towers.

SLUM CLEARANCE

*Resolved,* That the Congress be urged to enact a complete and workable program developed in cooperation with the individual municipality which will provide for the removal of all substandard temporary warhousing units and the rehousing of the occupants in permanent standard housing, employing for this purpose, along with other

moneys, the net profit already received from rentals of such temporary war housing.

FIRE PROTECTION

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association offer its cooperation to the International City Managers' Association in a study of the methods, procedures, or services by which municipalities may obtain a disinterested appraisal and grading of their fire-protection facilities, and the relation of such facilities to fire-insurance rates.

TITLE TO TIDELANDS

Whereas the title to lands lying beneath tidal and navigable waters has been resolved against the States and political subdivisions thereof by the Supreme Court decision in the case of United States against California; and

Whereas this decision has created multiple conflicts of opinion as to the validity of the title to these lands in the States and their several grantees; and

Whereas Federal legislative action appears to be sole remedy which States and cities have to secure title to these tidelands upon which billions of dollars have been expended by such State and local governments: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association urge the Congress of the United States, during its next session, to adopt legislation to correct the injustices which would follow from the Supreme Court's decision and restore to the States and their municipalities their property rights and titles in accordance with the law of property established by the Supreme Court of the United States in a long line of decisions handed down throughout 100 years, to the effect that the States and their grantees hold complete title and ownership to all lands lying beneath tidewaters and navigable waters within their respective boundaries; and that this organization lend its cooperation and full support to securing the enactment of such legislation.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Whereas the National Government proposes to call upon the cities to organize for civil defense; and

Whereas the report of the War Department Civil Defense Board makes the obvious point that in case of war the personnel of fire, police, and other emergency services of cities must be augmented rather than depleted; and

Whereas the uncontrolled and uncoordinated recruitment of municipal personnel by the various branches and units of the armed services, if made effective in time of war, would destroy the capacity of municipal government to function to protect life and property; and

Whereas these absolute contradictions in national policy must be reconciled and eliminated without delay: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association respectfully requests and urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of National Defense to take cognizance of this critical situation and to adopt and enforce policies relating to the recruitment of municipal personnel which will preserve the capacity of municipal government to protect its citizens and to discharge its national obligations for civil defense in case of national emergency.

SHARING HIGHWAY USER TAXES WITH MUNICIPALITIES

Whereas local municipal streets carry variously in the several States from 20 percent to 50 percent of total automobile traffic and, therefore, earn 20 percent to 50 percent of State and Federal highway user taxes; and

Whereas local municipal streets receive inadequate or no shares of such highway user taxes in many States; and

Whereas highway user taxes collected by State and Federal governments are now expended in substantial amounts to give this Nation good State highways and rural roads, although municipalities are still required to finance local streets primarily from property taxes, other general revenues, and borrowed funds: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the American Municipal Association endorse the principle that reasonable shares of highway user taxes be used for local streets on the basis of use.

## REPORT OF IMMIGRATION SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee during the Eightieth Congress, I have received a progress report from the Immigration Subcommittee. This subcommittee was headed by the former junior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. Revercomb. The progress report will, I believe, be very helpful to Members of Congress in their review of the controversial and complicated immigration and displaced persons' problems. All of us, I am sure, are seeking the answer to the immigration and displaced persons problem—a problem with grave humanitarian aspects, and one which we want careful consideration given from the standpoint of discharging our obligation to the foreign peoples and from the standpoint of national security. I, therefore, send to the desk, a copy of this progress report and ask that it be appropriately numbered and printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1. A bill to create an independent Civil Aeronautics Authority and an independent Air Safety Board, to promote the development and safety and to provide for the regulation of civil aeronautics, and to promote world leadership by the United States in aviation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2. A bill to provide for the use of 25 percent of grazing receipts from national forests for the making of range improvements within such forests; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3. A bill to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4. A bill authorizing the advanced training in aeronautics of technical personnel of the Civil Aeronautics Administration; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. McGRATH):

S. 5. A bill to provide a national health insurance and public health program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 6. A bill to aid in preventing shortages of petroleum and petroleum products in the United States by promoting the production of synthetic liquid fuels;

S. 7. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; and

S. 8. A bill to create an independent Air Safety Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 9. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 10. A bill providing for the issuance of certificates of statutory compliance with certain national standards to certain corporations, trade associations, and labor organizations engaged in or affecting commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 11. A bill to protect the foreign relations and to promote the trade and commerce of the United States, to require the disclosure to the United States of information affecting such trade and commerce, and to safeguard the security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 12. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 13. A bill to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 14. A bill to improve the administration of justice and reduce expenditures by eliminating overlapping functions of Federal agencies, preserving State and local jurisdiction, utilizing existing judicial remedies, and forbidding unnecessary proceedings;

S. 15. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; and

S. 16. A bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 17. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to certain settlers in the Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation, Nev.; and

S. 18. A bill authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to make payment to school districts as compensation for education of children of Federal employees residing on federally owned property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 19. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys;

S. 20. A bill to regulate the review of judgments of conviction in certain criminal cases; and

S. 21. A bill to regulate habeas corpus proceedings in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 22. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 23. A bill to facilitate the investment of venture capital in new enterprises; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 24. A bill conferring jurisdiction on United States circuit courts of appeals to hear certain appeals from convictions by general courts martial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 25. A bill to provide for the payment of a lump sum to the State of Nevada in lieu of taxes at Davis Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 26. A bill for the relief of Jose Babace; and

S. 27. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 28. A bill to supersede the provisions of Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1946 by reestablishing the offices of registers of land offices,

and providing for appointment of the Director and Associate Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 29. A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; and

S. 30. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of persons employed in Federal penal and correctional institutions for damage to or loss or destruction of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 31. A bill to amend the Taylor Grazing Act for the purpose of providing for greater participation by district advisory boards in administration of the act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 32. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetezar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 33. A bill to establish a National Water Conservation Authority, and for other purposes;

S. 34. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration; to provide for their orderly use, improvement, and development; to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range; and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1934, as amended; and

S. 35. A bill to establish a national natural resources policy, to create a Natural Resources Council, to provide for a national resources inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 36. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act so as to provide that regulations adopted pursuant to such act for any area, section, or flyway shall be based on conditions existing within such area, section, or flyway, and to create a Migratory Game Bird Advisory Committee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 37. A bill to cancel authority under the act of June 23, 1936, for the conveyance of certain lands owned by the United States to the city of Los Angeles, Calif.; and

S. 38. A bill to repeal an act which withdrew certain public lands of the United States in the State of California from settlement; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 39. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administration, as an adjunct to the Federal public-works program, to make loans and grants for the construction, remodeling, improvement, and extension of school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 40. A bill for the relief of William D. Norris;

S. 41. A bill for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.;

S. 42. A bill for the relief of Ellen Hudson, as administratrix of the estate of Walter R. Hudson;

S. 43. A bill for the relief of Jacobus Lubbertus Muller;

S. 44. A bill for the relief of Arthur O. Fisher;

S. 45. A bill for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208;

S. 46. A bill for the relief of Primitivo Urcelay-Ruiz;

S. 47. A bill for the relief of Fawn S. Loule;

S. 48. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile;

S. 49. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts;

S. 50. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; and

S. 51. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 962, so as to authorize reimbursement for official travel by privately owned automobiles by officers and employees of the courts of the United States and of the administrative office of the United States courts at a rate not exceeding 7 cents per mile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 52, to authorize the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

S. 53. A bill to incorporate the Federal City Charter Commission; and

S. 54. A bill to provide for the incorporation, regulation, merger, consolidation, and dissolution of certain business corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 55. A bill to authorize completion of construction and development of the Eden project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. KEFAUVER):

S. 56. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 57. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. MYERS also introduced Senate bill 58, to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS (for himself and Mr. McMAHON):

S. 59. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 60. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 61. A bill for the relief of the Plymouth Manufacturing Co., Inc.;

S. 62. A bill for the relief of Fritz Y. Mercer; and

S. 63. A bill to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 64. A bill to establish a Savannah Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development in the basin of the Savannah River in the interest of the control and prevention of floods, the promotion of navigation, and the strengthening of the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 65. A bill to provide for the air security and defense of the United States, to establish the composition of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. MALONE) (by request) introduced Senate bill 66, to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 67. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 68. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; and

S. 69. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 70. A bill to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States; and

S. 71. A bill for the relief of Constance Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 72. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America;

S. 73. A bill for the relief of Samuel M. Inman; and

S. 74. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be commenced against the United States by Hubert James, of Argyle, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 75. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; and

S. 76. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain tract of land in the State of Arizona to Lillian I. Anderson; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 77. A bill to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69); to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 78. A bill to authorize the appropriation of $300,000,000 to assist in providing telephone facilities in rural areas;

S. 79. A bill authorizing the appropriation of $1,000,000,000 for the purposes of rural electrification; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 80. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from $5,000 to $15,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 81. A bill granting service pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II;

S. 82. A bill to provide a $25 credit for income-tax purposes for persons who vote in elections of Federal officers;

S. 83. A bill to increase the credit allowed for dependent children of a taxpayer in computing net income; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 84. A bill to amend the provisions of the postal salary law relating to rural carriers; and for other purposes;

S. 85. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees; and

S. 86. A bill to provide equipment for use by examination applicants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 87. A bill granting exemption from income tax with respect to $1,500 of the amount paid to any individual by the United States

or by any State or political subdivision thereof as a pension, retired or retirement pay, or as a retirement annuity; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 88. A bill to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to Establish a Uniform System of Bankruptcy Throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended;

S. 89. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to suits by certain immigrant inspectors and employees for extra pay for Sunday and holiday services;

S. 90. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; and

S. 91. A bill to provide for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 92. A bill to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 93. A bill to prohibit the payment of retirement annuities to former Members of Congress convicted of offenses involving the improper use of authority, influence, power, or privileges as Members of Congress;

S. 94. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act; and

S. 95. A bill to provide for 26 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 96. A bill to provide for preliminary examination and survey of River Rouge, Mich., for the purpose of determining action necessary to control floods in the River Rouge drainage area; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 97. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 98. A bill to amend section 3 of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 so as to remove the requirement that immigration visas issued thereunder be charged against immigration quotas;

S. 99. A bill to amend section 3 (a) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, relating to the distribution of visas thereunder among the various groups of displaced persons; and

S. 100. A bill to amend section 2 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 relating to the definition of an eligible displaced person; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 101. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOBEY (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 102. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis and related neurological diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LUCAS (for himself, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. FLANDERS, and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 103. A bill to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 104. A bill to safeguard the health, efficiency, and morale of the American people; to provide for improved nutrition through a more effective distribution of food supplies through a food-allotment program; to assist in maintaining fair prices and incomes to farmers by providing adequate outlets for agricultural products; to prevent burdening and obstructing channels of interstate commerce; to promote the full use of agricultural resources; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. AIKEN (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. IVES):

S. 105. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 so as to establish a minimum wage of 75 cents an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 106. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 107. A bill relating to the salary grades of certain substitute employees of the postal service upon appointment to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 108, to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for a single executive department for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and to give the Secretary of Defense adequate power to enable him to formulate and place in operation integrated programs for the national security, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate bill 109, to require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. THYE):

S. 110. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 111. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Pearl Shizuko Okada Pape;

S. 112. A bill for the relief of Alexy W. Katyll and Ioanna Katyll;

S. 113. A bill for the relief of Floyd Oles and Helen Louise Oles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 114. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 115. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to preference accorded in Federal employment to disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 116. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit an adopted child of a deceased individual to receive benefits thereunder without regard to the period during which he shall have occupied such status; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. FULBRIGHT introduced Senate bill 117, to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes, w ich was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 118. A bill for the relief of Clemente Sabin Dopico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 119. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 120. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Freedom National Historical Park in Duval County, Fla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 121. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 122. A bill relating to the disability pensions payable to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 123. A bill for the relief of R. L. Fulford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 124. A bill to require the identification of cotton products for the protection and benefit of the producers and consumers thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 125. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable and certain other persons as provided for in United States Code, title 24, section 281, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 126. A bill to supplement the national transportation policy and to aid in achieving such policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. 127. A bill to provide that schools constructed under the act entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes," approved October 14, 1940, as amended, may be donated to local school agencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 128. A bill to restore the status quo in respect to certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; and

S. 129. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 130. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 131. A bill to exempt admission to certain charitable entertainments from the Federal admission tax; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

S. 132. A bill to assist the States in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 133. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequali-

ties of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

S. 134. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 135. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 136. A bill to provide for the naturalization of persons legally in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 137. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LONG) introduced Senate bill 138, to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 139. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Chacartegui;

S. 140. A bill for the relief of Peter W. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 141. A bill for the acquisition of additional land adjoining the Federal building in Idaho Falls, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 142. A bill authorizing the construction of a multipurpose reservoir on the Pend Oreille River in Idaho for flood control and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works;

S. 143. A bill to amend section 4450 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended by the act of July 29, 1937, and for other purposes;

S. 144. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to prevent the loss of nationality, by reason of continuous residence for 5 years in a foreign state, of certain persons declared to be citizens of the United States under such act;

S. 145. A bill for the relief of Anacortes Shipways, Inc. (Pacific shipways division), and for other purposes;

S. 146. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of J. N. Jones, and others;

S. 147. A bill for the relief of H. Lawrence Hull; to the Committee on the Judiciary;

S. 148. A bill relating to the administrative jurisdiction of certain public lands in the State of Oregon;

S. 149. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. 150. A bill to amend section 12 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 151. A bill to provide for the construction, equipment, and operation of an additional military academy and an additional naval academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 152. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos, N. Mex., project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 153. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," approved April 4, 1944; and

S. 154. A bill to provide for the reappointment to the retired list of officers of the Navy of Henry Eastin Rossell, former commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 155. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; and

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. CORDON):

S. 156. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 157. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 158. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; and

S. 159. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 160. A bill for the relief of Ellen F. Barbee;

S. 161. A bill for the relief of Arthur A. Broyles; and

S. 162. A bill to permit retired officers of the armed forces to act as agents or attorneys for prosecuting certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 163. A bill to authorize a mileage allowance of 7 cents per mile for post-office inspectors for travel on official business; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 164. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; and

S. 165. A bill for the relief of William F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 166. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 167. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah;

S. 168. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Central Utah project; and

S. 169. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Virgin River subbasin reclamation project in Arizona, Nevada, and Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 170. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 171. A bill to incorporate the Society of the Fifth (Red Diamond) Division, United States Army, Veterans of the World Wars;

S. 172. A bill for the relief of Valeriu Constantin Georgescu and wife, Lygia Maria Georgescu; and

S. 173. A bill to repeal the prohibition against the filling of a vacancy in the office of district judge in the southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH):

S. 174. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 175. A bill to encourage increased production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 176. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum-foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 177. A bill to authorize and direct the construction by the Tennessee Valley Authority of a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 178. A bill relating to custom duties on articles coming into the United States from the Virgin Islands;

S. 179. A bill to suspend for 1 year certain import duties on aluminum;

S. 180. A bill to provide for the disposition of internal-revenue collections on articles produced in the Virgin Islands; and

S. 181. A bill exempting from tax the transportation of persons to and from an airport in a motor vehicle having a seating capacity of less than ten passengers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 182. A bill to amend section 8 of the act of June 17, 1886, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 289), and section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, as amended (46 U. S. C., sec. 883); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 183. A bill to authorize an appropriation for the construction, extension, equipment, and improvement of public-school buildings and facilities at Winnebago, Nebr.;

S. 184. A bill to provide a civil government for the insular possession of American Samoa, and for other purposes;

S. 185. A bill to provide a civil government for the island of Guam, and for other purposes;

S. 186. A bill to emancipate United States Indians in certain cases;

S. 187. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain obligations of the United States to the Indians of New York; and

S. 188. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 189. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Nebraska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Mrs. Florence Benolken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 190. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to exempt from the requirements of sections 6 and 7 of such act employees engaged in the capacity of outside buyers; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 191. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Waline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 192. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the courts of the State of New York with respect to civil actions between Indians or to which Indians are parties; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 193. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of premiums on bonds of Government officers or employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 194. A bill for the relief of Bernadette Jones Marchbanks;

S. 195. A bill for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

S. 196. A bill for the relief of James G. Smyth;

S. 197. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

S. 198. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco;

S. 199. A bill for the relief of Chin Suey Hong and his wife, Lee Suey You;

S. 200. A bill for the relief of Lee Wee and Chan Suey;

S. 201. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders;

S. 202. A bill for the relief of Jesus T. Esteva and his family;

S. 203. A bill for the relief of Albert Vita Sciama; and

S. 204. A bill for the relief of Eugenio Maisterrena Barreneche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 205. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. DOWNEY (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 206. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 207. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Ella L. Browning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 209. A bill to create the office of Senator at Large in the Senate of the United States for ex-Presidents of the United States; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 210. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. THYE):

S. 211. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 212. A bill for the relief of John Joseph McKay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 213. A bill to provide benefits for members of the Reserve components of the armed forces who suffer disability or death from injuries incurred while engaged in active-duty training for periods of less than 30 days or while engaged in inactive-duty training;

S. 214. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948;

S. 215. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training;

S. 216. A bill to create an official ribbon to be known as the Army Reserve Special Commendation Ribbon;

S. 217. A bill to create an official ribbon to be known as the Air Force Reserve Special Commendation Ribbon;

S. 218. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Air Force Reserve Medal;

S. 219. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Army Reserve Medal;

S. 220. A bill to provide for the payment of a uniform allowance to officers of the Reserve components of the United States Army and the United States Air Force;

S. 221. A bill to authorize lump-sum payments to Air Corps Reserve officers who are selected for commission in the Regular Army;

S. 222. A bill to provide for payment to certain retired Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers of a lump sum equal to their active-duty pay and allowances for the period during which such officers remained in an inactive status without pay;

S. 223. A bill to remove the limitation on amount of retirement pay, under certain conditions, of persons retired for disabilities resulting from injuries or disease incurred in line of duty in the military or naval services of the United States;

S. 224. A bill to amend further the act of April 3, 1939, as amended; and

S. 225. A bill to provide for the erection of headstones for certain members of the armed forces buried outside the United States, lost at sea, or reported missing in the performance of duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 226. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Portland Cement Co.;

S. 227. A bill for the relief of Stone & Cooper Coal Co., Inc.;

S. 228. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Durang;

S. 229. A bill for the relief of E. W. Eaton Coal Co.; and

S. 230. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sonia Kaye Johnston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 231. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 232. A bill relating to the disposition of housing acquired or constructed by the United States;

S. 233. A bill to establish the Passamaquoddy power project development and use of tidal energy in the waters of Passamaquoddy Bay for the production of electrical power;

S. 234. A bill authorizing preliminary examination and survey of Round Pond Harbor, Maine; and

S. 235. A bill to authorize the construction of access roads necessary to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 236. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets;

S. 237. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for cargo aircraft adaptable for postal, commercial, and military service, and for other purposes; and

S. 238. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MCKELLAR:

S. J. Res. 1. Joint resolution to authorize the Tennessee Valley Authority to build a steam power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOEY, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. NEELY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. FLANDERS):

S. J. Res. 2. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. KKOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and Mr. TOBEY):

S. J. Res. 3. Joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MCCARRAN (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. MALONE):

S. J. Res. 4. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 5. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. J. Res. 6. Joint resolution designating the fourth Sunday in September of each year as Interfaith Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. ECTON, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. LANGER):

S. J. Res. 7. Joint resolution to provide for the transfer to the Bureau of Reclamation of functions relating to irrigation projects on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. J. Res. 8. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. J. Res. 9. Joint resolution to provide for the establishment of a Commission to be called the National Monetary Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 10. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to terms of office of President, and providing for nomination of candidates for President and Vice President, and for election of such candidates, by popular vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. J. Res. 11. Joint resolution providing for the ratification by Congress of a contract for the purchase of certain Indian lands by the United States from the Three Affiliated Tribes of Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. J. Res. 12. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in which June 6, 1949, occurs as Patrick Henry Week in commemoration of the sesquicentennial anniversary of the death of Patrick Henry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. J. Res. 13. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of blue and gray stamps to symbolize our national unity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. J. Res. 14. Joint resolution providing for awards of honor for agricultural production; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## UNIFICATION OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I reintroduce at this time my bill for unification of the armed forces in fact rather than in name only, which is the present status of our legislation.

I wish to say only this in regard to this bill, which I consider of vital importance to the security of this country, that I think it will save a minimum of $3,000,000,000 a year to the taxpayers of the country.

The bill (S. 108) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for a single executive department for the operation and administration of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force; and to give the Secretary of Defense adequate power to enable him to formulate and place in operation integrated programs for the national security, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## INCOME REPORTS BY GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. MORSE. I introduce a bill requiring Government officials to report the amount and the sources of their income, as a matter of public record.

The bill (S. 109) to require certain members of the legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the Government to file statements relating to amount and sources of income, and dealings in securities and commodities, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the American Legion has gone on record in favor of universal military service. They have prepared a bill for the information of the committee and the Congress, which I have been requested to introduce, and I herewith present it.

At the same time, inasmuch as the 70-group air force bill was considered by the Committee on Armed Services of each House, and passed one House, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] I am introducing it again for the attention of the Armed Services Committee.

The bill (S. 66) to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and Mr. MALONE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## MINIMUM-WAGE STANDARDS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to raise the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour, and I request that a statement in connection with the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 58) to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, introduced by Mr. MYERS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. MYERS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY MR. MYERS

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, said today he will have ready for introduction in the Eighty-first Congress at its opening session Monday a bill to raise the minimum wage from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour.

MYERS, who has been a cosponsor of various administration bills during the last 4 years to expand the coverage of the Fair Labor Standards Act as well as to raise the minimum wage, said his own bill will be restricted entirely to the wage-raising provision.

"There is no controversy over the need to increase the minimum wage for work done in interstate commerce from the present obsolete, starvation level of $16 for a 40-hour week," he declared. "Most of the Republican leaders of Congress have gone on record at one time or another, as has Governor Dewey, in favor of an increase.

"There is, however, considerable controversy over proposed changes in other sections of the Fair Labor Standards Act having to do with coverage, overtime, and so on. I strongly believe that we must not hold off on the enactment of legislation increasing the minimum wage to a realistic level until all of the many other issues involved in the Fair Labor Standards Act are settled in an omnibus bill.

"An increase in the minimum wage is an immediate, urgent necessity. While we are seeking to fight inflation with effective means, we must not forget that millions of Americans have already been impoverished by inflation and need the protection of a better minimum wage.

"This bill can be enacted into law almost immediately because the only controversy surrounding it has to do with the amount of the increase. President Truman and the Democratic platform are committed to a minimum wage of at least 75 cents. I think most members of the majority party in Congress agree with that platform promise. Many Republicans also concede 75 cents to be a reasonable figure. The bill, as I see it, can be disposed of promptly. After we have passed this bill, the Labor Committees of the House and Senate can then take up the fundamental issues involving other phases of the Fair Labor Standards Act and can consider them separately from the matter of minimum wage, which is of an emergency nature."

MYERS introduced a similar bill, S. 1288, in 1947, providing for a 65-cent minimum on the day that President Truman signed into law the Portal-to-Portal Act. The President at that time had urged a 65-cent minimum wage be adopted immediately. However, no action was taken on this or any other minimum wage bill by the Labor Committee of either House in the Eightieth Congress.

At the time the portal bill was before the Senate, on March 21, 1947, the Pennsylvania senior Senator introduced an amendment to it to increase the minimum to 60 cents, a figure he said then was so noncontroversial that he thought it would be accepted without discussion. However, on motion of Senator TAFT, the Myers amendment was tabled. Although Senator TAFT promised that the Senate Labor Committee would promptly get to work on a minimum wage bill, that was the last opportunity which either the Senate or the House had in the Eightieth Congress to vote on an increase in the minimum wage.

MYERS' 75-cent minimum would become operative 60 days after its enactment.

## ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for additional circuit and district judges. I request that a statement showing the justification for this legislation, together with the full text of the bill, be printed at this point in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement and the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 52) to authorize the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement and bill are as follows:

### BILL FOR THE CREATION OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGESHIPS

(Statement by Senator PAT McCARRAN)

The judicial conference of the United States, consisting of the Chief Justice of the United States as chairman, and the chief judges of the 11 judicial circuits, at its last regular meeting held in September 1948, recommended that the Congress provide for a number of additional circuit and district judgeships in specified circuits and districts. In the report of the meeting of the conference issued by the Chief Justice it is said

that the recommendations "contemplated the absolute minimum increase in judgeships necessary to adequately man the courts, and to provide for the continued efficient and orderly processing of the business of the courts." The report instructed the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts "to present these recommendations to the Congress and to inform it that the prompt enactment of legislation necessary to achieve the objectives sought thereby was, in the view of the conference, a matter of extreme urgency and importance to the judiciary."

I have today introduced a bill to carry out the recommendations of the judicial conference.

The legislation, if enacted, will provide for two additional circuit judgeships for the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, one additional circuit judgeship for the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit, and one additional circuit judgeship for each of the Courts of Appeals for the Seventh and Tenth Circuits. It will provide for four additional district judgeships for the southern district of New York, two for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, two for the western district of Pennsylvania, one for the district of New Jersey, and one for the northern district of Georgia. It will provide for a district judgeship for the northern and southern districts of Florida, and an additional district judgeship for the southern district of Texas, with a proviso that the official residence of one of the judges shall be in the southern half of the district. It will make permanent the present district judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri, held by Judge Richard M. Duncan. It will provide for two additional district judgeships for the northern district of California, and one additional district judgeship for each of the districts of southern California, Oregon, and Kansas.

This legislation is necessary in order to relieve an insufficiency in the number of Federal judicial personnel both in the district courts and in the courts of appeals which has become increasingly evident in recent months. Although this is most serious in the circuits and districts to which the legislation relates, it is due in part to tendencies in the business of the Federal courts which are of rather general application. Most important is the fact that the types of cases calling for the greatest amount of time on the part of the judges for their disposition have been increasing in recent years.

Criminal cases in the Federal courts are about at the level that they were in the fiscal year 1940, the first year of the administrative office, in fact slightly below. The number of criminal cases filed in the fiscal year 1948 was 33,300, compared with 33,401 in the fiscal year 1940. All the Federal courts recognize an obligation to give priority in disposition to criminal cases, and this is done. But criminal cases as a class do not make a large demand proportionately upon the time of the judges because the great majority of criminal cases are ended by a plea of guilty, and less than 1 defendant in 10 is tried. The business that is creating congestion in the Federal courts is in general certain types of civil cases, to a large extent private civil cases.

The total number of civil cases filed in the district courts went down from 1947 to 1948 as a result of a sharp decline in cases of price regulation. These cases, however, took relatively a small amount of time of the judges. While they were going down, the other types of civil cases making greater exactions upon the judges were going up. The number of civil cases, exclusive of price regulation cases, filed in 1948 was 43,156, which was 8,000 above the corresponding number filed annually in the years before the recent world war, 1938 to 1941. The annual average of private civil cases filed in the 84 districts in the States (exclusive of the District of Columbia) having purely Federal jurisdiction, in the years 1947–48 was 20,266, compared with an average of 15,149 for the years 1938 to 1941, an increase of 33.8 percent. Mr. Shafroth, Chief of the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics, stated in his annual report for 1948 that "a comparison of the present work of the district courts with the prewar volume shows that total civil actions commenced annually, excluding Government price-control cases, are now running one-fifth more in number than before the war and private cases one-third more."

It is cases in these classes that place the greatest burden upon the judges. Eleven judges who kept time records for a 3 months' period during the fall and winter of 1947 reported that 73.8 percent of their time spent on all civil cases in court and chambers was devoted to hearing and deciding private civil cases. The comments of district judges virtually without exception, confirm the fact that it is the contested civil cases and cases usually between private parties which take the heaviest toll of their time. Among the commoner types of this nature are cases under the Federal Employers Liability Act which were 10 times as numerous in 1948 as they were in 1941, cases under the Jones Act on account of injuries to seamen which were well above the 1941 level, and contract and tort actions brought in the Federal courts on account of diversity of citizenship in numbers nearly twice the 1941 level. Moreover in 1948, 1,503 cases were filed in the district courts under the Federal Tort Claims Act of 1946 which brought an entirely new class of cases within the jurisdiction of the district courts.

This increase in the time-consuming types of civil cases brought in the Federal courts since the prewar years, amounting as stated anywhere from a fifth to a third or more, has not been matched by anything like a corresponding increase in the judicial personnel. No new judicial district has been created in 20 years since 1928 when the State of Indiana was divided into two districts. The judicial conference at the same meeting at which it recommended the increases in circuit and district judgeships which have been specified, expressed its opinion that the creation of new districts was not the advisable way to solve the problem, and said that where it was found that additional judicial service was necessary it would recommend that such service be provided for by the creation of additional judgeships within the existing judicial districts. But from January 1, 1940, to June 30, 1948, the number of district judgeships provided for by the Congress increased only 10, from 189 to 199, or approximately 5 percent.

The district judges in 1948 increased their rate of disposition of private civil cases, terminating 26,417 such cases as compared with 23,091 in 1947. But with the lessened proportionate judicial power they could not keep pace with the increased volume of such litigation. The number of such cases pending rose during the year and congestion developed and increased. There is no way to meet this except by recognizing the condition and increasing the judicial power.

The number of private civil cases pending at the end of the fiscal year 1948, 29,899, was nearly 4,000 more than the number at the beginning, 25,973, and 9,000 more than the number 8 years earlier, June 30, 1940, which was 20,240. Inevitably the time required for the disposition of civil cases in the United States district courts has begun to rise. The median time elapsing from filing to disposition of civil cases disposed of after trial in the 84 district courts of the districts in the States (exclusive of the District of Columbia) during the fiscal year 1948 was 9.9 months, compared with 9 months in 1947, an increase of 10 percent. Earnest efforts are being made by the judges through use of the most efficient methods, including pretrial procedure and the assignment of judges to points of strain both within and beyond their circuits, to dispatch the business as promptly as possible. But there can be no question that more judges are needed, and unless they are provided congestion and delay will be bound to increase to the detriment of the litigants and the public.

The need for additional judges does not exist in all circuits and districts, although in nearly all, including jurisdictions which have heretofore been free from strain, the increased volume of private civil cases is putting a heavier burden upon the Federal courts than in previous years. There is less scope for the practice of temporarily assigning judges to areas of congestion outside of their circuits, because more and more judges who formerly responded to calls for help of this nature, are finding all or more than they can do to keep up with the work in their own courts. The increased burden of litigation became manifest first in the district courts, but it is now appearing in the courts of appeals, and will do so more and more as cases tried in the district courts reach the courts of appeals for review. The recommendations for additional judges, circuit and district, by the Judicial Conference were based upon a consideration by the members of the conference of the conditions within their individual circuits, and as stated in the report of its action, represent the minimum which in its judgment will enable the work of the courts to be carried forward effectively.

Salient facts in reference to the recommendations for the different circuits and districts are as follows:

CIRCUIT JUDGESHIPS

*The District of Columbia circuit*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges of the court of appeals for this circuit from 6 to 8.

The number of cases filed in this court increased from 264 in 1947 to 348 in 1948. Because of its location in the Capital of the Nation, the court receives many more cases involving Federal administrative agencies and high Government officers than the courts of appeals of other circuits. The pending case load per judge at the end of the fiscal year 1948, 45, compared with an average for all circuits of 28 and was the highest in the country. The median time from the filing of the record to the final disposition of cases terminated after hearing or submission in the court during the fiscal year 1948 was 8.7 months, compared with an average for the country of 6.3 months.

Chief Judge Stephens of the court estimated shortly prior to the beginning of the present court year in the fall of 1948, that after allowance was made for cases which would be disposed of without argument or opinion, there would be a remainder of 370 cases to be disposed of during the current year by opinion after argument. If this could be done it would require each of the six present judges to write some 62 opinions during the year which compares with an average of 27 opinions per year written by the judges of the court during the past nine fiscal years. The addition of two judges will still require a high average output.

*The third circuit*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges of the court of appeals for this circuit from 6 to 7.

The number of cases pending in this court per judge at the end of the fiscal year 1948 was 39, which next to the District of Columbia was the highest of any circuit. Judge Albert B. Maris is counted in the number of judges in this computation, although he is the presiding judge of the United States Emergency Court of Appeals, and his duties on that court require most of his time. By the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 jurisdiction was given to the Emergency Court of

Appeals to review the recommendations of local advisory boards in defense-rental areas in reference to the maximum rents of classes of housing accommodations if requested by the Housing Expediter. There seems reason to think that the volume of work under this provision will be considerable. In order to save the Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit from falling behind, the proposal for an additional judge of that court is made.

*The seventh circuit*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges of the court of appeals for this circuit from five to six.

The seventh circuit, which includes the States of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin, has a population which, according to the census of 1940, was approximately 14,460,000. Although it includes the city of Chicago, which is the second largest city in the country and a center of large-scale industry and commerce, the court of appeals for the circuit has fewer judges than that of any other circuit except the first, fourth, and tenth. It has been recognized for some years that on account of the complexity of the cases coming before it the court needed six judges. The number of pending cases in the court at the end of the fiscal year 1948 averaged 37 per judge, in comparison with an average of all circuits of 28.

*The tenth circuit*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of circuit judges of the court of appeals for this circuit from four to five.

The recommendation of an increase in the number of circuit judges in the tenth circuit results from a marked increase in the number of cases filed in the court of appeals for that circuit recently. The number in the fiscal year 1948 was 194 compared with 159 in the previous year. This trend has continued into the current year. The number of cases filed in the first 5 months ended November 30, 96, was almost equal to the number filed in the first 6 months of last year, 98. The pending case load on November 30 this year, 132 (which is the latest information available) compares with 99 at the end of the second quarter of the last fiscal year on December 31, 1947.

DISTRICT JUDGESHIPS

*The northern district of California*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges for this district from five to seven.

The work of the court for the northern district of California and other districts bordering the Pacific Ocean cannot fail to be affected by the marked increase in the population and business of that area, in the decade since 1940 now approaching a close. It is estimated that the population of each of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, has increased somewhere between 40 and 50 percent since the last census. The private civil cases filed in the northern district of California were 537 in the fiscal year 1948 compared with 302 in the fiscal year 1940, and 279 in the fiscal year 1941 which was the last full year before the war began to have its effect. The number of private civil cases pending in the court rose from 234 at the end of the fiscal year 1946 to 488 at the end of 1947, and 608 at the end of 1948. The average number of trials per judge in 1948 was 61.4 in comparison with an average for the 84 districts of 42.1. The average number of civil trials per judge was 45.2 compared with an average for the 84 districts of 30.1. For some time the resident judicial personnel of the district court for this district has been insufficient. Effort has been made to compensate in part by the assignment of outside judges, but the additional permanent judgeships which the judicial conference has recommended are the only way of meeting the situation satisfactorily.

*The southern district of California*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges for this district from eight to nine.

The increase in population and business in the Pacific Slope States in the last decade has had an important effect upon the work of the district court for the southern district. There has been a marked increase in the population of San Diego County which, in 1947 it was estimated, had risen from 289,000 in 1940, to 460,000. There is need for the court to spend more and more time at its headquarters in San Diego. The number of private civil cases pending before the court, 406, at the end of 1948 compares with 234 at the end of 1946, an increase of nearly 200 in 2 years. The State court system recently took account of the increasing volume of work for the courts in this part of California by increasing the number of superior court judges for Los Angeles County from 51 to 58 and the number of municipal court judges in Los Angeles from 41 to 51. The Federal court has an extraordinarily high criminal case load which in 1948 was an average of 423 per judge, compared with 167 for the 84 districts, and 153 only 6 years before. This is due in considerable part to the immigration cases that arise on the border with Mexico. While as stated these cases do not make so great a demand upon the judges per case as civil cases, and particularly private civil cases, yet the unusual volume of such cases in the southern district makes it a factor of some consequence in the burden upon the court.

The average number of trials per judge in the southern district of California in 1948 was 54, as compared with an average in the 84 districts of 42.1, and the average number of civil trials, 41.6, compared with an average of 30.1 in the 84 districts. Judge McCormick, the chief judge of the district court, is a judge of long experience, and he is emphatic in his judgment that the court cannot function satisfactorily without additional judge power.

*The northern and southern districts of Florida*

The bill provides for the creation of a district judgeship for the northern and southern districts of Florida.

The action recommended will only restore the number of district judgeships for the two districts in the State of Florida, namely 5, which existed until October 1, 1947, when Judge Dozier A. DeVane, who was then a judge for the northern and southern districts, became a judge for the northern district in consequence of the retirement of Judge Augustine V. Long, of that district. The statute providing for a judge for the two districts then lapsed according to its terms. There can be no question that the judgeship for the two districts should be restored. All the reasons which existed for providing for the judgeship when it was created in 1940 now exist in accentuated form.

There has been a marked increase in the population of the southern district in recent years, and the business of the court for that district has grown. The private civil cases filed in the district per judge have risen from 91 in 1946 to 129 in 1947, and 212 in 1948, compared with an average for the 84 districts in 1948 of 117, and an average for the southern district of Florida in 1942 of 76. The southern district is in great need of reinforcement which is being met as far as it can be by the assignment of judges from other jurisdictions. But the amount of help of this nature which can be given is comparatively small. There is urgent need for the appointment again of a judge for the two districts who, as in the case of Judge DeVane, would give most of his attention to the southern district.

*The northern district of Georgia*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges for this district from one to two.

This action as in the case of Florida would only restore the active judge power which existed until recently. A statute enacted in 1940 authorized two district judges for the district but provided that the next ensuing vacancy should not be filled. The second judgeship consequently lapsed upon the retirement of Judge E. Marvin Underwood on March 5, 1948, and at the present time there is only one active judge.

Unquestionably two active judges are needed. At the end of 1948 the number of pending private civil cases was 137 compared with 105 in the fiscal year 1941, the last full year before the war. Retired Judge Underwood recognizing the need has given an unusual amount of service to the court since his retirement, but there is a manifest limit to the help which can be fairly asked from him. When it is remembered that the city of Atlanta with its active population and industry is in the district, it would seem that there could be no doubt that the second active judgeship which the district formerly had, should be restored.

*The district of Kansas*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from one to two.

The provision recommended in reference to this district will also only restore the status which recently existed. A law passed in 1945 increased the number of judges from one to two. From the appointment of the present judge, Arthur J. Mellott, who took the oath of office on November 27, 1945, until the death on July 5, 1946, of Judge Guy T. Helvering, who, during that time, was the senior judge, the district had two judges. But the law which provided for the second judgeship prohibited the filling of the vacancy resulting from the death of Judge Helvering, and since that time, as before 1945, Kansas has had only one judge.

The population of Kansas, according to the 1940 census, was approximately 1,800,000. Except for one other State, Colorado, which, according to the 1940 census, had a population of around 1,100,000, Kansas is the only State in the Union with a population of 850,000 or more which does not have two or more district judges. The district of Nebraska, which adjoins it on the north, with a population in 1940 of around 1,300,000, has two judges.

The work of the district court for the district of Kansas imperatively calls for an additional judge. The load of private civil cases for the one judge in 1948 was 156, compared with a national average of 117 per judge, and 113 in the fiscal year 1942. Almost constantly district judges from other districts in the tenth circuit are being assigned by Chief Judge Phillips to the district of Kansas to help the resident judge. But the condition plainly calls for the creation of a second permanent judgeship.

*The eastern and western districts of Missouri*

The bill provides for making permanent the second district judgeship of the two districts presently held by District Judge Richard M. Duncan.

This judgeship was created by an act approved December 24, 1942. But it contained a proviso that the first vacancy occurring should not be filled. The purpose of the legislation recommended is to avoid the lapse of time which otherwise will occur if there is a vacancy in the judgeship before a statute can be enacted to continue it, and to assure the permanence of the position.

The judges of the court have arranged that Judge Duncan will make his headquarters in Kansas City and devote his attention to the western district and that Judge Roy W. Harper, who holds an interim appointment

to the permanent judgeship for the two districts. will make his headquarters in St. Louis and give his attention to the business of the eastern district. Presumably, this division of duties between the two judges for the eastern and western districts will continue indefinitely. Consequently, it is the business of the western district which has the principal bearing on the recommendation to make permanent the judgeship held by Judge Duncan.

The experience since the passage of the act of 1942 above referred to shows plainly that three judges will be continuously needed in the western district. The volume of business in that district is approximately at the level at which it was when the law was passed. The number of private civil cases filed in 1948 and pending at the end of the year which, as has been said are the most important categories from the standpoint of the load upon the judge, is greater than in the fiscal year 1942. The number of such cases filed in 1948 was 314, compared with 292 in 1942, and the number pending at the end of 1948 was 238, compared with 136 at the end of 1942. Consequently, every reason which existed for creating the temporary judgeship held by Judge Duncan now exists for making it permanent, and it is desirable that this be done in order to avoid any hiatus in the position in the future.

*The district of New Jersey*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from five to six.

As pointed out hereinbefore private civil cases are the most time consuming. At the close of the fiscal year 1948 there were pending in the District of New Jersey 866 private civil cases, a number slightly in excess of 173 per judge, while pending private civil cases in the 84 districts of the United States averaged but 131 per judge. It should be noted also that the number of pending private civil cases has risen from 572 in the year 1940 to 866 in the year 1948 and there has been a continuous increase since the end of the war.

The situation is further complicated by the fact that there have been constant vacancies in the court by reason of death or resignation, and the District Court of the District of New Jersey has been badly in arrears in the disposition of cases for more than a decade. It should be noted in this connection that while the median time interval from filing to disposition in the 84 districts in 1948 was 9.9 months, the similar time interval in the district of New Jersey was 20.1 months.

There have been frequent assignments of additional judges to the district of New Jersey both from within and without the circuit, but for the prompt and effective disposition of the business of the district it is necessary that there be created at least one additonal judgeship.

The recommendation of an additional district judgeship for the district of New Jersey has been made by the judicial conference each year for the last 5 years.

*The southern district of New York*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from 12 to 16.

Of the four additional district judgeships recommended, one, if created, will merely restore the position that lapsed under the terms of the statute when the late Judge John M. Woolsey retired on December 31, 1943. His retirement reduced the number of resident judges from 13 to 12 where it has since stood. Since that time the number of civil cases filed in the court has all but doubled, rising from 2,949 in the fiscal year 1943 to 5,896 in the fiscal year 1948. The number of private civil cases filed, which was 1,977 in 1943, was 4,302 in 1948, and the number of such cases pending at the end of the year, which was 2,474 in 1943, was 6,738 in 1948. The court with its present force of 12 resident judges is burdened with an intolerable load which their utmost exertions and the help of many outside judges who are assigned to the district, are insufficient to carry. As an example, the number of private civil cases per judge filed in the court in 1948 was 359, compared with an average for the 84 districts of 117.

Under these conditions, the number of pending private civil cases has necessarily risen sharply in the last 3 years, going from 2,820 in 1946 to 4,706 in 1947, and 6,738 in 1948. The median time elapsing from filing to disposition of civil cases in which a trial was held in the court in the fiscal year 1948, was 22.5 months, which was the highest in the country, compared with a median for the 84 districts of 9.9 months. The present condition entailing unavoidable delay is plainly unjust to litigants besides being wearing to the last degree upon the judges of the court. The four additional judgeships which are recommended will give the court no more than a moderate judicial force to handle the cases coming before it which not only are numerous, but because of the concentration of commerce and business in New York, include an unusual proportion of complex and difficult problems for decision.

*The district of Oregon*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from two to three.

The work of the court for the district of Oregon is affected by the increase in population and business of the Pacific Coast States to which reference has been made in connection with the districts of California. The valley of the Willamette River, in which Portland lies near its confluence with the Columbia River, became a center for shipbuilding and other large-scale industry during the war, and this activity is continuing. In recent years the number of civil cases filed in the district has increased from 320 in 1945 to 370 in 1946, 474 in 1947, and 482 in 1948. The increase in 1948 over the number a few years previously was not due to price regulation cases because only five such civil cases were filed. The number of private civil cases begun increased from 92 in 1945 to 111 in 1946, 172 in 1947, and 174 in 1948, and the number of such cases pending rose from 62 in 1945 to 72 in 1946, 127 in 1947, and 140 in 1948.

The court for the district of Oregon is known as a court in which pretrial procedure is regularly and vigorously used. Both of the judges are recognized as highly capable jurists and skilled in dispatching work. The increase in the number of private civil cases pending under these conditions shows that the judge power has become insufficient, and that the additional judgeship recommended by the judicial conference is needed.

*The eastern district of Pennsylvania*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from five to seven. It should be pointed out that Judge Frederick V. Follmer, who was appointed as a district judge-at-large over the three districts of Pennsylvania, adds in effect the equivalent of a one-third judgeship.

At the end of the fiscal year 1948 there were pending in the eastern district of Pennsylvania 1,514 private civil cases which, as stated hereinbefore, constitute the most time-consuming group, or an average of 284 per judge. This is to be contrasted with the corresponding figure for the 84 districts of 131 private civil cases to a judge.

To put it bluntly the eastern district of Pennsylvania is overwhelmed in judicial business despite the fact that there have been continuous assignments of additional judges to that district both from within and without the circuit. These assignments have been both by the Chief Justice of the United States and by the chief judge of the circuit, and while they have been of substantial assistance it has been impossible to dispose of the heavy case load by such means.

The median time interval from issue to trial of civil cases terminated after trial in the 84 districts of the United States in 1948 was 5.8 months, whereas the similar time interval in the eastern district of Pennsylvania was 10.3 months, or almost 100 percent longer.

It should be noted that there has been a steady increase in the number of private civil cases (with the exception of the war years) filed in the district. In 1941 there were 454 private civil cases filed, whereas in the year 1948 there were 1,087 like cases filed. This amounted to 204 per judge as contrasted with 117 per judge in the 84 districts of the United States. It should also be observed that whereas there were but 538 private civil cases pending in the district at the end of the year 1941, there were pending 1,514 private civil cases at the end of the year 1948, an increase of almost 200 percent.

Unless prompt aid is given to the eastern district of Pennsylvania by the creation of at least two new judgeships there will follow a substantial failure of justice in that district due to inevitable delays.

*The western district of Pennsylvania*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from three to five, with a proviso that the first two vacancies occurring on the court should not be filled. It should be pointed out that Judge Frederick V. Follmer, who was appointed as a district judge-at-large over the three districts of Pennsylvania, adds in effect the equivalent of a one-third judgeship.

Though the case load in the court is not unusual, two of the present judges, including the chief judge, are of advanced years and have not been in continuous good health.

The condition of this district must be considered in conjunction with that of the eastern district of Pennsylvania, since Judge Follmer, the judge-at-large over the three districts, is compelled to spend a very great portion of his time at Philadelphia, the pressing necessity of additional judge power in the latter district being overwhelming.

*The southern district of Texas*

The bill provides for an increase in the number of district judges from two to three, with a proviso that the official residence of one district judge shall be in the southern half of the district.

The southern district of Texas is another area in which there has been a marked increase in population and industry during and after the war. The number of civil cases begun in 1948 was 1,111, compared with 508 in 1942, or more than double. The number of private civil cases begun in 1948 was 576, compared with 301 in 1942. The number of all civil cases pending at the end of 1948 was 1,030, compared with 277 at the end of 1942, and the number of private civil cases pending at the end of 1948 was 408, compared with 143 at the end of 1942. The case load per judge of private civil cases filed in 1948 was 288, compared with the average for the 84 districts of 117. The load per judge for this district in 1942 was 151.

The criminal case load, because of cases arising on the border, is proportionately very high, and while, as stated, it is the private civil cases which, per case, require the largest amount of time on the part of the judges, still, criminal cases in the volume in which they arise in this district add to the burden. The load is increased by the very large area of the district and the long distance which it is necessary for judges to travel between the seats of the court. The conditions obviously call for the additional judgeship which the Judicial Conference has recommended.

The proviso that the official residence of one of the judges shall be in the southern half of the district, was approved by the conference in compliance with what the con-

ference was informed was the general sentiment of the district, and was deemed by the conference to be equitable.

---

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) the President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional circuit judges for the District of Columbia circuit, one additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit, and one additional circuit judge for the tenth circuit. Accordingly title 28, United States Code, section 44 (a), is amended to read as follows with respect to said circuits:

| "Circuits: | *Number of judges* |
|---|---|
| District of Columbia | 8 |
| Seventh | 6 |
| Tenth | 5" |

(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, one additional circuit judge for the third circuit.

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the northern district of California, one additional district judge for the southern district of California, one district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida, one additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia, one additional district judge for the district of Kansas, one additional district judge for the district of New Jersey, four additional district judges for the southern district of New York, one additional district judge for the district of Oregon, two additional district judges for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, and one additional district judge for the southern district of Texas, and the existing judgeship for the eastern and western districts of Missouri created by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), shall be a permanent judgeship. Accordingly title 28, United States Code, section 133, is amended to read as follows with respect to said districts:

| "Districts: | |
|---|---|
| California: | *Judges* |
| Northern | 7 |
| Southern | 9 |
| Florida: Northern and southern | 1 |
| Georgia: Northern | 2 |
| Kansas | 2 |
| Missouri: Eastern and western | 2 |
| New Jersey | 6 |
| New York: Southern | 16 |
| Oregon | 3 |
| Pennsylvania: Eastern | 7 |
| Texas: Southern (*Provided*, That official residence of 1 district judge shall be in the southern one-half of the district) | 3" |

(b) The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, two additional district judges for the western district of Pennsylvania: *Provided*, That the first two vacancies occurring in the office of district judge in said district shall not be filled.

(c) The act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1083), is hereby repealed and the incumbent of the judgeship created by said act shall henceforth hold his position under title 28, United States Code, section 133, as amended by this act.

## REPEAL OF TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to repeal Federal antimargarine legislation.

In the light of developments at the last session and since Congress went home, I am hopeful that repeal of the burdensome and unfair antimargarine laws will be one of the first orders of business of the Eighty-first Congress. In my opinion, only the legislative jam which developed during the closing days of the Eightieth Congress prevented complete repeal during that session.

As will be recalled, the House approved a repeal bill by a more than 2 to 1 vote; the Senate Finance Committee reported the House bill by a 12 to 0 vote. Test votes near the close of the session indicated that a bill to repeal the antimargarine laws would pass the Senate with votes to spare.

The issues in the margarine controversy are thoroughly known. Committee hearings were held in the House and Senate last session and the matter was thoroughly debated in both Houses. I see no reason for committee hearings at this session and feel that a vote should come as quickly as possible.

Since the session ended, the butter interests have come forward with the proposal that the taxes on margarine be lifted but that yellow margarine be banned by law altogether.

This simply represents an attempt to confuse the issue. The butter interests offered no concession whatever until it became apparent they could no longer resist the drive toward repeal of the unfair and outmoded legislation.

The butter lobby claims that the ban on yellow margarine is necessary to prevent margarine from being sold as butter.

A similar argument can be made in the case of hundreds of products which imitate and compete with an original product. If we accept butter's theory, we must prevent imitation leather from being colored brown. Otherwise, somebody might be deceived. The whole field of imitation jewelry is in danger for these imitate in color and in other ways the characteristics of the genuine gems. Furthermore, there are instances on record where these imitation gems have been sold as the real article. In the food field, we might have to color shortening some hue other than white, for fear that otherwise it imitates lard too closely. These examples could be continued at length.

Some of the illustrations I have given may sound ridiculous but when examined closely they are no more ridiculous than butter's assertion that it has a right to prevent a competitor from using a certain color.

Butter apparently is the only product in this country which claims a monopoly on any color. And, paradoxically enough, butter uses artificial coloring freely and, by law, butter is specifically exempted from the requirement that the use of artificial coloring must be stated on the label. If color is used in margarine that fact must be stated and the requirement applies to all other foods—with the exception of dairy products.

Butter has the yellow hue traditionally associated with the food only during some of the spring and summer months. In the winter, when the cows are no longer feeding on green grass, butter's color is likely to be white, and artificial coloring is used to make it yellow.

It is readily apparent that the proposal to ban yellow margarine cannot be defended from a logical standpoint. It clearly is an attempt by one commodity to cripple a competitor through punitive legislation.

No one, least of all myself, wants to see margarine sold as butter. There are laws against such sales now, both Federal and State. If these are not sufficient, let others be passed.

In this connection, an amendment was added to the oleomargarine tax repeal bill last year, when it was reported to the Senate by the Finance Committee which made the serving of margarine as butter in public eating places a Federal offense.

The amendment is substantially acceptable to me and I have included similar provisions in the bill I am introducing today. It provides that—

First. Each separate serving of margarine sold by a public eating place must bear labeling identifying it as oleomargarine; and

Second. A public eating place serving colored oleomargarine must place a prominent and conspicuous notice in the establishment stating that oleomargarine is served there, or notice be printed on the menu. These requirements apply regardless of whether the margarine served is transported in interstate commerce or whether it is sold in the same State or Territory in which it is produced.

In my opinion, a ban on yellow margarine actually would do much less toward the elimination of fraud in the sale of margarine than my amendment proposes.

Approximately 90 percent of all margarine sold is sold through stores for home consumption. Under the food and drug laws margarine must be clearly identified, and there is little danger of fraud in store sales for these reasons: Not only are the majority of the grocers honest and conscientious men but the penalty for removing the wrapping from margarine and selling it as butter is very severe. A grocer who deliberately does so may be sent to prison for 3 years or fined $10,000, or both. No grocer in his right mind would risk such a punishment for the comparatively small amount to be made from fraud in the sale of margarine.

We have then the fact that there is no danger of fraud in the case of 90 percent of the margarine sold. The remaining 10 percent goes mostly to the bakers, who do not care whether margarine is yellow or white. They use it to mix with other ingredients. There is no possible danger of fraud in the case of sales to bakers.

Thus, we have a situation where solely in the case of public eating places, there is a possibility of fraud. This possibility, as I have shown, exists in substantially less than 10 percent of margarine sales. Yet the butter interests want to force housewives all over the country to continue extra and unnecessary work in mixing color into margarine and to waste food in the process.

If the butter interests want to prevent fraud, let them support repeal with an amendment which makes the sale of margarine as butter in public eating places a Federal offense and which places enforcement of the amendment in the very efficient hands of the Food and Drug Administration.

There is more at stake in the repeal of antimargarine legislation than is readily apparent. The law is in reality an internal tariff. If the precedent it establishes is followed, this country would be Balkanized.

Antimargarine legislation discriminates not only against consumers but against cotton and soybean farmers and other farmers who produce fats and oils which go into margarine. This discrimination has been going on a long time and has been particularly costly to the cotton producers.

Nor will repeal injure the dairy farmers, for butter today is the least profitable use of milk. Over the years it has become steadily less and less important to dairying.

The bill (S. 117) to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

### SCHOOL-FACILITIES AID BILL

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a school-facilities aid bill.

One of the most acute problems facing our Nation today is that of providing adequate public-school facilities. Our population is increasing more rapidly than was anticipated and this, together with wartime restrictions upon construction, has resulted in an accumulated need for school buildings estimated last year by the United States Office of Education at $6,600,000,000.

The States and local school districts, faced with the related problems of providing more teachers with increased pay to compensate for higher living costs, are having great difficulty in financing building programs that are regarded as essential. This is a field in which Federal assistance is justified.

I am, therefore, reintroducing today the bill (S. 2909) which I offered at the special session of the Eightieth Congress last summer to provide $300,000,000 in grants and an additional $300,000,000 in loans for public school buildings and related facilities. This money would be distributed by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to State educational authorities on a basis proportional to each State's population of school age as compared with the national population in the same age bracket. The plan proposed by my bill is similar to that under which the PWA helped to finance 15,300 new school buildings or major additions providing accommodations for 2,384,000 students.

I feel that this approach not only offers Federal aid to education at a point of great need, but it also gives maximum assurance to those who would like to see aid provided but who fear ultimate interference of the Federal Government with our educational system. My bill sets up no new agency and gives no added authority to an existing agency, except for the simple provision that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may act as disbursing agent. State educational authorities are left with full power to use the funds allocated to them in whatever way will best meet their individual building needs. No additional appropriations will be required to enable the RFC to finance this undertaking.

The bill (S. 137) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

### NATIONAL HOUSING OBJECTIVE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. LONG, and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a national housing objective, and so forth.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a short synopsis and explanation of the bill, together with another document showing the major differences between the bill I am sending to the desk and Senate bill 866 which was considered by the Senate during the Eightieth Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the synopsis and explanation of the bill presented by the Senator from Louisiana, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 138) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public-housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The synopsis and explanation of the bill, presented by Mr. ELLENDER, are as follows:

MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL HOUSING OBJECTIVE AND THE POLICY TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE ATTAINMENT THEREOF, TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO ASSIST SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS AND LOW-RENT PUBLIC-HOUSING PROJECTS INITIATED BY LOCAL AGENCIES, TO PROVIDE FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FARM HOUSING, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES, AND THE COMPARABLE TITLES OF S. 866, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, AS PASSED BY THE SENATE

#### TITLE

There has been included in the title of the draft bill a specific reference to the provision of financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing.

*Section 2. Declaration of national housing policy*

The declaration of policy has been clarified by the addition of specific provisions with respect to governmental assistance for farm housing, and by the inclusion of provisions to make it clear that the portion of the policy relating to governmental assistance to localities for slum clearance and low-rent public housing is concerned with nonfarm families. A clause has also been added to the effect that appropriate local public bodies shall be encouraged and assisted to undertake positive programs of assisting housing cost reductions and increased efficiency in residential construction.

#### TITLE I—SLUM CLEARANCE

The maximum maturity of the long-term definitive Federal loans has been reduced from 45 years to 40 years. This is contained in the second sentence of section 102 (a) of the bill.

Provisions have also been included to authorize the Administrator to make loans to local public agencies for surveys and plans in preparation of projects which may be assisted under this title, and to permit contracts for such loans to be made upon the condition that such loans shall be repaid, with interest at not less than the applicable going Federal rate, out of any moneys which become available to such agency for the undertaking of the project or projects involved. These provisions are contained in section 102 (b) of the bill.

The total loan authorization has been reduced from $1,010,000,000 to an even $1,000,000,000, and the maximum period over which such authorization becomes available has been reduced from 6 years to 5 years. The rate at which the loan authorization becomes available has been changed as follows: $25,000,000 (in lieu of $10,000,000) in the first year (July 1, 1949), $225,000,000 (in lieu of $200,000,000) in the second year (July 1, 1950), and $250,000,000 (in lieu of $200,000,000 in each of the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth years) in each of the third, fourth, and fifth years, respectively (July 1, 1951, July 1, 1952, and July 1, 1953). Provisions have also been included to permit the increases in the loan authorization becoming available in any year to be increased (subject to the total loan authorization of $1,000,000,000), at any time or times, by not to exceed an additional $250,000,000 upon a determination by the President that such action is in the public interest. Provisions have also been included which make the issuance of obligations by the Administrator for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury under the loan authorization subject to the approval of the President. These provisions are contained in section 102 (c) of the bill.

The capital grant authorization remains at $500,000,000, becoming available at the rate of $100,000,000 each year over a 5-year period, and provision has been included to make the availability of these contract authorizations subject to the approval of the President. Provisions have also been included to permit the rate at which such authorization becomes available to be accelerated. Thus, the bill provides that (subject to the total capital grant authorization of $500,000,000) the initial $100,000,000, and each subsequent annual increase therein, may be increased, at any time or times, by an additional $100,000,000 upon a determination by the President that such action is in the public interest. These provisions are included in section 103 (b) of the bill.

The provision that capital grant contracts shall contain a condition that no funds shall be disbursed by local public agencies for the purchase of land in connection with projects assisted under this title prior to July 1, 1950, is retained, but provisions have been added to direct the Administrator to waive such condition upon a determination by the President that the disbursement of funds by such agencies for such purpose prior to such date would be in the public interest. These provisions are contained in section 103 (b) of the bill.

The provisions prohibiting the demolition of residential structures prior to July 1, 1951, except upon a finding that such demolition would not result in undue hardship for the occupants of such structures have been changed so that such action is prohibited unless the governing body of the locality finds that such demolition would not reasonably be expected to cause undue housing hardship in the community. These provisions are contained in the proviso of section 105 (c) of the bill.

The former provisions with respect to the preparation of budget programs and the maintenance of accounts in accord with the Government Corporation Control Act, "as amended as of the date of the enactment of this act" have been changed by deletion of the words "as amended as of the date of this act." These provisions are contained in sections 106 (a) (1) and (2) of the bill.

The provisions with respect to an annual report have been changed to require such report to be submitted as soon as practicable following the close of the year for which it is made, rather than a specific requirement that such report must be on a fiscal-year basis, with transmission not later than January 15 following the close of the fiscal year for which it is made. These provisions are contained in section 106 (a) (4) of the bill.

Provisions have been included to make it clear that the competitive bidding and other restrictive statutes with respect to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real property by the United States are not applicable to any real property which may be acquired by the Administrator pursuant to this title. These provisions are included in section 106 (c) (2) of the bill.

Provisions have been added to specifically exclude from the local grants-in-aid in connection with a project or projects assisted under this title (1) land in streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way which may be vacated in connection with the project; and (2) any demolition or removal work, improvement, or facility for which a State, municipality, or other public body has received, or has contracted to receive, any grant or subsidy from the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, for such work, or the construction of such improvement or facility. These provisions are included in section 110 (d) of the bill.

TITLE II—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

Throughout the revised bill the provisions applicable to the extended program are made to apply to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, instead of after July 1, 1948. A definition of the term "initiated" is also added in subsection 207 (b).

Section 201 now provides that no contract for financial assistance may be entered into unless the governing body of the locality involved has first entered into an agreement with the local public housing agency to provide the required local cooperation. This is in lieu of the provisions which merely required prior approval by the governing body of the provision of the low-rent housing. The gap of 20 percent between the lowest rents in available private housing and the top rents in a new low-rent public housing project must be established before a contract for contributions can be entered into, instead of prior to the time when a preliminary loan contract is entered into.

Section 201 in defining the requirements for eligibility of families as tenants of a law-rent housing project has been revised to include families which, at the time of their admission, actually are or are about to be without housing as a result of a court order of eviction due to causes other than the fault of the tenant.

The requirement that the question of greatest need be given due consideration in selecting tenants, has been strengthened by providing that, among applicants eligible for occupancy in a dwelling at a given rent, preference be granted to the families having the most urgent housing need.

The provisions of S. 866 (subsections 601 (b) and 602 (c)) permitting the removal of overincome tenants notwithstanding the provisions of any other laws, and authorizing the Public Housing Administration to exclude pensions for service-connected disability or death in determining net income for the purpose of tenant eligibility, have been deleted since such provisions are now contained in other legislation heretofore enacted by the Congress.

The cost limits on dwelling facilities and equipment for low-rent housing projects contained in section 203 have been revised in the following particulars:

(a) The former differential between the cost limits for projects developed in cities or metropolitan districts having a population of 500,000 or over and for projects in smaller localities has been eliminated. Such differential is no longer realistic due to the increased uniformity in construction costs, including both labor and material, irrespective of city size.

(b) The former limitations of $1,250 and $1,500 per room have been increased to a uniform $1,750 per room because of the increase in building costs; for dwelling projects in Alaska, the cost limitation has been increased from $2,200 to $2,500 per room.

(c) The provisions of S. 866 which authorized, under certain conditions, an increase of $250 per room in the applicable cost limitations for construction and equipment for any project initiated on or before December 31, 1952 (formerly December 31, 1951) have been revised to permit an increase in such cost limits of $750 per room without limit as to time.

Subsection 204 (c) which changes the definition of the going Federal rate has been revised so as to tie this rate to the interest on bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 10 years or more instead of 20 years or more, and has been further revised so that if there are two or more such rates the highest instead of the lowest thereof shall be applicable.

In subsection 204 (e), the maximum annual contribution rate is increased by one-half of 1 percent of development cost to compensate for the withdrawal of Federal income-tax exemptions on the interest of the obligations of the local public housing agencies.

Subsection 204 (h) which formerly authorized the Public Housing Administration to have outstanding at any one time notes and other obligations in the amount of $800,000,000, has been revised to increase this amount to $1,500,000,000, in recognition of the increased size of the program and of the increased construction costs anticipated in the extended program.

Section 205, which formerly authorized the Public Housing Administration to enter into contracts for annual contributions for low-rent housing projects in the amount of not more than $32,000,000 on or after the first day of July 1948, which limits were increased by further amounts of $32,000,000 in the years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952, respectively, thus providing for an aggregate authorization of $160,000,000, has been amended in the following particulars:

(a) The aggregate amount of annual contributions which may be contracted for in connection with the extended program has been increased to $445,000,000 in recognition of the increased size of the program and of increased construction costs.

(b) The Public Housing Administration is authorized to enter into contracts for not more than an aggregate of $85,000,000 after July 1, 1949, which limit is increased by further amounts of $90,000,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1950 through and including 1953, respectively. Subject to the total authorization, the President may accelerate this schedule by increasing any of the amounts by not more than $90,000,000.

(c) Provisions have also been included to make the availability of these contract authorizations subject to the approval of the President.

The provisions of S. 866 limited the new program of low-rent housing to a total of 500,000 dwelling units. Under section 205 of the bill, the Public Housing Administration can authorize the commencement of the construction of not more than 150,000 dwelling units after July 1, 1949, which limit is increased by further amounts of 150,000 dwelling units on July 1 in each of the years 1950 through and including 1955. The President is given the authority (subject to the total limitation of 1,050,000 units) to accelerate such construction by increasing any of the amounts by 150,000 dwelling units if he determines that this is in the public interest.

A new subsection 205 (b) has been added, which requires that low-rent housing projects initiated after March 1, 1949, be exempt from all real and personal property taxes, but authorizes payments in lieu of taxes in an annual amount not in excess of 5 percent of shelter rents charged in such project. These provisions are in lieu of the present requirements of the act as to local contributions. The subsection also permits the revision of contracts for projects initiated prior to March 1, 1949, on similar terms. These provisions are necessary to clear up the matter of payments in lieu of taxes which has been brought into question by limitations in the Government Corporations Appropriation Acts for 1948 and 1949.

A new section 206 has been added to better meet the needs of large families. The present provisions of the act are modified so that there will be a larger spread between the incomes for eligibility of families with few children and for those with a relatively large number of children. In addition, for the purpose of continued occupancy only, the income of a secondary worker who is under 21 years of age may be excluded in whole or in part, but such income must be taken into account in fixing rents.

A new subsection 207 (a) has been added, which amends the declaration of purpose of the United States Housing Act by changing the words "rural or urban communities" to the words "urban and rural nonfarm areas." This is done in view of the fact that farm housing will not be a responsibility of PHA under the act.

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

Provision has been included to exempt the dissemination of the results of technical research and studies from the existing provisions of law prohibiting any agency from distributing through the mail, free of postage, reports and other documents, unless a request therefor has been previously received by such agency. This is contained in the last sentence of section 301 (a) of the bill.

Provision has been included in the subsection relating to the preparation by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator of periodic estimates of national housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs to make it clear that such estimates and reports relate to urban and rural nonfarm housing. This is contained in section 301 (b) of the bill.

Provision has been included for the Administrator to consult with, and make recommendations to, other appropriate Federal agencies with respect to means for overcoming existing gaps in available housing data and facilities for the collection of such data. Provision has also been included to make it clear that the research and studies

can be undertaken cooperatively with industry and labor, as well as with agencies of State and local governments, educational institutions, and other nonprofit organizations. These provisions are contained in section 302 of the bill.

TITLE IV—FARM HOUSING

The basis of the definition of the term "farm" for the purposes of this title has been changed from the production of one or more agricultural commodities for sale or home use of "a gross annual value of not less than $400" to "a gross annual value of not less than the value as determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to a gross annual value of $400 in 1944." This is contained in section 401 (b) of the bill.

Provision has been included for the preparation by the Secretary of Agriculture of periodic estimates of national farm housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting those needs. This is contained in section 405 (b) of the bill.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Provisions have been included to authorize the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to appoint such advisory committees as may be necessary in carrying out his functions, powers, and duties under this or any other act. Provision is also included that service as a member of any such advisory committee shall not constitute any form of service or employment within the provisions of title 18, section 198 or 203, United States Code, or within the provisions of title 41, section 119, United States Code. These provisions are contained in section 501 on the bill.

(Provisions of title 18, section 198, United States Code, prohibit an officer of the United States, or a person holding any place of trust or profit, or discharging any official function under or in connection with any executive department, and others from acting as agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States or assisting in the prosecution or supporting any such claim or receiving any gratuity or favor or interest in any claim, and provides a fine of not more than $5,000, 1 year's imprisonment, or both.)

(Provisions of title 18, section 203, United States Code, prohibit an officer or clerk of the United States directly or indirectly from receiving or agreeing to receive any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter in which the United States is a party before any court or bureau, and provides a fine of $10,000 and not more than 2 years' imprisonment.)

(Title 41, section 119, United States Code (which is part of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944), prohibits any person employed in any Government agency to prosecute or act as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States or for any person within 2 years after such employment to prosecute or act as counsel or agent involving any such matter directly connected with which such person was so employed to perform duties. It provides $10,000 fine or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.)

In recognition of the special security features which would attach to the definitive bonds issued by public-housing agencies, there has been included an amendment of the National Banking Act so that national banks, and (to the extent permitted by State laws) State member banks of the Federal Reserve System, would be authorized to purchase larger amounts, and to underwrite, local public-housing agency definitive bonds. Without this amendment, investment in such bonds by these banks would continue to be subject to the same restrictions as are applicable to local public-housing agency definitive bonds, which are now issued without these special security features. In other words, they could be purchased for the bank's own account only to the extent of 10 percent of unimpaired capital and surplus.

The amendment would also cover the short-term notes issued in connection with the slum-clearance program, and those issued in connection with the low-rent public-housing program, when secured by a pledge of proceeds of Federal loans in an amount sufficient to pay the principal of and the interest on such short-term notes at maturity.

The Secretary of Labor has been included in the membership of the National Housing Council in the Housing and Home Finance Agency. This provision is contained in section 503 of the bill.

A new section 504 has been included to repeal the provisos which were inserted in the Government Corporations Appropriation Acts of 1948 and 1949 limiting payments in lieu of taxes. These provisos necessitated violations by the Public Housing Administration of certain contracts which had been legally entered into. Their repeal will permit payments in lieu of taxes to be made in accordance with such valid contracts. These provisos are superseded by subsection 205 (b) which establishes a permanent policy as to payments in lieu of taxes. Subsection (c) of section 504 repeals a proviso limiting the number of employees of the Public Housing Administration above grades CAF–10 and P–3 to not exceeding 20 percent of the total number of administrative employees. This repeal is necessary to permit the recruitment of the trained personnel which will be necessary to put the new program into operation.

---

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL HOUSING OBJECTIVE AND THE POLICY TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE ATTAINMENT THEREOF, TO PROVIDE FEDERAL AID TO ASSIST SLUM-CLEARANCE PROJECTS AND LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS INITIATED BY LOCAL AGENCIES, TO PROVIDE FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FARM HOUSING, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

*Section 1. Short title*

This section provides a short and convenient form of citation.

*Section 2. Declaration of national housing policy*

The purpose of this section is to set forth our national housing objectives as established by the Congress and the basic principles to be followed in attaining these objectives. In so doing it stresses the Nation's interest in housing production and related community development because of the basic contribution they can make both (1) toward improving the health and living standards of the people and (2) toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. Thus, the section calls attention specifically to the need for housing production and related community development sufficient to remedy the serious housing shortage, to eliminate slum and blighted areas, to realize as soon as feasible the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, to redevelop communities so as to advance the growth and wealth of the Nation, and to enable the housing industry to make its full contribution toward an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

The keystone of the national housing policy established by the Congress in this section to facilitate the attainment of these objectives is that private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total need as it can, and that governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve still more of the total need, and that local public bodies shall be encouraged and assisted to undertake positive programs of assisting housing cost reductions and increased efficiency in residential construction. As a complementary policy, the section states that governmental aid to clear slums and provide adequate housing for urban and rural nonfarm families whose incomes are so low that they are not being decently housed in new or existing housing shall be extended to those localities which estimate their own needs and demonstrate that these needs are not being met by reliance solely upon private enterprise, and without such aid, and that governmental assistance for decent, safe, and sanitary farm dwellings and related facilities shall be extended only where the farm owner demonstrates that he lacks sufficient resources to provide such housing on his own account and is unable to secure necessary credit for such housing from other sources on terms and conditions which he could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

TITLE I—SLUM CLEARANCE

*General summary*

This title provides for Federal aid to local communities for the clearance of their slums and blighted areas, so as to make such areas available for redevelopment, with the active participation of private enterprise. Two types of assistance are authorized:

1. Loans, both temporary and long-term (but not in excess of 40 years in the case of long-term definitive loans), where needed to finance necessary project costs, at an interest rate designed to return to the Government the cost to it of the funds it obtains to make the loans; and

2. A capital grant subsidy where necessary to enable the land in the slum or blighted area to be made available for redevelopment at prices consistent with proper and sound land use and planning.

The administration of the program would be under the jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator. In the administration of the program adherence to the following principles is required:

1. That any project assisted be related to the improvement of housing conditions in the locality.

2. That Federal assistance be confined to purposes of land assembly and preparation for redevelopment, as distinguished from actual redevelopment of the area.

3. That every project assisted be a local undertaking, locally planned, locally approved, and designed to serve local needs.

4. That plans for redevelopment afford maximum opportunity to, and require maximum reliance upon, private enterprise.

5. That there shall be local financial participation in an amount equal to at least one-third of the difference between the project cost and the new reuse value of the land comprising the project area.

6. That there be adequate provision for the rehousing of the families displaced by the clearance of the area.

*Section 101. Local responsibility to aid housing cost reductions*

This section provides that in extending financial assistance under this title, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator shall give consideration to the extent to which the locality has undertaken a positive program of encouraging housing cost reductions and efficiency in construction through the adoption and improvement of building and related codes.

*Section 102. Loans*

This section, together with section 103, sets forth the forms and extent of Federal financial assistance. Section 102 provides for assistance in the form of loans which (whether temporary or definitive) must bear interest at not less than the rate specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of 10 years or

more at the date the contract for the loan is made. The long-term definitive loans must mature within a period not exceeding 40 years from the date of the bonds evidencing such loans.

While providing for Federal assistance in the form of loans where necessary, the section also contains provisions to facilitate financing by private capital. It contains a provision to enable the local public agency to obtain loan funds from sources other than the Federal Government to the fullest extent practicable, and to substitute such funds for borrowing from the Government.

The section also provides that the Administrator may make loans to local public agencies for surveys and plans in preparation of projects which may be assisted under this title, and that the contracts for such loans may be made upon the condition that such loans shall be repaid, with interest at not less than the applicable going Federal rate, out of any moneys which become available to such agency for the undertaking of the project or projects involved.

To provide the funds necessary to make the loans, the Administrator is authorized, with the approval of the President, to issue and have outstanding at any one time notes or other obligations for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury aggregating not more than $1,000,000,000. This loan authorization becomes available over a 5-year period at the following rate: $25,000,000 on and after July 1, 1949, increased by $225,000,000 on and after July 1, 1950, and by $250,000,000 on and after July 1 in each of the years 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively. The section also permits the increases in the loan authorization becoming available in any year to be increased (subject to the total loan authorization of $1,000,000,000), at any time or times, by not to exceed an additional $250,000,000 upon a determination by the President that such action is in the public interest.

*Section 103. Capital grants*

This section provides for Federal subsidy, in the form of capital grants, in those cases where such assistance is necessary, if the land in the project area is to be available for proper use and soundly planned redevelopment at prices consistent with such use and redevelopment. The capital grants would be limited in amount to two-thirds of the net cost of the projects assisted in the locality.

The Administrator is authorized to contract to make capital grants aggregating not more than $500,000,000. This capital-grant authorization becomes available over a 5-year period at the following rate: $100,000,000 on and after July 1 in each of the years 1949, 1950, 1951, 1952, and 1953, respectively. The section also permits the specified amounts of the capital-grant authorization becoming available in any year to be increased (subject to the total capital-grant authorization of $500,000,000), at any time or times, by not to exceed an additional $100,000,000 upon a determination by the President that such action is in the public interest.

While contracts for capital grants may be entered into beginning with July 1, 1949, the section contains a provision that such contracts shall contain a condition that no funds shall be disbursed by the local public agency prior to July 1, 1950, for the purchase of land in connection with a project assisted under this title. Such condition may be waived upon a determination by the President that the disbursement of funds for such purpose prior to such date would be in the public interest.

*Section 104. Requirements for local grants-in-aid*

This section requires the locality to share the cost of any project assisted under this title and to call upon the Federal Government for aid only to the extent necessary. It provides that the local community must itself participate financially to the extent of at least one-third of the net project cost. Such local financial participation may take the form of direct reduction of project costs or expenditures, by contributions made in cash or its equivalent, demolition or removal work, or site improvements in the project area, and public improvements and facilities (other than low-rent public housing) which are primarily of direct benefit to the project and which are necessary to serve or support the new uses of land in the project area.

Where a locality undertakes more than one project with Federal assistance, this requirement relates to such projects considered in the aggregate.

*Section 105. Local determinations and responsibilities*

This section assures that aid to projects under this title will be based upon local determination of need and maximum reliance upon private enterprise. It provides that any contracts for financial aid under the title may be made (1) only with a duly authorized local public agency, and (2) only if the redevelopment plan is approved by the governing body of the locality. Moreover, such approval must include findings that the Federal financial aid to be provided in the contract is necessary to enable the land in the project area to be redeveloped; that the redevelopment plans will afford maximum opportunity for development or redevelopment by private enterprise; and that the redevelopment plan conforms to a general plan for the development of the locality as a whole.

This section also assures that all projects assisted will (1) conform to the locally approved redevelopment plan, and (2) be consistent with the interests of the locality as a whole. It therefore provides that as a condition to Federal assistance, the local public agency must agree to obligate those to whom it sells or leases the land in the project area, to devote the land to the uses specified in the redevelopment plan and to begin the building of their improvements within a reasonable time.

The section also requires that there be a feasible method for both the temporary and permanent relocation of the families who have been living in the area and who are displaced as a result of the clearance of the area. Also, in view of the present acute housing shortage, this section would prevent the demolition of residential structures in connection with this program prior to July 1, 1951, unless the governing body of the locality determines that such demolition would not reasonably be expected to create undue housing hardship in the community.

*Section 106. General provisions*

This section gives the Administrator the technical powers necessary for the performance of his duties under this title. In so doing, it provides for the appointment of a director to administer the provisions of this title under the direction and supervision of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

*Section 107. Payment for any land used for low-rent public housing*

This section assures that the financial assistance under this title will not result in a double subsidy to federally assisted low-rent public housing, by providing that any land in the project area made available for such low-rent public housing must be paid for by the public-housing agency undertaking such low-rent public-housing project.

*Section 108. Surplus Federal real property*

This section authorizes the sale of any Federal real property surplus to the needs of the Government and within the area of a land-assembly project, to the local public agency undertaking the project, at a price equal to its cash value. The proceeds from any such sales would be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

*Section 109. Protection of labor standards*

This section, designed for the protection of labor standards, requires that not less than prevailing wages be paid to those employed in the development of any land assembly and clearance project assisted, makes the "kickback" statute applicable to all such projects, and requires monthly reports by all contractors used on the project to the Secretary of Labor as to the number of persons employed by them, the aggregate amount of their pay rolls, the total man-hours worked, and expenditures for materials.

*Section 110. Definitions*

This section sets forth the definitions of the basic terms used in the title. Through these definitions, the section provides that no area selected for redevelopment would qualify for Federal aid unless it involves either the clearance of a slum area or the development or redevelopment for predominantly residential uses of a deteriorated or deteriorating area or a defunct subdivision or other open land whose development is necessary for sound community growth. Through these definitions also, the section limits Federal assistance to the furtherance of such purposes as (1) the acquisition of the land in the area requiring development or redevelopment; (2) the removal of existing structures; (3) the provision of the utilities essential for the new land uses contemplated; and (4) the making of the land available for development or redevelopment at prices consistent with its proposed new uses. Aid under this title to assist the construction of any of the buildings contemplated by the redevelopment plan is expressly barred.

Through these definitions, this section also provides that there may not be included in the local grants-in-aid (1) land in streets, alleys, and other public rights-of-way which may be vacated in connection with a project, or (2) any demolition or removal work, improvement or facility for which a State, municipality, or other public body has received or has contracted to receive from the United States, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, any grant or subsidy for such work or for the construction of such improvement or facility.

TITLE II—LOW-RENT PUBLIC HOUSING

This title provides for an extension of the low-rent public-housing program to serve urban and rural nonfarm families whose incomes are so low that they are not being adequately housed in new or existing private housing.

This title contains provisions to assure complete consistency with the basic objectives of primary reliance upon private enterprise to do as much of the total housing job as possible; increasing emphasis on local responsibility and initiative; special preferences to meet the needs of veterans of low income and their families; enlistment of private capital to finance substantially all of the capital cost of low-rent public housing projects; and an adaptation to current needs with respect to the amount and period of Federal annual subsidy to achieve low rents. The title also contains a miscellany of technical and perfecting amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937 that the 11 years of operations under it have indicated to be necessary and desirable.

*Section 201. Local responsibilities and determinations; tenancy only by low-income families*

This section provides that no contract shall be made for any Federal financial assistance, even for preliminary loans, unless (1) the local public housing agency has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Public Housing Administration that there is need for such low-rent housing in that locality which is not being met by private enterprise, and (2) the governing body of the locality has entered into an agreement with the local

public housing agency to provide the local cooperation and assistance which is required by the Public Housing Administration pursuant to this act.

This section also provides that no contract shall be made for annual contributions unless the local public housing agency has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Public Housing Administration that a gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed project and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and available existing structures) a substantial supply of decent, safe, and sanitary housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof. This section thus establishes as basic national policy that even with respect to the segment of housing need which private enterprise is not now serving, every opportunity is to be given to it to extend its servicing capacity downward in the income scale.

This section also provides that every contract for annual contributions shall require the local public housing agency to fix, subject to approval by the Public Housing Administration, maximum income limits for admission and for continued occupancy in the project; that, as indicated by actual investigation, every family admitted to the project was actually one of low income, and that every such family admitted came from an unsafe, insanitary, or overcrowded dwelling, or had been displaced by slum-clearance or land assembly and clearance projects, or was (without fault of its own) either without housing or was about to be without housing pursuant to a court order of eviction. For a period of 5 years, however, these requirements as to previous housing conditions do not apply to veterans or servicemen of low income. In the selection of tenants for low-rent housing, it is also required that there be no discrimination against families otherwise eligible on the ground that their incomes are derived in whole or in part from public assistance, and that (subject to the veterans' preference in sec. 206) families will be selected on the basis of the most urgent housing need. After admission, periodic examinations must be made of the incomes of all families which are tenants in the project so that, if their incomes increase to the point where they exceed the applicable income limits for continued occupancy they will be required to move from the project.

*Section 202. Veterans' preference*

This section guarantees preference to veterans and servicemen of low income in all new projects initiated under this title after March 1, 1949. Specifically, as between applicants who are eligible for a dwelling of given size and rent, it requires that preference be given to the families of veterans and servicemen (including families of deceased veterans and servicemen) who apply for admission within 5 years after March 1, 1949. First preference is to be given to disabled veterans whose disability is service-connected.

*Section 203. Cost limits*

This section is designed to end certain inequities and uncertainties resulting from present cost limits on low-rent housing assisted by the Federal Government, and to compensate for the drastic increase in building costs since the enactment of the United States Housing Act in 1937.

Experience has indicated that existing provisions, which place a ceiling on dwelling-unit costs as well as on room costs, and which provide for higher cost ceilings for cities of more than 500,000 population, are inadequate or faulty, in that (1) a limitation on cost of the entire dwelling unit hampers the provision of housing for larger-sized families of low income and so discriminates against such families; and (2) a differential in cost limits based solely on the size of the community is no longer realistic due to the increasing uniformity in construction costs, including both labor and material, irrespective of city size. The section, therefore, eliminates the limitation on dwelling-unit cost (but not the limitation on room cost, so that the essential limitation on construction costs is still retained in the act) and establishes a uniform ceiling, not dependent upon city size, for the cost of dwelling construction and equipment. In addition, the section simplifies determination of compliance with the cost limitations by specifically basing these limitations upon the cost of dwelling construction and equipment. This will ordinarily permit firm determination of compliance with the cost limitations of the act at the time the main construction contract is awarded.

In order that the drastic increase in building costs and the now apparent long-term nature of the housing shortage may not prevent the provision of housing needed for families of low income, the section provides for a higher cost limitation of $1,750 per room, as compared with existing limitations of $1,000 and $1,250 in small and large cities, respectively. It also authorizes an increase in this cost limitation by not more than $750 per room in areas where it would not be feasible without such an increase to construct the project without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design, and livability, and where there is an acute need for such housing. The percentage of increase in the cost limitation as provided in this section is substantially less than the percentage of increase in construction costs which has actually occurred since 1937.

Because of special cost problems in Alaska, the section also has special provisions permitting higher costs in that Territory if found necessary.

The authorization increasing cost limits is applicable to any low-rent project completed after January 1, 1948. This will make the increased cost limitations available in the case of low-rent projects which were deferred during the war, on some of which a small amount of construction work was done before they were deferred. It will also make the increased cost limitations applicable to, and permit the revision of contracts for, any projects which have proceeded (prior to enactment of this bill) under the provisions of Public Law 301, Eightieth Congress.

*Section 204. Private financing*

The basic purpose of this section is to amend the financing provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937 so as to make possible the permanent financing of substantially all of the capital cost of low-rent housing projects by the sale of bonds to private investors, and thus in effect limit Federal lending assistance for low-rent housing primarily to the temporary interim financing necessary prior to the issuance of definitive bonds.

Essentially, this section provides that, in the event of a substantial default by a local public-housing agency in its covenants to the Public Housing Administration, such local agency shall be obligated to convey the project to the PHA (subject to the right of the local public-housing agency to reconveyance upon a satisfactory curing of the default), and PHA would continue to make annual contributions for the project, but not in excess of the amounts contracted for pursuant to statute. This would assure both (1) that the project will continue to operate as a low-rent housing project, and (2) that investors who have furnished the capital funds for its construction in reliance upon the continuance of its low-rent character and the making of annual contributions therefor during the entire life of the loan, will have their investment adequately protected. With this assurance there is every reason to anticipate that private capital will be willing to furnish practically all of the capital cost through long-term loans and to do so at low interest rates.

Subsection (c) revises the provisions in the act relative to the going Federal rate (which determines the minimum loan interest rate and the maximum annual contribution rate) so as to provide that the governing rate is the one as of the date of Presidential approval of the contract for loan or annual contributions, respectively, rather than the date the contract happens to be signed by PHA and the local public-housing agency. Further, it provides that in the event there are two or more rates of interest on such date, the rate used shall be the highest thereof, and that in no event shall such rate be deemed to be less than 2½ percent.

Subsection (d) reduces the maximum loan period from 60 to 40 years in the case of projects initiated after March 1, 1949. It also reduces the minimum interest rate on Federal loans made for projects where the maximum loan and annual contribution period is 40 rather than 60 years, from the applicable going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 percent to simply the going Federal rate. Contracts for projects initiated prior to March 1, 1949, may thus be amended to reduce the loan and annual contribution period to not more than 40 years and thereby make the project eligible for an interest rate at simply the applicable going Federal rate.

Subsection (e) limits the period over which annual contributions may be paid on projects initiated after March 1, 1949, to 40 years as contrasted with the present authorization of 60 years. In order to make this possible, and thus substantially reduce the total amount of the annual contributions, and also to assure a highly marketable local housing agency bond even under adverse market conditions, this paragraph would, in respect to projects where the contribution period is limited to 40 years, amend the present requirement that the contribution shall not exceed a sum equal to the going Federal rate plus 1 percent upon the cost of the project so that the limitation would be a sum equal to the going Federal rate plus 2½ percent upon such cost. Contracts for projects initiated prior to March 1, 1949, may thus be amended to reduce the annual contribution period to not more than 40 years and thereby make the project eligible for annual contributions at the applicable going Federal rate plus 2½ percent. The shortening of the period over which contributions may be paid will more than compensate for these permitted increases in annual rate.

In addition to substantially reducing the need for Federal loan assistance, subsections (f) and (g) also revise certain conditions with respect to Federal subsidy assistance. This is done by providing: (1) that, instead of an adjustment in the maximum amount of annual contributions at 5-year intervals, in any year when the receipts derived in connection with the project exceed expenditures and charges, the excess must be used for purposes which will reduce subsequent annual contributions; and (2) that contracts for loan and annual contributions based on a certain going Federal rate may, in the case of a change in such rate, be amended so as to base the interest rate on Federal loans, or the maximum contribution payable, on the new rate whenever this would promote economy or be in the financial interest of the Federal Government.

Subsection (h) requires that borrowings by PHA be from the Treasury. At the same time, the statutory language with respect to PHA's borrowing authorization is adapted to the changes in PHA's lending program that would result from the provisions of this title, by relating the gross amount authorized to the amount of obligations that may be outsanding rather than to the aggregate amount that the PHA may issue exclusive of refunding obligations. The gross amount authorized is increased from $800,000,000 to

$1,500,000,000 in recognition of the size of the extended program and the increased construction costs anticipated. It is expected that with this amendment the PHA borrowing power will make it possible to provide all of the capital funds required from the Federal Government in connection with the extension of the low-rent program.

Subsection (i) provides a definition of development cost (which is not defined in the present act) which will include in capital cost all items which would be capitalized under standard business practice, including the cost of capital improvements made at any time during the life of the project. This definition, in accordance with business practice, includes appropriate carrying charges, such as interest, insurance, payments in lieu of taxes, local housing authority overhead, and any initial operating deficit. Carrying charges subsequent to the date of physical completion, however, may not be capitalized.

*Section 205. Annual contributions*

Subsection 205 (a) increases the Public Housing Administration's annual contributions authorization in order to provide for an extension of the program of low-rent nonfarm public housing. It authorizes PHA, after July 1, 1949, to contract for annual contributions aggregating not more than $85,000,000 a year (in addition to the existing authorization), which limit would be increased by further amounts of $90,000,000 in each of the following 4 years. The new authorization thus totals $445,000,000 per annum. In order to avoid possible increases in the level of construction costs due to putting the whole program under construction at an early date, it is provided that PHA may authorize the construction of not more than 150,000 additional dwelling units after July 1, 1949, which limit would be increased by further amounts of 150,000 on July 1 in each of the years 1950 through and including 1955, respectively, thus making a total of 1,050,000 dwelling units in 7 years. The authorized schedules for entering into annual contributions contracts and for commencing construction may be accelerated by $90,000,000 additional in any year for contributions or 100,000 additional units in any year, by the President if he determines that such action would be in the public interest.

Under subsection 205 (b), contracts for annual contributions on projects initiated after March 1, 1949, shall require exemption of the projects from all real and personal property taxes, but the contracts may authorize payments in lieu of taxes not in excess of 5 percent of shelter rents. This requirement of tax exemption is in lieu of existing provisions in the act as to local contributions. Contracts on projects initiated prior to such date may also be amended to include similar provisions in respect to annual contributions payable after July 1, 1949; but if the contracts on such projects are not so amended, payments in lieu of taxes will hereafter be limited solely to the amounts provided under contracts outstanding on July 1, 1947. As to contributions payable between July 1, 1947, and July 1, 1949, any payments in lieu of taxes (unless already made in larger amounts) will be made in the amounts specified in contracts validly in effect on July 1, 1947.

*Section 206. Special provisions for large families of low income*

Experience has proven that the existing provisions of the United States Housing Act make it difficult to meet the needs of large families of low income. In addition to the provisions in section 203 revising the cost limitations so as to permit the construction of larger dwelling units, this section revises the requirements as to eligibility for families with a relatively large number of children. In lieu of the present provision which requires that income at the time of admission may not exceed five times the gross rent, or six times the gross rent for families with three or more minor dependents, this section provides that the 5 to 1 ratio shall be used for all families, but that, in determining family income for admission and continued occupancy an exemption of $100 shall be given for each minor member of the family (defined, for the purposes of this section, as a person of less than 21 years of age). Under this new provision, there will be a somewhat larger spread between the incomes for eligibility of families with few children and those with a relatively large number of children, in recognition of the very substantial differences in their respective living expenses.

A further difficulty has arisen in the case of families who are eligible to remain in a project on the basis of the income of the regular, principal worker or workers, but who become ineligible if a child goes to work upon the completion of his schooling. Even though this be a temporary condition which will end as soon as a child marries and establishes his own home, the family would nonetheless be required to move from the project. The present provisions thus tend to force children to leave the home in order to continue the family eligibility. This section therefore authorizes the exclusion of the earnings of such a secondary worker from family income in determining eligibility for continued occupancy, but not for original admission to a project. This exclusion will be only a temporary matter, since it is limited to secondary wage earners who are under 21 years of age. Moreover, the income of such children will not be excluded in determining the actual rent to be paid by the family.

*Section 207. Technical amendments*

Subsection 207 (a) amends the declaration of policy contained in section 1 of the act so as to limit the future low-rent public-housing program of the Public Housing Administration to urban and rural nonfarm areas. It is contemplated that no assistance to farm housing will be provided under this title of the act.

The other subsections of this section provide technical amendments to the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, which are required either as a result of the substantive amendments to the act provided in this bill or have been shown to be necessary as a result of experience under the bill.

TITLE III—HOUSING RESEARCH

The purpose of this title is to assist in progressively reducing housing costs and increasing the production of better housing, and in making available necessary data on housing needs, demand, and supply.

*Section 301*

This section authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to undertake a program with respect to technical research and related studies which will stimulate and promote progressive reductions in housing costs and the increased and sustained production of housing through new and improved techniques, materials, and methods, improvement and standardization of building codes, modular coordination, and the development of other sound methods and standards, and other necessary housing data which will help attain the objectives of this title and of the act.

The section also provides that the results of such technical research and studies shall be disseminated in such form as shall be most useful to industry and to the general public. It also exempts the dissemination of the results of such technical research and studies from the existing provisions of law prohibiting any agency from distributing through the mail, free of postage, reports and other documents unless a request therefor has been previously received by such agency.

The section further contemplates inventories to be made by the Administrator, as necessary, of urban and rural nonfarm-housing needs and the progress being made in meeting those needs, and authorizes the Administrator to encourage localities to make studies, surveys, and plans with respect to their own housing needs, markets, and development.

*Section 302*

This section stresses the intention of cooperative effort between the Housing and Home Finance Administrator with industry and labor and with other Federal and local governmental agencies, educational institutions, and other appropriate agencies in carrying out the research program. The section further provides that the Administrator shall consult with, and make recommendations to, the other appropriate Federal agencies with respect to such action as may be necessary and desirable to overcome existing gaps and deficiencies in available housing data and the facilities available for the collection of such data.

TITLE IV—FARM HOUSING

While assistance to families of low income in urban and rural nonfarm areas is authorized under the present provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, the special and different problems attaching to farm housing require special provisions for such housing. This title, in making these provisions, recognizes the intimate relationship between farm housing and the entire farm economy and so places the responsibility for aids to provide adequate housing on farms upon the Department of Agriculture.

*Section 401. Assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture*

This section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to provide financial assistance to farm owners in the United States, and in Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and in the Virgin Islands, when necessary to enable them to provide decent farm dwellings and related facilities for themselves, their tenants, lessees, share croppers, or laborers. (For the purposes of the title, a farm is considered to mean a parcel or parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of one or more agricultural commodities and which customarily produces such commodities for sale and for home use of a gross annual value of not less than the values determined by the Secretary to be equivalent to a gross annual value of $400 in 1944.) Financial assistance under the title is explicitly limited to farm owners who are without sufficient resources to provide the necessary housing on their own account and who are unable to secure the credit necessary for such housing from other sources upon terms and conditions which they could reasonably be expected to fulfill.

*Section 402. Loans for dwellings on adequate farms*

This section provides for the assistance needed for those farmers lacking acceptable housing for themselves, tenants, share croppers, or laborers who cannot afford to improve the housing facilities on their farms if they are required to secure the needed credit assistance on the usual cooperative or private credit terms prevailing in the area, but who could do so on the basis of liberal credit terms. For farm owners in this group, the section authorizes loans for periods not in excess of 33 years, bearing interest at a rate not exceeding 4 percent per annum, and secured by the applicant's equity in the farm. In order further to assure the use of cooperative and other private credit sources to the fullest practicable extent, the section requires that the borrower shall refinance his loan through such credit sources whenever he should reasonably prove able to do so.

*Section 403. Loans for dwellings on potentially adequate farms*

This section provides for the assistance needed for those farmers whose present income is such that some assistance over and

above the long-term, low-interest credit provided in section 402 is necessary in order to put them into a position to acquire and maintain acceptable housing and related facilities, but whose farm enterprise is capable of being redeveloped by improvement or enlargement of the farm, or by adjustment of farm practices or methods, so as to bring them within a reasonable period of time within the group of farmers in need only of liberal credit aids. With respect to such farmers, the section provides that if the applicant undertakes an adequate farm enlargement or improvement or adjusted-practices plan (either with or without special assistance from the Department of Agriculture) the loan assistance provided in section 402 may be supplemented by annual contributions during the temporary period of time (which may not exceed 10 years) that the redevelopment of the farm enterprise is being effected. These contributions would take the form of credits against the installment of principal and interest due for any annual installment period and would be limited to the sum, not greater than the annual installment of interest plus one-half of the annual installment of principal, by which the net income of the borrower is insufficient to make the full amortized annual payment.

*Section 404. Other loans and grants for minor improvements to farm housing*

This section provides for the assistance that may be given to those farmers who do not possess adequate family-type farms and for whom there are no apparent means of providing an adequate income by a process of farm enlargement or redevelopment within a 10-year period. In order to avoid the possible danger that by establishing permanent dwellings for farmers under these circumstances, the perpetuation of the present unsatisfactory situation (which would seem to require different approaches) would be encouraged, the section authorizes only special loans and grants for improvements such as roof repairs, toilet facilities, a sanitary water supply, and other facilities designed to protect the health of the farmers and to so improve their living conditions that their situation is not a threat to the public health. Such assistance is limited to $1,000 per family unit (not over $500 of which may take the form of a grant or contribution), and to $2,000 in the aggregate to any one individual.

*Section 405. Technical services and research*

In order to facilitate the provision of decent farm dwellings generally, this section authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, without charge (or at appropriate charge), to all persons technical services such as building plans, specifications, construction supervision and inspection, and advice and information regarding rural dwellings and other farm buildings. The section authorizes the Secretary and the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to cooperate in research and technical studies in the rural housing field and also authorizes the Secretary to utilize (through the Agricultural Extension Service) the facilities of State agencies and educational institutions in furnishing the services and information authorized by this section.

This section also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress estimates of national farm housing needs and reports with respect to the progress being made toward meeting such needs, and to correlate and recommend proposals for such executive action or legislation necessary or desirable for the furtherance of the national housing objective and policy established by this act with respect to farm housing, together with such other reports or information as may be required of the Administrator by the President or the Congress.

*Section 406. Preference for veterans*

This section requires that the Secretary of Agriculture give preference to veterans in administering the provisions of the title.

*Section 407. Local public agencies and committees to assist Secretary*

This section authorizes the use by the Secretary of Agriculture of local county or parish committees of farmers to examine applications of farmers desiring to obtain the benefits provided by the title and to submit recommendations in appropriate form to the Secretary with respect to each application.

This section further enables the Secretary to make the assistance authorized under sections 402 to 405, inclusive, available through the use of local public agencies authorized to assist in providing housing for families in rural areas.

*Section 408. General powers of Secretary*

This section vests in the Secretary the power to establish standards of adequate housing necessary for the purpose of operations of the title. It also authorizes him to require that any recipient of financial assistance agree that the housing provided with such assistance shall not be a justification for changing the terms of the lease or occupancy agreement with the occupants of such housing to the latter's disadvantage without the approval of the Secretary.

*Section 409. Administrative provisions*

This section provides the various administrative and related powers necessary in order that the Secretary of Agriculture may administer the program authorized in the preceding sections.

*Section 410. Loan funds*

This section provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is to obtain the funds to make loans under the title from the Treasury. Such borrowings are limited to the amounts necessary to make loans not in excess of $25,000,000 on or after July 1, 1949, and the additional sums of $50,000,000 on or after July 1, 1950, $75,000,000 on or after July 1, 1951, and $100,000,000 on or after July 1, 1952.

*Section 411. Contributions*

This section authorizes the Secretary on or after July 1, 1949, to make commitments for contributions pursuant to section 403 of not to exceed $500,000 per annum, and additional commitments aggregating $1,000,000 per annum on or after July 1, 1950, additional commitments aggregating $1,500,000 per annum on or after July 1, 1951, and additional commitments of $2,000,000 per annum on or after July 1, 1952.

*Section 412. Authorization for appropriations*

This section authorizes the appropriation of the amounts necessary to permit payments on obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture equivalent to the contributions he makes under section 403 and interest on such sum; to make grants under section 404 aggregating not more than $1,000,000 on and after July 1, 1949, and additional sums of $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000, on and after July 1 of each of the years 1950, 1951, and 1952; and for such other amounts as may be necessary for the carrying out of the provisions of the preceding sections of the title.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

*Section 501. Advisory committees*

This section authorizes the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to appoint such advisory committees as may be necessary in carrying out his functions, powers, and duties under this or any other act.

The section also provides that service as a member of any such advisory committee shall not constitute any form of service or employment within the provisions of title 18, section 198 or 203, United States Code, or within the provisions of title 41, section 119, United States Code.

Title 18, section 198, United States Code, prohibits an officer of the United States or a person holding any place or trust or profit or discharging any official function under or in connection with any executive department from acting as agent or attorney for prosecuting any claim against the United States or assisting in the prosecution or supporting any such claim or receiving any gratuity or favor or interest in any claim, and provides a fine of not more than $5,000, 1 year's imprisonment, or both.

Title 18, section 203, United States Code, prohibits an officer or clerk of the United States directly or indirectly from receiving or agreeing to receive any compensation for any services rendered or to be rendered in relation to any proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter in which the United States is a party before any court or bureau, and provides a fine of $10,000 and not more than 2 years' imprisonment.

Title 41, section 119, United States Code (which is part of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944), prohibits any person employed in any Government agency prosecuting or acting as counsel, attorney, or agent for prosecuting any claim against the United States or for any person within 2 years after such employment to prosecute or act as counsel or agent involving any such matter directly connected with which such person was so employed to perform duties. It provides $10,000 fine or imprisonment or not more than 1 year, or both.

This section follows title III, section 303 (b), Public Law 253, Eightieth Congress—the National Security Act of 1947—except that this section of the bill provides a complete exception from title 41, section 119, United States Code, whereas the National Security Act provision grants exception from such provision unless the act of such individual is made unlawful when performed by such individual, with respect to any particular matter which directly involves the department or agency which such person is advising or in which such department or agency is directly interested. The provisions of this section of the bill necessarily must be broader so as not to bring a member of the advisory committee who is doing business with the Federal Housing Administration within the prohibition of that section.

*Section 502. Amendment of National Banking Act*

By reason of the provisions of the new section 22 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (which new section is added by section 204 (b) of the bill), special security features would attach to definitive bonds issued by local public housing agencies in connection with the low-rent public-housing program. Special security features would also attach to short-term notes issued by local public agencies in connection with slum clearance projects, and by public housing agencies in connection with low-rent housing projects, when secured by a pledge of rights of any such agency under its loan contract with the Government.

In recognition of these security features, this section provides for an amendment of the National Banking Act so that national banks, and (to the extent permitted by State laws) State member banks of the Federal Reserve System, would be authorized to purchase larger amounts, and to underwrite, local public housing agency definitive bonds and, when adequately secured, short-term notes issued by local public agencies in connection with slum-clearance projects or by

public housing agencies in connection with low-rent public housing projects. Without this amendment, investment in such obligations by these banks would continue to be subject to the same restrictions as are applicable to local public housing agency definitive bonds, which are now issued without these special security features. In other words, they could be purchased for the banks' own account only to the extent of 10 percent of unimpaired capital and surplus.

*Section 503. National Housing Council*

This section provides that the Secretary of Labor or his designee shall be included in the membership of the National Housing Council in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

*Section 504. Amendments of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1948, and the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949*

The Government Corporations Appropriation Acts for 1948 and for 1949 included provisos to the effect that no payments of annual contributions should be made which were occasioned by payments in lieu of taxes in excess of amounts originally contracted for. This reference to original contracts had the effect of prohibiting payments under revised contracts which had legally been entered into prior to July 1, 1947, the date on which the first of the appropriation-act restrictions was effective. These limitations on funds appropriated for annual contributions made it impossible for the Public Housing Administration, in a number of cases, to comply with contracts validly in existence. These provisos of the two appropriation acts are therefore repealed as of the beginning of the fiscal year for which they apply, in order that payments validly contracted for may be made. These provisos are superseded by subsection 205 (b) which establishes a permanent policy as to payments in lieu of taxes.

The Government Corporations Appropriation Act for 1949 also limits the number of employees of the Public Housing Administration above grades CAF–10 and P–3, to not exceeding 20 percent of the total number of administrative employees. Under the expanded program of low-rent public housing, a relatively greater number of trained technical employees will be required than were necessary under the former operations of the agency when low-rent public housing represented only a small portion of its total responsibilities. This section also repeals this 20-percent limitation in order to permit the recruitment of the trained personnel which will be necessary to put the new program into operation.

*Section 505. Amendment of Internal Revenue Code*

This section withdraws from the exemption from Federal income taxes (provided for by section 22 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code for interest upon obligations of a State, Territory, or any political subdivision thereof) interest upon—

1. Obligations issued by any local public agency in connection with a slum clearance project assisted under title I of the bill when such obligations are secured by a pledge of the rights of such agency under a loan contract, as provided for in section 102 (a) of the bill; and

2. Obligations issued by a public housing agency in connection with a low-rent public housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, when such obligations are secured either (a) by a pledge of the rights of such agency under a loan contract entered into under section 9 of said United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, or (b) by a pledge of annual contributions under an annual contributions contract between such public housing agency and the Public Housing Administration if such contract contains the covenant by the Public Housing Administration which is authorized by section 22 (b) of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended.

*Section 506. Act controlling*

This section contains the standard provision providing that the provisions of this act shall control in the case of inconsistency with other legislation.

*Section 507. Separability*

This is the usual separability clause.

## FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry. I shall make no further remarks regarding this measure except to point out that it is the same bill which was introduced by the same introducers in the last session, at which time it was Senate bill 984. I would further point out that it is being introduced by four Democrats and four Republicans. The approach is being made on an entirely bipartisan basis, and I pray and I hope that it will continue to be in that situation so long as this type of legislation is before the Senate.

The bill (S. 174) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## BILLS RELATING TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills, and ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a brief statement with respect to one of the bills.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, during the past 8 months businessmen engaged in interstate commerce have been greatly disturbed by the confused status of the law as to the payment, or absorption, of transportation charges. Last spring this body directed a subcommittee, of which I am now chairman, to study that problem. The testimony before that subcommittee shows that not only are businessmen confused, but that the members of the Federal Trade Commission and its staff are in complete disagreement as to when a seller may pay or absorb transportation costs.

The subcommittee has now heard 109 witnesses, including 4 of the men who buy everything the Government purchases. It is now time for the subcommittee to turn from its general study, to specific efforts to clarify the present chaos resulting from the Supreme Court interpretation of the law. This is not an administrative problem, it is not a political problem, and it is not a judicial problem. It is an economic problem which, in the best interests of our national economy, the Congress must decide. Whether we shall permit sellers acting in good faith to pay or absorb transportation costs to promote competition is a legislative problem.

Obviously, sellers conspiring to fix prices are not acting in good faith. I am certain all right-thinking men join me in urging the vigorous enforcement of the laws against conspiracies. The bill which I now introduce makes it clear that all such conspiracies are illegal and will in fact strengthen the powers of the Federal Trade Commission in dealing with them.

This bill is an attempt to eliminate confusion. I do not pretend that it is in perfected form, and constructive criticism is invited. Our subcommittee should like to hear the views of all interested parties on the effect of this bill, in order that we may ultimately report to the Senate the legislation most desirable to end the current chaos.

Mr. President, I have said that the members of the Federal Trade Commission and its staff are in complete disagreement as to when a seller may absorb transportation costs. I desire here and now to offer documentary proof that my very serious charge is correct.

On December 28, 1948, 3 days prior to his retirement from the Federal Trade Commission, the then Chairman of that Commission, Robert E. Freer, delivered a very carefully prepared speech before the City Club in Denver.

The Denver Post, commenting editorially on this speech, said, "Mr. Freer 'Bicycles' All Over the Ring," and followed that headline with the following devastating editorial:

Robert E. Freer, retiring Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, accomplished a great deal on his visit to Denver to speak before the City Club.

For one thing he convinced many Denver businessmen that a man may be a Washington bureaucrat and a strong defender of free competition at the same time.

He spoke convincingly on the theme—which is too likely to be forgotten—that a free economy requires government police work to prevent monopoly from getting a throttlehold on competition. In other words, there can be no freedom, except for the thugs, if the policeman is fired.

But when it came to discussing the basing-point issue, Mr. Freer engaged in the same kind of shadow boxing which has marked the FTC's statements of its views ever since the United States Supreme Court decided the Cement case in a manner to throw a chill into businessmen, large and small, throughout the country.

Mr. Freer reiterated his former declarations that, in spite of the recent court cases, a company is not barred from the use of a basing-point price system, provided it is not engaging in illegal price conspiracy or discriminating unjustifiedly against some of its customers in favor of others.

Mr. Freer asked us to take his word for that statement. He didn't try to prove it. He ignored all the arguments which have been presented to show that a succession of cases has brought us to the point where the courts are ready to outlaw any use of the basing-point system, if they have not already done so.

He ignored the fact that at least one member of the FTC believes the basing-point system already has been made illegal, for all practical purposes. He avoided any mention of excerpts from court decisions which indicate no company using a basing-point system can be sure that fact will not be used against it in Federal court.

He didn't even mention that it has been the aim for years of certain FTC officials and the men who surround them to outlaw all price systems except the system of f. o. b. mill.

Mr. Freer would have us believe the alarm which has spread over the business community because of basing-point decisions has been inspired almost entirely by the steel and cement industries. His respect for the intelligence of independent businessmen in other lines cannot be great.

In his Denver address, Mr. Freer said, "Personally I believe in freight absorption to meet competition." That certainly is an admission that the basing-point system may be used for good purposes as well as bad.

If that is Mr. Freer's position, he is hardly on sound ground when he objects to any amendment to Federal law which would simply give businessmen the assurance that the use of a basing-point system would not by itself be held against them unless there also is evidence of price fixing or unjustified price discrimination.

How such an amendment might hamper the work of the FTC, Mr. Freer does not explain, but he is against it. He and the other Commissioners are doing a lot of fancy footwork and dodging but very little solid infighting.

In this speech Freer, the former Federal Trade Commission Chairman, said:

During all of the time that this uproar has been going on officials of the Federal Trade Commission have been stating that the law does not require uniform f. o. b. mill prices, that the law does not prevent the absorption of freight to meet competition, and that the recent decisions apply only to situations in which there is organized monopoly and conspiracy to suppress and restrain competition.

Furthermore, he has disclaimed repeatedly any intention by the Commission to force "everybody in the country to sell at f. o. b. mill prices." Yet when our Senate subcommittee chairman wrote the Federal Trade Commission asking it to suggest suitable witnesses for his committee, this very same Robert E. Freer, on behalf of the Commission, officially suggested that the committee call Dr. Vernon Mund, Dr. Frank A. Fetter, and Mr. Walter Wooden. Dr. Fetter publicly testified that he believed all sellers should be required to sell at f. o. b. mill prices, and if that is not now required by the law, the law should be amended to so provide. Dr. Mund testified to the same effect, and the Commission's legal expert, Mr. Wooden, testified:

Dr. Fetter believes that there ought to be uniform mill-net prices; * * * I am inclined to believe he advocates the uniform f. o. b. mill price * * * and I think I agree with his economics 100 percent.

In a speech in New York on December 7, 1948, the Commission's Chairman said:

I will further state, as strongly as I know how, that no businessman, acting in a genuinely competitive way, need fear that the decisions in either the Cement or Rigid Steel Conduit cases will be used as precedents for declaring his competitive conduct unlawful.

But the attorneys for the Commission gave contrary testimony before the Senate subcommittee. Attorney Paulson testified:

The avenues of competition are being unnecessarily narrowed by reason of the Commission's having proceeded against freight absorption on an individual basis. * * * It is now the law that the individual and separate practice or system of a company in absorbing all or part of the freight costs to distant customers to match lower prices of nearby competititors results in varying mill-net returns and is illegal.

The Federal Trade Commission Chairman said in his Denver speech that—

During all the time that this uproar has been going on officials of the Federal Trade Commission have been stating that the law does not require uniform f. o. b. mill prices, that the law does not prevent the absorption of freight to meet competition.

But Attorney Walter Wooden testified at the Senate public hearings that the only "absolutely safe" way for a seller to be sure that he was not violating the law was to sell at f. o. b. mill prices, and Commission Attorney Paulson testified:

My answer, in the light of the Conduit order, as I read it, would have to be that its practical effect is to require f. o. b. mill selling.

The former Federal Trade Commission Chairman, Mr. Freer, said in his recent Denver speech:

The recent decisions apply only to situations in which there is organized monopoly and conspiracy to suppress and restrain competition.

Yet on May 19, 1948, the Commission, with Freer as its Chairman, issued an official press release on one of those "recent decisions"—the Conduit case—which said:

Court holds basing-point method of pricing to be unfair irrespective of conspiracy.

In a speech at Dixville Notch, N. H., on September 18, 1948, Freer said:

Basing-point and delivered-price systems, as such, are under no special attack. The Commission has attacked those delivered price systems where they appeared to be the core of price-fixing conspiracies.

And in a speech in Washington on August 4, 1948, the Commission's chief economist, Dr. Edwards, said:

Basing-point systems as such are under no special attack.

But the Freer and Edwards statements that all basing-point systems are not illegal are contrary to the statements of Walter Wooden, their own senior associate counsel, who argued before the Supreme Court that the cement company's pricing methods, apart from combination and conspiracy, results in unlawful discriminations, and who shortly after the decision, in a speech in Washington, quoted the Supreme Court as saying that the effect of these cases "was to forbid the adoption for sales purposes of any basing-point system." In fact, the inconsistent position of Federal Trade Commission officials testifying before the Senate committee was nothing less than shocking and scandalous. Diametrically opposing answers were given to identical questions submitted by Senators to them.

The Commission attorneys were asked if the Commission's orders in the Conduit and Pittsburgh-plus cases required f. o. b. mill selling. Commission Attorney Walter Wooden, senior associate counsel, replied "No," but Commission Attorney Lynn Paulson answered, "As a practical matter, I say 'Yes.'"

When those attorneys were asked if "knowing parallel conduct" was illegal "irrespective of whether it results from conspiracy or from competition," Attorney Wooden replied "No," but Attorney Paulson replied "It is in the Conduit order."

And when those attorneys were asked if the Supreme Court had limited the right to meet competition to individual cases, Commission Attorney Wooden said "Yes," and Commission Attorney Paulson said "No."

They were asked if the Conduit and Pittsburgh-plus orders permitted those sellers to absorb freight to meet competition. Commission Attorney Wooden said "Yes." But Commission Attorney Paulson said, "I say the practical effect of those two orders is to require f. o. b. mill selling." These quotations by the Commission attorneys are taken directly from the stenographic transcript of the public hearings of the Senate Trade Policies Committee. They are of course available to the public, and I am advised that the Federal Trade Commission purchased a copy from the reporter, so that presumably this testimony was available to Chairman Freer before he made his Denver speech.

This disagreement within the Commission is not limited to the attorneys. The Commission's chief economist, Corwin Edwards, appears to be in disagreement with Commission Attorney Walter Wooden, who was the trial attorney in the Cement case. Attorney Wooden testified before the Senate committee, "I think I would disagree with Dr. Edwards to some extent," and when asked if he disagreed with Dr. Edwards' writings that "when you outlaw freight absorption you impair competition by denying the buyer the right to buy competitively from distant sellers," Mr. Wooden replied, "I think I disagree with that."

The disagreement of these men is apparently mutual. For when Dr. Edwards was asked on the witness stand if he agreed with the views of Fetter and Wooden favoring required f. o. b. pricing for everyone, he replied, "In that respect, no."

The extent to which confusion prevails on this subject is further illustrated by the first draft of a book which Dr. Edwards wrote 2 months before he was hired recently by the Federal Trade Com-

mission as its Chief Economist. In that draft of his book he said:

It is to be hoped, however, that the Federal Trade Commission will abandon its present efforts to require rigid f. o. b. mill pricing in the terms of orders which it issues in cases of this class, or that the courts will modify the Commission's orders sufficiently to avoid that result.

Dr. Edwards testified at the Senate public hearings that after writing the book he submitted it to friends on the Commission, from whom he learned that he had incorrectly judged the Commission's attitude on this subject. He testified that after reading the printed material available to the public, he had come to the above conclusion, and only after checking with the people in the Commission did he find the view was erroneous.

On October 12, 1948, the Commission published a nine-page single-spaced statement intended to clarify the law on this subject. The following month Commission attorneys were asked at the Senate hearings the following question: "Do you think there is now confusion in the law as to what pricing policies are legal?" Two Trade Commission attorneys answered, "Definitely." Many other examples of inconsistencies in the public statements of Commission officials could be pointed out.

The printed record makes it crystal clear that officials of the Federal Trade Commission have not been saying that the recent cases are limited to conspiracy situations, and the printed record is equally clear that the Commission is divided within itself. While Commissioner Freer says that the law does not prevent freight absorption, does not require uniform f. o. b. mill prices, and is limited to conspiracy cases, Commissioner Mason in a speech at Harvard University on May 14, 1948, said:

Freight absorption is out. This affects every basic industry in the United States. * * * Individual universal delivered price system is out. * * * The basing point pricing system is out as a matter of law.

Industry and the Congress do not know who to believe, since all the people at the Federal Trade Commission were supposed to be experts. In the present confused status businessmen must learn the hard way and the expensive way who is correct. Candidly the American people are entitled to know what pricing systems are legal, and apparently the only place where a clarification of this important economic problem can be obtained is in the Congress. It dare not permit any Commission to continue to be all things to all people. We cannot permit some officials of the Commission to publicly state one view to be the policy of the Commission, while other officials give a diametrically opposed view of the same Commission's position. Congress must clear this thing up once and for all.

The bills introduced by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado were read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as follows:

S. 236. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets;

S. 237. A bill to promote interstate and foreign commerce and strengthen the national defense by providing for cargo aircraft adaptable for postal, commercial, and military service, and for other purposes; and

S. 238. A bill to amend section 25 of the Interstate Commerce Act to require certain common carriers by railroad to install and maintain communication systems and to establish and observe operating rules, regulations, and practices to promote safety of employees and travelers on railroads, and for other purposes.

## CHANGE IN METHOD OF ELECTING PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and myself, I reintroduce in the form of a joint resolution my proposal for a constitutional amendment abolishing the electoral college and splitting the electoral vote in each State in exact proportion to the popular vote. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a very brief statement descriptive of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 2) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice Presdent was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

The present arrangement whereby each State has a number of electoral votes equal to the number of its Representatives and Senators is retained under the Lodge amendment, but these votes would be divided between the candidates according to the proportion of the popular vote each receives. Under this arrangement, a candidate who receives 60 percent of the popular vote in a State with 10 electoral votes would get 6 votes and his opponent would get 4. Under the present system, the winner gets all 10, even when he beats his opponent in a photofinish.

In reintroducing this measure, LODGE pointed out how the 1948 Presidential election illustrated, in three different ways, the need for reform:

1. The will of the largest group of American voters which wanted to keep President Truman in the White House came dangerously close to being utterly frustrated by the antiquated "unit rule" system. A switch of fewer than 100,000 votes in five States (Illinois, Ohio, Wisconsin, Iowa, Nevada) would have given Governor Dewey the election, even with Mr. Truman still retaining his lead of two and a half million popular votes. Under the Lodge proposal, this comparatively small switch would not have changed the result. Short of a direct popular election of the President, the Lodge amendment comes as close as possible to reflecting exactly the will of the people.

2. A shift of a few thousand votes in as few as two States would have created a situation in which no candidate would have received a majority of the electoral votes. This would have left the country uncertain as to who would be President until the new House of Representatives made its choice, with State delegations voting as a unit so that each State would have only 1 vote. Not only would this have created grave uncertainty, unrest, and confusion, but it might well have been disastrous because of the delicate international situation. Because the Lodge amendment provides that the candidate receiving the greatest number of electoral votes shall be President, the possibility of such deadlocked decisions is eliminated, as is also the clumsy and universally condemned system of election in the House.

3. In one State (Alabama) it was not possible to vote for President Truman because his "electors" were not on the ballot. Consequently, many citizens of that State were in effect disenfranchised. Since the electoral college—and the dummy office of elector—is abolished in the Lodge amendment, such an undemocratic procedure becomes impossible.

The effect of the Lodge amendment would have several other important results:

1. It ends the present practice of concentrating Presidential politics on those States having the largest population and consequently on the voting minorities in those States.

2. It means that each candidate is credited with the votes cast for him and that he does not get credited with the votes actually cast against him.

3. It spreads the Presidential campaign and any subsequent Presidential activity into all the 48 States, tending, therefore to break up so-called "solid" or one-party areas.

4. It preserves completely the rights of the small States who still retain their two-vote credit (for the two Senators) in the number of electoral votes awarded.

5. It recognizes that the electoral college system has never functioned as originally conceived by the framers of the Constitution, for the electoral college has become a rubber stamp—and an inaccurate rubber stamp at that.

6. It discourages the tendency to select Presidential nominees only from among the residents of States having a significant electoral vote.

7. It weakens the strength of minority splinter-party pressures.

8. It confers no partisan or sectional advantage.

## AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MYERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 11), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the

Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MORSE. I submit a resolution to amend the so-called cloture rule of the Senate, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I wish to say that I hope at a later hour to explain it at some length.

The resolution (S. Res. 12) was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to a cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or of rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 2 hours on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Under the order of business of "Introduction of Bills and Joint Resolutions," the following occurred:

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], I submit a resolution relating to cloture. This resolution is in the exact language of Senate Resolution 25, Eightieth Congress, second session, which was reported in April 1947 by the Committee on Rules, which remained on the calendar under my name until final adjournment. This resolution seeks to make it possible, when two-thirds of the membership of the Senate shall approve, to end debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, and to vote upon the merits of the question. In plain words, it endeavors to make it possible for the Members of the Senate to vote on any subject within a reasonable time and after reasonable debate on the pros and cons when two-thirds of its membership believe that it is desirable to come to a vote. I think the American people expect such action. I hope that this resolution will be considered at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to offer it at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Are we not operating under the heading of "Bills and resolutions," and is it necessary to get unanimous consent to offer a resolution under that heading?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is proceeding under the order of bills, joint resolutions, and other resolutions.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understood, when I desired to offer my antifilibuster resolution earlier today that it required unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At that time it could be offered under unanimous consent.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator from Oregon mistaken in understanding that in reply to the Senator from Kentucky the Chair ruled that unanimous consent was not necessary to offer the resolution which was offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]? So far as the subject matter is concerned, the situation is identical with that of the resolution of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand the situation, the Senator from Oregon asked unanimous consent to offer his resolution.

Mr. MORSE. No; the Senator from Oregon did not. The Chair ruled earlier that unanimous consent was necessary.

Mr. BARKLEY. No Senator raised the point of order that it was necessary to have unanimous consent. I raised a parliamentary inquiry as to whether, under the heading of "Bills and resolutions," unanimous consent was required to offer a resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not so understand.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is exactly what I am trying to find out: whether, when the Senator offered his resolution, unanimous consent was required by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this stage, unanimous consent is required for the submission of a resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let us clear it up. Does that refer to joint resolutions only?

Mr. MORSE. That is the point I am trying to have settled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To bills and joint resolutions.

Mr. BARKLEY. Introduction of bills and joint resolutions is the present business, and there is another heading for concurrent and other resolutions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

The resolution (S. Res. 13) submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. IVES) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

" 'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

AGE LIMIT FOR SENATE PAGES

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) submitted the following resolu-

tion (S. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the following resolution of the Senate agreed to on December 6, 1870, namely:

"*Resolved*, That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 12 years, or remain in office after the age of 16 years," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 14 years, or remain in office after the age of 17 years, and who has not completed the eighth grade of school."

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 15), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

HOSPITALIZATION PROGRAM FOR FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 16), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation with respect to all matters relating to the desirability and feasibility of instituting a hospitalization program for the benefit of civilian employees of the Government of the United States, such program to include provision for prepayment of hospitalization and surgical costs in hospitals to be designated by such employees to be attended by physicians and surgeons also of their choice.

SEC. 2. The committee is directed to complete its studies and submit a report and recommendations for appropriate legislation not later than May 1, 1949.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings and to act at such times and places during the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such assistants as may be needed and to request such assistance and information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per 100 words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $10,000 for this project, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO GERMANENESS OF AMENDMENTS

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the standing rules of the Senate are amended by adding at the end thereof the following new rule:

"RULE XLI

"GERMANENESS

"No amendment to any bill or resolution pending in the Senate which is not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in such bill or resolution shall be received or considered; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of any such bill or resolution be received or considered which does not directly relate thereto. All questions of germaneness or relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and decided without debate."

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF MARTIAL LAW IN THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the administration of martial law in the Territory of Hawaii subsequent to December 7, 1941, including suspension of the writ of habeas corpus, peonage, involuntary servitude, other infringement of constitutional rights of civilians, and other abuses or alleged abuses in connection therewith.

Such committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the operation of the court-martial systems of the Army and Navy, both within the United States and abroad, and of the prisons, jails, and other places of incarceration or confinement of Army and Navy prisoners with particular emphasis on (1) alleged miscarriages of justice arising out of the operation of such systems and places of incarceration or confinement; (2) the question of whether variations in such systems or in the administration and application thereof in different areas or theaters of operations, with respect to review procedure or otherwise, constitutes or has constituted denial of due process or of equal protection of law in violation or derogation of the Constitution of the United States; (3) the question of whether or not punishments meted under such systems are unduly excessive; (4) the alleged lack of uniformity in punishments meted under such systems; (5) the question of whether or not present methods of holding courts martial are desirable and proper; and (6) any desirable improvements in or modifications of such court-martial systems and places of incarceration or the administration thereof.

The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date not later than December 15, 1946, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 19), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That that part of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to cloture (as shown on page 28 of the Senate Manual) is amended to read as follows:

"If a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate (1) upon a motion to take up a measure, together with any and all points of order against such measure, or (2) upon any pending question, is presented to the Senate at any time after 10 calendar days have elapsed since such debate has begun, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"If such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting in the case of any such motion to take up a measure, together with any and all points of order against such measure, then such measure shall be deemed to be the unfinished business.

"If such question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting in the case of any such motion to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure, then such measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of. Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or

dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

REFORM OF PROCEDURE BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution dealing with congressional reforms, an identical measure having been introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative McCORMACK.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 2) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the following provisions of this resolution are adopted as an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively.

SEC. 2. Any person who believes that testimony or other evidence given in a public hearing before any committee tends to defame him or otherwise adversely affect his reputation may file with the committee a sworn statement, concerning such testimony, which shall be made a part of the record of such hearing.

SEC. 3. Such a person shall in addition have the right (a) to testify personally in his own behalf, (b) to have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses requested by him for the purpose of testifying in his behalf, and to examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel, but no more than four such witnesses shall be called; and (c) to have the committee secure the appearance of witnesses whose testimony adversely affected him, and to cross-examine such witnesses, either personally or by counsel, but such cross-examination shall be limited to 1 hour as to any one witness.

SEC. 4. Any person who wishes to avail himself of the rights accorded by section 3, shall, within 30 days of the receipt by the committee of the testimony complained of, file a petition with the committee requesting the fixing of a time and place for the receiving of testimony or the conduct of cross-examination and designating the witnesses to be summoned. Such a petition shall be accompanied by the sworn statement of the petitioner that the petition is not filed for the purpose of delaying or obstructing the work of the committee, but because his reputation has been unjustifiably damaged or otherwise adversely affected by false accusations or inference. The committee shall, within 10 days after the receipt of such a petition, fix a time and place for the receiving of testimony or the conduct of cross-examination, which time shall not be later than 30 days after the receipt of the petition, and shall secure the appearance at such time and place of the witnesses designated in the petition.

SEC. 5. Any witness summoned at a public or private hearing before any committee shall have the right to be accompanied by counsel. Such counsel shall be allowed to observe the hearing, but shall not be allowed to participate therein or to advise the witness while on the witness stand unless the committee, in its discretion, shall otherwise determine.

SEC. 6. In the conduct of hearings, the evidence received shall, so far as possible, be relevant and germane to the subject of the hearing.

SEC. 7. If the testimony of a witness at a private or public hearing before any committee is reported stenographically, such witness shall be entitled to a stenographic transcript of such testimony upon payment of the cost of the transcript.

SEC. 8. A committee shall not publish or file any report, interim or final, unless and until a meeting of the committee has been called upon proper notice and such report has been approved by a majority of those voting at such meeting.

SEC. 9. No committee or employee thereof shall publish or file any statement or report alleging misconduct by, or otherwise adversely commenting on, any person unless and until such person has been advised of the alleged misconduct or adverse comment and has been given a reasonable opportunity to present to the committee a sworn statement with respect thereto as provided in section 2.

SEC. 10. No member or employee of a committee shall for compensation speak, lecture, or write about the committee, its purposes, procedures, accomplishments, or reports during the existence of the committee and while he is a member of the committee or in its employ.

SEC. 11. As used in this concurrent resolution, the term committee includes a standing or select committee of either House of Congress, a joint committee of the two Houses, and a duly authorized subcommittee of any of the foregoing.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of Senate Document No. 248, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Administrative Procedure Act—Legislative History, Seventy-ninth Congress," of which 1,000 copies shall be assigned to the Senate document room and 1,500 copies to the House document room.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SUBVERSIVE AND UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. McCLELLAN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 4), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That (a) there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Subversive and Un-American Activities (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of seven Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance not more than four Members shall be members of the same political party.

(b) Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection.

(c) The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice-chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make, from time to time, investigations of—

(1) the extent, character, and objects of subversive activities and un-American propaganda activities in the United States;

(2) subversive activities and un-American propaganda activities within the United States Government;

(3) the diffusion within the United States of subversive and un-American propaganda which is instigated or supported from foreign countries or of domestic origin, which attacks or seeks to destroy the principles of the form of government as guaranteed by the Constitution; and

(4) un-American activities generally and any other matter relating to the foregoing subjects that would aid the Congress in determining and enacting necessary remedial legislation.

(b) The joint committee shall make a full report to the Congress annually on or before the first day of February, and interim reports at such other times as it deems necessary, of its activities under this resolution, giving the results of its investigations and studies and its recommendations as to necessary remedial legislation or action.

SEC. 3. (a) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, either in public or executive session; to sit and act at such places and times; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditure as it deems advisable to carry out and perform effectively its duties. Subpenas shall be issued by the chairman or the vice chairman of the joint committee, or by the chairman of any duly authorized subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or the vice-chairman or the chairman of a subcommittee.

(b) The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the joint committee shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. Within 30 days after the appointment of all the members who constitute the first joint committee, the joint committee shall formulate general rules of practice governing the conducting of investigations, the holding of hearings, and the conducting of proceedings by the joint committee and shall report such rules to the Congress. Such rules shall become effective upon approval thereof by the Senate and House of Representatives by concurrent resolution or at the expiration of 30 days after the report thereof to the Congress without action thereon, whichever first occurs. Amendments and additions to such rules shall be made in the same manner as provided for the adoption of the original rules.

Sec. 5. (a) The joint committee shall have the power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as it deems necessary to carry out its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923 for comparable duties. All such officers and employees shall be appointed by the chairman, with the approval of the joint committee, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties assigned to them.

(b) Members of the joint committee shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties outside the District of Columbia.

(c) The joint committee is authorized to utilize the information and, with the consent of the head of the department, agency, or establishment concerned, the services, facilities, and personnel of the departments, agencies, and establishments in the executive branch of the Government.

SEC. 6. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY AT THE TOWN HALL DINNER HONORING SENATOR BARKLEY

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by

Senator O'MAHONEY at the Town Hall dinner honoring Senator BARKLEY at New York, December 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUPREME COURT DECISION IN CEMENT CASE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPEHART

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "United States Supreme Court Decision in Cement Case Brings Serious Problem," delivered by him, and published in the Journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists for December 20, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESERVATION OF A FREE ECONOMY — ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Preservation of a Free Economy," delivered by him to the New York Security Dealers' Association at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on December 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BUSINESSMAN'S OBLIGATIONS TO THE GOVERNMENT—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by him on the subject of the businessman's obligations to the Government and to the people, published in Dun's Review, December 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT AND HEALTH—ARTICLE BY SENATOR SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by him, entitled "Government and Health," which appears in the Appendix.]

PLANNING FOR CHAOS—EDITORIAL BY MERRYLE STANLEY RUKEYSER

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Planning for Chaos," by Merryle Stanley Rukeyser, from the New York Journal-American of December 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SEATTLE TIMES—ARTICLE FROM NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article with respect to the public service rendered by the Seattle Times, published in Newsweek, January 3, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

"EXHUMING" AN ECONOMIC LAW—EDITORIAL FROM THE DESERET NEWS

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "'Exhuming' An Economic Law," published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, on January 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFTER TAFT-HARTLEY, WHAT?—EDITORIAL FROM THE REGISTER-GUARD

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "After Taft-Hartley, What?" from the Eugene, Oreg., Register-Guard for December 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—RESOLUTION BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE PORTLAND LABOR-MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Portland Labor-Management Committee regarding labor-management relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed.

REPUBLICAN REPRESENTATION ON FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I understand that the able majority leader is not presenting for action this afternoon the recommendation of the Democratic majority in respect to committee memberships in the Eighty-first Congress. I understand that consideration of this subject, through his courtesy, is put off until tomorrow in order to permit the Republican side of the Senate to submit its suggestions at the same time the majority suggestions are presented.

Since I shall not be here tomorrow, because of personal reasons with which most Senators are familiar, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without stating for the RECORD my very great disappointment that the Democratic conference has seen fit in this connection to take the first partisan action in opposition to the theory and spirit of bipartisan cooperation in foreign affairs which has prevailed in the past 2 years.

I do not question the right of my friends across the aisle to apply their percentage of membership, as they see fit, to any committee in the Senate. They had to make a voluntary choice as between committees in selecting those to which the more drastic penalty of curtailed minority membership should be applied, the penalty of reducing the minority membership to five members. I merely wish to express my profound regret that in the exercise of that discretion and in the operation of that purely voluntary will they chose the Committee on Foreign Relations as one of those upon which the minority side of the committee should be reduced to the maximum possible.

Mr. President, I repeat, I do not question their right to make this order, I do not question the character of the splendid Senators who are recommended for new membership, but I do question the wisdom of an act which is implicit with hostility, as it will be interpreted by the country, to the maintenance in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations of an atmosphere in which partisan politics has not entered for one single second during the past 2 years. The Senator from Texas suggests to me the past 4 years; I agree with him.

But here is a decision, Mr. President, which is a political decision. I absolve the Senator from Kentucky and his associates from any conscious purpose to do the thing I am talking about in respect to its implications, but I submit that the implications are inevitable. The implications will be viewed by the country as inevitable, and the implications are without justification, and the implications are utterly unsound as a matter of public policy.

When the maximum reduction in the Republican membership is deliberately applied to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations what is the implication? The implication must be that in connection with the Administration's foreign program for this year, Republican Senators are not quite trustworthy, and that there must be faithful partisan Democrats, to the maximum, put upon the committee for the sake of the national welfare.

Mr. President, my friends across the aisle probably do not intend that challenge or that purpose. But I submit that the implication is inevitable. It is an implication which I have heard from disillusioned colleagues on this side of the aisle ever since the news became known. It is an implication which will inevitably be construed by the country as I have indicated.

I ask, Is the implication just? That is the reason for my rising. I care far less about the impact of the new percentage itself. Of itself, it is a very little thing. But I care a very great deal about whether or not the Democratic side of the Senate is justified in an action which carries the dubious implication to which I have referred.

Mr. President, I shall never live long enough not to be unalterably proud of the solidarity of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Democrats and Republicans alike, during the last two critical years of this country's history. I shall never cease to be proud of the fact that never once was a partisan word uttered in all the considerations of that committee.

I shall never cease to be proud of the fact that although upon many occasions we started with violent differences of opinion in the committee in respect to various phases of proposed legislation, that never once through long, patient, careful quest of a common denominator in our thinking did we fail to produce a unanimous result. I am proud of the indispensable Republican contribution to that record which clothed American international authority with the power of unity.

I shall never cease to be proud of the fact—I hope some day a record of equal unpartisan values can be made—I shall never cease to be proud of the fact that upon 47 critical occasions in the Eightieth Congress, which in this aspect was not the worst Congress in history, the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding, but was the best Congress in history, this committee voted 13 to 0 in behalf of the national welfare. Thus we denied any possibility that any alien enemy might think they could divide and conquer us.

Mr. President, I submit that that sort of a record invites and deserves a different treatment—a far different acknowledgment—than is accorded to the Republican side of the Chamber in the Democratic proposal to reduce the Republican membership upon this committee to the utter minimum.

I desire to refer to one other factor in passing. If we Republicans were permitted to have the same minority representation in the Eighty-first Congress that the minority had in the Eightieth, the Republican side of the Senate would produce representation on the Foreign Relations Committee for the great west coast of the country. We should have filled our one vacancy, which is now

denied to us, with a distinguished Republican Senator from the Pacific area. Due to the fact that we shall not be permitted to correct this lapse, which we have recognized for a long time, the committee, as it will stand, will again be without a single representative from that great Pacific area of the United States which has such a desperately intimate interest in foreign affairs.

Under all the circumstances my colleagues will understand why I deeply regret the situation which we confront. I would not overemphasize it. Of itself it is perhaps relatively insignificant. But I hope it is not an omen for the future, because in my view we are still in the grip of those times, Mr. President, when in respect to foreign relations we must think of our country first and our party second. I am sure that will continue to be the general pursuit and aspect of affairs. I am sure our friends across the aisle will undertake to permit us a full measure of cooperation. But I respectfully submit, Mr. President, that this is a very unhappy initiation of the enterprise, because cooperation has to be a two-way street and confidence must be mutual.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I regret the necessity in this first real session of the Senate to indulge in anything that might even seem to be a controversy over the assignment of Members of the Senate to committees. The situation which we confronted in determining in the first place how many committees should have a ratio of 8 to 5, and how many should have a ratio of 7 to 6, was one that presented difficulties.

We have, as a result of the election, a majority of 12, the ratio being 54 to 42. In the Eightieth Congress the majority of the Republicans was 6, the ratio being 51 to 45. Obviously the Democratic steering committee in undertaking to provide membership on committees for the increased majority of Members on this side was compelled to increase the number of committees that would have a ratio of 8 to 5.

In the last Congress, with a majority of six, the then majority decided on three committees that would have a ratio of 8 to 5, not including the Appropriations Committee, which had a larger ratio because of a larger membership.

The steering committee decided, and, based upon the representation of the two sides it seems a just decision, that we should have eight committees that would have a ratio of 8 to 5.

In the discussion of the question as to whether the Committee on Foreign Relations should be one of those eight there were many things that had to be considered. In the first place, 2 years ago, when the committee was organized, it became necessary to drop three Democratic members from the Committee on Foreign Relations because of the Reorganization Act, which limited the membership of committees and limited the number of committees in the Senate.

In addition to that we had a larger proportion, I should say, of Members on this side who had tried to become members of the Committee on Foreign Relations for a number of years, or ever since they had been in the Senate, than of any other committee. It is a desirable committee, and, naturally, in view of world affairs, Senators appreciate membership on it because they wish to contribute whatever they can to the solution of the international problems that face us.

I appreciate all that the Senator from Michigan has said in regard to the attitude of the Committee on Foreign Relations during the past 2 years during which I have been a member of it, and for a longer time than that. But I also want to call attention to the fact, and emphasize it, that even in the Seventy-eighth Congress, when we had a larger majority than we have now, and when the Committee on Foreign Relations was larger than it is now, and when we had a larger proportionate majority than would provide for even that 8-to-5 ratio, we initiated the so-called nonpartisan and bipartisan approach to all problems of international character.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who was then the chairman of that committee, in appointing a subcommittee to confer with the President and with the Secretary of State to try to work out a nonpartisan, bipartisan foreign relations program, appointed a subcommittee of eight, four Republicans and four Democrats. My recollection is that the Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, the then Senator from Vermont, Mr. Austin, the then Senator from Maine, Mr. White, and the then Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. La Follette, were the four representing the minority. The Senator from Texas, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. George, the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Barkley, and first the then Senator from Iowa, Mr. Gillette, and later the Senator from Utah, Mr. Thomas, represented the majority on that committee.

So that even long before the war ended, and before the death of President Roosevelt, the Committee on Foreign Relations thought that it saw far enough ahead to begin the foundations of a foreign policy that would be bereft of partisan politics, and even with a larger majority than we have now, the Senator from Texas provided an equal representation from both sides in that committee in trying to work out the foreign policy; and I think the Senator from Michigan will agree also that we did not hand the minority a bill of goods and say "take this."

In the very initiation, in the very beginning of the talks and conversations, first with Secretary Hull and later with Secretary Stettinius, we started from scratch, and we worked our way along inch by inch and sentence by sentence and page by page, and everybody, regardless of his politics, had an opportunity, and exercised it, to express his views in regard to everything leading up, for instance, to the Charter of the United Nations, and the entire foreign policy of our Government.

So that it is not quite accurate to emphasize that only in the Eightieth Congress was this nonpartisan and bipartisan approach maintained, for it was maintained even back in the Seventy-eighth Congress and through the Seventy-ninth Congress and it was continued in the Eightieth Congress.

I have heretofore expressed my profound appreciation and gratitude to the Senator from Michigan and to other Senators on the Republican side serving on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and even those who are not members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for the unity of approach which we have been able to attain in regard to foreign relations and international policy.

In determining what we should do in regard to the proportion of membership on this committee, we had no thought of any partisan division in respect to the actions of the committee. We had a problem to solve in regard to our own membership. We were confronted with twice the majority the other side had in the last Congress. We worked out a proportion which is based upon the pattern set by the Eightieth Congress. Wherever there was a fraction of a percentage, the majority took the whole and not the fraction. There is no way by which we can divide a man into halves or thirds. We must deal with whole numbers. We adopted the same pattern, and the proportion is almost the same, though slightly different both in the Appropriations Committee and in the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, we did not feel, and we do not now feel that the presence or absence of any one man on the Committee on Foreign Relations would make any difference so far as its attitude toward international problems is concerned. In view of the situation which confronted us in trying in the first place to restore to membership on the committee Senators who had to be dropped under the law 2 years ago, and the fact that there was an effort to give membership on the committee to some Senators who had sought to obtain membership upon it, whose records in the Senate are equally satisfactory and equally positive with respect to our international relations, I do not feel that we were in any way violating the proprieties by including the Committee on Foreign Relations as one of those to have a ratio of 8 to 5.

I shall regret it if there is any implication to be drawn from this fact from a partisan viewpoint. I do not know to what extent such implication would have been drawn by the public if nothing had been said about it today. But inasmuch as it has been mentioned, I wish completely to disclaim, not only for myself, but for the entire Democratic majority and for the steering committee which worked out these assignments, any sinister motive. I refuse, with all the force I command, any implication on the part of anyone that we have in any way been actuated by partisan politics or by any remote reflection upon the good faith, patriotism, or willingness of the members of that committee to go forward, as they have in the past, in a united spirit in dealing with our relationships with other nations.

This was one of the practical situations with which we had to deal. I suppose those who wish to do so may draw some implication from the circumstances, to which they will attribute motives of party politics. The question of politics

was not even discussed. The question of the attitude of Democrats or Republicans on the committee was not even discussed. We were seeking to meet a situation which confronted us, and we have met it, we think, in the best and most practical way possible.

It is always regrettable that Senators may not be assigned to the committees which they prefer. That applies to both sides of the Chamber. But we are all young yet, and there is a great future before us. As the Republican candidate said in the last campaign, our future lies before us. Therefore all Members of the Senate have a perfect right to aspire to membership on this committee as soon as circumstances will permit.

Mr. President, there is quite a difference between the existing situation and the situation which prevailed 2 years ago. This proportion takes no Senator off the committee, whereas 2 years ago we lost four members of the committee by reason of the operation of the law at that time. It may not be important, but it is a fact that by this ratio we do not remove any Senator from the committee. All Senators who are on the committee will remain on the committee, both majority and minority, with the exception of Senator Hatch, of New Mexico, who has retired from the Senate, and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who suggested that he be switched from the Committee on Foreign Relations to the Committee on the Judiciary, partly in order to take care of Senators who had been previously dropped. Furthermore, when I assume the office of Vice President, there will be a vacancy on the committee.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks on the subject on which the Senator from Michigan so ably addressed the Senate this afternoon.

I listened to the Senator from Kentucky in his reply to the Senator from Michigan. So far as I am concerned, I wish to say that I felt that most of his remarks were irrelevant and immaterial to the question which the action of the Democratic caucus has raised in regard to the continuation of a bipartisan foreign policy.

I wish to make one point very clear at the beginning: I am willing to eliminate myself from the consideration of this subject matter. If it be true that it appeared that if the Foreign Relations Committee remained on a 7-to-6 basis, the junior Senator from Oregon would be appointed to that committee, and if that was one of the reasons why the Democrats adopted an 8-to-5 ratio, I here and now, for the good of the country and the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy, wish to assure the Democrats that I withdraw from any further consideration. However, there are other Republican Senators from the Pacific coast and other Democratic Senators from the Pacific coast who should be considered for membership on the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not yield until I finish.

As I have just said, there are other Republican Senators from the Pacific coast and other Democratic Senators from the Pacific coast who should be considered for membership on the Foreign Relations Committee, because in my section of the country the people have Asia at their front door, and for some time now they have tried to make clear that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee should have at least one west coast member on it. I say that in the Eighty-first Congress the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate should have either one Republican or one Democratic member from the west coast.

The Senator from Kentucky talks about implications. I wish to say that the implications of the actions taken by the Democratic Members of the Senate in their caucus are perfectly clear. A few minutes ago we listened to the President of the United States deliver his message on the state of the Union. In that message there was not one word about the bipartisan policy, for which the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is at least as responsible as is any other public servant in America. The least the President could have done would have been to recognize by name the distinguished Senator from Michigan and give credit, it seems to me, for what he has done in recent years in developing a truly bipartisan foreign policy. There can be no doubt that the wise counsel and able leadership of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] prevented some of the mistakes that otherwise would have been made in the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Of course, the implications are clear. The implications are that the Democrats propose to play partisan politics with war and peace. The implications are clear that if occasions arise where they think it desirable to play politics with foreign policy, they will stack the committee with a great majority of Democrats. That is quite out of line with the spirit and purpose of a bipartisan foreign policy. I wish to say that when the Senator from Kentucky talks about the situation which confronted the Democrats in the Seventy-eighth Congress, he should point out that since then we have had the Reorganization Act; and it is the Reorganization Act which, so far as ratio is concerned, gives to the Democrats, and also to the Republicans, their problems in regard to the number of Members who shall serve on the committees.

But let us consider what the Republican Congress did under the Reorganization Act. We recognized, Mr. President, that if we are going to have a bipartisan foreign policy, clearly there is a relationship between it and the membership of that committee. I submit that bipartisanship, so far as the personnel of the committee is concerned, means equal numbers to the extent that such an arrangement can be mathematically worked out. I here and now charge that mathematically the Democrats did not attempt to carry out the bipartisan foreign policy which characterized the Republicans, when we had the majority and reassigned membership on the Committee on Foreign Relations. We thought the best way to carry out a bipartisan foreign policy was to give, under the ratio, on that committee, as near an equal number to Senators on both sides of the aisle as was mathematically possible—and thus the 7-to-6 ratio.

I come now to the last point I wish to make, Mr. President. I do not desire to embarrass the Senator from Michigan, because I think my love for him and the great esteem with which I hold him are well known both in this body and throughout the country. But let us deal with a political reality; let us face the fact that not always has the great senior Senator from Michigan been confronted with unanimity among Senators on this side of the aisle in regard to a bipartisan foreign policy. Through his magnificent qualities of leadership, Mr. President, he has been a great co-captain with administration forces in carrying forward a bipartisan foreign policy, sailing our Ship of State on a rather even keel, in my judgment, in the interests of a true bipartisan foreign policy. What do Democratic Senators think they have done to the standing of the Senator from Michigan as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, among other Senators on this side of the aisle, when in this Congress he has to come before his fellow Republican Senators and raise his voice again and plead for a position which he thinks is right, in the interests of the country? I shall give you one man's opinion, Mr. President. My opinion is that if Democratic Senators wished to set about undermining the effectiveness of the great work of the Senator from Michigan among Senators on this side of the aisle, they could not have done a better job of it than they did when they adopted an 8-to-5 ratio for membership on the Foreign Relations Committee. I think I know whereof I speak, because today I have talked with a considerable number of Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle. I tell the Senate now, and Senators can take it for what it is worth—but from the standpoint of the country, it is a matter of vital importance—that from the point of view of a Senator on this side of the aisle, in my judgment, as of this moment, the action of the Democratic Senators has weakened the position of the Senator from Michigan so far as concerns his leadership in support of what Democratic Senators will in the future contend to be a bipartisan foreign policy. Members of the Senate on the Republican side of the aisle are saying, "What do you mean when you say 'bipartisan foreign policy'? The best evidence we have of what the Democrats mean by a 'bipartisan foreign policy' is that they took the first opportunity they had to undermine the position of the Senator from Michigan by changing the ratio of membership on the Foreign Relations Committee from 7 to 6 to 8 to 5." I consider the action taken to be in effect an insult and an act of effrontery to the Senator from Michigan because it weakens his position, on our side of the aisle, in support of a bipartisan foreign policy.

So far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, I shall continue to fight for the type of foreign policy which my record stands for; and so far as I can recall, it is a record which does not show

one vote at variance with the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Because of my love for him and my appreciation of what he has done for our country, I say these words with a feeling of resentment against the action taken, for it will, in my opinion, be interpreted by some as a reflection on the leadership of the Senator from Michigan.

I hope that before Democratic Senators get through with this problem they will at least recognize the importance of taking the course of action necessary to give us at least one Democratic Senator from the west coast on the Foreign Relations Committee, so that the people of that section of the country will feel that they have a direct spokesman from their own territory who can help interpret, for the other Members of the Senate, what we consider to be the great, vital problems of the Pacific.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to belabor this subject, but the Senator from Oregon rather intimated that the action of the Democratic steering committee was based upon some intimation that he might be a member of the Foreign Relations Committee if the ratio were different. I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon that so far as I am concerned, I had no knowledge or suspicion or intimation as to who might be an additional Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The matter was not discussed or mentioned in the steering committee. I think the Senator from Oregon will give me credit for a sufficient degree of friendship for him over the years to understand that I would not be actuated by any such motives as that. So far as I am concerned, if I were still a member of that committee I should welcome the Senator from Oregon as a member of it.

Insofar as putting somebody from the West on the committee is concerned, I do not wish to be partisan in any respect, but the majority in the Eightieth Congress could have done that if they had seen fit to do so. They did not do it. They now, being the minority, complain because we are not doing it for them. The membership of a committee depends a good deal on the desire of Members of the Senate. They make their requests, and the requests are acted upon. They do not always concur with the viewpoint or the policy of the committee itself, and I do not think the question that there has been nobody on the Foreign Relations Committee from the West is any particular party's fault or any individual Senator's fault. It is just one of those things that has not worked out. Largely, as a rule, Senators from the West are interested in other matters besides foreign relations. They are interested in problems that affect the West, and they put in their requests as a rule for committees dealing with subjects in which they are vitally concerned.

So far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned, I do not think that anybody, especially the Senator from Michigan, and none of his friends, need be uneasy about the Senator's place in the history of the Senate or the history of the country, or the history of our foreign relations. Certainly the absence or the presence of one member of either party on the Committee on Foreign Relations will have no effect upon the Senator's standing in the country and in the Senate. I have too much respect for the patriotism and the sincerity of members of the Republican Party to believe that their attitude on the great question of international cooperation and interparty cooperation in dealing with foreign policy and affairs is to be affected by one man, and as to whether one man is or is not on the Committee on Foreign Relations. The position of the Senator from Michigan is safe. His place in the history of the country and in the Senate is secure, so he need not worry on this account, and I think no friend of his need worry. Certainly I am not worrying about it, because I do not think it is affected in the slightest degree.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, it is not possible for me to sit here and listen to what has been said without identifying myself completely with my distinguished colleague from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in what he said, and with what my colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has just said. I have served on the Foreign Relations Committee for 2 years, and all of us on that committee, Republicans and Democrats alike, had a great experience of inspiration and patriotism in serving our country together in an absolutely nonpartisan way and as Americans in dealing with basic international problems.

My heart has been full ever since I first ran for public office with my belief that the peace of the world depended on a united America and a united American front in our dealings with other nations of the world. I supported every measure in this body, whether introduced on our side or on the Democratic side, which looked toward the cooperation of the world, and which has called upon us to stand together as Americans in this critical period of the world's history. I went through the experience of the whole development of the ECA program. I knew the difficulties and the opposition that would come to that. I pay tribute to the Senator from Michigan for the inspiring leadership which he displayed in taking what was originally the administration measure and bringing about an agreement, a meeting of the minds between both sides of the aisle, without any thought of partisanship. We all acted for the best interests of the people of America in presenting this form of recovery aid to the other nations of the world. No act could have been more important than the way in which that program was handled during this last year. I desire to go on record as sharing with the Senator from Michigan his statement that the Congress, which has been designated as the worst Congress in history, was the outstanding and best Congress in American history so far as our foreign relations are concerned.

Naturally, then, this morning when I heard that the change had been made in the committee set-up I felt deeply shocked. Certainly the 7-to-6 ratio could have been retained in this vital committee. There were other committees where necessary political adjustments could have been made. Heretofore, with full approval of the American people we have agreed that politics should be adjourned at the water's edge. We cannot let the American people down at this time.

Mr. President, I should be the last one ever to desert the bipartisan approach. I could not contemplate such a thing, not for one minute. I desire to continue to identify myself with an all-American approach to these problems. But, Mr. President, I have a sinking in my heart that this should have been done without giving thought to the implications of this action and the reflections on our own leader, who has done so much in joining with the President of the United States and with the Secretary of State in developing our all-American foreign policy. It is distressing to me beyond measure, and I say it is especially distressing because of the deep affection that I have come to hold for my colleagues on the left of the aisle, Democrats with whom we worked together, with whom we traveled together abroad, with whom we roomed together, in trying to find the answer to these problems, without ever a whisper of partisanship.

Mr. President, it is not possible for me to sit here and not express my convictions, and my regret that this should have happened at the very inception of the Eighty-first Congress.

### THE NATIONAL HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, today the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced a national housing bill, which, so far as the general form is concerned, follows almost exactly the terms of the bill which he and I introduced at the last session and which has been introduced with bipartisan cooperation for the past 5 years.

This bill is 46 pages long. It was prepared without my knowledge by the administrative departments and sent to the Senator from Louisiana this morning. He called me up about an hour before the Senate met and showed me the bill. I had offered to sponsor with him the same bill which was introduced last year, but he pointed out that there were substantial changes, to which I shall refer. I had no opportunity to read the bill. Furthermore, the changes are very substantial.

The subject of housing has been a matter of bipartisan cooperation for 5 years. I was chairman of a subcommittee in a Democratic Congress which made the first over-all study of postwar housing and submitted certain recommendations. Both in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses the bill was introduced with the support of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and myself. I regret very much that I am unable to add my name to the list of sponsors of the bill which has today been introduced with purely Democratic sponsorship—the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from

Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I prefer to complete my statement. At the conclusion of my statement I shall be glad to yield.

Because of the shortness of time, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] also declined to permit their names to be used on the bill. We regret that we have not been able to join in sponsorship of this bill.

There are certain substantial changes, about which I certainly was not consulted at any time. The number of houses has been increased from 500,000 to the possibility of building more than 1,000,000 in 4 years. The annual expense of the subsidy has been increased from $190,000,000 to $445,000,000. The bonds of the various metropolitan housing authorities have been made taxable, which makes the expense to the Federal Government considerably greater.

I have not had an opportunity to examine the bill to determine whether there are other changes. In any event, the bill has been prepared without any consultation whatever with us, or any attempt to continue the bipartisan cooperation which has previously existed in regard to the housing policy.

The President of the United States used the following language in his message to the Congress today:

> I hope for cooperation from farmers, from labor, and from business. Every segment of our population and every individual has a right to expect from his Government a fair deal.
>
> They have a right to expect that the Congress and the President will work in the closest cooperation with one objective—the welfare of the people of this Nation as a whole.
>
> In the months ahead I know that I shall be able to cooperate with this Congress.

I can only conclude that in using that language the President meant cooperation with the Democratic majority, and not cooperation with the Republican minority in this Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, my name is on the bill. Through the generosity of the Senate I shall be the chairman of the committee. I shall welcome any suggestions for changes which the distinguished Senator from Ohio desires to offer.

What the Senator from Ohio says about nonpartisan cooperation in the past few Congresses is correct so far as the Senate is concerned. But every time we passed a housing bill for the veterans or for the people of the United States, the Republican House of Representatives defeated the bill, either on the floor of the House because a rule could not be obtained for its consideration, or in conference.

So I wish to assure my friend the Senator from Ohio that, as chairman of the committee, I shall use every effort to bring about cooperation on the part of the Republican and the Democratic Members of the Senate, because certainly the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio has done much for housing legislation.



## RUSSELL J. HOPLEY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on December 10, last, it was my privilege to attend a public affairs luncheon given by the citizens of Omaha, Nebr., in honor of one of its most distinguished citizens, who had but recently returned from a term of service here in Washington. I refer to Mr. Russell J. Hopley, president of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co., who had been named Director of Civil Defense. The appointment was made by the President of the United States. Mr. Hopley was in Washington on this very important assignment for nearly a year. His services were rendered gratis. Mr. Hopley's address, delivered to the people of Omaha, should be made available to the Members of this body, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that the brief introductory remarks made by the vice president of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Charles S. Reed, be printed ahead of the address by Mr. Hopley.

Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of December 15, 1948, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, immediately following the address by Mr. Hopley.

There being no objection, the addresses and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF CHARLES S. REED, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, AT TESTIMONIAL LUNCHEON OF THE OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON DECEMBER 10, 1948, HONORING RUSSELL J. HOPLEY, RETIRING DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE

Senator BUTLER, Governor Peterson, ladies and gentlemen:

Russell Hopley has honored the chamber of commerce by making his first general public appearance here since his return from Washington. Although I know that your presence today is solely a testimonial of your regard for Mr. Hopley, I do, on behalf of the chamber of commerce, wish to express our appreciation for your attendance at this luncheon.

We are especially grateful that Senator BUTLER and our Governor are here.

Since Russell Hopley came here in 1929, we have come to regard him as our own. I am sure, however, that no Omahan is the least bit jealous because his civic service was expanded into national fields. I have the pleasure of reading a message of national appreciation:

"I join with the citizens of Omaha in paying respect to one of its distinguished citizens, Russell J. Hopley. He has well served the National Military Establishment and the Nation during this past year as chairman of a committee studying civil defense planning, the report of which reflects the thoroughness of his organizational and administrative abilities. It is a fitting tribute that his fellow citizens have assembled at this testimonial luncheon to honor him.

"JAMES FORRESTAL,
*"Secretary of Defense."*

Before presenting the man you came to hear, I cannot resist a short recap of a life devoted to service.

I have heard the presiding officers, in keeping with the occasion, paint some very glowing pictures of our guests of honor. Sometimes the pictures were better than the subject, but I am not worried about such a possibility today because no one can overstate the accomplishments and character of our Russ Hopley.

Since he is an active leader in more than 25 local, State, and National organizations, I can only give you the high spots in his career.

He was born in Blue Island, Ill. Ambitious young people can take hope in the fact that his business career started as a collector for the telephone company at Fort Madison, Iowa. He served with distinction in the Signal Corps in World War I.

Early in life he began to devote a large share of his time and energy to the welfare of his community and State. His usefulness virtually forced him into leadership in a list of organizations that reads like a roster of human aspirations. Without attempting to emphasize one more than another, I refer to his devoted and sagacious leadership as chairman of the Omaha city-wide planning committee, which received national acclaim.

In the business field he was rapidly promoted to positions of increasing responsibility, until in 1937, he became operating vice president of the Northwestern Bell Telephone Co. He was elected president of his company in 1942, and we are glad that he continues in that capacity today.

With the invention and perfection of the airplane, radar, the atomic bomb, and guided missiles, and with the increasing possibility of mass destruction by bacteriological and chemical warfare, our Nation has become conscious of the necessity of planning for the security of our civil population in the unhappy event of another war.

It became the duty of the President of the United States to select a citizen to assume the responsibility of planning for the safety of our people in a national emergency. Even as a Republican, I am forced to admit that the President's selection of Russell Hopley was a stroke of genius. In March 1948, Mr. Hopley accepted the assignment as Director of Civil Defense Planning. The task ahead of him was new and uncharted. As he has always done in business and civic affairs, Russell Hopley devoted all of his keen insight, calm judgment, organizational ability, and tireless industry to getting the job done quickly and efficiently. His services were rendered gratis.

The character of his service is brought into relief by a consideration of the fact that in directing the work of a panel of 133 experts, organized into 10 advisory committees, he employed a staff of only 43 key persons.

On his judgment rested the possible future safety of millions of his fellow citizens. The consciousness of this obligation did not leave him for a minute. I had the pleasure of spending an evening with him in Washington several weeks ago. While he was his usual calm and gracious self, I could see evidence of his feeling of responsibility and the expenditure of his energy.

His approach to the problem and his ability were the talk of the Pentagon. Typical of the Russell Hopley we know, he completed his assignment with dispatch, and now he has returned to Omaha with no trace of Potomac fever.

His report has met with practically unanimous approbation. On November 22, President Truman personally expressed his thanks to Mr. Hopley, and the following day he was awarded a certificate of appreciation by Secretary Forrestal, the first such certificate ever presented a civilian.

Your attendance is a testimonial of your pride in this great Omaha citizen whose life is an example of civic service. Speaking for the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, I am proud and happy to present our distinguished fellow townsman, Mr. Russell J. Hopley.

ADDRESS BY RUSSELL J. HOPLEY, PRESIDENT, NORTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE CO. (FORMER NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF CIVIL DEFENSE PLANNING), OMAHA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PUBLIC AFFAIRS LUNCHEON IN HONOR OF THE SPEAKER, DECEMBER 10, 1948

CIVIL DEFENSE FOR NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. Chairman, Senator BUTLER, Your Excellency Governor Peterson, distinguished guests, distinguished ladies at the center table, and friends, I want you all to know that I deeply appreciate this splendid recognition and tribute on the occasion of the completion of my special assignment in Washington. Even though, from my own standpoint, I know that this high compliment is not fully deserved, I nevertheless want you all to know that I appreciate it very much.

After almost 9 months of intensive work and activity as Director of Civil Defense Planning with Secretary of Defense Forrestal, it is good, indeed, to be back in Omaha.

An intimate picture of the Washington assignment, which has been referred to by some authorities as one of the most important undertakings in government at this time, and some of the significant developments in the activity might be of interest.

I will endeavor to relate a few of the high lights together with a brief historical outline in connection with this most important undertaking.

On February 15 of this year, the report of the then War Department Civil Defense Board, which later became known as the Bull Board since it was headed up by Maj. Gen. Harold Bull, was released for public information. One of the principal recommendations of this board was that a general civil defense plan should be formulated for the United States, its Territories and possessions.

Little time was lost following the issuance of this report since 7 days after its release—on February 22—my telephone rang and as a result of a meeting at that time with Secretary of Defense Forrestal, and other high-ranking members of the Military Establishment and representatives of the Federal Government, he asked me to head up, organize, and direct the development of the fundamental civil defense plans and organizational structure for the country.

To visualize the need and necessity for a strong and sound civil defense plan and organization for our country, it is first necessary to think in terms of past, current, and future developments, such as:

1. Until this century, wars had been mainly contests between opposing bodies of fighting men and armies. Relatively few civilians were exposed to actual physical contact with the fighting—and those that were were the ones unfortunate enough to be caught in the paths of armies. Generally, civilians far from the scene of actual fighting suffered only heartaches and hardships.

2. That our homeland has been fortunate enough not to have suffered the devastation apparent everywhere in the stricken cities of Europe and Japan during World Wars I and II.

3. That there is no guaranty that if we are unfortunate enough to be involved in another conflict, that the cities of this country and our teeming industrial areas will not be potential targets of an enemy.

4. In the last decade, there has been an ever-growing list of instruments of destruction. Their use has not been confined merely to opposing armies—and one need only think of London, Coventry, Hamburg, Cologne, Berlin, Tokyo, Nagasaki, and Hiroshima to realize how war can now reach into cities far from the scene of actual battle.

5. Up to this time, we here in the United States have been fortunate—since two great oceans have served as effective barriers against large-scale enemy operations.

6. No American city has listened to the wail of a siren warning of real danger in this country, the rush of falling bombs, or the thunder of bomb explosions.

7. Nor, during enemy operations, have we had to live in constant fear that high-explosive bombs, incendiaries, atomic bombs, guided missiles, or buzz bombs would, with destructive force, land in our midst at any moment.

8. No longer can we in this country assume that we are safe from these dangers.

9. Weapons developed in the last stages of World War II, new weapons that have come into being since, as well as those that will be developed in the future, have made our country just as vulnerable as any other part of the world.

10. Both time and distance have dissolved and no one needs a crystal ball to see the possibility that the future may bring another Pearl Harbor or even a score or more of simultaneous Pearl Harbors to our own shores.

11. The objective of enemy action against our country today would be to render our cities and production facilities inoperative, thus minimizing the will to resist on the part of the people.

It is not within my sphere to make predictions as to whether this country will experience another war—I certainly hope and we all hope, and we all must assume, that the various peace agencies of governments throughout the world will be successful in negotiating a basis for lasting peace.

Certainly we all hope that another war with all of its horrors and suffering and loss of life and destruction will never come.

Yet, in these days of insecurity it is wise for us to go a step further than the classic statement of "keeping our powder dry." We must be prepared for the day of a new type of war more terrible, more frightful, more destructive, and more devastating than any of those of the past.

We have heard much, since World War II, of the necessity for a strong national defense. We in this country have taken steps to strengthen our Army, our Navy, and our Air Force and their supporting agencies but there is a missing link in our defense structure, and that missing link is civil defense.

Civil defense as related to national defense broadly means the organization of the people to minimize the effects of and recovery from enemy action—more specifically, it is:

The mobilization, organization, and direction of the civilian populace and necessary supporting agencies to minimize the effects of enemy action directed against people, communities, industrial plants, and other installations—and to maintain or restore those facilities essential to civil life and to preserve the maximum civilian support of the war effort.

With all of this as our premise, we undertook the process of carrying out the terms of the directive which was issued in establishing our organization—

"To prepare and submit a program of civil defense including a plan for a permanent Federal civil defense agency which, in conjunction with the several States and their subdivisions, can undertake those peacetime preparations which are necessary to assure an adequate civil defense system in the event of an emergency."

As the first step, it was necessary to recruit an able and effective organization. To do this, and to effect a good balance, we reached out over all geographical sections of the country and brought in the top talent and ability in all of the various specialized fields that would be involved in a broad civil defense activity.

We deliberately kept our organization on the small side and carried on our work with 43 key people—including our good friend, Jim McCrory, who is assisting in the preparation of training material—together with an outstanding group of 133 consultants and advisers selected from the fields of science, education, business, industry, and labor and other similar groups. It was highly significant that in asking people to serve with us, we had not one refusal on the part of anyone to serve.

Very often people would ask the question "How many people are working on the civil defense activity?" My usual answer was "In the first place, all of our people are working. Actually, we have 43 key people and 133 consultants and advisers"—then, the usual response would be something like this, "Well, my goodness, with the large amount of work involved in a problem of this sort, we thought perhaps you had four or five hundred people on the job."

In taking up our work, we had available to us the experience, recommendations, and findings of the United States strategic bombing survey in Europe and Japan and the World War II activities and experiences of the civil defense organizations in Europe, Japan, and in England, and in our own country.

It may surprise some of you to learn that Japan had the oldest civil defense system, since theirs was first organized in 1923. Japan's system was not too effective for the reason that the military kept telling their people that an enemy attack could never come to Japan—the result was the people did not work at it.

Germany had what could have been a strong system of civil defense, but for the fact that there were too many people reaching out for power and constantly attempting to exert political control over the various segments of the organization. In addition, the organization was hampered by administrative muddles. The result was constant conflict and their system did not work too well.

England had the strongest and most effective civil defense program—their system was organized 4 years prior to World War II. The people worked at it and the result was an effective system and one that contributed greatly to the survival of England and the actual winning of the war.

In our current planning activity we undertook to avoid the pitfalls and errors in all of the previous experiences and to develop a plan that would stand up as being sound, simple, workable, and acceptable and to avoid overlapping, duplication, and confusion.

In addition, we approached every phase of our work on the basis that as far as the end result was concerned that there could be no road blocks, no barriers, and no obstacles in the way of our turning out the right kind of a job—and further, that "we had been given the job to do and that we were going to do it."

During the course of our work, we held many meetings with representatives from the armed services; the various branches of Federal, State, and local government; representatives from some foreign governments; and many private organizations, groups, and individuals. We had the finest of cooperation and assistance from all of these groups.

In a nut shell, we brought together the best advice and experience of all interested groups in our entire activity.

Briefly, our final program entitled "civil defense for national security" proposes:

1. The establishment of a permanent Federal Office of Civil Defense to be established within the executive branch of the Government and to be headed by a strong and able civilian director.

2. Within this Office would be a technical staff, headed by a deputy director, with divisions comprising: communications, engineering, fire services, police services, warden services, and emergency transportation.

3. A plans and operations staff, headed by a deputy director, with divisions comprising:

organization and methods, mobile reserves and mutual aid, evacuation, aircraft observers and air raid warning, manpower and matériel, plant protection, and civilian war aid.

4. A training staff, headed by a deputy director, including: field services, methods and training materials, public education, schools and colleges, and leadership training.

5. A medical and health services and other special weapons defense staff, headed by a deputy director, to include medical and health services, radiological defense, chemical defense, and other special weapons defense.

6. We also propose the establishment of regional coordinators to assist in coordinating matters between the States and Federal organization and with the military and other agencies, when involved.

7. Our plan contemplates the establishment of a civil defense agency within each State—starting with the governor as the responsible head—then the appointment of an advisory council, composed of representative citizens of the State to advise and counsel on civil defense matters, and the State activity to be headed up by a director. The various operating divisions in the State organization would be similar to those in the Federal organization.

8. Similarly, in each community the establishment of a civil-defense agency under the mayor as the responsible municipal official, with an advisory council of representative citizens to advise and counsel on civil-defense matters, and the local activity to be headed up by a director. Here too, the various operating divisions in the local organization would be similar to those in the State and Federal organization.

9. Our entire plan is proposed on the basis of:

A. Placing full responsibility for operations in the States and communities where we think it properly belongs.

B. The Federal organization to furnish the leadership and guidance in organizing and training the people for civil-defense tasks, coordinating, training materials, and the advice and counsel that is needed.

C. Maximum utilization of volunteers, existing agencies and organizations—governmental, public, and private—and all available skills and experiences.

D. Well organized and trained units in communities throughout the country prepared and equipped to meet the problems of enemy attack, and to be ready against any weapon an enemy may use.

E. Intensive planning to meet the particular hazards of atomic or other modern weapons of warfare. (The atomic bomb is a triple-threat combination of (1) a high explosive, (2) a superincendiary, and (3) one of extreme radiation.)

F. A small nucleus peacetime organization which could be used in event of peacetime disasters such as fires, floods, explosions, tornadoes, and other similar catastrophies, and that could be quickly expanded to meet the exigencies of a given situation in a war emergency.

G. The plan and the legislation that we propose have been developed on a model basis for the Federal, State, and municipal organization, and can be easily modified and adjusted to meet a particular situation in the community or State.

H. Our plan and legislation also contemplate that the organization will not engage in any political activity or any other activities outside of the purely civil-defense field. We recognize that many other activities of various types will need to be carried on under different conditions but it is our thought that these should be organized separately from civil defense.

The basis of civil defense as related to a community sums up as follows:

1. The individual, who, with proper training and information, such as first aid, fire detection and prevention, detection of areas contaminated by war gases, ionizing radiation and other similar training, must in the event of an emergency take care of himself.

2. The family, similarly, with training, must take care of itself.

3. The community should as a general proposition organize to handle any emergency within the community. If the emergency were of such proportions that the community were completely overwhelmed and beyond its own capacity to take care of itself, then the calling in of—

4. Mobile reserves set up on the basis of mutual aid. Our plan proposes the organization of mobile reserve battalions (class A and class B) that can be moved into an overwhelmed community from various locations throughout the several States.

Briefly, and without going into the complete detail, it is proposed that these mobile reserve battalions be organized on the basis of setting aside a certain percent or a certain part of the protection services in each community in the State (such as fire, police, medical, etc.), to be supplemented by volunteers in sufficient numbers to round out an effective unit.

Each unit would comprise medical services, fire-fighting services, rescue, and debris clearance, police services, radiological defense services, emergency feeding services, and installation and repair services.

Each unit would also have assigned to it 6 planes and 12 pilots from the Civil Air Patrol to assist in transportation, traffic control, and similar duties.

If, after the mobile reserves were called in and the community was still overwhelmed beyond the combined capacity of the community and the mobile reserves to handle the situation, then we believe the next step should be—

5. Military aid to civil power to operate under emergency plans that have been and are being developed. The last step then would be—

6. Martial rule. And then the civil defense would continue operations, but under a new boss.

Those who are in a position to know have termed the structure of our plan as the best that has been developed for any country up to this time.

I have been most interested and greatly impressed by the almost universal endorsement and approval that our recommended program has received far and wide over the country as a whole.

A typical cross section of reactions to our plan is well summed up by these excerpts from editorials appearing throughout the country:

Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, November 24, 1948: "A job well done. * * * It is simply a prudent and reasonable plan to supplement this country's armed might with an adequate civil-defense program. The * * * committee has submitted such a program."

New York (N. Y.) Times, November 14, 1948: "We commend it (the plan) to Congress and to all citizens as a reasonable and important document. * * * The sooner a Civil Defense Act is passed here and put into effect the better it will be. This is an act of prudence that should not be long delayed."

New York (N. Y.) Herald Tribune, November 15, 1948: "The able report on this subject represents a minimum structure. * * * The proposed system has been very carefully constructed."

Washington (D. C.) Post, November 16, 1948: "Precisely because it is the efficiency of the civil defense organization that may determine whether this country can withstand atomic war. That is the purpose of a new and admirably thorough study—Civil Defense for National Security."

Washington (D. C.) Evening Star, November 15, 1948: "To ignore the warnings contained in the remarkably comprehensive report, to fail to make reasonable preparations to deal with some future emergency because the prospects seem too remote, would be to take risks of the gravest sort."

Baltimore (Md.) Sun, November 15, 1948: "The report shows wisdom in that * * * it calls only for an establishment on a nucleus basis * * * at the moment the quality of leadership and basic organization is more important than the total number of persons enrolled."

Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press, November 19, 1948: "One of the important merits of the civil defense organization which has been proposed * * * is its use in times of peacetime emergency."

Birmingham (Ala.) Post, November 15, 1948: "With world affairs constantly on edge, no time should be lost in placing on paper at least plans for any emergency."

Dallas (Tex.) Daily Times-Herald, November 16, 1948: "The program * * * as outlined * * * serves as a grim reminder of the sort of world in which we live. Therefore, it is up to those of us who are civilians to start getting ready * * * without delay."

Waterloo (Iowa) Courier, November 17, 1948: "Careful study has been given the subject by the Office of Civil Defense Planning. There is no possible harm in the enactment of such a measure, and it might save precious time in the future."

Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, November 19, 1948: "It (the civil defense report) does not offer any glib answers."

St. Albans (Vt.) Daily Messenger, November 19, 1948: "The plan for a civil defense organization to meet the hazards of an enemy attack on this country, just set forth * * * is a most important adjunct of our national defense system."

Boston (Mass.) Herald, November 16, 1948: "It is not warmongering to be prepared, particularly in the crucial field of civil defense. * * * The new Congress should lose no time in studying these proposals and providing legislation to put them into effect."

Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, November 14, 1948: "A thoroughly comprehensive * * * plan has been submitted. * * * It is a monumental piece of work reflecting tremendous credit."

Houston (Tex.) Post, November 16, 1948: "A comprehensive blueprint for the protection of the home front in case of war has been placed before Defense Secretary Forrestal."

Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, November 17, 1948: "Unhappily, every word of it is true. All we have is the book—a good basic text."

Lincoln (Nebr.) Evening Journal, November 15, 1948: "The committee * * * approached the problem as realistically as possible."

Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, November 17, 1948: "It is not hysteria to exercise foresight in providing adequate defense for the American home front. * * * Every detail for civil defense for the United States should be supplied by the Voice of America and other means to the people of Russia and other militaristic states. When knowledge is world wide, another conflict on modern terms may be impossible."

We have reviewed our plans with many organizations and groups, such as the council of state governments, the conference of mayors, the American Municipal Association, and others, and have received splendid and encouraging reactions from all quarters.

As a result, we feel that we have achieved our original objective of producing a sound plan and one of which all can be justly proud.

I should like to take this opportunity to pay my tribute to Secretary Forrestal as being a great American who is devoting himself unselfishly to our country; and to our fellow Omahans Lieutenant General Wedemeyer and Major General Gruenther—with

whom I had many contacts—as being great military leaders.

In conclusion, may I also compliment the chamber of commerce under the effective leadership of Tom Ashton and Charley Reed for their foresight and vision in undertaking a project of great importance to Omaha—I refer to adequate housing, not only to take care of the normal growth of the city—which, according to our company figures today, approaches 270,000 within the corporate limits and about 300,000 in the metropolitan area this side of the river—but to house the people who are now making Omaha their new home base such as the personnel of the Strategic Air Command and the other business and industries that are currently planning to locate here.

Thank you very much.

---

[From the Omaha Evening World-Herald of December 15, 1948]

THE ATTACK ON HOPLEY

A great many Government executives—President Truman and Nebraska's Governor Peterson among them—have commented that it is difficult, and becoming increasingly so, to persuade first-rate Americans to accept appointment to public office.

The reason? Not enough salary and too much abuse.

The recent experience of Russell J. Hopley illustrates the latter point. As Director of the Office of Civil Defense Planning, Mr. Hopley didn't get any salary at all. He took the job, for a limited time, as a public service—as one of the things a responsible man ought to do when his country calls.

But as soon as his report had been completed and handed to Secretary Forrestal, the shooting started.

Walter Winchell screamed over the air that the Hopley report was part of a military conspiracy to take over the country and destroy the Bill of Rights. Drew Pearson echoed a week or two later with "Congratulations to Walter Winchell on the firing of Russell J. Hopley as the head of Forrestal's Civil Defense Committee. A great job for the people." Winchell added shortly afterward: "The best news for all Americans, except a few perhaps in Mr. Forrestal's Department, is this—there will be no Hopley bill. This was the plan for civil defense that would have superseded your Bill of Rights. Thank you, Mr. President."

Now, let's look at the record.

First, Russell Hopley was not "fired." We make that statement categorically. When he left Omaha to take charge of civil-defense planning he said repeatedly, emphatically, and publicly that he would stay only long enough to complete the necessary study and make a report. At that time he said he hoped he would be in Washington no more than 6 months.

He stayed 3 months longer—9 months, in total—to get the job finished. Then, as he had told Secretary Forrestal he would, he resigned. The Secretary asked him to reconsider, but he refused.

So much for the Pearson canard. Now let's look at the Winchell theory that Russell Hopley engineered a sneak attack on the Bill of Rights.

If Winchell had read the Hopley report, which on the evidence seems doubtful, he would have learned that its chief emphasis is on civilian cooperation at the local level. The Hopley planners simply attempted to set up a stand-by organization which would reduce losses and save lives if this country should become involved in an atomic-biologic-chemical war.

This Nation-wide organization would be headed by a small Federal department or bureau which would provide leadership and coordination—but which would have no authority whatever over the civil rights of the people.

In only one circumstance would the procedure outlined in the Hopley plan impinge on anybody's rights. The plan suggests that if a monstrous calamity—such as atomic bombing—should befall any community, probably martial law would be declared there. Can any rational person doubt that? Could any rational person oppose it?

It is conceivable that an atomic war might wipe out not only the Bill of Rights but the whole Constitution, the Capitol, the White House, the radio networks and the Messrs. Winchell and Pearson and their Hooperatings.

But Russell Hopley didn't invent the atomic bomb.

He is simply an honorable and patriotic American who gave 9 months of his life to devising a plan to protect his countrymen against the furies which may be launched against them in World War III, if it comes.

For that he has been subjected to vicious and ill-informed attack. Can anyone wonder that decent and self-respecting men, who value their good name, hesitate to take public jobs which may expose them to abuse by the likes of Walter Winchell and Drew Pearson?

## DEFERMENT OF COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to thank the distinguished majority leader for withholding temporarily the assignments of the majority Members to committees. In my discussion with him I made the observation that it would please the minority if we might have 24 hours to consider the contemplated realinement of committee appointments and be able to iron out on our side of the aisle the assignments to committees in order that there should not be so much discussion on the floor of the Senate with reference to the subject. In my discussion with the distinguished majority leader I also made the observation that I felt we would be ready tomorrow to consider the minority assignments. I made that observation on the theory that the minority might caucus and consider today the assignments of the minority members. A conference has now been set for tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. I am wondering if the distinguished majority leader is ready to state when the assignments may be offered. I think they should be offered together. As I indicated, I think it will be difficult to get our realinement made before noon tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am glad to accommodate our side to the requirements of the minority. I had hoped that we might have the committee assignments ready for tomorrow so that we might adjourn over until Monday. Otherwise I think we should have a session on Friday, because the matter should not go over into next week, for the reason that there is some proposed legislation which it is desired to consider very promptly. Therefore I express the hope that the minority may be ready tomorrow. If not, we can recess until Friday.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished majority leader for that announcement, and I assure him now that if it is physically possible the minority will make every effort to be ready by tomorrow noon. In the event the minority does not make its realinement then, I ask the membership to note now that there will be a session on Friday. It is very necessary that the committee assignments be made and the legislative committees organized so as to consider immediately the bills which are introduced.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I hope that the suggestion of a session on Friday will not operate automatically to retard action by the other side.

## DEMOCRATIZING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address which I delivered on the subject, Democratizing Congressional Procedures, before the Association of American Law Schools at Cincinnati, Ohio, December 28, 1948.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATIZING CONGRESSIONAL PROCEDURES

(Address by WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon, before the Association of American Law Schools, December 28, 1948, Cincinnati, Ohio)

Political scientists have long been concerned about the intricacies of parliamentary procedure in the Congress of the United States and the opportunities presented for obstructionist tactics. Students of politics have discussed and written at some length concerning various proposals for liberalizing these procedures so that majority sentiment in the Senate and the House may be expressed by votes on proposed legislation. The problem should rightly concern lawyers and teachers of law as well, because it goes to the heart of the democratic process.

With particular reference to the Senate rules permitting unlimited debate, former Vice President Dawes said these rules put into the hands of individuals and minorities at times a power greater than the veto power given by the Constitution to the President. Dr. George B. Galloway, in his informative and very excellent and readable book, Congress at the Crossroads, in a sentence succinctly describes the hazards flowing from minority rule in making our national laws. "There are," he says, "many points on the legislative highways and byways where a few legislators can lurk, like the pirates of Tripoli, and take toll of the passing traffic."

In recent years some significant efforts have been made in the campaign to modernize our National Legislature and make it a stronger instrument of representative government. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is an outstanding example.

However, it should be remembered that the Reorganization Act of 1946 did not deal in any respect with the parliamentary rules of either the House or the Senate, but only with such organizational matters as a consolidation of committees, the organization of committee staffs, the designation of standing committees, the status of special committees, and the salaries of Members of Congress.

The failure in 1946 of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make specific recommendations covering changes in the rules was not an oversight on the part of the committee. The limitation of the jurisdiction of the committee specifically denied it any authority to make recommendations for changes in the rules of either the House or of the Senate. This limitation of the jurisdiction of the committee was the price which was exacted by the Congress as a whole before it would agree to the resolution authorizing the creation of a joint committee to conduct a study and make recommendations on the problems of reorganizing the Congress.

The incident shows how difficult it is to obtain any consideration by the Congress itself of any proposals for pruning some of its bewhiskered Rip Van Winkle rules.

I do not wish to minimize the accomplishments of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. Under the chairmanship of the then senior Senator from Wisconsin, Robert M. La Follette, Jr., it accomplished much good by way of streamlining the chassis of Congress. However, the engine is still of model T vintage and is in need of a complete overhauling—or better still, a new engineering design.

Nevertheless, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was a very good beginning on the job of reorganizing the Congress, which sorely needs to be completed.

On the eve of the convening of the Eighty-first Congress, the movement for further congressional reform is gaining momentum. The interest of the general public in proposals for reform of the procedures of the Congress is making some dent upon the politicians. The last election will undoubtedly have its effects—at least on those Members of Congress who come from districts where a two-party system makes a real contest out of a political campaign by forcing candidates for office to take "yes" or "no" positions on issues raised by the electorate.

It is to be hoped that the results of the last election will cause those Members of the Congress who heretofore have seemed to take the position that the rules of the Congress are the business of the Congress and not of the people, to wake up to the political fact that the American people are rapidly coming to understand that in a very real sense their substantive legislative rights, which they hope to gain through the Congress, are determined in a large measure by their procedural rights now existing under the archaic rules of the Congress.

There is much evidence flowing from the public forums across America that the people of this country are putting a finger of protest on the rules of the Congress. They are calling the attention of the politician to the fact that the rules of the Congress too frequently deny to the people as a whole their legislative rights in accordance with the great democratic principle of majority rule.

The politicians had better give heed, before it is too late, to this growing demand for a revision of the rules of the Congress in the interest of democratizing the Congress, because the American people—once convinced of an existing injustice—can be counted upon to deal at the ballot boxes with politicians responsible for a do-nothing attitude in this regard.

It is a safe prediction to suggest that in the Eighty-first Congress a series of proposals for reform of the rules of Congress will be offered.

On the House side we have the proposal of Congressman EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, to be offered on the opening day, which would deprive the House Rules Committee of "its broad powers to block consideration of, or to demand changes in, legislation" and confine it to what he and many others regard as its proper role—"a traffic director on the legislative highway."

Also, the American Civil Liberties Union and the bill of rights committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York have recommended reforms in the standards of congressional investigating committees which would provide greater protection and fairer treatment for witnesses and for persons whose names are brought into testimony before these committees.

Various groups interested in obtaining favorable consideration of civil-rights legislation are active in formulating suggestions designed to liberalize House and Senate rules which in the past have been so successfully used by the minority of legislators unalterably opposed to civil-rights proposals.

Among the many devices used to block legislation are the filibuster in the Senate and the autocratic power of the House Rules Committee. The seniority system of selecting committee chairmen also has a close relationship to any moves to democratize congressional procedures. I should like to discuss these institutions and some of the proposals for reforming them. Finally, I think it definitely worth while to consider what needs to be done by way of adopting a code of fair procedure for congressional investigating committees.

THE FILIBUSTER

Under the present rules of the Senate—which have not been changed in this respect for 30 years—it is possible for a third plus one of the Senators to block any attempt to limit debate, since petitions to invoke cloture require the support of two-thirds of the Senators voting. Moreover, cloture may be invoked only with respect to a "pending measure," a term which does not encompass many matters. The history of the Senate affords many examples of the extreme difficulty of obtaining affirmative action on such a petition even if an overwhelming majority of the Members are in favor of bringing an issue to a vote.

In 1917, following President Wilson's denunciation of the filibuster which defeated the armed ship bill, the Senate adopted rule 22, providing for closing debate upon motion signed by 16 Senators and adopted by two-thirds vote. The extreme difficulty of obtaining the required two-thirds majority is shown by an analysis of cloture petitions since 1917.

In the intervening 30 years 19 petitions have been filed. Only 4 obtained the necessary two-thirds majority; 7 received a majority of the entire membership; 12 received a simple majority of those present and voting; 6 obtained a minority of those present and voting; and 1 resulted in a tie vote. It is apparent, therefore, that the purpose of the committee that drafted the rule—to terminate successful filibustering—has not been realized.

Since 1917 at least a score of resolutions have been introduced in the Senate, in varying ways proposing limitations on debate. Many of these resolutions got no further than being referred to committee. In 1947 the Senate Rules and Administration Committee reported favorably a resolution, the principal feature of which was to permit a cloture motion to be laid before the Senate and not avoided by such parliamentary stratagems as amending the Journal, or raising other highly privileged matters. No change was proposed in the two-thirds voting requirement. However, the Senate took no further action, and it is obvious that the effort to obtain reformation of the cloture rule will have to be renewed in the Eighty-first Congress which convenes next week.

The time to reform the rules of the Senate to eliminate the filibuster is at the beginning of the session. On the first day of the next Congress all Senators who believe in the establishment of majority rule in the Senate should support an amendment to the rules aimed at preventing any future filibusters. There is little doubt, of course, that adoption of such a proposal will be vigorously resisted. It is equally clear that protagonists of obstruction will wage a last-ditch fight against antifilibuster legislation itself with their customary weapon, the filibuster. However, a filibuster can be defeated. The FEPC filibuster in the Seventy-ninth Congress could have been broken if a serious attempt to do so had been made.

At that time the Democratic majority in the Senate, supported by many Republicans, recessed the Senate between 4 and 6 o'clock each afternoon during the filibuster, and on Friday afternoons recessed until each following Monday at noon. The Democratic administration made public statements in support of the FEPC, but took no effective action against the filibuster. No Democratic Senator and only a few Republican Senators were willing to join in my suggestion at that time to hold the Senate in continuous session for 24 hours a day for as many days, weeks, and months as might be necessary to break the obstructionist tactics. An opportunity to establish, once and for all, majority rule in the Senate was passed up. It should not happen again.

For 3 weeks in January and February 1946, the technical issue before the Senate was the correction of the Journal, an issue against which a cloture motion could not be brought because of the ruling that a motion to correct the Journal was not a "pending measure" within the meaning of the cloture rule.

For several days during the special session last summer the Senate debated the motion to take up the anti-poll-tax bill. A cloture petition was presented, but the Presiding Officer, Senator VANDENBERG, upheld a point of order against the petition, pointing out that the term "pending measure" as used in the rule and as interpreted in the past cannot reasonably be construed to include a motion. In support of his ruling, he adverted to the fact that "numerous resolutions have been submitted from time to time having for their purpose an amendment of the rule so as to give a privileged status to a cloture motion, and expressly making its presentation in order at any time upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business."

There is no doubt that Senator VANDENBERG was entirely correct in his ruling, in light of binding precedents which have been handed down by preceding Presiding Officers who have been called upon to interpret the meaning of the words "pending measure" in existing rule 22. The answer to the problem is the one recommended by Senator VANDENBERG at a meeting of the Republican conference last July, when he suggested that rule 22 itself must be amended so that the words "pending measure" shall include any item of business pending before the Senate.

There has been some suggestion that Senator BARKLEY, who will be the Presiding Officer after January 20, may reverse the Vandenberg ruling. Apparently support for this view is found in Senator BARKLEY's statement last summer, in which he urged that cloture be applied to the motion to consider the anti-poll-tax bill. He expressed the view that the object of the rule is to bring to a conclusion a discussion upon a pending matter, and if we cannot bring it to a conclusion upon the preliminary motions which may be regarded as measures toward that end, then the effectiveness of the rule is completely destroyed, and the object of those who wrote it and adopted it has been completely defeated.

It is impossible to know how Senator BARKLEY will rule if a similar issue is presented to him. However, it is suggested that a reversal of Senator VANDENBERG's ruling would not materially help the cause of keeping debate within reasonable bounds, because it could be reversed by another presiding officer, while the fundamental reform needed might well lose some momentum.

It is obvious therefore that the cloture rule, in order to be effective, must be amended so as to apply to any motion, measure or pending matter. That is what has been proposed in the resolution reported by the Rules Committee.

On the questions of how large a majority should be required to impose cloture and how much time should be allowed for debate thereafter, opinions differ among proponents of reform. The Senate committee resolution leaves both matters as they are today—a two-thirds majority of those voting is necessary, and each Senator is entitled to speak an hour.

As experience with the present rules shows, a two-thirds vote has been mustered on only 4 out of 19 occasions, and only 7 petitions obtained a majority of the entire membership. However, if the rule required only a

majority of those voting, as is the case with all legislation except treaties or measures proposed to be passed over the President's veto, 12 of the 19 cloture petitions would have passed. If we bear in mind that it is the imperative duty of a legislative body not only to debate but to legislate, it would seem clear that no greater majority should be required to close debate, once there has been adequate discussion, than to enact a measure.

It is very important that adequate time be given for Members to debate the merits of an issue after cloture. My resolution proposes that 2 hours be allowed each Senator after cloture, with the right to farm out all or part of his time; in round numbers this conceivably would give 8 days of debate if necessary. However, we all know that, once the Senate has adopted a rule fixing a time definite and certain for a vote, there is no serious danger of consuming the maximum time just for the sake of filibustering. Nevertheless, adequate time for debate—erring, if at all, on the side of lengthy debate—is an essential safeguard to the people's interests, for there have been many instances where a full Senate debate prevented the enactment of very unsound legislation.

A valid and obvious distinction must be drawn between a filibuster, the purpose of which is to prevent a measure from ever coming to a vote, and a debate which seeks only to delay a vote for a reasonable length of time. The first type is a filibuster, pure and simple, and the possibility of its recurrence must be eliminated by changing the rules of the United States Senate. The second type, prolonged debate but technically not a filibuster, will never occur if the cloture rule is amended so as to guarantee the minority in the Senate a reasonable time limit after cloture in which to present its point of view in an endeavor to try to change itself from a minority to a majority.

If majority rule is to characterize the procedures of Congress, the voters of this country must make that clear to their representatives. Either we are going to reestablish the principle of majority rule in our Congress or we are going to continue to drift into government by minority interests and bloc pressures. The issue so framed furnishes another test of liberalism versus reactionism.

It is important that the American people recognize that our form of government can protect their rights only so long as they keep it strong and effective. Representative government is not a machine that works automatically. It is but a set of rules and principles which the people by their own consent have decreed shall be binding upon their own conduct. These principles cannot work unless they are administered by men and women responsive to the will of the voters who elected them.

The people must be ever watchful against institutions, like the filibuster, which permit the perversion of free government by self-seeking men. If the people relax their vigilance, they may lose the fruits of democracy which promote the greatest good for the greatest number within the framework of our private-property economy.

An example of the need for a rule which will permit the minority adequate time to debate proposals for unsound legislation, and make the necessary attempt to win enough votes through debate to convert themselves into the majority, can be easily illustrated.

In 1945 President Roosevelt proposed that workers be drafted into industry and moved from place to place across the country. Under this proposed bill the War Manpower Commission was to be given the power to assign workers to work for private industry under the direction and for the profit of private employers. A few of us in the Senate led the fight against that proposal and blocked an attempt on the part of the majority leader to force an early vote on the issue. When we announced that we would debate the issue for a week, the majority leader good-naturedly advised us that he would try to force the vote immediately because at that time he felt he had us beaten by eight votes. However, we did discuss the issue for a week and when the final vote was taken our view prevailed by a substantial number of votes. Thus, a reasonably short period of debate prevented the passage of a piece of legislation which threatened some basic principles of freedom.

Our success in this instance can be attributed to two main factors. First, the delay in the vote gave the people throughout the country time to react to the proposal for a draft of men into industry, and once they came to appreciate the threat to the principles of freedom which were involved, they made their objections known to the Members of Congress. In the second place, the debate itself had a great influence on some legislators who at first blush and without serious consideration had been enticed by the plausibility of this proposal. A scanning of the speeches made in that week's debate will show that the lawyers in the Senate did some very effective work in pointing out the constitutional weaknesses of the industry manpower draft proposal even in time of war.

The primary reason why the fight to pass an antifilibuster resolution should be waged at the beginning of the next Congress is that if the resolution is followed by a filibuster—as it undoubtedly would be—it will not hold up any other legislation, since none will be ready for Senate action. It would be very difficult to break a filibuster near the close of a session, because the unity of action required on the part of Senators is difficult to obtain when so many of them are anxious to recess and go home. It is likewise difficult to wage a successful fight against a filibuster in the middle of a session, since the argument is always made that taking the time to defeat a filibuster blocks action on other legislation vital to the welfare of the country.

The time is near for a major effort to secure majority rule in the Senate. Unfortunately, it may develop into a test of physical endurance, and on the surface it may seem an undignified and dramatic struggle. But it is a fight that must be made, or else representative government will continue to be perverted to undemocratic ends, and the promises of political and economic democracy will remain an empty mirage for millions of American people.

### THE HOUSE RULES COMMITTEE

The House, unlike the Senate, does not permit unlimited debate. However, by reason of the powers that it has assumed, the Rules Committee effectively keeps bills favorably reported by the appropriate legislative committees from reaching the floor, or gives them clearance only on such terms as satisfy the members of the Rules Committee.

The criticism frequently heard is that the Rules Committee, while supposed only to control procedure in considering legislation, increasingly injects itself into the merits of measures and substitutes its judgment for that of legislative committees and not infrequently the desires of a majority in the House.

One of the most glaring instances of usurpation of power by the Rules Committee occurred 2 years ago, when it took the extraordinary step of substituting the Case bill for the labor relations measure drawn by the House Labor Committee. The Committee on Rules, dissatisfied with the Labor Committee's labor bill, refused to give it clearance and instead substituted the Case bill which had been introduced only 2 days before and had not even been considered by the Legislative Committee. This action was vigorously denounced by both the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Rules Committee.

For many years the Rules Committee has followed the practice of insisting upon changes in legislation reported by other committees, as a condition of sending the bills to the floor of the House. In the second session of the Eightieth Congress the committee's action on the housing bill brought strong protests. The committee required elimination from the housing measure of provisions for public housing and slum clearance before it would grant a rule permitting House consideration, and then the rule forbade the offering of amendments on the floor of the House. Senator TOBEY condemned these tactics as thwarting "the will of the Senate and of the House committee and of the people of the country," and warned that if allowed to continue "the democratic processes will have gone by the wind."

On another occasion the Rules Committee refused to allow a vote on the administration-backed universal military training bill, although it had been favorably reported by the Armed Services Committee. After heavy pressure had been brought to bear on the House leadership, the Rules Committee granted a special rule for the Armed Services Committee's bill to revive the Selective Service System. Former Supreme Court Justice Roberts characterized the committee's obstructionists tactics in this instance as "a travesty on the American system of representative government."

What steps can be taken to trim the dictatorial powers of the Rules Committee? One of the first items of business when the new Congress convenes is the consideration of the standard resolution that the House adopt the rules of the previous Congress. At this point the way is open for the proponents of reform, because amendments to the rules can be adopted by a simple majority vote without reference to the Rules Committee.

Representative EBERHARTER has written all Members of the Eighty-first Congress soliciting their support for such a move. Press accounts report that he has received impressive backing. It is to be hoped that during the brief period available, he and his colleagues will seize the golden opportunity to strike a blow for democratic procedure and majority rule.

### THE SENIORITY SYSTEM

For a hundred years the prevailing custom in the Senate has been to select committee chairmen and make assignments on committees according to the principle of seniority in point of service. The same rule has been in vogue in the House since 1910.

The seniority rule ignores all other qualifications except the accident of tenure. Inevitably, the result is that chairmanships of major committees go to Members representing safe districts, who may be wholly out of sympathy with the most recent expression of the electorate in the country as a whole.

Defenders of the seniority system argue that the automatic method settles harmoniously the selection of chairmen, avoiding factional fights, logrolling, and political trading. Doubtless this method results in greater contentment and less danger to morale—for those high on the seniority roster—but the question may well be asked whether this device is likely to promote responsibility in office and responsiveness to the wishes of the people.

Business would be shocked if advancement to higher and more responsible positions in industry were governed solely by length of service. The usual response to such a suggestion in labor-management relations is that the principle of seniority, while entitled to weight, leads to mediocrity if rigidly followed. Congressmen are fond of criticizing the application of this rule in Government bureaus, rightly pointing out that it stifles the promotion of more able but younger men. In my judgment, a case for

ignoring these and other arguments against slavish adherence to seniority in the legislative branch of our Government has not been made.

There are times when the rule of seniority is ignored by the respective political party organizations within the Congress, particularly when the leaders of the party organization wish to discipline a Member of the Senate or of the House who seeks to exercise an honest independence of judgment on the merits of issues irrespective of the recommendations of the party policy makers.

In the Republican Party, liberal Republican Senators from time immemorial have felt the whiplash of party discipline inflicted in the form of denying them their rights, under the seniority rule, to important committees and other assignments within the Congress. On this point your speaker knows whereof he speaks.

Since the considered judgment of most students and critics of the congressional committee system is that the seniority custom ought to be abolished, what better alternative methods can be suggested?

With respect to assignments to membership on standing committees, it has been suggested by Senator White, who is qualified to speak from a lifetime of experience in Congress, that these committees should be composed of men representing both the principal sections of the country and the chief interests affected by legislation within the jurisdiction of the committee. In addition, it has been proposed that recent changes in public opinion would be reflected if assignments were made in proportion to the division of the membership into length-of-service brackets.

Thus, if in the House 25 percent of the membership are first-termers, the composition of each standing committee would be one-fourth first-termers. Under this formula the balance of the committee assignments would be divided in proportion between second-termers and those who have served three terms or longer. The result would be more equitable representation of the country as a whole and the sentiment of the electorate.

As to the selection of committee chairmen—who should, of course, meet the tests of ability, loyalty to national rather than sectional interests, and party responsibility—a great many suggestions have been made. Those which seem most likely to meet the foregoing tests are selection by party caucus, by the committee on committees, and by the presiding officer or majority leader.

Of these three methods, the party caucus is probably the least desirable, because of the size of the selecting body and the opportunities it affords for electioneering and log-rolling. Other devices, such as election of committee chairmen by committee members or from the floor, or by seniority, do not satisfy the important test of party responsibility.

It would seem that a fair balancing of all the interests involved would be accomplished best by the following suggested procedure for the selection of personnel of Senate committees, including the selection of committee chairmen.

The rules should provide for the election of the committee on committees of each party in the Senate by a majority vote of the respective party caucus or conference, which committee on committees would make nominations for committee membership. These nominations should be submitted to a full party caucus or conference with the right of any member of the conference to make additional nominations from the floor, the full conference by a majority vote then passing final judgment on the membership of each committee. The chairman of each committee then would be elected by a majority vote of the full committee after each party has designated its party representatives on each committee.

It is to be noted that by democratizing the selection of members and chairmen of committees in this fashion the result could conceivably be the election of a member of the minority party as chairman of a committee, if in the opinion of his colleagues on a committee his qualifications and their confidence in his nonpartisanship and statesmanship were such as to cause them to want to entrust him with the leadership of the committee.

As a practical matter, there would be few if any instances where anyone but a member of the majority party would be selected as chairman. However, it would be salutary to have a rule which would permit of a full operation of democratic procedures in the selection of committee chairmen, irrespective of partisan lines.

It is true that such a suggested procedure might occasionally result in some loss of party responsibility. However, the instances in which a chairman of a committee would be selected from the minority party would be so rare and exceptional that no great damage to party responsibility could be envisioned by such a rule.

On the other hand, the existence of such a rule which would permit of the selection of the individual considered by his colleagues on the committee as the best qualified to carry on the work of chairmanship of a committee would provide a healthy reassurance to the American people that the rules of the Senate as to committee assignments subordinate narrow partisanship to the public interest.

Of course, a necessary corollary to such a proposed rule would be an additional rule providing that the procedures, appointment of committee personnel, setting of hearings, and the conduct of all the business of a committee of the Senate shall be by a majority vote of the committee members. A chairman of a Senate committee should be required by the rules to function as a presiding officer of the committee and as a servant of the members of the committee—not their master.

Under existing practices and traditions in the Senate, committee chairmen over the years have acquired broad and sweeping administrative authority over the business and affairs of committees, so that in many respects they exercise almost dictatorial powers. If the committee procedures of the Senate are to be democratized as they should be in the interest of conducting the people's legislative business in an efficient manner, then the present practices of committee chairmen must be drastically revised by the adoption of rules of procedure which give to the full committee, through the operation of the majority-vote principle, full and complete authority over the business of the committee, leaving to the chairman the primary responsibility of administering those policies.

It is not very difficult to predict what will happen to the seniority rule in the Eighty-first Congress. The safe answer is "Absolutely nothing." However, there is growing discussion throughout the country of the need for a change in the seniority rule; and it is equally safe to predict that the demand for a change in the rules of Congress, including the rule of seniority, will not abate until Congress does something about the rules. In the meantime, democratic action at the ballot boxes will register its effect on those candidates for reelection who continue to take the position that the status quo should be preserved.

Political commentators have pointed out that if the seniority rule is followed in the new Congress, the likelihood is that some of the pledges in the Democratic Party platform will not receive sympathetic treatment from committee chairmen.

PROCEDURES OF INVESTIGATING COMMITTEES

It is not an overstatement to say that some of the procedures pertaining to House and Senate investigations result in a denial of the basic principles of judicial process taught in American law schools.

The shameful record being made by some congressional investigating committees needs no elaboration; it is painfully apparent to anyone who can read the daily papers. Witnesses, who for all practical purposes though not in strictly legal terms, are on trial, have been denied or closely restricted in their right to counsel. They have little or no right to question their accusers or examine the evidence on which they are brought to trial. Lurid charges and broad hints of sensational developments are aired in press conferences to the irreparable injury of individuals and to the utter shame of the Congress and the country. It is no answer to offer the accused—and even this is not always done—the opportunity later to deny the charges. As one witness recently observed, the sad truth is that denials seldom catch up with accusations.

Some of the hearings of congressional committees are in the class of "kangaroo court" procedure and certainly many of them do not give to a free American citizen, called before the committee, the basic judicial protection afforded in a police court. The committee conducting the investigation into Communist and subversive activities in our Government is a notorious example. While I firmly believe that Congress should investigate these and other matters and ferret out those working to destroy the American Government, I deplore the procedures being used.

As a lawyer, my confidence in the American judicial system is so complete that I know we can find whatever facts exist without ignoring the safeguards of the American judicial process which should be available to any accused person, the innocent as well as the guilty. Of course, legislative inquiries cannot be conducted in all respects as judicial trials, but I know of no reason why congressional investigations and hearings cannot be conducted with decorum and in complete compliance with those basic and fundamental protections of the American judicial process prevailing in the courts.

Much of the criticism of the House Un-American Activities Committee is sound, not only because the committee has failed to observe basic principles of fair procedure but also because it has so obviously engaged in political dramatics and sensationalism of the crudest sort. Even though realism teaches that politicians must pay some attention to public relations and to keeping the public informed, they ought to perform this function with dignity and in a manner which is calculated to educate the public as to the facts involved rather than to arouse public prejudice and partisanship.

Perhaps the most arresting statement coming from this committee was the remark of the chairman correctly summarizing the rights of witnesses before the committee. He said to a lawyer who protested being ordered to take the stand without benefit of counsel: "The rights you have are the rights given you by this committee. We will determine what rights you have got and what rights you have not got before this committee."

If further evidence were needed of the fact that reform in procedure is long overdue, the new low reached by the Un-American Activities Committee in the Duggan case should persuade even the die-hard defenders of the committee. This shocking exhibition of headline hunting compels agreements with the observation in the Washington Post editorial last Friday that committee proposals for self-reform must be viewed in a new perspective.

Just as the Congress adopted the Administrative Procedure Act so as to establish uniformity in the procedure and hearings of administrative agencies, so each House should enact over-all rules or a code of fair procedure to guide its committees. Proposals such as those advanced by the American Civil Liberties Union and by the New York City Bar Association committee have real merit. Of course there are minor differences, but the objective and the substantive suggestions are about the same. Any code of fair procedure should embrace the following points:

1. Before hearings are commenced, the subject of the investigation should be clearly stated, and the evidence elicited should be relevant

2. Witnesses should have the right to counsel, who would be allowed to advise his client while testifying.

3. The right to supplement testimony by oral or written statements, confined to relevant matters, should be accorded witnesses.

4. Accurate stenographic records of testimony should be kept of all testimony, whether given in public or executive session, and inspection allowed by the witness or his counsel. Copies of the transcript of public sessions should be furnished if requested, and in the case of executive sessions, it should be made available if later referred to in public session.

5. Persons mentioned or specifically identified in a public hearing should be afforded certain privileges before the committee or any member or employee comments adversely. Among these privileges should be the right to file a sworn statement, to be made a part of the record; the right to appear and testify; the right to limited cross-examination of witnesses whose testimony has adversely affected him; and the right to call, in the discretion of a majority of the committee, a reasonable number of witnesses in his own behalf.

6. No committee report should be issued except on adequate notice and with the approval of a majority of the committee.

An interesting suggestion of the New York City Bar Association committee is that no photographs, motion pictures, television or radio broadcasting of the proceedings be permitted while any witness is testifying. Much can be said for this proposal, for it is questionable whether the dispassionate search for the truth is materially aided by a battery of network microphones, klieg lights, and an imposing array of television and motion picture cameras.

The power of the Congress of the United States to conduct investigations should not be curtailed, because the investigative power of the Congress is one of our most effective checks against governmental abuses and one of our most valuable aids in finding the factual basis for needed legislation. It is only the procedures of congressional investigations that need to be subjected to careful surveillance in the interest of protecting the individual citizen from abusive practices of the Congress itself.

Under our system of checks and balances we must always be alert to the danger that any agency of Government, including the Congress itself, may, through the men in charge of its affairs, at any given time substitute caprice and arbitrary discretion for government through law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this address which I delivered in Cincinnati deals in its major part with the subject matter of a resolution which seeks to outlaw the filibuster from the floor of the United States Senate. Briefly, that resolution, which I have in my hand, requires that after a cloture petition has been signed by 16 Senators and presented to the Senate, then, by a majority vote, it can be agreed to. This is urged because if we are to deal with the whole question of majority rule in the Senate of the United States, let us get back to the simple procedure of the majority vote.

The second major provision of my antifilibuster resolution is one which guarantees to each Member of the Senate, after cloture has been approved, a maximum of 2 hours to discuss the merits of the issue involved in the legislation in regard to which cloture has been invoked, with the right to farm out all or part of that time.

Mr. President, as the Members of this body have heard me say before, I think it of utmost importance, as we seek to eliminate the filibuster from the Senate, that we adopt a rule which will guarantee to the minority in this body ample opportunity to make their case on the merits of any issue.

The Senate will recall that in the fight on the President's veto message on the Taft-Hartley bill, the junior Senator from Oregon objected to the effort to force a vote on that veto message on the afternoon it came in, or on the succeeding afternoon, as the attempt was made by the leadership on my side of the aisle, by means of a unanimous-consent request. I took the position at that time that the vote should not occur prior to Monday afternoon at 3 o'clock in order that Senators might then have the reaction of the country to the President's message. It should be observed that the time suggested for voting—3 o'clock Monday afternoon—was the soonest that a vote could have been taken, even under a cloture situation, if no Senator had wished to make use of the 1 hour debate provision under the existing cloture rule.

Mr. President, in the cloture amendment which I am offering, each Senator is allowed 2 hours, which, in round numbers, if all Senators desire to use their time, or farm out the time so that the total time would be used, would mean a maximum debate of eight full days. As I pointed out in my Cincinnati speech, it is very important that, on the great issues over which filibusters usually start, the people be given ample opportunity to make their position known. I recall distinctly the situation in 1945 when President Roosevelt sent to the Congress a proposal to draft free workers into industry, under the jurisdiction and power of the Manpower Commission. American workers would have been compelled to labor for private employers, for their profit dollar, and obliged to go wherever that Commission should decide to send them—all in the name of prosecuting the war. That bill passed the House after very short debate, but when it came to the Senate there were some of us who stood up in opposition to that proposal of President Roosevelt because we thought it challenged and jeopardized some basic rights of freedom.

The distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] notified us on a Tuesday that he hoped to obtain a vote on that measure by Wednesday or Thursday, and with equal good nature we said to the distinguished majority leader, "You are not going to get a vote on this measure for another week." He laughed and said, "What are you fellows going to do—filibuster?" We said, "No, but we are going to talk at length on the merits and demerits of this proposal." He said, "We have you beat by eight votes." We replied to him, "Yes, you have us beat by eight votes today, but you will not have us beat by eight votes a week from today, when we let this matter go to a vote."

If one will go back and check the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that week, he will find it very interesting to note that a series of very able speeches on the merits and demerits of that proposal of the President of the United States filled the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When we voted a week later we defeated the bill in the Senate, and thereby protected, in my judgment, some basic freedoms which that bill would have jeopardized.

I make that point, Mr. President, because I think it is of the utmost importance that we see to it that when we adopt a rule of procedure in the Senate by way of a modification of the cloture rule, we see to it that the new rule guarantees to the minority ample time to discuss the merits of the issue, and gives to the people of the country ample time to be heard from before a vote is forced through the Senate.

Our job of statesmanship in this matter is one of trying to strike that delicate balance between guaranteeing that the elected representatives of the people shall follow the majority vote rule in the Senate, and at the same time give to the minority a reasonable amount of time to try to change themselves into a majority.

Thus, under the amendment I offer, Mr. President, I propose that cloture shall be adopted by a majority vote, in contrast to the two-thirds vote provided for in the proposal offered by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and that after cloture has been adopted by a majority vote, then 2 hours shall be allowed each Senator to debate the issue, with the right to farm out all or a part of his time.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not until I finish my remarks. Then I shall be glad to yield.

The third provision of my proposed amendment to the rules is that cloture shall be applicable to all items of business, irrespective of the present provisions of rule III and rule VI or any other rule, so that never again will we present to the country the spectacle of filibustering for some 14 days on the question whether or not the Chaplain's prayer should be included in the daily Journal.

Mr. President, I think we can start out the Eighty-first Congress by making a clear record for putting into practice the principles of majority rule in the Senate, by this afternoon adopting the amendment to the rules which I offer.

Therefore, Mr. President, I send to the desk the resolution I propose, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 12), as follows:

*Resolved*, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a majority vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 2 hours on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same; except that any Senator may yield to any other Senator all or any part of the aggregate period of time which he is entitled to speak; and the Senator to whom he so yields may speak for the time so yielded in addition to any period of time which he is entitled to speak in his own right. It shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon requests unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution just read at the desk. Is there objection?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not familiar with all the details of the resolution which the distinguished Senator has proposed. I know it seeks to amend the rules of the Senate and limit debate.

However, I do know from observation the great ability of the Senator from Oregon to delay action by the Senate and postpone a vote on measures to which he is opposed. He is a past master of dilatory procedure. I therefore assume that the resolution he has been discussing, which he says is directed at filibusters, would give us a rule which would absolutely prevent extended speeches or discussions here in the Senate. If there is any virtue in the old adage that it takes a thief to catch a thief, the Senator from Oregon can draw a resolution which would virtually prohibit discussion in the Senate to the extent that no Member could even explain a bill at any length.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is a great institution which has been able to function for more than 150 years under the existing rules. Through times of peace and many wars it has never failed the American people. It is true that ofttimes the Senate is irritated and annoyed by lengthy speeches. I myself have felt that irritation.

But, Mr. President, when we look down the vista of the years which encompass our history, we do not find a single occasion where material damage has been done to the interests of the Nation or to the people through the operation of the rules assuring free and full discussion to every Member of this body. The present rule has prevented much more harm than it has worked.

Under the rules of this body we have acquired the proud title of the greatest deliberative body on earth. Under our existing rules the Senate of the United States stands as the last citadel of free and full discussion where the rights of the minority can be heard and fully protected. We alone among all the parliamentary bodies of the earth may speak fully and freely and bring to the attention of the American people vices in measures which are not readily apparent, which the majority gloss over, and which are not brought to light by the press or radio.

Mr. President, I shall not belabor this question at this time. I assume from what has been said here today that it is likely to be discussed at length in the future. I do know that this matter is of too much gravity to the future of our Nation, the freedoms of our people, and the rights of minorities and of the States to be considered in this manner and adopted in such shotgun fashion. Nothing more important than amendments to the rules which have heretofore guided the Senate will be before us at this session. I am, therefore, compelled to insist upon the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the resolution will go over for a day under the rule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Oregon whether the proposed 2-hour limitation contained in his resolution applies only to the bill itself which may be under discussion, or does it also include any amendments which may be pending at the time or which may be offered to the measure?

Mr. MORSE. It applies to the matter to which the cloture petition is directed. It means that once the cloture petition is adopted each Senator shall have not more than 2 hours to debate the entire matter before it comes to a vote.

Mr. LANGER. That includes amendments also?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the reply made by my good friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], in no way surprises me. I expected it to be in just about the form in which I heard it. I think I have demonstrated that I can talk at length on the floor of the Senate, if the occasion necessitates, when I am fighting for the minority. But I think that even the junior Senator from Oregon, and I am certain the distinguished Senator from Georgia, ought to be required to work under a rule that at least limits them to 2 hours' discussion after cloture has been invoked.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the resolution offered by the Senator from Oregon should be adopted it would prevent any Senator in the future from challenging his record for long-distance speaking on the floor of the Senate. If his resolution should be adopted by the Senate it would enable him to retire with the championship. No other Senator could ever even seek the laurels which he now so deservedly wears.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, inasmuch as other measures dealing with the same subject have been submitted today and have gone to the Committee on Rules and Administration, it seems to me appropriate that the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon should take the same course. Has the Senator from Oregon any objection to his resolution taking the same course?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Oregon is referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. If there is nothing further to be brought before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 6, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

### WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 5, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou who art infinite in love and mercy and power, we humbly wait in Thy holy presence. We pray that neither by word nor deed may we ever defile the image with which Thou hast endowed us.

In this fear-haunted world, do Thou give us light in our blindness, that by a wise and deeper understanding of our high calling we may rise above selfish joys and selfish sorrows. Guided by a higher conception of our responsibility to our Republic, may we be keepers of Thy commandments, defenders of Thy law, and towers of strength in all Thy righteous ways.

Let Thy spirit attend our President, our Speaker, and all who labor here. We pray in our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 3, 1949, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which

the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session on Thursday, January 6, 1949, to count the electoral votes for President and Vice President.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that after the message of the President all Members who desire to speak for a minute or to extend their remarks in the RECORD will be recognized. Before that time the Chair will administer the oath to two Members who were not here on the 3d, if they will present themselves at the bar of the House.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. CHESTER C. GORSKI and Mr. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 12:40 o'clock p. m.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 12 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 1. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 5, 1949; and

H. Con. Res. 2. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress on January 6, 1949, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws relating to the election of President and Vice President of the United States.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE

At 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Members of the United States Senate.

The Senate, preceded by the President pro tempore of the Senate and by its Secretary and Sergeant at Arms, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate took the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate took the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair on the part of the House appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore of the Senate. On the part of the Senate, the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

At 12 o'clock and 52 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the distinguished honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the state of the Union is good. [Applause.] Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness. It is foremost among the nations of the world in the search for peace. [Applause.]

During the last 16 years the American people have been creating a society which offers new opportunities for every man to enjoy his share of the good things of life.

In this society we are conservative about the values and principles which we cherish; but we are forward-looking in protecting those values and principles and in extending their benefits. We have rejected the discredited theory that the fortunes of the Nation should be in the hands of a privileged few. [Applause.] We have abandoned the "trickle down" concept of national prosperity. Instead, we believe that our economic system should rest on a democratic foundation and that wealth should be created for the benefit of all. [Applause.]

The recent election shows that the American people are in favor of this kind of society and want to go on improving it. [Applause.]

The American people have decided that poverty is just as wasteful and just as unnecessary as preventable disease. We have pledged our common resources to help one another in the hazards and struggles of individual life. We believe that no unfair prejudice or artificial distinction should bar any citizen of the United States from an education, or from good health, or from a job that he is capable of performing. [Applause.]

The attainment of this kind of society demands the best efforts of every citizen in every walk of life, and it imposes increasing responsibilities on the Government.

The Government must work with industry, labor, and the farmers in keeping our economy running at full speed. The Government must see that every American has a chance to obtain his fair share of our increasing abundance. These responsibilities go hand in hand.

We cannot maintain prosperity unless we have a fair distribution of opportunity and a widespread consumption of the products of our factories and farms.

Our Government has undertaken to meet these responsibilities.

We have made tremendous public investments in highways, hydroelectric power projects, soil conservation and reclamation. We have established a system of social security. We have enacted laws protecting the rights and the welfare of our working people and the income of our farmers. These Federal policies have paid for themselves many times over. They have strengthened the material foundations of our democratic ideals. Without them, our present prosperity would be impossible.

Reinforced by these policies, our private enterprise system has reached new heights of production. Since the boom year of 1929, while our population has increased by only 20 percent, our agricultural production has increased by 45 percent, and our industrial production has increased by 75 percent. We are turning out far more goods and more wealth per worker than we have ever done before.

This progress has confounded the gloomy prophets—at home and abroad—who predicted the downfall of American capitalism. The people of the United States, going their own way, confident in their own powers, have achieved the greatest prosperity the world has ever seen. [Applause.]

But, great as our progress has been, we still have a long way to go.

As we look around the country, many of our shortcomings stand out in bold relief.

We are suffering from excessively high prices.

Our production is still not large enough to satisfy our demands.

Our minimum wages are far too low.

Small business is losing ground to growing monopoly.

Our farmers still face an uncertain future. And too many of them lack the benefits of our modern civilization.

Some of our natural resources are still being wasted.

We are acutely short of electric power, although the means for developing such power are abundant.

Five million families are still living in slums and firetraps. Three million families share their homes with others.

Our health is far behind the progress of medical science. Proper medical care is so expensive that it is out of reach of the great majority of our citizens.

Our schools, in many localities, are utterly inadequate.

Our democratic ideals are often thwarted by prejudice and intolerance.

Each of these shortcomings is also an opportunity—an opportunity for the Congress and the President to work for the good of the people.

Our first great opportunity is to protect our economy against the evils of "boom and bust."

This objective cannot be attained by Government alone. Indeed, the greater part of the task must be performed by individual efforts under our system of free enterprise. We can keep our present prosperity, and increase it, only if free enterprise and free government work together to that end.

We cannot afford to float along carelessly on a postwar boom until it collapses. And it is not enough merely to prepare to weather a recession if it comes. Instead Government and business must work together constantly to achieve more and more jobs and more and more production, which mean more and more prosperity for all the people.

The business cycle is man-made; and men of good will, working together, can smooth it out.

So far as business is concerned, it should plan for steady, vigorous expansion, seeking always to increase its output, lower its prices, and avoid the vices of monopoly and restriction. So long as business does this, it will be contributing to continued prosperity, and it will have the help and encouragement of the Government.

The Employment Act of 1946 pledges the Government to use all its resources to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. This means that the Government is firmly committed to protect business and the people against the dangers of recession and against the evils of inflation. This means that the Government must adapt its plans and policies to meet changing circumstances.

At the present time, our prosperity is threatened by inflationary pressures at a number of critical points in our economy. The Government must be in a position to take effective action at these danger spots. To that end, I recommend that the Congress enact legislation for the following purposes:

First, to continue the power to control consumer credit and enlarge the power to control bank credit.

Second, to grant authority to regulate speculation on the commodity exchanges.

Third, to continue export control authority and to provide adequate machinery for its enforcement.

Fourth, to continue the priorities and allocation authority in the field of transportation.

Fifth, to authorize priorities and allocations for key materials in short supply.

Sixth, to extend and strengthen rent control.

Seventh, to provide stand-by authority to impose price ceilings for scarce commodities which basically affect essential industrial production or the cost of living, and to limit unjustified wage adjustments which would force a break in an established price ceiling.

Eighth, to authorize an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel; and, if found necessary, to authorize Government loans for the expansion of production facilities to relieve such shortages, and furthermore to authorize the construction of such facilities directly if action by private industry fails to meet our needs.

The Economic Report, which I shall submit to the Congress shortly, will discuss in detail the economic background for these recommendations.

One of the most important factors in maintaining prosperity is the Government's fiscal policy. At this time, it is essential not only that the Federal budget be balanced, but also that there be a substantial surplus to reduce inflationary pressures [applause], and permit a sizable reduction in the national debt, which now stands at $252,000,000,000. [Applause.] I recommend, therefore, that the Congress enact new tax legislation to bring in an additional $4,000,000,000 of Government revenue. This should come principally from additional corporate taxes. A portion should come from revised estate and gift taxes. Consideration should be given to raising personal income-tax rates in the middle and upper brackets.

If we want to keep our economy running in high gear, we must be sure that every group has the incentive to make its full contribution to the national welfare. At present, the working men and women of the Nation are unfairly discriminated against by a statute that abridges their rights, curtails their constructive efforts, and hampers our system of free collective bargaining. That statute is the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, sometimes called the Taft-Hartley Act.

That act should be repealed. [Applause.]

The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited. The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented. Without endangering our democratic freedoms, means should be provided for setting up machinery for preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest. [Applause.]

The Department of Labor should be rebuilt and strengthened and those units properly belonging within that Department should be placed in it.

The health of our economy and its maintenance at high levels further require that the minimum wage fixed by law should be raised to at least 75 cents an hour. [Applause.]

If our free enterprise economy is to be strong and healthy, we must reinvigorate the forces of competition. We must assure small business the freedom and opportunity to grow and prosper. To this purpose, we should strengthen our antitrust laws by closing those loopholes that permit monopolistic mergers and consolidations. [Applause.]

Our national farm program should be improved—not only in the interest of the farmers but for the lasting prosperity of the whole Nation. Our goals should be abundant farm production and parity of income for agriculture. [Applause.] Standards of living on the farm should be just as good as anywhere else in the country.

Farm price supports are an essential part of our program to achieve these ends. Price supports should be used to prevent farm price declines which are out of line with general price levels, to facilitate adjustments in production to consumer demands and to promote good land use. Our price support legislation must be adapted to these objectives. The authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate storage space for crops should be restored. [Applause.]

Our program for farm prosperity should also seek to expand the domestic market for agricultural products, particularly among low-income groups, and to increase and stabilize foreign markets.

We should give special attention to extending modern conveniences and services to our farms. Rural electrification should be pushed forward. And in considering legislation relating to housing, education, health, and social security, special attention should be given to rural problems. [Applause.]

Our growing population and the expansion of our economy depend upon the wise management of our land, water, forest, and mineral wealth. In our present dynamic economy, the task of conservation is not to lock up our resources but to develop and improve them. Failure today to make the investments which are necessary to support our progress in the future would be false economy.

We must push forward with the development of our rivers for power, irrigation, navigation, and flood control. [Applause.] We should apply the lessons of our Tennessee Valley experience to our other great river basins. [Applause.]

I again recommend that action be taken by the Congress to approve the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. [Applause.]

This is about the fifth time I have recommended it.

We must adopt a program for the planned use of the petroleum reserves under the sea, which are—and must remain—vested in the Federal Government. [Applause.] We must extend our programs of soil conservation. We must place our forests on a sustained-yield basis, and encourage the development of new sources of vital minerals.

In all this we must make sure that the benefits of these public undertakings are directly available to the people. Public power should be carried to consuming areas by public transmission lines where necessary to provide electricity at the lowest possible rates. [Applause.] Irrigation waters should serve family farms and not land speculators. [Applause.]

The Government has still other opportunities to help raise the standard of living of our citizens. These opportunities lie in the fields of social security, health, education, housing, and civil rights.

The present coverage of the social-security laws is altogether inadequate, and benefit payments are too low. One-third of our workers are not covered.

Those who receive old age and survivors insurance benefits receive an average payment of only $25 a month. Many others who cannot work because they are physically disabled are left to the mercy of charity. We should expand our social-security program, both as to size of benefits and extent of coverage, against the economic hazards due to unemployment, old age, sickness, and disability. [Applause.]

We must spare no effort to raise the general level of health in this country. In a nation as rich as ours, it is a shocking fact that tens of millions lack adequate medical care. We are short of doctors, hospitals, and nurses. We must remedy these shortages. Moreover, we need—and we must have without further delay—a system of prepaid medical insurance which will enable every American to afford good medical care. [Applause.]

It is equally shocking that millions of our children are not receiving a good education. Millions of them are in overcrowded, obsolete buildings. We are short of teachers, because teachers' salaries are too low to attract new teachers, or to hold the ones we have. All these school problems will become much more acute as a result of the tremendous increase in the enrollment in our elementary schools in the next few years. I cannot repeat too strongly my desire for prompt Federal financial aid to the States to help them operate and maintain their school systems. [Applause.]

The governmental agency which now administers the programs of health, education, and social security should be given full departmental status.

The housing shortage continues to be acute. As an immediate step, the Congress should enact the provisions for low-rent public housing, slum clearance, farm housing, and housing research which I have repeatedly recommended. The number of low-rent public housing units provided for in the legislation should be increased to 1,000,000 units in the next 7 years. [Applause.] Even this number of units will not begin to meet our need for new housing.

Most of the houses we need will have to be built by private enterprise, without public subsidy. By producing too few rental units and too large a proportion of high-priced houses, the building industry is rapidly pricing itself out of the market. Building costs must be lowered. [Applause.]

The Government is now engaged in a campaign to induce all segments of the building industry to concentrate on the production of lower-priced housing. Additional legislation to encourage such housing will be submitted.

The authority which I have requested, to allocate materials in short supply and to impose price ceilings on such materials, could be used, if found necessary, to channel more materials into homes large enough for family life at prices which wage earners can afford. [Applause.]

The driving force behind our progress is our faith in our democratic institutions. That faith is embodied in the promise of equal rights and equal opportunities which the founders of our Republic proclaimed to their countrymen and to the whole world.

The fulfillment of this promise is among the highest purposes of government. The civil rights proposals I made to the Eightieth Congress, I now repeat to the Eighty-first Congress. [Applause.] They should be enacted in order that the Federal Government may assume the leadership and discharge the obligations clearly placed upon it by the Constitution.

I stand squarely behind those proposals.

Our domestic programs are the foundation of our foreign policy. The world today looks to us for leadership because we have so largely realized, within our borders, those benefits of democracy for which most of the peoples of the world are yearning.

We are following a foreign policy which is the outward expression of the democratic faith we profess. We are doing what we can to encourage free states and free peoples throughout the world, to aid the suffering and afflicted in foreign lands, and to strengthen democratic nations against aggression.

The heart of our foreign policy is peace. We are supporting a world organization to keep peace and a world economic policy to create prosperity for mankind. Our guiding star is the principle of international cooperation. To this concept we have made a national commitment as profound as anything in history. To it we have pledged our resources and our honor.

Until a system of world security is established upon which we can safely rely, we cannot escape the burden of creating and maintaining armed forces sufficient to deter aggression. We have made great progress in the last year in the effective organization of our armed forces, but further improvements in our national security legislation are necessary. Universal training is essential to the security of the United States. [Applause.]

During the course of this session I shall have occasion to ask the Congress to consider several measures in the field of foreign policy. At this time I recommend that we restore the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to full effectiveness, and extend it for 3 years. We should also open our doors to displaced persons without unfair discrimination.

It should be clear by now to all nations that we are not seeking to freeze the status quo. We have no intention of preserving the injustices of the past. We welcome the constructive efforts being made by many nations to achieve a better life for their citizens. In the European recovery program, in our good-neighbor policy, and in the United Nations we have begun to batter down those national walls which block the economic growth and the social advancement of the peoples of the world.

We believe that if we hold resolutely to this course, the principle of international cooperation will eventually command the approval even of those nations which are now seeking to weaken or subvert it.

We stand at the opening of an era which can mean either great achievement or terrible catastrophe for ourselves and for all mankind.

The strength of our Nation must continue to be used in the interest of all our people rather than a privileged few. It must continue to be used unselfishly in the struggle for world peace and the betterment of mankind the world over.

This is the task before us.

It is not an easy one. It has many complications, and there will be strong opposition from selfish interests.

I hope for cooperation from farmers, from labor, and from business. Every segment of our population and every individual has a right to expect from our Government a fair deal.

When I first appeared before the Congress and addressed you on the 16th of April 1945, I quoted King Solomon's prayer wherein he asked for wisdom and ability to govern his people as they should be governed. I explained to you at that time that the task before me was one of the greatest in the history of the world and that it was necessary to have the complete cooperation of the Congress and the people of the United States.

We are now taking a new start with the same situation. It is absolutely essential that your President have the complete cooperation of the Congress to carry out the great works that must be done to keep the peace in this world and to keep this country prosperous. [Applause.]

The people and the country have a right to expect that the Congress and the President will work in the closest cooperation with one objective—the welfare of the people of this Nation as a whole.

In the months ahead I know that I shall be able to cooperate with this Congress. [Applause.]

I am confident that the Divine Power which has guided us to this time of fateful responsibility and glorious opportunity will not desert us now.

With that help from Almighty God which we have humbly acknowledged at every turning point in our national life, we shall be able to perform the great tasks which He now sets before us. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m., the President retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The members of the President's Cabinet retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The ambassadors, ministers, and chargés d'affaires of foreign governments retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

At 1 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m., the Speaker announced that the joint session was dissolved.

Thereupon the President pro tempore and the Members of the Senate returned to their Chamber.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 o'clock p. m. by the Speaker.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 1)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message of the President just presented be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 25) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON (chairman), North Carolina; JERE COOPER, Tennessee; JOHN D. DINGELL, Michigan; WILBUR D. MILLS, Arkansas; NOBLE J. GREGORY, Kentucky; A. SIDNEY CAMP, Georgia; WALTER A. LYNCH, New York; AIME J. FORAND, Rhode Island; HERMAN P. EBERHARTER, Pennsylvania; CECIL R. KING, California; THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, Illinois; J. M. COMBS, Texas; HALE BOGGS, Louisiana; JOHN A. CARROLL, Colorado; STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Ohio.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 26), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives: DANIEL A. REED, New York; ROY O. WOODRUFF, Michigan; THOMAS A. JENKINS, Ohio; RICHARD M. SIMPSON, Pennsylvania; ROBERT W. KEAN, New Jersey; CARL T. CURTIS, Nebraska; NOAH M. MASON, Illinois; THOMAS E. MARTIN, Iowa; HAL HOLMES, Washington; and JOHN W. BYRNES, Wisconsin.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OATH OF OFFICE, HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 27) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas ROY O. WOODRUFF, a Representative-elect from Michigan, from the Tenth District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said ROY O. WOODRUFF, at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said ROY O. WOODRUFF.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OATH OF OFFICE, HON. A. L. BULWINKLE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 28) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas A. L. BULWINKLE, a Representative-elect from North Carolina, from the Eleventh District thereof, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to administer the oath of office to said A. L. BULWINKLE, at Bethesda, Md., and that the said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said A. L. BULWINKLE.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATION OF MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to announce to my colleagues of the House that I have designated and appointed as the majority whip for the Eighty-first Congress our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

APPOINTMENT OF TELLERS TO COUNT ELECTORAL VOTES ON JANUARY 6

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 2, the Chair appoints as tellers to count the electoral votes on January 6, 1949, the following Members on the part of the House: The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE].

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, and in two of them to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Monday I received permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD. I have been advised by the Public Printer that the extension will take two and one-fourth pages and cost $195.25, notwithstanding which I ask permission that the extension may be made.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding the excess, without objection the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances, in one to include an editorial which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News; in one to include a letter from the Social Security Committee of the Associated Industries of Boston; and in one to include an editorial that appeared in the Columbia Magazine.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include a newspaper article by Margaret Mara, and in the other a eulogy delivered by Rev. Vincent O. Jenova.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include editorials from the Camden Evening Courier and the New York Times, one of which extols the virtues of the Speaker.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee appeared before the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

TOMORROW WILL BE BETTER

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow will be better for the world, our country, and Brooklyn; for Brooklyn, tomorrow will always be better, not in the dull, disinterested, and degrading way of Miss Smith in her latest feeble, fictional, and vacuous novel, but rather in the holy, hopeful, and humane manner befitting the inhabitants of that great community, a community of respectable residents and religious Americans of all classes and origins who shall remain ever alert to improve and promote themselves, their neighbors, and their great borough.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for Brooklyn, tomorrow will be so much better that this year shall not pass without the reelection of New York's and Brooklyn's great Mayor O'Dwyer and the rightful return to Brooklyn of the world's baseball championship.

THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's message to Congress presented in substance a program for state socialism.

It is a program of defeatism that pretends to look forward but actually is backward. He recommended that the United States follow the example of the tired, bankrupt, regimented people of Europe.

He seeks to induce the American people to sell their American birthright of individual freedom and opportunity for a mess of Truman political pottage: More

debts, more taxes, more Government control, and more bureaucracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the magazine the Work Boat.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an excerpt from a statement by the New York Bar Association.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a telegram.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article in reference to the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HERTER (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. COX asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, more than a quarter of a century ago a great President, Theodore Roosevelt, gave to the people of the United States the Square Deal.

In 1932 a great Democratic President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, brought to the people of the United States the New Deal.

Today, another fighting, courageous Democratic President, Harry S. Truman, brought to the Congress and the people of the United States the Tru Deal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) on account of illness in family.

To Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. EBERHARTER), for a few days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 6, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

21. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

22. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

23. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 777. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes, and the necessary public facilities therefor, for veterans of World War II through veterans' housing associations, and to make available more adequate financing for the acquisition of homes and farms by such veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 778. A bill to authorize payment for the transportation of household effects of certain naval personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 779. A bill to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 780. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Administrator, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 781. A bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 782. A bill to constitute the Federal Security Agency a Department of Welfare; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 783. A bill to provide a national health insurance and public health program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 784. A bill to increase the pay and to provide tax-exempt expense allowances for the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 785. A bill to assist the States in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 786. A bill defining benefits to disabled veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 787. A bill to provide that certain mortgages and loans shall not be eligible for insurance or guaranty under the National Housing Act or the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 unless a warranty is provided against structural and other defects in construction of the dwelling involved; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 788. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 789. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions, based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 790. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts, and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 791. A bill to continue rent control until June 30, 1950, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 792. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 793. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 794. A bill relating to migratory farm labor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 795. A bill to declare certain rights of citizens of the United States, and for the better assurance of the protection of such citizens and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 796. A bill to create the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Redwood Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 797. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 798. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, with respect to farmer-debtor relief; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 799. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 800. A bill to provide for price support for soybeans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 801. A bill to exempt from income-tax compensation and benefits paid to seamen on account of their internment by the enemy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 802. A bill to amend the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 803. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1945, by changing the basis of award of merit for uncompensated personnel of the Selective Service System from 2 years of service to 1 year of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 804. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to penalize black marketing of transportation tickets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 805. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 806. A bill to extend section 205 (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act to authorize refund to manufacturers of certain wearing apparel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 807. A bill for the relief of Chattooga County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 808. A bill to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 809. A bill to authorize discounts in sales and leases of surplus property to educational institutions; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 810. A bill relating to the use for Federal tax purposes of the last-in, first-out inventory method; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 811. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to penalize black marketing of transportation tickets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 812. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 813. A bill creating a commission to examine and render final decisions on all claims by American nationals who were members of the armed forces of the United States and who were prisoners of war of Germany, Italy, or Japan, for payment of its awards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 814. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 815. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide for a 20-percent increase in the survivor annuities payable under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 816. A bill for the relief of certain veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 817. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Albert Sidney Johnston National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 818. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 819. A bill to provide that postmasters shall be reimbursed for certain incidental expenses of third- and fourth-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 820. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to permit certain officers and employees of county agricultural conservation committees to elect to come within the purview of Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 821. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, to authorize relief in cases where the Government has actual or constructive notice or knowledge of certain losses incurred under war contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 822. A bill to provide for the payment of traveling and hotel expenses of the parents and/or wife to attend funeral of servicemen whose remains must be buried in a mass grave because of inability to identify same; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 823. A bill to amend the Social Security Act of 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 824. A bill to prescribe the procedures of investigating committees of the Congress and to protect the rights of parties under investigation by such committees; to the Committee on Rules.

H. R. 825. A bill to amend section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, approved December 20, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 826. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide that individuals who have completed at least 35 years of service may retire on a full annuity without regard to age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARNAHAN:

H. R. 827. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 828. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses of officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government while absent from their designated posts of duty on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 829. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to accept buildings and improvements constructed and affected by the Buffalo Rapids Farm Associations on project lands in the Buffalo Rapids water conservation and utilization project and canceling certain indebtedness of the association, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 830. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 831. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)) so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 832. A bill to provide for the acquisition of additional land along Mount Vernon Memorial Highway in exchange for certain dredging privileges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 833. A bill to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon common carriers engaged in interstate commerce by railroad by requiring such carriers to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 834. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 835. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 836. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 837. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to alimony and separate maintenance payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 838. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission over certain foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 839. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 840. A bill to punish bribery in connection with interstate athletic competition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 841. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to promote the construction of veterans' housing; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 842. A bill to amend the patent statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 843. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States naval hospital at the naval shipyards at Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 844. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to women members of the military or naval forces of the United States who lost their lives in World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 845. A bill to provide increased subsistence allowances to veterans pursuing certain educational courses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 846. A bill to refund certain interest payments made by World War I veterans on loans secured by adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 847. A bill granting service pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 848. A bill to provide for retirement of the Government capital in the central and

regional banks for cooperatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 849. A bill to establish conservation and orderly development of the Nation's agricultural land and water resources as a basic policy of the United States, to provide for a national agricultural land-and-water conservation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 850. A bill to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation and to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 851. A bill providing for the conveyance to the regents of the University of Texas of that portion of the San Antonio Arsenal determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 852. A bill to correct the inequities of Public Law 317, Seventy-ninth Congress, and to provide credit for faithful service to all substitute clerks and carriers of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 853. A bill to authorize the Federal Housing Administration to make loans to members of local home owners' leagues to finance the purchase or construction of homes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 854. A bill to amend Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, designated as the "Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 855. A bill to regulate the registration, manufacture, labeling, and inspection of fertilizer and fertilizer materials shipped in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 856. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 857. A bill to prohibit experiments upon living dogs in the District of Columbia and providing a penalty for violation thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 858. A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building-construction industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 859. A bill to strengthen national security and the common defense by authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water or other liquids, elements, or substances, in order to promote the general welfare of the Nation and to conserve and increase the national water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 860. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 861. A bill to provide for the construction of a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 862. A bill to provide for the construction of a new post-office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 863. A bill to provide for the construction of a customhouse building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 864. A bill to authorize the Federal Works Administrator to design and construct a new Federal office building at Los Angeles, Calif., on land now owned or hereafter acquired by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 865. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national-forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 866. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and state government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 867. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a new Federal office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 868. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a customhouse building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 869. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 870. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a new post office building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 871. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the prosecution of the Los Angeles County drainage area project for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 872. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a post-office garage building at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MACK:

H. R. 873. A bill to liberalize the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system by providing wage credits for military service during World War II; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 874. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 875. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of the act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 876. A bill to repeal the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 877. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 878. A bill to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 879. A bill to repeal the taxes on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 880. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Baton Rouge, La., a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 881. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Amite, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 882. A bill to provide adjusted compensation for veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 883. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to standardize the amount to be contributed by the United States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 884. A bill to increase the maximum amount of any deposit or trust fund which may be insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation under section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 885. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and the first sentence of paragraph (1) of section 2 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, approved June 3, 1937, as amended, so as to include the cost of all farm labor in determining the parity price of agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 886. A bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice and gambling in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 887. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their system of public education and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 888. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 889. A bill to deny admittance into the United States to all immigrants while the number of unemployed persons within the United States is 100 or more; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 890. A bill to amend section 32, as amended, of the act entitled "An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes," approved August 24, 1935; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 891. A bill to repeal the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (Taft-Hartley Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 892. A bill to authorize the establishment of a Federal Interagency Committee on Recreation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 893. A bill to provide for the erection of a memorial to the four heroic chaplains who sacrificed their lives in the sinking of the steamship *Dorchester;* to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 894. A bill to provide for the creation of conservation authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 895. A bill to appropriate funds for the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee inland waterway; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 896. A bill to restore full compensation awards in World War I presumptively service-connected cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 897. A bill to provide pensions for disability and age under veterans' regulation No. 1 (a), part III, in the same amounts as now provided for veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer Rebellion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 898. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 899. A bill to liberalize the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 900. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 901. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 902. A bill to provide for service connection of disabilities aggravated by active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 903. A bill to increase compensation and pension rates under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 904. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 905. A bill to provide an equitable basis for determining dependency of parents under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 906. A bill to facilitate cooperation of recognized organizations with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 907. A bill to provide funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, for carrying out certain provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 908. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 909. A bill to provide for an increase in monthly rates of compensation and pension payable to veterans of World War I and World War II and dependents of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 910. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1948 (Public Law 377, 80th Cong.), to include persons whose service-connected disability it rated not less than 10 percent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 911. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 912. A bill to amend subsection 200 (c) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 913. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 914. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 so as to provide readjustment insurance for those persons who served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REDDEN:

H. R. 915. A bill to authorize the Department of Agriculture to investigate and report on projects for reclaiming lands by drainage; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 916. A bill to provide for two judicial districts for the State of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 917. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 918. A bill to provide for United States post offices at certain places in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 919. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation determined to be surplus to the needs of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 920. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to furnish headstones to mark the actual or honorary burial places of deceased members or former members of the military and naval forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 921. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 922. A bill to provide for the coverage of barbiturates under the Federal narcotic laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 923. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 924. A bill to provide that Fort Montgomery, N. Y., may tap the West Point water-supply line, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 925. A bill to authorize the temporary admission to the United States as agricultural workers of students in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 926. A bill providing an allowance for the purchase of uniforms for city and village delivery letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 927. A bill relating to appointments of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 928. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 929. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 930. A bill to amend the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1948 to authorize an additional amount to be appropriated for construction of certain roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 931. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 932. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 60. Joint resolution designating March 30 of each year as "Shut-In's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 62. Joint resolution designating the first Tuesday of March of each year as National Teachers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGEL of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to provide for the observance of October 11 of each year to commemorate the death of Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 64. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joiner of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 65. Joint resolution relating to the assignment of a section of the 50-megacycle band of radio frequencies for frequency modulation (FM); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. J. Res. 66. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as "Shut-in's Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the disabled veterans of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 68. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 69. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Hambletonian; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. J. Res. 70. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of the Battle of Stony Point; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 29. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should direct the Export-Import Bank of Washington to lend $150,000,000 to Israel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 30. Resolution to discontinue the use of Alcatraz Island in California as the site of a Federal penal or correctional institution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1009. A bill for the relief of the Central Bank, a California corporation, as

assignee of John C. Williams, an individual operating under the fictitious name and trade style of Central Machine Works, of Oakland, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1010. A bill for the relief of Mrs. May K. Y. Mok, Frederick W. S. Mok, and Vincent W. C. Mok; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1011. A bill for the relief of the Pearl Assurance Co., Ltd., and the Bankers & Shippers Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1012. A bill to extend the benefits of section 2 of the act of June 29, 1943, to provide that Lt. Col. Francis R. Hunter, United States Army, retired, shall receive the retired pay of a lieutenant colonel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1013. A bill for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1014. A bill for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1015. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of Dr. Pradisth Cheosakul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1017. A bill for the relief of John Aaron Whitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1018. A bill for the relief of John D. Garrard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1019. A bill for the relief of George M. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1020. A bill for the relief of Moody L. Smitherman, Jr., a minor, and Moody L. Smitherman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1021. A bill to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,861,647; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1022. A bill for the relief of Alvin Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1023. A bill for the relief of Lois E. Lillie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1024. A bill for the relief of Jacob Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1025. A bill for the relief of Waymon H. Massey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1026. A bill for the relief of the estate of Susie Lee Spencer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1027. A bill for the relief of Speros Psaros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 1028. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Edmea Pacho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1029. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Haward C. Heckenlively; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1030. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Francis Howe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1031. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mark Wolfe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1032. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Estella Wolfe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1033. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Barrington MacDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1034. A bill for the relief of Jansson Gage Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 1036. A bill for the relief of R. C. Owen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1037. A bill for the relief of Samuel Ensler and Louis Puccinelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1038. A bill for the relief of William Richard Geoffrey Malpas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1039. A bill for the relief of Amy Alexandrovna Taylor and Myrna Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1040. A bill for the relief of Alfonso Felice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1041. A bill for the relief of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1042. A bill for the relief of Hoy C. Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1043. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cameron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1044. A bill for the relief of Glen G. Wetzel and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1045. A bill for the relief of James G. Smyth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEFFERNAN:

H. R. 1046. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1047. A bill for the relief of Aero-Bocker Knitting Mills, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1048. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Dowd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1049. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1050. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Liebermann Gordon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1051. A bill for the relief of Five Boro Personal Loan Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1053. A bill for the relief of Frank O. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1054. A bill for the relief of the Riegel Textile Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1055. A bill for the relief of Agnese R. Mundy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

H. R. 1056. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Preston L. Watson as administrator of the goods and chattels, rights, and credits which were of Robert A. Watson, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1057. A bill for the relief of John Keith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1058. A bill for the relief of Frederick W. Lass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1059. A bill for the relief of Louis Serlin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1060. A bill for the relief of David Dortort; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of Bernice Green; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of Lorrayne E. Graus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1063. A bill for the relief of Jack Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1064. A bill for the relief of Wladyslaw Kedzierski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1065. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Lander Thomas to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1066. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keatson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1067. A bill for the relief of Emile G. Peltier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1068. A bill for the relief of Maj. Jewell J. Frey (O340983), Monroe, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1069. A bill for the relief of Albert Burns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1070. A bill for the relief of Marion N. Harper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1071. A bill for the relief of Mary Wyshoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Max Schlomowitz (also known as Alec Frederick Reeves); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1073. A bill to authorize the President of the United States to present the Congressional Medal of Honor to Thomas W. Doyle; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1074. A bill to authorize and direct the District Court for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Bessie Irene Edgar without regard to previous settlements with other tort-feasors and lapse of time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1075. A bill for the relief of Harry C. Metts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Jennie Olsen Andersen, widow, and Arthur Andrew Andersen, infant son, of Carl Edward Andersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 1077. A bill for the relief of John Dionysios Theodoracopoulos and Mando John Theodoracopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1078. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivak, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Maria Veltri Magnone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1080. A bill for the relief of Elias Kulukundis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1081. A bill to provide for the relief of Chester J. Babcock; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of the Bunker Hill Development Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1083. A bill for the relief of Anita Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1084. A bill for the relief of John Masters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1085. A bill for the relief of Eva Enevoldsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1086. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helene Pelzmann, of Salzburg, Austria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1087. A bill for the relief of Janos and Marianne Mero Somogyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1088. A bill for the relief of Dr. Victor J. Cabasso; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1089. A bill for the relief of Hemming Adolf Andersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1090. A bill for the relief of Ewa K. Sudol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1091. A bill for the relief of Alexander and Alma Hofer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1092. A bill for the relief of Man Kwi Ling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In this prayer, O God, we come to Thee as children to a loving Father. We pray that Thou wilt help our Senators to face the problems that confront them, not alone by giving them wisdom greater than their own, but also by relieving their minds of all other anxieties. May they now turn over to Thee loved ones who need the healing touch of the Great Physician, with every confidence that Thou wilt hear our prayers of intercession, and as we do the work that is before us, Thou wilt do Thy work of healing in those whom we love. May Thy help be so plain and practical in our family affairs that we shall come to believe strongly in the help Thou dost offer in our national affairs.

Deliver Thy servants from personal worries, that they may be able to give themselves wholly to the challenges of this hour. In Jesus' name we ask it. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 5, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President of the United States from the States of Arizona, Connecticut, Kansas, Rhode Island, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

### TRANSPORTATION OF SENATORS IN MILITARY OR NAVAL AIRCRAFT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Defense, which was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, December 31, 1948.*

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: With the consolidation of the Air Transport Service and the Naval Air Transport Service into the Military Air Transport Service, it has become desirable that all requests for air travel in military or naval aircraft by Members of the Senate be directed to the Secretary of the military department (Army, Navy, or Air Force) in whose primary interest the travel is being performed. Cases not sponsored by any one of the individual services but which may be considered in the primary interest of the Military Establishment as a whole will be referred to the Military Air Transport Board. Such requests should preferably be in writing with the certification by the chairman of the Senate committee concerned that the travel is necessary. If time is short, telephonic requests (Army telephone: Republic 6700, extension 5792; Navy telephone: Republic 7400, extension 4590; Air Force telephone: Republic 6700, extension 5318; Secretary of Military Air Transport Board telephone: Hillside 3100, extension 4131 or 3137) may be honored with the understanding that such written certification will be furnished at a later date.

Such air transportation, without reimbursement, may be furnished only when the traffic is primarily of official concern to the National Military Establishment.

It is hoped this will result in better service and an economy of effort for all concerned. I would appreciate such measures as you consider desirable to inform Members of the Senate of this policy and to encourage uniform interpretation thereof.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF FOREIGN SERVICE EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 412 and 415 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to adjust salaries of officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND ITS SUBSIDIARIES

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Corporation and its subsidiaries for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-OWNED TIN SMELTER AT TEXAS CITY, TEX.

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States, as of December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD AND NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Mediation Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Fourteenth Annual Report of the National Mediation Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting three reports stating that no records have been disposed of during the year 1948 under sections 7, 10, and 11 of the act approved July 7, 1943, as amended July 6, 1945 (57 Stat. 382; 59 Stat. 434) (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, Orlando, Fla., favoring the enactment of legislation modifying the national airport-aid law so that funds allocated by it to the several States may be used for airport maintenance where such funds are no longer required for airport construction, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 239. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 240. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 241. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 242. A bill for the relief of the C. H. Dutton Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

S. 243. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 244. A bill to supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, to authorize regular appropriations for the construction of rural local roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 245. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LONG, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. IVES) introduced Senate bill 246, to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL) introduced Senate bill 247, to promote the progress of science; to advance the national

health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER) introduced Senate bill 248, to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 249, to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 250, to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah introduced Senate bill 251, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 252, to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 253, to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control, and other improvements on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible; which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 254. A bill repealing certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED:

S. 255. A bill to amend section 205 of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to joint boards;

S. 256. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; and

S. 257. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicles, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 258. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; and

S. 259. A bill to discontinue divisions of the court in the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 260. A bill to provide for payment of extra compensation for work performed by customs employees on Sundays and holidays during the period between September 29, 1931, and June 2, 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 261. A bill for the relief of Cesare Buia, Gabriela Buia, and Daniela Buia;

S. 262. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; and

S. 263. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 264. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the armed forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 265. A bill to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the National Housing Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 266. A bill removing a limitation affecting the pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care;

S. 267. A bill to facilitate filing and settlement of veterans' claims, and for other purposes;

S. 268. A bill to provide temporary pensions for veterans suffering total disability not the result of service, without regard to the permanence of such disability, and for other purposes; and

S. 269. A bill to amend section 602 (v) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for the payment of disability benefits to certain totally disabled veterans who had insurance in force on August 1, 1946; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 270. A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to "Trenton Dam"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S. 271. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern and middle districts of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 272. A bill to facilitate the admission of certain foreign workers desiring to perform agricultural work in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT, ETC.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am about to introduce several bills, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to make a very brief statement concerning them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Senator from Utah may proceed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, first I introduce the Federal aid to education bill in the identical form in which it passed the Senate during the last Congress under the leadership of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. This is the bill which was known as the Taft-Thomas-Hill bill. I am introducing it on behalf of myself, Senator TAFT, and many other Senators.

I also introduce at this time the science foundation bill, which was sponsored by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, and several others at the last session of Congress. This bill, also, is in the identical form, with the exception of necessary date changes, in which it passed the Senate. I may say for the benefit and information of Senators, that the bill meets the objections of the President when he vetoed a similar measure passed in the session before the last.

I am also reintroducing a bill amending the Fair Labor Standards Act. This bill is sponsored by several Senators, and was given committee consideration during the last Congress. The bill raises the minimum wage to 75 cents, and provides for one or two other necessary changes. The bill does not in any way conflict with the wage feature of the bill introduced by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] yesterday.

I also introduce a bill providing for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley features of the National Labor Relations Act, restoring the National Labor Relations Act as it was before the 1947 amendments were incorporated in it. I am making one change only, and that is to leave the National Labor Relations Board composed of five members instead of three. I am doing this primarily because the business of the Board must be continued and carried on, and also because I do not like to have it said that I am introducing a bill which would cut down my former colleague in this body, and an associate of so many Senators now serving.

The effect, Mr. President, of the introduction of these four measures will put before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare bills consistent with the message of the President, and measures in connection with which the suggestion for new law may be considered by the committee. The repeal of the features of the 1947 law, the Taft-Hartley law, will call for other legislation, and the President's message recommended other legislation. At the same time, these other proposals may be worked out as amendments or additions to the National Labor Relations Act as it stood before 1947, quite as well as if they were offered as amendments to the act as it stands today.

In regard to the Federal aid to education bill and the science foundation bill, since the Senate has already passed these bills with substantial majorities, it seems most consistent to present them to the Senate in the form in which they have already been acted upon.

Mr. President, I also introduced a bill, on behalf of myself and other Senators, authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States.

I also introduce a bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project in Utah.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills introduced by the Senator from Utah will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 246) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LONG, Mr. TAFT, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. IVES), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 247) to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; tc secure the national defense; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CORDON, and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 248) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 250) to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. AIKEN), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The bill (S. 251) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### DEFINITION OF REGULAR AND OVERTIME PAY RATES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is identical with one I introduced in May of last year providing for fair definition of regular and overtime rates of pay. This bill, popularly known as the overtime-on-overtime bill, has been urged by numerous business groups who are deeply concerned by the flood of suits that have been filed in our courts for overtime-on-overtime pay. Unfortunately, sufficient time was lacking in the Eightieth Congress to take up and consider this legislation. I am, therefore, hoping that it will be considered on a nonpartisan basis in this present Congress.

When Congress was confronted by a similar challenge with the portal-to-portal pay dispute it enacted a bill which was subsequently validated by the United States Supreme Court. The wisdom of that bill has been proved by experience and I feel that the wisdom of overtime-on-overtime legislation has also already become apparent. I send to the desk, therefore, and ask to be printed this overtime-on-overtime measure.

The bill (S. 252) to define and limit the jurisdiction of the courts, to regulate actions arising under certain laws of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### RIVER DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEW ENGLAND STATES

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I introduce a bill calling for authorization of an appropriation of funds for a complete and comprehensive survey of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers, together with their tributaries and watersheds, and other rivers in the New England States having possibilities of power, flood control, and other development. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief explanatory statement of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 253) to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control, and other improvements on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

One of the principal purposes of this joint survey by the Army engineers and the Federal Power Commission is to determine the full potentialities of these rivers as sources of sorely needed and reasonably priced hydroelectric power which New England farmers, manufacturers, and home owners must have. The recently manifested trend of large industrial concerns to move away from New England to other sections of the country because of the high rates locally charged for power makes this study especially vital.

Citizens of New England are required to contribute millions of dollars for low-cost hydroelectric projects on the rivers of the South, West, and Northwest. It is only fair that the people of New England share in the benefits of such policies.

The bill also calls for a study of New England rivers from the point of view of improving flood-control measures. The recent flash floods in the Berkshires caused millions of dollars of unnecessary waste and damage in addition to the tragic loss of life. Action should be started immediately to protect this area from future calamities of this type.

Another factor which this bill takes into consideration is the problem of water pollution. We have these fine rivers in New England which in many areas constitute a menace to healthy living conditions because of pollution. Moreover, pollution prevents development of these rivers for recreational purposes. There are many areas which would provide splendid, beautiful recreational facilities for citizens living in nearby cities and towns—swimming, boating, fishing, and picnicking. Licking the pollution problem would mean much to residents of these areas for that reason alone.

The joint engineer and power commission survey authorized in my bill is modeled on existing river-and-harbor legislation under which official action on the TVA and other power projects was initiated in 1926. My bill also includes such other important subsidiary matters as improvement of navigation, reforestation, and soil conservation.

The text of Senator LODGE's bill is as follows:

A bill to provide for a comprehensive survey to promote the development of hydroelectric power, flood control and other improvements on the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers and such other rivers in the New England States where improvements are feasible

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Chief of Engineers, under the direction of the Secretary of the Army, and the Federal Power Commission are jointly hereby authorized and directed to make a complete and comprehensive examination, survey, or other investigation as, in their opinion, may be required, of the Merrimack and Connecticut Rivers, together with their tributaries and watersheds, and such other rivers in the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut whereon power development appears feasible and practicable, with a view to the formulation of plans for the most effective and efficient improvement of such streams for the purposes of hydroelectric power development and the prosecution of such improvement in combination with the development of navigation, the control of floods, the needs of irrigation, reforestation, the conservation of soil and other natural resources, the control of water pollution, and the establishment of recreational facilities. The Chief of Engineers and the Federal Power Commission are further jointly hereby directed to report to Congress as soon as practicable the results of such examination and survey, together with such recommendations as they may deem advisable.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

### ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR CALIFORNIA SENATORS

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 20), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That until an appropriation shall be made to pay the compensation of the additional clerk to which each Senator from the State of California is entitled by reason of the fact that the population of such State exceeds 10,000,000, there is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate the compensation of an additional clerk to each of the Senators from such State at the basic rate of $1,500 per annum.

FEDERAL AID TO STATES IN CONNECTION WITH NONTAXABLE GOVERNMENT-OWNED LAND

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 21), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the burdens imposed upon the States, and political subdivisions thereof, by reason of the location within their boundaries of real property of the United States which is not subject to State and local taxation, and with respect to the extent, if any, to which the United States should contribute to the financial support of the governments of the States, and political subdivisions thereof, in which such real property is located.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

PRINTING OF LAWS RELATING TO THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES IN OKLAHOMA

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 22), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the manuscript of the laws, agreements, Executive orders, proclamations, and so forth, relating to the Five Civilized Tribes, Oklahoma, passed and proclaimed from 1890 to 1948, inclusive, to be known as "Laws relating to the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma, 1890 to 1948," be printed as a Senate document, and that 50 additional copies be printed for the use of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Indian agencies, 30 additional copies for the use of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and 30 additional copies for the use of the House Committee on Public Lands.

THE BIBLE AND THE CONSTITUTION—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Bible and the Constitution," prepared by him and published in the January 1949 issue of the Christian Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MRS. ALMA G. MADDEN AND SENATOR CAIN

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence between Mrs. Alma G. Madden and himself, relative to the Republican Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRAYERS BY THE SENATE CHAPLAIN, DR. PETER MARSHALL

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of January 6, 1949, regarding the prayers of Dr. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

END THAT PRESS SUBSIDY—EDITORIAL FROM ROCKY MOUNTAIN NEWS

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "End That Press Subsidy," published in the Rocky Mountain News, of Denver, Colo., of the issue of November 21, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED STATES NEEDS EXPERTS—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA (NEBR.) EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The United States Needs Experts," published in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of December 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

DISPOSITION OF PAYMENTS BY FINLAND

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, if it is appropriate at this time, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a few remarks in connection with the introduction of the Finnish-aid joint resolution which I introduced yesterday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, a little over a year ago, in collaboration with a number of my colleagues in the Senate, I introduced a joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland. Because of the uncertainties with regard to the Finnish situation at that time, and at the request of the State Department, we postponed consideration of the joint resolution during the Eightieth Congress. I am now advised by the State Department that the way ahead is clear, and that the Department has no objection to the proposal. Yesterday, in consequence, I introduced a new joint resolution having the same general objective.

In collaboration with the State Department, and in response to suggestions that came to me from the Acting Secretary of State, Hon. Robert Lovett, the new joint resolution has been slightly revised and given a somewhat wider application than was afforded by the draft I introduced last year. The purpose, however, is the same.

During the past year the Republic of Finland has paid to the United States the interest due on its World War I indebtedness, just as it has in previous years. To make this payment, it was difficult for Finland to secure the necessary dollars. The fact of these payments is of vastly more importance and significance than the mere payment of money from one country to another to settle a debt. As I said last year, it is my judgment that this is a matter of such importance that we should properly commemorate it. It has seemed to some of my colleagues and myself that now may be an appropriate time to review what Finland has done through the years in meeting her payments on her World War I debt, and to do some significant act to demonstrate our appreciation of her integrity. It was in this spirit that we offered our joint resolution of last year, and it is in this spirit that my colleagues and I are offering a revised joint resolution this year with the same end in view.

And now for the record let me review briefly the history of this obligation. Twenty-eight years ago, on the 30th day of June 1919, the American Relief Administration, an organization created and financed by the United States Government, consigned a quantity of foodstuffs and other relief aid to the newly created Government of the Republic of Finland. Eleven months later this same organization sent the people of Finland a second consignment of relief supplies. The total value of these two consignments was $8,281,926.17. At that time, just after emerging from centuries of control by other governments—and I regret to say that at the present time Finland is suffering from that situation—neither the people of Finland nor their Government could do more than promise to pay for these supplies at some time in the future.

Since that time other nations, great and small, rich and poor, have been compelled to default on their debt payments to the United States. I am not commenting on or criticizing that fact, but I do want to emphasize that at the time when this was happening the heroic people of little Finland have repeatedly demonstrated that they place integrity above comfort or convenience. They have constantly made payments on their indebtedness to the United States as those payments fell due.

These remarkable people, who contend with adverse destinies in a severe climate and who struggle for a living in a land which nature has treated with so little generosity, appear determined in a world of forgotten principles to make their country an example of integrity.

It is true that Finland faltered in her debt payments three times, but these falterings were only for brief periods—once, in 1932, under the shock of a world depression, and twice in the 1940's, when a World War made debt payments impossible. But let me note here that each time Finland carefully arranged for a moratorium agreement to cover these temporary defaults.

I am well aware that other countries which owed money to the United States after the First World War, and which have since defaulted on their debts, had serious difficulties to encounter, and that there may be reasons why their obligations could not be met. We find the appalling figure of nearly $15,000,000,000 owed by these other countries, with less than $3,000,000,000 repaid in principal and interest. Whereas other nations have repaid 18½ percent of their original indebtedness, Finland to date has paid a sum equal to more than 103 percent of her original debt. That is to say, against an original debt of $8,281,926.17, Finland has paid $8,541,558.43, including some $309,000 of interest on the debt before it was funded. The balance due to the United States today, counting interest payments of approximately $560,000, which were deferred by the moratorium agreements, amounts to the sum of $7,962,640.02, according to figures fur-

nished by the Treasury Department. This is comparable to what Finland has paid already, and as a matter of fact it is nearly the full amount of the original indebtedness.

Some may seek to disparage Finland's payment record because she owed so little in comparison with the amount other nations owe us, but that is wholly beside the point. In the first place, Finland's resources are slender and her needs great, but of far greater importance is this fact: Integrity is a question of quality not quantity. Her payment of her debt proves that the quality of Finland's integrity has successfully met all financial tests. The attitude of her people toward the people to whom she owes this debt proves that they are a truly superior people. To them America is not a grasping, materialistic land. Instead, immediately after their own country, it is the land of their heart's desire.

Circumstances, of course, make it impossible for Finland to send her people here in any large numbers, and, of course, obviously, the suggestion is impractical, but there is something we can do to aid them in their grim struggle against disease, destruction, and want. We can extend to them the hand of friendship in their desperate need by helping them to train a new generation of technical experts to replace their war-lost generation. On the basis of population Finland's war losses were 10 times greater than those of the United States.

Our offer to help Finland train the experts she so desperately needs carries other important possibilities. Such an act of disinterested helpfulness on our part will serve as an expression of good will which will warm the hearts and strengthen the hopes of the brave people of Finland.

In proposing that we apply the moneys hereafter paid by Finland to us on her World War I debt to the education of her young people—and that is the proposal I made yesterday in introducing the joint resolution—we are not proposing something new or untried. We are not establishing any new precedent. The precedent we are suggesting was established by the United States when nearly 40 years ago we remitted to China the balance of the Boxer indemnity payment "as an act of friendship in order to further develop the educational and other cultural activities of China."

I can tell Senators out of my own experience something about the beneficial results which have followed another project of a similar nature. The organization of which I speak is the Belgian-American Educational Foundation, of which I have been a director since it was created, in 1920, by former President Herbert Hoover. The funds for this foundation were derived from the liquidation of supplies which had been handled by the Belgian Relief Commission. During the 27 years of its existence, this foundation has arranged for the exchange of more than 700 individual students between the two countries. Several important results have followed. At the outbreak of World War II nearly one-quarter of the teaching and research faculty of the Belgian universities had been graduate students in American universities. One prime minister and six cabinet members have likewise done graduate work in American universities. Numbers of American and Belgian professors and specialists have been exchanged between our American and Belgian universities. I doubt whether there is a country in Europe where the ideals and purposes of the American people are better understood and respected than they are in Belgium. Belgium, in Europe, is a small country geographically, but I think I am safe in saying that there is no other country of Europe for which we in the United States have greater respect and affection.

These two acts of friendship with China and Belgium respectively are outstanding landmarks in our history which have closely cemented the cordial relations—and, yes, affections—of the people of the United States for the Chinese and the Belgians.

In light of these experiences, in light of Finland's need, and following our own Government's precedent of good will in handling the Boxer indemnity in China, in behalf of my colleagues and myself, yesterday I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 3, authorizing the President of the United States to hold in a special fund any payments which the Government of the Republic of Finland in the future may make in discharge of its World War I indebtedness to our Government. This fund shall be used to finance—

(a) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities for citizens of the Republic of Finland in the United States and its Territories and possessions, including payment for travel—together with transportation to and from Finland—tuition, subsistence, and other expenses incident to such activities, for the purpose of enabling the people of Finland to have the services of a new generation of technical experts to aid them in their efforts to rebuild the shattered economy and destroyed areas of their country; and

(b) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (1) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of Finland, and (2) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in Finland.

Mr. President, as I previously stated, yesterday I introduced this revised joint resolution on behalf of myself and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

## FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in connection with a bill introduced by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. TAFT. I have joined today in reintroducing, together with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the bill to provide Federal aid to education in an annual sum of approximately $260,000,000.

This is the same bill passed by the Senate in 1948. Its main purpose is to equalize educational opportunities for our boys and girls throughout the United States and increase the money available for that purpose, especially in the poorer States. Experience shows that many of these States, even though they make a greater comparative financial effort than the wealthier States, are unable to provide a minimum basic education for many children. The result has been widespread illiteracy in certain districts, and that means, of course, a failure of the equality of opportunity which we desire for all children born in this country.

Assistance is given to a State only after it has provided from its own funds a percentage of its people's income in excess of the general average throughout the United States. The only condition is that it shall make available from its own and Federal funds, at least $50 per child for every school, including separate colored schools, within the State. Except for this requirement, the bill forbids any Federal interference in the educational policy of a State, and prohibits Federal interference with school administration.

A number of amendments have been suggested. In the committee, a study of present statistics of income may permit amendments increasing further the standard prescribed. The standard now contained in the bill is $50. We may wish also to consider other amendments.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to propound an inquiry. I am glad to say that I was given the privilege of joining in the introduction of the bill to provide Federal aid for education, to which so many of us have been so long attached.

However, there is one amendment which I hope the committee may consider, and that is an amendment to provide funds on some proper basis for the construction of school buildings. I believe that the bill as introduced this year, and as passed by the Senate last year, provided funds for operating expenses, and primarily for teachers' salaries. However, it did not provide funds for the construction of buildings for public schools. May I ask whether the present bill includes such a provision?

Mr. TAFT. This bill does not contain any such provision. This bill is exactly the same as the bill passed by the Senate last year.

Mr. PEPPER. I raise this question because I wish to invite the attention not only of the sponsors of the bill but of all

Senators to the great need, which certainly prevails in my State—and I presume throughout the country—for funds with which to construct school buildings.

We have made progress in the field of teachers' salaries and in providing other facilities, but everywhere I turn in my State I find the greatest need for funds to aid in building construction. We simply do not have sufficient facilities to accommodate the growing school population and to accommodate the teachers we are able to provide. I give notice that it is my desire and intention to bring to the attention of the committee, when this subject is considered by the committee, the need for funds to aid in building construction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me that if we are going into the field of Federal aid for local public works, we become involved in a different principle from that of granting aid to pay the current operating expenses of schools. Certain districts are so poor that they cannot even operate schools.

I suggest to the Senator that if he wishes to present that issue, it should be presented in a separate bill. I think it presents a different fundamental principle. While any amendments, of course, will be considered by the committee, I hope the Senator will present that issue in the form of a separate program. Such a program would involve a great many other considerations. Standards for school construction must be provided, just as standards for hospital construction are prescribed.

I hope that question will not become involved in the bill which the Senate has already once approved, and which I hope we may approve without controversy or long-drawn-out discussion, so that the House may have ample time to give the bill more favorable consideration than it received last year.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I would not want to do anything to retard passage of the bill. I am glad to have the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio. At the same time, I do not see any difference between the Federal Government giving aid to States for the construction of school buildings and the Federal Government providing aid in furnishing instruction. Nor do I distinguish between construction of school buildings and construction of hospitals, which is already a Federal policy. Nor do I distinguish between Federal aid in the construction of highways and Federal aid in the construction of school buildings.

Moreover, I find in my State great need for the construction of dormitories and faculty housing at our colleges and universities.

I see no reason why the principles of Federal housing aid and housing assistance, generally, should not be extended to the construction of dormitories for students at colleges and universities, and the provision of faculty housing. I invite the attention of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to the possibility of considering that function as well as those already included in the bill, in the introduction of which I am proud to be privileged to join.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator believe that the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio is a good one, and that the matter of construction should be taken up in a separate bill?

Mr. PEPPER. That may prove to be the advisable approach to the subject. I am not interested in the particular bill in which the subject may be included. I merely wish to see some Federal assistance to the States in construction of school buildings. If we do not provide the buildings, naturally there will be no place for the teachers to teach or for the children to study.

I suspect that all over the country the situation is comparable to the situation in my State, and probably throughout the South. The local communities and the States are unable to provide the schools to accommodate the enlarged school population, which should be provided for.

Mr. LANGER. I fully agree with the Senator; but I believe that the subject should be treated in a separate bill.

Mr. PEPPER. That may prove to be the wisest course. When we come to consider the subject in committee we can discover what may be the better way to approach the subject.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, under an order previously made the Senate is to assemble in the Chamber of the House at 1 o'clock. I think there should be a quorum call before we depart for the House Chamber. I believe that we shall not be required to depart quite as early as we did yesterday. If we leave here at 10 minutes to 1, that will allow ample time.

Before making the point of the absence of a quorum, I wish to say that it had been my hope that by tomorrow the minority would be in position to present their committee assignments. I am advised by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and also the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that they will not be able to do that before Monday. Therefore, there is no point in having the Senate reconvene before Monday. Accordingly, I shall ask unanimous consent that when the count of the electoral vote has been concluded in the joint session of the two Houses, the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next. I make that request at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, do I correctly understand the request to mean that the adjournment will be taken after the Senate returns from the joint session and receives the report of the count of the electoral vote, when that report may be made to the Senate? It is customary for the tellers to report to the Senate what has been determined at the joint session.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does that have to be done today?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is advised that it can be done subsequently.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; it can be done Monday, anyway.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request with respect to the adjournment? Without objection, it is so ordered; and at the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses today, the Senate will stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum having been suggested, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Anderson | Hill | Mundt |
| Baldwin | Holland | Murray |
| Barkley | Humphrey | Myers |
| Bricker | Hunt | Neely |
| Bridges | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Butler | Jenner | Pepper |
| Cain | Johnson, Colo. | Reed |
| Capehart | Johnson, Tex. | Robertson |
| Chapman | Johnston, S. C. | Russell |
| Connally | Kefauver | Saltonstall |
| Cordon | Kem | Schoeppel |
| Donnell | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Douglas | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Downey | Langer | Sparkman |
| Eastland | Lodge | Stennis |
| Ecton | Long | Taft |
| Ellender | Lucas | Taylor |
| Ferguson | McCarran | Thomas, Okla. |
| Flanders | McCarthy | Thomas, Utah |
| Frear | McClellan | Thye |
| Fulbright | McFarland | Tobey |
| George | McGrath | Tydings |
| Gillette | McKellar | Watkins |
| Green | McMahon | Wherry |
| Gurney | Maybank | Wiley |
| Hayden | Miller | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Millikin | Young |

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is unavoidably detained, and he asks unanimous consent that he may be excused from attending the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON and Mr. HOEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] is necessarily absent because of the death of his mother.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate stand in recess until 10 minutes to 1.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.

At the expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 12:50 p. m. having arrived, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.), the Senate, preceded by its Secretary, Leslie L. Biffle, its Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of counting the electoral votes for President and Vice President of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The joint session of the two Houses having been concluded, the Senate (at 2 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), under the order previously made, stood in adjournment until Monday, January 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 6, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Arthur J. Hagan, of St. Cecilia's Roman Catholic Church, Boston, Mass., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Grant us, Thy servants, O Lord God, to enjoy perpetual health of mind and body. Thou who art the strength of them that hope in Thee, favorably give ear to our supplications, since without Thee, mortal infirmity can do nothing. Grant the help of Thy grace to the President of these United States, who this day is officially elected the Chief Executive of our beloved country; to the members of his Cabinet, the Speaker, and the Members of the Congress, and all others who have been or will be invested with authority. Guide and direct them, O Heavenly Father, in the way of righteousness and justice that our Nation, believing in Thee, may be a beacon light of hope to the nations of the world toward the attainment of a universal peace. Drive out of our hearts all hate and intolerance that charity and brotherly love might prevail among all men. Thus, we ask for all the blessing of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that some Members who have not yet taken the oath of office are here. If they will present themselves in the well of the House, the Chair will be glad to administer the oath to them.

Mr. WOODRUFF, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. POULSON, and Mr. NORBLAD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

SPEAKER RAYBURN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the birthday of any person is a matter of significance to him and to his family. The birthday of a great American in the life of our country is a matter of significance to the people of the country. But the birthday of our beloved Speaker is a matter of great significance to each and every Member of the House of Representatives, without regard to his or her party affiliation.

This is the birthday anniversary of our beloved Speaker. I know I speak the sentiment of all of my colleagues when I extend to him my congratulations and our very, very best wishes, with the hope that God will bless him with at least 50 more birthday anniversaries. From the democratic angle, I know my Republican friends will not be disturbed or offended if he continues as Speaker for countless years to come.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my sincere best wishes to those of your legion of friends throughout the country and the world who are today reminding you again of another anniversary. However, your spirit of fair play, your zeal to serve, and your ability to lead will never grow old. Your enthusiasm, your friendliness, and your dynamic personality will continue to lead, especially us newer Members of Congress, into paths of richer happiness and service. My personal wish is that the years may bring to you increased happiness through service in the very important position which is the fulfillment of your heart's desire.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 12:50 p. m.

(Whereupon, at 12:09 p. m., the House stood in recess until 12:50 p. m.)

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m., the House was called to order by the Speaker.

APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE TELLER ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GAMBLE] is unavoidably detained and is unable to serve as teller. The Chair designates the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] to act as teller in his stead.

COUNTING THE ELECTORAL VOTES

At 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m., the Doorkeeper, Mr. W. Mosley Miller, announced the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Senate of the United States.

The Senate entered the Hall, headed by the President pro tempore and the Secretary of the Senate, the Members and officers of the House rising to receive them.

The President pro tempore of the Senate took his seat as the Presiding Officer of the joint convention of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House occupying the chair on his left.

The joint session was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the Congress, the Senate and the House of Representatives, pursuant to the requirements of the Constitution and laws of the United States, have met in joint session for the purpose of opening the certificates and ascertaining and counting the votes of the electors of the several States for President and Vice President. Under well-established precedent, unless a motion shall be made in any case, the reading of the formal portions of the certificates will be dispensed with. After ascertainment has been made that the certificates are authentic and correct in form, the tellers will count and make a list of the votes cast by the electors of the several States.

The tellers, Mr. GREEN and Mr. WHERRY, on the part of the Senate, and Mrs. NORTON and Mr. GRAHAM, on the part of the House, took their places at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hands to the tellers the certificates of the electors for President and Vice President of the State of Alabama, and they will count and make a list of the votes cast by that State.

Mr. GREEN (one of the tellers). Mr. President, the certificate of the electoral vote of the State of Alabama seems to be regular in form and authentic, and it appears therefrom that J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, received 11 votes for President, and Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, received 11 votes for Vice President.

The tellers then proceeded to read, count, and announce, as was done in the case of Alabama, the electoral votes of the several States in an alphabetical order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Gentlemen of the Congress, the certificates of all of the States have now been opened and read, and the tellers will make final ascertainment of the result and deliver the same to the President pro tempore.

The tellers delivered to the President pro tempore the following statement of the results:

The undersigned, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and KENNETH S. WHERRY, tellers on the part of the Senate, MARY T. NORTON and LOUIS E.

GRAHAM, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1949:

| Electoral votes of each State | State | For President | | | For Vice President | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Harry S. Truman, of Missouri | Thomas E. Dewey, of New York | J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina | Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky | Earl Warren, of California | Fielding L. Wright, of Mississippi |
| 11 | Alabama | ---- | ---- | 11 | ---- | ---- | 11 |
| 4 | Arizona | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 9 | Arkansas | 9 | ---- | ---- | 9 | ---- | ---- |
| 25 | California | 25 | ---- | ---- | 25 | ---- | ---- |
| 6 | Colorado | 6 | ---- | ---- | 6 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | Connecticut | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- |
| 3 | Delaware | ---- | 3 | ---- | ---- | 3 | ---- |
| 8 | Florida | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- |
| 12 | Georgia | 12 | ---- | ---- | 12 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | Idaho | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 28 | Illinois | 28 | ---- | ---- | 28 | ---- | ---- |
| 13 | Indiana | ---- | 13 | ---- | ---- | 13 | ---- |
| 10 | Iowa | 10 | ---- | ---- | 10 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | Kansas | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- |
| 11 | Kentucky | 11 | ---- | ---- | 11 | ---- | ---- |
| 10 | Louisiana | ---- | ---- | 10 | ---- | ---- | 10 |
| 5 | Maine | ---- | 5 | ---- | ---- | 5 | ---- |
| 8 | Maryland | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- |
| 16 | Massachusetts | 16 | ---- | ---- | 16 | ---- | ---- |
| 19 | Michigan | ---- | 19 | ---- | ---- | 19 | ---- |
| 11 | Minnesota | 11 | ---- | ---- | 11 | ---- | ---- |
| 9 | Mississippi | ---- | ---- | 9 | ---- | ---- | 9 |
| 15 | Missouri | 15 | ---- | ---- | 15 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | Montana | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 6 | Nebraska | ---- | 6 | ---- | ---- | 6 | ---- |
| 3 | Nevada | 3 | ---- | ---- | 3 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | New Hampshire | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- |
| 16 | New Jersey | ---- | 16 | ---- | ---- | 16 | ---- |
| 4 | New Mexico | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 47 | New York | ---- | 47 | ---- | ---- | 47 | ---- |
| 14 | North Carolina | 14 | ---- | ---- | 14 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | North Dakota | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- |
| 25 | Ohio | 25 | ---- | ---- | 25 | ---- | ---- |
| 10 | Oklahoma | 10 | ---- | ---- | 10 | ---- | ---- |
| 6 | Oregon | ---- | 6 | ---- | ---- | 6 | ---- |
| 35 | Pennsylvania | ---- | 35 | ---- | ---- | 35 | ---- |
| 4 | Rhode Island | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | South Carolina | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 |
| 4 | South Dakota | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- |
| 12 | Tennessee | 11 | ---- | 1 | 11 | ---- | 1 |
| 23 | Texas | 23 | ---- | ---- | 23 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | Utah | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 3 | Vermont | ---- | 3 | ---- | ---- | 3 | ---- |
| 11 | Virginia | 11 | ---- | ---- | 11 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | Washington | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | West Virginia | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- |
| 12 | Wisconsin | 12 | ---- | ---- | 12 | ---- | ---- |
| 3 | Wyoming | 3 | ---- | ---- | 3 | ---- | ---- |
| 531 | Total | 303 | 189 | 39 | 303 | 189 | 39 |

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
*Tellers on the part of the Senate.*
MARY T. NORTON,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
*Tellers on the part of the House of Representatives.*

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, has received for President of the United States 303 votes.

Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, has received 189 votes.

J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, has received 39 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Alben W. Barkley, of the State of Kentucky, has received for Vice President of the United States 303 votes.

Earl Warren, of the State of California, has received 189 votes.

Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, has received 39 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1949, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Gentlemen, the purpose for which the joint session of the two Houses of Congress has been called, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 2, having been accomplished, the Chair declares the joint session dissolved.

Thereupon (at 2 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the joint session of the two Houses of Congress was dissolved.

## SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] will kindly take the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. COOPER assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

## THE LATE WILLIAM J. DRIVER

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to announce to the House the passing of a distinguished former Member of this body, my predecessor, Hon. William J. Driver, who passed on at his home city, Osceola, Ark., on October 1, 1948.

Judge Driver was a Member of this House for a period of 18 years, during which time he served on the important Committee on Flood Control. He was instrumental in the passage of various proposals for the construction of flood-control projects in the First District of Arkansas. The last few years of his service here was on the great Rules Committee of the House. He was an outstanding, learned, and able legislator. He was most generous in assisting me when I came to this House. He extended himself in my behalf like few, if any other, would have done.

In his early days he was a practicing attorney in Mississippi County and eastern Arkansas. He later became circuit judge of the second judicial district of the State of Arkansas, a member of the Arkansas Legislature, and a member of the constitutional convention of Arkansas in the year 1918, having been elected to the Congress in the Sixty-seventh Congress. He was reelected to the Sixty-eighth, Sixty-ninth, Seventieth, Seventy-first, Seventy-second, Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, and Seventy-fifth Congresses.

He was beloved by the people he so nobly served.

He was a gentleman in the truest sense. He was friendly and likable.

He made friends readily. He always retained friendships made. He was kind and considerate of everyone with whom he was associated.

One attribute with which he was endowed was his devotion for his loved ones—his wife, who preceded him in death; his son, William J. Driver, Jr.; his grandchildren; and other members of the family.

He was a scion of an illustrious family who were pioneer settlers in Mississippi County. His father was most outstanding and public spirited, being one of the original promoters of a levee system to protect the highly productive alluvial area from the ravaging floodwaters of the Mississippi River.

In recent years Judge Driver had devoted his energies to serving as president of the Planters Bank. He also had joined his son in the operation of farming interests and the managing of business properties.

My heart goes out to the bereaved ones who must carry on without his guiding counsel and loving, tender kindness.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad things about service in this House is the frequency with which the "milestones along the highway of life become monuments to departed friends."

I came to the Congress at the same time Judge Driver did in 1921 and was intimately associated with him all during the years he was a Member of this body. He was one of the finest Representatives I have ever known.

He was one of the greatest characters I have ever known.

He was one of the finest Americans I have ever known.

In his services here he put the welfare of his country above all other considerations.

I knew the members of his family and was intimately associated with him, having lived next door to them, and I can truthfully say there never was a finer or more affectionate husband and father than "Bill" Driver was at all times.

Measured from every standpoint, I do not believe I have ever met a finer character.

In the words of Shakespeare:

His life was gentle, and the elements so mixed in him that Nature might stand up and say to all the world, "This was a man."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the custom of pausing in the proceedings of the House to take notice of the passing of former Members is most appropriate.

I gladly join in tribute to the memory and the services of the late William J. Driver, of Arkansas. Our districts are separated by the Mississippi River, but our interests and our problems are substantially identical. They are located in the alluvial valley of the lower Mississippi River. They are subject to the flood hazards of that mighty river. It was natural, therefore, for me, who came to Congress some 4 years after he began his service, to be closely associated with him in promoting flood control not only along the Mississippi River but along all other rivers of the United States. He was an authority on the Mississippi River. From his youth he had been interested in the construction of levees and

other protective work. He and I served as members of the Committee on Flood Control until he left that committee to spend the remainder of his service in the House as a member of the Committee on Rules.

William J. Driver was born on March 2, 1873, and died on October 1, 1948, at Osceola, Ark., in the community in which he spent his entire life. He was a patriotic citizen and grew up in the public service. He took an active interest always in civic and political affairs. He was a Member of the House of Representatives in Arkansas. He served with distinguished ability as a judge of the circuit court and attracted State-wide attention by his ability as a presiding judge. He was courageous, fearless, and insisted upon obedience to the laws of the land.

He was a member of the constitutional convention of Arkansas in 1918. He was among the leaders of that epoch-making convention.

For 18 years—from March 4, 1921, to January 3, 1939—William J. Driver was a Member of the House of Representatives. He served on the Committee on Flood Control and on the Committee on Rules. He was often called upon to preside in the Committee of the Whole. He had the capacity to make and keep friends. He believed in party government and majority rule. He was among the leaders of the House of Representatives.

Following his retirement from the House of Representatives on January 3, 1939, he engaged in banking and agricultural pursuits. He continued to take an active interest in public and political affairs. At the age of 75, as one of the elder statesmen of Arkansas, he passed away, full of honors and full of years.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to hear the announcement of the death of our late beloved colleague, and I join in the expressions of sorrow that have been made by those who preceded me.

Bill Driver was one of the ablest men with whom I have ever served; a sincere, conscientious legislator; one possessed of a fine outlook on life and a very sound philosophy. If ever a man amplified love of neighbor, Bill Driver did. He always had a national outlook on public questions. As a Member of the House, particularly coming from Massachusetts, I regret his passing. But I am pleased to make these observations about one of the most nationalistic minded—and when I say nationalistic I mean from the broad national angle—legislators with whom I have ever served in the person of our late beloved colleague, Bill Driver.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure to have had the honor of serving with Mr. Driver for many years on the Committee on Rules. Though I have served with many outstanding and able Members I believe beyond any doubt that he was one of the greatest Americans that ever served on that committee. He had a noble soul. He was a man of vision and ability, and he was fair at all times, ever striving to do justice to all. I, too, deplore the sad report of his passing. I hope that other gentlemen will follow in his views and ideals and have the interest of our country at heart as he had in his service in this body.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to this House 20 years ago as a young man, one of the first Members in this body with whom I became acquainted was the late and lamented Judge Will Driver. I represented then the old Fourteenth District of Missouri, in the southeast corner of our State, which bordered on Judge Driver's district. We had many interests in common. We served together on the Committee on Flood Control. Both of us have served as president of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. Judge Driver was tremendously interested in the conservation and utilization of our soil and water resources, not only flood control, irrigation, and reclamation but also navigation and transportation.

I was not very much pleased when he was defeated. I had not, of course, met his successor, the present Member from Arkansas, Mr. GATHINGS. But I remember that I asked the judge, after serving so many years here, how he was defeated. He said, "DEWEY, my boy, I was defeated by a very fine young man, and I predict he is going to have a great career in the House." He is. TOOK GATHINGS is a worthy successor to an able Congressman and a noble man. Then I remember when the present Member, Mr. GATHINGS, arrived here. Judge Driver took him around personally and introduced him to various Members and helped him get located. That only goes to show the generous heart that he had. He was a kind man. He was an able jurist. He was always eminently fair. His judicious mind always saw both sides of an issue.

He was my personal friend. I thoroughly enjoyed every hour that I spent with him, whether it was in committee or when we took many trips throughout different sections of the country.

I shall miss him greatly, and extend my sympathies to his loved ones.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. It was with deep regret, Mr. Speaker, that I learned of the passing of Judge Driver. He was an honorable, useful, and worthy citizen of our State of Arkansas. Though it was not my privilege to know him very intimately, I met him since I have been in Congress. His advice and counsel on matters of great importance were of exceedingly great benefit to me. Judge Driver had an outstanding record in this House. He was not only known in the State of Arkansas as an outstanding and useful citizen, but we feel and we know that the entire country has lost a great and honorable man.

I join my colleague and other friends in paying this tribute of respect to him and expressing our deep sympathy to his family at his passing. May his soul rest with God.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I desire the RECORD to show that I endorse everything that has been said about Judge Driver. He was a fine businessman; he was an excellent lawyer; he was a great orator; he was an able legislator; and he was a good man.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD in connection with the passing of Judge Driver.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it was not my privilege to serve in the House with Mr. Driver, but I knew him well and admired him profoundly. He was one of the ablest Representatives of our State ever to serve in the Congress, and I join my colleagues in these expressions of sorrow at his passing.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, greatly regret to receive the word of the death of one of our former colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, Judge Driver. I wish I could recount, as so many others have done here today, the interesting things in connection with his service here in the House, but most of his service here was before I came. One thing does stand out in my mind: He was unusually considerate of me as a new Member when I came here in 1937. He accorded me privileges in connection with flood-control measures and other matters coming before the River and Harbor Committee over and beyond what any new man might expect. From this kindly consideration I can appreciate all that my preceeding colleagues have said concerning this great and good man. My sympathies are extended to his family.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered before the Council of State Governments at Detroit, Mich., on December 2, 1948.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial which appeared in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette.

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt from the address of Governor Dewey before the Legislature of New York State.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL TAXES ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to call the attention of the Members of the House to a resolution adopted on November 9, 1948, by the Fifth District, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, urging Congress to take immediate action to repeal the Federal taxes on oleomargarine. The women of my home district are intensely interested in the repeal of these taxes and have set forth in this resolution reasons and facts which justify us in giving this legislation the right-of-way and in promptly passing the bill which will permit the sale of this wholesome, nutritious article of food, free from the unjustifiable, discriminatory taxes with which it has been burdened for more than half a century. I ask your consideration of this resolution, and express the hope that prompt action will be taken to bring this legislation to the floor of the House for quick passage.

REPEAL OF FEDERAL TAXES ON YELLOW MARGARINE

Whereas repeal of heavy Federal taxes on yellow margarine means real relief for the food budgets of millions of Americans, since margarine is the only table spead within the reach of consumers in the low-income brackets; and

Whereas no other consumer issue had such widespread public support during the last Congress; and

Whereas an antimargarine tax repeal bill was passed by the House of Representatives by a vote of 260 to 106, and reported favorably by the Senate committee; and

Whereas no action was taken, lack of time being one explanation given by Senate leadership; and

Whereas butter production this year is estimated to be the lowest on record—one-sixth less than in 1947—barely 10 pounds per person—and butter prices are high; and

Whereas Americans are entitled to the right to get yellow margarine without heavy Federal tax now more than ever before: Be it

*Resolved*, That the members of the Fifth District, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs, write, wire, or telephone our Congressmen, urging that repeal of Federal antimargarine taxes be one of the first acts of the new Congress.

Mrs. R. H. JOHNS,
*Chairman, Consumer Relations.*
Mrs. D. N. MCCURDY,
*Chairman, American Home.*
Mrs. WILLIAM S. TAYLOR,
*President, Fifth District, Georgia Federation of Women's Clubs.*
Mrs. OSCAR PALMOUR,
*National Economic Council.*
Mrs. P. D. CHRISTIAN, Jr.,
*Chairman, Legislation.*

ATLANTA, GA., *November 9, 1948.*

DELAYED BUT WELCOME COOPERATION

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion if the leaders of organized labor had shown as much practical common sense at the time the Taft-Hartley bill was being written as they are now showing, much time, money, and ill will could have been averted.

Some of us on the committee who were only interested in trying to establish more harmonious and peaceful labor relations tried repeatedly to induce various labor leaders to cooperate with us in preparing legislation which would correct some of the all too apparent inconsistencies which existed. However, instead of cooperating or admitting that any irregularities existed, they took the adamant attitude that unions were perfect, could do no wrong, and that anyone connected with the labor movement was simon-pure. I talked with many leaders in my office, but not a single one of them would admit that any condition existed which should be corrected. They even denied the presence of Communists in the labor movement. Now I notice that these same leaders promise their cooperation in working with Congress on constructive amendments to the Wagner Act. This is exactly what I tried to have them do almost 2 years ago when we were writing the Taft-Hartley Act. Therefore, if the passage of this act has done nothing more than induce labor leaders to admit that constructive amendments were necessary, as well as to have induced the CIO in convention to take action to drive Communists out of their union, it has justified its existence even though it is repealed within the next 24 hours.

I have maintained from the beginning that if the closed shop had not been outlawed and if the title had been known as the Truman Act, the Wagner Act, or the Murray-Green-Lewis Act, that opposition would have been less violent. From my observations and inquiries some of these same leaders who are now willing to cooperate hate the authors of the act much more than they dislike the act itself. If changing the title and amending the act in a few instances will give us the guarantee that labor leaders will cooperate for the best interests of their members, of industry, and of the country in general, then I think that this would be a small concession to make in exchange for industrial peace and production.

I also believe that leaders of organized labor should take more time and educate new members in the real meaning and purpose back of the labor movement. For instance, the other day in Ohio I heard a young, newly made union member remark that he had just given the boss "a d—— good cussing." When I asked him why he had done so he replied: "Well, the so-and-so can't fire me, so I just thought I'd let him know what I thought of him." In other words, instead of selling union members on the idea that the real purpose of organized labor is to provide not only better hours, wages, and working conditions for themselves, but also increased production for management in order that their jobs may continue, many of them are being indoctrinated with the idea that management is their natural enemy and that class hatred should be exemplified. I am quite certain that this indoctrinating course is the work of subversive elements within the labor movement, and now since labor is attempting to drive them out of their organization I sincerely trust that the loyal patriotic leaders in the labor movement will educate their members to the real purpose back of the labor movement.

I believe in organized labor and collective bargaining, and all the rights and benefits which labor can obtain legally by collective bargaining. However, I also believe in the rights and privileges of the 128,000,000 unorganized workers, and I hope and pray that the leaders of the labor movement will cooperate with those of us on the committee who are only interested in seeing that both groups are treated fairly and equally under the law.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, disgusted with the actions of the Eightieth Congress, the American people on November 2 gave a mandate to the President and to this Eighty-first Congress to get busy and enact a real program for their benefit. Yesterday, President Truman outlined the main points of that program.

The President's speech makes me proud to be a Member of the Eighty-first Congress. The program which he has proposed to us will, I trust, be speedily enacted, and will make us live in history as one of the most potent and progressive Congresses ever elected.

We shall be honored to work with him to continue prosperity at home and to extend it to all our people. We shall be proud to help spread it to the rest of the world and to do whatever is in our power to dispel the shadow of war which today hangs over us all. The re-election of President Truman with a Congress friendly to his principles has reassured the people of America and of the world that the United States is going forward again, after a brief lapse caused by the unfortunate election of 1946.

Already the apostles of reaction—those political bourbons who have learned nothing and forgotten everything since 1932—are assailing the President's program. They are the spiritual heirs of those who attacked Jefferson and Jackson as dangerous radicals. They are the political descendants of those who assailed Theodore Roosevelt's Square Deal and Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal as socialism and communism.

It is worth noting that the reforms of the Square Deal and the New Deal are now law and accepted by practically all Americans as a basic part of our political and economic structure.

President Truman's message is in the same tradition. If this Congress is true to the mandate the people gave it on November 2, the Tru Deal will become an integral part of American life and be as widely accepted as the Square Deal and the New Deal.

I believe President Truman's message gives us a chance to carry on in the fine American tradition enunciated so ably by Abraham Lincoln when he said:

> The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves.

That thought should be the guide for all our votes in the Eighty-first Congress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask that the special order I had for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THE FEDERAL SALES TAX

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the principal responsibility, I believe, in the task of representing our districts is to know what our people back home want and how they are thinking.

To ascertain these things, a few days ago, I sent out 60,000 letters designed to reach every family in my district. In this message, I pointed out that if each person would answer the questions I asked, it would help me to do my job of representing the home folks better.

The questions I asked were about some of the leading issues the new Congress will have to settle. They dealt with the Taft-Hartley Act, price control, farm-price supports, the oleomargarine tax, with the bonus for World War II veterans, and with the sales tax.

While returns thus far received are fragmentary in comparison with what eventually will come in, I am prepared to draw a definite conclusion on one important subject.

I find that sentiment is running practically unanimous against a Federal sales tax. There just is not any support for this vicious proposal.

Of course, my stand against the sales tax is well known back home. I have always hated the very thought of such a tax.

To me, it is the perfect way for the rich man to shift his burden of tax responsibility to the poor man. The sales tax is the most diabolical method of raising revenue devised by the boys in the star chamber.

I wish to make my position emphatically clear at this time, if I was ever misunderstood before, that I will fight to the last ditch all attempts on the part of the administration or the White House to include the sales tax in the new demands for a tax increase to our Federal taxpayers and the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent on behalf of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

MEXICAN OIL SITUATION

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article by Arthur Krock from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, under House Resolution 595, Eightieth Congress, has conducted a continuing investigation of the subject of fuel supply and demand with particular reference to a long-range national fuel policy and the part played by various energy sources in our national defense.

Various hearings were held, and among the different aspects of the problem impressing your committee was the fact that, during these hearings, no mention was made of Mexico as a present and future source of petroleum supply. Accordingly, your committee undertook, at the invitation of the Government of Mexico, an on-the-spot study of the Mexican situation with a view to determining the place of petroleum in the economy of that country, in relations between that country and the rest of the world, particularly the United States, and the possibilities of increasing Mexican production.

The results of this study are contained in the committee's report—House Report 2470, Eightieth Congress, second session—on Mexican petroleum, which was prepared with a full realization that the development of Mexico's petroleum resources could be comprehended only in the light of its entire economy and its internal and external trade and financial position. This report, therefore, includes not only a discussion of Mexican petroleum but also the other aspects of the problem, all of which bear upon petroleum and most of which fall within the direct legislative jurisdiction of your Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Your committee's activities in the study of Mexican petroleum and the factors affecting the whole problem were discussed by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of December 30, 1948, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE VITAL QUESTION OF MEXICAN OIL

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, December 29.—While other committees of Congress have monopolized the headlines, the group which makes up the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, with a very able staff, has been quietly engaged in a study of more enduring importance. This is a survey of the actual and potential fuel supply in the Western Hemisphere, with special attention to Mexico and Venezuela; and the relation of this resource to Pan-American economy and the security of the United States is direct and vital.

Sometime this week the committee, headed by Representative WOLVERTON, of New Jersey, is expected to publish a progress report with the essential approval of the Democratic Members, soon to become the majority, as well as that of the Republicans. Those who have concentrated on the paramount importance of the subject are hopeful that the findings will hasten an adjustment of the current national policy which, if continued, could make Mexico an importer instead of an exporter of fuel—a very threatening prospect to the security of the United States. How threatening this would be was stressed by recent testimony at the Capitol by James Forrestal, the Secretary of Defense, to the effect that our petroleum deficiency in event of large-scale war could be 2,000,000 barrels a day.

Fifteen of the twenty-six members of the Wolverton committee investigated the Mexican oil situation at first-hand in August and September, and a subcommittee returned later on the same errand. They inspected all the major installations and fields of Petroleos Mexicanos (Pemex), the Government oil company, and returned with these impressions, which will probably be reflected in the progress report:

1. The cost and efficiency of the Marshall plan, the motive power of our own defense machinery, and that sound economy on this continent without which no "good neighbor" policy can be more than two empty words require each hemisphere supply its own petroleum needs. The reverse is true today.

2. This could come to reasonably early maturity in the Western Hemisphere, and assure enough fuel to the United States for any conceivable needs, if the Mexican potentials were properly explored and put in readiness for production.

3. The United States exports goods to the value of $500,000,000 to Mexico annually. But that cannot continue unless means are found to increase Mexico's supply of its great export crop of petroleum.

4. The obvious means is for the United States Government to give earnest consideration to loans to Mexico for this purpose. Pemex has a 5-year program, at an estimated cost of $470,000,000, to increase production from the present rate of 167,000 barrels a day to 463,000 barrels. A loan through the Export-Import Bank, to be disbursed at intervals under the supervision of an American-Mexican Commission by a United States agent, should be studied by the State Department with a view to early clearance.

It is in the area of oil production that private United States capital and the Government of Mexico have had the differences, leading to expropriation in 1938, that brought about the present situation. The Export-Import Bank, for example, has given an authorized credit of $150,000,000 for various plants, railroads, and roads in Mexico, but only $10,000,000 of this was earmarked for the state petroleum industry.

The ill feeling aroused by expropriation particularly affects certain United States petroleum companies, but others have neither inherited it nor strongly object to proposals made to them by Pemex if this Government will revise its current policy to that purpose. In fact, there have recently been discussions between Pemex and representatives of these latter companies in which the parties have found themselves near together on these proposals.

The terms offered are that, with approved financing by the Export-Import Bank, the private American companies would act as agents for Pemex, themselves choosing the sites for exploratory work, and, after discovery of sources, continue in that capacity, with the Mexican Government retaining title to the oil. After being reimbursed for capital costs and risks with about 35 percent of net income, the companies would have an option on all the supply not absolutely required by Mexico. All this could be done without changing the Mexican law.

Some American companies, however, including those which were in the thick of the expropriation battle, think 45 percent of the net income is the minimum fair arrangement, or object to other aspects of the proposal, among these the supervision by Pemex and retention of title to the product by the Mexican Government. They insist the law be changed, an attitude toward which the United States Government has been sympathetic and which has stood in the way of the Export-Import Bank loan that Mexico wants.

Thus once more two public policies of the United States are in conflict—that which is dedicated to building neighboring economy and getting adequate supplies, especially of petroleum, for any threat to our security, and that which seeks to protect American private capital abroad in its rights and agreements with foreign governments. The House committee has been searching for a meeting-ground of these policies, and its forthcoming report will demonstrate whether it has found one acceptable to most of those concerned.

Certainly Mexico, as a source of petroleum, is a better prospect for this Nation in troubled times than Venezuela, because the product can be brought in by pipes and overland conveyances without hazards of a sea voyage.

### LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have dropped into the hopper a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to reestablish the Wagner Labor Act as the basis for relations between labor and management.

Coming from a district which is strongly labor, I campaigned on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and certainly the results of the November election, both for President and Members of Congress, prove that the majority of the people favor the repeal of this act.

When the bill was approved, its backers assured us that it would reduce the number of strikes. Statistics for 1947 and the first 10 months of 1948, released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, show a striking similarity in the number of strikes, the total of strikers, and the volume of lost working time. In some cases, the law was found to be the underlying cause of strikes.

The conservative magazine Business Week concedes that the law went too far, and, by going that far, the law defeated itself. It warns that a law, in a democratic society, will fail unless it has the consent of the people.

It is true that some amendments to the Wagner Act may be necessary. I am sure that the Labor Committee will give both labor and industry equal opportunities to present their views on any proposed changes, and thus the amendments finally submitted to the Congress should be satisfactory to both groups. Such acceptance by both sides is absolutely necessary in the interest of industrial harmony, a worthy goal for this Congress.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a short pamphlet.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Milwaukee Journal.

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial and in the other to include a bill.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. NIXON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of some resolutions and a statement by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. ARENDS (at the request of Mr. REED of Illinois) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

### PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, peace with justice in the Middle East is what the world seeks. Britain's mysterious maneuvering in Egypt and Palestine and Transjordan do not seem to be contributing to that result. The British, for instance, appear to be trying to maneuver Egypt into invoking the 1936 Anglo-Egyptian treaty of assistance which Egypt has denounced as negotiated under coercion. The United States shows every sign of not being tied up with this policy of intrigue. We should throw our weight behind the new Palestine Conciliation Commission of the UN to bring peace quickly, if direct negotiations between Israel and the Arabs prove to be impossible. We should urge also that Britain make clear her stand to fully back the Conciliation Commission's search for peace, stop her maneuvers in Palestine, refrain from adding to the conflagration by sending her troops there, or renewing her arms shipments to the Arab states, and use her very real influence with the Arab states to get them to withdraw their aggressor forces from Palestine and to establish the conditions for a just peace. In no case should we be a party to British intrigues; that is not the course of security in the Middle East or of peace.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials and some extraneous matter.

Mr. WILSON of Texas asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Admiral Holloway made at Dallas, Tex., before the Fleet Reserve Association National Convention.

Mr. RANKIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Gordon Clapp, head of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BAILEY for Monday, January 10, 1949, on account of official business.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 7, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

24. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the amendments to the Rules of Civil Procedure for the District Courts of the United States (H. Doc. No. 33); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

25. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the National Mediation Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, together with the Annual Report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

26. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of the draft resolution on convention on privileges and immunities of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

27. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting three copies of a report of activities by the Department of Agriculture as requested in House Resolution 452, Eightieth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Agriculture.

28. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his recommendation for the increase of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and of other Government officers of comparable rank (H. Doc. No. 34); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

29. A letter from the director, Washington office, Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting three copies of the Fourth Semiannual Report of the United States Philippine War Damage Commission for the period ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

30. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

31. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting certificates of the final ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States for the States of Arizona, Connecticut, Kansas, Ohio, Rhode Island, Texas, Wyoming, and Utah, supplementing material of December 30, 1948; to the Committee on House Administration.

32. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

33. A letter from the Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting a report to the Congress on the Government-owned tin smelter at Texas City, Tex., and the program for purchase and sale of tin metal in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

---

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 933. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum clearance projects and low rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 934. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 935. A bill authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 936. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said land and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 937. A bill to provide certain equitable adjustments in disability compensation and pension to meet the rise in the cost of living; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 938. A bill to provide free postage for members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 939. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 940. A bill to authorize public improvements in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 941. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to locate, establish, construct, equip, and operate a hospital for the insane of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 942. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 512)" (Public Law 593, 80th Cong.); to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 943. A bill to amend section 3 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 944. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 945. A bill granting service pensions of $75 per month to veterans of World War I, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 946. A bill to provide for preference under the immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 947. A bill to provide for old-age assistance payments to the States with respect to needy individuals who are voluntary inmates of public institutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 948. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 949. A bill for the purpose of erecting in De Quincy, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 950. A bill to amend section 1700 (e) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 951. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 952. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 953. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 954. A bill to authorize the interment in adjoining graves in national cemeteries of certain parents and their children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 955. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 956. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POTTER (by request):

H. R. 957. A bill to provide for judicial review of administrative decisions declaring forfeit veterans' benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 958. A bill to exempt admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 959. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to the priority rights of veterans entitled to 10-point preference under such act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 960. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Charlevoix, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 961. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 962. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Rogers City, Mich; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 963. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near St. Ignace, Mich.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 964. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 965. A bill to establish the name of Kiser Glacier on Mount Baker, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 966. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a certain housing project in Kermit, Tex., to the Kermit Chamber of Commerce; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 968. A bill declaring Good Friday in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 969. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 970. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional judge for the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 971. A bill to discontinue divisions of the court in the district of Kansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 972. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 973. A bill to regulate in the United States Court of Claims and in the United States district courts suits for payment for the infringement of patents infringed by or for the Government and for the use of inventions used by or for the Government and for the better protection of the rights of inventors and owners of patents, and to stimulate the making of inventions useful to the Government and insure payment for the use

thereof when used by or for the Government and its contractors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 974. A bill to amend section 4915, title 35, section 63, of the United States Code, as amended by section 72a of the code, and for the protection of inventors and owners of patents and applications for patents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 975. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committe on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 976. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 977. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 978. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to equalize credits for service in the armed forces for pay and longevity purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 979. A bill to increase the monthly rate of service pension payable to certain widows or remarried widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 980. A bill providing for the incorporation of the Franco-American War Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 981. A bill to change the name of Culbertson Dam on the Republican River in the State of Nebraska to Trenton Dam; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 982. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, as amended, by establishing a policy for the administration of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 983. A bill to provide a deduction, for estate-tax purposes, of the value of estate-tax bonds purchased for the purpose of paying Federal estate taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 984. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 985. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 986. A bill authorizing and directing the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake a continuing study of species of fish of particular interest to sports anglers of the Atlantic coast, with respect to the biology, propagation, catch records, and abundance of such species, to the end that such Service may recommend to the several States of the Atlantic coast through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission appropriate measures for increasing the abundance of such species and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. R. 987. A bill to amend an act of June 24, 1936, the same being chapter 746, United States Statutes at Large, entitled "An act making it a felony to transport in interstate or foreign commerce persons to be employed to obstruct or interfere with the right of peaceful picketing during labor controversies," by adding four new sections thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 988. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 989. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 990. A bill to provide for revenue revision, to correct tax inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 991. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance for the construction of hospitals furnishing domiciliary care; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 992. A bill providing for the examination and survey of the San Antonio River, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 993. A bill to amend section 302 (a) of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 994. A bill to provide for disposition and use of tribal funds of the Navajo Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 995. A bill to amend section 213 (52 Stat. 1067, as amended by 53 Stat. 1266) of title 29 of the United States Code, the same being a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, so as to eliminate the exemption of small telephone exchanges from the overtime and minimum-wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 996. A bill to authorize retroactive payment of compensation or pension barred because of capture, internment, or isolation by the enemy during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 997. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 998. A bill to provide reduced annuities at age 55 after 5 years of civilian service for persons involuntarily separated from the Federal service not by removal for cause; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 999. A bill to extend to December 28, 1949, the period within which application may be made by alien spouses and children of World War II veterans for admission to the United States under the act of December 28, 1945; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1000. A bill to establish a United States Commission for the Promotion of Physical Fitness and making an appropriation for such Commission; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1001. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 1002. A bill to require identification of Communist-front organizations to appear on matter sent, or caused to be sent, by or for them through the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1003. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1004. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1005. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1006. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to purchase home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1007. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion, for purposes of calculating benefits under such act, of time spent in vocational rehabilitation by veterans injured while in the armed forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 1008. A bill to create the Board of Postal Rates and Fees in the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 71. Joint resolution providing for membership by the United States in the International Trade Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 72. Joint resolution to create a joint commission on basic industries to investigate production facilities in basic industries; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. J. Res. 74. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the nomination and election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that there should be a bipartisan platform on foreign policy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. Res. 31. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to investigate and study the status of American Indians with respect to social security and voting rights and the opportunities for self-support; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Res. 32. Resolution to authorize an investigation of ECA aluminum transactions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. Res. 33. Resolution creating a select committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation of the economic and political foreign policy of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 34. Resolution providing for the expenses incurred by the special committee authorized by House Resolution 33; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1096. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James Linzay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1097. A bill for the relief of Edgar Barbre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1099. A bill to provide for the reappointment to the retired list of officers of the Navy of Henry Eastin Rossell, former commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1100. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Suhrawardy and her two sons, Oleg-Jerry Calder and Gleb Zahid Suhrawardy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Anna Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1102. A bill for the relief of Rita Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Miriam Barkle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1104. A bill for the relief of Emmet Wood and Viola Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 1105. A bill for the relief of Hazel L. Giles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1106. A bill for the relief of King V. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 1107. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1108. A bill for the relief of Lillie E. Morgan; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1109. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Phena M. Anderson; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1110. A bill for the relief of Ann Irene Feikema; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1111. A bill for the relief of Tamara Boks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1112. A bill for the relief of the estate of James J. Barnett, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1113. A bill for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1114. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Pospischil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1115. A bill for the relief of Farmers Rural Telephone Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1116. A bill for the relief of Mexican Fibre & Twine Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1117. A bill for the relief of Angelina Gonzales y Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1118. A bill for the relief of Czeslaw Luniewski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1119. A bill for the relief of Patrick James O'Connor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1120. A bill for the relief of Carl Eggers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 1121. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Adolphus M. Holman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1122. A bill for the relief of Nunzio Signorelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 1123. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Mayfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1124. A bill for the relief of Lee Freddie Lambert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1125. A bill for the relief of Ellis C. Wagner and Barbara P. Wagner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1126. A bill for the relief of Lewis M. Burford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 1127. A bill for the relief of Sirkka Siiri Saarelainen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1128. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1129. A bill for the relief of José Antonio Elias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1130. A bill for the relief of Hanna Mussbach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1131. A bill for the relief of James Fred Girdley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 1132. A bill for the relief of Mabel H. Slocum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1133. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Merle Leatherbury Pyle and Patricia M. Pyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Rex Daniels; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1135. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Bowie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of June C. Dollar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1138. A bill for the relief of John G. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 1139. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Hancock, administratrix of the estate of Arch F. Hancock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of 185 citizens of Walla Walla, Wash., asking the removal of rent controls in Walla Walla, Wash.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

2. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, Silver Spring, Md., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his case against the Air Corps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3. Also, petition of Joseph A. Durgin, secretary-treasurer, Alaska Moose Association, Juneau, Alaska, petitioning consideration of their resolution favoring immediate statehood for Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## FRIDAY, JANUARY 7, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, we acknowledge our imperfections and pray that we may be strong and falter not in the presence of temptation.

When the way is uncertain and confused, do Thou show forth the light of Thy wisdom. Without fear or hesitation may our devotion to the public good be without stint or reservation. Grant that the Christ spirit may be the ruling passion of our conduct, that the strong may help the weak, the wise the foolish, and the rich the poor, and that peace and good will may extend and bless our people everywhere. In our Saviour's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that, pursuant to the authority conferred upon him by House Resolution 28, he did, on Thursday, January 6, 1949, administer the oath of office to the Honorable A. L. BULWINKLE at Bethesda, Md.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 35) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, Whereas A. L. BULWINKLE, a Representative from the State of North Carolina, has been unable from sickness to appear in person to be sworn as a Member of this House, but has sworn to and subscribed the oath of office before the Speaker, authorized by resolution of this House to administer the oath, and the said oath of office has been presented in his behalf to the House, and there being no contest or question as to his election: Therefore

*Resolved*, That said oath be accepted and received by the House as the oath of office of the said A. L. BULWINKLE as a Member of this House.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] desires to take the oath of office.

Mr. FREDERICK C. SMITH presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have some information about the program next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do not know of any business to come up next week. Of course, we have to wait until the committee assignments on both sides are made in order to secure real organization of the House. That will be done as speedily as possible.

On Monday it is my intention to ask unanimous consent that the House adjourn over until the following Thursday. I might make a qualification in case something develops. I do not want to say that nothing will be done, because when I make a promise to the House, as the Members know, I keep the promise. I do not see anything that will interfere at this time with going over except possibly to receive a message. I do not expect any, nor do I know of any. Therefore, there will be no business next week, so far as I know.

I may say further that we are hopeful something may be worked out by both branches between now and the 20th in relation to the salary situation confronting the President and Vice President. Of course, none of us would permit any increase to go through without due consideration of our own Speaker. I do not believe that can be worked out next week, but, as I stated, it should be done on or before January 20. It is a matter to be worked out by the leadership of both parties.

There may be one or two minor matters noncontroversial in nature which could go through only by unanimous action on the part of the House, with the leadership of both parties in complete understanding. I know of nothing, but I do want that slight qualification to be noted in case anything should develop. With that statement, I repeat I know of no business next week.

Mr. HALLECK. I have had several inquiries about the matter of increase in salaries of the President and Vice President. I recognize, of course, that it might be reached for consideration next week. Perhaps it might be well to take it up next week and dispose of the matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot say now that it will, but I would like to have the RECORD show that qualification, that little flexibility, to meet any situation that may develop, because we all know that if anything does develop it has to be done by agreement of the leadership on both sides, with complete unity as to any action taken.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader a question in reference to the salaries of the executive officers. I am willing to pay as high salaries as anyone, commensurate with the duties which they perform. I want to see that done. But I wonder whether we ought to grant a $50,000 expense bill, which will be worth more than $100,000 to him. Let us give him $100,000 additional, if necessary, but let him pay his taxes like everybody else and let him feel the pinch of paying taxes so he knows what it means to the other people of this country. If you do that I will go along with you in raising his salary, but I want him to know that he has got to do likewise when he wants other people to pay taxes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think the observation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is well to be considered by the gentleman himself. We have to consider the question outside of any individual who might occupy the White House. The President of the United States has tremendous expenses which arise as a result of being President. A great deal of this comes out of his salary. I do not think the gentleman from Pennsylvania or any other American would want to have any President subjected to that situation.

Mr. RICH. Let us make his salary what it ought to be, but let him pay his taxes just the same as anybody else and let him feel the pinch of paying taxes.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have a $2,500 expense account. We provided that exemption ourselves and I do not think the American people have condemned us for that. I am one who has made two speeches on the floor of the House to the effect that we should increase our salary to $25,000 a year, and I repeat that now. That is my viewpoint, but I am only one of a few who probably would go that far. I respect the gentleman from Pennsylvania very much, as he knows, but let me say that I do not know now just what the bill will provide, but some action should be taken. I am not discussing the contents of the bill because I have no knowledge of its ultimate scope. But, in making my announcement to the House, and being frank at all times, I wanted sufficient reservation that if it can come up, it should be brought up as expeditiously as possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 36)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Economic Report and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, D. C., January 7, 1949.*

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, Members of the Cabinet, and heads of the independent agencies.

Together with this report I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review, January 1949, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short article.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Sam Pettengill and an editorial appearing in the Bristol Courier.

Mr. PRESTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter regarding the proposed Blairs Creek Dam on the Current River, Mo.

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Washington Post entitled "Code for Investigators."

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day, and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## ARMORY CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure to provide national defense buildings for the use of the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States.

The armory construction program, by which States and communities have provided facilities for the National Guard, is well known to the public. Of less general public knowledge is the Naval Reserve armory program, under which the Federal Government provides training facilities for naval units.

These are insufficient to meet the needs for the expanded Reserve of the present day. It is not possible for the local communities to pay the cost of additional armory construction needed for guard and Army Reserve activities. There is an added weakness of costly inefficiency in the present program, in that it encourages the construction of armories for the different services side by side in the same town.

The National Guard has long since outgrown its historic function as a State force. Other Reserve units are entirely Federal in scope. In consequence, my bill proposes to relieve State and local communities of the expense of armory construction.

It is my belief that a common armory can be shared by all Reserve components in a community and by the recruiting officers of the various services. Generally, but one night's training is required of a Reserve unit each week. This will permit common use of the drill floor. Separate offices and supply rooms should be provided for the separate Reserve components. Use as a community center during other periods will increase its value and popularize Reserve activities.

The Reserve, under the American system, is the most practical and inexpensive way of providing a backlog of trained men for defense in the event of a national emergency. One of the greatest remaining drawbacks to a strong Reserve is the lack of armories for training and study. The cost of a program of armory construction as outlined here would total at least $500,000,000, but armories are long lived, and their construction would be extended over a period of years.

I believe the construction of national defense buildings will constitute one of the greatest boons now possible for the Reserve components. The need for such buildings is now generally recognized and I believe the proposal will have the backing of the administration, the armed services and the Reserve organizations. It is my earnest hope that active consideration by the Congress can proceed at once.

## INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. W. KERR SCOTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was a great day in North Carolina. It was the occasion of the inauguration of Hon. W. Kerr Scott as Governor. Previous to his election as Governor, Mr. Scott had served as North Carolina commissioner of agriculture for approximately 12 years. He brings to the office of governor a wealth of experience, honest convictions, and a courageous spirit.

Because of the significance of the content of his inaugural message, I am pleased to include as a part of my remarks the text of his inaugural message. It charts a program of outstanding and progressive services and policies for the people of North Carolina. In many respects it parallels the state of the Union message by President Truman.

I would label Governor Scott's message as one of the most ambitious and deserving programs ever launched in North Carolina, and it should not only have the support of every forward-looking citizen in North Carolina but might well become a pattern for the Nation. It is with a sense of pride I kindly invite my colleagues to study this message from a great Democratic Governor of a great Democratic State.

### INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GOV. W. KERR SCOTT, OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, members of the general assembly, and my friends from all over North Carolina, as I assume the duties of Governor today I am deeply conscious of the great responsibilities of the office. My campaigning dealt with definite proposals for the expansion and improvement of the public service. I take office with what I believe to be a clear mandate from the people to carry out the pledges I have given. I am deeply appreciative of the great honor this State has bestowed upon me, but I am even more acutely aware of the work ahead, and I dedicate myself with all the energies of my heart and mind to the discharge of the duties of the governorship.

You ladies and gentlemen of this general assembly have been elected by the people as their lawmakers. I have been elected their chief executive. Together we have a job to do. I cherish the opportunity to work with you. I want you to know that the resources of the Governor's office will always be at your disposal.

Our State stands now at a point where it must take counsel of courage rather than fear in plotting its advance.

We know we cannot chart the future with certainty. In business, and in government—which is the biggest business of all—it is necessary to plan 2, 4, and more years ahead. Budgets and all great public-service programs must be projected in order that what we do today will dovetail into what we do tomorrow.

Without claiming to be a prophet, I say here and now that I face the future with confidence. We are now in a period of readjustment. I see it as the leveling-off process expected since the end of the war—the normal change from a seller's to a buyer's market inevitable as production catches up with shortages. There is evidence that we have passed the peak of high prices, and in the months immediately ahead it would be surprising if the economic adjustment did not exact a toll in business casualty and individual unemployment. We would be foolish not to take this probability into consideration, but I think we would be equally foolish to magnify the consequences of what should prove to be a normal adjustment, due after years of almost uninterrupted upward movement.

We have returned the Government in Washington to control of the Democratic Party, under which we enjoyed our greatest prosperity. President Truman and the Democratic Congress have a mandate from the people to safeguard our economy with proper supports and controls. I cannot see the possibility of depression such as we experienced under the last Republican administration. Our party has created safeguards. Bank depositors are insured against loss. Labor has more than trebled its average wage in this State, and workers are insured against total loss of income in case of temporary unemployment. Farmers have support prices to insure them against selling below cost of production. Reserve funds have been accumulated to maintain subsistence payments to large numbers of the aged and needy through the social-security program. Out of substantial profits in the last 8 years, business, by and large, has been able to set aside reserves against temporary reverses.

I repeat, I face the future with confidence. I face it, too, with the conviction that now is the time to build for a greater future by bringing our public services current with the needs of the times. In doing this we can set the stage for the greatest era of prosperity ever experienced by our people.

During the war and postwar years, when neither labor nor materials were available, I think our State leadership wisely husbanded tax resources. Our State is in sound fiscal position. But we cannot overlook the vital factor: In amassing a hoard of tax dollars we accumulated a vast backlog of urgent public service needs. We must conclude that we do not have a real surplus, but actually a deficit in public services. To go forward, we must wipe out this deficit.

To begin as rapidly as possible to fund this deficit of service to the people, and to do it as rapidly as the resources of the State will permit, I submit now a 15-point program to the members of this general assembly chosen by the people in our 100 counties to speak and act for them in charting the course of our State for the biennium ahead.

1. Roads: We have made great progress in road building in the last three decades. We now have more than 62,000 miles of roads, nearly 16,000 miles of them hard-surfaced, but a great part of our State still does not have all-weather transportation. In my opinion, the most inexcusable waste in our economy is the mud tax. I propose repealing the mud tax just as rapidly as it is possible to build and improve roads that will enable every school bus to operate every day in the year, and provide all-weather access to markets, places of employment, churches, and medical care.

The rounding out of our road system with a network of all-weather secondary mileage is essential to the economic as well as the cultural development of North Carolina. We are a State of thickly populated rural areas and small cities. Industry more and more is dependent upon rural and suburban labor. By improving the roads upon which this potential labor supply lives, we increase our attraction for new industry to locate here. In getting the worker to the factory, we have a service of importance almost equal to that of getting the child to school, and getting the farmer's product to market in good condition.

I am, of course, aware of the colossal nature of the task of building in 4 years a dependable school bus route system and service roads for the industry of farm and factory. It may require both an increase in the gasoline tax and borrowing money for repayment over a long period. I am giving the matter of financing this road-building program the most serious thought and I am seeking advice on it from the most competent sources I know.

The cooperation of all concerned is essential. I realize that I, as your Governor, can go no further toward achieving this objective than the general assembly and the people are willing to go along with me.

2. Education: The most valuable crop we raise in North Carolina is our children. We have so recognized this in the allocation of tax moneys on a steadily increasing scale. From 1900, when the great educational crusade began under Aycock, the State government has increased annual appropriations for public schools from $100,000 to over $63,000,000. In the last 5 years the amount has been quadrupled. For next year, our educational leaders are asking for $35,000,000 more than the State is spending on its public schools this year, and in addition a program of school building which would cost $150,000,000, spread over a period of years. The question is not whether we need to increase our expenditures for public schools, but how far we can afford to go—or not to go.

I regard a comprehensive educational program, properly implemented with road, health, and utilities programs, as the soundest insurance policy the State of North Carolina can underwrite for the protection of its future.

The general assembly of 1947 provided for a special commission to make a study of the entire public-school system. I commend the members of the commission and those who helped make this report possible, and I recommend it to this legislature as a chart to our educational future.

I urge the general assembly to take positive action toward improving and enlarging teacher personnel by increasing teacher pay. I favor a minimum salary for A-grade teachers of $2,400 and increments to encourage better qualified teachers to remain in the service. I feel that this is imperative to make the teaching profession attractive to the kind of people needed in it. We may look, as a result of the Democratic victory in the Nation, for substantial Federal aid in paying for this—possibly as much as $20,000,000 a year.

I recommend that the legislature give consideration to the establishment of a system of State aid to counties for the construction of school buildings. Any such program would require reconsideration of the State's present policy and the careful examination of the present division of the cost of public services as between ad valorem and other local taxes and the State's tax levies. We may not know, before the session of the general assembly adjourns, the extent to which Federal aid may be available for this purpose. If it is necessary, I would not hesitate to call a special session to deal with any proposals in connection with Federal aid.

I am not convinced that our system of higher education is either the best or the most economical system we can devise. We know there is a tremendous economic loss due to a number of factors such as poor preparation, poor discipline and the unfitness of many young men and women for the sort of college education we offer them. We need only to look at the high fatality rate in the first- and second-year classes in our State supported colleges to appreciate the fact that something is wrong with the system and that something needs to be done about it. The answer may be that we need to develop a system of junior colleges as a part of the greater university. I therefore recommend that the general assembly provide for a careful survey of our system of higher education in order that recommendation may be made to the next general assembly with respect to the advisability of establishing a system of junior colleges with facilities for affording vocational education.

3. Health: The importance of improving our general health program was brought sharply under the public spotlight by distressing disclosures in the selective-service physical examinations. Two administrations have grappled with this problem realistically, and the result of studies of two able commissions has been approved by the people's representatives in the last legislature. We have made progress toward placing this over-all plan into effect, and we should continue to implement it as rapidly as our resources will permit. I would guard only against any phase of this health program being overemphasized at the expense of another. Headway is now being made on the 4-year medical school and teaching hospital at the State university. This is an integral part of the program, but it cannot fulfill its mission without correlated development of rural hospitals and clinics. The encouragement of country practice for the doctor and nurse is dependent upon the availability of such modern health service stations. It is my earnest belief that this part should take precedence, if for financial reasons we are unable to carry the entire program forward at this time.

There is, also, no question as to the need of a dental school, and the proposal to build one deserves serious consideration.

Our hospitals for the mentally sick must be made adequate physically and staffed with properly trained personnel. At no time, save perhaps overnight, should a jail be the waiting room for patients requiring mental treatment.

In increasing provisions for treatment of the sick, we must not overlook the part of the medical program devoted to the prevention of sickness as carried on by the State board of health.

We are lagging in providing facilities for the treatment and prevention of tuberculosis. Farmers long ago stamped out tuberculosis among cattle. I think it is high time we showed more progress toward eradicating it in the human family.

4. Welfare: We are not current with need in our humanitarian services. The Board of Public Welfare has submitted proposals for increasing aid to the aged and indigent. These proposals affect the physical and moral health of our people. Our old-age benefits should be adjusted in line with living costs and our relief standard generally should be brought up at least to the national average. Vigilance against fraud should be increased and local communities should be encouraged to shoulder greater responsibility toward caring for those unable to care for themselves.

Great work is being done for the blind through the State blind commission and a special project of one of our largest civic clubs. This public service is to be commended in the highest terms, and might well serve as an example for other organizations of this nature.

I am concerned about the frequency of serious crimes of violence. It disturbs me to hear that a large part of the large flow of convicts into our prison system consists of ex-service men of the late war. If we are to obtain social improvement through our courts of justice, our prisons must be more than merely places for detention. There must be greater emphasis upon returning prisoners to useful places in society, and to this end we should look critically at our system of prison administration and parole and probation.

5. Natural resources: In our department of agriculture, the experiment and extension services of our agricultural colleges, and the department of conservation and development, we have the facilities for promoting the broadened economic base that is vital to our continued progress. We face challenging opportunity to improve land usage. Forestry may be restored as a major industry. Commercial fishing may be expanded, and we have untold mineral wealth awaiting development. Here, especially, I mention our ports and harbors. These are of vital concern to the entire State—not merely areas adjacent to them.

6. Public utilities: A large number of our people are being penalized by not having electric power and telephone service. Our industry has been retarded by inequitable power and transportation rates.

Electric power is the cheapest labor the farmer, as well as the manufacturer, can hire. Yet there are still around 100,000 farms in North Carolina that do not have electricity, and there are sections in which industry is being throttled because it cannot get electric power on terms that will enable it to compete with similar industries elsewhere. I want to see these service deficits wiped out during my administration.

The telephone ranks at the top of modern conveniences. Yet the surface has barely been scratched in making the instrument available to all the people. This service deficit is not only retarding rural development but constricting our whole economic and social progress by encouraging movement of our people into already congested areas. Telephone service is a natural corollary to all-weather roads and electrification. It is essential to bringing about the better health services, marketing facilities, and broadening the scope of our labor supply which industry must have.

Our utilities are privately owned and they should be permitted a reasonable return upon their investment, but to justify their monopolistic franchises granted them by the people of the State, they must also provide the service to which the people are entitled.

In the field of regulating public utilities we must have fair and aggressive administration of fair laws designed to protect the public interest as well as the interests of investors in public utilities. Our laws regulating utilities are, in some respects, cumbersome, out of date, and inadequate to meet modern conditions. Our State utilities commission needs to be reorganized and supplied with the services of experts so that it can act promptly and effectively in the public interest.

I mention specifically here the urgency of eliminating freight-rate discriminations against our industry and agriculture.

7. Democratic representation: I have stressed the importance of broadening our economic base. I lay equal stress upon broader representation on the boards and commissions which serve the public interest. I consider such broadened representation a mandate of last year's election.

You will have before you for your consideration the report of the commission set up by the preceding legislature to study our present system of State examining boards. I find widespread belief that this business has been carried beyond the bounds of public welfare. We should go slow in creating new boards and scrutinize every such board already in existence where there is the slightest indication that it is serving special privilege and restriction of opportunity.

8. Referendum: The people have the right to express themselves on any important issue affecting their well-being. Our constitution stipulates that: "Elections should be frequent. For redress of grievances and for amending and strengthening the laws, elections should be often held." I urge this legislature to present the alcoholic-beverage question fairly to the people in a State-wide referendum without delay. A gag rule, or any rule, which stifles democratic processes of free and open debate and discussion is contrary to the spirit of our people.

9. Elections: Our election laws are in some respects archaic. They are generally not conducive to bringing out the participation of the people in government. This is the keystone of democracy. I consider it a disgrace that barely one-third of the people eligible to vote in our State took part in the November election. We have permitted our processes of voting to lag behind the times, and I advocate modernization of our election machinery to the end that people will be encouraged in exercising their rights of citizenship. It is my opinion that the time has

come for us to seriously consider the use of mechanical devices for the deposit and counting of ballots in all our elections.

10. Veterans: The more than 350,000 men and women who were in the armed services are now for the most part back in civil life. A great number are in positions of leadership in the State and its various localities. These men and women merit every consideration the State can show them in gratitude for their sacrifice, but I am convinced that the majority of veterans do not desire to be set apart as a special class. A great many of them have told me that, and also that the best bonus their State can grant them is better government and improved public services that will bring about better living conditions and open greater avenues of opportunity. That also is my belief.

11. Labor: No State has enjoyed better relations between labor and management than ours. We have a definite responsibility for continuing and improving these good relations. I have observed with deep satisfaction the increase in the last 10 years of the average weekly wage in industry from $16 to $41. Private business as well as public funds have felt the enriching effect of these enlarged pay rolls. We cannot have a well-balanced economy without wide distribution of buying power. A fair return for labor, whether it be in factory or on the farm, is essential to that condition.

Two years ago the general assembly enacted the so-called anti-closed-shop law. This was done at a time when labor's demands at the national level were influencing lawmakers all over the Nation to pass restraining legislation. I feel that the passage of time has convinced those willing to look upon both sides of this question that this law was harsh, and I recommend revision of this and other State labor laws to bring them in line with legislation adopted by the National Congress. I specifically recommend wage-hour legislation to remove discrimination as between business engaged in interstate commerce and business engaged solely in business within the State.

I also favor increasing unemployment benefits to a level in keeping with advanced living costs. I am informed that we can do this and at the same time lower the tax levied on business for this purpose.

12. Business and industry: The rapidly advancing industrialization of our State is responsible in large measure for our unprecedented prosperity in recent years. Our goal should be an economy soundly diversified between agriculture and industry. We can increase our attraction to industry by broadening our supply of competent labor through better training in our schools and better accessibility and communications, so that labor can be drawn from extended areas and not be confined to urban limits. Tax structures are important, and we should guard against our taxes on industry getting out of line with those of competing States, but even more important than the tax consideration is the supply of labor and natural resources. We have both awaiting development. This will become increasingly important as the dispersion of industry is accelerated by the atomic age.

I am opposed to any legislation unduly favoring or discriminating against any form of legitimate business enterprise.

Business in the last decade has built up a great bulwark against repetition of the panic of the early thirties by its contributions to the unemployment-compensation fund. There are now more than $150,000,000 in this fund and about 1,000,000 workers are covered in North Carolina. Payments from this fund are not large enough to encourage idleness, but they serve to tide workers, and the businesses dependent upon industrial pay rolls, over periods of temporary inactivity without danger of economic paralysis. This danger was ever-present before the establishment of the social-security plan.

In view of the large reserves accumulated in the unemployment fund, I feel that business should be given all the relief possible in reduction of this assessment, and recommend serious consideration of the proposal to this end made by the employment security advisory commission. As I have already mentioned, I am informed that this reduction can be made and at the same time unemployment benefits can be increased more in line with present living costs.

13. Personnel: The State cannot render services commensurate with the needs of its people, nor in fair exchange for the tax moneys it collects, without able and adequate personnel. This is true in every branch and division of our Government. To attract and retain personnel capable of rendering the services to which the taxpayers are entitled, compensation for public service must be reasonably commensurate with salaries and wages prevailing in competitive enterprise, both public and private. Our salary and wage scales do not at this time reflect such a condition. We should now raise these scales with a view to compensating for increased living costs with an equitable retroactive adjustment.

The State has lagged behind industry in personnel management, and should remedy this condition immediately. To this end I recommend removal of the duties of personnel administration from the office of the assistant director of the budget to a new personnel division under the direction of a specialist in this field. This office should proceed without delay to survey the whole field of State employment and to make revisions and adjustments that are needed as rapidly as possible. This office, too, must always be open to any State employee for hearing and investigation of any complaint regarding terms or conditions of employment by the State.

14. Local government: Cities and counties are reporting budgetary difficulties as expenses increase without commensurate increase of their revenues. There is a growing tendency to appeal to the State government for aid. At the same time, criticism arises in some quarters against the concentration of political power at the State capital. During the campaign there was a confusing mingling of the two ideas—that the central State should take on more financial responsibility for local government, and that it should restore to local government some of its powers.

This discussion, spurred on primarily by the municipalities, strongly suggests that the time has come for very careful study of the whole framework of North Carolina's government. The record of the concentration of power and financial responsibility at Raleigh shows little evidence in support of the theory that the State government sought to take on new power for the sake of exercise of the power itself. Usually, fiscal circumstances led to willing surrender of authority to the State by local governments as they struggled with problems such as roads and schools.

In the course of this political evolution, the areas of taxation occupied by the State, as compared with those areas left to local government, have been clearly defined in some instances. In other instances they have been loosely indicated with some overlapping. The State gave up ad valorem taxation of real property and restricted local government in certain other areas. The time is near, if not immediately at hand, when we must make a critical survey of our situation with a view to determining more definitely and expertly how the costs of government should be divided. This thinking leads inevitably to consideration of the haphazard, uneven valuation of property in the counties and cities for ad valorem levies.

The mercurial character of the State's tax levies, as well as the mounting costs of State services under the present constitutional and statutory responsibilities demand that we deliberate with great care all proposals to load the central State with large new obligations at the instance of local government. I say this while recognizing, with sympathy and understanding, that local government is entitled to the best we can do in equity and fairness to afford relief.

I have suggested the surrender by the State of a limited portion of the tax field wherein revenue now is derived from business licenses without State supervision or service of the business so licensed. By release of this revenue source to local government under statutory limitation, substantial local government aid could be provided. I am recommending, also, that the road-maintenance funds allocated to city streets be doubled.

Knowing that greater demands will be made upon the legislature for aid of local government, including the demand that the State help with the construction of needed school buildings, I trust that the general assembly wil confide to a special committee or a subcommittee the duty to make a prompt study of this pressing problem. I hope that this will be done early in the session, in order that all legislative proposals for new aid to local government may be scrutinized and acted upon with an eye not only to immediate needs, but also to long-range policy.

15. Federal cooperation: We are now receiving millions of dollars each year from the Federal Government in our road, school, health, and other programs. This aid may be increased. We should take full advantage of it. We have the campaign pledge of the Democratic Party that such Federal aid will be extended without interference with State administration in accordance with custom.

Some of these proposals I have outlined involve a substantial increase in spending, but the people understood that when they enccuraged me in my campaign. I have not and do not now minimize the cost of the major items in this go-forward program.

We know from experience that these things cannot be had cheaply. We know from experience, too, that social progress cannot far outrun material progress.

Our tax income is now at the highest place in our history, but we have little assurance that our revenues will continue to climb as they have climbed in recent years. Our sales, income, and utility taxes are extremely sensitive to economic conditions. They mount rapidly in good times. They could drop rapidly in adverse times. We must bear that in mind as we match our spending against revenue.

There are certain injustices in our present general tax schedule. I have pledged my support to their removal. These include abandonment of the present sales tax on meals served in public eating places in order to place such meals on tax equality with those served at home. This would complete the movement begun several years ago of taking the sales tax off all food. I also advocate the equalization of the sales tax upon farm machinery and industrial machinery. These recommendations would entail some loss of revenue. To keep our budget in balance, and it is imperative that we do so, we are faced with the need to obtain good value for our tax dollars in every case.

This will mean, aside from improving administrative efficiency wherever possible, the winnowing of services merely desirable from those urgently necessary.

The program of permanent improvements authorized by the general assembly of 1947 has scarcely been started because of the constantly increasing building costs. It is manifest that this program should be completed and the additional funds necessary should be provided. With respect to further permanent improvements at our various State institutions, it is necessary that the need be evaluated realistically and in relation to other needs. It is my belief that money we invest

in better roads and in better schools and in better health facilities will go further and faster, in the immediate future, toward creating new taxable wealth and in social well-being essential to the progress our people desire. I have, therefore, placed roads, schools, and health first.

A go-forward program calls first for long-range planning.

Every farmer will not get his all-weather road as soon as he would like it, and every community will not get a modern hospital this year. New and needed school buildings will not spring up everywhere immediately, and new factories will not rise in every community.

We are a great State, and a large State. We have over 3,500,000 people and nearly 32,000,000 acres of land and inland waters. We are inclined to judge a program by what is transpiring at our doorstep. Some will see the things I am advocating materialize sooner than others. Some must inevitably wonder at the slowness of their government to get to them.

But this I pledge: With the cooperation of the legislature, the things I have promised will be done in an orderly manner and as rapidly as our resources will permit. We will make North Carolina, in the 4 years ahead, a better place in which to live, in which to invest, and in which to play after the work is done.

To do this we must bring our over-all efficiency current with the times. Governments can no more maintain a competitive position with methods of a decade ago than can industry. Where I see our government in a rut I shall do everything in my power to get it out. If this means reorganization or even abolition of time-honored practices, I shall not hesitate to recommend such changes as appear in the public interest.

Nor shall I hesitate to slash red tape or push aside tradition if it is necessary to eliminate bottlenecks.

Government should never be remote. The people are entitled to know what is going on. It is my purpose to go on the radio from time to time and make first-hand reports of my stewardship. I shall also make information about our Government available as fully and completely as possible through the reporters of press and radio. Secrecy has no place in a people's government.

I come into office with no skeletons in my closet, and I shall strive zealously to see that none creep into the State's closets while I am Governor.

The door to the Governor's office will continue to be open during my administration.

I am most acutely aware of the fact that both the office of the Governor in the capitol and the executive mansion, and all the institutions and departments of government belong to you—the people—not to me whom you have designated as tenant in the office of Governor for the next 4 years.

In conclusion, I would not be speaking with candor if I did not say in no uncertain terms that I am proud of the progress made by our State under the guidance of a long line of distinguished men who have served as governor during the past 50 years.

I have had the opportunity of serving the State in the administration of our last four Governors—Ehringhaus, Hoey, Broughton, and Cherry. I cherish the opportunity to carry on the high tradition of public service established by my predecessors. I know that you ladies and gentlemen of this general assembly also succeed a long line of patriotic citizens who have served the State faithfully as members of the legislatures which have been the authors of the State's charter of progress. The record of our predecessors is a challenge to us to work shoulder to shoulder in the interest of all our people.

Let's go forward.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, on the first legislative day following the receipt of the budget, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a speech delivered by Assistant Secretary of the Navy Brown and in the other an address delivered by General Kenney.

Mr. JACOBS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from Norbert O'Leary which appeared in the Daily Telegram of Garden City, Kans.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very fine article appearing in the Boston Herald of November 28 with regard to our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of correcting an honest but erroneous impression that many newspapers, and particularly editorial writers, throughout the country seem to have, and that even some of our own Members did have, with regard to the meaning and effect of the amendment liberalizing the rules that the House adopted last Monday.

I have read a number of editorials, and all that I have read are favorable to this change in the rules, but most of them indicate that they feel the Speaker has the power to recognize or not to recognize when the chairman of a committee, on the day on which it is in order to call up motions to discharge committees, rises to call up a rule that has been in the Committee on Rules for 21 days or more or that has been reported adversely by that committee. That is an honest but incorrect impression.

The amendment liberalizing the rules makes it mandatory that the Speaker recognize the chairman of a committee under such circumstances. The language of the amendment is, "and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege."

Therefore, recognition under these circumstances is not a question of discretion with the Speaker.

May I say that the Speaker and I did not consider that proposition even for a minute. We would not consider that as a liberalizing amendment.

The two plans under consideration were the Eberharter plan and the proposal that a smaller number of signatures be required on a motion to discharge the Committee on Rules from further consideration of a rule providing for the consideration of a public bill reported out of a committee.

But the agreement was to recognize the chairman of a committee. Where there has been a noncompliance by the Committee on Rules with the rule as amended, the chairman of the committee, as a matter of right, can rise and be recognized. My purpose now is to correct that honest but erroneous impression.

The newspapers of the country and the editorial writers and others who are interested will know that this is really an effective liberalizing amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HALLECK. In order to add to the clarification of the situation, would it be in order to say that under this new arrangement any measure that is reported out by a legislative committee and which then goes to the Committee on Rules may be called up on the floor of the House even against the majority sentiment of the Committee on Rules or the sentiment of the leadership itself?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman is referring to any public measure.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I am referring to any public measure.

Mr. McCORMACK. In reply to the gentleman's statement, the answer is "Yes." The rule applies both ways. The rule applies to a situation where any public bill has been reported out of the standing committee and a rule has been applied for and the Committee on Rules fails to act within 21 days or should report adversely, which, of course, is a rare occurrence, but that language had to be included in order to cover that possibility. Then on any discharge petition day the chairman of a standing committee could rise and call that rule up just as any member of the Committee on Rules can now do after a rule has been reported out for more than 7 days. That is part of the rules, and we are simply

extending the same privilege or, rather, the same right—not a privilege—to the chairman of a standing committee where the Committee on Rules fails to act in 21 days, just as any member of the Committee on Rules now has that right when a rule is reported out and has not been programed for the consideration of the House by the majority leader within 7 days.

Of course, as my friend knows, in practical operation the chairman of a committee would come to me as majority leader and ask me to program it, just as members of the Committee on Rules would come to me if they desired that a bill should be called up after the expiration of 7 days. I am sure that Members have come to my distinguished friend during the time that he was majority leader, in similar situations. I am sure they would come to the leadership to see about programing any proposed legislation before exercising the high privilege that is now theirs under the rules as amended.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I sincerely hope for the sake of the Treasury of the United States, in view of the wish expressed by the President of the United States that we achieve a balanced budget and have a surplus to pay on the national debt, that the prophecy of the gentleman from Massachusetts as to what will transpire will prove to be correct, because under the gentleman's explanation as to the effect of this rule the legislative committee is in complete control of the situation and may bring any measure to the floor of the House without regard to the wishes of the leadership or of the Committee on Rules. As a matter of fact, committees often direct and require their chairman to press for passage of bills he does not favor personally. May I say further to the gentleman that in my service in the House of Representatives under the leadership of the able gentleman from Massachusetts and preceding leaders of Democratic Congresses, and at one time in my capacity as leader of the majority in the House, I know that bills aggregating billions and billions of dollars which would have completely bankrupted the country have not come to the floor of the House because it was decided by the responsible leaders that they should not come to the floor for consideration. I realize the great wish of so many people to liberalize the rules of the House and to bring everything to the floor of the House. But the gentleman knows as well as I do that many of those very bills will get practically a unanimous vote if they come to the floor.

May I say again, hoping that we do not run headlong into bankruptcy, that the gentleman and his colleagues in the leadership will be able to control the situation indirectly, having completely destroyed the power of the Rules Committee in respect to bills coming to the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has been proceeding upon and reacting to fear for 16 years. It is very evident that the gentleman is still proceeding upon fear. This is a rule effectively liberalizing the rules of the House, and I compliment the 49 Republicans who joined with the Democrats in that action. I was very sorry to see the Republican leadership make a test of this on the first day. They have to take the responsibility for the test on liberalizing the rule, where we will be able to carry out the will of the House and not be frustrated by six men who may be assigned to the Rules Committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

34. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, covering operations for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

35. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting for the consideration of the Congress, a repeal of a proviso contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for 1949 (H. Doc. No. 35); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

36. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of the Comptroller General of the United States on the results of a study of restrictions on the expenditure of appropriated funds; to the Committee on Appropriations.

37. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

38. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Fourteenth Annual Report of the Federal Communications Commission, for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

39. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 8, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Monongahela River and West Fork River, W. Va., with a view to providing navigation improvements from lock and dam No. 15 on the Monongahela River to Clarksburg on the West Fork River, authorized by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

40. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 11, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Fishing Creek, Cumberland County, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

41. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 10, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Charlotte Harbor, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 21, 1945; to the Committe on Public Works.

42. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting the Thirty-second Annual Report of the United States Tariff Commission, in compliance with the provisions of section 332 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1140. A bill to protect and conserve the salmon fisheries of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1141. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Rehoboth-Assateague National Seashore in the States of Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 1142. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 1143. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley law, and which is Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1144. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 1145. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic, to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1146. A bill to exempt certain fraternal societies operating under the lodge system from the tax imposed on billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1147. A bill providing for the incorporation of the United American Veterans and Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1148. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1149. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Vinton, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1150. A bill to restore cash allowances to retired enlisted persons of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, in lieu of allowances in kind heretofore authorized under the provisions of the act of 1885 establishing military retirement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1151. A bill to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1152. A bill to provide retirement and retired pay for enlisted men of the Army at the highest grade they held in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 1153. A bill to amend the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1154. A bill to provide authorization for additional funds for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1155. A bill to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a Swainsboro division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of the court to be held at Swainsboro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1156. A bill for the relief of Evans County, Ga.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1157. A bill to amend paragraph VIII of the Veterans Regulation No. 10, as amended by Public Law 439, Seventy-eighth Congress, which defines line of duty and misconduct for pension and compensation purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1158. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Marfa, Tex., of certain lands formerly owned by that city; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1159. A bill relating to the disposition of war housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1160. A bill to provide national defense buildings for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1161. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 1162. A bill to authorize the establishment of an additional coinage mint of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. J. Res. 75. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. J. Res. 76. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. Res. 36. Resolution to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. Res. 37. Resolution to amend rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to committee reports on bills and joint resolutions authorizing new programs of grants-in-aid; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 38. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 754, Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Communism in Action"; to the Committee on House Administration.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1163. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Wells; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1165. A bill for the relief of Arnett Wells Leslie, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1166. A bill for the relief of W. A. Chisholm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1167. A bill for the relief of W. A. Chisholm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 1168. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Boring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1170. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John Kaudy (formerly Stella Cappler); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 1171. A bill for the relief of the Reese & Argust Wrecking Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1172. A bill for the relief of Jack W. Darby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1173. A bill for the relief of Florence Bryant Peters and E. B. Peters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOWE:

H. R. 1174. A bill for the relief of Harold H. Naylor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1175. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Corrina Arena; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, since we cannot always do what we like, grant that we may like what we must do, knowing that truth will one day be vindicated and right in the end must prevail.

Bless thy servants this day and keep them all in Thy peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 6, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the business of the morning hour is begun, I understand that the minority are ready with the report of their assignments to committees, and, inasmuch as it is privileged, I ask that this routine matter be immediately attended to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I may say to the majority leader that the minority are ready to present their committee assignments, and I am perfectly agreeable that they be taken up at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest that the lists be sent to the desk and read by the clerk.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the minority list of committee assignments, and join in the request of the majority leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I present the list of the majority committee assignments, which I send to the desk, and ask that both lists be read according to the alphabetical order of the committees, and that both majority and minority members be assigned as set forth in the lists.

Mr. WHERRY. In behalf of the minority I have already sent to the desk the minority list of committee assignments, and I join the majority leader in the request he has made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the lists.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma, chairman; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; James P. Kem, of Missouri; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa.

On Appropriations: Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee, chairman; Carl Hayden, of Arizona; Elmer Thomas, of Oklahoma; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Pat McCarran, of Nevada; Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico; Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina; Allen J. Ellender, of Louisiana; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Chan Gurney, of South Dakota; Clyde M. Reed, of Kansas; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska; Guy Cordon, of Oregon; Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Milton R. Young, of North Dakota.

On Armed Services: Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland, chairman; Richard B. Russell, of Georgia; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Virgil Chapman, of Kentucky; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; Styles Bridges, of New Hampshire; Chan Gurney, of South Dakota;

Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts; Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut; William F. Knowland, of California.

On Banking and Currency: Burnet R. Maybank, of South Carolina, chairman; Robert F. Wagner, of New York; Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; A. Willis Robertson, of Virginia; John Sparkman, of Alabama; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Harry P. Cain, of Washington; John W. Bricker, of Ohio.

On the District of Columbia: J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island, chairman; Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; Bert H. Miller, of Idaho; John J. Williams, of Delaware; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: John L. McClellan, of Arkansas, chairman; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; Glen H. Taylor, of Idaho; Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Joseph R. McCarthy, of Wisconsin; Irving M. Ives, of New York; Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota; Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine; Andrew F. Schoeppel, of Kansas; Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan.

On Finance: Walter F. George, of Georgia, chairman; Tom Connally, of Texas; Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado; Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois; Clyde R. Hoey, of North Carolina; J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; Hugh Butler, of Nebraska; Owen Brewster, of Maine; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; John J. Williams, of Delaware.

On Foreign Relations: Tom Connally, of Texas, chairman; Walter F. George, of Georgia; Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah; Millard E. Tydings, of Maryland; Claude Pepper, of Florida; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; Brien McMahon, of Connecticut; J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas; Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Bourke B. Hickenlooper, of Iowa; Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts.

On Interior and Insular Affairs: Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, chairman; James E. Murray, of Montana; Sheridan Downey, of California; Ernest W. McFarland, of Arizona; Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico; Bert H. Miller, of Idaho; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Hugh Butler, of Nebraska; Eugene D. Millikin, of Colorado; Guy Cordon, of Oregon; Zales N. Ecton, of Montana; George W. Malone, of Nevada; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah.

On Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, chairman; Ernest W. McFarland, of Arizona; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania; Brien McMahon, of Connecticut; Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland; Lyndon B. Johnson, of Texas; Estes Kefauver, of Tennessee; Charles W. Tobey, of New Hampshire; Clyde M. Reed, of Kansas; Owen Brewster, of Maine; Homer E. Capehart, of Indiana; John W. Bricker, of Ohio.

On the Judiciary: Pat McCarran, of Nevada, chairman; Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia; James O. Eastland, of Mississippi; Warren G. Magnuson, of Washington; J. Howard McGrath, of Rhode Island; Robert F. Wagner, of New York; J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina; Bert H. Miller, of Idaho; Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin; William Langer, of North Dakota; Homer Ferguson, of Michigan; Forrest C. Donnell, of Missouri; William E. Jenner, of Indiana.

On Labor and Public Welfare: Elbert D. Thomas, of Utah, chairman; James E. Murray, of Montana; Claude Pepper, of Florida; Lister Hill, of Alabama; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois; Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota; Robert A. Taft, of Ohio; George D. Aiken, of Vermont; H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey; Wayne Morse, of Oregon; Forrest C. Donnell, of Missouri.

On Post Office and Civil Service: Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina, chairman; Kenneth McKellar, of Tennessee; Herbert R. O'Conor, of Maryland; J. Melville Broughton, of North Carolina; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Matthew M. Neely, of West Virginia; J. Allen Frear, Jr., of Delaware; William Langer, of North Dakota; Ralph E. Flanders, of Vermont; Raymond E. Baldwin, of Connecticut; Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota; Zales N. Ecton, of Montana; Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey.

On Public Works: Dennis Chavez, of New Mexico, chairman; Sheridan Downey, of California; John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Spessard L. Holland, of Florida; John Sparkman, of Alabama; John C. Stennis, of Mississippi; Virgil Chapman, of Kentucky; Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma; Harry P. Cain, of Washington; Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania; Arthur V. Watkins, of Utah; George W. Malone, of Nevada; James P. Kem, of Missouri.

On Rules and Administration: Carl Hayden, of Arizona, chairman; Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island; Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania; John C. Stennis, of Mississippi; Russell B. Long, of Louisiana; Guy M. Gillette, of Iowa; Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming; Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska; William F. Knowland, of California; Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts; William E. Jenner, of Indiana; Irving M. Ives, of New York.

Mr. BARKLEY. The reading of the lists having been completed I move that the names and assignments as read by the clerk be approved by the Senate as constituting the members of the various committees referred to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee assignments as read by the clerk will be approved. Is there objection?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent to say a few words on the subject of the method of establishing committees?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, my attention was diverted. May I inquire what the Senator from Ohio asked.

Mr. TAFT. I have in mind the matter about which I just spoke to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senate will have a morning hour now, after which the Senator can make his statement.

Mr. TAFT. I thought the statement would be appropriate in connection with the actual assignment of committees. I will wait, however, until the morning hour is concluded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the committee assignments as read are agreed to.

## ASCERTAINMENT OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I desire to make a report on behalf of the Senators appointed on the part of the Senate on the result of the election of the President and Vice President of the United States, which I understand is privileged.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island may proceed.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the tellers appointed on the part of the Senate, in pursuance of House Concurrent Resolution 2, to ascertain the result of the election for President and Vice President of the United States, I beg leave to report that the two Houses met in joint session on last January 6, that thereupon the certificates of electors of the several States of their votes for those offices were opened by the President pro tempore of the Senate and delivered to the tellers, and on being examined it appeared that the votes of the several States had been cast in accordance with the list as submitted to the two Houses in joint session, a copy of which I submit herewith.

That from those votes it appeared that the whole number of electors appointed to vote for President and Vice President of the United States for the term of office beginning on the 20th day of January 1949, was 531, of which a majority was 266.

The state of the vote for President of the United States appeared to be:

For Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, 303.

For Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, 189.

For J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, 39.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States appeared to be:

For Alben W. Barkley, of the State of Kentucky, 303.

For Earl Warren, of the State of California, 189.

For Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, 39.

Which result, having been ascertained and counted by the tellers, was delivered by them to the President pro tempore of the Senate;

Whereupon,

The President pro tempore announced the state of the vote to be that Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, had received 303 electoral votes; that Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, had received 189 electoral votes, and J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, had received 39 electoral votes for the office of President of the United States; and that Alben W. Barkley, of the State of Kentucky, had received 303 electoral votes; that Earl Warren, of the State of California, had received 189 electoral votes, and that Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, had received 39 electoral votes for the office of Vice President of the United States.

The list referred to, as submitted by Mr. GREEN, is as follows:

The undersigned, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN and KENNETH S. WHERRY, tellers on the part of the Senate, MARY T. NORTON and LOUIS E. GRAHAM, tellers on the part of the House of Representatives, report the following as the result of the ascertainment and counting of the electoral vote for President and

Vice President of the United States for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1949.

| Electoral votes of each State | States | For President | | | For Vice President | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Harry S. Truman, of Missouri | Thomas E. Dewey, of New York | J. Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina | Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky | Earl Warren, of California | Fielding L. Wright, of Mississippi |
| 11 | Alabama | ---- | ---- | 11 | ---- | ---- | 11 |
| 4 | Arizona | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 9 | Arkansas | 9 | ---- | ---- | 9 | ---- | ---- |
| 25 | California | 25 | ---- | ---- | 25 | ---- | ---- |
| 6 | Colorado | 6 | ---- | ---- | 6 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | Connecticut | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- |
| 3 | Delaware | ---- | 3 | ---- | ---- | 3 | ---- |
| 8 | Florida | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- |
| 12 | Georgia | 12 | ---- | ---- | 12 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | Idaho | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 28 | Illinois | 28 | ---- | ---- | 28 | ---- | ---- |
| 13 | Indiana | ---- | 13 | ---- | ---- | 13 | ---- |
| 10 | Iowa | 10 | ---- | ---- | 10 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | Kansas | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- |
| 11 | Kentucky | 11 | ---- | ---- | 11 | ---- | ---- |
| 10 | Louisiana | ---- | ---- | 10 | ---- | ---- | 10 |
| 5 | Maine | ---- | 5 | ---- | ---- | 5 | ---- |
| 8 | Maryland | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- |
| 16 | Massachusetts | 16 | ---- | ---- | 16 | ---- | ---- |
| 19 | Michigan | ---- | 19 | ---- | ---- | 19 | ---- |
| 11 | Minnesota | 11 | ---- | ---- | 11 | ---- | ---- |
| 9 | Mississippi | ---- | ---- | 9 | ---- | ---- | 9 |
| 15 | Missouri | 15 | ---- | ---- | 15 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | Montana | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 6 | Nebraska | ---- | 6 | ---- | ---- | 6 | ---- |
| 3 | Nevada | 3 | ---- | ---- | 3 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | New Hampshire | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- |
| 16 | New Jersey | ---- | 16 | ---- | ---- | 16 | ---- |
| 4 | New Mexico | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 47 | New York | ---- | 47 | ---- | ---- | 47 | ---- |
| 14 | North Carolina | 14 | ---- | ---- | 14 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | North Dakota | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- |
| 25 | Ohio | 25 | ---- | ---- | 25 | ---- | ---- |
| 10 | Oklahoma | 10 | ---- | ---- | 10 | ---- | ---- |
| 6 | Oregon | ---- | 6 | ---- | ---- | 6 | ---- |
| 35 | Pennsylvania | ---- | 35 | ---- | ---- | 35 | ---- |
| 4 | Rhode Island | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | South Carolina | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 |
| 4 | South Dakota | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- |
| 12 | Tennessee | 11 | ---- | 1 | 11 | ---- | 1 |
| 23 | Texas | 23 | ---- | ---- | 23 | ---- | ---- |
| 4 | Utah | 4 | ---- | ---- | 4 | ---- | ---- |
| 3 | Vermont | ---- | 3 | ---- | ---- | 3 | ---- |
| 11 | Virginia | 11 | ---- | ---- | 11 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | Washington | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- |
| 8 | West Virginia | 8 | ---- | ---- | 8 | ---- | ---- |
| 12 | Wisconsin | 12 | ---- | ---- | 12 | ---- | ---- |
| 3 | Wyoming | 3 | ---- | ---- | 3 | ---- | ---- |
| 531 | Total | 303 | 189 | 39 | 303 | 189 | 39 |

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH S. WHERRY,
*Tellers on the Part of the Senate.*

MARY T. NORTON,
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
*Tellers on the Part of the House of Representatives.*

The state of the vote for President of the United States, as delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Harry S. Truman, of the State of Missouri, has received for President of the United States 303 votes.

Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, has received 189 votes.

J. Strom Thurmond, of the State of South Carolina, has received 39 votes.

The state of the vote for Vice President of the United States, as delivered to the President pro tempore of the Senate, is as follows:

The whole number of electors appointed to vote for Vice President of the United States is 531, of which a majority is 266.

Alben W. Barkley, of the State of Kentucky, has received for Vice President of the United States 303 votes.

Earl Warren, of the State of California, has received 189 votes.

Fielding L. Wright, of the State of Mississippi, has received 39 votes.

This announcement of the state of the vote by the President pro tempore of the Senate shall be deemed a sufficient declaration of the persons elected President and Vice President of the United States, each for the term beginning on the 20th day of January 1949, and shall be entered, together with a list of the votes, on the Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives.

## ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 36)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, D. C., January 7, 1949.*

The honorable the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,

The honorable the SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIRS: I am presenting herewith my Economic Report to the Congress, as required under the Employment Act of 1946.

In preparing this report, I have had the advice and assistance of the Council of Economic Advisers, members of the Cabinet, and heads of independent agencies.

Together with this report, I am transmitting a report, the Annual Economic Review: January 1949, prepared for me by the Council of Economic Advisers in accordance with section 4 (c) (2) of the Employment Act of 1946.

Respectfully,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

### INCREASE IN COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN HEADS IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

A communication from the President of the United States, requesting prompt action to increase the compensation of the heads and assistant heads of the executive departments and of other Government officers of comparable rank; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### PRESENTATION OF STATUE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON TO URUGUAY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the presentation by the United States of a statue of Gen. George Washington to the people of Uruguay, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### REPORT ON CERTAIN REFUNDS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing refunds of internal revenue in excess of $500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

### REPORT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### TRANSFER OF CERTAIN FIELD STATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of certain agricultural dry land and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations are located, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### REPORT OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Agricultural Extension Service, fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

### JOHN I. MALARIN

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORT ON SPECIAL ASSISTANTS EMPLOYED BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the special assistants employed by the Department of Justice, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

### FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the number of officers above the rank of major receiving flight pay and the average monthly payments made to such officers during the period April 1 to October 1, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### REPORT OF STUDY OF RESTRICTIONS ON EXPENDITURE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report as to the cost of complying with restrictions placed in general appropriation acts, with such recommendations as deemed necessary or desirable (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

### REPORT OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### REPORT OF UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

### PERMISSION TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE TO RECEIVE FOREIGN DECORATIONS

Two letters from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation granting permission to Hildrus A. Poindexter, senior surgeon (Reserve), and Mary L. Mills, senior assistant nurse officer, of the Public Health Service, to accept the diplomas and wear the insignia of certain decorations bestowed upon them

by Liberia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ON EXPENDITURES BY UNITED STATES COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on expenditures of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## RESOLUTIONS IN TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR OVERTON AND THE LATE SENATOR BILBO

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Democratic conference as tributes to the memories of Hon. John H. Overton, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana; and Hon. Theodore G. Bilbo, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN H. OVERTON

Whereas almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable John H. Overton, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

*Further*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the Democratic conference, this 31st day of December 1948.

THEODORE G. BILBO

Whereas almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from us our colleague, the Honorable Theodore G. Bilbo, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi; and

Whereas throughout his long career in the United States Senate he rendered to our Nation and to his State a most distinguished service; and

Whereas as our trusted friend and close associate, he was ever ready to lend his judgment and his efforts in behalf of the Democratic Party: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, his Democratic colleagues in the United States Senate, express our deep sense of loss at his passing; and

*Further*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the family of the deceased, that they may be assured of our deep respect for the late Senator and of our condolences upon the passing of our friend.

Adopted by the Democratic conference, this 31st day of December 1948.

## RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE CENTRAL NEBRASKA BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION RELATING TO ACREAGE OF SUGAR BEETS, ETC.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference resolutions adopted at a recent meeting of the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CENTRAL NEBRASKA BEET GROWERS' ASSOCIATION, DECEMBER 7, 1948

Resolution 1

Whereas a reasonable acreage of sugar beets is essential to a proper rotation program in the central Nebraska area; and

Whereas an early agreement upon contract terms would aid in promoting a large acreage of sugar beets: Be it therefore

*Resolved*, That the board of directors be directed to request the officials of the American Crystal Sugar Co. to give consideration to the 1949 marketing contract immediately after the results of the cost survey being conducted by the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture are made available.

Resolution 2

*Be it resolved* upon condition that a fair and equitable marketing contract for 1949 is agreed upon between the American Crystal Sugar Co. and the directors of this association that the board of directors be instructed to offer to the factory officials all facilities of the association to assist in securing a normal acreage of sugar beets and a representative number of growers in all parts of the factory district.

Resolution 3

*Be it resolved*, That the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association express its appreciation to the American Crystal Sugar Co. for its cooperation in the collection of association dues and in permitting the use of its facilities by the association chemist.

Resolution 4

Whereas many prospective sugar-beet growers are hesitant about contracting beet acreage until a determination of labor rates has been made: Be it therefore

*Resolved*, That the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association urge the Department of Agriculture to make an early determination and release the findings on labor rates by January 1, 1949.

Resolution 5

Whereas both the growers of sugar beets and the sugar processors are at a disadvantage in negotiating a marketing contract without full information as to production costs and consumptive estimate for the ensuing year: Be it therefore

*Resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association*, That we request the Department of Agriculture to make public not later than January 1, 1949, the 1949 consumptive estimate and the results of the cost survey which has been carried on by the Sugar Section of the Department of Agriculture.

Resolution 6

*Be it resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association*, That the board of directors be instructed to request closer cooperation between the factory officials and the association in regard to the recruitment and employment and compensation of free labor.

Resolution 7

*Be it resolved*, That the American Crystal Sugar Co. be requested to make available to the members of the association all pertinent data obtained from the operation of their fertilizer and seed experimentation plots in this area, and we express our commendation of the factory for carrying on these experiments in the central Nebraska area.

Resolution 8

*Be it resolved*, That the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association again request from the American Crystal Sugar Co. that individual soil analysis be provided for the growers as a guide in selecting proper fertilizer.

Resolution 9

*Be it resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association*, That the factory officials be requested to establish closer cooperation with the growers on harvesting methods and conditions.

Resolution 10

*Be it resolved*, That the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association express its appreciation to the National Beet Growers' Federation for its services in behalf of the beet growers in matters of Federal legislation, and that the directors of this association be instructed to continue the affiliation of the association with the National Beet Growers' Federation during the ensuing year.

Resolution 11

Whereas the available supply of free Mexican labor will not be adequate for the care and harvesting of the 1949 sugar-beet crops: Be it therefore

*Resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association*, That we urge the Department of Agriculture to attempt to make Mexican national labor available for the 1949 season.

Resolution 12

Whereas our Nebraska Senators and Congressmen rendered invaluable service to the sugar-beet growers in the adoption of sugar legislation in the past session of Congress: Be it therefore

*Resolved by the Central Nebraska Beet Growers' Association*, That we express our sincere appreciation to our Nebraska Senators and Congressmen for their fine support of the sugar-beet growers in matters of national legislation.

## RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY NORTH DAKOTA FARM BUREAU RELATING TO SOIL CONSERVATION, ETC.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference resolutions which were adopted at the sixth annual convention of the North Dakota Farm Bureau. The resolutions deal specifically with soil conservation, submarginal land soil conservation, irrigation, consolidation of Government farm service agencies, sugar commodity storage, the parity program, research, the wheat agreement, surplus versus reserves, farm credit, rural electrification, and roads and highways. I do not request that the remaining resolutions, which deal with State problems, be included. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOIL CONSERVATION

*Be it resolved:* Realizing that the welfare of the people of North Dakota is dependent upon the soil and its productivity, and that soil conservation and prevention of soil erosion is of the utmost importance and that in recent years there have been instances of soil sacrifice in efforts to meet the demand for farm products, the North Dakota Farm Bureau recommends an accelerated soil-conservation program through the extension service of the North Dakota Agricultural College, by cooperation with other State and Federal agencies interested in soil conservation, by the encouragement of good farming practices and by a soil-conservation educational program among the people of our State.

SUBMARGINAL LAND SOIL CONSERVATION

*Be it resolved,* That the North Dakota Farm Bureau favors an extensive soil-conservation program designed particularly for submarginal land in North Dakota.

IRRIGATION

*Be it resolved,* That inasmuch as the growing season in North Dakota is shorter than in more southern areas in the United States and is a one-season program, and inasmuch as the crops suitable to our climate and soil require larger acreages to be a profitable enterprise than crops such as fruits, which are grown in more southern or western areas, it is urged that the American Farm Bureau Federation support a plan on irrigation for North Dakota which will permit irrigation tracts of sufficient size to be a profitable enterprise, and to make a good economic unit.

CONSOLIDATION OF GOVERNMENT FARM SERVICE AGENCIES

*Be it resolved,* in the interests of rendering the best service to the farmers of North Dakota, it is recommended that the Soil Conservation Service and Production Marketing Administration be consolidated into one governmental agency.

SUGAR

Whereas under existing law the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States sets a consumptive estimate on sugar consumption within the United States upon which import quantities are determined causing an effect upon market prices for sugar: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* that the Secretary of Agriculture be urged to set said consumptive estimate, consistent with the facts so that the prices paid for the raising of sugar crops and the profits therefrom, compare favorably with the prices and profits paid for the raising of other farm crops; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, D. C.

COMMODITY STORAGE

*Be it resolved:* 1. That the farmers of North Dakota be encouraged to use existing storage facilities and to provide additional storage facilities for the storing of grain on farms as a sound business and farming practice and as a stabilizing factor on grain markets;

2. That legislation be enacted enabling and empowering the Commodity Credit Corporation to maintain sufficient storage facilities to protect their own operations and maintain a reserve of farm products to meet national emergencies; be it further

*Resolved:* 1. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, Governor of the State of North Dakota, the Honorable Charles Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, and to the congressional delegation from North Dakota at Washington, D. C.

PARITY PROGRAM

*Be it resolved:* That the North Dakota Farm Bureau go on record favoring continuance of parity for agriculture and that we instruct our Representatives and Senators in Congress to work for the continuance of the AIKEN or long-range agricultural program of 1948 to fully protect agriculture.

RESEARCH

*Be it resolved:* We urge that the American Farm Bureau Federation exercise vigilance as to the progress made in the administration of the Research and Marketing Act in order that the funds appropriated may be expended wisely and to the best interests of agriculture. We believe that research should be made on major items rather than on minor items and that studies should be made for the development of new outlets for agricultural productions. We further recommend that the North Dakota Farm Bureau set up an appropriate committee to study the matter of finding new uses for small grains and for products derived therefrom and to determine what plan might be feasible for the North Dakota Farm Bureau to adopt further such research. It is further recommended that as a matter of policy, the producer should assist in bearing the cost of research in the development of new market outlets for the products which he produces.

WHEAT AGREEMENT

*Be it resolved,* That the North Dakota Farm Bureau recommends a thorough study of the International Wheat Agreement be made on both county and State levels so that the public may be more conversant with this matter when and if it should again come before our Congress.

SURPLUS VERSUS RESERVES

The Government of the United States has justly and properly assumed world leadership. Billions have been invested in military personnel together with the most powerful Navy, Air Force, etc., in the world.

The fruits of these huge investments are not labeled "surpluses," but are properly termed instruments of defense.

While this building program is being carried on this Nation's producers of foodstuff are engaged in producing the most bounteous harvests on record, which are so essential at this time in building and keeping the peace of the world.

While the American farmer appreciates the cooperation on the part of our Government in its efforts to support farm prices, these very necessary supports are distasteful to the American consumer at this time of inflated values. They feel that the Government, while trying to control inflation on the one hand, is on the other hand, by supporting farm commodity prices, in the face of commodify surpluses, unnecessarily holding prices up.

The heroic efforts on the part of the American farmer promise to build immense reserves, which we fear may lower farm commodity prices, reduce the farmers' buying power, and destroy that economic balance upon which our country's prosperity depends.

America's economy is faced with the possibility of commodity surpluses on the one hand and consumer resistance on the other hand, which conditions could result in monetary loss to our Government in its program to support commodity prices at reasonable levels.

We feel that our Government should regard food as an instrument for defense just as much as our Army, Navy, and Air Force, and it should acquire a great store of farm commodities while such commodities are available and hold it for use in national emergencies.

Such action on the part of our Government would not only remove possible future commodity surpluses and accompanying consumer resistance resulting in Government loss, but would create another powerful arm in our national defense program.

Such action on the part of our Government would also serve the double purpose of removing the pressure of commodity surpluses from our price supports and would also act as a guaranty against food shortage in case of war or crop shortages in future years.

It would also have a stabilizing effect on commodity markets which in turn would reflect stability to our consumer markets: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Government be requested to acquire and hold a large reserve of farm commodities to be used only in case of national emergencies.

FARM CREDIT

*Be it resolved,* That inasmuch as there are no adequate credit facilities available in the State of North Dakota for the purchase of farms and to enable persons to begin farming operations, and inasmuch as the Federal land bank makes loans in other States; and inasmuch as such loans are based primarily on the security interest in such land, the North Dakota Farm Bureau urges that the Federal land bank resume making North Dakota farm loans under existing North Dakota laws; be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of Agriculture at Washington, D. C.; to the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration at Washington, D. C.; and to the Honorable Fred G. Aandahl, Governor of the State of North Dakota, and to the North Dakota congressional delegation at Washington, D. C.

MORE DEMOCRACY

Whereas the selection of the PMA State committeemen is not democratic; be it

*Resolved,* That the people of our State be allowed to select their own. We would recommend that one be elected from each judicial district by the members of each district.

REA

*Be it resolved,* The North Dakota Farm Bureau reaffirms the stand that it has previously taken that it is solidly in favor of the extension of REA electric service within North Dakota. As of this time, REA electric service has been extended to only a small fraction of the farms in North Dakota. It is, therefore, urged that Congress and all governmental agencies make available the funds necessary and expedite the extension of REA electric service so as to make electrical service available to the greatest number of farms in North Dakota at the earliest possible time; be it further

*Resolved,* That the American Farm Bureau make every effort to defeat any proposed legislation which would give private power companies control of the power developed at Government dams and that REA cooperatives, governmental agencies, and municipalities be given first priority on said power.

A copy of this resolution to be sent to Claude Wickard, REA Administrator, Washington, D. C., all North Dakota Congressmen, and REA officials of the State.

ROADS AND HIGHWAYS

*Be it resolved:*

1. That the North Dakota Farm Bureau favors the centralization of all highway location and construction, in each county, under the supervision of a county administrative engineer. Said county administrative engineer shall have the duty of supervising and cooperating with county and township officers in the location, construction, and maintenance of all roads within the county. In the cases of State or Federal roads running through said counties, such administrative engineer shall cooperate with State and Federal officials and with the administrative engineer and officials of the adjoining counties.

2. That the North Dakota Farm Bureau establish a county road committee in each county who shall have the duty to consult with the county administrative engineer, the county and township officials, and with State and Federal officials concerning road matters, and in matters involving more than one county. Said county road committee of the counties involved shall consult and work with each other and with the county engineer and county, township, State, and Federal officials involved. The manner of selection of said county committee, the number of persons thereon, and the terms of office shall be determined by the county farm bureau.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LODGE introduced Senate bill 273, to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 274. A bill for the relief of Constantin E. Aramescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 275. A bill for the relief of Arthur C. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 276. A bill to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 277. A bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States;

S. 278. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; and

S. 279. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 280. A bill to incorporate National Service Star Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 281. A bill to insure the maintenance of full employment in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 282. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 283. A bill to protect producers, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers from the unrevealed presence of fiber content in spun, woven, knitted, felted, or other manufactured fiber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 284. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, part III; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 285. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for the Everglades National Park, Florida; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 286. A bill to remove the restrictions upon the acquisition, possession, and ownership of gold and to permit the sale of gold within the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 287. A bill to provide for grants to assist the States, Territories, and dependencies in the construction of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 288. A bill to provide equal treatment to disabled enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard on parity with existing law pertaining to disabled enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 289. A bill for the relief of Tania Ipolo and Lana Bouianovsky; and

S. 290. A bill for the relief of Maria Franzia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEM:

S. 291. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 292. A bill to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument, in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MCMAHON:

S. 293. A bill relating to the disposition of war housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 294. A bill for the relief of Hernando J. Abaya, his wife, and two children;

S. 295. A bill for the relief of Adolph Musil;

S. 296. A bill for the relief of Daniel George Fischer and Ladislas (Vasile) Taub;

S. 297. A bill for the relief of Ruggiero Di-Costanzo;

S. 298. A bill for the relief of John Rowland;

S. 299. A bill for the relief of Roberto De Vasconcellos;

S. 300. A bill for the relief of Margit Sigray;

S. 301. A bill for the relief of Joseph Bernstein;

S. 302. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter;

S. 303. A bill for the relief of Artin Djoundjian;

S. 304. A bill for the relief of Salomon Henri Laifer;

S. 305. A bill for the relief of Julio Laffitte; and

S. 306. A bill for the relief of Alfred Fulga, his mother, Aurelia Filipescu, and the latter's nurse, Steliana Istrate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCMAHON (by request):

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Engebert Axer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGRATH:

S. 308. A bill for the relief of Kaarlo Kalle Kalervo;

S. 309. A bill for the relief of Gabe Budwee; and

S. 310. A bill limiting the operation of sections 281, 283, and 284 of title 18, United States Code, and of section 190 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the representative of the United States of America on the United Nations Commission for Conciliation in Palestine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCGRATH (for himself and Mr. NEELY):

S. 311. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 312. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of George W. Norris, of Nebraska; and

S. 313. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps in honor of the Diamond Jubilee of American Nursing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 314. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Francisco Irilli;

S. 317. A bill for the relief of Margita Kofler;

S. 318. A bill for the relief of Ludovit Sturc, and his family, and Michael Frauwirth, and his family; and

S. 319. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 320. A bill to assist the States in the removal of adult illiteracy by the development and maintenance of special programs of basic elementary education for adults, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 321. A bill for the relief of Lloyd D. Lyles; and

S. 322. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Westway, legal guardian for Bobbie Niles Johnson, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 323. A bill to restore for a period of 1 year the special income-tax exemption previously applicable to military and naval personnel and to increase such exemption to $1,800 in the case of commissioned officers and commissioned warrant officers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 324. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 325, to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 326. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MCCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER) introduced Senate bill 327, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 328. A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1943 (57 Stat. 388), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to adjust titles to lands acquired by the United States which are subject to his administration, custody, or control"; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 329. A bill to increase the number of copies of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD furnished to the Vice President and each Senator; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 330. A bill for the relief of George Gabriel Herrmann, Greta (Marketa) Herrmann (wife), and Alice Herrmann (daughter); and

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 17. Joint resolution to authorize an increase in the professional and clerical staffs of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. HOEY (for himself and Mr. BROUGHTON):

S. J. Res. 18. Joint resolution for the relief of the First Citizens Bank & Trust Co., administrator of the estate of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. J. Res. 19. Joint resolution to provide for collecting and publishing the writings of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

S. J. Res. 20. Joint resolution authorizing the President to issue a proclamation designating October 31 of each year as Youth Honor Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim national observance of Defenders' Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. J. Res. 23. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of the birth of Elihu Yale; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. MORSE introduced Senate Joint Resolution 24, to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

## ENLISTMENT OF ALIENS IN REGULAR ARMY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I reintroduce for appropriate reference, in modified form, a proposal which the Senate passed last year; authorizing the Army to enlist up to 25,000 qualified aliens, and I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a brief statement I have prepared which presents in succinct form the reason for my introducing the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 273) to provide for the enlistment of aliens in the Regular Army, introduced by Mr. LODGE, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

This simple proposal permits the Army (with the concurrence of the Secretary of State) to accept up to 25,000 enlistments from young men of different nationalities between the ages of 18 and 35. It authorizes the Army to conduct this experiment for a 2-year period. The number 25,000 represents about 7 percent of the total of our Regular Army and is an amount which qualified experts believe can be effectively absorbed. These men would serve for 5 years, after which they would be eligible for American citizenship. They could be used wherever the Army found it desirable, and I believe that it is the Army's intention to use them initially in Alaska, the Caribbean, and the Far East.

This bill is similar to the amendment I offered last year to the Selective Service Act and which the Senate approved on a roll-call vote. I was disappointed when it was dropped from the act during the conference with the House and I hope that it will fare better this time.

Some of the points which should be emphasized at this time in connection with this plan are:

1. It is of enormous potential value to our national defense. We receive, in return for the benefits conferred, human talent which we can obtain in no other way and which the experiences of World War II, in our relations with friendly foreign troops, prove beyond question that we must have for training, combat, liaison, and intelligence.

2. It does not contemplate any sort of foreign legion at all. These young foreign soldiers would be scattered as individuals throughout all Army units. They would not be isolated in separate organizations or wear any kind of distinctive insignia. They would wear regular GI uniforms and would live in intimate daily contact with other young Americans.

3. The literally hundreds of letters which I have received from young men all over the world show that this plan has captured the interest and enthusiasm of the cream of young manhood abroad. We could expect fine human material. Of course, the initial screening of applicants would be highly exacting and discriminating; continuous supervision during the entire term of enlistment would likewise be aggressive. This is certainly more thorough than anything of which our immigration and naturalization services are normally capable.

4. It is neither a sign of weakness nor a radical policy for the United States to welcome allies in American uniform. Foreign soldiers have fought and given their lives for the United States from the Revolutionary War through the Civil War down to World War II. My plan simply seeks to substitute an orderly legislative long-range program for the old hit-or-miss method.

5. This proposal is truly one for the benefit of the United States. It is not a "hand-out." It is no cold-blooded hiring of mercenaries. It is an honorable exchange whereby both parties benefit—and therein, I think, lies its special strength.

6. Of overriding importance is the fact that there are millions of people the world over who look to the United States as the guardian of democracy. It is only right that the young and able-bodied men among these people should have the privilege of helping us carry the torch. For many reasons, they cannot put their armies into the field. But their young men can help as individual allies and should be enabled to do so. We have gone to great lengths and much trouble and expense in order to leave no stone unturned to have as many allies as possible in this troubled world. This is yet another way in which to secure more friends—this time an ally in the uniform of the United States Army.

## INCOME LIMITATION GOVERNING GRANTING OF PENSIONS TO CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for upward revision of income limitations affecting the entitlement to pensions of disabled veterans of World War I and the widows of such men. A measure similar to this bill was considered in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 4242. It was reported from the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, but, unfortunately, did not receive further action. I am, however, hoping that such action will be forthcoming in this Eighty-first Congress. This is one of the bills on the comprehensive legislative program for veterans' and widows' welfare of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, whose distinguished national legislative representative is Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, past national commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The bill (S. 325) to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes. In this bill I am joined by the able Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I ask that the bill be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and that a statement prepared by me in connection therewith be printed immediately thereafter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 327) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the creation of a consolidated international air carrier for the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the merger and the consolidation of international air carriers for the United States, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"TITLE XII—CONSOLIDATION AND MERGER OF INTERNATIONAL AIR CARRIERS

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 1201. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'domestic air carrier' means any air carrier, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from common-carrier business is derived from domestic air transportation.

"(2) The term 'international air carrier' means any air carrier, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from common-carrier business is derived from international air transportation.

"(3) The term 'consolidated carrier' means the international air carrier which acquires or operates properties and facilities unified and integrated by consolidation or merger pursuant to this title.

"(4) The term 'domestic air transportation' means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire, or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce, between points in the United States, or between a point in the United States and a point in Canada.

"(5) The term 'international air transportation' means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire, or the carriage of mail by aircraft, in commerce, between any point in the United States and any point in a foreign country other than Canada.

"(6) The term 'consolidation or merger' includes the legal consolidation or merger of two or more corporations and the acquisition by a corporation through purchase, lease, or

in any other manner, of the whole or any part of the property, securities, facilities, services, or business of any other corporation or corporations, or of the control thereof, in exchange for its own securities or otherwise.

"(7) The term 'continental United States' means the several States and the District of Columbia. The term 'United States' has the meaning set forth in section 1 (31).

"(8) The term 'Board' means the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"(9) The term 'flight equipment' shall include in addition to aircraft, engines, and propellers.

"DECLARATION OF PUBLIC INTEREST

"SEC. 1202. It is hereby declared that the interests of the commerce of the United States, the national defense and the postal service require that the United States shall have a system of international air transportation (a) sufficient to carry a substantial portion of its own international air commerce commensurate with the large proportion of such air commerce originated by it, to obtain a fair share of air commerce between other nations of the world, and to provide it with air communications on all routes essential to the national interest; (b) capable of serving as an aid to its military forces in time of war or national emergency, both directly and as a source of trained personnel; (c) owned and operated under the United States flag by citizens of the United States; and (d) composed of the most modern, safest, and most suitable types of aircraft constructed in the United States and manned with citizens thereof; and that, in order to foster the development and encourage the maintenance of such a system of international air transportation, it is necessary to avoid destructive rivalries between American companies abroad and to present a united American front against the competition of foreign air monopolies. It is therefore declared to be the policy of the United States that its international air transportation should be consolidated into a single company, to be formed under a plan approved or prescribed by the Board, which shall operate in the national interest under private ownership and management as a public utility under regulation by the Board.

"CONSOLIDATION OR MERGER OF INTERNATIONAL AIR CARRIERS

"SEC. 1203. (a) Within 60 days from the date of enactment of this section, or such longer period not exceeding 90 days from the date of enactment of this section as the Board may determine, one or more international air carriers or domestic air carriers engaged in international air transportation may file with the Board a proposed plan of consolidation or merger. Upon the filing of any such plan, the Board shall transmit a copy thereof to the President and to the Policy Committee hereafter named, and shall order a public hearing to be held with respect thereto, and shall give reasonable notice of such hearing in writing and an opportunity to be heard to any person whose properties are affected by the plan and to such other persons as the Board may deem advisable. If no such plan is filed within the period above specified, the Board shall as soon as practicable thereafter issue a proposed plan of consolidation or merger and shall transmit a copy thereof to the President and to the Policy Committee hereafter named, and shall order a public hearing to be held with respect thereto and shall give reasonable notice of such hearing and an opportunity to be heard as aforesaid.

"(b) Any proposed plan filed with or issued by the Board under subsection (a) of this section shall include the following provisions and may include such other provisions as shall be appropriate:

"(1) A statement that the consolidated carrier will acquire, by the issuance of an appropriate amount of its ordinary common stock, all of the assets, or all of the outstanding stock, of all international air carriers existing on the effective date of the plan, and, if the assets of such carriers are to be acquired, that the consolidated carrier will assume the liabilities of such carriers existing on the effective date of the plan;

"(2) A statement that the consolidated carrier will acquire the following:

"(i) All real estate and ground equipment owned by domestic air carriers which is located outside the continental United States and is used or held for use by such air carriers in international air transportation on the effective date of the plan;

"(ii) Any stock, notes, or other securities or evidences of indebtedness of any person engaged in any phase of aeronautics in a foreign country which are owned by any air carrier or person controlling an air carrier on the effective date of the plan, except that the plan need not provide for the acquisition by the consolidated carrier of any such stock, notes, or other securities or evidences of indebtedness acquired by an air carrier or person controlling an air carrier after October 25, 1945;

"(iii) Flight equipment owned by any domestic air carrier which on the effective date of the plan is primarily used or held for use in international air transportation or has been committed for by such a carrier primarily for such use, and such additional flight equipment owned or committed for by any domestic air carrier on the effective date of the plan so that the total flight equipment purchasable under this clause (iii) will constitute an amount of the flight equipment of any domestic air carrier engaged in international air transportation fairly representing the proportion of such flight equipment used in or committed for international air transportation, to such extent as any such domestic air carrier may request within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Board in its order approving the plan.

In any case where property is to be acquired by the consolidated carrier pursuant to this clause (2) directly from a person entitled to subscribe for carrier shares, the purchase price shall be payable in such shares and the right of such person to subscribe for such shares shall be reduced accordingly: *Provided*, That the carrier shares so issuable upon such purchase shall not exceed 3 percent of the proposed initial common stock capitalization of the consolidated carrier and any amount by which the purchase price shall exceed said 3 percent shall be payable either in cash or in notes of the consolidated carrier maturing not later than 2 years from the effective date of the plan and bearing interest at 3 percent per annum, or partly in cash and partly in such notes.

"(3) A statement as to the proposed initial capitalization of the consolidated carrier.

"(4) The form of charter of the consolidated carrier, which may be a charter under the laws of any one of the United States, and the form of bylaws of the consolidated carrier.

"(5) Provisions for the offer for subscription (i) to all domestic air carriers, (ii) to all citizens of the United States who are common carriers by water in foreign commerce or in commerce between the continental United States and a territory or possession of the United States, as defined in the Shipping Act, 1916, and (iii) to all class I carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act (other than terminal and switching companies and carriers which are not citizens of the United States as defined in this act), of three special series of common stock of the consolidated carrier (hereinafter referred to as 'carrier shares'). The series of carrier shares to be so offered to domestic air carriers shall constitute approximately 25 percent of the proposed initial common-stock capitalization of the consolidated carrier, the series of carrier shares to be so offered to citizens of the United States who are common carriers by water, as above defined, shall contribute approximately 20 percent of the said proposed initial common-stock capitalization, and the series of carrier shares to be so offered to class I carriers by railroad, as above defined, shall constitute approximately 10 percent of the said proposed initial common-stock capitalization. Such shares shall be allotted within each of the three classes on a fair and equitable basis which shall take account of the gross revenues and net worth of the respective members of each class, and other relevant facts, subject, however, to the provisions of subsection (b) (2) of this section and of section 1204 (a). The plan shall contain appropriate provisions (1) fixing a reasonable time of not less than 6 months within which carriers initially entitled to subscribe to carrier shares shall elect as to the extent to which they desire to avail themselves of their subscription rights and providing that the consolidated carrier may call for the payment of such subscriptions over a period of not less than 6 months nor more than 1 year from the date of such election; (2) stating what disposition, if any, shall be made of shares not so subscribed for; (3) establishing that if the consolidated carrier shall from time to time issue additional common stock (except where such stock is issued for property, services, or to employees of the consolidated carrier) each of the classes of persons herein specified as entitled to subscribe to a proportion of the shares originally issued shall be entitled to subscribe for a like proportion of such newly issued shares, the allotment of such newly issued shares within each class to be based upon the facts existing at the date of such new issue without regard to the amount of shares then actually held by any member of such class; (4) restricting the transferability of carrier shares; and (5) providing for representation of the holders of each of the special series of carrier shares upon the board of directors of the consolidated carrier: *Provided*, That the total number of directors provided to represent each of said special series of carrier shares shall approximate the proportionate amount of common stock of the consolidated carrier represented by such series.

"(6) Fair and equitable provisions to assure the continued employment of all citizens of the United States who are employed by international air carriers or who are employed by domestic air carriers engaged in international air transportation and whose duties have related primarily to such transportation, and the reemployment of employees of the same categories who since August 27, 1940, have left their positions for the purpose of entering the military or naval forces of the United States, which provisions shall confer benefits at least as extensive as those provided in respect of the consolidation or merger of telegraph carriers by subsection (f) of section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended by the act of March 6, 1934, and which shall apply to all flight personnel of the character above described without regard to the restriction imposed by subdivision (11) of said subsection (f).

"(7) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will assume and perform the terms and conditions of any and all collective-bargaining agreements in respect to rates of pay, wages, hours, and working conditions which shall be in effect immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger with respect to the employees specified in clause (6), and that the consolidated carrier will agree that any disputes or controversies that may arise as to seniority of the employees of the respective carriers and

similar questions shall be arbitrated under the terms of the Railway Labor Act.

"(8) An agreement that if any individual or organization shall have been certified by the National Mediation Board, prior to the approval of such consolidation or merger as the representative of any craft or class of employees of an international air carrier, and if such certification shall still be in effect immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, that the consolidated carrier shall recognize and treat with such individual or organization as the representative of said employees until such time as the National Mediation Board shall certify another representative or find that no representative is entitled to be certified.

"(9) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will render air-transportation service between the United States and every country in the world having a population of more than 5,000,000 persons to which such service can be operated, except such countries as to which the Board, on the recommendation of the Policy Committee hereinafter designated, shall find that air-transportation service is not required by the public convenience and necessity or otherwise to further national policy.

"(10) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will file rates, fares, and charges for foreign air transportation which shall not be higher than reasonable maximum rates, fares, or charges, or lower than reasonable minimum rates, fares, or charges which may be determined from time to time by the Board.

"(11) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will enter into through-traffic arrangements with domestic carriers, in such form or forms as may be approved or prescribed by the Board, in order to assure the domestic carriers fair and equitable treatment with respect to the routing of through traffic between points outside the continental United States served by the consolidated carrier and points within the continental United States served by more than one domestic carrier, and also to enable the consolidated carrier to compete effectively with foreign companies which have a preferential position with domestic connections in their respective countries, by utilizing the selling offices and organizations of the domestic carriers or otherwise.

"(12) An agreement that the consolidated carrier will enter into agency agreements with citizens of the United States who are common carriers by water, in such form or forms as may be approved or prescribed by the Board, for the solicitation by such water carriers through their selling offices and organizations abroad of air traffic for the consolidated carrier.

"(13) An agreement that, in time of war, the United States, acting by such agency or agencies as the President may determine, may take over the possession or may direct the operation of the properties of the consolidated carrier during such emergency, under such terms and conditions as will afford just compensation to the consolidated carrier.

"(14) Provisions insuring that the consolidated carrier shall be at all times a citizen of the United States as defined in section 1 (13).

"(15) Provisions for placing the plan in effect and for defining its effective date.

"(c) After the hearing provided for in subsection (a), the Board shall within 60 days render a report and order in which it shall approve a plan, which may be different from the plan proposed, upon finding that such plan will in its opinion meet the requirements of subsection (b) of this section, is fair and equitable, and will be compatible with the public interest. The Board may thereafter, upon petition for good cause shown, filed within 30 days of the date of its order, and upon further hearings if the Board shall deem necessary, in a supplemental report and order modify any plan which it has so approved. The members of the initial board of directors of the consolidated carrier shall be fairly representative of its respective constituent elements and shall be subject to approval by the Board.

"(d) Upon the approval of a plan by the Board, any law or laws which would otherwise make unlawful any transaction provided for in any such plan shall not apply with respect thereto, and any carrier participating in or resulting from any transaction provided for in any such plan shall have full power to carry such transaction into effect without securing approval otherwise than as specified in this section: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein shall in anywise affect the application of the antitrust laws as defined in the act of October 15, 1914, chapter 323, section 1, to transactions other than those provided for in this title.

"(e) Any plan approved by the Board shall be carried out by the parties thereto within such reasonable period as the Board may determine. Nothing in this title shall in anywise affect the right of the United States by appropriate legislation to require modifications or changes with respect to the consolidated carrier or to require the consolidated carrier to divest itself of its property in whole or in part and in such event shall have no rights other than to fair compensation for its property.

"(f) If any plan approved by the Board is not carried out within the period fixed by the Board as provided in subsection (e), the Board may apply to a court as provided in section 1007 (b) of this act, to enforce compliance with any such plan. In any such proceeding the court, as a court of equity, may to such extent as it deems necessary for purposes of enforcing compliance with such plan, take exclusive jurisdiction and possession of the company or companies or the assets thereof which are subject to such plan, wherever located, and the court shall have jurisdiction in any such proceeding to appoint a trustee, and the court may constitute and appoint the Board as sole trustee to hold or administer under the direction of the court the assets so possessed. In any such proceeding the trustee shall dispose of such assets in accordance with the plan approved by the Board.

"(g) The provisions of title I, section 5, of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, shall not apply to the issuance, sale, or exchange of any securities provided to be initially issued in any plan approved by the Board, which securities and transactions shall for the purposes of said Securities Act be treated as if they were specifically mentioned in sections 3 and 4 of said Securities Act.

"(h) The provisions of sections 1801 and 1802 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply to the issuance, transfer, or exchange of securities of the consolidated carrier or the making or delivery of conveyances in connection with the acquisitions by the consolidated carrier of the property, stock, or assets provided for in any plan approved by the Board.

"(i) (1) Section 112 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss upon certain exchanges) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(11) Gain or loss not recognized on consolidation or merger of international air carriers: No gain or loss shall be recognized if property of a corporation is transferred in pursuance of a plan of consolidation or merger approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under title XII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to another corporation organized or made use of to effectuate such a plan of consolidation or merger, in exchange solely for stock or securities in such other corporation.'

"(2) Section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to recognition of gain or loss) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"'(m) Exchanges by security holders in connection with consolidation or merger of international air carriers: No gain or loss shall be recognized upon an exchange consisting of the relinquishment or extinguishment of stock or securities in a corporation pursuant to a plan of consolidation or merger approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under title XII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in consideration of the acquisition solely of stock or securities in a corporation organized or made use of to effectuate such a plan of consolidation or merger.'

"(3) Section 113 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to basis of property is amended by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

"'(23) Property acquired pursuant to plan of consolidation or merger of air carriers: If the property was acquired by a corporation organized or made use of to effectuate a plan of consolidation or merger approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board under title XII of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the basis in the hands of the acquiring corporation shall be the same as it would be in the hands of the corporation whose property was so acquired, increased in the amount of gain recognized to the corporation whose property was so acquired.'

"OWNERSHIP OF STOCK IN CONSOLIDATED CARRIER

"SEC. 1204. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, partnership, association, or corporation to buy, acquire, hold, own, or control directly or indirectly, an amount of the common stock of the consolidated carrier which shall exceed 3 percent of the proposed initial common stock capitalization or the amount of common stock actually outstanding, whichever shall be higher. If any person, partnership, association, or corporation, by virtue of its stock ownership in an international air carrier or in a domestic air carrier engaged in international air transportation or otherwise, shall receive more than such 3 percent, such person, partnership, association, or corporation shall within 6 months after such receipt sell, distribute, or otherwise dispose of so much of the common stock of the consolidated carrier so received as shall exceed such 3 percent.

"(b) No person, partnership, association, or corporation entitled to acquire carrier shares of the consolidated carrier pursuant to subdivision (6) of subsection (b) of section 1203 shall acquire, directly or indirectly, any other voting stock of the consolidated carrier, except stock acquired by such person, partnership, association, or corporation as a result of the initial issue of stock of the consolidated carrier for property acquired by the consolidated carrier or stock distributed as a dividend on stock so initially issued or acquired pursuant to rights appertaining to stock which shall have been so initially issued or shall have been distributed as a dividend thereon.

"POLICY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 1205. There is hereby established a committee in the executive branch of the Government to be known as Policy Committee, International Civil Air Transportation (herein referred to as 'the Policy Committee'). The Policy Committee shall be composed of the Secretary of State, who shall act as its chairman; the Secretary of War; the Secretary of the Navy; the Secretary of Commerce; and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. The Board shall consult with and obtain the approval of the Policy Committee before ordering the establishment of new routes or services or directing the suspension or abandonment of routes or services pursuant to section 1205 (d). The Policy Committee shall have regular meetings at least once in each 3 months and shall have special meetings at such times as the chairman shall direct. The chief executive officer of the consolidated

carrier shall, unless otherwise directed, attend all meetings of the Policy Committee for the purpose of informing the Committee but without the right of vote.

"AIR TRANSPORTATION TO BE PROVIDED BY CONSOLIDATED CARRIER

"SEC. 1206. (a) The consolidated carrier shall have power to engage in international air transportation in all parts of the world. The consolidated carrier shall also have power to engage in air transportation between a point or points in the continental United States and a point or points outside the continental United States, and between one or more points in the United States outside its continental borders, to such extent and only to such extent that such air transportation shall have been authorized in a certificate of public convenience and necessity held at the effective date of the plan by an international air carrier the assets or capital stock of which are acquired by the consolidated carrier pursuant to the plan or thereafter issued to the consolidated carrier pursuant to section 401.

"(b) The consolidated carrier shall not hold or acquire, directly or indirectly, any interest in a domestic air carrier or consolidate with such a carrier or merge its properties, or any part thereof, with those of such a carrier.

"ROUTES AND SERVICES TO BE OPERATED BY CONSOLIDATED CARRIER

"SEC. 1207. (a) Except as provided in subsection (e), the consolidated carrier shall not operate any route or service unless such route or service shall have been specified in a statement of service plan filed with and permitted to become effective by the Board or shall have been required by the Board as hereinafter provided and shall not suspend or abandon any such route or service unless a statement as to such suspension or abandonment shall have been filed with and permitted to become effective by the Board or shall have been required by the Board as hereinafter provided. At least 30 days before the effective date of the plan, the consolidated carrier shall file with the Board and with the Postmaster General a statement of service plan setting forth the routes and services which the consolidated carrier proposes to operate during the year in which the consolidated carrier proposes to commence its operations. Such service plan may include services on any and all routes authorized by certificates of public convenience and necessity with respect to international air transportation held by any of the air carriers the capital stock or assets of which are being acquired pursuant to the plan, and on such other routes, if any, as may be deemed advisable in the public interest. Not later than the 1st day of December in each year, the consolidated carrier shall file with the Board and with the Postmaster General a statement of service plan setting forth the routes and services which the consolidated carrier proposes to operate in the ensuing year. The consolidated carrier may from time to time file with the Board and with the Postmaster General statements of proposed changes in any service plan theretofore filed.

"(b) Upon the filing of any statement pursuant to subsection (a) hereof, the Board shall give due notice thereof to the public by posting a notice of such statement in the office of the Secretary of the Board and by giving notice to such other persons as the Board may by regulation determine.

"(c) The initial statement of service plan required to be filed by the consolidated carrier and the statements required to be filed annually thereafter shall become effective within 30 days after the filing thereof and any other statement shall become effective within the time specified therein (which shall not be less than 10 days, unless the Board shall otherwise permit in a particular case), unless 5 days prior to the date when such statement would otherwise have become effective the Board shall give notice to the consolidated carrier postponing the effective date of any route or service proposed. If such notice shall have been given, the Board shall within not more than 20 days thereafter, either permit the statement to become effective or require it to be canceled or modified, as the Board shall determine to be in the public interest.

"(d) If the Board is of the opinion that routes or services in addition to those being operated by the consolidated carrier are required in the public interest or that any routes or services being operated should be suspended or abandoned, the Board shall give notice to the consolidated carrier to that effect. Unless within 20 days after the receipt of such notice the consolidated carrier shall file with the Board a statement of service plan complying with such notice and shall thereafter diligently proceed to initiate such service, the Board may require the consolidated carrier to take action in accordance with such notice. Any interested person may at any time request the Board to take action pursuant to this subsection.

"(e) The consolidated carrier may, without filing a statement of service plan pursuant to this section, operate extra sections, make charter trips or perform any other special service, subject, however, to the limitations provided in section 1206 (a) and to such regulations as the Board may prescribe.

"TRANSPORTATION OF MAIL

"SEC. 1208. The consolidated carrier shall provide necessary and adequate facilities and service for the transportation of mail on the routes operated by it, and shall transport mail whenever required by the Postmaster General, as provided in section 405 of this act. The consolidated carrier shall be paid reasonable compensation for such transportation. Such payment shall be at the same rates provided for payment by the United States for similar trasportation to foreign air carriers in any international treaty, convention, or agreement to which the United States is a party. If no such rate shall be applicable, the Board shall fix and determine the fair and reasonable rates of such compensation in the manner provided in section 406 of this act, except that the Board shall not take into account the third of the rate-making elements set forth in said section 406 (b).

"CONSTRUCTION-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

"SEC. 1209. (a) The Board is authorized and directed to grant to the consolidated carrier a construction-differential subsidy and other financial assistance for the construction by manufacturers in the United States of flight equipment to be operated by the consolidated carrier in international air transportation, as hereinafter provided.

"(b) The consolidated carrier may submit to the Board at any time plans for the acquisition of new flight equipment with respect to which it desires a construction-differential subsidy or other financial assistance under this section, giving such detail as to types, numbers, characteristics, cost, and the like as the Board may require. The Board, with the advice of the Policy Committee and any other interested agencies, shall promptly review such plans and, to the extent that it determines them to be adapted to effectuating the purposes of this title, shall certify them as qualifying for the financial assistance provided in this section upon the terms and conditions provided in this section and such further terms and conditions as it shall prescribe in the public interest. In such certificate the Board shall estimate the prospective economic life of such flight equipment.

"(c) In the case of any flight equipment which the Board has certified as provided in subsection (b), the Board will (i) as a construction-differential subsidy, pay to the manufacturer, or, if the consolidated carrier shall have made payment directly to the manufacturer, will reimburse the consolidated carrier for, the excess of the cost of the flight equipment (excluding the cost of any features incorporated therein for national defense purposes, which shall be paid by the Board in addition to the construction-differential subsidy) over the fair and reasonable estimate of cost, as determined by the Board, of the construction of such flight equipment under similar plans and specifications (excluding national defense features as above provided) in foreign aircraft plants deemed by the Board to furnish a fair and representative example for the determination of the estimated foreign cost of construction of flight equipment having the same general characteristics; and (ii) if the consolidated carrier shall so request, will advance not in excess of 75 percent of the net cost of the flight equipment to the consolidated carrier, any such advance to be secured by mortgage upon the flight equipment and to be repayable in a number of equal semiannual installments fixed by the Board over the prospective economic life of the flight equipment as certified by the Board and the unpaid balance to bear interest at the rate of 3½ percent per annum.

"(d) No flight equipment for which a construction-differential subsidy has been received pursuant to this section shall be sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of by the consolidated carrier during the economic life of such equipment as certified by the Board unless the consolidated carrier shall repay to the Board that proportion of the said subsidy (plus the cost of national-defense features) which the remaining economic life of such flight equipment bears to the economic life certified by the Board, or on such other terms and conditions as the Board may prescribe in the public interest. To the extent that any flight equipment for which a construction-differential subsidy has been received pursuant to this section is used by the consolidated carrier otherwise than in international air transportation, the consolidated carrier will pay to the Board annually that proportion of the construction-differential subsidy divided by the economic life of the flight equipment as certified by the Board which the gross revenues derived by the consolidated carrier from operations conducted by such flight equipment in other than international air transportation bears to the entire gross revenues earned by the consolidated carrier with such flight equipment during such year.

"(e) If the consolidated carrier proposes to acquire new flight equipment to replace flight equipment which is deemed by it to be obsolete or inadequate for successful operation, the Board is authorized in its discretion to buy such replaced flight equipment at a fair and reasonable valuation which shall not exceed the cost thereof to the consolidated carrier plus the actual cost previously expended thereon for reconditioning and less reasonable and proper depreciation, and shall apply such purchase price to that portion of the construction cost of new flight equipment which is to be borne by the consolidated carrier. The Board may scrap flight equipment so acquired or sell it after appraisement and due advertisement and upon competitive sealed bids.

"OPERATING-DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDY

"SEC. 1210. (a) The consolidated carrier shall be entitled to receive from the Board an operating-differential subsidy as herein provided.

"(b) The Board, with the advice of the policy committee, shall from time to time determine which of the routes and services included within the service plan of the consolidated carrier are subject to competition

by foreign-flag air carriers of such a character as to require the payment of an operating-differential subsidy in order to effectuate the purposes and policy of this title. The Board shall establish appropriate means for segregating the operations on account of which such an operating-differential subsidy is to be paid from other operations conducted by the consolidated carrier.

"(c) The amount of the operating-differential subsidy shall equal the excess of the fair and reasonable cost of wages and subsistence of flight and ground personnel, materials, insurance, and any other items of expense in which the Board shall find and determine that the consolidated carrier is at a substantial disadvantage in competition with one or more foreign-flag air carriers which constitute substantial competitors of the consolidated carrier on a particular route or service.

"(d) The basis for the payment of the operating-differential subsidy shall be initially established within 30 days after the initial service plan of the consolidated carrier shall have become effective. Such subsidy shall be payable on the basis of a final accounting made as soon as practicable after the end of each year or other period fixed by the Board. The Board may provide for the payment from time to time during any such period of such amounts on account as it deems proper. The basis of payment initially established shall be subject to review and readjustment from time to time but not more frequently than once a year at the instance of the Board or of the consolidated carrier. If any such readjustment cannot be reached by mutual agreement, the Board, on its own motion or on the application of the consolidated carrier, shall, after a proper hearing, determine the facts and make such readjustment in the amount of such future payments as it may determine to be fair and reasonable and in the public interest. The Board's decision shall be based upon and governed by the changes which may have occurred since the last preceding determination with respect to the items theretofore considered and other relevant facts and shall be promulgated in a formal order which shall be accompanied by a report in writing in which the Board shall state its findings of fact.

"(e) No operating-differential subsidy shall be paid for the operation of flight equipment which the Board shall determine to be obsolete unless the Board finds that the failure to replace such flight equipment has been occasioned by causes beyond the control of the consolidated carrier or that such payment is otherwise in the public interest.

"(f) If at the end of any 10-year period the net profit of the consolidated carrier (without regard to capital gains and capital losses) after deduction of appropriate depreciation and amortization charges has averaged more than 10 percent per annum upon the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for the operations of the consolidated carrier, the consolidated carrier shall pay to the Board an amount equal to one-half of such profit in excess of 10 percent per annum: *Provided, however,* That the amount of profit so recaptured in respect of any period shall not in any case exceed the amount of the operating-differential subsidy payments made to the consolidated carrier for such period: *And provided further,* That if the effective date of the plan is prior to July 1 in any year the first computation under this subsection shall be for the period ending on the last day of December in the tenth year thereafter and if the effective date of the plan is on or after July 1 the first such computation shall be for the period ending on the last day of December in the eleventh year thereafter.

"(g) The consolidated carrier shall create and maintain a special reserve fund in such depository or depositories as the Board shall approve. If the profits of the consolidated carrier without regard to capital gains and capital losses in any year exceed 10 percent per annum upon the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for its services, the consolidated carrier shall deposit annually such excess profits in this reserve fund. From the special reserve fund the consolidated carrier may make the following disbursements and no others:

"(1) Reimbursement to its general funds for the amount by which its net income for any year without regard to capital gains and capital losses shall be less than 10 percent per annum upon its capital investment used in or useful for its services.

"(2) Payment of amounts due from the consolidated carrier to the Board as provided in subsection (f) hereof, but such reimbursement shall be deferred until the amount on deposit in the special reserve fund shall be sufficiently in excess of 5 percent of the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for its services so that payment of such reimbursement to the Board will not reduce the special reserve fund below a sum equal to such 5 percent.

"(3) If at the end of any year the amount in the special reserve fund shall exceed 10 percent of the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for its services and if the amount in the special reserve fund shall also exceed the sum of 5 percent of the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in or useful for its services and the amount that would be payable by the consolidated carrier to the Board pursuant to subsection (f) hereof if such payment were required to be made at such time, the consolidated carrier may withdraw part or all of such excess reserve and pay the sum so withdrawn into its general funds.

"The Board shall adopt and prescribe rules and regulations for the administration of the reserve funds contemplated by this subsection and shall include definitions of net income and the capital investment of the consolidated carrier used in and useful for the business: *Provided, however,* That in computing net income proper allowance shall be made for charges for depreciation and amortization and that in computing the capital investment used in or useful for the business there shall be included capital borrowed for terms exceeding 1 year and investments in and advances to associated companies as defined in section 1213 to such extent as the Board may determine that such investments or advances are in furtherance of the objectives of this title. The earnings of the consolidated carrier which are deposited in the special reserve fund as provided in this section, except earnings withdrawn from the special reserve fund, shall be exempt from all Federal taxes. Earnings withdrawn from such special reserve fund shall be taxable as if earned during the year of withdrawal from such fund.

"NATIONAL INTEREST AND OTHER SPECIAL SERVICES

"SEC. 1211. (a) If the Board, pursuant to section 1207 (d), shall require the consolidated carrier to establish routes or services (unless such route or service was agreed to be established as provided in sec. 1203 (b) (9)), or if the Board shall refuse to permit the suspension or abandonment of a route or service as requested by the consolidated carrier (unless such route or service was agreed to be maintained as provided in sec. 1203 (b) (9)), the consolidated carrier may advise the Board that, in its opinion, the route or service, the establishment of which has been required or the suspension or abandonment of which has been forbidden by the Board, will not, after taking into account amounts receivable by way of operating-differential subsidy as provided in section 1210, provide a reasonable return (computed on an additional cost basis upon the additional investment required for the operation of such routes or services), and shall furnish the Board with all pertinent facts. If the Board shall nevertheless require the said route or service to be operated, the Board shall establish the additional amount to be paid to the consolidated carrier as fair compensation for such operation and shall, to such extent as it deems appropriate, make grants to the consolidated carrier for capital investment in ground facilities outside the continental United States required for such operation: *Provided, however,* That in any case where such a grant is made appropriate steps shall be taken that the property obtained therewith shall be used generally for the benefit of the United States and that no such property shall be deemed a part of the capital investment of the consolidated carrier.

"(b) The Board may from time to time enter into contracts with the consolidated carrier for the operation of particular routes and services primarily noncommercial in character, for the construction, maintenance, or operation of airports, air navigation, communications and other ground facilities outside the continental United States and for such other purposes as the Board, with the approval of the Policy Committee, may deem to be in furtherance of the objectives of this title, upon such terms and conditions as the Board may determine.

"SUBSIDY TO MEET GOVERNMENTAL AID PAID TO FOREIGN COMPETITORS

"SEC. 1212. If in the case of any particular route or service the Board shall find that the governmental aid provided for in this title is in any respect inadequate to offset the effect of governmental aid paid to foreign-flag competitors, it may grant such additional aid as it determines to be necessary for that purpose: *Provided,* That no such additional aid shall be granted except upon an affirmative vote of four of the members of the Board.

"ASSOCIATED COMPANIES

"SEC. 1213. The consolidated carrier shall continue to hold all securities of aeronautical enterprises organized under the laws of foreign countries which it may acquire pursuant to the plan of consolidation, except as the disposition of such securities may be approved from time to time by the Board, with the advice of the Policy Committee. The consolidated carrier may from time to time, with the approval of the Board, to be granted with the advice of the Policy Committee, make additional investments in the securities of such aeronautical enterprises.

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 1214. The Board shall include in its annual report to Congress a detailed statement of all transactions with the consolidated carrier under the provisions of sections 1209, 1210, 1211, and 1212.

"CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

"SEC. 1215. In addition to amounts payable by way of construction-differential and operating-differential subsidies pursuant to sections 1209 and 1210, which shall be paid out of sums to be appropriated therefor, the Board is granted authorization to enter into contracts or to make grants as provided in sections 1211 and 1212, in an amount not to exceed $25,000,000, which shall also be paid out of sums to be appropriated therefor.

"EXEMPTION OF CONSOLIDATED CARRIER FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF TITLE IV AND MODIFICATION OF CERTAIN OF SUCH PROVISIONS

"SEC. 1216. (a) The consolidated carrier is exempted from section 401 of this act except subdivisions (l) and (m) thereof, subject to the limitations provided in section 1206 (a), with respect to any routes

or services specified in a statement of service plan filed with and permitted to become effective by the Board or required by the Board pursuant to section 1207 of this act; from section 408 of this act with respect to any transaction approved by the Board pursuant to section 1213 of this act; and from section 409 of this act insofar as concerns any interlocking relationship between the consolidated carrier and any carrier which shall have acquired carrier shares as provided in clause (6) of subsection (b) of section 1201 of this act or which shall have acquired stock of the consolidated carrier pursuant to the plan of consolidation.

"(b) All certificates of public convenience and necessity issued to international air carriers and all certificates of convenience and necessity issued to domestic air carriers insofar as the same authorize international air transportation shall be canceled upon the effective date of the plan of consolidation.

"(c) If the Postmaster General shall find at any time that the needs of the postal service require the transportation of mail by aircraft between the United States and foreign countries in addition to the transportation of mail being effected by the consolidated carrier at the time, the Postmaster General, in lieu of proceeding under section 401 (n) of this act, shall certify such finding to the Board which, if it concurs therein, shall thereupon take action pursuant to section 1207 (d) of this act.

"(d) From and after the enactment of this section and pending the effective date of the plan of consolidation, no certificate of public convenience and necessity to engage in international air transportation shall be issued except to an international air carrier, and from and after the effective date of the said plan no such certificates shall be issued.

"(e) Section 408 of this act is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"'ACQUISITION OF INTERESTS IN FOREIGN AERONAUTICAL ENTERPRISES

"'(f) It shall be unlawful for any domestic air carrier as defined in section 1201 (2) of this act or any person controlling such an air carrier or any other common carrier to purchase, lease, contract to operate the properties or any substantial part thereof, or acquire control in any manner whatsoever, of any foreign air carrier or any person engaged in any phase of aeronautics otherwise than as an air carrier in any foreign country.'

"Subsection (e) of section 408 is modified by striking out in the first sentence the words 'subsection (a)' and inserting in place thereof the words 'subsections (a) and (f).'

"(f) Agreements made on behalf of the consolidated carrier in the plan of consolidation as provided in section 1203 (b) shall have the same force and effect as orders made by the Board pursuant to title IV of this act and violation of any such agreement shall be subject to the sanctions and penalties prescribed in titles IX and X in respect of the violation of any such order."

The statement by Mr. McCARRAN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAT M'CARRAN

Mr. President, I am today reintroducing my bill to provide for the creation of the all-American-flag line as a single instrument to carry the flag of the United States, throughout the world, in the field of international air transportation.

In reintroducing this bill, I am not unmindful of recent developments which have indicated a substantial change in attitude by certain persons, and by certain interests, with regard to the principle involved in this bill.

More than 4 years ago, when I introduced my first all-American-flag-line bill, I made the statement that what I then proposed was the only workable solution to the problems which the United States then faced and would face in meeting the competition of the chosen instruments of other nations in the field of international air transportation. Further, I made the prediction that whether the United States adopted the single-company principle for its overseas commercial aviation as the result of congressional enactment, or in some other manner, this principle was certain to be adopted ultimately, because the hard realities of the situation would require it.

Every major event in the field of global air transportation, since I made that statement, has helped to prove the truth of it; and one does not now have to look very far ahead on the horizon to see that my prediction, also, is soon to come true.

Merger of Pan-American Airways and American Overseas Air Lines is a very long step toward a single company. In fact, I think this merger, if approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board, will make the accomplishment of a single company, either by further merger or by attrition, a virtual certainty within a relatively short period.

While I naturally welcome any developments which show the correctness of my views, I think it is important that the single company which seems about to come into being will not be precisely the same kind of single company that I have envisioned from the beginning, or which is provided for in the bill which I am about to reintroduce. My conception of a single company is an organization in which every transportation interest in America will have representation and monetary interest, in which the public at large will have a substantial interest, and which will be fully backed by all the resources and powers of the Federal Government, in realistic recognition of its importance as an instrument of national policy, national commerce, and even national diplomacy.

The word "monopoly" has many undesirable connotations. I have always been anxious that the single company which would ultimately carry the American flag in the airways of the world would be able to escape the application of that word in all its offensive connotations.

I have been consistent about this matter from the beginning. Though my bill has been rewritten several times, its objectives and basic principles have remained unchanged. When others have wavered in their position with regard to this proposal, tolerating it one day, supporting it the next, and disowning it a little later, I have never changed my course.

Our choice today—that is, our choice for the immediate future—is not between having a single instrument, and having several competing companies, but only between having a single instrument which is a creature of Congress, set up under law and joining all the transportation agencies of the country in a bond of common interest, or having a single company which is entirely the result of business maneuvers and established not as a matter of national policy and as an instrument of national policy, but as a matter of commercial expediency and an instrument of private gain.

That is our choice; and it is to provide an instrument and a forum for intelligently considering and wisely making that choice that I am reintroducing my all-American-flag-line bill.

## BUILDING OF ACCESS ROADS IN FEDERAL FORESTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution providing for an appropriation of $30,000,000 for the building of access roads in the Federal forests of the United States. I desire to comment briefly on the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on this subject I wish to say that if we are to adopt a program of sustained yield, as the President recommended in his state of the Union message, if we are to make salable thousands of acres of presently federally owned timber, much of which is overripe, then we must afford access to the timber. If we wish to think about protecting the people's pocketbook, if we desire to adopt a program of sound economy in this Congress, this is one little item which will help to eliminate waste. At the present time there is great waste in the harvesting of the Nation's forests. Such waste takes the form in one particular of unavailability and inaccessibility of federally owned timber to those Government agencies which have control over it.

I recognize that there is some cause for believing that certain timber interests are opposed to an access road program, because, without the building of the roads—and they cannot be built unless the Congress of the United States appropriates the money—they find themselves in a preferred competitive position over small timber owners. I am advised by Government officials who have some jurisdiction over federally owned timber that it would be feasible for them, it certainly would be highly economical, to work out timber trade and timber contracts with small operators if the Government built access roads into Government timber so that such contracts could be consummated.

I have fought for this proposal heretofore. So far as economy is concerned, so far as need for a sound, sustained yield program is concerned, the evidence is all on my side. So far as opposition from large timber interests is concerned, interests which are seeking to prevent the passage of this type of legislation, I am perfectly willing always to meet them on the issue.

Therefore I am introducing this joint resolution again in this session of Congress. I respectfully urge an early hearing and an opportunity to present the economic data which, in my judgment, clearly support the measure.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 24) to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK

Mr. CAIN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

Whereas there is a need to conserve the scenic and the natural and historical objects and the wildlife within areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations, and a need for the preservation for public enjoyment of the Nation's

greatest natural spectacles make it imperative that they be reserved for posterity; and

Whereas the inclusion of areas within national parks, monuments, and reservations is necessary to carry out the afore-mentioned objectives even though the inclusion of such lands within such areas may cause hardships on the communities, industries, and individuals dependent on such areas for their economic development; and

Whereas an unlimited extension of this otherwise sound policy leads to an improper balance between the preservation aims of the Park Service of the Department of the Interior and the needs for a sound program for the conservation of natural resources; and

Whereas our natural resources have been depleted by the demands of World War II and will for some years to come be overtaxed by the unfilled needs of our domestic economy, the requirements of national defense, and the European recovery program; and

Whereas there is a need for the highest degree of utilization of our natural resources under a sound conservation plan which will foster sustained production rather than nonproductive holding of our natural resources in order to satisfy the social and economic needs of our people, to strengthen the Nation against the ravages of discontent, to combat inflation, to fulfill our commitments for the European recovery program, and to prepare for any eventualities that may arise due to world unrest; and

Whereas the Congress by act of June 29, 1938 (52 Stat. 1241), creating the Olympic National Park, determined that in light of the domestic needs existing at that time that the Olympic National Park area could be extended to include a total area not exceeding 898,292 acres, but because of the demands caused by World War II and the needs of our domestic economy circumstances have so changed as to necessitate the review by the Congress of the acreage contained in the Olympic National Park; and

Whereas there are lands included within the Olympic National Park which are submarginal recreational areas and not suitable for park purposes; and

Whereas the national interest, as well as the communities of the Olympic Peninsula and particularly the Grays Harbor area and Port Angeles, require the sustained production and conservation through utilization and renewal of the forest resources of the Olympic Peninsula in order to provide an annual long-range supply of timber, such as will result from the operations of a sustained-yield program, for the production of products of the forest necessary for the national defense and the national housing program; and

Whereas a sound forest conservation program requires the transfer from the Park Service of the Department of the Interior to the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture of those areas which are not particularly suitable for recreational or park purposes but would be highly beneficial in the maintenance and furtherance of a sound sustained-yield program by the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of the act of Congress of March 29, 1944 (58 Stat. 132); and

Whereas certain lands within the park can be transferred to the Forest Service without impairing the program established for the purpose of conserving the scenery and the natural and historical objects and the wildlife within said park: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on the Olympic National Park (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"), and to be composed of (a) four Members of the Senate, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to be appointed by the Vice President; and (b) four Members of the House of Representatives, two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Agriculture, and two of whom shall be members of the Committee on Public Lands, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. The committee, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, shall conduct a thorough study and investigation as to the lands included within the Olympic National Park, including but not limited to—

(a) the extent to which such lands are adaptable for park purposes;

(b) the extent, if any, to which such lands are not necessary to effectuate the program of the National Park Service;

(c) the extent, if any, to which such lands as found unnecessary for park service can be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture for administration by the Forest Service for operation in connection with conservation through utilization programs proposed by the Forest Service for that particular area;

(d) the establishment of a permanent boundary line for the Olympic National Park and a need for the establishment of highways, trails, and other accommodations both within the area under the control of the Park Service and the area under the control of the Forest Service in order to provide the greatest utilization of the two areas for the enjoyment of the American people and for sound and economic forest management; and

(e) such other problems and subjects relating to the Federal control and management of park lands and forest lands within the Olympic Peninsula as the committee deems appropriate.

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than December 30, 1949, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 4. The committee is authorized to call on the Director of the Park Service, Department of the Interior, and Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, to make available to the committee such technical services, information, and facilities as the committee shall require and may request the governments of the several States, representatives of business, industry, finance, and labor, and such other persons, agencies, organizations, and instrumentalities as it deems appropriate to attend its hearings, to give and present information, advice, and recommendations.

SEC. 5. The committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to have such printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services in reporting such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them.

SEC. 6. The expenses of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, incurred by the Joint Committee on the Olympic National Park, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $25,000, including expenditures for the employment of experts, assistants, and other employees, and all expenses necessary for travel and subsistence incurred by members and employees while engaged in the activities of the committee thereof, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman of the committee. Disbursements shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

## INVESTIGATION OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. KILGORE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 23), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas there has developed much doubt and confusion concerning the application of the laws relating to the registration and reporting of lobbyists; and

Whereas there is widespread public belief that lobbying activities are being carried on by persons not making reports thereof as prescribed by law, in some instances because they do not believe the law applies to them and their activities; and

Whereas Members of the Congress and citizens petitioning their Congress in behalf of measures are not able to ascertain through the disclosures now being made under the law the affiliations of many of those persons who are lobbying; and

Whereas it is desirable in strengthening the democratic process to have complete identification of all individuals and organizations lobbying before the Congress, the nature, sources, and amounts of their support; and

Whereas there is every evidence of general public support for enactment of legislation to strengthen the Lobbying Registration Act of 1946: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the United States does hereby authorize the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete investigation of all lobbying activities, and all efforts to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation, directly or indirectly.

The Committee on the Judiciary shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the result of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems necessary to remedy any undesirable conditions that may exist under the present lobbying registration law.

For the purpose of this resolution, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions and recesses of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such paid assistants as required, to require by subpena, or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of the stenographic service to report such hearings shall not exceed 25 cents per 100 words. There is hereby authorized from the contingent fund of the Congress the sum of _____ to defray the costs of the committee, to be paid upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

## FREEDOM HOUSE AWARD FOR 1948—ACCEPTANCE SPEECH BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator VANDENBERG accepting the

Freedom House Award for 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THINGS TO BE THOUGHTFUL ABOUT IN THE PRESENT WORLD SITUATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Things To Be Thoughtful About in the Present World Situation," delivered by him on December 8, 1948, at the Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif., under the auspices of the Institute of World Affairs of the University of Southern California, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPLY BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH TO NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL OF OCTOBER 3, 1948

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a reply made by him to a New York Times editorial of October 3, 1948, relating to the support by the New York Times of Mr. Dewey, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRUCTURE OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Structure of Peace," delivered by him on October 3, 1948, at Provo, Utah, under the auspices of the Brigham Young University Women's Auxiliary Organization, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S DOMESTIC PROBLEMS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on domestic problems delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine at the National Women's Press dinner in Washington, D. C., on January 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLITICAL STABILIZATION IN CHINA—ADDRESS BY STANLEY K. HORNBECK

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Political Stabilization in China—United States Interest In," delivered by Stanley K. Hornbeck at the meeting of the American Political Science Association in Chicago on December 28, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ZIONIST MEMORANDUM ON BRITISH ROLE IN WAR AGAINST ISRAEL

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Zionist memorandum on the British role in the war against Israel, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN HUNGARY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement sent by him to Milwaukeeans of Hungarian extraction in regard to religious persecution in Hungary and a telegram received by him from two clergymen relating to the same subject, which appear in the Appendix.]

DECISION OF SUPREME COURT ON CLOSED SHOPS—EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "States Can Ban Closed Shops," published in the Milwaukee Journal of January 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BERLIN AIR LIFT—ADDRESS BY HON. EUGENE M. ZUCKERT

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the relief of Berlin by the United States Air Force delivered by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, before the Commonwealth Club at San Francisco, Calif., on December 10, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEW YEAR'S MESSAGE BY REV. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, D. D.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Guidance—And Your Level Best," written by Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., former Chaplain of the Senate, and published in the Washington Star of January 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FREE PRESS ASKS NO SUBSIDY—EDITORIAL FROM THE WORCESTER (MASS.) SUNDAY TELEGRAM

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Our Free Press Asks No Subsidy," published in the Worcester (Mass.) Sunday Telegram of December 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD several editorials regarding the bipartisan foreign policy and the effect on it of the change in the ratio on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, which appear in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON SPY CASE—EDITORIAL FROM SALT LAKE TRIBUNE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Washington Spy Case May Tax Imagination, but It Happened, and Can Happen Again," published in a recent issue of the Salt Lake Tribune, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SEATTLE AIR TRAGEDY

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed by Lawrence M. Arnold to Joseph J. O'Connell, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, under date of January 6, 1949, an editorial from the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer of January 5, 1949, and a news column from the Seattle (Wash.) Times of January 5, 1949, relating to the Seattle air tragedy on January 2, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DONNELLY, OF MISSOURI, BEFORE MISSOURI RIVER STATES COMMITTEE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks a copy of a speech which was made at a recent meeting of the Missouri River States Committee by the Democratic Governor of Missouri, Hon. Phil M. Donnelly, who is the outgoing chairman of that very important committee. He is succeeded for the current year by the Republican Governor of Nebraska, the Honorable Val Peterson.

The Missouri River States Committee is a very important organization. It was provided for by the law passed in 1944 by Congress, and it is doing a very splendid job. I think the speech that was made on the occasion in question by the Honorable Phil M. Donnelly should be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I want to thank Governor Peterson for his invitation to address this group. I have enjoyed my work with the Missouri River States Committee and with the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee. As you know, under the Missouri constitution a Governor may serve 4 years but cannot succeed himself. My term of office will expire on next January 10, so this is the last meeting I will attend.

For a few minutes I want to look back over the past 4 years in an attempt to recount some of the progress made by these committees and use this as a background for a picture of the future.

For your information, the Missouri River States Committee is composed of the Governors of the 10 Missouri River States, together with two additional representatives from each State. This group was organized to promote closer cooperative action among the States of the Missouri Valley and to represent the interests of those States. It has done all this and more. It has promoted a better understanding of the multiplicity of problems throughout the basin and made us all cognizant of the necessity for cooperation.

The Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee is composed of five governors selected by the Missouri River States Committee and five Federal representatives from the Departments of the Army, Agriculture, Interior, Commerce, and the Federal Power Commission.

This group was organized initially to coordinate the work of the various Federal agencies. It has done this and a great deal more. It has succeeded in establishing a close working relation between Federal agencies in the Missouri Basin; perhaps closer than anywhere else in the country. It has established close working relations between the various States and between State agencies and Federal agencies. It has solved some of the most intricate and difficult problems of State-Federal relationship. It has programed the Missouri River Basin development, not only for this year and next year but for the next 6 years, thus providing for orderly and efficient progress in the future. All these things have been done under existing principles of law without additional legislation. That is why I am proud to be a member of such a group.

Although construction of many important projects has been started in the Missouri Basin during the last 4 years, I would say that the greatest progress has been the increase in our breadth of vision.

In the fall of 1944 the President signed Public Law 534 and the Pick-Sloan plan became law.

With the Pick-Sloan plan as a nucleus we have been able to formulate a plan of development for the Missouri Basin which may truly be called comprehensive. The plan includes flood control, drainage, irrigation, hydroelectric power, soil conservation, improved land use, forestry, recreation, fish and wildlife, industrial expansion, public health, and many other conservation and developmental measures. Although much of this is in the planning stage considerable progress has been made in carrying out the initial phases of the plan. I believe that a large part of the credit for the comprehensive plan of development for the Missouri Basin and for the progress made during the past 4 years should go to the Missouri River States Committee and to the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee.

The Missouri River Basin is a region of vast area and enormous resources. Let us look back into history for just a moment. The United States made the Louisiana Purchase in 1803. The population of the United States at that time was approximately 4,000,000 people, the same as in the State of Missouri according to the 1940 Federal census. The Louisiana Purchase comprised 827,987 square miles of territory, 529,000 of which are located within the Missouri River Basin. You can readily see how important that purchase was, is now, and always will be to our country. The total cost of the Louisiana Purchase was around $27,000,000. We have before us a developmental program

which calls for an expenditure of something over 100 times the total of that cost to be spent in developing navigation and flood control, irrigation and reclamation, soil conservation, and land improvement in order that we may enjoy the resources of that purchase. We have the opportunity of enhancing its value to our future citizens where it may again become worth many times the original cost and what we may spend on it. The job we have undertaken will require many years to accomplish completely, and, in fact, the improvement of the valley and the use of its resources will never end, so long as man resides therein and uses it for producing his daily needs.

The development of those resources presents a multiplicity of problems. For instance, Nebraska is the only State of the 10 States that lies wholly within the basin that has no means of ingress or egress without crossing over the borders of some of the other States. Anyone in the other nine States can get out of the basin by crossing the divide within the borders of the particular State in which he may reside.

Nebraska is about centrally located in the basin and contains a good cross section of the resources and problems of the basin. In the upper part of the basin one of the major problems is a deficiency in rainfall. Floods are relatively unimportant. In the lower part of the basin the major problem is excessive rainfall at times. Our problem in the lower basin is to protect ourselves from this damaging excess of water and to control it in such a way as to make use of it rather than to allow it to destroy our economy. We in the lower basin do not as yet find it practicable to use this excess water for irrigation. There is the problem of soil erosion almost throughout the basin. There is a shortage of power in every part of the basin. All of these problems and many others exist right here in your own State of Nebraska. All of these problems and many more are in the process of being solved by the Missouri River development program. In the northern and western part of your State you have the problems common to the upper part of the basin. You need to irrigate thousands of acres of land to increase your agricultural production and stabilize your economy. You have hydroelectric power resources to be developed. In the southern and eastern part of your State you have the problems common to the lower part of the basin. You are chiefly concerned with the loss of your soil and with the tremendous losses caused by floodwater.

Over half of my own State of Missouri lies in the Missouri River Basin. In this area one of our primary concerns is the alarming rate at which we are losing our soil. This is a severe loss to us in several ways. The economy of this area is largely agricultural and always will be. About 68 percent of all raw materials for manufacturing in the area comes from the farm. We cannot continue to lose our valuable soil at the present rate and maintain the economy of this region, to say nothing of improving it.

Records show that for a certain county in northwest Missouri the average corn yield 50 years ago was 30 bushels per acre. The average corn yield for this same county at the present time is still 30 bushels per acre. Experts tell us that due to improved seeds and farming techniques in the last 50 years the average yield should be 60 bushels per acre. The reason it is not this high is because the soil has lost about half of its original productivity. In other words, scientific improvements in seed selection and plant breeding together with improvements in farming technique during the past 50 years have barely kept up with the loss in soil productivity.

In addition to the loss in fertility of our uplands due to erosion, we have further damaging effects from silt. It increases maintenance costs and shortens the effective life of drainage and flood-control structures. It is damaging to improvements on our alluvial land. It sometimes decreases the fertility of our alluvial land.

Another important problem in the Missouri portion of the basin is the destructiveness of excess flood water. This was forcibly brought to our attention during the spring of 1947 when the Missouri River and its major tributaries caused a flood damage of about $60,000,000 in the State of Missouri alone. At one time the flood problem at Kansas City was considered to be one of the most critical in the country. I am happy to say that works completed within the past 2 years and work now under way and soon to be started by the Corps of Engineers have this problem pretty well in hand. Work now under way on agricultural levees and other work in the advanced planning stages will protect thousands of acres of our agricultural land from the ravages of floodwater. The huge reservoirs now under construction on the main stem of the Missouri River in the Dakotas will also give us important relief in this respect.

In the beginning we in Missouri were not in complete agreement with the original Pick-Sloan plan, as authorized in the 1944 Flood Control Act. We felt that certain changes and adjustments in the plan were necessary and that it offered little as a solution to some of our most pressing problems. It was particularly devoid of any remedy for our soil erosion and land-use problems. It called for tremendous sacrifices of land for reservoirs on our tributary streams without adequate benefit to offset these sacrifices.

However, through our relationship with the Missouri Basin interagency committee we were able to get a reconsideration of the plan for our State. During the past 2 years we have been engaged in cooperative State-Federal studies and have found the solution to some of our most difficult problems. These studies are continuing and we are confident that a satisfactory plan will eventually be worked out. Our procedure is to study each tributary stream basin individually and attempt to arrive at the best plan of land and water resource development for that particular basin, while at the same time giving due consideration to the over-all Missouri Basin development. All State agencies having responsibilities and interests in land and water resource development are cooperating in these studies. Likewise such Federal agencies as the Corps of Engineers, Soil Conservation Service, Federal Power Commission, Fish and Wildlife Service, Public Health Service, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and others are participating. Regardless of the problem that arises, I believe we have the best available technical skill to solve it, either at the State or Federal level, or both.

I want to stress the fact that the task of developing the Missouri River Basin can best be solved by cooperative effort on the part of the States located in the basin and the United States Government. If the people living within the basin do not put forth an honest effort to secure the best advantages for all, the United States Government can do little effectively and economically to secure the benefits desired. The 10 States concerned the most under this development do not have the resources by which they can do the things necessary in an effective way and in a way that will conserve the resources located within the basin.

I want to impress upon you that the States themselves cannot do the job in such manner as to conserve those resources. For example, in the State of Missouri, and I know it is true in the other States, we have been using the land for agricultural purposes in a most wasteful way. If we could have foreseen years ago what has been and is happening to our farm lands that wastes the soil and seriously reduces the productivity of that land, we would have taken steps to conserve it for future generations.

It is a difficult task for the people who are making their living from the soil to become financially able to do the things necessary to conserve the soil and retain its fertility. Likewise, those who are tilling the soil do not have the opportunity through their own efforts to gain the knowledge that is required for them to know how best to conserve the land for continuous use, so it necessarily becomes the problem of all of us through our governments to assist in the problem of determining how best to use our lands in order that we may live and that future generations may also have the same or similar uses of that land which we enjoy.

We sometimes hear objections to the granting by Congress of Federal funds for developing resources that are at times looked upon as being for local interests. Such objections should take into consideration all the benefits as well as the objectionable features.

The Missouri River States Committee and the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee are concerned in the over-all problem of the basin. We have held our conferences and have worked on the principle that what is good for us collectively is good for us individually. We have demonstrated we can cooperate 100 percent in our efforts to bring about the development of the resources of the basin. The physical structures needed are being brought into existence and the problems of conserving our natural resources are being solved.

I would not leave you with the impression that all this progress has been easy or that there is not a big job ahead. There have been differences and conflicting interests. There will continue to be. This would be disheartening if it were not for the fact that we have in existence two well-organized bodies to solve these differences. I refer to the Missouri River States Committee and the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee. These two groups always have been and I am confident always will be free from domination by any special interest. The public interest in the work of these two groups requires this must be so. Likewise these groups must remain free from domination by any State or Federal agency within their membership. Only in this way can they hope to continue to function properly in a democratic manner and for the public good.

One of the greatest dangers I can see for this great development program is that it could become overloaded with unsound accessories. In any large program of this kind there is always a temptation to throw in items here and there which may have nothing whatever to do with the main objectives of the program or which may be economically unsound. Too much of this can hurt the program as a whole and possibly destroy it altogether. I urge the members of the committees to analyze thoroughly proposed measures before placing them into the program.

I cannot urge too strongly active participation by the States in this development program. The people of the basin will never receive the full benefit from the program without the help of the States involved. I believe the States of the basin recognize this and will continue to fulfill their obligations in that respect. We see enormous dams and other engineering structures under construction. We are inclined to point to these structures with pride as evidence of the progress we are making. We are wholly justified in doing this.

But we must also recognize these structures for what they are—a means of improving the economic and social status of the Missouri Basin and of the entire Nation. These structures will help us to increase the supply of food and fiber for the Nation; they will light the homes of the Missouri Valley; they will help to do the work of the

overburdened farmer; they will save the homes and property of the valley from destructive floods; they will provide an incentive for new industries to spring up.

But to do all this they must first be properly planned, then properly constructed, and finally, properly used so that their full potentialities are made available for public benefit. State governments can and should be of great assistance in helping to see that all this is done.

By widespread use of soil conservation and improved land-use measures, we can greatly increase the agricultural production of the basin. We can at the same time reduce the damage from silt. Above all, we can conserve one of our most fundamental natural resources for those who come after us.

To do this job properly, we need the cooperation of every citizen in the basin. There is a tremendous educational task involved. Here again the States can and should render valuable assistance. This by no means exhausts the list of responsibilities which the States have in connection with the Missouri River Basin development program.

Before the job will have been completed, many of us now carrying on the work will cease to be actively connected with it and others will take over. Because of that, it requires continuous effort to transmit what we have learned to those who follow and to encourage all concerned to cooperate in order that we may receive the greatest development possible for the money that is to be spent in carrying out the work.

I should not fail to say that the work we can do in controlling the Missouri River to reduce the destructive effects of the floods within its basin, will also aid in protecting farmers and cities in the lowlands below the mouth of the river in the States that border the Mississippi extending to the Gulf of Mexico. So it is difficult to measure all the benefits that may come to the Nation from what we are engaged in doing.

I might say it would be very difficult to find an organization, made up of the two committees in the field actively carrying on this work, that would perform their task with as little dissension and with more honest effort than is being put forth by those connected with the Missouri River Basin development as being carried out under the Pick-Sloan plan.

In my work as a member of the Inter-Agency Committee I have traveled throughout the Missouri Basin. I have never failed to find enthusiastic support for the Missouri Basin development program. That has made possible the progress to date. Such support will assure continued progress. Such support indicates to me that the people of the valley are fully aware of the significance of this development and are willing to assume their share of the responsibility.

In concluding I want to say that I have thoroughly enjoyed working with my fellow governors and with the Federal representatives on these two committees. I am proud of any contribution I may have made to the Missouri Basin development program. Good progress has been made but we are only started. Much remains to be done. With continued cooperation between the people, the States, and the Federal Government, the program should not fail.

## RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION—BARRING OF RETURN TO GERMANY OF CERTAIN NUNS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement prepared by me dealing with a serious situation which should be the subject of inquiry by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR

Shocking revelations have come to us which indicate that we have not yet attained the objectives for which our people fought in the recent World War. That terrible conflict with its cost of lives and resources was waged primarily to save men everywhere from the degradation of slavery—slavery of the mind as well as of the body.

Today, unfortunately, in the midst of our continuing struggle for peace, there are disquieting evidences of such control of men's minds throughout the world which demand our vigorous protests if the world is not to lose completely the benefits of that recent costly struggle.

Yesterday news dispatches from Munich reported the barring, evidently by Communist officials, of a group of German nuns who had been teaching in Rumania from returning to their German homes. I believe that this action is of such grave concern as to warrant the investigation and study of the Foreign Relations Committee of this distinguished body.

America has furthered the doctrine of tolerance and of freedom of thought. Our country has been the leading exponent of this doctrine with regard both to our own citizens and to visitors from other lands. Continuingly, however, as in this case, we find concrete evidence that Moscow and the countries within the Russian orbit are not granting to their own subjects, or to others under their domination, that freedom of thought and mind which is so necessary to world understanding.

Again and again we have been given assurance from the Kremlin that freedom of thought and of conscience is permitted throughout Russia and throughout its allied countries. Again and again, however, their actions have belied their words.

The extraordinary vigor of the protest lodged with the Hungarian Government very recently by our Acting Secretary of State in connection with the arrest of Cardinal Mindszenty, Catholic primate of that country, brings into focus the very disturbing policies of the countries behind the iron curtain with respect to all those freedoms which we in America hold dear, and which must be fostered throughout the world if ever a true peace is to be had.

In this particular instance of the application of Communist policy a group of 40 nuns, who had been teaching for several decades in Rumania, were returning to their home in Germany, following efforts in their behalf by the American military government religious affairs officer and the Catholic archbishop of Munich. On their arrival at Salzburg they were warned by officials of an unidentified country not to return to Germany. If they did, they were told, none of their compatriots still remaining in Rumania would be permitted to leave.

Mr. James Eagan, United States military government religious affairs officer in Bavaria, did not identify the offending country. Nevertheless it is well known that both Russia and Rumania maintain liaison officers in Salzburg, and the inference is unmistakable.

Because America is responsible for a portion of Germany under occupation agreements, this recent action might be interpreted as the fault of our representatives in the American zone. We should disavow any such refusal to permit these nuns or any other religious groups from returning to their homeland. We should question further and protest vigorously against the action of any other nation in refusing freedom of conscience and of worship. Most important of all, we should protest to the world against the action of a tyrannical government which has embarked upon a course of oppression and persecution in order to accomplish an impossible task, namely, of wiping out religious beliefs from the hearts and souls of human beings.

I respectfully suggest that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee investigate this serious situation and report upon its findings for the information of the United States Senate and of the entire Nation.

## THE BUDGET

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which the Chief Clerk proceeded to read.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is a very lengthy message. I think the letter of transmittal comprises approximately 80 pages. I suggest that the further reading be dispensed with, and that the entire message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the message, with the accompanying budget, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For letter of transmittal, see pp. 134–153 of House proceedings of today.)

## LABOR LAW STRIKE-DELAYING MACHINERY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there appears in the Washington Post of this morning an article which reads in part as follows:

Cyrus S. Ching found fault yesterday with the elaborate strike-stalling machinery of the Taft-Hartley Act in national emergencies. He said important features of it delay agreements.

The Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service also said in a report to Congress that Government mediators must remain impartial to be effective in settling labor disputes.

But Ching refrained from stating any stand in the current controversy over whether his agency should remain independent or, as asked by Secretary of Labor Maurice Tobin, return to the Labor Department as it was prior to the Taft-Hartley Act.

READY TO RECOMMEND

However, Ching strongly insisted that Government mediators are at maximum usefulness only as long as they remain neutral as between labor and management. He said he was ready to make legislative recommendations when requested.

As a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I certainly shall call upon Mr. Ching to make recommendations at the earliest possible date, as soon as we can have a meeting of that committee. I say that because I know of no one in all America—and I make this statement in the utmost sincerity—whose views as to impartial processes in the field of labor relations I would rather have than those of the present Director of the Mediation and Conciliation Service. I served with him for 2 years on the War Labor Board when he sat there as a representative of industry. Although he was a very able representative of industry in seeing to it that the legitimate rights of industry were at all times considered by the Board, he was more than a representative of industry. In my judgment he fully filled the quasi-judicial position which was his

during the war as a member of that Board. So, I am satisfied that when he makes recommendations to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we shall have the recommendations, first, of a public servant who understands how to be impartial on great controversial issues.

The article continues to quote Mr. Ching, as follows:

It is essential to the effective performance of the mediator's duty, Ching advised Congress, that his institutional and personal relationships be such that neither side will have its suspicions aroused, however unjustly, that he is answerable to another with a suspected partisan stake in the dispute.

I digress further, Mr. President, to say that I am completely in agreement with that observation by Cyrus Ching; and therefore I shall assume, until he recommends to the contrary, if he should, that it would be rather difficult to make a case for a return of the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor. I happen to hold to the view that the Conciliation Service should be neither a part of the Department of Labor nor a part of the Department of Commerce; and it is just as sensible to make it a part of the Department of Commerce as it is to make it a part of the Department of Labor, inasmuch as the Conciliation Service is now an independent agency. It is true that housekeeping work is done for it in the Department of Labor; but certainly where we need to keep it is in a position of unquestioned impartiality, beyond suspicion either on the part of the general public or on the part of industry, in this case. Returning the Conciliation Service to the Department of Labor would, in my judgment, once more subject it to the charge of being biased. Such a charge would greatly weaken the effectiveness of the Service, even if bias did not, in fact, exist. I think great progress has been made in the effort to have the employers give full recognition to the service the Mediation and Conciliation Service can perform for them in bringing them together with the leaders of labor around a free collective-bargaining table.

Although Mr. Ching in his report does not make a definite commitment in regard to where the Service should be located, I take it for granted that his advice that the conciliators should always be answerable to both parties to a dispute, and that neither side should be in a position of even suspecting the impartiality of a conciliator, leaves no room for doubt as to where he will finally have to take his position in answer to specific questions which I intend to ask him when he comes before our committee.

The article continues:

The Mediation Service's report on its experience under several Taft-Hartley provisions included these observations:

1. The 80-day court injunctions in national emergency disputes have tended to delay rather than facilitate settlement, because both sides tend to sit out the period, leaving a question whether there should be a shorter injunction period or one of indefinite duration.

Mr. President, I particularly recommend this finding by the head of the Conciliation Service to the Members of the Senate on my side of the aisle, most of whom voted for the Taft-Hartley bill. I make this recommendation because, prior to the passage of the bill, I urged a consideration of the very observation which Mr. Ching now makes after more than a year's experience with the law.

I read further from the article:

2. The requirement that a Presidential fact-finding board must report its findings before an injunction can be obtained interferes with collective bargaining in the crucial period before a strike deadline.

I think Mr. Ching is quite correct. Once again I point out that those of us who opposed the passage of the Taft-Hartley bill in the form in which it was finally passed urged further consideration of this particular section of the bill. In fact, Mr. President, in a speech which I delivered on November 12, 1948, at the University of Pennsylvania, before a labor institute conducted by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, the speech being entitled "The Emergency Dispute Provisions of the Taft-Hartley Law," I discussed at some length this particular point which Mr. Ching raises in his annual report. Therefore, at this point in the RECORD, as part of the body of my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my speech of November 12, on the emergency dispute provisions of the Taft-Hartley law, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EMERGENCY DISPUTE PROVISIONS OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

(Address by WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon, before the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, November 12, 1948)

Chairman Balderston, President Stassen, ladies and gentlemen, you couldn't have paid me a finer compliment than to have me introduced by Harold Stassen. In his introduction of me he referred to the fact that at one time I was one of his teachers at the University of Minnesota. However, as a teacher I tried to put into practice the teaching rule that to be a good teacher one must be willing and able to learn from his students.

Let me tell you that Harold Stassen was one of those students who taught me much during my years at the University of Minnesota. He has taught me a great deal ever since in the school of American politics, and I am looking to him to keep right on teaching all of us in the Republican Party a great many lessons that need to be learned by the party.

I want to congratulate the University of Pennsylvania and the State of Pennsylvania in selecting such an American statesman to the presidency of the University of Pennsylvania. I am positive that Harold Stassen will prove to be a great educational statesman, as the head of this university. He would think it flattery, and I mean no flattery, if I proceeded to tell you of the high esteem in which I hold this fine American. Nevertheless, I want him to know that I expect to continue to sit at his feet, both in the field of education and of politics. I think there is a great future ahead for him because America needs the type of statesmanship Harold Stassen is giving to our country.

You all make me feel very homesick here, tonight, because as Harold has mentioned, for some 21 years it was my privilege and my opportunity to live in an academic environment where the motivation is, and should be, a search for the truth. I don't always live in that environment these days. Sometimes partisan politics and political strategy rather than a search for the truth and action based upon objective data come to prevail in the Congress of the United States. I offer the recent record of the Eightieth Congress as exhibit A in support of that observation. However, if my political fortunes should ever turn into misfortunes, I am sure I shall always be very happy to return to the cloistered walls of a great university again, working with teachers and students who recognize that after all the search for truth and putting the truth into practice represent the only hope for the democratic form of government.

In my comments here tonight I shall read a short paper on the Taft-Hartley law and national emergency disputes. Then, if time permits, I shall ad lib. a bit regarding my personal observations as to the problems which I think are ahead of us in regard to labor legislation.

It is with considerable diffidence that I approach a discussion of our experiences under those provisions of the Taft-Hartley law dealing with public emergency disputes.

In the months that have elapsed since the act became law in June 1947—and even before that time—I have spoken frequently and on occasion at considerable length in opposition to the Taft-Hartley law. Most of my comments have been concerned with needed amendments to the Wagner Act as a substitute program for the Taft-Hartley Act. My impressions of the operation of the Taft-Hartley law as it touches emergency disputes have been obtained primarily from the sidelines. I have no doubt that other speakers at this conference—such as Sumner Slichter and Harry Shulman, who spoke this afternoon, or Dean Balderston or George Taylor, can give you a much more intimate and informative discussion of the emergency disputes section of the law. They have had first-hand experience as members of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to the Taft-Hartley Act to report on specific national emergency disputes.

There can be no doubt that my good friend, Cy Ching, from his vantage point as director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, is better qualified to give you a well-rounded picture of the national emergency sections of the Taft-Hartley Act than I. Perhaps, speaking jocularly, I should suggest that the reason those who have served on boards of inquiry have not been prevailed upon to appraise the operations of the emergency disputes provisions of the act and to make suggestions to this conference is that their discussion might be construed as recommendations. Thus, they, mindful of the terms of the law which provide that reports of boards of inquiry shall not contain any recommendations, might feel constrained to refrain from expressing opinions or recommendations at this conference.

It is somewhat difficult to understand why those who have served as members of boards to inquire into the issues of labor disputes, and who have had the responsibility of ascertaining the facts regarding the causes and circumstances of a given dispute, should then be specifically enjoined from making recommendations for settlement of the dispute. I shall touch on the soundness of this provision of the law later in my discussion, but I do want to observe at this point that a flat prohibition against recommendations by boards of inquiry seems to me to be of questionable validity, assuming that the fact-finding technique serves a useful purpose.

Probably it is unnecessary to sketch for this audience, even briefly, the steps provided in the Taft-Hartley Act for coping with national emergency disputes. However, it may be well to recall the over-all scope and procedure of the act in this regard, before commenting on specific provisions.

Whenever, in his opinion, a threatened or actual strike or lockout involving all or a substantial part of an industry, not subject to the Railway Labor Act, will imperil national health or safety, the President is authorized to appoint a board of inquiry consisting of a chairman and such other members as the President shall determine. The board is authorized to hold public or private hearings and is vested with the power of compulsory process. After inquiring into the issues and ascertaining the facts of the dispute, the board is required to make a written report to the President which, however, shall not contain any recommendations. The President then makes the report available to the public and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

In the words of the statute, the President, "upon receiving a report from a Board of Inquiry"—but apparently not before—may instruct the Attorney General to seek an injunction. If the court finds that the dispute affects all or a substantial part of the industry and will imperil national health or safety, it may enjoin the strike or lock-out and make any other orders it deems appropriate. The Norris-LaGuardia Act is not applicable in these cases. After an injunction has issued, it is the duty of the parties to make every effort to adjust and settle their differences, aided by the Mediation and Conciliation Service. The law says, however, that the parties are under no duty to accept any proposals made by the Service.

After an injunction has issued, the President is required to reconvene the Board of Inquiry. If the dispute is not settled at the end of a 60-day period dating from the issuance of the injunction, the Board reports to the President the current position of the parties and the efforts made toward settlement, including the employer's last offer of settlement. Within the next 15 days, the NLRB must take a secret vote of the employees as to whether they wish to accept the employer's last offer. Five days later the Board must certify the results of the vote to the Attorney General, who then must ask the court to discharge the injunction. The motion has to be granted.

The final step is the requirement that the President make a full report to Congress, together with such recommendations as he sees fit.

Boiled down even further, it is, I think, fair to say that the emergency dispute sections of the Taft-Hartley Act enforce an 80-day "cooling-off" period, during which a Presidential board reports the facts without recommendations, and employees vote on the question whether to accept or reject, in toto, the last offer of their employer. If the dispute is not settled during this period, the President lays the problem before Congress.

One of the difficulties I see in the emergency dispute procedure is that the timetable established by the law may have the effect of interfering with direct negotiations and hampering the effective use of mediation at a time when continued negotiation and mediation would be especially helpful. This is occasioned by the provision which seems to require that before an injunction can be sought, the Board of Inquiry must have made its first report. While it may not be absolutely necessary that the Board report precede the petition for an injunction, apparently that chronological order of events was intended, because section 208 says that the President may direct the filing of an injunction petition "upon receiving a report" from the Board. In any event, the practice has been to follow this order, and it is fairly clear that the Board's findings materially aid the Government in persuading the court that an injunction should be granted.

The necessity for attending hearings of the Board and acquainting its members with the facts of the dispute, during the last week or two before the zero hour, not only takes valuable time which the parties might spend to better advantage in further negotiations and mediation, but also tends to an early crystallization of position. It is, of course, understandable that all preliminary steps should be completed in advance of the date any injunction needs to be obtained if a stoppage which seems likely to occur is to be delayed or averted. Assuming for the moment that the injunctive remedy is desirable, production is less likely to be interrupted if it is invoked before, rather than after, a work stoppage has taken place. Since the Board's report is regarded as an essential preliminary step to an injunction, it is of course desirable, once the President has concluded that an emergency situation is likely to arise, to convene the Board of Inquiry early enough so that it will have time to report the facts before the time arrives for petitioning for the injunction.

I believe that serious consideration should be given to revising the law so as to permit of greater flexibility in deciding whether the report of the Board of Inquiry should precede or follow application for an injunction. An alternative might be to provide that the President may direct the Attorney General to petition for court relief either upon receiving the Board of Inquiry's report or upon certification by the Director of the Mediation and Conciliation Service that the dispute threatens to imperil national health or safety. The Mediation Service is no stranger to the facts of an impending dispute, since it closely follows the progress of negotiations and frequently furnishes mediation and conciliation services. Hence its judgment as to the seriousness of the dispute and the likelihood of a stoppage is entitled to a great weight and, I suggest, could furnish the basis for action. As a matter of fact, the decision to appoint a Board of Inquiry in the first place is made, in large part, upon the basis of the appraisal by the Mediation Service. I see no compelling reason why the report of the Service could not, in many cases, be substituted for the first report of the Board of Inquiry as the preliminary step in the injunction proceedings.

A more debatable provision in the law, in my judgment, is the prohibition against recommendations by boards of inquiry. This provision stems from the Senate committee bill, which in turn was derived from proposals by Senator IVES. The theory behind it probably represents a reaction to the experiences of the war period. As explained in the report of the majority of the Senate committee, a procedure which amounted to compulsory arbitration was utilized through the instrumentality of the War Labor Board, and this system tended to emphasize unduly the role of the Government with the result that employers and unions tended to avoid solving their difficulties by free collective bargaining. Recommendations of fact-finding boards or over-all mediation tribunals, the report found, tend to set patterns of wage settlements for the entire country which are frequently inappropriate to the peculiar circumstances of certain industries and certain classes of employment. Hence the fact finders were prohibited by law from making recommendations—at least in public. The minority members of the Senate committee, on the other hand, said that the prohibition against recommendations was "unwise" and that there are many occasions upon which it is desirable for boards of inquiry to make recommendations.

While it is a mistake to draw too heavily upon experience under the Railway Labor Act, so frequently cited as a model of labor legislation, nevertheless, I have heard no serious suggestions that it should be amended so as to strip emergency boards of the power to make recommendations for settlement. Granted that there are historical differences between the labor problems of the railroad industry and other basic industries, and in the methods evolved for their settlement, I am not convinced that they are so great that we must avoid recommendations by governmental boards in one case and foster them in the other.

Undoubtedly the effect of recommendations by a governmental board is to bring public pressure to bear upon the parties to settle their dispute by accepting the recommendations of the fact-finding body. To that extent, there is an element of compulsion. However, it seems to me that this process cannot rightly be termed compulsory arbitration. If it can be so labeled, then we should also avoid fact-finding without recommendation, for the basic theory of both devices is the same: that the public, once apprised of the facts, will make its opinion known with such force that the parties will reach a settlement. In either case, I submit, our hopes are pinned to an effective mobilization of public opinion for an equitable settlement in the light of the facts. The question really is whether that opinion shall be enlightened and effective or confused and diverse. If boards of inquiry, composed of men well known and respected for their impartiality, were allowed, but not required, to make recommendations, the settlement of national emergency disputes might be aided rather than handicapped.

There is some evidence that the 80-day injunction is not altogether unwelcome in emergency disputes. While labor leaders uniformly protest in public against the injunction, it is probably no secret that in some of the recent cases they have privately attempted to pressure the Mediation Service and the executive offices to have a Board of Inquiry appointed and to secure an injunction prior to the strike deadline. Doubtless a partial explanation of this circumstance is that unions are understandably reluctant to have to bear the onus of a strike in a vital industry and hope that during the "cooling off" period a peaceful solution will be found. On the other hand, we have the Board of Inquiry in the maritime dispute, under the chairmanship of Harry Shulman, reporting that "some of the unions persist in the view that the injunction and the 'cooling off' period * * * impede, rather than encourage, settlement," because with respect to parties willing to cooperate the effect is to postpone settlement, while in the case of parties unwilling or unable to get along "resistance is stiffened and resentment heated."

There is danger, of course, that the existence of governmental machinery for arriving at suggested or recommended solutions to labor disputes will encourage one or the other of the disputants to bring about Government intervention in the hope that his cause will be supported by the recommendations of the official body. Certainly we must recognize that such an attitude was a significant factor in many disputes that appeared on the docket of the War Labor Board and that it was encouraged by the ready availability of the governmental decision-making agency. The result was to short circuit and discourage voluntary collective bargaining. We must be on our guard to avoid a repetition of that experience.

However, if we accept this premise that boards of inquiry in national emergency cases serve a useful purpose by finding and reporting the facts, and assume that discretion will be exercised in how frequently and in what disputes they are used, I am inclined to believe that it would be desirable to give them power to make recommendations. Especially would public recommendations be helpful if the parties were to agree, in advance, that recommendations should be made and that they would be adhered to on all or certain designated issues. The process would then take on the attributes of voluntary arbitration.

The requirement that the NLRB poll the employees on the last offer of the employer is, in my judgment, unnecessary and unsound. It perpetuates a device which experience with a similar provision of the War Labor Disputes Act demonstrated to be wholly ineffectual in reducing strikes. You will recall that Congress eventually came to the conclusion that these strike votes were of no value, and attached a rider to the appropriation of the NLRB prohibiting it from conducting any further such votes.

There are at least two fallacies in the last-offer vote provision. First, it erroneously assumes that the latest offer at the time the vote must be taken is in fact the employer's final offer. However, we all know that parties frequently are still in negotiation and may modify their positions considerably even before the poll can be conducted.

Second, the vote becomes a vote of confidence in the union's bargaining representatives, rather than an expression of satisfaction with the terms of the employer's proposal.

In most labor disputes, if you put up to the union members an issue of whether or not they are going to vote to sustain the union officers or overrule the union officers, you know what the result usually is—they vote to sustain. Thousands and thousands of dollars of public monies, in my judgment, have been wasted on these so-called last-offer votes, when what they are voting on is whether they want to go along with the union officers. I will make the guess that in 90 percent of the cases the union members have rejected the employer's last offer and thereby voted to sustain their union officials. This section has not produced the results hoped for by the proponents of the Taft-Hartley Act. Some of us had the temerity during the debates on the Taft-Hartley bill to predict that this provision entailed an empty gesture and showed a very unrealistic approach to labor disputes by the proponents of the Taft-Hartley bill.

In the history of the current west coast maritime dispute, we have a striking illustration of the fact that employees may be voting on a supposed offer of an employer which is nonexistent or which has been substantially modified prior to the vote. In this maritime case after the Labor Board had gone to the expense and trouble of sending ballots to seamen in far-off ports, the employers withdrew all offers. More recently, it appears that a new formula may have been found for settling this strike. But in any event, this one case should suffice to demonstrate the ineffectiveness of the last-offer vote. In any revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in the coming session of Congress, I believe it would be advisable to eliminate this provision.

Mentioning the current maritime dispute on the west coast, I want to take at least a minute once again to express my opinion about that strike. It is an opinion I have been expressing for many weeks on many platforms of America. I want to express it here again tonight even though it is an opinion which has caused me to receive some kicks from the leaders of the union and has not brought me any bouquets from the shipowners. Nevertheless, I am going to express the opinion that there is no justification for a continuance of that stoppage of work. Further there never was any justification for its starting in the first place, either on the part of the shipowners or on the part of the maritime unions. Here is an industry with one of the finest arbitration set-ups in any collective-bargaining agreement in the country, and it should have been used without any strike. I have said to the shipowners and to Mr. Bridges and his union in public statements, and I repeat it here tonight, "You are performing a great disservice to the economy of this country in continuing the dispute when you have in your own labor contract peaceful procedures of arbitration through which to settle your differences."

I say to them from this platform tonight that the irrelevant issues which both sides are raising in this dispute have nothing to do with the wages, hours, or conditions of employment about which the dispute is supposed to have arisen. The strike is costing us over $4,000,000 a day, and it should be stopped at once by returning to arbitration.

I want to commend two great men in the field of labor relations tonight, in connection with the west coast maritime strike—one representing the employer point of view, outside of the shipping industry, and the other representing labor's point of view, outside of the maritime unions. I refer, of course, to Almon Roth, of the San Francisco Employers' Council, and to Philip Murray, of the CIO. Both of these men, if I read the press aright, and if they are accurately quoted, and I think they are, recognize the fact that irrelevant issues have been raised by the parties to this dispute and that at the present time the fight is being fought not on issues that involve good-faith collective bargaining but rather over attempts to destroy the personal leadership of the men representing both the shipowners and the unions. I take the position that it is improper for the shipowners to try to break a union's leadership, irrespective of what they may think of that leadership, and I say, likewise, that it is equally improper for a union leadership to bring into a dispute involving wages, hours of work, and conditions of employment, political factors that have no connection with those issues. I hope I make myself clear.

Congress can perform a real service to the country if, in the consideration of proposals to amend or repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, it also gives careful attention to existing procedures for handling national emergency cases. Unfortunately, the tendency has been to act on little or poorly digested evidence, or to ignore the recommendations of those who are equipped to offer constructive suggestions. The objective is and should be the development and strengthening of voluntary procedures and free collective bargaining, rather than enlarging the role of Government as the decision maker.

The conclusions drawn early in 1947 by the labor committee of the Twentieth Century Fund, headed by William H. Davis, bear repeating in this connection. That committee concluded:

1. That there should be no Federal legislation prohibiting strikes or lock-outs, and that dispute settlement "should continue to be by industrial self-government through genuine collective bargaining with full freedom of contract";

2. That in industries essential to health or safety a stoppage is intolerable, and, in recognition of that fact, responsible management and labor should by agreement provide an adequate substitute for strikes and lock-outs;

3. Arrangements are needed to discourage the declaration of emergencies, which could be done by legislation authorizing the President to appoint emergency boards only on condition that the parties agree to try out board recommendations for a limited period;

4. If an emergency develops in an essential industry, chief reliance should be placed on emergency powers exercised through existing agencies; and

5. Any new legislation should prohibit strikes and lock-outs only after Government seizure, and adequate provision should be made for due process and just compensation, during Government operation, to both employer and employees.

Now, on the question of amendment of the act, I here and now recommend to the Labor Committee of the Senate, of which I am a member, the most careful and thorough consideration of the recommendations which Mr. Davis and his committee set out in that brilliant report of theirs. I recommend also to the Labor Committee that at the forthcoming hearings on proposals for amendment of the Taft-Hartley law men who know the business of labor relations, on labor's side and the employer's side, and particularly on the public's side, such as George Taylor, Harry Shulman, Will Davis, and the other great leaders representing the public at this conference, be brought to Washington for testimony based on their expert knowledge.

Now, before I close this address I wish to take just 2 or 3 minutes to express some observations as to the political implications of the Taft-Hartley law.

I have just finished a little speaking tour across the country in connection with the late lamented campaign. I made some 70 major speeches before many labor audiences. In those speeches I tried, as a constitutional liberal within the Republican Party, to tell American labor why I thought it should help elect a Republican President. It was very interesting. Results show that I was most unsuccessful. Labor didn't like the fact that a Republican-controlled Congress passed the Taft-Hartley law. Labor didn't like the failure of the Republican Party to make specifically clear just what amendments to the law it planned to offer and fight to pass through the next session of Congress if a Republican President were elected. A failure to take a clear-cut position on drastic revisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which are needed was very costly to the Republican Party in the election. The Republican Party speakers for the most part did not take specific stands on specific issues.

I didn't have to worry about discussing specific issues at my meetings—they were thrown at me, sometimes right between the eyes. My meetings were open forum affairs at which we discussed, for example, specific proposals for amending the Taft-Hartley law. I want to make this comment in all seriousness: Through the election we have seen a great example of democracy in action. Some of us may not like the results. I do not, but I refuse to ignore the results. I campaigned for my party because I am weary of liberals within the Republican Party who accept office from their party, hold high positions in the Republican Party, accept Republican committee assignments in Congress, and then at election time sulk in their tents because their party does not take their suggestions as though they spoke with the voice of infallibility. Such Republican liberals in the party have never grasped the full meaning, in my judgment, of the political ethics involved in party loyalty. The liberal must try to get his party into a position at election time so that it can assume full legislative responsibilities for the affairs of the Government. I think that is a test of political ethics which liberals within my party must be willing to meet if they are to accept the benefits that accrue to them as Republican officeholders.

I know there are those among the opposition party, as well as independent voters, who think I am inconsistent when I campaign for the Republican Party because as a member of the Senate I don't always vote with the recommendations of the Republican policy committee. My answer is that my party consists of the registered Republican voters of the party and not of the Republican policy committee. I am willing to let my voting record speak for itself as to whether or not it is consistent with the views and wishes of the majority of the Republican voters of the country.

As I sit in the Senate of the United States, the chairman of the Republican policy committee in the Senate, whoever he is, be he "BOB" TAFT or anyone else, will never cast my vote for me. The people of Oregon sent me to the Senate to cast my own vote on the merits of the facts involved in bills as they come before the Senate. They did not send me to the Senate to become a rubber stamp for the Republican policy committee.

I offer no apologies to this or any other audience for making the fight I made in the Senate of the United States on my side of the aisle against the Taft-Hartley bill. Subsequent events have shown that the position I took certainly was the position of the great majority, at least, of the overalls of America. It is time for politicians to stop thinking in terms of disfranchising the overalls of America, because the legs that carry the overalls also carry heads that know how to vote. Believe me when some Republican leaders tried to sell the bill of goods that it was only the labor leaders who didn't like the Taft-Hartley law they got their answer in the form of millions of votes against the Republican Party by the workers of the country on November 2, 1948.

Another fallacious argument that some Republican leaders have been making, in an attempt to rationalize their support of the Taft-Hartley law, is that the reduction in the number of strikes since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law is one of the direct beneficial results of the law. However, such an argument falls into the classification of a non sequitur fallacy. The politicians who, prior to the election, tried to convince the American people that there is a causal relationship between the Taft-Hartley law and a reduction of strikes since the passage of the law have simply illustrated once again the old tested formula that partisanship often blinds the partisan to the truth.

Thus, the politicians who voted for the Taft-Hartley bill and who are now confronted with the task of proving to labor that they knew what was best for labor, a la the Taft-Hartley bill, are defending their vote by pointing out that there have been fewer strikes since the Taft-Hartley bill was passed than there were during a similar period before it was passed. Oh, Aristotle, what fallacies are committed in thy memory.

Official Government labor statistics show also that during the period following the passage of the Taft-Hartley law national employment has increased. Surely the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law must be able to find some cause to effect relationship between the law and increased employment. It is no less a non sequitur to argue that because there have been fewer strikes since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law than there were for a similar period before its passage the Taft-Hartley law is the cause of the decrease in strikes.

It also is to be noted that the level of the cost of living has risen considerably since the passage of the law in spite of the flurry of recession in recent days. Surely the fact that the two phenomena have occurred in a close time relationship to each other must establish and bear out a causal relationship if we are to follow the logic, or lack of it, of the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law in respect to strike statistics.

Of course, when it is pointed out to the proponents of the Taft-Hartley law, who now are attempting to rationalize their votes on the basis of the decline in strikes since the passage of the law, that thousands upon thousands of American employers entered into evasive and subterfuge agreements with labor in order to get around the provisions of the law and avoid conflict with the workers over the act, their response is chiefly characterized by extra vocalization that doesn't even formulate itself into words.

When it is pointed out to these defenders of the Taft-Hartley law that there would have been strikes in major industries of this country whose labor contracts terminated after the passage of the Taft-Hartley law, if management in those industries had not yielded to the major economic demands of the unions in order to avoid a test under the Taft-Hartley law, these defenders of the Taft-Hartley law have a common reply; namely, "We just don't believe it." However, all they need to do is to talk to a cross section of employers who have signed labor agreements since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. They will find that employer after employer will tell them, if they win his confidence, that he made many concessions which he is sure he would not have needed to make if he had not considered it so very desirable that he avoid a test with his union over the Taft-Hartley law.

Until courts pass upon various provisions of the act it cannot be said within a certainty just how far the parties to a labor agreement can go in contracting out from under the provisions of the act. However, there is no doubt about the fact that thousands of labor contracts have been entered into since the passage of the act which cannot be reconciled with the spirit and intent of Congress in passing the act. It certainly is clear that in passing the act Congress had no intention of passing a so-called private act but rather the putting upon the statute books a public-policy act frequently referred to throughout the debate as union-control law.

Prof. Edwin E. Witte, of the University of Wisconsin, and one of the top labor economists of the country, comments upon the doubtful legal status of the many labor agreements which seek to exclude by agreement of the parties the application of the Taft-Hartley law to the terms of the agreement as follows:

"An illustration of the present uncertainty surrounding the new law is afforded by the public statements which the two Members of Congress whose names this measure bears made concerning the agreement concluded recently between John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers and the bituminous coal operators of the country. Congressman HARTLEY denounced this agreement as a clear violation of the labor law, and warned the operators that they faced criminal prosecution and heavy penalties if they observed the provisions of the agreement. Senator TAFT thereafter gave it as his view that the coal agreement was not 'in any way a violation of the law,' and going beyond this, he cited the agreement as illustrating that under the new law 'employers and employees should be able to make any contract they want.'" (Edwin E. Witte, Labor Management Relations Under the Taft-Hartley Act, Harvard Business Review, autumn, 1947, p. 554.)

In the same article, on page 573, Professor Witte writes:

"What has been most disturbing to managements sincerely desirous of maintaining or developing better relations with their unions has been the bitterness the new law has aroused among the leaders of union labor and the stanch union members. It has opened old sores of extreme distrust of business, which had been pretty well healed. It also has confronted managements with the prospect of having to find a solution before long for difficult problems of labor-management relations arising out of the new law. Looming large among these are the union insistence upon eliminating no-strike clauses in contracts and the problem of what to do when union-security provisions expire. In this connection it is worthy of note that most of those management witnesses who in their testimony in the congressional hearings strongly condemned the closed shop never had such a provision in their contracts."

Then, too, there have been those employers who, since the passage of the law, have signed agreements without such collective-bargaining controversy because they have been very anxious to grant substantial increases in wages for a variety of reasons, such as their desire to maintain an inflated price structure, out of which they are reaping, at the expense of a long-suffering public, excessive profits. Such employers have followed the course of avoiding any stoppage of work by going along with labor for the most part, even though it has meant substantial increases in wages because they know the pattern of American industry since the end of the war has been to increase prices, at least twice the amount necessary, to take care of any increase in wages.

In many instances the increase in prices has been several times the amount necessary to pay for increased cost of labor. However, by granting a wage increase they have been able to pass along to the consumer greater than necessary price increases under the half-truth that increased labor costs require it.

Then there have been other employers who have followed the advice of certain employer and trade associations that now is not the time to challenge labor under the Taft-Hartley law. This antilabor group of employers, who fortunately, at least at present, represent a minority of American industry, are adopting the strategy of acceding to the major demands of labor for the time being until they can feed public opinion with another prescription of propaganda opiates which will becloud the public into thinking that maybe after all the Taft-Hartley law is good for labor.

This group of employers is well trained in industrial warfare and appreciates the fact that the timing of a battle often means the difference between victory and defeat. They know that their battle against strong unionism by use of the legal weapons provided in the Taft-Hartley law can easily be won in time of declining employment rather than in a period of expanding employment such as still characterizes the American postwar economy. The truth is that it is going to take 2 or 3 years for the Taft-Hartley law to show its legal effects and it is to be expected as long as full employment exists and labor's economic demands are generally complied with there will be few strikes resulting from the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

However, when recession starts in with its inevitable resulting unemployment the labor-relations picture will change and then the opportunity will present itself under the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law for those employers who wish to take advantage of organized labor to do so. Then industrial conflicts will move from the arena of a few court-test cases which are presently being carried on to the arena of economic industrial warfare. Labor will be at a disadvantage at first in that struggle, but as always it will learn the hard way and in due course of time another legislative record in defense of the legitimate rights of free workers will be written into the statute books of America as was the case when the battles of the Norris-LaGuardia Act and of the Wagner Act were won. Be that as it may, the fact remains that statesmanship has a great opportunity to help avoid that potential industrial war by proceeding now to revise in many major respects the Taft-Hartley law.

Now, I want to say something to you labor representatives in regard to the type of legislation to be passed by the Eighty-first Congress. You know my position. I told some of you when you came before the Senate committee in January, February, and March of 1947 that you let American labor down by taking the position that no legislation at all restricting labor excesses should be passed. I told you that you were acting outside of the framework of American public opinion, and that whenever any group in our society acts outside of the framework of American public opinion, be it business, labor, doctors, or any other group, the pendulum of public opinion tends to swing too far to another extreme. That is the only way one can explain how it happened that a Congress under heavy public demand for the passage of some labor legislation came to pass such an extreme bill as the Taft-Hartley law.

Now, what is going to be labor's position? The principle for which I stood in 1947 in urging fair legislation will not change one iota in the next session of Congress. My

mind is open to considering the question of labor legislation on the basis of facts and the preponderance of evidence submitted to the committee for a new labor law. However, you will not find the junior Senator from Oregon taking the position that no labor legislation shall be passed. I shall vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. As I said on the Senate floor, it should not have been passed in the first place. I refuse to call it names. Labor hasn't helped its case against the Taft-Hartley law by calling it such names as a slave-labor law. Labor needs to inform the public about the serious injustices of the law. It is proof of its unfairness and violations of legitimate rights of American labor which the public wants to hear about. Labor has a good case against the Taft-Hartley law but it has failed to date to explain its case to the public.

I shall always continue to talk of the Taft-Hartley law in terms of its specific injustices and weaknesses and what I consider to be some of its unconstitutional provisions. I am also going to vote for a substitute in the form of amendments to the Wagner Act. I am going to vote for the type of bill which will give us what we ought to have had by way of a new labor law in 1947, and on which American labor leaders should have helped. Labor leaders made it tough for us in the Senate time and time again in 1947. When some of us would get up and offer a proposal for changing the Wagner Act, the fairness and justice of which couldn't be denied, proponents of the Taft-Hartley bill would say, and rightly, "You can't even get labor's support for that proposal." They were right about it because labor leaders had missed taking the pulse of the American people and were so blinded by labor's own shortcomings that they didn't see that in the interest of American labor it was desirable to have a fair and balanced revision of the Wagner Act. In this next session of Congress, I shall again stand for the principle which I stood for in 1947, namely, that there must be an equal application of the law to all parties falling within the same operative facts involved in a given dispute. This means, of course, that we must have a piece of labor legislation that is fair and square to the legitimate rights of labor, the employers, and the public.

The labor leaders of this country should stand up now and do the greatest job of industrial statesmanship that can be done in America. They recognize that the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed, but they must also come forward and help those of us who are devoted to only one ideal in government—namely, making our democratic system work for the common good in passing a revised Wagner Act including those changes necessary to equalize the rights of employers and of labor. Such a bill along the lines of the Morse-Ives proposals should have been enacted in 1947 instead of a Taft-Hartley law. Unfortunately, the Morse-Ives bill was emasculated by more than 35 procedural changes adopted in conference committee and by certain amendments which were passed by the Senate before the bill ever went to the conference committee. However, the bill which was reported to the floor of the Senate by the Labor Committee and which consisted for the most part of a combination of the Morse-Ives bills should have received the cooperation of the labor leaders of the country. Without that cooperation the Taft-Hartley bill was the inevitable result. The administrative law approach of the Morse-Ives bill was changed by amendments into the common law court action procedure of the Taft-Hartley bill. The American people need to be informed as to why the social and economic problems of labor relations cannot be settled successfully by common law court actions. They need to be told why the Taft-Hartley law will not work.

The public is fair once it comes to know the facts about any issue. It must be informed as to the reasons that support the argument that if we keep the Taft-Hartley law on the books it will once again weave into the fabric of American industrial life the same old pattern of resentment against employers. On the basis of resentment there can be no industrial peace in this country. I am pleased to see that increasing numbers of employers, as I go about the country, are now pleading for modifications of the Taft-Hartley law, in the direction of putting into practice the basic principle of American jurisprudence for which I have raised my voice in defense, tonight, namely the same rules must apply to both teams. The Taft-Hartley law as well as the old Wagner Act violated that rule of equal justice for all.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Ching is quoted further in the article, as follows:

3. Fact-finding boards, being prohibited from recommending any settlement terms, are unable to mobilize public opinion behind the disputing parties to reach an agreement.

4. The emergency dispute requirement that workers must be polled on an employer's last offer has proved useless. The ballots are expensive to conduct, and the experience of a year demonstrates they do nothing to promote settlement; to the contrary, they are a disrupting influence in collective bargaining and mediation. They have been repeatedly rejected by the workers.

5. Parties in labor disputes are required by law to participate in conferences called by the Mediation Service. But there is no penalty. A few employees and unions have refused to cooperate.

Mr. President, in regard to the third point raised by Mr. Ching in his report, that "Fact-finding boards, being prohibited from recommending any settlement terms, are unable to mobilize public information behind the disputing parties to reach an agreement," I think once again he calls attention to a very important criticism of the Taft-Hartley law in its present form. In fact we were treated to a rather weird experience of the operation of this particular section this summer when for weeks, because of the emergency disputes section of the Taft-Harley law, the shipping industry of the west coast was tied up in one of the most costly strikes that has ever afflicted the west coast, a strike which the minimum estimates of cost—and I am sure they were minimum—indicated a loss of more than $4,000,000 a day to the parties concerned and to the shippers. That strike, taking place under the operation of the Taft-Hartley law, proved, if proof should ever be needed, the unworkability of the so-called emergency disputes section of that law.

What is provided, in essence, by that section of the law? There is the injunction, following the report of a fact-finding board. The fact-finding board is, however, prohibited from even making a recommendation as to how the dispute ought to be settled. One would think that one of the primary purposes of a fact-finding board, composed of a group of experts, after it obtained the facts, would be to advise the American people as to how a particular strike ought to be settled. But in that case we were confronted with a section of the law which specifically made it impossible for the fact-finding board to make recommendations to the American public as to what the next steps should be in solving that costly dispute, and if I may say, while I comment on that dispute, what I said across this country during the weeks it took place, there never was a time when that strike was justified either on the part of the union or on the part of the employers concerned. Both sides to that dispute permitted to come into the dispute irrelevant and immaterial issues that had nothing to do with free collective bargaining. The employers on one hand publicly announced through their representatives that they were out to break the union leadership; and there is no question about the fact that the union leadership on the other hand itself was taking a position on matters irrelevant to disputes over hours, wages, and conditions of employment.

I have said, in decisions in the past, I have said on the floor of the Senate, that a political strike is never justified in this country, and it seems to me in that great maritime strike there should have been in operation at the time a law which would have given, as Taft-Hartley law did not, the people of the United States effective relief from the type of strike that was involved in that instance. Rather, we have a law that says "The fact-finding board shall make its finding." But what happens after that? To reduce it to its skeleton, after the fact-finding board makes its second report to the President of the United States, which must be within 60 days after the injunction, and after a 20-day period during which a vote is taken on the employer's last offer, the injunction that is involved vanishes into thin air; the injunction evaporates. It ought to be obvious to anyone that the health and the safety and the welfare of the people are just as much at stake in a strike or in a strike situation after a fact-finding board reports, as before. Why should the injunction then automatically be dissolved?

What does the law then provide? It then provides that the President shall make a report to the Congress. In the case of that particular strike, which lasted about 95 days, so far as I know, we have yet to receive the report of the President to the Congress. Of course, the strike is now ended. The strike was ended because some great industrial statesmen, not direct parties to the dispute, outside the shipowners and outside the union concerned—in this particular instance, Mr. Phil Murray, for the CIO, and Mr. Almon Roth, for the Employers' Council of San Francisco—recognized that the particular procedure made available to them under the Taft-Hartley law was not worth the paper it was written on, proceeded to use their industrial statesmanship to call the attion of shipowners and the CIO union involved to the fact that a continuation of that strike could not be justified in the public interest. The result was that through the intervention of that kind of industrial statesmanship, but not through the Taft-Hartley law, that strike finally was settled. Never should it have occurred in the first place.

I want to say, as one who took a very active part in the Eightieth Congress in trying to bring about the enactment of

legislation that would balance interests and protect legitimate rights, that I shall once again make a fight on the floor of the Senate and in committee for legislation that will protect the legitimate rights of American industry and of American labor; yes, also, Mr. President, and primarily, the interests of the public. That means that in my judgment we must have a drastic revision of the emergency-disputes section of the Taft-Hartley law, as well as the other major sections of that law. I repeat what I said during the campaign. I think the Taft-Hartley law was bad; I am convinced that it never should have been passed in the first place, and I recognize, as I think anyone who will read the handwriting on the wall should recognize, that it cost the Republican Party millions of votes in the last election—and it should have—because the "overalls" of America walked to the polls and made perfectly clear that they would register their resentment against a party primarily responsible for the passage of that law. It cost us one congressional seat after another. As I have said heretofore and now repeat, I think the farmers primarily cost us the Presidency; but the Taft-Hartley law cost us for the most part the control of both Houses of the Congress. In this session of Congress, we have the renewed obligation and responsibility of proceeding to work and vote for a law that will revise the Wagner Act. That causes me to make a comment that I know organized labor will not like, but I want to say from this seat today that organized labor, in the public interest, has no right to expect the Eighty-first Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and merely replace it with the Wagner Act unchanged.

The junior Senator from Oregon, who need make no excuse for his defense of the legitimate rights of labor, once again, as he has from other platforms in America, serves notice that he is not going to vote for a labor legislative program which, in his opinion, cannot be reconciled with the public interests.

In my judgment, what the Wagner Act needs is the type of revision for which I fought in the Eightieth Congress, namely, legislation which will revise the Wagner Act, giving to labor—and mark this, Mr. President—giving to labor and employers the same procedural rights and safeguards which labor enjoyed under the old Wagner Act.

I repeat what some have heard me say before that any law which violates an elementary rule of the playground by providing that one set of rules shall apply to one team and that another set of rules shall apply to the other team is not a law which will solve any controversial subject, such as the problems of industrial relations.

Therefore, American employers are entitled to receive from the Eighty-first Congress those drastic procedural changes in the Taft-Hartley law that will give to them, under an administrative-law approach to these problems, the same rights which labor enjoyed under the Wagner Act. Mark you, Mr. President, that means a drastic change in the procedural approach to labor problems. It means that we discard what I say is the underlying motif of the Taft-Hartley law, in the last analysis, namely, the approach to labor problems through common-law court action. Common-law courts are not the proper tribunals in which to solve the economic, social, and human problems involved in labor relations. Wages, hours, and conditions of employment are basically not legal questions; they are basically social, economic, and human questions.

So we have a great challenge as Members of the United States Senate to proceed now to draft legislation which will replace the Taft-Hartley law. By all means it ought to be replaced. I, here and now, have incorporated into my remarks every syllable I uttered from the floor of the Senate in my fight against the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. I know of no vote I have ever cast in the Senate of the United States of which I am more proud, save and except one other vote of which I am equally proud. I refer in the latter case to my vote for the passage of the compulsory world court jurisdiction resolution through this body. I know of no other vote of which I am equally proud than my vote against the Taft-Hartley law and my vote to sustain the veto, because I think the evidence is cumulative in support of the propositions I fought for then, when I said on the floor of the Senate to the Senators on my side of the aisle during that debate, "Gentlemen, if you incorporate certain provisions into the law you will hear from it through the ballot boxes of America." They got their answer on November 2, 1948. They will get it again in 1950 and 1952, Mr. President, if my party once again makes the pattern of the Taft-Hartley law the labor policy of the Republican Party, because the workers of America, the independent voters of America, will never put their stamp of approval upon a law which has in it so many unworkable, unsound, and unfair provisions as has the Taft-Hartley law.

I say to the Senators on the other side of the aisle, Do not become intoxicated by victory. Do not indulge the assumption that you have any mandate from the American people to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and replace it with the Wagner Act without drastic change, because if that be the policy, dangerous as prophecy is, I am willing to prophesy today that the great body of the independent voters of the country will reach the conclusion that you have not been fair to the public interest.

The Eighty-first Congress, Republicans and Democrats, should be motivated by one desire, and that is to enact legislation that will return to the collective bargaining tables of America the symbol of peace by way of fair legislation, rather than the symbol of war, which the Taft-Hartley law is, in the field of industrial relations.

Therefore I raise my voice on the floor of the Senate to Republicans and Democrats alike to throw political strategy out the window in regard to labor legislation. Let us go forward as two great political parties dedicated to the proposition that what we need is legislation which will be fair to all sides concerned in industrial disputes, and thereby protect the public interest. To do that, Mr. President, we need, yes, repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, but at the same time let us enact a revised Wagner Act along the lines of administrative-law procedures which recognize that employers are entitled to the same procedural provisions which the old Wagner Act gave to the unions against employers.

### THE LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS ACT, 1947

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has criticized the Taft-Hartley law in general terms, but he has specifically criticized the national emergency section of the law, to the general effect that it is unworkable because it did not work on the west coast in the maritime strike.

I very much like the approach of the Senator from Oregon to this problem, because he is now dealing with specific provisions of the law on their merits. If we can deal with each section and each problem involved in the Labor-Management Relations Act on its merits, and act on the merits of the various features of the act, I shall be more than satisfied, because I am quite clear that if the great majority of the individual issues are treated on their merits, it will result in a vote in favor of the provisions adopted by the Senate at the last session by an overwhelming vote.

As to the particular question of the national emergency section, of course, we faced a serious dilemma, when we entered upon the consideration of that provision. One of the questions was, should we prohibit a strike? Others were, is it possible to prohibit a strike and still maintain freedom? What procedure shall we provide? We finally reached a conclusion in the committee, I think probably to the complete satisfaction of no member of the committee, on a procedure by which a board would be appointed, and under which an injunction might delay a strike for 80 days, but after that, and after a vote indicating a determination to proceed, the men should be able to proceed.

I do not think any of us were particularly satisfied with that. The report and the bill were approved by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon, who was one of the members of the committee who approved the bill as it was reported by the Senate committee. I do not remember that any important changes in this particular section were made after the bill was reported from the committee.

This is one of the main sections which the President himself desires to have retained, and of course it should be dealt with on its merits, and should be debated in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, so that we may obtain the best possible machinery for delaying or preventing a strike which involves a national emergency.

I call the attention of the Senate to the report of the Joint Committee on Labor Management Relations, headed by the distinguished former Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Ball, which deals with this question on pages 16 to 22, in which the committee discussed all the cases in which that section had been used. In

general, I think it has been at least suggested in about 10 cases, and injunctions have been issued in 6. There was failure, in the case of the maritime workers, to prevent a strike. There was success in other cases.

The committee which had the function of determining the law has recommended two important changes, one of which is that which was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Oregon as advanced by Mr. Ching, head of the Mediation Service, who also appeared before the joint committee and recommended the changes. Those amendments will be found in the report, together with a proposal that the requirement of an actual vote on a strike be eliminated. The report deals on a factual basis with all the cases which have arisen under the act in all the different fields.

All I wish to say on this subject at this time is that I think we should proceed as the Senator from Oregon is proceeding, with a discussion of the different features of the law, and should determine each feature on its merits.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nominations of Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Secretary of State, and James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INCREASE OF MEMBERSHIP OF CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEES, ETC.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a Senate resolution, and I ask that it be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 24) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate as enacted in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 be amended as follows:

SECTION 1. The number of Senators on the following standing committees shall be increased from 13 to 15: Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, Committee on Armed Services, Committee on Finance, Committee on Foreign Relations, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

SEC. 2. Paragraph (4) of rule XXV is amended to read as follows:

"Each Senator shall serve on two standing committees, and no more; except that no more than eight Senators of the minority party may serve on three standing committees, and no more, if one of such standing committees is the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Committee on Public Works, or the Committee on Rules and Administration; and except that Senators of the majority party who are members of any said five committees may serve on three standing committees and no more."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to explain the object of the amendment to the rules covered by the Senate resolution I have just presented. It proposes that eight committees of the Senate be increased in membership from 13 to 15, and it proposes an amendment in that section of the law which now prevents any minority Senator from holding membership on more than two committees.

There are two reasons why I think this change should be made in the Reorganization Act. In the first place, I think that in many cases a committee of 13 is too small a committee. Where there are, as in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, four major subjects for consideration, and four major subcommittees, namely, on labor, education, health, and veterans, it is almost impossible for a Senator who serves on that committee to serve on two different subcommittees. Very much the same comment applies to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, which combines the former functions of the Committee on Commerce and the Committee on Interstate Commerce. Very much the same is true in regard to the Committee on Appropriations. It is also true with respect to the Armed Services Committee, which combines the functions of two previously important committees.

In the second place, in endeavoring to allot memberships on the minority side in particular—and I think the majority is bound to admit this—we have found that the provisions of the act are so rigid that it is almost impossible to give every Senator an important committee assignment. The 15 committees were intended to be the same in importance, but they are not. There are three, or four, or five committees, membership on which is not sought, two or three of which are of lesser importance. The inevitable result is that the new Members of the Senate are assigned the committees of least importance.

Under the provisions of the act no member of the minority may hold membership on more than two committees. The majority is not so bound. There are 203 places on the committees, and 2 places to each Senator would make a total of 192. Therefore, 11 Members of the majority may serve on three committees, and they may be assigned to one of the least important committees. Thereafter the least important committees are gradually filled up. Roughly speaking, I should say that 10 of the committees are better than the other 5, and there would be a sufficient number of places on the major committees to give every Senator a place.

Before the Reorganization Act went into effect there was a rule which protected the junior Senators. Under that rule every Senator was entitled to membership on three major committees and two minor committees. Consequently, a senior Senator could not take all his committee assignments on major committees and leave only the minor committees for the junior Senators. The result of the present act, however, is that that is exactly what he may do.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. If I recall correctly, the only exceptions, however, to a Senator, whether he be a member of the majority or minority, being allowed to be on more than two committees, is in respect to the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct. But the result is that the restriction is not nearly so severe on the majority as it is on the minority.

My proposal roughly is to increase the total number of committee seats by 16; and have 8 members of the minority able to serve on a third committee, and there would then be 19 members of the majority able to serve on a third committee, but only on a third committee of the second class, so to speak.

I submitted this matter to the majority before the committees were chosen, and pointed out the difficulties which have resulted in six of our members having membership on secondary committees, and no committee membership on committees of great importance. The majority does not desire to do anything at this time. I am submitting this matter to the Committee on Rules and Administration in order that it may be thoroughly discussed.

We have now had 2 years of operation of the Reorganization Act. Perhaps other changes should be made in the Reorganization Act, but in any event I hope very much that the Committee on Rules and Administration may give serious consideration to the rule so that present conditions may be adjusted, the work of the Senate may be somewhat more evenly distributed, and the situation will not prevail that a certain number of Senators have important jobs to do and a certain number of Senators are assigned to work which, while important, is not of the greatest interest. I hope, Mr. President, that the Committee on Rules and Administration will give consideration to this particular rule.

I may say that the minority—I think rightly so—2 years ago faced the problem we face now. That is true. The Reorganization Act was then a new act. No one had had any experience under it. No one knew how it would operate. The readjustments which would be required in any event were so tremendous that this particular matter was never considered at all, so far as I know. It was never presented to us. I think that, looking forward to the time when the majority will be the minority, they should also take an interest in seeing that such a change as this is made.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I must compliment the Senator from Ohio on having the long sight. He certainly is not nearsighted when he predicts that the majority will at any time within the foreseeable future become the minority of the Senate. Certainly he needs no nearsighted glasses in order to affect his vision at the moment.

I realize the difficulty which always arises when there is a change in the po-

litical control of the Senate, with respect to the assignment of committee memberships. We experienced it in a very drastic form 2 years ago when we had a wholesale exodus from the membership of most of our committees. When the Reorganization Act was passed it was the desire of the Senate, and of the Congress, to avoid a number of situations which had grown up like Topsy over a period of generations in the Senate, and also in the House.

One was the multiplicity of committees resulting in duplication, in various committees doing the same work, and the difficulty to draw the line of demarcation between the jurisdiction of committees, and also the membership of Senators on numerous committees. Frequently a Senator was on two or three, and in some cases four major committees, all meeting at the same time, and he had to exercise his own discretion as to which one of those committees he would attend. Obviously he was unable to function adequately and efficiently on all of them. That was one of the reasons why the Reorganization Act provided that no Senator should be a member of more than two committees, except in the case of the Committee on the District of Columbia, which was not regarded as a major legislative committee, so far as the country generally was concerned, and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which had up to that time not assumed major proportions, but which is potentially one of the most important committees of the Senate. The purpose was to avoid having Senators serve on several important committees and being unable to attend all their meetings. Perhaps he would have no voice himself in determining when they should meet, and even if he did he would have difficulty in determining when the various committees of which he was a member should meet in order that he might attend all of them. So the Congress wrote the Reorganization Act to avoid that situation, to avoid duplication in the jurisdiction of committees, and to give a more efficient legislative over-all coverage of the committees and the membership of the committees.

I appreciate the embarrassment which any minority, after having been the majority of the Senate, experiences in the assignment of membership to the committees. But it works as well for one as for the other. Certainly the embarrassment on the Republican side is nothing to compare to ours 2 years ago when we were compelled to drop nearly every Senator from one or more of the major committees.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may remind the Senator that the majority also had to drop many Senators from many major committees. I had to drop my membership on a committee on which I had served for 6 years. That was the Committee on Banking and Currency. In other words, the act required a complete realinement of all committees. I think this particular point, however, was not given very deep consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. When I was speaking of the majority I was referring to the party that had previously been in the majority, and had then become the minority party. Senators from both the majority and the minority had to give up memberships on committees. I had to give up memberships on two committees. I had to give up my membership on the Committee on Banking and Currency, on which I had served along with the Senator from Ohio, a committee on which I had enjoyed service since I was a Member of the Senate. I also had to give up membership on what is now the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I had served on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during the entire time I was a Member of that body. It was the only committee on which I served, because it was one of the 12 major committees, and membership on a major committee precluded the possibility of serving on any other committee. Two years ago I had to make a choice in membership on four major committees, and I chose membership on the Finance Committee and on the Foreign Relations Committee. That situation will exist every time there is a change in control.

I am not a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Even if I now were a member of that committee, I would not be a member long. Therefore, nothing I may say would necessarily bind that committee. But my fear is that in meeting a temporary situation at the beginning of every Congress we will whittle away at the Reorganization Act until we get back to the point where we were before the act was enacted—and that we will again have a large number of members on committees in order to meet some temporary situation that results in a hardship, but over a period of years it is no greater hardship on one party than on the other—until we get back to the point of duplication in the jurisdiction of committees.

What I am concerned about is that we may confront what an old judge in Kentucky used to speak of as the "numerosity" of membership on committees until we will come to the realization that there really is no Reorganization Act left. I believe the Committee on Rules and Administration will act on this matter. But I wish to express my fear, my anxiety, over the gradual whittling away of the Reorganization Act itself, which, on the whole, I think, has worked well. If we begin to tinker with it every time someone is dissatisfied or disappointed, or even a hardship is worked upon a Member of this body, we will gradually emasculate the Reorganization Act until there will be no Reorganization Act left.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I trust that the Senator from Kentucky, when he comes to consider the application of this proposal, will take into view what is, under prevailing rules, happening to the Committee on the District of Columbia. I have just looked at the list as announced today of the membership of the Committee on the District of Columbia, on the Republican side. I note with real interest that no Senator from the Republican side who has ever served on that committee before will serve on the District Committee during the Eighty-first Congress.

We are all conscious of the fact that the problems of the District are becoming larger and more difficult and awkward. Many Senators on both sides of the aisle are interested in the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I think perhaps that somewhere within the suggestion we might find a real way in which to achieve a continuity of effort in the solution of problems which, if tackled on a temporary, 2-year basis, will never be solved.

Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Kentucky will be glad to study and consider the observation which I have made.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

Speaking of the Committee on the District of Columbia, of course, the District Committee is always a problem. I believe it was 4 years ago, when we were in the majority, that we placed on that committee every ex-Governor who came into the Senate as a member of the majority, on the theory that Governors had had more experience in government than other Senators, and therefore would be good members of that committee. I believe that they rendered excellent service on the committee. However, we cannot expect a Senator, whether he was ever a Governor or not, or whatever may have been his profession or official experience, or from whatever State he may come, to wish to remain on that committee forever. It is a committee which deserves the utmost consideration, because the people of the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia itself are the children of the Congress and of the Constitution. The Constitution makes the Congress the exclusive legislative body to consider District matters. Someday I may have something to say on that question, but not now.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to make one further brief observation, if I may. The District of Columbia is a magnificent place as a city, as a symbol, and as an institution. If I may use the case of the junior Senator from Washington merely as an example; in the Eightieth Congress I served on three standing committees. One of those committees was the Committee on the District of Columbia. As a member of the minority party I must resign from one of the three committees on which I had previously served. There was no decision concerning choice to be made. I come to the Senate as a representative of the sovereign State of Washington, and therefore necessarily any decision must be made in favor of that constituency. But I think it is safe to say that my illustration is only an example of a number of other Senators on both sides of the aisle, who, when in the minority, if given an opportunity, would serve on the two national committees, and would say, "Certainly; if I can make

a contribution I shall continue my membership on the District of Columbia Committee in addition to my other committee assignments, so long as the leadership deems it advisable."

Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that I am serious in hoping that we can find an answer at this time—this year, if possible—which will insure an experienced Committee on the District of Columbia—for the fiscal involvement which surrounds and bewilders Members of Congress and administration officials of the city itself is in need of thoughtful attention and action which becomes more difficult of attainment as inexperienced committees undertake the task every 2 years.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, that is all I have to say.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding to me.

### AUTHORIZATION FOR A COMMITTEE TO SUBMIT REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday. The Committee on Post Office and Civil Service wishes to consider a matter during the recess, and to be authorized to make a report. I therefore ask unanimous consent that that committee be authorized to report to the Senate during the recess any legislation it may agree upon, in the hope that the Senate may take it up on Thursday and consider it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### OUR TREATMENT OF THE NAVAJO INDIANS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I shall take a few minutes today to explain the purpose of a bill which I introduced last Wednesday, Senate bill 170, for myself and the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]. I think the bill and its subject matter of sufficient importance to merit a brief explanation at this time to the Members of the Congress and to the people of the United States.

Last year the American press printed many thousands of lines and hundreds of pictures in an effort to tell the present-day story of the deplorable conditions under which the American Navajo Indian is forced to live. Radio also played its part by bringing to the American listener a word picture of the situation in hundreds of broadcasts.

The reports of these agencies, it will be remembered, stirred deep and intense feelings in the hearts of all Americans. Our citizens arose and contributed tremendous quantities of material things—principally food and clothing—in an effort to ease the desperate situation of the Navajos.

The present condition of the Navajos—I like to refer to them as early Americans—is not of their own doing. They made way for the westward advance of the white man during the early colonization of this great country.

In a spirit of peace and in an effort to assure themselves of a future in this great new country, the Navajo Tribe signed a treaty of peace with the United States of America in 1868—just 80 years ago.

This 80-year-old treaty with the Navajo Tribe committed each party to certain conditions. The Indians primarily agreed to live within the area of the reservation and to live in peace with their white brothers.

The United States, on the other hand, agreed to set aside a reservation, about 30,000 square miles in area, where the Navajo could live.

This great Government also made certain other commitments in that treaty, one of which was to educate the children of the Navajo. We were to provide one teacher for every 30 Navajo children of school age.

What the United States has done for these people during this 80-year interval is next to nothing. They are still the most primitive people in the United States.

This Nation, which could fight a war on any of the seven seas, which has airplanes and men to fly them that can bomb any place in the world, which has a standing military strength of millions of men, and which has appropriated billions upon billions of dollars for the rehabilitation of the downtrodden people of the world, today has not taken the time nor spent the money—infinitesimal when compared with war and foreign monetary expenditures—necessary to help these western American Indians and to meet the terms of a treaty which we signed.

This Indian reservation lies in an area stretching from southeastern Utah into Arizona and New Mexico. The reservation is as large as the combined areas of the States of Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts.

The land on which these Indians live is so submarginal that it is impossible for them to achieve any reasonable economic standard. It has been estimated that at least half of the Indians should be moved off the reservation if the other half is to be permitted to attain any acceptable living standard.

Mr. President, I should like briefly to consider from the factual point of view the conditions under which the Navajos are forced to live, and then I should like to discuss my bill and emphasize its importance in the over-all Navajo problem.

The Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held hearings nearly a year ago to investigate and consider a possible program for the education and general aid of these Indians.

It was found at these hearings that reservation schools were not the entire answer to the educational needs of the Navajos. There are very few sites where schools can be located. There are practically no settlements of any size, as settlements are known in the West. There is a scarcity of water. Many times it is necessary to drill deep wells and pump the water to the surface, if a water supply is to be obtained at all.

It is not contemplated that educational facilities on the Indian reservation shall be abandoned. The educational program for the Navajos would provide on-reservation day schools which ultimately could take care of the needs of approximately one-half of the tribe.

It has also been found that it will be necessary to move at least half of these Indians, some 30,000, from the reservation to other localities where they may earn a living.

The Navajos have increased in number from about 8,000 when they were placed on the reservation at the end of the Navajo war following the days of Kit Carson, to approximately 61,000.

These Indians have made their scanty living in the past on the reservation itself, largely by keeping small flocks of sheep and goats and doing a little farming where rainfall would permit. The bleak Navajo plateau country is so short of rainfall that it grows but a small amount of forage.

The Indian Service found that it was impossible for all 61,000 of the Navajos to be maintained by the sheep industry, and that other means would have to be found to provide for at least half of them.

Mr. President, this is an emergency situation. There are 16,000 Indian boys and girls who should be in school. We cannot move too rapidly to discharge our duty to these unfortunate people. Our obligations under our treaty and under the dictates of humanity demand that we act at once.

Important as the Navajo program is, it is but one facet in the solution of the Indian problem confronting this country. While the over-all Indian problem is broad, we must start somewhere. My bill to transfer Bushnell is a move in the right direction. It is my intention to introduce subsequent bills dealing with the solution of other Indian problems.

A 10-year program was outlined to our committee last year. It provided for development on the reservation, but it did not offer adequate means for removing the 30,000 Navajos who must find homes elsewhere.

Before anything much can be done to help these people, they must be taught the rudiments of the English language, so that they may be able later to understand what is said and being taught to them by their teachers.

It is difficult for them to work among white people, simply because they cannot understand instructions that are given them about the work they are to perform.

Dr. G. G. Salsbury, who is head of the Presbyterian Ganado Navajo mission—a mission which, by the way, has done a great deal of practical good for these Indians over the years—gave it as his judgment that an emergency program should be instituted at once.

He said even temporary school plants, to teach this new generation of Indians the English language so that they might be given lessons and help in industry and vocational training, would be most beneficial. After that, they would be much more able to take care of themselves among the white people, where they would have to get most of their employment and livelihood.

Mr. President, a day's journey by bus to the north of the Navajo Reservation there is a military hospital, built by the United States during World War II, for the care of wounded soliders. It is lo-

cated at Brigham City, in the very heart of agricultural and industrial Utah. This plant was built at a cost of more than $10,000,000. It is a permanent type of construction, with all modern improvements; in fact, it is a small but very modern city in itself. It is complete, with practically every facility needed, from fire station to a sewage disposal plant, recreational quarters, gymnasiums, swimming pools, picture houses, dormitories, officers' quarters, paved sidewalks and streets, and 26 acres of lawns, all located on a site of nearly 300 acres of some of the finest land in the State of Utah.

At one time during the war, nearly 4,000 wounded American soldiers were taken care of in this hospital. Immediately upon the close of the fighting, the Army decided the hospital was not located in the right place, or that it was no longer needed, and abandoned it. It was turned over the War Assets Administration for disposal.

That was in 1945. The War Assets Administration has been unable to find a suitable purchaser, either public or private, for this plant. It is costing the Government considerable money each year for caretakers and maintenance. It consists of 108 permanent buildings, which are in good condition.

Mr. President, I had held high hope that we might prevail upon the Army or the Veterans' Administration to reactivate this plant for the original purpose for which it was constructed. It seemed to me that this enormous expenditure of money should not be all in vain. However, all possibilities for utilizing Bushnell have been found to be impracticable, for a variety of reasons which I shall not discuss here.

The idea was then proposed by me to convert the hospital into a school for Indian children. Full advantage could be taken of all the physical facilities of this permanent institution, and, as a matter of fact, nearly 100 percent of its cost could be salvaged if it were used for such an institution

The matter was called to the attention of Acting Commissioner William Zimmerman, of the Indian Bureau. He, in turn, requested the War Assets Administration not to dispose of the plant, but to give the Indian Bureau an opportunity to investigate its possibilities.

Dr. Willard T. Beatty, head of the Department of Education of the Indian Service, and professional staff members, investigated the plant, and they came to the conclusion that it did have some very excellent possibilities as an Indian school site.

Members of the tribal council of the Navajos visited Brigham City. and, after a thorough inspection, became very enthusiastic about its possibilities. These men, who were sent to make the investigation on the ground, reported favorably to their superiors in Washington. Also, the people of Utah support the proposal.

The plan which has been outlined to date is to convert this hospital to an Indian vocational school for the education of the Indians of the nearby States, principally the Navajos, who are so badly in need of immediate facilities for educational purposes.



The bill I have introduced would authorize the War Assets Administrator to transfer Bushnell to the Department of the Interior for the purpose of establishing an Indian vocational school. This step was deemed necessary by legal authorities who have gone into the matter of the authority of the War Assets Administration to transfer the hospital, and likewise the authority of the Indian Service to receive it for the purposes named.

If this transfer is made, the Indian Service will be in a position to put the plant to almost immediate use. By "immediate," of course I mean such use as would come after a remodeling job has been done on the dormitories and after equipment necessary for the operation of the school has been put in place.

However, in order to get the fullest use of this plant—and all of it is needed—it will be necessary to construct some additional buildings, particularly classrooms.

The dormitories which were used for hospital beds and other facilities are readily adaptable for dormitories for Indian students. These dormitories should be used to their fullest extent, inasmuch as there are more than enough Indians to use the entire plant.

It is estimated that 2,000 students can be provided board and room in this institution, if the necessary classrooms are built nearby. There is ample room on the grounds for such additional school buildings as are necessary.

If immediate action is taken on this bill and if the necessary funds are provided as a deficiency appropriation, this plant could be put to use next September as a school, at least on a partial basis, even though the construction of the extra school buildings would not be completed by that time. Between 700 and 800 students, it is estimated, could use it during the construction period.

It is necessary to use to the limit all facilities that may be obtained for these Indians. I cannot emphasize too strongly that these boys and girls, future Americans, should not have so much of their lives spoiled by our delay in getting them into schools.

I think the American people are determined that an adequate program shall be provided for these people, so that they may have the same right that other American boys and girls have been enjoying for years, the right to an education.

Time is of the essence. Even a year saved will be of great value to these people. No one can measure its value in dollars and cents.

If this plant is accepted by the Indian Bureau and if Congress appropriates the necessary money for construction of the extra buildings and furnishing them with the needed equipment, at least a year and possibly 2 years will be saved in getting into a school at least 2,000 of the 16,000 Navajo children not now in school. The time of these 2,000 young people is important.

I urge that the committee to which this bill has been referred give it immediate attention. Upon its report to the floor of this body, as I believe it will be reported with a favorable recommendation, I shall ask that it receive immediate consideration.

I shall further urge, upon its passage, that the Congress of the United States, in the deficiency appropriation bill, appropriate sufficient funds to permit the immediate commencement of construction of the necessary school buildings. I shall request that the deficiency appropriation bill contain items for the construction of the necessary school buildings, so as to permit the utilization of this plant to its fullest extent, and also that the bill provide funds for remodeling and for equipping it, so that it may be put into use, even if only partially, by September 1949.

As a matter of fact, establishment of an Indian school at Bushnell would save the Government millions of dollars in new school-building construction. It also would serve as an excellent foundation upon which to build an off-reservation educational program for the Indians.

Mr. President, I have supported Federal aid to education. I voted for the bill when it was before the Senate last spring, and I shall vote for Federal aid to the States for the purpose of helping the children of this land. I am convinced that it is necessary. Indian education, which we have agreed to give by solemn treaty, has just as much merit, if not more.

It is true that the utilizing of these buildings will still leave 14,000 Navajo Indian children without school facilities. I intend to present other programs to put these youngsters into school in the near future. The Bushnell Indian school proposal is a beginning. We should take this step now and be ready to adopt a wider and larger program for the 14,000 not taken care of by this particular program.

Mr. President, I shall now conclude, but in so doing, I should like to leave with the Members of this distinguished body the wisdom expressed many years ago by an unknown western Mormon pioneer:

> The Indians are better than many of the whites—the Indians may scalp their enemies, but they don't skin their friends.

Mr. President, the News-Journal, of Brigham City, Utah, successor to the Box Elder News and the Box Elder Journal, recently published an editorial regarding the use of Bushnell Hospital for an Indian school. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial published in the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE'RE FOR THEM

Being only human, we are all afraid and suspicious of things we don't know and understand.

When we think about a Government Indian school at Bushnell, here at our very doorstep, we can't help wondering just how it will affect us. All of us like our town the way it is. The people we know we like, and the people we don't know—possibly the reason is because we're afraid we wouldn't like them—give us no trouble.

We have a good thing, here, in this community. And our first inclination is against sharing it with anyone else, against accepting any changes.

And would you believe it, the Navajos are just like us, they're afraid and suspicious of things they don't know and understand. They can't help wondering how we, as a community, will affect their young people if they should be sent to a boarding school adjacent to our town.

Can you imagine that? A little afraid, a little suspicious of us? Why, we're the best people in the world.

Take John Jones (providing there isn't a John Jones—if there is, make it Alexander Jones), when he moved to town, a few years ago, we were suspicious of him. He might complicate our smooth and satisfactory existence, in some way. He might compete with us for something we want—and be too tough competition, or at least make us extend ourself. We didn't bother to get to know him, right away. After all, we had plenty of friends.

Then, somehow, we got acquainted with Mr. Jones. He became a customer of ours, or he offered us a job, or he tackled one of those nonpaying community betterment assignments and did a good job of it. We couldn't believe it possible at the time, but we have a better town, and a better life, and one more friend, because Jones came to town.

Logic and reason make no difference. We're a little suspicious of the unknown, always have been and always will be, because we're human.

And so are the Navajos for the same reason.

The wise men of the Navajo Tribal Council who visited our town yesterday had their suspicions allayed for the most part. And they did much to allay our own suspicions. Of all the things we might have expected them to be, we were hardly prepared to find them to be just what they were—ordinary people, "God's chillun," just like the rest of us. Some of them were uneducated, but talking with them you realize once again that it is the wisdom of the years and experience that really counts.

And in all of their hearts—indeed, worn on their sleeves—is one burning desire: That their children shall have an education and opportunity, that they shall, after generations, claim the lost heritage that first was theirs, to have and hold, and live full American citizenship. These fine, wise, mild-mannered, bright-eyed Indian men, hold as their highest ambition a hope that their children may have a better, fuller life than they themselves have had.

Is that so much different from the rest of us?

Frankly, we're for them. Even if it doesn't mean a penny's business to Brigham City, even if there's nothing in it for anyone now living here, we still hope the Navajos can have the spendid school for 1,500 to 2,000 of their children that is possible with the excellent facilities at Bushnell.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want first to say to my good friend from Utah that I am glad to assure him of my cooperation again on this Indian matter, as I have cooperated with him in the past on other Indian matters. I am aware of the valuable work he has been doing on the committee that has charge of Indian affairs. I think he knows of my view on the general proposition, that it is incumbent upon us to give to the Indians of the country a full measure of freedom and also of the responsibility that goes along with freedom, because I hold again to the view I expressed before, that one of the great needs, so far as taking care of civil rights in this country is concerned, is to be found in connection with our Indian affairs. I hope to see the time in the not too distant future when we shall make very clear to the Indians that they must also assume the responsibility of a granted citizenship, and I hold fast to the view that one of the great contributions we could make for greater efficiency in our Government would be to have a drastic overhauling of the Indian Bureau. I am satisfied that what has happened over the years is that we have really built up a counterpart, so far as the Indian Service is concerned, of another WPA, and I am for taking the Indians off "WPA" and granting to them as rapidly as possible full and complete freedom and citizenship.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator from Oregon for what he has just said, and express to him my appreciation of the support he gave our program during the Eightieth Congress. It was very helpful indeed.

### AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MORSE. It was a pleasure to support it.

Mr. President, I really arose to make brief comment on another matter. I do not usually talk twice in one day on the floor of the Senate, but I am going to have to leave the city on business at the close of the day, and I wanted the RECORD to show the following comments before my return.

Mr. President, last Wednesday I submitted my antifilibuster resolution (S. Res. 12), and a number of other Senators also submitted resolutions on the same subject. My purpose in rising at this time is to urge that the first item of business of the Committee on Rules and Administration, after the committee is organized, be the consideration of these resolutions, because, as I have said many times, I believe it is of the utmost importance that this matter of amending the Rules of the Senate be considered and accomplished as early as possible in the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point an editorial which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post, entitled "Curb on Filibusters."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CURB ON FILIBUSTERS

Now that the House of Representatives has curbed the powers of its Rules Committee to veto legislation before it reaches the floor, the Senate can scarcely do less in liberating itself from the filibuster. Many Senators are alert to this necessity. On a single day last week five resolutions proposing amendments to the existing ineffectual cloture rule were introduced. Certainly the public is eager to see this reform put into effect. The time is ripe for its sponsors to press their case with all the vigor they can command.

All the resolutions offered last week would effect some improvement over the present helplessness of the Senate in the face of a talkfest. But the majority of them would merely extend the operation of cloture upon a two-thirds vote. Obviously, this would leave the major defect in the present system untouched. Under the existing requirement for a two-thirds vote, cloture has been adopted only 4 times out of 19 tries since 1917. In other words, cloture applied by a two-thirds vote is little better than no restraint at all on filibusters.

In principle, moreover, the two-thirds provision is wrong. It means that the action of the Senate, when a filibuster gets under way, may be controlled by the minority instead of the majority. That is the negation of democratic practice. If we believe in representative government, surely a simple majority can be trusted to make the decision as to when debate should be ended no less than to make other decisions. In these days when rapid action must often be taken to cope with an emergency, and when Congress is always faced by more needed legislation than it can possibly enact, the only argument that can be made for the two-thirds cloture rule is that obstruction of the democratic process is sometimes justified. And that argument seems to us indefensible.

Fortunately, two of the proposed amendments—those submitted by Senator MYERS and Senator MORSE—would permit the closing of debate by majority vote. Senator MYERS would limit each Senator to 1 hour of debate after a cloture motion had been voted. Senator MORSE would allow 2 hours. Neither limitation would work any real hardship, for the Senate has usually debated a bill thoroughly before any thought of invoking cloture arises. To assume that the Senate would throttle itself by this device seems absurd to anyone who knows the tradition of unlimited debate in that body. Rather, the proposed rules would save the Senate from making a ridiculous spectacle of itself when the country is demanding action in place of talk.

Mr. MORSE. I should also like to observe, Mr. President, that on Wednesday last I requested unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of my resolution, but that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], my very good friend, of whom I am very fond, objected.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I asked for immediate action on my resolution because during the special session of Congress the Republican Senators in conference assembled agreed to a motion, which was released to the public, notifying the American people that, come the first session of the Eighty-first Congress—and at that time we were of the opinion we would be in control of the Senate of the United States—the first item of business which we as Republicans proposed to take up was a resolution eliminating the filibuster from the Senate of the United States. There is some division among us as to just what the procedure should be, but there is no division on this side of the aisle as to the desirability and necessity, if we are really going to have the people's business transacted in the Senate of the United States, of having an antifilibuster resolution adopted at the earliest possible date. And of course the record is perfectly clear that, over the years, the barriers and blocks which have been thrown in the way of an antifilibuster resolution being adopted by this body have come almost invariably from the Democratic side of the aisle. I think it is very important that the American people understand first that it was the Republican program for the Eighty-first Congress to make an antifilibuster resolution the first

major item of business in that session of Congress. To keep faith with the spirit and intent of the action taken by the Republicans in conference last summer, I last Wednesday asked for immediate consideration of my antifilibuster resolution. I wanted the record made clear again as to where the objections came from, and once again the objections came from the Democratic side of the aisle. I venture to suggest that that is where the objections are going to come from again, as we go into this matter in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. But let us get the record perfectly clear from the very beginning. My good friend from Georgia, in objecting to immediate action of my antifilibuster resolution the other afternoon, among other things stated in substance that use of the filibuster had not over the years in any single instance resulted in material damage to the interests of the Nation. In this connection, I wish to call attention to a very able study of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, Public Affairs Bulletin No. 64, entitled "Limitation of Debate in the United States Senate," prepared by George B. Galloway. We find in that bulletin that an incomplete listing shows 37 major bills, some of them on three or four different occasions, have been defeated by the filibuster. This list does not include numerous appropriation bills that were talked to death. A partial list of such bills that failed because of the filibuster totals 82 between 1876 and 1916.

While I recommend to my colleagues that they give careful study to this excellent bulletin, I think it would be helpful if at this point in the RECORD there appeared the tabulation of legislation defeated by filibusters as shown in that bulletin at pages 20 and 21. Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that tabulation be printed in the body of the RECORD, as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Legislation defeated by filibusters*[1]

| Bills | Year |
|---|---|
| Reconstruction of Louisiana | 1865 |
| Repeal of election laws | 1879 |
| Force bill (Federal elections) | 1890–91 |
| River-and-harbor bills (3) | 1901, 1903, 1914 |
| Tri-State bill | 1903 |
| Colombian treaty (Panama Canal) | 1903 |
| Ship-subsidy bills (2) | 1907, 1922–23 |
| Canadian reciprocity bill | 1911 |
| Arizona-New Mexico statehood | 1911 |
| Ship-purchase bill | 1915 |
| Armed-ship resolution | 1917 |
| Oil- and mineral-leasing bill and several appropriation bills | 1919 |
| Antilynch bills (3) | 1922, 1935, 1937–38 |
| Migratory-bird bill | 1926 |
| Campaign investigation resolution | 1927 |
| Colorado River bills (Boulder Dam project) (2) | 1927, 1928 |
| Emergency officers' retirement bill | 1927 |
| Washington public-buildings bill | 1927 |
| National-origins provisions in immigration laws, resolution to postpone | 1929 |
| Oil-industry investigation | 1931 |
| Glass banking bill | 1933 |
| Supplemental deficiency bill | 1935 |
| Work-relief bill (prevailing-wage amendment) | 1935 |
| Flood-control bill | 1935 |
| Coal-conservation bill | 1936 |
| Anti-poll-tax bills (4) | 1942, 1944, 1946, 1948 |
| Fair-employment-practices bill | 1946 |
| Case strike-control bill | 1946 |

Numerous appropriation bills. For a partial list of 82 such bills that failed from 1876 to 1916, see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 28, 1916, pages 10152–10153.

[1] 37 bills appear in this incomplete list, not including the many appropriation bills that have either been lost in the jam that resulted from filibusters or were talked to death because they failed to include items that particular Senators desired for the benefit of their States or because grants they made were considered excessive. Several successful filibusters have sought and achieved the enactment of legislation favored by the filibusterers. Filibusters have succeeded not only in preventing the passage of legislation, but also in preventing the organization of the Senate, the election of its officers, and the confirmation of Presidential appointees. They have also succeeded in modifying the terms of legislation; in delaying adjournment of Congress; in forcing special sessions, the adoption of conference reports, of neutrality legislation, and of a ship subsidy; in postponing consideration of legislation, and in raising the price of silver. Legislation has also often been defeated or modified by the mere threat of a filibuster.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should merely like to say to the able Senator from Oregon that I think he is performing a very useful service both to the Senate and to the country in bringing up the matter of the necessity of making a change in the existing rules of the Senate. I speak as one of the minority members of the Senate Rules Committee. While there may be some honest difference of opinion as to what procedure should be followed in closing the loopholes which now exist in the rules, I think all of us will agree that under the present precedents of the Senate we have no cloture whatever in the Senate of the United States. So long as a filibuster may be conducted against a motion to take up a bill, not even two-thirds of the Members of the Senate can bring to a close the debate whenever it is the desire of one man or a small group of men to obstruct the legislative process.

I hope that the able Senator from Oregon will direct a communication to the able Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is the new chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and request an immediate hearing on his proposed amendment to the rules. I can say to the Senator from Oregon that I have today addressed a communication to the Senator from Arizona as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, asking for an immediate hearing on amendment of the rules offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on behalf of himself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself, the junior Senator from California. I think that all of these measures should be brought before the committee during the first week the committee is functioning, so that whatever is reported by the committee may be brought to the floor of the Senate during the month of January; and if we are to have a filibuster on some correction of the present rules of the Senate, then let it come immediately, and not later in the session, when it may obstruct important public business.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the views of the able Senator from California. He has been one of the leaders on our side of the aisle in the fight to do something about changes in the present rules which permit filibusters as a practice on the floor of the Senate. I wish to say to the Senator from California that I shall continue to work to that end. There is a difference between the resolution of which he is one of the coauthors and my resolution, to which I shall direct my attention momentarily.

I have heard the Senator from California say—and he is quite correct—that it is not safe, from the standpoint of this country, and I paraphrase his statement, to give any small group of men the tremendous power that such a group has in the Senate of the United States when they organize a filibuster. Many of us have said the same thing in different language forms.

On this side of the aisle we considered the subject in the Republican conference last July and came out with the unanimous opinion that it should be Republican policy to take steps necessary to try to force action on an antifilibuster resolution.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am in hearty agreement with what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] has said and with what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said. In 1942, at the end of a filibuster, I declared myself by saying that there comes a time when any self-respecting legislative body should stop talking and should vote. The defect in our rules has not been corrected up to this time. I hope that the Republican policy committee will take early action to bring the subject to a focus so that we can debate it in January, when we shall not be very busy, and there will be plenty of time to discuss all phases of the proposed changes in the rule.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his assistance and for his contribution to the debate.

I have only a word or two more to say on this subject at this time. I want to direct my attention to the proposal which I understand the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is supporting. Being chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, his support is, of course, a matter of considerable weight, so far as

action of the Senate is concerned. The Senator from Arizona talked to me regarding his proposal a day or two ago, and I told him I could not accept his proposal, because it was not a solution of the problem which confronts us, and that, in my judgment, his proposal will simply delay action for a long period of time, that it will be dilatory in its nature, and will be encouragement to further delay because it does not come to grips with the fundamental issue. Of course, there should be a change in the rule so as to provide that any item of business in the Senate, whether it be the approval of the Journal, a motion, or no matter what it be, shall be subject to a cloture motion. The Senator from California is correct when he says that in the rules today there is no effective rule on cloture.

Mr. President, we cannot get away from the objective data on the subject. The solution offered by the Senator from Arizona, in my judgment, is no solution at all, because the solution we must have is one which makes it possible by a majority vote to stop debate in the Senate and proceed with the people's business, guaranteeing, at the same time, sufficient time for the minority to seek to change itself into the majority. The Senator from Arizona does not propose to give to the Senate the power by majority vote. He seeks to retain the two-thirds vote requirement. I say, Mr. President, that the statistics are all against him, and demonstrate that such a requirement is not an effective measure. Even to the extent we can apply cloture under the present rule, Mr. President, in applying it to measures since 1917 the record shows that it has been possible to get a two-thirds vote only four times.

Mr. President, I want to participate in something more than a mere sham. I think filibustering should be stopped in the Senate of the United States. The way to stop it is to give to this body the power, by majority vote, to stop debate and, at the same time, amend the rules so that the minority will be adequately protected.

For future reference, let us quickly go through the procedure to which I am referring. My resolution, Mr. President, would require 16 Senators to sign a cloture petition before action could be obtained. As we watch the Senate in actual operation, it will have to be a matter of great moment—it must be made perfectly clear that the time has come to take action on limiting debate—before 16 Senators will put their signatures on a petition to end debate. But when, in the view of 16 Senators, debate should end, and a majority of the other Senators agree that debate should end following the filing of the cloture petition, plus a guaranty to the minority that every Senator on the floor shall have 2 hours in which to debate the merits, after cloture, and shall have the right to farm out all or part of his time to any of his colleagues, we shall then have an effective check on filibustering, and certainly, Mr. President, we shall have an effective rule which protects both the majority and the minority.

I shall urge, Mr. President, that consideration be given to the majority-vote principle, because a retention of the passage of cloture by a two-thirds vote will not give us the results we need, for we cannot marshal on many occasions, particularly those which involve such issues as full constitutional protection to all our citizens through civil-rights legislation, the necessary two-thirds vote, which is presently required.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Committee on Rules and Administration will give full hearing to the proposition that cloture be passed by action of the majority of the Senate, and that then each Senator have the privilege of speaking for 2 hours or farming out his time, so that the minority and the country can be amply protected on a given issue.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have no intention of engaging in a partisan debate over the question of cloture. It is a matter about which neither party can contend that it has a clean record altogether, because historically over a period of years, involving a generation or more, neither party has been clear-handed in regard to the use of the device of the filibuster.

I recall that many years ago the Congress automatically adjourned every other year on the 4th of March, so that whether the business of the session was concluded or not it had to adjourn. Many times Senators took advantage of that fact to filibuster in the late hours or days of a session against some measure to which they were opposed, and there was no particular priority on the part of either party as to the use of that device. I have a very vivid recollection of it being used on many occasions by members of the party across the aisle.

I have fought the filibuster ever since I have been a Member of the Senate, and I have been the victim of several filibusters which I undertook to stop, but I was not always successful in doing so. I have frequently announced myself in favor of such rules, or such fair interpretation of the present rules, as would give the Senate power to do business whenever it was ready to vote. I have always felt that the filibuster was an anachronism, that it had no place in a democratic legislative body. As a matter of fact, the effort to secure cloture usually takes place after there has been full debate, and not before there has been full debate.

I have already spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration in regard to bringing in an amendment to the rules as soon as possible. There is no guaranty that it would be the first matter taken up, because no one knows what committees will bring in measures, or whether they will bring them in at all, but I think I can say that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, intends to give the promptest consideration to this proposal.

With respect to the amendment to the rule offered by the Senator from Oregon, he charged the Democratic side with responsibility for its lack of consideration the other day. Of course, the Senator from Oregon knew when he asked for consideration he could not get an important matter like that taken up by unanimous consent without committee consideration, because his proposal was entirely different from that which had theretofore been considered. So the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] objected to the immediate consideration of the resolution carries with it no political implication except that the Senator from Georgia, in the exercise of his right, felt that that sort of a resolution should not be considered on the floor immediately without going to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which had already had referred to it other proposals of the same kind.

As to the Senator's proposal that each Senator have 2 hours, and that he be allowed to farm out his 2 hours to some other Senator, that does not strike me, I am frank to say, with much force. Under the proposal that each Senator be allowed 1 hour, if every Senator desired to talk about any pending proposal, that would mean 96 hours of debate. We might say that every Senator would not talk about the matter, but every Senator would have the right to talk about it, and that would mean 96 hours, and dividing that among the days in which we were likely to be in session, it would mean that there would be at least 2 weeks before there would be a vote on the proposal on which cloture was sought or had been voted.

If each Senator were allowed 2 hours, that would means 192 hours of debate, and if each Senator were allowed to farm out his 2 hours, and if we assume that half the Senators would farm out their 2 hours, it would mean that 48 Senators would have 4 hours each if they desired to use it to debate a proposal after cloture had been voted.

Mr. President, it seems to me that would not bring about as prompt a consideration of the final determination of the matter on which cloture had been voted as should be brought about.

I have always felt that 1 hour for each Senator is enough, after there has been ample debate. We assume there will have been ample debate when a cloture petition is filed, and that 96 hours is sufficient, and that 1 hour is enough for each Senator. I do not believe that the 2-hour proposal, with the right to farm out time, is in the interest of speeding determination of legislation after there has been debate to such an extent that the Senate would be willing to vote cloture, either by two-thirds vote or majority vote.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's point of view. I would, however, call his attention to two points, namely, that if such a rule as I am proposing were adopted, the Senate would then have a rule which would make definite and certain a terminal date, a time for the end of debate, and I think that is all we need in order to stop a fillibuster, that is, have the Members of the Senate know that, come a certain day and a certain hour, automatically debate will end. In my judgment, my 2-hour rule would give ample time for Senators to state their views on the merits of the pending question, it would give the coun-

try ample time to be heard from, and it would not stop the Senate from transacting other business. I think the Senator from Kentucky has overlooked that point.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not understand it possible to fix a definite date for the termination of debate so long as 96 Senators have the right to debate 2 hours. It would all depend on how long the Senate remained in session each day, and how many Senators desired to utilize 2 hours each. As the Senator has just suggested, other business might be transacted which would itself tend to postpone a final vote upon the matter on which every Senator had 2 hours for debate, and half of them 4 hours if the other half decided to yield their time to the other 48 Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a comment?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. If the language needs to be changed in order to carry out the intention, I shall be happy to have that done, but the intention is to have the clock start ticking the moment the Senate adopted the cloture petition.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not necessary to amend the rule in order for the clock to start ticking, if cloture is adopted.

Mr. MORSE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. BARKLEY. The point is that the number of 2-hour speeches or the number of 1-hour speeches which could be made in any one day would depend on the length of time the Senate was in session on that day. If it were in session 4 hours, it might be assumed there would be four speeches. If it were in session 6 hours, there might be six speeches, if 1 hour was the limitation; or a shorter session would bring fewer speeches, which would postpone the final vote. So that so long as each Senator has an hour or 2 hours it is impossible to fix an hour, or a day, on which there could be a final vote, until it had been determined that no other Senator wished to exercise the right to speak under the cloture rule, whether it be 1 hour or 2 hours.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the able Senator from Kentucky, who is soon to leave the floor of the Senate and to preside over its deliberations, that I can testify that on a number of occasions he has been vitally interested in finding some way to terminate a filibuster, as were some of us on this side of the aisle. But I also wish to point out to the able Senator from Kentucky, and I think he will agree to this, that if we are ever to get an amendment to the rules of the Senate we should endeavor to get it very early in the session, because unless the amendment is brought to the floor very early, we are then faced with the problem of appropriation bills, of the new ECA legislation, of other aid to Europe, perhaps in armaments, of social-security legislation, and the pressures become so great that there is a tendency to drop the fight to correct the rules in order to pass legislation dealing with other public business.

It seems to me that if there is the will to adopt a resolution providing for such a change in the rules of the Senate—and I know the able Senator himself desires such a change—on the part of both the majority leadership of the Senate and the minority leadership, they can bring the amendment of the rules to the floor within a very short period of time, and then instead of recessing for 3-day periods in the early part of the session, when there is ready for consideration very little legislative business, if the Senate should be kept in session each day to a reasonable hour in the evening, and, if a filibuster develops, should hold, if necessary, all-night sessions, before the legislative calendar becomes too cumbersome, then I think we would have a reasonable opportunity, working together, to close this loophole in the rules which I am sure the Senator from Kentucky recognizes exists.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator from California, and I agree with him that the proposal ought to be brought before the Senate promptly. I recall what happened in the last Congress. The matter of bringing in a rule to amend the rules was taken up in the committee early in that session, and the proposed amendment to the rule was reported to the Senate months before the end of the Congress and placed on the calendar. No one, however, made any effort to get it up. It might be said that anyone on the floor of the Senate could move to take up a certain matter that is on the calendar, and that is true. But the responsible leadership on the other side, which was then the majority, made no effort to bring it up. I can understand that, because it came in at a time when other matters of importance were under consideration, and therefore, I suppose, anticipating a very lengthy debate on the matter, it was thought expedient not to undertake to bring it up at that session. I recall the notice served by the then Republican majority in its conference that they were going to start something, inaugurate a movement of this kind quickly, as soon as they got back in the present session, but I think that was a sort of a death-bed confession, in view of the fact that nothing had been done in two whole years, and it turned out to be more of a death-bed confession than was at the time thought possible, I suppose.

At any rate, no matter who is responsible, or how many filibusters there have been, or on what side they originated, I agree wholeheartedly that the rules of the Senate should be amended, if it is necessary to amend them in order that this body may transact business. It is the only legislative body in the world where a single individual or a few individuals can interfere with the orderly procedure in regard to the consideration of legislation, to the point where the Senate can never vote on a measure which an overwhelming majority might favor. That does not apply to any particular type of legislation. It applies to anything that may come before the Senate.

REPRINT OF BILL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent to have Senate bill 110 reprinted so that the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] may be added to the names of the other sponsors of the bill. The title of the bill is as follows:

S. 110. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 13, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Secretary of State.

James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Edward H. Pruden, pastor of First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we begin a new week and a new legislative day we pause to acknowledge Thee as the source from whom all our blessings come, and to seek that leadership of Thy Holy Spirit without which we shall surely go astray. May Thy blessing be upon the Members of Congress and upon all legislative bodies everywhere that men of good will working together in every nation may establish peace in the earth. We pray, our Father, that Thou wilt help us to recognize the tremendous significance of the responsibilities which rest upon us; and in deep seriousness of purpose and in a dedication to the God of all mankind may we approach our tasks today. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 7, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if the majority leader expects to have a quorum here on Thursday?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a question of fact that the majority leader is unable to answer. I think it is immaterial. I doubt if any Member will raise that question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MINORITY EMPLOYEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution (H. Res. 39) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That pursuant to the Legislative Pay Act of 1929, as amended, six minority employees authorized therein shall be the following-named persons, effective January 4, 1949, until otherwise ordered by the House, to wit: John Andrews and William F. Russell, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum, respectively; James P. Griffin (minority pair clerk), to receive compensation at the basic rate of $4,000 per annum; M. L. Meletio, John McCabe, and T. J. Kennamer, to receive compensation at the basic rate of $3,800 per annum, respectively.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there are several Members who desire to take the oath of office this morning. If they will present themselves at the bar of the House, the Chair will see that the oath is administered.

Mr. THOMAS H. BURKE, Mr. FRED L. CRAWFORD, Mr. JOHN JENNINGS, JR., Mr. EDWARD H. JENISON, and Mr. THOR C. TOLLEFSON presented themselves at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 17)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting my recommendations for the budget of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950.

Under the laws of our country, the budget, when approved by the Congress, becomes the plan of action for the Federal Government. It thus embodies decisions of tremendous importance, particularly in these times, to the American people and to the entire world. The preparation of the budget is one of the most important duties of the President. It represents a carefully prepared plan for carrying out the many activities and services of Government which the Congress has authorized, and others which I am recommending, in response to the needs and desires of the American people.

This is the fourth budget prepared since the close of World War II. The character of the postwar world still presents many complex problems and unanswered questions. This budget is the clearest expression that can be given at this time to the program which the Government of the United States should follow in the world today.

It is founded on the conviction that the United States must continue to exert strong, positive effort to achieve peace in the world and growing prosperity at home. Substantial direct assistance is provided for other members of the family of nations, and expenditures in support of our armed forces are materially increased. Funds are included for the necessary strengthening of our economy through the development and conservation of the Nation's productive resources. Increased emphasis is placed on the provision of badly needed measures to promote the education, health, and security of our people.

To support this program, the budget provides for expenditures of 41.9 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1950, about 1.7 billion dollars above the requirements for the present year. Under existing law and with continuing high levels of economic activity, revenues for the fiscal year would be 41 billion dollars. This would result in an estimated deficit of 873 million dollars.

In a period of high prosperity it is not sound public policy for the Government to operate at a deficit. A Government surplus at this time is vitally important to provide a margin for contingencies, to permit reduction of the public debt, to provide an adequate base for the future financing of our present commitments, and to reduce inflationary pressures. I am, therefore, recommending new tax legislation to raise revenues by 4 billion dollars. Because of the normal lag in the collection of taxes, however, tax receipts in the fiscal year 1950 would be considerably less.

In presenting this financial program to the Nation, I have carefully considered the present economic situation of our country and the effect upon it of large Government expenditures. The Economic Report, submitted recently to Congress, emphasized the compelling need for financial prudence by the Government at this time. The actions taken in preparing this budget reflect that policy.

Because of heavy prior commitments requiring larger expenditures for a number of continuing programs in the fiscal year 1950 and the presence of inflationary forces in our economy, it has been necessary to deny many requests for additional funds which would normally be desirable. Necessary increases in our national defense program are expected to result in additional expenditures in 1950 of 2.5 billion dollars, or 21 percent, over 1949. Public works already authorized and now under way also require higher expenditures. Despite these and other unavoidable increases, the total expenditures contemplated for 1950 are only 1.7 billion dollars above the level of the present fiscal year.

Within the framework of this budget, provision is made for inaugurating certain essential economic and social programs which should no longer be delayed. An estimate of 290 million dollars is included for aid to education. An additional 500 million dollars is included for such programs as housing and slum clearance, expanded social security and the national health program. In addition, there will be an increase in receipts and expenditures of trust accounts under my recommendation for strengthening the contributory social insurance system.

The plans of each Government agency have been thoroughly reviewed, and the amounts shown in the budget represent, in my judgment, the minimum requirements for the next fiscal year. I believe that this budget reflects the necessities of our national policy and the desires of our people and that an extensive review by the Congress will result in its acceptance as a sound program of governmental action.

*Budget totals*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated |
|---|---|---|---|
| Receipts | $42,211 | $39,580 | $40,985 |
| Expenditures | 33,791 | 40,180 | 41,858 |
| Surplus (+) or deficit (−) | +8,419 | −600 | −873 |

NOTE.—Estimated expenditures are based on existing and proposed legislation. Estimated receipts exclude new tax proposals. Throughout this Budget, payments of refunds of Government receipts are reported as deductions from total receipts; in the past, they have been reported as expenditures.

The 1950 budget, like all those since the end of the war, is dominated by our international and national-defense programs. Together, they are expected to amount to 21 billion dollars, or half of all budget expenditures.

International affairs and finance account for 6.7 billion dollars of expenditures in the fiscal year 1950, compared with 7.2 billion dollars in 1949. Most of these funds will be spent as part of the strong economic support we are extending to the free nations of western Europe, whose recovery is the key to continued independence and to safeguarding freedom in many other parts of the world. Our investment in European recovery will repay us many times in terms of increased strength and improved organization for peace.

But in existing circumstances, economic strength is not enough to assure continued independence to free peoples. Under the Charter of the United Nations, therefore, we have been discussing with some of the western European countries measures designed to increase the security of the North Atlantic area. To further this objective, I expect later to request funds for providing military supplies to those countries and to certain other countries where the provision of such assistance is important to our national security. It is not possible now to predict accurately what will be needed, and I have therefore included no allowance in the budget. The fact that additional funds will be required to meet the demands of this program emphasizes

even more strongly the need for increased revenues in the years ahead.

While we believe that active participation in the work of the United Nations and support for the economic recovery and growing strength of free nations are the most important steps we can take toward peace, we must also maintain adequate national-defense forces. In this budget, expenditures for national defense are estimated to total 14.3 billion dollars in 1950, compared to 11.8 billion dollars for 1949. New authorizations recommended for national defense in 1950 total 15.9 billion dollars. Defense expenditures to maintain the present program are expected to be higher in 1951, as a result of expanding programs now under way and the large orders already placed for aircraft, ships, and other material and equipment, which will be delivered and paid for in the next few years.

The military forces recommended in this budget are the most powerful this Nation has ever maintained in peacetime. The principal objective we should have in mind in planning for our national defense at this time is to build a foundation of military strength which can be sustained for a period of years without excessive strain on our productive resources, and which will permit rapid expansion should the need arise. The recommendations in this budget move toward this objective. I believe that they will permit this Nation to maintain a proper military preparedness in the present uncertain period.

Two other commitments of the Government will continue to have a major impact on budget expenditures in the fiscal year 1950. These are interest on the public debt and our program of services and benefits provided for veterans and their dependents. Together they total 11 billion dollars, or 26 percent of the budget.

A general decline in the number of veterans drawing readjustment benefits reduces expenditures for veterans to 5.5 billion dollars, 1.3 billion dollars below the current year. Interest on the public debt, however, shows an increase from 5.3 billion dollars in 1949 to more than 5.4 billion dollars in 1950.

Expenditures for all activities of the Federal Government, exclusive of those required for the four items—international, national defense, veterans, and interest on the public debt—total 10 billion dollars or 24 percent of the budget.

Programs devoted to social welfare, health, and security require expenditures of 2.4 billion dollars. Of this amount nearly half is in direct grants to States for public assistance.

Development of our natural resources, including atomic energy, is estimated to cost 1.9 billion dollars. Programs devoted to agriculture and agricultural resources require expenditures of 1.7 billion dollars. Provision for transportation and communication facilities and services, many of them supporting our national defense activities, requires 1.6 billion dollars.

All other activities of Government—for housing, education, labor, finance, commerce, and industry and the costs of general government—amount to 2.3 billion dollars, or 5 percent of the total budget.

Expenditures of 6.4 billion dollars are included within the foregoing budget totals for new legislation. Of this amount, 5.6 billion dollars is directly concerned with international and national defense activities, while the remainder provides for domestic needs.

There are many activities of Government, authorized at various periods, which impose continuing financial obligations and tend to represent fixed elements in the budget. A careful review has been made of these programs to assure that they meet only the most essential needs in the light of present conditions. As a result, cut-backs have been recommended in the veterans' hospital construction program, recommendations for new public works have been included only where it is not in the public interest to postpone them, as in the case of some power projects, and an increase in postal rates has been recommended to lower the postal deficit. Similar changes are reflected in other areas.

In addition, a great deal of effort has been devoted to achieving the economies which should be obtained through more effective organization and conduct of Government operations. There is no easy way of attaining this type of economy, but the size and complexity of our governmental activities require that we devote continuing attention to improving the management of the public business. Further, we must make it possible for responsible Federal executives to take the actions which will lead to increased efficiency, economy, and closer coordination of activities.

To make more rapid progress toward this goal, to which I am firmly committed, this budget includes a request for a management improvement fund of $1,000,000 to be appropriated to the President and utilized by him to carry on necessary and worth-while management improvement activities. The budget also reflects certain anticipated savings which should result from management improvement activities now under way.

To strengthen further the management of the Government, I am recommending the immediate enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies. The budget includes a tentative estimate of the funds needed to provide these increases. I also recommend that the Classification Act be revised to permit the payment of more realistic salaries to career employees and to correct the dislocations and inequities created in recent years. The Government and its employees should be assured that the salaries paid for positions at all levels are fair compensation for the work performed.

Fiscal prudence requires that we consider the Government's program, not on the basis of a single year alone but in the light of the continuing national policies already adopted. It must be recognized that expenditures in the fiscal year 1951 are likely to be larger than those for 1950. Expenditures for national defense can be expected to rise substantially above the level estimated for 1950. We cannot expect any material decline in our international responsibilities. We must face squarely the fact that we foresee a deficit in the fiscal year 1950 under existing tax laws, even without any allowance for new military aid, and that even higher expenditures will probably be required in future years.

Furthermore, in the fiscal year 1950, the present large excess of receipts of trust accounts, with its anti-inflationary effects, will be sharply reduced by the scheduled payment to veterans of a dividend of about 2 billion dollars from the national service life insurance fund.

Finally, it must be apparent that in times like the present we must be in a position to make new plans if conditions change. I do not consider it prudent under such circumstances for the Government finances to be in unbalance, or even in precarious balance. In prosperous times like the present, we should take the necessary steps to reduce the public debt and place the Government finances on a sounder footing.

Therefore, I am recommending that the Congress enact new revenue legislation.

It is not an easy step for me to take to recommend new taxes. I do so with a double conviction, first, that under present circumstances a prosperous country cannot afford an unbalanced budget; and second, that after thorough review of the cost of each Government program my recommendations represent a level below which our responsibilities will not permit us to go in the next fiscal year.

The budget of the United States Government is large because its responsibilities are large. The budget reflects the realities of our international position and our concern for a strong and progressive domestic economy. This Nation is today the strongest bulwark of freedom in the world. The decisions we make concerning our national finances must be based on a sober understanding of this fact.

### Budget Receipts

On the basis of existing tax legislation, budget receipts for the fiscal year 1950 are expected to total $41,000,000,000, an increase of more than a billion dollars over receipts in the current fiscal year. The estimates assume the continuance of full employment and approximately the current levels of economic activity.

Income taxes: Income taxes on individuals and corporations are the major source of revenue of the Federal Government. Receipts from these taxes represent over two-thirds of budget receipts at present.

The Revenue Act of 1948, passed over my veto, is causing a sharp reduction of individual income-tax collections in the fiscal year 1949. Even though the continuation of the present high level of personal income is assumed, these receipts in the fiscal year 1950 will remain below the corresponding receipts in the fiscal year 1948.

Receipts from taxes on corporations are expected to increase substantially in the fiscal years 1949 and 1950. With the end of the war, the rates of these taxes were reduced and collections declined sharply from the high levels of the war years, but the general prosperity that

followed the reconversion period has brought steadily rising profits and higher tax yields.

Excises and miscellaneous receipts: Excise taxes and miscellaneous receipts are the other major sources of Federal revenue. Excise taxes are expected to continue the gradual upward trend of recent years, reflecting the continued high level of business activity. Miscellaneous receipts have been declining from the peak reached in the fiscal year 1947. The disposal of war surplus is nearing completion, and consequently by the fiscal year 1950 miscellaneous receipts will be approaching a more stable level.

*Budget receipts (including proposed changes in employment taxes and miscellaneous receipts)*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Source | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated |
|---|---|---|---|
| Direct taxes on individuals: | | | |
| Individual income taxes | $20,997 | $18,530 | $19,135 |
| Estate and gift taxes | 899 | 797 | 653 |
| Direct taxes on corporations: | | | |
| Corporation income taxes | 9,851 | 11,515 | 12,112 |
| Excess profits taxes | 323 | 194 | 140 |
| Excises | 7,402 | 7,715 | 7,900 |
| Employment taxes: | | | |
| Existing legislation | 2,396 | 2,610 | 3,324 |
| Proposed legislation: | | | |
| Health insurance | | | 260 |
| Expanded coverage, old-age and survivors insurance | | | 1,700 |
| Customs | 422 | 407 | 407 |
| Miscellaneous receipts: | | | |
| Existing legislation | 3,809 | 2,276 | 1,750 |
| Proposed legislation | | | 81 |
| Deduct: | | | |
| Appropriation to trust funds: | | | |
| Existing legislation | 1,616 | 1,754 | 2,420 |
| Proposed legislation: | | | |
| Health insurance | | | 260 |
| Expanded coverage, old-age and survivors insurance | | | 1,700 |
| Refunds of receipts | 2,272 | 2,709 | 2,097 |
| Budget receipts | 42,211 | 39,580 | 40,985 |

NOTE.—Payments of refunds of Government receipts are now reported as deductions from total receipts; previously, they were reported as expenditures. Overpayments by taxpayers are not true receipts of the Government nor are they, when refunded, properly chargeable as operating costs of the Government. Payments by wholly owned Government corporations and enterprises for retirement of capital stock and surplus, which were formerly reported as miscellaneous receipts, are also excluded from both receipts and expenditures, since they do not represent operating costs or true receipts of the Government. These improvements in reporting practice result in reducing budget receipts and expenditures for each year by equal amounts, and therefore have no effect upon the amount of surplus or deficit.

Employment taxes: The continuation of full employment brings gradually rising revenues from employment taxes. Furthermore, under existing legislation, the tax rate for railroad retirement increases in January 1949 and that for old-age and survivors insurance in January 1950. I recommend that the rate increase for the latter tax be moved forward to July 1949.

I have recommended programs of health and disability insurance and expansion of coverage for the social insurance programs now in operation. These measures would result at the outset in added collections of employment taxes greater than the added payments for benefits, but the funds would be transferred to trust accounts and would not appreciably affect budget receipts.

Refunds: This budget reflects the recent change in Federal financial reporting, under which refunds of receipts are shown as deductions from receipts, rather than as expenditures. These refunds are not true operating costs of the Government but are for the return of overpayments of taxes and duties. Such refunds are exceptionally high in the fiscal year 1949, because of the unusual "overwithholding" of individual income taxes for January through April 1948, resulting from the lower rates set retroactively by the Revenue Act of 1948. Interest paid on refunds continues to be shown as an expenditure.

### RETIREMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

The change in the budget outlook in the last 12 months has meant a corresponding change in the rate of reduction of the public debt. Instead of the budget surplus of nearly 5 billion dollars estimated last January for the fiscal year 1949, we now face a deficit of 600 million dollars. Accordingly, there will be no net reduction in the debt during fiscal year 1949, other than that made possible by a small reduction in the Treasury's cash balance during the year. The debt on June 30, 1949, is estimated to be 251.6 billion dollars.

The major reason for the failure to achieve any sizable debt reduction in 1949 is the tax reduction enacted by the Eightieth Congress. The increase in taxes which I am recommending should permit us to make, in 1950, the minimum reduction consistent with responsible fiscal policy in prosperous times such as these.

### BUDGET EXPENDITURES AND AUTHORIZATIONS

The complex budget of the Government can best be summarized in terms of major functions. These major functions—national defense, international affairs and finance, veterans' services and benefits, and so forth—set forth the broad purposes for which the Government spends money, regardless of which department or agency carries them out. Estimated expenditures for the fiscal year 1950 of 41.9 billion dollars include all expenditures from the general and special accounts of the Treasury, as well as the net expenditures of Government corporations and enterprises. They exclude expenditures made from trust accounts.

The full impact and direction of the Government's program cannot be measured in terms of expenditures alone in any one year. Many of the commitments made under the appropriations and other authorizations enacted by the Congress for any year do not result in expenditures until a later year. For example, of the estimated 1950 expenditures, 34 billion dollars will be made from new appropriations and authorizations recommended in this budget, and 7.9 billion dollars will be made from those enacted in prior years.

In order to give a comprehensive picture of the financial requirements of Government programs, my budget message sets forth the net new appropriations and other authorizations requested. "Net new appropriations," totaling 38.5 billion dollars for fiscal year 1950, represent total appropriations requested—including permanent appropriations—less those to be used to liquidate prior year contract authorizations. "Other authorizations," totaling 6 billion dollars for fiscal year 1950, include contract authorizations which permit the placement of specific contracts but require later appropriations to liquidate these contracts, and special authorizations to use the proceeds of Treasury borrowing to finance certain types of Government programs. Together, "net new appropriations" and "other authorizations," totaling 44.6 billion dollars represent the new obligational authority recommended for carrying on the Government's business.

*Budget expenditures and authorizations by major functions*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Function | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| International affairs and finance | $4,782 | $7,219 | $6,709 | $6,349 | |
| National defense | 10,924 | 11,745 | 14,268 | 13,219 | $2,455 |
| Veterans' services and benefits | 6,567 | 6,799 | 5,496 | 5,701 | |
| Social welfare, health, and security | 1,853 | 1,963 | 2,358 | 2,271 | 92 |
| Housing and community facilities | 82 | 349 | 388 | 227 | 1,987 |
| Education and general research | 75 | 85 | 414 | 452 | 18 |
| Agriculture and agricultural resources | 575 | 1,805 | 1,662 | 745 | 350 |
| Natural resources | 1,091 | 1,616 | 1,861 | 1,549 | 482 |
| Transportation and communication | 1,267 | 1,757 | 1,586 | 944 | 648 |
| Finance, commerce, and industry | 88 | 102 | 107 | 82 | |
| Labor | 183 | 184 | 187 | 187 | |
| General government | 1,504 | 1,187 | 1,224 | 1,160 | 7 |
| Interest on the public debt | 5,188 | 5,325 | 5,450 | 5,450 | |
| Reserve for contingencies | | 45 | 150 | 200 | |
| Adjustment to daily Treasury statement basis | −388 | | | | |
| Total | 33,791 | 40,180 | 41,858 | [1] 38,536 | 6,039 |

[1] In addition, this budget includes 3,036 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

### SPECIFIC PROGRAMS

The following sections describe in broad outline the Government programs in each of the major functional areas and the principal changes proposed in this budget.

*International affairs and finance*

Two world wars and the years between have convinced the people of the United States that their security and well-being depend on conditions of peace and stability in the world. The complexity of the international postwar recovery problem and the tensions which make the transition to peace more difficult have deepened this conviction.

The fundamental objective of United States foreign policy is to achieve world peace and international security resting on the strength, mutual interests, and cooperation of free nations. The budget reflects this policy in the funds provided for our participation in the United Nations and for the regular operations of the State Department and other agencies. But the instruments of our policy requiring the largest measure of budgetary support are the extraordinary programs of economic and military aid to those nations and peoples who share our international objectives and our determination to make them effective. Through all these means, we are acting to strengthen the great moral force of

freedom on which we believe the advancement of people everywhere depends.

Total expenditures for international activities, exclusive of possible expenditures for a new program of providing military supplies to certain countries, are expected to be 6.7 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950—a drop from the 7.2 billion dollars estimated for the fiscal year 1949. Expenditures for economic assistance may be expected to decline in subsequent years with continued progress toward world economic recovery. But any forward estimate of our international expenditures must be highly tentative in view of the present uncertain world situation.

Reconstruction and military aid: Our aid to European recovery is the major program of economic assistance in which we are now engaged. Begun in April 1948, this program is expected to result in 4.6 billion dollars of expenditures in the present fiscal year, and 4.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950—nearly 70 percent of our 1950 expenditures for international activities.

*International affairs and finance*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| | Expenditures | | | 1950 net new appropriations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | |
| Reconstruction and military aid: | | | | |
| Economic Cooperation Act—ERP (existing and proposed legislation) | $154 | $4,600 | $4,500 | $4,300 |
| Other proposed aid legislation | ------- | ------- | 355 | 600 |
| Greek-Turkish Aid (acts of 1947 and 1948) | 186 | 285 | 136 | ------- |
| Export-Import Bank loans | 460 | 0 | 146 | ------- |
| Treasury loan to the United Kingdom | 1,700 | ------- | ------- | ------- |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 4 | −31 | −35 | ------- |
| Foreign relief: | | | | |
| Army (occupied areas) | 965 | 1,265 | 1,030 | 1,000 |
| Assistance to China (act of 1948) | 1 | 350 | 49 | ------- |
| Other (mainly under Foreign Aid Act, UNRRA and post-UNRRA) | 1,027 | 185 | 7 | ------- |
| Palestinian refugee program (proposed legislation) | ------- | 16 | ------- | ------- |
| Displaced Persons Commission | ------- | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| Foreign relations: | | | | |
| Department of State: | | | | |
| Present programs | 144 | 171 | 171 | 160 |
| Proposed legislation (mainly war damage claims) | ------- | 17 | 1 | 2 |
| Other | 5 | 7 | 4 | 1 |
| Philippine war damage and rehabilitation: | | | | |
| War damage claims (Philippine War Damage Commission) | 23 | 171 | 165 | 165 |
| Rehabilitation program | 25 | 51 | 46 | 4 |
| Interest on deposits (Treasury) | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| Participation in international organizations: | | | | |
| International Refugee Organization | 69 | 73 | 70 | 70 |
| Other present programs | 18 | 53 | 57 | 31 |
| FAO building loan and ITO (proposed legislation) | ------- | ------- | 2 | 8 |
| Total | 4,782 | 7,219 | 6,709 | [1] 6,349 |

[1] In addition, this budget includes 3,036 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

United States aid to western European countries and the mutual self-help which it has stimulated among them are already resulting in substantial progress toward economic recovery and political stability. The volume of production—both agricultural and industrial—is increasing as the months go by. This momentum must be maintained if the European economy is to become independent of extraordinary outside assistance by the target date of July 1952. To meet this objective, it is also extremely important for this Nation to undertake through such means as an extended and less restrictive reciprocal trade act, those adjustments in our foreign-trade pattern which will help to bring about a higher level and a better balance of world trade.

Further authorizing legislation by the Congress will be necessary before the end of the current fiscal year in order to carry the European recovery program forward without interruption. By the end of December, authorizations issued to the European countries for procurement had nearly reached the limit set by the presently available Economic Cooperation Administration funds. The bulk of the commodities involved will be shipped by the end of March. This budget accordingly anticipates a supplemental appropriation request for 1,250 million dollars for the remainder of the current fiscal year, in addition to the 4.3-billion-dollar appropriation requested for the fiscal year 1950.

I recommend that, in extending the Economic Cooperation Act, the Congress eliminate the present legal requirement which in effect charges 3 billion dollars of the fiscal year 1949 expenditures for European aid against the fiscal year 1948 surplus. This wholly artificial bookkeeping shift in no way affects the Government's actual financial operations, but it does result in a distorted picture of the budget surplus or deficit in these 2 years.

I have already referred to the prospective North Atlantic arrangements, now under discussion. In addition, we are considering furnishing military supplies to certain countries in furtherance of our national security. As with the European recovery program, military aid will call for a large measure of mutual aid and self-help among the participating countries. Because of present uncertainty as to cost and timing, no amounts are included for this program in the budget.

The scope and magnitude of several of our other current assistance programs cannot be accurately foreseen at this time. These now include aid to Greece, Turkey, China, and Korea. Funds are provided for assistance programs of this character in the budget under "other proposed aid legislation," with appropriations tentatively estimated at 600 million dollars and expenditures at 355 million dollars for the fiscal year 1950. I shall recommend specific legislation and appropriations to the Congress at a later date.

The Export-Import Bank will continue to make loans in fiscal year 1950 for promoting international trade and economic development, particularly in Latin America. Net expenditures of the bank in the fiscal year 1950 are expected to be relatively low because of rising collections on earlier loans and because our aid to Europe is now financed almost entirely from ECA funds. Mainly because of a large Canadian repayment, the bank is expected to show no net expenditures in the current fiscal year.

Foreign relief: Our principal foreign relief activities at the present time are those under the Army's program of government and relief in occupied areas—primarily Germany and Japan. Tentative estimates of about 1 billion dollars of appropriations and expenditures for fiscal year 1950 are included in this budget—a substantial decline from 1949. These estimates include funds to continue the rehabilitation program now under way in Japan. With these additional sums for rehabilitation and with further ECA recovery aid for Germany in the next fiscal year, progress toward economic recovery in the occupied areas should continue, with a resulting further decline in expenditures in subsequent years.

Foreign relations: The principal change contemplated in the program of the Department of State is the planned expansion of information and education activities. Expenditures for Foreign Service buildings are expected to decline, so that total expenditures for foreign relations activities are expected to be about the same in the fiscal year 1950 as in 1949. As part of our general program for improved Federal administration, provision is made for increased flexibility in management for the Secretary of State through the consolidation of appropriations. Amounts are included in this budget to cover the cost of proposed legislation granting Foreign Service personnel pay raises similar to those given most employees under the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948.

I am requesting legislation authorizing the payment of 17 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949 for payment of war-damage claims of neutral European countries.

Philippine aid: Our assistance to the Philippine Republic in its recovery from war devastation is now at a peak level. Total expenditures for rehabilitation and for payment of war-damage claims are expected to decline slightly in the fiscal year 1950 and to fall much more sharply in the fiscal year 1951. In our veterans' program we are continuing to give compensation to disabled Philippine veterans who fought in our joint efforts against the Japanese. Provision for financing veterans' hospitals and medical services, authorized by recent legislation, are included in the reserve for contingencies, pending the development with the Philippine Republic of detailed plans for carrying out this program.

International organizations: Our contribution to the International Refugee Organization is estimated at 70 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950, approximately the same as in 1949. With the expected migration of refugees to the United States and other areas, the IRO program should be substantially completed by June 30, 1950. It is my hope that the present Displaced Persons Act will be speedily stripped of its restrictive

and discriminatory provisions in order that we may make a contribution to this program more worthy of our best traditions. A tentative estimate of 16 million dollars for the fiscal year 1949 is also included in this budget for our contribution to the United Nations program of relief for Arab and other refugees from Palestine.

Outlays for our participation in other international organizations, including the United Nations, will continue in the fiscal year 1950 at about the same level as in 1949. A 1949 supplemental appropriation of 65 million dollars is included for the loan for the United Nations' headquarters construction. Tentative estimates are included in 1950 for a loan to the Food and Agriculture Organization for construction of a headquarters building, and for our contribution to the International Trade Organization.

*National defense*

In my budget message for the fiscal year 1949 I indicated that in spite of the reduction of our armed services to a small fraction of their wartime strength, national defense still remained the largest single Government program. I further indicated that the funds recommended, about 11 billion dollars, provided for only the minimum national defense requirements.

Before the Congress could complete action on that budget, the uncertainty of world conditions made it necessary to consider steps to develop additional military strength which would give evidence of continuing firmness in world affairs. Therefore, in an address to the Congress on March 17, 1948, I recommended the prompt enactment of universal training legislation and the temporary enactment of selective-service legislation. Shortly thereafter, I recommended additional authorizations for national defense, bringing my total recommendations for fiscal year 1949 to more than 14.7 billion dollars.

Since then I have given continued study to our national security requirements for the present and the future. For the time being it is essential to continue the selective service process. However, this is not the solution to the Nation's long-range military manpower and training problem. Permanent legislation providing for universal training is essential if we are to achieve an acceptable degree of national security.

My budget recommendations for national defense in the fiscal year 1950 are based on a plan for a national defense positio of relative military readiness, coupled with a higher degree of mobilization preparedness. This type of military planning will permit us continuously to revise our tactics and develop our weapons to meet modern conditions, but is clearly consistent with our traditional concept of military strength for purposes of defense.

In arriving at my recommendations, I have had the benefit of the considered advice of civilian and military leaders best qualified to evaluate the international, strategic, and economic aspects of our national defense requirements. I believe that these recommendations reflect a proper relationship between our security requirements and our economic and financial resources, and envision an Army, Navy, and Air Force in a condition of relative readiness, all functioning as an integrated team. Moreover, I am convinced that we should plan our military structure at this time so as to insure a balanced military program in the foreseeable future at approximately the level recommended in this budget.

At the same time we must recognize that preparations for defense must be flexible, and not rigid. They must reflect changes in the international situation, changes in technology and in the economic situation. We must be in a position to alter our military programs as circumstances change.

The National Security Act of 1947 established an organizational framework better than we have ever had before and provided for a more flexible control and adjustment of our military program. The establishment of a Weapons Evaluation Board under the Secretary of Defense is an example of the type of development we are continuously making to achieve the best possible assignment of weapons and tasks among the military services. However, we have had enough experience under that act to recognize that further improvements need to be made which cannot be accomplished under existing law. Therefore, I expect to recommend certain changes in the National Security Act which will help to assure readjustments of our defense program as a whole and in all its parts as security requirements change.

The recommendations for the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1950 mark a beginning toward a national defense program in which our air, naval, and land forces plan and operate as a team under a unified strategic concept. The 1950 program gives priority to air power and to strengthening the civilian Reserve components, and continues to emphasize research and development and industrial mobilization. The budget provides for maintaining the necessary occupation forces in the former enemy areas for which satisfactory international settlements have not yet been worked out. The budget also provides substantial amounts to continue the matériel improvement programs for which large authorizations were enacted under the augmented fiscal year 1949 budget. Continuing expenditures will be necessary for an orderly replacement program in future years as existing inventories are used up and as matériel wears out or becomes obsolete.

Expenditures by the National Military Establishment for defense purposes in the fiscal year 1950 are expected to amount to somewhat over 13.1 billion dollars, including a tentative estimate of 385 million dollars for programs for which new authorizing legislation will later be requested. The stock piling of strategic materials and other activities supporting defense are expected to require additional expenditures of about 530 million dollars. Furthermore, a tentative estimate of 600 million dollars has been added for the first year cost of universal training—when in full operation this program may require expenditures of 2 billion dollars annually. In total, the national defense budget I am recommending will require estimated expenditures of slightly less than 14.3 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950, an increase of 2.5 billion dollars over the 1949 level. Somewhat higher expenditures are likely in subsequent years.

*National defense*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| National Military Establishment (excluding payments under Armed Forces Leave Act): | | | | | |
| Pay and maintenance of military personnel: | | | | | |
| Pay and allowances of regular personnel | $3,555 | $3,434 | $3,601 | $3,596 | ------ |
| Pay of retired personnel | 148 | 168 | 192 | 191 | ------ |
| Subsistence, travel, and other | 1,192 | 1,407 | 1,359 | 1,488 | ------ |
| Civilian components | 350 | 590 | 760 | 795 | ------ |
| Research and development | 534 | 557 | 505 | 534 | ------ |
| Aircraft and related procurement | 791 | 1,157 | 1,718 | 330 | $1,992 |
| Naval ship construction | 271 | 309 | 406 | 5 | [2] 47 |
| Military public works construction | 395 | 286 | 302 | 93 | 20 |
| All other | 3,316 | 3,422 | 3,908 | 4,317 | ------ |
| Tentative estimate for proposed legislation | ------ | ------ | 385 | 645 | 185 |
| Subtotal, National Military Establishment | 10,552 | 11,330 | 13,136 | 11,994 | [2] 2,244 |
| Activities supporting defense: | | | | | |
| Universal training | ------ | ------ | 600 | 800 | ------ |
| Stock piling of strategic and critical materials (Treasury) | 99 | 350 | 525 | 314 | 211 |
| Payments under Armed Forces Leave Act | 269 | 14 | 1 | ------ | ------ |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | −66 | −42 | −39 | ------ | ------ |
| Other | 70 | 93 | 45 | 36 | ------ |
| Total | 10,924 | 11,745 | 14,268 | [1] 13,144 | [2] 2,455 |

[1] In addition, the budget includes 2,061 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior contract authorizations and 75 million dollars to cover other prior year obligations.

[2] In addition, 279 million dollars is being made immediately available in the fiscal year 1949 to cover increased cost of completing authorized naval ship construction program.

Net new appropriations and other authorizations specifically recommended in this budget for the National Military Establishment in the fiscal year 1950 are 13.7 billion dollars. This total, however, includes an upward adjustment of 279 million dollars for increased cost of the naval ship construction programs authorized in 1949 and prior years. In addition, 830 million dollars is provided as a tentative estimate for additional public works, for military pay adjustments, and for other special programs, dependent upon the passage of necessary enabling legislation. In all, 14.5 billion dollars

of new obligational authority is provided for the National Military Establishment for use in the fiscal year 1950, an increase of 700 million dollars over amounts enacted for the fiscal year 1949.

Of the 13.7 billion dollars of specific recommendations for new obligational authority for the National Military Establishment, 11 million dollars is requested for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, 4.6 billion dollars for the Air Force, 4.5 billion dollars for the Army, and 4.6 billion dollars for the Navy, counting the upward adjustment for ship construction costs mentioned above.

In addition to the new obligational authority for the National Military Establishment, this budget includes 525 million dollars of new authority for procurement of critical and strategic materials, 36 million dollars for other defense-supporting activities, and a tentative appropriation estimate of 800 million dollars for the inauguration of universal training.

In all, new obligational authority for national defense programs of nearly 15.9 billion dollars is included in this budget. This compares with 14.7 billion dollars for the fiscal year 1949, including 2.9 billion dollars made available in 1948, and also including tentative supplemental authorizations of 341 million dollars chiefly for stock piling.

Of the 15.9 billion dollars, 13.2 billion dollars is requested in the form of appropriations and 2.7 billion dollars in contract authorizations. In addition, appropriations of 2.1 billion dollars are requested to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Military strength—summary: The requirements of the various services have been determined, not separately, but in relation to our total security position and the degree of military readiness which is planned. The basic concept upon which my recommendations are based is that this Nation's military security should rest on a nucleus of highly trained and mobile forces—Army, Navy, and Air—backed by ready reserves of trained men, stand-by equipment and productive facilities, and an integrated mobilization plan which relates our national security requirements to the tremendous productive capacity of American industry. Taken as a whole, the amounts recommended in this budget will permit the maintenance and operation in the fiscal year 1950 of the augmented defense forces now reached under the increased 1949 budget program.

Under this budget, the Air Force in fiscal year 1950 will continue at about the present strength of 412,000 officers and men on active duty. It is contemplated that the Air Force will be organized with a minimum of about 48 combat groups and 10 squadrons, together with 27 groups of the Air National Guard. Within the limit of the funds provided, it is possible that adjustments in unit structure or strategic planning may at any time require changes in the number of active groups. At the end of fiscal year 1950, the Air Force program contemplates an active inventory of 9,200 aircraft of all types from trainers to heavy bombers. Increased funds in the budget will permit the build-up of supporting forces in the Air National Guard to an average of 45,000 personnel and in the Air Force Reserve to 68,000 personnel in regular training status.

*Military strength*

[In thousands]

| | Regulars and Reserves on full-time active duty | | | Reserves in regular training status | | Other Reserves | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | April 1, 1948 | Dec. 1, 1948 (estimated) | 1950 average (estimated) | Dec. 1, 1948 (estimated) | 1950 average (estimated) | Dec. 1, 1948 (estimated) | 1950 average (estimated) |
| Air Force | 368 | 411 | 412 | 58 | 113 | 400 | 400 |
| Army | 538 | 662 | 677 | 375 | 555 | 650 | 650 |
| Navy and Marine Corps | 488 | 531 | 527 | 222 | 281 | 900 | 1,050 |
| Total | 1,394 | 1,604 | 1,616 | 655 | 949 | 1,950 | 2,100 |

NOTE.—The recommended strengths for all the services include 18-year-old 1-year enlistees and other personnel in training but exclude cadets and midshipmen at the Military and Naval Academies.

Personnel in the Army will be continued at 677,000 officers and men in order to maintain 10 divisions at increased strengths, together with 59 battalions. The active Army will be backed by the National Guard with an average strength of 325,000 personnel, an Organized Reserve of 230,000 in regular training status, as well as by other reserve personnel and equipment. Continuing responsibilities in the occupation of Germany, Austria, and Japan and in manning outlying bases will engage about 40 percent of the Army strength overseas in fiscal year 1950.

In the naval and marine forces a strength of 527,000 officers and men throughout the fiscal year 1950 is provided. The size of the active naval fleet is planned to be 731 ships, including 238 combatant ships. Its composition will be changed somewhat from the present fleet to accord with assigned functions and presently foreseen defense requirements. The active inventory of Regular Navy and Marine Corps aircraft is expected to be 7,450 in the fiscal year 1950.

Under the reserve programs of the Navy and Marine Corps, 281,000 officers and men will be trained in 1950. Stand-by ships and matériel to augment the active Navy will remain available if needed.

Although present recruiting rates indicate that only small inductions, if any, will be necessary under selective service, it is essential that such authority remain available in the event that voluntary enlistments drop. Moreover, it must be recognized that the existence of the Selective Service Act has in itself been a contributing factor to the current results of the recruiting program of the services.

Pay and maintenance of military personnel: The pay and maintenance for the average of 1,616,000 officers and men on active duty in the fiscal year 1950 will require estimated expenditures of 5 billion dollars, 38 percent of all defense expenditures by the National Military Establishment. Expenditures for pay, allowances, subsistence, travel, welfare, training, clothing, and medical care will average about 3,100 dollars per man in the fiscal year 1950.

The increases in rates of military pay and allowances in 1942 and 1946 did not provide a balanced pay structure for the military services. A general overhauling of the military pay, allowance, and benefit structure is overdue. Since it is desirable for remuneration of military personnel to be in line with salaries of Federal civilian employees and other comparable groups, a tentative amount for this adjustment has been included in the budget, pending later legislative recommendations.

Civilian components: Our concept of national defense places important reliance upon the readiness of citizen-soldiers. This budget provides for larger and better-trained reserves for the Air Force, Army, and Navy. Expenditures for civilian components in the fiscal year 1950, exclusive of amounts for construction of facilities, are estimated at 760 million dollars, 30 percent above outlays in the present year and more than twice the amount spent last year. These expenditures cover drill and training pay and maintenance of reservists, operating expenses, and procurement of equipment over and above amounts transferred from wartime stocks.

The budget recommendations of 795 million dollars of obligational authority for the fiscal year 1950 contemplate expansion of the reserve programs in 1950 and in later years toward the objectives outlined in my recent Executive order. Such expansion is planned at as rapid a rate as is consistent with sound organization, economical operation, and effective integration with the regular forces. The funds recommended for 1950 will permit an average of 949,000 officers and men in regular training status in air, naval, and ground units, as compared to 655,000 now participating.

Research and development: Scientific and technical advances are vital to a dynamic national defense program. To develop improved weapons and equipment and add to our basic knowledge, new appropriations of 534 million dollars are recommended for direct costs of research and development for the fiscal year 1950. This amount does not include substantial outlays for indirect costs such as the pay and maintenance of military personnel engaged in research and development activities, and the construction and maintenance of facilities.

Direct expenditures for research and development in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 505 million dollars. This is somewhat below the estimate for the fiscal year 1949, when payments for programs initiated at the end of the war will be completed. About one-half of the expenditures for research and development will be for aeronautical research and development.

Aircraft and related procurement: For the fiscal year 1949, 2.8 billion dollars of new obligational authority was provided for aircraft and related procurement, of which 2 billion dollars for the Air Force was made available for

obligation until the end of 1950 and included some amounts for nonrecurring expenses.

It is estimated that 3.2 billion dollars in unexpended authorizations from 1949 and prior years will be carried forward to the fiscal year 1950. New obligational authority of 2.3 billion dollars is recommended for the fiscal year 1950 to permit contracts for approximately 34 million airframe pounds. This will make a total of 5.5 billion dollars in aircraft and related equipment to be delivered and paid for in 1950 and subsequent years.

Expenditures for aircraft and related procurement in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 1.7 billion dollars, about 500 million dollars more than in the present year. Deliveries of 37 million airframe pounds are now scheduled for fiscal year 1950 and are expected to be slightly higher in fiscal year 1951.

Aircraft from wartime reserves will continue to meet a part of the replacement requirements in fiscal year 1950. In subsequent years, when these reserves are depleted, an increase in aircraft procurement may be required if the strength and structure of the Air Force and naval aviation are to be maintained at the level and replacement rates contemplated in this budget.

Naval ship construction: Expenditures for naval ship construction in fiscal year 1950 are estimated to be 406 million dollars, an increase of about 100 million dollars over the estimate for 1949.

Including the construction in fiscal year 1949, more than 1 billion dollars of naval ship construction, under present authorizations, will remain to be completed in fiscal year 1950 and later years. I am including in the budget 279 million dollars to cover increased costs of completing the present construction program, with some readjustment in types of ships to be built. In addition, I am requesting 52 million dollars of new authorizations for certain ships which will be substituted for some of those previously authorized.

Military public works construction: Expenditures for military public works construction by the Air Force, Army, and Navy in the fiscal year 1950, under existing legislation, are estimated at about the current level of 300 million dollars. This construction is largely for research and development facilities and badly needed housing for troops and dependents, both in the United States and overseas. This budget recommends new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1950 of 113 million dollars for projects for which legislative authorization exists.

There are, however, additional requirements for family housing, for research and development facilities, and for other military construction which are not yet authorized. A tentative estimate for these additional military public works is included in the budget, pending the enactment of authorizing legislation.

All other military expenditures: The remaining expenditures of the National Military Establishment in fiscal year 1950, are estimated at 3.9 billion dollars compared with 3.4 billion dollars in 1949. These expenditures cover the procurement of other matériel (in addition to aircraft and ships), supplies, and services. The largest part of these expenditures will be for civilian workers engaged in production, maintenance, and administrative activities, both overseas and in the United States. Of all Federal civilian employees, approximately 865,000, or about 40 percent, will be employed in defense activities by the National Military Establishment.

Expenditures for procurement of equipment (exclusive of aircraft and ships), particularly for the Army, will increase in the fiscal year 1950 as deliveries on 1949 contracts are made, even though new obligations for this purpose in 1950 will be lower. Expenses of maintaining and operating facilities and equipment including aircraft will also increase over the 1949 level, largely in the Army and Air Force.

Increased emphasis has been given to industrial mobilization preparedness in the budget for the National Military Establishment with the recommendation of appropriations of approximately 129 million dollars for fiscal year 1950 as contrasted with 57 million dollars provided for 1949. In addition to making provisions for the continued maintenance of tools and industrial plants held in stand-by status, the programs for industrial mobilization planning with industry and within the military establishments are being increased. Added emphasis is being given to coordinating the cataloging of supply items among the military services, and a greater integration of current procurement with industrial mobilization plans.

Stock piling and other defense activities: The aim of the stock piling program is to provide a basic reserve of materials in which accessible resources are deficient, thereby permitting a rapid and sustained economic mobilization in the event of emergency. Stock-pile procurement continues to be hampered by materials shortages and rising prices, since it must meet the competition of current industrial consumption, including that for military purposes. However, the concentration of procurement on the more urgently required materials should permit us to make substantial progress toward our goal of a reasonably adequate stock pile with minimum effect on current consumption.

Toward the stock-pile goal, this budget recommends 525 million dollars of new obligational authority for the fiscal year 1950 and supplemental authorizations of 310 million dollars for the present fiscal year. Of these amounts 211 million dollars for 1950 and 270 million dollars for 1949 are in contract authorizations to be used primarily for developmental contracts. A total of 800 million dollars in obligational authority has already been enacted in the last 3 years. In addition, by the end of fiscal year 1950, materials valued at about 700 million dollars will have been transferred to the stock pile from war surplus inventories and from Economic Cooperation Administration operations. Of the total stock-pile objective of 3.7 billion dollars, materials and authorizations amounting to 2.3 billion dollars will have been provided.

Deliveries and expenditures, of course, will lag behind authorizations. Expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 525 million dollars, an increase of 175 million dollars in outlays over the current year. By the end of the fiscal year 1950, materials valued at about 1.6 billion dollars are expected to be on hand.

The stock pile represents an addition to the supplies obtainable in an emergency from domestic production and imports from protected sources. The recommended authorizations will permit the stock pile to be built up to the point at which, with the aid of prompt and effective allocations, a comparatively high degree of protection will be afforded to our economy in the event of emergency.

Expenditures for all other defense programs, including expenses of the Selective Service System, maintenance of reserve industrial plants by the Federal Works Agency, and by other agencies, are estimated at 46 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950. On the other hand, net receipts of 39 million dollars are estimated in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation defense program.

*Veterans' services and benefits*

As a nation, we have sought to give our veterans opportunities to work, to earn, and to recapture the normal pattern of their lives. In addition to our general programs for full employment, increased health services, improved housing, and greater security for all, we have provided an extensive program of special benefits and services to veterans and their dependents.

The extent and scope of constructive measures to assist veterans of our earlier wars to return to useful civilian life were limited. Too often prior to World War I our country belatedly attempted to discharge its obligation to veterans merely by bestowing upon them pensions and gratuities. In contrast, servicemen of World Wars I and II have received more timely and better treatment both in the service and out. Improved medical and hospital care, insurance benefits, vocational rehabilitation, compensation, and other benefits have been provided to disabled servicemen or to the dependents of the deceased. Servicemen of World War I received adjusted compensation, while World War II veterans are receiving readjustment benefits to assist them in obtaining education, training, jobs, businesses, and homes.

At the present time our expenditures for veterans' programs are declining as readjustment benefits for World War II servicemen fall off. However, the long-run trend of compensation and pension costs and of hospital and medical care is gradually upward. This means that over-all expenditures under present legislation will remain high even after the completion of the temporary programs under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act.

The program of veterans' services and benefits should reflect the fundamental fact that our primary long-run obligation is to dependents of veterans deceased from service causes and to veter-

ans disabled in the service. In the fulfillment of these obligations we have two basic purposes. The first is to alleviate financial hardship to dependents of veterans deceased from service causes. The second is to help veterans surmount the physical and economic handicaps of their service disabilities. At the same time, we should preserve and stress our basic objective of assisting the recipients of these benefits to be as nearly as possible self-reliant and self-sustaining members of our society.

The necessity for new or extended benefits for veterans without service disabilities should be judged, not solely from the standpoint of service in our armed forces, but in the light of existing social welfare programs available to all, veterans and nonveterans alike. In recent years social-security protection, including unemployment and old-age and survivors' insurance and old-age assistance, has been made available to a large percentage of our general population. Prior to World War I the lack of such general benefits was, of course, one of the main reasons for the enactment of special benefits to veterans. At the present time we seek to broaden and extend these social-security programs and to enact a comprehensive national health and disability insurance program for all our people, including veterans, who with their immediate families will soon constitute 40 percent of the population.

*Veterans' services and benefits (excluding trust accounts)*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 net new appropriations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | |
| Readjustment benefits (Veterans' Administration): | | | | |
| Education and training | $2,497 | $2,481 | $1,993 | $2,552 |
| Unemployment and self-employment allowances | 677 | 424 | 78 | |
| Loan guarantees | 64 | 48 | 48 | |
| Other | 75 | 88 | 80 | |
| Pensions (Veterans' Administration) | 2,080 | 2,140 | 2,111 | 2,221 |
| Insurance (Veterans' Administration) | 151 | 488 | 62 | 77 |
| Hospitals, other services, and administrative costs: | | | | |
| Construction: | | | | |
| Veterans' Administration | 17 | 56 | 81 | ------ |
| Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions) | 36 | 127 | 179 | |
| Federal Works Agency | 53 | 3 | 1 | |
| Current expenses: | | | | |
| Veterans' Administration: | | | | |
| Hospital and medical care | 536 | 597 | 574 | 567 |
| Other activities | 377 | 345 | 287 | 282 |
| All other agencies | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 6,567 | 6,799 | 5,496 | 5,701 |

Total expenditures for veterans' benefits and services are expected to be 5.5 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950, about 1.3 billion dollars below estimates for the current fiscal year. This drop reflects the virtual completion of unemployment and self-employment allowances, an expected sharp decline in educational training programs, and the inclusion in the fiscal year 1949 of a nonrecurrent payment to insurance trust funds. Even at the expected lower level, expenditures for veterans' programs will still comprise more than one-eighth of the total budget.

Readjustment benefits: The readjustment program has provided valuable educational and other opportunities to veterans of World War II. It is estimated that by the end of the fiscal year 1950, 6,000,000 veterans will have used education and training benefits, more than 9,000,000 will have received unemployment and self-employment allowances, and nearly 2,000,000 will have obtained loan guaranties for homes and businesses. By the end of the fiscal year 1950 total outlays under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act since 1945 will have exceeded 13 billion dollars.

Enrollment in school, job, and farm-training courses is estimated to decline to 1,575,000 in 1950 from this year's average enrollment of 2,000,000. In 1950 more than two-thirds of the participants in this program will be in on-the-job, on-farm, and below-college-level training, while less than one-third will be in colleges and universities. Total expenditures, estimated at approximately 2 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1950, reflect the increased rates of subsistence allowances enacted in the last session of the Congress.

I am recommending reenactment in its present form of the provision of the 1949 appropriation act prohibiting the use of funds for avocational and recreational training. This constructive action on the part of Congress in eliminating expenditures for courses which are inconsistent with the basic purpose of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act is expected to save more than 50 million dollars this year.

Under present law only a small number of veterans will be eligible for unemployment and self-employment benefits after July 25, 1949. The average number of claimants to be paid in these two programs during the fiscal year 1950 is estimated at 74,000, as compared to about 400,000 in the fiscal year 1949. Expenditures decline correspondingly to 78 million dollars. By the end of the fiscal year 1950 aggregate outlays for veterans' unemployment and self-employment benefits since 1945 will have exceeded 3.5 billion dollars.

Under the loan-guarantee title of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, veterans obtained loans amounting to 7.4 billion dollars up to June 30, 1948, more than nine-tenths for homes, and the rest for farms and businesses. About 45 percent of this total is guaranteed or insured by the Government. Recent experience has shown a decline in the number of loans guaranteed. The estimates assume 322,000 loans in the fiscal year 1949 and 293,000 in 1950.

Pensions: It is estimated that an average of 2,968,000 individuals and families will receive compensation and pension payments in the fiscal year 1950, an increase of 52,000 over the number for the present year. About one-fourth of these payments involve non-service-connected death or disability. The 1950 expenditure estimate of 2.1 billion dollars for pensions includes 1.4 billion dollars in compensation for service-connected cases, and 500 million dollars in pensions for non-service-connected cases. It also includes 180 million dollars for subsistence allowances to service-disabled veterans in training, a decline of 70 million dollars from the present year. These expenditures reflect the increased rates of compensation enacted by the last Congress for dependents of veterans deceased or disabled from service causes.

Insurance: The Government contributes to the veterans' life insurance funds for war hazard claims. Budget expenditures for veterans' insurance, largely for such contributions, are estimated at 62 million dollars in fiscal year 1950. A tentative estimate of 413 million dollars is included for an additional contribution to the national service life insurance fund in the fiscal year 1949. This large nonrecurring item in the present year results from a re-evaluation of the Government's liability for war risk claims.

Hospital and domiciliary construction: The construction program under which the Veterans' Administration has been proceeding was planned and authorized during and immediately after the war. Now that we have the benefit of a period of postwar experience, I have reviewed the veterans' hospital and domiciliary construction program and find that to continue with the construction of the full number of 90 authorized hospitals will result in a serious overbuilding, in terms of beds needed to meet foreseeable requirements. A reduction in the program will still make it possible to provide for all service-connected patients in every geographical area and will provide an even more liberal allowance of beds for nonservice-connected patients than at present.

I have therefore directed that the program which I had previously authorized be curtailed by approximately 16,000 beds and asked the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to recommend specific adjustments in the program. I have approved his recommendations for the cancellation of 24 hospital projects, and the reduction in planned capacity of 14 additional hospitals. This will result in a reduction of 279 million dollars in the total of 1.2 billion dollars of construction previously authorized, and will reduce expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 by 115 million dollars. However, hospitals scheduled for completion will cost 42 million dollars more than originally estimated. Therefore, a net rescission of 237 million dollars in contract authorizations is recommended. Under this revised program, expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities are estimated at 260 million dollars, an increase of 77 million dollars over the fiscal year 1949, due to the progress of construction already under way.

Hospital and other services and administration: Current expenses for hospital and medical care are estimated at

574 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950, 23 million dollars less than the peak expenditure in 1949. This decline reflects largely a downturn in the out-patient medical-care program and increased use of excess supplies now in stock. Expenses of the in-patient care program will increase. The 1950 estimates provide for an average daily patient load of about 140,000, an increase of 4,000 over the current year.

Other current expenses, which are chiefly the costs of administering the nonmedical benefit programs of the Veterans' Administration, continue to decline in line with work loads.

Trust accounts: Veterans of the two World Wars hold 7,500,000 active policies under the Government life and national service life insurance programs. Premiums and earnings, supplemented by Government contributions to cover claims involving war risks, have built up substantial accumulations in these trust funds.

Assets of the national service life insurance fund will reach an estimated 7.7 billion dollars in the current fiscal year. The Government contributions anticipated for the fiscal years 1949 and 1950 will bring total Government contributions to the national service life insurance fund to over 4 billion dollars.

*Veterans' life insurance funds (trust accounts)*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Item | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated |
|---|---|---|---|
| Receipts: | | | |
| Transfers from general and special accounts | $145 | $482 | $56 |
| Premiums, interest, and other | 677 | 712 | 745 |
| Total | 822 | 1,194 | 801 |
| Expenditures for benefits, refunds, and other (deduct) | 377 | 381 | 2,421 |
| Net accumulation | 445 | 813 | −1,620 |

An initial dividend estimated at about 2 billion dollars is scheduled for payment during the fiscal year 1950 to all servicemen who hold or have held national service life insurance. The Veterans' Administration is now reviewing insurance records to determine the status of the fund, after which the amount of the dividend and the method of payment can be decided.

*Social welfare, health, and security*

In the last 15 years the Federal Government has established a basic pattern of activities in the field of social welfare, health, and security. The national system of old-age and survivors' insurance, the system of regular grants to States for public assistance payments to the needy aged and blind and to dependent children, the Federal-State system of unemployment insurance, and several grant programs for the promotion of public health and of children's welfare were established by the Social Security Act of 1935. More recent laws established the railroad retirement system and grants to States for the school lunch, hospital construction, and mental health programs. Also included in the Government's social welfare, health, and security programs are the older system of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation and those Federal services directed toward the prevention of crime and the apprehension and detention of criminals.

Under the Social Security Act, the national policy contemplated that old-age and survivors' insurance would be the primary Government measure affording economic protection to the needy aged and dependent children, and that unemployment compensation would provide temporary assistance to the unemployed. Other types of social insurance were to be added later to provide more adequate protection against major economic hazards of our society. Public assistance was designed as a backstop, a second line of defense, eventually to be replaced in large measure by social insurance benefits. We have not made progress toward this objective in the last decade. Individual benefit payments under public assistance now are substantially higher than under old-age and survivors' insurance. They are more adequate, in many cases, than under unemployment insurance.

Three principal steps should be taken now to strengthen and complete the system of social insurance, and thereby to make our governmental programs consistent with the basic national policy in this field.

First. Old-age and survivors insurance should be extended to nearly all the 25 million gainfully employed persons not now covered; the scale of benefits should be sharply raised; benefits should be provided for women at an earlier age; and higher part-time earnings should be permitted. (In addition, coverage under the unemployment-compensation system should be extended and benefits made more adequate, as indicated in the "Labor" section of this message.)

Second. Disability insurance should be provided to protect against loss of earnings during illness or other temporary disability, and to assure continuing annuities to workers who become permanently disabled and therefore unable to earn a livelihood.

Third. A comprehensive national health program should be established, centering in a national system of medical-care insurance, accompanied by improved services and facilities for public health and medical care.

These recommendations have had extended public discussion. Action is long overdue. I am confident that the Congress will enact promptly the legislation needed to achieve an integrated, comprehensive system of social insurance. In addition, I repeat my recommendation that the Congress give departmental status to the Federal Security Agency.

The needed legislation includes not only measures to establish administrative procedures and authorize benefit payments but also provisions for financing them. At present, workers and employers each contribute to the old-age and survivors insurance fund at a rate of 1 percent of the covered pay roll. Under present law, this rate will advance on January 1, 1950, to 1½ percent each for employers and workers. The tax applies only to the first 3,000 dollars of earnings of each employee in any year, and earnings in excess of that amount are not counted in calculating the retirement benefits. My recommendations contemplate raising the tax rate on presently covered employment on July 1, 1949, the date when increased benefits should be made available. In addition, I propose that we raise the ceiling on taxable earnings, as well as extend the pay-roll tax to workers and employers not now covered. The addition of insurance coverage for medical care and disability benefits will also require some additions to the pay-roll-tax rates in order that the whole social-insurance system will continue to be substantially self-supporting.

The financial impact of these recommendations is mainly in the trust accounts. For the fiscal year 1950, benefit payments and administrative expenses from the major trust accounts in the field of social welfare (other than unemployment insurance) are estimated at 1.3 billion dollars under existing laws. Under the legislation which I recommend, these payments would be doubled. Apart from this new legislation, they would rise by more than 100 million dollars above the total for the current fiscal year.

The total of budget expenditures for social welfare, health, and security also is expected to rise in the fiscal year 1950, to nearly 2,358 million dollars, exclusive of expenditures from trust accounts. The increase over the fiscal year 1949 is 394 million dollars, of which 147 million dollars is in transfers to the railroad retirement trust account and 86 million dollars is for increased grants to the States for public assistance under present Federal law. Most of the remainder of the increase is divided between present programs for the promotion of public health and proposed new legislation for medical care insurance and public assistance.

Excluding trust-account transactions, new appropriations requested for social welfare, health, and security for the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 2,271 million dollars. In addition, 92 million dollars of new contract authority will be needed, making a total of 2,363 million dollars of new obligational authority for these programs. This does not include 40 million dollars of appropriations necessary to liquidate contract authority made available in prior years, mainly for hospital construction grants. Of the new appropriations in budget accounts, 84 million dollars is for proposed legislation. All the rest is for programs under present laws.

Public assistance to the aged and other special groups: The public assistance programs of the Federal Government are all carried on in cooperation with the States, and the expenditures are almost entirely in the form of grants to State governments.

By far the largest amounts are for assistance to the aged, the blind, and dependent children, for which Federal Government expenditures under present laws are estimated at 1,064 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950. Each State de-

termines its own scale of benefits to individuals in these public-assistance categories, and the Federal Government reimburses the States for from 50 to 75 percent of the payments in each case, up to maximum individual benefit rates specified in the Federal law. The level of these matching payments was raised by action of the last Congress.

*Social welfare, health, and security (excluding trust accounts)*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| Assistance to the aged and other special groups: | | | | | |
| Federal Security Agency: | | | | | |
| Public assistance: | | | | | |
| Present law | $733 | $977 | $1,064 | $1,059 | ------ |
| Proposed legislation | ------ | ------ | 65 | 65 | ------ |
| Vocational rehabilitation and other programs | 27 | 23 | 23 | 23 | ------ |
| School lunch (Department of Agriculture) | 68 | 75 | 75 | 75 | ------ |
| Retirement and dependents' insurance: | | | | | |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 763 | 569 | 716 | 716 | ------ |
| Federal Security Agency and other | 3 | 5 | 9 | 9 | ------ |
| Promotion of public health: | | | | | |
| Federal Security Agency: | | | | | |
| Present programs | 135 | 177 | 234 | 174 | $91 |
| Medical care insurance system (proposed legislation) | ------ | ------ | 15 | 15 | ------ |
| Federal Works Agency and other | 11 | 21 | 35 | 12 | ------ |
| Crime control and correction (Department of Justice and other) | 84 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 1 |
| Other programs: | | | | | |
| Present programs (Federal Security Agency and other) | 28 | 26 | 27 | 26 | ------ |
| Federal Security Agency, change in employees' accident compensation rates (proposed legislation) | ------ | ------ | 4 | 4 | ------ |
| Total | 1,853 | 1,963 | 2,358 | [1] 2,271 | 92 |

[1] In addition, this budget includes 40 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

NOTE.—The Federal-State system of unemployment compensation and the Federal system of railroad unemployment insurance, formerly included in this category, are now reclassified under Labor.

Because of this grant arrangement, the amount of Federal expenditure for public assistance in any one year is not directly subject to Federal budgetary control, but is determined by the action of the several States in fixing benefit rates and approving individual claims for assistance. The total amount of Federal expenditures has steadily increased as the rising cost of living has compelled the States to give more assistance and the number of needy aged persons in our population has continued to rise. This increase in public-assistance expenditures would be slower, and should ultimately be reversed, if other contributory insurances are made adequate to carry most of the load.

The budget includes 65 million dollars as the tentative estimate of first-year expenditure under proposed legislation to improve the present public-assistance system and to help cover State relief payments to persons not now eligible for assistance from Federal grants.

Railroad retirement insurance: The expected rise in transfers to the railroad retirement trust account, from 565 million dollars in this fiscal year to 716 million dollars in 1950, reflects mainly a statutory increase in the tax rate, which has just become effective, and the continued rise in railroad pay rolls.

The estimates for 1950 assume favorable legislative action on several proposed changes in the timing of transfers from budget accounts to the trust accounts. These relate to Federal Government payments for military service credits, administrative expense appropriations, and the transfer of the special railroad taxes to trust accounts. The changes would not affect the benefit rights of any individual or the tax liabilities of any employer.

Good budgeting requires that the law be revised so that payments by the Federal Government to the railroad retirement trust fund on account of military service credits allowed to railroad employees may be made annually in the years ahead on the basis of the actuarial value of claims actually approved as workers retire. As the law now stands, these payments are to be made in advance, without adequate relationship to eventual requirements for actual benefits. We have already advanced 160 million dollars to the trust fund to cover such future claims. Unless the law is amended, a further transfer of about the same amount may be required in the fiscal year 1950, and this would have to be added to the total of budget expenditures.

Good budgeting requires also that the railroad retirement tax be transferred to the trust fund as it is collected, rather than on the basis of annual specific appropriations in advance of collections, as is the present practice. The estimates assume that an annual indefinite appropriation will be substituted, and also that the administrative expense appropriations will be consolidated and financed directly from the trust account.

Public health: Federal expenditures for public health purposes comprise substantial grants to State and local governments to help them combat disease and to meet part of the cost of new hospitals, as well as expenditures for direct Federal operations.

For the fiscal year 1950, I am recommending appropriations sufficient to double the general health grants to States, raising them to 22 million dollars, in order that the States in turn may extend and strengthen local health services. These stronger health services are an essential part of our national health program. I recommend that the present statutory limitation on the amount of such general health grants to States be removed from the Public Health Service Act, so as to authorize in later years the provision of larger amounts for the further improvement and expansion of local public health services. It is clearly more desirable to follow this course than to add new and separate grant programs or to continue to expand existing specialized health programs.

The estimates for 1950 provide for continuing at about the 1949 level the grants to States for specialized health programs, such as venereal disease and tuberculosis. Provision is made for new grants under the National Heart Act of 1948 and for grants for initial surveys under the Water Pollution Control Act of 1948. The Federal-aid hospital construction program will require additional contract authority to maintain the current limited volume of new hospital building.

I have included in budget accounts for the fiscal year 1950 a tentative estimate of 15 million dollars for initial expenditures for inaugurating the system of medical care insurance.

New facilities for medical and related research to be carried on directly by the Public Health Service are in process of construction. As these are completed and staffed, we shall achieve a substantial expansion of specialized types of research which will contribute significantly to the health and longevity of our people.

Crime control and correction: The work load of the Federal Bureau of Investigation is expected to continue at a high level in the fiscal year 1950, largely because of investigations of personnel employed in atomic energy work and international activities and the strengthening of the internal security program. A decline is expected in the inmate population of Federal prisons, and this will permit some reduction in staff, but the saving will be partly offset by higher per capita costs for care of prisoners.

Federal employees' accident compensation: Expenditures under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act of 1916, as amended, are estimated for the fiscal year 1950 at 9 million dollars more than in 1949, but the increase is wholly for war claims payments to American citizens abroad who were injured or suffered damage from wartime enemy actions. These payments will be covered by some of the proceeds of certain enemy-owned property.

Compensation payments to Government employees injured and to dependents of those killed in line of duty will continue under present law at about 14 million dollars a year. The benefit rates have not been changed since 1927. They are now quite inadequate. I recommend that these benefit rates be liberalized. The budget includes a tentative estimate of 4 million dollars for this proposed legislation.

Trust accounts: As I emphasized in a message to the Congress last May, this period of high employment and earnings offers a particularly opportune time for strengthening and broadening our social insurance system. At such a time, our people are best able to begin providing

for protection against the major economic hazards to which everyone is exposed. Although the recommended improvements will mean an immediate large increase in benefit payments, they will also result at the outset in a sizable increase in savings held in the social insurance trust accounts. This will help to reduce inflationary pressures and build a cushion of consumers' purchasing power against possible future recession.

*Social welfare, health, and security (major trust accounts)*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Fund and item | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated |
|---|---|---|---|
| Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: | | | |
| Receipts: | | | |
| Appropriation from general receipts | $1,616 | $1,754 | $2,420 |
| Interest and other | 191 | 231 | 266 |
| Proposed legislation extending coverage, raising tax base, and adding disability benefits | ---- | ---- | 1,700 |
| Payments of benefits and administrative expenses (deduct): | | | |
| Existing legislation | 559 | 656 | 745 |
| Proposed legislation | ---- | ---- | 1,500 |
| Net accumulation (including proposed legislation) | 1,248 | 1,330 | 2,141 |
| Railroad retirement account:[1] | | | |
| Receipts: | | | |
| Transfers from budget accounts | 758 | 565 | 716 |
| Interest on investments | 39 | 51 | 62 |
| Payments of benefits, salaries and expenses (deduct) | 222 | 289 | 317 |
| Net accumulation | 575 | 327 | 461 |
| Federal employees retirement funds: | | | |
| Receipts: | | | |
| Salary deductions and transfers from budget accounts | 486 | 566 | 693 |
| Interest | 108 | 120 | 139 |
| Payments of annuities and refunds, and expenses (deduct) | 244 | 274 | 277 |
| Net accumulation | 350 | 412 | 555 |
| Medical care insurance trust fund (proposed legislation): | | | |
| Receipts from pay-roll contributions | ---- | ---- | 260 |
| Payments for benefits (deduct) | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Net accumulation | ---- | ---- | 260 |

[1] Adjusted for proposed changes in legislation.

Despite benefit payments of more than 1.3 billion dollars under present laws, the major trust funds for social welfare, health, and security for the year are expected to add 3 billion dollars to their assets during the fiscal year 1950. This will bring the aggregate assets of these funds above 19 billion dollars. The legislation I have recommended will add an estimated 460 million dollars to these assets in the fiscal year 1950.

The trust account assets are invested in Government securities, and the interest earnings are added to the principal of each trust fund. Although all benefits are paid directly from these accounts, the handling of contributions varies. Pay-roll tax collections under the railroad retirement system are included in budget receipts and the transfers to the trust account appear as budget expenditures. Proceeds of the pay-roll tax for old-age and survivors insurance are transferred to the trust account without affecting expenditures; this transfer is made through a deduction from receipts and an equal credit to the trust account. Amounts withheld from the salaries of those Government employees covered by Federal employees' retirement acts, as their payments to the retirement funds, are credited directly to the trust accounts.

*Housing and community facilities*

The objective of the Federal housing program is to improve the housing standards of the Nation and, in particular, to help low-income and moderate-income families obtain more adequate housing in a suitable community environment. To this end the Federal Government provides a wide variety of financial aids for both private and public housing construction as well as research and other assistance on cost reduction.

In the past 3 years, housing construction has risen to the level it took 6 years to reach after World War I. Conversions of older houses have also increased the housing supply, and extensive repairs and modernization have improved housing standards. As a result, many of the most acute emergency needs, especially of veterans, have been met, and the number of families compelled to live with others or to make other temporary arrangements has been reduced.

Despite these encouraging gains, we still have a long way to go. The programs recommended in this budget, both under existing and proposed legislation, are directed primarily toward improving the housing of low- and moderate-income groups. These programs emphasize lowering of housing costs and production of rental housing, and provide continued preference for veterans' housing requirements.

Research in costs and markets: Basic to the entire housing program, both private and public, is the use of all available methods to lower construction costs. Technical research on the limited basis authorized by the Housing Act of 1948 has already begun. More extensive technical research, and analysis of housing markets and land-use, which would be authorized in the further legislation which I have recommended, are needed to assure effective use of both private and public funds in meeting our housing needs. The Housing and Home Finance Administrator will take the leadership in bringing potential cost reductions to the attention of industry and of State and local agencies in the form most useful to them.

A census of housing should again be authorized as part of the regular decennial census in 1950. Such a census would provide comprehensive and up-to-date information needed by both private industry and public agencies.

Slum clearance and urban redevelopment: I have recommended for several years legislation to authorize the Federal assistance needed to permit cities to start clearing their slums and preparing the sites necessary for sound urban development, primarily private housing. We should not delay longer in authorizing initiation of the first installments of this long-term program. I recommend, therefore, that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator be authorized to contract for Federal grants amounting to 100 million dollars a year for 5 years. In addition, I recommend loan authorizations of 25 million dollars for the fiscal year 1950 and larger authorizations in the following 4 years, totaling 1 billion dollars for the 5-year period. The only Federal expenditure likely in the fiscal year 1950 are loans of 10 million dollars for planning the projects.

*Housing and community facilities*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| General aids to housing: | | | | | |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency: | | | | | |
| Existing programs | $1 | $1 | $2 | $2 | ---- |
| Proposed legislation: | | | | | |
| Research and administration | ---- | (1) | 2 | 2 | ---- |
| Slum clearance | ---- | ---- | 10 | ---- | $125 |
| Alaska housing | ---- | ---- | 5 | 10 | ---- |
| Commerce Department: Proposed census of housing | ---- | ---- | 6 | 15 | ---- |
| Housing Expediter (excluding rent control) | 6 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| Aids to private housing: | | | | | |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency: | | | | | |
| Federal Housing Administration | −19 | 5 | 7 | ---- | ---- |
| Home Loan Bank Board: | | | | | |
| Home Owners' Loan Corporation | −156 | −123 | −95 | ---- | ---- |
| Proposed stand-by borrowing authority: | | | | | |
| Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 750 |
| Federal home loan banks | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 1,000 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation: | | | | | |
| Existing programs: | | | | | |
| Mortgage purchases, net | 113 | 333 | 149 | ---- | ---- |
| Loans to large-scale producers | ---- | 5 | 13 | ---- | ---- |
| Other | 4 | 2 | (1) | ---- | ---- |
| Proposed assistance for rental and cooperative housing | ---- | ---- | 50 | ---- | ---- |
| Department of Agriculture: Proposed farm housing program | ---- | ---- | 20 | 5 | 27 |
| Public housing programs: | | | | | |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency: | | | | | |
| Public Housing Administration: | | | | | |
| Existing programs: | | | | | |
| War housing | 48 | 48 | 34 | 162 | ---- |
| Veterans' re-use housing | 44 | 12 | 1 | 12 | ---- |
| Low-rent housing | 11 | −1 | 12 | 6 | ---- |
| Other | −5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | ---- |
| Proposed low-rent housing | ---- | 15 | 129 | 5 | 85 |
| Other agencies | −1 | −1 | −1 | (1) | ---- |
| Provision of community facilities: | | | | | |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 25 | 35 | 32 | ---- | ---- |
| Federal Works Agency: | | | | | |
| Existing programs | 10 | 15 | 8 | 1 | ---- |
| Proposed legislation: | | | | | |
| Disaster relief | ---- | ---- | 3 | 5 | ---- |
| Alaska public works | ---- | ---- | 1 | 2 | ---- |
| Total | 82 | 349 | 388 | 227 | 1,987 |

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

Private housing: The great bulk of the housing of the Nation is today and should remain privately owned and privately financed. In addition to the general aids provided for all types of housing, the Federal Government aids private housing through sharing financial risks and providing a supplementary source of funds.

Over one-third of the new housing started in the next fiscal year, it is estimated, will be financed by mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration. In the years ahead our mortgage insurance system should give increased emphasis to assisting housing cooperatives and production of rental housing and lower-priced sales housing. Amendments are needed for these purposes, as well as to simplify the variety of insurance aids now available. Both the Federal Housing Administration and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will encourage increased production of lower-priced housing by special financial assistance to producers using efficient large-scale construction methods. In addition, as part of our veterans' program, the Government will continue to guarantee loans made to veterans to help finance construction and purchase of homes.

The Federal National Mortgage Association, a subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, will continue to assist private lenders in certain cases where credit is short by purchasing federally insured and guaranteed mortgages. In the fiscal year 1950 these purchases, under the present authority, will result in estimated net expenditures of 149 million dollars. I am recommending revisions of the present limitations on mortgage purchases which will result in an estimated 50 million dollars of additional expenditures. In order to prevent inflationary pressures, any such broadening should, of course, be confined to measures urgently required to finance the most-needed types of housing construction, particularly rental housing and housing cooperatives.

As another credit aid to private housing, the Federal home-loan banks provide an important supplementary source of credit for the savings and loan associations, which make about one-third of all home-mortgage loans. The Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation insures the share-accounts of its member associations. Both the banks and the Corporation are supervised by the Home Loan Bank Board.

I am recommending basic revisions in the financial structure of these agencies designed to encourage substitution of private capital for Federal investments, to permit them to borrow from the Treasury in the event of any future emergency, and to give the Home Loan Bank Board more specific authority over the borrowing and lending operations of the member associations. Under this legislation, the additional retirement of Federal investment in home loan bank stock in the fiscal year 1950 will increase budget receipts by an estimated 81 million dollars. The stand-by borrowing authority requested for the home loan banks and the Corporation amounts to 1,750 million dollars. I do not anticipate that any use will be made of this new authority except in time of emergency, but it will provide additional assurance to the millions of shareholders, comparable to the assurance now given to bank depositors.

I am again recommending that the Congress provide for more adequate Federal aids to construction and improvement of privately owned farm housing. The new program would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide loans for farm housing, as well as contributions for housing for farmers on potentially self-supporting farms and limited grants to improve substandard housing of low-income farmers.

Public housing: Except for 3,000 permanent low-rent units authorized before the war, Federal assistance for new public housing since the war has been limited almost entirely to provision of temporary accommodations under the veterans' reuse program. With every month that passes, legislation to authorize a new and broader program of Federal assistance for low-rent public housing becomes more necessary. Only through such a program can cities make a substantial start in providing permanent housing for the low-income families for whom private enterprise cannot reasonably be expected to provide.

The legislation which I am now recommending would provide the Federal assistance required to permit construction of 1,050,000 low-rent units over a 7-year period. It would authorize the Public Housing Administration to make contracts with local public agencies providing for annual Federal contributions over a 40-year period sufficient to assure acceptable housing for low-income families at rents they can afford to pay. Contracts involving maximum annual contributions of 85 million dollars would be authorized for the fiscal year 1950, rising to a maximum annual amount of 445 million dollars by the end of the fiscal year 1954. In addition, the lending authority of the Public Housing Administration would be increased by 700 million dollars primarily for temporary financing. To minimize the cost of the program, the local housing agencies would meet their long-term financial requirements by selling to the public taxable obligations fully protected by the pledge of annual Federal contributions. Disbursements during the first year will amount to an estimated 129 million dollars, almost entirely for short-term loans.

The Public Housing Administration also has been administering the disposition of permanent and temporary units built under the war housing and veterans' reuse programs. I am recommending legislation to make possible more expeditious sale to private owners of all permanent war housing units, except those transferred to local housing agencies for low-rent housing. Adequate protection would be provided for present occupants. Legislation also is needed to permit transfer of all Federal ownership and other rights in temporary housing (with limited exceptions) to local communities which apply for such transfer. This step would permit the entire responsibility for such housing to be vested in local authorities, who can most readily determine the continuing emergency need.

Community facilities: In accordance with the economic stabilization program, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is limiting its new loans to public agencies to relatively low levels. Other expenditures will be made to complete the Brooklyn-Battery tunnel and to meet other prior commitments.

I again recommend legislation authorizing the Federal Works Agency to provide prompt assistance to communities in rebuilding facilities after floods and other disasters. A tentative appropriation estimate of 5 million dollars is included for this purpose.

Alaska housing and public works: As part of the program to develop the resources of Alaska, I have recommended special assistance for both private and public housing. Such housing is badly needed, but is hampered by excessive construction costs. This budget provides for a 10-million-dollar revolving fund to finance loans and construction by the Alaska Housing Authority. I also recommend a 2-million-dollar appropriation to the Federal Works Agency to provide for certain urgently needed public works in Alaska.

Appropriations and other authorizations—summary: Most of the expenditures for existing programs in the fiscal year 1950 will be financed from the corporate funds of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation provided in earlier years.

New appropriations of 44 million dollars and other authorizations of 1,987 million dollars would be called for under my legislative recommendations. The proposed stand-by borrowing authority of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation and of the Federal home loan banks accounts for 1,750 million dollars. Slum clearance, low-rent public housing, and farm housing proposals require contract and loan authorizations of 237 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950. An increase of 700 million dollars in the lending authority of the Public Housing Administration would be provided in the fiscal year 1949. It is estimated that 35 million dollars of the 174 million dollars in permanent appropriations, representing anticipated receipts from war housing and veterans' reuse housing, will be spent for current management and disposition activities. The remaining 139 million dollars will be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury without affecting budget expenditures.

*Education and general research*

It is important to the continued progress of the Nation that we raise our educational standards and expand our fundamental research. At the present time the Federal Government promotes education by providing professional leadership and advice to educators, and

by supporting vocational education and the land-grant colleges through grants-in-aid to the States. It also supports Howard University and educational institutions for the blind and deaf, and provides for the education of Indians. The Government provides library and museum services through the Library of Congress, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Gallery of Art, and the Botanic Gardens, and carries on general research through the National Bureau of Standards, the Bureau of the Census, and the Naval Observatory.

Expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 for education and general research are estimated at 414 million dollars. The increase of 329 million dollars over 1949 is almost entirely for proposed grants to States for education and for the decennial census of population.

*Education and general research*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| Promotion of education: | | | | | |
| Office of Education (Federal Security Agency): | | | | | |
| Present programs | $33 | $34 | $34 | $34 | ----- |
| Federal aid to education (proposed legislation) | ----- | ----- | 290 | 300 | ----- |
| Survey of educational building needs, and study of scholarships and fellowships (proposed legislation) | ----- | ----- | 1 | 1 | ----- |
| Federal Works Agency and other | 6 | 4 | 1 | (1) | ----- |
| Educational aid to special groups: | | | | | |
| Bureau of Indian Affairs (Interior) | 12 | 11 | 12 | 12 | ----- |
| Howard University (Federal Security Agency) and other | 3 | 6 | 12 | 5 | $6 |
| Library and museum services | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | ----- |
| General-purpose research: | | | | | |
| Department of Commerce: | | | | | |
| Seventeenth decennial census | (1) | 2 | 36 | 70 | ----- |
| Other Census Bureau programs | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | ----- |
| National Bureau of Standards: | | | | | |
| Present programs | 5 | 9 | 8 | 9 | ----- |
| Radio propagation building (proposed legislation) | ----- | ----- | (1) | (1) | ----- |
| National Science Foundation (proposed legislation) | ----- | ----- | 2 | 3 | 12 |
| Other agencies | 2 | 1 | 1 | (1) | ----- |
| Total | 75 | 85 | 414 | [2] 452 | 18 |

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

[2] In addition, this Budget includes 6 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

In addition to these general programs, many Federal agencies carry on specialized education and research activities which are included in other functional groupings. Some of these are the education benefits for veterans, fellowship and other training programs designed to produce needed specialists, and research for military and other purposes.

Aid to education: Although the Federal Government is engaged in this broad range of educational activities, we are not yet assuring all the children of our Nation the opportunity of receiving the basic education which is essential to a strong democracy. In many areas, teachers' salaries are low, particularly in the elementary grades. Too many are leaving the profession; too few are entering. Enrollments are rising. As a result, overcrowded classrooms and substandard instruction are common. As the large number of children born during and after the war reach school age, the situation will become even worse.

Many States are finding it difficult, even with high tax rates, to pay adequate salaries or to take other corrective measures. It is therefore urgent that the Congress enact legislation to provide grants to the States in support of a basic minimum program of elementary and secondary education for all our children and youth. This budget includes a tentative appropriation estimate of 300 million dollars for such grants in the fiscal year 1950.

We know that a shortage of school buildings exists in many parts of the country as a result of wartime deferment of construction and the increase in the school-age population. We do not know the over-all extent of the shortage, the particular areas in which it exists, and whether State and local governments can alleviate it without special Federal aid for construction. In order to provide an adequate factual basis for further consideration of the problem, I ask the Congress to authorize a survey of educational building needs and the adequacy of State and local resources available to meet these needs.

It has become increasingly obvious that the national welfare demands that higher education be made available to more of our talented young people. We should now determine the soundest and most practicable means of providing additional opportunities for capable young people who could not otherwise afford a college or university education.

The budget estimates include 1 million dollars as a tentative estimate of appropriations needed for these surveys when authorized by the Congress.

Howard University: An extensive building program is under way at Howard University to meet part of the need which results from the doubling of student enrollment since 1946. Additional contract authorizations of 6 million dollars are requested in connection with this building program.

National Science Foundation: The strength and economic welfare of our country in years to come are largely dependent on the advances that can be made in basic scientific research. To maintain and expand the Nation's efforts in scientific research and to help assure an adequate supply of trained scientists in the future, I again urge that the Congress enact legislation creating a National Science Foundation in a form which does not contain the basic administrative defects of the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. This budget includes tentative estimates of 2.5 million dollars of appropriations and, in addition, 12.5 million dollars of contract authority to enable the Foundation to establish its organization and initiate its program during the fiscal year 1950.

*Agriculture and agricultural resources*

Federal programs for agriculture include a wide variety of services, grants, loans, and other payments designed to promote the conservation and development of agricultural resources and to improve the efficiency of farm production. They include financial and other assistance aimed to assure reasonable stability in farm income. Finally, they include special aids to farmers whose farm resources are limited in order to give them an opportunity to improve their economic status. The common objective is to promote adjustments within the farm economy and between it and other parts of the national economy which will enable agriculture to contribute its part to the economic development of the Nation as a whole and assure farmers a fair share in the fruits of that development.

*Agriculture and agricultural resources*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| Loan and investment programs: | | | | | |
| Department of Agriculture: | | | | | |
| Commodity Credit Corporation | −$200 | $866 | $538 | ----- | ----- |
| Grain storage facilities (proposed legislation) | ----- | ----- | 25 | ----- | ----- |
| Farmers Home Administration | 61 | 122 | 116 | $115 | ----- |
| Rural Electrification Administration, net | 239 | 283 | 330 | 6 | $350 |
| Other corporate transactions | −67 | −63 | −14 | 7 | ----- |
| Other agencies | 2 | (1) | 2 | 2 | ----- |
| Other financial aids: | | | | | |
| Department of Agriculture: | | | | | |
| Conservation and use | 236 | 227 | 274 | 290 | ----- |
| Exportation and domestic consumption | 51 | 87 | 55 | 50 | ----- |
| Sugar Act | 60 | 71 | 65 | 65 | ----- |
| International Wheat Agreement (proposed legislation) | ----- | ----- | 56 | (1) | ----- |
| Other agencies | −3 | (1) | (1) | ----- | ----- |
| Agricultural land and water resources: | | | | | |
| Present legislation | 48 | 59 | 61 | 60 | ----- |
| Flood control—Missouri Basin (proposed legislation) | ----- | 1 | 4 | ----- | ----- |
| Other development and improvement of agriculture | 147 | 153 | 151 | 149 | ----- |
| Total | 575 | 1,805 | 1,662 | 745 | 350 |

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

The calendar year 1948 was another year of high prosperity for American agriculture. Because of the high level of national income and the continuing need abroad for American food and fiber, cash receipts from farm marketings totaled approximately 30.8 billion dollars—slightly larger than the 30.2 billion dollars in 1947. With rising production costs, however, net farm income declined for the first time in 10 years—from 17.8 billion dollars in 1947 to an estimated 17.2 billion dollars in 1948. This compares with 6.4 billion dollars in 1941.

The ratio of prices received by farmers to prices paid has gradually declined from the peak of 133 in October 1946 to 109 in December 1948. A continuation of the downward trend in this ratio will mean smaller net incomes for farmers in 1949 and 1950, an adjustment from the high levels of the immediate postwar years. This adjustment, prevented from becoming excessive by the operation of price supports, will contribute to over-all stabilization of the economy and to a lowering of the cost of living.

The principal factor causing the fluctuation in total agricultural expenditures is the volume of price support outlays by the Commodity Credit Corporation. This program largely accounts for the estimated increase of 1,230 million dollars in expenditures from the fiscal year 1948 to 1949, and the decrease of 143 million dollars from 1949 to 1950. Apart from price support outlays, expenditures in 1950 for agriculture and agricultural resources are expected to be larger than in 1949 because of the higher level of loan disbursements for rural electrification, larger outlays to encourage conservation of agricultural land resources, smaller net repayments on loans made by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and the proposed International Wheat Agreement.

Price support: Net outlays of the Commodity Credit Corporation are estimated to be 866 million dollars in 1949 and 538 million dollars in 1950, as compared with net receipts of 200 million dollars in 1948. Because of the very large production of wheat, corn, and cotton in the 1948 crop year, market prices of these commodities have declined to support levels, resulting in loan outlays or the acquisition of considerable stocks in the current fiscal year. Price support expenditures are expected also to be large on potatoes, eggs, and flaxseed.

For the 1949 crop year production of cotton, wheat, and corn will probably again exceed anticipated domestic and export requirements, even assuming lower yields per acre than in 1948. If 1949 production should equal the magnitude of the 1948 crops, expenditures of the Commodity Credit Corporation would be considerably larger in the fiscal year 1950 than now estimated.

As I said a year ago, price supports should be regarded "chiefly as devices to safeguard farmers against forced selling under unfavorable conditions and economic depression." Their purpose is to bring an element of stability into agriculture. At the same time they should not place excessive burdens on the Treasury and taxpayers or inhibit shifts in production needed to meet peacetime demands and to promote adequate conservation of our soil resources. The postwar revisions in the price-support programs, which take effect largely in the fiscal year 1951, need certain amendments to make the price support mechanism and the quota provisions more workable.

Two major defects were noted at the time I signed the bill granting a Federal charter to the Commodity Credit Corporation. The first, the restriction on the Corporation's authority to acquire storage facilities, has prevented the Government from fulfilling its obligations under the price-support program. The second, the provisions removing the Corporation from the direct supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, divide responsibility and make more difficult the sound administration of our agricultural program. I recommend that the charter of the Commodity Credit Corporation be amended to correct these deficiencies.

Rural electrification: Despite the extreme shortages of materials and electrical equipment since the war, the rural electrification program has made notable progress. The percentage of total farms electrified has risen from 48 percent on June 30, 1945, to over 68 percent on June 30, 1948. With the carryover of approximately 120 million dollars from prior-year loan authorizations of the Rural Electrification Administration, I recommend that the new loan authorization be reduced from 400 million dollars to 350 million dollars in 1950. New loan advances to rural cooperatives are estimated to be 360 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950, compared with 310 million dollars in 1949. With the rising percentage of total farms electrified, Rural Electrification Administration loans may be expected to level off in 1951 and decline in later years.

Conservation: The long-run well-being of both the farmer and the Nation depends on the preservation of our soil resources. To accomplish this objective, the Soil Conservation Service provides technical advice and services to farmers. The ultimate goal as it affects the farmer is a plan of management for his farm which will insure both sustained full production and preservation of the soil. The Federal Government also makes payments to farmers to encourage desirable conservation practices. Expenditures for this program are estimated to increase from 227 million dollars in the fiscal year 1949 to 274 million dollars in 1950. For the 1950 crop-year conservation program—to be reflected in expenditures in the fiscal year 1951—I recommend planning for a 262.5-million-dollar program to include the cost of administering any acreage allotments or marketing quotas which may be adopted, as well as payments to farmers and related administrative expenses.

A flood-control survey report covering the watershed of the Missouri will soon be presented to the Congress. If this report is approved by the Congress, a 1949 supplemental appropriation of approximately 5 million dollars will be required to initiate needed land-use changes and the construction of terraces and other structures to retard water flow and soil erosion on the lands in the Missouri Basin. These operations are essential supplements to the flood-control works of the Corps of Engineers on the downstream channels. Larger appropriations will be required in the years following 1950.

Wheat agreement: If the International Wheat Agreement is successfully renegotiated, I shall recommend its ratification and the enactment of the necessary legislation to fulfill its provisions. Under this proposal, the principal exporting and importing countries would guarantee over a period of years an annual trade of a large volume of wheat within an agreed-upon price range. Thus, the agreement would provide an orderly solution of some of the problems of international trade over the next few years without the demoralizing effect of unilateral action by governments acting independently. Approximately 56 million dollars is allowed in this budget to cover the probable loss to the Commodity Credit Corporation in bridging the gap between the price of wheat for the farmer under the price-support program and the price at which wheat is made available to foreign purchasers under the Agreement. Costs are expected to be less in later years and will be more than balanced by benefits to farmers and to the Nation in terms of greater stabilization of world trade.

Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation: In order to simplify the Government-lending operations which assist agriculture, I recommend that the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation be abolished, and that its functions and the capital stock revolving fund be transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture. Under this proposed change the Secretary could direct existing farm-credit agencies to draw upon the revolving fund to extend emergency credit to farmers in the event of floods, droughts, or other natural disasters.

*Natural resources*

The Federal Government has far-reaching responsibilities for the conservation and development of our natural resources. It must necessarily assume responsibility for the development of atomic energy; it must assure the proper utilization of its extensive land holdings which contain valuable forest, grazing, mineral, water, fish, wildlife, and recreational resources; it must provide for the improvement of such public resources as the major streams of the country. In addition, the Government must foster reasonable standards of conservation and development of resources in private ownership in the interest of the national welfare. We should reappraise our plans for using and conserving our resources in the light of the marked changes that have occurred during and since the war.

In this budget, programs are being restricted to the lowest level consistent with the heavy demands on our natural resources for both civilian and national-defense requirements. The estimated expenditures give particular consideration to the serious needs for electric power in certain areas and for critical minerals. They also allow for work made urgent by repeated postponements during and since the war.

Expenditures for the Government's natural-resources programs in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 1,861 million dollars, an increase of 245 million dollars over 1949. The largest expenditures, 725 million dollars, will be made by the Atomic Energy Commission. Other large expenditures include 481 million dollars for flood control by the Corps of Engineers and 344 million dollars by the

Bureau of Reclamation for development of water resources in the West. These activities represent more than four-fifths of the total estimated expenditures in 1950 and largely account for the increase over 1949.

*Natural resources*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| Atomic energy: | | | | | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | $466 | $632 | $725 | $365 | $427 |
| Other agencies | 9 | 2 | (1) | ----- | ----- |
| Land and water resources: | | | | | |
| Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions) | 246 | 442 | 481 | 505 | ----- |
| Bureau of Reclamation (Interior) | 175 | 282 | 340 | 380 | ----- |
| Rehabilitation and betterment projects (proposed legislation) | ----- | ----- | 4 | 5 | ----- |
| Bonneville Power Administration and southwestern power transmission system (Interior) | 18 | 31 | 41 | 27 | 24 |
| Other Interior | 9 | 15 | 15 | 15 | ----- |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 34 | 29 | 49 | 56 | ----- |
| Department of State and other | 3 | 5 | 10 | 4 | ----- |
| Forest resources: | | | | | |
| Forest Service and other (Agriculture) | 57 | 62 | 69 | 68 | ----- |
| Department of the Interior | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | (1) |
| Mineral resources: | | | | | |
| Bureau of Mines and other (Interior) | 26 | 34 | 31 | 30 | ----- |
| Department of the Navy and other | 7 | 15 | 18 | 10 | ----- |
| Commercial production of synthetic fuels (proposed legislation) | ----- | 1 | ----- | ----- | 30 |
| Incentive payments for exploration and development of minerals (proposed legislation, Interior) | ----- | 5 | ----- | 15 | ----- |
| General resource surveys (Interior) | 10 | 14 | 17 | 18 | ----- |
| Fish and wildlife resources (Interior and other) | 12 | 25 | 24 | 24 | ----- |
| Recreational use of resources (Interior) | 16 | 22 | 26 | 23 | ----- |
| Total | 1,091 | 1,616 | 1,861 | [2]1,549 | 482 |

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

[2] In addition, this budget includes 391 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

New obligational authority recommended in 1950 consists of 1,549 million dollars in net new appropriations and 482 million dollars in contract and loan authorizations, of which 427 million dollars is in contract authorizations for the Atomic Energy Commission. Appropriations required to liquidate prior-year contract authorizations amount to 391 million dollars.

Atomic energy: To an increasing extent our national welfare and security are linked to our atomic energy program. We must continue to add to our knowledge of this resource and move ahead with practical development. Special emphasis is given to the development of nuclear reactors as an eventual means for converting atomic energy into electricity and into power for propulsion of ships and airplanes.

The 1950 budget provides increased funds for the production of fissionable materials and the development of the science and technology of atomic energy. The present high costs of rapidly accomplishing these purposes must be balanced against the ultimate and far greater costs of failure to move ahead vigorously in this field.

Land and water resources: Present high costs of construction and large competitive demands from various sectors of the economy make it necessary to undertake new river basin projects only where urgency is evident. More than 90 percent of the recommended expenditures for river basin development in the fiscal year 1950 is to continue work started in prior years. Despite this restriction, Federal outlays for these resources will be about 1 billion dollars in 1950.

In view of the magnitude of the investment in these resources and its economic effects, there should be careful surveillance of the programs in order to prevent waste and assure sound development. We should apply the lessons of our Tennessee Valley experience without delay wherever they offer promise of improvement.

An essential first step for the flood control, reclamation, and other development activities is an expansion by the Geological Survey of its water resource investigations and topographic surveys.

The flood control program of the Corps of Engineers, involving the construction of major storage reservoirs, channels, and levees, will be limited in the fiscal year 1950 almost entirely to continuation of work on projects started in prior years. Particular emphasis is now given to the Mississippi River Basin but major projects are under construction in river basins on the Atlantic seaboard and Gulf coast, the Central Valley and Los Angeles areas in California, and the Columbia Basin.

The program of the Bureau of Reclamation is going forward on major projects in the Central Valley of California, the Columbia Basin, the Colorado River area, and the Missouri Basin. Because of the great increase in the estimated cost of the Missouri Basin development, the present plan should be reexamined to determine needed changes.

The anticipated shortage of power in some areas of the country makes it urgent that we move forward at a faster rate on certain of the Federal hydroelectric power projects in order to obtain benefits as early as feasible. Two large projects to be constructed by the Corps of Engineers are recommended for initiation in the Columbia Basin in the fiscal year 1950, in order to meet increasing power demands.

The Tennessee Valley, where the Government has broad responsibilities for power supply, faces a power shortage in the near future. Expansion of Tennessee Valley Authority's generating capacity is vital not only for the growing normal power demands, but also for the expanding needs of the atomic energy program. I recommend an immediate appropriation for 1949 to initiate construction of a steam plant to permit more effective utilization of the hydroelectric power resources of the area, and additional funds for 1950 to expedite progress on the project.

Construction by the Government of transmission and distribution facilities is essential in some areas for marketing the power from Government projects in compliance with law, which gives priority to public agencies and cooperatives. Funds have been recommended in the budget for this purpose.

The Federal lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management contain resources that are both large and diverse in character. A large portion of these lands is in the grazing districts of the West and is an important part of the livestock economy of that area. The Bureau's administration of mineral resources includes not only the resources on the public lands, but also those on several million acres of land where surface rights have passed into private ownership. Aggregate receipts from these Federal land resources greatly exceed the costs of administration.

Mineral resources: Two World Wars as well as subsequent needs for world recovery have drawn heavily on our mineral resources. The Federal Government has a responsibility for assuring the adequacy of these resources through intensive surveys, investigations, and exploration; fundamental research; and sound conservation practices. Funds recommended for the Bureau of Mines and some activities of the Geological Survey are directed to these purposes. In addition, I recommend legislation which will authorize incentive payments for the exploration and development of strategic and critical minerals.

The country must face squarely the fact that a major portion of its rapidly increasing energy requirements is being met by oil and gas, which constitute only a small portion of our energy reserve. The prospects are that we shall become increasingly dependent on foreign sources of oil unless appropriate action is taken. I recommend legislation to provide for proper conservation and planned use of the oil reserves under the sea which are vested in the Federal Government. The Federal Government should take steps also to encourage commercial production of synthetic liquid fuels from our abundant reserves of coal, lignite, and oil shale. I recommend legislation to authorize the Government to provide financial assistance for this purpose.

Other resource programs: Programs for the development of our forest, fish, and wildlife resources will be at about the same level in 1950 as in 1949. The increase in expenditures for forest-resource development is explained by the inclusion in this function of forest-development roads, previously classified with forest highways under the transportation function. An increase is recommended for the operation and improvement of the national parks. This increase is in recognition of the problems created by severe curtailment of upkeep

in recent years, and the increased use of the parks as indicated by a trebling of the number of visitors since the close of the war.

Alaskan resources: In my message to the Congress in May 1948, I stressed the need for certain immediate actions to aid in the development of Alaskan resources. I recommend in this budget funds for housing, community facilities, and transportation in this important area. In addition, the budget includes increased expenditures for the investigation and development of Alaskan timber, water, land, mineral, fish, and wildlife resources.

*Transportation and communication*

The Federal Government has a major responsibility in the development and regulation of the vital transportation and communication industries. The Government has, at various times, provided direct or indirect assistance to most segments of these industries. It must continue to do so where necessary. The ultimate objective of such assistance is the balanced development of these industries, to the end that they can eventually provide all necessary services at the minimum cost to the immediate user and to the taxpayer.

A major part of the Federal expenditures for transportation and communication are for basic facilities such as highways, airports, waterway improvements, and navigation aids. As postwar programs have developed, expenditures for such facilities have increased considerably in recent years. By fiscal year 1950, most of these programs will reach a level which is likely to be sustained with relatively little change in the near future.

While expenditures for these programs will increase between fiscal years 1949 and 1950, total expenditures for transportation and communication are estimated to decline from 1.8 billion dollars in fiscal year 1949 to 1.6 billion dollars in 1950. This decline results from an estimated reduction in the postal deficit, in line with my recommendation for postal rate revisions.

Postal service: The postal deficit for fiscal year 1950, on the basis of current postal rates, would be more than 400 million dollars. A deficit of this size is unsound; it imposes upon the general taxpayer a financial burden which should properly be borne by the users of the service.

Large postal deficits are resulting from a record volume of postal business, most of which is carried at rates which do not cover handling costs. The low rates for parcel post have led to substantial diversion of express traffic from common carriers, with the result that the Post Office Department is now receiving a volume and type of parcel business which it cannot efficiently handle with existing facilities. Present rates for second and third class mail are so low that they make only a small contribution to the costs of handling such mail. While the national interest in disseminating information justifies some preferential treatment for periodicals and other second-class matter, there is no sound basis for the extremely low rates now in effect.

*Transportation and communication*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| Promotion of aviation: | | | | | |
| Civil Aeronautics Administration (Commerce) | $98 | $150 | $196 | $127 | $67 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 38 | 44 | 60 | 56 | 22 |
| Promotion of the merchant marine: | | | | | |
| Maritime Commission | 183 | 152 | 182 | 90 | 60 |
| Inland Waterways Corporation (Commerce): | | | | | |
| Present programs | ----- | 2 | 1 | 1 | ----- |
| Proposed legislation | ----- | ----- | 2 | 2 | ----- |
| Provision of navigation aids and facilities: | | | | | |
| Panama Canal (Army, civil functions) | 11 | 20 | 16 | 15 | ----- |
| Corps of Engineers (Army, civil functions): | | | | | |
| Present programs | 114 | 168 | 209 | 229 | ----- |
| Proposed St. Lawrence seaway and power project | ----- | ----- | 8 | 20 | ----- |
| Coast Guard (Treasury) | 106 | 141 | 148 | 150 | ----- |
| Department of the Interior | (1) | 1 | 1 | ----- | ----- |
| Provision of highways: | | | | | |
| Public Roads Administration (Federal Works Agency) | 331 | 444 | 501 | 16 | 470 |
| Forest roads and trails (Agriculture) | 18 | 26 | 3 | 2 | ----- |
| Alaska and Indian roads (Interior) | 7 | 19 | 28 | 12 | 7 |
| Regulation of transportation (Interstate Commerce Commission and Civil Aeronautics Board) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | ----- |
| Other services to transportation: | | | | | |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | −1 | −4 | 2 | ----- | ----- |
| Coast and Geodetic Survey (Commerce) | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | ----- |
| Alaska Railroad (Interior) | 25 | 33 | 40 | 29 | 22 |
| Postal service deficit (Post Office): | | | | | |
| Present programs | 304 | 527 | 402 | 404 | ----- |
| Proposed legislation | ----- | ----- | −250 | −250 | ----- |
| Regulation of communication (Federal Communications Commission) | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | ----- |
| Alaska communications system: | | | | | |
| Present programs | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | ----- |
| Proposed legislation | ----- | ----- | 1 | 4 | ----- |
| Total | 1,267 | 1,757 | 1,586 | [2] 945 | 648 |

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

[2] In addition, this budget includes 495 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior-year contract authorizations.

In the last 2 years, I have recommended that the Congress raise postal rates to bring them more nearly into line with the increased costs of postal operations. A partial revision in rates was effected by the Eightieth Congress, but this did not offset the cost of the postal pay raise which was concurrently enacted. I therefore strongly urge again that the Congress enact at once an adequate revision of the postal rate structure. I have asked the Postmaster General to submit his recommendations for rate revisions sufficient to reduce the deficit to a reasonable level. The added revenue from such revisions, estimated at 250 million dollars for the fiscal year 1950, is shown in the budget under proposed legislation. The remaining deficit would represent largely the costs of Government penalty mail, franked mail, airline subsidies, and other costs not properly chargeable to the users of the postal service. Aside from such costs, postal operations should be conducted on a self-sufficient basis, with rates maintained at a level adequate to accomplish that objective.

Aviation: Commercial aviation, the newest of our transportation industries, is still in a stage of development that requires subsidy assistance. The program of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for modernizing the Nation's airways will assist the air lines in achieving greater safety and regularity, higher load factors, and thus eventually in reducing their dependence upon Federal financial aid. This program includes principally the installation of landing aids at major airports, and of new airway facilities to permit greater precision and flexibility in air navigation. The present transitional program, utilizing types of equipment currently available, is now getting fully under way, and the 1950 budget recommendation contemplates its completion within a few years. Research and development work required for a longer-range program will be actively started in the fiscal year 1950, looking toward a complete all-weather air-navigation system within a period of about 15 years.

New obligational authority for the Federal aid airport-construction program is held to 40 million dollars in this budget. Within these funds, primary emphasis will be placed upon the construction and improvement of large airports which are required for commercial air transport, and which would also have potential national defense importance.

The basic aeronautical research conducted by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics is essential for the design and development of improved aircraft, both military and civilian. The 1950 budget provides for new facilities, and increased use of existing facilities, primarily for research upon military aircraft requirements.

Water transportation: Promotion of the merchant marine, through Maritime Commission construction and operating subsidies, will require some increase in expenditures in the fiscal year 1950. The budget recommendations provide for the construction of new vessels related to the national defense. With minor exceptions, contracts for sale of these vessels to private operators will be required before construction is begun. Within recent months, the Commission has let contracts for the construction of five passenger-cargo vessels, and has received bids on the construction of a large, high-speed passenger liner. Construction activity on these and other merchant vessels will increase Maritime Commission shipbuilding expenditures from 26 million dollars in fiscal year 1949 to 121 million dollars in fiscal year 1950.

By the end of the fiscal year 1949 the Maritime Commission expects to have determined the postwar operating subsidy rates for all essential trade routes. Subsidy expenditures will therefore be on a full-year basis in fiscal year 1950, and are estimated at 22 million dollars,

more than twice the 1949 level. The substantial increases in construction and operating subsidy programs will be largely offset by declines in other Maritime Commission expenditures, particularly those for vessel operation and for liquidation of prior-year obligations.

The activities of the Coast Guard in maintaining rescue stations, enforcing maritime laws, and operating navigational aids, are of primary importance to safety at sea of both air and surface transportation. These programs are expected to cost 148 million dollars in fiscal year 1950. This is slightly higher than in 1949 as a result of the full-year operation of ocean weather stations and a higher level of maintenance of other Coast Guard facilities.

River and harbor improvement by the Corps of Engineers is held in the 1950 budget to the minimum required for navigation and related purposes. Most of the 1950 program will represent work on existing projects. Only 12 new projects, of high urgency, are proposed to be started in 1950.

I again urge the Congress to give early approval to the St. Lawrence waterway and power project. The navigational aspects of this project have recently assumed an increased importance as a result of the prospects for developing high-grade iron-ore deposits in Labrador. As our domestic deposits become depleted the proposed seaway will become an important link between our steel industry and this new potential source of ore. Furthermore this dual-purpose project is needed as a source of low-cost power.

The Inland Waterways Corporation, which helps bring the advantages of water transportation to shippers, large and small, urgently needs additional capital to modernize its equipment. Such rehabilitation should enable the Corporation to demonstrate the prospects for profitable operation of its services, and permit the sale of the Corporation to a private operator at terms which would safeguard the interests of both the Government and the users of the service. I recommend that the Congress authorize the additional capital funds needed.

Highways: Federal grants-in-aid for road construction have been increasing substantially in recent years, and in fiscal year 1950 will be close to the level authorized in existing legislation. Even with this high level of Federal aid, our highways are not being improved as fast as they wear out, nor are they being modernized to the extent required by postwar traffic conditions. Nevertheless, present high costs and the limited capacity of the construction industry make it undesirable for expenditures in the fiscal year 1950 to exceed the estimated level of 501 million dollars.

Federal regulation: Although most of the expenditures in this function are accounted for by the services, facilities, and subsidies discussed above, a highly important Federal responsibility is exercised by the regulatory agencies in this field. The regulation of rates and other aspects of transportation and communication services help to assure that the public interest will be adequately and efficiently served. The general economic adjustments within the past few years have substantially increased the normal work loads of these agencies. The Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Communications Commission in particular have been faced with major technological and economic developments within their expanding fields. Despite these increased problems, the present budgetary situation makes it desirable to hold these agencies to essentially their present levels.

Appropriations and other authorizations—Summary: To carry out the above programs, I am recommending 1,593 million dollars in new obligational authority. Of this amount, 648 million dollars represent new contract authorizations, and 945 million dollars represent net new appropriations. Excluded from the total of new obligational authority are additional appropriations of 495 million dollars which will be required for the liquidation of prior-year contract authorizations.

*Finance, commerce, and industry*

Except in times of war or other emergency, the Federal Government's finance, commerce, and industry programs are limited in the main to enforcing effective competition and to providing a wide variety of financial and nonfinancial aids to private industry. The principal agencies administering these programs are the Department of Commerce, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the various business regulatory agencies. I have already discussed the more specialized regulation and promotion of particular industries such as transportation and communication.

Total expenditures for finance, commerce, and industry programs are estimated at 107 million dollars in 1950, or slightly above the 1949 level. To carry out these programs, I am including in the budget appropriations of 82 million dollars for fiscal year 1950, including tentative estimates of 44 million dollars for extension of existing stabilization activities and for new controls under the proposed stand-by authority. Supplemental appropriations of 24 million dollars will also be required for the current fiscal year, chiefly for stabilization activities and for completion of the Census of Business.

Stabilization program: The major economic problem facing our country is to prevent further inflation and to move on into a stable economic situation without an intervening recession. To provide the necessary legislative authority, I recommend extending and strengthening the existing statutes covering rent, export and transportation controls, materials allocations, control of consumer credit, and bank-reserve requirements. In addition, I am recommending new authority for stand-by price and wage controls and for the allocation of a broader list of commodities, for use if voluntary measures prove inadequate, and for studies of the need for expanding productive capacity in shortage industries. Budget expenditures for this stabilization program are estimated at 41 million dollars in 1950.

Antimonopoly program: A strong antimonopoly program is essential for the preservation of our free enterprise institutions. It can also provide immediate assistance in the present effort to restrain inflation. By concentrating enforcement activities in major consumer commodities, conspiracies responsible for high prices can be broken and the cost of living reduced.

*Finance, commerce, and industry*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 net new appropriations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | |
| Promotion and regulation of business: | | | | |
| Stabilization program: | | | | |
| Housing Expediter—rent control and veterans' priorities: | | | | |
| Present programs | $19 | $18 | ------ | ------ |
| Proposed legislation | ------ | 5 | $23 | $24 |
| Department of Commerce: | | | | |
| Present programs | 1 | 4 | ------ | ------ |
| Proposed legislation | ------ | 1 | 5 | 5 |
| Department of Agriculture | 3 | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| Treasury Department | ------ | 1 | ------ | ------ |
| Proposed stabilization legislation | ------ | 2 | 13 | 15 |
| Continuing programs: | | | | |
| Antimonopoly program (Federal Trade Commission, Justice) | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Other regulatory agencies | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 |
| Department of Commerce | 19 | 27 | 23 | 18 |
| Business loans and guarantees (Reconstruction Finance Corporation): | | | | |
| National defense loans | −5 | −19 | −6 | ------ |
| Other loans to business | 35 | 54 | 37 | ------ |
| Aids to private financial institutions (Reconstruction Finance Corporation) | −21 | −10 | −9 | ------ |
| War damage insurance (War Damage Corporation) | 20 | ------ | 1 | ------ |
| Control of private finance (Securities Exchange Commission) | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Total | 88 | 102 | 107 | 82 |

A substantial increase in funds for the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice has been made available for the current fiscal year. I am recommending a small further increase in 1950, which will permit more adequate investigation of the extent of monopoly and monopolistic practices.

Business loans: To restrain inflationary credit expansion, general loans to business in 1950 by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will be held to approximately the 1948 level. A somewhat higher level is estimated for 1949 owing to substantial authorizations early in the fiscal year.

Collections on national defense loans and holdings of preferred stock in financial institutions continue but at a declining rate, as liquidation of these large depression and wartime programs is now nearing completion.

*Labor*

In our free enterprise system the conditions of employment of the labor force of more than 63 million persons are primarily matters for the joint determination of labor and management. The role of the Federal Government is to assure that acceptable minimum standards of

wages and working conditions are maintained and that both individual workers and organized groups of working people have a fair opportunity to improve their economic status. The Federal Government also promotes apprenticeship training and collects and publishes labor statistics and related information which are used widely by business, labor, and the general public. For the fiscal year 1950, the Government's labor programs will require budget expenditures of 187 million dollars, approximately 3 million dollars more than in 1949.

The Labor Department should be substantially strengthened through reorganization to bring together the units which properly belong in it. Toward this end I shall recommend certain organizational changes essential for more effective administration of the Government's labor program.

Mediation services and regulation of employment conditions: In my Message on the State of the Union I have already recommended urgently needed legislative action to provide fair laws under which management and labor can develop more fully the opportunities for cooperative production that collective bargaining affords. I have also recommended that the Congress promptly amend existing laws in order to establish up-to-date minimum standards for wages.

*Labor*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 net new appropriations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | |
| Mediation services and regulation of employment conditions: | | | | |
| Department of Labor: | | | | |
| Present programs | $5 | $6 | $6 | $6 |
| Industrial safety program (proposed legislation) | ------ | ------ | 3 | 3 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 5 | 9 | 9 | 9 |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment (proposed legislation) | ------ | ------ | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 4 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Labor information, statistics, and general administration: Department of Labor | 8 | 7 | 8 | 8 |
| Placement services and unemployment compensation activities: | | | | |
| Federal Security Agency | 71 | 137 | 140 | 139 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 15 | 15 | 11 | 11 |
| Department of Labor | 70 | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| Training of workers: Department of Labor | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Total | 183 | 184 | 187 | 187 |

NOTE.—The Federal-State system of unemployment compensation and the Federal system of railroad unemployment insurance, formerly classified in Social welfare, health, and security, are now included in Labor.

This budget includes tentative estimates to carry out the legislation which I have proposed to authorize grants to the States to foster safer working conditions, and to authorize establishment of a national commission against discrimination in employment.

Labor information and statistics: For programs now authorized in the Department of Labor, I am recommending increases to restore the facilities of the Department to meet more adequately the increasing needs for current information on employment, hours and earnings, consumer prices, and other subjects.

Placement services and unemployment compensation administration: Public employment services and administration of unemployment insurance will require approximately 150 million dollars or about 80 percent of all expenditures for labor programs. Except for 11 million dollars for the railroad unemployment insurance program, these funds are expended principally through grants to States.

Provision has been made, in the reserve for contingencies, for any added costs which may arise because of future statutory increases in State salary rates or because of unexpected increases in State work load.

Trust accounts: Total unemployment benefit payments are rising above the 1948 level, in large part because of increased labor turn-over, the return of prewar seasonal patterns and because many insured workers have exhausted their claims to veterans' unemployment allowances from the Federal Government and collect State benefits when unemployed. Growth of the labor force and liberalization of State laws are also factors. Receipts are below the 1948 level because of changes in the law relating to railroad unemployment.

My proposal to strengthen the unemployment compensation system contemplates that coverage will be extended to workers in small establishments, Federal employees, and other workers not now insured. It contemplates that in some States the level of benefits will be raised and their duration extended.

*Unemployment trust fund (trust accounts)*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Item | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated |
|---|---|---|---|
| Receipts: | | | |
| Deposits by States and railroad unemployment taxes | $1,148 | $991 | $1,017 |
| Interest | 165 | 181 | 185 |
| Proposed legislation extending coverage and improving benefits | ------ | ------ | 230 |
| Payments (deduct): | | | |
| State and railroad unemployment withdrawals | 856 | 963 | 1,020 |
| Proposed legislation | ------ | ------ | 150 |
| Net accumulation | 457 | 209 | 262 |

*General government*

Under "General government" are grouped not only the general management activities of the Government but also legislative and judicial functions, citizenship services, and government of the Territories. Most of the expenditures in this category are for collecting the internal revenue, interest on refunds of receipts, the Government contribution to the Federal employees' retirement system, property supply and disposal, and the maintenance and operation of public buildings. The Weather Bureau also is included under general government, because its activities relate to several major functions of the Government. Similarly, the general expenditures of a few departmental offices are classified in this category.

*General government*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Program or agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | Net new appropriations | Other authorizations |
| Legislative functions | $32 | $37 | $46 | $35 | ------ |
| Judicial functions | 18 | 20 | 26 | 21 | ------ |
| Executive direction and management | 7 | 7 | 10 | 8 | ------ |
| Surplus property disposal, foreign and domestic: | | | | | |
| Present disposal programs (mainly War Assets Administration) | 312 | 118 | 16 | ------ | ------ |
| Proposed legislation | ------ | [1] | 21 | 21 | ------ |
| Deposits and transfers of receipts, foreign sales (Army, clearing account) | $6 | 9 | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| Federal financial management: | | | | | |
| Bureau of Internal Revenue | 185 | 209 | 233 | 233 | ------ |
| Other Treasury bureaus | 194 | 150 | 133 | 136 | ------ |
| General Accounting Office | 34 | 36 | 37 | 37 | ------ |
| Other | 3 | 5 | 5 | 1 | ------ |
| Interest on refunds of receipts | 57 | 82 | 82 | 82 | ------ |
| Government payment toward civilian employees' general retirement system | 244 | 224 | 328 | 328 | ------ |
| Federal Works Agency (mainly Public Buildings Administration): | | | | | |
| Present programs | 71 | 78 | 91 | 74 | ------ |
| Office building (proposed legislation) | ------ | ------ | 5 | 7 | ------ |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation: | | | | | |
| Payment of interest to miscellaneous receipts | 89 | 1 | 14 | ------ | ------ |
| Other | −39 | −26 | −25 | ------ | ------ |
| Cemeteries and return of war dead (Army) | 87 | 73 | 30 | 6 | ------ |
| Other: | | | | | |
| Present programs | 115 | 150 | 168 | 169 | $7 |
| Salary increases for heads and assistant heads of agencies (proposed legislation) | ------ | ------ | 2 | 2 | ------ |
| National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission (proposed legislation) | ------ | [1] | 1 | ------ | ------ |
| Special fund for management improvement (proposed legislation) | ------ | ------ | 1 | 1 | ------ |
| Total | 1,504 | 1,187 | 1,224 | [2] 1,160 | 7 |

[1] Less than one-half million dollars.

[2] In addition, this budget includes 26 million dollars of appropriations recommended to liquidate prior year contract authorizations.

Total expenditures for general government functions have declined from a peak in the fiscal year 1948 and are now leveling off at about 1.2 billion dollars. Although the biggest reductions in war-liquidation programs have already occurred, further reductions are expected. Some increases, however, are estimated in the expenditures for permanent programs and services, particularly, in 1950

for tax collections and the employees' retirement system. Total new authorizations requested for general Government activities for the fiscal year 1950 are 57 million dollars less than estimated expenditures. I am postponing requests for contract authority for a general public buildings program and requesting only 7 million dollars in contract authority for other construction.

Property management: Last year I submitted to the Congress proposals for a comprehensive property management program for the Federal Government. The Congress took action to repeal certain of the provisions of the temporary legislation for surplus property disposal and to provide for termination of the War Assets Administration February 28, 1949, but it failed to complete action on permanent property management legislation. Such legislation is urgently needed to achieve economies by modernizing the Government's supply and disposal systems. This legislation should designate a single property management agency. The remaining functions of the War Assets Administration should be transferred directly to this agency.

At the end of February, the War Assets Administration will have residual inventories of surplus property amounting to more than 2.5 billion dollars in terms of original cost. I am recommending a supplemental appropriation of 15 million dollars for the fiscal year 1949 and 21 million dollars for the fiscal year 1950 on the assumption that a single property management agency will be made responsible for these disposal activities upon dissolution of the War Assets Administration.

Revenue collection: The operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue have been extensively reviewed by the Congress and also by a special management committee appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury. As a result the Bureau is currently engaged in decentralizing its administration, improving office procedures, expanding its enforcement staff, and training its personnel to do a better job. In addition to nearly 2,000 enforcement personnel to be added this fiscal year, the budget provides for a further increase of more than 7,000 in the fiscal year 1950. The Government has an obligation to its taxpayers to undertake complete collection of all the taxes that are legally due and to assure equitable treatment to each taxpayer. I am confident that the additional expenditures will represent a sound investment.

Retirement system: Last February legislation was enacted which liberalized the provisions of the Federal employees' general retirement system by increasing annuity payments and adding survivorship benefits. Higher payments to the retirement fund are required to finance these new provisions. The rate of deductions from employees' salaries for retirement purposes was increased from 5 percent to 6 percent. It is also necessary to increase by over 100 million dollars in the fiscal year 1950 the Government's payment toward the retirement system, based on the revised retirement provisions and the higher Federal pay roll estimated for the fiscal year 1950.

Public buildings: Because of the present inflationary conditions I am not now recommending a general public buildings program, although in many areas the Government is inadequately housed and such a program cannot be delayed indefinitely. However, I am proposing that work be started immediately on the construction of one building which should be completed in time for use by the Census Bureau in connection with the 1950 decennial census, and will thereafter be available for other needs.

Government Services Corporation: I recommend that the Congress create a new, self-supporting, Government corporation to provide certain cafeteria and recreational services, primarily for Federal employees, in Government buildings and on Government property. At present, these services are provided by several organizations which do not fall within the normal governmental framework. This is essentially a governmental responsibility, and should be subject to the usual processes of governmental review and control.

Virgin Islands Company: I renew my recommendation that the Virgin Islands Company be given a permanent Federal charter under comprehensive legislation. This Company is a chief contributor to the economic welfare of the Virgin Islands. The present stopgap measure, which extended the life of the Company for only 1 year and with narrow powers, contributes little toward making the Virgin Islands economically self-sustaining and raising the standard of living of its citizens.

The National Capital: The role of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission should be redefined and a stronger statutory basis established for the proper development of the District of Columbia and nearby areas in Maryland and Virginia.

I am not forwarding at this time an estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency to provide for the assembly of property in slum or blighted areas in the District of Columbia. When the redevelopment plans now being prepared by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission are approved, an estimate will be transmitted for consideration by the Congress.

I recommend pay increases for the employees of the District of Columbia government, including the teachers in the public schools, who were unfairly excluded from the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948.

*Interest on the public debt*

Expenditures for interest on the public debt in the fiscal year 1950 are estimated at 5,450 million dollars, an increase of 125 million dollars over the fiscal year 1949; and the 1949 estimate is, in turn, higher than actual expenditures in the preceding year by approximately the same amount.

*Interest on the public debt*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Agency | Expenditures | | | 1950 appropriations |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1948 actual | 1949 estimated | 1950 estimated | |
| Treasury Department | $5,188 | $5,325 | $5,450 | $5,450 |

The continued increase in interest on the public debt arises in several ways. Accruals on the large volume of savings bonds outstanding reach higher brackets each year. There will also be a further increase in the amount of special issues held by Government trust funds, and these issues bear relatively high coupon rates which are, in part, fixed by statute. In addition, the increases in short-term interest rates which were initiated in July 1947 are now beginning to be fully reflected in the cost of the debt. This latter factor is, to some extent, offset by the interest saving which has been effected by refunding maturing bonds bearing relatively high rates of interest into short-term issues bearing lower rates of interest.

Interest payments on marketable issues—issues which may be bought and sold freely in the market—will account for 55 percent of interest payments on the debt in the fiscal year 1950. The amount of interest paid on marketable issues is falling gradually because of a decline in the total volume of such obligations and the retirement or refunding of bonds bearing relatively high rates of interest. A portion of the interest paid out on marketable issues goes to the Federal Reserve banks, and most of such payments are coming back to the Government as miscellaneous receipts. This is a result of the Federal Reserve policy of paying approximately 90 percent of net Reserve bank earnings into the Treasury. Budget receipts from this source are estimated to rise from 140 million dollars in 1949 to 250 million dollars in 1950, thereby offsetting most of the increase in the total interest cost of the debt.

Interest payments are a fixed obligation of the Federal Government. Their payment is financed by permanent indefinite appropriations not requiring annual congressional action.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION—A SUMMARY

Estimated expenditures, appropriations, and other authorizations included in the budget total for programs under proposed new legislation are shown in the following table. The items in the table are of such importance as to warrant early enactment and financing in the next fiscal year. Moreover, legislative proposals for these items are sufficiently developed to permit tentative estimates of first year budgetary requirements.

The budget also contains a general reserve for contingencies. It is designed as a minimum provision both for unforeseen contingencies and for legislative proposals now in the discussion stage, which may require action before the end of the next fiscal year.

*Proposed legislation (summary of amounts included in the budget)*

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Function and program | Estimated expenditures 1950 | Anticipated supplemental appropriations and other authorizations | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1949 | 1950 |
| International affairs and finance: | | | |
| Economic Cooperation Administration | $4,300.0 | $1,250.0 | $4,300.0 |
| Other foreign aid | 355.0 | ---------- | 600.0 |
| Food and Agriculture Organization building fund | 1.0 | ---------- | 7.0 |
| Contribution to International Trade Organization | 1.0 | ---------- | 1.0 |
| War damage claims | ---------- | 17.0 | ---------- |
| Palestinian refugee program | ---------- | 16.0 | ---------- |
| Foreign service pay increase | 1.4 | .6 | 1.7 |
| National defense: | | | |
| National Military Establishment (public works, special programs, military pay adjustment, etc.) | 385. | ---------- | 645.0<br>(185.0) |
| Universal training | 600.0 | ---------- | 800.0 |
| Social welfare, health and security: | | | |
| Medical care insurance system | 14.9 | ---------- | 15.0 |
| Public assistance | 65.0 | ---------- | 65.0 |
| Change in employees' accident compensation rates | 3.8 | ---------- | 4.0 |
| Housing and community facilities: | | | |
| Slum clearance, low-rent housing, farm housing and research | 160.5 | .2<br>(700.0) | 11.7<br>(236.5) |
| Special assistance for rental and cooperative housing | 50.0 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Census of housing | 6.0 | ---------- | 15.0 |
| Stand-by borrowing authority: | | | |
| Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation | ---------- | ---------- | (750.0) |
| Federal home loan banks | (1) | ---------- | (1,000.0) |
| Alaska housing | 5.0 | ---------- | 10.0 |
| Alaska public works | 1.0 | ---------- | 2.0 |
| Disaster relief | 3.0 | ---------- | 5.0 |
| Education and general research: | | | |
| Federal aid to education | 290.1 | ---------- | 300.2 |
| Survey of educational building needs, and study of scholarships and fellowships | 1.0 | ---------- | 1.0 |
| Radio propagation building | .2 | ---------- | .2 |
| National Science Foundation | 2.0 | ---------- | 2.5<br>(12.5) |
| Agriculture and agricultural resources: | | | |
| Amendment of Commodity Credit Corporation charter (grain storage) | 25.0 | ---------- | ---------- |
| Flood control, Missouri River Basin | 4.0 | 5.0 | ---------- |
| International Wheat Agreement | 55.7 | ---------- | .2 |
| Natural resources: | | | |
| Commercial production of synthetic liquid fuels | 1.0 | ---------- | (30.0) |
| Incentive payments for exploration and development of minerals | 5.0 | ---------- | 15.0 |
| Bureau of Reclamation, rehabilitation and betterment projects | 4.0 | ---------- | 5.0 |
| Transportation and communication: | | | |
| Additional revenue from increased postal rates | −250.0 | ---------- | −250.0 |
| Inland Waterways Corporation, subscription to capital stock | 2.0 | ---------- | 2.0 |
| St. Lawrence seaway and power project | 8.0 | ---------- | 20.0 |
| Alaska communications system | .8 | ---------- | 3.6 |
| Finance, commerce, and industry: | | | |
| Anti-inflation program | 13.5 | 3.0 | 15.0 |
| Export control | 4.7 | 1.6 | 5.0 |
| Rent control | 23.3 | 5.4 | 24.0 |

[1] Budget receipts of 81 million dollars from additional retirement of Federal home loan bank stock.

*Proposed legislation (summary of amounts included in the budget)*—Continued

[Fiscal years. In millions]

| Function and program | Estimated expenditures 1950 | Anticipated supplemental appropriations and other authorizations | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1949 | 1950 |
| Labor: | | | |
| Industrial safety program | $3.1 | ---------- | $3.1 |
| National Commission Against Discrimination in Employment | .5 | ---------- | .6 |
| General government: | | | |
| Construction of Census Building | 4.8 | ---------- | 7.4 |
| Surplus property disposal | 20.6 | $15.0 | 21.0 |
| Salary increases for heads and assistant heads of agencies | 1.5 | ---------- | 1.5 |
| Special fund for management improvement | .9 | ---------- | 1.0 |
| National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission | 1.2 | 1.5 | ---------- |
| Total | [2]6,175.5 | (1,315.3<br>(700.0) | [2]6,660.7<br>(2,214.0) |

[2] Excluding additional postal revenue, total estimated expenditures are 6,425.5 million dollars and total anticipated supplemental appropriations are 6,910.7 million dollars.

NOTE.—Figures in parentheses are authorizations other than appropriations.

The responsibilities of freemen match the personal rights and political freedoms which are theirs. The Budget of the United States reflects our power for freedom and the advancement of mankind in our country and in the world.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

JANUARY 3, 1949.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after reading of the Journal and any other special orders, I may be allowed to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I note that the message of the President, as I understand it, has been referred to the Appropriations Committee.

The SPEAKER. No; the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RICH. Would it not be proper to return it back to the Bureau of the Budget with instructions that it send in at least one that is balanced?

The SPEAKER. That is not a parliamentary inquiry, and no one knows that better than the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. It is certainly sense.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order which I have for today be postponed until Thursday next after disposition of other business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a joint statement by the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association.

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Times-Herald today.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous material.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from J. L. Webb, of Bartlett, Mo.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

### THE LATE JOHN HARRIS SMITHWICK

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House of the death of John Harris Smithwick, who represented the Third Congressional District of Florida from 1918 to 1926. Mr. Smithwick was born near Orange, in Cherokee County, Ga., July 17, 1872. He graduated from Reinhardt Normal College, Waleska, Ga., in 1895 and from the law department of Cumberland University, Lebanon, Tenn., in 1897. He was admitted to the bar in 1898 and began the practice of law in Moultrie, Ga.

He moved to Florida in 1906, making his home in Pensacola. There he practiced law, and later engaged in the lumber, naval stores, and real-estate businesses.

Mr. Smithwick was elected as a Democrat to the Sixty-sixth Congress in 1918, and continued to serve the third Florida district until 1926. He was the first person who served that district in Congress for four terms, and is one of three

people who have been so honored to date.

As a Congressman he served with credit and ability. His record here was a commendable one and the friendships he made have endured down through the years.

Mr. Smithwick spent the later years of his life in Moultrie, Ga., and died on December 30, last. He is survived by his widow, formerly Miss Jessie Vereen, daughter of W. C. Vereen, Moultrie financier, one son, William Smithwick, and a daughter, Mrs. J. H. Moriarty.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

### INDIAN AND NEGRO SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION REIMBURSEMENT

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill about which I would like to say a few words. It is a bill to provide that the Federal Government shall reimburse the States for the construction of Indian and Negro schools. At the present time there is a great need for both Negro and Indian school construction throughout the entire country. This bill is not a bill which deals with segregation or nonsegregation. The bill will apply to all sorts of schools throughout the country. There is a tremendous need today for this assistance, and I know of no other way in which it can be adequately met. It is obvious that the Indians should be taken care of. That obligation has been acknowledged but it has not been fully met. With regard to the Negroes, the "colored people" as we sometimes call them, the obligation has not even been fully acknowledged. But our Constitution provided, when originally drawn, that there should be slavery and then the Federal Government abolished slavery. Yet, the Federal Government never assumed its full responsibility for the things that it allowed to take place. Certainly, those people have a right to have a better education than they presently enjoy throughout our country. This bill would provide for reimbursing the States for expenditures for construction only in schools for Indians and Negroes for the next 10 years. The amount of money going to a particular State will equal the per capita construction cost of schools used for those purposes multiplied by the number of people of those races who will use the structures.

### FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1950, H. R. 1177

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of his splendid message to Congress on the state of the Union, President Truman struck out boldly on a new path of economic policy for the Nation. First, he said:

> The Employment Act of 1946 pledges the Government to use all its resources to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. This means that the Government is firmly committed to protect business and the people against the dangers of recession and against the evils of inflation. This means that the Government must adapt its plans and policies to meet changing circumstances.

#### GOVERNMENT LOANS IF NECESSARY

Then, as a part of his program for dealing with immediate shortages in production, the President added that Congress should "authorize an immediate study of the adequacy of production facilities for materials in critically short supply, such as steel; and, if found necessary, to authorize Government loans for the expansion of production facilities to relieve such shortages, and, furthermore, to authorize the construction of such facilities directly if action by private industry fails to meet our needs."

#### MUST DEVELOP RESOURCES FOR HEALTHY GROWTH

Two days later, in his economic report to Congress, the President further indicated his concern with this problem of the achievement of an economy permanently stabilized at a high level of activity when, in his discussion of policies to promote balanced economic growth, he said:

> While alleviating the hardships of inflation and overcoming maladjustments which threaten our future prosperity, we must continue to develop our resources for healthy growth. We should press forward at once with some programs of high priority needed now to conserve and increase the strength of our Nation. In addition, we should be prepared with fully formulated plans for others. We cannot accept the dangerous idea that inflation's end will automatically bring about a period of stable prosperity. The continuing need for prudence in Government expenditures must not be translated into false economy.

It is clear from these statements that the President is leading the way toward an exploration of the ways and means whereby this Nation can achieve for itself stability, security, and increasing well-being without the abandonment of those traditional individual freedoms that have been the hallmark of American democracy.

As he said later in his state of the Union message, the American people are going their own way and will hammer out their own destiny without regard to the isms and theoretical formulas that have developed in other lands.

#### TO UPHOLD HAND OF PRESIDENT

In an effort to uphold the hand of the President in opening these magnificent new prospects for our people, I have today introduced a bill—H. R. 1177—the Full Employment Act of 1950, which represents one way of approaching this problem. The bill is brief and simple and I commend it to the attention of Members of the House. First, the bill would reorganize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It provides for the appointment of seven directors to be paid at the rate of $25,000 a year, with the principal function of achieving the long-range program of production, employment, and investment goals set forth in the economic report. This title of the bill also provides for the establishment of a citizens' advisory board modeled on the advisory board of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, which rendered such yeoman service during the hazardous days of the last war.

#### TITLE II. DEVELOPMENT FUND

Next, title II would establish a capital development fund to enable it to carry out its responsibilities. This fund would amount to $15,000,000,000 and would be used to make loans required to carry out its programs.

In extending these loans, the new RFC is directed to attempt to maintain, first, desirable levels of investment not only nationally but regionally; second, to encourage investment in such industrial and business enterprises as are currently or prospectively understood; third, to give due regard to wise use of natural resources and to promotion of the Sherman and Clayton Acts.

#### STATE GOVERNMENTS MAY COOPERATE

Three types of loans are authorized in the bill. The first type is loans to existing or new private business enterprises, through which the purposes of this act may be achieved. Second, if it does not prove possible for the RFC to find the private enterprisers who are interested in this kind of industrial development required to achieve the Nation's needs, it is authorized to offer to State governments the opportunity of receiving such loans for the purpose of constructing needed industrial facilities for operation by the State. Finally, in certain instances, the RFC would be authorized to make loans to the TVA or to similar regional agencies if such loans are required in order to facilitate the expansion of other private business in the region affected. I cannot emphasize too strongly that this bill is an effort to use the financial strength of the Government to promote the extension of private enterprise production required for the maintenance of an economy of full production, services, and employment. It is not an attempt to get at the problem of employment by the construction of public works. While it may be necessary at some time in the future to embark on a large-scale public-works program as a means of stimulating investment and employment, it is the hope of myself and my fellow sponsors in the other Chamber that the enactment of such a bill as this would go far toward avoiding the necessity of embarking on such a works program for any reason other than that the works were needed in themselves.

ATTACKS MONOPOLY

Moreover, this bill proposes to tackle the problem of recurrent cyclical depressions not by simply an emergency, indiscriminant attempt to supplement the amount of private investment necessary to keep the wheels of business turning, but by the achievement of industrialization in those areas where it is most needed and where unemployment crises can become most serious. In other words, it proceeds on the view that the existence of impoverished areas in the Nation is just as great a threat to permanent prosperity as the existence of impoverished income classes. Next it gets at the problem of unemployment by promoting the initiation of new enterprises in fields where monopoly exists. Concentrated control of industries always limits employment in those industries and this limitation becomes most severe at those times when it does the most damage to the economy. When industrial activity is curtailed, monopolistic industries tend to reduce employment and to keep prices high. This bill would seek to expand competition in those industries and thereby afford more jobs both in the new enterprises and enterprises where the industry is now tightly controlled.

RISK CAPITAL NEEDED

There can be no doubt as to the growing need for some action to insure the abundance of risk capital if this country is to go on expanding, creating ever more of the necessities and luxuries of life for its people and finding ways to make sure that they are able to buy them. Already, it is clear that such venture capital is drying up.

Orders for machine tools, a sure sign in this field, are dropping off even with the stepping up of the European recovery program, which, one would have thought, would provide a large market for such tools in the reconstruction of Europe.

Why should not the financial power of the Government be used to supply this lack of investment and venture capital? I for one believe that it should do so, that the primary responsibility of a government in modern times is to care for both the civil and economic liberties of its people. But it should not do this haphazardly.

If the financial power of the Government is used without discrimination, then the whole objective of its use will be defeated. If it serves simply to concentrate more economic and financial power in those sections and in those hands which already have too much, then in the end the house of cards will come tumbling down.

Therefore, some way must be found of providing such investment capital in those areas that need it most and in those industries where monopoly reduces the number of available jobs and reduces the amount of production made available to the people. The end result of leaving some regions underdeveloped is to cause unemployment. So is the end result of monopoly.

END RECURRENT DEPRESSIONS

Further, in an economy so vast and intricate as ours, there is another problem that must be solved if we are to tackle intelligently the problem of ending cyclical depressions. This is the problem of the flexibility of the management and labor force. In many lines, particularly of consumers durable goods, such as washing machines and refrigerators, our industry has become so efficient that it would be possible to satisfy an almost unlimited domestic demand within a relatively short period. Thus, there is a growing problem of enabling our managerial and labor skills to transfer from such an industry to another where demand remains unsatisfied. Some device for enabling the wise use of our human and industrial resources, continuously adjusting to need, is urgently needed.

COMBAT BOOM-AND-BUST CYCLE

For all of these reasons, it seems to me that some such bill as the Full Employment Act of 1950 which I have introduced today, should be studied carefully by enlightened businessmen as well as legislators, farmers, workers, and other citizens. It would be a confession of intellectual bankruptcy for this Nation to confess that it cannot find a way to combat the boom-and-bust cycle other than by simply hoarding needed public works until an emergency arises and then building them in order to provide employment. Public works should be built as needed, not simply in order to provide employment.

But we ought to be able to discover democratic ways of using the tools of government to insure our prosperity through other devices. And there is no reason why we cannot do this without sacrificing our hard-won individual liberties. So long as we are careful to maintain our Government's democracy and responsiveness to the people, we will get along all right on this score.

NEW BASIS FOR STATES' RIGHTS

It should be noticed, too, that this bill provides a new kind of federalism, a new basis for States' rights. If, under this measure, it proves impossible for the new RFC to make the necessary loans to existing or new private enterprisers, then it is authorized to offer to make such loans to State governments.

In accordance with this provision, for example, my own State of Texas could obtain the funds for locating in east Texas those industrial enterprises that are so badly needed, yet which have failed to provide.

The decline in the dignity and power of the State governments has not been by any means an accidental factor. The subversion of many State governments by powerful vested interests in the years immediately following the War Between the States was as much responsible as anything for their weakening. It became obvious then, for example, that an individual State government could not hold its own with a powerful railroad monopoly, which might have an income and resources greater than that of the State itself.

Such conditions led to the demand for national controls that inevitably weakened the power of the States. This trend was upheld in many decisions of the Supreme Court during that period. Now, however, an opposite trend has set in.

For several years the present Court has quietly, persistently been upholding the rights and powers of the State governments against the demands of these powerful interstate corporations. Only recently, in an opinion read by Associate Justice Black, the Court upheld the right of State legislatures to adopt laws prohibiting the closed shop. The Court did not endorse the wisdom of such laws, but nevertheless the decision was one more stone in the legal structure of new power and dignity for the State governments.

This line of decisions cannot but have the result of renewing the health and vigor of our Federal system, that unique experiment in government.

USE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO ASSIST STATES

In such a context it is more than ever desirable that we use the power of the Central Government to assist the States in economic affairs. Just as the Congress has adopted legislation providing Federal funds for improvement of education, for building roads, providing rural electrification, and for a variety of purposes, so the Central Government should afford the funds for necessary industrialization that cannot be achieved in any other way.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FURCOLO and Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include an editorial from the Detroit Free Press and in the other an editorial from the New York Journal.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. HORAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one an article by Dr. Conant, president of Harvard University.

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and two articles which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a story by the Associated Press appearing in the Washington Post on the new United Mine Workers hospital and medical service program.

Mr. GRANT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include in one a statement by Mr. Wayne C. Grover.

Mr. WELCH of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the St. Joseph News-Press.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain extraneous matter.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement containing the approved budget estimates for the fiscal year 1950 for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects which will be the subject for hearings before my subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations within the near future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the President's message containing requests for funds to run the business of the Government for the coming fiscal year will be presented today. There is great interest in the civil functions program and in order that interested parties may be promptly and correctly informed as to the amounts approved for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects I have obtained a break-down of such projects, State by State, and wish to have it placed in the RECORD following these remarks.

It will be noted that the budget approved amounts are in excess of the funds appropriated for the present fiscal year, and this is readily understandable. During the period of World War II projects such as these were stopped. Since the end of the war many large projects requiring a number of years to build have been started and are now at the period of construction requiring the greatest outlay of expenditure. It would be inefficient and expensive to the Government to curtail appropriations for these large projects at this time for the reason that it would prolong the construction time, prevent the work from going forward at an economical rate, and would delay to the Nation the benefits of the completed project. These projects have all been authorized, have had rather sizable sums expended on them, and there is no question that they are to be completed. Under such circumstances it is only feasible that the work should progress at a rate that will give the greatest value for the funds expended.

For the present fiscal year there was appropriated for rivers and harbors and flood-control projects the sum of $507,480,200, of which $166,989,100 was for rivers and harbors, and $340,491,100 for flood-control projects. The information I am now presenting shows budget approval for fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $659,461,700, of which $229,174,100 is for rivers and harbors and $430,287,600 for flood control; an increase in the request over the present fiscal year's appropriation of $151,981,500. While these amounts are large, it is to the credit of the program that all these expenditures will be made within the boundaries of the United States and the benefits therefrom will flow directly to all our people.

*Approved budget estimates, rivers and harbors, fiscal year 1950*

NEW WORK—CONSTRUCTION

| *State and project* | *Approved budget amount* |
|---|---|
| Alabama: | |
| Demopolis lock and dam, Warrior system, Mobile to Birmingham | $1,200,000 |
| Alaska: | |
| Nome Harbor | 1,020,000 |
| Wrangell Narrows | 500,000 |
| California: | |
| Crescent City Harbor | 700,000 |
| San Diego River and Mission Bay | 3,000,000 |
| Sacramento River Deep Water Channel | 2,000,000 |
| Connecticut: New Haven Harbor | 300,000 |
| District of Columbia: Potomac River, north side of Washington Channel | 475,700 |
| Florida: | |
| Jim Woodruff lock and dam (part of Apalachicola, Chattahoochee, and Flint River system) Fla. and Ga. | 8,900,000 |
| The Intracoastal Waterway, Tributary Channel, Okeechobee waterway | 350,000 |
| St. Andrew Bay | 136,000 |
| St. Johns River, Jacksonville to the ocean | 1,200,000 |
| Tampa Harbor | 617,700 |
| Georgia | |
| Jim Woodruff lock and dam. (See Florida.) | |
| Savannah Harbor | 533,000 |
| Illinois: | |
| Illinois waterway, Ill. (excluding Calumet-Sag modification) | 300,000 |
| Chain of Rocks (part of Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers), Ill. and Mo. | 12,000,000 |
| Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers (excluding Chain of Rocks improvement), Ill. and Mo. | 1,000,000 |
| Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis, Minn., Ill., Wis., Iowa, Mo. (excluding St. Anthony Falls) | 1,000,000 |
| Iowa: | |
| Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See Illinois.) | |
| Missouri River, Kansas City to Sioux City | 4,000,000 |
| Kentucky: | |
| Cheatham lock and dam, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn | 2,000,000 |
| Ohio River (open channel work), Ky., Ohio, W. Va. | 300,000 |
| Louisiana: | |
| Calcasieu River and Pass | 995,000 |
| Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (New Orleans district) | 3,500,000 |
| Pearl River, La. and Miss. | 1,500,000 |
| Waterway from Empire, La., to the Gulf of Mexico, La. | 588,000 |
| Maine: Portland Harbor | 300,000 |
| Maryland: Baltimore Harbor and channels | 800,000 |
| Massachusetts: | |
| Boston Harbor | 500,000 |
| Fall River Harbor | 1,050,000 |
| Michigan: St. Marys River | 3,000,000 |
| Minnesota: | |
| Mississippi River, between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See Illinois.) | |
| St. Anthony Falls | $2,500,000 |
| Two Harbors (Agate Bay) | 1,250,000 |
| Mississippi: Pearl River. (See Louisiana.) | |
| Missouri: | |
| Chain of Rocks. (See Illinois.) | |
| Mississippi River, between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers. (See Illinois.) | |
| Mississippi River, between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See Illinois.) | |
| Missouri River, Kansas City to mouth | 2,500,000 |
| Montana: | |
| Fort Peck Dam, Missouri River | 3,400,000 |
| New Jersey: | |
| Newark Bay, Hackensack and Passaic Rivers | 1,000,000 |
| New York and New Jersey Channels | 1,500,000 |
| New York: | |
| Buffalo Harbor | 800,000 |
| Hudson River | 100,000 |
| Hudson River Channel | 450,000 |
| New York and New Jersey Channels. (See New Jersey.) | |
| New York Harbor, entrance channels and anchorage areas | 600,000 |
| Ohio: | |
| Cleveland Harbor | 2,000,000 |
| Ohio River, open channel work. (See Kentucky.) | |
| Oregon: | |
| Bonneville lock and dam, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash | 1,500,000 |
| Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg | 161,800 |
| Coos Bay, Oreg | 1,000,000 |
| McNary lock and dam, Columbia River, Oreg. and Wash | 40,000,000 |
| Yaquina Bay and bar | 35,000 |
| Pennsylvania: | |
| Reconstruction locks 2, Monongahela River, Pa. | 4,500,000 |
| Schuylkill River above Fairmount Dam | 500,000 |
| Rhode Island: | |
| Providence River and Harbor | 210,000 |
| South Carolina: | |
| Winyah Bay | 508,200 |
| Tennessee: | |
| Cheatham lock and dam. (See Kentucky.) | |
| Texas: | |
| Galveston Harbor | 200,000 |
| Houston ship channel | 1,000,000 |
| Gulf Intracoastal Waterway between Apalachee Bay, Fla., and the Mexican border (Galveston district) | 700,000 |
| Sabine-Neches waterway | 1,000,000 |
| Trinity River, channel to Liberty | 1,000,000 |
| Virginia: | |
| Norfolk Harbor (exclusive of spoil disposal area) | 500,000 |
| York Spit Channel | 500,000 |
| Washington: | |
| Bonneville lock and dam. (See Oregon.) | |
| Chief Joseph Dam | 5,000,000 |
| Grays Harbor and Chehalis River | 800,000 |
| Ice Harbor lock and dam, Washington, part of project for Snake River, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho | 12,000,000 |

| State and project | Approved budget amount |
|---|---|
| Washington—Continued | |
| McNary lock and dam. (See Oregon.) | |
| West Virginia: | |
| Morgantown lock and dam, Monongahela River | $3,953,700 |
| Ohio River, open channel work. (See Kentucky.) | |
| Wisconsin: | |
| Mississippi River between the Missouri River and Minneapolis. (See Illinois.) | |
| Total, river and harbor construction | 144,934,100 |

*Approved budget estimates, flood control, general, fiscal year 1950*

NEW WORK CONSTRUCTION

| State and project | Approved budget amount |
|---|---|
| Arkansas: | |
| Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, Ark. and La. (See Lousiana.) | $3,000,000 |
| Blakely Mountain Reservoir | 48,000 |
| Blue Mountain Reservoir | 16,500,000 |
| Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo | 300,000 |
| Carden's Bottom drainage district No. 2 | 106,000 |
| Conway County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 8 | 11,000 |
| Conway County levee district No. 6 | 319,500 |
| Crawford County levee district | 370,000 |
| Little Rock to Pine Bluff | 4,650,000 |
| Narrows Reservoir | 80,000 |
| Nimrod Reservoir | 1,000,000 |
| Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo | 700,000 |
| Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La | 800,000 |
| West of Morrilton | 700,000 |
| California: | |
| Cherry Valley Reservoir | 2,000,000 |
| Farmington Reservoir | 3,500,000 |
| Folsom Reservoir | 3,000,000 |
| Isabella Reservoir | 7,500,000 |
| Los Angeles County drainage area | 200,000 |
| Merced County stream group | 8,600,000 |
| Pine Flat Reservoir | 800,000 |
| Sacramento River and tributaries | 5,000,000 |
| Whittier Narrows Reservoir | 1,026,000 |
| Colorado: | 110,000 |
| Cherry Creek Reservoir | 76,000 |
| John Martin Reservoir | 320,000 |
| Connecticut: | 1,000,000 |
| Hartford | 7,148,700 |
| Norwich | 14,500,000 |
| Florida: | 265,000 |
| Central and southern Florida | 277,500 |
| Georgia: | 3,500,000 |
| Allatoona Reservoir | 607,100 |
| Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C | 500,000 |
| Macon | 700,000 |
| Idaho: | 2,500,000 |
| Heise-Roberts area | 900,000 |
| Lucky Peak Reservoir | 500,000 |
| Illinois: | 900,000 |
| Coal Creek drainage and levee district | 227,000 |
| Columbia drainage and levee district | 111,000 |
| East St. Louis and vicinity | 300,000 |
| Farm Creek Reservoirs | 500,000 |
| Grand Tower drainage and levee district | |
| Mounds and Mound City | |
| Prairie du Rocher and vicinity | |
| Preston drainage and levee district | |
| Reevesville | |
| Rosiclare | |
| Wood River drainage and levee district | |

| State and project | Approved budget amount |
|---|---|
| Indiana: | |
| Cagles Mill Reservoir | $2,980,000 |
| Cannelton | 300,000 |
| Delphi | 87,000 |
| Indianapolis (Fall Creek section) | 908,400 |
| New Albany | 2,000,000 |
| Iowa: | |
| Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Missouri) | |
| Coralville Reservoir | 3,300,000 |
| Dry Run | 395,900 |
| Little Sioux River | 500,000 |
| Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. (See Kansas.) | |
| Missouri River, Sioux City, Iowa, to Kenslers Bend, Nebr. (See Nebraska.) | |
| Red Rock Reservoir | 2,500,000 |
| Kansas: | |
| Fall River Reservoir | 277,500 |
| Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans. (See Oklahoma.) | |
| Kanopolis Reservoir | 242,000 |
| Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans | 5,700,000 |
| Missouri River agricultural levees, Kansas, Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri | 8,000,000 |
| Kentucky: | |
| Ashland | 1,000,000 |
| Covington | 1,400,000 |
| Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. (See Tennessee.) | |
| Dewey Reservoir | 1,030,800 |
| Hawesville | 758,100 |
| Louisville | 5,500,000 |
| Maysville | 1,000,000 |
| Newport | 2,733,000 |
| Taylorsville | 50,000 |
| Uniontown | 130,000 |
| Wolf Creek Reservoir | 20,200,000 |
| Louisiana: | |
| Aloha-Rigolette area | 549,600 |
| Bayou Bodcau Reservoir, Ark. and La | 404,000 |
| Jonesville | 114,000 |
| Lake Pontchartrain | 600,000 |
| Mermentau River | 1,807,000 |
| Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.) | |
| Shreveport | 375,000 |
| Maryland: | |
| Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va | 1,000,000 |
| Savage River Reservoir | 1,700,000 |
| Massachusetts: | |
| Birch Hill Reservoir | 46,000 |
| Holyoke | 264,400 |
| Riverdale | 517,000 |
| Tully Reservoir | 141,000 |
| Michigan: Mount Clemens | 302,000 |
| Minnesota: | |
| Red Lake and Clearwarter Rivers | 1,500,000 |
| Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn | 1,000,000 |
| Missouri: | |
| Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.) | |
| Chariton River, Mo. and Iowa | 445,000 |
| Clearwater Reservoir | 60,000 |
| East Poplar Bluff and Poplar Bluff | 92,100 |
| Kansas Citys, Mo. and Kans. (See Kansas.) | |
| Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. (See Kansas.) | |
| Norfork Reservoir, Ark. and Mo. (See Arkansas.) | |
| Perry County levee districts Nos. 1, 2, and 3 | 1,000,000 |

| State and project | Approved budget amount |
|---|---|
| Nebraska: | |
| Harlan County Reservoir | $12,500,000 |
| Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri. (See Kansas.) | |
| Missouri River, Sioux City, Iowa, to Kensler's Bend, Nebr | 422,000 |
| Omaha | 1,700,000 |
| New Hampshire: West Peterboro Reservoir | 371,800 |
| New Mexico: Conchas Reservoir | 35,000 |
| New York: | |
| Almond Reservoir | 218,800 |
| Arkport Reservoir | 32,000 |
| East Sidney Reservoir | 897,700 |
| Elmira | 1,628,000 |
| Mount Morris Reservoir | 6,500,000 |
| Olean | 1,000,000 |
| Portville | 700,000 |
| Syracuse | 670,000 |
| Whitney Point Reservoir | 321,400 |
| North Carolina: | |
| Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C | 16,500,000 |
| North Dakota: | |
| Baldhill Reservoir | 235,800 |
| Garrison Reservoir | 31,000,000 |
| Homme Reservoir | 527,100 |
| Mandan | 40,000 |
| Oahe, S. Dak. and N. Dak. (See South Dakota.) | |
| Red River of the North, S. Dak. and Minn. (See Minnesota.) | |
| Ohio: | |
| Big Walnut Creek Reservoir | 1,800,000 |
| Burr Oak Reservoir | 1,295,600 |
| Delaware Reservoir | 999,400 |
| Dillon Reservoir | 1,717,000 |
| Ironton | 250,000 |
| Massillon | 2,133,700 |
| Muskingum River Reservoirs | 1,800,000 |
| West Fork of Mill Creek Reservoir | 1,400,000 |
| Oklahoma: | |
| Canton Reservoir | 183,100 |
| Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla | 300,000 |
| Fort Gibson Reservoir | 14,000,000 |
| Fort Supply Reservoir | 116,500 |
| Great Salt Plains Reservoir | 31,000 |
| Hulah Reservoir, Okla. and Kans | 4,748,000 |
| Polecat Creek | 1,000,000 |
| Tenkiller Ferry Reservoir | 6,146,000 |
| Wister Reservoir | 77,500 |
| Oregon: | |
| Cottage Grove Reservoir | 140,000 |
| Detroit Reservoir | 11,300,000 |
| Dorena Reservoir | 2,924,000 |
| Fern Ridge Reservoir | 208,000 |
| Lookout Point Reservoir | 11,000,000 |
| Milton-Freewater | 710,700 |
| Willamette River (bank protection) | 500,000 |
| Pennsylvania: | |
| Conemaugh River Reservoir | 8,500,000 |
| East Branch Clarion River Reservoir | 2,500,000 |
| Punxsutawney | 810,000 |
| Sunbury | 2,000,000 |
| Wilkes-Barre-Hanover Township | 380,000 |
| Williamsport | 2,110,000 |
| South Carolina: | |
| Clark Hill Reservoir, Ga. and S. C. (See Georgia.) | |
| South Dakota: | |
| Fall River Basin | 500,000 |
| Fort Randall Reservoir | 25,500,000 |
| Missouri River, Sioux City, Iowa, to Kensler's Bend, Nebr. (See Nebraska.) | |
| Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak | 2,000,000 |
| Red River of the North, S. Dak., N. Dak., and Minn. (See Minnesota.) | |

| State and project | Approved budget amount |
|---|---|
| Tennessee: | |
| Center Hill Reservoir | $7,000,000 |
| Dale Hollow Reservoir, Tenn. and Ky. | 631,000 |
| Memphis, Wolf River and Nonconnah Creek | 400,000 |
| Texas: | |
| Belton Reservoir | 2,000,000 |
| Benbrook Reservoir | 4,000,000 |
| Brady | 1,320,000 |
| Denison Reservoir, Tex. and Okla. (See Oklahoma.) | |
| Garza-Little Elm Reservoir | 3,000,000 |
| Grapevine Reservoir | 4,000,000 |
| Lavon Reservoir | 3,500,000 |
| Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., Tex., and La. (See Arkansas.) | |
| San Angelo Reservoir and Floodway | 4,800,000 |
| Texarkana Reservoir | 6,000,000 |
| Whitney Reservoir | 14,000,000 |
| Vermont: Union Village Reservoir | 601,000 |
| Virginia: | |
| Buggs Island Reservoir, Va. and N. C. (See North Carolina.) | |
| Philpott Reservoir | 2,800,000 |
| Washington: | |
| Mill Creek | 365,000 |
| Mud Mountain Reservoir | 464,000 |
| Tacoma, Puyallup River | 571,600 |
| West Virginia: | |
| Bluestone Reservoir | 1,562,200 |
| Cumberland, Md., and Ridgeley, W. Va. (See Maryland.) | |
| Parkersburg | 1,396,900 |
| Point Pleasant | 1,648,000 |
| Total, flood control, general construction | 412,502,600 |

A FANTASTIC STORY IN STEEL

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a week ago today the President in his message on the state of the Union spoke of the shortage of steel in this country and suggested that unless it can be remedied the finances of the Federal Government might even be employed in the erection of steel plants.

On the Friday following troops toward whose pay we are contributing, troops that we are feeding, in the Essen section of Germany, were called out to prevent the workers there from interfering with the demolition of one of the largest steel plants in the Ruhr.

It just does not make sense for the United States to contribute to the destruction of steel plants there and then call upon the taxpayers here to ship steel to western Germany and the other nations of western Europe, thus creating a steel shortage in this country, and then propose to remedy this shortage by using money from the taxpayers to build new plants here.

The simple facts in this whole situation are fantastic.

We pretend to be rebuilding western Europe, and yet we tear down a plant which can produce what western Europe needs, and use troops to do it, troops and workmen whom we feed.

At the same time we ship steel and semifinished steel from the United States to supply the needs of western Europe. And that makes a shortage at home, a shortage in scrap, and a shortage in ore, and a shortage in steel. And that creates a crisis, the President says, which may call for direct appropriations and Government construction of steel plants.

In Germany there are millions and millions of tons of scrap. There are plenty of workers. They should be producing steel. But we feed them to tear down the plants; we pay out our dollars to carry out the dismantling program and defeat our announced objectives.

A year ago, Mr. Speaker, more than a year ago now, the subcommittee of the Select Committee on Foreign Aid, the subcommittee of which I had the honor to be chairman, spent over a month in Germany. One of our major recommendations was that this dismantling program be suspended.

I introduced two resolutions to give effect to that recommendation. One of them, a resolution of inquiry, the House passed. The investigation that followed developed the fact that a large number of the plants scheduled for dismantling could contribute to European recovery if allowed to continue.

But the story of the past few days is a tragic commentary on what is going on.

Dollars to tear down steel plants in Europe. Dollars to send over the steel of an intensified shortage there. Dollars to build more plants here to make up the shortage created here.

Unless our senses and mental processes are completely deadened, this kind of business should stop.

AMENDMENT OF HOUSE RULES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] addressed the House to explain the effect of the resolution he rushed through the House to amend the rules. He very frankly stated that he took the floor for correcting an erroneous impression of many, including some Members themselves, as to the meaning and effect of the resolution.

Let me say to the majority leader that no explanation would have been necessary had his side of the aisle permitted debate on the resolution. As soon as the resolution was read by the Clerk on the opening day of the session, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] moved the previous question, and the entire membership of the House was thereby obliged to vote on the subject without any discussion whatsoever.

If this is the type of procedure the majority intends to follow in this Congress, I fear that the distinguished majority leader will be constrained to take the floor on many occasions to explain later what action they forced through the House.

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES OF CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes or less.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, in 1946 we passed the Reorganization Act. It provided as you know for the employment of professionals on the various committees. Section 202, subdivision G, of that act provides that if those professionals are let go by a committee they cannot be reemployed in any department of the Government, that is, in the executive department. I have this day introduced a bill to remove that injustice by permitting those men who are removed without cause to seek employment, if they so desire, in the executive department.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I am rather well acquainted with that matter. It has brought about an unintentional injustice. I agree with the gentleman that certainly staff employees of the committees should not be penalized that way. If a bill is reported out I assure the gentleman that I shall program it as quickly as possible.

Mr. REED of New York. I am very thankful for the gentleman's statement and for whatever help he can give in this matter. It is working a tremendous injustice. Many of these men were employed and had no knowledge of that provision. They expected that their work would continue, that they would become experts, and become more valuable to the Government as time passed. Now they are out. They cannot support their families without work. If they seek employment in private industry, private industry will misconstrue the act of the committees in letting them go, and say that there must have been something wrong with them, otherwise they would have been retained on the professional staff.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

THE WATCH-MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to your attention the fact that the Reciprocal Trade Act allows the Swiss Government to enter into agreements with the United States to sell watches at half the price that we can in Waltham. The question that comes to my mind is whether we are less important than the Swiss. I do not have to tell you about the Swiss people. They are neutrals. They have always been neutral and we do not want to find any fault with them. But, Mr. Speaker, when a company that has been in business for 100 years; a company that built

machines during the war to help run our airplanes, is in bankruptcy and nobody will lend them any money, I wonder if that is a fair situation. We listened here today to a recital of the amount of money that we have to spend for people here and people there and people everywhere. For goodness' sake, Mr. Speaker, let us do something for the people of this country who want to work.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

REPORT TO THE FOLKS BACK HOME

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, events of the past few weeks have convinced me that this and future periodic reports are necessary.

Paid propagandists, employed for a specific purpose, have done their job well.

They have found willing servants to carry their thought-control program.

Some of their twisted and half-truth statements have been transmitted from mouth to ear by a whispering campaign. Other misguided stooges have carried their false pamphlets from house to house. These lying juvenile cartoons made their appearance in the closing days of the campaign; too late for the truth to be told.

Now it is the privilege of a majority of the voters in my congressional district to remove me from office whenever they choose; either with or without a reason. However, I do not intend to stand by and permit certain unscrupulous individuals to deliberately misrepresent my voting record. Therefore at various intervals I intend to submit a report from the record of how I voted.

I am confident that the vast majority of my people are intelligent and if given the facts will be able to decide for themselves. This is impossible when they are being fed false and many times vicious propaganda deliberately planned to confuse the issue.

Let me be specific, Mr. Speaker, and show you just what I mean. In the closing days of the recent campaign, cartoons appeared in my district which said in part:

> Your Congressman voted against veterans' housing, school lunch, land reclamation, minimum wage, rural electrification, soil conservation, small business, labor.

Let us look at the public record regarding my vote on the above-named issues.

It shows that I voted for each and every piece of legislation which was offered to honestly help the veterans and their dependents. It also shows that I tried to have World War I veterans granted a pension on a par with Spanish-American War veterans. One hundred and eighty-eight separate pieces of legislation were passed to aid the veterans and their dependents and I voted for all of them.

The Federal Government made a complete failure in trying to get homes for veterans. Instead of getting better homes at less cost, Government interference boosted the cost of construction by 30 percent. Their plan, if it had succeeded, would have taken already scarce material and labor from veterans' housing projects and started clearing city slums. I am in favor of slum clearance but I am not in favor of denying houses to our veterans at the expense of providing housing for slum clearance. Slum clearance will make a worthy project if and when all veterans are housed and material and labor more plentiful.

The record also shows that I voted for all amendments which provided additional money to be used for rural electrification, school-lunch program, land reclamation, and soil conservation. Various farm organizations will verify the fact that I am on record as favoring and voting for their program 100 percent, and yet the scandal sheets which were circulated list me as voting against the farmer.

The record further discloses that an increase in the minimum-wage law never even reached Congress for a vote. I was not even a member of the subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee which held hearings on this important measure.

I have letters from the National Small Business Committee, veterans' organizations, many locals of organized labor, the National Milk Producers Co-op, and many other groups thanking me for the help which I gave them and pledging me their full support. These endorsements would not have been given if I had been against their organization.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the public record is replete with evidence which proves that this last-minute propaganda literature was filled with lies and half truths.

Therefore, I repeat that during this Eighty-first Congress I intend to submit periodic factual reports in order that those whom I represent may get the truth mixed in with the propaganda which will be offered them during the next 2 years.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois (at the request of Mr. REED of Illinois) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of pensions for World War veterans.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a letter on statehood for Hawaii and a speech on the treatment of leprosy.

THE STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] on the matter of building steel mills and producing steel I want to state that we have in this country an annual steel capacity of about 95,000,000 tons. During the past year, I understand, that on account of strikes the production was cut approximately 22,000,000 tons.

In this formula which has been advocated by the President, I ask the question, "What tolerance is to be allowed between the productive capacity of the steel mills and the amount that will not be produced as a result of strikes in arriving at the necessity for the building of steel mills by the Federal Government?"

Suppose strikes cut production 50,000,000 tons, then it might be shown that the Federal Government should go in and build steel mills to supplement the production which did not appear by reason of strikes. I call your attention to this matter at this time because of what the President has said and in connection with what the gentleman from South Dakota pointed out as to what is taking place in Germany.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Bristol Courier of Saturday, January 8, In a Nation Rich as Ours.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. CELLER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

STEEL PRODUCTION

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, it had not been my intention to take up the time of the House, but when the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] said that 22,000,000 tons of steel were not produced because of strikes, I must challenge that statement. As far as I can remember, there was not any major strike at all last year in the steel industry. I think the steel industry produced at least 90 percent of capacity during the entire 52 weeks. In fact, I think their capacity now is running about 96,000,000 tons a year. I therefore felt called upon, coming from the greatest steel-producing city in the world, the city of Pittsburgh, to challenge the gentleman's statement. If the gentleman from Michigan has any reliable figures showing that we did lose 22,000,000 tons by reason of strikes, I think the gentleman should produce those figures for the record, because it is an indirect attack on the working men and women who are producing steel in this country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has expired.

THE LATE GEORGE HERON MILNE

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, the Congress lost one of its oldest and most useful servants when on October 25, 1948, death ended the long and useful career of George Heron Milne, custodian of the congressional reading room in the Library of Congress. The number of Members he personally assisted in the 31 years of his service in that position must almost equal the number who have served in the Congress during that time. The variety and the effect of the research which he performed for Members and their families in those years was enormous. Hundreds of men, now or in the past, in the Congress will recall the patience, the courtesy, and the skilled intelligence which he brought to bear on their requests for information. No matter what the urgency or impatience of the demands of a Member, he never volunteered that other Members already were equally urgently and impatiently demanding his time. His quiet telephone voice has been well known to virtually every Member of the Congress and certainly to every secretary on Capitol Hill.

George Heron Milne was born to Alexander and Isabella Metcalfe Milne on July 3, 1887, in Washington. From 1902 until 1905 he was a member of the staff of the Evening Star and from 1906 until 1909 he worked in a Washington business firm. In November 1909 he was appointed as a messenger in the reading room of the Library of Congress. Soon he was promoted from messenger to stack attendant. In 1911, the then superintendent of the reading room wrote to the Chief Clerk:

> I have placed Mr. Milne on deck 7, which is admittedly the most difficult deck in the Library to keep in order. He has shown exceptional ability and industry in his previous service and has studied outside of the Library with marked success since he has been with us. I regard him as the best suited person of his present salary for this promotion.

In the many years of his subsequent service, commendations were to come often and enthusiastically for George Milne. Toward the close of his service the Director of the Legislative Reference Service, in commenting on Mr. Milne's efficiency report, wrote:

> Mr. Milne is almost ideal as custodian of the congressional reading room. He makes the problems of Members of Congress his own and gives them the kind of superservice that they greatly appreciate. He does extremely well in training new staff members, he has cooperated fully * * * in working with the rest of the Legislative Reference Service * * * his spirit and devotion to his work are almost too much and are sometimes carried to the detriment of his health.

Mr. Milne was assigned to the Library station in the Capitol in 1910 and after a year's service there was transferred back to the main Library, where he secured further experience in public reference work in the main reading room. He went to the congressional reading room in 1917 and from that date until 1 week before his death, when he was stricken with a heart attack, George Milne, day and night, year in and year out, served the Congress with a devotion, a vigor, and a technical skill which has seldom been equaled. A gentle man, quiet, unassuming, and patient, even with all his vast and heterogeneous store of knowledge, his simple dignity and quiet character secured and maintained the affectionate esteem of the Members of the Congress. Whatever their political loyalty or intellectual interest, he was completely at their command.

Mr. Milne was married on May 30, 1917, to Ella Lower. In his private life he accumulated a distinguished collection of contemporary first editions and for many years served as the librarian of the Cosmos Club. In announcing Mr. Milne's death to the staff of the Library, the Librarian stated:

> His self-sacrificing concern with his duties exemplified the highest type of public service.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

MEMBERSHIP OF APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 43) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved*, That, during the Eighty-first Congress, the Committee on Appropriations shall be composed of 45 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE LATE GEORGE F. JOHNSON

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I take this time today to eulogize one of the greatest Americans that ever lived. On November 28 last 150,000 people in the Triple Cities of Binghamton, Johnson City, and Endicott, N. Y., mourned and grieved at a dispatch which came to them in the papers of that locality and which was flashed over wire and radio to the world. The report read:

> Mr. George F. Johnson, world-renowned industrialist and humanitarian, Triple Cities pioneer, cofounder and chairman of the board of the Endicott-Johnson Corp., the largest shoe manufacturer in the world, died November 28 at his home. Although he had been in ill health for some time, his death was a great shock to the citizens of the Triple Cities, who always had the highest admiration and affection for the man who contributed immeasurably to the growth and prosperity of this area and who had described this section of New York State as the valley of opportunity.

Were this man just another employer, just another labor leader, I would not take the floor at this time to eulogize his life. The fact remains, however, that this was a man who was 50 years ahead of his time in labor relations, a man who believed in decent treatment of the working people of his factories as far back as 1881, when he was a foreman in the first shoe company in the city of Binghamton, N. Y. That was when many employers were looked upon as those who cracked the seven-tailed whip over their workers' backs.

Born of a fine New England family, George F. Johnson had a normal boyhood, participating in sports and studies with diligence. He took off his coat and in his shirt sleeves went into a shoe factory and worked his way from the bench up, making one of the most remarkable careers of advancement that has ever been known in American industry. He was born in Milford, Mass. He came to New York State, to Binghamton, in 1881, and for 66 years worked there and extolled the principle of the Golden Rule, which the industrial life of America can well emulate.

After assuming control of the Endicott-Johnson Corp. he immediately set about improving workers' conditions by doing the things which every employer in America should do today. Fifty years ago his conception of friendly relationships with the worker brought about a program of home building for workers who desired to have homes; and I may say that the 20,000 people who make up the personnel of the largest shoe corporation in the world constitute one of the happiest working groups the country has ever known. They are well satisfied with the home-building program which George F. Johnson brought to the valley of opportunity. As a testimonial of the admiration and devotion of the workers to this man they erected many years ago at the gateways to what they called the Square Deal Towns arches in tribute to his work and to his enlightened contact with his workers. I have spoken of the home-building program which he inaugurated 50 years ago. This has paid big dividends to all concerned. Every worker in the Endicott-Johnson Corp. has the chance of acquiring his own home, of having it built and financed with company assistance, the payments so spread out that he can afford to buy the home, become owner of it and be a forceful and respected citizen in his community.

Another program that George F. Johnson instituted, which was pioneering in labor relationships throughout the country, was the medical program that the Endicott-Johnson Corp. instituted. This has worked out admirably well for its workers. Every worker has free medical attention, every worker has the privilege of going to the medical clinic run by Endicott-Johnson and receiving for himself and his family adequate medical care. If any of his children are ill, he knows he can go to these clinics and get the attention they ought to have. I tell you that is a marvelous thing and is more satisfying than the relations most American industries generally have with their workers. It shows the desire on the part of this employer to do everything he could for the people who worked for him.

The good will which has been built up can be attested in an exhortation George F. Johnson has always had over

his roll-top desk, situated in a plain office without elaborate ornaments, and without an air of sophistication. It is taken from the Book of Galatians:

And let us not be weary in welldoing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.

Mr. George F. Johnson always emulated it during his lifetime.

In final tribute to him there was held one of the largest funerals ever to take place in America. This took place in Endicott, N. Y., when thousands and thousands of workers turned out to pay him homage for a great life and a good work well done. Those workers, 18,000 strong, were designated as Mr. Johnson's honorary pallbearers and they functioned at that funeral in one of the most impressive tributes paid any man on this continent.

Let me read to you, if I may, the words of George F. Johnson summing up his responsibility to the people who worked for him during the 50 years that he was head of Endicott-Johnson:

If I have the right angle on life, he who receives much must give much. It does not matter whether it is much of power, much of wealth, much of influence or any other good thing. You must give much of all these things if you receive them—else you fall far short of your duty and your responsibility.

Further, he said:

In cooperation with labor, large industries should provide homes needed by workers on a fair basis of interest charges, and sold at cost, with no profit.

They should, if possible, operate a full and complete medical department to take care of the health of workers and dependent members of their families. Thus cooperative medicine will be furnished them for half the cost if bought in open market. All these things are vitally important.

Then he goes on to say, and I think this is significant for everybody in our free-enterprise system to grasp:

My conception of the true relationship of labor and capital is for each industry—honestly capitalized, honestly organized, and economically conducted—to pay its labor as much as possible with a due regard for the rights of the investing and consuming public.

This would bring into control and for distribution an immense amount of capital now squandered by management in useless overhead, taking from labor and the consuming public both what fairly belongs to them, which, if given to them, would change the whole appearance of the picture as between labor and capital.

That was the principle by which George F. Johnson regarded the workers of the Endicott-Johnson Corp. When I was a boy I can well remember playing in the public playgrounds which George F. Johnson built for the Endicott-Johnson workers throughout the Triple Cities—and there are a half dozen of them. He was very much concerned about the future of the youth of America. He was apprehensive over the dangers which might come to those young people who did not have proper recreational facilities. The playgrounds which have been built by George F. Johnson stand as a monument of what can be done with good relationships in the free-enterprise system as regards the working people of America. There is not a single person in the Endicott-Johnson Corp.—and there are over 20,800 of them—who does not love the memory of this great man.

And let us not be weary in welldoing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.

That Biblical observation which has inspired many was constantly before him, and caused him to create and to establish the most humane, the most satisfactory labor relationships that have been known in this country of ours.

I am happy to take the floor at this time to pay my tribute to this outstanding American to one who worked from the bench up and built, from first-hand knowledge, a shoe business which became the largest in the world. E.-J. turns out in times of peace vital necessities for the American public and also takes care, as was so greatly demonstrated in World Wars I and II, of the needs in our military footwear. This great organization has been one of service not only to its community but to its country.

I might go a little further in labor relationships, since they seem to be some of the most pressing and some of the most timely subjects of discussion of the hour. This Congress is going to be called upon to make many momentous decisions in the relationships between management and labor. I can point with pride to the magnificent American spirit existing in the Triple Cities; while they come from every nationality, the workers are free from intolerance; they possess the fundamental qualifications which go to make up citizenship in this land you and I so dearly love.

George F. Johnson, among the many things he accomplished for social betterment, was able to establish these playfields, playgrounds, these hospital facilities, this free medical care, which every worker in the country should have a chance to enjoy, at least a quarter of a century before anything was ever done about it by most other enterprises in the United States. It is comforting that a forward-looking individual, one man, should have brought happiness to so many people and thus earned the respect and admiration of the citizens of Binghamton, Johnson City, Endicott, and that section of New York State. The home-building program he instituted offers to every worker the chance to be a king, to gain ownership of the home he lives in.

Suffice it to say that he had a heart, and he realized that if he were to have real progress in the factories of which he was head he would have to treat the workers squarely, because, after all, the workers are the ones upon whose good will the progress of any factory or plant depends. So the home-building program, the recreational pursuits, and the institutions of aid he provided are testimony to the friendliness and the desire to help the individual worker that George F. Johnson had and which he labored so earnestly to carry out.

Oh, it was not all easy going. He met many obstacles in his way. He met obstacles from reactionary forces that were not so generous and willing to be solicitous of working men and women. Those forces tended to work against the humanitarian program which George F. Johnson put into effect 50 years ahead of the majority of other employers in America. They tended to work against some of the forthright principles in which he believed with respect to the problems between management and labor. They tended to barricade and obstruct some of the friendly relationships which he was so desirous of creating among those who worked with him.

As I have said, the best testimony any person could have of the appreciation he received during his lifetime was the spontaneous receptions he was given, for instance, on his homecoming, when he had been away attempting to improve relationships in other, less fortunate sections of the country.

I can remember one time, after he had been on a long tour which took him throughout the length and breadth of America in an effort to promote fair free enterprise and achieve better industrial relationships, when 100,000 people turned out to greet him at the train. As the bands played and as his praises were sung by untold thousands, he went his way to his unpretentious office. Plain as it is, it is still the office from which come the policies of a company throbbing with the vitality of 20,800 people who are satisfied with the high standard of living they enjoy in the Triple Cities area.

Countless thousands turned out in 1931 en masse to greet George F. Johnson when he came home. The same was true in 1935, when he returned from a similar trip, and on many other occasions.

Those were not organized group meetings and get-togethers. They were inspired meetings, where citizens of all races and religions came to give recognition and to lend their enthusiasm and affection to welcome a great man.

Equally inspired, I take the floor today, filled with pride and imbued with enthusiasm to sing the praises of an American entrepreneur who realized that his lasting friendship with the people who worked for him was based upon the principle of the Golden Rule, to do unto others as you would have them do unto you. He realized the meaning of that exhortation in the Book of Galatians to "be not weary in welldoing: for in due time we shall reap, if we faint not." The deeds that he did, brought about a higher living standard and brought much happiness to so many men and women. Those deeds were not in vain because they helped people throughout the length and breadth of the land. They brought to America satisfactory relations between labor and management.

I say at this time that America can well pause to pay tribute to this great man in recognition of that wonderful program of good will and fellowship and fraternity which he brought forth in the Square Deal towns, as the Triple Cities are called. Mr. Johnson will forever be an inspiration to every person who hopes good will in America and constitutional government will survive in this country. He will forever be a hope that the American form of representative government, the greatest form of government in the world today, will continue to bring forth those blessings of liberty which the Americans of my district and the Americans of your district realize are the only proper foundation of an orderly society. Because of Mr. Johnson's good works,

men and women of all races and religions can join together for the common good to build a strong and greater country for generations yet unborn. This man George F. Johnson is the personification and the apotheosis of good relations between management and labor. Yes, this message is spasmodic. I take the floor moved by the genuine accomplishments of this man, just as 18,000 workers responded as honorary pallbearers at a funeral last month which has scarcely had its parallel in expressing respect to any man on the American scene since our country first came into being.

The employer who emulates George F. Johnson will have little difficulty with labor. The employer who institutes free medical care to give every worker a chance to send members of his family to the hospital when the worker cannot pay a doctor bill, when the worker cannot pay the bill for maternity care, when he cannot pay for an operation for his wife, child, or any other member of his family, when even the life of members of his family may be at stake, will have little difficulty with labor.

The American employer should emulate George F. Johnson in instituting a program of over-all medical attention, of hospital care; of giving the worker an opportunity to own his own home on reasonable terms. He gives the worker a chance to enjoy recreational facilities; to go on Sunday afternoons to the playgrounds, where he and his wife and children can enjoy relaxation. This privilege is not known to some sections of the country.

The employer in this country must take into consideration the program which George F. Johnson gave to his workers, the public dance halls, the public entertainment centers, the public playgrounds, the public athletic fields. He gave all an equal opportunity to enjoy these things rather than just a few who happen to have sufficient salaries to enable them to join some golf club or to enjoy exclusive membership in some select club. George F. Johnson gave to every worker, to each and every one of them, a chance to relax on Sunday. He encouraged their going to church. In fact, he paid off the mortgages on many churches in the Triple Cities and thus made it possible for them to worship God as they pleased; to give them equal opportunity to enjoy freedom of religion which is guaranteed in the American Constitution, and which you and I have always held is the priceless heritage of American citizenship.

George F. Johnson wanted these opportunities for all. He went further than words. He exemplified his attitude in deeds. He carried out a policy which so many have emphasized only by mouth.

He was reared in Massachusetts, in that great New England State where so many shoes are manufactured and produced. He carried his trade and his business to the Triple Cities area. He built the greatest shoe company that has ever been known. It was built on the principles of the Golden Rule.

I am enthusiastic today in expressing admiration for this man. I come before you to say that the American employer, if he has any idea of continuing this American system as we know it, has no other choice but to emulate and to imitate the actions and the policies of that great American, George F. Johnson, whose memory is loved, is revered, and is respected by every man, woman, and child who has found the pursuit of his daily life in the Triple Cities area. He is recognized as 50 years ahead of his time in industrial relations, in friendliness to the men and women who today so assiduously and energetically revere his memory. As long as the principles of George F. Johnson are carried out on the American industrial scene, these friendly relations between worker and management will continue to grow. It is sacred. It is the very life of our industrial vigor and it is because of those principles that the American worker, during peacetime and in wartime, has carried out the job of producing the necessary equipment for society. As long as that attitude continues to grow, we in America can realize that we will occupy the position of the greatest nation on the face of the earth. We will continue to attain the highest standard of living for the men and women of this country that has ever been known, and remain an inspiration to those countries which have not yet shared this principle of decent treatment of the rank and file of the workers but who are desirous of living in an American system.

In the words of the ancient, "He who would be the greatest of all, must first be the servant of all." George F. Johnson could easily qualify for this exalted position.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the Department of Agriculture and the answer thereto.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, also to insert an editorial from the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer of January 7 as part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

### THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended church at the Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church and heard a good sermon by Dr. Edward G. Latch, D. D. The subject of his sermon was, Learning To Take Criticism. As I listened to that sermon and heard a recital of the criticisms heaped against former President George Washington, former President Andrew Jackson, and former President Abraham Lincoln, I was amazed that such adverse statements could be directed against three such great men. Many times during life we have an opportunity to criticize men in public office, and I am going to take this occasion right now to criticize constructively the Budget Bureau which is directly under the supervision of the President of the United States.

At a time when our Treasury statement of January 3 shows we have a national debt of $252,472,787,150.55, at a time when the President comes in here with a budget in which he proposes to spend $41,888,000,000, at a time when he tells us he expects to take in only $40,985,000,000—or that we shall be in the red $873,000,000—some questions should be asked concerning such a proposition. It is not sound nor the sensible thing for them to do.

A few minutes ago I asked the Speaker why we should not send that message back to the Budget Bureau and ask that it be resubmitted and require them to come in here with a balanced budget. Naturally it is supposed to be referred to a committee of the House, but I think it should be sent back to the Budget Bureau. They ought to know better than to send an unbalanced budget of that kind to the Congress at this peacetime.

When the President asks for the expenditure of $41,858,000,000 he is asking for $2,150,000,000 more than his budget for last year. The President admits that this budget is $2,900,000,000 more than the budget for 1950 will be over the budget of 1949. So it is gradually going up, and up, and up. He cannot and never will balance our finances if he does not stop spending. Why does he not sound one word about economy?

Last year we cut taxes. Notwithstanding that we cut taxes, the Government revenues this year show an increase over last year. The President in his budget message admits they are going to be $1,700,000,000 more than a year ago. This shows that two things can be done: Taxation can be cut, with a resultant increase of business to provide additional revenue to the Government notwithstanding the lower taxes. It proves it was a sound thing to do. That is what happened back in 1921, when Andrew Mellon was Secretary of the Treasury. At that time our taxes were cut and the Government revenue increased. Of course, there is a limit to that procedure, and we about reached the limit in cutting taxes; but you have no sound reason to increase them if you want more jobs. Increase business taxes, and you stop progress rather than encourage it. You throw men out of jobs rather than create jobs. You go further into debt and closer to bankruptcy. So stop, look, and listen. Where will you get the money? Why, stop spending. Be wise and economize. Now, I ask the question, If you are going to do the many things suggested in the President's budget message, where are you going to get the

money to pay the bills? I have asked that question time after time, but I can never get an answer. I cannot conceive of why the Chief Executive of the United States would permit bills to come in here which are always demanding larger and larger outlays of Government funds.

We have had a deficit in this country for the last 15 years, with the exception of the last two, when we had a Republican House and Republican Senate. There were only 2 years since 1930 that we have not had a great deficit, all Democratic years. It is about time that the people wake up to the fact we are going to have a wreck in this country. It means eventual bankruptcy, socialism, or dictatorship.

Let us see what is happening here in Washington, taking the newspapers for the last week and noting the statements about the cost of living.

Here is a chart appearing in the Washington Post of January 2 showing that the cost of living has gradually come down all last year. Commodity prices are coming down. If you will look at the chart, you will see what is happening in this respect.

Here is an advertisement showing 20 percent to 50 percent off on furniture and another advertisement of a clearance sale in furniture with 20 to 50 percent off. I just picked these out of some of the local papers. Here is one that I took out of one of my home-town papers showing that $6,000 worth of rugs are being sold for $3,90^ Here are some fur sales with great reductions up to 50 to 60 percent. For instance, here is $108,000 worth of fine furs being sold for $66,325. It gives you the items, showing they are cutting down on furs; prices reduced on groceries, on meats, on clothing. Here is one about shoes that formerly sold for $29.95 now being sold for $13.90. This is a high-priced shoe store here in Washington. They also have shoes that were formerly $19.95 selling for $9.99. Here is an advertisement of topcoats, $50 reduced to $39; $50 to $60 suits reduced to $39; $59.75 suits reduced to $49.

Here is an advertisement of the Hecht Co. In January the Hecht Co. prices will come tumbling down. Grosner says that the semiannual sales are going to reduce all prices. You can take all of the stores in the city of Washington and observe the great reduction in prices. Why? The stores all have great stocks of merchandise.

The point I make is that you can go into the stores now and find everything. There is not a scarcity of anything. Prices are coming down. Radios at 50 percent of former value. Competition is becoming more keen. We have a surplus of merchandise at this time. If you are going to let the labor unions come in and demand more wages when all of these things are coming down, you are never going to stop the spiral that is going on in inflation. The time to stop, Mr. President, is now. You have the power to stop it if you have the backbone and the will. It is something this country has to cope with. It is a situation that is as serious as anything I can suggest to the Congress. You dare not let some of these things happen, or I fear the country will go to rack and ruin. We must get common sense or bust.

Let us see how much further we can go when we have a stock of goods on hand. You can buy anything with the exception of steel. The President in his message the other day stated that he will probably come in here and ask that the Federal Government go into the steel business in some manner, either by lending money or, if necessary, building steel plants. Over in Europe there is one of the greatest plants in the world. This is now under British control. In the German Ruhr the workers of Germany have refused to tear it down. We could go over there right now and start that plant to manufacturing steel that is so necessary for the people over there instead of our sending steel over to those countries and bringing it back in the form of pipes, automobiles, and things of that kind. They could operate this great steel plant and take care of the people over there, thus saving us from furnishing them steel, when they could do it themselves, and we save our own steel. Remember that we are over there trying to build all kinds of industry and all kinds of factories, yet here is a large steel factory already constructed and ready to operate, and we compel them to tear it down. We act like a bunch of boobs in permitting it to be torn down. It does not make sense to me. It is unsound, it is the work of vandals, not sensible, sane, sound people. When I think of some of the things we are doing today in shipping out so much of our materials of all kinds, creating scarcity here at home and keeping our prices up higher and higher, I am wondering, are we doing right by our own people in America? I say not.

Some of the President's proposals are good, but do not try to put everything into effect at once and break us up. One thing good at a time, and do that well before you start 10 things, would be my advice to the President. We do that in business, we do it in our home, and we should do it in Government.

I tell you it is high time that the Government bring a little common sense into the things here in America because the President, in his budget message, is asking us to send over there under the Marshall plan $4,600,000,000 in 1949 and $4,500,000,000 in 1950. What for? Why, to build a lot of plants to come out in competition with the plants and workers in this country. You heard one of the gentlemen from Massachusetts a few minutes ago say what is going to happen with these reciprocal trade agreements when they start putting watch plants up there in Massachusetts out of business. You will find that it is only going to be a few years when not only the watch plants but all kinds of plants will go out of business here in America and we will be here raising taxes, when the people in the foreign countries are going to manage things under the reciprocal trade agreements a whole lot cheaper than we can afford to manufacture them, unless you cut labor down 50 percent, and I do not want that to happen. But it will if you let imports put our factories out of business, or else we have no jobs for our workers. And who wants to do that? I do not. I say it is time for us to get a lot of good common sense into our legislatures and here in the Congress and stop some of these things that are being done for others that will only wreck our own economy. We heard the President come in here and ask for a lot of regulations in this message of his. I want to say that he gave 27 reasons the other day in his state of the Union message, and I say that most every one of those reasons that he gave here is a short road to managed economy; it is a short road to socialism, and eternal dictatorship, and it is a sure road to bankruptcy of our own free economy unless we wake up, stop, look, and listen. That is the duty of the Congress; it is your duty and mine, and I am not going to stand here and keep from criticizing somebody when I know he should be criticized. I herewith insert an editorial from the Doylestown Daily Intelligencer of January 7, 1949:

THIS IS IT!

True to predictions, the Truman proposals laid before the new Eighty-first Congress form a full-scale program in state socialism, closely imitating the Labor Party socialism now in effect in England.

It is a scheme of incredibly vast Government spending, with no reference to the Nation's earning capacity. If it is adopted, the weight of the program will call for ever-increasing Government controls—controls at the top of the economic heap, and filtering down to the smallest details of human affairs.

The end result of such a program will be a form of police state. Since the outlines of the Truman plan are not new, but have been tried out in various other countries, such as prewar Germany and Italy, and in Russia, it is easy to know where they will come out. If the American people allow themselves to be trapped into the program, they will wind up under a totalitarian dictatorship as complete as in the three nations just mentioned.

For the initial stages of this new radical departure from American methods, Mr. Truman has asked for a $4,000,000,000 tax increase for the coming year. The great bulk of the new costs, however, will be in the form of invisible taxes—largely tax deductions to be taken from pay envelopes.

The time may not be far distant when the wage earner will find from 20 to 50 percent of his wages gobbled up by the Government even before he receives them.

At the moment when the British Socialists are moving in on the steel industry, and planning to nationalize it just as they already have nationalized banking, coal, transportation, communications, etc., Mr. Truman produced a new gun to put at the head of private enterprise in the United States.

This weapon is the threat that the Government itself will go into direct competition with private industry for the production of steel, if the bureaucrats are dissatisfied with the way the Nation's present steel makers are operating.

He asked new laws permitting the Government to set up its own steel mills any time it wants to—or to go into any other line of production which Mr. Truman's appointees decide is in critically short supply.

This one provision alone, if Congress passes it and if it passes also the Truman ripper of the Taft-Hartley law, would be enough to plunge the country into full-scale nationalization of its basic industries—since all that would have to take place would be for conspirators in the labor movement to slow down production, and thus give Mr. Truman an excuse to open up Government mills and factories.

In several ways the President opened war on Congress—not on this Congress so much, as against any Congress ever exercising the powers assigned it under the Constitution. He attacked a basic principle of American Government—the parliamentary principle.

He served notice, for example, that the moment Congress tries to do what the Constitution intended—to use its own judgment on the kind of laws which are needed and the amount of taxes which ought to be collected—that moment the President will seek to beat Congress into line on the assertion that it is noncooperative.

The Truman forces, in reorganizing the new Congress, went to the furthest stage they dared in stripping minority factions of any power in the legislative branch of Government. All key committees were packed with hand-picked Democrats who can be depended on to do whatever the Truman payroll lobby demands. Neither the Republicans nor the large anti-Truman bloc of Democrats stands to have any say about the handling of the laws which Congress will have to consider.

In two major matters—labor laws and taxes—the President demanded that Congress reverse itself, and that it follow his own individual judgment against the decisions previously made by Congress by 3-to-1 majority.

A basic point of socialism is its unwillingness for the legislative branch to have any real voice in the Government. Socialism needs dictatorial powers in the hands of the Chief Executive; and it seeks to undermine any checks and balances which restrict the authority of the head of government.

Mr. Truman's attitude is precisely in line with this socialistic concept.

In the matter of taxes, he also is following the footsteps of the British Socialists. Every time the British Labor Government has received a new gift of American taxpayers' money, the first thing it has done has been to enlarge the number of those who pay no taxes, and to increase the amounts being given by the Government to the country's nonworkers.

Likewise, the Truman proposals in this field boil down to putting a penalty on energy, hard work, and thrift; and to putting a premium on laziness.

In England, the social program recommended by Mr. Truman has long been known to the Socialists as the Beveridge plan. Mr. Truman demands the same plan—but has picked a fancier (and more misleading) name for it: the "square deal."

Mr. Truman paused in his address to shed a tear for the decline of small business. He didn't point out, however, that it was the New Deal which drove small business to the wall in the United States—which started the herding of American production into one or the other of two great monopolies; either the big-business monopolies, or government monopolies.

The England of a generation ago was often called "a nation of small shopkeepers." Its greatness, in the days when it was great, rose from that fact. Much of the greatness of the United States came likewise from the fact that in earlier days anyone who wanted to, and who saved his money, could open up his own business.

The British Socialists are in process of wiping small business out of existence—along with liquidating the entire social stratum known as the middle classes. Mr. Truman's program, by design or by accident, would have the same effect in the United States.

But the implied hostility to small business in the Truman message does not mean that the major industries fare much better.

As noted above, Mr. Truman demanded laws which would let him put the Government directly into any major industry he wishes. By specific references in his message, he lays a predicate for the Government to enlarge its control and interference, by other methods, in the following: electric power, oil, housing, agriculture, transportation, commodity exchanges, and banking.

These are in addition to his demands for socializing medicine and nationalizing the school system.

In the broader field of ideology, Mr. Truman swallowed the dogma of socialism just as openly as he recommended a specific socialistic program.

Since the world began, it has been the assumption that those with initiative, vision, and skill enough to create wealth were entitled to at least a major portion of the fruits of their labor.

This, Mr. Truman denies. Instead, if he believes what he says he believes, he has decided that anyone—whether he works or not—is entitled to cut himself in for a share of what the worker produces, or buys with what he has saved.

What else could Mr. Truman mean when he said: "We believe * * * that wealth should be created for all"?

This is the essence of socialism, expressed in nine words—the "world owes me a living" complex which has slowed world advancement down to a snail's pace, and which, if it continues to grow, unquestionably will wreck civilization.

It touches the fundamental issue: are you to own what you earn—or do you have to give most of it away to those who are lazy or indifferent or shiftless?

And if a man doesn't profit by working, and is hereafter to make out just as well by taking it easy—then what's the use of working? Why not let's all quit?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

## AN EDITOR AGREES WITH MR. MURRAY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, acting under instructions of the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I went to Kalamazoo, Mich., on the 4th day of December last to ascertain, among other things, whether the Congress of Industrial Organizations approved of commando raids in connection with labor disputes and strikes.

Hearings were held on the 4th and 6th, and notice of the hearings was carried in the press. During the hearings, it appeared that the raid and the subsequent rioting were carried on in part under the direction of representatives of the parent CIO organization.

A CIO radio commentator, over a local Kalamazoo station, announced on Tuesday, December 14, that at a union mass meeting and rally held the previous evening, a Mr. Sigman, who was the personal representative of Philip Murray, presided at the meeting.

A subpena had previously been, and another was subsequently, issued, asking Mr. Murray to appear first in Kalamazoo and then in Washington so that he might publicly express approval or disapproval of the commando raid carried out by individuals wearing CIO buttons and professing to act in the interests of the CIO.

Mr. Murray did not appear in Washington—the subpena for his appearance in Kalamazoo was not served in time to give him an opportunity to appear there—and gave as his reason the opinion of his counsel that there was no authority for a congressional one-man subcommittee.

One of the editors of the Cleveland Plain Dealer wrote an editorial, which was later republished in the CIO News, in the last paragraph of which it was asserted that, in the opinion of the editor, I acted either because of a desire for publicity or to satisfy a long-standing grudge against organized labor, and not to adduce information helpful to Congress.

My answer to the editor, and a copy of the editorial, reads as follows:

JANUARY 4, 1949.

EDITOR, THE CLEVELAND PLAIN DEALER,
*Cleveland, Ohio.*

DEAR SIR: Editors of so-called conservative papers often complain of what they charge is a lack of courage on the part of their congressional Representatives who fail to expose or oppose movements which the editors think tend to destroy constitutional government. These editors profess to fail to understand why more public servants do not take a forthright position on some controversial issues.

Perhaps the answer may be found in such editorials as the one printed in the January 3 issue of the CIO News, entitled, "'Murray Was Right' in Defying Representative CLARE HOFFMAN," quoting an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer, under the caption, "Murray Was Right."[1]

Murray did not, as stated in the CIO News, defy HOFFMAN. He, as you charged, challenged the legal right of Congress, through a one-man subcommittee, to subpena a witness. If the Cleveland Plain Dealer agrees with Mr. Murray that a one-man subcommittee has no right to issue a subpena, it will find—if it will examine the authorities hereinafter cited—that it is in error.

If the reprint is accurate, a part of the answer to the apparent lack of courage of public servants is found in the last paragraph, wherein you write:

"In our judgment, HOFFMAN'S action was motivated more by a desire to be meddlesome, to satisfy his long-standing grudge against organized labor and to get publicity for himself, rather than to adduce information helpful to Congress."

That type of typical gratuitous insult may be one of the reasons why many a Senator and Congressman remains silent when inclined to speak.

The quoted paragraph contains two conclusions, neither of which is justified by the record. It assumes that I have a grudge against organized labor; that my motive in subpenaing Murray was to gain publicity.

I doubt if you can cite one word, one act of mine, in 14 years of service, which shows that I have a grudge against organized labor. I have been fighting goon squads and a certain type of so-called labor leader ever since 1937, and that course I shall continue so long as I have breath and opportunity. But it does not follow that I oppose either employees or organized labor any more than it would follow that, because you condemn unfair monopolistic practices on the part of some corporations, you are opposed to what is known as "free enterprise."

You are entitled to your opinion as to whether I act from honest, sincere motives or merely to obtain publicity. As to the publicity angle, let me say this: You print the news. I do not. The fact is—I can get no publicity except as the gentlemen of the press or radio commentators publicize what I say or do. If I get undue publicity, you are a party to it. You fall for what you say is merely a stunt on my part.

When refusing to appear, Murray justified his refusal to answer to a subpena of a one-man House subcommittee by writing to me, in part:

[1] Copy of the Cleveland Plain Dealer editorial is attached to this letter.

"I am advised by counsel that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 does not confer on standing committees (or subcommittees) of the House, other than the Committee on Un-American Activities, authority to issue subpenas."

Common sense, as well as an examination of the law, will show that Mr. Murray's counsel is mistaken. The very first words of section 1 of article I of the Constitution of the United States are these:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

One without legal training knows that Congress cannot legislate effectively and intelligently without making investigations. The average citizen knows that neither the Senate nor the House can legislate without the approval of the other. High school students know that constitutional provisions cannot be overridden by the Congress. Hence, it follows that the House, as well as the Senate, under the Constitution, has authority to hold investigations by committees; subpena witnesses, compel the giving of testimony which is necessary to enable it to function under the Constitution.

But the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 did not limit the authority of standing committees of the House, take from the House its authority to make rules to govern its procedure, nor could it destroy the investigatory power which is an essential part of the authority granted to and the duty imposed upon the House as well as the Senate to legislate.

It is true that section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 authorizes standing committees of the Senate, including subcommittees of such committees, to hold hearings, issue subpenas, and require the attendance of witnesses, and that it does not confer a like power upon standing committees of the House and subcommittees of such committees.

However, section 101 (a) of the act expressly provides that the sections of the Legislative Reorganization Act "supersede other rules only [2] to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and (b) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House."

Moreover section 121 (f) of the act provides that "The rules of the House are hereby made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable."

Under section 121 (f), from which I have quoted, the House at any time had the right to prescribe rules for the conduct of its business.

On February 21, 1947, the House adopted House Resolution 111. That resolution authorized the Committee on Education and Labor, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, to make investigations * * * to sit and hold hearings "whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned * * * and to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance and testimony of such witnesses as it deems necessary."

It further provides that: "Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him * * *. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses."

There is a Federal statute authorizing committees to issue subpenas, and section 191 of title 2 of United States Code, authorizes any chairman of any committee and any Member of either House to administer an oath to witnesses. Sections 192 and 194 of title 2 make it an offense for a witness to refuse to appear or to testify before a House committee.

When the House Committee on Education and Labor was organized on the 27th day of January 1947, "The chairman was given authority to appoint standing subcommittees and, at the same time, authorized to designate special committees when, in the opinion of the chairman, such action was deemed advisable."

Mr. LESINSKI and two other members of the committee were not present at this organization meeting. Perhaps that accounts for Mr. LESINSKI's mistaken opinion given to Mr. Murray.

House Resolution 111, Eightieth Congress, and the committee's action expressly authorized the House Committee on Education and Labor, acting through its chairman, Mr. Hartley, to do just what it did in this case. The committee's action, just referred to, was taken on January 27, 1947.

As long ago as 1927, the United States Supreme Court, in *McGrain* v. *Daugherty* (273 U. S. 135), held that congressional committees not only had the power, but that it was their duty, to hold hearings to ascertain the kind of legislation the Congress should enact. Nor would it seem the authority of the House Committee on Education and Labor to act through a one-man subcommittee is open to doubt.

In *United States* v. *Morris* (300 U. S. Supreme Court Reports 566 (October 1936)), the United States Supreme Court upheld the conviction of a witness who testified falsely before a two-man committee. In the course of its opinion, the Court said, "The committee (of five) so appointed, authorized Senator Nye, the chairman, to act as a subcommittee and to name a subcommittee of one or more members." (Note the word "one".) In that particular case, Mr. Nye named himself and Senator Dale. The Supreme Court clearly recognized the right of the full committee of five to authorize the chairman (one man) to appoint a subcommittee of one or more.

Now, mark you, it is not contended that a one-man subcommittee is the better procedure in all cases. The executive departments and agencies in many, many cases hold hearings, make reports of their finding through a single individual. From a practical, political standpoint, this being a two-party Government, legislative committees should consist of at least one representative from both parties. And that has been the usual procedure, though the majority party usually, by appointment of subcommittee members, retains control. But there have without criticism been many one-man committees.

The House Labor Committee during the past session found the volume of work so great, its members so occupied with their varied duties, that it was physically impossible to hold the necessary hearings by subcommittees consisting of more than one member from each party.

From September 5, 1947, to December 22, 1948, the House Committee on Education and Labor, or subcommittees thereof, sat on 302 days, held 47 hearings, which would have given, had all been printed, more than 21,000 pages of printed record, and that does not include committee reports. The above figures, furnished by a staff member, do not cover all hearings and reports.

From a legal standpoint, you and Mr. Murray are wrong in assuming that he was justified in refusing to appear in answer to a subpena.

I agree with you and with Mr. Murray that the better rule would be that in hearings where there is a controversial political issue, both the majority and minority parties should be represented. But the failure to so provide does not make a one-man subcommittee impotent.

Let us take up the question of motive. What you refer to as a "commando" raid, was made by several hundred people, wearing CIO buttons, who traveled from the eastern side of Michigan, a distance of some 150 miles, to Kalamazoo, Mich., where, before dawn on December 1, they maliciously injured real property—a felony; burned an employee's truck, causing damage exceeding $100—a felony; overturned and injured employees' automobiles—a felony if the damage exceeded $100; beat defenseless workers, both men and women; defied and threatened police officers.

International representatives of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, of which Mr. Murray is president, according to the press, publicly assumed responsibility for the raid. At a mass meeting of Local 3619, they stated, in substance, that the Congress of Industrial Organizations, from whom they take orders and of which Mr. Murray is president, supported the position of the Kalamazoo local in this strike.

Mr. Murray, as president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, speaks for several million members. In holding hearings to ascertain the facts in connection with what you call the "commando" raid on Kalamazoo, was it not the logical thing for me to subpena the head of the organization which has jurisdiction over those engaged in the raid? Is not organized labor, is not the public, entitled to an unequivocal statement from Mr. Murray as to his position in connection with such a raid made in support of a picket line maintained by a local of the international and directed by international representatives and agents? Was the subcommittee seeking publicity in subpenaing Mr. Murray or was it going to the fountainhead for information to which the public was entitled?

Had I not every reason to assume that Mr. Murray would welcome the opportunity to publicly condemn such actions? That he would publicly announce that he would discipline those responsible for the raid?

Mr. Murray, after a delay of several years, publicly denounced the Communists within affiliated CIO organizations. That was a fine, patriotic stand and was so heralded by the press and the public.

If every Member of Congress, if every public official, is to be accused of publicity hunting when he ventures to question responsible officials of organizations under whose auspices and direction admitted illegal, vicious, cowardly acts have been committed; is to be denounced by editorials in conservative, supposedly accurate, papers like the Cleveland Plain Dealer, do you still wonder why some representatives of the public, who are so often accused of being cowardly, venture to speak out?

You have "guts" enough to jump on me, but have you enough "guts" to jump on labor leaders who refuse to denounce violations of law and who exercise tremendous political and economic power?

It is one thing, Mr. Editor, to give me a kicking around when I venture to give Mr. Murray, the leader of several million workers, an opportunity to explain his position on "commando" raids. It is something else again to ask why Mr. Murray relied upon a technicality—if such it be—in refusing to appear and make clear this deplorable union "commando" raid.

Enclosed you will find copy of a report I made on the Kalamazoo situation. It is somewhat repetitious because there was no opportunity to rewrite it, but it contains Mr. Murray's letter and my own. The hearings, a copy of which will, when released, be sent you, will show at least some of the vicious, cowardly acts of the men wearing CIO buttons who were acting for Local 3619, USA–CIO, for whose conduct, according to the press, an international officer assumed full responsibility. Mr. Murray did not choose

[2] Please note that word "only."

to condemn that "commando" raid by appearing before the House subcommittee; his reason, as given to me, being that the subcommittee had no legal authority, that it was a subcommittee of one.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

---

[From the CIO News of January 3, 1949]

MURRAY WAS RIGHT

(Reprint of an editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer)

CIO President Murray was completely justified, this newspaper believes, in refusing to obey a subpena issued by a one-man subcommittee of the House Labor Committee, consisting of Representative HOFFMAN.

Murray challenged the validity of the subpena on the ground that there was no legal authority for HOFFMAN'S appointment as a one-man subcommittee. He also expressed the opinion that any subcommittee ought to include representation from the minority party in Congress as well as the majority.

Even HOFFMAN conceded that the authority of a one-man subcommittee was debatable.

Murray's action has focused attention on an issue which should be resolved by the next Congress. That is the establishment of an orderly and uniform procedure for the conduct of investigations and hearings conducted by congressional committees.

There is no question that Congress has virtually unlimited authority to investigate matters which have any bearing whatsoever on legislative enactments proposed or in effect. It can investigate its own Members or other branches of the Government.

Thus the powers of a legislative committee are extremely broad, but the procedure for the conduct of a legislative investigation has never been explicitly defined. For that reason there has been widespread criticism of the manner in which various congressional investigations have been handled. Each committee has been a law unto itself, and has made its own rules. The result, in some cases, has been chaotic and has led to grave injustices.

The situation should be corrected, without in any way impairing the investigating powers of Congress, if Congress would establish a uniform procedure under which all committees would be required to function.

We have several suggestions along this line. No subcommittee should be appointed except by a majority vote of the full committee, not merely by the chairman or a majority of those present. No subcommittee should consist of less than three members, or be composed entirely of members of one political party. And no subcommittee report should be made public until after it has been approved by a majority vote of the entire committee.

These provisions would put a curb on Congressmen who are overenthusiastic, irresponsible, or whose main objective is publicity.

Witnesses also should be protected by a stipulation that they could confer with their attorneys if they so desired, although counsel for witnesses should not be permitted to take part in the proceedings. Also any person accused of misconduct in a public hearing before a congressional committee should have the right to confront his accuser and to testify in rebuttal.

Our approval of Murray's refusal to obey Hoffman's subpena does not mean that we believe there was anything improper in the subject Hoffman was proposing to investigate. He wanted to find out who was responsible for organizing and carrying out a "commando" raid on an industrial plant in Michigan which was attempting to operate in spite of a strike. Such violence is unlawful and cannot be condoned, and the House Labor Committee has every right to investigate it if it believes such an investigation would be helpful in framing legislation to prevent a repetition of such an outrage.

But we doubt whether the full committee or a subcommittee appointed with the approval of the full committee would have gone to the extreme Hoffman did in calling Murray as a witness.

In our judgment, HOFFMAN'S action was motivated more by a desire to be meddlesome, to satisfy his long-standing grudge against organized labor, and to get publicity for himself rather than to adduce information helpful to Congress.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. JACOBS, for January 9 to 14, 1949, on account of official business.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 43 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Thursday, January 13, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

43. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the transfer of certain agricultural dry-land and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations are located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

44. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

45. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy, for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

46. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report showing refunds of internal revenue in excess of $500 made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

47. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Report of Cooperative Extension Work in Agriculture and Home Economics, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

48. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a copy of the detailed statement of expenditures of appropriations for the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report showing the special assistants employed during the period from July 1 to December 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

50. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Air Force, transmitting the United States Air Force flying-pay report for the period April 1 to October 1, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

51. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cheesequake Creek, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

52. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 14, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of harbor at the mouth of Au Train River, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

53. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a combined statement of receipts, expenditures, and balances of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

54. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Air Force, for the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

---

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1177. A bill to insure the maintenance of full employment in the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 1178. A bill relating to the discharge status of members and former members of the Air Forces Enlisted Reserve Corps who during World War II participated in the War, Navy, or Civil Aeronautics Administration training program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1179. A bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital in south Texas; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1180. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Federal district judge for the southern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1181. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army and Navy hospitals for retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1182. A bill to amend section 3469 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax imposed on transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1183. A bill to provide for cancellation of certain unenforceable judgments on the records of the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 1184. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 1185. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1186. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 1187. A bill to eliminate the crop year 1949 from the base period in determining acreage allotments for cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1188. A bill defining and regulating the practice of the profession of engineer-

ing and creating a Board of Registration for Professional Engineers in the District of Columbia; to the Commitee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 1189. A bill to name the twin highway bridge over the Potomac River in the District of Columbia the "Ohio Bridge"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1190. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1191. A bill to increase the compensation of all postal and classified employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1192. A bill to make section 112 (b) (7) of the Internal Revenue Code applicable with respect to certain corporate liquidations in 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1193. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Church Point, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1194. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1195. A bill to amend part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, with respect to establishment of uniform permile rates for the transportation, by railroad or by railroad and water, of grain and grain products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1196. A bill for the relief of certain claimants who suffered losses and sustained damages as the result of the campaign carried out by the Federal Government for the eradication of the Mediterranean fruitfly in the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1197. A bill to amend the act known as the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (46 Stat. 531), approved June 10, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1198. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Tishomingo, Miss.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1199. A bill making an appropriation for the construction and operation of a fish hatchery at North Attleboro, Mass.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1200. A bill to extend World War I veterans' benefits to persons in active military or naval service in Haiti between July 25, 1915, and April 6, 1917; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1201. A bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States for that portion of the construction cost of certain schools which is attributable to Negroes and Indians; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 1202. A bill to authorize and request the President to undertake to mobilize at some convenient place in the United States an adequate number of the world's outstanding experts and coordinate and utilize their services in a supreme endeavor to discover means of curing and preventing cancer; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOLTON of Maryland:

H. R. 1203. A bill providing for a preliminary examination and survey of the channel in Back River, Baltimore County, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1204. A bill to authorize the construction of a Veterans' Administration general medical and surgical hospital in Baltimore, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 1205. A bill to provide automobiles for blind veterans of World War II who are entitled to compensation for the loss, or loss of use, of one or both legs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 1206. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1207. A bill amending the Internal Revenue Code to provide an alternative tax, at the election of the taxpayer, on income derived from an unincorporated business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1208. A bill to extend the time for filing estimated income-tax returns in the case of farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1209. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1210. A bill to authorize the construction and operation of facilities for generating hydroelectric power at the Folsom project on American River in California and the use of power revenues therefrom to assist irrigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1212. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1213. A bill for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1214. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 1215. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1216. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1217. A bill to provide longevity pay for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 1218. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 1219. A bill to repeal the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1220. A bill to amend the Veterans' Regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1221. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam, and to make them racially eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1222. A bill to authorize the exchange of certain fishery facilities within the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 1223. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1224. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 1225. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1226. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1227. A bill to extend coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to certain employees of the Panama Railroad Company and to provide that such employees shall be subject to State unemployment-compensation laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1228. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and the tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1229. A bill to provide for the appointment of conservators, receivers, and other fiduciary officers to take charge of the affairs of Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1230. A bill to establish a national natural resources policy, to create a Natural Resources Council, to provide for a natural resources inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1231. A bill to amend the act of May 28, 1896, as amended, relating to the appointment of assistant United States attorneys; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1232. A bill to reestablish the original eleventh and twelfth Federal home-loan bank districts and to reestablish the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Los Angeles and the original Federal Home Loan Bank of Portland; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1233. A bill to provide a Federal bonus for service in World War II by residents of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1234. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons indigenous to Indonesia, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1235. A bill providing, in the District of Columbia, for the registration of locksmiths and certain other persons and imposing certain other requirements with respect to the practice and professions of locksmithing and key making; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1236. A bill to provide compensation for civil-service employees and other Federal employees who receive permanent partial disabilities resulting from injuries incurred while in performance of their duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LINEHAN:

H. R. 1237. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1238. A bill to amend paragraph (A) (1) of Public Law No. 662, Seventy-ninth Congress, chapter 869, second session, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1239. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1240. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1241. A bill to reclassify assistant postmasters and other supervisory positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1242. A bill authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson Remount Station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1244. A bill relating to the fixing of wage rates for employees in naval shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 1245. A bill to increase the rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1246. A bill to repeal the act of June 5, 1940, entitled "An act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed and plants, except for experimental purposes"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1247. A bill to provide for cooperation with State agencies administering labor laws in establishing and maintaining safe and proper working conditions in industry and in the preparation, promulgation, and enforcement of regulations to control industrial health hazards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1248. A bill to establish a presumption of service connection for functional disorders of the nervous system and psychoses for certain veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 1249. A bill to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital maintained at Temple, Tex., as the Thirty-sixth Division Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 1250. A bill to extend Veterans' Administration benefits to disabled retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without impairment of their right to receive retired pay which they had earned for stipulated service prior to their reentry into the service in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 1251. A bill to revise, codify, and enact into law title 46 of the United States Code, entitled "Shipping"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1252. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1253. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Florida to hear, determine, and render judgment in favor of all persons for damages or losses arising or resulting from the construction, further development, and improvement of the intracoastal waterway from Jacksonville, Fla., to Miami, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1254. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for the Everglades National Park, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1255. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide for the inclusion of military or naval service in the computation of the 5 years of service necessary for entitlement to annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1256. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1257. A bill to amend subparagraph (k) of paragraph II, part I, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide increased compensation for blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to increased compensation for loss or loss of use of one hand or one foot; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1258. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to authorize public assistance grants for medical services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1259. A bill to amend the Social Security Act of 1935; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1260. A bill to provide for the payment of retroactive death pension to widows and children of veterans after 7 years' continued and unexplained absence; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1261. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1262. A bill to provide Federal aid to the States for the construction of armories and similar training facilities for the National Guard and Naval Militia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1263. A bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 1264. A bill to prohibit Federal land banks from reserving mineral or timber rights when they dispose of certain real property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1265. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (61 Stat. 913) to provide for competitive bidding on leases issued thereunder; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1266. A bill to provide that a stenographic record be made and a transcribed copy be furnished the veteran's preference employee and/or his designated representative, of all appeal hearings held under the provisions of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1267. A bill to amend the veterans regulations to provide additional compensation for World War II veterans who suffer the loss of the use of a creative organ; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1268. A bill to establish within the Civil Service Commission a Board of Appeals on Efficiency Ratings; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 1269. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 77. Joint resolution extending to July 1, 1949, certain income-tax exemptions of military and naval personnel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to authorize the Postmaster General to make a study and report of mechanizing the postal-delivery service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Altoona, Pa., as the Corporal Harry R. Harr Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACK of Washington:

H. Con. Res. 11. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Committee on the Olympic National Park; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to invite General MacArthur to visit the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Res. 40. Resolution to amend rule XI (2) of the Rules of the House of Representatives with respect to the conduct of investigations; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 41. Resolution to transfer jurisdiction over un-American activities from the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SMITH of Kansas:

H. Res. 42. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and $250 funeral expenses to Mrs. Frances Hancock, widow of A. C. Hancock, late employee of the House; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 43. Resolution setting the size of the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 44. Resolution to prescribe tolls to be levied for the use of the Panama Canal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Res. 45. Resolution providing for compensation for three special messengers for the House Ways and Means Committee, effective January 1, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. Res. 46. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study existing Federal safety regulations for chartered passenger flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 47. Resolution to amend rule XI (1) of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 1270. A bill for the relief of John Thompson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1272. A bill for the relief of Edward A. Seeley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1273. A bill for the relief of Fred H. Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1274. A bill for the relief of Abraham Lipetz, Gittla Lipetz, Jacques Lipetz, Leon Matthew Lipetz, and Eric Lipetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1275. A bill for the relief of Anna Helman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1276. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ida Londinsky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 1277. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 1278. A bill for the relief of Doris High; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1281. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Leslie Paul Schroeder; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 1282. A bill for the relief of Mrs. T. A. Robertson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1283. A bill for the relief of Walter W. Hearne; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1284. A bill for the relief of the Wilson County Fair, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1285. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Lena Mae West, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1287. A bill to admit Maria Varanaki to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1288. A bill for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the steamship *Taiyuan*; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1289. A bill for the relief of Romulus Oscar Bean, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1290. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Wulf, warrant officer, junior grade, United States Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 1291. A bill for the relief of Eugene and Mary Potvoricky and children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Jan and Juliana Magura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1293. A bill for the relief of the Franco-Italian Packing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1294. A bill for the relief of Lt. (jg) Svend J. Skou; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1295. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rosaria Cusimano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1296. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Masao Hayashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1297. A bill for the relief of Alvin G. Patton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1298. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Hunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1301. A bill for the relief of the American Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 1302. A bill for the relief of Irene Maria Schneidmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 1303. A bill for the relief of Dr. Elias Stavropoulos, his wife, and daughter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

4. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Harold Coles, executive vice president, Florida State Chamber of Commerce, Jacksonville, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to modifying the national airport aid law so that funds allocated by it to the several States may be used for airport maintenance where such funds are no longer required for airport construction, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

---

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Stop us, O God, for a minute of prayer.

Stop our anxious minds from wandering, and our hearts from desiring anything but to know Thy will.

Let us stand at attention before Thee and hear what Thou hast to say to us.

We believe that Thou canst tell us not only what to do but also how to do it.

If it needs making up our minds, Thou who didst make our minds canst show us how to make them up.

If it needs changing our minds, Thou canst work that miracle, too.

Speak, O Lord, and make us hear, for Jesus' sake. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF SENATORS

DENNIS CHAVEZ, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, and WARREN G. MAGNUSON, a Senator from the State of Washington, appeared in their seats today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

NOMINATION OF HON. CARL A. HATCH

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the President has sent to the Senate the nomination of Hon. Carl A. Hatch to be Federal judge for the district of New Mexico. As we all know, Mr. Hatch was a Member of this body up to the present

Congress. It is usual for the Senate to take action on the nomination of a former Member of the body immediately but, due to the fact that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, is temporarily absent, I cannot ask that action be taken now. I feel certain that if the Senator from Nevada were present he would have made a motion that the nomination be confirmed. At a later date I intend to say a few words about my former colleague, Hon. Carl A. Hatch.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to be absent from sessions of the Senate for the remainder of this week.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 10th instant,

Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to which was referred the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, reported it on January 11, 1949, with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 1) thereon.

REPORT FOR PEILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report for the Philippine Alien Property Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS ON FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND (H. DOC. NO. 39)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

WOMEN'S BRANCH OF COAST GUARD RESERVE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SERVICE AS CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES IN FORMER BUREAU OF MARINE INSPECTION AND NAVIGATION, THE BUREAU OF CUSTOMS, AND THE COAST GUARD FOR MILITARY PAY PURPOSES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 23, 1947, so as to provide for the inclusion of time spent as a civilian employee in the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation, the Bureau of Customs, and the Coast Guard, for military pay purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TRANSFER OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FROM RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION TO STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer certain property from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Department of State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

LAWS PASSED BY LEGISLATURE OF PUERTO RICO

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of laws enacted by the sixth, seventh, and eighth special sessions of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

COST OF REHABILITATION AND REPAIR OF DAMAGES BY UNITED STATES MILITARY FORCES AT SIX PUBLIC AIRPORTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by United States military forces at six public airports (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDWIN B. ANDERSON

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain postal employees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ISSUANCE OF COMMEMORATIVE STAMP OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," approved June 29, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PERMISSION TO VERNON G. MACKENZIE TO ACCEPT AND WEAR A CERTAIN FOREIGN DECORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation granting permission to Vernon G. MacKenzie, Sanitary Engineer Director, Public Health Service, to accept and wear a certain decoration bestowed upon him by the King of Greece (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, ELEVATOR & RAILWAY CO.

A letter from the president of the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., reporting, pursuant to law, on the operations of that company, for the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the petition of James H. Schaffner, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for redress of grievance under the Constitution, relating to his military status; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

THE POLL TAX—PETITION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by the mayor and sundry other citizens of Jackson, Mich., relating to the poll tax, and I ask unanimous consent that the petition, together with the names of the signers of the petition, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition, together with the signatures, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, citizens of the city in which the Republican Party first asserted its belief in equality of opportunity for all Americans, respectfully present to the Congress our appeal for further progress in the implementation of that belief.

We remind ourselves and the Congress of the profound promise made 94 years ago by the founders of the Republican Party under Jackson's spreading oaks: "That the law of nature, which is the law of liberty, gives to no man rights superior to those of another." And we urge that the pledges reiterated in the Republican platform of 1948 be given sincere consideration by the Eighty-first Congress, pledges which promised to abolish the poll tax, to legislate against lynching, to extend equal educational opportunities and to advance those other rights which are part of our concept of freedom. While we petition in prideful memory of the founders of the Republican Party, we speak without partisan consideration as both Democrats and Republicans, for we are aware that also in 1948 the

Democratic Party pledged itself to support legislation which would guarantee the rights of full and equal political participation, the right to equal opportunity of employment, and the right of security of person.

We humbly acknowledge our own failures to be true to the Republican principles of Lincoln, the Democratic principles of Jefferson and of this city's namesake, Andrew Jackson, in recognition of human rights. Such failures are not limited to any certain section of our country. We pledge ourselves in our own community and state to seek rectification of those injustices under which minority groups live.

Cognizant of the concern with which good people of our Southern States contemplate these issues, we propose no belligerent approach to a problem the gravity of which all good Americans must acknowledge. Yet progress has been made, great progress, and we appeal for further steps to bring all Americans to a plane of democratic equality in opportunity and in Government.

Therefore, we, citizens of Jackson, call on the leaders of both parties to unite in the Congress behind their own party platforms and make 1949 the year of advancement toward the hopes and aspirations of all God-fearing people, as reaffirmed in 1854 in our own city when the Republican Party came into being.

James N. House, Mayor; Munro S. Furman, President, Greater Jackson Association; Mrs. W. K. McInally, President, Woman's Club; Thomas Morano, President, CIO Council, Jackson; Robert E. Lee, President, Jackson County Federation of Labor; C. W. Moulton, President, Jackson County Realty Board; Mrs. John Maher, President, Jackson City Council, PTA; Lacerne Patch, Chairman, Board of Supervisors; G. L. Greenawalt, Superintendent of Schools; Carl M. Saunders, Editor, Jackson Citizen-Patriot; Floyd J. Poole, County Clerk; Mrs. Hugh T. Roberts, Republican County Vice Chairman; L. M. Godden, President, Junior Chamber of Commerce; H. E. Handley, President, Board of Education; Mrs. T. J. Powell, President, Jackson Business and Professional Club; E. D. Cattell, City Clerk; Mrs. Hubert E. Cox, President, University of Michigan Alumnae; W. Earl Holman, President, Jackson Exchange Club; Mrs. N. Rosenfeld, President, Jackson Branch, American Association of University Women; Mrs. G. W. Duguid, President, Women's Division, Republican National Committee; Wilfred G. Bassett, Chairman, Jackson County Veterans Council; Mrs. Charles Dengler, President, Peace Council; Mrs. Lloyd Wolfe, President, Council of Church Women; Haskell Nichols, State Senator; John W. Bannasch, State Representative; Stanley Shoemaker, President, Jackson Teacher Club; Clarence H. Elliott, City Manager; Vincent Holda, City Commissioner; William D. Hunt, City Commissioner; James F. Thomson, Republican County Chairman; James C. Mead, President, Jackson County Ministerial Association; Mrs. A. D. Vetesk, President, YWCA Board; Howard F. Andrews, Jackson County Council of Churches; C. J. Straayer, Jackson Optimists Club; and More Than 300 Others.

## HOLIDAYS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ON JANUARY 20 AND 21

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably without amendment Senate Joint Resolution 16, making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

At the appropriate time during the afternoon a request will be made for unanimous consent to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received.

## PRINTING OF REVISED EDITION OF RULES AND MANUAL OF THE SENATE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original routine resolution providing for the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Senate Manual, which has been unanimously recommended by the committee, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 25), as follows:

*Resolved,* That Senate Resolution 238, Eightieth Congress, a resolution providing for the preparation and printing of the Senate Rules and Manual for the Eighty-first Congress is hereby rescinded; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Rules and Administration be, and it is hereby, directed to prepare a revised edition of the Senate Rules and Manual for the use of the Eighty-first Congress, and that 1,500 additional copies shall be printed and bound, of which 1,000 copies shall be for the Senate, 200 copies for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the remaining 300 copies shall be bound in full morocco and tagged as to contents and delivered as may be directed by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that this is a regular resolution that provides for the printing of 1,500 copies of the Senate Rules and Manual.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; for the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. And it is in line with the usual procedure at the beginning of Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to suggest that it might be practicable to defer the printing of the Senate Manual until we have amended the rules regarding filibusters. That would obviate the necessity for another reprinting of the rules within a short time after the printing provided for in the resolution presented by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Can the Senator from Maine indicate on what day certain that change will be made?

Mr. BREWSTER. Well, Mr. President, I defer to the judgment of the Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the committee in charge of the matter. I am sure, however, that unless we settle the question now it never will be settled.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am not a prophet. I make no prediction.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator does not have a crystal ball in which he can gaze and tell us how soon we can secure amendment of the cloture rule.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator have in mind perhaps when it will be taken up?

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be taken up for hearing by the committee on the 24th of January.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 25) was considered and agreed to.

## MEMBERS ON PART OF SENATE OF JOINT COMMITTEES ON PRINTING AND LIBRARY, RESPECTIVELY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report an original resolution providing for Members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committees on Printing and the Library, respectively, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 26) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. HUNT, of Wyoming; Mr. JENNER, of Indiana.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. HAYDEN, of Arizona; Mr. GREEN, of Rhode Island; Mr. LONG, of Louisiana; Mr. IVES, of New York; Mr. LODGE, of Massachusetts.

## ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR CALIFORNIA SENATORS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 20, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] on January 6, 1949, and I submit a report (No. 3) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The clerk will read the resolution for the information of the Senate.

The clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That until an appropriation shall be made to pay the compensation of the additional clerk to which each Senator from the State of California is entitled by reason of the fact that the population of such State exceeds 10,000,000, there is authorized to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate the compensation of an additional clerk to each of the Senators from such State at the basic rate of $1,500 per annum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration explain why such clerks are provided?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. There is a provision in the rules that any State which has a population of more than 10,000,000 shall be allowed an additional clerk for each Senator representing such State. California, according to the

latest United States census report available to the committee, now has a population in excess of 10,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the committee unanimously endorsed the request?

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee has; yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

AGE LIMIT FOR SENATE PAGES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 14, submitted by myself and Mr. WHERRY on January 5, 1949, and I submit a report (No. 4) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following resolution of the Senate agreed to on December 6, 1870, namely:

"*Resolved*, That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 12 years, or remain in office after the age of 16 years," be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That in no case shall a page of the Senate be appointed for duty in the Senate Chamber who is younger than 14 years, or remain in office after the age of 17 years, and who has not completed the eighth grade of school."

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 32), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-first Congress, $25,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, approved August 2, 1946.

REPORT OF WORK OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, 2 years ago, under the Reorganization Act, the scope of the work of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments was very much broadened. During the past 2 years it has been my privilege to be chairman of that committee. It has been a very happy privilege. I have had a splendid nonpartisan committee with which to work. My last act as chairman of that committee for the Eightieth Congress was to have prepared a report of the work of the first 2 years of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under the broadened authority given it by the Reorganization Act. The report, unfortunately, was not completed until my term of office as chairman had expired.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed as a Senate document. I understand that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Printing, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], has no objection to the matter being handled in this way.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, furthermore I should like to say that, as I have already stated, the relationship which I had with the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has been very satisfactory and pleasant indeed, and I am glad that the chairmanship of that committee is now turned over to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], who has given me the fullest cooperation during the time I was chairman of the committee. I only regret that circumstances do not permit me to remain a member of the committee so that I could give him equally good cooperation on my part.

VOICE OF AMERICA (S. REPT. NO. 2)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], under authority of the order of the Senate of December 31, 1948, I submit herewith a joint report of a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations of their investigation of certain allegations against radio broadcast operations under the Voice of America program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH—COMMUNICATION FROM HON. HERBERT HOOVER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Honorable Herbert Hoover, chairman of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, dealing with reorganization. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the communication printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The communication was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT,
*Washington, D. C., January 13, 1949.*

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
*President pro tempore,*
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: The necessity for reorganization of the executive branch of the Government was clearly recognized by the Congress when it created this Commission in July 1947, with the full approval of the President. Congress assigned the Commission the duty of examination and recommendation under the following statement from the act creating the Commission:

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

"(1) limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

"(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

"(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

"(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government; and

"(5) defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities."

This concern of Congress for economy and efficiency reflects the overwhelming interest of every thoughtful citizen and taxpayer in the land.

The writing and adoption of the Federal Constitution proved that a republic could deliberately analyze its political institutions and redesign its government to meet the demands of the future. The broad pattern that America then selected is sound. Today we must deal with the infinitely more complicated government of the twentieth century. In doing so, we must reorganize the executive branch to give it the simplicity of structure, the unity of purpose, and the clear line of executive authority that was originally intended under the Constitution.

As a result of depression, war, new needs for defense, and our greater responsibilities in the foreign field, the Federal Government has become the most gigantic business on earth. In less than 20 years the number of its civil employees has risen from 570,000 to over 2,100,000. The number of bureaus, sections, services, and units has increased fourfold to over 1,800. Annual expenditures have increased from about $3,600,000,000 to over $42,000,000,000. The national debt per average family has increased from about $500 to about $7,500. Such rapid growth could not take place without causing serious problems. Organizational methods, effective 20 years ago, are no longer applicable. The growth of skills and methods in private organization has long since outmoded many of the methods of the Government.

This Commission has found that the United States is paying heavily for a lack of order, a lack of clear lines of authority and responsibility, and a lack of effective organization in the executive branch. It has found that great improvements can be made in the effectiveness with which the Government can serve the people if its organization and administration is overhauled.

This Commission has been engaged in its task for the last 16 months and is reaching its conclusions only after the most painstaking research. We decided at an early date that we must have the aid of leading and experienced citizens to assist us in making findings of fact and recommendation of remedies. The Commission, therefore, divided its work into functional and departmental segments; it created 24 "task forces" with authority to engage such research aid as they might require. About 300 outstanding men and women, expert and experienced in the fields to which they were assigned, have now submitted to us their findings and recommendations. Thanks are due them. They brought great talent and diligence to their work. Their findings will be found useful by the Congress and the executive branch in solution of the problems considered.

Some of the recommendations contained in the volumes of our report, which we plan to file from time to time between now and the expiration of the life of the Commission, can be put into effect only by legislation. Others can be accomplished by executive action. But many of the most important

can probably be accomplished only if the Congress reenacts and broadens the power to initiate reorganization plans which it had previously granted to the President under an act which expired on March 31, 1948.

The Commission recommends that such authority should be given to the President and that the power of the President to prepare and transmit plans of reorganization to the Congress should not be restricted by limitations or exemptions. Once the limiting and exempting process is begun it will end the possibility of achieving really substantial results.

But, in saying this, the Commission should not be understood as giving sweeping endorsement to any and all reorganization plans. It does believe that the safeguard against unwise reorganization plans lies both in a sound exercise of the President's discretion and in the reserved power in the Congress by concurrent resolution to disapprove any proposed plan.

Limitations or exemptions upon this power to reorganize should not be imposed other than that of congressional disapproval. They have arisen in the past chiefly in connection with the regulatory commissions. In one of its reports the Commission will discuss these regulatory commissions in detail. It will point out in each case those regulatory functions which it is believed should continue to be performed independently. The Commission will also point out certain other functions which are of a different nature and which can be more efficiently and economically performed by purely executive officials. The inclusion in a reorganization act of provisions exempting certain agencies from its terms would prevent changes which are in accord with established principles in this field and which in no way impair the maintenance of independence and impartiality in the exercise of the great regulatory functions.

Similarly, the inclusion of general language, like that contained in section 5 (a) (6) of the Reorganization Act of 1945,[1] intended to prevent the submission of any plan which imposes limitations upon the independent exercise of quasi-legislative or quasi-judicial functions, would, in the Commission's judgment, be unwise. The phrases are extremely vague and of uncertain meaning. Ingenious and plausible arguments can be made to apply them to a wide range of functions which should clearly be subject to reorganization procedure. Such arguments would not be matters of purely theoretical concern or legislative debates, for the validity of reorganization could be made the subject of protracted litigation by private interests resisting the acts of a reorganized agency on the ground that it was illegally constituted. It might take several years of litigation to lay down interpretations of these general phrases and, even then, uncertainty would remain.

The Commission, in accordance with the act of Congress creating it, as amended, will file its report in a series of parts or volumes, the last of which will be delivered within 70 days of the organization of the Eighty-first Congress. These reports will contain its findings and recommendations. They will begin with the top organization and structure of the executive branch and proceed through the services which are common to the whole executive branch to the reorganizations recommended for particular agencies and groups of agencies.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER,
*Chairman.*

[1] SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of * * * (6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function.

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION BILL—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, through some error the name of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was left off as a sponsor of Senate bill 247, the so-called National Science Foundation bill. The Senator from Washington has had his name on similar bills from the beginning, and I am very sorry that the mistake was made. I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a sponsor to the National Science Foundation bill to which I have referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## DISPLACED PERSONS ACT AMENDMENTS—ADDITIONAL SPONSOR

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on January 5, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and I introduced certain amendments to the Displaced Persons Act. These bills were S. 98, S. 99, and S. 100.

Entirely through an inadvertency, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was omitted from these amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the RECORD show that the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was one of the cosponsors of this proposed legislation, and that his name appear on the amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to state that the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] was inadvertently omitted from the list of sponsors of the three amendments to the Displaced Persons Act; and I join in the request of the able Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] in that regard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the correction will be made, and the name of the Senator from New York will be added to the bill as a sponsor.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 332. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina also introduced Senate bill 333, to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribe the qualifications of the judges of such court, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 334. A bill for the relief of Olga Belokhovsky-Erelbe; and

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 336. A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building construction industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. NEELY:

S. 337. A bill for the relief of Roleigh Lee Stubbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 338. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended, so as to include thereunder the Cumberland River and Cumberland River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 339. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 340. A bill to facilitate the administration by the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, of the recreational uses of lands and waters within reclamation, flood control, power, and other Federal reservoir projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 341. A bill for the relief of the Yellow Cab Transit Co., of Oklahoma City; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 342. A bill to facilitate cooperation of recognized organizations with the Veterans' Administration;

S. 343. A bill to increase compensation and pension rates under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

S. 344. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age;

S. 345. A bill to liberalize the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes;

S. 346. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II;

S. 347. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents;

S. 348. A bill to provide an equitable basis for determining dependency of parents under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

S. 349. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; and

S. 350. A bill to restore full compensation awards in World War I presumptively service-connected cases; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 351. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md., Greendale, Wis., and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 352. A bill to regulate subsistence expenses of civilian officers and employees in the executive branch of the Government while absent from their designated posts of duty on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 353. A bill to protect scenic values along and tributary to Aspen Basin Road, and contiguous scenic area, within the Sante Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 354. A bill to authorize the conveyance of land to Clifford M. Phorpe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 355. A bill for the relief of Lee Hong Dick;

S. 356. A bill for the relief of Hugo Geiger; and

S. 357. A bill to make it a crime for Federal employees to make unlawful threats to a taxpayer for the purpose of collecting taxes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 358. A bill to provide judicial procedure for determining a taxpayer's liability for income-tax deficiencies; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR) introduced Senate bill 359, to permit farmers to carry over and carry back net operating losses for 8 years for income-tax purposes which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 360. A bill for the relief of Isac Glickman, Reghina Glickman, Alfred Glickman, and Ana Glickman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 361. A bill exempting from tax the transportation of persons to and from an airport in a motor vehicle having a seating capacity of less than 10 passengers; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 362. A bill providing for contributions to States and local governmental units in lieu of taxes on real property held by the Federal Government; creating a commission to determine and pay such contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. CAIN):

S. 363. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1250), and to rescind certain orders of the Secretary of the Interior establishing Indian reservations in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 364. A bill for the relief of Bloom Typewriter Exchange; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER (for himself, Mr. THYE, and Mr. WHERRY):

S. 365. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation for 1 year of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding materials; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 366. A bill for the relief of John Masters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 367. A bill to provide support for basic commodities; to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and for other purposes;

S. 368. A bill providing for grants to aid in establishing farmers' markets; and

S. 369. A bill to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the protection of forest lands, for the reforestation of denuded areas, for the extension of national forests, and for other purposes, in order to promote the continuous production of timber on lands chiefly suitable therefor," approved June 27, 1924; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 370. A bill to provide an appropriation for the reconstruction and repair of bridges on county roads in the flood-damaged areas of the State of Georgia; and

S. 371. A bill to provide emergency aid for the repair, restoration, or reconstruction of public facilities damaged or destroyed by certain catastrophes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. 372. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 373. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. C. Shepherd, trading as W. C. Shepherd Co.;

S. 374. A bill to provide for the furnishing of quarters at Brunswick, Ga., for the United States District Court for the Southern District of Georgia;

S. 375. A bill for the relief of Charles Seraphim Peroulas and George Athanasios Peroulas;

S. 376. A bill for the relief of Louise S. Page;

S. 377. A bill for the relief of Ernest J. Jenkins;

S. 378. A bill to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a Swainsboro division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of court to be held at Swainsboro; and

S. 379. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 380. A bill for the relief of Peter I. Tirbak and his family;

S. 381. A bill for the relief of Low Way Hong;

S. 382. A bill for the relief of Wong Suey Wing; and

S. 383. A bill for the relief of William Jennings Bleiler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 384. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation, of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 385. A bill to permit the furnishing of certain hydrographic charts without charge to official depositories in the university libraries of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 386. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 387. A bill for the relief of William K. Burlen; and

S. 388. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Lancaster, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 389. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to provide an increase in pay for certain personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 390. A bill for the relief of George M. Ford; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 391. A bill to increase the compensation of new employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 392. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 393. A bill for the relief of Kaia Helle;

S. 394. A bill to authorize the admission of Mrs. Julia Balint to the United States.

S. 395. A bill for the relief of Dorothea Singer; and

S. 396. A bill for the relief of Virgil L. Hesterly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 397. A bill for the relief of Franz Eugene Laub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 398. A bill to establish a United States Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 399. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican-border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 400. A bill to provide for ascertaining the economic justification for proposed improvements to the inland waterways of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 401. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 402. A bill to establish a Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; and

S. 403. A bill to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 404. A bill for the relief of Emma L. Jackson;

S. 405. A bill for the relief of J. H. Westfield;

S. 406. A bill for the relief of Margaret Dunn;

S. 407. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 62 years old;

S. 408. A bill for the relief of Barbara O'Brien Farquer;

S. 409. A bill for the relief of George Bailey;

S. 410. A bill for the relief of the former shareholders of the Goshen Veneer Co., an Indiana corporation;

S. 411. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hattie Truax; and

S. 412. A bill to legalize the admission into the United States of Vendelin Krajci; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 413. A bill to provide for an air parcel-post service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 414. A bill to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 415. A bill to amend section 514 of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to permit States and political subdivisions thereof to impose taxes on the personal property of members of the armed services located in such States and political subdivisions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I introduce 17 bills dealing with aviation, which are, in large measure, those which were presented, but without opportunity for consideration, in the last session. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the new chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, indicated to me it would be agreeable if the bills were introduced under the aegis of the committee which functioned in the last session for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 416. A bill to provide for the planning of military aircraft requirements, to authorize the development and procurement of military aeronautical equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 417. A bill to amend the Immigration Acts of 1917 and 1924 to permit the mitigation of certain fines, and for other purposes;

S. 418. A bill to exempt Canadian citizens and aircraft crewmen from certain visa requirements; and

S. 419. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims arising from the termination of contracts of the armed services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 420. A bill to provide for the avoidance of multiple taxation of air commerce, and for other purposes; and

S. 421. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 422. A bill to provide for the more expeditious carriage of domestic and foreign first-class mail by air, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 423. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 424. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to local enforcement of safety regulations of civil aviation, and for other purposes;

S. 425. A bill to encourage the development of a safe United States flag international air-transportation system properly adapted to the present and future needs of foreign commerce of the United States, of the postal service, and of the national defense, and to meet certain of the obligations incumbent upon the United States by virtue of its membership in the International Civil Aviation Organization, by providing for the transfer, establishment, operation, administration, and maintenance of airport and airway property located outside the continental United States, for the training of foreign nationals in aviation activities, and for other purposes;

S. 426. A bill to provide for the development of civil transport aircraft adaptable for auxiliary military service and for other purposes;

S. 427. A bill to authorize the United States Maritime Commission to provide for the development of lighter-than-air rigid airships for commercial use;

S. 428. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Air Policy Board;

S. 429. A bill to provide for coordination of aviation policy, and for other purposes;

S. 430. A bill to provide for an independent Office of Air Safety, and for other purposes;

S. 431. A bill to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 432. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of interstate contract carriers by air, and for other purposes; and

S. 433. A bill to provide for coordination of aviation policy, to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, to provide for an independent Office of Air Safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 434, to continue rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, ordered to be printed, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Kathe Schlomtropp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 436. A bill for the relief of Arkady Tkachenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 437. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs;

S. 438. A bill to amend section 15 (4) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 439 (by request). A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the use of Coast Guard radio stations for commercial messages;

S. 440 (by request). A bill to amend section 1 of the Federal Power Act, with respect to the terms of office of members of the Federal Power Commission;

S. 441 (by request). A bill to redefine the units and establish the standards of electrical and photometric measurements;

S. 442 (by request). A bill to amend the Air Commerce Act of 1926 (44 Stat. 568), as amended, to provide for the application to civil air navigation of laws and regulations related to animal and plant quarantine, and for other purposes;

S. 443 (by request). A bill to authorize the construction and equipment of a radio laboratory building for the National Bureau of Standards, Department of Commerce;

S. 444 (by request). A bill to provide for the acceptance and use of funds for support of the national weather service supplementing the funds appropriated for the operation of the Weather Bureau of the Department of Commerce;

S. 445 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to the regulation of civil aviation, and for other purposes;

S. 446 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 447 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to regulate the transportation, packing, marking, and description of explosives and other dangerous articles;

S. 448 (by request). A bill to improve the administration of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes;

S. 449 (by request). A bill to provide basic authority for the performance of certain functions and activities of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes;

S. 450 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for the delegation of certain authority of the Administrator, and for other purposes;

S. 451 (by request). A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, by providing for certain penalties for unlawful use of examination papers, and for other purposes;

S. 452. (by request). A bill to amend title II of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 453 (by request). A bill to authorize the establishment of 10 positions in the professional and scientific service in the Department of Commerce with rates of compensation not in excess of $15,000 per annum;

S. 454 (by request). A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse employees of the Department for the expense of entertainment of representatives of other countries, and for other purposes;

S. 455 (by request). A bill to facilitate the development of a system of air-navigation aids adequate to meet the needs of the air commerce and the military requirements of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 456 (by request). A bill to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in or in the vicinity of the District of Columbia; and

S. 457 (by request). A bill to amend the Transportation of Explosives Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 458. A bill to provide for a survey of physically handicapped citizens; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 459. A bill for the relief of Cornelis Ruhtenberg, also known as Cornelis Ruhtenberg Helmsing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 460 (by request). A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. GEORGE also (by request) introduced Senate bill 461, to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 462. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining-research station in the vicinity of Spokane, Wash., for investigation of methods of mining the ores and other mineral raw materials of the Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 463. A bill for the relief of the Northwest Lead Co.;

S. 464. A bill for the relief of Hans Hauser;

S. 465. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Gottfried Schmidt-Ehrenberg;

S. 466. A bill for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the steamship *Taiyuan;*

S. 467. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam, and to make them racially eligible for naturalization;

S. 468. A bill for the relief of Johnson & Gunstone, a copartnership;

S. 469. A bill for the relief of Catherine A. Glesener;

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Dr. Richard Grunberg;

S. 471. A bill for the relief of Lloyd Gordon Findley; and

S. 472. A bill for the relief of Osmore H. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 473. A bill to increase from $3,000 to $5,000 the maximum amount that a retired commissioned officer and certain other Federal employees may receive as combined retired pay and compensation from a civilian office or position under the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 474. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 475. A bill to aid in the naturalization of persons with wartime service in the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY) introduced Senate bill 476, making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 477. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winfred DeCoteau a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 478. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 479. A bill to extend annuity benefits under the Foreign Service Act of 1946 to widows of certain foreign service officers who died prior to the effective date of such act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 480. A bill for the relief of William R. Akers;

S. 481. A bill for the relief of C. J. Hartman;

S. 482. A bill for the relief of William H. Williams;

S. 483. A bill for the relief of Floyd H. Cropper;

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Jehuda Herszfeld;

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel;

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Song Kwan Lee also known as Paul Molina; and

S. 487. A bill to amend title 18, U. S. C., sections 2312 and 2313, so as to include thereunder motor vehicles and aircraft which have been converted, or taken by fraud; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 488. A bill for the relief of Sam Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Alethea Arthur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 489. A bill to authorize the refund to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Commission of the sum advanced for certain water facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 490. A bill for the relief of Frank Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 491. A bill to limit power of radio broadcast stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 492. A bill to amend an act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request):

S. 493. A bill to extend the benefits of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to the Virgin Islands;

S. 494. A bill to amend the Columbia Basin Project Act with reference to State lands; and

S. 495. A bill to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McMAHON (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 496. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through elementary and secondary schools, for the national security and general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, and Mr. MCFARLAND):

S. 497. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CAIN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. BROUGHTON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LANGER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MILLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) introduced Senate joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. J. Res. 26. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. J. Res. 27. Joint resolution to establish a Temporary Commission on Military Contract Audits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. J. Res. 28. Joint resolution to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Aviation Policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. J. Res. 29. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the National Jewish Hospital at Denver; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. J. Res. 30. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as the Edward W. Combs Veterans' Facility Hospital; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) introduced Senate Joint Resolution 31, to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. CAIN):

S. J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to provide for the maintenance for public use of certain highways in the Shenandoah National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. J. Res. 34. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## LOSSES OF FARMERS IN COMPUTING INCOME TAXES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which is designed to permit farmers to carry over and carry back net operating losses for 8 years for income-tax purposes. At the present time the farmer is being discriminated against. He may have had a loss in 1 year or 2 years or 3 years, and yet if he happens to have a good crop and receives a good price he has to pay an enormous income tax without having the privilege that business has, to deduct for losses incurred during a certain period of years. In order to equalize the tax burden and to treat the farmer in the same way that all other businessmen are treated, I have introduced the bill, and I call it particularly to the attention of the Finance Committee.

The bill (S. 359) to permit farmers to carry over and carry back net operating losses for 8 years for income tax purposes, introduced by Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## ADDITIONAL JUDGES OF MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 333) to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribe the qualifications of the judges of such court, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

EXPLANATION OF BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE APPOINTMENT OF THREE ADDITIONAL JUDGES OF THE MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND PRESCRIBE THE QUALIFICATIONS OF THE JUDGES OF SUCH COURT

The primary purpose of this bill is to create three new judgeships on the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The municipal court of the District of Columbia is at present greatly overworked, is running behind on its docket, and has no prospect except to run further behind, unless additional judges are provided. The court has not been increased in membership in recent years, in spite of a great increase in the population of the District of Columbia.

This is an important court, and litigants are entitled to the speedy justice which can only be provided when there are enough judges to handle expeditiously all cases filed.

It is important to note that this court has a net income of over $1,000,000 per year, which is paid into the general fund of the District of Columbia. Therefore, the proposal to increase the number of judges for the court is not one which will require any expenditure of the revenues of the United States.

A further purpose of this bill is to more adequately prescribe the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

At the present time, authority exists for the appointment of 2 of the 10 judges, now authorized for this court, from among nonresidents of the District of Columbia. As a matter of fact, all 10 of the present judges are residents of the District.

This bill would, in effect, require that 11 of the 13 judges of the court, which it would authorize, should be bona fide residents of the District of Columbia, and shall (except in the case of an appointee who shall have been a judge of one of the courts of the District of Columbia) have maintained an actual place of abode within the District for not less than 5 years immediately prior to appointment, and shall, during such 5-year period, have been actively engaged in the private practice of the law in the District of Columbia, maintaining an office in the District for the purposes of such practice, and devoting a major portion of working time to such practice and deriving the principal portion of income from such practice.

The bill would provide that service during the present emergency in the armed forces of the United States shall be included in the computation of the 5-year requirements specified.

Not more than 2 of the 13 judges which would be authorized under this bill might be either (1) a nonresident of the District of Columbia who shall have been for at least 5 years prior to appointment a member of the bar of the highest court in the State in which he has been domiciled, and who is a member of the bar of the District of Co-

lumbia, or (2) a member of the bar of the District of Columbia, for at least 5 years prior to appointment, who has been employed as an attorney in the District of Columbia in either the Government of the United States or the government of the District of Columbia. In applying this provision, members of the present court would be disregarded. The bill requires that in making appointments to the three additional vacancies authorized, at least one person shall be appointed from the classes mentioned in this paragraph.

Section 3 of the bill contains the technical provisions necessary to make available for the payment of the proposed new judges moneys appropriated for the government of the District of Columbia during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

A similar bill was considered and passed by the Senate in the Seventy-ninth Congress. Although the bill was reported favorably by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, it was not acted upon by the House and failed to become law.

## EXTENSION OF RENT CONTROL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the extension of rent control to June 30, 1951. I ask unanimous consent that a statement I am issuing on this bill be printed at this point in the RECORD, as well as an analysis of the bill, and I ask that these be followed in the RECORD by the printing of the bill itself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill together with the statement and analysis of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 434) to continue rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MYERS was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Housing and Rent Act of 1949."

SEC. 2. The provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, are amended by inserting the following immediately preceding Title I—Amendments to Existing Law.

"DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

"This act is hereby declared to be in the interest of the national defense and security and necessary to the successful completion of the present war. The Congress recognizes that an emergency exists with regard to housing accommodations due to the acute shortage of all types of housing and especially rental housing.

"The purposes of this act are, during the transition period from war to peace, to stabilize rents for housing accommodations and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in rents for such accommodations; to prevent unwarranted evictions because they would cause grave hardships to tenants and because unlimited evictions would render it extremely difficult to control rents; to protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, consumers, wage earners, and veterans and other persons dependent upon life insurance, annuities, pensions, and allowances granted to veterans attending school or learning trades, from undue impairment of their standard of living; to prevent the disruption of production due to the inability of employees to find adequate housing; and to assist veterans to obtain adequate housing for themselves and their families."

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I OF HOUSING AND RENT ACT OF 1947, AS AMENDED

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "April 1, 1949" wherever such date appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1951."

TITLE II—MAXIMUM RENTS

SEC. 201. Section 201 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 202. Section 202 (c) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The term 'controlled housing accommodations' means housing accommodations in any defense-rental area, except that it does not include—

"(1) any housing accommodations rented or offered for rent exclusively for transient occupancy (temporary occupancy on a daily or weekly basis) in hotels; or

"(2) any motor court, or any part thereof; any trailer or trailer space, or any part thereof; or any tourist home serving transient guests exclusively or any part thereof."

SEC. 203. Section 202 (d) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The term 'defense-rental area' means any part of any area in which rents were regulated on March 31, 1949, under the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and any part of any defense-rental area so designated under the Emergency Price Control Act, as amended, and any areas hereinafter designated and placed under regulation pursuant to the authority of this Act, as amended."

SEC. 204. Section 202 (e) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The term 'rent' means the consideration, including any bonus, benefit, or gratuity demanded or received for or in connection with the use or occupancy of housing accommodations, or the transfer of a lease for such housing accommodations."

SEC. 205. Section 202 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(f) The term 'maximum rent' means the maximum lawful rent for the use of defense-area housing accommodations.

"(g) The term 'defense-area housing accommodations' means housing accommodations within any defense-rental area.

"(h) The term 'documents' includes records, books, accounts, correspondence, memoranda, and other documents and drafts and copies of any of the foregoing.

"(i) The term 'district court' means any district court of the United States and the United States court for any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States; and the term 'circuit court of appeals' includes the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia."

SEC. 206. Section 203 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) On the termination of rent control under this title all records and other data (the cabinets or containers holding such records and data) used or held in connection with the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents by the Housing Expediter, and all predecessor agencies, shall, on request be delivered without reimbursement to the proper officials of any State or local subdivision of government that may be charged with the duty of administering a rent-control program in any State or local subdivision of government to which such records and data may be applicable: *Provided, however*, That any such records or data (and the cabinets or containers holding such records or data) shall be so made available subject to recall for use in carrying out the purpose of this title."

SEC. 207. (a) Section 204 (a) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out "March 31, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1951".

(b) Section 204 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) During the period from the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 and ending on the date this act ceases to be in effect, the maximum rent for controlled housing accommodations, unless and until changed by the Housing Expediter in accordance with paragraph (5) of this subsection, shall be the rents fixed by the Housing Expediter determined as follows:

"(1) For housing accommodations for which a maximum rent was in effect on March 31, 1949, the maximum rent shall continue to be such maximum rent;

"(2) For housing accommodations not included within the definition of 'controlled housing accommodations' as this definition read prior to the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, the maximum rent shall be the higher of (a) the rent generally prevailing in the defense-rental area for comparable accommodations on the maximum rent date for such area, plus due allowance, where new construction is involved, for general increases in the cost of construction in the area from 1939 until the date the construction is or was completed; (b) the maximum rent last in effect for such housing accommodations under Federal rent control;

"(3) For housing accommodations which were exempt from control pursuant to the second proviso of section 204 (b) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 as section 204 (b) read prior to amendment by the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, and for housing accommodations which were exempt from control pursuant to section 204 (b) (2) and (3) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, as section 204 (b) (2) and (3) read prior to the effective date of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949, the maximum rent shall be the rent established for such housing accommodations by such lease;

"(4) For housing accommodations recontrolled pursuant to the provisions of this act, as amended, the maximum rent shall be the maximum rent established by the Housing Expediter in the order or regulation of control;

"(5) The Housing Expediter may by regulation or order, make such adjustments in the maximum rents established under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection (b) as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act, as amended."

(c) Section 204 (c) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he shall issue a declaration setting forth the necessity for, and recommendations with reference to, the stabilization or reduction of rents for any defense-area housing accommodations within a particular defense-rental area. If within 60 days after the issuance of any such recommendations rents for any such accommodations within such defense-rental area have not in the judgment of the Housing Expediter been stabilized or reduced by State or local regulations, or otherwise, in accordance with the recommendations, the Housing Expediter may by regulation or order establish such maximum rents for such accommodations as in his judgment will be generally fair and equitable and will effectuate the purposes of this act. So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum rent for any defense-area housing accommodations, the Housing Expediter shall ascertain and give due consideration to the rents prevailing for such accommodations, or comparable accommodations, on or about April 1, 1941 (or if, prior

or subsequent to April 1, 1941, defense activities shall have resulted or threatened to result in increases in rents for housing accommodations in such area inconsistent with the purposes of this act, then on or about a date not earlier than April 1, 1940), which in the judgment of the Housing Expediter, does not reflect such increases, and he shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability in respect of such accommodations, including increases or decreases in property taxes and other costs within such defense-rental area. In designating defense-rental areas, in prescribing regulations and orders establishing maximum rents for such accommodations, and in selecting persons to administer such regulations and orders, the Housing Expediter shall, to such extent as he deems to be practicable, consider any recommendations which may be made by State and local officials concerned with housing or rental conditions in any defense-rental area. Whenever the Housing Expediter shall find that, in any defense-rental area or any portion thereof specified by him, the availability of adequate rental housing accommodations and other relevant factors are such as to make rent control unnecessary for the purpose of eliminating speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increase in rents and of preventing profiteering, and speculative and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions caused by congestion, the controls imposed upon rents by authority of this act in such defense-rental area or portion thereof shall be forthwith abolished; but whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter it is necessary or proper, in order to effectuate the purpose of this act, to reestablish the regulation of rents in any such defense-rental area or portion thereof, he may forthwith by regulation or order reestablish maximum rents for housing accommodations therein in accordance with the standards set forth in this act. Before issuing any regulation or order of general applicability under the foregoing provisions of this subsection, the Housing Expediter shall, so far as practicable, advise and consult with a national advisory committee composed of 15 members to be appointed by him which is representative of both landlord and tenant interests and of the general public."

(d) Section 204 (d) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Housing Expediter is authorized to issue such regulations and orders as he may deem necessary to carry out the provision of this act. Any regulation or order under this section may be established in such form and manner, may contain such classifications and differentiations, and may provide for such adjustments and reasonable exceptions, as in the judgment of the Housing Expediter are necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, as amended. Any regulation or order under this act which establishes a maximum rent may provide for a maximum rent below the rent or rents prevailing for the defense-area housing accommodations, at the time of the issuance of such regulation or order. Regulations, orders, and requirements under this act, as amended, may contain such provisions as the Housing Expediter deems necessary to prevent the circumvention or evasion thereof. The powers granted in this section shall not be used or made to operate to compel changes in established rental practice, except where such action is affirmatively found by the Housing Expediter to be necessary to prevent circumvention or evasion of any regulation, order, or requirement under this act, as amended."

(e) Section 204 (e) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) (1) The Housing Expediter is authorized and directed to create in each defense-rental area, or such portion thereof as he may designate, a local advisory board, each such board to consist of not less than five members who are citizens of the area and who, insofar as practicable, are, as a group, representative of the affected interests in the area, to be appointed by the Housing Expediter from recommendations made by the respective governors: *Provided*, That in any case where the governor has made no recommendations for original appointments to local boards or appointments to fill vacancies, within 30 days after request therefor (subsequent to March 31, 1949) from the Housing Expediter, the Housing Expediter shall without such recommendations appoint the original members of such boards or such members as may be required to fill vacancies. The Housing Expediter shall immediately subsequent to March 31, 1949, screen the membership of the boards to determine if their membership complies with the standards set forth in this section and shall promptly take steps to effectuate any change in the membership of any board necessitated by this provision.

"(2) The Housing Expediter shall furnish the local advisory boards suitable office space and stenographic assistance and shall make available to such boards any records and other information in the possession of the Housing Expediter with respect to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents for housing accommodations in the respective defense-rental area which may be requested by such boards.

"(3) The local advisory boards shall have the following functions: (a) to make recommendations to the Housing Expediter with respect to the decontrol of the defense-rental area or any portion thereof; (b) to make recommendations to the Housing Expediter with respect to the adequacy of the general rent level in the area; (c) to make recommendations with respect to the operations generally of the area rent office; (d) to exercise such functions for educational, administrative, and compliance purposes as are delegated by the Housing Expediter.

"(4) The Housing Expediter on receipt of a recommendation from a local advisory board shall give full and careful consideration to such recommendation and to any data accompanying it, but the responsibility for deciding any matter so presented shall rest solely with the Housing Expediter. Within a reasonable time after receipt of any recommendation from a local advisory board concerning a general rent increase or the decontrol of housing accommodations, the Housing Expediter shall approve or disapprove such recommendations by issuing an appropriate order or amendment to his regulations accompanied by a statement of the grounds upon which his decision is based and any economic data and other facts of which he has taken official notice."

(f) Section 204 (f) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(f) The provisions of this title shall cease to be in effect at the close of June 30, 1951."

(g) Section 204 (g) of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 208. Section 205 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by striking out from the heading of such section the words "by tenants"; and by changing the period at the end of the sentence, "Suit to recover such amount may be brought in any Federal, State, or Territorial court of competent jurisdiction within 1 year after the date of such violation" to a colon and inserting: *"Provided*, That if the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received, either fails to institute an action under this subsection within 30 days from the date of the occurrence of the violation or is not entitled for any reason to bring the action, the Housing Expediter may institute such action on behalf of the United States within such 1-year period. If such action is instituted by the Housing Expediter, the person from whom such payment is demanded, accepted, or received shall thereafter be barred from bringing an action for the same violation or violations."

SEC. 209. Section 206 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 206 (a) It shall be unlawful for any person to demand, accept, or receive any rent for the use or occupancy of any controlled housing accommodations in excess of the maximum rent prescribed under section 204, or otherwise to do or omit to do any act, in violation of this act, or of any regulation or order or requirement under this act, or to offer, solicit, attempt, or agree to do any of the foregoing.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter any person has been engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, he may make application to the appropriate court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, and upon a showing by the Housing Expediter that such person has engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

"(c) Any person who willfully violates any provision of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and any person who makes any statement or entry false in any material respect in any document or report required to be kept or filed under this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be subject to a fine of not more than $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or to both such fine and imprisonment. Whenever the Housing Expediter has reason to believe that any person is liable for punishment under this subsection, he may certify the facts to the Attorney General, who may, in his discretion, cause appropriate proceedings to be brought.

"(d) The district courts shall have jurisdiction of criminal proceedings for violations of this act, or any regulation or order issued thereunder, and concurrently with State and Territorial courts, of all other proceedings under section 205 and subsection (b) of this section. Such criminal proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred. Such other proceedings may be brought in any district in which any part of any act or transaction constituting the violation occurred, or may be brought in the district in which the defendant resides or transacts business, and process in such cases may be served in any district wherein the defendant resides or transacts business or wherever the defendant may be found. Any such court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of any criminal or other proceedings brought before it under this section. No costs shall be assessed against the Housing Expediter or the United States Government in any proceeding under this act.

"(e) No person shall be liable for damages or penalties in any Federal, State, or Territorial court, on any grounds for or in respect of anything done or omitted to be done in good faith pursuant to any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder notwithstanding that subsequently such provision, regulation, order, or requirement may be modified, rescinded, or determined to be invalid. In any suit or

action wherein a party relies for ground of relief or defense upon this act or any regulation, order, or requirement thereunder, the court having jurisdiction of such suit or action shall certify such fact to the Housing Expediter. The Housing Expediter may intervene in any such suit or action.

"(f) The principal office of the Housing Expediter shall be in the District of Columbia, but he or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of his powers in any place, and attorneys appointed by the Housing Expediter may appear for and represent the Housing Expediter in any case in any court.

"(g) The Housing Expediter is authorized to make such studies and investigations, to conduct such hearings, and to obtain such information as he deems necessary or proper to assist him in prescribing any regulation or order under this act, or in the administration and enforcement of this act and regulations thereunder.

"(h) The Housing Expediter is further authorized by regulation or order, to require any person who rents or offers for rent or acts as broker or agent for the rental of any housing accommodations, to furnish any such information under oath or affirmation or otherwise, to make and keep records and other documents and to make reports, and he may require any such person to permit the inspection and copying of records and other documents, and the inspection of defense-area housing accommodations. The Housing Expediter may administer oaths and affirmations and may, whenever necessary by subpena require any such person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents or both at any designated place.

"(i) For the purpose of obtaining any information under subsection (g), the Housing Expediter may by subpena require any other person to appear and testify or to appear and produce documents, or both, at any designated place.

"(j) The production of a person's documents at any place other than his place of business shall not be required under this section in any case in which, prior to the return date specified in the subpena issued in respect thereto, such person either has furnished the Housing Expediter with a copy of such documents (certified by such person under oath to be a true and correct copy), or has entered into a stipulation with the Housing Expediter as to the information contained in such documents.

"(k) In case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena served upon, any person referred to in subsection (i), the district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Housing Expediter, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce documents, or both; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof. The provisions of this subsection shall also apply to any person referred to in subsection (h).

"(l) Witnesses subpenaed under this section shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid witnesses in the district courts of the United States.

"(m) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirement under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (U. S. C., 1935 ed., title 49, sec. 46), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

"(n) The Housing Expediter shall not publish or disclose any information obtained under this act that such Housing Expediter deems confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless he determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

"(o) Any person subpenaed under this section shall have the right to make a record of this testimony and be represented by counsel."

SEC. 210. Section 208 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) The Housing Expediter may, subject to the civil-service laws, appoint such employees as he deems necessary in order to carry out his functions and duties under this act, as amended, and shall fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. The Housing Expediter may utilize the services of Federal, State, and local agencies and may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed. In the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Office of the Housing Expediter no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but all such appointments and promotions shall be given and made on the basis of merit and efficiency."

SEC. 211. Section 209 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 209. Whenever in the judgment of the Housing Expediter such action is necessary or proper in order to effectuate the purposes of this act, he may, by regulation or order, regulate or prohibit speculative or manipulative practices or renting or leasing practices (including practices relating to recovery of the possession) in connection with any defense-area housing accommodations, which in his judgment are equivalent to or are likely to result in rent increases inconsistent with the purposes of this act."

SEC. 212. Section 211 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 211. The provisions of this act shall be applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 213. Title II of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, is amended by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"SEC. 214. (a) At any time after the issuance of any regulation, amendment to regulation, or order under section 204, any person, including any tenant, affected by any provisions of such regulation, amendment, or order, may, in accordance with regulations to be prescribed by the Housing Expediter, file a protest specifically setting forth objections to any such provision and affidavits or other written evidence in support of such objections. Statements in support of any such regulation or order may be received and incorporated in the transcript of the proceedings at such times and in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Housing Expediter. Within a reasonable time after the filing of any protest under this subsection, but in no event more than 30 days after such filing, the Housing Expediter shall either grant or deny such protest in whole or in part, notice such protest for hearing, or provide an opportunity to present further evidence in connection therewith. In the event that the Housing Expediter denies any such protest in whole or in part, he shall inform the protestant of the grounds upon which such decision is based, and of any economic data and other facts of which the Housing Expediter has taken official notice.

"(b) In the administration of this act, the Housing Expediter may take official notice of economic data and other facts, including facts found by him as a result of action taken under subsections (g) to (m) of section 206 of this act.

"(c) Any proceedings under this section may be limited by the Housing Expediter to the filing of affidavits, or other written evidence, and the filing of briefs.

"(d) Any protest filed under this section shall be granted or denied by the Housing Expediter, or granted in part and the remainder of it denied, within a reasonable time after it is filed. Any protestant who is aggrieved by undue delay on the part of the Housing Expediter in disposing of his protest may petition the Emergency Court of Appeals for relief; and such court shall have jurisdiction by appropriate order to require the Housing Expediter to dispose of such protest within such time as may be fixed by the court. If the Housing Expediter does not act finally within the time fixed by the court, the protest shall be deemed to be denied at the expiration of that period.

"(e) Any person who is aggrieved by the denial or partial denial of his protest may, within 30 days after such denial, file a complaint with the Emergency Court of Appeals, specifying his objections and praying that the regulation or order protested be enjoined or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such complaint shall forthwith be served on the Housing Expediter, who shall certify and file with such court a transcript of such portions of the proceedings in connection with the protest as are material under the complaint. Such transcript shall include a statement setting forth, so far as practicable, the economic data and other facts of which the Housing Expediter has taken official notice. Upon the filing of such complaint the court shall have exclusive jurisdiction to set aside such regulation or order, in whole or in part, to dismiss the complaint, or to remand the proceeding: *Provided*, That the regulation or order may be modified or rescinded by the Housing Expediter at any time notwithstanding the pendency of such complaint. No objection to such regulation or order, and no evidence in support of any objection thereto, shall be considered by the court, unless such objection shall have been set forth by the complainant in the protest or such evidence shall be contained in the transcript. If application is made to the court by either party for leave to introduce additional evidence which was either offered to the Housing Expediter and not admitted, or which could not reasonably have been offered to the Housing Expediter or included by the Housing Expediter in such proceedings, and the court determines that such evidence should be admitted, the court shall order the evidence to be presented to the Housing Expediter. The Housing Expediter shall promptly receive the same, and such other evidence as he deems necessary or proper, and thereupon he shall certify and file with the court a transcript thereof and any modification made in the regulation or order as a result thereof; except that on request by the Housing Expediter, any such evidence shall be presented directly to the court.

"(f) No such regulation or order shall be enjoined or set aside, in whole or in part, unless the complainant establishes to the satisfaction of the court that the regulation or order is not in accordance with law, or is arbitrary or capricious. The effectiveness of a judgment of the court in enjoining or setting aside, in whole or in part, any such regulation or order, shall be postponed until the expiration of 30 days from the entry thereof, except that if a petition for a writ of certiorari is filed with the Supreme Court under subsection (g) within such 30 days, effectiveness of such judgment shall be postponed until an order of the Supreme Court denying such petition becomes final, or until other final disposition of the case by the Supreme Court.

"(g) Within 30 days after entry of a judgment or order, interlocutory or final, by the Emergency Court of Appeals, a petition for a writ of certiorari may be filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, and thereupon the judgment or order shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court in the same

manner as a judgment of a circuit court of appeals as provided in section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 28, sec. 347). The Supreme Court shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of all causes filed therein pursuant to this subsection. The Emergency Court of Appeals, and the Supreme Court upon review of judgments and orders of the Emergency Court of Appeals, shall have exclusive jurisdiction to determine the validity of any regulation or order issued under section 204, and of any provision of any such regulation or order. Except as provided in this section, no court, Federal, State, or Territorial, shall have jurisdiction or power to consider the validity of any such regulation or order, or to stay, restrain, enjoin, or set aside, in whole or in part, any provision of this act authorizing the issuance of such regulations or orders, or any provision of any such regulation or order, or to restrain or enjoin the enforcement of any such provision.

"(h) (1) Within 30 days after arraignment, or such additional time as the court may allow for good cause shown, in any criminal proceeding, and within 5 days after judgment in any civil or criminal proceeding, brought pursuant to section 205 or section 206 of this act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, involving alleged violation of any provision of any regulation or order issued under section 204, except a regulation or order issued in connection with any recommendation of a local advisory board, the defendant may apply to the court in which the proceeding is pending for leave to file in the Emergency Court of Appeals a complaint against the Housing Expediter setting forth objections to the validity of any provision which the defendant is alleged to have violated or conspired to violate. The court in which the proceeding is pending shall grant such leave with respect to any objection which it finds is made in good faith and with respect to which it finds there is reasonable and substantial excuse for the defendant's failure to present such objection in a protest filed in accordance with subsection (a) of this section. Upon the filing of a complaint pursuant to and within 30 days from the granting of such leave, the Emergency Court of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to enjoin or set aside in whole or in part the provision of the regulation or order complained of or to dismiss the complaint. The court may authorize the introduction of evidence, either to the Housing Expediter or directly to the court, in accordance with subsection (e) of this section. The provisions of subsections (f) and (g) of this section shall be applicable with respect to any proceeding instituted in accordance with this subsection.

"(2) In any proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 or section 206 of this act or section 37 of the Criminal Code, involving an alleged violation of any provision of any such regulation or order, the court shall stay the proceeding—

"(i) during the period within which a complaint may be filed in the Emergency Court of Appeals pursuant to leave granted under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision;

"(ii) during the pendency of any protest properly filed by the defendant under subsection (a) of this section prior to the institution of the proceeding under section 205 or section 206 of this act, or section 37 of the Criminal Code, setting forth objections to validity of such provision which the court finds to have been made in good faith; and

"(iii) during the pendency of any judicial proceeding instituted by the defendant under this section with respect to such protest or instituted by the defendant under paragraph (1) of this subsection with respect to such provision, and until the expiration of the time allowed in this section for the taking of further proceedings with respect thereto. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, stays shall be granted thereunder in civil proceedings only after judgment and upon application made within 5 days after judgment. Notwithstanding the provisions of this paragraph, in the case of a proceeding under section 206 (b) of this act, as amended, the court granting a stay under this paragraph shall issue a temporary injunction or restraining order enjoining or restraining, during the period of the stay, violations by the defendant of any provision of the regulation or order involved in the proceeding. If any provision of a regulation or order is determined to be invalid by judgment of the Emergency Court of Appeals, which has become effective in accordance with subsection (f) of this section any proceedings pending in any court shall be dismissed, and any judgment in such proceeding vacated, to the extent that such proceeding or judgment is based upon violation of such provision. Except as provided in this subsection, the pendency of any protest under subsection (a) of this section, or judicial proceeding under this section, shall not be grounds for staying any proceeding brought pursuant to section 205 or section 206 of this act or section 37 of the Criminal Code; nor except as provided in this subsection, shall any retroactive effect be given any judgment setting aside a provision of a regulation or order issued under section 204.

"SEC. 215. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to offer any housing accommodations for rent: *Provided, however,* That the Housing Expediter may provide reasonable restrictions on evictions to prevent circumvention or evasion of this act."

"SEC. 216. The provisions of this act, and all regulations, orders, and requirements thereunder, shall terminate on June 30, 1951, or upon the date of a proclamation by the President, or upon the date specified in a concurrent resolution by the two Houses of the Congress declaring that the further continuance of the authority granted by this act is not necessary in the interest of the national defense and security, whichever date is the earlier; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred, prior to such termination date, the provisions of this act and such regulations, orders, and requirements shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper suit, action, or prosecution with respect to any such right, liability, or offense."

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. If any provision of this act of the application of such provision to any person or circumstances shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the act, and the applicability of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 302. This act shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

The statement and an analysis presented by Mr. MYERS were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, ON INTRODUCING NEW RENT CONTROL BILL, JANUARY 13, 1949

I am introducing today a bill to extend rent control until June 30, 1951, and to close most of the loopholes on effective regulation opened up by action of the Eightieth Congress in 1947 and 1948.

The most unfair thing about rent control as it now operates is that numerous property owners, as a result of one or another of the provisions in the present act, have been able to get out from under rent control and to charge their tenants whatever the traffic will bear, while the great mass of landlords are held rigidly under control. The answer to this inequity is not to turn all rental property loose, but to regulate all property owners in the same way.

Although this bill will strengthen rent control materially, it is not designed to eliminate present procedures under which hundreds of thousands of landlords have been able legally to obtain individual upward rent adjustments for their properties on the basis of increased operating costs, repairs or improvements, higher taxes or utility costs, or for a variety of similar reasons.

The intent in the bill is to close the avenues to chiseling, arbitrary evictions, gray-market practices in renting vacant properties, widespread violations of the law, and other slick tricks used by a small minority of landlords whose practices seriously undermine the whole rent-control program and spread insecurity and fear among tenants.

The Republican Eightieth Congress twice enacted rent-control laws which were essentially decontrol laws. From year to year, the Republican majority in that Congress indicated that each new rent control act would probably be the last one. The continuing housing shortage demonstrates how unrealistic that approach was. Unless we are satisfied to see wholesale suffering among the American people through rent inflation, we must not only continue rent control but bring it more into line with the realities of the housing shortage.

I intend to seek early hearings by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on this legislation which, I am sure, will receive sympathetic attention from a Congress elected to put the brakes on inflation.

MAIN PROVISIONS OF BILL

In general outline, the bill would restore rent control pretty much to the status it held prior to the enactment of the 1947 and 1948 acts. It sets up the machinery to recontrol all types of housing accommodations in defense-rental areas, with the exception of motor courts and trailers or trailer spaces and of transient accommodations in hotels and tourist homes. Thus, new construction, conversions, property previously owner-occupied, permanent hotel accommodations, including the so-called apartment hotels, would be recontrolled.

Authority would be provided for the control or recontrol of any areas not now under rent control.

No new 15 percent increase leases would be permitted, but those leases now in effect would continue and properties on which such leases had been negotiated would be continued at the higher ceiling.

Authority to regulate evictions would be returned to the Federal Government. Criminal powers against violators would be restored to the expediter. Also, the right of the expediter to sue for triple damages would be restored.

The act would be continued until June 30, 1951.

Both tenants and landlords would be given the right to appeal from regulations and decisions of the Housing Expediter.

The local boards would be continued, with certain safeguards as to their degree of representativeness, but the act would make it clear that their powers are advisory only. The Housing Expediter would be required to act publicly on every recommendation of these boards and to state his reasons and supporting data for approving or rejecting such recommendations.

A national advisory committee of 15 members representing landlords, tenants, and the general public would be set up to work with and advise the Housing Expediter.

The District of Columbia, for the first time, would be covered into the national law and uniform standards would thus be set up, particularly as regards the so-called cooperatives racket.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF BILL

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the "Housing and Rent Act of 1949."

Section 2 adds a new declaration of purposes.

Section 3 provides for the continuance to June 30, 1951, of the veterans' preference provisions in section 4 of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended.

TITLE II—MAXIMUM RENTS

Section 201 repeals the declaration of policy in the present law which emphasized congressional intent to decontrol rents speedily.

Section 202 defines "controlled housing accommodations," including thereunder all types of housing accommodations in defense-rental areas except transient quarters in hotels, in tourist homes, and also any motor courts and trailers or trailer space.

Section 203 redefines "defense-rental area" in such a way as to permit once again extension of control to new areas and the recontrol of any areas which have been decontrolled.

Section 204 redefines "rent."

Section 205 adds definitions of "maximum rent," "defense-area housing accommodations," "documents," and "district court."

Section 206 provides for the delivery without reimbursement of the cabinets containing rent control records, as well as the records themselves, to local officials on the termination of national rent control.

Section 207 (a) extends the Office of the Housing Expediter to the close of June 30, 1951.

Section 207 (b) sets up standards for the establishment of maximum rents over recontrolled housing units, including due allowance, where new construction is involved, for general increases in the cost of construction; it continues present rent ceilings for housing covered by the 15-percent voluntary leases, and provides authority generally for the Expediter to set rents on any recontrolled housing which was at some time decontrolled under the 15-percent lease provision.

Section 207 (c) revises the machinery for control of new areas and decontrol of areas substantially along the lines of the original Emergency Price Control Act and further provides for the appointment of a national advisory committee composed of 15 members representative of both landlord and tenant interests and of the general public to advise and consult with the Housing Expediter under this subsection.

Section 207 (d) authorizes the issuance of regulations and adjustments to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 207 (e) applies to the local advisory boards. It sets up standards for the appointment of the members. It limits their status to an advisory one only. It limits their recommendations to matters of area decontrol, adequacy of area general rent level, and operations of local rent offices and the exercise of "such functions for educational, administrative, and compliance purposes as are delegated by the Housing Expediter." Full authority for passing on any recommendations of a local board rests with the Expediter. However, he must approve or disapprove such recommendation within a reasonable time and give a statement of the grounds upon which his decision is based and any economic data or other facts of which he has taken official notice.

Section 207 (f) extends the provisions of title II having to do with maximum rents to the close of June 30, 1951.

Section 207 (g) repeals present prohibitions against the Housing Expediter's regulating the practice of requiring security deposits from tenants.

Section 208 provides for treble damage suits to be instituted by the Housing Expediter, restoring powers which he previously held.

Section 209 provides for criminal sanctions and the use of the administrative subpena by the Housing Expediter, restoring powers which he previously held.

Section 210 provides for standards for employment in the Office of the Housing Expediter.

Section 211 restores to the Housing Expediter the power he held prior to the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 to regulate evictions.

Section 212 makes the act applicable to the several States and to the Territories and possessions of the United States and to the District of Columbia, which has had a separate law of its own since before the original Price Control Act was passed.

Section 213 provides machinery for review of regulations and orders issued by the Housing Expediter and permits tenants and landlords to appeal to the Expediter and to the Emergency Court of Appeals. (Since recommendations of local boards would be advisory only, there would no longer be automatic appeal to the Emergency Court of Appeals by any local board in case the Expediter should reject a local board recommendation. However, tenants or landlords could appeal.) Section 213 also provides that nothing in this act shall be construed to require any person to offer any housing accommodations for rent; provided, however, that the Housing Expediter may provide reasonable restrictions on evictions to prevent circumvention or evasion of this act. This section also provides that rent control can terminate earlier than June 30, 1951, if Congress should rescind the authority or upon a proclamation by the President that the continuance of this authority is not necessary in the interest of the national defense and security.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 301 is the separability clause.

Section 302 provides for the act to become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

## CLARIFICATION OF SECTION OF NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and I ask unanimous consent that a résumé of the bill, which was recommended by the Veterans' Administration, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the résumé presented by the Senator from Georgia will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 461) to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, introduced by Mr. GEORGE (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The résumé presented by Mr. GEORGE was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RÉSUMÉ OF PROPOSED BILL RECOMMENDED BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

PURPOSE OF BILL

To clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended.

To make it clear that as to insurance maturing on or after August 1, 1946, in cases where the beneficiary could not have elected to receive in a lump-sum settlement, any accrued installments on such insurance not paid to such beneficiary during his lifetime shall be paid to the estate of the insured rather than to the estate of the beneficiary.

The enactment of the proposed bill would not involve any cost and would lessen the probability of future litigation in insurance matters.

NOTE.—The present law provides payment to the estate of the insured:

(1) Where no beneficiary is designated by the insured;

(2) Where the beneficiary does not survive the insured;

(3) Where the designated beneficiary is not entitled to lump-sum payment and survives the insured, the remaining unpaid amounts go to the estate of the insured.

Under existing law payments go to the estate of the beneficiary in cases where the beneficiary is entitled to lump-sum payment, but elects some other mode of settlement and dies before receiving all benefits due and payable, the remaining unpaid amounts go to the estate of the beneficiary and not to the estate of the insured.

A comparison of the proposed bill with existing law, showing changes, is enclosed.

PORTION OF SECTION 602 (U)

[Changed language in brackets. New language in italics]

| *Present law* | *Proposed bill* |
|---|---|
| (u) * * *; and in any case in which no beneficiary is designated by the insured, or the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, or a designated beneficiary not entitled to [choose] a lump-sum settlement survives the insured, and dies before receiving all the benefits due and payable, the commuted value of the [insurance remaining unpaid] shall be paid in one sum to the estate of the insured. | (u) * * *; and in any case in which no beneficiary is designated by the insured, or the designated beneficiary does not survive the insured, or a designated beneficiary not entitled to (omits "choose") a lump-sum settlement survives the insured, and dies before receiving all the benefits due and payable, the commuted value of the *remaining unpaid insurance (whether accrued or not)* shall be paid in one sum to the estate of the insured. |

## NATIONAL HOLIDAY ON ELECTION DAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing that national election day be a national holiday, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement of the Senator from Washington will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 476) making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, in every even-numbered year, a legal holiday, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WARREN G. MAGNUSON, UNITED STATES SENATOR

NATIONAL ELECTION DAY SHOULD BE A NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Today I am introducing a bill on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Minnesota, which, if enacted, will make the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November

of every even-numbered year a legal holiday. Most of us in the United States Senate are aware of the fact this is national election day. Some of those who were Members of this body last year are also aware of that fact.

This bill, which I hope to see enacted in this first session of the Eighty-first Congress, should have the support of every Senator, Congressman, and citizen who believes in representative government and the democratic process.

July 4 has been designated as Independence Day—to commemorate the vision and achievements of that band of patriots whose action brought forth upon this continent a new Nation. This is as it should be. But certainly the day most closely associated—by concept and purpose—with Independence Day is election day.

At the ballot box every 2 years the electorate of this Nation have the opportunity to exercise the prerogative of a free people. Cumulatively their decisions, on men and issues, determine the social and political course of this Nation. It is regrettable that decisions of such vital import to the people of the United States are made by such a small percentage of eligible voters.

In 1940 there were 83,789,000 civilians of voting age in the United States. Only 49,820,000—59 percent—voted for Presidential electors. In the election just passed, 93,704,000 citizens were eligible to go to the ballot box. Only 48,680,000—52 percent—did so. In the 1900 Presidential election 74 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls. Nineteen hundred and forty and 1948 were Presidential years. In 1946 only 38 percent of the eligibles participated in the congressional elections.

From my own experience and observation I am convinced many more citizens would have gone to the polls if November 2 had been a legal holiday. Parenthetically, I do not think a heavier vote in November would have produced a change in tenancy at the White House. Nevertheless, many workers find it extremely difficult—if not impossible—to work an 8-hour shift and return to their precincts in time to vote.

Some people will argue that if the voting privilege means as much to Americans as it should, citizens will find a way to cast their ballots. There is some point to the argument. However, there is no doubt in my mind, participation in congressional and Presidential elections will be significantly increased if election day becomes a legal holiday.

All the Fourth of July means to our people finds its chance for expression on election day. I propose, therefore, that we—the elected representatives of the people—acting for the people, dedicate that day to the lofty concepts upon which this Nation is founded. Those concepts, with all the benefits emanating therefrom, will be preserved and increasingly activated, so long as free people exercise their free choice for men and issues at the ballot box.

## EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT—SPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, a group of Senators have joined in the introduction of a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution which is popularly known as the equal rights amendment. As Senators know, legislation dealing with this subject has been introduced in various Congresses, and has achieved certain progress, but has never passed the Congress for submission to the States.

The following Senators are joined in the introduction of the measure: The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

On behalf of these cosponsors and myself I send the joint resolution to the desk for introduction and appropriate reference.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, introduced by Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. CAIN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. BROUGHTON, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. KERR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. FREAR, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. LANGER, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. REED, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MILLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. MALONE, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## THE FREEDOM TRAIN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States. A brief statement has been prepared which may be of some benefit to the committee when this measure is considered, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Illinois will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. LUCAS (for himself and Mr. WHERRY), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. LUCAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR LUCAS

### THE FREEDOM TRAIN

The attached interim report of the president of the American Heritage Foundation to the board of trustees of the foundation, dated November 4, 1948, sets out the facts concerning the Freedom Train.

The American Heritage Foundation is a private charitable corporation organized to carry out a plan conceived by the Attorney General of the United States to make available to the people of the country the opportunity to see the documents which constitute milestones in the history of our country.

The original plan was that the foundation would underwrite the operation of the train for 13 months from September 17, 1947. Because of the tremendous demand for the train, sponsorship of it by the foundation was extended, first, to January 1, 1949, and now, finally, to January 22, 1949. The foundation desires now to terminate its sponsorship.

However, tremendous demand for continuance of the train's tour still exists. As of a recent date the train had visited 350 cities in the United States. To carry out the purpose of giving opportunity to view the documents aboard the train to all sections of the country, it was possible usually for the train to stop only 1 day in each city. Approximately 45,000,000 people have participated in ceremonies relating to the train. However, because of the physical limitations on the number of people who can pass through the train in a given time, only 4,500,000 have actually seen the documents aboard the train and countless millions had to be turned away disappointed.

It appears that there is a large amount of sentiment in the Congress for the continuance by the Government of the tour of the train. Congressmen MCCORMACK and MARTIN of Massachusetts have introduced a bill for this purpose (H. J. Res. 84). Preliminary inquiries indicate that if the Government desires to continue operation of the Freedom Train the American Heritage Foundation will turn over to it, free of charge, the equipment, of very considerable value, which the foundation assembled for storage and display of the documents. No negotiations have yet been had with respect to use by the Government of equipment and facilities not owned by the American Heritage Foundation.

The train is made up of an engine and seven cars. The engine, a Diesel electric, has been loaned, with fuel and crews, by the American Locomotive Co. and the General Electric Co. The three cars presently containing the documents are owned by the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. but were transformed into museum cars at very considerable expense by the American Heritage Foundation. It had been indicated that the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. will be willing to sell these cars to the Government at their second-hand value when they were delivered to the American Heritage Foundation. An additional car, containing humidifying, firefighting, and similar equipment, has been loaned by the Santa Fe Railroad, and three pullman cars for accommodation of the crews, the guard of honor, and other personnel aboard the train have been rented from the Pullman Co. It is believed that there will be no difficulty about continuing arrangements appropriate to retaining the last four mentioned cars. All units of the Freedom Train are, of course, especially painted.

Approximately 80 percent of the documents aboard the Freedom Train are owned by the Government. The majority of these come from the National Archives, the rest from the Library of Congress. The other documents, 20 percent of the total, have been

loaned by private owners. The Archivist and the Librarian of Congress favor the continued operation of the train, because of its tremendous educational value, and they have agreed, as has the Attorney General, that the Archivist is the logical person to continue operation of the train if its operation is taken over by the Government. It is believed that the owners of private documents will be glad to continue their loan for continued exhibition.

Preliminary estimates indicate that acquisition of the train and its operation by the Government until June 30, 1950, will cost between $2,000,000 and $2,500,000.

### UTILIZATION OF GERMAN AND JAPANESE INVENTIONS, ETC.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 27), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*Resolved,* That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete inquiry for the purpose of determining the best method, in the interests of our interstate and foreign commerce and particularly of American consumers and small business, of disseminating information with respect to, and promoting the utilization of, those inventions, discoveries, and copyrighted works which have come into the possession of the Department of Commerce as a result of the examination of German and Japanese Government archives.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself, I submit a resolution asking for an appropriation to complete the payment of all salaries and terminal leave for the employees of the Small Business Committee, which committee expires by the terms of a Senate resolution, on January 31, and I ask for its appropriate reference.

The resolution (S. Res. 28), submitted by Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY), was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, created by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947, and extended by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, agreed to March 15, 1948, and Senate Resolution 280, Eightieth Congress, agreed to December 31, 1948, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $12,668.24 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL-BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 29), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*Resolved,* That a special committee consisting of 12 Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is hereby authorized and directed to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small-business enterprises, obtaining all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation. The committee shall begin its study and research survey as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study and research survey expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings; to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-first Congress; to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants; to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government; to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; and to take such testimony and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $ , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. The special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1948, as extended and supplemented, is hereby terminated as of January 31, 1949: *Provided,* That the authority of such special committee to hold hearings and conduct investigations shall terminate on the date this resolution is agreed to.

### INVESTIGATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER COMMODITIES

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 31), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*Resolved,* That the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of prices of agricultural and other commodities with a view to ascertaining the causes for unreasonably large spreads between prices received by farmers, manufacturers, and other producers and prices paid by ultimate consumers.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than June 30, 1949.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $20,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

### DECENTRALIZATION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire to submit a resolution. I should like to read it into the RECORD and then make a few remarks about it. The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to possible methods by which the Department of National Defense may be further decentralized and the activities of the Department transferred to field offices for purposes of greater national security, economy, efficiency, and a better and more expeditious handling of the problems of the Nation's armed services.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than 6 months from the date of this resolution's adoption the result of the study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

Mr. President, the resolution I am submitting directs the Senate Armed Services Committee to make a full and complete study of ways and means of decentralizing the National Defense Department, and report back to the Senate in 6 months.

The problem of all the world is how best to make each nation more adequate to meet the challenges of the present and the future. This resolution is similar to Senate Resolution 136, which I submitted in the Eightieth Congress, for the purpose of securing a similar study by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on ways and means of decentralizing the Department of Agriculture. At that time I stated in substance that the Department of Agriculture needed to be decentralized for very apparent reasons. Here on the east coast we are trying to prescribe the medicine for agricultural districts all over the Nation. I am still vitally interested in securing a dispersion to field offices of our overcentralized agricultural organization. However, it is quite obvious that our primary need is for decentralization of our vastly overcentralized Military, Naval, and Air Force Establishments from the Pentagon Building across the river, and from other jammed buildings throughout this congested city.

I need not call attention to what happened in Japan because of one bomb. I need not call attention to what could happen here, so far as concerns the Nation being totally put out of business if its heart in the armed services and in the legislative and executive services were blown to smithereens.

There is no need to become agitated over what I am saying. But, Mr. President, I am seriously concerned. We are in the habit of believing that a New York doctor can prescribe for a sick patient in one of the Dakotas. I think it was clearly demonstrated in the last election that that could not be done. I am satisfied that it cannot be done in connection with some other things.

It is necessary that we get away from petty considerations and realize that we are living in a world in which New York City could be blotted out by one bomb. The same statement applies to the Capital of our country. If in this city is located the heart of the defense of the Nation, it is more than important that the legislative branch begin to think in terms of today, and not in terms of yesterday or 10 years ago.

I need not point out that a recent newspaper item purported to describe an incident which occurred on the shores of the Caspian Sea. The item was undoubtedly authentic. A great explosion occurred. It was recorded by the seismograph, or whatever other instruments Georgetown University and other universities throughout the country have. The intelligence branch of the Government went into action and ascertained that it was not an earthquake. We need not surmise as to what happened. It undoubtedly was an experimentation with fission. The result was the destruction of life and property. Russia is moving ahead.

I need not call attention to the fact that on the shores of the Mediterranean there is a possible volcano. The same situation prevails in China and in many other places. If that be true, are we going to proceed on the theory that we are sufficient if we adopt the ways and means of yesterday? No, Mr. President.

The first step is the decentralization of our thinking. The next step is the decentralization of the brains which unite the great organization which we call the National Defense Department. That Department is centralized in Washington. Time and time again I have pointed out that a single atomic bomb hitting Washington could with one blow blast the very brain and central nervous system and the heart of our entire national security organization. For many long months I have been in contact with the National Security Resources Board, the Department of Defense, and other officials in our Government regarding this suicidal military overcentralization. We have heard promises of dispersion of some of the central organization, but those promises mean as little to me as they must mean to the Soviet high command, which undoubtedly recognizes that America would be a sucker for an atomic punch against the Pentagon. I recognize the tremendous administrative problems involved in decentralization; but when has America ever hesitated to meet, head on, problems of this character, problems which go to the safety and the future of our Nation?

Obviously, dispersing our security setup cannot be accomplished overnight, but it should be begun at the earliest possible date. As civilians, I am sure that no Member of the Senate, including myself, would want the Defense Department to breach any security regulations by telling to what extent secret plans already have been made for decentralization. At the same time, as civilians, we have the right to know of those plans which can be made a matter of public information. There are all sorts of rumors of secret master plans and super plans to disperse central military headquarters from Washington; but, from the look of things, those plans will not go into operation until Washington is decentralized by an atomic bomb blasting this city to rubble.

I yield to no one in my love and admiration of this Capital City, but I do not want to see it become a death trap for a million people or for 148,000,000 people who look to our military chiefs for adequate security.

Mr. President, in the days which lie ahead, our time will be taken with a great many small matters, relatively speaking; and we shall be overlooking the big problem. We shall be thinking that we can deal with Russia—and I hope to God we can; but in this world there are 3,200,000,000 human beings, and there are less than 300,000,000 of us who think in terms of personal liberty and the American way of life. We can make all the arrangements and agreements we want to make; but the Kaiser's idea of a treaty as being merely a scrap of paper is still the order of the day, except insofar as we have dealings, for we keep faith. However, on the commercial basis, Mr. President, and on the political basis there is but one power, and that is the power of force and foresight and ingenuity and invention that will determine the course of human beings for centuries to come. The millennium is not just around the corner, so we had better decentralize.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me ask whether it would be better to have the resolution require a report within 4 months. Six months will be about the 15th of July.

Mr. WILEY. In the resolution I used the words "at least."

Mr. LANGER. I wonder if the Senator would mind amending the resolution so as to provide for a report within 4 months.

Mr. WILEY. I shall be glad to accept that amendment.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) as modified was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to possible methods by which the Department of National Defense may be further decentralized and the activities of the Department transferred to field offices for purposes of greater national security, economy, efficiency, and a better and more expeditious handling of the problems of the Nation's armed services.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate not later than 4 months from the date of this resolution's adoption the result of the study and investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

### THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Senator HENDRICKSON commenting on the President's state of the Union message, which appears in the Appendix.]

### COMPENSATION OF HIGHER FEDERAL OFFICIALS — ARTICLE BY SENATOR O'CONOR

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "We've Got To Pay More for Leadership," written by Senator O'CONOR, and published in the American Magazine for January 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ITALIAN COLONIES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him on the subject of Italian colonies, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE AMERICAN AIR FORCE—TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BARKLEY—ADDRESS BY W. STUART SYMINGTON

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, at the Town Hall dinner honoring Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice-President-elect, on December 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

### POLICIES OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Defense, dated January 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### AMERICA, THE LAST HOPE OF MANKIND—ADDRESS BY DANIEL L. MARSH

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Last Hope of Mankind Rests With Us," by Daniel L. Marsh, president of Boston University, which appears in the Appendix.]

### AMERICAN BUSINESS AND EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY FRANK W. ABRAMS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "How Can American Business Help American Education?" delivered by Frank W. Abrams, chairman of the board of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, to the thirty-fifth annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges on January 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES—LETTER BY HAMILTON FISH

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated December 23, 1948, addressed by Hamilton Fish to President Truman, which appears in the Appendix.]

### SOME ENDURING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE LINCOLN ADMINISTRATION—ESSAY BY J. DUANE SQUIRES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an essay on the subject, Some Enduring Achievements of the Lincoln Administration, 1861–65, by J. Duane Squires, professor of the department of social studies at Colby Junior College, New London, N. H., which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON NEWS

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Beyond Safe Limits," from the Washington News of January 11, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BRITISH AID TO EGYPT—ARTICLE BY GENE CURRIVAN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Gene Currivan from the New York Times of January 10, 1949, relating to British arms delivery to Egypt, which appears in the Appendix.]

REASONS FOR THE RECENT ELECTION RESULTS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Why It Happened," published in the El Paso Herald Post of November 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

CASH VALUE OF THE DISPLACED PERSONS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA BULLETIN

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cash Value of the DP's," published in the Philadelphia Bulletin for January 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS—EDITORIAL FROM RICHMOND (IND.) PALLADIUM-ITEM

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Just As We Expected," published in a recent issue of the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

ECA DOUBLE-CROSS—EDITORIAL FROM SOUTH BEND (IND.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "ECA Double-Cross," published in the South Bend Tribune of December 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NO UMT ACTION?—EDITORIAL FROM SOUTH BEND (IND.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No UMT Action?" published in the South Bend Tribune of December 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MAN WHO FIGHTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ARKANSAS GAZETTE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Man Who Fights," published in the Arkansas Gazette, Little Rock, Ark., for November 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRUMAN DEMOCRATIC VICTORY—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM AGE-HERALD

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stupendous Surprise," published in the Birmingham Age-Herald of November 4, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW CRISIS IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The New Crisis in the Republican Party," delivered by him on Saturday, December 4, 1948, to the Young Republicans Convention at Salem, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE—NOTICE OF HEARINGS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, a moment ago the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] referred to the question of limitation of debate in the Senate, and I said that hearings would soon be held by the committee on the subject. I now announce that the Committee on Rules and Administration decided yesterday to begin hearings on the several resolutions which have been submitted with respect to the limitation of debate in the Senate, at 10:30 on Monday, January 24. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] was the first to request the hearings, and we will hear him first. Other Senators are invited to appear if they so desire.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona a moment ago inquired of me whether I could indicate on what day certain the change with respect to the Senate rule would be made. I call his attention to the fact that when the President presented a very formidable program, including this particular matter, last summer to us at the so-called turnip session, he advised us that 15 days should be ample to accomplish the entire program. So I hope members of the committee will have the President's admonition very much in mind in considering the subject of limitation of debate, and all the rest of the program which we now have before the Congress.

Mr. HAYDEN. This particular matter was not mentioned by the President.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think Members of the Senate should be under no delusion that before we accomplish anything respecting civil rights we will have to do something about filibusters.

INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 103.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will that motion require unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will not. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that all that is required is a majority vote. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Morning business has been concluded, has it not?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has.

Mr. WHERRY. Is not the motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Not in the morning hour.

The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill, S. 103, to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may present an amendment at this time, in order that the amendment may be before the Senate, before the Senator proceeds with his address?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I send to the desk an amendment to the bill and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after line 15 on page 3 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall become effective at noon on January 20, 1949.

It is proposed to amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 103.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may submit an amendment?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, after the period in line 2, it is proposed to insert a new sentence, as follows:

In determining the amount to be deducted from the compensation of any official whose salary is determined under this act for the purposes of section 3 (a) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and in computing the amount of any annuity under such act, any increase in compensation provided by this act shall be disregarded until further action of the Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 103.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the legislation embodied in Senate bill 103 now before the Senate is of greatest importance to all the people of the United States. If the Congress acts favorably on this bill it will be the first time in the

history of our country that comprehensive action has been taken to consider and evaluate the salaries of the men we hold responsible for the day-to-day management of our governmental agencies.

The first section of the bill would increase the salary of the President to $100,000 and provide him with an additional expense allowance of $50,000 a year. It would also increase the salaries of the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to $30,000 each and provide these officials with expense allowances of $10,000 a year.

Section 2 of the bill would increase the compensation of Cabinet members to $25,000 a year.

Sections 3, 4, and 5 would increase the rates of compensation of heads of independent agencies, members of independent boards and commissions, and certain White House officials to $22,500, $20,000, and $17,500, upon the basis of their respective responsibilities. The positions covered and the salaries to be paid are specifically set forth in the bill.

Section 8 of the bill corrects certain inequities resulting from the exclusion from the provisions of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 of employees of the District of Columbia municipal government and certain employees in the Foreign Service by granting to such employees the $330 increase provided by that act for Government employees generally.

The bill under consideration has been developed after more than 1½ years' study by a subcommittee composed of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and the junior Senator from Maryland, appointed by the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in July 1947.

The subcommittee has made a very thorough study of the problem. It began by taking a complete inventory of all positions in the Government paying $9,975 and above. There are approximately 3,000 positions in that category in the Government, including the 223 covered by Senate bill 103. All available information was assembled concerning these three thousand-odd positions: the salary rate for each position, how the salaries are fixed, how appointments to the positions are made, and when the salary rate was established. This information was tabulated in various ways to give the subcommittee an opportunity to study and compare the positions individually, by groups and by agencies. These data were studied by the subcommittee to determine how the salaries should be fixed for these top-level positions, and what rates would be a fair compensation for the heavy responsibilities carried by the men in such positions.

Following its consideration of the matter in the spring of 1948, the subcommittee submitted its recommendations to the entire Senate Committee on Civil Service. The committee then gave attention to the subject matter and reported favorably a bill, S. 1537, Eightieth Congress, but insufficient time was left for the discussion of the matter in the Senate and the portion of the bill relating to the top-bracket officials was deleted when the measure was passed.

After months of study the subcommittee held hearings on a proposed redraft of a bill. The President's views were expressed in these hearings regarding the pay of positions in the bill, other than his own, the Vice President's and that of the Speaker of the House. Also, the subcommittee heard former President Hoover, Mr. John Stevenson, president of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Robert Ramspeck, former long-time Member of Congress, now vice president of the Air Transport Association; Arthur Flemming, former Civil Service Commissioner, now president of Ohio Wesleyan University; and representatives of Federal employee groups.

Before testifying for the President in favor of the bill, the Director of the Budget circulated the draft of the bill prepared by the subcommittee to all agencies in the executive branch with the request that they express their views in writing concerning the provisions contained therein.

Each of these agency replies was carefully considered in relation to the organizational structure of the executive branch, and, where possible within the framework approved by the President, their suggestions were incorporated.

Therefore, S. 103 as introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] represents the best judgment of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of representatives of the executive branch, the Hoover Commission, competent persons from private industry, and representatives of the employee organizations.

On January 20 a new presidential term will begin. Because of this fact it is of utmost importance that this legislation be enacted. Two factors control the necessity for immediate action. First, unless the salaries of the President and Vice President are acted upon before January 20, the Constitution would prevent this act from becoming operative for the duration of the term of office upon which they will enter on that day. Second, the men and women in the positions covered in the bill include the executives with whom the President must surround himself to carry out his tremendous task of managing the Government programs approved by the Congress.

To secure for the Government the services of the best management talent available for these positions, the President must be able to compete with private enterprise and to offer opportunities for public service without at the same time asking that too great personal sacrifices be made. To do this he must be in a position to offer them fair salaries. Fair salaries will attract good men, and good men are needed in our Government. Unfortunately too many capable officials have been forced to leave the Government service because of insufficient compensation. After acquiring valuable experience and knowledge in Government posts, they have been compelled to accept better paying positions with private concerns.

Because of the action taken by Congress in recent years to increase salaries at the lower levels, the salaries which the President can offer top officials today are in many instances lower than those of subordinates whose work they will be guiding and supervising. This is an unsound condition which would not be tolerated in any private business. It is a situation which the Congress must correct immediately if opportunity is to be afforded to the President to secure the most capable executives and improve the management of our agencies.

I submit, Mr. President, that the Congress should act forthwith to correct this intolerable situation, and to increase the efficiency of governmental processes. Certainly the best available talent must be attracted to public service if the President is to be assisted in carrying out the tremendous tasks which confront him as he begins his new term.

The salaries of the key positions in our Government are today out of line in comparison to the responsibilities attached to them. They bear no relationship to each other and certainly have no rational relationship to the salaries paid for subordinate positions, when the salaries for many subordinate positions are higher than those paid the agency head. This situation has been brought about because of the fact that before Senate bill 1537 was introduced in the last Congress, relating to the positions now covered in Senate bill 103, the Congress had never given consideration to the problem of the salaries for the heads of agencies, except on a piecemeal basis. Actually, the rates of pay for these positions have in practically every case been considered and fixed individually.

Under these circumstances, no study could be made of the relationships between them, and none was made. Consequently, we have subordinate positions paying salaries as high as $15,000 in agencies where the men responsible for the entire agencies' operations are receiving $10,000. There are also instances where certain subordinate positions have been taken out of the Classification Act pay scale, and the salary fixed by statute at several thousand dollars above the rate paid for other comparable positions under the Classification Act, and above the rates for positions as agency heads.

In any sensibly operated organization, whether it be public or private, the rates of pay for the positions making up the organization should reflect the relative responsibility of the position. Senate bill 103 represents the first comprehensive effort to accomplish this simple principle of management in the Federal Government. It is a most important step. It will bring order into a salary structure which Congress has allowed to get badly out of adjustment. It will establish fair salaries for these important positions in the Government, and will provide the President a much-needed asset. Moreover, it will provide a benchmark and guide to the Congress in fixing the salaries for subordinate positions.

It became apparent to the subcommittee studying the problem of top-level

salaries that in determining what positions the bill should cover, there was only one clear distinction that could be drawn among the 3,000 positions which are compensated at $9,975 and above. That is the distinction between positions as the heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies, and the positions subordinate to them. Every conceivable combination was considered; and in every case it became apparent that in order to be absolutely fair in the judgments applied, the distinction between positions as the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies and subordinate positions was the only one that could possibly be made on a sound basis by the Congress.

The committee is of the definite opinion that this bill does not cover all the top-rank positions, the salaries of which should be readjusted. Furthermore, it emphasized the fact that this is but one step in what should be a comprehensive effort to correct the inequities throughout the governmental service. Included among the very important posts which the committee feels should be the subject of further correction and increase are those of Administrator of Rural Electrification Administration, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Commissioner of Public Roads, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, among others. The salaries paid for these positions are admittedly too low, and should be raised at the earliest possible date. However, in the opinion of the subcommittee and the others who have studied this problem, the salaries of these positions should be fixed under the provisions of the Classification Act, as is now the case for the majority of them.

Therefore, it was the recommendation of the subcommittee that the Classification Act salary scales be revised early in this session of Congress. Any revision of that act should provide a maximum salary which would be sufficient to increase the salaries of the bureau chiefs and the heads of subordinate agencies to a realistic level and place them in their proper relationship with the positions covered in the bill now under consideration.

Senate bill 103, if enacted, will be the first step in a program which will bring about a realistic and well-balanced structure for the Federal Government from the top to the bottom. With its enactment, the endless confusion and argument as to what should be the proper level for the top management positions in the Government will be resolved.

It will make possible early consideration of the proper pay scales for subordinate positions, without extended committee discussions which otherwise might develop.

Such discussions might well result in the failure of the Congress to take action at this session on this highly important matter. If Senate bill 103 is not enacted by the Congress and if early action is not taken to revise the Classification Act so as to make higher salaries possible for persons in subordinate positions, other capable men can be expected to leave the Government service; and at the present low salaries their replacement with well-qualified men will be, as the President has found in many cases in the past, almost an impossible task.

The simple fact that the salaries of many of the men filling subordinate bureau-head and other positions are at present higher than that of the head of the agency in which they are employed is proof that the salaries of their positions have been increased to some degree without any consideration of the salaries of their superiors.

Again it can be emphasized that after exhaustive study of this problem, our subcommittee, in considering the three-thousand-odd positions at $9,975 and above, concluded, first, that there was only one clear line of demarcation that could be fairly drawn, namely, the line between the heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies and subordinate positions; secondly, that positions immediately below the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies should be paid under the salary scales of the Classification Act; and, third, that the salaries of practically the entire group of 3,000 are too low to allow the Government to secure and keep top management talent in these positions.

Mr. President, great importance was attached to the authorization for the appointment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Considerable funds have been expended in the study of this Commission under the able leadership of the former President of the United States, Mr. Herbert Hoover. This bill has the unqualified endorsement of that Commission. Mr. Hoover himself testified in favor of this bill. Mr. John Stevenson, president of Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., and chairman of the Hoover Commission task force on Federal Personnel Management; Arthur Flemming, former Civil Service Commissioner, now president of Ohio Wesleyan University, and member of the Hoover Commission; and Robert Ramspeck, executive vice president of the Air Transport Association, and former chairman of the House Committee on Civil Service, all supported the purpose of the bill and the proposed salary rates contained in it.

All of these men stated that they believed the Government must pay more adequate salaries for its top-management positions in order to attract and retain the services of competent persons for these jobs. The importance of having capable men in these positions was greatly stressed by every witness before the committee. The representatives of the employee organizations were 100 percent in favor of immediate enactment of this bill.

They are aware of, and stressed the importance of, having competent men in these positions as well as the imperative need for immediate action to raise the salaries for the positions involved. While they recognize that the bill does not include the positions of subordinate officials, they believe the increases provided in this bill will make early action possible to adjust those other salaries and put them in their proper relationship to the salaries of the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies.

Finally, Mr. President, the cost of the provisions of the bill which would increase the salaries of the heads and assistant heads of the departments and agencies will be $1,600,000 a year. That is a relatively small cost for the benefits which will accrue to the Government as a result of the enactment of this legislation.

In conclusion, I wish to refer briefly to a portion of the letter transmitted to the President pro tempore of the Senate by the President of the United States, from which I read as follows:

That bill—

Referring to S. 103—

establishes a salary range of from $17,500 to $25,000 for the officials in question. These provisions are in accordance with recommendations made to the subcommittee by the administration. I urge their passage in their present form. Questions concerning the compensation of Federal officers and employees not included in this bill should not be permitted to impede or delay its passage, but should be considered separately at an early date.

The letter from the President of the United States to the President pro tempore continues:

On January 20, a new Presidential term will begin. During that term the executive branch of the Government will be called upon to bear responsibilities of great magnitude. Prompt action on this bill is of great importance to me in strengthening the management of the executive branch to meet those responsibilities. Its small cost will be repaid many times. I ask the Congress to give me the means which will make it possible for me to get and keep the men who are required for the job ahead.

I hope that this legislation will be enacted into law immediately.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I invite the Senator's attention to section 105 of the United States Code, and I ask whether the Senator will state how many assistants the President is going to have?

Mr. O'CONOR. Eleven.

Mr. LANGER. I now call the Senator's attention to lines 16 and 17, on page 4 of the bill, reading as follows:

Two at rates not exceeding $22,500 per annum, three at rates not exceeding $20,000 per annum, and seven at rates not exceeding $17,500 per annum.

Do not those three items, "2," "3," and "7," total 12?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is very true.

In answer to the question of the Senator from North Dakota, with respect to secretaries, as I have stated, there is in addition one other secretary of the Executive, the Secretary of the National Security Council, who is included in the category to which the Senator from North Dakota refers. Eleven is the correct answer as to the number of secretaries.

Mr. LANGER. How many does the Chief Executive have at the present time?

Mr. O'CONOR. Eleven.

Mr. LANGER. That is, now?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct. In other words, the bill does not create any new positions. Its primary purpose is to determine the proper pay for the positions already created.

Mr. LANGER, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Chair.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland has concluded, I should like to have the floor in my own right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the pending subject has been before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in some form or other for approximately 8 years. The entire matter of salaries for Federal employees has been considered repeatedly. The Senate and the country as a whole owe a great debt to the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] for the very complete and detailed study he made of the matter while a member of the committee, as chairman of a subcommittee appointed by former Senator Mead, of New York, when he was acting chairman of the committee, which appointment, I believe, was confirmed by the distinguished President pro tempore now occupying the chair, and which was later confirmed by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. A very careful study was made. Finally the Byrd-Langer amendment was agreed to, which provided that within practically every department a certain number of persons should be removed from the Federal pay roll. Enforcement was left to the Bureau of the Budget so that the number of persons on the Federal pay roll could be reduced. Immediately after the war there were approximately 3,000,000 employees on the Federal pay roll. The Byrd-Langer amendment was enforced, but, as every Senator knows, legislation was subsequently enacted particularly exempting new employees from its provisions. The result was, for example, that some 250,000 employees were added by the Veterans' Administration alone. Employees were added by the Atomic Energy Commission. The distinguished Senator from Virginia has repeatedly drawn the attention of the Senate to the fact that the number of Federal employees has not been decreasing so rapidly as we might desire.

As the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland stated a few moments ago, in July 1947, I, as chairman of the committee, appointed a subcommittee consisting of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. Bear in mind that was in July 1947. I am sure all the senior Members of the Senate are familiar with the fact that in the month of June 1948 our committee, upon recommendation of a subcommittee, reported a pay-increase bill. The bill was amended on the floor upon motion of the distinguished Senator from Virginia. Certain of the top-flight salaries were eliminated through the action of the Senate. Immediately thereafter we again took up the matter of pay increases for various Federal employees. The distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] raised a question with respect to employees within the District of Columbia. The committee refused to report the bill for a pay increase to those employees unless a District sales tax were enacted. Certain Senators who were opposed to the sales tax fought the measure, with the result that when the Congress adjourned nothing had been accomplished for those employees.

Today, Mr. President, we face a very peculiar situation. My friend on the opposite side of the aisle, for whom I have the most affectionate regard, knows that, as a member of the committee, I was in a hopeless minority of 1 against 10. I alone opposed the passage of the measure in its present form. I was astounded at that time, as I was astounded this morning, to have the distinguished Senator from Maryland quote as a great authority, as the man who says the bill should be passed, a former President, Herbert Hoover, now head of the Hoover Commission. My mind goes back to a time only a few years ago when I heard certain of the same distinguished gentlemen, who the other day quoted with approval Mr. Hoover at our committee meeting, say that everything Herbert Hoover did was wrong. They made fun of him and ridiculed him. Now it is said to be a great tribute to Herbert Hoover, when the very Senators who a few years ago ridiculed him now rise on the Senate floor, as did the junior Senator from Maryland, and say the bill should be passed because Herbert Hoover, that great authority, said it should be passed because he had made an investigation of the subject and found the legislation was desirable.

Mr. President, so far as the study mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Maryland is concerned, I call attention to the fact that last June some of the members of the Bureau of the Budget were called before the committee and were asked how long a time would be required to draw up a bill which would include the heads of bureaus and departments. Mr. Winslow at that time stated that it would take between 6 and 7 months. We come back today, and what do we find? Under this bill, if it be passed, the head of the Rural Electrification Administration, a man who passes on millions of dollars worth of contracts, is omitted from the suggested salary increase; he is not to receive an increase. The head of the Bureau of Immigration, which has charge of 6,000,000 aliens, and which has charge at this time of deportation proceedings in 12,000 cases—the man whose duty it is to keep Communists out of this country—is excluded from the proposed salary increase. The head of the Bureau of Internal Revenue is excluded, as are all the other officials named a few moments ago by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. It is said that they will be taken care of some time in the dim and distant future; it may be within 2 years or 3 years. Who says that, Mr. President? I have here the report of the subcommittee, and I wish to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Maryland to page 13 thereof, on which it is stated that an effort will be made to accomplish it in the near future, possibly at this session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I submit that the subcommittee has not made a thorough study of the subject. I submit, on the contrary, that the report states that there are 3,107 positions in the executive branch and certain other agencies receiving annual salaries of $9,975; but less than 300 positions are covered by the bill.

Mr. O'CONOR. The number as previously stated by me is 223.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, out of the 3,107 the committee has picked out 223. It does not make any difference how honorable and fine is the record of the head of the REA or the head of the FBI. They are excluded. The report says that it is not sure whether their case will be taken up this year.

One of the reasons for passing this bill, it is said, is that it will improve morale. Maybe it would improve morale in the particular departments affected, but I submit that in 2,700 other places the morale, instead of being improved, would be lowered, because of the fact that men who do no more work, in some instances, and much less important work, in some instances, suddenly have their salaries increased, while other salaries are left at $10,000. That is certainly not the way to improve morale.

Mr. President, an Assistant Attorney General will have his salary increased to $22,500, under this bill. But Mr. Hoover, who is head of the FBI and who employs as many as 10,000 agents, will have his salary remain at $10,000.

I again refer, Mr. President, to the Commissioner of Immigration. In my judgment there is no more important job than is his. He is omitted from the salary increase. His salary will be left at the sum of $10,000.

Mr. President, both the Republican platform and the Democratic platform pledged economy. We went before the people, both the Republicans and the Democrats, and said we would economize. Yet here is bill No. 1, Mr. President, to raise the salaries of 223 Government employees, from the President down, as the first action of the majority party toward economy.

When I inquired in the committee meeting I was told that it was an action for economy, because those 223 employees affected will do much better work when they receive more salary; their morale will increase. I submit, Mr. President, that when 2,700 other officials are omitted, we have the very kind of piecemeal legislation which the distinguished Senator from Maryland said a few moments ago had been in effect for many years. As a matter of fact, the subcommittee was appointed to take care of all the Federal employees at one time.

Mr. President, I take issue with the expressions in the majority report of the Senate Committee on Post Office and

Civil Service, entitled "Compensation of Top Government Officials." My reasons are as follows:

The President of the United States unwittingly is being made an example of the need for adjusting the compensation of salaries of top Government officials. Considerable has been said on the necessity for adjusting the President's personal expense account, although the subcommittee was silent on the entire matter of the President's salary during the Eightieth Congress. I object to any means of putting the President in the position of having to draw the load of pulling several hundred high-placed officials into even more lucrative salaries without first calling attention to the actual facts.

What are the facts, Mr. President? We do not find them in the report of the subcommittee. There is nothing in the report stating the amount of the President's personal expense allowance. I want to set the record straight by stating that, although I find nothing in the report stating just what the President's personal expense allowance is today, today's figure actually is $40,000 and not the popularly supposed $25,000 so often referred to. As recently as 1946, the $25,000 figure was raised to $40,000; nor need the President account in any way except by voucher for the expenses so authorized. This, of course, is as it should be considering his exalted office.

The majority views of the committee have not explained to the Senate that, although the President is authorized to have an entertainment and travel fund for his personal account of not less than $40,000, during the 2 years such authorization has existed he has not used this amount, despite the national campaign intervening. For the fiscal year 1948 the President used only $32,039 of the $40,000 granted. Therefore, there has been no demonstration of the need for increasing this personal, tax-free expense account.

So far as the salary of the President is concerned, I find no reason for failing to adjust the figure from $75,000 to $150,000, if the majority so desires, although it should still be noted that there is no provision for changing the language as today expressed, which says the salary should be "in full."

It is possible the committee majority does not intend to set $90,000 as the actual figure, but the amount of the allowance is not freely discussed in the report.

I call attention further to the fact that, inasmuch as there is no conflict in language between S. 103 and section 42, title 3, of the United States Code, we are entitled to assume that the President shall receive in full for his services the amount so provided in the bill, $100,000, as salary. This means that if the Bureau of Internal Revenue sees fit it may rule that the President may receive this salary "in full," which can have no connotation other than that there shall be no tax levied on the remuneration.

In the Congress' zeal to be fair to men in high office, it must not lose its sense of proportion in dealing even-handedly with those whose classification as taxpayers will in nowise be distorted.

A great deal has been said recently about the desire of the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission to deal with the chiefs of the bureaus separately from the proposed legislation, and for this reason such chiefs have been barred from consideration under the provisions of S. 103.

During the committee consideration on January 11, 1949, of the purposes of S. 103, we were told by the spokesman for the bill that bureau chiefs would be given separate and secondary attention for purposes of adjusting salaries.

Mr. President, I submit that the committee majority voiced sympathetic views on the subject, but failed to support my position in favor of actual attention to the financial plight of these officials.

Mr. President, I want every Senator on this floor to understand that the Bureau of the Budget in taking care of itself all right. At the very time when they bar every other bureau, the Bureau of the Budget is getting full consideration. Yet it, too, is only a bureau. Therefore we have rank discrimination as between the officials of bureaus, despite the protestations that bureaus are to be dealt with in separate legislation. It is interesting to note that it is the Bureau of the Budget which is one of the main activators in favor of this legislation, and that this bureau and its representatives have traipsed all over Capitol Hill, in session and out, actually writing the legislation to which the Congress is to be called upon to give its favor.

It is significant that the Bureau of the Budget is taken care of, and no other bureau is. If we can take care of one bureau by the proposed legislation, we should take care of every other bureau.

At no time has the pending legislation ever been considered or examined or participated in by the committee as a whole, despite the fact that this committee has employed a staff equipped and ready to give its assistance. Not until the entire transaction was completely finished has the committee been given more than a preview of the purpose of the bill. It is noteworthy that in the two hearings, one an executive session, the other public, no one was invited and no one was welcome to speak in opposition to the legislation. For a substantiation of this statement I invite careful study of the hearings. Of course, there were some union heads who appeared, the testimony showed, and what did they say? They were in favor of the proposal. "Just as soon as possible we want our union members to be reached, too."

Contrast the report on S. 103 to the evidence arrived at by the subcommittee in extensive and public hearings on S. 1848, S. 1849, S. 1930, S. 1931, and S. 1949. Those bills, Mr. President, were bills to raise the salaries of the little fellows, like the man who is trying to support his wife and child, as a mail handler, on $1,900 a year. When the bill affecting mail handlers was up for consideration, of course, we had to have public hearings. There were several hundred pages of public hearings, which lasted weeks and months, on every one of these four bills.

These bills were considered in support of the contention that the rank and file of Government employees and officials should be given like recognition for salary purposes. When those bills were up for consideration before the same three members of the subcommittee, before the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, and the distinguished Senator from Maryland, who had charge of the same four bills, public hearings were held. They were granted by the full committee. Everyone who wished to come and testify was permitted to do so, and notice was given on the floor of the Senate inviting people to testify. Yet here we find that bill No. 1 is presented to us, and if the District of Columbia employees were included, it would cost more than $1,600,000. I ask the distinguished Senator from Maryland if that is not correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is, the payments to the 7,500 employees of the District, which of course are made from another fund.

Mr. LANGER. How much does that amount to?

Mr. O'CONOR. It amounts to $2,700,000.

Mr. LANGER. What is the total involved, then?

Mr. O'CONOR. Six million two hundred-odd thousand dollars.

Mr. LANGER. In other words, we are not considering passing a bill for $1,600,000, but it involves more than $6,000,000. That is what this bill involves.

As to the four bills I have mentioned, anyone could appear to testify, and they were considered in support of the contention that the rank and file of Government employees and officials should be given like recognition for salary purposes. At that time the Bureau of the Budget was completely silent as to the necessity for adjusting salaries.

The President has been quoted as saying that he wants to bring down the cost of living as a means of bringing relief to Government employees. The cost of living has not even yet declined.

I wish to say to every Senator in all candor that the total salary increases since 1925 have been 49 percent. Those in the lower grades are getting salaries of $1,500 and $2,000, and some veterans get $2,400 or $2,500 a year. The cost of living has gone up 75 percent, according to the subcommittee's own report, while the salaries have increased only 49 percent. Yet it is proposed today to increase the salaries, not of the little fellows, but of those receiving large salaries. Some seem to be afraid those receiving the large salaries cannot get along on their salaries.

I submit, Mr. President, that we should carry out the original purpose of the legislation submitted back in July 1947, at the time the subcommittee considering it reported on the subject, and that there be no increase in higher salaries unless at the same time the little fellow is taken care of. He must eat, Mr. President. The little fellow, the veteran with a wife and child or children receiving $2,450, and in some cases $2,350, must eat, and so must

his family. I submit that the Senate should see to it that, if we are going to have salary increases for the big fellows, at the same time we should take care of increasing the salaries of the little fellows down below.

WHAT THE REED-BULWINKLE BILL IS AND WHAT THE REED-BULWINKLE BILL IS NOT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, in 1942 the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice began proceedings before a Federal grand jury in Chicago involving certain railroads. It was contended that they had violated the antitrust laws by their participation in routine rate conferences among railroads and between railroads and shippers. These conferences had been openly and publicly carried on over a period of more than 40 years without question from any source. It was contended that such conferences, in and of themselves, were price-fixing conspiracies which violated the antitrust laws. I shall later discuss in some detail the situation thus created.

In 1944 the Department of Justice and the State of Georgia brought injunction suits against various railroads. These suits went further than the original contention that rate conferences, as such, violated the antitrust laws. They alleged an underlying conspiracy among the railroads to discriminate against the South and the West in the rates fixed and to discriminate against the West in services and other matters. Discriminatory freight rates for many years have been, and still are, unlawful under the terms of the Interstate Commerce Act.

That distinction is important. Those supporting the Reed-Bulwinkle bill, both in and out of Congress, were, and now are, interested solely in fixing a legal status for rate conference machinery necessary to the maintenance of an equitable structure of rates. It was never the purpose, or the result, of that bill to legalize discrimination in the rates fixed or conspiracy to fix discriminatory rates.

Under edicts laid down by Congress, rates charged by regulated carriers must not only be "just and reasonable" but must be fairly related so as to avoid preference and unfair discrimination. Railroads, for more than 40 years prior to 1942, had been engaging in conferences with each other and with their shippers concerning rates the individual carriers would file with the Interstate Commerce Commission. The purpose of those conferences was not only to establish rates to be filed by connecting lines but to work out differences between competing lines, as well, so the carriers might obey the mandate of the law in maintaining sound economic conditions in transportation and in avoiding preference, prejudice, and unfair practices in the rates filed. These organized conferences and public hearings had become a necessity in keeping the rate structure flexible and in step with the needs of commerce. They were only a preliminary step in the rate-making process. Any rates thus agreed to were no more than proposals, for they must still be filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission and remain subject to the complete power of the Commission under all the requirements of the law. The rights and interests of the traveling and shipping public were under the complete protection of Commission authority.

Since each carrier retained its right of individual and independent action and since the rates discussed were subject to complete control by the Commission, no one had assumed that there was anything unlawful or improper about those rate conferences. For more than 40 years they had been permitted to operate as public institutions without serious question.

But in 1942, during the darkest days of the war, the Antitrust Division came forth with the assertion that those rate conferences, and rate bureaus through which they were conducted, in and of themselves were price-fixing conspiracies carried on in violation of the antitrust laws.

There was instant reaction from the shipping public. Agitation for clarifying legislation began. All experienced traffic men regard these conferences as absolutely necessary to the movement of the Nation's commerce.

On the intervention of the Army, the Navy, and the Office of Defense Transportation, the criminal proceeding at Chicago was dropped. Under a law dealing with wartime emergencies, the Chairman of the War Production Board issued a certificate declaring such rate conferences to be "requisite to the prosecution of the war," and making it illegal to commence, under the antitrust laws, any civil or criminal action "with reference thereto." Early in 1943 a bill, S. 942, was introduced by Senator Wheeler to make sure those conferences would be valid and place them under the supervision of the Commission. Extended hearings were held on that proposal, but, under the assurance of the WPB certificate, that legislation was not then pressed.

However, in 1944, in the face of that certificate, the Antitrust Division and the State of Georgia brought the injunction suits mentioned a moment ago. These cases were known as the Lincoln case and the Georgia case. In both cases the defendant railroads pressed motions to have the cases dismissed, contending, among other things, that the suits were with reference to rate bureaus and were therefore barred by the WPB certificate. Against those contentions the courts, in each case, held that the broad purposes of those suits were to enjoin the railroads from carrying on an alleged conspiracy to discriminate against the South and West in freight rates and from conspiring to discriminate against the West in services rendered and in other matters.

In 1945 Representative BULWINKLE introduced a new bill intended to accomplish, in a somewhat different way, the purpose of the earlier bill, S. 942. It became known as the Bulwinkle bill and later as the Reed-Bulwinkle bill. It sought to establish a distinction between the treatment accorded a regulated industry and that accorded to business not subject to regulation. Its purpose and effect was not to validate discrimination against the South or West or any other part of the country, nor conspiracies to discriminate, but to make it clear that conference procedure in establishing rates and services, when found to be in the public interest and in furtherance of the national transportation policy, would not be unlawful and would be placed under the continuing regulation and supervision of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

That legislation made the same distinction that had been made by the courts. The courts distinguished between an ordinary rate conference, as covered by the WPB certificate, and an underlying conspiracy to discriminate. Despite the certificate protecting ordinary rate conferences, the courts permitted the Government and Georgia to carry on suits the purposes of which are to enjoin conspiracy to discriminate. With that same distinction in mind the Reed-Bulwinkle Act was for the purpose of making certain that rate conferences are to be valid without at the same time validating conspiracy to discriminate. To make that distinction clear the bill made valid only those conferences and agreements expressly found to be in "furtherance of the national transportation policy." A high percentage of the time spent in debate by those opposed to the bill was devoted to the "discrimination" and "conspiracy to discriminate" features of the Georgia and Lincoln suits. Again and again supporters of the bill pointed out the confusion among those opposing the bill on this vital point.

Probably no transportation bill in history has evoked such public support from all parts of the country. Certainly no transportation measure has had a comparable record of hearings, debate, and action by both Houses of Congress. Beginning with the hearings on S. 942 in 1943 down through action on H. R. 2536 by the Seventy-ninth Congress and on S. 110 by the Eightieth Congress, there have been 71 days of public hearings before committees, 259 witnesses have testified, filling 4,551 printed pages of reports of hearings. More than a thousand organizations representing shippers, farmers, State and Federal commissions, labor organizations, and others have endorsed the bill. There have been four favorable reports by committees, requiring 76 pages to express majority views and 13 pages to show the minority views of one Senator and one House Member. There have been 11 days of debate in the House and Senate, filling 253 pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There have been 35 speeches by Senators which inspired questions or comment from 48 Senators. The bill first passed the House by a vote of 277 to 45 on December 10, 1945. In the Eightieth Congress the bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 60 to 27 on June 18, 1947, and was passed by the House on May 11, 1948, by a vote of 271 to 53. The conference report was adopted by both Houses without a record vote, was vetoed by the President, and the veto was overridden in the Senate by a vote of 63 to 25 and overridden in the House by a vote of 297 to 102.

When the Senate first passed the bill in 1947 the opposition was ably led by my friend and colleague from Georgia

[Mr. RUSSELL]. His opposition was based upon the belief—which I did then and do now contend was unfounded—that adoption of the bill would legalize or validate conspiracy by the carriers to establish or maintain a structure of freight rates which would discriminate against the people of Georgia and the South. A review of his statements makes this clear. His principal speech appears at pages 6601–6618 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 9, 1947. I have taken the time to review that speech and call attention to some quotations explaining his position. At the beginning of his speech, the Senator from Georgia said:

Furthermore, Mr. President, the measure would remove from the jurisdiction of the courts of this land two tremendously important pieces of pending litigation against the railroads and the appurtenant freight bureaus, one of them being the State of Georgia case, pending in the Supreme Court of the United States sitting as a court of original jurisdiction, the other being the civil action filed through the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in an effort to break the stranglehold which the railroads have had upon the people of the West, and to obviate the discrimination against them in freight rates which they have so long borne.

At page 6603 appears an exchange between the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Moore, and the Senator from Georgia, as follows:

Mr. MOORE. I am anxious to understand the gravamen of the case which the State of Georgia filed in the Supreme Court as a court of original jurisdiction. Did that case have anything to do with matters dealt with in the pending bill, that is respecting rate-fixing bureaus, or is not that case an action brought to determine whether there was discrimination in freight rates?

Mr. RUSSELL. The charges were conspiracy to invoke unfair freight rates against the State of Georgia.

At page 6606 appears a statement by the Senator from Georgia in reply to comment by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON]. It is as follows:

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut may intrigue himself with the idea that the railroads could not be run without rate bureaus; but I do not think we should become involved in that question, for I think it has no relationship to the issue which is now before us. No one is undertaking to abolish the rate bureaus. We are simply saying that the railroads should be operated in the same way that other corporations in the United States are operated.

The discrimination complained of was alleged to be not only against the South, but against the West as well. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], in commenting upon studies by the Board of Investigation and Research, said (p. 6609):

I might further suggest that it is my recollection, from the many meetings which I attended when we endeavored to have additional money appropriated in the Appropriations Committee in the last 2 years to continue the Board of Investigation and Research, that the western discriminations were even greater than the southern, particularly in the Nebraska area.

In reply to the statement by the Senator from South Carolina, the Senator from Georgia said:

Yes. There is no doubt that some of the States in the western regions are laboring under greater discriminations than we are confronted with in the South.

In his closing remarks the Senator from Georgia said:

Mr. President, we have been the victims of discriminatory practices which have affected us at every turn. We have been the victims of cartels which, through the discriminatory practices which this bill seeks to perpetuate, have held us in economic bondage because we could not wage this unequal struggle against the obstacles which have been inflicted upon us. * * * Mr. President, in the bill now before us we are asked to give our blessings to an indefinite prolongation of this subversion of our transportation system to the purpose to deny the West and the South any industrial development.

The above quotations and review of the full speech by the able Senator from Georgia show that he made it perfectly clear to the Senate that his objections to the bill, and those of his colleagues who joined with him, were based upon the fear that enactment of the legislation would legalize action to perpetuate a structure of freight rates which would discriminate against the South and West, and that the pending suit of the State of Georgia was not to destroy rate conferences but to enjoin conspiracy to discriminate.

In the closing moments of the consideration of the bill the Senate adopted the so-called Russell amendment, the purport of which was to insulate the Georgia suit against any possible effect of the bill.

In the spring of 1948 the House passed the bill, but in doing so it made changes, at least two of which are important to this discussion. It eliminated the Russell amendment and narrowed the scope of the bill so that it covered only agreements as to rates and related matters and excluded agreements as to matters of service. The conferees finally adopted the House version of the bill and the conference report was then adopted by both Houses. The bill was vetoed by the President and was then presented for passage in the Senate notwithstanding the veto.

My attention has been called to a recent memorandum opinion by the Court in the Lincoln case which refers to statements I made on the floor of the Senate during debate on the veto message. During oral argument on a motion in that case, one of the attorneys for the Government read to the Court one or two of my sentences. The attorney who quoted my language took it out of context, failed to quote the qualification which was implicit in the full text of my statement, and attributed to it a meaning which was never intended. That would have been apparent to one who had had the benefit of the full text and who was familiar with the background and history against which my statements were made.

The Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] questioned me as to the reasons for and the effect of the elimination of the Russell amendment by the conferees. The statements I made, and which were quoted to the court at Lincoln, Nebr., were parts of statements in reply to those questions. I was quoted as saying:

There is nothing in the bill that would affect the antitrust proceeding pending in the court at Lincoln, Nebr.

Further:

The bill will not affect the Georgia case or the Lincoln case in the slightest degree.

Those quotations taken alone do not constitute a fair statement of what I said and of what I meant. In this connection, it is proper to look at the full context of my remarks and to bear in mind the position of the Senator from Georgia. Knowing that his real concern was the fear of legislative action which would legalize conspiracy to discriminate against the South, I said in my reply to the Senator from Georgia:

Be that as it may, I want to say to my friend from Georgia and my friend from Alabama, there is nothing in the bill that in any way allows or permits discrimination against the South in the freight-rate structure; there is nothing in the bill that would affect the validity of the Georgia suit in the Supreme Court, and there is nothing in the bill that would affect the antitrust proceeding pending in the court at Lincoln, Nebr. This bill has been trimmed down to where the only thing it does is to give exemption in the making of rates, fares, and charges and the actual handling of equipment and costs of handling equipment as between the different railroads.

A few moments later, in reply to a question from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] I said:

Mr. President, the case of the State of Georgia rests upon the allegation of a conspiracy between the railroads to establish rates which were illegal because discriminatory. The bill has no relation at all to any case that rests upon conspiracy. The bill, if enacted into law as I firmly believe it will be today, will not affect the Georgia case or the Lincoln case in the slightest degree.

It is abundantly clear that the statements I made, when read in their full context and against the background of the whole debate, related to the real issues that were there under discussion. There was nothing in that bill, and there is nothing in the law today, that would authorize, or legalize, or validate in any way, conspiracy to discriminate against the South, or the West, or any other part of the country. My statements were meant, and I am sure they were understood to mean, that there was nothing in that bill which would interfere with those suits in the slightest degree, in their purpose to enjoin a conspiracy to establish or maintain discriminatory freight rates.

A simple reading of the bill, which was then officially before every Member of the Senate, made it abundantly certain that the only agreements authorized by the bill were those which the Commission may expressly find to be in furtherance of the national transportation policy. Anyone with sufficient interest to read the opening paragraph of the Interstate Commerce Act may plainly see that a conspiracy to discriminate or an agreement which would promote or encourage

unfair discrimination is contrary to and not in furtherance of that policy.

It is well to observe that there is not, and never has been, any confusion as to what that bill was intended to do. Its plain language leaves no room for doubt. In response to popular demand, clearly and eloquently expressed, and based on a half century of experience, the bill was passed by the overwhelming vote of Congress—by the votes of the majority of the Democrats and the majority of the Republicans. Its purpose was to make rate conferences in transportation legal, to give to the Interstate Commerce Commission the power and the duty to determine whether or not a proposed conference is "in furtherance of the national transportation policy," to place such conferences under the continuing regulation and supervision of the Commission, to remove any doubt about the validity of proper rate conferences and to prescribe means by which they could be preserved and regulated.

The legal effect of that legislation upon the pending suits has been the subject of differences of opinion. But those differences result not from doubt or confusion as to the intent of the legislation but from apparent confusion as to the purpose of the suits.

It is not the duty nor the responsibility of Congress or its Members to interpret the objectives of litigation pending in the courts. Those objectives are often obscure and the results are frequently at variance with the expectations of all the parties involved. But it is our duty to declare the national policy and to spell it out in laws that may be understood. Where there is need for clarification of policy or of the law, as was the occasion for the enactment of this bill, we are not obliged to await disaster nor to sit idly by awaiting action by the courts to interpret that which we may have said or to reconcile conflicting pronouncements we may have made in the past. By the enactment of that bill we made it clear that rate conferences between regulated carriers, when found by the Commission to be "in furtherance of the national transportation policy," are not to be considered as "conspiracies in restraint of trade" which we prohibited by the enactment of the antitrust laws; we designated the Interstate Commerce Commission as the body to determine whether or not proposed conferences are "in furtherance of" that policy; and we placed the conferences expressly found to be of that character under the continuing supervision of that Commission. The very fact of controversy as to the effect of that legislation upon the Lincoln suit and the Georgia case is further justification for the enactment of that bill at the time we passed it. By the adoption of the Reed-Bulwinkle bill we validated only that which is "in furtherance of the national transportation policy." If it was not the purpose of these suits to frustrate that policy, then they will not be affected by the legislation. As I have said, if the purpose of those suits was to enjoin conspiracy to fix or maintain a structure of freight rates which discriminate against any part of the country, the passage of the bill did not affect them, because the bill did not validate conspiracy to discriminate. If the Government proves charges of that character, the legislation would not give the carriers relief. On the other hand, if the real purpose of those suits was to declare illegal and to destroy rate conferences expressly found to be "in furtherance of the national transportation policy," then the language of the bill is clear and necessary.

## INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly on the pending measure, Senate bill 103. I wish to address myself particularly in support of the very fine presentation made by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] on the relationship of this bill and its proposals to the exceedingly important subject of economy in the administration of our Government.

The proposals of this bill constitute step No. 1 in the attainment of a greater and exceedingly necessary measure of economy in the operations of the Federal Government. Attention has been called again and again to the comparatively low rates of salary which are offered in Government administration, as compared with what the same degree of experience and ability can obtain under private business. In the proposals of this bill there is no endeavor to make the return to the individual official as great, for the experience and ability required, as the return which would be offered him or the return which he may have been getting under private employment. Mr. President, it is assumed that some degree of sacrifice is involved in working for the Federal Government, rather than in working for private business. However, this bill endeavors to make sure that the degree of sacrifice involved is not so great that it becomes impossible to hold the men of the required degree of experience and ability to carry on in an economical and effective way the enormous operations of the greatest big-business organization the world has ever seen, which, of course, is the administration of the Federal Government of the United States of America.

I said, and I wish to repeat, that this is the first step in any endeavor to cut down the expense of the operations of the United States Government. Without this first step, no second step can be taken.

The first requirement is that there shall be available for the administration of the various branches of the Government men who are able to handle, with experience, with good judgment, and with integrity, the billions of dollars which are involved—amounts far exceeding in total, and in many of the subdivisions of the total, any amounts handled by any private business undertakings whatsoever the world over. Any President, be he a Democrat or be he a Republican, will not only be handicapped, but will be hamstrung if he is unable to obtain the services of men of requisite qualities for the enormous responsibilities the President has had handed to him by the legislation enacted by the Congress and by the conditions of the world and of the country which he must consider.

I should also like to address myself to the question of why the bill before the Senate stops at the point where it does in going down from the top officials toward those who are lower. One practical point is involved, and that is that it was necessary to find a stopping place. There is one point at which a line of demarcation can clearly be drawn, and that is the point at which the line is drawn in this bill. It is drawn so as to include the heads of departments, the Cabinet members, who are the secretaries in charge of the various departments, the under secretaries, and the assistant secretaries, the heads of the independent bureaus, and the heads and members of the important independent commissions. That line can be drawn. It is not merely practical, in that it can be drawn; it is also logical, in that it includes practically everyone in the way of a policy-determining administrator for all the branches of the Government and all the undertakings of the Government. No one who has been working on this bill or who has supported this bill or understands this bill would for a moment say that it includes more than a fraction of those who are holding important positions, who have held them faithfully, who have done good work for the Government, and who in the months and years to come, throughout their tenure of office, can be expected to render to their Government service of which they can be proud and with which we can be satisfied.

It is not the intention in thus limiting the application of the bill to pick out this official or that official, or the other group of officials, and reward them on the basis of good service. The line is drawn, as I said, from the practical standpoint of there being a place at which to draw the line, and from the logical standpoint of including those on whom the ultimate responsibility must be fixed for the carrying out of the Federal governmental operations with which under the law they are charged. The work of arranging or providing adequate compensation extends then beyond the limits of the bill. There is very much more to be done, but it should be done in order.

I have in my hand a letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, indicating the status of the studies of that branch of the Government on the question of adequate pay for the remainder of the salary list. It is addressed to the junior Senator from Maryland, and, with his permission, I shall read it:

MY DEAR SENATOR O'CONOR:

In response to your request concerning the status of recommendations for a revision of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, please be advised that within the next few days there will be transmitted to the Congress for its consideration a proposed draft of bill providing for a complete revision of that act.

I wish to say a word on another phase of the matter, that of having separated the top group for early action. It would be understandable, it would be without the bounds of any reasonable criticism that we should have done this in the Congress and have done it early, had the event of a new President transpired. As most of us know, that did not happen; we have the same President, and largely the same administration. However, the principles which would have applied to a new President in giving him the means of attracting and holding men of the great ability required to transact the business of the Nation hold, in only a slightly less degree, to the present incumbent, who holds over from last year, and whom we shall shortly inaugurate as the President of the United States. I say, "in only a slightly less degree," because there has been, and will continue to be, in the early months of his administration, a rather high degree of turn-over in top officials. We read in the newspapers that this Cabinet official and that Cabinet official and the other, and the head of this agency, the head of this administration or bureau, or what have you, is not going to resign, and then, within a short space of time, he resigns. I think we are all resigned to that perfectly practical situation. There is a turn-over at the beginning of a new administration. Who the officials will be, we do not know, but we do know that in order to get men of the requisite caliber in the first few months, whether the Chief Executive be Democrat or Republican, he must be assured that he has within his power the means of attracting and holding men of ability, and in particular, men who do not have large private means of their own, so that he will not have to search principally among the uncommonly well-to-do to find men of the type he wishes to employ.

Those are the reasons, Mr. President, on which I would support first the passage of the bill as a whole; and, second, the line which determines the particular group which the bill covers. But, thirdly, I want to refer to one other point in the bill which to my mind is overwhelmingly important from the standpoint of justice.

In the closing hours of the special session last year, we eliminated from the pay-bill increase for the civil-service employees, one large group. We did it because there were in sight at that time no funds with which to pay them. That very practical appeal was agreed to by the Members of the Senate. We left out every civil-service employee of the District of Columbia, and we gave the pay increase to every other civil-service employee the country over, with one exception.

I submit, Mr. President, that in spite of the budgetary situation involved, we should and must find the funds to bring civil-service employees in the most expensive city in the United States on a par with those in the other sections of the country.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. I should like to ask the Senator how section 8 of the bill cures the distressing situation to which the Senator has just referred?

Mr. FLANDERS. It gives the $330 increase and makes it retroactive.

Mr. CAIN. To whom among the employees of the District of Columbia does it give the $330 increase?

Mr. FLANDERS. It gives it to those in the classified service.

Mr. CAIN. I may ask the Senator, for I think it is a very fair and important question, what provisions are to be made for the unclassified workers of the District of Columbia, who outnumber by several thousand the classified workers?

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the junior Senator from Washington that I would expect that question to fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the District of Columbia. It does not fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee which reported the pending bill.

Mr. CAIN. I am very conscious of that fact, but I wondered what would result administratively within the District of Columbia if, through the passage of section 8 of Senate bill 103, we provided a retroactive increase in salary for 7,000 workers, leaving 11,000, working side by side with them, without a penny by way of a pay increase.

Mr. FLANDERS. Those salaries, as between the classified employees and those directly under the jurisdiction of the District Committee, have always been handled separately. In evidence thereof, I should like to call the attention of the junior Senator from Washington to the fact that in 1947, I believe it was, the salaries of a large number of those under the jurisdiction of the Committee on the District of Columbia were raised without raising the salaries of those under the classified service.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is quite true that school teachers, who are unclassified workers, were given increases to make up for the fact that previously they had not been given increases commensurate with those given to other employees. But may I ask the Senator this question? In view of the fact that there are 18,000 employees of the District of Columbia, would it not be much better, from every point of view, particularly because the Senate has already given evidence of its wish to make any pay increase retroactive, to handle the problem of the 18,000 employees at one time, rather than to take a specialized group of 7,000, increase their wages at this time, and leave for some future action the rights of 11,000 other employees?

Mr. FLANDERS. I would say to the Senator from Washington that, so far as I am concerned, I can only feel and act on a responsibility to which I am committed by my position on the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I thoroughly appreciate the responsibility which confronts the Senator from Vermont, but our concern for the District of Columbia, the Capital City of the Nation, the only Federal city in the United States, gives to both of us an over-all responsibility which certainly extends beyond the confines or limits of a particular committee responsibility.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I would accept that extension of responsibility which the Senator has so plainly and logically indicated. I find my refuge in an ancient Latin proverb which I endeavored to give in Latin on the floor of the Senate at one time and concerning which I had to be corrected by the erudite reportorial force. I shall not now endeavor to give it in Latin; I shall give it in plain English:

Let justice be done though the heavens fall.

That, it seems to me, is properly applicable to this situation. I would therefore suggest that we proceed with remedying the injustice and that the members of the District Committee proceed as rapidly as possible with any other adjustments which may have to be made.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont and I differ in this instance only on the interpretation and definition of what justice really is. I think that, to be just to the problem confronting us with reference to the District of Columbia, we have a very high obligation to do no less for one segment of the workers of this grand community than we are willing, at the same time, to do for any other segment.

Aside from that, may I inquire of the Senator from Vermont where the money—we are all interested in money—is coming from to meet this obligation to pay the classified workers retroactively a $330 increase?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, with regard to that question, I would defer to any suggestions, any legislation, which may come before the Committee on the District of Columbia. I wish to assure the Senator that so far as the Senator from Vermont is concerned, any reasonable endeavor to meet these moral obligations of the United States of America will have my support.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think that is very important to the future. Certainly the heads of the government of the city of Washington would be very grateful. But I should like to inquire whether there have been before the Senate within recent months reasonable revenue-raising measures which, if passed, would have met the obligation with money in hand some time ago? It is far different today. The Senator is very well aware that we are proposing to pay out money which we do not happen to have in sight. May I ask, if it be a fair question, whether or not Congress has met its responsibility both in raising revenues, and in deciding to whom those revenues will be given?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, so far as the arrears are concerned, and, I believe, so far as the fiscal year is concerned, the President's budget recently submitted to Congress has in it provisions for the extension of $330 to which reference has been made.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I do not care to labor the point, but if the Senator will permit me, I want to urge that it is important. The President submitted a budget of $103,000,000 for the District of Columbia, the largest budget ever dreamed of by this community. It is a balanced budget—balanced on

two assumptions, both of which are likely to turn out to be completely meaningless. In order to balance the budget, the first assumption the President made was that a sales tax to provide $13,000,000 would be passed. The Senate has not passed a sales tax, nor has the Congress. Such a measure was before us last year, but it was filibustered. The second assumption of the President in the $103,000,000 budget for the District of Columbia was that no consideration would be given to retroactively paying employees of the community $330, nor would the $330 increase be included in the 1950 provision for the District of Columbia employees. The basic question I raise is, How far can we go, either in or out of the District of Columbia, in passing legislation which obviously is intended to help people, without having the faintest or slightest idea as to the source of the money?

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wanted to call the attention of the Senate to one other piece of injustice which has occurred, by inadvertence, through inability to see where the money was coming from, to which the Senator from Washington has so logically referred, without, however, I believe, trying to indicate that injustice should not be remedied, if possible, somehow and somewhere.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, may I inquire as to how we are going to remedy it in the face of a lack of revenue with which to meet the obligation we intend to incur?

Mr. FLANDERS. I should gladly appear before the Appropriations Committee and ask that the money be appropriated from the funds of the Government, if there is no other way to do it.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, does that mean that, from the Senator's point of view, we should ignore and pass over the possibility of meeting the obligation through the imposition of a sales tax similar to that which already has been passed by most of the States of the Union, or at least by quite a number of them?

Mr. FLANDERS. I said, if there were no other way.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator consider that the sales tax is a reasonable way by which to meet the responsibility?

Mr. FLANDERS. The sales tax certainly is a reasonable way. It is one which has been tried in other places. I shall want to balance it against other possibilities before I commit myself to it.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator from Vermont think that the requirements of the situation demand that before we give consideration to proper methods for financing the District of Columbia and its obligations we should meet such obligations without the money in hand?

Mr. FLANDERS. I believe that we should do that first. The Senator has stated my position very clearly. It should not be taken out of the employees. The responsibility lies with the Congress, and it should not be taken out of the income of those who are working at comparatively low salaries in the most expensive city in the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Yet one fact, I think, is rather obvious, that during the debates in the closing days of the last Congress it was agreed by the Congress in an informal fashion, but I think a very proper one, that when moneys were found—which called for a complete restudy and reappraisal of the whole awkward, bad financial situation in the District—they would apply retroactively to the salaries of District employees, both classified, as the Senator from Vermont has referred to them, and unclassified, as well, to which the junior Senator from Washington and a good many other Senators have referred in times gone by.

I raise only that question, as to whether it is not proper, in the name of good government and sound financing, for those who know that when the problem is solved they will be taken care of, through retroactive salary increases, to wait a reasonable length of time, and place the responsibility for reasonableness on this Congress, until a solution which makes good, hard-headed, common sense can be found by the Congress.

Mr. FLANDERS. My memory may fail me, it does in many situations and as to many matters, but I should be very much surprised to find that the record showed that I voted to postpone that obligation.

Mr. CAIN. There was no personal reference by the junior Senator from Washington to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. I understand that, but I am merely indicating to the Senator from Washington that that argument did not appeal to me particularly at that time. I think we have incurred an obligation, which we are bound to make good at the earliest possible moment, to these men and women—again, I say, in the most expensive city in the United States.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator agree with me that one of the reasons why this is "the most expensive city in the United States," to use the Senator's words, is because on too many occasions we create obligations without first having determined how we are going to finance them, and in consequence we move too rapidly toward the attainment of our otherwise acknowledgedly good goals?

Mr. FLANDERS. That, I submit, is a proposition to be proved, not simply to be stated.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator. I should like to ask one last question, with the Senator's permission. Assume we pass this provision, which says the classified workers shall get an increase, to which I for one, and everyone else in this Chamber, I know, says they are entitled, then it necessarily follows, in the Senator's words and mine, and those of others, that we must give comparable consideration to unclassified workers. If we take such action, we are going to create a deficit of approximately $10,000,000 beyond and above what we have now for the District of Columbia, which has its gigantic and largest budget of $103,000,000. Where is that money to come from? We have not met the issue of a sales tax head-on. We are going to take the easy way out.

The question I wish to ask the Senator is this: Does not the passage of this legislation, as proposed, mean that we are likely to continue to avoid a full discussion of the sales tax, in favor of taking these moneys from the only other available source, namely, the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. FLANDERS. First, as to the amount involved, so far as the classified service is concerned it amounts to about two and one-half million dollars a year, retroactively, for approximately 6 months, which would mean $1,250,000. The Senator from Washington can say in a very much more informed and clearer manner than I can what he would assume to be the necessary adjustments in other salaries, involving the expenditure mentioned to go along with the proposed action, which has been taken following the line of the jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. CAIN. Yesterday I called up Mr. Fowler, the budget officer of the District, and I found that the $330 obligation, which we are considering for the classified workers, in accordance with the budget which the President recently sent to Congress would amount, for 7,000 workers, to $2,208,000 plus. If we gave the same consideration to the 11,000 unclassified workers, the cost would be $3,077,000. So we are talking about a total obligation in the future, to meet these increases of more than $5,000,000, in addition to what the retroactive amounts would actually cost.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Vermont for the light which he has shed on a difficult subject. I know I have not been misunderstood in my questions. I am completely satisfied that we share the same desire, namely, to be of service to the workers of the District of Columbia. I have merely maintained, and very seriously, too, that by setting precedents of this character in securing wage increases, we shall in due time be doing a great disservice not only to the workers of the District of Columbia, but to the average, ordinary American taxpayer as well.

Mr. FLANDERS. I wish to say, in return, if the Senator from Washington does not mind, that his material has given me food for thought, but with the overriding necessity for justice still in my mind, and I am sure he still understands that.

There is one other group which was left out, by inadvertence, in the bill which we passed in the closing hours of the Eightieth Congress, namely, those in the classified service under the Foreign Service Act. They are certainly as much entitled to an increase as were the other members of the classified service to whom an increase was granted. So in the final section of the bill, in order to remedy that inadvertent injustice, we ask that they be included in the $330 raise, again retroactively.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. During the time the distinguished Senator from Vermont and myself were on the committee together we worked along very well, and I wish to ask the Senator now whether he thinks that under his Latin proverb, which he gave in English a few moments ago, it would be just to pick only 223 out of

3,107 employees who are getting $9,975 a year?

Mr. FLANDERS. I think there are two things to be said with regard to that. In the first place, this is not a cost-of-living bill. This is a practical bill, designed to procure and retain the very highest ability that can be attracted to the Government service for the most important jobs.

Mr. LANGER. Would the distinguished Senator say that at the present time we do not have them?

Mr. FLANDERS. There have been certain times and with reference to certain positions when the junior Senator from Vermont was in a pessimistic state of mind, when he wondered whether in all cases we did have such men.

Mr. LANGER. Let me ask the distinguished Senator, then, if he thinks that raising certain salaries to $22,500 and others to lesser amounts will make it possible to attract such men, like those on the long list the Senator mentions in the report, for example, the head of the United States Rubber Co., who receives $300,000 a year. Does the Senator expect to attract men of that caliber to Government service?

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have not the slightest idea whether the president of the United States Rubber Co. would make a good government official. I think he would last about 2 weeks, blow up, and buy a ticket home. But there are men farther down the line, still earning salaries higher than any that is proposed to be paid in the bill, who might be more useful than the president of the United States Rubber Co.—and I am saying nothing against him, I want that clearly understood—men who have had experience in dealing with widespread details and organizing those under them, who might be persuaded to enter the Federal service at salaries considerably below those now being paid them.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FLANDERS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I have no desire to prolong the discussion. Has the Senator had any agreement with the majority as to when action shall be taken with respect to the remainder of the 3,107, if we pass the bill providing for the 223?

Mr. FLANDERS. There is no agreement on the part of the members of the committee with the majority. I did read a letter from the Bureau of the Budget—I think I read it while the Senator from North Dakota was absent from the floor—in which the writer said that the Bureau of the Budget was prepared to report and would very shortly report its recommendations for the full salary list.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Vermont a further question. The Senator was chairman of the committee which acted during the last night of the Eightieth Congress, when the matter of the last pay increase was taken up jointly with the House. Is that not true?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. At that time the bill as it was reported by the Senate committee, and acted upon in the Senate, contained the Reclassification Act. Is that not true?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. LANGER. Did not at that time the House Members say that if that were left out, and the bill as it was, without the Reclassification Act, were passed, they would immediately get together in the next 6 or 7 months and prepare a complete reclassification measure? Did the Members of the House not promise that?

Mr. FLANDERS. They promised that. Of course, technically one House cannot promise anything for another. The House does not hold over as the Senate does. But I am sure the Senator from North Dakota will be glad to know that the information is that they are now working on that bill as promised by the members with whom we dealt in that joint committee.

Mr. LANGER. Then may I ask, why would it not be just, right, and proper to wait until that report is made, and then at that time to take up the entire question of all the employees in one bill, rather than do it piecemeal the way we have been doing in the past 6 or 7 years?

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I have tried to give my reasons for feeling that this top group should have the earliest possible action so that in the early weeks of this administration the President may be free to make such changes in the top group as he deems wise. In that regard I feel the members of the minority party have a particular responsibility for giving the President those means, so that there shall not rest on them at least one scintilla of responsibility for any maladministration in any remote nook and corner of the administration of the opposite party.

Mr. LANGER. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont in conclusion that if the Senator's theory is correct, and if that is the reason why the Senator is in favor of the pending bill, then the Democratic Party, the party of the Members on the other side of the aisle has been negligent in the past 16 years in not taking care of the Federal employees. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will say to the distinguished Senator that I agree with practically anything on principle that expresses doubt as to the complete wisdom of the action of our friends on the other side of the aisle, and we can only hope that now and in the future they will show a higher degree of wisdom.

I might read from a letter sent to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, on January 6, from the President, this concluding paragraph:

> On January 20 a new Presidential term will begin. During that term the executive branch of the Government will be called upon to bear responsibilities of great magnitude. Prompt action on this bill is of great importance to me in strengthening the management of the executive branch to meet these responsibilities. Its small cost will be repaid many times. I ask the Congress to give me the means of making it possible to get and keep the men who are required for the job ahead.

A Republican President entering upon a new administration would very properly have written the same message to the heads of the two Houses here in the Capitol, and whether he be a Republican or whether he be a Democrat, I think we have the responsibility for upholding him upon this matter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate with amendments.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate bill 103 and ask only that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 8 it is proposed to strike out subsection (a) of section 8.

## SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF PURDUE UNIVERSITY—AWARD TO WALT DISNEY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on the 15th day of this month that great Hoosier institution, Purdue University, at Lafayette, Ind., will celebrate its seventy-fifth anniversary.

Needless to say, suitable ceremonies have been planned for this memorable occasion. Proper tribute will be paid then to one of the Nation's outstanding symbols of progress.

At the same time, the university will pay tribute to another symbol of Americanism. It will present its distinguished service award to Walt Disney and declare him an honorary member of its alumni association.

These happy events combine to make this an occasion not only of great interest but of great significance. It can truly be said that it is world-wide in both interest and significance.

We of Indiana, Mr. President, are justly proud of Purdue. As one of the greatest of all institutions for education, it has greatly contributed to the leadership of America in the world and it has enriched the world itself.

In the professions for which Purdue prepares its students it has exacting standards. It is no less exacting in its selection of those who receive its distinguished-service award.

This award is not come by lightly. It has been awarded only twice before, and Walt Disney is the first American to be accorded this unique and distinguished honor.

He is only the second man to be made an honorary member of the Alumni Association of Purdue University, being preceded only by the immortal Will Rogers.

Mr. President, I am certain that my colleague [Mr. JENNER] and the other Members of the Indiana delegation in the House of Representatives, join me in this tribute to Purdue and to its worthy choice for one of its highest honors.

Walt Disney is a living example of the creative spirit which has made America great. As with all true artists, he blends inspiration and imagination with precisionist technique.

Mr. Disney has created a beloved character that has become a friend of all the world—the enchanting, beguiling little sprite of the inkwell, Mickey Mouse.

Known in every country, I believe Mickey Mouse is destined to live forever with other immortals of tradition, song, and story, such as Columbine and Pantaloon, Santa Claus and Robin Hood.

Mr. President, we of the Indiana delegation to the United States Congress believe that the words of citation which will be delivered to Walt Disney by Purdue University are apt and perfect tribute to him. That citation reads:

To Walt Disney, artist, producer, director, and creator, but above all, welder of the arts of painting, music, and the drama into a new unity that has made a world public sensitive to the values inherent in motion pictures, Purdue presents this citation to show its recognition of his effectiveness in bringing pleasure to a humanity that needs a healing power of laughter and beauty.

ISRAEL AND GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, later this afternoon I shall have a few remarks to make in regard to an amendment to the pay bill, in the form of a bill which now is being prepared, but at this time I wish to address myself to an entirely different subject.

The other day five Royal Air Force fighters and bombers were shot down—some on Israeli territory and some on the Israeli-Egyptian border. There has been an angry reaction on the part of Great Britain, but it is fair to ask the question, "What were British planes doing over that area, anyway?" They had, in my opinion, as little right to be flying over the battlefield in Israel and Egypt as they would have had to be flying over Long Island. The act of the British Government in sending planes to that area was a deliberate and provocative one. Even the kindest interpretation must see it as a provocative act. The British Foreign Office asserts that the planes, though armed, were under orders not to shoot, and were sent only for reconnaissance. But I ask, What were armed planes doing in an area in which they had no business to be—an area thrice delicate by the conflict in which it was involved?

Reconnaissance in military science is recognized as a military activity. It is not a harmless act.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I do not care to yield until I finish my remarks, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Reconnaissance, as every military man knows, is the first phase of attack, and is thus recognized. If Mr. Bevin is now seeking an incident, he chose no better method than to send armed fighter planes of the RAF over an area in which the forces of another country lie waiting with antiaircraft guns to defend their soil against aggression.

Mr. President, there is no doubt that today we are witnessing a war of nerves in the Middle East. What we are seeing is a definite, deliberate, and consistent British attempt to force their way into the Jewish-Arab conflict. It is the more reprehensible because that conflict seems well on its way toward resolution. United Nations representatives are holding peace talks in Rhodes between Egyptians and Israelis. A truce has been achieved on the once-bloody Israeli-Transjordan front. Peace—and ultimate stabilization—are coming more and more into view, day by day.

This is the moment when the great powers of the world should be studiously correct and most circumspect in every word and in every act which might tend to disturb the delicate equilibrium now reached in the Middle East.

Yet this is the moment when Great Britain chooses to send British troops into the port of Aqaba, in Transjordan, just across the border from Israel; to land British fighting planes at Mafrak, Transjordan; to reassemble her naval forces in the Middle East; to announce that they are taking precautionary measures likely to deter any aggressive intentions that the Jews might have; and to send armed planes over Israeli territory.

It is certainly subject to suspicion, to say the least, that Mr. Bevin's real intent is to precipitate a major crisis in the Middle East; to throw a ring of armed might around Israel; and thus finally to demand that the new state acquiesce to those designs for its suicide which Mr. Bevin was unable to sell the Anglo-American Committee of Inquiry on Palestine in 1946, the United Nations Special Committee on Palestine in 1947, and the United Nations itself in 1948.

I am not alone, Mr. President, in criticizing Mr. Bevin. I find myself in a goodly company each time I do so. Only recently, Mr. Winston Churchill and Mr. Anthony Eden, speaking in the House of Commons, demanded to know—as I ask today—why the RAF was sticking its nose into a territory in which it had no business.

The Manchester Guardian, on Monday morning, said bluntly:

Mr. Bevin is taking perilous and needless risks in the Middle East. * * * His policy is making fools of us and is in danger of doing worse.

Mr. President, this country has a very profound stake in a stabilized Middle East. Through the past years American foreign policy has aimed at achieving a measure of stability in Palestine and the surrounding Arab states. It has been a matter for congressional resolutions and for Presidential statements. It has been part of our major party platforms. The issues have been discussed and debated, and have been the subject of innumerable analyses and investigations by committees and by the United Nations itself.

If that stability now, at last, appears on the horizon, every responsible power should do all in its ability, and use every resource at its command, to encourage the cessation of hostilities and the arrival of peace. Mr. President, sending fighter and bomber planes over Israel is not the way to promote peace.

I maintain that we are well tired of war and the alarms of war in that unhappy corner of the world, and that long ago there would have been peace were it not for the interference of Great Britain. Today, even though Britain has presumably washed her hands of the Palestine issue, having turned it over to the United Nations, it is obvious that Britain is very much an upsetting factor in the problem.

It is fear of British armed intervention which today halts every peace move in the Middle East. This fear makes for ill will among both Israelis and Arabs. It strengthens those Arab leaders who stand for intransigeance. It weakens those Israeli leaders who seek genuine peace. It keeps the entire situation in flux, and makes fools, not only of the British, to quote the Manchester Guardian's words, but it makes fools of all who attempt to achieve a final agreement between the warring parties.

To our own people I say: Upon us devolves the important task of making clear to Mr. Bevin and those few British ministers, if any, who support his bitter, provocative policy, that this Government will not ignore what has happened.

We are pledged to support Israel's territorial integrity. We are pledged to support the United Nations decision which gave that territory to Israel. We cannot remain unaware of this war of nerves, which may develop into a far more serious matter, and which threatens to upset every constructive step taken thus far in the long, arduous road toward Middle East peace. Nor can we permit the British, through Mr. Bevin, to make fools of the United Nations itself.

Let us say, clearly and without subterfuge: "This is far enough, Mr. Bevin. You have failed in 3 years of intrigue and war against the Jewish people in Palestine. Your policies have not been endorsed either by the British people as a whole, or by the community of nations at large. Thus far, and no further. Our interest in peace, our stake in Middle East stability, is too grave for us to allow you to jeopardize all that has been achieved so far."

As one Member of this body, Mr. President, those are my views and that is my answer to Mr. Bevin.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like first to comment on what the Senator from Oregon has said, and to ask him whether he is aware that this morning the British authorities have issued a statement attributing a portion of the responsibility for the reconnaissance to the United States. I read the dispatch which has just come over the cables or radio from London:

British authorities reported that scouting planes were sent over the Egyptian-Israeli battle front only after talks with the United States made clear to both sides an urgent need for precise information on Jewish invasions of Egypt.

Five British planes were shot down in the frontier area last Friday.

British authorities said they initiated the use of reconnaissance planes in the battle zone after Anglo-American conversations in Washington at the end of the year.

At that time, it was said at the Foreign Office, the need for word on the extent of Israeli incursions into Egypt was clear to both sides. As such information could not be had from United Nations sources, British authorities used the only means of obtaining information—aerial reconnaissance.

I ask the Senator from Oregon whether he feels that we should be backed into intervention of this character through casual conversations such as are indicated in the report now issued to the public by the British Foreign Office?

Mr. MORSE. I can say to my good friend from Maine that if the British report is true as to such American conversations, then of course those conversations were carried on clearly outside the framework of United Nations procedure.

Mr. BREWSTER. Precisely.

Mr. MORSE. If we have any Americans in the State Department or Foreign Service who are conducting any such conversations as the Senator has mentioned, then it is high time, in my judgment, that the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate should proceed with a thorough investigation as to the policies of the State Department in operating outside the framework of the United Nations.

In fact, I may say, in view of the trends which have taken place recently in the Senate of the United States, in respect to an undermining of a bipartisan foreign policy, I think it has now become incumbent upon many of us in the Senate to center greater and greater attention on the State Department in regard to its foreign policy, because I think the time has now come when he must make perfectly clear to the people of the United States that there is a group in the Senate who recognize that bipartisan foreign policy in America has become nothing but a name, and that it is now incumbent upon us to find out what the policies of the State Department are, by whatever Senate investigations may be necessary.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it should be clear that there is nothing in the statement to indicate, and I should certainly be most reluctant to believe, that anyone in the Senate of the United States was consulted in action being taken of the sort indicated here, although if the conversations were sufficient to warrant the British in carrying aerial reconnaissance of that character over the country now in possession of the Israeli Government, which we have ourselves recognized de facto, it certainly would be a most unfriendly and most unwarranted act, particularly when it required the superseding of the authority of the United Nations, which is now so obviously involved. I say this in all deference to the one who, more than anyone else perhaps in this body, was responsible for the development and evolution of the United Nations as a means of stabilizing the peace of all the world. Not until there is clearer evidence than is presented here, shall I believe that any Member of the Senate was in any way involved or responsible for the action which the British Government alleges it took upon warrant of conversations with individuals apparently in our State Department.

NECESSITY FOR ECONOMY IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—BRITISH ACTIVITIES IN MIDDLE EAST

Mr. President, the budget message recently received by this body from the President of the United States places on our shoulders a tremendous responsibility. The expenditures recommended by the President cannot be incurred without either raising the national debt, even beyond its present staggering height, or further increasing the heavy load of taxation with which individuals and business enterprises in this country are burdened.

In the circumstances, and before agreeing to either of these two serious alternatives, it is our duty to consider most carefully whether it is not possible to reduce the budget on the expenditure side here and there without threatening the essential needs and interests of the United States. The main purposes toward which these expenditures are directed cannot, of course, be questioned. The day-to-day functioning of all branches of the United States Government must be assured. A certain minimum of social services and of expenditures seeking to maintain the American people on a high level of prosperity must by all means be continued, perhaps even, in some instances, increased. Our obligations to pay the interest and part of the principal of the national debt are beyond doubt. In the present international situation an adequate budget for national defense is essential. For the same reason, as well as in order to insure the return of economic stability in the world, a certain measure of economic aid to friendly foreign countries may well be desirable.

And, yet, we have no alternative but to scan closely and carefully each one of these items in order to see whether we cannot reduce them without jeopardizing the general purpose of these expenditures. In doing so, we must look at the evidence and try to find out whether there is anywhere an indication that our moneys are being spent carelessly or for purposes with which our Government is not in accord. Wherever we find such evidence, it is our obligation to the people of the United States to reduce such expenditures, before calling on the American people for greater sacrifices in the form of increased taxation or a heavier national debt burden.

Reserving to myself the right to bring up at a later time other items where such reductions may be possible, I want to suggest today that, judging from recent events, we might well be justified in recommending a considerable decrease in this country's economic aid to Great Britain. As is well known, Britain is the principal beneficiary of the European economic-aid program and is scheduled to remain the principal beneficiary for some time to come. Several billion dollars—billions and not millions—have been and are being placed at the disposal of the British Government for various purposes. A considerable portion of these billions is to be spent in the coming year. It is clear that if any important saving can be attained in this item, a great deal would be achieved toward our purpose of balancing the budget at a lower figure and toward easing the burden on the taxpayers of America.

Now the purposes for which our economic aid is granted to Great Britain are manifold. We want to help the people of Britain who suffered so much destruction and deprivation during the war to get on their feet economically and otherwise. We are doing this because of our deep sympathy for and our traditional kinship with a people with whom we have so much in common. We are also doing it because Britain is one of the principal centers of world trade and an important customer of this country. Anything that will help the British achieve economic prosperity will be a step in the direction of world economic stability and may well contribute to the maintenance of prosperity in America as well. Furthermore, we regard the people of Britain as one of the mainstays of our western way of life, and anything that will strengthen the internal structure of Britain will help maintain successfully our common traditions against the forces which now seek their overthrow.

But the very fact that both the Government of the United States and the British Government believe it necessary to invoke American economic aid for those purposes shows their belief that Britain, even when straining and exercising every effort, cannot achieve them by its own means. Surely the British people would have been too proud to ask for our assistance if they could pull themselves out of their present economic difficulties without it. And surely our Government could not justify to the American people the sending of tremendous amounts of money and goods to Britain if Britain were able to achieve the purposes mentioned above without such aid. Of course, if Britain is shown to be able to spend large amounts of money on capricious military and diplomatic adventures, this can be taken as prima facie proof that its need for help in connection with its most basic requirements must be exaggerated.

I refer to recent newspaper accounts of British military and diplomatic activity in connection with Palestine. I am not concerned at the moment with the political justification which may or may not exist for these activities. Personally, I think that these activities are quite unjustified, most provocative, likely to threaten the peace, indicate a contempt for the United Nations, and show a rather arrogant determination by the British Government to set its own will above the will of the international community. From reports in the newspapers, I gather that the Government of the United States is inclined to view these activities in a somewhat similar light.

I say that in spite of the report of the British Foreign Office this morning attributing to their conversations with the United States State Department the responsibilities for the aerial reconnaissance by the British planes which were shot down, which I find it is very difficult to believe. I do not see any warrant for such action.

But Great Britain is an independent and sovereign country, and far be it from us to suggest that the Congress of the United States should attempt to tell the British Government what to do or what not to do.

But there is one side of the issue with which the Congress of the United States is fully competent to deal. Not only is it competent to deal with this issue, but the Congress of the United States, in

my judgment, is under a duty to the American people to deal with this aspect. The question I have in mind is as follows: If the Government of Great Britain can afford to spend its own resources for military and diplomatic adventures of that kind—and from all we know they must be fairly expensive adventures—can it be said that the British Government is as badly in need of our economic assistance as we have been led to believe?

From evidence on hand, there would seem much reason to believe that the answer should be in the negative. I am inclined to believe that if the British Government is in a position to squander its resources on an attempt to intervene in the conflict between Arabs and Jews, that Government must be able to get along without economic help from us or, at any rate, with a much reduced amount of American aid. I suggest that the appropriate committees of the Senate review most carefully the expenditures proposed for American aid to Britain in the light of this situation.

I understand that there may arise an even more direct connection between American aid to Britain and current British activities in the Middle East. I understand that there is some question about Britain using in its military adventure in the Middle East airplanes placed at Britain's disposal under the American-aid program, tanks and guns and other military supplies procured in America or with funds coming from our economic-aid program.

I might say that in the disposal of war surplus at the end of the war vast stores of American military equipment were turned over to the British in the Middle East. The disposition of those stores in connection with the current problem is something to which I trust the appropriate committees of the Senate will give their very careful attention in the tense months or moments which are obviously ahead.

I trust that the appropriate committees of the Senate will investigate this question most thoroughly, for not for a moment do I believe that the Congress had intended to send funds and supplies to Britain with a view to their use in a threatened war against the tiny State of Israel.

But even if this is not found to be a fact, it would fail to satisfy me, and I suggest it should fail to satisfy the United States Congress. It does not matter whether the man to whom I give a dollar bill and a piece of iron pipe for his own needs uses that same dollar bill and that same piece of iron pipe to attack a third party for his own selfish reasons, or whether he uses in his attack a different dollar bill and a different piece of iron pipe which he had lying in his closet all along. What is important is that because he received aid from me he is in a position to use part of his own resources in an attack which he might not have been able to mount if I had not subsidized him. I submit, Mr. President, that a profligate use of funds for an unnecessarily aggressive policy by a government which is the recipient of so many billions of American economic aid places upon us squarely the responsibility for reexamining our expenditure under that item.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks which I made earlier in the day, dealing with events overseas, an item reported in the Washington Evening Star of today, under an Associated Press date line from London, dealing with the Palestine situation. It should be in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. It points out the extent to which oil is a factor in our difficulties in Palestine and the Middle East.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRITAIN MOVES FOR UNITED STATES ACCORD ON SETTLING PALESTINE CONFLICT; ENVOY TO CALL ON TRUMAN TODAY—FRANKS IS REPORTED ORDERED TO STATE STAND ON ISRAEL

LONDON, January 13.—The Foreign Office announced British Ambassador Sir Oliver Franks will see President Truman today in a meeting apparently aimed at patching up deepening British-American differences over Palestine.

(The White House disclosed that Franks was on the calling list to see the President at 10:30 o'clock this morning.)

A Foreign Office spokesman said Franks will seek to "make plain the attitude of His Majesty's Government, and to learn further the attitude of the American Government, in the hope that the two countries can cooperate" in settling the Holy Land conflict.

INSTRUCTIONS REPORTED GIVEN

An informed diplomatic source said Franks has received instructions from Foreign Secretary Bevin since yesterday's 4-hour-long British Cabinet session telling him to make these points to President Truman:

1. Britain regards the Jews as the aggressors in the present phase of the Palestine war.

2. Britain feels that unless Jews and Arabs get a settlement the "security, tranquillity, peace" of the Middle East will remain upset, with results that can only benefit communism.

3. Britain will regard a Jewish attack on the Red Sea port of Aqaba, or on any other part of Transjordan, as an attack on itself, now that King Abdullah has invoked the British-Transjordan mutual defense treaty.

4. Britain does not intend to suspend the precautionary measures it has taken in the conflict area. (This includes alerting of naval units in East Mediterranean bases, dispatch of British troops to Aqaba, placing of RAF airfields in the Suez Canal zone of Egypt on a war-preparedness basis.)

EDEN FEARS BREAK

Earlier, Anthony Eden, the Conservative spokesman, expressed fear of a British-American break over Palestine, and termed Mr. Bevin's handling of middle eastern affairs confused.

Mr. Eden declared in a political talk at Warwick last night the British Labor government and the State Department must share the blame "for failure either to declare a firm policy or take a firm line."

"I have long been anxious lest these Palestinian events should imperil Anglo-American friendship," said the man who was wartime Foreign Secretary under Winston Churchill and is second only to Mr. Churchill in the Conservative Party leadership. "Surely the time has now come when a supreme effort must be made to agree on an Anglo-American policy and carry it out."

PLANE ATTACK HELD UNWARRANTED

Mr. Eden said the destruction of five British planes by Israeli forces during a battle between Jews and Arabs on the Palestine-Egyptian border last Friday was an unwarranted and aggressive act.

But he added:

"Why were our aircraft sent to carry out a reconnaissance over battle areas in such conditions?

"What useful British purpose could the flight be held to serve?"

Those were a sample of the questions expected to be asked Mr. Bevin by both Conservative and Laborite critics when Parliament meets again next week. It resumes sessions Tuesday.

A Labor Member of Parliament, W. N. Warbey, told a Jewish Sccialist Party gathering in London the British-Israeli tension grew out of "the great irresponsibility of British authorities in sending military aircraft into the battle area."

Another view was emphasized in the Daily Express, an independent imperialist newspaper. It said Britain must give everybody notice she is not a lodger, but one of the landlords in the Middle East.

PRIMARY INTEREST IN OIL

Aside from defense, a primary British interest is access to middle eastern oil. This asset was emphasized in the prediction of Egyptian Government officials in Cairo yesterday that the Sinai Desert area east of the Suez Canal will become one of the richest oil-producing regions in the world.

A prospecting well drilled by Socony Vacuum not far from Sidri came into production this week. Government officials estimated the new field will yield 5,000 tons of petroleum a day. This is more than the daily production of all Egyptian fields in 1946.

The Negeb Desert of Palestine, focal point of recent Israeli-Egyptian fighting, juts down like an arrowhead toward the Red Sea between Egypt's Sinai Desert and Transjordan. The Negeb, which the United Nations partition plan assigned to the Jews, is believed to have oil possibilities.

OLD CAMPS REFURBISHED

Just off the tip of the Negeb arrowhead British troops are refurbishing old camps, digging trenches, and consolidating their positions in Aqaba. Transjordan, like Egypt, an Arab foe of Israel, called for the troops under terms of her mutual-aid treaty with Britain. Israel protested to the United Nations against this and other British activity. Security Council delegates have side-stepped a direct show-down.

"I do not think we will initiate any incursions or start hostilities," a senior regimental officer said, "but we will not allow anybody to approach Aqaba or attack our forces."

## INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN FEDERAL OFFICERS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I send to the desk, on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon and myself, three amendments proposed to Senate bill 103. I should like to be heard with respect to those amendments at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Bricker | Byrd |
| Anderson | Bridges | Cain |
| Barkley | Broughton | Capehart |
| Brewster | Butler | Chapman |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chavez | Johnson, Tex. | Neely |
| Connally | Johnston, S. C. | O'Conor |
| Cordon | Kefauver | O'Mahoney |
| Donnell | Kem | Pepper |
| Douglas | Kerr | Reed |
| Downey | Kilgore | Robertson |
| Ecton | Knowland | Russell |
| Ellender | Langer | Saltonstall |
| Ferguson | Lodge | Schoeppel |
| Flanders | Long | Smith, Maine |
| Frear | Lucas | Smith, N. J. |
| Fulbright | McCarthy | Sparkman |
| George | McClellan | Stennis |
| Gillette | McFarland | Taft |
| Green | McGrath | Taylor |
| Gurney | McKellar | Thomas, Utah |
| Hayden | McMahon | Thye |
| Hendrickson | Magnuson | Tobey |
| Hickenlooper | Malone | Tydings |
| Hill | Martin | Vandenberg |
| Hoey | Maybank | Watkins |
| Holland | Miller | Wherry |
| Humphrey | Millikin | Wiley |
| Hunt | Morse | Williams |
| Ives | Mundt | Young |
| Jenner | Murray | |
| Johnson, Colo. | Myers | |

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as stated immediately before the quorum call, I desire to be heard on the amendments which I have sent to the desk, and I respectfully request that the clerk read them for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read the amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. I suggest that the clerk read the amendment pertaining to the President first, then the one with respect to the Vice President, and then the one with respect to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read as requested.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1 it is proposed to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, and on page 2, to strike out lines 1 to 8, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 102. The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation of $100,000 a year, to be paid in equal monthly installments, and an annual allowance of not to exceed $50,000 for defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which an accounting shall be made by him, and which allowance shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented. He shall be entitled also to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

On page 2 it is proposed to strike out lines 17 to 22, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 111. There shall be paid to the Vice President an expense allowance of not to exceed $10,000 per annum for defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which allowance no tax liability shall accrue, and for which an accounting shall be made by him, and which allowance shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented.

On page 3 it is proposed to strike out lines 3 to 10, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(e) There shall be paid to the Speaker of the House of Representatives an expense allowance of not to exceed $10,000 per annum (which shall be in lieu of the allowance provided by sec. 601 (b), Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) for defraying expenses to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which allowance no tax liability shall accrue, and for which an accounting shall be made by him, and which allowance shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Chair just what is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments were simply read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the President pro tempore.

Mr. DONNELL. The three amendments which have just been read by the clerk, and which have been presented on behalf of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself, are based on the premise that an allowance for expenses should not be free from the obligation of accounting. The present provision of the bill as reported to the Senate, insofar as it relates to the President of the United States, is as follows:

The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $150,000 a year, to be paid monthly, consisting of $100,000 for salary and an expense allowance of $50,000 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him. He shall be entitled also to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

The provision relative to the expense allowance for the Vice President is, generally speaking, to similar effect. It reads as follows:

There shall be paid to the Vice President in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him.

The provision relative to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as it appears in the bill as introduced and reported, generally speaking, is to the same effect, and is as follows:

There shall be paid to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum (which shall be in lieu of the allowance provided by section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him.

Mr. President, it will be observed that in each of the three provisions which I have read from the bill, as it has been presented to the Senate, there is a freedom from the obligation to account for the expenditures of the moneys which are granted as expense allowances. I want to call attention, before discussing this matter more fully, to two rather important portions of section 102, namely, that although $50,000 of the $150,000 is therein described in one breath as an expense allowance, nevertheless it is included in the term "compensation," for the word "compensation" as used in said section 102 is, to quote the section:

In the aggregate amount of $150,000 a year.

I submit, Mr. President, that the use of the term "compensation" as applied to the $50,000 included in the $150,000, although it is thereafter amplified in the section as being an expense allowance of $50,000, is a contradiction in terms, for if it is an expense allowance, it is not compensation, and if it is compensation, it is not an expense allowance.

I call attention also, Mr. President, to the fact that in the bill as presented—and I refer to line 2 on page 2 of the bill—it is stated that the expense allowance, so-called, of $50,000, is, and I quote the language:

To assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties.

We listened with interest only a short time ago today to the address made by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and I quote a portion of one of the sentences of that address. He said:

The majority views of the committee have not explained to the Senate that, although the President is authorized to have an entertainment and travel fund for his personal account of not less than $40,000, during the 2 years such authorization has existed he has not used this amount, despite the national campaign intervening. For the fiscal year 1948 the President used only $32,039 of the $40,000 granted.

Mr. President, it occurs to me that it is somewhat curious that, although in 1948, as the distinguished Senator from North Dakota says, despite the national campaign intervening, the President used only $32,039 of the $40,000 granted to him, we now have a bill which undertakes to increase by $50,000 his expense allowance. The $50,000 allowance, instead of being provided to cover all of it, or to cover it all with whatever provision now exists, is expressed in the pending bill as being merely to assist in defraying expenses. Why this enormous increase in expense? I do not know whether the expenses of the campaign included the trip of any of the campaign trains, particularly the one which went forth on the so-called nonpolitical trip early in the spring or summer of last

year. Regardless of that fact, and whatever the fact may be, why is it that, although only $32,039 was used in 1948, despite the intervention of the national campaign, we should now be called upon to leave to the President the existing sum, whatever it may be, that is provided by statute, and then, merely to assist—and I underscore the word "assist"—in defraying his expenses, is it proposed to authorize a further sum of $50,000?

Mr. President, the fundamental point to which I invite the attention of Members of the Senate is that it is not sound public policy for us to be giving as expense allowances substantial amounts without requiring accounting as to the purposes for which those amounts shall be used.

Many of the Members of this body have been governors of their States.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will recall that when we increased the salaries of United States Senators we gave them an expense account of $2,500 without any accounting whatsoever. As I recall, the Senator from Missouri was here and agreed to that provision. He made no such argument at that time as he is now making. I wonder if he would care to explain that inconsistency.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be very glad to explain what the Senator refers to. I have in my hands the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, to which the distinguished Senator has referred. I was fully aware of that act when these amendments were presented to the Senate today. I may say in frankness that there is an inconsistency. To my mind a mistake was made in the process of enacting the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, in omitting to provide for an accounting.

I do not recall whether there was a record vote. If there was, I voted for the bill, because I was in favor of it. But regardless of that fact, to my mind what we should have done—and I think it should still be done—was one of two things: Either to provide in the law that the $2,500 which by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is declared to be an expense allowance shall be subject to the obligation of accounting, or if it be deemed proper and just to Members of Congress, that there be a provision describing that amount as compensation. If it is desired to have that portion of the compensation free from tax liability, all well and good. That may be entirely proper. It might be entirely proper to have a $12,500 salary subject to income tax, and $2,500 not subject to income tax. But in response to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I say, first, that he is correct in saying that there is an inconsistency; second, that although there is that inconsistency, we should not commit an error similar to or identical with that which was committed in 1946; third, the proper procedure would be to amend the act of 1946.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand the amendments submitted by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon, the purpose is to leave the bill with respect to these three items as it stands, except to call for an accounting in each case of the sum which is provided to assist in bearing the expense of the office.

Mr. DONNELL. The statement by the Senator from Georgia, although it strikes at and refers to the fundamental principle of the amendments, is not quite correct, in this respect: Although the bill as it is now pending before the Senate, and as it was introduced in the Senate, provides for an outright sum of $50,000 in any event, no matter if $1 or $50 or $100,000 of expense shall be incurred, this amendment—and I am reading now with relation to the President of the United States—provides as follows:

> The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation of $100,000 a year, to be paid in equal monthly installments, and an annual allowance of not to exceed $50,000 for defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which allowance no tax liability shall accrue, and for which an accounting shall be made by him, and which allowance shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented.

Let me say in concluding my response to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that the effect of this amendment—at least the intent, and I believe the effect—is that the President is granted an additional $50,000 for expenses, or rather up to but not exceeding $50,000, but that he shall receive of that sum only such amount as is actually expended, and for which vouchers are presented.

Mr. GEORGE. I thought the difference to which I first alluded was the only difference between the original and the amendment. But what troubles me—and I should like to have the Senator address himself to that point—is this: Since no requirements are made of the President and Vice President and Speaker of the House which would call for the expenditure of money by them in connection with their offices, that is, since nothing is made mandatory upon them in connection with their offices except such duties and responsibilities as are prescribed for the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, how is the requirement for an accounting consistent? Our beloved Vice President-elect might spend the full $10,000 on anything he thought had to do with his office. Since there are no prescribed extra duties which he must perform, and in connection with which he might have some expense, what is he to account for?

Mr. DONNELL. I think the bill itself, as it has been introduced and reported, answers the question of the Senator from Georgia. With respect to the Vice President, it provides:

> There shall be paid to the Vice President in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties.

Mr. President, obviously that section contemplates that there are "expenses"—and again I quote—"relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties."

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator be kind enough to enumerate those duties or to refer to some statute which does enumerate them?

Mr. DONNELL. I know of no such statute; but I think obviously the Vice President will be called upon to incur numerous expenses—as, for illustration, in responding to invitations to speak, either in the United States or possibly abroad. He will be required to incur expenses for transportation, even locally, and doubtless other expenses. In the absence of bad faith—and, of course, there will be no bad faith; I have the utmost confidence in our good friend who will be called upon shortly to assume the Vice Presidency—I undertake to say that "expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties" will in fact relate to or result from the discharge of his official duties. I do not think there is any practical or legal difficulty in connection with the query made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I am greatly disturbed by it, because the amendment would require an accounting, and presumably the General Accounting Office would look over the account, and might say that certain items were spent foolishly.

Mr. DONNELL. If that be so, then the proposed act is foolish in providing $10,000 for expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of the official duties of the Vice President.

Mr. GEORGE. That may be true; but when we provide official duties, and when no standard is fixed for them, and when nothing applies to them, except the discretion of the officer concerned, I do not think there would be any accounting standard, other than a statement at the end of the year, "I have a certain amount left of the $10,000, and I will put it back in the jug."

Mr. DONNELL. I do not share the apprehension of the Senator from Georgia. The Vice President of the United States unquestionably does incur expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties; and in the absence of an unreasonable construction of what expenses are embraced within that term, I think his certificate would be accepted and, as a matter of fact, in practicality would be of the utmost finality in determining the amounts allowed to be charged to it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that I completely share the views expressed and the analysis made by the Senator from Missouri. I think the Senator from Georgia has raised a point which points out the Achilles heel of the measure presented by the Democrats. When the Senator from Georgia makes the point that the office of President and the office of Vice President do not maintain itemized lists of so-called official expenses to which he thinks our amendment would be applicable, my reply is that the American taxpayer should not be called upon to pay the expenses of any Government officer if those expenses are not official expenses. If there are expenses of the

White House and of the Vice Presidency which ought to be paid by the American taxpayer, then it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to enumerate them and make them official. It is our duty to set forth the standards for official expenses to which the Senator from Georgia refers.

Mr. President, I share the view of the Senator from Missouri in regard to the so-called tax-exempt expense allowance for United States Senators. I voted for it, but I voted for it under protest, and with a public statement in opposition to that particular section of the bill. But, Mr. President, once again we were confronted, as so frequently we are confronted on the floor of the Senate, with a composite bill which we had either to vote for in its entirety or else vote it down in its entirety. I wish to say, because the Senator from Missouri and I talked about this very point earlier this afternoon, that I am one who believes that the section of our salary law which allows Senators $2,500 for expenses without an accounting and makes it tax-exempt in addition should be modified so that United States Senators would not benefit from any type of tax-exempt expense allowances such as the one we voted ourselves under the 1946 reorganization law. If we think we should have a $15,000 salary, then let us vote it as $15,000, subject to taxation. If we think we should have a $12,500 salary and have certain specific expenses paid, then let us list the expenses in the law and require an accounting. But I say it is a bad practice for the Congress of the United States—and it is bad for the American people—to have a provision of the type contained in the Senators' salary section of the 1946 reorganization bill.

Therefore. I take the position, in support of this amendment, that if the salary of the President of the United States and the salary of the Vice President and the salary of the Speaker of the House should be raised, let us raise them some fixed and definite amount. I protest including in the bill language which would permit a hidden expense account for which any officer of this Government would not have to make an itemized accounting, be he the President or the most lowly employee in our Government service.

Mr. President, what do you imagine thousands upon thousands of Government employees think down in their hearts about the legislation on the statute books which permits United States Senators to have a $2,500 expense account for which they have to make no accounting, whereas every time a Government employee has to take a trip on Government business, he has to make a detailed accounting of his expenses. Just consider the vouchers and the accounting he has to make for the very small sums we allow him even on his per-diem expense account. I am satisfied that the American people will not approve of a continuation of this tax-exempt, no-accounting expense fund policy. We should end it now.

There is something I wish to say further, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to do so while I am on my feet, and then I shall not have to add further comment when he finishes. I desire to say that I think the time has come when certainly we should see to it that Government salaries for high offices are adequate for services performed; but Mr. President, there are compensations in public service, over and above money. There are those intangible values and personal satisfactions which come from serving one's fellow citizens through high office. There are the values of patriotic service which make public office a great inspiration to those of us who seek to make our contribution to human welfare through politics. I wish to say that I do not share the views of the subcommittee, in offering this bill today, that we have to pay salaries as high as those the subcommittee has provided in this bill, in order to have good, effective, able public service. I say some of these salaries are entirely too high. Some of the salaries listed in the bill—proposed salaries for certain jobs of $22,500 and $20,000 and $17,500—are entirely too high for the services rendered by the men in those jobs. This is especially true when we take into account the intangible values and satisfactions which such persons get out of the opportunity to serve their country through public office. People should not be encouraged to go into public service in order to make money. I want them to have a decent living; but I do not think we help to any extent the cause of good government by setting up a salary schedule for high Government officials in this country which makes it possible for them to either make lots of money out of their jobs or live lavishly in Washington at the taxpayers' expense. That is not the way we have built up strong, democratic principles of public service in this country. We will weaken the quality of unselfish public service in our Government if we make the economic benefits of the jobs something to be sought after rather than make the jobs a source of rich opportunity for public service. I refuse to concede that the only way we can obtain able and qualified public officers is to substitute the motive of money making for the patriotic motive of public service.

Let me say here—and I say it kindly, but I say it by way of observation after having been in Washington for some years—that there is entirely too much high living in Washington on the part of high Government officials. In Government service in this country, Mr. President, there is a trend that I do not think is consonant with the simple, democratic way of American life. I do not think it is necessary for Assistant Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Cabinet officers to spend the amount of money that many of them spend in connection with their jobs. The type of living that characterizes so many of them in Washington, D. C., is resulting in an overemphasis of the social aspects of Government service and is out of keeping with simple democratic ways. Cocktail parties that cost from $500 to $1,000 should not be considered as being a necessary expense or social obligation of the job of serving in high public office in this country. One reason for the demand that the salaries of our high officials be raised is that the social expenses which have been allowed to develop around those jobs in Washington have become ridiculously extravagant and highly undemocratic. Poor men hesitate to take the jobs because of the expensive social tinsel which has been draped around the jobs. It is time to cut out much of the social extravaganza of the official life of Washington.

What Washington, D. C., needs is some simple living. We ought to set an example here in the Congress of the United States by not voting for a proposal which, in my judgment, will be an inducement, an encouragement to some of the unnecessary high living that has come to characterize to a considerable extent public service in Washington, D. C. The high costs of social life in Washington is having an effect, I may say, down in the grass roots of our democracy. Men of little wealth who would like to run for public office are discouraged when they hear of the expenses that some seem to think they have to incur if they are to meet the social obligations of the job. They are being told, and the example certainly is being set for them in Washington, that unless they have considerable economic backing of their own they cannot come here and meet the standard of living which some of our Government officials have been setting in so-called Washington social life. I want to say that one does not have to associate and rub shoulders with the rank and file of the American people very long without detecting a growing resentment over the extravagant living that has come to characterize so much of public life in Washington, D. C.

Certainly I want to see decent salaries paid; but I am not going to sit here, Mr. President, and vote for salaries which, in my judgment, will give encouragement to some of the unfortunate features of social life in Washington, which I think are not setting a good example so far as simple democratic life in America is concerned. In my opinion, some of the salaries are entirely too high. We should pay salaries adequate to enable the Government to obtain the services of competent men; but let such men recognize that the taxpayers are not going to pay them salaries which will permit them to conduct themselves on a social level of high living and social extravagance which have come to characterize so many of our official functions here in Washington. It is not true that one has to become involved in that social whirl in order to serve the interests of his State in Washington or perform the functions of any appointive job in Washington. Unfortunately too many Government officials seem to hold to a contrary view, but they should not receive any aid from Congress by such large increases in salary as this bill proposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri indulge me just a moment? I do not want to trespass on his time.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to say I raised only the one question as to accounting, not the question whether the expense

account ought to be exempt from taxation. I think that is a very bad principle. I would not undertake to defend it here and now, or hereafter, so far as that feature of it goes. But I call the Senator's attention to the fact that, without prescribing the duties relating to the office of President, Vice President, and Speaker, there is introduced an incongruous, inconsistent, and illogical provision, when it is sought to prescribe that there shall be an accounting for what they do with that money. There is a difference that I wanted to point out in the case of senatorial salaries. While personally I argued with the author of the bill against the exemption from tax of the $2,500 there is this distinction, and it is very vital: Under our revenue laws, in all businesses where any officer or agent representing the business is required to go away from his home to discharge his duties, he has a right to charge against his income all legitimate items of expense incurred by him, including the hiring of rooms or the maintenance of an apartment, if his business carries him into a city frequently enough; his meals, and everything else. It was thought, with a great deal of reason and common sense, that inasmuch as the official duties of a Member of Congress were performed principally, but not wholly, in Washington, and partly also in the State of the residence of the Senator and the Member of the House, when the Member of the Congress was away from his home on official business under the requirement of the law, he should have a perfect right to charge his actual expenditures; that is to say, all legitimate expenses incurred in attending to his official duties away from his home.

That is precisely why it was arbitrarily said that $2,500 of the amount is certainly a minimum for the expenses incurred by the Member of Congress when he is on his official duties and is away from his home. He maintains his home anyway; his expenses go on at home, and when he comes to Washington he simply has an additional expense account. That is why $2,500 was provided in the reorganization bill free of tax, and I dare say there is no Senator who will not agree at once that $2,500 will not defray the expense of any single one of the Senators in Washington while he is in Washington carrying on his official duties.

That is the explanation of that. I do not think there is any real inconsistency in supporting that principle, except I think it a bad principle to exempt anything that is in the nature of compensation or income from the payment of the tax. But that is the only legitimate ground, as I see it, upon which any just criticism can be made of the $2,500 allowance in the salary of Members of the House and Senate, or attaching to that salary.

I am still worried, I may say to the Senator, that without any standard to go by, and without any legal requirement regarding the expenditures the President and the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, respectively, may make, the accounting is tantamount to saying, "Well, you have this money," and at the end of the year we shall take a look at it. Perhaps it will be publicized in the press, as to how much you have spent for this, that, or the other, or what you have spent it for, and how much you still have left." If we are to allow an expense account, a sum total, the fair way of doing it is not to require an accounting of it, but do just as we do in the income-tax law. We say that if the taxpayer employs the short form of return, he may deduct 10 percent of his total income, or $500, to cover such items as contributions to charity, taxes, and so forth. That is an arbitrary determination; and we can likewise arbitrarily determine that the President should have $50,000 for expenses and the Speaker and the Vice President $10,000.

I think it would be better to subject all allowances of every kind in the nature of compensation to taxation, so that if the tax is too burdensome, when the President asks us to raise $4,000,000,000 additional taxes, he will have a gentle reminder of what it all amounts to. I think from that aspect the Senator stands on a very sound basis, but when it comes to accounting for something in one's own free discretion, it strikes me that the amendment is not well considered on that point, and for the reason I have stated.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the Senator from Missouri it has been ruled by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, practically ever since the income-tax law went into effect, that allowances for quarters, light, heat, rations, and travel, and all other allowances to Army and Navy officers, were not even to be listed on their income-tax returns. Those items were totally and completely exempted from taxation, so that the only tax levied against such persons was on the actual pay they received, the remainder being considered as expenses of their business, just as officials of private companies and their employees are allowed an exemption for personal expenses.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the discussion has certainly been interesting to me, and I am very happy to have the comments of the distinguished Senators who have spoken, all three of them, the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Georgia, and the Senator from West Virginia. The point made by the Senator from Georgia, namely, that there probably should be more definite standards in the law than there are now, of course appeals to everyone.

Perhaps I am not stating quite fairly the position of the Senator from Georgia, and I shall rephrase my statement. The Senator takes the view, as I understand, that because statutes at the present time do not set forth with particularity the duties of these various officers and for what they may expend funds, therefore there would be difficulty in requiring an accounting for expenditures which are not specifically authorized or the purposes of which are not specifically assigned in connection with the duties of those respective officers.

Mr. President, I can see that point, and it may well be that there should be amendment made to the statutes of the United States more clearly and definitely stating just what it is for which these various officers may expend money. I should have no objection, Mr. President, to the passage of a statute which would provide that the President of the United States may expend money for transportation, for food, upkeep, and various other matters which may be outlined in detail.

I see on the floor of the Senate this afternoon various Senators, including the distinguished proponent of this bill who presented the initial argument in favor of it, who have served as governors of their States. While I am not familiar with the statutes of other States, I have no doubt that their statutes are somewhat similar to those of my own, which require, at least in most instances, a very considerable accounting on the part of the Governor of the State as to the expenditures which he makes and for which vouchers are issued to him.

Mr. President, I think the amendment in which the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I have joined, is a wholesome amendment. I undertake to say that the people of the United States, who are the stockholders of this great corporation or entity, namely, our Government, are entitled to know for what purposes the moneys which are allotted as expense allowances are expended. I take it that they are entitled to know it.

Furthermore, Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Georgia, apparently those Senators who prepared the bill were of the opinion that it is possible to recognize what items constitute expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of the official duties of each of these three officials. If, Mr. President, it is impossible to determine what the expenses are, what they relate to, or whether they result from the discharge of official duties, what justification is there for this bill reciting as the purpose of the expense allowance assistance in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of official duties? If it be proper to use that language in the bill for the purpose of justifying the so-called expense allowance which in the earlier portion of the same sentence is referred to, as I have pointed out, not merely as expense allowance, but as compensation, or if it be proper to use the language "relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties," it certainly would be possible for the man who spends the money, the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, reasonably to state on paper, over his signature, what the expenses are and how they relate to or result from the discharge of official duties.

I should not be averse to supporting, in due time, an appropriate amendment more clearly and specifically outlining the purpose for which these officers may spend money. Every proponent of the bill, as I understand, every member of the committee, except the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], voted in favor of reporting the bill to the Senate, thereby voting in favor of the proposition that the expenses referred to relate to or result from the discharge of the official duties of these vari-

ous officials. I undertake to say that is strong presumptive evidence that the President, our distinguished Vice President-elect, and the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives can point out with very clear distinctness what it is they have spent and why those expenses relate to or result from the discharge of their respective duties.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, does not the Senator agree with me that it is no reflection on the President, Vice President, or the Speaker to make an accounting for the money they spend? In my State, as Governor I had to account for every item of $1 or more, and I had to do so under oath. The distinguished Senator from Missouri has just said that that is the custom in his State, and, I believe, in many other States. Certainly I believe that the President of the United States should set an example for every other public official in this country.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator from North Dakota. I thoroughly agree with him, Mr. President.

As the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has pointed out, when one of the subordinate officials of our Government, or one of the employees, or one of the auditors, goes out over the United States on an official trip of some kind, upon official duty, he must put down that he spent so much for board and lodging, so much for telegrams, so much for Pullman fare, so much for airplane passage, or whatever the expense might be. It seems to me that it is hardly appropriate to suggest that the President of the United States shall have prepared for his benefit a provision that no accounting shall be made by him for his expense allowance.

Mr. President, I think the fact which has been previously mentioned, namely, that according to the information of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], of the $40,000 already available to the President, he has used only $32,039 for the year 1948, raises very clearly a question, first, as to why he should have any additional allowance for expenses, and, secondly, if he should have it, why should he not account to the people of the country, the stockholders who pay the bill, and why should he not tell us for what purposes he spends the money?

I had some experience many years ago in traveling around a little for a private corporation. It was required of me, as I recall, that I furnish an expense account to the corporation for which I traveled. There is nothing unreasonable about it. There is no reflection upon anyone. It is wholesome. It is an example which should be given by the Chief Magistrate and the other high officials of the people of the country.

Mr. President, I see across the Chamber one of the Senators from the State of California. I recall with clear distinctness that it was only last spring that the legislature of his State passed a bill providing for a certain amount—I have forgotten the amount at this time——

Mr. LANGER. It was $25,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Twenty-five thousand dollars which should be available for the purpose of advocating a certain measure called the Tidelands measure. In the bill passed by the legislature of the State of California there was a provision to the effect, in substance, that the persons spending money need not file vouchers for their expenditures. I think I saw local newspapers in Washington—certainly I saw newspapers from California—which commented upon the curious spectacle of a sum of money authorized without the obligation of accounting and with an affirmative statement that the filing of vouchers was not necessary. What happened? The Governor of the State, who had been previously nominated and elected as the candidate of both the Democratic and Republican Parties, failed to sign the bill. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that the wave of feeling which was engendered by the passage of that bill at least rendered some possible service in calling to the attention of the chief magistrate of California the fact that it was improper and unwholesome that such legislation should be passed.

Mr. President, I shall not trespass longer, at this time, at any rate, upon the Senate. I merely rose upon the proposition that the bill as it now stands is unwholesome in that it relieves the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the obligation to account; and upon the further proposition that it is wholesome, and for the best interests of our Nation, that every person in this country may know what every dollar of an expense account is expended for.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I rise to support the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon. I had planned to offer similar amendments, but since they have previously offered theirs, I shall support the amendments offered by the two Senators.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to understand the Senator would like to join as one of the cosponsors of the amendments?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should be very happy to join.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure I speak for the Senator from Missouri when I say that he and the junior Senator from Oregon will welcome the Senator as a cosponsor of the amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. We certainly will, Mr. President.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, after 2 weeks of work at this session it seems ironic to note that the first piece of legislation to be considered by the Eighty-first Congress should be a bill to raise the salaries of the President, Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and well over 200 of other top executives heading the numerous Government agencies. Furthermore, there is not a single one of the sponsors of this bill who will dispute the fact that the proposed salary increase for these executives is no other than a forerunner of a general salary increase for all executive branches of the Government service, and that another bill incorporating a substantial increase for all of the other thousands of this group will be following in the very near future.

As a background for this increase, the sponsors of the bill S. 103 have relied upon the report of the Hoover Commission as endorsing these salary adjustments, but what they have completely ignored is the fact that the Hoover Commission in making recommendations for these salary increases in certain executive departments of our Government has also recommended a drastic reorganization of these departments, eliminating many of the overlapping agencies and, in general, achieving a substantial economy in the administration of our Government.

This latter recommendation for the overhauling of our Government departments is going to be the major, not the minor, recommendation of the Hoover Commission and while I am not opposed to an upward revision in the salary schedules of these executives as recommended by the Hoover report I do feel that such salary increases should be made contingent upon the adoption or at least the consideration of the report itself.

It is common gossip in the cloakrooms now, as every one of us knows, that the work of this Commission, which was authorized by the Eightieth Congress and endorsed by the President himself, is expected to be ignored by the Congress in fear that its adoption would eliminate some of the patronage it now enjoys. I feel very strongly that any action whatsoever in revising salary scales of the heads of these departments, as recommended in this report, should be postponed until such time as consideration can be given to the report in its entirety.

I do recognize, however, that consideration toward revising the salary scale of the President and Vice President is in a different category in that any changes made in their salary base in order to be applicable during the next 4 years must be taken prior to the 20th day of January. For that reason I feel that it is proper that consideration should be given and a decision made as to what we intend to do in regard to their two salaries.

The office of the President of the United States is the highest and most important position in our country, and the requirements demanded of the man who holds that position, in addition to the social obligations demanded of him by virtue of his position, are such that this office should carry a salary commensurate with his responsibility.

Here again we find that the Hoover Commission approached this subject upon a sound and realistic basis when it recognized the social obligations of the President, and recommended that the Government should take over the complete expenses of the operation of the White House. In President Hoover's testimony before the committee upon this subject, he stated:

Perhaps if the Government should take over the obligation of running the White House, which I think should have been done

20 years ago, it might be even a better solution than increasing the President's salary.

If we are to follow President Hoover's recommendation in this respect, which I think is a sound approach to the problem, then there is no necessity for rushing this bill through Congress at this time, because action could be taken after January 20, at some time when we were considering the Hoover report itself.

As it is now, the President, in addition to the $75,000 annual salary, receives a $40,000 expense allowance which must be accounted for. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that expenditures from this expense account should be accounted for. During the war years this $40,000 fund was augmented by a special contingency fund which Congress allocated to the President to be handled at his discretion.

Senate bill 103 proposes to continue this expense allowance of $40,000, in addition to any other money which may be appropriated by the Congress toward the payment of expenses of the White House. Supplementing these expense allowances, the bill under consideration proposes to increase the President's salary from the current $75,000 to $100,000 a year, and at the same time grants him a special $50,000 tax-exempt payment upon which no accounting would be required. Simply stated, the proposed salary for the President under this bill is $150,000, of which $50,000 is tax-exempt.

I am unalterably opposed to the establishment of a precedent under which a portion of the salary of the President or of any other Government official would be made in the form of a tax-exempt payment. The system now in operation, under which a portion of the salaries of the Members of Congress are tax-exempt, is wrong, and if I had been a Member of the Congress at the time the law was enacted, I most certainly would have voted against that provision.

The President of the United States, the Members of Congress, and other top officials of the executive branch of our Government, are responsible for the fiscal affairs of our country. We as policy makers authorize these large expenditures which necessitate increased tax rates, amounting in some instances to confiscation. I think it is a healthy condition for our own good, and particularly for the good of the country, that we as officials of the Government suffer along with the other taxpayers. For this reason I feel that whatever increase in salary is proposed for the President and Vice President or any other Government official should be made on a flat basis, subject to all such rates of taxation as are applied to other individuals in this country. This can be done by increasing the figures in the bill as salary compensation to a point adequate to take care of the desired objective.

Another advantage to this approach is that it will bring home forcibly to the President and to all officials responsible for the fiscal policy of our Government the seriousness of our existing and future tax burdens, by making all taxes applicable to their own fortunes as well as to the fortunes of the other 145,000,000 Americans.

There is no use in our kidding ourselves. We all know that the only reason for this approach of making a portion of their salaries tax-exempt is that we are afraid to call to the attention of the American people the seriousness of our present tax structure by inserting in this bill a salary figure high enough to bring the take-home pay up to that point which is desired at this time. Under this proposal the salary of the President is set at $150,000, of which amount $50,000 is tax-exempt. This formula is used because the sponsors of the bill wish to grant to the President a net take-home pay, after taxes, of around $93,000. To have achieved this result by merely granting the President a salary increase high enough to leave a take-home pay of this amount under our existing tax laws would have necessitated an increase in his salary from the current $75,000 a year to about $300,000, or an increase of about 400 percent. This was called to the attention of the committee by President Hoover himself, who said:

> The President and the Speaker and the Vice President, as all of you gentlemen, are afflicted with the increased income tax; and the salary, nominal salary, does not at all represent what is left. That is also one of your problems in the upper brackets of civil service; that the greatly increased income taxes tend to greatly lessen all these incomes.

Mr. Hoover continued:

> Every citizen has to bear his share of that burden, but particularly on the President, I think, it is too hard a burden. The President has to carry a great many public burdens that can only be met indirectly, and I would like to suggest to you a line of inquiry.
>
> I am not prepared to say whether the President should not have an increase in salary, but if you look at the effect of the income tax upon an increased salary, you will see he does not get much if you double it. * * *
>
> I looked into the income tax, State and Federal, and I note that the salary of $75,000 for the President, after deduction of State and Federal income taxes, leaves about $43,000. Whereas, if you put his salary up to $150,000, he would have about $68,000 left.

The committee recognized this situation, where, under our existing tax rates, to achieve its objective of leaving the President around $90,000 take-home pay, his salary would have to be set near $300,000. In other words, were we to set his salary at $300,000 annually and allow him to pay all of the taxes now being demanded of any other American citizen making a similar amount, the President would have left actually less money than he would have under the bill before us. There are many people in our country who do not realize that once a man reaches these upper brackets 81 percent of his earnings is returned to the Federal Treasury and out of the remaining 19 percent which he has left he is still called upon to pay his State and local taxes.

To me this adds up to confiscation, but in spite of this astounding fact we find the President himself in his message to this Congress urging that we enact laws to raise these rates even higher on all those individuals who are earning in excess of $5,000, and particularly that we should raise rates on those who are earning exceptionally high salaries. To extend to the President at this time a special tax exemption would be, it seems to me, inconsistent with the President's own recommendations to this Congress when he said that the burden of paying the running expenses of the Government should always fall on those who are earning high salaries. As I said earlier, I am not opposed to a revision of the President's salary, but I know of no better way to emphasize to the President himself the fact that our tax rate has almost reached the confiscation level than to keep him and all other Government officials always in a position where their own salaries will be taxed along with the rest of the people.

For the information of those who are not familiar with our tax rates, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a chart showing our present graduated tax rates and would urge that each Member of Congress keep those rates forever in mind when advocating unnecessary expenditures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Over $2,000 but not over $4,000: $400, plus 22 percent of excess over $2,000.

Over $4,000 but not over $6,000: $840, plus 26 percent of excess over $4,000.

Over $6,000 but not over $8,000: $1,360, plus 30 percent of excess over $6,000.

Over $8,000 but not over $10,000: $1,960, plus 34 percent of excess over $8,000.

Over $10,000 but not over $12,000: $2,640, plus 38 percent of excess over $10,000.

Over $12,000 but not over $14,000: $3,400, plus 43 percent of excess over $12,000.

Over $14,000 but not over $16,000: $4,260, plus 47 percent of excess over $14,000.

Over $16,000 but not over $18,000: $5,200, plus 50 percent of excess over $16,000.

Over $18,000 but not over $20,000: $6,200, plus 53 percent of excess over $18,000.

Over $20,000 but not over $22,000: $7,260, plus 56 percent of excess over $20,000.

Over $22,000 but not over $26,000: $8,380, plus 59 percent of excess over $22,000.

Over $26,000 but not over $32,000: $10,740, plus 62 percent of excess over $26,000.

Over $32,000 but not over $38,000: $14,460, plus 65 percent of excess over $32,000.

Over $38,000 but not over $44,000: $18,360, plus 69 percent of excess over $38,000.

Over $44,000 but not over $50,000: $22,500, plus 72 percent of excess over $44,000.

Over $50,000 but not over $60,000: $26,820, plus 75 percent of excess over $50,000.

Over $60,000 but not over $70,000: $34,320, plus 78 percent of excess over $60,000.

Over $70,000 but not over $80,000: $42,120, plus 81 percent of excess over $70,000.

Over $80,000 but not over $90,000: $50,220, plus 84 percent of excess over $80,000.

Over $90,000 but not over $100,000: $58,620, plus 87 percent of excess over $90,000.

Over $100,000 but not over $150,000: $67,320, plus 89 percent of excess over $100,000.

Over $150,000 but not over $200,000: $111,820, plus 90 percent of excess over $150,000.

Over $200,000: $156,820, plus 91 percent of excess over $200,000.

These rates are subject to the reductions approved under Public Law No. 471—Eightieth Congress.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I hope and urge that this bill will be amended by the Senate, removing this tax exemption in favor of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House—the three men who more than any others should be held responsible for the solvency of our Government.

Let us extend whatever salary increase we wish to give these officials in the open.

If this special tax exemption feature is not removed from the bill, I will be compelled to vote against the measure as a matter of principle.

Confronted as we are today with a national debt of over $250,000,000,000 and a record peacetime budget for the next fiscal year in excess of $41,600,000,000, it is unthinkable that we should even consider setting aside a special group of Government officials to be exempt from their obligations of helping to support the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The first amendment was on page 3, after line 10, to strike out:

(f) The allowance for clerical assistance to the Vice President contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1949, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, hereby is increased from $32,385 per annum to $45,000 per annum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. MORSE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Morse |
| Anderson | Hill | Mundt |
| Barkley | Hoey | Murray |
| Brewster | Holland | Myers |
| Bricker | Humphrey | Neely |
| Bridges | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Broughton | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Butler | Jenner | Pepper |
| Byrd | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Cain | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Capehart | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Chapman | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Chavez | Kem | Smith, Maine |
| Connally | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Cordon | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Donnell | Langer | Stennis |
| Douglas | Lodge | Taft |
| Downey | Long | Taylor |
| Ecton | Lucas | Thomas, Utah |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Thye |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Tobey |
| Flanders | McFarland | Tydings |
| Frear | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Fulbright | McMahon | Watkins |
| George | Magnuson | Wherry |
| Gillette | Malone | Wiley |
| Green | Martin | Williams |
| Gurney | Maybank | Young |
| Hayden | Miller | |
| Hendrickson | Millikin | |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, after line 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 8, to insert:

Notwithstanding the act of February 23, 1931 (5 U. S. C. 152a), the salary of the legal adviser of the Department of State shall not be increased as a result of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after line 15, on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect at noon on January 20, 1949.

It is also proposed to amend the title so as to read:

A bill to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, to include the $330 not added to the salaries of the classified employees of the District of Columbia and of the Foreign Service.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. I am offering an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. How can the Senator offer an amendment to my amendment until I yield the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont will be given an opportunity when the Senator from Illinois has concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, this amendment strikes out of Senate bill 103, beginning on page 3, line 16 of the bill, section 2, and the remaining part thereof, merely leaving for consideration that portion of the bill which seeks to increase the rates of compensation of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Before I discuss these three provisions briefly, let me say to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], who was responsible for the appointment of the subcommittee to hear evidence on this important measure, that the majority desire to thank him for that service, and also to thank the members of the committee for the contribution which they have made in reporting a bill of great importance.

We on this side regret exceedingly that we are compelled at this time to offer this amendment. We do it for a very good and valid reason. It has already been demonstrated here today, as a result of these debates, that insofar as employees in the lower classifications are concerned, there is some disagreement as to whether or not other individuals should be included; and perhaps some who are included should be excluded.

I think it goes without saying that in the event we should send this bill in its present form to the House of Representatives, as a result of the debates which we have had today, it would be defeated through delay because in paragraph 6 of section 1 of article II of the Constitution of the United States it is provided that:

The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation, which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

Unless the Congress of the United States acts with dispatch, the President of the United States will not be able to receive during the next 4 years the benefits provided in the bill. I am informed by the leadership in the House of Representatives that as yet the House committees have not been organized. The turnover was great in the House of Representatives. There are many difficulties in the assignment of committees. Consequently, if this measure is to become law before the 20th of January, it will be necessary for the House of Representatives to obtain unanimous consent in order to take up this measure. The leaders of the majority as well as the leaders of the minority in the House of Representatives have agreed, insofar as they can, to go along with those three provisions of the bill, provided we get the bill over to the House of Representatives as expeditiously as possible.

That is the parliamentary situation in the House of Representatives. I am certain that the great majority of the Members of the Senate desire to increase the salary of the President of the United States and to increase his expense account. I think it would be short of elemental justice to him if we did not do this immediately. That is especially true if we give those in the lower classifications and others who are not included in the classifications an increase in salary later on.

Remember, Mr. President, that this subcommittee was composed of the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. Two Republicans and one Democrat made this subcommittee report to the full committee, and the full committee reported the bill by an affirmative vote of 10 to 1. Surely the least we can do, in view of the study made by the subcommittee and the action of the full committee, is to pass the bill with the amendment which I have offered. I hope that the bill will go to the House of Representatives in the form suggested, with the exception of one amendment which I have agreed to with the minority leader and which will be offered in due course.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I apologize to him for having interrupted him out of order. I had supposed that the President pro tempore was about to put the question on the amendment. That was the reason for my jumping up hastily as I did.

The amendment which I am about to offer would retain in the bill the last section, section 8, on page 8, relating to the

two groups who did not receive an increase last July when an increase was granted to all other members of the classified service. Therefore, I move to amend the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois by retaining section 8, and renumbering it as section 3. I offer that as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Vermont is simply offering the amendment to my amendment; is that correct?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is all.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, speaking as the minority leader, and referring to the amendment just proposed by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont, to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, I think it necessary to state that in the minority policy committee meeting this morning, at which the pros and cons of the question of taking up this bill or any part of it were discussed, it was the opinion of the minority policy committee that only the part that is included in the so-called Lucas amendment—namely, the provision increasing the salaries of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House—should be reported from the committee and debated by the Members of the Senate, because of the fact that if we were to consider the entire subject, there would be many meritorious proposals which Senators would like to consider.

So, not only because of the parliamentary situation which prevails, as was so ably pointed out and discussed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] but because of the fact that if we are to pass the bill and have it passed by the House of Representatives, we must pass it promptly, it was the opinion of the policy committee that, even though the meritorious position taken by the distinguished Senator from Vermont might be entirely justified, yet the only feature of the bill which should be brought up for debate and on which the minority should take a position, was the part relating to the salaries of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House.

Therefore, much as I hate to do so—because there are many provisions which I should like to see debated and incorporated in a complete bill—for the reasons just stated it will be necessary to oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

I hope, as minority leader, I have made my position clear.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I bear witness to the fact, since I was present, that the minority leader is carrying out the decision of the minority policy committee.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska whether—assuming that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is defeated—the minority will cooperate in seeing that justice is done to the District of Columbia employees, in securing for them the pay raise which was denied them last summer, which denial has worked a grievous injustice upon them.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to answer the Senator.

The minority is always glad to cooperate in seeing that justice is done anywhere along the line. But for me to say that the minority will agree to that particular matter is useless. All I can say now is that we are perfectly willing to agree now, as the minority, to see to it that the salaries of the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House of Representatives are increased. We are willing to agree to that in order to get the bill passed by the Senate and sent promptly to the House of Representatives, so as to make it possible for the House to pass the bill by the 20th of January.

There are other amendments which will be offered, and when they are offered it will be up to each individual Senator to take his own position in regard to how he feels about the amendments themselves. But as the minority, we have taken this position in the hope that we can be most cooperative and can expedite the passage of the bill at this time.

In further answer to the Senator, let me say that I am satisfied that when we come to all other pay bills we shall be glad to give full consideration to the reporting and debating of bills which we hope will do justice all around.

Mr. O'CONOR. But does not the Senator feel that an unusual situation exists with respect to District of Columbia employees, in that they have been denied an increase which has been granted to others during the past 6 months?

Mr. WHERRY. No doubt that is correct, but if we take up that matter today, the bill will not be passed today, as I believe it should be, for, as stated on both sides of the aisle, if we are to do anything in this connection promptly, we must do only this much. Therefore, I think we should act as I have indicated.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to discuss a matter which was brought up by the minority floor leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. FLANDERS. Am I correct in saying that the amendment I have offered to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois was not brought up before the minority policy committee, so that it is not a policy matter, but is an individual matter for each Senator to decide?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; except that the minority policy committee took the position that we would go this far and no further at this time, on account of the parliamentary situation and also because of other reasons which were brought out at that time.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Maryland one or two questions if I may do so.

In his observation several minutes ago, the Senator from Maryland said he was hopeful that Senators on this side of the aisle and all other Senators would take an active interest in seeing that justice is done to the employees of the District of Columbia. Do I correctly infer from his otherwise splendid statement that the Senator from Maryland means to indicate that the section of the bill relating to the matter would provide a retroactive pay increase for all District of Columbia employees?

Mr. O'CONOR. I answer the question by saying that it would provide a retroactive increase for all who were excluded from the Pay Revision Act of 1948.

Mr. CAIN. Let me suggest to the Senator from Maryland that in part—and in part only—is he correct. The provision of the bill would give increases to 7,000 out of 18,000 civil-service servants of the District of Columbia. In the absence of legislation which will adequately provide for all those having equal rights to such advantages, I should certainly think that at this time the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois should be voted down.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am in thorough agreement with the Senator from Washington in his expressed desire to see justice done to all employees of the District of Columbia. However, as the Senator well knows, a certain segment of that group was excluded last July.

In this bill we were attempting to put back into that status the group which was excluded, and we were hopeful that that would be the first step in doing justice to the entire group, as the Senator from Washington undoubtedly wants done.

Mr. CAIN. But I suggest that in the last weeks of the session of Congress last summer, the entire 18,000 were excluded, for the bill would have made increases, not only for the 7,000 referred to in the measure now before us, but for the entire 18,000.

Mr. O'CONOR. Of course it is our desire to see that justice is done both to the 7,000 and to the entire 18,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. I do so for yet another reason, which I hope the Senate will bear in mind.

It was my experience, upon going home after the last session, at which we increased by $330 the salaries of various classified employees in the civil service and other employees, that there are a great number of the lowest paid employees of the Government, not included

in the civil service, as to whom that pay raise does not apply. I understand now that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, simply would provide a raise—as should be done, at the proper time—for those who were excluded in the District of Columbia; that is, employees of the District of Columbia; and perhaps some of the Foreign Service employees. I think, before any such sweeping action is taken, a measure should be drafted that will do justice to the many thousands of unclassified employees who, either by design or by accident, were excluded from the provisions of the act passed by the last Congress. For that reason—and I think it is an excellent one—I certainly object to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. I hope it will be voted down by the Senate.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should again like to call the attention of the Senator from Florida to the fact, which is important in the proceeding, those in the classified service are the only employees over whom the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has any authority. It has no jurisdiction in any way over the other employees of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to say merely one more word, that I neglected to say, in the previous short address I made to the Senate upon the pending measure. I talked to the President of the United States last night about the bill. In fact, he called me. In substance he said—and he wanted the Senate to know this—that he is more anxious and more interested in the groups in the lower classifications getting what is necessary in the way of adequate pay in order that they may render efficient service to the Government than he is in his own increase in salary. I assured him that the moment we were able to pass the pending bill in the Senate, I would be prepared to introduce a measure dealing with all the other officials and employees of Government in the various classifications. I have conferred with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the committee, and I have a bill ready to be introduced today, as soon as the pending bill is passed. It is a bill which will bear the names of the same Senators who introduced a similar bill heretofore. The bill will be referred immediately to the committee. The Senator from South Carolina has assured me that hearings will be held and every opportunity given to individual Senators to present further their views, and the bill will be reported with all convenient speed. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois is entirely correct. At this time I want to say I have talked to the Senators on the committee. A majority of the Members feel that at this time, under the circumstances in which we find ourselves, we should go along and pass the bill the acting majority leader wants passed, and then later we take up another bill, and include in it not only the employees covered by this particular bill, but many others who ought to be covered, such as those the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] mentioned a few minutes ago.

We mean to have hearings, and try to report a satisfactory bill, if possible. Work is being done on the matter. The subcommittee worked tirelessly for long hours, and did a good job, but at the same time, after the pending bill was brought before the full committee, I think it was agreed that other officials and employees and groups of employees should be provided for. We certainly want provision made for them. I refer, for example, to the FBI, the Farm Credit Administration, and the REA head. We could go on to name others. That matter will be taken up at the proper time in the hearings. But we find ourselves in a position at the present time where we must act quickly. We can carry only so much of the load. We want to carry as much as we can, but no more. For that reason I shall have to vote against the amendment which has been offered to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois, because I do not want to load the bill with anything that might prevent its passage when it goes to the other House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I noticed that the Senator from South Carolina named certain officials that he said would receive consideration. In looking over the bill, it occurred to me that it was very ironic that the official who is responsible for raising all the money the Government spends, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who has a job of vast responsibility, who is supposed to raise the $44,000,000,000 that is to be expended, was omitted entirely. He was left with a $10,330 salary. All the officials of the Government who have the duty and responsibility of giving away our money or loaning our money receive very substantial pay increases. It does seem to me that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who has the stupendous job of collecting the money and getting it into the Treasury, should have a little consideration.

The bill in its present form also increases greatly the pay of all the Assistant Attorneys General, and of nearly all the other lawyers connected with the independent agencies; but the general counsel for the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, who has to wrestle with the greatest tax lawyers in the Nation, working day and night in protecting the Treasury, has received no recognition whatever in the bill.

I wanted to bring that matter to the attention of the Senate. I think certain of the salaries are entirely too high, and I cannot support the pending bill as written. I shall support a fair salary-increase bill. But certainly if we are going to increase the salaries of all those whose duties are to spend the money or to give the money, we should give some recognition to the very important officer who has to sweat out the job of supervising the collection of all the tax funds throughout the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask a question. It may be that it should very well be addressed to the Senator from Maryland, who, as I understand, served as chairman of the subcommittee that reported the bill.

From a reading of the language in the first section, amending section 102 of title III, it appears that the aggregate amount we are allowing to the President is $150,000, consisting of $100,000 salary and an expense allowance of $50,000. From all reports, the newspaper reports and various things we have heard, it is my understanding that the purpose is to give the President an additional expense allowance of $50,000, for which there shall be no accounting; which is in addition to another $40,000 that is allowed him. That is the purpose, is it not?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is the purpose. The Senator's statement is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I ask the question because it appears from reading the language of the bill, particularly when reference is made to the aggregate amount of $150,000, the intention of the bill would be to allow the President only $150,000, and not that amount in addition to the $40,000 he is already receiving.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the explanation is that the allowance of $40,000 is by separate authorization. It is not mandatory. The statute specifically says, "There may be expended by the President an amount not to exceed $40,000, if and when it is authorized and appropriated by the Congress." So that the amount mentioned in Senate bill 103 is in addition to and separate and distinct from that authorization.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is not intended by the language of the bill to repeal the authorization of that additional amount of $40,000, is it?

Mr. O'CONOR. It is not so intended.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks made relative to the determination of the policy committee of the minority this morning, I want to have it strictly understood it was only in the form of a recommendation. It is not a question of party policy. Each member of course, can do as he pleases in voting on the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I desire to make it clear that this is a perfect illustration of what it means to have a policy committee within the Republican Party. Here are 11 Senators holding a meeting of the policy committee, in which six have control, yet the minority member of the committee is not invited to attend. I offered an amendment at the time we met, providing that the policy committee should consist of every single Republican, the entire 42. At that time I was assured by the distinguished Senator from Ohio that whenever anything came up involving the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I should be invited. On the very first bill, we find that the policy committee of 11 men met, without the minority member being called in.

I now serve notice that I shall give the week's notice which is required by the

rules of the Republican organization, and that I shall call again upon every Member of the Republican Party to vote upon the proposition as to whether six Republicans are to control Republican policy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks just made by the Senator from North Dakota, I wish to back up the statement made by our able minority leader. No six Republicans are trying to determine our policy in this instance. I happen to be acquainted with the situation to which the minority leader refers. The policy committee is a part of this body under the Reorganization Act, and it has certain responsibilities. It took action and recommended that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as modified by the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], be approved.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say in response to that statement that the trouble with the argument is that the views of the different members of the Republican Party are not even brought before all the members of the policy committee. It goes down to the very roots of the difficulty. If I were a lobbyist, the only members of the Republican Party I would have to see would be six men. If I convinced those six men, I would know the Republican policy. The same may be true of the Democratic Party, although I am not familiar with the rules of that party. Even though the verdict of the policy committee is not binding, nevertheless it does influence certain Senators, especially new ones, in some instances. That is my entire objection. I state it now because this is an appropriate time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I offer to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of Mr. LUCAS it is proposed to insert at the appropriate place a new section 2, as follows:

In computing the amount to be deducted from the compensation of any official whose salary is increased under this act for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and in computing the amount of any annuity under such act, any increased compensation provided by this act shall be disregarded until further act of Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the amendment provides that the increases in compensation provided by the bill shall not be considered in determining the amounts of annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. At the present time the President and the Vice President are not covered by the Retirement Act. It affects the Speaker of the House. However, we felt that it might establish a precedent, and in view of the fact that the complete Retirement Act and amendments thereto will be gone into at this session, we felt that it should be separated, because it is a pay bill and not a retirement bill. That is the purpose of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). In view of the possible interest that I may have in this legislation, I ask to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is excused from voting.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senater from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

I announce further that if present and voting the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—84

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Douglas | Hoey |
| Anderson | Downey | Holland |
| Brewster | Ellender | Humphrey |
| Bridges | Ferguson | Hunt |
| Broughton | Frear | Ives |
| Butler | Fulbright | Jenner |
| Byrd | George | Johnson, Colo. |
| Cain | Gillette | Johnson, Tex. |
| Capehart | Green | Johnston, S. C. |
| Chapman | Gurney | Kefauver |
| Chavez | Hayden | Kem |
| Connally | Hendrickson | Kilgore |
| Cordon | Hickenlooper | Knowland |
| Donnell | Hill | Langer |
| Lodge | Morse | Sparkman |
| Long | Mundt | Stennis |
| Lucas | Murray | Taft |
| McCarthy | Myers | Taylor |
| McClellan | Neely | Thomas, Utah |
| McFarland | O'Conor | Thye |
| McKellar | O'Mahoney | Tobey |
| McMahon | Pepper | Tydings |
| Magnuson | Robertson | Vandenberg |
| Malone | Russell | Watkins |
| Martin | Saltonstall | Wherry |
| Maybank | Schoeppel | Wiley |
| Miller | Smith, Maine | Williams |
| Millikin | Smith, N. J. | Young |

NAYS—2

Ecton Flanders

NOT VOTING—10

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin | Kerr | Thomas, Okla. |
| Barkley | McCarran | Wagner |
| Bricker | McGrath | |
| Eastland | Reed | |

So the amendment of Mr. LUCAS, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, is it in order now to offer the amendments which have been presented and which were discussed a little while ago?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is in order now to offer the amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, at this time I offer the three amendments which have been previously presented for reading and for discussion by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL]. Inasmuch as the principle involved in each of the three amendments is identical, I respectfully ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be voted upon en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing en bloc to the amendments.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and desire to be heard upon the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second to the request for the yeas and nays?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to be heard in respect to these amendments, in view of the fact that a very considerable number of Senators are now on the floor who were not here at the time the previous discussion of the amendments occurred.

The amendments present the proposition that instead of having a provision, as the bill would otherwise provide, by which no accounting is to be made by the President, the Vice President, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of an expense allowance of, respectively, $50,000, $10,000, and $10,000 per annum, there shall be a requirement that an accounting shall be made by each of these respective officers of the amount granted as an expense allowance.

In addition, Mr. President, the amendments present this proposition: The bill itself, in the form presented, provides that there shall be, in addition to a salary of $100,000 to the President, an expense allowance of $50,000, regardless of whether any of it is spent, or regardless of how much of it is spent. The amendments, applicable to each of these respec-

tive three offices, provide for an allowance of not to exceed a specified amount, in the case of the President $50,000 per annum, in the case of the Vice President $10,000 per annum, and in the case of the Speaker of the House of Representatives $10,000 per annum, with a provision that an accounting shall be made by each of these respective officers, and that the respective allowances shall be payable in monthly installments on vouchers duly presented.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to read all three of the amendments, but I should like to have the indulgence of Senators while I read the one applicable to the President, and I can assure the Senators that the principle involved in each of the other two is identical with that in the one which I shall read.

I think it would be well to read first the provision of the bill itself, as now before the Senate, in respect to the President, and then the provision of the amendment. The bill provides:

> The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $150,000 a year, to be paid monthly, consisting of $100,000 for salary and an expense allowance of $50,000 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him. He shall be entitled also to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I heard the Senator's remarks, and I know how sincere he is in everything he says. This question arises in my mind: We of the Senate are allowed $2,500 in an expense account, payable in monthly installments. There is no requirement on us to make a return as to how we expend that $2,500, is there?

Mr. DONNELL. There is not, and I am glad the Senator asked the question, because earlier this afternoon we discussed the identical question on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. The only point in my mind is that the two are entirely similar. The principle is the same, is it not?

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is. There has been a suggestion by one of the Senators on the other side that there is a difference in principle with respect to the Executive provision and that applicable to the Congress. To my mind there is an inconsistency, and I shall be happy, if I may, to answer the inquiry, unless the Senator from New Hampshire desires to elaborate upon it.

Mr. TOBEY. I do not.

Mr. DONNELL. The same point, I may say, Mr. President, was raised earlier this afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the then acting floor leader of the Democratic Members of the Senate, and the point was one which had occurred to the three of us who submitted the amendments, before their submission. I have now in my hand, and had upon my desk at the moment that the Senator from Illinois raised the question, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. There is a provision in it which I should like to read:

> Effective on the day on which the Eightieth Congress convenes, there shall be paid to each Senator, Representative in Congress, Delegate from the Territories, Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, an expense allowance of $2,500 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to, or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall incur, or accounting be made; such sum to be paid in equal monthly installments.

I take it, Mr. President, that the principle of what I have read from the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is precisely the same as that contained in the bill now pending before the Senate for consideration. I stated in response to the question of the Senator from Illinois that in my mind there is an inconsistency between the two positions, and that to my mind the position which we took, and for which I certainly voted, if there was a record vote, and certainly approved if there was no record vote, when we voted on the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, is not consistent with the proposition I am advocating this afternoon.

But my proposition, Mr. President, is that the action taken in 1946, insofar as it undertakes to grant an expense allowance and then provide no obligation for an accounting—indeed the act contains an affirmative provision that there shall be no accounting—was a mistaken type of legislation, and were the vote to occur again this afternoon I should oppose it just as I am opposing this provision in the pending bill.

I may say further that to my mind there should be introduced in the Senate of the United States an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to correct what I deem to be an unwise piece of legislation.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in just a moment to the Senator from Oregon.

In the third place, I may say that the provision in the Legislative Reorganization Act, which is therein set forth, to my mind should by proper legislation be changed in either one of two ways. Either that each Member of Congress shall be granted a salary of $12,500 plus an expense allowance, to be supported by vouchers, and to be paid only on vouchers, or if it be deemed just and proper to the Members of the Congress that there shall be a $12,500 portion of the salary which is subject to income tax, and a $2,500 portion of salary—not expense money—of salary, which is exempt, then we should state it, rather than stating it on the basis of an expense allowance not supported by vouchers.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I simply wish to add to what my good friend, the Senator from Missouri, has said, that under the parliamentary situation which existed when we debated the Reorganization Act of 1946, we either had to vote for the entire bill as it came back to us from conference or vote against it in the entirety. It is true that some of us objected to the particular principle in the Reorganization Act of 1946 which authorized a tax-exempt expense account for Senators. Earlier this afternoon we served notice that it was our intention to eliminate this principle of a tax-exempt expense account for United States Senators, by way of an amendment to the act. Our amendment will be offered in this session of Congress. However, as to the pending bill, I would point out that two wrongs never make a right. We have an opportunity here to stop the extension of the entire principle of tax-exempt expense acocunts for Government officeholders. Therefore, the amendments which we have offered merit approval.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon that the Reorganization Act provision relating to expense allowances to Members of Congress should be corrected. However, I would point out that there is a difference between a provision for expense allowance for Members of Congress and a proposed expense allowance for the President. It is common knowledge that the expenses of a Member of Congress living in Washington amount to more than $2,500 a year, whereas it is evidenced by the reports submitted to the Congress that the expenses of the President have not amounted to $50,000 a year, and that any difference between the actual expenses and the $50,000 would constitute a tax-free increase in his salary. I am not going to vote against the bill if the amendment is not adopted. I simply want to point out that there is a difference because the expense of a Member of Congress amounts to considerable more than the $2,500 a year allowance. But it is wrong to have it written as it is in the Reorganization Act. It should be clean-cut expense allowance with expenses proved, or it should be a straight increase in salary.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator from Vermont believe that a similar clean-cut statement of an expense allowance, supported by vouchers for actual expenses incurred, would be a wholesome thing in the bill now pending on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. AIKEN. I will answer that by saying that I shall vote for the Senator's proposed amendment.

Mr. DONNELL. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] further that a similar suggestion came from the other side of the aisle, and I may say it came from a very distinguished member of the majority in whose opinion I have great confidence. I refer to the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who made somewhat the same point, though perhaps slightly different, as that made by the Senator from Vermont. The point made by the Senator from Georgia, as I recall it, was that inasmuch as a large part of the

services of Members of Congress are rendered away from home, obviously it is clear that we will incur expenses which, I think he said, every Member of the Senate would agree unquestionably do amount to more than $2,500. While to my mind that is a fact, I do not think it is consistent in one bill to say that there shall be an expense allowance without accounting, and in another bill that there shall be an expense allowance with accounting. I stand on the proposition that in every case where an expense allowance is given, as distinguished from compensation, there should be an accounting to the people of the United States for the money that is spent, and that the accounting should designate the purposes for which the expenditures were made.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. As I understand the amendments submitted by the Senator from Missouri, they do not change the Reorganization Act. Do they?

Mr. DONNELL. They have no effect on the Reorganization Act.

Mr. TOBEY. But a moment ago the Senator from Missouri very constructively said that he did not believe in having one bill framed in one way and another bill dealing with a similar subject framed in another way. So if the Senator's amendments are adopted, will they not have that unhappy result? Will we not pass the bill now before us in one way, whereas the Reorganization Act was passed in the other way?

Mr. DONNELL. Which I think can be remedied by an amendment to the Reorganization Act.

Mr. TOBEY. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. In that connection, if I may answer the Senator further, I will say that I am in thorough accord with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who said that two wrongs never made a right, and that even though we made a mistake in 1946 in providing an expense allowance for Members of Congress without an accounting, we should not now do the same thing in this instance.

Mr. TOBEY. We have heard a great deal of talk lately with respect to the Taft-Hartley Act, and that action should be taken by Congress with respect to it, some contending that legislation on the subject matter should all be contained in one package, rather than to be embraced in two separate bills. The consensus of opinion seems to be that it should be acted upon in one package. Similarly, would not the Senator be of opinion that what he seeks to do by his amendments should apply to all alike, and that any change made should apply to Members of Congress as well as to the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker; in other words, that action should be taken in one package? If we adopt the Senator's amendment, we shall then impose upon the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives conditions which are not imposed upon Members of Congress under the Reorganization Act. There is no guaranty that legislation imposing those conditions on Members of Congress can be passed. The Chief Executive and the Presiding Officers of both branches of Congress will be in one position, and Members of Congress will be on a different basis. Is not that true?

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator is entirely correct; but I think we are confronted by the fact that as a practical matter we cannot at this time undertake to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and still provide the increase in salary for the President which is here advocated, and which doubtless has justification.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I point out to the Senator that this amendment takes nothing away from the President, because, as I understand, under existing law he is required to make an accounting.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Vermont points out that the amendments now under discussion take nothing away from the President, because it is his understanding that the President is required to account for the $40,000 which he now receives. I may say in that connection that I am not certain whether he is required to account for the $40,000. I have not read that particular section. However, I am clear about the fact that the bill now before the Senate distinctly provides that he shall make no accounting for the $50,000 which it is proposed to grant him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. Let me finish this one point before I overlook it.

The point was made a few moments ago by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] that the President has not in fact utilized all of the existing $40,000 allowance; that is to say, he has not spent the entire $40,000 per annum granted to him by existing law. Again I invite the attention of Senators, as I did earlier this afternoon, to the very clear statement on that question made on this floor this afternoon by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] in this language:

> The majority views of the committee have not explained to the Senate that although the President is authorized to have an entertainment and travel fund for his account of not less than $40,000, during the 2 years such authorization has existed, he has not used this amount, despite the national campaign intervening. For the fiscal year 1948 the President used only $32,039 of the $40,000 granted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

Although nearly $8,000 of the $40,000 allowance was not used in 1948 the bill undertakes to do what? According to its own language, it provides an expense allowance of $50,000—

> To assist—

It is not completely to cover the expenses, but to help, aid, or assist—

> To assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties.

As the Senator from North Dakota has pointed out, notwithstanding the fact that the national campaign has intervened, the President has not found it necessary to use even the $40,000; yet it is proposed to give him $50,000 more to assist him—not to give him all he needs, but to help him with his expenses. Notwithstanding these facts, it is affirmatively provided that no accounting shall be made by him.

I now yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have been absent from the Chamber during a part of the discussion. I am wondering if it has been suggested that possibly a better plan would be to give the President a salary which would net him the same amount as would the $50,000 expense item, which would be tax exempt, plus the $100,000 salary.

Perhaps a better plan would be to give him a salary which would net him $95,000. That would require a salary of between $400,000 and $450,000. The tax on a $100,000 salary for a married man, such as the present occupant of the White House, is $45,000. Therefore he would have $55,000 left. It is proposed to give him a $50,000 allowance which would not be taxable; so he would have $105,000 of net income or take-home pay, the kind that he could put in his pocket. We would have to give the President an additional $300,000 in salary, on top of the $150,000 we are talking about, to give him $105,000 which he could put in his own pocket.

Why would it not be better to increase the President's salary to $450,000, and let him pay income taxes, just as everyone else does? Would not that be more honest? Would it not be better? Then if income taxes should go down, as they possibly never will—let us pray that they will—the President would have more take-home pay, or more money that he could spend. I believe that the better plan would be simply to increase his salary to $450,000. If my figures are correct—and if they are not, I wish some Senator would correct them—he would then have $105,000 left after paying his taxes, which is exactly what would remain under the system of giving him $100,000, on which he would pay a tax of $55,000, and then giving him an allowance of $50,000 which would be nontaxable. The net result would be exactly the same as though we were to increase his salary to $450,000. That might be the better way to do it. I agree that the President's salary should be increased. I am wondering if an amendment will be offered to increase the President's salary to $450,000.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me answer the Senator from Indiana in this manner:

It is extremely interesting, I am sure, to those of us who were in the Chamber during the earlier portion of this debate, to recall the admirable and constructive address delivered today by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], one of the sponsors of the amendment for which I am now arguing. He joined in sponsorship of the amendment after it was submitted.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. DONNELL. I see the Senator from Delaware on his feet. In a few

moments no doubt we shall hear from him. He takes substantially the same position as does the able Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, had I known that, I would not have taken the time of the Senator. However, I thought that point should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. I am sure that it is always of value to the Senate to have the views of every Senator. The distinguished Senator from Indiana has a wide range of knowledge of business affairs, and he is adequately qualified to enlighten and assist us.

Before yielding to the Senator from Delaware, let me say that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has indicated his desire to say a word.

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I respectfully suggest that we have a little order in debate, if we may.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I point out to the Senator from Indiana that this afternoon I brought to the attention of the Senate the fact that the bill is an indirect method of achieving the result of giving the President take-home pay of approximately $100,000, and that in order to attain the same result we would have to raise the salary of the President to approximately $300,000.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further comment?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The reason why I think it might be a better method is that when taxes do come down, if they ever do, under a $450,000 salary the President would have more take-home pay than we otherwise might give him.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me say that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] pointed out very clearly this afternoon that there is real merit in calling the attention of the President of the United States to the tremendous burden of taxation existing today, as well as in having the rest of us realize something of that burden.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wonder whether the authors of the bill would care to tell us why they arrived at a figure of $50,000 without the payment of taxes, rather than a $450,000 straight salary. There must be some merit to it; otherwise, they would have arrived at a salary of $450,000 for the President, which would give him the same amount of take-home pay the pending bill would give him. Will the authors of the bill tell us why they did not propose a $450,000 straight salary?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the authors of the bill make such a statement, but I think the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is correct in saying that we should preserve ordinary debating order, and I think we shall make better progress if I am permitted to complete my statement, rather than to have an undisclosed Senator or Senators called upon now.

Mr. CAPEHART. May we have an opportunity to hear the authors of the bill state why they arrived at this method, rather than the method of increasing the salary of the President to approximately $450,000, which would give him the same amount of take-home pay that is proposed by the pending bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me suggest that we hope to stay here tonight until we finish action on this bill. I am merely apprising Senators who may contemplate leaving of that fact.

Mr. President, I feel sure that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] will answer the argument and question propounded by the Senator from Indiana. If the Senator from Maryland does not do so, I shall, because the argument the Senator from Indiana is making is utterly fallacious.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois—I do not know whether he is the majority leader or not, although, of course, he hopes to be—that he starts out, already in the session, by saying that the Senator from Indiana is trying to do something that is not right.

Mr. LUCAS. No; I did not say that.

Mr. CAPEHART. I say we have a perfect right to ask the authors of the bill why they arrived at the conclusion they did reach. I say there is some sinister motive on the part of the authors of the bill, with the result that they are not willing to disclose why they arrived at that proposal.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri will permit me to reply——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, my friend, the Senator from Indiana, made a very far-reaching statement when he said there was a sinister motive back of the bill.

I had nothing to do with the taking of the testimony in the committee; I am not even a member of the committee. All I said was that the argument of the Senator from Indiana is a fallacious one. If he takes exception to the use of that word, I will say his argument is an incorrect one. The facts will appear in due course. The Senator from Indiana should not become excited about that statement, and he should not charge those responsible for this bill with having sinister motives. I am certain he has committed a grievous error, because he includes some of his own Republican colleagues.

Mr. CAPEHART. All I say——

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator to wait just a moment; the Senator from Missouri has been kind enough to yield to me.

Let me say I can understand how the Senator from Indiana might make such a charge against some Senators on this side of the aisle, but I suggest he apologize to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who sits on the Republican side of the aisle, and who is one of the most conscientious and honest Members of the Senate, as well as to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who is absent at this time and cannot now protect himself, although I am sure some Republican Senator will defend the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois said I was fallacious in this matter, and he was intimating that I was not sincere about it. All I say is that it is a repetition of what occurred in the last Congress. When they do not want to be frank and do not want to answer questions correctly, they charge someone else with insincerity. I said exactly what I intended to say, and if it applies to any Senator on this side of the aisle, I am sorry.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. FLANDERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I regret that my friend the Senator from Indiana simply did not hear what I said. I did not charge him with any insincerity. I simply said I thought he was making a fallacious argument. If he objects to the use of that word, then I should say he was making an incorrect argument. If he objects to the use of that word, then I withdraw the statement entirely, because I would not want to offend my friend the Senator from Indiana in the opening days of this Congress. Perhaps later I might if I feel justified.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, if I misunderstood the Senator from Illinois, I apologize.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, the part of the bill which apparently, from what I have been able to learn from the newspapers, is to be the only part which will be passed before January 20, was not in the original bill. The so-called authors of this bill originally did not have in it anything with relation to the President, the Vice President, or the Speaker of the House. The provision referring to the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House, which was put into the bill by the so-called authors of the bill, was put in at the suggestion and with the advice of that sterling New Deal Democrat, ex-President Hoover, and in exactly the terms he suggested. He told us that his Commission had given a great deal of thought to this particular question. We had not. We are giving thought to it now, evidently. But these are the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Two or three misunderstandings are current among the Members of the Senate now in the Chamber. Under present conditions, the President has a $40,000

expense account for travel and entertainment. That has nothing to do with the ordinary expenses of the White House. It has nothing to do with any other of the President's expenses here in Washington. It was Mr. Hoover's estimate—after having some experience; of course, whether he applied the inflationary ratio to it, I do not know—that it costs at least between $25,000 and $30,000 a year to conduct the White House. That money comes out of the President's own pocket.

Senators talk about take-home pay of $95,000, but there is no such thing for the President of the United States. An official of a business firm getting a salary of, let us say, $105,000—mention was made of such a sum—could live as simply or as elaborately as he pleased. He could have his wife cook his breakfast, his luncheon, and his dinner and they could live in one of the new $9,000 five-room houses; or they could spend every cent they had, and could borrow more. But that is not possible for the President of the United States. Although I am not one of the authors of this bill, in the sense of having originally proposed or originally worked out with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] these provisions for the President of the United States, nevertheless I was strongly impressed, as were the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Connecticut, by the experience and advice of ex-President Hoover and by the thought that he and those working with him had given to this matter; and we were glad to put the provision into the bill, and I am glad to support it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to address a question or two to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS]. Does the Senator from Vermont know of any of the White House expenses to which he has referred in his remarks that could not very well and simply be listed in an accounting by the President of the United States? Does he know of any reason why they should not be listed in an accounting by the President of the United States?

Mr. FLANDERS. He does account for the $40,000.

Mr. MORSE. I am speaking of the $50,000 covered by the bill.

Mr. FLANDERS. So I come to the $50,000. It could be done. Without any doubt, it would require an accounting department, because it is made up of an enormous number of small bills. But an accounting department could be set up, and it could be done.

Mr. DONNELL. He does account for the $40,000, does he not?

Mr. FLANDERS. He accounts for travel, and he accounts for entertainment.

Mr. DONNELL. What kind of accounting does he make, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. FLANDERS. I will read the statement.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

Mr. FLANDERS. I read:

> There may be expended for or on account of the traveling expenses of the President of the United States such sums as Congress may from time to time appropriate, not exceeding $40,000 per annum such sum when appropriated to be expended in the discretion of the President and accounted for on his certificate solely.

As we heard today, he does not always use that $40,000.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield, that I may ask the Senator one more question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield, Mr. President, for the purpose of a question to be addressed to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Vermont agree with me that it is apparent that the real purpose of the bill is to increase the President's salary, not only the $25,000 in the new $100,000 figure but an additional flat $50,000, and give him, as to that amount, tax exemption? Is not that the underlying purpose of the bill?

Mr. FLANDERS. The purpose of the bill, yes, is that he shall have tax exemption on the expenses incident to his office.

Mr. MORSE. But he is to have tax exemption on the amount of money under the name of "expenses," when the fact is that the total salary he is going to get will be $150,000. Why do we not call it what it really is?

Mr. DONNELL. I emphasize, Mr. President, that the answer of the Senator from Vermont to the query by the Senator from Oregon is obviously correct, because the framers of this very bill, before they ever got down to the expression "expense allowance," called the entire $150,000 "compensation."

It is perfectly clear, Mr. President, that the purpose of the framers of the bill was to do exactly what the Senator from Oregon says, to give the President $150,000, and to call $50,000 of it expense allowance, and to free him from the obligation of making an accounting, which by the very terms of the act now in effect with respect to the $40,000 he is required to make.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I am glad the Senator brought up the point, as I have prepared an amendment which I shall offer at the proper time, designed to meet it. It seemed to me originally that we should use the language on the first page of the bill, saying that the President should have compensation in the amount of $150,000. My amendment will provide that he shall have compensation in the amount of $100,000, and, in addition, an expense account.

I do not know about Missouri, but I know in my own State of Maine, which is a rather frugal State, there was allowed the Governor, during my period of service, an expense account at that time of $10,000, for which an accounting was not required. I think that very many States—we have many governors here—have followed that practice, so I was not particularly disturbed that this amount, on the recommendation of Mr. Hoover, was proposed. But I certainly think the language of the bill should be clarified. I have discussed it with some of the authors, and they say it is entirely agreeable to insert that change.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. In just one moment, if I may finish. In reference to the contribution made by the Senator from Maine to the discussion, I may call to his attention the fact that in the respect to which he refers, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is not guilty of the same fallacy of language as is the bill now before us, because the $12,500 allowed to the Senators and Representatives is what is therein termed the "compensation," whereas the other $2,500 is distinctly referred to as an "expense allowance," and is not included within the term "compensation."

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Maine is precisely correct, as I see it, in taking the view that Senate bill 103, which is now before us, is in error in calling the $50,000 compensation.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I promised to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to address an observation to the Senator from Vermont. It may not be pertinent, but it may not do any harm. On the testimony given in my presence this afternoon, reference has been made to the $40,000 allowance for travel which the President had. He had, did he not, $40,000 for travel?

Mr. DONNELL. He was entitled to it.

Mr. TOBEY. He was entitled to it?

Mr. DONNELL. May I answer that?

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator from North Dakota stated that during the 2 years such authorization has existed, he has not used that amount, despite the national campaign intervening.

Mr. TOBEY. Exactly. That is my point.

Mr. DONNELL. Pardon me just a moment. For the fiscal year 1948 he used, so the Senator from North Dakota tells us, only $32,039.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator hold that a minute?

Mr. DONNELL. I hold it.

Mr. TOBEY. I address my remarks jointly to the distinguished Senator from Missouri and to the distinguished Senator from Vermont. If the President of the United States, Harry Truman, with a $40,000 expense account for travel assured him under the law, only spent $32,000 and won the election by 303 electoral votes, I ask the Senators, as authorities, how big a majority he would have had in the electoral college had he spent the whole $40,000?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, although the Senator, with his clarity and

beauty of expression, has perhaps somewhat appealed to the jocularity of certain Members of the Senate, I undertake to say there is a lot in what he says, because if the President of the United States with an expenditure of $32,000 can carry this country as he did, how much more would he be able to exert by way of effective influence, perhaps, with an expenditure of $90,000, without obligation to account for the $50,000?

Mr. TOBEY. That is a political logarithm, is it not?

Mr. DONNELL. It is, and it is to the *n*th degree.

Mr. TOBEY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is decidedly in point in this case.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I am thankful for the opportunity of getting down to something I can understand. We have in the original bill this section, which I will now read. I refer to the original bill as we presented it for examination by the General Accounting Office.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator, if he will pardon me for a moment, does he know whether or not in the amount accounted for by the President in the fiscal year 1948, this $32,000, in round figures, there is any item for a special train carrying the President of the United States on a nonpolitical trip earlier in 1948 to the western area of the country?

Mr. FLANDERS. I do not know, and I would suggest that that inquiry be addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I am not informed.

Mr. DONNELL. Very well.

Mr. FLANDERS. This is the way the bill was presented to the General Accounting Office for their consideration of the legal aspects, and as I have said before on the floor of the Senate, there are rare times, God forgive me, when I regret that I am not a lawyer. The original section read as follows:

> There shall be paid to the President in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $50,000 per annum, to assist in defraying expenses resulting to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liabilities shall accrue or accounting be made by him.

Mr. DONNELL. Who introduced that particular language?

Mr. FLANDERS. That language came—and I did not object to it—from the subcommittee, and was agreed to by them on December 23, 1948. It was submitted to the General Accounting Office for criticism. They took up certain legal aspects of the language which I am completely, absolutely, irrevocably, and eternally unable to pass judgment upon. But this is the way in which the General Accounting Office asked us to reword that provision:

> The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $150,000 a year to be paid monthly, consisting of $100,000 for salary, and an expense allowance of $50,000 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him, and shall be entitled to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion.

In the viewpoint of the General Accounting Office, there was something dubiously illegal about the original wording, in spite of the fact that there were two lawyers and only one layman on the subcommittee.

Mr. DONNELL. Was there any suggestion made by the General Accounting Office that it would be impossible for the President to account for what he does with the $50,000?

Mr. FLANDERS. That question was not raised.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it happens that we raised that question, and the General Accounting Office representative said there would be nothing illegal about it. They advised the subcommittee to change the language of the bill, to separate the amounts and call $50,000 an expense account, as it was evident on the surface that the $50,000 was nothing more than an additional salary, part of which would evidently accrue to the President as a net gain. It was stated that it would not be constitutional to include it unless it should be designated as an expense account.

I shall read a statement made by the Senator from Vermont in the committee, which it may be he has forgotten. He was discussing with former President Hoover the same question, and Mr. Hoover called attention to the fact that, even if the President's salary were doubled, there would be very little gain accruing to the President. The Senator from Vermont made this statement——

Mr. FLANDERS. Will the Senator refer to the page?

Mr. WILLIAMS. At page 56 of the hearings of December 13 and 14, 1948, following what Mr. Hoover had said. I now read the statement made by the Senator from Vermont at that time:

> Well, one of the criticisms made of this proposal in the Eightieth Congress was the expense of a million dollars or so. Just on plain arithmetic, I suppose we could have figured out that Uncle Sam would get back a considerable part of that $1,000,000, but, of course, that is not the point at all.

But I say that is the point. An attempt is being made to raise the take-home pay of the President by an indirect method.

I talked with a gentleman in the General Accounting Office who stated that this was the only legal way they could raise the take-home pay of the President, by separating those two items, making the salary $100,000 and calling the other an expense account $50,000. Of course, it could be raised to four or five hundred thousand dollars, or to a million dollars; but the only way the President could be given an exemption from income tax would be to call part of it an expense account.

Mr. DONNELL. In doing that, Mr. President, they inadvertently failed to eliminate the word "compensation." I do not know whether it was done inadvertently, but the word was eliminated. The expense allowance of $50,000 is to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of the President's official duties, although he did not need all of the $40,000 previously received; at least, it was not needed through 1948.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, Mr. President. If it was needed, there would be no objection on the part of the committee to its being accepted as an expense allowance.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I am not arguing against giving the President $50,000 or so much thereof as he may expend as an allowance for expenses. That is provided for in the amendment which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and I are sponsoring before this body. But we think—and we reiterate it as strongly as we can—that just as it is possible for the President now to account for $40,000, and just as I understand the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is of the opinion that he could account for the $50,000, I say it is equally true that it is sound business judgment and wholesome legislation to require an accounting.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I think it might be worth while to read what Mr. Hoover stated about the expense of living in the White House. He said:

> Mr. HOOVER. I have not looked recently into the exact appropriations for allowances for the President, but in my time there was an allowance of $25,000 a year. However, it was confined to traveling expenses, purely official relationships and functions, and had nothing to do with the ordinary living in the White House.
>
> If there has been no change since that time, I should think the American people would be perfectly willing and glad to see the Government give board and lodging to the President. He does not get it now for he must pay his own board and that of numerous other people. He gets his lodging free, but even there he has to pay part of the upkeep cost. I should think the minimum cost to the President is somewhere between $25,000 and $30,000 a year of conducting the White House in such a fashion as it should be conducted.
>
> He must receive a great many guests that he cannot charge to his allowance account, and so forth. We want the White House to be the leading and gracious home of the Nation. At least, I feel the American people would want that to be.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I agree thoroughly with the remarks so well made regarding the desire that the White House be a gracious home in which our people can be entertained, but I fail to see anything in any argument which has been presented to indicate that the expense of operating the White House, the

cost of soap, labor, material, food, clothing, and other things, cannot be listed on a piece of paper and filed under certificate of the President, just as is true in the case of the $40,000 to which reference has been made.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I referred to the senior Senator from California, who is also now on the floor, and I mentioned the fact that in his State the legislature had considered a certain bill. We had been talking about the custom in various States. I do not recall my own State's having any fund available until a few years ago, at any rate, that could be used without some type of accounting. As I say, we were talking about the States and their requirements, and I mentioned this afternoon, as I again mention now since both Senators from California are present, the fact that only a few months ago the Legislature of the State of California, in its zeal to advocate and assist in passing a bill which would undertake to give to the State the tidelands, passed a bill providing a $25,000 appropriation for expenditure by a committee, with a provision that there should be no obligation to file vouchers with respect thereto. As I indicated earlier this afternoon, the press, certainly in California—I would not be sure about it here—distinctly called that fact to the attention of the public, and the Governor of the State, elected, as he was, as the candidate of both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, did not sign the bill providing for the $25,000 payment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in a moment. To my mind there can be no answer to the proposition that it is wholesome that when a public official handles money of any sizable amount and expends it, he should account to the people of the United States as to the purposes for which the money is used. The very illustration I have employed with respect to the State of California indicates that there is a revulsion in the minds of the citizenry of the country against any plan under which sizable amounts of money are handed forth for expenditure by public officials without an obligation to account.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator has been stating to the Senate that there is an accounting with respect to the $40,000 that is allowed the President of the United States for travel expenses. The provision of the law specifically states that the President shall make a certificate only of the total amount he has spent during the year, as I understand. He does not make any itemized accounting whatsoever of the money he has spent for travel expenses. I merely wanted to call that to the attention of the Senator, because I think he has been quoting the provision incorrectly. The President makes a certificate of the amount he has spent and the balance on hand. As I recall, last year he had some money left in the travel-expense fund.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as I stated earlier this afternoon, I have not read the statute with respect to the $40,000. It was given to us a few minutes ago for the first time this afternoon, and then by the Senator from Vermont. I read it now:

> There may be expended for or on account of the traveling expenses of the President of the United States such sum as Congress may from time to time appropriate, not exceeding $40,000 per annum; such sum, when appropriated, to be expended in the discretion of the President, and accounted for on his certificate solely.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. To my mind it is perfectly clear that the public official required to give a certificate as to how money was expended certainly would be required to say how it was expended. That is what the sponsors of these amendments are asking for in the instant case.

Mr. LUCAS. I challenge the Senator to show where the President of the United States at any time in the past has ever submitted an itemized statement, under a provision of the kind we are now discussing. It has been the custom, as I understand it, all down through our experience as a republic, for the President to make nothing more than a certificate of whatever amount is expended. This is the first time anyone has ever raised a question with respect to the expenditures being itemized by the President of the United States.

I wish to say to the Senator that we never had such argument as this when the Senate was voting on an increase in its salaries. We raised our salaries, we gave ourselves a $2,500 exemption for expenses, and the Senator spent no time on the floor of the Senate making the arguments then he is making now. He accepted that situation. In other words, we all have confidence in ourselves to spend the $2,500 which we get under an exemption, without accounting to anyone, but we have no confidence, according to the Senator's argument, in the President of the United States, in the Vice President of the United States, or in the Speaker of the House of Representatives. That is what it amounts to. Senators of the United States can do no wrong. We can spend the $2,500 the way we see fit, and no one is going to suspect us in our spending of it. But some Senators do not have any faith in the President of the United States in spending this money in the manner in which it should be spent. They want him to make an accounting; they want him to present an accounting for every item he spends in the White House, every time he buys a can of fruit, every time he engages a painter or a carpenter, every time he buys a ham, every time he sends a messenger boy across the street on an errand and so on ad infinitum. They want him to make an accounting—How absurd and ridiculous. He would have to have three bookkeepers and one certified public accountant to keep a record of the $50,000 he is getting for expenses for the White House down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

To me it seems preposterous that we should spend time charging the President of the United States, a man elected to the highest office within the gift of the people, with not spending money honestly and accurately and fairly, as Senators are attempting to do in the amendments.

The Senator from Missouri even said in the beginning of his remarks that possibly the train the President used at one time, along last May, I think it was, might have something to do with this very provision we now have placed in this bill. Yet the able Senator from Vermont said that the individual responsible for it was not the President from the Senator's State of Missouri, but was the Honorable Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States, who was chiefly responsible for this provision. Harry Truman had nothing to do with it. Any implication on the part of the Senator from Missouri that the President is responsible for this provision does not square with the facts. As I said before, Harry Truman told me last night that he would rather not have a single dime of this money if there was any way for him to accomplish the real purpose of the bill, namely to take care of the men in the lower echelons, in the lower classifications, whom he needs to assist him in the enormous national and international responsibilities which have been thrust upon the shoulders of the Chief Executive of this Nation.

Mr. President, the Senator is wholly wrong. The amendments should be defeated, and especially so, in view of our own vulnerable position upon this point. We should not require the President of the United States, or the Vice President-elect, one of our own Members, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to make this type of accounting for these moneys, when we do not do so with our own expense accounts, and that is exactly what is being done when this kind of an argument is made.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. In a moment. In regard to the very vigorous presentation made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, so skillfully and eloquently, so far as I am aware there has not been one word uttered upon the floor of the Senate this afternoon which has directly or indirectly charged the President of the United States with any improper conduct with respect to money, or with respect to anything else. However, there has been presented, as well as I can do it, the proposition that the stockholders of a great institution, namely, the people of the United States of America, are entitled to know what their money is spent for. I undertake to say that the men I see right before me now, who were Governors of the States wherein they reside only a few years ago, did not resent the requirements of their statutes, or perhaps of their constitutions, if there were such provisions requiring an accounting of money expenditures.

The distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota has told us that in his State every governor is required to account for every item of expenditure that exceeds the sum of $1. Is not that correct?

Mr. LANGER. That is exactly correct, and he does it under oath.

Mr. DONNELL. Let me ask the distinguished Senator, while he is on his feet, if he ever felt any resentment, or thought that there was any disgrace on him, when he was Governor of North Dakota, because of that provision of the law?

Mr. LANGER. Of course not, because it has been the law since we adopted a constitution.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. DONNELL. I promised to yield first to the Senator from Utah, but if I may continue for a moment, I say that it is equally possible to account for $50,000, for such purposes as are described in the bill, as expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of official duties, as it is in the case of the $40,000 covered by the statute to which reference has been made.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

With respect to the train that went to the West. I do not know whether it was paid for by the United States Government, or by the Democratic National Committee, or by the railroad companies, or who paid for it. I think, Mr. President, it is an entirely proper inquiry to propound as to who did pay for it. I am not ashamed for having mentioned that train here this afternoon. It went out to the West on the theory that it was on a nonpolitical expedition, and yet as the campaign proceeded we noted, or at least some of us did, that the reference to the so-called nonpolitical character became one of satire and of laughter. Obviously, Mr. President, it is proper to know who paid for that train. Furthermore, it is just as possible to put down in a certificate what the items of expense were, how many dollars were paid for the train, how many dollars were paid for food, as it would be to provide for expenses of any other item.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] for his question.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, can the distinguished Senator from Missouri advise me whether or not the $50,000 provided for in the pending bill is in addition to the $40,000 which is now allowed?

Mr. DONNELL. It is. It is in addition to the $40,000, and it has no relation to it, except that it is in addition to it.

Mr. WATKINS. If the bill as it is now before us were to be passed it would mean, would it not, that $90,000 would be provided the President to use for expenses?

Mr. DONNELL. There will be $40,000 under the existing statute. There will be up to $50,000 more provided by the bill, but only such part of the latter $50,000, under our amendment, can be used as is covered by vouchers duly presented. But under the bill as it comes before us the entire $50,000 additional amount will be available to the President, with an express provision that no accounting shall be made by him. That is the provision that is before us in the bill. That provision, as I have indicated, says that he shall be allowed up to $50,000 additional, depending on what his expenses are, as properly vouchered.

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to make an observation with reference to what the Senator from Illinois said concerning Congress voting itself expense money for which it does not need to account. I was not here at the time action was taken on that measure, and I did not vote for it. If the question were up for action today I would not vote for such a measure. I think it is wrong in principle.

Mr. DONNELL. Permit me to interrupt the Senator from Utah to say that I previously made a similar statement twice this afternoon. Although I either voted for the Reorganization Act, or certainly approved it if a vote were taken on it without a record of the vote being made, yet I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Utah that it is unwholesome for either the legislative body, the executive branch, or the judicial branch to expend money without accounting for the purposes for which it was expended.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri if it is not true that all employees of the Government who have expense accounts, including Cabinet members, must render an accounting before they receive the expense money?

Mr. DONNELL. I have never studied the statute covering that point, but that is my impression.

Mr. WATKINS. It is my understanding that all employees of the Government have to render expense account vouchers for the money they have expended, before they can obtain the money. Should there be any different rule for Senators, members of the Cabinet, and the President than there is for other employees of the Government?

Mr. DONNELL. My answer is unequivocally "No."

I now yield to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Missouri be content with the same sort of accounting in the cases we are now discussing as applies under existing provisions respecting expenditures, that is by certification?

Mr. DONNELL. I assume that the certificates state the purposes for which money is expended. I have not seen such certificates, but I do not propose to change the language of the amendment merely because other language was not clearly and closely drawn. I think we are entitled to have filed with the appropriate officer a voucher, just as the governors of the various States—certainly in many instances—file vouchers showing how money is expended by them.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I remind the Senator that many of the governors have so-called contingent funds, as to which they make no certificate at all. They are not required to make any kind of an accounting. Personally, I would be entirely content if the President of the United States made a certificate that he had spent a certain amount of money for expenses, without requiring him to present an itemized list. In the limited field we are talking about, covering the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House, I would not require them to go around with notebooks in their pockets making records of every nickel they spend, and making that kind of detailed accounting. I am speaking of my own sense of the morals and the proprieties involved in this particular limited situation. I would take the word of any President of the United States that he had spent so much personal expense money, on his mere certification. I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that when we cannot do that we shall have come to a very bad pass.

Mr. DONNELL. I certainly would believe the President of the United States on certificate; that is certainly true; but, Mr. President, at the same time, while we see vividly, from the language of the Senator from Colorado, the notebook that is being carried around, and the notes being made, nevertheless the President is not actually the man who is making the expenditures. He is not the man who goes across the street as the messenger boy. He is not the man who engages the train. The man who makes the expenditures certainly can file a voucher showing for what purpose the expenditures were incurred. I see no reflection, I see nothing that indicates that we have come to a miserable pass by requiring that that be done. I think we would be safe with the other plan. I should have no special objection to it from my own standpoint, but I feel that from the standpoint of sound bookkeeping, for a permanent record for the United States, we should have vouchers duly presented evidencing the expenditures of funds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I simply want to say that the suggestion of the Senator from Colorado that our amendment be changed in order to allow the President to just file a certificate, without an accounting, would be most unsatisfactory to me, as one of the sponsors of the amendment. There is no office in the United States so high, or no person in the United States occupying high office, who should not be made to account for the expenditure of the taxpayers' money. The President of the United States, I hope, is still in principle the servant of the people of this country. He should be required as a servant of the people to report to the people the expenditures of operating the White House if he is to receive by this bill an extra $50,000 for that purpose. However, the real rub is that this entire expense proposal is but a subterfuge for hiding the real intent of the bill, namely, to increase the President's salary another $50,000 and call it an expense account. It is an immoral principle and I object to it.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I agree with that statement, and I want it distinctly understood that although I stated

a moment ago that, so far as I am personally concerned, I would be willing to accept any certificate from any President of the United States—certainly I would, just as I would accept a certificate from many subordinate officials—nevertheless, in my opinion, the proper accounting practice would be best carried out by a provision such as is contained in the amendment now pending. It is not unreasonable. It does not require the President to go around with a notebook and make an entry every time he buys a postage stamp. That is obviously a total distortion of the actual situation, and the requirement of presentation of vouchers is reasonable and proper.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I simply want to point out that in this limited category, by analogy to long-continued practice in the States, I believe that many of our people—or it would not be a long-continued practice—are perfectly willing to carve out an exception to the usual accounting practices. Certainly I have no desire to have a keyhole or transom view of the personal expenditures of the President of the United States.

Mr. DONNELL. Neither do I desire any such thing, Mr. President. But we are entitled to have a record of expenditures. If an individual expends a thousand dollars for telegrams, we are entitled to know the purpose for which the telegrams were sent and to whom they were sent, and the amount expended.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I suggest that the present occupant of the White House has demonstrated that the matter can be left to his certification. That is demonstrated by the fact that he has accounted for a surplus during the time that he has had an expense fund.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not think, Mr. President, that answers the point involved here at all.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I will admit, if the Senator will again yield, that it does not answer the point, except that it goes to the practice, and that is important.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator from Colorado if he knows of his own knowledge what is stated in the certificates that are issued in connection with the $40,000?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I hope it is in his certificate, as is any other certificate. I hope his certificate will be in substance that "I have spent so much expense money pursuant to authorization of a certain act of Congress." So far as I am concerned, if he will make such a certificate, that is sufficient. Nothing less than that would be satisfactory to the junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. As one of the sponsors of this amendment, I am not so much concerned, perhaps, as is the Senator from Missouri, with the point he is making. I was talking with the Comptroller General regarding the point raised by the Senator from Colorado, and he stated that in his experience in auditing accounts, all the Presidents, including President Truman, had gone out of their way to list their expenditures, and that such expenditures were listed better by Presidents than by any other officers, and I agree with the Senator from Colorado that any President should be trusted.

Mr. DONNELL. As I understand, no difficulty has thus far been experienced in listing them in detail.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is certainly no criticism with regard to what has been done in the past.

Mr. DONNELL. And there is no reason why such accounting could not be rendered in the future, is there?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I know of no reason.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not a fact that there is a very much larger sum than the sum we are discussing here, namely, a sum of several hundred thousand dollars now in the hands of the President under very similar regulations? Is the Senator from Missouri familiar with that fund?

Mr. DONNELL. I am not.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think I am correct. I think the fund approaches $1,000,000, for which he gives no accounting whatsoever. I believe that fact shows a recognition of the peculiar responsibilities of his office.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. I should like to invite the particular attention of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] to a matter with reference to which he has just stated his views.

As I understood him, he stated that he would be satisfied with the certificate of the President of the United States that he had spent so much money pursuant to a certain appropriation or a certain law, and that he would not be satisfied with anything less. This bill does not require any certificate of any kind. The payment is made monthly, as the salary payment is made monthly. There is no requirement of a certificate for any payment. The only certificate of the President is his endorsement on the back of the Treasury check, that he has received the money.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senator from Missouri will accept the suggestion that the President be permitted to report his expenses on certificate, as he now does. I told the Senator from Missouri that I would vote for his amendments, and I will do so; but when I made that statement, I thought that the President was submitting itemized accounts, as do other employees of the Government. I find that he does not do so, but that he is required to report by certificate only the amount which he has spent.

I find also that that requirement was last reiterated by the Congress on August 2, 1946, only a little more than 2 years ago, when the limit on expenses was raised to $40,000.

I had intended to support the provision requiring the President to make reports to the Congress. I shall vote for the Senator's amendments because I promised to do so, whether or not he accepts the suggestion.

Mr. DONNELL. I do not insist on the Senator voting for them.

Mr. AIKEN. I will take the word of the President of the United States that his expenses have been so much, without requiring him to account for every pair of shoe laces. However, I point out that this requirement was last reiterated by the Congress about 2½ years ago. I believe that the President's party was in control of Congress at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire from the Senator how much longer he intends to take?

Mr. DONNELL. I was about to say that I think we should conclude this discussion shortly, and I shall endeavor to do so.

Mr. President, I think it is entirely true that none of us would question the word of the President of the United States as to an expenditure. My proposal is simply that, as a matter of sound business, as an example of the way business is transacted in the Government, these amendments should be adopted.

Let me conclude these observations with mention—which I think is proper—of a point which was made very forcefully by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. He took the position this afternoon on the floor that he was very much worried over the difficulty of determining what items would be properly included—in other words, that no standard is prescribed by law as to the duties of any of these officers.

In answer to that point, it seems to me, first, that if there is no standard, there should be a standard.

In the second place, the drafters of the bill have distinctly recognized that the duties of these officers are sufficiently defined in the law to determine what are expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of official duties, because the drafters of the bill have used that language not only once, but I believe three times in the course of the various sections. They have used the term "expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties." To my mind it is entirely possible for an adequate accounting to be made, and I submit that these amendments are wholesome and should be adopted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri. Under a previous order of the Senate, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have checked the emergency fund of the President, which is the item to which I referred previously. It has been in existence for many years under a similar provision, as I understand. Last year it was $200,000. In the current budget it is carried at $1,000,000. So that item will

come under examination in the course of time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Missouri. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). For the same reason heretofore assigned, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky will be excused from voting.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—22

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Taft |
| Butler | Jenner | Vandenberg |
| Byrd | Kem | Watkins |
| Capehart | Langer | Wherry |
| Cordon | Malone | Wiley |
| Donnell | Martin | Williams |
| Ecton | Morse | |
| Gillette | Schoeppel | |

NAYS—61

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hunt | Murray |
| Brewster | Ives | Myers |
| Cain | Johnson, Colo. | Neely |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | O'Conor |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | O'Mahoney |
| Connally | Kefauver | Pepper |
| Douglas | Kerr | Robertson |
| Downey | Kilgore | Russell |
| Ellender | Knowland | Saltonstall |
| Ferguson | Lodge | Smith, Maine |
| Flanders | Long | Smith, N. J. |
| Frear | Lucas | Sparkman |
| Fulbright | McCarthy | Stennis |
| George | McClellan | Taylor |
| Gurney | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Hayden | McKellar | Thye |
| Hickenlooper | McMahon | Tobey |
| Hill | Magnuson | Tydings |
| Hoey | Maybank | Young |
| Holland | Millikin | |
| Humphrey | Mundt | |

NOT VOTING—13

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin | Eastland | Reed |
| Barkley | Green | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bricker | McCarran | Wagner |
| Bridges | McGrath | |
| Broughton | Miller | |

So Mr. DONNELL's amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I shall state it briefly, and then ask that it be read.

The amendment applies to the term "compensation," on the first page of the bill, as it seems to be perfectly ridiculous, the General Accounting Office to the contrary notwithstanding, to call as "compensation" the sum of $50,000 which is allowed the President for expenses.

My amendment accordingly provides, on the first page, that "compensation" shall be "in the aggregate amount of $100,000 a year, to be paid monthly;" and I continue by striking out, on the second page, the words, "consisting of $100,000 for salary"; and then inserting the words "in addition," so as to read "and in addition an expense allowance of $50,000"—which it seems to me is a much more realistic presentation of the situation, and one which would do much more justice to what the Senate apparently contemplates in this enactment.

I now ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, in line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000".

On page 2, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out "consisting of $100,000 for salary."

On page 2, in line 2, it is proposed to insert, after the word "and", the words "in addition."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. LUCAS. I am familiar with the amendment. I think it is proper. I have no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I move to strike out the word "no" in the fifth line on page 2; to strike out the word "him" in line 6 on page 2; and to insert, after the word "by", at the commencement of line 6 on page 2, the words "his certification."

That would carry out the thought of having the President certify whatever his expenses may be.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before we vote on that amendment, will the able Senator from Colorado give us an explanation of exactly what he means by "certification," because there are different interpretations of what a certification is, and different constructions have been placed upon that word during this debate this afternoon. So before we agree to the amendment, I should like to know what it means.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes. Mr. President, from the standpoint of the Senator from Colorado, "certification" means certification, that it is discretionary with the President whether he wishes to add any stuffing, that on certification alone the requirement would be met. That is the interpretation of the junior Senator from Colorado.

As I said during the debate I am not interested in having a transom or a keyhole view of the President's expenditures so far as personal affairs are concerned, where we cover them by appropriation, and I do not intend any such result; but if the President wishes to supplement his certification with a detailed accounting, I, of course, could have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator correctly, then, if the President of the United States is given this $50,000, and he certifies that he spent $47,000, that would be sufficient?

Mr. MILLIKIN. That would be sufficient, and in accordance with my intent in offering the amendment. It would be up to the President, whether he wanted to add anything else. I understand that is now the law, as it relates to the expenditures which have already been authorized.

Mr. LUCAS. I take it he could not draw it in monthly installments under the certification proposed?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I do not understand why not. I mean, that is an accounting procedure that I would not be familiar with, but I do not understand why not.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I know that is the custom in the executive offices of the Governor. It is done in precisely that way each month. He simply files a certificate.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to thank the Senator from Colorado for the observations he made a short time ago with respect to his confidence in the President of the United States. I also want to thank the Senator from Maine with respect to his statement of what the governors in his State do. That is exactly what is done in the State of Illinois. In other words, I think in most States the governors have been given a specific sum for expenses to take care of the mansion and other incidental expenses, and have never been required to make any itemized accounting such as has been requested and proposed to be required here this afternoon of the President of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. If that were done, it would cause the personal and official business to become mixed up to the point where, if a report were made of any kind, the newspapers, the columnists, and the radio commentators would be happy to come in and see each month what the President of the United States was doing, and what the Vice President was doing, and what the Speaker was doing, and they would eventually get to the question of what Senators of the United States were doing with respect to their $2,500—a perfect set-up for distortions. I say the proposal is utterly foolish.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator that when I was a young man I worked in a governor's office. The legislature of that State habitually gave the governor what we called a contingent fund, for which he did not even have to make a certification. All he had to do was to draw on it. He made no accounting at all. But I

should say also, we took great pains against the possibility of future attack by keeping a very careful private account of it.

Mr. LUCAS. That is right, and the governor was absolutely correct in doing that. But if the time comes in this country when the governor of a State cannot be trusted, or the President of the United States cannot be trusted, or the Vice President, or the Speaker, to keep an honest account with respect to this little expense money without itemizing every item, then America is not very safe.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Oh, I agree entirely. Would it satisfy the point in the Senator's mind if the word "annual" were inserted before the word "certification"?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, certainly that would be desirable, because the President might spend twice as much money one month as he would spend in another month. It ought to be an annual certification.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Then, Mr. President, I would add the word "annual" before the word "certification."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be so modified.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield, I wonder if he would go further, when the various appropriation bills are presented this year, and whether he intends to endeavor through legislation to require the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of the Air Force, generals of every rank, and, as a matter of fact, all officers in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, who have various allowances, to meet a similar requirement? Are we going to make the same requirement of Members of Congress? We do not make any certification.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Colorado, I hope, made it very clear awhile ago that his remarks on this subject apply only to the office of the Presidency, the Vice Presidency, and the Speaker of the House. We shall have to decide as to the others when we reach them.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield gladly.

Mr. WATKINS. When the Senator says "certification," does he mean that the certificate shall show that the money was spent for expenses?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes; it would naturally be that kind of certificate, because it would have to relate back to the enabling statute; and that is the nature of the statute.

Mr. WATKINS. That is what I wanted to get clear in my mind, whether the Senator intends that it shall be a certification that he spent the allowance for Presidential expenses.

Mr. MILLIKIN. For Presidential expenses, as authorized by this particular statute.

Mr. WATKINS. And not in a campaign?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Not in a campaign.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not going to vote on the pending amendment, but I should like to know what it means, inasmuch as it applies to an office which I am soon to assume. The bill as reported provides that the expense allowance shall be paid in monthly payments. It is entirely possible that during any one month not half of the amount would be expended for the purposes indicated. It might be that in the following month twice as much as the monthly allowance would be expended. For efficient purposes, what sort of certificate would be required, for instance, of the Vice President or the Speaker, in order that he might draw the allowance monthly? Would he be allowed to draw it in monthly installments of equal amount, or would he draw only the amount for which he made a certificate at the end of the month? If the certificate were for only a part of the monthly payment out of a fund, would he be allowed to certify a larger amount in the following month, if the expenses had been larger than the one-twelfth of the entire amount that was paid?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding, under the explanations which have been made here, that the beneficiaries of this fund could draw it all out at once, that they could draw any part of it out from time to time and without it being any fixed, regular, stated time. They are required only to make an annual certification that it was for expenses.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understood the bill as written to provide that the allowance should be paid in monthly installments, which means an equal amount each month.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. On page 2, line 1, I think, the Senator will observe that equal monthly payments are required. How could that come about, if the recipient has to wait until the end of the year to make a certificate as to the amount he has expended?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I understood the distinguished Senator from Maine to state that under the practice——

Mr. BREWSTER. I think perhaps the Senator did not realize the purport of my amendment, which would strike out the provision as to the monthly payment of the $50,000, that was in the earlier provision. On the adoption of my amendment, that passes out.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator's amendment apply to all three of the offices?

Mr. BREWSTER. Yes. I wanted to raise the question as to whether the annual certification would not present a difficulty. It seems to me it is much better to leave it "certification", because under the word "annual" the President necessarily would have to wait until the end of the year, and would be obliged to put up the $50,000 for expenses, with no means of recoupment. Certainly he could not certify, on July 10, that his expenses next June would be a certain amount. If it is left without the word "annual" he can file a monthly, bimonthly, or tri-monthly certificate and receive compensation for whatever his expenses have been.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think what the Senator from Colorado wishes to do, as I understand, and what the Senator from Kentucky is hoping will be done, as I understand, could be reconciled by making the salary part of the appropriation payable monthly, and the expense amount, payable if, as, and when the recipient desired to draw it. That could be done simply by transposing the words "be paid monthly" in connection with the $100,000 salary, saying nothing about when the $50,000 expense money would be paid, except that there would be a certification required annually for the expenditure of that fund.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Would the Senator please indicate where his words would come in, and what they are?

Mr. TYDINGS. Strike out the words "to be paid monthly" on page 2, line 1. It would then read "a year, consisting of $100,000 for salary." Then insert, "to be paid monthly"——

Mr. BREWSTER. That is already in, is it not?

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will wait just a moment, until the meaning is made plain, it would then go on to say, "and an expense allowance of $50,000 a year," which would not necessarily have to be paid monthly. It could, as the Senator from Colorado has pointed out, all be drawn in 1 day, 1 month, or 6 months, or a year, depending upon when the recipient desired to use the money. But the salary would be paid in 12 monthly installments. The only requirement, then, as the amendment has been redrafted, would be a certification for the expense money annually, at the end of the year. I believe that is what the Senator from Colorado desires, and I think it would meet the point of view of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, that is what the junior Senator from Colorado desires to do.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, if I heard the Senator from Colorado correctly, that is exactly what he stated when he suggested his amendment. My understanding of the amendment which was offered by him is that it provides compensation in the amount of $100,000 a year, to be paid monthly, and an expense allowance of $50,000. The provision for payment monthly goes fully to compensation and not to the expense account.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I shall yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not understand that the Senator from Colorado is proposing any new restrictions on the President's fund. Congress has continued the proviso that the President shall certify each year as to what his expenses have amounted to during the year. The legislation which we are now considering proposes to drop the requirement that the President certify the amount of expense for the White House

each year. The Senator from Colorado is certainly proposing no new restrictions.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I agreed to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I understand that the Senator from Colorado stated that certification, so far as the President is concerned, is annual?

I wish to bring out the point that so far as I can see by reading the amendment handed to the Clerk, the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] does not apply to the Vice President or to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I bring that out because the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] asked with reference to his expense account. Is the Vice President to be on a monthly basis as opposed to an annual basis for the President?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I understand the situation the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine takes care of the contingency which the Senator from Colorado and I were discussing, so that the President's regular salary is paid in twelve regular installments, but his expense account can be drawn upon whenever the President desires, and there is an annual certification. If the Millikin amendment prevails for the present, and we have not corrected the comparable condition in which the Vice President's expense account and the Speaker's expense account find themselves, I suggest to the Senator from Maine, who has drafted the first amendment, that if he will redraft the language relating to the Vice President's and the Speaker's expense accounts, along the same line, I think the bill will be in consonance and every Senator will have what he seems to want.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I would explain to the Senator from Maryland that my amendment has been adopted, and the question is now on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. It seems to me better to omit the word annual and have it subject to one certification. The addition of similar language with reference to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House would bring about the same objective.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment, and I would ask the Clerk to read my proposed modification.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 6, the words proposed to be inserted are, "his annual certification." The modification reads, "his certification."

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask if the amendment which has already been adopted referred to the President's salary and expense account. We have been assured by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] that like language will be introduced as to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. I should like to ask with reference to the Vice President's salary and expense account. If the amendment is agreed to, where will it leave the Vice President relative to the amount of expense to which he is entitled?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, it would be the intention of the junior Senator from Colorado to conform the language of the bill so that the same privilege is available to both the Vice President and the Speaker of the House. I understand that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is working on such an amendment at this time.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the amendment, the President, the Vice President, or the Speaker of the House of Representatives can draw at any time desired the amount of money desired, and he is required to make certification whenever he draws it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. All I am seeking is information. I shall not vote on the amendment one way or the other. I should like to inquire if it is proposed to strike out the monthly installment entirely. I am endeavoring to find out what I have to do.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I will say to the distinguished Senator that it is my intention to conform the language relating to the Vice President and the Speaker of the House with the language relating to the President.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does it provide for an annual certification?

Mr. MILLIKIN. It requires certification at the time expense money is drawn out. The word "annual" has been taken out.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if that be the interpretation, then I want to ask again if the Vice President would have to finance himself until he drew out the money, in order to certify his expenses?

Mr. MILLIKIN. When the Vice President has a need for reimbursing himself for expense money within the limits provided for in the bill, he makes a certification at any time he wants to make it within the appropriating year, in such amounts as he wants to make it, within the over-all limitation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, may I ask if that means that he must certify that he has already expended the money or that he wants to expend it?

Mr. MILLIKIN. He must certify that he has expended the money.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the result is that the Vice President and the Speaker of the House have to finance the expenses to be covered by their allowances and then be reimbursed by a certification some time during the year.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I suggest to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky that it would be rather difficult to make a certification that money has been spent on an advance. I do not know of any practical way in which that could be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I realize that; and that presents a difficulty, because it is obvious that the same amount may not be expended each month for expenses incident to the two officers. It creates confusion in the mind of the recipient as to what his rights are. As I understand, under the language of the Senator's amendment, the officer certifies only what he has spent in any one month, and the amounts may be different each month, depending entirely on circumstances. I find it difficult to understand how he can comply with this requirement.

Mr. MILLIKIN. It is the intention of the junior Senator from Colorado that any time the distinguished Vice President or the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives or the President finds that he has spent money attributable to this account he can clear it with a certification that he has spent it. Otherwise we would be operating on an advance basis. I have no intention of putting in an amendment to give advances for expenses before anyone knows what the expenses are.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. For purposes of clarity, would it not be better to follow the "$50,000" by the words "per annum," in the second line, the same as is done in line 19 on page 2 and line 5 on page 3? Otherwise, there may be some complications from the Comptroller General's office as to the amount.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would accept the Senator's amendment to that effect.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I do not care to be a nuisance in inquiring about what the result may be, but to whom is this certificate to be presented, to the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, the Secretary of the Treasury, or to the Disbursing Officer of the Senate? Where is the certificate to be presented in order to allow these two particular officers to draw whatever they can draw out of this expense allowance?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would assume that whoever officially pays that kind of money to the President would be the person to receive the certification, and the same would apply to the Vice President or the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. In the case of the Vice President, the Disbursing Officer of the Senate pays him.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think that is true. I do not know how the matter is handled so far as the Speaker of the House is concerned. Nor do I know who directly pays the President, but whoever pays him is going to take the certificate to clear his account.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I suggest that there will not be too much difficulty about it. Since 1906 the law has provided for the allowance of travel expenses and for funds to the President for entertainment. It has always been provided that that is to be for the President, and the language is, "to be accounted for solely on his certificate,"

which is exactly the same thing the Senator suggests, so unquestionably the modus operandi has been worked out.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, to take a practical case as applied to the Vice President or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Vice President could simply say, "I hereby certify that I require the sum of $1,500, or $2,000, or $360, in connection with the expenses of the duty of the office of Vice President."

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would put it slightly differently.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not mean to choose the words; I am getting at the spirit of it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say, "I require $1,500 to reimburse me for the expenses of my office, which I certify have been incurred under this statute."

Mr. TYDINGS. That certainly could be made the day the expense was incurred, or the day after.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. And the payments would come immediately.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. The whole purpose of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado is to give to the Vice President, without any accounting, the money he needs whenever he needs it, but he will simply say so in writing.

Mr. MILLIKIN. If he will make his certification, and the same applies to the President and the same applies to the Speaker of the House, and of course all those officials are at liberty to make such supplemental accounting as they wish.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] as modified.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In the event the $50,000 or the $10,000 which is certified as being required for expenses relating to the office is not spent, does the remainder stay in the Treasury? Does it revert back to the Treasury, or can it all be drawn out?

Mr. MILLIKIN. As I understand, we are making an allowance of expense money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. At a maximum?

Mr. MILLIKIN. If it is not spent, I imagine, in an appropriating period, it probably goes back into the general fund, and we would have to reappropriate it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In other words, they can draw out only that which is expended in the course of their business?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would say that is correct.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In order that the matter may be clearly understood by the Senate, the clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Colorado as modified.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

SEC. 102. The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $100,000 a year, to be paid monthly, and in addition an expense allowance of $50,000 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which accounting shall be made by his certification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would call attention to the fact that the amendment as read by the clerk does not cover the Vice President or the Speaker.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We have not gotten to that yet. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. (Putting the question.) In the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" have it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, in view of this vote, I should like to clarify the situation. I think my amendment was agreed to. The other amendment simply applies to the certification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question was on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BREWSTER. Which was not the one read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Maine was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine said the amendment voted on was not the one read. I am now completely at sea. I desire to know what amendment we just voted on.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The vote was on the certification amendment presented by the Senator from Colorado, and in the opinion of the Chair it was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would a division be in order on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The result has already been announced.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the confusion, I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the announcement of the Chair that the amendment was defeated, that a division be allowed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to have the situation clear. Is it understood that the amendment which I proposed has been agreed to?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that the only question is now about the proposal of certification made by the Senator from Colorado?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. [Putting the question.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). Under the same circumstances referred to before, I ask to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is excused from voting.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—38

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Jenner | Saltonstall |
| Brewster | Johnson, Colo. | Schoeppel |
| Butler | Kem | Smith, Maine |
| Cain | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Cordon | Langer | Taft |
| Ecton | Lodge | Thye |
| Ferguson | McCarthy | Tobey |
| Flanders | Malone | Tydings |
| Gillette | Martin | Watkins |
| Gurney | Millikin | Wherry |
| Hendrickson | Mundt | Williams |
| Hickenlooper | Robertson | Young |
| Ives | Russell | |

NAYS—38

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Humphrey | Magnuson |
| Chapman | Hunt | Maybank |
| Chavez | Johnson, Tex. | Morse |
| Connally | Johnston, S. C. | Murray |
| Donnell | Kefauver | Myers |
| Douglas | Kerr | O'Conor |
| Ellender | Kilgore | O'Mahoney |
| Frear | Long | Pepper |
| Fulbright | Lucas | Sparkman |
| Hayden | McClellan | Stennis |
| Hill | McFarland | Taylor |
| Hoey | McKellar | Thomas, Utah |
| Holland | McMahon | |

NOT VOTING—20

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin | Downey | Neely |
| Barkley | Eastland | Reed |
| Bricker | George | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bridges | Green | Vandenberg |
| Broughton | McCarran | Wagner |
| Byrd | McGrath | Wiley |
| Capehart | Miller | |

So Mr. MILLIKIN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief explanation of the vote I have just cast. I voted against the certification requirement because in my judgment it is perfectly clear from the discussion this afternoon that the real purpose of the alleged expense account has been to increase the salary of the President of the United States. There is no real desire on the floor of the Senate, in my judgment, to make the President of the United States give a true accounting of his expenditures. I am not one who believes in voting for mere form. I think that the amendment we voted on in regard to certification was nothing but an empty gesture, a matter of empty form. Unless we are willing to do directly what we ought to do I am not going to seek, by way of indirection, to put on the books what I consider to be a matter of empty form. It is a subterfuge to conceal what the proponents do not want to do directly, namely, grant the President a $150,000 salary.

I repeat, the President of the United States ought to be required to give a full accounting of $50,000 of the taxpayers' money allegedly given to him in this bill for the purposes of running the White House. The people ought to know what that money is spent for. We should not allow the President to get away with the $50,000 by simply filing a mere formal certification that he used it for expense money. Thus, if we cannot have a full accounting, my vote necessarily had to be "no" because I think there is a great moral principle involved in this matter.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I desire to say that my vote of "nay" on this amendment was for the reason that I think the proper method of handling this matter is by accounting which states what the items were for which the expenditures were incurred—not a mere certification. Furthermore, it is entirely possible that the accounting could be definite, certain, clear as to what the items were. A mere statement that the moneys have been used for expenses relating to the office to my mind is not proper, is not the proper example for the public, is not the proper example for the United States Government, and my vote was "nay" for that reason.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the event Senate bill 103 is passed by the House without amendment, the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled bill after the adjournment of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it has just been called to my attention that the only office which we are acting upon which must be acted upon prior to January 20 is that of the President, and that after January 20 we can still act on these expense accounts in the committee, and perhaps reach a more intelligent conclusion as to what we should do. With that thought in mind, Mr. President, I move to strike out, beginning on page 2, line 1, after the word "year", all the remainder of the bill, inserting a period after the word "year." That strikes out all action with respect to the salaries of the Vice President and the Speaker.

Article II, section 1, paragraph 6 of the Constitution provides as follows:

> The President shall, at stated times, receive for his services, a compensation which shall neither be increased nor diminished during the period for which he shall have been elected, and he shall not receive within that period any other emolument from the United States, or any of them.

There is no reference to the Vice President or Speaker, and we can take action with respect to them at some later date. There seems to be quite a difference of opinion on the question, and that is why I am offering my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware. [Putting the question.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair the "noes" have it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest to the acting majority leader the point of no quorum.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska suggests the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Holland | Millikin |
| Anderson | Humphrey | Morse |
| Barkley | Hunt | Mundt |
| Brewster | Ives | Murray |
| Butler | Jenner | Myers |
| Cain | Johnson, Colo. | O'Conor |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | O'Mahoney |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Pepper |
| Connally | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Cordon | Kem | Russell |
| Donnell | Kerr | Saltonstall |
| Douglas | Kilgore | Schoeppel |
| Ecton | Knowland | Smith, Maine |
| Ellender | Langer | Smith, N. J. |
| Ferguson | Lodge | Sparkman |
| Flanders | Long | Stennis |
| Frear | Lucas | Taft |
| Fulbright | McCarthy | Taylor |
| George | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Gillette | McFarland | Thye |
| Gurney | McKellar | Tobey |
| Hayden | McMahon | Tydings |
| Hendrickson | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Hickenlooper | Malone | Wherry |
| Hill | Martin | Williams |
| Hoey | Maybank | Young |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, there seems to be a difference of opinion as to whether or not the President would be the only one included. Therefore I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment may be withdrawn.

The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARKLEY (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as I have heretofore made, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from voting.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection the Senator from Kentucky is excused from voting.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent by leave of the Senate.

If present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. MCGRATH] the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is unavoidably detained. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—68

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hoey | Maybank |
| Anderson | Holland | Mundt |
| Brewster | Humphrey | Murray |
| Butler | Hunt | Myers |
| Cain | Ives | O'Conor |
| Chapman | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Chavez | Johnson, Tex. | Pepper |
| Connally | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Cordon | Kefauver | Russell |
| Douglas | Kerr | Saltonstall |
| Ecton | Kilgore | Schoeppel |
| Ellender | Knowland | Smith, Maine |
| Ferguson | Lodge | Smith, N. J. |
| Flanders | Long | Sparkman |
| Frear | Lucas | Stennis |
| Fulbright | McCarthy | Taft |
| George | McClellan | Taylor |
| Gillette | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Gurney | McKellar | Thye |
| Hayden | McMahon | Tobey |
| Hendrickson | Magnuson | Tydings |
| Hickenlooper | Malone | Wherry |
| Hill | Martin | |

NAYS—9

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Donnell | Langer | Watkins |
| Jenner | Millikin | Williams |
| Kem | Morse | Young |

NOT VOTING—19

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin | Downey | Reed |
| Barkley | Eastland | Thomas, Okla. |
| Bricker | Green | Vandenberg |
| Bridges | McCarran | Wagner |
| Broughton | McGrath | Wiley |
| Byrd | Miller | |
| Capehart | Neely | |

So the bill (S. 103) was passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the title will be amended in accordance with an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I renew my previous request, by asking unanimous consent that in the event Senate bill 103 is passed by the House of Representatives without amendment, the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled bill after the adjournment of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMPENSATION OF HEADS AND ASSISTANT HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce at this point for appropriate reference a bill to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 498) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

CHARTER OF ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CHARTER

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the charter of the Organization of American States, Executive A, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the charter, and the charter, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Charter of the Organization of American States, formulated at the Ninth International Conference of American States, and signed at Bogotá, Colombia, in the English, French, Portuguese, and Spanish languages on April 30, 1948, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of the other American Republics.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Acting Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to the Charter above mentioned, together with a copy of the report of the United States delegation on the Bogotá Conference.

The principles, purposes, and provisions of the Charter have my complete and wholehearted approval and I am happy to recommend the Charter to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Charter of the Organization of American States, Bogotá, April 30, 1948—certified copy; 3. Report of the United States delegation on the Bogotá Conference.)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the international convention for the safety of life at sea, Executive B, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, signed at London on June 10, 1948, by the respective plenipotentiaries of the Government of the United States of America and the governments of 27 other states.

The character of the convention, which is intended to replace the International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea signed at London on May 31, 1929, is explained in the enclosed report of the Acting Secretary of State.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate in connection with its consideration of the convention, a certified copy of the Final Act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, held at London from April 23 to June 10, 1948, and a copy of the report of the delegation of the United States of America to that conference.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2, Certified copy of International Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea, 1948, signed at London June 10, 1948; 3. Certified copy of Final Act of the International Conference on Safety of Life at Sea, 1948; 4. Copy of report of the United States delegation.)

CONVENTION OF WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the Convention of the World Meteorological Organization, Executive C, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the convention of the World Meteorological Organization, in the English and French languages, which was opened for signature at Washington on October 11, 1947 for a period of 120 days, and was signed, during that period, by representatives of the United States of America and of 41 other states.

In this connection, there is transmitted herewith a certified copy of a protocol which was also opened for signature at the same time as the convention.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State regarding the aforementioned convention.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Certified copy of the convention of the World Meteorological Organization; 3. Certified copy of protocol.)

INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION ON GRANTING OF POLITICAL RIGHTS TO WOMEN—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the Inter-American Convention on the Granting

of Political Rights to Women, Executive D, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Inter-American Convention on the Granting of Political Rights to Women, formulated at the Ninth International Conference of American States, and signed at Bogotá, Colombia, on May 2, 1948, by the plenipotentiaries of the United States of America and by the plenipotentiaries of other American Republics.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report which the Acting Secretary of State has addressed to me in regard to this convention.

The purpose of this convention, and the principle underlying it, have my complete and wholehearted approval and I am happy to recommend the convention to the favorable consideration of the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report by the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Inter-American Convention on the Granting of Political Rights to Women, Bogotá, May 2, 1948—certified copy.)

CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL RECOGNITION OF RIGHTS IN AIRCRAFT—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM CONVENTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the Convention on the International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft, Executive E, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a copy, as certified by the Secretary General of the International Civil Aviation Organization, of the Convention on the International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft, signed at Geneva on June 19, 1948.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Certified copy of Convention on the International Recognition of Rights in Aircraft.)

PROTOCOL ON REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY FROM PROTOCOL

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of secrecy with regard to the protocol prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1948, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, Executive F, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the protocol, and the protocol, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol dated in London August 31, 1948, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1948, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Acting Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Certified copy of protocol of August 31, 1948.)

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some hours ago I sent to the desk, for introduction and proper reference, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment. It was introduced for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and myself. I had expected to ask unanimous consent to make a statement regarding the joint resolution; but because of the lateness of the hour I simply ask now that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, showing the introduction thereof.

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 34) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. HOEY, Mr. BROUGHTON, and Mr. ROBERTSON), was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

INAUGURATION HOLIDAY FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN THE DISTRICT AND METROPOLITAN AREA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], who is chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported today Senate Joint Resolution 16, making January 20 and 21 of this year holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. Unanimous consent is required to take up the joint resolution at this time. I hope it may be granted, and that we may complete action on it today. Otherwise, we shall have to adjourn until tomorrow, and have a session then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader why it is necessary that we have a legislative enactment setting aside these two days for a holiday.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the distinguished minority leader that it is my understanding that in the past all inaugural days have been a holiday for employees in the District of Columbia, either through an Executive order by the President of the United States or through congressional action.

This inauguration falls on Thursday the 20th of January. Of course, Friday will be the 21st; and Saturday and Sunday will be holidays in the regular course. Many persons from all over the United States will be coming to this inauguration. Many friends and relatives of Senators upon both sides of the aisle will be here. In view of the fact that one day definitely will be a holiday it was thought that it would be just as well to include the next day, which is Friday. That will give the employees 2 days as a holiday or vacation.

I may say to my friend the Senator from Nebraska that I think on inauguration day there will be quite a celebration. I understand that the number of people coming to Washington next week possibly will be greater than the number who have come to any other inauguration in the history of the United States, and I think there will be a rather gay and glorious patriotic time around the Capital. I may add that there is to be an inaugural ball and a general celebration all over the city, and I assume that probably the employees would like another day for vacation, on Friday, after the night before.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the majority leader for the explanation as to the holidays. I am not at all quarreling with the celebration that is expected to be put on. In fact, I do not know whether the acting majority leader knows it or not, but I happen to be one of the members of the inaugural committee that is trying to provide the facilities and help as much as possible in carrying out the inaugurational program. But that is not the question I asked my distinguished friend. What I want to know is, Why does there have to be legislative authority for this? I have not checked the history of it, but in times gone by I think it has simply been done by executive decree or proclamation.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend it has, with respect to 1 day. It so happens that this year Inauguration Day falls on Thursday, and the President of the United States feels that the holiday period should be extended to 2 days. He does not desire to take all the responsibility for it; but he would like to go along with the Congress in making it 2 days.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to object to the unanimous-consent request, because the Senate, I understand will not convene until next Monday. The resolution was reported today, and it would have to lie over 24 hours, in order to be brought up in regular order. I think there is no doubt that we want to cooperate in the inauguration. For that reason, I shall offer no objection to the unanimous consent. I should like at this place in my remarks however to include a short statement relative to the authority the President now has to make Inauguration Day a holiday by proclamation. For that reason, I wanted to know why it was necessary to have a legislative enactment, when there is a custom that has been followed in inaugurations gone by.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

The President has the authority to make January 20 and 21 holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District without the necessity of any congressional action. In 1923 the Acting Attorney General rendered an opinion to the President (33 Op. Atty. Gen. p. 485) stating that the power to close the executive departments and independent bureaus in the District of Columbia and the District government offices, whenever he deems proper in the interest of the public service, is inherent in the President. The opinion points out that there are numerous precedents for such action, none of which have ever been questioned, and cites 22 Opinions of the Attorney General 472, 474, for additional precedents. Since 1923 this power has been exercised on numerous occasions both with respect to employees in the District and with respect to employees in the field service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I think so long as we are going to have many functions going on, taking on the characteristics of a Roman holiday, that the Government employees certainly ought to be allowed to share in it and observe it. However, I do want to say that when I compare the plans being made for this inauguration with the very simple and dignified inauguration that last occurred in this city, down on the lawn of the White House, it is most unfortunate that we are wasting the great sums of money which are being spent on the inauguration. I think it is another bit of proof of my remarks made earlier this afternoon, when I commented upon the expenditures that are laid out in the city of Washington, D. C., under the name of social functions. When I think of the thousands of dollars which are going to be spent unnecessarily on this inauguration, I wonder what has happened to the word "economy." I am led to believe that the inauguration is a fitting introduction to what has every evidence of becoming anything but an economic administration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not know that I shall object, I should like to ask the acting majority leader a few questions. I understood him to say—which, of course, is correct—that every previous Inauguration Day has been a holiday, and I do not think on either side of the aisle there is any question about that. I should like to inquire, however, whether to his knowledge there has heretofore ever been a case, and I imagine that Thursday has been an Inauguration Day a number of times in the country's history, when a 2- or 3-day holiday has been granted for the inauguration?

Mr. LUCAS. Saturday, of course, is a holiday anyway. I cannot answer that question, I will say to my friend from California. It may be that some member of the Committee on the District of Columbia can answer it. I am merely presenting the joint resolution, because the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] was compelled to go to New York.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator from California will yield, I might answer his question. Only during the past 3 or 4 years has Saturday been a holiday among Government employees. Heretofore there has been no Saturday holiday in the District of Columbia, and the joint resolution is offered because of Saturday now being a holiday, and it would have to be, anyway, even if there were no inauguration. It was thought that inasmuch as Thursday is a holiday and Saturday is a holiday, there is no particular point in requiring the Government employees to work on Friday.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, I should like to make an observation and ask whether the majority leader had given thought to it. People will be coming into Washington in order quite properly to take part in the inauguration of the President of the United States, and they will be coming in regardless of partisanship, because the man being inaugurated is President of the entire United States and not of any one political party. But when they come into this city, it might well be that with the expense they are undergoing, they might have some public business to transact, if the public offices were open on Friday. After they had participated in the inauguration of the President of the United States and paid their respects to him, it seems to me that they then might want to carry on some public business in some of the public offices. Under this arrangement, it seems to me they would have to stay over two extra days or three extra days in order to transact any public business in their Nation's Capital.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think the record should be clear that this is only a holiday for the employees. As I understand, the banks did not want it made a regular holiday, which would compel them to remain closed on Friday. So that this is not a holiday, to all intents and purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is merely to give a vacation to the employees designated in the bill itself; is it not?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct. It does not apply to business houses at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. It does not apply to them as a holiday.

Mr. WHERRY. The resolution applies only to the metropolitan area. It does not extend beyond that; does it?

Mr. LUCAS. I think it extends to Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. It would extend only to the metropolitan area; would it not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I have yet to find any justification for a holiday on Friday. It is entirely different from situations of this kind that might occur when there is a normal national holiday, and the employees of the Government might be going home for a vacation, and they might need an extra day, in which case as a gesture to their convenience and their good times, an extra day is often given. This is a celebration to be observed in Washington only. There is no occasion, so far as I know, for employees going to their distant homes and no advantage in giving them another day for that fundamental purpose. I see utterly no justification. I do not believe that I shall object to the Senate acting on the resolution, if they care to act on it today, but certainly I see no justification for an extra holiday at public expense on Friday, merely because Saturday happens to follow Friday, and Sunday happens to follow Saturday, and they all three follow the inauguration. I feel that it is setting a dangerous, bad, and ill-advised precedent. I might not oppose it at all, and I might support such a move, if it were a day following Thanksgiving. I have voted for such holidays, if they really served the convenience of the people in the District for travel purposes or added time with their families, or something of that kind. But

in this instance there is nothing but the stoppage of Federal work for 1 day, with an excuse that I have been unable to find, in any explanation, or in the resolution itself. I shall not object, if the majority wants to have it done, as a vacation for the people in the District. I shall not object to the consideration of the resolution, but I want to say now that, without further justification, my conscience will not permit me in the public interest to support this extra holiday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the joint resolution is passed.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator, and I thank the Senate. Before I take my seat, let me say just one word in response to what has just been said.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not hear the ruling of the Chair. I realize I am a little late on the decision, but my understanding was there was no objection to considering the joint resolution. Was it also passed? There was no opportunity for anyone not in favor of the resolution even to express himself, before final action was taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ruling of the Chair will be rescinded. Any Senator who wants to be heard on the joint resolution will be heard. The resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. There being no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 16) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in the event the House of Representatives passes Senate Joint Resolution 16 without amendment, the President pro tempore be authorized to sign the enrolled joint resolution after the adjournment of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ALLEGED EXTRAVAGANCE IN CONNECTION WITH INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief reply to what my good friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] said a moment ago regarding extravagance in connection with the coming inauguration of President Truman. I am surprised that my friend did not know that the Republican committee, before the election on November 2, had full charge of making all contracts with respect to this inauguration. It is my understanding that no Democrat was consulted as to what was to be done. The truth of the matter is that they built the stands for the inauguration of Mr. Dewey, not Mr. Truman, and the contracts were let by the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which my former colleague, former Senator Brooks, was chairman.

The Democrats had nothing to do with the $100,000 which is being spent here. The contracts were let before we came into power. We suggested that something be done, if possible, to do exactly what the Senator from Oregon has referred to; in other words, to cancel the contracts, if possible, have the inaugural ceremonies upon the White House balcony, which was built by the President of the United States, for which many people criticized and condemned him, and let the people of the country extract such amusement as they could from that situation. But the contracts had been let and could not be terminated.

So I want my friend to know that any extravagance in connection with the inaugural ceremonies must be laid to the Republicans, and not to the Democrats.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Illinois that he cannot shuffle off responsibility quite so easily.

Mr. LUCAS. I am doing it, however.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is trying to. I want to say to the Senator from Illinois that I am aware of the fact that some Republicans apparently entered into an agreement to waste a great deal of lumber in front of the Capitol in anticipation of a Republican inauguration. But I want to say that I have also gone into the factual questions behind the type of statement which the Senator has just made on the floor of the Senate, because I have been reading statements similar to his made to the press by other Democrats. The facts will not bear out the statement of the Senator from Illinois, if he means to assert that the Democrats have not been adding to the expense of the inauguration ceremonies. There are many items which the Democrats have added to the costs, including some amusing ones. I call the attention of the Senator from Illinois to the calliope which will tag end the circus and which was not in the original plans for the inauguration. I think the Senator knows me well enough to know that the division caused by the middle aisle of the Senate does not make any difference, so far as I am concerned, in trying to protect the people's money. The Democrats should have made some rescission of the plans, if the Senator thinks the Republicans are responsible for the waste. It will not be found in the record that any such rescission was attempted.

I simply wish to say that this inauguration, in my judgment, entails the waste of many thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money which should be saved.

### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 13, 1949:

#### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons for promotion from Foreign Service officers of class 1 to Foreign Service officers of the class of career minister of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Ralph H. Ackerman, of California.
David McK. Key, of Tennessee.
Karl L. Rankin, of Maine.
Howard K. Travers, of New York.

H. Lawrence Groves, of Pennsylvania, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Stephen E. Aguirre, of Texas.
Archibald E. Gray, of Pennsylvania.
Robert M. Taylor, of Washington.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Charles W. Adair, Jr., of Ohio.
Frederick J. Cunningham, of Massachusetts.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Sherburne Dillingham, of the District of Columbia.
Harrison Lewis, of California.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Charles Gilbert, of New York.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Robert Alexander, of the District of Columbia.
Charles R. Enlow, of Kansas.
William Kling, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 4, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which offices they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

James F. Amory, of Virginia.
Raymond J. Barrett, of New York.
Jack B. Button, of Kansas.
Stuart B. Campbell, Jr., of Virginia.
Thomas F. Conlon, of Illinois.
Robert W. Eastham, of Virginia.
Benjamin A. Fleck, of Pennsylvania.
Jackson E. Heffner, of California.
Jack T. Kilgore, of Indiana.
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Ralph J. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.
Daniel J. Meloy, of Maryland.
Richard B. Parker, of Kansas.
John B. Root, of New York.
Robert W. Ross, of California.
John A. Sabini, of the District of Columbia.
Michel F. Smith, of Texas.
Karl E. Sommerlatte, of Florida.
Christopher T. Taloumis, of Massachusetts.
George E. Tener 2d, of Pennsylvania.
Sidney Weintraub, of New York.

Don A. Gribble, of Vermont, a Foreign Service reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Mallory Browne, of New York.

George Kenneth Holland, of Maryland.

William R. Tyler, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America, to which office they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate:

Ernest L. Eslinger, of Tennessee.

Arnlioth G. Heltberg, of California.

Frederick C. Johnson, of New Jersey.

Ernest V. Polutnik, of Montana.

James R. Riddle, of Alabama.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Edward H. Foley, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of A. Lee M. Wiggins, resigned.

Mr. Foley is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, Jr.

Mr. Graham is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Jesse J. Gilbert, of Ohio, to be Assistant Registrar of the Treasury, in place of Byrd Leavell, resigned.

Mr. Gilbert is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Daniel A. Bolich, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Stewart Berkshire, resigned.

Mr. Bolich is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

BUREAU OF MINES

James Boyd, of Colorado, to be Director of the Bureau of Mines, terminating recess appointment. Vice Boyd R. Sayers.

BUREAU OF THE MINT

George B. Gillin, of California, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy.

Gilroy Roberts, of Pennsylvania, to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy.

These officers are now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Charles F. Murphy, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of Customs with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (Reappointment.)

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Ralph W. Cripe, of South Bend, Ind., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, to fill an existing vacancy.

John J. Fitzpatrick, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, to fill an existing vacancy.

Mr. Fitzpatrick is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

Stuart L. Crenshaw, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

John H. Alsmiller, of Kentucky, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., in place of Harry M. Brennan, deceased.

Tully Garner, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex., in place of Harry P. Hornby, deceased.

These officers are now serving under temporary commissions issued during the recess of the Senate.

William H. Burke, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4 with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (Reappointment.)

ASSISTANT ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Hon. Alexander M. Campbell, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Attorney General. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. David Northon Edelstein, of New York, to be Assistant Attorney General, customs division. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William Marvel, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Gilmore S. Haynie, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana, vice Alexander M. Campbell, resigned.

Joseph F. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Deeb is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.)

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana. (Mr. Tansil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Miles N. Pike, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada. (He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires January 22, 1949.)

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York. (Mr. Grobe is now serving under an appointment which expired October 1, 1947.)

Gerald A. Gleeson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania. (Mr. Gleeson is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 7, 1948.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware. (Mr. Messick is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 17, 1948.)

Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa. (Mr. Biermann is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired September 27, 1948.)

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine. (Mr. Curran is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.)

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Mr. Bolger is now serving under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

Fred A. Canfil, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the western district of Missouri. (Mr. Canfil is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired January 17, 1948.)

Harold K. Claypool, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio. (Mr. Claypool is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.)

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon. (Mr. Caufield is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired October 28, 1947.)

Carl H. Fleckenstine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

THE JUDICIARY

Hon. F. Ryan Duffy, of Wisconsin, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Hon. Evan A. Evans, deceased.

Hon. Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Herbert W. Erskine, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Hon. Adolphus Frederick St. Sure, retired.

Hon. Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. (Judge Tamm is now serving in this post under a recess appointment.)

William T. McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Hon. Arthur D. Healey, deceased.

Thomas Patrick Thornton, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Hon. Ernest A. O'Brien, deceased.

Hon. Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico, vice Hon. Colin Neblett, retired.

James T. Foley, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Hon. Edward S. Kampf, resigned.

Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Hon. Wilson Warlick, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina, vice Hon. Edwin Y. Webb, retired.

Hon. Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Emil C. Peters, term expired.

Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Albert M. Cristy, elevated.

Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. (Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947.)

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia. (Judge Fennell is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired July 7, 1948.)

Hon. Angel R. de Jesus, of Puerto Rico, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. (He is now serving under a recess appointment.)

MILITARY AND NAVAL STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Rear Adm. Bernhard H. Bieri, United States Navy, to be the senior naval member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, Corps of Engineers, to be president and a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 27:33 U. S. C. 642), vice Maj. Gen. Robert Walter Crawford, relieved.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective January 1, 1949:

Abraham Wolfthal
William E. Dudley
Robert L. Capehart

To be assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective January 1, 1949:

Jean M. Lynch
Joseph J. Hackett

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective January 1, 1949:

Edward J. Vesey
Lowell R. Pfau
Adelbert E. Briggs

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective January 1, 1949:

Isaac M. Zigler
J. Howard Beard

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective January 1, 1949:

Charles M. Gillikin
Robert F. Wettingfeld
Harry R. H. Nicholas III
Edward B. Lehmann
Alan F. Thometz
Daniel M. Enerson
James V. Woodworth

Assistant dental surgeons to be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective January 1, 1949:

Edmond G. Vanden Bosche
Tyler C. Folsom, Jr.

NOTE.—The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

To be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Charles L. Newberry, October 20, 1948.
Hildrus A. Poindexter, November 5, 1948.
Richard F. Boyd, December 29, 1948.

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Harold Heller, June 30, 1948.
Frederick G. Gillick, July 16, 1948.
Michael J. Clarke, November 20, 1948.
James G. Telfer, December 14, 1948.

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Calvin W. Applewhite, June 29, 1948.
James B. Gilbert, June 29, 1948.
J. Carter Wright, June 29, 1948.
Frederick E. Phillips, June 30, 1948.
J. D. Leggett, June 30, 1948.
Eldis M. Christensen, July 1, 1948.
Ted E. Becker, July 1, 1948.
Allen N. Koplin, July 1, 1948.
Roland H. Corbet, July 1, 1948.
John H. Tuohy, July 1, 1948.
P. Councilman Morgan, July 1, 1948.
Edwin B. Thomas, July 1, 1948.
David M. Dumville, July 1, 1948.
R. Raymond Green, July 1, 1948.
Donald J. Ottenberg, July 2, 1948.
Harold H. Davidson, July 2, 1948.
Jules Glenn, July 2, 1948.
John J. Johnson, July 2, 1948.
Eugene V. Nininger, July 3, 1948.
William H. Gutstein, July 3, 1948.
Frederick A. Thompson, Jr., July 5, 1948.
Richard A. Reiss, July 6, 1948.
Gerald Giges, July 6, 1948.
Robert W. Mowry, July 8, 1948.
Reed M. Broadbent, July 14, 1948.
Andrew G. Morrow, July 15, 1948.
Paul W. Rogers, July 15, 1948.
Robert O. Scow, July 22, 1948.
John F. Montroy, July 24, 1948.
Victor A. McKusick, October 1, 1948.
Charles H. Fish, October 1, 1948.

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Victor A. McKusick, July 1, 1948.
John M. Vogel, July 1, 1948.
R. Guy Lewis, July 1, 1948.
David S. Wilder, July 1, 1948.
Glenn M. Gordon, July 1, 1948.
Robert L. Price, July 1, 1948.
Stewart M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
McClain Johnston, July 1, 1948.
Richard A. Saavedra, July 2, 1948.
Arnold W. Pratt, July 2, 1948.
Edward A. Rogers, Jr., July 3, 1948.
Gordon L. Farrell, July 8, 1948.
Albert L. Patrick, July 9, 1948.
Milton Sheinbein, July 16, 1948.
John F. Lowney, July 23, 1948.

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated:

Harry G. Trautman, June 28, 1948.

To be senior sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Hugh R. McCall, October 27, 1948.
Alfred H. Wieters, October 29, 1948.

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

M. Allen Pond, August 25, 1948.
Duncan A. Holaday, September 9, 1948.
Hayse H. Black, December 27, 1948.
Paul D. Haney, December 30, 1948.

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Bernard B. Berger, October 7, 1948.
Frederick S. Kent, October 8, 1948.
Donald J. Schliessmann, October 9, 1948.
Samuel R. Weibel, October 11, 1948.
Ernest P. Dubuque, November 23, 1948.
Ralph J. Johnson, November 24, 1948.
Sheldon L. Lang, November 24, 1948.
Lawrence B. Hall, November 24, 1948.

To be assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Irwin P. Sander, October 1, 1948.
Robert L. Stenberg, October 7, 1948.
Ronald E. Bales, November 15, 1948.
Gerald N. McDermott, November 30, 1948.

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Albert L. Platz, September 29, 1948.
Mary E. Rydberg, September 30, 1948.
Howard E. Ayer, October 1, 1948.
Frederick Nevins, October 1, 1948.
John G. Morris, October 2, 1948.
Leo Weaver, October 2, 1948.
Charles E. Sponagle, October 3, 1948.
Leland J. McCabe, Jr., October 3, 1948.
George W. Burke, Jr., October 7, 1948.
Dade W. Moeller, October 8, 1948.
John V. Miner, Jr., October 8, 1948.
George R. Shultz, October 28, 1948.
Robert A. Gerber, November 12, 1948.
James P. Sheehy, November 12, 1948.

To be pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Guy H. Trimble, November 1, 1948.
J. Solon Mordell, November 10, 1948.

To be scientist directors (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective dates indicated:

Lyndon F. Small, November 12, 1948.
Helmuth H. Schrenk, November 13, 1948.

To be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

Clarence M. Tarzwell, June 29, 1948.
Leon Jacobs, December 30, 1948.

To be veterinarians (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:

William T. S. Thorp, July 1, 1948.
Robert T. Habermann, December 30, 1948.

To be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Mary E. O'Connor, October 29, 1948.
Marie D. Grant, December 27, 1948.

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Mary E. Allen, November 2, 1948.
Albina A. Bozym, November 19, 1948.
Joyce B. Beveridge, December 13, 1948.

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated (continued):

Mildred E. Barnett, December 27, 1948.
Ruth E. Anderson, December 27, 1948.

To be junior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Florence A. Canada, November 2, 1948.
Marion E. O'Neil, November 15, 1948.
Frances R. Donoghue, November 28, 1948.

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:

Fortunat A. Trole, July 1, 1948.
Oswald F. Hedley, July 1, 1948.
Paul A. Neal, July 1, 1948.
Erwin W. Blatter, July 1, 1948.
George G. Van Dyke, July 1, 1948.
Waldemar J. A. Wickman, July 1, 1948.
Donald W. Patrick, July 1, 1948.
Calvin B. Spencer, July 1, 1948.
Victor H. Haas, July 1, 1948.
Bert R. Boone, July 1, 1948.
Carroll E. Palmer, July 1, 1948.
W. Palmer Dearing, July 10, 1948.
Alexander G. Gilliam, July 10, 1948.
Leonard A. Scheele, July 10, 1948.
Frederick J. Brady, August 20, 1948.
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr., August 22, 1948.
John R. Heller, Jr., October 15, 1948.
Henry A. Holle, November 1, 1948.
Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1948.
Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1948.
Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1948.
Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1948.
Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1948.
John W. Hornibrook, December 1, 1948.
Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1948.
John E. Dunn, December 1, 1948.
Eugene A. Gillis, December 15, 1948.
Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1948.
John W. Cronin, December 29, 1948.
Havelock F. Fraser, December 29, 1948.
Jonathan B. Peebles, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Edgar W. Moreland, December 29, 1948.
Harry Heimann, December 29, 1948.
John B. Alsever, December 29, 1948.
Alexander A. Doerner, December 29, 1948.
Russell E. Teague, December 29, 1948.
Abraham Wikler, December 29, 1948.
Mabel Ross, December 29, 1948.
Lydia B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
Ira Lewis, December 29, 1948.
Carl M. Eklund, December 29, 1948.
Ladislaus J. Zbranek, December 29, 1948.
Erwin C. Drescher, December 29, 1948.
Marion B. Noyes, December 29, 1948.
John B. Hozier, December 29, 1948.
Virgil J. Dorset, December 29, 1948.
Curtis R. Chaffin, December 29, 1948.
Paul T. Erickson, December 29, 1948.
Eugene W. Green, December 29, 1948.
Hugh L. C. Wilkerson, December 29, 1948
Robert L. Cherry, December 29, 1948.
Charles F. Blankenship, December 29, 1948.
Frederick J. Krueger, December 29, 1948.
Frank S. French, December 29, 1948.
Harold M. Janney, December 29, 1948.
Russell O. Settle, December 29, 1948.
Robert F. Martin, December 29, 1948.
Herman E. Hilleboe, December 29, 1948.
John R. McGibony, December 29, 1948.
Theodore L. Perrin, December 29, 1948.
Harris Isbell, December 29, 1948.
David J. Zaugg, December 29, 1948.
Howard D. Fishburn, December 29, 1948.
Rolla R. Wolcott, December 29, 1948.
James F. Lane, December 29, 1948.

John N. Bowden, December 29, 1948.
Ralph B. Hogan, December 29, 1948.
Waldo B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
Henry W. Kassel, December 29, 1948.
Vernon B. Link, December 29, 1948.
Norman H. Topping, December 29, 1948.
James A. Grider, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Byron J. Olson, December 29, 1948.
Harold R. Sandstead, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:
Samuel C. Ingraham II, July 7, 1948.
David M. Gould, July 7, 1948.
Robert E. Miller, July 11, 1948.
Donald J. Birmingham, July 14, 1948.
Roland K. Iverson, December 18, 1948.
Bernard D. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Raymond Hofstra, December 29, 1948.
Will H. Aufranc, December 29, 1948.
James A. Hunter, December 29, 1948.
Burnet M. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Paul V. Joliet, December 29, 1948.
Gilcin F. Meadors, December 29, 1948.
William L. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
George A. Shipman, December 29, 1948.
John C. Cutler, December 29, 1948.
David S. Ruhe, December 29, 1948.
Carruth J. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
George W. Comstock, December 29, 1948.
H. Charles Franklin, December 29, 1948.
William C. Jenkins, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Randolph P. Grimm, December 29, 1948.
Elmer L. Hill, December 29, 1948.
Robert M. Foote, December 29, 1948.
James F. Maddux, December 29, 1948.
Eugene J. Gillespie, December 29, 1948.
Bertrand E. Bennison, December 29, 1948.
I. Ray Howard, December 29, 1948.
Robert H. English, December 29, 1948.
Edward T. Blomquist, December 29, 1948.
John B. Spriggs, December 29, 1948.
William H. Errgong, Jr., December 29, 1948.
James L. Elliott, December 29, 1948.
Willys M. Monroe, December 29, 1948.
John J. Davies, December 29, 1948.
Leon A. Heppel, December 29, 1948.
Arthur Kornberg, December 29, 1948.
Andrew P. Sackett, December 29, 1948.
Fred W. Thyng, December 29, 1948.
Leroy R. Allen, December 29, 1948.
Theodore E. Hynson, December 29, 1948.
Glenn H. Algire, December 29, 1948.
Mary Walton, December 29, 1948.
John C. Hume, December 29, 1948.
Elton S. Osborne, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Robert W. Rasor, December 29, 1948.
William W. Richards, December 29, 1948.
Lewis C. Robbins, December 29, 1948.
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., December 29, 1948.
James A. Salmons, December 29, 1948.
Frederic C. Bartter, December 29, 1948.
Herbert Tabor, December 29, 1948.
Milton I. Roemer, December 29, 1948.
Carl R. Kunstling, December 29, 1948.
Griffith E. Quinby, December 29, 1948.
Robert J. Huebner, December 29, 1948.
Jacob C. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
Fred W. Harb, December 29, 1948.
Arthur L. Koven, December 29, 1948.
Leo P. Krall, Jr., December 29, 1948.
William G. Hollister, December 29, 1948.
George J. Cooper, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Joseph Kovacs, Jr., December 29, 1948.
J. Frederick Bell, December 29, 1948.
William Roemmich, December 29, 1948.
Paulo do A. Pamplona, December 29, 1948.
James O. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Richard B. Stephenson, December 29, 1948.
Maurice L. Brodsky, December 29, 1948.
Raymond F. Corpe, December 29, 1948.
George Adams, December 29, 1948.
James T. Hearin, December 29, 1948.
Robert Guthrie, December 29, 1948.
Robert L. Faucett, December 29, 1948.

Assistant surgeon to be senior assistant surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):
Raymond W. Herrmann, December 29, 1948.

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:
Oscar Mikkelsen, July 1, 1948.
Ralph S. Lloyd, July 2, 1948.
John W. Knutson, July 2, 1948.
George E. Jones, July 2, 1948.
William P. Kroschel, July 2, 1948.
Bruce D. Forsyth, July 2, 1948.
Henry F. Canby, November 16, 1948.
Norman F. Gerrie, December 29, 1948.
Robert M. Stephan, December 29, 1948.
Herbert A. Spencer, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Charles H. Wright, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Howard J. Woodbridge, December 29, 1948.
Francis A. Arnold, Jr., December 29, 1948.
William W. Calhoun, Jr., December 29, 1948.
George E. Waterman, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:
Edward J. Driscoll, December 29, 1948.
George A. Nevitt, December 29, 1948.
Eugene H. Hess, December 29, 1948.
Howard K. Wyatt, December 29, 1948.
Dennis E. Singleton, Jr., December 29, 1948.
John C. Heckel, December 29, 1948.
Earl C. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
Maurice S. Rodgers, December 29, 1948.
Carl E. Johnson, December 29, 1948.
John W. Holt, December 29, 1948.
David B. Scott, December 29, 1948.

Assistant dental surgeon to be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effectice date indicated:
Frank W. Nelson, December 29, 1948.

Sanitary engineers to be senior sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:
Elmer J. Herringer, October 1, 1948.
Walter N. Dashiell, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:
Russell W. Hart, August 1, 1948.
Malcolm C. Hope, September 19, 1948.
Fredrick C. Roberts, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Harry G. Hanson, December 29, 1948.
Wesley E. Gilbertson, December 29, 1948.
Callis H. Atkins, December 29, 1948.
Edmund C. Garthe, December 29, 1948.
Chris A. Hansen, December 29, 1948.
Frank Tetzlaff, December 29, 1948.
Albert H. Stevenson, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Palange, December 29, 1948.
Richard S. Green, December 29, 1948.
Richard S. Mark, December 29, 1948.
Arthur H. Neill, December 29, 1948.
George D. Clayton, December 29, 1948.
Richard F. Poston, December 29, 1948.
Charles D. Spangler, December 29, 1948.
Hershel Engler, December 29, 1948.
Leonard M. Board, December 29, 1948.
Kaarlo W. Nasi, December 29, 1948.
Richard L. Woodward, December 29, 1948.
Elroy K. Day, December 29, 1948.
Gerald W. Ferguson, December 29, 1948.
Conrad P. Straub, December 29, 1948.
Henry L. Roahrig, December 29, 1948.
Ernest C. Anderson, December 29, 1948.
George L. Carley, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Donald L. Snow, December 29, 1948.
Roscoe H. Goeke, December 29, 1948.
Graham Walton, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Graber, December 29, 1948.
Herbert W. Haas, December 29, 1948.
William W. Payne, December 29, 1948.
Howard W. Chapman, December 29, 1948.
William E. Holy, December 29, 1948.
Richard Hammerstrom, December 29, 1948.
Henry N. Doyle, December 29, 1948.
Leonard B. Dworsky, December 29, 1948.

Scientists to be senior scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective dates indicated:
Howard L. Andrews, July 1, 1948.
Joseph M. Bobbitt, December 29, 1948.
Samuel W. Simmons, December 29, 1948.
Sidney H. Newman, December 29, 1948.
Harry J. Bennett, December 29, 1948.
John C. Keresztesy, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant scientists to be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective dates indicated:
Lewis J. Cralley, December 6, 1948.
Pope A. Lawrence, December 29, 1948.
Harry D. Pratt, December 29, 1948.
Roy F. Fritz, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Barnes, December 29, 1948.
H. Page Nicholson, December 29, 1948.
John A. Rowe, December 29, 1948.
Francis M. Middleton, December 29, 1948.
Don E. Eyles, December 29, 1948.
Raymond Fagan, December 29, 1948.
George A. Hottle, December 29, 1948.
William J. Bowen, December 29, 1948.
Falconer Smith, December 29, 1948.
Samuel B. Salvin, December 29, 1948.
William C. Frohne, December 29, 1948.
Harold B. Robinson, December 29, 1948.
Dohrman H. Byers, December 29, 1948.
Dale R. Lindsay, December 29, 1948.
Oliver R. Placak, December 29, 1948.
Marion M. Brooke, December 29, 1948.
William W. Smith, December 29, 1948.
David B. Lackman, December 29, 1948.
Howard W. Bond, December 29, 1948.
Elmer G. Berry, December 29, 1948.
John H. Hughes, December 29, 1948.

Senior assistant veterinarian to be veterinarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date indicated:
James H. Steele, December 29, 1948.

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:
Loretta C. Parsons, July 1, 1948.
Viola E. Matheson, July 1, 1948.
Madge M. Neill, July 1, 1948.
Ruth N. Crawford, July 1, 1948.
Florence T. Thieman, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Brimberry, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Rice, July 1, 1948.
Irma C. Thomsen, July 1, 1948.
Magdalene E. Roller, July 1, 1948.
Elizabeth C. Laczko, July 1, 1948.
Hazel E. Owen, July 1, 1948.
Katherine L. Tucker, July 1, 1948.
Mary Matthews, July 1, 1948.
Beatrice Zingle, July 1, 1948.
Adele L. Henderson, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude L. Anderson, July 1, 1948.
M. Lois McMinn, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude I. Miller, July 1, 1948.
Myra I. Johnson, July 1, 1948.
Helen Gertz, July 1, 1948.
M. Estelle Hunt, July 1, 1948.
Jean C. Feely, July 1, 1948.
H. Jean McIver, July 1, 1948.
Irma M. Lamberti, July 1, 1948.
Arne L. Bulkeley, July 1, 1948.
Dorothy G. Erickson, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Smellow, July 1, 1948.
Stella M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
Winifred M. Mendez, July 1, 1948.
Sally Wladis, July 1, 1948.
Flora Jacobs, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Rust, July 1, 1948.
M. Elizabeth McBride, July 1, 1948.
Sylvia Simon, July 1, 1948.
Helen E. Enright, July 1, 1948.
Mary E. Ingle, July 1, 1948.
Marie F. Henzel, July 1, 1948.
Edna L. Easterday, December 29, 1948.
Anne J. Lello, December 29, 1948.
Genevieve T. Piette, December 29, 1948.
Helen A. Gentilman, December 29, 1948.
Latis M. Campbell, December 29, 1948.
Anne K. Buck, December 29, 1948.
Mary F. Callan, December 29, 1948.
Dorothy L. Connors, December 29, 1948.
Vivian L. Gibson, December 29, 1948.
Mary B. Krause, December 29, 1948.
Emilie S. Wilson, December 29, 1948.
Florence J. Ullman, December 29, 1948.
Jennie Rakich, December 29, 1948.

Junior assistant nurse officers to be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective dates indicated:

Joan M. Norkunas, July 13, 1948.
Norma G. Russell, August 1, 1948.
Margaret M. Sweeney, October 20, 1948.

Assistant dietitians to be senior assistant dietitians (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective dates indicated:

Myrtle M. Morris, July 1, 1948.
E. Grace Gibson, July 1, 1948.
Engla J. Anderson, July 1, 1948.

NOTE.—The above-named officers were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, O3807, Chief of Staff (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress, approved June 26, 1948.

Maj. Gen. Willard Stewart Paul, O5616, United States Army, retired, for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list under the provisions of subsection 504 (d) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Lt. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin, O3397, United States Army (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Commanding General, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

NOTE.—Lieutenant General Chamberlin was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

*To be major generals*

*Maj. Gen. Alexander Russell Bolling, O7548, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edmond Harrison Leavey, O8559, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Bryant Edward Moore, O8633, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Doyle Overlton Hickey, O10123, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gen. David Goodwin Barr, O10313, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

*To be brigadier generals*

*Col. Vennard Wilson, O7207, United States Army.

*Col. Paul Wolcott Rutledge, O7289, United States Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of section 515 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

*To be brigadier generals*

*Col. Albert Pierson, O11838, United States Army.

*Col. Joseph Pescia Sullivan, O5328, United States Army.

*Col. Fenton Stratton Jacobs, O6931, United States Army.

*Col. Letcher Ogle Grice, O8273, United States Army.

*Col. Hugh Bryan Hester, O8405, United States Army.

*Col. Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219, United States Army.

NOTE.—Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (*) were appointed during the recess of the Senate.

The following-named officers for appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States without specification of branch, arm, or service:

First Lt. John Marshall Evans, O39493, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

First Lt. James Rock Walpole, O38579, Medical Service Corps, United States Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

*To be first lieutenants*

Donald Wesley Alberti, O56695.
Douglas Albright Armstrong, O38527.
Bud L. Jones, O38522.
×Leo Thomas McMahon, Jr., O41352.
William Jeremiah McNeese, O41354.
Howard Deschler Rhodes, O50525.
Jasper Clyde Vance, Jr., O56715.
John Henry Von Der Bruegge, Jr., O38523.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

*To be first lieutenant, Women's Medical Specialist Corps*

Joyce Bodycomb, J22.
Francine B. Bundt, M10018.
Josephine Mary Burt, M10081.
Ruth Eleanor Clevenger, M10049.
Mae Augusta Engsberg, M10032.
Theresa Maria Ferrazzoli, M10080.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Carl Spaatz, AO3706, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, for appointment as general, United States Air Force, with rank from February 11, 1945, under the provisions of Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress.

NOTE.—General Spaatz was granted a recess appointment as general under the provisions of this law on June 28, 1948, and retired thereunder on June 30, 1948.

The following-named officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, AO16731, Air Force of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), to be special assistant to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, for Reserve Forces, with the rank of lieutenant general, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Lt. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, AO17917, Air Force of the United States (major general, U. S. Air Force), to be commanding general, Strategic Air Command, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Col. Reginald Carl Harmon, AO28796, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), for appointment as Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, for the period of 4 years beginning September 8, 1948, under the provisions of Public Law 775, Eightieth Congress.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 515, Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. Richard Cox Coupland, AO9792, United States Air Force.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Perry McNaughton, AO16491, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Sarsfield Power, AO17854, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Robert Whitney Burns, AO17961, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Carl Amandus Brandt, AO18171, Air Force of the United States (colonel, U. S. Air Force).

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Abraham Robert Ginsburgh, AO9747, United States Air Force.

Col. Wallace Gordon Smith, AO11471, United States Air Force.

Col. James Francis Joseph Early, AO15212, United States Air Force.

Col. James Elbert Briggs, AO17103, United States Air Force.

Col. Howard Graham Bunker, AO17200, United States Air Force.

Col. Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., AO18080, United States Air Force.

Col. Millard Lewis, AO18163, United States Air Force.

Col. Robert Broussard Landry, AO18868, United States Air Force.

Col. Pierpont Morgan Hamilton, AO900788, United States Air Force Reserve.

Col. John Bevier Ackerman, AO18706, United States Air Force.

NOTE.—Prior to being placed on their present assignments, Lieutenant Generals Quesada and LeMay were assigned as Commanding General, Tactical Air Command, and Commanding General, United States Air Forces in Europe, respectively. All of the officers named on this nomination received recess appointments to the positions and/or grades indicated, except Col. John B. Ackerman, AO18706, United States Air Force, whose name is contained in paragraph 3 of this nomination.

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Raymond A. Spruance for permanent appointment in the grade of admiral in the Navy as authorized by Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress.

The following-named officers to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Vice Adm. George D. Murray, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Gerald F. Bogan, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Russell S. Berkey, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Donald B. Beary, United States Navy.

Vice Adm. Felix B. Stump, United States Navy.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Wesley M. Hague | Walter G. Schindler |
| Thomas H. Binford | George L. Russell |
| Walter E. Moore | Milton E. Miles |
| Burton B. Biggs | Harold D. Baker |
| Grover B. H. Hall | Thomas M. Stokes |
| Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr. | Robert E. Blick, Jr. |

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 510 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

*To be colonels, Dental Corps, with rank from August 10, 1948*

Col. James Melvin Epperly, O16288, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Marvin Edward Kennebeck, O16523, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Edwin Chase, O16937, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Mackey Joseph Real, O16350, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Pearce Fulton, O16938, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold George Ott, O16977, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Letcher Irons, O16526, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Dale Bowlby Ridgely, O17797, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Price Canby, O17904, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Roger Giles Miller, O17798, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant Colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Simon Cathroe, O18312, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Tyler James Walker, O19324, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Lt. Col. Merrill Hubert Judd, O51128, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Russel Dreisbach, O18938, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Weaver Nichol, O18939, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Paul Johnson, O18940, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Upton Weaver, O18941, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Frank Wilson, O18943, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Major Samuel White, O18944, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Prazak, O18951, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Roger Hubbard Allbee, O19299, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Urho Robert Merikangas, O19300, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Bernard Herman, O19301, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Pease Russell, O18919, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Aloysius Keeney, O29143, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Bernard Dismukes, O29144, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Gordon Blitch, O19302, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Robert Shaeffer, O29152, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Purcell Rea, O19326, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Llewellyn Cox, O29153, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Houser Matuska, O29155, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Arthur Eugene White, O19328, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Henry Schuldt Murphey, O19338, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Merle Powell, O19340, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Henry Morhouse, O19342, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Lemoin Crawford, O19343, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Cordray Dodson, O20495, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Herbert Stevenson, O41705, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Roy Sewell, O39496, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Darrell Willis, O20496, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Marren, O41706, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Emmett Montgomery Smith, O29161, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Vernon James Erkenbeck, O19304, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Herbert Thompson, O19305, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joe Alexander Bain, O19308, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Cecil Spencer Mollohan, O19309, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis Whitney Hall, O19310, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Richard Howard Eckhardt, O19312, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Mars Caldwell, Jr., O19313, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Parmalee Ward, O19314, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Arthur Lodmell, O19315, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Lester Paul Veigel, O19317, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Lewis Beatty, O19318, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Harold Irvin Amory, O19319, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Edgar Louis Olson, O19322, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Edwards Spellman, O19655, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joe Harrell, O18929, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle Everett Smith, O56785, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Errett Hamilton, O29170, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Gordon G. Bulla, O19597, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Albert Todd, Jr., O19598, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Bowdoin Stapleton, O19656, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, O19599, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Stultz Brua, O19600, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Willis Howard, O19601, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Sherwood Taylor, O19602, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Jenner Garnett Jones, O19603, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Eaton Wesley Bennett, O19604, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Tom French Whayne, O19657, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erling Severre Fugelso, O20980, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Garber Cocke, O19658, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Alfonso Michael Libasci, O19606, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Owings Alexander, O19607, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Daniel John Waligora, O20055, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dell Fred Dullum, O21011, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Byron Ludwig Steger, O19661, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Louie Render Braswell, O19662, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bateman Draper, O29176, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Estes Blount, O19612, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Franklin Culp, O41713, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinz Kuraner, O19665, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emmett Leroy Kehoe, O19613, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Knox Dunlap, O19667, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Dominic Berardinelli, O19668, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Jacob Rell Till, Jr., O23657, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Lawrence Carter Ball, O19616, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Leland Bohannon, O21012, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Knox Cullen, O19617, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Howard William Doan, O20057, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Weston Boal, O20058, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Max Plagens, O41714, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Dean Schamber, O20497, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frank Dominick, O29190, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred William Seymour, O19671, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Joseph Arthur Baird, O19672, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Allan Arthur Craig, O19621, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Emile Graham, O19622, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Jay Franchel Gamel, O19623, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Aubrey L. Jennings, O19673, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Titus Sichi, O19674, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Goree Moore, O20531, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert LaShore Callison, O19648, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Donald Graham, O20067, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Coryell Jacobs, O20499, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Warren Roe, Jr., O19675, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earle Henry Christenson, O56792, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Quimby Simmons, Jr., O41720, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Albert Alfred Biederman, O20501, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Mattingly, O20068, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Fred Patient, O19626, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hugh Latimer Westbrook, Jr., O19625, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred August Grebe, O20502, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Joseph Frank Peters, O20075, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Benjamin Green, O29196, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Donald Davis Flickinger, O19677, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Marion Richmond, O19678, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Morris DeYoung, O20076, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Angvald Vickoren, O19680, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Emmert Carl Lentz, O20503, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Leslie Snyder, O19627, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Thair Cozzens Rich, O19631, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Hugh Lane, O19632, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron Glen McKibben, O19633, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Robert Tuthill Gants, O19636, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. George Foster Peer, O19638, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Everus Harrison, O20078, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warner Fremont Bowers, O29197, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Marshall Nelson Jensen, O20504, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Christopher Sitter, O20079, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Angel Antonio Cardona, O24299, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Rudolf Wernitznig, O20505, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Calvin Shellenberger, O20506, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Andrew Schindler, O38642, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Sheldon Seymour Brownton, O38643, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Woods Shiflet, O20507, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Paul Alexander Paden, O20981, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delmar Eichler Domke, O22788, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gottlieb Leonard Orth, O20509, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Colvin Wood Salley, O29205, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Sigurd Aronson, O29206, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Alexander Cleve, O20510, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Blair Kendrick, Jr., O20511, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Walter McCoy, Jr., O19685, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. James Clark Van Valin, O20080, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lucius George Thomas, O19688, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Robert Hirschmann, O20081, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Fred Howenstine Mowrey, O19687, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Hubert Thaddeus Marshall, O19689, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Byrd Stryker, O19691, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Langford Spaulding, O19704, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. John Thompson Brown Strode, O19709, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army.)

Lt. Col. Paul Hartsock Leach, O20082, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix Shelley Bambace, O56797, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Ralph Moody Patterson, O21013, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Harmon Jobe, Jr., O22777, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Rex Clayton House, O20515, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clifford Paul Michael, O20083, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Oscar Samuel Reeder, O20086, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Hoagland, O20516, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Kenneth Fair, O29222, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Leo Tobin, O19705, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Allen Nelson Bracher, O19706, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ronald Fisher Kirk, O20517, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Alvin Conrad, O39654, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Fisher, O20982, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Bryan Coleman Thomas Fenton, O20088, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Leon Marx, O22262, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aloysius Thomas Waskowicz, O19708, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Anthony Czerwinski, O38646, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Charles Joseph Farinacci, O20518, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gladen Robert Hamilton, O20089, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward August Zimmermann, O29230, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Joseph Ackermann, O51155, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Francis Harris, O41730, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gus Warlick Neece, O20521, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ryle August Radke, O20522, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Scott Murray Smith, O20524, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Louis Keller Pohl, O21473, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Reed Kelley, O20984, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Henry Diessner, O20519, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert LaTourrette Cavenaugh, O20090, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Crawford Davidson, O20108, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Bramlitt, O20030, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Stuart Nelson, O20111, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruno Jastremski, O20526, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Moffett Carow, O20527, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Polk Sullivan, O20528, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wanless Clotfelter, O20029, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. George Frederick Baier 3d, O20034, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Kenneth Mantell, O20035, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harry King, Jr., O20036, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert White DuPriest, O20039, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marco Romolo Bonsignore, O20237, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Hyman Richard Osheroff, O21015, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. William Edgar Wilkinson, O20529, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Mitchell, O41731, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harden Schutt, O20107, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Anderson Strickland, Jr., O20400, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Edwin Matthew Goyette, O20530, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Allen Myers, O20532, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hartwin Adolph Schulze, O21474, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Frank Hiram Van Wagoner, O20095, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Clarence Asa Tinsman, O20390, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Bullen Peterson, O20535, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond McKinley Williams, O20399, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Lloyd Ethan Gould, O20538, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Horace Byrne, O29244, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Armand Kind, O20936, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Theodore Cleveland Bedwell, Jr., O22701, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be majors, Medical Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Lt. Col. Wilbur Warren Hiehle, O22275, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Everett Marquis Chalker, O30901, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Everett Charles Freer, O22276, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Eugene Hudson, O22278, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Hamilton Bryarlie Dear, O22279, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Gladding Moseley, O22765, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Harold Hammond, 051958, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wellington Brown, 022296, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Wesley Hayes, O30903, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alva Edward Miller, O22283, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Gilmore McShatko, O22285, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron Atlee Nichol, O22286, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Norman Elwood King, O22287, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mayo Talbot, O22289, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rolland Bernard Sigafoos, O22291, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Leonce Hullinghorst, O22292, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Neil Ekman, O22293, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Laurence Addison Potter, O22294, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Patrick Lauer, O30904, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Salyer, O23570, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Carl Winn Hall, O22302, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Slowko Zelenik, O43124, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tillman Davis Johnson, O22301, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Deane Buscemi, O22303, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. James Samuel Fisackerly, O22306, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Curtis Harrell, O22307, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hensley Starling Johnson, O22309, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredrick Clinton Hopp, O22311, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Clark Boyd, O22312, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Steiner Svare, O22313, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward John Doyle, O22314, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Burton Watson, O23582, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stanley Bagnall, O24382, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Herbott Kerr, O22693, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Andrew Kostecki, O30910, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Louis Kaminsky, O23593, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Knight Bayne, O30913, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Taylor Dubuy, O23650, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Larry Allen Smith, O22767, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. Frederick Joseph Frese, Jr., O23637, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carlos Coolidge Alden, Jr., O30915, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Dominick Minerva, O51962, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Livingston Hartridge, O22763, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Riordan Connolly, O22791, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Nagle, O23601, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Louis Berman, O22697, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Isaiah Alonzo Wiles, O22709, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Blackford Look, O23668, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ellison Melcher, O22708, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Leo Spann, O23641, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit Hudson Anderson, O23572, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Robbins deForest, O23584, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Woody Harwood, O30920, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Jesse Collins, O22687, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cannon Armstrong Owen, O22688, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Nelson Piper, O22690, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Ross Marshall, O22692, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Martin, O22694, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank James Shaffer, O22695, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Thomas, O22700, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otis Whittier Snyder, O22702, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverley Eugene Smith, O22706, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward James Dehne, O51965, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Lynn Binkley, O23594, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nelson Sumner Irey, O30928, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Murble Henry Pearson, O23661, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Eugene Shuey, O23640, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Irvin Draper, O23599, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gardiner, O23600, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jake William Hearn, O22780, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Gold, O24314, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Frederick Funsch, O22785, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Abram Salmon Benenson, O24295, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Milton Eberhart, O51967, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Glenn Thompson, O23568, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hayden Waldo Withers, O23571, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Manah Robert Halbouty, O23580, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Augustus Marion Davison, O43130, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Henry Spillane, O30932, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Lyons, O23639, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Peyton Moffitt, Jr., O22764, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Hardy Sullivan, Jr., O22770, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling James Ritchey, O22771, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Alexander Bergman, O22772, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brown Gordon, O22774, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Sams, O22776, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ward Regan, O22783, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry James Grossman, O22786, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Don S. Wenger, O22787, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Buffington Graves, O22790, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Haney Brooks, O25152, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Brooks Dickerson, O40103, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Arista Wier, O26416, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Allen Groves, O43133, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Charles Burry, O23569, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Christian Rauscher, O23573, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fratis L. Duff, O23566, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert William Coone, O43135, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Jackson Barker, O23638, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Robert Lawrence, O30944, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Goodwin Rate, O24372, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ivan Charles Dimmick, Jr., O24308, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bronko Peter Lelich, O23574, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Henry Crouch, O23587, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Thomas Rush, O23591, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Stanton Fraser, O23595, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Ferguson Angen, O23596, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Roscoe Grunwell, Jr., O23597, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Jack Bollerud, O23602, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Williams French 3d, O23603, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Morris Hardaway 3d, O24301, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. N. Robert Drummond, O24367, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Norton Schwartz, O24324, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Spencer Amos O'Brian, O23658, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralegh Howard Lackay, O24366, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Walter Henrik Moursund, Jr., O24305, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Weldon Joseph Walker, O24307, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Phillip Benjamin Smith, O30952, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Hardy Bennett, O26968, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Taylor Beeler, Jr., O23635, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Vincent Michael Downey, O30956, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Hudson Talbott, O23655, Medical Corps, Army of the United States, (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Tygertt, O26412, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Bernhard Arnoldi, O56822, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Frederick Tessmer, O24300, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Humbert Lewis Riva, O26947, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Humphreys, Jr., O23644, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elwyn Nickell Akers, O24379, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harold Bornstein, O23648, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving Richard Lyman, O24319, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Henry Cleveland, O23647, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ficicchy, Jr., O24327, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, United States Army).

Maj. Edwin Stow Chapman, O24318, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Ziegler Berry, O23665, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Raymond Henry, O24310, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Vernon Potter, O26434, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Selby Andreson, Jr., O30962, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Todd DeVan, O26440, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Nicholas Furst, O23653, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Anthony Butkus, O23659, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey George Tousignant, O23662, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Philip Harney, O23663, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon David Pettit, O23664, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Frank Ferrell, O23669, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Hunter, Jr., O23680, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Shepherd Smith, O30968, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Thayer Smith, O24341, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Withers Lyddon, O26413, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlton Willard Sargent, O26991, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orland Stenberg Olsen, O26399, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Albert Wurl, O24309, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David George Eisner, O30984, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Edward Boysen, O30985, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Justice Brightwell, O51982, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burt Nelson Coers, O30989, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Sivley Moore, O30992, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Millar Sabin, Jr., O30993, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Allen Hellams, O56825, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Alexander Kiersch, O24386, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Brown, O24640, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Hiller Bungardt, O26403, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U .S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Stoddert Parker, O24317, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Mitchell Willis, Jr., O24389, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Alphonzo Mantz, Jr., O26414, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Colin Francis Vorder Bruegge, O26958, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thurman Knight Hill, O26404, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Sugden Paul, O24311, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Sidney Rice, O24326, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Joseph Carbonell, O24626, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Celestin Le Golvan, O24634, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Edward Block, O24636, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix Claudius Feamster, O25145, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Mercer Hursh, O25146, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Joseph Geppert, O26406, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Caspar Kossuth, O26437, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Lennox Brown, O26436, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hicks Holmes, O24625, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Patrick Campbell, O24633, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Holmes Crosby, Jr., O24639, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Kernaghan Mills, O25142, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Maloney, O25147, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic John Hughes, Jr., O26370, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Abraham Chartock, O24638, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Andrew Carroll Offutt, O25143, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Morrow Webb, O25148, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Archer Orbison, O26405, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Dan Crozier, O26408, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Joseph Genetti, O26965, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gregory Thalmann, Jr., O24303, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Brown, O24315, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Henry Vogel, Jr., O24321, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be captains, Medical Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Capt. Samuel Oscar Smelsey, O37633, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Joseph Brennan, Jr., O56933, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neal Rupert Fisher, O49943, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hoyt Jenkins, Jr., O49944, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elmore Mitchell Aronstam, O56211, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Osborn Rixey, O39341, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Thomas Long, O56936, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Sanders Crawford, O56937, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ben Allen Rutledge, O49950, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Byron Henry Johnson, O56941, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Stewart Penner, O56223, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guy Walker Dean, Jr., O56225, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Moncrief, Jr., O37637, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Philip Makel, O56227, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Ehrenfeld Edwards, O56945, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richmond Shepard Paine, O56938, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aubrey Kenna Brown, Jr., O49959, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl William Brannon, Jr., O56231, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Carter Hernquist, O56949, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Edward Horton, O49960, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Currie Campbell, Jr., O49964, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lorenz Eugene Zimmerman, O56221, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Leo Lester, O56961, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Burt Rowen, O56245, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Valerius Hastings, O49968, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Edmond Purvis, O56963, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Randall William Briggs, O56962, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Hamilton Cannon, O56964, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Garber Musser, O56894, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stuart Hodge Walker, O56247, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Garland Wood, Jr., O56967, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hubble Wilkins, O56222, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Nicholas Kraus, O56969, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Bradley Hartney, O56244, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Witherspoon Inmon, O56254, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Prentiss Perrine, O56971, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Bradley, O56255, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lane Butler Cooke, Jr., O56257, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Arthur Henderson, O56972, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Milholland Patterson, O49571, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Emil Joseph Klinger, O56979, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin LeRoy Scott, O49975, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William James Rees, O56271, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Chisholm Winter, Jr., O56274, Medical Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Lt. Col. Edmund Fillmore Wipf, O56779, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer LeRoy Puderbaugh, O56780, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Thomas Williams, O19345, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Pinkard Campbell, O51129, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Clifford Dirksen, O29146, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Buttermore, O29147, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Donald Strathern, O51130, Dental Corps, Army of the United States major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Wayne Gillinger, O56782, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Standish O'Grady, O29160, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. H. Beecher Dierdorff, O19347, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Fryer Houck, O29162, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Col. John Kenneth Sitzman, O18931, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis Bowden, O51133, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Newton Burgin, O18932, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Earl Hammersberg, O18933, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Wilburt August Schroeder, O29166, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hamilton Robert Young, O56786, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Marvin Cayton, O29169, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Jasper Post, O56787, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving Matthew Hauser, O51136, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Elmer Fisher, O29175, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Stirling Beiter, O19692, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Dwyer Collins, O51140, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Louis Schwinghamer, O29184, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Henry Becker, O51141, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Frederick Waldorf, O51142, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar John Ogren, O20037, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Aloysius Disch, O29186, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyndon Sheldon Wilder, O56789, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Ramsey, O29191, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ottis Elbert James, O29192, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Stuart Daugherty, O41716, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Henry Kothe, O29194, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Emerson Toye, O41723, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Castle Hampson, O19652, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Kenneth Welker, O51148, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Allen Cornish, O29198, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Cashman, O19653, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Wardwell Warren, Jr., O29207, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Joseph Tvrdy, O51151, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Nicholas Kracht, O20923, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Everett Schonen, O51152, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Albert McFall, O29215, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Conrad Toral Kvam, O20467, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernice Julius Cehrs, O29220, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald J. Collins, O29221, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Bowman Denny, O51153, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles William George Craig, O29224, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Perkins, O20468, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy L. Bodine, Jr., O20484, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. L. D. Alexander, O41728, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Farrer Jeffcott, O20077, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Harry McCue, O41729, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael A. Uram, O38648, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Leroy Bernier, O20093, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Barrington Bell, O29233, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Julian Hemberger, O20485, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Elmer Hoblit, O29234, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Taylor Richardson, O29236, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Morgan Hollenbach, O29240, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Walthers, O38649, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Rashleigh Peel, O29245, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (major, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be majors, Dental Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Maj. George Henry Parrot, Jr., O23675, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Andrew Egan, O40098, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Max Ream, O30905, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Stoltenberg Early, O30907, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Patrick Henahan, O30909, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Spencer McClench, O30911, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elbert LaFayette Fenske, O22254, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Ray Allen, O51961, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Jackmond Burch, O22255, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Perry Williams, O22744, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Eastman, O30916, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reginald James Fallis, O22256, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Peter Christensen, O22257, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Hightower Traynham, O22258, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Louis Cook, O22259, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Scott Darrow Linn, O22260, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wallace Swanson, O30925, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Moyer Swink, O22315, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Benjamin Caldwell, O22316, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond George Waldmann, O22317, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Godfrey Hawkinson, O22318, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert Moulton, O22319, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Broughton Foote, O22320, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grayson Gwynne Garrison, O23339, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. August Rudolph Huberwald, O40101, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Garner, O30933, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dayton Chase, O30936, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Glenn Snyder, O38854, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Chase Hazard, O24335, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Judson Newton, O22746, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Chipps, O22743, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold John Malan, O22745, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Smith Lister, O22747, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Jacob Powers, O24369, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Bernard Palmer, O23679, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Reese Clawson, O43134, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Leonard Walsh, O23677, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Hugh Madden, O30950, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rex Hutchinson, Jr., O30957, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Emerson Montgomery, O30958, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Herman Tornstrom, O43138, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Herman Moser, O30960, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Eugene Boudreaux, O23344, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Kenneth Ramage, O23348, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pearson White Brown, O23610, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be captains, Dental Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Capt. Harold Goble Sandlin, O56932, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Francis Baranowski, O56210, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Arnold Moll, O49945, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marlin Kleinfelter Gingrich, O56214, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Elwood Ward, O56980, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Eugene Bates, O56939, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Blair White, O49952, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilfred Harold Gladue, O56951, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Clay Thompson 3d, O56973, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Roper, O56237, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maness Eugene Lauraine, O49965, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Elwood Huchel, O56955, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Charles Schulte, O56959, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Eifort Long, O49970, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Calvin Alling, O56253, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Charles Wendt, O49973, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Albert Watkins, Jr., O56259, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Hombs, O56976, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Elisha McCoy, O56258, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vernon Stanley Fricke, O49974, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marvin Wilbur Carius, O56261, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hosea Frank Sawyer, O56262, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hector Bethart, O56266, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Irvin Wian, Jr., O56267, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Theodore Thompson, O49976, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willis Charles Gross, Jr., O49977, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Roscoe Chandler, Jr., O56983, Dental Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Dental Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Lt. Col. Bernard Norton Riordan, O56795, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frank Cruse, O56802, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Stuart Morgan, O41696, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edgar Haughey, O29142, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Ludwick Gilbert, O29148, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Black, O17375, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Selwyn, O41704, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Warren Chester Eveland, O29167, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Joseph Kotte, O29172, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley J. Carpenter, O41712, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Rankin Cleland, O29178, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Whiting Bullis, O29182, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Carrol Britell, O29183, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Buel, O56810, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Othmar Frank Goriup, O29187, Chief of the Medical Service Corps (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Clarence McCullough, O18314, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Felix Williams, O18324, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Gibson Fleetwood, O29202, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Christian Borup, O18649, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bernard Aabel, 029239, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen John Blake, O29229, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Donald Maxwell, O29265, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adolf Pharo Gagge, O41742, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Thomas Sheen, O29268, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Claymour Hill, O29272, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carrol Conrad Barrick, O19330, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerard Adrien Belanger, O19333, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Max Prince, O29288, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gaines Mosley, O38656, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlyle Steven Marchek, O29290, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Mackin, O29300, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rufus Dolton Huff, O29311, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Perry McGill, Jr., O29330, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilfred Arthur Emond, O19642, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harland William Layer, O19643, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Gordon Cooper, O19644, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dwight Stephen Hollis, O30975, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elton Rice, O30983, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps. U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley John Weidenkopf, O41771, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eli Egbert Daman, O19703, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Col. Dale LeBaron Thompson, O39668, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Lorraine Deemer, Jr., O30995, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Walter Partin, O19699, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Paige, O31023, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (major, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Bradley Smith, O51997, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Deil, O56841, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be majors, Medical Service Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Maj. Arthur James Orange, O51986, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Monroe Edward Freeman, O56826, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Alexander Walkowski, O51994, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Obed Pennepacker, O52005, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmo Dorman Nolan, O52016, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leland Lloyd Fetterman, O56856, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Madison Vandel, O52026, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Earl Starks, O52029, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Joseph La Casse, O52034, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Guthrie Long, O52035, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Milton Butler, O31029, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Stepczyk, O20051, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Bruce Martin, O20052, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry John Nelson, O20053, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Johnson, O20054, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Francis Quinn, Jr., O31031, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Renaldo Gerard Belanger, O40109, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James J. Adams, O31044, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Murphy, O31047, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Pappas, O31056, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. R. L. Parker, O31057, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Di Giacomo, O40111, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Gibbons Alexander, Jr., O31058, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Clarence Plowman, O31059, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Nelson Read, O38864, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Augustus John Daniel Guenther, O31067, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Fenn Chaffee, O52057, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Paul Daykin, O40114, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Auburn Harris Smith, O31073, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Arthur Bohn, O31075, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse James Jarboe, O30921, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thaddeus John Domanski, O31082, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Samuel Comella, O31084, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Howell Louis Curd, O31086, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Anthony Carilia, O40115, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Keith Smith, O20563, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Martin Hunt, Jr., O31089, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Miller Goss, O52059, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frank Clark, O43161, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Gilbert Bell, O31094, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Herman Splittgerber, O52062, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Howard Wingo, O31098, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Almond Partlow, O31099, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Floyd Tolbert, O31104, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Walsh Fitch, Jr., O52064, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Lacewell Berry, O38866, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Randolph Crow, O31105, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fenner Harvey Whitley, Jr., O31106, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edwin Donovan McMeen, O31109, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Greenwood Lord, O38868, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tolbert Henry Belcher, O40118, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony John Zolenas, Jr., O31127, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Edward Geise, O43167, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tomas Carter Jefferis, O31137, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Brim Nelson, O20564, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Leslie Beeson, O31143, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward Gabriel Streidl, O31145, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gordon Spencer Kjolsrud, O31147, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertrand Nelson Beaudet, O40119, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Terence O'Reilly, O40120, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harvey Lyons, O52079, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elwood Wilbur Camp, O43173, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Paul Zagelow, O21006, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy I. Weir, Jr., O38874, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Henry Nelson Parrish, O31158, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Huber Frick, O31160, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Earl Cochran, Jr., O31162, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Blackwell Frazee, O31165, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey Earl Archer, O31170, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Richard Kinney, O38877, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ordway Reid, O31175, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Ambrose Hamrick, O38878, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Lonero, O43185, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Henry Wilson, O21007, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Valdo Painter, O21010, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Eugene McKeown, O31200, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harris Douthitt Gamble, O31203, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Doyle, O40127, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Winslow Chorpenning, O38382, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maxwell Dauer, O31217, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Kramer, O31221, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Hunter Adams, O40131, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Wilbur Polkinghorn, O31227, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Zubkoff, O31228, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Elmore Brooks, O31238, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Goetz, O31239, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Benjamin Lindberg, O43205, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Blair Kegerreis, O31242, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Patrick Boeckman, O31247, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Otis Hastings, O31248, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Clark Thompson, O31250, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claud Dale La Fors, O21704, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Andrew Ferguson, O31251, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edgar Merriken, O31253, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Korn, O21705, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ennis Dallas Sandberg, O21706, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Richards, O21707, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Ogden Stout, O31255, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Van Pamale Frey, O40134, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gideon Coats, O31260, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Vail Cairns, O31261, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Joseph Sheehan, O43221, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Jacob Zurcher 3d, O38888, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Lewis LaCombe, O31284, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen De Fields Cousins, O43222, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Burns Hunt, O31285, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Wray Phelps, O31288, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Augustus Pendlyshok, O31304, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Cable Larnce, O22793, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emerson Beery Taylor, O22794, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arvey Charles Sanders, O43236, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Azelle Carter, O31315, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fredrick Junior Haase, O31320, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elliott Powell Rigsby, O22885, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde William Henderson, O31324, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Crawley Stith, O37385, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Millard Christian Monnen, O37387, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Armand Walter LeMire, O37386, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manley Glenn Morrison, O73389, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Kenneth Lawford, O37395, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Casimir Rogowski, O23622, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Abington Walker, O37402, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Cecil Bullard, O37404, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chris Dallas Hoover, O37408, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Craig Miller, O37409, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Winsor Whittemore, Jr., O43255, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Tillmon Walden, O37422, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russel Lee Bryant, O37423, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Francis McCleary, O37425, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Trenholm, O37427, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Jack Coker, O39330, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alton Hill, O37431, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Edward Benade, O37433, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles S. Gersoni, O56185, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Basil Mayo Winstead, O56194, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Ford Barlow, O56925, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Gerald Sacks, O56199, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carmen Anthony Peterson, O49921, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be captains, Medical Service Corps, with rank from July 1, 1948*

Capt. John Dietrich Flintjer, O56920, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Keith Hurd, O56186, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Allen Grove, O56187, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Richard McAlpine, O56188, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Robert Freeman, O56189, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifton Willard Bovee, O56190, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold George Molyneaux, O56193, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lee Moore, O56921, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Francis Vire, O56923, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Lee, O56196, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marlo Ernest Smith, O56924, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Theodore Kretschmer, O56198, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Leonard Wilkins, O37439, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United

States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glen Branch Wagnon, O56201, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allan Duff Sutton, O56926, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Austin Ware, O56203, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Conan Himber Millstein, O49920, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Henry Muschel, O49922, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Everett Wayne Malone, O49925, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Preston Love, O37436, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul William Murphy, O37437, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Robert Francis, O37440, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Eugene Thompson, O56205, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walter Eledge, Jr., O37441, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Otto Stoler Good, O37442, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bertram Samuel Wright, O41137, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Vernon Hubert Loisel, O37443, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Lawrence Shanahan, O37444, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Otto Krause, O37448, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Melville Clarendon Hutchinson, O37449, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Traub, O37450, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Rulon Schlicher, O37452, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Raymond Scroggs, O37453, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Freeman Westra, O49938, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Joline Colyer, O41138, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Sylvester Albrecht, O49937, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Paul Larson, O49936, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Ambrose Bryan, O37455, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles John Cowgill, O37457, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Joseph Pytlewicz, O37458, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Allen Ahr, O37439, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Lee Turnipseed, Jr., O37459, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Bridson Stewart, O39335, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hasty Wilson Riddle, O37456, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Marks, O41139, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Felix Meyer, Jr., O37461, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph David Dowless, Jr., O37460, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Justus Gorrell, O49942, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Allen Edwards, O37466, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Redmond Wolf, Jr., O37467, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Milton Johnson, O37468, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Wallace Evans Jarboe, O37463, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Ovila Desautels, O39337, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maynard Allen Sangster, O56208, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William White Southard, Jr., O37465, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Robert Lenn, O37469, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Andrew Cubbler, O37470, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Kenneth Bradley Johnson, O26984, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Woodrow Wilson, O41141, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Francis Conrad, O37473, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hayes Moore Sadler, O37474, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Joseph Coleman, O39339, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley William Egense, Jr., O37475, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Schofield Wiegele, O56212, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Otto Henry Sandman, Jr., O37476, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Cease Tutor, O37477, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Templeton Gray, O37480, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Edgar Hill, O41142, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Martin, O41143, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Philip Caito, O37478, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Doyle Arnold, O49947, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Michael Hallahan, O37479, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Julian Richards, Jr., O37485, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leonard Calvin Barney, O37487, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Sprott Alexander, O37488, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Charles Carmichael, O37489, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Hugh Snider, O37493, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Thomas Haden, O26972, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Steuart Greer, O39343, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Edward Thompson, O37495, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew James Kowalsky, O37496, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Strnad, O37497, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Louis Hahn, O41144, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Reubin Edwards, O37499, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Keith Nashold, O37500, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Leonard La Manche, O37501, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Frederick Otter, O37502, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Melvin Wehrman, O37504, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Thomas Brown, O37506, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis John Kelly, O37505, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Floyd Eugene Van Sickle, Jr., O41145, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dee Curtiss Buchanan, O37509, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Sidney Gaines, O39344, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ross Forrest Swall, O37511, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. R. V. Rivenbark, O49956, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Donald Grindell, O37515, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Andrew Plemmons, O37517, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lonnie Knox Blue, O37518, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank David Godwin, O37525, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orville Jefferson Eslick, O37526, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Richard Kifner, O37530, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Walsh Dempsey, O37529, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Wilburn Nichols, O37532, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Vance Breyfogle, O37534, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Leo Gans, O37536, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Andrew Brown, O49963, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Warren Martindale, O37537, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elliott Gardner Parker, O37540, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Willie Cleveland Magness, O37541, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Clegg, Jr., O37542, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Chester Barnett, O56236, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Kidd Fugitt, O39346, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Gayle Howard, O37550, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Harry Wallace, O37552, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thomas Saling, O37553, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Edward Britt, O37551, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Patrick James Pomphrey, O37557, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Sylvester Hall, O41155, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Freeman Merritt, O56238, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice William Hylden, O26980, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Henry Gelby, O37560, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilmot Livingston Gibson, O37562, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Warren Harding Holmes, O37563, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Phillip James Buckler, O37564, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Woodrow Holt, O41154, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dale Russell Maher, O37559, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Lamar Grow, O37573, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Felix George Rajecki, O37574, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster LaMarr Watts, O37569, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army).

(NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.)

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

*To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 1, 1948*

Lt. Col. Walter Francis Dix, AO50892, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lothar Charles Maurer, AO41382, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Maj. Gen. Reginald Carl Harmon, AO28796, Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kirk Hamilton Scott, AO50896, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Llewellyn Goode Duggar, AO28799, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ralph Wright Totman, AO50899, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wayne Milton Roberts, AO50900, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Willard Gardner Barker, AO41387, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Merritt Smith, AO28807, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Reineman Forbes, AO28808, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Rogers Alan Gardner, AO16066, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Grant Bryte, Jr., AO16076, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Turner Noyes, AO16271, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Llewellyn Wheeler, AO16304, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norme D. Frost, AO16305, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Linus Dodge Frederick, AO16306, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Miles Murphy, AO16309, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emory Lee Bruns, AO41391, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Wilson van der Veer, AO50906, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Ernest Osborne, AO50907, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Lloyd Stratten, AO50909, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carroll Shaw Miller, AO41395, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fletcher Pollard Jaquess, AO28817, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ellis Harold Wilson, AO28821, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel Norman Van Meter, AO41402, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William McKinley Miles, AO28828, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry William Generous, AO28829, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Alstein Rollison, AO50914, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ronald Francis Wilson, AO39530, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edward Lee Hurlburt, AO28832, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Parker Archibald, AO28833, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edgar Winfrey Gardner, AO38603, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis David Glasheen, AO50915, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Jackson Knight, Jr., AO39531, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Raymond Fisher, AO50916, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Edwin Turner, AO41407, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Denard Cooper, AO28841, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel Gershon, AO28843, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Colville Myers, AO28846, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Harley Holmes, AO28849, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Frederick Wiseheart, AO41410, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Burnett Rhodes, AO41412, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Plympton Mayhew, AO41413, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lebbeus Bigelow Woods, AO28853, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Fitzpatrick Payne, AO41415, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Siebenaler, AO41417, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Russell Weaver, AO41419, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Wagner Marshall, AO28863, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert George Foote, AO39535, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Anthony Westphal, AO50920, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Gordon Spillinger, AO28869, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Wallace Van Meter, AO16383, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force.).

Col. Charles Winslow O'Connor, AO16560, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Narcisse Lionel Cote, AO16569, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Hall Sparhawk, AO16686, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Felix Guillett, AO16570, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick August Bacher, Jr., AO16646, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Edgar Cheatle, AO16663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton William Davies, AO16690, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Dozier, AO50924, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank James Shannon, Sr., AO41434, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Merle Eugene Parks, AO50925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lewis Welling Jones, AO50926, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jean Paul Harrison, AO28878, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Hoffman, AO28881, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Franklin Carter, AO39543, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Franklin Hornor Colby, AO41445, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Erwin Franklin Gardner, AO41373, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John James Wilson, AO41446, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bernard Brice Smith, AO50931, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Reed, AO39546, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Adkins, AO28891, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Louis Weinaug, AO41450, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Oscar Moody, AO28893, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gerald Charles Ward, AO50937, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Burton Gordon, AO28896, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Milton Blair Samuel, AO50939, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Clinton Robbins, AO16714, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Keillor, AO16716, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Andrew Morehouse, AO28898, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edward Percefull, AO50943, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe Luther Dukes, AO50945, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Wells Jones, AO50946, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leroy Gordon Cooper, AO41460, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lowell Emmett Peaster, AO28914, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Henry Voeller, AO50951, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bennett Moseley Venable, AO41464, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gus Benning Hoffman, AO28917, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Baily, AO41466, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bertrand Ellwood Johnson, AO28920, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee Bird Washbourne, AO16746, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Earl Thiebaud, AO16785, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lewis Easton, AO16933, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter William Gross, AO16983, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John N. Jones, AO16987, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Philip Marstin, AO41468, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lucas Mason, AO41470, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Kane, AO28925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Oren Hanford, AO41471, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Richard Geer, AO17014, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Melvin Newstrom, AO17026, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ivan Maurice Palmer, AO17030, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Atticus Morris, AO38611, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Wendell Crane, AO28931, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Neal James O'Brien, AO41476, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Orron Moore, AO29561, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hampton Ray Kenaston, AO39562, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Ivon Doty, AO28948, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harley Sanford Jones, AO28952, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Beverley Habersham Rockwell, AO50980, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clare Wesley Bunch, AO41513, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Nicholas Dick, AO39583, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leroy Gray Heston, AO29002, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bradford Allen Shaw, AO29007, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Jensen Dau, AO17077, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Raymond Bienfang, AO17162, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elmer Wentworth Gude, AO17272, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Wadman, AO17277, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Marshall Ambler Glazebrook, AO41542, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Solomon Jack Zoller, AO29025, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Anderson Zartman, AO38620, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederick Funston, Jr., AO51007, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melvin Spedden Hollidge, AO38624, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Edward Baumeister, AO29058, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Monroe Thompson Smartt, AO41572, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Oscar Bond, AO29066, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Oscar Allison, AO28897, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard Cecil Rose, AO29075, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Donald Menzies Hamilton, AO41580, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Warren Herbert Higgins, AO17387, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roland Ogden Strand Akre, AO17403, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Frost Hix, AO17418, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Terrell Edward Phillips, AO29083, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ira David Snyder, AO29087, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Edward Jost, AO29090, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Williamson Cheyney, AO17438, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Rhudy, AO17444, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Mueller Jacobs, AO17470, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Wilson Stewart, AO17482, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Irvine Dugan, AO17486, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Morris Scattergood, Jr., AO29115, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ward Terry Abbott, AO17515, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clayton Earl Hughes, AO17536, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Lee Scott, AO17545, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis McCulla, AO17580, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Gilmer Bowyer, AO17663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melie John Coutlee, AO17699, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Luke Bruce Graham, AO17755, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Richard Lynch, AO17768, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Llewellyn Charles Howell, AO29121, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis, Jr., AO38632, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jerome Brooks McCauley, AO29336, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philo Orson Rasmusen, AO29354, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe A. Bennett, AO29359, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Alton Moody, AO39631, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Barlow Lancaster, AO41638, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Phil Nell, AO39635, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Curtis Warren, AO41641, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Joseph Kennedy, AO51078, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Harvey Baxter, AO17925, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Thomas Wright, AO17929, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Waldron Egan, AO17948, Air Force of the United States (major U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Wiley Baylor, AO17968, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Meldrum Kuhfeld, AO38663, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Algene Earl Key, AO29397, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Dahl Farr, AO38666, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester William Light, AO41682, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Edward Reilly, AO39679, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Edward Brooks, AO41691, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerald Hoyle, AO17994, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Archibald Johnston Hanna, AO18017, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Cechmanek, AO38671, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Van Gorder Dunn, AO29428, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Gordon Lassek, AO38672, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. LeRoy Bartlett, Jr., AO18032, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles William Haas, AO18056, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Phillips Waller Smith, AO18112, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Neal Edwin Ausman, AO18137, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Brazelton Fillmore Dice, AO18162, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Othel Rochelle Deering, AO18164, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Buford Russell Nyquist, AO18173, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richards Montgomery Bristol, AO18184, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerry Leonard Mason, AO18221, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hebern Paul Dellinger, AO18222, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Duncan Stenhouse, AO29444, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elvin Freestone Maughan, AO18259, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Walton Peterson, AO29453, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Elmer Mayberry, AO41800, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John David Howe, AO29459, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert James Goewey, AO41801, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Stanley Dolan, AO41803, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Sledge, AO38675, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stewart Sherman Maxey, AO23620, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ethelred Lundy Sykes, AO29494, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Michael Norman Wright McCoy, AO39698, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Hardin Lyle, AO41825, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Daniel Campbell, AO29498, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Rentz, AO41841, Air Force of the United States (major, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Urbach, AO29527, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Mel Schweizer, Jr., AO29554, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hamilton Monay, AO29559, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Tracy Kemp Dorsett, AO41874, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Charles Kingsbury, AO38694, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elwin Herklas Eddy, AO18364, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roger Willard Moore, AO18370, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alfred Christian Gay, AO18377, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Francis Carroll, AO18390, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. A. J. McVea, AO18401, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Pickering Corbin, Jr., AO18402, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William John Bell, AO18441, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Edwin Barr, AO18459, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Augustine Guenther, AO18462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jermain Ferdinand Rodenhauser, AO18470, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Chester Young, AO18472, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Freeman Fulton, AO18484, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Frederick Hartman, AO18501, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Wilbert Carlmark, AO18504, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles North Howze, AO18506, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Hungerford Wise, AO18507, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Francis Densford, AO18508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Travis Clayton, AO51239, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irwin Barnard Anderson, AO41900, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allen Wood Rigsby, AO24289, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Blanchard Foote, AO29596, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Gilbert Kirk, AO29603, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Rex. James Elmore, AO51251, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Valentine A. Rutherford, AO51253, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth William Mosher, AO29617, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Wesley Schott, AO29632, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Aram Senekerim Tootelain, AO41944, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Louis Callish, AO29636, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Allen Elkins, AO29639, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dross Ellis, AO29643, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Morgan Anderson, AO29648, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Prine Kleinoeder, AO29655, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ralph Fred Gallogly, AO51280, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Harvey Rothrock, AO29663, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Grant Martz, AO41993, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Riley Kane, AO29680, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Bradford Richard, AO29682, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Douglas Hopson, AO29686, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Orville Laird, AO29699, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Lester Loewenberg, AO42035, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Junior Mac Nees, AO29942, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester Maxwell Taylor, AO29722, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Harold Jacobsen, AO29723, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Babcock, AO38717, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Troy William Crawford, AO39778, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Gaston Davis, AO29752, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Hanson, AO42063, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Ray Hoehl, AO18665, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Ronald Stewart, AO18675, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Torgils Grimkel Wold, AO18705, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Jepson Webster, AO18714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Forsyth Thompson, Jr., AO18717, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Cecil Porter, AO18746, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Merle Robbins Williams, AO18820, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Earnest Powel, AO18823, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Edward Stoltz, AO18839, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walden Bernald Coffey, AO18853, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Richard Nuzum, Jr., AO29764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Arthur Miller, AO29768, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Einar Axel Malmstrom, AO29775, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Davis Giddens, AO42083, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Clemons Slagle, AO29779, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Lee Halsey, AO29785, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank John Seiler, AO29791, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alexander Stuart Young, AO42097, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Casper Sloan, AO42108, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theron Herman Whitneybell, AO38729, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Fred Oscar Easley, Jr., AO29832, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Fred McClendon, AO29834, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Aaron Lowell Johnson, AO42129, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Stewart Cassady, AO29861, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Henderson, AO29879, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roscoe Townley Nichols, Jr., AO29883, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Allen Addington, AO29884, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Francis Delaney, AO29913, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carlos John Cochrane, AO29932, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Otto Gerhard Quanrud, AO29940, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Parker Lessig, AO29947, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hogan Clark, AO29732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Nathan Cowles, AO29960, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Platt Linn Welker, AO29985, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Bernard Card, AO18980, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Allen Glass, AO18997, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Livingston Travis, AO19009, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Joseph Hale, AO19018, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Glenn Armstrong, AO19029, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vernon Cleveland Smith, AO19051, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Stephen Bishop, AO19055, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Henry Fairchild, AO19062, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Deane Marshall, AO19092, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Nelson Burkhalter, Jr., AO19106, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Moore Cairns, AO19129, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Martin Breit, AO19171, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Harold Heintz, AO19177, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Haller King, AO19184, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Corwin Paul Vansant, AO19199, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alton Alexander Denton, AO19219, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Thomas King, Jr., AO19232, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roland Arthur Elliott, Jr., AO19324, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Truesdell, Jr., AO19258, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Loren Haskin, AO19274, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Mattern Montgomery, AO19289, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Aubertin Bott, AO29995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Johnson Nesbitt, AO30002, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Daniel Gasser, AO30005, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Senter Robbins, AO30007, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Harold Monahan, AO51442, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Woodward Berkeley Mann, AO30012, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Charles Chambers, AO30013, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Anthony Heim, AO29597, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Taylor Thurman, AO26374, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Eaton Rankin, AO30052, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Durham Smith, Jr., AO30057, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Elmer Jung, AO42298, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Roger Taube, AO30132, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilmore Vincent Minnis, AO30139, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Albert Fuller, AO30141, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Millard Archibald Libby, AO30153, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Clifford Jensen, AO30155, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lewis Olinger, AO30182, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Walter Holmes, AO29716, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wilfred James Smith, AO42370, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Maxwell Williams, AO30199, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Haskell Erva Neal, AO30202, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph D. Croft Caldara, AO30226, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Vernon Jones, Jr., AO30229, Air Force of the United States (captain U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harris Benjamin Hull, AO30230, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orville Ernest Mohler, AO51530, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Orlin Butler, Jr., AO39915, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Neil Gray, AO42415, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Jones Schofield, AO42416, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Burroughs Cary, AO19352, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Carter Ashworth, AO19362, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Walter Moore, AO19376, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Delano Sluman, AO19378, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Sebastian Stone, AO19384, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Loveland Rogers, AO19388, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Bernard Dany, AO19389, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawson S. Moseley, Jr., AO19393, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jean Paul Craig, AO19395, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Leslie Crystal, Jr., AO19400, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Wood Barnes, AO19401, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Jack Holzapfel, Jr., AO19409, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gene Huggins Tibbets, AO19431, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Tompkins Hanley, AO19435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Edward Shuck, AO19436, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John dePeyster Townsend Hills, AO19443, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Monte Canterbury, AO19451, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Edward Blair 2d, AO19454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles John Bondley, Jr., AO19462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dale Orville Smith, AO19465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Perry Bruce Griffith, AO19478, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilson Hawkes Neal, AO19496, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elvin Seth Ligon, Jr., AO19497, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Burton Winkle, AO19501, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Monroe Hutchison, AO19508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arno Herman Luehman, AO19513, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Lawrence Barton, AO19514, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Judson Reeves, AO19523, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Harvey Wise, AO19527, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Andrew Legg, AO19528, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Thompson Alness, AO19531, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Theodore Wilson, Jr., AO19543, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William White, AO19550, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Lafayette Inman, AO19559, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Joseph Donovan, AO19560, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Edward Barzynski, Jr., AO19595, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Harley Perry, AO42435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Claude Bryant Thompson, AO30276, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Channing Ernest Beasley, AO42476, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Thomas Quirk, AO42483, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emmett Buckner Cassady, AO42493, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Christian Dale Kauffman, AO42497, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Luther Moran Bivins, AO51588, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Arthur McKerley, AO51593, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Berthold Eugene Nowotny, AO30388, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Stolle, AO42542, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ned Baker Chase, AO30395, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Grad Holzman, AO30412, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marion Daniel Unruh, AO42573, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James William Smith, AO42594, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Van Henry Albertson, AO42600, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Ovid Newell, AO51631, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee William Fulton, AO30465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis DeVos, AO30502, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Joseph Shower, AO19714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Wallis Hickman, AO19718, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leighton Ira Davis, AO19721, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Van Gorder Wilson, AO19744, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Kimball Brown, Jr., AO19758, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Morris Stillman, AO19760, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Elmer Ellsworth, AO19767, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Gordon Russell, AO19795, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Paul Bergquist, AO19802, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Allison Fickel, AO19809, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Downs Eugene Ingram, AO19813, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Howard Walsh, AO19824, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willis Fred Chapman, AO19832, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henderson Baynes, AO19835, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Aaron Warner Tyer, AO19847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. German Pierce Culver, AO19855, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Morris, AO19869, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Carlton Boys, AO19876, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lamont Saxton, AO19896, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Orin Houston Moore, AO19909, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Cebern Musgrave, Jr., AO19916, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Joseph Gent, Jr., AO19927, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Pelham Davis Glassford, Jr., AO19937, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hollis Strauss, AO19940, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Monroe Simons, AO19941, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Roberts, AO19963, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Curtis Thompson, AO19978, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Barcus Knowles, Jr., AO19979, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Baird Buck, AO19981, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dale Franklin Pocock, AO30508, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ray Willard Clifton, AO19987, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Randolph Lowry Wood, AO19988, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arnold Theodore Johnson, AO19989, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Frederick Stalder, AO19991, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Noel Francis Parrish, AO19992, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dolf Edward Muehleisen, AO19993, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Swyter, AO19994, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Cole Weller, AO19995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Morris Gavin, AO19996, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Jarmon, AO19997, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Neff Moyers, AO20000, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Bynum Stanley, AO20003, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Morice Sartain, AO20005, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Hughes Price, AO20006, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Caruthers Moore, AO20007, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Scott Fulwider, AO20008, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lester Stanford Harris, AO20009, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Newman Wackwitz, AO20011, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clair Lawrence Wood, AO20014, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bennett Harvin, AO20015, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bob Arnold, AO20017, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Burton Wilmot Armstrong, Jr., AO20018, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lee Neely, AO20020, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Erickson Snowden Nichols, AO20021, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jasper Newton Bell, AO20022, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Lee Waldron, AO20023, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Foster Day, Jr., AO20024, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Edwin Hooks, AO20027, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Patten Todd, AO20028, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Glenn Workman, AO30499, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrance Owen Brown, AO20042, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clayton Baxter Claassen, AO20045, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Thomas Hudnell, AO20046, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lawrence Kreider, AO20047, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Oman Neal, AO20048, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Agnew Sebastian, AO19561, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent Thomas Cannon, AO42660, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walden Alexius Sundell, AO30562, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Irwin Williams, AO51679, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Holmes Congdon, AO39995, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Herbert McCann, AO30574, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward J. Hopkins, AO30587, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Harmon Lewis, AO30589, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Albert Milton, AO30620, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rollo McNitt, AO30625, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Collins, Jr., AO30630, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Pratt Brown, AO30638, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Russell Vaughn-Ritchey, AO30369, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Eugene Thomas, AO30644, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Xavier Krebs, AO30645, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Donald Neely, AO42720, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Abe Shumsky, AO42732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Durson Forman, AO30672, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Thomas Black, AO30673, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Allen Adams, AO42761, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alban Boardman Ogden, Jr., AO40024, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ellery David Preston, Jr., AO30706, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Spinx Blackwell, AO38836, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer Van Ness Schuyler, AO30770, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Louis Clark, AO30781, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joe Kennith McNay, AO30786, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Winzer Davis, AO51802, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Gifford Norman, AO30800, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oliver Garfield Haywood, Jr., AO20113, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Edward Combs, AO20121, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Barnard Stewart, AO20126, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dwight Oliver Monteith, AO20127, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benjamin Oliver Davis, Jr., AO20146, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gordon Harrison Austin, AO20161, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jay Dean Rutledge, Jr., AO20164, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Frederick Frost, AO20166, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Dean Gapen, AO20175, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howell Marion Estes, Jr., AO20183, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Knox Arnold, Jr., AO20188, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Dermott Vincent, AO20189, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Carmichael, AO20203, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Walter Gillespie, AO20206, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rutland Gunn, Jr., AO20207, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Tate Perkins, AO20210, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Patton Clark, Jr., AO20218, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Richard Kelly, AO20225, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Calvert Spencer, Jr., AO20228, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Reynolds Terrell, AO20230, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bernard Tyler, Jr., AO20232, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fredrick Bell, AO20233, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Milton McCorkle, AO20239, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Denton Cairnes, AO20247, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilfred Henry Tetley, AO20252, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Twaddell, Jr., AO20254, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Russell Grohs, AO20255, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Swinton Steele, AO20260, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Milton Bartella, AO20261, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Utterback True, AO20271, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Turner Clifton Rogers, AO20272, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Paul Champion, AO20279, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Garnett Lee, Jr., AO20308, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Warren Newcomb Wildrick, AO20323, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Von Roy Shores, Jr., AO20335, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ellerbe Covington, Jr., AO20336, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Rigden Van Dickson, AO20350, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clark Lewis Hosmer, AO20356, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Wesley Jones, AO20358, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph James Nazzaro, AO20364, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edmund Whritner Miles, AO20371, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Levere Kimball, AO20372, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Samuel Holmes, Jr., AO20379, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wallace Conrad Barrett, AO20381, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Conrad Francis Necrason, AO20384, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Hermann Wagner, AO20385, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Holden Best, AO30817, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Martin Menter, AO30826, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William James Cummings, Jr., AO31325, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles James Lester, AO40058, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Grady MacDaniel, AO31359, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard M. Wootton, AO42916, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Henry Curtis, AO31383, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Marwell Harvey, AO31390, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland Ellsworth Sliker, AO31393, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Godfrey T. McHugh, AO31403, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Berton Root, AO20459, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Melville Brown, AO20462, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herman Alfred Schmid, AO20464, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Pauahi Hopwood, AO20449, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Arthur DeMarco, AO20451, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Day Lee, Jr., AO20434, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leslie Raybold, AO20457, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilbur Walter Aring, AO20458, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Oscar Guthrie, AO20425, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Phillip Hollstein, AO20426, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Lindley Randolph, AO20424, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Homer Astley Boushey, AO20438, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Orville Darrow, AO20429, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Austin Gunn, AO20443, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Leslie Rivard, AO20422, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Henry Miller, Jr., AO20416, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allen Hilger, AO20437, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Clinton Coddington, AO20452, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Richardson Cook, AO20420, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Engberg Todd, AO20453, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis William Proper, AO20460, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Charles Rockwood, AO20435, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Tom Jefferson Cunningham, AO20432, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henry Gist, Jr., AO20430, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ross Robertson, Jr., AO20463, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Stanley Holtoner, AO20423, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Clyde Selser, Jr., AO20427, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Ellsworth Williams, AO20455, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Leo Mundell, AO20417, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brooke Empie Allen, AO20465, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Beaumont Cornett, AO20446, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Hal Jeffus, AO20419, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Boyd Hubbard, Jr., AO20431, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman Lewis Peterson, AO20450, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Raymond Haugen, AO20433, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hilmer Cannon Nelson, AO20439, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Parker Fisher, AO20461, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Windeck Hall, AO20454, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Howard Dane, AO20466, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Graves Hubbard Snyder, AO20418, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Witten Cecil, Jr., AO20440, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Markward Reynolds, AO20448, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Wester Luker, AO31417, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Augustus Maine Minton, AO42941, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Iddings Fletcher, AO31429, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Henry Mackey Smith, AO42956, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Virgil Floyd Fairfax, AO38906, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Allen Gardner, AO31452, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Bernard Hohman, AO42977, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Bohn, AO42992, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oliver Tillman Simpson, Jr., AO38912, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Cobb Mallary, AO43017, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter George William Clatanoff, AO40159, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Miles Howlett Thompson, AO20555, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Emmett Murchison Tally, Jr., AO31545, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Andrew Jackson Curbo, Jr., AO43065, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Samuel LeNoir Moise, AO51899, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Bruin Ocamb, AO31605, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Orrin Beckwith, Jr., AO31611, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Leofric Temple, AO31613, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Alexander Gunn 3d, AO31616, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Norman Donohew, AO20574, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Dudley Stevenson, AO20583, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nils Olof Ohman, AO20586, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Lawrence Holcomb, AO20587, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Ray Clingerman, Jr., AO20591, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Asher Burtis Robbins, Jr., AO20596, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Eckman, AO20602, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Noel Snouffer, AO20607, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Phillip Klocko, AO20608, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Francis Batjer, AO20627, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Sayre Wade, AO20631, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Gordon Eriksen, AO20635, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert William Griffin, AO20641, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Risley Barden, AO20644, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Allen Russell, Jr., AO20645, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Fellows, AO20655, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Whiteford Carlisle Mauldin, AO20659, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Keener Holloway, AO20664, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Arthur Preston, AO20673, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ivan Wilson McElroy, AO20677, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Kienle Horrigan, AO20678, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alan Doane Clark, AO20683, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hensey Herman, AO20686, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Linscott Aldin Hall, AO20691, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Richard Ostrander, AO20697, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Caldwell McDowell, AO20709, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Young Parker, AO20712, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Wilkerson Agee, AO20714, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Taylor 3d, AO20715, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Thomas Shields, AO20722, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Curtis Raymond Low, AO20732, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Borden Broadhurst, AO20744, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Bainbridge Westover, AO20746, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel Charles Gurney, Jr., AO20753, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harvey Charles Dorney, AO20755, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul William Scheidecker, AO20764, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Junious Harrison, AO20776, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Emmett McDonald, AO20778, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Russell Ulricson, AO20783, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Grover Hipps, AO20787, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Focht, AO20791, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marshall Randolph Gray, AO20792, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Augustin Mitchell Prentiss, Jr., AO20796, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Woodrow William Dunlop, AO20814, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Oliver Sanborn, AO20819, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Joseph Cain, Jr., AO20833, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Malcolm Green, Jr., AO20836, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles William Stark, AO20839, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Morton David Magoffin, AO20847, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Ragland Maxwell, AO20849, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Theo Posey, AO20850, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wesley Skilton Calverley, AO20854, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leo Belton Smith, AO40189, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Howland Baker, Jr., AO20873, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George William Croker, AO20910, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Wright Smith, AO20911, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hart Hanson, AO20912, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Jenkins Huddleston, AO31657, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Neywood Hutchings Roberdeau, AO31658, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gilbert Earle Teal, AO40197, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Samuel McClure Smith, AO31667, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Lafayette Musgrave, AO43358, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Nelson Ewbank, Jr., AO31702, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James William Thomson, AO43376, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Audley Thorpe, AO43379, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Alban Gibbs, AO20932, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leon Howard McCurdy, AO31733, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lawrence Morgan Thomas, AO31750, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Martin Harvey, AO31759, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Herman Blase, AO31770, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Robert Orr, AO43427, Air Force of the United States (captain, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Daniel Graham Hawes, AO31782, Air Force of the United States (captain U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carlton Julian Martin, AO43460, Air Force of the United States (captain, United States Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Lester Hamrick, AO31838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Gordon Thorup, AO31847, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Chaney Segrist, AO43478, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Barton Morrow Russell, AO31850, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Johnnie Radford Dyer, AO40253, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Joseph Friedman, AO31870, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carl Woodrow Andrews, AO31871, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Howder, AO40256, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frederick Mauger O'Neill, AO31873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William Oberdorf, AO52168, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clinton Douglass Bannister Smith, AO43545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Pierce Hall, AO31927, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Hall Waller, Jr., AO31947, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Herrelko, AO31960, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Allen Breitweiser, AO21055, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Theodore Preuss, AO21060, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Killian Kelley, AO21068, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Brett Kieffer, AO21075, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Vernon Harman, AO21077, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Marshall Batterson, Jr., AO21082, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Kenneth Skaer, AO21091, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Prescott Miner Spicer, AO21093, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Leland Crouch, Jr., AO21100, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Craddock Coleman, AO21104, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Cleveland Heflebower, Jr., AO21112, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sherwood Ernest Buckland, AO21115, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Dale Ryan, AO21117, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert Peterson Sights, Jr., AO21123, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Omar Ellsworth Knox, AO21125, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Pleasants Sturdivant, AO21140, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Earl Johnson, Jr., AO21146, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Doan Kenzie, AO21149, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Joseph York, AO21151, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bertram Cowgill Harrison, AO21152, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Keith Kincaid, AO21157, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford Field Macomber, AO21158, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Douglas Clinton Polhamus, AO21164, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Edward Coira, AO21166, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lee Snider, AO21168, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ashley Burdett Packard, AO21169, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Ward Saunders, AO21172, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Peek Brett, AO21174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Herbert Spangler, AO21183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Nicholas Horace Chavasse, AO21187, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Charles Huglin, AO21188, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Cornelius Morrison, AO21191, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Franklin Bromiley, AO21199, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Raymond Lemon, AO21201, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Virgil Lee Zoller, AO21205, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Carleton McBride, AO21206, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Neil David Van Sickle, AO21209, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Cozart Pitchford, AO21210, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Robert Hawes, AO21220, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hugh Blanchard, AO21223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Castex Paul Conner, AO21224, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hugh Douglas Wallace, AO21232, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Rhea Luper, AO21240, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carter Eugene Duncan, AO21242, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Murray Dean, AO21245, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Henry Frederick, Jr., AO21262, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent Morgan Miles, Jr., AO21264, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Breece Wells, AO21266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harris Edward Rogner, AO21269, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roy Ray Brischetto, AO21278, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gibson Emerson Sisco, Jr., AO21281, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Elam Sims, AO21282, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Mathes Young, AO21292, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Merrick Bayer, AO21294, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Littleton James Pardue, AO21300, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wallace Stafford Ford, AO21312, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Claude Reddoch, Jr., AO21315, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Horace Isbell, AO21350, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Boddie Coleman, AO21352, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Felix Moses Hardison, AO21354, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Monroe Means, AO21358, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Danville Brown, AO21384, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Philip Leber, Jr., AO21388, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Michael Joseph Coffield, AO21394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Waymond Austin Davis, AO21397, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Henry Dalton, Jr., AO21400, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Ray Kilgore, AO21402, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henley Vedder Bastin, Jr., AO21403, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Shepard Chickering, AO21405, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Leonard Hudson, Jr., AO21407, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Carl Orth, AO21412, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George William Prentice, AO32000, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Erath Arnold, AO32458, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Mark Everett Hubbard, AO32026, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Walter Moore Bridgers, AO38960, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh Harcourt Master, AO43646, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Joseph Stone, Jr., AO32052, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Lewis Jones, AO21484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Madison West, Jr., AO21486, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Dodge Shoemaker, AO21487, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Alvin Roubal Luedecke, AO21488, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Russell Spicer, AO21489, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willard Van Deman Brown, AO21490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Haldane Councill, AO21492, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Ray Kreps, AO21493, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Peter Havens Remington, AO21494, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Blaine Ballif Campbell, AO21497, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Morris Henry Shedd, AO21498, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Mayhue Delbert Blaine, AO21500, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Fish Nichols, AO21501, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Beeton Klein, AO21502, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marion Malcolm, AO21503, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick Lawrance Moore, AO21504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Emlen Marion, AO21505, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ben Ivan Funk, AO21506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard William Simons, AO21508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Spencer Hardy, AO21510, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Louis Donicht, AO21512, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ladson Green Eskridge, Jr., AO21514, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Harry Matthews, AO21515, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ryder Waldo Finn, AO21516, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Franklin Hardy, AO21517, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Wietzel Zehrung, AO21519, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Jenkins Pierce, AO21520, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Francis Worden, AO21521, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Bradford Baker, AO21523, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Reed Volin, AO21525, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Alan Bennett, AO21526, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Garfield Thorne, Jr., AO21527, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Baskin Reid Lawrence, Jr., AO21529, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sam Philippe Triffy, AO21530, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Bernard Young, AO21531, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Mason Reid, AO21533, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bernard Adolf Schriever, AO21536, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Ernest Watson, AO21537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cy Wilson, AO21538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Craven Clark Rogers, AO21539, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lewis Curry, AO21540, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Audrin Rotha Walker, AO21541, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Calvin Ely Peeler, AO21542, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold S. Ecklund, AO21544, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Kay Martin, AO21545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. John Beverly Montgomery, AO21546, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allen Way, AO21548, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Ferguson, AO21549, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Brewer Keese, AO21550, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Frederick Hunker, AO21551, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Bell David, AO21554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Francis Burnham, AO21555, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Box, AO21556, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chris Henry William Rueter, AO21558, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Brig. Gen. Horace Armor Shepard, AO21559, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Louis Wilhelm, Jr., AO21560, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Franklin Kendall Paul, AO21562, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ben Allen Mason, Jr., AO21563, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raleigh Hunter Macklin, AO21564, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Graeme Stewart Bond, AO21565, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marcus Fleming Cooper, AO21566, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Victor Schwanbeck, AO21567, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Melville Caldwell, AO21568, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Abbott Thomas, AO21569, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elbert David Reynolds, AO21570, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Sheldon Garman, AO21571, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Frederick Wackwitz, Jr., AO21572, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Christian Demler, AO21573, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Cecil Hampton Childre, AO21574, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jacob Jerval Brogger, AO21575, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irvine Alfred Rendle, AO21576, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Junius Waldo Dennison, Jr., AO21577, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Wilbur Keating, AO21580, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Sutton Brewer, AO21581, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Irving Lewis Branch, AO21582, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Charles Carlson, Jr., AO21586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Eades, AO21587, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald William Eisenhart, AO21588, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Sam Maddux, Jr., AO21589, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Lewis Polifka, AO21590, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Reed Stewart, AO21591, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Klahr McNown, AO21592, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert William Ryder, AO21595, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Avelin Paul Tacon, Jr., AO21598, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Conrad Joe Herlick, AO21599, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Evart Wilbur Hedlund, AO21600, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Franklin Helmick, AO21601, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Loughery Johnston, AO21603, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James John Roberts, Jr., AO21604, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lloyd Atwood Walker, Jr., AO21605, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur William Schmitt, Jr., AO21606, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Ray Martin, AO21608, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Edward Glaser, AO21609, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Franklin Strickland, AO21613, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Ovide Bordelon, AO21618, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clyde Charles Harris, Jr., AO21620, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jean Rogers Byerly, AO21621, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward George Kiehle, AO21624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Earl Eugene Bates, Jr., AO21625, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Wade, AO21627, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. J. Francis Taylor, Jr., AO21628, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Wilford Maschmeyer, AO21629, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ray Hamilton Martin, AO21632, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederick John Sutterlin, AO21633, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Murray Alston Bywater, AO21634, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Delmar Edmond Wilson, AO21635, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joshua Thomas Winstead, Jr., AO21636, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Duncan Jones, AO21637, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Haywood Beverly, AO21638, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Edward Schaetzel, AO21640, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Grenville Huish, AO21641, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Claude Edwin Putnam, Jr., AO21642, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Carl Woltz, AO21645, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Edwin Rouse, AO21648, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vernon Lake Stintzi, AO21650, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Theodore Edwinson, AO21651, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Carroll Cochran, AO21653, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Whitmell, Tompkins Rison, AO21656, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leslie Ethridge Martin, AO21658, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gwen Grover Atkinson, AO21660, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Michael Keeffe, AO21661, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Wesseler Bicking, AO21662, Air Force of United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Edward Hild, AO32063, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Mark Curtis Bane, Jr., AO32078, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent William Howard, AO40320, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Holliday Chick, AO32567, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Byron Manning Sansom, Jr., AO32095, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hewitt Terrell Wheless, AO32096, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Glynn Poff, AO32100, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leslie Wallace Holman, AO32102, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Screven Bond, Jr., AO40330, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Patrick Gerrity, AO32147, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Rader Powell, AO32151, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Thomason Nicholson, AO32157, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Eugene Kofahl, AO32162, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kyle Loyd Riddle, AO32161, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Wendell Moore, AO32165, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Thornal Compton, AO32174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert George Ruegg, AO32183, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Morris Brown, Jr., AO32188, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ola Paul Thorne, AO32207, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glen Robbins Birchard, AO32217, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Leonard Johnson, AO32221, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Howell Starbuck, AO32228, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sydney Thomas Smith, AO43803, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Oscar Reynold Schaaf, AO32262, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Arnold Delahay, AO32266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Johnson Pugh, AO32269, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elmer George Prohaska, AO43833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Goldsworthy, AO32283, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Loren George McCollom, AO32298, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Narce Whitaker, AO38985, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ralph Buchert, AO32336, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh O'Neill McTague, AO32340, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Staats Rader, AO32342, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Delmer Joseph Rogers, AO21740, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Spoor Samuel, AO21742, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roscoe Campbell Crawford, Jr., AO21752, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Yount Jumper, AO21763, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Crandall Newcomer, AO21770, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph George Perry, AO21771, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Harriman Curtin, AO21773, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norman James McGowan, AO21778, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Josephus Alan Bowman, AO21785, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Benjamin Miller, AO21787, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Wilson Carpenter 3d, AO21790, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wayne Laverne O'Hern, AO21793, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edmund Howard, Jr., AO21806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adam Kirk Breckenridge, AO21815, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland Wallace Boughton, Jr., AO21816, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Arthur McDavid, AO21817, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Rufus Hardy Holloway, AO21826, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allen Forrest Herzberg, AO21827, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Riggs Sullivan, Jr., AO21830, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Lawrence Dickman, AO21833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Joseph Long, AO21834, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Hillhouse, AO21838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roger Edwards Phelan, AO21842, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Merwyn Wray, AO21843, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Andrew John Kinney, AO21845, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Allen Romig, AO21856, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orin Henry Rigley, Jr., AO21861, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Elbert Owen Meals, AO21872, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin John Latoszewski, AO21875, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Daniel Curtin, AO21888, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Wallace Iseman, Jr., AO21889, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Barclay Knapp, AO21890, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Cerel McFarland, AO21894, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Benoid Earl Glawe, AO21902, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Carver Sears, AO21906, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Evans Greer, AO21910, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Shepler Ward FitzGerald, Jr., AO21912, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Roy Little, AO21917, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Leslie Evans, Jr., AO21925, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Steele Morrison, AO21951, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Bernard Whitehouse, AO21958, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Daniel Farrington Tatum, AO21959, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Gordon Lycan, AO21968, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Wallace Roger Zethren, AO21970, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Strother Banks Hardwick, Jr., AO21973, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Charlwood Richardson 3d, AO21975, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Brereton Bestic, AO21976, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Urban Brombach, AO21978, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elliott Vandevanter, Jr., AO21989, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wilbur Winston Bailey, AO21991, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Mercer Higginson, AO22003, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Gordon Merrell, AO22004, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Stein Boyd, AO22012, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Thomas Smith, AO22014, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alfred Virgil Walton, AO22020, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Lee McDowell, Jr., AO22029, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ray Joseph Will, AO22030, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert John Rogers, AO22032, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Perry Milo Hoisington 2d, AO22044, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Salvatore Edward Manzo, AO22053, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leonard Neil Palmer, AO22055, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Kemp Martin, AO22061, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Royce Gideon, Jr., AO22064, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Prentiss Davis Wynne, Jr., AO22084, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ellsworth Reily Jacoby, AO22089, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Vincent Reardon, AO22111, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Theodore Kingsley, Jr., AO22112, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Christian Habecker, AO22117, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Carlos Edwards, AO22131, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Louis McCoy, AO22141, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Willard Barber Atwell, Jr., AO22142, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Manly Walton, Jr., AO22145, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Peter Schmid, AO22156, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Wilson Stocking, AO22160, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Matthew James McKeever, Jr., AO22161, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Walter Wilson, AO22174, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Bernard Adams, AO22178, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ronald Fredric Fallows, AO32382, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Sterling Leland, AO43930, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Henry Berkenkamp, AO43932, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Byron Benjiman Webb, AO22197, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Bruce Miller, Jr., AO22220, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dale Donald Brannon, AO22228, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Thomas Crimmins, Jr., AO22242, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Batchelder Fletcher, AO22243, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Leonard McNickle, AO22249, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Weeks Ingenhutt, AO32424, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brooks Albert Lawhon, AO32446, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Bayzand Seim, Jr., AO32448, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oswald Weeks Lunde, AO32454, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Franklin Bronson, Jr., AO22324, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Elbert Helton, AO22325, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Viccellio, AO22326, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frederic Colbert Gray, Jr., AO22327, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph Lowell Wassell, AO22329, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Osmond Jay Ritland, AO22332, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Victor Lenvik Anderson, AO22339, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe Gordon Schneider, AO22340, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bourne Adkison, AO22342, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harold Douglas Courtney, AO22343, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Benjamin Greene, Jr., AO22344, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Kenneth Crain, AO22345, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Loring Franklin Stetson, Jr., AO22346, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glendon Philip Overing, AO22347, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oscar Allen Heinlein, AO22348, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Emanuel Eubank, Jr., AO22349, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Creer, AO22352, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hubert Zemke, AO22353, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Thomas Kight, AO22356, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William John Bohnaker, AO22357, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Crawford McGehee, AO22358, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jo Kyle Warner, AO22359, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Stephen Chennault, AO22360, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Leroy Robinson, AO22362, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Herbert Snavely, AO22364, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Northcutt, AO22365, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clarence Arthur Neely, AO22366, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Alton Cheney, AO22370, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Allison Pechuls, AO22372, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Lynn Sullivan, AO22375, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hiette Sinclair Williams, Jr., AO22378, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Fred Delaway Stevers, AO22379, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glenn Carlyle Nye, AO22380, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Columbus Agan, Jr., AO22381, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ernest Gordon Ford, AO22382, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lee Bannerman Coats, AO22383, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Col. Murray William Crowder, Jr., AO22385, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edwin Basye, AO22386, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Air Force).

Col. Wayne Earl Thurman, AO22390, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Miles Ramage, AO22391, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Don Coupland, AO22392, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Quentin Timson Quick, AO22393, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Beverly Howard Warren, AO22394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Van Hatton Slayden, AO22395, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Wilbur Anderson, Jr., AO22398, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Daniel Aynesworth, AO22399, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Erwin Elder, AO22402, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hervey Haydon Whitfield, AO22405, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edgar Davis, Jr., AO22406, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Hodder Gibson, AO22410, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Jay Barrett, AO22411, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Walter Ohlke, AO22415, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Vernon DeShazo, AO22417, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Bream Diehl, AO22418, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Chester Lee Sluder, AO22419, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald James French, AO22422, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Julian Marian Bleyer, AO22423, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Frederick Setchell, AO22428, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Theodore Barthelmess, AO22429, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Stuart Dunlap, AO22432, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bruce Burns Price, AO22434, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Duane Louis Kime, AO22435, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Arnold Tate, AO22437, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Allman Tenney Culbertson, AO22440, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Wesley Hughes, AO22442, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Ross Greening, AO22443, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Walter Gray, AO22447, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman Luellen Ballard, AO22448, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Clyde Bagby, AO22449, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leonard Boston Storm, AO22451, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Bosworth Darling, Jr., AO22453, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Austin Ames, AO22454, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Julian Mason, AO22456, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Paul Fulcher, AO22457, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hugh Boyd Manson, Jr., AO22460, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Stanley Emrick, AO22461, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. A. J. Bird, Jr., AO22463, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Marvin Stoll Zipp, AO22465, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Estes Moore, AO22466, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edgar Wade Hampton, AO22468, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Richard Rowland, AO22470, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Albert Rouse, AO22472, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Allen Kurtz, AO22473, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Louis Rector Hughes, Jr., AO22480, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James William Chapman, Jr., AO22481, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Mudgett Jones, AO22482, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Warren Philbrick, AO22483, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clair Arthur Peterson, AO22484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stanley Anthony Dallas, AO22485, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bingham Trigg Kleine, AO22486, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Hubbert Cleveland, AO22487, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant. U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Benjamin Reed, AO22488, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Dean Berry, AO22490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theron Coulter, AO22491, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clinton Curtis Wasem, AO22493, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Philip Henry Greasley, AO22497, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cyrus William Kitchens, Jr., AO22499, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Troy Keith, AO22504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Henry Schwartz, Jr., AO22506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Walter Bennett Putnam, AO22508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brian O'Neill, AO22509, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Colonel John Timothy Fitzwater, AO22510, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gladwyn Earl Pinkston, AO22511, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oliver George Cellini, AO22517, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Henry MacDonald, AO22518, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Kelly, AO22519, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Kellond, AO22520, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Broadus Beene Taylor, AO22522, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Monty Duran Wilson, AO22523, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Arthur Ray DeBolt, AO22525, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Harold Moore, AO22527, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank B. James, AO22529, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Theodore Wightman Tucker, AO22530, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Raymond Frank Rudell, AO22532, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ralph William Rodieck, AO22533, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Norton Harding Van Sicklen 3d, AO22534, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Gardner Chandler, Jr., AO22537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Albert Vandenburgh Endress, AO22538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Air Force).

Col. William Sydnor Barksdale, Jr., AO22539, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Danforth Van Auken, AO22540, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Edwin Roberts, AO22541, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Leland Stanford McGowan, AO22542, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Carpenter Averill, AO22543, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Keith Karl Compton, AO22545, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack William Saunders, AO22546, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Christopher Otho Moffett, AO22548, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Eugene Dougherty, AO22550, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Christian Droz, AO22552, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Baird Tipton, AO22554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Affleck Dunning, AO22556, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Lee Strickland, AO22557, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dalene Edward Bailey, AO22558, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clemens Kieffer Wurzbach, AO22562, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Pinkham Smith, AO22563, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William David Gilchrist, AO22566, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Dellinger Dick, AO22569, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. J. C. Bailey, AO22571, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Valentine Edmundson, AO22573, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adam Joseph Heintz, AO22575, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Vincent George Huston, AO22576, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry Joseph Holt, AO22577, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ansel James Wheeler, AO22580, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Guy Hamilton Rockey, AO22581, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Leo Francois Dusard, Jr., AO22585, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Kenton Hester, AO22586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Blake Young, AO22589, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Milton Wade, AO22592, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Renwick Nevitt, AO22595, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Giannatti, AO22599, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Richard Anderson, AO22600, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Milton Herbert Ashkins, AO22604, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harry J. Bullis, AO22605, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jack Simmons Jenkins, AO22606, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Henry Mears, AO22608, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Adolph Edward Tokaz, AO22609, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Dickson Terry, Jr., AO22611, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Huie de Russy, AO22612, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Rufus Yancey, AO22613, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Robert Feeney, AO22614, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Clifford John Heflin, AO22617, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Kenneth Andrew Cavenah, AO22618, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Theodore Chadwell, AO22620, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Allison Johnson, AO22621, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harold Jacob Rau, AO22623, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sam Wilkins Westbrook, AO22624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Melvin Francis McNickle, AO22628, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Romaine Aylesworth, AO22629, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William James Wrigglesworth, AO22630, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Addison Blakey, AO32460, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Isadore Wood, AO22657, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Paul Howard Long, AO32489, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Randall Holzapple, AO32490, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edwin Allen Doss, AO32504, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Dumont Greenfield, AO32503, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Howard Elroy Watkins, AO32535, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Lewis Plank Ensign, AO32554, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Watterston Veal, AO32568, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Salvador Phillip LaBarbera, AO32570, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Clayton Robertson, AO44101, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Benson Downer, AO32579, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Charles McPherson, AO32586, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Norman Gayle Morris, AO32597, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Oren James Poage, AO32601, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Ira Cornett, AO32617, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Tarleton Harvin Watkins, AO32623, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Osborn Hall, AO32624, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Howard Gorden Cook, AO32639, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Lee Delashaw, AO32646, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Edward Charles Tates, AO32653, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harley Camden Vaughn, AO32654, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Eugene Haile Callahan, AO32672, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Walter Elliott, AO32675, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Frederick Anderson, AO52433, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Robert Large, Jr., AO32707, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Eugene Bernard LeBailly, AO32720, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Harvard Wendell Powell, AO44223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Henry Dittman, AO32752, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Edwin Andrew Loberg, AO32757, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Warfield Tibbets, Jr., AO32761, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Todd Crowell, AO32769, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Owen Patteson, AO32779, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ronald Dean Hubbard, AO32785, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Albert William Fletcher, AO32794, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Wallace Packard Mace, AO32800, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John George Glover, AO32806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Hallock Peter Kindle Walmsley, AO32814, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert William Witty, AO32818, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil Herbert Scott, Jr., AO32821, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joe Lennard Mason, AO32831, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roswell Freedman, AO32839, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. David Arthur Burchinal, AO32840, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charlie Rankin Bond, Jr., AO32850, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Dalton Jones, AO52511, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Churchill Hutchinson, AO22802, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Peter Bostrom, AO22804, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Herbert Otto Wangeman, AO22805, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richmond Archibald Livingstone, AO22806, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Sylvan Davis Hand, AO22807, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Copeland Paul, AO22809, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Franklin Whisenand, AO22812, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roland John Barnick, AO22820, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Thomas Harber Holbrook, AO22822, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Clarence Bernard Hammerle, Jr., AO22824, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John William Weltman, AO22825, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert John Koster, AO22828, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Daniel Mayden, AO22831, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Anthony Vincent Grossetta, AO22832, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Henry Carter, AO22833, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Brunow William Feiling, AO22838, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Glen Webster Martin, AO22839, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Gregory, AO22841, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Charles Marion Eisenhart, AO22843, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gilbert Louis Meyers, AO22848, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Keith Wesley Dech, AO22849, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Lowry Dunn, AO22856, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Jerome Hughey, AO22857, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Everett Wilson Stewart, AO22859, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Robbins Pancake, AO22861, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Wallace Momyer, AO22862, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Nelson Boaz, Jr., AO22867, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph James Preston, AO22868, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Randolph Maney, AO22871, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jerome Tarter, AO22872, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Dewey Slocumb, Jr., AO22873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adriel Newton Williams, AO22877, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Paul Constantine Schauer, AO22879, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Echelbary Cranston, AO22882, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Loran John Anderson, AO44355, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Lawrence Pritchard, AO32873, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Victor Edwin Warford, AO32914, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin McConnell 2d, AO32920, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Elroy Kimmel, AO32926, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Winston Cureton Fowler, AO22893, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Cutright Sheetz, AO22895, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Austin James Russell, AO22906, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Harry Albright French, AO22908, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Nathan Louis Krisberg, AO22931, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Edward Applegate, AO22933, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Carey Law O'Bryan, Jr., AO22936, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Jack Stewart DeWitt, AO22956, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Webster Bagstad, AO22986, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Hamilton Warren, AO22989, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Manford Jay Wetzel, AO22990, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Richard Josiah Kent, AO23005, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Willis Franklin Lewis, AO23013, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Wilbur Wilcox, AO23020, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Sargent Abbey, AO23022, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Francis Clare Gideon, AO23034, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Philip Courtney Loofbourrow, AO23050, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Davison Dalziel, AO23071, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Edward Buck, Jr., AO23072, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Joseph LaBreche, AO23075, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Raymond Starrat Sleeper, AO23088, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Robert Wilbraham, AO23091, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Beverly Campbell, AO23101, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. James Fant Berry, AO23125, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Dill Baynard Ellis, AO23133, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Everett Houston Ware, AO23134, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Reginald James Clizbe, AO23155, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ernest Bryant Jones, AO23163, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Maurice Earle Parker, AO23166, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Andre Ringgold Brousseau, AO23209, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Ross East, Jr., AO23212, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Lester Cicil Hess, AO23214, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert William Strong, Jr., AO23215, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Henry Hudson Norman, Jr., AO23216, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John William Norvell, AO23223, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Allan Ashley Crockett, AO23227, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Warren Curtis Stirling, AO23230, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Raymond John Downey, AO23233, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Roy Willard Nelson, Jr., AO23238, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Arthur Theodore Frontczak, AO23246, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stanton Thomas Smith, Jr., AO23266, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Julius Boswell Summers, Jr., AO23271, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Karl Tweeten Rauk, AO23272, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Francis Coleman, AO23280, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Burton Elmo McKenzie, AO23289, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. James Mason Smelley, AO23291, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Air Force).

Col. William Powell Litton, AO23300, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alvan Cullom Gillem 2d, AO23302, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Theodore Ross Milton, AO23307, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Kermit Robert Dyke, AO23318, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Stewart, AO23332, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Wendell Rogers, AO32929, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Olen Turner, AO44433, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Francis Robert Royal, AO32933, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Hubert Stonewall Judy, Jr., AO32937, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Weldon Marion James, AO23353, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Norton Reynolds, AO23354, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. William Elza McEntire, AO23355, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Bryan Brand Harper, AO23356, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alvin Edward Hebert, AO23360, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. George Miles McNeese, AO23361, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Richard Condie Sanders, AO23366, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Ernest Roderic Manierre, AO23367, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Robert Fleming Harris, AO23368, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Baseler, AO23371, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Gerhard John Schriever, AO23373, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Adolf Milton Wright, AO23374, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Cecil James Looke, Jr., AO23375, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. George Edward Glober, AO23377, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Charles Afton Gayle, AO23379, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Orville Herman Rehmann, AO23383, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Orie Olin Schurter, AO23384, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. William Ellsworth Boyd, AO23389, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Alexander George Evanoff, AO23391, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Jerry Dentler Page, AO23392, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Rollen Henry Anthis, AO23393, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Joseph Austin Cunningham, AO23394, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Dorr Ellsworth Newton, Jr., AO23396, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Donald Leonard Clark, AO23397, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Stanley Jeffrey, Jr., AO23400, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Stephen Davenport McElroy, AO23467, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Roger McKee Crow, AO23476, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Horace Albert Hanes, AO23480, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Stuart Moss Porter, AO23481, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Alvan Neavitt Moore, AO23484, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. Frank Lee Wood, Jr., AO23485, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Frank Norton Graves, AO23506, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Thomas Robert Ford, AO23508, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Carl Paul Walter, AO23521, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. Ariel Wayne Nielsen, AO23537, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Col. John Barkeley McPherson, AO23538, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

Lt. Col. John Edward Nitsche, AO23557, Air Force of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Air Force).

*To be first lieutenants*

Second Lt. Thomas Alonzo Webb, AO50407, United States Air Force, with rank from June 1, 1948.

First Lt. Elwood Dean Storrs, Jr., AO56563, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 2, 1948.

First Lt. Gordon Joseph James, AO38408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 2, 1948.

First Lt. William George Morley, AO50408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 4, 1948.

First Lt. Ward Ellsworth Protsman, AO27060, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Rean Lochry, AO27064, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Hegenberger, AO27067, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Handford Lindsley Cummings, Jr., AO27081, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hal Lloyd FitzPatrick, AO27097, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wallace Gourley Hynds, Jr., AO27099, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arnold Horowitz, AO27106, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Frederick Bond, Jr., AO27109, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Paul Baker, Jr., AO27113, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Estes Farrar, Jr., AO27116, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Gifford Merrill Holden, Jr., AO27120, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Edward Reuler, AO27123, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David James Crawford 3d, AO27127, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hugh Campbell Parker, Jr., AO27129, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arthur Summer, AO27134, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Henry Lee Warren, AO27137, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Standish Stoer, AO27144, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Kellogg Stebbins 3d, AO27149, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Edward Richards, AO27152, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur James Steele, AO27153, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Maxwell Oscar Johnson, Jr., AO27155, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Byron Franklin Knolle, Jr., AO27166, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kendall Russell, AO27167, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Russell Marks, AO27173, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Francis Lish, AO27175, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ross Karr, AO27182, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Arthur Willis Walton, AO27186, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Warren Marshall Briggs, AO27187, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Offa Swann Nichols, Jr., AO27189, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Tuinenburg Preston, AO27192, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Arnold Reints, AO27195, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roland Daniel Foley, Jr., AO27199, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Freeman Marvin, AO27202, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Lee Maynard, AO27205, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Jarrell, Jr., AO27206, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Clark, AO27208, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Bobby Lee Marlow, AO27209, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Vergil Calvin Givens, AO27214, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederic William Hartwig, AO27215, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Eugene Duvall, AO27217, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Martin Harvey Brewer, Jr., AO27218, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kelton Merrill Farris, AO27220, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Doremus Whitcraft, Jr., AO27221, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Will Coffey, Jr. AO27222, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Brierton Townsend, Jr., AO27223, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Derrick Raymond, AO27225, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Harlie Bacon, AO27243, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roger Lundeen Johnson, AO27246, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Baird MacWherter, AO27250, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Winthrop Draper, AO27262, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Malcolm Nebeker Stewart, Jr., AO27266, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Atkinson Jones 3d, AO27268, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Gardner Thompson, AO27269, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Jack Graham Crouch, AO27270, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Patrick Conniff, AO27271, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Manlove, AO27274, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Alexander Williams, Jr., AO27275, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Vernon Monroe Smith, AO27276, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Roland Neville, Jr., AO27278, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Scott Basham, AO27280, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert McChesney Smith, AO27281, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William King Moran, Jr., AO27283, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Wauchope Crockett, AO27284, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Dow Swain, Jr., AO27286, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chester Arthur Skelton, Jr., AO27287, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jeptha Hughes Evans, AO27299, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Edward Barnett, AO27305, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Franklin Case Davies AO27306, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Henry Hull Stick, AO27307, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Graham Valpey, AO27311, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Glenn Coulter, Jr., AO27313, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Anthony Roberts Parrish, AO27314, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Sylvester Attinger, Jr., AO27315, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Milton Thompson, AO27316, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Samuel Holtze, AO27317, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Orlando Holway, 3d, AO27322, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Frank Gilbert, AO27325, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Joseph Ford, Jr., AO27328, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. J. F. Allen, Jr., AO27330, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Lewis Gandy, Jr., AO27334, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Brown Adams, Jr., AO27335, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wendell Jackson Long, AO27337, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Bradley Chickering, AO27338, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert George Lindsay, AO27339, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Shelton Gillespie Spear, AO27340, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Byrd Minor, AO27341, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Richard Golden, AO27351, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Harry Randolph Patrick, AO27352, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Broomhall Swartz, AO27353, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Chase Pettee, AO27354, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Jerome Avery, AO27358, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Storb, AO27360, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harrison Larkin, AO27366, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kingdon Alva Davidson, AO27368, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Goodman Lake, AO27372, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edgar Marvin Munyon, AO27377, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Billy Neel Hollis, AO27385, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Cecil Leland Rutledge, Jr., AO27386, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Sterling Wood, AO27387, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Paule Eckert, AO27391, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Blount Craig, AO27392, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edmund Anthony Rafalko, AO27393, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Basil A. Brockles, Jr., AO27887, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roy Leon Marston, AO27402, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Grant Harrison Fenn, AO27408, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Samuel Kenric Lessey, AO27409, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Duncan Gault AO27414, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Thomas Bess, Jr., AO27417, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×Second Lt. Harold Howard Buth, AO27418, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Brown Rupert, AO27420, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Pauly, AO27424, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Adolphus Giles, AO27425, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. David Murray Field, AO27428, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clifford Edward Myers, Jr., AO27430, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

XCV——17

First Lt. Paul Clement Whelan, AO27439, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edgar Walker Nichols, AO27443, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Calvert Lewis Estill, Jr., AO27444, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wilson Patrick Hurley, AO27449, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John William Campbell, Jr., AO27450, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Henry Lee Cobb, Jr., AO27451, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Ernest James Davis, Jr., AO27456, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Norman Hoffman, AO27459, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jesse Bethea Hearin, Jr., AO27460, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Denton Ledford, AO27465, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Edward McGlynn, AO27470, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Archie Rice Patterson, Jr., AO27472, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jack Harding Romney, AO27482, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jesse Cecil Gatlin, Jr., AO27483, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Russell Eugene Taliaferro, AO27500, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Irvin Daubert, AO27502, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Wale Williver, AO27505, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ewing Lawrence, AO27506, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Duer Ludlow, AO27510, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Malcolm Fitzpatrick, AO27512, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Clifton Thayer, Jr., AO27513, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Clark Wayne, AO27517, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Turbush Galligan, AO27518, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Lee Treester, AO27526, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Ray Bissell, AO27528, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Spearman Simpson, AO27532, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Francis Deacon, Jr., AO27533, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Allen Perez, AO27534, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Rowland Charles William Blessley, Jr., AO27536, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Alan Ellis, Jr., AO27537, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edwin Harry Bailey, AO27538, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James John Rouch, AO27539, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clair Gene Whitney, AO27541, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Ballard Wohlford, AO27548, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Lee Jackson, AO27549, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Jones Mason, AO27552, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Edward Pine, AO27557, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Wesley Sherwood, Jr., AO27559, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Cross, AO27561, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Stanley Jones, Jr., AO27572, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Richard Middleton, AO27573, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Homer Werner, AO27574, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Finley Trimble, AO27586, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Edwin Godwin Kellum, A27590, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Jacob Knight, AO27591, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Clarence Virgil Slack, Jr., AO27592, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Gale Breene, Jr., AO27596, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Scott Anthony Kuntz, AO27598, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Lewis Babin, AO27599, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Edward Moran, AO27606, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Dirck deRyee Westervelt, AO27615, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Ralph Granik, AO27617, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Augustine Stephen Puchrik, AO27260, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frank Aloysius Lee, AO27621, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Gordon Mason, AO27625, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Morgan Seeger, Jr., AO27626, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Clarence Leslie Linton, AO27630, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Simpson Bartron, AO27631, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Glen Chadwick Childs, AO27632, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Yale Francis Trustin, AO27633, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Roff Horner, AO27637, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Frederick Wadsworth Robinson, AO27638, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James David Morrison Morris, AO27644, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chauncey Brooks Vandevanter, AO27647, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Rumley Wallace, Jr., AO27650, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Winthrop William Widman, AO27654, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Branham Dillard 3d, AO27657, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Jack Nelson, AO27659, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Barrett English, AO27660, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Lewis Bailey, AO27662, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Peter Van Matre, AO27663, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lorrin Carlton Peterson, AO27665, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Homer Robert Minckler, AO27671, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Thomas Farr, AO27676, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Rice Byron, AO27686, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph Schibilsky, AO27687, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Ash Callahan, AO27688, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore Mayer Fite, AO27690, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Cole Dempster Bacon, AO27691, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. John Edward Coulahan, Jr., AO27692, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nat Dulaney King, AO27694, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Dudley Bruton, Jr., AO27705, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Warren Hurdis, AO27706, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Ralph Francis Croal, Jr., AO27707, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Cannon Hanes, AO27709, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Louis Lyon Martin, AO27710, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Ivan Leon Foster, Jr., AO27716, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Claudius daSilva Fingar, AO27717, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Roger Eugene Miller, AO27718, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Max Findell, AO27720, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jacques George Beezley, AO27730, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leon Alexander Dombrowski, Jr., AO27731, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Charles William Pratt, AO27742, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Earl Vane Wilkinson, Jr., AO27754, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Randolph Carrington Heard, AO27755, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Allen Evans, AO27757, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Valen Crowe, AO27758, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Marshall Pulliam, AO27762, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Pagenstecher Liebel, AO27763, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Devol Brett, AO27767, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Chester Val Braun, AO27768, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Price Smith, AO27769, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Benton Catron, 4th, AO27770, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Elmer Resides Haslett, AO27890, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Norman Gardiner Sauer, AO27773, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Einer Huseby, AO27776, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Aaron Carter, Jr., AO27778, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Morton Spiegel, AO27780, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harry Grady Walker, Jr., AO27781, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Frederick Corbin Blesse, AO27784, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alexander Otto Froede, Jr. AO27788, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Leonard William Lilley, AO27792, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

×First Lt. Daniel Crawford Perry, AO27793, Air Force of the United States (second lieu-

tenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Stewart Sylvester Stabley, Jr., AO27795, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Nathan Brown Chase, AO27799, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Francis McCaddon, AO27801, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Paul Kenneth Bullard, AO27804, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. George Elden Shaffner, AO27808, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Harold Frederick Brenneman, AO27811, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Philip Brown, AO27817, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Alfred Dixon Blue, AO27819, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Harry Drake, AO27824, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Wilbur Raymond Pugh, AO27826, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Elias Spragins, AO27827, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. James Slade Nash, AO27828, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Emmet Rochfort, AO27832, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Thomas O'Neal, AO27835, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Leslie Gerald, Jr., AO27841, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Paul Walker Field, AO27850, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Lyman Screven Willcox, AO27851, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Hanley Curtis, AO27854, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Donovan Low McCance, AO27855, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hally Delmar Chesney, Jr., AO27865, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Robert Stickman, Jr., AO27867, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Jacksel Markham Broughton, AO27870, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Daniel Ely Farr 2d, AO27878, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Kenneth Thompson Blood, Jr., AO27881, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Josiah Snow 2d, AO27882, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 5, 1948.

Second Lt. Rodney Hugh Newbold, AO50409, United States Air Force, with rank from June 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Dias Hippert, AO27884, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 6, 1948.

×First Lt. Jesse Henry Johnson, AO27885, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 7, 1948.

First Lt. Theodore Mark Jablonski, AO41334, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 9, 1948.

Capt. Anthony Joseph Rose, AO50412, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 10, 1948.

First Lt. Lloyd Gerald Miller, AO56567, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 12, 1948.

×First Lt. Lawrence Eugene Killion, AO56566, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 12, 1948.

Capt. Alvin Mathew Welbes, AO50413, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 13, 1948.

First Lt. Carl Edwin Fales, AO56569, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 13, 1948.

First Lt. George Drexel LeMay AO38505, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 14, 1948.

First Lt. Herbert Richard Dahl, AO56570, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force) with rank from June 16, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Rodney Thomis, AO56573, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 16, 1948.

Second Lt. Lawrence Thomas Lawler, AO50414, United States Air Force, with rank from June 16, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Eugene Julin, AO56575, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 18, 1948.

First Lt. Harris Ong Poy, AO56576, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 19, 1948.

Second Lt. Alfonso Christopher Toler, AO56577, United States Air Force, with rank from June 21, 1948.

Second Lt. Don William King, AO50416, United States Air Force, with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Lewis Eugene Williams, AO50417, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Alphons Edward Kosciuszko, AO56578, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Ray Eugene Sterling, AO50418, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Francis Nee, AO38481, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 23, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Richard Van Sant, AO50420, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 24, 1948.

First Lt. Glendor D. McAdams, AO56986, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. John Tilla Parish, Jr., AO50421, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

First Lt. William David Small, Jr., AO38483, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. William George Metsopoulos, AO56581, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

Second Lt. James Holte Hegg, AO56580, United States Air Force, with rank from June 27, 1948.

Capt. Gail Eugene Jacobson, AO56583, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 28, 1948.

First Lt. Harley LeRoy Grimm, AO56584, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 29, 1948.

First Lt. Delphin Randolph Hasty, AO56585, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 30, 1948.

First Lt. James Joseph Connolly, AO38484, Air Force of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Air Force), with rank from June 30, 1948.

(All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.)

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Theodore C. Lonnquest | Daniel V. Gallery, Jr. |
| Louis Dreller | Walter F. Boone |
| David H. Clark | Joseph F. Bolger |
| John E. Gingrich | Oswald S. Colclough |
| Austin K. Doyle | John H. Carson |
| Thomas H. Robbins, Jr. | Ernest E. Herrmann |
| William G. Tomlinson | Ernest H. von Heimburg |
| Richard F. Whitehead | |
| Charles Wellborn, Jr. | |

The following-named officer for permanent apointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Morton D. Willcutts

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Andrew G. Bisset

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Clemens V. Rault

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Oliver W. Gaines | Jesse L. Hull |
| William L. Pryor, Jr. | Upton S. Brady, Jr. |
| Mario G. Vangeli | Charles N. Day |
| Willard M. Sweetser | John F. Greenslade |
| Clarence Broussard | John A. Winfrey |
| Karl F. Poehlmann | Theodore R. Frederick |
| James F. Byrne | William A. Dolan, Jr. |
| William G. Cooper | Theodore C. Aylward |
| William L. Anderson | Eugene F. May |
| Etheridge Grant | William T. Jones |
| Clarence W. McClusky, Jr. | William Miller |
| Wendell F. Kline | William R. Smedberg 3d |
| Donald L. Mills | Francis L. Busey |
| Samuel M. Tucker | John P. Fitzsimmons |
| Clifford H. Duerfeldt | William R. Hollingsworth |
| Paul W. Watson | |
| Louis E. French | James E. Leeper |
| Clarence O. Taff | Ford N. Taylor, Jr. |

Roy A. Gano
Robert R. Johnson
William K. Romoser
Edward L. B. Weimer
John E. Fradd
Robert B. Ellis
Ralph S. Clarke
Valery Havard, Jr.
Charles W. Moses
Robert S. Purvis
Gordon Campbell
Fondville L. Tedder
Gerald D. Zurmuehlen
John A. Glick
Gordon A. McLean
Robert G. Armstrong
John G. Foster, Jr.
Baron G. Lowrey
Joe B. Paschal
Ranson Fullinwider
John L. Woodbury
Charles Jackson
Henry T. Dietrich
Walter L. Dyer
Edward S. Hutchinson
Kenneth Craig
Oscar Pederson
Charles T. Singleton, Jr.
Lawrence H. Martin
Charles E. Crombe, Jr.
Laurence H. Frost
Leonard J. Dow
Paul L. Dudley
Burnham C. McCaffree
Eugene S. Karpe
Jacob E. Cooper
Luther K. Reynolds
Louis E. Gunther
Charles J. Whiting

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Omar J. Brown
John R. Weisser
Kenneth H. Vinnedge
Milton R. Wirthlin
Thenton D. Boaz
Frank P. Gilmore
Paul Vaughn
Carr E. Bentel
William L. Berkley
Norris M. Hardisty
Gerard B. Creagh
Anselm C. Hohn
Craig B. Johnson

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Fred L. Haerlin
Norman A. Helfrich
Lysle W. Cease
Mark W. Clay

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Edward B. Harp, Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Clifford E. Allen
Raymond A. Lowry

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the line of the Navy:

Thomas K. Kimmel
Sydney S. Sherby
Ellis B. Orr
Archibald E. Teall
William Blenman
Otis R. Cole, Jr.
James J. Southerland II
Robert "W" McElrath
Charles S. Manning, Jr.
Thomas B. Dabney
Richard R. Bradley, Jr.
James H. Barnard II
Sherman "E" Wright, Jr.
Delmer F. Quackenbush, Jr.
Warfield C. Bennett, Jr.
Parker L. Folsom
Joseph A. Coppola
Henry A. Romberg
James R. Hansen
John N. Boland
Fitzhugh L. Palmer, Jr.
Bennett C. Oelheim
Harry A. Barnard, Jr.
John V. Noel, Jr.
Hoyt D. Mann
George H. Whiting
Malcolm C. McGrath
Frank G. Law
Paul E. Summers
Gilven M. Slonim
William A. Ellis
Donald G. Gumz
Paul C. Stimson
Everett M. Link, Jr.
Charles E. Houston
Marshall F. Thompson
Richard R. Pratt
Joseph B. Icenhower
Gordon Fowler
Frank E. Hayler
John K. Fyfe
James W. McCauley
Ed R. King
Bruce R. Ware, III
Robert H. Caldwell, Jr.
James B. Rutter, Jr.
John H. Carmichael
Daniel McE. Entler, Jr.
James W. O'Grady
Harlan G. Kirkpatrick
Robert C. Morton
Harry F. Holmshaw
Robert F. Kelly
Fred D. Michael
Donald G. Dockum
William H. Shea, Jr.
Norman C. Gillette, Jr.
Richard L. Fowler
William H. Wright
Ormond G. Sexton, III
Walter W. Boyd
John R. Millett
Renfro Turner, Jr.
William J. Lederer, Jr.
Richard A. Teel
Paul H. Bjarnason
Thomas W. Samuel
Paul B. Ryan
Jasper N. McDonald
John J. Kircher
Ray S. Thompson, Jr.
Ralph R. Humes
Edward E. Hoffman
Charles M. Holcombe
Oliver N. Fowler
Carlos L. Dean
William C. Mott
Francis A. Klaveness
James L. Foley
Charles K. Hutchison
Elliott M. West
Vincent F. Casey
John J. Lynch
Edgar E. Stebbins
Jack B. Dawley
Harry E. Cook, Jr.
Joseph A. Gage, Jr.
James O. Taylor
Forrest A. Roby, Jr.
Brendon J. Moynahan
William R. Staggs
Harry W. Harrison, Jr.
Ben Moore, Jr.
John P. Sager
William H. Hilands
Hawley Russell
Pliny G. Holt
Paul C. Griggs
John H. Pennoyer
Charles J. Eastman
Aram Y. Parunak
Alfred L. Gurney
Glenn W. Okerson
Harold H. Hirschy
James L. Skinner
Gordon E. Bolser
James W. Klopp
Eugene R. Dare
Charles H. Franklin
William C. Dunn
Howard M. Avery
Robert L. Eldridge
William G. Von Bracht
Richard L. Friede
Alfred I. Boyd, Jr.
Ernest L. Simpson, Jr.
Richard G. Touart
Gordon R. Fiss
Algernon S. Joyner, Jr.
Ramond C. Ericson
Thomas R. Langley
Paul W. Card
Oscar E. Loeser, Jr.
Philip A. Tague, Jr.
Curtis A. Myers
William I. Darnell
Alfred M. Aichel
Earl H. Pope
Edwin G. Conley
Charles F. Phillips
Alvin Robinson
Clarence F. Clark
Donald I. Mather
George H. Chapman, Jr.
Frank E. Blackmore
Joseph T. Thornton, Jr.
George P. Huff
Julius E. Smith, Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

John E. Nardini
Martin Cooperman
Alvin J. Paulosky
Vernon E. Martens
Otto C. Baumgarten
Bruce L. Kendall
Harry T. Stradford
DeSales G. DuVigneaud
Paul Deranian
William J. James
Phillips L. Claud
Elvin E. Keeton
Ferdinand V. Berley
James Crawford
Hugh V. O'Connell
Leonard H. Barber
Horace D. Warden
Edward T. Byrne
Jacob G. Hebble 3d
John H. Moser
John H. Cox
LeRoy L. Kenney
Marvin M. McLean
Harold H. Hill
Roy E. Crowder
Harold D. Giddings
Wesley Fry
Rexel Goodman
Robert E. Henderson
Harold F. Thompson
Walter W. Gilbert
George M. Lynch
John S. Hanten
John S. Gruggel
Arthur B. R. Smith
Miles C. Krepela
James H. Gillen, Jr.
Jack Warren
Edward A. Hynes
Robert B. Shepardson
Bernard I. Kahn
Roger A. James
John R. Cavanagh
Ferold D. Lovejoy
Sidney A. Britten
William F. Lyons
Edgar F. Hooker
Paul W. Carrigan
Alexander N. Chaffin
Graham R. Johnston
Sidney F. Johnston
Leo W. Olechowski
Edward H. Taylor
George N. Schiff

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

William J. Johnston
Martin Miller
Edgar D. Vestel, Jr.
Billy Johnson
William M. Huey, Jr.
Elton W. Sutherling
John D. Hyerle
Norbert C. Brady
Marcus A. Peel, Jr.
Stanton M. Trott
Irwin S. Moore
Richard E. Winslow, Jr.
Avery A. Pabst
James N. Witherell

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

John P. Murphy
James E. Davis
Raymond C. Hohenstein

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

John W. Gordanier
Richard E. Harris
Howard M. Lloyd
Jack G. Dodd
Gerald Q. Thacker
Roscoe A. Davidson
Clemens E. Spellman
Frank L. Endebrock
Kenneth M. West
John C. Sease
Richard W. Smith
Weston M. Johnson
Frank C. Tyrrell
George M. Gans
Samuel K. Wilson
John P. Roulett, Jr.
Robert B. Morris
William O. Treber
James F. Cunniff
Lattimer W. Reeder
Roscoe E. Van Liew
Edward H. Feldmann

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Sidney C. Liedman
Richard J. H. Stanton
Wilson P. Kemp
Richard C. Shaw
Theodore A. Lesney
Howard B. McKinney
William R. Stanmeyer
Harry B. McInnis
Robert A. Colby
William J. Charm
George R. Reynolds
Fred E. Goodell
Walter B. Lett
Clyde L. Martin

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Richard H. Lee

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy:

Richard H. Hart
Wylie M. Hunt
Charles W. Rainwater
John W. Mason, Jr.
Walter L. Fisher
Claude R. Frazier
William A. Rawls
George H. Sult
Shelby C. Gass, Jr.
William T. Amen
Jimmie E. Savage
Harris O. Torgerson
Robert B. Blodgett
Greenville R. Berkeley, Jr.
Mottrom J. Ball
Lawrence Kelley
Laurence L. Hamrick
Richard H. Shireman, Jr.
Arthur C. Cason
Samuel L. White
Bernard Amman
Chester D. Rogers
James L. Daily
Paul J. Siegel
James D. Taylor
Carl L. Speirs
Jewell S. Fahlgren
Andreas P. Anderson
Richard Z. Hughes
Harold C. Stirling
Ralph S. Taylor
Hollier G. Tomlin
Henry Suerstedt, Jr.
John C. O'Connor
Thomas R. McKelvey, Jr.
John C. Coulthard
George F. Nasworthy
Robert H. Jennings
Paul B. Garrison
Ciro N. V. Whited, Jr.
Paul E. Pugh
John D. Carter, Jr.
John M. Breen
Jesse T. Barker
William E. McLaughlin
Clarence B. Gregg
Bennie W. Jones, Jr.
Robert J. Beaudine
Willard D. Dietz
Richard D. Warner
Edmund W. Creekmore
Lester D. Olson
Nicholas Brango
Leslie J. Carr
Frederick M. Rountree
Bradford M. Dyer
Charles J. Schroeder
Robert J. Hunt
William S. Adami
Gaylord T. Forrest
Frank E. Standring
Archie L. Mills
Ferdinand J. Plumer
Albert J. Mayer
Samuel H. Dinsmore
Lauris J. Leary
Samuel W. Forrer
James A. Downs
Harley F. Thompson
William B. Craig
Charles S. Tanner
Dwight D. Nott
Marvin L. Ramsey
Lawrence E. Flint, Jr.
Rodger R. H. Lade
Harold E. Belew
Lawrence H. Reagan
James L. Harlan
Elbert O. Berns
William T. Sorensen
Matthew R. Gromada
Robert I. Myers
Claredon H. Sigley
William B. Garrison, Jr
Harold L. Buell
John H. Bahlman
William M. Laird
Roy S. Reeves
Francis B. Mooney
John H. Bear
Patrick E. Russell
James L. Naftzger
Arthur E. Simmons
Frederick N. Conyne
Phillip G. Marquart
Alan M. Thewlis
Robert W. Laughead
Wayne T. Wilcox, Jr.
Thomas R. Wheaton
Francis X. Timmes
Gaines B. Turner
Orville W. J. Dryer
Chester F. Rief
William D. Baird
Gordon M. Riddick
Wayne R. Waters
James R. P. Gotch

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Benn A. Fairchild
Edmund G. Oelkers
Paul J. Loegel
Richard B. Murto, Jr.
William Ward
Ernest M. Joyce
Ernest W. Rogers
James M. Williams

| | |
|---|---|
| Clark Dunn | Goff E. Manuel |
| Joseph H. Lillis | John A. Hagan |
| Edgar M. Brown | Dallas E. Kellum |
| Merwood R. Bishop | Paul Tasker |
| Walter C. Chapman | David E. Fay |

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Richard W. Ricker
Howard A. Seymour
James E. Reaves

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| David E. Rogers | Harry C. Wills |
| Harold I. Taylor, Jr. | Verne M. Tregonis |
| Samuel C. Gill, Jr. | |

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Rupert S. Walker | George E. Dudley |
| Furman L. Sheppard | James G. Rogers, Jr. |
| Arthur J. Loring | |

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Albert M. Gulledge

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Nellie M. Quinn | Teresa M. Duggan |
| Gladys Smith | Anna L. Welsko |

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 13, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Everlasting God, the Father of all men, we pray that our responsibility to our country may be revealed through our thoughts, our speech, and our works. Give us, O God, a faith that will not shrink from criticism, that seeks to do our whole duty to our people.

Whatever hardship may be entailed, make our daily procedure altogether worthy of the confidence of our fellow men. O come richly and abundantly to our beloved homeland, with a tremendous surging of brotherhood in the soul of our Republic. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 10, 1949, was read and approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. SOMERS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

### EXEMPTION FROM TAX OF CERTAIN TICKETS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight next Saturday to file a report on House Joint Resolution 85.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I am not going to object, will the gentleman from North Carolina explain what this joint resolution seeks to do?

Mr. DOUGHTON. This House joint resolution exempts from tax amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Programs on the occasion of the inauguration of the President of the United States in January 1949.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have a little explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is a resolution similar to what has been passed on other occasions. It has been introduced and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The Committee on Ways and Means will consider it. This is a unanimous-consent request that the committee have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What is the request?

Mr. McCORMACK. That the committee have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. To file a report respecting what?

Mr. McCORMACK. Respecting the resolution which would exempt from the payment of the miscellaneous tax sales of tickets sold in connection with the ceremonies relating to the inaugural by the Inaugural Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman tell the House why these tickets should be exempted from taxation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that question will be discussed later.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I trust the gentleman from Ohio will not object. This is simply a request to file a report by Saturday night, a request that has been made many times by legislative committees, and the practice is one that has always been followed so far as I know.

Now, whether or not action should be taken on it afterward is a question to be determined by the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. My purpose is to bring before the House the underlying purpose and the real facts relating to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask whether this just applies to tickets for seats or does it include many other exemptions other than tickets?

Mr. McCORMACK. It applies to admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

Mr. RICH. How far does it go beyond the sale of tickets for seats along the parade route?

Mr. McCORMACK. Without committing myself, that will be brought out later, but I should imagine it would probably apply to the inaugural ball and only official activities authorized by the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, which has been officially appointed for the purpose.

Mr. RICH. If it does apply to more than seats along the parade route, are we going to have an opportunity to know about those things before we vote?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that we are getting ready to inaugurate a Democratic President on a Republican platform.

That platform was built to inaugurate Mr. Dewey on, and it cost a great deal of money.

Therefore, these tickets are rather high; and this measure is designed to lighten the burden of the individuals who come to witness the inauguration.

Mr. RICH. Then they ought to pay a tax on these tickets, in order to help defray the expenses of the inauguration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I have for today be vacated and that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 hour on Monday next following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of deceitful propaganda.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House for 15 minutes today following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, numerous reports have reached me in the last few days that hotels in Washington are overcharging for rooms during the period of the inauguration. I do not know whether rates have been raised generally, and

it may be that only a few hotels are overcharging. I know of one instance where a friend of mine from down in our district was quoted a price, for two ordinary adjoining rooms, of $38 per room, $76 per day, with a requirement for a minimum of 3 days' occupancy and an advance deposit of $200. I personally know that the price so quoted is at least four or five times the amount ordinarily charged.

If the hotels in Washington are overcharging visitors to the inauguration the facts should be ascertained and the practice exposed. Washington is the one city that belongs to all the people of our country and is the seat of the Government of all the people. And, therefore, Washington, of all places, should treat fairly the citizens who visit it. And to such hotels as may be charging exorbitant rates I should like to propound the question—Are you trying to keep the people who elected President Truman from seeing him inaugurated or shall we interpret your action as merely an invitation to the Congress to place hotel rates in Washington under rent control?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table today, and any other special orders, I may be permitted to proceed for 40 minutes on the subject of air power in the 1950 budget.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE ARTHUR D. HEALEY

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with keen regret that I inform the House of the death of a former Member and my immediate predecessor from the Eighth Massachusetts District, Hon. Arthur D. Healey. He passed away on September 16, 1948, in Somerville, Mass., the city of his birth and in which he had always lived.

Judge Healey was born December 29, 1889. He attended the public schools, was a graduate of the Somerville Latin School, and attended Dartmouth College. He later graduated from the Boston University Law School with the degree of LL. B. and began the practice of law in Boston with his brother, Robert T. Healey, under the firm name of Healey & Healey. He served in the infantry in the First World War, rising to the rank of lieutenant.

Upon the retirement of Congressman Charles L. Underhill, Arthur Healey was elected to succeed him in the Seventy-third Congress. He was reelected to the Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses. He served on the Committee on the Judiciary and later on the Committee on Ways and Means, and it was mainly due to his efforts on the Judiciary Committee that legislation recommended by President Roosevelt and the Department of Justice was drafted into law to meet the crime wave then challenging the Government. Together with the late Senator David I. Walsh, he was one of the authors of the Walsh-Healey Act setting up fair labor standards for all Government contracts. He served also as a member of the Dies Committee on Un-American Activities, and although much interested in the work of that committee he was a frequent critic of the methods of the committee in the conduct of its hearings.

While serving in his fifth term as a Congressman he was appointed to the United States district court by the late President Roosevelt. As a judge on the Federal bench he exhibited the same capacity for industry and devotion to duty which characterized his earlier service in Congress. He was a kindly and sincere man possessed of the highest personal qualities and earned a reputation of being an able judge who was unfailingly just in his dealings with all who came before him.

He was married to Tresla Fisher, who survives him together with four children, Robert, Arthur Daniel, Jr., Elaine, and Ruth Mary. I know that I speak for all of his former colleagues in the House in expressing sympathy to his splendid family, who will take consolation from the fact that a devoted husband and father has bequeathed to them the priceless legacy of having crowded into 58 years of life so much of notable achievement as to make up a respected and honored career in the service of city, State, and Nation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the death of Arthur Healey is indeed a very sad one to those of us who served with him and who knew him. It is particularly so to me because of the very close personal friendship that existed between us during a lifetime in professional life, as well as his service in this body and in his distinguished career as a United States district judge in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Arthur Healey was one of the most sincere and conscientious Members I have ever served with, a man devoted not only to his work in this body, but also to his work on the bench, a judicial position he occupied with great distinction for several years prior to his death. Every one of us who served with him will always remember his genial personality, as well as his serious and sincere character. He was really an outstanding Member of this body. He was the author of several bills so properly referred to by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN], bills which benefited the average person in this country, bills which made great contributions to the progress of our country.

In a sense it may be said that he died in line of duty. I remember that about a year and a half or 2 years prior to his death he suffered a shock. His condition remained serious for some time, but being of a determined spirit he went back to his judicial duties as quickly as he could, and labored in the performance of his work. I am satisfied that his devotion to the duties of his office aggravated his condition and precipitated his death. The entire Massachusetts delegation, and I particularly as a member thereof, join the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN] in expressing to Mrs. Healey and her fine family our profound sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. It is indeed distressing to learn of the demise of Arthur Healey. I served with him over many a stormy period in this House. He was a distinguished Member of this body and later became a most exemplary jurist. He was beloved by all who came in contact with him. He was able, selfless, intelligent, hard-working. Well might we say with the prophet Micah that he did justice, he loved mercy, and he walked humbly before his God. Our condolences go to his widow and dear ones.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I wish to add to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], and the gentleman from Massachusetts who just yielded to me, had to say about Judge Arthur Healey. When Judge Healey first came to the Seventy-third Congress he served a portion of the district I now have the honor of representing. I know that the people of Somerville and the surrounding areas all held him in the same high regard when he was first a Congressman as they did later when he served them as judge. I know I reflect the feelings of all the people in my district in expressing my regrets at the untimely passing of Judge Healey. His progressive and humanitarian service in the Congress of the United States has been indelibly imprinted on the Nation's statute books, in the many laws, such as the Walsh-Healey Act, which bear his name as author or coauthor.

In his role as judge, he upheld to the fullest the standards of humaneness, fairness, and justice.

Arthur Healey was indeed the ideal public servant.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. I served here in this body with Arthur Healey, and it delights me to be able to testify to the high standing and to the high favor in which he was regarded by his associates. He was a man of extraordinary ability, always faithful and devoted in the discharge of the duties that devolved upon him as a public servant.

I regarded him very highly, as did all of my associates who come from the section of the country that I represent. He was a good citizen, he was a fine man, he was a man of profound convictions, deep faith, and he contributed much to the solution of the problems with which the country was afflicted at that time.

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also that any Members who desire may extend their remarks on the late Judge Healey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered today I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement issued on November 21, 1948, by the bishops of the United States.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Boston Post.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the text of the message of the Governor of Montana to the legislature of that State. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.25, but I ask that it be printed, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Miami Daily News.

Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the West Virginia plan for veterans' housing.

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by C. W. Warren, of Mill Spring, Mo., taken from the Wayne County Journal-Banner, of Piedmont, Mo.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement in the form of a paid advertisement appearing in the New York Times of January 11, 1949.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report of the Fair Employment Practices Commission of the State of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two letters and an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable Alf M. Landon.

Mr. CAVALCANTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include editorials appearing in the Evening Standard, Uniontown.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by J. R. Breed, president, the University Bank, Kansas City, Mo., entitled "'Gimme' Checks" and also "Fifty-two Reasons Why Something Is Wrong 'When.'"

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE VOLUNTARY ALLOCATION PROGRAM

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to continue the authority of the President with respect to the making of voluntary agreements for the allocation of scarce materials.

This authority was given the President by the Eightieth Congress, but expires on March 1, 1949.

It is my judgment that the allocation of scarce materials by voluntary agreements has been a good thing. In a peacetime economy, it is the proper approach to such a problem. It provides for the Government to assist business in an advisory and helpful manner, rather than swinging a big club to require conformity with rigid, incentive-stifling red tape.

As late as July 1, 1948, the President wrote Secretary Sawyer, stating that he did not consider it appropriate to invoke the mandatory authority over steel, and requested the development of voluntary programs for the armed forces requirements.

With production rising in all lines of manufacturing, it would seem even more true today that the voluntary method is still appropriate. That in spite of the idea of price control, rationing, and mandatory allocations presented by the Fair Deal, we should insist that this program be given an opportunity to succeed. It is important that the Congress act at once on this measure. The termination date of the present law—March 1, 1949—has caused a lag in the program. The industrial processes involved must be planned on the basis of a fairly long period, and the uncertain future of the law has made negotiations difficult. I hope this bill will receive early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

STEEL OPERATIONS EXPECTED TO SET RECORD

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD on steel operations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the country's steel industry this week expects to achieve the greatest weekly production in history, the American Iron and Steel Institute announced on January 10, 1949. The output is expected to reach 1,830,600 net tons of ingots and steel for castings, surpassing by 26,300 tons the previous weekly record established in the week of November 29, 1948.

The anticipated production for the current week compares with 1,802,500 tons last week and a month ago, and with 1,723,200 tons in the week of January 12, 1948.

The industry's operating rate this week is computed on the revised capacity of 96,120,930 tons annually. Based on this new estimate, the rate will be 99.3 percent, compared with the revised figure of 97.8 percent last week, with 100 percent a month ago and 95.6 percent a

year ago on the former, lower capacity. The 1948 capacity was 94,233,460 tons annually.

In 1948, 88,509,033 tons were actually produced. Average annual output was 93.9 percent of potential capacity. The best year so far was 1944, when the wartime peak of 89,600,000 tons was produced.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, I was given permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Admiral Holloway. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES CLUB

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on next Monday night, January 17, the Congressional Secretaries Club, which is composed of our office staffs, is presenting their first program of the year at the Department of Commerce auditorium. The program is in the nature of a welcome to incoming secretaries, Members of Congress and their families.

Beginning promptly at 8 o'clock, the program will feature an address by the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force symphony orchestra and glee club. Films depicting the operation of the Berlin air lift will also be presented. The subject of Mr. Symington's talk will be The New Department of the Air Force.

This event will be of special interest to all new Members of this House. I wish that every Member could see the Berlin lift in operation—short of that—I wish all could see this picture.

It is truly a stupendous spectacle.

There will be a gala musical event featuring the 90-piece Air Force Band, which will close the evening's meeting.

In behalf of the Congressional Secretaries Club, of which my able secretary, Merrill Winslett, is president, I invite all Members of the Senate and of the House, their wives and families to enjoy with our office staffs the talk of our Secretary of the United States Air Force—to see the great picture of the Berlin lift and close the evening by enjoying a splendid musical treat given by the Air Force Band, acknowledgedly one of America's greatest symphony bands.

As you know, the Congressional Secretaries Club, established many years ago, is an organization made up of the secretaries and other employees in the offices of the Members of both Houses of Congress. The objective of the organization is to assemble and disseminate information with respect to governmental departments, agency procedures, policies and all other factual information which might be helpful in the operation of their offices and the discharge of their duties to their respective Representatives and Senators.

The purpose of the Congressional Secretaries Club is primarily educational. During the first 2 months of each new session a series of lectures is given by the veteran members of the club. These lectures are followed by discussion period in order to afford all new secretaries and others in their staffs an opportunity of informing themselves how best to make departmental and other facilities available to their use. Discussions cover all manner of subjects with respect to correspondence, the dissemination of literature, booklets, and other items which make for the most efficient operation of their congressional offices.

The club meetings have long been patronized by members of the President's Cabinet and other top-flight departmental executives and diplomatic officials who intimately discuss, not alone the objectives of their several departments, but ways and means of developing closer cooperation between the legislative offices here on Capitol Hill and all governmental activities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by a prominent San Francisco attorney on socialized medicine.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a definition of success.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances, one with regard to a bill he is introducing, and in two instances to include extraneous material.

Mr. COLE of New York (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Representative HERTER which appeared in the January issue of Nation's Business and is captioned "Everybody is for it, but."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered at the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the first national forest in the Black Hills.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short item.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article on the water problems of California.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the former Governor of Maine to the National Convention of Grangers.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I join with a distinguished member of Britain's House of Commons in concern over the consequences of the British Government's Palestine policy, and urge the British people not to be "Bevinized" in the current British-Israeli crisis. In other words, not to let hurt feelings over loss of the Palestine mandate, and attendant trying events, prevail over the best interests of Great Britain and the world in attaining a secure and peaceful Middle East.

Anthony Eden, in a speech yesterday, asked why the RAF carried out reconnaissance over an Israeli-Egyptian battle area, and what useful purpose it could serve. I am asking the same and other questions of our State Department in a resolution of inquiry which I am introducing, not intended, in any sense, as critical of our State Department, which has kept to an even-handed course in this crisis, but only intended to adduce for all our people a clear exposition of the facts.

There have been a number of truce resolutions by the United Nations Security Council since July of this year, and regardless of conflicting claims on violation of the truces, it is a fact that Israel and Egypt had already agreed to sit down with the United Nations mediator to negotiate an armistice, when British air forces appeared over an Israeli-Egyptian battle area and brought on the latest crisis. In this way the British Government by its action gave the impression of putting itself athwart the hopes for peace. Let us hope that Egypt and Israel will proceed, nonetheless, to consummate their armistice and to seek to attain a general peace in the Middle East.

BEVIN'S PETULANCE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Ernest Bevin's actions toward Israel are wicked, and President Truman deserves praise for his refusal to countenance Bevin's blustering and bellicose posturing. Even Anthony Eden has condemned Bevin and has indicated that the British had no right to be over the battle area in Palestine. One of the pilots who bailed out admitted that he was over Israeli territory. Bevin offers the excuse that they are giving aid under the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty. But Egypt has repudiated this document and has asked the United Nations to have it abrogated. Despite solemn warning by President Truman, Bevin is employing British armed might in the Mediterranean at Aqaba and Cyprus, which undoubtedly jeopardizes peace negotiations between Israel and Egypt.

There can be no hope of achieving stability in the Middle East with the continuance of Mr. Bevin's personal war against Israel. Achieving stability there is a matter of vital concern to the United States.

THE PLIGHT OF INVESTMENT CAPITAL

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, in the midst of all the arguments that have been taking place with respect to the President's budget, it is indeed refreshing to read an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of Wednesday, written by Eleanor Roosevelt, entitled "Investment Capital Is Getting Harder and Harder to Find."

I commend this article to the attention of my friends on the right, and to my colleagues on the left, as a statement emanating from one of our great leaders in America, indicating the problems that lie ahead when we consider the legislative program submitted by the President.

The article is as follows:

INVESTMENT CAPITAL IS GETTING HARDER AND HARDER TO FIND

(By Eleanor Roosevelt)

Tuesday.—One of the leading newspapers points out that among President Truman's economic advisers there seems to be less concern about the financial return to those who have capital to invest and who live on the income derived from that investment than there is consideration of the proper level of farm prices and the proper return to labor.

This always has been one of the most delicate balances that anyone guiding the financial interests of the country has had to make.

It is essential to a high level of employment that it be profitable for capital to be invested not just in safe enterprise but in new and untried enterprises.

There must be incentive for this, particularly in times of peace. In times of war, when many men are risking their lives at the battle fronts, many others are willing to risk their money to do whatever is necessary for the well-being of the country. However, in times of peace there is not the same patriotic motive with which to prod capital into productive enterprise and, therefore, incentives must be found.

Some of our biggest investors—such as trust companies, banks, and insurance companies—are limited by law in their investments in order to safeguard those whose money they are using. Therefore, if we expect to develop new enterprises, to employ more people and to have more buying power, there must always be available capital from the individual investors. This is getting harder and harder to find today.

It is of vital interest, of course, to the farmer and the wage earner that the things they have to buy keep on increasing in cost, because even though wages go up and farm prices go up they never seem quite to cover the increased cost of living brought about by inflation and the passing on to the public of whatever costs have been imposed on the manufacturer.

Therefore, it is going to be necessary, it seems to me, to examine everything not only with an eye to what we would like to do, but with the constant thought before us of what the essentials are that must be done.

The preservation of the credit of our Government is of vital importance to us and to the world as a whole, and while I believe there are many things in our program, as outlined by the President, that are essential and will help to bring us prosperity, I think even the best of them should be weighed with the viewpoint of their essentiality in attaining the objectives that we have before us. These objectives are rehabilitation in the world at large and stability and strength in our own economic system at home.

These ends should never be forgotten and their importance should be explained to the people as each step is taken in this carefully balanced program which alone will see us through the difficulties of the next few years.

INCREASING SALARIES OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address my remarks principally to the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]. He has always been fair with me and I want to be fair with him, in this respect, because I understand they are going to bring a bill in here asking that unanimous consent be given to increase the salaries of Government officials.

I think we should increase the President's salary if it is necessary, but I think that we are doing wrong when we bring in a bill asking for $50,000 on top of a $40,000 expense account, making $90,000, as part of salary with no accounting. The President is now advocating the greatest expenditure of Government funds. He is not advocating a balanced budget. His budget for spending is $873,000,000 more than our income for 1950.

I think the President of the United States should pay taxes the same as everybody else in the country, especially when he is asking for a budget that is $873,000,000 out of balance. He should feel the pinch of taxes just the same as everybody else. I want the majority leader to know that I am not going to let that bill come up by unanimous consent. I give him that notice now so that he can prepare some way to get the legislation in here, if he wants it to pass. I say give the President a $200,000 salary, if that is what he needs, but do not grant a $50,000 expense account plus the $40,000 expense account he now gets. It does not make sense. No wonder he is so anxious to spend other people's money, no wonder he wants to tax everybody else. Let him have some of his own medicine, in the form of taxes. Suppose a president of a corporation recommended the great spending of corporate funds, much more than the corporation takes in, do you think the stockholders would permit it? If they did not arrange for a balanced budget sometime they would go into bankruptcy. The stockholders would not elect a board of directors that would have such a president. The stockholders would clean house with such a board of directors. Therefore, I feel it my duty to stop the Congress from doing the same thing to our President of the United States, from spending, spending, spending. I feel it my duty to stop it if I can, and I will always do my duty to my constituents, God being my helper.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HUBER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence and in another instance to include another article.

FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—(H. DOC. NO. 39)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the Unted States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith a report by the Acting Secretary of State, showing all receipts and disbursements on account of refunds, allowances, and annuities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, in connection with the Foreign Service retirement and disability system as required by section 862, Foreign Service Act of 1946 (Public Law 724).

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

(Enclosure: Report concerning retirement and disability fund, Foreign Service.)

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF PHILIPPINE ALIEN PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by

the Clerk and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the First Annual Report for the Philippine Alien Property Administration for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 13, 1949.*

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the ground upon which he seeks recognition on a question of personal privilege.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, before dawn on the morning of December 1, 1948, at the factory of the Shakespeare Co., located at Kalamazoo, Mich., where a picket line was being maintained by local 3619, USA–CIO, there was violence.

The Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, was authorized and directed by the chairman of the committee, the Honorable Fred A. Hartley, Jr., to proceed to Kalamazoo and to hold hearings to ascertain, among other things, whether the so-called Taft-Hartley Act was adequate, was being enforced, or whether the act should be amended.

The Member so designated proceeded to Kalamazoo, held hearings there on the 4th and 6th. Thereafter, and on the 14th day of December 1948, the Kalamazoo Gazette, a newspaper published at Kalamazoo and circulated in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, the southwestern part of Michigan, and the northern part of Indiana, on the front page published a picture of the Honorable JOHN LESINSKI, Member of Congress from the Sixteenth District of Michigan, and under the picture were the words: "Representative JOHN LESINSKI ponders riot probe. Then followed a news story captioned, "HOFFMAN's quiz lashed by LESINSKI—Next House labor chairman speaks here."

The news story continued:

> Representative JOHN LESINSKI, ranking Democratic member of the House Labor Committee and slated to become its next chairman, last night lashed out at Representative CLARE HOFFMAN's investigation of the December 1 mob attack on the Shakespeare plants and said he may conduct his own congressional investigation.
>
> He declared that HOFFMAN had "no more authority than a rabbit" in conducting the recent investigation.

Further along in that news story are these words in bold-faced type: "Slaps at HOFFMAN." Those words were followed by the statement: "Representative LESINSKI called Representative HOFFMAN 'a pimp of Joe Stalin.'"

That statement, published in the Kalamazoo Gazette, reflects upon the integrity, the patriotism, in his official capacity as Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. It tends to subject him to ridicule and contempt. It charges that he, acting in his Representative capacity and as a member of a standing committee of the House, was guilty of unpatriotic, disloyal conduct.

The SPEAKER. The Chair believes the gentleman from Michigan has stated grounds for addressing the House on a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this is a most unpleasant situation. It is one which I would like to avoid. But there should be, there must be, a limit to what can be printed and said about a Member of Congress.

This incident reflects upon the integrity of the House. It is a charge that there is in the House of Representatives an agent of a foreign government, a government commonly known as a potential enemy, a government with which we are waging a cold war; a Member the House permits to act as an agent of one of its committees.

It is a situation which calls for plain-speaking, the use of simple, understandable words.

It is a charge which, so far as it involves me personally, I will take care of at the proper time, in the proper way, before the proper tribunal. But because it is something more than a personal matter and because, as stated, it reflects upon the integrity of the House itself, this time is being used to warn the Members of Congress, and especially those who are serving a first term, of what they may expect if they oppose certain groups, politically powerful.

Members of the House have on occasion—and rightly—expressed a great deal of sympathy and indignation for individuals in the executive branch of the Government, who, it was charged, were smeared by a congressional committee. Have they any rebuke for those who in this instance seek to smear one of their colleagues?

Perhaps the greatest safeguard protecting the liberty of the people, the welfare of the Nation, is a free press, the right to speak freely.

The greatest danger to the citizen's liberty and the security of the Nation is false propaganda, designed to undermine the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives, in their existing form of government.

Notwithstanding the fact that we in this country have more of everything that contributes to prosperity, freedom and happiness, too many of us are inclined to listen to and follow the words and thoughts of those of and from other lands, where the people have less of everything that is desirable.

Communists seeking to destroy us find propaganda one of their most available and effective weapons.

For so long have radio commentators, editors, propagandists, unfairly criticized the Congress of the United States and its individual Members, that many newspapers, not realizing the effect upon Members of Congress of the unjustifiable and often untrue statements reflecting upon their ability, their sincerity, and their loyalty, have perhaps inadvertently given publicity to propaganda which was designed to, which does, shake the confidence of the people in their chosen representatives and in the Congress as a whole.

Elected to the Eighty-first Congress are 94 Members of the House who are now serving their first term. Twenty-two Members who formerly served in the House were elected in November.

It is to give to my colleagues who are serving their first term some warning of what they may expect from some critics that this time is taken.

A week ago today, the Supreme Court of the United States decided that the laws of two States, the constitution of another State, which protected the right of the individual who did not belong to a labor organization to earn his livelihood in the sweat of his face, were within the power of the States to enact, the right of the people to adopt.

The fact that it became necessary for the Supreme Court to render such a decision is most astounding. From the beginning of human existence, every individual who stopped to think knew that, if man would eat, wear, clothing, be protected from the elements, he must work.

But the decision was necessary, for, in this country, there has grown up in the last few years the theory that, to exercise his right to work, the individual must join, pay the initiation fees, dues, and special assessments prescribed by organizations which have no authority to limit a man's right to work, but which have been successful in doing just that.

Because, for more than 13 years, I have opposed that theory, fought for the right of a man to work when and where he wished, attempts have repeatedly been made to coerce and intimidate me, to force me to cast my vote here in the House in favor of or against certain bills. The alternative offered was political execution.

Because those attempts, the methods employed, and the procedure followed by certain politically powerful organizations in a campaign against me run parallel to those employed by the same organizations to deprive a man of his right to work, which the laws of some States and the constitution of one State recently outlawed, it is my purpose to point out to my colleagues some of the things they may expect if they vote contrary to the orders of the CIO.

The nonunion man, sometimes the union employee, who wishes to work in a struck factory, is oftentimes by massed pickets barred from his place of employment. If he attempts to force his way through a picket line, he is pushed and shoved, and sometimes beaten.

If it appears that the picket line is unable to keep men from work, then often in comes the goon squad.

What is a goon squad? Usually it is a gang numbering anywhere from 25 or 50 to one or several hundred big, able-bodied individuals, some of them apparently professional bruisers. They come sometimes from other factories, sometimes from other communities and cities, sometimes from other States. Sometimes they travel a hundred miles or more. For example, in the sit-down strikes in Michigan in 1937, some came in from Atlanta, Ga. In the Galion strikes in Ohio, some came from Buffalo, N. Y.

When they arrive on the scene the officers are defied, court orders are ignored, property is destroyed, and individuals are beaten.

Those are the methods employed to prevent a man from working, to deprive a man of an available job.

Now, how do these same organizations get at a Congressman? They do not beat him physically. Is it just possible that they are afraid of public opinion? Is it possible that they think he might be armed and oppose force with force? The goons seldom act except in a cowardly manner, when they have overwhelming force available.

No, they do not physically beat up a Congressman. They assail his reputation. They attempt to smear him. They lie about him. They vilify him. They try to humiliate him and the members of his family.

Sometimes they go into his district, as on one occasion they came into mine and put out two pamphlets with cartoons containing many false charges.

Some of their agents and sympathizers falsely assail him over the radio, in public meetings which are reported, as in the case to which I am now referring, in the daily press.

When picket lines are unable to stop returning workers at the factory gates, on occasion their sympathizers go to the worker's home, throw bricks through his windows, call his wife or members of his family over the phone and threaten them with bodily injury, sometimes with death.

The character assassins of the CIO likewise seek to reach a man through his family. They give utterance to and cause to be printed charges which bring grief, shame, and humiliation to his wife, to his children—yes, and in some cases, to his grandchildren.

And that was the method that was employed at Kalamazoo. Permit me to tell you something about that situation.

On September 7, 1948, local No. 3619, United Steelworkers of America, CIO, of Kalamazoo, Mich., called a strike against Shakespeare Co. and Shakespeare Products Co., two corporations engaged in manufacturing fishing tackle and automobile accessories. A picket line was established. The dispute ran along in what might be described as the customary manner from the 7th day of September until the 1st day of December.

A back-to-work movement had made such progress that, on November 30, out of a possible 778 employees, 535 were working.

During the strike, the local union had been advised and "serviced" by at least three representatives of the United Steelworkers of America, CIO, namely, Clarence (Jerry) Jackson, Thomas Shane, and Glen S. Sigman.

Before daylight on the morning of December 1, between 30 and 40 cars with license plates from counties on the eastern side of the State, more than 150 miles away, carrying between two and three hundred physically well-developed, well-dressed men, many of whom wore CIO buttons, parked before the plant entrance.

Those in the cars got out. They acted with military precision. Some of them threw missiles through windows, through the glass in the doors. Some overturned the cars of working employees; burned a truck; forced their way into the plant and there assaulted and beat both women and men.

Mrs. Judy Smalley, who lives in North Bloomingdale in Michigan, in the Fourth Congressional District, 25 years of age, punched in at the time clock at 6:25 a. m. She was sitting on a bench by the time clock, waiting to begin work, when she saw a man coming into the factory. Suddenly she heard cries of "Let's get busy." Men approached and one of them grabbed her by the hair, pushed her head back, and then another man, who had gloves on, according to her sworn testimony, slapped her on the face, first on one side and then on the other, while another man was holding her head back.

She said:

> The one in the blue jacket slapped me. I saw these little white buttons they have—they had little white CIO buttons on. * * * You just cannot believe, sir, that men come in and hit women.

At this point, let me state that Mr. Glace, the president of that local, and Mr. Betz, the recording secretary, were both sitting in this young woman's presence as she told her story under oath. They both, upon being asked, stated emphatically that they did not approve of that kind of conduct.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield briefly to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] is present and heard the statement propounded by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to the Speaker. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] used the language that is charged, he transgressed the rules of this House. I am sure he recognizes that to be so, and I am likewise sure that he is big enough to ask unanimous consent of this House to permit him to retract the statement made.

I wonder if the gentleman who now has the floor would not yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] to propound a unanimous-consent request. If granted, and the gentleman should make retraction, that would end the controversy which has now arisen.

Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will answer that in due time.

I may ask the gentleman from Georgia when he speaks about a retraction, how can a man retract a statement made before more than a thousand people in the city of Kalamazoo in the locality adjoining my home, only 23 miles from my home? I will give him an opportunity later on, but I want the House to know of this situation because, these 94 new Members who have come in here are entitled to know what may happen if they oppose certain political action groups whether they will have protection from the kind of conduct charges such as are set forth in this publication.

Mrs. Smalley continued her story:

> Well, he slapped me. He caught me in the eye—you probably cannot see it—and in my mouth there was a little sore. * * * I thought that my heart would never beat again, and I got up and ran. * * * I ran and screamed. * * * I crawled under a machine and stayed there—so that I could hide. I did not want to get hit any more; I was so scared. * * * Then somebody found me and I went upstairs * * * and the doctor came and they took me in the ambulance * * * and they were taking employees out in the ambulance. * * * There was quite a mob down there and they stood there and they beat on the windows of the ambulance and said, "I hope you die; I hope you die."

Edwin Starrett, an employee, was working in the plant when the goons arrived. They beat and kicked him, though he had dropped to the ground to escape injury and pretended that he was unconscious. Finally, one of the goons said, "That's enough, fellows. Let's go."

Although this raid was in support of the picket line being maintained by local 3619, USA-CIO, at least two of its officers expressed their disapproval. The raid was carried out principally by those who came in cars from the vicinity of Detroit, who drove around 150 miles to stage their rioting.

What has all this to do with the false, slanderous, and libelous charges made against me? I will tell you.

The then chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor had, in writing, instructed me to go to Kalamazoo and hold hearings. Hearings were held on the 4th, 6th, and 17th of December 1937. From that sworn testimony, which was reprinted to some extent in the local press, the people of Kalamazoo learned of the lawlessness, the savagery, the viciousness, the cowardliness of this raid, and which turned public sentiment against the union.

Having through the raid lost much of its public support, the union decided to stage a public rally and mass meeting. On December 13 it ran an ad in the Kalamazoo Gazette and put out handbills which read as follows:

> Attend the public rally and mass meeting in support of Shakespeare strikers, Monday, December 13, 1948, 7:30 p. m., Lincoln High School, North Burdick Street, Kalamazoo, Mich.
>
> Speakers: Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan, next chairman of the House Labor Committee; August Scholle, president, Michigan CIO Council and regional director of the State of Michigan; John Riffe, international representative, USA-CIO; Thomas Shane, director, district 29, USA-CIO, who will discuss Judge McDonald's proposal.
>
> Everybody welcome. Follow the crowd.

Tuesday evening, over station WGFG, Kalamazoo, Ray Pasnick, speaking officially for the United Steelworkers, said:

> A high point in the fight of the United Steelworkers at the Shakespeare plant was reached last night at a public indignation meeting held in the Lincoln High School auditorium and attended by more than 1,000 Kalamazoo citizens from all walks of life.
>
> It was a meeting that will long be remembered. Congressman JOHN LESINSKI, of Michigan's Sixteenth District, the principal speaker, brought the house down with a wild and thunderous ovation when he promised that a full-dress investigation into all aspects of the Shakespeare strike would be conducted by Congress.
>
> Congressman LESINSKI is slated to become the new chairman of the House Labor and Education Committee in the Eighty-first Congress and spoke last night with authority, although not officially.

It was a tense and expectant audience that waited for the Congressman to be introduced and I can assure you they were not disappointed. From the moment he began to speak until he concluded his address, the citizens of Kalamazoo saw a fighting, militant representative of the people in action.

The Congressman opened his remarks by saying he had listened carefully to previous speakers describe the struggle endured by Shakespeare workers in their fight for a new working agreement. "As I sat there," he said, "I wondered whether I was in Hitler Germany or Soviet Russia." He indicated that only under either of the dictatorship governments could the same thing happen. And then, amdist the rousing cheers and overwhelming applause of those present, he said, "I am going to find out just what is happening here."

Congressman LESINSKI had nothing but scorn for the 2-day inquisition into the Shakespeare strike conducted by Republican Congressman HOFFMAN here a week ago. He charged HOFFMAN with proceeding with the so-called investigation without authority. "I can assure you," Congressman LESINSKI added, "that CLARE HOFFMAN did not consult with any of the Democratic Party members on the House Labor and Education Committee before coming to Kalamazoo and giving this company aid and comfort."

He then went on to say that in the interest of justice and fair play, a new and impartial investigation was absolutely necessary.

* * * * *

While there was little doubt in anyone's mind last night that Congressman LESINSKI stole the show at the meeting, several other important speakers made vital contributions to the cause of the strike.

It might be added that, although the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] lives in Dearborn, which is in Wayne County—you will remember that some 27 of the goon-squad cars carried license plates issued to individuals residing in that vicinity—and although notice of the hearings of the Labor Subcommittee was carried in Detroit and other papers, and although the hearings were held on the 4th, the 6th, and the 17th of December and the union rally was not held until the 13th, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] never availed himself of the opportunity to protest a one-man hearing. He knew that similar meetings had been held in other cases.

If he knew of the organization of his own committee, he would have known that on the 27th day of January 1947 the chairman of the committee was authorized, by unanimous vote, to do just what he did in this particular case.

But the radio script does not carry all that was said at this rally on the 13th of December, sponsored by the CIO. Nor does it carry all that the Kalamazoo Gazette charges was said and which the Kalamazoo Gazette reprinted.

At that meeting, where the radio commentator for the Steelworkers said the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] brought down the house and was greeted with a wild and thunderous ovation, the Kalamazoo Gazette said that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] said "Representative HOFFMAN is a pimp of Joe Stalin."

What is a pimp? A pimp is a pander, a procurer. To the average individual it means a procurer, a solicitor, of business for a house of prostitution.

Sworn statements from individuals present at the meeting allege that the words above quoted were followed by the words, "a prostitute."

Inasmuch as, being a man, I cannot be a prostitute, and inasmuch as there has never been the slightest intimation or any evidence that I was a pander, the only logical conclusion that can be drawn is that the words as here used mean, and were intended to mean, that I was a despicable servant or agent of Joe Stalin.

But the Kalamazoo Gazette said that "Representative LESINSKI called Representative HOFFMAN 'a pimp of Joe Stalin.'"

If the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan made that statement, what did he mean?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Briefly.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman having the floor now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], if he wishes to be recognized?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If he wants to tell me, first, did he say that I was a pimp? I will yield to him.

Mr. COX. I am not endeavoring to embarrass anybody. I am trying to end an unhappy sort of a controversy over a matter which can be remedied by a simple statement of apology or retraction by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan has never asked to be recognized, and he never denied that he made the statement. He never said, if he made it, that it was untrue.

Who is Joe Stalin? He is the head of the U. S. S. R., a nation commonly known as communistic.

We affirm "In God we trust." We open every session of the House with prayer. When this Congress convened, every Member bowed his head and joined in reciting the Lord's prayer. And we are not hypocrites.

What do the Communists advocate? The Communists do not believe in God. They seek the destruction of our Government by force.

The only meaning to be drawn from the charge against the Member from the fourth district of Michigan, as printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette, is that he is the agent of a government which advocates the overthrow of our Government by force. In short, a charge that he is guilty of disloyalty and treason.

It is a charge which is false. It is a charge which every Member of this House who has served here during the past 10 years knows to be false.

Does this House propose to let such a charge against a Member go unrebuked?

I challenge this House to call before it those responsible for that charge in the Kalamazoo Gazette; to have the writer of that charge, as printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette, under oath disclose the source of his information.

I challenge the House to then call before the bar of the House or before a committee of the House the gentleman who originally made the charge, if it was made; call upon him to substantiate the charge or to appear in the well of the House, withdraw his charge and accept whatever censure, if any, the Speaker may care to impose.

If there develops the slightest evidence that the Representative from the Fourth Michigan Congressional District has ever been or has ever acted as an agent of Joe Stalin, then he should be expelled from this House.

But let me proceed.

Why was I called a pimp of Joe Stalin? Was it because there is anything in my record that would lead anyone to believe that there was any truth whatever in that charge? No, there is not.

Then why was the charge made? Was it made because the Communists, because certain racketeers and ambitious politicians in certain labor organizations, by intimidation, by unjustifiable and despicable false charges against me, are trying to force me to refrain from exposing some of their activities?

Is it an attempt to shut the mouth, still the voice, silence the opposition, of a Member of Congress to certain union politicians?

They are trying to do to me what some try to do to the nonunion worker.

For 13 years, 11 months, and 347 days prior to the 13th day of December, the Member from the Fourth Congressional District served in this Congress.

He was assigned to serve on the Committee on Labor on January 12, 1940. For more than 8 years, at the meetings of that committee, he sat across the table in the committee room from the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. Never once in all that time was there any personal controversy, although we differed in our views as to what was best for organized labor.

Did the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] make the statement attributed to him by the Kalamazoo Gazette?

When those responsible for the publication in the Gazette were told that they would be called to account for that publication, they told me they would justify it by showing that the paper did not originate the statement, that in truth and in fact it was made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI].

Did he make it? On the 29th day of December, by registered letter, postage fully prepaid, two letters were mailed to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], calling his attention to the publication in the Kalamazoo Gazette. One letter went to him at his office address in Dearborn, Mich.; the other to his home address in Dearborn. In neither case was a registered mail receipt card received by me until the 11th day of January last, when two cards came back showing the following:

RETURN RECEIPT

Received from the postmaster the registered or insured article, the original number of which appears on the face of this card.

1. JOHN LESINSKI.
(Signature or name of addressee)
2. E. Corbett.
(Signature of addressee's agent. Agent should enter addressee's name on line one above.)

Date of delivery: January 10, 1949.

The second card and receipt was the same except as to number.

Friday last, Mr. LESINSKI was personally advised of the mailing of these letters and there was delivered to his secretary—and he was present in his office—a copy of that same letter. No reply from him has been received. Saturday last, his office was notified that I would speak from the well of the House on this matter. Last Monday I spoke to him personally—asked him about my letter, he said he had it. I told him I would comment on the situation from the well of the House today. He is here to make such answer as he is advised may be proper.

So to what does it boil down? What do the facts show?

The facts in this case show that, if a Member of Congress attempts to protect the right to work, even though he does it in a fair manner—and there is no justifiable charge in this case that in the hearings there was anything unfair—he may expect that the CIO will, in some way, sponsor dirty, nasty, vicious, false charges to be made against him.

The individual worker, seeking to go through a picket line is called a scab, vile and indecent names; sworn at; sometimes beaten; his family threatened; his wife and children frightened. The Congressman, protesting a commando goon-squad raid, is called, so it is charged in the Kalamazoo Gazette, "a pimp of Joe Stalin" by one of his colleagues.

Here, when a Member of Congress over the years ventures to express opposition to the racketeering of some union officers—and in the Philadelphia Dock Street case, after our committee had exposed their activities, three of the officers of a union were tried for racketeering, were convicted of a violation of the Hobbs Antiracketeering Act—if he speaks against the goon-squad method employed by a union whose officers have refused to sign anti-Communist affidavits, he is the victim of a campaign of vilification. A newspaper circulating in his home town and district says he is called a pimp of Joe Stalin.

He is subject to abuse and vilification.

Why do I say that? I know. I have taken it ever since, in 1937, I condemned the sit-down strikes and the lawlessness of, and the Communists in, the CIO.

But who would have dreamed that a Member of Congress would be assailed by one of his colleagues with the charge that he was—and I quote—"a pimp of Joe Stalin," and, I might add, according to sworn affidavits in my possession, that was not all that was said by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]. The affidavits alleged that he said, and I quote, "Hitler couldn't do any worse than HOFFMAN. HOFFMAN is a pimp of Joe Stalin—a prostitute."

How much time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 33 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am going to offer a resolution to bring this matter to a head. If the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan wants 10 minutes of my time, he is welcome to it. I assume that he can get it anyway. I have no objection to any man having the floor to answer the proposition that I have made.

But I want to repeat. Outsiders smear the House as a whole. They vilify and falsely accuse Members of the House. I want to know and I am challenging the House to say what they are going to do in a case like this. The resolution I offer is for the appointment of a committee of three to ascertain what? First, whether the Kalamazoo Gazette is correct and accurate when it said that the gentleman from Michigan from the Sixteenth District made that statement.

Then to ask the gentleman from Michigan, from the Sixteenth District, to offer evidence on his oath and substantiate his charge if he can. If he can make it stick and if the House can find where I am guilty, then I should be expelled at once. If the charge is not substantiated, then for the good of the Congress, the gentleman from Michigan should appear before the bar of the House and be told by the Speaker what is and what is not proper conduct for a Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, I send a resolution to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read.

Mr. McCORMACK. Just a moment. If the gentleman will yield, with reference to this resolution, the gentleman has not consulted the leadership on the Democratic side, has he, in relation to any intention to introduce a resolution today?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. Do you want to know why?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman does not have to tell me why.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I will be glad to.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I would be glad to hear why if the gentleman wants to tell us.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Ordinarily, if it were an ordinary resolution, of course I would consult the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] who in all the years that I have served here has been eminently fair. But, unless I am mistaken, and the precedents that I can cite do not bear me out, this is a privileged resolution.

Mr. McCORMACK. This is with reference to something that took place outside of the House of Representatives?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. But I can cite, if the gentleman wishes, authorities where the same course has been followed.

Mr. McCORMACK. What the gentleman is doing then is with reference to alleged remarks carried in a newspaper—whether or not they are correct, I do not know because I know nothing about them—but they were made outside of the House during a campaign?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, no, there was no campaign.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, they were outside of the House. That is immaterial. They were not made in the House by one Member against another. But the gentleman is trying to make those remarks a basis for action in this body?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am saying that those remarks raise not only a question of personal privilege——

Mr. McCORMACK. A question of personal privilege is one thing, but the question of action by the House of Representatives is another thing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I trust the gentleman will permit me to continue?

Mr. McCORMACK. Surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. These remarks raise not only a question of personal privilege, but they also raise the question of privilege of the House which must be accompanied under the rule by resolution.

Section 661, page 275, of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives quotes the rule and cites some of the authorities. If the gentleman wants me to postpone this matter of the introduction of a resolution, I am perfectly agreeable. I am always willing to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] wherever I can, and whenever it will promote harmony. I would just as soon postpone this matter of the resolution and bring it up on a subsequent day and have the Speaker of the House rule on the matter of whether it raises the question of privilege of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not want my position misunderstood. The gentleman knows I have a very friendly feeling for him and I know he has for me. While we disagree on occasions, we respect one another. As majority leader, it being my position to do so, on this occasion I simply injected myself into this. This is none of my business, other than as majority leader. I am on the side lines when a couple of Members are having a fight. I do not believe in getting into those affairs, but when the gentleman offers a resolution, then it becomes a different proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Nobody is asking anybody to get into a fight between two Members.

Mr. McCORMACK. No, no. I understand that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The question I am raising has two aspects.

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not make that observation except from my own angle, to show for the record why I am injecting myself into this, because it is my duty as majority leader in connection with the gentleman's statement that he is offering a resolution. Under those circumstances, I hope the gentleman will not offer the resolution today, even if it is within the rules, because the gentleman has not given any notice to the leadership. Personally, my offhand opinion would be that remarks made outside—for instance, if some Member up in Massachusetts attacked me on the outside, I do not consider that I could offer a resolution making an attack upon me on the outside the subject of official action by the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is absolutely right about that. There is no disagreement between us. As I understand it, the gentleman is on his feet because he questions the right to raise this matter as a point of privilege of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with you that if somebody said something outside, just as an individual, of a Member as an individual or even, though the authorities do not agree on this, as a Member of the House, well and good; no privilege of the House would arise.

But in this particular case, the gentleman from the Fourth District of Michigan had held public hearings there at Kalamazoo. This mass meeting where it is alleged the objectional remarks were made was called to protest the employer's attitude, which again was proper, but the speech made by the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan referred to the action of the Member from the Fourth District of Michigan as a member of the committee of this House acting as a subcommittee chairman under direction of the chairman of a standing committee of the House.

Now, I will withdraw this resolution and will ask unanimous consent at this time, Mr. Speaker, to revise and extend my remarks and include citation of certain authorities.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Let us have the facts in this case clear in our minds. There was a strike. There was a commando raid. There was a destruction of personal property and injury to real estate, a beating of defenseless citizens. It was carried on by individuals who invaded the city; who came from more than 150 miles away; who wore CIO buttons.

The press carried a stateme :t from an international representative of the CIO to the effect that it assumed responsibility for the raid.

The hearings were held on the 4th and the 6th of December 1943. Spokesmen for the CIO condemned the hearings as being unauthorized. The gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] charged—and he admits the statement—that the subcommittee chairman holding the hearings "had no more authority than a rabbit." He compared the procedure to that followed by Hitler.

The Kalamazoo Gazette quoted him as making the charge to which reference has heretofore been made.

When the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan spoke at the rally on the night of the 13th of December, he was speaking of and condemning, not the conduct of an individual, but the course followed by a subcommittee chairman who was acting under the written authorization of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, who, by House Resolution 111 and by the action of his own committee on January 29, 1947, had been authorized to appoint subcommittees to do just what was done in this case.

The remarks to which complaint is here made referred to a Member of the House in his official capacity, who at the time was acting as an agent of the House, and who, according to the newspaper publication, was charged with treasonable conduct.

Permit me to quote from Hinds' Precedents:

Hinds' Precedents, 1907, volume 3:

SEC. 2653. A resolution directing an inquiry into alleged treasonable conduct on the part of a Member was admitted as a question of privilege. On December 19, 1865, Mr. John F. Farnsworth, of Illinois, as a question of privilege, submitted the following:

"Whereas it is alleged that Benjamin G. Harris, a Representative in this House from the Fifth District of the State of Maryland, was, in the month of May last, before a very respectable and intelligent court martial tried, and by said court convicted, upon charge and specifications, to wit: 'Violative of the sixth article of war,' by giving aid and comfort to the public enemy and inciting them to continue to make war against the United States, declaring his sympathy with the enemy and his opposition to the Government of the United States in its efforts to suppress the rebellion; and

"Whereas it was proved at such trial (as is alleged) that the said Harris expressed his regret that the assassination of President Lincoln came too late to be of any use to the rebels, and at the same time declared that Jeff. Davis was a great and good man, all of which acts on the part of said Harris are inconsistent with the oath which he has taken as a Member of this House; and

"Whereas the said court martial sentenced the said Harris (among other things) to be forever disqualified to hold any office of honor, trust, or profit under the United States, which sentence was approved by the President: Therefore

*"Resolved*, That the Committee of Elections be directed to inquire into the facts of the case and that they report the same to the House, together with such action as said committee shall recommend; and in making their investigations said committee to have power to send for persons and papers."

Mr. Charles A. Eldridge, of Wisconsin, raised the question of order that no question of privilege was involved.

The Speaker held that the question raised was a question of privilege, and of the very highest kind, since it involved the right of a Member to his seat.

The resolution was then agreed to, yeas 138, nays 21.

SEC. 2652. A charge that a Member had been holding intercourse with the foes of the Government was investigated as a question of privilege. On July 15, 1861, Mr. John F. Potter, of Wisconsin, offered the following resolution:

*"Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary be directed to inquire whether the Honorable Henry May, a Representative in Congress from the Fourth District of the State of Maryland, has not been found holding criminal intercourse and correspondence with persons in armed rebellion against the Government of the United States, and to make report to the House as to what action should be taken in the premises, and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers and to examine witnesses on oath or affirmation, and that said Hon. Henry May be notified of the passage of this resolution (if practicable) before action thereon by said committee."

Mr. Henry C. Burnett, of Kentucky, made the point of order that the resolution was not in order as a question of privilege.

The Speaker submitted the question to the House, and the House decided that the resolution was in order as involving a question of privilege.

By a vote of 56 yeas to 82 nays the House refused to lay the resolution on the table. It was then agreed to.

SEC. 2649. A proposition to censure a Member presents a question of privilege.

Early instances wherein the Speaker passed on questions presented as of privilege instead of submitting them directly to the House.

On January 24, 1842, Mr. Thomas W. Gilmer, of Virginia, presented the following resolution:

*"Resolved*, That in presenting for the consideration of the House a petition for the dissolution of the Union the Member from Massachusetts (Mr. Adams) has justly incurred the censure of this House."

Mr. Joseph R. Underwood, of Kentucky, objected to the reception of the resolution at this time, as not within the established order of business, and consequently not now in order.

The Speaker said that he considered this a matter of privilege, and referred to a precedent that occurred in 1836, in which the gentleman from Massachusetts offered a petition from certain slaves near Fredericksburg, Va., and on which occasion a resolution was offered by a gentleman from Virginia that the gentleman be brought to the bar and censured. Under this precedent the Chair did not feel at liberty to arrest the proceeding.

SEC. 2628. A newspaper charge that an officer of the House had conspired to influence legislation was considered as a question of privilege. On April 26, 1876, Mr. John D. White, of Kentucky, submitted as a question of privilege a preamble and resolution reciting an allegation from a newspaper charging that the Clerk of the House and some of his subordinates had conspired to prevent retrenchment of expenditures, and directing the Committee on Rules to investigate the charges and make report thereon.

Mr. William M. Springer, of Illinois, made the point of order that the resolution did not involve a question of privilege.

The Speaker overruled the point of order on the ground that the resolution, though going to the verge to which any matter of privilege of a Member of the House should go, involved enough of substance in its connection with the House and legislation to bring it within the rule and definition of a question of privilege.

If a newspaper charge that an officer is guilty of improper conduct or a crime raises a question of privilege, then most assuredly a newspaper charge that a Member is guilty of treason raises a question of privilege.

If the publication by a Member of false and scandalous charges against other Members raises a question of privilege, does not the publication of a charge by a Member that another Member is guilty of treason raise a question of privilege?

Note the following:

2637. The publication by a Member of alleged false and scandalous charges against the House and its Members, which he also reiterated in debate, was held to involve a question of privilege.

The House took action as to a Member who reiterated on the floor certain published charges against the House, although other business had intervened.

Instance wherein testimony taken before a committee and relating to the conduct of a Member was not reported to the House at once.

On July 29, 1892, Mr. Charles J. Boatner, of Louisiana, as a matter of privilege, submitted the following resolution, and demanded immediate consideration thereof, to wit:

"Whereas on page 216 of a book purporting to have been written by Thomas E. Watson,

of Georgia, a Member of the House of Representatives, the following charge appears:

" 'Drunken Members have reeled about the aisles, a disgrace to the Republic. Drunken speakers have debated grave issues on the floor, and in the midst of maudlin ramblings have been heard to ask: "Mr. Speaker, where was I at?" ' and

"Whereas the publication of such charges, if untrue, is a grave wrong to this body, and if true the responsibility should be placed where it belongs; and

"Whereas the said Watson has reiterated the same on the floor of the House: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House,* That a committee of five Members be appointed by the Speaker to investigate and report to the House whether such charges are true, and, if untrue, whether the said Watson has violated the privileges of the House and their recommendations relative to the same. That said committee have leave to sit during the sessions of the House, to send for persons and papers, to swear witnesses, and to compel their attendance."

Mr. Thomas B. Reed, of Maine, submitted the question of order, whether, the House having failed to take action respecting the remarks of Mr. Watson at the time he reiterated the charges on the floor of the House, and having passed to other business, it was not now too late to hold him to account therefor.

Mr. Louis E. Atkinson, of Pennsylvania, made the further point of order that the pending business before the House was a conference report, which was itself a matter of the highest privilege.

The Speaker held that the resolution submitted by Mr. Boatner presented a question of privilege, and that whenever the Speaker is of opinion that a question of privilege is involved in a proposition, he must entertain it in preference to any other business.

The Speaker also held that the pending business was the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 752, and that no conference report was pending. Both points of order were therefore overruled.

On August 8, 1892, Mr. Boatner submitted the report of the select committee authorized by the adoption of the resolution, and of which he had been made chairman.

This report stated that the committee summoned Mr. Watson and such witnesses as he indicated, and very soon the fact was developed that the charge as to drunken speakers referred to Mr. J. E. Cobb, of Alabama. The committee thereupon went on and examined testimony as to Mr. Cobb, no point of order being made that the testimony implicating a Member should first be reported to the House.

The committee concluded that the charge was a libel upon the membership, and recommended the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That the charges made by Thomas E. Watson in his book against the House of Representatives, viz, 'that drunken Members have reeled about the aisles, a disgrace to the Republic,' and 'drunken Members have debated grave issues on the floor,' etc., are not true, and constitute an unwarranted assault upon the honor and dignity of the House and that such publication has the unqualified disapproval of the House."

This report was made in the last hours of the session and does not appear to have been acted on.

There are other precedents cited in section 22, page 192, volume 11, Cannon's Precedents; also beginning on page 198, of the same volume.

This proposed resolution does not charge that the gentleman from the Sixteenth Michigan District made these allegations. It charges that the Kalamazoo Gazette printed the statement that he made the charges, and it asks only that a committee of three be appointed to ascertain first whether the charge made in the Gazette that the gentleman from the Sixteenth District actually uttered the words is true or false; then it goes on from there. It does not assume that anyone is guilty of anything. It only asks for an inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand it, the gentleman is not going to press his resolution now.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not care about pressing it now.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am stepping out now. That is all I am interested in.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But I do say to the gentleman that I will press it at some later time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not entering into that. I hope the gentleman will serve notice on the leadership when he intends to do so, because then he proposes a question of something other than a dispute or a fight or a contest between two Members.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The point which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has alluded to is one which I want to definitely establish. That is whether or not the remark which precipitated this was in connection with or related to the acts of the gentleman from Michigan from the Fourth District [Mr. HOFFMAN] as chairman of a subcommittee duly authorized to perform certain duties by the chairman of the House Committee on Labor and Education.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly the Gazette article carries that implication; otherwise there would be no privilege of the House. The statement in the paper is that the chairman of the subcommittee had no more authority than a rabbit. The report of the speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] carries the statement that "HOFFMAN had no more authority than a rabbit." That, of course, was referring to the holding of the hearings.

As I said before, whether there was authority or whether there was not, I am not arguing about that proposition, although there is plenty of precedent for it, but what I am saying is that in referring to a Member of Congress, who was acting in his official capacity, as a "pimp of Joe Stalin," which can only mean that he was the agent of Joe Stalin and was engaged in treasonable activities—that is what it means when you boil it down—that and the other statements raise a question of privilege of the House. I say to the new Members and to the old Members I can throw as much mud as anybody. Other people can do the same. Are we to open the door to everyone who is so constituted that he wants to go out and destroy the people's confidence in their Congress and their Congressmen?

There are rules for our conduct here in the House. Should there not be some rules which limit our utterances when they refer to our colleagues who are acting under authority—or whom we assume in fact to be acting under authority—of the House? That is the point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield briefly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That, I think, makes clear that there has been raised an entirely different issue than that involved in a statement of one Member concerning the personal activities of another Member uttered possibly in the heat of the congressional campaign. Certainly, if a duly created committee or subcommittee can be referred to in any such language, stating that they are the tool of the head of any other government, and particularly carrying the implications that were made in the statement cited, there is quite a different issue before the House than a simple reference by one Member to another during the course of a campaign.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What any Member of this House cares to say about me as an individual is limited only by his good judgment and his good taste. What he says, however, as a Member of this House about me as a Member of the House who is attempting to act by authority of the House is something else again. If the House will not protect itself from the charge that it has within its membership a traitor, then why should we complain when editors and commentators try to smear us? That is the issue, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Briefly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman intend to ask that the resolution be read for the information of the House and for its study between now and the time the gentleman may press his resolution?

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. Why does not the gentleman ask for time of his own?

Mr. LESINSKI. No; I will go right on.

Mr. Speaker, I realize the statement of the gentleman from Michigan. There are many words said during many different campaigns, and the gentleman evidently realizes it that way.

On that particular day I was invited by the steel workers to go along with them to Kalamazoo. While driving with them I asked many pertinent questions of the officials in the car in which I was riding, what the condition of the union was, what were their actual beliefs, whether they were "Commies" or not. That is what I wanted to know because I have always said that I have had no interest in any organization that was Commie-dominated.

When we got to Kalamazoo I found that the gentleman from Michigan was a one-man grand jury there, something in which I do not believe. Another

thing, being the ranking Member, I knew of no inquiry to be made by a committee. So when I got to the gathering I told the people there point-blank plain that I had no authority, that I was not there authorized to tell them what they should or should not do, that I came there on my own, and that what I said was my own personal word. Knowing of the gentleman's being there with an inquiry, I decided I would stay a couple of days and find out what was going on.

That evening I spoke at the gathering. The newspaper quoted me correctly, that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] had no more right than a rabbit. That is the statement I made. I went on to explain my situation. Then toward the end of my talk I said these words, and I want the gentleman to listen to them: "That to me is what Mr. Hitler tried to do to the unions in Germany and that is why he wrecked the unions and made one controlled union; and that to me Mr. Hitler is a pimp of Joe Stalin, a prostitute." Those are my words. I have nothing to apologize for because I did not talk of the gentleman. I had on my mind only one thing and that was to tell the people over there I had no use for fascism or communism. That is why I made those remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman saw the article that was printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette, did he not?

Mr. LESINSKI. I have.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman got my letter, did he not?

Mr. LESINSKI. I have. I got them here in Washington.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment.

Mr. COX. Will not the gentleman content himself with the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] that he was not referring to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan has refused to yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman saw the statement in the Kalamazoo Gazette?

Mr. LESINSKI. The reporter told me about it and I told him plainly I was not quoted exactly as I said it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did not the gentleman say at that meeting that HOFFMAN could do no worse than Hitler?

Mr. LESINSKI. No, sir.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman says on his honor as a Member of this House that he did not say that HOFFMAN was a pimp of Joe Stalin, a prostitute?

Mr. LESINSKI. That is not the way I said it. I said that to me Hitler was nothing but a pimp of Joe Stalin, a prostitute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the question now is just as important as it ever was because if a newspaper can publish a statement charging a Member of the House with making a charge which I quoted here, then the gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan is entitled, too, to the appointment of a committee, and so are the Members of the House, to learn whether or not the paper correctly quoted him. I have affidavits bearing out the charge carried in the newspapers. The Members of the House should know the truth. The gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan has been libeled by the charge made in the Kalamazoo Gazette if the gentleman's statement that he never made the statement attributed to him is true. It is important that the House know whether the gentleman made the charge publicly, as an encouragement to a certain political organization, and as to whether or not it was true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I was a member of the Committee on Expenditures last year of which the gentleman was chairman. Was there a subcommittee out there investigating?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. How many were on the subcommittee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. One.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who was that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was. The gentleman from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who had the authority to appoint a subcommittee of one? I would like to know that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I would like to find out.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will tell the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman will have to do a lot of telling.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will tell the gentleman. It is very simple and clear. First, under authority of a decision of the United States Supreme Court (300 U. S.) in United States against Norris. Second, under Resolution 111, which gave the chairman of the Labor Committee authority to appoint committees and under the action taken by the Labor Committee according to its minutes of the 27th day of January, 1947. The foregoing authorities show the right of the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor to appoint a one-man subcommittee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was this a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not the Committee on Expenditures?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not the Committee on Expenditures. The gentleman from the Sixteenth District of Michigan was not present at this meeting to which I referred where the full committee authorized the chairman to appoint committees. My appointment was by Mr. Hartley, the chairman, I have that in writing, and I have it by wire.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor of one?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is unusual.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, not this last summer.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not in the last 2 years. But never prior to that did we have subcommittees of one. The Democrats never allowed that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have loaded the committees up now so it does not make any difference whether it is a committee of one or more. You are loading up these committees at the present time. You changed our own Committee on Expenditures from 15 to 10 to 18 to 7—we gave you 1 out of 3—now you take 2 to 1 and 4 extra.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman was not chairman of the Committee on Labor?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am an ex-member. I was never chairman of the Labor Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. Did the chairman of the Committee on Labor officially delegate the gentleman from Michigan as a subcommittee of one?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. By wire and by letter, both.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a subcommittee of one?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of one.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was there any discussion with any Democratic member?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. At least I do not know of any.

Mr. McCORMACK. None?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; although I do not know. Nor do I know of any protest until the speech on the 13th.

Mr. McCORMACK. So the Democrats on that committee were not even consulted about this?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They never made any protest at any meetings that I ever held.

Mr. McCORMACK. But is it not rather arbitrary for the chairman to appoint a subcommittee without consulting the ranking minority Member? We know the procedure of committees. The gentleman, as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures would not appoint a subcommittee without consulting with Carter Manasco, would he?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I recall some of the Members on the gentleman's side writing reports, and they all signed them.

Mr. McCORMACK. Would the gentleman, as chairman, appoint a subcommittee without consulting with Carter Manasco, the ranking minority Member?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know I always do——

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would not do that, would he?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I never did. I appointed a subcommittee of one, Mr. HARDY, a Democrat from Virginia. He was appointed to go down into Florida and inquire into something, sure, and he submitted a report and a good one, and it was all right. The gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Manasco, who was ranking minority Member was consulted and he made no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman did not take any pride in that. Of course, you are the Republican Chairman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was. And I sent a lone dyed in the wool Democrat from Ole Virginny all alone and the results could not have been better.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sure.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has quite thoroughly, may I say to the gentleman——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May I have a couple of more minutes, Mr. Majority Leader?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is commencing to be really enjoyable.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but you are getting a little away from the topic.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a perfectly worthy topic, yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Just a moment, the gentleman yielded to me. I rise to ask a question which perhaps might be in the minds of most people on the floor, and that is, are we to conclude as an ultimate fact from what has already thus far in this matter boiled down, that the contention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], is that he did not call the gentleman a pimp of Joe Stalin in the exact language which he charged was published in the papers?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the gentleman can speak for himself, maybe.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there? We might just as well be fair about this thing and perfectly frank about it with ourselves and with one another. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]—and I hold no brief for him—has stated in his place on the floor of this House what he contends was the language that he used, and his statement is a repudiation of the charges that have been made, that is, that he called the gentleman from Michigan a pimp of Joe Stalin. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in good faith, as brethren here in a common cause, we ought to be willing to accept the word of our fellow Member. The gentleman from Michigan has denied that he called the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] a pimp, and that ought to satisfy everybody and end this controversy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman contend then that the House—where a paper publishes that statement, and where I can produce affidavits from the people who were present—should overlook it?

Mr. COX. I contend that under the circumstances that the House ought not to dignify an unimportant happening by the setting up of a committee to ascertain whether or not the gentleman from Michigan made such a statement as charged when the gentleman here on the floor, in the presence of the Members of this body, has stated in exact language exactly what he said, and since that language does not offend the rules the controversy is not a matter of further concern of the House. The setting up of a committee to ascertain what was said when we now know what was said, would be, in my judgment, a colossal piece of foolishness.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to say to the gentleman from Georgia, I wonder if I went down in a district adjoining the gentleman's district and charged him with being a traitor to his country and several other things——

Mr. COX. But the gentleman——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right, let me answer—and if the gentleman had affidavits and statements of friends and then I came on the floor and said, "Well, I have always admired the gentleman from Georgia; he is a fine, good citizen. I never said it," must the House accept my denial?

Mr. COX. Under those circumstances I would accept the word of my brother Congressman as representing exactly his position as to what he said and did, and would not haggle about it. I think the gentleman does himself a disservice when he haggles.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman is talking about me, my answer is that I am not haggling.

Mr. COX. Whether or not he will accept the statement of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] his fellow Congressman, as to what happened in Michigan on this occasion.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. Now I will say to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], all right, you can make that statement here on the floor if you want to.

What the argument of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] leads to is this: If newspaper A says that Congressman B said that Congressman C was a traitor and if Congressman B, when the statement is called to his attention on the floor, replies that he never made it, and, thereafter, testimony taken shows that Congressman B did say that Congressman C was a traitor, then, under the logic of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], Congressman C is a traitor because, forsooth, the word of a Congressman must be taken, even when shown to be false. That sort of reasoning does not appeal to me.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And I will say this to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX]. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] had three opportunities to deny that he made the statement. He had written requests three times to deny it. He never did deny it. Only when it was brought here to the attention of the House and then he seemed rather uncertain about what he has said. Now, if you want to defend that sort of procedure, defend him.

Mr. COX. Let me say that I think the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] rendered a disservice to himself when he failed to embrace the first opportunity to make proper amends to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My hide is thick. I am not overly sensitive. I do not hesitate to hand it out and I can take it. In the 14 years I have been here I have vigorously and bitterly assailed views and policies which I believed fallacious and injurious to our Nation, but I have never, no, not once, made a personal attack upon a colleague. I have taken a lot of abuse from political opponents who have no sense of decency. But there is a limit. This attack, under the sponsorship of the CIO, goes too far. This situation is brought to your attention today because, in my humble judgment, it is time that the House put its stamp of disapproval upon Members of the House who falsely charge their colleagues with disloyalty and worse, if that is possible.

Kalamazoo County juts into the block of counties which comprise the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan. The Kalamazoo Gazette has readers in my old home town of Constantine, which lies some 60 miles to the south, where I lived in my boyhood days, where I have many friends. It goes into Sturgis, Three Rivers, Mendon, Colon, Fabius, all through the farming district of St. Joe County. It goes into Paw Paw, Gobles, Bloomingdale, Hartford, Keeler, all through the farming community of Van Buren County; it goes into Cassopolis, Dowagiac, Jones, all through Cass County. It goes into Plainwell, Wayland, Otsego, yes, into my home town of Allegan in Allegan County.

It goes into the home of my son and his wife and my two grandchildren—boys of 12 and 13 years of age. It goes into the home of another son and his wife; the home of a grandson who is now a midshipman at the Academy; the home of a granddaughter, the winner of a scholarship, and now in the University of Michigan; the home of a granddaughter 12 years of age.

The 12-year-old girl, Evie, picks up the Kalamazoo Gazette which comes to her home 7 days a week. Kid-like, she looks at the funnies. It may be she thinks Grandpa is a nice old fellow. Perhaps she sees the words, "Representative LESINSKI calls Representative HOFFMAN a pimp of Joe Stalin." She says, "Mamma, the Kalamazoo Gazette says grampa is a pimp. What is a pimp, mamma?"

I say to you, my colleagues of the House, what do you, deep down in your hearts, honestly think of this situation?

Overlong, men and women throughout the country, who were dependent upon their pay checks for a livelihood, have been driven from their jobs by goon squads; have been vilified, slandered and libeled by propagandists who speak, not for the rank and file of the CIO, but for a few, a very few, of their leaders, who are using the union organizations for their own selfish ends.

Is it not time that the responsible officials at the head of the CIO—one of them, Philip Murray, its president—publicly condemn actions of that kind?

Overlong, Members of Congress, seeking to express their honest convictions as to what was good for labor, have been falsely charged with being antilabor, unkind, uncharitable, as taking the bread out of the mouths of the workers' children. Those charges have been made by union officials, sometimes by representatives of the international.

Just as the action taken against the individual worker seeks to deprive him of his right to earn a livelihood, so these false and malicious charges—in this case, this false and malicious charge—seek to intimidate the people's Representatives, to frighten them, to prevent them from

expressing their views on labor legislation.

This charge, according to the Kalamazoo Gazette, was made at a mass meeting which the CIO radio announcer said was presided over by Glen S. Sigman, personal representative of CIO President Philip Murray.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], we are advised, is to be chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. If he will go into Michigan at a mass meeting, attended, so it was said by the radio announcer of the union, by more than 1,000 people, there falsely charge, there make the untrue charge, that one of his colleagues is a "pimp of Joe Stalin," what will he do to industry's representatives when they appear here before the House committee, if they venture to oppose the legislation demanded by the CIO?

My colleagues, how many of you, if this charge published in the Kalamazoo Gazette goes unchallenged, will feel free to vote your convictions, when before the House comes a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, reenact the Wagner Act, write legislation affecting organized labor—legislation either opposed or supported by the politicians in the CIO?

It is apparent that it was the purpose of the goon squad to intimidate the employees of the Shakespeare Co. at Kalamazoo. It is apparent that it is the purpose of the CIO, its international and district representatives, to frighten, to intimidate the Members of Congress who are about to consider labor legislation.

The Washington press tells us there is a lobby of 45 CIO members on the Hill today.

The Supreme Court a week ago today publicly announced that the people of the States had the right to enact laws which would protect the man who desired to work.

This House, in my humble judgment, should in some way assure its membership that it will protect them from intimidation and coercion when they attempt to voice their convictions.

Although granted permission to print as a part of my remarks the resolution sent to the Speaker's desk, because that resolution contains other remarks published in the Gazette, which perhaps have not been referred to by me today, I will not print it here but will wait until it is offered on some future occasion.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I know nothing about this occurrence that has just gone on except what I have heard on the floor today, but many of us who were here in the House understood that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] sent a resolution to the Speaker and so stated. The gentleman has consumed the hour for which, under the rule, he was permitted to talk. He has talked. Then he buttressed that talk, as I understand from the floor here, by a resolution. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] seemed to indicate there was something in that resolution with which he did not agree. The rest of us would like to know just where the resolution is, and what is in it.

The SPEAKER. There is a paper lying on the desk of the Speaker. It starts by saying "Resolution." The gentleman from Michigan never did offer the resolution. He said he was sending up to the Speaker's chair, and he intended to offer, a resolution, but he did not.

Mr. MICHENER. Then the status is that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] sent a paper up there, and there it lies. What will become of it?

The SPEAKER. There is nothing before the House at this time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include one of the finest editorials I have ever read, which appeared in the Boston Post, entitled "Captain Courageous," when that great newspaper came out in a militant manner in support of President Truman and made such marked contributions to the President's carrying Massachusetts.

I further ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial that appeared in the Sheboygan Press, of Wisconsin, on November 11, 1948, and further to extend my remarks and include an address recently delivered by Floyd B. Odlum.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress faces two grave responsibilities, the maintenance of peace abroad and the preservation of prosperity at home; we must keep out of war and we must avoid another depression.

The consequences of a Nation-wide depression are too recent in the minds of men to require elaboration.

And even clearer is the realization of the hazards of another war. It could mean the repudiation of the national debt; the establishment of economic and military dictatorships which might not be completely shaken off in 100 years. It would involve deficit financing of crushing proportions, possibly the confiscation of private property, as in Great Britain; in any event a return to rigid regimentation of the most drastic character and the abandonment of national fiscal and industrial status which probably could not be recovered within the next generation. It would mean—even if we won—the destruction of major cities and loss of life measured by millions.

There is only one way to avoid war, and that is to remain so strong that no nation will dare attack us. Weakness invites invasion. We must maintain superiority on land and sea, and especially in the air. We must equip and maintain the most powerful military force in the world, and support an adequate and progressive domestic economy at home.

This can be effected only through vast expenditures, and the budget just received from the President is designed to implement both national defense and national prosperity.

It is the largest budget ever recommended in time of peace. As a matter of fact it is not a peacetime budget. We have been fighting a cold war since 1945—and in recent months a losing war. The stalemate in Europe and the debacle in Asia have materially prejudiced our strategic position.

Defense of the Nation from subjugation and exploitation is a subject which brooks no debate and considered in this light the amounts proposed in the budget are not excessive.

It is essentially a war budget. Half the amount carried is to pay for measures to prevent or prepare for future war. Another quarter is consumed in the cost of past wars, in provisions for care of veterans, interest on the national debt, and related expenditures. In other words more than 75 percent of this budget relates to past and prospective wars. If the war items could be eliminated we could this year pay $30,000,000,000 on the public debt.

But these are arbitrary items on which we have little or no discretion. We have no choice but to pay and the only latitude we have is in the exercise of care and economy in their administration.

On a close analysis, many of these expenditures proposed by the budget are in the nature of capital expenditures. They fall within the same category as the purchase of rolling stock by railroads, or the construction of generating plants by utilities. They are part of a long-term program of national defense and continued economic stability, the benefits of which will continue to accrue through coming years.

The defense of the Nation is necessarily projected far into the future, and current expenditures for that purpose, beyond mere maintenance, should not be wholly charged to the annual supply bills of any one session of Congress.

It is a burden which must be borne regardless of cost or consequences. But, let me insist that, as necessary and imperative as it is, security should be provided at the lowest cost obtainable. We must spend generously for defense, but we should handle such expenditures soundly and wisely. We are confronted today with a debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars. Merely the interest on our existing debt, although funded at the lowest rate at which a public debt was ever financed, aggregates $5,000,000,000 a year, an amount which must come out of our tax income before unobligated revenue is available for any other purpose whatsoever.

Every item in the budget should be subjected to every possible test to determine whether the services or commodities so provided cannot be secured more economically or whether they cannot be dispensed with altogether. If, for example, national safety can be insured for one penny less than $15,000,000,000 that penny should be saved, and as many more as the situation permits under the most exacting analysis.

The welfare items should be especially scrutinized. Whether a dollar can be advantageously expended or invested is not the criterion. The question is whether it should be spent for any purpose other than debt retirement at this critical time.

There is a disposition to assume that the National Treasury is a bottomless well with a never-failing flow of inexhaustible funds untrammeled by natural economic law or economic principle, capable of creating something from nothing, adequate to meet every draft drawn by the Committee on Appropriations and endorsed by the Congress. Public funds, even when appropriated by Congress, are not like the oil from the widow's cruse, magically self-perpetuating, nor like Aladdin's lamp, to be invoked and replenished by the simple expediency of legislative enactment. Passing an appropriation bill does not create money.

The original plan under which each appropriation bill carried with it a revenue provision for raising the funds appropriated had many advantages; and no appropriation bill should be passed in this session without careful consideration simultaneously of the source from which such funds are to be drawn.

The only source of funds appropriated by this Congress is taxes or loans, and the public debt is long since too large to warrant a resort to loans except under the most urgent and imperative conditions.

Regardless of any merit, however convincing the argument that an item calling for an appropriation will contribute to the public welfare, it must always be subject to the question: Can we afford it? The situation is too critical, the public debt is too large, our national resources are too limited to provide for any expenditure which can be abandoned or postponed over this emergency. Desirable as are rivers and harbors, reclamation, irrigation, public works, aid to navigation, and the public health—however appealing social reforms may appear—when such expenditures involve deficit financing they must yield to the urgent necessity of national security and economic stability.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Do I understand that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is against an appropriation for public education, and so forth, and so on?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly not. I strongly favor all of them. Whether they should be provided for at this particular time is yet to be determined.

Mr. Speaker, the budget comes to us in the red. That is the lamentable fact, though not surprising. The expenditure program approved at the last session did not justify a deliberate lessening of income. That was quite apparent then. It is even more evident now.

May I remind you that within 6 months after the close of the fiscal year in which World War II hostilities ceased, President Truman submitted to the Congress a balanced budget. That was the budget for the fiscal year 1948 presented in January 1947. It was in balance despite the fact that debt retirement had but recently been effected to the extent of more than $20,000,000,000. If anyone desires a citation, he will find this set out on page M–13 of the 1948 Budget.

But there began at that time a 2-year hiatus in the complete control of our Federal finances, with the result that the present budget as now presented is again in the red.

Expenditures during the fiscal year commencing next July 1 are estimated to aggregate $41,858,000,000.

Availability for the liquidation of such estimated expenditures is estimated at $40,985,000,000, or a shortage of $873,000,000.

It is our job and our responsibility to make up that shortage, and we can undertake it mainly in three ways:

First. Search out ways of curbing proposed expenditures without hurt to the general welfare.

Second. Curtail current expenditure programs where changed conditions justify that course.

Third. Raise additional revenue.

The first step is largely a task for the Committee on Appropriations of the two Houses. I believe we can pledge that the House committee will endeavor in every way to discharge this task faithfully and scrupulously. And we solicit the cooperation of every Member of the House.

The following summation of proposed expenditures by objects indicates the difficulty of the job:

| | |
|---|---|
| International affairs and finance | $6,709,000,000 |
| National defense | 14,268,000,000 |
| Veterans' services and benefits | 5,496,000,000 |
| Interest on the public debt | 5,450,000,000 |
| Social welfare, health and security | 2,358,000,000 |
| Agriculture and agricultural resources | 1,662,000,000 |
| Natural resources | 1,861,000,000 |
| All other | 4,054,000,000 |
| Total | 41,858,000,000 |

The second step is not altogether a function of the Committee on Appropriations. The appropriate legislative committees can be relied on to cooperate. The legislative committees might concern themselves not alone with current expenditures but with projected or potential commitments under existing authority entailing Treasury withdrawals in subsequent fiscal years. Our problem is not an immediate one. Our concern is to adopt a sound, dependable fiscal course.

The third step, of course, is within the province of the Committee on Ways and Means.

There is still another step and a very important one, that of authorizing legislation.

Expenditures flow from appropriations, and appropriations flow from legislative enactments. The appropriation committees are hampered in maintaining sound expenditure levels when authorizing legislation piles up new or added demands upon the Federal purse. All too often costs, when passing authorizing legislation, seem to be of secondary concern. It is of paramount importance with a public debt the magnitude of ours and tax burdens such as we are now carrying and which we cannot expect to lessen for some time to come. No more effective means exist of curbing expenditure than to check at the source measures embodying authority to make appropriations.

Congress should consider carefully the initiation of new expenditures and new Federal activities. All such proposals start with small appropriations, but with the practical certainty that in future years they will require millions of dollars as the program develops. It should be remembered that once begun, they cannot easily be discontinued, regardless of the expenditures which they entail. The initiation of activities on small-scale expenditures is a process familiar to us all. But as we will recall, they usually blossom forth into ramifications requiring the expenditure of unexpected sums which must be provided in future years, and in deficit budgets every added expenditure is reflected in corresponding increases in the public debt.

There are many who do not seem to be greatly concerned over the magnitude of the public debt; many who are not averse to letting it sort of coast along, curtailing it according to our circumstances, without any determined purpose to liquidate it as rapidly as might be under a definite plan. Of course, that is the easiest way, a hand-to-mouth plan; let tomorrow take care of itself, the line of least resistance. We had an example of that in the last session when in the face of rising expenditures, occasioned by the international situation, Congress proceeded to reduce the revenue. I have discussed the subject before, and I refer to it again because it is so vital to the fiscal stability of the Government and the welfare of present and future generations.

The public debt at its peak was $279,214,000,000. At the end of December—that is, at the end of last month—it had been reduced to $252,800,000,000. The interest appropriation on the debt for the peak year was $4,500,000,000, although it was floated at a minimum rate of interest. You might consult page 785, Senate Document No. 85, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, to get the exact amount of the interest upon the national debt at that time. For the fiscal year commencing next July 1, the interest item, according to the budget now before us, is $5,450,000,000, or an increase over the peak debt year, 1946, of $950,000,000, despite the debt reduction in the interim of $27,000,000,000.

Now, what does that indicate? It means that without a substantial and periodic debt retirement, there is a continually increasing interest bill, eventually attaining a level of possibly astounding proportions, depending upon the rate at which refunding may be accomplished, because as the vast amount of securities, none of which exceed 10 years in maturity, fall due, aggregating as much as $30,000,000 in 1 year under peacetime conditions, and with the demand for money which we may expect at that time, the rate of interest must be raised; it cannot be refunded at the present low rate of interest. Consequently, without

a substantial debt retirement, as rapidly as can be effected, a continually increasing interest bill of large proportions, depending upon the rate at which refunding must be accomplished, must be met annually.

That interest money is money which otherwise might be channeled into roads, into flood-control work, into assistance to States for education, into inland water transportation and power, into soil conservation, into rural electrification, into aid to the aged and infirm and many other worthy objects which would contribute to the enrichment of our people and so contribute to a happier and more prosperous America. But instead of spending it for that purpose we must pay it out in interest upon this great debt hanging over us, an old man of the sea in time of peace and a sword of Damocles in time of war.

It is our responsibility, therefore, to cut that interest bill and to effect economies which can be secured without injury or prejudice to the public welfare in order that the largest possible amount of the national revenues may be utilized for national benefits.

We should keep always in mind the devastating effect that would ensue from pyramiding upon the present debt, or any substantial part of it, the cost of another world conflict.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. There is an article in Look magazine, I believe, which states that we are spending $400,000,000 a year in Japan, in addition to the cost of our military operations there, trying to help the Japanese. Does not the gentleman think we had better let the Japanese go to work and make their own living, and use some of that money to improve our own country and make it possible for us to pay the interest and sinking fund on the debt we now owe?

Mr. CANNON. That is a subject which would require, for elaboration, more time than we have this afternoon; but let me say to the gentleman that whenever we abandon the Eastern Hemisphere to Russian communism we invite a situation which must be met in the future by sums compared with which the $400,000,000 to which the gentleman refers will be inconsequential.

Mr. RANKIN. This article goes on to say that what we are doing there now is provoking communism instead of discouraging it. I was just wondering if we are really getting anywhere. I do not mean provoking him but provoking those people who follow the Communist line. I did not understand we were fighting Japan just to take them over and raise them.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. After we have cut down our public debt from $279,000,000,000 to $252,000,000,000, it requires larger appropriations to take care of it than it did before. Will the gentleman elaborate on that?

Mr. CANNON. I have discussed that in my statement and, suggest that the gentleman look at my remarks when they appear in the RECORD.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In order to reply to the question propounded by the gentleman from Mississippi, will the gentleman from Missouri be kind enough to permit me to comment briefly on it?

Mr. CANNON. I shall be glad to have the gentleman discuss the subject. He is perhaps as familiar with it as any Member of the House.

Mr. STEFAN. We should know that under international law we are obligated to feed the civilian population of conquered countries at a certain minimum amount. I want to make a statement with reference to the amount he mentioned in this newspaper article with which the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations is familiar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 15 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, certainly there is no inclination on my part to object. Many Members have sat here listening with a great deal of interest to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. But there are many more special orders, including one, the next following, by the ranking Republican member of the committee. I do not know how much of his time would be used, but I do not believe there should be an undue extension of time, because that will prejudice others who have special orders.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. The Army under GARIOA is feeding these people in the occupation areas. The gentleman from Missouri, and the members of the Committee on Appropriations know that the Army has reduced the amount of money that we are spending in occupied areas to feed the people and is making every effort to make them self-sufficient.

Mr. RANKIN. If the gentleman from Nebraska had the information that I have, he would know that we never did admit that it was our obligation to feed the people of conquered countries. I know that because I lived in a country which was conquered once, and which was starved for 20 years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly the statement has been repeatedly made by representatives of the administrative branch of the Government to the Committee on Appropriations, and to the subcommittee dealing with the Army, as well as to the Committee on Defense, in connection with the presentation of requests for GARIOA that under the Hague and Geneva conventions we do have a responsibility to feed the country when we occupy it, at least to the extent necessary to prevent disease and unrest. I think he knows that that has been cited as authority for making of these appropriations and the responsibilities that we have incurred.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. On page 7 of the President's budget message he states he expects at a later date to request funds for providing military supplies to western European countries. Can the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations give us any rough idea at this time as to how much funds may be involved in that request?

Mr. CANNON. I imagine that no one in the department could at this time estimate accurately the amount which may be involved. As the gentleman knows, we must from time to time revise our estimates to meet rapidly changing conditions abroad. Certainly the Committee on Appropriations of the House will have an opportunity to pass upon the amount or the necessity for any amount for such purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the budget message portrays with considerable clarity our present and prospective financial status. It makes possible an understanding approach to the questions involved. Our final conclusions, of course, must rest on exhaustive inquiries in the course of the hearings.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that we can effect sizable and justifiable reductions in the budget.

I have yet to see a budget of which this was not true. It is the President's budget, true, but it would be humanly impossible for the President personally to determine the amount necessary to implement the thousands of objects which the budget embraces. He must rely upon subordinate agencies to work out such details, and I am certain will welcome any method we may find for efficiently attaining the same objectives proposed at less cost.

As I said earlier, much help in effecting economies can be given by the legislative committees, but I have in mind particularly the Committee on Armed Services.

The appropriations for the armed services for the current fiscal year, plus contractual authority of $220,000,000, amount to $10,674,477,413. That was the amount of new spending money voted, some of which, of course, will not be drawn from the Treasury until the fiscal year 1950 and fiscal years subsequent thereto. In addition to that vast sum, current fiscal year Treasury withdrawals will be augmented appreciably in consequence of the supplemental National Defense Act of 1948, which did not become a law until May 21, 1948.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The time of the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 20 additional minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of all other special orders today I may be allowed to complete this speech.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, that act appropriated $929,000,000, and included contractual authorizations aggregating $2,275,000,000. For the fiscal year 1950 the budget proposed a new obligation available for the armed services under the heading of "National Military Establishment," including contractual authorizations of $2,058,000,000, amounting to $13,486,000,000.

On the expenditure or Treasury withdrawal side for the armed services alone the budget estimates these amounts, predicated upon existing legislation:

For the current 1949 fiscal year, $11,260,000,000.

For the fiscal year 1950, $12,760,000,000.

Is it necessary to devote that much money to national defense? Is it not possible, with altered circumstances, to permit the recapture of a part of the huge amount voted at the last session of Congress? Is it possible appropriately to ready our armed forces for appreciably less by pursuing more economical practices and eliminating many war-born practices of a costly nature, which do not contribute to military preparedness? Have all war-created activities, justified solely by war, been eliminated? Have all costly practices initiated during the war, no longer justified, been discontinued? Those are questions, the answers to which no one can be certain of until there is careful scrutiny of the estimates and justifications. So far as I am aware, there has been no searching inquiry as to some of these questions since the Seventy-ninth Congress when we were pursuing a systematic program of recapturing appropriation balances.

There must be further inquiries by the Appropriations Committee, and I trust also by the Armed Services Committee as well. If Members of the House have any ideas or suggestions in that connection I can assure them that such suggestions will be welcomed and carefully weighed by the committee.

Like many others, I feel that we should derive some substantial economies in consequence of the National Security Act of 1947. Thus far it would seem that about all that has been done is to superimpose upon existing agencies a super agency occasioning larger instead of lesser expenditures. It is to be hoped that the Armed Services Committee will review that law and inquire into its workings with a view to achieving more efficient and more economic results. It is a matter of no little urgency if we are to realize savings either during the remainder of this fiscal year or the ensuing fiscal year.

It is the generally accepted fact that material economies must come very largely from lessened pay rolls. It is my considered opinion that the armed services and those other agencies of the Government that were expanded during the war years have not reduced their staffs to levels which would be adequately efficient to the dispatch of the essential functions. Overstaffing no doubt exists in other places. I am inclined to doubt whether the heads of the agencies concern themselves enough on this matter. Maybe they lack the experience of having had to meet pay rolls. I do not recall any evidence of economy in pay rolls by the heads of agencies since the time the late Claude Swanson shortly after his assumption of office as Secretary of the Navy ordered a 10 percent reduction in the Navy Department's civilian staff. Possibly a helpful step would be to set up in each agency a qualified group whose business it would be to survey jobs and search out ways of economizing in their personnel. Overstaffing, however, is not alone responsible for heavy pay-roll costs. We liberalized the Classification Act of 1923 a few years back and we have since been passing a succession of pay increase measures all adding to the cost of standing Federal agenices and the cost of running the Federal Government. Despite the fact that we have a budget in the red and face a deficit this fiscal year, there is a hue and cry for further increases in the Classification Act ratings. How can we justify further pay increases under such circumstances? We can justify to the American people the grant of funds for paying a living wage to all employees who may not now be drawing a living wage, but beyond that common sense dictates that we must not go at this time. In the higher pay brackets of Civil Service employees there may be some isolated case where sufficient skills and talents might demand higher compensation in private employment, but it has always been so. In the great majority of cases I daresay that Federal employees are drawing higher pay than persons in comparable positions on the outside. The truth is we have too many employees in the higher pay brackets. The Classification Act has developed into an excellent vehicle for that very situation. There are too many employees now who are nothing more than senior clerks who have been clothed with high-sounding titles which carry added pay, and when one gets one of these titles it is apt to mean further expense such as a private room, a personal secretary, and possibly a special messenger.

I entertain no objection to advances within pay grades which occur periodically when efficiency standards are maintained, but pay rolls constitute such a large proportion of the cost of government that I feel we should exercise more voice in their circumscription and administration. We should see that a proper balance is established and maintained as regards distribution of employees in grade and that might mean stopping grade advancements above a certain level—say $5,000 or $6,000—without advance approval by Congress.

When we think of Federal pay we should not lose sight of the fact that we have provided a liberal retirement law, that there is a short workweek and a short workday, that there are numbers of holidays with pay and often with extra time off, and that that there are generous leave periods, including sick leave. These are benefits that cannot be overlooked in determining fair and just compensation. There are occasions when we lose good men to industry or other fields of employment, but that is the experience of every employer. By and large, the service is attractive to those who are in it and is sufficiently attractive to draw capable or promising new employees when needed. The fact cannot be stressed too often or too forcibly that our financial status demands the exercise of the most rigid economy. Essential demands are too heavy to allow any leeway for continued unessential costs or to take on new obligations that are not of a self-liquidating character or that will not immediately or in the future contribute in proportion to the national wealth.

As it all adds up we have a real task ahead of us to guard and preserve our financial integrity. The committee will have this objective in view. What it will be able to do depends upon its findings at the detailed examinations it will conduct on the budget estimates. What economies it can effect must await those examinations. Any prophecy of the final net result could only be a guess.

That raises the question of the legislative budget, provided for in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. We have had 2 years of experience under that law, and they have been rather disappointing. Its faults, and its disadvantages were clearly pointed out when the legislation was under consideration by the House, and still more effectively in the Senate. Its advocates, and they were few and relatively inexperienced, could not defend it, but pleaded for a trial, and the House consented to give it a trial. At the first session of the Eightieth Congress, the majority Members of the Legislative Budget Committee guessed, and I use the word advisedly, that there would be effected an expenditure saving of between four and one-half and six billion dollars. The Senate insisted on the lower figure and the House proposed the higher figure. Incidentally, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and I cast the determining vote which committed the House to the larger proposed saving. However, the difference between the two Houses was never reconciled and no legislative budget was adopted. Now, bear in mind those amounts applied to expenditures and not to appropriations.

To make expenditure savings of such proportions would necessitate reducing appropriations by considerably larger amounts because appropriations remain available for expenditure after the close of the fiscal year for which made. The official record for the first trial year shows appropriation reductions of $3,162,877,443, as may be noted on pages 796 and 797, Senate Document 106. As I

have explained, that means a gross expenditure reduction well under that amount. So the first attempt with the legislative budget culminated in a difference between the two Houses, both dominated by same political party, which was never resolved, and in a net result of something less than half of the goal advocated by the House and about two-fifths less than the goal advocated by the Senate.

At the second session of the Eightieth Congress the majority members of the Legislative Budget Committee again hazarded a guess. The Members of the two bodies were more in unison and more conservative. Their joint aim was an expenditures saving of two and one-half billion dollars. The official record for the session shows appropriation reductions of $2,770,628,775, as may be seen on pages 894, 895, and 896 of Senate Document 205, and that, too, does not mean expenditure reductions of that amount, but rather an amount well under the objective which had been set.

Now, what was accomplished by these two attempts? What useful purpose was served? Some Member of the House—who was not a member of the joint committee—has been reported in the press as saying that the procedure creates an incentive to accomplish a more effective economy job. Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, do we need any more incentive than a glance at the public debt, the "must" expenditures, and the tax burdens we are carrying?

May I call attention, and particularly the attention of the new Members, to this very voluminous volume.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I have been listening to the gentleman from Missouri with a great deal of interest. I would like to ask this question: Does the gentleman, who is now chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, expect to make as good or better a showing regarding the reduction of needless expenditures of the Government as did the Eightieth Congress? I would like to know just what he is thinking, and I think the American people would like to know.

Mr. CANNON. That is the very thing I am talking about. As has been said, it is utterly impossible, without hearings and without investigation, and especially in view of rapidly changing conditions, to make anything like an accurate estimate at this time. That is why the legislative budget system in effect at this time is impractical and unworkable.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CANNON. With pleasure.

Mr. JENSEN. Then I would like to know, since the gentleman has given me the answer that he has, is the gentleman going to attempt to make any kind of savings whatever under the budget estimate of the President?

Mr. CANNON. I certainly am, and I trust I shall have the cooperation and help of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows he always has that support.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER in the chair). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman knows my record well enough, since I have been on the Appropriations Committee with him for the past three terms, to know that I have always supported the gentleman or anyone else who attempted to cut out unnecessary expenditures.

I must say in all fairness to the new Members of the Congress and to the American people that there have been many times when I was terribly disappointed in the position the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] took on expenditures. There were many times when I felt he wanted to spend too much money on a lot of things that were not necessary. I hope that now, since we have a big job ahead of us, as the gentleman has just recited to the House, he will go along with the Republicans and the Democrats on the committee who do want to cut out unnecessary expenditures. I am sure, after listening to the gentleman, that that is what he intends to do.

Mr. CANNON. I trust that the gentleman, when he extends his remarks, will specify the times in which the gentleman from Missouri has approved expenditures of which the gentleman from Iowa did not approve, and I will say that I recall, myself, instances in which I advocated economy when the gentleman voted against me.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman then go to the trouble of picking out those instances where I have supported legislation or appropriation bills in greater sums than has the gentleman from Missouri? If the gentleman wants me to pick out the many instances where I have supported economies which I felt were necessary, and put them in the RECORD, then certainly I should expect the gentleman to do likewise, and I think the gentleman will in all fairness do that.

Mr. CANNON. I will not wait for that. When we brought on the floor a proposition to eliminate the yearly appropriation for guayule, on which we threw away millions of dollars.

Mr. JENSEN. For what?

Mr. CANNON. The appropriation for guayule.

Mr. JENSEN. Guayule rubber?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. What did I do?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman voted to continue the appropriation when I urged its discontinuance, and we have spent millions of dollars on it.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman is picking out peanuts to talk about. Now let us talk about some of the things the gentleman has voted for which amount to tens and thousands of times the little guayule appropriation.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman may give them now, but $50,000 is not peanuts.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman give me time to name some of them?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; proceed.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman was quite instrumental as a Member in advocating not one but dozens of things that I opposed, but it happens that they were in full committee, and the gentleman knows, as everybody in the House knows, that we cannot talk about the battles we had in full committee.

Mr. CANNON. To what does the gentleman refer? The gentleman says I voted for appropriations of which he disapproved. Let the gentleman specify them.

Mr. JENSEN. All right. Then I will turn around and say the same thing to you. Name some of the things that I approved.

Mr. CANNON. I just named one.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, yes; guayule.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; and the gentleman does not deny it. Fifty thousand dollars absolutely thrown away.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to this voluminous document. Every word in it and every figure in it must eventully come before the House and be passed upon by the membership of the House during this session of Congress. It is a 1,950-page volume. Apart from the transmittal message and various tables and indexes it comprises 1,345 pages of details which must be reviewed in detail by the Committee on Appropriations. It is a task that takes weeks of study and exploration before we can reach sound conclusions and bring our recommendations to the House.

This provision in the Legislative Reorganization Act specifies that before this detailed examination can be made, a joint committee of the House and Senate shall first make an estimate of all Federal receipts for the ensuing fiscal year.

Second, make an estimate of expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year.

Third, make a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditures during the ensuing fiscal year, including a reserve for deficiencies.

Note that it is not the maximum amount to be appropriated, but the maximum amount to be expended during the first year of the availability of these appropriations.

Fourth, make a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt if estimated receipts exceed estimated expenditures.

Fifth, make a recommendation to be included in a concurrent resolution which shall accompany the joint committee's report expressing the sense of the Congress that the public debt be increased by the amount of the excess if the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts.

You understand there is nothing binding on anybody after all this is done. All these preliminaries are required before the regularly constituted agencies of the House having jurisdiction can make their studies and reach any sound conclusion. Manifestly, if the requirement were not to operate until such studies have been completed and decisions arrived at, we would be merely confirming

what we have done already, or what we are about to do.

The executive departments worked for more than 6 months preparing the budget estimates. The figures come to the Congress early in January. It is idle to believe that such a ceiling could be arrived at or could be maintained for the rest of the year in an era when almost every week is marked by some emergency requiring additional appropriations. It is a useless obstacle to the legislative process.

The Federal budget, Mr. Speaker, is not a national affair influenced by caprice or depending on the partisan policies of the party in power in the executive branch, but, on the contrary, is a documented volume of recommendations based largely on law previously enacted by the Congress to carry out Government policies inaugurated during the regimes of each political party.

The plan proposed by the Reorganization Act of determining in advance the fiscal requirements of the Government as a whole, and establishing a relationship between estimated revenues and expenditures is not new. It has been proposed many times, notably on February 28, 1913, when the inauguration of the budget system was under consideration, and again repeatedly in 1921, when the budget system was first adopted.

In each instance the House, after making every effort to incorporate the idea in a workable plan, found it impracticable. The inescapable difficulty is that it requires a report in the nature of a court verdict without considering the evidence. Long and detailed hearings are necessary before a figure can be accurately determined, and a figure arrived at by any other course is worthless and embarrasses the committee later in the session when justifiable reductions or warranted increases should be made in response to facts adduced in the hearings.

It is also an imposition on the public who are led to believe that the first figure announced is dependable. The man in the street gets the idea that the President's budget has been cut anywhere from $1,500,000,000 to $6,000,000,000 when a final tabulation at the close of the session may show that the budget has actually been increased. In other words, contrary to the general impression, no resolution under the Reorganization Act is binding on the committee or the Congress. No such resolution can establish any limitation on the Federal budget. Any such resolution is meaningless in effect and without force of law, misleading to the public, and imposes a duty on the Congress which—however laudable its objective—is impossible of attainment under the present law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman consumed?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has consumed 60 minutes altogether.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I might say, of course, permission has already been given to the gentleman to extend his remarks and to have them appear in the RECORD as a continuation of the remarks he made earlier in the afternoon, so that to all intents and purposes this will constitute an extension beyond the 1 hour ordinarily permitted under the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he is prepared at this time to yield for the purpose of a question.

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the gentleman prepared to yield for the purpose of a question at this time, if the additional time is granted?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The question I should like to propound to the chairman of the committee is whether or not he proposes to do something about the situation with respect to the legislative budget ceiling?

Mr. CANNON. That is our purpose, Mr. Speaker, in asking for a suspension of the provision until we can make further studies.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then the chairman expects to proceed with the consideration of a legislative budget ceiling resolution, under the terms of the existing House rules?

Mr. CANNON. Not if the concurrent resolution is agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So that the Appropriations Committee and the members of the Ways and Means Committee will have to act on this joint committee and try to get out this report by the 15th of February, just as we struggled to do in the last 2 years?

Mr. CANNON. It is to be hoped that will not be necessary; as the gentleman is aware, in the last 2 years no advantage has accrued from the larger amount of time and money wasted on the legislative budget.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That may be, but the responsibility is on that committee to make a report. Whether or not the House acted upon it, the responsibility was on the joint budget committee to report a resolution by the 15th of February, and they did so.

Mr. CANNON. Not in the first session. They adopted a figure in the second session, and thereafter paid no attention to it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My memory is that the resolution was prepared by the joint committee in both sessions and whether the House acted upon it or not was not in the control of the committee. Did not the House act upon the report in the second session?

Mr. CANNON. Without any hearings or any basis of fact.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Whether the House acted or not, was it not the responsibility of the joint legislative budget committee to submit a report by February 15 under the rules embodied in the so-called Legislative Reorganization Act?

It has always been my contention that that particular part of the Reorganization Act was an unrealistic and futile gesture. Even if the Congress adopted the report, a subsequent act could always, in effect, repeal any ceiling figure mentioned in the report.

Mr. CANNON. The figure considered was not supported by any data. All members of the subcommittee agreed that the plan was unworkable. The chairman of the joint committee, Mr. BRIDGES, so announced in the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is no argument between the gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from South Dakota with respect to the practical difficulties of making any firm estimates before the 15th of February when the subcommittees have not had an opportunity to hold hearings. That is the point the gentleman has been making, and is well taken, but the basic question I am asking is whether or not as chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the Eighty-first Congress the gentleman from Missouri proposes to do anything about that in this year. I am sure that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] who was chairman of the committee in the Eightieth Congress also felt that the February 15 report was largely a futile thing but since it was the law and the first application of it, that it should be followed lest someone say it was not even tried.

Mr. CANNON. We propose to follow the law, but we trust that the House will agree to suspending that provision until we have had an opportunity to write a workable budget provision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Suspending it in this session?

Mr. CANNON. Suspending it in this session.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And will a resolution on that point come up in the near future?

Mr. CANNON. That depends on action by the committee.

Too frequently, Mr. Speaker, the fact is overlooked that we have a Budget and Accounting Act which became a law on June 10, 1921. It was the product of the best and most experienced minds on the subject at that time. It was framed by Members of this body with long experience and proven and recognized capacity. It was adequate to our purposes then and it is adequate today, but its provisions are effective only so far as Congress is concerned, only as Members individually and the committees having jurisdiction conscientiously and diligently discharge their obligations.

The budget before us is presented in consequence of that law.

It estimates over-all receipts for the ensuing fiscal year as $40,985,000,000.

It estimates expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year as $41,858,000,000.

And it proposes appropriations and authorizations for expenditure during the ensuing fiscal years of $34,000,000,000.

Instead of prejudging those amounts and substituting, without any sound basis for so doing, figures of our own as objectives, we should view them in their true light as recommendations to the Congress and approach them with a determination to improve each category to the extent the situation permits. It is not a guessing proposition. It is a task requiring diligence and application and business common sense. We can perform the task more efficiently, and certainly more expeditiously, if our time is not wasted in going through all the formalities leading up to and preparing a useless and meaningless legislative budget.

I have introduced today a concurrent resolution suspending the operation of that section of the Legislative Reorganization Act applying to the legislative budget pending further study. It is the quickest approach to waiving the requirement pending study of a better method and it is a course made permissive by the Legislative Reorganization Act itself. The Appropriations Committee should be permitted to proceed immediately with the examinations and studies it must conduct without being needlessly delayed by the ponderous and useless routine entailed by the legislative budget requirement.

I trust that the concurrent resolution may have the benefit of your thoughtful study and consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he had introduced such a concurrent resolution?

Mr. CANNON. I have introduced such a concurrent resolution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

What does the gentleman propose to do about the Appropriations Committee investigatory staff which was set up under the Reorganization Act? Of course, as the gentleman knows, we have had a staff which gave the Appropriations Committee much information, much assistance, and I am wondering just what the gentleman proposes to do with that staff.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with it. I initiated the system, and it operated for 3 years during my chairmanship of the committee very effectively. We expect to continue it.

Mr. JENSEN. In like manner as we now have it, a permanent staff of investigators, or how?

Mr. CANNON. I would expect it to operate with increasing efficiency. The details of it will be taken up when the committee is organized.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean he is going to borrow an employee from one department of the Government to investigate another department?

Mr. CANNON. It will be taken up with the Committee on Appropriations. What plan will be evolved I cannot say at this time. I am merely one member of a committee of 45 and am not in a position to say what the committee will do, but I will say that the matter will be submitted to the committee and the decision reached by the committee will be followed.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with matters of too serious import, too far-reaching world-wide importance, too fraught with the possibility of national catastrophe to afford the luxury of partisanship. The committee earnestly invites the counsel and cooperation of the membership of the House both in the formation of the bills reported in response to the budget recommendations, and in their consideration on the floor.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the American Legion Magazine, notwithstanding the fact that the cost would exceed the amount allowed by $196.

Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Mr. Biggers, of Texas.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Standard Sentinel, of Hazleton, of January 7.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the time allowed me today under special order, and that I may be allowed to revise and extend my remarks and include a speech that I made on October 26 at Fond du Lac, Wis., in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. COOPER) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

## SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FORRESTAL

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks by way of a letter in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, there has recently emanated from some of our columnists and radio commentators considerable material with reference to the conduct of Secretary of Defense Forrestal. Some of those comments were of such drastic character that I considered it advisable to communicate with Secretary Forrestal on the subject, and attached hereto is a communication from Secretary Forrestal with relation to the topics above referred to, which is self-explanatory. I personally want to commend Secretary Forrestal for the splendid manner in which he is handling many difficult problems.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, January 11, 1949.*

HON. HARRY SHEPPARD,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. SHEPPARD: I have looked into the matters referred to in your telephone call of last week, and the only conclusion which I can draw is that the broadcast mentioned by your constituent appears to be an attempt to discredit the foreign policy of this Government.

The broadcast contained a statement to the effect that the administration was seeking power to "throw the country into war without even notifying the Congress." From other statements contained in the broadcast, it seems clear that this language has reference to proposed legislation which would set out in clear and simple terms the authority of the President, under certain circumstances directly involving our national security, to furnish military supplies to other countries.

As you know, the field of foreign policy is the responsibility of the President, and the President generally formulates policy in this field after seeking the advice of the Secretary of State. The National Military Establishment does not make foreign policy. The National Military Establishment is, however, one of the organizations which the President may, if he so desires, utilize in carrying out certain aspects of foreign policy. The occupation duties of the Army are an illustration.

In order that our foreign policy may be kept in balance with our military strength, Congress established the National Security Council, and gave the Council the duty of advising "the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to the national security so as to enable the military services and the other departments and agencies of the Government to cooperate more effectively in matters involving the national security."

In accordance with the congressional language just quoted, the National Security Council—with a membership including, among others, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense—recently advised the President of the desirability of seeking the legislation referred to above. The President has approved this recommendation of the National Security Council.

In his budget message of January 3, President Truman discussed this matter as one of the most important items of his legislative and budget program, and said: "In existing circumstances, economic strength is not enough to assure continued independence to free people. Under the Charter of the United Nations, therefore, we have been discussing with some of the western European countries measures designed to increase the security of the North Atlantic area. To further this objective, I expect later to request funds for providing military supplies to those countries and to certain other countries where the provision of such assistance is important to our national security."

This same subject was discussed at some length in a State Department press release of December 29, a copy of which I attach. It was also discussed at pages 13 and 21 of my annual report (copy attached), as released to the press for use in morning newspapers of December 30.

The broadcast referred to by your constituent described this proposed legislation as a request for "the power * * * to throw the country into war without even notifying the Congress." In the light of the information set out above, I trust you will agree with me that there is no basis whatever for such an allegation with respect to the proposed legislation—which, of course, as the President

has clearly stated, is being submitted by him to Congress for congressional consideration.

In the broadcast referred to by your constituent, a second matter—and one which has no relation whatever to the subject I have discussed above—was mentioned. This second matter appears to be a reference to an investment which I made 20 years ago in a Canadian company organized by me. This 1929 investment was made 11 years before I severed all my connections with the banking firm with which I was associated, in order to become an administrative assistant to President Roosevelt.

In 1933, when I was testifying before a committee of the United States Senate, I stated that the applicable tax laws of the United States and Canada had led me to make the investment. On this same occasion, I also testified that the total income taxes paid by me to the United States and the State of New York, for the year under discussion, were in excess of $300,000.

This particular hearing was a public hearing conducted by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate, and the full text of the testimony is readily available to the public in a volume which can be identified as follows: Stock Exchange Practices, Hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency, United States Senate, Seventy-third Congress, second session, on Senate Resolution 84 (72d Cong.) and Senate Resolution 56 and Senate Resolution 97 (73d Cong.).

If I can be of any further assistance to you in connection with any inquiries you may have concerning the broadcast in question, please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### THE BUDGET MESSAGE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the President has submitted a budget message, including the liquidating of contract authorizations, for the fiscal year 1950 of $41,572,000,000. Of this figure $3,036,000,000 is for the liquidation of contract authorizations. There may be additional requests if additional authorizations are passed by the Congress.

These figures are what we will have to work on and correspond with actual appropriations of $34,273,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949 which is now about one-half over, indicating a proposed increase in appropriations of upward of $7,000,000,000.

A tremendous increase is included in the estimates for national defense totalling $4,500,000,000. A very large portion of this increase, $3,100,000,000—is for the Air Force. A $750,000,000 increase for the Navy and a decrease of approximately $1,100,000,000 for the Army.

In arriving at these figures, with the exception of the Army and the veterans, almost every single unit of the Government shows an increase. It is going to be necessary for us to review these appropriations with the utmost care to see that we do not provide funds for projects or purposes which are not necessary and without which we could get along just as well. We must take cognizance of the facts just as far as we can and try to avoid permitting the waste of money.

The President has shown us on page M39 of his budget statement, why we should eliminate one item from the consideration by this Congress, wherein he states:

In the past 3 years housing construction has risen to the level it took 6 years to reach after World War I. Conversions of older houses have also increased the housing supply and extensive repairs and modernization have improved housing standards. As a result many of the most acute emergency needs, especially for veterans, have been met and the number of families compelled to live with others or to make other temporary arrangements has been reduced.

This indicates clearly that the housing situation has improved very markedly in the last 2 years without the Federal construction of houses and that it will continue to improve if we permit private industry to continue to function. It indicates that, in his own opinion, the situation will continue to improve and that the shortage will be entirely eliminated if we do not do foolish things which will stop private construction. Public construction of houses means priorities for Government construction and that means breaking down the possibility of private contractors securing the materials necessary to build. It is a study of all of the demands that are made upon us, and a careful analysis of all the legislation that is introduced and the most exacting examination of these things by the Appropriations Committee that will prevent wasteful operations on the part of the President.

The President has asked for an increase in the appropriations for the veterans' services and yet he estimates expenditures $464,000,000 below the amount of the appropriations. I believe that the President is very much mistaken in a great many of his requests and that the need is not going to materialize in the way that he anticipates and that we are going to be able to find ways to save large sums of money just as we have been able to do in the past.

I ask of the Congress the utmost of good faith in approaching this problem and that they realize that all of these governmental expenditures are inflationary and dangerous and that, if we provide funds that are not absolutely necessary for the conduct of the Government, we are betraying the trust that the people of the United States have placed in us.

In 1948 the President's estimate of receipts turned out to be many billions of dollars below what the actual receipts were. The present situation is that, so far this year, down to the last date available, the revenue receipts of the Government are about $200,000,000 above what they were last year. It is therefore at least reasonable to expect that the revenues will run $42,500,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949, after deducting the tax refunds. In 1950, if business conditions continue anywhere near as good as they are at the present, the revenue receipts should be as large—actually larger because revenue receipts have always increased after a tax reduction bill so that, unless the Congress fails in its responsibility to properly review the requests of the President and properly cut them down, we should have a surplus instead of a deficit for the next 2 years.

The Congress handicapped itself by adopting an amendment wiping out the power of the Rules Committee and making it mandatory on the part of the Speaker to recognize the chairman of any committee 21 days after a resolution had been introduced in the House for the consideration of a rule after a bill had been reported. This takes away the protection that the people have had for the past 100 years in the House of Representatives. It makes it possible for the regular committees of the House to be sure that if they report a bill it can be brought up for consideration. This sort of thing will result in much larger appropriation requirements and must larger expenditures out of the Federal Treasury, unless we have a greater sense of responsibility on the part of every committee in the House of Representatives.

This action was the most reactionary step that has been taken in the Congress in my day. It was a step which indicated that the majority of the House was careless of their responsibilities to the people of the United States. Bad results flowing from that situation can only be prevented by the most exacting and the most careful committee work on the part of the Members of the House.

I ask that a special effort be made by them to be sure that no bills are reported that call for the expenditure of public funds unless it is absolutely necessary. It is only by that sort of conduct and activity that we can meet our responsibility to the people of the United States.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an article from Pathfinder magazine and in the other an article from the Seafarer's Log.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of the legislative business and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### THE MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, President Truman in his message on the state of the Union, as was expected, urged the adoption of a legislative program to perpetuate and to perfect the Socialist regime patterned after that of Stalin and Hitler, which was formally launched by his predecessor.

Among other things, he asked Congress to give him power to again subject our people to the torture of the OPA era, black markets, empty store shelves, to reline the streets with long queues anxiously and tiresomely inching their way

to the counters for their daily allowances—price control and rationing.

To make political so-called loans to private industry.

To further socialize housing and thus add to the political corruption that so seriously afflicts the home-building industry—so-called low-rent housing, and so forth.

To continue and to strengthen the power of the political authority to liquidate owners of rental property and further aggravate the difficulty people are having to find a place in which to live—rent control.

To create the most fearful and the most avaricious bureaucracy of all, socialized medicine, and to engage in destroying the best medical care ever received by any people in the world.

To imitate the German Reich and other totalitarian states and bring the common school system under the juristion of the political authority controlling the Federal Government for the purpose of indoctrinating our youth with the philosophy of socialism, and, of course, to secure the political support of teachers—so-called Federal aid to education. It is a law, but with very few exceptions, that every dollar loaned or granted by the political authority, whether to private individuals or political bodies, carries with it a degree of political control, which control expands progressively as such loans or grants are repeated, all legal verbiage, or absence of such, to the contrary notwithstanding. The very existence of these devices is contingent upon the political dividends they pay.

To implement the available political means for maintaining the artificial prosperity the farming community is experiencing and to move it closer to the brink of liquidation and collective farming—political soil conservation, triple A, subsidies, Marshall plans, and so forth.

To fetter the expansion of and to destroy private electric energy producing and distributing plants, and to implement the program under way for ultimate socialization of the entire electric power industry, more TVA's, and so forth.

To exact in taxes for current operating costs from the low-income groups, in the guise of soaking the rich, about three and one-half billion dollars for an indefinite period of years, for that is about the proportion of the burden these classes will be forced to bear if the President's proposal to raise an additional $4,000,000,000 in taxes annually goes through.

To broaden the insidious income tax, disguised as social security, to cover some 20,000,000 additional workers to feed the insatiable maw of politics.

The incidence of taxation is such as to cause wage earners and the other low-income groups to pay the greater portion of taxes no matter upon whom or what they are levied. This is inherent in the very nature of things. Just as white sheep give more wool than black ones, because there are more white ones to fleece, so wage earners and working people in general pay in the aggregate more taxes than the rich and well-to-do. Taxes are ultimately paid out of production. One cannot eat or wear money but only the things that money will exchange for. Since the low-income groups produce and consume much the greater proportion of the necessaries of life and since general taxes ultimately and inevitably fall upon consumption goods, the real source of taxes must always remain predominately with those groups.

Banks, agriculture, railroads, coal mines, in fact all industry is well in the process of socialization. President Truman recommended to Congress that he be given power to authorize the construction of facilities to produce materials "in critically short supply, such as steel, if action by private industry fails to meet our needs." This is a bold and forthright request for power to formally put the political authority in the business of producing steel, which, in the nature of things, would have to eventuate in the complete communization of the entire steel industry.

And, finally, the President asked for over-all power to impose upon the Nation universal conscription, the essence of tyranny and the ultimate resort for making the regimentation complete and for maintaining a permanent status of war to keep a ravaged, disillusioned, and restive people from staging a successful revolution.

President Truman has heretofore himself stated the powers he asked Congress to give him represent police-state methods and inferentially condemned them. Now he seeks to impose them upon the Nation in perpetuity and even proceeds on the preposterous assumption that he was given a mandate to do so in the last election.

The result of last November's election shows nothing remotely resembling anything like an authorization to President Truman to continue or advance the program of communizing the United States.

Only about one-half of the eligible voters took the trouble to go to the polls. Though the population has greatly increased in the last decade, the total vote cast in the Presidential election in 1940 was about 2,000,000 greater than that of the last election. Why? Because a great number of those who still believe in freedom and constitutional government of strictly limited powers, the kind of government under which this Nation achieved its greatness, viewed the platforms of the two major parties, and the conduct of party leaderships during the last decade or so, as being so completely and so similarly socialistic that there was no choice left to them but to stay home.

Furthermore, millions who did take the trouble to go to the polls, whether they voted the Democratic or Republican ticket, did so with decided reservations, lacking faith that either party would do the right things instead of the politically expedient ones.

And by no means of least importance is the fact that millions voted outright for New Dealism not knowing its implications or realizing that it is leading this Nation into universal slavery, and, perchance, even to domination by some foreign power, as surely and as straight as the crow flies.

There is nothing whatever in the situation warranting the claim that the election gave President Truman a mandate to do anything. Only if, on the one hand, the voters had had a clear-cut choice of voting for the existing political system which is based wholly on plundering the producing elements of the population, and, on the other hand, for true government as expressed by Jefferson, one that "shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned," and President Truman had won out, then, but only then, could it be claimed that he was given a mandate to perfect the police state. But the voters had no such choice which completely exposes the pretension of any mandate.

The attitude of the electorate in respect of the several factions contending with each other for control of the Government and the election results clearly and unmistakably show dangerous political corruption of our national life. It is to this that we must look for an explanation of the true meaning of the recent election.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I should like to ask the gentleman from Ohio something about this low-cost housing he was talking about. Would the gentleman tell me and the rest of the Members of the House what low-cost housing is?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman from Ohio has so often expressed himself on that point to the Members that, if the gentleman from Massachusetts will permit, he prefers not to discuss it at the moment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER.) Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD—DANGER SIGNALS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning's press contains some danger signals. I wonder if they are caused by the Federal Reserve Board's policy, which is squeezing credit through Regulation W, or by causing the commercial banks to reduce their loans, or both.

### GOOD WAGES AND FAIR PRICES

We are on a very high plateau in this country. We are on the plateau of a $250,000,000,000 national debt, jet propulsion and atomic energy. The only way we can pay off this national debt is with a high national income. There is only one way we can have a high national income, and that is through good wages and fair prices.

There is no other way that we can pay the debt. Therefore we must not go back to "horse and buggy" days or the ox-cart days, insofar as our national economy is concerned.

### SLUMP IN LOANS

On the front page of the Washington Post this morning there is a headline, "Sharp drop in business loans laid to healthy inventory cut." This article discloses that there was a spectacular $195,000,000 slump in farm and trade

loans for the week ending January 5, but the Federal Reserve authorities consider it healthy. I wonder if it is healthy. I also wonder if it is a No. 1 danger signal that the Federal Reserve Board should recognize instead of trying to apologize for, or try to explain. The same article indicates that the banks increased their holdings of Government securities especially reflecting sharp increases in holdings of 1-year and 90-day securities. Does this mean that loans for production and distribution are cut down and the lack of earnings made up through purchases of Government bonds and securities?

BROAD POWERS

It is all right for the Federal Reserve Board to have broad powers, if they are exercised discreetly. But I doubt that they are being used discreetly. The people believe that the Federal Reserve Board caused the depression of 1920. Many of them also believe that the Board contributed to the depression in 1929 to 1932. Many of us believe that the Board almost caused another devastating depression in 1937 by doubling the reserve requirements or raising the reserve requirements of banks 100 percent. One more depression caused by the Federal Reserve Board and I predict that that will very likely be the end of the Federal Reserve Board.

Possibly consideration should not be given to require certain powers to be exercised by the Federal Reserve Board, only in collaboration with the United States Treasury Department. This morning's press also carries the following danger signals: "Hundreds of laid-off workers flocked to the offices of the Maryland Employment Security Department for compensation checks last week."

Maryland paid out $443,342 in unemployment benefits last week to 22,768 claimants. In the corresponding week a year ago, the sum of $139,000 was paid to 7,571 claimants. The number of applicants has more than doubled in the past 3 weeks.

Unemployment in New York State at the end of 1948 was about 40 percent higher than a year ago. It is reported in the morning press that that represents an increase of 65 percent in the past 3 months. The Bankers Trust Co. declares in its annual report issued yesterday that the firmer money policy of the monetary authorities helped to restrict credit expansion. What does this mean? Does this mean that the monetary authorities have sent word down to the commercial banks that they must not make so many loans?

It has always been insisted by financial experts that a little inflation is impossible. In other words, we have always been told that you cannot control it, that there is no way to keep it under control and that a little inflation must not be permitted. I wonder if a little deflation is likely to be equally devastating to our country. If you cannot control inflation, can you control deflation, and should we take drastic steps toward either inflation or deflation?

The Federal Reserve Board's record of becoming very active to deflate and never seemingly greatly concerned about increasing the ability of the people to consume is very disturbing to me. Another thing very disturbing to me is a report coming directly from a board member, from a member of the Federal Reserve Board, that a recession is long past due, and the earlier we have it the better off our country will be. In other words, the quicker the better. Is the Federal Reserve Board advocating and trying to cause a recession? I would like to know. Many of the steps they have taken and which they are now taking are steps in that direction. I hope they give careful consideration to withdrawing some of the drastic provisions they have put into effect affecting our economy to the extent that we now have a considerable credit squeeze.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that if the powers that be in the Administration would try to keep this country on an even keel, on a balanced budget, instead of trying to spend eight hundred and thirty-five million more than we are going to take in, if they would stop this squandering of money they would not need to issue such orders. You cannot spend yourself into prosperity and ever balance the budget.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] told us a while ago we are going to have a surplus. I am in favor of a balanced budget. I would be in favor of raising taxes in order to balance the budget. I do not want deficit financing. That is the reason why I voted twice last year against the tax-reduction bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is discussing one of the most important subjects that will confront this Congress. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. One way to prevent ruinous inflation and ruinous deflation would be the passage of a law fixing a limit beyond which Federal Reserve banks could not inflate or below which they could not deflate. You would have no trouble in stopping inflation. When they started to deflate you should provide that the Treasury Department should issue United States notes, with gold reserves behind them, to take the place of the Federal Reserve notes that are being retired, and in that way stabilize the currency, and let the American people know what they can depend upon, and prevent the disasters that were brought on in 1921 and 1929.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman to ask a question.

Mr. RICH. Where has the Federal Reserve or the Federal Government retired any of its indebtedness? No such thing has happened.

Mr. PATMAN. We retired $20,000,000,000 in the last year or two.

Mr. RICH. Oh, they took some notes that are coming due and they supplanted them with something else, but they are not retiring any debt. They are selling more bonds all the time.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no. The national debt was over $270,000,000,000 and now it is $250,000,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. If we let these Federal Reserve banks deflate the currency below the danger point, we never will pay our national debt. We must stabilize the currency within a given limit, or we are headed for disaster.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. You have been headed that way for 15 years.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, that sounds like campaign talk.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to get one thing in my mind.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will ask his question, I shall be glad to try to answer it.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Yes. I am not going to make any speech. I understood you were against the Federal Reserve System——

Mr. PATMAN. No. I am not against the Federal Reserve System. I am for the Federal Reserve System, properly operated. I am objecting to what the Federal Reserve Board has done.

Mr. NICHOLSON. What I want to bring out is, if I can, that because of laws passed in the Congress, the Federal agency had to go along with them.

Mr. PATMAN. The law did not specify how a regulation should be administered. It is not the duty of Congress to do that. It is now within the power of the Federal Reserve Board to change, for instance, regulation W; and I am insisting that they should liberalize regulation W.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I tell the gentleman from Texas, although I am a new Member and he is an old Member here, that we in the Congress tell the Board what they can charge for interest, and so forth, and so on?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; we have passed a law about savings deposits, that the Federal Reserve Board can fix the amount of interest to be paid on savings deposits in certain banks; and we made it an absolute violation of the law for interest to be paid on demand deposits.

Mr. NICHOLSON. But the Committee on Banking and Currency can bring in a bill here and say what the Federal Reserve Board shall do. Is not that so?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; we could bring in a bill like that; but I regret that the people who administer these laws will not administer them in a way that the economy of the Nation will not be harmed or injured. That is what I am talking about, that they are not properly administering the laws of this Government—that is, according to my notion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. It is a well-known fact, as any first-class economist will tell you,

that prices in a free economy, such as ours is supposed to be, are governed by two things, the volume of the nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation. For that reason I have insisted that the Banking and Currency Committee bring in a bill to stabilize the currency at a given limit. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas if he agrees with me on that proposition.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; generally, I do. I do not of course agree on the volume of actual currency multiplied by velocity, for I maintain that in currency must be included bank deposits and things of that kind that can be converted.

Mr. RANKIN. Things that grow out of the volume of currency.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; we will agree on that generally; yes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that you have been printing money for the last 15 years at the rate of about three or four tons a day?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. And the Treasurer of the United States says that he has printed more money in the last 15 years than any other Treasurer who has ever been in the Treasury Department; and he goes on to say further that it is worth less.

Mr. PATMAN. I presume the gentleman is proud of that because we could not do business in this country without money. Money as the gentleman knows is being mutilated and made unusable every day, that is being worn out at the rate of 3 or 4 tons a day.

Mr. RICH. The Secretary of the Treasury is a Democrat, from St. Louis. He is a pretty good fellow. He does not agree in the printing of all this money.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman certainly could not stop it. We have got to have money to do business. We cannot go back to the old barter system, trading a couple of hogs for a horse, and and vice versa.

Mr. RICH. But if you keep printing it, it will be just like the German mark which once was worth 24 cents but which finally got so cheap you could go out and get it off the dump for nothing. That is what is going to happen to our own money if we do not stop the printing presses.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think we are coming to any such situation as that.

Mr. RICH. That is the road we are on.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman agree that there should be a limit to the amount of currency that can be in circulation at any one time, that there should be a ceiling above which it cannot rise and a floor below which it cannot fall? If we had such a system we could have prosperity in this country for the next hundred years. But if we do not, we will never know from one year to another where we stand.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not think we could make a feasible plan limiting the amount of actual money in circulation for the reason that it varies with the people's demand for their money in their bank deposits. You cannot control the demand of the people. Sometimes they want actual money, at other times things that money will buy.

Mr. RANKIN. But you can establish limits beyond which it cannot go and below which it cannot fall and keep the currency in circulation within a reasonable limit.

Mr. PATMAN. If that were possible I surely would like to see it done. If the gentleman's theory is the answer I certainly would like to see it in operation. I will give it further consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. By having a ceiling above which it cannot rise you stop runaway inflation, and by having a floor below which it cannot fall you prevent disastrous deflation and perpetuate the prosperity we now have.

Mr. PATMAN. We could have another $60,000,000,000 in the circulation today if the people just demanded it.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman mean $60,000,000,000?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; or up to the limit of the deposits in banks; probably more.

Mr. RICH. If that should happen your money would not be worth anything.

Mr. PATMAN. It would be worth just as much as it is worth now; as it would be the same kind of money. It is used as money now by giving checks on banks.

Mr. RICH. That is what Hitler did over in Germany. Do you want that to happen here?

Mr. PATMAN. I suggest the gentleman ought to give a little more consideration to the question and he will not likely have that opinion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Massachusetts tell us what the program will be next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. On Monday there will be three suspensions. There will be a resolution in relation to tickets for the various inaugural activities which at prior inaugurals has been passed. There is also a Presidential salary bill which, I understand, is being considered by the Senate now. There is another resolution providing for a 2-day holiday on January 20 and 21 for Federal employees in the District of Columbia only. That bill is also up for consideration in the Senate and, if passed, will be considered under suspension of the rules on Monday.

For the rest of the week I know of no legislation that will come up but, always keeping faith with the House, I would like it understood that if anything should arise I may have a little flexibility in action so far as any matter of importance which we feel should come up, and then only by and through the consent of the leadership on the minority side. Those things are very carefully canvassed. It is not a question of my calling up anything. It has to go through the regular procedure and secure the consent of the leadership on your side.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it to be understood that the bill dealing with increases if brought up under suspension will deal only with the emoluments of the Presidential office?

Mr. McCORMACK. The President, the Vice President, and the Speaker, according to my understanding. I may say that that is the only extent to which the leadership would permit any bill or any resolution to come up. It would have to be confined to those three officers. The others can wait, and I say that without in any way indicating that I am prejudiced to any part of a broader bill. However, this bill will be confined to the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have the distinguished majority leader make that clear, because if the matter is to come up under suspension of the rules it is proper that the Members know the scope of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, if we could get it through by unanimous consent, that would be much better. I may say that the President pays an income tax on his salary and any increase in his salary would be subject to a tax.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the majority leader be in position to advise the membership at this time with respect to any plans for the election of Members to the various committees? Would that come up next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. Of course, that is a matter for each side to determine. On the majority side we expect to hold a caucus on either Monday or Tuesday. That has not been definitely decided. It will be very shortly, however. The Democratic committee on committees will make its report to the caucus, then, of course, presentation of a resolution to the House for its action takes place immediately. It is a matter also of your committee on committees to bring it up through your processes, your conferences, by making a report. So that ought to be done the early part of next week.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman state whether or not it would be the plan to have the House in session on Tuesday or Wednesday to consider nominations to the various committees?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the situation arises, that could be done. I would not want to commit myself, because that is a matter for conference with the leaders on both sides, depending on what the situation is. I think that if both parties were in position to organize their committees on Tuesday, we ought to meet and organize them and get the committees going.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is your responsibility under the rules of the House to present a resolution or report relating to the legislative budget, because it cannot get to work until those committees have been designated.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is true.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I withdrew my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader if he can tell us what the salary bill is going to be that is coming in?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be frank with the gentleman. My understanding is that the increase will be from $75,000 to $100,000 a year, and that the expense account will be increased to $50,000. I do not know definitely now whether it is $20,000 or $30,000, but to increase it to $50,000.

Mr. RICH. The President now gets $40,000 expense account, does he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know; I will be frank. As I understand, we increase it to $50,000.

Mr. RICH. You are going to increase it to $50,000, and with the $40,000 he gets now, that would be $90,000 that he would not have to account for. Now, what I would suggest to do, to be right between man and man and between the taxpayers of the country, would be that you give the President $200,000 and eliminate the $50,000 expense money. I would vote for that, but I will not let unanimous consent come in here for $50,000 exemption, because the President is now squandering the taxpayer's money, and he ought to pay taxes just like anybody else.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls for the regular order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the rules governing Members on this floor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized for 40 minutes.

AIR POWER AND THE FISCAL YEAR 1950 BUDGET OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the budget for 1950 has again brought to the forefront the question of the preservation of American leadership in the air. Those of us who have served in the Seventy-ninth and Eightieth Congresses are rather familiar with air-power problems because of a number of basic studies and surveys concluded during the lives of those Congresses by distinguished, impartial survey groups.

However, there are some 110 Members of this Congress who did not have an opportunity to study those surveys and findings about the condition of American air power. For their benefit and because of the importance of the issues raised by the budget message, I am going to review some of the background that led to the creation of the distinguished survey groups. I will also summarize some of the findings reported by these groups which bear directly upon the budget problem.

At the very outset I would like to emphasize something which I think the President's budget message also concedes, namely, that air power has now become our first line of defense. These are indeed critical times in international relations during which it would be the height of folly to fail to take the action required to insure our air power leadership.

THE POSTWAR DISINTEGRATION

It is difficult for anyone not actually a student of the problem to recollect or understand the extent of the disintegration of our military power following VJ-day. At the end of the war we possessed an aerial strength the like of which had never before been imagined. The Air Force was operating 243 air groups. Production of aircraft had soared to an annual rate of more than 100,000 planes a year. Our aircraft production was easily more than double the production of any other nation in the world. Our air power literally battered into rubble enemy defenses that had been considered almost impregnable and made possible a frontal assault by land and sea forces that forced final capitulation.

But pell-mell demobilization scattered all this strength to the four winds. Our Air Force plummeted down to a condition where it could scarcely muster 15 adequately equipped groups. Only three were rated "combat ready." Production of aircraft tobogganed to only 1,300 military planes in the entire calendar year 1946—the equivalent of only a couple of days' production at the peak rate of March 1945. Even with the few planes it was operating, the Air Force experienced severe difficulties and its accident rate soared for lack of adequate maintenance.

With the sharp cut-backs and cancellations, conditions in the aircraft industry were even more alarming. Almost every company plunged into the red in 1946 and the losses began to mount more sharply in 1947. Efforts to get enough commercial business to keep the invaluable teams of engineers, designers, and production technicians together were unavailing, and even compounded the losses. By the late spring of 1947 the very survival of an aircraft-manufacturing industry worthy of the name was in serious question.

CRITICAL IMPORTANCE OF THE INDUSTRY

To those who have not had the opportunity of making a study of modern national-defense requirements, the question could well be raised why there is any concern about the financial status or the well-being of the aircraft-manufacturing industry. The answer lies in some relatively simple facts. First, the aircraft industry is a specialized industry because of its very highly technological aspects. You cannot transform a household-appliance or automobile plant into the manufacture of aircraft, and experience has shown that neither can an aircraft company be transformed successfully into the business of manufacturing household appliances or automobiles. An aircraft company is in the business of research, design, testing, and manufacture of airplanes, or it is not in business.

Furthermore, an aircraft company is composed of highly trained specialists—from the president on down through the research and engineering departments, the production departments, to the last man on the production line, the field employees, and the test pilots. It took an almost superhuman effort to expand the aircraft industry to the peak production mark made in March 1945 from a relatively small and inconsequential industry in 1938. I may say to you with perfect confidence that if it had not been for British orders placed in 1938, along with British capital supplied for plant expansion, that President Roosevelt's then well-nigh fantastic production demand, made in 1940, of 50,000-plane production per year could not have been achieved, and quite probably that the war could not have been won in 1945.

No nation can afford to maintain a standing army, a standing navy, or air force in sufficient readiness to engage in all-out combat at a moment's notice, as that would require a tremendous reserve not only of men but of continuously modernized matériel. That reserve in storage would be necessary in order to meet the rapid attrition of matériel which would begin to occur at the very onset of war. Instead mobilization plans must be prepared which will permit the most rapid mobilization of the manpower, the plant capacity, and the equipment needed to prosecute a war when and if war comes. Under modern conditions the principal delaying factor in mobilization is always equipment and seldom manpower. This is more true in the field of aviation than in any of the others because of the time required to design, develop, accumulate parts and instruments, and then build airplanes.

The principal components of an aircraft-manufacturing company are a design team and a production team. It takes a long time to build a design team, a team of competent research men, engineers, draftsmen, and other technicians, and it takes a long time to develop a competent team of skilled production workers. The very existence of these design and production teams in a state of readiness to expand is an important aspect of the national security.

Consequently, it is of the highest importance to the national security that our Nation maintain at all times an aircraft industry capable of fulfilling its function in the national defense. The President of the United States stated this on August 8, 1945, when he said:

> It is vital to the welfare of our people that this Nation maintain developmental work and the nucleus of a producing aircraft industry capable of rapid expansion to keep the peace and meet any emergency.

Actually, under current conditions the demands upon the aircraft industry are considerably less than would appear on the surface. This is because our air forces, both naval aviation and the United States Air Force, are living off the fat of surplus planes left over from the war. For example, in the fiscal year 1948 the two air forces withdrew from

war-storage surplus a total of 43,000,000 air-frame pounds. The total thus withdrawn from surplus and placed into service in that year was more than double the total weight of new aircraft purchased.

In simpler terms, while the naval air arm and the Air Force put into service in the fiscal year 1948 airplanes whose air frame weighed approximately 64,000,000 pounds, 43,000,000 pounds came out of storage—World War II surplus aircraft—and the balance, less than 21,000,000 pounds, was from new modern production. To put it another way, better than two-thirds of the airplanes that went into service in the fiscal year 1948 were obsolete World War II stocks from surplus and the balance of less than one-third were modern aircraft.

But the surplus of World War II aircraft in storage will soon be exhausted. Where, then, will we obtain the production of aircraft to maintain even the 1948 rate of input of new aircraft into the armed services. It must come from new production, of course. Now, I want to give you some startling figures. Ordinarily, it takes a year and a half from the day the orders are issued to double the production of an aircraft factory. If, when that order is given, it is not merely to double production but to go all-out as did President Roosevelt in his orders of 1940, then the experience of that time indicates that to double the production again requires about half the length of time of the first doubling, and then to double it again requires a little more than half of that time, and so on until you reach your maximum potential output. The important point here is that you can achieve top speed much sooner from a running start than you can from a standing start.

The Air Coordinating Committee, the President's Air Policy Commission, and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board all realized those facts. They saw that World War II surplus storage aircraft were soon to be exhausted and that it was necessary to start more than 2 years in advance of exhaustion of storage to build the production industry to the point where it could carry the load of an annual input of new airplanes into the armed services at even the 1948 rate of 64,000,000 air-frame pounds per year. That is why we in the Congress in 1948 voted the appropriations necessary and the authorizations necessary to build the aircraft production industry to meet the requirements that we knew full well must be met in a few years.

Toward the close of my remarks I will insert a table showing the recommendations for minimum annual procurement of military aircraft, but at this point I shall present certain of those figures.

In 1945 the Air Coordinating Committee recommended that the minimum production rate of aircraft needed to "cooperate in maintenance of world peace" is 60,000,000 pounds of air frame per annum. On January 1, 1948, the President's Air Policy Commission recommended that the production rate for the calendar year 1949 be expanded to 56,000,000 pounds of air frame. On March 1, 1948, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board said that "the strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war" required an annual production rate of not less than 63,000,000 air-frame pounds per annum and that "the initial strength to mount promptly a successful air offensive" requires a production rate of 111,000,000 pounds of air frame per annum. A Stanford University survey—as quoted by the Associated Press in 1948—stated that the minimum annual production rate necessary to provide a base for expansion is 80,000,000 pounds of air frame per annum.

It is my belief that in the fiscal year 1949, while the figures are not available, that the same situation as existed in 1948 is continuing; that is, withdrawals from war-surplus storage by far exceed the new planes purchased. By this process we are, of course, eating up our stored war-surplus aircraft very rapidly. It is admitted that by the end of the next fiscal year our surplus of usable planes will be exhausted and we can only turn to new production for replacement of normal attrition losses and for modernization of our air groups.

With the available supply even of obsolete planes thus being used up, the vital necessity of not allowing our aircraft industry to disintegrate and disappear should be apparent—especially in view of the critical international situation.

SURVEYS AUTHORIZED

The history of the official surveys to which I have referred should perhaps be detailed at least in brief as follows:

Concern over the air-power situation increased in 1947 and Members of Congress and of the administration began to consider methods of developing a remedy. Legislation was introduced in both Houses of Congress to provide for comprehensive and exhaustive surveys of air-power problems and to make remedial recommendations.

The official Air Coordinating Committee had been studying the problem for 2 years, ever since their report on demobilization of the industry was published in 1945. In the late spring of 1947 that committee urged the President of the United States to set up a commission something like the famed Morrow Board of 1925 to study the problem.

Such a group was established in the executive branch of the Government by President Truman on July 17, 1947. This was the President's Temporary National Air Policy Commission, of which the chairman was the eminent Thomas K. Finletter. The other members, none of whom were connected with the services or the aircraft industry, were persons who have made notable contributions of disinterested public service to the country. They were: George P. Baker, the vice chairman; James J. Hill, professor of transportation at the Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration; Palmer Hoyt, publisher of the Denver Post; John A. McCone, president, Joshua Hendy Corp., Los Angeles, Calif.; and Arthur D. Whiteside, president of Dun & Bradstreet, Inc. All had long records of service in various Government positions and were in a position to make an analytical study of the situation. The report of this Commission, Survival in the Air Age, graphically expressed the concern the Commission felt at the then low ebb of the Air Forces, the naval air arm, and the aircraft industry.

Almost simultaneously the Congress established the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, which was equipped with almost identical instructions to survey the whole field of air power and come back to the Congress with remedial recommendations.

The members of this board were Senators OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine; ALBERT W. HAWKES, of New Jersey; HOMER E. CAPEHART, of Indiana; EDWIN C. JOHNSON, of Colorado; and ERNEST W. MCFARLAND, of Arizona; Representatives CARL HINSHAW, of California, vice chairman; CHARLES A. WOLVERTON, of New Jersey; KARL STEFAN, of Nebraska; ALFRED L. BULWINKLE, of North Carolina; and PAUL J. KILDAY, of Texas.

In addition, the congressional board had the benefit of the advice and experience of outstanding leaders in American aviation, who served as members of the board's council. Serving as adviser to the board was Merrill C. Meigs, Director of the Aircraft Division of the War Production Board from 1940 to 1942, during the critical period in which production was being built toward war-needed goals. Among those who served as members of the council were such distinguished citizens as General of the Army H. H. Arnold; Admiral John H. Towers; William A. M. Burden, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Air; Richard R. Deupree, president of Procter & Gamble and Chief of the Munitions Board in 1946–47; Lt. Gen. James H. Doolittle; Joseph D. Keenan, noted labor attorney; Dr. Clark M. Millikan, professor of aeronautics, California Institute of Technology; L. Welch Pogue, former Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; Charles E. Sorenson, vice chairman, Willys-Overland Motors, Inc., adviser, aircraft production, War Production Board, 1942; Col. Roscoe Turner; and Gill Robb Wilson. These and other distinguished citizens participated in the studies undertaken by the four subcommittees of the board.

The President's Commission held both open and closed hearings to obtain the voluminous information required for its conclusions. Its members sat almost constantly from the time of appointment until the report was submitted on January 1, 1948. The congressional board, taking advantage of the spadework accomplished by the painstaking work of the President's Commission, analyzed this testimony and then sought its own conclusions and verifications in independent investigation and in closed hearings with the Nation's top aviation authorities. Its report was made to the Congress on March 1, 1948—Senate Report 949, Eightieth Congress.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I will be glad to yield to my distinguished friend from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I cannot refrain from congratulating the distinguished gentleman from California for the very excellent and timely statement he is making to the House at this time. I trust that every Member of this body will care-

fully read the speech that the gentleman is delivering and that the Congress will take appropriate action and that regardless of politics, Members on both sides of the aisle will vote for the 70-group air force for our national security.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman is very kind in his remarks.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman from California has made an exhaustive and extensive study of this subject over a period of many years, and I know of no one in Congress or out of Congress who is better qualified or more competent to speak with intelligence and authority than the able gentleman who is now addressing the House.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman from California is embarrassed by the expressions of the gentleman from Missouri.

PARALLEL RECOMMENDATIONS

It is highly significant that these two bodies, working in coordination, but making their own independent investigations for the executive and legislative branches of the National Government, presented recommendations that virtually parallel themselves in the all-important field of military security.

Both recommended urgent attention to rebuilding the air forces and the naval air arm to the strengths of 70 groups for the Air Force and 14,500 planes for the naval air arm. Both issued sharp warnings that the air forces, the naval air arm, and the aircraft industry, upon which the country must depend in an emergency, were woefully short of meeting the elementary demands of our security.

The President's Commission reported that—

It is the overwhelming view of those most qualified to know that the country must have a new strategic concept for its defense and that the core of this concept is air power.

The conclusions of the Commission thus fix as the target date by which we should have an air arm in being capable of dealing with a possible atomic attack on this country at January 1, 1953. For convenience we will refer to this date as A-day.

We believe that A-day divides the future into two clear phases for strategic purposes. The first phase is that which begins now and extends to A-day. We call this phase I. The second phase is that which will exist on and after A-day. We call this phase II.

SEVENTY-GROUP AIR OFFENSIVE

The congressional board examined the requirements for security and detailed the situation as follows:

PLAN A

From the information made available to the board by the Air Force and by the Navy separately, it would appear that the initial strength necessary to mount promptly an effective, continuing, and successful air offensive against a major enemy, is what is termed the Air Force 70-group program of 20,541 aircraft, plus the Navy program of 14,500 aircraft, total 35,041 aircraft. At the level-off period in 1953 these programs would require thereafter an annual Air Force procurement of 86,000,000 air-frame pounds and an annual Navy procurement of 25,000,000 air-frame pounds—total 111,000,000 air-frame pounds annually.

PLAN B

Based on the same sources of information, the strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war upon the outset of hostilities appears to be the same program outlined in plan A above, but without reserve aircraft, which means a combined Air Force and Navy aviation procurement of 63,000,000 air-frame pounds annually. For the purpose of comparative budget study we have assumed that the combined annual procurement of 63,000,000 pounds might be divided into approximately 45,000,000 for the Air Force and 18,000,000 for the Navy. This plan is designed to provide a force sufficient to (a) withstand an initial blow intended to cripple the United States, (b) form the basis for a strong Territorial defense, and (c) provide effective retaliation, but not a sustained offensive action. Under this plan it is estimated that the aircraft manufacturing industry would require a year longer to reach the volume of aircraft production necessary to cope with attrition, than it would under plan A.

COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORT AND NATIONAL SECURITY

A highly significant topic on which both the President's commission and the congressional board are in general agreement was their recognition of the importance of commercial air transport as an auxiliary of the national defense. Our congressional board said:

Civil and military aviation are indivisible in assessing total American air strength. The air transport industry of the United States and the military air arms must fit into a single pattern.

Both groups as a result were in agreement upon the need of immediate adoption of and support for a program to encourage all-weather flying. There had been developed almost simultaneously with the report of the congressional board a comprehensive program of navigational aids which was calculated to bring an immediate improvement in the regularity of air schedules, and after a period of 10 years to insure almost 100 percent schedule reliability. The importance of such a system of navigational aids to the military air arm should be obvious. Without it the commercial air lines cannot develop into the healthy auxiliary required for the logistics of modern warfare. This plan is known as RTCA Report SC-31-3.

I am glad to see the new budget recognized the value of this program.

Both the congressional board and the Finletter commission also recognized the imperative need of providing modern up-to-date transports for the military services. Testimony presented to both indicated that the armed services required a larger number of modern cargo and passenger air carriers than they were able to order out of current procurement funds.

Actually, last year, when Congress was considering the appropriation measure to provide the first year of a 5-year plan of procurement for the 70-group air force and for naval aviation, it was proposed to add the sum of $922,000,000 to the measure as received from the defense establishment. This sum included $100,000,000 for the provision of new and modern transport aircraft for the armed services.

Unfortunately during consideration of this measure, $100,000,000 was eliminated from the appropriation and the Air Force wiped out the provision for new transport planes to that extent.

LESSON OF THE AIR LIFT

While the congressional board and the Finletter commission emphasized the important role of air transport in modern warfare it must be conceded they did not anticipate that their observations and recommendations were to be so dramatically confirmed in a few short months by the Berlin air lift. I believe the story of the air lift is familiar to all the Members of the Congress and I will not go into it now. It does demonstrate dramatically and indelibly the need for prompt action to restore the transport arm of the armed services to its highest efficiency. The already inadequate transport equipment available is being worn out in the Berlin operation far more rapidly than had been anticipated. I am glad to note that the Air Force has already recognized the situation by announcing recently an order for 27 additional Boeing Stratofreighters, which according to news reports are being paid for out of appropriations previously allocated to tooling for aircraft production.

It is my hope that the Air Force will take further action to remedy the situation and will come to the Congress and ask now that the $100,000,000 taken out of last year's appropriation measure be restored immediately to purchase badly needed transport planes. This $100,000,000 should be requested in the form of a deficiency appropriation so as to enable the placing of orders in the near future instead of late next summer, when funds for the next fiscal year become available. If we do not provide for the transports by a deficiency appropriation, the production lines for transport planes may shut down and tooling be scrapped before action can be taken to order the necessary transports.

THE IMPACT OF THE BUDGET

In this connection, Members of the Congress should be aware that the procurement of new transport airplanes takes longer than may be thought. Production of transport airplanes today is tion, there are shortages in production of materials and almost no sustaining orders from commercial air lines to keep production lines moving smoothly and consistently. It will take many, many months from the time of order by the Air Force before many transports would be available for actual use.

In order that the pipe line of transport aircraft production might flow properly and produce the airplanes needed when they are needed, it is necessary that the start of that pipe-line flow be made now, immediately.

Just a few days ago, it came to light that the first impact of the President's budget for the Air Force has caused a cancellation of production orders for several new and advanced types of military aircraft. To me and to you, I believe, these cancellations are a crying shame. The very cancellation of these orders for new and advanced types of aircraft with longer range and higher speed may of itself lend encouragement to predatory foreign forces. As one member of this distinguished body responsible as it is to the American people for supplying the

needs to maintain the peace, I am heartsick at the news.

I have reviewed at some length the conditions that led to the establishment of the congressional board and the Finletter commission mainly to show you that the 5-year program presented to the Congress last year is supported by an impressive amount of evidence. Adoption of such a program had been recommended by every impartial group that had studied the subject from 1945 on. The Congress last year passed the first year's appropriation for the 5-year program by such overwhelming margins as to constitute virtual unanimity.

In the face of this record it is almost unbelievable that the budget presented to the Congress this week completely disregards all of the study that had been given to the problem and ruthlessly scraps without question the 5-year program for restoration of American air power. I find nowhere in the message any assurance that would give reason for abandoning the 70-group air force or for scrapping the 5-year modernization program. The consequence of the action taken is admitted, however, on page M25 when the message admits that procurement will have to be increased in future years because of the curtailment now projected.

This paragraph in the budget very frankly admits we are living off our fat when it says:

> Aircraft from wartime reserves will continue to meet a part of the replacement requirements in fiscal year 1950. In subsequent years, when these reserves are depleted, an increase in aircraft procurement may be required if the strength and structure of the Air Force and naval aviation are to be maintained at the level and replacement rates contemplated in this budget.

The budget provision for aircraft procurement not only disregards entirely the program initiated last year but also makes provision for procurement far below any level recommended as the very minimum requirement by the groups that have studied the question. The budget states that the procurement provided by the recommended appropriation will be 34,000,000 pounds. I present below a table showing the recommendations of the various groups that have surveyed the subject. None considered that it was safe at present to maintain a procurement lower than 56,000,000 pounds, while the most recent and most authoritative report recommends a minimum of 80,000,000 pounds. The recommendations are as follows:

*Recommendations for minimum annual military aircraft—procurement and amount recommended by the budget for 1950*

| | Pounds |
|---|---|
| 1. Air Coordinating Committee, 1945: | |
| Minimum after world peace is well assured | 30,000,000 |
| Minimum to cooperate in maintenance of world peace | 60,000,000 |
| 2. President's Air Policy Commission 1948: | |
| Recommended for 1948 (calendar year) | 84,000,000 |
| Recommended for 1949 (calendar year) | 56,000,000 |

*Recommendations for minimum annual military aircraft—procurement and amount recommended by the budget for 1950*—Con.

| | Pounds |
|---|---|
| 3. Congressional Aviation Policy Board: | |
| Initial strength to mount promptly an * * * successful air offensive requires | 111,000,000 |
| Strength necessary to prevent the loss of a war | 63,000,000 |
| 4. Stanford University survey (quoted by Associated Press, 1948): Minimum annual procurement needed to provide base for expansion | 80,000,000 |
| 5. Amount provided by 1950 budget | 34,000,000 |
| 6. Amount ordered in 1949 appropriations (estimated) | 45,000,000 |

While all of the groups that have surveyed the problem recommended an air force of 70 groups, the budget that has been given us proposes only 48 groups.

This budget is so startling that there is very little one can say about it except to ask for an explanation. What in the international situation has justified the abandonment of the long-term plan that competent authorities have deemed so essential? How have our foreign relations improved to justify abandoning the 70-group program? What reason is there for ignoring the findings of the Air Coordinating Committee, the Senate Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, the President's own Finletter Commission, the Congressional Aviation Policy Board, and the survey of Stanford University?

This budget means that aircraft-production programs, just barely started, must be cut back. Indeed, the cutbacks, with their attendant lay-offs of skilled workers, already have begun. In addition, large sums of money already expended for tooling, for expanded facilities, and for recruiting of workers will be wasted. Yet we are going to waste these sums of money and toss our expansion plans out of the window now, even though the budget message tells us quite plainly that 2 years from now we will have to go through the whole process again. We will at that time repeat the process of tooling up and expanding—only it will be more costly. We will have lost time.

NEED FOR MORE UNIFICATION

The report of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board emphatically warned the country and the defense establishment that more effective action should be taken to define the missions and the roles of the various components of the armed services. It was clear to all of us on that Board, as it has been to many other students of the problem, that without prompt and effective action to eliminate overlapping and duplication in the armed services it would never be possible to bring defense costs down to a reasonable level.

The current budget reduces the unification process to an absurdity, just as did the budget for fiscal year 1949. I can conceive of nothing more preposterous than a budget-making process that arrives at virtually identical figures for budget costs for each of the three services. The obligational authority for the Air Force in the new budget is $4,600,000,000; for the Navy is $4,600,000,000; and for the Army is $4,500,000,000. After a great deal of supposedly careful study of roles and missions and supposed adaptation of the missions to the realities of modern warfare, it has apparently been decided to toss a coin and divide the pie into three equal slices.

This is a fine way to settle a dispute among fraternity brothers, but it is patently absurd as a method of apportionment of the taxpayers' dollar. Think of a number and then divide it by 3 so as to provide us with the modern economical defense the Nation requires.

Unquestionably there must be a better way to eliminate overlapping and duplication in the armed services and to provide the funds we need to preserve our air power. Meantime, America's vaunted air power is being seriously crippled by the shut-down and cut-back in that productive capacity which is the basic of air power.

HOUSE RESOLUTION 36, TO ABOLISH THE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, the voters in my district have shown by their vote on Tuesday, November 2, 1948, what they thought of the Un-American Activities Committee. The people of the whole country are sick and tired of the silly antics of that committee. The Un-American Activities Committee should be abolished and abolished immediately.

Dr. Condon is not the only eminent scientist to feel the smear of the Un-American Activities Committee. Scores of prominent educators, scientists, writers, and liberals have been smeared, maligned, slandered, and scored by the headline-hunting committee. And none of them was given a chance to present his story.

The Un-American Activities Committee flouted the fundamental rights of many of our citizens. It is directly or indirectly responsible for either murder or suicide. It is to blame for broken homes, broken lives, and shattered reputations. It ruined many an innocent person. It destroyed the earning capacity of many a promising Government worker. It drove some of our finest and ablest educators and scientists from Government service. This country can ill afford to lose such valuable men—men who can earn tenfold their Government salaries in private industry.

Such shocking examples of totalitarian tactics as featured some of the hearings of this committee brought shame and fear to millions of Americans who believe in fair play. While they dragged the red herring through the headlines they caused red faces among real Americans.

This committee failed to unearth a single case of fascistic activities in this country. They failed to uncover and publicize the hordes of anti-Semitic,

anti-Catholic, anti-labor, anti-Negro, anti-foreign-born groups that infest many sections of our country. Such activities undermine our form of government as much, if not more, than the Reds and pinks.

The Communists must and should be watched. Spies and saboteurs should be routed. Government employees should be 100 percent loyal to America and beholden to no foreign power or foreign ideology. But this should be done in the American way, under the American Constitution and American concept of fair play.

The country has lost respect for, or confidence in, the Un-American Activities Committee. It has an important work to do and no matter how well-meaning its new members may be, they will fail to recapture the public confidence and respect. That is why I urge you to support House Resolution 36, which seeks to abolish the Un-American Activities Committee and assign its duties to the Judiciary Committee, where it belongs and where much good can be done for our American way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include certain resolutions from labor organizations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, 2½ years ago, I stood upon the floor of this House to speak in support of a bill to establish a Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor. The bill had just been introduced by our former colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], who is now a valuable addition to the other body, and myself.

At that time—July 23, 1946—the Seventy-ninth Congress had just been bewitched by the siren voices of the NAM into providing for the removal of effective price control. These same siren voices were about to persuade the Eightieth Congress that it had a mandate to try to stampede the Nation back to normalcy, to use the words of the gentleman from Minnesota who was the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in that Congress. This was to be done by refusing to restore price control, but cutting taxes so as to increase purchasing power for high-income-tax payers by 59 percent, but only 3 percent for low-income-tax payers and by enacting the so-called Management-Labor Relations Act, which came to be known unfavorably as the Taft-Hartley Act.

In introducing my bill at that time, I expressed the hope that the bill, which then had wide nonpartisan public support in addition to the unanimous support of all of organized labor, might receive nonpartisan support in this House and in the Senate and that it might be reintroduced and receive attention, hearings, and enactment in the Eightieth Congress.

Such a bill was introduced in the Eightieth Congress in the House under the joint sponsorship of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]. In the other body, it was introduced by Senators WAYNE MORSE and ELBERT THOMAS.

In the other body, it received hearings in which broad support was manifested by witnesses representing labor, education, and other citizens' organizations and was reported favorably.

A subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor held hearings ending in May but took no action on the bill before Congress adjourned. I may say that this inaction was not unique. Many other excellent bills which would have contributed much to the health and stability of our people and our Nation were left in that committee's deep-freeze locker when the Eightieth Congress passed from the scene.

The bill is now being reintroduced by me, and again being reintroduced in the other body by Senators MORSE and THOMAS of Utah. It is practically identical with the bill reported out favorably last year. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] have introduced identical bills to mine in the House.

Mr. Speaker, enactment of such a bill is tragically overdue. When I stood on the floor of this House 2½ years ago to speak in behalf of this bill, I pointed out that in asking for its enactment labor was supported by organizations of teachers, civic, welfare, and church groups—all of them concerned, as were the responsible leaders of labor, with the working out of intelligent, fair, and peaceful solutions of industrial relations.

I pointed out then that the November 1945 management-labor conference called by the President, while unable to reach an agreement on some basic issues, had recommended in its report that there be greater educational activities among workers to stimulate a more constructive approach to collective bargaining and for the improvement of collective bargaining as a whole. That conference, held 3 years ago, recognized that the use of facts and reason is a desirable substitute for costly tests of economic strength in strikes and lock-outs.

In the Seventy-ninth Congress we heard much discussion of industrial relations. We heard heated denunciation and warm words in its defense.

In all this clangor in the Congress and throughout the Nation over management-labor relations in that first postwar year of readjustment, labor came forward with a united voice to ask for the enactment of this bill so that wage earners wanting access to facts and reason, and to training and skill in their use, as citizens and as workers in their relations with the community and employers, could have made available to them, as similar services have long been available to farmers, the accumulated knowledge and teaching resources of our institutions of higher learning.

Mr. Speaker, 2½ years ago I described the need for such a bill as urgent. There was a hunger and a demand then for more knowledge and understanding among wage earners themselves. It was and is a fact needing neither explanation nor apology that industrial workers and others in the lower-income groups of our population have for the most part been limited by the force of circumstances to education confined to the primary grades. Few have completed high school, and still fewer have been able to begin a university education.

Because of this hard fact, labor's part in the field of labor relations often reflects not only limited experience, but also a limited knowledge of relevant facts and limited facilities in dealing with such facts. Although labor leaders have displayed good American common sense and shrewdness in relations with management, some wage earners have had too little knowledge of the resources and methods available to them in equipping themselves for relations with management and with the community.

The demand which I described then has increased since. In 1946, support for the proposal had been expressed by more than 50 colleges and universities who were then offering on a small scale extension services to various kinds of wage earners and by many other institutions just starting such programs or prepared to undertake such programs if supplied with the necessary know-how and assistance.

Today, some 80 such institutions have small pilot operations under way. Surveys show that the demand is far beyond the ability of these institutions. In one instance, it has been reliably stated that a leading university is unable to meet more than 5 percent of the requests made for services. The demand for these services, to be made available by a labor extension division located within a rehabilitated Department of Labor, is supported by intelligent management, by educators, by church groups, and by other groups who are concerned with working out peaceful and equitable solutions of the many problems that now complicate industrial relations and the achievement of steady full production.

A labor extension service located within and drawing upon the resources of the Department of Labor and other agencies will make available to nonagricultural wage earners expanded resources and trained personnel, through the States and through institutions of higher learning within the States to aid in the diffusion of knowledge and understanding of these resources and training and experience in their use. Such understanding, such experience are prerequisite to the development of sound industrial relations. As I said 2½ years ago, before the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act, the sooner a labor extension service is established, the sooner we will strengthen the foundation for equitable, reasonable, and peaceful industrial relations. Of course, labor cannot bring this about without the cooperation of management. The demand for this bill, which has grown steadily for the past 3 years, is proof positive that labor is

willing and anxious to do its share toward the peaceful negotiation and settlement of discussions with management by the use of facts and reason on both sides of the bargaining table, with less and less recourse to the test of naked economic force.

As I pointed out then—and I think it will be more generally recognized today after the experience of the past 2 years—such peaceful, reasonable negotiation, turning upon and being decided by the facts, by reason, equity, and justice, freely practiced and without diminishing by one whit the right of freemen to withhold their labor or employment—is in the most profound sense in the public interest, in the national interest, and is conducive to the welfare of individual citizens and the democratic strength of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the Eightieth Congress did not elect to act upon this bill. In my opinion, the Congress, along with the press, radio, and too many of the so-called leaders of thought and opinion in the Nation, were swept into an anti-labor hysteria which resulted in the adoption of that incredible and incomprehensible hodge-podge of legal gobbledy-gook, dead-falls, and backfiring bazookas called the Taft-Hartley Act that was put together under unique circumstances by attorneys for interested and notoriously reactionary corporations. At this point, I cite the statement by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN] appearing on page 3421 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 15, 1947:

> The bill was actually written with the help of the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Some of the most valuable assistance came from William Ingles, who represents Allis-Chalmers Co., Fruehauf Trailer Co., J. I. Case Co., the Falk Corp., and Inland Steel Co. Patrioteer Theodore R. Isserman put aside his rich Chrysler law practice for two full weeks to help out the House Labor Committee.

And also the opinion of the Taft-Hartley monstrosity expressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN], appearing on page 3543 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 16, 1947:

> The authors of this bill are clearly not interested in pushing the American economy steadily uphill to higher living standards. They are bent upon establishing monopoly control over the roller coaster and taking the American people for a dangerous ride.

Instead of choosing to promote fair and peaceful management-labor relations, insofar as men of good will and adequate information in the ranks of labor can do so, the Eightieth Congress preferred to adopt methods of regimentation, coercion, reprisal, division, and punishment, leveled unilaterally against the working men and women of America. That ill-starred venture, foisted upon the Congress and the American people under the misleading label of a bill to promote harmonious relations between management and labor, has been condemned and rejected by the American people in the November 2 elections.

Now we are ready for a fresh start in a new Congress and in a new climate of opinion in this country. We cannot make a better start than by accomplishing early repeal of the infamous and, I repeat, incomprehensible Taft-Hartley Act, and by speedily enacting this labor-extension service bill which, by promoting the quiet quest for truth, will help bring about peaceful collective bargaining and settlements between wage earners and employers—at least insofar as knowledge, skill, and good will among wage earners can promote that happy state of affairs. I make this qualification because peace, like war, requires two parties in its making. Employers must, of course, address themselves to facts and reason and meet labor halfway and deal fairly at the bargaining table.

The value and the urgency of this bill are not limited to the field of management-labor relationships, broad and important as that field is. Labor wants more than merely access to facts and knowledge that will equip and aid in matters related to employment. Labor wants access to other facts and skills that are stored up in our institutions of higher learning and, by public and private subsidy, are made available to those who can afford to attend these institutions as full-time resident students.

Labor wants parity with farmers in access to these riches of the mind so that nonagricultural wage earners and their families may participate more fully and effectively as citizens in the life of their community, their State, their Nation, and that part of the world which is still free.

Throughout our history, the relatively high level of education and informed intelligence among our people has been a principal source of national strength, welfare, and prosperity. It has contributed to our survival. It insured the production necessary to military victory.

As I pointed out 2½ years ago, our concern and practical provision for the diffusion of knowledge has been the shield of the Republic, protecting freedom and democracy against the stealthy encroachment of special privilege and economic power on the one hand and, on the other hand, that mob rule which lends itself so easily to the manipulations of cynical and unprincipled demagogs. Our defense against those dangers would have been even more effective if our provisions for the diffusion of knowledge had been more thorough and more practical.

Today this is truer and more obvious than ever. Nothing less than our maximum strength and intelligence as a nation of free individuals is enough for national security in the global conflict between freedom and totalitarianism. We need the more rapid diffusion of more and better knowledge among all our people.

For its part, labor is asking help in getting such access to that knowledge as other segments of our population already enjoy; the well-to-do because they have enough financial resources to take advantage of the public and private subsidized institutions; the farmers because the Federal Government, pursuant to the principles set up under the Morrill Act of 1862, has maintained the Agricultural Extension Service.

That act, be it noted in passing, established a national policy of promoting the diffusion among the people of useful knowledge for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts, and for the benefit of the human beings engaged in those occupations. Federal funds devoted to the Agricultural Extension Service, which serves some 6,000,000 farm families, aggregate $14,000,000 a year. The bill introduced today does not carry a money figure, but it is estimated that the amounts finally determined to be adequate would be much smaller proportionately than the amount appropriated for the Agricultural Extension Service, in view of the fact that educational facilities available to nonagricultural wage earners and their families are somewhat better than those available to farm people. However, since the total to be served would be in the neighborhood of 47,000,000 nonagricultural wage earners, the ultimate cost might be somewhat greater than the total now being appropriated for the benefit of 6,000,000 farm families, though the per capita cost would be smaller.

The bill declares its purpose to be the promotion of "the welfare of wage earners, through a program for the dissemination of useful knowledge to provide a means by which the Nation may conserve the creative capacities of workers, and to promote cooperative relations and mutual understanding between labor and management."

Section 2 sets forth plainly the nature of the program to be made available to wage earners:

> There shall be established in the Department of Labor a Labor Extension Service. The program of the Labor Extension Service shall include the following:
>
> 1. Promotion of the welfare of wage earners and thereby the industries of which they are a part by developing and making available information useful to wage earners and their bona fide labor organizations in presenting factually and effectively their contribution to production as a basis for compensation and by making available information on practices in writing collective-bargaining agreements and in carrying out collective-bargaining activities and practices;
>
> 2. Making available information and research facilities concerning principles and techniques in labor and management relations appropriate to assure both full and continuous employment and production in a free-enterprise economy;
>
> 3. Making available information concerning living and working conditions;
>
> 4. Making available information on labor law and legislation and its administration;
>
> 5. Promoting through dissemination of knowledge constructive relations between workers and management which will contribute to the advancement of the public interest and of the national welfare and security;
>
> 6. Making available information on the significance of the free-enterprise system in the economic history and growth of the United States, and on the history of trade-unions, their responsibilities in promoting the understanding and appreciation of democratic processes, their rights, responsibilities, duties, and obligations with respect to the public, their members and fellow workers, and management, and their relationship to the development of democracy in the United States.

The bill provides for the establishment of a Labor Extension Service within the United States Department of Labor, for

the establishment of a National Labor Extension Council, composed of representatives of institutions of higher learning and of the nonagricultural wage earners for whom the service is to be established.

The bill provides that services shall be provided only if, as, and when requested by nonagricultural wage earners themselves. When they wish such services, the bill provides that they may cooperate with an institution of higher learning in preparing a plan for classes and other methods of instruction. These plans, made to meet the needs of nonagricultural wage earners, within the purposes set forth in section 2 of the bill, are then to be presented to State boards provided for in section 5 of the act and consisting of representatives of cooperating institutions of higher learning and nonagricultural wage earners in the State.

This board, appointed by the governors, would, under the bill, assemble requests and plans as received and formulate a State plan. After checking to make sure that funds were available out of the total earmarked for each State under the bill's formula apportioning the total available Federal funds appropriated among the States on the basis of proportion of nonagricultural wage earners in the State to the total in the Nation, the board would forward the consolidated State plan, or supplements thereto, to the Secretary of Labor.

The bill provides that "the Secretary of Labor shall approve any plan which complies with the standards for State plans to be set up by Congress in section 6A."

As a further safeguard against so-called Federal dictation of program content, section 6C provides:

No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, any cooperating institution to which any funds which have been or may be available or expended pursuant to this act. No term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this act, whether by agreement or otherwise, shall seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction of any cooperating institution.

Upon approval of a State plan, the Secretary would request the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the amount, "as determined by the State board," to each cooperating organization within each State, within the limits of the annual allotment earmarked for each State under the formula I have described.

Provision is made for matching Federal funds with at least 25 percent of State or local funds, which may be in cash, kind, or services.

The bill defines "cooperating institution" as meaning "any college, school, or institution in any State receiving the benefits of the act of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and acts supplemental thereto, and any other public or private nonprofit college, university, or research agency in any State, certified as eligible by the State board"—section 11 C.

I wish to insert this point in my remarks, a resolution adopted by the American Federation of Labor at its Cincinnati convention November 19, 1948, reading as follows:

The convention appreciates the executive council's support of the labor extension service bill and are sure that they will continue their efforts in behalf of this bill until same is finally made into law. It is moved and seconded that this portion of the executive council's report be accepted.

The portion of the A. F. of L. executive council's report to which the convention action refers follows:

Representatives of the American Federation of Labor appeared before the Senate and House committees in support of the principles of extension services for workers. Labor wants such a program. The Nation needs it. It seems unjustifiable that there should be an extension service program for agriculture and that a similar program for labor has not been provided by the Federal Government.

The success of such a program of labor extension services would, as in the case of the agricultural extension services, depend upon maintaining it on a cooperative basis with local labor requests and proposals initiating all undertakings.

Such an extension service would provide materials for workers in their union activities and educational projects.

And I also insert Resolution 14 adopted by the convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations at Portland, Oreg., November 22–26, 1948:

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF A LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE IN THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR ADOPTED BY THE TENTH CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF THE CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, PORTLAND, OREG., NOVEMBER 22–26, 1948

Adult American wage earners suffer a gross inequity due to the almost total lack of public facilities for labor education, while American farmers have long enjoyed millions of dollars' worth of educational benefits through the Federal Agricultural Extension Service, and business and management representatives receive training and services through publicly supported State universities and other institutions.

A bill to establish a Labor Extension Service in the United States Department of Labor was introduced in the Eightieth Congress, through which workers' education services would be made available to unions on a Nation-wide scale, and the bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Education but was killed by the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That legislation be enacted by the Eighty-first Congress to establish and provide Federal funds for a Labor Extension Service program to be administered by the United States Department of Labor to provide the Nation's adult workers with special educational services through the cooperation of universities and unions within the States; and that

All affiliated international unions, councils, and local industrial unions are urged to support the campaign to enact a Labor Extension Service bill by resolution, publicity, and communications to Members of Congress and cooperation with and financial assistance to the National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, which is coordinating the drive for its enactment.

Since 1942, both the A. F. of L. and CIO have by annual convention action adopted resolutions supporting the plan for a labor extension service to be located within the United States Department of Labor. I quote the resolutions adopted by the 1947 conventions of the A. F. of L. and CIO:

RESOLUTION ON LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE PASSED BY THE SIXTY-SIXTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR OCTOBER 1947, SAN FRANCISCO

Whereas the United States Congress enacted the Morrill Act on July 2, 1862, donating public lands to the several States and Territories to provide colleges for the benefit of those engaged in agriculture and the mechanical arts; and

Whereas these land-grant colleges over the years have not promoted the welfare of those engaged in the mechanical arts nor has the Department of Labor provided research and technical assistance to workers comparable to such services provided by the Department of Commerce for employers; and

Whereas a labor extension service bill has now been introduced in both Houses of Congress (S. 1390 and H. R. 4078) to amend the Morrill Act making specific provision for research, information, and educational extension services for workers through universities, colleges, and research agencies: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the American Federation of Labor in convention assembled reiterate its support for the immediate establishment of a labor extension service to provide research, information, and extension services to workers throughout the Nation through the enactment of S. 1390.

---

FROM THE REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR TO THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONVENTION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., OCTOBER 6, 1947

*Section on education (workers' service and education program)*

Since the enactment of the program of Federal aid for the land-grant colleges, and the development, many years later, of the Agricultural Extension Service, the need for a similar service for industrial workers has been recognized.

However, no funds have been made available for such service. With the growing need for the development of a sounder appreciation of industrial and labor conditions, the need for such a service has been more and more recognized. During the last year, the American Federation of Labor, in cooperation with other interested groups, helped draft legislation which would establish such a service-educational program in the Department of Labor similar to the agricultural extension program in the Department of Agriculture. The legislation, which the committee on education of the American Federation of Labor helped prepare, would establish a Federal-State system of labor service centers working in cooperation with State and local trade-unions and in cooperation with such educational and research institutions as meet the standards set up by a national advisory board on which would serve representatives of education, professional persons, and labor.

Certain groups in the country, completely insensitive to the needs which such a service program would fulfill, have urged that the administration of such a program be placed in the United States Office of Education. However, there would be no more justification for transferring the Agricultural Extension Service from the Department of Agriculture, where it has always functioned, to the United States Office of Education than there would be for having the program affecting the industrial workers function away from the Department of Labor. It is important that such a program be recognized as a service program, which through research and educational assistance seeks to service the workers in a community, should be administered as a service program to these groups

and should not at any time promulgate educational theories or promote the distribution of educational content.

The bill which the American Federation of Labor helped prepare contains the necessary safeguards and merits the active support of the federation.

And I quote from 1946 resolutions. First, from the A. F. of L.:

Such a service would give workers the material and tools with which to meet their educational needs. (Unanimously adopted, sixty-fifth convention, A. F. of L., Chicago, Ill., October 1946.)

Second, from the CIO:

All affiliated international unions, councils, and local industrial unions are urged to support this program, by resolution, publicity, financial assistance, and communications to their respective Members of Congress, and cooperate with the Committee for the Extension of Labor Education toward this end. (Unanimously adopted, eighth constitutional convention, CIO, Atlantic City, N. J., November 1946.)

Here is the endorsement of the bill by the spokesmen for railway labor:

Our association endorses the principle and objectives of this proposed legislation. (A. E. Lyon, executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association, January 14, 1947.)

And I quote also statements by the presidents of these two great organizations of labor.

William Green, president of the A. F. of L., writing in the American Federationist, June 1946, said:

The Department of Labor should have a labor extension service similar to the Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. The Morrill Act of 1862, under which the Agricultural Extension Service was set up, provided Federal aid for land-grant colleges for the benefit of agriculture and the mechanic arts. Labor was not represented in the executive branch of the Government at that time and did not benefit by this opportunity. Farmers, on the other hand, have been able to get research and technical advice on their daily problems, so that agricultural management has greatly improved. Every farmer has such aids readily available.

Workers need services to enable them to plan for progress and to promote their economic well-being. They need decentralized technical assistance to promote health and safety in places of work. They need to be sure of their rights as well as their responsibilities. They should have the necessary services readily available. All of the agencies properly within the Department should contribute information and experience to such a service.

And here is a statement by Philip Murray, president of the CIO, endorsing the principles, the purpose, and the method proposed in this bill for the establishment of a labor extension service:

A free labor movement is indispensable in a free world. This fact is often overlooked when labor disputes have given rise to demands for laws restricting labor's right to bargain collectively, to strike if need be, to defend its sacred political and economic rights.

To fetter labor with restrictive governmental regulation such as the Case bill is to endanger the very principle of American freedom. To establish constructive programs for the betterment of labor relations is to serve the welfare of the whole people.

A Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor is one of many possible constructive programs which could foster good labor relations without sacrificing labor's freedom. It takes education and practical experience to participate effectively in collective bargaining. There must be a combination of skill, knowledge of facts, understanding of issues, knowledge of procedure. From the beginning the CIO has recognized this need. CIO has built an education department to supply information upon request from any CIO union. Many CIO internationals have developed their own education departments to fill the special needs of locals in the various industries. The larger the union know-how in collective bargaining the better the labor relations that will result.

It follows that a better stewardship will result in better grievance procedure through which the contract operates day by day.

Unions have grown by leaps and bounds in the last decade. Four million strong after World War I, organized workers now total 15,000,000. Each day new workers join our ranks. These numbers constitute a practical difficulty. We need more than skilled well-trained labor leaders. We must have skilled, well-informed union members. This means that we need new teachers, new techniques for teaching, new materials, pamphlet libraries, and educational films. Demands for education services are now so numerous and so urgent and have grown to such vast proportions that only a Government service can meet them. That service is a responsibility of the United States Department of Labor which can neither be ignored nor met halfheartedly.

A Labor Extension Service should be backed by all the resources of the Labor Department. In addition, the Labor Department should channel to the Labor Extension Service the many necessary facilities of other governmental departments. In other words, all the resources of Government should be integrated by the Labor Department to serve the people it was established to serve.

The country's farmers have had the benefit of extension services for many years. They can apply to the Department of Agriculture for technical help on their problems. They can ask for information, for research, for expert advice, and get them. As a matter of cold statistics the Nation's industrial workers outnumber the farmers, and no one seriously denies that the Nation's industrial health and well-being depend upon industrial workers. It is high time for the Labor Department to supply an extension service to the many workers upon whom so much of the country's future prosperity depends.

Finally, a partial list of organizations that have endorsed the plan for a Labor Extension Service within the Department of Labor:

LIST OF ORGANIZATIONS WHICH HAVE ENDORSED THE PLAN OF A LABOR EXTENSION SERVICE WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

American Federation of Labor.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
The railway brotherhoods.
American Labor Education Service.
Workers Education Bureau of America.
Young Women's Christian Association.
United Council of Church Women.
National Farmers Union.
Michigan Consumers League.
Michigan Federation of Teachers.
Detroit Federation of Teachers.
Workers Educational Service, University of Michigan.
Labor and Management Center, Yale University.
Hudson Shore Labor School.

Mr. Speaker, in supporting and asking for the early enactment of this bill, labor makes a challenge to this Congress. It is a challenge that I hope we will accept, and at an early date. It is a challenge to give practical aid and implementation to a plan for promoting a wider knowledge, better understanding, and greater use of facts and reason in the day-to-day relations between management and labor—in the shop, mine, mill, and factory. Of equal importance, it is a challenge to give richer resources to the 47,000,000 wage earners and their families, to be used by them as fully participating citizens in their community, State, and Nation who aspire to a fuller, richer life not only in creature comforts but in what has been called the delights and satisfactions of the mind and spirit.

In the long run, yes, Mr. Speaker, and in the short run, too, this positive, constructive method for promoting understanding and cooperation—insofar as labor, as the party of the first part, can promote such cooperation—will contribute a great deal to more peaceful and equitable management-labor relations and greater strength, dynamic stability, and security to our Nation as we enter upon a new phase in the long effort of mankind to establish on this earth both security, freedom, and dignity for the individual human being.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a magazine.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by Dr. Benson, of Arkansas.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. GRAHAM), on account of death in family.

To Mr. KEARNEY (at the request of Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 17, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

55. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a copy of a proposed joint resolution granting permission to Vernon G. MacKenzie, sanitary engineer director, Public Health Service, to accept and wear a certain decoration bestowed upon him by the King of Greece; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

56. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a copy of a proposed joint resolution granting permission to Hildrus A. Poindexter, senior surgeon (reserve), and Mary L. Mills, senior assistant nurse officer, of the Public Health Service, to accept the diplomas and wear the insignia of certain decorations bestowed upon them by Liberia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

57. A letter from the president, Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co., transmitting a report showing the stock, earnings, and expenses for the calendar year

1948 for the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

58. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a volume containing the acts of the sixth, seventh, and eighth special sessions of the Sixteenth Legislature of Puerto Rico, May 14 to 21, July 12 to 25, and August 30 to September 4, 1948, respectively; to the Committee on Public Lands.

59. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting the annual report of activities of the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 8); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

60. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a statement in regard to the filing of its report in a series of parts or volumes, the last of which will be delivered within 70 days of the organization of the Eighty-first Congress (H. Doc. No. 37); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

61. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $2,000,000 for the Treasury Department (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

62. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of proposed transfers of various naval vessels; to the Committee on Armed Services.

63. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting certifications by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of the cost of rehabilitation and repair of damages caused by the United States military forces at six public airports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

64. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

65. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

66. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

67. A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

68. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

69. A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

70. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the month of November 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

71. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a report of the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics concerning operations under the Federal Airport Act during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

---

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1304. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1305. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1306. A bill to exempt from the manufacturers' excise tax certain articles sold to fire-fighting companies not organized for profit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1307. A bill to authorize payments of pensions to certain World War I veterans for partial disabilities not the result of service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1308. A bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting records of the Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1309. A bill to provide additional retirement benefits for certain persons serving in the Coast Guard who served in the former Lighthouse Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1310. A bill to exempt from admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1311. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to make employees eligible for annuities after 30 years of service, regardless of age, and to make widows eligible for annuities, regardless of age; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1312. A bill to amend the civil-service retirement rights—persons in military service, approved November 9, 1945, in order to protect the retirement rights of persons who leave the service to enter the merchant marine; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1313. A bill to exclude from gross income lump-sum payments for service as aviators in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1314. A bill to require that the congressional committees having jurisdiction over the Coast Guard be notified before any Coast Guard installation is discontinued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1315. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 1316. A bill to authorize cancellation of interest and, in some cases, the principal on certain feed and seed loans; providing a penalty for falsifications; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1317. A bill to prohibit any elective or appointive officer or employee of the United States Government from gambling in food products, providing a penalty for the violation thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 1318. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 1319. A bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1320. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps in honor and commemoration of the centennial of the Angora goat in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1321. A bill to grant recognition for wartime service in the United States merchant marine and to provide that persons who served in the wartime merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1322. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Joseph Lee, Sr., founder of recreational and civic groups and organizer of recreational activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1323. A bill to amend the Norris-LaGuardia Act with respect to the definition of the term "labor dispute"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 1324. A bill to expedite the borrowing of funds from established lending institutions, for the acquisition of homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 1325. A bill to provide additional income-tax exemptions to widowered heads of families; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1326. A bill to encourage the development of new domestic sources of zinc ores by amending the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1327. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt air taxis from provisions of the transportation tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 1328. A bill to provide for the Admiral David Glasgow Farragut Birthplace National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1329. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, to provide income-tax exemption for obligations of certain corporations engaged in providing low-rent housing for veterans of World War II; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1330. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1902, as amended, to provide exemption from payment of personal-property tax in the District of Columbia for veterans' organizations incorporated by acts of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 1331. A bill to provide for the publication of an illustrated history of the coins and currency of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1332. A bill to extend the applicability of certain provisions affecting the price-support program for agricultural commodities, and to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1333. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 per centum of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 1334. A bill granting to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children pensions equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the War with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1335. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948 with reference to the deferment of registrants engaged in agricultural occupations or endeavors; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1336. A bill to authorize the American River Basin Development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1337. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation and other public purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. R. 1338. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown, at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 1339. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 1340. A bill for United States-flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1341. A bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1342. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of Fort Stoddart, Ala.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1343. A bill to encourage the prevention of stream pollution by allowing amounts paid for plants for the treatment of industrial waste as a deduction in computing net income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1344. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHESNEY:

H. R. 1345. A bill to allow for income-tax purposes a deduction for depreciation and repairs on the residence of a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 1346. A bill to continue the authority of the President with respect to the making, by persons engaged in industry, business, and agriculture, of voluntary agreements; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 1347. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of June 16, 1936 (49 Stat. 1524), as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1348. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1349. A bill to permit the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 1350. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1351. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of citizens of the United States and other persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1352. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a $1 minimum hourly wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1353. A bill to prohibit race segregation in the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1354. A bill to provide for a per capita payment for funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1355. A bill authorizing annual payments to States, Territories, and insular governments, for the benefit of their local political subdivisions, based on the fair value of the national forest lands situated therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1356. A bill creating a Commission on Federal Reimbursement to States and local governments by reason of Federal ownership of improved and unimproved real property; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1357. A bill to authorize the establishment of the St. Croix Island National Monument, in the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 1358. A bill to provide certain benefits for employees in the field service of the Post Office Department who are veterans of World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 1359. A bill to protect scenic values along the tributary to Aspen Basin Road, and contiguous scenic area, within the Santa Fe National Forest, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1360. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a free bridge across the Rio Grande at or near Del Rio, Tex.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1361. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on admissions, cabarets, and so forth; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1362. A bill to provide for the display of the American flag on every post office in the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1363. A bill to permit partially disabled World War II veterans to reenlist in the armed forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard for limited duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1364. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions of States for the construction of devices to protect the shores of publicly owned property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1365. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1366. A bill to establish a National Superhighway Commission in order to provide for the making of plans and surveys for the construction of a national superhighway system; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1367. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1368. A bill to clarify and make certain freedom of expression; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1369. A bill to require approval by Congress of executive agreements with respect to the reduction of tariff rates before the same become effective; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1370. A bill authorizing the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia, prescribing the qualifications of appointees to the municipal court and the municipal court of appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1371. A bill to repeal the tax on cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1372. A bill to repeal the taxes on admissions and cabarets; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 1373. A bill to designate as a depository of Government publications the public library of each city having a population of 100,000 or more in which there is no such depository; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HUBER (by request):

H. R. 1374. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to extend the period during which readjustment allowances may be paid; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1375. A bill to amend the Public Health Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H. R. 1376. A bill to provide assistance to farmers in securing farm housing and other farm buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1377. A bill to correct an inequity existing in the case of holders of adjusted-service certificates who did not accept payment in bonds under the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1378. A bill to incorporate the American Division, Inc., World War II Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1379. A bill to correct the inequities of Public Law 317 (79th Cong.), and to provide credit for faithful service to all substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1380. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1381. A bill to incorporate the National PT Veterans Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1382. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make equitable ad-

justments of claims arising out of the sale of World War II surplus edible commodities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1383. A bill to continue on a permanent basis a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1384. A bill to amend the act of December 20, 1944, to provide for the issuance, without examination, of licenses to certain persons to engage in business; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1385. A bill to amend Public Law 195, Eightieth Congress (ch. 258, 1st sess.), entitled "An act to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1386. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to provide for the better control of the alcoholic-beverage industry in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1387. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1388. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Sulphur, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEFEVRE:

H. R. 1389. A bill to authorize the participation of States, Territories, and insular possessions in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, to provide for the acquisition of land within certain areas administered by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1390. A bill to amend the Mustering-out Payment Act of 1944, approved February 3, 1944; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1391. A bill to equalize the retirement benefits payable to Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1392. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in connection with the dedication of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1393. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for certain Federal employees who have rendered at least 20 years' service in the investigation, apprehension, or detention of persons suspected or convicted of offenses against the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1394. A bill to cancel emergency crop, seed, and feed loans where the maker of such loans has been disabled or killed in action in World War II; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1395. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 1396. A bill to implement and augment existing statutes so as to increase the prevailing immigration quota for Greece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1397. A bill to provide pensions for disabled veterans of the World War under similar conditions, and in the same amounts, as now provided for disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1398. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1399. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1400. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of 160 years of cotton textile manufacturing in the United States of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 1401. A bill relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 1402. A bill to establish a Department of National Health and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1403. A bill to withhold Federal aid from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. NIXON:

H. R. 1404. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Azusa, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1405. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and for the construction of a suitable building thereon for the use and accommodation of the United States post office at Arcadia, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 1406. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II on the basis of age and on the basis of permanent and total disability; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1407. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Bad River Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1408. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Lac Courte Oreilles Band of Lake Superior Chippewa Indians of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PASSMAN:

H. R. 1409. A bill to amend section 3771 (a) of title 26 of the Internal Revenue Code by reducing certain refund interest rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1410. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1411. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public-library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1412. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1413. A bill to provide for service connection of disabilities aggravated by active military or naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1414. A bill to restore full compensation awards in World War I presumptively service-connected cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1415. A bill to provide minimum ratings for service-connected arrested tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1416. A bill to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1417. A bill to provide Government protection for widows and children of deceased veterans of World Wars I and II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1418. A bill to liberalize the basis for award of disability pension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1419. A bill to increase compensation rates under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1420. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1421. A bill to facilitate cooperation of recognized organizations with the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 1422. A bill to amend title 18, section 61, and title 18, section 64, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America in force January 3, 1949, by adding thereto sections 61 (1), 61 (2), and 61 (3) relating to offenses in elections and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1423. A bill relative to granting and giving instructions in civil and criminal cases in the district court of continental United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 1424. A bill to appropriate funds for works of improvement for flood control on the Tombigbee River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 1425. A bill to amend section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1426. A bill to provide terminal-leave pay for certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1427. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1428. A bill to provide for the admission to the United States of an additional number of aliens of Italian nationality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 1429. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in or near Marietta, Ohio, for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1430. A bill prohibiting membership in subversive organizations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

H. R. 1431. A bill to designate as "Citizenship Day" each general election day and regular primary election day on which the people elect Presidential and Vice Presidential electors, Members of Congress, or candidates for President, Vice President, or Members of Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1432. A bill to amend an act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1433. A bill to provide 4 years of college education to the children of persons whose death resulted from service in the armed forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1434. A bill to provide for the recall of officers to active duty for purposes of rehospitalization and evaluation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1435. A bill to authorize payment of $1,600 on purchase price in excess thereof of an automobile or other conveyance for certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1436. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 1437. A bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1438. A bill to clarify the application of title II of Public Law 759, Eightieth Congress, to the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1439. A bill to create additional Secretaries of the Armed Services for Reserve components; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1440. A bill to incorporate The Mothers of World War No. 2, to set forth and establish the purposes and aims of the organization, fixing its corporate powers and establishing the rights of membership, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 1441. A bill to extend pension benefits to persons who served on certain vessels operated by the Army during the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the China Relief Expedition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 1442. A bill for the relief of Amite County, Miss.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1443. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1444. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the terms of office of judges of the Supreme Court of the United States and inferior courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak., as the Clarence Theodore Hoverson Memorial Veterans Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Con. Res. 13. Concurrent resolution suspending legislative budget pending further study; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. Con. Res. 14. Concurrent resolution to authorize the President to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward extending the existing railroad system between the Territory of Alaska and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAND:

H. Res. 48. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on Ways and Means to make a study of the relationship between the Federal Government and the States in all fields, with special reference to the field of taxation; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 49. Resolution amending the rules of the House of Representatives to change the name of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to "Committee on Maritime Affairs"; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 50. Resolution to obtain information from the Secretary of State on the Palestine situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1445. A bill to authorize Comdr. Morton C. Steinberg, USNR, to accept the appointment as honorary consul for the Republic of Panama as has been tendered to him by the President of the Republic of Panama; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 1446. A bill for the relief of Conrad L. Wirth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1447. A bill for the relief of Miss Ethel Roth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1448. A bill for the relief of Emma Thompson Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1449. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Trapolin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1450. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Armbruster, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1451. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Katherine Doerr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 1453. A bill for the relief of Anita Bloom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1454. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Stamatia Lymberopoulos and Leonidas Stavrou Limperopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1455. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sapho Diamantopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1456. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Virginia Preston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1457. A bill for the relief of Thomas H. Moss; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1458. A bill for the relief of Joseph R. Gregory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silva Mapelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of the L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:

H. R. 1462. A bill for the relief of Numa A. Winstead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 1463. A bill for the relief of J. E. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1464. A bill for the relief of W. B. Terry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 1465. A bill for the relief of Tibor Kahan and Mrs. Illona Kahan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 1466. A bill for the relief of Daniel Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1467. A bill for the relief of Thomas O. Troth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1468. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Smolowitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1469. A bill for the relief of Miss Sylva D'Arpe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1470. A bill for the relief of the estate of James F. Delahanty, deceased; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1472. A bill for the relief of the Olympic Hotel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1473. A bill for the relief of Garnet Green Morris III; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1474. A bill for the relief of Miguel A. Viera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1475. A bill for the relief of Domenico Salvi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1476. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Coutoulakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1477. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jean Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1478. A bill for the relief of the Somerville Dressed Meat Co., of Somerville, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1479. A bill for the relief of Michael A. Driscoll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1480. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Terwilliger and Alberta M. Terwilliger Palmer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1481. A bill for the relief of the estate of Julius Zaffareni; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Francis L. Marshall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1483. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Giovanna Follo Discepolo, and her three children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1484. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Capodanno, and the legal guardian of Vincent Capodanno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of Josephine Lisitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1486. A bill for the relief of certain Latvians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1487. A bill for the relief of Lt. Giacomo Falco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYLE:

H. R. 1488. A bill for the relief of Thomas C. Meehan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of James I. Matthews; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1491. A bill for the relief of Father Louis Naclerio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1492. A bill for the relief of Harold L. Lindquist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1493. A bill for the relief of Cecil L. Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1494. A bill for the relief of the Montana Engineering & Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1495. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert Joseph Welch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1496. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thelma Lee Rynaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1497. A bill for the relief of Ralph A. Wood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1498. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Nellie C. Mitchell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 1499. A bill for the relief of John K. Jackson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1500. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara Guanapoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 1502. A bill for the relief of John L. Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1503. A bill for the relief of George Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1504. A bill for the relief of John E. Tate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1505. A bill for the relief of Harry Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1506. A bill for the relief of Zoe Tjumerka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1507. A bill for the relief of George K. Wyman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1510. A bill for the relief of Herman Jung Ho and his wife, Yen Wai Har; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

PETITION, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

5. Mr. CHIPERFIELD presented a petition of residents of the Nineteenth Illinois Congressional District opposing national compulsory health insurance, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

---

# SENATE

## MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, O God, to treat every human heart as if it were breaking, and to consider the feeling of others as we do our own.

Help us to be gentle, and to control our tempers that we may learn to love one another.

Give us the grace so to live this day, in the name of Jesus, who loves us all. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 13, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the New York Times of January 14 there appeared an article by Arthur Krock which describes what might be happening now if the election for President and Vice President had been thrown into the House of Representatives. The article is so carefully thought out that it really takes rank as historical source material. In view of the fact that there is now pending before the Senate Judiciary Committee a proposal to amend the Constitution so as to count the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote, I believe this article would be of particular interest to the Members of the Senate, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—JUST ABOUT NOW IF THE HOUSE WERE CHOOSING

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 13.—Those citizens who were closely following the returns of the 1948 Presidential election in the early hours of November 3, and especially those whose business it was to inform the public of the outcome, will not soon forget the wobbling count in Ohio and California through the night. For until it became certain that these two States were to give their electoral votes to President Truman he lacked the majority necessary for election. They could not have brought victory to Governor Dewey by going Republican. He would have needed Illinois, too. But by doing so they would have thrown the election into the House of Representatives.

CLARITY ENDANGERED

Had that happened the House at this moment would probably still be balloting, with noon on January 20, 1949, drawing ever nearer, at which hour Mr. Truman's term as President expires by fiat of the twentieth amendment. The House would probably still be balloting because of the partisan compositions of the delegations from the 48 States that also were chosen on November 2. And if the deadlock had continued until noon on January 20, as well it might have, the country might have had a President whose title was not entirely clarified by the Constitution or the Statute of Presidential Succession.

The reasons are these:

1. When a national election is thrown into the House because no candidate has received an electoral majority—now 266—each State delegation is given one vote by the Constitution, and this vote is determined by the majority of its delegation. In the present House there are 21 delegations with a Democratic majority, 20 with a Republican majority, 3 that are evenly divided, and 4 which represent States carried by the Democratic States' rights ticket.

NO VISIBLE MAJORITY

2. The Constitution limits the House in such circumstances to make its choice from the three candidates who led in the national poll, and on November 2 these were President Truman, Governor Dewey, and Governor Thurmond. If each of the 45 delegations unevenly divided had obeyed the mandate of the voters in its State, none of the candidates would have had the required constitutional majority of 25 even if the three evenly divided delegations had contrived to vote.

3. Mr. Truman would have been obliged to swing four of the seven delegations from the evenly divided States, and those Democratic States in which he was defeated by Mr. Thurmond. Mr. Dewey would have required a shift of five. Mr. Thurmond would have required a shift of 21. So a deadlock on the Presidency might now be afflicting the Nation.

THE PRESSURE GROWS

4. As noon on January 20 drew nearer the pressures of these seven delegations would have produced violent emotions which can only be imagined by reading the history of similar situations in 1801, 1825, and 1877.

Of the delegations from these seven States (Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—carried by Mr. Thurmond—and Connecticut, Idaho, and Montana—evenly divided), Louisiana, Idaho, and Montana—conceivably might have yielded to the pressure for President Truman. But it is difficult to envisage the same shift in Alabama, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Connecticut. So Mr. Truman, with 24, would still be one short of the required majority.

5. Until or unless a member shifted in the Connecticut, Idaho, and Montana delegations these would have been unable to vote. This would have left 45 State delegations to produce a requisite majority of 23. But that would have been the same problem expressed in lower figures. Mr. Truman, Mr. Dewey, and Mr. Thurmond would then have needed shifts in 2, 3, and 19 delegations, respectively.

TWO WAYS OUT

Suppose the deadlock had continued until close to noon on January 20. How could the United States have acquired a President? On this point the twelfth amendment, the twentieth amendment, and the Statute of Succession of 1947 are not wholly clear, but the destructive condition might have been resolved without successful legal challenge in one of the following ways:

1. The Senate is composed of 96 Members, of whom a majority of 49 can elect a Vice President; if no candidate for that office has an electoral majority, from the two who polled the highest number of votes—in this case Senator BARKLEY and Governor Warren. There are 42 Republicans in this Senate, to whom for speculative purposes might be added the 8 from the 4 States carried by the Thurmond-Wright ticket, reducing the regular Democratic membership of 54 to 46, or 3 less than enough to choose Mr. BARKLEY. A shift of only 3 Senators from the Dixiecrat States would have made him Vice President, and in such circumstances this is more than conceivable. On the failure of the House to choose a President by noon on January 20 this Vice President would have become President for the full term, but once again there would have been no Vice President.

2. If both House and Senate had been deadlocked at noon on January 20, Public Law 199, the Statute of Succession, seems to provide that the Speaker (now SAM RAYBURN) would have become Acting President.

This nightmare vision of a might-have-been furnishes another reason for such electoral reform as the Lodge-Gossett-Kefauver bill proposes.

## DAMAGE FROM FLOODS IN BERKSHIRE COUNTY, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in Berkshire County, Mass., which is the county at the extreme western end of the State, there were very serious floods on December 31, 1948. These floods underline the need for farsighted action and planning to prevent the recurrence of such disasters in the future. They also point to the need for immediate help in every possible way. Because of the importance of this matter, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a statement published by the County Commissioners of Berkshire County descriptive of the harm which was done.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF THE BERKSHIRE
COUNTY COMMISSIONERS.

Estimated municipal damage caused by the flood in Berkshire County on December 31, 1948. These figures were submitted to the Berkshire County commissioners by the selectmen or road commissioner for each town and by the mayor or commissioner of public works for each city in the county, and they do not include private damage.

| Town or city | Roads | Bridges | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Adams | $17,000 | $2,000 | $11,000 | $30,000 |
| Alford | 6,000 | 300 | 500 | 6,800 |
| Becket | 3,680 | ---------- | 1,000 | 4,680 |
| Cheshire | 4,250 | ---------- | ---------- | 4,250 |
| Clarksburg | 3,000 | 600 | 1,400 | 5,000 |
| Dalton | 2,000 | 3,000 | ---------- | 5,000 |
| Egremont | 6,000 | 200 | ---------- | 6,200 |
| Florida | 14,150 | ---------- | 85,000 | 99,150 |
| Great Barrington | 10,000 | 550,000 | 45,000 | 605,000 |
| Hancock | 6,350 | 15,000 | 6,500 | 27,850 |
| Hinsdale | 5,000 | 1,000 | ---------- | 6,000 |
| Lanesborough | 7,925 | ---------- | ---------- | 7,925 |
| Lee | 14,900 | 3,000 | 151,000 | 168,900 |
| Lenox | 15,000 | 151,000 | ---------- | 166,000 |
| Monterey | 4,950 | ---------- | ---------- | 4,950 |
| Mount Washington | 4,000 | ---------- | ---------- | 4,000 |
| New Ashford | 1,350 | ---------- | ---------- | 1,350 |
| New Marlborough | 4,800 | 15,000 | ---------- | 19,800 |
| North Adams | 140,000 | 450,000 | 630,000 | 1,220,000 |
| Otis | 5,000 | 200 | 1,000 | 6,200 |
| Peru | 5,000 | ---------- | ---------- | 5,000 |
| Pittsfield | 5,000 | 80,000 | 15,000 | 100,000 |
| Richmond | 5,000 | ---------- | ---------- | 5,000 |
| Sandisfield | 6,063 | 250 | ---------- | 6,313 |
| Savoy | 4,300 | ---------- | 600 | 4,900 |
| Sheffield | 15,000 | 50,000 | ---------- | 65,000 |
| Stockbridge | 17,800 | 200 | 1,750 | 19,750 |
| Tyringham | 8,250 | 1,000 | ---------- | 9,250 |
| Washington | 1,150 | ---------- | ---------- | 1,150 |
| West Stockbridge | 12,000 | 5,000 | ---------- | 17,000 |
| Williamstown | 70,000 | 63,500 | 28,000 | 161,500 |
| Windsor | 2,500 | 2,000 | ---------- | 4,500 |
| Total | 427,418 | 1,393,250 | 977,750 | 2,798,418 |

## IMPROVEMENTS IN ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION OF THE GOVERNMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives.)

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON THE STATE OF FINANCES

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

GENERAL SUPPLY FUND OF BUREAU OF FEDERAL SUPPLY

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

AUDIT REPORT OF DEFENSE HOMES CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the Defense Homes Corporation, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of that Administration, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISION OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal a provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 requiring certain expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 to be considered as expended during the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of that Commission on its activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period October 1 through December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF WAGE AND HOUR AND PUBLIC CONTRACTS DIVISIONS

A letter from the Administrator of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Divisions, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of those Divisions for the year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

CREATION OF POSITIONS IN CERTAIN HEADQUARTERS OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that company for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS

The following petitions were presented, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation equalizing the differential for the marketing of tobacco under the grading and tieing system

"Whereas the tobacco markets in the State of South Carolina are losing approximately 10,000,000 to 12,000,000 pounds of tobacco each year by reason of the fact that the system of grading and tieing is required in this

State, while in the adjoining State of Georgia tobacco is sold ungraded and untied; and

"Whereas the differential of 4 cents per pound provided in this State is not sufficient to equalize the cost of labor and the loss of 5 to 10 percent in weight incurred in marketing tobacco under the grading and tieing system: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America is memorialized to enact legislation which will either increase the differential provided for the marketing of tobacco under the grading and tieing system from 4 cents to 10 cents per pound or require the acceptance of ungraded and untied tobacco by the flue-cured tobacco stabilization corporation in this State during the times in which the tobacco markets in the State of Georgia are open, to the end that the inequities accruing by the system of marketing tobacco in South Carolina under the grading and tieing system will be met; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from South Carolina in the Congress of the United States of America."

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Legislative Resolution 2

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to a national compulsory sickness insurance program

"Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the best standards of scientific medical care, and the finest medical institutions ever attained by any major country in the world; and

"Whereas these accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free people working under a system of free enterprise; and

"Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care, to the detriment of the health of the people: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska respectfully request the Congress of the United States to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this Nation any form of compulsory insurance or any system of medical care designed for national bureaucratic control.

"2. That Nebraska Senators and Representatives now in the Congress of the United States be, and are hereby, respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

"3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from Nebraska."

## REPORT OF INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. REPT. NO. 5)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit the First Annual Report of the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This report summarizes the work of the Investigations Subcommittee since its organization on March 1, 1948.

This subcommittee, of which I had the privilege of acting as chairman, conducted a number of investigations which have resulted in financial savings in the executive branch of the Government, and have effected greater efficiency in several of the executive branches. I do not now intend to take up the time of the Senate discussing in detail the work of the subcommittee, because I believe that the record speaks for itself. However, I should like to mention one or two special cases in passing. As a result of the work of this subcommittee and its predecessor, the Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, the Air Force has completely revised and streamlined its investigative procedures. This single action on the part of the Air Force will undoubtedly make for greater efficiency and savings in that important branch of our armed services and should go a long way to prevent the recurrence of cases similar to that involving former Maj. Gen. Bennett E. Meyers. In another case, involving the use of public storage facilities by the Government Printing Office in Baltimore, Md., it is estimated that the investigation by the subcommittee resulted in an annual saving to the Government of approximately $75,000 a year. This saving resulted from the fact that after our investigation started the Government Printing Office reviewed its storage requirements in the city of Baltimore and made substantial reductions in the amount of space being rented in that city.

Mr. President, the subcommittee also conducted several other investigations and submitted reports to the Senate in the following cases:

First. The investigation of the Federal employees' loyalty program.

Second. The administration of export controls.

Third. The conduct of the Ilse Koch war crimes trial.

Fourth. The Voice of America, which was a joint report with the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

There is little doubt that each of these investigations resulted in pointing out and correcting deficiencies in our Government.

Mr. President, as retiring chairman of the subcommittee, I wish to state here on the floor of the Senate that the success which this investigating subcommittee has enjoyed is attributable to the time and effort which the members and staff of the committee have devoted to the work. On several occasions various committee members came back to Washington during the recess period in order to take part in our investigations and they have spent many long hours examining the facts in the various cases presented to us and in taking testimony from the many witnesses who appeared in our public and executive hearings. Our staff, under the direction of its chief counsel, Mr. William P. Rogers, has done an excellent job. The subcommittee has been fortunate in having on its staff a number of men and women of wide training and experience in the investigative field. I believe that all the committee members of both parties will agree with me that our staff has always performed its tasks in an outstanding and bipartisan manner.

I regret that because of other committee assignments I will not be associated with the subcommittee in the Eighty-first Congress. But I wish to emphasize, as does this first annual report, the importance of the investigative function of the Congress. As the report states, and I reiterate:

> The mere existence of an active congressional investigating committee has had a pronounced salutary effect on the executive departments. Employees and officials of executive agencies tend to give more thoughtful consideration to their decisions when they realize that Congress is in a position to call them to answer for their actions.

Mr. President, I sincerely believe that the continued existence of a fair-minded, progressive investigating subcommittee in the Congress is in the public interest.

Before I entirely dissociate myself with the investigating subcommittee I wish to point out one more important matter discussed in this first annual report, that is, the matter of the rules of procedure which were adopted and uniformly followed by the subcommittee. I believe, and I have always believed, it to be a fundamental matter of great importance that the proceedings of congressional investigating groups be conducted fairly and judiciously. Although I did not entirely agree with all the rules of procedure adopted by this subcommittee, as they are set out in the report, I have followed these rules as have the other members of the committee in the belief that it is necessary to protect the rights of individuals and the rights of the public in the conduct of congressional investigations. To my knowledge this is the first congressional investigating group which has ever adopted and followed such an elaborate set of rules, and to my knowledge this is the first time that such rules have been published publicly.

Mr. President, in view of the widespread discussion, both publicly and in the Halls of Congress, concerning rules of procedure for investigating committees, I believe that every Member of this body would do well to study and examine carefully the procedural rules which have been adopted by the subcommittee. These rules were adopted after careful study for the purpose of giving individuals under investigation every reasonable protection against unfair treatment or unjust defamation, without impairing or curtailing the traditional investigatory powers of Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## CONVENTION CONCERNING STATISTICS OF WAGES AND HOURS OF WORK IN PRINCIPAL MINING AND MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate remove the ban of

secrecy with regard to the convention concerning statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture, Executive G, Eighty-first Congress, first session, which was sent to the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the ban of secrecy is removed from the convention, and the convention, together with the President's message of transmittal, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD.

The President's message is as follows:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith an authenticated copy of the text of a convention concerning statistics of wages and hours of work in the principal mining and manufacturing industries, including building and construction, and in agriculture (No. 63), adopted by the International Labor Conference at its twenty-fourth session held at Geneva June 2–22, 1938.

This is the same convention which was transmitted to the Senate with the message of the President of April 24, 1939, with a recommendation favorable to ratification. As the Senate did not find it possible to take action with respect to the convention during the war, I informed the Senate of my desire to withdraw it for further study and consideration in the light of developments since 1939, and on April 17, 1947, the Senate directed that the convention be returned to me.

A fresh appraisal has been made of the provisions of the convention, and the Departments of State, Labor, and Agriculture have indicated that in their opinion the convention should be ratified. In this connection, I transmit herewith the report on the convention made to me by the Acting Secretary of State and copies of communications from the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture with regard to the convention.

In view of the desirability of furthering international efforts to assure the development of uniform statistics relating to basic enterprises, I request that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of this convention, subject to the understanding that, in accordance with the provisions of article 23 thereof, the convention shall apply only to the continental United States.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1949.*

(Enclosures: 1. Report of the Acting Secretary of State; 2. Authenticated copy of text of convention No. 63; 3. Letter from Secretary of Labor, copy; 4. Letter from Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, copy.)

NOMINATION OF DEAN G. ACHESON TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE — EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (EX. REPT. NO. 1)

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Dean G. Acheson, of Maryland, to be Secretary of State, and I submit a report thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has just reported the nomination of Mr. Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. May I ask him, for the information of the Senate, to indicate when he intends to have this nomination taken up on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, because of the fact that we are anxious to prevent any interregnum between the outgoing of Secretary Marshall and the assumption of the office by the new Secretary, it had been my purpose to ask that the Senate consider the nomination tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator from Kentucky if that is the prospect?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes, it is my purpose to move, when the Senate concludes its business today, that it adjourn until tomorrow.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator from Michigan any objection?

Mr. VANDENBERG. No; that is perfectly satisfactory.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 499. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 500. A bill relating to the application of section 251 of the Internal Revenue Code to prisoners of war and others in the Philippines during the Japanese occupation; and

S. 501. A bill repealing section 202 (e) of the Sugar Act of 1948; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong;

S. 503. A bill for the relief of Solly Manasse;

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Petrita P. Chavez;

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Fred S. Tutton;

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Clara Gallegos; and

S. 507. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorraine Malone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 508. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Elser; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 509. A bill to provide for the advancement of Commissioned Warrant Officer Chester A. Davis, United States Marine Corps (retired), to the rank of lieutenant colonel on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 510. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 511. A bill for the relief of Eugene Kahan, Gizella Kahan, and Marianna Maria Racz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 512. A bill to provide for payment to certain public school districts in the State of Nebraska of amounts owed by the United States under contracts for the education of Indian pupils; and

S. 513. A bill to establish the position of Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, and to give such Resident Commissioner and the Delegates from Alaska and Hawaii the right to vote in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 514. A bill to clarify the definition of partnership for Federal income tax purposes;

S. 515. A bill to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus;

S. 516. A bill to amend the excise tax on toilet preparations;

S. 517. A bill to exempt admissions to agricultural fairs from taxation; and

S. 518. A bill to authorize the deduction from income of expenses of leveling farm lands; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself and Mr. BYRD):

S. 519. A bill to limit the United States contributions to international organizations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 520. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Leo Farwell Glenn, a Crow allottee, a patent in fee to certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 521. A bill to increase the period of validity of passports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MALONE, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. KNOWLAND) introduced Senate bill 522, to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 523. A bill for the relief of Jesus Llona Mencheca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. TAYLOR also introduced Senate bill 524, authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement at Bonners Ferry, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 525. A bill to remove restrictions upon loans by Federal agencies to finance the construction of certain public works: to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. O'CONOR) introduced Senate bill 526, to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 527. A bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies; and

S. 528. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons con-

tracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BARKLEY (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HILL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. GREEN) introduced Senate bill 529, to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 530. A bill to amend section 801 (d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, in relation to exports; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 531. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 532. A bill to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 533. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 534 (by request). A bill to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a women's reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve;

S. 535 (by request). A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409); and

S. 536 (by request). A bill to require that the congressional committees having jurisdiction over the Coast Guard be notified before any Coast Guard installation is discontinued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 537. A bill to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 538, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 539. A bill to amend section 498 (a) (1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase from $100 to $250 the value of merchandise with respect to which the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prescribe regulations relating to declaration and entry; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 540. A bill to reestablish and extend certain rights granted by Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 541. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air-mail field railway post offices; and

S. 542. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, relating to the compensation of employees in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. O'CONOR also introduced Senate bill 543, to provide for United States flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes, which was referred to the Committe on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 544. A bill to further amend section 302 (c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended by section 202 (a) of the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 545. A bill to provide for Federal participation in rights-of-way and other costs in connection with the authorized local flood protection project on Amazon Creek at and in the vicinity of Eugene, Oreg.; to the Committee on Public Works.

## FEDERAL FUNDS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF LOCAL PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the appropriation of Federal funds to assist the States in improving and expanding their local public health services. Most Americans today take for granted their local health departments, unaware of the shocking deficiencies in health protection which result each year in 200,000 needless deaths, in sickness, poor health, and tremendous economic loss.

They do not know that less than 10,000,000 of our 146,000,000 people have professional, full-time health departments to guard their water, milk, and meat supplies from contamination, to supervise disposal of sewage and garbage and control communicable diseases.

Forty million Americans lack the basic protection of full-time health departments. Another 85,000,000 have only the dubious protection of understaffed health offices.

Disease-carrying flies, mosquitoes, and rats cannot be quarantined. The germs in today's garbage can be on your lunch tomorrow.

Public health is too often the forlorn stepchild among governmental services. Public health departments are too often pushed off into courthouse basements or attics, in abandoned schoolhouses, or old-fashioned dwellings. Only one-tenth of the local health departments in the United States have facilities for carrying on a reasonably adequate public health program.

Health departments are desperate for trained, competent workers. Miserably low salaries are driving them into other jobs. There has been a 75-percent turnover among State health officers alone during the past 6 years.

The bill we are introducing, in providing Federal funds in aid to the States, would take a long step toward helping to get enough trained doctors, nurses, and technicians into the local and county health departments to carry on the great fight of preventive medicine against tuberculosis, syphilis, malaria, typhoid and undulant fever, hookworm, pellagra, infantile paralysis, dental caries, and the epidemic diseases.

The bill would help provide health examinations for our children at the all-important preschool age, when so many physical defects can be discovered and corrected.

The bill, which gives aid on the basis of need, fully protects State control and administration of health programs and has the endorsement of the State and Territorial Health Officers Association, the American Public Health Association, and the American Medical Association. The bill is sponsored by some 30,000 chapters and 5,000,000 members of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers.

In urging the bill Mrs. L. W. Hughes, PTA president, recently declared:

> This Nation is looked up to for its preeminence in medicine, sanitation, and cleanliness. Yet so long as millions of our people live under primitive public health conditions we must bow our heads in shame.

America has produced wondrous new drugs, equipment, and methods for mending and healing the human body. Yet we neglect to take the basic precautions of preventive medicine through adequate public health services. We must stop thinking of health so much in terms of remedies and cures, and begin thinking primarily in terms of prevention.

Benjamin Franklin said nearly 200 years ago that "public health is public wealth."

This bill will help America preserve her greatest resource—the health of her people—now being wasted by the pennywise denial of adequate support for public health services.

The bill (S. 522) to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize assistance to States and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public health units, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MALONE, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. KNOWLAND), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

## CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN WORKS AT BONNERS FERRY, IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the construction of certain works at Bonners Ferry, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes.

Last year we suffered a very bad flood in Idaho, and this year there is a heavy snowfall, and unless action is taken, I am afraid it will result in the necessity for the expenditure of much more money than if we lock the stable before the horse goes out.

The bill (S. 524) authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement at Bonners Ferry, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes, introduced by Mr. TAYLOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and myself I introduce for appropriate reference a

bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, in line with the message from the President just read. If enacted, the bill would be designated the "Reorganization Act of 1949."

The purpose of the bill is to increase efficiency and economy by reducing the number of Government agencies, eliminating duplication and overlapping, and obtaining better organization of the Government.

The bill carries out the recommendations made to the Congress by the President in the message which was read a few moments ago, as well as the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, in accordance with the letter submitted by the chairman of that Commission, former President Herbert Hoover, which was incorporated in the RECORD last week.

Both the President and the Commission have advised Congress that a simplified method of reorganization similar to that formerly authorized by the Reorganization Acts of 1939 and 1945 is essential for the substantial improvement in organization of the Government. This bill generally resembles the Reorganization Act of 1945, which became inoperative on April 1, 1948, but it is broader in scope, and is intended to be permanent rather than temporary legislation.

The bill empowers the President to submit reorganization plans which become effective after 60 days unless rejected by concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, I shall not at this time go into any further detail regarding the bill, but I should like to announce that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will schedule hearings on the measure at an early date, and we shall undertake to hear, of course, those who are interested in the legislation, especially Members of the Senate who would like to be heard on it.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the bill as introduced, together with a statement indicating that part of the Reorganization Act of 1945 which has been eliminated from the bill. It also indicates new provisions included in the measure I am presenting which were not in the 1945 act.

I do this so that Members of the Senate may easily ascertain, by reading this material, what the differences are, better to enable them to prepare any testimony they may wish to present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the statement by the Senator from Arkansas, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. HOEY, and Mr. O'CONOR) was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

TITLE I

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1949."

NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(5) the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions; or

(6) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have, any functions, is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more other officers of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation or other type of reorganization) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of a reorganization made by the plan such provisions are necessary. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than 4 years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of that found by the President to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any reorganization;

(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available for use in connection with any function or agency affected by a reorganization, as he deems necessary by reason of the reorganization for use in connection with the functions affected by the reorganization, or for the use of the agency which shall have such functions after the reorganization plan is effective, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof; or

(2) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(3) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(5) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office; or

(6) transferring to or consolidating with any other agency the municipal government of the District of Columbia or all those functions thereof which are subject to this act, or abolishing said government or all said functions.

TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization

plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

DEFINITION OF "AGENCY"

SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term "agency" means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act the term "reorganization" means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 3.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by any agency or function affected by a reorganization under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such reorganization, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, have the same effect as if such reorganization had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested the function in the agency from which it is removed under the plan, such function shall, insofar as it is to be exercised after the plan becomes effective, be considered as vested in the agency under which the function is placed by the plan.

(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization plan under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization effected by such plan or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 11. Each reorganization plan which shall take effect shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in sec. 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered transmitted to Congress by the President on , 19 ", the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of sec. 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

The statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCLELLAN

DRAFT OF BILL ON EXECUTIVE REORGANIZATION

There is shown below a comparison between the text of the Reorganization Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 613) and the currently proposed draft bill (S. 526) on executive reorganization. The black bracketed text was included in the 1945 act but is not retained in the current bill; and the italic text is included in the new bill but was not included in the 1945 act.

By Senator MCCLELLAN (for himself and on behalf of Senators EASTLAND, HOEY, MCCARTHY, and O'CONOR):

"A bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes

*"Be it enacted, etc.—*

"TITLE I

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the 'Reorganization Act of [1945.'] *1949.'*

"NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government

and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

"(1) to [facilitate orderly transition from war to peace;] *promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;*

"(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

"(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable [within the revenues];

"(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

"(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

"(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

"(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

"[(e) It is the expectation of the Congress that the transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions under this act shall accomplish an over-all reduction of at least 25 percent in the administrative costs of the agency or agencies affected.]

"REORGANIZATION PLANS

"SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

"(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

"(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

"(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

"(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

"*(5) the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions; or*

"(6) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the [reorganizations specified in the] reorganization plan will not have, any functions.

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the [transfers, consolidations, coordinations, and abolitions,] *reorganizations* as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each [transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition referred to in paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (5) of this section and specified] *reorganization included* in the plan, he has found that such [transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition] *reorganization* is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function [specified] *included* in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

"OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

"SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

"(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

"(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more [assistant heads] *other officers* of any agency (including an agency resulting from a consolidation *or other type of reorganization*) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of [transfers, consolidations, and coordinations made by the plan, the responsibilities and duties of such head are of such nature as to require such action] *a reorganization made by the plan such provisions are necessary.* The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than 4 years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of [$10,000 per annum,] *that found by the President to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch,* and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any [transfer, consolidation, coordination, or abolition] *reorganization*;

"(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, *and of other funds,* available for use in connection with any function or agency [transferred, consolidated, or coordinated,] *affected by a reorganization,* as he deems necessary by reason of the [transfer, consolidation, or coordination] *reorganization* for use in connection with the [transferred, consolidated, or coordinated] functions *affected by the reorganization,* or for the use of the agency [to which the transfer is made,] *which shall have such functions after the reorganization plan is effective,* but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

"(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

"LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 5. [(a)] No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

"(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof or [establishing any new executive department; or] *consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof; or*

"[(2) changing the name of any executive department or the title of its head, or designating any agency as 'Department' or its head as 'Secretary'; or]

"[(3)] (2) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

"[(4)] (3) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated [if the reorganization had not been made, or beyond the time when the agency in which it was vested before the reorganization would have terminated] if the reorganization had not been made; or

"[(5)] (4) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

"[(6) imposing, in connection with the exercise of any quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative function possessed by an independent agency, any greater limitation upon the exercise of independent judgment and discretion, to the full extent authorized by law, in the carrying out of such function, than existed with respect to the exercise of such function by the agency in which it was vested prior to the taking effect of such reorganization; except that this prohibition shall not prevent the abolition of any such function; or]

"[(7)] (5) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office [.] *; or*

"*(6) transferring to or consolidating with any other agency the municipal government of the District of Columbia or all those functions thereof which are subject to this Act, or abolishing said government or all said functions.*

"[(b) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, Securities and Exchange Commission, National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, and Railroad Retirement Board.]

"[(c) No reorganization plan shall provide for any reorganization affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to any such civil function. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection.]

"[(d) No reorganization plan shall provide for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection if it also provides for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No reorganization contained in any reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, United States Tariff Commission, and Veterans' Administration.]

"[(e) If, since January 1, 1945, Congress has by law established the status of any agency in relation to other agencies or transferred any function to any agency, no reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of, changing the status of such agency in relation to other agencies or of abolishing any such transferred function or providing for its exercise by or under the supervision of any other agency.]

"[(f) No reorganization specified in a reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is transmitted to the Congress before April 1, 1948.]

"TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 6. (a) [The reorganizations specified in the plan shall take effect in accordance with the plan] *Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect* upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of trans-

mittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

"(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

"(1) continuity of sessions shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

"(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

"(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

"DEFINITION OF 'AGENCY'

"SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, *council,* independent establishment, *Government* corporation [wholly or partly owned by the United States which is an instrumentality of the United States], board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government [.], *and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.* Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

"MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

"SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act *the term 'reorganization' means* any transfer, consolidation, coordination, [abolition, change, or designation of name or title, disposition, winding up of affairs, or provision for the appointment and compensation of the head or assistant heads of an agency,] *authorization, or abolition,* referred to in section 3. [or 4, shall be deemed a 'reorganization'.]

"SAVING PROVISIONS

"SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by any agency or function [transferred to, or consolidated or coordinated with, any other agency or function] *affected by a reorganization* under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such [transfer, consolidation, or coordination,] *reorganization,* shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law *or by the abolition of a function,* have the same effect as if such [transfer, consolidation, or coordination] *reorganization* had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested [functions] *the function* in the agency from which [the transfer is made] *it is removed* under the plan, such [functions] *function* shall, insofar as [they are] *it is* to be exercised after the [transfer,] *plan becomes effective,* be considered as vested in the agency [to which the transfer is made under the plan.] *under which the function is placed by the plan.*

"(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

"(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization *plan* under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization *plan* takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization [so] effected *by such plan* or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

"UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

"PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

"SEC. 11. [If the reorganizations specified in a] *Each* reorganization plan *which shall* take effect [, the reorganization plan] shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

"TITLE II

NOTE.—The text of title II of the currently proposed bill is the same as the text of title II of the Reorganization Act of 1945, approved December 20, 1945, 59 Stat. 613. That title prescribes the procedure by which the two Houses of Congress consider and dispose of reorganization plans.

## PROMOTION OF MAXIMUM EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill which I and a number of other Senators introduced in the last Congress. It was then Senate bill 1652. The bill is to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free-enterprise country. It has particular reference to the welfare of veterans. I shall not read the names of Senators whose names appear on the bill as sponsors. The names of some Senators who were on the bill in the last Congress also appear on the present bill as sponsors. There are quite a number of sponsors of the present bill who were Members of the last Senate. In addition the names of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] appear on the bill. On behalf of myself and the other Senators who are sponsors of it, I introduce the bill and ask for its appropriate reference.

The bill (S. 529) to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy, introduced by Mr. BARKLEY (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HILL, Mr. JENNER, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. GREEN was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## SUPPORT PRICE OF MILK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity as the law provides, and I ask that it be appropriately referred. The bill covers all milk, regardless of ultimate use.

The bill (S. 538) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement as to why I am introducing this bill, which, incidentally, is a companion measure to a bill already introduced in the House of Representatives (H. R. 1333) by my able colleague from Wisconsin, Representative REID F. MURRAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

DECLINE OF MILK PRICES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as everyone who has been following the farm situation knows, milk prices have been gradually falling, and the health of the dairy segment of our economy is in jeopardy. When the agricultural section of our economy becomes impaired, the whole economy feels the impact and is impaired. It is just common sense that we begin to think of our own a little bit, as well as responding to our obligations in relation to our neighbors in foreign lands. We have heard a lot of discussion lately in relation to making sure that we do not go into an economic tailspin. The sort of measure which I am introducing today, if it became law, would stop the tailspinning of a very important section of our economy. While my own State is 50-percent agricultural, the production of milk is the main element in its agricultural program.

But the subject of this bill is not a partisan matter, or just a State-wide or regional matter. It is a subject that calls for earnest consideration by every thinking legislator. Most of the 170,000 dairy farms in my State are relatively small in size. As a consequence, they have not gotten the benefits of large-scale production as have the growers of wheat, for example, in the case of big farms in some other States.

The dairy farmer's income has been increasingly limited, and his lot has been helped only where he has been fortunate enough to have a large family to help him meet the problems of the labor shortage and the high costs of labor. But with the high costs of feed and fertilizer, the high costs of machinery, and other supplies, his net income has been relatively low. Throughout the war years, by working extended hours, he and his wife and children have been able to make a go of it, to purchase high-priced machinery in many instances.

I may say, Mr. President, that when I left Wisconsin last fall I paid $2,600 for a tractor, with a little addition, which in 1939 could have been bought for $900 for my farm. That is a slight indication of what is happening.

I may divert from my prepared remarks for a moment to say that, in relation to the general price of milk in Wisconsin, the farmer is getting about 7 cents a quart, but, of course, the consumer is paying anywhere from 19 to 21 cents for the same milk. The people of the United States were sold a bill of goods in the last campaign, particularly when a certain

group tried to make out that the farmer was getting the big end of the deal. The very milk which is produced and sold at a little over 7 cents a quart, in less than 2 or 3 hours reaches the housewife, and the price then is from 19 to 21 cents a quart.

During the war years, about which I have been speaking, we have seen a depletion in the soil on the farm and a depreciation in the farmers' houses and barns and sheds. They have deteriorated because the farmers have not been able to keep them up, first, because it was not possible to get the labor necessary; second, the farmer could not get the material; and, third, he did not have the time to do the necessary work. So, if farming is to continue, the farmer must have sufficient income to meet the costs entailed in rebuilding his soil and repairing his home. Otherwise there will be a continued exodus from the farms, with the result which may be expected.

As I have said, in my own State 50 percent of the income of the commonwealth depends upon agriculture. The economic life of the villages and cities depends upon the purchasing power of the farmers, and if we permit the condition of the farms to deteriorate, we will reap the whirlwind.

DANGERS OF DROP IN FARM INCOME

If aid cannot be given the farmers, it will be found that the milk-cow herds will gradually be reduced further in numbers, and with that reduction will come also further depletion in the soil and further depletion of the beef supply of the Nation. It is not generally known that a large portion of the meat supply of this country comes from these very dairy farms. More than 40 percent of that supply comes from that source. We think of it as coming from the plains of the West, but more than 40 percent comes from these very dairy cows.

Mr. President, let us remember that the dairy industry is the largest single source of farm income. This very industry, the dairy industry, supplies approximately 40 percent of our beef and veal, as well as all our milk. The dairy farmers of America have indicated in no uncertain terms that they are not going to stand idly by and allow their prices to go through the floor, or see the days brought back when they had to dump milk from trucks onto the road because they could not get a fair price for the so-called "surplus milk" they were producing.

Not only the farmers, but the businessmen, tradesmen, professional men, and bankers in villages and in the cities of the States where milk is produced, are clearly concerned over this situation. A threat to the farmer's income is a threat to everyone's income, because he is the greatest buyer and purchaser of the things labor produces. It is imperative, Mr. President, that we do not allow the whittling away of the farmers' income.

The farmer asks no more than the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. He asks no more than fair prices in return for his back-breaking toil. He is entitled to fair prices, and this bill will help assure such prices for him.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks a short article from a Wisconsin newspaper, the Arcadia News-Leader, entitled "The Milk Market," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MILK MARKET

The Wisconsin milk market is wavering uncertainly, and farmers and their leaders are angrily worried about it. Last July the average price paid Wisconsin producers for milk going into all uses was $4.43 per hundredweight. In December the price had declined to $3.65. Farmers wondered about the future market, as they studied their production plans and problems for the new year.

From the Pure Milk Products Cooperative, one of the State's largest and most enterprising, came a resentful blast about the price trend. Said W. O. Perdue, of Fond du Lac, cooperative manager: "There is no sound reason for today's low price paid to farmers for manufactured milk. Consumer demands remain firm. National income is still at a record high. * * * It leads us to believe there has been a great harvest for the speculator—at the expense of the farmer."

The cooperative and its members produce largely for the evaporated milk market, which has been shaky of late. Perdue said the cooperative would renew its efforts to obtain a Federal evaporated milk market order under which the producers would have a part in establishing prices.

## UNITED STATES FLAG SHIPPING PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT-FINANCED CARGOES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a United States flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Maryland will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 543) to provide for United States flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR RE INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR UNITED STATES FLAG SHIPPING PARTICIPATION IN GOVERNMENT-FINANCED CARGOES

Recently the Administrator for ECA, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, announced his intention no longer to require that 50 percent of the ECA bulk cargoes be carried on United States flag ships unless such ships are available at competitive rates. I believe that under existing circumstances this action is ill-advised.

The American people are making tremendous sacrifices to supply aid to the countries of western Europe whose economy has been disrupted by the ravages of war. It is essential, of course, that the great sums of money appropriated for this purpose be handled in accordance with good business practices. And unquestionably the Administrator is acting in conformance with the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which provides that he shall assure, so far as is practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities purchased within the United States out of ECA funds shall be transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates.

While understanding the reasons prompting the Administrator's position, we must not forget that there is even more urgency in the protests that have been raised against ECA's contemplated reduction in shipping in American bottoms. It is of the greatest importance to our country that the American merchant marine be maintained on a level necessary for the conduct of America's business throughout the world. We cannot, in reason, provide funds that will be used to build up the merchant marine of other nations, while American shipping, on which the lifeblood of our country's economy is dependent, is allowed to remain idle.

The argument that it is good business to penalize American shipping because costs are somewhat higher would, if carried out to its logical conclusion, necessitate the passing over of countless American products, because they might be available at lower prices in other countries, where the standard of living is tremendously lower than here, and where costs of production are less.

In a bill which I have introduced in the Senate it is provided that products purchased by the Government or any agency of the Government or through funds or credits allocated for this purpose, i. transported by water, shall be transported on United States flag vessels, at market rates for United States flag vessels, to at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of such commodities, computed by countries, and separately for dry bulk carriers, dry cargo liner, and tanker services.

The bill further stipulates that this minimum of 50 percent of gross tonnage must be maintained unless the United States Maritime Commission, after investigation, shall certify that United States flag vessels are not available in sufficient numbers or at market rates for United States flag vessels to effectuate the purpose of the act.

It further directs all departments and agencies to cooperate with the Commission through their agreements covering transportation of purchases and requires the Commission to report to the Congress within 90 days after the enactment of the act and every 4 months thereafter the record of shipping covered by this legislation.

## HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MAYBANK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 33), which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Eighty-first Congress to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. Upon the termination of the special committee, authorized pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, to study the problems of American small business

enterprises, the files and records of such committee shall be transferred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. F. RYAN DUFFY, TO BE CIRCUIT JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS, SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. F. Ryan Duffy, of Wisconsin, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Hon. Evan A. Evans, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] chairman, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. WILSON WARLICK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Wilson Warlick, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina, vice Hon. Edwin Y. Webb, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. EDWARD ALLEN TAMM, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Edward Allen Tamm, of the District of Columbia, to be United States district judge for the District of Columbia. Judge Tamm is now serving in this post under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HERBERT W. ERSKINE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Herbert W. Erskine, of California, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California, vice Hon. Adolphus Frederick St. Sure, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. ROY W. HARPER TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF MISSOURI

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri. Mr. Harper is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLIAM T. McCARTHY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of William T. McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Hon. Arthur D. Healey, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THOMAS PATRICK THORNTON TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Thomas Patrick Thornton, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Hon. Ernest A. O'Brien, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WILLSON C. MOORE, TO BE FOURTH JUDGE OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Willson C. Moore, of Hawaii, to be fourth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii. Judge Moore is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 27, 1947. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. ALBERT M. CRISTY, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Albert M. Cristy, of Hawaii, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Emil C. Peters, term expired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD A. TOWSE, TO BE SECOND JUDGE OF THE FIRST CIRCUIT, CIRCUIT COURTS, HAWAII.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon

the nomination of Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be second judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Albert M. Cristy, elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF HON. ANGEL R. DE JESUS TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Angel R. de Jesus, of Puerto Rico, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. Mr. de Jesus is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF LUIS NEGRON FERNANDEZ TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico. Mr. Fernandez is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BROUGHTON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding Senate Joint Resolution 2, providing for a constitutional amendment so that the electoral votes for President and Vice President will be counted in proportion to the popular vote, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERTSON

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Preservation of the American System of Private Enterprise," delivered by him at a meeting of the Virginia Medical Society at Richmond, Va., on January 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TOTAL JUSTICE AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Total Justice and Administrative Procedure," delivered by him before the graduating class of Notre Dame Law School on January 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE TO VICE PRESIDENT-ELECT BARKLEY BY THE HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address paying tribute to Senator BARKLEY, Vice President-elect, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at Town Hall dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City December 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE JEWISH STATE IN PALESTINE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on January 15, 1949, regarding the state of Israel, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE BRITISH-ISRAELI SITUATION

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by George Sokolsky discussing the British-Israeli situation, published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RED MASS SERMON BY THE MOST REV. JOHN J. WRIGHT

[Mr. McGRATH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon delivered by the Most Reverend John J. Wright, D. D., auxiliary bishop of Boston, at the Catholic University of America, on January 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WISCONSIN'S UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM—EDITORIAL FROM THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A New Jobless Pay Maneuver," dealing with the Wisconsin system of unemployment insurance credit ratings, published in the January 8, 1949, issue of the Milwaukee Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

RESPONSIBILITY IN THE AIR—ARTICLE BY MARQUIS CHILDS

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Responsibility in the Air," by Marquis Childs, dealing with the recent chartered airplane disaster in Seattle, Wash., published in the Washington (D. C.) Post, of January 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC HIGH LIGHTS

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Economic High Lights," sent to him by Mr. Dan B. Noble, of the Pacific Northwest Development Association, Portland, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

ANALYSIS OF THE AMERICAN CHARACTER—ARTICLE BY HENRY STEELE COMMAGER

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an article entitled "Analysis of the American Character," written by Henry Steele Commager, and published in the New York Times Magazine of January 2, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ADDRESSES, ETC., AT INAUGURATION OF GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following my remarks certain statements made recently at San Juan, Puerto Rico, on the occasion of the inauguration of its first elected Governor, the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín. These statements include: First, the personal message sent by President Truman to Senator Muñoz-Marín, Puerto Rico's first elected Governor; second, the address made by the President's special representative at the Governor's inauguration, Oscar L. Chapman, Under Secretary of the Department of the Interior; and, third, the inaugural address delivered by the Governor-elect, Luis Muñoz-Marín.

Mr. President, I believe all will agree that the inauguration of the first elected Governor in Puerto Rico, 450 years after its discovery, marks an epoch in the history of the Western Hemisphere. It is further evidence that we in the United States are continuing to foster democratic processes, and shows that we are not interested in the growth or development of a colonial system. A similar epochal meeting in Manila on July 4, 1946, attended by representatives of the United States, also bears this out.

It was my good fortune to attend the Manila ceremonies, but it was impossible for me to be in Puerto Rico at the time of the Governor's inauguration ceremonies. Having been the author of the legislation authorizing an elected Governor for Puerto Rico, I very much wanted to be present, and regret that it was impossible. Since the ceremonies took place on January 2, 1949, many other Members of Congress who had planned to attend this historic ceremony were also unable to be there. I hope some of us will be able to go to Puerto Rico at a later date to pay our personal respects to Governor Muñoz-Marín and to the good people of Puerto Rico. I feel certain that all Members of Congress will be interested in reading the statements now being made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S MESSAGE TO THE HONORABLE LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN ON THE OCCASION OF HIS INAUGURATION AS FIRST ELECTED GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO

DEAR SENATOR: Your inauguration as the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico is a happy and historic event. For you personally as a loyal son of Puerto Rico and of a distinguished father who spent his life in the service of his native land, it should be a profound satisfaction. It is no less so for all of us who have followed with interest and admiration the progress of the Puerto Rican people under your leadership.

Your election as governor by an impressive majority after a warmly contested campaign in which so large a proportion of the Puerto Rican people exercised their right to vote is a fine demonstration of American democracy in action.

The peaceful election of a citizen of Puerto Rico as Governor by the ballots of its own people is a further important step along the road to complete self-government which is the ideal and goal of American policy toward all our Territorial areas.

You have my congratulations and best wishes for an administration full of constructive achievements. I recall with great pleasure the cordial reception extended to me by the people of Puerto Rico when I visited the island last spring and I extend to them through you my New Year's greetings and the assurance of my deep interest in their welfare.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

---

SPEECH BY OSCAR L. CHAPMAN, UNDER SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, AND SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, AT INAUGURATION OF HON. LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN AS GOVERNOR OF PUERTO RICO ON JANUARY 2, 1949

My delight at being here on this very historic occasion is exceeded only by President Truman's disappointment at not being able to come. He asked me to express his deep regret and recall to you his very great enjoyment of his visit last spring. He recognizes, as do I, that this inauguration of Luis Muñoz-Marín, as the first elected Governor of Puerto Rico, is not only a long stride forward in the island's 50 years' march toward self-government, but it also marks the first time in the history of America, if not the world, that a Territorial people has been given the right to choose its own chief executive.

I know how much this means to the people of Puerto Rico. I can assure you that all Americans are just as happy as you are over what is happening here today. Those of us who, in our history, have suffered also the irritations of appointed authority, as you have, are happy because we feel this demonstrates to the world once again our fundamental belief in self-government and our desire to avoid anything that even resembles colonial exploitation.

From now on you make your own laws as before, and you administer them through your own elected Governor, and through men chosen by him. As of today Puerto Rico has virtually all of the advantages of self-government enjoyed by the 48 States of the American Union—plus many financial benefits not enjoyed by those States. Indeed, the status of Puerto Rico has become so favorable as compared with the States, that many of our businessmen are seriously considering, or have already decided upon, establishing their businesses and even their residences in your beautiful island.

On behalf of the President, and on my own behalf, I want to congratulate your new Governor, your retiring Governor, your able Resident Commissioner, and the people of Puerto Rico. President Truman has asked me to read the following message to Governor Muñoz-Marín:

(Mr. Chapman read and personally handed to the Governor President Truman's message, which precedes this address.)

In the sentiment he expressed in the message, President Truman was speaking for all the rest of the American people. Though most of us have never lived under an outside government, our whole tradition of self-government is based upon an unhappy experience of that kind about 150 years ago. In those days, I might add, our forefathers had neither the privilege of electing their own governors, nor the tax concessions enjoyed by Puerto Rico today. Had the leaders of the British Empire recognized our basic political and economic rights, our history might have been quite different.

I do not want to give the impression that I feel the glory of this occasion belongs to us, rather than to you. This unprecedented grant of self-rule was earned by the people of Puerto Rico who, through 50 years under the American flag, have shown a clear and unquestioned ability to govern themselves and handle their own problems with wisdom and maturity.

No people in the Western Hemisphere have struggled under more adverse circumstances. Your population is denser on your limited land resources than the population of any country in this hemisphere. You started this 50-year battle for economic independence and self-government with little education and with tremendous health problems.

Yet despite these handicaps, the people of Puerto Rico have maintained a steady climb upward on the ladder of economic and social progress, particularly during the past fey years under two great American Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman.

In the past 50 years your illiteracy has declined from 79 percent to 31 percent, and to a figure probably below that today. Despite the tremendous increase in your population, school facilities per child of school age have doubled. Your annual income has become the highest in the Caribbean; your doctors and your facilities for medical care have multiplied; your housing and diet, though still inadequate, have been improved tremendously; your transportation system has been developed from almost nothing, and your industry is now expanding at a sensational rate.

From the long-range standpoint this industrial expansion is the most promising of all your economic developments. Within recent years 40 new industries have been started and more are on the way. Industrial expansion offers hope for balancing your unfavorable trade balance with the mainland, for increasing your per capita income and your standard of living. I have tremendous faith in the future of Puerto Rican industry. Together with migration, I believe it can solve most of the economic problems resulting from your dense population.

Puerto Rico's growth to political maturity has been just as remarkable as her climb up the economic ladder. Only 50 years ago you were under military government as a conquered territory after 400 years as a colonial possession of Spain. The Foraker Act in 1900 set up a civil government, but under the complete control of the President and Congress. You were citizens of Puerto Rico, but not of the United States.

The first big advance came in 1917 when Congress passed the Jones Act which remains today as the Organic Act of Puerto Rico. That made you citizens of the United States, provided for a legislature elected by the people, and gave you a bill of rights similar to ours. This event today marks the next big advance. It results from congressional recognition of your political maturity.

Your recent progress has come under the leadership of a great man—your new Governor, Luis Muñoz-Marín. It would be difficult to find a more appropriate selection for your first elected Governor than Luis Muñoz-Marín on the basis of ability and accomplishment. Thoroughly trained in the traditions and culture of both the Americas, he has demonstrated outstanding qualities as a writer, an orator, a political leader, and a statesman. He has been the fountain head and the driving force behind much of the phenomenal progress made by Puerto Rico in the last decade. Furthermore, he was born, quite appropriately, the year Puerto Rico came under the American flag, as a worthy son of Luis Muñoz Rivera—distinguished patriot and leader of Puerto Rico in the difficult period of transition from the Spanish to the American way of life.

I cannot close these remarks without paying tribute to another great Puerto Rican and great American—Jesús T. Piñero—who as your Resident Commissioner and your first Puerto Rican Governor, was a powerful force in accelerating the progress we are celebrating today. Governor Piñero's warm personality, his integrity, and his perseverance, won the confidence and respect of Members of Congress and everyone else who knew him in Washington.

I wish it had been possible for me to make at least a portion of my remarks today in the beautiful Spanish tongue which most of you have always spoken. To me it is most appropriate that here where Anglo Saxon and Spanish cultures are mingled, both languages should be used and understood by everyone. It is inevitable that Puerto Rico will serve more and more as a very important bridge between the Americas, a source of trained bilingual technicians and leaders, a perfect place for international conferences, a common meeting ground where North America and Central and South America, and the Caribbean area can also feel at home and be understood.

In this very important cultural aspect, no less than in the fields of social and economic achievement, I foresee a brilliant future for Puerto Rico, a future which the people of the United States will be proud to share. To Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín and all his people I say good luck, and God bless you.

---

MUÑOZ-MARÍN INAUGURAL ADDRESS

I have just taken an oath to serve the people of Puerto Rico faithfully in the office which I have assumed today. Let it be understood as sincerity, and not a lack of humility, when I say that it was not necessary for me to do so. With an oath or without it, the forces of my conscience have sought to make my life an oath of service to my people. In the government or out of it, there is this obligation for everyone who sees ways of serving, and who feels that he has the strength to do so.

By the vital nature—not merely of law—of this oath, there is no reason why you should not all share it with me. The courage, the hope, and the fortitude of this people expect it from all—from all those who in one form or another of public administration, of legislation, in the capitol, in the departments, in the municipalities, in the barrios—have some one function of service, be it notable or humble. It is also expected from all those who in private activity have functions that affect the lives of many—those who make our industries, those who manage our marketing, those who develop cooperatives, those who give the workers the force of organization, those who think, those who study, those who teach, those who heal the sick, those who minister to the soul as before the mystery of the unknown. From all these, the great human masses of our island, who know how to face adverse destiny with strength and dignity, expect an oath of dedication. And they expect that this will not be an oath of condescending paternalism, but one with good democratic meaning.

The great masses owe it to themselves to take this oath that every life serve better the nobility of spirit that animates it, that every hand serve better the land that it cultivates and the tools that it uses and thus justice and liberty for all; that every mind serve better its own understanding and thus the clearer understanding of all. It is in this way and not by an oath and the dedication of one man alone, or of some men, that the people of Puerto Rico may, within the smallness of their territory, realize the greatness of their destiny. It is not necessary to say the oath out loud. Rather it belongs to the higher voice of the conscience of all those who are listening to me here, and of all those who tomorrow will hear those who have heard me today. This is the basis of my program of government, because it is the basis of a program of life for the people.

To this attitude the multiple actions of government itself, should refer, from the care of the most remote country road to the greatest plans for education, production, and justice. To this attitude should be referred also fundamentally, everything in private action that may be of public interest and consequence. To this attitude also

should be referred fundamentally, in accordance with the free determination of the consciences concerned, all that which, because of honest differences of thought is to constitute the opposition to the forms and manners in which the government directs the uphill struggle of this people.

The situation of this people growing on a small island is serious. But the ability of this people is greater than the seriousness of their situation. The affliction of this people is great; its courage is greater. Its spiritual qualities are magnificent, and they have scarcely begun to use these magnificent qualities. No plan of government, or of private initiative, can produce full results if these magnificent qualities are not put into day-to-day use.

Our people have the quality; all that has to be done is to continue clarifying it in order that it covert itself, definitely, into a creative attitude, already growing, with which it will better the plans, diagrams, and purposes, of its struggle in the great challenge that destiny presents to them.

Our people, naturally have virtues and faults. To deny the faults is to incur another fault. But it is a fact that the people of Puerto Rico have excellent virtues. Of these, I would say that the most valuable are: Natural intelligence that provides a great facility for learning techniques and democracy alike; fortitude, generosity; and a humanist attitude that keeps them at a healthy distance from obsolete contemporary nationalism and that makes them feel better as members of Christendom than as inhabitants of political frontiers. Because of this it is that Puerto Rico seemingly a colony, in a deeper sense is not one; and, able to be a nation in a narrow sense, has neither great objections to, nor great preoccupations about, being one.

I believe that ours is a people that does not need juridical definitions as an aid to spiritual welfare. And this, in the world of atomic energy, is a preeminent and pioneer virtue. To find its way out of obsolete colonialism it does not feel compelled to recur to obsolescent nationalism. It finds itself more compelled to search in its own understanding, and to look to its leaders, for new creative roads more in harmony with the immense fact of atomic energy and with the immeasureableness of the Christian attitude.

I have mentioned the two great forces—the only ones that are truly great—of the time in which we live. The only other force that can stand up against the atomic is the Christian, and not only in the sense of churches, but in the root that the equality of all men before the history of life has in the conscience. The people of Puerto Rico, without having thought, nor debated, nor analyzed, feel itself, by a spontaneous attitude to belong to the brotherhood of man. I suspect that it is not Puerto Rico alone, but many peoples, that have this quality and that only historical circumstances have prevented them from expressing it clearly.

I believe that this is the appropriate moment to point out, for today and tomorrow, the factors that contribute to my thinking on political status. There are two truths that I seem to see clearly. One is that colonialism is obsolete and is disappearing with relative speed from the face of the earth. The other is that the narrow nationalistic spirit is obsolescent, and is disappearing, with dangerous slowness, from the face of the earth. Conditions of modern life make colonialism undesirable, in many cases even for those who until yesterday were its beneficiaries. They also, with every day that passes, make enlightened living together more difficult, in terms of national sovereignty, for the creatures of God who inhabit the nations. It seems more evident each day that there is no way in which multiple weak hands, proud, jealous, suspicious, futilely authoritarian, of the multiple sovereignties, can cope with the atomic bomb, nor with creative atomic energy in its day. Neither socialism, nor capitalism, nor communism, nor nationalism, are forces comparable to the tremendous and ineluctable force of atomic energy. Only Christianity, in its practical sense of human equality, is a force of the spirit that can contend with material atomic force. Only by carrying the feeling of brotherhood to the modes and practical institutions of his life can man find his way out of the tragic blind alley, into which he has got himself by permitting his science to develop more rapidly than his wisdom to guide its use. I am not referring, it should be clear, to brotherhood in a merely sentimental sense. The change that is in order is that of the attitude deeply understood through wisdom, vigorously clarified by intelligence, and severely judged and maintained by conscience.

Within this frame, what are colonies? They constitute a form of political relationship that is disappearing, that is due to disappear completely. Those who live in them object to them. Those who dominate them—with some notable exception in Asia—no longer need them, although at times, because of a false sense of prestige, they avoid acting on the fact. If the narrow nationalistic concept is to disappear, so that it will not be civilization itself that disappears, and if the colonial concept is disappearing, then the situation is that archaic colonialism is in danger of becoming archaic nationalism. Without a stout revolution in thinking, that is the futility of the picture—the battle of the gig to convert itself into a carriage in a world of airplanes; the squandering of spiritual force in the fight to convert the obsolete into the obsolescent, to get out of something that has no reason to exist in order to enter into something that sooner or later will not have reason to exist either.

It seems clear to me that what an anquished community clamors for from its leaders—its intellectual, religious, scientific, cultural, and political leaders—is hard creative thought, deep understanding of human values.

Specifically, how is all this related to the problem or political status in Puerto Rico? We should not fall into the well-known intellectual vice of raising grand ideas in order to escape from practical obligations. Hardly could Puerto Rico contribute in any appreciable manner to the solution of the great world problem; and our obligation here is to try to solve the problem of Puerto Rico. One more small nationality is not going to aggravate the tragedy of the national concept in the face of atomic forces. One small nationality less is not going to mitigate it. Then, how is what I have said related to what it falls to us to do in Puerto Rico in fraternal cooperation with all the people of the United States?

The relation is this. The colonial system not only is going to disappear in Puerto Rico, but is already speedily disappearing, much more so than in other places. In what colony, in what part of the world or in what time, has there taken place an act like this? What colony has ever elected, with the free votes of its people, its own legislative and executive government? No greater tribute can be paid to the people of the United States, and particularly to their President and Congress, than recognition of the unprecedented nature of their action. Traces remain of the colonial system in Puerto Rico; but it is evident that colonialism is being abolished rapidly in this community. There is still some distance to travel. Precisely for this reason it should be our concern to see well where we are going, what the objective is ahead of us. Can it be the limited national concept?

The United States tomorrow can, without loss, declare Puerto Rico a nation apart; and the most notable political novelty would be a change in my title and that of my successors. But there could be economic changes that would be highly damaging in their effect of restricting the integral liberty, in their work, in their commerce, in the betterment of their homes, in security, in the creative dynamism of millions of human beings who could hardly be benefited by a change in my title.

It can be said that a people should not place high things of the spirit in the balance with material things. I not only admit this, but energetically affirm it; they should not. But it is not a mere material convenience to be free from want, to have path of hope that liberates from hopelessness; and, above all, the narrow national concept is not a high value of the human spirit in the times of anguish and creation in which we live. A people ought to be ready to make great material sacrifices in order to create an understanding of deep and clean human fraternity, which is a high ideal of the spirit and to dissolve the hardness which permits it to contemplate insensibly the misery of others, because to dissolve this hardness is a high ideal of the spirit; and to give root to attitudes that lead man to be more creative than acquisitive, which is a high ideal of the spirit; and to destroy bitterness of race, language, and culture, because to destroy them is a high ideal of the spirit. But a people cannot make such sacrifices for a concept of diminishing validity, plagued by the germs of hatred and violence because this ailment is not a high ideal of the spirit. Quite on the contrary, it is a high ideal of the spirit to contribute to its cure.

I know that this people of ours, in its humble masses, and in its leaders in all fields of thought, if it persists in creating solutions, will create solutions. That to which it cannot resign itself is to put aside its creative capacity and to feel that it is forever enslaved in its understanding by a banal dilemma under the terms of which it is obliged to believe that there are only two doors through which it can go out to meet its future, even if both are mined with destruction. To this it could be said by a habitually superficial school of thought that it is better to go out one of the two doors, even though they are mined, than not to go out at all. The answer to this is that nobody speaks of not going out. Does man perchance not know how to open doors where there are none? Is it not his duty to himself to look for ways of opening new ones when those that there are may be mined for his destruction? Is it not the essence of liberty to have the power to choose from among alternatives? And if intelligence multiplies the alternatives, is it not in that way widening liberty? The people always can, in choosing among many, old and new alternatives, decide for one of the old with the same freedom as for one of the new.

That which I have said so far, although in part it widens consideration of the theme by giving it a background of world in crisis, on the other hand has limited it to the mere political nature of status. A political status, of course, does not exist in an economic vacuum. Thinking on the political status cannot be developed in a vacuum of economic or cultural thought. Ways of living and working; the forward-looking habits in a community; the religious vision; the land and its crops, and the factories, and the tools, and the techniques, and the raising of children, and the cultivation of the understanding, and science, and art, and recreation, and health habits, and sustenance, and clothes, and sheltering roof, and justice, and light, and generosity and serenity—all these together, and their political status, and more—are the life of a people. The manner of expressing all these together in harmony is the ideal of life of a people. And the spontaneity and dynamism with which they are expressed constitute the people's integral liberty. It is on the basis of this conviction, that I have said before today that we must exercise responsible care in not risking un-

necessarily many components of liberty by a fixation on only one of its components.

Of course, certain aspects of integral liberty are closely related to the possibility or impossibility of other aspects. If a community does not develop an economy which is founded, or has hopes of being founded, on a victorious productive effort, it will see other forms of its life and liberty impeded, or decayed, or destroyed. From this comes our great dedication, which we should further strengthen on this day, to the task of constantly increasing production in Puerto Rico—more rapidly than the growth in population; more rapidly still to absorb unemployment; more rapidly still to go on raising the standard of living and security; and more rapidly still so that present imperative necessity for aid shall not become permanent. And I want to say here, most emphatically, that sweatshop labor is definitely not one of the incentives we provide for new investments in industrial development. The production program is for the people. The workers form the largest part of the people. One of the basic necessities of all the people is a decent standard of living for the workers who are the majority of the people.

Tax exemption for 12 years for new industries is a counterbalance to factors which initially are adverse, such as the distance at which many raw materials are found, and the natural disadvantages inherent in all periods of apprenticeship in an agricultural economy which needs, in order to survive, to convert itself into an industrial economy.

I do not wish to close without paying tribute—and let us all pay tribute on this day—to a man great in spirit, strong in humility, who in his austere administration has aided the new form of government to begin auspiciously today. I refer to Jesús Piñero.

Neither do I wish to end without the expression of my most profound respect for the common man of Puerto Rico who has known how, beset by hardship and suffering, to establish with his vote a government that has not offered him sweets or marvels, but to lead him honestly along the difficult uphill road.

## STEEL SUPPLIES—EDITORIAL FROM LONDON TIMES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the London Times of January 13, 1949, headed "Steel supplies." In view of the fact that the nationalization program has gone a long way in Britain, and that the steel industry is one of the few major industries which have not been nationalized, I believe that Members of the Senate will find this editorial of extreme interest, particularly in view of the President's recent proposal to start putting the United States Government in the steel business.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STEEL SUPPLIES

Over a year ago, when the target for the steel industry's output was set at 14,000,000 tons in 12 months, it was believed by some observers that the adaptability and vigor shown by the industry's achievements in the autumn of 1947 and the scope for further adaptations made it reasonable to lock for an output of 15 million tons. Actual output in the year, which has now been announced, was 14,877,000 tons. It is an impressive achievement, far above any earlier output in the British industry, and reflecting an important advance in output a man over the best results before the war. How this contrasts with the experience of coal mining needs no underlining. The estimates on which the low initial target was based probably took too cautious a view of the amount of old iron and steel scrap which could be got either from home sources or from imports for resmelting into steel. The scrap bought in the year exceeded forecasts by 800,000 tons, and not all of this was used; stocks, which had been drawn upon heavily in 1947, have now recovered by about 130,000 tons. How the consumption of pig iron in steel making compared with the plan is not published. Pig-iron output, while only a little higher than the estimate, was almost 1,500,000 tons above the 1947 figure, and of this about a million tons went into steel.

Steel output this year could be bigger still, if the flow of raw materials allows it. During the past year there has been growing appreciation of the desirability in present circumstances, with exceptionally high costs for wholly new plants and an immediate and urgent need for increased supplies, of making the most of existing facilities and of raising production by relatively small but quick adaptations of plants and processes. The determining factor will almost certainly be the supply of pig iron. More and better coke is indispensable, and this may well prove to be the weakest link in the chain of supply. Although imports of iron ore are larger than ever before, the cheap lower-grade home ores are now considerably less used than during the war, and there is no serious reason to suppose that the supply of ore need set any sharp limit to output. In wartime home ores were often transported longer distances than their value might justify in peacetime, but their value in comparison with imported ores is greater than was commonly estimated. Forecasts just after the war frequently expressed the hope that imported ores might come down in cost to about 30s. a ton at the ports here, but in fact they are now costing 56s. a ton.

The prospective demand for steel is more difficult to estimate than the supply. There have been many signs in the past year that the margin of unsatisfied demand is smaller than has been thought. Stocks in general seemed to be growing more rapidly than consumption. Some users were certainly building up abnormally large quantities of the kinds of steel most difficult to get. It was freely admitted early in the year that duplicate orders were placed with different steel suppliers as an insurance; and by the end of the year some steel users were being asked to place orders. Some requirements—for example, for locomotives and railway wagons—have been found to be much exaggerated; and stocks of steel at coal mines are believed to have reached unprecedented levels. Some industries, on the other hand, notably shipbuilding, had much less steel than they could use; and shipbuilders were critical of the stockbuilding and hoarding, as they conceived it, of other users of steel. Here again, however, it may be that if the shipbuilders were able to finish and deliver ships more quickly the apparent pressure of demand for new ships might be seen to be slackening.

Certainly there is some reason to suspect that the demand for steel is now more nearly satisfied than appears on the surface. This is an issue in the United States as well as in this country. One significant factor in the demand for steel receives far less notice than it should. There is little doubt that the same amount of finished articles which is obtained from the present output of steel could be got from an appreciably smaller tonnage of steel if methods and technique could be further improved. The qualities of steel could be more fully utilized if designs could be changed by discarding unnecessary safety factors which made no allowance for improvements in the manufacture of standard steels over the last 30 years, and if the more costly high-tensile steels could be used more extensively. In the war there were important advances in these directions, but there was also great resistance among some users. Since the war there has actually been some falling away; and it is unfortunate that, partly for political reasons, steel prices have been kept below costs, because this policy removes one of the most powerful correctives—the corrective of cost—to the carefree use of scarce materials. The savings which could be obtained by a better use of steel and the use of better steels are considerable, and, since this country is bound to be increasingly at a disadvantage in raw materials, economy in their use is a national necessity.

## ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today is the two hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. As a Senator from the State where Franklin was born and passed his early boyhood, I am glad to join on his birthday in commemorating his many services to his country and to the advancement of the happiness and welfare of people all over the world.

Our only regret in Boston is that Franklin left so soon for Philadelphia. While Boston's place in early American history is large and solid, much would be added to its glory had Franklin stayed there long enough to accomplish some of the many outstanding feats which have established him in the eyes of many historians as our greatest American.

Franklin left Boston as a boy of 17 and traveled to Philadelphia by water in October 1723. There he built, by intelligence, concentrated study, and long hours of work, a career whose glory is so bright as still to cast continuing reflections throughout the civilized world. Certainly few, if any men, have combined in one personality so many qualities of greatness as did Benjamin Franklin—statesman, diplomatist, scientist, author, inventor, printer, philosopher, philanthropist, and educator. He was preeminent in his time in all of these fields.

Today, as we honor him, we pay homage to a man whose greatness still grows, whose genius and intellect still serve his country and the world generally. A recent example of that homage is the opening of 36 Craven Street, the last surviving house in London in which he lived, as a permanent shrine to him.

Franklin's part in building the foundation of our Nation is so vast that it is impossible briefly to begin to scratch beneath the surface which time has laid upon it. But we cannot fail to recall his great service in helping to frame the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Nor can we ignore the continuing dividends we all receive from such institutions as the University of Pennsylvania, which he founded, and the Franklin Institute, for which his philanthropy was responsible.

As a philosopher he has provided the foundation for many of the ideas which are today still spurring us onward to develop a happier, more peaceful and secure world. We do well to remember his words:

> God grant that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere and say, "This is my country."

At one time, it seems to me, we were nearer that objective which Franklin so clearly expressed than we are today. Had we attained that goal of Franklin's, we would not now be spending some $32,000,000,000 annually for past wars, the future security of our country, and living up to our responsibilities in many parts of the world. If our citizens could move about the world more freely, we would not feel that our security so much depended upon retaining under arms such a large number of our youthful citizens. We would not feel the need of concentrating so much of our capacities toward producing weapons to provide us with the best possible defense. We might not sense the vast difference between the varying ideologies in the world that we see today.

As a philosopher, Franklin visualized the enhancement of human rights so dear to him and so desired by all of us today, 200 years later. In a letter in 1780 to a friend of his, Joseph Priestly, the English chemist and early Unitarian, he said:

> The rapid progress true science now makes occasions my regretting sometimes that I was born so soon. It is impossible to imagine the height to which may be carried, in a thousand years, the power of man over matter. * * * Oh, that moral science were in as fair a way of improvement, that men would cease to be wolves to one another and that human beings would at length learn what they now improperly call humanity.

We have truly advanced far in the field of science and social services since Franklin's day, but we still have far to go before we reach that stage where men can settle their differences peacefully and without feeling the necessity of personal attack upon one another. But our spirit of optimism in making progress toward a peaceful world must always remain with us, as that spirit always remained one of Franklin's outstanding qualities.

In this connection truly we can learn today from one of his fables. In it he said:

> Has not the famous political fable of the snake with two heads and one body some useful instruction contained in it? She was going to a brook for a drink and on her way was to pass through a hedge, a twig of which opposed her direct course. One head chose to go on the right side of the twig, the other on the left; so that time was spent in the contest, and before the decision was completed, the poor snake died of thirst.

That fable emphasizes to us the continuing need for us here in the United States and those in other nations of the world to get together and to work toward a lasting peace in order that the many benefits that we still feel accruing from the genius of Franklin can have their full and lasting effect upon us, and we can derive the maximum benefit from the goals of science for which he, over two centuries ago, laid so skillfully the foundations.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania very much appreciates the fine tribute paid to Benjamin Franklin by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. As he has said, today is the two hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, illustrious patriot of American freedom, vigorous advocate of human liberty, and first citizen of Pennsylvania.

It is almost impossible to recall a single step in the progress of mankind that was not given impetus by his all-embracing genius.

Volumes have been written about his amazing career. He was the foremost scientist of his time. His success as a diplomat contributed vastly to victory for American independence. His public service strengthened the young Republic in the early struggles of its formative years.

As a philosopher, author, publisher, businessman, and politician he worked unceasingly to advance the welfare of his fellow citizens, and all the world.

One outstanding feature in the greatness of Benjamin Franklin was his unlimited faith in the capacity of man for self-government. His steadfast devotion to individual liberty is worthy of study and emulation in these days of crisis when human rights have been swept away, in many parts of the world, by aggression and tyranny.

Franklin's own words express most eloquently his hope for a world of freemen at peace with each other.

"God grant," he wrote, "that not only the love of liberty but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set foot anywhere on its surface and say, 'This is my country.'"

Mr. President, another excerpt from Franklin's writings is most appropriate for solemn reflection at this time.

There is a profound lesson for every American in Franklin's words:

> They that can give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety deserve neither liberty nor safety.

These are words of warning. If we fail to give them proper heed, we may find ourselves deprived of liberty, or safety, or both.

Unfortunately among a large element of our citizenship there is a disposition to hold lightly the sacred liberties that we enjoy under the American system of government. There is a tendency toward reliance upon government, rather than one's own initiative and enterprise, for security and well-being.

There is a growing trend toward surrendering to bureaucratic government many of the liberties, rights, and privileges that Franklin and the founding fathers rightfully insisted were the most precious possession of the people.

The record of history has demonstrated convincingly the wisdom of the framers of our Constitution. They were gravely concerned with the dangers that would inevitably arise from a government that would be the master and not the servant of the people. They were determined to establish safeguards against encroachment upon the liberties of the citizens by an all-powerful central government.

Their primary objective was to limit the powers of government over the lives of free men. The Bill of Rights was added because it was considered imperative to state explicitly the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

In their wisdom and vision they foresaw clearly the dangers of big government.

Today we are confronted with proposals which—if adopted in their entirety—would defeat the principles of individual liberty to which the founders of our Nation were passionately devoted. Many of these proposals and recommendations are based upon socialistic theories which have failed in every part of the world where they have been attempted.

In many instances the doctrine of control by the Federal Government is made palatable to the people by sugar-coating it as social legislation. The promise of an easy way of life is held out to divert attention from the costs involved and the increased burden of taxation which must be imposed upon the people. The hope of security is advanced to overshadow the sacrifice of the greater boon of liberty and individual freedom under which all American progress has been achieved.

As I study the recent message of the President of the United States on the state of the Union, I cannot escape recalling the warning which has come down to us from Benjamin Franklin. If we are to deserve liberty and safety, we must not give up essential liberty to obtain a little temporary safety or security.

Franklin would have been the first to point out that the fruits of individual effort, self-reliance, and thrift, are the basis of our national greatness and prosperity. He would have warned that dependence upon an all-powerful government to provide for every need would mean giving up our essential liberty.

Mr. President, I should like to recall an incident of the closing day of the Constitutional Convention, as recorded by James Madison. The delegates had completed their labors, which held so much significance to the future of the United States. The last members of the Convention were signing the document when Dr. Franklin—looking toward the President's chair, on the back of which a sun happened to be painted—remarked upon the difficulty of distinguishing between a rising and a setting sun.

I have—

Said he—

> often and often in the course of the session—and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue—looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting. But now, at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun.

The rising sun of freedom—as observed by Benjamin Franklin on that historic occasion—has guided America to its powerful place among the nations of the world.

Chaos and destruction have been the tragic fate of nations where the people have surrendered freedom in the hope of achieving security.

From many centers of pressure and propaganda we are constantly bombarded with a philosophy that would destroy the principles of American free-

dom. I am deeply alarmed over the growing acceptance of that philosophy. Under its teachings we find ourselves drifting away from the time-honored lessons of history and the wisdom of Benjamin Franklin. Unless this course is checked, we may, in the not too distant future, find ourselves face to face with the same disasters that have overtaken many great nations which were led in socialistic experimentation.

Only by preserving—with true loyalty, honesty, and courage—the principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and by unswerving allegiance to the Constitution and the Bill of Rights can we hope to go forward to a better world of freedom, justice, and human progress.

Americans must never forget the philosophy and the teachings of Benjamin Franklin.

NOMINATION OF CARL A. HATCH

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably the nomination of Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico, and request that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico, vice Hon. Colvin Neblett, retired.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on this morning it was my privilege and my pleasure to call a special meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary, and at that meeting I presented to the committee the nomination of former Senator Carl A. Hatch to be district judge for the district of New Mexico. The committee waived the rule which requires notice to be given for a period of 1 week, and unanimously recommended that the nomination of Carl Hatch be confirmed by the Senate.

It is now my pleasure to present that report and to say a few words about Senator Hatch.

Senator Hatch came to this body some 15½ years ago, shortly after the senior Senator from Nevada came to this body. Since that time he has demonstrated a fine knowledge of the law, a fine conception of justice, and, above all, a splendid understanding of Americanism.

Senator Hatch came from New Mexico to the Senate, after having served on the bench of that State and having served in other official capacities with honor and distinction to himself. He will return to the State of New Mexico by the endorsement of this body and the appointment of the President of the United States, to occupy the Federal bench there, in which position his colleagues here believe he will fill the place with honor and distinction to himself, as he has filled his place here in the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be considered and acted upon at this time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although, as the acting minority leader, I shall not object—let me say that Senator Hatch was a colleague of ours, and I understand that the procedure requested has been adopted many times in the Senate when a colleague has been appointed to a judicial position. I have heard of no objection from any Member of the Senate on this side of the aisle. I understand from the Senator from Nevada that the report of the committee is unanimous. Therefore, I shall not object.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course I shall not object. I wish to have quick action taken on the nomination.

I desire to thank the committee for acting so promptly on the nomination of our former colleague. Suffice it for me to say "Amen" to everything the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has stated about by former colleague. We in New Mexico are proud of Carl Hatch, and his nomination has been received with the most popular approval of any nomination I can recall. I know he will make good in New Mexico. We wish to thank the President of the United States for having such confidence in Carl Hatch and appointing him to the high office of Federal judge in New Mexico. He will not be a disappointment to anyone, and we wish him Godspeed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration, as in executive session, of the nomination of former Senator Hatch to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in executive session, proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word before the nomination is acted upon. I congratulate the former Senator from New Mexico upon his appointment to the bench, I congratulate the President upon his selection, and I congratulate the judicial district over which he will preside. It is a matter of regret of course that we are losing Senator Hatch from the Senate. He had become prior to his retirement an influential, alert, penetrating, industrious Member of this body. He was a great legislator, in the real sense of the word. The only consolation for his loss is that we gain in his stead an outstanding citizen of New Mexico of long and varied experience to take his place. I shall not hesitate or cease to miss Senator Hatch here, his wise counsel, his level-headedness, his common sense, his knowledge of the legislative process, and his knowledge of the law. I wish for him a long and distinguished career upon the bench.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, when the Senate is considering Senator Hatch's nomination for this important office I cannot let the opportunity pass without saying a word because of my very happy association with him during the past few years, and especially the past 2 years on the Foreign Relations Committee.

It was my privilege to serve with Senator Hatch on a committee that went abroad a year ago, and to enjoy the intimate acquaintance with him that comes when friends travel together in a common purpose to try to promote the welfare of their country. It is a great regret to me personally, without reflecting on his distinguished successor, that Mr. Hatch did not remain in the Senate as one of our colleagues. But it is with the greatest pleasure that I rise to support the immediate confirmation of his nomination, and to express to him, here, to my full ability, my best wishes for the greatest possible success and for his happiness in the new work he is about to undertake in high judicial capacity.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, coming from the neighboring State of Colorado, I should like to say that my association with Senator Hatch has convinced me of his great abilities as a lawyer and his quality of fair-mindedness. I believe he will be an ornament to the Federal bench.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words before the nomination of former Senator Hatch is confirmed. It has been my privilege, and it has been a privilege in every sense of the word, to serve with this distinguished American, whose name is now before the Senate for confirmation as United States district judge, during the entire period of his service in this body. For some time we were desk mates, occupying seats across the aisle from each other. I am of course happy to see him realize his ambition to return to the judicial branch of the Government, which he left when he came to the Senate; but my pleasure is tempered with a knowledge of the loss that this legislative body will suffer by reason of his departure. I say that, Mr. President, of course, with appreciation of the fact that the State of New Mexico has sent a distinguished and outstanding American to succeed him. Carl Hatch possesses peculiar qualities of character that are very seldom found in men. He was my idea of a true liberal. He believed in social progress, but he did not believe in social progress as an end to political expediency. He would never have bent his knee to accede to the demands of groups that, in the guise of social progress, insist upon change for mere selfish advantage. Both clamor of numbers and political threats fell upon deaf ears when directed at Carl Hatch.

In his service here he was an independent thinker, and he possessed the courage when he arrived at a decision to do what he thought was right without regard to politics. I doubt if the question of political advantage ever entered his mind in the performance of any official act. In his leave taking of this body, the loss of the Senate will be the gain of the judiciary. He is an unusually able lawyer. He has a fine conception of the philosophy of our republican form of government, and of the Constitution of the United States as a charter of the liberties of all who live beneath our flag. The people of his beloved State of New Mexico are to be congratulated upon having him to serve them as a district judge. I profoundly regret that his great ability, his judicial temperament, and

his determination to do that which he thinks is right will not be at the service of all the people of this Nation.

Carl A. Hatch would be an ornament to any bench and his presence would add strength to the highest court in the land.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I concur in the encomiums that have been passed upon former Senator Hatch, now an appointee to the Federal judiciary. The reason I take the floor for a moment is that I served with Senator Hatch on the Committee on the Judiciary, and I there learned that he is a very profound lawyer. He has a grasp of legal principles which I greatly admire. I shall not discuss his general attitude in the Senate; all Senators who served with him are familiar with that; but I wanted particularly to stress his great knowledge of the law and his fine judicial mind, which I observed not only on the floor but in the intimate contacts on the Committee on the Judiciary, where we considered a great variety of legislation upon a vast number of public questions. I consider him one of the finest legal minds we have had in the Senate for some years. I have a high personal regard for Senator Hatch, and I think the judiciary is the gainer by his assumption of the duties of that responsible position. I wish him well.

To his distinguished successor I may say, of course, we are all pleased to have him here with us. We are sure that he will have a career of usefulness and efficiency to the Government and to the people of New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would not attempt to compress into a few seconds a statement of the affection and esteem I have for a man whom I have known for 30 years, who has been my personal and political friend for a quarter of a century. I merely want to say that the people of New Mexico are thankful to the President for the nomination he has made, and particularly thankful to the Senate for its courtesy in permitting that nomination to come up for immediate confirmation. Senator Hatch, in the 15 years he was here, became an expert in the field of election reform, and a keen student of international affairs; but I am sure the Members here remember him best as a fine, amiable friend. I am deeply grateful to the Members of the Senate for permitting his nomination to come before it at once.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with those who have said a word in commendation of Senator Hatch. His personal touch and his understanding of the law will make him one of the outstanding judges in the Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was unanimously confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation of the nomination.

### AUTHORIZATION FOR RECEIPT OF MESSAGES AND SIGNATURE OF BILL AND RESOLUTION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am about to move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before the motion is made, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to receive messages from the House subsequent to the adjournment of the Senate today, and that the President pro tempore be authorized to sign S. 103 and Senate Joint Resolution 16—the salary increase and holiday measures, respectively—in the event they are passed by the House without amendment and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY AND DAYS FOLLOWING

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] makes the motion to adjourn, I should like to ask him what the plans are for tomorrow, or for the day to which it is now proposed to adjourn, in order that we may have the statement in the RECORD so all Members may be fully informed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that on tomorrow it is proposed that the Senate consider the nomination submitted by the President of Mr. Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State.

There will also come over from the House tomorrow a joint resolution the purpose of which is to exempt from taxation the moneys paid for certain tickets of admission in connection with the inauguration. That measure will perhaps be handled by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Aside from those two matters, I know of nothing that will be considered by the Senate at that time. Following that, I believe it is the plan to adjourn until Thursday, probably until 11:30 or 11:45, at which time the Senate will convene and proceed in a body to the inaugural stand.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may interrupt, I wish to say that the adjournment over from Tuesday to Thursday will depend on whether there is any business left over from tomorrow which ought to be handled on Wednesday.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Kentucky is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, as I understand, there will be no business on Wednesday unless there is something left over from tomorrow, and there will be no business transacted in the Senate on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. There will be no business on Thursday, except the meeting of the Senate for the purpose of marching in a body to the inaugural stand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And that will be at 11:30.

Mr. LUCAS. That will be at 11:30.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

### EXEMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN INAUGURAL TICKETS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have House Joint Resolution 85 held at the desk in the event it is transmitted from the House today. I have canvassed all members of the committee respecting the joint resolution, and there is no objection to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 19 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 17, 1949:

#### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

Ralph Wright, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

#### COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Preston Delano, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency. (Reappointment.) Mr. Delano is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.

#### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

James M. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a Civil Service Commissioner, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

#### INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1955. (Reappointment.)

#### UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

George McGill, of Kansas, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1954. (Reappointment.)

#### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

#### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

#### FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Thomas Chalmers Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1952, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

#### UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

David J. Coddaire, of Massachusetts, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term expiring April 15, 1954, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Harry Alfred Curtis, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1948.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Frank P. Douglass, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1952. (Reappointment.)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate. (Reappointment.)

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, to be Director of Selective Service, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma. (Mr. Summers is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 5, 1948.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

Surgeons to be senior surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Reuben F. Reider
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith

Senior assistant surgeons to be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

| | |
|---|---|
| Norman B. McCullough | Clinton C. Powell |
| Harold S. Barrett | J. Russell Mitchell |
| Wade H. Etheridge | Pasquale J. Pesare |
| Marvin O. Lewis | George A. Spendlove. |
| Eliah M. Nadel | Rheim M. Jones |
| Birdsall N. Carle | Weldon C. White |
| | R. Carl Millican |

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

| | |
|---|---|
| Robert M. Paine | Milton Sheinbein |
| Charles O. Metzmaker | Carlyle F. Stout |
| Laurence Finberg | Sidney Shindell |
| Keith H. Frankhauser | Richard A. Saavedra |
| Gorden L. Farrell | Leonard J. Ganser |
| John F. Lowney | Norman G. Hepper |
| Ralph S. Paffenbarger, Jr. | William H. Baker |
| | Stewart M. Williams |

Assistant surgeons to be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain) continued:

| | |
|---|---|
| Arthur D. Fisher | John W. Cashman |
| Glenn M. Gordon | Delmo A. Paris |
| John P. Utz | Wendell L. Pierce |
| Robert A. Sammons | Robert L. Price |
| Russell G. Lewis | David S. Wilder |

Dental surgeons to be senior dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Harry G. Trautman
Arthur G. Malucky

Senior assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Maurice Costello

Assistant dental surgeons to be senior assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

William J. Braye
Robert W. Anderson

Sanitary engineer to be senior sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel):

Mark D. Hollis

Senior assistant sanitary engineers to be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

Howard W. Spence
Floyd B. Taylor

Senior assistant pharmacists to be pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

| | |
|---|---|
| Ronald G. Esson | Robarts L. Proper |
| Reid M. Hovey | Arnold H. Dodge |
| Francis R. Ellis | |

Senior assistant scientists to be scientists (equivalent to the Army rank of major):

| | |
|---|---|
| Milton Silverman | Richard P. Dow |
| Louis J. Olivier | James E. Irren |
| Alan W. Donaldson | Morris B. Ettinger |
| Joseph Greenberg | George R. Weber |
| Libero Ajello | Julius S. Youngner |
| Isadore Zipkin | Herbert A. Sober |

Assistant nurse officers to be senior assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain):

| | |
|---|---|
| Anne Woudema | Enid L. Taylor |
| Mary M. Bouser | C. Vistula Lancaster |

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. David H. Clark, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 2 years.

IN THE NAVY

The following named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from date indicated after each name:

Arland A. Adams, June 4, 1948.
Robert G. Aldrich, June 3, 1949.
Frank J. Alfonso, June 4, 1948.
Glenn L. Allen, June 4, 1948.
Lawrence R. Allen, June 3, 1949.
James E. Alley, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Coe M. Anderson, June 4, 1948.
John B. Anderson, June 4, 1948.
William R. Anderson, June 4, 1948.
Joe E. Armstrong, June 4, 1948.
Albert L. Audette, June 3, 1949.
Max D. Barr, June 4, 1948.
Russell H. Baum, June 3, 1949.
Norbert L. Bausch, June 4, 1948.
Alan E. Beck, June 4, 1948.
Archie E. Benton, June 4, 1948.
John R. Berkey, June 3, 1949.
Robert L. Blood, June 3, 1949.
Allen M. Bosworth, III, June 4, 1948.
Keith D. Boyer, June 4, 1948.
Richmond D. Brannen, June 4, 1948.
William J. Brantley, June 4, 1948.
William E. Brodowski, June 3, 1949.
Charles H. Brown, June 4, 1948.
Eldon W. Brown, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William E. Brown, June 3, 1949.
Jesse A. Bruce, June 4, 1948.
Otis T. Budd, June 3, 1949.
Joseph H. Burke, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth A. Burrows, June 4, 1948.
James D. Burton, June 4, 1948.
William H. Busse, June 3, 1949.
Charles E. Butler, June 3, 1949.
Emery LaV. Campbell, June 4, 1948.
Arthur W. Carpenter, June 3, 1949.
William F. Carrozza, June 4, 1948.
Durward L. Cecil, June 3, 1949.
James H. Chapman, June 4, 1948.
Frank L. Cheek, June 4, 1948.
Leonard R. Cheshire, June 3, 1949.
Gordon E. Clark, June 4, 1948.
Gordon T. Collier, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth W. Colman, June 4, 1948.
Orville T. Cooper, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth E. Cornell, June 3, 1949.
Henriques C. Cotton, June 3, 1949.
Rodney Crawford, June 3, 1949.
Stewart P. Crowell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Jack G. Daubs, June 4, 1948.
Dale E. Davis, June 3, 1949.
Thomas E. Davis, June 4, 1948.
Donovan D. Day, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Manuel O. Delgado, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Dwight "L" Dennis, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John R. Dewenter, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Joseph F. Dobronski, June 4, 1948.
David A. Doll, June 4, 1948.
William E. Dozier, June 4, 1948.
Marion T. Dragastin, June 4, 1948.
Douglas E. Drake, June 4, 1948.
Frank J. Drechsler, June 4, 1948.
Willis H. Dukelow, June 3, 1949.
Norman L. Dunbar, June 4, 1948.
Luther F. Duncan, June 4, 1948.
Alex R. Dunn, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Peter M. Dyke, June 3, 1949.
Robert E. Eilertson, June 3, 1949.
Kenneth E. Ent, June 3, 1949.
Harry Epperson, June 4, 1948.
Stuart E. Ferguson, June 4, 1948.
Donald T. Fitzgerald, June 4, 1948.
Robert W. Ferraez, June 3, 1949.
Arthur B. Forrest, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Richard G. Forward, June 4, 1948.
Ralph E. Foster, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Albert J. Frainier, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Eugene L. Franz, June 3, 1949.
Oel "L" Futrell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Francis G. Gergen, June 4, 1948.
Charles H. Gibson, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Wilmer R. Gilbert, June 3, 1949.
Floyd H. Gilkey, June 4, 1948.
William V. Gillen, June 4, 1948.
William H. Glasgow, June 4, 1948.
James C. Glover, June 4, 1948.
Coleman Goatley, June 3, 1949.
Donald R. Goodrum, June 3, 1949.
Ercel D. Goossen, June 3, 1949.
Ernest E. Grant, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John A. Grauer, June 4, 1948.
James B. Griffin, June 3, 1949.
Louis M. Guerrieri, June 4, 1948.
George C. Hafner, June 4, 1948.
Donald L. Hainworth, June 4, 1948.
Robert S. Hamilton, June 3, 1949.
Julian R. Hansen, June 4, 1948.
Perry W. Hanson, June 4, 1948.
Raymond A. Harding, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Frank H. Harvey, June 4, 1948.
Orleane K. Haugen, June 4, 1948.
Stanley M. Hayes, June 4, 1948.
William L. Hembree, June 4, 1948.
Donald E. Henning, June 3, 1949.
Robert R. Hensley, June 4, 1948.
William J. Hepburn, June 4, 1948.
Judd C. Hodgson, June 3, 1949.
Robert A. Holden, June 3, 1949.
Marvin A. Holgren, June 3, 1949.
George H. Hollod, June 4, 1948.
Allan F. Holmgren, June 3, 1949.
Archie N. D. Hood, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Richard F. Hood, June 4, 1948.
Charles E. Hopper, June 3, 1949.
John E. Horan, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Kenneth A. Horn, June 4, 1948.
Robert L. Horton, June 3, 1949.
Donald H. Howard, June 4, 1948.
Joe P. Howell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Floyd E. Hower, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roy T. Hynes, June 3, 1949.
Jack W. Ingram, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Burdett L. Ives, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Thomas Jardine, June 4, 1948.
James F. Jenista, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Harry T. Jenkins, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert H. Jenks, June 4, 1948.
Jack K. Johnson, June 4, 1948.
Bruce R. Jones, June 4, 1948.
David P. Jones, June 4, 1948.
Richard G. Jones, June 3, 1949.
Bernard C. Jongewaard, June 4, 1948.
Francis W. Joyce, June 4, 1948.
Joseph L. Kain, June 4, 1948.
Stanley J. Kakol, June 4, 1948.
Walter M. Karbowski, June 4, 1948.
Allyn W. Kaste, June 3, 1949.
Frederick E. Kelley, Jr., June 4, 1948.

Edward P. Kellogg, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Roger W. Kelly, June 4, 1948.
LeRoy M. Kile, June 3, 1949.
George E. R. Kinnear, 2d, June 4, 1948.
Richard T. Kirchhoff, June 3, 1949.
Joseph E. Klause, June 4, 1948.
Ralph C. Knight, June 4, 1948.
Karl H. Kober, June 3, 1949.
Otto R. Kosfeld, June 4, 1948.
Frederick L. Krauth, June 3, 1949.
Hugh C. Kuhlman, June 4, 1948.
John E. Laurence, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert R. Leavitt, June 4, 1948.
Alan G. Lewis, June 3, 1949.
Gene R. Lewis, June 4, 1948.
George S. Locke, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Victor C. Lopez, June 3, 1949.
Louis M. Love, June 4, 1948.
Donald E. Luallin, June 4, 1948.
Preston Luke, June 3, 1949.
Robert R. McFarlan, June 4, 1948.
Ted R. McGinnis, June 4, 1948.
Robert LeR. McIntyre, June 4, 1948.
Donald P. McKay, June 4, 1948.
William E. Madden, June 4, 1948.
Stuart G. Madison, June 4, 1948.
William D. Mallinger, June 4, 1948.
Harold L. Marr, June 3, 1949.
Robert J. Martin, June 4, 1948.
John R. Martuccelli, June 4, 1948.
Rothwell B. Mason, June 4, 1948.
James E. May, June 3, 1949.
Richard D. Meldahl, June 4, 1948.
Roy D. Meyers, June 3, 1949.
Alexander A. Miller, 3d, June 3, 1949.
David B. Miller, June 3, 1949.
Harry G. Miller, June 4, 1948.
John R. Miller, June 3, 1949.
Daniel M. Morris, June 4, 1948.
William D. Morse, June 4, 1948.
John E. Mulcahy, June 4, 1948.
Godfrey L. Munter, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Roy D. Murphy, June 4, 1948.
William L. Murphy, June 4, 1948.
William R. Musgrove, June 4, 1948.
Harold L. Neely, June 4, 1948.
Carl C. Neidlinger, June 4, 1948.
Harold Nemer, June 3, 1949.
John D. Ness, June 4, 1948.
William L. Newell, June 4, 1948.
Fred S. Newman, June 3, 1949.
John R. Nicholas, June 4, 1948.
Jerome E. Nicholson, June 3, 1949.
John M. Nickell, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Richard H. Nickerson, June 4, 1948.
Frederick M. Nizich, June 4, 1948.
John H. Nyhuis, June 4, 1948.
Bruce A. Nystrom, June 3, 1949.
James A. O'Donnell, June 4, 1948.
Robert C. Olsen, June 4, 1948.
Lyle R. Olson, June 4, 1948.
George L. Page, June 3, 1949.
William B. Paradis, June 4, 1948.
Stanley J. Pederson, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Donald W. Perry, June 4, 1948.
Jack W. Perry, June 4, 1948.
Robert R. Perry, June 4, 1948.
James R. Peterson, June 4, 1948.
Rudolph E. Peterson, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Paul E. Petty, June 4, 1948.
Howard E. Phillips, June 3, 1949.
Ralph T. Phillips, June 4, 1948.
James T. Pilgreen, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Pond, June 3, 1949.
Charles S. Porter, June 4, 1948.
Louis C. Potter, June 4, 1948.
Frank E. Price, June 3, 1949.
Jay C. Proctor, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William F. Quarg, June 3, 1949.
Richard R. Rak, June 4, 1948.
Robert E. Ramsay, June 4, 1948.
William J. Rankin, Jr., June 4, 1948.
James R. Redden, June 4, 1948.
John W. Reid, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John C. Reilly, June 4, 1948.
William L. Richards, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Liona R. Roberts, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Frank A. Rockwell, June 3, 1949.
Earl Rogers, June 3, 1949.
Richard J. Rosa, June 4, 1948.
George B. Rothrock, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Rex R. Rowell, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roger E. Roys, June 3, 1949.
Richard O. Rudd, June 3, 1949.
Paul R. Rupert, Jr., June 3, 1949.
George G. Russell, June 3, 1949.
Maclyn K. Russell, June 4, 1948.
Paul E. Ryan, June 4, 1948.
James O. Santineau, June 4, 1948.
William F. Schallert, June 3, 1949.
Arthur S. Schlofman, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Carl E. Schluter, June 4, 1948.
Clifford W. Schmidt, June 4, 1948.
Ernest H. Schorz, June 4, 1948.
George M. Schrauth, June 4, 1948.
Richard M. Shrewsbury, June 3, 1949.
James C. Shows, June 4, 1948.
Edward S. Siergiej, June 4, 1948.
Louis H. Simmons, June 4, 1948.
William G. Sizemore, June 3, 1949.
John R. Skinner, June 4, 1948.
George F. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Gordon H. Smith, June 3, 1949.
John J. Smith, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Loren D. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Philip J. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Robert P. Smith, June 3, 1949.
Robert K. Smyth, June 4, 1948.
Floryan L. Soberski, June 3, 1949.
Dwight LeR. Souders, June 3, 1949.
Benjamin E. Spence, June 3, 1949.
Wensil M. Stanek, June 3, 1949.
Henry M. Stanley, June 3, 1949.
George E. Stanton, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Joe D. Stell, June 3, 1949.
Reynold F. Stelloh, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Claude M. Stephenson, June 4, 1948.
Charles W. Stevens, June 4, 1948.
Glenn McF. Stinchcomb, June 4, 1948.
George R. Stith, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Stockwell, June 4, 1948.
Walter S. Stokes, June 4, 1948.
William J. Streetman, June 3, 1949.
Bobby J. Stringer, June 4, 1948.
John J. Sughrue, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Donald A. Sumner, June 3, 1949.
Harold C. Tapley, June 4, 1949.
Creigh W. Taylor, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roy Z. Taylor 3d, June 4, 1948.
Bernard Tesch, Jr., June 3, 1949.
David G. Thomas, June 3, 1949.
Earle V. Thomas, June 3, 1949.
Lawrence W. Thomas, June 3, 1949.
Malcolm E. Thompson, June 4, 1948.
Keith E. Thomson, June 4, 1948.
Richard G. Thomson, June 3, 1949.
Ernest E. Tissot, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert G. Tombrinck, June 3, 1949.
Marland W. Townsend, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Paul R. Tripp, June 4, 1948.
Nicholas J. Vagianos, June 4, 1948.
Vere P. VanKeuren, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Eldon P. Varner, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Donald E. Viewegh, June 4, 1948.
Thomas A. Voorhees, June 4, 1948.
Donald W. Wachenfeld, June 4, 1948.
Robert H. Wade, June 4, 1948.
William G. Wald, June 4, 1948.
Russell G. Walden, June 4, 1948.
John S. Ward, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Lemuel O. Warfield, June 4, 1948.
Lawrence C. Warren, June 4, 1948.
William R. Warren, June 4, 1948.
Frederick C. Weber, June 3, 1949.
Dean E. Webster, June 4, 1948.
Albert J. Weil, June 3, 1949.
Charles H. Welling, Jr., June 3, 1949.
John W. Westad, June 4, 1948.
Charles L. Wharton, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Ward B. Whitten, June 4, 1948.
Thomas W. Wilbor, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Herbert W. Willis, June 3, 1949.
Robert Wochinger, June 4, 1948.
Richard J. T. Wood, June 3, 1949.
Kyle H. Woodbury, June 4, 1948.
Donald A. Yale, June 3, 1949.
Vern M. Yates, June 3, 1949.
Robert A. Zajichek, June 4, 1948.
Austin LeR. Zicht, June 4, 1948.
Herschel E. Zirger, June 4, 1948.

The following named (naval ROTC) to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from date indicated after each name:

David W. Berger, June 3, 1949.
Lester N. Hill, June 4, 1948.
James A. Howe, June 3, 1949.
Fred B. Kosack, June 3, 1949.
Judah L. Siegal, June 3, 1949.
Robert L. Taylor, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Valentine, June 4, 1948.

Edward Stanton (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

Stephen B. Profilet (naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy to rank from date indicated after each name:

Harry A. Ackley, June 4, 1948.
William K. Adams, June 4, 1948.
Richard P. Allen, June 4, 1948.
James J. Ashford, June 4, 1948.
John D. Austin, June 4, 1948.
Joseph F. Bachman, June 4, 1948.
Fred F. Bailey, June 4, 1948.
Homer D. Bailey, June 4, 1948.
Donald R. Baird, June 4, 1948.
Daniel Balish, June 4, 1948.
William R. Ball, Jr., June 4, 1948.
David "P" Barker, June 4, 1948.
Arthur J. Bauer, June 4, 1948.
James R. Bell, June 4, 1948.
Richard M. Bellinger, June 4, 1948.
Manuel A. Benero, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Guy J. Bennett, June 4, 1948.
Syd "A" Bennett, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth LeR. Bernstein, June 4, 1948.
Harry E. Betts, June 4, 1948.
Bartley J. Billings, June 4, 1948.
Louis Bilyk, June 4, 1948.
Carl E. Blaes, June 4, 1948.
George A. Blais, June 4, 1948.
Robert P. Blount, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Paul Bock, June 4, 1948.
Tudor M. Bogart, June 4, 1948.
Charles D. Bolan, June 4, 1948.
Herbert L. BonDurant, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Raymond J. Borntraeger, June 4, 1948.
Eugene H. Bouslog, June 4, 1948.
Joseph J. Braun, June 4, 1948.
Martin F. Bremus, June 4, 1948.
William N. Brook, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles O. Brown, June 4, 1948.
George Brown, June 4, 1948.
Oliver F. Brown, June 4, 1948.
Woolson S. Brown, June 4, 1948.
James D. Bryan, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Terry D. Bryson, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Clarence V. Burch, Jr., June 4, 1948.
David W. Carey, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Earl C. Carpenter, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Horace "B" Chambers, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Adrian E. Chavannes, June 4, 1948.
Eugene R. Christie, June 4, 1948.
James V. Clampet, June 4, 1948.
Graham S. Clark, June 4, 1948.
John G. Clifford, June 4, 1948.
William E. Conniff, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John A. Connors, June 4, 1948.
Joseph E. Coogan, June 4, 1948.
Robert G. Cox, June 4, 1948.
Richard S. Coy, June 4, 1948.
Richard H. Crangle, June 4, 1948.
John M. Cravens, Jr.,, June 4, 1948.
William R. Crawford, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Samuel R. Crowell, June 4, 1948.
Donald H. Dansby, June 4, 1948.
Ralph A. Davidson, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Walter M. DeLoach, June 4, 1948.
Thomas G. DeMuesy, June 4, 1948.
Richard N. DeMun, June 4, 1948.
Joseph C. Diedrich, June 4, 1948.
Henry C. Dinger, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Lewis L. Dobbs, June 4, 1948.
Henry H. Dodd, June 4, 1948.
William K. Donnell, June 4, 1948.
Richard W. Duerner, June 4, 1948.
John C. Dunn, June 4, 1948.

Gerald C. Edwards, June 4, 1948.
Donald L. Egger, June 4, 1948.
Frank N. Eklund, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert T. Ellsworth, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William A. Ellsworth, June 3, 1949.
Joseph T. Erk, June 4, 1948.
Oliver N. Evans, June 4, 1948.
William "J" Fade, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Fahrenwald, June 4, 1948.
Andrew C. Ferguson, June 4, 1948.
Robert L. Field, June 4, 1948.
Ernest D. Fife, June 4, 1948.
Michael J. J. Fleming, June 4, 1948.
Philip T. Forsling, June 4, 1948.
James A. Forsyth, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth D. Fosnaught, June 4, 1948.
Fredrick L. Foster, June 4, 1948.
Benjamin B. Fowke, June 4, 1948.
Alfred N. Fowler, June 4, 1948.
Fred A. W. Franke, Jr., June 4, 1948.
James R. Garner, June 3, 1949.
Alvin E. Geist, June 4, 1948.
William E. Gildow, June 4, 1948.
Claude F. Giles, June 4, 1948.
Donald A. Gillham, June 4, 1948.
Frank C. Gilmore, June 4, 1948.
Gordon B. Gish, June 4, 1948.
Roy M. Goldsmith, June 4, 1948.
Richard L. Graham, June 4, 1948.
Richard C. Guess, June 4, 1948.
Roy V. Gunther, June 4, 1948.
Edwin K. Hacker, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Hackler, June 4, 1948.
James R. Hackney, June 4, 1948.
Joseph F. Hall, June 4, 1948.
Preston DeW. Hall, June 4, 1948.
Robert Hall, June 4, 1948.
Robert W. Hall, June 4, 1948.
Russell L. Handy, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Chester J. Hardenburg, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Joe W. Hargrove, June 4, 1948.
Edgar W. Harlan, June 4, 1948.
Willie A. Harter, Jr., June 3, 1949.
Arthur R. Hasler, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Edward A. Hawks, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John W. Healy, June 3, 1949.
Keith H. Helms, June 4, 1948.
William McG. Hepburn, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John G. Herndon, June 4, 1948.
Walter J. Hester, June 4, 1948.
Harry C. Hiatt, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Alvin S. Hibbs, June 4, 1948.
Peter B. Hill, June 4, 1948.
Rowland P. Hill, June 4, 1948.
Robert T. Hoar, June 4, 1948.
Leland A. Holdren, June 4, 1948.
Matthew V. Hoover, June 4, 1948.
John L. Hotes, June 4, 1948.
Claude "C" Howell, June 4, 1948.
Robert E. Huntzinger, June 4, 1948.
Richard W. Ilgen, June 4, 1948.
John G. "W" Jackson, June 4, 1948.
Eldon A. Jacobs, June 4, 1948.
Rollin E. Jeffries, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Ronald H. Jermstad, June 4, 1948.
James B. Jones, June 4, 1948.
Henry F. Kaiser, June 4, 1948.
Robert C. Kaiser, June 4, 1948.
Martin J. Katcher, June 3, 1949.
John R. Kearney, June 4, 1948.
James H. Kendall 2d, June 4, 1948.
William H. Kernan, June 4, 1948.
Neal Kincannon, June 4, 1948.
George C. Kiser, June 4, 1948.
James W. Kissick, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert A. Komoroff, June 4, 1948.
Albert J. Kralik, June 4, 1948.
William A. Lebert, June 4, 1948.
John F. Leicester III, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Lewis, June 4, 1948.
James E. Liles, June 4, 1948.
Richard L. Lombard, June 4, 1948.
Thomas A. Loomis, June 4, 1948.
Robert B. Luzader, June 4, 1948.
James A. McCaig, June 4, 1948.
Herbert P. McCaw, June 4, 1948.
Richard K. McCorkle, June 4, 1948.
Louis H. McCormick, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William W. McCue, June 4, 1948.
Carl J. McCurdy, June 4, 1948.
Jack H. McDonald, June 4, 1948.
Ralph I. McFarland, June 4, 1948.
Max R. McGlamry, June 4, 1948.
William "E" McLuckie, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles W. McMillan, June 4, 1948.
William M. McRostie, June 4, 1948.
Stuart C. MacIntire, June 4, 1948.
Thomas E. Maloney, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Mankus, June 4, 1948.
Charles W. Mann, June 4, 1948.
John C. Mape, June 4, 1948.
Walter G. Markham, June 4, 1948.
Lee R. Marshall, June 4, 1948.
Lee C. Miles, June 4, 1948.
Carol R. Mohring, June 4, 1948.
Randolph Moore, June 4, 1948.
John C. Moorhead, June 4, 1948.
Charles T. Morden, June 4, 1948.
David H. Morris, June 4, 1948.
LeRoy O. Mosher, June 4, 1948.
William L. Mumma, June 4, 1948.
James F. Murphy, June 4, 1948.
Eugene R. Murray, June 4, 1948.
Arthur E. Nash, June 4, 1948.
John N. Neal, June 4, 1948.
Richard D. Nielsen, June 4, 1948.
Harry M. Noland, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert J. Norvell, June 4, 1948.
Raymond P. Notson, June 4, 1948.
Arthur Nuttall, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John D. Omvig, June 4, 1948.
Bryce Osborn, June 4, 1948.
Burdett A. Otis, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William B. Otto, June 4, 1948.
John S. Patton, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Jacob L. Pawer, Jr., June 4, 1948.
William V. Peacock, June 4, 1948.
Stuart A. Petrie, June 4, 1948.
Ira G. Plouff, June 4, 1948.
Bernard Poppert, June 4, 1948.
William Poulakis, June 4, 1948.
Ross S. Power, June 4, 1948.
Byron Price, June 4, 1948.
Joseph F. Rabbitt, June 4, 1948.
Wesley L. Ralston, June 4, 1948.
Thomas E. Rand, June 4, 1948.
Charles C. Ratcliff, June 4, 1948.
Earl L. Reardon, June 4, 1948.
Jackson B. Reavis, June 4, 1948.
William L. Redmon, June 4, 1948.
Alfred J. Reichel, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Elmer A. Rice, June 4, 1948.
Lonnie J. Robbins, June 4, 1948.
Keith H. Robertson, June 4, 1948.
Clarence O. Robins, June 4, 1948.
Frank J. Roehrenbeck, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert A. Rohr, June 4, 1948.
Allan W. Romans, June 4, 1948.
Brent C. Rosa, June 4, 1948.
Edmund I. Rosendahl, June 4, 1948.
Henry M. Ross, June 4, 1948.
John Ruggiero, June 4, 1948.
George E. Russell, June 4, 1948.
Donald F. Sager, June 4, 1948.
Kenneth M. Sandon, June 4, 1948.
James A. Schader, June 4, 1948.
John F. Schneider, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Richard A. Schnorf, June 3, 1949.
Lawrence W. Schultheis, June 4, 1948.
Harold C. Schwan, June 4, 1948.
Richard D. Schwartz, June 4, 1948.
William "S" Shaffran, June 4, 1948.
Alfred L. Shiner, June 4, 1948.
Frank J. Shoemaker, June 4, 1948.
Donald R. Simon, June 4, 1948.
Walter H. Singleton, June 4, 1948.
Charles A. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Lucian L. Smith, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles M. Sodersten, June 4, 1948.
Robert W. Somers, June 4, 1948.
Emory R. Sourbeer, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Raymond W. Spangrud, June 4, 1948.
William A. Staff, June 4, 1948.
Robert G. Staffney, June 4, 1948.
Earl M. Stein, June 3, 1949.
Billy M. Steubing, June 3, 1949.
Robert L. Steward, June 4, 1948.
Arthur J. Storeide, June 4, 1948.
James B. Stricker, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Max W. Stults, June 4, 1948.
Joseph L. Sunderlin, June 4, 1948.
Raymond H. Swientek, June 4, 1948.
Stewart E. Tangeman, June 4, 1948.
James J. Thompson, June 4, 1948.
James L. Thompson, June 4, 1948.
Benjamin K. Tice, June 4, 1948.
Eugene F. Timpe, June 4, 1948.
Robert E. Tisdale, June 4, 1948.
Dennis W. Tomlin, June 4, 1948.
Albert Towle, June 4, 1948.
James R. Trommlitz, June 4, 1948.
Neely E. Turner, June 4, 1948.
James F. Turney, June 4, 1948.
David J. Vaughan, June 3, 1949.
John C. Vogel, June 4, 1948.
Lek K. Von Kaesborg, June 4, 1948.
William F. Wade, June 4, 1948.
William G. Wagner, June 4, 1948.
Donald G. Wallace, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John I. Walling, June 4, 1948.
Robert N. Wallis, June 4, 1948.
William G. Walston, June 4, 1948.
Glenn W. Ward, June 4, 1948.
Richard K. Watson, June 4, 1948.
Lee E. Wells, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Howard W. Westervelt, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Otis "V" Wheeler, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Walter A. White, June 3, 1949.
James R. Whitehead, June 4, 1948.
Ralph G. Wilde, June 4, 1948.
William E. Willingham, Jr., June 4, 1948.
James L. Willson, June 4, 1948.
Frank M. Wilson, Jr., June 4, 1948.
John C. Wold, June 4, 1948.
Dwight E. Wood, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Robert C. Wood, June 4, 1948.
William H. Wood 3d, June 4, 1948.
Guy G. Wooten, June 4, 1948.
Bynum McW. Works, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Walter J. Wright, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Billy G. Yarbrough, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Young, June 4, 1948.
Robert M. Young, June 4, 1948.
David E. Zacharias, June 4, 1948.
Walter P. Ziarnik, June 4, 1948.

The following named (women) to be ensigns in the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Carolyn E. Abrams | Vivian J. McLaughlin |
| Rhoda Berenfield | Olive A. Meining |
| Edith M. Blauvelt | Gloria E. Morenz |
| Patricia Cook | Carol L. Muth |
| Virginia Craig | Grace Olekszak |
| Mary C. Crombie | Annabelle Peterson |
| Genevieve E. Doherty | Judith S. Plaster |
| Mary E. Donnelly | Beverly M. Robinson |
| Jean F. Harrington | Ami W. Sear |
| Katherine J. Hinman | Anna M. Shaub |
| Dorothy V. Holliday | Dorothea H. Shinn |
| Constance L. Jones | Dorothy J. Taylor |
| Mary J. Linderman | June A. Tyler |
| Sara J. Lloyd | Mary J. Zurick |
| Iris C. McGlothlin | |

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officers):

| | |
|---|---|
| Ben M. Cole | John P. Maloney, Jr. |
| Dee W. Douglass | Walter W. Manley |
| Benjamin Gettler | Oscar H. Marsh |
| Harrell M. Graham | Donald J. Pepple |
| Daniel C. Jaquint | Robert Wrzesinski |

The following named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

*To be commander*

George D. Skow

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Fred A. Ellis
David F. Hottenstein

*To be lieutenants*

| | |
|---|---|
| James A. Brimson | Arthur G. Rink |
| John H. Hege | Karl R. Whitney |

*To be lieutenant (junior grade)*

Frank R. Johnson

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Morton J. Aronson
Jack S. Biesenkamp
Arthur J. Blanchard
Winton R. Boyd
Leland C. Brannon
Carl A. Broaddus, Jr.
Edward F. Burkhart
Benjamin F. Burns
Jonathan G. Busby
Jack E. Byrd
John B. Caire
Edmundo V. Castillo Amy
William J. Champion
Kenneth "E" "M" Chapman
Frederick A. Clark, Jr.
Leon W. Clark
Walter T. Colbert
Robert E. Dent
Keith S. Ditman
Winfield D. Edgerton
Donald W. Edwards
James B. Flanagan
Samuel M. Fox, III
William L. Hall
Alfred K. Hawkes
Robert L. Hill
Harry L. Hoffman
Hampton Hubbard
Albert M. Jenkins
Clarence H. Johnston
Theo N. Kirkland, Jr.
Hoyt Kirkpatrick, Jr.
Stuart D. Kustermann
Edward D. Loweecey
Francis X. MacAulay
Charles E. Mangin
Joseph L. Mays
Robert E. Mitchel
Duncan O. Montgomery
Robert S. Mutch
Kenneth A. Parmalee
Robert O. Peckinpaugh
Maxwell G. Potter
Maurie D. Pressman
Anthony P. Prezyna
James S. Reed
Harry L. Roberts, Jr.
David R. Rogers
Neal D. Sanborn
Frederick W. Shillinger
William R. Sillery
Alexander C. Smith
James B. Smith
Ray T. Smith, Jr.
Ernest A. Sneddon
James E. Stark
James H. Stewart
Sam D. Waldrop
Robert Warren
James H. Wells

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy to rank from date indicated after each name:

Philip S. Bashor, June 3, 1949.
William H. Bason, June 4, 1948.
James D. Bennett, June 4, 1948.
Charles R. Bowen, June 4, 1948.
John M. Bristow, June 4, 1948.
John R. Burke, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Elwood A. Carmer, June 4, 1948.
Dan M. Carpenter, June 4, 1948.
George I. Chegin, June 4, 1948.
Francis J. Chester, June 4, 1948.
Wayne R. Crozier, June 4, 1948.
Harry C. Dolbeck, June 4, 1948.
Robert F. Dunbar, June 4, 1948.
Vaughn H. Earley, June 4, 1948.
Glendale M. Eaton, June 4, 1948.
Melvin I. Freedman, June 4, 1948.
William F. Glase, June 4, 1948.
John C. Green, June 4, 1948.
William M. Hamilton, June 4, 1948.
Herschel B. Hamric, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Paul C. Herndon, June 4, 1948.
William W. Hoban, June 3, 1949.
Dale E. Jackson, June 4, 1948.
William H. Jeffery, June 4, 1948.
Selden D. Kelley, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Milton E. Kreyenhagen, June 4, 1948.
Robert S. Leventhal, June 4, 1948.
Harley D. Lindquist, June 3, 1949.
Walter E. Linthicum, June 4, 1948.
Donald C. Mehaffey, June 4, 1948.
George L. Moreman, June 4, 1948.
David F. Morrow, June 4, 1948.
Lawrence C. Murdoch, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Carl H. Newman, June 4, 1948.
Raymond B. Renne, June 4, 1948.
Bradley B. Ridge, June 4, 1948.
John H. Rolfs, June 4, 1948.
Homer D. Simons, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Roy F. Smith, June 4, 1948.
Thomas B. Stanley, Jr., June 4, 1948.
Charles C. Swanke, June 4, 1948.
Darrell E. Swenson, June 4, 1948.
Clarence G. Tatum, June 4, 1948.
Kay K. Thurman, June 4, 1948.
Richard E. Utman, June 4, 1948.
Wesley W. VanMalsen, June 4, 1948.
Wayne S. Vroman, June 4, 1948.
John W. Walsh, June 4, 1948.
Robert L. Weaver, June 4, 1948.
Harry K. Welge, June 4, 1948.
Emmett J. Wild, June 4, 1948.
Leslie W. Williams, June 4, 1948.

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

John A. Abucewicz
Peter J. Bakker
Paul W. Chalfant
Richard P. Chase
Joseph F. Cloonan
Benjamin J. Davis
John P. Fay
Jack W. Hayes
William M. Hearn
Richard G. Hutcheson, Jr.
Kevin J. Keaney
Patrick A. Killeen
Henry T. Lavin
Carroll McB. Mershon
Daniel J. O'Leary
Glen A. Bademacher
George F. Rossbach
Homer L. Schnick
Eugene J. Sheridan
Charles A. Szczesny
Charles E. Webb
John A. Widman, Jr.
John E. Zoller

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Carlyle J. Baker, Jr.
Charles K. Bresett
Keith H. Dearth
William G. Hample
Robert Q. Heglund
Paul R. Jasper
Russell J. Klingenmeier, Jr.
Harold W. Merritt, Jr.
Frank R. O'Neill
Donald A. Patrick
Martin J. Roddy, Jr.
Winfred A. Shaw
Lloyd E. Stiffler, Jr.
William C. Stookey
William H. Sturman
James H. Vaughan, Jr.
Charles F. Zirzow

The following named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

*To be commander*

Max J. Brandt

*To be lieutenant commanders*

William C. Brandon, Jr.
William E. Crolius, Jr.
Leroy R. Frantz
Harold J. Ralston
George H. Sandman

*To be lieutenant*

William C. Riesenberg

*To be lieutenant (junior grade)*

Lewis L. Gunther

The following named (civilian college graduates) to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Donald R. Bassett
George A. Besbekos
Frank D. Buckley
Melvin L. Calton
John J. Fritz
John W. Hardwick
Richard S. Hay
Aloys D. Heyen
Robert E. Hill
Milton Isaacson
William B. Kovacs
Frank A. Marmarose
Clifford H. Prince, Jr.
Ward E. Quilter, Jr.
Leo V. Ready
John P. Scullin
George D. Selfridge
Joseph Siegelman
William F. Sikes
Henry E. Snell
William T. Strahan

The following named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Jane E. Alexander
Wadealene Allen
Charlotte A. Antonelli
Mary J. E. Apollo
Edna L. Archibald
Frances L. Bartczak
Mary G. Bartlett
Sara J. Barton
Velva D. Berg
Ann A. Bergen
Lucille M. Bernson
Mildred J. Bishop
Arkie A. Bothwell
Patricia C. Bowers
Martha L. Boyette
Opal E. Bridges
Shirley L. Brooks
Irene R. Broski
Ruth M. Bruland
Jean D. Cairns
Oleta M. Cameron
Viola "C" Carboy
Ann E. Carlson
Mary E. Carmickle
Emma L. Carroll
Margaret E. Chapman
Barbara A. Chappell
Pauline M. Chisholm
Martha V. Chisolm
Kathleen J. Christensen
Nell M. Chumley
Kathleen Claffy
Virginia M. Cleary
Florence M. Collins
Pauline T. Cote
Shirley E. Cowan
Frances R. Crump
Jean M. Cushing
Alice LaV. Davis.
Betty M. Davis
Daisy L. Deem
Esther V. DeGree
Nettie A. DeLisa
Rose A. M. Dell'Acqua
Florence J. Delynko
Marionne L. deMoulin
Alice "M" DeReyes
Winifrede Devan
Mary V. Dewey
Louise H. Dewing
Janet F. Dixon
Margaret L. Donahue
Patricia L. Dowell
Mary J. Elco
Marilyn Ewing
Sarah J. Ezell
Rose C. Fidale
Jean M. FitzPatrick
Dessie J. Flood
Elizabeth A. Folan
Lillie M. Frank
Marion A. Fredrickson
Mary E. Frew
Dorothy J. Garber
Norma H. Gardill
Roma E. Garner
Mary M. Gilmore
Mary E. Glavin
Bessie Gochis
Dorothy J. Goodell
Marcia O. Graham
Alice T. Griffin
Frances T. Griffin
Helen K. Grubisich
Shirley A. Hakius
Shirley A. Harbaum
Laura C. Haring
Ima G. Harrell
Annie P. Hartin
Cristina Hernandez
Rhoda C. Hilke
Dorothy E. Holt
Enid Y. Horning
Joan L. Huber
Celeste M. Hughes
Barbara E. Hull
Mary A. Humphrey
Dorothy J. Hurley
Veronica D. Iasiello
Charlotte J. Jackson
Phyllis A. Jeffrey
Lois M. Johnson
Marion G. Johnson
Marjorie L. Johnson
Billie J. Johnston
Katherine L. Johnston
Eva D. Jones
Lenora M. Judy
Esther T. Kaczmarek
Mary L. Kaiser
Margaret B. Karas
Phyllis N. Keene
Mary A. Kelly
Florene Kelly
Arline L. Kennedy
Elizabeth G. Kennedy
Genevieve M. Kesner
Julia Kidda
Margaret E. Kissinger
Mary F. King
Geraldine M. Koliha
Aldona Krushinski
Tula J. LeNoir
Cornelia F. Long
Gloria Y. Lugar
Anna McConnon
Eleanor C. Mahoney
Ann Manley
Jackaline J. Marsh
Dorothy L. Martin
Lois C. Merritt
Dolores Michalski
Jeanne M. Milles
Betty M. Millsop
Dorothy E. Moore
Louise A. Morin
Arvice E. Moses
Jean E. Moury
Siran Mozian
Ila D. Mullenix
Eileen A. Murphy
Margaret M. Murphy
Esther G. D. Nielsen
Elizabeth J. O'Brien
Mary A. O'Connor
Eleanor L. Owens
Maribelle Page
Audrie M. Peplinski
Ruby T. Perrin
Jean E. Peterson
Geraldine E. Pike
Luisa A. Power
Shirley A. Raymond
Edna M. Riemann
Nathalie A. Roark
Ruth C. Robinson
Phyllis A. Rodenbaugh
Patricia A. Roe
Helen Roller
Eva K. Roth
Marcella Schmokel
Betty L. Sharp
Katherine G. Shea
Mary C. Sheridan
Dorothea M. Short
Dorothy B. Slaven
Leona Soback
Billie J. Sorrells
Angeline J. Spotto
Mary R. Staehling
Melva Stankovich
Anna M. Stary
Gloria J. Sterling
Mary J. Stevenson
Lillis L. Stoops
Catherine E. Storms
Betty J. Streeb
Ada M. Strickland
Ellen E. Stricklin
Dorothy N. Sweetman
Alfreda Szkodna
Lucy I. Tarvin
Elizabeth Taylor
Kathryn A. Terhune
Jean E. Tolbert
Mary F. Trocchi
Dolores Troskoski
Virginia C. Trujillo
Katherine A. Trumble
Patricia C. Tye
Elzbieta A. Uka
Georgia Vassilakos
Geneva E. Walker
Barbara Warner
Dorothy J. Watson
Mary M. Wein
Florence J. Welty
Marjory H. Werme
Lola E. Wilkinson
Patricia A. Wilkinson
Helen A. Womac
Joan A. Wunder
Loree Young
Marvis E. Young
Kathryn E. Zabel
Joan B. Zdeblick
Mary A. V. Ziebol

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy (special-duty officers):

*To be commander*

Charles G. Duffy

*To be lieutenant*

Dennis D. Nelson 2d

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy (women):

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Mary E. Brown
Bess A. Dunn
Eleanor J. Durrett
Joy B. Hancock
Etta B. Kitchen
Marie E. McDonnell
Elinor D. Rich
Louise K. Wilde
Anna M. Willauer
Audrey F. C. Williams

*To be lieutenants*

Mildred D. Aaberg
Olive B. Andrews
Alice E. Applegate
Mary E. Appler
Mae D. Arata
Mary A. Armstrong
Lillian A. Arslanian
Mary C. Ashton
Rosina F. Bachhuber
Mary T. Baker
Shirley R. Baraw
Quana E. Barber
Frances E. Biadasz
Mary E. Birch
Helen E. Bisz
Mary K. Bonds
Ruth M. Bosier
Alice W. Brackett
Dorothy A. Brennan
Blanche MacK. Broadway
Sophia E. Brogan
Sara E. Brown
Ruth Brownell
Mary E. Bruns
Virginia Cameron
Ann L. Canney
Zelda Carof
Carrie C. Carte
Margaret E. Carver
Marguerite C. Champagne
Mary D. Chapman
Josephine L. Chenault
Leona K. Cloutier
Margaret S. Coates
Laura C. Cobb
Leonora A. Cofer
Marie J. Colpoys
Carol M. Comstock
Barbara A. Conard
Patricia G. Conwell
Dorothy I. Council
Anita E. Crews
Almira B. Davis
Susan F. Davis
Dorothy C. Dennis
Katherine C. Doe
Kathryn Dougherty
Jane S. Dunning
Olive W. Ehrich
Jane G. Fisher
Mary T. Flynn
Jeanne M. Fontaine
Christine Forrester
Mary L. Fraitas
Josephine R. Garrison
Virginia L. Gilmer
Moriece Gleason
Sybil A. Grant
Dorothy M. Hagen
Elsie R. Hanson
Frances L. Hill
Mary W. Horton
Mabel V. P. Hughes
Helen L. Irby
Helen C. Jackson
Anne P. Jameson
Naomi Johnson
Myldred E. Jones
Dorothy J. Joyce
Dorothy V. Karabinus
Virginia A. Keener
Marie B. Kelleher
Anne King
Sue C. King
Genevieve Koester
Clara A. Kuehn
Ruth K. Laughlin
Helen W. Lawrence
Mary E. Leighton
Abigail P. Leik
Rita Lenihan
Nancy B. Long
Esther M. K. Lound
Winifred Love
Marie A. McCabe
Mary R. McCann
Marion J. MacDonald
Frances S. Mitchell
Mildred W. Myrick
Mary E. Noble
Melba R. Parks
Lillian M. Pimlott
Erma J. Potter
Winifred R. Quick
Elizabeth L. Rawl
Noma P. Reid
Dorothy E. Richard
Mildred A. Robertson
Jane E. Ryan
Carolyn W. Schaefer
Norphlett Scott
Miriam A. Shelden
Katherine E. Shilling
Eleanor J. Sowers
Gladys M. Sperrie
Jean M. Stewart
Mabel M. Stockert
Mildred E. Sutton
Dorothy F. Swanson
Grace A. B. Taylor
Geraldine F. Twining
Elizabeth L. Tyree
Ellen M. U'Ren
Hattie P. Vestal
Marion F. Wagner
Hazel P. Welch
Ethel A. Weyant
Dorothy J. Williams
Laura E. Wintersteen
Dorothy T. Yarnall
Kathleen Ziegler

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Gladys J. Adams
Mary M. Angas
Doris M. Armor
Helen Augustiny
Eudora L. Beadle
Gladys Bickmore
Irma E. Bibens
Vivienne F. Boudreau
Rosa A. Brannon
Frances L. Broughton
Eleanor M. Casey
Constance E. Clark
June M. Cogswell
Catherine E. Cox
Catherine V. Cronin
Beatrice E. Dalier
Doris A. Defenderfer
Jean E. Dilgard
Donna S. Doe
Elizabeth M. Dougherty
Olive I. H. Dunham
Frances E. Earle
Louise L. Edelmann
Florence L. Erickson
Patricia C. Evans
Betty M. Fannan
Vera V. Foster
Barbara L. Greenwood
Mary E. Hannan
Eleanor R. Homan
Helen J. Hooker
Helen M. Horne
Marguerite H. Kiernan
Betty J. Knighton
Mary E. Lardner
Mary J. Lynch
Virginia K. McKinley
Dorothy L. Maraspin
Charlotte P. Nevers
Muriel E. Neville
Martha M. Perry
Grace S. Person
Gloria R. Pignatelli
Jeanne E. Piper
Mary M. Pritchard
Anita W. Reinecke
Dorothy Riggle
Dorothea Ritchie
Viola B. Sanders
Lucile A. Seielstad
Mary Sharples
Thelma W. Sites
Sybil M. Space
Mary M. Stark
Ruth M. Streeter
Betty R. Tennant
Eleanor A. Thompson
Lucile S. Thompson
Frances A. Townsend
Margaret E. Tracy
Beatrice M. Truitt
Margaretta vonSothern
Elinor J. Wagner
Effie J. Walker
Ellen W. West
Ellen Word

*To be chief ship's clerk*

Alma H. Plakke

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

*To be commanders*

Vernal G. Backman
James J. Hayes
Vernon E. Martens
Thomas P. Rogers
John F. Wyman

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Warner D. Budens, Jr.
Charles A. Castle
Broor A. Johnson
Ross B. Lautzenheiser
Clifford A. Stevenson
Berger Thomas
Bennett A. Wight

*To be lieutenants*

John R. Bierley
Walter H. Jarvis, Jr.
John F. McCabe
Leo S. Madlem, Jr.
Trowbridge R. Mafit
John H. Stover, Jr.

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

William F. Bennett, Jr.
William E. Carter
August P. Ciell
Nathaniel M. Cohen, Jr
Thomas J. Coleman
David C. Dixon
Leo J. Frank, Jr.
Frank D. Fuller
Harold W. Garvin
John S. Graettinger
Martin O. Greaney, Jr.
Walter F. Hansen
Tom C. Hardy
James H. Holmes
Raleigh M. Hood
George T. Van Petten
Burton Willard
Robert A. Loeffler
Jay D. Wilson

The following-named officers (women) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

*To be lieutenant commander*

Frances L. Willoughby

*To be lieutenant*

Gioconda R. Saraniero

*To be chief warrant officer, Hospital Corps*

Marion E. Cramer

The following-named officers (women) to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

*To be lieutenant commander*

Dorothy M. Quinn

*To be lieutenants*

Isabelle G. Ashton
Clara E. Bassett
Natalie T. Bell
Maxine Carrell
Margaret A. Cunningham
Kathleen A. Deery
Jean R. Edwards
Ellen Ford
Helen R. Gorham
Bessie Hagopian
Eleanor J. Hennessy
Klayne Jones
Susan H. Magette
Marie A. Marek
Margaret W. Mayes
Yvonne Nelson
Jane E. Schopfer
Arlene M. Sheehan
Florence M. Smith
Bettie B. West
Mary W. Wooldridge

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Mary J. Aplin
Faynola V. Armstrong
Margaret E. Barton
Betty J. Brown
Rita P. Brychal
Kathleen D. Corneil
Virginia G. Finney
Dorothy McC. Harrah
Shirley J. Kaye
Rosemary Lafferty
Jean I. Moon
Grace J. Page

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Irvin R. Barker
John O. Booth
Frederick H. Bradshaw
Oscar A. Combs
Harry E. Denen
Walter V. Felcyn
Joseph R. Grysbeck
Richard C. Harwood
Derwood F. Hattendorf
John P. Jones
Jack J. Kelly
Oliver S. Levitz
Frederick B. Lukins
Willard R. McClellan
Lattimer C. Rucker
Theodore C. Sample
Ernest A. Thayer
John E. Wiseman

*To be lieutenants*

Charles A. Bill
Rosolino J. Curreri
George I. Gilchrest, Jr.
Clyde A. Harris
Gerald L. Hodgson
Edward J. Kamarit
Charles L. Kelso
Jan F. King
Albin J. Koenig
Patrick J. Lamb
Melvin R. Leonard
Arthur J. Loring
Robert A. Oswald
Thomas "J" Ownby
James F. Pennington
Frank B. Rhobotham
Robert J. Roesser
George Sturm, Jr.
Joseph G. Tippin, Jr.
Charles G. Walder
Harold F. Wimp
Zenan J. Woycik

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

John A. Bancroft, Jr.
Elwood R. Bernhausen
Clyde N. Campbell
Lyle W. Cohler
Richard "C" D'Vincent
Stewart T. Elder
Bertel T. Malmberg
Neale H. Morrow
Eugene S. Pawlicki
James H. Tanaka
William D. Ungricht
Enrique Valentin, Jr.
Walter F. Woodward

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

*To be lieutenants*

Gordon C. Bell
John J. Beretta
Leonard J. Bodenlos
Robert S. Herrmann
Frederick J. Lewis, Jr.
William J. Perry
Joseph F. Snyder
Rufus L. Thompson
Robert C. Will
Ulmer Wilson

*To be lieutenant (junior grade)*

Andrew D. Singleton

The following-named officers (women) to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Margaret M. Diehm
Mildred R. Lewis
Mary T. Sproul

*To be lieutenants*

Lois Brownell
Dorothy L. Chandler
Lucille R. Clark
Doris Cranmore
Melba A. Grafius
Mary F. Keener
Frances Spear
Margaret A. Stirewalt
Paula Towle

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Maria E. Aquino
Gladys H. Brewer
Glenna L. Cahill
Virginia J. Eager
Elizabeth Reeves
Georgie I. Simpson
Mary W. Winter

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

*To be lieutenants*

Regina M. L. Harty
Helen A. Reid
Mary M. Trantham
Esther V. Walenga
Marion F. Wardell
Helen L. Young

*To be lieutenant (junior grade)*

Margaret B. Binkley
Catherine M. Cirillo
Kathryn R. Day
Martha L. Gabuzda
Rose A. Gallagher
Winifred T. Gewehr
Mary T. Gilfedder
Eleanor C. Hayes
Helen A. Mieras
Thelma J. Moran
Ruth L. Price
Elizabeth L. Spangler
Mildred K. Teass
Martha A. Van Wye
Antoinette M. Weixelman

*To be ensigns*

Marie C. Bringgold
Eleanor M. Lux
Martha G. McKelley
Aileen A. Salisbury
Mary C. Seaton
Rita B. Voth

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification deck:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Troy Brashear
Earl W. Brown
Milton P. Dominguez
Robert Fisher
John D. Garland
Luin G. Kingman
William O. Kuykendall
Charles A. Parsons
Dewey Walley
Charles J. Wichmann

*To be lieutenants*

Irvin Boaz
Daniel A. Boone
Adolph M. Bothne
Aubra Calhoun

William R. Carter
Earl H. Clark
Thomas L. Cleaver, Jr.
John R. Davidson
Victor L. Davis
Ernest W. Downey
George L. Dunn
Clifford W. Engler
William J. English
Biagio O. Furnari
Harold G. Gibson
Carl T. Gleason
Harry A. Guthrie
"J" "C" Hale
William S. Hall
Orion A. Hammett
Rex Harbert
Hubert E. Harroun
Edward G. Hatchell
Leslie Jones
Jesse E. Lee
James S. Lees
Stanley J. Lewandowski
George M. Maloof
Cecil H. McCullar
John K. Metzger
Charles A. Miller
Kenneth A. Mundy
Charles E. Napier
Arthur W. Nordquist
George E. Paris
Ralph N. Pickles
Marinus Pilkington
George E. Poore
Charles A. Rourk
James T. Schermerhorn
Robert J. Siegelman
Sidney M. Skjei
Caydar E. Swenson
William O. Talley
Clarence M. Taylor
Milfred W. Thomas
Ephraim R. Weaver
Raymond F. Willett
Thomas S. Williamson

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

William F. Adams
Theodore F. Aldous
Robert M. Beckley
Frank L. Brimmer
Evan M. Chanik
Homer W. Chellew
William T. Davern
Mack D. Ellis
Robert J. Erickson
Ned A. Gardner
John E. George
Ralph H. Habecker
Robert G. Hoffman
Boyd D. Hughes
Malcolm R. Massie
Clinton J. Merritt
Robert L. O'Brien
Quinnie B. Preston
Carl O. Quarterman
Elsworth C. Reynolds
Meredith C. Riddle
William H. Robb
John B. Saylor
Urban E. Schaffner
Mike Stapleton
Lloyd V. Sternberg
John S. Tuttle
Elwood Vaughan
Howard A. Westphal
Jesse L. White

*To be ensigns*

Ralph L. Anderson
Horace W. Atkisson
Richard K. Barley
Marion L. Bohgren
Clinton F. Churchill
Vardy D. Garvey
John G. Gilyard
Louis C. Hambley
Hans P. Hansen
William F. Harris
Vernon L. Homer
Charlie R. Jones
John P. Kreckel
Francis E. Law
Philip L. Mann
Robert D. McBain
William R. Morgan
Lawrence O. Nasset
Alfred F. Norwood
Eugene A. O'Brien
Aquilino L. Ponciroli
Robert F. Reed
Wilbur E. Reed
Russell L. Sanders
Joseph E. Sullivan
Harry E. Weber
Billis L. Whitworth
Louis J. Yakich
Harold M. Yelton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification ordnance:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Theodore R. Brown
John O. Cavanaugh
James M. Hale
William T. Hall
Wilbur R. Hunter
Eugene F. Marker
Magnus D. Olavsen
Hampton L. Outlaw
Gleason Sherman
Oscar G. Urquhart
Samuel J. Whitehead

*To be lieutenants*

Robert F. Ault
Albert H. Baker
Frederick M. Betts
William R. Boehlert
Charles H. Eaton
Edwin H. Edgerton
Robert W. Eichelberger
Francis A. Farrow
Harold J. Gilpin
Charles E. Hackwith
Charles W. Henning
William P. Hoag
George P. Koch
Robert H. Krombar
Arthur H. Larson
Howard W. Mabus
James W. McBrier
Lesley D. McVey
Joe R. Moring
Marvin Purcell
Samuel Roy
Charles E. Saxton
Joseph M. Schick
Robert S. Selby
Walter A. Sheltren
Garnet M. Smithson
Raymond F. St. John
Robert E. Weaver
Carl H. Wehr

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Norman W. Bixby
Bruce L. Black
William B. Dickson
John W. Gay
Emile R. Gemoets, Jr.
John S. Gibson, Jr.
Paul R. Hodgson
Leo T. Howard
Harvey B. Jones
Fowler H. Justus
Arthur N. L'Heureux
Howard B. Miller
Ernest J. Ogilvie
Sigmund Popko
Edwin P. Smith
Robert B. Stickles
Woodrow W. Thompson
John S. Walden

*To be ensigns*

Warren B. Brann
Warren L. Clary
William A. Dyrdahl
Alvin K. Fentress, Jr.
Vaughn H. Gary
Waldo D. Groom
Arthur L. Hage
Quentin R. Hatchl
Judson D. Huggins
Robert F. Jones
Willard Koone
Hugh W. Latham
Howard E. Lyon
William J. Miller
Robert L. Odell
Howard J. Owen
Charles F. Pape
Kenneth L. Shurtleff

The following named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification administration:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

James E. Callan
Douglas N. Thomas

*To be lieutenants*

Edward A. Ballard
Joseph O. Bernier
Edgar O. Bonnell
Louis J. Broussard
William M. Calkins
Colie Chavis
Oakley W. Cheney
Moody O. Curry
William S. Edwards
Oliver E. Emmons
John S. Ervin
Loren P. Fitzgerald
Francis F. Garrett
Benjamin Groundwater
Donald L. Hartwich
Clarence C. Hawk
Harry L. Jackson
Homer L. Kisner
John M. Lynn
David L. Martin
William G. McClellan
Murrill C. Morris
James R. Morrow
Francis T. Nash
Leland Norton
Charles Olasky
Francis V. O'Leary
Carl J. Pritchard
William McK. Rigdon
Alexander K. Robinson
Martin Romano
Durwood G. Rorie
Robert R. Ruff
Guy R. Strickland
William E. Taylor
Paul A. Terry
Nicholas S. Thompson
Joseph W. Vercher
Charles H. Wainscott
Jeptha C. Weems
John E. Whitely
Donald A. Yetter
Clarence J. Zielke

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Edward G. Ames
John C. Arthur
Clarence J. Barry
Alvin C. Bergquist
Silas M. Blakely
Edward F. Block
Harold B. Boaz
William T. Coulson
Charles M. Dorris
Harry W. Enabnit
Elton E. Flowers
Harold M. Frediani
Lloyd E. Helwick
Max W. Henry
Frederick J. Hicken
Clayton F. Johnson
Ben G. Jones, Jr.
Wayne W. Litchfield
Herbert W. McGuire
Kenneth L. Mell
Roman G. Mislicky
Lennon T. Paige
James E. Plowden
Gilbert W. Rappelt
John R. Shannon
Theodore J. Wildman

*To be ensigns*

Lawrance L. Beese
Royal D. Berg
William G. Bigony
Douglas I. Blancheri
Willis J. Boo
Gustave L. Caros
William Q. Damon
Luis A. Dasso
Anthony Dombroski
Elmer H. Earnhardt
Dale C. Hillman
Reo M. Hood
Paul A. Hunt
Robert P. Javins
Charles E. Johnson, Jr.
Carl B. Kole
Charles L. Lowry
Eugene B. W. Meeker
David L. Miller
Kenneth Richardson
Russell D. Rider
Floyd Robertson
Francis J. Rodstrom
Lewis B. Shults
Donald D. Stone
Charles R. Sullenger

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Robert F. Baker
Kenneth B. Bell
Fred W. Boettcher
Walter E. Burke
Bartholomew H. Faherty
Dean Fluss
Charles T. Foley
Charles F. Foster
Glenn Gardner
Joshua H. Garrett
Loren Henderson
Edwards R. Hinson
Michael J. Hurley
Wilfred S. Iredale
Kenneth R. Kee
Joseph M. Lenart
Robert H. Lynn
James J. Marron
Frank McDole
Herman Miller
Otis C. Oliver
Daniel Osburg
John M. Owen
John W. Poteet
Arthur H. Randall
Harry O. Reynolds
Charles S. Seidle
Richard G. Sly
William A. Smith
Chester M. Stearns
Edwin W. Streeter
Herbert J. West
Olen "C" Woodroof
Alphonse V. Zeis

*To be lieutenants*

William E. Bell
George "H" Boyd
Earl D. Bronson
Fred M. Burdette
Garland Casey
Francis E. Chamberlain
Woodrow D. Crossley
Joe B. Decker
Paul H. Dice
Paul E. Dignan
Lawrence J. Dobson
Henry V. Durlin
Harold E. Erickson
Otto A. Fennig
Jesse W. Franklin, Jr.
Harold C. Gabriel
Richard R. Garriott
Merle A. Grant
William T. Harrison
Ernest B. Hess
William I. Hobbs
Robert N. Huey
John J. Huggard
Clarence E. Johnson
Mathis S. Johnson
Marvin C. Jorgenson
Carl F. Lee
Roy E. Marsden
Philip N. MacDonald
Stanley Mandekic
Gerald M. Meter
William T. Miller
John S. Morse
John W. Nesbitt
Elmer E. Niebuhr
Ralph H. Packer
Richard A. Pohl
Rollin M. Reed
Frank E. Robb
Albert D. Robbins
Oscar E. Robinson
Donald K. Ross
John I. Rustin
Roy C. Shriber
Victor A. Schmalfeldt
John M. Siran
Norman L. Sorenson
Emmett C. Suggs
Clyde W. Summers
Norman Thompson
John J. Trimner
Herbert H. Vanaman
Adolph Viegelmann
Furman D. Waltrip
David A. Ware
Nelson J. Watkins
George S. Watson
James J. Whipps, Jr.
William Williamson
Virden J. Wixon
Wayne G. Wright
Oran W. V. Young

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Robert H. Armour
Thomas E. Bager
George R. Becker
Laurence G. Brooks
Jim W. Bryson
Morrison E. Cavanaugh
Vincent R. Dahlen
Joseph D. DeLuca
James D. Dodge
Leon S. Ertle
Jack M. Feliz
Paul E. Fournier
Laron S. Franklin
Theodore C. Gavett
John G. Gillissie
Stuart V. Glenn
Lyle T. Griffis
William E. Harper
Rollin F. Heassler
Orville B. Hoel
Spencer W. Horner, Jr.
Paul E. Huffman
George L. Kent
Lloyd C. Knowles
Roland L. Loper
Richard R. Matthews
Joseph F. Miller
Charles F. Murray
Stephen J. Nemeth
George W. Perrin
Harry R. Ridge
George S. Schlemmer
Russel D. Smith
James B. Taylor
Leo E. Therrian
John T. Timmerman
Joseph Turnauer
Frank W. Warrick

*To be ensigns*

Charles C. Allen
Fredrick R. Barker
Charles J. Barr
Francis M. Brosnihan
Stewart V. Buchanan
John J. Butlak
Frederick S. Butz
Don M. Cameron
Howard W. Carr
Hugh A. Cleveland
Charles W. Combs, Jr.
Leonard W. Cushing
Fred W. Davenport
Telofil Dmoch
Carl B. Ditto
Jesse W. Dunwoody
William J. Egan
Marion S. Evans
John W. Fietsch
George H. Gaddy
Donald Gaither
Stuart M. Johnston
Jack J. Jones
William Kahler
Harry R. Kohler
Travis A. Mathis
John L. Minnick
James D. Moore
Francis C. Moses
Freeman H. Myers
Guy L. Pitsenberger
Chesley W. Richey
Claude E. Riley
Ray W. Seiwert
Gerald O. Spears
Robert A. Stahl
Harold M. Steeves
Courtenay McK. Stone

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification hull:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Harold L. Carpenter
Herbert L. Chapman
William J. Condon
Benjamin F. Edwards
Roy C. Parlier

*To be lieutenants*

Louis E. Biechlin
George H. Boyer
Gradie L. Carter
Edward M. Doran
Robert A. Dusch
Henry H. Frye
John R. Gorman
Edward N. Hann
William L. Henson
Christian T. Jensen
William A. Mahan
William C. McOwen
James W. Meehan
Robert M. Metzger
John F. Miller
Warner M. Minor
Looie W. Rash
Charles L. Schooler
Allen W. Bain
Francis W. Barrington
Albert O. Tate
Clyde H. Toland
Alfred J. Yuzakewich

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Thomas E. Acton
John W. Barden
William E. Barron
Allan R. Carlson
Gordon B. Dosskey
Harold F. Duval
William E. Fuller
Edward J. Kratochvil
James H. McDonald
John W. Newman
Loren J. Roberts
Lloyd P. Ross
Howard K. Smith
Cecil R. Thorne

*To be ensigns*

Albert A. Bartholomew
Henry F. Berck
John B. Griffin
Joe H. Hunt
George D. Jackson
Donald F. Krysan
Robert N. McKinney
Troy M. McKinney
Glenn O. Poplin
William H. Potts, Jr.
Richard F. Schumaker
Anderson V. Showen
Robert H. Smith
Charles C. Tidwell, Jr.

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification electronics:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Wilby R. Brown
Frank H. Clarke
Adna R. Crawford
Charles S. Deaton
Gordon O. Denzin
Donald L. Dickson
Albert P. Hilar
Arthur T. Hodges
William C. Louderback
Chester Lovell
Hugh C. Overstreet
Edward S. Pelling
Paul R. Reed
Kirke G. Schnoor
Earl W. Sloan
Frank L. Smith
John R. Stacey
James E. Teague
Ralph A. Turner
Arvell B. Ward
Guy W. Warren

*To be lieutenants*

Carroll C. Andrews
Floyd C. Atnip
John J. Bartko
Myron E. Beard
William H. Benedict
Vane M. Bennett
George M. Chaffin
Irwin R. Colldeweih
Joe M. Danielski
Delmas H. Denton
Joseph W. Dochnahl
Charles T. Duvall
Ned A. Garretty
Eldon L. Guhl
William A. Harpster
Russell G. Harriman
Girthel R. Hill
John M. Jones
Chauncey B. King
Charles H. Klouck
Robert L. McClaren
James R. McKenzie, Jr.
Stewart C. Miller
Douglas T. Morse
Nels J. Nelson
Francis M. Oakley
Bascome K. Osborne
Oscar Osheim
Clarence O. Payne
Lafayette W. Remillard
Jackson M. Rightmyer
Fred C. Rupprecht
Otis L. Scheibeler
Walter Schimmelpfennig
Leland V. Starkey
Charles L. Suggs
Peter G. Trapani
Willard Triska
Truman E. Turnipseed
Fay W. Wadhams
Edward A. Waiswilos
Cecil E. Wilson

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Robert G. Blakely
Abrahm H. Brower
Donald F. Byers
Wade H. Cone
Lawrence W. Covert
Edward H. Daughtrey
Ivan H. Douglas
Harold M. Dubree
Lewis L. Edwards
David E. Goudy
John Greksouk
Truman F. Grubl
Robert B. Harris
Bernard A. Middleton
Oscar B. Nelson
Victor S. Pedersen
James R. Rodman
John E. Russ
Crissie C. Sanders
James Sei
Will L. Stalnaker
Sumner E. Thompson, Jr.
Alfred H. Thorne
Joseph B. Tiara
Joseph W. Trumbo
Irving E. Wetmore
Paul H. Williams

*To be ensigns*

George A. Ales
James M. Arnold
Ira H. Ball
John H. Bilkey
Rudolph M. Buselmeier
Graig McD. Coley
Fred R. Crumbaugh, Jr.
William A. Evans
Alfred F. Ferguson
Charles J. Fox
Raymond A. Frady
Roy L. Hoffmann
Nathan H. King
Charles E. Landahl
Edgar H. LaRose
Alexander Lennox, Jr.
John D. MacKinnon
Roy W. McCotter
John E. Nichols
Ross Peters
Charles W. Postlethwaite
Elmer R. Rath
Francis L. Schlude
Harold J. Shapard
Robert E. Tyler
Merle W. Walton

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification operations aviation:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Jesse A. Fairley
Theron R. Jordan
Leon G. Lehrer
James C. McCoy
John G. Pendergraph

*To be lieutenants*

Edward H. Bayers
Elton W. Bode
Donald V. Chacey
William E. Chase
Gordon E. Firebaugh
Donald R. French
Marion H. Hawkins
Robert M. Israel
William N. Livingston
Leroy Loewer
Winfield G. Maurer
George R. Mills
Bacil C. Wheatley

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

George W. Bolt
Joseph Buehlman
Paul E. Dickson
Mason O. Erwin
Frederick G. Hewitt
Dale S. Lyons
Johnnie E. Mattis
Walter Schauer

*To be ensigns*

Arthur C. Black
George W. Brooks
Reid E. Coble
Edmond F. Frazier
George E. Smith
Kenneth W. Scott
Gordon W. Jones

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification ordnance aviation:

*To be lieutenants*

Congrave C. Callaway
Thomas H. Davis
Ivan C. Floerchinger
Charles W. Gibbo
Fred J. Livingston
Edward M. Medart
Luther R. Miller

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Dwight F. Asmus
Arthur L. Bureau
David E. Hilton
Charles F. Yarbrough

*To be ensigns*

Richard D. Blair
Claude L. Dickerson
James D. March
Edward G. Phillips

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering aviation:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

John C. Clarke
Joseph C. Clemens
Harry E. Holt
John C. Lafferty
John R. McCants
Gerard T. Morton
Clarence L. Pearson

*To be lieutenants*

Ernest J. Baldwin
Fletcher N. Baldwin
Daniel J. Bennett
Harry P. Beverage
Harold W. Bramblett
Michael P. Dennis
James F. Donnelly
Maynard S. Dubois
Howard W. Dye
Emery C. Geise
Oren E. Gibson
Eugene C. Gilbert, Jr.
William R. Guyer
Henry I. Harrison
Thomas W. Heath
John E. Hunt
John F. Ivy
John Kaspary
Paul E. Keith
Leif I. Larson
Stephen B. Lewis
George C. Littmann
Manuel Luke
Ira T. Lynn
James H. Manning
Don E. McLeod
Stuart R. Miller
Tom C. Pearce
Henry H. Philipsen
Glenn C. Poston
Vern A. Prather
Russel O. Reich
Preston R. Rucker
Raymond Rucker
Horace D. Schultz
Walter E. Schwartz
Frank M. Screws
Lewis E. Thompson, Jr.
Juston W. West

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

John T. Baker
Alfred V. Boutin
Nels E. Brugman
Lester D. Carter
Norbert A. Commons
Harry D. Hall
William D. Hall
Joseph H. James
Charles C. Kauffman
Omar F. Keith
Wesson A. Mansfield
Norman W. McLeod
Edward C. Miller
John R. Moore
Jerry P. Morelock
William J. Norton
Miles E. Piper
Richard M. Quattlebaum
Standlee L. Rank
Donald E. Runyon
William F. Salkowski
Arnold J. Scanzillo
William A. Simpson
Paul St. Jerne

*To be ensigns*

Louis A. Barich
Woodson P. Bremer
Max A. Crain
Anthony S. Creider
Edward O. Crosby
Daniel B. Delly
Eugene R. Forsht
Herbert A. Franck
Philip C. Gliem
Richard Green
George T. Hamilton
William C. Harrell
Willie W. Harris
Herbert L. Hope
Francis R. Jones
Norman N. LeMote
Francis F. Matthewson
Allan E. McArthur
Marcus McHenry
Champ C. Mulligan
Harry E. Ramsey
James M. Simpson
Donald E. Stanley
George Wilder

The following named officers to the grades indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only, classification electronics aviation:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Clayton W. Bailey
Samuel H. Foster
Mack C. Veltman

*To be lieutenants*

Albert L. Ballard
Paul J. Bartko
Irvin H. Bordihn
Curtis L. Downey
Joseph D. Ellis
Harry F. Grace
George K. Herman
Glen A. Herndon
Horton C. Kessler
Robert E. Mansard
Joseph P. C. Martineau
Alton R. McMullen
Alonzo R. Moeller
James F. Murray
Kenneth R. Norton
Earle B. Perce
George A. Tourville
Sam C. Violett
William P. Warwick
James A. Weatherbie

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Samuel B. Arnold
Jack G. Churchill
Russel L. Hendrickson
William E. Jenkins
Arthur C. McLean, Jr.
Lavern C. Moore
Leroy Perkins
Jack O. Polk
Lester A. Powers, Jr.
John A. Tennant
Ralph C. Thomas
Boyce St. C. Webb

*To be ensigns*

Walter R. Crandall
Roger E. Dickeson
Claude J. Hinds, Jr.
Robert L. Holt
Elmer E. Jackson
Edwin R. Jenks
Raymond A. Kulig
Robert G. Langland
Howard W. Masterman
Charles H. McMakin
John A. Pino
Lewis J. Polansky

The following named officers to the grades indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only:

*To be lieutenant commanders*

Charles B. Cotton
John Peak

*To be lieutenants*

Montell Abercrombie
Albert Albert
Joseph F. Arnold
Emmett O'N. Barlie
Clifton Brewer
Arnold R. Bruhn
John E. Connelly
John N. Davis
Clarence Deeming
Marvin A. Desmither
Robert E. Gaffney
Henry L. Geoghegan
George G. Gosting
Samuel O. Grayson
Francis W. Hardacre
Simeon G. Higgins
Francis Illum
Gerald W. Jackson
Page N. Keesee
Stanley S. Logsdon
Jake F. Marshall
Irving W. Martin
Marson W. Morgan
Melvin E. Morse
Carleton H. Mundell
Austin B. Pomel
Edgar D. Reinhold
Clarence Roseneck
Brandon D. Rosser
Joe E. Schruhl
Boyd M. Shaffer
Thomas J. Sikes
William A. Smith
Bernard J. Stacey
Thomas I. Stephens
Kenneth H. Stimeling
Russell G. Vail, Jr.
Louis E. Yost

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

| | |
|---|---|
| Charles C. Alexander | James H. Miller |
| Carl I. B. Anderson | Edward R. Morey |
| Paul L. Anderson | George L. Owen |
| Howard F. Conley | Lawrence O. Purkaple |
| Curtis Cullen | Willard N. Schneider |
| Kenneth P. Dehart | Horace D. Sharon |
| Widar J. Forde | Joseph J. Snapp |
| Loyd Goolsby | William W. Statia |
| Robert F. Hart | Ernest H. Wendt |
| Robyn H. Henderson | Luther N. White |
| Eddie M. Johnson | Roquel A. Wilson |
| Adolph Mathews | William D. Wright |

*To be ensigns*

| | |
|---|---|
| James F. Armlin | John A. McCormick |
| William Backer | Raymond A. Medlin |
| Mack B. Bingham | Paul J. Metcalf |
| Emlin N. Brown, Jr. | Edwards M. Morris |
| Cassel O. Crain | Albert K. Pavelka |
| William J. Crutchfield | Robert V. Schmidt |
| Leonard D. Ellingwood | John G. Slattery |
| Gerald K. Gamber | Ralph A. Smith |
| Harold Kearsley | Philip A. P. Stine |
| William D. Little | Joseph H. Tetrault |
| Richard C. May | Kiehl E. Underhill |
| Walter M. McCandless | Stephen J. Walsh |

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only:

*To be lieutenants*

| | |
|---|---|
| John W. Aufdenspring | George O. Helms |
| Herman L. Berube | Claude D. Masters |
| Robert W. Epps | Lowell H. Muse |

*To be lieutenants (junior grade)*

Robert E. Dilley
Kerman C. McDuffie

*To be ensigns*

| | |
|---|---|
| Arnold W. Ebert | John D. Watson, Jr. |
| Arthur E. Hackett | Frank D. Wilson |
| Nestor P. Michaleczko | |
| Richard L. Tinklepaugh | |

IN THE NAVY AND NAVAL RESERVE

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve, on active duty, for appointment to the ranks and grades hereinafter stated, and to correct typographical errors as previously nominated and confirmed:

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Allred, Jimmie "B", Jr. | Ney, Kenneth C. |
| Amos, John B., Jr. | Redgrave, DeWitt C., Jr. |
| Callahan, Francis J., III | Reisinger, Edward A. |
| Clark, Angus-Kerr | Rickman, Wilford M. |
| Connellee, William L. | Robertson, Chaytor L., Jr. |
| DeBold, Joseph F. | Scheuhing, Robert E. |
| Fisher, James R. M., II | Schneider, Frank J., Jr. |
| Fleeger, Eugene G. | Schubert, Allen H. |
| Galland, Frank J. | Searle, Willard F., Jr. |
| Gibbs, LeRoy C. | Skoog, Joseph L., Jr. |
| Gilles, Donald A. | Smyth, Terence J. |
| Griswold, Richard A. | Stevens, Mortimer, Jr |
| Hollingsworth, Robert J. | Stickels, Jack R. |
| Holt, Edward | Stiegelmar, Loren R. |
| Kline, Edward C., Jr. | Tice, John J., III |
| Lacewell, Lasley K., Jr. | Tiemann, Wilbur F., Jr. |
| Langille, Justin E., III | Timpson, Nephi H., Jr. |
| Leute, George M., Jr. | Vrolyk, Raymond F. |
| McGrane, Clarence V., Jr. | |

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| August, Joseph J. | Landis, Calvin D. |
| Clements, Daniel J., Jr. | MacDonald, Albert P., Jr. |
| Dooling, David | Maragides, Harry N. |
| Haley, Robert S. | Sueur, Charles A. |
| Jordan, Robert L. | Weir, Robert A. |
| Klecotka, Carl J. | |

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

LaLande, Albert M., Jr.
Roy, Vershall A.
Whyte, David P.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Armitage, Horace G.
Stutler, David R.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| DiVincenzo, Julia J. | Lux, Eleanor M. |
| Fischer, Corinne A. | Sieland, Rita A. |
| Forest, Yolande A. J. | Simpson, Elizabeth M. |
| Holmes, Mary A. | Steinmetz, Anna M. |
| Hunsecker, Isabel V. | Troyan, Dorothy M. |
| Kraince, Ethelyn E. | |

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of commissioned warrant officer in the Navy in the grades indicated:

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS

Eikam, Joseph
McCammond, Earle A.
Pearson, Robert L.

TO BE CHIEF GUNNER

Grigsby, William

TO BE CHIEF ELECTRICIAN

Buell, Clement A.

TO BE CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIAN

Young, Herschell B.

TO BE CHIEF MACHINISTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Dallendorfer, Andrew J. | Stephens, James M. |
| | Tegeler, Russell C. |
| Fennig, Otto A. | Williams, Pinckney M. |
| Jones, Granvil H. | |

TO BE CHIEF CARPENTER

Dosskey, Gordon B.

TO BE CHIEF PAY CLERKS

Knowles, "J" Marshall
Vail, Russell G., Jr.

TO BE COMMISSIONED WARRANT OFFICER, HOSPITAL CORPS

Witcofski, Louie K.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Belman, Kenneth B. | Miears, Roy R. |
| Donoho, Charles G. | Premselaar, Seymour J. |
| Fellers, Howell E. | Smiglewski, John J. |
| Hahne, Charles E. | Terry, Charles F. |
| Hicks, Thomas E. | Vander Veen, Don |
| Koza, Harold D. | |
| Loveland, Edward C. | |

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Burkholder, Arthur W., Jr.
Sumrell, Guy H., Jr.

The following-named officer for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Borja, Arthur

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Freedman, Alice R.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Naval Reserve:

McHugh, Edward A.

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Naval Reserve:

D'Auria, Gloria V.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the line of the Navy in grades hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT

Linder, Arthur E.

TO BE ENSIGN

Ryan, Joseph C., Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in grades hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

La Barre, Carl A.
Vaklyes, John W.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Gillis, Arthur W. | Sheen, Raymond H. |
| Hough, Homer H. | Standish, John C. |
| Lachicotte, Albert S., Jr. | Werner, Sherwood H. |

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

| | |
|---|---|
| Anderson, Emil | MacEwan, Clarence L. |
| Applegate, Richard C. | Morgan, Bobby G. |
| Chamberlin, Lewis C. | Noga, Edward L. S. |
| Clifton, Emory V. | O'Neil, Gerald P. |
| Gibson, John C. | Travers, Sumter L. |
| Hart, Carten M. | Vasey, Charles A. |
| Johnson, Carl M. | Wingo, Rodney K. |
| Knight, Richard H. | |

TO BE ENSIGNS

| | |
|---|---|
| Bagnall, Roger S. | Owen, Frank T., Jr. |
| Braley, Charles R. | Sorge, Monroe B. |
| Case, George O. | Stewart, Donald R. |
| Havener, Millard F. | White, Warren P. |
| Johnson, John T. | Winslow, John A. |
| Jones, Alfred H. | |

The following-named officers for permanent appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy in grades hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT

Chesnut, Luther T., 3d

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

| | |
|---|---|
| Collier, James R. | Mascenik, John |
| Coyer, Charles B. | Walton Albion W., Jr. |

TO BE ENSIGNS

| | |
|---|---|
| Cassidy, Earle M. | McGuire, Larry C. |
| Gaddis, Paul O. | Nichalson, Leroy F. |
| Gentry, William W. | Otto, Carl W. |

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the line of the Navy in the grade hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Linder, Arthur E.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in grades hereinafter stated:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Hough, Homer H.
Werner, Sherwood H.

The following-named officers of the Navy and Naval Reserve, on active duty, for appointment to the rank and grades hereinafter stated:

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Andrews, Carroll A. | Blount, Robert H. |
| Armstrong, Richard G. | Bodamer, Robert E. |
| Armstrong, Russel I. | Body, Lawrence G. |
| Askew, George V. | Bose, Bertram L. |
| Athow, Robert F. | Bothwell, John H. |
| Aubrey, Joseph H., III | Brand, Richard G. |
| Banks, Charles A., Jr. | Brems, John H. |
| Barnett, Gene A. | Brewer, Norman E. |
| Beam, Jay K. Y. | Brooks, Richard I., Jr. |
| Beck, Lester H. | Brown, Barry W. |
| Beesley, David L. | Buegler, Robert J. |
| Berry, Henry M. | Bueler, Charles M. |
| Besel, Michael N. | Buller, Ronald M. |
| Beydler, Warren H. | Butler, John E. |
| Blair, James A. | Campbell, Kenneth C. |

Campbell, William M.
Canto, Joseph V.
Cardillo, Robert J.
Carlin, Joseph W.
Carlstead, Edward M.
Carter, Otis D.
Castro, James
Chillemi, Richard L.
Cockrell, Jack R.
Coll, Charles L.
Collis, James E.
Comingore, Edward G., Jr.
Conditt, Leslie T., Jr.
Corey, Richard A.
Corrigan, John F., Jr.
Counihan, Henry R.
Coyle, Arthur J.
Crohn, Arnold E.
Cusumano, Robert D.
Cwirko, Walter A.
Darr, James, Jr.
DeLaVergne, Cornelius B.
Denissen, Richard J.
DeVeas, Thomas E.
Dille, Ralph E.
Dionne, Robert J.
Doescher, Walter W., Jr.
Dolan, Eugene F.
Dollard, Thomas J., Jr.
Dougherty, Edmund D.
Dunlap, George R.
Dunton, Stanley W.
Easley, David E.
Eckman, Charles J.
Eldridge, Richard A.
Essert, Antone
Evans, Donald W.
Everett, James G.
Ewald, Arden A., Jr.
Fenwick, Joseph E.
Ferguson, Robert E.
Filson, Paul L.
Fisher, Robert W.
Fisher, William B., Jr.
Forsyth, Donald D.
Fowler, Earle B., Jr.
Foy, George E.
Frazier, Holly G.
Fritsch, Edward C., Jr.
Gabrielsen, Carl A.
Gardner, Charles A.
Gardner, Harvey R.
Gaunt, Richard H.
Gebler, Gerard P.
Gettings, Harold W.
Glowasky, William A.
Goodman, Louis R.
Gordon, Jack W.
Gorsuch, Reynolds G.
Goudy, Maynard P.
Gott, Charles L.
Graham, John H.
Graham, Thomas A.
Gray, Gordon L., Jr.
Gray, Harland A., Jr.
Green, Robert P.
Gremer, Charles E.
Grigsby, Hubert C., Jr.
Gumb, Dana F.
Gurley, Walter P.
Hafner, Joseph J.
Hall, John C.
Hallen, Walter E.
Hancock, Burton W.
Hardy, Willis A.
Harris, William F.
Hartley, Cecil M.
Hartwell, James O.
Haycraft, Logan, Jr.
Hedgepeth, Charles H.
Heimbach, Hilton R., Jr.
Heising, John C.
Herbert, Christopher A.
Hesse, Theodore S.
Hessom, Robert C.
Hill, Arnold M.
Hilton, Calvin E.
Hilton, Jack
Hodges, Richard H.
Holm, Kenneth C.
Holmberg, Frank E.
Hopkins, Barry P.
Hord, John W.
Houck, John F., Jr.
Howe, Thomas
Hulihan, John W.
Hulka, Edward H.
Husty, Richard M.
Irvine, Harry B.
Iselin, Earl C., Jr.
Jackson, James A.
Jefferson, James E.
Jensen, William G.
Johnson, Charles E.
Jones, Allen, Jr.
Jones, Grover C.
Junghans, Robert C.
Justice, James O., Jr.
Keefe, William J., Jr.
Kelly, William F.
Kelly, William J.
Kemp, Glenn E.
Kennedy, Herbert S.
Kile, Newton A.
Kilgore, Frank J.
Killingbeck, William E.
Kinney, Donald E.
Kleczewski, Marion J.
Klepin, Leon E.
Klippstein, Thomas A.
Knueven, William H.
Krebs, Edward C., Jr.
Kroencke, William H.
Kuehn, Walter J.
Lackore, Raymond C., Jr.
La Perche, Jacques B.
Lasseter, Joe F., Jr.
Leask, Joseph A.
Ledridge, Robert B.
Leisk, William H., Jr.
Lember, David B.
Leo, Joseph P., Jr.
Levin, Philip
Lewis, Frederick E.
Lucero, William H.
Lyons, James I.
Mamber, Solomon
Mann, Frederick H., Jr.
Mann, John B., Jr.
Mark, Robert B.
McCabe, Robert E.
McGrath, Charles J.
McGucken, Paul M.
McHenry, Carl E.
McHugh, Paul J., Jr.
McMahon, Robert S.
McMurray, Samuel F.
Meyer, Wayne E.
Miles, Neagle W.
Mingo, John J.
Mongilardi, Peter, Jr.
Moseley, Richard E.
Mount, Harold W.
Negele, John H., Jr.
Nelson, Eugene L.
Newhouse, George B., Jr.
O'Meara, Charles K.
Pace, Robert D., Jr.
Panther, James E.
Parks, Thomas B.
Peddy, James T., Jr.
Phillips, George W., Jr.
Phinney, Glenn W., Jr.
Pierucki, Ervin J.
Pinkepank, Merril C.
Plunkett, Robert D.
Polson, Arthur D.
Pool, George R.
Potter, Eugene "W"
Presson, Herman W., Jr.
Price, Charles H.
Price, Mood B., Jr.
Purcell, Stephen E., Jr.
Ranzau, Walter W.
Rapalus, Henry W.
Rawls, Raymond L.
Reeb, Edward L., Jr.
Reichwein, Fremont E.
Richards, Kurt D.
Richardson, James P.
Ricker, Marshall A.
Riddick, John C.
Rider, Richard G.
Rodgers, Lawrence G.
Rowe, Donald E.
Rummelhoff, Warren E.
Russell, George A., Jr.
Ryan, Bayliss Q.
Ryan, Eugene P.
Sabin, Nelson
Salisbury, Thomas G. 2d
Saubers, Maurice D.
Sauter, George G.
Sawyer, Kenneth E., Jr.
Schatz, Clifford E.
Schneider, Robert F. S.
Schnopp, Robert W.
Schoenhere, Charles G.
Schwan, Alfred P. G.
Seay, Howard R.
Shuett, Donald W.
Shumaker, Charles E.
Simmons, Mitchell M.
Sisterhenm, William H.
Small, Rufus C.
Smerdon, John E., Jr.
Smith, Albert J.
Smith, Billie E.
Smith, Charles W.
Smith, George E.
Smith, Harold L.
Smith, James V.
Smith, Wendell K.
Snellman, William C.
Snyder, Charles E.
Snyder, Jack L.
Stanfield, Henry L.
Stansfield, Richard J.
Stecker, Kenneth W.
Steer, George L.
Stephens, Lawrence B.
Stewart, Richard C.
Stiles, Carl
Stobie, Edwin F.
Stockstill, Peter T.
Stone, John F.
Suttles, Raymond H.
Tait, Albert J.
Talago, Joseph, Jr.
Talmadge, Charles J.
Tanton, Paul W.
Thompson, Clifford E.
Thorson, Robert L.
Tigert, Marion A.
Truesdale, Francis E.
Twaddell, Miles E.
Vader, Robert L.
Vanderpool, Jay R.
Vaughan, Jack A.
Walters, Joseph A., Jr.
Waters, Alex "C"
Weaver, Keith T.
Webb, Milton G.
Werle, Joseph P., Jr.
Westmoreland, Arthur E.
Whaley, Lucien O. G.
Whitaker, Andrew W.
Whitehead, John D.
Whittle, Claude B.
Wilson, James G.
Wilson, William D.
Wise, Richard E.
Woerman, William B.
Wright, Merritt A.
Wright, William R.
Zuehlke, Lloyd T.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Acree, Calvin "H"
Adams, Leroy W.
Anderson, John J., Jr.
Anderson, Oscar M., Jr.
Baccaro, Michael V.
Barber, Gayle E.
Barnett, Edward B.
Boltwood, Chester M.
Bruening, Paul M.
Bundren, Cecil E.
Cherryman, Rexford R.
Condon, Thomas P.
Cook, William H.
Cooper, William M.
Davis, Albert S.
Donahue, Daniel F.
Drzewiecki, Casimir A.
Ehlers, Jerome E.
Flock, Jens B., Jr.
Gallagher, Granville W.
Galligan, Charles H., Jr.
Gaschen, Frederick S.
Goetzmann, John C.
Hawley, William F.
Hein, Joseph J., Jr.
Helvey, Roy
Heurich, Robert G.
Hurst, Gordon F., Jr.
Hynes, Edward J.
Jones, Ivor H.
Jongeward, Keith W.
Kammerer, John H.
Kamps, John H.
Kilcourse, William R.
Kuehm, Fred L. G.
Kuhlman, Norman H. C.
Kulow, Frederick C.
LaPlante, Robert W.
Lent, Robert E.
Link, Robert E.
Long, Samuel M., Jr.
Longmire, Billy R.
Luck, William E.
Lundberg, Eugene D.
Manore, Thomas E.
Masterson, James E.
McBroom, William M.
McStay, John J.
Mercadante, James A.
Minton, Horace L.
Mossing, Raymond L.
O'Brien, Richard J.
Pavelko, Anthony J.
Pavlick, Marvin S.
Polk, William E., Jr.
Potts, Stanley W.
Punch, Willard M.
Quintero, Donald B.
Radeke, Waldemar H., Jr.
Raney, William O.
Schutt, Richard C.
Searcy, William C.
Sylvester, Nelson J., Jr.
Teichler, Alfred H., Jr.
Thomas, Matthew L.
Thompson, Charles E.
Tylman, Frank J.
Unkrur, Arthur T.
Warner, Robert J.
Watson, Lawrence A.
Watson, Raymond A.
Watt, Robert J.
Weihrich, Walter F.
White, Francis H.
Xefteris, Zefter C.
Yoakam, Bernard

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Black, Dock F., Jr.
Dunnells, Robert E.
Flippen, Homer W.
Goetzke, George A., Jr.
Jacobson, Ray O., Jr.
Locke, Harry A.
Mallory, Charles W.
Malvin, David W.
Michael, Edwin M.
Miles, Bert H.
Moffat, Robert E.
Rautenberg, Carl N.
Ross, Willard A.
Stapelfeld, Johann F.
Ward, Howard T.
Woods, Kenneth G.
Young, Robert C.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Deatley, James M.
Kentner, Robert W.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Bennett, Elinor
Clark, Elizabeth E.
Gaffney, Elizabeth G.
Ince, Melanie
Johnson, Myrtle J.
Kratz, Hedwig L.
Moon, Dorothy M.
Nulty, Helen
Petit, Marita D.
Rennock, Eleanora W.
Worsham, Mildred I.
Wynn, Hazel A.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Navy:

Ahles, Raymond W.
Bailey, Sidney E.
Blitz, Victor E.
Bloom, Stanley A.
Booth, Harold T.
Brown, Donald B. F.
Dickson, Earl S.
Dilley, Warren G.
Everson, Carl
Foster, Frank P.
Malinowski, John H.
Marona, "G" "L"
McWhorter, Harry W.
Nester, Charles E.
Niemann, Jay J.
Patterson, Harry E.
Pessillo, Joseph F.
Peterson, Robert J.
Price, Frank J.
Pugh, Thomas B.
Smith, Bert H.
Walker, Harrison M., Jr.
Westcott, Robert O.
Whipkey, Arthur L.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line of the Naval Reserve:

Abernathy, Little F. B.
Boyer, Robert C.
Click, Carl E.
Cloyd, David E.
Dangl, John R.
DeBiase, Raymond G.
Doherty, Philip A.
Dolan, Vincent A.
Ellingson, Lemoyne E.
Enzler, Arthur J.
Fife, Glade W.
Finch, Truman W.
Foy, Henry K.
Furches, Stephen L., Jr.
Hanson, Pierce O.
Henyan, Richard R.
Hearn, John C.
Holcombe, Alan R.
Hoover, Charles W., Jr.
Johnson, Leland F., Jr.
Kenney, Harold T.
Kincheloe, William M., Jr.
Kreutz, Arthur R.
Kreuze, Floyd J.
Kyle, James W.
LaMorte, James F., Jr.
Lyon, Clarence S.
Martin, Louis H.
McEwan, Alexander W.
Mitchell, Franklin O.
Mitchell, Joe L.
Paradise, Fred V., Jr.
Patten, Paul H.
Paulsen, William
Powers, Donald F.
Ritter, Edmund U.
Santa Maria, Alberto H., Jr.
Scholl, Edmund R.
Schor, Morris
Slaiter, Vinson R.
Smith, John L.
Stiles, Robert G.
Strider, Donald H.
Thout, Clifford G.
Vorndran, Joseph W.
Warren, Walter L.
Weissberg, Stanley K.
Wells, John T.
Wentworth, John P.
Weimar, William R.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Naval Reserve:

McIntosh, Terrance E.
McKeen, Edward N.
Whittles, Carl, Jr.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be captains, to rank from March 20, 1945:

George F. Hicks
Alexander L. Ford
Stephen H. Evans
John A. Glynn
John E. Fairbank

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a commander, to rank from October 20, 1942:

John S. Merriman, Jr.

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a commander, to rank from November 18, 1942:

William H. Snyder

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be commanders, to rank from January 1, 1944:

Peter J. Smenton
Thomas R. Midtlyng
John B. Oren
Harry E. Davis, Jr.
Joseph Howe
George W. Holtzman
William W. Childress
John H. Wagline
John J. Hutson, Jr.

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant commander, to rank from October 1, 1942:

Warren L. David

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant commander, to rank from May 15, 1943:

Victor E. Bakanas

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant, to rank from December 31, 1942:

Robert S. McLendon

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard to be a lieutenant, to rank from May 15, 1943:

Vincent J. Cass

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be lieutenants (junior grade), to rank from the dates indicated:

Robert O. Bracken, December 31, 1942.
Charles Wayne, April 1, 1944.
Robert H. Roberts, May 1, 1945.
Albert G. Jones, November 15, 1946.
Donby J. Mathieu, November 15, 1946.
Donald E. Ullery, January 1, 1947.
Robert N. Rea, January 1, 1947.
John G. Milosic, January 15, 1947.
Theodore L. Roberge, January 15, 1947.
Francis Twarog, January 15, 1947.
Thurston L. Willis, January 15, 1947.
Bernard B. Wood, January 15, 1947.
Samuel W. Branin, January 15, 1947.
Jack E. Stewart, January 15, 1947.
Norman P. Weinert, January 15, 1947.
James A. Emery, January 15, 1947.
Paul L. Anderson, February 1, 1947.
William C. Carber, February 1, 1947.
Rubin E. Young, Jr., February 1, 1947.
Fred J. Michalson, February 1, 1947.
Richard C. Green, February 1, 1947.
James B. Reynolds, February 1, 1947.
Wesley J. Quamme, February 1, 1947.
William C. Akers, February 1, 1947.
Philip S. Bell, February 1, 1947.
Donald D. Davison, February 1, 1947.
Ivan C. McLean, February 1, 1947.
Edward G. Taylor, February 1, 1947.
Louis E. Price, February 1, 1947.
Franklin F. Bohlk, February 1, 1947.
Samuel H. Yearta, August 22, 1948.
Russell W. Lentner, August 22, 1948.
William H. Yates, August 22, 1948.

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be ensigns, to rank from January 15, 1947:

William C. Wallace
Henry G. Cassel
Harley B. Shank
Raymond M. Miller
Charles A. Haley
Everett B. Kopp
Philip G. Ledoux

The following professor (temporary) of the United States Coast Guard to be professor, with rank of lieutenant, to rank from October 1, 1942:

Robert E. Reed-Hill

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenant commanders, United States Coast Guard, to rank from the dates indicated:

Elvin C. Hawley, June 5, 1943.
Emery H. Joyce, June 5, 1943.
Frank McLaughlin, June 14, 1943.
Allan V. Falkenberg, June 24, 1943.
Russel O. Foster, July 7, 1943.
Frank T. Burtle, July 29, 1943.
Arnold J. Larsen, December 1, 1943.
Lionel H. DeSanty, December 1, 1943.

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants, United States Coast Guard, to rank from the dates indicated:

David H. Douglas, May 15, 1943.
Theron H. Gato, May 15, 1943.
Paul F. Foye, July 1, 1944.

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade), United States Coast Guard, to rank from the dates indicated:

George A. Philbrick, March 1, 1944.
Henry W. Stinson, Jr., March 1, 1944.
John W. Day, January 1, 1947.
Thomas G. Condon, January 1, 1947.
Maurice W. Tiehen, January 1, 1947.
Leo M. Bracken, January 1, 1947.
Paul S. Hofmeister, January 1, 1947.
Albert P. Hartt, Jr., January 1, 1947.
George E. Tooloose, January 1, 1947.
William E. Sale, January 1, 1947.
Andrew B. Christensen, January 1, 1947.
Harold A. French, August 22, 1948.
Sam Pisicchio, September 15, 1948.

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade), dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with the regulations governing the determination of precedence as commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard of Reserve officers, former Reserve officers, and former temporarily commissioned officers:

Walter J. Felton
Harry G. Kosky
Richard W. Bagnell
Edward P. Sawyer
Leonard A. Wardlaw, Jr.
Leonard J. Knight, Jr.
Jerry Komorech
Enoch A. Poulter
Douglas D. Vander Meer
Charles D. Zettler
Frank A. Klafs
Hugh C. McCaffrey
Owen B. Smith
Eric G. Grundy
Merle L. Harbourt
Harold L. Appleton
Gordon Crymes
William A. McCreary
Francis J. Bell

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be ensigns, dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with the regulations governing the determination of precedence as commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard of Reserve officers, former Reserve officers, and former temporarily commissioned officers:

Robert E. Ogin
Roger J. Dahlby
Nelson W. Allen

The following officer of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be professor (temporary), with rank of lieutenant, to rank from July 1, 1944:

Raymond J. Perry

The following person who served with the former Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation to be a lieutenant commander, United States Coast Guard, to rank from June 3, 1943:

Carl A. Anderson

NOMINATIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

*To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 1, 1948*

Lt. Col. Francis Nicholas Miller, O41791, Army of the United States (major, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erwin Orlo Gibson, O29899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

*To be majors with rank from July 1, 1948*

Maj. Robert Nicholas Smith, O39709, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Allen Kallis, O38687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Francis Victory, O41869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Norman Michael Wagner, O51225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Paul Carter, O29580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Milton Blum, O39728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Maurice Brown, O18453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Roger Urban, O18490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Rosser Patterson, O18491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Mackay Read, O18527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Winston Candler, O18562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Ambrose Herman, O18563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dexter Lowry, O17628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Taylor McAninch, O29601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Ernest Moyers, O41938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Antrim Saxton, O51275, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vasco Laub, O41975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Duke Crinkley, O29669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Conway Knight, O29684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Nelson Reed, O51297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Willis Wilmore, O29706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ewing Johnson, O51309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thore Fritjof Bengtson, O18670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Vibert Doyle, O18712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Charles Cowan, O18807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Vines Johnston, Jr., O18836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Deisher, O18852, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Bartlett Babcock, O18887, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Randall Everman, O18910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Wesley McKnight, O29760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Danhouse Martz, Jr., O29769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis McAneny, O42075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Rennie Sanderson, O42076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathan Sanborn Mathewson, O29771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Herman Rasche, O51339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Munson Elliott, Jr., O51340, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alva Lawrence Ritchie, O39788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Amos Hawes, O42077, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adams Edwin Rackes, O42078, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Yenne Earl Snider, O51341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Francis Gibbons, O38724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Rolfe Archibald, O29776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Knapp Franks, O51343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Armitage, O42079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wellford Taylor, O38725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles John Timmes, O29777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Franklin Gaffney, O51345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Michael Mendell, O42082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Crank, O51346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herber Carlton Leney, O39789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orval James Baldwin, O39790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Bell Butler, O29783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray King Bannister, O29784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John George Wagner, O51348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan Beresford Todd, O42088, Army of the United States (catain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Loveaire Ackley Hedges, O29786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cameron Forrest Woods, O42089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon Lester Slisher, O29787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Alford Laforge, O51349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Alton Hough, O42090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Grant Waite, O30358, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Vinson Wyss, O29788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tom Bryson Hembree, O29789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Preston Tuggle, Jr., O42093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Willis Clarke, O29792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hans Wilhelm Helm, O29794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Maria Koster, O29796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Dale Graves, O29795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Warner, O39791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Grant Bent, Jr., O29797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Russell Whitehead, O42095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winslow Randall Willis, O51352, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Thomas Hazlett, O39792, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert H. Cole, O29798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Herrward Mauz, O29799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Irvine Sanders, O42096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Grant Learnard, Jr., O29801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Virgil Guisleman, O39793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Greenlief Smith, Jr., O29804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Richard Boyles, O29803, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Raymond Judson, O39794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Lyman Sawyer, O51355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenan McLendon Rand, O39795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Monroe Brown, O29806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Lindley Pickett, O42099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Martin Sassé, O29807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ralph Thomas, O51356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Raymond Robertson, O51357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lauren Elmer Hannah, O51358, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Buttner, O42100, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Maxwell, O39796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Richard Hill, O42101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ira Winfield Hart, O29808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Joseph Laux, O42102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alwyn Vincent Larkin, O29809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Orville Rupp, O42103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Oliver Irvin, O42104, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irvin Louis Allen, O29810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Truman Snowden, O29811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lewis Bivens, O42105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Leo Sievers, O29814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Parsons, O29816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Timothy Howard McKenzie, O39797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester W. Kale, O29815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Loren Elmer Gaither, O42109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Arthur Klinetop, O39798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Ernest Newcomb, O38727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Vinyard Diehl, O51361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Emery Baya, O29817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Augustine Kleff, O39799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Ruebush Andrews, O51362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Robinson Higgins, O38755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Andrew Conlin, O42111, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter William Gerken, O42113, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ellsworth Stoever, O42114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Lee Grider, O42112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ludwig Schulz, O42115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Conran, O29820, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Wiley Burton Davis, O29822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Louis Littell, O29823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Voorhies Nicholas, O51363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Theodore Edson, O29827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hays Holmes, Jr., O29828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank William Herberth, Jr., O29829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Murray, O29833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Charles Jones, O42119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Miguel Joseph Pomar, O42120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Hugh Powers, O42123, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Walter Wurfel, O29835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Joseph Ingeman, O42124, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Clifton Creighton, Jr., O29836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erquiet Taylor, O29838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton William Janes, O38730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floy William McGinn, O42127, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Francis La Piana, O51365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Sumner Standley, Jr., O29840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Wortendycke Beggs, O39802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Felix Menegus, O42128, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilburn Lesca Strickland, O29839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Thomas Simpson, O29841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Linwood Bush, O29843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Gerhard Eger, O29842, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Ralph Lolli, O29844, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Vernon Hart, O38732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Lee Williams, O30082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Townsend Powell, O51368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Patrick Gibbons, O39804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mackentyre Thames, Jr., O29846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Amos Byron Churchill, O29847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hill Greene, O42130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Arny, Jr., O51369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Eugene Pickett, O42131, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur LeRoy Baker, O39805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lydon Briggs Cole, O29848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Frank Bogner O51370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Smith, Jr., O29850, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Herman Meinert, O29851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Howard Bates, O39806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Askins, Jr., O29852, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Cooke, O29853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Fredrick Kirkpatrick, Jr., O39807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holmes Hoffman Bevington, O42133, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Temple Johnson, O29856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Burns, O38733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lorraine Lynnhaven Manly, O51373, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gardner Baker Gross, O29859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lee Andrick, O42134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Harry Davidson, Jr., O39808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Timothy Chapman, O29860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Humphrey Tomlinson, Jr., O38734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Evander Francis Kelly, Jr., O51377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Parmelee Babcock, O39809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edgar Wilson, O29863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kirk Buchak, O29864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Silas Rosswell Langlois, O29865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Melvin Lundberg, O42136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Silas Benjamin Dishman, O29052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Alexander Dasche, O39810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Joe Gosiger, O29867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Edward Conn, O29868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Richard Dwyer, O42138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Neal Anderson, O51379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry C. Brindle, O51380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Robinson Heard, O39811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Littlefield Davis, Jr., O29869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Daniel Fitzgerald, O29870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Maxwell Rodgers, O39812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Blair Eliot Henderson, O39813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Samuel Winsper, O39814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Lacy Ringgold, O30115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franz Heiberger Ross, O29871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Newell Skaggs, O39816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Benjamin Besbeck, O42142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Marshall Sprake, O29872, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willard Pumpelly, O51384, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Glenn Rees, O39817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Gustin Hall Smith, O29877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Decatur Fagin, O42145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj Edwin Hart Druley, O29876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Strother Ison, O39819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Anthony Sivigny, O51385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis LaFarge, Jr., O42147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Weir-Mitchell Weir, O42150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Hadrick Ebbert, O29885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Leonard Leidy, O29886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kermit James Silverwood, O42153, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Lattin, O29887, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Melville Bisant, Jr., O51387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Sidney Levie, O38735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Howard Loomis, O29889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Braxton Eugene Small, O42156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Harold Meek, O29890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Heltzel, O29891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Jackson Magee, O42158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lyndon William Merry, O51391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dwight Thornton Hamersley, O42159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Quentin Samuel Quigley, O29894, Army of the United States (captain, U S. Army).

Lt. Col. Teddy Hollis Sanford, O29893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Rupel Walton, O39821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Richardson Palmerlee, O29895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor B. Fox, O29896, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wenzel David Roth, O51392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stephen Bodner, O51393, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Gibson Davis, O51394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Roland Creighton, O42161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Schaeffer Mansfield, O29898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Richard Siemers, O42162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harllee Royall O'Neal, O42163, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Otto Fischer, O29901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Conrad Hildebrant, O29902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Milton Reiser, O39823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jean Paul LaCour, O39822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Stewart Bessmer, O39824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Raymond Keasey, O38736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beverly Taylor, O29903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Otto Peterson, O29904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jackson Knight Judy, O39825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Abner Richardson 3d, O29906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Claude Miller, O51396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Bauer Sames, O42167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dane Oatman Sprankle, O42169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon O'Brien, O42171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eldon Alfred Koerner, O42172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Wilbur Greene, O38737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Humphrey Johnson, Jr., O29908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Major Ayars, O42173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Martin Shipley, O39827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mattison Albert Darragh, O42174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Conk, O29909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander George Eagle, O29910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harley Derrell Brown, O29911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Joseph Hannon, O42175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Knox Bell, O29912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Dilg Frampton, O42176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Patrick McKenna, O42179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Wesley Earl Farmer, O51398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Anthony Shaw, O42181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Rudolph George Winckler, O51399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Elvin Johnson, O39828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cecil Malcolm MacGregor, O42182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Alfred Earl Stevens, O29916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Douglas Osborne Toft, O42183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Roland Haddaway del Mar, O29917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Eugene Londahl, O39829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. George Victor Johnson, O39831, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frank Wright Roberts, O39830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Lt. Col. Roy Edward Goode, O29921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Albert Havens Jackman, O51402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Walter Lee Coleman, O38738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Hamilton Gibson, O29923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Allen Leavitt, O51403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Wilfred Gustafson, O51404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Jack Farnell Hudson, O42184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orlando Adam Scott, O42187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Reid Dorman, Jr., O51406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Arthur Luther, O38740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Weston Locke Blanchard, O29925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt.. Col. Slaftcho Katsarsky, O39832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robinson Baird Rider, O51408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Albert Mark Smith 2d, O29927, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Lee Henry Morrison, O51409, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Sherburne Jackson Heliker, O29928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Levern Bates, O29929, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Glen Black, O39833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Samuel Haviland, O42189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frazer Woodruff Rodman, O38741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Leonard Kerr, O42191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Heron McNary, O38742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edward Jackson Grant, O38743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Harwood Taylor, O29931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Perl Dunn, O51413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Maxwell Birge Fogarty, O42193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Benjamin Chesson, Jr., O51414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Edwin Bisbort, O29934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Lewis Peyton, O29935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Earl Leroy Icke, O42195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Fred Lewis Plahte, O29936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William Arthur McAleer, O42196, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Seymour Austin Potter, Jr., O29937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Albert Fanning, O29939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Ashworth Robblee, O42198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Bonner Garretson, O39835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Lowrey Robert Moore, O29941, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Beecher Reed, O30193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Albertson Bradley, O39836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. William James Whitehead, O39837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Cecil Gordon Gealta, O38744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Arthur Gustav Kiel, O42199, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Tom Watson Sills, O29949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William Thomas Evans, O29950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. William James Sutton, O29951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Albert Martin, O51419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Orman Goodyear Charles, O29954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Dudley Peterman, O29955, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Arthur James Watson, O29730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Edwin Courtney Shewbridge, Jr., O38745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harold Andrew Cassell, O29956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Alden Norell, O39838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Ralph Anthony Devine, O42202, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Paul Howard Raftery, O39839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ernest LeeRoy Ritchie, O29957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Harvey Sibbald, O29958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Thomas Johnson Henderson, O42203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harry Jarvis Engel, O39840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph Sullivan, Jr., O29961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph Agoa, O42205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clayton Wallace Wells, O29962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frank Henry Preston, Jr., O42206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Walter Lawrence Norfray, O51423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Harold Ralph Yeager, O29567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Charles Peter West, O29964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Angelo Michael Ricciardelli, O42208, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Charles Edwin Rust, O29965, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Robert Scott Cain, O42210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Prentiss Bishop Reed, Jr., O39841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Malcolm Wesley Courser, O42211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Hans Godfrey Jepson, O29966, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Herbert Gregory Lux, O42212, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Ralph Kenneth Johnson, O42213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Kenneth Paul Burns, O51426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. James Francis Adams, O29968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Delmer Pearl Anderson, O29969, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Argyle Phillips Jones, O39842, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Guy Vinton Miller, O42215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Franklin Riley Patterson, O38746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Frederick Miller Sperry, O51427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Wilmer Arthur Edge, Jr., O38747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Marcus William Heskett, O42218, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Reed Turman, O42217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. John Joseph Dalton, O42219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. James Noel Brewer, O42220, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Edward Philip Thomson, O29974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Harry Herman Bittner, O42221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. George Zinn Traeger, O51429, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Claude Elbert Ray, O51430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
×Maj. Fay Kenyon Green, O29976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Clarence Raphael Dunlap, O29975, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).
×Maj. Arnold Boogher, O39843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Joseph Edward Stannah, O29977, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Fred LeRoy Eaker, O42223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Roy Charles Baker, O29979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Paul Patrick Byrne, O51433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Jack Reeves Murphy, O51431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Maj. Frank Kellers, O51432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. John Phil Dicks, O29982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).
Lt. Col. Valentine Motte Barnes, Jr., O51434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Hensley Fulton, O29984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Leroy Lewis, O42224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dulaney Lee O'Roark, O29986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Earle Nelson, O51435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Reed, O51436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Armand Fulton, O42225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Peter, O29987, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Anthony Cain, O29988, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rafael Montilla, O51437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Warner Posse, O29989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter August Kneyse, O42227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harold Bach, O42228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Wesley Doverspike, O42229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtis Theodore Ricketts, O51438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Frederick Linthwaite, O29990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kenneth E. Fields, O18957, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wood Beeler, O18958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duncan Hallock, O18960, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Dodd Starbird, O18961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Douglas Matheson, O18962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Davis Meyer, O18963, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Joseph Lincoln, O18968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Campbell Tripp, O18972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward George Herb, O18973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. William Jonas Ely, O18974, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Honeycutt, O18975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Harris, O18976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gardner Shinkle, O18979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hoy D. Davis, Jr., O18982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Charles Davis, O18985, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellsworth Barricklow Downing, O18986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Amrine Turner, O18987, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Warren Gray, O18988, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Sherman Henry, O18989, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Orin Blandford, O18990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Adonis Downing, Jr., O18991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Cecil Lothrop, O18992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Crain Leslie, O18993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Watters, O18994, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Francis Joseph McMorrow, O18995, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Golding Dunn, O18996, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dabney Ray Corum, O19001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lauren Whitford Merriam, O19002, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert George Sparrow, O19003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wolcott Meals, O19005, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter August Jensen, O19006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bodeau, O19008, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Marion Humphries, O19012, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Denton Armitage, O19014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore John Conway, O19015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Elton LaDue, O19017, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Daniel, O19019, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Arthur Dahlen, O19020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Lane, O19021, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ira Whitehead Cory, O19025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William York Frentzel, O19026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Otto, O19030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lamar Cecil Ratcliffe, O19034, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Chapman, O19035, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Lawlor, O19036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Alfred McCrary, O19037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Parker, Jr., O19038, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Haskell Kibler, Jr., O19039, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Oswald Edwards, O19041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Zeller, O19043, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beall Franklin, O19046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Gordon Bartlett, O19047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Nelson Gillon, O19048, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Rudolf Walters, O19050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thorndike Ashworth, O19052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bruce Logan, O19053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lafar Lipscomb, Jr., O19054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Sheldon Tubbs, O19056, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Henry Kaesser, Jr., O19057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Charles Plapp, O19059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Joseph Henry O'Malley, O19061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hobart Chapman, Jr., O19064, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick William Guiney, Jr., O19066, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Thorlin, O19067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Harris Shepardson, O19068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Fritz, O19069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Worman Hain, O19072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Goyer Patterson, O19073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Lucken Jones, O19074, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Edward Maston, O19075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ethan Allen Chapman, O19076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, O19077, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Warren White, O19079, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Park, Jr., O19080, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverly DeWitt Jones, O19081, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hadley Richardson, Jr., O19082, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Roosevelt Brindley, O19087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Tague, O19090, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Leon Van Way, O19093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Chase, O19095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Virgil Adamson, O19096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Ferris, O19097, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Penn Thompson, O19098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Roland Klanderman, O19099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Merton Wallace, O19101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paul Whelihan, O19102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marshall Woodruff Frame, O19103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin George Speiser, O19104, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James Given, O19105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Avery John Cooper, Jr., O19107, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, O19109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hardin Leonard Olson, O19110, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cam Longley, Jr., O19112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Benton Neely, O19114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Henshaw Pope, O19115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Warren Stilwell, Jr., O19117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Robert Cyr, O19119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wilson Tyson, O19120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Menzie Pittman, O19121, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Allen Carver, O19122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph O'Connor, O19125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Rushmore Gretser, O19126, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sherburne Whipple, Jr., O19130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Collins Doleman, O19131, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Joseph Letzelter, O19132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Light Hine, O19134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Wallace Rudolph, O19135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Abell Cleveland, Jr., O19136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Powers 3d, O19137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joshua Robert Messersmith, O19139, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Tripp Evans, Jr., O19140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Martin Cahill, O19141, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Ryan, O19142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Skinner, O19144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Frank Kleitz, Jr., O19145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Thomas Carroll, O19146, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Meyer, O19147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randolph Whiting Fletter, O19148, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harlow Miles, Jr., O19151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Humbert Joseph Versace, O19152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Guest Smith, O19154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Baumer, O19155, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Pugh Pearson, Jr., O19157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Jacob Macherey, O19158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Alspaugh, O19159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Lorenzo Roberson, O19161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Edward Bastion, Jr., O19162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. Thomas Herbert Beck, O19164, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Evans Kaiser, O19165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Thomas Harris, O19166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gardner Wellington Porter, O19167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry William Sweeting, Jr., O19168, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyrus Abda Dolph 3d, O19170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Lindsay Richey, O19172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Bowes Evans, O19174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Andrew Fleckenstein, O19175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Gibney Rothwell, O19176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fant Damon, Jr., O19179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Clay Bridgewater, O19182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Mikell Clarke, O19183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Keith Johnson, O19187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Orr Boswell O19188, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Parker Gibbs, O19189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maddrey Allen Solomon, O19194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyle William Bernard, O19195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelby Francis Williams, O19196, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jean Evans Engler, O19198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Abner Huntsberry, O19200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Donald Stephenson, O19201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Graver Gilbert, O19202, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Laurence Elder, O19203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Cameron Cubbison, Jr., O19204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Amaury Manuel Gandia, O19205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harrold Bayne, O19207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gwinn Ulm Porter, O19210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Robert Zierath, O19211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hulburt Douglas, O19212, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Darnell, Jr., O19213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brice Crawford, O19215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Coleman 3d, O19216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wiltse Sellers, O19217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Gibb, O19222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Kemp Markle, Jr., O19223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Talbot 3d, O19226, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ellsworth Leydecker, O19227, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Andrew Miller, O19228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris King Henderson, O19230, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel O'Reilly, O19233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Ralston Fredendall, Jr., O19235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edson Schull, O19236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Reynolds, Jr., O19238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Graydon Casper Essman, O19242, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Franklin Akers, Jr., O19243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Leslie Bowen, Jr., O19244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duff Walker Sudduth, O19245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wagstaff, Jr., O19246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Rhoden Pritchard, O19248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Gee, O19251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alston Grimes, O19252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Otto Hartel, O19254, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Walter Parr, Jr., O19255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Roberts Calhoun, O19256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edson Duncan Raff, O19261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Braddock Degavre, O19262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Agin Bailey, O19264, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Newman Scoville, O19267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Field Due, O19268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Demosthenes Clainos, O19269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Schmelzer, O19270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Thomas Jellett, O19273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Remus, O19275, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Harrell, O19276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Allen Risden, O19278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Nelson Lonning, O19281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., O19282, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Wilson Quinn, O19283, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charner Weaver Powell, O19284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pearce Bellican, O19235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Spalding Ehlen, O19286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Tallant Kilday, O19288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Roberts Kimmell, Jr., O19291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Vernard Thompson, O19292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wilkinson Rayburn, O19295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emmanuel Salvador Cepeda, O19297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kimball Clay Smith, O29882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Harper Rogers, O29992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Marquette, O42231, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gus Hugh Montgomery, 29993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Colella Evans, O42233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Delos Losey, O42235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alanson Tyler Leland, O42236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Sidney Britt, Jr., O42237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ernest Harrison, O29991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duff Green, Jr., O42239, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Harper Pryor, O29996, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Lewis Seeger, O29997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Franklin Decker, O29999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Luther Wilkin, Jr., O39847, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melville Hulbert Griffith, O39846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilbur Barker 2d, O30001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hughe Doyle Coleman, O39848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Arrington Middlebrooks, O51440, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Jay Nichols, O30003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Curren, Jr., O33749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mary Woestenburg, O30004, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Taylor Miller, O30006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Anthony McGuire, O51443, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Bohrer Thrift, O39849, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kurt Ladislaus Walitschek, O42241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Peter Georges, O42242, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Le Page Beauchamp, O51444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Seney Ballagh, O30009, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Porter Snooks, Jr., O30011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Cornelius Kelleher, O38750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harland Stuart, O42244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel David Mack, Jr., O30015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elbridge Leroy Brubaker, O51445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Penaat, O29598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Jackson Carson, O51446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reginald Conklin Miller, O26375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Pitzer, O26378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Alexandre Guimond, O26379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wesley Booth, O26382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Charles Buser, O42246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrian Leonard Hoebeke, O19334, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry von Kolnitz, O30018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Truden, O42248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Cantey, O30019, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Soares, O30020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Stark, O51448, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Snelson Neill, O51447, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Glover Lewis, O42250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Angelo Domenic Bollero, O39853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jacob Berkowitz, O39854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Maguire, O42251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Taft Stump, O30023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Evans, O30025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ambelten Mangles Ahrens, O30026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Louis Rehmann, O30027, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Ripley Lodge, O42252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hamilton Davin, O42253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luigi Francis Claps, O39855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Wesley Darrah, O30029, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Victor Smith, O30030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harry Van Dine, O30032, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Calvin Lambert, O30033, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Augustus Wingo, O51451, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Gaul Merritt, O42255, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ralph Yancey, O42256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Conners, O30034, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Kabrich, O39856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Reeves Maddox, O30036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew Williams, O42257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irving Haumerson Eales, O38751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jennings Pritchard, O42258, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alton Dresser, O30037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Presley Horton, O42259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon William Cox, O51453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Edward Spitzer, O30039, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry W. Cooper, O42261, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Norton, Jr., O42262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eual Wister Culbertson, O42263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Lemon Young, O51455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Frederick Clark, O30040, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Conrad Mullen, O51456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Rambo Dale, O39857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Earle Echols, O42265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rhoman Edward Clem, O51457, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Cesario Granzin, O30041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Holley Johnson, O30042, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julius Theodore Dargusch, O51459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold Dicks, O30043, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Edwards, O42267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Moore Markley, O38752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Augustus Weaver, O30044, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmore Patrick Moore, O51460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Marshall Richardson, O42269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gail Addison Eaton, O42268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Arnold Mathewson, Jr., O38753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brookman Renninger Painter, O38754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Terrance Marshall Longacre, O30047, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Troth, O42270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Oliver Rishoi, O51462, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Theodore Glen, O29953, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Glen, O30049, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Garland Guthrie, O30050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Hall Forcum, O51464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Louis Lash, O42272, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Morse Johnson, O39858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Regis Whitlo Luke, O39859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dave John Cook, O30051, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Shaw Sabine, O39860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Donald DeMarr, O42273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Chapman Coleman, Jr., O30053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Llewellyn Stewart, O42274, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin George Tieman, Jr., O30303, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Frederick Hein, O51467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Gilbert Spinney, O30054, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Heck, O51469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Laron Street, O30055, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Werlen Franklin Cheney, O42276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray William Whitson, O30056, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Aubrey Ranney, O39863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey James Yost, O42277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Boynton Lininger, O30059, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Orsen Branch, O42279, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Fuller Allen, O30060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Otto Frederick Sonneman, Jr., O42280, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Asbury Haines Jackson, O29629, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifton Frank Nooncaster, O30061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burdwell Hoyt Shipe, O30065, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mitchell Franklin, O39864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton LaFayette Johnson, O42284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Halbert Jennings Slagle, O39865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Painter, O56813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Tyra Stafford, O39866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ivan Orville Walt, O42286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arles Henry Miller, O42287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Franklin Metcalf, O42288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Elsbree Higgins, O39867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Colonel Edwin William Grenelle, O38757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Griffith Johnson, O38756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Jenkins Butler, O30068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Leslie Chenault, O30069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Cecil Hines, O42289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Hatch Haines, O39868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winston Lewis Field, O39869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Hardman, O30072, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtiss Welt Oakes, O51471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Hamilton Bolton, O39870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wayne Coffman, Jr., O42293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Hampton, O30073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Arthur Hamilton, O42294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Amoroso, O30076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Anderson Smith, O30079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Dake Chilson, O39871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilbert Proctor Dubia, O39872, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Auspitz, Jr., O30081, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Hardy Duerson, O30084, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clifton Howell, Jr., O30085, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Patterson Streetman, O30086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Robert Osborne, O42299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adam Watts Meetze, O30087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Clayton Hanson, O39873, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alvin Bergmann, O42300, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Peter Rinque, O39874, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Roy Miller, O51472, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Leroy Tjostem, O30089, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Watson Sylvester, O51473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Monas Nathan Squires, O38758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Frick, O42303, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Philip Hendricks, O42302, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arvine Walter McElroy, O30093, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edwin Routh, O39875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Martin McGrail, O39876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon David Gladding, O30095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Edward Daehler, O42304, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Harley Anderson, O30096, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ervin Daniel Karl Hoehne, O39878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merwin Bishop Forbes, O30097, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Leo Orton, O42306, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Billings, O30098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Stacus Tennant, O51474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Harry Kern, O42309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Earl Dorsey, O30100, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Powhida, O51475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elwood Voorhees, O30101, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Hawley Jones, O30102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, O30103, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore August Rathje, O42311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nelson Isaac Decker, O30105, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Henry Snyder, O30106, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor Morgan Ryan, O42312, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edwin Hisle, O51476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Evert Spencer Thomas, Jr., O30107, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Howard Willoughby, O30108, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Leonard Clinebell, O30109, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Millard Shaw, O42313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clark Webber, O30111, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Terry Bill, O30112, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold David Blair, O51477, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Hastings Wrightson, O38879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Gabriel Villere, O42520, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Arthur Briggs, O42315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Jackson Woolley, O51478, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pasquale Pietro Maiorano, O42316, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dana Emerson Smith, O38759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Archer Young, O51479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Kenneth Hughes, O38708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Llewellyn Corey, O56814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Leroy Mennie, O39880, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank John Culley, O30117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Abner Stanley, O30118, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Russell Reifsnyder, O39881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Martin Bradley, Jr., O42318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Lester Lewis, O30119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph James Griffin, O39882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Usera, O39883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ramon Antonio Sandin, O39884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mervin C. Bowers, O42319, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Snowden Mathews, O30121, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John David George, O30122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Arthur Augustus Weinland, O30123, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gustaf Adolph Engstrom, O30124, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Hawkins Horton, O30125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gines Perez, O30126, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Perry Henderson, O51483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius James Rinker, O30129, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Donald Kamy, O42321, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle John Senn, O42322, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Shoemaker, O30133, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron Edward Williams, O30134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Langley White, O39885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Hammonds, O51486, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harold McCreary, O42324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Thomas McElroy, O30135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hartley Fuller Dame, O51487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Huse Pray, O39886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Andrew Seitz, O30137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kershaw Lee, Jr., O30136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Ansel Gaston, O30138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Larry James O'Neil, O38761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn E. Nida, O30140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Angus Sanders, O51489, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtis Moultry Banks, O30143, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Quincy Bass, O39888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fitzhugh Horton Chandler, O42328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Le Roy Fincher, O30145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Marshall Johnson, O42329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Richard Blankenship, O42330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Andrew Hunt, O39889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William James, O30146, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Albert Lucke, O42331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frank Mallalieu, O42333, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rodgers Clifton, O30148, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Saenz, O38762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Jay Jewett, O39890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Arthur Minot, O42335, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Paul Coleman, O42336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William M. Campbell, O42337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emanuel Martin Robertson, O30149, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Graham Hanley, O30150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald MacGlashan MacWillie, O30152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Painter Osborne, O30151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Bradley Smith, O51491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Courtland Forrest Brittain, O42341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Edward Miller, O30156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelly Prusher Myers, Jr., O30157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stewart Hood Knowlton, O30159, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Arthur Shaw, O42343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Terry DeJarnette, O42344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Russell Spillman, O42345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Oliver Cromwell, O42346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Woodard Smiley, O30160, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alexander Mowery, O51492, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stephens Neel, O51493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mason French Goodloe, O30161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lund Foster Hood, O39892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Bender, O30162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Chester Bucher, O51494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugo George Goetz, Jr., O39894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Ernest Akans, O39893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merwin Howard Smith, O42349, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Harvey Harrelson, O42350, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Edward Wellendorf, O29538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Bradley Roelofs, O38764, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Doyle Nutt, O30164, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Richards Hubbard, Jr., O30165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stuart Meredith Cox, O39896, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Coward O51495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas O'Neill, O30166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Joseph McGowan, O42353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Theodore Grenier, O30167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Henry Keyes, O38765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Guy Anthony Orsino, O30168, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John McDonald, O30169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hawley Hayden, O42356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dudley Clark Breckenridge, O39897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Forrest Phillips, O30170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Richard Nagel, O30171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Harper, O51497, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gus Spiece Zinnecker, O42357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Bochnowski, O51498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Thomas Kent, Jr., O30172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erman Milford Newman, O30173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Massingale, O51499, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Wadsworth Eddington, O30174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Carrithers Threlkeld, O51501, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest August Benser, O42360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Sheets Hoff, O38766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frank Day, Jr., O51502, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Edwin Long, O30176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Ray Ewing, O42362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Victor Blaser, O42364, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Byron Feindel, Jr., O30177, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertram Howard Johnson, O51503, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Roper, O42365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Alexander Murray, Jr., O42366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ralph Turner, O39899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Williamson, O30178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rubert Daniel Chapman, O42367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilton George Gaefe, O30179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert McFarland Mouk, O42368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Lewis Boyd, O30180, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Ludman Stevens, O51506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Elmer Brown, Jr., O39900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Ernst Messner, O30181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Charles Alexander, Jr., O39901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elverson Earl Baker, O30183, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Christ Petros, O30184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Roy Ridlehuber, O39902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nelson Swartz, O39903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Martin Ernst, O42371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Embree Ensign Reynolds, O51507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Tabor Martin, O30188, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon William Rice, O30189, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merrill LeRoy Tribe, O42374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Martin Hurst, O30191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dominic Limoncelli, O42375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bernard McNally, O30192, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major George Edward Crane, O42377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ervin Huneycutt, O29946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major Townsend Canfield Anderson, O30195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Brogan, O30194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Buie Hess, O42379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Luther Ford, O38767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Murthas Jones, O30197, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Leonard Reed, O42380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Marx Stiebel, O30198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Manfred Jacques Haas, O30200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gustive Schepp, O42382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Blanchard Jeffery, O30201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis LeVerl Flamm, O42384, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Glenn Goodhand, Jr., O51511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Winfield Mize, O30204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Gordon Harton, O42385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Cooper Bush, O30205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harlan William Hendrick, O30208, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Webb, O30207, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edmund Trail, O30206, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Fredrick Ryan, O30213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Roy Taylor, O42387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Johnston Preston, Jr., O42388, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Albert McEachern, O39907, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willard Caughron, O51513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clayton Parry, O39908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald George Dow, O42389, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clewis Clayton Moffett, O39909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis Moynahan, Jr., O30210, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lennart Yngve Ohlsson, O30211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick McGovern, O42391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Blaire Aloysius Froehle, O42392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clair M. Worthy, O39911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Troy Alton Barker, O42394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harper Brown Cowles, O51515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Levin, O39912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Edward Baker, O42395, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Raymond Riley, O38768, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thornton Eugene Jones, O30214, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert B. Evans, O30215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John McBride, O30216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osmyn Arsene Vining, O42398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seaborn Hawes Mosely, O42399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Buford Pack, O51517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Boyce, O42402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Lee Johnson, O30219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Karl Pratt, O51519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Ernest Bellamy, O30220, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Cad Luna, O42403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Aubrey Locke, O29967, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Danna Lee Lane, O51520, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Harper, Jr., O42404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Murphy, O30222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Grant Harrison, O51522, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Marvin Larner, O30223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sam James Rasor, O38769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Stock Himes, O30224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maskell Edward Brown, O39914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Walden Phillips, O42407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Anthony Sabatelli, O51525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Kelly Blair, O51526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lewis Willey, O42408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vancel Ritson Beck, O30233, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Lincoln Nelson, O30232, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Paul Curtin, O30231, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Noble DeVaney, O38770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Louis Ryan, Jr., O30234, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McNamara, O51528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Veeder Miller, O30235, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Augustus Deagle, O30237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Freebairn Jackson, O51529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Constantine Vardas, O30236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Dale Malen, O42410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Courtland Parks, Jr., O30238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Oscar Pond, O42412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Renwick Seymour, O38772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Douglas Cornell, O51531, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Barry, O39916, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Hudson Vail, O51533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Garfield Wobbeking, O42417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Franklin True, O38773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Emmett Ashburn Morgan, O51535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverly Matthews Leigh, Jr., O39917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold John Pearson, O42418, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Louis Hart, O30241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frederick Kuster, O42419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick George Ward, O39918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Vincent Holly, O42420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Michael Clisson, O30243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Tank, O19350, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas DeForth Rogers, O19351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Erlenkotter, O19354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Staunton Lindsley Brown, O19356, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Moser Sieg, O19357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Julian Tate, O19359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Blodgett Bruce, O19360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert George MacDonnell, O19361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Leon Andrews, O19363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Jackson Renfroe, Jr., O19364, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joslin Himes, O19365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beauchamp Miller, O19366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Fell, O19368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Rea Revie, O19369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ochsenschlager Killian, O19370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Heber Lipscomb, O19371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Walsh, O19372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Wortham Betts, O19373, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Page Buehler, O19374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Irving Gilman, O19377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Butler Warren, O19380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilford Edward Harry Voehl, O19382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jonathan Owen Seaman, O19385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit LeVelle Davis, O19386, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Oakes Davis, O19387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Julius Jablonsky, O19390, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Urquhart Pullen Williams, O19391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Samuel Peca, O19392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ringo Moorman, O19394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Oscar Baker, O19396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hicks Anderson, O19398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Severin Richard Beyma, O19399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Beehler Bunker, O19402, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Frelinghuysen Hoffman, O19403, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Birkett Chatfield, O19404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry White, Jr., O19407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mathew Valois Pothier, O19410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Sylvester Piram, O19411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Adams, O19412, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Almon White Manlove, O19413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John DuVal Stevens, O19414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Yale Harold Wolfe, O19415, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Farnsworth Smoller, O19416, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Craig Smyser, O19417, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Kemble, Jr., O19418, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Richardson Hester, O19419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gersen Leo Kushner, O19420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Edward Weber, Jr., O19421, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Charles Davall, O19425, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Delbert Womack, O19426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gardner Baker, O19427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ronald LeVerne Martin, O19428, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wadsworth Hill, O19430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Donald Oliver Vars, O19432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry William Ebel, O19434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Belmont Routh, O19437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Carl Miller, O19438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Travis Ludwell Petty, O19439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Peter James Kopcsak, O19440, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Griffith Finkenaur, O19441, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Scott Penn, Jr., O19442, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Willoughby Moorman, O19444, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Lake Sanders, O19445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merlin Louis DeGuire, O19446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander James Stuart, Jr., O19447, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Percy Thomas Hennigar, O19450, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Riffel Kenerick, O19452, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Lee McKee, O19453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Howard Garrett Fuller, O19190, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stacy William Gooch, O19455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clark Lynn, Jr., O19456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo William Henry Shaughnessey, O19458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Jenkins Hubbard, O19459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Knox Yarbrough, Jr., O19460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Free Surratt, O19461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Morris Howard, O19464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Graham Warner, O19466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Patterson Mossman, O19469, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Bahr, O19470, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Carter Norvell, O19471, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walker Darrah, Jr., O19473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hawkins Adams, O19474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Glover McLennan, O19475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Franklin, Jr., O19476, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Gilmore Bilbo, Jr., O19477, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Berton Everett Spivy, Jr., O19479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stilson Hilton Smith, Jr., O19480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Alonzo Cunin, O19481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Eugene Wood, O19483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredric Carson Cook, O19484, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Elmer Fellenz, O19485, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Percival Stanley Brown, O19487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Clary Foote, O19488, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bernadou Elliott, Jr., O19490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Winn, O19491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Henry Heyne, O19493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Evans Lardin, O19494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Colonel Charles Herbert Wood, O19498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dana Watterson Johnston, Jr., O19506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Murray Cheston 3d, O19507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Edward Still, O19510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Guldlin Simenson, O19511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Caufield, O19515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Snee, O19516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dudley Wilmeth, O19519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Lester Hillyard, O19524, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hutcheson Craig, O19526, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Doak McKinney, O19529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Johnson, O19534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carson Kyser, O19535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dixon Lawlor, O19536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell William Volckmann, O19537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Linscott Durfee, O19538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hallett Daniel Edson, O19541, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Rusteberg, O19542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Trueheart Gould, O19544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Webb Browning, O19545, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Hadley Andrae, O19546, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Northam, O19547, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lowe Eatman, O19548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Berchman Stanley, O19549, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Brown, O19552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Plummer Ward, 3d, O19553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Buchanan Wells, O19554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Adams McPheron, O19555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Hogan Hayes, O19556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Conly Brookhart, O19562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Messmore O'Connell, O19563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Walker Jenna, O19564, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerhard Leroy Bolland, O19565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Bentley Kern, O19566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Alfred Walsh, Jr., O19567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Horner Gerhart, O19569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Andrew McCrary, O19570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John George Benner, O19571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Travis Tabor Brown, O19574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Gantt Hickman, O19575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alexander Cunningham, 3d, O19579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Meade Julian Dugas, O19582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Almon O'Neil, O19583, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emory Alexander Lewis, O19584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Mullen, Jr., O19586, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hammond Waugh, Jr., O19587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Neilson, O19588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Hector McKinnon, O19590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dennis John McMahon, O19592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James O'Hara, O19593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nabors Tyson, O19594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Buchanan Richardson, Jr., O19596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion George Stewart, Jr., O30244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Shirley Guy Blencoe, O30245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harry Reynolds, O39919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Clark Wilson, O30248, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Henry Naughton, O51536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John O'Connell, O42422, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clark Graham Campbell, O38774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ferdinand Schmidt, O42423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Valleau Rathbone, Jr., O42424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Page Harrison Slaughter, O30250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fredrick Stein, O51538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Edgar Yanka, O30252, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Gregory Ford, O38775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Grady Hattox, O30253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Fillmore, O30254, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hal Peter Andersen, O39920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Eugene Foster, O30256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marzelle Freeman Boyd, O39921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald King Gifford, O51539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Barney McGary, O51540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walter Finn, O30257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Patrick Joyce, Jr., O42426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Roy Falke, O51542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Paul Ireland, O51543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Thomas Trial, O30259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ford Elliott Allcorn, O51544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bishop Crossman, O42428, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Franklin Morris Fliniau, O30263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neal Woodrow Harper, O30262, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harlow Engle Allen, O39922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Robert Richmond, O30265, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robley Dunglison Evens, O39924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Clark Harvey, O38776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Escudé, O30519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bascomb Miller, O30266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Henry Burd, O42434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Norby, O51548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Myron Alley, O30268, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Owen Thomas McCloskey, O30269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Kilbourne Eggleston, Jr., O30271, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth William Gillespie, O30273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle Fillmore Mitchell, O30272, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Walter Edwards, O30274, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard John Grondona, O42439, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Roscoe Brickles, O30278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Jay Banigan, O42443, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Devon Jackson, O51555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wentworth Hamilton Taylor, Jr., O30280, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Christopher Jesse, O42446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Godbey, O30281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Miller Davis, O30282, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Montgomery Arnold, O30283, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Lewis De Haas, O30284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin Brem Gardner, O38777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic Donald Ray, O51553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Dill Raney, O30285, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Richard Hershey, O30286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stuart Wilkes, O30288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ferdinand Vering, O30289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Goddard Foster, O30291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Charles Bass, O30292, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thaddeus William Drobek, O42453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Martin Nawrocky, O30293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Oscar Rooney, O42454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Henry Watson, O42458, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Kreigh Moody, O38778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Farles Pindar, O42463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Archibald Douglass, O30296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilfred Knobeloch, O42464, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claudius Albert Beall, Jr., O39931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sanford Joseph Butler, O30297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Henry, O30299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Robert Sievers, O30298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philo Milton Baumgartner, O38780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Pongonis, O30301, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Arthur Miner, O39933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Anthony Stahl, O39934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Pinkerton Litz, O30304, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holman Don Hoover, O30305, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Buckley Melody, O38782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Emmett Rochford, O30307, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Edwards, O30309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Andrew Taylor, O51566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lee Ferguson, O30046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Foley, O42474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Patrick Miller, O42475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Donald Peterson, O30311, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Louis Davids, O38783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur John Cornelson, O51567, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Edgar Willis, O30313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max James Roadruck, O42479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Edward McMaken, O30318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Parker Barnett, O38784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry William Berry, O42480, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin William Saurel, O42482, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Frank Blackmon, O51569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allen Noel, O51570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis M. Etherton, O39940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Tilden McDowell, Jr., O30321, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Devitt Edmunds, O30323, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Delio Perez, O30324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Eugene Stevenson, O38785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Douglas Middleton, O30329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Hand, O30328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Rhea, O30327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Jogl, O30330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willice Edgar Groves, O30075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Maguire, O30332, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Bennett Laugerman, O30333, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Floyd Pegran, O42487, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Edward Steck, O42490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Edward Sullo, O42491, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Wilson, O42494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lynn Hubert Webb, O39946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Charles Gill, O42495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilton Briggs Moats, O30336, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dasher Shearouse, O30337, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Wiltrakis, O51575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Erwin Hyde, O51576, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo George Woerner, O30341, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Gustav Thomas, O30344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Donald Hoisington, O30348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manlius Rupert Stewart, O42503, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul William Albert, O42507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Taplin Scott, O30351, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Drexel Morgan, O42508, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Emil Lange, O30353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis William Anderson, O30354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Curtis Chedister, O30355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Deaderick Willoughby, O38787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice E. Webb, O30357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Walter Bidwell, O29508, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Alexander Wilson, O30359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Sage Hahn, O56815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John D'Alessandro, O42510, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Helmer Hallden, O30360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. Harrell Glenn Hall, O51530, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale D. Dixon, O38788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Honald Noel Maidt, O42513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robbins, O42512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Conrad Howard, O42515, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nyles Wesley Baltzer, O51581, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilber Alexander Stevens, O30365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Bowen Potter, O30366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Homer Stephens, O30367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Wagner, O42518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Matthew Flint, O42519, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Lindsay Hall, O51584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert William Lockridge, O42524, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Frederick Zinser, O30370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Preston Miller Motes, O30372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Calvin Neely, O30374, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Peter Carberry, O38789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Verner Burke, O38790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Carl Feil, O30379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alexander Cawlfield, O30378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edgar Mickel, O38793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Helmer August Holmstrom, O30382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilton Louis Sanders, O38794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Hert, O39952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Edwin Towne, O30385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Barney Oldfield, O42532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas McKee, O30383, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Scott Hays, O42534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Wesley Gontrum, O51596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted James Madden, O42537, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Glenn Neely, O42538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Gordon Brown, O42539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Adams Little, O39956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Glenn Lang, O51600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Wilson Pine, O30392, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Edward Burns, O30394, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Peters, O39961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Carl Garrison, O30144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morton Albert Rubin, O39962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Milton Hamilton, O30338, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas John Trainor, O51604, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl McClellan Poston, O30400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Frith Bienvenu, O30401, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eugene Byrns, O51606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Robert Berricklow, O56816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Garnett Steffey, O30404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton Adolph Waggoner, O42552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Alexander Persell, O51608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Hermann Dahmlow, O30406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Chandler Dodenhoff, O30407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mario De Maio, O30399, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leniel Edward McDonald, O30408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Mudgett, O30409, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edwin Jennings, O39964, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Clifford Peterson, O42555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ivor Jones, O30410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Duncan Goodall, O30411, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Levis Chalmers Wiggins, O42556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Russell Powell, O30414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Herbert Mahoney, O51613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward William Quinlan, O51617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond George Trampe, O42561, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Walter Brugger, O39966, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Bolling Seay, O30420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Jefferson Hornaday, O30423, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Balthasar Steiner, O51622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Edwin Johnston, O30424, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arent Orvil Wiken, O30426, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Archie Cheatham, O30427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Shelley, O42571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Cornelius Culbreth, O30429, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Chester Malcolm Stratton, O30431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nathan McQuade Quinn, O42574, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kennard Smith Vandergrift, O42575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Edward McClish, O30432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Coates, O30433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wilkens Burnett, O42578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Floyd Eason, O30435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Henry Overby, O30437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Hudson Newton, O42579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Colvin, O30434, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Albert Hauck, O30436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Prokop, Jr., O38797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dick Andrew King, O30438, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Morgan Barnes Heasley, O30175, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Tracy Gerard, O30445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy George DeVecchio, O42584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Richard Bech, O42585, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur von Molt DeLoach, O30449, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Joe Dyekman, O30455, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Emmanuel Fernandez, O30454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Earl McKenzie, O39967, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wilkes May, O39968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jefferson Rueben Cronk, O30461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Wilson Johnston, O30462, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Rossing, O42593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Leland Motz, O42596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward McClam Foxworth, O42598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Andres Troy, O42597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grant W. Mason, O30738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Allen Darden, Jr., O42599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Condon, O39972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Hugh Moore, O42602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Charles Nauman, O30467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry McCann, Jr., O30468, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Lucien Fortin, O42605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edwin Skelly, O30473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Kimball, O42607, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jacob Fargo Wagner, O30475, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Brooks, Jr., O38801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Blaine Frastus Anderson, O39976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Shadrick Turner, O51632, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Wendell Caron, O30479, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Barton Emmons, O39979, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Samuel Mathes, O30481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Justin William Stoll, O30483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Jerome Newman, O51635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph T. Mozley, O42611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Lyle Barnett, O30489, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert Kirkman Whaley, O42612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James George Basbas, O42354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Stevens Hardiman, O30492, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver O. Dixon, O30494, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Roberts, O30493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herrick Franklin Bearce, O30498, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Francis Lovell, O42616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jenkins Badger, O39981, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Ballentine, O39983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Frederick Hansen, O42618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Lawrence Weinerth, O42620, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Byron Baker, O30239, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Slaughter Carpenter, O42622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Garlen Randolph Bryant, O30507, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Holbrook, O51646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Lester Lewis, O42628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Drake Bristor, O19710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Abeel Phelan, O19711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aaron Evan Harris, O19712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Hamilton Gregg, O19713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Campbell Wallace, O19715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Houston Frye, Jr., O19716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Caran Gee, O19717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Allen Elliget, O19719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Calhoun Zeigler, O19720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Joseph Pickard, O19723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Jacob Rohde, O19725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Somers Buist Dick, O19726, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Winston Lapsley, O19727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James DeVore Lang, O19728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Jephthiah Jeffus, O19730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Lewis Hille, Jr., O19731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ruhlen, O19733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelis DeWitt Willcox Lang, O19734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Richards Parker, O19735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Carl Haug, O19736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Sutton Growdon, O19737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Duffy, O19738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Sylvester Everett, O19739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Watkins Miller, O19740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Salvatore Andrew Armogida, O19741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Paulding Grieves, O19742, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Tage Birger Johnson, O19743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Sanders Waterman, O19746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Benjamin Hall, Jr., O19747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Langfitt Bowditch Wilby, O19748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dudley Cole, Jr., O19749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Raymond Wilkins, O19750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry James Lewis, O19751, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Symroski, O19753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Chaffee Thayer, O19754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Yeates Adams, O19755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Jacob Lemley, Jr., O19756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duncan Sinclair, O19757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Geoffrey Dixon Ellerson, O19759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Allen Pillivant, O19761, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellery Willis Niles, O19763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Stafford Eckhardt, O19766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Dolliver Robbins, O19769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney George Spring, O19770, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Stephen Bechtold, O19771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seth Lathrop Weld, Jr., O19772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Clare Rumsey, O19774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel John Murphy, O19776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Bidgood, O19777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Albert Simpson, O19778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Durward Ellsworth Breakefield, O19781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Welsh Horstman, O19783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Kelso Gordon Clow, O19784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Porter van Ormer, O19787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Kraus, O19789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Irwin Curtis, O19790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Charles Moore, O19791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alexis Gloriod, O19793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Nathaniel Macon Martin, O19794, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Salathiel Fred Cummings, Jr., O19796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Martin Worthington, O19797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Donohue, O19798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clarence McDonald, Jr., O19799, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Waters Keating, O19800, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Halford Robert Greenlee, Jr., O19801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Robert St. John, O19805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Frederick Brown, O19806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard George Root, O19807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Maclean Peeke, O19810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Boyd Firehock, O19812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Lawrence Rosen, O19814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Mobley Kimbrough, Jr., O19816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ralph Wright, Jr., O19817, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Barnwell Harden, Jr., O19818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Moseley Harris, O19819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Luke Frink, Jr., O19821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer John Gibson, O19822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julius Desmond Stanton, O19823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Bryde, O19825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Washington Woodyard, Jr., O19826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Gilbert Fries, O19827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Rich Hale, O19828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Frederick Leonard, Jr., O19829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frank Skells, O19830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seneca Wilbur Foote, O19833, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Willoughby Totten, O19834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Henry Walter, O19836, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Curtis Wells, Jr., O19838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Melroy Miner, O19839, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nevin Howell, O19840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hamilton Austin Twitchell, O19843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Ashman, O19846, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dyce Alger, O19848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., O19849, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ewing Chase Johnson, O19851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Johnstone Murdoch, Jr., O19853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pennock Hoyt Wollaston, O19854, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Theodore Isham, O19856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Mark McGoldrick, O19857, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilhelm Cunliffe Freudenthal, O19858, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John Alfrey, O19859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Rieber Russ, O19860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Dilley, O19861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Charles Orth, Jr., O19863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Duncan Gillis, O19864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Autrey Joseph Maroun, O19865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Clay Taylor, O19867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Cobb Stancook, O19870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Brown Morgan, O19871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Henry Wiechmann, O19874, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Foster Rhoades, O19875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Oglesby, O19877, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Calvin Stapleton, O19878, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Vincent Martz, O19879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Arvid Skinrood, O19882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Maurice Cox, O19883, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Crook Anderson, O19884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hart Caughey, O19885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Thomas Cherry, Jr., O19888, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Joseph Treacy, Jr., O19892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Henry Tucker 3d, O19894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Genier Proctor, O19895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Hardic Walker, O19898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clair Beverly Mitchell, O19899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Williamson, O19900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Duzzette Farnsworth, Jr., O19904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wythe Gleaves Rich, O19910, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald William Bernier, O19911, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Bower, O19912, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Harvey Foreman, O19913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Garfield Pratt, O19915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Cole, O19917, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward William Sawyer, O19918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bradford Means, O19920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gibson Sherrard, Jr., O19922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Boyle, O19924, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Disbrow Cocheu, O19925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin White Heckemeyer, O19930, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nassieb George Bassitt, O19931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Rawles Bowyer, O19934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John James Davis, O19935, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Basil Edwards, O19936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Eugene Tucker, O19938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Kirk duMoulin, O19943, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Edward Bare, Jr., O19944, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul James Bryer, O19947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burnis Mayo Kelly, O19950, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lester Lewes Wheeler, O19951, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carmon Ambrose Rogers, O19952, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Batch Smith, O19953, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Samuel Griffin, O19954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Hayden Agnew, O19956, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Leroy Thomas, O19958, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Lynn Hawkins, O19960, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Per Ramee, O19961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Hood Ferris, O19962, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Madison Jones, O19965, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Louis McGehee, O19969, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Graham Barnwell, Jr., O19589, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Albert Riemenschneider, O19970, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Pierce O'Neal, Jr., O19971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Place Hill, Jr., O19972, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melville Brown Coburn, O19973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Bonesteel Stone, O19976, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Osborn Lashley, O19982, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Thomas Robert Clarkin, O19983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Pope Blackshear, O19984, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George August Meidling, O42634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edward Lucas Austin, O38805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Henry Elges, Jr., O30511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Orth Beckner, O30512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland James Halada, O42635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip MacGregor Judson, O30516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Olin Hoffman, O30517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Flores Punsalan, O42639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hamilton Colwell, O42640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Humphrey Price, O30518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clinton Whicher, O39986, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard William Bowden, O42642, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Loring Driscoll, O30525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Elbert Von Kaenel, O30527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Joseph O'Connor, O51654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Nason Walker, Jr., O51655, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Chesley Harris, O30529, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Allen Gross, O30528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Porter Grant, O42646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Wilhelm Reisner, O51656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Knight Britton, O30532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul James Ritchie, O38808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Luther Elman Johnson, O30535, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Millard G. Bowen, Jr., O30536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orval Calvin Thompson, O30539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Hull Mapes, O30538, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neal Wallace Lovsnes, O30540, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Wilson, O30542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Schermerhorn Markham, O20073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Edward Gidinsky, O30543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Vernon Munson, O42654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Merle Garretson, O38809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Nicholas Nahas, O39990, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alvin Pace, O30552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sture Alexander Ansel, O30554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinrich Gary Schumann, O39991, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lowell Traxler Bondshu, O51670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Fox Astrella, O42656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pat M. Stevens 3d, O30557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Hewitt, O30558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Ivy Davis, O42658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Wyttenbach Ewbank, Jr., O30474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Smith, O30559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merlin Oscar Tryon, O38810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Hamilton Miller, O39992, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert French Evans, O42662, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rellie Weldon Adams, O42663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Merriweather Smith, O39993, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leslie Calhoun, O42664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Byrd Gall, O30563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Benson Alexander, O30565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ramon Carl Dougan, O30566, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erdie Otis Lansford, O30569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lucian Ward, O38811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Fenton McFeely, O38812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Schnee Messec, O51682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Coile A. Quinn, O30571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bennett Goodwin, O30573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Whitwell Bowman, O38813, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles MacKinnon Ackley, O39997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Morgan Johnson, O30577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Armel Dyer, O42674, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Entricen Townsend, O30578, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lewis Schaefer, O39999, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fay Edward Joseph Carey, O38814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Everett Holman, O38815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arland Eugene Bigelow, O51687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Barton McMath, Jr., O42678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Stevens, O38816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irwin Thomas Shaw, O42679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Russell Gilbert, O51689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guinn Burch Goodrich, O42680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Wenzel Correll, O30582, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Bieri, O42682, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gus Edward Lehmann, O40001, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Gerson Haskell, O30588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wells Vance, O51693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lamoreaux Warfield, O30590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Neal Clark, O42690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herman Bosbyshell, O30596, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Maxwell McClain, O42693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Brown Richardson, O30597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Beatty Woodbury, Jr., O30598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winston Butscher, O30599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harrison Hines Finlayson, O42697, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Ashenfelder, O40008, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lawrence MacKusick, O42695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Deason, O30601, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Spencer Simcox, O30602, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Paul Mulrooney, O42699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Walter Burkett, O30603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Elhannon White, O42700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gilbert Turner, O31414, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roberts Homer Billingsley, O30608, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Law Poole, Jr., O30606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Eugene Michael Lill, O40011, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Paul Flanagan, O30609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Giles Henry Gere, O51707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Murphy Murray, O30610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrian Johansson, O51710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milburn Neil Huston, O30612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Lassetter, Jr., O51714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Donald McPhail, O30613, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Raber, O30614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Larned Eastmond, O40013, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Armington Baldry, O30615, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Cornelius Taylor, O30616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Eugene Pons, O30621, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lennard Charles Sorensen, O42710, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Lawrence Williams, O30622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Miles Albert Kinley, O51718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Massie Throckmorton, O42711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Edward Kendall, O30623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Wesley Philpot, O30627, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Warren Horton, O30626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Yates Farrell, O30628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Richard Guehring, O51723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edgar Baker, O42714, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman William Dammer, O30634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Douglas Edgar, O30635, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Warren Schroder, O30637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Keith Olson, O30640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Brinsmead, O42715, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Joseph Matkovcik, O30641, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Cogswell Higley, O38821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving William Finberg, O42716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Scott, O42718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Warwick King, O30646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Earl Sheen, O40015, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Halsell Reynolds, O42721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry William Meinecke, O42722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Bill Bassett Hunkapiller, O40016, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Allen Rawley, O30648, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ambrose Thomas McGuckian, O42725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orvie Palmer Anderson, O42727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredolin William Kuhn, O51734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Radam, O51736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Byron Gregory, O51737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Winston Langley, O30649, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dillard Land, O30650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Raymond Cupello, O38822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stafford Ashley Cooper, O42730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Oliver Fudge, O30652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Franklin Wells, O30654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Lee Freshwater, O51739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harrison Dixon, O42733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Graham Roy Evans, O30656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isadore Benjamin Burdick, O42735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Allen Miller, O40018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Blair O'Connor, O51740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Frederick Kuenning, O42739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Steven Malevich, O30660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Donnell, O30663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Donald Carnes, O30666, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Cliff Hudgins, Jr., O38824, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Carrol Settle, O30665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Thomas O'Keefe, O30669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Aloysius Muth, O30670, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond LaVerne Blust, O30671, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Farnum, O42743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Otis Wyatt, O40020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Donald Rogers, O30676, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Bernard Markey, O38826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Clifton Pennington, O42749, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Ernest Frazier, O30678, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert de Melker, O30679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bob Haynes Glover, O30680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Fred Deakyne Bendler, Jr., O30681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Joseph Galanti, O30684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edward Hagerty, O30685, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Bailey Tibbs, O30688, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lindley Ogden, O30689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willard Britten, O38828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Fabritius, O40021, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Rensselaer Sanford, O38827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Chesley Barton, O38829, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Crawford Farmer, O30691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frederick Durbin, O51748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Donovan McCormick, O42765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Berkeley Bush, O30692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Josephi Helms, O30694, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Hora McLauchlin, Jr., O51752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Carroll Hess, O51753, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ritchie Garrison, O30696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry William Bues, Jr., O42772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Lobit, O30699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hamilton Reger, O30700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Edwin Lee, O42775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Sidney Redfield, O30704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marcus Webb Adams, O40025, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Louis Ziegler, O30707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rolla Darby Pollock, O38832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ewell Grant, O42778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George MacElwain Barker, O30708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. B. J. Leon Hirshorn, O51762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Terry King, O30713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Emil Myers, O51765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marter Denton Middleton, O51767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Vincent Phelps, O40026, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Arthur Tolve, O40027, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Weston Arthur McCormac, O30716, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Frederick Field, O42784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Percy Davidson, O42785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Hector, O30717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adrianus Johannus Van Oosten, O40028, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marsh Patrick Stockton, O51769, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Harold Moore, O30721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Fella Hill, O38835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Vincent Douglas, O42786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Laughlin, O30723, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Henry Hauschultz, O42789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Robb, O42790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shelby Linwood Gillette, O30727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bruce Layton, O30729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Josef Albert Prall, O51772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Connerat, Jr., O30730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Robert O'Brien, O40032, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Wulfe Kuehler, O30731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kermit Harry Glenn McCoy, O51776, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Hughes, O30733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Oliver Olson, O30734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gottfried Gramzow, O30735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Cooke, O30736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Russell Miller, O30737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Abraham Walk, O42796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Ernest Kehke, O42797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Vasserot Merle, Jr., O51778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Bankus, O42799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Lathrop Paddock, Jr., O30740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Lloyd Williams, O42800, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alph Hamberg, O30741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army.)

Lt. Col. Ralph Harvey Elliott, O30744, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Garton Buck, O30745, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Fred Arfman, O42802, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Adolph Traeger, O30746, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald McBurney Curtis, O38837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Merton Barnum, O51780, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Earl Dykes, O51781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Otto Max Boerner, O30747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kaighin Watts, O30752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Marshall Slayden, O30754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Clifton Conine, O30203, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Webster Wilder, Jr., O51784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Georg Wilhelm Finke, O40037, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wheeler Godfrey Merriam, O30759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James O'Donnell, O51786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Cassels Jeffrey, O30763, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul LeGrand Jolley, O30764, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Alford, O30765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richmond F. Thweatt, O30766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Harold Birch, O42816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Richard Lutz, O30767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Adolf Hoherz, O42819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Pickett Smith, O30772, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Mayo Ogilvie, Jr., O30773, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Waldemar Johnson, O42821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Brown Franks, O40041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Marvin Brown, O30777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Bernard Heyer, O40042, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Franklin Sutherland, O30779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Melvin Hunt, O30782, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Benjamin Gullion, O42826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward William Fitzgerald, O30495, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene S. Tarr, O42827, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar William Fulton, O30784, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Charles Hunter, O40045, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elbert Dupree, O40044, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Franklin Keist, O38843, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wythe Munford Peyton, Jr., O42830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Mellette Johnson, O51797, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royden Arnold Konopaska, O30787, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Benjamin Page, O40046, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wendell Swanson, O30788, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jennings Seigler, Jr., O30789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Church Clark, Jr., O42834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Clapper, Jr., O42835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Albert Salet, O30790, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Van Fleet, O51801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Welbec Parsons, O30793, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Poats Littlejohn, O42837, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Lawrence Leidenheimer, O30795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford LeRoy Woodliff, O30796, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Abraham Funk, O30798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Wilbur Otto, O30799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clifton Davie, O40050, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burton Keeney Philips, O40048, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Summers, O42841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Waters, O20114, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Ralph Dickson King, O20115, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond John Harvey, O20116, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Palmer, Jr., O20117, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Reeves Shuler, O20118, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Dean McCarty, O20119, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herbert Kerkering, O20120, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Victor Kieffer, Jr., O20122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Karl Theodore Klock, Jr., O20123, Army of the United States (captain U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Milton Jacoby, O20125, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Alexander Faiks, O20129, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ervan White, Jr., O20130, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Meding Dorland, O20132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jay Hayes 3d, O20134, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Henry Holterman, O20135, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander Finley, O20136, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mellard Connor, Jr., O20137, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Jacob Katz, O20138, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wright Hiatt, O20139, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kramer, O20140, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Allen Morris, O20141, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Elliott Smith, O20142, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Hall Thompson, Jr., O20143, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Milne, O20144, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Benjamin Lampert, O20147, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Reginald Joseph Beauregard Page, O20149, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edward Laurion, O20150, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Bernard Bess, O20151, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Albert Cozart, O20152, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew Davis Chaffin, Jr., O20153, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Nott Beard, O20154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Kelly, O20156, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Walsh Holderness, O20157, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Emmett Goodwin, O20158, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Paul Francis Oswald, O20160, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Eldon Spann, Jr., O20162, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Foster LeRoy Furphy, O20163, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Pinkney Persons, Jr., O20167, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adam Stephen Buynoski, O20169, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel McElheny, O20170, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Kenneth Einar Madsen, O20171, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Van Valkenburg Sutherland, O20173, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thea Lewis Lipscomb, O20174, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oren Swain, O20176, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David McCoach 3d, O20177, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Kessler, O20178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Edgar Mikkelsen, O20179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Kinard, Jr., O20180, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Everett Lockhart, O20181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maxwell Morrison Kallman, O20182, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Richard Ganns, O20184, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett George Hahney, O20185, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Frederick Cordes, Jr., O20186, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Matthew Burnett, O20187, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Woodrow Hiester, O20191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Dudley Hartman, Jr., O20192, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Selwyn Dyson Smith, Jr., O20194, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Lemuel Cato, O20195, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Walter Romlein, O20197, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Aldrich Davis, O20198, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Alexander Grove, O20200, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Barry Yost, O20201, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Partridge, O20204, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Worthington Williams, O20205, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Charles Landry, O20208, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eldred George Robbins, Jr., O20211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard McCrum Snyder, Jr., O20213, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orville Newton Stokes, O20215, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Edward Landrum, Jr., O20216, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Davis Torrey, Jr., O20217, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Prince, O20219, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Gilbert Grothaus, O20221, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Taylor Norris, O20222, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Childs Westmoreland, O20223, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Earl Barlow, O20224, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Francis Dawalt, O20226, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Merritt Warfield, O20229, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Copeland Shea, O20231, Army of the United States (captain, United States Army).

×Lt. Col. Harold Roy Low, O20234, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Beverley Evans Powell, O20237, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Read Bodine, O20238, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Franklin Holton, O20241, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ridgway Pancoast Smith, Jr., O20243, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hall Safford, O20244, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Clare Dunn, O20245, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Victor Clifton, Jr., O20246, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Maben Griffith, O20250, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Langdon Andrew Jackson, Jr., O20251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joshua Asher Finkel, O20253, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry David Lind, O20256, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Paul Christensen, O20257, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Edward Gooding, O20258, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl LaVerne Rickenbaugh, O20259, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Charles Haneke, O20263, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Tillman Willis, O20264, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Lee Crawford, O20266, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert George Fergusson, O20267, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward McCabe, O20269, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Jakle, O20270, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Walter Breaks, O20273, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Harold Gaston, Jr., O20276, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Wheaton Cole, Jr., O20277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Rainier Weaver, O20278, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arnold Heintges, O20281, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harold Daly, O20284, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Daniel Mohlere, O20286, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Meany, O20287, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Woods Garland, Jr., O20288, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Butler Broyles, O20289, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randolph Charles Dickens, O20290, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Willford Grubbs, O20291, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Livingood Walker, Jr., O20293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Weldon Childs, O20294, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Chiles, O20295, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Creighton Williams Abrams, Jr., O20296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Gregory Beggs, O20297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Thomas Ryder, O20298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Edward Sievers, O20299, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Latham Crandell, Jr., O20306, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Worthington Cooke, O20307, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. McPherson LeMoyne, O20309, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Wilkins Ripple, O20312, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett O'Brien, Jr., O20313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Sheffield Greene, O20314, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thurman Wesley Morris, O20315, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Clyde Lafayette Layne, O20317, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Cyrus Drain, Jr., O20318, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marvin Williams, O20319, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin Glenwood Fisher, O20324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Lee Simpson, O20325, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Leeds Peck, O20327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hersey Michaelis, O20328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Rogers Sibert, O20329, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Illig, O20330, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Curran, O20338, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Burnham Milliken, O20340, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Clinton Miller 2d, O20342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Renwick Hughes, O20343, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Franklin McManus, O20346, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Trout, O20347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Horace Tiffany, O20348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Austin Sikes, O20353, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Wallace Noake, O20357, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Lincoln Edwards, O20359, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas James Lawlor, O20361, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Pelham Yarborough, O20362, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aloysius Elliott McCormick, Jr., O20363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Billingslea, O20367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Billy Leer, O20370, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Matthew Lynch, O20377, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Manly Pack, O20378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Janof, O20382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Nicolson, O30804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Stanton Palmer, O30806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Price Jones, Jr., O30807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lawrence Atkins, O30809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James McCauslin Moynahan, O42848, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Arthur Claffee, O30810, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll James Williams, O30811, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Davidson Alexander 3d, O40052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burkitt Ameral Reynolds, O30814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Waters Regar, O40053, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Howard Devine, O31975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Alexander Paterick, O42853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Morgan, O30251, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Adam Arnold, Jr., O30815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Eugene Deering Billings, O30816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Michael Scott, O30822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Otto Gerot, O30818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Earkin, O51809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Ernest Doran, O38892, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Alderson Blair, O42858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Vernon Porter, O31328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sylvester Alvin Hall, O40057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Argyle Campbell, O42861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Frederick Fleming, O42863, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Lawrence Slob, O42867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Asa Calvin Black, O38694, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bolick Albert Saholsky, O31331, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Breckenridge Coffin, O38895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James McBride, O42870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emett Robert White, O31334, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan Benedict Rochford, O42876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ridley Spark, O51812, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Lewis Adams, O31339, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Arno Lorenz, O30534, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ernest Schoenfeld, O31342, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Louis Siegel, O42879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Frank Walker, O31344, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Isaac Francis Bonifay, O40061, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Warren McCarthy, Jr., O40062, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Joseph Julian, O51814, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Welch Hill, Jr., O31348, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Edward Miles, O42886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Vincent Shea, O40063, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Tomlinson, O31354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Emil Lofstrand, O42889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Waldo Wilburn Montgomery, O42890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Moore, O31355, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Roy Dyer, O40065, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Co. Horace Bruce Frederick, O42891, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Wyburd Furrell, O42894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wyatt Rawlings, Jr., O42895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry A. Hall, Jr., O51819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Gordon Belser, Jr., O42897, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Danahy Albro, O31360, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Finis Garrett Johnson, O40067, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Platt Boyd, Jr., O40068, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob William Bealke, Jr., O31365, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Mason Bagley, O42902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Hargreaves Williams, O40069, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollin Harvey Smith, O31367, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Thornton Walker, O31368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Aaron Jenkins, O31369, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Cecil Williams, O31372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Kilburn Schiffman, O31375, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Vernon Pickell, O31376, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bland West, O31378, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Ramsey Hoskot, O31379, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Bernard Jones, O42919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Webster Marcy, O31380, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Star, O42920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lee Witt, O31382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Stover, O31381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin James Withers, O42921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Albert Millson, O42922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Dunn, O31385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Draper Easton, Jr., O51822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin William Kernkamp, O42923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julian Powers Fox, Jr., O51823, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Furman Walbridge Marshall, O42925, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Hunt Hemion, O40075, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Frank Whitton, Jr., O51825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Akins, O40076, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Omer Siegmond Dews, O40079, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Holmes Harrison, O31396, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clay Orville Collier, O42928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ezra Cuttino, O31397, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Albert Dunphy, O31398, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Adam Anson, O31400, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Edwin Sommers, O31405, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Melvin Carter, O31406, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel Hines, O38900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curry Ned Vaughan, O31407, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Carroll Martin Covington, O40083, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ernest Lyman, O38903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Kuhn, O31419, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Mitchell Marr, O31420, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Andrew Woodbury, O42943, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Downing Temple, O51834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Weisberg, O40085, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bradford Butler, Jr., O31425, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lyman Peter Marden, Jr., O40086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Ashley Futral, O42948, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ara Guy Lindley, O31427, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Jesse Reichel, O40087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dured Ellsworth Townsend, O31430, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Magnusson, O31432, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seymour Blair Satterwhite, O31431, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ford Edwin Pratt, O31433, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Leonard Whitney, O31435, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Livermore Whitten, O42954, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Allen Shurm, O31436, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Levin Bruce Cottingham, O42955, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Fort, O31437, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Serle Blodgett, Jr., O31438, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Springer, O30624, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Cornelius Blake, O42959, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Sutton, O42961, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norbert Charles Miller, O38905, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gratfan Michael Yatsevitch, O31442, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Albert Hall, O40039, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Barney Johnson, O42963, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Hayden Arp, O31445, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Louis Crownover, O42968, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army)

Maj. Eugene Milton Orton, O51844, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard George Robinson, Jr., O31448, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Joseph Martineau, O42971, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Hall Thurston, O31453, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frances Quinn, O31454, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Frank Hill, O42973, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major Aldon Mellroy Hoffman, O42975, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Philip Carlson, O31456, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Walton, O31459, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Francis Nowe, O31460, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dyson Crawford Sweger, O31461, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard William Keyes, O31467, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Richard Smoak, O31463, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Milford Freidinger, O42983, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arthur Goshorn, O31465, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Darien Duncan, O31466, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harold Shell, O31472, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Loren Emerson Bishop, O40091, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Austin Stricklen, Jr., O31473, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Mimms Lee, O31474, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ambrus Thornton, O31818, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Duval Smith Adams, O42997, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Silas Gassett, O31481, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Hiram Champlin, O30661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Carter Quinlin, O51860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Merod Schroeder, O43002, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Brennan Egan, O43003, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Arnold Anderson, O31483, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army)

Lt. Col. Edward Daniel Comm, O31484, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wiley King, O51864, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Herman Lang, O43006, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mabry Griffin Miller, O31486, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Clifford Gilbert, O40095, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Harvey Matchette, O31490, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ron Lamar, O43014, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph LeRoy Dickie, O31493, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robert Swarm, O43018, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert August Jordan, O38795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Allen Clark, O31496, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Waldemar Alexander Solf, O40145, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Wesley Roberts, Jr., O40154, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmot Thomas Baughn, O40155, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Arthur Clema, O43020, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellis Dillon Blake, O43023, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Angus Bethune, O31502, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glover Steiner Johns, Jr., O31501, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward McArdle, O30695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robert Clark, O31506, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Clarence Lee, O43030, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Clifton Dalrymple, O31509, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lincoln McMackin, O31511, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Corydon Blake, O51875, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Edmond Feidt, O31513, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Albert Geddes, O31512, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Camden Frisby, O20543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmonde Bernard Kelly, O20544, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Perry Jones, Jr., O20546, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Paul McCrone, O20548, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Aldo Hector Bagnulo, O20550, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis James Loomis, O20551, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Dillon, O20552, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christian Hanburger, O20554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Walter Sloat, O20556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Fred Eklund, O20557, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard James Lowe, O20558, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Edward Leonhard, O20559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Nels Redling, O31516, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Joseph Lagasse, O31517, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Knapper Eberhard, O40161, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph McLeod, O43036, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Benjamin Mangold, O31522, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robin Gloor Montgomery, O31525, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Austin Thetford, O38913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Armond Ulrich, O31527, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jeff F. Hollis, O31528, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Earle McShea, O51881, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Duda, O43041, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Frederick Jeffers, O40165, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Harry Scordas, O38914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allyn Ord, O31532, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emerson Francis Hurley, O31533, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph John Peot, O31536, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Rudisill Bush, O40166, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward McShane, O51884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wilson Grant, O31539, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Denzil Laval Baker, O43052, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Donald Eister, O38915, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Robert Yost, O31542, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fredric Rader, O31543, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Alexander Cromartie, O43057, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Fitzhugh Shepherd, O43060, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Waldemar Martin Mueller, O31553, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Payne, O31554, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lawrence Prahl, O31555, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Pierce Jacobs, O31556, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin William Weissman, O31559, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Francis Lambert, O38919, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Udell Clay, O43072, Army of the United States (captain, U S. Army).

Lt. Col. Linwood Griffin, Jr., O43074, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Harold Davidson, O31560, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Frederick Nelson, O43073, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Benjamin Priest, O31562, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Henry Considine, O40172, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Raciene Mason, O31563, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Richards, O31565, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).*

Lt. Col. Leonidas George Gavalas, O31569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arnold Clifford Gilliam, O31570, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Barry Foster Phillips, O51893, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sydney Emil Sacerdote, O38920, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald D. Shepherd, O31571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Leverett Sanford, Jr., O31572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Haviland Arthur Neil Connolly, O31575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Gershenow, O31577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Melville Gold, O40179, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Julian Owens, O43087, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey Earl Sheppard, O43086, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Frankel, O40178, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Robert Blum, O31695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Lee Janes, O31587, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Earl Scott, O51898, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Bledsoe, O31592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Willis Bartling, O43091, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Adair, O51901, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Vincent Smart, O31597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Dent Leroy Lay, O40181, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas William Willis, O43099, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Seaton Franswell McDaniel, O43098, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Ashton Crosby, O43102, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Barney Driggs White, O31606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Phillips Brown, Jr., O38922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earle Bennett Butler, O43106, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Leonard Humphrey, O31609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Nesen Brownson, O43108, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hunter Smith, Jr., O31614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Frederick Shull, O43277, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lauren Arden Arn, O43290, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jean Paul Sams, O43293, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rafael Cleveland, O31618, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Anton Cuphaver, O43296, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Christopher Dalia, O43297, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Olin Page Holt, O43298, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Alton Sturm, O40185, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Solon Moncrief, Jr., O31623, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Bennett Parker, O20571, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Clarke, O20572, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Joseph Stann, O20573, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Earl Ressegieu, O20575, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Mitchim, O20577, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bayer Strandberg, O20579, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Moses McAfee, Jr., O20580, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Stanley Kuna, O20581, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Vincent Sollohub, O20584, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Boes Hines, O20585, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Chandler Spaulding, O20588, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Clarke Hyzer, O20589, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Stephen Barko, O20590, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hamilton William Fish, O20592, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Edmund Wilhoyt, Jr., O20593, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lewis Register, O20594, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leigh Cole Fairbank, Jr., O20595, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Manning Cromelin, O20597, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Horace Lewis, O20598, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Otto Diercks, O20599, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Tice Griffin, O20600, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Giles Lincoln Evans, Jr., O20603, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Alan Abercrombie, O20604, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglass Phillip Quandt, O20605, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Brockenbrough Randolph Hines, O20606, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gamble Schermerhorn, O20610, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Stanley Palmer, O20611, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Houghton Ross Hallock, O20612, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Houk Ellis, O20614, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack West Chapman, O20616, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Henry Walker, O20617, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Joseph Murray, Jr., O20619, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlin Hamlin Whitesell, Jr., O20620, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Miller, O20625, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Cinn DeBill, O20626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Wilt Shive, O20628, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Huston Eubank, O20630, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Graham Zierdt, O20632, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond William Rumph, O20634, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Mershon Spengler, O20636, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwyn Norman Kirsten, O20637, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Harvey Clark, O20638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar John Ingmire, O20639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Greeley Davisson, O20650, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Armitt Scott, Jr., O20652, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William George Easton, O20656, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Franklin Leist, O20657, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Martin Cone, O20658, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Morris Lee, O20661, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Haynes Reeves, Jr., O20665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emmette Young Burton, Jr., O20672 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Lee Johnson, O20681, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682 Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Nixon Peale, Jr., O20684, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Wise Bailey, O20687, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Major Teeter, O20688, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Allen Richards, O20689, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Harrison Wilson, Jr., O20693, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Bearse Nye, O20695, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas McGarey Metz, O20696, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Denman Neier, O20698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley John Cherubin, O20700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Meyer Arendt Edwards, Jr., O20702, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Clyde Gildart, O20703, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Pierce Campbell, O20704, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Early Norvell, O20706, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Stumpf, O20707, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Brady Mitchell, O20713, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lukas Ernest Hoska, Jr., O20717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Marion Postlethwait, O20718, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Battle Malone Barksdale, O20719, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Levering Green, O20720, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ludger Chabot, O20721, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Luis Fernando Mercado, O20724, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Maurice Stegmaier, O20725, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Everett Marr, Jr., O20729, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Cashemere Russell, O20730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Himes, O20731, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harper Hodges, Jr., O20733, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Clem Conway, O20735, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Laurence Powers, O20736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Coy Lyman Curtis, O20737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Shields George, O20740, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Lawrence Lindquist, O20748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Peter Major, O20750, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hincks Montgomery, Jr., O20754, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Johnson, O20756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. LeRoy Lutes, Jr., O20757, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Heber Van Volkenburgh, Jr., O20758, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Maryan Maliszewski, O20759, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Samuel Brierley, O20760, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Meyer, O20762, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Gordon Kreiser, O20765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Walter Elkins, O20766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Whitelaw Browning, O20767, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James John Cosgrove, O20768, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Besson, O20771, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Ferris Pearsall, Jr., O20774, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Warren Connelly, O20775, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Hertel Laflamme, O20781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kelton Seymour Davis, O20786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maxwell Awyn Tincher, O20798, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Clagett, O20799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll David Wood, O20803, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Delano Brant, O20804, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delk McCorkle Oden, O20805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander McGee, Jr., O20806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Dawes McKinley, O20807, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ralls Lawson, O20808, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winfield Lee Martin, O20809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Dodds, O20815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kelley Benjamin Lemmon, Jr., O20816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elery Martin Zehner, O20820, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Bidwell Sloan, O20821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kirkham Amos, O20822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olen John Seaman, Jr., O20825, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Jarvis Tolson 3d, O20826, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Huff Van Vliet, Jr., O20828, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Walter Richardson, O20830, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold McDonald Brown, O20832, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wilson Duncan, O20834, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Noel Ambrose Menard, O20835, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ephraim Foster Graham, Jr., O20838, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Barrett Travis, O20840, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Millard Simmons, O20841, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Talmage Kimbrell, O20851, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Norrington Smalley, O20853, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eads Graham Hardaway, O20855, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Brackett McClellan Chase, O20856, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Ray Harrison, O20858, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Fleming Polk, O20859, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Powers Connor, O20860, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Blauvelt, O20861, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted Franklin Douthitt, O31626, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Loose Miller, O43302, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Vincent Johnston, O43313, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Popowski, Jr., O31633, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Joseph O'Rourke, O38923, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Montague Blight, O40191, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Howard Saylors, O31638, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Clarke Ashby, Jr., O43320, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Vincent McLaughlin, O31639, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor A. Ishoy, O31640, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William McGrath, O43322, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Thompson Newton, O20865, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Clinton Clayman, O20866, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Warren Sisson, Jr., O20867, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Greene Hammond, O20868, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Russel Groves, O20869, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Whitsett van de Velde, O20870, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur George Christensen, O20871, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laurence Clifford Brown, O20876, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merten Kenneth Helmstead, O20880, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon John de Penne Rouge, O20882, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Sherbourne McCrea, O20884, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Frederick Thompson, O20885, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Nelson, O20886, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Unsworth Allen, O20889, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Byron William Ladd, O20890, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Washington, O20894, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Robert Etzler, O20895, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Steve Archie Chappuis, O20899, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Bolton Kennedy, O20900, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Brownbridge Simpson, O20902, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Thomas Boleyn, O20903, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fredrick William Nagle, O20904, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jabus Willie Rawls, Jr., O20906, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Leslie Coan, O20908, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Kent, O20909, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willis Paddock, O20913, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Horace Edward Alphin, O43324, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Frederick Haberman, O40193, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Orton Dicken, O43327, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Peters, O31646, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Frederick Dyer, O43328, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Lester Edwards, O31647, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Ralph Pierce, O43332, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer K. Curtis, O51918, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Edward Grant, O31653, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patton Brooks, Jr., O31654, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norvell Riley Stark, O31335, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Aubrey Knox, O51921, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Matile Griswold, O31660, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Randolph Hinson, O51922, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Van Dyke Murphy, Jr., O31663, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bisbing, O31665, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Edward Minor, O31668, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Gallagher, O31669, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Edgar Galusha, O43345, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Dutee Wilcox, Jr., O43347, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elias Carter Townsend, O31680, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kenneth Gaynor, O43354, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Robert Short, O31685, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl Conner, O31686, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin J. Briggs, O43363, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert John Check, O51936, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Forbes Jenks, O31691, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Yancey Talbott, Sr., O31664, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl George Lutz, O43366, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Parrish McWhorter, O31692, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Benjamin Blank, O43368, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James McDonnell, Jr., O31698, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Major Walter Franklin Diesem, O43372, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. McClure Hudelson, O43371, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Hewins Bowman, O31700, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jules Emmable Gonseth, Jr. O40211, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Ferguson Schneider, O31708, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mann Haycock, O31712, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Hennigan Tyler, O31711, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wallace Grote, O31717, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Austin James Montgomery, O51942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlton Wallace Nelson, O43381, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Brooksie Kemp, O43382, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Jay Redding, Jr., O43385, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Edward Shelton, O51944, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Hurst Prather, O31722, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Alfred Manning, O43386, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William George Van Allen, O20931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Cortland Adams, O20933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lavonne Edwin Cox, O20934, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles V. Ruzek, Jr., O20937, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Holmes Fielding Troutman, O20938, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Hamilton Van Atta, O20939, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Cottrell Rowland, Jr., O20940, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Anthony Smedile, O20942, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Allan Morrison, O20945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Andrew Allgair, O20947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Pierce, Jr., O38928, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Edward Roth, O43387, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dean Holm, O20948, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Forrest Wilson Duff, O43391, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alphonse Joseph Sockoloskie, O51945, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Rowan, O31727, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dudley Randolph Berwick, O51946, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Forest Locke, O31728, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Lanphier, O20949, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Carlysle Speedie, O31730, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Elmo Peddicord, Jr., O43397, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wiles Pervier, O31736, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Riley Alexander Graham, O43404, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Charles McNamara, O31738, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stephen Saunders, O31737, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Durham, O31739, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Busby Hudiburg, O31741, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Ogle McGillin, O31743, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Churchill Dunbar, O43408, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eric Hall, O31747, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Frederick Plank, O43410, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Henry Bronn, O31748, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Calvin Francis Finn, O43413, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Cullin Sandlin, O31752, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Selmer John Espelund, O43416, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Cecil Dinsmore, Jr., O40225, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry George Thomas, O31756, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lance Ernest Booth, Jr., O31755, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Martin, O42947, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stanley Taylor, Jr., O31765, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Hoadley Dempsey, O31766, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Parsons, O40228, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis McCay Clark, O38931, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Edwin Whitmore, O52122, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Lappe Walton, O31777, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Cyril Parker, O31778, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Koletty, O40230, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Augustus Theodore Terry, Jr., O31781, Army of the United States (captain, U. S Army).

Lt. Col. Greg J. Brown, O31783, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Randall Haywood Bryant, O31785, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Christ Angel, O31789, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis George Ethel, O31786, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Bednarek, O38932, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Gordon Smigelow, O31791, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver William Schantz, O31795, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hughes Lanier Ash, O31799, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Morley Kernan, O40236, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Virgil Tiede, O31801, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Marshall Kenderdine, O43446, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Gresham Fraser, Jr., O31805, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Lawerence Thornton, O31806, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald MacGrain, O38933, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Dowling Tanner, O52132, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Francis Gagne, O43452, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Edwin Reid, O31809, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. James O'Biern Millott, O40240, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cameron Knox, O31815, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Will Dan Joslin, O31816, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Lorenzo Purkhiser, O31819, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Wiley Sellers, O31821, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nash Ody Thompson, O31822, Army of the United States (captain, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Herbert Wishart, O38935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Gergely Gregory, Jr., O31828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Warren Holmberg, O38937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest William Fischer, O31829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Bannon, Jr., O31830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Barlow, O31835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Charles Holland, O31840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew John Bartosik, O52145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wallace Page, O40247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Campbell Robertson, O31845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wesley Brooks Edwards, O31848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clayton Williams, O52146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carleton Edward Fisher, O31852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward McWilliams 3d, O31853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Anthony Ucherek, O31854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Wayne Whitney, O31855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Hoffman, Jr., O31856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Lafayette Burchell, O40251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel Hickey, O52152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivan Willard Elliott, O31863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Elmer Loudenslager, O52155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jeff George Ray, O31865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Arthur McKee, O31867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy Clancy Hill, O31874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Javier Buldain, O43495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nelson Beck, O40258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Eagle Jurgens, O43496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmore Grenville Lawton, O38941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Edward Craig, O31879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chalmers Hilliard Armstrong, Jr., O31877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee May, O40260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Lee Newbury, O38942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Atwell O'Reilly, Jr., O31881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell R. Reed, O52162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred James Reese, O31884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elisha Orrin Peckham, O31885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alexander Craig, O43505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Curtis Prentice, O31888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Linton Mushen, O43508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Edmund Harrison, O31892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Joseph McWade, O43512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius Cuthbert Albaugh, Jr., O40268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Donald Klous, O31899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar LeRoy Arnold, O31902, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Steven Zimmerman, O38946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl C. Turner, O31909, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Ryan Rodgers, O43529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Paul Baerman, O40273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mervin Sterling Waters, O43533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Alexander Belisle, O52175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Stanley Hirsch, O38947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Louis Coates, O31912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mitchell Abraham Mabardy, O31913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur James Downey, O31914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Nolan Turner, O31921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Conroy Stewart, O43541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Cargill Erickson, O52177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Fenn Quist, O52178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thompson Hancock, O31923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Niles Denniston, O43552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Martin Minion, Jr., O31601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Doane Willets, O40281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Ransom Roderick, O31941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Morgan Prosser, Jr., O31945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland John Meeker, O52185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Patrick Burk, O43569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Hannibal Martin, O31958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Carlson, O43577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Jannarone, O21053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew John Altenhofen, O21054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. George Willard Bixby, O21056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Desloge Brown, O21057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Burney Chubbuck, O21058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander John Frolich, O21059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Eugene Kelsey, O21061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Worrell Love, O21062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Allen Orr, O21064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Giles Stillwell, O21065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Thompson, O21067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Linn Lewis, O21069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Glazier Williams, O21071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Howard Anderson, O21072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, O21073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stoddard Crocker, Jr., O21074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Clinton Harvey, Jr., O21076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Ward Smith, Jr., O21078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Alan Langford, O21079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Alfred Bailey, O21083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Joseph Kasper, O21084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Paul Barschdorf, O21085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Martin Elmore, Jr., O21086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Woodworth Jenkins, O21087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Gray O'Connor, O21088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Edward Lotz, Jr., O21090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claire Elwood Hutchin, Jr., O21092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Mason Hogan, O21094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Nelson Moorman, O21095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Rhodes Russell, O21097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Trevor Nevitt Dupuy, O21098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Fernald Haynes, O21103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Iver Arthur Peterson, O21105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fillmore Kennady Mearns, O21106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Welby Beverley, O21107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred John D'Arezzo, O21109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Wade Norris, O21110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Lt. Col. John Fouché Brownlow, Jr., O21111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Robert Brown, O21113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Charles Lough, O21118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Braden Latta, O21119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McGregor Lynn, Jr., O21120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col Joseph Conigliaro Conell, O21121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Blake, Jr., O21122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvar Bertil Sundin, O21128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Edward Michelet, O21131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Knox Eaton, O21132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ted Irving Sawyer, O21133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Fuller Thomas, O21135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Bailey, Jr., O21136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tracy Bovard Harrington, O21137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Lockwood Webb, O21138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Joseph Weinnig, O21139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Canning Davis, O21141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Yeager Browning, O21142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Harland Swenson, O21143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Lester Tittle, O21144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hollis Vail, Jr., O21145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Burnett Harrison, O21147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alvin Lee Burke, O21148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Corbett, O21150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Anthony Sussmann, O21165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arpad Arthur Kopcsak, O21167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Nickerson, Jr., O21170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Simon Rudel Sinnreich, O21173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joseph Long, O21175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ferdinand Joseph Chesarek, O21177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gailon Myers McHaney, O21179 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Lee Grubb, O21180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edgar Stanton McKee, O21182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Taylor, Jr., O21184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Emmett Ekman, O21190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jaroslav Folda, Jr., O21193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Nevin Howell, O21194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Fremont Tillson 3d, O21196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Albert Bassett, O21202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lorenzo Dow Adams, O21203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Loyd Jackson, O21207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Charles Damon, O21208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harlan Keith Holman, O21211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Ellsworth Hallinger, O21212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Wallace Hayes, O21214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merton Singer, O21215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Lee Clarke, O21216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jefferson Johnson Irvin, O21217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Rhyne, O21219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Chilton Works, O21221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Francis Gillivan, O21225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Little Haley 3d, O21226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Gray Duncan 3d, O21227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Johnson, Jr., O21228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carl Erlenbusch, O21230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Emmet Strange, O21231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Davis Offer, O21233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Henry Patrick, O21235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Adolph Sundlof, O21236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Lynch, O21237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allen Douglas Hulse, O21238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Earle Beck, O21239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patrick Wansboro, O21241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Laskowsky, O21243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollin Benedict Durbin, O21244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Benedict Missal, Jr., O21247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Warren Rand Williams, Jr., O21250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Joseph Sweeney, O21254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Charles Brown, O21256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roberts Sherwood Demitz, O21259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Sylvester Collins, Jr., O21260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Milton Izenour, O21263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Walker Thackeray, O21265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Walson, O21267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Mrazek, O21268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Dickson Miller, O21270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Augustine Broberg, O21272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Owen Byars, Jr., O21273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Stephen Kujawski, O21276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Nelson Sibley, O21277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mark Francis Brennan, O21279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Arthur Machen, Jr., O21284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Allen Jones, Jr., O21287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Charles Teich, Jr., O21288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Carl Thomas, O21289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Joseph Denholm, O21293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas English, O21296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Alexander Norris, Jr., O21299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Franklin Henrie Hartline, O21301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Maxwell Murray, O21303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Eliason Boyt, O21304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Wallace Siren, O21306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Leaning Ashworth, O21308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Thomas Hannum, Jr., O21316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hodson Rhine, O21317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Lahti, O21322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Birdsey Lee Learman, O21324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Corley, O21325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Ewing, O21326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Eugene Henderson, O21327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clark Jackson, Jr., O21329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Conyers Fite 2d, O21331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andy Archer Lipscomb, O21333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Kent Schmidt, O21335, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Cornell Abert, O21337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Sanford Ryan, O21339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Artman, O21342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Rapp Zohrlaut, O21344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Gibson Sherrard, O21345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Edward Hartman, O21346, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Chalgren, Jr., O21349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frost Staples, O31967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Elliott Fonger, O31969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Stinnie Huff, O43583, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elliott Burwell Cheston, O31976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Oliver, O43536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Lafayette Nash, O43587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Perkins Pope, O31981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Kenneth McCormick, O31982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Vincent Roddy, O21356, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Perry Elmer Conant, O21357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bruce Bissell, O21360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Amos George Johnson, O21363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carolus Adams Brown, O21364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Peers, O21366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Ernest Walker, O21368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Morgan Summers, O21369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifton Ferdinand von Kann, O21371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laverne Arthur Parks, O21372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Peter Hagen, O21373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Elroy Sparks, O21374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Albert Armstrong, O21375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank George White, O21378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Theodore Sauser, O21379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwin Thomas Knight, O21380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Gill Springer, O21382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gregory Leo Higgins, O21385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Alexander Abston, O21391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Winfred Alban Ross, O21395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Bernard Burkett, O21398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Harold Stangle, O21406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Meredith Ernest Allen, O21408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Emerson Babcock, O21413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Burhyte Wilmot Corey, Jr., O21415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rollie Neel Blancett, O21416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Benjamin Schweizer, O21418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Matthew Eschbach, O21419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Kenneth Howell, O21421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Brennan Stelzenmuller, O21422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmer Kersey Benson, Jr., O21423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ellsworth Skinner, O21425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Myron Ellsworth Page, Jr., O21426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Hilton Dunn, O21427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Judson Woodring Wark, O21428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Mortimer Fry, Jr., O21431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry George Woodbury, Jr., O21432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Chipman Holley, O21433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wright Bennett, O21434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Evans Brown, O21437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Claude Potter, Jr., O21439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Ellison, Jr., O21440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Milner, O21441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Russell Rorabaugh, O21445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henderson Beddow, O21446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Carpenter Paules, O21447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Andrew Vaiden Inge, O21448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

*To be captains with rank from July 1, 1948*

Maj. John Pachomski, O40252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Davitt, O43490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Elmer Rownd, O31868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Henry Bauer, O43502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Whitman Young, O31891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Bernard Richmond, O43519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Melvin Oscar Miller, O40283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Milton Vinson, Jr., O31990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Glade, O21181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Starr Wright, Jr., O21328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Salvatore Campanella, O21348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Ellis Deshon, O21362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Ernest Veale, O21435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Zitzer, O21444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Commerford, Jr., O40293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Earl Crump, Jr., O31983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Felder Lavett Fair, O31984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Elza Waller, O40294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Steele Long, Jr., O31985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold William Wheeler, O31986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Captain John Adams Alley, Jr., O52203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Leckie, O40296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Wesley Roe, O52205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Haig Jackson, O52204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis William Pflanz, Jr., O43600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Howard Nelson, Jr., O31992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Gordon Gorski, O31993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Melville Bowman, Jr., O43601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Burns Noland, O43603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Stanley Tyler, O43602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Allen Bucha, O31996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Stephen Gerety, O43605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Henry Koreman, O38953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Edwin Daniel, Jr., O38954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Edward MacDonough, O52208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Irving Wallace, O21467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Luther Blue, O31997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Carter, O38955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Francis Schiltz, O38956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Arnold Bierl, O40298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Foreman Wood, O32001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Bryant Slimp, O43608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Stuart Lawrance, Jr., O32003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Stacy Capers, Jr., O32004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas William Ackert, O32005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Trout, O43610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Tinsley Dodge, O21468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Samuel Casto, O32007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ted Joseph Palik, O43611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Kendal Whitehead, O43612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Luther Regan, Jr., O32008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan Scott McMillin, O32010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Nelson Ostrom, O43614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Eugene Woodrow, O32011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Owen Waite Owens, O38958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Justice Beeson 3d, O32013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Spencer Campbell, O43615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Stegall, Jr., O32014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick West Hawksworth, O43619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle McDaniel Clarke, O32015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Louis Haberstroh, O52210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mortimer Robert Staley, O43620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Francis Ryneska, O32017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wesley Herbert Burr, O32019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Benjamin Caulder, O42626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gardner Alston Williams, O40301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Irvin Casterline, O43628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rudolph Charlemagne Koerner, Jr., O52211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dalton Walker Lain, O40302, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Herbert Bearss, O32020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Moses Cookson, O32021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Gerber, O32023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Joseph McCool, O32024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Jordan Brown, O38959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Captain Wallace Creel Wardner, O52212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Willard Jones, Jr., O43631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Joseph Macken, O40304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Hugh Keefe, O43634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Shirley Hicks, O32028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew Rice, O43635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Cloake Small, O52214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Augustus Perry, O32030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Henry Slover, O43638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Hill Campbell, O32031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leon J. Fishkin, O52215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leland Earle Anderson, O52216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Josef Wicker, O32033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilford Lloyd Willey, O38961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wellington Snoad, O32034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Wilbur Baumgartner, O43642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Howard Marsden, Jr., O43643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kay Kipling Cowan, O52217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Herbert Gregg, O32037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Paul Ehrhardt, O43644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Damian Donlon, Jr., O32039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Runyan Linvill, O40305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Peter Ketcham, Jr. O38963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas St. John Arnold, O32040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Sigman White, O32041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Dobley Fleming O32042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Cornelius Spiedel, Jr., O32044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Clayton Bane Lyle, Jr., O40306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Burk, O32043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Christie Kingman, O32045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lionel Edward Scott, O32046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward G. Edwards, O32048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Emery Veatch, O32047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack David Wolfson, O40307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Neil Marshall, O52221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jewett Agusta Dix, O32049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Harvey Houser, O32050, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Edward Dueker, O32051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Daugherty, O52222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Victor Lesneski, O32053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Preston Donald, O52223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Weldon Winston Wilson, O32054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Freeman Francis Gage, Jr., O32055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Merritt William Briggs, O38964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Campbell, Jr., O43649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Leonard Pridgen, Jr., O38965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert LeRoy Staver, O43650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Leon Adams, Jr., O43651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Charles Hess, O32059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ayres William Stoddard, O43652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick Brown, O43653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ford Murray Beardsley, O40311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Earl Wills, O32060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Sion Cook, Jr., O43655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Priestley Napier, O43657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Walter Flint, O43656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Peter VanCourt, O38966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Frederick Benjamin, O32062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Everett Kooken, O43658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Ellsworth Keough, O43659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Harvey Williams, O38967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Saffold, O43660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Noble Allwine, O43661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Gustavus Stotlar, O43662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Orr Graham, Jr., O32064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Garrett Sutton, Jr., O43663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Carroll Roder, O43664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Alfred Martin, O43665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lee Wallace, O32065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Philip Murphy, O52226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Robideaux, O32066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Gordon Kinney, O32067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Kiely, Jr., O32069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Cecil Ball, O32070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Morehead Hargrave, O32071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Abram Jameson, Jr., O32072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Keith Herbert Houlson, O52229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Otto Rudolph Koch, Jr., O32074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edgar Wales 3d, O40315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene John Hollerbach, O32076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Lawrence Norling, O32112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wright Williams, O32077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Milliff, O40316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Gerlach Sory, O43670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Grant Lavell, O32080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Rose, O32079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hughes Alfred Carnes, O43674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Donald Mitchell, O31625, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Aaron Underwood Trimble, O43675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chase Rawson Teaboldt, O32082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Morrison Owen, Jr., O32083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Osvold Currier, O40318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Palmer Johnson, O43677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ollie James Allen, O32085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hobert Wayne Sharp, O43678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Beeman Mullinix, O32086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Randolph Archer, O38968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Herring Sharpe, O43682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Anthony Slad, O32088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Bert Outlaw, O32089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry Arthur Munro, O32090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Atkinson Greer, O43685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Fletcher Rolph, O32091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Joseph Attaway, O40321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wood Calvert, O52232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harrison Sam Francis, O52233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Elman Leighton, Jr., O43688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Dunlap, O32094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Frank Albert, O32097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carlton Stack, O32098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Gradon Reynolds, O32099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Curtis Payne, O32101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Boyd Claypool, O43693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Elmer Allen, O32103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Barrell, O32104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Audemard Beplat, O43694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Thomas Kellett, O40323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Benjamin Murphy Goetz, O43696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Laverne Woods Graff, O52239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Raymond Johnson, O43697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Howard Clarence Parker, O32108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John David Sapp, O32109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Daniel Haskins, O32110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Dean Harris, O32111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Jarrold, O43699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Carlisle, O40324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Adrian Bogart, O40325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Phillip Ignatius Klein, O32113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Snead Blocker, O32118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maynard Byron Weaver, O32120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Everette Johnson, O43704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph Convery, Jr., O52244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Wilson Corder, O43706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Angster, O32124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Albert Brinkerhoff, O43708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Gordon Drouillard, O32125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oren Dean Chapman, O40328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Arver Twomey, O32126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leon Frederick Lavoie, O32127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Shannon Delos Brown, O52247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Freeland Allyn Daubin, Jr., O43709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Wilbur Smith, O32128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Anthony Eckstein, O40331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Francis Wilson, O38971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Luke Hustead, Jr., O43711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Lauriston Harding, O32134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sheldon Scott, O43712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Millard Glen Gray, O32137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Royal Ector Phillips, O32136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ramon Francis D'Elosua, O43713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Allen Rankin, O32140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Shepherd Fromer, O32141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Lewis Whipple, O43714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Thomason Ayres, Jr., O43715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Evans, O32142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Jackson Gillespie, O32143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Calhoun Hooker, O43717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Wesley Boyer, O32145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charley Walker Haynes, O43719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Peter Murr, O43720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irwin Allen Edwards, O32149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Bennett Wild, O40333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Bernhard Sandell, O32153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Michaels, O38972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Lloyd Osborne, O32154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank von Phul Williams, O40334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Palsrok, O43722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Moseley Bachelor, O43723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond August Seifert, O52253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Evers Jacobs, O52256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nathan Hanks Hixson, O52254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ellis Harry Mist, O52255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Henry Levine, O32155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Murray Brannon, O32156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Aaron Hoard, Jr., O43729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Daniel Drake, O32158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Philip Lyke, O43731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Dooley, O32159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William May Myers, O32160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Sailor Bowers, O38973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Duncan Conley, O52260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexander Johnston Rankin, O32166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Ellis Lawrence, O52261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harle Grady Bailey, Jr., O32167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Law, O32169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Julian Boyles, O32168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Edward Fives, O32170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Michael Witter, O32172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Duncan Aboosh, O32171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Drazen, O40336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Mathew Cromwell, O32176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrell H. Burnett, O32177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jorge Jose Lluy, O5c898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fountain Fox Beattie, Jr., O52265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Alexander Galt, O43743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hendric Byrd, Jr., O52267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmett Sullivan, O43745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Emerson Perry, O38974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph George Belon, O43746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Julian Louis Hogan, O32178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Ronan, O43750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Campbell, O32180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Broadus Hodges, O43751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Feliz, O43752, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Cella, O52269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Simon Kostanski, O43755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Patrick James Brennan, O43756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Gabriel Katin, O43758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Francis Register, Jr., O43757, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamine Marvin Brothers, O32185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Barney Golden, O40337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emmett Gilliam Scott, O43760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornell Dent Booth, O52271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lucian Capers Croft, O32189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Austin, O32191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Wilbur Wendt, O32190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Warren Black, O32192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Harvey Lane, O40338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bruce Warner Reagan, O38975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Howard Gibbs, O43764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Victor Bruni, O32195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Francis Flynn, O43765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lee Stahler, O32197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis William O'Brien, O32196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Fred Ax, O32198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Charles Kulp, Jr., O43768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bless Boswell, O38976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Preston Lerner, O32199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Morris Cramer, O52273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Clement Hatchell, O32200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlo Willis Mitchell, O43772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Miller Heiser, Jr., O43773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Middleton Rutledge, O32201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Dalton von Rohr, O43774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifton Allen Peters, O32202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Stone Livermore, O32203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Crouch, Jr., O43777, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Theodore Guenther, O32206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Kenneth Long, O43778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Werner Holtz, O32209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Monroe Johnson, O52276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Bernard Tenhagen, O43785, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Donaldson, Jr., O32721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Kenneth Hutson, O32212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Capt. Maxim James Dowd, O32210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George McCutchen, O40341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Mervyn Wilson, O38978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bennett Scott, O32213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tyrus Raymond Ambron, O32215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Haberer, Jr., O52278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Keith Saxe, O43790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Paul Clark, O40342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Park Trammell Jenkins, O32218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Miller, O32220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Atticus Thrasher, O32733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice James Reynolds, O43793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Eugene BeLieu, O32223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Kenneth Walker, O32225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Ephriam Downard, O32224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Middleton Thompson, O43794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis Vandenberg, O38979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Holder Crawford, Jr., O32229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Aloysius Graham, Jr., O32231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellwood Frederick Hanson, O52281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leslie Maurice Payne, O43797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glen Ercil Daugherty, O38980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerome Sydney Jefferds, O52283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Heinrick Von Benge, O32237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elias Frederic Liakos, O32238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. McLean Hampton, O32239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Mouchet, O43802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myron McClure, O32241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynn Dillon Fargo, O32242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Earl Riggs, O52285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Logsdon Albert, O40344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thurston Tyler Paul, Jr., O32243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Alfred Stanford, O43808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Everett Moore, O32244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Webster Holmes, O32247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Griswold Grandin, O32248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Walker Tomlin, Jr., O32249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Ray Wilcox, O32251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Raymond Huston, O43812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Dean George, O43815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Clair Hinckley, O52289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Alonzo Chamblin, O32255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Charles Pertl, O40349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Watkin Reese, O43818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Cleland Osborne, O43819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Boice O'Hara, O31887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kenneth McWilliams, O32257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Henry Pierre, Jr., O32258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reuben Nathan Salada, O32261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Ben McKenzie, O32264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris John Naudts, O32265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Carroll Case, Jr., O43824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Williams, O40352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill Woodrow Paden, O52291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Berri Armstrong, O32267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Robert Pershall, O43825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis James Smith, Jr., O43826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Lawrence Mosheim, O32272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Egbert Bruehl, O32270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William David Gnau, O43828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Leon Kelly, Jr., O52292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thorvald Jorgen Guerdrum, O43829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Curtis Everett Healton, O32275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Young Canon, O43830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Hennessey, O32274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Harry Huppert, Jr., O32277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Gray Patterson, O32278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Edward Albert, O32279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Henderson Hollis, O38981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Holmes Colley, O38982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Patrick Scholl, Jr., O32281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Cordrey Pardue, O40354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Emil Papa, O52294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Ellis Nestlerode, Jr., O32282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Frederick Balkman, O32285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Heywood Oakley, O43841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ellis Butts, O32286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Thomas Pullen, Jr., O52296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Burnett Price, O43842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eric Armand Rundquist, O43843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Claude Bartholet, O43845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Cummings Motter, O32288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Douglas Hoskins, Jr., O43846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Melvin Arthur, O32290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Conrad Olia Mannes, Jr., O32293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stockton Donald Bruns, O32292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert David Hand, O32294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Ray Edgerton, O43850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burton Staley Andrews, O43849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sharp Bary, O32296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Emil Davidson, Jr., O32295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pierre Donald Boy, O32297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan Louis Bogardus, O43853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hugh Wikoff, O32301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Samuel Ryan, O32300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl George Witte, O32303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Justus Crawford Kennedy, O43856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Schoonover, O32304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Secord Smith, O32305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Roy Cheek, O32306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roman Irodian Ulans, O52302, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Byron Saul Smith, O43860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Robert Kenigson, O52303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Hayes, O32309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lunsford Wyatt, O32310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Eldon Hanks, O43866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Jeffrey, O40358, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Innes, O43867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hotenel James Huff, O43868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Lee Redman, Jr., O32311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertram Isaac Nash, O40361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Loyd Cone, O40362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl George Peacock, O43873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Thomas Seaburn, O32314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Leland Pence, O43875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Lawrence Weigand, O32315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stanton Niccolls, O32317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Paul Gierlak, O40363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ian Frederick Turner, O32318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thomas Specht, Jr., O32321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Cowley Jones, O32320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Nestor Black, O52309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McCaw Hughes, O32322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Claire Kreighbaum, O43883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Prindle Bartow, O52310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard William Martens, O32324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Frederick Pille, O52311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Emil Holt, O32326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Hamor Hamlin, O52312, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gordon Ulysses Tapper, Jr., O52314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Darce Ronald Knight, O43887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Henry Sweet, O38984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Van Nostrand Grace, O40365, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Vivian Kling, O40366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Rowe O'Farrell, O43888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stuart Frederick Brady, O32329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Rodman Drake, O43894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert James Jackson, Jr., O38986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Talbert Iredell Martin, O43893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Kinnicutt Brown, O32333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Elmer Eckland, O32334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Francis Queenin, O40367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Hugh Mize, O32335, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burrell Curry Hassett, Jr., O38987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Thomas Hillis, O40369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Michael Mullen, O43896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Ray Ware, O52317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth William Wallace, O32338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Laverne Etka, O43898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Wellington Fox, Jr., O52318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hustler Blair 3d, O44388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Willits Crowell, O52319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Woodrow Way, O32341, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Joseph Bird, O32343, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Lee Tate, O38988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Kronke, Jr., O40371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald August Lake, O43901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Francis Zeoli, O32345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Clarence Frederickson, O32347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bradfoot Lyle, O32348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Thomas Fry, O43904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Watson Carter, Jr., O32349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Leon Wilson, O32350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Morris Solomon, O32351, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Albert Schmidt, O52322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Spencer Skillman, O38989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mahlon D. Hickman, O32355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wilbur Casey, O32356, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sherman Dell Cosgrove, O38990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orlando Lee Greening, O43906, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred William Kellner, O32358, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harmon Henry Seale, O32360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John White Yow, O32361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Irving Seekins, O32362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chesley Folsom Durgin, O32363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Sylvanus La Mee 3d, O32364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvador Francis Taranto, O40372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Raymond Steckla, O32366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Martin Garvey, O43910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Stanley Nelson, O52325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Challen Clowes, O32367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Francis Dudley, O40374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lachlan Maclean Sinclair, O32369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Glen Wilson, O32370, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Vinyard Christianson, O43913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Juskalian, O32371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isaac Hoppenstein, O32373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Champ Bush, O43914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Craig Dameron, O32376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Walter Dziuban, O21738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, Jr., O21739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Albert Kunzig, Jr., O21741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Duncan Wolfe, O21743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilmot Ruet McCutchen, O21744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Kirby-Smith, O21745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elting Coates, Jr., O21746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harvey Reed Fraser, O21747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Edgar McCollam, O21748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jay Phelps Dawley, O21750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Montgomery Lee Webster, O21751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Marsden Duke, O21753, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Woodrow William Wilson, O21755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Medusky, O21756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Mason Matheson, O21757, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lewis Cantrell, O21758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Farrell, O21759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Riis Ploger, O21760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Donald Richardson, O21761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Lloyd Winegar, O21764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nicholas Paraska, O21765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Johnson Wells, O21766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Riel Stanton Crandall, O21767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Thomas Bradley, O21768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Sidney Taylor Martin, O21772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward John Gallagher, O21775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Evans Brinker, O21776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Pavick, O21780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence LeRoy Beckedorff, O21781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis Cassidy, O21783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Studer, O21786, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lawton Collins, Jr., O21788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ladislaus Casimir Maslowski, O21789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Johnson Ewell, O21791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Eugene Showalter, O21794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Hyde Camp, O21798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Joseph Minahan, Jr., O21799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mabry Williams, O21801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Irvin Muir, Jr., O21802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Wald, O21804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Harry Kurth, O21807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Penn Haffa, O21809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Walter Allen, Jr., O21810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Belmont Stuart Evans, Jr., O21811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter MacRae Vann, O21812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Charles Dolle, O21813, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Martin Royce, O21814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert Schrader, Jr., O21818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Peterson Winton, Jr., O21819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Richardson Reeves, O21820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ray, O21821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward McCleave Dannemiller, O21822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Fenton Rollins, O21823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Godfrey Urban, O21825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas James Bartley Shanley, O21828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jasper Jackson Wilson, O21829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry McNeil Myers, O21835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll William Dietz, O21836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Dalton Byrne, O21837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Mortimer Crawford, O21840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Albert Hinternhoff, O21844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., O21849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Gustavus Gilbert, O21850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Dobson, O21851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Livingston Nelson Taylor, Jr., O21853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Haskett Lynch Conner, Jr., O21855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard deForest Cleverly, O21862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Putnam Scroggs, O21863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Leon Yarnall, O21864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Kummer Norris, O21865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Young Nanney, O21866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joel Furman Thomason, O21867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James McMenamin Shepherd, O21868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Anthony Janowski, O21869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Howard Keller, O21871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Russell Johnson, O21873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ulrich Georg Gibbons, O21874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Barton George Lane, Jr., O21876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Wright Caldwell, O21877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wayne Reed, O21878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christopher Charles Coyne, O21879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael John Krisman, O21880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin George Megica, O21881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles David Thomas Lennhoff, O21882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Norman Hunsbedt, O21883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Maughan Hull, O21885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles David Kepple, O21886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Millar Geary, O21887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic William Boye, Jr., O21891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Leroy Robinette, O21892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Chessman Beere, O21893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph John Hanchin, O21895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Vernon Tuttle, Jr., O21896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Campbell Bane, O21897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Kosier Newcomer, Jr., O21898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Bradner Marlin, O21899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Watt, O21901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Price, Jr., O21903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Irving Coffey, O21904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., O21905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Herbert Wohlfeil, O21907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Thomas Holt, O21908, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Jordan, O21911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clark George, O21913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Badger Goodwin, O21914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Randall Seaver, O21916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hulen Dee Wendorf, O21919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Frederick Roberts, O21920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Turner Bowie, O21921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Whitehead West 3d, O21922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Davis McFerren, O21923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roger Merrill Lilly, O21924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Jay Henry, O21928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Gordon Johnson, O21929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Lee Shepard, Jr., O21931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Sykes Billups, Jr., O21932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Hill, Jr., O21933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benton Raymond Duckworth 2d, O21934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edward Pickett, O21938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Chester Chapman, O21939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Boiler Maxwell 2d, O21942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Max Cochran, O21945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Seth Foster Hudgins, O21947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Boyle, O21953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles James Hackett, O21954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Heinz Weisemann, O21956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lincoln A. Simon, O21961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., O21963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Gifford, O21964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Alexander McChristian, O21966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Albert Trahan, O21967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Buford Davidson, Jr., O21969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vester Melvin Shultz, O21974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marshall Wallach, O21977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Casper Clough, Jr., O21979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, O21980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Mull Crawford, O21983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wiley Burge Wisdom, Jr., O21985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Max Simpson, O21986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., O21987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Andrew Nolan, Jr., O21988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Jr., O21990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Thomas Mildren, O21992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Lentz 2d, O21993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Traywick McConnell, O21996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Ellsworth Wood, O21998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Dean Poinier, O21999, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Thomas Smith, O22001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Schellman, O22002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvatore Joseph Mancuso, O22006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joel Terry Walker, O22007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moorhouse Coleman, O22008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Joseph Belardi, O22009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Willis Walker, O22011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick David Mulcahy, O22015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., O22016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Bertolet St. Clair, O22017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Busby Miller, O22018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry de Metropolis, O22021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Stephen Charles Farris, O22022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Langley Patrick Medinnis, O22023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Keith Boles, Jr., O22025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matt Combes Cavendish Bristol, Jr., O22027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Wright Allen, Jr., O22034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Vincent Cooperider, O22035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Comerford Smith, O22038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Charles Wickboldt, O22047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Manning Kirby, O22048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Geoffrey Lavell, O22049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William James McConnell, O22052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fidelis David Newcomb, O22056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Walker Davis 3d, O22059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Riley Bess, O22060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Paul Smith, O22063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McCaffrey, O22065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Franklin Hull, O22067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Olav Herstad, O22068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Neary Davis, O22070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Osburn Dickerson, O22071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Goodhue Kail, O22072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Patricio Lasché, O22073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Carter Stone, Jr., O22075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James LeRoy Rogers, O22076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Malcolm Frank Gilchrist, Jr., O22077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John William Jaycox, O22078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Beirne Spragins, O22080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard George Teeters, O22081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. DeWitt Nalley Hall, O22083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Raymond Odom, O22086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward MacDonald Serrem, O22090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Chapman Williams, Jr., O22091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles George Fredericks, O22092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Walter Herbert Grant, O22093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stanley Robert Larsen, O22094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Barclay Carvey, O22095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Kelly, Jr., O22097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Calvin Banning, O22098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Montgomery Preston, O22099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Leland Lampert, Jr., O22100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Frank Goodwin Forrest, O22101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Shields Warren, Jr., O22103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Holloman Barnett, O22104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Lowe Schwenk, O22106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ned Woods Glenn, O22107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Moushegian, O22109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henderson Patterson, Jr., O22110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bradford Smith, O22113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Kopf Rippert, O22115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Elliot Rager, O22116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wesley Florance, Jr., O22119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert William Page, Jr., O22120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Lansing Scott, O22121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eric Olson, O22125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Terry Sutton, Jr., O22128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Wilmarth Kouns, O22129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Griswold Barber, O22130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Allen Matter, O22132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earle Livingstone Lerette, O22133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Tucker Clifford, O22135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Emmet McMahon, O22137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Anderson Roosa, O22138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Pennell, O22139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Lawrason Murray, Jr., O22140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jackson Fling, O22144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Frederick Brockman, O22147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Lore Miller 2d, O22149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Everett Reynolds, O22151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Richard Harrison, Jr., O22152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick Aidan Kelly, O22154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl August Buechner, Jr., O22155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Peter Mial, O22157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Law McCrorey, Jr., O22158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Laurence Boylan, O22162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robison Reilly, O22163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Reeson Looney, O22164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar William Schroeder, O22166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Wilson Collins, O22169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Charles Chapla, O22170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Josiah Scott Kurtz, O22171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Levin Lane Lee, O22172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Watson McClellan, O22173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. David Samuel Dillard, O22175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Meyer, O22179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Constant August Troiano, O22180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Deimel Green, O22182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles John Parsons, Jr., O22183 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Hale, O22184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Kelly, O22185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Earl Mitchell, Jr., O52328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lem Morris Kelly, O32378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John James Petro, Jr., O32380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glendale Draper Gallaher, O43925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hugh Bedford, Jr., O43926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Crawford Dean Lyons, O43924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Batlin, O43927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill James Tutin, O32381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Sexton Simmerman, O40376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Terrell Shaver, O43928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Adams Laing, O43929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hallie Augustus Matlock, O40377, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Oscar Witherspoon, Jr., O40378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis John Aebischer, O32384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Allard Helfert, O32385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Josiah Borden Miller, O32386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Clifford Rountree, O32387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harvey Seymour Browne 3d, O36992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee S. Kaufman, O32388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Bell Erb, O40379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Robert Tam, O43933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Rufus Shepherd, O40380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Becker, O32392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph Scannon, O32393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mario John Zecca, O32396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oliver Jacob Helmuth, O32395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beryl Leon Boyce, O32400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Eli Delnore, O32398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Leonard Bjork, O32399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sterling Henry Abernathy, O32401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland Swarts Devore, Jr., O32404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thornton Edgar Pfaff, O32405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Wilson Jacks, Jr., O32407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. C. W. McConnell, O40381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Alloyse Requarth, O22189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walden Francis Woodward, O22190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Carpenter Dewey, O22191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert William Frink, O22192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Merril Hoover, O22193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Joseph Genetti, O22194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Edward Hassenfelt, O22195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Richard Luczak, O22196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Robert Donaldson, O22198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Harley Lumry, O22199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Gorn, O22200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Dowe Vieman, O22201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Francis Slaughter, O22202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kurt Gustav Radtke, O22203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Pettingell Samson, O22204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Alphonse Hussey, O22205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Murphy Williams, O22206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Gool Pavey, O22207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mylo LeRoy Heen, O22208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Myers, O22209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Enos Wood, Jr., O22210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Richard Christofk, O22212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irving Pray, O22214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joe Ahee, O22215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Hamilton Ragsdale, O22217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Balish, O22218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oliver Kenneth Marshall, O22219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Murray Dean Dougan, O22221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Newton Shigley, O22222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Reeves, O22223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Earl Lay, O22224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Thomas Schooley, O22225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Martin Bachman, O22226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Edward Miller, O22227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Allen Sharrer, O22229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Franklin Bishop, O22231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leslie Hector Cross, O22232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Farris Ludeman, O22233, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Taylor Beelman, O22235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard George Jewett, O22236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Albert Swatta, O22237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glen S. Waterman, O22239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Calvin Oliver Smith, O22240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Jones Merrill, O22241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Price Moorefield, O22244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Gunnard Carlson, O22246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Fleetwood Crocker, O32410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harlan Moore Freeman, O32409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Landon Greaud Cox, O32413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edmund Victor Harnstrom, O32414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Chester Emmett Canine, O43949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Kendall Harrold, O32417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon August Miller, O40386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Gray, O40387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Louis Lossen, O32420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Delbert Sasse, O32421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lee Kinson, O43955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl August Peterson, O52344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ripley Bruce, Jr., O32423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Dee Gallagher, O43958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. George Leslie Morelock, Jr., O43960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Abraham, O32427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Urban Edward Rohr, O38996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Siddell Hannum, O32428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles George Micheau, O32429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Crawford Henry Lydle, Jr., O52349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Carl Turner, O43965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Leigh Husman, O32431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Joseph Petrilli, O32433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Penly, O22300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Leonard Erickson, O32434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Barnes Marshall, O52350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Norman Hale, O43968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lloyd Jorgenson, O32436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Edwin Fisher, O32435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Baum, O38997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Wendell Reynolds, O43969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Amel Lavaine Cox, O43971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Ainsworth Hamilton, O52352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Washington Johnson, O52351, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas McKnight, O32439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Koshko, Jr., O43974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Preston Dawson, Jr., O38998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert William Wildey, O52353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Eugene Hood, O32443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ross Young, O39001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Wenbert Murphy, O43979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Andrew Reid Duvall, Jr., O32444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Bernard Sellers, O43981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Newman Smith, O32449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Hays Wineman, O52354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max McCord, O52355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Walter McWhinney, O32450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Simms, O32451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Evans Ackner, O32452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Melvin Layman, Jr., O32455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Dantzker, O43992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Pierce Reeves, Jr., O43996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ashton Ross, O39003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lon Devere Marlowe, Jr., O32459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kenneth Doyle, O44000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Herman Dickey 3d, O44001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Isaiah Lewis, O43360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lee Richardson, O44002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Parker Warner, O32462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Walter Taylor, O32465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Myron Gray, O44007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Franklin Giles, O56899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Harold Kyckelhahn, O32467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Charles Wilkins, O44009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Arnold Rodgers, O44010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edwin Arthur, O32468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bevelle Taliaferro Brown, O32469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elwyn James Fonk, O44015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Dallas Burns, O32472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jackson Rushing, O40391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernard Edward Babcock, O44018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lionel Friedman, O32474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Seth Sanders, O52359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Vinning Clark, O40393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oscar Glazier Piland, O52360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Edward Eitt, O32477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Raymond Russell, O32478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederick Louis Schumm, O32479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Keith, Jr., O32482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Merle Fondren, O32481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Nelson Jean, O22632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hubert Denwood Thomte, O22633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Sewanee Baskin, O22634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Otto Johnson, O22635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Gordon Ratliff, O22637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sylvan Preston Lay, O22638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ira Bertram Richards, Jr., O22639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Eugene Allen Dees, O22641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald William Coons, O22642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Charles McCrum, O22643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Reeve Bruyere, 3d, O22644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Dunlap Hill, O22645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lemuel Edwin Pope, O22646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vladimir Bohdan Kovac, O22647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stephen Wheeler Downey, Jr., O22649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Parrish McQuail, O22651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Lee Copley, O22652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Johnson Grant Lemmon, O22653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vernon Ehlert Rex Rawie, O22654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Sterling Charles Holmes, O22655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Hastings, O22658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Snow, O22659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willys Hicks Pearson, O22660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Ezra Shoemaker, O22661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Robert Moore, Jr., O22662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Latta Mann, O22663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Overton Gall, O22664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Francis Heasty, Jr., O22665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Avery W. Masters, O22666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Louis Thorkelson, O22667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Longwell Foster, O22669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Augustine Kenan, O22670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Beaty, O22672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick William Hasselback, Jr., O22673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Burns Barry, Jr., O22674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Buck White, O22675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Franklin Kent, O22676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Logan Irby, O22678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Clay Holloway, Jr., O22679, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morgan Garrott Roseborough, O22681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Cantrell, O22682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dorsey Elwood McCrory, O22683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Dayle Balliett, O22684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aleck Francis MacDonald, O22685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Grady Ford Rials, O44022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Christy, O44023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Ewing Cole, O32484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gerald Lucey, O44025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Kaiser, O52323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Frederick MacLeod, O44026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Cross Gee, O44027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Whittick, O32487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude William White, O44029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Elmer Rousek, Jr., O44030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Schaeffer Bare, O32488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Norman Ward, Jr., O32491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harrison John Merritt, O32492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William John Besser, O44039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Willard Ralf, O44037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Christopher Worth Chaney, O32496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Brubaker, Jr., O32497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Edward Hall, Jr., O32330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John MacLean, O44042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Royce Lester Eaves, O32499, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Temple Heston, O52371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Denton Callaway, O32502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford John Van Sickle, O32505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Page Hudson Brownfield, O40395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Allen Corcoran, O31721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Lewis Norwood, O44048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Halland William Hankel, O44049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Thomas Behnken, Jr., O44052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Getty Fairchild, O40396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linden Kinder Cannon, Jr., O32509, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Allison Shaw, O32511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arthur Williams, O32513, Army of the United States, (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Winston Landes, O40397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lewis Brooks, Jr., O44054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Greene Risley, O32516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Getchel Maynard, O32515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harauld Dean Langham, O32518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Cannon Bradford, O32519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Winford Leonard, O44056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Scott Kendall, Jr., O32521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Capt. Virgil Glenn Brown, O40398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis James Wadle, O44059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert Rankin, O32522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erik William Jordahn, O44060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wesleigh Molloy, O32526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edwin Carruth, O44064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles E. Surber, O32528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brian Odell Montgomery, O32529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Hodges, O44065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Newhall Page, O32530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Dean Dickson, O32531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Earle Tardy, O32532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Stuart Werngren, O39006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gordon Bennett, O40400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Aloise Luszki, O44073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Paul Killman, O32536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Whitfield, O32537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Girard Di Meo, O44074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Reid Raber, O44076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Calvin Featherston, O44075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Warren Moon, O32540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ross Putnam Frasher, O40401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Arthur Welde, O40402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Aloysius Sullivan, O44080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Byron Mills, O32544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Keagle Buck, O32545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rodney Douglas Brown, O32547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milton Michael Miletich, O32546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Frank Lester Lear, O39007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Benjamin McGrath, O32548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Conn, O32550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Wayne Engelland, O32551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thad Sam Oliver, Jr., O32553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tony Francis Perpich, O32552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lilbourne Wayne Sherrod, O40403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Theron Strickland, O44085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cleo Vernon Hadley, O44086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Raymond Brice, O32557, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Victor Doriot, O52386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Albert Laliberte, O32558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Philip Heller, O52389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Wayne Gaines, O32559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hudson Christie Hill, O32560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Charles Johnson, O44090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernst Fredrich Liebmann, O44091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Oswald Miller, O40404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Raymond Bernard Graeves, Jr., O32563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Baker Hallums, O32564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. C. Craig Cannon, O39008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Albert Walsworth, O32565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Francis Smith, O40406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Laurence Edmund Chloupek, O44094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Martin Trauger, O44095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Terrell Dunn, O32612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Seely Hutchinson, Jr., O32611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Melvin Thompson, O44098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Collyer Smith, O32572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Byron Gordon, O32573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Pickering Nichols, O40407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Leonard Lerner, O44103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Shelton E. Lollis, O32575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clyde Morton, O39010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Whiting, O32577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel David Wilder, O44104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Judson Hyde, O44109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Gordon Russell, O32580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Kinnison, O32581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Stuart Crossman, O32583, Army of the United States (first ljeutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Craig Beechley, O44115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Franklin Melvin, O32585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Clem Garrison Hailey, O40409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. LaMar Arthur DeSpain, O32587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Carney, O52396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Gilbert Raff, O32588, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank McPherson Bullard, O44121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bill Buerkle, O52399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Harry Daubert, O32593, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Bartley Axum, O52400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Broderick Huntley, O22714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elbert Mack Sleeker, O22716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Emil Barker, O22717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elbert Emerson Stickels, O22718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Alan MacGregor, O22719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dean Edgar Painter, O22720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Lee Pitney, O22721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Walter Stephenson, Jr., O22722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Shacter, O22724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Hubbard Strong, O22725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Wilhoit Stulting, O22726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Boisseau Watson, O22727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel McCord Hollis, O22728, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Charles Mautz, O22729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Nelson Eddy, O22730, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Arnold Kreidberg, O22733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lucius Walton, O22734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Belton O'Connell, O22735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wright Williams, O22736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Armistead Robison Harper, O22738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene John White, O22739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Xavier Bradley, O22740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Ellison Hart, O22742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thornton Jones, O32595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paull Alonzo Bane, Jr., O32596, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Sylvester Jones, O52403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ogene Pitts, O44126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Lyndon Peter Kramer, O40413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Asher Stone, O40414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank John Wasson, Jr., O39011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Winston Anson Jones, O32602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Woodrow Gray, O44130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herald Heyman Smith, O32603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Elliott Renaud, O44131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Mildridge Frazier Vaughn, O40415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Franklin Edward Duda, O52407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Lorenz, O52408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Anton Barten, O32605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Monroe Marlow, O32606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Francis Hamele, O32610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Alfred Knute Clark, O32608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Martin Davis, O52410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osborn Cooper, O44135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Edward Foxx, O40418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Cecil Fralish, O32668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles William Eifler, O32614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Grover Chester Richards, Jr., O44139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wallace McKee Kendrick, O32615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Guy Luckett Campbell, O32616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Phillip Elcano, O44142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Selby McKay Frank, O32620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Jenkins Halsey, Jr., O32619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Davis Sydnor, Jr., O32618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Harold Duckworth, O32621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Arthur Allen, Jr., O32622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frank Taylor, O44143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Thomas Rhatigan, O52412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Mitchell Dill, O32626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Christian Neumann, Jr., O44145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence William Drye, O52413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Silas Rice, O32628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Halsted Graham, O40420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Gaines Stark, O40421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Escar Cowart, O52415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Harllee, O44146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Blake Stark, O32633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myron Laithwaite Brewer, O32495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Allen Marshall, O52416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jim Alva Campbell, O52417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lorenzo Albino Mella, Jr., O52418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elba Walter Bowen, O32634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor Emile Morissette, O44149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roderick Dermott Eason, O52420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Tommins Adler, O32635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Howard Dunning, O52421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Southward Robbins, O32636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hiram Madison Merritt, O32638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Timothy Augustus Moran, O32640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel William Rachal, O44159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Merrill Farmer, O44158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Samuel Hilton, O32643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Nat Giambelluca, O44161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris Bailey Montgomery, O44162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Elmer Bates, O32644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Barclay Wolff, O32645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tom Walker Barnett, O44164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Eugene Long, O40422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Mark, O32647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Franklin Marshall, O32648, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Rutledge Greer, Jr., O32651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frederick Ottinger, O39012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Clancy Cassaday, O32658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Simpson Keisler, O32657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Fairfax Bayard, O44169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Minot Boyd Dodson, O32660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Giles Houghton Kidd, O32659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Lovell Hooper, O32662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph McIntyre, Jr., O44171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Ramey Keller, O33248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hayden John Price, O39013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. LaRue Henry Ritter, O40424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Buckley, O52429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Robert Duffy, O52428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Miller Hartman, Jr., O44177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Farren, O32670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Martin Gettys, O44181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clyde Milton Dillender, Jr., O32671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carmon Lavon Clay, O32673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Goodwin Hubbard, O52430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Hughes, Jr., O32676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Emile Joseph Bussolati, O32677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Wayne Sunderlin, O32678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thomas Heinrich, O39014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Richard Joseph Giuffre, O40425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Daniel Wise, Jr., O32682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edwin Kirk, O32681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold McCord, O32683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Legare Jenkins, Jr., O32684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Weaver Henderson Gaines, O32686, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nathan Guelzow Schmidt, O44188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marshall Garrett McBee, O39015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Bruce Jeffress, O44190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Gilbert Moran, O52434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Herber, O32689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Adolph Joseph Gondek, O44196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Richard Radzwich, O32691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Murphy, O44201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Garcia Lundy, O32692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Lee Goodrich, O32693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Willett Wood, O44203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Henry Birch, O32696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Baker Clark, O32695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raleigh Osborn Worrell, O32697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas William Alvey, O32698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Lyle, O32700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Douglas Patterson, O32702, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Storey McMillan, O32703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Welsh, O32706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Perry John Roberts, O44208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Lawrence Steinbacher, O32709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Alden Hurt, O44210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix Edward Tharpe, O32204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charis Roger Sparra, O32712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Otis Ross, O52442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hays Hammond, Jr., O44213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clifford Freeman, O44214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Elmer Godfrey, O52444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Charles Kingsley, O32717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Hill Carter, O52445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Lawrence Yerby, O32719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard German Murdock, O44221, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Barton Ormsbee Baker, O44222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerard James Grogan, O40429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Hayes Ruffner, Jr., O39017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Milford Walter Wood, O32723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Lewis Lucas, O40249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Carter, O40430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Benjamin Ross, Jr., O32724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur William Ries, O44226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Byron Owen, O32725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Eric Blumensaadt, O32727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leon Herbert Rainville, O32726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Murray Parker, O39018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jonas Alvin Vilhauer, O32732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cyrus Reyon Shockey, O44234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Edison Pell, O40432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Talton Woodrow Long, O32735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willis Elmo Smitherman, O52455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wendell Wright Gaffney, O44235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Orville Emil Bloch, O32736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lyles Snyder, O52456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Charles Wall, O32738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Alfred Joseph Montrone, O32737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Ford Hoffman, O44240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ronald Watson, O52459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hal Hardenbergh, O32740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Verner Heim, O32743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Flagg Murray, Jr., O32744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Riddle, O32745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Benjamin Beckham, O32747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Dexheimer, O32749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee George Kays, O32750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oakley McCurdy Lamb, O32751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Chase Gleason, O44245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Graham Buhmann, O32748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Irvin Norris, O44246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Bernhardt Schuppener, O52465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Judson Spencer, O44248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Slifer Leidy, O32755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walcott Watson, O32756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julius Willie Levy, O52466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Hantzes, O52467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Willhite Hannah, O32760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Edgar Stuart, O52468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Wright, O32765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Thomson Guth, O32768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Wells Johnson, O44258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oliver Glen Stutzman, O32771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert William Hartung, O44261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Aubrey Wolfe, O44262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Ariel Swope, O32774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Leonard Dunn, O40437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Clayburn Tipton, O32777, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence August Mette, Jr., O32776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Ewing Foster, O52471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic N. Oettinger, Jr., O32782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Preston Stockwell, O40438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Alvin Johnson, O33361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Edward Harper, O32783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Andre Harry Nelson, O44271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Herman Johnson, O44273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Hunt, O32789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Bigelow Allen, O44275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Craig, O52479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Engl, O44278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Harold Ward, O44280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy Clifford Emery, Jr., O52481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Nelson Axtell, O44281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvis Morrow Howell, O32797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Curtis Allan, O32798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Frederick Cook, Jr., O32801, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Edward Twyon, O32805, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Samuel Dillon, O32807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carlyle Hegsted Shurtleff, O44288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gordon Elwood McQuain, O40441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Taft Benson, O52484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Norman Davis, O32808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick Francis Cassidy, O32809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Ernest Meisell, O32812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Chester Herman Hancock, O44292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Thomas Wiley, Jr., O40442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Asa Glass, Jr., O44293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Henry Dawson, O39023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bristow Sanford Hopper, O32815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Sanders, O44296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clark Vincent Telquist, O40443, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kermit Herbert Rosenberg, O52487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Russell O'Grady, O40444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Wilson, O32820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Albert Henry Woodman, O32822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Witus Thybony, O39024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Prior, O44304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Smith McElhenny, O39025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Eddison Wade, O32824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Garland May, O32825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Henry Harrison Hewitt, O32827, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Elmore Dalness, O44310, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Newton Lingenfelter, O32829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Stack Hastings, O32830, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Martin Ruck, O33049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Samuel Stoneback, O44316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Leo Davis, O44317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Beverly Risque, O40446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Donald Canfield, O44318, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Louis Eisirup, O44319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Wilson White, O40448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elwood Dale McSherry, O44322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Larry Gene McPherson, O52498, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eben Randolph Jones, O32836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allen Law Morrison, O32837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Wellman Duvall, O32842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Ryno Yourtee, Jr., O44329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Alexander Penn, O32843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Hewitt, O44332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Anthony Henry Ortenzi, O33383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Goldsmith Thompson, O32844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lyle Eugene Hershey, O52502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Rains White, O32847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Yarnell Kimball, O32852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Dayton Colvin, O32853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Duane David Davis, O39026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe McAdoo Willis, O32854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Frederick Langland, O52505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Einar Watten, O44342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Kenneth Bunney, O52507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Hugh Darlington, O33440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otho Tindall Winstead, O44345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Aubrey Sanford, O32857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harlan Veatch Logsdon, O44347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lawrence Dean, Jr., O32860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William George Barry, O40452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Gross Stover, O32845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Lewis Lillyman, O32861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Everett Osthues, O52512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Tyler Gilbert, O44348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Jackson Chatham, O52513, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexander Anthony Zaresky, O44353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor Allen Davis, O40453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Elwood Conway, O44354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy French Clark, Jr., O32863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Thomas Richardson, O32864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Charles Spinney, O44357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walker Felton Nolan, O52516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Russell Carl Krueger, O32865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Emmett McKay Lewis, O32866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Thomas Avery, Jr., O32867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Reed Behnke, O32869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Gordon Evans, O52521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Paul Blakely, O32870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allan Lee Swaim, O32871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Wintrode Wyand, O44363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Cook, Jr., O32876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Frederick Coyle, Jr., O52523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leopold Frederick Hofinger, O44368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Hoover, O44370, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Armour Stewart Armstrong, O44372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Denton Hickman, O44374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Edwin Strauss, O44375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Melvin Dietzel, O32881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Christopher Raymond Keegan, O44383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Tuttle Barnaby, Jr., O44385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Lee Baker, O40456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Trevor Eifler Williams, O32883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Willie Lee Tate, O32885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Kruse Kolster, O32886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Archie James Griggs, O44389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Evert Cecil Way, O32888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Emil Schulten, Jr., O40457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Floyd Harrison Long, Jr., O32889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Reino Oscar Lehtonen, O52532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aaron Ellsworth Blewett, O32893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Julius Rozamus, O32892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Boothe, Jr., O52533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Rigel, O32894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Leroy Hicks, O52535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Langdon Leonard, Jr., O32898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ward Truett Blacklock, O32899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Wallace Aux, O44399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arley Leroy Outland, O44400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harlos V. Hatter, O32901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harrington Griffith, O44403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Franklin Prysi, O32904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Von Pawel, O52541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Max Zaumeyer, O32906, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Hudson, O44410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roosevelt Thomas Plummer, O44412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lee Huffaker, O32911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Frederick Hooper, O39028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Ernest Beda, O32916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Martin Scott, Jr., O52544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carroll Evans McHenry, O52545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Edward Murray, O44421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Joseph Flanigan, O44422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Lawrence Cormier, O32923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Clayton McLaughlin, O44423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Kenneth Nelson, O44426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Stewart, O32925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Prunty, O32924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Clifton Brown, O22888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Edward Gee, O22889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John William Burfening, O22891, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Anthony Graf, Jr., O22892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Bellows Hazeltine, Jr., O22896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leo Erway Dunham, Jr., O22897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Francis Dixon, Jr., O22899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ashod Michael Ahmajan, O22900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Joseph Fuller, O22901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Francis O'Neil, O22902, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Gordon Forbes, O22903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Richard Peterson, O22904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Stuart Parker, O22907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Harold Goodrich, O22911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Aiken Flanders, O22912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Thomas Podufaly, O22913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marvin Leroy Jacobs, O22915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clayton Allen Rust, O22916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Wilson Penney, O22917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Duvall Quaid, O22919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Maurice Clock, O22920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Carter Pfeil, O22921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Richard Sullivan, O22923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Landon Haseman, O22925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Henry Free, O22926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Gaylord Cook, O22927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Eugene Gunster, Jr., O22928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Hobart Krauss, O22932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thaddeus Michael Nosek, O22934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Joseph Legere, Jr., O22937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Oval Hale Robinson, O22938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul David Phillips, O22939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Harvey Banks, O22940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Harvey Roedy, O22941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Carmin Noble, O22942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Morris Rogers, O22943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Bunyan Corbly, Jr., O22944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Lovell Elliott, O22945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Dixon Arnold, O22946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cuyler Llewellyn Clark, Jr., O22947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerhard Evans Brown, O22948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Minahan, O22949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Regis Shanahan, O22950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Pershing Strauss, O22951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Irving Dice, O22952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edmund Harrison, Jr., O22953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Urey Woodson Alexander, O22954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Payne Francisco, O22955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Maurice Smith, O22960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Roger Guy, O22961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ray Williams, O22962, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Montgomery Moore, O22963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wendell John Coats, O22964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Ferrell Winton, Jr., O22966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Ambrose Ferry, O22967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Jacob Yeager, O22969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Mayo, Jr., O22970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Renola, O22971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence William Clapsaddle, Jr., O22972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Loeb Shoss, O22973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Moore Brewer, O22975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth McRae Lemley, O22976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Harvey Spengler, O22977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond LeRoy Shoemaker, Jr., O22978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nils Martin Bengtson, O22979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Hamilton Kyle, O22981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Homer Barron Chandler, Jr., O22982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Titus Vanderhoef, O22984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Silvasy, O22985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Haldeman Baumer, O22987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dean Marti Benson, O22991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Augustine Miley, Jr., O22993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robert Wendt, Jr., O22995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Talmage Marsh, Jr., O22996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rolland Woodrow Hamelin, O22997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edward Gushurst, O22998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Raymond Weir Millican, O23000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Vivian Bennett, O23001, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Allen Cunningham, Jr., O23003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Woodrow Wilson Vaughan, O23004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Willard Walters, Jr., O23006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Daniel Carnahan, O23007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Merrick Patten, O23008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Fate, O23010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kirkbride Taylor, O23011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin Fahey Black, O23012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robinson Riley Norris, O23014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Harrison Mullin, O23015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Burdett Eugene Haessly, O23016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Huntington Monroe, Jr., O23017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hobart Burnside Pillsbury, O23019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Louis Hoffmann, O23023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Manley Calbraith Perry, O23024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Jacob Beiser, O23025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Boyle Stewart, O23028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Simonton Brice, Jr., O23029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., O23030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Crown, O23031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett DeWitt Light, O23033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Alexander Shaunesey, Jr., O23036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Andrew O'Brien, O23037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Woodfin Hobson, Jr., O23038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerry Spears Addington, O23041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Milton Orman, O23046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otis Maxwell Ulm, O23047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Henry Hendrickson, O23048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dennis Ladislaus Barton, O23049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Griffith Baker, O23051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Levin Belt, O23053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Thompson Simpson, Jr., O23054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Joseph Fellenz, O23055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John MacNair Wright, Jr., O23057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Campbell Cassibry, O23058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Loring Clay, O23059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Michael Paulick, O23060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Jerome Delaney, O23067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. William Roscoe Kintner, O23068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wendell Burley Sell, O23069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Armand de Latour, Jr., O23073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Langworthy Beaudry, O23077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Kieser Britt, O23078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Elroy Tyler, O23079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Hobbs Fraser, O23080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Carroll Haggard, O23081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Herbert Rosen, O23082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donovan Paul Yeuell, Jr., O23083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stewart Lawrence McKenney, O23084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edison Albert Lynn, Jr., O23085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bertil Andrew Johnson, O23086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan Phillip Thayer, O23087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Pidgeon, O23089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederic Watson Oseth, O23090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jordan Joseph Wilderman, O23092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Harold Nelson, O23093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Stevens Harnett, O23094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frederick Kreitzer, O23096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Aber, O23097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alan Martin Strock, O23099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gilbert Hume Woodward, O23102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Osmund Alfred Leahy, O23106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Butler Bonham, O23107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Anthony Lotozo, O23109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Alexander Aubrey, O23110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul S. Cullen, O23111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Frederick Gordon, O23112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Kenney, O23114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edmund Collins, O23116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Francis Bavaro, O23117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Frederick Horton, O23118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olin Lee Bell, O23119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Mead Bowlby, Jr., O23120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Scott Montgomery Case, O23121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Edward Kramer, O23122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rowland Herman Renwanz, O23123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Wilbourne Milner, O23124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Schuyler Hardin, O23126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jules David Yates, O23127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sanford Patrick England, O23129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Goodnow Stoddard, Jr., O23130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Richard Maedler, O23132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip John Moore 3d, O23135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ronald Maurice Kolda, O23136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Scott Greene, Jr., O23137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Jefferson Turner, Jr., O23138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salvo Rizza, O23139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Robert McLean, O23140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Deber Townsend, O23141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Herold Wohner, O23142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wing Fook Jung, O23144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Corwin Chamberlain, O23145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cornelius Arthur Murphy, O23146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Michael Rooney, O23147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Hennessy, O23148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Edward Zahrobsky, O23149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Anthony O'Brien, Jr., O23152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Christie Emery, O23153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Delbert Earle Munson, O23156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roderick Wetherill, O23158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Robert Barry, O23160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bryce Frederic Denno, O23161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Russell Dodderidge, O23164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Leo Clement, O23167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Porter Briggs, O23169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ford Prioleau Fuller, Jr., O23170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Lionel Bierman, O23175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas O'Keefe, O23176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel McClure Goodwin, O23177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carroll Cameron, O23178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace James Hackett, O23179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Barbour Byrne, O23181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lester Frank Schockner, O23182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. John Dibble, Jr., O23183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Henry Bates, O23184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Ami Stella, O23185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Bert Lane, O23187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Eugene Farthing, Jr., O23188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Martin Bell Chandler, O23189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George John Bayerle, Jr., O23192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Park Richards, O23194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kerr Roberts, Jr., O23195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hans Mueller, O23196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Balthis, Jr., O23199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leland George Cagwin, O23200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henry Muller, O23201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Silvio Emil Gasperini, Jr., O23203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harmon Porter Rimmer, O23204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James David Loewus, O23205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Fielding Lewis, O23206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Rockwell Crocker, O23207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Myers Kasper, O23210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Meszar, O23211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Thomas Cassidy, O23213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lee Watson Fritter, O23217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Orville McDonald, O23218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sanford Harvey Webster, O23222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Frederick Williams, Jr., O23224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Deming Lucas, Jr., O23225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Washington England, Jr., O23226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Francis O'Donnell, O23228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Anthony Schmaltz, O23229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilford Dalton Green, O23231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Chittenden Mandell, O23234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emory Sherwood Adams, Jr., O23235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Gordon Malone, O23237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Ware Mabee, O23241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Florian John Erspamer, O23242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Eugene Oglesby, O23244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Theodore Biswanger, Jr., O23245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bidwell Moore, O23248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thaddeus Philip Floryan, O23249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Dale Epley, O23250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Webster Hough, O23251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Lewis Paul Wermuth, O23252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andrew Donald Budz, Jr., O23253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Talman Watrous, Jr., O23254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Durward Henry Galbreath, O23255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jodie Gibson Stewart, Jr., O23256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Lt. Col. Eben French Swift, O23258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Weisman Davis, O23259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Neville Mackin 3d, O23260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Alexander Shagrin, O23261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Louis Gonzaga Mendez, Jr., O23262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Gildart, O23264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sidney Vincent Bingham, Jr., O23269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Bernard Morrissey, O23270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Clair Baugher Klunk, O23273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Victor George Conley, O23276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Merrill Gleszer, O23278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Lee Mastran, O23279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Drummond Swank, O23281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Norman Holm, O23282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Sorg Reinecke, Jr., O23284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Miner, O23285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Raleigh, O23287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dunphy Fitzpatrick, O23288, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Julian Aaron Cook, O23290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Thomas Larkin, O23293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Page Egerton Smith, O23294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Force Daniels, O23295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William White Saunders, O23296, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Harley Arnold, Jr., O23299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Hatfield Merchant, O23301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Moffet Freudendorf, O23303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Joseph Manzolillo, O23304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Franklin Delamater 3d, O23305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Borden, O23306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Philip Robert Cibotti, Jr., O23309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Thomas Devlin, O23314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Newlin Ross, O23315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Landon Albert Witt, O23317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bertram Coontz, O23319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton David Lederman, O23320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Grinnell White, O23326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Jennings Floyd, O23328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Kuziv, Jr., O23330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Bennett, O23331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Cicero Fogle, O44428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Gorrie Alexander, O32927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Burrell Hewette, O44430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Rasmus Anderson, O40461, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Beals Scudder, O36179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Francis Morand, O32930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Bee, O44437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Acton Kirk, Jr., O44442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Meade Parker, Jr., O32936, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burkhardt Marshall Senn, O52560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ivan George Phillips, O32941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Winston Lewis Olson, O32940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Reeves Garton, O32945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Paul D'Arezzo, O23333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Frederick Freund, O23334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hilton Densley, O32946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Helmuth Simmons, O39029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Camden Page Fortney, Jr., O32949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce Braid, O32950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard James, O40463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles Rohan, O32954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Courtney Heald, O44454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Neil Sands, O32957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick William Baum, O23385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Herbert Batte, O23401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herman Walter Wright Lange, O23402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Stanley Griffith, Jr., O23403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Washburn Bruneau, O23404, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Cook Tredennick, O23405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Conrad Miller, O23406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Hall Livingston, O23408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hunter LeGear Stockton, O23409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jene Earl Mills, O23410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Bryan Sigley, O23411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Pratt Alexander Warren, O23412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Warren Randall King, O23413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Gray Platt, O23414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Joseph Harness, O23415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Denisevich, O23416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Archie Hatten, O23417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilbert Warren Curl, O23418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Lincoln Brassel, O23420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Cobb Benjamin, O23422, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Blair Green, O23423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harlan Bull, O23424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Burbank Webster, Jr., O23425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emerson Wallace Grant, O23427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Blatchford Robinson, O23428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifford Ellwood Lippincott, O23429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Dana Young, O23430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Francis Carter, O23431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kethley Gillmore, O23432, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cyril Dean Sterner, O23434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Walton Walker, O23435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Alvin Kersting, O23436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Walker Sample, O23437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Grant Taylor, Jr., O23438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Irvine Manning, O23439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Sheridan Eldridge, O23442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Misha Nicholas Kadick, O23444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Storey Sandiland, O23445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Houghton Collart, O23447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Scandrett, O23448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrel Gee Costello, O23449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bergen Brokaw Hovell, O23450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Henry Symbol, O23452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Samuel Daley, Jr., O23453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Howard Ressijac, O23454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Finney Lane, O23456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Mix Gilbert, O23457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas O'Connor Blakeney, O23458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jackson Natzel, O23459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Hammond Walker, Jr., O23460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otto Bismarck Cloudt, Jr., O23462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Diedrich Hansen, O23468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emil Paul Eschenburg, O23469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Arn, O23470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Cone Mahoney, Jr., O23486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Chester Goers, O23487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David William Iunghuhn, O23488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Darrel Cavness, O23489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Bennett Johnson, O23490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Parker Ewan Connor, Jr., O23491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Pancratius Fagan, O23496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Unverferth, O23499, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Alban, O23500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Metcalf, O23501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl William Edwards, O23502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bert Perrin, O23503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Raymond Thomas Shelby, O23504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Henry Lorenz, Jr., O23505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Christopher Wilkinson, Jr., O23512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Charles Brill, O23514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Washington Shivers, Jr., O23515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clyde Stump, O23516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Cecil Evans, Jr., O23517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Ernest Rice, O23518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fogg Twombly 3d, O23519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Spencer Phair, O23520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Troxell Olin Mason, O23522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jacob Franklin Mynderse, O23523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merle Reed Preble, O23524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Hall, O23525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Alexander Schendel, Jr., O23526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Charles Durgan, O23527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Everett Albert Hansen, O23528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Thompson Horner, Jr., O23530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Milton Hightower 3d, O23531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hal Dale McCown, O23532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh William McClary, O23533, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Marion Brumfiel, O23534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. Henry John Richter, O23536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin O'Connor, Jr., O23539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Harold Lahlum, O23541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Condit Ingalls, O23542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vallard Cassius Smith, O23543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Pershing Brown, O23544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Clark Manson, O23545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Claire Tillson, O23546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nye Maguet Scofield, O23547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Greenwood, Jr., O23548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Law Bryan, O23549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Melvin Desmond Clark, O23550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Howard Bayer, O23551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Marvin Kinzer, O23552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Brinkley Ramsey, O23553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Donham Higgins, O23554, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Zim E. Lawhon, O23555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elgin Gilbert Radcliff, O23558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Somer Shapland, O23560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Harry Pell, O23561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Alexander Edens, O23563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Vincent Wilson, O23564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvin Albert Johnson, O40464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Newell Barber, O52568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Charles Smith, O44457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Kenneth Smith, O32959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Farrar Bristol, O44459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Wayne Mather, O44453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Raymond Budge, O52569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clifford Melius, O44464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willard Pearson, O44466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bernhard Randle, O52570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Riley, O40465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Osborne Romeo Rumph, O40466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ledford Lain, O32967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Davis Preston, Jr., O32969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl J. Brown, O39031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allen Poe McCarthy, Jr., O32970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Gleason Cornett, O32972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Robert Hansen, O52571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alexander Higgins, O40468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lashlie Utley, O32977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delbert Lewis Jellum, O44478, Army of the United tSates (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman I. Zimmerman, O52576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Warren Sisco, O52579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Hobart Gerard, O32982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Albert Newlin, O32983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Colmer Whitting, O44487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Adrain Michaelis, O44486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Neal Tudor, O39032, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harrison Crowe, O32986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Clark Bingham, Jr., O40471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Vincent Schafbuch, O32990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Morris Scott, Jr., O44501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Le Vere Henry Strom, O32995, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Hawley Matthews, O32997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leland Henry Langbein, O40473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexander Finlay Berol, O33000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Schwartzman, O40475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alva Thomas McDaniel, O44521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Andrew Young, Jr., O44524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Guice Kimball, O52599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gamble McIlhiney, O33005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Clarence Aylesworth, O23614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Dickerson, O23615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Earl Treadway, O23617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Entwistle Burton, O44526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ben Warner Legare, O39034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tracy James Hardman, O33007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Andrew Roberts, O33008, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester Alphonso Kearney, O33010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Hyatt Malone, O33014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ray Goodman Lawrence, O52606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Neil Mackay Matzger, O44539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Carlisle Griffin, O33018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gilbert Martin, O39035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rieder William Schell, O33021, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Roger Harris, O44544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Ballard Porter, O40477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Clifford Pittman, O33022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Reinoldi, O52610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Kenneth Addison, O44547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert David Branagan, O33024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Branson Cobb, O33025, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mayer Wilson, Jr., O33026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Clements Blackwell, O40478, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Elmer Pederson, O40479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Marion Conover, Jr., O33029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Patrick Mullarkey, O33030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Eugene Scherer, O33032, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Larsen, O44558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Henry Clifford, O33033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bernard Benjamin Beck, O40481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Brice Pace, O33035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Walter Lang, O33034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Howard Hanson, O52615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Herberts Bykerk, O33038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vincent Edward Osborne, O33039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene C. Oates, Jr., O44576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Cooper Gibson, O44578, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marcello Worthington Bordley, Jr., O44580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Armand Leo Bellavance, O40484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Dickson Polley 3d, O39036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norman Elwood Petty, O33041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Burrows, O23621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hector Carrie, Jr., O33043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pratt Mason, O44587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold William Athan, O52624, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph James Delaney, O33048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Throckmorton Ghent, O52626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Leon Leva, O52627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anders Olof Wiklund, O44597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Thomas Ryan, O52629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Donald Allen, O52630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Arthur Wooten, Jr., O44599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Orrsin King, O44600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Vincent Fahey, O33054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Stern Quick, O44602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Calone Bieri, O33055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Alfred Collins, O40486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Brown Mitchell, O52633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Roberts Prewitt, O44603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Cullinan, O44604, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Tillman Hunt, Jr., O33057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Adams Hall, O44605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wah Geung Chin, O33058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Blackburn Stephens, O33060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Ernest Ward Smith, O33064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Garland Rawlings, O33065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Clifford Wood, Jr., O52640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Francis Roberts, Jr., O44612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Webster, O33071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Peter Parker, O40487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Golden Bogle, O52642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Goulding Marriott, O33072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Frederick Byers, O52643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thornton Boyle, O33074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karlton Warmbrod, O33077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Gerald Irwin, O40490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Sumstad, O52646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James Rosa, O33078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Thro Haslam, O33079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Todd, O40491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Louis D'Amelio, O44627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Blades, O33082, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Davis Skipper, O33083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edwin Niffenegger, O33084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Foster Ball, O39039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank John Kent, O33087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ira Waugaman, Jr., O33086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Holt Green, O33085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alton Randolph Taylor, O33092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Max Edward Billingsley, O44631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlin John Kehe, O33094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Strother Branch, O40494, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Merriam, O33095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Percy Leahy, O33097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Thomas Reitz, O33096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dwight Bennett Dickson, O33099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Franklin Clymer, Jr., O40495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Clair Ritze, O44634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Daniel Mucha, O44636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marion Leon Daman, O40496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fletcher Smith, O44638, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred F. White, O33776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Wilson Brotherton, O52658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Gerard Downey, O33106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Joseph Flahaven, O40497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Robert Adams, O39042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John MacKellar Ansley, O39041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Palmer Hill, O33108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Fletcher, O33111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Harold Schwab, O44646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Alley Thompson, Jr., O33113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Wilbur Manning, O33114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lynell William Green, O52665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edwin Dressler, O44653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmet Kennington, O23623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Trabue, O23625, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Love Latta, Jr., O23627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Bangs Corbett, O23628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alfred Martin, O23629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Kenneth Warren, Jr., O23630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barwick Strahan, O23631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Greenwood Thomas, O23632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Michael Delaney, O23633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Marion Smith, O23634, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Samuel Wanner, O33116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Babington Macaulay, O23549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lewis Oliver, O33118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Edward Sloan, O33117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Robert Smith, Jr., O33119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Gilkey Gunning, O52669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold George Creyts, O44662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harris Toney Mitchell, O52670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilbur Oscar Miller, Jr., O33126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Alfred Rasmussen, O40502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Napier Butchart, O44664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Randlett Irving, O33127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Aloysius Murphy, O44667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Merithew Freeman, O40503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. William Roger McLean, O33136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Hopkins, Jr., O40504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Harold Hughett, O44674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Patterson Dailey, O52682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Nicholas Zarpas, O40505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Lobdell Brown, O40506, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herbert Austin Johnson, Jr., O33140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Higgins, Jr., O33141, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Henry Scanlon, O33142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edwin Englehardt, O33143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Dan Adams, O33147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Chandler Fairbanks 3d, O33145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Boulton Bainbridge Miller, O33148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Eugene Moore, O33149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Frederick Dietrich, O39043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Russell Blair, O33150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Curtis Clarence Batson, O33152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Ulieao Sieben, O33153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lee Woolfolk 3d, O52687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Kinney Welch, O33155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Benjamin Gray Moore, O33158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jacques DeMers, O33159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Denmark C. Jensen, O44694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norman Edward Meyer, O40511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond James Wardrop, O44698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur William Delaney, O44697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Edward Bobo, Jr., O33164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Carlyle Park, O33163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donal Irvin Medley, O33165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Milton Adolph Pullman, O33166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Carl Johnstone, O44702, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Karl Amos Zipf, O39044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Judson Locke, O40512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Edward Tistadt, O44706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Lundberg, Jr., O33170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Francis Smith, O33169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Smalley Greene, O40514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jefferson Melvin Fairley, O52699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hoover Calahan, O40515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Heard Carter, O33174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wyatte Gristie Trainer, O40516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jesse Foss Wheeler, Jr., O44719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Walston Scarburgh, O44723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank August Sandholm, O33178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pearson Buckley Yeager, O33176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Schafer, O39045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Frederick Cook, O44727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Keith Lincoln Ware, O33181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wesley McAlhany, O40517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Eugene Goldoni, O33182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Charles Ware Youngman, O33183, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Levene John Weigel, O33187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Jordan Strait, Jr., O44735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thomas White, O52708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Howard Walton, O44746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Van Lear Hawes, O52711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Argyle Williams, O44750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Allen Hutchinson, O33200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Everett Porteous, O33203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenji Hino, O44753, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Joseph Gravel, O33206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byrd Sergent, O52717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Nicholas Schoming, O44755, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edmond Reichmuth, Jr., O33209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edwin Bowman, O33211, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Richard Duddy, O33214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Robert Obermeyer, O44759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, Army).

Capt. Andrew Harold Prudhomme, O33213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene David Manary, O33216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Moorman Gardner, O40522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Boyd Lightfoot Brown, O33215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bobby Boyd Larsen, O52722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Warren Wright, Jr., O33217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Uel Wilford French, O33218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Joseph Guy, O33219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred William Scott, O44765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Craig Anderson, O44768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ivey Oscar Drewry, Jr., O33224, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Arthur White, O40524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Norvi Zeigler, Jr., O44773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Turner Merrill, O33225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Murel Sayre, O33220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Andrew Muir, O44774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Duncan Shi, Jr., O33230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clare Sherrets, O44781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eber Hilliard Thomas, Jr., O44780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Leroy Clancy, O52733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Flake, O40526, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Bruce McRae, O33236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lemuel Chafin Downs, O40527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Noel Dahlstrom, O33238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edward DeKemper, O33240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Robert Creel, Jr., O33241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Hamilton Hilliard, O33246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Clarke Archer, O44792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur William Ritchings, O52739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Murray Edward Manley, O52740, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Warren Pruden Davis, O33245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Powell Venable, O33247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Eugene Brewer, O52741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Respess Arnold, O32664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cesides Victor Barberis, O33249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Hiser, O44795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Anthony Ingerski, O40531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Herbert Sablitz, O40532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Masao Kobayashi, O52745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lanier Dunn Buford, O39046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Spartan Ferrari, O44810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Donald Crow, O52746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edison Eugene Yates, O39047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Dodge Servis, O52747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gillis Metcalfe, O52749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Charles Costabile, O44814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Anthony Joseph Wilkowski, Jr., O52748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Harris Wiltamuth, O44817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerard Conery Adams, O44819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Chester Allan Richardson, O33259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Gregory Sisak, O52751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack David Smith, O33260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Owen Davidson, O33262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David McVicker Kyle, O33263, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Frank Freeman, O44823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gilbert Charles Russi, O53264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Page Jones, Jr., O44826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Loyd Wilson, Jr., O33268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lehman Holson Johnson, Jr., O44831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carlyle Fredrick McDannel, O33271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Edward Harbert, O44833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Edward Nelson, O52756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arlo Albert Miller, O44835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Waldo Jones, O40530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Thomas Hanna, O52758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Marion Gibson Williams, O44841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Charles Ulrich, O44842, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hartsell Hamilton Northington, O33275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Chandler Conroy, O33276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Vail Converse, O39050, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Pryse Alcorn, O44844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Dale Nielson, O33280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Conway Lyman Ellers, O39051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Bradshaw, O44846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn David Walker, O33282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Perry Ewing, O33284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Clinton Tarkenton, Jr., O33283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Joseph Paciorek, O33285 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Sylvester Donnell, O33295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Charles McGuire, O33293, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Washington Simon Kuhn, Jr., O44862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Carroll Kelly, O44863, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Wayne Lawson, O33298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rufus James Cleghorn, O52767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Marvin Vinquist, O44867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Tracy, O44869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alford Clifford Shellum, O33299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Duda, O52768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Webster Prewitt, O33301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bickley Stevens, O44872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Julian Meeker, O33304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wakeley Patchin, O40537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert William McCartney, O39052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Maltbie Alexander, O33305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sterling Evans Purnell, O44875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Cay Nelson, O52775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Albert Troup, Jr., O33306, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lewis Duckwall, O39053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Rodney Dean, O44877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benedict Andrew Karnosky, O44878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert David Harback, O44880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Franklin Andrew Werner, O33307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald O'Connor Vaught, O33308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Gustave Schade, O33311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Julius Holmes, O33317, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Davis Pryor, Jr., O33316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Postford Arthur Loiselle, O33321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McCoy Goodman, O33323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bernie Francis Morgan, O44899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Richard Thomas Neumann, O39054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Luther Gates, O40539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Beauchamp, O44907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alexander Riegle, O33325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Charles Troescher, O39055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hubert Jerome Arsenault, O44917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jonathan Monroe Kight, O44919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan Preston Nesbitt, O52782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Phillip Walter Ryan, O33328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph King, Jr., O33329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Collin Bushway, O33330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gail Bruce Lee, O33332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Jackson Bowen, O33333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Robert Gooding, O33334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Andrew Cumbie, O40542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Harrison Costigan, O33336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wade Hampton Arrington, O40543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Henry Bramble, O33341), Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Lowell Sims, O33345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Elmer McDaniel, O33346, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jim Hillery McCoy, O52796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alexander Vitarius, O40544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Paul Flynn, O33350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Stuart Joseph Palos, O52797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd Albert Ramsey, O33352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Delmar Leavengood, O44938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Waugh Keyser, O33355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Webb Foster, O52802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence Joseph Corley, O33360, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward William Quinlan, Jr., O33359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Merle Edison Hamner, O52805, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Benjamin Krainik, O33567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Carl Girtman, Jr., O44951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Patrick William Harrington, O33372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Wesley Duke, O33373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kyle Terry, O33375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dominick Charles Dennis, O44953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Roger Longacre, Jr., O33378, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. J. Elmore Swenson, O33380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Henry Heldreth, O33382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Frank Garbacz, O40548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kemuel Kenyon Blacker, O44956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Eskil Johnson, O44959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Murdock Hanes, O33384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howell Barrett Thompson, O33385, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Elwin Coulter, O33386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Holton Eugene Blomgren, O44964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Johnson, O33387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Raymond Cole, O33392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Flint, O44970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Alvin Gottlieb, O44972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gage Cogswell, O33393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Oliver Moberg, O44973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claire Stillwell Curtis, O33394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Phillip John Linn, O33395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Bernard Bennett, O44977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arlo Reed Gill, O44983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl C. Edmondson, O44982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Harvey Robinson, O44984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Joseph Corbin, O33399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Angelo Enrico Pilla, O44989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hamilton Smoot Rebentisch, O44991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William McKinney Mantz, O33403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Henry Blohm, O44994, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ottis Audrey Davis, Sr., O40553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Robert Milton Denny, O33406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Nathan Martasin, O44997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Donald Charles Felton, O39058, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Franklin Coffey, Jr., O44998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Ferris Lieblich, O33409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Raleigh Evans Coleman O52823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dale Howard Shick, O33412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Henry Ford, Jr., O33411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sidney Dodds Hilton, O33413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Hamilton Schuler, O33414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren George Duemmel, O45004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gerald Bethune Little, O40554, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Hancock, O45013, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Sayle Smith, O33424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Albert Rogers, O40555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Wilbur Collins, O33425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Frank Massoglia, O52831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dan William Johnson, O33426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ray Ralph Liedike, O39060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Harlan Palmatary, O45026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Michael Joseph Strok, O52838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph Vinci, O45029, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gibson Cooper, O33430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Burner, O33434, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Burton Seeley, O33436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edgar Sleadd Waugh, O33439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Edward Eggleton, Jr., O52844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Trevett Williams, O52845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cecil Floyd Hunnicutt, O33442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Hathaway Stewart, O33441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peyton Royston Lucas, O33445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Robert Murphy, O52847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Joseph Hejna, O45033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Grant Freeman, O33450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Frank Butler Greer, O33447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ferris Adam Kercher, O33456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Albert Reynolds, O52852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Eugene Davidoff, O33460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Joseph Cooke, O45043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clifford Alvin Curtis, O33462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. James Hubert Tirey, O33464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Max Richard Machnicke, O33465, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Atwood Herod, O52859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Morris Allen Lent, O33469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Rawson Melton, O33470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Zais, O33471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnnie Derrick Duffie, O33474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Newell Jenkins, O40561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Daniel Anders, O33475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Bernard Schaefer, O40562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Richard Aguglia, O33477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elon Lee Hiller, O45059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Douglas Davis Peairs, O33479, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Savilla, O40563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Martin Kamp, Jr., O33482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Farnsworth Goodsell, O33483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Max Verlyn Kirkbride, O33485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Nelson Simmons, Jr., O39063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Edward Konkol, O52868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mills Brown, O33487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert William Jones, O33488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Heinz Peter Rand, O33490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Whitson Kane, O33492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duane Wright Ackerson, O45068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Otis Doane, O33493, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry George Mathos, O45077, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Monsey Thomas Gresham, Jr., O45076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Boyd Shemwell, O44395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Henry Landers, Jr., O39064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Chilton Holbrook, O33501, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Killian, O33502, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Frederick Schweitzer, O52875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Smith Riddick, Jr., O40570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hain Mengel 2d, O33504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Jacob Howard, O33508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Homer Humphrey Hammond, O33507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clair Gillespie Henline, O45087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mertan Smith Coe, O52876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arnold William Alexander, O45089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Oscar Franson, Jr., O39065, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rocco Francis Meconi, O33516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Edwards Mecredy, Jr., O45091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Norman Lunsford, Jr., O33518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Clark Standish, O39066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Luther Denlinger, O33519, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Z. Helber, O45094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Jefferson Hatch, O45096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Hugh Agnew, O45102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Conrad Rudolph Underdahl, O33523, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilbert Denning Meeks, O45109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alex Noble Nelson, O33528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Llewellyn Sobke, O33529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Brian Detchemendy, O45117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Raymond Ebbs, O45116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Walrath Burns, O52887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Judson Force Moody, O23685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Parker Yates, O23686, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Clifford Hodges Lee, Jr., O23688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Lloyd Powell, Jr., O23689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Roy Oswalt, Jr., O23690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Jensen, O23692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Ira Schnittke, O23693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Paul Carlson, O23694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Gribble, Jr., O23695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Wheaton Chapman, Jr., O23696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sears Yates Coker, O23697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Warren Clark, O23698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Austin Gerig, Jr., O23701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Skiles Kelley, O23703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Wyman Ramee, O23704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jess Paul Unger, O23706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Schilling, O23707, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Schremp, O23709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Field Michel, O23710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Delaney, O23711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mack Tarbox, O23715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Kenneth Wade Kennedy, O23716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lynn Cyrus Lee, O23717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Strain, O23719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Graham Waitt, O23720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Campbell Clendening, O23721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Henry Carroll, O23722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Van Horn Ellis, Jr., O23724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Charles Besancon, O23725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Meriwether Ramey, O23726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Miles Linton, O23728, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Sealey Kramer, O23729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harrington Willson Cochran, Jr., O23731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick John Baker, O23732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ingram Gurfein, O23734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Grygiel, O23737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Webb VanHoy, Jr., O23739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mills Carson Hatfield, O23741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Leon Rowny, O23744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Herbert Richardson, Jr., O23748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Edward Mather, O23749, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Walter Samz, O23750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Leo Smith, O23751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Dorsey Maynard, O23754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Holmes Camp, O23758, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burnside Elijah Huffman, Jr., O23759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Denis Blundell Grace, O23760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Roy, O23762, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Burtchaell, O23764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Edward Kuzell, O23766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Stigers, O23767, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Francis Thomas Murray, O23768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allan George Woodrow Johnson, O23769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard John Rastetter, O23770 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Thaddeus Kosiorek, O23772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. George Lawrence Slocum, O23773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Roy J. Clinton, O23774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee Bradley Ledford, Jr., O23775, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Millikin, Jr., O23781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Vaughan Elsberry, O23783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Andrew McCulloch, Jr., O23786, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Pressly Scott, O23787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hyman Bodzin, O23788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Gabriel Gauvreau, O23789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Harleston deSaussure, Jr., O23790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Leroy McMillan, O23791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Alfred Lee, O23792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Jeunet Whitaker, O23793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Corwin Johnson, O23794, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter James Woolwine, Jr., O23795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Robert Salisbury, O23797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Gabriel Redmon, O23802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Joseph Geldermann, O23803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bissland Moore, O23804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Roopen Adjemian, O23806, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mortimer Buell Birdseye, Jr., O23807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Campbell Tyler, O23809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wallace Michael Lauterbach, O23810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gregg LaRoix McKee, O23811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Clinton Stanford, O23812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stanley Reilly, O23813, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Stevens Neumeister, O23815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Gerard Healy, O23816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul George Skowronek, O23822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Russell Reed, O23824, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duward Lowery Crow, O23825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Panke, O23831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Duncan Brown, Jr., O23832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jonathan Edward Adams, Jr., O23833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Arthur Cannon, Jr., O23835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Franklin Foster, Jr., O23837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Fletcher, O23839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William McIntyre, O23841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Frank Starr, O23843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lawrence Theisen, O23846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Benjamin Manley, Jr., O23847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Knighton Harris, O23848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Oscar Green 3d, O23850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Longstreet Lawson, O23852, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Eugene Clifford, O23853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Waggener Couch, O23855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Moore Christensen, Jr., O23856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Maj. Walter Francis Molesky, O23857, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Norton, O23858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Cooper, O23860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Potter Campbell, Jr., O23861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Malcolm Graham Troup, O23862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Charles Tonetti, O23864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Joseph Canella, O23865, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Chester Day, O23866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Depher Collison, O23868, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Lippincott Knowlton, O23869, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lyman Saunders Faulkner, O23870, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lloyd Meyer, O23871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Vivans Greene, O23872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Bertron Magruder, O23874, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Clarence Harrison, O23875, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul von Santen Liles, O23876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Miroslav Frank Moucha, O23877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morton McDonald Jones, Jr., O23879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Patrick Ahern, O23881, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jacob Heffner Towers, O23883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Henry King, O23884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Charles Henzl, O23885, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Horace Maynard Brown, Jr., O23886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Joseph Lenihan Greene, O23887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Putnam Detwiler, O23892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Fuller McKinley, Jr., O23893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Morris Hoge, Jr., O23894, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Frank Aliotta, O23895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edward Lanigan, O23896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Leighton Atteberry, Jr., O23899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hunter Woodward, O23900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harley Truman Marsh, Jr., O23901, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Winston Curley, O23904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William Cooper, O23905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Auburon Paul Hauser, O23908, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Evarts Clark, O23911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin McCaffery, Jr., O23912, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Boswell, Jr., O23913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Guthrie Miller, O23914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Patrick Henry Tansey, Jr., O23915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward McElroy, O23917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Alexander Tidmarsh, O23918, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Coakley, O23919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Huff Edger, O23921, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Channing Borman, O23922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Paul Johnson, O23926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Cornelius Fitzpatrick, O23927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Matthew Gordon Harper, Jr., O23928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Leonard Robinson, O23929, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Jacob Hoebeke, O23930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Abbott Hume, O23931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Bibb Pickett, Jr., O23932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Benjamin Berry Kercheval, O23933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merritt Lambert Hewitt, O23934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Gray, Jr., O23935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gibson Niles, O23938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Moody Elmo Layfield, Jr., O23939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reynolds Robert Keleher, O23941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Raine Laney, Jr., O23942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, United States Army).

Maj. Dick Stanley Von Schriltz, O23944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Ray Thomas, O23947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Manly Busbee, Jr., O23950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wendell Pollitt Knowles, O23953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Felix John Gerace, O23954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Peter Kirkbride Dilts, O23955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Gleason, O23956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Irving Stern, O23957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Howard Ellis, O23958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Benton Howze, O23960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Faye Roton, O23961, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Coles Barney, Jr., O23963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Boynton Buttery, O23966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linton Sinclair Boatwright, O23968, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Tuck Brown, O23969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Willoughby Garrett, O23971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Augustus Purdy, O23973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Harold Gurnee, Jr., O23974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Victor Woodrow Campana, O23975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Carl McIntyre, O23976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Dooley Vaughan, O23978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Crawford Root, Jr., O23979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Mar Levy, Jr., O23980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wilson Sharkey, O23981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Charles Kisiel, O23984, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Walter Raleigh Mullane, O23987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Ward Maxwell, O23988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edgar Pigue, O23990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maynard George Moyer, O23991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richardson, O23993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Courtenay O'Connell, O23994, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nelson Paul Monson, O23996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Freemont Danforth, O23997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas James Cleary, Jr., O23998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peer de Silva, O24000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Niles Rising, Jr., O24002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Daniel Fowler, O24003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Llewellyn Flanders, Jr., O24006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Frank Muzyk, O24010, Army of the United States (first lieutanant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ellis Rossell, Jr., O24011, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Salinas, O24012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Lyons Driscoll, O24018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Richard Kemp, O24019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Franklin Poff, O24020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Alvord Spiller, O24023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Mercer Presley Longino, O24024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph McGrane, Jr., O24027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harwell Leon Adams, O24028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy Pierce Collins, Jr., O24031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Angelo Augustine Laudani, O24033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Toombs Dixon, O24035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Samuel Dalby, O24036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Truman Eugene Deyo, O24037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Paul Forsyth, O24038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Breed Deane, O24040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Lawrence Felchlin, O24041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanton Claude Hutson, O24042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Martin Andrew Shadday, O24043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Vincent Brown, O24044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leslie Wilmer Bailey, O24045, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Rayford Sykes, O24046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Henry Zott, Jr., O24048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bradish Johnson Smith, O24049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Kellogg Plume, Jr., O24054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Hardy Barrow, O24055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Reed Upton, O24063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wetherby Graham, O24064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Bernarr Celmer, O24066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Schuyler Tanous, O24067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bernard Keagy, O24072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Joseph Myers, Jr., O24073, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clinton Earl Male, O24078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Doyle Pratt, O24079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl K. Buchanan, O24080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wilson Callaway, O24081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lawrence Kaiser, O24085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Hollenback Welles, O24086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas McDaniel, O24088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Holroyd Linnell, O24089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy George Hendrickson, O24093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Benedict Zarembo, O24094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Vincent D'Esposito, O24095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clare Hibbs Armstrong, Jr., O24098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard James O'Neill, O33536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Knox White, O24102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Gerard McBride, O33539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sydney Fletcher Frazier, O33540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Alfred Coulter, O33541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Miller, O33542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred F. Lash, O40574, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilson Williams, O45122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Eugene McArthur, O52892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Donald Pearsall, O33548, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Berry Galbreaith, O33549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Wood Audet, O52899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Garrison Hopkins, Jr., O33551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Matthew Rankin Collins, Jr., O33550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Luther Griffin Jones, Jr., O40575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Carlton Brown, O33556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roger Willard Spigelmoyer, O52903, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ambrose Claibourn Arthur, O52904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Noel Ritter, O33558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Victor Thieme, O33561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Wallace Peyton, Jr., O45138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Francis Ahlgren, O33566, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Copeland O'Byrne, O52910, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Gillette Wetherell, O45147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Harry Kendall Bagshaw, O24068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander Bell, O33577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Archie Stanley Walker, O52915, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Glenn Smith Finley, Jr., O24117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Wendell Constance, O24118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Erwin Drewes, O24122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Collins Bagg, O24132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Willard Guest, O24133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Broudy, O24134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Allan Gardner Pixton, O24137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Ruane McGuire, O24138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles McDonald Parkin, Jr., O24150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Philip Fabianich, O24151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alexis Michael Gagarine, O24153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harland Glen Wood, O24154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Carl Sparrow, O24155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur McMurrough Murphy, O24156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Heck, O24157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albin Felix Irzyk, O24158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard James Darnell, O24159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lewis Warner Fogg 3d, O24160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Lowell Chambers Scott, O24161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Peter Leon Urban, O24163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Eldon Phelps, O24165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morris Cowan Stout, O24166, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glen Carl Long, O24170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Ethelbert Cowan, O24171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Allan Pierce, Jr., O24172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jeff William Boucher, O24173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Elbert Gowell, O24174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Miller Hustead 2d, O24175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Zebulon LaFayette Strickland, Jr., O24176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilburt James Irwin, O24179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Arnold Martin, O24180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas John Sharpe, O24181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Vandiver Langston, O24182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reuben Eugene Wheelis, O24184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Herbert Savage, O24186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rawlins Murrell Colquitt, Jr., O24189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Edward Tennesson, Jr., O24190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lloyd LeRoy Hanes, O24191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jules Maurice DuParc, O24192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Bernard Pohlman, Jr., O24193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Francis Kosmacki, O24194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Alexander Clayton, O24196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Boyd Bullock, O24198, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John William Paxton, O24199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Earl Walters, O24200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Rudolph Kermit Brunsvold, O24201, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Sutherland, Jr., O24202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Arthur Benner, O24203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin LaHatte, O24206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Kelly Thomson, O24207, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Donald Ward, O24208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Ira Taylor, O24209, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Vaughn Beck, O24210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Henry Bigger, O24212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Victor Sanden, O24213, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lester Ballard, Jr., O24215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Henry Janz, O24217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Selden Holcombe, O24218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burt Lunney Mitchell, Jr., O24219, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Fredrick Cathrae, O24220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Van Middleworth, O24226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Penquite Mulcahy, O24227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elmer Hugo Almquist, Jr., O24228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Logan Schutz, O24229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Beall Knight, O24231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Price Tucker, O24232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilson Freeman, O24234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Neville Sloan, Jr., O24235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., O24237, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Gordon B. Cauble, O24239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wendell Gunn, O24241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Elwood Kennedy, O24242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William E. Feeman, O24243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James William Haley, O24244, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Robert Charles Barthle, O24246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Theodore McQuaide, O24247, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burton Bryant Chandler, O24250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Bernard Jennings, O24251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Otho Eugene Holmes, O24252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Loring Douglass, O24254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Bond Jones, O24255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maxwell Bryant Thurmond, O24256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byron Mark Kirkpatrick, O24257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albro Lefils Parsons, Jr., O24259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Samusson, Jr., O24260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj William Barker Wootton, Jr., O24261, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robertson Desobry, O24262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Walter Gillespie, Jr., O24264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Louis DuBois, O24265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Albert Becker, O24267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Frederick Ostner, O24271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Blaine Wells, O24275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lindsay Disharoon, Jr., O24277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Michener Wilson, O24280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Taylor Newman, O24281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Eugene Watson, Jr., O24283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dean Dunlop, O24284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Gorrell Kearfott Miller, Jr., O24285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Douglas Mitchell, O24286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Warren Adcock, O24287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Madison Atkins, O52916, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Paul Berger, O33579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Dean Hoile, O33580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Cowles West, Jr., O45153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Wright, Jr., O40580, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Vogel, O33585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Wesley Strunk, O40581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Michael Holland, O45157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Everett Wandel, O45160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Vivian Harris, O33595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph William Bergman, O45174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Douglas Gardiner, O45175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lee Erickson, O33597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll Brice Smith, O45178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norval Milner Locke, O33601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rolf Erling Mickelson, O45184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gordon John Hartzler, O33603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Bennett Mechling, O24333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Roper, O33605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Allen Webb, Jr., O40585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin George Schuck, O33606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Oscar Manasco, O33608, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Horton, O33609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Frederick Olliver, O40586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Tate Poffenberger, O45197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Pauly Field, O45196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bright Jaccard, O45195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jurgen George Pohly, O52934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Arthur Minton, O45199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morgan Alexander Brakonecke, O33616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brice James Martin, O33620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Donnell Van de Voort, O39071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lester Robert Patrick, O45212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Jacob Halper, O39072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Champlain Shaw, O33626, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Thomas Krampitz, O33630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldon Woerner Schmid, O33627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Layton Carlos Tyner, O33640, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lewis Wells, O33641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edward Blount, O45217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Dominick Klunder, O52947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Robertson Ward, O33646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Karl Bandley, O45222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winant Sidle, O33651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Robert Redden, O33657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Julius Lind, O45230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Claude Darrell Barton, O33663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Jack Wayne Duke, O33662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Harris Gardner, O33665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Joseph Lacey, Jr., O33668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Francis Austin, O45239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Maj. Neil Geiger Stewart, O33670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. French Greig Lewis, O33676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Scott Madding, O33680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Gaspard Wall, O33023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Maxwell Conover, O33685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Henderson Andrews, O33688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Presbury Patterson, O33687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Worthy Millard Cunningham, O45258, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thompson McCrea Colkitt, O33690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederick Walter Coykendall, O33694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ralph Leon Todd, O33696, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Dare Gray, O40596, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alden Peverley Shipley, O33699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ancher Emil Christensen, Jr., O45271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert Cleveland Hicks, Jr., O40598, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Julius Albert Sakas, O33709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Eugene Walters, O33710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Truman Holt Setliffe, O24350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Dowling Hiers, O33715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Shannon Tabb, O33721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elmer Booth Lagerman, O52980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Reese Bierer, O33722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Wise Riley, Jr., O33658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Mayse Nash, O33727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Emile Hansard, O45303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Troy Edwin Whiting, O33729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. J. T. Smyrl, O33732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Dunwody Blackburn, O33734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Menon Walker Whitsitt, O31384, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Edwin Taylor, O45316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Farr, O33737, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Jerome Anderson, O33741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Robert Lewitz, O45325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Thomas Prendergast, O45327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Donald Prendergast O40599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Theodore Schrader, O33747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leo Rush, O39076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John James Carroll, O52996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Kent Harris, O40600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Hubert Cox, O33751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Arthur Warren, O45337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard Eli Bozeman, O45339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Muir, Jr., O33754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Thomas Joseph, O33756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Merton Wendle, O33764, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hallowell Holcombe, O45349, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Worth Marlow Curtiss, O53005, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Balkman, O33766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Temple Quick, O53006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander Bailey, Jr., O40602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Petersen, O33771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Nelson Whitney Tobey, O33778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Welsey Dalton Harris, O45371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy Charles Brown, O33782, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. David Penson, O33787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Montgomery, O33788, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Forbes Antrim, O33793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Donald Richardson, O45380, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pearce Youens, O40605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elliott Taylor Katherman, O53023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Denton Carl Rountree, O33797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Donald Iseman, O33798, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Dyson, O33799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lerch Ditamore, O33800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Kazmir Wojcik, O33802, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. LeRoy David Brummitt, O44087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Joseph Gavin, O33807, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Thomas Caprino, O33808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Edward Muggelberg, O33812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Grover Marks, Jr., O45395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Hollister Scott-Smith, Jr., O33817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Allen Wilson, O33818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Caldwell Knox, O45402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Merwin Hinman, O33822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manford Ray Murphy, O45403, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Franklin Roberts, O33825, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chris McCullough, O40611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Joseph Parziale, O33829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Edward Dougherty, O53037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl William Kappel, O33833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Alexander Kane, Jr., O34140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ragsdale Howton, O40613, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joshua LeRoy Holley, Jr., O40612, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis LeRoy, O33835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Parkhurst Cloud Hough, O33836, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Edward Davis, Jr., O53041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Alois Neibert, O45411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Stein, O33837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Balis Dexter, O33838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent White Rasper, O40615, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Otto Fischer, O45412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Henry Brakebill, Jr., O33840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William George Skinner, Jr., O53044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stephen Louis Garay, O45416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow Wilson Morse, O53048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Bob Eugene Edwards, O33844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. John Wellington Campbell, O33151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Herbert Karstedt, O33849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arnold Mandigo Bloss, O45424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Arthur Mackenzie, O40618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Kirk Hamilton, O45425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Madison Tolliver, O33856, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thomas Webster, O33858, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Charles Copenhaver Webb, O40620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Matthias Frassrand, O40621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Byrne, O45428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arsene Peter Bonifas, O45437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Francis Philp, O53061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herbert Lundy Garris, O33872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roderick Joseph MacEachen, O53064, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wythe Parks Brookes, O45447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Cohee Blossom, Jr., O45451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Alexander Todd, O33878, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clark Richard McCauley, O40623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gregg Newhall Jennings, O45454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Wayne Davis, O33888, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Davis, O33886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hoyt Edward White, O33889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Maxey Silvey, O33887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Theodore Kramers, O33890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Bogner, O33892, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Kennedy Smith, Jr., O45463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald George McNamara, O39085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Melvin Martin Lawson, O45475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Ralph Davis, O40629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Franklin Moffitt, Jr., O40630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilbur John Lage, O33911, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lamar Asbury Welch, O24391, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ernest Conine, O24393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Jones Williams, O24394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edmund Hand, O24395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Verle Douglas Miller, O24396, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Henry Stone, O24397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel Meyer Lipton, O24398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col Lucien Fairfax Keller, O24399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James DeLuca, O24400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Thomas Carlton Reddington, O24401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Julian Maline, O24402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Farwell Mitchell, O24405, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Norman Cameron, O24408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gene Richard Welch, O24409, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Liggett, O24410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Dorsey Hulsey, O24411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Clifford Healy, O24412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hunter Marion Brumfield, O24413, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irvin Marshall Rice, O24414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Mace Gonseth, O24417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt Col. George Marcel Cummins, O24418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Esmond Bailey, Jr., O24420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Parsons Clark, Jr., O24423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Waldorf Barnes, O24425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Xavier Leary, O24427, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Almon Louis Hugins, Jr., O24428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Tom Billie Strother, O24429, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Numsen Lucke, O24430, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Calvin Aldrich Heath, O24431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clark Storey, O24433, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Webster Hodges, O24437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Corson Landrum Hilton, Jr., O24438, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Vincent Maixner, O24439, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Oliver Gordon, O24440, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Emery Ellis Bellonby, O24441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Phillip Haines Baker, O24442, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Robert Tuck, O24444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Abbott Lucey, O24446, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Carl Maldonado, O24447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay Byron Mowbray, O24450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Leslie Bereuter, O24451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl William Plitt, O24452, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Arthur Martin, O24453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter John Rankin, O24455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Leo Dooley, O24456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Elliott Arthur, Jr., O24457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wiley Freeman Shaver, Jr., O24459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wilbur Craig Boyce, Jr., O24460, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Frank Sills, O24463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Glen Ferguson, O24464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Niels Marius Dahl, O24466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Daniel Francis Munster, O24467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Harold Lee, O24469, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joshua Logan, O24470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fredrick Kenneth Hughes, O24471, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard James Goodsell, O24472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Owen Becker, O24473, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Walter Erickson, O24474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Michael Williamson, O24476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Albert Gile, O24477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Szabo, O24480, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harrison Zimmerman, O24481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Francis Dunn, 024482, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Olcott Foster, Jr., 024483, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Nicholas Wellems, 024484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert McDonald Shannon, Jr., 024486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Easton Nelson, 024487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vitaly Kovalevsky, 024488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Buford Patton, 024489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Beal Kelly, 024490, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Milton Davis, Jr., 024491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Eugene Burrell, 024492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Sweeney, Jr., 024494, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Leroy Miller, Jr., 024495, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Arthur Ford, 024497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Maurice Johnson, 024498, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Alva Ogle, 024500, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clinton Fort Matthews, 024503, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Fairfield Carr, 024504, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl Howard Schofield, 024505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Thomas Larson, 024506, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Peden Croninger, 024507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry John Muller, Jr., 024508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George I. Forsythe, 024510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Charles Forbes, 024511, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edmund Francis Driscoll, 024512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Charles McInnis, Jr., 024516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maynard Clayton Raney, 024517, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Arthur Hebbeler, 024518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Elmer Simmons, 024521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Jennings, Jr., 024522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Vincent Louis Ruwet, 024524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Myron Thorne Johnston, 024525, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Louie Coleman, 024527, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Millman Morrill, 024528, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Frederick Lawson, 024529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Porter Stubbs, Jr., 024530, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Lt. Col. Elmer Schmierer, 024531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Ovid Hamilton, 024532, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Maurice Clavelle Holden, 024534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Thielens Peeples, 024537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul V. Hannah, 024539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Friedman, 024540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Melvin Charlton, Jr., 024543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Morrison Allen, Jr., 024550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Woodrow Cozad, 024552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Herbert De Chow, 024553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McAdams, 024555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George William Carter, 024556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Furman Spencer, 024559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Walter Sedr, 024561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Palmer Boyer, Jr., 024563, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dayton Willis Eddy, 024565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gilliland Renfro, 024567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Viron Edward Bird, 024568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Martin Kane, 024569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kearns Muller, 024570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Grover Holland, Jr., 024573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jose Antonio Andino, 024575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Henry Koepcke, Jr., 024581, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Jack Helm Remele, 024585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Elwood Kimball, 024586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward McBride, 024587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arden Wirth Dow, 024591, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Martin Volheim, 024593, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Walter Harvey, Jr., 024598, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Hammer, 024599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Lee Cary, 024600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clare Norton Lyke, 024601, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Allen William Rodeheffer, 024602, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas James Camp, Jr., 024603, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Raymond Graham, 024605, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Campbell Williams, 024609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Raymond Cross, 024610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Rorbach Fisk, 024614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ben Lamar Anderson, 024616, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Orwin Clark Talbott, 024617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Woodburn Matheny, Jr., 024619, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Mayer Hamilton, 024621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elbridge Lee Snapp, 024622, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leonard Charles Miller, 024623, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Killilae, 025017, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Burkhart, 025018, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Joseph Richardson, 025019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Curtis Jeffries, Jr., 025020, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Taylor Elliott, 025022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Freese Kernan, 025023, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Herbert Brown, 025024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Clement Moran, 025027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Elmer Pershing Curtis, 025028, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrel Leon Syron, 025034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gerald Johnson, Jr., 025035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Max Snyder, O25036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Brittain Kreutzer, O25037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joseph Stillman, O25038, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Richard Hull Verheul, O25039, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irving Heymont, O25040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Orville Kenneth Knight, O25043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major Harold Vernon Mackey, O25046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Rhodes Thompson, O25047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Arthur Bird, O25048, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerry Marion Wimberley, O25049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Blakely Todd, O25051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harry Mobley, O25053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Dulaney Schutz, O25054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Parker Osborne Stuart, O25055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Pershing Traylor, O25060, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Joseph Daly, O25061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Overton Golladay, O25062, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reuben Wallis Mundy, O25063, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Will Gillespie Atwood, Jr., O25067, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Weamer Elder, O25068, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Harry Bowen, O25069, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Marshall Woods, O25071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. David Leroy Ramsey, O25072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Wilbur Best, Jr., O25074, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Apthorp Gould Fuller, 2d, O25075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Edgar Nossaman, O25079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Jerald Culhane, O25083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leroy Cosby Land, O25084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bradford Lee Smith, O25086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Carl William Schaad, O25087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Karl Heinrich Zornig, O25089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Fred Poppenburg, O25090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Bayard Sessoms, Jr., O25092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert James Welsh, O25096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil William Delu, O25097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Durrenberger, O25099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Latimer Whittle MacMillan, Jr., O25100, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Hall Woods, O25101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gordon Francis Tyrrell, Jr., O25102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Neil Grove, O25104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ellis Cox, O25105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Leroy Buckman Wilson, O25106, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Franklin Charlton, O25107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Reid, C25108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William McKinley Shepard, O25110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Murchison Grusky Locksley, O25111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Alfred Higgins, O25112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Edgar Rayle, Jr., O25113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Charles Hughes, O25114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Stephen Rice, O25119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Stuart Cumings, O25120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bernard Via, O25121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Flynn, Jr., O25122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Reginald Eklund, O25123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gaynor William Hathaway, O25124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Wilson Starkey, O25126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Moyer Delos Harris, O25129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Walter Philip Leber, O25130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Philip Geise, O25131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Lindsay Koob, Jr., O25132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Earl Simons, O25136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Chester Thomas Harvie, O25138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Laverne Hoff, O25140, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Edwin Pinard, O25172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Elmer Gould, O25174, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Leo Kolb, O25184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cleveland Charles MacLane, Jr., O25185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Dale Weston, O25186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Frederick Crecelius, O25187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donn Royce Pepke, O25188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Yates McCachern, O25190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edwin Allison Nichols, O25192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Benedict Cullison, O25193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Paul Burns, O25194, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Casper Wittmann, O25195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Athel Bangert, O25202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alexander Hume Lucas, Jr., O25204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Lewis William Leeney, O25206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Doherty, O25212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Ames Moon 2d, O25214, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walton Orville Threadgill, O25215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Joseph Ptak, O25216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Clendenen Davis, O25218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Condy, O25220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Carr, O25222, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Leonard Anderson, O25223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edmondston Coffin, O25234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald Michael Dailey, O25249, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Allen Carroll, O25250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Cline Irby, O25251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Edgar Thompson, O25252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Simeon Moore, O25253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Boyd Lee Branson, O25254, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William McCaffrey, O25256, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Charles Craig, O25262, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Melvin Armand Goers, O25265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Bansley Falks, O25266, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Samuel Beatty, Jr., O25268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Arthur Lorenzo West, Jr., O25269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Clinton Taber, O25270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Brent Vivian, O25272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ray Spurrier, O25273, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Arthur Nilsson, O25274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Wyman Healy, O25275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Albert Whitehorne 3d, O25277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Potvin Barry, O25283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Thomas Berry, O25284, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Hancock Hay, Jr., O25290, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Scott Pollard, Jr., O25291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Andy Walter Pribnow, O25292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Fred Hilton Cantrell, O25295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Willard Webster Morris, O25297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Jay Holliman, O25298, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Lawrence Sullivan, Jr., O25299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Wright MacFeeters, O25300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Adellon Franck Hanson, O25301, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert H. Schulz, O25303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Wightman Sanders, Jr., O25305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barton Lamond, O25309, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Thornton George, Jr., O25319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Pierce Gillespie, O25320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William FitzGerald Brand, Jr., O25323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Paul Hamill, O25324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerome Bailey York, O25327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Dalrymple, O25329, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Bayless Mitman, Jr., O25330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Douglas Yelverton Ostrom, Jr., O25331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Fannon Sullivan, O25332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Michael Smolensky, O25333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Duane Seaman Cason, O25334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Floyd Lester Johnson, O25336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Emerson Vandervort, Jr., O25337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Bernard Ellis, O25338, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Haakon Lindjord, O25340, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edmund Dwan 2d, O25354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Gibbons, Jr., O25355, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Norton Hathaway, O25366, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Paul Alexander Simpson, O25368, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Jack St. Clair, O25369, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Nathaniel Acuff, Jr., O40637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Guy O'Neil De Young, Jr., O33925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Maurice Jean Palizza, O33924, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jacob Lewis Riley, Jr., O53161, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Sidney Benson, O33954, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carleton Preer, Jr., O45567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Marcus Sanders, O33923, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Willis Grady, O33940, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cornelius Wesley Coghill, Jr., O33928, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Merrill Grover Hatch, O33918, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Roscoe Smith, Jr., O33922, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Frederick Kreager, O33919, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Henry Blakefield, O33927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Alfred Feyereisen, O39089, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Lavin, O45613, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald White Glenn, O33931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Howard Neill, O33930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Edward Connor, Jr., O33933, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lewis Culp, O45508, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Joseph Miller, O45642, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Aloysius Boulger, O33935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Norton Skardon, O33939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Ainsworth Clark, Jr., O33937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Garrett Leroy Hill, O33941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Herbert Birdsong, Jr., O33945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Elihue Ball, O33944, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ritchie Herbert Clarke, O35173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dwight David Bonham, O33949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ernest Terrill Barco, Jr., O33938, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Leon Vincent, O33948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Lamar Sallee, O33951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Francis Farrell, O33950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leonard Carlton Turner, O33952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Edwin Coffey, O53220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Stephen Kelly, O45513, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Wayne Townsley, O33953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Elwood Glassen, O33932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Francis Hughes, Jr., O33956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilson Sifford, O33920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Kent Shaffer, O40639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Snedecor Maxwell, O53163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arnold Edward Rice, O45730, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Edward Connor, O33960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Coxe Covington, Jr., O53151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Allison Morgan, Jr., O45520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred DeMasse Clarke, Jr., O45673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Thorwald Netterblad, Jr., O33971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William B. Askren, O45507, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Pearce Fleming, Jr., O33975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jackson Evert Shirley, O33977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jess Edward Newland, O45793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Curtis Leland Hankins, O35190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Donald Evans Hoffmeister, O33942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Victor Manson Wallace, O53124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ross Franklin Powell, O33980, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard Joe Seitz, O33979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Van Scoten Lanterman, O33983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Dozier Crosby, O33981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Burg Dyer, O53095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick James Bailey, Jr., O33982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James William Cocke, O35168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Milton Joel Mastalir, O33992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John George Georgelas, O33978, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Pierce Elliott, O40658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Louis Brown O33987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Jones Pierce, O33989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert John Faust, O40641, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Albert Cropper Williams, O33974, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Spencer Penrose Edwards, Jr., O33990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Joseph Gendron, O45776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kary Cadmus Emerson, O33991, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stanley Lancey, O33997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Otto Reed, O53102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Rudolph Corey, O34006, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Clark Taynton, O34007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Judson Bestor, O33972, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Herbert William Bennett, O45675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Warren Love, O34026, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emitt Cleveland Witt, Jr., O34027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sterling Kenwood Eisiminger, O40651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Leo Schreiber, O34043, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Brown Sewell, O45491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Snow Griffin, O53096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Lawrence Woodard, O34031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Henry Hislop, O34034, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Gerald Sullivan, O39097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Olinto Mark Barsanti, O34037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Kenneth Chenault, O45678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ashley Anthony Blinn, O35322, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George James Heil, Jr., O39109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Marvin Smith, O34041, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Triplett, Jr., O34030, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Joseph Nawn, O53200, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Patrick Downing, O33917, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Riley Chapman, O40711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Hamman Smith, Jr., O34044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Willard Elder, Jr., O34033, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin William Flora, O34083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Theodore Christopher Mataxis, O34035, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rhinehart Washington, O34042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Thomas Pitts, Jr., O34036, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Grant Ellsworth Jones, O40649, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Willis Davis, O34046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William John Yamber, O40656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Preston Baldwin Cannady, O34101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ovid Morgan, O34049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Owen Jones, O34059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Joseph Kron, O45822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Clarence Joseph Lang, O40705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Harold Harper, O40735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Edgar Charles Wood, O34051, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sam Efnor, Jr., O34054, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Lafayette Mabry, Jr., O34047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Pershing Muir, O39105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herman Beverly Boyle, Jr., O34090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Charles Guerin, O34052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Hamlet Cooper, O45975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Francis Unger, O34056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rex Russel Sage, O34061, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Lee Farrar, O34053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Archey Dean, O46007, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Asa Parker Gray, Jr., O34096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Joseph Raffaeli, O53170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Raymond Victor Bottomly, Jr., O34071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Charles Ohl, O34078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Elwood Murphy, O34080, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Anderson Smith, Jr., O34081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Lowndes Davis, Jr., O34079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert Gale Peabody, O39098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Hayward Hubbard, O34111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dale Douglas Hogoboom, Jr., O34085, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Danield Thornton Chapman, O34086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. John Levant Strong, O34088, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edwin Webb, O34092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellis Earl Pickering, O53113, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Allen Loop, O45735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmett McGraw, O39107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl Marine Carpenter, O34098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Cole Jeffries, O34093, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnny Mac Rice, O34094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Joseph Munch, O45546, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harley Lester Moore, Jr., O40729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linus Patrick Ward, O53191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roy Lester Inman, O34102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Ray Kent, O34103, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Cary Allen, O34104, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norvel Harold Barnhart, O34105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Milton Jacob Weber, Jr., O53319, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lynnwood Murat Johnson, Jr., O35199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Coleman Parker, O34123, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Worth Williams, O34107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Hill Stewart 3d, O35205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Madison Farnell, O34108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Wilbur Chapman, O40704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Emert Howard, O45529, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jack Girard, O34110, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ira Cornelius Redfern, Jr., O34109, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Don Davis, O45687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Augustus Edwards, Jr., O34116, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rafael Negron, O34115, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ronald William Van Orne, O40725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter James Davies, O53328, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jay William Herrington, O34121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Reinhold Carl Riede, O45810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Charles Glover, O34122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dantes Alto York, O45549, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Glenn Thomson Pillsbury, O34125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Julian Caldwell Propst, O45943, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alexander Lawson Ransone, O34142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Crosby Park Miller, O34151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Whitaker Alexander, O34143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brilsford Pease Flint, Jr., O34146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Richard George Ciccolella, O34117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Bryan, O34150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Harold Felter, O53216, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Blanding Jones, O34152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lloyd Louis Rall, O40632, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Jones Davis, Jr., O34154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Francis Hollingsworth, O34155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John William Irving, O53276, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nathan Anderson Roane, Jr., O34156, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Neal Charles Galloway, O34158, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Verde Weaver Bennett, O34157, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Long, O34180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lee L. Stewart, O34184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Nagel Stanford, O35182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Wallace Witcover, O45522, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Barton Pratt, O34186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Phillip Howe, O45555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Speaks, O34196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leverne Jenkins, O45935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Lee Treadwell, O53121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Earl McQuillis Cooper, O34191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Coke Whitworth, Jr., O35231, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hilary Eugene DuVal, O53137, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Jones Adams, O34197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Wilson McGregor, O39096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Walburn Zarger, O45568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. James Owen Murphy, O34193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Scott Saunders, O34205, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard LaVerne Cornutt, O45992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Randolph Dudley, O45497, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Roland Paul West, O34208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Robert Bush, O53342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Ellis Snetzer, O35458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Miller Boggs, O34087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Paul Ludwikosky, O34228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Elliott Lang, O45628, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Sidney Andrew, Jr., O34235, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emil Victor Benard Edmond, O34234, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ottis Mazel Plant, O40714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Hermanson Courtney, O35196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joy Kaufman Vallery, O34241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Louis Schaf, Jr., O45860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Freeman Harris, Jr., O34242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lawrence Harland Walker, Jr., O34243, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raymond Dunn, O34084, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Robert Borns, O34245, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dan Kistler Dukes, Jr., O34283, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Marvin Callahan, O34055, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Oxley Quirey, O39102, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aubrey Parkerson Nathan, O34270, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Bowden Street, O34272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd Dewitt Gattis, O34269, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Russell Earl Whetstone, O53212, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ray Lynch, Jr., O34268, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Scarborough Hughes, O34271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Gordon Morris, O45665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Sammie Newell Homan, O34279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce DesBrisay Jones, O34238, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Marvin Browning, O35220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Stuart Terrell, Jr., O53118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Royal Dickson, O34091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Smith Lawrence, O34286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Louis Mueller, O34292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Weldon Emanual Laiche, O34295, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Walter Heatwole, O35215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herron Nichols Maples, O45920, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Lewis Smith, O33515, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Allen Thomas Smith, O34320, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emro Joseph Quashnock, O34321, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hezekia Jacob Ross, Jr., O34112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edwin McDowell, O40674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Scott Housman, O53308, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Barton Jones, O34239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willis Howard Davis, O34325, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Elmer Kjeldsen, O34326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Austin Grinnell, O53260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morrell Ray Sexton, O34057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Frazier, Jr., O39094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack LeRoy Marinelli, O34331, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Walter Green, O34332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Allen Eicher, O40665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Clinton Lindley, O45614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Henry Schweiter, O34334, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Grant Chesley, O53265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Alexander McWatters, O34336, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Delbert Leroy Bristol, O34340, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerry French Dunn, O34342, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theodore Leonard, O34124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mont Sandels Johnston, O53169, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carl Roth, O39095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Larson, O45964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Norvell McVeigh Walker, O34375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Christian Hansen, O34333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Gifford Carson, O53255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Graham Edward Schmidt, O34348, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Earl McBride, Jr., O34347, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Chester Biggs, O45688, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harry Donald Kight, O56904, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Gloyd Shettle, O40706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roland Edward Denby, O34192, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William John Donnelly, Jr., O34359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Ernest Creek, O39099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Tobias Raphael Philbin, Jr., O34406, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carroll Wayne Andresen, O34388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marvin Leo Lindmark, O34393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Hiram Darwin, O33779, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Woodrow John Steichen, O34392, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Emmett Vollendorff, O34398, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Wilbert White, O32250, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clifton Henry Chamberlain, Jr., O56907, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Paul DeCamara, O34399, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Prusaitis, O34402, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Thurmond Gordon, O34397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Luther Seale Crawford, O34297, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Calvin Cross, O39092, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Terrance Charles Fitzgerald, O45700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Woodrow Wild, O39142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sidney Thomas Mixon, O34281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Morris James Lucree, O33401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Ralph Gates, O53457, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wesley Charles Franklin, O45565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Wayne Moser Winder, O34420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Delmar Lewis Oaks, Jr., O34419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Regnault Fausset, O34421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Woods Bengel, O34423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Ira Fernandes, O53128, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Clement Burn, O34426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Paul Parlier Hinkley, O40675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Lawrence Havel, O53180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Eugene Porter, O34480, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Joseph Paul Alexander, Jr., O34481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward LeRoy Nicely, O53251, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Edward Roberts, O35232, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ellis Warner Williamson, O34484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Melvin Cook, O34294, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest LeRoy Perry, O53324, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Patrick Sweeney, O34485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Peter Louis DalPonte, O34486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Henry Gerfen, O53165, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Delaney McDowell, O35204, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Lynton Dalton, O34488, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Jackson Hawkins, Jr., O45759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gust Edwin Olson, O46079, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard Edwin Garrett, O35307, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joachin Joseph Speciale, O45946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Joseph Edward McKinney, O39090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Edwin Divine, O54423, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frederic Calvin Thompson, O35255, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cader Cothren Terrell, O34555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vern Louis Joseph, O53375, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lysle Iver Abbott, O34559, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hodo Boykin, O45838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hubert Lester Nolan, O39111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winfred Clayton Naselroad, O35259, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guysbert Bogart Vroom, Jr., O46019, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William David Brodbeck, O34565, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Woodrow Wilson Marriott, O33486, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Britton Mayo, O46024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Hunter McCorkle, O45867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Albert Harris, O53117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Adelbert Dale Boggs, O34569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Clark Rubottom, O35286, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Langendorf, O45551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus Lindley Parsons, O45699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jay Dee Vanderpool, O34570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Alan Rogers, O34572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Earl Lloyd Harper, O35272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Tobias Burke, O34575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Rocky Ross, O34278, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harold Frederick Via, O34635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Chesley, Jr., O53264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Howard Harvey Featherston, O34339, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Willard Adelbert Smith, O34637, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dean Warren Barnes, O40745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Leonard DeNoya, O53352, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Andrew Dee Pickard, O34639, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack G. Hines, O46117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Bernie Jordan, O34644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leo Clifford Cooksey, O34571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Henry Deason, O35323, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Irving Resseguie, O53240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George William Dickerson, O34189, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Miller Duncan, O34647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Archie Tom Madsen, O45806, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Robert Lindner, O34650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Floyd David Williams, O39139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Levens Metcalf, Jr., O53179, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Worth Linn, O34653, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Reeves Howell, Jr., O46248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Teir, O40701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Roy Little, O53090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Billy Harland Kerr, O34655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Johnnie Clites Brink, O34658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Newton, O40742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Rhodes Kugler, O34663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donn Warrington Yoder, O34664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jean Lindley Wood, O34660, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harley Nelvell Miller, O53155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Cornelius DeGooyer, O45562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earle Warren Aldrich, O34667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Malone Hall, O40692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Austin Joseph McDermott, Jr., O40754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Joseph Carney, O34672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Martin Piper, O34674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter John Angers, Jr., O34677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Leon Geer, O34675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Robertson Kent, O34678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jim Dan Keirsey, O34681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Caryl Helena, O53271, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oscar Esko Davis, O39136, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Lawrence Keeth, O34687, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald William Bunte, O39122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Cecil Calvert Snoddy, Jr., O34690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Art Harvey Davis, O34693, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Martin Flynn, O39133, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Joseph Waszak, O35415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Arthur Hicks, Jr., O53246, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Burns Crayton, O34682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Ralph Richmond, O46217, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Nelson, O34692, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clovis Dee Heard, O34680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Fred Dennis Chesnut, O45795, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Nelson Harris, O40659, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Houck Spencer, O34719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Donald McLanachan, O46037, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Spann, O34695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Hawthorne Armor, Jr., O45590, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.

Capt. James John Cortez, O53277, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Lynn Balthis, O34706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Holt Hitchcock, O34708, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Cooper, Swearingen, O34711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Henry Jordan Fee, O34705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Joseph Hoffman, O34709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arndt Lewis Mueller, O34700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Eugene DePuy, O34710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Paul Arntz, O39126, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Newton Stewart, O34712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Clayton Novin Gompf, O34716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Gilchrist, O45818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edgar Hiatt, O34717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Mair Muller, O34715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Norman Harold Gold, O34862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Randolph Thomas, Jr., O45667, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles LaForrester Cudlipp, O35265, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Beverly Matthews, O34721, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Chambers Bird, O35264, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Felton Hatcher Moore, O34724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Walter Urban, O34722, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. John Joseph Morgan, O35260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Michael Kessler, O34723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Anthony Richeson, O34725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Philip Zeigler, O34726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Harold Boswell Ayres, O34732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frank Leroy Gunn, O34734, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Howell Moore, O34735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Alexander Murray, Jr., O34739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Keith Merrill Schmedemann, O34742, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Clark Maling, O34745, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster Franklin Flegeal, O39118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Key Walker, Jr., O34744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Keith Angwin, O34741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Joseph Vidlak, O46142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Glenn Morris Harvey, O46210, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Welch Stone, Jr., O40712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Franklin Herrington, O34756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Brad Wilson, O35162, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stuart Manly Seaton, O34760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Glenn Appel, O40700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Francis Buerschinger, O46015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Alexander Noseck, O45645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Louis Packman, O34761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray Clinton Lewis, O53181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Hayes, O53437, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Russell Meacham, O53374, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winston Earl Wallace, O34766, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Hart, Jr., O45792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Blodgett Avery, O45706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Harold Bingham, O34828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert John Ryan, O40631, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Erling Jerome Foss, O39127, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ray Harry Hurst, O45720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Cassin Langley, O40691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Abb Chrietzberg, O34838, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gibson Reynolds Finley, O34837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Oswalt, O46071, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilfred Christian Becker, O34839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederic Harold Palmblad, O34845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Mahan Brooks, O53449, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Rex Golston, Jr., O40657, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Lewis Edward Maness, O39135, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Webster Downer, O34854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Elliott Moran, O39108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howard Elder, Jr., O53453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Bowlby, O45718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Robert Bauch, O34401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Edward Nolan, O53275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Leroy Victor Pearson, O34860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Frierson Burgess, Jr., O35280, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack George Condon, O45542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles John Rahaeuser, O34873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Eggleston Eastlake, Jr., O34879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Gerald Hugh Shea, O34882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Serlo Isenson, O34884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Ralph Johnson Grimsley, O39119, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rex Harry White, Jr., O45595, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marcus Lundy Powell, Jr., O34558, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Powell Alexander Fraser, O34889, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Mahlon Brown, O39120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Beverly Money Read, O46180, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Burr Johnstone Randall, Jr., O35611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Stanley Barrett, O34939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Joseph Gill, O45784, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Monroe Kemp, O39146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rodney Middleton Covert, O45998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Franz, O53425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Earl Holmes, O46227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edwin I. Donley, O34887, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Alfred Shuford, O45876, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Harold Craze, O53279, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Warren Cobb, O45651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Sheldon Harley Wheeler, O34949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Edward Parker, O34951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Elmer Westervelt, O45723, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Anderson McIntosh, Jr., O45816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Hamilton Franklin, O35175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Marion Burney, O34956, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Karl William Gustafson, O45560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Stewart Stafford, O34556, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Lane, O53091, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Edward Griest, O34573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Lynn Nungesser, O53150, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Joseph Neary, O34964, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvin Francis Carpenter, O39112, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Francis Sylvester Conaty, Jr., O34965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Leroy Morgan, O45796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Carter France, Jr., O34967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irvine Furman Belser, Jr., O53122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hudson Rupert Hurst, O53242, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Winston George Whall, O34970, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Luther Leonard Sexton, O45778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Gordon Fowler, O53218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Eberhart Griscti, O34666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Magnus Leo Smith, O40698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

×Maj. John Harold Harden, O34977, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Douglas Haig Patterson, O34979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Taylor Agee, O45709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henri Frederik Frank, O46187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Vinson Milano, O46052, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Andrew Fisher, O53311, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Kloos, O53291, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Hanitch Johnson, O46097, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Nicholas Samuel Strider, O45589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. D. L. Benton, Jr., O35022, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Irving Darris Warden, O53379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Richard Couch, O53462, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Randall Harris Wise, O53315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Mitchell Smith, Jr., O40724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George James Holly, Jr., O46075, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Aley Leonard Smith, O35044, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Franklyn Jenkins, O53168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Lee Burke, O35047, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Thomas Bernard, O45997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stanley Peter Hidalgo, O35049, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Roger Carpenter, O53450, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Arch Van Sandt, O40762, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John James Mann, Jr., O40652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Francis Pope, O40672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Benjamin Silman, O35048 Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Howard Mehaffie, O40761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Elden Sharp, O35046, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bryant Pridgen, O53197, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Henry Phipps, Jr., O39087, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Norman Fairbanks, O40747, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Castle, O35299, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman Lee Hall, O46208, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claudius Miller Easley, Jr., O35056, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kebbe Anderson, O35057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leo Henry Eberhardt, O53435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. William Michael Puetz, O34654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Montgomery Graham, Jr., O53182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William McKinley Copley, Jr., O39114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph DeWight Kooken, O34743, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Lee Smith, O34746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Herman Henderson, Jr., O45534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Perry Michael, O40689, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Kenneth Allen Ward, O34415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Kent Miller, Jr., O53428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Helmuth Otto Froeschle, O35070, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lee Waters, O34720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Walter Markey, O35143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Harold Greeley, O35144, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Guy Humphrey Drewry, Jr., O35274, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Edwin Howell, O39149, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Lee Newell, O35145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul LaVern McCrillis, O45768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Stuart King, O35147, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Merritt, O46220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Edward Marfing, O34713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Robert Franks, O53431, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugo Wagner Heffelfinger, O46143, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Claude Hazen Purkitt, O35152, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Yancey Henry Knowles, O35153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Roy Ligon, O35154, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Sampson Wiley, Jr., O45927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Glenn Crane, O46186, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip George Walker, O46287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond LaVerne Latimer, O34833, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Granville Attaway Sharpe, O34986, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Henry Homburg, Jr., O35159, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Adams Smoak, O46267, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel LaFayette Reid, O35160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Beatty Meanor, Jr., O34981, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Cameron Johnson, O34950, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Louis Gundlach, O35163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Dixon Tummons, O46124, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Emery Branigin, O53419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Bill Gene Smith, O53387, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Bruce Smith, O46241, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Olaf Gunnir Miller, O53184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Gildee, Jr., O35303, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ellsworth Cundiff, O34847, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Bautz, Jr., O34750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vernon Wilbur Morgan, O45837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Antonio Villarreal Reyes, O35292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Isaac Williams, O34960, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Arthur Dwight, O35305, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Charles Beaumont, O35059, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claire Benjamin Penzkofer, O46282, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Lloyd Osgard, O35315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Chadwick Blazzard, O35453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Matthew Hart, O34665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Siegfried Henry Spillner, O35300, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Ray Dingeman, O53468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerry M. Sage, O35326, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Nelson Crawford, O35353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Washington Coss Carter, O35390, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Douglas Pemberton Frazier, O46344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Edward Williams, O35386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Brown Thompson, O36635, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Donovan Ziler, O35412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harley Willard Ladd, O53512, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Wilson Dean, Jr., O35420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Thomas Knowles, O35418, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Thomas Harwell Barfield, O35425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Howard Walton Greer, O35426, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Russell Solomon Bieber, O35424, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Haskell Lee, O35428, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Sims, O35435, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Phillip Randall Smith, O35445, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Daniel Kennedy, Jr., O35444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ben Wilson Perry, O35447, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laurence William Jones, O45646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clayton Albert Shaw, O35451, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Gordon Wilbur Cook, O35454, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Hugh Edward Quigley, O46420, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Ike Looney, O40776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Leigh Fallwell, O35463, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alan A. Sawyer, O35464, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Sabolyk, O35475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Newton Jack Heuberger, O35476, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Lee Meggs, O35474, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Randolph Lacy Jones, O35477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Percy Franklin Lisk, Jr., O53540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cary Andrew Kennedy, Jr., O40779, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McEachron Gaustad, O39164, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Herschel Henry Hutsinpiller, O35487, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hollis Dakin, O40780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Gage Kline, O46466, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joyce Bailey James, O53547, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stanley Feller Parr, O35524, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Fred Clarke, Jr., O46484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Ottis Quimby, Jr., O35534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hoyt Leslie Fulmer, Jr., O35535, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carl Robert Rotz, O46505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Roy Reed Van Dusen, Jr., O35538, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joffre Haig Boston, O35537, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Earl Staten Browning, Jr., O35536, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Pickering Waters, Jr., O35543, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Joseph Cronin, O35545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester Earl Barlow, O35544, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. William Joseph McCabe, Jr., O39167, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Daniel McLaughlin, O46520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard McGowan Lee, O35551, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Londy Bailey, O35552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Herbert Roberts, O35553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Malcolm Kullmar, O35555, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Winfield Scott Williams, O40789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herbert Solomon Lowe, O35561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Leverne Doupe, O35562, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Thomas, O35564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Robert Ulrich, O35566, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Richard Kennedy, O46534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Arthur Godding, O40790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Paul Keleher, O35568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William McEvoy, O35570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Woodson Barnett, Jr., O46540, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Robinson Sheffield, O35569, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Bartley Kitchens, Jr., O40791, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Ray Jackson, Jr., O46542, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Owen Edward Woodruff, Jr., O36172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Carroll Kendrick, O46545, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hutchinson O'Connell, O35575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Edward Leeper, O46552, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Geyer Jones, O24576, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Knut Harold Raudstein, O53611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Madison Ramsey, O53610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Lt. Col. Jack Jennings Wagstaff, O35585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Vincient Roberts, O35584, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Peter Mahon, O40792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert James MacDonald, O39172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Dreiss, O35589, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hal LeRoy Schroeder, O25397, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Junior Newton Cox, O46561, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Henry Hoye, O46570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oren Clifford Wingfield, O39173, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fariss Hardin, O35600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Billie McKemie, O46573, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arnold Alvord Berglund, O35599, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Cornwell Geist, Jr., O46585, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Joseph Gettings, Jr., O46600, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Martin Lloyd Raines, O35621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Foster Barto Watson, O35665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Sammet, Jr., O35624, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John DeHart Foulk, O35629, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marshall Milford Motes, O46627, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Benjamin McDivitt, O53661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Ulin Overall 3d, O46630, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Walter Vail, O35647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Alden Burke, O46646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Binkley Williams, O35669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Eyre Redheffer, O35672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Elmer Holmgrain, O46656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Charles Aycock, O46664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Darrell Bowen, O46668, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edwin Harris, O46675, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert John Daniels, O53682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Bradley Simmons, Jr., O53683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Basil Wilcox Henderson, O46671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Don Carlos Faith, Jr., O46673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter William Mirras, O53684, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Kennedy Bennett, O35691, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marvin Minter Parr, O53681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Sam Floyd Warren, O34289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ed Vardo Hendren, Jr., O46682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Michael Gussie, O35697, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Frederick Gay, O40804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wilford Dennis Gower, O35699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Swaim, O46685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Samuel Chester McAdams, O39177, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Smith Coleman, O35710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ernest Earl Durham, O35709, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wesley Jarrell Simmons, O35713, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. George Chason Walker, O35719, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Febrey Arnold, O46714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Harry Cowles, O35735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Lockhart Horn, Jr., O53717, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Roger Barclay, O46727, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harris Whitton Hollis, O53724, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Emerson Ford, O35741, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wayland Jones, Jr., O35763, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Philip Fredric Dean, O35768, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Delard Goudreau, O46744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Wallace Moore, O53733, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Morris Zimmerman, O53738, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Anthony Robbins, O35780, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Charles Crawford, O35784, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marion Steele Bell, O35787, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Brooks Ogden Norman, O35793, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Daniel McNally, O35796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Curtis Bone, O35792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clarence Clark DeReus, O35790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elmer Gordon Owens, O39181, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Wilburn Elihue Grant, O35789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Elden Cornelius Campbell, O40817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Lenier Anderson, O35797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Carl Schrader, O40820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Adolph Herman Phillips, O35883, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Killip, O40823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Patrick McEvoy, O46774, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Emil Stielau, O35815, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Lee Waddell, Jr., O25371, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Dougherty, O35817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Chester Bayard Hansen, O35819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bernard Augustine Dever, O40827, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lewis Minor Stewart, O46789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elvin Vernon Vestal, O40828, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome William Schrader, O35821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Freeman Beaver, O46800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cud Thomas Baird 3d, O40804, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert James Bigart, O35831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Waldron John Winter, O35832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Stephan Lekson, O35837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmond Ragland Urquhart, O40831, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Cook White, O46808, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Manford Milton Canary, O35841, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Wylie Ben Walters, O35840, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eugene Forrest Boomer, O35846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl William Kruger, O35845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Lloyd George Smith, O38024, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Rathbone Mumma, O46819, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Zakel, Jr., O35849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Andrew Seitzer, O46818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Wilson Hemingway, O35854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Phillip Holcomb, O46829, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence William Patten, O35859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert James Bennett, O46832, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred George Steiner, O35860, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Durning Harlan, O35861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Arthur Gleason, Jr., O35882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Woodrow Reed, O35884, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward John Chrysler, O53809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Donald Denchfield, O35886, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wallace Raymond Elliott, O40837, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Earl Holzbach, Jr., O46861, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard LaVerne Nispel, O53810, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vincent Henry Ellis, O53814, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Theodore Macek, O46866, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Jessie Ellison, O40846, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oliver Herman Bruce, O46926, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Lewis Long, O46931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Morrison Click, O39188, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Dale Reid, O35712, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jeremiah Bryant Monk, Jr., O46946, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Herman Parthum, Jr., O35939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ardery Campbell, O25400, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kermit Reginald Mason, O46951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louie Neil Rodgers, O35941, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Tyron Earl Tisdale, O46953, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Jackson Allen, O46952, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Oeland Denham, O35948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Radford Donald Hyde, O35949, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clifford Earl Roberts, O46969, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Brandon Brantwood Trussell, Jr., O39190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Isaac Edward Whisnant, O46983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Henry Hill, Jr., O39191, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Robert Poole, O35959, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Alvah McKean, O35958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Paul Tallon, Jr., O35965, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Norfleet Chavis, O39193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore Stanley Staiger, O53879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Walton Fickessen, O35973, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Truett Cooper, O35983, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard John Titley, O35982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bryan Cowan, O40850, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Vocqsal Doss Wood, Jr., O47003, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Walter MacIndoe, O25407, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Dods Beard, O47010, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Franklin Johnston, O35987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Milotta, O35989, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Davis Morgan, Jr., O47012, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Locke Lyons, O35997, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Don Rue Hickman, O35996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Purcell Ludington, O47015, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Esler Whitmore, O35993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hugh Wear, O47014, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Marlin Watson Camp, O35999, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Truman Alexander Hopkins, O36057, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Laurence Sylvester Browne, O47086, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Braddock Babbs, O39203, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Eugene Adams, O39202, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Tomlinson Eichnor, O53927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Franklin Davis Bush, O47101, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carl Peter Keiser, Jr., O36066, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William James Harris, O47105, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Ellsworth Dunlap, O40862, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Martin Wright, O53931, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Albert Broadus Dillard, Jr., O53930, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Morton Young, Jr., O47107, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Cecil Vogelsang, O36078, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lester DeWayne Royalty, O36081, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Washington Putnam, Jr., O39206, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vernon Trampe Loesing, O36090, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hart Hottenroth, O24645, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. James Henry Hayes, O24646, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Preston Halsell, O24647, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sam Ellsworth Cumpston, O24650, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Edward Hesselbacher, Jr., O24651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Paul Young, O24652, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Bryan Newman 3d, O24654, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Reiley Finney, O24655, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Irving Rock Obenchain, Jr., O24658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Willard Vogel, O24661, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Winthrop Barnes, O24663, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ward Watkin, Jr., O24664, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leon Joseph Hamerly, O24665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Edward Ambrose Martell, O24666, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Francis Paul Koisch, O24669, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Arthur Raymond, O24670, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jerrold Duster Snow, O24671, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph John Schmidt, Jr., O24672, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Castlereigh Orme, O24673, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Robert Cerar, O24674, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alvin Dumond Wilder, Jr., O24676, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip George Krueger, O24677, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Tuttle Hamilton, Jr., O24678, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Miles Lowell Wachendorf, O24679, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Robert Peyton Tabb, Jr., O24680, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Frederick Charles Roecker, Jr., O24681, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Edgar Rosell, Jr., O24682, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clement Mattina, O24683, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mahlon Eugene Gates, O24685, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Louis Hennessy, O24690, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roger Alley Barnes, O24694, Army of the United States (first lieutenant U. S. Army).

Maj. Seymour Rubenstein, O24695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmond Harrison Leavey, Jr., O24698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Eugene Voegeli, O24699, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eugene Leland Weeks, O24700, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Preston Sheffey 3d, O24701, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Baker, O24704, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clyde Raymond Eisenschmidt, Jr., O24706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Leonard Bart, O24707, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Peter Bonasso, O24714, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Matthew Rienzi, O24715, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Fred Shutrump 2d, O24718, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Rollin Thomas Steinmetz, Jr., O24720, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Russell Kraft, Jr., O24726, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Patrick Murphy, O24729, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur Lawrence Lambert, O24731, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Garrard Foster, O24732, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Garth Stevens, O24735, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Davis Terry, O24739, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Walter Fritz, O24744, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Corley, Jr., O24746, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army)

Maj. John Randle Watson, O24748, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Alfred Vivian, O24751, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Henry Riedel, Jr., O24756, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dale Eldon Buchanan, O24759, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George R. Allin, Jr., O24760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Lahm, O24761, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Leonard John Pasciak, O24765, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Raybourn O'Neal, O24772, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Hilary Connolly, Jr., O24783, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Dean Short, O24789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel John Dilworth, O24790, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Rogers Seip, O24792, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edgar Allan Rickman, O24796, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Samuel Hubbard Hays, O24797, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Windsor Rice, O24800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Horatio Clagett, Jr., O24803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Lee Lewis, O24809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Severino Martinez, Jr., O24811, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Joseph Short, O24812, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert William Carpenter, Jr., O24816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Cecil Kenneth Charbonneau, Jr., O24817, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Dennis Sitterson, Jr., O24818, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Francis Joseph Roberts, O24820, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Albert Nicholas Thompson, O24823, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Mark Howard Terrel, O24826, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Russell Deane, Jr., O24835, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Boone Bartholomees, O24839, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry Harmeling, Jr., O24843, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Roy Stanley Geiger, Jr., O24845, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Peter Iuliucci, O24848, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Henry Ivey, O24849, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Harvey Tarver, O24851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Philip Alfred Wyman, O24854, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Hilton Offley, Jr., O24871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Marmaduke Grimshaw, O24872, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Samuel William Koster, Jr., O24873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Linwood Fogg Jordan, O24879, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Henry Crosson, Jr., O24880, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ulysses Grant Jones, Jr., O24882, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Houston Townsend, O24890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Willis Dale Crittenberger, Jr., O24893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawrence Haley Caruthers, Jr., O24896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Dean Hennessee, O24897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Edward Hunter, O24898, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas Cunningham Murray, O24899, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Richard Pendergrast, O24905, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joel Beck Stephens, O24913, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Griffin Clapp, Jr., O24914, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert MacDougall Bringham, O24925, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edwin Hall Marks, Jr., O24935, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Butner Clay, O24937, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Alfred Divers, O24945, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Peter Talbot Russell, O24947, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Fuller Davis, Jr., O24948, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Wolcott Ryder, Jr., O24951, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Robert Burnett Spilman, O24955, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Edward Halpin, O24957, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Henry William Urrutia, O24966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Ray Rogers, O24967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edgar Shedd 3d, O24971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joe Virgil Morey, O24975, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Lawrence Eckert, O24976, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Richard Miles, Jr., O24979, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donnelly Paul Bolton, O24982, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charlie Calhoun Coleman, O24987, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Simmons Timothy, O24992, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Edward Seifert, O24993, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Boyd Freeze Walker, O24998, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Joseph Alleo, O25000, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Doan Rehkopf, O25004, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert George Brugh, Jr., O25009, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. John Denis Crowley, Jr., O25016, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Walter Anderson, O25383, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Earl Parsons, Jr., O36095, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Neil Hickok, O36096, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Pedro Roxas Flor Cruz, O47122, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Vincent Silvis, O36098, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Christian Beachler, O36099, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles William Schudt, O53939, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Andrew Meads, Jr., O36108, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Andrew Wiley, O47130, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ned Rowland Bethea, O47132, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Claude Arther Hays, O47134, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ralph Augustine Kerley, O47139, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Gerald William Homann, O25382, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Orville Theodore Lowe, O36111, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Marshall Whitenton, O36114, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Albert Guenthner, O47146, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Ignatius Ciraldo, O36117, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Bruce Thomas Falls, O47145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Barr Nixdorff, O40867, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald King Stevens, O36118, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hughes Hard, O36120, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Pershing Bane, O36121, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Nathaniel Andrew Gage, Jr., O47155, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Blount Harding, Jr., O53958, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Adams Wilson, O36129, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Leslie Crawley, Jr., O53963, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Bartley Cagle, Jr., O36131, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Donald Thomas Paul, O36142, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Jack Felix Wilhm, O47170, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Lane Gude, O36138, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Simuel Henderson, O25412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Reece Sedberry, Jr., O25415, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Russell Alexander Duke, O40873, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Artha Darby Williams, Jr., O40871, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Harding Stutler, O36148, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Heacock McBride, O47172, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Richard Miller, O53967, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Jean Dennis, O36151, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ivan King, O36153, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Wilbur Gilman, O25394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Ralsey Stevens 3d, O39215, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Erwin Bailey Jones, O36168, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Leo Farrell, Jr., O36160, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Eschman Curran, Jr., O36163, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Max Adams Morris, O25379, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Verne Church, O36171, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Clifton Honea, Jr., O36175, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Clayton Butsch, O47199, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Arthur Woodrow Kogstad, O36176, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter Andrew Guntharp, O36178, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Griffith Hays, Jr., O25390, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Leroy Harrison, O25373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Andrew Spencer, O36076, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lloyd Lorenzo Leech, Jr., O25386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Benjamin Thomas, O25411, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Carter Fuson, O36184, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Major William Evans-Smith, O53988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edward Mitchell Hill, O36185, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Francis Ahern, O36187, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Henry Hamilton McKee, O36190, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles John Anderson, O25376, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Berrisford Harlan Walker, O36195, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Forrest Richardson, O36193, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carroll Fordyce, O53996, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Louis Paul Testa, O40877, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Dow Seigel Grones, O47225, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Marion Seignious, O47226, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Theodore Lunger, O25388, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edmund Wendel, Jr., O36220, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frederick Eugene Williams, Jr., O36227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. James Dewey Ramsey, O36228, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Derwood Cann, Jr., O36230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Eric Roland Mills, Jr., O47272, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Virgil Parker Foster, Jr., O36229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Patrick Barry Ward, O36239, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harold Kenneth Reynolds, O39218, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Earle Pinckney, O47275, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kimball Russ Richmond, O47281, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hall Breaden McElree, O36252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Salve Hugo Matheson, O36253, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Dallas Andrew Pilliod, O36257, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Linwood Arthur Carleton, O36260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Warren Newton Levick, O47292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Harry Leslie Field, Jr., O40890, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Kenneth Lawson Johnson, O36285, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alfred Vitold Weiss, O36287, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jack Clifford Neve, O40893, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Arthur Norman Whitley, O47359, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Edwin Mead, O36314, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Cyril Dorn, O36316, Army of the United States (first lieutenant), U. S. Army).

Maj. William Treloar Russell, O25410, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Campbell, O47367, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Maj. Harold Paul Baker, O40895, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Gregory Gust, O36330, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Louis Klingenhagen, O39223, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Hugh Franklin Young, O36327, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Clyde Hudgins Baden, Jr., O36333, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Frank Joseph Nemethy, O36332, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Edmund Neidner, O47381, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Richard George Foelsch, O36337, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Niram LeRoy Sauls, O47386, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elton David Vaughan, O47395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Charles Golladay, O40897, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Kenneth Elwood Shiflet, O47394, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James William Gunn, O40896, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Daniel Basile, O40900, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Stanley Kimmitt, O36343, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Benjamin Dowell Capshaw, Jr., O36345, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Jermiah O'Leary, O36344, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Bee McFadden, Jr., O54083, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Gelling, O36353, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Sumner Freedland, O47401, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Willard Young, O36350, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Marshall Bragg Garth, O36357, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Edward Cunningham, O36361, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Charles Young, O36362, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Attison Luttrell, O36363, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Petruzel, O36364, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Cleveland Armentrout, O47412, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Edwin Harry Patterson, O54094, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. David Edward Condon, O36373, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Anthony McCloskey, O36372, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Molloy Clark Vaughn, Jr., O25393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Morgan Agustus Whitfield, O36389, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Daniel Webber, Jr., O36393, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Calvin Pinson, O36408, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Edwin Temple, O47459, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Thomas Murphy, O36776, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Herbert L. Duncan, O39230, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Eugene Napper, O36416, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Urban Schmidt, O36425, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Gayle Whitsitt McFadden, O54125, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Dan Anthony Mobley, O54145, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Rufus Eugene Hallmark, O47516, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herald Bud Gallinger, O36481, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jack Pershing Brubaker, O36484, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Stephen Edward Cavanaugh, Jr., O36485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Curtis Franklin, O47521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Briggs Lathrop, O36492, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Oats A. Pynes, Jr., O36491, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Leary Peterson, O36496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army.)

Capt. Charles Irvan Olsen, O47541, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Albert McMahon, O54182, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Howard Pickford Clarke, Jr., O36505, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Wayne Elbert Ligon, O36510, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kroner Eney, O36514, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Carl Crisson, O36520, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joe Hillsman Underwood, O36521, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Marshall Prescott Kean, Jr., O40927, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Merrill Brizzard, O54027, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Darrell George Wood, O54196, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Fred Orr Jackson, O47577, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cornelius John Shaffer, O47534, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Boehmer, O36550, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Leslie Davis Smith, O33042, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jerome Belsky, O40932, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Francis Rey, O47633, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Jesse Lee Morrow, Jr., O36564, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John William Edwards, O54229, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Whitson Marr, O36567, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Raymond Restani, O36568, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Theodore William Peterson, O47644, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Howard Chapin, O47651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Carlton Bender, O47706, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Capt. Oscar Ernest Schlamersdorf, O39248, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldridge Clair Dudley, O54260, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Walter Alexander Pashley, Jr., O40942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward O'Neal Logan, O36610, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Henry Herndon, O36636, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William John Regner, O25395, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Saunders Parkins, Jr., O47716, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Ross Bond, O36618, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Elza Reafleng, O36620, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Raymond Spencer Webster, O36621, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Charles Finneran, O36643, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jasper Stuart Moore, O47770, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Ransom Olcott, O54292, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Beall Harvey, O47778, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Anthony Joseph DeAngelis, O39252, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh King Boyd, O36658, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Robert Fredrick Robens, O36665, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Ernest Lester Knoll, O54304, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Louis Scott Torgeson, O25421, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Thomas Laney Gordon, O36662, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Carroll McFalls, Jr., O47800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Michael Hudak, O47803, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Howell Mathias, O47844, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Frederick Monsarrat, O36698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harry Eugene Gibb, O47853, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph Council Braxton, O36703, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Howard Irvine, O36705, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lawson William Magruder, Jr., O36711, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Richard Burdick, O36760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Eldon Robert Davis, O36771, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Anthony Abrignani, O40966, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Charles Warren Johnson, O36315, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. William Randolph Mathews, Jr., O47934, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Richard Adrain Raichlen, O54419, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Joseph William Scanlan, O47971, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vincent Louis Corrado, O54417, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alvin Clendenning Metcalfe, O36809, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Arthur James Sutton, O36816, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Paul Biggio, Jr., O36821, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Edward Potts, O54461, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Hugh McGovern, O36851, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Herman Lamar West, O48031, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Austin Donald McQuinn, O48053, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Franklin Parkins, O36855, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Byrne Allen Evans, O36859, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Paul Bernard McCain, O48072, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Tetley Omenhiser, Jr., O54485, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Leon Baldwin, O36864, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Forrest Ithamar Rettgers, O36414, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Maurice Waldo Dunn, O40985, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Garcia Uglade, O36354, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Ernest Milloy, O35289, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Oswald C. Smith, O54531, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward Pieklik, O36942, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Reiley Guthrie, O36240, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Maertens, O48227, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Laddie L. Stahl, O36988, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Crawford Sheldon, O48236, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

×Maj. Grady Francis Lilly, O36990, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Joseph Edward O'Leary, O37002, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Kirk Singlaub, O37040, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Allen Knowlton, O25436, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. DeWitt Clinton Armstrong 3d, O25441, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. George Anthony Rebh, O25444, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Frank Ambler Camm, O25448, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Douglas King Blue, O25453, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Roscoe Ellis, O25455, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John McClure, Jr., O25456, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Creel Marshall, O25467, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Johnson Talbott, O25468, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Darrie Hewitt Richards, O25458, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Albert Emmanuel Saari, O25470, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Cecil George Young, Jr., O25472, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Love Starnes, Jr., O25475, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Robert Guthrie Hillman, O25477, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Emmett Robinson Reynolds, O25489, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Charles Stuart MacVeigh, O25496, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Walter William Hogrefe, O25518, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Foster Stephens, O25539, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Robert Nickel, O25553, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Stewart Canfield Meyer, O25560, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Paul Edward Andrepont, O25570, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Lawrence Philip Bischoff, Jr., O25571, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Gray Wheelock 3d, O25572, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Lowell Lyndon Wilkes, Jr., O25575, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. McGlachlin Hatch, O25578, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Vasco John Fenili, O25579, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Merle Landry Carey, O25586, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alfred Lukacs Toth, O25587, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. John Jacob Luther, Jr., O25597, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Donald Eugene Wilbourn, O25606, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Robert Michael, O25609, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Edward Kelleher, O25611, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hugh Mease, Jr., O25614, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. John Alden Hine, Jr., O25617, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Jesse Benjamin Hollis, Jr., O25651, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Clarence Maude Davenport, Jr., O25656, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Norman David Greenberg, O25695, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. George Kameil Maertens, O25698, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Edward Michael Flanagan, Jr., O25710, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Charles Alvin Wirt, O25725, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. James Hamlin Schofield, Jr., O25754, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. James Daniel Moore, O25760, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Wilson Brown, O25769, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. William Hiram Pietsch, Jr., O25773, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Elvy Benton Roberts, O25781, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Boone Seegers, O25789, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Everett Edward Lowry, Jr., O25799, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Henderson Farnsworth, O25800, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Maj. Thomas Arthur Mesereau, O25822, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

Capt. Carlton Clyde Thornblom, O33750, Army of the United States (first lieutenant, U. S. Army).

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion:

*To be first lieutenants*

First Lt. Raimon William Lehman, O56586, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

First Lt. John Paul Vann, O38485, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Anthony Ryan, O56587, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 3, 1948.

First Lt. Melvin Jordan Sowards, O39473, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Parks Blanton, O39474, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

First Lt. John Neal Kennedy, O50425, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Herman Siegrist, O39475, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 5, 1948.

First Lt. Louis George Selig, Jr., O50427, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

First Lt. Winfred Bullard Senior, O56588, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

First Lt. John Hilary McAuliffe, O56594, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 7, 1948.

First Lt. Otto Paul Scharth, O41337, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 14, 1948.

First Lt. Gordon Sumner, Jr., O38489, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 23, 1948.

Second Lt. Charles Liston Gambill, O50435, United States Army, with rank from July 26, 1948.

Capt. Charles Raymond Sniffin, O50437, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 29, 1948.

First Lt. Robert Louis Pomerene, O50438, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from July 30, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Lee Moriarty, O50440, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 4, 1948.

First Lt. Richard Bruce Elliott, O50442, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 5, 1948.

First Lt. Loren Ralph Keefer, O38492, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 7, 1948.

First Lt. Victor David Green, O50445, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 11, 1948.

First Lt. Edward Bertram Ledford, O38496, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 13, 1948.

First Lt. William Joseph Farrell, O38488, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 14, 1948.

First. Lt. Jefferson DeRosenroll Capps, O50447, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 15, 1948.

First Lt. Ernest Mahlon Monroe, Jr., O38497, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army) with rank from August 15, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Francis Gioe, O56619, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 16, 1948.

First. Lt. Raymond Godfrey Lehman, Jr., O56621, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 17, 1948.

First Lt. Donald Cary Schaffer, O38231, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 28, 1948.

Capt. Charles Lenton Stark, O50451, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from August 29, 1948.

First Lt. Clyde Othneil Clark, O56632, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 5, 1948.

First Lt. William Raymond Healey, O50456, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 6, 1948.

First Lt. John Frederick Bates, O56633, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 7, 1948.

First Lt. Mac Cyril Eversole, O56634, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 8, 1948.

First Lt. William Allin Herring, O41340, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 14, 1948.

First Lt. James Arthur Driscoll, O50467, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 14, 1948.

First Lt. Joseph Leon Strelecki, Jr., O50468, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 15, 1948.

Second Lt. Fernand Mitchell Achee, O50470, United States Army, with rank from September 17, 1948.

×First Lt. Robert Milton Prater, O38507, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 18, 1948.

First Lt. Randolph Goodwin, O56641, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 19, 1948.

Capt. Julius Hoesterey Braun, O50472, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 21, 1948.

First Lt. William Scott Smith, O38509, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 24, 1948.

First Lt. Walter Allen Jacobson, O50473, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 24, 1948.

×First Lt. Thomas Meredith Waitt, O50475, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 26, 1948.

First Lt. Don Smith Fletcher, O50476, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from September 26, 1948.

First Lt. Allen Driscoll Rooke, Jr., O38511, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from October 5, 1948.

First Lt. Hobart E. Dewey, O39479, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from October 20, 1948.

Capt. Chester Carlton Westfall, Jr., O50489, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from October 24, 1948.

First Lt. Charles Coolidge Ross, O56661, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 6, 1948.

First Lt. Matthew William Reiss, O56659, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 6, 1948.

First Lt. George Samuel Blankenbaker, O50494, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 8, 1948.

First Lt. George Robert Allen, Jr., O50495, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 9, 1948.

First Lt. George Catron Viney, O38516, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 10, 1948.

First Lt. Francis Joseph Quinn, O56664, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 16, 1948.

First Lt. Paul Mulford Wakeman, Jr., O50500, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 20, 1948.

First Lt. John David Zaficek Kinsey, O38517, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from November 27, 1948.

Second Lt. John Lynch Davis 3d, O39480, United States Army, with rank from November 27, 1948.

First Lt. Albert Henry Conyne, O50505, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 1, 1948.

Capt. Judson Frederick Miller, O38518, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 5, 1948.

First Lt. Olva Barland Butler, O50507, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 13, 1948.

First Lt. Gene Albert Roberts, O41349, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 15, 1948.

First Lt. Hampton Rowland, Jr., O38512, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 20, 1948.

First Lt. Thomas Laverne Stovall, O50512, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, U. S. Army), with rank from December 21, 1948.

*To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps*

First Lt. Thomas Ross Ostrom, O50576, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 7, 1948.

Second Lt. James Rock Walpole, O38579, Medical Service Corps, United States Army, with rank from August 3, 1948.

First Lt. George Raymond Krough, O38580, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 22, 1948.

First Lt. Ralph Edwin Craycraft, O38582, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 10, 1948.

First Lt. Conrad Stenset Braaten, O38581, Medical Service Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Medical Service Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 16, 1948.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

*To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps, with rank from August 31, 1948*

Maj. Dora Annie Noble, N25, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Bernice Watson Chambers, N20, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Frances Charlotte Henchey, N23, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Augusta Lee Short, N24, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Elizabeth Beatrice Mahoney, N499, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Lt. Col. Alta Berninger, N504, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (major, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

*To be majors, Army Nurse Corps, with rank from August 31, 1948*

Capt. Marie Louise Pace, N66, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Cora Elva Collison, N517, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Alice Josephine Johnson, N518, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Blanche Hazel Eager, N38, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Anne Katherine Pilegard, N520, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Theresa Anna Wilson, N521, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Alvine Louise Schmidt, N39, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

Maj. Josephine Helen Balestra, N522, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Ella Vendeline Shorney, N523, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Maj. Welma Grace Wiehe, N525, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (captain, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Myrtle C. Huhner, N42, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army.

*To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps*

First Lt. Catherine Nelda Cotsones, N1506, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from April 26, 1948.

First Lt. Amalia Rita Lazaro, N1519, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States, (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Patricia Anne Donaldson, N1709, Army Nurse Corps, United States Army, with rank from July 1, 1948.

First Lt. Rosemary Witt, N1520, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 1, 1948.

First Lt. Joan Martha Wissing, N1710, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 3, 1948.

First Lt. Ellen Marie McDonald, N1187, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 6, 1948.

First Lt. Marie Josephine Schmahl, N1521, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 13, 1948.

First Lt. Nancy Bolt Power, N1626, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 14, 1948.

First Lt. Gladys Irene Breault, N1522, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 16, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Marla Kish, N1523, Army Nurse Corps, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 1, 1948.

*To be majors, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, with rank from July 19, 1948*

Capt. Elsie Kuraner, M10033, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Edna Lura, M10034, Assistant Chief of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps and Chief of the Physical Therapist Section (captain, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Harriet Shannon Lee, M10001, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Felie Woodrow Clark, M10002, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Brunetta Avis Kuehlthau, M10019, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Lt. Col. Eleanor Lois Mitchell, R10035, Assistant Chief of the Women's Medical Specialist Corps and Chief of the Dietitian Section (captain, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army).

Capt. Hilda Muse Lovett, R10061, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Nell Wickliffe, R10036, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Grace Smith, R10001, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Helen Alice Dautrich, R10002, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Ethel May Theilmann, M10055, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Myrtle Aldrich, R10003, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Agnes Patterson Snyder, M10003, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

Capt. Helen Morris Davis, R10004, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*To be major, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, with rank from November 10, 1948*

Capt. Miriam Esther Perry, R10005, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army.

*To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps*

First Lt. Harriet Louise Wood, M10066, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 2, 1948.

First Lt. Betty Ann Harlan, M10016, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

First Lt. Frances Jane Johnson, M10031, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from July 10, 1948.

First Lt. Margaret Eileen Mahoney, M10017, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from August 9, 1948.

Second Lt. Barbara E. Bangs, J20, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from August 27, 1948.

First Lt. Edith Ailene Hill, R10057, Dietitian, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army), with rank from September 1, 1948.

Second Lt. Mildred V. Bond, J21, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from September 27, 1948.

Second Lt. Ellen M. Lund, J2, Occupational Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army, with rank from October 15, 1948.

First Lt. Rosamond Ella Hughes, R10029, Dietitian, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from October 31, 1948.

First Lt. Mary Ann Perta, M10048, Physical Therapy Aide, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Physical Therapist Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, United States Army), with rank from November 1, 1948.

First Lt. Dorothy Edith Fisher, R10058, Dietitian, Army of the United States (second lieutenant, Dietitian Section, Women's Medical Specialist Corps, U. S. Army), with rank from November 6, 1948.

FOOTNOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

---

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 17, 1949:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. Carl A. Hatch, of New Mexico, to be United States district judge for the district of New Mexico.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, JANUARY 17, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Jacob S. Payton, D. D., of Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we acknowledge with gratitude Thy innumerable mercies. Here on the threshold of another week we would dedicate ourselves only to such objectives as have Thy approval. Illumine the minds of these Thy servants that they may oppose real rather than fictitious evils. May the moral obligations that unite them have priority over all prejudices that may seek to divide them. So this day may those who labor within these walls, strive to make America strong through the might that comes through justice, and durable through

Thy truth that cannot be shaken. This we pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 13, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 26):

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Hunt, of Wyoming; Mr. Jenner, of Indiana.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library: Mr. Hayden, of Arizona; Mr. Green, of Rhode Island; Mr. Long, of Louisiana; Mr. Ives, of New York; Mr. Lodge, of Massachusetts.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JAMES

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, one of the greatest men that ever lived. We, in Pennsylvania, delight to do him honor. As a Governor of our great Commonwealth, and a signer of the Declaration of Independence, and as a member of the Constitutional Convention, we are proud of this great man who did so much for America and for all the world.

Mr. Speaker, we are honored today in that we have in our Pennsylvania Republican delegation the man who has succeeded him as president of the Franklin Printing Co., the Honorable BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JAMES, of Pennsylvania.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

ONE-MINUTE SPEECHES

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

It has been the policy for some years now that when there is a legislative program for the day the so-called 1-minute speeches that contain more than 300 words will be put in the RECORD after the business of the day or in the Appendix of the RECORD. The Chair trusts that Members will regard this agreement that we have had for quite a while.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BURDICK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH and Mr. HÉBERT asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two particulars and include in each an editorial.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a speech by the Secretary of Labor, Hon. Maurice Tobin.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial that appeared in yesterday's Sunday Post and in the other a radio address he delivered over Station WMEX.

WASHINGTON HOTEL RATES

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, an article appearing in the Evening Star of Friday, the 14th, states that while certain hotels in Washington have increased their rates to double or more for the period of the inauguration that at least three in the strategic downtown area have not increased their rates at all. These are the Mayflower, the Carlton, and the Occidental—there may be others. The managers of these fine hotels are to be commended for their spirit of fairness and hospitality.

I am sorry to note that some of the hotels have refused to reveal their rates to newspaper reporters. All the Washington hotels should fully disclose to the public through the press what their rates are for the period of the inauguration. And if they feel such rates are justified they should state their reasons.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include some extraneous material.

IMMIGRATION FROM ITALY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a bill similar to one which I introduced during the Eightieth Congress. This bill provides that the annual immigration quotas for Italy for the fiscal years 1950 and 1951 shall be increased by an amount equal to the unused Italian quotas for the past 10 years. If this bill becomes law, the number of Italians who would be admitted to this country during the next 2 years would be 36,709.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has sought to help Italy to recover from the ravages and devastation of war. The United States has, since the end of the war, spent upwards of $2,000,000,000 to rehabilitate Italy.

We know that the course of events in Italy has a sharp and significant impact upon the economy and national security of the United States and upon the peace of the world. We know that had the Communists obtained power in the Italian elections on April 18, 1948, western Europe would probably have fallen under the Communist boot and we should have had to convert our Nation into an armed camp.

Mr. Speaker, the Marshall plan, while necessary to the recovery of Italy, does not deal with Italy's major problem which is overpopulation. The optimum population for Italy is approximately 38,000,000 people. Yet today, Italy has a population of between forty-six and forty-seven million and her population is increasing at the rate of some 450,000 a year. Approximately 200,000 additional workers are made available each year.

The problem of overpopulation in Italy is one with which Premier De Gasperi and his government cannot deal with unassisted.

I wrote to the President last August urging him to take the position that Italy's pre-Fascist colonies should be returned to her. These territories could absorb at least a few of Italy's surplus people. In that same letter I urged the President to instruct his representatives to the United Nations to present Italy's demographic problem to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations in order that that body, as well as the

International Labor Organization, should help toward its solution.

The passage of this bill is, in my opinion, the very least we can do to help Italy in her time of trial.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. John Baer.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of Wednesday, January 12, 1949, in relation to the President's budget message to the Congress.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE LATE HONORABLE EDWARD L. O'NEILL

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ADDONIZIO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is with genuine sorrow that I inform the House of the death of a former Member of Congress from New Jersey, Edward L. O'Neill, of Newark, on Sunday, December 12 last. Mr. O'Neill died several hours after suffering a heart attack at his home. He was 45 years old.

Mr. O'Neill, a Democrat, represented the Eleventh District of New Jersey from 1936 to 1938, and earned a reputation as a hard-working and conscientious Member. He was named to five House committees, more than any other first-term Member, eventually serving on the Committees for Civil Service; District of Columbia; Education; Coinage, Weights, and Measures; and Claims. He subsequently resigned from those committees, as required by House rules, to become a member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, at that time one of the three major committees in the House. Members of the House who were his colleagues remember Mr. O'Neill's youthful appearance and friendly manner as well as his devotion to duty and capacity for work.

Born in Newark, Mr. O'Neill attended schools in that city and was in private employment for 9 years before embarking upon his career of public service. He made his first political speech before he was 27 at a dinner in honor of William H. Kelly, who was—and still is—chairman of the Essex County Democratic Committee, and he was soon recognized as a young man with a promising future. At 29 he was campaign manager for William L. Wachenfeld in his candidacy for State senator. He was the youngest man ever to receive the support of the county Democratic committee in his first bid for the eleventh congressional seat in 1934. He lost to the Republican incumbent by less than 1 percent of the vote cast in the district, and he was successful against the same candidate in the next election.

Prior to his term in Congress Mr. O'Neill was with the Federal Housing Administration as field representative and mortgage risk examiner, and later was a member of the Essex County Tax Board for 7 years.

The same tireless energy and enthusiasm which characterized Mr. O'Neill's official assignments marked his civic and charitable activities. He was Essex County chairman of the March of Dimes for several years and was planning this year's program at the time of his death. He was long active in the Knights of Columbus and the Holy Name Society and held high offices in these organizations, having been grand knight of the Newark Council of the Knights of Columbus, and vice president of the Essex County Federation of Holy Name Societies.

Mr. O'Neill served in both the naval and military branches of our armed forces. As a youth of 15 he enlisted in the Navy and served 4 years, part of the time with the Asiatic Fleet. In World War II he was commissioned in the Army and was retired on account of physical disability with the rank of captain.

Surviving are his widow, Mrs. Ida Mary Koch O'Neill, a daughter Margaret, and two sisters, Mrs. Margaret Ryan and Mrs. Ann McConnan, of Newark.

I was privileged to know Mr. O'Neill for many years and, as did all who knew him, held him in high regard and esteem. He was a man of integrity and ability, and a warmhearted and sincere friend. He will be long remembered by his numerous friends, by his former colleagues here, and by all who were associated with him in his useful career. He served his city, State, and country with fidelity, and he has left an honorable record of public service. His untimely passing is a deep personal loss to me, and I extend my sincere sympathy to his bereaved family.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the bill H. R. 501 dealing with the merchant marine and to include therein a short newspaper article.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt.

Mr. GORE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Edward B. Smith, which appeared in the Knoxville News-Sentinel.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two statements from extraneous sources.

Mr. MERROW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances: in one to include several resolutions introduced by him in the present Congress, and in the other to include an editorial.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the Legislature of Nebraska.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article from Panama.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on three separate subjects and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and insert copy of an address delivered by Commissioner Freeland on the efforts made to mislead the people on the basing-point system.

Mr. PATMAN also asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks on another subject and include certain statements and excerpts.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 42)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In my recent messages to the Congress I have presented the program which I believe this Government should follow in the months ahead. The magnitude and importance of that program, both at home and abroad, require able leadership and sound management. The Government must have the most effective administrative machinery to carry out its vast responsibilities.

The Congress has recognized these needs by the establishment of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. The recommendations of the Commission,

which are soon to be reported to the Congress, may be expected to contribute significantly to our ability to meet the problem before us. To carry out those recommendations and to accomplish other improvements in the Government's complex operations will, however, require further and more detailed steps. Improving the management of the public's business calls for continuing efforts by the Congress, the President, and all agencies of Government.

Throughout my administration I have taken action to effect improvements in the organization and operation of the Government. In 1945 I asked the Congress to enact legislation authorizing permanent changes in administrative structure by the reorganization plan procedure. Under the authority granted by the Reorganization Act of 1945, numerous reorganizations were made which contributed to the efficiency of the Government and its transition from war to peace. The establishment of the permanent Housing and Home Finance Agency was an outstanding example of the improvements thus achieved. I also recommended, and the Congress enacted, a major improvement in the organization of our armed forces by the creation of the National Military Establishment. On matters not requiring legislation I have made program adjustments designed to increase the effectiveness of governmental operations.

It is my firm intention to continue to require, throughout the executive branch, the highest degree of attention to this need for improved management. I expect each department and agency head to consider this a major part of his responsibility. It is essential that they be given the tools for effective management of their agencies. Further, I believe that every official and employee of the Government should feel a personal responsibility for improving the way in which his work is performed.

Increased efficiency and economy in the Government's far-flung activities can be realized only if certain essentials of organization and operation are satisfied. These essentials are not confined to Government. They have proven their effectiveness in the successful operation of large-scale enterprise, both public and private. They are matters on which it is easy to agree in principle but which are often violated in practice.

There must be, first of all, a clear definition of the objectives of public programs. Second, organizational arrangements must be established which are consistent with those objectives and designed to produce responsible and effective administration. Third, qualified personnel must be obtained to administer the programs. Fourth, the methods by which operations are conducted must be constantly reviewed and improved. Fifth, there must be provision for thoroughgoing review and evaluation of operations, by the President and the Congress, to assure that the objectives are being attained. These conditions can be achieved only through teamwork by the President and the Congress in carrying out their respective responsibilities under the Constitution for conducting the affairs of Government.

I have already recommended to the Congress two measures which will help us obtain better government. The enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of the heads and assistant heads of departments and agencies and to revise the Classification Act will greatly assist the Government in securing and holding the services of the best qualified men and women. The appropriation to the President of a special fund of $1,000,000 for management improvement will yield major contributions to the better operation of the Government. It will be used in part for the development and installation of recommendations coming from the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, and in part for the preliminary expenses incident to the appraisal and trial of other suggested improvements. This fund will in no sense be a substitute for the present day-to-day efforts by all Government agencies to improve the conduct of their operations.

In addition to these steps, I am now recommending that the Congress enact legislation to restore permanently the reorganization procedure temporarily provided by the Reorganization Acts of 1939 and 1945. This procedure is the method of executive-legislative cooperation whereby a reorganization plan submitted to the Congress by the President becomes effective in 60 days unless rejected by both Houses of the Congress.

In a letter to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government has pointed out the need for such a method of reorganization in dealing with many of the changes which it will recommend. I fully agree with the Commission on the necessity of reviving the reorganization plan procedure, which became inoperative on April 1, 1948.

In recommending the enactment of a new reorganization measure, I wish to emphasize three things.

First, the reorganization legislation should be permanent rather than temporary. While the work of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government makes such legislation especially timely and essential, the improvement of the organization of the Government is a continuing and never-ending process. Government is a dynamic institution. Its administrative structure cannot be static. As new programs are established and old programs change in character and scope to meet the needs of the Nation, the organization of the executive branch must be adjusted to fit its changing tasks.

The impracticability of solving many problems of organization by the regular legislative process has been frankly recognized for many years by congressional leaders. In many cases changes which are essential cannot attract the necessary legislative attention in competition with the many other matters pressing for congressional action. On the other hand, the reorganization plan affords a method by which action can be initiated and the proposal considered with a minimum consumption of legislative time.

The reorganization-plan procedure is a tested and proven means of dealing with organization problems. Twice within the last 10 years the Congress has authorized this method of reorganization for short periods. Under each of those authorizations many changes were made which added to the efficiency of the executive branch and tended to simplify its administration. The advances made during the brief life of the Reorganization Acts of 1939 and 1945 clearly indicate the desirability of permanent reorganization legislation.

Second, the new reorganization act should be comprehensive in scope; no agency or function of the executive branch should be exempted from its operation. Such exemptions prevent the President and the Congress from deriving the full benefit of the reorganization plan procedure, primarily by precluding action on major organizational problems. A seemingly limited exemption may in fact render an entire needed reorganization affecting numerous agencies and functions wholly impractical. The proper protection against the possibility of unwise reorganization lies, not in the statutory exemption from the reorganization plan procedure, but in the authority of Congress to reject any such plan by simple majority vote of both Houses.

Finally, let me urge early enactment. Under the reorganization procedure, reorganization plans must lie before the Congress for 60 calendar days of continuous session in order to become effective. Unless the necessary legislation is adopted in the early weeks of the session, it obviously will be impossible to make effective use of the reorganization procedure during the present session.

The proper execution of the laws demands a simple, workable method of making organizational adjustments. Without it the efficiency of the Government is impaired and the President is handicapped in performing his functions as Chief Executive. In my judgment permanent legislation to restore the reorganization plan procedure is an essential step toward efficient and economical conduct of the public's business.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 17, 1949.*

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[Mr. MARTIN of Iowa addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCRIVNER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks and include an article entitled "Political Medicine."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF HON. FRANK PACE, JR.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the appointment by President Truman of Mr. Frank Pace, Jr., of Little Rock, Ark., is most commendable. That appointment deserves the plaudits of the American people. Here is a man who came from the bottom to the very top rung of the ladder, by virtue of his tireless energy, ability, and devotion to duty. The President recognized the fine qualities with which he is endued. Arkansas is proud of her native son, Frank Pace, Jr., who joins other Arkansans who occupy high positions of trust and responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, and to include an article by Sam Stavisky entitled "Pace Appointment to Budget Bureau Post Fulfills Predictions of Many About Him."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 8, 1949]

PEOPLE IN THE NEWS

(By Sam Stavisky)

PACE APPOINTMENT TO BUDGET BUREAU POST FULFILLS PREDICTIONS OF MANY ABOUT HIM

The fast pace and friendly face of Frank Pace, Jr., new Director of the Budget Bureau, yesterday carried the 36-year-old Ozarks boy high up on the ladder of Government service—onto a rung near the very top. The lank, limber Arkansan has been marked as a "bright young man" ever since he came to Washington during the war while serving with the Air Transport Command. Folk who met the personable attorney told one another that there was a young man definitely going places. President Truman yesterday made the collective prediction come true.

Back home in Little Rock, big things were long ago prophesied for the 6-foot son of Frank Pace, Sr., prominent Arkansas attorney, one-time law partner of the famed Governor and Senator, Jeff Davis.

The rugged son of mountain pioneers finished high school at 14, polished up at a prep, whizzed through Princeton, strolled through Harvard Law, and came home with his degrees in '36. During the next 6 years Frank served a sort of apprenticeship—in the district attorney's office, in the State revenue department, and in private practice with his dad. The junior Pace spent 4 years in uniform, returning to civilian life in '46 as a major.

*Caught Hannegan's eye*

Frank went to work with the United States Attorney General's Office as a special assistant, but not for long. His vivacious personality, genial chuckle, and real ability had caught the eye of Postmaster General Frank Hannegan, who appointed the "Arkansawyer" as his executive assistant.

Two years later—January of 1948—Pace stepped up a pace as Assistant Director of the Budget under Jim Webb, another young blood. In the 12 succeeding months, Frank Pace gave up to a large extent two of his great affections, people and golf.

It's been said that Pace, the younger, knows every person in Washington claiming Arkansas as his home or birthplace. He likes people and people like him. He makes friends easily, often influential friends, like Secretary of Treasury John Snyder, Presidential assistant John Steelman, Presidential confidant Les Biffle, to name a few who happen to be from the Ozark country.

As to golf, Pace was a pacesetter who could make 18 holes in the low seventies. The past 2 years in a row he captured the National Press Club crown. He was awarded an Oscar last year for his low score in the national celebrities' golf tournament, sponsored by the Washington Post.

*Burned midnight candle*

Frank Pace never did lose that easy-breaking smile of his, but he did virtually give up making new friends and influencing new golf balls in his last year with the Budget Bureau. The Arkansas lawyer burned the candle many a night mastering the million and one details that go in preparing the proposed spending of Uncle Sam's billions.

At Princeton, Frank was kind of puny—he stretched out to 6 foot—later. He liked sports, but failed to make a first team. He loved a blonde Pennsylvania beauty named Peggy Jane. He made first team with her. Today they live in a brick house at 5126 Albemarle Street NW., with two young daughters, one flaxen haired like her mother, one dark haired like her father.

Three weeks ago, while working late into the night on the budget the President will send to Congress Monday, Frank felt a sharp pain in his abdomen. He went home feeling bad. By morning he felt worse. He was rushed to the hospital and underwent an emergency operation for acute appendicitis.

So now Pace has to slow up his pace for a while. Looks like he'll have to go back to the 8-hour day.

AMENDMENT TO RULES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a resolution which I am introducing today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, America has never been in more danger from within than she is today.

In my opinion, the House of Representatives made a terrible blunder the other day when it virtually abolished the Rules Committee.

If there ever was a time when we needed that committee functioning as a real Rules Committee, as it was set up by some of the wisest men who ever served in Congress, that time is now.

In order to protect the House, and the country, from a barrage of unwholesome, unnecessary, unreasonable, and unstable legislation, at a time when every effort is being made by the enemies within our gates to take advantage of the opportunity to undermine and destroy this country and to discredit it abroad, we need to keep the Rules Committee intact, and not try to weaken or destroy it.

In order to correct the terrible mistake the House made the other day in adopting a rule that virtually abolished the Rules Committee, I am introducing a resolution to correct that mistake by amending the rules of the House to conform with the rules of the Eightieth Congress in order that we may avoid the disasters which might result if this mistake is not corrected at once.

The resolution referred to follows:

Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules) to read as it read during the Eightieth Congress

*Resolved, etc.*, That paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business, within three legislative days of the time when ordered reported by the committee. If such rule or order is not considered immediately, it shall be referred to the calendar and, if not called up by the Member making the report within seven legislative days thereafter, any member of the Rules Committee may call it up as a question of privilege and the Speaker shall recognize any member of the Rules Committee seeking recognition for that purpose. If the Committee on Rules shall make an adverse report on any resolution pending before the committee, providing for an order of business for the consideration by the House of any public bill or joint resolution, on days when it shall be in order to call up motions to discharge committees it shall be in order for any Member of the House to call up for consideration by the House any such adverse report, and it shall be in order to move the adoption by the House of said resolution adversely reported notwithstanding the adverse report of the Committee on Rules, and the Speaker shall recognize the Member seeking recognition for that purpose as a question of the highest privilege."

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Republican conference has unanimously appointed LES ARENDS as Republican whip.

EXEMPTION OF ADMISSION TICKETS FOR CERTAIN INAUGURAL EVENTS FROM THE ADMISSIONS TAX

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 85 to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. REED of New York. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. J. Res. 85) to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of

the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That all amounts paid (whether paid on, before, or after the date of the enactment of this joint resolution) for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949 shall be exempt from the tax on admissions imposed by section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code, all the net proceeds from the sale of such tickets to be donated by such committee to charity.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to exempt from taxation under section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code only those tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect on January 20. It is understood that the exemption will only apply to tickets sold to the grandstand to view the inaugural parade, to the inaugural ball, and to the gala concert.

Precedent for this action is the legislation enacted for the inauguration in 1941 as the result of the election of 1940. Similar legislation was enacted as the result of the inauguration in 1933 for the 1932 election, and in 1937 for the 1936 election, and in 1941 for the 1940 election. It was not done in 1945, because of the war, when the inauguration ceremony took place at the White House. There was no exemption at that time because there were no such tickets issued or sold.

It is definitely understood that no one is to profit by this legislation. If there is any profit whatever after expenses incurred by the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies, then that will go to charity. In view of the precedent for such action in every inauguration except 1945, I am surprised that there is objection.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Who makes the decision as to which charity the net profit, if any, goes?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why, the same authority that has made such determinations in the past, as I understand it, the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. It is understood that any surplus above expenses goes to charity and is paid over to the Community Chest which, as you know, includes the Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, and various organizations covered under the Community Chest in the city of Washington.

Mr. DOUGHTON. A lot of these tickets have been sold, but the taxes have not been collected, in the expectation of the enactment of legislation following the precedent of similar action taken for every inauguration since 1933. No one will make any profit out of this. It is appropriate that this legislation be enacted.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Is it the purpose, if this legislation goes through, to cut the price of the tickets to the people who buy them by the amount of the tax, or to collect the full amount and give it all to the community fund here in Washington?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The tax will just not be collected.

Mr. VORYS. Part of it has been collected; is not that true?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. The tickets that have been sold have been sold without the collection of the tax. None of the money from this will inure to the benefit of any individual. May I say further that the members of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies will themselves have to buy and pay for their own tickets.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if it is not true that the only way they could get this tax now would be to pay it out of the money that has been received for the tickets? It would be impossible to go back to the ticket purchasers and tax them for it, because who knows who has the tickets?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. If you do not pass this resolution, it simply means that an amount of money will have to be taken out of this expense fund, any balance of which goes to charity, to pay for the taxes on the tickets already sold.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the chairman is quite correct that in connection with former inaugurations, from 1933 down to the present time, resolutions identical to this one have been passed with reference to these excise taxes. Of course, during Republican administrations there were no such taxes to be collected. In the first place, taxes had been reduced each year during Republican administrations until less than 2 percent of the people were paying income taxes alone, to say nothing about nonexistent excise taxes. But here we come along with this House Joint Resolution 85, which clearly states its purpose. The statements that have been made with reference to it have been accurate.

Conditions have changed throughout the country since Presidents prior to 1933 were inaugurated. Television was not in operation then. Television now is in operation all over the United States. The result will probably be that the people back home may want to collect money for charity, but admissions will be taxed and not go to charity. They will go to these television shows and it will be a commercial matter, and the home folk will have to pay these taxes.

When this resolution was first brought up here today I objected and asked for a "second" in order to get time for some discussion of this matter. Personally, I do not want to be small about this proposal. I have voted against every kind of tax I possibly could, for the benefit of the people back home, both excise taxes and income taxes. This is a small matter, but what happens? Every time you bring in legislation to pour two or three billion dollars into some rat hole or some boondoggling project, everybody votes for it and thinks nothing of it.

So as I say, I do not want to be small about it, but we were not faced with this situation during our administrations. I wonder what the people back home, the people who collect and administer funds for crippled children, and other people who are raising money for charity by selling tickets for benefits which are taxed—I wonder what they are going to say in the face of the high taxes that now exist when they see this Congress relieving people from admission taxes who are able to travel all the way to Washington to fill inaugural grandstands to see an imperial parade.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we have before us a question involving the waiving of the admission taxes on the entertainment in connection with the inauguration.

May I say, at the outset, that President Harry S. Truman is the President for all the people of the United States, and as such he is entitled to an inauguration in keeping with the best American traditions. He is the winner in the eyes of all the people. However, neither President Truman nor partisan politics is an issue in this tax matter before us today.

The issue is, Shall the individuals, many of whom are of wealth and political influence, who buy the tickets for the inaugural parade, the inaugural gala, and the inaugural ball pay the same admission tax as everyone else back home pays for their entertainment? It should not involve the Inaugural Committee. The purchasers of the tickets should pay these taxes.

Equality before the law is not just a slogan, it is one of the things that makes up America. If the people back home go to a theater and see a newsreel of these inaugural festivities they will have to pay the regular admission tax. We should keep in mind that movies are the poor peoples' entertainment.

Every 4-H Club fair in America, even though they operate basically for educational purposes, has to deal with this tax. Charitable organizations selling tickets of admission must collect and pay this tax, even though their proceeds go to the most worthy causes.

It is contended that this tax on the inaugural entertainments ought to be waived because the net proceeds will go

to some charity. That is not the rule with respect to any other activity or any other community. Admission taxes have to be paid by all other groups, even if there are no net proceeds or in the case where all of their proceeds are given to charity.

This admission tax is high. It is part of our wartime tax system that has not been taken off the people throughout the country. Families who must live on a small income seldom make a long-distance call or send a telegram unless it is absolutely necessary, yet, when they do, they must pay the Federal Treasury a high wartime tax of 25 percent.

The women of America must still pay these high wartime excise taxes on cosmetics and many of the articles they buy in the drug store for the care of their children. There is still a tax on handbags and countless other articles. These taxes are burdensome to the consumer and are exceedingly burdensome to the small businessman involved. The barber and the beautician must still pay an excise tax on the cosmetics they use on their customers. This is a tax on the tools of their trade.

Mr. Speaker, time will not permit me to enumerate all of the burdensome wartime taxes that are still thrust upon the people of the country who do the work of the world and pay the taxes to keep the city of Washington going. This Congress could well be considering ways to cut down the expenses of Government and relieve the tax burden of these people.

Instead or doing something for all the people, we are today asked to waive the tax for a privileged group. My answer to that is a positive no. It should not be done.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, legislation to exempt admission tickets sold on account of inaugural festivities is absurd. This includes tickets to the inaugural ball that are sold at not less than $10 and to only those who are invited. Also tickets to the big gala show by Hollywood actors and musicians the night before the inauguration that cost from $5 to $10, and special seats that cost from $3 to $10 or more, to view the parade.

There is no good reason why people who buy tickets to these activities should not be required to pay taxes. These activities are not really a part of the inaugural ceremonies on Capitol Hill except that the parade to the Capitol does pass in front of reserved seats for which charges are made.

Do not forget the ordinary government worker has no chance to participate in these festivities. They are exclusive except the parade seats, for which, if he wants one, he would have to pay from $3 to $10.

It is estimated the proceeds from these events will amount to more than $250,000, so the Government will lose $50,000 in taxes. People who can pay $10 admission certainly can pay the tax. To say the least, this resolution is discriminatory against a number of nonprofit organizations who are required under the law to pay taxes on entertainment programs sponsored by them, such as the Red Cross, community chest, boys' clubs, and others.

It is pretty difficult to justify the approval of special legislation to exempt tickets costing $5 and $10 each to the big gala show where big Hollywood actors perform, and then charge 20-percent tax admission for the average family to attend a picture show at the local theater, or to attend a concert in his community.

I do not believe the Federal Treasury should be used in this manner to finance these extra events. In my judgment taxes ought to be charged for these dances and shows as the law now provides.

Furthermore, in view of the administration's demand for additional taxes, it it pretty poor precedent that the first tax legislation submitted to this Congress should be to exempt from taxation admission to Hollywood's gala shows, dances, and parades, costing from $5 to $10 per person. I remind you again these are charges for admission to what are termed "extra events" where high prices are charged. This is not good legislation. About the only excuse for this bill is that a precedent was established in 1932. If so, the precedent is not good and ought not, under the circumstances, to be followed by any administration.

I understand that one of the excuses given for this extra legislation is that some of the businessmen in Washington have advanced funds to finance these expensive shows and events to the extent of $200,000, and they want to make sure they get their money back. Of course, there is no objection, except whatever funds are returned should be subject to taxes.

Most of these funds are advanced by hotels, eating houses, and others who will get more than their money back in profits by reason of the tremendous crowds that come to Washington this week. They will also be refunded, as they should be, from the proceeds of the sale of these tickets, so no one is going to lose except the taxpayers to the extent of some $50,000.

It is estimated more than $30,000,000 of extra money will be spent in Washington during the next few days. Why not do the fair thing, the wholesome thing, and let everybody pay a fair share of taxes and not exempt anyone from the provisions of the law.

It will be said if any funds are left over they go to charity. This is not a charity event. My only criticism is that those who are in control of these festivities have seen fit to charge high admissions for the entertainment. Then they ought to pay the regular tax the same as anyone else.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have elected a President of the United States, and we must all assume responsibility for the things that are going to happen from now on in our country. I want to assist him if I can, in making our country the best place we can to live.

I have been a Member of this House for many years. During the last 15 years I have sat here when the Democratic administration has increased taxes at least 15 times to try to keep up with the amount of money we were spending. I voted for most of those tax measures. It was necessary to keep solvent. I can see no good reason why we should exempt the festivities on this occasion from taxes. It does not make sense to me. I would say the same thing if it were Republican or Democratic President being inaugurated.

I can see that they are going to need every dollar we can raise in taxes to defray the expenses of government. Here we are asking exorbitant prices for the festivities. It is said here, and rightfully so, that most of the people who attend them will come as a result of invitation to a ball at $10 a ticket. Well, if a fellow is able to pay $10 a ticket to go to a ball he is able to pay the tax on it. Back home the fellow who buys a ticket, even though it be for only a dollar, to go to a ball or anything else has to pay a tax on that dollar. Surely those who can afford to go to the President's ball at $10 a throw can afford to pay the tax.

These stands that have been erected all along the parade route are going to cost the Government money. In the end, we have got to foot the bill. The prices range from $3 to $10 a seat. Anyone who buys a seat can afford to pay the tax. A person going to a movie pays 50 cents for a ticket and pays a tax.

The President has already suggested that we devise additional taxes, additional taxes for everything he wants in order to fulfill the requirements of this budget he has suggested to the tune of $41,800,000,000 when he knows we are going to have an income of only $40,980,000,000.

We are going to have a deficit of $873,000,000. The President says nothing of economy. We are inviting a wreck of our Government. He wants you to raise money to take care of that deficit the President has in his budget—here is where you can get the money. Then, why not continue the tax laws we have instead of trying to rebate some of them? I do not follow the philosophy of tax reduction or exemption from taxation. The President's message also showed that in the next year, 1952, he is going to ask for a budget that will be $2,900,000,000 more than he is asking for 1951. That shows that he is going to spend, and spend, and spend to the point that I question very much whether the American people are going to be able to carry on with the great load that will come to them from this spending. Why does not the President talk some of Government economy?

I do not think this is a tax that should be eliminated. This resolution should not pass.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, this proposal to exempt inaugural parade and inaugural ball tickets from taxation is outrageous.

Anyone who can afford to put up $10 for an inaugural ball ticket or from $3 to $10 for an inaugural parade ticket can also well afford to pay the same admissions tax which our people are required to pay when they pass 50 cents or a dollar through the window for a ticket to the movies.

If there ever were a genuine rich man's tax bill, this is it. I would be extremely sympathetic to a legislative suggestion to wipe out altogether the admissions tax on tickets which cost less than $1. Those who can least afford to contribute to the expense of running the Government would thereby be relieved. The effect of the present bill, however, is to give preferred treatment to the very ones who least need it.

The argument is now made that these $10 tickets have already been sold in large numbers without consideration of the fact that an admissions tax had to be paid. My answer to that is: Let the committee or group arranging these festivities pay the admissions' tax out of the proceeds of the take, thereby cutting down the prospective profit, in just exactly the same way which any private group would be required to do if they had committed this same error.

There is considerable irony in the fact that the first three issues to be brought before this Congress are, first, to raise the salaries and expense accounts of the President, Vice President, and Speaker; second, to give Federal employees in Washington a holiday to enjoy the circus atmosphere of the inauguration; and, third, the most brazen of all, to exempt the politicians and comfortably situated citizens, who are this week flocking into Washington, from paying the same tax on the festivities here which everyone else throughout this country pays for their own entertainment. I do not recall that any such issues were presented to the people by the majority in the recent campaign.

There is no justification for this legislation. It should be defeated.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD.]

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, first let me say that I concur in the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS]. He made able argument on behalf of the defeat of this particular measure.

The presence of this measure before us today brings to mind a situation that occurred in my home town not too long ago when some people who were trying to aid a very excellent charity went ahead and sold tickets without full knowledge of the consequences so far as the excise taxes were concerned. I do not recall that particular charity getting through any resolution or action by Congress. It seems to me that if we pass a resolution of this sort we are not playing fair with the very many worth-while charities and organizations in your district and in mine that put on events for the benefit of the children of our respective communities. If we do something of this sort we are selling them and others like them down the river.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I think the people should know the type of legislation that the new Democrat-controlled Congress is passing. May I reminisce and call to your attention the many speeches that were made by many Democrat candidates for Congress and the Democrat candidate for President, appealing to the American people that the Democrat Party was a party of the common people, and was against those of great wealth. They also charged the Republican Party and the Republican candidates were those who yielded to the demands of special groups, and those of great wealth.

Congress has been in session since January 3 and under the complete domination and control of a Democrat majority, and let us see what constitutes the first three bills presented to us for consideration.

The first bill we have for consideration today is House Joint Resolution 85, to exempt from taxation admissions for inauguration tickets. This legislation would exempt from taxation those who purchase the $10 tickets for the inaugural ball, and also would exempt from tax the $10, and less, tickets to witness the parade. This legislation will exempt from payment of tax the individuals who can afford the expenditure of hundreds of dollars to come to Washington, who can afford to pay $35 for hotel rooms, and can afford to pay $10 for inaugural ball tickets. Yet Mrs. John Doe, who lives in the Seventeenth District of Ohio, or any other district of the United States, who works and sacrifices in order to buy a ticket for a movie once a week, has to pay her tax. This applies to the different school groups who put on plays, that they might purchase uniforms for high-school bands, or to earn money to finance a trip to the great Capital City of the United States for their graduating classes. My friends, those people are not exempt and have to pay tax, yet the first bill passed by the Democrat-controlled Congress is one for the wealthy people who can afford to come to Washington and see their President inaugurated.

The second bill that is coming up today is S. 103, a bill to increase the compensation of the President, whose present salary is $75,000, and which bill would increase the salary to $100,000 a year and would give him $40,000 tax-free expense account, which he does not have to make an accounting for whatsoever.

The third bill, if you please, is Senate Joint Resolution 16, holidays for Federal employees, granting a 4-day holiday to Federal employees in the District of Columbia, including the bureaucrats. A conservative estimate of this cost alone will near several million dollars.

May I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, all of these bills are brought up under the suspension of the rule, because they are considered so important by the Democrat-controlled Congress that no hearings are held, and all rules must be suspended in order to secure immediate passage.

I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, what some of the Members of this Congress will say to their constituents after they have voted for this "class" legislation, as I know that many of them made statements during the campaign that they were definitely against class legislation, and all people should be given consideration, whether rich or poor.

Remembering the campaign promises made by the Democrat candidates, and comparing them with the actions of the Democrat-controlled Congress today, I feel certain these activities can be adequately described by an old axiom: "Sometimes people's actions speak so loud we cannot hear the words they say."

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask my friend from Tennessee a question? He says that the tax has not yet been paid. I understand that the tickets have all been sold, according to the papers, and as the law stands now the tax is payable from those who collected for the tickets. So the tax has already been paid and has been included in the purchase price in every instance. Is that not correct?

Mr. COOPER. That point is covered right on the face of the bill.

Mr. VORYS. If you pay $10 for a ticket, the tax has been included in that payment. If a change in the tax law is made the saving will go to the person who bought the ticket, is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. I do not think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. VORYS. Then this bill does not reduce the price to the purchaser at all. I think 10 percent of the amount collected is now due as tax, and by this bill local charities get this 10 percent instead of the Government. I do not think we should support local charities or inaugural shows in this way. The inaugural ceremony at the Capitol is free and open to the public. This was provided by the Eightieth Congress. The elaborate shows, the parade, the gala, the ball, which have been planned to entertain the inaugural crowd, will only be seen by those who can buy tickets; no exception should be made in our tax laws for such shows.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think any of these three bills should be passed today under suspension of the rules. This postelection band-wagon rush, resulting in the inflated inaugural plans now under way, is getting out of hand. We Republicans owe it to the administration and to the country to attempt to keep it within bounds. This is an unpopular task here in Washington this week. Unless we condone poor taste and help to create bad precedents, we will be called poor sports. After all, we are told, this is emergency legislation and involves only a few million dollars. I think some fundamental principles and precedents are involved in this hasty consideration of these three bills. I do not think there should be bipartisan unity on this first emergency program of the Eighty-first Congress.

Next will come the 4-day holiday bill. Remember, it is this bill making the day after the inauguration a holiday which will result in a 4-day holiday this week. The Attorney General has ruled that the President has power to close departments and bureaus whenever he deems proper in the interest of the public

service. Obviously, this Friday holiday is not in the interest of the public service. It was described in the Senate as desirable after the night before. I do not think we should authorize a hang-over holiday. The thousands of people coming to the inaugural may want to do business in public offices on Friday; it would be a healthy thing for them to see the departments working instead of loafing. The public business all over the United States should not be subjected by law to a 4-day departmental delay. The thousands of Federal employees who work in my district are not getting such a holiday, but in thousands of instances, their operations will be delayed because they cannot get word from Washington for 4 days. Washington should set an example of working at least 1 day in 4 at the end of this week.

After that will come the salary bill. It may be that the President's expense account should be increased, it may be that we ought to pay our Presidents more in the future. We will have time to take this up and debate it before Thursday. We do not need to rush it through under a gag today. We may be in danger of losing Cabinet officers and bureau chiefs because of low pay. The fact remains that the minority who elected President Truman in November thought they were electing a $75,000 President who wanted the job, not a $150,000 President, with $50,000 exempt from taxes or accounting. When we raised congressional salaries and expenses, we upgraded the office and then ran for it. The people knew they were electing $15,000 Congressmen. We have time before Thursday to deliberate on whether the President, Vice President, and Speaker need more money. There is utterly no danger of our losing these officials because of their pay and expense allowances.

We have all received broad, loud hints that it is poor taste to object to any of these three demands today. Someone ought to remind someone that it may be poor taste to make these demands. The precedents we establish today may make trouble in the future.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, to say that I am amazed at some of the remarks made by certain of my Republican colleagues on this resolution is expressing myself very mildly. The position taken by my friend from New York [Mr. REED] is a very proper one. As I understand it, while he is not opposed to this bill, he is opposed to the principle in it. The other speeches which have been made by Members on the other side are rather farfetched and savor very strongly of poor sportsmanship.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember that all hotel rooms were reserved before November 3 by the Republicans in anticipation of the election of Governor Dewey. We must also remember that the local inaugural committee could not be appointed by either Governor Dewey or President Truman until it was ascertained which one would be elected, despite the fact that the distinguished Governor from New York was very confident of his election. However, the people decided otherwise.

We are therefore faced with a situation where it was impossible for the Congress and the leadership under the stress of business in both the regular and special sessions to pass such a resolution. Probably the better course would have been to have passed a resolution before the election, while the Congress was in session, and have that matter determined. But, it was not passed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman would indulge me the right to inquire, if the Eightieth Congress had brought in such a resolution as this last summer before we adjourned, whether or not the gentleman then would have favored it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I certainly would. I said the leadership on both sides. I was not criticizing the leadership of the Eightieth Congress for failure to do this, and I suggest that probably the leadership on both sides overlooked it, and probably it would have been better if we had passed it, but the fact is, we did not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. Well, I think if our side had won, we would not have had the resolution in here.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will say this much, if your side had won there would have been a resolution in here, and if any Democrat had opposed it, I would personally think that it would have been a small, mean thing to do, and that is my opinion.

Now, what is the situation? The civic-minded businessmen and organizations in Washington have subscribed a $200,000 fund to guarantee the payment of costs in connection with the inaugural ceremonies. When national conventions take place, businessmen and associations do that, whether Democratic or Republican, and in connection with the inaugural ceremonies here the businessmen have done it. The same thing would have been done if Governor Dewey had been elected. Now, they make no gain; there is no profit in it for them. If there is any profit, as I understand, it goes to the Community Chest Federation to be used for charitable purposes. That is my understanding.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I wanted to find out as a matter of information whether it is not true that the congressional appropriation all goes for the arrangements out in front of the Capitol for the inaugural ceremonies, and the $250,000 is to be used for stands down on Pennsylvania Avenue; is that right?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my understanding that the congressional appropriation is confined to the activities here at the Capitol and in connection with the building of stands outside, and that the activities which are performed by the Official Inaugural Committee is a District affair. A joint congressional committee takes care of the activities at the Capitol.

Mr. VORYS. But there is no charge for the use of any of the arrangements provided by the congressional committee; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; of course not. Now, I cannot believe that there are many of my Republican friends who are going to vote against this resolution. I am not going to make any political observations except this, that if on election day the fortunes of the political contest had gone the other way, and if a resolution had been offered by the Republican leadership, and if I knew of any Democrat who was going to speak against it, other than in principle, which is a different proposition, because we recognize this is a rare exception, I would do everything within my power to try and persuade the Democratic Member not to do so. I would consider it poor sportsmanship if any Democrat were to oppose the resolution if Governor Dewey had been elected; a resolution offered for the same purpose as this resolution has been offered. I would consider it small on his part to try and make politics out of a resolution of this kind. I am choosing my words very carefully, because I do not want to say anything that would offend the sensibilities of the great majority of the Republican Members who, I am confident, are not going to vote against this resolution.

The observation I am now about to make was contributed to me by my distinguished friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] while we were sitting alongside each other, and I want him to get the credit for it, because it is so pertinent and so sound. The gentleman from Tennessee said to me, "Everyone knows that if a Republican had been elected in November there would not have been a voice raised against such a resolution on the Republican side." I agree with that, and that is the way it should be.

I am amazed at the attempts of some of the Republicans—note that I say "some"—to try to create emotionalism and misunderstanding in the minds of some throughout the country on a resolution of this kind. I am constrained to label vigorously such efforts as awfully small and constituting very poor sportsmanship.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 199, noes 49.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### MAKING JANUARY 20 AND 21, 1949, HOLIDAYS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass Senate Joint Resolution 16.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the several executive departments, independent establishments,

and other governmental agencies of the United States, including the legislative and judicial branches, and of the District of Columbia, in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia shall be closed all day on Thursday, January 20, 1949, Inauguration Day, and on the succeeding day, Friday, January 21, 1949. All employees of such departments, establishments, and agencies and of the District of Columbia in such area, except those who may for special public reasons be required to be on duty on such days by the heads of their respective departments, establishments, or agencies, shall be excused from duty on those days; and such days shall be considered holidays for the purpose of all statutes relating to the compensation and leave of employees of the United States, and of the District of Columbia, employed in such area. For the purposes of this resolution, the term "metropolitan area of the District of Columbia" shall include, in addition to the District of Columbia, Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.; Arlington and Fairfax Counties, Va.; and the city of Alexandria, Va.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the majority leadership will not on this occasion charge me with petty partisan politics in an attempt, at least, to protect the record in this particular legislation. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the fact that this legislation which involves the pay of some 250,000 Federal employees has not been referred to a committee of this House. If you want to talk of steamroller tactics, or of putting legislation through without any hearings of any kind, here is a fair example:

The first bill that came before the House is to exempt certain groups from the payment of taxes. No. 2 deals with the question of Government employment and the bill was not even referred to a committee, which should have been done. Of course, the answer by the majority is, "We do not have time. We have to hurry this thing through."

There is no good reason why you could not have the members of your committee appointed and have them consider this legislation tomorrow, thus permitting the Committee on Civil Service and Post Office to do what it has a right to do, and that is to go over the bill and hold hearings, if necessary, before it comes to the floor of the House for consideration by this body. Members of the House are entitled, at least, to the benefit of hearings by our committee.

Now, what are you doing? You talk about this great 4-day holiday. Certainly I have no objection to permitting Government employees in this area to attend the inaugural ceremonies, if they have a chance to do so. They should get to attend. But I call your attention to the fact, however, that if they want to go to the gala show they have to pay $5 and $10 a throw and have to be invited besides. Comparatively few will get to attend.

You cannot go to the big dance, because, unless you are invited and have a top place in Government, you will not get to go there. They cannot see the parade unless they can see it from around a corner and other out-of-the-way places because you have already sold the tickets for the good seats for $2.50 to $10 each. They cannot even look at the parade from the Federal buildings along the way unless they are invited to do so by those in charge of those buildings.

Do you think that they are going to be able to watch the parade as they ought to be able to do? Not at all. They go to those buildings by invitation only. They have been so informed. Anyhow, in some way if they have a chance, they may be able to see the parade. From afar off, they might get to look at the inaugural ceremonies. It appears it is the best that could be done by the management. Now then, on top of that you are going to permit them to have this extra holiday and you are going to quit business from Wednesday until the following Monday. Do you know its cost—or is that important? But, anyway, it might interest you at least to know that you have, as I said a moment ago, something over 200,000 employees and it is going to cost this Government over $2,000,000 for that extra day, because these people will be drawing their pay on Friday and will not be working, except those who are going to be required to carry on necessary duties, including the postal employees and some others who are going to stay on the job.

Let me repeat that I do not want to be misunderstood. I think the Inauguration Day should be a holiday. I think every person who can get to Washington ought to be permitted to attend, and I think, too, it is extremely important that Government employees, those so closely associated with the affairs of our Government, ought to have a chance to attend all ceremonies they can and ought especially to have a chance to witness the inauguration of the President.

My contention is that to allow the additional day, being the following day, as a holiday is unnecessary and uncalled for. It results in a closing down of all operations of Government in Washington from Wednesday evening until the following Monday morning.

Now, while you are putting on a 1-day celebration you make 4 days out of it, yet we do not give these folks a chance to do anything except perhaps witness the parade or the ceremonies from some far-distant point.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I understand the Attorney General has ruled that the President has the power to close departments and bureaus "whenever he deems proper in the interest of the public service." Therefore, it would seem that this request for legislation indicates that the President does not deem it in the interest of the public service to close all Government departments.

Mr. REES. Of course not. If they were to have only 1 day, the President would ask for 1 day, and, of course, it would be granted. There would not be any question about that. But why throw in the extra day? Why close all Government bureaus for 4 days in a row? It is going pretty far, especially when it is not necessary.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that Government employees have 30 days' vacation with pay?

Mr. REES. Oh, yes; but that is something else.

Mr. RICH. I am willing to give them this time off, and I think they should have it if we can afford to do it. But if they get 30 days' vacation, why not charge this day up to one of their 30 days so that the taxpayers back home who never get more than a week or two vacation will not have to pay the bill for these fellows to have extra holidays?

Mr. REES. As the distinguished gentleman from New York said, while it seems rather small to talk about it, it is the principle of the thing that I am thinking about. It does not look good. The way money is being spent, of course, $2,000,000 does not seem to amount to very much. This would be a lot of money in my State. The principle of the thing makes the situation worse. Furthermore, I have been informed by a number of employees they would rather work on Friday than to take the extra holiday. I do not see any justification for it, and no case has been made for it.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. I am not opposed to this bill, but it strikes me it is highly discriminatory. This bill would give every employee in the District of Columbia 4 days off with pay. Why should not other people who are working for the Government throughout the United States in all the various installations and field services be given the same benefits as those who are located in the District of Columbia?

Mr. REES. The only reason is because they do not live in this area.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman from Kansas has consumed 7 minutes.

Mr. REES. I yield myself one additional minute, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. In cold dollars and cents what will this proposed holiday cost the taxpayers of this country?

Mr. REES. Oh, I do not know but it will be a lot of money. I am just talking about this 1 day off for Federal workers. The extra holiday will cost more than $2,000,000. I do not know what the whole celebration will cost.

Mr. JENNINGS. Would it run into as much as a million dollars?

Mr. REES. Oh, yes; considerably more. The extra day under this bill will cost more than $2,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 2 minutes to

the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, in 2 minutes I cannot do justice to this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to register my opposition to the pending resolution which provides for a holiday next Thursday and Friday for the Government employees in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia. I have yet to hear a sound reason as to why the Government employees should be relieved of their duties for an extra day simply because of an inauguration.

It is agreeable with me that the various Government agencies be closed on Thursday, the day of the inauguration. But there is no reason, none whatsoever, for the following day also being made a holiday. Such a privilege is not being granted those who work in the stores, in private offices, and other enterprises. In this, as in everything else, the administration looks upon Government employees as the favored, privileged group. This is bureaucracy.

As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I hear again and again from the various officials of the Government who appear before our committee as to how much of a work load their particular bureau or agency must handle. They invariably appeal to us for more funds to meet the need for additional employees to carry the load. Yet it is proposed by this resolution to grant two complete holidays while all the work of the Government supposed to be serving the people stops.

We are living in very serious times. We are faced with many grave problems. There is much to be done. But, judging from all the arrangements that are being made in connection with the inauguration and all the money being spent for it, this is a gala occasion to be known in history as the inaugural circus. Everyone is to have fun at the expense of the taxpayers.

When one thinks about it, the kind of inauguration celebration being prepared by the administration supporters is quite in keeping with the kind of administration we are to have. No one is to care about the costs involved. No one is to care about the work left undone, or the waste involved in an elaborate parade and extravagant parties. To be sure, this inauguration is a gala day for the millions of bureaucrats on the Government pay roll. The President has already indicated by the size of his budget for the next fiscal year that they are secure in their soft jobs and more jobs are to be created. By this bill the administration proposes to give them an extra day to celebrate.

It is perfectly clear that Thursday, January 20, is to be a happy one, calling for 4 days of celebration, for the bureaucrats; but it is a sad day for the taxpayers of the United States. They will realize this more and more in the coming weeks.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts use some of his time.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have only one speaker. Under such circumstances I think the gentleman from Kansas should exhaust his time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has the right to open and close the debate.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, we reserve the balance of our time. Is the gentleman from Massachusetts going to close the debate?

Mr. McCORMACK. We have only one speaker. He will close the debate; yes.

Mr. REES. Then I suggest that the gentleman use his time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] such of the 20 minutes as he may need.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] made the admission that he had no objection to giving public employees in the city of Washington Thursday off to see and participate in the inaugural ceremonies. I am certain that he agrees with me that the public employees in this city have done a great job; that all during the war they worked overtime long hours and now this is some little modicum of reward to them.

Someone has tried to confuse the issue a little by talking about 4 days off. As a matter of fact and as a matter of right, Saturday and Sunday are not work days in the District of Columbia. Thursday is Inauguration Day, and I am glad he admits that that day should be given to these people. So it leaves the intervening day, Friday, as the only day, the only concession we are actually giving the Federal employees in this city. As a practical matter, when you try to call people back during the midst of any season of celebration, especially when the following day is the regular day off, you are not going to get very much work out of them and there is not going to be a great efficiency in their work.

Lots of people are coming to Washington from all over the country to see this inaugural, and I am happy that they are coming to see Mr. Truman inaugurated. Many people are coming in here who are the relatives and friends of these employees and they want to entertain them and show them the sights of Washington. So I do not see any great harm in what is being done. It is, in fact, a morale builder.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree with the gentleman that we ought to give them Thursday off. My objection is that the Government employees are getting 30 days' annual leave and 15 days' sick leave, something no other individual I know of in the country enjoys—the two days, Thursday and Friday, should be charged to the 30 days' annual leave. I think that is the sensible thing to do.

Mr. MILLER of California. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that all Government employees do not get that liberal vacation and sick-leave allowance. The people in the postal service only get 15 days' annual leave, but we are going to try to correct that at this session of the Congress.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot see why we are raising such a lot of fuss about this extra day, because I am quite sure that the country would be better off if we gave the American people a 6 months' breathing spell by letting all the Federal employees take a vacation, from the President on down. I think that would be good for the country.

Mr. MILLER of California. I know that the gentleman has advocated that philosophy when it comes to certain functions of government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think everyone will agree that if the employees were not given permission to be off Thursday they could not get to their place of employment in the District. At least, very few could. As a matter of fact, automobile traffic will be prohibited to a great extent in the city on Thursday and that of necessity, because of the inaugural ceremonies and the inaugural parade. So from the practical standpoint, if we did nothing, how are they going to get to their work? A few might get through, but it will be impossible for the great majority of them to get through. Therefore, something has to be done on Thursday. Everyone will concede that.

Now, the only question is, Saturday and Sunday being off days, should we in the light of all the circumstances give the employees Friday off? I recognize that Members may honestly disagree as to that. Thursday would be a day on which they would have to stay out of their employment anyway. That is forced upon them because of the conditions that will prevail in the District due to the inaugural and to their inability to get to the various offices and agencies or Departments they are employed in. Saturday and Sunday are holidays. They do not work on those days anyway. So when it is stated that this is a 4-day holiday, it is not a correct statement. In fact, it is only a 1-day holiday. It is simply a matter for the judgment of the various Members.

Mr. RICH. It is two days.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Thursday they could not get to their various departments.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman so far as one holiday is concerned. I am for that. But does not the gentleman think that where we allow such a great length of time to Government employees, giving them from 15 to 30 days annually, and our people back home have to pay for this time, we ought to charge this up to that vacation period which they get annually, especially those with 30 days off every year?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not a holiday. Let us suppose we do nothing.

Mr. RICH. Oh, well, let us do something.

Mr. McCORMACK. The great majority of the employees could not get to their agencies, yet they would have to charge that up against their annual leave when, so far as they are concerned, they would report if they could get through. They cannot get through because of the parade and the other inaugural ceremonies on the streets. The streets will be barricaded to automobile traffic, except to those who have a tag on their automobile. There are very few who have those tags. We do, because we have to have them as Members of the Congress, and there are a few others. So, without regard to any other consideration, we would have to give them Thursday off, otherwise, we would be making them take a day off their annual leave when they would report for duty if they could do so but they cannot report for duty because of the conditions prevailing on that day. They could not get to their agencies. The only matter to be considered is should we give them Friday off, Saturday and Sunday being regular days off?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES. May I say to the gentleman that there is no question about Thursday. That is Inauguration Day. The matter has been stated correctly in that regard. Thursday ought to be a holiday because it is Inauguration Day for the President of the United States. That is understood. We are talking about Friday and that is all there is to it. But it does have to cover 3 days. I am not talking about a 4-day holiday, excepting as it is described in the newspapers. But, that is the way it works out.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is simply a question whether under the circumstances they should be given this day off.

Mr. REES. Friday I am talking about.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand. It is a question whether there will not be a holiday unless we pass this resolution.

Mr. REES. Except the President could, if he wanted to, by Presidential order, set Thursday as a holiday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That might be so. But, the only question is, whether with Saturday and Sunday off, as they will be off, and Thursday, if you are going to give the Friday off. That is the question involved. As far as I am concerned, it is the proper thing to do under the circumstances, and I think this way, no matter who would have been elected. If the nominee of your party had been elected, I would feel identically the same way.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, will, the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a measure for Federal aid to education. It is certainly a cherished principle and tradition of our American democracy that every child in our Nation have an opportunity for an education that meets commonly accepted standards of adequacy. In a land now blessed with abundance of wealth, with unprecedented prosperity, and with grand possibilities for even greater good fortune, there can be no reasonable excuse for depriving any American child of his right to go to school for at least 180 days a year in a safe and clean schoolhouse and to classes staffed by properly accredited and certified teachers. But the fact is that for several million American children the opportunity for a decent education simply does not exist. This is the basic reason for Federal aid to education.

One may ask immediately, "Why do not the States appropriate enough money for their schools?" The answer is well known.

Some States simply do not have enough taxable resources to produce sufficient revenue for their schools. Most of these States actually are expending for education a relatively larger percentage of their income than are States which with a minimum of effort manage to spend far more than the national average for every child in school. From the statistics on the Federal-aid question, I gather that some States, even though they were to double their expenditures for education, would still fail to provide enough money for the kind of education to which every American child is entitled. Federal aid, therefore, seems to be the only method by which we may correct this situation.

While I am convinced that Federal aid is necessary, I do not want Federal funds to replace State funds in educational finance. Consequently, the measure which I have introduced explicitly stipulates that no State may reduce its present expenditures for education or may it reduce teachers' salaries or may it in any other way shift its responsibility to the Federal Government. Moreover the bill provides that a floor on educational expenditures will be established whereby every child will be assured that a minimum of $50 from local, State, and Federal funds will be available for his education, regardless of the State in which he lives or where he lives in a particular State. I cannot stress too emphatically my conviction that my only reason for advocating Federal aid to education is my interest in every American child.

It is this conviction that has led me to incorporate into my bill a provision often overlooked in other Federal-aid measures. I refer to the provision for services for public- and non-public-school pupils. In my opinion, the Federal Government should be concerned with the welfare of all American children in every American school, public and nonpublic. For this reason my bill carries an appropriation to provide essential school services for public- and non-public-school pupils. The amount is modest—10 percent of the total appropriation of $325,000,000.

It seems to me that this appropriation for services will encourage the States to improve their transportation services, to expand their free textbook programs, and to broaden their school-health services. It is very distressing to find that many school children, forced to walk long distances to school along open highways, are in frequent danger of serious accident as autos and trucks speed past them. It is equally distressing to learn that thousands of children do not derive full benefit from their education simply because they do not have essential supplies and textbooks. In the field of health services, doctors report that children are absent from school frequently because many schools do not have adequate clinical facilities. These are situations which would be corrected at least in part through the proposed bill's appropriation for services.

It should be noted that these services pertain to the welfare of children in both public and nonpublic schools. Regardless of one's convictions about the relative merits of public and nonpublic education, no person reasonably would want to subject any child to traffic hazards, or to deprive him of essential textbooks and health services simply because he happened to attend the nonpublic school of his parents' choice. For this reason, the funds for services are not restricted to public-school children only.

It is important to note that 90 percent of the appropriation will be available exclusively to improve public schools as such; not one penny of this amount will be used for direct or indirect aid to any nonpublic school. Ten percent of the appropriation—approximately $32,000,000—will be available for services. Of this amount approximately 10 percent—about $3,000,000—would be used for nonpublic-school pupils.

Three million dollars is a very small amount when compared with the savings to the Nation's taxpayers from the operation of nonpublic schools, which is in excess of $400,000,000 every year. In other words, if the two and a half million pupils now enrolled in nonpublic schools were suddenly transferred into the public-school system, the total increase to the taxpayers would amount to over $400,000,000, a sum in excess of the total amount authorized in this bill. Moreover, it should be noted that the supporters of the nonpublic school spend well over $200,000,000 a year for their schools. Finally, the replacement value of non-public-school buildings is in excess of $1,000,000,000. In view of these statistics, it would be absurd to say that my bill in any way constitutes a measure to secure support for nonpublic schools.

I do anticipate, however, a number of objections to this measure on the score that aid to non-public-school pupils, particularly those in parochial schools, constitutes a violation of the principle of separation of church and state, that it is a threat to our Nation's public-school system and it is the use of public money for a private purpose. On the first charge the Supreme Court of the United States has rendered a very clear opinion. In the Cochran case involving a Louisiana law authorizing free textbooks for both public- and non-public-school pupils, the Court, in a unanimous decision,

declared the law constitutional. In the Everson case decision involving a New Jersey transportation law, the Court declared the statute constitutional. Rendering a majority opinion, Mr. Justice Black said that "It was not the purpose of the first amendment to cut off church schools from services separate and indisputably marked off from the religious function." To my knowledge nobody has challenged the constitutionality of State laws to provide school health services for non-public-school pupils.

The argument that any form of aid to non-public-school pupils is a threat to the American public-school system simply raises the question: Are nonpublic schools really a part of the Nation's school system? In my opinion, they are. Public schools and non-public schools are partners—not competitors—in American education. In full compliance with compulsory education laws parents may send their children to either a public or non-public school. Graduates of both schools are qualified for public office and are subject to military service. I think, therefore, that persons who generally support non-public schools have a perfect right to resent any implication that their schools are un-American or less American than public schools. And this definitely is the implication in the argument that Federal aid for school services to children in such schools is a threat to the American public-school system.

It is also alleged that such aid is the use of public money for a private purpose. I fail to see how the protection of a child's health and welfare can be construed as a private purpose. On the contrary, the State has a duty to afford this protection. To perform this duty public funds must be available for health and welfare services for children in both public and nonpublic schools.

I should not like to see the day when the public schools would have a monopoly of education in the United States. We need both public and nonpublic schools. If we really believe that parents have the right to select one or the other, we should not penalize those parents who choose the nonpublic school.

Yet this is exactly what the State does when it refuses non-public-school pupils bus rides, textbooks, and health services. I do not want the Federal Government to impose a similar penalty. In terms of Federal aid, every child is a citizen of these United States—not just of one State or another. I for one have no intention of relegating non-public-school pupils to a status of second-class citizens.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I just want to inquire, if we pass this resolution, whether there will be any mail delivery at all in that 4-day period?

Mr. MILLER of California. I could not answer that. I believe there will be mail delivery.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not think it is a question of who is elected President, nor do I think it is a simple question of creating a 4-day holiday. I think the basic question is whether or not in the interest of public service we can give another day off from the regular duties of these offices. A few days ago I happened to call up one department asking about the progress of a certain program, and they told me that they had a backlog of 2 years in their work, and they gave that as an excuse for not having progressed any further. It occurs to me that the real merit of this proposition is whether or not the public business demands that these people be at their positions on Friday, or if they are not there, charge up the date to their annual leave. They have 26 days annual leave, except those in the Post Office Department. I presume the postal workers will have to work just the same, they will not get this day off, thereby increasing the disparity between them and the other civil employees of the Government. As far as I am personally concerned I feel it is purely a matter of the public welfare. If the work of the different departments is such that they can be spared, well and good, but if not, the employees ought to be at their positions or take the extra day, Friday, out of their annual leave.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## INCREASING RATES OF COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT, VICE PRESIDENT, AND SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 103) to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That (a) section 102 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"COMPENSATION OF THE PRESIDENT

"SEC. 102. The President shall receive in full for his services during the term for which he shall have been elected compensation in the aggregate amount of $100,000 a year, to be paid monthly, and in addition an expense allowance of $50,000 to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which expense allowance no tax liability shall accrue and for which no accounting shall be made by him. He shall be entitled also to the use of the furniture and other effects belonging to the United States and kept in the Executive Mansion."

(b) Section 104 of title 3 of the United States Code (relating to salary of the Vice President) is amended by striking out "$20,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "30,000".

(c) Chapter 2 of title 3 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF VICE PRESIDENT

"SEC. 111. There shall be paid to the Vice President in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him."

(d) The matter following the semicolon in section 601 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "and the compensation of the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall be at the rate of $30,000 per annum."

(e) There shall be paid to the Speaker of the House of Representatives in equal monthly installments an expense allowance of $10,000 per annum (which shall be in lieu of the allowance provided by section 601 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended) to assist in defraying expenses relating to or resulting from the discharge of his official duties, for which no tax liability shall occur or accounting be made by him.

(f) The allowance for clerical assistance to the Vice President contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1949, at rates of compensation to be fixed by him in multiples of $5 per month, hereby is increased from $32,385 per annum to $45,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. In computing the amount to be deducted from the compensation of any official whose salary is increased under this act for the purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and in computing the amount of any annuity under such act, any increase in compensation provided by this act shall be disregarded until further act of Congress.

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall take effect at noon on January 20, 1949.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is a second demanded?

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill increases the President's salary from $75,000 to $100,000 and gives him $50,000 for expenses. The last time the President's salary was increased was about 40 years ago. There has been no increase in the Presidential salary for close to 40 years. I think that 1909 was the last time that the salary of the President was increased. The President receives by law the use of the White House and its furnishings. He also by basic law is authorized the use of not more than $40,000 annually for travel expenses of the President.

We all know the household expenses of the President are very large by reason of his position as President, no matter who is President, and he should not be expected to maintain those expenses. As I understand, no money is appropriated for the President's household or living expenses. There may be an appropriation to defray the cost of official dinners, but there are many activities in

which the President must engage that cannot be charged to such an appropriation, and he has to pay the cost of such activities out of his salary. There is tremendous expense laid upon any man who is President of the United States that arises out of the fact that he is President, and he must pay the cost of such activities out of his own salary.

That, briefly, is the story. This bill increases the President's salary by $25,000 and gives him an expense allowance of $50,000, just as we receive an expense allowance of $2,500. He has to certify for income-tax purposes that he has used it, just as we have to certify that we have incurred $2,500 or more of expenses in connection with our official work in Washington. The President will have to make the same kind of return we do in relation to the amount he will receive as an expense allowance if this bill is passed.

This seems to me to be only a fair proposition. The most pleasing thing about it is that this suggestion of an increase in salary came from a Republican source, from former President Herbert Hoover, not from President Truman himself. To me that is most refreshing. Certainly it is wholesome, and certainly it comes from a man who has undergone himself the experience of living in the White House and knows through actual experience just what are the financial difficulties and the financial responsibilities of the occupant of the White House, the Chief Executive, when he undertakes to carry on the activities of the White House as they should be handled. He is compelled to pay a considerable sum of money out of his own salary and his own personal income.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman permit me to say that while I supported the two resolutions that have just been acted upon by the House, I was not too enthusiastic about them because I think the sooner we can get away from the practice of extending special favors to Federal workers living within the Washington area the better for us. As far as the latter resolution is concerned, I fear that we will in the future be called upon in the interest of uniformity of treatment to do something for the other Federal workers living in the outer areas of the country.

As to the pending resolution, I find myself very strongly in favor of its adoption.

The office of the President is the most important station in the world. That of the Vice Presidency and the Speakership approach it in importance. I feel that the Congress should provide salaries and expense accounts which would enable them to carry on in the fashion that the people of the entire country expect of them. In other words, the Congress in its treatment of this whole question ought to guard the right and to make it possible for a person of moderate means to occupy these high stations.

I hope there will not be a single Member of the House who will oppose the adoption of this resolution. The resolution should be unanimously adopted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I say in closing that the argument that the bill should have come out of the committee is a very sound one. I want my friend, the gentleman from Kansas, to understand that. But in the light of present circumstances, where the House is not completely organized, that is impossible. We meet in caucus this afternoon when our committee on committees will make its report to our caucus. Your committee on committees, I understand, have made their report. We have to wait until tomorrow before the members are officially appointed in the House. That is the only time that the committees are officially appointed, so that they could proceed to the consideration of any business. We have to act on this before Thursday. So I recognize thoroughly the weight of the argument made by my friend, and I can assure the gentleman from Kansas, that the leadership on both sides during my years of experience here have given full recognition to it.

But I believe, when I say we have an emergency situation here, where the matter has to be acted on, and the committees could not possibly consider it, that Members will realize the urgency of the situation.

With reference to the first resolution that was adopted this morning, the Committee on Ways and Means was organized and the committee did consider it. It was formally reported out of the committee. But on the last resolution and on this bill we cannot have official action by a committee, because the committees are not in existence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that I do not want to be misunderstood with respect to this legislation. I realize, as has been suggested by other Members that the President is entitled to a fair and adequate salary and is entitled to a fair and reasonable allowance to take care of necessary expenses for running the White House. The Vice President is entitled to sufficient pay to take care of his living and his expenses. The Speaker of the House I know does have expenses in addition to the ordinary expenses of Members of Congress and he is entitled to consideration in that respect.

I do feel, and by the way I am speaking as ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House, that you are rushing through a piece of legislation without giving it the consideration to which it is really entitled. Here you are today, after having been in session since the 3d of January, unable to refer legislation to a committee, so that that legislation could have the fair consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In fairness, does not the gentleman consider the fact that organization of the House has not yet been perfected and that these committees have not as yet been created; and is that not a circumstance that gives justification to this unusual procedure, necessary to effectuate a result that is highly desirable?

Mr. REES. I will tell the gentleman that the whole procedure thus far today to say the least has been very unusual.

Mr. COX. I agree with that. I am not combating the proposition of the gentleman. I say that ordinarily matters of this kind should go to appropriate legislative committees of this House for the consideration and report of those committees, but the pending circumstances are such that would seem to me to justify this unusual and extraordinary procedure which, if the object aimed at is to be attained, must be resorted to.

Mr. REES. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that in view of the fact that the majority leadership has not yet selected committee members, or at least has not announced them, it is impossible to refer this bill to the committee where it belongs. Of course, you have had 2 weeks during which to select members of the committee. Committee members could be appointed and the bill be considered by the committee tomorrow. Of course, to get the legislation through today, the only thing that can be done is to follow the procedure at hand. I think this procedure is quite unusual, to say the least, and if you keep it up, it could cause a considerable amount of trouble. It is simply a matter of streamlining the legislation that you want to get through right away. The procedure you have followed on these three bills is one that allows, as you know, only 20 minutes discussion from each side on each bill, and the only way by which we can talk about any of these bills for as much as 20 minutes is to demand a second.

I am not objecting to the consideration of this particular piece of legislation. If I had a chance to do so, I would offer to modify it by amendments, but under the rule, I am not in position to do so.

I am not opposed to allowing the President adequate salary and a reasonable expense account. I call your attention, however, to the fact that if the President did not have the exemptions in this bill, it would be necessary to pay him a salary of between $300,000 and $400,000 in order that he might have as much left as provided in this bill.

Going one step further, if we do what the President requested, that is, do away with the community property amendment passed in the last session, you would have to pay him a salary of approximately $500,000 a year. That is, in order to provide a similar income as we have in this legislation. As the distinguished majority leader of the House has said, the President is entitled to a fair salary. I would not be misunderstood on that point for anything in the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The President has a terrific job, and it is impossible to pay him the money that the position is worth. It is not done that way. We allow a certain amount. The work cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. We all understand that. But I do think that since you are allowing an additional $50,000—and I know we must trust the President—but it is a lot of money not to have any accounting for and entirely free from taxation. I believe the administration should have been more moderate in its demands. It just does not look too good to exempt half of the income entirely from taxation. I am not objecting to it, but it is just a lot of money.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. Not at this time.

The answer of course is that if you cannot trust the President to spend the money any more than a Member of Congress, it ought not to be done. I realize that. I do not know how much it takes to run the White House, of course, and neither does the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. But I know the President cannot get rich on his salary or on the allowances. There is no doubt about that.

Attention is called to a statement by former President Hoover as an authority for this legislation. Here is what former President Hoover said, and I quote:

> I looked into the income taxes, State and Federal, and I note the salary of $75,000 for the President, after deduction of State and Federal income taxes, leaves about $43,000, whereas if you put his salary up to $150,000 he would have about $68,000 left.

I do not remember that he said anything about allowing him this additional $50,000 expense account, making a total of $90,000 free from taxes. I mention this only because the ex-President has been quoted. We are paying the President of the United States a fair salary and allowing him this extra income, yet the President says we ought to increase taxes on everybody who receives more than $6,000 a year income. It is rather interesting at least.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it is significant, in the nature of a forewarning, that one of the very first bills to be called up in this new Democratic Congress is one to increase the cost of Government, and it is called up, without hearing in committee, and under suspension of the rules which limits debate to 40 minutes and precludes any amendments.

The bill before us, S. 103, provides for a salary increase for the President of the United States, the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. It is admitted that this bill is the forerunner of legislation to increase the salary of practically all the top officials of the Government.

I recognize that the President, the Vice President and the Speaker of this House are the three most responsible offices in our Government. In many respects they are the three most important positions in the world. Those who occupy these positions should be paid a salary in some measure commensurate with their heavy duties and responsibilities. I would have no objection whatever to a bill providing for a proper increase in the salary for these three offices if it provided for such increase in a proper manner and in the proper amount.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a fraud on the taxpayers of the United States. This bill is so designed as to lead the people to believe that the increase in compensation is merely nominal, whereas in fact the increase is very, very substantial.

Under the terms of the bill the President's salary is increased from $75,000 to $100,000. and he is given a tax-exempt expense account of $50,000. The taxpayers are thus led to believe that the increase in compensation is only $35,000, and that the total compensation for the President is but $150,000.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that under the terms of this bill a salary of around $300,000 is in effect granted the President. You will note that this is an increase of about 400 percent over his present salary of $75,000.

The sponsors of this legislation have disguised the actual salary increase provided by the bill by setting up a tax-exempt expense account of $50,000. They wish to give the President a salary of around $93,000, after taxes, but instead of making a direct approach to the objective, the disguise of a tax-exempt expense account is used. They are afraid of the public reaction to a bill which would simply increase the salary to $300,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am definitely opposed to the principle of granting tax-exempt compensation to officials of our Government. As Members of Congress we receive a $2,500 tax-exempt expense account. I opposed this measure when it came before the Congress. I am still opposed to it, and I think legislation should be enacted for its repeal.

It is true that as Members of Congress we have extraordinary expenses in connection with our work. We must maintain two homes. We have the expense of traveling back and forth to our respective districts. We sometimes have the expense of extra clerical assistance. We have the expense of election campaigns.

But the policy of providing a tax-exempt expense account is definitely wrong. It is a fraud on the people we represent. They are deceived as to what they actually pay their Government officials.

If we are to provide the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker an increase in salary, it should be on a flat basis, and they should be obliged to pay all the taxes on the salary as all other individuals in this country.

It is perfectly evident that somehow we must bring forcibly home to those who are in charge of the fiscal policy of our Government that taxes represent a heavy burden on our people, and in some cases reach the point of confiscation. If the President were obliged to pay $207,000 in taxes on a $300,000 salary, leaving him take-home pay of only $93,000, he would perhaps have some realization of what existing taxes amount to. Each year, when he files his income-tax return, he would have a gentle reminder that taxes destroy incentive and initiative, and retard progress. He would have a reminder of the heavy load of the cost of government which the American people are obliged to carry.

Mr. Speaker, we are today faced with a national debt of over $250,000,000,000. The President has recently submitted to us the record peacetime budget of almost $42,000,000,000. He, and every other official of this Government, including us as Members of Congress, should be required to help support this great debt and expense of Government. It is wrong to set aside a certain group of Government officials and allow them an income which is not subject to taxes.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this bill is a fraud on the taxpayers of the United States. I want the people I represent to know that under the terms of this bill the President of the United States is actually being given a salary of around $300,000. The increase in compensation is being provided under the guise of a tax-exempt expense account. I also want my people to know that insofar as the tax-exempt expense account is concerned there is no provision in the bill for any accounting or certification.

What I have said here with respect to the salary or compensation increase provided for the President by this bill applies also to that provided for the Vice President and the Speaker. I am opposed to providing for any tax-exempt payments, just as I opposed the expense account provided for Members of Congress, although it was nominal in amount considering the expenses which we must necessarily incur. This is not a question of personalities. This is a question of principle.

There is also a constitutional principle involved in connection with this bill. In order to protect the people our founding fathers provided that salaries of their elected officials could not be increased during their term of office. This was done to give the people themselves opportunity to pass upon the question as to what their officials should receive. Today, after the election but before the term of the President and Vice President actually begins, we are raising their salary. By rushing this bill through in this manner we are acting contrary to the very spirit of the Constitution. If this measure had been acted on by the Congress prior to the election, it would be an altogether different matter, for the people would then know the salary they would pay to the man selected by them for the office.

We are being pressed to do today that which we will not be able to do next Friday. I must register my protest against both the manner in which this bill is drawn and the manner in which it is being rushed through Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, in support of this resolution, I am wonder-

ing whether the gentlemen who oppose it know that under American supervision, Hirohito of Japan receives yearly 20,000,000 yen, the equivalent of 74,000 American dollars, tax-free, with living quarters, food, servants and other expenses.

Franco of Spain received in 1948 the sum of 2,986,000 pesetas, the equivalent of 271,455 American dollars for salary, receptions and other expenses, tax-free, together with living quarters.

The King of England receives £410,000 or the equivalent of 1,722,000 American dollars, tax-free, with living quarters and other expenses.

Peron of Argentina receives 144,000 pesos.

The Governor General of India receives 250,000 rupees, and the President of Chile receives 500,000 pesos. All three salaries are tax-free, with living quarters, food, servants and all traveling and other expenses.

The Congress of these United States is the only law-making body on earth that votes a salary to the Chief of State and then with another vote snatches back approximately 50 percent of it as income tax.

We proud Americans should pay our President $200,000 per year, tax-free, with living quarters, food, servants and all necessary traveling and other expenses.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to observe that this question is merely one of whether or not we shall pay the President of the United States a sufficient salary so that he does not have to go into his own pocket to make up the deficit. I did not vote for the first resolution before the House, although some of the arguments, trivial and petty arguments I might say, from the other side almost convinced me that I should. I did not vote for that resolution because I am opposed to the principle involved.

Why, Mr. Speaker, should we have a lot of irrelevant discussion about a matter upon which there is general agreement? This debate has resolved itself into a series of petty arguments, if you please. Out in Ohio in one of our great farm areas, which unfortunately is not in my district, and I refer to Wayne County, where they grow a tremendous crop of potatoes, there is an old saying that they put all the small potatoes into cans. I suggest that would be a good procedure to follow here with the arguments which have no bearing except for petty political references in the next campaign. As has been said before, I doubt if such vociferous objections to giving the President a raise for the first time in 40 years would have been heard if the gentleman from New York had won the recent election.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania gave a list of the heads of various countries who receive greater salaries than the President of the United States. I wonder if the gentleman realizes that the amount we are paying to the King of England and the princesses over there, over a million dollars, is all being paid by the taxpayers of America under ERP. If we do not stop that, ours will get nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of increasing the salary of the President of the United States. I would give him $250,000 a year under this bill, if I were doing it, but I do not like the feature in the bill which grants a $50,000 tax-free bonus to him. I do not like these tax-free type of salaries to anybody. It is un-American—what is good for one is good for all.

I want to insert in the RECORD as part of my remarks a statement from Mr. Stam, Chief of Staff, Internal Revenue Department, showing just what the taxes would be on salaries of $75,000, $100,000, $150,000, $200,000, and $250,000.

JANUARY 14, 1949.

Hon. ROBERT F. RICH,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. RICH: The attached data are furnished in reply to your request of January 13, 1949.

You also asked what gross salary would have to be paid the President of the United States so that he would have after income taxes $50,000 more than he does at present. His salary would have to be approximately $201,567. At present he has left after taxes $48,275. The increase in salary from $75,000 to $201,567 would increase his salary after taxes by $50,000 or to $98,275.

Respectfully yours,

COLIN F. STAM,
*Chief of Staff.*

*Individual income tax under the present law for married couples with selected salaries*

NO DEPENDENTS

| Total salary | Tax [1] | Total salary after tax |
|---|---|---|
| $75,000 | $26,725 | $48,275 |
| 100,000 | 40,067 | 59,933 |
| 150,000 | 69,836 | 80,164 |
| 200,000 | 102,244 | 97,756 |
| 250,000 | 137,083 | 112,917 |

[1] Assumes taxpayer has no other income other than his salary—assumes that taxpayer has personal deductions such as charitable contributions, medical and dental expenses, etc., that amount to 10 percent of his salary.

Now, I think we should give the President sufficient money to carry on the affairs of his office, but when you start in to make these tax-free gratuities, you are doing something you should not do. Let the President of the United States get a salary sufficient to carry on his office, but let him pay the taxes the same as every other taxpayer in this country, and let him feel the pinch of taxes. He says that people receiving $5,000 and over should pay more taxes. Let him pay his share of taxes. If that is right, let him pay the same in proportion to others with like salaries. Now he is getting a $40,000 free gratuity. Why, he only spent $32,039 of that $40,000 in 1948, so why then continue to increase that gratuity when he gets his house for nothing? He does not have any expense there in the White House with reference to the running of his house; the Government pays for that. The Government pays for his chauffeur. It gives him a private plane, and a private train, and a private yacht. All those things are being paid for by the Government, and he certainly can get along if we give him $250,000. But let him pay his taxes. It cost the Government $260,400 last year to keep up the White House and grounds; for butlers, servants, yardmen, household furnishings, so the President does not even have rent to pay like the Members of Congress. He has a fleet of limousines and chauffeurs. Let the President practice economy—has he no regard at all for taxpayers? He could not run his own business, now he will break up everybody that now remains in business, then he will find out that foreign countries will not pay his salary.

In the name of all that is good "be wise and economize." I will vote against this bill if the $40,000 tax-free feature is not stricken from the bill.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is with some hesitancy that I ask for this time. It is purely a matter of principle. A few years back when one worked for the State he did not have to pay any Federal-income tax. That practice has been corrected, and it was a step in the right direction, because if a man worked for the State I often wondered why it was that he should be relieved of paying Federal-income taxes just because he had a job with a State government. Now then, we drifted along. The next thing we did in the Seventy-ninth Congress was to provide that the people who worked for the United Nations were excluded from paying any Federal-income tax. They probably tell everyone all over the world that they are Americans, but they do not tell them that they do not help to keep the old machinery going. Now we appear to be ready for the next step. I surely cannot ask anyone here to take my judgment as to what the President needs to carry on his office. I do say, however, that as a principle—and I found out in life that you never get in trouble for sticking up for the things one believes in, even if some people call you small potatoes, but sometimes when they get older they will find out that the potatoes are a good deal larger than they think they are—it is unwise to continue on the road of tax exemption. I say to every Member here today that we are going down the wrong road. I do not care who he is, no one is compelled to be a candidate for office if he does not want to, and any time we provide tax exemptions, regardless for whom it is, we are going down the wrong road. It is surely a great start for the Eighty-first Congress; more for the few less for the many.

Mr. Speaker, the article I refer to is as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star]

LITTLE PEOPLE TO BEAR COSTS OF PAY RAISES PROPOSED FOR OFFICIALS—PLAN SEEN GIVING TRUMAN AN INCOME EQUIVALENT TO $240,000 BEFORE TAXES

(By David Lawrence)

This is the administration of the "little fellows"—the one, it will be recalled, that the "little people" everywhere elected last November. And yet about the first thing the Democrats are doing in the new session of Congress is to vote on a proposal to raise the pay of President Truman to an income equivalent to about $240,000 before taxes.

Various devices are suggested to give Mr. Truman $50,000 expense money which he would not have to account for to anybody and which would be free from taxation, and, in addition, a raise in salary.

There is a general move on to raise salaries in the Government and the principal reason cited for it is that it is hard to attract executives of ability into the Government service at present salary rates. But it would appear that there are plenty of men with executive ability—some of them even in Congress—who would be glad to serve as President at the present salary rate of $75,000 a year and only $40,000 instead of $90,000 for expenses. Some of them are Democrats, too, and they are not at all men of independent means. Perhaps it would be embarrassing to mention them, but sometime between now and the national conventions of 1952 their names doubtless will be revealed to the public.

HIS SIGNATURE REQUIRED

The idea of raising the President's pay is presumably something which Mr. Truman himself didn't start. A commission headed by Herbert Hoover has been studying Government salaries and has recommended more pay for the President, the Vice President, the Speaker of the House, Cabinet members, and so on. All this is unquestionably due to the devaluation of the purchasing power of the dollar.

But it has been supposed for years that men who entered the public service did not do so for materialistic reasons. Only people influenced by the profit motive in business were presumed to be materialistic in their attitudes.

Mr. Truman may feel that this is something from which he can remain aloof. But his signature will be required to make the bill into a law. By approving the measure he will be raising his own pay in almost the first legislative act since he was elected.

It would not appear in such bad taste if it were not for the fact Mr. Truman is announcing that he wants everybody in America with an income over $6,000 a year to pay increased taxes. The theory that certain citizens in effect shall be tax exempt and others shall bear the added costs of Government implies that only a few shall be privileged to pay these higher taxes. There was a time when the American theory of good citizenship included the right of every citizen to be permitted to share in the obligations of government. Certainly it would be odd if all labor unions, for example, decided to exempt from the payment of dues those who earned less than a certain amount per week. The idea always has been that those who share the benefits should always pay part of the cost.

MANDATE QUESTIONED

Mr. Truman is asking that an additional $4,000,000,000 in taxes be imposed on both business and individual incomes, and that a $2,000,000,000 increase in social security taxes be deducted from pay rolls each week.

It might be questioned by the voters—including many who voted for a Democratic Congress, as did this correspondent—whether the people gave a "mandate" to increase taxes for everybody over $6,000 and to exempt everybody else from the increase, and whether the people voted to give more pay to the officials of Government, at least in such sums as are being mentioned.

If the budget has to be balanced, the first step is to reduce expenses. If it remains unbalanced even then, the next step is to spread the burdens of taxes equitably so that all citizens pay a fair share of the cost of maintaining Government, a fair share of the expense of feeding Europe and the money needed to prepare the Army, Navy, and Air Forces to give America military security. Certainly many citizens on reflection will want to pay something more at least toward the additional costs of armament. It doesn't look, moreover, as if this is the time to raise by huge sums the pay of those officials who went up and down the country denouncing the Republicans as men who would enrich themselves at the expense of the Government. The "little fellows" may not like it.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM].

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, just a few years ago the gentleman who then occupied the White House took the position that the top salary for anyone should not exceed $25,000 after taxes.

I remember quite distinctly the conversation of some of those individuals who insisted that I should go along with a Presidential directive fixing this salary as the maximum which anyone could earn. Of course, the question before the House at that time was not one of determining whether a specific amount should be the top salary which a person could earn, but rather should the President of the United States be permitted by Presidential directive to limit one's income to a certain figure, which in this case was $25,000.

To my way of thinking it is inconceivable to put a limit on anyone's ability to produce or earn. If such a directive had been in existence at the time the Pilgrims came to America we would not have made the progress which stamps us as the foremost nation of the world.

What I started to say Mr. Speaker was that the passage of this resolution increasing the President's salary and expense account should put an end for all time to the talk of limiting a man's income to $25,000 after taxes. I notice that some of those who are now apparently 100 percent in agreement with granting this increase, are the same individuals who condemned some of us a few years ago for not giving the President authority to limit salaries to $25,000 after taxes.

I am convinced that some of those who are evidently planning to change our form of government, are even now building up propaganda to put the blame on so-called big business or the profit incentive. These same individuals are not only advocating and pursuing a program which if carried to its ultimate conclusion is bound to result in bankruptcy for our country, but are already softening up the people into believing that it would be the results of the profit system which produced it. The most sure and quickest way to ruin an individual is to get him hopelessly involved in debt. It is also the most sure and quickest way to ruin a nation.

I trust that from here on this Congress may have the wisdom to separate the chaff from the grain, and I sincerely trust that all this talk against limiting a man's ability to earn, produce, and invest for the good of future generations will be considered chaff and dealt with accordingly.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Congress is asked to rush through this salary-raise bill for the President, Vice President, and the Speaker. It has been brought before the Congress with a time limit so short that it cannot, in fact, be given careful and proper consideration. This legislation should have been brought before one of the sessions of the Eightieth Congress last year when it could have been given careful study and thought before the Members were asked to vote on the legislation.

All of us want to deal generously in fixing entirely adequate salaries for the President, Vice President, and Speaker of the House. We honor and respect these high offices and their incumbents. We want them to have salary schedules compatible with the responsibilities of their offices, and the high dignity of the positions they hold in helping to direct the affairs of our Nation.

Had this matter been considered in the previous Congress, it could have been handled with a great deal less embarrassment to any of the Members of the Congress. None of us, even for good and sufficient reasons, like to oppose the measure now before us.

This bill, as I understand it, would increase the salary of the President from $75,000 to $100,000 annually, and in addition would provide the Chief Executive a tax-free expense account of $90,000. In addition, it would increase the salary for the Vice-President and Speaker of the House to $30,000 a year and would also give each of them $10,000 tax free in expenses. They now get $20,000 and $15,000, respectively, with no expense money.

I regret I cannot support the measure because of the tax-free expense accounts provided in the bill. I would rather raise the President's salary to $150,000 or more; also raise the salaries of the Vice President and Speaker of the House, and eliminate the tax-free provisions of this bill.

I believe it sets a very bad example and a bad precedent. I regret exceedingly I must take this position.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the legislation before us, sections 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been stricken from the measure, so that it now applies only to the salaries and the expense accounts of the three most important officials in the United States—the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

By direction of this House I have been serving for the last year and a half on the Commission established by a unanimous vote of Congress—the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. It is perhaps better known in most circles as the Hoover Commission because it is headed by the distinguished former President of the United States—may I say the only living ex-President of the United States—Herbert Hoover.

The Commission has been making a very careful study of all of the various agencies and departments and divisions of the executive branch of the Government. We have used task forces and subcommittees, some 28 task forces and some 30 subcommittees, in these studies. Mr. Hoover has himself served as the chairman of the subcommittee which has studied the President's Office, and, as a result of a report of that subcommittee, it has been the unanimous opinion of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government that an increase in compensation should be granted to the President of the United States, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House, and, I might also add, to other top officials in the executive branch of the Government, also.

Mr. McCORMACK Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry you overlooked the majority leader this time.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think both our majority and minority leaders are entitled to some additional consideration because they most certainly do carry a heavy burden of work.

While the Commission has not yet made its full report to the Congress and the Commission did not fix the salaries they believe would be the right amounts for these various officials, I think I can say to you that it was the original opinion of the subcommittee that the President's salary should be fixed at $150,000 per year.

The Commission did not consider the expense-allowance features, which I see are included in this measure, but those of you who have served some time in the House know what my position is on that particular matter. I feel very firmly that any public official, even though he should be the President or just a humble Member of Congress, is entitled to reimbursement for the expenses which he may incur in connection with the conduct of his official duties. I do not believe it wise to hold down the salary of the President of the United States, or the Vice President or the Speaker of the House, to the point where only rich men can afford to serve in such positions.

Therefore, I am supporting the small salary increases proposed in this measure.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to extend their remarks on this particular measure at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES]?

There was no objection.

NEED SALARY INCREASE, TOO

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, high taxes and high costs unquestionably have made the President's present-day salary too low and it should be raised.

The same high taxes and high costs have made the salaries and expense accounts of other top officials of the Government too low, and, no doubt, these should be raised.

But these are not the only public employees who are suffering from the high cost of living and high taxes. There are thousands of other public employees whose wages are so low or whose expense accounts, so inadequate, that they, too, even as much as the President and topmost officials, are feeling the pinch. They, too, need relief and should have it.

Now, while we are proceeding to raise the salaries and expense accounts of the topmost employees, it seems to me, is an appropriate time to call attention to those Federal employees in the lower brackets of income, in the hope that Congress will give their problem speedy and fair treatment.

In the office buildings of the Congress there are numerous elevator operators whose salaries are only $185 a month. For this wage, these elevator operators work a 7-day week of 7½ hours each day. They get only 1 day off every 2 weeks. In short, 1 week they work 52½ hours and the next 45 hours. If absent because of illness or other reason their pay is docked. Their average wage is barely 80 cents an hour. After deducting their transportation costs for going to and from work 7 days a week, and after withholding taxes, there is not much carry-home pay left.

They, as well as the topmost officials, are entitled to more adequate pay and to some easing of the long-hour week they now work. There is not much fun in life for the man who must, to live, work 7 days a week.

In the Pentagon Building, within the past fortnight, I saw Government employees operating what are known as offset presses. I asked what wage they received and was told $2,100 a year, before taxes.

I have for some years operated a printing establishment. We have presses of the same type as those in the Pentagon Building. The operators of these presses in my shop are paid about $85 a week. I believe that is about the average wage paid by private industry for this work, yet Government workers employed at the same work, I was told, receive only about $40 a week, only half of that paid similar workers employed in private industry.

There are in the Federal service tens of thousands of employees, especially those in the lower brackets, who get wages so low that after taxes, these are adequate only for the lowest scale of living. These workers, as well as those in the topmost brackets, are entitled to a raise.

We want the best employees we can get in Government. That rule should apply to the employees in the lowest brackets as well as those in the highest brackets.

Wars are won as much by the zeal, courage, and loyalty of the private and noncom in the ranks as by the ability of generals, and similarly an efficient, productive Government organization depends on a satisfied personnel, paid adequate enough salaries to prevent a rapid turn-over. A turn-over of thousands in the low classifications of Government is just as costly to governmental efficiency as the occasional retirement of a topmost official.

These low-paid workers need a raise.

In expense accounts, high taxes and the high cost of living have worked just as great, or even greater, hardship on the low-wage Government employee as upon those in the topmost rungs of the salary scale.

For example, Government employees who by the nature of their work are compelled to travel a good deal now are allowed $6 a day for subsistence while traveling on Government business.

This $6 is supposed to pay their hotel lodging bill and for three meals a day while they are on the road. Surely, no Member of Congress believes this $6 is adequate to buy a night's lodging and three meals in any large city of this country. The $6 would not buy that in any second- or third-class hotel. The sustenance allowance of these workers who, to hold their jobs, must travel on Government business should be raised to $8 a day.

Recently, I talked to a Government worker who, from the nature of his job, must travel a good deal of the time. He told me he had kept figures on his cost of living on the road while traveling on Government business. At the end of the year, he found, he said, that he had spent $900 more than he had received from the $6-a-day subsistence allowance. He was wondering if he should deduct this $900 from his income tax and thereby save part of it. The Government should not expect its employees to make such sacrifices in order for them to keep their jobs.

To compel them to do so will, in the long run, prove penny-wise and pound-foolish, for the continuation of this situation will compel many employees to leave the Government service. The Government then will have to employ new persons to fill their places and go through the expensive and often wasteful cost of training untried and inexperienced personnel to fill their places.

The present law allows internal revenue collectors and other Federal employees who use their own automobiles when traveling on official Government business only 4 cents a mile when traveling within their post of duty and 5 cents a mile when traveling outside their post.

This 4- and 5-cents-a-mile allowance for use of a car is substantially below that allowed by most private businesses. It is totally inadequate to meet the cost of car insurance, gas and oil, storage and upkeep, to say nothing of depreciation. The Government should

not expect its employees to be out of pocket in order to keep their jobs.

If I had my way I would much prefer that the inadequate salary and expense account situation of those in the lower brackets be taken care of first and that of those in the topmost brackets later. But this, unfortunately, is not to be the procedure.

Let us cherish the hope that the Congress, after taking care of the Government's topmost men, first, will then not forget and neglect those who are in greater need of a fair deal, those employees in the lower brackets.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, if this bill goes through to give the President a $100,000 salary and a $90,000 tax-free expense account, I am informed by the Legislative Reference Service that it will be the equivalent of approximately a $530,000 a year salary. It is important that the issue before us be clarified.

He now is paid a salary of $75,000 and has a tax-free expense account of $40,000. The effect of the twofold proposal in this measure is to increase his salary, not from $75,000 to $100,000, but from $75,000 to over $300,000.

Although a modest increase in his salary from $75,000 to $100,000 a year may be justified, I am opposed to the subterfuge involved in the proposal now before us.

The bill provides that he shall not be required to make any accounting as to the way he spends this extra $50,000, nor, indeed, is he even required to certify that it is actually expended. We all know that it is simply an attempt on the part of the majority to increase his compensation substantially without incurring the opposition which would be Nation-wide if the people were given the facts.

We have no right to be parties to bamboozling the public in this fashion. If we propose to make this move we should do it in a forthright fashion by increasing his salary to $300,000. The very statement of that proposal gives one pause. While ample provision should be made for the Chief Executive of the land, we should not convert the office into one which will be sought by those who have only a financial motive.

Furthermore, it is well for the President, as well as other high-salaried officials, including Members of Congress, to realize that their compensation is subject to tax. A case could be put up for everyone in the country, high-salaried executives and working men and women alike, to be allowed a tax-free sum for expenses. Everyone incurs such expenses in connection with his work, for which he is denied any tax exemption. A simple illustration is the bus fare or streetcar fare or automobile expense which almost everyone incurs in going to and from his work. The President already has this large tax-free fund of $40,000 completely exempt from taxes.

He was not elected on a platform or with the expectation that he should be paid the equivalent of a $530,000 a year salary.

This resolution should be defeated.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I will vote to support the resolution to increase the President's salary and allow an adequate expense account. It is just and fair to do so.

The dignity and importance of the high office of President of the United States entitles the occupant of that office to compensation that is commensurate with the duties he performs. As the highest officer of our Government the responsibilities that he is called upon to carry are enormous. They are not equaled by any ruler in any nation of the world. Yet, many of these in nations far smaller than our own are receiving compensation far beyond that which we contemplate paying the President under the resolution now before the House.

Furthermore, beyond the tremendous physical strain his duties place upon him, there is a heavy financial drain upon his own resources to keep up with what the American people expect of their President. To do this, it should not be necessary for the President to depend upon his own personal financial resources.

To withhold adequate compensation may preclude a man of limited means, such as Mr. Truman, from being a candidate to the office of President. We don't want to ever let it be said that you must be a rich man to be President of the United States.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in considering S. 103, I believe it to be important to keep in mind the tendency, which seems to be growing, for the Congress to pass legislation which exempts from the provisions of the income-tax law certain emoluments which come to Federal officials which are really compensation for their services. This bill as originally drawn provided that the President should receive compensation in the aggregate sum of $150,000. The bill was modified in the other body so as to make it appear that only $100,000 of that sum is salary and $50,000 was designated as expense allowance and this sum is not subject to tax liability and no accounting shall be made by the President with respect to it.

Apparently in reality it is compensation. When the legislation was presented in the House increasing our own salaries and providing for a tax-free expense account I voted against it for that reason. I believe it is sound from a legislative standpoint, and equitable, to provide adequate compensation not only for our officials who occupy high positions but also for all Federal employees in low-income brackets. Certainly I believe it proper and just to provide adequate salaries for the President and Vice President and the Speaker of the House. I do believe that it is a mistake to provide tax-exempt compensation for these officials or any other officials.

I include as a part of my remarks a statement from the issue of January 21, 1949, United States News and World Report, page 5, which sets forth in detail the compensation and expense allowances for the President and his office:

NEWSGRAM

The country plans to do quite well by its President in 1949 and years to come. Mr. Truman, taking up the job, is to find it not a bad one at all.

Pay is being raised. It's planned to be $100,000, subject to tax, plus $50,000 in tax-free expense account. It has been $75,000 with no expense account. Mr. Truman last year couldn't quite make out on $48,000 left after taxes.

Take-home pay, after taxes, it has been decided, should be at least $100,000. That's what the job is supposed to be worth annually. Mr. Truman is scheduled to get around $110,000 after taxes with the raise and the expense account. He could do what he wants with the expense account, spend it or save it.

Tax-free pay isn't available to the ordinary citizen. To have $110,000 left over, after taxes, a person would need at least $240,000 of taxable income. That's before any new tax increase. Not many people make that much.

What is happening is that Congress is deciding that a person can't really make what he is worth under the present rate of taxes. To enable the President to have pay that is supposed to be adequate, it is proving to be necessary to dodge the tax laws by setting up a tax-free expense account. A straight pay raise to $240,000 seemed to Congress to be too much.

Mr. Truman favors a tax increase for persons with net income above $6,000.

The President's job, if you can get it, offers other things, too.

A house goes with the job. It's a big white house and expensive to run. Upkeep is to cost taxpayers $260,400 in the year ahead. That's for butlers, other servants, yardmen, household furnishings, and other things.

The house itself is run down. It's to be fixed up at a cost of at least $4,000,000. The house sits in a 16-acre wooded estate. Rent is free.

A private airplane is provided, too. It's four-engined and de luxe.

There's a yacht, a big seagoing yacht. The Navy maintains that, and it is always ready when wanted, with full crew. A private railroad car always is ready. There is a fleet of limousines with chauffeurs.

Travel allowance is $40,000 a year. That's for private transportation. It doesn't pay for airplane, yacht, and limousines. It must be accounted for.

The $110,000 net in take-home pay, after taxes, doesn't have to be used to pay for these things. But the President must entertain often at his private expense. He gets reimbursed for official receptions and that's all. The job in some years cost the late Mr. Roosevelt money and it has cost Mr. Truman some money, too. Mr. Roosevelt was the first President who paid an income tax. In pre-New Deal days, when prices were lower and the President paid no tax on his income, many Presidents saved quite a bit of money out of their pay.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, to me this matter seems simple. We are allowing the President the sum of $50,000 annually to take care of expenses he incurs because he is President. If we think he is entitled to an expense account—and I think he is—then we should not give him an amount and then proceed to whittle it down by taking part of it back as taxes.

The logic of some of those that object to this allowance may be sound. But there is another approach to this particular problem than the logic of the situation. It is that the man who was elected President should have an expense account that will help him pay for the necessary entertainment that falls to him as our Chief Executive. In many cities and in my home city we do this for our mayor. We ask no accounting of him

and we do not subject this allowance to any taxation. We give him the money and say in effect, "Take this and spend it as you wish to build up the good will of our city and us by being a good host. You represent us by virtue of your election and we will take pride in anything you may do in the way of entertaining people as we know it will reflect credit on you and us as well." We should have that same feeling wtih respect to our President and for this reason I am in favor of granting this allowance, tax free.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the record straight in this matter, I would like to say that it comes before the House at this time because of the urgency of the situation.

If this legislation does not become law before the 20th of this month, then President Truman will not have the benefit of it under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

I would like to go further and tell you that early in December, from December 13 to December 15, a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service held extensive hearings on this subject. They had before them a bill introduced by Senator FLANDERS, then the chairman of that subcommittee. That bill increased the salary of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker, and some 223 heads of departments and under secretaries.

That bill was the original bill, S. 103. But because the Senate Committee of this Congress did not have time to hold hearings on it, it comes before us now in this abbreviated form, taking care of only the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House.

The last time the salary of the President of the United States was raised was in 1909. A great deal of water has gone over the dam since that time. There have been many changes. It is beyond the memory of some of the people here and some of the younger Members were not then even born. Yet, we continue to evaluate this high office, the greatest office of public trust in the world, in terms of 1909.

There have only been three adjustments in the salary of the President of the United States during the history of the Republic. The salary was first fixed in 1789 at $25,000 a year. In 1883 it was raised to $50,000 a year. In 1909 it was raised to $75,000. Now we propose to make it $100,000.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes; I yield for a correction.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Massachusetts a while ago mentioned that there had not been a raise in salary for 40 years, but that the expense account was raised in recent years from $25,000 to $40,000.

Mr. MILLER of California. I will come to that in a minute. But I fail to see where the statement of the gentleman constitutes a correction, because the last time the salary of the President was raised was in 1909 and this being the year 1949, it was 40 years ago. So the gentleman from Massachusetts was correct in making that statement. The expense account that has been spoken of here is not a general expense account. The money that has been referred to is a travel allowance, which, by law, may be fixed at not to exceed $40,000. But it is limited as a travel allowance. Last year the President only used $32,000, so the surplus there cannot be charged against the general expenses of running the White House.

There is currently running in one of the newspapers a series of articles by the housekeeper who entered the White House with President Roosevelt in 1932. I commend this series of articles to you for reading. You will see that they did not have money enough to properly run the White House, and that they had to get the money out of certain of the food allowances, in order to rebuild the kitchen.

That series of articles will tell you some startling things in connection with the operation of the Executive Mansion, the home of the President of the United States. Former President Hoover appeared before the Flanders subcommittee. I happen to have been the only member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service then in Washington, and I was invited, as a courtesy by Senator FLANDERS, to sit with that committee, and I sat with him during the hearings.

I want to say that former President Hoover was referring to the salary proposed by a bill then before it by Senator FLANDERS which fixed the President's salary at $150,000 a year. Frankly, if you go into the record, you will see where former President Hoover suggested that perhaps fixing the salary at a lower figure and giving a tax-free allowance might be the better way to approach this subject.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it not a fact that in our State it is the common practice in cities and municipalities to allow the mayor to have a similar fund?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes. I thank the gentleman for that contribution.

Former President Hoover said:

I should think the American people would be perfectly willing and glad to see the Government give board and lodging to its President. He does not get it now, for he must pay his own board and that of numerous other people.

Then he goes on. The matter appears in the transcript of the hearing.

The so-called task force from the Committee on Reorganization in Executive Departments appeared before the Flanders committee in the person of former President Hoover, Mr. John A. Stevenson, president of the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.; Mr. Arthur Flemming, president of Ohio Wesleyan University; and Hon. Robert Ramspeck, our former colleague, all urging that this matter be given immediate consideration by the Congress and that the dignity of the office of President be recognized by fixing his salary on a basis comparable with that office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is, Shall the rules be suspended and the resolution passed?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Eleven Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## SIGNING OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today, the Speaker be authorized to sign any bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 51) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the Eighty-first Congress the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 28 members.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. May I ask why the membership of this committee is reduced below what it was in the Eightieth Congress? I notice that on a great number of committees the membership was cut down on this side much more than it was in the last Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman will not find that to be true. That is a matter that the leadership on both sides very carefully discussed.

I can assure my friend that there is no discord among the leadership on that question.

Mr. RICH. I looked over the list and found that in some of the committees—not all, but in some—there are fewer Republicans this year than there were Democrats in the last Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. In the last Congress 56 percent plus of the membership of committees were Republican. In this one 60 percent plus are Democrats. I

can assure my friend that on the 15 elective committees there is perfect accord amongst the leadership on both sides.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not know whether the minority leader is on the floor at the moment or not, but the matter had not been called to my attention previously. I have just been informed by the ranking member of the committee that he is not familiar with the proposal. I wonder if the gentleman from Massachusetts would withdraw his request until such time as we might have an opportunity to make some determination about it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts withdraws the resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. KEATING) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. LODGE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address by National Commander Frackman, of the Regular Veterans' Association, at a State meeting of the Regular Veterans' Association.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a sermon delivered at the red Mass on yesterday.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD with regard to the power shortage in the Pacific Northwest and legislation he has introduced regarding it.

Mr. BLATNIK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

PUTTING ALL OUR SECURITY EGGS IN EUROPEAN BASKET: A RECKLESS GAMBLE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, for a long time millions of thoughtful Americans have been properly disturbed by the administration's policy of making every possible effort to help the existing governments of western Europe resist further expansion of Communist control, and no real effort in the last 3 years to help the Chinese Government resist Communist expansion. It has been generally supposed that those responsible for the policy of concentrating on Europe justified it on the thesis that there can be no peace or security until the Soviet Union is forced to retreat within its own boundaries in Europe, and, in fact, until the present tyranny in the Kremlin is overthrown.

I agree with that thesis completely. But it does not follow that in order to save Europe it is or ever was necessary to abandon China to the Communists, except for a few feeble gestures and some relief measures to keep the American people, and perchance the Chinese people, from realizing that since December 1945 our policy in Asia, in fact if not in words, has been one of abandonment of the Chinese Government, accepting and in reality making certain its destruction, though it is an official and loyal ally.

On the contrary, the stupendous victories, both strategic and psychological, which world communism is winning in Asia, make enormously more difficult our efforts to hold and defeat it in Europe. Can it be either necessary or wise for us to put all our chips on the European front? Even though we should win there, it would not be fatal or even too serious for the Soviet regime if it has most of Asia into which to retire and wait while the western nations bleed themselves to death with expanding budgets and diminishing resources. When will we wake up to the magnitude of the disaster befalling us in the Far East and its menace to the success of our policies in Europe?

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer making public the policy which has long existed and discussing the enormous risk we are taking by gambling everything on getting victory on the European front:

The United States is now firmly committed to gambling the fate of the world upon its success in beating Russia to the punch during the next 2 years.

That statement is based upon unimpeachable information whose source I am compelled to withhold. What it means is that beneath the misleading surface maneuvers of President Truman's administration, there is a basic foreign policy that is clear and coherent, and one of the most decisive in American history.

If this has not been generally recognized, it is because the Government's true foreign policy, so far as I know, has never been publicly stated; and it has not been stated because it is so audacious as to appear reckless.

Many American students of world affairs are deeply worried by what appear to be profound inconsistencies in American foreign policy since Truman, Marshall, and Lovett began revamping it in January 1947. The inconsistency, if not the worry, vanishes when we know what the President and his assistants actually have in view.

Only this revelation which I am privileged to make explains President Truman's apparent negligence in permitting the Communists to take over China, and his seeming indifference to the danger of a resurgent, brutally expansive Germany. Both of these are part of a reasoned scheme.

Under Harry S. Truman, exactly as he promised me back in September 1945, the United States now has a foreign policy extending all over the world. It is definite, it is consistent, and it means business. It is also dangerous. I can sum it up best in the language of bridge and chess:

"West to play and checkmate East in 2 to 3 years."

BASIC UNITED STATES POLICY

West is obviously the United States, with such like-minded peoples as are willing to follow our lead; East is the Soviet Union with its satellite states and its world-wide network of Communist stooges.

Briefly summarized, American foreign policy is frontal pressure upon the adversary along a relatively narrow front, namely western Europe, the Mediterranean, and the Middle East as far as Iran. This pressure is being exerted, and is to be further exerted, by all possible means short of war. It is to be backed by what American leaders believe is the irresistible air-and-atom power of the United States, by the world's greatest fleet, and ultimately by well-armed European holding forces along the area to discourage any sudden sneak attack.

The key to this policy is concentration—squeezing the Soviet Union to compel it first to stop and then to retreat from its illicitly acquired conquests in eastern Europe. The Soviet Union is to be forced into honoring the Yalta and the Potsdam agreements.

All means are being concentrated to this single purpose. Since Germany is to be rescued, German good will is necessary. Therefore the Germans are being babied beyond their deserts. There is—as the planners see it—no risk of a strong Germany involved, since success in stopping Russia will be prompt, after which the policy of favoring the Germans can be reversed if necessary.

EXPEDIENCY VERSUS LONG-TERM AIMS

Ideologies also become temporarily negligible. The United States leaders will gladly accept the assistance, unless harmful to the plan, of any country—reactionary Greece or Communist Yugoslavia—just as they accepted the help of Communist Russia against Hitler during World War II. Since time is short, United States leaders do not feel compelled to make Greece reform or the nations of western Europe unite. Such aims are long-run objectives and Washington is concentrating on the short run.

Furthermore, since even America's means are limited and the real conquest of China by the Communists will (allegedly) take a long time, China can safely be neglected. For, if the policy in Europe is successful, it will lead to a world-wide arrangement with the Russians that will liberate China.

This policy is not the "containment" of Russia advocated a year or two ago by George F. Kennan, of the State Department; it is obviously not "containing" Russia in Asia. This is a policy of direct pressure on one area with all the concentrated peacetime strength of mighty America.

Clearly, too, it rests upon the belief that under such pressure the men in the Kremlin must yield. The argument seems to be that the Soviet Union, like Hitlerite Germany, is a bicycle-like body that can stand up only when advancing at a rapid pace. Make it stand still and it will fall over. American students of Soviet affairs purport to see in the recent hysterical Soviet purges of economics, literature, music, biology, and physics, signs of the first weakening within the country. Therefore, they argue, we must keep up the heat, maintain the Berlin airlift regardless of cost—and victory and lasting peace will soon be ours.

Such a policy is coherent even in its neglect of the United Nations. It neglects literally everything that does not immediately contribute to its success. One can even argue that since it needs the speed, concentration, and resolution of a military campaign, its execution is properly being entrusted to military men.

Its weakness lies in the immensity of the risk it entails. It is entirely postulated on the belief that Russian imperialism can be brought to bay quickly. If it fails, it will leave the United States and the like-minded

nations in a desperate position: The European recovery money gone and no European unity to show for it; Germany relatively powerful and likely to ally itself with the Soviets, the greater part of Asia communized, and our Pacific outposts in jeopardy.

That is the gamble taken by President Truman. It is a gamble that has never been authorized or even understood by the American Congress or the American people. It is a gamble even greater than President Roosevelt took during World War II when he banked on his ability to tame the Soviet Union—and failed.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

JUDICIAL USURPATION IN THE CEMENT CASE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the Supreme Court's decision in the so-called Cement case. My home town, Oglesby, Ill., is a city of 4,000 people, most of whom depend upon our two cement mills for a living. The pay rolls of these two cement mills constitute the major part of the financial lifeblood of our community. No wonder I am interested in the Cement case.

I bring this Cement-case decision to the attention of the Members of Congress because unless some remedial legislation is passed at this session to remove the Nation-wide confusion and uncertainty that now obtains throughout American industry, as a result of the order of the Federal Trade Commission and the supporting decision of the Supreme Court, irreparable harm will be done to our American economic system.

Mr. Speaker, for half a century it has been the practice of heavy industry in America—cement, steel, building materials, lumber, newsprint, corn products, and furniture—to quote delivered prices to the buyers of their products. This method of pricing is also used by makers of cigarettes, cough drops, and thousands of other articles that have a Nation-wide sale. The Commission's order has produced chaos and uncertainty in all lines of American industry, and threatens to dislocate and wreck our economic system. At a conservative estimate the various industries affected by the decision in the Cement case represent an aggregate of $50,000,000,000 of American investment, and employ approximately 16,000,000 American workers, with factories located in every State in the Union. Literally millions of workers in industries, such as iron and steel and their fabricating industries, rubber, tobacco, and food products, have been placed in jeopardy by this decision. On the proper solution of this pricing problem by the Congress rests the future development of thousands of cities and towns in which the savings of our citizens have been invested in plant facilities. What affects these industries will affect the workers in them—their jobs, their accumulated technical experience, their homes, their families, and the communities in which they live. One can readily see, therefore, that this pricing problem has Nation-wide ramifications that affect the lives of the majority of our American people. It is safe to say that there is not one congressional district in the United States that is not adversely affected by this attack upon our established pricing practices.

THE CEMENT CASE

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Cement case, briefly stated, is as follows:

A. The Federal Trade Commission charged the cement manufacturers with maintaining a combination to restrain competition among themselves in the prices which they charged for portland cement. The complaint alleged an industry-wide agreement to use, and the actual use of, what is known as a multiple basing-point system of pricing, pursuant to which all cement is sold only at delivered prices, which at any given time and place, are invariably identical as to all defendants offering cement for sale. The primary charge was that the combination in restraint of trade constituted an unfair method of competition within the prohibition of the Federal Trade Commission Act. The secondary charge was that, as a result of the combination, prices charged by each defendant to its customers were discriminatory and therefore violated the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act.

B. The Trade Commission issued an order against the cement companies, restraining them from continuing the alleged combination and from using certain specified methods of pricing and marketing cement in connection with any combination or agreement.

C. The issue was then taken to the courts by the defendant cement companies. After a full and complete hearing the Circuit Court of Appeals, Seventh Judicial Circiuit, set aside the Trade Commission's order on the ground that there was insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of combination and conspiracy.

D. The Federal Trade Commission then took the case to the Supreme Court of the United States, which, on April 26, 1948, reversed the order of the court of appeals and directed it to enforce the Trade Commission's order. In doing so, the Supreme Court sustained the Trade Commission's contentions as to jurisdiction; and, in the language of the opinion, the Trade Commission's administrative interpretations were approved. Going beyond the necessary decision of the contested issues, the opinion of the Supreme Court contained a general discussion of the economic theories advanced by the Federal Trade Commission in its argument before the Court. The effect of this discussion, which lawyers commonly call "dicta," was to create confusion throughout American industry as to the extent of the meaning and application of the Court's opinion.

WILL RESTRICT BUSINESS

Mr. Speaker, the results of extended and reliable inquiries show that if the Trade Commission's position is not corrected by the Congress, delivered pricing methods and practices, not only in the cement industry, but in many other industries, that have been established for more than half a century, must be abandoned; manufacturers will be compelled to substitute uniform f. o. b. plant pricing; buyers will have to contend with the complications of freight rates and routings, which many of them are not equipped to handle; sellers will be confined to sales areas in which they have a freight cost advantage over their competitors, and they will be shut out of many markets where they have heretofore been able to offer their goods for sale in competition with manufacturers who have a delivery cost advantage. Many long-established business enterprises will be compelled to restrict their operations and in some cases close down or move from their present location closer to sources of supply of manufactured materials which they reprocess.

As a concrete example of what will happen all over the United States, I cite the two cities of La Salle and Oglesby, my home community, where three cement plants were located many years ago. These three plants produced most of the cement manufactured in Illinois. They served the Chicago area market before the United States Steel Corp. plants in Lake County, Ind., were established. When the steel corporation built these new plants within the Chicago switching district, they acquired a freight cost advantage in delivered cement to the Chicago market. Thereafter, the Oglesby and La Salle plants had to make delivered prices in the Chicago area, such prices reduced to meet the lower delivered price which the steel company was able to make by reason of its delivery cost advantage. As a result, cement buyers in Chicago were able to take advantage of this competition, have their choice between the products of a number of cement manufacturers, and compete with one another on the basis of equality in the price which they pay for cement.

Enforced f. o. b. plant pricing, which the Trade Commission advocates, will drive the La Salle and Oglesby plants from the Chicago area market. In normal times cement consumption outside the Chicago market area would be insufficient to keep even the smallest of the three plants in full operation. Under those conditions whatever cement the plants produced would have to be sold at higher prices because production costs would be higher as a result of the reduced rate of operation. My home town of Oglesby would then take on the semblance of a ghost town, and the workers and the small-town merchants dependent upon the employees of the cement plants would be in the same condition as displaced persons.

Mr. Speaker, I attended Senator CAPEHART'S committee hearings on this Nation-wide pricing problem and listened with a great deal of interest to the testimony presented. I concur fully with the statement of Mr. William Schoenberg, general president of the United Cement, Lime, and Gypsum Workers International Union, when he said:

There is a genuine danger confronting every cement worker as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case.

Concerning this genuine danger Mr. Schoenberg testified as follows:

Cement plants are located mostly in small communities that have grown up around the cement plants. As these cement plants grew up, the workers in them built homes for their families, schools for their children, and churches for worship, which represent all their savings and in which their entire equity in life is tied up. The moving or closing of any of these large cement plants, or placing them upon a part-time production basis, would seriously affect these workers, and would create ghost towns all over America.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Trade Commission has been crusading for many years against these long-established pricing practices, practices in which the producer absorbs the freight. The Commission proposes to substitute f. o. b. plant prices for the delivered prices. Twice the Commission has attempted to persuade Congress to pass legislation to bring about this change, but Congress has refused to do so because the Commission has failed to prove that such a change in pricing practices would be an over-all benefit to the American people. In 1936, when such proposed legislation was before a Senate committee headed by Senator Burton K. Wheeler, the Senator said:

I hope I am not foolish enough to think that I can confine the industries of this country to the particular radius of the locality in which they operate. That is preposterous on its face.

The Commission has now succeeded in getting the Supreme Court to render a decision which, in substance, does what the Congress has twice refused to do. This tendency on the part of the courts of today to usurp the functions of the Congress was very aptly put by the judge in the case of the Aetna Portland Cement Co. against Federal Trade Commission, supra, at page 573, when he said:

In our judgment, the question as to whether the basing-point price system should be declared illegal rests clearly within the legislative domain. We know of no criticism so often and so forcibly directed at courts, particularly Federal courts, as their propensity for usurping the functions of Congress. If this pricing system which Congress has over the years steadfastly refused to declare illegal, although vigorously urged to do so, is now to be outlawed by the courts, it will mark the high tide in judicial usurpation.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts presented at the hearings before the Senate committee, facts that I have tried to present in condensed form, in view of the Nation-wide effect that the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case has had and will have upon half of the Nation's industrial life; in view of the adverse effect the decision is bound to have upon some 16,000,000 American workers; in view of the chaos and confusion that is present today in American industry as a result of this Cement case decision, and in view of the fears that beset American industrial plants and their employees today, as a result of the Federal Trade Commission's order and the Supreme Court's decision upholding the legality of that order, I urge this Congress to take immediate action to clear up and remove the chaos, the confusion, and the fear that is now prevalent throughout American industry as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the Cement case.

## COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 51) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That during the Eighty-first Congress, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce shall be composed of 28 members.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

## CONSPIRACY TO CORRUPT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I have arisen at this time and in this manner in order to address the House on what is really a question of personal privilege. However, my remarks will be devoted to a proceeding which occurred during another Congress, and I am informed that under a technical interpretation of parliamentary procedure I am not entitled now to invoke the right of personal privilege.

On October 22 last, less than 2 weeks before the 1948 national elections, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor held a hearing in my congressional district in San Francisco. The members of the subcommittee present were former Congressman Charles J. Kersten, of Wisconsin, who presided as chairman, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

The announced purpose of this subcommittee hearing was to investigate Communist infiltration into labor unions which serve the industries of the United States. During the hearing a witness, William Patrick Brandhove, accused various labor union officials of being members of the Communist Party. Toward the end of his testimony, Brandhove introduced my name into the record by making the following statement:

We have traced $180,000 of the union's funds that have been spent by the Communist Party for numerous front organizations and in assisting the political campaigns of such individuals as FRANCK R. HAVENNER when he was friendly with them; Oleta O'Conner Yates, county chairman of the Communist Party; Scottie Sneddon, who ran for the legislature in Portland; the National Negro Congress, and organizations too numerous to mention.

Soon after Brandhove completed his testimony, the meeting was adjourned. A few minutes later I learned that my name had been used, and I tried vainly to get in touch with the members of the subcommittee in order to demand that I be given an opportunity to be heard. I was informed that the committee members had left San Francisco, and that no further hearings would be held until after the elections. As a matter of fact, so far as I am aware, no more meetings of this subcommittee were held in San Francisco.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not so much concerned about this clumsy attempt to smear me — because it failed of its purpose at the polls — as I am about the obvious fact that certain unscrupulous politicians in my district have been able repeatedly to use committees of the Congress of the United States as tools in a political conspiracy to besmirch the reputation of a Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I never received any notice that a meeting of this subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor was to be held in the congressional district which I have been five times elected to represent in this House. Even if this had been due merely to an oversight, it would have been a breach of one of the basic rules of congressional courtesy. But, Mr. Speaker, there are abundant reasons to believe that the failure to invite me to attend this subcommittee hearing was far from being an oversight; that, on the contrary, there was a deliberate purpose to keep me in ignorance of the meeting until it was over, so that I would have no opportunity to refute any slanderous testimony against me or indeed to have any reason to suspect that any such slanderous testimony might be given. I might describe this whole proceeding as a deliberate hit and run operation.

Mr. Speaker, I shall now proceed to show that the campaign manager of my opponent for Congress in the recent election knew all about the fact that this congressional subcommittee would hold a hearing in my congressional district shortly before election day, and that he offered financial inducements to William Patrick Brandhove to appear as a witness at this committee hearing, and to give testimony which would link my name with alleged Communists and with organizations which were alleged to be subversive.

I shall also show that the witness William Patrick Brandhove was notified to attend and did attend a conference with the chairman of the subcommittee, former Representative Kersten, of Wisconsin, and certain other individuals, in a San Francisco hotel on the night prior to the subcommittee hearing and that he did then and there discuss in advance with Kersten and the others the program for the hearing.

I now read a copy of an affidavit, dated October 24, 1948, made before a notary public in San Francisco in the presence of witnesses, by William Patrick Brandhove:

OCTOBER 24, 1948.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
*City and County of San Francisco,*
*October 24, 1948:*

In March 1948, I was approached by Warnock Walsh, San Francisco police commissioner, who suggested that I go to see William Mailliard, now a candidate for Congress on the Republican ticket from the Fourth (San Francisco) District. Walsh saw me in person at the E. F. Hutton Co. in San Francisco. At his suggestion, I went to see Mailliard at the office of Mailliard's father, Mailliard and Schmiedell, 320 California Street.

Mailliard suggested that I run for Congress. His reason was so I could tag FRANCK R. HAVENNER, Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District, as a Communist. He wanted me to do this in the same way that I tagged HAVENNER a Communist during the campaign for mayor in San Francisco in 1947 when I ran for the board of supervisors. Mailliard's plan was that when we had thoroughly tagged HAVENNER as a Communist then

I would withdraw in Mailliard's favor and Mailliard would become the candidate. In this way, HAVENNER might be defeated in the primary, leaving the field to Mailliard.

Mailliard suggested I see Don Nicholson, now campaign manager for William Mailliard. I met Nicholson about 2 days after my meeting with Mailliard. Nicholson told me that, in his opinion, it would be foolish for me to run for Congress and suggested I wait until the general election so that I could assist the Mailliard campaign by labeling HAVENNER a red.

After a trip to sea aboard the *Kelso Victory* which lasted approximately 3 months, I returned to San Francisco on June 16, 1948.

WM. PATRICK BRANDHOVE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of October 1948:

R. M. SPILLANE,
*Notary Public in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.*

My commission expires July 17, 1951.

At this time I shall read a copy of another affidavit, also dated October 24, 1948, made by William Patrick Brandhove before a notary public in San Francisco:

In early July, I went to Mailliard's office. We discussed the issue of labeling HAVENNER as a red. Mailliard wanted me to commence working during the month of October for his campaign committee. Mailliard suggested I see Nicholson about this plan.

The next day I saw Nicholson. Nicholson told me to contact him the first of October. Nicholson said the job would be to label HAVENNER as a red. I left the mechanics to him.

I called Don Nicholson in the first week of October. Nicholson said that in his opinion the best thing to do would be to go after HAVENNER in the last week of the campaign.

Nicholson said that if the occasion arose, and I had the opportunity to do it, that I should trace funds of the marine cooks and stewards union to a campaign of HAVENNER—that I should make the charge that marine cooks and stewards funds were used for some HAVENNER campaign.

At that time Nicholson told me the opportunity would arise to tag HAVENNER. He told me the Kersten committee would come here. I knew that. We talked about what the committee was coming for and I told Nicholson that I would take advantage of that opportunity to smear HAVENNER.

On Tuesday, October 19, I had another meeting with Nicholson and he told me that he would provide me with a sound car, which ostensibly would be used to campaign for an assembly candidate and that I should tag Assemblyman George Collins and Congressman HAVENNER as reds in a tour around the city. The sound truck was to be made available on Monday, October 25. Nicholson said he would give me some operating money on October 25 and after the campaign he would give me $1,000.

Nicholson told me that the committee hearing—the Kersten committee—would be my opportunity to take care of HAVENNER in the manner we had discussed.

During my testimony on Friday, October 22, before the Kersten committee at the post-office building at Seventh and Mission Streets in San Francisco, the opportunity presented itself to follow out Nicholson's suggestion. I stated that the Communist Party leadership of the marine cooks' and stewards' union had donated moneys to a Havenner campaign.

By tying Congressman HAVENNER's name to the Communist leadership of the marine cooks and stewards and Oleta O'Conner Yates, a known Communist, I felt that I was doing the job that Nicholson required of me.

But I know that FRANCK HAVENNER is not a Communist and I know that he is opposed to communism. Furthermore, I know that the Communist Party is opposed to the election of FRANCK R. HAVENNER.

Immediately after the hearing at the post office, I telephoned Nicholson. I told him what happened at the hearing. He said I did a good job.

In that conversation I asked him what the next step would be. He said to come in Monday about the sound car and that he planned to use this stuff toward the close of the campaign.

This statement was given by me voluntarily, without any promise of remuneration, and is, to my own knowledge, true and correct.

WM. PATRICK BRANDHOVE.

OCTOBER 24, 1948.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a notary public in and for the city and county of San Francisco, State of California.

R. M. SPILLANE,
*Notary Public in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.*

My commission expires July 17, 1951.

In a supplementary affidavit, also dated October 24, 1948, and sworn to before a notary public in San Francisco, Brandhove described a conference which he had with Congresman Kersten, chairman of the congressional subcommittee; Howard Rushmore, an employee of the Hearst newspapers; and others, at the Mark Hopkins Hotel, San Francisco, on Thursday evening, October 21, the night before the congressional subcommittee hearing was held in San Francisco:

OCTOBER 24, 1948.

I wish to give the details of my meeting at the Mark Hopkins Hotel, San Francisco, with Congressman Kersten and others on Thursday, October 21.

Martin Kaplan telephoned Congressman Kersten at 4:30 p. m. Thursday, October 21, and arranged for myself, Alex Harris, and W. H. Handelsman to meet with Congressman Kersten's committee that evening at 9 p. m. at the Mark Hopkins Hotel. Kaplan told us about these arrangements, then he left for Los Angeles.

The three of us went together to the hotel—myself, Harris, and Handelsman. When I walked into the room on the sixth floor, I was surprised to see Howard Rushmore. I had known him before. Also present were Harper Knowles, Congressman Kersten, and the three of us.

We had been there about 10 minutes when the phone rang. Howard Rushmore answered. He said it was Harry Lundeberg. In a few minutes, Lundeberg came up but Lundeberg was let into an adjoining room by Rushmore.

We carried on a conversation for fully a half hour. The conversation was strictly political. I thought I was to talk over testimony with both Members of Congress. But the Democratic Member was not present.

Kersten started off with a statement about how terrible the waterfront situation was on the west coast. He said if the Republican Party got elected, they'd remedy this situation. Kersten talked about what a good man Dewey was and what he proposed to do about Communists. He came right out and said these committee hearings received Nationwide publicity and showed the American people that the committees of Congress do something about the Communists. I asked him where the Democratic member of the committee was and Kersten said he was out with some friends. Kersten made no bones about the fact that the committee hearings would help the Republican Party in winning this election in November.

WM. PATRICK BRANDHOVE.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 24th day of October 1948:

R. M. SPILLANE,
*Notary Public in and for the City and County of San Francisco, State of California.*

My commission expires July 17, 1951.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time during my service as a Member of Congress that a congressional subcommittee has been used for the purpose of making a surreptitious political smear attack upon my reputation. It was only last June that the House Committee on Un-American Activities, by unanimous vote of all the members present, expunged from the records of that committee all of the perjured testimony concerning me which was taken at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee, held down in Beaumont, Tex., in July 1940. For a detailed account of this amazing proceeding I shall now read a statement placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 18, 1948, by Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, the former and present majority leader of this House:

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to announce that a black blot upon the records of a former committee of the House of Representatives has been officially erased during the present session of Congress. On June 15 the Committee on Un-American Activities, by unanimous vote, ordered that testimony attacking the reputation of Representative FRANCK R. HAVENNER, of California, which was given at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, be expunged from the records of the committee.

Thus a regrettable chapter in the history of the so-called Dies committee has been obliterated by official action.

During the summer of 1940, while the Seventy-sixth Congress was in session and while Representative HAVENNER, a Member of that Congress, was at his post of duty here in the National Capital, he received information that an attempt would be made to give certain derogatory testimony concerning him before the Dies committee. Mr. HAVENNER informs me that he went to see the chairman of the committee, Representative Dies of Texas, and inquired whether there was any truth in this report. Mr. Dies replied that he had heard nothing about it. Mr. HAVENNER then requested Chairman Dies to notify him if anyone attempted to give any testimony concerning him before the committee, in order that he might appear before the committee and exercise his right as a Member of Congress to testify in his own behalf. Dies assured him that this would be done.

Afer talking to the chairman, Mr. HAVENNER visited Representative Dempsey of New Mexico, the ranking member of the Dies committee, and Representative Voorhis of California, also a member of the committee, and made the same request of them. Both also assured Representative HAVENNER that they would notify him immediately if they learned that any testimony concerning him was to be heard by the committee.

Now comes the most amazing feature of this regrettable episode in congressional history.

Not until more than 4 years had elapsed did Representative HAVENNER learn that, shortly after his conversation with Chairman Dies, a meeting of a subcommittee of the Dies committee, which was not public,

was held in Beaumont, Tex. At that meeting, which was attended, as Mr. HAVENNER states, only by one member of the committee, the secretary of the committee, Robert E. Stripling, and the then investigator for the committee, James H. Stedman, a witness named John L. Leech testified under oath that it was his understanding that Representative HAVENNER had been and was at that time a member of the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker, this is not in Mr. McCORMACK's remarks, but the RECORD shows that the Member who attended that secret subcommittee meeting in Beaumont, Tex., was Mr. Dies himself.

I resume quoting from Mr. McCORMACK's remarks:

The first time that Congressman HAVENNER knew that this meeting had been held on July 16, 1940, and that damaging testimony concerning him had been taken under oath, was when political advertisements, containing excerpts from the testimony given by the witness Leech were printed in San Francisco newspapers in October 1944, during Mr. HAVENNER'S campaign for reelection to Congress.

Mr. HAVENNER never received any notification from Mr. Dies or from any other member or employee of the committee, or from anyone else, that this meeting was to be held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and he was never given any opportunity to appear before the committee to refute this damaging testimony.

The record of the subcommittee hearing, which was not a public meeting, held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, was kept on the secret file of the committee for more than 4 years, and was never officially released by the Dies committee for publication.

Just how the supporters of Mr. HAVENNER'S opponent in the 1944 campaign for Congress learned about the secret subcommittee meeting and obtained the record of its proceedings for publication has never been officially disclosed.

When Mr. HAVENNER was returned to Congress in January 1945 he took the floor of the House of Representatives and denounced the testimony of the witness Leech as perjury in its entirety. On that occasion every member of the old Dies committee who was present arose and stated that they had never heard of the secret subcommittee meeting held in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940, and had never known anything about the testimony concerning Mr. HAVENNER until he made his speech on the floor of the House.

When Mr. HAVENNER had concluded his statement many Members of the House of Representatives voluntarily arose and expressed their confidence in Mr. HAVENNER'S patriotism and integrity.

Not a single Member of the House attempted to condone this testimony given in an attempt to smear their fellow Member, and many Members denounced it as an outrageous proceeding.

I participated in the discussion on the floor of the House on that occasion, and in the course of my remarks I said:

"There should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happened to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

"If that testimony was false it means that there was a conspiracy among certain individuals in California to smear the gentleman for a particular purpose. It seems to me to be a matter of interest to each and every Member of the House and I think, speaking as an individual, if anything is done, that the committee should go further and if they do find falsehoods, look into them. They will find falsehoods, for the gentleman has denied that the statements were true. They should investigate the conspiracy because it concerns every Member of this body.

"As far as the gentleman himself is concerned, I have served with him, and I believe I speak the sentiments of every Member of this body. The gentleman may differ with me on this or that question, or differ with some of us who serve with him, but because we differ on public questions does not mean that we are not good Americans; it means simply a difference in our individual conscience and our individual judgment as to the best interests of the country. We may disagree as to judgment, but every man here has a love of America and is actuated by the same high patriotic motives as the gentleman from California, who enjoys the confidence of every Member on each side of the aisle, as far as I know, who serves with him. I rise particularly to make this contribution because the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] enjoys our respect and confidence and because we recognize that he is both honorable and trustworthy."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yeld?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As I understand, this meeting in Texas was a secret or executive meeting. There was no official release of the testimony. Has the gentleman information as to how it got out?

Mr. HAVENNER. I stated in my statement on the House floor 4 years ago, which appears in the RECORD at that time, that I had never been able to find out how it was released.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will say the gentleman is entitled to know how it got out all right.

Mr. HAVENNER. I thank the gentleman.

The conviction which I expressed in these remarks back in 1945 that this whole unsavory affair indicated that there had been a conspiracy to misuse the privileged authority of a congressional committee in order to defame a Member of Congress is strengthened by certain information which Representative HAVENNER has recently given me. He states that with the permission of Chairman THOMAS he talked with the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Stripling, who was present at the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee down in Beaumont, Tex., on July 16, 1940.

Mr. HAVENNER asked the clerk of the committee who had arranged to bring the witness, Leech, whose home was in Los Angeles, out to this secret meeting in Beaumont, Tex., to give perjured testimony against a Member of Congress. The clerk, Mr. Stripling, replied that it was the duty of the investigator, James H. Stedman, to produce witnesses for the committee hearings. When Mr. HAVENNER asked to see Stedman, he was informed that the former investigator had not been employed by the committee for several years. Congressman HAVENNER inquired where Stedman was located, and was informed that after he left the committee he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., in Los Angeles, and was still in the employ of that company.

The president of the Honolulu Oil Co. is Mr. Albert C. Mattei, a gentleman who has been very active in Republican politics in northern California for many years. Congressman HAVENNER states that Mr. Mattei has been the chief financial and political supporter of every Republican candidate for Congress who has run against HAVENNER since our colleague was first elected to this House back in 1936. Mr. Mattei was the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER'S Republican opponent for the Congress in 1940, when the secret subcommittee meeting of the Dies committee was held down in Beaumont, Tex. Mr. Mattei was again the chief financial and political backer of Mr. HAVENNER'S opponent for Congress in 1944, when the defamatory perjured testimony taken at the secret subcommittee down in Beaumont, Tex., first saw the light of day in a political advertisement designed to defeat Mr. HAVENNER as a candidate for Congress.

And now it develops that when former Investigator Stedman, who is reported by the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities to have produced the witness who gave the defamatory perjured testimony against Congressman HAVENNER at the secret subcommittee meeting down in Beaumont, Tex., severed his connection with that committee, he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., of which Mr. Mattei is the president.

I leave this astounding sequence of facts to the judgment of Congress and the American people.

Congressman HAVENNER is one of the ablest Members of the Congress. Sincere, courageous, a fighter for the people, and loyal to the best interests of the people, he is a credit to the people of his district. Congressman HAVENNER is a great American.

It is an interesting and significant fact, Mr. Speaker, that the campaign manager for my opponent in the congressional campaign of 1940, when the perjured testimony against me was taken without my knowledge at a secret meeting of a subcommittee of the old Dies committee down in Beaumont, Tex., was the self-same Don Nicholson, who managed the campaign of my Republican opponent for Congress last year. Nicholson also managed the campaign of my Republican opponent in 1944, when the perjured testimony taken by the Dies subcommittee in 1940 was mysteriously made public for the first time in newspaper advertisements published in San Francisco just before the election of 1944. Prior to that time I had no knowledge that any such testimony had ever been given concerning me, but obviously my opponent's campaign advisers knew all about it and were able to procure its release from the secret files of the Dies committee for use in political advertisements. Now Mr. Nicholson is accused by the witness, William Patrick Brandhove, of having offered him financial inducements to give smearing testimony against me before the Kersten labor subcommittee last October.

Mr. Speaker, on January 11, 1945, I stood in the well of this House and recited, in detail, the astounding story of the secret meeting of the Dies subcommittee held down in Beaumont, Tex., more than 4 years before, when perjury was permitted to be perpetrated against me.

On that occasion, after I had concluded my statement, Members of the House from many sections of the country arose and voluntarily expressed their confidence in my patriotism and loyalty to our Government. All of them declared their abhorrence of the idea that a congressional subcommittee, in secret session, should receive defamatory testimony against a Member of Congress without ever letting him know that he had been attacked or giving him any chance to appear and testify in his own behalf. Among other speakers at that time, the gentleman from Massachusetts,

the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House, made the following statement:

There should be an investigation of the conspiracy to smear a gentleman who was a former Member of Congress, and who is a Member of Congress today. The gentleman from California is the one who happens to be in that position today, but it might have been any other Member of this House.

Four years have elapsed since I arose to a question of personal privilege on the floor of this House and denounced the use of a congressional subcommittee to receive defamatory and perjured testimony against a Member of Congress, who happened to be myself, and permit that vicious testimony to become part of the official committee record, without letting the Member know that he had been attacked or allowing him to appear in his own behalf.

Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the facts which I have presented here today clearly show that I have again been made the target of a political smear attack through the medium of a congressional subcommittee hearing held in my congressional district just prior to the last national elections. I was not notified by the members of the subcommittee that any defamatory testimony had been given concerning me, nor was I extended the opportunity, which is the right of every Member of Congress under similar circumstances, to appear before the subcommittee in my own behalf and endeavor to refute the smear.

So it becomes apparent, Mr. Speaker, that there must be among my political enemies in California and elsewhere certain individuals who have repeatedly conspired to have false and defamatory testimony given before congressional subcommittees concerning a Member of Congress, in this instance myself.

In this connection, the following matters would appear to be worthy of investigation:

First. The former investigator for the Dies committee, James H. Stedman, was, according to Mr. Stripling, the clerk of the Dies committee, responsible for bringing the witness who gave the perjured testimony against me to the secret meeting of the Dies subcommittee in Beaumont, Tex., in 1940. After Investigator Stedman left the Dies committee he was employed by the Honolulu Oil Co., of which Albert C. Mattei is president.

Albert C. Mattei was head of the finance committee for my opponent for Congress in 1940, when the secret Dies subcommittee meeting was held in Beaumont, Tex. Mattei was then and has ever since been closely associated in politics with Don Nicholson, who was the campaign manager for my opponent for Congress in 1940. Mattei has been the chief financial backer and Nicholson the campaign manager for all of my opponents for Congress at general elections in recent years.

Second. The sworn statement by William Patrick Brandhove, the witness who linked my name with the names of alleged Communists at the meeting of the Kersten labor subcommittee in San Francisco, that Don Nicholson promised to pay him $1,000 if he would tag me as a Red during the recent congressional campaign, and that Nicholson repeatedly told him that a hearing of the Kersten subcommittee would provide the opportunity to do this.

Third. The presence of Howard Rushmore, an employee of the Hearst newspapers, at the conference which Brandhove and other prospective witnesses had with Chairman KERSTEN and others on the evening before the congressional subcommittee hearing was held in San Francisco. At about this time and, indeed, on numerous occasions during my campaign for reelection to Congress last year, the San Francisco Examiner, a Hearst newspaper, published various editorial attacks upon me, one of which contained the following statement:

A vote for Havenner is a vote for Bridges and the Kremlin.

It was not until after the election was over that the Examiner published a front page retraction of this editorial. I have filed suit for libel against the San Francisco Examiner, and intend to press that suit to a final conclusion.

It may have been only a coincidence, but certainly a very peculiar one, that the first knowledge I ever had of the perjured testimony which was given against me at the secret Dies subcommittee hearing held in Beaumont, Tex., in 1940, was received when I read a political advertisement, containing excerpts from that perjured testimony, in the San Francisco Examiner during the latter part of October 1944, just prior to the congressional elections of that year.

Mr. Speaker, the law enforcement agencies in various parts of this Nation have been extremely vigilant in recent years to protect the integrity of basketball, football, and baseball games, boxing bouts, and other sporting events against corruption by gambling interests. Heavy penalties have been imposed upon individuals who offered bribes to players who participated in those games. It would seem that the integrity of congressional procedure ought to be just as important to the American people as the integrity of professional sporting events, and that an offer of a bribe to a witness to give defamatory testimony before a committee of Congress should rank, in the eyes of the law, as of at least equal importance with an attempt to corrupt a professional athlete.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that I have not occupied the time of this House today for the purpose of seeking personal vindication through any action that this body may see fit to take. The voters of my district have demonstrated their contempt for the cowardly smear attacks that have been made upon me, and have expressed their confidence in me by repeatedly reelecting me to represent them in the Congress of the United States.

But, Mr. Speaker, the evidence and the record which I have placed before you today make it unmistakably apparent that there has been a continuing conspiracy among my political enemies to corrupt the integrity of congressional committees through the use of bribery and perjury. The attacks which have been made upon me by these vile methods, and which were designed to besmirch my name, to destroy my reputation, and to bring humiliation and shame upon my loved ones could have been made upon any other elective public official. What has happened to me, my colleagues, might happen to any one of you if you had the misfortune to incur the political enmity of individuals so devoid of human honor and decency as the authors of these foul attacks.

I am not a revengeful person. While I abhor the conduct of these conspirators, I might be content to leave them alone with their guilty consciences, but for the fact that over a period of nearly a decade these same persons have repeatedly plotted to undermine and break down a thing which ought to be sacred and inviolate—the integrity of the Congress of the United States.

Men have been imprisoned for contempt of Congress because they refused to answer questions put to them in committee hearings. Surely the measure of contempt is vastly greater when men bribe witnesses to give false, slanderous, and perjured testimony before congressional committees.

Having been the victim on several occasions of testimony of this nature, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge that a select committee be appointed, or that a standing committee of the House be authorized, to investigate this conspiracy to produce false, slanderous, and perjured testimony at hearings of congressional committees or subcommittees, and to report to the House its recommendations for legislative or other action to prevent similar corruption of committee proceedings in the future.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman about the appointment of the committee to investigate attempts to corrupt committees of Congress. I ask whether the gentleman agrees with me that when one Member of Congress goes out publicly and charges another Member with treason, whether he ought to be investigated on that, or is it just when my ox is gored?

Mr. HAVENNER. I would say to the gentleman that in my opinion, the editorial which I quoted from the San Francisco Examiner by inference and by direct implication accused me of treason.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman has not yet answered my question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HAVENNER. I am seeking a remedy for any attacks of this kind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is attacks on the Congress?

Mr. HAVENNER. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Or on Members of Congress?

Mr. HAVENNER. I am not seeking personal vindication.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand that.

Mr. HAVENNER. I would like to see the rules amended so that we may be protected against this sort of thing in the future.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand, the gentleman is taking care of his part of it. You are talking about Congress generally.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. FISHER. The gentleman has mentioned my name as a member of the subcommittee. I would like to say to the gentleman that until this morning I did not know his name had been mentioned in the hearings. I recall the testimony of the witness Brandhove, but the reference to the gentleman who is now addressing the House did not catch my attention and I did not know until this morning that he had been referred to.

With regard to the San Francisco hearings, I point out that those hearings were held by the subcommittee after hearings had been held in Alaska during the west coast shipping strike, with which the gentleman is familiar. Alaska was paralyzed from the strike, and the subcommittee had strong evidence indicating that it was a Communist-inspired strike, directed by Harry Bridges. It was, therefore, very proper and pertinent to our inquiry that hearings be held in San Francisco.

The gentleman has seen fit to refer to my colleague Mr. Kersten, of Wisconsin, who is not here to answer the charges that are being directed at him. I want to make it plain that it was my idea, not his, that we stop over in San Francisco for those hearings. The hearing there was highly necessary and as the record will disclose was conducted fairly and in accordance with the best rules of procedure. It was objected to, of course, by the Communists, and they picketed the courthouse 700 strong during the brief hearings.

The reason why the hearing was concluded rather suddenly, as the gentleman has pointed out, was because of the absence of witnesses. Subpenas were issued for 16 witnesses, including Bridges, but they went into hiding, all but three, and could not be found by the United States marshal's office. I am certain that if the gentleman had gotten in touch with either Mr. Kersten or myself, or had gotten word to us, the hearings would have been reopened and the gentleman would have been heard. We were there at the hotel overnight after the hearings were concluded, and up to noon the following day, but the gentleman did not contact us.

I will say further to the gentleman, since he has made a rather severe attack upon Mr. Kersten, who is not here to answer for himself, that my dealings with Mr. Kersten on that subcommittee convinced me that he is eminently fair and that he is not the type of man who would engage in any conspiracy to smear any man.

Mr. HAVENNER. I would like to say to the gentleman that I tried to make it plain that his name has not been used in this affidavit in any way, except that he was present at the meeting of the subcommittee, but did not attend this conference which Mr. Kersten did attend on the evening prior to the meeting.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. The gentleman must realize that the Committee on Education and Labor in the last session of the Congress had $75,000 and the gentleman remembers how some of the Members rose on this floor and said, "Where are we going to get the money? Where are we going to get the money?" Yet they were able to cover this country from coast to coast, from east to west, from north to south, doing one-man grand jury investigations. We in Michigan are used to that. When a judge is on the other side of the fence he can force a witness to say "Yes," and when he says "No," he gives him 30 days for perjury.

Mr. HAVENNER. I will say to the gentleman that the continuing experience I have had with smear attacks of this same nature, some in the past even more severe and more damaging than this, have convinced me that there is a conspiracy to corrupt congressional committees, in my part of the country, at least. I would like to see an investigation made to find out who is responsible for this corruption. I repeat I am not seeking any personal vindication here.

Mr. LESINSKI. Does the gentleman remember this great Hollywood investigation? It cost a good many thousands of dollars. Has a report been made on it yet? I made that trip at my own expense, and it was a fluke, the same as many investigations.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. Gladly.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I regret very much that the former Representative from the Fifth District of Wisconsin was responsible for this latest attempt to smear the very distinguished gentleman from California, but I am not surprised that it happened.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker; a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman is going to attack a former Member of the House who is not here, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAVENNER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am well acquainted with the situation that confronts the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER]. It is one that every one of us should feel keenly about. The gentleman from California is one of the most honorable Members of this House. We do not have to call one another names because we do not agree. I never impugn the honesty of any of my colleagues. I may disagree with their judgment, that is a right I have, but I do not impugn the honesty of their motives. The gentleman from California has been subjected locally in California to most unfortunate situations. Several years ago it was with local individuals, and last fall again with local individuals.

The very fact he was reelected on both occasions shows the confidence the people have in him. I know how I would feel if in my district someone or a group entered into continual conspiracies in an effort to destroy me through undermining my character and smearing my reputation. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is completely justified in giving to the House the affidavit that he has received, which is convincing evidence that locally in his city and district there are some individuals who engage in a continuing conspiracy against him.

A group of men trying to beat a candidate is one thing, that is all right, but to smear and destroy the reputation of someone is something entirely different.

I am glad to testify today, whatever consolation it might bring to the gentleman from California, although it is not necessary, and to his dear ones who are the people who keenly suffer, and to the people of his constituency, that the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is one of the most sincere Members of the House of Representatives, keenly devoted to his duty and loyal to his people. He is one of the finest Americans that I have ever met.

## SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRIEST). Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks I might insert two resolutions I have presented, and also a letter I have mailed to the chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is in the resolution? May we see them first?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be glad to answer the gentleman. The first one is to appoint a select committee and the second resolution is for the purpose of outlining investigating committee procedure, aimed at no particular committee. It has nothing directly to do with Mr. HAVENNER'S case that was just presented. The resolution outlines a code of procedure which I think would be well for any committee to use and which most committees do use in the conduct of their hearings and in the investigation of their witnesses.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is not asking for a vote on that today?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

## A SELECT COMMITTEE SHOULD BE FORMED FOR THE PURPOSE OF STUDYING COMMITTEE PROCEDURE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Members of the House have just listened to a carefully prepared and well-documented speech by my colleague from California, the Honorable FRANCK HAVENNER. There is an old saying which tells us that lightning never strikes twice in the same place, but the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] has proved to

this House that political lightning does not follow the afore-mentioned rule.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] has been the victim of the abusive, vicious, and irresponsible use of the power of a congressional committee twice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not in order in attacking the action of committees of the House. If I get the statement correctly that is what he is doing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that the gentleman would be going quite far afield if he said a Member of the House would not have the right to criticize the actions of a committee of the House. The gentleman from California will proceed in order.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the first abuse was committed by the former chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Martin Dies, of Texas. Ex-Congressman Dies was a Democrat, and this is important because our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], was and is a Democrat. Being a Democrat during the regime of a Democratic administration did not protect the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] from the abuse of power by a congressional committee.

In the first instance, an irresponsible statement made before a one-man subcommittee was released at the opportune time to Mr. HAVENNER'S political opponent and to an antagonistic newspaper for the sole purpose of smearing the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] and causing his political defeat.

It is very interesting to note how the same pattern was followed in the second instance of abuse. Once again we see a subcommittee which ostensibly had two members, former Congressman Charles J. Kersten, the Republican chairman of the subcommittee, and a present Congressman, our colleague, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. O. C. FISHER, a Democrat. The evidence presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] shows, I understand, that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] was not present at the hearings of the subcommittee when the irresponsible and libelous testimony of Mr. Brandhove was given. So for all practical functioning purposes, we have a one-man subcommittee operating again.

We also have the same pattern followed by the release to the antagonistic newspaper, and undoubtedly to Mr. HAVENNER'S political opponent, of the character-assassinating, libelous testimony of a confessed professional witness. This release occurred just before election day at a time when it was planned, as the testimony shows, it would be the most damaging to the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER].

I point out again that this pattern of abuse by a congressional committee or subcommittee does not depend on political or partisan affiliation. It has no allegiance to party. It is something completely segregated from the struggle for party advantage, although it can and has been used occasionally in a partisan manner.

The abuse of committee power goes far deeper than partisanship, both in its methods and in its results. It has not been confined to a single committee or subcommittee either. Various committees and subcommittees have abused the tremendous power which of necessity must be deposited in the legislative body. I am not today concerned with the academic question—although it is important—of reducing the investigative powers of a committee of Congress. I realize that great responsibility is placed in the Congress, and that great power is necessary to discharge that responsibility.

But, we, as Members of Congress, cannot escape our responsibility as representatives of the American electorate, by condoning, excusing, or ignoring flagrant abuses of this great power. The American people are judging the institution of Congress, I am sorry to say, not by our constructive accomplishments, but by the abusive procedures of certain congressional committees and by the reprehensible conduct of certain individuals who too often, in my opinion, hunt the headlines of the sensational press.

In this period of world chaos, when the democratic processes are on trial throughout the world, we cannot afford the luxury of indifference to public opinion. Public opinion is powerful. If the public loses confidence in Congress as a democratic institution, it will be but a matter of time until the institution itself will fall. Therefore, when we find thoughtful people, great national periodicals, great nationally distributed newspapers, and even Presidents of the United States condemning the procedures of certain congressional committees, it is time for us to scrutinize carefully the cause of such criticism.

Have we been criticized without cause?

Has the conduct of our committees been fair and in accordance with recognized principles of American fair play and justice?

Have congressional committees conducted their investigations and hearings in conformity with the recognized principles of American jurisprudence?

Have our congressional committees practiced in their hearings the democratic processes guaranteed to our citizens by the Bill of Rights?

I believe the answer to these questions is very important. I believe that it goes beyond the personalities of those who have been guilty of abuse of power, and beyond the personal fortunes of those who have been victims of the abuse.

I share with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], the indignation which he rightfully feels at being the target for abuse by a congressional subcommittee, not once, but twice. I know that he will be vindicated for the second time by proper action on the part of his colleagues in Congress. The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is one of our most respected and valuable Members. The California congressional delegation is proud of his record of patriotic service to the people of California during a long life of valuable public service. The people of San Francisco have expressed their confidence in him by electing him five times to the Congress of the United States. He also served his State many years on the highly important California railroad commission.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] is highly capable of fighting his own battles and his colleagues who rise with him today in protest do so voluntarily because we share his indignation, not because he needs our assistance.

But, as I said before, the abuse of congressional committee power goes beyond the personality of the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER], Mr. Kersten, or any other individual.

And at this point I want to say a word for the unnumbered American citizens, prominent and obscure, who do not have the congressional rostrum to present their defense against the abuses they have suffered. Abuses they have suffered at the hands of men who thought more of tomorrow's headlines than they did of today's civil rights.

These are the people who have felt the whiplash of vicious newspaper releases. These are the victims of unfounded and irresponsible testimony, yes, and even printed committee reports, all of which tended to degrade and humiliate them in the eyes of their professional colleagues, their friends, and their loved ones.

Many of these people suffered character assassination without recourse. Safe behind congressional immunity, which is granted Members of Congress and witnesses before congressional committees, these people read with a feeling of horror that their patriotism, their loyalty to their Nation, their integrity as citizens had been attacked. Many of them tried to fight back. They asked for the right to answer the malicious charges. They asked for the right to refute the derogatory testimony. They wanted the opportunity to expose their accusers by cross-questioning. But these people were denied the simple American rights we give a chicken thief before a police court. They cannot rise on the floor of the House of Representatives as the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] has done and defend their good name.

That is why I arise today, as I have arisen many times before, to plead for those who have been denied the opportunity of pleading for themselves.

Not only do I plead the cause of the victims of congressional committee procedure abuse but I plead the cause of the Congress of the United States before the bar of public opinion. I plead the cause of democracy, which is on trial throughout our beloved country and the world.

Let us prove to American citizens that their rights are God-given and irrevocable, that their rights as witnesses before congressional committees are just as sacred as they are before a police-court judge.

Let us prove to them that the Congress of the United States can correct its

own procedures. Let us prove to them that the dignity and respect which most of the committees of Congress enjoy and deserve shall not be lost because of certain abuses which have been practiced by a very few.

How can we do this?

I believe the subject needs careful study. I know that long-standing precedents and procedures deserve careful consideration before alteration. I do not believe drastic procedural change or curtailment of useful powers is necessary. I do believe that fair procedures which are now used voluntarily by the great majority of congressional committees should be made obligatory on all committees.

Certainly we can require in the interest of the dignity and reputation of Congress before the American bar of public opinion that decent, fair procedures shall be the rule for all committees. A rule now followed by the majority of the congressional committees voluntarily because of its innate decency and justice cannot be objectionable if it be made obligatory on those individuals, committees, or subcommittees which have failed to act wisely and according to the best traditions of American jurisprudence.

Many of my colleagues have joined me by introducing resolutions for the purpose of setting up fair rules for conduct of committee hearings and examination of witnesses. Our majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK; Mrs. DOUGLAS, of California; Mr. CARROLL, of Colorado; Mr. BIEMILLER, of Wisconsin; and others have shown their concern by introducing resolutions on this subject.

I have introduced three resolutions outlining different approaches to the committee procedure problem. Their numbers are H. R. 74, H. R. 191, and House Concurrent Resolution 4. They are similar to the resolutions introduced by my afore-mentioned colleagues, and also similar in some instances to resolutions introduced for the same purpose in the other body.

As it is obvious that there are several approaches to this timely and important problem, I introduced on opening day, January 3, 1949, a resolution, House Resolution 16, which seeks to create a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of committee procedure as used by committees of the House of Representatives. This select committee would be empowered to hold hearings and recommend by an early date a code of fair conduct under which all committees of the House would proceed.

Upon the completion of the committee's hearings and upon receipt of its recommendations, the House would have the opportunity to evaluate its report and could subsequently take such action as it might deem advisable.

I believe this is the right way to solve this problem. Such action would, in my opinion, mean a great and cleansing step forward in the eyes of our people and in the eyes of the world.

I have written a letter to the great Committee on Rules asking for the privilege of presenting my case for a rule.

I sincerely hope that I shall have the support of every Member of this House, both Republicans and Democrats.

Democracy is challenged in many places, and wherever democracy can be strengthened, that is where we should stand and fight without partisanship, whether it be on the battlefield or in the legislative Halls of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, D. C., January 15, 1949.*

Hon. ADOLPH J. SABATH,
*Chairman of the Committee on Rules,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR COLLEAGUE: On opening day I introduced House Resolution 16 which seeks to create a select committee for the purpose of studying House committee procedure and recommending to the House a code of fair conduct to be observed by all committees.

I respectfully request that I be given an opportunity to appear before your committee for the purpose of requesting a rule for the consideration of House Resolution 16.

Sincerely yours,

CHET HOLIFIELD,
*Member of Congress.*

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman that it is necessary to have these rules, all right, but it does seem to me that the majority of the Members of Congress or all the Members of Congress ought to be able and ought to have good sense enough to hold hearings that are in accord with fair play.

You speak about smearing. What about these people on the outside—columnists, and radio commentators, and newspapers? I recall very distinctly that I introduced a bill 2 years ago, when the gentleman's party was in power, trying to give the right to those who were slandered to bring suit in the Federal district where they lived. I could not get that through.

Now you are talking about smearing. What about this attack being made today on Mr. Kersten, a former Member, who is not here. Is that smearing, or is it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize that the gentleman has already had time—1 hour—on a question of personal privilege, I believe, on this particular matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will get another one next week.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. And I know that the gentleman can take care of his own fortunes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have no fault to find with our committee; have you?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have been waiting here for an hour or two for a Democratic caucus. If we are going to carry on speeches of this kind indefinitely, we ought to know it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are other special orders.

Mr. RANKIN. We have more special orders, and if we are going to keep this up, perhaps we ought to call off the caucus, and hold it tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. There are two more special orders.

Mr. RANKIN. I have no objection to the request of the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Mississippi, as well as the courtesy of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], in bringing these matters up. I do not intend to take the time of the House unduly. I would say that my concern today is to bring before the House a method of controlling its own procedures. We have no direct control over outside agencies, such as newspapers and other people. But we do have control of the procedure of committees of the House of Representatives, and my attempt is to bring before a properly constituted select committee a study so that judicious determination might be made as to whether committee procedure rules would be advantageous to the House in establishing and maintaining the dignity of the House of Representatives. We should not proceed as we have in the past with certain individuals, certain subcommittees and committees using measures which, in my opinion, have brought disrepute and loss of dignity to the Congress.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WALSH (at the request of Mr. MADDEN), for 3 days, on account of sickness in family.

To Mr. LEFEVRE (at the request of Mr. COLE of New York), for January 17, on account of absence from city on official business.

To Mr. POWELL (at the request of Mr. MULTER), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. SHORT (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), on account of attending funeral in district.

## SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

## SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. If we are going to have to listen to this for 30 minutes more, the other Members ought to come here and share this with us.

Mr. MULTER. If the gentleman will withdraw his point of order, I assure him I will keep my remarks within 12 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. No. I am not going to withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] There is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 18, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

72. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a report of the United States Maritime Commission on the activities and transactions of the Maritime Commission under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, October 1 through December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

73. A letter from the Assistant Director, Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to repeal a provision of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 requiring certain expenditures in the fiscal year 1949 to be considered as expended during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

74. A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

75. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the internal security of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

76. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules of records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

77. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

78. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of Defense Homes Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (H. Doc. No. 41); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

79. A letter from the Administrator, United States Department of Labor, Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division, transmitting the annual report of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor, for the year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

80. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," approved June 29, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

81. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting the annual report of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. to the Congress of the United States for the year 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

82. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson, a city letter carrier in the post office at Newton, Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

83. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter by the Acting Secretary of the Navy recommending the enactment of a proposed draft of a bill to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

84. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

85. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

86. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

87. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

---

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 85. A joint resolution to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1511. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HUBER (by request):

H. R. 1512. A bill to authorize the appointment of doctors of chiropractic in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 1513. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, chapter 120, first session, commonly known as the Taft-Hartley law; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1514. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 1515. A bill to provide for the gradual elimination of salmon traps in the waters of Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1516. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1948, so as to provide annual automatic within-grade promotions for hourly employees of the custodial service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1517. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 1518. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to authorize payment of benefits in certain cases to individuals otherwise entitled to such benefits who have failed to apply therefor within the prescribed time limits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 1519. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1520. A bill to amend section 2800 (d) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1521. A bill to provide a voluntary participation annuity plan for widows, minor children, and certain named beneficiaries of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1522. A bill to amend the act of August 29, 1916, as amended, so as to require the lessee of certain public property to pay State, Territorial, county, municipal, or local taxes thereon; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1523. A bill to provide dental treatment for dependents of naval and Marine Corps personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1524. A bill to amend section 25 (b) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1525. A bill for the erection of a public building at Adel, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1526. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefit payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1527. A bill to amend title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights), pertaining to loans for the purchase or construction of homes, farms, and business property, so as to provide more adequate and effective farm-loan benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1528. A bill for the erection of a public building at Ames (College Station), Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1529. A bill for the erection of a public building at West Des Moines, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1530. A bill to grant retirement with pay to certain emergency officers of World War I seriously disabled from gunshot wounds incurred in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1531. A bill for the erection of a public building at Story City, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1532. A bill for the erection of a public building at Indianola, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1533. A bill to authorize the incorporation of National Association, Rainbow Division Veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1534. A bill to relieve persons in the military service from refunding to the United States the amount of life-insurance premiums, and interest thereon, guaranteed under the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1535. A bill to appropriate $800,000 for the construction of a building at Knoxville, Iowa; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 1536. A bill for the erection of a public building at Woodward, Iowa, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1537. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the several States over offenses committed by or against Indians within Indian country; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1538. A bill to prohibit utilization of the facilities of interstate or foreign commerce in connection with desertion or abandonment of minor children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1539. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1540. A bill to repeal the tax on gasoline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GORDON:

H. R. 1541. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new postal building to house the Wicker Park postal station in Chicago, Ill., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 1542. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1543. A bill relating to assignments of claims against the United States for consideration for performance of personal services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1544. A bill to amend section 251 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to exempt from taxation certain income earned by employees at naval and air bases leased from foreign countries for periods of 25 years or more; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1545. A bill to provide that the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may by regulation eliminate the requirement that certain tax and information returns shall be made under oath; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1546. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in commemoration of the Bowne house, located in Flushing, Queens County, N. Y., which Bowne house was dedicated as a national shrine to religious freedom and tolerance on October 10, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1547. A bill to exempt posts or organizations of war veterans from the tax imposed on billiard and pool tables; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1548. A bill to provide for equitable adjustment of the insurance status of certain members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1549. A bill to provide for the settlement of certain parts of Alaska by war veterans; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 1550. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 1551. A bill to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary and secondary school facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1552. A bill relating to the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to impose consumer-credit controls with respect to automobiles; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 1553. A bill providing tax incentive for the creation of additional farm storage facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 1554. A bill making the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November in every even-numbered year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1555. A bill to authorize the shipment of grade A milk into the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 1556. A bill to extend the educational benefits of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 to the eldest children of veterans of World War II where the veterans have received no educational benefits under such act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 1557. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. R. 1558. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in more adequately financing their system of public education and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and public secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1559. A bill to amend section 23 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1560. A bill to establish and maintain in the Bureau of Land Management a record of title to all lands held by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 1561. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commission, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1562. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1563. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern and southern districts of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 1564. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and the tax on transportation of property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1565. A bill relating to the authority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to impose consumer-credit controls with respect to automobiles; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1566. A bill to protect the public with respect to practitioners before administrative agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1567. A bill to provide for an appropriation of $150,000 with which to continue the survey of the old Indian trail known as the Natchez Trace through Louisiana and Texas, with a view of constructing a national road on this route to be known as the Natchez Trace Parkway; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 1568. A bill to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 1569. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. R. 1570. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through elementary and secondary schools, for the national security and general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1571. A bill providing for compensation at the rate of $5 per day for members of local boards under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1572. A bill to provide compensation for excess hours of work by certain employees of the United States Employment Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1573. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis and related neurological diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1574. A bill to grant permanent and total disability ratings to veterans suffering from severe industrial inadaptability as a result of war service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1575. A bill to provide for the continuance of the farm-labor supply program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1576. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Rayne, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1577. A bill to authorize the construction of a research laboratory for the Quartermaster Corps, United States Army, at or in the vicinity of Boston, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 1578. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1579. A bill to amend the Printing Act of January 12, 1895, as amended, with respect to the printing of extra copies of congressional hearings and other documents; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1580. A bill to extend the time for filing valid application for disabled emergency officers' retirement benefits, to grant retirement pay to World War emergency officers who now have or who may later establish a 30 percent or more service-connected permanent disability for this and/or other purpose; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1581. A bill for the acquisition of a site and erection of a post office at Roodhouse, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 1582. A bill to authorize transfer of a percentage of tax collections from individual and corporate income taxes to the States and Territories for use for educational purposes only, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 1583. A bill for the acquisition of a site and the erection of a post office at Winchester, Ill., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. WOODHOUSE:

H. R. 1584. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. J. Res. 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special commemorative stamp to mark the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Dr. Edward Livingston Trudeau; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. J. Res. 94. Joint resolution making provisions for the refund of the processing tax on hogs marketed for slaughter by the raisers and producers who in fact bore all or part of the burden of such tax; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 95. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. J. Res. 96. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to call a conference for the revision and strengthening of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to investigate Federal Government competition with private business; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relative to the legislative budget; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution authorizing a reprint of supplement III (country studies A, B, and C) of the report of the Subcommittee on National and International Movements of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, entitled "The Strategy and Tactics of World Communism," for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. Res. 52. Resolution to amend paragraph (q) of rule XI of the rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 53. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Rules to investigate a contract entered into and a manuscript prepared by Robert E. Stripling; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 54. Resolution to amend paragraph (2) (c) of rule XI of the rules of the House (relating to the Committee on Rules) to read as it read during the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

---

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, calling attention to Assembly Joint Resolution 4, relative to shipbuilding on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with respect to a national compulsory sickness insurance program; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 1585. A bill for the relief of Leilah begum Alaoui Mullin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1586. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Trautwein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1587. A bill for the relief of Abel V. Del Vecchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 1588. A bill for the relief of Istvan Kovacs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1589. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Abraham J. Ehrlich; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 1590. A bill for the relief of Joe Tortolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Ohio:

H. R. 1591. A bill for the relief of Bram B. Tellekamp; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 1592. A bill for the relief of Howard R. Amundsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1593. A bill for the relief of 84 Estonians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1594. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Homer G. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1595. A bill for the relief of Alma Wharff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1596. A bill providing for the payment of the findings reported by the Court of Claims in favor of certain engineers, firemen, mechanics, and laborers for extra time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Hal W. Cline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 1598. A bill for the relief of D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc., and Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1599. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1600. A bill for the relief of Gustav Schilbred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. R. 1601. A bill for the relief of the Lafayette Brewery, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1603. A bill for the relief of Walter P. Gardner, sole surviving trustee of the property of the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1604. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Breinig Bros., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART (by request):

H. R. 1605. A bill for the relief of Universal Steamship Co. for losses sustained due to the interruption of a voyage of the American schooner *Ninette M. Porcelle*, by reason of a Presidential proclamation, effective September 28, 1917, forbidding sailing vessels from entering the war zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1606. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1607. A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers*, destroyed by a German raider during the World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1608. A bill for the relief of Clinton Construction Co. and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 1609. A bill for the relief of Arne Gordon Westly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1610. A bill for the relief of Nicholas DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1611. A bill for the relief of Walter E. Miller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1612. A bill for the relief of Manley O. Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1613. A bill for the relief of Nicolae N. Ionnitiu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1614. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria N. Laborde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1615. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zumrut Zelveian, Haig Zelveian, and Mary Zelveian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1616. A bill for the relief of S. L. Ayres & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1617. A bill for the relief of Howard Samuel Warnock; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1618. A bill for the relief of Kenneth J. MacKenzie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1619. A bill for the relief of St. Elizabeth Hospital, Yakima, Wash., and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1620. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Bridge and Leslie E. Ensign; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1621. A bill for the relief of Erzsebet Vizer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1622. A bill for the relief of Peter Pal Vizer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1623. A bill for the relief of Jozsef Vizer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1624. A bill for the relief of Harris A. Bakken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1625. A bill for the relief of Christine Kono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 1626. A bill for the relief of Mrs. A. H. Hill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1627. A bill for the relief of Filip Nicola Lazarevich; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 1628. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Winfred DeCoteau a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 1630. A bill for the relief of George Scheer and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1631. A bill for the relief of John J. O'Mara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1632. A bill for the relief of Rita V. L. Flaherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. R. 1633. A bill for the relief of Arthur J. McGurn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 1634. A bill for the relief of Joaquim Madiera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1635. A bill for the relief of Stephan Karpatjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1636. A bill for the relief of Gaetanina Lombardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.:

H. R. 1637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Dora Fruman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 1638. A bill to pay Warren P. Hoover for services rendered the Army of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey Horticultural Society, urging reversal of the decision of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Harwood case and the maximum amount of exemption for agricultural commodities under section 203 (B) (6) of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7. Also, petition of North Hudson Chapter, No. 1, of the American Veterans Committee, West New York, N. J., urging the withholding of full recognition to Franco Spain and denying it membership in the United Nations, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8. By the SPEAKER: Petition of James B. Pettit, mayor, Pomona, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to financial aid and assistance for agriculturists due to the freeze which has caused great destruction and placed them in a serious position financially; to the Committee on Agriculture.

9. Also, petition of James H. Schaffner, through his attorney, Jay T. Barnsdall, Jr., Buffalo, N. Y., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to redress of a grievance; asking for the investigation of the conditions of all prison camps; investigation of the general court martial; complete and public investigation of all illegal and unlawful sentences of all courts martial held against members of the armed forces during World War II; that proper and immediate medical attendance be provided for James H. Schaffner, petitioner, and all other persons suffering from the effects of illegal imprisonment and starvation by the United States Army; that suitable provision be made for the support of the petitioner and the members of his family, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

10. Also, petition of parent-teachers association, rural zone, Aguadilla, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation to provide Federal aid to education for Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

11. Also, petition of president, the National Defense League of America, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the national defense of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

---

# SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, once again we offer unto Thee our grateful thanks for Thy mercy that cared for us during the night and brought us safely to this hour.

Today is the tomorrow we worried about yesterday, and we see how foolish our anxiety was.

Teach us to trust Thee more completely and to seek Thy help in all that we have to do, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 17, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think that we should have a quorum, and I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Miller |
| Anderson | Hill | Millikin |
| Baldwin | Hoey | Morse |
| Barkley | Holland | Mundt |
| Brewster | Humphrey | Murray |
| Bricker | Hunt | Myers |
| Bridges | Ives | Neely |
| Broughton | Jenner | O'Conor |
| Butler | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Byrd | Johnson, Tex. | Pepper |
| Cain | Johnston, S. C. | Reed |
| Capehart | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Chapman | Kem | Russell |
| Chavez | Kerr | Saltonstall |
| Connally | Kilgore | Schoeppel |
| Cordon | Knowland | Smith, Maine |
| Donnell | Langer | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Lodge | Sparkman |
| Downey | Long | Stennis |
| Eastland | Lucas | Taft |
| Ecton | McCarran | Taylor |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Flanders | McFarland | Thye |
| Fulbright | McGrath | Tobey |
| George | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Gillette | McMahon | Watkins |
| Green | Magnuson | Wherry |
| Gurney | Malone | Wiley |
| Hayden | Martin | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Maybank | Young |

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware, and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard, as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The Chair desires to make an announcement. Under the rules of the Senate speeches can be made during the consideration of the morning business only by unanimous consent. The Chair hopes Senators will remember the rule and adhere to it.

RESIGNATION BY SENATOR BARKLEY AS A SENATOR OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a copy of a letter written by me to the Governor of Kentucky, which I ask that the clerk may read for the information of the Senate and for the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1949.

Hon. EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
*Governor of Kentucky,*
*Frankfort, Ky.*

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In view of my election as Vice President of the United States for the term beginning January 20, 1949, I hereby tender my resignation as Senator of the United States from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to take effect at midnight on January 19, 1949.

Very sincerely yours,

ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will lie on the table.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF ROBERT E. LEE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, to those of us who live in Lexington, Va., January 19 is an important anniversary. It is the birthday of that great, stalwart educator, civic leader, and Christian gentleman, Robert E. Lee.

In commemoration of the one hundred and forty-second anniversary of the birthday of Gen. Robert E. Lee, the District of Columbia Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy will hold a memorial service at the statue of General Lee in Statuary Hall tomorrow forenoon, January 19, at 11 o'clock. Mrs. Ferguson Cary, of Alexandria, Va., the national historian general, will make the presentation of the wreath in behalf of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. Other wreaths will be presented by the Virginia State Society and the Sons of Confederate Veterans. Miss Liza Ellen Carpenter, president of the District of Columbia Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, will preside.

All Members of the Senate are invited to be present. There will be no speeches.

MESSAGE FROM HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 17th instant,

The Secretary of the Senate received the following message from the House of Representatives:

That the House had passed, without amendment, the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

That the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on January 17, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY STATE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by the Department of State under the Federal Tort Claims Act for the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES OF FOREIGN ECONOMIC ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS PROGRAM

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a summary (designated as pt. I) of the first annual report of that Commission on the operation of the trade agreements program for the period June 1934 to April 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT ON CLAIMS PAID BY MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, that no relief was granted claimants under the provisions of Public Law 657 during the quarter ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

Mr. LANGER presented a concurrent resolution of the legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota pertaining to the ratification of a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution A

Ratification proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

Whereas the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session, begun and held at the city of Washington on Friday the 3d day of January 1947, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, made and passed a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States of America, which joint resolution was duly ratified by Congress and approved by the President of the United States, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

*"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein)*, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SEC. 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress": Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That the said foregoing proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America be, and the same is, hereby ratified by the legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota; and be it further

*Resolved*, That certified copies of this Concurrent Resolution be forwarded by the Governor of this State to the Secretary of State for the United States of America at Washington, D. C., and to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the National Congress.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. MCMAHON) introduced Senate bill 546, to require certain contractors with the Government to guarantee an annual wage for their employees, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 547, to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MAYBANK also introduced Senate bill 548, to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 549. A bill to amend section 631 (b) of title 5, United States Code, by adding a new subsection, to be cited as subsection (c); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 550. A bill increasing the fees of witnesses and jurors in United States courts;

S. 551. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be filed under the Federal Tort Claims Act on the claim of Lela Elizabeth Spencer Brown;

S. 552. A bill for the relief of Eleni Saclarides;

S. 553. A bill for the relief of Leon Anderson;

S. 554. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; and

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Eiko Nakamura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 556. A bill to provide for the sale of a part of war-housing project No. Fla–8252–1 to the Department of Public Safety of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 557. A bill for the relief of the McCormick Engineering Co. and John E. Price, an individual doing business as the Okeechobee Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. LANGER, Mr. O'CONOR, and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 558. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; and

S. 559. A bill to provide for salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia Municipal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Engelbert;

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Froehlich; and

S. 562. A bill for the relief of Walter Engelbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHERRY:

S. 563. A bill for the relief of the P. S. Cook Co.; and

S. 564. A bill for the relief of Rita Berliner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 565, to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 566. A bill to fix the salaries of certain justices and judges of the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 567. A bill to provide for the retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 568. A bill to provide for the tenure of office and retirement of the justices of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, the judges of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii, and the judges of the United States District Court for the Territory of Hawaii;

S. 569. A bill for the relief of Anna Netty Gordzialkowska Konopka and her daughter Bernadette Marie Konopka; and

S. 570. A bill for the relief of Donald Francis Wierda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. 571. A bill to prohibit interstate common-carrier pipe lines from transporting commodities in which such carriers have any interest;

S. 572. A bill to divorce the business of producing, refining, and transporting of petroleum products from that of marketing petroleum products; and

S. 573. A bill to prohibit producers, refiners, and marketers of petroleum products from operating tankers and barges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 574. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Berry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 575. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office, courthouse, and customhouse building at Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 576. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND:

S. 577. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 578. A bill to provide for service connection of disabilities aggravated by active military or naval service; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 579. A bill to incorporate the Retired Officers Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 580. A bill for the relief of Miltiadis Dionysious Siadimas; and

S. 581. A bill for the relief of Sherman White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 582. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 583. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the estate of Archangelo Straneri;

S. 584. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. V. Raff;

S. 585. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd;

S. 586. A bill for the relief of G. Brinton Fagen;

S. 587. A bill for the relief of Sister Stefania Cuprys; and

S. 588. A bill to repeal section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940 and to provide that no person shall have lost his nationality thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 589. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; and

S. 590. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR) introduced Senate bill 591, to provide for United States flag shipping participation in Government financed cargoes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson;

S. 593. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; and

S. 594. A bill for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 595, relating to the internal security of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 596. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. J. Res. 35. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## GUARANTEED ANNUAL WAGE FOR WORKERS IN INDUSTRIES HAVING GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill providing for a guaranteed annual wage for all workers in industries having Government contracts.

This bill would amend the Walsh-Healey Act so as to add the provision that in any contract made by the Federal Government for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, and equipment in any amount exceeding $10,000 there be included a stipulation that the employee be employed on an annual basis.

The bill (S. 546) to require certain contractors with the Government to guarantee an annual wage for their employees, introduced by Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. MCMAHON), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD a statement descriptive of this proposal.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

We commonly speak of hours, wages, and working conditions as summing up the factors on which the well-being of the everyday citizen depends; and indeed it is true that if these are not right, our life cannot be right.

But hours, wages, and working conditions, while they take care of our day-to-day existence, do not take into account that need for security which is felt by all of us as we travel on life's uncertain voyage. No matter how adequate our hours, wages, and working conditions may be, we cannot be happy or successful or productive if we are constantly haunted by the worry as to where we'll be or how we'll be living by the end of the year.

Man wants to make his plans by the year. The education of children, the acquiring of a real home, the planning of recreation and vacation—all the things which give life meaning and make for permanence and dependability involve the ability to plan by the year.

In order to meet this need for security, government has developed old-age payments and unemployment insurance. For Federal workers there are pensions, retirement plans, and other security measures. Meritorious legislation to provide aid for medical purposes and for housing are proposed. These plans all fill real needs and are all right as far as they go. But it is assuredly far better to earn the money which comes from full employment rather than to look forward either to some slender pittance because reg-

ular employment has ceased or to depend on Government aid for services which, in our free society, could come from regular employment.

The real way to meet this need for security is for all industries which are able to do so to say to their employees: "We know that we want to hire you by the year. Therefore we are going to guarantee you your wages for a year. You can count on it." The employee who receives this assurance then knows where he stands. He can plan his life and that of his family; he can make commitments for the education of his children, for necessary dental or medical work, for payments on his house, and for the other things which raise his standard of living. Unless he receives a guarantee that his wages would be paid for a year he cannot make these commitments. Even though he might by the end of the year have earned as much money, the fact that he had had no assurance of it would have required him to live virtually a hand-to-mouth existence.

There are already companies in the United States which have followed this guaranteed wage policy with wonderful results. But it is not a policy which most firms can adopt without some sort of legal encouragement, because one firm cannot afford such a policy if his competitor refuses to do it also.

In order to give encouragement to industries to pay wages on a guaranteed annual basis we are introducing a bill which amends the so-called Walsh-Healey Act so as to provide that in any contract made by the Federal Government for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, etc., in any amount over $10,000 there be included a stipulation by the contractor that his employees be employed on an annual basis.

The Walsh-Healey Act already contains provisions for minimum wages, a 40-hour week, 8-hour day, safe and sanitary working conditions, and a ban on child or convict labor. To these stipulations our bill would add the guaranteed annual wage.

The bill consists of two parts. The first part, containing the heart of the bill, is modeled on language used in the Federal Social Security Act which has stood the test of more than 13 years' experience. The second part is based on existing provisions of the Walsh-Healey Act, and, for the sake of necessary flexibility, authorizes the President to make modifications so as to enable the Government under all conditions to receive the services which it might need. The bill also contains a provision for revision of the wage guaranties when this becomes necessary, due to increases in the cost of living.

This idea of a guaranteed annual wage is not only referred to and defined in two existing statutes—the Federal Social Security Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act; it is also endorsed by the leaders of our great labor organizations.

The sponsorship of this measure is bipartisan. If enacted into law, it will provide guaranteed annual wages for all who work for firms having Government contracts—surely a very large number of persons. It should set an example for other industries to follow and thus spread the guaranteed wage to all parts of the country. Due to the world situation, our Government is embarked on an immense purchasing program; surely none will deny it the right to prescribe conditions for conducting this program which will promote better living and better citizenship. By avoiding the costs which unemployment and insecurity cause, this scheme will save money. It will certainly involve no cost to the taxpayer. In fact, the cost will not be in dollars; but in headwork and good planning.

This annual wage bill should also have many far-reaching results which it is now difficult to estimate. The greater sense of security which all these families will possess will lead to better living, better education, better medical care, and better community life generally. This will have incalculable effects on the buying power, economic habits, and labor relations of the beneficiaries of this scheme.

This bill is in essence an attempt to induce our free system to yield all the benefits which it is capable of yielding. If the free system does not do all the good of which it is capable, increased governmental services are inevitable. In fact, this bill may well mark a parting of the ways: either we make the most of our present system and develop all its latent strength—or we can expect a succession of policies which will progressively sap its vigor and thus eventually make lower living standards for everyone.

Finally, this proposal will also have a real effect on the faith and enthusiasm which people have in the soundness of our country's institutions. The more completely people share in the blessings and benefits of our way of life the more they believe in it. The more people believe in our way of life, the richer and more productive it becomes. The measure which we propose should still further make of the United States a land where freemen can grow and flourish in ever-increasing numbers.

TEXT OF SECTION 1 OF THE WALSH-HEALEY ACT, FOLLOWED BY NEW SUBSECTION AS PROPOSED IN THE LODGE-M'MAHON AMENDMENT

(1) In any contract made and entered into by any executive department, independent establishment, or other agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by the District of Columbia, or by any corporation all the stock of which is beneficially owned by the United States (all the foregoing being hereinafter designated as agencies of the United States) for the manufacture or furnishing of materials, supplies, articles, and equipment in any amount exceeding $10,000, there shall be included the following representations and stipulations:

"(f) That the contractor has guaranteed in advance 30 hours of wages for each 40 calendar weeks (or more, with 1 weekly hour deducted for each added week guaranteed) in 12 months, to all the individuals in his employ in one or more distinct establishments, except that any such individual's guaranty may commence after a probationary period (included within 12 or less consecutive calendar weeks); in the event, however, that the cost-of-living index as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, known as the Consumer's Price Index, should, at any time during the term of such guaranty, show a rise of 10 or more points by comparison with the index on the date upon which such guaranty became effective, appropriate modification of such guaranty may be made between the contractor and his employees: *Provided*, That whenever in his judgment inclusion in the proposal or contract of the representations or stipulations set forth in this subsection will seriously impair the conduct of Government business and will not serve the public interest, the President is authorized to modify or suspend any or all of the representations and stipulations contained in this subsection."

## CONTINUATION OF LAW RELATING TO VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AND PLANS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO CONTINUE THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 1949, CERTAIN AUTHORITY CONFERRED ON THE PRESIDENT BY SECTION 2 OF PUBLIC LAW 395, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, REGARDING VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AND PLANS

The purpose of the proposed legislation is the temporary extension, to September 30, 1949, of the authority of the President to approve voluntary agreements and plans under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress (act of December 30, 1947; 61 Stat. 945). The present authority terminates on March 1, 1949, subject to a 6-month wind-up period of limited effectiveness for agreements then in effect. The proposed temporary extension through September 30, 1949 (with no wind-up period thereafter) will make it possible to keep the program going pending congressional consideration of more comprehensive stabilization proposals.

On the basis of its experience in carrying out the administration of the act, the Department of Commerce is of the opinion that the program has been successful, within the limitations inherent in any voluntary program, in overcoming some of the problems arising from shortages of goods and facilities. In so doing the program has contributed on a voluntary basis to meeting certain essential requirements of our domestic economy as a whole, and also to meeting the steel requirements of the armed forces and the Atomic Energy Commission, these military requirements being also covered by the mandatory-order provision of section 18 of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (Public Law 759, 80th Cong.).

An immediate interim extension of the present authority through September 30, 1949, is necessary in order to preserve the full benefits of the voluntary agreements in effect on March 1, 1949, and to permit entering into such new agreements as might provide substantial benefits before September 30, 1949, pending consideration of a general stabilization program. While these voluntary agreements in effect on March 1 could continue to provide limited benefits after that date, their full effectiveness and the realization of any benefits whatever from new agreements would be lost if the continuity of the program were interrupted or stopped.

## CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from South Carolina will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement presented by Mr. MAYBANK is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR THE REGULATION OF EXPORTS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The proposed bill would provide for continuance of existing export-control powers through June 30, 1951, subject to termination at an earlier date by the President or the Congress. The present law authorizing control over exports, section 3 of Public Law 395 of the Eightieth Congress, expires February 28, 1949.

Through export controls the Department of Commerce is able to limit the quantity of shipments abroad and thus lessen the inflationary impact of foreign demand. Of even greater importance at the present time are the measures which are being taken thereunder to channel critically needed commodities to those areas where they will be used to promote world recovery and also to control certain exports in the interest of national security. The extension of this law is clearly necessary and should be authorized as soon as possible for reasons of administrative continuity and so that there may be adequate notice to the trade community of the continuance of these controls.

Section 1 of the proposed bill would provide the factual justification for extending these powers and section 2 sets forth the policies which shall govern their exercise.

Under existing law the authority to issue purely enforcement regulations is implied from the general authority granted to issue all necessary rules and regulations. However, in the light of recent developments indicating the need for a broader and stronger enforcement program, it is considered desirable to obtain specific authority for undertaking all necessary enforcement measures. Such authority would be established by section 3. For the same reason provision is made in section 6 for necessary investigatory powers.

Section 4 (a) would provide for interdepartmental consultation as to specific items to be controlled and the extent of the control. Section 4 (b) would provide for consultation with representatives of the export trade concerning licensing criteria and related matters. Under existing law, consultation on this matter is entirely discretionary. These provisions describe and would require the continuation of current operating policies and at the same time permit the administrative flexibility which experience of several years has demonstrated to be essential.

Section 5 would continue existing penalties for violations except that the maximum prison penalty has been reduced from 2 years to 1, in order to permit the institution of prosecution by way of information rather than formal indictment and to that extent enable prosecution of violators of the law to be expedited. Moreover, in the few criminal cases that have thus far been prosecuted under the Export Control Act, penalties of much less than 1 year have been imposed.

In accordance with the policy for temporary legislation set forth in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act, section 7 would provide an exemption from all provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act except the public information requirement of section 3 of that act. Section 8 would continue the present reporting requirement, except that it provides for the submission of reports within 45 rather than within 30 days after each quarter for administrative convenience and so that the reports may contain more current information and statistical data.

Section 10 would provide that the export licensing of tin-plate scrap, now controlled by the Department of State, would be handled under this act. No changes are proposed, however, in the existing special arrangements with respect to the control of exports of helium, gold, munitions of war, or atomic energy materials.

Section 12 would establish June 30, 1951, as the termination date for this control activity. This section also provides expressly for earlier termination by the President or the Congress. Exercise of control over the exportation of specific articles, materials, or supplies would, of course, be adjusted by the procedure set out in section 4 (a) and in accordance with policy delcared in section 2.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended. It is identical with Senate bill 1403 of the Eightieth Congress.

The purpose of the bill is to double the present limitation on outside earnings of widows receiving social-security payments without depriving them of their survivor's insurance or the aid which they get for dependent children. At present the limitation is $14.99 per month on these outside earnings, and my proposal, in line with suggestions to me from the Social Security Board, would double this limitation to $30. This is obviously not a large sum to permit these folks to earn on their own initiative; it is clear, however, that the sum cannot be made too large so that, as the Social Security Board states, it would become unnecessary to give the individuals survivor's aid. The Board, therefore, recommended either $25 or $30 as a limitation, and I have, therefore, used the latter figure.

I am hoping for early action on this bill by the Senate Finance Committee and upon legislation in the entire field of social security.

The bill (S. 565) to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSPORTATION OF GOODS IN AMERICAN SHIPS UNDER THE ECONOMIC RECOVERY PROGRAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at the last session of Congress the Senate placed an amendment in the measure providing for the economic recovery program which provided that 50 percent of the goods, in bulk or otherwise, to be shipped to Europe under the program, be transported in American bottoms, the American merchant marine. The Director of the Economic Recovery Program, Mr. Paul Hoffman, announced approximately a month ago that the language in which the Senate and House made this mandatory was somewhat ambiguous, and that his directive on the matter should, therefore, be reviewed by his legal department, which was done. In line with that Mr. Hoffman announced that probably his organization would not have to follow that formula.

Several of us are very much interested in this matter, because of our interest in the future of the American merchant marine and the part it might play in economic recovery and world trade. We had a meeting this morning with Mr. Hoffman, attended by representatives of all the principal shipping interests, by representatives of the labor groups involved, and by representatives of both the House and the Senate. It was agreed to postpone the order until the Congress could make a determination as to just what it desired in regard to participation by the American merchant marine in our economic recovery program for Europe.

In order to make that clear, the chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. BLAND, of Virginia, has introduced a measure in the House, and I now introduce a similar bill, making clear the congressional intent in this matter.

The bill (S. 591) to provide for United States flag shipping participation in Government-financed cargoes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by me regarding the purpose of the bill, together with three editorials.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON; INTRODUCTION OF MERCHANT MARINE POLICY BILL

On behalf of myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] I am today sending a bill to the desk for appropriate reference which, if enacted, will establish a national policy with reference to transportation of cargoes financed by American funds—whether they be grants-in-aid, direct loans, or credits for the procurement of commodities in this country by other nations. The bill proposes that American-flag ships shall carry at least 50 percent of all Government-financed cargoes.

This provision applies to all Government agencies and departments. The only exception to this basic principle would occur when and if the United States Maritime Commission certifies to the agency or department concerned that United States flag ships are not available in sufficient number to do the job.

Most Members of this Senate, I am sure, realize the serious situation currently confronted by the United States merchant marine. In the last 17 months over 1,200 United States ships have gone into the inactive fleet. In truth, the American flag is rapidly disappearing from the seas. All of us know the vital role the merchant marine and the shore installations necessary to maintain it, played during World War II. In my judgment, it is absolutely essential to national security and to our national economy that the Congress promote maritime policies aimed at maintaining a minimum but adequate fleet of merchant vessels flying the American flag.

One step in this direction is to establish a national policy governing shipments of United States financed cargoes—a policy such as I am proposing in this bill.

For over 2 weeks in March of last year, the Senate debated problems in connection with the so-called Marshall plan. One of the items of deep concern to all of us was the proposal contained in the original draft for sale and charter of American ships to foreign nations. The senior Senators of Maine, Con-

necticut, Michigan, and Kentucky, and the junior Senator from California were among those instrumental in deleting this provision in the final draft of the bill. These Senators and others joined with me in insisting also that a provision be written into the act requiring the Administrator to move at least 50 percent of the commodities purchased in the United States for participating countries in American bottoms.

An amendment submitted by the junior Senator from California became section 111 (a) (2) of the act. That section reads:

"The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, so far as is practicable, that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities, procured within the United States out of funds made available under this title and transported abroad on ocean vessels, is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates."

All of us vitally interested in the problem thought this language and its legislative history sufficiently strong to clearly indicate to the Administrator congressional intent on the subject.

On December 1, 1948, however, the Administrator announced that after December 31, 1948, ECA would no longer consider itself bound by the 50 percent provision. Subsequently, the effective date of the Administrator's decision was deferred to January 31, 1949. I and other Senators have protested to the Administrator this change of policy.

I believe the Congress can avoid such difficulties in the future by establishing a national policy along the lines I am suggesting in the bill. Had such a policy existed at the time ECA legislation was under consideration, the executive departments would have tailored their recommendations in the light of principles clearly set forth by the Congress.

Within the next few days, I will propose to the Senate that a full-dress study of maritime problems be inaugurated by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. The bill I am introducing today is one facet of that study. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Seafarers Log, from the Marine Digest, and from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer be incorporated as a part of my remarks.

[From the Seafarers Log of January 7, 1949]

"THE FACTS, MR. HOFFMAN

"In a letter to Senator STYLES BRIDGES, former chairman of the congressional watchdog committee on the Marshall plan, ECA Administrator Paul G. Hoffman tried to justify his infamous proposal to move all bulk Marshall plan cargoes in foreign vessels by a statement that simply does not fit the facts.

"He declared that the cost of shipping a ton of coal from the United States to France is sometimes as much as $4.50 less on a foreign ship than on an American ship. He strongly implies that this big differential was the rule rather than the exception, and he forgot to note that it was an exception that was no longer happening on December 3 when he wrote the letter.

"The facts are these: The American rate for carrying coal from the east coast to France is $10.85 a ton. This rate is set by the Maritime Commission. On foreign ships the rate ranges from $8.50 a ton to about $9. This week, in an effort to get at the truth, a shipping official called three operators of foreign-flag vessels to inquire about the coal rate. Two of the operators quoted $8.50. The third wouldn't talk about any rate below $9 and seemed to prefer a higher one.

"Thus, the actual differential about which Hoffman has been bleating turns out to be no more than $2.35 a ton at the most and only $1.85 or less in some cases. And the story doesn't end there, because the differential is just about wiped out later so far as American taxpayers are concerned. Coal is not the only bulk cargo, but the coal rate continues to be the root of the controversy.

"Another facet of the Marshall plan shipping situation has been overlooked completely by Hoffman and his executive assistants. At least, they have not mentioned it in their public statements. Whether Hoffman knows it or not, foreign operators are getting away with a scheme so obvious that one can only conclude that Hoffman is a very gullible gent.

"It is no secret that representatives of French shipping interests recently told a member of the Maritime Commission that they deliberately depressed their rates in a maneuver to get a bigger slice of the melon. Later on, the Frenchmen continued, up would go the rates. The Americans would be hoodwinked.

"Shipping men of other nations participating in the Marshall plan are reported to have said substantially the same thing, although they said it less bluntly than the Frenchmen. Foreign rates already are rising as the foreign operators smack their lips in anticipation.

"Foreign operators haven't been worrying about making or losing money for the present period. If they lose money they expect to be reimbursed directly or indirectly through the Marshall plan. This would mean American subsidization of European merchant fleets with low labor standards. And if they get the extra cargoes and raise the rates, too, their chances of losing money are very slight. Yet Hoffman, in his letter to Bridges, wailed that to pay the American rates was to subsidize the American merchant marine, and copies of that letter were sent to many trade-unionists, Senators, and Congressmen who have taken up the cudgels in the SIU's fight to have the Hoffman order rescinded. In the early days of the battle, Hoffman and his assistants apparently believed that this letter was enough to fool everybody. Actually, it fooled nobody.

"What of the rate differential that remains? Is it as devastating as Hoffman would have it sound? The answer is a resounding 'No,' after some of the elements in steamship financing are examined.

"If a minimum of half of the bulk cargoes are to be carried under the American flag as the law now provides, despite Hoffman's peculiar interpretation, they will go for the most part in Libertys under bare-boat charter from the Maritime Commission.

"When a company charters a Liberty from the Commission, it pays $7,500 a month in rent. If 150 Libertys should fail to operate because of the Hoffman order, it would mean a dead loss in revenue to the Government of $1,125,000 a month. The charter hire for Victory ships is $10,000 a month, and if any Victory should fail to operate because of the order the loss of revenue would be correspondingly greater.

"Maritime Commission spokesmen point out that the money from chartering a ship is almost entirely profit to the Government. The loss to the Government is even greater, however, for a ship in the boneyard costs the Commission about $10,000 a year to maintain.

"Then there is the matter of taxes. If a company charters a Liberty, the first 10 percent in gross profit on the capital invested in the operation of that ship is subject to normal corporate income taxes. When the profits go higher, the taxes spiral. After the 10 percent has been taxed separately, the Government divides additional gross profits by the number of days the company actually operated the ship.

"The company is then taxed 50 percent of the first $100-a-day profit, 75 percent of profit between $100 and $300 a day, and 90 percent of any profit above $300 a day. The steamship companies still pay substantial dividends while the Government gets millions and millions in taxes.

"In short, if the Maritime Commission ships are in the boneyard, the Government loses: (1) Millions of dollars in charter hire; (2) millions of dollars in maintenance charges; (3) millions of dollars in corporate taxes; (4) millions of dollars in unemployment benefits paid to seamen and others in the maritime industry.

"Hoffman maintains that if all the bulk cargoes go on foreign-flag ships this country will be able to ship more goods to Europe. This is a dubious argument at best, since shipping costs are only one item in the Marshall plan.

"However, he might better insist that 60 or 70 or even 100 percent of the bulk cargoes go in American ships, and he might ask that the extra taxes collected by the Government from the shipping industry be appropriated to purchase the goods that the people of the war-ravaged nations of Europe must have, despite chiseling in shipping and other matters by some of their businessmen.

"The SIU will carry on its fight to have the Hoffman proposal defeated. This battle is far from over, but each day we gain new allies in the labor movement and Congress. The SIU never has lost a beef and will not lose this one."

---

[From the Marine Digest]

"ECA RULING SERIOUS BLOW TO UNITED STATES SHIPS

"A newly disclosed ruling by Economic Cooperation Administrator Paul G. Hoffman to stop giving a 50–50 share of Marshall plan 'bulk' cargoes to American ships has resulted in a major Government controversy in Washington, D. C.

"In another development on Capitol Hill this week the foreign-aid program came under fire with charges that a 'few giant companies' get the lion's share of exports, while small firms 'go hungry' for freight shipped abroad.

"RULING 'FANTASTIC'

"Maritime Commissioner Grenville Meller described the ruling of Hoffman as 'fantastic' and summoned his fellow Commissioners to a special session to consider the move order to go into effect January 1. Hoffman said he based his action on the ground that the use of higher-cost American shipping for transportation of grain and coal is cutting into funds meant for European recovery.

"Coal shipments to France, he said, cost $4.50 a ton more in American ships than in foreign bottoms. The decision means that no United States shipping will be used to transport American coal, grain, and petroleum products.

"The Foreign Aid Act, passed last April, directed Hoffman to see that American-flag vessels carry at least 50 percent of all United States cargoes financed by ECA, but it added that Hoffman should do so 'as far as practicable,' and to the extent that such vessels are available at market rates—that is, at competitive world freight rates.

"In discussing the situation, Hoffman said:

" 'Any ruling by me that the 50–50 provision should be observed when rates are higher for American ships would be a subsidy to American shipping out of dollar appropriations for European recovery.'

"LION'S SHARE

"The charge that a few giant companies get the lion's share of exports came from Representative Ploeser, Republican, of Missouri, chairman of the House Small Business Committee. Ploeser said that the European-aid program is injuring small United States firms by reducing the supply of strategic and critically short materials in this country. Citing the August report of ECA, on cotton exports, Ploeser said one firm, Anderson, Clayton & Co., and its subsidiaries, received 71.2 percent of August cotton procurement

authorizations under the ECA program. Will Clayton, former Assistant Secretary of State, has a large interest in the firm. During the same month, 296 firms obtained all the foreign-aid business of ECA."

---

[From the Marine Digest]

"A SUGGESTION FOR MR. HOFFMAN

"What is the matter with ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman?

"Instead of busying himself with cutting down the portion of bulk cargo carried in United States bottoms under the Marshall plan, he would be better occupied with making sure that the cargo is put to its proper use in the countries to which it goes.

"While Mr. Hoffman is busying himself with saving a few dollars at the expense of the United States merchant marine, which is justly entitled to 50 percent of the trade, we learn that Great Britain, Belgium, and Holland have resold to American business nearly 20,000 tons of aluminum and lead scrap they bought with Marshall plan dollars.

"Are we to believe that this is a sole and solitary instance or are there further similar disclosures to follow?

"If we were ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman, we would spend more future time checking on the proper use of Marshall plan dollars instead of figuring out a pinch-penny program which may well wreck our already dwindling United States merchant marine.

"Congress issued a direct mandate that no less than half of ECA's cargo should be carried in American ships and it is not within Mr. Hoffman's province to decide otherwise, without the consent of Congress.

"The question, as United States Maritime Commissioner Mellon has already noted, is not only one of getting the lowest possible rates for ECA bulk cargoes, but of preserving the American merchant marine."

---

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Post-Intelligencer of July 19, 1948]

"OUR MARITIME DECLINE

"A striking example of the manner in which the American merchant marine is being permitted to decline, just as it did after World War I, is provided by the experience of a pioneer Pacific Northwest shipping company.

"The company—Pope & Talbot, which has been doing business in Puget Sound for just 2 years short of a century—recently paid the Maritime Commission $5,000,000 for four C–3 vessels to operate a freight and passenger service to the east coast of South America.

"To be able to compete with foreign lines—which, incidentally, are using American-built ships obtained from the Maritime Commission—the company must have a subsidy to compensate it for the difference between its high operating costs and the low costs of its competitors.

"The company therefore applied to the Maritime Commission for a subsidy on exactly the same terms as one now being paid to another American company operating over the same route.

"Its application has the backing of every chamber of commerce on the Pacific coast, as the discontinuance of the service would mean the loss of an excellent market for American raw materials—but nothing has happened to date.

"And unless the subsidy is granted, the line will be abandoned.

"There is also the case of the American President Lines, recently and for the second time since the war confronted by the collapse of a replacement program designed to restore it to prewar status.

"This company, which had seven passenger liners in round-the-world service before the war, now has only two. Moreover, of its 20 combination passenger-cargo vessels utilized for war service, only 3 returned.

"Yet the essential measures of Federal cooperation are utterly lacking, which is the explanation of the failure of the company's program of restoration—and of the continuing decline of the whole structure of American maritime enterprise.

"Legislation proposed in the last session of Congress to continue our war-won maritime supremacy was one of many vital measures of national interest which failed of passage.

"In the light of such experiences is it any wonder that foreign maritime enterprise is rapidly outstripping ours?

"While we are stifling our own merchant marine, our alert and progressive maritime competitors—and especially the British—are steadily and surely winning back the position and prestige which they enjoyed before the war.

"Thus the overseas edition of the London Daily Mail was recently able to point out that 'one in every four merchant ships at work today' flies the British flag, as compared with 'one in every three' before the war.

"And it suggests that Great Britain can look forward with confidence to the reestablishment of its traditional supremacy in ocean commerce at a fairly early date.

"While the British merchant fleet lost 2,000 ships during the war out of a total of 3,400 in service at the start, wartime replacements and postwar construction have made a total of 3,100 vessels available today—while new ship construction in this country is at a virtually complete standstill and a major part of our existing tonnage is on the inactive list.

"It is with sound reasoning and laudable purpose that the London Daily Mail comments:

" 'Postwar shipping needs are greater, and will continue greater, than prewar.

" 'We are aiming at a larger merchant navy to secure as much of that increased trade as we can.'

"And it is with good reason that the British newspaper also says:

" 'The British merchant navy's recovery has been magnificent. * * *

" 'Britain will win back the trident she lost to the United States.' "

## INTERNAL SECURITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Department of Justice. It is entitled, "Relating to the Internal Security of the United States."

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, because of its particular significance, be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and that an explanation furnished me by way of a letter from the Attorney General be printed in the RECORD following the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 595) relating to the internal security of the United States, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That title 18, United States Code, section 793, be and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining information respecting the national defense with intent or reason to believe that the information is to be used to the injury of the United States, or to the advantage of any foreign nation, goes upon, enters, flies over, or otherwise obtains information concerning any vessel, aircraft, work of defense, navy yard, naval station, submarine base, fueling station, fort, battery, torpedo station, dockyard, canal, railroad, arsenal, camp, factory, mine, telegraph, telephone, wireless, or signal station, building, office, or other place connected with the national defense, owned or constructed, or in progress of construction by the United States or under the control of the United States, or of any of its officers, departments, or agencies, or within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, or any place in which any vessel, aircraft, arms, munitions, or other materials or instruments for use in time of war are being made, prepared, repaired, or stored, under any contract or agreement with the United States, or any department or agency thereof, or with any person on behalf of the United States, or otherwise on behalf of the United States, or any other prohibited place so designated by the President by proclamation in time of war or in case of national emergency in which anything for the use of the Army or Navy is being prepared or constructed or stored, information as to which the President has determined would be prejudicial to the national defense; or

"(b) Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, and with like intent or reason to believe, copies, takes, makes, or obtains, or attempts, to copy, take, make, or obtain, any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, document, writing, or note of anything connected with the national defense; or

"(c) Whoever, for the purpose aforesaid, receives or obtains or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain from any person, or from any source whatever, any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note, of anything connected with the national defense, knowing or having reason to believe, at the time he receives or obtains, or agrees or attempts to receive or obtain it, that it has been or will be obtained, taken, made, or disposed of by any person contrary to the provisions of this chapter; or

"(d) Whoever, lawfully having possession of, access to, control over, or being entrusted with any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates or transmits or attempts to communicate or transmit the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it on demand to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"(e) Whoever having unauthorized possession of, access to, or control over any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates or transmits or attempts to communicate or transmit the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it; or

"(f) Whoever, being entrusted with or having lawful possession or control of any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, note, or information, relating to the national defense, (1)

through gross negligence permits the same to be removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or to be lost, stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, or (2) having knowledge that the same has been illegally removed from its proper place of custody or delivered to anyone in violation of his trust, or actually lost, or stolen, abstracted, or destroyed, and fails to make prompt report thereof to his superior officer—

"Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 10 years, or both.

"(g) If two or more persons conspire to violate the provisions of this section, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be subject to the punishment provided for the offense which is the object of such conspiracy."

SEC. 2. No prosecution shall be brought under title 18, United States Code, section 792, 793, or 794 except upon the express direction of the Attorney General of the United States.

SEC. 3. An indictment for any violation of title 18, United States Code, section 792, 793 or 794 may be found at any time without regard to any statute of limitations. This section shall not authorize prosecution, trial, or punishment for any offense now barred by the provisions of existing law.

SEC. 4. The act of June 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 631; 22 U. S. C. 611–621), entitled "An act to require the registration of certain persons employed by agencies to disseminate propaganda in the United States, and for other purposes," as amended, is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) Strike out the word "and" at the end of section 1 (c) (3), insert the word "and" at the end of section 1 (c) (4), and add the following subsection immediately after section 1 (c) (4):

"(5) any person who has knowledge of or has received instruction in the espionage, counterespionage, or sabotage service or tactics of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party, unless such knowledge or instruction has been acquired by reason of civilian or military service with the United States Government;"

(b) Add the following subsection immediately after section 8 (d):

"(e) Failure to file a registration statement or supplements thereto as required by section 2 (a) and section 2 (b) shall be considered a continuing offense for as long as such failure exists, notwithstanding any statute of limitation or other statute to the contrary."

SEC. 5. (a) The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Director of the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Director of Intelligence, United States Air Force, and the Chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department are authorized under rules and regulations as prescribed by the Attorney General, in the conduct of investigations to ascertain, prevent, or frustrate any interference or any attempts or plans for interference with the national security and defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, violations of the act requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals (act of June 8, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 631)), violations of the act requiring the registration of organizations carrying on certain activities within the United States (act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201)), or in any other manner, to require that telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications and copies or records thereof, or, upon the express written approval of the Attorney General, that any information obtained by means of intercepting, listening in on, or recording telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, or any other similar messages or communications, be disclosed and delivered to any authorized agent of any one of said investigatorial agencies, without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103). The information thus obtained shall be admissible in evidence, but only when such evidence is offered in a criminal or civil proceeding in which the Government is a party.

(b) No person shall fail to comply forthwith with the request of any duly authorized person, pursuant to this section, for the disclosure and surrender of any telegram, cablegram, radiogram, or other wire or radio communication, or copies or records thereof in his possession or under his control.

(c) No person shall divulge, publish, or use the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this section otherwise than for the purposes hereinbefore enumerated.

(d) Any person who willfully and knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

(e) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

(f) For purposes of this section the term "person" shall include any individual, partnership, association, business trust, corporation, or any organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not.

(g) The Attorney General is hereby authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 6. (a) Whoever willfully shall violate any regulation or order promulgated or approved by the Secretary of the Navy pursuant to lawful authority for the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities, relating to fire hazards, fire protection, lighting, machinery, guard service, disrepair, disuse, or other unsatisfactory conditions thereon, or the ingress thereto, or egress or removal of persons therefrom, or otherwise providing for safeguarding the same against destruction, loss, or injury by accident, or by enemy action, sabotage, or other subversive acts, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine of not to exceed $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the application of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. (a) Whoever willfully shall violate any regulation or order promulgated or approved by the Secretary of Defense, or by any military commander designated by the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to lawful authority for the protection or security of aircraft, airports, or airport facilities, relating to fire hazards, fire protection, lighting, machinery, guard service, disrepair, disuse, or other unsatisfactory conditions thereon, or the ingress thereto or egress or removal of persons therefrom, or otherwise providing for safeguarding the same against destruction, loss, or injury by accident or by enemy action, sabotage, or other subversive actions, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be liable to a fine of not to exceed $5,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

(b) If any provision of this section or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this section and the application of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be construed to require or establish military or civilian censorship or in any way to limit or infringe upon freedom of the press as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
*Washington, D. C., January 14, 1949.*

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill relating to the internal security of the United States.

The proposal has been drafted to carry out the recommendations of the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee, composed of representatives of the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation of this Department. The recommendations reflect conclusions which were unanimously reached by the Committee, after a thorough study of the provisions and inadequacies of existing law, beginning in 1945, and are based on the needs and experiences of the three agencies during both World War II and peacetime.

The first section of the proposed legislation would amend the fourth paragraph of title 18, United States Code, section 793 (subsec. (d) under proposed amendment), to provide that only those who have lawful possession of the items relating to national defense enumerated therein shall be subject to its provisions. This is proposed in view of the fact that a refusal to deliver such items in response to a proper demand therefor is an element of an offense under the subsection, whereas it is deemed advisable that those who have unauthorized possession of such items should be subject to the provisions of a separate subsection, as hereinafter explained, and required to surrender them to the proper authorities regardless of the demand therefor.

The first section of the proposed legislation would also amend the fourth paragraph of title 18, United States Code, section 793 (subsec. (d) under the proposed amendment), to include "information relating to the national defense which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation" among the items of which the unauthorized transmission or retention would be unlawful. The phrase "which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation" would modify only "information relating to the national defense" and not the other items enumerated in the subsection. It is deemed advisable to broaden the provision to include such information, in order to render the law more effective against unauthorized transmissions and retentions which may not come within the existing specifically enumerated items but which are considered nonetheless dangerous to the national security.

The first section of the proposed legislation would amend title 18, United States Code, section 793, to provide (subsec. (e) under proposed amendment) that those who have unauthorized possession of the items enumerated therein must surrender possession thereof to the proper authorities regardless of a demand therefor. Existing law provides no penalty for the unauthorized possession of such items unless a demand for them is made by the person entitled to receive them. The dangers attending the unauthorized possession of the items enumerated in this

statute are self-evident, and it is deemed advisable to require their surrender in such a case, regardless of demand, especially since their unauthorized possession may be unknown to the authorities who would otherwise make the demand. In summary, the only difference between subsection (d) and subsection (e) of title 18, United States Code, section 793, if amended as proposed, would be that a demand by the person entitled to receive the items would be a necessary element of an offense under subsection (d) where the possession is lawful, whereas such a demand would not be a necessary element of an offense under subsection (e) where the possession is unauthorized.

The first section of the proposed legislation would amend title 18, United States Code, section 793, by adding a provision (subsec. (f) (2)) to provide for the punishment of those who are entrusted with the items relating to national defense enumerated therein and who have knowledge of, but fail to report, the loss, theft, abstraction, destruction, or unlawful transmission of such items. The danger of such an item, e. g., a code book or plan of operation, being lost, stolen, or compromised by the enemy or prospective enemy, needs no emphasis. As an illustration, it is now common knowledge that our compromise of an enemy coding system was an important factor in our defense and operations against the enemy in the early and vital stages of the recent war. It is not unreasonable to assume that the advantage would be reversed should an enemy compromise a coding system of the United States. The existing law provides no penalty for the failure to report such knowledge by those entrusted with the above items.

The first section of the proposed legislation (subsec. (g) under proposed amendment) would amend title 18, United States Code, section 793, to provide a penalty for a conspiracy to violate the section. Section 794 presently includes a conspiracy provision, and there appears to be no reason why a conspiracy to violate section 793 should not be similarly punishable.

The first section of the proposed legislation would designate the several paragraphs of title 18, United States Code, section 793, as subsections (a) through (g) for purposes of convenient reference.

Section 2 of the proposed legislation would provide that no prosecution could be brought under title 18, United States Code, section 792, 793, or 794 except upon the express direction of the Attorney General.

Section 3 of the proposed legislation would provide that an indictment for the violation of section 792, 793, or 794 of title 18, United States Code, could be found at any time without regard to any statute of limitations. Under existing law (18 U. S. C. 3282), the statute of limitations with respect to a violation of section 792, 793, or 794 in peacetime is only 3 years. A violation of subsection 794 (b) or (c) during war constitutes a capital offense and is therefore not subject to the statute of limitations (18 U. S. C. 3282). In view of the fact that a violation of section 792, 793, or 794 during either peace or war may not be detected, or the identity of the violator discovered until more than 3 years after the violation was committed, e. g., until hostilities cease and the records of the enemy are accessible, it is considered advisable to amend the law so that the prosecution of an espionage violation may be instituted at any time. Such an amendment would also permit the prosecution and consequent public disclosures of such offenses to be held in abeyance, for strategical purposes, pending the detection and apprehension of other offenders who may also be involved in the same or affiliated espionage ring. The amendment, of course, because of the constitutional bar against ex post facto criminal laws, would not authorize the prosecution or punishment of an offense which is already barred by existing law.

Section 4 (a) of the proposed legislation would amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of June 8, 1938, as amended (22 U. S. C. 611–621), by adding a subsection 1 (c) (5) immediately after subsection 1 (c) (4) (22 U. S. C. 611 (c) (4)) to require the registration of persons who have knowledge of, or have received instruction in, the espionage, counter espionage, or sabotage service or tactics, of a foreign government or a foreign political party, unless such knowledge or instruction has been acquired by reason of civilian or military service with the United States Government. Under existing law, a person trained by a foreign government for purposes of espionage and sabotage is immune from prosecution provided there is no substantial evidence of his having violated the Espionage Act, and he is in no way obliged to divulge either his intentions or the very useful information which is peculiarly within his knowledge, information which if acquired by our counter-intelligence agencies could spell the difference between success and catastrophe in counteracting the plans and tactics of an enemy. Examples of those who would come within this category are those whose operations may defy detection and those who may be dispatched to this country for purposes of espionage or sabotage and who either postpone their operations until an opportune time or, for fear of apprehension or other reason, abandoned their mission. The amendment is proposed for a threefold purpose, namely, to discourage further the unknown presence of potential spies and saboteurs; to provide a basis for the prosecution of unregistered potential spies and saboteurs before they commit an act of espionage or sabotage; and to assist this Government in its counter-intelligence work by acquiring the information regarding foreign espionage and sabotage systems and tactics that would be disclosed by those who elected to register rather than run the risk of prosecution for not so registering.

Section 4 (b) of the proposed legislation would amend the Foreign Agents' Registration Act by adding a subsection 8 (e) immediately after subsection 8 (d) (22 U. S. C. 618 (d)) to provide that a failure to file a registration statement or supplements thereto as required by sections 2 (a) and (b) (22 U. S. C. 612 (a) (b)) shall be considered a continuing offense for as long as such failure exists, notwithstanding any statute of limitations or other statute to the contrary. The purpose of this proposed amendment is to permit the prosecution of an offender at any time during the period he continues to disregard the statute and not merely within a 3-year period from the time that he first became subject to the law and should have registered but failed to do so.

Section 5 of the proposed legislation would authorize, under rules and regulations as prescribed by the Attorney General, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the Military Intelligence Division of the Department of the Army, the Director of Intelligence, United States Air Force, and the Chief of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, in the conduct of investigations involving the national security and the registration of foreign agents and organizations, to require that radio, telegraph, and telephone communications be disclosed and delivered to the authorized agents of the foregoing investigatorial agencies. The obtaining of information by interception of communications would be authorized only upon the express written approval of the Attorney General. Information thus obtained would be admissible in evidence, but only when such evidence is offered in a criminal or civil proceeding in which the United States Government is a party. It would be unlawful for any of the information to be divulged except for the specifically enumerated purposes of this section. A violation of the proposed statute would constitute a felony and would be punishable by a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both. Section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U. S. C. 605) permits the disclosure of such information only in response to a subpena issued by a court of competent jurisdiction or on demand of other lawful authority. The proposed statute would provide the necessary lawful authority to the above investigatorial agencies and assist them considerably in the performance of their duties. It seems incongruous that the existing law should protect our enemies and hamper our protectors in such matters, and it is proposed that the anomaly be corrected as suggested by this section.

Section 6 of the proposed legislation would reenact as permanent legislation the act that provided a maximum penalty of a $5,000 fine and 1 year imprisonment for the willful violation of regulations or orders promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities, approved July 9, 1943 (50 App. U. S. C. 1312), the expiration date of which was June 30, 1947. This is deemed advisable in order to continue the additional protection from both accidental and deliberate danger which the statute afforded such vital facilities. As we have so tragically observed during the war, e. g., the burning of the *Normandie*, the Port Chicago, Calif., disaster, and later the devastation in Texas City, Tex., there is a need to strengthen, rather than relax, the law relating to the safety of maritime and water-front facilities.

Section 7 of the proposed legislation would provide a maximum penalty of a $5,000 fine and imprisonment for 1 year for the willful violation of any regulation or order promulgated or approved by the Secretary of Defense for the protection of aircraft and aircraft facilities. This section is similar to section 6 of this proposal for the protection of maritime facilities, and its purpose is self-evident.

The entire proposed bill has been drafted to serve the needs of the Departments of the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, and Justice in the successful discharge of their responsibility to protect and improve the internal security of the Nation. The swift and more devastating weapons of modern warfare, coupled with the treacherous operations of those who would weaken our country internally, preliminary to and in conjunction with external attack, have made it imperative that we strengthen and maintain an alert and effective peacetime vigilance.

The enclosed proposed legislation is transmitted herewith for your consideration and such action as you may deem appropriate.

Sincerely,

TOM C. CLARK,
*Attorney General.*

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill is of unusual importance. Going to the Committee of the Judiciary, as it will, it will be submitted to a subcommittee for study. The bill touches upon many things which heretofore we have regarded as exceedingly sacred to the individual; for instance, the right to be protected from wire tapping, and other rights, which are affected by powers given to the Department of Justice. In my judgment the bill should receive careful consideration, because those weapons which we afford for national protection and defense might be turned to the destruction or impairment of individual human rights. Therefore the bill should

have the study and consideration of every Member of the Senate, as well as of the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRINTING OF DOCUMENT ENTITLED "FINAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES DE SOTO EXPEDITION COMMISSION"

Mr. PEPPER submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there be printed 1,000 copies of the Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission (H. Doc. 71, 76th Cong.) for the use of the Senate document room.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution to establish the joint committee on social security, to be composed of members of the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee. It is identical with Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 of the Eightieth Congress.

The purpose of this joint committee would be to prepare a thorough evaluation of our present obsolete social-security system, and to formulate recommendations to the Congress on a comprehensive security plan for the Nation. It is obvious that the problem of security for our elderly folks represents one of the greatest challenges of modern times to our country or any other land. It seems incongruous that the Congress should have an efficient Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and yet should lack such a committee when it comes to the field of social security, which it seems to me, is just as important as taxing our people. I well recognize that there have been countless studies in the field of social security, and the purposes of this joint committee would not be to delay action upon the various plans presented as a result of these studies. On the contrary, through such a committee, we could secure a comprehensive analysis of the President's suggestions for social-security revision, and of the many suggestions which have come from outside—from labor unions, industry, and so forth.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 7) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a Joint Committee on Social Security (hereinafter referred to as the joint committee) to be composed of eight members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and six members of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the need for and advisability of modification or enlargement of the present social-security program, and to consider any proposals submitted to the Congress in connection therewith. The joint committee shall report, from time to time, to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, or, in its discretion, to the Senate or the House of Representatives, or both, the results of its studies and investigations together with such recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties, but the compensation so fixed shall not exceed the compensation prescribed under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, for comparable duties. The joint committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $ , shall be paid out of the contingent funds of the Senate and House of Representatives, one-half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and one-half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

INVESTIGATION OF CONTRACTS WITH RAILROADS FOR CARRYING UNITED STATES MAILS

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 34), which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is authorized and directed (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to contracts with railroads for carrying United States mail with a view to ascertaining whether, in the light of changes in the volume of mail carried, any change in the rates charged for such service is necessary or advisable, and (2) to report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation together with such recommendations for necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF SAMUEL HAMILTON KAUFMAN TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York. Mr. Kaufman is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF PAUL P. RAO TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court. Mr. Rao is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JAMES T. FOLEY TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 11 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of James T. Foley, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Hon. Edward S. Kampf, resigned. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NATIONAL HOUSING LEGISLATION—STATEMENT BY SPONSORS

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement regarding the proposed national-housing bill, issued to the press by several Senators, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEALTH CARE FOR AMERICANS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Need To Provide Good Health Care for Every American," written by him and published in the Alexandria, Va., Gazette of January 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD statements and data relating to possible election of President and Vice President by the House of Representatives, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE VOICE OF AMERICA—ARTICLE BY HON. GEORGE ALLEN

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article prepared by Hon. George Allen, Assistant Secretary of State, dealing with the Voice of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND ANNUAL MESSAGE BY GOVERNOR DRISCOLL OF NEW JERSEY

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the second annual message delivered by Governor Alfred E. Driscoll, Governor of New Jersey, to the legislature on January 11, 1949, and editorial comment thereon, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREIGN AIR BASES—EDITORIAL FROM MILWAUKEE JOURNAL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Air Bases Vital to Peace" recently published in the Milwaukee Journal which appears in the Appendix.]

MANCHURIA, THE TINDERBOX OF ASIA—ARTICLE BY GEORGE MOORAD

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Manchuria Still the Tinderbox of Asia," written by George Moorad and published in the January 9, 1949, issue of the Sunday Oregonian of Portland, Oreg., which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASED SALARY AND EXPENSE ALLOWANCE OF THE PRESIDENT—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by David Lawrence, entitled, "Tax-Free Allowance Voted by Senate Seen Problem for Truman," published in the Washington, D. C., Star of January 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RIGHTS OF ALASKAN INDIANS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ALASKA WEEKLY

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Saving the Indians," from the Alaska Weekly of January 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is closed.

THE FREEDOM TRAIN

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the Freedom Train is now in Washington.

This is most appropriate at a time when the attention of every American is centered upon the inauguration of our President.

Since it was dedicated in Philadelphia—on Constitution Day, September 17, 1947—the Freedom Train has made a journey of patriotic inspiration covering 33,500 miles.

More than three and a half million men, women, and children have visited the train in 325 cities throughout the United States.

The American people are deeply indebted to Attorney General Tom Clark who brilliantly conceived the idea from which the Freedom Train was developed.

Also deserving of high praise is the American Heritage Foundation, headed by Winthrop W. Aldrich, of New York, under whose able direction the Freedom Train pilgrimage was conducted.

The Freedom Train carries 127 of the most precious documents of American history. On the train are found the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and many other papers dear to the hearts of men and women all over the world who love individual freedom.

I had the honor of taking part in the dedication ceremonies held at Philadelphia, September 17, 1947.

The program was presided over by Arthur C. Kaufmann, now president of the Chamber of Commerce of that city. The train was christened by Mrs. Kaufmann.

Mr. Aldrich was present and explained the plan of the American Heritage Foundation.

The principal address on that occasion was made by Attorney General Tom Clark, and I now ask unanimous consent to have his address printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. TOM C. CLARK, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, UPON THE OCCASION OF DEDICATION OF THE FREEDOM TRAIN, PHILADELPHIA, PA., SEPTEMBER 17, 1947

Mr. Aldrich, trustees and officers of the foundation, and guests, this is a magnificent occasion. I know that all of us here have a feeling of deep gratitude to the officers and trustees of the American Heritage Foundation, to the Librarian of Congress, and to the Archivist of the United States, who have played so big a part, and to the many others who have made documents available, or have helped in many, many other ways. They cannot all be publicly acknowledged, but surely their work is rewarded by the feeling of pride in our past, and the determination that our future shall at least equal that past, which comes to every man who walks through this fine train and, as a distinguished American used to say, "Look at the record."

It is a good record. There is none other in the world that can match it. And it was made by men. Indeed, the inspiring pageant of freedom which is dramatized by the great historic documents aboard this Freedom Train is a reminder to all of us, and to each of us, that men are the architects of their own liberty. If men are to have freedom they must build it for themselves. No one man, no little group of men can fashion freedom to suit their own ends and give it in return for subservience, or withhold it to obtain conformity. That is not freedom at all.

None of these landmarks in our history which are aboard this train was wrought singly by any one man. Each was born of the labors of many men, in their turn representing many others. So it is with freedom. No man can have it for himself alone and deny it to others. No man can have freedom for himself at all unless he is willing to share it with every other man without regard to his brother's color, or his race, or his creed. And exactly in the degree that we deny freedom and the realistic blessings of liberty to any man, exactly in that degree do we make prisoners of ourselves. All must be free, or none of us is wholly free.

The faint heart, the grudging, unwilling heart, those who think of freedom as something for a few, will make prisoners of us all. And if we so foolishly make prisoners of ourselves, in our own good home, what chance can there be for freedom elsewhere in the world? Let us have no second-class citizens in America, for whatever ugly reason, and in time men can walk in the sunshine of freedom every place in the world. Unless we Americans share our freedom with our neighbors and with the world, in the end we shall have none for ourselves.

Equality before the law and in the sight of God for every man. That is the ideal of freedom which the American way of life has to offer to humanity. It is a goal yet to be completely achieved in our own fair land and in the broad reaches of the world. Surely, these magnificent documents show us the way.

Mr. Aldrich, I would be less than candid if I did not tell you that this colorful Freedom Train and the program of the American Heritage Foundation have far exceeded the modest conception in my mind at the outset. It is a demonstration, in the field of the concrete political principles to which this Nation is enduringly attached, of the vigor and vitality by which the American people beat down the threat of fascism and communism. Into this program of rededication, of which this Freedom Train is the climax, has gone the work and the enthusiasm and the thinking of a fine group of representative Americans. I say representative because they are of all faiths, races, and many shades of political belief. They have united together in firm faith in the integrity and humanity of American principles. I know, as all of us here today know, that the American people will be deeply stirred by the illumination of our future which this look into our past gives to all of us.

As the chief law-enforcement officer of the Federal Government, my concern over the growing disrespect for the rights of individual citizens has been no secret. It is my belief that the American Heritage Foundation program will do much to correct and abate this great evil. Thus, as the sponsoring official, with gratitude for the tremendous task which the foundation has performed so far, and with pride in the program which you propose, I am happy to deliver the Freedom Train and its priceless documents into your safekeeping. I know it is in good hands.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I also had the honor of speaking on that occasion, and I ask unanimous consent to have my address printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF UNITED STATES SENATOR EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE DEDICATION OF FREEDOM TRAIN, PHILADELPHIA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1947

What is happening in Philadelphia today is good for America and for Americans. We are starting Freedom Train on its year-long journey about the United States. We are sending to the people the documented story of our Nation's proudest heritage. By means of this train Americans everywhere—old Americans and new Americans, no matter what color and no matter what creed—will be brought closely and vividly into contact with the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Declaration of Independence, William Penn's Charter of Privileges to the colonists of Pennsylvania, and many other immortal documents.

That cannot fail to make better citizens of us all by reminding us whence we came and how it is we enjoy inalienable rights which the citizens of most other countries would regard as rare privileges.

Too much credit cannot be given Attorney General Tom Clark for having brilliantly conceived and developed this idea. Too much credit cannot be given those patriotic Americans who formed themselves into the American Heritage Foundation to carry forward the program and who have privately financed it.

It is particularly appropriate that this train should be christened and should commence its journey in the city of Philadelphia, the birthplace of American independence, on Constitution Day. I suppose, however, any day would be the right day for Freedom Train to bring its priceless cargo to the city which is so closely interwoven with so many of the documents carried on this train.

I need not remind a Philadelphia audience that it was here, just a few blocks from where we stand, that the Articles of Con-

federation were signed, the Declaration of Independence proclaimed, and the American Constitution adopted to become the basic law of our land.

I don't need to remind Philadelphians that this is the city of Independence Hall, the cradle of liberty, whose walls echoed the stirring words that "these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states."

Here reposes the Liberty Bell, sacred symbol of freedom "throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof." Here stands Carpenters' Hall, meeting place of the First Continental Congress, and you have the little house on Arch Street where Betsy Ross made the first flag. It was here, at Old Christ Church, that Washington and other patriots whose memory we revere prayed for divine guidance in their conduct of the affairs of the infant Republic.

Not many miles from here is Valley Forge where General Washington's ragged forces, who were later to be trained into a victorious army, suffered in the terrible winter of 1777–78. Not far away is Washington's Crossing where, the winter before, General Washington ferried these men to New Jersey to win the battles of Trenton and Princeton, the first victories of the infant American forces.

This is the city in which George Washington's magnificent Farewell Address first appeared, printed in the Philadelphia Daily American Advertiser, in 1796. That document is on Freedom Train and its anniversary is only two days off, on September 19, when this train will still be here.

These are just a few reasons why it would have been inconceivable for Freedom Train to begin its journey elsewhere than in Philadelphia. For it was here, more than a century and a half ago, that the original Train of Freedom began its journey through history to undying greatness and creation of a country which, like its first President, stands today first in war and first in peace.

I like what has been said of our Republic that it is "the last best hope on earth."

I like, too, the story of that first Constitution Day whose anniversary we are celebrating. When the document had been ratified, Philadelphia's own Benjamin Franklin stepped from Independence Hall into the street where a multitude of citizens was waiting.

"What kind of a government have you given us?," they asked. Franklin replied: "We have given you a Republic—if you can keep it."

Fellow Americans—this is a good time and a good place to assure Ben Franklin across the years:

"We have kept it. Thousands of heroes have shed their blood to defend it in the 160 years since that day in 1787. We still cleave to that Republic and that Constitution."

Today let us rededicate ourselves to American freedom and to that Constitution. Under it we have enjoyed the greatest blessings ever given to a people—freedom of religion, wide civil liberties, and freedom of expression—the press, the radio, the motion pictures. All three have served the country well in war and in peace.

The film industry has produced motion pictures of patriotism in the same tradition as Freedom Train. Many patriotic messages have gone over the air by radio.

We cannot praise too highly the leadership of the free American press in patriotic inspiration for our people. Throughout our history the newspapers have served as beacons of light, guiding all of us to a greater appreciation of our liberties and reminding us of the responsibilities which these liberties impose upon every citizen.

Within the past few days the press demonstrated anew how it serves by uncovering a Communist plot to discredit Freedom Train. The plot was to deceive the people into believing that all of this—this train, these great documents, and what they stand for, is merely a propaganda plant by reactionaries and big business. The Communists called it "Wall Street imperialism." This falls of its own weight of course, by the fact that William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, and Philip Murray, president of the CIO, are vice chairmen of the American Heritage Foundation, sponsoring Freedom Train. Other leading Americans are associated with this great patriotic movement.

I don't know if there are any Communists within the sound of my voice. If there are, let me assure them, as well as all others, this time they have left themselves and their motives naked. Even the most gullible cannot fail to understand that here is the kind of movement against which Benjamin Franklin was warning when he told those early Philadelphians to keep the Republic.

There is an impressive sermon in this for all good Americans. If anyone in Russia had planned deliberately to warp and distort the meaning of a similar train there—not a Freedom Train, but a Totalitarian Train—you know what would have happened to him.

But we are different here. We have a Constitution and a Bill of Rights. We have our civil liberties. If people here talk dangerous foolishness, we guard against it not with slave camps or firing squads, but with intelligent education, with our great channels of free expression, and with even-handed laws.

One of the great messages Freedom Train can carry to the whole Nation is this:

Guard those precious civil liberties for all. If we permit them to be wiped out for some minorities—political or racial or religious—then we shall lose them for all the people. The majority, too, will wake up one morning to find that its civil liberties are gone. These things are indivisible. All the people must share in them, or none can possess them long.

That is important to remember in these days when we are threatened by a philosophy which gives the individual no civil rights at all. In that system the people are completely subordinate to the state, which, in turn, is a tool in the hands of a few willful men subject to no law but themselves. I say we can fight that system and win without stooping to its tactics.

Freedom Train is the time-tested proof. Walk along its corridors and what do you find—the Magna Carta, the English Bill of Rights of 1689, the Pennsylvania Charter of Privileges of 1701, the various early laws for religious freedom, America's Constitution and Bill of Rights, the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, yes, the nineteenth amendment granting women suffrage and last year's Proclamation of Independence for the Philippine Islands.

There is the main stream of human progress for 1,000 years—broad, deep, calm, and powerful. Each document is a rung in the ladder of greater spiritual and temporal freedom for the individual. Each carries man upward in human dignity and in civil liberties.

By such steps and such tradition has America grown and prospered.

Certainly it will profit us nothing to recede down the ladder. We do not want to retrace our steps toward serfdom, in fear of unwarranted search and arrest, and fear of the heavy hand of government upon the shoulder of every citizen.

I feel strongly about the dangerous crackpots and fractional Americans who take their orders from Moscow. But I am equally strong in opposition to hooded men who take the law into their own hands, and against vigilantes who supersede the good laws of our country.

There are rumbles here and there by some who would violate the civil liberties of persons they merely suspect. There are hotheaded groups branding all foreign born in our land as subversive. Many of our most loyal and best citizens were born across the water. All of us are descendants of foreign born who immigrated to the New World. In every branch of our armed forces foreign born and their sons died wearing the American uniform in the recent war.

If we permit bands of vigilantes to determine who may have civil liberties and who may not; who may work in peace and who shall be persecuted, the result will be exactly the opposite from what the Constitution provided. We will not beat communism that way. We will feed its fires. Persecuted people will turn in bitterness from Americanism to communism. Inadvertently, we shall be building a fifth column within our gates.

I am not talking appeasement. I am talking for equal justice as set forth in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

I am talking against doing in this country what Hitler did in Germany and Stalin does in Russia today. Those misguided Americans who have set themselves up as a drumhead court over their fellow citizens should remember that our ancestors came here to escape religious, racial, or economic intolerance in the old country. They fled from places where they had no civil liberties to a land where they could enjoy such rights. Those who have come in recent times have turned to America for the same reasons.

Let us not merely talk the Golden Rule. Let us practice it. One way is to give to others the same protection under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights which we claim for curselves. In exercising our rights we must not forget the obligations of American citizenship.

Let Freedom Train carry this message to the Nation.

I wish that when it has finished its tour of the United States, a year from now, it could be sent across the oceans to other lands so that the whole world could see it and learn from it and absorb the rich and great spirit of America's heritage.

Godspeed this caravan of Americanism.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, further ceremonies were held in Philadelphia on January 9 of this year, when the Freedom Train returned to that city.

Again Attorney General Clark was the speaker of the day. I now ask unanimous consent to have his address on that occasion printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF HON. TOM C. CLARK, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES, AT THE FREEDOM TRAIN EXERCISES UNDER THE AUSPICES OF FORCES UNITED FOR INTELLIGENT CITIZENSHIP, ACADEMY OF MUSIC, PHILADELPHIA, PA., JANUARY 9, 1949

It is most fitting that the Freedom Train, in its final days of travel under the auspices of the American Heritage Foundation, should return to the City of Brotherly Love. Here, 16 months ago, on September 17, 1947, it began its history-making tour in celebration of the one hundred and seventieth anniversary of Constitution Day—probably the most important day in the Nation's calendar, since it marks the beginning of the United States of America.

This brilliant and inspirational journey will come to an end in a few days during the panoramic demonstration marking the inauguration of the President of the United States. This climax, too, is fitting, as it symbolizes the right of a free people to govern themselves and is a tribute to the President who gave the project his blessing.

We are not assembled here to deliver or hear eulogies on the expiration of this shrine on wheels. This is a joyous occasion. We are here to honor and pay glowing tribute to

the public-spirited officers of the American Heritage Foundation, and its efficient staff.

We also laud the thousands of citizens of the 320 cities in every State of the Union who so happily cooperated in making it possible for the train to travel 35,000 miles, be visited by over four and a half million people and enabled millions of others to participate in patriotic exercises that were spearheaded by the coming and going of the train.

While the train has run its present course, the spirit continues on and will continue on as long as freemen live to carry out the spirit of the sacred documents that it carried. Some may ask, Is it enduring?

Yes, it is enduring. The good that is done is not measured as we measure potatoes in a bushel, or cold statistics on a chart, or cloth by the yardstick. You can't estimate the spirit and influence of the train in that manner.

Some of that influence is very apparent before us here at this hour.

Your Philadelphia organization—Forces United for Intelligent Citizenship—which sponsors this memorable patriotic event today, is a direct outgrowth of the Freedom Train's first visit to this community. Your movement is an educational program for better citizenship on the grass-roots level, your members shouldering responsibilities inherent in a free society. That is an excellent way to keep the wheels of democracy turning in the right direction.

Forces United promotes happiness and harmony among men when it serves as a meeting ground for uniting persons and organizations interested in furthering the brotherhood of man and emphasizing the supreme worth of the individual.

Another cheering part of this wonderful program is the presence of these newly naturalized citizens who come from many different lands. They have received the most precious possession this country has to offer—that of United States citizenship.

Since the beginning of our Republic millions of others from all races and all places have come here to share in our heritage and have contributed their part in building and enriching America.

Surely, the train's mission, that of spreading the gospel of freedom, will endure. The hundreds of thousands of children from the quiet, small towns and teeming centers, often braving the fury of the elements to view the immortal papers, will remember and cherish all through life what they saw and read and heard. Beyond that, what they learned will be passed on to their children and their children's children.

The Freedom Train has not ended. It is the endless story of the United States—the story of you and me, of free enterprise—that democratic principle and way that has made our Nation the inspiration of freedom-loving people everywhere.

The unity of purpose—the cooperation—which brought together educators, labor and religious leaders, captains of industry, financiers, members of the press and radio, is strikingly illustrative of how America rallies to a noble cause.

I, too, like other Americans, have gained much from this experience. The Freedom Train has proved a moving witness of the people's impregnable faith in America and of the devout love and the deep reverence they hold in their hearts for its institutions.

The fervent and loyal reception accorded this carrier of our precious documents of liberty is a thundering answer to the enemies of our cherished way of life. No wicked ideology will find a hiding place in the hearts of such Americans.

With an alert America and God's help, we will keep it that way.

## EXEMPTION FROM ADMISSIONS TAX OF CERTAIN TICKETS TO INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate House Joint Resolution 85, a joint resolution which was passed yesterday by the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate House Joint Resolution 85, which will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Georgia ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. GEORGE. I ask that it be laid before the Senate. I am about to move that the Senate proceed to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 85) to exempt from the tax on admissions amounts paid for admission tickets sold by authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of the President-elect in January 1949.

The joint resolution was read the second time by title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. BALDWIN. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, unanimous consent is required for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection, but I want to be sure that we understand the procedure. This is a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair asked if there was objection, and the Chair heard none.

Is there objection to the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 85?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a preliminary statement. I have conferred with all members of the Senate Committee on Finance on both sides, and all have agreed that the joint resolution might come up for consideration without reference to a committee. Members thus agreeing do not necessarily bind themselves to support the joint resolution, but they all agree that it may be considered without reference to a committee. I now ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent has already been granted.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, this joint resolution is the same resolution which has heretofore been passed at all times, so far as I know, when we had an admission tax which covered the sale of seats on Pennsylvania Avenue and tickets to certain functions incident to the inaugural ceremonies. In 1940 a resolution almost in the same terms as the present joint resolution, was passed by the Congress and approved by the President on October 9, 1940. That resolution provided for the appointment of the Inaugural Committee, but since the Inaugural Committee has already been functioning, the present resolution merely exempts the tickets which are sold by or on the authority of the Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies from the tax imposed by section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code, being the admissions tax.

It is understood, of course, that actually the only tickets which will be sold by the Inaugural Committee are tickets to the grandstand seats for the inaugural parade, tickets to the inaugural ball, and tickets to the inaugural gala concert. Of course, all tickets sold by individuals, partnerships, or corporations are subject to the tax. Only tickets sold under the direct authority of the Inaugural Committee or by the committee itself are to be exempted from the tax.

It is also understood that it is the purpose of the Inaugural Committee to pay to general charities a certain percentage of the receipts if the receipts exceed the expenditures in preparing for the inaugural exercises. I therefore ask that the Senate approve the joint resolution in order that it may go to the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is open to amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 541 (b) of the Revenue Act of 1941 (terminating certain exemptions from admissions tax), section 1701 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code shall apply with respect to amounts paid on or after the first day of the first calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, for admission.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to exempt from the admission tax the admission fees charged to agricultural fairs. In the first session of the Eightieth Congress the House passed a bill which would exempt the admission fees to agricultural fairs from the imposition of this tax. That bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Finance. Because at that particular time, as I understand, the Finance Committee was considering a general over-all amendment to the excise-tax measures, the bill was not reported.

It seems to me that if we are to exempt from the admissions tax admissions to the different ceremonies mentioned in this particular measure, it is only fair

and just that admissions to agricultural fairs should also be exempted.

Agricultural fairs are one of the oldest institutions in the United States. For many years they furnished a great source of encouragement to agriculture. They afford opportunity for the farmer to learn new things, and at the same time display the results of his own energy and ability. They are conducted primarily and essentially in the public interest and in the interest of agriculture. I believe that they merit far more serious and sympathetic consideration than do the exemptions asked for in this joint resolution.

At the time this question was previously before the Senate, as I stated a moment ago, the Committee on Finance was concerned with the general question of excise-tax legislation, and it did not have time to consider the question here involved. This offers us a good opportunity to take action similar to that taken in the House in the last Congress, and exempt agricultural fairs from the imposition of admission taxes.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut, as well as the Senator from Georgia, the adoption of this amendment would make it necessary for the joint resolution to go back to the House. I do not know how complicated the result would be. The result might possibly be no legislation whatever on this subject. That might result in having the inaugural committee ask Congress to appropriate money to pay a deficit which might be incurred in the expenses.

We understand that all the expenses for all these functions, outside of the expense involved in the erection of the platform on the east front of the Capitol Building and the expenses incurred by the joint congressional committee, are not paid out of the Treasury, but are paid by a sum of money raised in the District of Columbia by private subscription, and the sale of the tickets is to enable the inaugural committee to reimburse itself for the outlay here in the District of Columbia.

If we pass no joint resolution at all exempting these tickets from taxation—and such action might in some way retard the sale of the tickets and might result in a deficit on the part of the inaugural committee in connection with these expenses—I wonder whether we would be encouraging the presentation to Congress of some sort of resolution providing for reimbursement of the local inaugural committee for expenses incurred in connection with the inauguration. Has the Senator any view or opinion on that phase of this matter?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should say that as I have ridden up and down Constitution Avenue and Pennsylvania Avenue, I have seen signs on most of the groups of bleachers and seats indicating that all have been sold.

So far as causing a delay in the action of the House of Representatives is concerned, let me say that at the first session of the Eightieth Congress a bill exempting from taxation admissions to agricultural fairs was passed by the House of Representatives. Of course, we do not know that the House will do the same thing this time, but at least once in recent months it has gone on record in favor of this particular exemption.

It does not seem to me that it would cause undue delay if we were to adopt this amendment and send the measure back to the House of Representatives. This amendment is in the interest of agriculture and in the interest of the farmers and in the interest generally of the people who attend agricultural fairs, which are nonprofit functions and are designed to promote agriculture and the public interest in agriculture generally. It seems to me that inasmuch as the House of Representatives has once indicated its interest in support of a measure such as this, we shall not cause any undue delay by giving the House an opportunity again to register its approval or disapproval, if that be the case.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am sympathetic with the objective the Senator from Connecticut has in mind with regard to agricultural fairs, and I have previously expressed my sympathy toward that objective. However, it has no relationship to the object of the particular joint resolution which is now pending.

I am somewhat concerned in my own mind as to whether an extraneous matter, however meritorious it may be, should be added to this joint resolution, which is purely for local purposes. I should like to have the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] give his view about the matter, if he can enlighten us on it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, obviously I would have to oppose the amendment.

In the first place, no agricultural fairs are to be held right away. Before the people get around to holding agricultural fairs again the Congress will have ample opportunity to consider the whole subject of excise taxes, including admission taxes, in some general tax measure which will come to the Senate from the House of Representatives.

Obviously also the House committee would reject the joint resolution if we were to attach this amendment to it, because we would be asking the House to pass upon a matter to which that committee has not, at least in the Eighty-first Congress, given the slightest consideration.

I think it would be most unfortunate if the Senator from Connecticut were to press for the adoption of his amendment now. There are many persons in this country who wish to have the fur tax removed, and there are many persons who wish to have the jewelry tax removed. In the past the House of Representatives has passed some joint resolutions to that effect. There are many persons who wish to have the transportation tax removed. Now, to single out agricultural fairs, which probably will not commence to exhibit until next September or October, before which time we shall have practically an entire year during which to consider this matter, would, I think, be unwise.

It seems to me that the Senator takes, at least, a very inconsistent position in offering this amendment to the joint resolution. Certainly, if the Inaugural Committee sustains a deficit, the Committee will come to the Congress and ask that it be reimbursed, and probably that will follow, because if this tax were paid, in most instances now it would be paid by the Inaugural Committee. The Inaugural Committee never thought that Congress would do otherwise than it has done heretofore. In fact, if the Inaugural Committee had read the joint resolution which was adopted in October 1940, it would have been assured that Congress would not deny the privilege of this exemption on the tickets for this particular occasion, which does not recur within the next 4 years.

I can assure the Senator that during the consideration of any tax measure ample opportunity will be afforded to consider all the excise taxes; but I would not want to be bludgeoned into accepting an amendment offered on the floor without an opportunity on the part of the committee to consider it, and I would not wish to ask the House of Representatives to accept an amendment of that sort to a measure of this kind. So I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not press for the adoption of his amendment.

If the Senator does press for its adoption, I can assure him that, if it prevails, its only effect will be to kill this particular joint resolution; and then the Inaugural Committee will come to the Congress and request an appropriation, of course.

I can also assure the Senator that a great many of these tickets—in fact, the larger portion of them—have been sold less the tax, on the assumption that Congress would do precisely what it has done in the past, namely, exempt these admissions from the tax.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I must confess that I find myself somewhat unhappy to be opposing the position the distinguished Senator from Georgia has taken, for I have the highest admiration for him, not only as a man, but as a statesman.

In the first session of the Eightieth Congress I introduced a bill or an amendment which would have taken care of this particular situation. However, that measure did not get to a vote.

Mr. President, this is a revenue measure; and the Senate cannot originate any revenue measure, of course. The only opportunity the Senate has to pass upon a matter pertaining to revenue and taxation is when some bill or other measure on the subject comes to the Senate from the House of Representatives. So it seems to me that it is appropriate to discuss this particular tax at this time.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia has mentioned other excise taxes. He has mentioned, for example, the tax on transportation, the tax on furs, and other matters of that kind. Those are excise taxes, but they are not admission taxes. The field of admission taxes is a very limited one, and the amendment deals exclusively with an admission tax. That is the matter now before the Senate: Shall we grant an exemption from taxation on admissions to the various ceremonies here in Washington?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand the Senator's amendment, he proposes to relieve county and public agricultural fairs from amusement taxes.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does the Senator propose to include in the exemption commercial excise taxes in connection with fairs or commercial ventures?

Mr. BALDWIN. No. The amendment, I may say to my distinguished friend from Iowa, is concerned exclusively with taxes on admissions to agricultural fairs.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I may say to the Senator that in my State the question of the amusement tax on county and State agricultural fairs has been a very troublesome thing for a long time. The State legislature and boards of supervisors from time to time appropriate as a rule a specific amount of money to each county fair, and a specific amount of money to the State fair, and in case of a deficit, they appropriate moneys to make up the deficit. It would seem to me that, under such circumstances, the county agricultural fairs and the State fair, as educational, and importantly educational, institutions in the agricultural areas, are every bit as much entitled to tax exemption as are the ceremonies of day after tomorrow and of the days following.

I have no objection to exempting the inaugural ceremonies from amusement taxes. I do not know whether or not those ceremonies will be considered by some people as amusements, but I had just as soon exempt them, except that I believe, in the same category the county agricultural fairs in my State and the State fair, which bring great benefits and progressive development and information to the farmers, and other people all over the State, should equally enjoy freedom from a tax on something that is not an amusement but is a public educational institution. I think the Senator's amendment is well filed. I think it merits consideration at this time.

The Senator pointed out a while ago that the question of exempting agricultural fairs from the tax has been acted on heretofore by the House. It is not at all a new subject. It is a subject well known to every Member of the Senate, and it has had formal approval by the House of Representatives. The agricultural fair is a public institution and it is a nonprofit venture. I am in hearty accord with the Senator. In fact, had I known the Senator was to file his amendment this morning, I should have asked permission to join with him as sponsor of it.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to the Senator I should have been very happy to have him as a sponsor of the amendment. In fact, I should be very glad to have him join in it now, if he would like to do so.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should feel it a great privilege, if the Senator will permit my name to go on the amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall be happy to do that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I see no reason why the amendment should not be agreed to. There is no question of profit. The amount of taxes taken from agricultural fairs is infinitesimal, the microfraction of a percent of the amount of taxes that come in from other commercial amusements throughout the country. The fairs are educational in effect. I think the Senator's amendment is perfectly in order. I am delighted to join with the Senator as a sponsor of the amendment. If I may I should like to ask the Senator a question; it runs in my mind that the tax, for instance, is imposed in the case of church and religious bazars that are held specifically and solely for the purpose of raising money for charitable purposes. Can the Senator enlighten me on that point?

Mr. BALDWIN. I think that is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That, I think, is a matter that should have some little attention in the future. But, inasmuch as the particular amendment is now before the Senate, I am delighted to join with the Senator in advocating it. I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his remarks and for his support. I subscribe most heartily and cordially to all he has said.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I should appreciate it if the Senator from Connecticut will shed some light on several questions which come to one's mind as he reads the joint resolution. Can the Senator state to the Senate which charity has been selected, to which all the net proceeds will be given? If so, can he also give an approximation of the net profits expected to result from the inaugural activities?

Mr. BALDWIN. I am sorry to say that I cannot, because I am not familiar with that particular phase of the matter. I do not know.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator permit me to ask that question of the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]?

Mr. BALDWIN. I shall be very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not familiar with that aspect of the matter. I know nothing of the inaugural committee, in fact, except that I have been asked to present the resolution when and if passed by the House. My general understanding is that the community chests would be the beneficiaries of the total of any receipts over and above the expenditures made by the inaugural committee in Washington, but I apprehend that perhaps there may not be any net receipts over and above expenditures. So far as I am advised, there will not be.

Mr. CAIN. Will the Senator perhaps agree that if a charity is designated as beneficiary, the name of such charity should be mentioned in the resolution, in order that all other charities that are not to benefit from it may know ahead of time that they need not line up on the right?

Mr. GEORGE. No, I would not offer such an amendment. If some of my distinguished friends on the other side wish to encumber this simple resolution with that sort of amendment, they are quite free to do so, but I have no desire to do that. I should like, however, to call attention to the fact that all agricultural fairs are not conducted by nonprofit organizations. I know of some that are not. Moreover, I call attention to the fact that we are now taxing even church entertainments and fairs. This of course was a wartime tax. There are other admission taxes which should be considered when we have the opportunity to consider this particular excise tax. We certainly would not want to exempt county fairs and leave a tax on charitable and church and religious exhibitions and displays which are held only and solely for the purpose of raising money for the church or for church purposes. I am hopeful at least that if the Senator presses his amendment, it may be rejected, so that we may proceed with the vote on the joint resolution, which otherwise of course will die, because I would not want to go back to the House and ask them to consider relief from a particular admission tax when there are so many excise taxes that need reexamination.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. As I may make a few comments on the joint resolution, with the consent of the Senator from Connecticut, I should like to say to my good friend from Georgia that if there is anything which would help kill the resolution, I certainly should support it, because there is a great deal of truth in the old adage that haste makes waste. Certainly the attempt of the Congress to pass this type of legislation will not only be productive of waste but productive also, in my judgment, of an exceedingly bad precedent. The Senator from Georgia in his comments said in effect that if we do not pass the joint resolution today, we shall simply be confronted in the future with the inaugural committee coming before the Congress and asking for an appropriation to make up a deficit. My answer to that prediction of the Senator from Georgia is "So what?" Let them come. Then I think the answer of the Congress of the United States should be, "No appropriation, gentlemen." If a deficit occurs, then the committee should be required to fall back upon the people who are responsible for the situation in which we find ourselves today. If I am correctly in-

formed, the social functions of the inaugural have been underwritten by certain sponsors, particularly business concerns. A typical safeguard has been followed which many of us, in connection with community programs, have followed in our home States, of securing an underwriting of the program in advance. These gala social events of the inaugural have a commercial value and basis, too. The merchants, hotels, and other business establishments will make great profits out of this affair. Hence, as I understand it, many business concerns have agreed to pay any losses that the inaugural committee may suffer. I think it is good business for them to pay such losses, if any, and they and not the taxpayers of the country should be made to pay any deficit.

Thus I repeat my understanding, Mr. President, that the merchants who are somewhat "out on a limb" this morning, because they want to get this tax-exemption resolution agreed to for their own financial benefit, have, in effect, guaranteed the expenses of the inaugural ceremonies so far as the social functions are concerned. I have been associated with some rather large community amusement programs, pageants, and what not, and we have always gone about getting some insurance against possible deficits by way of an underwriting program, so that if a deficit should occur the underwriters would make it up. I see no reason in this instance for relieving the business concerns and other sponsors of these social functions from their underwriting obligations.

I certainly am not one who shares at all the view of the Senator from Georgia, that if a deficit results in this instance, then the Congress of the United States should make it up. Let the underwriters make it up. That is the purpose of having underwriters. They know the risk they run when they underwrite any amusement undertaking. Let us not make it only a form for the underwriters.

Mr. President, I have noticed the prices on some of the tickets issued. They are exorbitant, to put it mildly; they are clearly exorbitant—$10 for a seat with not even a back against which to lean while the circus goes by.

In times past I have introduced proposed legislation, such as Senate bill 2096, in regard to amusement taxes on school functions. In this instance I think some very important values were involved in my bill proposing to allow grade-school and high-school students to obtain some tax relief for their school programs. I see no important value—and I say this quite kindly, Mr. President, in connection with the social features of the inaugural program for which this tax exemption is sought. My remark has nothing to do with the President of the United States; it has to do only with the extravaganza which has developed in connection with the inaugural ceremonies. I see no important value in connection with the social functions of the inaugural celebration which justify our exempting the tickets from taxes. No man on the floor of the Senate has a higher respect for either the President or the Presidency than has the junior Senator from Oregon. But simply because this extravaganza of amusement is connected with the inauguration of the President I do not propose to sit here and vote for the type of resolution which has been offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. President, in a previous Congress I introduced Senate bill 2096. I introduced it because of some practical experience. I introduced it as president of a parent-teacher association in the District of Columbia. I was president of that association last year, and I am president of it again this year. It is the Alice Deal Junior High School Home and School Association. As a result of my experience, as president of that parent-teacher association, I have some understanding, as other parents in this body have, as to the type of problem with which we are confronted in putting on grade-school and high-school entertainments. For example, in our school if we wish to put on a little parent-teacher entertainment in order to raise some money to repair the violins and other instruments used in the little school orchestra or to buy some instruments for children who come from homes which cannot afford to give the children the instruments they need if they are to receive the musical education their talents indicate they are capable of absorbing we must pay a Federal tax on the admission tickets.

I have not been able to receive a hearing on my bill which embodies a fine and sound principle. However, when it comes to the great inaugural celebration Roman circus to be held in Washington, D. C., the assumption appears to be that a resolution can be jammed through the Congress because one side of the aisle thinks it has the votes to exempt from amusement taxes the tickets for that circus.

Now that I have the floor, I wish, at least, to read into the RECORD the substance of my school bill, which I think the parents and the teachers throughout the country will understand involves a great principle of justice and fairness to the children of America. I would that I could elicit at least as much interest in exempting little school programs from amusement taxes as the Senator from Georgia has been able to arouse with great haste in order to protect, apparently, some businessmen who have underwritten this inaugural extravaganza of theirs. Business sponsors who fear they might wake up to the fact that unless they secure the passage of this joint resolution they will have to absorb some taxes and pay a deficit on the social amusements of the inaugural.

My bill provides as follows:

That (a) subchapter (A) of chapter 10 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 1705. Exemption from tax.

"(a) No tax shall be levied under this subchapter with respect to the first $100 in aggregate amount collected in any calendar year from the sale of admissions the proceeds of which inure exclusively to the benefit of any high school or elementary school.

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to amounts collected, on or after January 1, 1949, for admission."

Mr. President, I serve notice, and I hope my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle will please take note of it, that I shall reintroduce this school bill in this session of Congress. I hope I can get as much enthusiastic support for the effort to do something to help the boys and girls in grade schools and high schools who find themselves handicapped by the type of amusement tax which the bill seeks to rectify, as is now given to the resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia to exempt the dances, shows, parades, and other amusements of the inaugural from amusement taxes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there is a fund of $32,000 available for the inauguration ceremonies. Yesterday a friend of mine, from the West, a good Democrat, telephoned me and said he wanted me to get him a box at the ball. It seems that there will be a ball of some kind in connection with the inaugural ceremonies. I telephoned to those in charge and was told that there was no box available. A little later I was called back and told that because of the fact that I was a Senator they had finally found a box, the cost of which was $250. So I wrote out my check for my good friend and sent it over. It seems to me, Mr. President, that with all the boxes sold at $250 apiece, there should be a surplus rather than deficit, and, therefore, in my opinion certainly this measure should not pass.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the question has been raised by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] as to whether my amendment would exempt from tax admissions to country fairs which are run on a profit basis. In answer to that inquiry I will say that the purpose of my amendment is to restore a provision in an earlier act, which reads as follows:

Any admissions to agricultural fairs if no part of the net earnings thereof inures to the benefit of any stockholders or members of the association conducting the same, or admissions to any exhibit, entertainment, or other pay feature conducted by such association as part of any such fair—if the proceeds therefrom are used exclusively for the improvement, maintenance, and operation of such agricultural fairs.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. If I may make just one statement, then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, my amendment deals with what are absolutely and completely nonprofit institutions, none of whose net earnings accrue to the benefit of any individual or group. I do not think, Mr. President, that can altogether be said regarding the money collected for the inaugural ceremonies in Washington.

It is perfectly proper that the commercial interests of this city, the hotels, the theaters, and the stores—and they are well within their rights in doing so—should make, as I understand they have made, large contributions to the inaugural fund, because they wanted to encourage people to come to Washington.

It is a perfectly natural action for any community to take, because with the great number of people coming into the community, naturally business will be improved, and I am glad to see it improved. Therefore I submit that it cannot be said that so far as the exemptions proposed to be granted are concerned, they are going to inure to people or organizations not interested in the celebration on a profit basis.

However, Mr. President, so far as the amendment is concerned, it deals only with country fairs and State fairs. When a similar measure was before the Senate on another occasion, I received a letter from my distinguished friend, the Senator from Texas, who asked me if I would not broaden my bill so that it would include the State fair of Texas. The amendment is carefully so framed as to include the State fair of Texas, as it will include all the State fairs in the United States, and the little county fairs and the little town fairs, which are so important in the agricultural sections.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I find myself in sympathy with the motive and purpose of the Senator from Connecticut. I am also heartily in sympathy with the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I propound an inquiry to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. Would it not be more inclusive and more helpful, rather than singling out any special objective for release from the tax, to offer an amendment to remove from the application of the excise taxes all gatherings and all meetings sponsored and promoted by nonprofit organizations, and stop there? That would include the agricultural fairs, the parent-teachers associations, it would include church gatherings, and the like. The principle is sound, but it should be applied all along the line to nonprofit gatherings, in my judgment. Does the Senator concur?

Mr. BALDWIN. I do concur; yes. My reason for making it applicable merely to county fairs is that it is in line with the bill I originally introduced, and in which I was particularly interested. It affects many local, county, and other fairs; but if the Senator would offer such an amendment, I would support it, because I think the principle is just as applicable to the gatherings he has in mind as to the county fair.

Mr. TOBEY. It would be more inclusive and spread the mantle of justice in a more over-all manner.

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Toward the end of last year someone connected with the proposed plans telephoned me and asked what would be the attitude of the Senate Committee on Finance as to an exemption from taxation on these tickets. There were no members of the Committee on Finance in the city except myself, so I asked two questions. First: "Is there a precedent for it?"

I was assured there was. Second, I asked: "Is the enterprise one for profit?"

I was assured that it was not. Whereupon I stated that, speaking only for myself, I would support the legislation necessary; and I shall do so.

I am very much embarrassed in having to speak against the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I remember very well his zeal last year to have admissions to county fairs excluded from the admissions tax. At that time, when this side of the aisle was in the majority, we took the position that we should not consider these excise taxes piecemeal.

The suggestion of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire emphasizes the necessity for a more orderly approach to excise taxes, and all kinds of taxes that can be had on the floor of the Senate. The Senator would propose an enlargement of this subject to cover all profitless operations. That ramifies in a dozen different directions, and unless we desired to spend a week's time here having a hearing, which should be conducted by the Senate Committee on Finance, we could not possibly reach a sensible conclusion.

Personally, I am in favor of taking the tax off profit-free county fairs, and when the issue is raised in an orderly fashion I shall vote that way. I think I have already assured the Senator from Connecticut, in connection with other remarks, that I would do so. I thought last year, and so expressed myself, that we should approach our taxes on an orderly basis. I thought last year that we should not approach excise taxes on a piecemeal basis. I still feel the same way, and most reluctantly I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield so that I may ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. O'MAHONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As to the last statement the Senator from Colorado made, I think he will recall that the Democratic members of the Committee on Finance at that time were in hearty accord and agreement with the position the Senator took with respect to piecemeal legislation regarding excise taxes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should have said that when I was speaking before. The Senate Committee on Finance, regardless of the political potencies which might be involved in piecemeal approaches, stood solid on that proposition. I think it is a sound way to proceed. I thought so then, and I think so now, and I say with the greatest reluctance that I shall vote against the amendment, but I shall vote for such an amendment when we can reach it in an orderly fashion.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, the particular resolution now offered in and of itself is piecemeal legislation, and my reason for suggesting the amendment is that if we are to have piecemeal legislation, let us make the piece big enough to be worth while, let us make it apply to many other people, who are more entitled to the exemption, in justice and equity, than those exempted in the particular resolution we are discussing.

I stand with the Senator on the question of piecemeal legislation, but I submit we are in that field now. The resolution itself is piecemeal legislation. Let us proceed to enlarge it, and spread the benefits of this piecemeal legislation to people who, I submit, are more entitled to it than are those who will be covered by the resolution.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I think there is a very distinct difference between what is embodied in the main resolution and what is embodied in the Senator's amendment. That which is embodied in the main resolution is obviously of an emergent character. As the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia has pointed out, county fairs and their admissions are not yet emergent. They will become so later in the year, and I am quite sure we will be getting at some kind of tax legislation prior to that time. So far as I know, there are not any county fairs in operation at the present time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to make an inquiry of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. Is the tax on these admissions due at this time, or will there be more time to consider the proposed legislation? I have read somewhere that the actual tax returns will not be filed until the end of the year. If that be so, then would it not be possible to let this legislation take a more leisurely process, so that it would not affect these other important matters? Or is it like the President's pay bill, in which we were working against a deadline on January 20?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Obviously, an admission tax either is or is not paid. The time when the question is most relevant is in connection with the current sale of the tickets. It might be that if the tax were not now collected there would be later accountability, but of course the purpose of the proposal is to make the whole subject clear. As I said before, I think this subject deserves a good deal of discussion, and I think it should be considered specifically in connection with our next tax bill. I do not believe that in the future we should approach it on an emergency basis. But, as I have said, the junior Senator from Colorado made inquiry to ascertain whether there was precedent for handling the matter in the way suggested, and whether it was a profitless operation, and he was informed that there was precedent, and it was not intended to be profitable, and that if there were profit it would go to charity. That is why I am supporting the joint resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that the tickets have been sold, so that it is

now only a question of accounting for tax? They were sold tax-free, were they not?

Mr. MILLIKIN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And it would be a question of accounting for the tax. Therefore the Senate would have considerable time, if not the whole session, to consider this question and the other questions involved?

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would reply to that, that under the circumstances, where there are individuals here who are working gratuitously for this ceremony, it would be grossly unfair to suspend a possible liability against them until some future undetermined time, when we might get around to considering the matter, with our judgment then in doubt.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in response to what my distinguished friend from Colorado has just said, I always have assumed that it was a very fundamental principle of jurisprudence in this land of ours that people are presumed to know the law. They act with that presumption in mind, and we cannot proceed in any orderly fashion on any other basis. When these admissions were fixed and when the whole affair was planned, it must be presumed that the people who were planning it knew that the tickets might be subjected to an admission tax just like the tickets of admission to plays presented by parent-teachers associations, or to the little county and town fairs throughout the land. It does not seem to me that now they can properly come forward and say, "We did not know anything about this tax. It works a great injustice upon us." They should have laid their plans with this particular fact in mind.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The people who are promoting this ceremony had a decision to make: Either to make or not to make their tickets bear taxes. Under past precedent they did not bear taxes. The enterprise is not one for profit. I think they had a fair right to believe that under the past precedents there would be an exemption. In any event they had to make a decision.

The basic question is whether those tickets should be tax free. If they should be tax free then we should not be suspending or deferring possible liabilities. The thing should be decided before the event is over. In view of the past precedents, in view of the fact it is nonprofit enterprise, in view of the fact that if any profit results it goes to charity, I believe we are well justified in granting an exemption here and now.

I also believe that the matter should be more carefully examined in the future so that no one attempting to promote an event of this kind will be apt to get himself into jeopardies which he is not intending to assume.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Are we talking now about amusement taxes?

Mr. BALDWIN. Taxes on county and State fairs.

Mr. CAPEHART. Such taxes come under the heading of amusement taxes, do they not?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wonder if we are not acting possibly on the wrong premise here, because my observation is that half of the people of the United States are not going to be particularly amused or get any enjoyment out of this so-called parade, and maybe for that reason they do not even owe a tax, since to them it would be no amusement.

Mr. BALDWIN. Whether it is amusement or not, I am going to enjoy it, within limitations. I plan to go to the inaugural ball. I plan to see the inaugural parade. After all, this is an American institution. We are inaugurating a President of the United States, who is our President, and I am going to join in the fun. I will admit that under different circumstances there might have been a little more hilarity on my part [laughter], but nevertheless I think that we ought to take part in it, and we ought to enjoy it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then the Senator does think it comes under the category of amusement?

Mr. BALDWIN. It is a great American institution.

Mr. CAPEHART. If it does not come under the category of amusement, then those who take part possibly do not owe a tax under the law. I am not so certain about that. I think we might forget the whole thing and say that it does not come under the heading of amusement, and then those who buy tickets will not have to pay a tax.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized and has the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have had the floor right along.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut surrendered the floor to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. I had no intention of doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BALDWIN. I appeal from the ruling of the Chair. I had no intention of yielding the floor to the Senator from Colorado, Mr. President. I was standing in my place all the time, and had yielded to different Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say that the Senator did not yield to the Senator from Colorado. The Senator from Colorado asked the Chair for recognition and received it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Oregon may be permitted to waive his right to the floor and defer to our distinguished colleague from Connecticut. The Senator from Oregon can gain the floor almost any time he wants to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I was going to say that I will be very happy to yield the floor, or yield to the Senator from Connecticut, whichever meets his desire.

Mr. BALDWIN. I do not ask anyone to yield the floor. I claim it in my own right.

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair may say for the information of the Senate that under the rules of the Senate no Senator can take the floor and parcel out the time of the Senate to other Members of the body. The rules require that that task be performed by the Chair.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is recognized.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, addressing myself again to the idea of piecemeal legislation, I agree with what my distinguished friend the Senator from Colorado says that we ought not to have piecemeal legislation in this matter. But I repeat that this is a revenue measure, and the only way I can see to get before the Senate my proposition of exempting from tax, tickets of admission to country fairs or State fairs and local fairs, is to take it up in connection with some revenue bill that comes over from the House, or a bill concerning revenue, such as the pending measure indeed is. Time and time again in the brief period I have been a Member of the Senate, I have seen amendments of this kind tacked onto other revenue measures, and it seemed to me that it was especially appropriate to offer an amendment dealing with the tax on admissions to agricultural fairs to this particular revenue measure.

Mr. President, addressing myself to piecemeal legislation. I agree that matters of this kind should not be dealt with piecemeal, but I submit that the measure before the Senate itself is one dealing with a matter piecemeal. I say again that if we are going into this subject, let us make the piece big enough to be worth while.

On this point, Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate what the Acting Secretary of the Treasury said in 1947 concerning proposals dealing with exemptions on a piecemeal basis. He said:

> Experience has shown that any exemptions from the admissions tax greatly increase the work of the administrative officers of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, give rise to difficult administrative problems, and are expensive to administer. Prior to the general elimination of the exemptions in 1941, collectors' offices were constantly deluged with claims, and the clerical and investigating work incident thereto was tremendous. A substantial number of these claims were found to be unjustified and accordingly denied, with resultant dissatisfaction and ill-feeling. In administering the law, as it existed prior to 1941, the Bureau found it necessary to obtain increasingly detailed information from organizations claiming exemption in order to cope with a constantly growing number of flagrant abuses. Furthermore, it is difficult, if not impossible, to provide any exemptions from the admissions tax which will operate equitably and without undue controversy. Enactment of the proposed bills would be a discrimination against, and lead to demands for exemptions

by other institutions and organizations having equally meritorious claims to preferential treatment.

Mr. President, all of that statement applies to this particular measure. If we adopt it, it will do everything that the Acting Secretary, Mr. Wiggins, in 1947, said it would do. But if we are going to get into that field, let us make it a broad field, let us deal with other exemptions, which, as I have said before, are more equitable and deserving than I consider to be the particular one provided for in the pending measure.

I read further, Mr. President, from the opinion of the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Wiggins:

Under these circumstances the Treasury Department would view as undesirable, the enactment of any legislation granting exemptions from the admissions tax. The position of this Department is in harmony with the conclusion reached by the Congress in 1941 when, after a study of the specific problem, it eliminated all such exemptions. It is to be noted that this congressional decision to deny exemptions has been consistently followed since 1941 on the several occasions that the question has been raised.

Mr. President, in this resolution we propose to abandon that point of view. We propose to go ahead on another basis. If we are going to abandon it, if we are going to give it up, if we are going ahead on another basis, why not include this exemption for agricultural fairs?

I know of no more wholesome thing in our whole land than a county fair. Women work for weeks, and bring the results of their arts, which they have dedeveloped in the kitchen, to the fair. The 4–H Clubs and all other organizations concerned with agriculture bring to the exhibitions their cattle, poultry, dresses, and other things which they have to exhibit. They look forward to it for weeks and months, and work long after dark to accomplish results.

Consider the admissions to the inaugural ball alone. Assume that 10,000 people attended that affair. Twenty thousand dollars would go into the Federal Treasury. Think how much detail there is in collecting the small pittance involved in the admission tax on county fairs and local and State fairs across the land. It seems to me that equity and justice cry out for the adoption of this amendment to the joint resolution.

I submit again that if in the Senate we are going into the field of exemptions now is the time to adopt this amendment exempting county fairs, while we are passing this joint resolution, if indeed it is to be passed. In the Senate we have an opportunity to act on revenue measures only as they come over from the House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the first place, let me say that the position of the junior Senator from Oregon would not be one whit different if a Republican President were being inaugurated and the same request from tax exemptions of inaugural dances and shows were being made from the Republican side of the aisle.

We are dealing with a resolution which cannot be justified in principle. I point out that the report on the inauguration in 1932 shows that—

A high light in the Inaugural Committee work was the handsome profit of slightly more than $60,000 over outlay.

The committee made money on the inauguration in 1932. It certainly should make money at the one this year and still pay amusement taxes on the purely entertainment features of the affair.

Mr. President, it is almost impossible to buy an inaugural ticket today. This resolution is an attempt to give the businessmen of this area complete assurance of relief from their responsibility of underwriting the amusement features of it. If the project should run into a deficit, then let us cross that bridge when we come to it. Let us go into the facts surrounding the deficit at that time. Let us find out why a deficit was incurred. I see no reason why we should stand here today and in behalf of the taxpayers of the United States pass a tax-exemption resolution which, in the last analysis, would help certain commercial interests so as to give them all the commercial gravy from the inauguration, and remove any risk that they run in collecting that gravy.

Mr. President, the argument of the Senator from Colorado does not have much force with me when he talks about the fact that we are confronted with an emergent situation. He argues, therefore, that we ought to act in this emergent situation now by passing the resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado. He argues further that later during the session we should take up through the Committee on Finance, questions of tax exemption involved in county fairs, parent-teachers' associations, schoolhouse amusements, and excise taxes generally. For 2 years he was chairman of the Committee on Finance, when there was an opportunity to come forward with a real tax-revision program. During that 2-year period there were emergencies connected with each one of the groups interested in protection from some of the exorbitant and unjust excise taxes. Where was the argument of emergency then? Why was there not a tax-revision program coming through from this side of the aisle? Why did not the Senator from Colorado argue, then, in support of meeting the emergency situation created by unfair excise taxes? No; we dealt primarily with a tax-reduction program and not an overhauling of the tax structure to eliminate inequities which need to be eliminated if we are to give encouragement to venture dollars so that we can increase our production. We had 2 years to offer revision of unfair amusement and excise taxes, but we did not do it as a party on this side of the aisle.

I am not moved by the argument of the Senator from Colorado that in connection with this resolution we are dealing with what he considers to be an emergency. For 2 years past we ought to have been dealing with the emergency of a complete overhauling of the tax structure of the country.

I think the time has come to stop giving the kind of emergent treatment proposed by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Colorado in this resolution especially when we recognize that, after all, it is bottomed pretty much on the basis of political pressure. Mr. President, I believe that the joint resolution should be defeated and that we ought to send the whole problem back to to the Committee on Finance to come forward with a complete overhauling of the entire tax structure.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed, contrary to the views of my distinguished friend from Oregon, with the suggestion made by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. I am wholeheartedly in favor of the general proposition of exempting county fairs and organizations of that kind from the tax to which reference is made. However, at this moment we have very little opportunity for real consideration. Many new Members of this body were not in the Eightieth Congress. It seems to me decidedly unwise at this time to step forward with hasty action with respect to the exemption of county fairs. I am impressed with the idea that while we should consider the question, it should be done in an orderly fashion, at a proper time. I concur with the Senator from Colorado in that respect.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. This is a revenue measure coming over from the House of Representatives. How can we be assured that this question can ever be considered on the floor of the Senate? It was not considered in the past 2 years, and I think perhaps for a very good reason. I know how the distinguished Senator from Colorado, as chairman of the Finance Committee, worked. This is the one opportunity that I, as a Senator from Connecticut, have to submit a proposal of this kind. I originally introduced a bill covering the particular objective. This is the one opportunity of which I can be assured that the question will be considered on the floor of the Senate. That is why I am urging my amendment.

Is not the amendment perfectly consistent with the pending measure? In the joint resolution we are dealing with the question of exemptions. The amendment deals with the question of exemptions. In the joint resolution we are dealing with the question of exemptions from admission taxes. The amendment deals with an exemption from an admission tax. It seems to me that it is most appropriate for this amendment to be considered at this time. I do not like to find myself in disagreement with my distinguished friend from Missouri, but I think he is fundamentally mistaken.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I have not examined the law on the question whether or not it is possible in the Senate to propose an exemption from a revenue measure; but it seems to me that in all probability this body will have ample opportunity, in the consideration of various revenue proposals which will doubtless be made, for the consideration of this

particular question. The President of the United States has advocated that Congress increase revenues by approximately $4,000,000,000. No doubt a revenue proposal will in time be placed before the Senate. In view of the statement of the President of the United States in his state of the Union message, it is inconceivable to me that the subject of revenue will not come before the Congress many times. In all probability, regardless of whether an exemption measure can or cannot be originated in the Senate—and as to that I express no opinion at this moment—it is to be expected that the Senator from Connecticut will have opportunity to bring his proposal before the current session of Congress. It is almost inconceivable to me that such an opportunity will not be afforded.

Mr. President, to my mind, there is something in this question far more fundamental than anything that has been mentioned here today or, at any rate, anything I have heard. It seems to me that this proposal illustrates the fact that there are people—and, alas, I think there are probably too many of them—who undertake to take into their own hands matters which are already matters of law in the United States statutes. At the time when these ceremonies were promoted the gentlemen of the city of Washington who promoted them had the statute of the United States before them and they realized that there was a liability for the admissions tax to which reference has been made. With that in mind, realizing the fact that under the law the purchasers of those tickets were responsible for the payment of the tax, what did they do? The testimony we receive today from the distinguished Senator from Colorado is that instead of waiting until they found out whether legislative approval could be had they went to one eminent Member of the Senate, eminent lawyer that he is, chairman of the committee that he was—but, after all, he is but one Member of the United States Senate, out of the 531 Members of the United States Congress—to find out whether they might violate the law with impunity. It seems to me, Mr. President, that every Member of the Congress of the United States should wait until the law has been changed before he relies upon a change in the law in the future.

So it seems to me that when the distinguished Senator from Georgia and other Senators today advocate that now we give an exemption to these gentlemen for something as to which they knew they were violating the law, they should wait until the whole subject matter is presented to us.

Mr. President, so far as this particular matter is concerned, there is no special equity in connection with the question of violation of the law. Of course, there will be an inauguration ceremony, and I trust that it will be dignified and beautiful and will inspire in the people of our Nation greater admiration for our Government. I trust that the sentiments expressed on that occasion will not be ignoble ones. Indeed, Mr. President, let me take this opportunity to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a very beautiful statement which appeared in the Washington Star of day before yesterday. The statement is by the former Chaplain of the Senate, the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D., and it is entitled "Making the Inauguration an Altar—Sees America Speaking to the World for Freedom While Presidential Induction Proceeds."

Mr. President, I quote only a few words from those eloquent remarks by Dr. Harris. He says:

> The open Bible and the solemn oath before God are the inaugural symbols that the liberties which we broadcast as our credo and of which we are but trustees is essentially and inherently a spiritual concept.

Further on he says:

> A free society can be kept only as it maintains its rootage in the religious soil from which it sprang, drawing its strength from spiritual springs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks the entire statement by Dr. Harris in Sunday's Washington Star be printed as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I was about to elaborate somewhat on my statement that no special equity is involved in this matter.

In the first place, there is no equity, because of the fact that the citizens committee, laudable though their purpose may have been, proceeded in known violation of a law as spread upon the statute books.

In the second place, there is nothing particularly ennobling in some of the ceremonies, at any rate, which are to occur. I am not criticizing them; I do not say they are necessarily out of place. But certainly I do not wish this RECORD to go down to future generations without contradiction of the remark and recital of House Joint Resolution 85 that the amounts paid for admission tickets on the occasion of the inauguration of President-elect in January 1949 constitute payments for tickets which will enable people to hear the address of the President and to see the President take the solemn oath to which Dr. Harris has referred. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, so far as I know, there is no admission charge for seeing the inaugural ceremony, beautiful as I trust it will be, adjacent to where we are today. The charges are not to be made for the inaugural ceremony at all. The hundreds or perhaps thousands of persons who will be permitted to be within the sound of the President's voice on that occasion and who will see the beautiful inaugural ceremony are not the ones who will pay for the particular privileges to which reference has been made. So far as I know, the persons who are paying for tickets are divided into three classes. Of course there may be others as to whom I am not informed.

First, there is the great multitude of people who are to pay for the seats along the route of the parade. Mr. President, I have no objection to their having those seats. I have no objection to having the parade. There may be some question in the minds of some persons as to whether the parade will be of appropriate dignity, as to whether it will extend itself into some rather undignified features; but I am not basing my proposition upon that point.

I say that the first category of persons who are paying for these tickets is made up of persons who will look at the parade. They will not see the inaugural ceremonies. They will see the cavalcade go down the street, among which will be the float from my own State, and among which will be the calliope which I understand will bring up the rear of the procession. Those persons constitute the first class of the ones to whom this tax will apply.

The second class, as I understand, will be made up of the persons who will be present at the inaugural ball. I have no criticism of the inaugural ball; I think it is appropriate, and doubtless it will be most beautiful and will be an occasion to be long remembered by those who will be privileged to participate therein. But, after all, it is not a part of the solemn, beautiful ceremonies which will take place here at the Capitol, when the President will rededicate himself to the patriotic duty of his great office.

The third category, so far as I know, of persons who will buy admission tickets is made up of those who will buy tickets of admission to the other portion of the ceremony, so-called, and that is the so-called gala which is to take place on the night before the inauguration. I observe in this morning's Washington Post a picture of a young lady, and it is entitled "Movie Actress Jane Powell, in Washington, Runs Over the Songs She Will Sing at the Inaugural Gala Wednesday Evening."

Mr. President, I have read in the newspapers from day to day the list of artists who will perform on that stage the night of the gala enterprise. I have no criticism of it, but I do not want this RECORD to convey to future generations the idea that in acting on this matter we are passing solely on the question of the exemption from taxation of tickets of admission to the beautiful inaugural ceremony. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, these tickets are tickets to the parade and to the inaugural ball and to the gala which will take place on Wednesday night; and they have about them no particular solemnity which would entitle them to exemption from this particular tax under the law.

So, Mr. President, not that I am opposed to the matter on its merits, but because I think this is not a good time to bring it up, I am opposed to the amendment presented by my good friend the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], and likewise I am opposed to the joint resolution presented by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. I am opposed because of the

fact that if the joint resolution were passed by the Congress, it would encourage people to take steps in defiance of law without having first secured the consent of the legislative body; and I am opposed, in the second place, because there is no special solemnity attaching to the ceremonies or events to which the tickets apply, such as would entitle the purchasers of those tickets to exemption from a law now on the statute books of the United States.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Washington Sunday Star of January 16, 1949]

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—MAKING THE INAUGURAL AN ALTAR—SEES AMERICA SPEAKING TO THE WORLD FOR FREEDOM WHILE PRESIDENTIAL INDUCTION PROCEEDS

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

All the world has tickets for the inaugural of the thirty-second President of the United States on this coming Thursday. All nations will be gathered before the canopied white stand in front of the dazzling dome, shrine of a people's devotion. On January 20 more people will hear the voice of one man than ever before in history.

To the kingdom of the spoken word there is now no frontier. In the commerce of the air waves, blocked with verbal traffic, the most potent voice resounding this day around a troubled world is the Voice of America. When one man out of 150,000,000 kisses the Holy Book and says: "I solemnly swear" he but lends his voice to a united Nation pledging undying devotion and eternal vigilance for all that America means at its best. Thank God that that stand so near the legislative halls of freedom is not a balcony where a dictator with clenched fists threatens and thunders. It is, rather, a pulpit where a servant of the Most High and of the people proclaims anew America's creed and bows in reverence before the Judge of all the Earth. As the silver trumpets of democracy are sounding, America will give utterance to its faith in the hearing of the greatest concourse earth has known. On this day when the world—a tragic part of it in physical or mental shackles—stops to listen, this is what it will hear the Voice of America saying:

"We believe God created man free and endowed him with certain inalienable rights and that no government has any right except that which is given it by the consent of the governed, and that the State is made for man, man the individual, and not man for the state. We believe that the future of our Nation and of the world depends on the spread of these ideas everywhere."

This is the authentic voice of earth's mightiest nation that desires nothing for herself that she does not covet for the whole world. It says to the emerging peoples of the east, yearning for freedom, "America understands your passion to be your own masters; America is on your side. We have forever renounced all desire to become the imperial ruler of subject peoples. We want you to see that our Revolution for Independence was a much more tremendous convulsion than the Russian revolution. We come to you not with the regimentation of Lenin, but with the emancipation of Lincoln."

The open Bible and the solemn oath before God are the inaugural symbols that the liberty which we broadcast as our credo and of which we are but trustees is essentially and inherently a spiritual concept. In our prayer for America there must ever be a petition: "Make me big enough to be an American; purge me from conceptions too narrow for freedom." But another petition must always be added: "Make me good enough for freedom."

Undisciplined people never can keep their freedom. Their very liberty will corrupt them. They become their own despots. Lust, liquor, and license will eat out the inner fiber of any nation. These vices threaten a free nation even more than they do a slave state where private lives are regulated by external tyranny. A free society can be kept only as it maintains its rootage in the religious soil from which it sprang, drawing its strength from spiritual springs.

This means that the Voice of America must not just be against something. It must be made crystal clear, so that stirring millions around the world will know that America is for something and take courage. We must broadcast to a bewildered world exactly what that something is. It is liberty that cannot be bartered for security. It is freedom that will not sell its crown jewels for some collectivist Utopia. It is strength that never bullies the weak. It is liberty under God.

Rededication to this will consecrate the inaugural platform as a national altar set up where the whole world may see an America conscious of the awe-inspiring role these fearful days are thrusting upon her, sanctifying her might, moral and material, to something bigger than her own destiny.

As an atom bomb-conscious humanity hangs breathless on what the next 4 years may hold for weal or woe, America will be called to give much. But may she be reminded, as with the rest of the world, she faces the blessing or the curse, life or death, that there is one supreme sacrifice God requires of those to whom much has been given:

"Still stands thine ancient sacrifice,
An humble and a contrite heart.
Lord God of hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will count the number of Senators joining in the request for the yeas and nays. [After a pause.] The clerk reports that there is not a sufficient second.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Miller |
| Anderson | Hill | Millikin |
| Baldwin | Hoey | Morse |
| Barkley | Holland | Mundt |
| Brewster | Humphrey | Murray |
| Bricker | Hunt | Myers |
| Bridges | Ives | Neely |
| Broughton | Jenner | O'Conor |
| Butler | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Byrd | Johnson, Tex. | Pepper |
| Cain | Johnston, S. C. | Reed |
| Capehart | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Chapman | Kem | Russell |
| Chavez | Kerr | Saltonstall |
| Connally | Kilgore | Schoeppel |
| Cordon | Knowland | Smith, Maine |
| Donnell | Langer | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Lodge | Sparkman |
| Downey | Long | Stennis |
| Eastland | Lucas | Taft |
| Ecton | McCarran | Taylor |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Flanders | McFarland | Thye |
| Fulbright | McGrath | Tobey |
| George | McKellar | Vandenberg |
| Gillette | McMahon | Watkins |
| Green | Magnuson | Wherry |
| Gurney | Malone | Wiley |
| Hayden | Martin | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Maybank | Young |

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BALDWIN and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the roll is called, I wish to have a word to say. Certain of the distinguished Senators on the other side of the aisle have referred to the joint resolution as having been introduced by myself. The truth is the resolution was introduced in the House of Representatives. It was referred to the House Ways and Means Committee. That committee recommended its passage. Yesterday it was passed by the House, and in order to expedite its consideration in the Senate, I merely asked the committee if there was objection to bringing it to the floor without reference to a committee. The joint resolution conforms to what has been done on other inaugural occasions, when there was an admission tax applicable to the sale of certain seats and to the admission to certain events in connection with inaugural ceremonies. I do not quarrel with anyone who objects to the tax on agricultural fairs or religious entertainments or shows put on by high schools and other schools. In fact, there are many excise taxes which undoubtedly ought to be lowered, and some of which ought to be entirely eliminated. But I think it is all out of place to offer an amendment to a joint resolution of this kind, which has taken its regular course, and for which I am not responsible. I want to assure my friend from Connecticut that I have no seat on the Avenue and do not expect to buy one; I am not going to the inaugural ball; and I am even going to skip the gala. Those are the only three things for which an admission tax is paid.

Let me assure my friends on the other side that the joint resolution is not a Democratic measure. One would think it was. I am a bit disturbed that Senators on the other side of the aisle are wasting their ammunition on a thing of this kind. I am a bit concerned that they do not wait until something more momentous arises and then go into action on it. The joint resolution is not a Democratic measure, it is not a partisan measure. The Inaugural Committee was set up when the distinguished Senator from Illinois, Mr. Brooks, whom we all remember with great affection, was chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He was chairman of the Inaugural Committee. There were two Republicans upon the committee and but one Democrat. Later, the events of November having transpired, there was a reorganization of the Senate and of the Committee on Rules and Administration. The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has become chairman of the Inaugural Committee. The committee of course necessarily has certain expenses. In the first place it relies primarily on appropriations made by the Congress to take care of those expenses. But there are numerous expenses incident to the carrying on of proper ceremonies on the occasion of the inauguration of a

President, so the Inaugural Committee does the best it can. Whether it secured a committee of businessmen here to underwrite the expenses in part or not, I care nothing about that. All I know is that the Inaugural Committee itself is asking for the exemption on the three particular tickets sold by it or under its authority, on which they desire to be relieved of the admission tax. Undoubtedly admissions to farm or agricultural fairs ought to be relieved; and undoubtedly admissions to religious and church entertainments ought to be relieved. I have no doubt they will be relieved. I can assure my distinguished friend from Connecticut and all other Senators that, before the year is out, there certainly will be an opportunity to consider such admission taxes as have been here discussed.

The joint resolution is not a proposal to repeal the law; it is not a proposal to enact permanent legislation. It is simply a proposal to exempt from admission taxes the sales made in the month of January for a particular and limited occasion; that is all. If it were a proposal to relieve for all time all sorts of tickets from the admission tax, there might, of course, be a good reason for amending the law permanently so as to take care of county fairs and agricultural fairs, and to take care of religious and school entertainments. I share all the noble sentiments of my friends on the other side of the aisle with respect to these great entertainments. I am anxious to see the tax on such admissions removed, but why not wait until we have the opportunity of doing that?

Lest I should lose a single vote, I repeat that the pending joint resolution is not mine. It is House Joint Resolution 85. I presume that perhaps the distinguished chairman of the House committee may have introduced it, but it has not been introduced in the Senate. It is simply here because it was passed by the House.

I am not opposed, certainly, to lifting many of the excise taxes. I am not opposed to reducing a great many of them, if it is possible to do so. Of course, it is a bit difficult, if we are called upon to raise an additional $4,000,000,000 from taxes, to begin exempting various things, but I am quite sure that that would not apply to a reconsideration of certain of the excise taxes, particularly excises of the kind here in question.

I ask my friends in the Senate to please bear in mind that the joint resolution is not an offer to repeal an existing law. It merely exempts from the payment of tax the particular admission tickets on a single, particular occasion; that is all. It is in conformity with precedent heretofore established. The House having passed the joint resolution, I thought I might with some degree of immunity at least bring it before the Senate and ask that it be acted upon without unnecessary delay. So, Mr. President, I express the hope that the Senate will reject the pending amendment or any other amendment that may be offered, however meritorious, to the end that the joint resolution may here be voted up or voted down, and let the House be advised.

I repeat that all my information is to the effect that the Inaugural Committee, mindful of the precedents heretofore set, advised the people who were selling the tickets that perhaps it would not be necessary to collect taxes because the Congress would certainly relieve them. But although that was unwarranted and may be subject to certain criticism, it nevertheless is the fact that tickets already sold and delivered, less the tax, will subject the Inaugural Committee itself to the payment of such tax as may be due the Treasury, unless Congress intervenes to relieve them of the tax.

So I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will reject the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I have already taken considerable time of the Senate in order to debate this amendment, but I want to express my appreciation for the patience of my colleagues——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair how many times a Senator can speak on the same amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the rules, a Senator can speak twice on the same amendment on the same day.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I might add that I am a bit unhappy to find myself opposed to so distinguished a Senator as is the senior Senator from Georgia. I understand the situation in which he finds himself. The joint resolution came over from the House. It is not the Senator's resolution, but it relates to a matter which is in the purview of the Finance Committee, and it is the Senator's duty to support the resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I have not any particular quarrel with the joint resolution itself. I think I shall vote against it, but I do not feel so violently opposed, perhaps, as do some other Senators with regard to it. However, under the Constitution, we in the Senate have only very infrequent opportunities to consider revenue measures. We must wait for such a measure to come over from the House. In the first session of the Eightieth Congress I introduced a bill which would have exempted from the tax admissions to agricultural fairs. Unfortunately, the committee did not act upon it, and, I think, for good and sufficient reasons. There is now before the Senate the subject of exempting from the tax admission tickets in connection with the inaugural ceremonies. It happens that this particular matter concerns itself with the exemption of taxation on admissions to the various functions for which fees are charged in connection with the inaugural ceremonies.

As has been ably pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], there is no charge to be paid by persons who wish to view the administration of the Presidential oath, which is, after all, the only essential part of the entire ceremony. I think it is perhaps appropriate that, surrounding that ceremony, for a period of time, there should be other gala occasions. Those are essential occasions for the pleasure, amusement, and celebration of the people, and they are particularly appropriate to the tax. If they are to be exempted, then it seems to me, Mr. President, there are other exemptions which, in justness and fairness, should be granted. I can think of no single one which is more meritorious to receive an exemption from the tax than admissions to agricultural fairs. My amendment is very carefully drawn so that it deals exclusively with those fairs from which no one derives any profit, either monetary or otherwise, except the profit which is shared in common with every man, woman, and child interested in agriculture, which includes almost everyone in the State of Connecticut, and I think it is true of everyone in the other 47 States.

So I say, Mr. President, in the first place, that this amendment is an appropriate amendment, and that in justness and fairness it should be adopted. I urge that the Senate adopt my amendment.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia says that this is not a Democratic measure. If he says it is not, I am sure it is not. I think it is fair to say that it is part of the Democratic program in this Congress. That, Mr. President, leads me to say a few words regarding that program.

Last summer the President of the United States called the Republican Eightieth Congress back for an extra session and put before it a list of 29 measures, all of them far-reaching and highly controversial measures, involving fundamental changes in the American way of life and costs to taxpayers running into billions of dollars. In calling the Congress back the President said that it could pass all of the measures recommended within 15 days if it so desired.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks, at this point, a list of those 29 measures proposed by the President at that time.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Reestablishment of an excess-profits tax.
2. Restoration of consumer credit control.
3. Greater authority for Federal Reserve Board to regulate bank credit.
4. Authority to regulate commodity exchange speculation.
5. Authority for allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities.
6. Strengthening of rent controls, and extra appropriations for enforcement.
7. Stand-by rationing authority.
8. Price control authority.
9. Wage control authority.
10. Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Increase of minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.
13. Fifty-percent increase in old-age pensions, lowering of eligibility age for women

from 65 to 60, extension of social security to all not covered now.

14. Amendment of Displaced Persons Act.

15. A United States Government loan for construction of United Nations headquarters.

16. Senate ratification of an international wheat agreement.

17. Extra appropriations for a TVA steam plant and other power projects and removal of certain limitations from the law.

18. Revision of Federal pay schedules.

19. Anti-poll-tax bill.

20. Antilynch bill.

21. FEPC bill.

22. Compulsory health insurance.

23. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and its replacement with another Truman-endorsed labor-management relations law.

24. Additional farm legislation.

25. Additional reciprocal trade agreements legislation.

26. Additional antitrust legislation.

27. Universal military training.

28. A national science foundation.

29. Approval of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I think it is interesting to recall what the President said at that time, because today happens to be the fifteenth day of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, which is under Democratic control. Here is the record of that Congress, in which those who like may take such pride as they feel.

First. A bill has been passed increasing the pay of the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House, giving each of them a generous tax-free allowance.

Second. A bill has been passed giving Government employees a 4-day inaugural holiday.

Third. The House has made a change in its rules which is hailed by the Democrats as a liberal measure, but which, it seems to me, literally takes us back to Cannonism.

Fourth. The House has passed, and we in the Senate are now asked at once to pass, a bill exempting from the Federal admissions tax tickets for the inaugural functions.

Mr. President, that is all; that is the record of the Democrat leadership to date. Those four items of legislation have been brought to our attention by the leadership on the other side of the aisle.

I wish to make just a few observations, Mr. President, about the achievements of this leadership in the past 15 days.

The bill to raise the President's pay has a direct bearing on the late election campaign. In that campaign the President and others denounced the Republican tax reduction law because they said it favored the rich. Yet I notice that taxes on high incomes are so severe that in order to raise the President's salary it is necessary to adopt the subterfuge of a tax-free expense account. No private person of wealth of course has any such easy escape from taxation.

Another bill affecting taxes is also slated today by the Democratic leadership. It is this measure to exempt from the Federal admissions tax tickets to the inaugural parade, the inaugural ball, and the gala concert.

It is intimated by high authority that the purpose is to bail out the Inaugural Committee from a loss which they may otherwise take on account of having sold these tickets without including the tax.

Of course, Mr. President, no privately run festival, as has been several times said already, would escape such a loss even if the private operator went into bankruptcy. Community and charitable events throughout the Nation do not escape these Federal excise taxes, but the pending joint resolution, to exempt these particular tickets from taxes, illustrates the principle that whenever the Federal Government engages in an activity, a request is quickly made that the Government itself be relieved from the burden of taxes.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that the first 15 days under the Democratic Eighty-first Congress achieved a magnificent record, a record of not passing the program which the President said the Republicans could have passed in a similar period, but simply passed bills raising taxes for Democratic officeholders, exempting Federal officials from the payment of taxes, and exempting a Democratic-controlled festivity from the payment of excise taxes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who is absent on official business, would vote "nay," if present.

I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and Hon. Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent. If present, the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who is necessarily absent, would vote "nay," if present.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—38

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hickenlooper | Reed |
| Baldwin | Ives | Schoeppel |
| Brewster | Jenner | Smith, Maine |
| Bricker | Kem | Taft |
| Bridges | Knowland | Thye |
| Butler | Langer | Tobey |
| Cain | Lodge | Vandenberg |
| Capehart | McCarthy | Watkins |
| Ecton | McMahon | Wherry |
| Ferguson | Malone | Wiley |
| Flanders | Martin | Williams |
| Gurney | Morse | Young |
| Hendrickson | Mundt | |

NAYS—54

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Green | McCarran |
| Barkley | Hayden | McClellan |
| Broughton | Hill | McFarland |
| Byrd | Hoey | McGrath |
| Chapman | Holland | McKellar |
| Connally | Humphrey | Magnuson |
| Cordon | Hunt | Maybank |
| Donnell | Johnson, Colo. | Miller |
| Douglas | Johnson, Tex. | Millikin |
| Downey | Johnston, S. C. | Murray |
| Eastland | Kefauver | Myers |
| Ellender | Kerr | Neely |
| Fulbright | Kilgore | O'Conor |
| George | Long | O'Mahoney |
| Gillette | Lucas | Pepper |
| Robertson | Smith, N. J. | Taylor |
| Russell | Sparkman | Thomas, Okla. |
| Saltonstall | Stennis | Thomas, Utah |

NOT VOTING—4

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chavez | Tydings | Wagner |
| Frear | | |

So Mr. BALDWIN's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is still before the Senate and open to amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I send to the desk certain amendments which I now offer, and ask that reading of them be temporarily deferred, so that I may explain them.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the reading of the amendments will be temporarily deferred.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, let me say that I heartily agree with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] when he says that it would be better if we would not amend the joint resolution, but could vote it up or down on its merits—and I do not think it has any merits in its unamended form.

However, the rules under which we operate make it impossible for a Senator to introduce tax legislation. For that reason the only method by which I can bring the matters I have in mind before the Senate is to offer them as amendments to tax legislation which comes from the House to the Senate. Such is the situation today. Were I not to introduce these two amendments today, it is entirely possible that the opportunity might not again arise during this session of the Congress. For that reason I feel I have no alternative but to offer my amendments to the joint resolution which is today before the Senate.

Mr. President, I do not intend to take much of the Senate's time today. I feel that a mere statement of the purpose of the amendments will be the best argument for them.

First, is my amendment to remove the tax on cooking stoves. At the present time a young couple who marries and buys a stove on which to cook their meals must pay a "luxury" tax on the stove. A 20-percent luxury tax on an item which is as necessary in every home as a cooking stove is ridiculous and should be removed.

My second amendment is to remove the tax on oils, creams, and powders that are necessarily used on babies. This, in my opinion, is the most preposterous of all so-called luxury taxes. Any doctor will say that the use of oil and powder on a baby is a necessity for the comfort and health of the baby—yet, these items are placed in the "luxury" class and taxed 20 percent.

In view of the Democrats' professed interest in a poor-man's tax bill, it seems to be unusual and out of line with this professed interest that the majority party should now sponsor a bill to exempt from tax the tickets to the inaugural ball and other inaugural activities. I cannot understand the attitude that going to the gala night or paying $20 for tickets to the inaugural ball is a necessity, but it is a luxury for a family to have a baby. While I am a bachelor and cannot speak with authority on the sub-

ject, I understand that a baby is not a luxury.

A vote against my amendment to exempt these toilet articles from the 20-percent luxury tax is, in effect, saying to the young mother who is at home taking care of her baby that she is being taxed for that luxury. I am sure the mother who is obliged to stay at home powdering and applying oil to her baby's bottom does not feel that it is any luxury and would never be able to understand why $20 tickets to attend a dance could be considered in the category of a necessity.

So I urge at this time, Mr. President, that the Senate adopt my amendments—one exempting from taxation the stoves which young married couples must buy on which to do their cooking; and the other exempting from taxation toilet articles which are used in the care of babies, on the theory that such products are necessary to the health and welfare of the people of this country, whereas tickets to the inaugural festivities are obviously luxuries.

Mr. President, on my amendments I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to have the amendments read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the joint resolution it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to excise tax on toilet preparations) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The tax imposed by this section shall not be applicable with respect to any substance, article, or preparation which is used or applied, or intended to be used or applied, on babies."

(b) Section 3406 (a) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the excise tax imposed upon electric, gas, or oil appliances) is amended by striking out "electric, gas, or oil appliances of the type used for cooking, warming, or keeping warm food or beverages for consumption on the premises;".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective on and after the first day of the first month following the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely wanted to have the amendments read for the information and edification of the Senate and the country. I am ready for a vote.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll on the amendments of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY].

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and Hon. Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—28

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ives | Schoeppel |
| Baldwin | Jenner | Smith, Maine |
| Bricker | Kem | Tobey |
| Bridges | Langer | Watkins |
| Butler | Lodge | Wherry |
| Cain | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Capehart | Malone | Williams |
| Ecton | Martin | Young |
| Flanders | Morse | |
| Hendrickson | Reed | |

NAYS—63

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hill | Maybank |
| Barkley | Hoey | Miller |
| Brewster | Holland | Millikin |
| Broughton | Humphrey | Mundt |
| Byrd | Hunt | Murray |
| Chapman | Johnson, Colo. | Myers |
| Connally | Johnson, Tex. | Neely |
| Cordon | Johnston, S. C. | O'Conor |
| Donnell | Kefauver | Pepper |
| Douglas | Kerr | Robertson |
| Downey | Kilgore | Russell |
| Eastland | Knowland | Saltonstall |
| Ellender | Long | Smith, N. J. |
| Ferguson | Lucas | Sparkman |
| Fulbright | McCarran | Stennis |
| George | McClellan | Taft |
| Gillette | McFarland | Taylor |
| Green | McGrath | Thomas, Okla. |
| Gurney | McKellar | Thomas, Utah |
| Hayden | McMahon | Thye |
| Hickenlooper | Magnuson | Vandenberg |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chavez | O'Mahoney | Wagner |
| Frear | Tydings | |

So Mr. MCCARTHY's amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MORSE and Mr. BALDWIN asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the joint resolution itself.

We have just voted against the amendments offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and I, like any other American, abide by the result. The majority must have its way.

However, it seems to me that in his argument he pointed out something pertaining to the amendments which is applicable to the joint resolution itself.

His amendments would exempt oils and creams used for the care of babies. They are now taxed as luxuries. We have defeated those amendments. The joint resolution would exempt from taxation as a luxury the admission charges to the gala occasions attendant upon the inauguration.

At this point I should like to read into the RECORD a letter from a young constituent of mine which I inserted in the RECORD last year, because it seems to me to be peculiarly appropriate. It has to do with the luxury tax on baby creams. This comes from a young mother in Connecticut.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., *June 1, 1948.*

The Honorable RAYMOND E. BALDWIN,
*Senator from Connecticut,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SIR: The other day I went to the drug store to buy some baby cream for Louis, our year-old son, whose little bottom had gotten all red and irritated. I was charged 47 cents for a jar which holds about 2 ounces. That price is high enough to pay for this product but when I have to give 10 additional cents for a luxury tax for a baby item, that is when I get my dander up.

Since when has it been considered a luxury for the baby to have a sore bottom? It is hard enough trying to raise a family and give America the healthy future sons, daughters, and voters she needs without these additional burdens such as luxury taxes on essential baby items.

I realize that the Government is sustained through taxes and I am willing to give my share, but luxury tax on the essentials of a baby's well-being is going too far. I'm sure there must be many other sources from which this additional money can be obtained and which would feel the pinch much less than the already overburdened budget of today's young parents. What do you think?

Respectfully yours,
(Mrs.) LOUIS W. MINGIONE.

Mr. President, what do we think? First, let me ask myself, What do I think? I think that those who attend the inaugural ceremonies and functions, primarily for their pleasure—and they are perfectly proper functions—can much better afford to pay the tax which the law as it presently stands provides for than can young mothers afford to pay a luxury tax on baby creams and baby oils.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the final passage of the joint resolution. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 45, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—45

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Ellender | Hoey |
| Barkley | Fulbright | Holland |
| Broughton | George | Humphrey |
| Connally | Gillette | Hunt |
| Douglas | Green | Johnson, Tex. |
| Downey | Hayden | Johnston, S. C. |
| Eastland | Hill | Kefauver |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Kerr | McMahon | O'Conor |
| Kilgore | Magnuson | O'Mahoney |
| Long | Maybank | Pepper |
| Lucas | Miller | Sparkman |
| McCarran | Millikin | Stennis |
| McFarland | Murray | Taylor |
| McGrath | Myers | Thomas, Okla. |
| McKellar | Neely | Thomas, Utah |

NAYS—47

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Robertson |
| Baldwin | Hickenlooper | Russell |
| Brewster | Ives | Saltonstall |
| Bricker | Jenner | Schoeppel |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Smith, Maine |
| Butler | Kem | Smith, N. J. |
| Byrd | Knowland | Taft |
| Cain | Langer | Thye |
| Capehart | Lodge | Tobey |
| Chapman | McCarthy | Vandenberg |
| Cordon | McClellan | Watkins |
| Donnell | Malone | Wherry |
| Ecton | Martin | Wiley |
| Ferguson | Morse | Williams |
| Flanders | Mundt | Young |
| Gurney | Reed | |

NOT VOTING—4

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Chavez | Tydings | Wagner |
| Frear | | |

So the joint resolution was not passed.

Mr. BREWSTER. I move to reconsider the vote just had on the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider. That question is not debatable.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. IVES. Do I correctly understand that the vote about to be taken is on the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—42

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Capehart | Hendrickson |
| Baldwin | Cordon | Hickenlooper |
| Brewster | Donnell | Ives |
| Bricker | Ecton | Jenner |
| Bridges | Ferguson | Johnson, Colo. |
| Butler | Flanders | Kem |
| Cain | Gurney | Knowland |
| Langer | Reed | Tobey |
| Lodge | Saltonstall | Vandenberg |
| McCarthy | Schoeppel | Watkins |
| Malone | Smith, Maine | Wherry |
| Martin | Smith, N. J. | Wiley |
| Morse | Taft | Williams |
| Mundt | Thye | Young |

NAYS—49

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hoey | Maybank |
| Barkley | Holland | Miller |
| Broughton | Humphrey | Millikin |
| Byrd | Hunt | Myers |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | Neely |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | O'Conor |
| Connally | Kefauver | O'Mahoney |
| Douglas | Kerr | Pepper |
| Downey | Kilgore | Robertson |
| Eastland | Long | Russell |
| Ellender | Lucas | Sparkman |
| Fulbright | McClellan | Stennis |
| George | McFarland | Taylor |
| Gillette | McGrath | Thomas, Okla. |
| Green | McKellar | Thomas, Utah |
| Hayden | McMahon | |
| Hill | Magnuson | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Frear | Murray | Wagner |
| McCarran | Tydings | |

So the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether it is permitted that I may withdraw the motion to reconsider?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Only by leave of the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The question now recurs on the motion to reconsider.

Mr. BREWSTER and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent because of illness.

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 47, as follows:

YEAS—44

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hoey | Magnuson |
| Barkley | Holland | Maybank |
| Broughton | Humphrey | Miller |
| Chavez | Hunt | Millikin |
| Connally | Johnson, Tex. | Myers |
| Douglas | Johnston, S. C. | Neely |
| Downey | Kefauver | O'Conor |
| Eastland | Kerr | O'Mahoney |
| Ellender | Kilgore | Pepper |
| Fulbright | Long | Sparkman |
| George | Lucas | Stennis |
| Gillette | McFarland | Taylor |
| Green | McGrath | Thomas, Okla. |
| Hayden | McKellar | Thomas, Utah |
| Hill | McMahon | |

NAYS—47

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Robertson |
| Baldwin | Hickenlooper | Russell |
| Brewster | Ives | Saltonstall |
| Bricker | Jenner | Schoeppel |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Smith, Maine |
| Butler | Kem | Smith, N. J. |
| Byrd | Knowland | Taft |
| Cain | Langer | Thye |
| Capehart | Lodge | Tobey |
| Chapman | McCarthy | Vandenberg |
| Cordon | McClellan | Watkins |
| Donnell | Malone | Wherry |
| Ecton | Martin | Wiley |
| Ferguson | Morse | Williams |
| Flanders | Mundt | Young |
| Gurney | Reed | |

NOT VOTING—5

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Frear | Murray | Wagner |
| McCarran | Tydings | |

So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, reported favorably the nomination of Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, Corps of Engineers, to be president and a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of law, which was ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar.

SECRETARY OF STATE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dean G. Acheson to be Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in presenting the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Secretary of State, I wish to pay tribute once more to the collective wisdom which characterized the deliberations and decisions of the Committee on Foreign Relations during my previous chairmanship. I was always pleased at the spirit of harmony and unity with which the committee performed its all-important tasks. During the past 2 years, under the able leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], this teamwork continued without a break. It is my hope that we shall carry on in the same way in the present Congress.

Mr. President, the Senate of the United States, in performing its function of confirmation or rejection of Presidential appointments, exercises a vital power in public affairs. The Constitution wisely provides that the President shall have

power "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for." This provision represents one of the checks and balances of the Constitution. It constitutes a limitation upon the power of the Executive to make appointments of high Government officers.

It lays a distinct responsibility upon the Senate. It imposes the duty of advising as well as consenting to Presidential nominations and to the making of treaties. The Senate must bring to the discharge of its duty thorough knowledge as to the qualifications of appointees and of their fitness to perform the duties of their offices. The Constitution lays upon the Senate a solemn obligation.

On January 3, 1949, a great American, George C. Marshall, tendered his resignation as Secretary of State. As Chief of Staff of the United States Army during World War II, he had played a decisive part in the victories in Europe and Japan. At the end of the war he forsook the retirement he so deeply desired and richly deserved to answer his country's call by entering upon the great office of Secretary of State.

When illness overtook him and forced him to resign, President Truman wrote to him as follows:

> Those of us who have had extensive experience in public affairs know full well that there are very few indispensable men. Happily for the continuity of government, there appears from time to time a man of outstanding ability, whose service in one post of responsibility gives him exceptional qualification to discharge other duties of equal moment in a quite different field of activity. You are the exemplification of the type of public servant I have in mind.

These words echoed the feelings of grateful millions of Americans throughout the United States. They felt a great sense of loss.

To fill the position of Secretary of State in these turbulent and troubled times President Truman felt the need of one with an intimate knowledge of the foreign relations of the United States, experienced in the conduct of our foreign policy, versed in the State Department organization, and able to carry on the excellent work of Secretary Marshall with unbroken continuity.

Today the Senate, in pursuance of its authority and in accordance with its judgment and convictions, is called upon to confirm or reject the nomination by President Truman of Mr. Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State of the United States. The office to which he has been nominated is one of lofty functions and high responsibility. The Secretary of State is the adviser to the President in the matter of the relations of the United States with foreign countries. The Constitution lays upon the President responsibility for the conduct of our foreign relations. The Secretary of State is therefore charged with the duty of keeping the President advised of transactions in the realm of foreign relations, which are of such vital concern to the Government of the United States.

The nomination of Mr. Dean Acheson was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the committee held a public hearing on January 13, 1949, and on the following day, January 14, held an executive session of the committee. No Senator made any request that any particular witness should be summoned or heard by the committee.

The fullest opportunity was given to members of the committee to interrogate the nominee, in both the public hearing and in the executive hearing, upon any matter touching on his experience and qualifications, or in anywise relating to the performance of his duties.

In the hearings there was no formal charge filed by anyone against Mr. Acheson's character, ability, or experience. However, in the press there were various statements by individuals of a critical nature. In the hearings, all of these matters were reviewed and investigated. At the end of the hearing, the committee of 13 members unanimously voted to approve the nomination and recommend that the Senate confirm Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State.

The action of the committee was thoroughly nonpartisan, both Republican and Democratic members having voted as a unit in his support.

As a result of the hearing, it was disclosed that Mr. Acheson is 55 years of age; that he is a graduate of Yale University and of the law department of Harvard University. For a period he was law secretary to Mr. Justice Brandeis. For some years he was a member of the law firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb.

In 1933, Mr. Acheson served as Under Secretary of the Treasury. Later he served, at the request of the Attorney General of the United States, as the chairman of the Attorney General's committee on administrative procedure, which made its report to Congress in 1940, which report was subsequently of use to the Congress in legislation on the subject of administrative procedure.

Mr. Acheson served as Assistant Secretary of State from 1941 until August 1945. Later he was appointed Under Secretary of State and served in that capacity until July 1947. During that 2-year period, Mr. Acheson was often called upon to fill the role of Acting Secretary of State during the frequent and extended absences of the Secretary from the country.

This fact is worthy of emphasis, Mr. President. The State Department is no new field for Mr. Acheson. Experience has demonstrated that he is thoroughly at home in the Secretary's office. This should be comforting, for we know of the terrible complexity of the many problems from Europe, Korea, Asia, Palestine, the Balkans, Indonesia, the atom bomb, and other problems, with which the Secretary must contend.

It is my belief that Mr. Acheson will make a distinguished record as Secretary of State. He is a man of splendid tact, is familiar with the practices of diplomacy, is the possessor of a virile and aggressive policy in carrying out his conviction of duty and responsibility to his country. He will maintain the foreign policy of the United States with firmness and skill.

Mr. Acheson is a man of unusual ability and his former service in the State Department has given him experience and knowledge of foreign relations which are superb. His nomination was endorsed by former Secretary Cordell Hull, by former Secretary Stettinius, and by former Secretary Byrnes. Mr. Hull said:

> As Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson will display the same type of outstanding ability that has characterized his previous service to the Nation.

Former Secretary of State Byrnes said he "deeply regrets General Marshall's resignation as Secretary of State," and added that Mr. Acheson "is well qualified to serve as Secretary."

Former Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius made favorable comment on Mr. Acheson. He personally appeared before the committee and said:

> I have found Mr. Acheson to be a man of unusual intellectual brilliance, of great personal integrity, forceful, and courageous in meeting problems. He is patient, a tireless worker, and he wins the confidence of those with whom he is associated. He is uniquely qualified for this post from the standpoint of natural endowment, age, temperament, and capacity, and his intimacy and familiarity with foreign affairs as a result of his long experience with such statesmen as Cordell Hull, James Byrnes, and George Marshall in the roles of Assistant Secretary of State, Under Secretary, and Acting Secretary of State.

That statement was made by Mr. Stettinius before the committee.

Former President Hoover made favorable comment on the nomination. He said that Mr. Acheson will bring outstanding ability to the State Department.

Mr. John Foster Dulles, a distinguished Republican, and reputed to have been the adviser of Governor Dewey on foreign relations, and a man who has served with great usefulness and distinction as a representative of the United States on a number of occasions in the United Nations, said:

> I deeply regret Mr. Marshall's resignation as Secretary of State. He contributed great prestige and wisdom in a spirit of loyal devotion to this country. Since his resignation had to be, I am glad that his successor will be one who, as former Under Secretary of State, has gained the experience and demonstrated the capacity to carry forward our foreign policy without interruption or vacillation that, in the present state of affairs, could be disastrous.

Mr. President, it is my view that the Senate should confirm Mr. Acheson by an overwhelming vote. The foreign relations of the United States are of the highest moment. The United States, by reason of its tremendous power in the economic field and its potential strength as a military power, cannot avoid its high responsibility as a world leader. Its efforts to maintain world peace must be maintained and strengthened and advanced. The conduct of its foreign relations calls for the strongest ability in the field of public affairs. Its conduct

must be handled with the greatest delicacy and yet with firmness and resolution. Secretary Acheson will firmly and consistently assert and support the foreign policy of the United States in the preservation of its rights and the rights of its citizens and in its determination to secure world peace and freedom from aggression. It is my belief that Mr. Acheson possesses the ability, the character, and the experience which eminently qualify him to perform the gigantic duties of Secretary of State of the United States and as the chief adviser of the President in these troublous and dangerous years.

The Senate should confirm his nomination by an overwhelming vote that will carry a message to the entire world that he has our confidence and support and that he will carry on the foreign policy of the United States with dignity and strength and upon a level above partisan or petty politics—an American policy, of lofty moral leadership in the cause of world peace.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the nomination of Mr. Dean Acheson to become Secretary of State has aroused some anxieties both in and out of the Senate. In view of those anxieties, and in contemplation of the committee action recommending his confirmation, I think the situation requires me to make a very frank statement about the problem which confronts us at the moment when the roll is called.

Mr. President, in discussing any change in State Department management at the present time I wish first to discharge an obligation. As chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee through the active tenure of Secretary Marshall and Under Secretary Lovett, I state for the record that they gave us the fullest possible measure of courtesy, confidence, consideration, and cooperation which could exist between the executive and legislative branches of the Government in respect to the tasks upon which we collaborated in the Eightieth Congress. I am sure this is the unanimous opinion of the committee. I regret to see them leave.

The Senate now faces the responsibility of passing judgment upon their successors. The immediate question before the Senate is the confirmation of Mr. Acheson.

I wish by way of approach, Mr. President, to say for myself that I look upon Presidential appointments to the Cabinet in a somewhat different light than I do other nominations. The reason is obviously inherent in the phrase "official family" by which the Cabinet is usually described. These are the President's intimate personal advisers. This is peculiarly true in respect to the Secretary of State, because this officer necessarily must be the President's sympathetic and responsive agent in the discharge of the President's unavoidable responsibility under the Constitution for the conduct of foreign affairs.

I do not suggest that the Senate's collateral responsibility of confirmation is a mere formality. It is not. But I do respectfully suggest that in the case of the President's official family, his own right of choice carries a strong presumption in its favor; and it is appropriately vetoed by the Senate only for preponderant reasons of ineligibility. I am frank to say that I have found it necessary upon at least one occasion in the past to exercise this veto. I have no quarrel with any Senator who uses such a veto today. I am simply stating for myself that I think the President's choice of an official family, and particularly a Secretary of State, is more his business than it is ours; that it is more his responsibility than it is ours; and, barring clear public policy to the contrary, I personally shall leave this preponderant responsibility where I believe it belongs, and where I can thereafter hold it to strict unpartisan accountability.

But this viewpoint by no means absolves the Senate from faithful examination of any Presidential nominee's credentials. In an unprecedented effort to make the record clear, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in the present instance ordered a public hearing, in which Mr. Dean Acheson, the nominee, was asked to face all the objections which had been raised against him. He did so with what I believe even his critics would concede was a complete and commendable candor. I urge a careful reading of this public hearing, the print of which is upon every Senator's desk. I urge it upon all Senators and citizens who have rightly asked that their objections be explored.

With these preliminary observations, I shall state in a few words the factors which bring me to my own personal conclusion in this matter.

Affirmatively—and I believe beyond dispute—it can be said that Mr. Acheson has had a long and distinguished career in the public service, and particularly in foreign affairs. As a result he perhaps has a greater and more reliable familiarity with all the vast detail of our utterly complex current diplomatic problems than any other new Secretary who could be taken either from private citizenship or from another department of the Government. This is so essential a qualification that, taken by itself, it could be conclusive.

Mr. Acheson also has had a large experience in his contacts with Congress, where I believe it will again be generally conceded that he has proved himself to be one of the ablest advocates ever to appear before committees of the Senate and the House. We all are familiar with his habit of complete mastery of subjects which he brings to our attention. My own personal testimony is that in many dealings with him in the State Department, though we have had many differences of opinion, I have always found him reliable, helpful, cooperative, and trustworthy.

During previous tenures in the State Department he has been personally associated with the development of most of the major foreign policies which we are now pursuing. Therefore his appointment as Secretary of State, if it predicts anything, predicts continuity in these national attitudes rather than otherwise. He has so indicated, so far as he personally can, in his testimony before our committee.

But, of course, Mr. President, it is impossible to ask him or any other nominee precisely what policies he will pursue, because he or any other nominee will pursue whatever policies are directed by the President of the United States. Only the President himself can answer that question; and the answer may sometimes be quite impromptu and unpredictable.

We cannot control foreign policy through our action on this or any other nominee. I want to make that plain. Therefore it should be made wholly obvious that we do not underwrite the results, in terms of foreign policy, which will flow from our confirmation of this or any other nominee. But let me significantly add at this point, Mr. President—and this is one of the things which I confess appeals to me—that Mr. Acheson has demonstrated his possession of a rugged character, in that he has demonstrated that if and when, in the course of his public work, he fundamentally disagrees with his President, he knows how to resign.

Let me with equal brevity turn to the arguments which we have heard against the confirmation of Mr. Acheson. In the Hiss matter he sharply discriminates between Alger Hiss, for whom he appears to have had absolutely no responsibility, and Mr. Donald Hiss, his law partner. I believe the records of the House Un-American Activities Committee, plus subsequently pending court actions, justify this discrimination. Nowhere in this connection are there any sinister implications involving Mr. Acheson in any degree that have reached my notice. I may add that the men are legion who held a high opinion of Alger Hiss before the disclosure of events which he admits, to say nothing of events which he denies.

I have asked Mr. Acheson if I might summarize his Hiss attitudes in the following single sentence, and he agrees:

> An assertion of personal friendship for the Hiss brothers; a stanch defense of Donald Hiss; a purpose to leave Alger Hiss to the courts. Total and aggressive hostility to subversion in the State Department.

It is to be noted in this connection that the one and only reason Mr. Acheson's name came into the Hiss discussions was a statement by former Assistant Secretary Adolf Berle regarding a difference of opinion between them long predating any Hiss disclosures. Mr. Acheson categorically denies the Berle thesis, and Mr. Berle voluntarily wired the committee that he thinks Mr. Acheson's nomination should be promptly approved.

This phase of the case inevitably involves collateral issues. I wish to touch upon three or four of the questions with which we have been approached by many persons during the past few days in regard to this problem.

What does Mr. Acheson think about communism? This is what he thinks. I quote his categorical statement to our committee in response to a direct question:

> It is my view that communism as a doctrine is economically fatal to a free society and to human rights and fundamental freedoms. Communism as an aggressive factor in world conquest is fatal to independent governments and to free peoples.

Will Mr. Acheson be a softy in dealing with communism?

Mr. Acheson says—I am quoting from the hearings on Senators' desks:

> The things I read about myself as an appeaser are so incredible that it is difficult for me to believe that even disinterested malevolence could think them up.

That may be an oblique answer. But it is susceptible of but one emphatic interpretation.

Will Mr. Acheson continue State Department house cleaning if and when disloyal personnel is uncovered? Specifically, many Senators who believe in Assistant Secretary John Peurifoy's work in this regard want to know whether he will be allowed freely to carry on, and wish to make sure that he will. The answer seems to be that Peurifoy will be one of the new Secretary's key men.

What does Mr. Acheson think of Moscow? Perhaps the best answer is to turn the question around: What does Moscow think of Mr. Acheson? Upon at least one historic occasion it has officially and violently protested his statements about Russia and complained bitterly of his attitudes.

So much for this phase. The other important, critical phase has related to Mr. Acheson's law-firm connections and its activities. I shall not dwell upon the details because they are completely available in the printed hearings on Senators' desks. Mr. Acheson has made a full disclosure of all his firm's foreign clients and their fees for these labors. In most instances the cases involve litigation in the jurisdiction of the courts and are unrelated to the jurisdiction of the State Department. The exception is the matter of the Polish loan. Mr. Acheson's law firm did legal work for the Polish Government in connection with a $90,000,000 loan when Mr. Acheson was in the State Department and out of the firm. In March of 1947, after President Truman had made sharp statements regarding the Polish Government, the law firm, from which Mr. Acheson had disassociated himself, canceled its connections with the Polish Supply Mission.

In all instances, Mr. Acheson withdrew from his firm, and from any of his firm's emoluments, when he entered upon any of his public tours of duty. Heretofore, however, his name has remained in the firm name. That could involve dubious implications. When I asked him, in the public hearing, whether this might invite misunderstanding, he promptly replied that he is asking his partners to remove his name from the firm name when he becomes Secretary of State. I do not know how we could ask him to do more.

Balancing up all these facts, Mr. President, and remembering the rule which I said I apply for myself in passing upon Cabinet nominees to the President's "official family," I am unable to find any such predominant ineligibility in Mr. Acheson as would warrant me in voting against his confirmation.

But, in fairness to Mr. Acheson, I do not wish to leave the matter in that somewhat negative climate. Regardless of the rule, I think that Mr. Acheson's record and the committee record combine to affirmatively recommend Mr. Acheson's confirmation.

There remains, Mr. President, just one final point to which I shall advert. I have been asked by some Senators whether I strongly opposed the suggested appointment of Mr. Acheson as Administrator for ECA, and, if so, why that same opposition does not persist in respect to the Secretaryship of State. That is a fair question. I am glad to answer.

I did vigorously oppose the suggested appointment of Mr. Acheson as ECA Administrator, for very specific reasons which were no reflection upon him and which have no remote application in the instant case. Senators will remember that in our long debates on ECA the Congress made it abundantly clear that it would insist upon separating rehabilitation economics from diplomatic statecraft in the management of this vast business enterprise. Congress recognized that the State Department would inevitably find itself deeply concerned from time to time with the impact of ECA decisions upon foreign policy, and it wanted to preserve the State Department's wholly legitimate right of consultation. Therefore, adopting a formula recommended by the famous Brookings Institution, it provided in the ECA legislation that the Secretary of State should have a right of consultation with the ECA Administrator whenever he might feel that foreign policy is involved, and that the President should umpire any dispute between them on this score. Having thus fully protected the interests of the State Department, Congress demanded—and was categorically promised by me and other sponsors of the legislation—that the paramount economic phases of ECA should be in the hands of an Administrator who was a proven success in large-scale business management, and who was not related to the State Department. Mr. Acheson was not a large-scale business operator, and he was substantially related to the State Department. Therefore, I did not believe he qualified as ECA Administrator under the particularly narrow and technical specifications which we had drawn for the job. No such specifications are involved in the Secretaryship of State, and that is my point. Indeed, Mr. Acheson's long and intimate connections and experience in the State Department actually become one of his assets in the present instance. His distinguished professional standing as a lawyer establishes a factor of eligibility to be Secretary of State, as Mr. Paul Hoffman's distinguished place in American business conclusively did for him to become Administrator for ECA.

I think the distinction is clear, Mr. President, why Mr. Acheson was not eligible to be appointed Administrator of ECA, but on the face of the record has ample credentials for the consideration of the President in making this personal choice of a Secretary of State.

That concludes what I have to say, Mr. President. I join in the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in which five Republicans are counted with eight Democrats in voting that Mr. Acheson shall be confirmed.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to say that it gives me, perhaps I should say, mild pleasure in preparing to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. Certainly I am happy to have a civilian as Secretary of State. I always had a high regard for General Marshall as a man and as a general; but I thought his background as a general qualified him for the job of Secretary of State in about the same way that a minister of the gospel is qualified to be Chief of Staff. So I am happy to see that we shall have a civilian Secretary of State again.

Mr. President, I feel very strongly about our foreign policy. There can be little doubt of that, because recently I jumped my party traces and ran for Vice President on the ticket with Henry Wallace, not because I was profoundly disturbed at domestic developments in our country, but because I felt sincerely and honestly that our foreign policy was leading us to disaster, to a world war which no one could win; I felt that we were spending fabulous sums of money only to buy enemies, really. That was the way I saw it, and that is the way I still see it.

I think it is a sad thing, indicative of the hysterical times in which we live, that Mr. Acheson was forced to undergo what amounted to a third degree, practically, before he was recommended for confirmation as Secretary of State. To my mind, it is deplorable that in the executive session of the committee, attention was called to one sentence or one paragraph in which Mr. Acheson took some rather severe blows at the Soviet Union. I say this inasmuch as it is the Soviet Union that we must get along with if we are to have world peace and if we are to avert a world-wide catastrophe. Certainly if I were sending an emissary to try to make peace between myself and a neighbor of mine, with whom I had not been on good terms, I should not deem it to be the best approach for the intermediary to issue a statement saying that he hated my neighbor even more than I did, probably, but nevertheless he would go and try to make peace with him. So I think that is a very bad handicap with which to start Mr. Acheson on a mission of trying to make peace in the world.

I am happy, as I say, to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Dean Acheson, and while I do not seriously expect that it means any fundamental change in our foreign policy, I may still hope; and I am convinced that the people of the country are becoming fed up with our foreign policy as it is presently constituted. Even the dumbest person must realize that we could have spent many times the millions of dollars we have spent on China, helping a corrupt dictator like Chiang Kai-shek, and still have come to the same sad end to which we have come in China.

The situation in Greece goes from bad to worse. I am proud that I opposed it from the beginning. I still oppose it. I read in the newspapers that the guerrillas are beginning to win minor victories

in Greece. That is bad, when we have taken the adamant stand over there that we have. I read in the press that there is great unrest in Turkey, that the government there has recently fallen, and that the people are dissatisfied.

Mr. President, all the money we have spent around the world has not won us a friend among the common people. We have set up a few cardboard governments here and there and have maintained them in power simply by the expenditure of vast sums of money for armaments. I cannot but recall that during the last session of Congress there had been in this country a growing sentiment for world government. I am happy to say that I was one of the first to get into and encourage the movement for a world republic. At the last session a resolution was presented on the floor ostensibly to encourage the world government forces, by reason of the pressure which was being put on the Congress to do something about it. The resolution was adopted, and it was made known immediately that the object in adopting it was not to facilitate our reaching agreements with all the nations of the world, but to facilitate our reaching agreements with enemies of Russia for military arrangements against Russia. I think this foreign policy is disastrous. I do not believe the people will permit its continuation much longer.

I have the fear that the American people are going to be forced once again into isolationism. They do not understand clearly what the word implies, but they are tired of spending billions of dollars and having their taxes increased in order to send money around the world—to Great Britain, for her imperialist ventures against the Jews in Palestine; to the Dutch, for their imperialist ventures against the Indonesians; and for all the sad things that are occurring throughout the world, and for which we are getting the blame, indirectly at least. So as I say, I am mildly happy to have an opportunity at least to vote for a civilian for Secretary of State. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, this is probably the last time I shall have an opportunity to utter a word from this chair before I retire from the membership of the Senate. I would not want the opportunity to pass without a word of commendation of Mr. Dean Acheson as Secretary of State, and a word of congratulation to the President for his appointment. I do not take even these few moments of the Senate's time with the expectation that anything I say may influence any vote, but I do wish to put myself on record as being extremely well pleased over the appointment of Mr. Dean Acheson as Secretary of State. I have over the years associated with him in the legislative way whenever there was any measure before a number of committees of the Senate of which I was a member and before whom he appeared, either in advocacy or in opposition. That includes the Committee on Banking and Currency, dealing with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, the International Monetary Fund, and the international economic problems with which Mr. Acheson was called upon to deal and which he was to expound before the committee; in this case, the Committee on Banking and Currency.

While he was associated with the State Department he had many occasions to appear before the Committee on Foreign Relations representing that Department. In all those instances, Mr. Acheson displayed a profound knowledge of the subject which he discussed. He displayed great courtesy, frequently under considerable provocation, in presenting his views to the committee. He displayed great firmness and tenacity in holding to the opinions which he expressed. He is a man of the highest education and culture. It seems to me that he fits the Secretaryship of State, by reason of his environment, his education, his tradition, his background, and his opinions, as well as any man who has been recently appointed to that high station.

I probably feel a very personal admiration for Mr. Acheson, and to that extent what I say in his behalf probably should be discounted, but my association with him, officially and personally, has given me a profound appreciation of his sincerity, his good faith, his unalterable Americanism, his belief in the traditions and the policies and in the Government of the United States, in what we have fought for in time of war and what we are fighting for in time of peace—not only peace in our generation but in all generations if possible; peace not only for our country but for all countries if possible, based upon justice, based upon the right of every people to self-determination and to the enjoyment of those principles of self-government in which we ourselves believe and which we for a century and a half have practiced and tried to perfect.

From all those standpoints, Mr. President, I have a profound feeling that Mr. Acheson will adorn the State Department. Therefore I am in favor of the confirmation of his nomination. From the standpoint of my personal confidence in his integrity, and in his refusal to dissimulate in regard to any profound question of fundamental doctrine related to our Government, I think he is entitled to confirmation; and I predict for him a brilliant record, if he shall be confirmed, as I have no doubt he will be, in the State Department, as the head of that arm of our Government in dealing with all the nations of the world with firmness, with courtesy, and with patience, in the hope that out of all the frustration, chaos, and turmoil which now beset mankind there may come permanent peace throughout the world, for which, in the providence of Almighty God, I hope we may in a large measure be responsible.

For those reasons, Mr. President, I am happy to vote for the confirmation of Mr. Acheson's nomination as Secretary of State.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I have often wondered just how long the American people could put up with all the political shim-sham that is thrown at them.

For 16 years of the New Deal I waited for that saturation point. It never seemed to be reached.

For about 60 days before last November 2 I thought surely the cup would overflow. But it did not.

I was sure that either the ice would break after that state-of-the-Union message on January 7, or that some people might at least be fearful of venturing any farther out on the loaded limb. But I have been wrong.

Now, as we await the Nation's greatest spectacle in this great and beautiful city of Washington, we get a chance to witness another spectacle—of a far more private type, of course.

We now get a chance to see the central figure of the January 20 spectacle eat some of the words he so carelessly cast over the land prior to November 2.

He made a street in New York the scapegoat of his campaign for the Presidency of the United States. It was Wall Street.

On that street, so said the gentleman who will ride at the head of the parade on Thursday, were the wolves who would eat every Little Red Riding Hood in all this land.

There, he said, was where all the pain and misery were cooked up for America.

Dastards. That is what they were, those Wall Streeters. Mr. President, I think Mr. Truman was right. I have been hearing and reading about how the Claytons, the Hisses, the Achesons, and other world bankers, world brokers, and world lawyers have been dabbling in all these international affairs.

When so many of our fine people thought, as did our President, that those Wall Streeters were bad, I decided to find out if all of it were true.

Well, I found out, just as did Mr. Truman, that enough of it was true so that I am going to join right with him in his crusade to keep them out of our Government.

I shall follow the people and our President in voting right out of our Government this Wall Streeter who is a partner to loans to Communist-dominated countries, to Arabian oil interests, and to other international money-making enterprises.

Mr. President, accept my willingness to abide by the bipartisan effort of this Congress and the spirit of cooperation with our President by recording my vote against the confirmation of the nomination of Dean Acheson.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without making a very brief comment on the remarks of the majority leader of this body. I refer to his statement that this is the last time his voice will be raised in this Chamber. I am consoled by the fact that he will not leave the Chamber and that we Senators, at least, shall have the benefit of his counsel, his wisdom, and his advice in the deliberations which are to take place in this body within the next 4 years.

I raise my voice, Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. Acheson because, first, I have confidence in him; secondly, he is my friend; thirdly, he was born, reared, and educated in my State. His father was a distinguished and beloved Episcopal bishop in Connecticut. We in Connecticut have naturally taken a special pride in his achievements in government

service. Those achievements have indicated a character and a disposition which have won him the admiration and affection of all members of the public who have had occasion to come into contact with him.

I am especially pleased that he seems to be opposed by what I would term the extreme left and the extreme right. He is a man who knows the middle of the road. He is a man who knows the value of adherence to principle, and he is a man who knows the art of diplomatic compliment.

Reference has been made to Mr. Acheson's achievements as Under Secretary of State, but there is one more achievement which I should like to point out for the record, because, in my opinion, the record which he shall make as Secretary of State, no matter how brilliant it may be, will contain no page which shines with greater distinction than does the one on which he took his part in writing the control policy for atomic energy in the State Department, which subsequently became the policy of the United Nations. That, Mr. President, is one of the achievements of diplomacy and statecraft in our time, and as the years go by its great value will continue to be recognized to the point where all men will agree with the truth of what I say.

Mr. Laski, an Englishman of great intellectuality, but with whose philosophy I certainly do not agree, recently made the remark that this achievement was probably the greatest one which has ever occurred in a free nation in diplomatic intercourse with other nations. That is, of course, only one of Mr. Acheson's achievements, but I thought it worth mentioning.

At any rate, Mr. President, the Senate will confirm the nomination of Mr. Acheson, I think, to the satisfaction of the people of the United States. I personally look forward to the opportunity of working with this friend and public servant in the effort which we here must make in the next 4 years in the forging of a permanent and lasting peace. That work has scarcely begun. There is much to do. I am very happy indeed that President Truman has sent to the Senate the nomination of a man for Secretary of State who, I am confident, will carry his share of the burden and will cooperate with the Senate in this great task.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay the vote, but I do desire to associate myself with the sentiments expressed by the majority leader.

When I first came to the House of Representatives I was a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Acheson was one of the first witnesses to come before that committee. Throughout the following years he has appeared before various committees, particularly the Committee on Banking and Currency. I do not believe there has ever been a witness from the executive department of the Government who appeared before committees with better information and more complete control of all the aspects of his subject. Most of the questions, it is true, dealt with economic affairs, such as were discussed at Breton Woods, and so forth. But he did a remarkable job and reported it to the Congress. I do not believe that any Secretary of State who has been nominated in the past 15 years has been better qualified by experience and by intellect to fill that position. While he has not had the top position in policy making, he has played an extremely important part in the implementation of the policy of the Government, and I, for one, take great heart and great encouragement in his appointment, and I am delighted to vote for the confirmation of his nomination.

Certainly, I do not mean by any implication at all to cast any reflection upon any other nomination of recent years, but I do think in all fairness no one can say that any man nominated equaled Mr. Acheson in experience for the position to which he has been appointed, which I believe indicates a very serious and forward step in the improvement of the foreign relations in the executive branch of the Government.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am very happy to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the business before the Senate for consideration is the nomination of Mr. Acheson to become the Secretary of State. To me this is one of the most important nominations that will come before the Senate for confirmation in this session of the Congress, and I might add I think it may prove to be the most important in generations, for the man who is chosen and confirmed to be the next Secretary of State will hold the destiny of America and of the nations of the world in his hands. Mr. Acheson, or whoever may become Secretary of State, will be responsible for commitments affecting both our foreign and our domestic policy, because whatever commitments he makes internationally, as has already been demonstrated, will fashion our domestic policies at home. It just cannot be otherwise. So the confirmation of this nomination is a most serious responsibility. It is a matter for each individual Senator to settle for himself in his own mind and with his own conscience. It certainly is not a partisan matter in any sense of the word.

Mr. President, I am in complete accord with the observations made by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], about the provision that the President shall appoint his Cabinet members, with the advice and consent of the Senate, as he stated. Certainly, as he so forcefully said, the President has a right to choose whomever he pleases, because the administration is responsible, and if the administration is to assume responsibility, then the President should have the right to choose whom he wishes to carry out his administration policies. I think there can be no disagreement with those observations.

Mr. President, the Senate, too, has a duty and a responsibility, namely, to weigh and to exercise its best judgment in either acepting or rejecting a nomination. It is only in that light, as an individual Senator, that I make these very brief observations, in explanation only of the vote I intend to cast against the confirmation of Mr. Acheson's nomination.

Mr. President, when Mr. Acheson's nomination was announced I made this public statement:

> I was surprised at his nomination; my opinion of Mr. Acheson remains unchanged.

Later I made a further public statement, as follows:

> That any course of action I might take relative to the nomination would depend upon the report of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I have kept faith with that public statement, and I here and now wish to compliment the Committee on Foreign Relations for the manner in which they conducted the investigation, for the opportunity which they gave each and every person a chance for a public hearing to question Mr. Acheson, through the chairman. I personally wish to thank the chairman of the committee for taking action in the orderly fashion he has followed, having the nomination lie over 24 hours. No one could help having praise for the very admirable and fair way in which the nomination has been handled.

Mr. President, as I have said, the nomination of Mr. Acheson came as a complete surprise. It was a surprise to me because of his record. His influence has affected vital policies of the Government in many cases in recent years.

As the able majority leader has said, Mr. Acheson has appeared on Capitol Hill time after time representing the administration. He went to the Treasury Department early in 1933, and remained there until November. In 1941 he became Assistant Secretary of State, and remained in the State Department until about a year ago. So he has had a long experience, and time after time he has come to the Capitol and appeared before committees, and has represented the administration on many important pieces of legislation.

It was Mr. Acheson who presented the UNRRA legislation to Congress. He helped to sell it to the Members of Congress. He, more than anyone else, in my opinion, was responsible for attempting to sell it to the American people. So what? it may be asked. It is easy to forget, but all of us know UNRRA turned out to be an international organization which helped to siphon food and goods to help Russia and her satellite countries, whom we sought to encourage, and whose friendship and cooperation we were then seeking, and do now seek.

UNRRA food was used for other purposes besides that. I shall never forget my experience when, on my own, I went to Europe to investigate. I found that Russia fed her armies off the food of the land in other countries, while UNRRA was used to feed the civilian population. So that in reality, as was found to be true in Russian-occupied Austria, we actually furnished the food to feed the Russian armies.

Mr. President, I am simply giving my own opinion, and all other Senators have the privilege of their own opinion, but

I would hold that if I voted for Dean Acheson today, it would mean that I condone UNRRA, an international organization which I did not and cannot now justify. As I said a moment ago, Senators can, of course, believe as they please; that is their privilege, but my conscience will not permit me to confirm the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State, because I think that would mean that I condone that piece of legislation which he presented to the Congress and helped to sell to the American people.

During the period when Mr. Acheson was in the Department of State the administration executed many secret agreements. I do not say he was a party to them, but I do say the Department executed a great many secret agreements, such as the Yalta agreement, and agreements which provided that German industry be decentralized. I found that to be true when I was over there. The administration's plans provided for an extensive program of dismantling manufacturing plants in Germany, a program which I fought at every point along the road in the Senate. We are now replacing these plants with the money of the American taxpayer.

These secret agreements also provided for forcing the German people to make a living upon the land, to lead an utterly different kind of life, and to engage in an entirely different economy than many of them had theretofore known. I said then, and I say now, that this program has retarded the recovery of all Europe. It created a vacuum in which 100,000,000 people of Germany and the satellite countries were thrown into confusion. This program cost the American taxpayers $20,000,000,000. It completely failed. The administration admitted its failure, because the Marshall plan was drafted to take its place. So, once again, I say that a vote for Mr. Acheson would, to my mind, mean condoning the enforcement of the administration's program to destroy the German industry and keep her forever an agricultural state.

It may be asked what Mr. Acheson has to do about that? He has been in the administration all these years. He is a part and parcel of the complete program, and he was in the State Department many days functioning as the Acting Secretary when he was the Under Secretary, carrying out the provisions of this administration. My conscience will not permit me to vote to condone what has taken place. I simply cannot do that this afternoon.

Mr. Acheson attempted to force upon Japan the acceptance of a unified government in the administration of which Russia would have had a part. It is unnecessary to go into that now. This issue was debated on the Senate floor for nearly 2 days, when Mr. Acheson's appointment as Under Secretary of the Department of State was under consideration. Certainly his attempt to impose on the people of Japan what I call a coalition government, in which the Communists could play a role to advance their ideology, should be given every consideration today when we vote to confirm or reject the nomination of Mr. Acheson to be Secretary of State. The record speaks for itself, if Senators want to read it. Were I to vote to confirm the nomination of Dean Acheson at this time it would mean that I approved his attempt to impose upon Japan what he called a most liberal government.

He was a part of the State Department regime that has given us the shameful policy in China under which China now is being captured and controlled by Communists under the direction and the leadership of Moscow. With the loss of China our whole position in the Orient has been jeopardized.

This is the record as I see it. These are the reasons why I made public the statement that I was surprised Mr. Acheson was chosen by the President to become his Secretary of State. Because of this record I formed my opinion, and my opinion has remained unchanged; therefore I cannot vote to confirm him now.

Then I looked at the report of the subcommittee. I went through the report of the hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee to see whether any part of this record was cleared up, whether or not any defense was made, because during many months of this time, Mr. Acheson, the Under Secretary of State, as I have said, acted as the Acting Secretary of State to carry out these policies.

What does the report of the Foreign Relations Committee reveal? To sum it up all in one brief paragraph it is simply this, that in some speeches since the Marshall plan was put into effect, Mr. Acheson has said that he now endorses nothing in the nature of an appeasement policy toward Russia. But there is not anything to guide us respecting what we might expect from Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State in his relations toward Russia except the broad general statement that he now makes to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. Adolf Berle, who was mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, formerly an Assistant Secretary of State, has corroborated my opinion of Mr. Acheson's record, in his testimony before the Committee on Un-American Activities, of the House of Representatives. Mr. Berle said then that Mr. Acheson was in the pro-Russian bloc of the State Department, along with the others the Senator mentioned.

After Mr. Acheson was nominated to be Secretary of State, Mr. Berle was quoted as saying that Mr. Acheson now has apparently had a change of heart toward Russia; that he has recanted his appease-Russia views, and is now O. K., thoroughly solid, in his position that Russia's dictators are trying to rule the world and cannot be appeased.

Mr. President and fellow Senators, as I have traveled around over the United States I have discovered a fact which cannot be denied, and I submit it to the Senate as I make this last observation relative to the confirmation of Mr. Acheson, that somehow it is common knowledge that Mr. Acheson has been an appeaser of Russia. This fact is proven also by the Foreign Relations Committee itself when it has allowed only one excerpt of Mr. Acheson's testimony taken in executive session to be made public. And what is it? Why, it is the excerpt that was quoted by the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, Mr. President. When I have completed the statement, I shall be very glad to yield to the Senator from Texas. The excerpt in question is brief, and I will read it:

> It is my view that communism as a doctrine is economically fatal to a free society and to human rights and fundamental freedoms. Communism as an aggressive factor in world conquest is fatal to independent governments and to free peoples.

With that statement I have no disagreement whatsoever. I endorse it 1,000 percent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator mind if I finished my statement?

Mr. CONNALLY. I thought the Senator had finished. I will defer my request.

Mr. WHERRY. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I will wait until the Senator completes his statement.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President; I am glad to yield now.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator made some reference to the Foreign Relations Committee giving out only one little excerpt. As chairman of that committee I will say to the Senator that we have a complete copy of the executive hearing, and the Senator from Nebraska is at liberty to come down to the committee room and read the whole proceedings at any time he wants to.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I have already commended the Senator from Texas upon the very fair treatment he has given to Senators.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not hunting compliments.

Mr. WHERRY. But the fact, if the Senator will permit me to state it, is that what I have said is common knowledge throughout the country, and I think my statement cannot be denied. If Senators will talk to the people in various sections of the country they will find it to be a matter of common knowledge that Mr. Acheson has, at least up to this time, been considered as one who has gone along in an appeasement policy toward Russia. He is a symbol of the administration, because he has been in it all these years.

The question may be asked: "What has UNRRA got to do with the matter? What has the Morgenthau plan got to do with it? What has Mr. Acheson's policy toward Japan to do with it?" It has this to do with the matter, that he has indelibly stamped himself among the people I know as one who has been in favor of appeasing Russia.

I say now that in order to defend him and in order to meet that criticism the Foreign Relations Committee evidently released this one excerpt. It is one of the finest statements I have ever heard of what it means to permit communism to come into an independent nation and

destroy its economy. I have already said that I endorsed it a thousand percent.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield again.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not seek to interrupt the Senator to argue with him. All I meant to say was that the committee will permit any Senator to examine the record of its executive hearings.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not trying to argue with the Senator about his main discussion.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. IVES. The question which I wish to raise with the able Senator from Nebraska is a very pertinent question. The Senator has accused the gentleman whose nomination we are now considering of pursuing an appeasement policy with respect to Soviet Russia. I should like to ask the Senator if he will be so kind as to state at least one instance which he considers to be pursuit of such policy. I should like to know what it is. I have not been present all the time during this discussion. The Senator may have cited such instances already.

Mr. WHERRY. The endorsement of the UNRRA plan, permitting Russia to feed her armies off the food of the land, using our food to feed the civilian population, resulted in helping Russia in her policy toward satellite countries. That we cannot condone.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to complete my statement. I shall be glad then to answer any questions, but I should like to have the statement intact in the RECORD. However, inasmuch as I am asked these questions, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New York has asked me a question, and I should like to answer it. I cannot answer it if he will not permit me to do so.

The second thing on which I base my statement of Mr. Acheson's policy of Russian appeasement is the fact that during the years from 1940 until the time he left the State Department in 1947, Mr. Acheson was a party to the so-called Morgenthau plan, which I maintain was an appeasement policy toward Russia. That plan included the dismantling of plants in Germany and forcing the German people to decentralize, which has resulted in the spread of communism. The opposite policy would have been the way to stop the advance of communism in the first place. That plan has cost the American taxpayers $20,000,000,000, and I maintain that putting that program into effect has been a proappeasement policy toward Russia.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to answer his question. I have another example.

In 1945, when the nomination of the Under Secretary was brought to the floor of the Senate, it was Mr. Acheson who made a public statement that he felt that there should be established in Japan a more liberal government, a government in the administration of which Russia would have a part.

I do not know how many more examples the Senator wants to show that Mr. Acheson has carried out an appeasement policy toward Russia. That is my answer to his question.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to make a statement first.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator wishes to make a statement, I ask him to withhold it and make it at the conclusion of my remarks. I decline to yield until I finish this statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Getting back to the definition which has been given by Mr. Acheson, this expression means that there was doubt in the minds of members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. That is the way I feel about it. Certainly, if there was no doubt in their minds, there is a doubt in my mind that cannot be erased. There is still a grave doubt relative to Mr. Acheson's proappeasement policies with respect to Russia. In my judgment Mr. Acheson's record up to this moment is certainly in direct contradiction to the excerpt which has been released by the Foreign Relations Committee. My opinion is that only time will tell whether Mr. Acheson means what he says and says what he means.

Mr. President, I have nothing in the world personally against Mr. Acheson; but on the record itself it is impossible for me to vote for confirmation. However, I am most hopeful—and I should like to put this in blazing letters in the RECORD—that Mr. Acheson will carry out the work of Secretary of State in keeping with his most recent statement. So far as I am concerned, while I cannot vote for the confirmation of his nomination today, if he continues a firm policy toward Russia, as he has outlined in this statement to the committee, I want the President and every Member of the Senate to know that I shall do everything in my power to see that his policies receive my full support.

Mr. President, I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I do not wish to ask a question. I wish to make a statement.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I should like to say something about UNRRA, which has been dragged into the discussion of the question now before us. Perhaps the question of UNRRA and its political implications has affected me as much as it has affected any other Member of the Senate. It so happens that my opponent, when I ran for the Senate in 1946, had been the Director of UNRRA. I refer to former Governor Lehman, of New York State.

I wish to point out to Members of the Senate that the question of UNRRA, so far as its being a question of pro-Soviet or anti-Soviet relationship is concerned, had nothing to do with the issues in my campaign. I have never accused Governor Lehman—and I never shall—of being pro-Russian, unless something incredible happens after these remarks to cause me to change my attitude. I know that he is an intensely loyal American.

I do not believe that the question of UNRRA has anything to do with the question now before us. It was very pertinent in 1946; but at that time there were a great many loyal Americans who were strongly in favor of UNRRA and other aid of that kind. Some were very critical of the way in which it was being handled. Some were critical regarding the wisdom of the policy which was being followed. But I know of no one who was accusing anyone in high office of being pro-Russian in his attitude in that connection; and I do not believe that the question of UNRRA has the remotest thing to do with the subject now before us.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I did not intend to say anything at all on this subject, but I believe an explanation of how I intend to vote might be in order.

I realize that a man in public life today who believes as I do will be held up to ridicule and sarcasm, and will be driven from public office, although he is sincere to the bottom of his heart in his beliefs.

Mr. President, since I have been a Member of the Senate I have cast one bad vote, in my estimation. As a freshman Senator I voted for the Greek-Turkish loan. That was a vote, supposedly, to contain communism wherever it reared its ugly head. I was for that, and I believe America was for it. However, I watched the unfolding of the foreign policy. As the Senator from Nebraska has pointed out, for a while we went down the road of UNRRA and the Morgenthau plan, and then, suddenly, we completely changed our direction and became firm. We quit playing put-and-take with Uncle Joe, although, as one in high office says, he is not a bad fellow, and he likes him.

What happened to the Truman doctrine? I was told on the floor of the Senate that wherever communism reared its ugly head there the American Government would strike back, with force, if necessary, to contain it. I ask Senators who are my elders and who are experienced in these matters what happened to the Truman plan in China? This very day China is being overrun by Communists. Nothing save America will keep all of China and all of Asia from going communistic. When that happens 50 percent of the population of the entire world will be under communistic domination.

We started with a foreign policy over the past 4 or 5 years which would have required one with St. Vitus dance to follow. It has happened in this great country that a man who honestly believes that he should be for his country, and should try to make it strong and sound, is compared to a worm crawling on a rotten board in a wall. He is ridiculed and subjected to sarcasm if he dares say that he is for his country first. I am not ashamed of the stand I take. I think this foreign policy is absurd, and I think America is going to get ulcers

if the present program is continued. I have said that before or this very floor.

Here we are, Mr. President, faced in our own Nation with tremendous problems. I point out education, for example. Within 5 years from today, 6,000,000 children will need public schooling in the United States, and yet every school district in my State is up to the hilt in debt, and cannot provide for adequate education. Bills for national education will be introduced in the Congress, because the same problem of education exists in other States, and some Senators say the problem exists particularly in some of the Southern States.

Others talk about health. Of course America needs public health; but under our foreign policy we are paying for free medicine, socialized medicine if you please, in other countries. People in England are given free eyeglasses, free false teeth, free babies, free everything; and the American taxpayer is paying for all of it. Why on earth can we not have it for our own people, Mr. President?

So I could run through the list, and mention reclamation; the need for more power and greater production, and many other problems.

Mr. President, do you know what it will cost to provide properly for the public health of the people of America? The cost will run into the billions of dollars.

I simply say that I do not believe we can do all these things for our own people and all these things for people all over the world, and still remain a strong, free, economically sound Nation. I say to you, Mr. President, that we were the first to have the free-enterprise system, and under God's sun today we are the last Nation that has a free-enterprise system. I say to you that the hope of all other peoples and the hope of freedom all over the world will go down into the rat holes of time unless America remains strong. This year we shall spend at least $45,000,000,000 for government. With the proposed projects offered to our people and with the proposed projects for continuing the enormous foreign policy we have launched upon, we shall easily be spending from $60,000,000,000 to $70,000,000,000 in the next 2 or 3 years. Mr. President, today in the United States production is at an all-time peak, and we cannot take taxes of from $60,000,000,000 to $70,000,000,000 out of the American economy, and still remain a strong, economically sound Nation.

Mr. President, some may call me an isolationist, some may laugh at me, some may call me a reactionary, and some may call me a conservative; they may call me whatever they please; but I say to you that I stand here today as a liberal, because one who will preserve his country, this country of ours, and its freedoms, and will give liberty and justice to our people is the greatest liberal there can be.

So, Mr. President, on the basis that Mr. Acheson is willing to go along with UNRRA, and is willing to go along with a unified Japanese Government, and is willing to go along with the Morgenthau plan, by which we took factories from Germany and sent them to Uncle Joe, playing put and take—we put our money over there, and Uncle Joe takes—on that basis, on the basis that Mr. Acheson believes in the policy that our Government is pursuing today, I, in my deepest convictions, could not condone that or vote for confirmation of the nomination of a man who entertains such ideas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. On this question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I shall take only 2 or 3 minutes of the time of the Senate in connection with the nomination of Mr. Acheson, but I believe in justice to my position I should make my record clear on this matter.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee I voted to recommend the confirmation of the appointment by the President of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. I shall vote to confirm this appointment by the Senate. In taking this position I am fully aware of certain factors which have caused controversy in connection with the appointment, and I have weighed all such factors in reaching a decision to vote for confirmation. It has long been accepted as fundamental that the President shall have the widest latitude in the selection of members of his official family, who make up his Cabinet and the Senate has exercised great restraint, from time to time, in opposing this very important right lodged in the President. The Secretary of State is the ranking officer in the President's Cabinet, the individual through whom the President exercises his constitutional obligations and functions in connection with foreign affairs. Because of the responsibility lodged in the President with respect to foreign affairs, he should be free to select his spokesman in this field, but in return for this freedom of selection he must also assume full responsibility for the management of foreign affairs by his Secretary of State. He must be, and is, answerable to the American people for the success or failure of this Department in the conduct of our foreign relations. I may remind you, Mr. President, that the people of the United States elected the President and charged him thereby with this responsibility.

In connection with the Senate's confirmation of such appointment it must be borne in mind that the Senate does not have the appointing power and has no choice of alternative selections.

It is always probable that any specific appointment to such an office by the President might be objected to by some because, in their opinion, another individual might be more acceptable or might be better able to do the job, but, again, the appointing power rests with the President and not with the Senate, and I have no choice except to vote for or against the President's appointment, in which latter case fairness would demand that I support my objection with most substantial reasons. I do not believe these reasons should be whimsical or nebulous.

So far as Mr. Acheson is concerned, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind as to his personal integrity. I believe it to be of an unusually high order. So far as his mental ability is concerned there is no question. I believe him to be a brilliant man. So far as his experience in international matters is concerned, he has had opportunity for unusual experience in the State Department and in other phases of government operation, during a period when matters vitally affecting future policy have been formulated. He therefore brings to the office personal integrity, high ability, and unusual experience.

Criticism has been directed at him, charging that he has had in the past a so-called soft policy toward Russia and a lack of perception of the destructive aims and purposes of communism so far as its objectives of infiltration and destruction of our form of government are concerned. These charges have not been substantiated, and in any event it is highly doubtful that he, as a subordinate official under the Secretary of State, made or was finally responsible for some of the ill-advised earlier foreign policies, the spawn of which now rise to plague us. So far as I am concerned he has fully and frankly discussed his views about the United States and our policy, and I am convinced that he is completely devoted to and is fully aware of the necessity of unswerving advancement of the principles upon which our Government lives, and that he will defend those principles for us and for the world.

Criticism has repeatedly been directed at the State Department because of the infiltration of a number of so-called fellow travelers in this vital Department, and suggestions have been made that Mr. Acheson, while never personally accused of being suspected as a fellow traveler, has, nevertheless, by a blind loyalty to certain associates and friends, shut his mind to the possibility of such infiltration in important and vital areas of our foreign department. There is every evidence that he has a strong and tenacious loyalty to those for whom he forms a friendship. It might be possible that this quality of loyalty to friends, which is not to be condemned as a general principle, on occasions might have compelled him, or might now compel him, to refuse to be suspicious where reasonable grounds for suspicion might exist. Nevertheless, I have confidence that he will differentiate between personal loyalties and personal friends, on the one hand, and vital public interests, on the other; that he will not let the first control his judgment or his actions, with regard to personnel in the State Department, in connection with inviolate safeguarding of public business vital to our security.

He is the choice of the President for this vital Cabinet post. His selection and future administration of the Department is the prerogative and also the responsibility of the President. I trust and believe that he will bring to the office a high degree of ability and perception, and I wish him, not only personally, but also in the interests of the recovery of a free world, every success.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD four editorials from the Greensboro (N. C.) Daily News, commenting on the qualifications of Mr. Dean Acheson for the position of Secretary of State and

Mr. James E. Webb for the position of Under Secretary of State. In my opinion, the careful analysis of the appointments and their effect on foreign policy contained in these editorials makes their preparation and publication a real public service, and I believe they merit the consideration of everyone interested in the foreign policy of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE—I

Unlike Presidents Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt, President Truman will not be his own Secretary of State. Therefore his appointment of a new Secretary of State to succeed Secretary Marshall at this crucial period of world affairs is an event of importance to ourselves, and indeed the world, second only to the election of a new President.

It is not that our foreign policy will suffer a break in continuity but that, in a world which does move, changing circumstances alter cases and that new facts and personalities interact on each other to mold history inexorably for better or worse.

The appointment of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State and James E. Webb as Under Secretary is therefore a major event deserving the most thoughtful consideration at home. We may be sure it will receive it abroad.

North Carolinians naturally take pride in the Webb appointment. James Webb has a brilliant record in scholarship, business, war and government. That record tends to show that he has the brains, force, and character to meet successfully the exacting duties of the position to which he has been called.

But the literally awe-inspiring responsibility of guiding the foreign policy of the United States, with all that that means to each one of us and the civilization of which we are a part, has fallen on the shoulders of one man, Dean Acheson. This does not mean exactly that he is a solitary Atlas, for he will have the help of able men in his Department, in his Government, and indeed in other governments; but it does mean that the ultimate—or at least the penultimate—responsibility of directing our foreign policy in an extremely perplexing and perilous world is squarely his and that he will need the comprehending support of the people of the United States as badly as they will need his wise leadership.

It is natural then for the people to be asking questions about their new Secretary of State. What sort of man is he? What is his training? What is his experience? What is his basic philosophy? How does it apply to the world today? To the United States? To Russia? What are his ideas of short-term and long-term foreign policy? Of the way to attain durable peace?

---

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE—II

Dean Acheson, our new Secretary of State, was born in Connecticut 55 years ago, the son of an Episcopal bishop; got an A. B. degree at Yale in 1915 and graduated from Harvard Law School in 1918; served as an ensign in the United States Navy in World War I; acted as private secretary to Justice Brandeis of the United States Supreme Court; practiced law; served as Under Secretary of the United States Treasury for a short time in 1933, resigning because of a split with President Roosevelt over the devaluation of the dollar; practiced law again; returned to Government service as Assistant Secretary of State in 1941 and served as Assistant or Under Secretary of State from February 1941 to July 1947, that is to say, during the whole of World War II and then some.

So much for his training and experience which are excellent and extensive.

What are Secretary Acheson's basic philosophy and attitude toward world affairs?

Some light may be thrown on this by considering what he did as Under Secretary of State. In addition to his work during the war years, he had a leading part in formulating our program of aid to Greece and of Soviet containment and in originating and drafting the Marshall plan. He also directed as chairman the work of the Committee on Atomic Energy which resulted in the Acheson-Lilienthal Report on the International Control of Atomic Energy which formed the basis for the Baruch plan and which is probably the finest example of men thinking, and by that thinking reaching a possible solution for an almost insoluble problem which our period of history affords.

Further light may be thrown on the question not only by what he has done but also by what he has said.

It may be recalled that at a time when we were still speaking softly to the Soviet Union in order not to offend her sensibilities, he characterized the Russian policy (February 10, 1947) as an aggressive and expanding one.

But the fullest and clearest statement of Secretary Acheson's philosophy and conclusions on various phases of foreign affairs that we have seen is his speech at Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn., on June 15, 1947, a couple of weeks before his resignation as Under Secretary of State. It was a brilliant and illuminating speech, worthy of deep consideration and extended quotation.

In it he asked himself, "What is the fundamental tradition of the American people?" His answer was this: It is "insistence upon the liberty of the individual, the worth of the individual, the ultimate test of truth by reference to the individual. * * * It seems true in society as in nature that the greatest energy is created by releasing the power of the smallest unit. In one case, the individual; in the other case, the atom. History and philosophy gave us this doctrine. Geography and experience have confirmed it."

A corollary of our insistence on our own freedom is our desire to extend freedom to others. But "we have no desire to force our behavior and ideas on other people. If for reasons incomprehensible to us they want to act differently and—to us—quite misguidedly, that is their affair. But we don't like them to push other peoples around—particularly when those other peoples are trying to live as we think all decent people should live."

Yet he made it clear that in his thinking liberty was not something to be passed around like a box of candy. "It seems to me that liberty has come to those whose stout hearts and hard heads have won it. Here again we must conclude with Jusitce Holmes that the mode by which the inevitable comes to pass is effort."

---

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE—III

One very good reason why there will probably be no break in the continuity of our foreign policy is that our policy was in the main formulated by the very man who has now been appointed Secretary of State to carry it out. This policy in its short-term phase consists largely of containment of the Soviet Union and aid to countries attempting to keep themselves free of Soviet encroachment.

In a speech at Wesleyan University in Connecticut, made just 2 weeks before his resignation from the position of Under Secretary of State on July 1, 1947, Mr. Acheson spoke strongly and freely.

Part of his speech was in effect a bill of indictment against the Soviet Union for its postwar course of aggressive expansion. After noting the aid we had given the Soviet Union up to that time, amounting to some $12,000,000,000, and the series of acts we had engaged in with a view to securing international peace and individual freedom, he charged the Soviet Union with blocking those efforts, opposing international accord and recovery, using its military position in Eastern Europe to violate the Yalta agreements, and to fasten unwanted governments and economic arrangements on the peoples involved, fostering war in Greece, et cetera. Due to these acts, he said the United Nations had not been able to "apply the principles set forth in its charter but has instead had to furnish the forum for bitter, unprofitable and inconclusive dialectics."

From this and other sources it appears clear that Mr. Acheson, far from being too soft on the Soviet Union, is in the forefront of those who would halt its expansion.

Perhaps this is the central problem of our foreign policy. But bound up with it and no less perplexing is the problem of what we should do about conditions in various parts of the world which breed revolutions, and in which, indeed, revolutions are sometimes overdue, but which lend themselves all too easily to Communist exploitation.

On this general theme Mr. Acheson said:

"This country always has responded to people struggling to attain or maintain their freedom. We have done so because it is important to us that they shall succeed. Sometimes we can do much, sometimes little, but the response is always there. It was there in the case of Greece over a century ago and in the case of Hungary and Poland and Italy. It was there throughout the nineteenth century in the struggle of the Latin-American states to obtain and keep their freedom from the encroachments of European powers. It underlay our efforts for decades to help China in her struggle against foreign subjugation.

"So President Truman was acting and the Congress was acting in the truest and soundest American tradition. The case was an extreme one because Greece was near the abyss. But the principle was as old as our country."

Such a policy is clear enough in principle. But it is very difficult in its application. We want to give Europe back to the Europeans, but not to the Darlans and the Badoglios, the black marketeers and racketeers, the Fascists or the Communists. Our great tradition is for freedom, as Mr. Acheson so clearly sees, but our intervention has not brought freedom to Greece or China, the two countries where our policy has met its most open tests.

The trouble has been perhaps in the administration of that policy. If so, the new Secretary has a job on his hands of attaining that policy's aim through more effective methods. In some countries, as in China, the problem may be insoluble. In any case we think that Mr. Acheson will cope with it—and with Russia—as well as anyone the President could have chosen.

---

NEW SECRETARY OF STATE—IV

The Department of State needs thorough overhauling. For a long time the United States, protected by two oceans and the British Navy, could enjoy the luxury of a situation in which no foreign policy was better than any foreign policy. Those days are gone forever. What was left was buried in the blitz of London and the atomization of Hiroshima.

Now the State Department faces a world it never made, a world which is very badly out of joint and which, being radioactive, is entirely too close for comfort. The Department was not made to deal with anything like it, but must do something about it—and fast.

When Dean Acheson's appointment is confirmed, the United States will have had five Secretaries of State within a little more

than 4 years. That is quite a turn-over for a position which demands unlimited wisdom and experience. It has been our custom to appoint men as Secretaries of State with little experience in the field of foreign policy and to give them Under Secretaries who know what foreign policy is all about.

With Dean Acheson as Secretary and James E. Webb as Under Secretary this custom will be reversed. The stage is thus set for overhauling the Department. Acheson will not have to learn about foreign policy because he knows about it already. He will not even have to formulate it because he did that as Under Secretary. He will just have to keep it rolling and tend to the steering wheel.

He and James Webb, who is an excellent administrator, can thus concentrate for a time on bringing the Department up to date as a piece of governmental machinery. It may not be futuramic when they finish the overhauling, but it will at least be a 1949 model instead of a 1919 one.

Mr. Acheson has some ideas for modernizing the Department, as James Reston points out in the New York Times:

"It is known, for example, that he favors (1) placing the foreign service and the State Department under a single administration; (2) appointing two deputy Under Secretaries of State, one for policy and one for administration; (3) reorganizing the whole assistant secretary level in the Department so that there will be eight assistant secretaries; for public affairs (including the Voice of America), for international affairs (UN and conferences), for coordinating policy with other agencies, for congressional affairs, for Europe, for the near eastern and African affairs, for far eastern affairs, and for Latin-American affairs; (4) creating an intelligence evaluation committee to advise the Secretary and keep in contact with the Central Intelligence Agency."

These, we should think, are reforms which are necessary now.

But perhaps something more is needed, something more elusive but far more important, a long-term program for durable world peace, something which must be based not on containment or balance of power, but on world law enacted and enforced by the necessary government of the whole.

The State Department has neglected this essential defense, not only of our Nation but of our civilization.

It is easy enough to see why it has done so. With a mortality rate of approximately one Secretary of State a year, and with our secretaries kept so busy traveling, conferring, and arguing that they hardly ever had time to see more than one jump ahead, how could such a long-term policy have had a chance of conception, much less of birth?

We hope that Dean Acheson will be Secretary of State a long time, and that he will do something about it. The problem of world government, for that is what it is, is a most difficult one, since it involves the creation of a government which would not be more dangerous to the liberties of men than the present anarchy which it would supersede. Yet nations must admit to the rule of law if our civilization would live. The problems of world government and of the control of atomic energy are binary stars; they cannot be solved separately. The State Department found a board of distinguished consultants useful in reaching a possible solution for the latter problem; this solution contained at least the seeds of a world government. Why would it not prove profitable for the new Secretary to appoint a board of consultants on the control of national energy through law—manned by elder statesmen such as Stimson, Baruch, Byrnes, Grenville Clark, and Thomas K. Finletter—to work out a long-range program for what must be our fundamental foreign policy, the establishment of enduring peace?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State?

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is absent because of illness, would vote "yea" if present.

I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is attending the ceremonies incident to the inauguration of Hon. Elbert N. Carvel as Governor of the State of Delaware, and the Honorable Alexis I. Dupont Bayard, as Lieutenant Governor of the State of Delaware, and is therefore necessarily absent. If present, the Senator from Delaware would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], who are necessarily absent, would vote "yea," if present.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who is absent because of illness, would vote "yea," if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] is unavoidably detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 83, nays 6, as follows:

YEAS—83

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hill | Millikin |
| Baldwin | Hoey | Morse |
| Barkley | Holland | Mundt |
| Brewster | Humphrey | Murray |
| Bricker | Hunt | Myers |
| Broughton | Ives | Neely |
| Butler | Johnson, Colo. | O'Conor |
| Byrd | Johnson, Tex. | O'Mahoney |
| Cain | Johnston, S. C. | Pepper |
| Chapman | Kefauver | Reed |
| Chavez | Kem | Robertson |
| Connally | Kerr | Russell |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Saltonstall |
| Donnell | Lodge | Smith, Maine |
| Douglas | Long | Smith, N. J. |
| Eastland | Lucas | Sparkman |
| Ecton | McCarran | Stennis |
| Ellender | McCarthy | Taft |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Taylor |
| Flanders | McFarland | Thomas, Okla. |
| Fulbright | McGrath | Thomas, Utah |
| George | McKellar | Thye |
| Gillette | McMahon | Tobey |
| Green | Magnuson | Vandenberg |
| Gurney | Malone | Wiley |
| Hayden | Martin | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Maybank | Young |
| Hickenlooper | Miller | |

NAYS—6

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Jenner | Langer |
| Capehart | Knowland | Wherry |

NOT VOTING—7

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Schoeppel | Watkins |
| Downey | Tydings | |
| Frear | Wagner | |

So Mr. Acheson's nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmation.

## ALBEN W. BARKLEY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute or two of the time of the Senate.

I think all of us could not fail to detect a little sadness not only in the voice of the speaker but in the sentiments manifested by Senators when our distinguished leader on this side of the aisle, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] said, rather hesitatingly, a few moments ago, that perhaps those were his last remarks as a Senator. Although the words to which I shall now refer were used by President Roosevelt in referring to another great American, I do not know of any other man who could more aptly be described in the way that Franklin D. Roosevelt described Al Smith when he nominated him to be Democratic candidate for President: The Happy Warrior. Certainly that is the proper description of ALBEN BARKLEY.

We have known him here, and he has been loved by us as few men have been loved. He has the greatest variety of talents that could almost be imagined. He can roar like a lion or coo with the gentleness of a wooing dove. With his ever-constant good humor, he could smooth over even exasperating disagreements.

Surely, Mr. President, unless he shall come back once more to our membership with even greater honors, we shall not again see the like of ALBEN BARKLEY.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I wish to add just a word to what has been said about our majority leader, who is leaving us.

I have had a very high regard for him ever since I came to the United States Senate. I think one of the best things about the way the recent election turned out is that I was defeated by ALBEN BARKLEY. [Laughter.]

ALBEN BARKLEY has always been very kind to me. I wish to say that in the recent election I was not running against him; I was looking for an opportunity to "cuss" our foreign policy. So there was nothing personal about that matter, and in the campaign I never once mentioned ALBEN BARKLEY'S name. If anyone ever asked me privately about him, I always said he was a swell fellow, and I think he is and I know he is.

Mr. President, we shall hate to have him leave our midst; but it may be better to have him sitting on the rostrum before us, where we can look at his handsome face all the time.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is not easy for me to find the words which express the subtle mixture of my feelings today as I rise to add my voice to the chorus of other voices lifted in tribute to our beloved leader, ALBEN BARKLEY.

We rejoice with him that by the grace of the American people he leaves the Senate floor to assume another and higher office. And yet our joy is tempered by our own sense of irreplaceable loss. No longer will we hear this chamber ring with his persuasive speech. No longer will we smile at the gracious wit which so distinguishes his eloquence. The rough and tumble of debate within these historic walls will always be the poorer because by reason of his office he is cut off from partaking in it.

But for those of us on this side of the aisle, it means a much graver loss. By his elevation to the Vice Presidency we lose a man who has led us for nearly 12 years—years which thrust on the broad shoulders of the majority leader legisla-

tive problems more complex and more onerous than any faced by any other leader in our time.

How valiantly he discharged the responsibility of his office must be left to the judgment of history. But while we can, let us who have been with him in the battle give testimony of the stout heart and nimble brain which earned him the respect and affection of every man of whatever party who has served in the Senate since he came here more than a score of years ago.

And, because of our esteem, let us share his pleasure at the reward he has now received at the hands of the people. For it is not every man who, having stepped over the threshold of the biblical three score years and ten, goes not into seclusion but into more exalted office. To me there is a kind of happy fitness in the fact that his career in this body should culminate by his presiding over it, where his amazing fund of parliamentary learning will be put to its most important use.

Many great men have sat in the chair of the President of the Senate. I venture to suggest, however, that since John Adams presided over the first session of the Senate no man has ever been more suited to fulfill the duties of that office than the senior Senator from Kentucky.

We remember him best for our delight in his great poise and ready wit. And yet we miss the essential point if we fail to realize that this same wit, this same poise, concealed a man of towering stature, who some day will take his rightful place among the greatest statesmen who have graced American politics since Washington and Jefferson first led the young Republic into nationhood. But only those of us who have had the privilege of day-to-day association with him in debate, in conference, and in a common bond of fellowship, can really appreciate the sterling qualities of our friend.

His career has followed in all those classical traditions of America's great men. Like another great statesman and story teller, the immortal Abraham Lincoln, BARKLEY, too, was born in a log cabin in Kentucky. He possesses the same Lincolnian traits of tolerance and humanity. In his life's struggle to succeed, he experienced similar vicissitudes.

It is not for me, as one who has served with him for the brief space of only 10 years, to describe the brilliance of that congressional career. That I leave to others in this body, whose service runs in length of years much beyond mine. Let me say only that, for my part, I shall always treasure the hours without number we have spent together as political allies, united by the bond of a deep friendship. I look forward to many more such hours which his vigor and strength so amply promise. He is still ours, though he leaves his seat on the floor to ascend to the seat of the Presiding Officer. It is a comfort to know he will be there, ready, from his rich store of experience, to lend us the guidance and counsel we have learned to trust.

I know that I speak the mind of the 96 Members of this body and, indeed, of the American people, when I say that we wish for him everything in life he wishes for himself. No man ever deserved more for his patient, devoted, and brilliant service to the American people and the institutions that we represent.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I hasten to join in the observations made in tribute to the retiring majority leader. Much has been said along that line, and I wish to join in the sentiments expressed. If the remarks just made were the last speech the Senator from Kentucky is to make in the Senate, I rather acknowledge that with reluctance, because I know the Senator would desire to take part in legislation whenever he had the opportunity.

Besides being an outstanding leader, which has been listed as one of his qualities, one thing I would mention this afternoon is that after 6 years of association with him, I pay tribute to him for rising to the heights when it became necessary to pour oil on the troubled waters. He has watched the Senate explode, which it does at times, and then stepped in, and in masterly fashion sort of quieted us, and we got down to business and performed the work the Senate was supposed to do.

I shall never forget the tribute he paid some of us at the conclusion of a very hectic session in 1944 or 1945, when the OPA and price controls were under consideration. Several times during the debate the Senator from Kentucky and the junior Senator from Nebraska had had very serious issues presented to us, he on one side and I on the other, and finally, as he went around smoothing everything over, he came over to our side of the aisle and said, "There is the junior Senator from Nebraska. I love him. I love him more than any man with whom I have so often differed."

Mr. President, that illustrated the philosophy of the retiring majority leader, and after that speech, he had me feeling that he was one of the outstanding leaders we have had in the Senate of the United States.

I therefore assure the Senator that as he retires as majority leader, those on this side of the aisle will remember him and cherish the very pleasant memories we have of him, even of some occasions when we were under pressure and there was a great deal of heat. We will reflect with pleasure upon his actions in the days to come.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, some of us who were sitting here in the Senate a few minutes ago observed what I think is a very historic incident, that is, the preparation which the majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], was making at his desk for departure from the floor of the Senate. It causes many of us sadness to see him leave his place on the floor of the United States Senate, and that is true regardless of whether we are on one side of the aisle or the other.

I rose particularly at this moment, however, for the purpose of calling attention, for the record, to one historical fact of which I am sure the people of the great State of Missouri who know of it are, and those who do not know of it would be, very proud, namely, that the birthplace of the mother of our distinguished friend, Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, was Caruthersville, Pemiscot County, Mo. I realize that the influence of a mother upon a son or daughter can be, and usually is, of the highest value in the formation of character and in the development of the traits of manhood or womanhood.

So, this afternoon, Mr. President, as one who was born in Missouri, I take pleasure in expressing to the Senator from Kentucky our pride in the fact that his mother came from our great State.

I also take this opportunity to wish him Godspeed in his future undertakings.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to express my personal regret that the Senator from Kentucky is no longer to conduct, as leader, Democratic affairs on the floor of the Senate, that we are not to be able to engage in the very pleasant controversies like those which have characterized our relations for 10 years.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky and I have worked together for some 8 years while he was majority leader. We have labored together on the Committee on Banking and Currency in attempting to work out many of the problems which arose during and after the war. We had some very violent differences of opinion on the floor, but I do not think anyone has ever questioned that the Senator from Kentucky treated everyone in the Senate most fairly throughout the administration of his office as majority leader.

During the past 2 years the Senator has, in the most kindly way, cooperated in procedure to forward the business of the Senate. He has sometimes become very excited in debate, but I do not recall an occasion when 5 minutes later he did not have all the good humor which any man could possess. I do not recall the time when he was not willing to forget personal differences of opinion, and I certainly regret very much, from the point of view of our own pleasure here on the floor of the Senate in the conduct of orderly and friendly and determined debate, that he is to take the seat on the rostrum.

Mr. President, I recall that in the play, The State of the Union, the man who was asked to take the nomination for the Vice Presidency refused to do so because he thought his mother would not like it, and the answer to him was, "Oh, she will never know." [Laughter.] I hope very much that we never will really know that the senior Senator from Kentucky is removed from us as Vice President, and I trust that he will maintain the same personal relations with us here in the Senate which have characterized our friendship during the last 10 years. [Applause.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief comment on the very high esteem in which I hold the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I should like to point out to the young people of America that if they will study the political record of the Senator from Kentucky they will study a record of statesmanship put to work. I wish here publicly to express my debt of gratitude to the Senator for the inspiration he was to me long before I came to the Senate of

the United States, and has been ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. He is a great liberal, and, after all, standing for the liberal principles of great human values knows no party. I submit his record as an example of liberalism in the highest sense, put to work for the benefit of the people of his country.

OBJECTION TO MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSIONS AND NOTICE OF OBJECTION TO CERTAIN UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the last comment I want to make is by way of an announcement so that—although I do not hope for agreement—there will be no misunderstanding as to two parliamentary positions I shall take during the Eighty-first Congress. I think the time to announce those positions is at the beginning of the Congress.

Last Thursday afternoon, while the Senate was in session, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held a very important meeting. It was a meeting I would have liked to attend had it not been for the fact that I felt that my first duty was on the floor of the Senate, and for the further fact that I was engaged in a running debate during most of Thursday afternoon. However, Mr. President, I have before expressed my conviction that the Senate sessions should be attended by Members of the Senate and that I do not think that at the time Senate sessions are being held Senate committee meetings should be held. Certainly that is not only the spirit and the intent, but it is also the letter of the law. I read the following provisions from the Reorganization Act of 1946:

> No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session.

This morning, Mr. President, we had another meeting of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I was advised at that meeting that the committee last Thursday afternoon had decided to hold its regular meetings on Thursday afternoons. At the meeting this morning I protested and said that the junior Senator from Oregon, within his rights as a Senator, would always object on the floor of the Senate to any meeting of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare being called on Thursday afternoon, if the Senate were in session, unless some exceptional circumstances would justify departure from what I think clearly was intended by the provision I have read from the Reorganization Act.

Mr. President, the holding of Senate committee meetings when the Senate is in session has become the practice of the Senate and not the exception. Therefore I serve notice, Mr. President, that, insofar as any Senate committee of which I am a member is concerned, it will be my parliamentary practice to object to any meeting being held while the Senate is in session. If that is not the desire of the Senate, then let the Senate change the Reorganization Act. I submit, Mr. President, that if enough Members of this body would follow that practice in connection with committees of which they are members, we soon would bring about a change in our procedure which is much to be desired, namely, a modification of our rules whereby the Senate would meet on certain specific days, such as, for example, Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, leaving the other days for committee meetings. But I do not think that it is consonant with orderly procedure in the Senate and with deliberate consideration of the people's business to have this body in session and at the same time have a series of committee meetings being held around the Capitol which take the membership of the Senate off the floor.

Mr. President, the second notice I want to serve is that it will be my practice, as a general rule, to object to any unanimous-consent agreements to fix voting time as of a specific hour, with a proviso that a certain amount of time shall be divided up at the discretion of the leaders on the two sides of a bill prior to the vote. As a general practice, again subject only to exception when it can be demonstrated to me that it is an exception, that it is desirable, or recognized, the junior Senator from Oregon will object to all unanimous-consent requests to vote as of a certain time. Although I have no right to it I shall request, and at this time wish to make the request, that I be allowed the courtesy of a quorum call before any such unanimous-consent request is made during the Eighty-first Congress.

THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this seems an appropriate time to refer on the Senate floor to the mixed situation in the Middle East. Today in the United States the Senate just now has confirmed the nomination of a new Secretary of State, and today in Parliament Winston Churchill and others are challenging Britain's Palestine policy. It is reported that Foreign Secretary Bevin will be asked for a statement on the Holy Land. I understand also that at least three Cabinet Members of His Majesty's Government are against Mr. Bevin's policy.

A number of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives have mentioned the distressing subject of one-sided action by the British in the Middle East. I should like to join them in deploring this unfortunate position.

To see a great power bullying a small and weak neighbor is never a pretty spectacle. If the small and weak country shows a lot of courage and fighting spirit, and is willing to defend itself to the death against invasion, this does not change the fact that it is still small and weak.

The new Jewish State of Israel has shown just that spirit. It has shown courage and fighting spirit, and has successfully defended itself against invasion and attempts to destroy it by the six neighboring governments which ganged up on it. As a result, our respect for its people has grown rather than diminished. They have certainly earned the right to be left alone, especially now when these same neighbors seem ready to talk peace.

What the British are doing in the Middle East does not make nice reading. Everybody realizes what the British under the direction of Foreign Secretary Bevin are up to. They are after that part of the Jewish state which is known as the Negev and to some extent they are moved by wounded pride and anger against the Jews. Neither is a sentiment worthy of a great nation. If it is true, as our English friends say in public, that the Negev is an empty desert, it is not worthy of a great empire to begrudge a tiny nation the possession of a small desert. If it is true, as the Jews assert publicly and our English friends whisper in confidential tones, that the Negev has oil and other riches, Britain, which controls so much oil and so many riches, does not play a very noble role in trying to grasp for itself the one possible source of mineral wealth of that tiny new state; and if the main reason for this intrigue is unadulterated frustration and sheer bitterness of the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Bevin, and some other British officials, this certainly will not contribute to our esteem of British policy.

But the worst feature of all, in my opinion, is the devious search for alibis and the succession of lame excuses with which the British Government tries to cover up and to justify its course of action. Anything, even the brutal and crude admission that Britain wants to grab the Negev because it wants it, because it is strong enough to get it, and because it is annoyed at the Jews for having thrown her out of Palestine, would be better than such a show of hypocrisy.

At first, I understand, they pretended that they were coming to the aid of the Egyptians because Egypt asked them to—until it was shown that the Egyptians had not asked them at all. Then it was asserted that British planes were conducting their reconnaissance flight over Egyptian territory only—until it was proved that they were outside of Egypt and inside Palestine. Still later, British spokesmen explained that their planes went up at the request of the observers sent to the Middle East by the United Nations—until those observers denied ever having made such a request. Having run out of other excuses, they have even tried to involve the United States in these machinations by implying that the planes were sent up as a result of consultations with the United States Government—until our own Government vehemently denied it.

The latest British formula, I understand, while admitting that they sent the planes up on their own responsibility, is to hint that in some way they did it in order to do us a favor and to supply us with information which we allegedly wanted to obtain.

Let me say to our English friends that they will not achieve anything by that kind of tactics. They and we are united to keep the world as free, as peaceful, and as prosperous as possible. We hope that as a result of our united efforts the world will find that peace which men of good will everywhere seek. If a fight cannot be avoided, let us pick on someone our own size. The alliance between our country and Britain was not made in

order to grab pennies from infants, nor to grab the Negev from the State of Israel, which is smaller than the State of Maryland. But if the British have to do it, let them come out in the open and admit that greed or frustration or whatever it is that induces them to pick a quarrel which might lead to another world war. Let them stop pretending to be noble while carrying on an act of petty imperialism, since no one will believe them anyway.

PROGRAM OF THE SENATE FOR REMAINDER OF THE WEEK

On motion of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, it was—

*Ordered*, That at the conclusion of its business today the Senate adjourn until Thursday, January 20, at 11:45 a. m.; that upon reconvening it proceed in a body to the east front of the Capitol for the ceremonies attending the inauguration of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that at the conclusion of said ceremonies the Senate stand adjourned until Monday next.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, under the order just entered, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate, under the order previously entered, adjourned until Thursday, January 20, 1949, at 11:45 a. m.

---

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate January 18, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

---

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 18, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean G. Acheson, to be Secretary of State.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 18, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as we meet today, help the Congress to walk in honor, avoiding anything that would dim the glory of free government.

O for a world of strife shut out and a world of good will and patience shut in. More and more give us courage to resist the allurements which so often are the fruits of success; more and more give us strength to fulfill our mission with patriotic zeal. Steady our hearts; guide us with Thine eye and keep us this day without sin. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted to me by the House for today be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, upon the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and the special orders heretofore entered for that day, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects and to include newspaper articles.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by a colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. BENJAMIN FRANKLIN JAMES, at the Franklin Memorial yesterday.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include sundry newspaper articles.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix in two separate instances, in one to include a statement from the Worldgram and in the other an address by Dr. Alexander Brin.

Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the State Legislature of South Carolina.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain extraneous material.

HOTEL RATES IN WASHINGTON

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Speaker, so far as I know a number of the hotels in Washington have not seen fit to take the public into their confidence by giving to the press a statement of their rates for the period of the inauguration. I, therefore, suggest that we cooperate in Congress by requesting our friends who are visiting Washington at this time to demand receipted bills when they make payment for their rooms and that they write on the back of the bill the type of accommodations they had. If we Members will accumulate this kind of evidence from our visitors we will have all the evidence we will need. In the meantime as to such hotel managers as are unwilling to reveal their rates, I recommend they read at least the last half of verse 19, chapter 3, of the Gospel of St. John.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. HEFFERNAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a tribute to Max Abelman, secretary to the board of directors of the Jewish Hospital, of Brooklyn.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

THE STEEL SHORTAGE

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, you have listened with patience many times during the past year to comments I have had to make on this floor as to the necessity of bringing steel scrap from the German Ruhr to augment our scanty supplies of this vitally important ingredient to the manufacture of steel. Despite the fact that there has been no lessening of demand for finished steel, many of you may have noticed in the current press that the market for scrap steel has broken, and this must, at least in part, be attributed to the shipments that have been coming over from western Europe in our relief ships, which for the most part are returning empty. Whatever return of this scrap steel has been induced has been helpful, but I want to say to you that this has only been a mere trickle of what it should have been or what it should still be to reinforce our economy, not only for our domestic needs but to meet our commitments abroad. In other words, instead of 100,000 tons a month, we should be bringing back several times that amount to safeguard our position, and any idea that this could impair steel production abroad, which is steadily on the increase, cannot be supported by competent authority.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the address by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Thursday next, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE UNTIL JANUARY 20 AND FROM JANUARY 20 TO JANUARY 24, 1949

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 55) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That when the House adjourns on Tuesday, January 18, 1949, it stand adjourned until 11:30 a. m. Thursday, January 20, 1949; that upon convening at that hour the House proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the purpose of attending the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice President of the United States; and that upon the conclusion of the ceremonies the House stand adjourned until Monday, January 24, 1949.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make the following announcement:

The Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies was appointed during the last session of Congress. The Chair has had many inquiries by Members with reference to the proceedings on Thursday. The Chair has been requested to announce to the House that all Members who expect to go out on the official platform will assemble here in the Chamber of the House at 11:30 o'clock Thursday morning. I have been requested to state that in order to get by the police, including the marines, it will be absolutely necessary for each Member to display the official ticket in order to get his seat on the Presidential platform. The committee feels that this is an entirely reasonable regulation.

If a Member does not have his ticket, it will be impossible for him to get his seat, for there will be no opportunity to join the procession after it leaves the House. There are no tickets available to ex-Members for this platform, inasmuch as the seating capacity is limited.

The Chair is further requested to announce that no children will be allowed upon the platform, and there will be no seats except for Members actually holding tickets for their own seats.

That, the Chair thinks, covers the announcement that he was requested to make.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution, House Resolution 56, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Harold D. Cooley (chairman), North Carolina; Stephen Pace, Georgia; W. R. Poage, Texas; George M. Grant, Alabama; Walter K. Granger, Utah; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; Eugene Worley, Texas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; James G. Polk, Ohio; Pat Sutton, Tennessee; Eugene D. O'Sullivan, Nebraska; John C. Davies, New York; Cecil F. White, California; James F. Lind, Pennsylvania; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Appropriations: Clarence Cannon (chairman), Missouri; John H. Kerr, North Carolina; George H. Mahon, Texas; Harry R. Sheppard, California; Albert Thomas, Texas; Michael J. Kirwan, Ohio; W. F. Norrell, Arkansas; Albert Gore, Tennessee; Jamie L. Whitten, Mississippi; George W. Andrews, Alabama; John J. Rooney, New York; J. Vaughan Gary, Virginia; Joe B. Bates, Kentucky; John E. Fogarty, Rhode Island; Henry M. Jackson, Washington; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Antonio M. Fernandez, New Mexico; William C. Stigler, Oklahoma; E. H. Hedrick, West Virginia; Prince H. Preston, Jr., Georgia; Otto E. Passman, Louisiana; Louis C. Rabaut, Michigan; Daniel J. Flood, Pennsylvania; Christopher C. McGrath, New York; Sidney R. Yates, Illinois; Foster Furcolo, Massachusetts; Edward H. Kruse, Jr., Indiana.

Committee on Armed Services: Carl Vinson (chairman), Georgia; Overton Brooks, Louisiana; Paul J. Kilday, Texas; Carl T. Durham, North Carolina; Lansdale G. Sasscer, Maryland; James J. Heffernan, New York; L. Mendel Rivers, South Carolina; Philip J. Philbin, Massachusetts; F. Edward Hébert, Louisiana; Arthur Winstead, Mississippi; Franck R. Havenner, California; Melvin Price, Illinois; O. C. Fisher, Texas; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; William J. Green, Jr., Pennsylvania; Clyde Doyle, California; Edward deGraffenried, Alabama; John R. Walsh, Indiana; L. Gary Clemente, New York; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on the Judiciary: Emanuel Celler (chairman), New York; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Sam Hobbs, Alabama; William T. Byrne, New York; Joseph R. Bryson, South Carolina; Thomas J. Lane, Massachusetts; Martin Gorski, Illinois; Michael A. Feighan, Ohio; Frank L. Chelf, Kentucky; Ed Gossett, Texas; J. Frank Wilson, Texas; Robert L. Ramsay, West Virginia; Dixie Gilmer, Oklahoma; Boyd Tackett, Arkansas; Edwin E. Willis, Louisiana; Winfield K. Denton, Indiana; James B. Frazier, Jr., Tennessee.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Schuyler Otis Bland (chairman), Virginia; Edward J. Hart, New Jersey; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; Donald L. O'Toole, New York; Clark W. Thompson, Texas; Frank W. Boykin, Alabama; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Victor Wickersham, Oklahoma; William A. Barrett, Pennsylvania; James B. Hare, South Carolina; Charles E. Bennett, Florida; Phil J. Welch, Missouri; Edward Breen, Ohio; James J. Murphy, New York; Tom B. Fugate, Virginia.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Tom Murray (chairman), Tennessee; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; James C. Davis, Georgia; John Bell Williams, Mississippi; John A. Whitaker, Kentucky; Thurman C. Crook, Indiana; Raymond W. Karst, Missouri; Homer Thornberry, Texas; James V. Buckley, Illinois; F. Ertel Carlyle, North Carolina; Eugene J. McCarthy, Minnesota; A. S. Herlong, Jr., Florida; Chester C. Gorski, New York; George M. Rhodes, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Public Lands: Andrew L. Somers (chairman), New York; J. Hardin Peterson, Florida; John R. Murdock, Arizona; Clair Engle, California; Monroe M. Redden, North Carolina; Tobey Morris, Oklahoma; Ken Regan, Texas; Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr., Texas; Compton I. White, Idaho; Walter S. Baring, Nevada; Reva Beck Bosone, Utah; Fred Marshall, Minnesota; Harry P. O'Neill, Pennsylvania; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; John E. Miles, New Mexico; E. L. Bartlett, Alaska; A. Fernós-Isern, Puerto Rico.

Committee on Public Works: William M. Whittington (chairman), Mississippi; Charles A. Buckley, New York; Henry D. Larcade, Jr., Louisiana; George H. Fallon, Maryland; Clifford Davis, Tennessee; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Tom Pickett, Texas; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; Robert T. Secrest, Ohio; Harry J. Davenport, Pennsylvania; T. Vincent Quinn, New York; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri; John H. Marsalis, Colorado; Chester A. Chesney, Illinois.

Committee on Rules: Adolph J. Sabath (chairman), Illinois; E. E. Cox, Georgia; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; William M. Colmer, Mississippi; Ray J. Madden, Indiana; John E. Lyle, Jr., Texas; John McSweeney, Ohio; James J. Delaney, New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: John S. Wood (chairman), Georgia; Francis E. Walter, Pennsylvania; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia; John McSweeney, Ohio; Morgan M. Moulder, Missouri.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: John E. Rankin (chairman), Mississippi; A. Leonard Allen, Louisiana; Walter B. Huber, Ohio; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; W. M. (Don) Wheeler, Georgia; Hamilton C. Jones, North Carolina; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Clarence G. Burton, Virginia; Peter F. Mack, Jr., Illinois; Clare Magee, Missouri; Earl Chudoff, Pennsylvania; Harley O. Staggers, West Virginia; Peter W. Rodino, Jr., New Jersey; James E. Noland, Indiana; Carl Elliott, Alabama; Harold A. Patten, Arizona.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Brent Spence (chairman), Kentucky; Paul Brown, Georgia; Wright Patman, Texas; A. S. Mike Monroney, Oklahoma; Brooks Hays, Arkansas; Albert Rains, Alabama; Frank Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Abraham J. Multer, New York; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; George D. O'Brien, Michigan; Chase Going Woodhouse, Connecticut; Clinton D. McKinnon, California; Hugh J. Addonizio, New Jersey; Isidore Dollinger, New York; Hugh B. Mitchell, Washington; Barratt O'Hara, Illinois.

Committee on the District of Columbia: John L. McMillan (chairman), South Carolina; Oren Harris, Arkansas; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; Howard W. Smith, Virginia; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Olin E. Teague, Texas; John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts; Robert E. Jones, Jr., Alabama; James C. Davis, Georgia; Walter K. Granger, Utah; James H. Morrison, Louisiana; George P. Miller, California; Frank Buchanan, Pennsylvania; Monroe M. Redden, North Carolina; Paul C. Jones, Missouri.

Committee on Education and Labor: John Lesinski (chairman), Michigan; Graham A. Barden, North Carolina; Augustine B. Kelley, Pennsylvania; Adam C. Powell, Jr., New York; John S. Wood, Georgia; John F. Kennedy, Massachusetts; Wingate H. Lucas, Texas; Cleveland M. Bailey, West Virginia; Leonard Irving, Missouri; Carl D. Perkins, Kentucky; Charles R. Howell, New Jersey; Hugo S. Sims,

South Carolina; Andrew Jacobs, Indiana; Thomas H. Burke, Ohio; Tom Steed, Oklahoma; Roy W. Wier, Minnesota.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: William L. Dawson (chairman), Illinois; Chet Holifield, California; Henderson Lanham, Georgia; Porter Hardy, Jr., Virginia; Frank M. Karsten, Missouri; John W. McCormack, Massachusetts; Herbert C. Bonner, North Carolina; George G. Sadowski, Michigan; Walter B. Huber, Ohio; John A. Blatnik, Minnesota; Harold D. Donohue, Massachusetts; Earl T. Wagner, Ohio; Robert L. Coffey, Jr., Pennsylvania; William P. Bolton, Maryland; M. G. Burnside, West Virginia; Richard Bolling, Missouri; Anthony F. Tauriello, New York.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Sol Bloom (chairman), New York; John Kee, West Virginia; James P. Richards, South Carolina; Joseph L. Pfeifer, New York; Thomas S. Gordon, Illinois; Helen Gahagan Douglas, California; Mike Mansfield, Montana; Thomas E. Morgan, Pennsylvania; Laurie C. Battle, Alabama; George A. Smathers, Florida; A. S. J. Carnahan, Missouri; Thurmond Chatham, North Carolina; Clement J. Zablocki, Wisconsin; Abraham A. Ribicoff, Connecticut.

Committee on House Administration: Mary T. Norton (chairman), New Jersey; Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; Burr P. Harrison, Virginia; Omar Burleson, Texas; George A. Smathers, Florida; Charles B. Deane, North Carolina; Edward A. Garmatz, Maryland; Ken Regan, Texas; James W. Trimble, Arkansas; Carl Albert, Oklahoma; W. M. (Don) Wheeler, Georgia; Paul C. Jones, Missouri; Wayne L. Hays, Ohio; Anthony Cavalcante, Pennsylvania; George H. Christopher, Missouri; Vito Marcantonio, New York.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Robert Crosser (chairman), Ohio; Alfred L. Bulwinkle, North Carolina; Lindley Beckworth, Texas; J. Percy Priest, Tennessee; Oren Harris, Arkansas; George G. Sadowski, Michigan; Dwight L. Rogers, Florida; Eugene J. Keogh, New York; Arthur G. Klein, New York; Thomas B. Stanley, Virginia; John B. Sullivan, Missouri; William T. Granahan, Pennsylvania; Andrew J. Biemiller, Wisconsin; John A. McGuire, Connecticut; George H. Wilson, Oklahoma; Neil J. Linehan, Illinois; Thomas R. Underwood, Kentucky.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 57) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Agriculture: Clifford R. Hope, Kansas; August H. Andresen, Minnesota; Reid F. Murray, Wisconsin; Edwin Arthur Hall, New York; William S. Hill, Colorado; Charles B. Hoeven, Iowa; Sid Simpson, Illinois; Ernest K. Bramblett, California; Paul B. Dague, Pennsylvania; Norris Cotton, New Hampshire; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Appropriations: John Taber, New York; Richard B. Wigglesworth, Massachusetts; Charles A. Plumley, Vermont; Albert J. Engel, Michigan; Karl Stefan, Nebraska; Francis Case, South Dakota; Frank B. Keefe, Wisconsin; Ben F. Jensen, Iowa; H. Carl Andersen, Minnesota; Walt Horan, Washington; Gordon Canfield, New Jersey; Ivor D. Fenton, Pennsylvania; Ralph E. Church, Illinois; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; John Phillips, California; Errett P. Scrivner, Kansas; Frederic R. Coudert, Jr., New York; Cliff Clevenger, Ohio.

Committee on Armed Services: Dewey Short, Missouri; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; W. Sterling Cole, New York; J. Parnell Thomas, New Jersey; George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Paul W. Shafer, Michigan; Charles H. Elston, Ohio; Jack Z. Anderson, California; William W. Blackney, Michigan; Leroy Johnson, California; Harry L. Towe, New Jersey; Leon H. Gavin, Pennsylvania; Walter Norblad, Oregon; James E. Van Zandt, Pennsylvania; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Banking and Currency: Jesse P. Wolcott, Michigan; Ralph A. Gamble, New York; Frederick C. Smith, Ohio; John C. Kunkel, Pennsylvania; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; Rolla C. McMillen, Illinois; Clarence E. Kilburn, New York; Albert M. Cole, Kansas; Merlin Hull, Wisconsin; Hardie Scott, Pennsylvania; Donald W. Nicholson, Massachusetts.

Committee on the District of Columbia: George J. Bates, Massachusetts; Sid Simpson, Illinois; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Henry O. Talle, Iowa; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Education and Labor: Samuel K. McConnell, Jr., Pennsylvania, Ralph W. Gwinn, New York; Walter E. Brehm, Ohio; Wint Smith, Kansas; Carroll D. Kearns, Pennsylvania; Richard M. Nixon, California; Thruston Ballard Morton, Kentucky; Thomas H. Werdel, California; Harold H. Velde, Illinois.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Clare E. Hoffman, Michigan; Robert F. Rich, Pennsylvania; R. Walter Riehlman, New York; Ralph Harvey, Indiana; Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Harold O. Lovre, South Dakota; William L. Pfeiffer, New York.

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Charles A. Eaton, New Jersey; Robert B. Chiperfield, Illinois; John M. Vorys, Ohio; Frances P. Bolton, Ohio; Lawrence H. Smith, Wisconsin; Chester E. Merrow, New Hampshire; Walter H. Judd, Minnesota; James G. Fulton, Pennsylvania; Jacob K. Javits, New York; John Davis Lodge, Connecticut; Donald L. Jackson, California.

Committee on House Administration: Karl M. LeCompte, Iowa; C. W. (Runt) Bishop, Illinois; Earl Wilson, Indiana; Benjamin F. James, Pennsylvania.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce: Charles A. Wolverton, New Jersey; Carl Hinshaw, California; Leonard W. Hall, New York; Joseph P. O'Hara, Minnesota; Wilson D. Gillette, Pennsylvania; Robert Hale, Maine; Harris Ellsworth, Oregon; James I. Dolliver, Iowa; John W. Heselton, Massachusetts; Hugh D. Scott, Jr., Pennsylvania; John B. Bennett, Michigan.

Committee on the Judiciary: Earl C. Michener, Michigan; Chauncey W. Reed, Illinois; Louis E. Graham, Pennsylvania; Frank Fellows, Maine; John Jennings, Jr., Tennessee; Clifford P. Case, New Jersey; Kenneth B. Keating, New York; William M. McCulloch, Ohio; J. Caleb Boggs, Delaware; Angier L. Goodwin, Massachusetts.

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries: Alvin F. Weichel, Ohio; T. Millet Hand, New Jersey; Henry J. Latham, New York; Thor C. Tollefson, Washington; John J. Allen, Jr., California; Edward T. Miller, Maryland; Charles E. Potter, Michigan; Franklin H. Lichtenwalter, Pennsylvania; Edgar A. Jonas, Illinois; Charles P. Nelson, Maine.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Edward H. Rees, Kansas; Harold C. Hagen, Minnesota; Robert J. Corbett, Pennsylvania; Katharine St. George, New York; Antoni N. Sadlak, Connecticut; Edward H. Jenison, Illinois; Usher L. Burdick, North Dakota; Gardner R. Withrow, Wisconsin; H. R. Gross, Iowa; James S. Golden, Kentucky.

Committee on Public Lands: Richard J. Welch, California; Fred L. Crawford, Michigan; William Lemke, North Dakota; Frank A. Barrett, Wyoming; Dean P. Taylor, New York; Jay LeFevre, New York; A. L. Miller, Nebraska; Wesley A. D'Ewart, Montana; Norris Poulson, California; John Sanborn, Idaho; Joseph R. Farrington, Hawaii.

Committee on Public Works: George A. Dondero, Michigan; Homer D. Angell, Oregon; J. Harry McGregor, Ohio; Paul Cunningham, Iowa; James C. Auchincloss, New Jersey; J. Glenn Beall, Maryland; Gordon L. McDonough, California; W. Kingsland Macy, New York; Russell V. Mack, Washington; Charles W. Vursell, Illinois; Gerald R. Ford, Michigan.

Committee on Rules: Leo E. Allen, Illinois; Clarence J. Brown, Ohio; James W. Wadsworth, New York; Christian A. Herter, Massachusetts.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Edith Nourse Rogers, Massachusetts; Bernard W. (Pat) Kearney, New York; Alvin E. O'Konski, Wisconsin; Herbert A. Meyer, Kansas; James T. Patterson, Connecticut; Dayton E. Phillips, Tennessee; Glenn R. Davis, Wisconsin; Hubert B. Scudder, California; Cecil M. Harden, Indiana; Richard W. Hoffman, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Woodrow Wilson.

BEVIN BLOCKS PEACE

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the entire world could be at peace today but for one person—Ernest Bevin. His shameful, disgraceful behavior is causing us much concern.

It is clear that after the Arabs refused to continue their war against the Israeli Government with the use of British arms, the British Government, under Bevin, continued the undeclared war with its own manpower.

It is obvious today that, left alone, the Arabs and Israelis could negotiate a peaceful settlement of their differences. However, Bevin will not permit it to happen. Britain's official policy toward Palestine and Israel has been almost solely dictated by Bevin. This policy, which will be tested in full-dress debate in Parliament today, is one of nonrecognition of Israel and blocking Israel's entry into the United Nations and of restricting the new state in order to obtain and control the Negev and destroy the new nation of Israel.

Not only has Britain but the Netherlands as well have deliberately gone out of their way to break down the effectiveness of the United Nations. We will not permit them to make the United Nations another League of Nations. This is our last chance of world peace—another war will wipe out civilization.

We want peace and will exert all our efforts in that direction. If we are to have peace, we must recognize the sovereignty of other nations; we must certainly recognize Israel. Of course, ways

must be found to bring unruly and obstreperous nations into line. We must hit them where it hurts them the most; not by declaration of war, but by withholding assistance.

The Marshall plan was never put into being to permit nations to use the funds for war. Are we to continue to give these nations help so that they in turn can continue their undeclared wars? It is our job to take the most effective means at our disposal to put a stop to all this blundering. The most effective action which we can take unilaterally is to lift the arms embargo to Israel, cement our friendship by extending de jure recognition, and approve the economic loans already being negotiated. This we must do at once. But we can and should go a large step further. We should make it clear at once that our European recovery funds will be shut off immediately to any nation, including Great Britain, which persists in financing a war of aggression.

We have been, in fact, nearly that firm with the Netherlands on Indonesia. We must be very firm with both these nations now, since if we falter at this time, the peace in Israel and the hope of peace in the world will be sacrificed to Ernest Bevin's hatred of Israel and his covetousness of the oil and land of the Negev.

The American people do not intend to finance any wars. We can best prove to the world that we want peace by withholding all Marshall-plan aid from any country which directly or indirectly participates in any acts of aggression. We must act at once. Any delay on our part at this time will be disastrous to world peace.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an address he delivered before the Alexander Hamilton Club of Tulsa, Okla., on the evening of January 15, and in the other an editorial published in the Tulsa Tribune of January 15.

Mr. SCRIVNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article showing that Kansas needs a second Federal judge.

Mr. PETERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Representative WELCH of California.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a series of four articles from the New York Times as to how displaced persons have fared in the United States, notwithstanding the additional expense, which is estimated by the Government Printing Office at $177.50.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

### PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, this will be perhaps the last opportunity this week to make an announcement in relation to the program for next week.

The committees have been officially organized, and many of them are going to start functioning next Monday. I am unable to state to the House at this time any program for next week. It is all dependent upon what action is taken by any of the committees. For example, if the minimum-wage law is reported out, I would make every effort to bring it up next week. I say this to illustrate my state of mind and my intentions. I cannot see that many bills would be reported out next week that could be called up, but there might be one or two which, if they are reported out of committee, I shall make every effort to bring up. I cannot give the House any kind of definite information as to the program for next week. I am sorry I am in this position, but there is no other statement I can make to the House at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman kindly tell us what the one or two bills are that may be brought up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state that, except that I referred to bringing up the legislation regarding increasing the minimum wage, if that is reported out of committee. I hope they will not have more than 1 day of hearings on that. It has been heard and reheard so many times that everybody knows his mind on that subject. I am very hopeful that the Committee on Education and Labor will hold hearings on that matter next Monday. I do not know whether they will or not, but I hope they will, and report out the bill. If so, I shall make every effort to bring it up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman would expect, of course, that on a bill of such great magnitude and importance to the American economy as a minimum-wage bill, that there would be at least 1 day of hearing and consideration in committee, would he not?

Mr. McCORMACK. I said 1 day. Of course, that is up to the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But he would expect that it would be given at least 1 day's consideration?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is up to the committee. Of course, my personal opinion is that it has been heard and reheard many times. There have been many hearings on it in past years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. But the gentleman realizes, of course, that there are a good many new Members in the House of Representatives and on the committee and they might like to know about it, too.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, it is a matter of great import and favorable to the national economy of our country. I am sure that is what my friend had in mind.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I am referring to orderly procedure in the House and the orderly procedure of the work of legislating.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, if a bill is reported out, I want to advise the House that I naturally shall make every effort possible to bring it up next week. Whether or not it will be reported out, I cannot say. I hope it will be reported out, and, if it is, I shall make every effort to bring it up.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Has the Committee on House Administration on your side been completed?

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe so. I believe there are one or two vacancies, but it has been completed.

Mr. REED of New York. The reason I ask is that I am very anxious, if possible, to have the bill which I introduced to amend the Reorganization Act, to benefit about 14 or 15 employees who are completely out of employment, and will be for 1 year, unless we can get that bill out.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure, if my friend will take that matter up with the chairman of the committee, he will find a very responsive state of mind to hearings on that. I am in agreement with the gentleman, as I stated when he made his 1-minute speech several days ago.

Mr. REED of New York. I was looking over the Chamber and I believe the chairman of the committee is not present on the floor. I wondered whether the committee had been completed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is a rather difficult one, but knowing the competency of the gentleman, I venture to put it. Is it your policy or your purpose to get around so that we adjourn sometime in July early?

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course the gentleman is looking many months ahead.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know the gentleman has a program and I know his efficiency. I wonder if we are going to get it through, because some of us want to make our plans.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am naturally human enough to be pleased with the gentleman's flattery. I can assure the gentleman we will expedite matters as quickly as possible and I am hopeful, without committing myself and looking months ahead, as I say, that we will be through at least by the early part of July.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to say to the gentleman that it was not flattery, but just a statement of fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is awfully nice of the gentleman.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes, p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 20, 1949, at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

88. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Thirty-fourth Annual Report of the Federal Trade Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

89. A letter from the Chairman, United States Tariff Commission, transmitting a copy of the summary (designated as pt. 1) of the First Annual Report of the Tariff Commission on the Operation of the Trade Agreements Program, through June 1934 to April 1948; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 1639. A bill making additional appropriations for the welfare of Indians in the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1640. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office, courthouse, and customhouse building at Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1641. A bill to provide that Federal funds shall not be used for loans, grants, or other financial assistance to provide housing with respect to which there is any discrimination against occupancy on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1642. A bill to withhold Federal aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1643. A bill to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1644. A bill to provide for the preservation of the frigate *Constellation*; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1645. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1646. A bill to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 1647. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act with reference to the general powers of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 1648. A bill to correct the inequities of Public Law 317 and to provide credit for faithful service to all substitute employees of the postal service when appointed to regular positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1649. A bill to repeal section 342 (h) of the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1650. A bill to amend the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act of 1934; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 1651. A bill designating building guards employed in public buildings in the departmental and field service as United States Building Police, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 1652. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1653. A bill for the erection of a public building at Hemingway, S. C., and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1654. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1655. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the acquisition and development of systems of State parks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H. R. 1656. A bill to require that one member of the Interstate Commerce Commission be from the New England States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 1657. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 1658. A bill to equalize the purchasing power of the American dollar and currencies of the United States when the same come into competition with foreign moneys in the purchase of goods and merchandise of all kinds not on the free list that are bought for transportation and importation into the United States of America from foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1659. A bill to exempt retirement annuities of governmental employees from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1660. A bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1661. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1662. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to acquire on behalf of the United States Government all property and facilities of the Rainier National Park Co.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WELCH of Missouri:

H. R. 1663. A bill to make permanent the judgeship provided for by the act entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri," approved December 24, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. J. Res. 98. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Con. Res. 19. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinatz, of Yugoslavia, and Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 1664. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Polvere, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. R. 1665. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vasilia Parselles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 1666. A bill for the relief of Maurice J. Symms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1667. A bill for the relief of Harold W. Britton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1668. A bill for the relief of Walter F. Zagrodny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1669. A bill for the relief of Tibor Stephen Laszlo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 1670. A bill for the relief of Smith Distributing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Kostas Kallinikos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. R. 1672. A bill for the relief of Jack Phillips; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1673. A bill for the relief of Ellen F. Barbee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 1674. A bill for the relief of Johann Otto Hermann Polle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1675. A bill for the relief of Joseph Bernstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1676. A bill for the relief of Thomas M. Bates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1677. A bill for the relief of Marciano Pugliese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1678. A bill for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 1679. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Skio Takayama Hull; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H. R. 1680. A bill for the relief of Myron Kolodziejczak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1681. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose Katchios; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

12. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Joseph Geiger, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to national defense, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

---

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, in whom we trust, and by whose guidance and grace this Nation was born, bless the Senators of these United States at this important time in history and give them all things needful to the faithful discharge of their responsibilities.

We pray especially today for our President, and also for him who will preside over this Chamber.

Give to them good health for the physical strains of their office, good judgment for the decisions they must make, wisdom beyond their own, and clear understanding for the problems of this difficult hour.

We thank Thee for their humble reliance upon Thee. May they go often to the throne of grace, as we commend them both to Thy loving care and Thy guiding hand. Through Jesus Christ our Saviour. Amen.

SENATOR FROM KENTUCKY

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present the credentials of the Senator-designate from Kentucky, Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follow:

CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

FRANKFORT, KY., *January 17, 1949.*

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

This is to certify that pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, I, Earle C. Clements, Governor of said Commonwealth, do hereby appoint Hon. GARRETT L. WITHERS a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent the State of Kentucky in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of Hon. ALBEN W. BARKLEY is filled by election as provided by law—said appointment to become effective January 20, 1949.

Witness His Excellency, our Governor, Earle C. Clements, and our seal hereto affixed at Frankfort, Ky., this 17th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1949.

Given under my hand and seal as Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky this the 17th day of January in the year of our Lord 1949 and in the one hundred and fifty-seventh year of the Commonwealth.

EARLE C. CLEMENTS,
*Governor, Commonwealth of Kentucky.*

Attest:

[SEAL] GEORGE GLENN HATCHER,
*Secretary of State.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, the Senator-designate is present and ready to take the oath.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Senator-designate from Kentucky will present himself at the desk, the oath of office will be administered to him.

Mr. WITHERS, escorted by Mr. CHAPMAN, advanced to the desk, and the oath prescribed by law was administered to him by the President pro tempore.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday last, the Senate will now proceed to the east front of the Capitol for the inaugural ceremonies, at the conclusion of which it will stand adjourned until Monday next.

At 11 o'clock and 50 minutes a. m., the Senate, headed by the President pro tempore (KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from the State of Tennessee) and the Secretary (Leslie L. Biffle), proceeded to the inaugural platform at the east front of the Capitol and took the spaces assigned to them on the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The House of Representatives, headed by the Speaker (SAM RAYBURN, a Representative from the State of Texas) and the Clerk (Ralph R. Roberts) had preceded the Senate to the platform and taken the spaces assigned them on the right of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The governors of the States were escorted to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The Chief of Staff to the Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and the Commandant of the Coast Guard, with their aides, were escorted to the places assigned them on the right of the inaugural platform.

The diplomatic corps were escorted to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The members of the President's Cabinet were escorted to the places assigned them on the left of the inaugural platform.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, headed by the Marshal, Thomas E. Waggaman, and the Clerk, Charles Elmore Cropley, were escorted to the inaugural platform and took the places assigned them, the Chief Justice being seated immediately to the right and the Associate Justices being seated to the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

The President-elect of the United States, Harry S. Truman, of Missouri, and the Vice-President-elect of the United States, Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky, were escorted to the inaugural platform by the Secretary of the Senate, and the Joint Committee on Arrangements, consisting of Senator Carl Hayden, chairman; Senator J. Howard McGrath, Senator Kenneth S. Wherry, Representative John McCormack, Representative Harry R. Sheppard, and Representative Charles A. Halleck, the joint committee being headed by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, Joseph C. Duke, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, Joseph H. Callahan.

The Vice-President-elect was seated immediately to the left of the place reserved for the President-elect.

Mrs. Harry S. Truman and Miss Margaret Truman, wife and daughter of the President-elect, with Mrs. Max O. Truitt and David M. Barkley, daughter and son of the Vice-President-elect, and other members of the respective families, were escorted to the places assigned to them on the platform.

PRAYER

Rev. Edward Hughes Pruden, minister, First Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

God of the nations, in whom we live and move and have our being, and from whom cometh every good and perfect gift, we pause at the beginning of this day's historic proceedings to invoke Thy blessing upon this beloved country of ours, and upon all who serve her highest interests.

Grant to Thy servant, the President of the United States, all needed wisdom, health, and strength as he rededicates himself anew today to the high office to which he has been called. May he continue to lead us as he is led by Thee, in the ways that make for domestic tranquillity and international accord.

Bestow upon us, Our Father, the happiness which is reserved for that nation whose God is the Lord. Through Jesus Christ, Our Redeemer, we pray. Amen.

SINGING OF NATIONAL ANTHEM

Mr. Phil Regan, of Brooklyn, N. Y., sang the Star-Spangled Banner, accompanied by the United States Marine Band, led by Maj. William F. Santelmann.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, administered to the Vice-President-elect the oath of office prescribed by law, which he repeated, as follows:

I, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter, so help me God.

PRAYER

Rabbi Samuel Thurman, of the United Hebrew Temple, St. Louis, offered the following prayer:

Lord God of all the nations: The hearts and minds of this Nation turn to Thee in this solemn moment in prayer and in gratitude. This Nation, blessed by Thee and dedicated to the holiest conception of Thee as the Father of all mankind, is now being reconsecrated and rededicated in the person of its first citizen, the President of these United States of America. A son of the people, champion of social justice and civic righteousness, he is about to take the oath of his high office.

We pray Thy blessing upon him and his dear ones. Chosen by the people to be their Chief Magistrate, may the people's confidence in him never wane. May he continue to hold the high convictions of righteousness and justice, of truth and peace, which have won for him the people's faith and admiration. Touch him with Thy divine wisdom that he may, with humility, yet also with strength and courage, pursue the high purposes and noble ideals which have moved him to seek and to win the leadership of this Nation. May Thy hand lead and guide him through the many and tortuous paths through which this Nation and all the nations of the world must pass in the years ahead. Keep his heart steadfast and his mind single in the performance of the tasks and duties of his great office, and may this Nation, under his leadership, hold fast to its traditional ideals of freedom and justice for all men. Thus, blessed by Thee and devoted to the holy purposes of Thy will, our Nation shall go forward with unabated strength and unceasing labor in the service of Thee and of humanity, spreading light and liberty to those peoples that walk in darkness and dwell in servitude. By Thy bounty we have become rich and mighty among the nations of the world. O Lord, make us more worthy of all Thy blessings, to the end that both leader and people may continue to find favor in Thine eyes, and so live and serve that Thy glory, Thy majesty, and Thy power may abide with us forever. Amen.

## ADMINISTRATION OF OATH TO THE PRESIDENT-ELECT

The Chief Justice of the United States, Fred M. Vinson, administered to the President-elect the oath of office prescribed by the Constitution, which he repeated, as follows:

I, Harry S. Truman, do solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability, preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help me God.

## INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 5)

Thereupon the President of the United States delivered the following inaugural address:

Mr. Vice President, Mr. Chief Justice, and fellow citizens, I accept with humility the honor which the American people have conferred upon me. I accept it with a resolve to do all that I can for the welfare of this Nation and for the peace of the world.

In performing the duties of my office, I need the help and prayers of every one of you. I ask for your encouragement and for your support. The tasks we face are difficult. We can accomplish them only if we work together.

Each period of our national history has had its special challenges. Those that confront us now are as momentous as any in the past. Today marks the beginning not only of a new administration, but of a period that will be eventful, perhaps decisive, for us and for the world.

It may be our lot to experience, and in a large measure bring about, a major turning point in the long history of the human race. The first half of this century has been marked by unprecedented and brutal attacks on the rights of man, and by the two most frightful wars in history. The supreme need of our time is for men to learn to live together in peace and harmony.

The peoples of the earth face the future with grave uncertainty, composed almost equally of great hopes and great fears. In this time of doubt, they look to the United States as never before for good will, strength, and wise leadership.

It is fitting, therefore, that we take this occasion to proclaim to the world the essential principles of the faith by which we live, and to declare our aims to all peoples.

The American people stand firm in the faith which has inspired this Nation from the beginning. We believe that all men have a right to equal justice under law and equal opportunity to share in the common good. We believe that all men have the right to freedom of thought and expression. We believe that all men are created equal because they are created in the image of God.

From this faith we will not be moved. [Applause.]

The American people desire, and are determined to work for, a world in which all nations and all peoples are free to govern themselves as they see fit and to achieve a decent and satisfying life. Above all else, our people desire, and are determined to work for, peace on earth—a just and lasting peace—based on genuine agreement freely arrived at by equals. [Applause.]

In the pursuant of these aims, the United States and other like-minded nations find themselves directly opposed by a regime with contrary aims and a totally different concept of life.

That regime adheres to a false philosophy which purports to offer freedom, security, and greater opportunity to mankind. Misled by that philosophy, many peoples have sacrificed their liberties only to learn to their sorrow that deceit and mockery, poverty and tyranny, are their reward.

That false philosophy is communism.

Communism is based on the belief that man is so weak and inadequate that he is unable to govern himself, and therefore requires the rule of strong masters.

Democracy is based on the conviction that man has the moral and intellectual capacity, as well as the inalienable right, to govern himself with reason and justice. [Applause.]

Communism subjects the individual to arrest without lawful cause, punishment without trial, and forced labor as a chattel of the state. It decrees what information he shall receive, what art he shall produce, what leaders he shall follow, and what thoughts he shall think.

Democracy maintains that government is established for the benefit of the individual, and is charged with the responsibility of protecting the rights of the individual and his freedom in the exercise of his abilities.

Communism maintains that social wrongs can be corrected only by violence.

Democracy has proved that social justice can be achieved through peaceful change. [Applause.]

Communism holds that the world is so widely divided into opposing classes that war is inevitable.

Democracy holds that free nations can settle differences justly and maintain a lasting peace.

The differences between communism and democracy do not concern the United States alone. People everywhere are coming to realize that what is involved is material well-being, human dignity, and the right to believe in and worship God.

I state these differences, not to draw issues of belief as such, but because the actions resulting from the Communist philosophy are a threat to the efforts of free nations to bring about world recovery and lasting peace.

Since the end of hostilities, the United States has invested its substance and its energy in a great constructive effort to restore peace, stability, and freedom to the world.

We have sought no territory; we have imposed our will on none. We have asked for no privileges we would not extend to others.

We have constantly and vigorously supported the United Nations and related agencies as a means of applying democratic principles to international relations. We have consistently advocated and relied upon peaceful settlement of disputes among nations.

We have made every effort to secure agreement on effective international control of our most powerful weapon, and we have worked steadily for the limitation and control of all armaments.

We have encouraged, by precept and example, the expansion of world trade on a sound and a fair basis.

Almost a year ago, in company with 16 free nations of Europe, we launched the greatest cooperative economic program in history. The purpose of that unprecedented effort is to invigorate and strengthen democracy in Europe, so that the free people of that continent can resume their rightful place in the forefront of civilization and can contribute once more to the security and welfare of the world.

Our efforts have brought new hope to all mankind. We have beaten back despair and defeatism. We have saved a number of countries from losing their liberty. Hundreds of millions of people all over the world now agree with us that we need not have war—that we can have peace. [Applause.]

The initiative is ours.

We are moving on with other nations to build an even stronger structure of international order and justice. We shall have as our partners countries which, no longer solely concerned with the problem of national survival, are now working to improve the standards of living of all their people. We are ready to undertake new projects to strengthen a free world.

In the coming years, our program for peace and freedom will emphasize four major courses of action.

First, we will continue to give unfaltering support to the United Nations and related agencies, and we will continue to search for ways to strengthen

their authority and increase their effectiveness. We believe that the United Nations will be strengthened by the new nations which are being formed in lands now advancing toward self-government under democratic principles.

Second, we will continue our programs for world economic recovery.

This means, first of all, that we must keep our full weight behind the European recovery program. We are confident of the success of this major venture in world recovery. We believe that our partners in this effort will achieve the status of self-supporting nations once again.

In addition, we must carry out our plans for reducing the barriers to world trade and increasing its volume. Economic recovery and peace itself depend on increased world trade.

Third, we will strengthen freedom-loving nations against the dangers of aggression.

We are working out with a number of countries a joint agreement designed to strengthen the security of the North Atlantic area. Such an agreement would take the form of a collective defense arrangement within the terms of the United Nations Charter.

We have already established such a defense pact for the Western Hemisphere by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro.

The primary purpose of these agreements is to provide unmistakable proof of the joint determination of the free countries to resist armed attack from any quarter. Every country participating in these arrangements must contribute all it can to the common defense.

If we can make it sufficiently clear, in advance, that any armed attack affecting our national security will be met with overwhelming force, the armed attack may never occur. [Applause.]

I hope soon to send to the Senate a treaty respecting the North Atlantic security plan.

In addition, we will provide military advice and equipment to free nations which will cooperate with us in the maintenance of peace and security.

Fourth, we must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas.

More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. Their food is inadequate. They are victims of disease. Their economic life is primitive and stagnant. Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas.

For the first time in history, humanity possesses the knowledge and skill to relieve the suffering of these people.

The United States is preeminent among the nations in the development of industrial and scientific techniques. The material resources which we can afford to use for the assistance of other peoples are limited. But our imponderable resources in technical knowledge are constantly growing and are inexhaustible.

I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development.

Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.

We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies whenever practicable. It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom. [Applause.]

With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country, this program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living.

Such new economic developments must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. Guaranties to the investor must be balanced by guaranties in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labor go into these developments. [Applause.]

The old imperialism—exploitation for foreign profit—has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair-dealing.

All countries, including our own, will greatly benefit from a constructive program for the better use of the world's human and natural resources. Experience shows that our commerce with other countries expands as they progress industrially and economically.

Greater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge.

Only by helping the least fortunate of its members to help themselves can the human family achieve the decent, satisfying life that is the right of all people.

Democracy alone can supply the vitalizing force to stir the peoples of the world into triumphant action, not only against their human oppressors, but also against their ancient enemies—hunger, misery, and despair.

On the basis of these four major courses of action we hope to help create the conditions that will lead eventually to personal freedom and happiness for all mankind. [Applause.]

If we are to be successful in carrying out these policies, it is clear that we must have continued prosperity in this country and we must keep ourselves strong. [Applause.]

Slowly but surely we are weaving a world fabric of international security and growing prosperity.

We are aided by all who wish to live in freedom from fear—even by those who live today in fear under their own governments.

We are aided by all who want relief from the lies of propaganda—who desire truth and sincerity.

We are aided by all who desire self-government and a voice in deciding their own affairs.

We are aided by all who long for economic security—for the security and abundance that men in free societies can enjoy.

We are aided by all who desire freedom of speech, freedom of religion, and freedom to live their own lives for useful ends.

Our allies are the millions who hunger and thirst after righteousness.

In due time, as our stability becomes manifest, as more and more nations come to know the benefits of democracy and to participate in growing abundance, I believe that those countries which now oppose us will abandon their delusions and join with the free nations of the world in a just settlement of international differences. [Applause.]

Events have brought our American democracy to new influence and new responsibilities. They will test our courage, our devotion to duty, and our concept of liberty.

But I say to all men, what we have achieved in liberty, we will surpass in greater liberty.

Steadfast in our faith in the Almighty, we will advance toward a world where man's freedom is secure.

To that end we will devote our strength, our resources, and our firmness of resolve. With God's help, the future of mankind will be assured in a world of justice, harmony, and peace. [Applause.]

BENEDICTION

Most Rev. Patrick A. O'Boyle, Archbishop of Washington, pronounced the following benediction:

Blessed art Thou, Lord God of our fathers, and worthy to be praised and glorified forever.

Stretch forth Thy hand, O Lord, in fruitful blessing upon our President, our Vice President, the Members of our Congress, our judges and magistrates, and all those who, by our will, are entrusted with the well-being and security of our country, so that by Thy aid they may be able to discharge their duties of office with wisdom and prudence and justice.

Great indeed are our faults and numberless our needs, but complete is our trust in Thee, the God of all consolation, into whose hands we commit ourselves with faith and docility. Bless the people of our country that they may be governed by Thy law and walk in the ways of Thy commandments. Endow them with grace to bear one another's burdens in that generous spirit which befits men in true brotherhood under Thee, the common Father of all men.

Send forth Thy Holy Spirit in the fullness of His gifts to bless us with wisdom to perceive the ways of Thy holy will; with understanding to enlighten the darkness of our minds; with counsel to guide us unfailingly in the path of rec-

titude; with fortitude to sustain and strengthen us; with knowledge to instruct our ignorance; with piety to fructify in good works; and with reverent fear to deliver us from evil.

Multiply, O Lord, upon this Nation the manifold marks of Thy divine approval and benediction, set up, as it is, like a sign and symbol among the nations of the earth. Bless the land with fertile soil to bring forth the harvests that nourish us and feed the hungry mouths of the unfortunate who look to us for the necessities of life. Erkindle in our people the spirit of charity for the many whom poverty and misery have reduced to conditions unworthy of the dignity of man. Awaken in the souls of all who call Thee Father a hunger and thirst after social justice and fraternal charity.

Grant, O Lord, peace in our days, peace in our land, and peace among the nations, to the end that the rainbow of peace and reconciliation may enfold under its serene light all peoples of the earth with the graces and blessings of tranquillity. Amen.

At 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m. the President and Vice President of the United States, escorted by the Joint Committee on Arrangements, retired from the platform, followed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and the other distinguished guests who had been invited to witness the ceremonies.

ADJOURNMENT

After the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate, without returning to its Chamber, under the order entered on January 18 instant, stood in adjournment until Monday, January 24, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1949

The House met at 11:30 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, we praise Thee for the marvelous history of our Nation and for those institutions which are the glory of our democracy.

In this historic moment, we seek Thy divine guidance to direct our President and Vice President. Preserve their health in the days to come; with increasing faith in the right, may they be fully prepared to enter upon their labors. We ask in Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 18, 1949, was read and approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a brief announcement for the benefit of all Members. The Chair announces to the House that we will leave here in a body to go out on the official platform for the inaugural ceremonies. In order to get by the police and the marines it will be necessary for each Member to display the official ticket in order to secure his seat on the platform. The seats to be occupied by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives have no cover and it is advisable for Members to take with them their overcoats and hats.

The Chair also desires to state that pursuant to House Resolution 55, at the conclusion of the ceremonies at the east front of the Capitol, the House will stand adjourned until noon on Monday next. The Speaker, preceded by the Clerk, will head the procession, and the Members of the House will form in double column following them.

Thereupon, at 11:35 o'clock a. m., the Members of the House, preceded by the Speaker and the Clerk, proceeded to the east front of the Capitol.

ADJOURNMENT

At the conclusion of the inaugural ceremonies (at 12 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House, without returning to its Chamber, pursuant to House Resolution 55 stood in adjournment until Monday, January 24, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1682. A bill providing for the creation of the Curtiss Memorial Commission; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 1683. A bill relating to the status quo of coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1684. A bill to provide that certain loans secured by realty taken for a public use shall not be counted in computing the aggregate amount of loans that may be guaranteed for any veteran under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1685. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Kinder, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1686. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1687. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act approved July 16, 1916, and acts amendatory thereto and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1688. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1689. A bill to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1690. A bill to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, to create a National Labor Relations Board, to repeal certain provisions of law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1691. A bill to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1692. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1693. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 1694. A bill to provide for the return of rehabilitation and betterment of costs of Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 1695. A bill providing for the conveyance to the State of South Carolina of that portion of the Fort Moultrie Military Reservation by the War Assets Administration determined to be surplus to the needs of the United States Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 1696. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of Public Buildings to convey to the Temple Methodist Church, a nonprofit corporation of San Francisco, Calif., a portion of the federally owned building known as 100 McAllister Street, San Francisco, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to give full recognition to the State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Res. 58. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation with respect to debts owed to American citizens by foreign governments, municipalities, and corporations; to the Committee on Rules.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1697. A bill for the relief of Mildred Smith Butler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1698. A bill for the relief of Hans Oscar Hansen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1699. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kraus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1701. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vesta Meinn and Mrs. Edna Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 1702. A bill for the relief of Marco Buono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Today, O Lord, as the Members of the Senate pause in this moment of prayer, we unite our petitions for Thy blessing upon Thy servant who, in his new capacity, presides over this body. We thank Thee for his long years of devoted public service, for the testimony of his life and the inspiration of his example.

May he never feel lonely in this chair, but always be aware of Thy hand upon him and Thy spirit with him.

When differences arise, as they will, may Thy servants be not disturbed at being misunderstood, but rather be disturbed at not understanding.

May Thy will be done here, and may Thy program be carried out, above party and personality, beyond time and circumstance, for the good of America and the peace of the world. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 18, and Thursday, January 20, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT (ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hill | Morse |
| Anderson | Hoey | Murray |
| Baldwin | Holland | Myers |
| Brewster | Humphrey | Neely |
| Bricker | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Pepper |
| Byrd | Johnston, S. C. | Reed |
| Cain | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Capehart | Kem | Russell |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Knowland | Schoeppel |
| Connally | Langer | Smith, Maine |
| Cordon | Lodge | Smith, N. J. |
| Donnell | Long | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Lucas | Stennis |
| Downey | McCarran | Taft |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Taylor |
| Ecton | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ferguson | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Frear | McGrath | Thye |
| Fulbright | McKellar | Tobey |
| George | McMahon | Tydings |
| Gillette | Magnuson | Vandenberg |
| Green | Malone | Watkins |
| Gurney | Martin | Wiley |
| Hayden | Maybank | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Withers |
| Hickenlooper | Millikin | Young |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

## LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained consent that his colleague [Mr. KERR] be excused from attendance in the Senate today because of his inability to return to Washington from Oklahoma, due to bad weather.

Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate until Friday of the present week.

## REMARKS OF THE VICE PRESIDENT ON ASSUMING THE CHAIR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senate begins the transaction of business, I ask its indulgence for a few moments to respond to the very gracious remarks made by Members of the Senate on last Tuesday from both sides of the aisle upon the occasion of my retirement as a Member. I could not trust myself on that day to respond appropriately, because, as I have said frequently, I did not abandon, without regret, that seat upon the aisle in the front row after occupying it for 12 years. But I do appreciate the very generous remarks, not only made by Members of the Senate in public, but similar remarks that have been made to me in private upon the occasion of my departure from the Senate as a Member, and the assumption of my duties as its Presiding Officer.

I recall that in 1913, when Vice President Marshall from this very rostrum took the oath of office, as was then the custom, he made a little speech, after announcing that his reason for it was that he was entering upon a 4-year period of silence. I do not put myself precisely in that position, because I shall probably have to adjust myself gradually to the fact that I am not a Member of the Senate, and it might not surprise the Senate if some day I should thoughtlessly walk down from the rostrum and begin to debate some problem, upon which occasion I would expect to be called promptly to order. But I do appreciate, of course, the magnitude and the unanimity of the courtesies which have been extended to me as a Member of the Senate of the United States by all Members, regardless of their party and regardless of their States.

I have often doubted, and I do not hesitate to say that I doubt yet, whether there is any promotion to a higher office than a United States Senator that can be regarded as such, or to a role that can be regarded as more important than the role played by a Member of the United States Senate. We frequently refer to the Senate as the greatest deliberative body in the world. I have sometimes, in my impatience at what may have seemed to be too lengthy debate, referred to it as the most deliberative body in the world. But be that as it may, I believe that the United States Senate—and I say it with due apologies to any other legislative body—is the greatest deliberative body, because there is deliberation here, there is the right to speak; there is the right to be represented; there is the right to express one's views, however much they may disagree with the views of other Members of the Senate or with the people outside the Senate. So that to me membership in the Senate constitutes one of the supreme honors that the American people, through any State, can confer upon one of their citizens.

While it is true that every Senator represents the State which has chosen him, and in the very nature of things is interested in the problems which affect his State, in a real and a broader sense every Senator is a Senator of the United States. Though chosen by a single State, every vote he casts here for or against legislation which is general in its scope affects the people of every other State, as well as the people of his own State. So that it is a great thing not only to be chosen by a State as its ambassador to this great body, but it is a great thing to feel that while in that capacity we are Members here, we are also Members of the United States Senate for the country at large. So I experienced considerable regret in dissociating myself from this body as a Member.

I will be hanging around for 4 years, and I wish not only to welcome the cooperation of every Member of the Senate, but I invite the cooperation and the sympathetic good will of every Member of this body, regardless of politics. I can assure you that not only personally but officially I will accord to every Member of the Senate, regardless of the State from which he comes, and regardless of his political inclinations, that same degree of good will and cooperation which I hope to receive from you.

I wish also to say not only to the new Members who are just coming into this body, but to the older Members also, that if in my capacity of Presiding Officer of the Senate I can be of service to you in a legislative way, in helping you to solve your problems, I shall be most happy to do so.

While I am on that phase of what I am saying I wish also to say that, while the Constitution prescribes only one duty for the Vice President of the United States, and that is to be the Presiding Officer of the Senate, I should like the Senate to know, and the Congress to know, and the administration and the Government to know, and the people to know, that if at any time I may be of service to the Congress, to the administration, of course, and to the Government and to the American people beyond the mere technical duties of presiding over the Senate, I shall be happy to be available for any such service as any branch of the Government, or both branches of the Congress, may feel I can render.

So let me again thank all the Members who are here today, and all those who

have been here while I have been a Member of this body, for the unanimous courtesy and consideration of which I have been the object. You have been tolerant of my mistakes, you have been patient with my shortcomings, and I look forward to a season of cooperation, of sympathetic understanding and work, nonpartisan work in most instances, I am sure, because most of our problems here are not partisan, unless we seek to make them so. I look forward to 4 years of happy, cooperative, understanding service to the American people, and I wish for each one of you that same degree of success and the contentment and satisfaction with your work that I hope to receive from my own. [Applause, Senators rising.]

MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The VICE PRESIDENT. Due to the shift in the representation of the majority and minority on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, there is a vacancy, to which the Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

MEMBER OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC REPORT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to announce the appointment of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the vacancy on the Joint Committee on the Economic Report caused by the retirement of former Senator Ball, of Minnesota.

ASCERTAINMENT OF ELECTORS FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, certified copies of the final ascertainment of the electors for President and Vice President of the United States from the States of Florida, New York, and Wisconsin, which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

REPORT ON PERSHING HALL MEMORIAL FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report covering transactions for account of the Pershing Hall Memorial Fund, fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

WITHDRAWAL OF REQUEST FOR COMPLIANCE UNDER ALLOCATION OF CERTAIN STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, withdrawing his request for compliance to the Maridon Manufacturing Co., Inc., of New York, under the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for warm air heating equipment for residential housing (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

EXTENSION TO COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY OF PROVISIONS OF ARMED FORCES LEAVE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON VALUATION OF PROPERTIES OF SHELL OIL CO., INC., PRODUCTS PIPE-LINE DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the final valuation of properties of the Shell Oil Co., Inc., Products Pipe-line Department, Valuation Docket No. 1283 (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the sixty-second annual report of that Commission, for the period November 1, 1947, to October 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated by that Committee, for the period July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDER OF BUSINESS DURING MORNING HOUR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before the Senate embarks on the routine morning business, the Chair wishes to make an announcement, and he wishes to make it now, in advance, so that no Senator can possibly construe the announcement or the ruling as being applicable only to him.

In the routine business of the Senate, almost from time immemorial, there has been what is known as the morning hour. The morning hour comes only following an adjournment of the Senate. It does not come following a recess of the Senate, because under immemorial custom a recess of the Senate is different from an adjournment, in that when the Senate reassembles after a recess it is still operating in the same legislative day in which it recessed. Therefore there is no morning hour after a recess, but only after an adjournment.

In order that the routine business of the morning hour may be accomplished with dispatch and promptness, a certain order has been laid down in the rules for the transaction of such business. The first order of business is the presentation of petitions and memorials; next come reports of committees; then the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, followed by the submission of concurrent and other resolutions.

Ordinarily it does not take very long to go through the morning business. Because of the fact that many Senators come to the Chamber for the purpose of presenting petitions and memorials, submitting reports, or introducing bills and joint resolutions, or other resolutions, the rules provide that there shall be no debate and no speeches on any subject during the consideration of morning business. Of course, after the morning business is concluded, so long as there remains a part of the morning hour, debate is permissible. The Chair is sure that all Senators will realize that it is not quite fair to Senators who have come to the Chamber in order to take part in the transaction of morning business to be required to wait until speeches are made, either on a subject which may be before the Senate or on any other subject.

Therefore the Chair desires to announce that, without any Senator making a point of order to that effect, the Chair expects to enforce the rule against the making of speeches of any kind by any Senator during transaction of morning business, in order that the routine business of the Senate may be promptly dispatched.

Furthermore, the Chair points out that it has become a habit, during the part of the morning hour set aside for the presentation of petitions and memorials, for Senators to rise and ask unanimous consent, out of order, to introduce bills or submit resolutions. Ordinarily it requires only 5 or 10 minutes to reach the order for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions. Therefore the Chair feels that it would be in the interest of orderly procedure for Members of the Senate not to ask to introduce bills out of order during the order of business for the presentation of petitions and memorials, but to wait until the Senate reaches that part of the morning hour set aside for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions.

With that brief comment upon what the Chair hopes will be a cooperative effort to observe the rules of the Senate for the benefit of all Senators, the Senate will now enter upon the morning business. Before that is done, the Chair would like to urge new Senators—and some old ones—to study the rules of the Senate. They should take the Senate Manual home with them and study it. It has been frequently said that the Senate has no rules. It does have rules. It has specific rules set out in the book of rules. It has other rules which have come down by interpretation, tradition, and custom. It is almost as difficult to master all the rules as to master the decisions of the supreme court of any State. A Senator must work his way into them by daily attendance upon the sessions and by observation. It will be helpful to new Senators to study the book of rules carefully so that they will know what their rights are, and what the rights of other Senators are.

The first order of business is the presentation of petitions and memorials.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Josef Geiger, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the atomic bomb (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mary I. Riley, of the United States, relating to rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Gordon Griswold, president, National Advisory Board Council on Grazing, Salt Lake City, Utah, favoring the enactment of emergency legislation for the relief of the storm-ridden States in the West; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Percy Bohlen Gifford, of Los Angeles, Calif., relating to rent control (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A telegram in the nature of a petition from Omar Brown, supervisor, St. Thomas, V. I., relating to the election of Resident Commissioner of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from W. J. Fiddy, of Norfolk, Va., relating to the registration of lobbyists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## INVESTIGATION OF LOBBYING

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a resolution urging a congressional investigation of lobbying, adopted by the executive council of the International Association of Machinists. Following this resolution, I ask that there be printed a letter sent by President Truman to the International Association of Machinists, commending the resolution and affirming the desirability of such an investigation.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, IN REGULAR SESSION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Whereas certain special interests used their tremendous resources to finance high-powered lobbying activities which confused the Members of the Eightieth Congress and deceived them as to the attitude of the majority of the citizens of this country; and

Whereas there is ample evidence already that these same groups are preparing an even larger assault on the Eighty-first Congress in a last desperate effort to thwart the will of the majority and to block President Truman's legislative program; and

Whereas charges were made on the floor of the Eightieth Congress that manufacturers spent $100,000,000 to put over the Taft-Hartley bill, and that charge never has been refuted; and

Whereas the people of this country, as well as the Members of the Eighty-first Congress, are entitled to the full facts concerning the lobbying objectives, the identity and interests of individual contributors, and lobbying methods of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Committee for Constitutional Government, the National Physicians Committee, the National Association of Electric Companies, the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Real Estate Boards, the Association of American Railroads, and other lobbies, which while less widely publicized are working no less assiduously for special favors for their special interests from the Congress; and

Whereas a thorough investigation of such activity by a joint congressional committee would build a foundation of information from which adequate regulatory legislation could be framed and at the same time acquaint the people of this country with some of the pressures to which their elected representatives in Congress are subjected; and

Whereas the spotlight of publicity on these lobbies will not harm any legitimate representation of any group in Washington: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the executive council of the International Association of Machinists respectfully urges that a thorough investigation of all lobbying activities be initiated by a joint congressional committee as the first order of business by the Eighty-first Congress after it has organized; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this request be transmitted to President Truman and to leaders of the Eighty-first Congress, including Vice-President-elect ALBEN BARKLEY, and Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, SCOTT LUCAS, and FRANCIS J. MYERS, and Representatives SAM RAYBURN and JOHN MCCORMACK.

---

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, November 30, 1948.*

Mr. ERIC PETERSON,
*General Secretary-Treasurer, International Association of Machinists, Ninth Street and Mount Vernon Place NW., Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PETERSON: Thank you for your telegram of November 20 transmitting the text of the resolution adopted by your executive council urging a congressional investigation of lobbying activities during the Eightieth Congress.

I think your organization has rendered a distinct public service in taking a stand on this matter.

While it is up to the Congress to determine the subjects which it will investigate, I feel sure that a thorough investigation of lobbying activities would have a very salutary effect, and I would be glad to see such an investigation undertaken.

Sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

## RESOLUTIONS OF WISCONSIN STATE GRANGE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received today a copy of several resolutions adopted by the annual convention of the Wisconsin State Grange. Representing as it does the views of many farmers in my own and other States, I feel that these Grange resolutions should be given the most careful attention.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the text of these resolutions presented to me by Mr. William E. Seffern, master of the Wisconsin State Grange, be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, they will be printed in the RECORD.

To the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas there is a widespread misunderstanding among business and commercial groups in regard to the activities of cooperatives and their place in our economic system. Cooperatives should and do operate within the framework of the competitive system; they do not and are not designed to replace private enterprise. Their principal difference from other types of private enterprise is the distribution of earnings or losses. We hold that the self-help cooperative way of doing business should continue to be recognized as a contractual arrangement wherein the net earnings or losses of the business legally belong to the cooperative member and therefore be taxed in his hands only.

"We, therefore, insist that the present tax status of cooperatives be preserved. We will oppose any effort, State or National, which would tend to destroy this position through legislation or otherwise."

---

"PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS AGAINST OLEOMARGARINE DECEPTION

"Consumers have a right to buy either oleomargarine or butter; consumers also have a right, by using their God-given sense of sight, to know at all times and in all places which product they are getting.

"We insist that until such time as the oleomargarine industry ceases its present practice of consumer confusion and deception, that until such time as oleomargarine is offered for sale and consumption in some distinctive color other than yellow, we will emphatically oppose any change in present oleomargarine legislation."

To the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"Whereas the R. F. D. is still carried on as in the horse and buggy days when it was necessary to limit mileage; and

"Whereas farmers today are operating with a shortage of help and it is a handicap to make several trips a day to a mail box located at a distance from the farm; and

"Whereas all are paying their proportionate share of the tax and are entitled to the same service: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the State and National Grange go on record favoring rural free delivery to every farm gateway, and do all in their power to get action to that effect. And we further recommend that the rates on second-class mail be increased."

---

To the Committee on Appropriations:

"Whereas the REA has been of vital service to our rural people; and

"Whereas there is still a great need of extended service of the REA: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin State Grange support legislation for adequate authority, appropriations, and loan funds for REA in order that unmet needs be fulfilled as fast as practical."

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 130. A bill to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities; without amendment (Rept. No. 6).

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 15. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office", approved December 11, 1926; without amendment (Rept. No. 7);

S. 26. A bill for the relief of Jose Babace; without amendment (Rept. No. 8);

S. 27. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; with amendments (Rept. No. 9);

S. 29. A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; with amendments (Rept. No. 10);

S. 32. A bill for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; without amendment (Rept. No. 11); and

S. 90. A bill to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; with an amendment (Rept. No. 12).

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the fol-

lowing reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| James M. Kendall, clerk | $7,405.06 | $3,702.53 |
| Joycette K. Jones, clerk | 6,356.72 | 3,178.36 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $10,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 790.70 |
| Amount expended as of June 30, 1948 | 5,268.41 |
| Balance unexpended | 3,940.89 |

ELMER THOMAS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—SUBCOMMITTEE TO MAKE STUDY OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 223, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $5,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 209.83 |
| Balance unexpended | 5,790.17 |

ELMER THOMAS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY—SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE FARM PROGRAM, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 147, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, 80th Congress, 1st session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $15,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 622.22 |
| Amount expended as of June 30, 1948 | 7,823.34 |
| Balance unexpended | 6,554.44 |

ELMER THOMAS,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Everard H. Smith, chief clerk | $10,330.00 | $5,164.98 |
| Cecil H. Tolbert, assistant chief clerk | 9,854.13 | 4,927.02 |
| Thomas J. Graves, professional staff member | 10,330.00 | 5,164.98 |
| Thomas J. Scott, assistant clerk | 8,827.10 | 4,413.54 |
| Earl W. Cooper, professional staff member | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |
| Francis S. Hewitt, professional staff member | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |
| Harold E. Merrick, professional staff member | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |
| Robert H. Montgomery, professional staff member | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |
| John Pillsbury, professional staff member | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |
| Kimball Sanborn, professional staff member | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |
| Edmund T. King, professional staff member | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |
| Adelbert F. Teague, assistant clerk | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |
| Lawrence H. Wendrich, assistant clerk | 6,852.05 | 3,426.00 |
| Herman E. Downey: | | |
| July 1–Nov. 15, assistant clerk | 6,770.54 | 2,538.94 |
| Nov. 16–Dec. 31, assistant clerk | 7,879.08 | 984.88 |
| Marie Jeneau: | | |
| July 1–Oct. 11, clerical assistant | 3,791.04 | 1,063.59 |
| Nov. 6–Dec. 31, clerical assistant | 3,791.04 | 579.18 |
| Bernadine Wassam, clerical assistant | 3,542.74 | 1,771.32 |
| Mary K. Yanick, clerical assistant | 3,542.74 | 1,771.32 |
| Yvonne A. Beaudry, July 1–15, clerical assistant | 3,377.22 | 140.71 |
| Margaret Mechling, July 16–Dec. 24, clerical assistant | 3,377.22 | 1,491.57 |
| Regina H. Simons, July 1–31, clerical assistant | 3,377.22 | 281.43 |
| Richard C. Venne, Sept. 15–Dec. 31, clerical assistant | 4,204.86 | 1,238.08 |

STYLES BRIDGES,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| EMPLOYED TEMPORARILY | | |
| Claire A. Christiansen, Aug. 1–Nov. 15, clerical assistant | $2,880.63 | $840.17 |
| Ralph Hanson, Nov. 8–22, consultant | [1] 21.88 | 328.29 |

[1] Per diem.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $50,000.00 |
| Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 1,168.46 |
| Balance unexpended | 48,831.54 |

STYLES BRIDGES,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 8, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report in addition to the statement showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

*Miscellaneous expenses*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Unexpended balance of funds authorized by Reorganization Act and S. Res. 130, as of Jan. 1, 1948, plus additional authorizations in S. Res. 201 and 265 | | $25,875.37 |
| Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948 | $13,587.97 | |
| Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 5,130.84 | |
| | | 18,718.81 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | | 7,156.56 |
| Unexpended balance of amount authorized by S. Res. 129, June 26, 1947, as of Jan. 1, 1948 | | 43,158.89 |
| Amount expended Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948 | $5,031.91 | |
| Amount expended July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 741.35 | |
| | | 5,773.26 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | | 37,385.63 |

STYLES BRIDGES,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| John G. Adams, chief clerk | $10,330.00 | $5,165.00 |
| Justice M. Chambers, staff adviser | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Mark H. Galusha, staff adviser | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Verne D. Mudge, staff adviser | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Herbert S. Atkinson, assistant chief clerk | 6,770.54 | 3,385.27 |
| Georgia P. Earle, clerical assistant | 3,956.56 | 1,978.28 |
| Irene P. Gray, clerical assistant | 3,956.56 | 1,978.28 |
| Roberta Van Beek, clerical assistant | 3,956.56 | 1,978.28 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong | $15,000.00 |
| Amount expended Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948 | 11,234.66 |
| Balance unexpended July 1, 1948 | 3,765.34 |
| Amount expended July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 3,048.19 |
| Balance unexpended Dec. 31, 1948 | 717.15 |
| Funds authorized by S. Res. 263, June 19, 1948 | 25,000.00 |
| Total balance unexpended | 25,717.15 |

CHAN GURNEY,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 7, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Robert D. L'Heureux, professional staff member | $10,330.00 | $5,164.98 |
| William F. McKenna, professional staff member | 10,330.00 | 5,164.98 |
| Joseph P. McMurray, professional staff member | 10,330.00 | 5,164.98 |
| Charles T. Andrews, professional staff member | 10,330.00 | 5,164.98 |
| Raimond Bowles, chief clerk | 10,330.00 | 5,164.98 |
| Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant | 5,611.84 | 2,805.90 |
| Caro Pugh, clerical assistant | 3,873.80 | 1,936.86 |
| Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant | 3,873.80 | 1,936.86 |
| Edna A. Stewart, clerical assistant | 3,873.80 | 1,936.86 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure—Balance remaining July 1, 1948 | $4,993.56 |
| Amount expended | 1,080.65 |
| Balance unexpended | 3,912.91 |

CHAS. W. TOBEY,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| J. George Stewart, chief clerk | $8,353.09 | $4,176.54 |
| James R. Kirkland, chief counsel | 9,301.11 | 4,650.54 |
| Thomas S. Henderson, assistant counsel | 7,879.06 | 3,939.54 |
| Edna L. Ward, assistant clerk | 3,956.56 | 1,978.26 |
| Ruth Wallace, assistant clerk | 3,625.51 | 1,812.72 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $10,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 4,442.22 |
| Balance unexpended | 5,557.78 |

C. D. BUCK,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| J. H. Macomber, Jr., chief clerk | $10,330.00 | $5,164.98 |
| Glenn K. Shriver, assistant chief clerk | 7,958.08 | 3,979.02 |
| E. B. Van Horn, staff director [1] | 10,330.00 | 1,922.52 |
| Walter L. Reynolds, staff member | 9,064.11 | 4,532.04 |
| Philip C. Ward, staff member | 9,854.13 | 4,927.02 |
| Gordon R. Ewing, staff member | 10,330.00 | 5,164.98 |
| Ann M. Grickis, clerk-secretary | 5,446.32 | 2,723.16 |
| Emily I. Tennyson (Mrs.), clerk-stenographer | 3,791.04 | 1,895.52 |
| Marie C. Tylor, clerk-stenographer | 3,956.56 | 1,164.97 |
| Velda Blanche Holder, clerk-stenographer | 3,542.74 | 1,771.32 |

[1] Terminated Sept. 6, 1948.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, 80th Cong | $10,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 4,491.75 |
| Balance unexpended | 5,508.25 |

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUNDS AUTHORIZED AND EXPENDED UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 152 AND SENATE RESOLUTION 259

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Eli E. Nobleman, counsel, Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations (S. Res. 152) | $7,563.07 | $3,781.50 |
| Paul H. Menk, Jr., administrative analyst, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments (S. Res. 259) | 7,168.06 | 3,868.89 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for expenditure under S. Res. 152, 80th Cong | | $30,000.00 |
| Amount expended: | | |
| Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations | $5,517.02 | |
| Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations | 8,624.13 | |
| Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments | 4,813.43 | |
| Balance on statutory receipt | 479.67 | |
| | | 19,434.25 |
| Balance unexpended | | 10,565.75 |

GEORGE D. AIKEN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 1, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS—SENATE INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Adlerman, Jerome S., assistant counsel | $7,563.07 | $3,597.18 |
| Bellino, Carmine S., accounting consultant | 8,906.10 | 4,453.02 |
| Boos, George F., chief investigator | 8,037.08 | 1,384.15 |
| Brosnan, Robert E., assistant counsel | 8,906.10 | 4,453.02 |
| Coughlin, Frederick M., assistant counsel | 6,770.54 | 3,281.79 |
| Cousins, Mary G., assistant clerk | 3,708.27 | 1,854.12 |
| Flanagan, Francis D., chief assistant counsel | 10,328.14 | 5,164.02 |
| Leadbetter, John D., messenger | 2,552.00 | 453.67 |
| Lee, Lydia, record clerk | 5,363.55 | 2,681.76 |
| McCahill, Myles C., investigator | 6,025.66 | 3,012.78 |
| McCarthy, Mollie Jo, assistant clerk | 3,459.98 | 1,729.98 |
| McElroy, Robert J., assistant clerk | 3,542.74 | 1,771.32 |
| Minor, Robert W., assistant counsel | 4,701.44 | 1,862.36 |
| Montier, Gladys E., assistant clerk | $3,956.56 | $1,978.26 |
| Morris, Constance L., assistant clerk | 3,459.98 | 1,729.98 |
| Oliver, Betty F., assistant clerk | 3,046.16 | 1,523.04 |
| Piper, Robert L., assistant counsel | 6,025.66 | 1,422.70 |
| Rogers, William P., chief counsel | 10,330.00 | 5,164.98 |
| Shepherd, Mary Lou, assistant clerk | 3,459.98 | 1,441.65 |
| Sheridan, James F., investigator | 6,025.66 | 3,012.78 |
| Young, Ruth M., clerk | 4,122.09 | 2,061.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $120,802.41 |
| Amount expended | 59,375.38 |
| Balance unexpended | 61,427.03 |

HOMER FERGUSON,
*Chairman, Subcommittee.*

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to January 1, 1949, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Sherwood B. Stanley, chief clerk (deceased Dec. 3, 1948) | $9,222.11 | $3,893.73 |
| Elizabeth B. Springer, assistant chief clerk | 5,960.14 | 2,980.07 |
| Fred R. Peel, research clerk (resigned Nov. 1, 1948) | 5,611.84 | 1,870.60 |
| Bernice M. Crouze, stenographer | 4,370.38 | 2,185.19 |
| Janice Everly, stenographer | 4,370.38 | 2,185.19 |
| Jesse R. Nichols, document clerk | 3,625.51 | 1,812.75 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $10,000.00 |
| Amount expended Jan. 1, 1947, through June 30, 1948 (previously reported) | 7,520.66 |
| Amount expended July 1, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1948 | 373.77 |
| Total expended | 7,894.43 |
| Balance unexpended | 2,105.57 |

EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Francis O. Wilcox, chief of staff | $10,330.00 | $5,164.98 |
| Richard H. Heindel, professional staff | 10,330.00 | 5,164.98 |
| Thorsten V. Kalijarvi, professional staff | [1] 10,330.00 | 5,070.29 |
| C. C. O'Day, clerk | 8,906.10 | 4,453.02 |
| Emmett M. O'Grady, assistant clerk (to Nov. 8, 1948) | 4,866.97 | 1,730.47 |

[1] Rate effective Aug. 1, 1948.

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Isabel M. Smith, assistant clerk | $4,370.38 | $2,185.14 |
| Morella R. Hansen, assistant clerk | 4,039.33 | 2,019.66 |
| Eilene Marie Galloway, assistant clerk (to Aug. 1, 1948) | 5,611.84 | 483.23 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, $20,000—balance July 1, 1948 | $8,871.16 |
| Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 965.84 |
| Balance unexpended, Dec. 31, 1948 | 7,905.32 |

A. H. VANDENBERG,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 7, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Hugh R. Brown, chief clerk | $10,330 | $5,165 |
| Nellie D. McSherry, assistant chief clerk | 7,405 | 3,702 |
| Albert A. Grorud, professional staff | 8,037 | 4,018 |
| Elmer K. Nelson, professional staff | 8,037 | 4,018 |
| Oscar G. Iden, professional staff | 7,563 | 3,781 |
| Wallace Barlow, professional staff | 7,405 | 3,620 |
| Orville Watkins, clerical staff | 5,116 | 2,558 |
| Charlotte Mickle, clerical staff | 3,542 | 1,771 |
| Elizabeth Magill, clerical staff | 3,294 | 1,509 |
| Estelle Bedsworth, clerical staff [1] | 3,873 | 1,291 |

[1] Terminated Nov. 1, 1948.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $32,396.36 |
| Amount expended | 10,822.86 |
| Balance unexpended | 21,573.50 |

HUGH BUTLER,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Vera Burgess, clerical assistant | $4,949.73 | $2,474.87 |
| Edward Cooper, professional staff member | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Halford G. Davis, professional staff member | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Harriet Gray, clerical assistant | 3,956.56 | 1,978.28 |
| Edward Jarrett, clerk | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Dorothy Prout, clerical assistant | 3,956.56 | 1,978.28 |
| Martha Shaffer, clerical assistant (temporary) | 3,956.56 | 1,978.28 |
| Charles W. Tobey, Jr., professional staff member (temporary) | 7,405.06 | 1,768.96 |
| Atlee F. Zellers, professional staff member | 7,405.06 | 1,768.96 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $19,372.45 |
| Amount expended | 6,975.19 |
| Balance unexpended | 12,397.26 |

ED. C. JOHNSON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 11, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRADE POLICIES (PURSUANT TO S. RES. 241, 80TH CONG.)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| William P. Bolles, chief clerk | $5,694.61 | $2,625.84 |
| Eileen R. Browne, clerical assistant | 3,459.98 | 1,276.78 |
| Fred E. Clark, economist | 10,012.13 | 2,454.62 |
| Cecelia M. Cook, clerical assistant | 3,459.98 | 1,153.32 |
| Edith W. Dallas, clerical assistant | 2,109.80 | 375.13 |
| Elizabeth J. Gergely, clerical assistant | 3,459.98 | 701.64 |
| Frank W. Schattschneider, assistant counsel | 5,198.02 | 1,848.15 |
| William Simon, counsel | 10,012.13 | 4,171.70 |
| L. Evelyn Spicer, clerical assistant | 4,370.38 | 2,185.14 |
| Willard B. Van Horne, Jr., assistant general counsel | 8,669.10 | 3,250.89 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $50,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 27,779.35 |
| Balance unexpended | 22,220.65 |

ED. C. JOHNSON,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 15, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Richard Arens, professional staff (legal) | $8,274.09 | $4,137.05 |
| Maurice Covert, professional staff (legal) | 8,274.09 | 4,137.05 |
| Joseph A. Davis, assistant clerk | 8,274.09 | 4,137.05 |
| Miriam O. Fox, stenographer | 4,370.38 | 2,185.19 |
| Helen Ganss, stenographer | 3,791.04 | 1,895.52 |
| Margaret Holland, stenographer | 3,791.04 | 1,895.52 |
| Mary Rogers, stenographer | 4,370.38 | 2,185.19 |
| J. Carlisle Ruddy, professional staff (legal) | 8,274.09 | 4,137.05 |
| Charles A. Webb, professional staff (legal) | 7,405.06 | 2,591.73 |
| Robert B. Young, clerk of committee | 8,985.10 | 4,492.55 |
| TEMPORARY EMPLOYEE UNDER S. RES. 120 | | |
| Lelia Lively, clerk-typist | 8,791.04 | 1,895.52 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $16,173.65 |
| Amount expended | 7,178.81 |
| Balance unexpended | 8,994.84 |

PAT MCCARRAN,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION (PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 137 AND SENATE RESOLUTION 236, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS)

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Thomas J. Davis, investigator | $6,931.05 | $3,465.48 |
| Otto J. Dekom, investigator | 6,931.05 | 866.37 |
| John A. Loftus, investigator | 6,931.05 | 3,465.48 |
| Guy M. Massey, investigator | 6,931.05 | 2,214.06 |
| Fred M. Mesmer, investigator | 6,931.05 | 3,465.48 |
| James C. Messersmith, clerk | 6,931.05 | 3,465.48 |
| Margaret P. Hogan, stenographer | 3,956.56 | 54.95 |
| Ethel Johnson, stenographer | 3,956.56 | 1,813.40 |
| Stephanie Lojewski, stenographer | 3,956.56 | 1,252.89 |
| Lois C. Odham, stenographer | 3,956.56 | 1,978.26 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $64,805.89 |
| Amount expended | 29,792.77 |
| Balance unexpended | 35,013.12 |

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 2, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Philip R. Rodgers, clerk | $10,012.13 | $5,006.04 |
| Earl B. Wixcey, assistant clerk | 8,511.09 | 4,255.50 |
| Paul Sample, clerical assistant | 5,032.50 | 2,516.22 |
| Crawford C. Heerlein, clerical assistant | 4,453.15 | 2,226.54 |
| Vivien Harman, clerical assistant | 3,542.74 | 1,771.32 |
| Dorothy Murphy, clerical assistant | 3,294.45 | 1,647.18 |
| Melvin W. Sneed, professional staff member | 8,353.09 | 4,176.54 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure: | | |
| Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948 | $10,000.00 | |
| July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 8,000.00 | |
| | | $18,000.00 |
| Amount expended: | | |
| Jan. 1 to June 30, 1947 | $3,660.00 | |
| July 1 to Dec. 31, 1947 | 3,533.35 | |
| Jan. 1 to June 30, 1948 | 7,342.53 | |
| July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 25.05 | |
| | | 14,560.93 |
| Balance unexpended | | 3,439.02 |
| Funds authorized or appropriated for Subcommittee on Health expenditure, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | $10,000.00 | |
| Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | None | |
| Balance unexpended | | $10,000.00 |

ROBERT A. TAFT,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Baca, Anna, clerical (1 month) | $4,287.62 | $357.31 |
| Betsch, Lorena, clerical | 4,287.62 | 2,143.81 |
| Burnett, Frank, staff member | 8,590.09 | 4,295.04 |
| Chrissos, Costas D., reporter | 5,363.55 | 2,681.77 |
| Fox, Thomas F., assistant chief clerk (Nov. 24-Dec. 31) | 5,860.14 | 602.29 |
| Gayden, Mrs. Doris, clerical (Nov. 23-Dec. 31) | 3,377.22 | 356.47 |
| Homan, Colette, chief clerk | 7,010.05 | 3,505.02 |
| Irwin, Mary, clerical (1½ months) | 5,032.50 | 629.06 |
| Lynott, Dorothy, clerical | 4,287.62 | 2,143.81 |
| Phenix, John D., statistician | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Riley, George D., staff director | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $12,500.00 |
| Amount expended | 9,660.20 |
| Balance unexpended | 2,839.80 |

WILLIAM LANGER,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 3, 1949.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE—SUBCOMMITTEE OPERATING UNDER SENATE RESOLUTION 81—LAST RESOLUTION AGREED TO RESOLUTION 264, JUNE 20, 1948

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1 to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No staff employed since last report—only expenditure of funds was one field trip made by Senator LANGER.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $35,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 34,170.60 |
| Balance unexpended | 829.40 |

WILLIAM LANGER,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| E. W. Bassett, professional staff | $10,330.00 | $5,165.00 |
| Ronald Moist, professional staff | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| William A. Stevens, professional staff | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Theo W. Sneed, professional staff | $8,590.00 | $4,295.00 |
| Orren L. Jones, clerical staff | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Eloise Porter, clerical staff | 5,611.84 | 2,805.92 |
| Priscilla E. Cordova, clerical staff | 5,611.84 | 2,805.92 |
| Frances A. Stovall, clerical staff | 4,949.73 | 2,474.86 |
| Mary Batalo, clerical staff | 3,625.51 | 1,812.75 |
| Dorothy Kramer, clerical staff | 3,791.04 | 805.72 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure, original appropriation and S. Res. 247 | $15,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 7,181.17 |
| Balance unexpended | 7,818.83 |

CHAPMAN REVERCOMB,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 10, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Albert L. Seidel, chief clerk | $10,329.96 | $5,164.98 |
| Nelson Deranian, professional staff (counsel) | 10,329.96 | 5,164.98 |
| George J. Nilles, assistant clerk | 6,852.05 | 3,426.00 |
| Laura Vogt, clerk (secretarial) | 3,377.22 | 1,688.58 |
| Myrtle Paynter, clerk (stenographic) | 3,294.45 | 1,647.18 |
| B. Floye Gavin, clerk (research) | 5,198.02 | 2,598.96 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure remaining July 1, 1948 | $9,127.17 |
| Amount expended July 1 through Dec. 31, 1948 | 17.10 |
| Balance unexpended | 9,110.07 |

CARL HAYDEN,
*Chairman.*

JANUARY 8, 1949.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Arthur R. Breor, Jr., chief investigator | $6,687.78 | $3,343.86 |
| Betty J. B. Du Jack, secretary | 4,122.09 | 2,061.00 |
| Kelso Elliott, assistant counsel | 8,669.10 | 4,334.52 |
| Mary L. Green, administrative clerk | 4,122.09 | 2,061.00 |
| Grace E. Johnson, clerk | 6,687.78 | 3,343.86 |
| Henry P. Kiley, investigator | 6,025.66 | 3,012.78 |
| Joseph F. Langan, investigator | 6,025.66 | 3,012.78 |
| Robert K. Lyle, investigator | 4,288.68 | 769.78 |
| Joseph V. McCann, investigator | 6,025.66 | 3,012.78 |
| Lena Orme, secretary | 3,542.74 | 1,771.32 |
| Jack M. Poorbaugh, investigator | 5,446.32 | 2,723.16 |
| William P. Reed, investigator | 5,529.08 | 2,764.50 |
| Samuel H. Still, Jr., assistant counsel and investigator | 4,949.73 | 2,474.82 |
| Gerald W. Ohrn, investigator | 5,280.79 | 2,640.36 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $113,650.14 |
| Amount expended, salaries and expenses | 48,587.14 |
| Balance unexpended | 65,063.00 |

W. E. JENNER,
*Chairman.*

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

| Name and profession | Rate of gross annual salary | Total salary received |
|---|---|---|
| Bauer, Virginia Lee, file clerk | $2,964.40 | $1,486.70 |
| Beverage, Albion P., research consultant | 6,852.05 | 2,855.00 |
| Dickey, Raymond R., chief counsel | 9,380.11 | 4,690.05 |
| Guyon, Catherine L., consultant | 8,195.08 | 3,649.84 |
| Holshauser, Dorothy N., editorial secretary | 4,122.09 | 2,061.04 |
| Loveland, Ailene J., secretary | 4,122.09 | 2,061.04 |
| McNamara, Catherine G., secretary | 3,791.04 | 1,895.52 |
| Meredith, George F., executive director | 10,330.00 | 5,165.00 |
| Nichols, Pearl Mae, secretary | 4,122.09 | 2,061.04 |
| Wolken, Albert J., chief investigator | 8,748.10 | 4,374.05 |
| Wynes, Gene, clerk-messenger | 2,715.10 | 1,244.43 |
| Youse, Alma N., secretary | 3,791.04 | 1,895.52 |
| Dodd, Alice M., secretary | 3,791.04 | 631.84 |
| Charlotte Van Rensselaer, secretary | 3,791.04 | 1,737.56 |
| Moran, Avis, stenographer | 2,280.00 | 100.70 |
| Johnson, Albert E., special counsel | [1] 7,201.92 | 3,600.96 |
| Dickey, Maxwell, special investigator | [1] 7,201.92 | 3,600.96 |
| Zopf, Homer, special investigator | [1] 7,201.92 | 3,600.96 |
| Broadgate, William, special counsel | (1) | 1,658.85 |
| Hadlick, Paul, special counsel | (1) | 695.25 |
| Casey, William J., special counsel | (1) | 373.03 |
| Graham, Earl, special counsel | (1) | 2,925.82 |
| Jack Baggett, clerk-messenger | 1,620.00 | 226.24 |
| Taylor, Nita O., stenographer | 2,280.00 | 63.18 |

[1] Per diem, $25.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure | $215,000.00 |
| Amount expended | 212,380.41 |
| Balance unexpended | 2,619.59 |

KENNETH S. WHERRY,
*Chairman.*

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By. Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Miles N. Pike, of Nevada, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada;

William Marvel, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware;

Gilmore S. Haynie, of Indiana, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana, vice Alexander M. Campbell, resigned;

Jack R. Caufield, of Oregon, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon;

Paul B. Messick, of Delaware, to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware; and

Thomas N. Curran, of Maine, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

### AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow or Wednesday, not until Thursday, and then will adjourn over until the following Monday, I wish to ask that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which will meet tomorrow, may be permitted to file a report during the recess on the nomination of Mr. James E. Webb to be Under Secretary of State, so that the nomination may go to the Executive Calendar and be considered at the Thursday session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 597. A bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 598. A bill to advance knowledge on the history and culture of the American Indian through the acquisition and preservation of irreplaceable artifacts and relics; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 599. A bill authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement at Lewiston, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 600, to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

S. 601. A bill to provide for the establishment of a reservoir on Bear River, Utah, for the maintenance of water levels in the Bear River Migratory Bird Refuge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 602. A bill for the relief of John B. H. Waring; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. McGRATH):

S. 603. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 604. A bill for the relief of Wilhelm Fritz Rathjens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 605. A bill to authorize the appropriation of sums of money needed for the relief and rehabilitation of persons of German ethnic origin, who, pursuant to the Potsdam agreement of August 1, 1945, have been expelled from countries of eastern Europe and forced into Germany and Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 606. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

S. 607. A bill for the relief of Eva Andresen;

S. 608. A bill for the relief of Doctor Ilan Zac;

S. 609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Bertie Grace Chan Leong; and

S. 610. A bill for the relief of Man Hee Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 611. A bill to authorize additional appropriations for the Willamette River Basin project; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 612. A bill to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed $10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 613. A bill for the relief of John D. Garrard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) introduced Senate bill 614, to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (Title VI of the Public Health Service Act) to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL):

S. 615. A bill for the relief of James Greenwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah (by request):

S. 616. A bill to assist veterans to borrow funds from established lending institutions for the acquisition of homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 617. A bill for the relief of Francesco Alvino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 618. A bill to credit to active and retired officers of the Medical Department of the Army all service performed as interns in Army hospitals on a civilian-employee status; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 619. A bill for the relief of the Spicer Ice & Coal Co.;

S. 620. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship & Yacht Corp.;

S. 621. A bill for the relief of Horace J. Fenton; and

S. 622. A bill for the relief of Isaiah Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 623. A bill for the relief of George Krinopolis; and

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 625. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works at and in the vicinity of Bradford, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 626. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Antoine Gazda and Leopoldine Gazda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 627. A bill for the relief of Leon Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 628. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes;

S. 629. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 630. A bill to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 631. A bill to amend the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to equalize credits for service in the armed forces for pay and longevity purposes; and

S. 632. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 633. A bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; and

S. 634. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 635. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 636, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of noncertificated air carriers and contract air carriers, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 637, to increase the salaries of judges of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN (by request) also introduced Senate bill 638, to amend title 28, United States Code, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By McCARRAN (for himself and Mr. CAIN):

S. 639. A bill to encourage the development of new domestic sources of zinc ores by amending the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 640. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor-vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 641. A bill for the relief of James Thomas Powers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMAHON (for himself and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 642. A bill for the relief of R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 643. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to exclude from the tax on transportation of persons amounts paid for transportation to places outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 644 (by request). A bill to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation and to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. WILEY introduced the following bills, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appear under a separate heading:

S. 645. A bill to amend Public Law 663, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to protect the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations;

S. 646. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 54296 relating to the badge of the American Legion;

S. 647. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 55398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary; and

S. 648. A bill to amend title 18, U. S. C., section 705, to protect the badge, medal, emblem, and other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations and for other purposes.)

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. SPARKMAN):

S. J. Res. 37. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the 150th anniversary of the establishment of Fort Stoddert, Alabama; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MALONE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. ECTON):

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies of the Government, to break through snowbound areas in the Western Range States, and to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms which have created an emergency; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## RENT CONTROL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me, together with a summary of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement, together with the summary, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 600) to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The statement and summary presented by Mr. MAYBANK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

This bill extends rent control for 2 years beyond the March 31, 1949, termination date of the present act. In addition to extending the period of rent control, it extends coverage to several types of accommodations not now under rent control and corrects weaknesses in the present act. It also gives the Housing Expediter authority to recontrol areas previously decontrolled.

Brought back under rent control under this bill are the following:

1. Hotel accommodations not rented for transient occupancy on June 30, 1947. This will bring back under rent control some 500,000 hotel apartments rented to permanent guests as distinguished from transients.

2. Rental units covered by 15-percent voluntary leases. The bill provides that housing accommodations with present 15-percent leases shall be under rent control and it recontrols housing accommodations on which such leases were previously terminated, but at the lease rent. The right to enter into such leases is not renewed.

3. Accommodations which were not rented for 24 months during the period from February 1, 1945, to March 30, 1948. Such units are exempt from rent control under the present act. This bill brings them under control.

Under this bill, conversions are no longer automatically decontrolled, as in the present act. Converted housing accommodations remain under control until the Housing Expediter finds that the conversion resulted in additional, self-contained family units.

The bill authorizes the Housing Expediter to bring back under rent control areas previously decontrolled.

Provisions in the bill for strengthening rent control include the following:

1. The right of the Expediter to sue for treble damages for overcharges on failure of the tenant to do so. At present only a tenant has such right. In practice, few tenants have exercised their right from fear of being evicted.

2. Control over evictions is restored to the Housing Expediter. Under the present act, a tenant is compelled to go into court to protect his rights if he believes the eviction to be illegal. Under this bill, the Housing Expediter would be better able to prevent illegal evictions.

3. Criminal sanctions and use of the administrative subpena by the Housing Expediter. Criminal sanctions are intended for use against repeated and willful violators who apparently have little respect for civil penalties. By use of administrative subpena, the Expediter will be able to obtain additional information essential for better enforcement of the act and regulations.

This bill continues in effect the local advisory boards and their powers to make recommendations to the Housing Expediter, but it provides that if the Housing Expediter disapproves a board recommendation, appeal may be taken through complaint filed by the board in the Emergency Court of Appeals. Under the present act, such appeal is automatic.

While the bill extends rent control to the close of March 31, 1951, it authorizes termination of the act by Presidential proclamation or congressional concurrent resolution if the emergency is declared over prior to that date.

Veterans' preference is also continued to March 31, 1951. As before, it provides that veterans of World War II are to be given first opportunity to rent or purchase new houses or apartments not built for owner-occupancy.

---

### SUMMARY OF PROPOSED BILL TO EXTEND RENT CONTROL TO THE CLOSE OF MARCH 31, 1951

Section 1 provides that the act may be cited as the Housing and Rent Act of 1949.

Section 2 provides for the continuance to the close of March 31, 1951, of veterans' preference for the sale and rental of housing accommodations.

Section 201 (a) limits decontrol of hotel accommodations to those used exclusively on June 30, 1947, for transient occupancy.

Section 201 (b) provides for the decontrol of future conversions only on order of the Housing Expediter and recontrols housing accommodations which for 24 months during the period from February 1, 1945, to the enactment of the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 were not rented.

Section 202 provides for the transfer without reimbursement of the cabinets containing rent-control records as well as the records themselves to local officials on the termination of national rent control.

Section 203 (a) extends the Office of the Housing Expediter to the close of March 31, 1951.

Section 203 (b) provides that housing accommodations with present 15-percent leases shall be under rent control and recontrols housing accommodations on which 15-percent leases were previously terminated.

Section 203 (c) provides that the Housing Expediter furnish local boards with reporting services for public hearings.

Section 203 (d) provides for review of nonapproved local board recommendations by complaint filed in the emergency court of appeals by the local board.

Section 203 (e) eliminates cost ceilings for reporting services.

Section 203 (f) extends the provisions of title II to the close of March 31, 1951, but authorizes the termination of the act by Presidential proclamation or congressional concurrent resolution if the emergency is declared over.

Section 203 (g) provides maximum rent standards for recontrolled units.

Section 204 provides for treble-damage suits to be instituted by the Housing Expediter on failure of the tenant to do so.

Section 205 provides for criminal sanctions and the use of the administrative subpena by the Housing Expediter.

Section 206 provides for the regulation of evictions by the Housing Expediter.

Section 301 provides that no person shall be required to offer any housing accommodations for rent.

Section 302 provides for the reestablishment of maximum rents.

Section 303 is the separability clause.

Section 304 provides for the act to become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following the month in which it is enacted.

## AMENDMENT OF HOSPITAL AND HEALTH CENTER CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Hospital and Health Center Construction Act, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Alabama will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 614) to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act) to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. TAFT, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement presented by Mr. HILL was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR HILL

The bill would amend the Hospital and Health Center Construction Act as follows:

First, increase the amount of Federal aid from $75,000,000 a year to $150,000,000 a year.

Second, extend the time for the operation of the act an additional 5 years or making a total of at least 8 years.

Third, place the Federal allotment for the individual hospital or health center project on the same variable need basis as the overall allotment to the particular State. Under the act the individual project today receives 33⅓ percent of the cost from Federal funds. Under the amendment the 33⅓ percent would be increased in communities of low income and the Federal contribution to individual projects would vary between 33⅓ percent and 70 percent. There would be no increase in the over-all allotment to the particular State. The provision in the amendment for the increase of Federal allocation to the

individual State is the same as it was when the original act was passed by the Senate.

Fourth, provide $1,200,000 in Federal funds for aid to States, political subdivisions, universities, hospitals, and other public and private nonprofit institutions or organizations for projects for the conduct of research, experiments, or demonstrations relating to the development, utilization, and coordination of hospital services, facilities, and resources.

Fifth, provide Federal funds to aid States in the administration of the State plan for hospitals and health centers.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and so forth.

By way of explanation in connection with the bill I send forward copy of a letter I have addressed to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and I ask that this letter and the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 636) to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the regulation of noncertificated air carriers and contract air carriers, and for other puposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 1 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after paragraph (25) thereof the following:

"(25A) 'Noncertificated air carrier' means any air carrier other than an air carrier holding a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued under the provisions of this chapter."

SEC. 2. Section 401 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting immediately preceding the first sentence thereof the following:

"Except as provided in section 417 of this title."

SEC. 3. Title IV of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended by inserting after section 416 thereof the following new section:

"417. (a) No person shall engage in air transportation as a noncertificated air carrier unless there is in force a license issued by the Board authorizing such noncertificated air carrier to engage in such transportation: *Provided*, That if a noncertificated air carrier is engaged in air transportation under a letter of registration or exemption issued to such noncertificated air carrier under the provisions of this chapter, or any order, rule, or regulation thereunder, on January 1, 1949, such noncertificated air carrier may continue so to engage in air transportation for 120 days after said date, and thereafter until such time as the board shall pass upon an application for a license for such transportation if within said 120 days such noncertificated air carrier files such application as provided herein.

"(b) Application for a license shall be made in writing to the board and shall be so verified, shall be in such form and contain such information, and shall be accompanied by such proof of service upon such interested persons, as the Board shall by regulation require.

"(c) Upon the filing of any such application, the board shall give due notice thereof to the public by posting a notice of such application in the office of the Secretary of the Board and to such other persons as the board by regulation may determine. Any interested person may file with the Board a protest or memorandum of opposition to or in support of the issuance of a license. Such application shall be set for public hearing, and the Board shall dispose of such application as speedily as possible.

"(d) The Board shall issue a license authorizing the whole or any part of the transportation covered by the application, if it finds that the applicant is fit, willing, and able to properly perform such transportation, otherwise such application shall be denied. The Board may issue a license to a noncertificated air carrier with reasonable limitations of duration if it finds that such limitations are required by the public convenience and necessity; but where the application was made for a license of unlimited duration the applicant may reject such limited license if such right of rejection is exercised within such reasonable time as the Board may by regulation determine.

"(e) If any applicant who makes application for a licence within 120 days after the effective date of this section shall show that, from January 1, 1948, until the effective date of this section, it, or its predecessor in interest, was a noncertificated air carrier holding a letter of registration hereunder, the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall issue a license to such applicant. Such license shall be limited to the operations shown to have been conducted by the applicant between said dates, and such license may be further limited to the types of service, classes of traffic, and the commodity or commodities carried by the applicant while so operating.

"(f) Each license issued under this section shall specify the points between which operation as a noncertificated air carrier is to be authorized, the nature of the traffic and scope of the business to be authorized thereby. There shall be attached to the exercise of the privileges granted by such license, or amendment thereto, such reasonable terms, conditions. and limitations as the public interest may require, except that no term, condition, or limitation shall restrict the right of the noncertificated air carrier to change or add to its equipment or facilities for performing the authorized transportation as the development of the business and the demands of the public may require: *Provided*, That no license issued under this section shall authorize the holder thereof to operate or to hold out, directly or indirectly, that it operates: (1) More than three round-trip flights per week between the same two points or more than four one-way flights per week between the same two points; (2) more than a total of four one-way flights and round-trip flights per week between the same two points; (3) in scheduled air transportation.

"(g) Each license shall be effective from the date specified therein, and shall continue in effect until suspended or revoked as hereinafter provided, or until the Board shall certify that operation thereunder has ceased, or if issued for a limited period of time under subsection (d) of this section, shall continue in effect until the expiration thereof, unless prior to the date of expiration, such license shall be suspended or revoked as provided herein, or the Board shall certify that operations thereunder have ceased: *Provided*, That if any service authorized by a license is not inaugurated within such period, not less than 90 days, after the date of the authorization as shall be fixed by the Board, or if, for a period of 90 days or such other period as may be designated by the Board, any such service is not operated, the Board may by order, entered after notice and hearing, direct that such license shall thereupon cease to be effective to the extent of such service.

"(h) The Board, upon petition or complaint or upon its own initiative, after notice and hearing, may alter, amend, modify, or suspend any such license, in whole or in part, if the public convenience and necessity so require, or may revoke any such license, in whole or in part, for intentional failure to comply with any provision of this subchapter or any order, rule, or regulation issued hereunder, or any term, condition, or limitation of such license: *Provided*, That no such license shall be revoked unless the holder thereof fails to comply, within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Board, with an order of the Board commanding obedience to the provision, or to the order (other than an order issued in accordance with this proviso), rule, regulation, term, condition, or limitation found by the Board to have been violated. Any interested person may file with the Board a protest or memorandum in support of or in opposition to the alteration, amendment, modification, suspension, or revocation of a license.

"(i) No license may be transferred unless such transfer is approved by the Board as being consistent with the public interest.

"(j) No license shall confer any proprietary, property, or exclusive right in the use of any air space, civil airway, landing area, or air-navigation facility."

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 24, 1949.

Mr. JOSEPH J. O'CONNELL, Jr.,
*Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,*
*Commerce Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The notice of the Civil Aeronautics Board dated December 10, 1948, with reference to its proposed amendment and partial repeal of section 292.1 of its economic regulations governing small and large irregular air carriers has been called to my attention. I am submitting herewith for your consideration my views with respect to the legality of the proposed regulation, and certain questions of policy involved therein.

First of all, permit me to point out that on August 30, 1946, prior to the promulgation of the existing section 292.1, I addressed a communication to Mr. James M. Landis, the then Chairman of the Board, in which I stated as follows:

"Being the principal author of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as well as its sponsor throughout its whole legislative history, I may be presumed to have a clear idea of the legislative intent of Congress in enacting the law.

"I wish to state unequivocally and unalterably that the act never, at any time in its history, contemplated the economic regulation of nonscheduled or fixed base operators. No representatives of such persons appeared at any of the hearings either in favor of or in opposition to the bill nor were they requested to do so. Moreover, there is not to be found a single reference to such operators in the whole legislative history of the act. The only mention of nonscheduled operations in the entire act is in section 416 (b) (2), and that provision was inserted solely to assist the small operators who continuously held themselves out as scheduled operators but because of financial or other difficulties were often unable to meet their scheduled commitments. It was in no sense intended to bring the nonscheduled operators within the purview of the statute (83 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 7079).

"Admittedly, all airmen and all aircraft are subject to the safety requirements but no parallel provision is made in the so-called economic sections of the act. Rather, the

act applies its economic sections only to carriers engaged in air transportation, which term, by a series of definitions in the act, means the carriage by aircraft of persons or property as a common carrier for compensation or hire or the carriage of mail in interstate commerce. The use of the words 'common carrier' in section 1 (21) without further definition is sufficient demonstration that the economic regulations promulgated by the Board do not, and cannot, extend to private and contract carriers by aircraft as long as they are operating on a nonscheduled basis, regardless of whether or not such carriers engaged in interstate, overseas, or foreign commerce.

"It has often been charged that the Board is 'air-line minded' and if this is true I wish to compliment the members sincerely because there is no doubt in my mind that the intent of the act was to provide regulation of the air lines and the Board is to be congratulated for recognizing and accepting its proper sphere of activity. On the other hand, if the Board now seeks to enlarge its activity without legislative authority, I will condemn it and oppose any such assumption with all the force at my command."

Notwithstanding my communication and the clearly expressed intent of the Congress to cover only scheduled air lines in the legislation encompassed within the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, the Board proceeded to promulgate regulations to cover and govern the nonscheduled air carrier industry.

I have not been unaware of the tremendous development of the nonscheduled air carrier industry in this country since World War II. I am aware that there are approximately 5,000 such nonscheduled operators, and I am further aware that they have developed a large and substantial business. Many of these operators received their initial training in the pilot training programs which I sponsored.

It is my belief that if civil aviation in this country is to grow and fill the needs of our people, nonscheduled operators must be encouraged to develop and expand their business in a safe and proper manner. The nonscheduled industry of this country represents civil aviation's greatest potential growth; but that growth must be properly regulated in the public interest.

I have already introduced my bill to revise and rewrite the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and bring it up to date. In addition to the contract carrier provisions of that bill I have been for some time considering a draft of an amendment specifically covering all noncertificated air carriers. This amendment I propose to introduce within a few days, though I am not sure I have solved certain technical problems of draftsmanship which are involved. My bill S. 1 and this proposed amendment will, for the first time, provide legislative authority for the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the nonscheduled aviation industry of this country. I do think that the Civil Aeronautics Board should, in the meantime, stay its hand and give the Congress, the only body legally authorized to speak, an opportunity to act on this subject. The reason I did not include the full amendment covering all nonscheduled operations in my original bill was that I have not heretofore felt that such legislation was necessary, as I believed for some time that the noncontract phases of nonscheduled operation should be allowed a free and unfettered opportunity to develop. But I now believe that the Congress should fully cover the complete air carrier field and express its policies on the subject, so my proposed amendment is designed to take care of this situation.

The latest draft of my proposed amendment is enclosed. I shall appreciate any comments or suggestions which the Board would like to make; and I hope the Board will come before the committee when hearings are scheduled and express its views fully. To cover such a varied industry as the nonscheduled air carriers of this country in broad language is quite difficult. You will note that my proposed amendment sets up a licensing system and that it vests rather broad authority in the Board. The full mechanics of what I have in mind may require a much more detailed bill.

In view of my position on the need for new legislation to cover the nonscheduled air carriers, I will not comment in detail on the provisions of the proposed regulation. As author of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, I do point out that the failure to continue the use of the "letters of registration" now used by the existing regulation appears to be an attempt to get away from the provisions and protections of that act. I do not believe the Board would intend such a result.

I believe that all possible action should be taken to assure safe operations by nonscheduled air carriers. This means sound economic regulations as well as proper safety regulations. Since the Congress in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 covered only safety regulations in a comprehensive way, the Congress should now fill in the void which exists in the economic regulations for nonscheduled air carriers.

Kindest regards and all good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

## INCREASE IN SALARIES OF CERTAIN JUDGES

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the salaries of certain judges of the United States. In connection with this bill I ask that an attached memorandum, with footnotes, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the memorandum will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 637) to increase the salaries of judges of the United States, introduced by Mr. MCCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The memorandum presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM AS TO THE NECESSITY FOR INCREASE IN THE SALARIES OF UNITED STATES JUDGES

The purpose and effect of the proposed legislation is to provide for a $5,000 increase in the annual salary of each member of the Federal judiciary, except in respect to that of the Chief Justice of the United States for whom is proposed an increase of $9,500. The proposed legislation applies in both terms and effect to the salaries of the Chief Justice and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court, of the judges of the United States courts of appeals, of the judges of the United States Court of Claims, of the judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, of the judges of the United States district courts, of the judges of the United States Customs Court, of the judges of the district courts of the Virgin Islands and of Alaska, and of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States. The proposed legislation applies in effect, although not in terms, to the salary of the judge of the District Court of the Canal Zone for the reason that the statutes provide that the judge of that court shall receive "the same salary as is allowed to United States district judges.[1] The present salaries, which the proposed legislation would supersede, were established by the act of July 31, 1946 (60 Stat. 716). The salaries fixed by that act and the salaries to be established by the proposed legislation compare as follows:

| | Present salaries | Proposed salaries |
|---|---|---|
| Chief Justice of the United States | $25,500 | $35,000 |
| Associate Justices of the Supreme Court | 25,000 | 30,000 |
| Judges of the United States courts of appeals | 17,500 | 22,500 |
| Judges of the United States Court of Claims | 17,500 | 22,500 |
| Judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals | 17,500 | 22,500 |
| Judges of the United States district courts | 15,000 | 20,000 |
| Chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia | 15,500 | 20,500 |
| Judges of the United States Customs Court | 15,000 | 20,000 |
| Judges of the district courts of the Virgin Islands, Alaska, and the Canal Zone | 15,000 | 20,000 |
| Judges of the Tax Court of the United States | 15,000 | 20,000 |

HISTORY OF FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES

The history of Federal judicial salaries has been as follows: Prior to 1911 the salary of the Chief Justice of the United States was $13,000;[2] in that year it was raised to $15,000; in the same year the salaries of the Associate Justices were raised from $12,500 to $14,500.[3] In 1926 the salary of the Chief Justice was raised to $20,500 and the salaries of the Associate Justices to $20,000.[4] Until 1891 the salaries of the District judges varied in the several districts.[5] In that year a uniform salary of $5,000 was fixed.[6] This was increased in 1903 to $6,000[7] and in 1919 to $7,500.[8] In 1891 the salary of the judges of the circuit courts of appeals was fixed at $6,000.[9] This was increased in 1903 to $7,000[10] and in 1919 to $8,500.[11] In 1926 the salaries of the judges of the United States circuit courts of appeals, including the justices of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of

[1] 47 Stat. 816 (1933); 42 Stat. 1005 (1922); 37 Stat. 565 (1912).

[2] For salaries prevailing from 1903 to 1911, see 32 Stat. 825 (1903).

[3] 36 Stat. 1152 (1911).

[4] 44 Stat. 919 (1926).

[5] Rev. Stat. § 554 (1878).

[6] 26 Stat. 783 (1891).

Since the establishment in 1891 of uniform salaries for district judges, it has been recognized "that it is impossible to make and pass a bill fixing graduated salaries and paying different compensations to judges of the same class because of geographical or other reasons.

"The mind of the bar association and that of all persons interested in the present bill recognizes the fact that a flat advance is all that can be accomplished. This is justified because today, under the law governing the appointment and assignment of judges to different localities and districts, judges of our Federal courts are like a mobile army that can be moved here and there and assigned to work distances probably [far] from their home district. All this favors the creation of a flat increase that shall be the same in every district throughout the United States." The quotation is from page 3 of H. Rept. No. 232, 69th Cong., 1st sess. (1926).

[7] 32 Stat. 825 (1903).

[8] 40 Stat. 1156 (1919).

[9] 26 Stat. 826 (1891). This was the compensation of the then circuit judges proper, which was fixed at $6,000 in 1871, 16 Stat. 494. The circuit courts were abolished in 1911, Judicial Code, ch. 13, § 289, 36 Stat. 1167.

[10] 32 Stat. 825 (1903).

[11] 40 Stat. 1157 (1919).

Columbia, were fixed at $12,500; [12] those of the judges of the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and of the Court of Claims, at $12,500; [13] those of the judges of the United States district courts, including the district court of the United States for the District of Columbia, at $10,000, except that of the chief justice of the district court of the United States for the District of Columbia which was fixed at $10,500; [14] the salaries of the judges of the United States Customs Court were fixed at $10,000.[15] The salaries of the judges of the district courts of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and Alaska were fixed by amendments to the respective organic acts at $10,000 in 1926, [16] and in 1946 at $15,000.[17] The salary of the judge of the District Court of the Virgin Islands was fixed in 1928 at $7,500; [18] in 1940 at $10,000; [19] and in 1946 at $15,000.[20] In 1946 the salaries of the judges of all the other lower Federal courts as well as the salaries of the Chief Justice and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court were fixed as set forth in the compilation printed at the beginning of this memorandum.[21] As stated the salary of the judge of the District Court of the Canal Zone is fixed by the statutes referred to in note 1, supra, which are still in effect, at the same rate as that paid to judges of the United States district courts generally. The salaries of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States were fixed in 1924 at $7,500.[19] This was increased in 1939 to $10,000 [20] and in 1946 to $15,000.[21]

PRESENT FEDERAL JUDICIAL SALARIES COMPARED WITH THOSE IN OTHER COURT SYSTEMS

In England, the Lord Chancelor, who is the highest judicial officer, receives an annual salary of £10,000 (approximately $40,000 at the present depreciated rate of exchange). The presiding judge of the Supreme Court of New York, appellate division, first and second departments, receives an annual salary of $31,500; the associate judges receive salaries of $30,000. The chief judge of the Court of Appeals of New York receives $25,500 plus $3,000 expenses, and the associate judges receive $25,000 plus $3,000 expenses. The justices of the Supreme Court of New York, the trial court of general civil judisdiction, in the large metropolitan areas, including New York County, receive salaries of $28,000 a year. The judges of the court of general sessions of New York, the trial court of general criminal jurisdiction, receive $28,000 a year in the large metropolitan areas, including New York County. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Jersey receives $25,000 a year and the associate justices of that court receive $24,000 a year. The judges of the superior court, the trial court of general jurisdiction, receive $20,000 a year. The chief justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania receives $23,500 a year, while the associate justices receive $23,000. The judges of the court of common pleas of the State of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia and Allegheny Counties, a trial court of general civil jurisdiction, receive salaries of $16,500 a year.

ECONOMIC CHANGE SINCE ESTABLISHMENT IN 1946 OF THE PRESENT SALARY SCALE

An important factor in favor of an increase in judicial salaries is that fixed salaries have over a long period of years been diminishing salaries so far as purchasing power is concerned. According to figures made available by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Consumers' Price Index for moderate income families in large cities as of December 15, 1937, stood at 103; as of December 15, 1946 (the year in which the latest legislation for increase of judicial salaries was passed), the index stood at 153.3; as of November 15, 1948, the index stood at 172.2.

THE EFFECT OF TAXES UPON JUDICIAL SALARIES

Judicial salaries have declined in adequacy in part because of taxes. The figures set out below, which are computed under the Revenue Act of 1948 and on the assumptions set out in footnote 22, show the amount of taxes to be paid by the judges at present salaries and at the salaries proposed:

| | Present salary | Tax | Proposed salary | Tax |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chief Justice of the United States | $25,500 | $5,709.92 | $35,000 | $9,464.00 |
| Associate Justices of the Supreme Court | 25,000 | 5,542.72 | 30,000 | 7,381.92 |
| Circuit judges | 17,500 | 3,224.80 | 22,500 | 4,706.72 |
| District judges and judges of the Tax Court | 15,000 | 2,564.80 | 20,000 | 3,948.16 |

Using a circuit judge's salary as an example, on January 1, 1937, the salary was not taxable by either the Federal Government or a State government. The salary was $12,500 net to the judge. While the 1946 act increased the salary to $17,500, this salary was subject to a Federal income tax of $3,224 in 1948, leaving $14,276. The net gain to the judge over his 1937 salary was only $1,776. The cost of living, according to the figures given under the previous heading, increased from 103 in 1937 to 172.2 in 1948. If the proposed increase be granted by Congress the net to the judge, deducting a tax of $4,706 from $22,500, the amount of the proposed salary, will be $17,794—a gain of $5,294 over his 1937 salary. This will be of aid in overcoming the increased cost of living.

RELATION BETWEEN JUDICIAL SALARIES AND SALARIES OF OFFICERS OF THE EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENTS OF THE GOVERNMENT

There has been a definite relation between the salaries of the United States judges and those of officers of the executive department of the Government. Since 1925, except for dislocation arising from recent legislation, the salaries of Cabinet officers have been maintained at a level of $2,500 above that of circuit judges. For example, in 1926 the compensation of Cabinet officers was $15,000 while that of circuit judges was $12,500. The salaries of the Chief Justice of the United States and of the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court were fixed in amounts of $5,000 in excess of those of Cabinet officers. The salaries of the judges of the United States district courts were fixed in an amount of $5,000 less than those of Cabinet officers and $2,500 less than those of circuit judges. The proposed legislation will reestablish and maintain the historic relationship between the salaries of the judiciary and the Cabinet officers.

The salaries of the Vice President, of the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and of the Chief Justice of the United States have been on a substantial parity except for the increase effected in the latter's salary in 1946. Legislation enacted by the Eighty-first Congress, first session (S. 103, Public Law No. 2, 81st Cong.), provides that the Vice President and the Speaker shall receive salaries of $30,000 each, plus $10,000 each as an expense allowance. The salary of the Chief Justice should be increased to $35,000 because of this as well as on account of his numerous onerous administrative duties.[23]

COST OF THE PROPOSED INCREASE OF JUDICIAL SALARIES

The proposed salary increases involve 337 judgeships. The additional annual gross expenditure would amount to $1,689,500. But as noted above a substantial portion of this will go back to the Treasury in the form of taxes.

GENERAL COST OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM

It is appropriate to point out that the appropriation for the Federal judiciary is less than one-nineteenth of 1 percent of the total appropriation for the Government.[24]

## AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I by request introduce for appropriate reference a bill having to do with proposed changes respecting the United States Court of Claims.

This proposed legislation was submitted to me by the Honorable Marvin Jones, chief justice of the Court of Claims; and I introduce it by request, and so that it may have proper study and consideration in the Committee on the Judiciary, where it will be referred to the standing Subcommittee on Improvements in Judiciary Machinery.

So that my own position with regard to this matter may be clear, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of a letter which I addressed to Judge Jones, under date of January 13, having to do with the legislative proposals embodied in the bill which I have just introduced, together with the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the letter presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 638) to amend title 28, United States Code, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1949.

Hon. MARVIN JONES,
*United States Court of Claims,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR JUDGE: In answering your letter of December 7, I promised to write to you again after the new Congress got under way.

As you know, Public Law 773 of the Eightieth Congress was a comprehensive act codifying the entire title 28 of the United States Code. Even though great care had been taken in the preparation of the bill, by reason of its size and complexity, it was anticipated that there would probably be numerous typographical errors and matters of a similar nature that would need to be corrected by a subsequent bill. As fast as these errors or other defects appear, or are brought to light, they are being assembled, all to be included in a single corrective bill.

However, it is planned that this bill will include no substantive changes in the law as it was prior to June 1948, and as it was

[12] 44 Stat. 919 (1926).
[13] 44 Stat. 919 (1926).
[14] 60 Stat. 716 (1946).
[15] 45 Stat. 997 (1928).
[16] 54 Stat. 220 (1940).
[17] 60 Stat. 716 (1946).
[18] 60 Stat. 716 (1946).
[19] 43 Stat. 337 (1924).
[20] 53 Stat. 159 (1939).
[21] 60 Stat. 716 (1946).

[22] The computation is based upon the assumptions that: (1) the judicial salary is the only income of the judge; (2) the judge is married; (3) his wife has no income; (4) standard deduction is taken; and (5) the tax is computed by the use of the split-income method.

[23] For example, the Chief Justice is chairman of the Judicial Conference of the United States.

[24] The appropriation for the Federal judiciary for the present fiscal year (1949) is $21,021,611; the total appropriation for the Government is $40,180,017,813.

intended to be enacted, but only such changes as are necessary to make it typographically or grammatically correct.

Numerous substantive changes have been proposed from time to time, some of which were included in Public Law 773, and others of which were included in the original bill (H. R. 3214, 80th Cong.) as introduced, but which were dropped out before final passage and approval.

The changes proposed in your letter of December 7 are substantive in nature and therefore, in my opinion, should not be included in the corrective bill; but, rather, should be considered on their individual merits, there being sound arguments, both pro and con, on these proposals.

Your first proposal is controversial in that it provides for interchange of judges between the Court of Claims (and the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals) and the regular United States district courts. The immediate question is raised as to the constitutionality of this proposal, since it provides for the judge of a legislative court to exercise the functions of a judge of a constitutional court. In my opinion, this proposal merits thorough and careful study from this angle, as well as from the angle of necessity.

Your second proposal would enlarge the judicial conference by the inclusion of the chief judge of the Court of Claims (and of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals) as members. At present the United States district judges are not represented (except by their senior circuit judge) and many of them now feel they should be represented on said conference. Should an individual legislative court be so represented, much argument would be presented for its further enlargement to include a direct representative of the district judges. While this proposal appears to have some merit, I believe it should be carefully studied for its possible implications.

Your third proposal, to grant Court of Claims commissioners a travel allowance of $10 per day (in lieu of the present maximum of $7) unquestionably is sound and should be enacted.

In this connection, I call your attention to my bill, S. 48, a copy of which is enclosed.

Your fourth and fifth proposals, respectively, to grant additional powers to the court to issue mandamus and similar writs, and to repeal existing provisions of law authorizing the court to receive cases from Government departments for a report on the facts and law, under its rules, both appear to have merit, but neither should be enacted hastily, as part of an omnibus bill, and without considering the arguments both for and against.

Your sixth proposal, to permit appeals under the Tort Claims Act from district courts to the Court of Claims, without agreement of both parties (as now required by law), also is a substantive change, obviously having much merit; but, also, too important, in my opinion, to be rammed through in an omnibus bill.

These are preliminary thoughts only, and not final conclusions; but I wonder if you may not feel, upon reflection, it would be better to include your proposals in a separate bill (or perhaps two or more separate bills) rather than trying to tack them onto the proposed corrective measure for title 28.

I shall be happy to have your further views in this matter.

Kindest regards and all good wishes.

Sincerely,

PAT MCCARRAN.

## PROTECTION OF BADGES, ETC., OF AUXILIARIES OF VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce four bills which I feel are vitally necessary in order to protect the badges, medals, emblems, and other insignia of auxiliaries of veterans' organizations and in addition, to renew certain patents on the badges of the American Legion and its auxiliaries. These bills have been kindly suggested by the able director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, Gen. John Thomas Taylor.

The first of the bills is identical to a bill which I introduced in the Eightieth Congress, S. 2239, in order to protect the badges, medals, emblems, and other insignia of auxiliaries of the veterans' organizations. The American Legion has furnished me with a list indicating unmistakably that these veterans' emblems have been infringed upon in several cases filed with the FBI by various commercial organizations. Such commercial infringement for private purposes should, of course, be stopped. Obviously, we owe it to our ex-service men and women, to their widows and sons, to make sure that their official badges and medals are used only for the public-spirited purposes of these fine veterans' organizations.

The other three bills are designed to extend the patents on the badges of the Legion, the Legion auxiliaries, and the badge of the Sons of the American Legion. During the Seventy-fourth Congress, we enacted Public Laws 230 and 231, extending the 14-year patent period of the Legion badge and the Auxiliary badge. Such patent extension is called for in the public interest and I feel that it should be promptly approved by the Congress.

In addition, I should like to point out with relation to bill No. 4 that the patent on the badge of the Sons of the American Legion expires on May 8, 1949, and, therefore, it is essential that this patent be extended, too.

I am hoping that the Senate Judiciary Committee will be able to take prompt action on all of the four measures. In so doing, it will prove (just as I am sure the Congress will prove) its deep interest in the magnificent work done by these organizations which is entitled to appropriate recognition.

The bills introduced by Mr. WILEY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 645. A bill to amend Public Law 663, Seventy-sixth Congress, so as to protect the badge, medal, emblem, or other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations;

S. 646. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion;

S. 647. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary; and

S. 648. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, section 705, to protect the badge, medal, emblem, and other insignia of auxiliaries to veterans' organizations; and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT OF ACT CREATING INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION—AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 211) to amend the act entitled "An act to create the Inland Waterways Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the mandate and purpose of Congress as expressed in sections 201 and 500 of the Transportation Act, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1924, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

## STUDY OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in connection with an article entitled "Language Is Ordnance" by Max Sherover, from the magazine Armed Force, which I have presented for printing in the Appendix, I submit a concurrent resolution for appropriate reference.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 8) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as follows:

Whereas the present position of the United States of America in world affairs necessitates greater contact between citizens of the United States of America and other nationals; and

Whereas a knowledge of foreign languages by American citizens is deemed by this Congress to facilitate the success of American peacetime policy; and

Whereas, in the event of hostilities, mastery of foreign languages on the part of military personnel is deemed of great value to the United States of America; and

Whereas the ability of Americans to communicate in foreign languages will contribute to greater cooperation with the United Nations: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That it shall be the policy of the Government of the United States and its official agencies to encourage the study of foreign languages by American citizens; and be it further

*Resolved*, That no Government agency shall in any way discourage the study of foreign languages on the part of any citizen eligible for schooling or training under its facilities or sponsorship; and be it yet further

*Resolved*, That members of the armed forces of the United States and veterans of the armed forces shall be given every opportunity and encouragement to take advantage of training facilities in foreign languages which are availale to them, and that the specific agencies of the United States Government shall be responsible for encouraging the study of foreign languages among those falling under their jurisdiction and are specifically instructed to place no hindrance to, nor in any way inhibit, such study; and be it still further

*Resolved*, That the Veterans' Administration of the United States Government shall not refuse to authorize enrollment in language courses under its sponsorship to any veteran who has educational entitlement under Public Law 346 or Public Law 16 provided only that he has the educational qualifications to pursue such course and regardless of his present or contemplated vocation.

## PRINTING OF PRESIDENT'S INAUGURATION ADDRESS (S. DOC. NO. 5)

On motion of Mr. HAYDEN, and by unanimous consent, it was—

*Ordered*, That the inauguration address of the President on January 20, 1949, be printed as a Senate document.

## COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. WITHERS] be assigned to service on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUSINESS CONDITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address regarding business conditions, delivered by him in Philadelphia, January 11, 1949, at the annual dinner meeting of the Tacony Manufacturers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTRAVAGANCE IN GOVERNMENT SPENDING—ARTICLE BY SENATOR BRIDGES

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to extravagance in Government spending, entitled "Where To Swing the Ax," written by him and published in the December issue of the American magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR HILL—MAN OF THE YEAR IN SERVICE TO SOUTHERN AGRICULTURE

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the announcement in the Progressive Farmer magazine of January 1949, of its selection of Senator HILL as "Man of the year in service to southern agriculture," together with press comment, which appear in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the text of Senate Joint Resolution 2, together with a letter from the Brookings Institution, and newspaper comment, which appear in the Appendix.]

A BLUEPRINT FOR 1949–52—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Blueprint for 1949–52," from the Washington Post, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SITUATION IN CHINA—RETIREMENT OF CHIANG KAI-SHEK

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial relating to conditions in China, entitled "We Let Down a Friend," published in the Washington News of January 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LANGUAGE IS ORDNANCE—ARTICLE BY MAX SHEROVER

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Language Is Ordnance," by Max Sherover, from the magazine Armed Force for December 25, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, or other routine matters, morning business is closed.

CONSIDERATION OF LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief announcement. I have noticed that over the week end there has been some newspaper discussion in regard to the position taken by the junior Senator from Oregon as to the time table for the consideration of labor legislation. Apparently there has been something more than newspaper discussion over the week end, because someone apparently has been at work, judging by communications I am receiving from various labor groups, seeking to give the impression that the junior Senator from Oregon is attempting to stall action on labor legislation.

Mr. President, I am very glad to reply to labor from my seat here today, because I think it is time for American labor to face some legislative realities and to recognize, before it is too late, the difference between political gestures and a sincere attempt on the part of some of us to work for a revision of labor legislation which will protect the legitimate rights of labor, as well as of employers.

Certainly, Mr. President, if I wished to make political capital out of the labor legislation problem which confronts us I could say to American labor, "I shall support an immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and immediate repassage of the Wagner Act." But I am not going to mislead American labor; so I am asking, in reply to the communications I have received from American labor, "What do you want? Do you want careful, thorough consideration of labor legislation by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or do you want a labor bill written on the floor of the United States Senate?"

Mr. President, I wish to say that any attempt to immediately repeal the Taft-Hartley law and repass the Wagner Act without change will only result in a host of amendments to any such proposal on the floor of the United States Senate. I do not intend, as one who can really stand on his record for protecting the legitimate rights of labor, to be a party to any such political gesture or strategy.

I want fair legislation, and I am going to fight in the Labor Committee for fair legislation; but the enactment of fair legislation calls for considered judgment. It calls for hearings—open hearings, fair hearings, hearings in which all points of view will have an opportunity to present their case in support of their contentions.

Mr. President, it is true that at the last meeting of the Committee on Labor, I offered a motion. In effect, the motion was that the committee should seek to attempt to convene hearings on labor legislation this week. In fact, I think I said in committee that I hoped our first hearing could be not later than Thursday of this week. I urged further that we should seek to make our goal the ending of the hearings by March 1, and that we should seek then, on the basis of the record made at the hearings and the records already on file with the committee, complete drafting of the bill by the first part of April. I urged that at least sometime during the first 2 weeks of April we should bring to the floor of the Senate the best piece of legislation which the composite viewpoints of the committee can present.

Mr. President, I see no chance, I do not see it as being within the realm of possibility, to complete the hearings on labor legislation within less than a month. So I am not going to say to American labor that I think we can rush through hearings within less than a month. If future events show, as the committee goes to work, that we can finish the hearings before March 1, the junior Senator from Oregon will not be a party to forcing the hearings to be continued to March 1 because of any particular date which may have been set. If, on the other hand, let me say to labor here and now, future events show that we cannot complete the hearings by March 1, and that a few days thereafter may be needed, the junior Senator from Oregon will vote for an extension of the hearings.

As for the rest of the timetable, Mr. President, if during the month of April we in the committee can complete committee action in less than a month, certainly the junior Senator from Oregon will do everything within his power to speed up the consideration in the executive sessions of the committee—but only insofar as such a course is consonant with due deliberation on the evidence before us.

It is not in the interests of American labor, Mr. President—and I want American labor to take it from me now—for them to attempt to push through the Senate of the United States within a few short days or two or three short weeks labor legislation which is to their liking and which they think must be passed. I am satisfied that the rank and file of American workers want fair legislation, and nothing more. I am satisfied that, upon reflection, all labor leaders in America will recognize that their best interests will be served only by the passage of fair labor legislation.

It happens to be the judgment of the junior Senator from Oregon that in the Taft-Hartley bill, against which I voted, the Congress went to an extreme position in passing legislation which transgressed upon the fair, legitimate rights of labor. Therefore I have said all over the country that I think the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed. I also think it should be repealed—speaking partisanly for a moment, Mr. President—so as to get a Republican label off of it. But I think it should be repealed on its demerits, and that we should pass legislation which is fair to all parties concerned, including the American public. But I also say to American labor today, from this desk, that the repassage of the Wagner Act without change would not be fair to the legitimate rights of American employers, for reasons which I have expressed at length, both in committee and on this floor, time and time again.

Thus, I hope that it will be clear to American labor that the junior Senator from Oregon is going to oppose any steam-roller tactics on the part of American labor. I shall always stand up to be counted against the steam-roller tactics of any other group in this country.

When the debate on this subject is over, Mr. President, it will be found that I shall have made a record on it, and it will be a record for fair legislation—fair to employers, fair to labor, and fair to the American public. Therefore I serve notice that I am not going to be rushed into any quick action on labor legislation.

I think a timetable which seeks to have labor legislation brought on the floor of the Senate not later than the first 10 days of April is a perfectly fair timetable. I say now to labor—because I

want labor to know now what I shall do in executive session of the committee—it is a timetable for which I shall vote this afternoon when the Labor Committee reconvenes.

AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 31

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have been informed that it is anticipated that after the Senate adjourns today, it probably will reconvene on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If that be so, I should like to obtain consent to report Senate Joint Resolution 31, relating to the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train during the adjournment, provided my committee finishes with it in the meantime, as if the Senate were in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, tomorrow the free people of Israel are to conduct elections, thus giving evidence of their readiness and eagerness to adopt the practices of democratic and freedom-loving people. This is the first time in recorded history that such elections have been held in that part of the world, proving conclusively Israel's good faith in upholding the ideals of democracy.

It seems timely, therefore, for us, who have been sympathetic with the efforts of the Jewish people to establish a homeland in Israel, to bespeak the utmost cooperation of our State Department and our Government in furtherance of the effort to attain a peaceful settlement of the issues in that troubled area.

It seems obvious that, since the establishment of the independent State of Israel, its leaders and its people have given to the world the most convincing evidence, first, of their unshakable devotion to the idea of a homeland that would provide a refuge to members of their race throughout the world, and, secondly, of their ability to govern themselves successfully and defend themselves against attacks from without or within.

Israel has amazed the world not only by its military successes but by its ability to cope with any of the emergencies that have developed. By their own indomitable courage and tenacity its people have brought stability to their national economy. Most important of all, they have won the respect of the neighboring Arab states to such an extent that negotiations looking to a peaceful settlement of the controversial issues are now under way or pending with three of their erstwhile opponents.

In the unsettled state of the world today, and with the Middle East a potential source of world conflagration, there is cause for satisfaction in the direct negotiations now being conducted on the island of Rhodes between representatives of Israel and Egypt.

Reports of preliminary discussions between representatives of Israel and of both Lebanon and Transjordan give increased significance to the advance that has been made by the Israel Government in its efforts to reach peaceful settlement of the boundary question and other issues.

With such indications of coming peaceful arrangement of the affairs of Israel it would be most fruitful of good if our State Department would lend the good offices of this country toward the avoidance of any possible unfortunate intervention by any country at this time.

In view of the truce achieved between Arab powers, represented by King Abdullah of Transjordan, and Israel, it would seem a most unfortunate moment for any action which would tend to disrupt the current conference.

Israel has placed itself in the hands of the United Nations. The United States, as has been indicated in the commendable utterances of President Truman, has given recognition to the new government. But it is to be hoped that the United States will recognize Israel de jure as well as de facto.

Our country should, at this moment, use every means at its command to convince the world that amicable adjustment of difficulties should be encouraged and not thwarted. Let us hasten the day when the people of Israel, with their background of culture and rich tradition, shall have their place in the sun.

HAND-PICKING JURORS IN FEDERAL COURTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, with the confident expectation that I shall have practically the unanimous support of the Members of this body, I bring to the attention of the Senate once more the flagrant, un-American, and totally inexcusable situation that exists in some of our Federal courts today, namely, the power that some Federal judges have seized, to hand-pick juries.

On Saturday last, according to the Associated Press, Federal Judge John C. Knox, of New York, appeared before the Fayette County Bar Association at Uniontown, Pa., and reiterated what he had previously stated in executive session before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which subcommittee I was chairman, when we were considering Senate bills 17 and 18, dealing with uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts, and for other purposes.

Judge Knox, according to the Associated Press, said:

> That he had been told repeatedly that selection of jurors in his district was a hand-picked process. "If this be a valid indictment of my conduct, I cannot do otherwise than admit my guilt," the jurist said. "Nevertheless, unless restrained by an authority that I cannot resist, jurors in my district will continue to be hand-picked."

Here, Mr. President, we find a Federal judge boasting that he has already hand-picked jurors in his court, and saying that he is going to continue to hand-pick them.

What does the Constitution of our country say about trial by jury? Article III, section 2, provides:

> The trial of all crimes, except in cases of impeachment, shall be by jury.

Not by a judge who hand-picks them, but by a jury.

Later, by section 1 of the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution, it is provided:

> No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

Judge Knox, of course, in mitigation, in what I cannot help but characterize as an outrageous, reprehensible action by a Federal judge, says that—

> those (jurors) chosen should possess as high a degree of intelligence, morality, integrity, and common sense as can be found by those who make the selection.

Mr. President, I wish to make it emphatically, unequivocally, and straightforwardly clear that I am first, last, and all the time opposed to any Federal judge hand-picking any jurors in any case whatever, civil or criminal. I care not whether the men to be tried are murderers, bank robbers, or smugglers, or whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or Communists. Under the Constitution, a defendant in any criminal case is entitled to a fair trial by his peers; and that, in my judgment, does not mean that a Federal judge, who beforehand has made up his mind that someone is guilty of a crime, should be allowed, either directly or indirectly, either through the clerk of court, or court commissioner, or otherwise, to select the 12 men who are going to try that defendant.

Judge Knox's position is not new. On the contrary, it is as old as the hills. There is not an informed lawyer in this body who does not know that approximately 100 years ago, namely, in March 1851, a Member of Congress described the wild country then known as Indian Territory, and the territory west of the Arkansas border, by declaring there was "no God west of Fort Smith."

Thus, in March, 1851, Congress cut the judicial district in two, the eastern section taking in all of Arkansas with the exception of nine counties in the northern part of the State, the western section embracing those nine counties and all the vast area east of Texas and Colorado and what was then called "No Man's Land," the unexplored country beyond the Indian territory.

The site of the first court seat was Van Buren, Ark. Its first presiding judge was Daniel Ringo. However, in 1865, 14 years later, by congressional act, the court's location was moved 5 miles down the Arkansas River to Fort Smith. In that same year, Henry Caldwell was appointed as the first judge to govern exclusively the western jurisdiction, which at that time covered the largest judicial district in the world. His authority was absolute and final. It represented the only legal authority west of Fort Smith, where a Member of Congress had declared there was no God.

In 1872, Judge Caldwell was replaced on the bench by a young lawyer named William Story. I particularly call attention to this Judge Story because it was alleged that he was able to smell money

farther than any other judge of his time. Court costs during his 14 months' tenure as judge ran into the fabulous sum of $400,000. He was charged with corruption, incompetency, and bribery. In July 1874, in order to avoid impeachment proceedings in Congress, he resigned.

President Grant immediately thereafter appointed Isaac Charles Parker as judge. To give some idea as to what this judge was like, it will suffice to say that the judge scorned having but one rope, demanding 12, in order that 12 men might be suspended from a single ridge pole. Twelve trap doors were so set that they could be dropped separately or simultaneously.

For 14 years, from the day he stepped on the bench, no appeal could be taken from his decisions. Here in America, a judge's decision was final. No appeal could be taken from his pronouncements of death. He could sentence a man to death, without the possibility of an appeal—a power with which no other judge in America has ever been invested since his day. So what Judge Knox is talking about is not new. The decisions of the judge to whom I referred were absolute and final. He sentenced 168 men to die on the scaffold, of whom 88 were actually hanged. He thus earned for himself the title of "the judge who hanged 88 men." What happened to the rest of the men whom the judge sentenced to death?

I listened to the testimony given by Judge Knox. I heard him tell about the fine character possessed by Federal judges in the United States. I agree that the overwhelming number of them are fine, honest, straightforward men, and that they are good judges.

Every Member of this body has knowledge of several corrupt judges in England, whose records are still a blot on Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence. In this country we have also had some Federal judges whose records have been bad, or else they would not have been tried through impeachment proceedings by this very body.

What happened to the 80 remaining convicted men who were sentenced to death by this judge, with all his power? Of the 80 remaining convicted men, 43 had their sentences commuted by the President. Then suddenly Congress provided that after May 1, 1889, the right to appeal to the United States Supreme Court would lie in all cases where the punishment was death. Twenty-three of the 80 appealed and were convicted of lesser crimes, five died in prison, four were granted new trials, one was killed while attempting to escape, two were pardoned, one was declared insane, and another was bonded and never recaptured.

I want the Members of the Senate to pay particular attention to this statement:

While Judge Parker had this enormous responsibility, so fearful were the defense attorneys of incurring Judge Parker's wrath that it was not until 10 men had been sentenced to hang that a defense attorney dared exercise his right in behalf of his client, though the law had been established on May 1, 1889. The attorney who dared appeal the case was Attorney J. Warren Reed, a newcomer to the Fort Smith bar.

What was the record when this first appeal was taken? The appellant was Henry Starr, a professional bank robber whom Judge Parker had sentenced to the scaffold for the slaying of Deputy Floyd Wilson. The Supreme Court reversed his decision and remanded the case under the mitigating circumstance that Starr killed Wilson in an open fight after he had told the deputy to go for his gun. Again Starr went on trial and was sentenced to hang.

Again Reed braved Judge Parker's wrath and appealed. Within 16 months Starr was again granted a new hearing.

Judge Parker could no longer stand the vexation of having his opinions overruled. In his dispute with the United States Supreme Court, he declared that he was more familiar with criminal procedure and criminal law than were the justices of the country's highest Court, whose work was limited almost exclusively to reviewing civil cases.

Newspapers headlined his controversy with Supreme Court Justice Edward D. White, who later became Chief Justice. The Justice accused Parker of being opposed to the right of appeal, and Judge Parker accused the Justice of lack of knowledge of the law.

It was on this score that Judge Parker got into trouble.

Friends of the offended judge of the high court got the ear of Congress. Lawyers who had lost numerous cases before the hanging judge saw a chance to vindicate themselves and damned the court for its cruelties and inhumanity. Considering only the words "he hanged 88 men," others condemned him as being harsh and tyrannical. And in Washington, Senator John Vest, of Missouri, took the floor to declare the Fort Smith hall of justice "a shambles, a butcher's domain, a stench, and a disgrace to civilization."

Almost immediately Congress stripped him of his powers and later abolished his court.

What I wish to call to the attention of the Senate today is that while the Constitution granted the right of trial by jury, the jurors in this court were selected under his personal supervision, with the disastrous result which I have outlined.

What is the present situation in America? Perhaps no one is better qualified to testify as to our jury system than is the Honorable Joseph B. Keenan, practicing attorney in Washington, D. C., and who was head of the Criminal Division and Assistant Attorney General from October 1933 to January 1936, and Assistant to the Attorney General from then until February 1939. For almost 6 years he was the chief prosecutor in this country. He made a record so fine that he was selected by President Truman to take charge of the prosecution of Tojo and other Japanese criminals.

What did Mr. Keenan say when he testified in April 1947, on Senate bills 17 and 18, dealing chiefly with the intention to establish uniform qualifications of jurors in Federal courts?

What he said, Mr. President, is worth reading by every Senator; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the testimony of Joseph B. Keenan, the prosecutor of Tojo and his associates in Japan.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOSEPH B. KEENAN, ATTORNEY, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. KEENAN. I am Joseph B. Keenan. I have been head of the Criminal Division and Assistant Attorney General from October 1933 to January 1936 and assistant to the Attorney General from then until February 1939.

I would like to present a brief general statement, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to give my notions as a result of my experience with reference generally to the Federal judiciary.

I think that when you take the statistics as to the number of Federal judges and the instances where there have been difficulties with their character, the percentage of high-caliber and satisfactory judges is very remarkable and has been for a long period of time.

I do feel this way, however: That in the administration of justice in Federal courts there is a tendency to bring about what I can no better describe than "blue-ribbon juries."

I think that in turn leads to the jury as a group, perhaps involuntarily, surrendering some of its duties—I won't say privileges alone—to conform to what they may feel the Federal judiciary believes to be the truth, particularly in criminal cases.

Naturally, any such tendency cannot be corrected by any single act or piece of legislation, in my humble opinion. And I do not believe that, except in very rare instances, Federal court judges have any desire to exercise improperly their prerogatives of the bench. Yet I have known of many instances, where it has seemed that the Federal judge might himself undertake the job of making a determination of cases that do not belong to a jury, but that is a different subject matter.

But I feel from experience which is entirely impersonal that if there could be a measure devised for selection of the judiciary that would be practical, which measure would give the jury a feeling of independence, a feeling of being free from any obligation or influence in their method of selection, it would be a decided improvement in the administration of justice universally.

Now, I have heard the discussion this morning about too many farmers being excluded from the judiciary.

In Cleveland, where I practiced law, we noticed that almost all of the jurors came from outside the city of Cleveland. The city at that time was approximately 800,000.

But in the county, which had a population of about 1,200,000, we found that almost all of the jurors came from the outlying districts.

And while at that time I had no criminal practice in Cleveland, it was notable to the lawyers that we never found any municipal or city representatives on the jury.

I ascribed that, as did other lawyers in the time that I was there, to the fact that the system of selecting jurors was to blame; that if there had been some method by which jurors could have been selected by lots, you would have had less of the rural percentage and more of the urban, which would have been, in the opinion of most lawyers that I talked to, or knew of, a decided improvement in the administration of justice in criminal cases.

From the standpoint of the fairness of judges, I think that always the character of the men that are on the bench will determine that. And whether or not our system, which follows the British system, which gives the Federal judges the right to comment to a limited extent upon the evidence, is a wiser system than that prevailing in many State jurisdictions, where those rights are sharply curtailed, and even forbidden, is another subject matter which has caused, I suppose, a great deal of controversy in years back.

I have read this bill that is submitted here, and I see no particular improvement from the standpoint that I am talking of, in taking 150 or 300 names and putting them in a wheel and then drawing those out by lots.

There is some improvement in it, but it does seem to me that a system of justice where the jury is selected by lot brings a different cross section.

I do not mean from the standpoint of politics at all; it is not that. I would prefer to see every criminal case in the land decided by jurors of the average intellect.

I might recall one instance that is illustrative of that. It was a rather well-known case, tried in the Northwest, involving very serious crime.

There were, I think, four defendants. The Federal court judge was both learned and extremely conscientious, and he discussed the matter of whether or not he would use his prerogative of summing up the evidence, or in any manner tending to any extent to give his views as to the truthfulness of one witness or another.

He said that he had felt when he accepted his position on the bench that he never wanted to do that. But he was positive that these four accused were guilty.

We, who were representing the prosecution, had some doubt, but it was quite a confusing case. There was much evidence pointing to guilt. It had to do mostly with identification.

The court, however, refrained from making any comment, and it left the matter to the jury, which was a jury picked from the rural and the urban populace, about evenly divided.

The jury was out 7 or 8 hours and came back with a verdict of not guilty.

One year later, we brought in four other men, one of whom pleaded guilty to the offense. In other words, we had the wrong men. And with all due respect to the utmost sincerity of this judge and the care with which he followed the case and every detail of it, it confirmed the view that I had.

It is only one instance, it is true, but that confirmed the view that I had, that a jury of men and women distributed from different groups in life, from the rural and urban population, ordinary artisans, are the people that I am convinced, from my experience, I would like to have the matter left to, both from the standpoint of the Government and from the standpoint of the rights of the individual, where they clash with the Government.

So I am here, Mr. Chairman, naturally with no other motive in mind than to give my humble expression, from very limited experience, that any change that could be made in the selection of the Federal jurors that would bring about the conclusion in their mind, "Well, we are here because we have a right to be here. We are performing our functions as citizens of the United States. We are not beholden to any Federal judge or any Federal clerk or any Federal jury commissioner that is appointed by any Federal judge. Our function is just as separate as though we were one of the other three branches of Government, Members of Congress, or members of the legislative branch," would be a decided advance.

There might be considerable difficulty in working it out practically, but I am sure I have never met a Federal judge who had anything else but a desire to get the very best jury that he could get.

I do think, though, that though it is not anything personal as to any particular judge or any jury at any time, it is one of the weak spots in the administration of justice in which improvement could be made, if it were practical—I am sure it could be done—to have the law changed in such a fashion as to permit a wider variance of the type of people involved.

I think there is too strong a conviction that if you get professional men or bank clerks, or men of high education, they are going to be able to determine the facts of a case better than the man who works in the machine shop, or on the farm, or in the corner grocery store—if there are any left. That type of composite jury of 12 people, I think, goes further toward insuring the intelligent and faithful administration of justice than the present system which we have.

The nearer we could go toward that, the greater the improvement which could be achieved.

* * * * *

Senator LANGER. I would like to have your comment on what Mr. Keenan said about getting these jurors by lot in some manner.

Judge KNOX. We have had this selection of jurors under the present system since the Judiciary Act of 1789; being bound, as I have already said, by the State statutes. And I do not know how, outside of what is proposed in this bill, you are going to improve the method.

Now, you get into a political situation all over the country, where people have been asked to select names, county chairmen, for example, and they send in the names of persons who are on their voting lists, or something of that kind. That is the easiest way in the world to pack a jury, if one wants it to be packed.

What I am trying to do there is to broaden the scope of the jury commission, so that it may, under the direction of the judge, get a cross section of the entire community, and have them serve as jurors.

You had a selective draft during the war. You got the men who were capable of entering into the armed services. All we are asking here is to have a jury selection, and to get good people, people with brains, people with experience, people who have a stake in the country, onto our juries.

Senator LANGER. I cannot see—can you, Mr. Burdick—how you could pack a jury with names chosen a year in advance, chosen by various city councils and county commissioners.

Mr. BURDICK. Absolutely no chance. Because the case would not be in existence at the time they are drawn.

Judge KNOX. A great many are in existence, as a matter of fact, because they went over substantial lengths of time. And you have got to change your jurors' names in the wheel ever so often under the statute.

Anybody can pack a jury—I will grant you that—if you have someone who is dishonest.

Mr. CLARK. Another thing: You would have deaths. People would move away. And there would be exigencies that would destroy your system.

Judge KNOX. There would be a thousand and one things.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to ask Mr. Keenan: Do you think that under this system you would get a higher class of jurymen than you would by just picking them at random? Do you think you would get people who are more highly educated and people who would have a higher sense of values?

Mr. KEENAN. I think you would get better educated people, but, though it may be an idiosyncrasy of mine, I just feel that when you take the common man from the shop and do not lay so much stress on the education, you get a pretty good result from your jury. It may be that they will be fooled a little bit more easily, but I doubt it.

Mr. CLARK. That may be true in many cases, but many cases are very highly complicated. Do you not think, from your experience with the Federal courts, that they get a pretty good jury?

Mr. KEENAN. In Federal courts? Yes; I think you do.

To go back again—and this is surely without any reference to any individuals or any judges—I do think that there is a necessity for having a jury system as independent as it possibly can be. I do not care who the judge is. They look up to him. They look up to a State court judge, but particularly to a Federal court judge, who is appointed for life.

I think the intelligence is there, of course.

Mr. CLARK. You do not mean to say they would be influenced by the time for which they would be selected by a commissioner?

Mr. KEENAN. I remember a case that I can tell you of, out in Cleveland, that did not take more than 2 hours to try. I do not know the name of the man, and never did know what it was, but he was tried in the morning and convicted and sentenced, and I sat there waiting for a motion. I was just curious, because I could not, as a lawyer, find much if any evidence of the man's guilt. I talked to the foreman of the jury after they had voted for the conviction. He was one of the best-known men in Cleveland, the head of a large enterprise that had to do with a publishing company.

He said, "Why, of course there was no evidence in the case; none at all."

"Well," I said, "the judge charged you that unless you found these men to be guilty beyond a reasonable doubt, they should be acquitted."

"Well," he said, "we just made up our minds that" so and so—naming the assistant district attorney—this was several years ago—"probably brought in the wrong brief case."

"But," he said, "do you mean to say that the judge, whom you know, on that bench, would permit an innocent man to go to the penitentiary? Why, certainly not. The Federal agency that did the investigating knew the man was guilty. This judge, who has practiced law, has a long and honored record in the city of Cleveland, and he would not permit an injustice."

But I am telling you that he was the type of citizen that I am talking about; one whom you would select if you were picking out a "blue ribbon jury." I use that expression without intending offense to anyone. He would be the sort of man you would pick out.

Mr. CLARK. The same thing might occur in the selection of a jury at random.

Mr. KEENAN. It could, but my honest opinion is that the independent juror would be more likely to say, "Well, I do not care who the judge is. I did not try to get this job."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Keenan, do you not think that the average person picked at random would have a much higher respect for and confidence in a judge, and in fact would be afraid not to follow his instructions, to a greater extent than would a person such as you describe?

Mr. KEENAN. It could be, Mr. Attorney General. Nevertheless, when the man comes from the lower strata, the workingman, the farmer, he is more apt, I think, to say, "Well, this is my job," and have a little bit more pride in the job as juror than the well-educated man. But that is just a viewpoint.

Mr. BURDICK. I would like to ask Mr. Keenan a question.

Senator LANGER. Go right ahead.

Mr. BURDICK. Intelligence is not necessarily measured by education, is it?

Mr. KEENAN. I think not.

Mr. BURDICK. Then, even though a man worked on a farm or was a stone mason or a clerk in a store, he might have just as keen intelligence to determine a case as a graduate of Yale or Harvard; is that not true?

Mr. KEENAN. I feel you are undoubtedly correct about that.

Mr. BURDICK. This matter of education does not change anyone's intelligence.

Mr. CLARK. I did not mean we should have only college graduates on a jury. I meant that there are many cases where one who has had some experience in business life would be able to pass on it much better.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, two and two make four, and that is what a common jury looks at. My experience has been exactly as Mr. Keenan's has been with juries. I have had lots of them. I tried more jury cases before I came to Congress than anybody who ever came here. And I find that the cross-section of the people, no matter what they are doing, is the best kind of a jury you can have, men and women both.

Senator MOORE. That does not mean, Mr. Chairman, that under this proposal we are confining the selection of jurors to any particular section of society. It is a cross-section of the country.

Mr. BURDICK. That is right.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at about the same time there was testimony given by USHER L. BURDICK, who is now a Representative from the State of North Dakota. He was assistant United States attorney in North Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to have certain portions of his testimony printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. USHER L. BURDICK, FORMER REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, WILLISTON, N. DAK.

Mr. BURDICK. I am USHER L. BURDICK, of Williston, N. Dak.

* * * * *

Well, I have been a member of the legislature, speaker of the house, lieutenant governor, State's attorney, and Member of Congress.

Senator LANGER. You were a Member of Congress for how long?

Mr. BURDICK. Ten years. I also was assistant United States district attorney for North Dakota.

Senator LANGER. How long were you assistant United States district attorney?

Mr. BURDICK. Three and a half years.

Senator LANGER. You are familiar with the jury system in the Federal court, are you not?

Mr. BURDICK. I am.

Senator LANGER. Will you just state your experience, in view of the questions that I have asked the Attorney General, as to what your experience has been in connection with the Federal courts, Mr. BURDICK?

Mr. BURDICK. Well, as I understand the situation here now, you are trying to devise a plan that will produce fair and just juries. That is the aim; is it not?

Senator LANGER. That is right.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, under the present system, as it operates, that may be done; or the converse of that may be done.

Under the present system, if I am a district judge and determined to convict someone, I will guarantee that he will be convicted. And it all arises from the fact that these jury boxes are filled with names that are presented either to the clerk of the district court or the judge or the commissioner by interested parties.

After the box is filled, the drawing is just and legal. But the point is: Whose name gets into that box?

Now, we have had several experiences in that connection in North Dakota. I can put any name in that box that I want to, if I am a United States district attorney. I have been requested time and time again to help fill the box with names.

Mr. CLARK. That would be a violation of the statute. You ought to report it.

Mr. BURDICK. No; that would not mean any violation. If the commissioner says, "Now, Mr. BURDICK, are there some good jurors in your county, good intelligent, well-educated men, or businessmen? If there are, give me their names"—that is not a violation of law.

Mr. CLARK. That is just making a suggestion. That is not putting them in the box.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, I don't think it would be a very difficult legal problem to take all of the various districts in the United States and lay them out on the table and then devise a law that would cover them all at one time. That can be done.

Mr. CLARK. That is what the judges and the various people that have worked on this bill have tried to do.

You see, you must remember that this bill applies to 48 States. There are a lot of differences in the various districts, so you have to get a system that would be workable in each district, regardless of the population, whether it is a thickly populated area or a State where the population is not so thickly distributed.

Mr. BURDICK. Well, No. 4 is that the choice of specified sources from which names of prospective jurors are selected must be entrusted to the good faith of the clerk or the jury commissioner, acting under the direction of the district judge.

Now, then, if you have a district judge who is determined to convict somebody, then your system goes right back to where it was before.

For example, take the case of this particular judge. He is not a judge now; he is retired. Here is the way he would show his leanings in a lawsuit.

I have tried a great many cases before this judge, and those he wanted to convict he embarrassed me by making it too easy, and those he wanted to let loose it was almost impossible to do anything about.

Now, here is the way to do it:

He is instructing the jury:

"Now, gentlemen," he said, "if you find from the evidence submitted in this case that the defendant is not guilty, it is your duty to acquit him. But, on the other hand, if you are convinced from the evidence that he is guilty, it is your duty to convict."

Mr. CLARK. He could say that under your system, could he not, just as easily as under mine?

Mr. BURDICK. No; he would not have the same school to address.

Mr. CLARK. Those are the instructions to the jury.

Mr. BURDICK. He would have a jury right from the grass roots.

Mr. CLARK. He could still address them, though.

Mr. BURDICK. No. But we have a way of paying no attention to some fellows.

Mr. CLARK. If he wanted to be crooked, he could discharge them. We are assuming we are dealing with a crooked judge.

Now, there are many ways in which he could throw a case out rather than try to go to the trouble of selecting a jury and putting them in a box. He could dismiss the jury—dismiss the case. Hold that there was was not enough evidence. There are plenty of ways—if you are assuming that there is a crooked judge. I think that is an improper assumption.

I think we prosecuted one case from Pennsylvania in the last few months, and I think there has only been one other such prosecution in the history of the United States.

Mr. BURDICK. Of what?

Mr. CLARK. Of a district judge, or any judge.

Mr. BURDICK. I was not here very long, but we removed one while I was a Member of Congress.

Mr. CLARK. Several resigned, of course.

Senator LANGER. Of course, it would not do any good to dismiss that case because the next jury would be drawn out of the same box containing the same kind of men. The judge would not gain anything.

Mr. BURDICK. I am not finding fault with the way the names are drawn out of the box, but the way those names get in the box in the first place.

Mr. CLARK. You see, your example breaks down. The judge could say the same thing to those jurors that you picked under your system as to those who were picked under this proposal.

Mr. BURDICK. He could, but he would be saying it to a different crowd of people.

Mr. CLARK. And if he just had this impelling force—this crooked mind that you spoke of—he would not have to do that. He would just say, "Gentlemen of the jury, the evidence is not sufficient. The case is closed. The court is out of session." And he would walk off the bench.

Mr. BURDICK. How would it work the other way? He would not say, "The case is dismissed and we shall go home," if he wanted to convict.

Mr. CLARK. Then he would make them a speech, under the example you give. He would make them a speech about how guilty this person was. Then, if they found him not guilty, of course, he would not be able to control that.

But if the district judge makes his mind up along the lines you have indicated, he could certainly say the same things to a jury picked under your system as he could to a jury picked under this system.

Mr. BURDICK. I am perfectly willing to trust a jury, no matter what the judge says, if a jury comes in just like ordinary juries do.

But when a judge also selects a jury and makes a speech to them, I am saying right now that that is unfair and unjust.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I do not know one of the 11 defendants who are on trial in New York today. I do not know a Communist in New York City. I have not communicated with any of them, directly or indirectly. But I will say that in America a murderer, a Communist, a Democrat or a Republican, a smuggler or a bank robber, under the Constitution of the United States is entitled to a square deal when he goes into court; he is entitled to a fair and impartial jury.

I read in the newspapers of yesterday and several days previously what was transpiring in a so-called court of justice, and I conceived it to be my simple duty as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and as a United States Senator to bring to the attention of this body and to the people of the entire country the fact that, in my judgment, the lawyers who are appearing for the Communists have a right, first of all, to show that the jurors are not impartial, because they are not picked from the community at large, but, on the contrary, are, perhaps, as they are alleged to be, members of a jury composed of persons who will not give the defendants a fair trial because of their previous economic condition or their present economic condition, or because of their views on public matters.

Finally, I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the law provides that

the jurors shall be selected by the clerk of the court and the jury commissioner. What good does it do if the clerk of the court and the jury commissioner are under the influence of a judge who says, "I am going to continue to hand-pick juries"?

PROBLEMS AND FUNCTIONS OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has announced a public hearing to take place beginning on January 31, at which Secretary J. A. Krug, of the Department of the Interior, his assistant secretaries, and the bureau chiefs, will lay before the committee their point of view with respect to the problems and functions of the Department of the Interior. In announcing this public hearing, the committee did so in the hope that Members of the Senate and of the Congress, generally, particularly members of the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives, might find it possible to attend.

The development of a sound national policy for the conservation and utilization of the natural resources of the United States will be one of the primary duties of the Eighty-first Congress. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has jurisdiction over matters dealing with the natural resources of the United States. The Bureau of Mines, for example, which deals with the problems of mining throughout the United States, is under the jurisdiction of this committee. The Geological Survey, the studies of which cover the entire country, is also within the jurisdiction of the committee.

The development of the natural resources of the United States becomes a most important problem at this juncture in the national affairs of the country, because the conservation and the utilization of our natural resources must be the foundation upon which will be built our own contribution to world peace and to economic rehabilitation.

The committee is inviting the attention of the public authorities of the various States and the private organizations which deal with water power, mines, and mining, and various other natural resources of water within its jurisdiction.

This will be only the beginning of the broad study contemplated by the committee. Public and private organizations will be invited to submit their suggestions. State bureaus of conservation and of mineral development will be asked to contribute to the study, as well as other Federal agencies like the National Security Resources Board of which Dr. John Steelman of President Truman's staff is the acting chairman.

Announcement was made this week by Edward V. Hickey, Acting Director of the Office of Production of the National Security Resources Board, that complete mobilization plans for all industries for quick expansion and conversion in the event of war are in the process of preparation. More than this is needed if a firm basis for permanent peace is to be established.

Modern war, as the last conflict proved, is an industrial effort as much as it is a military effort. The best preventive of conflict, therefore, is to mobilize our resources for peace before war comes, and thereby demonstrate to the world that the constructive efforts of a peaceful people can win far more for humanity than when natural resources are diverted to destructive purposes.

If we wait for war to mobilize our resources, it will necessarily be done in a totalitarian manner. If we mobilize them for peace now, it can be done in a democratic manner.

The objective of the study now being launched by the Interior Committee will be to find the ways and means by which private capital can be invested for the most effective utilization of the raw materials and the scientific knowledge now available to mankind.

The people of the United States committed themselves to the economic rehabilitation of Europe as an antidote for war. This policy can be successful only if we maintain a sound economy here. That in turn means that we must have, first, a thorough survey of our resources, and, secondly, a policy for their utilization in a manner which will keep the United States economically strong and keep the door of opportunity open for all people to utilize the resources nature has provided.

The United States gained its industrial leadership and its economic strength by reason of the rich endowment of raw materials with which it was blessed. Science is constantly revealing new uses for old materials, and is providing substitutes for those raw materials which are not in as plentiful supply. The coal and oil-shale beds of the United States, for example, provide sources of liquid fuel greater by far than all that is available from petroleum. It has already been demonstrated by the studies of the Bureau of Mines that the reserves of all the oil shale found in the United States alone exceed the total petroleum reserves of the Middle East.

Light metals and plastics are performing old and new tasks for the people. In our Western States we have vast deposits of alumina clay sufficient to make the United States independent of any foreign supplies.

It is not exactly intelligent to wait for a new war before we undertake the full utilization of these vast possibilities, just as it is not intelligent to await a new depression before we work for economic stabilization. That is the expensive way to do the job. For example, after the surrender of Japan, bringing the fighting to a close in World War II, Congress repealed more than $70,000,000,000 of appropriations. We were ready to spend that money to continue the war. A small fraction of it will prevent another war if expended in searching for the ways and means for the full utilization of our natural and scientific and our human resources in a free social and political structure.

Back in 1941, during the Seventy-seventh Congress, I introduced a Senate resolution for a study of the development of mineral resources on the public lands "with a view toward, first, providing for more effective development and utilization of such resources for the purposes of national defense; second, fostering free competitive enterprise and the investment of private capital in the development of the mining industry and the production of essential and useful minerals; and, third, conserving such mineral resources to the fullest extent which is consistent with their proper development and utilization."

One result of these studies was to reveal new opportunities for mineral production later developed through the RFC during the war.

Later a select committee of the Senate was appointed to investigate petroleum resources and to recommend a national policy. I submitted the report of that committee to the Senate on January 31, 1947. Copies are still available.

During the Eightieth Congress Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, was chairman of a Special National Resources Economic Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This committee carried on extensive research.

From these beginnings under both Democratic and Republican auspices, it is to be hoped that a national policy may be made effective which will preserve a sound economy in the United States without which peace itself will be impossible.

I make this announcement, Mr. President, in order that the Members of Congress and the public may be aware of the hearing.

I ask unanimous consent that the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as set forth in Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Public lands generally, including entry, easements, and grazing thereon.
2. Mineral resources of the public lands.
3. Forfeiture of land grants and alien ownership, including alien ownership of mineral lands.
4. Forest reserves and national parks created from the public domain.
5. Military parks and battlefields, and national cemeteries.
6. Preservation of prehistoric ruins and objects of interest on the public domain.
7. Measures relating generally to Hawaii, Alaska, and the insular possessions of the United States, except those affecting their revenue and appropriations.
8. Irrigation and reclamation, including water supply for reclamation projects, and easements of public lands for irrigation projects.
9. Interstate compacts relating to apportionment of waters for irrigation purposes.
10. Mining interests generally.
11. Mineral land laws and claims and entries thereunder.
12. Geological survey.
13. Mining schools and experimental stations.
14. Petroleum conservation and conservation of the radium supply in the United States.
15. Relations of the United States with the Indians and the Indian tribes.

16. Measures relating to the care, education, and management of Indians, including the care and allotment of Indian lands and general and special measures relating to claims which are paid out of Indian funds.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION—NOMINATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is on the Executive Calendar one nomination, that of Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, Corps of Engineers, to be president and member of the Mississippi River Commission. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed, and the President notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, as in executive session, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified.

PROGRAM FOR THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I now move——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he knows what is to be taken up when the Senate meets on Thursday?

Mr. LUCAS. When the Senate meets on Thursday there is nothing of any major importance to be considered by the Senate. We hope that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will report the joint resolution introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself continuing the Freedom Train for a period of 2 years. It is a nonpartisan measure. A similar measure was introduced in the House by Representatives MCCORMACK and MARTIN of Massachusetts. I doubt if there will be any objection to it. We will take it up for consideration on Thursday next, if meanwhile it is reported favorably by the committee.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think perhaps the Senator from Illinois should add for the information of the Senate that it is the hope of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the nomination of Mr. Webb to be Under Secretary of State will be reported favorably by the committee and will be available for consideration by the Senate on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Michigan is correct. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, made a request relating to that nomination a few moments ago, and that nomination will be considered by the Senate on Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be permitted to report the Freedom Train measure during the adjournment of the Senate?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the distinguished Vice President that such consent has been obtained, on request made by the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I am sure that that order was entered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Very well.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24, 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Louis F. Blanchard, of New Mexico.

Louis B. Mazzeo, of the District of Columbia.

Robert C. Brewster, of Nebraska, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

*To be lieutenant colonels*

Leland Francis Adair, O41473.
Frank Adams, O51189.
Eugene Thomas Adler, O29549.
John Burton Albin, O51296.
Frederick Beasley Alexander, Jr., O41949.
Robert Francis Alexander, O41912.
Frank Clarence Alfred, O41503.
Daniel Wayne Allison, O29071.
Donald Knox Armstrong, O18578.
George Lloyd Atwood, O39750.
Robert Marshall Bacher, O51045.
George Arlan Bachman, O51186.
Richard Lee Baldwin, O29113.
Aaron Bank, O28959.
James Theodore Barber, O17551.
Keith Harry Barber, O39606.
Frederick McCreary Barberie, O51050.
Gordon Lanier Barclay, O29691.
Thomas Ralph Barner, O41820.
Edwin William Baron, O42012.
Frank Edgar Bartlett, O41614.
Wyatt Garner Batton, O38696.
×Harry Kyle Bayless, O29104.
Charlie G. Beckenbach, O29031.
Cletos Otho Bennett, O28966.
Curtis Hargrave Bennett, O41821.
Joseph Edward Benoit, O51070.
Donald Bernard Berrigan, O28960.
Robert Huson Betts, O50956.
James Lee Beynon, O17605.
George Walter Frank Biles, O39590.
Frank Lee Blue, Jr., O17496.
Thomas Greenleaf Boardman, O38665.
Lewis Alexander Bonifay, O29040.
Richard Nicholas Borgfeldt, O42019.
David Wainewright Bowman, O39711.
Thomas Joseph Brascher, O39749.
Fred Brasted, O41854.
Guilbert Guion Brinckerhoff, Jr., O41686.
Arthur DeWitt Brittingham, Jr., O39577.
Wendell Mark Broadus, O29690.
Kirk Patrick Brock, O41650.
Irving Wilson Brooks, O39783.
James Madison Brooks, O29736.
Francis Joseph Brophy, O39723.
Louis Fisher Brossard, O28965.
Lobdell Percy Brown, O39757.
Richard Owen Brown, O39751.
Laurance Hilliard Brownlee, O17583.
Sewell Marion Brumby, O18846.
Clarence O. Brunner, O29456.
Angel Francisco Bruno, O39632.
Fred Lafayette Bryson, O41969.
Roy Thomas Bucy, O51188.
Vernon Morgan Budge, O42017.
R. Beverly Caldwell, O51185.
Ross Rowland Caldwell, O51111.
Peter Duryea Calyer, O17116.
William Wesley Campbell, O29755.
Kenneth Anthony Carson, O42030.
Charles Edward Case, O51260.
William Turner Cathcart, O41521.
Paul Eugene Chappell, O41968.
Robert Moorman Cheal, O18613.
Arthur Clark Cheyne, O29512.
Carl Francis Chirico, O29506.
Harry Cousins Chuck, O51032.
Carey Alexander Clark, O51315.
Jeff Clay 3d, O29667.
Robert Anthony Cliffe, O29515.
Theodore Philip Coates, O41480.
William Miles Coeyman, O51316.
William Norman Cogswell, O41945.
Sidney Oliver Cohen, O51085.
Howard Coleman, O29457.
King David Colson, Jr., O29668.
Reed Nelson Colvin, O51190.
James Walker Connor, O29479.
Jewell Howard Cook, O39595.
Herbert Walter Cooley, O39773.
Harry Bryant Cooper, Jr., O18469.
Marcus Edward Cooper, O51327.
Russell Burton Cooper, O28938.
Frederick Leon Coots, O50995.
Thomas Joseph Counihan, O17183.
John Francis Cox, O41534.
Ray Joseph Cox, O29571.
Gerard Beekman Crook, O39713.
Joseph Franklin Crosby, O51023.
×Edward Edgecombe Cruise, O17738.
John Howard Cunningham, O51325.
Ronald Bryce Currens, O41816.
James Chase Damron, O41793.
Madison Amos Daniels, O51019.
William George Davidson, Jr., O18862.
Edward Shelton Davis, O51121.
Harry Richard Davis, O41894.
Thomas Charles Davis, O41981.
Wallace Harvey Dawson, Jr., O39712.
James Mitchell DeBardeleben, O51266.
Earl Lester Denton, O41561.
William Brown Derrickson, Jr., O51282.
Frederick William Dies, O51067.
George Edwin Dietz, O18500.
Thomas Venson Dixon, O51277.
Abbott Edward Dodge, O51326.
Robert Edward Doe, O42066.
Francis Gerard Donahue, O29001.
George William Dorn, O41979.
George Raymond Dougherty, O51055.
Frank Hupman Drake, O41887.
Clarence Raphael Dunlap, O29975.
Edward Duvall, O41921.
Lee Llewellyn Dymock, O29708.
Aldean Aaron Eakin, O41994.
John Kenneth Eakin, O51222.
Hiram William Earle, O28958.
Kenneth Alfred Eddy, O29014.
LaRue Maxwell Edelen, O29445.
Frederic Nelson Eichorn, O39636.
Horace Napoleon Elkins, Jr., O39770.
Marvin Columbus Ellison, O41494.
John Ascalon Elterich, O29696.
C. A. Holmes Eubanks, O42014.
William Arthur Evans, O42060.
Eugene Paul Fahringer, O41930.
Herbert Fred Farmer, O39704.
Louis Joseph Ferony, O50979.
Arthur Albert Fiedler, O38719.
Eugene Joseph Field, O29830.
William Raymond Fields, O51288.
Herbert Morton Fitzgerald, O29022.
William Cullen Fitzhugh, O51047.
×David Franklin Foster, O29473.
William Floyd Foster, O51016.

Clarence T. Foust, O41860.
Charles Kerwin Fox, O41545.
John Rudolph Fox, O42024.
Dale Raymond French, O17570.
Edwin George Fritz, O51063.
George Wellington Gage, O41590.
Robert Earl Gambrill, O39716.
Robert Sherlock Garner, O29640.
Edward Lane Gibson, O42049.
Emery Menzo Gibson, O41604.
George F. Glass, O41790.
Francis John Goatley, O51256.
Herman Philip Goebel, Jr., O41475.
Mandel Nathaniel Goldstein, O29711.
Frank Edward Golembieski, O41486.
John Taylor Goodley, O29566.
Walter Parks Goodwin, O18733.
Arthur Deane Gough, O18413.
Ira Wellington Grande, O29503.
William Ewing Grubbs, O18146.
Paul Dickson Guernsey, O41810.
Clarence Harvey Gunderson, O18041.
William Arthur Hagerty, O41883.
Lawson Edmond Hahn, O29650.
Clebert Leon Hail, O17779.
Robert Guy Haines, O29460.
Earl Walter Hall, O38698.
Andrew William Hamilton 3d, O29767.
Harold Louis Hamilton, O28993.
Oscar Theodore Hammerness, O39752.
Benjamin James Handwerker, O29671.
Kenneth Kalmar Hansen, O29481.
William Virgil Harber, O39578.
Byron Edgar Hargrove, O51202.
Basil Aldine Harkins, O51015.
Harley Douglas Harpold, O41831.
Carroll Henry Harrison, O51252.
James Albemarle Harron, O41619.
Ralph Henry Hatfield, O39755.
Kenneth Clair Haycraft, O29704.
Paul Hayne, Jr., O39619.
Marvin Hays, O41826.
Harold Sinclair Hayward, O51213.
Max Webster Hazlehurst, O38723.
John Joseph Healy, O39707.
Ernest Fred Heidland, O17688.
Edward Blackburn Hempstead, O17649.
Alfred Dean Henderson, O41647.
Fred Robert Henderson, O41540.
Lyle Kenneth Henry, O41605.
Lowe Herman Herndon, O51223.
Charles Raymond Herrmann, O39779.
Kurt Norman Heyne, O39756.
Terrence Robert Joseph Hickey, O18567.
Frank Leonidas Hickisch, O39686.
James Wallace Higgins, Jr., O29542.
Alton Arrington Hill, O29384.
Richard Frank Hill, O39625.
Samuel Thomas Hill, O41680.
Eugene Goliday Hite, O29756.
Glen Ellis Hofto, O41585.
×Arthur Hamilton Hogan, O18551.
×Frank Leslie Holmes, O29076.
Harry Ernest Hornecker, O29082.
Frank Musser Hosterman, O38631.
Francis Eugene Houghton, O39742.
Charles Shircliffe Hoult, O42047.
Clyde Aylmer Houltry, O51224.
John Marquis House, Jr., O29729.
William Hand Browne Howard, O39613.
Jerome Hubbard, O41814.
Clarence George Hubbart, O29718.
William Calvin Huber, O42052.
William Russell Huber, O18797.
Robert Gwynne Humphrey, O29646.
Kenneth Marion Hurst, O41947.
Charles William Hutchins, O29714.
George Wilfred Hutchinson, O29744.
Sydney Frank Hyde, O29035.
Joseph Jacob Imhoff, O51009.
Forney Hurst Ingram, O29698.
Rupert Ingram, O51103.
Thomas Robertson Ireland, O51004.
William Harris Isbell, Jr., O18474.
Edward Bedell James, O41549.
Maximiano Saqui Janairo, O18098.
Wayne Otto Jefferson, O29766.
Horace Lester Jennerson, O39620.
Clarence Melvin Jennings, O41643.
Burchard Mount Johnson, O29051.
Folkey Lauretz Johnson, O29431.
Gordon McTavish Johnson, O29406.
Richard Woodmansie Jones, Jr., O51090.
Robert James Jones, O28970.
William Sewall Jones, O29402.
Walter Edwin Jordan, O41910.
Johnathon Thomas Kaigler, O29721.
Harry Carl Kait, O29532.
William Elton Kaley, O41818.
Andrew Donald Kane, O42073.
O'Neill Keren Kane, O18150.
Alfred Emil Kardos, O39705.
William Michael Keane, O38702.
Elmer Andrew Kell, Jr., O33699.
Henry Alexander Keller, O39637.
Theodore Douglas Kern, O51209.
Hugh William Kevin, O41583.
Willard Harper Kilpatrick, O41895.
Arthur Thomas Kirley, O28979.
Robert Patterson Kline, O39780.
Ernest Clair Knapp, O38684.
Lawrence McAllistor Knapp, O41942.
William Watson Knox, O41558.
Elmer Lee Koup, O41999.
Stanley Adolph Kretlow, O39708.
×Tewes Kundel, O29037.
Joseph Ronaldo Lachance, O41500.
John Christopher Lackas, O29366.
Lawrence Donald Lally, O41674.
Percy Harold Laming, O42000.
Alexander Eugene Lancaster, O41875.
Thomas Francis Lancer, O51317.
Harley Arnold Lanning, O39720.
Carl Henry Larson, O42048.
Charles Pirie Law, O41684.
Charles Wyman Lawrence, Jr., O41613.
Aaron Meyer Lazar, O18738.
McWesley Ledbetter, O51096.
Stewart Henry Legendre, O42004.
Kenneth Llewellyn Leiby, O51286.
Benjamin Albert Lentz, O29401.
Frederick Joseph LePenske, Jr., O39774.
Maynard Norwood Levenick, O18514.
×Berkley Read Lewis, O29065.
Clarence Shirley Lewis, O29039.
James Franklin Lewis, O41915.
Lehman Jerome Lewis, O29537.
John Cook Light, O39611.
Herbert Frederick Lindal, O51243.
Julian Broster Lindsey, O17772.
Harold Matheson Lindstrom, O28932.
Laurence Wheeler Lougee, O41933.
Winton Henry Loveless, O39643.
Sidney Lowenstern, O51285.
Fred William Ludecke, O41898.
John Joseph MacFarland, O18100.
William Erwell Mackintosh, O51221.
Paul Elliott MacLaughlin, O17332.
John William Mac Leod, O41919.
Thomas Henry Magness, Jr., O51199.
William James Mahoney, O18616.
John Bradford Mallon, O51123.
James Edward Maloney, Jr., O18610.
Mervin Emil Mansager, O41878.
Donald Oran Markham, O29705.
Joseph Clayton Marphis, O51003.
Leon Deane Marsh, O39739.
John Taylor Marshall, O51041.
Frank Henry Mathews, O39569.
Peter Ulys Maxey, O51314.
Luie William Mayfield, O42025.
Walter Danley McCahan, O28936.
Gerald Patrick McCarthy, O41617.
Joseph Maney McCarthy, O29043.
Veon Maurice McConnell, O51333.
Charles John McCormick, O51083.
Robert Joseph McDuff, O28976.
Upton Albert McGill, O41659.
James Edward McHugh, O39745.
Basye Clay McKee, O29041.
Alton Oscar McLane, O38658.
Donald Winthrop McRell, O29606.
Benjamin Earle Meadows, O41637.
William Elwood Means, O18901.
John Arthur Meek, O51261.
×John Abner Meeks, O18735.
×William Menoher, O18690.
Michael Theodore Metz, O42071.
Harry Theodore Meyers, O41608.
Edward Gibson Miller, O41633.
Melvin Miller, O41783.
Whitside Miller, O17790.
Harold William Miner, O51102.
Edgar Ray Minnich, O51197.
George Gordon Moore, Jr., O38626.
John Virgil Moore, O29093.
Robert Beasley Moore, O51294.
Robert Folkes Moore, O18781.
Thomas Joseph Moran, O17266.
Montescue Theodore Moree, O41834.
Wayne Williamson Morris, O50999.
Charles Adam Mount, O41934.
Sam Francis Muffie, O51201.
×Ralph Thomas Mulvanity, O29674.
Clarence Joseph Murphy, O39647.
Edward James Murphy, Jr., O42061.
Walter Harold Murray, O38693.
Charles Anthony Nebel, O42040.
Ruel Raymond Neiger, O39576.
Andrew Carpenter Nelson, O38676.
Godfrey B. Nemec, O28967.
Vardell Edwards Nesmith, O39669.
Henry Smith Newhall, O29717.
Harwood Sterling Nichols, Jr., O51219.
Stephen Laird Nichols, O28844.
×Svend Wright Nielsen, O39753.
James Lawrence Nolan, O38689.
John Earl Norman, O51279.
Richard Anderson Norton, O41984.
Royal Oscar Nunamaker, O29391.
Charles William Nussbaum, O51281.
Max Oboler, O51287.
Charles Joseph Odenweller, Jr., O18135.
Charles Mason O'Donnell, O29010.
James Dupree Ogletree, O29492.
Edward Julian Ormiston, O29015.
John Upshur Dennis Page, O29085.
Nolan Page, O51101.
Richard Cloyd Parker, O18230.
Samuel Walter Parnelle, Jr., O29501.
Wayland Henry Parr, O17565.
Walter Herbert Parsons, Jr., O39782.
Kenneth Clarence Paterson, O51022.
Carl Mitchell Patterson, O39567.
Charles Seawell Paullin, O29443.
×Lawrence George Paulus, O29019.
George Denver Paxson, O29633.
Ralph Emerson Pearson, O51077.
Maurice Anthony Peerenboom, O39684.
Edward William Pennington, O29496.
Wendell Woody Perham, O28999.
Harold Tuft Perkins, O51284.
Ernest Clyde Peters, O18603.
Arthur Julius Peterson, O29881.
Joseph Anthony Petrolino, O29712.
Henry Lemle Phillips, O51249.
Herbert Lloyd Phyfe, O29390.
Milton Owen Picknell, O41952.
Robert Prescott Pike, O42023.
Lunsford Clay Pittman, O39586.
Arthur Joseph Pollard, O42029.
Alfred Prahinski, O41620.
William Clemens Pritchard, O29455.
Carroll Huston Prunty, O17281.
Pyueng Son Pyuen, O41976.
Harry Celistine Quartier, O18879.
Maurice Myrlen Radcliffe, O39787.
William Thomas Ramsay, O56778.
Raymond Russell Ramsey, O29470.
Delphine Delmas Rasco, O41973.
Clarence Edward Read, O39602.
Harrell Reagan, O51060.
Herman Hughes Reed, O29031.
Melvin Wilson Reed, O29553.
Frederick W. W. Reese, O39600.
Richard Francis Reidy, O18557.
Cornelius Michael Reing, O29637.
Barclay Thurston Resler, O42068.
Harry Brownwell Reubel, O29050.
McDonald Rigdon, O28997.
William Pitt Ring, Jr., O29467.
James Franklin Ritter, O41578.
James Harry Ritts, O38720.
Elvyn Ambrose Robb, O42006.
Willis George Robbins, O51081.
William Ray Robinette, O29539.
Karl Robinson, O41857.
George Fisk Rogers, O29544.
John Edward Rogers, O41505.
Harry George Roller, O18597.
Leo Orrin Rostenberg, O29119.
Harold Carlos Rowe, O29413.
Walter Allen Rude, O18732.
×Karl Leonard Rudser, O29110.

John Carl Ruggaber, O28943.
Charles Frederick Russe, O50967.
Lee Johnson Rutz, O51276.
Ernest Allen Sallee, O41523.
Gerald Allison Sams, O41931.
Thomas Eason Sams, O28989.
Kenneth Otto Schellberg, O39743.
Karl Laurance Scherer, O18784.
George Joseph Schill, O51229.
William Otto Schlotter, O41495.
Russell Whitney Schmelz, O29353.
Glen Lawrence Schmidt, O28935.
Howard Ignatius Schmitt, O50987.
Carl Peter Schneider, O39688.
Ernest Corwin Seaman, O29607.
Arthur Lloyd Selby, O38669.
William Clarence Shakel, O39612.
Leland Claypool Shannon, O29346.
Joseph Sharove, O42021.
×William Summers Shoemaker, O39694.
Verne Richard Silbaugh, O41489.
Clyde Causty Simkus, O50998.
Kenneth Lovell Sipes, O41989.
Edwin Cooper Skinner, O50985.
Ernest Entler Smith, O29418.
George Waite Smith, O29013.
William Ruthven Smith, Jr., O18661.
Morton Solomon, O51002.
William Horace Spicer, O29719.
Lynn Spillman, O50981.
Harold Edwin Sprague, O41940.
Ralph Parker St. John, O39706.
John Melvin Stark, O39622.
Roy Hesten Steele, O41847.
William Alvin Stephens, O39768.
Ernest La Verne Stockton, O39560.
Frank Rockwell Swoger, O29429.
Kenneth Hensley Tando, O39695.
Fred Carlton Taylor, O39761.
Harold Lee Taylor, O29694.
William Lee Taylor, O41939.
Edward Frank Thelen, O29649.
×Bernard Thielen, O18782.
Wyan Elliott Thiessen, O51087.
Homer Downing Thomas, O41621.
Willie Nussum Thomas, O29644.
Hundley Thompson, O41663.
×Millard Thompson, O28951.
Samuel Wesley Thompson, O41690.
Milton Peter Thomson, O51211.
Kenneth Edward Tiffany, O18822.
Reed Muriel Titus, O41879.
James Carter Todd, O41972.
John Day Tolman, O51191.
John Allen Townley, O41819.
Admiral Brinkley Trammell, O41501.
Theodore Burton Tufte, O39732.
Joseph Henry Twyman, Jr., O18116.
James Christopher Ulmer, O41792.
Robert Glenn Van Ness, O39646.
Hugh Anderson Vest, O39692.
Luster Azil Vickrey, O17592.
Lewis Voiers, O39763.
Homer Reamer Wallar, O51196.
Leon Wendell Walton, O29062.
Lynn Smith Waters, O41950.
William Alfred Watkins, O51237.
Ernest Chisolm Watson, O29652.
Travis Karl Watterson, O51008.
Thomas A. Weadock, O39748.
George Daland Webb, O41916.
Frederick Reginia Weber, O18148.
George Winship Weego, O41484.
Awtry Porter Wehrle, O51017.
Julian Earle Weisler, O42028.
Francis Louis Wellenreiter, O28987.
Harold Baker Wetherbie, O41823.
Richard Fisher Whitcomb, O41531.
Edmund David White, O29077.
Edward Ceasar White, O39766.
Eli Edward White, O41951.
George William White, O51200.
Hiram Brown White, O41849.
Ralph Wallace White, O39717.
Elmer Lloyd Whitman, O29569.
Howard Raymond Whittaker, O29408.
Thomas Hale Wick, O41689.
Homer Widmann, O29032.
Harry Elsworth Wilbert, O41539.
Frank Forest Wilkins, O39731.
Paul Sawyer Willard, O29541.
George Clinton Willette, O17289.
Alex Norman Williams, O41623.
Basil Emerson Williams, O51025.
Zack Maroney Williams, O50966.
William Edward Williamson, O50970.
John Lea Wilson, Jr., O39587.
Minor Keith Wilson, O41626.
Robert Beryl Wilson, O39685.
Robert Fitzpatrick Wilson, O39687.
Wesley Carlton Wilson, O17725.
Leonard Wilton Winget, O41896.
Roy Harold Winters, O39580.
Samuel Stanford Wolf, O38674.
Julian Cook Wood, O41651.
Thomas Wood, Jr., O29563.
Wayne Lorrain Wood, O51250.
Raymond Carlyle Woodes, O29067.
George Edward Woods, Jr., O41840.
×Daniel Turner Workizer, O18608.
Herbert William Wurtzler, O39596.
×Leslie Haynes Wyman, O17149.
Ben Milton Young, O51255.
Robert Goodwin Youngblood, O29423.
James O. Younts, Jr., O29552.
John Todd Yule, O29627.

*To be major*

John Charles Abercrombie, O31386.
Gilbert Gordon Ackroyd, O31813.
Lloyd Phelps Acton, O42467.
William Adams, O42631.
Francis Joseph Aerni, O31920.
Andrew Adolphe Aines, O43463.
Norman Ernest Akers, O51673.
Edward John Albertie, O40007.
Albert William Albrecht, O31558.
John Nelson Albro, O40217.
Lawrence Hanower Alexander, O51731.
Robert William Alexander, O40280.
Rowan Pearce Alexander, O42979.
John Calhoun Alford, O38838.
Edward Gerald Allen, O31878.
Hugh Edward Allen, O43348.
Robert Mach Allgeier, O42822.
Robert Harold Ammerman, O30546.
Berry Kenneth Anderson, O30384.
George Lester Anderson, O31762.
Robert Nendel Anderson, O21436.
Roland Anderson, O31790.
Truett Carroll Anderson, O38804.
Woodrow Wilson Anderson, O40220.
William Earl Anglin, O31464.
William Olmsted Antozzi, O43307.
Carlyle Whitton Arey, O30642.
Elbert Armstrong, O51677.
James Hale Ashcraft, O51658.
Neill Stewart Atkins, Jr., O42815.
Woodrow Wilson Atkins, O43292.
Reynold Atlas, O31894.
Edward Wallace Austin, O51789.
Frank Jesse Austin, Jr., O40207.
Charles Spencer Babcock, O30668.
David Albert Baker, O39971.
Marshall William Baker, O43558.
Paul Stefan Balas, O40234.
Coy Wilson Baldwin, O31924.
Austin Frederick Balkman, O32285.
Raymond Compton Ball, O52184.
Calvin Byron Banigan, O30376.
Henry Halton Banke, O51832.
Richard Griffin Banks, O43407.
Harold Dean Banning, O42780.
Reginald Collinson Barber, O42560.
Wilfred Finley Barber, O31683.
Charlie Gordon Bare, O43050.
William Carter Barefield, O42763.
Leonard Carl Barker, O40213.
Stockbridge Howland Barker, O38949.
John Barr, O40148.
Luther Richard Barth, O43418.
Howard Lehman Bartholomew, O43524.
William Tyler Bartlett, O42468.
Harold Enloe Beaty, O38930.
Donald Carl Beck, O31329.
Henry Charles Becker, O31944.
John Landes Beebe, O39970.
Howard Olsen Beeth, O42489.
Urcel La Rue Bell, O31731.
Walter Thomas Belland, O43450.
Byron Graham Belote, O42851.
Harold Boyd Benedict, O31566.
James Alton Benford, O51676.
Harry Gantcliffe Benion, O20872.
Don Carlos Benjamin, O43070.
Dayton Ernest Bennett, O40212.
William Euclid Bennett, O31754.
Herbert William Berendt, O31861.
Gerald Aloysius Bergin, O51722.
John Ernest Berry, Jr., O31707.
Warren Eugene Besse, O39988.
Carlos Betances-Ramirez, O30524.
Richard Lewis Bettien, O43528.
John Mason Bigelow, O31579.
David Dodge Billing, O42820.
Edward Russell Billings, O39945.
Peter Thaddus Leland Black, O31900.
William Herbert Blackmarr, O42836.
William Lawrence Blake, O30751.
John Franklin Blakistone, O42586.
Philippe Pierre Boas, O39960.
Vic Fayette Bodner, O51551.
William Baimes Bogue, O30470.
Jean Herman Boling, O31817.
Virgil William Bond, O42878.
Dow Lincoln Bonnell, Jr., O40088.
Alfred Eugene Bonniwell, O42931.
Robert Middleton Booth, O19964.
Gordon Bruce Borin, O42621.
Joseph Henry Botts, O31514.
James Robert Bower, O42768.
Clifford Albert Bowman, O30728.
Ernest Michael Bozak, O43486.
Joseph Louis Brack, O51746.
Glenn Milton Bradley, O51768.
Lawrence Wallace Brady, O30703.
Kerlin Joseph Bragdon, O42766.
Thomas Ray Bragg, O51732.
Arnold Nicohlus Brandt, O31955.
Herbert Pendleton Brann, O30686.
Joseph William Brantley, O30440.
Buck Bratcher, O43409.
Garland Edward Brenneman, O42576.
John Yeomans Brightman, O31366.
×Joseph Shields Brinkley, Jr., O31444.
John Allen Brock, O42914.
Howard Freeman Brook, O42907.
William Fout Brott, O42966.
David Henry Brown, O20320.
Ernest E. Brown, O51928.
John Marion Brown, Jr., O31897.
Robert Edward Brown, O52098.
William McAmis Brown, O31583.
John Theodore Browne, O40092.
James Lewis Bryan, O42883.
Floyd Herman Buch, O43500.
Louis Walter Buckalew, Jr., O43462.
Thomas Warner Burke, O31508.
Lyman Dean Burkett, O30428.
Walter Lamon Burt, O43093.
Allen Samuel Butler, O30422.
Stephen Ernest Butterfield, O42839.
Jerome Stanley Byrne, O21404.
Robert Edward Byrne, O43281.
Walter Joseph Cagney, O51813.
George Isaac Calvert, O30521.
George Nevil Calvert, O43053.
Thomas Joseph Cameron, O42804.
Clarence Stenson Campbell, O40163.
Kermit Winston Campbell, O30690.
William Edward Campbell, Jr., O43316.
William Reginald Campbell, Jr., O40267.
Raymond Thomas Caraballo, O31062.
Stanley Kenneth Carlson, O52534.
John Joseph Carmody, O51659.
Taylor Elliott Carney, Jr., O40264.
James Marsh Carson, O51626.
Stanley Karl Carter, O42852.
John Joseph Carusone, O21295.
Richard King Carver, O40039.
Lawson Bernice Caskey, O42828.
Lloyd Woodrow Cassell, O31586.
George Frederick Cassill, O30464.
Shirley Mattison Castle, O51850.
Thomas David Caulfield, O30732.
John Phillips Cavanagh, Jr., O51810.
Joseph Lee Chalk, O52112.
John Harlan Chambers, O21323.
Edward Vernon Chandler, O51931.
Clayton Lawrence Chaput, O43314.
Arthur Burton Chatham, O31480.
Raymond Clayton Cheal, O20845.
Joe Elbert Childers, O31936.
Albert Oliver Chittenden, O31574.
Henry Morris Clanton, O30771.
Charles Taliaferro Clark, O40070.

James Brewer Clark, O31723.
Lester Howard Clark, O42945.
Theodore Stanley Clark, O39998.
James Odin Clay, O42666.
Thomas Howard Clements, O31735.
Robert William Clirehugh, O31833.
Archie Lee Cochran, O43343.
Byers Hearsman Coleman, O43342.
Irving Merton Coleman, O31715.
Leonard Frank Colwell, O31358.
Russell Mervan Colwell, O38839.
Harold Eugene Cone, O43100.
William Harold Conley, O30823.
John Ora Cook, Jr., O51562.
Edwin Remick Cooley, O51770.
Joseph Edgar Cooper, O43285.
John Francis Coote, O31596.
Kenneth William Copeland, O40177.
George Harlan Cornish, O40038.
Charles Droege Corwin, O38834.
Robert Lee Coughlin, O40284.
Everett Paul Courson, Jr., O39943.
James Terry Craig, O21248.
Warren Ellsworth Crane, O42608.
Harold James Crase, Jr., O31771.
Joseph John Crimmins, O43265.
Clifford Eugene Cross, O51733.
Frederick James Crossett, O39963.
Robert Edward Cullis, O31942.
Isaac Wesley Cundiff, O43096.
Martin Cunningham, O40059.
Roger Melvin Currier, O30522.
William Costello Curry, O31677.
Christopher Berry Cushing, Jr., O31836.
Irwin Alphy Dahl, O43356.
Leonard Melvin Dahl, O42935.
James Joseph Dalton, O40171.
George Elmer Danald, O31402.
Howard Wilson Darrow, O31488.
William Walter Davenport, O43077.
Albert Charles Davies, O38916.
John Davis, O43012.
John Hewitt Davis, O40036.
John M Davis, O31761.
Thomas Ryall Davis, O20380.
Wilbur Emmet Davis, O20716.
Albert Daykin, O42762.
Oak Egan de Berg, O42974.
Michael Richard De Carlo, O42445.
Arthur Dow Decker, O30583.
Jacob Roy Degenhardt, O30391.
Louis Frederick de Lesdernier, O20275.
Norman Thomas Dennis, O43547.
René Edward de Russy, Jr., O40164.
Harry Clifford Detlie, O39996.
Edward Thomas Devlin, O51680.
Herbert Roland Dichtenmueller, O51706.
Marshall William Dickson, O42930.
Mackin Robert Dillon, O30802.
Holston Taylor Dixon, O51766.
Matt Peter Dobrinic, O42985.
Oscar Maynard Doerflinger, O31972.
Adam Edward Dogan, O30413.
Chester Dombrowski, O31353.
Joseph Richard Donahue, O43294.
Harold Lee Dorsett, O40194.
John Henry Dougherty, Jr., O31582.
Joy Dow, Jr., O38802.
William Gerald Downey, Jr., O43273.
Edward Jackson Downing, O42655.
John Joseph Slevin Doyle, O42617.
William Leo Drennen, Jr., O31890.
Reno Earl Drews, O43420.
Virgil Homer Drissel, O40010.
Burleigh Brammer Drummond, O51771.
Edgar DuBois, O51806.
Sam Kendrick Dudderar, Jr., O31764.
Gerald Hermann Duin, O20148.
Kenneth Stephen DuMond, O30748.
Leland Rockwood Dunham, O31469.
Deane Allison Dunloy, O38825.
James Sylvester Dunn, O40173.
Paul James Durbin, O52110.
William Ainsworth Eadie, Jr., O42554.
Andrew Jack Eaken, O40090.
Truman Dennis Eckols, O43078.
John Hilton Edgerly, O51684.
Bertram Junior Ellis, O40244.
Jack Ridge Emery, O40276.
Nickolaus Marion Emig, O40005.
George Boyd Emory, O31903.
Robert Oscar English, Jr., O31371.
Richard Raphael Entwhistle, O40198.
Bill Alward Evans, O30714.
Gustavus Warfield Evans, O30444.
John David Evans, Jr., O40056.
Robert Hugh Evans, O31628.
Ben Maxwell Faribault, O30801.
Julius Blaine Farley, O40226.
Jack Martin Faulds, O42581.
Charles Edmund Fay, Jr., O40231.
John Patrick Feehan, O30647.
Marion Francis Felt, O42810.
William McCague Ferguson, O42665.
William Heim Fickes, O43279.
Harry Carpenter Fields, Jr., O43592.
Frank Anthony Filippi, O30701.
Arthur Clarence Fillbrandt, O30520.
John E Finch, O31797.
Caesar Frank Fiore, O19897.
Grosvenor Wardwell Fish, O42932.
Joe Fishback, O42492.
Clarence Arthur Fleming, O51941.
Joseph Mathias Flesch, O31800.
Fred James Flette, O30594.
Clifford Gustav Folen, O40255.
George Matthew Folley, O51541.
Peter Raymond Forame, O42866.
Emory Hill Fordham, O30340.
Embert Aaron Fossum, O40210.
James Wilburn Foster, O39965.
Ira Hon Fowler, O30531.
Vincent William Fox, O51871.
Joseph Benjamin Franklin, O43304.
William Alden Franks, O43301.
George Marvin Frasor, O31594.
Henry McCall Freeman, O51926.
×Robert Edward Frith, O19881.
Melford Palmer Fritsvold, O43473.
John Archibald Frye, O30509.
John William Fueg, O40289.
Cecil Hudson Fuller, O40158.
LeRoy Robert Fullerton, O31690.
William Sewell Fultz, O31439.
Lawrence Michael Furey, O51674.
John Austin Gahr, O51947.
Frank Eugene Garden, O31742.
Lyman Spencer Gardner, O40205.
Paul Edward Gardner, O38951.
×Earl James Gebbie, O31361.
Claude Delos George, Jr., O31788.
Comet Gibson, O30497.
Cortland Ivan Gillett, O43027.
Turner Wright Gilman, O31831.
William Hendrick Gilmore, O43414.
Joseph Bernard Giordano, O30381.
Melvin William Godshall, O40184.
John Philip Goettl, O31682.
Howard Fulton, Goldsmith, Jr., O31946.
James Lawrence Goodnow, O31363.
Albert John Goodwin, O42588.
Frank Wimberley Gorham, O42461.
Gordon Andrew Goss, O42688.
Wesley Gough, O43474.
Gilvary Preston Grant, O51775.
Walter Arthur Gray, O38939.
Warren James Green, O42898.
Clyde Gregory, O43044.
Robert Emil Greiner, O38925.
Robert Jackson Griffin, O43005.
Martin Carl Grigg, O30711.
Robert Austin Grimes, O42869.
Carl Erwin Grimsley, O42568.
Francis Joseph Grogan, O42949.
John Frederick Grogan, O42637.
Leslie M. Gross, O38938.
Helmer Marvin Grotte, O31622.
Walter Nicholas Guletsky, O21309.
×James O. Guthrie, O31470.
Theadore Rees Gwillim, O42946.
Perry Bradbury Hackett, O21443.
Leo Leavitt Hadley, O42481.
John Finzer Hagan, Jr., O42438.
Martin Allan Hagerstrand, O42957.
Robert Leander Haines, O39994.
Thurman Allen Hale, O30275.
Carl Clayton Hall, O30722.
Robert John Hall, O31882.
Wilbur Thomas Hall, O42908.
Edward Griffith Halligan, O40201.
George Bruce Hamilton, O42737.
Charles Marion Hand, O31669.
John William Hanger, O39975.
James Kenneth Hanks, O42473.
William Bradley Hardin, O30581.
John Edward Harding, O31627.
Lowell Upton Hargus, O30315.
Dana Lloyd Harkleroad, O51593.
Lawrence Rust Harkness, O40066.
Allen Henry Harnar, O42470.
Thomas Logan Harrigan, O43538.
Arthur Charles Harris, Jr., O20874.
Glenn John Harris, O39985.
Robert Lord Harrison, O40275.
John Joseph Hart, O51618.
Murray Lynn Harvey, O38333.
Theodore Sebastian Hatzfeld, Jr., O31773.
×Boyce Victor Hawkins, O40233.
Taylor Coker Tyler Hayes, O43542.
James Phillip Healey, Jr., O42906.
Charles Franklin Helderman, Jr., O31716.
James Elliott Helgestad, O40003.
John Henry Hempel, O42457.
Allen Robert Henderson, O51708.
Joseph Patrick Henry, O40241.
Wesley George Henshaw, O43355.
Gustin Anthony Hess, O40180.
Carroll Philip Hickman, O42564.
Fred Arthur Hicks, O31948.
Samuel Nathan Highsmith, O51694.
×Clifford B Hill, O40055.
Jesse Nicholas Hill, O30702.
Kenneth Rolfe Hill, O31898.
Philip Henderson Hill, O42805.
Alvin Ralph Hillebrand, O30586.
Carter Lavelle Hilsabeck, O31389.
Edward Hamilton Hilsman, O43021.
John Charles Hinchie, O31537.
Oliver Martin Hirsch, O40060.
Lloyd Eugene Hirschhorn, O43433.
Morris Fritz Hobbs, O31416.
Willard Jefferson Hodges, Jr., O21401.
Kenneth Joe Hodson, O43268.
Arthur Julius Hoeman, O42485.
James Carlton Hogle, O42901.
Walter Henry Holdridge, O51895.
John Curtis Hollinger, O20148.
Albert Emanuel Holtz, O40285.
Francis Miller Hope, O30541.
John William Horstmann, O42566.
Russell Truman Houghton, O30430.
Benjamin Zacharia Houston, Jr., O31979.
Charles Edward Howard, O20605.
Harold Francis Howard, O30643.
William Robert Howard, O51629.
Harmon Martin Howdeshell, O39973.
Clifford Weldon Howell, O31462.
James Anderson Hudson, O52137.
J P Hughes, O42745.
John Frederick Hummel, O42712.
Russell Wallace Humphreys, O31910.
James William Hungate, Jr., O39951.
William Anderson Hunt, Jr., O51866.
Thomas Benjamin Hunter, O28791.
William Hupalo, O40269.
Wesley Charles Hurley, O43319.
Howard Overholt Husband, O52093.
Ralph Newhall Huse, O30819.
Robert Maxe Huston, O38943.
Edward Inglis, O31964.
Fred Bailey Irby, O42693.
Samuel Loyd Irwin, O31346.
Donald Frederick Isaacson, O31965.
Michael David Isrin, O30756.
Eugene Stephen Iwasko, O42831.
James Harold Jackson, O31580.
Marion Hubert Jackson, O31629.
Norton Jackson, O40054.
Gerald Otto Jacobs, O31548.
George David Jacobson, O31703.
Morton Selig Jaffe, O52105.
Joseph Willard Jarvis, O31530.
Charles Edwin Jeffries, O40208.
Cleveland Hall Jennings, O30480.
Carl Clifford Jensen, O38904.
Dovre Christian Jensen, O52166.
Raymond Eugene Jessen, O51590.
David Brownell Jodrey, O43590.
Dwight Edwin Johnson, O39932.
Edward Christopher Johnson, O30753.
Elmer Johnson, Jr., O38799.
Ernest Edward Johnson, O40043.
John Gideon Johnson, Jr., O43557.
Leonard Hazlett Johnson, O40227.

Bertil Vernon Jones, O31968.
Dean Hughes Jones, O30724.
George Washington Jones, O31521.
Harold LaRoy Jones, O43337.
John Thomas Jones, O30687.
Sherbert B Jones, O42988.
Virlyn Young Jones, O30739.
Winston Irving Jones, O51954.
Harry Frederick Jost, O40292.
William Gottlieb Kaeser, Jr., O42685.
Charles Ferdinand Kane, O43046.
Michael Kane, Jr., O31476.
Charles Hope Kederich, Jr., O43556.
Frank Muir Kehoe, O43380.
Robert Raymond Kemm, O52139.
Robert Bowers Kemp, O40040.
Robert Kenneth Kemp, O31364.
Robert Sorrel Kennedy, O20780.
Charles Mathew Keranen, O51578.
Leonard Calvin Kincaid, O31732.
Francis Joseph King, O40265.
John Lucien King, Jr., O31491.
Warren Jack King, O42850.
Harry Frank Kinsella, O31424.
Albert Victor Kinslow, O30808.
Simon Kinsman, O39942.
John Kionka, O51642.
William Edward Kish, O56818.
Waldemar John Klasing, O31478.
Edmund Leo Klint, O42970.
Raymond H. Knapp, O42546.
William Ferdinand Knoll, O43535.
Joseph Wiley Knott, O31350.
Ohio Knox, O30572.
Paul Mathew Koerner, O40263.
Lee Henry Kostora, O31598.
Leslie Beller Kovacs, O51697.
Edward Klement Kreml, O39926.
Harold Kenneth Krohn, O42702.
Paul William Lackro, Jr., O30325.
Amos Edward La Faver, O42447.
Benjamin Ives LaFlare, O52159.
Arthur Joseph Laib, Jr., O43107.
Donald Clell Landon, O30402.
Ernest Scharpe Landry, O51932.
Rollin Albert Lanpher, Jr., O30636.
George Edward Larsen, O31550.
Charles Cleveland Lathan, Jr., O39950.
Patrick William Laurie, O40222.
Louis Thomas Lazzarini, O43425.
Paul Joseph Leahy, O43267.
Wilson Van Doorn Ledley, O43579.
Ray Marion Lee, O31974.
Robert Clendenin Leech, O40183.
Richard Leffers, Jr., 031843.
Frank Browne Leggette, O43503.
Roland Adalor LeMay, O39987.
Warren Arthur Le Van, O42514.
Evan Hughes Lewis, O40238.
Paul Stanley Lindberg, O52194.
×La Von Parker Linn, O30757.
Francis Donald Linse, O31858.
Robert Thomas Lisk, O39957.
James Vincent Loftus, O42451.
Harlan James Long, O42994.
Roy West Lonsinger, O52192.
James Lauritz Low, O30585.
Robert Lawrence Lowe, O42913.
Irvin Lionel Luthi, O38830.
John William Lynch, O42984.
×William Frederick Lynch, O40182.
Carl Freeman Lyons, Jr., O20824.
Thomas MacConnell 3d, O40286.
George Angus MacEachern, O38806.
Mario Arthur Maffeo, O43264.
John James Maher, Jr., O42756.
Edward Maurice Majors, O31971.
Anthony John Malankowski, O30500.
Oscar Austin Mall, O31796.
Duane Williams Malone, O31479.
Earl Vernon Manning, O39941.
Charles Frank Manov, O51840.
Harry Margolies, O40235.
Harry Joseph Marker, O51688.
Michael Charles Markham, O42986.
Norman Elliott Martin, O51831.
Don Alva Mason, O31694.
Joseph Peter Mastrucci, O31768.
Orval Quincy Matteson, O43509.
Albert Ambrose Matyas, O19928.
Royall Richardson Mauzy, O39984.
Thomas Hermon Mayers, O30439.
Edward Raynesford Warner McCabe, Jr., O40262.
Walter Louis McCaddon, O40239.
Charles Falconer McCallum, O51952.
Willie Harrison McCann, O42603.
Glenn Lowery McConagha, O42623.
James Glenn McConaughy, O43272.
Waynes Dallas McConnell, O43457.
Samuel James McCune, O51668.
Howard Steele McCutcheon, O51703.
Lloyd Leslie McDaniel, O30513.
Willis Olin McDaniel, O51900.
Daniel Edwin McDonald, O42884.
Lee Roy McDonald, O52133.
Robert Joseph McDonough, O43591.
Joseph Patrick McElligott, O31482.
Harper Lee McGrady, O30450.
Horace Sherman McIlroy, O30460.
John Burton McKean, O42502.
Robert Aloysius McKenna, O51907.
Edward Jennings McKillips, O40175.
Edward Wallace McLain, O20888.
Gregg Clarke McLeod, O30674.
Ralph Michael McMahon, O30526.
×Stephen Robert McNabb, O39959.
James David McNally, O43317.
Evan Arthur McNear, O31774.
Wesley Franklin McPheron, O30794.
Robert James McSheehy, O30750.
Everett Virgil Mead, O30317.
×Stephen Johnson Meade, O31834.
Patrick Henry Meehan, O51889.
Robert Gaitskill Meguiar, O40314.
Walter Meigs Meier, O30443.
William Herbert Melhorn, O51557.
Clinton Gadeken Merrill, O31849.
George Metcalfe, O51637.
George Francis Meyer, Jr., O31584.
×William Russell Middleton, Jr., O30338.
Edward Milton Miller, Jr., O40167.
Samuel Theodore Miller, O31377.
Sidney Asa Miller, O52154.
James Roy Mills, Jr., O30824.
Joseph Phillip Minecci, O38823.
Harold Edson Miner, O43019.
George Washington Misevic, O51782.
Allan Wilcox Mitchell, O31704.
James Gordon Moak, O43454.
Kirk Brasfield Moberley, O51758.
Frank Glover Moffett, Jr., O42606.
Gilbert Alden Monti, O51641.
Otho Anthony Moomaw, O20905.
William Perrow Moon, Jr., O31589.
Harold Theodore Mooney, O42918.
Charles Franklin Moore, O51837.
Henry Hays Moore, Jr., O51847.
Lister Russell Moore, O39947.
Lowell Gideon Moore, O43539.
Orven Donald Moore, O43581.
John Joseph Moran, O40004.
Patrick Joseph Moran, O42899.
Otis Samford Moreman, Jr., O51856.
Leonard Stuart Morgan, O31814.
Clinton Orlando Morton, O51729.
Edwin Loui Peter Mueller, O52181.
Vincent DePaul Murphy, O42872.
William Franklyn Murphy, O31441.
Gordon Charles Murray, O31644.
Lawrence Astor Musick, O31811.
Marshall Woodrow Myers, O52188.
Carlos Antonio Nadal, O20670.
Edward Van Rensselaer Needels, O30537.
James Edward Neely, Jr., O40093.
Henry Helge Nelson, O31916.
James Edward Nelson, O52090.
James Harold New, O43435.
Richard Ivan Newcomb, O42844.
Raymond Francis Newkirk, O51876.
Marion Eugene Newsom, Jr., O43378.
Thomas J. Newton, O42563.
George Bogart Niblock, Jr., O42917.
×Andrew Barry Crook Nicholls, O31957.
Erwin Gilbert Nilsson, O31593.
Joseph Edward Noble, Jr., O31973.
John Calhoun Noel, Jr., O31404.
Russell Leroy Norgordt, O43589.
Clovis Byron Norris, O51861.
Harris Joaquin North, O52158.
×Edward Danby Northrop, O40282.
Jonathan Oscar Nottingham, O30482.
James Loys Oakes, O51643.
Francis John O'Connell, O30667.
John Joseph O'Connor, O52160.
Ernst Carl Oeding, O43259.
Francis Zavier O'Leary, O40214.
James Norman Olhausen, O40084.
×Harold Oscar Olsen, O31726.
Harry Charles Olson, O31399.
Robert Hermann Oppelt, O42969.
Melvin William Ormes, O30549.
Robert John Ormond, O40192.
Edward Herbert Oswald, O43330.
William Jereslaw Owen, O43536.
George Draughon Pace, O31531.
Henry Morrison Page, O42744.
Francis James Pallister, O43476.
Ira Arterburn Palm, O40245.
John Russell Palmer, O42758.
Leslie Firm Palmer, O43531.
Christopher Louis Pappas, O51724.
Clifford Edward Parr, O51605.
Thomas Leake Parsons, O39949.
William Edward Patrick, Jr., O30310.
Leroy Patterson, O31421.
Robert Allen Patterson, Jr., O43393.
William Robert Patterson, O19933.
Harvey Lee Patteson, O43439.
Gilbert Michael Payne, O31713.
Laurance Brown Payne, O51830.
Walter Orville Peale, Jr., O20946.
Maynard Denzil Pedersen, O19842.
Robert William Pedersen, O30350.
Harvey Johnson Pence, O43011.
William Kennon Perrin, O30260.
Theodore Dale Perry, O31725.
Frank D. Person, O51807.
Milfred John Peters, O43395.
Byron Noel Petersen, O42734.
Charles David Peterson, O51633.
Kenneth Howard Peterson, O40035.
Ted William Peterson, O51760.
Kenneth Raymond Philbrick, O31642.
Henry Joseph Phillips, O31839.
John DeWitt Phillips, Jr., O31937.
Hurlbert Robert Piburn, O42500.
Lowell Brower Pickett, O31336.
Bruce Pierce, O40200.
James Eugene Pinney, O42506.
Harmon Luther Pippin, Jr., O40033.
Henry Edmund Pizzati, Jr., O31679.
Paul Vincent Plapp, O43362.
Frank Jacob Frederick Polifka, O31943.
Richard Joseph Pollard, O42845.
Fred Albert Polumbo, O42860.
William Harry Pople, O43525.
Charles Alexander Post, O31524.
Maurice Glynn Powell, O40259.
Eames Asbury Powers, O40073.
Marshall Caldwell Preston, O38893.
Neill Franklin Price, O51841.
William Portwood Price, O30780.
Herman Elbert Pringle, O30477.
John Robert Pritchard, O52111.
Thomas Arden Pugh, O42526.
Anthony Jackson Race, O52163.
Angus Norman Rackleff, O30488.
Robert Merrill Rader, O31523.
Thomas Augustus Rafferty, O31793.
Tony John Raibl, O51799.
James Max Railing, O30593.
Howard Lee Ralls, Jr., O40186.
Stephen Vann Ralph, O40080.
Thurman Francis Ramsey, O51571.
Frank Joseph Randall, O38842.
×John Bruce Rankin, O40209.
Clarence Edward Ransick, O40147.
Daniel Arthur Rauenzahn, O42528.
Woodrow Wilson Reagan, O43351.
Elmer Cecil Reagor, O30639.
Lemuel Burton Redd, O43089.
Roger Stanton Rees, O31652.
Joseph Bunyan Regan, O43105.
George William Reitz, O30510.
Curt Alden Remfrey, O40169.
Lawrence Samuel Reynolds, O42982.
Robert Wesley Reynolds, O42638.
Dean Augustus Rhody, O30270.
Edward James Ribbs, O51713.
Cecil Percy Rice, O42801.
James Alexander Richardson, O31395.
Budd Walter Richmond, O30658.
Charles LeRoy Ricks, O43266.
Joel McFall Ridgell, Jr., O30769.
George Andrew Rigely, O40204.

Elwyn Arthur Riley, O40023.
Clifford Thomas Riordan, O21318.
Lyman Hodges Ripley, O20891.
Andrew William Ritchey, O31934.
Charles Arthur Robbins, Jr., O30611.
Jack Albert Robbins, O43543.
Lawrence Andrew Robbins, O51652.
William Wilson Roberts, O30264.
Charles Emory Robertson, Jr., O51756.
Joda Lee Robinson, O51857.
John Scott Robinson, O38948.
John Wylie Rodgers, O42764.
William Clark Rogers, O31602.
John William Rood, O52092.
David Nelson Roper, O31507.
Ming Rose, O42873.
Fred Lucian Ross, O30760.
Thomas Prince Ross, O40082.
Carmen Aldo Rossi, O52165.
Frank Pete Rosso, O38820.
Samuel Benton Rotharmel, O51929.
Thomas Harrison Rousseau, Jr., O52148.
Charles Arthur Rowan, O42619.
Donald Tregarthen Ruby, O40151.
Choice Randall Rucker, O31610.
Albert Martin Ruemmele, O31824.
George Burton Russell, O51913.
Roland Joseph Rutte, O19977.
Edward Anthony Ryan, O42795.
Thomas Aquinas Ryan, Jr., O51795.
James L. Ryburn, O51644.
Howard Graves Salisbury, O43510.
Joseph Louis Salonick, O40266.
Leo Benjiman Santerre, O39938.
Bert Santora, O31758.
Stanley Joseph Sawicki, O40215.
Chester Chris Schaefer, O42643.
Elmer Martin Schaudt, O51664.
Howard Paul Schaudt, O31673.
Arthur Mills Scheid, O42812.
Bernard Joseph Scherer, O52147.
Frank William Scheurlein, O31810.
Cornelius Michael Schmelzle, O31547.
Milton George Schneider, O51639.
Mathias Joseph Schon, Jr., O42633.
Kermit Richard Schweidel, O19862.
Dale Jarvis Schweinler, O51930.
Enofio Edward Sclafani, O52097.
Clifford LaRoy Scott, O51835.
Eccles Hinkle Scott, O30595.
Marvin Robert Scott, Jr., O38898.
Dudley Byrd Selden, O51845.
Russell Biglow Sell, O38918.
Richard Martin Sengle, O51839.
Charles Edward Septfonds, Jr., O31837.
Joseph Hayward Sevier, O43464.
George Hugh Sewell, O51595.
Lewis Newell Shaffer, O31541.
Walter Charles Sharp, Jr., O31408.
James Jerome Shaug, O51645.
Norris Shealy, O43088.
Calvert Probasco Shelton, O51783.
John Pearson Sherden, Jr., O19901.
William Tecumseh Sherman, O42667.
Burrell Porter Shirey, O39969.
Joseph Adelbert Shoemaker, O42993.
Arthur Melvin Shomion, O40094.
× Anthony Harry Shookus, O31772.
Allen Cromer Shuler, Jr., O31970.
Hubert Woodrow Shurtz, O42967.
Chadwick Perle Simmons, O42924.
Edward Holbrooke Simpson, O30418.
Eugene Sites, O43526.
× William Grauer Sitnek, O40142.
Nicholas Joseph Sloane, O43582.
Dan Laws Smith 2d, O40156.
Emmitt D. Smith, O42788.
Harold Alvin Smith, O31615.
Leo Alfred Smith, O30478.
Myron Douglas Smith, O31860.
Robert Quin Smith, Jr., O31636.
Stanley Wise Smith, O43042.
Marion Hartzog Smoak, O43288.
Emanuel Philip Snyder, O43286.
Frank Lawerence Snyder, O43061.
Richard Frank Snyder, O37937.
William David Sommers, Jr., O43270.
Martin Oliver Sorensen, O31784.
Morris Elmer Sorenson, O31977.
Roy Willie Sorrell, O30287.
William Howard Sparrow, O42589.
Walter Lincoln Spaulding, O31915.
Frank Wheeler Speir, O42671.
Richard George Spreng, O51594.
Raymond Louis Springer, O31961.
Frederick Edson St. John, Jr., O31394.
Richard Clarke St. John, O43530.
Robert Carlton Stack, O32098.
Robert Sherman Stacy, O31905.
John Philip Stafford, Jr., O30827.
Harry Carlyle Stakes, O30775.
Robert Bertel Staley, O43331.
Gilbert John Stark, O42791.
Carl August Steidtmann, O38896.
Thomas Fettyplace Stein, Jr., O31411.
Albert Martin Steinkrauss, O51843.
× John Joseph Stephens, O31844.
Jerome Morgan Stevenson, O51897.
Arthur Anthony Stiefel, O38934.
Loren Frederick Stone, O31504.
Joseph Edward Stopp, O31693.
× Luther Gragg Strange, O40288.
John Tapp Strawbridge, O40287.
Robert Patton Strickland, O30749.
Simon Albert Stricklen, O52136.
Homer Alton Stuverud, O43523.
John Michael Sullivan, O30698.
Joseph Winston Sullivan, O43260.
Thomas Howard Swan, O31471.
× Samuel McGraw Swearingen, O21381.
Jack Giles Sweek, O30633.
James Leonard Sweeney, O31457.
Arthur Otis Swisher, O51611.
Louis Byron Swortwood, O31672.
William Rhett Taber, O51927.
Owen Hurford Taggart, O51696.
Albert Lewis Tait, O31568.
John Paul Tawes, O31357.
Carlisle Copeland Taylor, O40150.
Russell Miller Tegnell, O42677.
John Ware Thames, O30768.
Virgil Henry Thornton, O31503.
George Martin Thorpe, O40031.
Estill Stanley Thurston, O43469.
Marion Foster Thurston, Jr., O52088.
Erland Alfred Tillman, O20941.
George Edward Tilson, O51638.
Emanuel August Timm, O30619.
Edward Wendell Tippett, O42570.
Lear Pierre Titard, O43001.
Ralph Reid Todd, O40242.
Robert John Tolly, O31551.
Owen Olaf Tonstad, O43560.
Clyde Fischer Townsend, O31526.
Wilbur Ole Townsend, O42562.
Orrin Ardeen Tracy, O31645.
John Frederick Troll, O43029.
John Covert Troutman, O31841.
LaMonte Adair Tucker, O42610.
Harry Raymond Tuebner, O31624.
James Robert Tully, O31352.
Cecil Loren Tune, O51793.
Elmer Ellsworth Twining, O30662.
Willoughby Bartlett Tyler, O31699.
Clarence Roy Underwood, O31911.
Edward Nicalos Usnick, O42525.
James Wells Utterback, O40174.
Leo Francis Valiante, O31643.
Louis duRest van de Velde, O31895.
Daniel Francis VanGundy, O31938.
Paul William Van Sloun, O51761.
Francis Merle Vaughn, O31567.
Earle Edgington Veirs, Jr., O42958.
Ben N. Velasquez, O31779.
Joe Verde, O40218.
Homer Jerome Victory, O31826.
Edward Joseph Vincent, O38910.
Joseph Bateman Vincent, O42846.
William Rhoads Vivian, O31347.
Ralph Burns Vote, Jr., O51818.
Paul A. Voyatzis, O31499.
Edward Franklin Waggoner, O42794.
William Henry Waikart, O30504.
Ward Barnette Waits, O40051.
John Hale Walker, Jr., O42857.
Norman Maurice Walker, O31925.
Robert Maxwell Walker, O31740.
Stephen Morrison Walker, O30561
Charlton Ormsby Wallace, O42981.
Aloysius John Walsh, O51792.
Edward Cockerill Walter, O31578.
Harry Francis Walterhouse, O51882.
William Randolph Ward, O43262.
Martin Joseph Waters, Jr., O31939.
William Edward Watts, O40291.
Henderson Oscar Webb, Jr., O42527.
Ira Bolt Webber, O43375.
Ralph Henry Wells, O40014.
John Beresford Welsh, O30544.
Kenneth Robert Welton, O42929.
Matt William Werve, O31832.
John Townsend West, Jr., O30825.
William Floyd West, O30484.
George Frederick Westerman, O52106.
Eugene Bissell Whalen, O52150.
Clyde Hart Wherley, O30675.
Edwin Hudson Whitaker, Jr., O42703.
Jack Chester White, O40000.
John Winthrop White, O21319.
Victor Wendell White, O43479.
× Hayden Bryant Whitehouse, O38798.
Clyde Clarence Whiteside, O43010.
Jack Riley Whitley, O42705.
William Layton Whitsett, O51892.
Howard William Wickey, O30458.
Judson Dwight Wilcox, O30718.
Ernest Beverly Wilder, O40271.
Friedrich August Otto Wildforster, O30346.
Charles Woodrow Wilkinson, O43280.
Arthur Henry Williams, Jr., O43436.
Donald Burns Williams, O38901.
John Rodger Williams, O42996.
Lewis Cass Williams, Jr., O40081.
Sam S. Williams, O38902.
Timothy Cornelius Williams, Jr., O30791
Samuel David Williamson, O39989.
James Mitchell Wilson, O40224.
John Samuel Wilson, O43271.
Lynnford Samuel Wilson, O51886.
James Ernest Windham, O30651.
Daniel Atherton Winterbottom, O30710.
William Henderson Witt, O39925.
Raymond Christian Wittmayer, O31631.
William Johnstone Wolcott, O30496.
Harold Kannan Wolfe, O31729.
Vernon Eugene Woodard, O31753.
Thomas George Worley, O31494.
Charles Elmer Wright, O31564.
Charles Roy Wright, Jr., O31388.
Jay William Wright, O51916.
Robert Morris Wygant, O31926.
Henry Jewell Wylie, O40071.
John Rudolph Yakshe, O31820.
Charles Glen Young, O20739.
Claude Clayton Young, O31935.
William Hilbourn Young, O42753.
Harry Franklin Yuill, O43571.
Alarich L. E. Zacherle, O42817.
Herbert Andrew Ziegler, O30347.

*To be captains*

Harold Robert Aaron, O26207.
Charles Richard Abel, O26358.
William Crawford Abernathy, O37308.
Dwight Lee Adams, O36323.
Harold Donald Adams, O37281.
John Robert Adie, O47634.
Robert Due Agers, O40905.
John Park Agnew, Jr., O53985.
Barry Edward Albright, O47947.
Charles Richard Albright, O36502.
Jack Alvin Albright, O40870.
Shannon Dowdy Albright, O40787.
James Anthony Aleveras, O25835.
George Louis Alexander, O26021.
Charles Francis Alfano, O25640.
Grant William Allison, O25293.
Jack Phillips Ancker, O37217.
× Charles Thomas Anders, O36679.
Eldon Buryl Andersen, O35991.
Andrew Cecil Anderson, O36146.
Brooks Doran Anderson, O35664.
Edward Gustav Anderson, Jr., O36391.
Gordon Vincent Anderson, O47345.
John Victor Anderson, O36984.
× Jonathan Waverly Anderson, Jr., O25820.
Ralph Clinton Anderson, O54269.
Ralph Westley Anderson, O36305.
John Taylor Andrews, Jr., O33908.
Stephen Elwood Andrews, Jr., O33976.
Theodore Antonelli, O46189.
Virginio Lorenzo Antonioli, O25663.
Irvine Appleton, O34867.
Raymond Francis Aquilina, O36782.
Theodore W. Archer, O48383.

×Edward Rice Ardery, O25503.
×Thomas Seelye Arms, Jr., O24996.
John Winthrop Armstrong, O25686.
Robert Martin Arn, O48366.
×William Bruce Arnold, O26359.
William Earl Arnold, Jr., O36388.
Richard William Aronson, O39073.
Robert Edward Arthur, O40968.
Barney Brooks Asbury, O46788.
Laurence Whitaker Ash, O54165.
Robert Francis Askey, O47707.
Byron Demitrois Athan, O53273.
Quintus C. Atkinson 5th, O26317.
Samuel Aurit, O47925.
Benton McDonald Austin, O35161.
George Arthur Austin, Jr., O25420.
John Dutcher Austin, O46516.
Paul Autrey, O46504.
Philip Shuford Avery, O36241.
William Benjamin Aycock, O35051.
Franklin Alvin Ayer, O34199.
Albert Wesley Aykroyd, O35069.
David Carl Baatz, O41048.
Ben Lee Baber, O25567.
George William Baccus, O35670.
Robert Eugene Baden, O25671.
Spencer Roe Baen, O27005.
Edward Jay Bagwell, O47269.
Charles Irwin Balcer, O36519.
×Clarke Tileston Baldwin, Jr., O26037.
Paul Anthony Baltes, O39285.
Wyndham Harry Bammer, O36903.
Henry Anson Barber 3d, O25568.
Robert Kennard Barber, O36728.
Robert John Barickman, O25932.
Anthony Barkovich, O54530.
John Harold Barner, O36700.
Carroll Eric Barnes, O37064.
John William Barnes, O25768.
Frank H. Barnhart, Jr., O36516.
Richard Vernon Barnum, O36167.
Donald Fredrick Barraclough, O36996.
Laurence Overton Barrett, O36652.
×Willie Wilson Joseph Barrios, O36748.
Thomas Augustine Barrow, O35686.
Frank Albert Bartell, O37206.
George Lloyd Barton 3d, O46382.
Glenn Lee Bass, O40818.
Koy McLaurine Bass, Jr., O39125.
Roy Hilsman Bass, Jr., O39311.
Frank Alexander Bates, Jr., O53290.
James Madison Bates, O36565.
Richard Traber Batson, O25434.
Claude Glenn Baughman, O37173.
John Blair Beach, O25978.
Horace Edward Beaman, O35583.
Samuel Martin Beem, O54685.
John Pierce Beeson, O24686.
Robert Sprague Beightler, Jr., O25642.
Benjamin Calvin Bell, O48708.
Carl Hamilton Bell, Jr., O35743.
John Calvin Bell, Jr., O25937.
Theodore Spear Bell, O36122.
Joe Oronzo Bellino, Jr., O41047.
Edward Elmer Bennett, O25463.
Ralph Owen Bennett, O36860.
Robert Austin Bennett, O40864.
Charles Edward Benson, O26263.
Joseph William Benson, O25601.
Walter Robert Benson, Jr., O39180.
Deward Elzie Benton, O33761.
Marvin Jay Berenzweig, O25811.
Casper Berger, O41052.
George Alvin Berlin, O36858.
Samuel Christopher Berte, O48711.
Roger Alexander Bertram, O25508.
George Betts, O26204.
James Allen Betts, O25891.
Donald Arnim Beyer, O40751.
William Lawrence Bibby, O26276.
×Edward Joseph Bielecki, O25465.
Linwood Wilson Billings, O34831.
Carroll Davis Billmyer, Jr., O34676.
David Andreas Bisset, Jr., O47274.
×Myron Richard Bittikofer, O25041.
Willis Walter Bixby, O36104.
Don William Black, O36126.
Garland Cuzorte Black, Jr., O26106.
Joseph Elliott Black, O39268.
William Wharton Blackburn, O34244.
John Lee Blackwell, O36378.
John Roy Blackwell, O53789.
John Davis Blair 3d, O37272.
×Robert Morris Blair, O24934.
Robert Tompkins Blake, O25837.
William Robert Blake, O36162.
Larry Ader Blakely, O36426.
Leo Mose Blanchett, Jr., O25585.
Kermit Blose Blaney, O35591.
Raymond Carlton Blatt, Jr., O26186.
Arthur McCabe Bliss, O36852.
Leonard John Blissenbach, O24938.
Victor Bloecker, Jr., O41058.
LeVerne Edwin Blount, O25939.
Charles Kenneth Blum, O36898.
Robert Frank Blume, O37024.
Dumas Howard Boardman, Jr., O34963.
Mark Mayo Boatner 3d, O26248.
Frederic Thomas Bockoven, O37354.
Rudolph Robert Bodd, O47137.
Lucian Dalton Bogan, Jr., O25810.
Alexander Patton Bolding, Jr., O46764.
Fletcher Wilson Boles, O46985.
John Arnold Bollard, O39241.
Quellen Denis Boller, O26050.
Alexander Russell Bolling, Jr., O26066.
John Buchanan Bond, O26077.
John Russel Fulton Bond, O35986.
Anthony Pierre Bonnaffon, O24608.
James Cecil Bonta, O34731.
Herschel Albert Booth, O36985.
Jack Boswell, O25080.
Luther Billy Botts, O36752.
Henry Cleveland Bowden, Jr., O47536.
William Harvey Boyd, O37205.
Gerald Edward Boyea, O37258.
Richard John Boyer, O37202.
Harry Francis Boyle, O39258.
Joseph Francis Boyle, O26347.
×Thaddeus Aloysius Boyle, O35791.
Kimberly Brabson, O35465.
William Harold Brabson, Jr., O26069.
John Stanley Brady, O26064.
Alfred Anthony Bragolone, O36080.
Ralph Wilson Brake, O35708.
Matthew Douglas Branch, O35799.
Thurman McCord Brandon, O24754.
LeRoy James Brandt, O54518.
Roland Alfred Brandt, O25901.
Roy Edward Branson, O37149.
Harold Matthew Branton, O37345.
Edward Bray, O48259.
Frank Peter Breitenbach, O26365.
Howard E. Bressler, O40967.
James Alexander Brice, O26101.
John Klotz Brier, O26185.
Richard Frost Briggs, O36032.
Robert Lewis Brigham, O37326.
Charles William Bright, O37159.
Heber Cowan Brill, O26162.
Arthur Frederick Brindley, O36504.
Arthur Brinson, O47740.
William Thompson Briscoe, O54688.
Robert Clarence Britt, O54425.
Frank Roy Brockschink, Jr., O47741.
Wade Young Brookreson, O35588.
Engle Redic Brooks, Jr., O34764.
Waldo Walker Brooks, Jr., O54679.
Jewel Richard Browder, O45583.
George Horace Brown, O48840.
Harold William Brown, O47807.
Luther Edward Brown, O27054.
Percy Daniel Brown, Jr., O37255.
Stephen Oliver Brown, O26105.
Lee Byron Brownfield 2d, O36135.
Edward August Browning, O53019.
Newton Francis Browning, O46964.
Fred Roy Brownyard, O35279.
Edward Cooper Bruce, O25404.
Henry Louis Bruley, O35457.
Harold Francis Bryant, O36886.
Robert Edman Bryant, O54484.
Ernest Dale Bryson, O47161.
Earl William Buchanan, O36352.
Russell Bennett Buchanan, Jr., O37291.
Stephen Charles Buchanan, O39182.
Charles Adelbert Buck, O34641.
Vernon Maughan Buehler, O53373.
Kenneth Ecklund Buell, O25772.
Wallace Richard Buelow, O36319.
George Gordon Bugg, O26175.
Daniel Sargent Buhler, O47799.
Richard Terry Bull, O53984.
Robert Lee Bullard 3d, O25774.
Jack Pershing Burch, O45948.
Allen Mitchell Burdett, Jr., O26048.
Francis Xavier Burgasser, O37061.
Charles Augustus Burgess, Jr., O53513.
Frank Edwin Burgher, O36180.
Robert Belleau Burlin, O25484.
×Philip Duane Burnes, O34153.
Charles Herbert Burr, Jr., O25758.
Edward Burr 2d, O26009.
Lynn Stewart Burr, O53788.
Robert Emmet Burrows, Jr., O25918.
William Andress Burt, O36940.
Jonathan Rowell Burton, O36198.
Lewis Robert Burton, O34567.
William Henry Buth, O54312.
Ernest Cornish Butler, O35578.
Farley Porter Butler, Sr., O39321.
James Wahl Butler, O54157.
John Lawrence Butler, O40980.
John Locke Butterfield, O26194.
John Francis Buyers, O25862.
Ernest Arthur Buzalski, O25906.
Robert Guy Byrne, O36854.
Laurence George Byrnes, O54163.
Beverly Marcelle Bzdek, O39269.
Jaime Leopoldo Cabassa, O48569.
Ralph Lincoln Cadwallader, O25509.
×Joseph Metcalf Caffall, O37029.
Lee Emir Cage, O24909.
Harold Eugene Cahill, O36331.
×James Webster Cain, O26208.
James Marshall Cake, Jr., O25372.
Henry London Calder, Jr., O34671.
James Alexander Caldwell, O25315.
William Michael Calnan, O26120.
George Morgan Calvert, O36061.
Ross Hamilton Calvert, O47933.
Ernest Vance Cameron, O40876.
Engene Clark Camp, O37072.
Gay Campbell, O35586.
George Thomas Campbell, Jr., O26084.
Joseph Lewis Campbell, O47277.
Robert Boyle Campbell, O33868.
Robert Hansen Campbell, O26074.
Robert Jacob Canfield, O34881.
Austin James Canning, Jr., O26277.
Joseph Morgan Cannon, Jr., O24930.
George Gordon Cantlay, Jr., O25979.
Dayton Francis Caple, O49054.
Edmund James Carberry, O25565.
Robert Ellis Carey, O47519.
Raymond Willard Carraher, O45292.
Benjamin Lafayette Carroll, O37321.
Thomas Moore Carson, O32918.
Hamlet Robinson Carter, Jr., O26134.
William Cowan Carter, O54761.
William Clarence Carter, Jr., O37290.
William Maurice Casart, O35848.
Edgar Lawrence Casey, O36324.
William Prager Cassedy, O25044.
Cecil Hill Cates, Jr., O33600.
James Woodfin Cavender, O46443.
James Harley Cawthra, O36981.
Henry George Challen, O40902.
David Smith Chamberlain, O25871.
John Sherman Chambers, Jr., O25357.
Milton Pierre Champlin, Jr., O37313.
Francis Alexander Chance, Jr., O36784.
James S. Changaris, O25819.
Neil McKay Chapin, O55006.
David Marston Chase, O26212.
James Edward Chase, O47642.
Joseph Vincent Chaufty, O25969.
John Locke Cheney, O24604.
John Stewart Chesebro, O47284.
Michael Chessnoe, O48968.
Ernest Childers, O48416.
Samuel Jack Chilk, O53777.
Paul Chmar, O37640.
James Chrietzberg, Jr., O39129.
Max Stanton Christol, O34343.
James Vincent Christy, O25909.
Alvin McLean Churchwell, O41055.
David Clark Clagett, O24952.
Gerald Harley Clark, O47206.
Howard Laverne Clark, O40928.
James Thomas Clark, O33773.
Lyman Hyde Clark, O37019.
×Robert W. Clark, O26032.
William Kueven Clark, O41001.

Edward Ryan Cleary, O26304.
Louis Xavier Cleary, O54965.
Robert Eugene Cleveland, O36664.
Richard Warren Clifford, O36761.
Charles Lee Cline, O36543.
Gordon Frank Clyde, O47271.
Gerald Gordon Coady, O54223.
Harry Reynolds Coates, O36067.
James Justus Cobb, O25629.
John Hiley Cobb, Jr., O26233.
Earl Junior Cobey, O54909.
Collins Leslie Cochran, O40964.
John Henry Cochran, Jr., O26115.
John Howard Cochran, Jr., O54787.
Walter Bingham Cochran, Jr., O53411.
James Knox Cockrell, Jr., O24805.
John Clinton Cockrill, Jr., O24730.
Howard Beverly Coffman, Jr., O25941.
Caleb Allen Cole, O26171.
Charles Baker Cole, Jr., O39304.
×John Leonard Cole, Jr., O36092.
Fred Allen Coley, O40851.
Edgar Bergman Colladay, Jr., O24968.
John Walter Collins 3d, O26079.
David Baldwin Conard, O25885.
Roger Leon Conarty, O26067.
×Joseph Bartholomew Conmy, Jr., O25645.
George Ignatius Connolly, Jr., O36666.
Eugene Blair Conrad, O34204.
Lewis Ward Conway, O37021.
Benjamin Thomas Cook, O47175.
Charles Henry Cook, O34201.
Charles William Cook, O35737.
George Lester Cook, O35450.
James Harry Cook, Jr., O25296.
×Marshall Avert Cook, O36561.
Robert Morehead Cook, O25690.
Walter Hugh Cook, Jr., O25466.
William Chipps Cool, O54108.
William James Coonly, Jr., O36724.
Jacob Baer Cooperhouse, O24840.
Chester Jules Copmann, Jr., O46636.
William Robert Cory, O36069.
Gerard Vincent Cosgrove, O25683.
Buford James Couch, O52969.
John Allen Coulter, O24454.
Thomas Nugent Courvoisie, O24549.
William Worthington Cover, O26287.
Charles Thomas Cox, O36699.
Emmett Willard Cox, Jr., O37200.
Richard French Cox, O24541.
John Charles Coyne, O46506.
John Edward Craig, O24784.
Charles Leonard Crane, Jr., O26059.
Hal Parsons Crane, Jr., O54794.
Virgil Eugene Craven, O34824.
William Douglas Craven, O53969.
Gerald McAdoo Cravens, O35188.
James Robert Creighton, O36498.
Eugene Stephen Cronin, O39070.
Patrick Martin Cronin, O40786.
Arvid Paul Croonquist, Jr., O25639.
Kenneth William Cross, O35852.
Clyde Clair Crosswhite, O40750.
Horace Johnston Crouch, Jr., O46131.
Robert Emmett Crowe, O47805.
William Samuel Crumlish, O45536.
Belmonte Pasquale Cucolo, O25834.
Daniel Bernard Cullinane, Jr., O26145.
Walter Phillip Cumbie, O54718.
×Donald Haffly Cunningham, O36799.
Hubert Summers Cunningham, O39303.
×Robert Kuhlman Cunningham, O37120.
Donald Arthur Curry, O46211.
James Arthur Curry, Jr., O54865.
Eugene Roland Curtan, O40814.
Paul Joseph Curtin, O26361.
Elbert Raymond Curtis, O36547.
Wesley James Curtis, O25792.
Elliott Carr Cutler, Jr., O24649.
Michael Lowell Czajkowski, O41004.
John Titus Dabinett, O47114.
Chester Edwin Dadisman, O36497.
Leonard Raymond Daems, Jr., O47270.
Howard Miller Dailey, O34702.
Myron Haines Dakin, O25733.
Joseph Wilkerson Dale, Jr., O36144.
Edward Joseph Daley, O36418.
Robert Curtis Dalrymple, O39100.
Robert Douglas Danforth, O26081.
Emile Wright Daniel, Jr., O34871.
Earl Everett Danley, O47136.
Donald Dan Dannenberg, O40798.
James Dennard Danner, O53384.
James Richard Darden, O26142.
×Arthur Robert Datnoff, O35053.
Eugene Bernard Datres, O35166.
Robert James Davenport, O26089.
Paul Ward Davidson, O54119.
Shirley Davidson, O37122.
×George Alfred Davies, O41010.
John Myrddin Davies 3d, O25010.
×Claiborne Watkins Davis, Jr., O37001.
Ernest Homer Davis, O34740.
Mike Bedwell Davis, O26188.
Paul Alonzo Davis, Jr., O36887.
Paul Wood Davis, O36375.
Robert LeVerne Davis, O25661.
Young Joel Davis, O47572.
Frederic Ellis Davison, O45682.
William H. Deadwyler, Jr., O36298.
James Franklin Deatherage, O25892.
John Quentin Deaver, O54765.
Duane Leonard DeBow, O40970.
William Paul DeBrocke, O25986.
John Taylor deCamp, Jr., O26040.
William Cleveland Deekle, Jr., O26310.
Joseph Ignatius Degiovanni, O36866.
Vernon Elsworth Dehner, O37147.
Donald James Delaney, O34852.
William Fay Dellinger, Jr., O53658.
Roger Arthur Del Zoppo, O39243.
Robert Henry Dempsey, O55030.
Russell Burnham Denham, O53714.
Richard Francis Dennison, O34040.
Robert Cushing Dennison, Jr., O49010.
Robert Werner Des Jarlais, O47377.
Henry George Dettmar, O37117.
Ralph William Deuster, O27002.
Thomas Diamantes, O35694.
Robert Leon Dickenson, O53199.
Charles Wendell Dickinson, O26033.
Jean Howard Dickson, O36606.
Allan Grant Dingwall, Jr., O37249.
Francis John Dirkes, O25887.
×Eugene Alexander Doerfler, O37211.
Sam Frank Doering, O53058.
Edmund John Dollard, O47369.
Franklyn William Donahue, O41071.
George Peter Donaldson, Jr., O54609.
Thomas Quinton Donaldson 4th, O25480.
Ross Isaac Donnelly, O36533.
Charles Woodrow Donovan, O36500.
Edward Allen Doran, O25782.
Charles Henry Dornacker, O36370.
Richard Wesley Dowell, O39225.
William Victor Downer, Jr., O24331.
Pierce Anthony Doyle, Jr., O24891.
William Thornton Dozier, O48008.
×Harry Vaughan Drinkard, O40898.
Vernon Burge Drum, O39318.
Donald Leo Ducey, O35811.
Robert Lawrance Dudley, O33746.
David Arthur Duffy, O34662
Jack Willis Duffy, O37349.
Robert Calhoun Duke, O36697.
Thomas Arthur Duke, Jr., O37062.
James Edward Dunn, O36137.
Henry Vaughan Dunstan, O40953.
Harold Halsey Dunwoody, O26197.
×Roy Calvin Durbon, O37219.
Elton Woodrow Duren, O35087.
Clifton Otis Duty, O35981.
Clifford Perry Duvall, O39270.
Robert Daspit Dwan, O26052.
John Leopold Dworak, O25757.
Harold Howard Dyke, Jr., O53334.
William Clarence Dysinger, O54976.
George Eager, Jr., O36766.
Clyde Tener Earnest, O25923.
Warren Conrade Eastham, O37025.
Joseph Harry Eastmead, O26297.
Henry John Ebrey, Jr., O25627.
×Kenneth Russel Eckert, O39196.
George Gage Eddy, Jr., O54991.
×William Custer Edler, O33725.
James Mason Edmunds, O35174.
Bethell Edrington, Jr., O26329.
Walter John Eisler, O36919.
Thomas McGahey Elgin, O26090.
James Burton Ellingsworth, Jr., O47793.
Howard Deane Elliott, O25445.
Mayo Jack Elliott, O26179.
Albert Murray Ellis, O26352.
Arthur Phelps Ellis, Jr., O36150.
Clarence Heyward Ellis, Jr., O34762.
Rodney Charles Ellis, O34872.
William Henry Napier Ellis, O53993.
×John Ashton Ely, O24807.
George William Erdman, O37350.
Russell Wilbur Ernst, O37256.
Jasper Newton Erskine, O36768.
John Willard Ervin, O39216.
Thomas William Essen, O25974.
Edward Jack Evans, O37374.
Frank Joseph Evans, O53630.
Gerald Wayne Evans, O46758.
Thomas Horace Evans, Jr., O39179.
William Ewald, O36949.
William Daniel Falck, O25293.
Reginald King Fansler, O40608.
Clare Francis Farley, O25915.
Jack Howard Farley, O53839.
Frank Arnold Farnsworth, O37216.
Brock Hiram Faulkner, O45844.
Edmond Lawrence Faust, Jr., O25450.
Lawrence William Fawcett, O45319.
Vincent Felix Fazio, O46947.
Robert Henry Fechtman, O46262.
Allen Ellsworth Ferguson, O45765.
Charles Marshall Fergusson, Jr., O24709.
Robert Morrison Ferrell, O53808.
Allan Barton Ferry, O35253.
Harold Irving Fiedler, O36177.
Kenneth Stanley Field, O36932.
Richard Stockton Field, Jr., O25012.
Jesse Willard Fielder, O33842.
Vernon Files, O37086.
Harold Crum Finlayson, O41028.
Perry Seale Finney, Jr., O48263.
Harold Sidney Fischgrund, O37183.
Rue Dana Fish, Jr., O46559.
Jesse LeRoy Fishback, O25858.
Archibald Donald Fisken, Jr., O24868.
Robert Emil Fiss, O25511.
George Woodrow Flager, O53081.
John Joseph Flanagan, O47734.
Thomas Walsh Flatley, O25638.
Raymond Edward Fleig, O47197.
Vernon Gail Fleury, O48249.
James Harrison Flint, O53525.
Robert Presley Flint, O40921.
Charles David Folsom, O45951.
Rudolf Herman Folts, O40784.
×Wilfred Craig Ford, O25005.
Russ Charles Foss, O46767.
Randolph Vaughan Foster, O45728.
Robert William Foster, Jr., O25360.
Clifton Clisto Fox, O47142.
George Ferry Fox, O36234.
Ogden Randolph Fox, O47943.
James Joseph Fragala, O40583.
Charles Samuel Fraleigh, Jr., O36862.
Ernest Harris Francis, O40758.
×Louis Sterling Francisco, O26280.
Fred James Frank, O54078.
Gustav Henry Franke, Jr., O52959.
Leonard S Frankenstein, O54172.
Victor Arnold Franklin, O25658.
Bruce Howard Fraser, O37276.
Joseph Jerome Fraser, Jr., O53292.
Walter Gordon Frauenheim, Jr., O48978.
Frank Walter Frazier, O37085.
Floyd Frederick, O36243.
Edgar Jesse Fredericks, O26302.
John Leonard Fredericks, O47721.
Graydon Francis Fredrikson, O35700.
Arthur Leslie Freer, O25451.
James Edward Freestone, O36937.
Jack Smith French, O48380.
Billy Elmer Fritts, O39276.
John Edward Fritz, O25021.
William Hayes Fritz, O25620.
Robert Joseph Fromme, O39246.
Ernest Michael Fry, O48666.
Charles Robert Fulbruge, O34190.
Ellis LeRoy Fuller, O37366.
Hiram Garrett Fuller, O25936.
John Milton Fulmer, O47846.
Richard Proctor Fulmer, O39130.
William Bennison Fulton, O25385.
Thomas Patrick Furey, O24876.
Walter Edward Gaby, Jr., O34656.
Robert Galbreath Gadd, O26303.
John Mac Galbraith, Jr., O33957.
Ralph Vincent Gardner, O33236.

George Howell Garnhart, O25267.
Melvin Garten, O48990.
Wayne John Gaynor, Jr., O35222.
Kirby Alexander Gean, O25588.
Edward Joseph Geaney, Jr., O26328.
William Robert Geelan, O40963.
Billy Burris Geery, O34877.
Frederick Richard Gehring, O36462.
Edward Harry Geiger, O46621.
Charles Curtis George, O24770.
Wilmah Melvin Getchell, O40737.
Edward Franklin Gibb, Jr., O45769.
Murray Francis Gibbons, Jr., O54398.
Wells Herbert Gibbs, O34661.
Raymond Francis Gibney, O36068.
James McKinley Gibson, O48730.
John Stewart Gibson, O53145.
Thomas Alvin Gibson, Jr., O35478.
Stewart Shepherd Giffin, Jr., O26342.
Harold Napoleon Gilbert, Jr., O37307.
Stanley Keith Gilbert, O47926.
Warren Ambrose Giles, O37874.
Harold Warren Gingrich, O26076.
Arthur Junior Glasebrook, O45192.
William Mitchel Glasgow, Jr., O25905.
James Keith Glendening, O26176.
John Russell Glick, O48877.
Solomon Platt Glickson, O54079.
Roy Glisson, Jr., O37078.
Edgar Nicholas Glotzbach, O27011.
Garland Denzil Godby, O36189.
Norman Alexander Godwin, O46291.
Robert Goggans, O49051.
Roland Lee Gohmert, O35402.
Mitchel Goldenthal, O25482.
John Garth Goodlett, Jr., O54600.
Glenn Winfield Goodman, O54171.
Jess Lewis Goodman, O47795.
×Frederick Churchill Goodwin, O34335.
James William Goodwin, Jr., O53694.
William Duke Gooley, O53743.
Herschell Gaines Gordon, O46942.
James Louis Gordon, O39213.
Preston O. Gordon, O35828.
Stephen Ellison Gordy, O26125.
Vincent Joseph Gorman, O41019.
Henry Martin Gossett, O36941.
Richard Eburn Gottliebsen, O48309.
George Henry Gould, O55058.
Arthur Beardsley Grace, Jr., O25498.
Ronan Calistus Grady, Jr., O25985.
Ralph Wayne Graham, O45995.
×Andrew Robert Grant, O25045.
Francis Alfred Grant, O40643.
Jonathan Masten Grant, O36083.
Joseph Hamilton Grant, Jr., O25384.
Belfrad Hampton Gray, Jr., O33666.
Thomas Edward Gray, O47851.
George Eugene Green, O40983.
James Franklin Greene, Jr., O25900.
Dale Robert Greenlief, O36476.
William James Greenwalt, O25998.
Robert John Greiner, O54034.
×Raymond Charles Greis, O33880.
Thorpe Coalson Grice, O26326.
Wilson Albert Griesbeck, O40604.
Thomas Everett Griess, O25533.
Bobbie Allen Griffin, O25908.
Jack David Griffiths, O36376.
William Lawrence Grimes, O35598.
Henry Frederick Grimm, Jr., O25519.
Thomas Cecil Grissom, Jr., O46263.
Kenneth George Groom, O54786.
Bernard Grossman, O41018.
Nicholas John Grunzweig, O47845.
Joffre Louis Gueymard, O46963.
Thomas Francis Guidera, O47165.
Arthur Wellesley Hackwood, Jr., O36109.
William Reed Hahn, O25566.
Robert Wesley Hakala, O48852.
Wendell Eli Hakala, O53672.
×William Calleson Hale, O36124.
Norman Ray Haley, O36911.
Alphus Waldo Hall, O54490.
Chester Allen Hall, Jr., O48018.
Claude Harrison Hall, O47794.
Frederick Walker Hall, O47574.
Harold Moore Hall, O47123.
Richard Reid Hallock, O37367.
Archelaus Lewis Hamblen, Jr., O26187.
Harry Bulkley Hambleton, Jr., O40670.
James Maurice Hamblin, O25127.
George Felix Hamel, O46167.
Stuart Adams Hamilton, Jr., O36152.
William Mason Hamilton, O53618.
Robert Webster Hamlin, O54941.
Rex Herbert Hampton, O47211.
Charles Wesley Hanchey, O36889.
Daniel Ward Hancock, O35281.
Robert Hand, O36415.
×George Edward Handley, Jr., O37294.
Thomas Joseph Hanifen, O40926.
Grat Bandy Hankins, O35257.
Loyd George Hanna, O35843.
×Leslie Buckingham Harding, O25512.
Leslie Boone Hardy, O26003.
Lorne T. Hargis, O53866.
John Husband Harkins, O33724.
×Edwin Freeland Harlan, O25343.
Joseph Fable Harps, O53692.
William Francis Harrigan, O36438.
Elva Harris, O36714.
James Holford Harrison, O46389.
John Franklin Harth, O36997.
Ben Harvey, Jr., O40688.
William Alex Hash, O36625.
William Langhorne Hastie, O54089.
Robert Fleming Hatch, O54234.
Robert Preston Hatcher, Jr., O53259.
William Timothy Hatter, O24468.
Richard Earl Haughton, O36868.
Walace Euel Hawkins, O40969.
Frank Hawthorne, Jr., O54194.
Roy Arthur Hayden, O46991.
Leo Victor Hayes, O26213.
×Robert Lester Hayes, O41016.
Thomas Franklin Hayes, O34738.
Charles Edward Hazel, O39260.
Harold Sears Head, O26272.
John Dennis Healy, Jr., O25715.
Richard David Healy, O36033.
John Wilkinson Heard, O24953.
Warren Robert Hecker, O26292.
Gerard Heimer, O33907.
Kenneth Richardson Helms, O37023.
×Llewellyn Sherwood Heisley, O36900.
Charles Lester Heltzel, O25746.
Harold Bailor Henderly, O36065.
Chester Thomas Henderson, O39274.
Tony Sinclair Henderson, O39279.
Jack James Henley, O33959.
Charles Arthur Henne, O46253.
Albert Clifford Henry, O34497.
Gregg Henry, O25574.
William Ernest Hensel, O25531.
Philip Brown Henshaw, Jr., O34856.
Emery Madison Hensley, O35720.
Ira Clifton Henson, Jr., O36423.
John William Herold, O36548.
Fred Willard Herres, Jr., O25996.
Harry Leo Herres, O41049.
Charles Goldsborough Hershey, Jr., O37364.
Jack McKinley Hertzog, O40856.
Richard Frank Heske, O35641.
James William Hevener, O37121.
Charles Robert Hiatt, O37099.
Charles Taylor Hickman, Jr., O47943.
David Hickman, O33986.
Joseph Criswell Hiett, O34657.
Hugh Richard Higgins, O36183.
James Leonard Higgins, O36306.
Joseph Peter Higgins, O48665.
Norman Hilditch, O40617.
Benjamin Ira Hill, O24791.
Charles Russell Hill, O24940.
David Arthur Hill, Jr., O54124.
Harry Green Hill, O34106.
Ralph Julian Hill, O26127.
Roger Hilsman, Jr., O25899.
Frederick Morris Irving Hjertberg, O37266.
Charles Edwin Hoagland, O34645.
Alfred Paul Hobrecht, O34968.
Michael Frederick Hochella, O36480.
John Hodges, O34353.
Ralph Warren Hoffman, O36786.
Ralph Mills Hofmann, O25495.
James Henry Hogan, O37144.
Charles Kenneth Hokenson, O35615.
William Lewis Holcomb, O53160.
Leonard Donald Holder, O37267.
William Euless Holland, Jr., O48873.
Jean Wilson Hollstein, O35559.
Jefferson Thomas Holman, O36987.
Henry Benjamin Holmes 3d, O25348.
Robert Milton Holmes, O26110.
John Broadus Holt, Jr., O48996.
Burton Francis Hood, Jr., O25729.
Herman Peter Hoplin, O36975.
Richard Carter Horne 3d, O40863.
Paul Nelson Horton, O36254.
Charles Edward Howard, O39153.
Herbert Henry Howard, O46959.
Robert Curtis Howard, O53368.
DeWitt Clinton Howell, O45937.
Maurice Wilbur Howell, O35883.
Samuel Withers Howell, Jr., O24989.
Edward Brandes Hrdlicka, O33985.
Enrique Jerald Hubert, O36518.
Terence William Huck, O36513.
Harlow Maxwell Huckabee, O47121.
James McClain Huddleston, O25554.
Lloyd Gordon Huggins, O36139.
Algin James Hughes, O25630.
Clyde Edward Hughes, O48881.
John Patrick-Michael Hughes, O47232.
×Paul Ancil Hughes, O37157.
Thomas Kleberg Hughes, O24449.
William Robert Hughes, O24802.
Charles Van-Buren Humphrey, O40945.
John Osborne Hunnicutt, Jr., O36380.
George Thomas Hunt, O36777.
Herman Turner Hunt, Jr., O26053.
William Patrick Hunt, Jr., O26192.
William Lew Hunter, O49016.
Frederick Joseph Hurley, O46434.
Walter James Hutchin, O25916.
Robert Cliff Hutchinson, Jr., O53429.
Mortimer James Hutchison, O34727.
Russell James Hutchison, O52921.
John Francis Hyde, O36905.
Archie Richard Hyle, O37271.
Charles Sutherland Hymers, O48228.
Paul Thomas Ingle, O37329.
Glenn Paul Ingwersen, O25993.
Lloyd Joshua Inman, O36274.
Charles Joseph Ippolito, O37208.
Pierce Butler Irby, Jr., O34282.
Thornton Ennells Ireland, O37325.
Richard Irvin, Jr., O25118.
John Hamilton Irving, Jr., O27004.
Alvin Curtely Isaacs, O48816.
George Drexel Ish, O36102.
Alvis Emmit Isner, O46626.
Gabriel Alexander Ivan, O25865.
Burwell Bright Jackson, O34840.
Gordon Everett Jackson, O46950.
Harry Ross Jackson, O53997.
Joseph James Jackson, O39235.
Kenneth Eugene Jackson, O36349.
Page Spencer Jackson, O26042.
Robert Lee Jackson, Jr., O53104.
Donald Joseph Jalbert, O26309.
×Walker Jamar, Jr., O25864.
Lee Boyer James, O25619.
Stanley Livingston James, Jr., O25833.
Neal Fontaine Janousek, O36127.
Clarence Edwin Jeffress, O25255.
John Harrison Jeffries, O36427.
Arthur Haddon Jemmott, Jr., O37043.
James Raymond Jenkins, O35054.
Samuel Wright Jenkins, O26199.
Raymond Jasper Jennings, O34120.
Melvin Merlin Jensen, O45771.
Roland Harry Jensen, O53300.
Benjamin Edwin Johnson, Jr., O40646.
×Donald Lesley Johnson, O35636.
Earle Albie Johnson, Jr., O26211.
Fredric Eskil Johnson, O35885.
Hugh Woodrow Johnson, O33873.
James Morgan Johnson, O54002.
John Frank Johnson, O25538.
Leonard Louis Johnson, O35441.
Thomas Matkins Johnston, O25942.
William Russell Johnston, O47363.
Alan Walter Jones, Jr., O25868.
Charles Albert Jones, Jr., O24533.
Charles Myers Jones, Jr., O25890.
Dearl Forest Jones, O48423.
Frank Williams Jones, Jr., O26178.
Harry Lee Jones, Jr., O48397.
Kenneth Miley Jones, O40829.
Lee Glasier Jones, O24757.
×Lloyd Edmonstone Jones, Jr., O25396.
Ralph Kilbreth Jones, O26123.

Russell Gene Jones, O37213.
William Mallory Jones, O37209.
Wyly King Jones, O46743.
Edward Eugene Jordan, O54028.
Stanton Wayne Josephson, O24745.
Archie Bewing Joyner, Jr., O54001.
Edgar Russell Kadel, Jr., O35801.
Francis Casimir Kajencki, O25582.
×Edwin Cyril Kalina, O33604.
Ronald Augustine Kapp, O37070.
Howard Lyon Karnes, O36515.
Samuel Nairn Karrick, Jr., O25446.
Charles Lee Kasler, O34599.
Harold Wesley Kasserman, O48070.
Robert Clark Kates, O24787.
Sidney Katz, O26327.
Eldeen Henry Kauffman, O39257.
Paul Roy Kaufmann, O36377.
William Joseph Keating, O36503.
Jerry Vincent Keaveny, O53772.
Leonard Leslie Keene, Jr., O36529.
Thomas Edwin Kelley, O37155.
Dimitri Alexander Kellogg, O25433.
John Joseph Kelly, Jr., O25869.
Randall Kelly, O47876.
Herbert Eugene Kemp, O25742.
Maurice Wesley Kendall, O27003.
Lansford Franklin Kengle, Jr., O25975.
Arthur Hobbs Kennedy, O39300.
Clarence Newton Kennedy, O53230.
Paul Richard Kennedy, O35563.
Richard Thomas Kennedy, O48390.
Stanley Young Kennedy, Jr., O37179.
William Michael Kennedy, O36640.
William Thomas Keogh, O33742.
James LeRoy Keown, O36528.
Gerald Lee Kerr, Jr., O41033.
James Wilson Kerr 3d, O25417.
Herbert Lee Key, Jr., O54858.
William Theodore Kidd, O48216.
James Donald Kidder, O26227.
Morton William Kimball, O47178.
Glennis Lamar King, O33661.
James Bacon King, O46196.
William Werner KinKead, O40838.
Ralph Kinnes, O36800.
Howard Dreher Kinney, Jr., O34697.
Alfred William Kirchner, O36559.
Leonard Monroe Kirk, O36130.
Richard Varick Kissam, Jr., O36339.
Darwin Jack Kitch, O25748.
William Spedden Kittrell, O49082.
×Donald Aloyse Klein, O36668.
Louis John Klekas, O54888.
William Rudolph Arthur Kleysteuber, O53062.
Harry Keating Klie, O47792.
Sidney Alvin Knutson, O36199.
Bruce Carlton Koch, O25947.
William Adam Koenig, Jr., O40906.
Conrad Epping Koerper, Jr., O25500.
Joseph Wilson Kohnstamm, O40645.
James Talbot Kolb, O47708.
Armand Michael Kolesar, O36783.
John Bernard Kopf, O40812.
Irving Koss, O40685.
Robert Theodore Kranc, O36667.
Edward Anthony Kreml, O26283.
Harold Robert Kressin, O45387.
Mervin Krieger, O49000.
Herbert William Krueger, O39207.
Richard Oscar Kruger, O36575.
John Erwin Kuffner, O25602.
J. W. Kuykendall, Jr., O35836.
Jack Verne LaBounty, O34422.
Charles Emil La Chaussee, O37164.
Arthur Joseph Lacouture, Jr., O26240.
Thomas Michael La Patka, O36646.
Gerard Joseph Ladner, O37143.
Paul Glenn Laird, O45698.
Jack Francis Lake, O34391.
Eugene Manuel Landrum, Jr., O55032.
William Joseph Lanen, O36907.
Lawrence Quentin Langland, O39238.
Charles Francis Langley, O40834.
Warren Granville Langley, O55029.
James Douglas Langstaff, Jr., O26314.
Alex Thomas Langston, Jr., O55069.
Royce Parry Larned, O55108.
William Edmund Larned, Jr., O25636.
Gerald Ewald Larsen, O36893.
Virgil Venable Laughlin, O41059.
James Herbert Leach, O48718.
Ross Eugene Leach, O54970.
Charles Scott Leavitt, O40830.
Oscar William Lee, Jr., O36670.
Henry Emile LeFebvre, O36358.
Albert Francis Leister, Jr., O36201.
Richard Martin Leonard, O53957.
Armand Rosairo Levasseur, O47280.
William Baldwin Levin, O53865.
Charles Andrew Lewis, O53421.
Herbert Suddath Lewis, O25734.
Hollis Clinton Lewis, O25205.
Norman Francis Lewis, Jr., O48701.
Morgan Cornwell Light, O36773.
Morris Louree Lindsey, O40935.
William James Lingan, O48851.
Frederick Alvin Lingner, O36387.
William Clyde Linton, Jr., O26140.
Ralph Edward Lipscomb, O36409.
Augustine Brabson Littleton, O46066.
John Russell Lloyd, Jr., O26298.
Wilmer Rufus Lochrie, O36936.
Thomas William Locke, O53105.
William Lindsey Lockett, O36708.
×Richard Jose Lombard, O33904.
Harry Longerich, O53791.
Horace Christopher Lorck, O36359.
Nicholas Akin Lord, O46045.
Steven Wayne Losten, O48412.
James Norris Lothrop, Jr., O26057.
Jack Patrick Loughman, O26282.
Joseph Patrick Loughran, O37167.
Richard Meredith Lovelace, O39079.
Herbert Ramsey Lovell, O39253.
Elward Wiley Lowe, O54717.
Henry Augustus Lowe, O34748.
Horace Alvin Lowe, Jr., O36857.
John Porter Lucas, Jr., O26159.
Alphonse Francis Lucier, Jr., O34832.
William John Lueck, Jr., O36716.
William Luk, O40642.
Howard Ivan Lukens, O53619.
Claude Cleo Lumpkin, Jr., O24941.
George Bradley Lundberg, O25679.
Maurice Williams Lundelius, O54864.
×Irvin Merl Lundy, O41000.
Edwin Martyn Lutz, O36755.
George Arthur Lutz, O37296.
William David Lutz, O26018.
Robert Lee Lybarger, O47360.
Joseph Patrick Lydon, O33853.
James William Lyle, O35484.
William John Lynch, O53175.
David Reed Lyon, O53594.
James Rholon Lytle, O48021.
Ned Bowen Mabry, O53148.
John Erie MacArthur, O40885.
Augustine Gregory MacDonald, O36989.
William Gordon MacFarlane, O36948.
Lawrence Prince Mac Queen, O35614.
Francis John Madden, O46258.
Wallace Clifton Magathan, Jr., O25861.
James John Mahan, Jr., O48988.
Thomas Bradford Mahone, Jr., O46521.
George Cunningham Major, O46041.
Barton James Mallory, O25764.
William Francis Malone, O26044.
Martin Jack Manhoff, O24538.
Sabatine Robert Marconi, O36128.
Sidney Michael Marks, O36977.
William Leon Marks, O39275.
×James Robert Marland, O39145.
John Marrero, O54297.
Clyde John Martak, O54719.
Allen Clinton Martin, O34231.
James Frederic Martin, O47908.
L. D. Kirkwood Martin, O37177.
Lawrence Emanuel Martin, Jr., O47622.
Harry Hudson Marts, O37186.
Robert Christopher Masenga, O54101.
Hale Mason, Jr., O25345.
James Horace Massingill, O34274.
×Joseph Theodore Materi, O24330.
Robert Edward Mathe, O25878.
Lawrence Glenn Mathews, O25402.
Milton Alexander Matthews, O56906.
Robert Arthur Matthews, O46599.
Robert Hamilton Mattox, Jr., O26316.
David Darwin May, O24946.
Marion Hopkins May, O25576.
Rene Emile Maysonave, O45650.
Reno Augustus Mazzucchi, O36208.
William Stein McArtor, O47849.
Jack Albert McAuley, O36706.
Robert Benjamin McBane, O48890.
Robert Bruce McBride 3d, O37277.
Edward Francis McCabe, O25926.
John Terrence McCabe, O37126.
Ray Nolan McCall, O37381.
Robert Louis McCanna, O26047.
Max Reynolds McCarthy, O36249.
Paul Norton McCarthy, O33648.
John Edward McCarty, Jr., O48713.
Stuart McCash, O36824.
Mack Junior McCaughey, O36196.
Robert Hugh McCauley, O36756.
Ralph Edward McClain, O36661.
Paul Jones McClure, Jr., O35640.
Richard McClure, O35064.
John Douglas McCormick, O36236.
×Richard Locke McCoy, O36950.
Robert Gerald McCoy, O41003.
Raymond John McCrory, Jr., O37146.
Louis Phillip McCuller, O34636.
Roy Marsh McCutchen, Jr., O54575.
William John McDermott, Jr., O48180.
Charles Taylor McDowell, O37309.
Robert Bruce McDowell, O25980.
Frank Dixon McElwee, O25409.
James Doyle McFarland, O53149.
Wallace Beman McFarland, O48721.
Dale Fletcher McGee, Jr., O26253.
Norris Dale McGinnis, O37232.
×John Daniel McGowan, O25759.
William John McGuigan, O36993.
Paul Melville McGuire, O35705.
Donald Joseph McGurk, O48078.
John Joseph McKenna, O33704.
William Hill McKenzie 3d, O25929.
Hugh Lee McKinney, O36986.
Howard McMillen McLain, O54984.
Charles Michael McLaughlin, Jr., O37128.
George Pilcher McLendon, O37133.
Bill Gene McLeod, O36374.
Charles Alexander McLeod, O27047.
Eldon Lowell McLeod, O35688.
Jack Emmet McMahan, O37300.
Vincent Joseph McManus, O36334.
William Cowie McMillan, O54971.
Gail Borden McMurtrey, O46748.
Donald Carl McNair, O33791.
Harry McNamara, Jr., O35795.
John Gilmore McNamara, O25677.
Quentin Lowry McNary, A37212.
William Daniels Meara, O35823.
Walter Erwin Mehlinger, O36149.
Donald John Mehrtens, O25877.
Arthur Clayton Meier, O35560.
Clarence Richard Meltesen, O40616.
Earle Cooper Merkl, O53306.
Thomas Leslie Merrick, O37132.
Spurgeon Arthur Messner, O53753.
Albert Caswell Metts, Jr., O26091.
Charles Thomas Mewshaw, O40832.
Richard Hemmig Meyer, O25872.
Franklyn Jack Michaelson, O48532.
Anthony John Miketinac, O45671.
Arthur Woldemar Milberg, O35842.
Earl Beckwith Milburn, O48727.
Richard Cutler Miles, O24939.
William Maynadier Miley, Jr., O37077.
James Cleveland Miller, Jr., O25961.
Millard Joseph Miller, O47804.
Ralph Ben Miller, O37302.
Robert Earl Miller, O54264.
Robert Ernest Miller, O37356.
Winthrop Grant Miller, O45957.
Felix George Millhouse, O36609.
Jack Augustus Milligan, O54586.
William Seth Milliken, O41017.
Charles William Milmore, O26045.
Ronald Augustus Milton, O54957.
Howard Gray Minch, O34945.
Rex David Minckler, O25581.
Roscoe Thomas Minson, O34568.
Gene Lewis Mitcham, O33622
Henry Gaston Mitchel 3d, O24461.
Arthur Frank Mitchell, O36489.
John Riley Mitchell, O25665.
Joseph Al Mitchell, Jr., O48753.
Joseph Wyatt Mitchell, Jr., O36351.
Walter George Mitchell, Jr., O26075.
Michael Peter Mitro, O54862.

Charles Malcom Mizell, O24728.
George Robert Moe, O26022.
Joseph Alexander Moneyhun, O48065.
Melvin Candee Monroe, O34552.
Percy Alpha Monty, O53945.
Clayton Henry Moore, Jr., O48625.
Clayton Homer Moore, Jr., O35178.
Howard Everett Moore, O25816.
Robert Daniel Moore, O36329.
Robert Franklin Moore, O36304.
Roy Moore, Jr., O37063.
Thomas Nall Moore, O37295.
John Moran, O53964.
Henry Grady Morgan, Jr., O26305.
Reuben Thomas Morgan, O36154.
William Harold Morgan, O24660.
Harry Clair Morley, O37341.
Jack Wirt Morris, O45540.
John Woodland Morris, O25992.
Woodford Tanner Moseley, O35858.
James Russell Moses, O41035.
John George Moses, Jr., O25528.
John Wills Moses, O26170.
Vaughn Roberts Moss, O34144.
Roule Cole Mozingo, O26274.
William Mulheron, Jr., O47285.
James John Mullen, O36191.
Tracy Ellsworth Mulligan, Jr., O54309.
David Francis Mulliken, O34948.
Frank Ainsworth Mulroney, O35833.
William Hudson Mundhenk, O36155.
Charles Patrick Murray, Jr., O41057.
Edward Henry Murray, O25730.
Jack Henry Murray, Jr., O35974.
Paul Murray, Jr., O36982.
Hampden Joseph Murrell, O53641.
Albert Farley Myers, O35239.
Frederick William Myers, Jr., O54959.
William Robert Myers, O25513.
Woodrow Horace Myers, O53888.
Grover Elwin Nash, Jr., O36182.
James Herschell Nash, O26153.
Holady Cornelius Neafus, Jr., O54544.
William Douaire Neale, O25755.
William Robert Nealson, O34407.
William George Nechanicky, O33910.
Walter Francis Nechey, O47231.
Christopher Columbus Needham, Jr., O37261.
William Warren Neely, O24332.
R. Wilson Neff, O53439.
Dennis William Neill, O46137.
Harold Alexander Neill, O26271.
Carlton Nelson, O47373.
Oliver Wesley Nelson, O37084.
Donald Maxwell Nethery, O54988.
Joseph Edward Nett, O25804.
Robert Burton Nett, O41070.
William Cornelius Neubauer, O35572.
×James Denton Neumann, O35956.
Robert Harvey Newberry, O39232.
×Gilbert Ubertas Newby, O40858.
George Newlands, O40606.
George Edward Newman, O26015.
George Woodrow Nichols, O54033.
John Sherman Nickell, O35794.
Edward Louis Nielsen, O40868.
William Hoskins Niland, O45456.
Richard Hobart Niles, O35853.
Victor Merle Nixon, O47617.
Lloyd Elmer Nobles, O36865.
Marvin Charles Otto Nolte, O36763.
John Jacob Norris, O25713.
Thadeus Pierce Northcutt, O40677.
Allen Hale Nottingham, O36157.
Jack Graham Null, O36202.
Walter Edwin Nygard, O25669.
Joseph Francis O'Connor, O36411.
Joseph Patrick O'Connor, Jr., O40648.
William Schwab O'Connor, O54316.
James Jerome O'Donnell, O47982.
Warren Martin O'Gara, O34616.
John Thomas O'Halloran, O55106.
John Thomas O'Hea, O35486.
Arthur Arvid Olson, O36174.
John Francis O'Malley, O46050.
Beverly Foreman O'Neal, Jr., O46929.
John Sergeant Oppenhimer, O36490.
Donald Charles O'Rourke, O36611.
Richard Cameron Orphan, O26039.
Uriah Newton Orr, O53877.
Francis James Orsi, O36238.
Michael Noel O'Sullivan, O37162.
Allen Monroe Otis, O24990.
Edward Stanley Ott, Jr., O25860.
Edwin Bradstreet Owen, O47079.
Cecil Wray Page, Jr., O25723.
Eugene William Palm, O35643.
Wallace Davidson Pardue, O36413.
Harold Robert Parfitt, O25914.
Douglas Francis Parham, O26226.
Lester Leonidas Parker, O36638.
Nicholson Parker, O26193.
Reuben Dale Parker, O47214.
Charles Patrick Parrish, O53233.
Merlin Harry Parson, O36084.
Melvin James Pasta, O36713.
Fred Patterson, O35446.
James Albert Patterson, O36549.
×Richard Irving Paul, O36814.
Pete Daniel Pavick, O25699.
Laurent Dupre Pavy, O26088.
Irving Philip Payne, O53878.
Otho Clair Payne, O54764.
Howard Wallace Peak, O47981.
William Oliver Peak 3d, O26025.
Helge Enock Pearson, O45958.
Robert McNeely Peden, O25798.
Russell Cone Peeples, Jr., O36558.
Norman Erland Pehrson, O25912.
James Naduro Peixotto, O47628.
Victor Bryan Penuel, Jr., O48015.
Del Sullivan Perkins, O26016.
Robert Laurence Perley, O46454.
Arthur Gordon Perry, O52985.
Benjamin Ernest Perry, O37328.
Emanuel Paul Peters, O41006.
Gustov William Peters, O35421.
Kenneth Arthur Peters, O47220.
Ralph Douglas Peters, O46228.
Eugene Iver Peterson, O36085.
Peter Rust Peterson, Jr., O47806.
Glen Earl Petrie, O36827.
Morris Winham Pettit, O34100.
Gustave Adolph Peyer, Jr., O37207.
Joseph Warren Pezdirtz, O36779.
Joseph Morris Pfeffer, O34836.
×Phil Roy Phelps, Jr., O26251.
Henry Gerard Phillips, O36383.
James Walter Phillips, O26236.
Steve Franklin Phillips, Jr., O36624.
William Joseph Phillips, O46987.
Wayne Fredrick Pickell, O46670.
Milton Keith Pigg, O26004.
×Edwin Graham Pike, O40720.
Samuel Williams Pinnell, O25880.
Carl Eugene Pister, O53390.
Conrad Ben Pitcher, O36642.
Charles Hall Pitney, O47798.
Thomas Bentley Pitts, O53951.
James C. Pleasant, O36059.
Robert Peter Pleitz, O53378.
Robert Ernest Plett, O25924.
Frank Plichta, O40884.
Hubbard Thomas Plunkett, Jr., O36991.
Francis Joseph Popovich, O40803.
Clark Wesley Porter, O46162.
Donald Franklin Powell, O25762.
Herb Duane Prather, O36258.
James Martin Pratt, O25135.
Charles Victor Pregaldin, Jr., O34425.
Vernon Franklin Pressentin, O35391.
Altus Emory Prince, O25714.
×Harry Hall Pritchett, Jr., O25705.
Fred Beaver Proctor, O25990.
Lamar McFadden Prosser, O36317.
George Jackson Pruett, O37054.
Lloyd Otho Pruett, O39309.
George Shipley Prugh, Jr., O54092.
Charles De Puckett, O26210.
Frank Best Puckett, O48137.
×William Earnest Pulos, O26225.
William Gus Pursley, O46780.
George David Putnam, O36328.
Ray Buryl Quinn, O36604.
John Carpenter Raaen, Jr., O25486.
Robert James Rader, O25676.
Vernon Charles Ramberg, O53063.
Robert Hoagland Ramsay, O35494.
Arthur James Ramsel, O35616.
Thomas Edward Ramsey, O25716.
Arthur Henry Rasper, Jr., O26121.
Stanley Carle Raub, O36209.
Ernest Charles Raulin, Jr., O25793.
Robert Maurice Rawls, O24675.
Roger Ray, O26035.
William Johnson Ray, O26139.
Ellis Avery Ream, O36165.
Gerald Vernon Reberry, O37359.
Thomas Lester Redd, Jr., O35508.
Charles Sumner Reed, Jr., O25944.
John Palmer Reed, O35839.
Harry Langdon Reeder, Jr., O26214.
James Beard Rees, O35539.
Frellsen Reese, O53349.
Albert Charles Reinert, O24936.
Richard Henry Reitmann, O25875.
Charles Edward Remick, O34408.
Robert Bruce Reppa, O34978.
Frank William Rhea, O25876.
Edwin Milton Rhoads, O25956.
William Arthur Rhodey, O53943.
Joseph Anthony Riccio, O25737.
Robert Howard Richards, O47545.
Donald Howard Richardson, O37160.
Howard Begg Richardson, O36934.
James Randolph Richardson, O25491.
Warren Lincoln Richardson, O48271.
James Lucas Riffe, O54861.
William Lafaette Riles, O36221.
Donald Ector Rivette, O34757.
Harold Kilburn Roach, O25626.
Henry Grady Roberts, O33733.
John Linton Robinson, O36134.
Reaford Leroy Robinson, O36774.
Charles Ainsworth Rockwood, O37293.
Walter Leo Roe, O26344.
Bernard William Rogers, O25867.
Charles Irvin Rogers, O36778.
Warren Rogers, O25913.
Bruno John Rolak, O46725.
Henry Romanek, O25911.
Warren Ladd Romans, O39150.
Gerhart Otto Romstedt, O55056.
Robert Lee Rooker, O26155.
William Bahney Roop, O54199.
William Fredrick Roos, O25982.
Frank Ulric Roquemore, Jr., O36712.
Charles Edward Rose, O35066.
James Thomas Ross, Jr., O36931.
John Roy Ross, Jr., O25688.
Raymond Harvey Ross, O36412.
Leonard Rothbard, O54051.
Vernon Ray Rottstedt, O53185.
Tom J Rounsaville, O36259.
Councill Powell Rountree, O34050.
John Vincent Rowan, Jr., O47374.
Gerald William Rowe, O35810.
Jack Wildey Ruby, O45871.
Nicholas Demitri Rudziak, O47988.
Harry Erwin Ruhsam, O47135.
Edward Joseph Rumpf, O26180.
Walter Gerard Runte, O36525.
Roger Samuel Rush, O47718.
×Cecil Robert Russell, O36600.
John Thomas Russell, Jr., O25721.
Roger Lee Russell, Jr., O24689.
Robert Dorsey Rutherford, O34355.
Raymond Francis Ruyffelaere, O25814.
Peter John Ryan, O26205.
Lawrence Theodore Ryhlick, O48716.
Robert Eugene Sadler, O36522.
Harold Jacob Saine, O26291.
Max Donald Salter, O37037.
Everett Guy Salyer, O36107.
Lewis Frew Samusson, O36147.
Paul Fredric Sanders, O53770.
Roy Alexander Sanders, O25612.
Vernon Keith Sanders, O25476.
William Bruce Sandlin, Jr., O36406.
Frank Harold Sargent, O48462.
David Besley Savage, O46184.
George Frederick Sawyer, O25033.
Kenneth Trevor Sawyer, O25957.
Henry William Scharf, O40683.
John Patrick Schatz, O26224.
Frederick Scherberger 3d, O53918.
James Byron Scherer, O24415.
Thomas Augustine Schintz, O39074.
George Ardell Schnebli, O36639.
Gerald Clement Schnelker, O36785.
Robert Bertrand Schoos, O37375.
John Lawrence Schott, Jr., O40901.
Gordon Albert Schraeder, O25896.
John Whiting Schreiner, Jr., O47422.

Henry John Schroeder, Jr., O26028.
Leonard Treherne Schroeder, Jr., O45879.
Martin Frank Schroeder, O35548.
Fred William Schumacher, O33869.
Thomas Chadderdon Schumacher, O54290.
John Melborn Schwalje, O36430.
Robert John Schwind, O33900.
James Mack Scott, O37201.
Russell Faux Scott, Jr., O26325.
Samuel Blake Scott, Jr., O36312.
Elmer Bermon Scovill, O35851.
William Birnnie Scruggs, Jr., O45775.
Allan Richard Scullen, O24984.
James Augustus Seab, O46598.
George Washington Seabrook 3d, O48225.
Harold Duncan Seaman, O36616.
Frank Sheldon Sears, O45378.
Arthur Joseph Sebesta, O25644.
Paul Seibel, O36861.
Clarence Kimbrough Sells, O53600.
Leon Sembach, O26007.
Clifton Paul Semmens, O34857.
William Gee Senior, O46632.
Joseph Beck Sestito, O45893.
William Edward Sexton, O48110.
William James Shadle, Jr., O37262.
Edward Fondren Shaifer, Jr., O26343.
×Adolph Lawrence Shaima, O36677.
James George Shanahan, O36322.
Neil John Sharkey, O37299.
Hunter Lewis Sharp, O36523.
John Daniel Sharp, Jr., O46693.
Sam Houston Sharp, O54968.
George Frederick Sharra, O36891.
Charles Robert Shaw, O47789.
Franklin Prague Shaw, Jr., O25492.
William Guillian Shaw 3d, O53248.
Frank White Shelton, O33612.
Frank Landis Shenk, O37193.
Robert G Shepherd, O52951.
×Francis Philip Sheridan, O36170.
Keith Sherman, O52812.
×Joseph Holmes Sherrard 4th, O40597.
Frank George Sheviak, Jr., O40878.
Harry Hobart Shields, Jr., O54994.
Robert Edward Shipp, O36119.
Alton Martin Shipstead, O26345.
Joseph Alvin Shirley, O25065.
John Ogden Shoemaker, O54351.
David Sanford Short, O36603.
×James Harvey Short, O26242.
John Laurence Shortall, Jr., O25544.
James Clark Shoultz, O46792.
×John Jacob Shultz, Jr., O25550.
Robert Leroy Sickler, O37231.
Paul Otto Siebeneichen, O34729.
Harry Fritchel Sieber, Jr., O54161.
Lionel Carlton Simmons, O40797.
Donald Eugene Simon, O24776.
George Herbert Simpson, O34704.
Joe Richard Simpson, O46190.
Leonard Densmore Simpson, O46128.
Alexander Skorina, O52984.
Eugene Jeremy Small, O47190.
Robert Frederick Smiley, O48683.
Anderson Quillian Smith, O34187.
Bowen Neal Smith, O53523.
Chester Mervin Smith, O40993.
Dale Lafean Smith, O54616.
Daugherty Mason Smith, O25717.
×Edward Ellis Smith, O27016.
Edward Walter Smith, Jr., O45586.
Ellsworth Walter Smith, O48540.
Frank Bertram Smith, O25888.
×Frederick Mark Smith, O25497.
Gordon Lord Smith, O26029.
Horrell Holcomb Smith, O36562.
James Fletcher Smith, O37046.
James Luke Smith, Jr., O25059.
Norvin Eckert Smith, Jr., O34694.
Orvil Taft Smith, O37353.
Roy E. Smith, O35777.
Vincent Pershing Smith, O36499.
William Elmer Smith, O34859.
William Jacob Smith, O35320.
Neil Norman Snyder, Jr., O34319.
Eduardo Miguel Soler, O26020.
×Robert Daniel Sonstelie, O26141.
Rosario Sorbello, O25066.
William Joseph Spahr, O26177.
Basil Dennis Spalding, Jr., O26341.
Frederick Clayton Spann, O25561.
James Hamilton Spann, O45979.
James Hinton Spears, O33815.
John Hugh Spears, O46027.
Harry Speight, O48882.
Ronald Charles Speirs, O35820.
Donald Calhoun Spiece, O25989.
Frank Joseph Spiegelberg, O54373.
Robert Claude Spiker, O35972.
William Herbert Sprigg, O36318.
Adrian St. John, Jr., O25583.
Joseph Peeler Stabler, O25647.
Warwick Brooke Stabler, O34322.
Frederick Dana Standish 2d, O24981.
Leslie Everett Stanford, O54587.
Felix Weir Stanley, O36426.
LeRoy Samie Stanley, O36112.
John Tillinghart Stansill, O40738.
Marshall Wolcott Stark, O25294.
Norman Baxter Starr, O36922.
Stanley Marcell Staszak, O25960.
Charles Jacob Stauffer, O33757.
Glenn Allan Steckel, O46036.
Louis John Stefani, O40707.
Herbert Allen Steil, O48092.
Alois Louis Steinbach, O48109.
Milton Ernst Steinbring, O25946.
Harry Joseph Stempin, O45786.
×John Martin Stephens, Jr., O34689.
Edward Arthur Sterling 3d, O53284.
×Burrowes Goldthwaite Stevens, Jr., O25950.
Kenneth Theadore Stevens, O36203.
Milton Ernst Stevens, O25471.
Wilmer Burton Stevens, O37079.
Don Winward Stevenson, O34863.
Claude C. Stewart, O47006.
Dana Lee Stewart, O25608.
Edward Ward Stewart, O46148.
Willard Cornelius Stewart, O53438.
Robert Bruce Stiles, O27000.
John Buchanan Stockton, O26152.
George Isadore Stoeckert, O36757.
Lloyd Eugene Stone, O37138.
Stephen Grant Stone, Jr., O47960.
Charles Senour Stough, Jr., O35187.
Everette Arthur Stoutner, O36105.
Robert Walter Stowbridge, O36501.
William Roland Strantz, O54512.
Donn Pere Strausbaugh, O45681.
James Morgan Sessions Strickland, O35184.
Roger Arthur Stroede, O49045.
LeRoy Strong, O48417.
Ray Bernard Stroup, O34267.
Walter Chalmond Stubbs, Jr., O41039.
George Delp Styer, O36035.
Alden Patrick Sullivan, O41069.
James Kirwin Sullivan, O36916.
Leo Joseph Sullivan, O37027.
Lloyd Stilwell Sullivan, O53326.
Robert Edward Summerall, O39314.
Norman Robert Sumner, O33854.
Robert Stanley Sumner, O36867.
Arthur Thurston Surkamp, O25935.
Henry Surum, O36478.
×George Mills Sutton, O35970.
Alva William Swartz, O25077.
William Rector Swearngan, O36143.
Arthur Hamilton Sweeney, Jr., O40865.
William James Sweet, Jr., O35814.
Wilbur Eric Swenson, Jr., O36060.
John Donald Swensson, O46859.
James Lee Swofford, O53451.
Eugene Dudley Taber, O47959.
Max Verne Talbot, Jr., O26322.
Jack Tallerday, O36346.
John Lewis Tanner, O33683.
Thomas Kelly Tannler, O26158.
Hubert Edward Tansey, O26031.
×William Davis Tatsch, O24822.
Bernard Lloyd Tauber, O36715.
Cloyd Veron Taylor, O47850.
×Dale William Taylor, O36935.
Noble Everette Taylor, O40924.
Richard Isgrig Taylor, Jr., O36676.
Warren Leigh Taylor, O26068.
Jack Teague, O26354.
×Eugene Joseph Temme, O34553.
×Duane Paul Tenney, O26000.
George William Terry, O37101.
John Wade Therrell, O40899.
George Thomas, O37081.
Jesse Thomas, Jr., O24590.
Jesse Reamer Thomas, O36320.
Lorres Charles Thomas, O25930.
William Fred Thomas, O45885.
William George Thomas 3d, O53386.
Howard Mitchell Thompson, O47399.
Shelden Leslie Thompson, O35687.
Frank Lamont Thomsen, O54615.
Arington Calaway Thomson, Jr., O54322.
Donald Edward Thomson, O35490.
John Holden Thorne, O36166.
Warren George Thornton, O46663.
Willard Davis Tiffany, O34230.
×George Gordon Tillery, O39267.
James Lewis Tilly, O36870.
Forrest Blaine Tilson, O47769.
Max Eugene Timmons, O53965.
Charles Franklin Tisdale, O45925.
William Holmes Tomlinson, O26333.
Jack Winford Tooley, O46860.
Harold Kimball Toomer, O40849.
Alphonso Axel Topp, Jr., O25408.
Maxwell Stephen Torgersen, O37083.
Anthony Joseph Touart, Jr., O25377.
Delbert Leroy Townsend, O41062.
James Munroe Townsend, O36069.
Lester Boyette Townsend, Jr., O53798.
Robert Turrentine Townsend, O46913.
Charles Stuart Townshend, Jr., O40833.
Alfred Thomas Trainor, O33767.
Paul Alonzo Trees, O45254.
Joseph Anthony Tringali, O39152.
Ralph Joseph Truex, O25558.
Fred Cutting Tucker, O24865.
Walter Ferson Tucker, O24548.
William Owen Tucker, Jr., O48880.
Harry Nathaniel Tufts, O40679.
Henry Harold Tufts, O54270.
Julian Turner, O40697.
Edward Arnold Turrou, O48222.
Frederick Charles Uhler, O25003.
Carl Comer Ulsaker, O24815.
Louis Blanton Umlauf, Jr., O26338.
Charles Calvin Underwood, O34337.
Vernon Warren Underwood, O36204.
John Jones Upchurch 3d, O25435.
Wendell Grant VanAuken, Jr., O26269.
George Van Laethem, O36342.
Arthur William VanSchoick, Jr., O26017.
Frederick Edward Van Tassell, O36087.
Clarke Steady Vaughn, O48868.
Fletcher Read Veach, Jr., O26301.
×Edgar Leigh Venzke, O40979.
Jack Howard Vess, O48639.
Felipe Vias, O36110.
Oscar Clarence Vigen, O48256.
Donato Nicolas Vincent, O36674.
Albert Henry Voegeli, O56909.
Alden Edward Vognild, O37080.
Blaine Owen Vogt, O54699.
Karl William Volk, Jr., O54596.
Friedrich Abercrombie Von Brincken, O53933.
Robert Henry Von Burg, O35449.
Jonathan Sawyer Vordermark, O25917.
Edward Joseph Voso, O54117.
Arthur Pearson Wade, O25666.
James Kuykendall Wade, O26348.
Mitchell T. H. Wadkins, O46063.
Paul R. Wagner, O53850.
Lewis Carroll Waid, O54314.
John Henry Walbridge, O54767.
James Robert Waldie, O36347.
Charles Stanley Walker, O48299.
Frank Edwin Walker, Jr., O34691.
Harold Staats Walker, Jr., O25635.
J. LeRoy Walker, O37248.
Mansell Archie Walker, O54889.
William James Walker, O36551.
George Russell Wall, O40836.
Marshall Waller, O24758.
William Louis Wallschleger, O48250.
Charles Frederick Walrath, O36207.
John Eugene Walsh, O33794.
Louis Arthur Waple, O24584.
Robert John Ward, O35689.
Patrick Gerald Wardell, O25628.
Edgar Bourke Warner, Jr., O53206.
VanCleave Parrott Warren, A24856.
William Charles Warren, O24852.
Wilfred Carlyle Washcoe, O36554.

×Fred Brenning Waters, Jr., O25449.
James Henry Waters, O37327.
William Edwin Waters, O25719.
George William Watkins, O34638.
Douglas Henry Watson, O45908.
George Harvey Watson, O25740.
Richard Reasoner Watson, O34354.
×Thomas Robert Watson, O25718.
James Henry Watts, O36348.
Hugh Weyman Webb, O47228.
Robert Mason Webb, O35571.
Travis Eugene Webb, O36509.
Benn Louis Wechsler, O54528.
Raymond Warren Weeks, O36173.
Miner Lile Weems, O40999.
Howard Franklin Wehrle 3d, O25454.
Alton James Weigley, O45241.
Joseph Conrad Wein, O46294.
Irwin VanAlstyne Weller, O36764.
Forest O. Wells, O46515.
Jack Dale Wells, O48257.
John Armstrong Wells, O36205.
Sidney Lawrence Wells, O36810.
William John Welsh, Jr., O26339.
John Joseph Wessmiller, Jr., O54052.
Thomas Euel Wesson, O37280.
Clyde Hoxie Westbrook, Jr., O47007.
Robert Lane Westbrook, O37049.
Clarence Richard Westfall, O26024.
Raymond Milton Westmoreland, O36607.
×Joseph William Weyrick, O26294.
John Parsons Wheeler, Jr., O25824.
Robert Farrell Wheeler, O40872.
Arthur Bain White, O54886.
John Franklin White, O25507.
Lee Allen White, O41061.
Willis John Whitesell, O39169.
Harold Neal Whitfield, O41032.
Charles Goodwin Whitmire, O25257.
Mancil Ray Whitworth, O36563.
×Howard Tilghman Wickert, Jr., O26312.
Edward Gray Wiggins, O36457.
Walter William Wikan, O36512.
Thomas Wildes, O40778.
Harlon Raymond Wiley, O37082.
Leland Frederick Wilhelm, O48723.
John Francis Wilhelmy, Jr., O37233.
Robert George Wilke, O47408.
Reading Wilkinson, Jr., O26257.
Edwin James, O25594.
Albert Sidney Williams, Jr., O25374.
Frank Savage Williams, O34649.
Harry Orval Williams, O37184.
James Eugene Williams, O48104.
Louis Albert Williams, O36161.
Norman Lewis Williams, O26173.
Paul Robertson Williams, O36707.
Richard Walter Williams, Jr., O47344.
×James Barnett Williamson, O35648.
Robert Hubbard Williamson, Jr., O34560.
Lester George Willig, O47419.
Jean Paul Willis, O37283.
Charles Allan Wilson, Jr., O25907.
Francis Howard Wilson, Jr., O53452.
Gerald Robert Wilson, O36338.
John Miller Wilson, O25556.
Lloyd George Wilson, O34685.
Roy Robertson Wilson, O25827.
Russell Jordan Wilson, O40848.
Stanley Livingston Wilson, Jr., O26168.
Victor Owen Wilson, O25387.
William Mims Wilson, O47616.
Paul Millard Wimert, Jr., O48914.
Thomas Bates Windsor, O25670.
Richard Marshall Winfield, Jr., O26117.
Albert Gresham Wing, Jr., O46100.
Andrew William Winiarczyk, O47278.
Jack Coleman Winn, Jr., O26049.
Candler Roy Wiselogle, O39271.
Carlyle Philip Woelfer, O25350.
Karl Everett Wolf, O26202.
Morton Wolfson, O48975.
Richard Earl Womer, O36623.
Franklin Wood, O26104.
John Shirley Wood, Jr., O25655.
John Duncan Woodman, O40662.
Stanley Williams Woodruff, O36530.
James Robert Woods, O35812.
Kenneth Joseph Woods, O53413.
Joseph Garland Woodward, O39101.
George Burdette Woodworth, O35995.
John Henry Wooten, O53968.
Niel Marne Wreidt, O34753.
David Bryan Wright, O54276.
Edward McWayne Wright, O24693.
Elam William Wright, Jr., O37214.
Ernest Charles Wright, O53926.
Lucius Featherstone Wright, Jr., O25966.
Raymond Jay Wright, O36780.
Charles Henry Wuest, O39280.
Ray James Yantis, O47002.
Quentin E. Yoder, O48994.
Crawford Young, O25984.
Curtis Field Young, O37305.
George Haywood Young, Jr., O36242.
James Rader Young, O37365.
Maurice Lee Young, O36794.
Ralph Edgar Young, O26331.
Sidney Hooper Young, Jr., O24942.
Douglas Gordon Younger, O36945.
Harold Wallace Yount, O54875.
×Vincent Raymond Zdanzukas, O34971.
Albert Earl Zellefrow, O40982.
Irving Zuckerbrot, O36901.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Corps of Chaplains*

Elmer Pettiford Gibson, O29145.
Henry Lawson Gillenwaters, O41702.
Ralph Augustine Hill, O29151.
John Ignatius Koch, O29138.

*To be majors, Corps of Chaplains*

Palmer Phillippi Pierce, O40102.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps*

Francis Joseph Aldwin, O39653.
Saul Leighton Avner, O41701.
William Earl Barry, O19682.
Robert Joseph Benford, O20513.
Jack Harvey Bristow, O29189.
Joseph Maxwell Cameron, O29180.
George Robert Carpenter, O51147.
×Elven Ross Cooper, O29171.
Lester Orville Crago, O20498.
Carl Robert Darnall, O19339.
Ernst Dehne, O56790.
Albert Julius Glass, O29247.
James Harrison Gordon, O29227.
Lawrence Benton Hanson, O56783.
Robert Paul Hargreaves, O29216.
Joseph William Iseman, O39651.
Harold Stewart McBurney, O29248.
×George Darsie McGrew, O18942.
Max Naimark, O19303.
×Alvin Winfred Paulson, O51159.
Charles Bateman Perkins, O20389.
William Joseph Power, O19614.
Weldon Kenneth Ruth, O20520.
×Alton Herbert Saxer, O22263.
Eldridge Cook Simmons, O56798.
Wilson Theodore Smith, O19306.
Russell Dean Steele, O56300.
Robert Lee Whitfield, Jr., O29177.

*To be majors, Medical Corps*

Frank Louis Bauer, O26430.
Harold Frederick Bertram, O31019.
Savino Walter Cavender, O31005.
Charles Sidney Christianson, O56824.
Joseph Carlos Denslow, Jr., O43122.
Alan Bayliss Eaker, O43146.
Walton Merideth Edwards, O24377.
Julius Abraham Goldbarg, A43143.
×Michael Joseph Hitchko, A24390.
Hugh Beals Hoeffler, O51983.
×Archie Arthur Hoffman, O31006.
John C. Holliday, O51972.
Harold Mendez Jesurun, O26439.
Robert Richard Jones, O26964.
George Edward Lathrop, O56827.
Raymond Arnold Lawn, O23656.
Joseph Francis McDonough, O31008.
Hubert Wainright Miller, O31013.
Donald Eugene Reiner, O22281.
×John Rizzolo, O40108.
Max Laurel Smith, O38853.
Helmuth Sprinz, O30919.
Henry Fred Steinbock, O51966.
LeRoy Otten Travis, O24368.
Walter Cecil Twineham, O24635.
Edward Jenner Whiteley, O24627.
Jack Odell Yeager, O56823.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps*

×Donald Patrick Kettrick, O29238.
George Stanley Moore, O51158.
×Carl William Pfanner, O29246.

*To be majors, Dental Corps*

Stacy Wendell Clapp, Jr., O30990.
×Thomas Benton Connell, O30998.
Robert Lincoln Coombs, O23611.
Winston Vance Cruzan, O30981.
Kenneth Cheney DeGon, O23676.
Maurice Fred Ekstrom, O51964.
×Kenneth Ray Elwell, O23340.
Pierre Oscar Evans, O23351.
Clement Andrade Farrell, O30988.
Henry Amos Goodall, O30977.
Thomas Roosevelt Haddock, O23350.
William Madison Harley, Jr., O30964.
Harold Preston Haskins, O23347.
John William Helton, O23337.
Frederick Robert Krug, O23613.
John Robert Law, O23345.
George Andrew Long, O23346.
John Robert McEvoy, O23606.
Lowell Edison McKelvey, O30967.
James Maxwell Murphy, O23609.
Merle Wayne Ogle, O22261.
William Orville Orsinger, O23343.
×Ewalt McCune Osborn, O30986.
Raymond Joseph Talbot, O23608.
Harold Wilenzick, O23342.
Karl Otto Zieger, O38855.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps*

Philip Ray Carter, O29159.
Harvie Russell Ellis, O17791.
Ralph William Mohri, O17985.
Edgerton Lynn Watson, O18308.

*To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps*

Edgar Allan Blair, O56803.
Franklin Sylvester Blanton, O38634.
Robert Mark Bynum, Jr., O39649.
Charles Lawrence Driscoll, O17036.
Joseph Orr Wintersteen, O51168.
Paul Estabrooke Zuver, O17373.

*To be majors, Medical Service Corps*

Ardis Tillman Cox, O56868.
Carl James Koehn, O52048.
John Foster Pierce, O56872.
Elon Bramble Tucker, O52040.
Edward Wilhoit, O31166.

*To be captains, Medical Service Corps*

Edward Stephens Adams, O56230.
James Franklin Allen, O49955.
Stephen Justin Beaudry, O37503.
Byron Winfield Brown, O39340.
Jesse Nichols Butler, O26983.
Melbourne Caldwell Chandler, O37486.
George Travis Collier, O30898.
Raymond Joseph Creamer, O37472.
Melvin Francis Cunningham, O41146.
George John DeGraff, O49935.
Joseph Robert DeVine, O37520.
William Thomas Doidge, O37491.
Findlay Freeman Flatter, O49941.
Ronald Clarence Force, O56934.
Howard Jewell Funston, O41136.
Robert Lee Gaines, O49957.
John Maurice Geary, O56930.
Bernard Williamson Hammaker, O37492.
William George Handorf, O49954.
James Anderson Hazelrigs, O39345.
×Howard Crawford Hensley, Jr., O41147.
Claude L. Hooker, O37482.
Otto George Hrdlicka, O37512.
James Vernon Huffman, O37507.
Dean Melvern Jewell, O49924.
Wayne Horace Jonson, O37484.
Hugh Lawrence Keegan, O49928.
Grover Cleveland Kistler, O49958.
Douglas Venable Lord, O41149.
William Clifford Luehrs, O37521.
Francis Timothy Lynch, O56217.
Bruce Stewart Markel, Jr., O49932.
×Robert Edward Maybell, O37446.
Jeff Roger McLeland, O56215.
Robert Joseph O'Malley, O49923.
Harry Charles Powell, O39336.

Norman Reich, O37516.
Walter Frank Robbins, O56929.
Henry Jacob Rockstroh, O56942.
Joseph Patrick Rossi, O37508.
Anthony Scarpitta, O37519.
Clayton Lee Shedivetz, O37514.
Lloyd Books Shepler, O37445.
James Harvie Snelling, O49927.
William McLeroy Sorrells, O37494.
Fred Hans Swanson, O37471.
×Hughie Conroe Thomas, O37462.
Elmer Leroy Thompson, O37513.
Jerry Vincent Thompson, O37451.
Robert Moir Van Horn, O56219.
Alonzo Richard Williams, O41140.
Nathan Richard Wisser, O37522.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 107 of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947:

*To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps*

Rosalie Dudley Colhoun, N29.
Elizabeth Fitch, N30.
Louise Miller Fitzgerald, N515.
Pauline Kirby, N35.
Cora Jane Maxton, N509.
Doris E. Medlin, N510.
Mary Jo Miller, N27.
Helen Harriet Patton, N514.
Amy Rose Pendergraft, N28.
Mary Genevieve Phillips, N512.
Alice Chauncey Wickward, N33.
Sarah E. Williams, N508.

*To be majors, Army Nurse Corps*

Vivian L. Ailmendinger, N52.
Ethel Marie Anderson, N548.
Eleanor R. Asleson, N56.
Margaret Marie Bitzel, N531.
Monta Rey Boswell, N43.
Kilie E. Bridger, N84.
Ruby Ficklin Bryant, N79.
Hazel Irene Burford, N549.
Nora P. Capps, N71.
Florence A. Dressell, N541.
Bertha Elsner, N542.
Sylvia M. Evans, N536.
Martha Fulwood, N44.
Laura E. Goodale, N68.
Inez Haynes, N88.
Mary E. Haynes, N532.
Edna Dora Hess, N74.
Bernice Mary Hill, N75.
Naomi Jane Jensen, N80.
Katharine Virginia Joliffe, N77.
Helen Johanna Jurash, N528.
Laura Clapp Kelley, N78.
Ethel A. Lamansky, N41.
Irene L. Miller, N547.
Louise Miller, N544.
Elizabeth G. Mixson, N533.
Margaret Mary Moss, N54.
Ruth Payne, N529.
Mary Frances Prucha, N72.
Grace Henrietta Rickert, N545.
Alice Junice Robbe, N85.
Nila Pearl Rutherman, N538.
Olive P. Shadie, N527.
Ada Miriam Simpson, N76.
Genevieve Marion Smith, N539.
Faye Gracia Still, N539.
Mabel G. Stott, N73.
Cathern M. Ullom, N67.
Kathryn Grace Witter, N82.
Marian York, N81.

NOTE.—All of the above-named officers were promoted during the recess of the Senate.

---

### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 24, 1949:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSIONER

Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, Corps of Engineers, to be president and a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, JANUARY 24, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, in whose strength alone we are made strong, purge our minds of prejudice and help us to withstand any conflicts of this hour. As we face the obligations of our high office enable us to measure up to our urgent duty, sweeping aside every obstacle that doth beset us.

To these ends bless abundantly our Speaker and the Congress; help us that we abuse not our privileges; vouchsafe unto us new light and new guidance that we may serve Thee as Thou deservest, and labor for our country with understanding. In the holy name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 20, 1949, was read and approved.

### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] may have permission to address the House for 30 minutes on February 2, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILBURN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the New York State Legislature.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an editorial.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain resolutions.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include a letter from the Western States Meat Packing Association and in the other to include a statement by Mr. Samuel Moment, of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RAINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article by Generoso Pope.

Mr. McGUIRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Mr. Jesse Randell, president of the Travelers Insurance Co., at the Hartford Rotary Club, Hartford, Conn.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech delivered by Mr. Justice William O. Douglas. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $165, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech which he delivered at a Jackson Day dinner held in East St. Louis, Ill.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he delivered to the Daughters of the American Revolution at Fredericksburg, Va.

### THE LATE LINDLEY HOAG HADLEY

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce the death of a distinguished former Member of this body. Lindley H. Hadley passed away on November 1, 1948, in the State of Connecticut. He is survived by two daughters who now reside in that State.

Lindley Hoag Hadley was born of Quaker parentage in Sylvania, Ind., on June 19, 1861. He attended Wesleyan University at Bloomington, Ill. For a number of years he followed the teaching profession in the State of Indiana. During this time, he studied law and was admitted to the bar. In September 1890 he moved to New Whatcom, now Bellingham, Wash., to engage in the practice of law with his brother Hiram, who later became a judge of the State Supreme Court of Washington. He was long active in civic and political affairs in Whatcom County.

In 1914 he was elected to Congress from the Second Congressional District of the State of Washington on the Republican ticket and served continuously in this body until 1933. During his long service in the House of Representatives, he was a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries from 1915 to 1919 and the Committee on Ways and Means from 1919 until 1933. During his service on the Committee on Ways and Means, he specialized on various tariff problems.

Lin Hadley was an outstanding and respected leader of his party. He was conscientious and devoted to those principles of government that he thought were best for his country.

I join with Members of this body in expressing our deepest sympathy to his family.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I served with Mr. Hadley for many years. We lived in the same hotel, Congress Hall. I certainly subscribe to everything the gentleman from Washington has said about him.

I never met a finer, more patriotic, conscientious Representative since I have been a Member of Congress than Mr. Hadley.

Mrs. Hadley was one of the finest ladies I have ever known, and those charming daughters were loved and admired by every one who knew them.

Our hearts go out to them in their great bereavement.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

GOVERNMENT SERVICE UNIVERSITY

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a Government Service University.

The purpose of this bill is to provide our Government with more qualified men and women in administrative, diplomatic, economic, and other fields of Government work. During the last month or so before I came to Congress I had what I called national affairs forums. At these meetings I suggested various pieces of legislation that I hoped the people would give their opinions upon. On this particular piece of legislation there was a unanimous feeling of approval on the part of my constituents. There are many young people in this country today who are able and qualified for Government service and who would like to make a career of such service, but who do not have the opportunity. Students would be chosen by competitive examinations given by the Civil Service Commission. Tuition and basic living costs would be provided to the Government. Students would agree to work for the Government for a minimum of 10 years after graduation. I hope that you gentlemen will support this bill and thereby help to improve the quality of Government service in your country, which is good, but can yet stand improvement.

THE AUSTRIAN PEACE TREATY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE Mr. Speaker, according to press reports, conversations regarding an Austrian peace treaty are to be resumed on February 7.

I have been reliably informed that the Russian Foreign Office has been working hard for many months in an effort to devise a plan which would induce us to withdraw our troops from Austria.

It appears that the Kremlin is no longer anxious to obtain Carinthia for the fractious Yugoslavs.

It is quite likely that a compromise regarding German assets in Austria will be arrived at. Our conditions may well be met; an Austrian peace treaty is perhaps in the offing.

Mr. Speaker, I need hardly point out the critical value to the western world strategically, economically, and politically of maintaining freedom in Austria. In Austria, freedom's forces thrust some 135 miles behind the iron curtain. The manifold advantages of this position are abundantly clear.

In view of the events of the last few years, particularly in eastern Europe, it seems obvious that once the British, French, and American troops have been withdrawn from Austria, the freedom and independence of that country become precarious indeed.

Were Austria drawn behind the iron curtain the Kremlin would have a common boundary with Italy and would be able to exert tremendous and perhaps fatal pressure upon that country, with consequences which could not fail to affect American national security.

I express the fervent hope that our desire for peace does not lead us into a step which would only weaken our position and thereby multiply the hazards of war.

Surely it is better not to reach an agreement than to agree to a treaty which would render Austria a hostage to a Communist tyranny.

We must think steadfastly in terms of constructive alternatives.

Preponderant evidence points to this present choice: either we remain in Austria with all the unpleasantness and sense of frustration which this involves or we withdraw, thereby ceding vital territory to Russian imperialism and sacrificing more freedom-loving people on the altar of wishful thinking.

The loss of Austria as a bastion of freedom would be a major defeat in our cold conflict with communism.

Let us think carefully before we undertake to nullify still further the tragic cost of the recent war.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star]

THIS CHANGING WORLD—WESTERN ALLIES AND RUSSIA EXPECTED TO SIGN AUSTRIAN PEACE TREATY SOON

(By Constantine Brown)

A peace treaty for Austria is expected to be signed near the end of February by the United States, Britain, France, and Russia.

The main outlines of the treaty were agreed on by the Big Four Foreign Ministers at their London meeting in 1946. But final agreement was prevented by Yugoslavia's territorial demands and the question of payments to Russia for Nazi assets in Austria.

At that time Marshal Tito was Moscow's fair-haired boy. He insisted, and was strongly supported by Foreign Minister Molotov, that Austria yield to Yugoslavia the rich province of Carinthia, which the Balkan dictator claimed should be part and parcel of Yugoslav territory. The Austrians, backed by the western powers, opposed this demand because it lacked any real justification. The matter since has been in abeyance.

DEMANDED $200,000,000

The Russians also demanded about $200,000,000, which they said represented Nazi assets in Austria. The American representatives opposed this demand because they knew that eventually it would have to come out of the pockets of American taxpayers.

The United States suggested that the Soviet delegates be satisfied with $125,000,000. Foreign Minister Molotov turned down this offer for political rather than financial reasons. He insisted that no bargaining was possible until we accepted Tito's territorial claims.

Now that relations between the Yugoslav dictator and the Cominform are strained, Moscow has no interest in furthering the demands of its former puppet, and has indicated indirectly that it is willing to sit at the diplomatic table with the western representatives and the Austrian delegates to discuss the peace treaty on the basis that Carinthia remain Austrian.

As for the Austrian payment for Nazi assets—in cash, goods, and services—it is understood that Moscow is ready to meet us halfway, by accepting $150,000,000.

The prospective signing of a peace treaty between Austria and Hitler's conquerors will be hailed as the first indication in 2 years that, given good will and patience, it is possible to get along with the Russians. This type of publicity is necessary for the morale of the western nations, which have been accustomed for so long to a negative attitude in the Kremlin on all international matters.

But careful analysis of the situation shows that the signature of such a peace treaty is no more indicative of a change of mood on the part of Russia than the agreement on Italy was.

In November 1943, when Secretary of State Hull made a good will trip to Moscow, the Soviet government agreed to consider Austria as outside the Axis circle, provided that the Austrian people show willingness to rid themselves of the Nazis. A declaration to that effect was signed by Mr. Hull, British Foreign Secretary Eden, and Mr. Molotov. Our position in that matter was particularly easy, since we, unlike the Russians, had never

recognized the annexation of Austria by Hitler in March 1939.

STRIPPED OF ASSETS

Although the Austrians cooperated with the Allies as soon as it was possible for them to do so, and lived up to our expectations, the Moscow agreement was a dead letter. The Russians insisted on treating Austria as an enemy country, and under the excuse that the Nazis had large assets in the country they stripped the Austrians of some of their most important industrial establishments. But after this was done there was no further reason for the Russians to refuse to sign a peace treaty with Austria which, unlike Germany, had a legal constitutional government.

The treaty which is expected to be signed next month will provide for the evacuation of Austrian territory by the Allied occupation forces. This will mean that we will withdraw our troops—about 8,000 strong—several thousand miles from Austria, while the Russians will withdraw their divisions less than 100 miles.

During the years of occupation Russia has organized, not only in its own sector but also in the western areas, Communist cells which are expected to become active as soon as the treaty has been confirmed by the United States Senate and the other signatories. Unless our observers are unduly pessimistic, it will be difficult for that small Republic to maintain its democratic form of government when all her neighbors are under Communist domination.

These observers predict that within a short time after the Allied forces have left Austria there will be a repetition of the coups we witnessed in Czechoslovakia and Hungary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short speeches delivered before the Commonwealth Club, of San Francisco.

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include two editorials from the Sioux City Journal.

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Time magazine.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Pennsylvania Grange about Hawaii.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a consolidation of certain testimony before a congressional committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from Hoard's Dairyman.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. WOODRUFF) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short radio address, and further to extend his remarks and include a clipping from the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles by former Representative Pettengill.

NATIONAL THEATER, OPERA, AND BALLET

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide for a national theater and for a national opera and ballet. The United States almost alone among the great powers does not advance these arts as an official Government activity. For example despite very serious economic problems Great Britain has just found $4,000,000 for its arts council to support a national theater. Great areas of our country are denied the benefit and pleasure of first-rate theater and music because it is no longer economically feasible on a straight profit basis to bring to them these arts and the leading artists. I realize full well the dangers of the paralyzing hand of Government control of the arts, and of the use which can be made of them to control thought, hence my bill provides for a constitutional convention to be called by the President representative of all branches of the theater, opera, and ballet—performers, workers, writers, and audience—to draft and propose plans—but not WPA schemes for unemployment relief—which will deserve Government support while providing for the democratic control of a national theater and a national opera and ballet by the constituent elements so called together. In this way America's riches in dramatic and musical talent may best be developed and our democratic culture served and advanced. The approach taken by this bill has the support of Clarence Derwend, president of Actors Equity Association, Vinton Freedley, president, and C. Lawton Campbell, chairman of the board, of the American National Theater and Academy—ANTA—organized under Federal charter and has also been fully discussed with Lawrence Tibbett, president of the American Guild of Musical Artists.

The bill will be introduced this week in the Senate by Senator IVES, of New York. It is my hope that other Members and Senators will join in supporting it and that it will, as it should, be a bipartisan measure.

"OPERATION HAY"

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a review of "operation hay" as it has been carried on in my district during the last 2 weeks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in these days when we talk about providing funds to establish a national ballet and international programs for the sharing of knowledge, I urge that the House of Representatives and the Congress expedite action to make adequate funds available to meet catastrophic conditions which are taking place in the Western States.

Literally millions of cattle are facing starvation. Literally hundreds and thousands of ranchers are isolated by drifts of snow so that it is impossible for them either to communicate their distress or to get their livestock water or feed. Old-timers say they have never seen anything like this January before.

In this extremity we have been receiving emergency aid from the Air Force and the Army and the Farmers Home Administration as well as the Red Cross. We are also receiving cooperation from the Federal executive branch so as to make some of the President's disaster funds available, but more will be needed as the snow continues to pile up and low temperatures prevail.

In order that the Members of the House may know how emergency feeding operations have been carried on, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a transcript of a radio interview describing "operation hay."

There was no objection.

AID TO STORM-RIDDEN STATES

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most devastating and unprecedented snowstorms has covered the Western States practically since the 1st of January. It has been snowing intermittently until hundreds of thousands of head of cattle and sheep ar marooned. Losses will be tremendous. I am introducing a resolution today to authorize an appropriation sufficient to lend every assistance possible to all the States that are now in this desperate condition. The Governor of my own State has declared a state of emergency, and all the machinery and manpower necessary is being utilized to meet this situation. I hope the Committee on Appropriations will act expeditiously and make an appropriation available to help these States.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

THE STATE OF GEORGIA AND THE INAUGURAL PARADE

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be misunderstood in the remarks that I am going to make. I feel that the great State of Georgia should have had a float in the inaugural parade. I am also quite certain that the great State of Georgia will pay any obligation which she may owe.

However, an article in yesterday's paper has caused some confusion. It states that the Warm Springs Foundation ordered the float and that the builder of the float expected the foundation to

pay for it. We are now in the midst of the March of Dimes campaign to help polio victims. That campaign might be hurt if people thought that the Georgia float was paid for out of polio funds, especially since the float was declared to have been a monstrosity. I trust that this point will be cleared up so that it will not interfere with the worthy cause of raising money for the polio funds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EMPLOYMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND CLERICAL STAFFS ON COMMITTEES

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 601, passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress, was an act to provide for an increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government. Section 202 (a) and (c) reads as follows:

SEC. 202. (a) Each standing committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives (other than the Appropriations Committees) is authorized to appoint by a majority vote of the committee not more than four professional staff members, in addition to the clerical staffs, on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office and said staff members shall be assigned to the chairman and ranking minority member of such committee as the committee may deem advisable. Each such committee is further authorized to terminate the services by a majority vote of the committee of any such professional staff member as it may see fit. Professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

(c) The clerical staff of each standing committee, which shall be appointed by a majority vote of the committee, shall consist of not more than six clerks, to be attached to the office of the chairman, to the ranking minority member, and to the professional staff, as the committee may deem advisable; and the position of committee janitor is hereby abolished. The clerical staff shall handle the committee correspondence and stenographic work, both for the committee staff and for the chairman and ranking minority member on matters related to committee work.

It has come to my attention that the Democratic leadership in the House is violating not only the word but the spirit of the law. This morning the committee of which I am a member—Public Lands—with its Democratic majority passed a resolution permitting the chairman of the committee and the subcommittee chairmen to appoint the professional and clerical staff without the approval of the majority vote of the full committee. I am quite sure that some of the professional staff will be engaged in work other than committee business. It seems certain that instead of employing individuals "without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of office," that this phrase should be replaced by the words "only for deserving Democrats."

I understand that the professional and well-trained personnel of other standing committees in the House are being fired by the Democratic leadership. It is unfortunate indeed that the law passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress is being violated openly and without embarrassment by those in the majority. It is quite apparent that the reorganization bill and law is just so many words and is being twisted and perverted by the Democratic majority in the Eighty-first Congress to fit their own particular needs. I am certain that the people of the country will be the ones who will suffer and the cause of good government will be relegated to the ash can.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

BASING POINT SYSTEM

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which will clarify present uncertainty and confusion concerning the basing point system, which many believe was outlawed by recent decisions of the courts. The proposed bill contains absolute safeguards against illegal conspiracies, combinations, and agreements in restraint of trade, monopoly, and unfair trade practices and competition.

This matter is of utmost importance to New England and particularly to industrial Massachusetts. For many years our industries have purchased raw materials and other products under the basing point system, which in general permits freight absorption by sellers and shippers and insures relatively equal competitive advantages for all regions and sections in the national market. The basing point question is bound up with long-established railroad rate differentials, trade customs and practices, and the entire matter is exceedingly complicated. It may have most serious implications for our various transportation systems.

Most New England business, in fact business throughout the Nation, is very apprehensive that departure from the basing point system will bring distinct and substantial competitive disadvantages which cannot possibly be overcome even by the efficiency of production and very high skill of labor and management. It is asserted by business groups, economists, and experts who have studied the broad intricate ramifications of this question that irreparable damage will be done to our industry, that widespread unemployment will directly ensue, unless our New England industries are able to compete on an equal price basis with competitors in the national field. The available evidence indicates that with basing points eliminated freight costs will increase, industries will be crippled and liquidated or required to move to other localities. Our section depends upon other sections for raw materials and markets. If price basing is eliminated many industries will be unable to survive or will be forced to curtail production and employees so it is believed.

Let me emphasize that I am opposed to monopolies, conspiracies to restrain or impede trade and commerce, cutthroat and unfair competitive methods and, therefore, this bill contains language which will militate against such undesirable and baneful practices. It aims to provide for New England industries a fair and reasonable chance to sell their products in competition with other industries. If this or some similar legislation is not enacted by the Congress and we are forced to conduct business under tortured concepts of various wholly desirable trade regulatory laws, it is stated that we will face economic collapse. I hope that not only our industries and labor but every other class of our people as well will support these efforts to clarify, and if necessary rectify, possible punitive economic pressure against our section, which many believe will affect adversely the prosperity of our industrial, mercantile, agricultural, and laboring people.

I hope it will be possible for various organizations concerned with the welfare of New England—labor, management, governmental, and others—to appear before committees of the Congress to urge a careful study and every prompt remedial action necessary in a situation which could have such dire consequences to New England. I am also urging the executive department of the Government to collaborate in efforts to achieve the objectives of the bill.

The question has been exhaustively studied by the Capehart committee of the other body, which, under the leadership of the able Senator from Indiana, held lengthy hearings and presented certain recommendations.

The capable and distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has already introduced similar legislation in the other body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on three subjects and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement promulgated by the National Grange with reference to agricultural policy and program recommendations. I have an estimate from the Public Printer that this will cost $301. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD notwithstanding.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, it may be inserted in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JUDD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in four instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may sit during the sessions of the House during this Congress when found necessary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND THE INAUGURAL BALL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, probably I should have arisen to a question of personal privilege to answer some of the scathing abuses that have been heaped upon me over the radio and through the press during the last few days.

The President of the United States in his inaugural address had a great deal to say about the dangers of communism abroad. I agree with what he said on that point.

But our country is in more danger from the Reds at home than she is from the ones abroad.

The action of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, the way they went about changing the membership of the Committee on Un-American Activities, was silly, if not stupid. It looks like the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob. Neither Benjamin Franklin, George Washington, General Grant, Robert E. Lee, Jefferson Davis, or Herbert Hoover could have served on that committee under these rulings.

I have no apology for my fight to protect my country against these enemies within our gates. They are here now busy as bees, and were all during the war.

The Committee on Un-American Activities exposed the greatest spy ring in history. It was not a red herring. It was a Red ring of misrepresentatives of the American people in the State Department.

As long as I am a Member of this Congress, I will fight to expose such treason and demand investigations and prosecution of these enemies within our gates.

These Reds won a great victory when they were permitted to conduct the inaugural ball, and force hundreds of Negroes onto the floor of that ball for the first time in history.

This was the greatest insult ever perpetrated against the white girls of Washington, and the whole country, as for that matter.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 304, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report the following members on the part of the House: Mr. HART, New Jersey; Mr. PATMAN, Texas; Mr. HUBER, Ohio; Mr. BUCHANAN, Pennsylvania; Mr. WOLCOTT, Michigan; Mr. HERTER, Massachusetts; Mr. RICH, Pennsylvania.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

BUTTER VERSUS YELLOW OLEOMARGARINE, H. R. 1703

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain extracts and extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the dairy farmers of the Nation who swung their political strength to Harry S. Truman on November 2, thus assuring his election, will be poorly repaid if repeal of all restrictions on yellow oleomargarine is foisted on them.

The President's Economic Report to Congress is being twisted to threaten a death blow to 2,500,000 dairy farm families who supply the Nation with vital livestock products. The suggestion that oleo taxes and license fees be repealed, with which leading dairy and farm organizations agree, is now being interpreted to mean the repeal of all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine. This threat to the existence of the dairy industry is sponsored and financed by only 28 oleomargarine manufacturers, which industrial group seeks to remove all legislative restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

Oleo manufacturers want the unrestricted right to sell oleo colored yellow to imitate butter and thus monopolize the table spread market. With butter and dairy prices already declining and pushing down dairymen's income, an additional loss of $250,000,000 a year will mean outright disaster to dairy farmers and their families and to 40,000 small dairy plants and their employees.

Farmers will be forced to slaughter millions of milk cows—an economic body blow to consumers who are dependent on dairy herds for 40 percent of their beef and veal and all of their milk. This can only result in scarcities and high prices for meat, milk and other dairy products. It will also bring to an end the historic soil conservation program practiced on every dairy farm without Government subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill based on a policy that is fair to consumers, fair to retailers and distributors, and fair to the oleo industry. It will protect the vital dairy industry against a complete loss of its crucial butter market to a product using a deceptive coloration to gain economic advantage.

My bill will prohibit the imitation of butter through the manufacture and sale of oleo colored yellow in semblance of butter, but will remove all taxes and license fees on oleo itself. Under my bill every housewife can obtain all the oleo she wants without the payment of any taxes whatever, but the product will be sold for what it is, and not as an imitator of butter. The passage of my bill will protect the consumer against this kind of fraud and deception. The bill is H. R. 1703.

Competent economists estimate that the complete legalization of yellow oleo would take away an additional 600,000,000 pounds a year in butter sales. A loss of this size could cost the farmers of this country immediately a quarter of a billion dollars in annual cash income. The result would be liquidation of dairy herds on a scale never before seen, since small farmers would simply be unable to operate any longer.

Decline in dairy cow numbers as a result of lost butter markets would be heaviest in States depending most on butter as a source of income. For example, there are 18 surplus-milk-producing States where sales of farm-separated cream, largely destined for butter, amount to one-fifth or more of total sales of milk in all forms. Nearly 27 percent of all milk produced in the country normally is churned into butter.

This is what is meant when it is said that butter is the balance wheel of the entire dairy industry. It is dangerous to the economy of the country to jeopardize the existence of all dairy farmers by legalizing the unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored yellow to imitate butter.

I recognize that it is not popular to oppose any part of Truman's fair-deal program, but when it comes to taking a position on the welfare of 2,500,000 dairy-farm families as against 28 large oleomargarine manufacturers, I take my stand with the dairy farmers of the United States. They are a vital part of our American economy. They pay substantial taxes into the Federal Treasury, and also provide the Nation with vital and nutritious food.

The fight between oleo and butter is an economic battle. It will be argued that dairy farmers must yield to scientific progress. We must all yield to honest scientific progress, but when 28 oleomargarine manufacturers attempt to steal the historic butter color for their synthetic product, I cannot go along on the scientific argument. I want the synthetic product called oleomargarine to be sold for what it is and not as an imitator of butter. The fight this year is over the color yellow. Last year it was over the tax. My bill removes the tax but prohibits the sale of yellow-colored oleomargarine.

The oleo industry is using the housewives of the country to sponsor its program so that it can put out a synthetic product, make it look and taste like butter, and thereby steal the butter market from the dairy farmers of the United States.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman, as I understand it, is not opposed to the removal of the tax on oleomargarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. My bill provides for the removal of all taxes and fees.

Mr. GRANGER. As a compromise, that is what the gentleman is offering. As I read the Democratic platform and the statements of the President of the United States, I do not see anything in either that is not in harmony with what the gentleman says. The Democratic platform said it was going to remove the tax on oleomargarine. The gentleman proposes to do that. The President has said he wants the tax removed. So there is complete harmony, it seems to me, with the declaration of the President and the Democratic platform.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am very glad to have the gentleman's interpretation of the Democratic platform, because he is one of the distinguished leaders on the Democratic side, and he is with the majority. I know when he speaks he speaks with authority.

Mr. GRANGER. I thank the gentleman. One more observation, however. I think the gentleman knows that the oleo interests are today in the chain stores of the country getting individuals to sign post cards to indicate that there is a great grass-roots movement to repeal the tax. I think all of us should be apprised of what is going on, the same tactics that were used last year through the expenditure of millions of dollars to repeal this tax.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman brought that matter up. I have a newspaper clipping here from Indianapolis, Ind., showing where the oleo interests not only wrote the letter, but they are also furnishing the letterhead, the envelope, and the postage. The industry is writing and mailing letters for these individual consumers whom they are using as a front to make more money for the oleo industry.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I want to get it clear whether the gentleman's concern is to prevent fraud, to prevent deception, and to prevent any possibility that one might buy oleomargarine in the belief he is buying butter, or whether his concern is to prevent competition for a market, where the public would know what they are buying and where the public made a free choice of colored margarine as against colored butter. Which is the matter of concern with the gentleman?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am glad the gentleman asked that question because my concern is identical with his concern. He is concerned about the welfare of the cotton farmers of the South. He wants them to secure more money for their cottonseed oil; therefore he proposes in his bill that oleomargarine be colored yellow, after elimination of the tax, so that oleomargarine manufacturers will buy more cottonseed oil at a higher price and sell it to the American people in the form of oleo colored yellow to imitate butter. In other words, my interests are identical with the gentleman's. He is trying to protect the cotton farmers and I have repeatedly assisted him in doing that and I will do it in the future; but when it comes to his misguided effort to try to take away the principal market for the dairy farmers of the country, why, then, we have come to the crossroads of mutual assistance.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield further since he has discussed my philosophy?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman will pardon me, I want to make some further remarks.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has discussed what I believe. Now will he not yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will yield after making this next statement.

I think that the gentlemen from the Southern Cotton States are making a big mistake. They are making a big mistake in that they do not realize that the northern dairy farmers are their best buyers for cottonseed meal and the products of cotton. Now, the average family uses about 12 or 14 pounds of butter a year, and to have a little more cottonseed oil used in oleomargarine and sold to the people would not mean a great deal more money, if any, to the cotton farmers for their cottonseed oil.

What has happened to cottonseed-oil prices during these past years? There are 28 large oleomargarine manufacturers. I could easily name them, but time will not permit. I do not hold anything against them, because they are out trying to increase their business. But, what is happening to the price of cottonseed oil in connection with the farmers of the South? When they have cottonseed or cottonseed oil to sell, the oleo and the soap interests go out of the market and let the price go down, where it is today, around 16 cents a pound for the cottonseed oil, and after they have bought it all, then they up the price, so the price range may be 10 cents higher, and they are the ones that make the money out of it, and not the cotton farmers of this country. You can look at the market records year after year and you will find that the 28 oleomargarine manufacturers and the crushers of cottonseed set the market price, and the price goes down at the time the farmer has his cottonseed to sell. The cottonseed-oil industry makes the money on oil and not the cotton farmer.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to ask the gentleman if it has not been demonstrated that a lot of false information has gone out by pseudo scientists, but it has never been proven yet that vegetable oil is equal to animal fat; is that not right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right. I think that Dr. Carlson is one of them.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Not mentioning any names, but it has never been proven yet, and the only experiment that they have conducted has been based on where two dairy products were used in the experiment to try to prove that the vegetable oil is equal to the animal fat.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If they can throw the dairy industry to the vegetable-oil wolves altogether, it is just the first step, is it not? The next will be the filled ice cream, filled evaporated milk, and filled cream. I would like to have the gentleman discuss that possibility, because a lot of our fluid-milk boys have been going around rather smug and saying it does not make any difference whether you eat oleo or not, but how about this magic mix that is appearing on the market.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will be the next step, with our dairy cattle, in part, liquidated. The next step will be a synthetic milk, made out of cottonseed oil and skimmed milk.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? The genteman found time now to yield to the opponents of this measure. Can he not yield to me?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will in just a moment. I will say to the gentleman from Texas, the South is going extensively into the dairy business.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has already said a good deal, and he yielded for a few questions from the opponents. Will he yield to me?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has already said as I understand it—and I want him to correct me if I am wrong—that his interest in this was to protect the market for the dairy people of the United States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is what the gentleman said. I did not say that.

Mr. POAGE. All right. That is the gentleman's interest then.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman want me to restate it?

Mr. POAGE. I heard what the gentleman said, and I could not understand it. I thought that is what you meant, and I wanted to get it clear so the Membership of this House could understand whether you were interested in the dairy people or the consumers.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I decline to yield further. I did not yield for a speech, I yielded for a question.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has not yet stated what his interest is.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would be delighted to let the gentleman know. He knows already that my interest is the same as his. No. 1, I want to protect the consumers of the United States from the fraud and deception that can be practiced as a result of legislation he has offered. No. 2, I want to protect the integrity of the greatest group in American agriculture, two and one-half million dairy farm families who are furnishing the milk, meat, and dairy products for the people of the United States at reasonable prices.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman explain how the consumer is not protected when we offer legislation here that requires a printed notice with every serving of margarine that it is margarine?

Will the gentleman explain how that fails to protect the public from fraud and deception?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman's bill is much better than the Rivers bill that was introduced last year, but we can see the objective back of it. The fight again is over the color yellow. It was last year, it was in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and so on, every time it has come up. It is the color, yellow, because the oleomargarine industry wants to steal the historic color away from butter for oleo.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. Do I understand it to be the gentleman's proposal that the tax be taken off oleomargarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Entirely removed.

Mr. COX. But that the manufacturers be denied the right to color it?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. COX. Do the butter people color their product?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The butter people at certain times of the year do, but it is not done to deceive the people.

Mr. COX. It is put in simply to make it a more attractive product?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is put in to make the butter uniform throughout the year.

Mr. COX. Would the gentleman be willing to apply the same rule that he now proposes shall apply to the manufacturers of oleomargarine to the dairy people, that is, deny the dairy people the right to color their product, the same as the manufacturers of margarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If the gentleman is making that proposal on behalf of the Members on his side, I say yes, I will agree to it for myself.

Mr. COX. What can there be wrong about that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is all right with me. I am glad to hear that offer come from the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I agree with the gentleman that people producing one product should not be permitted to deceive the consumers into thinking they are getting an entirely different product.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is a possibility of that. I recognize that my friend from Texas has tried in his bill to correct that, but people do not generally follow the law, or a good many of them. We have restaurants and hotels in the United States that serve 65,000,000 meals a day in public eating places. Generally the people go in there and pay for butter and they expect to get it, but they may be served with yellow oleo despite the notice my friend from Texas requires when yellow oleo is served.

Mr. COX. How can the gentleman justify permitting the dairy people to color their product and denying that right to the manufacturers of margarine?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am willing to concede that.

Mr. COX. In other words, the gentleman wants to outlaw a practice which deceives the public.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Butter is not colored to deceive anyone, while the purpose of coloring oleo yellow is to make it look like butter, to imitate butter, so that it fools the public.

Mr. COX. I am disposed to agree with the gentleman in the accuracy of the statement he has just made, that the butter people probably use coloring to make a more attractive product.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, to make it uniform throughout the year. There are certain times of the year, as in June, when the cattle are out on grass, hence the color is more yellow.

Mr. COX. Why should the dairy people be permitted to use coloring and others be denied that right?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. They can make oleomargarine out of coal, pulpwood, and petroleum products; they can make it out of most anything. Science is wonderful. The gentleman would not advocate that they should do that or permit that to be colored yellow, would he?

Mr. COX. I certainly would not advocate imposing a tax upon a domestic product and denying it the right to compete with a different product.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman want to injure the dairy business of the country?

Mr. COX. No; I do not want to injure the dairy people. I want to see the dairy people prosperous.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Good. And you want the dairy business to increase in the State of Georgia, do you not?

Mr. COX. Yes; I do.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And it is going to. There are farmers from your State and from nearly every Southern State, who are in favor of the legislation that I am offering. You are trying to build up the dairy industry in the South. If the gentleman was on our Committee on Agriculture today he would find out about the disastrous situation facing cotton. You must get into diversification.

Mr. COX. I would go along with the gentleman, were he to advocate a measure taking the tax off oleomargarine and denying both the manufacturers of oleomargarine and butter the use of coloring with a view of creating a false impression.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman think that having butter look the same throughout the entire year creates a false impression?

Mr. COX. Is it not put in for the purpose of engendering the idea that it is a product of a richer and more desirable character?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; it is only put in during the winter months.

Mr. COX. Why is it put in then?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is put in during the winter months when the cattle are off the pasture, so as to give the butter a uniform color throughout the year, and that is the truth.

I yield to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. There is a tremendous distress among the people who milk cows; and in the great dairy States they are wondering what they can do to help some of these poor dairymen out of the situation that they are in. Imagine, hay is now $80 a ton and cottonseed cake is from $80 to $100 a ton, and here we are proposing today to make it more difficult for these people to get anywhere. It seems to me that the time is absolutely inopportune to place a greater burden on the dairy people. I am speaking about the fellow who milks the cows. They are the people after all, they are the ones out in the hinterlands in every congressional district in the country, who build the country roads and maintain the schools.

Why anybody would want to do anything to make their burden heavier, I am unable to understand.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I agree with the gentleman and thank him for his statement, because after all it demonstrates that in the United States we are coming to the proposition where there is an economic fight going on between two groups of American citizens, which should not exist at all in this country. I have been on the Committee on Agriculture for over 22 years. During all of my service on that committee we have worked together as a unit and there has been no political dividing line and never was until this proposal came up.

The South against the North—it should not be, because you need our help and we need your help to maintain a strong economy for agriculture in the United States.

If agriculture goes down in this country, then the entire country will go down.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief comment?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COX. It would appear to me that the gentleman in the proposal that he now offers is at least approaching a fair solution of this controversial question.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think it is a fair solution. It gets down to the crux of the problem and that is the color of the product. The oleo industry wants to color their product yellow, to make it look like butter, and that affords the possibility of fraud and deception. The primary objective of the oleo industry is to make more money by taking the spread market from the dairy farmers of the United States.

That, my friends, will bring ruin and disaster, not only to the dairy farmers, but also to the entire country, because our dairy farmers use 27 percent of their milk to make butter. If they do not have that outlet, they will have to liquidate their dairy herds and go into other types of production like soybeans and other crops. It will ruin their soil-conservation program, which has been historic on every dairy farm, and it will not only mean the liquidation of the livestock, but in the end it will mean higher prices for milk and meat to the American consumers, because the dairy farmers of today supply 40 percent and more of the meat that is used in the United States

and all dairy products. If you liquidate a great portion of our milk-cow population—we have lost over 3,000,000 head in the last 3 or 4 years—in the end the consumer will pay dollars and dollars more where they might be saving a few cents because they can buy yellow-colored oleomargarine.

So the issue is far greater than just the coloring of yellow oleomargarine. The issue extends to the economy of the entire country. I say this because 25 percent of the diet of the people comes from dairy products and livestock. Therefore we should try to carry out what the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, has said; farmers should produce more milk cows, more beef cattle and hogs. But if you put through something like the legislation proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] that permits the coloring of oleomargarine to make it look like butter, you destroy the very industry that should be built up in the United States to consume the corn and the feed that is produced in abundance. It will also stop the expansion of the dairy industry in the South, where you need it so much in order to replace cotton production.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I was interested in the interpretation which the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] placed on the Democratic platform, in view of the fact that he, among the Democratic members of the Committee on Agriculture, stood alone on that committee last year, and the way in which nearly all Members voted on this question when it came before the House. Does their action in the past seem consistent with the interpretation which the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] has placed on that platform?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was glad to get that interpretation from him. I hope that is the correct interpretation, because, if it is, then the President would veto any bill that would come to him to permit oleomargarine to be colored to make it look like butter.

Furthermore, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is a man who thinks about the entire economy of the country—the economy of agriculture. He tries to figure out how the different components of agriculture fit into the picture. He recognizes the importance of the dairy industry in this country and the nutritious value of the vital products that come from the dairy cow. Of course, there are some who would give a quart of milk to every person in the world. Well, it cannot be done from the United States. We have 3,000,000 less milk cows now than we had in 1944. Milk-cow population is going down and the human population is increasing by leaps and bounds. If you want to drive the little dairy farmers of the country out of business, all you have to do is to pass legislation that will permit 28 oleomargarine manufacturers to color their product yellow, to make it look like butter. That is the only reason they want that law passed, in order to make more money. I think the time has come for the House to take a stand on this proposition, whether or not you are for 2,500,000 dairy farmers in this country who are providing the vital dairy products for the people, or for the oleo industry, that only desires to make more money. If the oleo manufacturers succeed with their scheme it will wreck the dairy industry and our American economy.

I have before me an advertisement which appeared in the Memphis Press-Scimitar of December 13, 1948, and the Memphis Commercial Appeal on December 14, 1948, signed by 29 farm and dairy organizations in the South itself. It well states the position of small-business men and farmers in regard to the butter-oleomargarine controversy.

[From the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar and Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal of December 13-14, 1948]

BUTTER AND THE SOUTH

Widespread fraudulent substitution of yellow oleomargarine for butter must be prevented. This can be done by a flat ban on the imitation of butter through the commercial manufacture or sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Such a ban would enable Congress and the State legislatures to remove all taxes and license fees now imposed on the butter substitute and still protect consumers.

The commercial-yellow ban would permit housewives to obtain all the oleomargarine they want for home use in its most economical uncolored form, without payment of any taxes whatsoever.

A policy to this effect was proposed by representatives of three leading dairy organizations on October 26, 1948. This policy has since been ratified separately by members of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association. The National Grange has expressed its agreement in principle. These organizations represent virtually all dairy farmers who produce milk or cream for sale in commercial channels. They total 25 percent of all the farmers in America.

This policy would abolish all fees and reporting requirements for oleo retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers. Hospitals and other institutions could buy uncolored oleo without license or tax.

At the same time, a ban on imitation butter would curb unfair competition for the butter market, so vital to successful dairying in the South as elsewhere.

The Food and Drug Administration has opposed the addition of artificial colors, as well as spices and other substances, which result in giving food a deceptive appearance.

BUTTER IS VITAL TO THE SOUTH

The dairy industry is more important to the southern farmer—and to the southern consumer—than all the oleomargarine ever manufactured. It supplies all of our milk, half of our beef and veal, and one-fourth of our total food consumption.

The dairy farmer does not seek to deprive anyone of butter substitutes. But the manufacture and sale of oleo colored yellow in imitation of butter leads to "butterlegging"—the passing off of oleo as butter, at butter prices. This reduces the income of the southern farmer and businessman, and hurts the consumer.

Only one-third of 1 percent of the farmers' cash income in leading cotton States can be traced to oleomargarine. On the other hand, oleomargarine is a definite threat to southern markets for dairy products, lard, vegetable shortening (with which oleo competes), and cottonseed meal sold as feed for dairy cattle. To the Cotton Belt farmer, these markets are 28 times as important as the oleo market, as shown by the following table:

*Cash income to farmers in 1946*

| State | From oleomargarine | From products competing with oleomargarine |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | $1,919,000 | $30,956,000 |
| Arkansas | 2,263,000 | 36,891,000 |
| Georgia | 1,815,000 | 35,949,000 |
| Louisiana | 765,000 | 22,277,000 |
| Mississippi | 3,035,000 | 39,908,000 |
| North Carolina | 1,244,000 | 37,909,000 |
| Oklahoma | 639,000 | 63,802,000 |
| South Carolina | 1,090,000 | 19,294,000 |
| Tennessee | 888,000 | 65,766,000 |
| Texas | 3,881,000 | 126,051,000 |
| Total, 10 cotton States | 17,539,000 | 478,803,000 |

Help your farm neighbors and protect your own pocketbook as well. Support the ban on the imitation of butter by oleomargarine colored yellow in semblance of butter. Let butter substitutes sell on their own merits, without butter's naturally yellow color.

Dairy farm organizations of the South, representing farmer members in the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas: Chattanooga Area Milk Producers Association, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Coastal Bend Milk Producers Association, Corpus Christi, Tex.; Consolidated Dairies, Birmingham, Ala.; Dairy Farmers Cooperative Association, Inc., Kentwood, La.; Dairy Producers, Inc., Montgomery, Ala.; Enid Cooperative Creamery Association, Enid, Okla.; Falls Cities Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Louisville, Ky.; Farm Bureau Milk Producers Association, Fort Smith, Ark.; Georgia Association of Cooperative Dairies, Atlanta, Ga.; Hale County Dairy Association, Greensboro, Ala.; Knoxville Milk Producers Association, Knoxville, Tenn.; Maryland and Virginia Milk Producers Association, Washington, D. C.; Maryland Cooperative Milk Producers, Inc., Baltimore, Md.; Miami Home Milk Producers Association, Miami, Fla.; Mid-South Milk Producers Association, Memphis, Tenn.; Nashville Milk Producers, Inc., Nashville, Tenn.; Nolensville Cooperative Creamery, Nolensville, Tenn.; North Carolina Milk Producers Federation, Greensboro, N. C.; Paducah Graded Milk Producers Association, Inc., Paducah, Ky.; Plains Cooperative, Inc., Plainview, Tex.; Richmond Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Richmond, Va.; Roanoke Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Roanoke, Va.; Rutherford County Cooperative Creamery, Inc., Murfreesboro, Tenn.; South Texas Producers Association, Inc., Houston, Tex.; Sumner County Cooperative Creamery, Inc., Gallatin, Tenn.; Valley of Virginia; Cooperative Milk Producers Association, Harrisonburg, Va.; Mississippi Jersey Cattle Club; Southern Region, American Guernsey Cattle Club; Southern Region, Holstein-Friesian Association of America.

It must be remembered that this controversy is, in part, a struggle between small business and big business. The 40,000 dairy plants and the 2,500,000 dairy farmers in this country, many of them situated in the South as elsewhere, are essentially small business organizations. The cottonseed oil and oleomargarine interests, by contrast,

are very big business, indeed. Much of their ownership is closely held by absentee capital operating in the East and Middle West, and even from abroad.

This advertisement shows, moreover, that the aggregate income to small-business men and farmers in the South from dairy products competing with oleomargarine is far above and beyond the comparatively small returns from the butter substitutes.

BUTTER IS VITAL TO THE SOUTH

Only one-third of 1 percent of the farmers' cash income in leading cotton States can be traced to oleomargarine. On the other hand, oleomargarine is a definite threat to southern markets for dairy products, lard, salad oils, and vegetable shortening, with which oleo competes, and cottonseed meal sold as feed for dairy cattle everywhere. To the Cotton Belt farmer these markets are 28 times as important as the oleo market.

The dairy industry is more important to the southern farmer—and to the southern consumer—than all the oleomargarine ever manufactured. It supplies the Nation with all of its milk, 40 percent of its beef and veal, and provides the second largest source of farm income to the South. The dairy farmer, in addition, is one of the best customers of the cotton farmer, who gets half again as much for his cottonseed meal when sold for dairy cattle feed as he gets for the cottonseed oil he sells to oleomargarine manufacturers. Soybean growers get 2½ times as much income from soybean meal sold for dairy-cattle feed as they get from the soybean oil sold for oleomargarine. In the face of these figures, it is hard to understand why the southern farmer should want to cut his own throat for the benefit of the absentee ownership that controls the oleomargarine industry in this country.

A certain element of southern business wants increased markets and increased prices for its cottonseed oil. It believes that the oleomargarine market promises to offer those increases. To foster the oleo market, that element is willing to encourage the possibility of fraud and deception against the American consumer by demanding the right to color oleomargarine yellow in imitation of butter.

OLEOMARGARINE OPENS THE DOOR TO FOREIGN IMPORTS

The oleomargarine manufacturers are willing to go still further. They are willing to sacrifice cotton growers, who derive benefit from the dairy industry, without in any way helping them. The facts are that for three decades there has been a market for every pound of edible oil in the manufacture of shortening and salad dressing. In fact, in each of the years 1935–37, it was necessary to import as much as 100,000,000 pounds of edible cottonseed oil from outside the country to satisfy these needs.

Much cottonseed oil is now being diverted to oleomargarine, leaving an increased vacuum to be filled by other low-priced imported vegetable oils for other products. There is little difference between the formula for vegetable shortenings and the formula for oleomargarine. A difference of only one-fourth of a cent a pound is enough to divert oil from one product to another and, to the modern chemist, it is a simple problem to use such oils interchangeably.

In case some of the gentlemen in this House may not understand why I raise this point, may I digress long enough to explain the essential difference in pricing dairy products as against commercial oils and fats. Over the years the dairy farmer, to obtain full value from his milk, has learned to sell on a classified basis. Fluid milk brings in the highest price, then cream, then evaporated milk, then butter and cheese. There are many variants of the system by which he obtains the maximum return from his product, but classification is the heart of all of them.

The benefits of such classification have not been made available to producers of cottonseed oil, though the peanut growers have used the method to advantage. For example, there is one price to peanut shellers and another to crushers, irrespective of grade. The producer of cottonseed gets no such classified price, and neither does the crusher. The cotton oil mill still sells crude oil on a blind-broker basis. The manager of such a mill does not know and may not care what his oil is used for, even though the profits of their eventual conversion may be greater for one product or another, depending on the season and its circumstance.

Nor does the independent mill owner know whether the price of the tank of oil he is selling is being bid down by another mill operating as part of a chain. The syndicate mill can absorb losses in the added profits it makes by taking the conversion market away from the independents. Any loss shown by the mill is merely a bookkeeping item in that case.

So, out of a tank of oil produced perhaps in the district represented by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE], a part may be used for vegetable shortening after it reaches its northern destination, and a part may go into salad oil, and the remainder may be used for oleomargarine. The grower has no way of knowing what becomes of it or how much its eventual use may bring. He gets the same low price under every circumstance. With a constant shortage of cottonseed oil for edible purposes, it is not possible for any current or expanded sale of oleomargarine to put a single extra penny into the pockets of the American cottonseed oil producers. The same thing applies to the producers of domestic soybean oil.

MONEY TALKS

It is true that for the year 1947 the oleomargarine industry, as represented by only 28 major manufacturers, is known to have spent $6,600,000 for advertising directed in part toward the repeal of oleo restrictions according to Tide magazine. It is true that in 1948, when they thought their battle was all but won, they nevertheless spent an additional $5,400,000 to mislead American housewives on the question of yellow oleomargarine, according to the same publication. It is true that the impact of these millions of dollars of advertising revenue has been reflected by columns of favorable news and editorial comment in return

It is true that Congressmen have been subjected to a barrage of synthetic mail signed by employees of oleomargarine manufacturing concerns, who received suggestions as to what sort of letters their employers wanted them to write. It is true that oleo companies have furnished the stationery for such letters, addressed the envelopes, stamped them, and mailed them in great quantities. It is true that State legislatures have been swamped with petitions for oleo-tax repeal for which, in Ohio at least, the persons who circulated them received 10 cents a name. Many such petitions were circulated by newsboys on their paper routes, and it is possible that the housewives who signed them were merely being charitable.

Money talks; yes. But no oleo money talks loud enough to drown out the fact that milk and its products constitute the largest single source of farm income. And no amount of paid propaganda can conceal the fact that 26.9 percent of all milk in commerce is consumed in the form of butter. Without adequate butter outlets, it is impossible for the Nation to maintain a stable and profitable dairy industry. No advertising expenditure in the world can explain to the American housewife the scarcities and high prices for milk and meat that would result from an oleo monopoly of the market for spreads.

More than 25 percent of all the food consumed annually in this country is produced by the dairy industry. The dislocation of that industry through unfair competition from imitation butter would cost the consumer millions. Mr. Speaker, I say again that this would be too great a price to pay for cheaper oleo—even if the unrestricted use of yellow coloring were to lower the price of oleomargarine, which it would not.

Oleomargarine propaganda does not mention that 24 States have on their statute books legislation restricting the sale of colored products, and that repeal of the Federal restrictions on yellow oleo would not affect States' rights in this matter. These States have heavy concentrations of industrial population and are natural targets for the 28 big oleomargarine manufacturers, who produce and distribute the bulk of this product. As the oleomargarine lobby itself say, "So long as Federal restrictions upon the manufacture and sale of margarine are continued in effect, State restrictive laws are more difficult to remove."

Repeal of Federal restrictions on oleo, therefore, may be considered as an initial attack on the State laws of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, South Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, California, Alabama, Florida, and Missouri.

However, in certain of these States circumstances have developed that give rise to a question as to the effectiveness of several of these statutes, for example:

In Alabama the attorney general of that State, in an opinion given in 1944, stated that the Alabama code did not prevent the sale of colored oleo in that State.

In Florida the State supreme court held in an opinion rendered December 8, 1944, that where oleo was sold under the original natural color of the oil used as a base—even though the oil had bleached out during the refining process and annoto had to be added to restore color—it was not within the statute prohibiting the sale of any spurious preparation purporting to be butter.

In Maine the attorney general of that State, in an opinion given June 1, 1948, stated that yellow oleo could be sold in Maine if properly labeled and identified.

In Missouri the attorney general of that State, in an opinion given June 29, 1948, stated that yellow oleo could be sold in Missouri if the containers or cartons had printed thereon the word "oleomargarine."

In Maryland dealers are selling colored oleo on advice received from their State health department, food and drug division, that oleo is not a substitute made or colored to resemble natural butter as prohibited by the Maryland law. The State's attorney of Montgomery County has a test case under advisement at this writing.

MISLEADING PROPAGANDA AS TO COLOR

Oleomargarine manufacturers are further guilty of leading the public to believe that their product is naturally yellow in color. They infer that Federal restrictions force the removal of this color by bleaching, and that the housewife is unfairly required to restore it. Butter, they say, is colored with the same dyes with which oleo is colored; and restraints on their use of the yellow color is unjustified discrimination.

The facts are that it is impossible to make a naturally yellow oleomargarine out of domestic oils. The Armour Research Foundation of the Illinois Institute of Technology has revealed the results of scientific tests in this respect. When cottonseed oils are turned into fat they become tattle-tale gray. When soybean oils are turned into fat they become a murky green. They are then bleached, not because of the Federal laws, but to remove undesirable odors, flavors, and colors.

Laboratory analyses of hydrogenated soybean or cottonseed oils, the domestic oils generally utilized in commercial production of oleomargarine, indicate that, regardless of whatever other qualities oleo may or may not have, it does not in the least resemble natural butter in its original state as far as color is concerned.

A small percentage of winter butter is colored, of course. However, when color is added to butter, it is for purposes of uniformity and not with the idea of deception and fraud in trying to make butter look like something which it is not. Would the oleo manufacturers want to color their product yellow if butter was naturally pink?

Certainly not. Their demand for yellow is based solely on a desire to imitate butter's naturally yellow color.

OLEOMARGARINE IS A SYNTHETIC PRODUCT

We must remember that oleomargarine is a contrived product of uncertain ancestry. It can be and has been made of fish oil, animal fats, tallow, waste packing-house byproducts, and vegetable oils both domestic and imported. To say that oleo is the nutritional equivalent of butter is to say that horsemeat is the nutritional equivalent of prime roast beef. The statement might be technically true, but it is morally dubious.

Foreign chemists have made oleo successfully from wood pulp and even from coal. Already we are witnessing a return of imported oils, such as coconut and palm-kernel oils. These imports will increase if price advantages warrant. There is no assurance whatever that American oleo will continue to be made from cottonseed and soybean oils. It is fun to be fooled, but not at the expense of diet or health.

In any case, the processing of oleo requires the deodorizing of some oils, the removal of unpleasant off-tastes from others, and bleaching to give a uniform white base for the addition of color. Diacetyl must be added to imitate butter's taste. Vitamin A, which is extracted from shark livers, must be added to imitate butter's nutrition. Milk must be added to oleo to imitate butter's texture. The use of yellow would be the final step toward fraud and deceit by imitating butter's color.

The repeal of the Federal restrictions on yellow oleomargarine would lay the consumer open to substitution on every hand. The markets would be wide open to adulterations and imitations of every kind. Many outlets for butter as a quality product would be destroyed—and that is exactly what the oleomargarine manufacturers want. They want, not part of the market for spreads used on bread, nor most of that market, but all of the market. In other words, they want to destroy the dairy industry and secure a monopoly for their synthetic product.

DAIRY HERDS ENDANGERED

If the Congress takes action to permit the manufacture and sale of oleo colored yellow to look like butter, what will be the effect on the dairy farmers? The lost butter market will be felt first by two and one-half million farmers, many of whom only milk from three to six cows. These farmers and their families depend upon widely distributed local creameries, cheese plants, condensers, and milk plants, totaling more than 40,000 establishments, for almost their only weekly cash income.

During the flush season, cows produce about 50 percent more milk than in winter, while consumption remains about the same. A large percentage of this surplus must go into butter. Indeed, almost 27 percent of all milk produced in this country is thus used, as I have said. Without butter outlets for surplus milk, the small dairy farmers will have no alternative but to reduce their herds, with far-reaching results.

If Federal controls over yellow oleo are repealed, I foresee that the reduction of dairy herds within the next 3 years will have a disastrous effect on the agricultural economy. We lost nearly a million dairy cows between January 1, 1947, and January 1, 1948. This was the sharpest decline in dairy-cow numbers ever recorded in a single year, according to the United States Department of Agriculture.

This drop in milk-cow population will soon be severely felt in those cities which now depend upon abundant supplies of fluid milk and will hurt the very consumers to whom the oleo manufacturers now appeal. Any possibility of savings from cheaper oleo will be reflected many times over in the consumer's increased milk bill. Surplus milk which finds no outlet in butter will be cheap for a while, then farmers will sell their cows and turn to other types of production or even to other occupations.

With increased population and increased demands for milk, a further reduction in dairy herds will produce milk shortages. Higher prices for milk will be inevitable. Higher prices for meat will be equally inevitable, since about 40 percent of our meat supply comes from dairy herds. If this vicious trend is to be continued, we can easily be reduced from our traditional American meat and milk products diet to a subsistence diet of grain and synthetic foods.

Filled milk, filled cheese, and other filled dairy products using cottonseed oil instead of milk fat would follow as a matter of course. In Mexico, a synthetic product consisting of skim milk and cottonseed oil is already being made and sold in bottles. Filled condensed milk has been canned in Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri. Do we want a peon diet for our own children? In Texas certain manufacturers are already substituting cottonseed oil for butterfat in ice cream, and a move is under way to make this deception legal. Where does that leave the dairy farmer?

A shift in production to soybean and other soil-depleting crops would be unavoidable. This, in turn, would mean larger appropriations from Congress to meet our increasing soil-conservation needs and to match the job once taken over without subsidy by our Nation's dairy farmers. The end would be disastrous for farmers and city folk alike, and would endanger the economy of our country.

DAIRY FARMERS ARE NOT PROFITEERS

Yet dairy farming is the backbone of diversified modern agriculture. Manufactured dairy products are a necessary outlet for milk which cannot be sold in bottles, and butter continues to be a product upon which the dairy farmer relies for his livelihood. It is a product which both farmer and consumer must be able to count upon—a quality product which is both a food and a flavor.

From the consumers' standpoint, the law must give protection against fraud and misrepresentation in the substitution of colored oleomargarine for butter. The oleo manufacturers will tell you that there is no other parallel in our laws of one food product being protected against another food product. The answer is that no other type of merchandise affords even a close parallel for comparison.

The monetary incentive to sell colored oleo at the price of and in the guise of butter is absolutely unique. With the quantities of butter sold so huge and a price spread between oleo and butter, there would be tremendous incentive for substitution and fraud if the unrestricted sale of yellow oleomargarine were permitted.

THE NEW DAIRY POLICY

Widespread fraudulent substitution of yellow oleomargarine for butter must be prevented. This can be done by a flat ban on the imitation of butter through the commercial manufacture or sale of yellow oleomargarine. Such a ban would enable Congress and the State legislatures to remove all taxes and license fees now imposed on the butter substitute and still protect consumers.

Such a ban would permit housewives to obtain all the oleomargarine they want for home use in its most economical uncolored form, without payment of any taxes whatsoever. At the same time, a ban on imitation butter would curb unfair competition for the butter market, so vital to successful dairying in the South as elsewhere.

A policy to this effect was proposed by representatives of three leading dairy organizations on October 26, 1948. This policy has since been ratified separately by members of the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, the American Butter Institute, and the National Creameries Association, and the major national dairy-cattle breeders' associations. The National Grange has expressed its agreement in principle, as have many State farm bureaus. I can say with confidence that a majority of all organized farmers in America are behind this policy.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill which provides for those objectives and which, I believe, will receive the approval of every fair-minded Member of this House. It is fair to consumers, because it allows the removal of all taxes and sales restrictions on oleomargarine. It is fair to oleo retailers and wholesalers, because it permits the elimination of all license fees and reporting requirements. Finally it is fair to the dairy farmer. This bill urges a ban on the unfair commercial imitation of butter to insure fair competition for an industry that is vital to national employment, national income, and our national standard of living.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Star]

BUTTER INDUSTRY'S VIEWS ON OLEO

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Your editorial of January 13, Yellow as Butter, seems to favor repeal of the internal revenue laws which effectively have regulated the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine but does not advocate any effective means of protecting consumers from fraud and deception, if these are repealed.

Naïveté does not generally characterize your editorials but your statement, "All oleomargarine, no matter where or how sold, should be labeled as such" achieves a new high for ingenuousness.

It is a fact well known by food enforcement officials that there are certain basic deceptions which are sometimes employed in the preparation of foods which are not correctible by any form of label statement. The use of artificial color for the purpose of simulating a valuable food probably is the foremost example of this type of deception.

Item 1. The Food and Drug Administration throughout its rulings has been sensitive to the deception caused by the use of artificial yellow color in foods which makes them appear to contain eggs. The use of yellow color is forbidden in such foods as macaroni and noodle products, mayonnaise and salad dressings.

Item 2. The circuit court of appeals has upheld the Food and Drug Administration in its contention that white poppy seeds artificially colored to resemble more valuable Dutch blue and Turkish grey poppy seeds, are adulterated.

Item 3. In a 1940 opinion (still valid) the Food and Drug Administration said, "Bakery products, or any other food containing pumpkin, which gives the appearance of having an egg content when no eggs are present, or a greater egg content than is the case, would be an adulterated article under any form of labeling."

A truthful label statement that artificial color had been added would not be a successful defense to a charge of adulteration in any of the above illustrations. Yet, inadequate regulation of yellow oleo would relegate any of the above adulterated foods to the chicken-feed class as a source of booty to the unscrupulous because of the large margin of profit involved and the closeness of the resemblance of yellow oleo and butter in appearance and taste.

Your statement that some butter is artificially colored is a yellow herring. Butter never is colored to make consumers believe it is oleo.

The sound principle upon which the dairy industry's new policy is based was once expressed by a Food and Drug official who after 30 years' experience in protecting consumers from deleterious foods and economic fraud said, "It is our experience in law enforcement that the purchaser is guided many, many times in the identity of a product, by its flavor, its appearance, its physical properties, regardless of what statements are made on the label, with respect to artificiality or coloring, as the case may be; and it is one of the fundamentals of law-enforcement procedure that such effects, resulting from appearances and flavors, when they are deceptive are not correctible by label declaration."

Do not minimize the fraud potential inherent in removing the effective protection which has been afforded housewives by the revenue laws. It grieves me to see the Star running with the pack on this issue. It would seem your really great newspaper should be in the van, endorsing legislation which will give consumers a decent measure of protection, if the tax on yellow oleo is to be removed.

CHARLES M. FISTERE,
*Counsel, American Butter Institute.*

---

[From the Soybean Digest of January 1949]

SOYBEAN OIL IS LOSING MARGARINE MARKET

Soybean oil stands second in quantity among oils used in margarine the first three quarters of 1948. This, of course, is not news. Soybean oil has been second on the list of margarine oils for a number of years. The news is that the quantity gap between soybean oil and cottonseed oil, in first place, is widening.

Some years during the war soybeans supplied almost as much oil to the margarine industry as did cottonseed. But the first 9 months of last year soybean oil constituted only 35.5 percent of the oils going into margarine. Cottonseed furnished 59.8 percent.

Part of the reason for the shift away from soybean oil in the margarine market is the greater availability of all vegetable oils. Buyers are in position to be more choosy. So while soybean oil is finding a wider field among industrial users, it is losing ground relatively as an ingredient of a higher-value product—margarine.

This development gives point to the need for pushing ahead with basic research on the cause and cure of soybean-oil reversion, which is its chief handicap with margarine. We have mentioned this need here many times before. If soybean oil is to compete on equal terms in the high-value field, its weaknesses need to be known and corrected. Such action cannot wait.

The high-value markets are the ones that will support a good price for soybean oil—and soybeans. Once lost, they will be much more difficult to regain.

---

[From the St. Cloud (Minn.) Times]

THE FIGHT ON OLEO

Early in the Eightieth Republican-controlled session of Congress a few oleo manufacturers launched a multi-million-dollar attack against the dairy farmers of the United States.

The Republican Congress had expressed its displeasure with such things as the Democratic farm program and reciprocal trade agreements, so the oleo manufacturers probably thought that the chances were good to put a law through so that they might distribute and actually sell oleo in a color that would look like butter. Their sole objective was to remove the 10 cents a pound Federal tax on oleo colored yellow to masquerade as butter. The sheer force which came near to brutality of oleo's onslaught kept the dairy farmers on the defensive throughout the session. If Congress had not adjourned without finishing a lot of its work, the oleo people might have won out.

As Hoard's Dairyman says, some newspaper editors and other oleo fellow travelers have either innocently or intentionally misinterpreted the new dairy stand. They have surreptitiously played up the portion of the stand that agrees to the removal of all Federal taxes, licenses, and license fees, and have purposely overlooked the fact that the removal of these levies will not be agreed to until yellow oleo has been wiped from the map of the United States. The first action must be absolute abolition and prohibition of the sale and manufacture of fraudulent yellow oleo. When this has been accomplished and enacted into law then, and only then, will the dairy farmers be ready to remove the long-standing Federal levies. This is as it should be. Many States have been following this procedure for several years. They have within their boundaries prohibited the sale and manufacture of fraudulent yellow oleo.

Now the substance of all this is that the oleo industry will not sell its product in its color and on its own merits unless forced to do so by legislation. Enactment of such legislation is the intention of the dairy industry during the 1949 session of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has expired.

WILLIAM A. JUMP

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I announce with the deepest regret the death of Mr. William A. Jump, one of the most efficient officials of the Government and one of the Nation's greatest public servants.

During his long and faithful service with the Department, Mr. Jump served under 11 Secretaries of Agriculture. In 1947 he received the Department's distinguished service award for outstanding service and leadership in the advancement of public administration.

For several years he served as the United States representative on the Subcommittee on Finance of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Mr. Jump began his career in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and was promoted regularly, becoming personal secretary in 1921 to the then Secretary of

Agriculture, Henry C. Wallace. In 1922, during the Harding administration, Mr. Jump was appointed budget officer for the Department, a post which he held continuously thereafter.

Widely known both inside and outside the Federal Government as an outstanding leader in the advancement of public administration, Mr. Jump was a prominent advocate of many improvements in the Federal budgetary and management practices.

Throughout his career as the Department's liaison officer, Mr. Jump was in close contact with Members of the Congress, earning praise for his able handling of the agency's budget matters.

I recall that some years ago when Mr. Jump had rendered particularly valuable service to my subcommittee we voted to increase his salary. He declined, saying such an increase would be disproportionate to the other salaries paid in his department. It is the only instance within my knowledge when an employee of the Government declined an increase in compensation.

On his recent retirement I wrote to him expressing regret at his leaving the Department and my deep appreciation of the great service he had rendered the committee and the Congress and the Nation. In reply he wrote just a day or two before his death:

JANUARY 17, 1949.

Hon. CLARENCE CANNON,
*Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations.*

Dear Mr. CANNON: I cannot tell in the brief space of a note how much your letter of December 22, 1948, meant to me. You probably did not know at the time your letter was written that my retirement from Government service was due to critical illness. I have known since June that I had cancer of the liver, but the suddenness with which I became completely disabled was a surprise.

There has been nothing in my lifetime that has made a deeper impression on me than my frequent and close contact with the congressional appropriations committees of Congress. During the 30 years I have appeared before these committees I have learned to have an entirely different viewpoint on the quality and functioning of the Congress from that which, it seems to me, is most unfortunately held by the general public. I have found Congress to be not weak as the public sometimes seems to believe nor muddle-headed as is the viewpoint often expressed by segments of the public. On the contrary, I have found that Congress is generally strong and generally sound, and working upon a final discovery in the best public interest of a solution of the great pending questions of the day. Their success in finding these solutions, when you consider the enormous ramifications of current times when things legislative have grown and moved away from simplicity and assumed overwhelming complexity, is truly remarkable. The Congress is not perfect any more than other parts of the American scene are perfect, but it is so much better than the American people either believe it to be that it is a shame that this disparity between fact and theory prevails. I say this not in defense of Congress as an institution but as a commendation and urgent need for the general public to find its greatest dependability in the execution of legislative affairs. It is the public itself that is the loser in its inability to grasp the significance of Congress in the whole scheme of economics, continuation of liberty and proper execution of a number of the most important constitutional requirements under our American system. The public seems to be awake on this point and indeed I believe they are making progress on grasping what things are all about. My 30 years before Congress has led me to believe that there is not a single thing of such fundamental importance as for the people to grasp fully their great dependence on the legislative system.

I have tremendously enjoyed my congressional relationships. If I had my time to go over I would try to make them even more useful and effective. I have also enjoyed and place the highest value on the confidence which has been shown me over the years by the Committee on Appropriations.

My best wishes for the future go out to both the House and Senate committees, and I hope the problems that now seem to be unsoluble will quickly turn out to be an enigma of the past, and that the American people will come to the highest general appreciation of these great instruments of government for which our Constitution provides.

With personal good wishes to all of the members of the committees and subcommittees with which I have dealt, and especially my personal good wishes to you and the other chairmen involved, I remain,

Sincerely,

W. A. JUMP.

Active for many years in his professional field, he was a member of the organization committee which led to the establishment of the American Society for Public Administration. He also worked on a committee of the American Political Science Association, a unit promoting closer relations between members of the association and Federal, State, and local government public officials.

Mr. Jump was widely recognized for his professional abilities and was frequently asked to give lectures and special courses at various universities and colleges, including Harvard, Princeton, University of North Carolina, Mount Holyoke College, and American University.

A short time before his death, Mr. Jump, in response to many messages and tributes from his colleagues, wrote a farewell message to his associates in the Department of Agriculture, in which he said:

There is no finer place in America than the Department of Agriculture in which to grow up and spend a lifetime, as I have done. I feel that I have been most fortunate in having had that privilege.

Not a week passes that I am not stimulated by some fresh evidence of the spirit of true public service that is the strong foundation of the Department. Somehow and in some way the fact that from the beginning the Department has existed for the sole purpose of making life in America a better, richer, and fuller experience has resulted in an honest, vigorous, and intensely realistic public-service concept on the part of the staff of the Department, high and low, that is truly remarkable.

This makes the Department a most stimulating and inspiring place to work. A member of the Department does not have the feeling that he is just helping to turn the wheels that make a large organization work; he feels he is a partner in a great enterprise.

This institutional appreciation is a priceless asset. It could not be created by the use of money or by any of the modern methods of building a so-called esprit de corps, as important and desirable as that may be.

I would be the first one to admit or even assert that the Department is not perfect. There is no danger of this, but if it ever gets to be perfect it will become so self-centered as to be of little use as a public-service institution. For many years my work has involved extensive and varied external relationships, both public and private. I have kept my eyes and ears open. The net result is that I am more deeply convinced than ever that in the USDA we have something quite unusual, whether measured by public or private standards.

We have become so accustomed to all this that sometimes it appears that we just take it for granted. But, as everyone knows, traditions have to be kept alive and passed forward. We are not static, which I think is very good, since nothing would be more objectionable than an insulated or too highly inbred bureaucracy.

Heads of the Department, bureau heads, and the personnel at large come and go. Even bureaus come and go as the cycle of organization and reorganization keeps in motion. It is noteworthy that regardless of the scope and degree of such changes and the strain they sometimes impose, the traditions and ideals of the Department are kept alive by recognition by the officers and personnel generally of these great intangibles among our institutional assets and determination and eternal vigilance to keep it so from generation to generation.

That is why I feel compelled to mention the traditions and public-service ideals of the Department as one of the outstanding impressions I have at the close of a lifetime of sharing in this good and wholesome atmosphere.

In like spirit he wrote in his last days to Secretary Brannan:

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
*Secretary of Agriculture.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: When I last mentioned the subject of my retirement I had hoped to be able to remain on the job until after the first of the new year. During recent weeks, however, my physical condition has grown worse so rapidly that I now have no choice but to apply at once for disability retirement.

After spending nearly 42 years in the Department I regret very much the necessity for leaving in such summary fashion. I had expected to retire at 60, about 3 years hence, and always took it for granted that when that time came I would have the usual opportunity to say good-by, individually and in person, to my many friends and associates in the Department. Since that is not now possible, I should like to take this opportunity, through you as the head of the Department, to say good-by and to thank each and every one for their kindness and cooperation over the years. There are no finer folks anywhere than those who comprise the Department of Agriculture. I have the deepest personal affection for them and I am going to miss them very much indeed.

Among many other things that I should like to say at this time there is one more that I feel I must say. I would be either the most ungrateful, or the least discerning, person in the world if I left without saying it. And that is that there is no finer place in America than the Department of Agriculture in which to grow up and spend a lifetime, as I have done. I feel that I have been most fortunate in having had that privilege.

Not a week passes, even after all these years, that I am not stimulated by some new and fresh evidence of the spirit of true public service that is the strong foundation of the Department of Agriculture. Somehow, and in some way, the fact that from the beginning the Department has existed for the sole purpose of making life in America a better, richer, and fuller experience, has resulted in an honest, vigorous, and intensely realistic public-service concept on the part of the staff of the Department, high and low, that is truly remarkable. This makes the Department a most stimulating and inspiring place in

which to work. A member of the Department of Agriculture does not have the feeling that he is just helping to turn the wheels that make a large organization work; he feels he is a partner in a great enterprise. That has been my experience for 42 years. I know it is the experience of countless others in the Department who could not be tempted to work anywhere else. This institutional appreciation is a priceless asset. It could not be created by the use of money or by any of the modern methods of building a so-called esprit de corps, as important and desirable as that may be.

Of course, some will say that these are merely the enthusiastic, or overenthusiastic, observations of a person who has spent his lifetime within the walls of the USDA. I admit to some vulnerability on that score and have tried all the more, therefore, to be objective about the Department. I would be the first one to admit or even assert that the Department is not perfect. There is no danger of this, but if it ever gets to be perfect it will become so self-centered as to be of little use as a public-service institution. For many years my work has involved extensive and varied external relationships, both public and private. I have kept my eyes and ears open. The net result is that I am more deeply convinced than ever that in the USDA we have something quite unusual, whether measured by public or private standards.

We have become so accustomed to all this that sometimes it appears that we just take it for granted. But, as everyone knows, traditions have to be kept alive and passed forward. We are not static, which I think is very good since nothing would be more objectionable than an insulated or too highly inbred bureaucracy. Heads of the Department, bureau heads, and the personnel at large come and go. Even bureaus come and go as the cycle of organization and reorganization keeps in motion. It is noteworthy that regardless of the scope and degree of such changes and the strain they sometimes impose the traditions and ideals of the Department at large are kept alive by recognition by the officers and personnel generally of these great intangibles among our institutional assets and determination and eternal vigilance to keep it so from generation to generation. That is why I feel impelled to mention the traditions and public-service ideals of the Department as one of the outstanding impressions I have at the close of a lifetime of sharing in this good and wholesome atmosphere.

In building such a valuable institutional tradition over the years the Department has had great help from the existence of certain characteristics or factors that have a bearing on all that it does. The relative virtue we have attained, it seems to me, has been tremendously influenced by some of these. No two people would agree on a list of such factors but some that I have seemed to see quite clearly are:

The impact of research on the character of the Department. The existence from the beginning of research and experimentation as the basic function of the Department has instilled a general respect for the eternal quest for the truth and a corresponding skepticism and scorn for sham, half-truth, conclusions not supported by facts, and so on.

The practice of maintaining the closest possible contact with the people themselves and their elected Representatives in Congress in determining what constitutes sound policy and program at any given time. This has resulted in the desirable situation where there is no such thing in fact as a Department of Agriculture program. For convenience, we refer to USDA programs, but over the years I sense that we have learned that the people's programs are the only ones that have a sound and lasting place in a democracy. Occasionally, the Department pushes forward more rapidly than some people believe justified. This is desirable evidence of dynamic and progressive leadership arising out of our public-service concept. When the shake-down occurs we know the actual programs will and must be those the people want and support.

The collaborative and cooperative process: The great connectionalism (I know about the word "nexus" but it's too simple a word to do justice to agricultural organization in the United States) in which the Department is involved with the land-grant colleges and other State agricultural departments and institutions, the farm organizations, the farmer committee systems, the cooperatives, the agricultural credit agencies, the industry and trade groups, the congressional committees, and so on, has developed a philosophy of collaboration and cooperation that has made an imprint on the Department and its methods of thought and action that is unique in Government. While fulfilling the obligations of this vast and intricate pattern of relationships is burdensome at times, the results have made the United States the envy of the world where food and agriculture are concerned. A byproduct is that the Department has been saved from becoming arrogant, self-sufficient, smug and too satisfied with itself. These are alleged to be common sins of bureaucracy. I say "alleged" because they are not nearly so prevalent as some would have the public believe and personally I don't believe they exist in Government in as great degree as in private enterprise. While some, of course, say we have these sins (and doubtless we do, in spots, for temporary periods) I believe we have largely avoided the pattern of officialdom they suggest because we are, and must be, a part of this vast agricultural connectionalism.

The democratic process in internal administration, arising, I believe, out of some of the factors mentioned above, the Department is distinctive in its practice of collaboration and cooperation in the development of policies and methods of internal administration and operation. This contributes tremendously to making the Department a wonderful place in which to work. I do not know of any place in the world where an arbitrary or unsound adminstrative policy or practice has less chance of survival than in the Department of Agriculture.

The Department also has been blessed throughout its history by high-grade leadership at the top. I have worked under 11 Secretaries of Agriculture, including the present Secretary, and every one of them has dedicated himself to the highest possible standards of public service. For years I have advanced the theory that God looks out for the Department of Agriculture in this respect. Whatever the reason, the fact remains that we have never had other than able men who understood and believed in the public-service concept as Secretaries of Agriculture. That has been a big factor in maintaining the high character of the Department, both externally and internally.

It is a source of deep regret to me that I will not have the privilege of serving with you personally in the years ahead. I have always enjoyed working with you. Particularly, I have admired your courage and vigorous and consistent championing of the principles of public welfare, fairness, and justice as applied to Government policies and programs. I wish you happiness and every success in your leadership in American agriculture as well as in the Department internally and I have no doubt you are going to continue to have an interesting and satisfying experience.

I appreciate all of the consideration which has been shown to me and will always be tremendously interested in what you and the Department of Agriculture are doing.

With warm personal regards,

Sincerely,

W. A. JUMP,
*Director of Finance.*

Perhaps the best summation of Mr. Jump's long and distinguished public career was written by President Truman when, on learning of his resignation as Director of the Department's Office of Budget and Finance, he wrote:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, December 21, 1948.*

MY DEAR MR. JUMP: I have received with a sense of deep loss the word that you are retiring from the Government service. Few public servants have earned a rest as much as you have, and I send you every good wish as you relinquish your duties as Director of Finance and budget officer of the Department of Agriculture. In addition to my personal relationship with you, for which I shall always be grateful, I know that I speak for hundreds of others when I say that your retirement will create a void which will be hard to fill.

However, you have become a symbol of such a high standard of public service that we cannot think of your retirement as ending your career. Your example of selfless effort to improve public administration has blazed a wide and clear trail which is already being followed by many of your associates and will be followed by many others for a long time.

You carry with you the good wishes of your coworkers. It is a privilege and a pleasure to extend to you the thanks of the Government which you have served through more than four decades with such self-sacrificing devotion and fidelity.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. GATHINGS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MCDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in both to include extraneous matter.

## SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes tomorrow following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for the day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

## REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT BUREAUS AND DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments this morning began hearings on H. R. 1569, a bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies and for other purposes.

The bill is somewhat similar to previous legislation, but, as in previous legislation, it carries a provision in section 6 of title I which makes it subject to the objection that it is unconstitutional.

Permit me to state that I agree with the overwhelming majority of the Con-

gress that there should be a reorganization of the executive departments which will give greater efficiency at less cost.

Nothing is sought to be accomplished by this bill which cannot be accomplished through legislative procedure.

The argument that no previous Congress has attempted a general reorganization of the executive departments is not an answer to the fact that this Congress has authority to do that job if it so desires.

We have a Democratic President and we have a Democratic majority in the Senate and in the House. Presumably, that Democratic majority in each House is working with the President. Nor is there any reason to believe that the Republican membership in both Senate and House will not go along with the President on any reasonable, valid plan which promises greater efficiency and economy.

There is at this time no excuse for evading or ignoring constitutional provisions.

Say what you will, our procedure and progress under the Constitution have demonstrated that it is still the form of government which gives to the citizen the greatest freedom and prosperity, to the Nation the greatest degree of security. Having the best, why should we scrap it or disregard its essential provisions?

To attain a desired objective, should we disregard fundamental principles and procedure incorporated in the instrument which has protected the liberty of the citizen, guaranteed the safety of our Nation? The answer is obvious.

Unfortunately, this bill (H. R. 1569) as written, seeks to reverse the constitutional legislative processes.

Section 1 of article I of the Constitution provides that—

> All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

The second paragraph of section 7 provides that—

> Every bill which shall have passed the House of Representatives and the Senate shall before it becomes a law be presented to the President of the United States.

Now it is true that section 3 of article II provides that the President "shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient."

But nowhere in the Constitution nor in the amendments to it, so far as I have been able to find, is there a sentence or a word which authorizes the President of the United States and one branch of the Congress to enact legislation.

H. R. 1569, construed as a whole, authorizes the President to send down reorganization plans, and it expressly states that, unless within 60 legislative days, both the Senate and the House disapprove of those plans as written, they shall be the law of the land.

This reorganization bill ignores the constitutional provisions that the legislative power shall be vested in the Congress of the United States, which, according to the Constitution, "shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives."

Under the Constitution, as every Member of this House and every schoolboy knows, before a bill or a resolution can become the law of the land it must receive the approval of a majority of the Members of the Senate and the House. Then, if the President vetoes the bill or resolution, it must before it becomes law, receive the approval of two-thirds of the Members of each House.

Under the reorganization bill as written and as now being considered by the committee, the procedure would be changed, and a bill or resolution or plan, whatever you prefer to call it, submitted by the President would, if it was approved by either the House or the Senate and disapproved by the other, nevertheless become the law of the land.

Stated in another way, the proposed reorganization plan would give to the President and to one branch of Congress the authority to enact legislation having to do with the reorganization of the executive department.

Or if the President sent down a bill and neither House acted adversely within 60 legislative days, the President's plan would become the law of the land. To state that somewhat differently, the President, under this bill, can "introduce" a bill and that bill becomes a law without the action of either House.

Under the Constitution, although a majority of the Senate and the House pass a bill, the President has the authority to veto it. Unless that veto is disapproved by two-thirds of each House, the bill or resolution does not become a law.

Under the reorganization plan, a bill or resolution or plan proposed by the President becomes the law of the land unless it is vetoed within 60 legislative days by both branches of the Congress.

Such a departure from constitutional provisions is so apparent, so radical, that I cannot support it.

Believing as I do in the purpose of the bill, I shall, in committee, and if unsuccessful there, later on the floor, if the rules permit, offer an amendment striking out section 6 and providing in a general way that when any such plan is suggested by the President, it shall, by the proper officer of either body, be referred to the proper committee for action in the customary manner.

Such an amendment will also require the Congress to act upon the plan so submitted within a fixed period of time.

One or two other amendments will be offered to the bill at the proper time, but none will be so drafted as to in any way interfere with a speedy and complete reorganization of executive departments in the manner indicated by the President if the Congress so desires.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. It is true that there is legislative precedent for this, is there not? Even prior to the war we passed legislation which did just that?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There may be legislative precedent, but what has that to do with the legality of the procedure? The gentleman does not claim we are bound by the actions of a previous Congress, does he? There are many bad precedents. The United States Supreme Court has recently overruled some of its own decisions. I recall the precedent established by the United States Supreme Court back in March of 1942 when it decided under the law that then existed certain organizations had the right, in the words of Chief Justice Stone, to practice highway robbery. But we fixed that. The fact that some other Congress, a rubber-stamp Congress, if you please, has dodged its duty, shirked its responsibility, or made a mistake is no reason why the objections which I raise, if they are valid, should not now be acted upon favorably. May I ask the gentleman, the fact there is legislative precedent for it would not standing alone justify us in passing this bill, would it?

Mr. GRANGER. In answer to that I would say "No," but I did want the gentleman to know this is not an absolutely new thing. It has been done before.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. I would say it has been done two or three times, but that does not make it right. That is no reason why we should now shirk our responsibility, dodge our responsibility, if you want to put it that way, and turn over this power to the President and to one House of Congress, or more accurately, if both Houses fail to act, to the President.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Is it not a fact that the courts have not ruled on the legality of this proposed legislation?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not so far as I know. Of course, that may be due to the fact no one has brought it up. It has not been tested. But the Constitution is so clear, the provisions as to how legislation shall be enacted are so plain, that I cannot see how there can be any difference of opinion as to what the Constitution provides. If there is no difference of opinion as to that, why should we attempt in this way to circumvent, dodge, or repeal the provisions of the Constitution?

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. From the gentleman's study of this bill, does he think it will really accomplish great economy for the people of the United States?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I cannot tell about that. We had the unification bill up for consideration. We were told in the beginning that it would bring about economy through unification of the armed services, but before the hearings were over the witnesses did not know whether there would be economy or not. We all know that there is plenty of room for economy. We should have it. We hope this bill will bring that about.

Certainly, I would say that if former President Hoover and the Commission

which has given so much study cannot devise a plan to give us greater efficiency and economy, I do not know of any commission that can.

Mr. GOLDEN. That was my hope, that we would accomplish a great, needed economy for our people that are already overburdened.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with that. I am in agreement that we should take this plan in the main, but I would like to change that particular provision as to when it shall become a law and how it shall become a law. One other thing in the bill: There is no limitation in the bill as to the time in which the President must submit his reorganization plan. I think there should be. I do not care whether you make it 60 days or 90 days after the convening of Congress, but there should be a limit. For this reason, that if the Congress must act—that is, both Houses of Congress—within 60 legislative days from the time the bill is submitted, and if the President should wait until 61 days before adjournment date—and adjournment is fixed by the Reorganization Act—then, as we all know, there is a flood of bills before the Congress, a great deal of business before the Congress, and we would not be able, no matter how much we desired, to give that reorganization plan the consideration that it ought to have.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that the Commission does not recommend a Cabinet position for the Veterans' Administration? It leaves it as an independent office. I have always felt that anything so important as the Veterans' Administration should be a department, with the head of it having Cabinet rank. The head of the Veterans' Administration has a great responsibility.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understand the gentlewoman's consideration for the veterans. I do not believe there is an hour of any day that she is not thinking of the veterans. But, I do not see why we should establish a separate department.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think that it makes for efficiency, as well as a benefit to the veterans. The Veterans' Administration has the welfare of some 18,000,000 persons under its jurisdiction with an increasing load. It has, also, a very far-reaching effect on the economy of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Columbia Basin Commission.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include newspaper comments.

Mr. FELLOWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. NORBLAD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to state to my colleagues in the House of Representatives that early in the present session I introduced for your consideration a bill providing for Federal aid to our elementary and secondary schools.

Under the Federal Constitution of the United States, this Government has the right to appropriate Federal funds to improve the general welfare of our people. Conditions have arisen in the United States over the past few years that make it imperatively necessary for our Central Government to aid our various State governments in financing the schools of this great free country. There is, in my opinion, no bill pending before the Congress of the United States, of a domestic nature, of more vital importance to our people than this bill. Since the inception of our country, one of the greatest privileges of America has been the opportunities given to our school children for a free education.

With a very large number of the States of this Union having already reached the ceiling and limit of their ability to tax their people and raise funds for school purposes locally, we are confronted with a national emergency that, in my sincere opinion, requires the Federal Government to supplement the State funds to prevent our educational system from deteriorating to such an extent that it would permanently injure the welfare of our people for several decades to come.

Under our republican form of government, where the people themselves have the free right to vote for measures and men in order that our people may maintain their liberty and the blessings of this country, we must have an educated electorate, and we must keep and maintain high educational standards so that communism and other destructive ideologies cannot and will not take root in America to destroy us.

Furthermore, if we educate our youth they will not only be better able to maintain themselves, and to contribute greatly to our national income by their increased capacity to produce, but will also be able to remove themselves from the classes of people who are often dependent and who call upon our National Government for various kinds of support, and will thereby again greatly strengthen the entire people of America, and contribute directly to our national welfare.

In this dawn of the atomic age, or better stated, the dawn of scientific age, if we do not improve our educational standards in America, the doors of opportunity will be slammed in the faces of millions of our boys and girls. America has definitely assumed world leadership, and never before in the history of our country has it been so vitally important for us to educate our youth.

It is apparent to all thoughtful men and women who believe in the freedom and dignity of the individual and believe devoutly in Christianity—that the entire peoples of the world are now in a mortal struggle where the forces of evil, slavery, communism, and dictatorship are arrayed against the American way of life. This terrible struggle will go on for years.

We are in a righteous crusade, endeavoring to hold aloft the torch of Christianity and freedom in order that mankind everywhere may have the blessings of freedom. We cannot maintain this great leadership, neither can we win this great struggle, unless we continue to educate the boys and girls of America. We must greatly increase their educational opportunities. I think we have a tremendous obligation to provide equality of opportunity to the children of the United States. No child can have equality of opportunity, in my opinion, unless to start with he has a basic minimum education. There are many children who may have the mental capacity or the mental brilliance to rise above the handicap, and there are many who will likely educate themselves, but I think they comprise a very small proportion of the total. The ordinary child who receives no education is, in effect, condemned to a life of poverty, a life on the basis of a low standard of living, a life of little interest, and a life which is of little value to the people of the United States.

During World War II over 1,200,000 men, representing 8 percent of all those examined for selective service, were rejected because of deficiencies. I am advised that a very large percentage of this great army of rejected young men came from States that were unable to properly educate their youth. This threw an additional burden upon the few States who had maintained higher educational standards for their children.

The Federal census of 1940 disclosed that 10,000,000 adult Americans had less than 5 years of schooling. The census of 1945 disclosed that 4,000,000 children between the ages of 5 to 17, inclusive, and 2,000,000 children in the usual school brackets of 6 to 17, inclusive, did not attend any school. In proportion to population, the largest number of adults and children of school age in these groups reside in low-income States.

This is a Nation-wide problem. We should not look at it from a local or State viewpoint. We should have as nearly as possible in America an equalization of educational opportunities for all of the youth of this great country. This necessary equalization cannot be had unless we obtain Federal aid to supplement State funds for schools.

Over the past recent years, with the purchasing power of the dollar greatly descending, tens of thousands of our school teachers and educators have worked in their vital profession for salaries and compensation far below the requirements of a decent living, and our

teachers have for years made personal sacrifices to continue in their chosen profession—at great personal loss to themselves. In addition to this, many of our great educators and splendid school teachers have been forced to retire from the field of education and seek employment in other lines that pay a great deal more. As a consequence of these trends our schools are in a deplorable condition. Thousands of young teachers, with inadequate training, and with only emergency and temporary certificates, have been required to assume the great responsibility of training and teaching our children. However, great credit must be given to emergency teachers who have kept open schools that might otherwise have closed, but their unselfish service does not excuse the failure to pay salaries that will hold qualified teachers, and give incentive to emergency teachers to qualify themselves, and advance the standards of teaching.

There is something wrong with an economic and social system which makes better provision for men and women in labor, industry, or other professions, than for those who have made great sacrifice in time and money to prepare themselves to teach the youth of the Nation. There is no prospect of this deplorable situation getting any better without Federal Aid, and without such aid it will rapidly get much worse.

During the year 1943, more than 1,000,000 new Americans were born in the United States. In the year 1947, 1,300,000 American children were born in the United States. This is far more than usual. The children born 5 and 6 years ago are now entering school, trying to get in schools that are already understaffed with teachers and overcrowded with pupils.

Any American boy or girl, if given a preliminary education in this great free country of ours will have unlimited opportunities spread before them throughout life. If they have no education, they will likely be a constant expense and drain on the rest of our people.

If we tackle this problem now and keep our educational standards high, and greatly improve them, we will not only see many of our young American men and women rise to eminence and statesmanship, and fill the great offices of our country, but there will be tens of thousands of essential places in our society that educated young men and women can and will fill. We must remember that besides the exceptionally few brilliant successes that come from our schools, the ordinary men and women of tomorrow march out from the school doors of our beloved land unprepared and not ready to meet and master the complexities of our modern civilization.

There should be no State boundary lines considered while this bill is pending before the House of Representatives, and there certainly is no political issue involved. It simply presents a great emergency that demands the thoughtful and early consideration of every Member of Congress in order that we may keep this great country free and secure.

It will take two-thirds of all the women graduates from all our colleges and universities going into the field of education to supply new and qualified teachers in order to meet the bare needs that now exist. It takes money and a lot of it in order to furnish only a reasonable staff of American teachers. We must have a million teachers in order to enable our boys and girls to receive the education and training they are entitled to.

While this Government has been generous and helpful to many of the peoples of the world, it is my belief that we should now first give consideration to our own people, our boys and girls, and the $300,000,000 per annum provided for in my bill is a small sum indeed as compared to other appropriations that have been and will likely be made to aid millions of people in other countries.

My bill is H. R. 1144. I think it embraces all the good features necessary to enable our children to receive a higher standard of education. In 1944 there were approximately 29,000,000 school children ranging in age from 5 to 17 in in the United States. This number is increasing rapidly. There are approximately 867,248 elementary and secondary teachers. This bill will directly benefit both these large groups of our people. Last week the United States loaned $100,000,000 to the Government of Israel. Why not use some of our national fund for our own people who deserve and need it most? To do so will strengthen this great Nation of ours.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN.) Under previous order of the House the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, since this Congress is committed to enlarge the scope of old-age security, and aid to crippled and the blind, it will not be out of place to state to this Congress just how the matter operates today under our present law. Under the present law the Federal Government pays a maximum of $45 per month for each person certified on the relief rolls. On the first $15 the Federal Government pays two-thirds and then one-half of the remaining allowance up to the maximum of $45. Specifically, it would work out as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| First $15: | |
| Government's share | $10 |
| State's share | 5 |
| Next $30: | |
| Government's share | 15 |
| State's share | 15 |

In other words, on a $45 basis the Government would pay $25 and the States, $20.

It is unnecessary to point out to this House the inadequacy of this $45 in times where the cost of living, the cost of clothing, the cost of everything a poor man has to buy has pyramided to new heights. Congress must realize this, for it was not long ago that the Congress increased the salaries of Congressmen to $12,500 and added an extra untaxable expense account of $2,500.

Just think this over. What could you do in times like these if all you had to spend was $45 per month? That is not the worst of the situation. Under North Dakota law the welfare boards are authorized and do file liens against any property old people own, and of course, this is a superior lien to anything but taxes and a first mortgage. When the old person dies up comes this lien and if the property is worth the amount of the money advanced, the property is sold for that purpose unless the heirs decide to redeem the property and pay the money back which the aged received for old-age assistance. There have been instances where jewelry or silverware, long in the family, have had to be disposed of.

In other words, as this law operates, we make the aged of the country abject paupers before they can draw a dime from the welfare boards. Is that what is called an old-age pension? The aged should draw the annual payments as a matter of right and retain their self-respect. We do not do it that way. We help an aged person only when he is down and completely out, and if he still clings to a little property that sustains his self-respect, we take that away. The first thing we do is to make sure that he is a pauper and an alms beggar. If he is not down and out, we make him so.

In the State of North Dakota the sales tax is divided and set aside for two purposes: One is to support the schools of the State and the other to take care of the aged, blind, and crippled. Three-fifths of this tax goes to schools and two-fifths to the other purposes. North Dakota is now collecting about $11,500,000 in sales taxes and is able to match Federal funds without changing the ratio of the division of the tax, and without any extra appropriation from the legislature.

If this Congress would change the present formula to match funds on a basis of $90 per month, there is no question but what North Dakota could match Government funds.

The Social Security Act should be amended with a provision that funds shall be paid to recipients as a matter of right and not as an alms gift; that any property owned by an applicant shall not be subject to a lien as a condition precedent to participation in the social-security fund. No State welfare set-up should be approved that has this abject-pauper clause in it.

This Congress wants also to remember that before the Townsend movement swept the country we were doing nothing for the aged. That scheme was labeled fantastic and visionary, and Dr. Townsend was described as a bad character. We even put him in jail here in Washington because he was outspoken in his demand for old-age assistance. That movement, nevertheless, no matter how roundly criticized, was the mother of the present Social Security Act. It was a start, but, as little as it was, credit for the start must be given to those thousands who put in their dimes and nickels to support a great humanitarian movement.

This agitation will go on—no one can stop it—until the aged in the United States have adequate old-age assistance that is honorable and which comes to them as a matter of right.

The majority of this Congress and the President himself are bound by their campaign pledges to come to the relief

of the aged men and women of the United States. I am bound by that pledge; and, as a Republican Member of this Congress, I will make available to the aged of the United States my time and whatever ability I have, to bring a little more sunshine into their lives—the lives of our pioneers.

Not all of our citizens over the age of 65 years ever make an application for old-age assistance. In the United States today there are approximately 11,000,000 who have reached the age of 65 years. As the social-security administration has functioned, only 2,482,350 have filed applications for assistance.

In North Dakota in 1948 there were 46,114 persons who had reached the age of 65 years, but the number asking for assistance was approximately 8,713, or about 13.9 percent of the total number of aged persons.

If the Federal yardstick or limit of assistance was raised to $90 per month instead of $45, the Government would pay approximately $4,860,000 annually and the State of North Dakota a like amount. Can the State of North Dakota match this fund? The answer is "Yes." The sales tax brings in $11,000,000 annually and two-fifths of this or $5,000,000 is earmarked for the aged, blind, and crippled.

For the aged in the entire United States who apply for old-age assistance to get $90 per month would require a fund of approximately $990,000,000, of which the Federal Government would pay one-half, or $495,000,000. The various States would pay a like amount.

This seems like a huge sum, but let us stop for a moment and see what a billion means to Congress.

World War I cost us with outstanding commitments, $80,000,000,000, and World War II, $450,000,000,000, and since the shooting stopped we have extended aid to foreign countries in the approximate sum of $63,000,000,000. We dumped three billion into China and bet on the wrong horse, and our aid to Greece and Czechoslovakia will probably end in total losses. I will present in the RECORD, as soon as I get the information from the Treasury Department, a full statement of loans to foreign countries, or gifts, as these loans in the most part will be gifts when payment time comes. England owed thirty-four billion and we canceled that in full if they would pay the interest. They did not have the interest so we loaned them enough more to pay the interest. Does anyone think we will collect this? Why not be plain about it and say that we canceled the thirty-four billion of England's indebtedness to us completely.

There are a great many people in the United States fearful that communism will gain a foothold here, hence we are out to stop its spread before its gets to this country. That is the whole sentiment behind the Marshall plan. We are not making much headway in this matter as in country after country we have spent our money in vain.

Did anyone in the State Department understand that to loan money and send materials to the Chiang Kai-shek Government of China would stop the Communists? Chiang is probably the richest potentate on the face of the globe and has presided over more starving millions than anyone in history.

Let us determine in what kind of soil communism grows. Does it grow and spread anywhere in the world where there is no hunger, distress, and suffering? No, it requires the soil of starvation and want. As long as we here in the United States or in the governments of any country keep this burden off the backs of the people, there will be no communism. If we preserve and enforce the guaranties of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, there will be no flocking of the people to communism.

We have neglected our own people while we have been attempting to bring the four freedoms to all corners of the earth. Are we not now neglecting the aged of this country? Can we expect them to live on a $45 per month allowance in times of pyramided prices? They are suffering now—we are keeping them in distress. And, by the way, are we protecting our own people when we have half-starved and half-naked Indians tramping through the snow to hunt something to eat?

I do not say that we should not help starving people in other countries, but we should not pour out the billions for that purpose without a whimper while our own people are in want. Let us keep the United States sound and committed always to a people's government, where all the people shall have the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We should never allow conditions to develop here where want, suffering, and distress overtake the people. We should be too proud as a Nation—a Nation that has the opportunity to give hope to distressed people everywhere—to permit our aged people and our citizen Indians to beg for something to eat. Let us as Congressmen resolve right now that hungry Indians shall be fed and that the old pioneers of America shall not have to stand in a beggars' line.

In their last days, let the aged of America know that a great Government, one which they helped to build by their years of toil, is the kind of a government that does not forget them.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURDICK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I am very glad the gentleman has so early in this session brought this question before the House. I sincerely hope that many of us in the House will follow him and try to do something about this problem.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

LET US GET THE FORESTRY JOB DONE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, just a year ago on December 11, 1947, in the Eightieth Congress, I made a speech entitled "Starting the Forestry Job Now." I quoted from a magazine article which stated that other countries were developing their forest resources on a huge scale. I urged as strongly as I knew how that we in this great Nation get started on an adequate program for the restoration and development of our own forest resources.

In the same Eightieth Congress, I and several of my distinguished colleagues, including Senator Russell, Senator Ellender, Congressmen Pickett of Texas, Allen of Louisiana, and Riley of South Carolina, introduced bills which would have given our Nation some of the stimulus needed to produce timber for war or peace, for soil and game conservation, and for flood-control problems.

Furthermore, in the Eightieth Congress some 124 Congressmen, a number of representative small-woodland owners, and many other interested persons appeared before congressional committees and pleaded for an adequate start now in building up our forest resources. Yet all of you know that but little resulted from the efforts for forestry in the Eightieth Congress.

In 1947 the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, headed by our distinguished former colleague, Representative Everett Dirksen, of Illinois, stated in its report:

> Farm and other private forestry cooperation. * * * This is another item which stands high in the esteem of the committee. It is carrying the work direct to the farm and is resulting in additional dollars in the farmer's pocket as well as improvement in the conservation of the soils of the farms.

Here is a great Republican leader speaking when the Republicans were in the majority and speaking in favor of a forestry item. But look at the record and you will find that nothing in the way of an expanded-action program was started. These wise words are just as significant today because forest-resource development—and, gentlemen, this is most important—forest-resource development is and must be a nonpartisan opportunity. And it is in this same nonpartisan spirit that I address you today.

The title I used last year—"Starting the Forestry Job Now"—is still appropriate and I use it again. This time, however, I shall emphasize two forestry items of outstanding importance—fire protection and tree planting.

As I said before, each year we delay makes the reconstruction of our forests more difficult and more costly. Another year has slipped past. During that year we suffered losses of tree growth through forest fires on 20,000,000 acres. The area needing planting was increased by probably several hundred thousand acres. The two items to which I give particular attention today—fire protection and planting—are both basic forestry measures. We must protect what we plant and we must plant areas where we have failed in our protection job.

I will not take your time in pointing out the absolute necessity of protecting and conserving our forest resources. I take it for granted that you appreciate how essential an adequate forest resource is to our peacetime economy and how vital it is in times of national emergencies. A few days ago President Truman, in his message on the state of the Union, stressed the need for putting all our forest lands on a sustained-yield basis.

Obviously adequate protection from fire is the first essential step in that direction.

The forest-fire-protection problem in this country centers mainly on privately owned forest lands. By and large, these privately owned lands are the more accessible and productive three-quarters of our total forest-land resource. The great bulk of our lumber and other wood products now and in the future must come from these areas. Largely as a result of Federal aid extended under the Clarke-McNary Act, we now have organized fire protection on 328,000,000 acres of these lands. But 111,000,000 acres—an area nearly four times as large as the State of Pennsylvania—is as yet without any form of organized forest-fire control. Most of these unprotected areas are in the Southeastern States; but, wherever they may be, it is on these unprotected forest lands that the greatest damages from uncontrolled fire occur.

As a Member of the Congress I must look at this problem from the standpoint of our entire country. But protection from forest fires does strike very close home with me. In my own State of Florida we have 21,500,000 acres of forest lands, two-thirds of which are urgently in need of organized forest-fire control but do not get it now mainly because of lack of funds. I hope I appreciate the need for economizing in public expenditures whenever and wherever it is prudent to do so, but I feel very strongly that to prevent, as far as possible, the needless destruction of essential natural resources is a sound public investment. I believe that failure to do so is false economy.

This Congress should increase the present authorization of section 3 of the Clarke-McNary Act in order that the Federal Government may meet its obligation to the States and complete the cooperative forest-fire-control program contemplated by that act. The present authorization of $9,000,000 is based on the low prewar costs of 1937. I am informed that to do a minimum country-wide fire-control job will now cost at least $40,000,000 a year. On a matching basis the Federal share would be $20,000,000 as compared to the current limitation of less than half that amount. The States and cooperating private landowners already are spending about $16,000,000 a year. They feel that the National Government is lagging behind in carrying its share of the load.

Now I want to talk briefly on tree planting. As I stated last year there are something like 75,000,000 acres of forest land so heavily cut, burned, or otherwise stripped of productive cover that they must be artificially replanted. At the rate we are doing this job now it would take several hundred years to replant this enormous acreage even if no additional lands are denuded. We cannot afford to wait so long.

Most of this land is privately owned. What can the Federal Government do to encourage tree planting on privately owned forest land? One of the easiest and most effective steps which can be taken is to provide low-cost planting stock to small landowners. This can be done very easily and very quickly simply by expanding the Federal-State forest tree nurseries now operating on a small scale under the authority of the Clarke-McNary and Norris-Doxey Acts.

During the war some of these nurseries were abandoned or plowed up and planted to food crops. As a result, in 1947 they produced only 42,000,000 trees. Since then, the States have been struggling to increase production but the supply of trees is still far short of the demand. For example, farm plans made by soil-conservation districts alone call for 490,000,000 trees more than are now available.

I emphasize again, because I cannot repeat too often, the tremendous size of this job and its vital importance to our Nation's peacetime welfare and wartime security. You will be shocked to learn, as I was shocked to learn, that the total Federal expenditures for this vital cooperative program amount to only $124,600 a year. The States spend in addition somewhat more than this but it should be clearly evident that separately or together the effort is ridiculously inadequate.

Let us not discourage ourselves or others with the fallacious belief that trees planted now will take so long to produce useful crops that they will not bear dividends in our lifetimes. We have many examples in my State and elsewhere which prove that the benefits of tree planting begin to show up in a relatively short period of time. Let me tell you a little story to illustrate this point.

When she was 56 years old in 1930, Mrs. A. M. E. Brown, of Columbia County, Fla., planted her first pine trees. The county agent suggested she try a tree crop and the forester from the State forester's office recommended slash pine, native to her farm. The pine seedlings were planted on a 42-acre field which had failed repeatedly when planted to the usual crops of cotton and corn. When the trees were 14 years old Mrs. Brown, then at the age of 70, had one-third of them cut for pulpwood. Receipts from the sale of pulpwood gave her a return of $900 over and above all costs. This forest is now ready for a second thinning and there will be even greater yields in years to come.

I think the significant part of this story is that although 56 years old Mrs. Brown had faith in the future. The 14 years required on her land to produce a tree crop was not discouraging to her. Fourteen years or 20 years or 40 years are all brief periods in the life of a nation. But a beginning must be made. If we want to get, within a reasonable time, the benefits of planted forests or of natural growth in the form of jobs, timber, flood control, soil and game conservation, windbreaks, and recreational opportunities we must start now.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 16 minutes, p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, January 25, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

90. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a copy of a proposed draft of legislation to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

91. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a copy of the notice of the withdrawal of his request for compliance from the Secretary of Commerce to the Maridon Manufacturing Co., Inc., of New York, under the voluntary plan for the allocation of steel products for warm-air heating equipment for residential housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

92. A letter from the Under Secretary of State transmitting certificates of final ascertainment of the electors of President and Vice President of the United States chosen in the respective States on November 2, 1948, copies of certificates from the States of Florida, New York, and Wisconsin received subsequently to formal transmittal dates of December 30, 1948 and January 6, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

93. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of the following final valuation of properties of this carrier subject to the act: Valuation Docket No. 1283—Shell Oil Co., Inc., Products Pipe Line Department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

94. A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting a report under the date of November 8, 1948, that as of September 30, 1948, relief had been granted to one claimant, Clinton E. Smith and Douglas Corgey, doing business as the Corpus Christi Shipbuilding Corp., at Corpus Christi, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to stowaways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

96. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to fees of witnesses and travel allowance of witnesses attending in United States courts or before United States commissioners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

97. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to perjury; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

98. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to mental-disease cases in the nearby Maryland and Virginia districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

99. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the transportation of obscene literature in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

100. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to naturalization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

101. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Foreign Economic Administration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

102. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting the first annual report

of claims paid by the Department under the Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

103. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 21, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Charlevoix Harbor, Mich., with a view to constructing a breakwater, requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 10, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

104. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 22, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Shelldrake Harbor, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

105. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 5, 1947, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Salem River, Salem County, N. J., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

106. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

107. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

108. A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the sixty-second annual report of the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 1703. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 1704. A bill to increase the compensation of new employees in the field service of the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1705. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1706. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 1707. A bill to provide for the promotion of moral, temperance, and character education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education; and to provide for cooperation with the States in preparation of teachers of moral, temperance, character, and good-citizenship subjects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 1708. A bill to provide financial assistance to urban communities of the United States for the acquisition, assembly, revaluation, financing, and disposal of areas for urban redevelopment, and as a part of such redevelopment for the construction by local agencies in such areas, or elsewhere, of low-rent public-housing projects for families of low income; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1709. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to provide limitations on the time within which actions may be brought for the recovery of undercharges and overcharges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle, common carriers by water, and freight forwarders; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1710. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1711. A bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1712. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1713. A bill to provide for the deduction from gross income for income-tax purposes of expenses incurred by farmers for the purpose of soil and water conservation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 1714. A bill making the 14th day of August in each year a legal holiday, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1715. A bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1716. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit an adopted child of a deceased individual to receive benefits thereunder without regard to the period during which he shall have occupied such status; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 1717. A bill to release reversionary rights of the United States to certain property in Stockton, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1718. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Lake Arthur, La., a post office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1719. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 1720. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land in Missoula County, Mont., to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of Montana State University; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MERROW:

H. R. 1721. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the payment of prior construction costs of certain hospitals approved as projects under such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1722. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1723. A bill to repeal the tax on oleomargarine, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to complete the requirements for the positive identification of yellow oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1724. A bill to terminate certain wartime and other excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 1725. A bill to amend the act of July 24, 1946, with respect to the multiple purpose plan of improvement for the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1726. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the city of Hot Springs National Park, Ark., a perpetual easement for the construction and operation of a water-main pipe line; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1727. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1728. A bill to admit to the United States as nonquota immigrants certain displaced Polish citizens who have rendered service to the United States Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1729. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of cerebral palsy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1730. A bill to require motor vehicles to be provided with suitable illuminated license plates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1731. A bill to extend certain provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1732. A bill to amend the National Housing Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 1733. A bill relating to overpayments of the surtax on undistributed profits imposed by the Revenue Act of 1936; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1734. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1735. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on luggage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1736. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1737. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 1738. A bill to authorize the American River Basin development, California, for irrigation and reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. R. 1739. A bill to establish the Government Service University; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 1740. A bill to raise the minimum-wage standards of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 1741. A bill to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 1742. A bill to provide for one national cemetery in every State and Territory and such other national cemeteries in the States, Territories, and possessions as may be needed for the burial of members of the armed forces of the United States dying in the service or former members whose last discharge therefrom was honorable, and certain other persons as provided for in title 24, section 281, United States Code, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. R. 1743. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 1744. A bill to reimburse certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons of the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 1745. A bill for the more economical operation of the general supply fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 1746. A bill to provide that the United States shall aid the States in fish restoration and management projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 1747. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and to revive the National Labor Relations Act (the Wagner Act); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 1748. A bill to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 1749. A bill for the relief of the town of Mount Desert, Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1750. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN:

H. R. 1751. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain educational benefits not used by veterans of World War II to the children of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1752. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 1753. A bill to authorize the sale of certain Indian lands situated in Duchesne and Randlett, Utah, and in and adjacent to Myton, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1754. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 1755. A bill to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 1756. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the eightieth anniversary of the birth of Booth Tarkington; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 1757. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, approved December 2, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 1758. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act approved June 21, 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 1759. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code with reference to the running of any statute of limitations applicable to any offense committed by an officer, agent, or employee of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1760. A bill to authorize the expenditure of public funds for the assistance of State, municipal, and other nonprofit youth projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 1761. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1762. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 1763. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act with reference to the general powers of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1764. A bill providing for the incorporation of the United American Veterans of the United States of America, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1765. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in furtherance of national safety against traffic and other accident hazards; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1766. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 1767. A bill to repeal the retailers' excise tax on toilet preparations and on luggage, purses, and similar articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1768. A bill to provide price support for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 1769. A bill to amend section 118 of Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1770. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1771. A bill relating to loans by Federal agencies for the construction of certain public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1772. A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1773. A bill to provide compensation for sheriffs or other law-enforcement officers who transport mentally incompetent veterans to a Veterans' Administration hospital or home; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1774. A bill to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 1775. A bill providing for the insurance, by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, of membership share balances in Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 1776. A bill to deny apportionment of compensation, pension, or emergency officers' retirement in certain cases; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1777. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of the town of Watertown, Mass., for the loss of taxes on certain property in such town acquired by the United States for use for military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 1778. A bill to incorporate the National Guard Auxiliary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1779. A bill to provide for medical education assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1780. A bill to provide a correctional system for youth offenders convicted in the courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 1781. A bill to amend the Social Security Act with reference to deductions from old-age assistance payments to States based upon amounts recovered from the estates of deceased recipients; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of California:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. J. Res. 101. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to take action to relieve distress among persons and animals isolated by storms which have created an emergency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution to authorize funds to start construction of flood walls on the Susquehanna River in the Endicott-Vestal-Johnson City, N. Y., area; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. J. Res. 103. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 104. Joint resolution to provide for a national theater and a national opera and ballet; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JUDD:
H. J. Res. 105. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:
H. J. Res. 106. Joint resolution designating the week of February 14 in each year as National Heart Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. Res. 59. Resolution providing for compensation for one special messenger for the House Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on House Administration.

---

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact a bill to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

---

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:
H. R. 1782. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:
H. R. 1783. A bill for the relief of Mickey Baine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:
H. R. 1784. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Frances B. Bynum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1785. A bill for the relief of Loui Usry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:
H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Gabriele Gildo Falbo Citrigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1787. A bill for the relief of Serafim Antonio Furtado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. R. 1788. A bill for the relief of Edward Kimoktoak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:
H. R. 1789. A bill for the relief of the Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:
H. R. 1790. A bill to restore certain land in Alaska to the public domain and to authorize its sale to Ford J. Dale, of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:
H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHATHAM:
H. R. 1792. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Ader; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:
H. R. 1793. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of Lieutenant Commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COUDERT:
H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1795. A bill for the relief of Lewyt Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1796. A bill for the relief of Robert Turell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:
H. R. 1797. A bill for the relief of Constance Jenkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:
H. R. 1798. A bill for the relief of Giles Kavanagh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:
H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacob Ornstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:
H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Howard E. Giroux; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1801. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sylvia Laquidara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN:
H. R. 1802. A bill for the relief of Walter Wettschreck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:
H. R. 1803. A bill to permit John E. Harris to prosecute claims against the United States, notwithstanding section 190 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERTER:
H. R. 1804. A bill for the relief of Charles Kokinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:
H. R. 1805. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Lank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:
H. R. 1806. A bill for the relief of Dr. Oskar Klinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1807. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Maholanyi and Katalin Moscovies Maholanyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1808. A bill for the relief of Miklos Felkai, Magdalena Eichenbaum Felkai, and Julia Agnes Felkai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1809. A bill for the relief of Steven Kaiman Tordai, Maria Margaret Tordai, and Janos Steven Tordai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1810. A bill for the relief of Eugene Nemes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:
H. R. 1811. A bill for the relief of Rosario Varacalli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:
H. R. 1812. A bill for the relief of 84 Estonians who crossed the Atlantic in two small sloops and sought admission to the United States without documents or other evidence entitling them to admission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1813. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:
H. R. 1814. A bill for the relief of Caroline M. Newmark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:
H. R. 1815. A bill for the relief of Zina Della Mura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H. R. 1816. A bill for the relief of Ernesto Smimmo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:
H. R. 1817. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Rose A. Mongrain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:
H. R. 1818. A bill for the relief of Howard S. Lawson; Winifred G. Lawson, his wife; Walter P. Lawson; and Nita R. Lawson, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

13. By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER: Resolution adopted by the Assembly of the State of New York in protest against the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

14. Also, petition of Albert J. Zak, city clerk, Hamtramck, Mich., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

15. Also, petition of Charles C. Swanson, city clerk, Minneapolis, Minn., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

16. By Mr. WELCH: Assembly Joint Resolution 4 of the California Legislature, relative to shipbuilding on the Pacific coast; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

17. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Juan B. Garcia, president of the International Longshoremens' Association, local No. 1740, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to extending to Puerto Rico the Fair Labor Standards Act and social-security legislation in equal condition as to the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Harold W. Peterson, of Melvin, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, creator of all men, we meet today as free men in a world besieged by numberless fears and overtaken by hesitancy that is born of perplexity.

In the knowledge of the fact of our freedom, we thank Thee for the unlimited power man has succeeded in exerting for good when he has worked for Thee as in Thy sight.

Bless us with wisdom, courage, and a lively sense of conscience as we freely labor, that we may find blessing for ourselves and all mankind.

We pray for Thy presence in this place and for Thy continued guidance of our people, that peace may come through our efforts, and that a spirit of good will may be the heritage we leave for those who shall follow us. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### OUR FOREIGN POLICY IN CONNECTION WITH CHINA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, over this week end we have learned the extent of the disaster that has befallen China and the United States. The responsibility for the failure of our foreign policy in the Far East rests squarely with the White House and the Department of State.

The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming, unless a coalition government with the Communists

was formed, was a crippling blow to the National Government.

So concerned were our diplomats and their advisers, the Lattimores and the Fairbanks, with the imperfection of the democratic system in China after 20 years of war and the tales of corruption in high places that they lost sight of our tremendous stake in a non-Communist China.

Our policy, in the words of the Premier of the National Government, Sun Fo, of vacillation, uncertainty, and confusion has reaped the whirlwind.

This House must now assume the responsibility of preventing the onrushing tide of communism from engulfing all of Asia.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include an interesting item appearing in a Lynn paper; secondly, an address by a very reverend clergyman; and, third, an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain statements and excerpts.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the regular order of business, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR HIGH-SCHOOL STUDENTS

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the Congress to legislation I am preparing in connection with a plan that I am outlining in detail in extending my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

It should be of interest to any Members who are concerned with enabling qualified high-school students to complete a higher education when they are financially unable to do so. I do not want to take the time of the Members today to outline the plan in detail, but I do wish to call attention to it so that those who are interested may read about it in the Appendix tomorrow.

The plan is intended to enable approximately 5,000 high-school students a year to have a complete 4-year college course; and approximately 500 college students a year a complete 4-year postgraduate course at no actual cost to the Federal Government. It is open only to students who want to continue their education but are financially unable to pay for higher education. The Federal Government makes the plan possible but at no actual cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD to outline the plan in detail and to include therein a chart of figures.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter to the Department of the Army on the progress of graves registration in Europe.

Mr. CELLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two separate subjects.

Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial entitled "Florida Likes Margarine," which appeared in the Orlando Morning Sentinel of January 23.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, by inadvertence the bill (H. R. 1551) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary- and secondary-school facilities was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A similar bill in the last session was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I understand a bill substantially similar was referred to that committee in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be discharged from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 1551 and that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. REDDEN. Mr. Speaker, with reference to what the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] has just said, permit me to state a few facts which I think will clarify the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER], another member of the Public Lands Committee.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] said yesterday:

> It has come to my attention that the Democratic leadership in the House is violating not only the word but the spirit of the law.

He laments the fact that the committee passed a resolution authorizing the chairman of the committee and the chairmen of the respective subcommittees to employ the clerks and other personnel of the committee. I wish to call to the attention of the House the fact that a similar resolution was passed under the chairmanship of the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]. It reads as follows:

> The chairman presented the name of Ernest A. Grant to be clerk of the committee and asked authority of the committee to appoint him and to fill the remaining positions of the clerical staff with such persons and at such times as he deemed advisable. Upon motion of Mr. ENGLE, seconded by Mr. MURDOCK, unanimous approval of the committee was given.
>
> By virtue of this resolution the following were added:
>
> 1. Mr. Reeve.
> 2. Mrs. Arnold.
> 3. Mrs. O'Brien.
> 4. Mr. Regan.
> 5. Mrs. Curtiss.
> 6. Mr. Soule.

These appointments were without any knowledge or further consent on the part of any member of the committee so far as I know. That authority was delegated to the chairman and we were happy for him to exercise it.

I can tell you that up to this date there has been only one member of the committee personnel who was not employed by the chairman who preceded me. That was Mr. Grant and it was not for any reason I was advised of but for reasons satisfactory to the chairman. All the members and clerks of the Public Lands Committee, regardless of their political affiliation—I can say all but one was a Republican—were employed by the chairman and members of the subcommittee who had been delegated this authority, if they were with the committee when it was organized.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] says that the phrase should be replaced by the words "only for deserving Democrats." He intends to say that the chairman of the committee is only employing deserving Democrats. I can say to you that he has retained all of the Republicans except one and I hope that we may find a deserving Democrat a job or two on this committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. David Lawrence.

COMMUNISM IN AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to salute the president of a great American university, the president of one of our great State universities on the far-West coast,

the University of Washington. The president of the University of Washington and his board of trustees as well as those individuals responsible for accepting the challenge of communism in our institutions in this country by firing three professors, who are purported to have been members of the Communist Party, are to be congratulated.

I hope that the president of the University of Washington and the university itself have set the beacon light upon the highways of this country to pursue further the intrigues and the infiltration of communism into the universities of America.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Committee on Un-American Activities will take due cognizance of this action in the far West and proceed immediately to ferret out and find out to what extent our boys and girls are being led down the path of communism in this country by educators who are supposed to protect our American way of life.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief report of my European trip.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of volunteer fire associations.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by one of his constituents.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Marshall Andrews appearing in the Washington Post of last Sunday.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

TEN THINGS YOU CANNOT DO

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, certain that it never comes amiss for us to refresh our memories and perhaps clarify our thinking by recalling words once spoken by such men as Abraham Lincoln, may I read a few lines:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

3. You cannot help strong men by tearing down big men.

4. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

5. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.

6. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.

7. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.

8. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.

9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.

10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL (at the request of Mr. JENNINGS) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the Governor of Nebraska.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include the inaugural address by His Excellency the Governor of the State of Connecticut, Chester Bowles. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $248.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE PERSONNEL

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOMERS] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. REDDEN] seem to be disturbed about my attack yesterday on methods being employed in the committee for appointment of professional and clerical personnel. If the Members of the House will refer to page 515 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD they will find that I merely cited the provisions of the reorganization bill which requires that—

Each standing committee of the Senate and House of Representatives is authorized to appoint, by majority vote of the committee, not more than four professional staff members, in addition to the clerical staff, on a permanent basis without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office—professional staff members shall not engage in any work other than committee business and no other duties may be assigned to them.

The Public Lands Committee on January 24 passed a resolution permitting the chairman and the subcommittee chairmen to hire the professional and clerical staff without the approval of the full committee. I maintain that this is a violation of the Reorganization Act which was passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress. I defy any Member on the majority side of this House to justify a resolution which bypasses the full committee.

I think the gentleman from New York is a little sensitive because he comes from Brooklyn, and under the seniority rule, he is to be chairman of the Public Lands Committee which deals with problems of irrigation, reclamation, public lands, mines and mining, Indian affairs, and Territories. He has, under the rules of the House, a perfect right to this chairmanship. The gentleman from New York, if my memory serves me right, attended but one meeting of the full committee during the last 2 years, and yet he is to be chairman of the same committee during the Eighty-first Congress. I cannot believe that he will fully understand many of the complicated problems of the Western States which come before the full committee. I am also apprehensive that unless the full committee has the right to pass upon the professional and clerical staff that individuals from the East who have no knowledge of the problems of the West will be serving as supposed experts.

I shall watch with a great deal of interest the individuals selected as our experts. I hope I have no further occasion to call your attention to the provisions of the Reorganization Act that are apparently to be disregarded.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next. There will be no business on Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SNOWSTORM DAMAGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] will place in the RECORD a telegram from the Governor of Nebraska. It relates to the damage being suffered by reason of the snowstorm. It will point out that in many places the snow is measuring on the level from 40 to 60 inches in depth. A continuous series of high winds and blizzards extending over several weeks have caused intense human suffering, loss of life and loss of property, and perhaps the livestock losses will run one-half of the total. It will further point out that the local communities are stretching themselves to the utmost degree to render adequate aid to remove

the snow and relieve the suffering. All the agencies of the Federal Government are desperately needed in the storm territory, and needed now.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that every Federal agency extend to the stricken areas all possible aid. I shall support every measure that may bring help.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to make the announcement that the Committee on Education and Labor will meet in full committee tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock on the matter of reorganization.

I also wish to announce that we are ready to go ahead with the minimum-wage bill. I shall also put up to the committee tomorrow the matter of the pressure for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the reinstatement of the Wagner Act. These matters will be discussed within the committee tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House providing there are not matters on the floor during whose consideration the Speaker will not permit us to sit; in other words, that the committee may sit when the House is not in session in the afternoons or when there is general debate on the floor.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman asking for this right for 1 day, or for 1 week, or is he asking for it indefinitely during the session?

Mr. LESINSKI. I should like to have it indefinitely during the session, so we can go ahead with a few other bills we want to report out.

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated to the gentleman from Michigan that he would not recognize him to request permission for the committee to sit during any time that a bill was being read for amendment. Under the gentleman's speakership, committees have been allowed to sit when the House was considering bills in general debate, but the Chair will not recognize anyone to request permission for a committee to sit while the House is reading a bill for amendment. I think that is the policy the gentleman from Massachusetts has followed.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I inquire if this is to be a precedent for the year? I do not know that in the past we ever gave such a consent for the whole session. We have given it from week to week, and I would not object to that, but I do want to know if this is to be a precedent so that any committee could get this permission covering an entire session.

The SPEAKER. The Chair simply puts the request. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means yesterday received that permission for the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Appropriations also has it. The question is whether or not the House wants to grant this privilege to other committees.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the distinguished gentleman who occupies the Chair think we should give this privilege to all the committees, or should we do as we have in the past?

The SPEAKER. The only thing the present occupant of the chair is charged with now is putting the request.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. LESINSKI. During the last session of the Eightieth Congress we sat in the afternoons for 2 or 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is quite true.

Mr. LESINSKI. We should like the same opportunity now, so we may go ahead with our legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If I may make my position clear, I am not objecting to expediting business, I am trying to maintain the integrity of the rules and procedure of the House. I have no objection to the gentleman's getting permission for his committee to sit next week or the week after, but I do think we ought to keep within the jurisdiction of the House the procedure; that is all. That is the reason I am making this inquiry, to see if the Speaker of the House is going to join in maintaining the rules as in the past.

The SPEAKER. The present occupant of the chair has been diligent for over 36 years in maintaining the procedure of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I appreciate that fact. For that reason, I wanted to call his attention to what was going on.

The SPEAKER. The Chair never knows at all times what unanimous-consent request a gentleman is going to submit. The Chair would not want to enter an objection to a unanimous-consent request when there were many Members on either side of the House listening to the request, and has done so only once.

Mr. RANKIN. If we are going to retain the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives, I am of the opinion that no committee should be given the right to sit during the sessions of the House for more than 1 week at a time. If the gentleman will confine his request to the balance of this week, I will not object; but I am not going to agree that any committee from now on shall sit during the sessions of the House for the rest of the session, unless that permission is granted to all committees.

If the gentleman from Michigan wants to amend his request to cover this week only, that will be all right. And next week he can ask for that permission again.

Mr. LESINSKI. This is only a question of 1 day, then.

Mr. RANKIN. It is more than 1 day.

Mr. LESINSKI. I would not like to make the request for 1 day only. I amend my request then to cover the balance of this week and to include the following week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. RANKIN. I will not object to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the modified request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 45) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, effective January 1, 1949, until otherwise provided by law, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives compensation, to be paid monthly, to three messengers to the Committee on Ways and Means to be appointed by the chairman thereof, as follows:

One messenger at a basic salary of $1,500 per annum;

One messenger at a basic salary of $1,620 per annum;

One messenger (Harry Parker) at the rate of $1,560 per annum; but the authority contained herein for the last-named position of messenger shall terminate whenever a vacancy occurs therein after the first appointment.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEATRICE KELLY

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 23) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Beatrice Kelly, widow of John Joseph Kelly, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said John Joseph Kelly.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCES HANCOCK

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 42) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Frances Hancock, widow of A. C. Hancock, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed $250 toward defraying the funeral expenses of said A. C. Hancock.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill

(H. R. 1252) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who is author of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may we have the bill read? We would like to know what is in it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 202 (g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (prohibiting the employment in the executive branch of the Government of any former professional staff member of a committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a period of 1 year after he ceases to be such a member), is hereby repealed.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced H. R. 1252 in order that this Congress may do justice to some of the fine young men who are expected to remain as career men on the professional staffs of committees.

It so happened that quite a number of these fine young men, some from the executive departments downtown and some from outside the District of Columbia, came here with the expectation of being career men, but as the administration has changed there seems to have been a change of heart on the part of some of the committees with reference to their professional people, and under subtitle (h), now that they are off these committees as professional men or career men, they cannot go back to a position in the executive departments for 1 year. Some of them have gone out to industry looking for jobs. I know some who have gone to Philadelphia and some who have gone to New York. They tell their story to industry, but the heads of industry are not too familiar with political situations such as this and they say, "Well, your story sounds well but, after all, there must have been some reason why they let you go," indicating that they thought the career men were relieved of their position because of inefficiency or that there was something wrong with their character.

Some of these boys have come back very discouraged. Some of them could be taken back into the executive departments downtown were it not for the provision (h) of section 202 of the Reorganization Act. They have families; they have children; and it has worked out as a most unjust provision of the act.

I have consulted with the Speaker and with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, and the leaders on this side, and as far as possible among other Members, and I have yet to find any objection to this resolution. I hope it will be passed unanimously.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say I can see no objection whatever to it.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I might say to the gentleman from New York that one of the principal purposes of this section which the gentleman is now seeking to repeal was to prevent the professional staffs of the committees of Congress from being offered jobs by the executive departments downtown. We have not yet succeeded in creating a career service for the congressional staffs, unfortunately. Therefore, there will probably be a year or 2 years or 3 years in which we will go through a period of trial and error and experimentation. Many of the men who had a lifetime of service downtown, who were trained in these committee jobs, will in the present change be suffering a great handicap economically. I certainly think at this time it would be wise to permit the repeal of this section and then if the legislative staffs are threatened by jobs offered by executive departments, I am sure that Congress will reenact this section if that threat occurs.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. I may say that the committee of which the distinguished gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] is chairman felt that this legislation should be passed at an early date because of the fact that there are a number of persons who are apparently going to be out of employment and are not going to be able to go back to the departments from which they were drawn for professional services. We thought this legislation was important.

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman very much.

I wish to take this occasion to thank the lady from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON] for her fine cooperation and the promptness with which this bill was reported out by her committee.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], a very outstanding Member of this body, has 20 minutes reserved today to discuss the rules of the House. His discussion will be completely nonpartisan. I want to make this announcement and urge the membership to remain upon the floor and hear the gentleman from Michigan, particularly those who have recently joined us, because I think I am safe in assuring them that they will find very profitable what the gentleman from Michigan has to say.

COMMUNISM IN UNIVERSITY FACULTIES

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to add my voice to the statement made by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] congratulating the president of the University of Washington for beginning a house cleaning—getting Communists out of the faculty of that great institution. That house cleaning is long overdue, not only in the University of Washington, but in many other of the leading universities and colleges throughout the country.

You have heard all this criticism of the Committee on Un-American Activities. A great deal of it has come from these subsidized professors such as Harlow Shapley, of Harvard, who belongs or did belong to a half dozen or dozen Communist-front organizations.

I see where they have organized a Communist cell in the student body of the University of North Carolina. It may be going on in my State, but I want to tell you now that one of our gravest menaces is this attempt to poison the minds of the youth of this Nation, using everything from the crossword puzzles to motion pictures, from the radio to the local press, anything into which they can get their insidious propaganda. They are using every effort to poison the minds of the youth of this Nation, to undermine and wreck this Government and to destroy the American way of life.

I congratulate the University of Washington on its efforts to clean these Communists out of its faculty and help to save America for Americans.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ELSTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 14.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate in-

stances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

## ORDER IN THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, in that matchless volume of Hebrew literature, the Bible, the following passage appears:

Set thine house in order. (Isaiah 38: 1.)

When our constituents come to Washington to visit their Nation's Capital, it is almost certain that they will visit this Capitol Building. Their presence is noticed daily when they occupy these balconies, especially when Congress is in session.

I doubt if there is a Member in this body, who has served any length of time, who has not heard with chagrin and embarrassment the unfavorable comment and harsh criticism leveled at our lack of dignity and decorum in this historic Chamber.

Information from officials of the House indicates that hardly a week passes without complaints regarding our habits and conduct on the floor.

Here in the House of Representatives the people speak and here their voice is heard. This is their forum, established by our forefathers. From them come the noble and distinct character of American institutions.

The very walls of this Chamber echo with the voices of our great and our past. It is rich in the traditions of our Nation. Many whose names adorn the pages of history labored in this room to serve the cause of freedom and self-government. They were the torch bearers of humanity's forward march.

May God help us to preserve their influence and labors by reverence for this notable place and forbid that we should ever be irreverent toward it and the memory of those who made our day possible.

Our position as Members of Congress is one of great responsibility. If a proper attitude and proper conduct toward the position to which we have been elevated is wanting, we deface and impoverish our position in the eyes of those who pass this way.

Whether in the game of life or in a game of football, infraction of the rules brings punishment and penalty. The penalty we pay individually and collectively is the loss of respect, the loss of prestige, the loss of faith and confidence, and a gradual breaking down of self-government by a free people.

This House of Representatives is governed by rules, some as old as the Government itself. They were designed to govern the conduct of Members on this floor and the orderly procedure of our legislative work.

Not one of us here is entirely blameless for breaking the rules of the House. In a thoughtless moment, and unconsciously, we all have broken the written and long-established code of conduct for this floor. Many of the older Members, knowingly, and many of the newer Members, unknowingly, because of unfamiliarity with the rules, have allowed certain habits to violate the proprieties of this body.

For the benefit of the many new Members, and to refresh the memories of the older Members, including myself, the observations I am about to make are confined solely to the rules governing our conduct on this floor. My remarks are wholly impersonal and are not intended as a scolding of any Member individually or of the House collectively.

I now come to the rules violated daily in this forum. How should a Member address our Presiding Officer? At public gatherings throughout the country it is customary and in good taste to say, "Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen," and so forth. In this Hall such a salutation is improper and a distinct breach of the rule. The rule requires a Member to address himself to "Mr. Speaker" or, if the House is in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, to "Mr. Chairman." To add more is a slight upon the Speaker who represents the House in its organization. When we address the Chair, we address the entire membership of the House.

It is a violation of precedent, and bad form, to conclude an address by adding the words, "I thank you." There is no necessity for any Member to thank anyone. We speak as a matter of right.

Express provision is made for the manner in which a Member may address the House. Rule XIV, clause 1, reads:

When any Member desires to speak or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to "Mr. Speaker," and, on being recognized, may address the House from any place on the floor, or from the Clerk's desk.

Committees of the House should not be designated as: "The Rules Committee," "the Appropriations Committee," and so forth. The proper way to designate any committee of the House is to say: "The Committee on Rules," "the Committee on Appropriations," and so forth.

Another rule violated daily is rule XIV, clause 7, which provides:

While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair.

It has become a custom for Members to walk in front of a Member while he is addressing the House from the lecterns here in the well of the House. Such practices are a violation of a long-established rule of this body and are a contributing cause to the confusion and distraction evidenced on this floor from day to day. To walk in front of a Member who is speaking is objectionable and discourteous.

Another part of clause 7, rule XIV, grossly violated by many Members, reads as follows:

During the session of the House no Member * * * shall smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause. Neither shall any person be allowed to smoke upon the floor of the House at any time.

What constitutes the floor of the House? The space behind the rail is the floor of the House as much as the space in front of the Speaker's rostrum. Smoking behind the rail is smoking on the floor of the House and equally an infraction of the rule; it is most obnoxious to our visitors in the galleries. Walking into the Chamber with a cigar or pipe held in the mouth, whether lighted or not, is an invitation for caustic criticism and disparaging remarks on the part of the public who come to visit our sessions.

A practice as defenseless as it is objectionable is the habit of placing one's feet against or on top of the seat in front of one. This habit, a clear and distinct breach of the rules of decorum of this House, is most noticeable from the galleries and draws the sharpest criticism and adverse comment from those who come to visit this legislative body in action.

Reading newspapers on this floor when the House is in session may not fall within the text of any definite rule, but such a habit conveys to the public, and to the Members of the House, an impression of the want of interest, indifference to legislative duty, and failure of attention to the matter under discussion on the floor.

A practice that has grown to be a habit is that of referring to a Member in the second person as "you" or "your." Some distinguished Members, with long service here, have designated their colleagues by their given names, such as "John" and "Jim." We all know better. These are plain violations of ordinary parliamentary procedure. Each one of us can make his contribution in preserving dignity and orderly conduct during our sessions by observing and obeying the rules of the House. The proper way to address a colleague is "the gentleman or gentlewoman from Maine," or whichever State the Member represents.

Dignity and decorum commensurate with the greatness of this body, and the power we possess, should prevail at all times in the discharge of our duty to the Nation. These matters may seem small, unimportant, and of no serious consequence in themselves, but upon the whole they are destructive of the respect and confidence of the people. Let every Member constitute himself a committee of one to see to it that the rules are respected and obeyed.

By reason of our membership here, each Member is clothed with tremendous power over the lives and destiny of a mighty people. With that power goes a corresponding responsibility to discharge the trust reposed in us by the people. Every word we speak, every decision we render, is weighed with the position we hold. The confidence and faith of the

people in the legislative branch of their Government must be preserved if the Republic of the United States is to survive. May we be worthy of the high honor conferred upon us as Members of Congress by discharging our responsibility to the Nation with that dignity and decorum which the people have a right to expect from us.

May the visitor to these galleries observe in us a genuine respect for this House of Commons of the American people, and leave with greater love for our Republic and greater pride in his American citizenship.

Holy Scripture again reminds us:

Let all things be done decently and in order. (I Corinthians 14: 40.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one an editorial letter and in the other a magazine article.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor indicated that there would be hearings held by that committee this week, I presume on the wage-hour law. I understand, however, that the question of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is coming up very soon. So that we may be advised as to the reasons for repeal, I ask those who are asking for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act to some time, either from the well of the House or by extension of remarks in the RECORD, point specifically to those provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which they think are wrong.

I am familiar with the general broad statement that it is a slave-labor bill, but if there are provisions of the act to which there is specific objection I should like to know what they are.

I am moved to make this request because of what was said in a debate last night and on previous occasions when I have heard the attorneys for the CIO condemn the act as a whole. But when specific questions are put to them as, for example, last night I heard a former member of the Committee on Labor endorse, as I remember, six or seven provisions of that act. So I make this request sincerely and, in all kindness, so that those of us who expect to vote to continue that act may have the objections and we may change our minds and go along with the administration, which is now demanding the complete repeal of the act, if the reasons given are sound.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] is recognized

OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk to you for a few minutes, perhaps not the whole 15, regarding the proposed repeal of all taxes on margarine that is colored yellow.

I do not come before you this evening with theories, I come before you with first-hand information. All my life I have been a farmer. I began milking cows when I was 10 years old, and that was 50 years ago. I have milked cows with my hands since the vote was counted the 2d day of November in the year 1948. I am not only not ashamed of that fact, I am proud of it.

All my life I have been helping to produce the beef, the pork, the milk, the eggs, and the wheat that has helped to make this Nation great, that has helped us to win the wars in which we have engaged, not because we wish strife, because we never did, but because those wars were thrust upon us. Through two wars I have been asked by my Government to expand and increase the production of food on my farm.

I have always heeded that call to the very best of my ability. I am proud of that fact. I stand before you this afternoon representing the greatest agricultural district in the State of Missouri, if not the greatest agricultural district in the Nation—a place where we practice diversified farming, a place where we trust the dairy cow to help us with our soil-conservation measures, where we trust the dairy cow to help us to keep our hills and our sloping land tied down in grass so that the remainder of our soil fertility will not drift down the Mississippi River out into the Gulf of Mexico. Recently I drove an automobile from Butler, Mo., to St. Louis, Vincennes, Ind., Louisville, Ky., Parkersburg, W. Va., and on to Washington, D. C. I watched as I drove along. I saw thousands of fields with 70 percent to 90 percent of their topsoil gone. There were rows of corn stubs up and down the slopes, and tobacco stubs. The slopes would run as high as 20 percent. There were little piles of corn fodder by the barns and little stacks of broom sage stacked up around a pole, about 1 ton in a place, that no animal in the world would eat except to keep life in its body. There was no alfalfa. There was no red clover. There was no sweetclover. There were no terraces. I will tell you gentlemen without fear of contradiction that the destruction of the topsoil in the United States of America is a greater menace to our Nation today than communism or Russia or anything else; and unless we conserve our soil, this Nation is headed for destruction, war or no war.

Our topsoil is now half gone. In the interests of soil conservation, I want to see the dairy cow and the dairy farmer protected. It has been thrown in my face since I have come to Washington that I am dominated by the dairy lobby. I have no first-hand information as to what a dairy lobbyist looks like. Up to this minute I have never seen one, and neither have I seen a lobbyist for the margarine industry. As far as I know, there are none of them. But I do represent my dairy farmers, and I am irrevocably opposed to oleomargarine being sold in the markets of the United States colored yellow. What is yellow margarine? It is imitation butter. Whoever saw an imitation of anything as good as the thing it sought to imitate? I never have.

I am ready to vote for the repeal of all taxes on oleomargarine, if they will color it red, or color it green, or color it purple, or leave it white. But I do think that if the American dairy farmer does not have a copyright on the yellow color that God and nature gave to butter, then he ought to have that copyright.

How many of you gentlemen ever stepped out of your door some morning in a 40-mile wind full of ice, when the thermometer registered 10 below zero, and made your way to an unheated barn and milked 25 cows? I have done it many a time—not 1 day a week, not 5 days a week, but 7 days a week, 365 days in the year. No 5-day week for the dairy farmer; no 8-hour day. The milk truck calls at my place at 6:30 in the morning. My boys are out there now with snow a foot deep in zero temperature, starting to milk at 5 o'clock in the morning. How would you like it? There is no theory about this. You milk twice a day. Christmas Day, Washington's Birthday, Fourth of July, Sunday. There is no dairy farmer who does not milk every day. I do not want to see a synthetic imitation butter ruin and destroy our market.

I realize that perhaps there are people whose incomes are so low that it may be necessary for them to eat oleomargarine instead of butter. But I do not want them to be deceived by the yellow color into thinking they are buying and eating butter.

There is another thing I want to talk about for a minute. Occasionally I meet a man who says, "Oh, it doesn't make any difference. You sell your whole milk." I am not selling butter. Our milk goes to Kansas City. Let me tell you what the Federal Market Administrator bases the price of milk on in the Kansas City area. He bases it on the market price of 92-score butter in Chicago. Anything that ruins the price of the 92-score butter in Chicago ruins the price of my milk in Kansas City.

I live a hard life, and my boys and my neighbors, to keep our part of the country in beef and butter and milk and cheese. I and my neighbors are entitled to the protection of the yellow color that God gave to butter.

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS AT THIS POINT

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution calling for the investigation of the handpicking of juries in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York.

I shall press my resolution. I am confident that I shall obtain a hearing on it. The brazen admission by Judge Knox, of the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, that he is re-

sponsible for the hand-picking of juries is a challenge to the American people and cannot be ignored. This corruption of our jury system warrants a thorough investigation and the removal of those responsible for it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMATHERS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by Senator KEFAUVER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, January 27, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

109. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

110. A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, transmitting a report covering the contracts negotiated by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics during the period July 1 to December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

111. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a report relative to the adjudication of certain claims resulting from the evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

112. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for fiscal years 1949 and 1950 in the amount of $37,937.52 and $125,115, respectively (H. Doc. No. 40); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

113. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $480,702,340, together with certain proposed provisions and increases in limitations pertaining to existing appropriation (H. Doc. No. 44); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 45. A resolution providing for compensation for three special messengers for the House Ways and Means Committee, effective January 1, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 2). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 1252. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 5). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 23. A resolution for the relief of Beatrice Kelly; without amendment (Rept. No. 3). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 42. A resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' gratuity and $250 funeral expenses to Mrs. Frances Hancock, widow of A. C. Hancock, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 4). Referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, the Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1551) to authorize the making of grants and loans to the States to assist in providing adequate public elementary- and secondary-school facilities, and the same was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 1819. A bill to amend the act creating the Federal Trade Commisison, to define its powers and duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 1820. A bill to grant increased retired pay to certain disabled enlisted men of the Regular Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 1821. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies of the Government, to break through snow-bound areas in the western range States, and to take other necessary actions to move supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms which have created an emergency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1822. A bill to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 1823. A bill to amend the act of February 19, 1941, as amended, so as to establish a Women's Reserve as a branch of the Coast Guard Reserve; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 1824. A bill to amend the act of July 23, 1947 (61 Stat. 409); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 1825. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1826. A bill to authorize the appointment of four additional district judges for the southern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1827. A bill to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce, to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement, and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 1828. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1829. A bill to provide that pianos shall not be subject to the excise tax on musical instruments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 1830. A bill to amend the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1831. A bill to provide for a simplified manner of authenticating records of any public office of any State, Territory, or possession of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1832. A bill to provide that the tax on the transportation of persons shall not apply to transportation on boats for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1833. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1834. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of treaty merchants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1835. A bill to convey to the Washington State Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, certain lands in Kittitas County, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1836. A bill to permit certain displaced persons under 16 years of age orphaned as a result of World War II to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1837. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 1838. A bill to establish a Commission on Tax Coordination in the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1839. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1840. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Welsh, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 1841. A bill to limit the pool elevation and the size of dikes for the Garrison, N. Dak., reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1842. A bill to provide an equitable basis for determining dependency of parents under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 1843. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide

that safety standards shall require air carriers to equip their airplanes with parachutes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1844. A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 1845. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1846. A bill to authorize the appointment of additional circuit and district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 1847. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1848. A bill to amend section 32 (a) (2) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1849. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 1850. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. YATES:

H. R. 1851. A bill to extend rent control until April 30, 1951, to reestablish rent controls for housing accommodations used for permanent occupancy in hotels and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. R. 1852. A bill to repeal the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 107. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution relating to Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and providing for the refund of all penalty taxes collected and for the cancellation of all uncollected penalty taxes on so-called excess wheat for the years 1941 and 1942; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution providing for the payment of a 30-cent bonus per bushel on all wheat and corn harvested and sold between June 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. J. Res. 110. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; providing for making the St. Lawrence seaway self-liquidating; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. J. Res. 111. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. Res. 60. Resolution to investigate the hand-picking of juries in the United States District Court, Southern District of New York; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 61. Resolution expressing the sense of the House that the President should direct the Export-Import Bank of Washington to lend $300,000,000 to Israel; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1853. A bill to provide for the reappointment to the retired list of officers of the Navy of Henry Eastin Rossell, former commander, Construction Corps, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 1854. A bill for the relief of Kenneth Everard Hadfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 1855. A bill for the relief of Louis Nadasdi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 1856. A bill for the relief of Erwin Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 1857. A bill for the relief of the estate of Josephine Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1858. A bill for the relief of John Waipa Wilson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1859. A bill for the relief of Chin Hien Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1860. A bill for the relief of Kenji Takumi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1861. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1862. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Walter K. Miyamoto (formerly Miyoko Takahashi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1863. A bill for the relief of Frederick C. Cowell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1864. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Mitsuo Higa, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1865. A bill for the relief of Mitsuo Arita; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Honorio Canciller Evangelista; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 1867. A bill for the relief of Agnes Poulson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 1868. A bill for the relief of John A. Hogg and Mrs. Leona Pearl Hogg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1869. A bill for the relief of Nevin Hurren Nisli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1871. A bill for the relief of Hilde Flint; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1872. A bill for the relief of Gunnel Degerlund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 1873. A bill for the relief of Domenico Marrazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 1874. A bill for the relief of John W. Mahoney, Charles Sorenson, Charles A. Stewart, and Stanley Thiffault; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1875. A bill for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 1876. A bill for the relief of Ralph Martin Elzingre, also known as Ralph Seawell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 1877. A bill for the relief of Felice Monti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 1878. A bill for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Mrs. Shao Hung Pond, and their son David Yat Wei Bond, aged 11 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

18. By the SPEAKER: Petition of chairman, Rusk County Agricultural Conservation Association, Ladysmith, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support price on butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

19. Also, petition of chairman, Washburn Agricultural Conservation Association, Spooner, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to support price on butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

20. Also, petition of city clerk, Bayonne, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the passage of legislation to establish a day in honor of General Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

21. Also, petition of secretary-treasurer, Local 154, United Construction Workers, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

22. Also, petition of city clerk, St. Paul, Minn., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the passage and approval of the General Pulaski's memorial day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

23. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted at the annual convention of the Wisconsin State Grange, held last December, showing their position on the major questions of agricultural policy; to the Committee on Agriculture.

24. By Mr. LANE: Petition of the merchant marine Gold Star Mothers and merchant marine widows, of Lynn, Mass.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

25. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition for civil tax fund from students and faculty of William Penn College, Oskaloosa, Iowa; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

26. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles H. Nutting, Daytona Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of his resolution asking Congress to work for the passage of Townsend bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

27. Also, petition of Nicholas J. Curtus, of Trenton, N. J., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to claims against the Greek Railway Express Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1949

The VICE PRESIDENT. Prayer will be offered by Dr. Clarence W. Cranford, minister, Calvary Baptist Church, of Washington, D. C.

Dr. CRANFORD. The prayer I shall offer this morning was written for this session by Dr. Peter Marshall, as one of the last things he did before he died.

PRAYER

Deliver us, our Father, from futile hopes and from clinging to lost causes, that we may move into ever-growing calm and ever-widening horizons.

Where we cannot convince, let us be willing to persuade, for small deeds done are better than great deeds planned.

We know that we cannot do everything. But help us to do something. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 24, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 24th instant,

Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, on January 25, 1949, reported favorably the nomination of James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 2) thereon.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; and

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed letter from the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft legislation to authorize an appropriation for a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees. In submitting this proposed legislation, I wish to invite attention to the provisions of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations emphasizing the critical situation of these refugees and urging all states members of the United Nations to make voluntary contributions as soon as possible to meet their needs.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1949.*

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, on this particular matter I desire to say that the Committee on Foreign Relations has voted favorably to report a resolution carrying out the President's requests, but it has not formally been reported to the Senate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

RESERVATION OF CERTAIN INDIAN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no reservations were made during the calendar year 1948 of lands within Indian reservations valuable for power or reservoir sites or necessary for use in connection with irrigation projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DONATIONS BY NAVY DEPARTMENT TO NONPROFIT INSTITUTIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, a list of institutions and organizations, all nonprofit and eligible, which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN LANDS FOR RECREATIONAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, that no exchanges of lands classified chiefly valuable for recreational purposes for lands of equal value or equal quantity, had been consummated during the calendar year 1948; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON ADJUDICATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the adjudication of certain claims resulting from the evacuation of certain persons of Japanese ancestry under military orders (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON AGREEMENTS AND PURCHASES AND CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS RELATING TO NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVES

A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all agreements, and all purchases and condemnation proceedings entered into under the act of June 30, 1938 (52 Stat. 1252), as amended by the act approved June 17, 1944 (58 Stat. 280) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON LAND ACQUISITIONS

A letter from the Chairman of the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on land acquisitions by that Commission, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

BOARD OF VISITORS TO COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, advising the Senate of the appointment, pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939, of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], as members of that committee to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

BOARD OF VISITORS, UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I desire to announce that, pursuant to Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

Resolutions adopted by the Townsend District Council of the Fifth Congressional District, Orlando, Fla., favoring the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan, to provide old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A memorial of several citizens of the State of Michigan, remonstrating against the seating of Senator FERGUSON; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a message forwarded via the Governor of Guam, extending greetings and best wishes for a successful and prosperous New Year; ordered to lie on the table.

IMPRISONMENT OF ARCHBISHOP STEPINAC AND CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTIONS OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, during the fall of 1946 and the recent arrest, in last December, of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, are two bitter current examples of authoritarian deprivation of civil and religious liberty. As a liberty-loving people, we are distressed over both such oppression and the implications of such oppression.

I have received two resolutions condemning this action by the Hungarian Government and calling upon our Federal Government to exercise every legitimate force to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty. These two resolutions are not identical, but come from each house of the New York State Legislature, and I request that they be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The resolutions were received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
*Albany, January 10, 1949.*

(By Mr. Feinberg)

Whereas the whole civilized world and all individuals who believe in God, regardless of race, creed, or denomination, have been profoundly shocked by the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary; and

Whereas it appears that there is no justification for this arrest and imprisonment but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

Whereas every right-minded person in this country must desire with all his heart to do something to bring about the release of this great churchman. Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate of the State of New York express its utter condemnation of the act of the Hungarian Government; *and be it further resolved*, That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of the Congress from this State be urged to do everything in their power and to use every legitimate force to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Senators and the Members of Congress from New York State and to the Hungarian Legation in Washington.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
*Clerk.*

---

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN ASSEMBLY,
*Albany, January 10, 1949.*

(By Mr. Douglas)

Whereas the whole civilized world and all individuals who believe in God regardless of race, creed, or denomination, have been profoundly shocked by the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary; and

Whereas it appears that there is no justification for this arrest and imprisonment but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

Whereas every right-minded person in this country must desire with all his heart to do something to bring about the release of this great churchman: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Assembly of the State of New York express its utter condemnation of the act of the Hungarian Government; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of the Congress from this State be urged to do everything in their power and to use every legitimate force to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the United States Senators and the Members of Congress from New York State and to the Hungarian Legation in Washington.

By order of the assembly:

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
*Clerk.*

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and myself I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution stating that it is the sense of the Congress that the action of the Yugoslavian and Hungarian Governments constitutes persecution for political and religious beliefs and violates the Charter of the United Nations. The resolution further declares that, as a member nation, the United States should submit to the next General Assembly of the United Nations the issues raised by these deplorable incidents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can submit the concurrent resolution only by unanimous consent at this time. The Chair suggests that the Senator defer submitting the resolution until we reach that order of business.

Mr. IVES. The reason I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the concurrent resolution, which is very brief, to be inserted at this particular point in my remarks is that it is in connection with the two previous resolutions I have submitted and asked to have printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 9), submitted by Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. WAGNER), was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas on September 18, 1946, Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, Roman Catholic primate of Yugloslavia, was arrested on charges of committing "crimes against the people" and of "being the center of terrorist opposition" to the Government of Yugoslavia; and

Whereas on October 11, 1946, the said Archbishop Stepinac was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 16 years and deprived of his civil rights for 5 years; and

Whereas the conduct of the trial of the said Archbishop Stepinac which resulted in such sentence was a travesty on justice and a violation of the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas on December 26, 1948, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was arrested on "suspicion of treason, attempting to overthrow the democratic regime, espionage, and foreign-currency abuses" and has been held incommunicado since such date; and

Whereas the charges upon which the said Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested constitute distortions of truth and justice: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the arrest and imprisonment of the two eminent Roman Catholic primates, Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, (a) constitute persecution on account of political and religious beliefs, (b) violate the declaration in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men * * *," and (c) violate the third purpose stated in article I of the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "To achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It is further the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by such violations should be submitted by the United States to the United Nations at the next meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

## RESOLUTION OF NOTRE DAME CLUB OF LA CROSSE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a resolution which I have received from Mr. August Grams, Jr., Secretary of the Notre Dame Club of La Crosse.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it resolved*, That the Notre Dame Club of La Crosse, Wis., in the belief that the Government of the United States recognizes the existence of a divine being, hereby vigorously protests the action of the representatives of the United States at the United Nations Conference for their failure to support this belief and prevent the withdrawal from the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights, the clause that all human beings "are created in the image and likeness of God," and urges that such action be taken as necessary to include in the Declaration of Human Rights recognition of God from whom all human rights are derived.

## ACTING POSTMASTER AT CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA—RESOLUTION OF AMERICAN LEGION POST

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, in my home town of Cedar Rapids there has been a considerable dispute over the selection of a postmaster to fill the vacancy which now exists. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a letter from R. D. Spooner, commander of Hanford Post, No. 5, of the American Legion, together with a resolution officially adopted in connection with this matter by that post.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANFORD POST NO. 5,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
*Cedar Rapids, Iowa, January 19, 1949.*

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
*Senator from Iowa, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR HICK: I am enclosing with this letter copy of an important resolution adopted at a meeting of Hanford Post in Cedar Rapids at a post meeting January 19, 1949.

This resolution was the result of a very unfortunate appointment by the Democratic State Central Committee which, in filling the position of acting postmaster in Cedar Rapids, chose a nonveteran over a qualified veteran. That veteran was John E. Greenlee.

The nonveteran chosen for the position is 36 years old. John E. Greenlee is 37 years old and is a veteran of World War II who served in the Navy as chief turret gun captain aboard the cruiser *Houston*. The *Houston* was torpedoed by the Japanese during the first battle of the Philippine Sea. Mr. Greenlee received a personal commendation from Adm. William F. Halsey for heroic action in that engagement. He also received the Purple Heart Medal for shell fragments in his head and legs.

Greenlee is a successful businessman and is an active civic leader, as you know. He was the first World War II commander of this American Legion Post of 3,098 members.

This resolution was adopted by the executive committee on January 11 and by the post membership January 18. Both adoptions were by unanimous vote.

Yours very truly,

HANFORD POST NO. 5,
R. D. SPOONER, *Commander.*

---

Whereas it has come to the attention of the executive committee of Hanford Post, No. 5, American Legion, Department of Iowa, that the Democratic State Central Committee of the State of Iowa has seen fit to recommend the appointment of a nonveteran of military age during World War II as the appointee to the position of acting postmaster of Cedar Rapids, Iowa; and

Whereas this appointment involved the choice of this nonveteran over a qualified veteran; and

Whereas this choice was contrary to community and national sentiment and policy: Now be it

*Resolved*, That this executive committee does hereby recommend that Hanford Post No. 5 adopt unanimously the following resolution:

*"Be it resolved by Hanford Post, No. 5, American Legion, Department of Iowa,* That inasmuch as the principle of veterans' preference has been long established at all governmental levels and has become an integral part of our community and national policy, that we hereby urge that this policy be adhered to strictly in all recommendations and appointments; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of all political parties—national, State, and county—and to our elected representatives."

Adopted unanimously by post executive committee January 11, 1949.

Attest:

R. D. SPOONER,
*Commander.*

Adopted unanimously by membership of Hanford Post January 18, 1949.

Attest:

R. D. SPOONER,
*Commander.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 278. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 21); and

S. 279. A bill to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lieut. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; without amendment (Rept. No. 22).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 307. A bill for the relief of Engebert Axer; without amendment (Rept. No. 15);

S. 315. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; without amendment (Rept. No. 16);

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old); without amendment (Rept. No. 17);

S. 335. A bill for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; without amendment (Rept. No. 18); and

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; without amendment (Rept. No. 19).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; without amendment (Rept. No. 20).

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 547. A bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; without amendment (Rept. No. 23); and

S. Res. 33. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Banking and Currency to make certain expenditures and employ temporary assistants and providing for the transfer of certain records; with an amendment (Rept. No. 14), and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably Senate Resolution 28, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 28), as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Special Committee to Study the Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, created by Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 24, 1947, and extended by Senate Resolution 153, Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947, and Senate Resolution 191, Eightieth Congress, agreed to March 15, 1948, and Senate Resolution 280, Eightieth Congress, agreed to December 31, 1948, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate $12,668.24 in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for the same purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the Senator from Arizona if the resolution continues or extends the authority of the Small Business Committee beyond February 1, 1949, the date on which it is supposed to expire?

Mr. HAYDEN. No, it does not. There was submitted to the Committee on Rules and Administration a budget which shows that there was a balance of some $4,000 available after the first of January, which, with the additional sum provided by the resolution would enable the Committee to wind up its affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

## VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, and I submit a report (No. 23) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I asked.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business will be concluded in a moment. The Chair suggests to the Senator that he await the disposition of the morning business.

## COMMUNICATIONS STUDY—REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a brief report filed this week by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dealing with a study of various communication matters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is an interim report by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which was appointed by Chairman Wallace H. White, Jr., on June 19, 1948, to study certain communications problems. The subcommittee originally consisted of Senators White, Tobey, and McFarland; on July 30, 1948, Senator White resigned and appointed in his stead Senator Hawkes. The subcommittee on August 8, 1948, adopted an agenda (which is printed herewith as an appendix) and began inquiry and the assembling of data. However, Senator Hawkes was unable to participate actively in the work of the subcommittee and this interim report is submitted by Senators TOBEY and MCFARLAND.

It will be noted that the agenda adopted by the subcommittee outlines an extremely broad study involving practically every phase of communications. Obviously, in the period thus far available to the subcommittee, only a few of the agenda items could be surveyed. The subcommittee, therefore, limited itself to a consideration of what it regarded as the more pressing matters from a time standpoint. In making this report, and such recommendations as it deems pertinent, the subcommittee believes it important to emphasize that a communications study of the scope outlined in the agenda should be continued and carried to a conclusion in the interest of a sound national and international communications industry, the national defense, and the general public interest.

1. Organization of Commission and administrative problems: Basically, a major problem in the communications field relates to the regulatory agency itself. It has been well said by an experienced legislator that "good administrators make a bad law work but bad administrators can vitiate even the best law." No independent agency in our Government over the years has been the subject of more criticism and legislative investigation, much of it earned, than has the Federal Communications Commission.

We are of the opinion that the administrative faults, which still exist, are due basically to an archaic and clumsy organization of its administrative machinery. We are aware that the Commission, even today, frequently ignores and bypasses its own rules in arriving at decisions; that it continues the extra-legal conduct of judicial lawmaking which is repugnant to sound regulation; and that on occasion it arrogates to itself powers and authority which we fail to perceive in the basic act.

Our survey of Commission operations and our consultations with Commissioners themselves convince us that a great deal of the very valid criticism made against the Commission could be eliminated, or at least modified, by an internal reorganization.

We are informed that the Commission has prepared and tentatively approved the draft of an order modifying its internal organization. We are, in a general way, familiar with the broad outlines of that plan. Without approving or rejecting its plan, we offer the following observations and recommendations.

The Administrative Procedures Act and the Commission's own policy provides for the use of hearing examiners in all contested cases. Such hearing examiners, under present procedure, hear evidence and prepare what is known as a proposed decision. That decision may, or may not, become the final decision of the Commission as a whole. During the past 10 years or more, as a result of conferences and recommendations made by bar associations, administrative bodies, and the judiciary generally there has been general recognition and approval of the hearing examiner system in order to speed up procedures in administrative bodies. There also has been frequent reference to the creation of divisions or panels within commissions to divide the work and thus expedite final decisions in contested cases. This background

was undoubtedly one of the factors that motivated Senator WHITE in proposing a panel system for the Federal Communications Commission in his bill of the Eightieth Congress and may have actuated the Commission itself in drafting its proposed plan.

We must observe that the panel system has its weaknesses. We believe it is one of the axioms of judicial procedure that the body created to render decisions is expected to render those decisions as a whole. Litigants have a right to expect that a decision which may vitally affect them has been passed upon by the entire Commission created to make such adjudications. Many Members of Congress feel, and we believe rightly, that creation of a panel system may result in bypassing of the Commission as a whole with contested decisions being left to three Commissioners, which could mean under certain circumstances that one Commissioner finally decides the issue. On the other hand, we are aware that the Commission must find a method of speeding up its work and reducing the current backlog of cases, which we are informed represents as much as 15 months' work.

It is our view, however, that adoption of the panel system without enactment of legislation specifically dealing with the subject is not contemplated by the existing law which contemplates that all decisions must be made by the whole Commission. We are of the opinion that any attempt to make decisions by less than the whole Commission would not be in accord with the Communications Act. But we believe that the work of the Commission would be expedited by following a procedure somewhat similar to that of our appellate courts. We therefore suggest the following.

With respect to contested cases, in which two or more private litigants, or the Commission and a private litigant, are involved, we firmly believe that the decision should be that of the whole Commission. We are of the opinion, however, that even these cases can be handled more expeditiously with full protection to the rights of litigants by assigning the case to a group or subcommittee of the Commission for writing of the final decision. However, the same group or subcommittee of Commissioners should not be assigned to every case or type of case; it is essential that all Commissioners participate actively in all phases of operation of the Commission. This permits the fullest consideration of contested cases by all of the Commissioners and permits those who dissent from the majority view to prepare a dissent.

In this connection, we deem it important to emphasize that in the preparation of such final decisions by the Commission as a whole, it should have the legal aid of personnel who are not a part of the legal staff who prosecuted or represented the Commission during the hearing or rehearing procedure. The present system in which members of the Legal Division who prepared the case in the first instance and who prosecuted it, or represented the Commission viewpoint during the hearings, also aid in the preparation of the final decision is not conducive to production of a fair and unbiased decision, we believe. We do not suggest that the staff of the Legal Department would wittingly twist the law. We do suggest that they are human and that having been advocates of one view during the proceedings it is only natural that they will attempt to carry that view through in the final decision. We believe the Commission can obviate many of the criticisms that have been made on this score by the creation of a legal review board, not subject to the jurisdiction of the Law Department, whose sole duty would be to aid the Commission itself in the legal review of the hearing examiner's proposed decision and the preparation of the Commission's final decision.

A somewhat similar procedure to that outlined above for contested cases also could be followed with respect to uncontested cases. The decision prepared by the group or subcommittee of Commissioners to which each such case was assigned would naturally become the final decision of the whole Commission unless objected to by the majority.

This leads to consideration of a further point with respect to the present organization of the Law, Engineering, and Accounting Departments of the Commission. Our observation is the present structure is not the most efficient, does not make the best use of the personnel, and that it does not square with current problems of the Commission. We are of the opinion that the Commission should be organized along the lines of its work load—i. e., broadcast, common carrier, and safety and special services—and that the Law, Engineering, and Accounting Departments be made functioning units in such a divisional set-up, with the general counsel, the chief accountant, and the chief engineer directly under the Commission itself. It would appear that such a functional organization would permit far more rapid consideration of applications and cases, and at the same time free the responsible heads for consideration of over-all administration.

We think it important to emphasize that the rule-making function must, of course, remain as it is today, the duty and responsibility of the Commission as a whole. This and other specific duties placed upon the whole Commission by law should and must remain the responsibility of the whole Commission.

We are informed that the Commission's proposed plan for modification of its organization contemplates that the chairman shall not be a member of any of the panels, except as a substitute for a member not present, and shall devote his principal efforts to being the chief administrative officer of the agency. While we agree that there is considerable merit in this proposal and that some of the broader problems of communications dealing with frequency allocations and revisions of rules require closer attention than they have received, we believe that a note of caution is necessary here. The chairman is the responsible head of the agency and it cannot, by its own rules, lift from him the responsibility that the law lays upon him. We already have made clear our opinion in regard to the adoption of a panel system without a change in the present law. However, the procedure suggested by your subcommittee would permit the chairman to spend more time on administrative duties.

2. Cease-and-desist orders: Our conferences with Commissioners and a study of decisions and actions of the Commission lead us to the conclusion that early attention should be given to improving that section of the Communications Act dealing with revocation of licenses (sec. 312). The present law provides that a station license may be revoked for false statements either in the application, or in the statement of fact which may be required from time to time, which would have warranted the Commission to refuse the license on an original application; or for failure to operate substantially as set forth in the license; or for violation or failure to observe any of the restrictions or conditions of the act or of the regulations of the Commission authorized by the act or a treaty ratified by the United States. This makes obvious, therefore, that revocation is the only administrative penalty for violations ranging from the most serious to the most minor, including even innocent violation of technical regulations.

We do not believe that such a situation makes for fair and efficient administration. Obviously the Commission would be reluctant to revoke a license for a minor offense and therefore minor offenses may be committed almost with impunity. Moreover, there is no distinction between the gravity of offenses; it is as if the penalty were the same for murder and for illegal parking of an automobile. It is our opinion that numerous actions which deserve censure and action thereby escape while at the same time the licensee has hanging over his head the final penalty of losing his license for a minor offense.

Your subcommittee recommends, therefore, the enactment of a section which would authorize the issuance of cease-and-desist orders for less serious violations. The revocation penalty would remain in effect for two classes of violations: (1) for cases in which the Commission learns of facts or conditions after the granting of a license which would have warranted it to refuse a license originally had it known those facts; (2) for violation of a cease-and-desist order. Both the revocation and cease-and-desist procedure would remain, of course, subject to judicial appeal.

Such a provision was a part of the White bill (sec. 12 of S. 1333, 80th Cong.) and had the general support of the Commission, the industry, and members of the bar who practice before the Commission. The cease-and-desist-order procedure has had considerable trial in other administrative agencies and has proved generally satisfactory.

3. Radio and wire communications frauds: Your subcommittee recommends the enactment, either as part of the Communications Act or as part of the general criminal code, of a fraud statute similar to the postal fraud statute (18 U. S. C. 338) which would make it a Federal offense to use wire or radio communications to defraud.

We are informed that the Commission from time to time has had called to its attention situations in which persons have used radio facilities for the perpetration or attempted perpetration of obvious frauds. In most of these cases, the station licensee is not a party to the fraud or culpable but rather is himself a victim of the fraud. In such cases, there is no basis for proceeding against the licensee. And unless the fraud scheme also involves use of the mails, there is at present no means of reaching perpetrators of such schemes. While the Federal Trade Commission has certain powers dealing with unfair methods of competition these have not proved to be fully effective in deterring such frauds.

4. Clear channels and superpower in AM broadcasting: The subcommittee believes that the most important question from a policy standpoint in the field of AM radio broadcasting is that involving so-called clear channels and the amount of power with which such stations should operate.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that a brief review of the background of this question would be helpful. There were in the United States (as of January 1, 1948) a total of 1,962 AM radio broadcast stations. These operate on 106 channels, i. e., paths through the ether. Obviously, there must be many more than a single station on one channel. To facilitate allocation the channels were divided into three classes: local, regional, and clear. There are 6 local channels which must be shared by 1,032 stations; there are 41 regional channels which must be shared by 804 stations; but there are 24 clear channels which during nighttime hours are each occupied by only 1 station through the United States. (A technicality in allocation has assigned one additional station to one of the clear channels but a class 1-B channel is maintained without duplication.) Originally, in the earlier days of broadcasting in this country, there was upward of 50 clear channels but as need for more and more stations grew, the regulatory agency began to duplicate stations on some of these channels. In short, even then the problem was whether channels should be reserved exclusively as clear or whether the country should receive more and improved

radio service. The regulatory agency decided in favor of the public interest and duplicated assignments. We regard this as an important precedent and we do not understand why the Commission suddenly halted such assignments.

However, despite ever-increasing demands for more radio stations and for improved service, 24 channels remain to this day reserved for exclusive nighttime use by stations. Because the assignments on these clear channels were made in the early days of radio broadcasting, the clear-channel stations are in the best part of the radio spectrum, and have become the rich, powerful stations located in the largest and most lucrative markets. Their collective power and position is a factor in their successful resistance to any attempt to duplicate the channels they presently occupy. We cannot refrain from drawing the analogy to the dog in the manger story; radio frequencies are a scarce natural resource; additional stations are needed in many parts of the country and yet these 24 channels which would allow assignment of 75 to several hundred additional stations are reserved without duplication.

But exclusive use of a channel is only half of the story. Equally important to the fact that 24 stations have exclusive nighttime channels, is the amount of electric power with which they are authorized to broadcast. These stations broadcast with a power of 50,000 watts. The significance of this power may be realized when it is understood that a local station generally operates with a power of 250 watts and has a coverage of perhaps 10 miles in radius; regional stations operate with power varying from 1,000 to 10,000 watts and cover a radius on the average of 50 to 75 miles. Clear-channel stations, however, use power ranging from 5 to 250 times as much as any other radio station and cover an area of 175 to 200 miles in radius, although their signal may be heard under ordinary favorable conditions for upward of 500 miles. In act, the total power used by 24 clear channels is greater than the power used by all the remainder of the radio stations in the United States combined.

Thus, it may be readily understood why these clear-channel stations already provide a type of competition against which the smaller local stations experience difficulty. They attract the large national advertisers, exercise tremendous influence over vast areas far removed from the source of the transmitter, and have made fantastic returns on their investment. Only a few years ago examples of annual returns of 100 percent to 200 percent on the investment were not uncommon in radio-station operation.

Some 10 years ago a majority of these clear-channel stations formed an organization with the express purpose of securing Federal Communications Commission authority for a 10- to fifteen fold increase in power for clear-channel stations. They sought 500,000 watts to 750,000 watts instead of the 50,000 watts then and now assigned to them. Even prior to that time (in 1934) one of their number (WLW in Cincinnati) had been granted a temporary experimental license to operate with 500,000 watts. That operation brought such opposition from so many smaller stations in the Midwest which complained of monopoly and unfair competition that the Senate approved a resolution (S. Res. 294, 75th Cong.) on June 13, 1938, asserting that it was the sense of the Senate that no AM broadcast radio station in this country should be operated with power in excess of 50,000 watts. We concur in that view today, and in the absence of affirmative legislation authorizing power in excess of 50,000 watts we doubt the Commission's legal authority to grant power in excess of 50,000 watts.

A few months after the passage of the Senate resolution the Federal Communications Commission withdrew the experimental license for superpower it had granted the Cincinnati station. Since that time (1939) no radio station has operated with more than 50,000 watts. But the organization of clear-channel stations seeking superpower continued its fight both in and out of the Commission for its demands. It lobbied Members of Congress, filed petitions before the Commission, and participated in additional hearings. The advent of World War II put a temporary damper on its activities. But immediately after the war, it renewed its efforts. The Commission thereupon again conducted another hearing on the question during 1946 and 1947. By the spring of 1948, it had become an open secret in the radio industry that a decision in the clear-channel case, as the issue had come to be known, could be expected later that year. But more important, so publicly confident were members of the clear-channel association of the outcome that hundreds of smaller radio-station operators throughout the Nation became alarmed and began imploring Members of Congress to do something to prevent creation of a monopoly situation which they said would put them out of business. Educators and public figures wrote members of this committee that domination of the Nation's airways by a few high power stations (owned by 15 corporations) would be dangerous to freedom of speech.

Concerned with the situation, Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced on February 26, 1948, a bill (S. 2231, 80th Cong.) which would provide for duplication on clear channels and limit their power to 50,000 watts. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the following day (February 27) instructed its acting chairman (Senator TOBEY) to write the Federal Communications Commission requesting that it defer any final action in the clear channel case until the committee had come to some conclusion on the bill. On March 5, Chairman Wayne Coy of the Commission replied to this committee advising that no action would be taken in the case pending Senate committee action.

Hearings on the Johnson bill began on the following April 5, and continued for 10 days through April 23, 1948. Seventy witnesses made personal oral statements; nearly 1,100 additional persons and companies, a substantial majority of which spoke for hundreds of radio stations, sent in statements or letters expressing their views; the final printed hearing covered nearly 1,600 pages. Members of this subcommittee attended a substantial part of the hearings and have examined the record rather closely. The subcommittee believes this hearing was one of the largest, best attended, and comprehensive held during their personal experience in the Senate.

We have cited this brief history of the clear-channel superpower question so that our summary and recommendations will be more readily understood. One other fact should be noted. In discussions of the clear-channel superpower question, reference has been made frequently to the provisions of the North American regional broadcast agreement. This is a radio treaty governing use of radio frequencies in North America to which Canada, Newfoundland, Mexico, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, the Bahamas, and the United States are signatories. It sets standards of operation and practice for radio stations in these countries. One of its provisions is that clear-channel stations should use a minimum power of 50,000 watts. Members of the clear-channel organization who advocate superpower assert that if the United States does not authorize higher power our present clear channels will be duplicated in the other signatory countries and we will lose our clear channels. A further corollary argument is made that because a North American regional broadcast conference is to be held next September in Quebec and because the position of our Government at that conference must be circulated very shortly among the other signatories, it is necessary that the Federal Communications Commission make an immediate decision in the clear-channel superpower case. Of course, when these two arguments by the advocates of superpower are coupled, it becomes obvious that they mean that the Commission should authorize operation of clear-channel stations with power of 500,000 to 750,000 watts.

We believe that these contentions centering around the North American regional broadcasting agreement should be disposed of first. In the first place, we are firmly of the opinion that adherence to the present agreement does not require radio stations within the United States to operate with power in excess of 50,000 watts. We have studied the agreement and we assert that with respect to this point it is clear that the only requirement is that the clear channels of signatory governments operate with a minimum of 50,000 watts. That is the practice and policy within the United States today. It is implicit from the agreement that the signatory countries bind themselves by adherence to certain standards not to interfere with the signals of radio stations located in the other countries. It would be, in our opinion, an unwise policy, indeed, for this country to have agreed to a policy of radio broadcasting which is injurious to American broadcasting generally and which would not serve the general public interest. Obviously, we did not subscribe to any such policy in the existing agreement.

Secondly, we reject completely the argument that the Federal Communications Commission should render a decision forthwith in the clear-channel case so that United States policy on this question would be established for the purpose of informing the other countries now of what our position is to be at the forthcoming conference. It would be a new departure in Government, in our experience, for a regulatory agency decision involving private litigants to become binding as formulating what this country's policy should be in an international treaty. We would deplore the rendering of such a decision prior to the conference meeting as—

(1) An action designed to bypass the Congress on a basic-policy question;

(2) An action designed to bind this country's hands in advance of an international conference; and

(3) An action productive of suspicion and resentment on the part of the other signatories.

We know from conferences held with a number of representatives of other signatories that their countries do not look with favor on operation of United States radio stations with power of 500,000 to 750,000 watts. And, for our own good, we should oppose the operation of clear channels in the other countries with excessive power as being injurious to many of our own stations. Such high-power operation in Mexico at the present time already provides serious interference with stations ranging from Florida to California. We believe the United States should enter into the forthcoming conference in good faith, bound by only one basic consideration: to stand for a general policy of operation of domestic radio stations with such limited power as not to interfere with radio stations in neighboring countries. We believe that this means that the upper limit should be 50,000 watts and we are firmly of the opinion that all of the signatories would be better served by an agreement that no clear-channel station should operate with more than 50,000 watts.

If it is necessary that we should now make known to the other signatories what this country's position with respect to clear channels and superpower is to be at the Quebec

Conference, we believe they should be informed that this country's basic law does not permit operation of AM radio stations with power in excess of 50,000 watts and that in the absence of a specific statute authorizing such operation the United States proposes to operate its domestic radio stations with not more than 50,000 watts of power, that this is best suited to our internal needs and the general public interest, that such a policy will not interfere with radio-station operation by any other signatory, and that we will advocate that policy for all signatories.

Now with respect to the question of a decision by the Federal Communications Commission in the clear-channel superpower case: We are well aware of the contention that has been made, by advocates of superpower, that this case involves an engineering equation and that the regulatory body is the only proper authority to make such a decision. We reject that contention as unrealistic, bureaucratic, and not in accord with the formulation of the Communications Act and the legal precedents thereunder.

We believe that the clear-channel superpower question is a fundamental policy issue of tremendous national import to be determined by the lawmaking body and not a technical engineering problem to be decided by a regulatory agency. It must be clear, even to a layman, that were clear-channel stations authorized to broadcast with power of a half million to three-quarters of a million watts, a few stations located in large metropolitan cities would dominate radio broadcasting in this country. Not only would the overwhelming majority of smaller stations find it economically impossible to exist, but more important, radio would no longer serve local needs or have local responsibility. It has been asserted that such superpower stations are necessary to give diversified radio coverage to small, isolated communities located in the Rocky Mountains and southwestern parts of the United States which are covered by only one or two stations at present. We have heard much of these so-called white areas alleged to have little or no radio coverage. But we have yet to be convinced by a factual survey of such areas that they do not, in fact, get adequate radio coverage. The major evidence on this subject presented to the committee during the hearings on the Johnson bill were engineering diagrams and curves which purported to show by mathematical calculation that there are areas without adequate coverage. What we should like to see, and we believe that the Federal Communications Commission should want to have, is a careful, on-the-spot survey of these alleged areas to learn from radio listeners themselves what kind of radio service they receive.

We deem it essential to point out here that the most effective and available means of bringing additional AM radio service to such underserved areas is to duplicate in those areas the present clear-channel stations. There is no sound reason, either from an engineering or policy standpoint, why the same channel now occupied by a New York or Chicago or Louisville station could not also be assigned to a station located in Texas, or Arizona, or Utah, or Colorado, or Idaho, or eastern Washington to provide additional radio service to those areas. Certainly there would be no possibility of interference to the New York or other midwestern stations and greater service to more people would be brought about by a more efficient and economical distribution of frequencies and the so-called white areas would be eliminated. In fact, we suggest that under the Communications Act the Commission has a duty under the fair-and-equitable-distribution-of-facilities section to make a better and fairer assignment of frequencies than now exists; we do not believe that exclusive use of a frequency by a single licensee is in accord with the clear meaning of the law.

The important question here, however, is not so much the allegation that there are such unserved radio areas as the larger and far more vital question of what would happen to radio in the United States generally if a few already privileged stations were to be granted superpower. We believe, and we assert, that there is ample evidence that the basic objective of the Communications Act of 1934 would be subverted if a small number of stations were to secure authority to operate with more power than now authorized. The basic purpose of the law is that radio should serve the public interest and that the regulatory agency should promote a policy of competition in radio broadcasting. In our view, the language of the act with respect to the granting of licenses in the public interest, the promotion of competition in radio broadcasting, and the equitable distribution of radio frequencies is so clear that the Federal regulatory agency should (a) have continued to carry out the policy it began years ago of duplicating so-called clear channels in the interest of better use of scarce radio frequencies and not have retained pristine the 24 clear channels that remain today; and (b) have summarily rejected any application for operation of AM broadcast stations with power above 50,000 watts as one which not only would foster monopoly but which, if granted, would be in fact contrary to the clear intent of the law itself.

Your subcommittee, therefore, makes the following recommendations with respect to the clear-channel superpower question:

(a) That since the question of increasing power for operation of AM radio stations above the present limit of 50,000 watts involves a basic, fundamental policy of the highest national importance concerned with the economic and political health of the United States, it is a question which can legally be determined only by the Congress through the enactment of legislation (the Commission obviously has reversed its interpretation of the law and has abandoned its own precedents of duplicating clear channels); that such legislation should not be considered until after the North American Regional Broadcasting Conference is held; thereafter the Commission be invited to make recommendations for such legislative changes as it deems advisable with respect to these matters; and

(b) That if it is deemed essential to circulate this country's views on the clear-channel superpower question among the other signatories to the North American regional broadcast agreement prior to said Conference, the United States should declare that since the Congress has never authorized operation of domestic AM radio stations with power in excess of 50,000 watts in this country, the United States will advocate such 50,000-watt power limitation for all signatories (with each signatory having the authority to prescribe such use of its own clear channels as best serves its own listeners and the country's public interest but no signatory shall share or duplicate the clear channels heretofore assigned to any other signatory); and

(c) That the Federal Communications Commission be promptly advised of these recommendations.

5. Frequency allocation—FM radio: The problem of allocation of frequency space in the spectrum is a fundamental one. It is an authority fraught with so many consequences to development of the whole communications art that it is a pity that it is not better understood and its consequences more sharply realized.

Unfortunately, because it involves decisions based on highly technical knowledge of electronics and the application of such knowledge, the average citizen—and this includes Members of the Congress—knows little about it. Nevertheless, these so-called engineering decisions directly affect and actually control long-range policy determinations which decide not only who shall be licensees in the operation of AM radio broadcast stations, FM broadcast stations, television stations, radiotelegraph and wire telegraph common carriers, but more important, in what parts of the spectrum these various services shall operate.

Decisions of this latter kind have an important bearing on which types of service shall move ahead and which shall be retarded; in fact, which shall live and which shall die. For example, a decision in which part of the spectrum television shall operate has the effect of determining (a) that television service shall be available only to limited parts of the United States and to a limited number of people; (b) that television service will be only in black and white and not in color; (c) that developer and patent holder X shall have a preferred position over developer and patent holder Y or Z. Or, for example, a decision that certain frequencies are more suitable for television than for FM radio becomes determinative in so retarding the development of FM radio that this latter service is denied a wide use and application throughout the country.

It may be asserted that the results which flow from such decisions may not have been considered in arriving at the original decision. It is claimed that the original decision was made in good faith, based on engineering information and knowledge then available. But it is just because such decisions are based on engineering knowledge at the time, and because like all other experts, engineers may differ with respect to their findings and conclusions as well as with respect to the projection of their findings on the ultimate situation, that it is important to evaluate to what degree so-called engineering decisions should be the sine qua non of a basic determination.

Your subcommittee calls attention to a hearing held by a subcommittee of this committee in the last Congress, generally titled "Progress of FM Radio." This hearing, held during March, April, and May of 1948, sought to develop to what extent certain commercial interests in the radio industry affected and controlled engineering decisions which resulted in basic policy determinations. The hearing brought out, in the opinion of your subcommittee, that electronics is a rapidly developing and changing art; that despite the fact it is based on such exact sciences as physics and mathematics, it is still far from being an exact and positively predictable art; that reliable and able engineers differ widely; that some engineers whose opinions have been of influence in making decisions of great magnitude are not always abreast of all developments and facts in the art; that the regulatory agency has had to and does still rely on the testimony and experiences and experiments of engineers who are the employees of major commercial interests in the industry; that the regulatory agency appears to be overawed and too much impressed by such engineering views and does not always balance these views against the broad public policy of what is best for the general interest of the people of the United States.

We have made this condensed and brief summary merely to point up the basis of one of the many criticisms made of the Federal Communications Commission. We think that such censure has been deserved in the past; we trust that the procedure and approach that earned it will be removed in the future.

Meanwhile, we earnestly recommend that this committee continue its investigation into this phase of Commission and industry operations with the purpose of a complete exploration of every influence that has been exerted to bring about various decisions.

We recommend this course because only by such pitiless exposures can we hope to make certain that yet-to-be-made decisions of the greatest and most paramount importance to the American people in the field of electronics generally and radio television specifically will be really in the general public interest and not for the benefit of vested interests.

6. Censorship of radio programs: Your subcommittee deems it wise to make some reference in this report to the frequently discussed so-called censorship question. We had thought that the views of this committee, as a whole, were firmly and cogently expressed in the report on the White bill (S. Rept. 1567, 80th Cong.). There has been, however, repeated reference to Commission interpretations of the act as limiting free speech or imposing censorship on radio licensees. It is apparent to your subcommittee that a planned propaganda effort is being carried on among well-meaning but uninformed persons to secure congressional revision of the act with respect to the so-called censorship question.

It should be pointed out that the act itself contains a "no censorship" section (sec. 326) which makes clear that there can be no censorship of radio programs. The language itself is brief. It states plainly that the Commission does not have the power of censorship over radio communications and that it shall not make any rule or condition which shall interfere with the right of free speech by radio. There are no "if's," "and's," or "but's," no weasel words or hidden clauses. What has provoked certain radio interests is Commission interpretation of its licensing and licensing-renewal power (sec. 309) which declares that the Commission must determine that the granting of a license or renewal is in the public interest, convenience, and necessity. The Commission has, from time to time, exercised this latter authority by withholding or denying renewals until it determined that the licensee had operated in the public interest.

Probably no other provision of the law has been attacked in the courts more frequently and by more able legal counsel. Probably no other section of the law has been subject to more searching scrutiny by the courts, including the Supreme Court of the United States. Uniformly and without exception, the final decision has upheld the Commission's authority to determine whether or not a licensee's operation has been in the public interest. Moreover, the court decisions have held that such exercise of authority by the Commission does not invade or vitiate the "no censorship" provision of the law. When the courts have on more than one occasion spoken clearly that the Commission has the right and duty under the law to determine whether the public interest is being served and that in so doing there is no violation of free speech, we believe the final judicial interpretation has been made.

We concur, of course, completely and fully with the line of judicial decisions on this point. To us it appears ridiculous to hold that a person operating under a Federal license shall not be answerable to a constituted authority for his performance under that license. To hold otherwise would be to set at naught the license system, to make the license in fact a perpetual grant. So long as radio frequencies are scarce national resources, the Government has a right to expect and demand proper use of them.

In view of the repeated court decisions which confirm our interpretation of the act, we see no need for and recommend no legislative changes in the act in this respect.

7. Common carriers, domestic and international: Your subcommittee is seriously concerned with the problems of communications common carriers, operating both in the domestic and international fields. Since the end of the war, their revenues have suffered serious decline. The domestic wire carrier, Western Union, is engaged in a large program of modernization designed eventually to reduce operating overhead, but meanwhile faces financial difficulties. It has sought and obtained rate increases, but these do not solve the problem because they have the effect of reducing business. In addition, Western Union is in a position where it cannot exploit its cable facilities because of a provision of law which requires the company to divest itself of international operations. The international carriers are only slightly better off, financially speaking. Moreover, the international carriers must compete, not alone between themselves for business and frequencies but against Government-owned foreign communications monopolies which continue to play off United States carriers against each other for more favorable contract arrangements.

Efforts to meet some of these problems were undertaken by this committee before the war. An investigation was held, hearings and conferences undertaken; an effort to formulate a national policy was pushed. The war intervened. However, these earlier actions were not wholly fruitless. In the past year a great deal of attention has been given to the formulation of a national communications policy which would be based on substantive legislation. Representatives of the State Department, the Federal Communications Commission, the various military services, and other Government users of communications are giving serious and continuing attention to this entire situation.

We recommend that this committee continue the study of telecommunications common carriers in the Eighty-first Congress with the purpose of formulating legislative proposals to cope with the problem.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I also want to take this opportunity, as the chairman of the committee, to commend the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], members of the subcommittee, for their excellent work. I am very much interested in one of the points raised by the subcommittee, the issue of superpower and clear-channel broadcasting. It is a subject on which extensive hearings were held in the last Congress. I hope every Member of the Senate will read the report carefully because it deals realistically not only with the question of monopoly control of the physical broadcasting plant of America, but with the much more important issue—the centralization of power in a few hands to sway public opinion.

Furthermore, the committee report raises the important legal question of whether a fundamental policy matter which directly concerns and affects all the people of the United States shall be decided by an administrative regulatory agency created by Congress for that function or whether such a paramount question of important national policy should be determined by the Congress itself. I believe, and I am sure all Senators believe, that basic, fundamental policy questions must be determined by the lawmaking body.

We are all aware that the trend during recent years has been for the regulatory agencies to arrogate more and more power to themselves; to interpret language of the laws under which they operate so broadly as to give them authority never contemplated by the Congress. I, for one, am opposed to this practice and intend to oppose it as vigorously as I know how.

The report, which I believe should be in the RECORD so that all Members may read it, asserts unequivocally that the Federal Communications Commission does not have the legal authority under the Communications Act of 1934, to grant licenses for the operation of superpower radio stations because such operation would be contrary to the clear intent of the law which says that station licenses may be granted only in the public interest and that the regulatory agency must promote competition in broadcasting.

It is not my purpose here to quote from the report but I want it distinctly understood that I personally commend fully and endorse completely the viewpoint expressed by the subcommittee with respect to superpower and clear-channel operation of radio stations.

REPORT ON PROGRESS OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION (S. REPT. NO. 13)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the chairman of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, I should like to say just a word about the committee's Report on Progress of the Economic Cooperation Administration, which I have just submitted.

This committee was established last April by section 124 of Public Law 472—the law which set up the Economic Cooperation Administration. The committee's duties were set forth in section 124, as follows:

> It shall be the function of the committee to make a continuous study of the programs of United States economic assistance to foreign countries and to review the progress achieved in the execution and administration of such programs * * * and it shall make a report to the Senate and the House of Representatives, from time to time, concerning the results of its studies, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

Throughout its 10 months of existence, this committee, assisted by a well-qualified staff, has endeavored to act in close accordance with both the letter and spirit of the section I have just quoted. That is, we have directed our efforts toward determining facts, and from those facts we have analyzed the working out of the foreign-aid programs.

Under the direction of the committee, the staff has maintained close daily contact with officials of the Economic Cooperation Administration here in Washington. In addition, several members of both the committee and its staff have made trips to Europe and China to see at first hand how the program is going in the participating nations.

This report, then, is one of the results of 10 months of continuous study and analysis of this country's foreign-aid

programs—and I think that the adoption of the report by unanimous vote of the committee is a good indication of the success we have had in carrying out the job in the manner in which the Congress intended we should when it set up the committee last April.

Now a word about the report itself. First, I would like to remind you that this Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation is not a legislative committee—it is a watchdog committee, and, in fact, that is the name by which it is popularly known. Therefore, you will not find in the report any firm recommendations as to what should or should not be done by Congress in connection with forthcoming legislation on United States foreign-aid programs. In fact, most of the report consists of a section called a checklist, which gives pertinent information on what has been done by the Economic Cooperation Administration and the participating nations to implement and comply with Public Laws 472 and 793.

However, as a result of its studies, the committee believes that there are certain portions of our foreign-aid programs which need either clarification or strengthening and, in addition, that certain problems are sure to arise which would cause serious trouble if we did not anticipate them now. For that reason, I would like to invite special attention to the first section of our report. This section is entitled "Problems Requiring Consideration by Congress." It outlines 10 different problems and briefly discusses the pros and cons of various possible solutions to those problems. For example, this first section of the report discusses the following:

First. German reparations—whether or not it would be desirable to require that participating nations agree, as a condition for receiving further United States aid, to reduce the number of German plants that are to be dismantled.

Second. Strategic materials—whether or not ECA should be given increased responsibility for arranging with participating nations for development and future delivery to the United States of strategic materials needed by this country.

Third. Grants versus loans—whether or not it would be better to provide all further aid on a grant basis until participating nations become reasonable credit risks.

Fourth. Shipping—whether or not Congress should require unequivocably that at least one-half of the gross tonnage of goods sent to participating nations from the United States be transported on United States flag vessels.

Finally, I wish to commend this report to Members of the Congress as a valuable source of information and guidance in connection with the forthcoming hearings and floor discussion concerning United States economic aid to foreign nations. It is the labor of a committee which has functioned well and harmoniously, and I believe that as long as the Congress has a watchdog of this type it can rest easier concerning the operation and administration of whatever foreign aid it continues to make available.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing a nomination, which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

James M. Mitchell, of Illinois, to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Paul P. Rao, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court;

James T. Foley, of New York, to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York, vice Edward S. Kampf;

Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York;

William T. McCarthy, of Massachusetts, to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts, vice Arthur D. Healey;

Angel R. de Jesus, of Puerto Rico, to be chief justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico;

Luis Negron Fernandez, of Puerto Rico, to be an associate justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico;

Gerald A. Gleeson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania;

Cleon A. Summers, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma;

John B. Tansil, of Montana, to be United States attorney for the district of Montana;

Carl H. Fleckenstine, of Pennsylvania, to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania;

Harold K. Claypool, of Ohio, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio; and

Frederick Elliott Biermann, of Iowa, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Hon. F. Ryan Duffy, of Wisconsin, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit, vice Evan A. Evans, deceased.

By Mr. BROUGHTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Wilson Warlick, of North Carolina, to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina, vice Edwin Y. Webb, retired.

By Mr. DONNELL, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Roy W. Harper, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

By Mr. FERGUSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Thomas Patrick Thornton, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Ernest A. O'Brien, deceased;

Joseph F. Deeb, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan; and

Edwin D. Bolger, of Michigan, to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Maurice J. Tobin, of Massachusetts, to be Secretary of Labor, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate;

Ralph Wright, of New York, as Assistant Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor;

Frank P. Douglass, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1952 (reappointment);

John M. Houston, of Kansas, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate (reappointment);

Reuben F. Reider, and sundry other candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

Abraham Walfthal, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Charles L. Newberry, and sundry other candidates for appointment and promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

## NOMINATION OF WILLIAM E. WILLETT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have placed on the calendar the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency reporting favorably the nomination of William E. Willett, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

I should add that the nomination was unanimously reported out by the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## NOMINATION OF PRESTON DELANO

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have the honor to report the nomination of Mr. Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency. I ask that the nomination, which has been favorably acted upon by the committee, be confirmed by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has submitted a report on a nomination from the Committee on Banking and Currency. Does the Senator ask for the present consideration of the nomination, or does he submit the report for the calendar?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should prefer to ask for the present consideration of the report, if it is in order to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination just reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency be considered by the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from Virginia state his request again? I could not clearly hear what the Senator said. What is the nomination the Senator referred to, with respect to which he asks action by the Senate?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Preston Delano, who for 10 years has most acceptably served as Comptroller of the Cur-

rency, has now been nominated for a new term of 5 years. The nomination has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider the nomination, and that it be confirmed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator state why it is necessary to suspend the rules and proceed by unanimous consent? Why could not the nomination be properly acted upon at the next session of the Senate, in order that we might maintain the regularity of procedure with respect to action upon nominations?

Mr. ROBERTSON. If there is any objection, Mr. President, I shall withdraw my request. I did not think the nomination would be contested or debated. Mr. Delano is serving an interim term. It is not a material point, however, and if there is objection——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know of no objection, but, as a question of policy, I believe it would be better to let the nomination go over.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia withdraws his request. The nomination will go to the calendar.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 649. A bill to increase the mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees for use of privately owned vehicles and to increase the per diem allowances of civilian officers and employees while traveling on official business; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 650. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Ozawa;

S. 651. A bill for the relief of the Fisher Brewing Company, Salt Lake City, Utah; and

S. 652. A bill for the relief of Sadae Aoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. THOMAS of Utah also introduced Senate bill 653, to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 654. A bill for the relief of Klara Ungar Klajn; and

S. 655. A bill for the relief of Carl Nygren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 656. A bill to coordinate the educational functions of the Federal Government in a single agency; to define its organization, powers, and duties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 657. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; and

S. 658. A bill for the relief of Adolf Max Schmitz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 659. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for research and investigation as to the cause, prevention, treatment, and possible cure of epilepsy; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 660. A bill to amend the act of June 27, 1944, Public Law 359, and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; and

S. 661. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 662. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma to sell tribal cemetery; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma also introduced Senate bill 663, to provide for an adequate national reserve of agricultural commodities and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Kihei Matsuo; and

S. 665. A bill for the relief of Margaret D. Scott and Lydia M. Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. KNOWLAND also introduced Senate bill 666, to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to provide for the admission into the United States of certain persons of Russian origin residing in China, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 667. A bill for the relief of the Shelby Shoe Co., of Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 668. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur;

S. 669. A bill to permit certain displaced persons under 16 years of age orphaned as a result of World War II to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants; and

S. 670. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. WAGNER):

S. 671. A bill to authorize the conveyance of a portion of the United States military reservation at Fort Schuyler, N. Y., to the State of New York for use as a maritime school, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. HENDRICKSON introduced Senate bill 672, to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 673. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 674. A bill to incorporate the Twenty-ninth Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 675. A bill for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 676. A bill granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY also introduced Senate bill 677, to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 678 (by request). A bill to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 679. A bill to establish a Bureau of Coal Mines Inspection in the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 680. A bill for the relief of James E. Dick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 681. A bill to amend an act entitled "An Act to Provide a Government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 682. A bill for the relief of John B. Boyle; and

S. 683. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments.

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 684, to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SPARKMAN introduced Senate bill 685, to provide assistance to farmers in securing farm housing and other farm buildings, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. SPARKMAN also introduced Senate bill 686, to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, in order to assure the availability of low-cost financing on liberal terms to World War II veterans who need homes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 687. A bill to establish a Cowpens Battleground National Military Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 688. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; and

S. 689. A bill to permit certain postal employees or substitute postal employees to receive credit for military service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 690. A bill to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 691. A bill relating to the amount of Federal payments to the States under the Social Security Act with respect to State payments to Indian wards of the United States of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 692. A bill to provide for a grant to the Prisoners Relief Society for use in the rehabilitation of chronic alcoholics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNEY:

S. 693. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 694. A bill to repeal the Philippine Trade Act of 1946; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 695. A bill authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement near Kooskia, Idaho, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 696. A bill to provide additional compensation in lieu of allowances for retired enlisted personnel of the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 697. A bill for the relief of Grover Crosbie; and

S. 698. A bill for the relief of Rhode Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 699. A bill to provide for the restoration of certain lands occupied by the United States under war powers to the owners thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 700. A bill to authorize the issuance of a license to practice osteopathy in the District of Columbia to Maria G. Waksmundzha; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 701. A bill to increase the mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees for use of privately owned vehicles; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 702. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide for crediting certain service performed in the employ of carriers under Federal control during World War I; and

S. 703. A bill to permit the mailing of correspondence course lessons at the rates of third- and fourth-class matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. PEPPER also introduced Senate bill 704, to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 705. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 706. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

S. 707. A bill to provide for the advance planning of public works; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. RUSSELL introduced Senate bill 708, to establish a Voluntary Racial Relocation Commission, and to prescribe its authority which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. BALDWIN (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. THYE, Mr. IVES, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL) introduced Senate bill 709, to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 710. A bill to vest title to the Laguna project lands in the pueblo of Laguna of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 711. A bill to incorporate the Army and Navy Union; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MAYBANK (for himself, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LONG) introduced Senate bill 712, to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. TAYLOR introduced Senate Joint Resolution 39, to repeal all except certain provisions of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. IVES (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. J. Res. 40. Joint resolution to provide for a national theater and a national opera and ballet; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(Mr. O'CONOR introduced Senate Joint Resolution 41, to establish a commission to study intergovernmental fiscal relationships, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself, Mr. HILL, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LONG, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. STENNIS):

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution of the House of Representatives were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1252. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with a comparison of the bill with a former bill, and a sectional analysis thereof be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement, together with the summary and the analysis, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 653) to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Utah, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The statement, summary, and analysis of the bill were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

I have today introduced a bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes. During the present session of the Congress I have introduced two bills which would provide amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The first bill, S. 248, was introduced on behalf of myself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MYERS, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. WAGNER and was identical with a bill introduced during the Eightieth Congress, on which hearings were held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 2062. I also introduced this year S. 336, which would clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act as applied in the stevedoring and building-construction industries. I am now introducing a bill which provides a general revision of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This bill includes substantially all of the amendments which were contained in S. 2062, Eightieth Congress, as reintroduced as S. 248 of this Congress as well as the provisions of S. 336. In addition, however, it includes a number of other amendments and improvements of the law which have been recommended by the President in his state of the Union message and by the Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division in his annual report to the Congress.

I have had prepared a comparison between the Thomas bill (S. 2062, 80th Cong.; S. 248, 81st Cong.) and the bill which I am introducing today. I have asked unanimous consent that this comparison be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks. I have also had prepared a sectional analysis of the bill which I am introducing today. I have asked unanimous consent that this sectional analysis be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following the comparison referred to above.

It is my intention that the various bills on this subject, including the bill I have introduced today, shall receive early consideration by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

---

COMPARISON BETWEEN THE THOMAS BILL (S. 2062, 80TH CONG.; S. 248, 81ST CONG.) AND BILL TO REVISE THE WAGE AND HOUR LAW

Comparison between the Thomas bill (S. 2062, 80th Cong.; S. 248, 81st Cong.) and the attached draft is as follows:

COVERAGE

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft expand coverage by bringing within the scope of the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act employees engaged in or about an enterprise affecting commerce.

The Thomas bill strengthens the child-labor provisions by imposing a direct prohibition on the employment of oppressive child labor in or about any establishment where an employer is engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. The attached draft contains stronger provisions by directly prohibiting the employment of child labor (1) in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, and (2) in or about an enterprise affecting commerce.

MINIMUM WAGES

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft raise the minimum hourly rate to 75 cents an hour. This may be raised up to $1 by the industry committee procedure. The attached draft would also permit rates to be lowered, but not below 75 cents an hour, where necessary to prevent substantial

curtailment of employment due to a general business recession.

MAXIMUM HOURS

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft provide for payment of time and one-half the regular rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of 40 per week. The attached draft also defines the term "regular rate," which is not defined in the Thomas bill.

EXEMPTIONS FROM BOTH WAGE AND HOUR PROVISIONS

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft continue the complete wage and hour exemption with respect to any employee engaged in an executive, professional, administrative, or outside salesman capacity and for retail or servicing establishments. In both bills the 50-percent interstate commerce test as to retail or service establishments has been dropped and chain stores and large department stores are placed outside the exemption.

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft continue the complete wage and hour exemption as to employees employed as fishermen but eliminate this exemption as to employees engaged in fish processing. The attached draft, however, would provide a 14-week seasonal exemption, where justified, for the fish-processing industry.

The attached draft continues the complete wage and hour exemption as to employees engaged in agriculture. The Thomas bill limits this exemption to nonindustrialized farms.

The attached draft retains the complete exemption from the wage and hour provisions of the act as to certain classes of switchboard operators. The Thomas bill eliminates this exemption.

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft eliminate the complete wage and hour exemption with respect to employees engaged in processing agricultural commodities. Under the attached draft, however, agricultural processing may be given a 14-workweek seasonal exemption, where justified.

EXEMPTIONS FROM OVERTIME

Both the Thomas bill and the attached draft narrow the present overtime exemption as to certain classes of motor-carrier employees. The attached draft would, however, more narrowly restrict the exemption so that it would only apply to drivers and drivers' helpers in over-the-road transport operations.

The Thomas bill continues the complete exemption from the overtime provision of the act with respect to railroad employees. The attached draft, however, limits this exemption to employees who travel with the train between terminal points.

The Thomas bill continues the complete exemption from the overtime provisions of the act of all employees of air lines. The attached draft limits the exemption to flight personnel.

The Thomas bill eliminates the minimum wage and overtime exemptions as to seamen. The attached draft continues the overtime exemption as to seamen but would apply the minimum wage provisions.

CHILD-LABOR EXEMPTIONS

The attached draft exempts from the child-labor provisions children employed in retail or service establishments other than chain stores and large department stores. The child-labor provisions are also made inapplicable to employees engaged in agriculture outside of school hours as well as to newsboys. The Thomas bill, which covered child labor less broadly, did not contain either the retail or service establishment exemption or the exemption for newsboys. It does contain the agriculture exemption "while not legally required to attend school," as in the present act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

1. Secretary of Labor made responsible for administration: The attached draft would place administration of all provisions of the act under the Secretary of Labor, at the same time preserving the Administrator as an officer of the Department of Labor appointed by the President. The Thomas bill makes no provision of this nature.

2. Rule-making power: The attached draft authorizes the Secretary of Labor to make regulations necessary to carry out the purposes of the act whereas the Thomas bill contains no similar provision.

3. Restitution of back wages: The attached draft provides for collection by the Secretary of Labor of back wages and overtime pay due employees and enables suits for this purpose, whereas the Thomas bill contains no similar provision.

---

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF BILL TO REVISE WAGE AND HOUR LAW

Section 1.—Contains the enacting clause and short title.

Section 2.—Amends the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 as follows:

Section 1. Changes title of act to Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949.

Section 2 (a). Broadens findings in original act to make them applicable to industries engaged in activities affecting commerce, in addition to industries engaged in commerce or in production of goods for commerce.

Section 2 (b). Clarifies policy section of original act by referring to the exercise of congressional power over commerce with foreign nations as well as among the several States. This is appropriate in connection with the extension of the minimum-wage provisions to American seamen.

Section 3 (a). Definition of "person." No change.

Section 3 (b). Definition of "commerce." Amended to cover incoming in-bound in addition to out-bound foreign commerce. This makes possible full minimum wage coverage of American seamen.

Section 3 (c). Definition of "State." No change.

Section 3 (d). Definition of "employer." No change.

Section 3 (e). Definition of "employee." No change.

Section 3 (f). Definition of "agriculture." No change.

Section 3 (g). Definition of "employ." No change.

Section 3 (h). Definition of "industry." No change.

Section 3 (i). Definition of "goods." No change.

Section 3 (j). Definition of "produced." No change.

Section 3 (k). Definition of "sale." No change.

Section 3 (l). Definition of "oppressive child labor." Amended to close loophole in present act under which a parent may employ a child under 16 in a hazardous occupation although he could not employ the child in the same occupation if the child was 16 or 17 years of age.

Section 3 (m). Definition of "wage." Amended to provide minimum wages free and clear for seamen and for meal-service employees on common carriers, without deductions for board, lodging, or other facilities.

Section 3 (n). New subsection defining "activities affecting commerce."

Section 4 (a). Amends existing law to place administration of the act under the direction and control of the Secretary of Labor, and provides for continuation of the Wage and Hour Division as the Bureau of Wages and Hours, headed by an Administrator appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Section 4 (b). Technical changes made in existing provisions regarding agency personnel in order to conform to revised provisions of section 4 (a).

Section 4 (c). New subsection. Gives Secretary of Labor power to define terms and make other regulations or orders necessary to effective administration of the act. Provides protection from liability for employers conforming in good faith to such regulations or orders.

Section 4 (d). Conforms section 4 (c) of the present law (relating to place of exercise of agency powers) to amended language in section 4 (a).

Section 4 (e). Transfers the duty of making an annual report to Congress from the Administrator to the Secretary of Labor.

Section 5 (a)–(e). Amends existing law regarding the appointment and functions of industry committees to reflect the extension of coverage to industries affecting commerce. Technical changes made to conform the section to the amendments placing responsibility in the Secretary of Labor. Last paragraph of subsection (e) of the present act deleted as obsolete.

Section 6 (a)–(c). Amended to increase minimum wage to $0.75 an hour (and up to $1 an hour on recommendation of industry committees), and to extend coverage to employees of employers engaged in activities affecting commerce. Provision relating to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands amended to preserve existing wage orders in these islands until superseded, and to adapt the coverage of such orders to the broadened coverage provided by the amendments. Paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (a) and subsection (b) deleted as obsolete. Paragraph (5) of the present subsection (a) reenacted as paragraph (2) of that subsection, unchanged except by substitution of the Secretary of Labor for the Administrator.

Section 7 (a). Amended to extend coverage of the overtime provisions to employees of employers engaged in activities affecting commerce. Obsolete provisions of subsections (1) and (2) deleted.

Section 7 (b). Partial exemptions from overtime provisions made applicable up to 10 hours (instead of 12) in any workday or 50 hours (instead of 56) in any workweek. The specific exemptions in this subsection are amended as follows:

Paragraph (1). Exemption unchanged except for substitution of 1,040 hours for 1,000 hours as the contract period.

Paragraph (2). Provisions of existing law modified to encourage greater use of guaranteed annual employment premiums.

Paragraph (3). Exemption for seasonal industries expanded to care for peak-load overtime needs of industries for which exemptions now contained in sections 7 (c), 13 (a) (5), and 13 (a) (10) are eliminated.

Section 7 (c). Present exemption provision deleted (see sec. 7 (b) (3) above) and new subsection substituted. The new subsection (c) prevents evasion of the overtime requirements by use of so-called guaranty or Belo plans which fail to provide a genuine increase in compensation for an employee who works overtime, in accordance with the number of overtime hours worked.

Section 7 (d). Present subsection deleted as obsolete and new subsection defining and delimiting the term "regular rate" substituted. Makes clear that sums which are not compensation for hours worked and sums paid as overtime compensation are excluded from the regular rate. Meets the so-called overtime on overtime problem.

Section 7 (e). New provision. Permits overtime payments at time and one-half the applicable piece or job rate under appropriate safeguards.

Section 7 (f). New provision. Provides that certain premium compensation for overtime work pursuant to contract or practice may

be credited toward statutory overtime compensation due.

Section 8. Subsection (e) deleted as obsolete and remaining provisions relating to wage orders revised to provide for establishment of minimum wage rates between 75 cents and $1 per hour through the action of industry committees and the Secretary of Labor. Wage order coverage expanded to include industries engaged in activities affecting commerce. A new subsection (f) provides for reduction of minimum wage rates set by wage orders down to, but not below, the statutory minimum of 75 cents per hour, when necessary to prevent substantial curtailment of employment in the industry due to a general recession of business activities.

Section 9. Attendance of witnesses. No change except substitution of the Secretary of Labor for the Administrator.

Section 10. Court review. No change except for substitution of the Secretary of Labor for the Administrator.

Section 11 (a). Investigations. Amended. Substitutes Secretary of Labor for Administrator. Authorizes Secretary of Labor to make investigations of employment of minors. Eliminates provision authorizing Administrator to utilize the bureaus and divisions of the Department of Labor for investigations. This provision unnecessary.

Section 11 (b)-(c). No change except substitution of Secretary of Labor for Administrator.

Section 12 (a). Child-labor provisions. Technical change with respect to effective date.

Section 12 (b). New subsection. Prohibits employment of oppressive child labor in commerce, in the production of goods for commerce, and in or about an enterprise affecting commerce. Present subsection authorizing Secretary of Labor to make investigations with respect to employment of minors deleted as such authority is now contained in section 11 (a).

Section 13 (a). New subsection. This subsection supplants the present subsection 13 (a) (2) which exempts from the minimum wage and overtime provisions of the act any employee employed in any retail or service establishment the greater part of whose selling or servicing is in intrastate commerce. The new subsection exempts from the minimum wage, overtime, and child-labor provisions of the act any employee of an employer operating a retail or service establishment which derives 75 percent or more of its receipts from "retail selling or service" as such phrase is defined in this subsection, provided that the employer has neither more than four such establishments nor a total annual volume of sales or servicing of more than $500,000. Sales to farmers for ordinary farming use would generally meet the definition of "retail selling or servicing" as more specifically defined in this subsection.

Section 13 (b). Amends section 13 (a) and continues the present minimum wage and overtime exemptions with respect to certain classes of employees but with some exceptions and modifications, namely:

Paragraph (1). Amends subsection 13 (a) (1) by deleting words "local retailing." The exemption with respect to employees employed in bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacities is continued.

Present subsection 13 (a) (2) is deleted, being superseded by subsection 13 (a), supra.

Present subsection 13 (a) (3) with respect to seamen is deleted. A new subsection exempts seamen from the overtime provisions only. (Sec. 13 (c) (4), infra.)

Present subsection 13 (a) (4) exemption with respect to employees of carriers by air is deleted. A new subsection exempts flight personnel employed on an aircraft from the overtime provisions only. (Sec. 13 (c) (a), infra.)

Paragraph (2). Amends subsection 13 (a) (5)—catching, harvesting, etc., of various aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life—by incorporating certain technical changes and by deleting that portion of this subsection which extends the exemption to processing and other on-shore occupations.

Paragraph (3). Exemption for any employee employed in agriculture. No change from subsection 13 (a) (6).

Paragraph (4). Exemption for employees affected by regulations or orders of the Secretary of Labor issued under section 14. No change from present subsection 13 (a) (7) except substitution of Secretary of Labor for Administrator.

Paragraph (5). Exemption for employee employed on certain weekly and semiweekly papers. No change from present subsection 13 (a) (8).

Paragraph (6). Exemption for employees of local trolley and motor-bus carriers and other metropolitan carriers. No change from present subsection 13 (a) (9).

Present subsection 13 (a) (10)—"area of production" exception with respect to certain operations on agricultural products—is deleted. Exemption for seasonal industries expanded to take care of peak-load overtime needs now contained in subsection 7 (b) (3), supra.

Paragraph (7). New subsection. Present provision with respect to switchboard operators (sec. 13 (a) (11)) deleted. Exemption for switchboard operators provided for exchanges having only one operator on duty at a time.

Paragraph (8). New subsection. Exempts employees of employers engaged in business of operating taxicabs.

Section 13 (c). Amends present subsection 13 (b). Exempts from the overtime provisions of the act the following classes of employees.

Paragraph (1). New subsection. Narrows overtime exemption to drivers and helpers who spend greater part of the workweek in over-the-road transport operations. Present subsection 13 (b) (1) deleted.

Paragraph (2). New subsection. Narrows overtime exemption with respect to railroad employees to employees employed on line-of-road trains. Present subsection 13 (b) (2) deleted.

Paragraph (3). New subsection. Grants overtime exemption for air carrier employees if employed on an aircraft. Supersedes the present minimum wage and overtime exemption with respect to any employee of a carrier by air. (Subsec. 13 (a) (4), supra.)

Paragraph (4). New subsection. Grants overtime exemption to any employee as seaman. Supersedes the present minimum wage and overtime exemption for seamen. (Subsecs. 13 (a) (3), supra.)

Section 13 (d). Amends present subsection 13 (b) (3). Makes child-labor provisions inapplicable to newsboys. Incorporates clarifying language permitting employment, outside of school hours, of children employed in agriculture.

Section 14. Learners. No change except substitution of Secretary of Labor for Administrator.

Section 15 (a). Prohibited acts. Technical change with respect to effective date. Substitution of Secretary of Labor for Administrator. Amendment to section prohibits violation of rules and regulations issued by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to section 4 (c).

Section 15 (b). No change.

Section 16 (a). Penalties. No change.

Section 16 (b). No change.

Section 16 (c). New subsection. Authorizes Secretary of Labor to collect unpaid wages on behalf of employees which, if accepted by employee, constitute a waiver of his right to sue for such back wages, liquidated damages, court costs, and attorneys' fees. Upon request by and with the consent of the employee, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to sue to recover on behalf of the employee the actual amount of back wages due him, the right to liquidated damages being likewise waived. This subsection is in no way to affect or limit the right with respect to injunctive actions.

Section 17. Injunctive proceedings. Technical change only.

Section 18. Relation to other laws. No change.

Section 19. Separability of provisions. No change.

Section 3.—Amends the Portal to Portal Act of 1947 as follows:

Section 3 (a). Amends sections 6 (a) and 6 (b) by substituting a 4-year statute of limitations for the present 2-year period.

Section 3 (b). Transfers the present functions and duties vested in the Administrator by section 10—reliance on regulations, orders, rulings, etc.—from the Administrator to the Secretary of Labor.

Section 4.—Effective date of certain changes.

Section 4 (a). Act is to become effective 120 days after its enactment except that the Secretary of Labor may immediately exercise the functions vested in him and except that the overtime provisions of the act become effective immediately after the date of enactment.

Section 4 (b). The orders, rulings, and interpretations of the Administrator are to remain effective until amended, modified, or rescinded by the Secretary of Labor.

Section 4 (c). Provides a limitation of 4 years for claims accruing prior to enactment of this act.

## NATIONAL RESERVE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an adequate national reserve of agricultural products, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement thereof prepared by me be printed in the RECORD, immediately following the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Oklahoma, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 663) to provide for an adequate national reserve of agricultural commodities and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Farm Commodity Reserve Act."

### TITLE I—STORAGE FACILITIES

#### SURVEY OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 101. The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) shall, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, as expeditiously as may be possible, make a complete survey of (1) warehouses, elevators, and other facilities available in the United States for the storage of agricultural commodities and their products, including surplus storage facilities located at any Army or Navy camp, airfield, depot, or manufacturing plant; and (2) the requirements of the various areas of the United States for additional facilities for such storage. Upon completion of such survey the Secretary shall report his findings and recommendations to Congress, specifying the areas in which such storage facilities are inadequate and the kind and quantity of storage facilities required.

CONSTRUCTION OF STORAGE FACILITIES

SEC. 102. The Secretary is authorized, through the Commodity Credit Corporation and other means available to him, upon completion of the survey and report provided for by this Act, to make additional facilities for the storage of agricultural commodities and their products available in such areas of the United States as he may deem advisable by (1) encouraging, through loans, subsidies, lease-agreements, guaranties, or otherwise, the construction or operation of such facilities by producers, cooperatives, or others; or (2) constructing or operating such facilities where suitable arrangements for their construction or operation by others cannot be made. Storage facilities constructed or operated with assistance provided for by this section shall be maintained and operated pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be issued by the Secretary from time to time; but no such rule or regulation shall become effective until after sixty days' public notice.

ACQUISITION OF STORAGE FACILITIES BY COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

SEC. 103. Section 4 (h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act is amended by deleting the second sentence thereof and inserting in its place the following: "The Corporation shall have power to acquire personal property necessary to the conduct of its business; but shall not have power to acquire real property or any interest therein, except that it may (a) rent or lease office space necessary for the conduct of its business, and (b) acquire real property or any interest therein for the purpose of providing storage adequate to carry out effectively and efficiently any of the Corporation's programs, or of securing or discharging obligations owing to the Corporation, or of otherwise protecting the financial interest of the Corporation."

TITLE II—FARM COMMODITY RESERVES

RESERVES

SEC. 201. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall, through its price-support operations, acquire a reserve of corn in the amount of six hundred million bushels, a reserve of wheat in the amount of four hundred million bushels, and a reserve of cotton in the amount of four million five hundred thousand running bales. The Corporation shall not sell or dispose of any corn, wheat, or cotton acquired through its price-support operations if, after such sale, the reserve of such commodity will be lower than the amount specified for such commodity in this section, except that—

(1) if the Secretary determines that the national security or welfare so require, the Corporation shall sell such commodity at the lesser of (A) a price determined on a pricing basis for its stocks of such commodity on hand, which makes due allowance for grade, type, quality, location, and other factors and which is reasonably calculated to reimburse it for costs incurred by it with respect to such stocks, or (B) the parity price of such commodity;

(2) the Corporation may sell or otherwise dispose of any such commodity which has substantially deteriorated in quality, but shall immediately thereafter acquire an equal quantity of such commodity; and

(3) the Corporation may exchange any such commodity pursuant to the Act entitled "An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad", approved August 11, 1939.

The amount of corn, wheat, and cotton in the reserves provided for by this section shall not be considered in the computation of "total supply" for the purposes of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, or any other computation or determination with respect to acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or price-support levels.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

QUOTAS—1949 ACREAGE

SEC. 301. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotments for corn, wheat, cotton, and rice for any year after 1949 shall be computed and apportioned without regard to acreage planted, or to yields, in 1949. The acreage planted, and yields for the year next preceding the earliest year which, but for this section, would be used in such computation or apportionment shall be used in lieu of the acreage planted and yields in 1949 in such computation or apportionment.

PROHIBITION ON PRICE SUPPORT AFTER ADVERSE REFERENDUM

SEC. 302. Section 302 (b) (3) (B) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1948, to be effective January 1, 1950) is amended to read as follows:

"(B) no price support shall be required to be made available for any basic agricultural commodity normally marketed in any marketing year with respect to which marketing quotas for such commodity have been disapproved by producers."

EXCHANGE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES FOR STRATEGIC MATERIALS

SEC. 303. The act entitled "An act to facilitate the execution of arrangements for the exchange of surplus agricultural commodities produced in the United States for reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials produced abroad," approved August 11, 1939, is amended to read as follows: "That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, to accept strategic and critical materials produced abroad in exchange for agricultural commodities in its reserves; and for the purpose of such exchange the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, acting jointly through the agency of the Munitions Board in the National Defense Establishment and in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior and other departments and agencies shall determine which materials are strategic and critical and the quantity and quality of such materials to be accepted. In order to carry out the provisions of this act, the Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized, upon terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, to procure, convey, transport, handle, store, maintain, or rotate such reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials, as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this act.

"Such reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials shall be stored on military or naval reservations or in other locations approved by the Secretary of Defense. The Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to transfer such reserve stocks of strategic and critical materials, upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Agriculture shall approve, to any other governmental agency. When necessary to prevent deterioration, the Commodity Credit Corporation or other governmental agency is authorized to replace those quantities of the reserve stocks of such strategic and critical materials subject to deterioration with equivalent quantities of the same materials. The funds now or hereafter made available to the Commodity Credit Corporation are hereby made available to carry out the purposes of this act. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be required to carry out the provisions of this act. All funds for carrying out the provisions of this act shall be available for allotment to bureaus and offices of the Department of Agriculture, and for transfer to such other agencies of the Federal Government as the Secretary of Agriculture may request to cooperate or assist in carrying out the provisions of this act."

The statement presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF OKLAHOMA

I am introducing a bill to provide for an adequate national reserve of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes. The bill, if enacted into law, is to be known as the Farm Commodity Reserve Act.

The first section of the bill proposes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make a Nation-wide survey to ascertain the extent to which storage space is available for warehousing farm commodities.

The second section provides that after full information is had as to what we have in the way of storage space the Secretary is authorized to procure additional storage space, if necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the act, at points where acceptable storage space does not exist.

Such additional storage for farm commodities is to be secured through loans, subsidies, lease agreements, guaranties, or otherwise, to the end that farmers may have the opportunity of placing their surplus crops in acceptable storage in connection with their applications for loans upon such commodities.

Section 3 of the bill proposes to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation charter by eliminating certain restrictions from the present law.

Section 4 of the bill proposes to set forth goals for permanent reserves of certain farm commodities. The permanent reserve of wheat is fixed in the amount of 400,000,000 bushels, the permanent reserve of corn is fixed in the amount of 600,000,000 bushels, and the permanent reserve of cotton is fixed in the amount of 4,500,000 running bales.

The bill provides for the acquisition of the reserves through the support-price-loan system.

Commodities placed under loan and thereafter unredeemed should be taken over by the Secretary and made a part of the permanent reserves of such commodities.

The section further provides that all commodities placed in such permanent reserves shall not be considered in the computation of total supply for the purpose of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and shall not be taken into consideration in determining acreage allotments, marketing quotas, or price-support levels as provided by existing law.

Section 5 provides that acreage planted to wheat and cotton for the crop year of 1949 shall not be taken into consideration, in consideration of future allocation of acreage where quotas are imposed.

Section 6 provides that in the event the reserves as specified in the act shall be built up to the full amount, then the Secretary shall be authorized to propose production and marketing quotas for the next year's crop, and in the event such quotas are not approved by the producers of any given commodity, then the Secretary is authorized to discontinue support prices for such commodity.

Section 7 of the act provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall confer with other Federal agencies with respect to the exchange of reserve stocks of farm commodities for strategic and critical materials produced abroad and needed for stock piling in the States of such materials.

The ends to be attained through the enactment of the suggested legislation are as follows: First, to protect producers of farm commodities in providing for them

support prices; second, to protect consumers in providing a substantial stock pile of basic farm commodities for use in case of emergencies such as drought or war; and, third, to provide a plan for stabilizing the price of farm commodities at or near the full parity price of such commodities.

New provisions, changes in or amendments to the existing agricultural program are now being proposed.

One of the important new provisions will be the vitalization of the concept of a Nation-wide ever-normal granary system to be used first to embrace all kinds of storage such as warehouses and elevators and other forms of acceptable storage for farm products and, second, the amount of each of the approved commodities which may be fixed as a goal to be and constitute the quantity of such granary or reserve.

The plan or bill being proposed provides that the Secretary of Agriculture shall cause a survey to be made to determine what storage facilities are now available and the information secured will advise the Congress and the country of the points, or areas, where satisfactory storage is nonexistent. In addition to the information with respect to the points where storage should be provided the Secretary will be authorized to advise the Congress where storage should be provided and the kind of such storage recommended. It is not contemplated that competitive storage of any kind or character shall be either authorized or constructed. In other words, no additional storage of any kind shall be provided or even considered at points or in areas where storage is already in existence. The plan under consideration provides for a permanent system of support prices at a certain percent of the parity price of any given farm product. If and when loans are made the products pledged as security will be placed in Government approved and supervised warehouses. Thereafter, if the loan is not paid and the farm product redeemed then the commodity pledged will be retained by the Secretary and converted into what is termed a national stock pile of the commodity mentioned.

The plan will set forth the amount of the various commodities to be stock-piled. If and when the stock pile of any given farm product is built up to the point to be fixed by law, then the Secretary of Agriculture will be authorized and directed to call a referendum by the producers of any such commodity on the issue of whether or not quotas shall be authorized and provided for the next year's crop.

In the event the producers shall fail and refuse to approve of quotas for any commodity and the stock pile continues to expand, then the Secretary of Agriculture shall be authorized to withhold support prices for any such product until such time as the said stock pile is reduced to such an amount as to make it feasible and sound to resume the program of stock-piling. The program of warehousing and stock-piling of farm commodities is being considered as a major agriculture policy.

The policy is being presented and developed as a plan to stabilize the price of farm products at or near the full parity price of any such product. The plan will provide, first, a price floor for farm products and in so doing will enable farmers to plan their crop production accordingly and, second, the plan will provide against runaway prices to consumers. When the stock pile is developed and thereafter, in an emergency, such as a war or draft, then the Secretary will be authorized and directed to sell from such stock pile commodities in short supply and spiraling in price first, to farmers for seed and, second to mills for processing and distributing such products at prices to cover the cost of the loan and incidental expenses, per unit, or the full parity price, whichever is the lower.

If the present law respecting support prices in the form of loans, remains unchanged, then support prices will fluctuate from time to time between 60 and 90 percent of the parity price of any mentioned farm product. Speaking for myself, and not as the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, I favor a fixed support price of basic agricultural products at 90 percent of the parity price of such products.

The full parity price of any farm commodity is intended to give the producers enough money for such product to enable them to purchase the products of industry which they need in carrying on their businesses.

This concept set up a 100-percent standard of living for farmers. It is obvious to me that a 90-percent support price will reduce the farm standard of living from 100- to a 90-percent standard of living. If the support price is reduced as low as 60 percent of parity, as now provided by law, effective January 1, 1950, then the plan provides for a 60-percent standard of living for farmers and such a plan or program is entirely foreign to my way of thinking.

## AMENDMENT OF DISPLACED PERSONS ACT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to provide for the admission to the United States of certain persons of Russian origin residing in China. These are the displaced persons who were displaced by the Russian revolutions, both under the Kerensky regime and under prior regimes.

The bill (S. 666) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to provide for the admission into the United States of certain persons of Russian origin residing in China, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EDUCATIONAL BENEFITS OF CERTAIN VETERANS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1, and I ask unanimous consent that a very brief explanatory statement may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from New Jersey will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 672) to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. HENDRICKSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

This is a "tidying-up" bill which will insure equal treatment to all men who enlisted in armed forces up through October 6, 1945. As matters now stand, all who joined armed forces before October 6, 1945, have their educational benefits cease accumulating as of July 25, 1947, the end of the war powers acts. But Public Law 190 was passed in October 1945 in an attempt to encourage and stimulate enlistments and said that those who enlisted between October 6, 1945, and October 5, 1946, were entitled to the maximum benefits under the GI bill of rights laws as passed by Congress.

For example, two boys enlist, one on October 1, 1945, serves until October 1, 1948, his benefits under Public Law 346 ceased accumulating on July 25, 1947. Second boy enlisted October 7, 1945, serves until October 7, 1947, his benefits continue accumulating straight through and he gets more schooling under GI than did a man (No. 1) who served a year longer.

## EMPLOYMENT OF HANDICAPPED VETERANS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the kind suggestion of the Disabled American Veterans of the United States, I am glad to reintroduce a bill previously identified as S. 1325, of the Eightieth Congress.

The purpose of this bill is to encourage the employment of handicapped veterans.

The bill (S. 677) to encourage employment of veterans with pensionable or compensable service-connected disabilities through Federal reimbursement to any employer, insurer, or fund, of amounts of workmen's compensation paid on account of disability or death arising out of such employment, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## ADMINISTRATIVE COURT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an administrative court of the United States. In view of the fact that the bill is brief, I ask that it be printed in full in the body of the RECORD, and that a statement explanatory of the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD immediately following the text of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Nevada, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 684) to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there shall be a court of record known as the Administrative Court of the United States. By and with the advice and consent of the Senate the President shall appoint a chief judge and four associate judges for the court, who shall be learned and experienced in both the general and administrative law of the United States but shall not, within 5 years of such appointment, have served as an officer or employee in the executive branch of the Government of the United States. No more than three of the judges of the court shall be appointed from the same political party. It shall be organized and begin to function as soon as its chief judge and two of its associate judges shall have been appointed and qualify. Each judge shall hold office during good behavior and receive a salary equal to that of a circuit judge. On the request of the court any active or retired

judge of the United States may on his consent be assigned, by the chief judge of his court or the Chief Justice of the United States, to duty as a judge of the court for a temporary period or for participation in specified cases there pending. The chief judge shall have precedence and preside at any session of the court which he attends. Whenever the chief judge is not present, is unable to perform the duties of his office, or the office is vacant, his duties shall devolve pro tem upon the associate judge in active service who is next in precedence. The associate judges shall have precedence according to the seniority of their commissions but, if commissions bear the same date, precedence shall be determined according to seniority in age.

JURISDICTION AND POWERS

SEC. 2. To provide an effective remedy for every wrong to any person as well as to provide for the just enforcement of public policy except (1) with respect to cases otherwise cognizable in the Court of Claims, the Customs Court, the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, or the Tax Court or (2) so far as a money judgment is sought, an issue of tax liability is presented, or the grant or denial of a patent is questioned.

(a) The court shall have exclusive jurisdiction of all cases which, except for this act, would be within the jurisdiction of any court of the District of Columbia (1) for the judicial review of agency action or (2) for the civil enforcement of the rules, orders, or investigative demands of any agency.

(b) The court may take jurisdiction in any case involving the judicial review of agency action, otherwise cognizable or pending in any court of the United States other than the Supreme Court, at the request of any person who (1) desires to bring such an action or (2) has brought it elsewhere but seeks to transfer it to the court before trial, argument, or submittal for decision.

(c) The court may take jurisdiction in any case involving the civil enforcement of the rules, orders, or investigative demands of any agency, otherwise cognizable or pending in any court of the United States other than the Supreme Court, at the request of any person against whom such an action has been brought but has not been tried, argued, or submitted for decision.

(d) With the permission of the court any agency may institute in the court an original action for the suspension or revocation of the whole or part of any license otherwise subject to revocation by the agency.

(e) In any case in which jurisdiction is conferred by this section the court shall have all the powers of any court which has, or but for this act would have, jurisdiction. In addition, in connection with any case in which jurisdiction is conferred upon the court by this section or in any case which may be instituted in the court for the purpose by any person or agency, the court shall have authority (1) to declare in any dispute the rights, privileges, immunities, and legal relations of any person or agency with respect to agency action or powers and (2) to direct, compel, or otherwise provide for the taking of agency action wrongfully withheld or erroneously applied. For all purposes the court shall be deemed an independent, specialized, and superior tribunal with respect to the subject matter and issues of fact or legislation before it, endowed with primary jurisdiction and final authority, and created to assure protection of all persons, conformity with legislative policy, and uniformity in the interpretation and administration of law.

OPERATION AND PROCEDURE

SEC. 3. The official station of the judges of the court shall be the District of Columbia. Not less than three judges shall constitute the court in any case of a type which, except for this act or if brought in another court, would require a court of more than one judge. Otherwise any one or more of the judges of the court, including judges temporarily assigned thereto, shall suffice as provided by the rules of the court. Where more than one judge sits, a majority of the judges of the court for the case shall constitute a quorum. The court shall hold an annual term at the seat of government but may hear or decide cases at general, special, or adjourned terms or sessions at any place within the jurisdiction of the United States. In any case in which the permission of the court is required it may be sought by ex parte petition or otherwise as the court may provide by rule or instruction. A written opinion shall be filed as a part of the record in each case, certified to each of the named parties therein, and published in compilations issued by the court from time to time. Save as modified by the court, general rules of procedure in the district courts of the United States shall govern. So far as pertinent, the general provisions of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C., part V) and the provisions thereof respecting procedure in the Court of Claims (28 U. S. C., ch. 165) shall apply. The court, and each judge or commissioner thereof, shall possess all the powers of a district court of the United States for preserving order, compelling the attendance of witnesses, requiring the production of evidence, and achieving the execution of process.

JUDGMENTS AND REVIEW

SEC. 4. To assure in every case both that full justice shall have been done to each person and that public policy shall be fairly and equitably executed—

(a) In any case determined by one judge of the court, the judgment shall become final at the expiration of 30 days unless within that time (1) the parties waive rehearing and review by the court, in which case it shall become final upon such waiver, (2) it is modified or suspended by the judge who entered it, in which case the time shall begin to run again after such modification or the reentry of the judgment, or (3) any party thereto petitions for a review by three or more judges of the court sitting as an appellate division pursuant to the rules of the court. If such a petition is filed and denied, the judgment shall thereupon be final. If such review is granted, the judgment shall become final when and as affirmed, modified, or reversed by the appellate division of the court after opportunity for rehearing.

(b) In any case determined originally in the court by more than one judge, the judgment shall be final after opportunity for rehearing.

(c) Any final judgment of the court shall be reviewable only by the Supreme Court on writ of certiorari granted at the petition of any party, or on appeal if such would be available but for this act, (1) to the extent that such review may be required by the Constitution or (2) so far as the court may have failed in any case to afford full and equal protection to private and public rights, powers, privileges, or immunities. The court may also certify to the Supreme Court any question of law in any case as to which instructions are desired, and upon such certification the Supreme Court may give binding instructions on such questions.

MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 5. For the purposes of this act—

(a) The definitions stated in the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. sec. 451) and the Administrative Procedure Act (5 U. S. C. sec. 1001) shall be applicable to the same terms used in this act.

(b) The court and the judges thereof shall be subject to the pertinent general provisions of the Judicial Code (28 U. S. C. ch. 21). The budget of the court shall be handled in the same manner as that of the Court of Claims (28 U. S. C. sec. 605). Judges of the court may retire for disability in the same manner as judges of the Court of Claims (28 U. S. C. sec. 372).

(c) The officers and employees of the court shall be the same, and be governed by the same provisions of law so far as relevant, as those of the courts of appeals (28 U. S. C. ch. 47) and the Court of Claims (28 U. S. C. ch. 51). They shall also be subject to the general provisions of the Judicial Code applicable to officers and employees of other courts of the United States (28 U. S. C. ch. 57).

(d) The court shall at any time report to Congress the need for additional judges or for legislation in its field of special competence or jurisdiction.

The statement presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

I am today introducing a bill "to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States." The subject is not new. The condition it is designed to meet is not new. I should like to say a few words about both.

I

The need for a measure such as this is something we all know about generally. We know that government is growing larger in size. The complexity of the modern administrative machine of state increases daily. Its impact upon our people grows more intense. Its interests flow beyond the seas.

Now, with world leadership forced upon us, we must be even more vigilant that our domestic concerns and our institutions at home retain the vigor which has brought us this far along the road of history. We must avoid the regrettable chronicle of empires which, while extending their interests over the globe, neglected to make sure that there was commensurate progress at home.

But even on this continent times change and our institutions must be adjusted accordingly. In the field of government, the greatest development of the twentieth century has been the growth of administrative agencies and bureaus to do what Congress and the courts previously did. Nowadays more laws are made by administrative agencies than by Congress, except that we call those laws regulations instead of statutes. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars every year merely publishing those regulations, in the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations. Similarly, bureaus and commissions decide far more specific cases than the courts, except that we call those decisions orders instead of judgments. Some are published in vast sets of law books, but the greater part of them never see the light of publicity.

Faced with this condition, we have taken various precautions to continue a government of divided powers. Congress still retains its authority to empower and to guide, by the instructions it writes into the public statutes or the appropriation acts. But those instructions have necessarily become more and more general. The inevitable consequence has been that administrative agencies have greater and greater latitude to interpret the statutes we write.

Similarly, we still have a system of courts. During the last 15 years many things have been done to strengthen them in numbers and in method. We have provided for more and more judges. The bar of the country has given its best efforts to modernize judicial procedure. The judicial system as such has been developed by a series of notable statutes. But still the courts, though augmented in numbers and facilities, are no longer the tribunals of primary resort in the matters which we have committed to administrative agencies. The latter make the rules and decide the cases in the first instance. In great part the courts serve merely

as appellate agencies designed, or deeming themselves designed, to exercise their powers only to correct abuses of the grossest nature.

II

In one respect I believe we have been unfair to our judicial system in recent years. We have heaped upon it new tasks in connection with new legislation of a social nature, not realizing that in the growth of the country their old functions have also grown in magnitude. In an age of specialization, we have also failed to afford them an opportunity to specialize. We have demanded that their jurisdiction embrace both old and new functions. And the new functions of the last 15 years, as we all know, are matters of utmost intricacy.

Of course, we have allowed this situation to continue because we respect our judicial institutions. We also desire to continue their general jurisdiction unimpaired so that they may bring our Federal justice to every district of the country where they sit. I should be the last person to say that we should abandon our ideal of one system of courts, one bar, and one law.

Yet our history demonstrates that we have had to depart from that ideal very often. In a sense, we have abandoned it most markedly in setting up numerous boards and commissions to do what our courts would have done in an earlier day. We also departed from the ideal when we created the Court of Claims, the customs and patent courts, and the Tax Court.

But those specialized courts were set up not in derogation of our legal system, but in recognition that there were some specialties which required special courts to protect and foster—rather than to impair—our system of government under law. They are special courts only in the sense that they confine their attention to special subjects. Otherwise their methods and their judges are like those of other courts.

These special courts have been successful. I know of no real complaint about the special court system. It is therefore surprising that, despite the great expansion of Government and judicature in the last 15 years, no new specialized courts have been created for a generation or more. The reason, presumably, lies in the fact that we had previously and generously taken care of the several special fields of our law so that there was no great need for more of them.

III

But a dozen years ago it was widely proposed that there be established an administrative court. The proposal was endorsed and publicized by the American Bar Association. The idea appears to have perished for two reasons. First was the fact that, perhaps unwisely, it was proposed to abolish the specialized courts I have mentioned and merge them in the administrative court. Second was the fact that the legal profession turned its attention to more immediate problems such as the formulation of uniform rules of procedure and regulation of administrative procedure.

In considering remedies for some of the legal problems we have today, it has occurred to me that a properly constituted administrative court may contribute greatly to the improvement of the administration of justice. It may do so by contributing specialization where specialization is sorely needed, by relieving the regular courts of part of their burdens, and by aiding both Government and private interests through expert handling of the complex problems of administrative law.

It is an anachronism for us to accept specialization as a necessity in administrative law at the administrative level, but to assume that generalization is sufficient at the judicial level of the same subject. If—as we are told—it requires specialists to regulate securities for example, why is not some specialization at least desirable in courts dealing with security regulation cases? Of course the specialization is desirable. We have admitted it in our legislation in recent years. During the war we created an Emergency Court of Appeals to assure specialization and uniformity in the judicial review of price-control regulations. More recently we have created a tax court out of what was previously a board, in order to achieve a judicial specialization in the field of taxation.

There would certainly be no harm in relieving our regular courts of some of their duties in administrative-law cases. Such proceedings are extensive. The record in a single case may be many volumes of print. The issues are complex. The courts must, therefore, devote to them precious time during which litigants in regular cases must suffer delays.

On the other hand, an administrative court could bring to its task a degree of familiarity, expertness, and dispatch which would improve the over-all administration of justice greatly in administrative-law cases. For the lack of those things both Government and people suffer in this field. The Government is injured every time a court fails to understand the special problems in one of these cases. People seeking justice are injured every time a court, for lack of understanding, denies them their full rights or delays decision.

It should not be necessary to expand on these reasons. Obviously specialization is a matter of national policy, even in the judiciary, and we resort to it from time to time as need requires. Plainly the regular courts would be aided by relief from their present burdens. Manifestly expertness is needed at the judicial level for the adequate determination of intricate administrative-law cases.

IV

Believing as I do about these things, and with some familiarity as to legislative needs and judicial methods of our court system, I have sought to devise an Administrative Court which would be adequate to the problem but would not trench unduly upon either our regular or specialized courts in their essential functions. It has been necessary to determine (1) the type of court, (2) its jurisdiction, (3) its operational procedure, and (4) its setting in our appellate system. I should like to close this statement with a few words about each of these matters.

(1) We shall need an Administrative Court of several judges. I have proposed that there be five judges. They would be appointed in the usual fashion except that, because of the nature and purpose of the court, the appointees should have the special qualification of training and experience in administrative as well as other law. At the same time, however, it is essential that the court should not be made up of personnel drawn immediately from the executive branch because, among other things, appointments so made would require such judges to disqualify themselves in many cases and would also lead people to feel that such a court would be unduly partial to Government agencies. Of course the court will measure up to its purpose only to the extent that its judges measure up to the necessary qualifications.

(2) In the matter of the jurisdiction of the court, it seems to me that a simple system will not only suffice for immediate purposes but will permit growth and adaptation over the coming years. I have therefore proposed that the court have (a) exclusive jurisdiction over all administrative law cases instituted in the District of Columbia and (b) permissive jurisdiction, at the instance of the private parties involved, with respect to such cases instituted elsewhere. But in neither situation would the court supersede the Court of Claims, the customs and patent courts, or the Tax Court.

(3) The procedure of the court would be of two kinds and, for each kind, it would be similar to that with which we are all familiar. When the court sits as a trial court, it would operate like other trial courts—with one or more judges, etc. It would also be a reviewing or appellate court in the same fashion as other courts—with three or more judges sitting in a case. In other words, there would be nothing unusual about the method and procedure in the court. It might operate anywhere in the country, however, depending upon the needs of its business as time goes on.

(4) In appropriate cases as required by the Constitution, and in any case in which the court should fail to afford equal protection to the parties before it, appeals could be taken to the Supreme Court in the same fashion as in other cases in other courts.

These are the essentials of my proposal. The provisions of the bill I have introduced are quite simple. Any member of Congress and any lawyer can understand them. For the problem it is designed to reach, this proposal is in fact much more direct and simple than many of the schemes laid before us.

In closing I should like to say again, as I have on other occasions, that we have a duty here to keep our governmental machine attuned to the needs of today and tomorrow and the years to come. What we do here in the way of substantive legislation will not long endure if we do not also make sure that we have a governmental machine that can handle it. At the same time we must maintain unbroken contact with our democratic tradition of a government of divided powers under law. The proposal I have made, for an Administrative Court of the United States, should aid us in performing that duty and achieving that purpose.

## RURAL HOUSING

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to rural housing, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory analysis of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 685) to provide assistance to farmers in securing farm housing and other farm buildings, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The analysis presented by Mr. SPARKMAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE FARM HOUSING ACT OF 1949

The Farm Housing Act of 1949, which I have today introduced, would provide authority for Federal assistance toward the construction and improvement of farm homes and other farm buildings. It would make available to farm residents a means, equally effective with those available to urban residents, of securing adequate, safe, and sanitary homes. The bill contemplates the extension of financial assistance through existing Federal agencies to the owners of farms without decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings and adequate other farm buildings, who are unable to finance such improvements through credit from other sources upon terms and conditions suitable for such purposes. Such financial assistance in the form of limited grants would also be extended to eliminate hazards to health and safety to the

occupants of the buildings and to the community which cannot otherwise be improved. The bill also contemplates an extensive program of research and technical studies for the purposes of stimulating the construction of farm buildings, approving architectural design and utility of buildings, utilizing new and native materials, effecting economies in materials and construction methods and other phases of farm buildings with a view of reducing the cost and adapting farm buildings to more efficient and economical farm use. Technical services, including furnishing of building plans and specifications and supervision and inspection of construction, is another type of service authorized by the bill.

It is proposed to inaugurate the program by authorizing loans not exceeding $25,000,000 on and after the beginning of the first fiscal year after the enactment of the bill and additional amounts of loans on and after the beginning of the second, third, and fourth year after the enactment of the act of $50,000,000, $75,000,000, and $100,000,000, respectively.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

The bill, in section 2, would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, through the Farmers Home Administration, to extend financial assistance to the owners of farms to enable them to construct, improve, alter, repair, or replace dwellings or other farm buildings so as to provide the applicants, their tenants, sharecroppers, and laborers with decent, safe, and sanitary living conditions and adequate improvements. For the purposes of this act, a farm is defined as one or more parcels of land operated as a single unit which is used for the production of agricultural commodities and customarily produces, or is capable of producing, for sale and home use agricultural commodities of a gross value equal to a value of $400 in 1944. Many rural tracts classified as farms in the census definition would not be eligible for assistance under this definition, but for the most part the units which would not be eligible are more accurately described as rural residences, the occupants of which are engaged primarily in pursuits other than agricultural, and the agricultural production from which is merely incidental.

Financial assistance under the bill would not be extended to the owners of farms now having adequate farm dwellings or other farm buildings or who are able to secure the necessary improvements through their own resources or from other credit sources on terms and conditions suitable for the purposes of the loan.

Section 3 would authorize loans for the period of 33 years at 4 percent interest on farms having income and earning capacity sufficient to repay the full sum loaned. Section 4 would authorize loans on farms having adequate agricultural or other income to support adequate housing and other buildings only in connection with the undertaking of the owner of the farm to enlarge or otherwise develop its agricultural income, so that within a period of 10 years the full obligation of the owner with respect to such loan could be met. During the intervening period, installments due on the loan would be credited as paid in amounts not exceeding the annual installment of interest and 50 percent of the accrued principal installments in any year to the extent only that the borrower's income is, in fact, insufficient to enable the borrower to make such payments on schedule. The credits on the loan would inure only to the benefit of the owner of the farm at the time of the loan, except that, with the consent of the Secretary of Agriculture, such credits might continue to be extended to some other eligible person who acquires the farm after such a loan is made.

Some farming units coming within the definition of the farm in the bill are so situated or are so nonproductive that there is little possibility of enlarging or developing them into self-sustaining units. Dwellings and other buildings on such units often constitute severe hazards to the safety and health of the occupant, his family, and the community. Section 5 would authorize the Secretary to make grants or combinations of loans and grants with respect to such farms to cover the costs of improvements or additions such as structural supports, repairing roofs, providing toilet facilities, convenient and sanitary water supply, screens or other similar repairs or improvements. The amount of financial assistance on such farming unit would be limited to $1,000 on farms having a single dwelling or a total of $2,000 to any one owner. The grant portion of the assistance with respect to such farms would be limited to $500 for any one farming unit or dwelling.

Loans under sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill would be secured by the applicant's equity in the farm and such additional security or collateral as may be necessary to reasonably assure repayment of the indebtedness. When the borrower is able to refinance such loans through cooperative or other private lending sources, he will be required to do so.

TECHNICAL SERVICES AND RESEARCH

Section 6 of the bill would require that all buildings constructed or improved by means of financial assistance under the bill should be substantially constructed and in accordance with such building plans and specifications as the Secretary might require. The construction and repair of such buildings so financed would be supervised and inspected to the extent required by the Secretary. In addition to such services to borrowers under this authority, the Secretary would also be authorized to furnish to other persons, with or without charge, building plans, specifications, and construction supervision and inspection regarding farm dwellings and other farm buildings. Section 6 also would authorize the Secretary to conduct research and technical studies in the field of farm housing and other buildings, including the development, demonstration, and promotion of construction of adequate farm dwellings and other buildings; and other research studies designed to reduce the cost of, and adapt, farm buildings, fixtures, and appurtenances for more efficient farm use.

ADMINISTRATION

The bill would be administered by the Secretary through existing agencies. The Farmers Home Administration, now administering the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is adequately organized to perform the functions of the Secretary with respect to financial assistance. Existing committees appointed under prior authority, composed primarily of local farmers, would be required to approve the application for financial assistance and to recommend the values of farms for security purposes. The research and technical services can be adequately performed under the direction of existing agencies in the Department of Agriculture.

Under section 7 of the bill, veterans and families of deceased servicemen would be given preference as between eligible applicants seeking assistance.

In section 9, the Secretary would be authorized to establish the standards for adequate housing and other farm buildings by farms or localities, taking into consideration the type of housing, meeting the needs of the family using the housing, the type and character of the farming operations, and the size of the farm and its earning capacity. The recipient of a loan or grant would be required not to change the terms of any lease or other agreement with the occupants of the farm by reason of the improvements constructed with financial assistance under the act.

Section 10 provides the necessary power to the Secretary to service loans of this type. The authority of the Secretary in this respect is similar to the authority now vested in him with respect to loans under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

COST OF THE PROGRAM

With respect to loans under sections 3, 4, and 5 of the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to borrow from the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as the Congress might from time to time determine. The initial borrowings which would be available until expended would be limited to $25,000,000. At the beginning of the second year after the enactment of the act, the Secretary could borrow for the purpose of making loans an additional $50,000,000, and during the third and fourth years after the enactment of the act, could borrow $75,000,000 and $100,000,000, respectively. The terms and conditions of such borrowings would be those agreed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury with interest determined in relation to the current average rate of outstanding marketable obligations of the United States at the end of the month preceding the issuance of the obligations by the Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury would be authorized to use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act for the purpose of advancing funds to the Secretary of Agriculture.

With respect to loans under section 4 on potentially adequate farms, the Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized to make commitments for credit contributions aggregating $500,000 per annum for not more than 10 years in connection with loans made on and after the beginning of the first fiscal year after the enactment of this bill. On and after the beginning of the next three fiscal years, the aggregate of these commitments would be limited to $1,000,000, $1,500,000, and $2,000,000 per annum, respectively.

Under section 13, it is contemplated that direct appropriations would be made whenever necessary to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to repay his obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury to the extent of the actual contributions of credits made by the Secretary on the principal due from borrowers under section 4, and the interest on a similar sum due on the notes and obligations of the Secretary of Agriculture to the Secretary of the Treasury. The amount of money needed for grants under section 5 would also be appropriated, but not to exceed $1,000,000 on and after the beginning of the first fiscal year after the enactment of this act and additional sums of $2,500,000, $4,000,000, and $5,000,000, respectively, for the next three fiscal years.

Authorization is also provided for such further sums as may be necessary for the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the act, including administrative expenses in connection with loans and technical services, research and the distribution of the results thereof.

COMPARISON WITH OTHER AUTHORITY

Title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, by the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make and insure loans for terms of not to exceed 40 years at 4 percent interest for the acquisition and improvement of efficient family type farms. Such loans are required to be secured by a first lien and limited funds available under this authority are required to be allocated

between the States on the basis of population and the prevalence of farm tenancy.

The prime purpose of this authority is to provide the opportunity for capable farm tenants, sharecroppers, and laborers to become farm owners. In connection with this purpose, of course, adequate farm dwellings and other buildings are essential. However, the assistance which might be rendered under existing authority is limited by the requirement of a first lien, by the distribution of funds, and by the limitation of the assistance to family-type farms not greater than average value. The proposed legislation would expand the scope of assistance, without these limitations, to the present owners of farms who cannot qualify for assistance under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act but who nevertheless are without adequate housing or farm buildings and without adequate credit. The minimum security requirements of Federal land bank loans eliminate the many farm owners who are in need of adequate farm homes and farm buildings and who are without sufficient credit base to be eligible for a Federal land bank loan. The proposed legislation makes no minimum security requirements other than that reasonable security be taken for the loan. Similarly, the programs authorized by the National Housing Act, the Housing Act of 1948, and the United States Housing Act of 1937, although including some authority for assistance in rural areas are designed primarily to meet the needs of urban residents. The loan terms and conditions, the security requirements and the administrative organizations under these statutes are not designed to meet the need of credit for the farm owner for the construction of his dwelling or other farm buildings.

The provisions of the various general housing bills that have been introduced in this Congress are inadequate to meet the farm needs, primarily because the authority for financial assistance is limited to loans for farm housing and facilities incident to family living. This would preclude the making of loans for the construction or repair of buildings the farmer must have in order to increase his farm income sufficiently to support a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling he might secure by means of assistance under such legislation. The Farm Housing Act of 1949, on the other hand, would authorize financial assistance for both the dwelling and other farm buildings, so that the farm operation could be made more efficient and thus increase the probability of repayment on many of the loans, reduce the number of loans which would qualify only under the provisions of section 4 relating to credits because of insufficient farm income, and should have a significant and beneficial influence upon the agricultural pattern and agricultural production of the Nation.

## HOUSING FOR VETERANS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill relating to housing for veterans, and I ask unanimous consent that a brief analysis of the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 686) to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, in order to assure the availability of low-cost financing on liberal terms to World War II veterans who need homes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory analysis of the bill presented by Mr. SPARKMAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND THE GI BILL IN ORDER TO ASSURE LOW-COST FINANCING ON LIBERAL TERMS TO WORLD WAR II VETERANS WHO NEED HOMES

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF BILL

Section 512: This section provides an adequate secondary market for GI 4-percent home loans. To encourage lenders to make new 4-percent GI loans available to veterans, the bill requires that lenders who sell to the market shall certify that they will reinvest an equivalent amount in new GI loans carrying an interest rate not in excess of 4 percent. The authority to purchase loans would expire June 30, 1952.

Section 513: This section seeks to assure the opportunity to obtain a 4-percent GI home loan for any credit-worthy veteran who is unable to obtain one from a private lender. The Administrator of Veterans Affairs is authorized to make such loans (with a $10,000 limit on individual loans) if he is satisfied that the veteran can afford the loan and is unable to get a GI loan through private channels. The Administrator's authority to make direct loans would run until June 30, 1951.

Section 514: This section directs the Secretary of Treasury to provide the necessary funds (up to $800,000,000 for the secondary market, and up to $500,000,000 for direct loans, with specified fiscal year limits) out of the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended. The Treasury will receive interest at the going rate (to the Treasury) on funds thus made available to the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

Section 515: This section terminates the guaranty of second mortgage loans under section 505a of the GI bill. The present second mortgage type of home purchase plan raises financing costs to the veteran at least 10 percent above the costs of a straight 4-percent first-mortgage GI loan. This is true because of the higher rate of interest (4½ percent) and insurance premium (one-half of 1 percent) charged for the underlying FHA-insured first mortgage, because of duplication of costs, and because of brokerage and other charges permitted on FHA-insured loans which are not allowable on GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

Section 516: This is a separability clause for the loan guaranty provisions of the GI bill.

Section 2: This section amends the National Housing Act and removes from the Federal National Mortgage Association the authority to purchase GI loans, except for previous commitments.

To encourage lender support of low-interest mortgage loans, this section also removes FNMA authority to purchase any mortgage loan which carries an interest rate higher than 4 percent, except for previous commitments.

## AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT RELATING TO LEPROSY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter from the president of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Washington, D. C., together with a petition signed by sundry patients at the Carville (La.) National Leprosarium, several of whom are residents of the State of Florida.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the letter and peition, will be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached to the petition.

The bill (S. 704) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the leprosy situation in the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PEPPER, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "National Leprosy Act."

TITLE I—DISSEMINATION OF PERTINENT FACTS CONCERNING LEPROSY

SEC. 101. (a) It shall be one of the purposes of this act to promote an enlightened public opinion, a new and more accurate understanding on the part of the American public upon the subject of leprosy as one of the major requirements in the national plan to effect control and the elimination of leprosy in the United States, by disseminating to Federal and State health agencies, including Federal and State medical colleges; private medical colleges and nurse-training schools, and other private agencies that are in any way concerned with the diagnosis and/or treatment of communicable disease; the medical profession of the United States, and to the general public, the pertinent facts essential to each group and agency listed above, concerning leprosy, including information upon the latest improved medicine and methods for treating this disease, and including a statement of the procedure to be followed to obtain proper treatment.

(b) The leprosy health problem in the United States being a national responsibility, the Public Health Service, as an agency of the Federal Government, is hereby charged with the duty of preparing and disseminating the information outlined in section 101 (a) of this title.

(c) In carrying out the provisions of this title, it shall be the duty of the Public Health Service to promote the welfare of the people of the United States by aiding and fostering a spirit of tolerance and understanding upon the part of the public, in the interests of persons who have, or who may in the future contract leprosy, as an initial step in the national fight against this disease, and by showing the injustice of the leprosy stigma for the purpose of allaying the unreasonable fear of this disease in the public mind.

(d) The word "leper" shall not be used in any statement, lecture, data, report, or other material prepared by the Public Health Service subsequent to the passage of this act.

SEC. 102. In carrying out the provisions of this title, the Public Health Service shall—

(a) advise and cooperate with other agencies and departments of the Federal Government, with State governments and agencies, and with private agencies functioning in the field of health;

(b) collect and analyze statistics and make studies, investigations, and reports on conditions, problems, and needs in the leprosy field in the United States and in other countries, and disseminate to the people of the United States pertinent information thus obtained.

SEC. 103. The Surgeon General, Public Health Service, is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for books of reference and periodicals, and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the

provisions of this title and as may be provided by the Congress from time to time.

SEC. 104. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for such additional administrative expenses of the Public Health Service as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 103 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

TITLE II—TREATMENT OF LEPROSY PATIENTS

SEC. 201. In order to encourage persons afflicted with leprosy to apply for treatment, the Public Health Service is hereby authorized and directed to provide suitable methods and facilities for treatment purposes generally more accessible to leprosy patients, as outlined in this title, and to establish leprosy-treatment principles, methods, and regulations for administering leprosy treatments more in harmony with the customs of society as applied to the care and treatment of persons afflicted with other diseases.

SEC. 202. In carrying out the provisions of this title the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to—

(a) arrange and provide for administering treatment to certain veteran patients in Veterans' Administration hospitals; certain other patients in State, county, and city hospitals; and in leprosy-treatment centers other than and in addition to the present national leprosarium; certain others as out-patients, and to have treatment administered to certain patients in their homes.

(b) to supply or pay for the medical treatment which, in his opinion, is most suitable for use in each case treated outside of Public Health Service hospitals, and to supply printed instructions covering the use of such treatment: *Provided*, That payment for medicines administered to veteran patients by the Veterans' Administration hospitals will be made by the Veterans' Administration;

(c) base the decision, as to the locality at which treatment is to be administered, upon the type of the disease contracted in each case, the degree of communicability of the disease when the case is examined by the Public Health Service; the proximity of the patient's home or place of residence to the nearest available hospital or treatment center, and the feasibility of treating the patient as an out-patient, or of administering treatment in the patient's home.

(d) establish such regulations governing treatment of leprosy patients at leprosy-treatment centers, at other hospitals, as out-patients treated at such centers and hospitals, or as home patients, as will be conducive to and encourage the voluntary application for treatment upon the part of persons afflicted with leprosy.

(e) utilize the services and facilities of any executive department or agency of the Federal Government, as needed to carry out the provisions of this act, in accordance with an agreement with the head thereof. Payment for such services and for the use of such facilities shall be made as may be agreed upon between the Surgeon General and the head of the department or agency furnishing them.

SEC. 203. In carrying out the provisions of sections 201 and 202 of this title the Surgeon General is authorized and directed to arrange with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the admission and treatment of veterans of the armed forces afflicted with a noncommunicable type of leprosy, for hospitalization or out-patient treatment; and for admission and treatment of veterans with a communicable type of the disease who have made sufficient progress toward its arrestment to justify their transfer to a Veterans' Administration hospital for the remainder of the treatment; and for the admission and treatment of such other veteran patients as may be approved by the Surgeon General for treatment in a Veterans' Administration hospital.

SEC. 204. The Surgeon General will arrange with the director of State health departments, in appropriate cases, or with the responsible head of State, county, and city hospitals for the admission and treatment of persons afflicted with leprosy of a noncommunicable type as hospitalized, or as out-patient cases; and persons with a communicable type of the disease who, in the opinion of the Surgeon General, have made sufficient progress toward its arrestment to justify receiving the remainder of the treatment in or from an approved hospital other than the national leprosarium.

SEC. 205. (a) The Surgeon General is hereby authorized to arrange with any qualified physician in the United States to treat persons having leprosy in the patient's home.

(b) The Surgeon General will determine the qualifications of physicians to administer treatment to leprosy patients prior to authorizing the home treatment provided by this section.

SEC. 206. As a prerequisite to a patient being authorized to receive treatment for leprosy other than as a hospitalized patient in a United States marine hospital, or other treatment center operated by the Public Health Service, the Surgeon General is authorized to require a written agreement that the patient will follow the treatment instructions specified by the Public Health Service, until the disease is arrested and the official discharge from treatment requirements is received by the patient; and that, thereafter, the patient will regularly and promptly present himself for periodical physical check-up over the period designated by the Surgeon General. Failure upon the part of the patient to comply with such agreement will authorize the Surgeon General to transfer the patient to a suitable Public Health Service hospital for treatment.

SEC. 207. The Public Health Service shall receive into any hospital or treatment center operated by that service, and not set aside and reserved for treating mental patients, or designated as a tuberculosis hospital, any person afflicted with leprosy who presents himself for care and treatment, and to send for any person reported by the proper health authority of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to be afflicted with leprosy, and to convey such person to the nearest suitable hospital or treatment center, if necessary, for an examination to determine the type of the disease contracted, and the place where the patient is to receive treatment in accordance with the provisions of this title.

SEC. 208. All cases determined by the Public Health Service to be of a communicable type of leprosy which, in the opinion of the examining officer, cannot be satisfactorily treated except at a marine hospital or other treatment center operated by the Public Health Service, will be transferred by the Surgeon General to the United States marine hospital, not set aside for mental, or tuberculosis patients, nearest the patient's home, or to such hospital in a nonendemic State as may be desired by the patient concerned, or by the parents, or guardian, if the patient is a minor: *Provided*, That patients having a communicable type of the disease who reside in a nonendemic State will be sent to a United States marine hospital in a nonendemic State for treatment.

SEC. 209. Release of patients from treatment requirements, regardless of where the treatment is administered, will be by the authority of the Surgeon General or his designated representative in each case.

SEC. 210. Transportation of patients, except those being treated as out-patients, from their place of residence to hospitals and treatment centers and return to their homes within the United States and its Territories, when discharged, shall be met with funds available for the maintenance of hospitals of the Public Health Service, except in those cases where another Federal agency is authorized or required to pay for such transportation.

SEC. 211. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided by Congress, from time to time.

SEC. 212. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for such additional administration expenses of the Public Health Service in carrying out the provisions of sections 201 to 211, inclusive, of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 213. Except as specifically provided herein, nothing in this title shall be construed as conferring on any Federal officer or employee, or any other person, the right to exercise supervision or control over the leprosy-treatment methods and policies established by the Public Health Service.

SEC. 214. In order to carry out the provisions of this title with respect to the establishment of such additional leprosy-treatment centers as may be found necessary, the Administrator, Federal Security Administration, is authorized to acquire by purchase, condemnation, donation, or otherwise, a site in each of the four endemic States of California, Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, and one site in a nonendemic State having a climate approximately described as cool and dry and not subject to extremely low temperatures in winter, and to erect thereon, furnish and equip such buildings and facilities, or to acquire by purchase or donation such site and installations as may be available and suitable, and to provide such personnel as are needed to establish and operate leprosy-treatment centers, as funds are made available therefor. When established, these treatment centers are to be known as "United States marine hospitals."

SEC. 215. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, a sum not to exceed $1,500,000 for the acquisition of a site and the establishment thereon of a leprosy-treatment center in a nonendemic State having a suitable climate as described in section 214 of this title, to provide facilities for administering leprosy treatment to approximately 200 patients at a time, in such a climate in comparison with the same treatment administered at the present national leprosarium.

(b) The amount authorized in this section to be appropriated shall include the cost of preparation of drawings and specifications, and supervision of construction, and other administrative expenses incident to the work.

TITLE III—THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON LEPROSY

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby created the National Advisory Council on Leprosy, to consist of the Surgeon General ex officio, who shall be Chairman, and 11 additional members to be appointed without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, by the Surgeon General with the approval of the Administrator, Federal Security Administration.

(b) Six of the appointed members shall be selected from leading medical authorities not otherwise in the employ of the Federal Government, who are outstanding in the study, diagnosis, or treatment of leprosy and thoroughly familiar with leprosy conditions and problems in the United States. One of the appointed members shall be selected from a national press organization, and one

from a national veteran organization. One of the appointed members shall be a discharged leprosy patient whose disease has been arrested by treatment administered at the Carville (La.) National Leprosarium. Two of the appointed members shall be representatives of bona fide labor organizations.

(c) The five nonmedical members of the Council are authorized to vote on all matters considered by the Council except purely medical or technical matters pertaining to leprosy research and medical treatment administered to leprosy patients.

(d) Each appointed member shall be appointed for a term of 3 years, except that any person appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the first term for the originally appointed members shall expire, as designated by the Surgeon General at the time of the appointment, four at the end of 1 year, four at the end of 2 years, and three at the end of 3 years after the date of appointment. All appointed members shall be eligible for reappointment at the discretion of the Surgeon General.

SEC. 302. Each appointed member of the Council while attending conferences or meetings of such Council, or while otherwise serving at the request of the Surgeon General pursuant to this title, shall be entitled to receive compensation at the rate fixed by the Surgeon General, the rate of compensation to be the same for all members of the Council, but not to exceed $75 per diem, and shall also be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling expenses, including subsistence expenses, while so serving away from his place of residence.

SEC. 303. The Council shall meet as frequently as the Surgeon General deems necessary, but not less than once every 6 months. Upon the request by three or more members, it shall be the duty of the Surgeon General to call a meeting of the Council.

SEC. 304. It shall be the duty of the members of the Council to advise and consult with the Surgeon General upon any and all matters relating to the titles of this act, and upon other matters pertaining to leprosy conditions and problems in the United States, at the request of the Surgeon General, and to initiate recommendations as a council, or as individual members thereof, which they jointly or individually deem advisable and necessary to bring to the attention of the Surgeon General in order to accomplish the purposes of this act, and otherwise to improve the leprosy situation in the United States. The recommendations and reports of the National Advisory Council on Leprosy shall be printed as public documents.

SEC. 305. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided for by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 306. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 305 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purpose.

TITLE IV—REHABILITATION AND REEMPLOYMENT OF LEPROSY PATIENTS

SEC. 401. In order to assist leprosy patients to prepare themselves for remunerative employment following the arrestment of the disease, the Surgeon General shall establish a rehabilitation and reemployment program for such patients who are treated at the national leprosarium or other leprosy-treatment center. This program shall—

(a) be designed to restore by education and training the skills and abilities in the patient's previous occupation, or provide in another more suitable occupation the requisite skills and abilities for self-support, and a reasonable degree of economic security for himself and family;

(b) be available for such patients as, in the opinion of the Surgeon General, or his representative, are physically able to study or take training, and who are expected to be employable, or capable of self-employment, at the termination of their treatment period;

(c) be available for any employable discharged leprosy patient treated by the Public Health Service or by the authority of that Service;

(d) include plans to obtain the cooperation of Federal, State, and other employment agencies, corporations, and businesses in placement of employable discharged leprosy patients.

SEC. 402. Educational and/or vocational training as may be needed and desired by the patient will be made available for hospitalized patients at any time during their treatment period when, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, such activities will not retard their recovery or interfere materially with their treatment. Such instruction and/or training will be continued during their stay at the hospital or treatment center as needed to complete the training objective.

SEC. 403. Employable discharged patients shall be given preference, without regard to the provisions of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, in filling employee vacancies in the Public Health Service hospitals and treatment centers for which they are or can be qualified by on-the-job training.

SEC. 404. On-the-job training at the leprosarium and treatment centers will be used as fully as practicable for vocational-training purposes under such supervision and methodical step-by-step guidance as will fit the patient, when discharged, to enter and satisfactorily fill the job for which he or she is being trained.

SEC. 405. Educational and vocational training will not be limited to that necessary to engage in the occupations available at the Public Health Service hospitals and treatment centers, but will be based as fully as practicable upon the needs and desires of the individual patient.

SEC. 406. The rehabilitation and reemployment program will be under the general supervision and control of the medical officer in charge of the hospital or treatment center. The active supervision of educational and training activities will be conducted by a licensed occupational therapist and such assistants as, in the opinion of the medical officer in charge, are necessary. The employment of this supervisory personnel, and the purchase of the minimum requirements in training equipment and supplies for the actual and exclusive use of this program, are hereby authorized.

SEC. 407. Work satisfactorily performed, including scholastic and training programs satisfactorily carried out by patients, or by discharged patients, shall be compensated at such hourly, daily, or monthly rates as, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, are most suitable for the kind of work or scholastic effort concerned, but which shall not exceed $50 per month, while the patient or discharged patient is in training.

SEC. 408. Upon the completion of the training period, or periods, patients who have qualified for regular employment and who, in the opinion of the Surgeon General or his representative, are physically able to carry on the work in the leprosarium or treatment center for which they have been trained, and in which occupation a vacancy exists to which the patient can be and is appointed, the compensation for such patient will be 75 percent of the rate paid by the Public Health Service to nonpatient employees engaged in such work.

SEC. 409. Employable discharged patients who return to the leprosarium or treatment center for reasons other than for additional treatment, when employed at these institutions, shall be compensated at the same rates, and be employed under the same conditions as are applicable to other nonpatient employees.

SEC. 410. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding, training equipment, and supplies) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, and as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 411. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for the administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 410 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purpose.

SEC. 412. The Surgeon General shall establish the necessary regulations for carrying out the provisions of this title.

TITLE V—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR LEPROSY PATIENTS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

SEC. 501. There shall be included in the annual appropriations for the administration of the National Leprosarium and leprosy-treatment centers, provision for a fund to be known as the patient's welfare fund, from which patients taking treatment in these institutions who do not have an income equal in amount to $10 per month, who are not physically able to engage in such compensated tasks as are available, or for whom no such task is available for which they are qualified, or who are physically unable to take educational or vocational training, shall receive the sum of $10 per month to defray incidental expense common to the needs of all patients undergoing treatment over an extended period away from home.

SEC. 502. In order to carry out the provisions of section 501 of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, a sum not to exceed $20,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and such sums thereafter as Congress may provide.

SEC. 503. The dependent or dependents of leprosy patients who are hospitalized for leprosy treatment shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for the period during which the patient continues to take such treatment, plus 1 month following the patient's discharge from treatment requirements.

SEC. 504 (a) The dependents of hospitalized leprosy patients authorized to receive the family allowance shall include the wife; child or children under 18 years of age and unmarried, including stepchildren and adopted children; the patient's father, mother, father-in-law, and mother-in-law, who have received their chief support from the patient for a period of 6 months before the patient entered the hospital for treatment; the patient's brother and sister under 18 years of age and unmarried, or who are physically or mentally unable to support themselves and unmarried, who have received their chief support from the patient for a period of 6 months prior to the date the patient entered the hospital for leprosy treatment.

(b) Monthly family allowance authorized in this title shall apply to those cases where the patient is a parent or guardian who is the breadwinner or provider for the family. In cases where the patient is a wife who is not the family provider but who is living with her husband and children immediately prior to her entry into the hospital for

leprosy treatment under the supervision of the Public Health Service, the monthly family allowance will be 75 percent of the amount authorized in section 505 of this title.

(c) Dependents of such leprosy patients as are authorized by the Surgeon General to take treatment outside of Public Health Service hospitals shall be entitled to receive such portion of the family monthly allowance as are approved by the Surgeon General, based upon the actual need in each case for such family assistance, and the inability of the patient to continue to provide for his dependents without interfering with the leprosy treatment requirements, or his chances of recovery.

(d) Application for monthly family allowance shall be initiated by the patient. The medical officer or physician responsible for the patient's treatment will certify as to the correctness of the information furnished by the patient and forward the application to the Surgeon General, who, upon his approval of same, will forward the application to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Federal Security Agency, for payment.

SEC. 505. The monthly family allowance authorized for dependents of leprosy patients taking treatment under the supervision of, or by the authority of, the Public Health Service, are as follows:

(a) To a wife without children, $60; a wife and one child, $80; and an additional $20 for each additional child.

(b) To a child, but no wife, $42; with an additional $20 for each additional child.

(c) To one parent but no brother or sister, $50.

(d) To two parents but no brother or sister, $68.

(e) To one parent and one brother or sister, $68, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

(f) To two parents and one brother or sister, $79, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

(g) To a brother or sister but no parent, $42, with an additional $11 for each additional brother or sister.

SEC. 506. In the case of a wife living separate and apart from the patient under any temporary or permanent court order, or decree, in a divorce allowance, or legal-separation proceedings, or written agreement, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife will not exceed the amount provided in such order, or decree in a divorce allowance, or legal-separation proceedings or written agreement to be paid to such wife, and if such order, decree, separation, proceeding, or agreement provides no amount to be paid such wife, no family allowance will be paid to her.

SEC. 507. In the case of a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such former wife divorced will not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree as the amount to be paid to such former wife divorced, and will not in any event, exceed the amount of $60 per month authorized in subparagraph (a) section 505, of this title.

SEC. 508. Changes in the status of a dependent which will terminate entitlement to a monthly family allowance include—

(a) Death of the dependent;

(b) Attainment of the age of 18 years by a brother, sister, or child, except when such dependent is physically or mentally incapable of self-support;

(c) The marriage of a brother, sister, or child;

(d) Marriage of a former wife divorced;

(e) Cessation of required degree of dependency of dependent fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters;

(f) Divorce of wife without alimony, or a termination of alimony;

(g) Divorce of a husband from the patient will terminate entitlement of his dependents to any part of the family allowance paid under the provision for 75 percent of the total amount authorized, as provided in subparagraph (b) of section 504 of this title.

SEC. 509. Changes in the status of the patient which will terminate entitlement to monthly family allowance include:

(a) Death of patient;

(b) Discharge of patient from treatment requirements: *Provided*, That one additional monthly allowance shall be paid in case of the death or discharge of the patient;

(c) Unauthorized absence of the patient from the place of treatment designated by the Surgeon General, or unauthorized discontinuance by the patient of the treatment provided by, or by the authority of the Surgeon General, will authorize that authority to terminate entitlement to family allowance;

(d) The amounts of family allowance to be paid to dependents of native leprosy patients of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone, who reside in those areas, shall be determined by the Surgeon General, United States Public Health Service, within the limits specified in section 205, title II of this act: *Provided*, That said payments shall not be less than 25 percent of the amounts so specified.

SEC. 510. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title; and as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 511. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, for administration expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of this title, including such expenses as are described in section 510 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 512. The Surgeon General will establish the necessary regulations for carrying out the provisions of this title.

TITLE VI—COMPENSATION FOR DISABILITY INCIDENT TO LEPROSY

Sec. 601 (a) Prior to the discharge of leprosy patients from treatment requirements, the medical board authorizing or recommending their discharge from Public Health Service hospitals, shall determine the degree of physical disability, if any, sustained by the patient due to leprosy and/or treatment therefor. Such disabilities sustained by patients treated in other hospitals, or as out-patients, or as home patients, will be determined by the physicians responsible for their treatment, who will forward their recommendations thereon to the Surgeon General.

(b) The Surgeon General or his designated representative will review the findings and recommendations in each case, and if they are approved, they will be certified and forwarded to the Bureau of Public Assistance, Federal Security Agency, for payment of the following compensation for physical disability incident to leprosy.

(c) To discharged patients who are classified as totally and permanently disabled, there shall be paid a sum, starting immediately following their discharge, in the amount of $125 per month.

(d) To discharged patients who have suffered total blindness incident to leprosy the compensation paid shall be $150 per month.

(e) Patients who are found to be physically disabled incident to leprosy in a degree less than total shall receive a portion of the compensation authorized in this title, the amount of which shall be graduated in accordance with the percentage of their physical disability. Disabilities determined to be less than 10 percent will not be certified for compensation payments.

Sec. 602. Compensation received under the provisions of this title shall not bar the discharged patients from further improving their economic situation.

Sec. 603. Unauthorized departure of the patient from hospitals and treatment centers, or unauthorized discontinuance by the patient of treatment provided or authorized by the Public Health Service under the provisions of this act, will authorize the Surgeon General to cancel the right of such patient to receive the benefits provided by this title.

SEC. 604. The Surgeon General is authorized to make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and for printing and binding) as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and as may be provided by the Congress from time to time.

SEC. 605. There is authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated for administration expenses, including such expenses as are described in section 604 of this title, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for each year thereafter, the sum necessary for such purposes.

TITLE VII—EXPANSION OF LEPROSY RESEARCH

SEC. 701. (a) It shall be one of the purposes of this act to provide for an immediate expansion of research to discover—

(1) the method or methods by which leprosy is contracted and transmitted;

(2) a method or means for detecting the leprosy bacillus during the incubation period;

(3) more effective and faster-acting remedies and techniques for the arrestment of all types of leprosy; and

(4) the possibilities of developing preventive medicines and techniques for combating this disease.

(b) The Public Health Service is hereby charged with the duty of conducting and supervising the national research effort as outlined in section 701 of this title.

SEC. 702. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this title, the Surgeon General will conduct, assist, and foster research, experiments, demonstrations, and studies relating to the cause, method of transmitting, treatment, prevention, control, and elimination of leprosy's ability to survive and spread in the United States.

(b) The Surgeon General will coordinate research activities in the leprosy field conducted by the Public Health Service and similar research conducted by private research agencies, organizations, and institutions and make grants-in-aid to public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions for conducting leprosy research as authorized in this title.

SEC. 703. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise obligated, to carry out research in the field of leprosy the following sums for the years and purposes indicated:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, for leprosy research activities of the Public Health Service, or for grants-in-aid for leprosy research at the discretion of the Surgeon General, a sum not to exceed $100,000; and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, for leprosy research activities of the Public Health Service, not to exceed $100,000, and for grants-in-aid for leprosy research not to exceed $100,000; and thereafter such sums as may be provided by Congress from time to time.

SEC. 704. Sums authorized for leprosy research for a fiscal year and remaining unencumbered at the end of such year shall remain available to the Public Health Service

for such purpose for the next fiscal year (and for such year only), in addition to the sums authorized for such next fiscal year.

TITLE VIII—MISCELLANEOUS

If any provisions of this act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance, is held invalid, the remainder of the act and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 802. It shall be the duty of the Surgeon General to insure that all laws passed by Congress and regulations established by the Public Health Service pertaining to the care, treatment, rehabilitation, and reemployment of leprosy patients are brought to the attention of patients undergoing treatment.

TITLE IX—AMENDMENTS

SEC. 901. Title III of the Public Health Service Act (Public Law 410, 78th Cong.) is amended by eliminating sections 331 and 332, part D, of that act, and by substituting therefor the provisions of title II, treatment of leprosy patients, of this, the National Leprosy Act.

SEC. 902. The provisions of this act supersede and invalidate the provisions of other national acts and instructions which are contrary to this act as applicable to the national plan for the control and elimination of leprosy in the United States.

SEC. 903. This act shall become effective 90 days after enactment.

The letter and petition, without the signatures attached, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED, INC.,
*Washington, D. C., January 24, 1949.*

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CLAUDE: Herewith, we tender you a petition, signed by numerous patients at the Carville (La.) National Leprosarium, several of whom are residents of your State, Florida. This petition urges that you assume sponsorship of a bill to establish the National Leprosy Act, the original draft of which has already been tendered to you.

This bill, written by Col. George H. Rarey (U. S. Army, retired), who spent many years in the Orient and came into personal contact with many of the victims of Hansen's disease (leprosy), presents the most exhaustive and lengthy research into this field yet performed. Colonel Rarey has contacted eminent epidemiologists, specialists in treatment of this disease, the world over, and his findings represent an impartial picture of the great need of those afflicted by Hansen's disease, as well as their families, who are innocent victims of public ignorance, indifference, fear, and superstition.

The Patients' Federation, at Carville, as well as our own lodge there, which is headed by Mrs. Gertrude C. Hornbostel, whose signature is appended to the petition in question, and whose gripping and dramatic story, as the wife of heroic Maj. Hans Hornbostel (U. S. Army, retired), captured and held in a Jap prison camp at the outset of World War II, where she contracted Hansen's disease, is well known to the American public, and Stanley Stein, that great-hearted editor of The Star, the monthly publication put out by the patients, as they say, "to radiate the light of truth on Hansen's disease," and who, although himself a patient, and blinded more than 17 years by the disease, yet carries on a vigorous campaign for public enlightenment and justice for these afflicted—all these, and many more, fervently pray that you will use your best efforts to steer this bill through the Congress and thus afford needed relief to American citizens who are, today, incarcerated through no fault of their own, and whose requirements have not been adequately met by our great Government.

We pledge our cooperation, in every way possible, to speed this enactment.

Sincerely,

PAUL A. STRACHAN,
*President.*

---

UNITED STATES MARINE HOSPITAL,
POINT CLAIRE BRANCH POST OFFICE,
*Carville, La., January 4, 1949.*

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: The undersigned citizens of Florida and others request your kind consideration and support of H. R. 6653, the National Leprosy Act, which was introduced in the Eightieth Congress and will be reintroduced in the Eighty-first, probably under a different number.

We, who are patients at this hospital, and under treatment, realize since our arrival here, and since becoming better acquainted with the different aspects of the disease, that there are many more patients in Florida and elsewhere in endemic States who are not under treatment than those who actually are. For this we blame the present harsh laws, which demand segregation of all cases and types, regardless of whether they belong to a type which is transmissible or not.

From a humanitarian and from a public-health point of view, such laws are wrong and work in reverse, particularly now that drugs have been found which will arrest the disease the same as tuberculosis can be arrested, without, however, being as transmissible as tuberculosis.

Since H. R. 6653 contains the modern approach to the management and treatment of the disease and since Florida is one of the endemic States, we ask you, as Senator from Florida, to give this bill your kind consideration and support.

Sincerely,

(Signatures omitted.)

## PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill, and I also desire to make a statement in reference to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The bill (S. 709) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BALDWIN (for himself, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MORSE, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LODGE, Mr. THYE, Mr. IVES, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. HENDRICKSON, and Mr. SCHOEPPEL), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, this bill is a housing bill, and it seems appropriate, with the introduction of the bill, to give some word of explanation concerning its origin. At the last session of the Eightieth Congress, the Senate passed the so-called Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill. At the opening of the Eighty-first Congress, however, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] introduced a bill somewhat similar to the TEW bill, without the Republican sponsorship which previous housing bills had had.

Knowing that housing was one of the vital issues facing the American people, it seemed to many of us on this side of the aisle that we, as Republicans, should propose housing legislation. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], who last year was a member of the Joint Committee on Housing, was particularly active in the preparation of this bill. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and myself began work on the measure several weeks ago. Because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] had worked on housing legislation—and I may say by way of interpolation that I think the senior Senator from Ohio is probably the best-informed man on the Senate floor on matters of housing—we asked the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from New Hampshire to join with us. In fact, this measure contains many provisions of bills which the Senator from Ohio had previously cosponsored. It would have been most appropriate if the Senator from Vermont could have introduced this bill today, but, as he is necessarily absent, the task devolved upon me. So, Mr. President, I am introducing this bill on behalf of the Senator from Vermont, the Senator from New York, the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from New Hampshire, and a number of other Senators, including the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The housing shortage is not news. The Democratic administration discovered it more than a decade ago. Until recently we had as many as 34 housing agencies dealing with the shortage. We have spent billions of dollars in alleged attempts to correct it. The shortage still exists. It seems to us that it is about time that we evolve a realistic, comprehensive approach.

Republicans recognize as well as anyone else that there is a housing shortage in the country and that some workable, feasible, understandable program is necessary to meet it. We believe that this bill does so most adequately. We have not attempted in this bill to outbid or outdo anybody. We have merely attempted to draft housing legislation designed to meet the American need.

In our deliberations over the provisions of the bill, we considered the matter of loans to veterans for housing and other private financing aids. This bill, Mr. President, is already 33 pages long, and it seemed to us the better part of wisdom not to incorporate in it provisions with reference to loans in aid of veterans and other private financing agencies, but to do that in a separate bill.

In this bill, Mr. President, we have opened the door for the widest kind of

cooperation on the state and local level. We have included those provisions which are designed to encourage private financing and private construction, believing as we do that the obligation of meeting the need for housing must continue to rest largely upon local enterprise and individual and private action. We recognize, however, that housing is required in some areas at a cost beyond the reach of individual initiative and financing. We believe that the provisions of this bill adequately meet this situation.

It provides for the construction of 600,000 units over a period of 6 years with a maximum annual contribution of $240,000,000. There is a clause, however, which permits considerable flexibility—authorizing the President, through the Housing Authority, to increase or decrease this number in any one year, cumulatively, upon a finding that the condition of the building industry makes an increase possible or a decrease necessary.

The slum clearance title of the bill permits loans and grants to cities for the purpose of clearing blighted areas.

The bill also contains provision for farm housing. We have approached this problem, however, on a realistic basis, making provision for loans and grants to adequate farms and potentially adequate farms. We believe it economically unsound to give either loans or grants to farms that are not adequate or potentially self-sustaining. For farms with an adequate income but unable to secure private financing, the Secretary of Agriculture could make direct loans. If marginal farms can be improved within a reasonable period of time to be self-supporting, the plan would provide a combination of loans and grants for a period of 10 years.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and myself, I introduce a bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

In his state of the Union message, the President said:

> Most of the houses we need will have to be built by private enterprise, without public subsidy. By producing too few rental units and too large a proportion of high-priced houses, the building industry is rapidly pricing itself out of the market. * * * The Government is now engaged in a campaign to induce all segments of the building industry to concentrate on the production of lower-priced housing.

In urging the production of homes large enough for family life at prices wage earners can afford, the President called for additional legislation to encourage such production. Mr. President, I believe this bill will accomplish that purpose.

This bill will make the more liberal FHA insurance aids available only for the construction of lower-cost homes. To help in getting the production of such homes which are large enough for family life, it offers additional incentives for the production of lower-cost three- and four-bedroom homes.

It improves and extends the FHA insurance available for long-term loans to housing cooperatives, particularly with respect to coperatives whose membership consists primarily of veterans of World War II. It provides for a number of aids to veterans' housing cooperatives in which the national veterans' organizations have expressed a very great interest, particularly in respect to cooperatives building individual homes for purchase by their veteran members, and in specifically authorizing the FHA to furnish technical advice and assistance to housing cooperatives in their organization and in the planning, construction, and operation of their projects.

To further assist in the production of more rental-type housing and lower-cost sales housing which average wage earners can afford, the bill would exempt from the 50-percent limitation on the amount of loans which can be purchased from any one mortgagee by the Federal National Mortgage Association, mortgages on cooperative housing projects, rental housing projects, and lower-cost homes built for sale. It would also extend the present authority of the FHA to insure loans for large-scale rental housing projects to March 31, 1950.

It encourages large-scale construction of lower-cost homes by improving the provisions for the insurance by the FHA of construction advances on groups of 25 or more single-family homes being constructed on a single site. It does this by adjusting both the maximum mortgage amount and the percentage of value to levels which will permit maximum accomplishments under this form of insurance consistent with the production of adequate housing at more reasonable prices.

Also, to assure that adequate financing will be available for projects undertaken by housing cooperatives, particularly veterans' cooperatives, it provides for direct, long-term Government loans through the Federal National Mortgage Association, where necessary private financing cannot be obtained even with FHA insurance available.

Mr. President, I believe that this bill will do much to help get a more adequate production of good housing at lower prices and lower rentals.

So that the Senators may have more complete information as to the details of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks a section-by-section summary of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the summary of the bill, presented by the Senator from South Carolina, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 712) to amend the National Housing Act and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAYBANK (for himself, Mr. WAGNER Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MYERS, Mr. HILL, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. LONG), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The summary of the bill presented by Mr. MAYBANK was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

This proposed bill consists of various amendments to the National Housing Act which affect mortgage insurance programs administered by the Federal Housing Administration and the secondary market program of the Federal National Mortgage Association.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

*Section 1*

The present authorization under title I of the National Housing Act to insure lending institutions against losses they may sustain on home modernization and repair loans and small loans (not exceeding $4,500) to finance the construction of modest homes expires on July 1, 1949. This section would extend that authorization on a permanent basis and would increase the present amount of insurance authorization under title I.

*Section 2*

This section would increase the total insurance authorization under title II of the National Housing Act by $1,000,000,000. The use of this additional authorization would require the approval of the President.

*Section 3*

Subsection (a) of this section would amend section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act (relating to the maximum obligations of mortgages insurable under section 203 of the act) to simplify the provisions therein and to provide for increased maximum amounts for low-cost dwellings with three or four bedrooms. Paragraph (D) would be amended to provide for a maximum mortgage amount not to exceed $6,650 and not to exceed 95 percent of the appraised value of a single-family dwelling approved for mortgage insurance prior to construction. Such dollar amount limitation could be increased by not exceeding $950, in the case of a three-bedroom house, or $1,900 in the case of a four-bedroom house, where prescribed findings are made by the Federal Housing Commissioner. As paragraph (B) would become obsolete, provision is made for its repeal. (Paragraph (B) now provides for a maximum mortgage amount not to exceed $6,300 and not to exceed 90 percent of appraised value, and paragraph (D) now provides for a maximum mortgage amount not to exceed $6,000 and not to exceed 90 percent of appraised value, or 95 percent where the Commissioner determines it would not contribute to substantial increases in costs.)

This subsection (a) would also amend paragraph (C) of section 203 (b) (2) of the National Housing Act to provide a maximum mortgage amount not to exceed $9,450 (as contrasted with the present $9,500) and not to exceed the sum of 95 percent of $7,000 of the appraised value plus 70 percent of such value in excess of $7,000 and not in excess of $11,000 (as contrasted with the present 90 percent and 80 percent of such values) of a single-family dwelling approved for mortgage insurance prior to construction. This would make increases in maximum mortgage amounts under paragraph (C) conform more closely to graduated levels of appraised values.

Subsection (b) of this section would provide that, notwithstanding the repeal of the above paragraph (B), applications already filed for insurance thereunder could be approved, and insured mortgages could be refinanced thereunder.

*Section 4, 5, 6, and 7*

These are technical amendments made necessary by section 10 which is summarized below.

*Section 8*

This section would amend section 211 of the National Housing Act to authorize the Federal Housing Commission, with respect to dwellings of not more than four families, to issue regulations permitting provisions in insured mortgages for the deferrment of monthly payments in hardship cases beyond the control of the mortgagor. Such provisions could not extend the maturity of any mortgage for more than 3 years.

*Section 9*

This section would continue the present situation with respect to the applicability of the prevailing wage provisions of section 212 of the National Housing Act to cooperative housing projects and would bring under the prevailing wage provisions of section 212 the large-scale rental projects insured under the yield insurance title of the act.

*Section 10*

This section would add to the National Housing Act a new section 213 on cooperative housing mortgage insurance which would take the place of the provisions on this subject now contained in section 207 of the act. This new section would provide for insurance of 90 percent, 40-year, 4 percent interest loans on nonprofit cooperative ownership housing projects (as presently provided for under section 207) and of 100-percent, 40-year, 4 percent interest loans (as contrasted with the present 95-percent, 40-year, 4 percent interest loans) where at least 80 percent of the members of the cooperative are veterans of World War II. The maximum amount of the mortgage in the case of the 90-percent loan would remain at $8,100 per family dwelling or $1,800 per room, but in the case of the 100-percent loan provided for by this section, the maximum amount of the mortgage would be $9,000 per family dwelling or $2,000 per room. In the case of these ownership cooperatives the insurance would be based on current replacement costs.

This section would provide that the maximum principal obligation of an insured mortgage of a nonprofit cooperative corporation, organized for the purpose of constructing homes for transfer to its members, may equal the total of the principal obligations of mortgages for which such members could obtain insurance on the individual houses under section 203. This would be in lieu of the provisions now in section 207 limiting the principal obligation of an insured mortgage of such corporation to 90 percent of the value of the property and to $8,100 per family dwelling or $1,800 per room.

This section would also specifically authorize the FHA to furnish technical advice and assistance to housing cooperatives in the organization thereof and in the planning, construction, and operation of their projects.

*Section 11*

Section 301 of the National Housing Act, which authorizes the FNMA to purchase certain housing mortgages, now provides in effect that the aggregate amount of all such mortgages purchased by FNMA from one mortgagee may not exceed 50 percent of the amount of all mortgages made by such mortgagee which are otherwise eligible for purchase by FNMA. Section 11 of this bill would amend section 301 of the act to provide that in computing, for this purpose, the aggregate amount of mortgages purchased by FNMA from the mortgagee, there shall be excluded the amount of any such mortgages which are (1) insured under paragraph (D) of section 203 (b) (2) of the act (explained above), or (2) insured under section 207, section 213, or section 608 (including section 608 pursuant to section 610) of the act, or (3) guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, if the amount of the mortgage does not exceed $7,000 per dwelling.

This section would also authorize the FNMA to make real estate loans which are accepted for insurance or insured under section 213 of the National Housing Act.

*Section 12*

This section would amend section 302 of the National Housing Act to increase (for the purposes of the above amendments to section 301) the aggregate amount of outstanding FNMA obligations.

*Section 13*

This section would amend section 305 of the National Housing Act to authorize FNMA to sell on terms or otherwise dispose of property acquired by it through foreclosure or other means. It may now dispose of such property only through cash sales.

*Section 14*

This section would amend section 4 (c) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act to increase the total amount of obligations which the RFC may purchase thereunder, so that it will have appropriate authority to purchase the additional FNMA obligations which would be authorized by the amendment to section 302 of the National Housing Act which is summarized above.

*Section 15*

This section would extend for 1 year (until March 31, 1950) the present authority of the FHA to insure mortgages on rental housing projects under section 608 of the National Housing Act.

*Section 16*

This section would amend section 610 of the National Housing Act (dealing with the insurance of mortgages on federally owned housing which is being sold) to raise the maximum permissible interest rate from 4 percent to 5 percent in the case of insured mortgages on 1- to 4-family dwellings.

*Section 17*

This section would amend section 611 of the National Housing Act (dealing with the insurance of mortgages, including construction advances, on groups of 25 or more single-family houses on a single site). It would permit the principal obligation of a mortgage insured under that section to be in an amount not exceeding 85 percent of the value of the completed project and not exceeding a sum computed on the individual dwellings as follows: $5,950, or 85 percent of the valuation, whichever is the lower amount, with respect to each dwelling, except that, in the case of a three- or four-bedroom unit, such dollar amount limitation could be increased in the same manner as the dollar amount limitation on a mortgage on such a unit insured under section 203 (b) (2) (D) explained in the above summary of section 3. Under the present provisions of section 611, the mortgage may not exceed 80 percent of the value of the completed project nor a sum computed on the basis of $6,000 per dwelling unit or 80 percent of the value of each dwelling unit, whichever is less.

*Section 18*

This section is a purely technical amendment. It reflects the change in title from Federal Housing Administrator to Federal Housing Commissioner, and the fact that the Commissioner is no longer appointed for a specified term of years (which changes were made by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1947), and also reflects the fact that the basic rate of compensation of the Commissioner is now fixed by other law.

## REPEAL OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to repeal all except provisions of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948. I expect to address myself to that subject later.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 39) to repeal all except certain provisions of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. TAYLOR, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## COMMISSION TO STUDY INTERGOVERNMENTAL FISCAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to establish a commission to study intergovernmental fiscal relationships, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me of the bill together with an editorial may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement and editorial presented by the Senator from Maryland will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) to establish a commission to study intergovernmental fiscal relationships, introduced by Mr. O'CONOR, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The statement and editorial presented by Mr. O'CONOR were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONOR

Taxation is a matter uppermost in the minds of many of our people today. They are concerned—vitally concerned—with the octopuslike growth of the taxing systems of the Federal Government, the several States, and of the counties and municipalities. It has been well said that "the power to tax is the power to destroy." Some there are who fear that the current unplanned and undisciplined rush by government on all levels to discover and adopt new ways to attract tax dollars to their coffers may eventually destroy our form of government, unless it is checked.

On many sides today proposed budgets are at all-time highs. States and local governments throughout the land, hard-pressed for revenues to meet the mounting costs of governmental services, are reaching more and more into new tax fields. And the harassed taxpayer is becoming more and more bewildered by the increased assaults from every side on his ever-shrinking income residue.

The entire tax and fiscal situation is in urgent need of revamping. There is an evident lack of consistent planning, and a complete absence of coordination among the various levels of government. The result is widespread overlapping of tax sources, and resultant costly duplication of tax-collection methods and procedures.

All this is unbusinesslike in the extreme. More, it is a tragically serious matter to the millions of workers and businessmen who must pay the piper. With tax collectors from two, three, or sometimes more taxing agencies pulling and hauling at the same taxpayer, collection costs are higher than they ever should be, governmental employee totals are continually rising, and the percentage of the national income going into the Nation's tax coffers keeps ever growing.

It is no far-fetched statement to warn that such hit-and-miss taxation is the Achilles' heel that could bring about the downfall of our American form of government. Certainly it places an undue and exceedingly bitter burden upon the shoulders of every

single person in the Nation. Whether he be a resident of city or the most remote rural area, whether he pays his inordinate share of taxation directly or through the countless indirect forms of taxation which have been devised to hide the extent to which Government is reaching into the tills and the pockets of each and every one of us, the result is the same.

During the Eightieth Congress I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 90, to establish a commission to study intergovernmental fiscal relationships. It provided for a national group that would include representatives of the Federal Government, the council of State governments, the conference of mayors, and the American Municipal Association. Preliminary studies have been made of the matter in conjunction with the National Governors Conference, but definite action has not yet resulted.

It is becoming more and more urgent that something be done to correct the abuses of our multiple taxation form of government financing. An editorial from the New York Times of Sunday, January 23, which I ask to be printed in the RECORD as a supplement to my remarks, faces up to the problem squarely. "We shall not solve this problem" the editorial declares, "until it is approached on a national scale, through an official body on which the Federal Government, the States, and the cities are represented." "We urge," the editorial concludes, "that Congress embark on this long-range study by setting up a Commission for tax reform."

I submit herewith, for appropriate reference, a resolution which, in line with Senate Joint Resolution 90, would authorize a national study of intergovernmental fiscal relationships, looking toward the much-desired goal of lower over-all governmental costs.

---

[From the New York Times of Jan. 23, 1949]

FOR TAX REFORM

This is the time of year when government on all levels, Federal, State, and municipal, begins looking around for new ways to raise more money in taxes, and we hear faintly, here and there, renewed appeals for reform of the tax structure. Duplication of taxation, as between Federal Government and the States, is, of course, an old, old story. Lately, as cities found their financial lot increasingly difficult, duplication has given way to triplication and the end is not in sight. Within a few months last year the number of cities taxing incomes rose from 3 to 61, and this number has been steadily on the increase since.

The annual conference of governors has long recognized the problem of overlapping taxes. In July 1947, at Salt Lake City, there was an illuminating discussion of it, and general recognition of the grave difficulty of accomplishing reform. Governors Dewey and Driscoll both warned then against expecting an overnight miracle. Mr. Dewey remarked that one difficulty was that all taxing authorities, when confronted with the need of additional revenues, had sought out the goose that squawked the least as its feathers were being pulled.

This process of seeking out new geese to be plucked is now in full swing. Among the several States already mentioned in the news columns as searching for new revenues are California and New York. California's budget will pass the billion-dollar mark for the first time, and Governor Warren is suggesting a higher State sales tax, corporate and personal income taxes, and bank and corporation franchise taxes, as well as a 2-cent cigarette tax, an increased liquor tax, and a higher parimutuel race tax. California is feeling the financial burden of its greatly increased population, and its budget will be higher than any other State's. New York, moving toward a budget that will be nearly a billion dollars, is also going to need more taxes. Two New York legislators have just moved for a State commission study of the overlapping of Federal, State, and local taxes.

But the reservation to the several Government levels of certain fields of taxation, important as it is, is only one phase of the problem. Simplification in methods of collection, reduction of the infinite number of taxes, and relief from the complex, burdensome accounting labor saddled on business, industry, and the individual are equally important. The financial cost and the expenditure of human energy involved in the collection of a dozen different municipal taxes, a dozen State taxes, and on top of that the bewildering variety of Federal taxes are appalling, and they exert their harassing effect on the pay roll of both Government and the business community.

We shall not solve this problem until it is approached on a national scale, through an official body on which the Federal Government, the States, and the cities are represented. All will have to give and take, and if the task is pursued with wisdom a rewarding economy, an increase in productivity, and social gains can be the result. We urge that Congress embark on this long-range study at this session by setting up a commission for tax reform.

## ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, created by title IV of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, is authorized after December 31, 1948, and through February 28, 1949, to incur expenses not to exceed $10,000, which shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

## INVESTIGATION OF THE LIFE-INSURANCE INDUSTRY

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation of the life-insurance industry of the United States.

Representative CELLER, chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, is today introducing an identical concurrent resolution.

Congressman CELLER and I have prepared a joint statement on this proposal, and I now ask unanimous consent that this statement, together with the text of the resolution, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a cochairman from among its members.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the life insurance industry of the United States, with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and to the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws, and (2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1950, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and other employees, including consultants or firms of consultants, as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or cochairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

The statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR M'CARRAN AND REPRESENTATIVE EMANUEL CELLER INTRODUCE IDENTICAL SENATE AND HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS TO ESTABLISH A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES

We are today introducing a joint resolution to provide for an investigation of the life insurance industry of the United States, with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws.

The purpose of this investigation is to find facts.

The sheer size of this industry, its dominant position in the world of finance, and the power which it wields and could wield in many fields of endeavor, coupled with the fact that detailed information concerning the operations of the industry is not only greatly lacking but apparently very difficult to secure, give ample ground for this investigation.

While it is contemplated that charges which have been made against the industry will be thoroughly investigated, if this resolution is approved, it is not the intent of the sponsors of the resolution to seek support for any predetermined conclusions. The sole objective is to gather the facts and all the facts, and from the study of those facts, to reach reasonable and fair conclusions. The investigation will be studiously objective and rights of witnesses will be properly and judicially protected.

In connection with this proposed investigation, it will undoubtedly be necessary to consider not only the impact of the Federal antitrust laws upon the life insurance industry, but also the question of the suitability and desirability of Public Law 15 with respect to its application to the life insurance industry, and the further question of whether Public Law 15 requires any modification or amendment. (Public Law 15 provides, among other things that "the business of insurance, and every person engaged therein, shall be subject to the laws of the several States which relate to the regulation or taxation of such business.")

It is contemplated the proposed investigation will be sufficiently broad to encompass an evaluation of State insurance legislation in this field.

A copy of the concurrent resolution follows:

"That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of three Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and three Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filed in the same manner as the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a cochairman from among its members.

"SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee (1) to make a full and complete study and investigation of the life-insurance industry of the United States, with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and to the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws, and (2) to report to the Senate and the House of Representatives not later than June 30, 1950, the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

"SEC. 3. The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

"SEC. 4. (a) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such officers, experts, and other employees, including consultants or firms of consultants, as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

"(b) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $100,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or cochairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made."

## PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION"

Mr. GEORGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 35), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance 2,400 additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 208, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Recommendations for Social Security Legislation."

## INVESTIGATION OF PRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL CROPS

Mr. GILLETTE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 36), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the production, means of production, and plans for production of all types of agricultural crops, with particular reference to the fullest possible utilization of the Nation's food, feed, and fiber production, including studies of the construction, location, management, and use of industrial plants for the processing of various farm products. Also including studies in the field of the distribution of farm crops and the methods and costs of transferring the crops from the producer to the consumer. Also including special attention to new uses and the study and development of new uses and markets, both foreign and domestic, for farm crops including further studies in the production, means of production, and plans for production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber and the utilization of all natural materials for such purposes. Also including investigation of the organization or organizations now controlling or seeking to control for the future such alcohol and rubber production, together with the use of patents and processes used in such manufacture, whether developed or owned in whole or in part by foreign companies, corporations, individuals, or agents, and particularly to inquire into the plans and purposes and policies of our governmental agencies with reference to such utilization in the processing and production of industrial alcohol, synthetic alcohol, and synthetic rubber. And the subcommittee is specifically directed to make careful study in all fields of possible expanded use of farm production looking to the fullest possible utilization of farm crops to prevent as far as possible the adverse impact of recurrent surpluses of farm production on our agricultural economy and on the other segments of the Nation's economic structure. For the purpose of this investigation, farm crops include grains, canes, fruits, vegetables, livestock, and livestock products.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable and, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $12,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## INVESTIGATION OF WATER RESOURCES IN CERTAIN CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 37), which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby requested to make a study and investigation of the water needs and resources of Santa Clara, Alameda, and Contra Costa Counties, Calif., with a view to ascertaining the most feasible means of relieving present shortages in the water supply of such areas for agricultural, industrial, domestic, and other purposes, and to report to the Senate the results of such study and investigation at the earliest practicable date.

## INVESTIGATION OF FOREIGN OIL CONCESSIONS TO AMERICAN OIL COMPANIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution authorizing and directing the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the granting of oil rights and concessions to United States oil companies by foreign governments, and for other purposes.

The resolution (S. Res. 38) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed (1) to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the granting of oil rights and concessions to United States oil companies by foreign governments and (2) to report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

## INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make a full and complete study of the administration of military justice by courts under the jurisdiction of the armed forces of the United States; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement describing the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 39), was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of military justice by courts under jurisdiction of the armed forces of the United States in occupied areas, with a view to ascertaining (1) whether the conduct of trials and the treatment of prisoners in cases involving civilians (both citizen and noncitizen) as

well as cases involving military personnel have been in accordance with American concepts of justice, and (2) whether any legislation is necessary or desirable for the purpose of improving the operations of such courts. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $ , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The statement presented by Mr. LANGER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LANGER

The purpose of this resolution is to provide for an inquiry into the type of justice which is being administered by our forces overseas. There are now more than 100,000,000 people outside the United States and its territories who are liable to some sort of prosecution, trial and punishment under the American flag.

These people may be tried and are tried on charges of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against the occupation forces. All of these charges, in case of conviction, incur heavy penalties.

Yet these courts and courts systems are not subordinate, or have not been so far subordinate, to any regularly established court of the United States. The theater commander in practice has the last word.

As one might expect, in a system so far removed from popular constitution and control, many abuses have crept in. These abuses have been compounded by the hybrid rules of procedure. They combine American, Continental, and Russian rules. As a result their rulings are a far cry from what would be demanded by American standards.

One of the most glaring abuses now exists in Germany. At the American military government court, at Dachau, 1,672 persons were tried as of August 12, 1948; at the time of the latest figures reported by the Department of the Army, 1,416 had been convicted. Two hundred and ninety-seven death sentences were approved. Of these, according to subsequent newspaper reports, 217 have been executed. There remain 39 defendants still under death sentences.

(The Department of the Army reports only 29, and this number has been reduced to 14 by various commutations.)

This sounds like a record of justice done to the criminal members of a criminal conspiracy. But in fact it may well turn out to be, upon investigation, one of the most deplorable miscarriages of justice in history.

A two-man civilian board which made a survey of the trials at the request of Secretary Royall came back to the United States recently and reported.

They said the following methods were used to force confessions:

Beatings and brutal kickings.
Knocking out teeth and breaking jaws.
Mock trials.
Solitary confinement.
Torture with burning splinters.
Posturing as priests.
Very limited rations.
Spiritual deprivation.
Promises of acquittal.

Judge E. LeRoy van Roden, of Media, Pa., and Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Supreme Court of Texas, who composed the Board, recommended to Secretary Royall, after making these shocking discoveries, that a permanent clemency program be started for most of those convicted. They further recommended that 29 of those under death sentences be spared.

With what could be described as blindness or vengeance, but which we will attribute to callousness or negligence, the Army went ahead and hanged six of those for whom mercy had been recommended. Church leaders in Germany and in the United States are aroused about this.

Josef Cardinal Frings, of Cologne; Bishop Neuhaeusler, of Munich; and Bishop Wurm, of Stuttgart, led the protest. Cardinal Frings said the hangings would set back reconciliation between the nations for years.

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America has pleaded for justice for these people. Their delegation to Attorney General Tom Clark was told that the Department of Justice has no authority in this matter. The American Civil Liberties Union, which is concerned about the case, learned that the charge of using third-degree methods is evidently true and is seeking a way to do something about it.

The Christian Century says the evidence reported so far indicates that American justice as administered by the military is "a disgrace to the United States."

This resolution has been so framed that it could include within its scope cases like that of Mrs. Wilma Ybarbo. She was told by one of our judges in Germany, "When an American leaves the continental United States he leaves the United States Constitution behind." It could also include the case of the GI whose legs were frozen and then amputated after being detained in an Army prison. His case was reported in yestereday's newspapers.

We cannot have a double standard of justice, one brand for us at home and another for export. We must get to the bottom of this shocking deviation from American principle in American occupied areas and we must correct the situation.

## INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION LAWS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference a Senate resolution relating to an investigation of the immigration laws and the administration thereof, and I ask that the accompanying explanatory statement, together with the text of the resolution, may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Nevada will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 40), submitted by Mr. McCARRAN, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 137, of the Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947 (providing for a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system), is hereby continued during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $135,000.00.

The statement presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARRAN

Mr. President, I have sent to the desk a resolution extending the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation of our entire immigration system.

On January 5 of this year, there was presented to the Senate by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] a progress report (S. Doc. No. 3), which had been made to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary by the Subcommittee to Investigate Immigration and Naturalization pursuant to Senate Resolution 137 of the Eightieth Congress.

It is not my purpose at this time to restate the contents of that progress report, but I should like to comment briefly on the work which has been accomplished so far, and the importance of continuing this study and investigation to a final conclusion.

Right there, Mr. President, may I state that this study and investigation is not, in any sense, a "witch hunt," but on the contrary, is an objective, analytical appraisal of our entire immigration and naturalization system, with the end in view of a comprehensive report and over-all legislation designed to improve the pattern and administration of that system.

WORK THUS FAR ACCOMPLISHED

Pursuant to the direction of the Senate in Senate Resolution 137 of the Eightieth Congress, a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, together with a small staff, has been continuously engaged in assembling facts by means of extensive transcribed inquiries which have been held both in Washington and during the course of various field trips. Several thousand pages of transcribed inquiries have been taken not only from officials and employees of the Government who administer our immigration and naturalization laws but from representatives of a number of nongovernmetal organizations that are interested in our immigration and naturalization system. In addition, there has been acquired a great volume of reports and other statistical data, and considerable independent research work has been completed by the subcommittee staff in the development of background material. Virtually all of this information has now been cataloged for reference in the preparation of a comprehensive report and proposed legislation, and the work of collating the information is now in progress.

The scope of this study includes a great many areas. It includes an appraisal of the operation of our immigration laws, which have been established by not only two comprehensive enactments which are still in effect, but by more than 200 additional laws. It includes a study of the organization and functions of the Visa Division of the Department of State, and of the Immigration and Naturalization Service. These are the two principal agencies dealing with our immigration and naturalization system.

The scope of the study further includes an analysis and appraisal of the various procedures for the admission, exclusion, and deportation of aliens. It includes consideration of the problems of enforcement, and questions relating to illegal entries and aliens who are in an illegal status in the United States. It includes study of the general situation in the United States with respect to the reception and assimilation of aliens.

Each of these areas of study and investigation has several facets, which have been set up as separate projects. Work has now begun on writing up the factual material on some 15 separate projects, and it is expected that the comprehensive report will embrace about 200 projects, which will be integrated in the over-all study.

PROSPECTIVE WORKLOAD AND PERSONNEL NEEDS

Since the war there has been a tremendous increase in the workload of the Standing Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and in view of recent enactments by the Congress, this workload seems sure to be still further increased. As pointed out in the progress report, approximately 1,400 bills relating to immigration and naturalization were introduced in the Eightieth Congress. This was almost two and one-half times as many

such bills as were introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and there were introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress almost twice as many such bills as were introduced in the Seventy-eighth Congress. In addition, pursuant to Public Law 863 of the Eightieth Congress, it is anticipated that approximately 15,000 cases in which deportation has been suspended will be referred to the Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee during the present Congress, for affirmative action in each case.

This constantly growing work load has necessitated the use of part of the time of the staff of the investigating subcommittee for processing the work of the standing Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee. The present staff of the investigating subcommittee consists of 10 staff members and 4 stenographers. It is estimated that at least two staff members will be required to process the suspension of deportation cases and that one staff member will be required to process private and general immigration and naturalization bills. In addition, there is an appreciable work load of correspondence and referral items, which together with the general clerical work of the subcommittee staff, will account for the time of one other staff member. It is apparent, therefore, that during the Eighty-first Congress 4 of the 10 subcommittee staff members will be taken away from the study and investigation for the purpose of processing the routine work load of the standing Immigration and Naturalization Subcommittee.

The effect of the resolution which I have just introduced is to extend the authority of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary during the life of the Eighty-first Congress, and to authorize an appropriation for the continuation of the work for 1 year from March 1, 1949, the date upon which the present authorization expires.

The last general investigation of our immigration and naturalization system, Mr. President, was made beginning in 1907 and continuing until 1911. This investigation cost more than $800,000 and necessitated the employment of over 200 persons. It is, therefore, apparent that the terms of the resolution which I have just introduced are not only modest, but constitute a bare minimum provision for supporting this important study and investigation. I anticipate that with the addition of 5 or 6 more temporary staff members, the study and investigation, together with the comprehensive report and draft of an omnibus bill, can be completed in approximately 1 year.

### AUTOMATIC RECORDING OF SENATE ROLL CALLS AND VOTES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am resubmitting today a resolution previously identified as Senate Resolution 171 of the Eightieth Congress, in which I suggested that the Senate Rules Committee study the possibility of the installation of an automatic voting system in the United States Senate, together with a study of changes in the rules which might be necessitated thereby.

The purpose of this resolution, Mr. President, is obvious. I feel that in view of the staggering work-load confronting this and previous Congresses, it is essential that we use every modern device consistent with good parliamentary government in order to husband our time, which means in effect husbanding the taxpayer's time.

Many of my colleagues come, as I do, from a State wherein one or both houses of the State legislature have automatic voting systems. It seems to me totally incongruous that we in the National Legislature in this atomic age should proceed in the present horse-and-buggy fashion of voting which consumes needless time that might be otherwise used for consideration of important issues of the day.

Of course, I believe that the problem is more serious in the House of Representatives—with its larger membership—than it is in the Senate. But if we attend to this problem of time on our side of Capitol Hill, I am sure that our colleagues in the House will do likewise.

The resolution (S. Res. 41), submitted by Mr. WILEY, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a study (1) of the desirability and feasibility of installing a mechancial or electrical device for automatically recording roll calls and votes of the Senate, and (2) if the installation of such a device is recommended by the committee, of any changes in the Rules of the Senate which might thereby be necessitated.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of such study together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, Senate bill 210, which is a bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, was referred by the President pro tempore of the Senate to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I have discussed the matter with the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. The Senator from Wyoming has no objection to having the bill referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Therefore, I move that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico, the author of the bill, who is himself a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has asked the chairman of the committee to grant consent to this change of reference. I may add that the lands affected were originally taken from the State of New Mexico for the atomic-energy project. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is completely familiar with all the facts and details, and can proceed with much more expedition than can the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. So I have no objection to the requested change of reference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 210, and it will be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

### PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON SAVANNAH RIVER, GA. AND S. C.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to call a matter to the attention of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina.

On March 28, 1946, at the request of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], a resolution was passed requesting certain information from the Army of the United States. On November 26 the Secretary of the Army submitted a report pertaining to a review of the Savannah River in Georgia and South Carolina. I should like to ask unanimous consent that the report be referred to the Committee on Public Works, and printed as a Senate document, with an illustration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR OVERTON

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute paid to the memory of the late Senator Overton of Louisiana by Judge Gaston L. Porterie of the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE AMERICAN FORUM OF THE AIR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a brief address delivered by him in the weekly program of the American Forum of the Air, January 18, on the occasion of the twenty-first anniversary of that forum, which appears in the Appendix.]

### FEDERAL AID TO HOUSING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Federal Aid to Housing," delivered by Senator TAFT before the Mortgage Bankers Association of America and the Graduate School of Business Administration of New York University at New York City on January 25, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### DOES THE REPUBLICAN PARTY HAVE A FUTURE?—ARTICLE BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Does the Republican Party Have a Future?" written by Senator LODGE and published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### PROBLEMS FACING THE AMERICAN PEOPLE—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the problems facing the American people, delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the twenty-first annual midwinter meeting of the New York State Bankers' Association at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, on January 24, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### CORRESPONDENCE RELATING TO THE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD correspondence

between him and Mr. George J. Burger relative to the recent action of the Banking and Currency Committee in creating a small business subcommittee, which appears in the Appendix.]

SIX FATAL BLUNDERS—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM H. CHAMBERLIN

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Six Fatal Blunders," written by William Henry Chamberlin and published in Human Events of the issue of January 19, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPENSATION FOR AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Unjust Delay," relating to the payment of compensation to American citizens who were prisoners of enemy nations during World War II, published in the San Francisco Examiner of December 1, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain newspaper editorials and articles dealing with the constitutional amendment proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 2, which appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE OF PIUS XII TO SPANISH PEOPLE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a dispatch by Arnaldo Cortesi, published in the New York Times on December 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN AMBASSADOR TO ARGENTINA

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Dr. Lovelace acclaims United States Argentine Emissary," by Wayne L. Scott, published in the December 28, 1948, issue of the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. YOUNG asked and obtained consent to be excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate until Wednesday next.

Mr. GREEN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate on official business, beginning on February 2 and lasting for possibly a fortnight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions or routine matters?

If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

VOLUNTARY RACIAL RELOCATION COMMISSION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, and ask for its appropriate reference; and I ask unanimous consent that the reading clerk may read the caption and the preamble.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The bill (S. 708) to establish a Voluntary Racial Relocation Commission, and to prescribe its authority, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading clerk may read the caption and the first section of the bill, explaining its purpose, which are very brief.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 708) to establish a Voluntary Racial Relocation Commission, and to prescribe its authority

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the purpose of this act is to reduce and eliminate racial tensions and improve the economic status of the American people by equitably distributing throughout the several States those citizens belonging to the two largest racial groups included in the population of the United States who of their own volition desire to change their place of residence. One of the primary objectives of the program provided for by this act shall be to improve the living standards, and the social, economic, and employment opportunities of all of those who may avail themselves of the provisions of this act, thereby assisting the less privileged and improving the standard of living and economic opportunities of all of the people of the United States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill may be printed at this point in the RECORD, and then I desire to address myself briefly to the subject.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 708) is as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the purpose of this act is to reduce and eliminate racial tensions and improve the economic status of the American people by equitably distributing through the several States those citizens belonging to the two largest racial groups included in the population of the United States who of their own volition desire to change their place of residence. One of the primary objectives of the program provided for by this act shall be to improve the living standards, and the social, economic, and employment opportunities of all of those who may avail themselves of the provisions of this act, thereby assisting the less privileged and improving the standard of living and economic opportunities of all of the people of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby established an independent agency to be known as the Voluntary Racial Relocation Commission and to be composed of three members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall designate one of the members as chairman, who shall receive compensation at the rate of $17,500 per annum. The other two members shall receive compensation at the rate of $15,000 per annum.

SEC. 3. On the basis of data furnished by the Bureau of the Census, the Commission shall—

(1) determine the two largest racial groups in the United States having separate and distinct racial characteristics, and

(2) from time to time determine the number of persons attributable to each of such groups per thousand population of each State, and per thousand population of the United States as a whole.

The number of persons attributable to either of such racial groups per thousand population of any State shall be considered to be below normal if less than 95 percent, or above normal if more than 105 percent of the number of persons attributable to such group per thousand population of the United States as a whole.

SEC. 4. The Commission shall formulate and effectuate a program to encourage and assist persons who are members of either of such racial groups and who desire to take advantage of the provisions of this act to move from States where members of their racial group are above normal and to relocate in States where members of their racial group are below normal. Insofar as may be possible, the Commission shall equalize the number assisted to move from, and the number assisted to move to, each State. Such program shall not be made applicable to any State which shall not have given its assent thereto. Such assent may be given either by action of the State legislature or in writing by the Governor of the State.

SEC. 5. In effectuating such program the Commission shall have the authority, within the limits of funds made available, to—

(a) make or insure loans for, or otherwise assist in financing, the transportation, subsistence, housing, establishment in business or occupations, acquisition of land, or other costs necessary to the relocation and reestablishment of the persons assisted. Such loans or financing shall be made at such interest rates and upon such security and terms and conditions as will best tend to effectuate such program and will afford a reasonable prospect of repayment;

(b) make arrangements for, and provide at reasonable rates, suitable transportation, subsistence, and housing for persons assisted;

(c) make grants, where necessary, for the transportation, subsistence, and temporary housing of persons assisted; and

(d) provide for the employment of persons assisted in agriculture, industry, commerce, public projects, or in any other business or occupation in which there is a fair likelihood of the person assisted achieving success.

The Commission shall endeavor to see that the housing and living facilities of any family which may be assisted to relocate are superior to those enjoyed by such family before it availed itself of such program, and that the employment or business opportunities of each person assisted are greater than those available to such person prior to relocation. The Commission is specifically empowered to make contracts with industrial enterprises and other persons, firms, and corporations affording employment to persons assisted, and is authorized to make loans to any such employer in an amount not exceeding $10,000 for each such person employed by such employer.

SEC. 6. The Commission is authorized to utilize the services of any agency of the Federal Government or of any State government which may assist in effectuating the purposes of this act, and to make such delegations of authority as the Commission may deem necessary and desirable. The Commission is further authorized to take all steps necessary or desirable to promote the effective execution of the program provided for by this act and to protect the health and promote the welfare of persons assisted under such program.

SEC. 7. The Commission may, within the limit of funds which may be made available, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees in accordance with the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for law books and books of reference, and for paper, printing, and binding), as it may deem necessary to

carry out the provisions of this act. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Commission may sue and be sued in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal.

SEC. 8. For carrying out the purposes of this act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the sum of $500,000,000, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years the sum of $1,000,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights and his subsequent endorsement of that report have made a national political issue of social, racial, and economic problems which have, for more than 80 years, unfairly burdened that section of the Nation generally called the South. The recommendations of the Commission and the legislation necessary to implement them are in the main admittedly directed at the Southern States. Taken altogether they propose to revolutionize the social and political relations between the whites and the Negroes in the 11 States of the South in order to make them conform to a national pattern.

The avowed objective of the program is to destroy the system of segregating the races which exists in the South. This system of segregation is the basis of a social order which has been painfully created through a process of trial and error—over a period of 83 years, by people of both races—at a time when they were beset by difficulties which are incomprehensible to those living in other sections of the Nation.

The term "civil rights," as used in the report of the Commission and in American political discussion today, means the question of Negro rights, racial relations, and the solution of a racial problem. The whole program of the Commission propounds and supports the theory that any form of segregation or any restraints upon the freest intermingling of the races in all of the relations of life is an illegal discrimination against our Negro citizens and a denial of their civil rights.

Many of the leaders who have inspired and promoted this program are frank enough to admit that striking down all segregation of the races in every form will have the eventual effect of solving the racial problem of the United States once and for all by bringing about the amalgamation and absorption of the minority Negro race by the more numerous white race. I do not see how any rational thinker can escape a similar conclusion.

The majority of the people of the South believe in their present social order based on segregation. They abhor the idea of solving the racial problem by amalgamation. They consider this to be the mongrelization of both races, and they are unalterably opposed to such a solution. They therefore have opposed and continue to oppose each and every piece of legislation which will contribute in any degree to that end. The rest of the Nation, constituting a majority of our people, appear to be either indifferent to the certain final result of the program or to favor it or to favor legislative action which will eventually bring about such results.

Mr. President, I have long been aware of the fact that an opinion of a person living in a community where from 1 to 5 percent of the population are Negroes as to what constitutes a proper pattern of relations between the white and Negro races is almost certain to be quite different from that held by a person living in a community where 40 to 50 or even 60 or 70 percent of the population are Negroes. The feeling on the question of segregating the races in separate schools—to use an illustration which is dramatized in the report of the Civil Rights Commission—varies in intensity in accordance with differences in the percentage of the members of each race living in the area affected. The degree of feeling varies even as between the Southern States, in accordance with the percentage of the population of the State that happens to be Negro. The bitterness engendered over the proposal to solve the racial problem of the country by fixing a Nation-wide pattern in Washington is much more acute in Mississippi, with 49 percent Negro population, and South Carolina, with 43 percent Negro population, than it is in North Carolina and Florida, with lower percentages of 27, respectively. It is more marked in Florida and North Carolina than in Texas, with 14 percent Negro population.

The 11 Southern States most acutely affected by the proposed civil-rights program have a total population, according to the last census, of 31,831,026. This is approximately 24 percent of the total population of the United States. It will be noted, however, that these same 11 States have more than 75 percent of all the Negroes living in the United States. Out of a total of 12,865,518 Negroes, according to the last census, 8,878,912 of them live in the 11 States of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Texas. It is true, Mr. President, that the war brought shifts in our population, as people of both races sought to better their economic lot by moving to areas where war industries were located and higher wages abounded, but the figures which I have given are the latest accurate ones available, and the proportions and percentages cited are very nearly accurate today. Not only do we have the greater part of the Negro population of the United States, but there are any number of counties and subdivisions of Government in the Southern States where the Negroes outnumber the whites.

To make clear the great impact the adoption of the program to destroy the system of segregation in the South will have upon the life of the people of that section, I offer for the record a table showing the number of counties and parishes in the 11 Southern States having a high percentage of Negro population. It will be noted that there are 182 counties in these States where the Negro population outnumbers the white. I ask that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Table showing percentage distribution of Negro population by counties or parishes in southern States (beginning with counties or parishes having 30% or more Negroes)*

| State | Total number of counties | Number of counties having Negro population equal to or greater than the indicated percentage | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 30 percent | 40 percent | 50 percent | 60 percent | 70 percent | 80 percent | 90 percent | More than 50 percent |
| Alabama | 67 | 12 | 6 | 8 | --- | 7 | 3 | --- | 18 |
| Arkansas | 75 | 9 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 1 | --- | --- | 9 |
| Florida | 67 | 19 | 8 | 2 | 1 | --- | --- | --- | 3 |
| Georgia | 159 | 31 | 25 | 22 | 17 | 6 | --- | --- | 45 |
| Louisiana | 64 | 16 | 12 | 7 | 6 | 2 | --- | --- | 15 |
| Mississippi | 82 | 13 | 12 | 13 | 5 | 15 | 2 | --- | 35 |
| North Carolina | 100 | 19 | 22 | 7 | 2 | --- | --- | --- | 9 |
| South Carolina | 46 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 12 | 3 | --- | --- | 22 |
| Tennessee | 95 | 4 | 1 | --- | 1 | 1 | --- | --- | 2 |
| Texas | 254 | 15 | 9 | 3 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 3 |
| Virginia | 124 | 17 | 17 | 11 | 6 | 1 | --- | --- | 18 |
| Total | 1,133 | 161 | 129 | 84 | 54 | 36 | 5 | --- | 179 |

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the great unbalance in the number of Negroes in these 11 States, as compared with the rest of the Nation, as well as the threat to the system of segregation of the races which is an integral part of southern life, are facts which any fair-minded man should take into consideration if he would understand the grave concern which these proposals have caused the southern people.

This concern has engendered great bitterness, which might easily grow into racial strife. The campaign for what are euphemistically called civil rights is planting seeds of disunity when our Nation needs to be united. Whether rightly or wrongly, the people who live where the two races are most evenly divided in numbers are strongly opposed to having imposed upon them the racial pattern which the remainder of the Nation, constituting a large majority of our population, seems determined to fix for the entire Nation by Federal laws.

If the rest of the Nation is determined to force their views upon the southern people and use the Federal power to revolutionize the social and political relations between the races in the South, destroying the social order in which our people believe, common fairness would demand that they assist in equalizing our racial problem with that of the rest of the Nation. This will enable those who believe in the program to make a contribution to its success and fulfillment equal to that which they propose to require of us who oppose it. It would be manifestly unfair and un-American for the rest of the country to compel the white people of the South, by Federal fiat, to associate in the most intimate relations of life, with and perhaps eventually absorb, a much higher proportion of Negroes than they themselves will have an opportunity to accept and absorb.

The bill is presented in the belief that its enactment offers more hope for a permanent and peaceable solution of the

grave social and political issues growing out of the race problem than any other suggested. It proposes the creation of a commission whose duty it is to encourage and assist individuals and families who voluntarily desire to do so to relocate throughout the Nation in such a way as to accomplish an equitable distribution of the largest racial groups comprising our population.

This bill should strongly appeal to all social-minded people. It assures that in the process of bringing about an equitable distribution of the Negro and white races as between the States and sections of the Nation, it will at the same time lift the living standards and improve the economic and employment opportunities of several million American citizens who have heretofore been disadvantaged as compared with their fellow citizens. The Commission is charged with the duty of seeing, and I quote from the bill, "that the housing and living facilities of any family which may be assisted to relocate are superior to those enjoyed by such family before it availed itself of such program, and that the employment or business opportunities of each person assisted are greater than those available to such person prior to relocation."

The powers of the Commission to assist in obtaining employment extend to the authority to make loans in an amount not exceeding $10,000 for each person relocated who has secured a better job with the borrower than he enjoyed before his relocation. This provision of the bill not only will help equitably distribute the population, but will assist in a more general diffusion of the industry of the Nation. It will contribute to the establishment of plants in many States which now have little industry. If the purposes of the measure are finally accomplished and the work of the Commission created therein succeeds, Negroes who of their own accord desire to avail themselves of the benefits and opportunities of this bill will be distributed on a basis of approximately 10 percent in each State. In like manner, white people from the States now having an unbalance of white population will enjoy better economic opportunities if they desire to locate in the States from which the Negroes are moved, in the shift to equalize the population of these States.

It is, of course, impossible to give any data on the racial composition of the several States without knowing how many people of each race the Commission will be able to relocate. I do, however, offer for the RECORD a table which would show the distribution by States of those belonging to the white and Negro races if the population were already divided equitably. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Table showing racial and total population of the States and 10 percent of total population (based on 1940 Federal census, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census)*

| State | Total population | White population | Negro population | Other racial population | 10 percent of total population | Shift of Negro population |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama | 2,832,961 | 1,849,097 | 983,290 | 574 | 283,296 | −699,994 |
| Arizona | 499,261 | 426,792 | 14,993 | 57,476 | 49,926 | +34,933 |
| Arkansas | 1,949,387 | 1,466,084 | 482,578 | 725 | 194,938 | −287,640 |
| California | 6,907,387 | 6,596,763 | 124,306 | 186,318 | 690,738 | +566,432 |
| Colorado | 1,123,296 | 1,106,502 | 12,176 | 4,618 | 112,329 | +100,153 |
| Connecticut | 1,709,242 | 1,675,407 | 32,992 | 843 | 170,242 | +137,450 |
| Delaware | 266,505 | 230,528 | 35,876 | 101 | 26,650 | −9,266 |
| Florida | 1,897,414 | 1,381,986 | 514,198 | 1,230 | 189,741 | −324,457 |
| Georgia | 3,123,723 | 2,038,278 | 1,084,927 | 518 | 312,372 | −772,555 |
| Idaho | 524,873 | 519,292 | 595 | 4,986 | 52,873 | +52,278 |
| Illinois | 7,897,241 | 7,504,202 | 387,446 | 5,593 | 789,724 | +402,278 |
| Indiana | 3,427,796 | 3,305,323 | 121,916 | 557 | 342,779 | +220,863 |
| Iowa | 2,538,268 | 2,520,691 | 16,694 | 883 | 253,826 | +237,132 |
| Kansas | 1,801,028 | 1,734,496 | 65,138 | 1,394 | 180,102 | +114,964 |
| Kentucky | 2,845,627 | 2,631,425 | 214,031 | 171 | 284,562 | +70,531 |
| Louisiana | 2,363,880 | 1,511,739 | 849,303 | 2,838 | 236,388 | −612,915 |
| Maine | 847,226 | 844,543 | 1,304 | 1,379 | 84,722 | +83,418 |
| Maryland | 1,821,244 | 1,518,481 | 301,931 | 832 | 182,124 | −119,807 |
| Massachusetts | 4,316,721 | 4,257,596 | 55,391 | 3,734 | 431,672 | +376,281 |
| Michigan | 5,256,106 | 5,039,643 | 208,345 | 8,118 | 525,610 | +317,265 |
| Minnesota | 2,792,300 | 2,768,982 | 9,928 | 13,390 | 297,230 | +269,302 |
| Mississippi | 2,183,796 | 1,106,327 | 1,074,578 | 2,891 | 218,379 | −856,199 |
| Missouri | 3,784,664 | 3,539,187 | 244,386 | 1,091 | 378,466 | +134,080 |
| Montana | 559,456 | 540,468 | 1,120 | 17,867 | 55,945 | +54,825 |
| Nebraska | 1,315,834 | 1,297,624 | 14,171 | 4,039 | 131,583 | +117,412 |
| Nevada | 110,247 | 104,030 | 664 | 5,553 | 11,024 | +10,360 |
| New Hampshire | 491,524 | 490,989 | 414 | 121 | 49,152 | +48,738 |
| New Jersey | 4,160,165 | 3,931,087 | 226,973 | 2,105 | 416,016 | +189,043 |
| New Mexico | 531,818 | 492,312 | 4,672 | 34,834 | 53,181 | +48,509 |
| New York | 13,479,142 | 12,879,546 | 571,221 | 28,375 | 1,347,914 | +776,693 |
| North Carolina | 3,571,623 | 2,567,635 | 981,298 | 22,690 | 357,162 | −624,136 |
| North Dakota | 641,935 | 631,464 | 201 | 10,270 | 64,193 | +63,992 |
| Ohio | 6,907,612 | 6,566,531 | 339,461 | 1,620 | 690,761 | +351,300 |
| Oklahoma | 2,336,434 | 2,104,228 | 168,849 | 63,357 | 233,643 | +64,794 |
| Oregon | 1,089,684 | 1,075,731 | 2,565 | 11,388 | 108,968 | +106,403 |
| Pennsylvania | 9,900,180 | 9,426,989 | 470,172 | 3,019 | 990,018 | +519,846 |
| Rhode Island | 713,346 | 701,805 | 11,024 | 517 | 71,334 | +60,310 |
| South Carolina | 1,899,804 | 1,084,308 | 814,164 | 1,332 | 189,980 | −624,184 |
| South Dakota | 642,961 | 619,075 | 474 | 23,412 | 64,296 | +63,822 |
| Tennessee | 2,915,841 | 2,406,906 | 508,736 | 199 | 291,584 | −217,152 |
| Texas | 6,414,824 | 5,487,545 | 924,391 | 2,888 | 641,482 | −282,909 |
| Utah | 550,310 | 542,920 | 1,235 | 6,155 | 55,031 | +53,796 |
| Vermont | 359,231 | 358,806 | 384 | 41 | 35,923 | +35,539 |
| Virginia | 2,677,773 | 2,015,583 | 661,449 | 741 | 267,777 | −393,672 |
| Washington | 1,736,191 | 1,698,147 | 7,424 | 30,620 | 173,619 | +166,195 |
| West Virginia | 1,901,974 | 1,784,102 | 117,754 | 118 | 190,197 | +72,443 |
| Wisconsin | 3,137,587 | 3,112,752 | 12,158 | 12,677 | 313,758 | +301,600 |
| Wyoming | 250,742 | 246,597 | 956 | 3,189 | 25,074 | +24,018 |

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Georgia will yield, in view of the fact that I must leave the Chamber. I have a report that affects the Senator's State.

Mr. RUSSELL. I shall be through with my remarks in about 4 minutes, if the Senator will indulge me.

Mr. President, there has been a time when the plan envisaged by this bill would have been regarded as radical or revolutionary. Today when we look about the globe and see the gigantic scale on which the United States is using its wealth and resources to solve the problems of the people of the earth who live in foreign lands, this relocation of a million and a half American families becomes comparatively a minor matter. The cost is small compared to the great benefits which will accrue. When we consider that such a law will effect a permanent solution to a problem which divides the Nation, consumes the time and energies of the Members of Congress, creates bitterness and threatens strife, the cost is not at all significant.

We have appropriated stupendous sums of money to rehabilitate the peoples of Europe. We have assisted in the relocation of millions of people and are today engaged in bringing thousands of displaced persons to our country. At a small fraction of the cost and effort we are expending in our effort to straighten out the rest of the world, we can alleviate the gravest domestic issue which confronts and disturbs our people today, and at the same time greatly strengthen our economy.

When this movement to distribute the two races equally is once well started, it will almost operate itself. Other social measures which are pending in the Congress may be used to expedite the movement. For example, we are proposing legislation whereby the Federal Government is to assist in the construction of millions of new homes. Through an agreement between the Relocation Commission and the Housing Administration, a certain proportion of these new homes can be made available to those assisted by this bill. We are planning vast public works projects in every section of the Nation. Through agreements with the contractors on these projects we can assure employment for large numbers of people on the project and the Government can then give many of them jobs to operate the completed project. Industry and business are complaining today about the difficulties they encounter in borrowing money with which to expand and modernize their plants. The loans provided for could be secured from the Commission on agreement to employ those who have relocated residence under the terms of this proposed act.

Mr. President, one of the last measures introduced in the Senate before the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was translated into the Vice Presidency of the United States was a bill which he introduced, Senate bill 529, in conjunction with 18 other Senators, a bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free

competitive economy. The organization which this bill proposes to establish can be utilized to effect the objectives of the bill I offer.

In the very nature of things, those at the bottom of the economic ladder will be the first to avail themselves of the opportunities for improvement which this law will proffer them. We will be bettering the economic status of a million and a half or two million of the most underprivileged families of our land, white and Negro. We will strengthen America and take a long step toward the abolition of poverty from our national life.

If the Commission appointed by the President is reasonably prudent in its administration of this act, there is no reason why most of the moneys appropriated and loaned should not be repaid. There is no doubt in my mind that, in proportion, the money recaptured from these loans will be much greater than that collected from foreign nations on advances heretofore made or now in process.

The passage of this bill will be a great contribution to the preservation of the rights of the States and of our American form of government. Without impugning the motives of thousands of Americans who are supporting the civil rights program, we know that it has also been seized upon by subversive elements who seek to sow discord in the land and those who seek, by generating sympathy with what is regarded as a humanitarian cause, to establish state socialism in these United States.

Mr. President, I have no pride of authorship in this bill. I will gladly support legislation coming from any other source which will accomplish the desired purpose. I would that a Senator from some other section had offered this measure.

I hasten to assure the Senate that this bill cannot be construed as being a belated demand for a Marshall plan or an ECA to restore the ravages of civil war or to assist the Southern States to achieve their desire for readmission to economic equality with our sister States. It is offered in a sincere effort to assure domestic tranquility and national betterment. It will not help the underprivileged of the South, or the South as a section, any more than it will benefit the disadvantaged of other areas and the economy of the Nation as a whole. It will appeal to all fair-minded persons who believe in equality and justice.

In our expensive quest for peace and the happiness of men everywhere, let us not neglect measures necessary to assure the peace and happiness of the people of the United States. The plan proposed is workable. The monetary cost will be inconsequential. In the best American tradition it seizes upon the solution of a grave and perplexing problem as a means of moving forward and improving the status of the American people.

### CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is the call of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### NOMINATION OF JAMES E. WEBB TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to move that, as in executive session, the Senate consider the nomination of Mr. James E. Webb to be Under Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator moving that the Senate go into executive session?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am moving that the Senate consider the nomination as in executive session. I ask unanimous consent that that be done, if that is the way to proceed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent, as in executive session, that the Senate consider the nomination of James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and the clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James E. Webb to be Under Secretary of State.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, it is very necessary that Mr. Webb be confirmed at an early date because of the importance of the functions of the office of Under Secretary. Of course, he has not yet entered upon the duties of the office.

I beg to report that the Committee on Foreign Relations has had the nomination before it, and has given it thorough consideration, and the committee voted unanimously to recommend that the nomination be confirmed.

I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks a biographical sketch of Mr. Webb which sets forth his experience and his training be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

James Edwin Webb, Government official; born, Granville County, N. C., October 7, 1906; son of John Frederick and Sarah (Gorham) Webb; A. B., University of North Carolina, 1928; student, George Washington University Law School, 1933–36; married Patsy Aiken Douglas, May 14, 1938; children—Sarah Gorham, James Edwin, Jr. Employed in accounting department; and secretary to president, R. G. Lassiter & Co., Raleigh, N. C., 1924–25; secretary, Bureau of Educational Research, 1928–29; law clerk and stenographer, Parham & Lassiter, Oxford, N. C., 1929–30; secretary to Congressman Edward W. Pou, Fourth North Carolina District, 1932–34; in office of O. Max Gardner, lawyer, 1934–36; personnel director and assistant to president, Sperry Gyroscope Co., Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., 1936–41; secretary and treasurer, 1941–43, vice president, Sperry Gyroscope Co., 1943–44; assistant secretary and assistant treasurer, Sperry Corp., 1943–44; with firm, Gardner, Morrison & Rogers, Washington, D. C., 1945–46; executive assistant to Under Secretary of Treasury, 1946; Director, Bureau of Budget, since 1946. Student naval aviator, Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla. (private first class, USMCR), 1930–31; second lieutenant, Fleet Marine Corps Reserve, active flying duty, Aircraft Squadron of East Coast Expeditionary Force, United States Marine Corps, Quantico, Va., 1931–32; served as major, Ninth Marine Aircraft Wing, United States Marine Corps; commanding officer, First Marine Air Warning Group, 1944–45. Member board of directors and executive committee, National Aeronautics Association (president, Greater New York chapter); member aviation advisory committee, New York World's Fair, 1939; secretary-treasurer, and member board of directors, United States Aviation Exhibit, Inc., New York World's Fair, 1939; member, board of directors, Private Flyers Association; member of advisory committee, to American section, International Technical Committee, Aerial Legal Experts, United States Department of State; member of advisory panel of Public Contracts Administration, Department of Labor; member of Airways Operation Advisory Committee, Department of Commerce; executive vice chairman, committee on reception to governors of States, third inaugural of Franklin D. Roosevelt; member of aviation committee, Commerce and Industry Association of New York; member of Institute of Aeronautical Sciences, North Carolina Business Foundation; Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association; American Society for Public Administration; American Political Science Association; Society for Advancement Management; American and District of Columbia Bar Associations; Phi Beta Kappa; Presbyterian. Democrat. Clubs: University (New York and Washington). Home: 3407 Rodman Street NW. Office: State Department Building, Washington, D. C.

Mr. CONNALLY. I also ask to have included in the RECORD a letter from the President in reply to one from Mr. Robert A. Lovett, who retired from the position of Under Secretary of State, together with Mr. Lovett's letter in the same connection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 7, 1949.

MY DEAR BOB: I have received with heartfelt regret your letter of January 3. Because of my familiarity with the personal considerations which prompt it, I have no recourse but to comply with its terms and accept your resignation as the Under Secretary of State, effective January 20, 1949.

In taking this action I need hardly assure you as you return to private pursuits that I heartily reciprocate the personal sentiments of friendship and respect which you express.

You have earned the gratitude of the Nation for outstanding service. As Special Assistant to the Secretary of War and as Assistant Secretary of War for Air, you had gained invaluable experience before I called you to assume the intricate responsibilities of the office of the Under Secretary of State.

The country has been fortunate in having the benefit of your expert abilities in peace as well as in war. You have been guided and inspired through all of your varied service by the highest intellectual integrity and you have brought to each task untiring industry, outstanding ability, and selfless devotion to the public interest.

Although you must now relinquish public office, I shall like to think that we can call upon you from time to time for the advice and counsel which you can give out of your rich experience.

With every good wish,

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

---

JANUARY 3, 1949.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For personal reasons with which you are familiar, I respectfully submit my resignation as Under Secretary of State.

I thank you most sincerely for the confidence you have reposed in me and for your unfailing consideration and kindness.

With great respect and deep appreciation, I am,

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT A. LOVETT.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to add a word of approval to the unanimous report of the Foreign Relations Committee in recommending the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. James E. Webb, as Under Secretary of State. Mr. Webb is a young man of broad experience, unusual capacity, and eminent qualifications for this important position. He is schooled in the best American traditions and ideas, and has a background of public service and experience in official and economic matters which will enable him to serve the State Department and the Nation.

Mr. Webb is the finest product of our civilization. North Carolina feels a peculiar pride in his record of achievements and accomplishments, and has the utmost confidence in his ability, courage, intelligence, and integrity, and his thorough and complete devotion and loyalty to his country under all circumstances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of James E. Webb, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of State?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, for the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report unanimously many routine promotions in the Army and Navy which have accumulated during the recess of the Congress. I think immediate action on the nominations is very desirable at this time because of our situation in Europe and in Asia, as well as at home.

I ask unanimous consent that I may report the nominations, and that they be considered immediately, that they be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Senator from Maryland whether the nominations were all approved unanimously by the committee, and were considered carefully by the committee?

Mr. TYDINGS. They were.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And there is reason for putting them into effect immediately?

Mr. TYDINGS. There is. They are all provided for by law. They are purely routine.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the chairman of the committee know of any objection from any Senator about any nomination?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a single objection to a single nomination was received by the committee as to any of the promotions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in executive session, the report of the nominations will be received, and without objection the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be notified at once.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I renew my unanimous-consent request that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 547, which is the bill to extend the authority of the President regarding voluntary agreements.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that one of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency has an amendment to offer to the bill, and I should like to have an opportunity to have it printed. I shall have no objection to having the bill brought up on Monday, if the majority leader so indicates. I should most respectfully object to having the bill brought up at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask the majority leader if he would have any objection to making the bill the first order of business on Monday.

Mr. LUCAS. The majority leader has no objection to making the bill the first order of business on Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to making the bill the unfinished business to be considered following the routine morning business on Monday next? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RELIEF OF STORM-STRICKEN AREAS IN THE WEST

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am about to ask unanimous consent to submit a unanimous report from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to request the immediate consideration of a bill to provide for relief for the snow-bound States of the West. I should like to state the supreme gravity of the problem to which we are addressing ourselves.

First, Mr. President, I send forward to the desk a unanimous report of the Committee on Interior on the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) introduced at the last session of the Congress by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on behalf of the Senators from Utah, Nevada, Colorado, Montana, and Wyoming, being Report No. 24. The joint resolution is designed to provide relief for the snow-bound States of the West. The unanimous report urgently recommends the passage of the resolution.

Since the introduction of the joint resolution conditions have become even more grave than they were then. The blizzard, of which we have all been reading in the press, extends from South Dakota and Nebraska to the Pacific coast. There has been an extraordinary fall of snow accompanied by subzero temperatures and high winds, resulting in the Rocky Mountain States in a disaster which exceeds anything within the memory of any living person.

The conditions were so bad, Mr. President, that the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation, at the request of State authorities, has been making available to the States and the counties the road equipment owned by those agencies, in order to open and keep open the snow-covered areas so that feed might be taken to isolated herds of cattle and sheep. The Army, the United States Air Force, and other agencies have cooperated. This work was done with the consent and knowledge, indeed, I may say, by the order of the President, who out of his disaster fund allocated the sum of $100,000, part of it being allocated for the relief of Indians in the snow-bound States. An additional allocation was made yesterday.

Mr. President, the committee held a hearing, at which representatives of all the agencies which are cooperating were present, the Federal Works Agency, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Bureau of Forestry, in the Department of Agriculture, and the armed services. The committee also consulted the Bureau of the Budget. I have here a letter from the executive assistant to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which I shall submit later, together with letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior. In its present form the joint resolution authorizes the expenditure of $750,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be taken up for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 38, which will be read by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 38) to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies of the Government to break through snow-bound areas in the western range States, and to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms which have created an emergency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that this joint resolution in substance authorizes and legalizes the expenditure of funds which have already been spent?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; it is to save these agencies from violation of the anti-deficiency law, on account of the utilization they have made of their machinery and their personnel, their gasoline and their oil, in fighting this terrific storm.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a letter from Mr. Lawton expressing the approval of the Bureau of the Budget of the enactment of the joint resolution.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, before the letter is read at the desk, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall be very happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to know if the measure has been coordinated with the action taken today by the House of Representatives. The Senator from Wyoming and all other Senators from the section of the country affected by the heavy snowstorms know that we must expedite whatever action we are going to take, because the help which is afforded next week or 2 weeks from now will not be anywhere near as good or effective as help given right now. I am informed that the House of Representatives has passed an appropriation measure, House Joint Resolution 112, giving to the President disaster relief funds in an additional amount of $500,000. That is almost as much as is authorized in the joint resolution which is now before the Senate. If we want to take quick action, I ask the Senator from Wyoming, would it not be wise to suggest to the Senate now that the fair thing to do would be to pass the appropriation measure which the House passed today? Then possibly we could later pass the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Wyoming, and reimburse the agencies of Government. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming is informed as to what action the House has taken.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, with whom I have recently had a conference, is, I understand, planning to hold a meeting of the Appropriations Committee this afternoon, at either 1:30 or 2 o'clock, to pass upon the appropriation measure referred to. But I may say that that appropriation is altogether separate and distinct from the action proposed by the joint resolution now before us. It is true that the President had to draw upon his disaster funds in order to meet a part of the distress occasioned by these snowstorms, and the measure passed by the House, and to be considered by the Senate Appropriations Committee this afternoon, is intended merely to reimburse the President's disaster fund.

I may say to the Senator from South Dakota that the Geological Survey, to which I addressed an inquiry this morning, has advised me that the fall of snow in the Columbia Basin, for example, is already much greater than that which caused the disaster of a year ago.

The two things are separate and distinct. The President's disaster fund may be used for any purpose. The small allocations of $200,000 or $300,000 for the Bureau of Public Works, for the Indians, for relief in connection with the western blizzard, has depleted the disaster fund which can be used for any disaster—flood, or snow, or earthquake, or fire, or any of the disasters with which we are all familiar. So I hope that the Senate will proceed to pass the joint resolution immediately, and then when the Senate Committee on Appropriations has acted upon the other measure, take that up.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly hope that the request of the Senator from Wyoming will be granted, and the joint resolution passed. I do not want to delay its passage one single moment. But I want to present this fact. The question which has arisen today points up the need for permanent disaster relief legislation and permanent disaster relief funds. If we were not in session right now we would have exactly the same situation as to these areas which have been so terribly affected by the heavy and unprecedented fall of snow, that we had in my State a year and a half ago when a disastrous flood came on, and when, in the absence of a session of Congress at the time, we found ourselves rather powerless and hopeless insofar as finding any substantial funds that could be made available to relieve the distress, or any machinery to which we could turn.

And while I hope that this legislation will be immediately passed to bring relief to the areas where it is so badly needed, I do hope that the passage of this and similar measures from time to time to deal with any specific disaster should not obscure our minds from the consideration of the necessity for permanent disaster relief legislation and permanent disaster relief machinery, created to be ready and available to deal with the disasters wherever they arise, and whenever they arise, and without having to wait so that some regions months later can have their vital affairs come to the attention of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

I certainly recognize the fact that these terrible problems have no regional application, no political application, and that simply because of human distress and suffering the legislation will immediately be passed, but I hope that then we shall immediately proceed to do the long-time over-all job which has been so long necessary, to set up adequate machinery to deal with these recurring disasters.

BUDGET BUREAU VIEW

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I quite agree with what the Senator from Florida has said. I had sent to the desk a letter from Mr. Lawton, of the Bureau of the Budget, and if the Senator from Nevada will just withhold his statement for a moment, I think it will be well to have the letter brought before the Senate so that it may know that in presenting this joint resolution the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has secured the cooperation of the Bureau of the Budget and the agencies involved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington, D. C., January 27, 1949.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have reviewed Senate Joint Resolution 38 authorizing agencies of the Government to use existing funds to meet emergencies created by unprecedented weather conditions in the Western States and providing for reimbursement of funds spent on this account. Government agencies in the affected areas have, to the extent of their ability, furnished aid and assistance to the States and local communities to alleviate hardship and suffering caused by these storms and avert the loss of human life and the destruction of great numbers of livestock. This has, of course, put an unexpected drain on the funds available to the agencies and it is urgently necessary to make immediate authorization for restoration of those appropriations.

In addition, the President has today recommended a supplemental appropriation for $1,000,000 for his disaster relief fund. This fund will be used to directly aid States and local communities and in taking further steps toward meeting the present emergency. It is not a substitute for the provisions for Senate Joint Resolution 38, but represents aid and assistance to the States over and above that which is already being rendered by Federal agencies.

In order to permit agencies to continue to carry on the types of aid which they have been rendering in this emergency, it is necessary that they be given immediate assurance that funds will be made available to meet the expenditures that they have already incurred. Senate Joint Resolution 38 would do this.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON,
*Executive Assistant.*

STATEMENT FROM INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of this date, addressed to me, from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, may be printed at this point in the RECORD without reading.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
*Washington, January 27, 1949.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
*United States Senate.*

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: The blizzard disaster in the West is still developing in some sections and new information of critical conditions that have existed for several days is being received almost hourly. The storms that have swept the region repeatedly since December 22 are without precedent since the white man has penetrated the high plains and intermountain areas.

The Department of the Interior put all of its field services in the Nevada, Utah, Wyoming, Montana, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, and Colorado areas on an emergency basis nearly a week ago and in several localities the Bureau of Land Management had been working on an emergency basis since January 1. I have instructed all of our agencies to respond in real disaster areas with men and equipment, where they are available, on the request of the local disaster committees that have been set up. On most of these committees, representatives of our field forces serve as members.

It will be necessary later to submit to the Congress detailed reports and justifications for estimates to cover the extraordinary expenditures that we have made. The size of the expenditures to date in this work may exceed $500,000. There were still 25 towns of 50 to 200 population isolated in Utah yesterday, but generally the main roads were open in the areas of heaviest snowfall yesterday afternoon. However, reports this morning indicate that blowing snow has closed them in some of the winter-range areas and the work is to be done over again. Also, the 5-day forecast of the Weather Bureau

at Billings is for another general blizzard which may be expected at any time and which, if it follows the pattern of those that we have already experienced, may cover the entire storm-bound area.

Even if the remainder of the winter is no more severe than normal, the expenditures of this Department alone can be expected to reach several millions of dollars to meet the emergency that has already been created. I hestitate to anticipate what might be the requirement if the remainder of the winter, which by the calendar is still young, should be as severe as the month that has passed.

Real suffering is being recorded in several Indian reservation areas. A sudden recent storm deposited 40 inches on the western part of the Navajo Reservation. The extent of the disaster there still is not known. We have urgent demands for allocation of funds at Fort Berthold and Turtle Mountain in North Dakota with all funds exhausted, but are determined to meet these instances of dire need approaching catastrophe with diverted funds.

I sincerely hope that the Congress in its desire to assist in the rapidly moving and quickly developing emergency will not fix ceilings so low as to enforce curtailment of the activities of the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the Bureau of Reclamation which have prevented the disaster so far from wiping out herds and flocks and ranchers in several States. While I am not presuming to speak for other departments, I would like to point out that several agencies of the Department of Agriculture and the armed services have responded, as have our agencies, in the disaster areas and that their work undoubtedly has utilized funds that were programed for other regular activities. These expenditures should be calculated as well in any summation of the allotments to be covered by legislation. The President's emergency fund now has been virtually exhausted. Its use was designed primarily for other purposes, such as supplementing the resources of local communities that had exhausted their funds and facilities. The need of our Department should not be confused with the need for restoring and supplementing the emergency disaster fund.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
*Assistant Secretary of the Interior.*

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. I wish to clarify the remarks which the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has just made. It will be remembered that last year the subject of a disaster fund for the President was debated on the floor of the Senate, and that the Columbia River disaster was the reason for the recommendation. The subcommittee of the Public Works Committee of which I was chairman, not only made money available for relief of those affected by the disaster on the Columbia River, but recommended a permanent fund of $500,000 for a revolving fund or a fund which was subject to allocation by the President in emergencies. The only debate on this floor was whether or not we should designate the agency which would expend the fund in case of disaster, or leave such designation to the President. It was decided to leave such designation to the President of the United States which agency would be in charge of expending the fund, and he has now designated the Public Works Administration in this case.

Mr. President, as chairman of the committee of western Senators chosen to follow through in coordinating the work of relief in the snow-bound areas of the six States of Idaho, Colorado, Nevada, Montana, Wyoming, and Utah, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point communications, including wires, letters, and memoranda received in that connection.

There being no objection, the communications were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ELY, NEV., *January 22, 1949.*

Hon. Senator GEORGE MALONE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Eastern and central Nevada suffering from worst storm conditions in years. Livestock situation approaching disaster condition. Seventy thousand sheep in critical condition. These will have to be shipped out or stock will die. Over 100,000 sheep involved. Thirty-five thousand in critical condition; 50,000 jeopardized. Loss continuing daily. Will need feed and forage. Stockmen anticipate 50-percent loss, unless feed forthcoming at once. Deepest snow in years with high winds. All available snow-removal equipment, including large crawler tractors, unable to cope with the drifting snow on roads that have been open in last few days. Equipment has not been able to reach outlying stretches of county roads. Standard snow equipment cannot cope with situation. Need heavy tractors, trucks, and funds to break roads so that feed convoys can reach sheep and cattle herds. County commissioners, State highway and Government agency officials estimate future emergency needs if conditions get worse $100,000 to keep present equipment operating. County funds almost exhausted. All private and government agencies assisting with all means and equipment available, but lack funds for operation of equipment. Estimated cost for feed relief $200,000 in next 30 days. Five hundred thousand dollars estimated emergency funds needed by spring if present conditions continue. Some families and ranchers still isolated.

Emergency Relief Comittee, consisting of United Stockmen's Association, Nevada Woolgrowers' Association, United States Department of Agriculture Council, White Pine Soil Conservation District Supervisors, Nevada Grazing Districts 4 and 5, Advisory Board, Nevada National Forest Advisory Committee, White Pine County Farm Bureau, Commissioners, White Pine County.

---

ELY NEV., *January 21, 1949.*

Hon. Senator GEORGE MALONE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Concur in telegram to you from Emergency Relief Committee. Situation desperate; emergency relief needed badly. All assistance you can give us in obtaining relief in order to save our livestock will be greatly appreciated.

Daniel B. Clark, Alfred Uhalde, John Urrizigia, Bertrand Paris, Joe Laxague, B. H. Robison, J. P. Johansen, D. C. Robison, George N. Swallow, P. P. Hoover, Dee Heckethorn, R. A. Yelland, Gustav Henroil, George Eldrige, John Coonway, John P. Wright, George Nesbitt, Pete Delmue, Clair Whipple, Allen Whipple, Arthur Carter, Carl L. Peacock, Ernest Gubler, Charles Funk, Myron Adams, William Sellas, Clay Hendricks, Dearden Bros., K. A. Barton, E. A. Henroid, Lawrence Henroid, Melbourne Robison, Milo Smith, Warren Robison, Wallace Thorley, Frank Thorley, Douglas Clark, Lloyd Sorensen, Wade Perrish, Harold Parker.

RENO, NEV., *January 21, 1949.*

Senator GEORGE W. *Malone,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

George Swallow says there is going to be 50-percent loss of stock in White Pine, Lincoln, parts of Nye and Eureka and it will be even heavier if new storm comes. Gordon Griswold unreachable today, but our Elko correspondent says Elko County in fair shape. Ranchers there have been collecting hay and concentrates in expectation of such conditions.

Vernon Metcalfe says that entire country east of Eureka is going to be hit hard. Western part of State is in good shape but ranchers aren't taking any chances and are starting to bring stock off winter ranges and close to home ranches. Swallow says that unless feed is shipped in quick or stock shipped out fast, losses are going to be even heavier. Jack Fogliani at Caliente says situation is tough in Lincoln County. Cliff Jones as Acting Governor has declared emergency so that State Highway Department and other agencies and National Guard as well can use all their equipment and facilities without delay or red tape.

Tried another check late this afternoon but couldn't reach Swallow for latest outlook. Our Ely man says there is nothing encouraging in sight. Regards.

JOHN SANFORD.

---

Mr. GEORGE SWALLOW,
*Ely, Nev.*
Mr. VERNON METCALF,
*Nevada Livestock Credit Association,*
*Reno, Nev.*
Mr. GORDON GRISWOLD,
*Elko, Nev.*

Meeting with Senators today relative storm emergency intermountain area. I am chairman subcommittee to follow through on necessary emergency railroad rates, feed, and livestock and contacting western governors for information extent of emergency and preparing Senate resolution assuring deficiency appropriation, Bureau of Land Management, for specified assistance in breaking trails and other cooperation. Pittman here and met with us. Please wire any information you have on extent of emergency and necessary cooperation and assistance.

Regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator.*

---

To Marvin E. Carter, editor, Boulder City News, Boulder City, Nev.; Arthur N. Suverkrup, Carson City Appeal, Carson City, Nev.; Chris H. Sheerin, editor, Elko Free Press, Elko, Nev.; Paul A. Leonard, editor, Ely Daily Times, Ely, Nev.; James H. Dooley, editor, Las Vegas, (Nev.) Courier, Las Vegas, Nev.; John F. Cahlan, editor, Las Vegas Review-Journal, Las Vegas, Nev.; Joseph F. McDonald, editor, Nevada State Journal, Reno, Nev.; Merrill S. Gaffney, editor, Reno Gazette, Reno, Nev.; William Friel, editor, Humboldt Star, Winnemucca, Nev.:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., January 21, 1949.—Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, Nevada, today called together the Senators of the six intermountain States—Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Utah, Wyoming—on a definite plan of cooperation with the governors of their respective States in the storm emergency in moving feed and livestock in the area. A subcommittee including Senators GEORGE W. MALONE, Nevada, chairman; LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, was chosen to follow through and contact the railroads serving the area in the matter of emergency rates in moving such feed and livestock; to enlist Government agency cooperation including the Army, Federal roads, and other agencies in furnishing manpower and equipment in clearing roads and trails; and to prepare resolution to be introduced in Senate Monday, January 24, to provide for a

deficiency appropriation for the Bureau of Land Management under the Secretary of the Interior for funds expended under certain conditions in clearing trails and transporting feed and livestock in the emergency area.

"The committee today wired the governors of the States in the mountain area for further particulars as to the extent of the emergency and for their definite recommendations.

"Gov. Vail Pittman, of Nevada, who is here attending the Presidential inauguration, was called into the meeting by Senator MALONE and explained in detail the situation in Nevada which is comparable with that in Utah and to a somewhat lesser degree in the other States.

"GEORGE W. MALONE,
*"United States Senator."*

---

Hon. J. BRACKEN LEE,
*Governor of Utah,*
*Salt Lake City, Utah.*
Hon. JOHN W. BONNER,
*Governor of Montana,*
*Helena, Mont.*
Hon. W. LEE KNOUS,
*Governor of Colorado,*
*Denver, Colo.*
Hon. C. A. ROBINS,
*Governor of Idaho,*
*Boise, Idaho.*
Hon. A. G. CRANE,
*Governor of Wyoming,*
*Cheyenne, Wyo.:*

We understand that some of our western governors of snow-bound States intend to make formal request of railroads for emergency reduced rates for moving livestock and feed into and out of distressed areas. We want you to know that if such action is taken we will be glad to give our support and full cooperation. A subcommittee including Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, chairman, Nevada; Senator LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming; and Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, will follow through on emergency freight rates and other cooperation.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
*Chairman, Nevada.*
Senators WATKINS and THOMAS,
*Utah.*
Senators ECTON and MURRAY,
*Montana.*
Senators MILLIKIN and JOHNSON,
*Colorado.*
Senators O'MAHONEY and HUNT,
*Wyoming.*
Senators MILLER and TAYLOR,
*Idaho.*

---

Mr. GEORGE ASHBY,
*President, Union Pacific Railroad,*
*Las Vegas, Nev.:*

Will call you 8:30 your time Saturday morning. Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator.*

---

Mr. A. T. MERCIER,
*President, Southern Pacific Railroad,*
*San Francisco, Calif.:*

Will call you 8 o'clock your time Saturday morning. Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator.*

---

JANUARY 24, 1949.

MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR GLEN H. TAYLOR, IDAHO; SENATOR BERT H. MILLER, IDAHO; SENATOR PATRICK M'CARRAN, NEVADA; SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE, NEVADA; SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS, UTAH; SENATOR ARTHUR V. WATKINS, UTAH; SENATOR EDWIN C. JOHNSON, COLORADO; SENATOR EUGENE D. MILLIKIN; COLORADO; SENATOR JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, WYOMING; SENATOR LESTER C. HUNT, WYOMING; SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY, MONTANA; SENATOR ZALES N. ECTON, MONTANA

The emergency conference of western Senators held in the Interior and Insular Committee room (224), called by Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, in response to urgent messages from the storm areas, for 2:30 p. m. on Friday, January 21, decided:

1. To introduce a Senate resolution to be prepared by Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, authorizing the Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Public Roads, and all other Government agencies to render whatever assistance possible in the transportation of feed and livestock and in clearing the roads and trails for such transportation, including the assurance of a deficiency appropriation for money expended within certain limits.

2. To contact the railroads serving the area and determine the possibility of securing emergency freight rates in the transportation of such feed and livestock—60 percent of the regular rate was discussed.

3. To wire each of the governors of the six States for further details as to the extent of the emergency and just what in their opinion would be necessary in the way of such emergency help and assistance.

4. To contact the Federal agencies in working out the details as to just what help can be rendered in this connection.

The subcommittee selected to follow through consisted of Senator GEORGE W. MALONE, of Nevada, chairman, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, and Senator LESTER C. HUNT, of Wyoming.

The wires were sent to the governors on Saturday afternoon and as yet very little information has been secured, probably for the reason that the governors would not be able to do anything officially until this morning, Monday.

The presidents of the railroads serving the area were contacted. Some information has already been received and while not particularly favorable to date, they are working on the problem. The committee will meet with Mr. Edwin Martin, representative for the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad and Mr. Howard Blatchard, representative for the Union Pacific Railroad, today and further information will be forthcoming.

Emergency meetings are being held in the Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Government and we are to be kept advised.

We have been in communication with Mr. John Steelman at the White House who is working on the matter and will keep us advised.

The committee will keep you advised as the information comes in and progress is made.

All the Senators in the six States were notified of the conference and the following attended: Idaho: Mr. James H. Hawley, representing Senator BERT H. MILLER; Nevada: Senator GEORGE W. MALONE; Utah: Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS; Colorado: Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON; Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN; Wyoming: Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Senator LESTER C. HUNT; Montana: Senator ZALES N. ECTON.

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
*Chairman.*
Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS.
Senator LESTER C. HUNT.

---

Emergency meetings are being held in the Department of Agriculture and other departments of the Government and we are to be kept advised.

We have been in communication with Mr. John Steelman at the White House who is working on the matter and will keep us advised.

The committee will meet with Mr. Edwin Martin, representative for Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, and Mr. Howard Blatchard, Union Pacific Railroad, today and further information will be forthcoming.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 24, 1949.*
GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senate:*

Your telegram 22d regarding emergency conditions on livestock in western range territory. Department of Agriculture now have subject up with Chairman Dana of Western Traffic Executive Committee and Great Northern will collaborate fully in handling subject with Department of Agriculture.

F. J. GAVIN,
*President, Great Northern Railway.*

---

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 24, 1949.*
GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Your message 22d concerning relief rates on feed in the distressed areas and livestock out of such areas. Blizzard conditions caused us very heavy expense and with our high operating costs and comparative low rate levels we cannot afford to make reduced rates under present conditions because of situations of this kind. Furthermore our reports of our territory in Wyoming do not indicate that reduction in freight rates would alleviate the situation.

R. L. WILLIAMS,
*Chicago & North Western Railway Co.*

---

THREE FORKS, MONT., *January 4, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Wire Saturday, have just been through our territory in Montana but do not find any distress conditions such you cite and have had no requests for distress rates from interests involved. The trouble is evidently south of us.

C. H. BUFORD.

---

ST. LOUIS, MO., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Missouri Pacific will cooperate with railroads that directly serve range areas referred to your telegram 22 in considering emergency freight rate on feed and livestock.

P. J. NEFF,
*Missouri Pacific Railroad.*

---

SPOKANE WASH., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senate:*

Regarding your wire January 22, 1949: Spokane International Railroad will cooperate to fullest extent on any plan to help feed and transport livestock in critical areas. We will join with other railroads in making emergency rates. As our operating ratio is 80 percent feel rate should be minimum of 80 percent of normal.

F. C. RUMMEL,
*President, Spokane International Railroad.*

---

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator:*

Request emergency reduction feed and livestock rates submitted by Charles B. Bowling, Department of Agriculture, Saturday, to Chairman Dana, Western Traffic Association, who is handling with western lines as emergency matter. Our Montana mileage limited but will join other lines in careful consideration of proposal.

H. C. GROUT,
*President Soo Line.*

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senate:*

Your wire 22d about difficulty being encountered by Nevada livestock industry because of severe weather conditions. Southern Pacific fully appreciative of situation confronting Nevada cattle industry. However, as you know, railroad industry likewise facing critical situation because of failure of rates to meet mounting costs. We have already explained to Nevada Public Service Commission that we are not in position to grant requested reduction in rates on livestock or feed as existing rates are on extremely low basis.

Railroads are being constantly asked to reduce rates in similar situations, as, for example, in connection with severe drought which occurred in California last spring.

A. T. MERCIER,
*President, Southern Pacific.*

---

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 24, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Your wire 22d. No emergency exists in the territory in Montana served by the Northern Pacific. We will do everything necessary to provide service if an emergency develops, but are now operating at very heavy expense, due to extreme cold and snow, and will have little, if any, net income this month. Transportation at less than published rates cannot, in my opinion, be justified under these conditions.

C. E. DENNEY.

---

DENVER, COLO., *January 24, 1949.*
GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator from Nevada.*

DEAR GEORGE: In reply to your telegram, January 22, your problem, as far as livestock is concerned, is not one of freight rates and I see no necessity of establishing emergency rates at this time. Your problem is to get feed to the sheep and cattle on the ranges.

As you well know, west of Ely and in this sheep country, sheep are located 100 to 150 miles from a railroad, and, as Senator WATKINS knows, this is equally true of southern and western Utah and the Utah sheep that range in Nevada.

The worst thing to try to do is to get them to a railroad. What is needed are bulldozers and equipment to clear the snow to get to the sheep and cattle so that hay and pellets can be brought in as quickly as possible and not too late. The worst thing that could happen would be to try to drive this stock to a railroad head unless, of course, tractors and snow plows are used to make a trail for them.

I know this picture because I was interested in a band of sheep which we wintered west of Ely and sheep, incidentally, are more seriously affected in this picture than cattle. Both, however, are in distress.

I agree with your first and second provisions.

Regards,

WILSON MCCARTHY,
*President, Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co.*

---

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 24, 1949.*
GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator, Nevada,*
*Chairman:*

Conditions arising from storms mentioned in your telegram 22d include northwestern Nebraska. There has been a continuous battle in these States with snow conditions the past 3 or 4 weeks. Our main lines are now open and operations approaching normal with constant use of snow plows. Some branch lines still closed. We have been making every effort to restore service at all points. Our general solicitor, Eldon Martin, who is familiar with these conditions, is arriving in Washington today, and I am asking him to see you and others about the situation.

RALPH BUDD.

---

OMAHA, NEBR., *January 23, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Acknowledging your telegram January 22, which reached me here at Salt Lake City today. I presume that in your consideration of questions presented someone must have recognized the fact that the railroads are being put to enormous expense, not only for maintaining service at all but also utterly out of the question to expect all concerned to recover losses sustained under conditions like this through reductions in freight rates which are already so low that adequate maintenance for future service has to be curtailed. My answer, therefore, to applications for emergency freight rates for feed, livestock, or anything else must be in the negative.

G. F. ASHBY,
*President, Union Pacific Railroad Co.*

---

ELKO, NEV., *January 22, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Emergency snow conditions existing throughout Nevada with most critical areas in Elko, White Pine, Lincoln, Nye, Eureka, and Humboldt Counties. Authorization from Congress to Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, Army, and Navy to take any steps necessary to relieve emergency arising from winter storms with assurance of deficiency appropriation to cover of utmost importance. Lack of heavy snow-fighting equipment to stricken areas. Necessary action for emergency railroad rates on feed and livestock to and from critical areas should follow. Losses in both cattle and sheep are increasing daily with many sections still isolated and no reports available. Immediate action for relief is vital.

GORDON GRISWOLD,
*President, National Advisory Board Council.*

---

Mr. JOHN SANFORD,
*The Reno Gazette, Reno, Nev.:*

Have contacted President Truman availability disaster fund storm emergency. Will have information Monday.

Regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator.*

---

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
*President of the United States,*
*The White House, Washington, D. C.:*

Terrific emergency throughout range area of six Western States. Perhaps hardest hit Nevada and Utah. Understand possibility your disaster fund available such cases. All available machinery, State National Guard, Federal Roads Administration, being mobilized to clear highways and trails. Appreciate information as to availability of fund such cases. Will call you Monday morning.

Regards,

Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
*Chairman, Subcommittee, Western Senators.*

---

Mr. A. T. MERCIER,
*President, Southern Pacific Railroad,*
*San Francisco, Calif.*
Mr. GEORGE ASHBY,
*President, Union Pacific Railroad,*
*Las Vegas, Nev.:*

Informed real emergency exists in certain range areas of the six States of Nevada, Utah, Montana, Colorado, Idaho, and Wyoming. I called the Senators of these States together yesterday to determine what could be done in response to emergency requests from the area. As a result I am chairman of a subcommittee including Senators LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, to follow through to: First, mobilize all Federal agencies including the armed services, Bureau of Public Roads, etc., for the use of road- and trail-clearing facilities in order to get feed in to the stock and the livestock out of the dangerous areas; second, to prepare and introduce a Senate resolution on Monday, January 24, authorizing the Bureau of Land Management to make emergency expenditures from its regular appropriation and preparing the way for a deficiency appropriation to make up the amount so expended; and third, to contact the railroads direct serving the areas and determine their attitude toward an emergency freight rate for feed and livestock. The amount of 60 percent of the regular rate was discussed. Have tried to reach you on the telephone since yesterday noon and will call you Monday morning. In the meantime, however, could you let me have the benefit of your suggestions and reaction to the cooperation desired.

Regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator, Nevada.*

---

To: President, Western Pacific Railroad Co., San Francisco, Calif.; President, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; Wilson McCarthy, President, Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., Denver, Colo.; President, Northern Pacific Railway, St. Paul, Minn.; President, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; President, Colorado & Southern Railway, Denver, Colo.; President, The Great Northern Railway, St. Paul, Minn.; President, Chicago & North Western Railway Co., Chicago, Ill.; President, Colorado & Southern Railway Co., Denver, Colo.; President, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; President, Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railroad, Minneapolis, Minn.; President, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; President, Missouri Pacific Railway, St. Louis, Mo.; President, Spokane International Railway, Spokane, Wash.:

"Informed real emergency exists in certain range areas of the six States of Nevada, Utah, Montana, Colorado, Idaho, and Wyoming. I called the Senators of these States together yesterday to determine what could be done in response to emergency requests from the area. As a result I am chairman of a subcommittee, including Senators LESTER C. HUNT, Wyoming, and ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Utah, to follow through to, first, mobilize all Federal agencies including the Armed Services Bureau of Public Roads, etc., for the use of road and trail clearing facilities in order to get feed in to the stock and the livestock out of the dangerous areas; second, to prepare and introduce a Senate resolution on Monday, January 24, authorizing the Bureau of Land Management to make emergency expenditures from its regular appropriation and preparing the way for a deficiency appropriation to make up the amount so expended; and third, to contact the railroads direct serving the areas and determine their attitude toward an emergency freight rate for feed and livestock. The amount of 60 percent of the regular rate was discussed. Could you let me have the benefit of your suggestions and reaction to the cooperation desired.

"Regards,

"GEORGE W. MALONE,
*"United States Senator, Nevada."*

---

RENO, NEV., *January 25, 1949.*
Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Conditions are very bad many areas and cold continues. Distress spotted Army planes

flying hay from Fallon and Minden to Ely and dropping some in remote spots. Government agencies are exerting fully with reasonable success; losses surely severe even with feed supply now. Many can still be saved. Know efforts are appreciated. Best regards.

R. C. TURRITTIN.

---

CARSON CITY, NEV., *January 24, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,

*Senate Office Building:*

Wire just received; my information coincides with press reports; impossible to give specific details. All desert areas, White Pine, Nye, and Lincoln Counties, where winter feeding is not common practice are seriously affected. Heavy losses quite certain; every effort to relieve should be exerted.

R. C. TURRITTIN,
*Nevada State Tax Commission,*

---

JANUARY 25, 1949.

We have just been successful in getting $100,000 allocated from President's disaster fund to be used under supervision Public Works Department coordinating activities Government bureaus within area, $50,000 confined to Indian Bureau, $50,000 to Bureau of Land Management for movement of feed and livestock, clearing roads, trails, etc. Trying to get additional $150,000. Senate resolution introduced yesterday, committee hearings completed today, will be presented to Senate tomorrow for $750,000 limit reimburse Federal agencies for emergency expenditures. These agencies include Bureau of Public Roads, the armed services, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Reclamation, Forest Service, Soil Conservation Service, and all others available within the area.

Committee of western Senators, of which I am chairman, have contacted all railroads serving the affected areas and have received replies, some not favorable but mostly willing negotiate assistance freight rates.

One result is general assurance from all roads that necessary equipment for movement of feed and livestock will be made available through priority. I have contacted C. V. Isbell, contractors, Reno, and they are mobilizing all available private contractors' equipment, including D eights, D sevens, motor patrol equipment, and other machinery suitable for road and trail clearance, all of which if necessary could be obtained under the emergency bill now before the Senate and the President's disaster fund allocation, and they say can be moved into the Ely or Elko areas within 24 hours. The committee is following through, keeping in close touch with all departments. Field of Public Works is leaving for the storm area immediately. Am urging railroads send in representatives assist shipping.

Please wire progress being made, additional equipment and personnel necessary, and what more can be done here. Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator, Nevada, Chairman, Committee of Western Senators.*

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
*United States Senator, Utah.*
LESTER C. HUNT,
*United States Senator, Wyoming.*

---

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,

*United States Senate:*

Thanks for your telegram last night. All carriers appreciate your cooperation and efforts move stock and feed areas affected by severe weather. As I am sure you have heard from many of the executives indicating special efforts they are making not only expediting movement stock and fed but in locating sources of supply of feed.

Assume your telegram last night was sent same executives you telegraphed few days ago and if so not necessary for me to repeat to them.

Regards,

W. H. DANA.

---

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 26, 1949.*

GEORGE W. MALONE,

*United States Senator, Nevada, Chairman:*

Thank you for your night letter about relief to livestock in storm area. Burlington men are on the ground and will continue in intimate touch with situation.

RALPH BUDD.

---

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,

*Senate Office Building:*

In line with your telegram 25th, glad to cooperate to best our ability in making equipment available to move feed and livestock in storm area.

F. G. GURLEY,
*Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, Chicago, Ill.*

---

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 26, 1949.*

GEORGE W. MALONE,

*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building:*

Wire 25th. We are amply supplied with equipment to move both feed and livestock and are sending additional men into our territory to insure fullest measure of cooperation in emergency.

C. H. BUFORD,
*Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, Seattle.*

---

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 26, 1949.*

GEORGE W. MALONE,

*United States Senator,*
*Senate Office Building:*

Wire 25th. We are amply supplied with equipment to move both feed and livestock and are sending additional men into our territory to insure fullest measure of cooperation in emergency.

C. H. BUFORD,
*Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad Co., Seattle.*

---

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,

*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Your telegram January 25. Southern Pacific officers are in close touch and cooperating fully with associations and individuals in this critical matter. At request of Wool Growers Association on January 21 we immediately investigated supplies of hay, feed, etc., available along our lines, and have furnished this information, with quoted prices, to United Livestock Association, Ely. Our representative has been in Ely working closely with the association and will remain there throughout emergency. Necessary action has been taken to assure ample equipment supply to handle feedstuffs and livestock originating on our lines.

A. T. MERCIER,
*President, Southern Pacific Co.*

---

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,

*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Night letter of January 25. As far as we know, no emergency exists in the territory served by Great Northern, but our general livestock agent is now on the ground obtaining first-hand information on this situation.

F. J. GAVIN,
*President, Great Northern Railway Co.*

---

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,

*United States Senator from Nevada:*

Your wire 25th. This company will cooperate fully in relieving livestock emergency in our territory. Our representatives have been instructed to contact stockmen and shippers. Regards.

H. C. GROUT,
*President, Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railway Co.*

---

SPOKANE, WASH., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE,

*United States Senate:*

Re your wire of January 25. Our railroad serves panhandle of Idaho, Spokane to Coeur d'Alene to Eastport. Advise us by wire of any emergency area served by our railroad and we will have representative on job immediately. We will cooperate to our fullest ability.

F. C. RUMMEL,
*President, Spokane International Railroad Co.*

---

To: Ralph Budd, president, Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; Wilson McCarthy, president, Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad Co., Denver, Colo.; C. E. Denny, president, Northern Pacific Railway, St. Paul, Minn.; F. J. Gavin, president, Great Northern Railway, St. Paul, Minn.; R. L. Williams, president, Chicago & North Western Railroad Co., Chicago, Ill.; P. J. Neff, president, Missouri Pacific Railway, St. Louis, Mo.; G. F. Ashby, president, Union Pacific Railroad Co., Omaha, Nebr.; A. T. Mercier, president, Southern Pacific Railroad, San Francisco, Calif.; H. C. Grout, president, Minneapolis, St. Paul & Sault Ste. Marie Railroad, Minneapolis, Minn.; F. C. Rummel, president, Spokane International Railway, Spokane, Wash.; president, Western Pacific Railroad, San Francisco, Calif.; president, Colorado & Southern Railway, Denver, Colo.; president, Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; president, Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railroad, Chicago, Ill.; W. H. Dana, chairman, Transcontinental Freight Bureau, Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.:

"Preliminary wire to you from committee western Senators headed by myself was acquaint you situation let you know Senators and Governors storm area States alive situation, ready cooperate any way possible knowing you vitally interested survival livestock area served your road. One immediate and constructive result assured by your representatives priority equipment necessary move feed and livestock established areas where necessary. Other committee work includes allocation $100,000 from the President's disaster fund allocated $50,000 Indian Bureau and $50,000 Bureau Land Management other governmental organizations coordinated by Public Works Bureau. We are asking for $150,000 more since storm not abated situation more serious than first estimated. Today Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported out joint Senate resolution introduced yesterday. Will go Senate floor tomorrow assuring governmental organizations deficiency appropriation make up regular funds expended necessary work to extent of not more than $750,000. Recommend sending your representatives into emergency area to confer with stockmen and shippers on the ground. Appreciate your cooperation.

"Regards,

"GEORGE W. MALONE,
*"United States Senator."*

JANUARY 25, 1949.

F. G. GURLEY,
*President, Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railroad, Chicago, Ill.:*

Preliminary wire to you from committee western Senators headed by myself was acquaint you situation let you know Senators and Governors storm area States alive situation ready cooperate any way possible knowing you vitally interested survival livestock area served your road. One immediate and constructive result assured by your representatives' priority equipment necessary move feed and livestock established areas where necessary. Other committee work includes allocation $100,000 from the President's disaster fund, allocated $50,000 Indian Bureau, and $50,000 Bureau Land Management, other governmental organizations coordinated by Public Works Bureau. We are asking for $150,000 more since storm not abated. Situation more serious than first estimated. Today Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported out joint Senate resolution introduced yesterday. Will go Senate floor tomorrow assuring governmental organizations deficiency appropriation make up regular funds expended necessary work to extent of not more than $750,000. Recommend sending your representatives into emergency area to confer with stockmen and shippers on the ground. Understand you are not in the emergency area as yet but recent information is that storm area is spreading. Appreciation your cooperation; thanks anyway.

Regards,

GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senate.*

---

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 25, 1949.*

HON. GEORGE W. MALONE,
*Senate Office Building:*

I presume you realize, as I am sure the livestock people in our territory realize, that the storm conditions mentioned in your telegram 22d did not affect our area nor the livestock interests in our territory. Kind regards.

F. G. GURLEY,
*A. T. & S. F., Chicago, Ill.*

---

CHICAGO, ILL., *January 25, 1949.*

SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senate:*

Your telegram reference emergency livestock relief six Western States. Railroads recognize seriousness of situation. Matter under consideration by interested lines.

J. DIFARRINGTON,
*Rock Island Lines.*

---

JANUARY 26, 1949.

ISBELL CONSTRUCTION CO.,
*Reno, Nevada:*

Regarding your telegram, the information on availability and costs of equipment has been put into the hands of Gen. Philip B. Fleming, Administrator, Public Works Administration where authority for expenditure President's disaster fund allocation has been placed. Also responsibility for coordinating other Government organizations. Said he would wire you immediately. Keep me advised.

Regards.

GEORGE W. MALONE,
*United States Senator.*

---

RENO, NEV., *January 26, 1949.*

Hon. Senator GEORGE W. MALONE,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

Equipment available for snow removal in eastern Nevada as follows: Eight D–8 and one D–7 caterpillar with dozers, four motor patrol graders at Reno; Three D–8 caterpillars with dozers and four motor patrols at Fallon. Rates per hour including equipment. Operator and fuel as follows: D–8, $15.50; motor patrols, $8. Contractors to be reimbursed for subsistence. Travel time and difference between straight time and overtime rates of operators and cost of repairs to equipment other than that due to ordinary wear and tear. Due to subzero weather conditions it will be necessary to cut holes in track plates to avoid packing of snow and resulting track breakage. This involves replacement of tracks later. Rates for truck transportation to move equipment to job site $12.50 per hour. Approximate moving time Reno to Ely 20 hours; Reno to Elko 12 hours. However, due to highway conditions trucks could easily be delayed. Can have first equipment on job within 24 hours after notice to proceed.

ISBELL CONSTRUCTION CO.

---

JANUARY 27, 1949.

WASHINGTON, D. C.—The Senate today approved a joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of $3,000,000 for the purpose of breaking trails through the snow-bound areas for feed and livestock, and a resolution reimbursing $500,000 to the President's disaster fund created last year, it was announced today by Senator MALONE. To date $300,000 has been allocated from the President's disaster fund to the Western States, including fifty-thousand designated for the Indian Bureau and today a further request is being made for an additional $500,000 for the same purpose.

The cooperative response from the Government bureaus has been 100 percent and the railroads have placed a priority on equipment for the transportation of feed and livestock and are sending their representatives into the areas, the Senator advised.

Also the heavy equipment mobilized by the committee in the State of Nevada and other areas is now in use.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I inquire what is the parliamentary situation?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The parliamentary situation is that the joint resolution is before the Senate.

Mr. WATKINS. Is it open to amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is a committee amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof, the following:

That (a) in order to transport sufficient feed and otherwise take care of livestock isolated by storms in the Western States, all agencies of the Government performing functions in the affected areas are authorized, upon request of the Governor of any such State and the approval of the coordinating agency, to break trails through snow-bound areas in such State and to take such other action as may be necessary temporarily to protect such livestock.

(b) Such agencies of the Government are also authorized to take action to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms, if the coordinating agency certifies such action is necessary.

SEC. 2. The President shall designate an agency of the Government (herein called the "coordinating agency") to coordinate all activities of Government agencies performing functions under this joint resolution. Any Government agency performing such functions is authorized to cooperate with, or to use the personnel, supplies, facilities, and other resources of any other agency of the Federal Government and, with the consent of the head thereof, of any State, county, or local governmental agency.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $750,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. Any unexpended balance of funds appropriated for any purposes to any agency of the Government performing activities under this joint resolution are hereby made available to carry out such activities and deficiency appropriations as are hereby authorized, subject to the limitation specified in this section to reimburse in full the appropriation to such agency for any expenditures made hereunder. Sums appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained herein shall be available to reimburse in full the appropriation to any such agency for any expenditure made or obligation incurred, prior to the date of designation of the coordinating agency, if such expenditure or obligation is certified by the head of such agency to have been necessary in accomplishing the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC 4. Any agency performing activities under this joint resolution is authorized to employ additional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States, by contract or otherwise, for the acquisition, rental, or hire of equipment, services, materials, and supplies, for shipping, drayage, travel, and communication, and for the supervision and administration of its activities under this joint resolution. Such obligations may be incurred in excess of any appropriations available to such agency, but the aggregate amount of such obligations and any other expenses incurred pursuant to this joint resolution shall not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 3. Neither section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) nor section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 665) shall be applicable to any action taken pursuant to this joint resolution. The provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, shall not be applicable to additional personnel employed hereunder.

SEC. 5. The authority conferred by this joint resolution shall not extend beyond April 15, 1949.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the committee amendment was agreed upon by the committee and the representative of the Bureau of the Budget.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment is open to amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has been recognized.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 4, section 3, line 17, to strike out the figures "$750,000" and insert "$3,000,000." I wish to speak briefly on the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Utah will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In section 3, on page 4, line 17, in the committee amendment, after the words "not to exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah to the committee amendment.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the committee heard considerable evidence with respect to the amount of money which would be necessary to carry on the program already under way by the Federal agency. I now have figures before me for some of the States involved and some districts in the States, from a few of the services which have been active during this emergency. A note from one of the agencies gives me the information that in Utah, Colorado, and one grazing district in Nevada, the following governmental agencies—the Forest Service, the Soil Conservation Service, the Indian Service, and the Bureau of Land Management—have up to January 26 expended approximately $400,000 in storm relief. If the expenses continue as they have been running until February 5, the amount will be $570,000. This expenditure has amounted to approximately $170,000 a week. This note was just handed to me, having been received from the Bureau of Land Management, which has expended the larger portion of the sums named.

The storms began early in December in my State, and they have been continuous off and on ever since that time. We have had subzero temperatures much of the time, even when the storms were occurring. Sheep and cattle, and particularly sheep, are ranged on what is called winter range, on the western deserts of my State. The same condition exists also in Nevada and in other sections of the West where large flocks of sheep are ranged on summer range in the national forests, and are later taken to the western deserts, where they can get forage for the winter without being hand-fed.

The situation has developed to the point where, instead of having a normal supply of snow, which usually is barely enough to supply water for the sheep on the desert, it is now impossible for them to move more than a few yards from the camp where they usually come in for the night, and where they are bedded down. Because of this condition it will be necessary to feed for a long time.

Only about an hour and a half ago I received word that another snowstorm is raging in Utah and portions of Nevada, and other parts of the West. This means that the roads which have already been opened by the combined efforts of the counties, States, and Federal agencies involved will probably be filled with drifts in another 24 hours. It means that those agencies will have to use all their facilities day and night to keep the roads open, or these animals will perish. Even after the roads are opened and the storms cease for a time, there is so much snow on the ground that it will be impossible for the animals to forage for natural feed. The snow is entirely too deep, even for cattle to forage; and for sheep, of course, it is an utter impossibility. That means that they will have to be fed. It means that a constant patrol will be necessary to keep the roads open. As many of the sheep as can be moved to feed lots near the main highways will, of course, be moved; but there will be a continual expenditure.

One of the men from the Sheep Growers' Association in my State reported this morning that the probabilities are that relief will be needed for 60 days, in the normal course of a winter such as we usually have in the Mountain States. That does not mean that any abnormal condition will exist from now on, but even in the normal course of the weather, it will be necessary to have help for the next 60 days. The first 2 feet of snow which has fallen on the ground has become heavily saturated with water, and frozen, and it will be a long time before that snow melts. It may be even as late as the first of May before the sheep can get natural water and forage on the desert.

Mr. O'MAHONEY rose.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator from Wyoming wish me to yield to him?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to make a comment.

Mr. WATKINS. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to say that the committee was desirous of holding the sum to be authorized down as close as possible to the need. I know that what the Senator from Utah has just said is true. I have also received official word today from the State of Wyoming that snow is again falling and the wind is blowing. The new snow and the old snow are drifting and closing the roads. So I have no way of estimating what the eventual cost of this operation will be. I do know that the State Legislature of Wyoming has already made an appropriation. So also has the Legislature of South Dakota. If I am correctly advised, the Legislature of the State of Nebraska has also acted.

In view of the fact that this bill will have to be considered in the House, I am wondering if the Senator would modify his amendment so as to make it $2,000,000 instead of $3,000,000.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator that yesterday the State of Utah appropriated $250,000 to aid in this relief work. I understand that the States which have not appropriated money are preparing to make appropriations.

I point out to the Senator that the Bureau of Land Management stated to me only today that unless a considerable sum is authorized it will be necessary for that agency to close down its work in probably less than a week. The funds they now have are not sufficient to carry on much longer. Having spent as much as they have spent in the districts and States to which I have referred, not to mention the other States which are involved, they will be out of money and will not be able to carry on. In my judgment, it would be much better to keep the amount high enough to take care of these emergencies as they are taking place, rather than to make the sum too small. My judgment is that even $3,000,000 will be inadequate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the bill must go to the House for consideration, I am not disposed to object to the Senator's amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to the committee amendment on page 4, line 17.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have had some correspondence and telephone calls from the governor of my State, and I find that the State legislature has appropriated $100,000 for quick relief. It did so a few days ago. The information coming to me is that feed for this livestock is in the area. What is needed is funds to augment the efforts of the State highway department. I fear that the language is not quite broad enough. If the Senator from Wyoming will look at line 25 on page 3, he will notice that the language authorizes these agencies to break trails. After the word "trails" I should like to add the words "open highways and farm-to-market roads." I offer that amendment on page 3, line 25, in the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 25, in the committee amendment, after the word "trails", it is proposed to insert the words "open highways and farm-to-market roads."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I quite agree with the purpose of the amendment; and on behalf of the committee, I shall be very glad to accept it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment to the committee amendment is agreed to.

Are there further amendments to be offered to the committee amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to, as follows:

That (a) in order to transport sufficient feed and otherwise take care of livestock isolated by storms in the Western States, all agencies of the Government performing functions in the affected areas are authorized, upon request of the Governor of any such State and the approval of the coordinating agency, to break trails and open highways and farm-to-market roads through snowbound areas in such State and to take such other action as may be necessary temporarily to protect such livestock.

(b) Such agencies of the Government are also authorized to take action to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms, if the coordinating agency certifies such action is necessary.

SEC. 2. The President shall designate an agency of the Government (herein called the "coordinating agency") to coordinate all activities of Government agencies performing functions under this joint resolution. Any Government agency performing such functions is authorized to cooperate with, or to use the personnel, supplies, facilities, and other resources of any other agency of the Federal Government and, with the consent of the head thereof, of any State, county, or local governmental agency.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. Any unexpended balance of funds appropriated for any purposes to any agency of the Gov-

ernment performing activities under this joint resolution are hereby made available to carry out such activities and deficiency appropriations are hereby authorized, subject to the limitation specified in this section, to reimburse in full the appropriation to such agency for any expenditures made hereunder. Sums appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained herein shall be available to reimburse in full the appropriation to any such agency for any expenditure made or obligation incurred, prior to the date of designation of the coordinating agency, if such expenditure or obligation is certified by the head of such agency to have been necessary in accomplishing the purposes of this joint resolution.

SEC. 4. Any agency performing activities under this joint resolution is authorized to employ additional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States, by contract or otherwise, for the acquisition, rental, or hire of equipment, services, materials and supplies, for shipping, drayage, travel, and communication, and for the supervision and administration of its activities under this joint resolution. Such obligations may be incurred in excess of any appropriations available to such agency, but the aggregate amount of such obligations and any other expenses incurred pursuant to this joint resolution shall not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 3. Neither section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) nor section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 665) shall be applicable to any action taken pursuant to this joint resolution. The provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, shall not be applicable to additional personnel employed hereunder.

SEC. 5. The authority conferred by this joint resolution shall not extend beyond April 15, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority, I offer, and desire to have adopted, a preamble to the joint resolution.

The preamble was read and agreed to as follows:

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior and other agencies of the Government have made expenditures and incurred obligations in connection with the emergency resulting from the continuing unprecedented storms in the Western States; and

Whereas additional authority is necessary to reimburse the appropriations of such agencies for expenditures heretofore made and to provide for the continuation of relief in such areas until the emergency created by such storms has abated: Therefore be it

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to authorize the United States to break through snow-bound areas in western range States, to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms in such States, and to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the report of the committee be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 38) to authorize the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Reclamation, and other agencies of the Government to break through snow-bound areas in the western range States, and to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms which have created an emergency, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with the following amendment in the nature of a substitute, and recommend that the resolution, as amended, do pass.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

"That (a) in order to transport sufficient feed and otherwise take care of livestock isolated by storms in the Western States, all agencies of the Government performing functions in the affected areas are authorized, upon request of the Governor of any such State and the approval of the coordinating agency, to break trails through snow-bound areas in such State and to take such other action as may be necessary temporarily to protect such livestock.

"(b) Such agencies of the Government are also authorized to take action to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms, if the coordinating agency certifies such action is necessary.

"SEC. 2. The President shall designate an agency of the Government (herein called the 'coordinating agency') to coordinate all activities of Government agencies performing functions under this joint resolution. Any Government agency performing such functions is authorized to cooperate with, or to use the personnel, supplies, facilities, and other resources of any other agency of the Federal Government and, with the consent of the head thereof, of any State, county, or local governmental agency.

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $750,000, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution. Any unexpended balance of funds appropriated for any purposes to any agency of the Government performing activities under this joint resolution are hereby made available to carry out such activities and deficiency appropriations are hereby authorized, subject to the limitation specified in this section, to reimburse in full the appropriation to such agency for any expenditures made hereunder. Sums appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained herein shall be available to reimburse in full the appropriation to any such agency for any expenditure made or obligation incurred, prior to the date of designation of the coordinating agency, if such expenditure or obligation is certified by the head of such agency to have been necessary in accomplishing the purposes of this joint resolution.

"SEC. 4. Any agency performing activities under this joint resolution is authorized to employ additional personnel without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, and to incur obligations on behalf of the United States, by contract or otherwise, for the acquisition, rental, or hire of equipment, services, materials and supplies, for shipping, drayage, travel, and communication, and for the supervision and administration of its activities under this joint resolution. Such obligations may be incurred in excess of any appropriations available to such agency, but the aggregate amount of such obligations and any other expenses incurred pursuant to this joint resolution shall not exceed the amount authorized to be appropriated under section 3. Neither section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C., sec. 5) nor section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C., sec. 665) shall be applicable to any action taken pursuant to this joint resolution. The provisions of section 607 of the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, shall not be applicable to additional personnel employed hereunder.

"SEC. 5. The authority conferred by this joint resolution shall not extend beyond April 15, 1949."

Hearings were held by the committee on this resolution at which representatives of the Interior and Agriculture Departments, armed services, Forest Service, Public Roads Administration, and the American Red Cross were heard.

It was pointed out that the snowstorms and extremely cold weather which have occurred in certain Western States are without question worse than western winter conditions in the memory of any living man. The admitted dire results are impossible to estimate. Senators and Congressmen from all the snow-bound States have been receiving frantic telephonic and telegraphic requests for Government action and assistance.

The resolution aims to provide immediate emergency relief in the areas affected by the continuing serious winter storms by cooperating with the governors of the States to the fullest extent possible with the money authorized to be appropriated herein. Such cooperation will take the form of furnishing, among other things, road-breaking equipment to open and keep open the roads in the devastated areas so that livestock now isolated by the storms may be fed. The resolution also legalizes expenditures of, and provides for reimbursement to, Federal agencies which have already engaged in relief measures. It makes clear that any sums heretofare spent by such agencies are not a violation of the antideficiency law. The aggregate amount of money that may be spent for the purposes specified in the resolution (whether made on or before the date of enactment of the resolution) is $750,000. It is also provided that such money may be used for emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms. A coordinating agency, to be designated by the President, will coordinate all activities of Government agencies performing functions under the resolution so that duplication and overlapping of effort will be avoided.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior William E. Warne advised the committee that certain bureaus of his Department have been on an emergency operating basis for the past 10 days. The conditions are extremely bad in western Utah, eastern Nevada, Wyoming, and Montana. The main roads were opened at one time during the week in Utah and eastern Nevada, but they have been closed again by subsequent storms.

Secretary Warne said there is great distress among the Indians, particularly in certain sections of the Great Plains. He stated that in order to get the roads opened all the equipment available to the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and other agencies at the disposal of the regional disaster committee has been working vigorously, and that now the equipment available is breaking down as the result of continuous and trying operation.

Secretary Warne added that "we are now moving on a basis of dire emergency, and we will need—seriously need—the kind of authority that this resolution contains to back up the actions we have taken." He said the figure of $500,000 in the original resolution was much too low and asked that it be increased. While no accurate estimate can be given at this time, he believes, if the winter continues in only moderate severity, expenditures will be heavy, but, if it remains critical, they may greatly soar.

Representatives of the American Red Cross advised the committee that between thirty and thirty-five thousand dollars have already been spent by the organization for emergency type of assistance to meet human needs.

Their records show that 30 counties in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Nebraska alone are in disaster status.

Reports from Wyoming's statistician for the department of agriculture, in Cheyenne, show that 55,200 head of cattle and 100,000 head of sheep have already been lost. On Monday the temperature in Wyoming was as low as 40° below in one area, and we are advised that a consistent below-zero temperature, ranging from 12° to 80° below zero, persists in Montana.

A representative of the Federal Works Agency stated that, while the State highway departments and the county highway departments had had the resources to get the main roads cleared, these were fast becoming expended, and there seems to be a lack of authority and money to get from main roads into where the cattle are located.

The representative of the United States Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, stated that—

"In our judgment, we need to be financed to take care of about 15 complete outfits in the inner-mountain region at about $100 a day. That would be 15 to 20 outfits, with an additional number in the Rocky Mountain region, and then, if the situation develops in Arizona, as we, too, are getting rumors it might, we will need an additional amount down there. Altogether, for 30 days, it is our estimate that it would take us between $90,000 and $120,000 for equipment that we have available and wish to throw into this job."

The committee was also informed that in one particular area 75 bulldozers were available at a rental rate of $8 per hour with operators—at a cost for a 30-day period of $432,000.

In view of the action of the President in designating the Federal Works Agency (acting through the Bureau of Community Facilites) to enter into agreemnts with the governors of the respective States with regard to the funds he has made available, it was the opinion of the committee that this resolution should be accordingly amended.

It is also the view of the committee that the amount of $500,000 is inadequate for the existing emergency. The amount has been increased to $750,000.

The continued destruction of livestock is extremely serious and of great interest to the whole country. The estimate of loss at the present time is from 30 to 50 percent. It is of inestimable importance that the roads be opened at the earliest possible moment.

The Legislature of Wyoming has appropriated $200,000, the State of South Dakota $100,000, and the State of Nebraska is now considering an appropriation of $500,000 for assistance in those States.

### DISASTER RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably House Joint Resolution 112, making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes. This is similar to the Senate joint resolution which has just been passed by the Senate. The Senate joint resolution provided for larger appropriations. However, it seems to be very necessary to start this work at once. The House has already adjourned, and the only opportunity to start it at once is to act upon the House joint resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Without objection, the report will be received, and the joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

### MEMBERSHIP IN PROPOSED NORTH ATLANTIC PACT AGAINST AGGRESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, during the past week the representatives of the Scandinavian countries of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark have been meeting to discuss, among other things, whether they should or should not become members of the proposed North Atlantic pact against aggression.

Press reports both here and abroad indicate that Sweden wants to sit on the side lines, Norway wishes to ally herself with the Western World, and Denmark is trying to compose the different points of view.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article from the London Times of January 20, to be followed by an article from the New York Times of January 25.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the London Times of January 20, 1949]

#### SCANDINAVIA AND DEFENSE—AGREEMENT UNLIKELY

(From our diplomatic correspondent)

The Prime Ministers, Foreign Ministers, and military experts of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, accompanied probably by six members of Parliament from each country, are to meet in Copenhagen on Saturday for further discussion of the question of mutual defense and the attitude of Scandinavia to the Atlantic Pact. There will be a final meeting in Oslo on January 29, but the Norwegian Prime Minister has given the opinion that a decision may be reached at Saturday's meeting.

It is understood that the Danish and Norwegian Governments were asked by Washington toward the end of the year whether they wished to be invited to the conference that will draft the Atlantic pact of mutual assistance. Discussions with Sweden were initiated, and the issue, now crystallized, has caused some heartburning. Briefly, it is the issue whether, as Sweden insists, the traditional Swedish policy of armed neutrality should be extended through the medium of an exclusively Scandinavian defense pact to cover Norway and Denmark, or whether, as Norway proposes, the Scandinavian countries, while cooperating between themselves, should also seek the security of the Atlantic pact.

#### DENMARK AS MEDIATOR

Denmark's role has been that of a mediator intent on holding the three countries together. One of its suggestions met Sweden's idea of a Scandinavian pact, but would have left the signatories free to associate themselves, if they wished, also with the Atlantic pact. Its final suggestion, mentioned by our Stockholm correspondent yesterday, was that the Western Powers be asked whether military support would be available to a Scandinavian bloc owing no obligations either to west or east. That was scotched by a State Department announcement, since confirmed by the American Ambassadors in the three capitals, that no military supplies or raw materials would be available to countries (other than a few to which America has specific obligations) not associated with the United States in collective defense arrangements.

Sweden's objections to joining the Atlantic pact can be understood. She has by her neutrality policy succeeded in staying out of two world wars. She suspects that, as an ally of the Western Powers, she would be immediately in the front line in the event of a conflict with the Soviet Union. In the meantime her strategic position would have been impaired if Scandinavia's adherence to the Atlantic pact were made the pretext by the Soviet Union for a tough policy toward Finland. Norway, whose experience is rather different, puts little value on neutrality once aggression has been unleashed anywhere, and argues that it is confusion and disunity among all the countries of the west, rather than their solidarity for defense, that is more likely to tempt a would-be aggressor.

#### SWEDEN'S RESOURCES

A Scandinavian defense pact is an advance in Swedish thinking, but the Norwegians are strengthened in their position by knowledge that Sweden lacks the resources—particularly raw materials such as oil—to sustain an adequate military establishment for Sweden, to say nothing of equipping and protecting Norway and Sweden as well. So much has been publicly admitted by the Chief of Staff of the Swedish armed forces, General Jung. Of course, the signatories of the Atlantic pact might find that there is not as much in the way of military supplies to go round as they could wish. That is not to say, however, as some Swedes do, that France or Britain would prefer Scandinavia to remain outside the Atlantic pact until French and British needs in military equipment have been met. The advantage of having Scandinavia associated with the continuous planning of the defense of the western world is regarded as outweighing by far the disadvantage that Scandinavia's needs in military equipment will reduce the amount available to other signatories.

Latest statements by Scandinavian political leaders, and opinions in the press, indicate that no agreement between the Three Powers is to be expected. Sweden, for the time being at any rate, is likely to go its isolationist way, and Denmark is likely to follow Norway into the Atlantic pact.

---

[From the New York Times of Jan. 25. 1949]

#### ACCORD NO NEARER ON NORDIC DEFENSE—TALKS IN COPENHAGEN HALT, BUT WILL BE RESUMED ON SATURDAY IN OSLO

(By George Axelsson)

COPENHAGEN, DENMARK, January 24.—The question of a Scandinavian mutual defense pact remained unsettled when the high-level talks between Norway, Sweden, and Denmark ended here tonight. The door has been left open for further talks in Oslo.

It proved impossible here to compose the differences between Sweden and Norway on an approach to the United States for arms for a Nordic defense union. The next try in Oslo this coming Saturday will not necessarily be the final one.

A well-nigh unbridgeable gap exists between Norway and Sweden. Norway seems determined to pledge membership in the Atlantic Union in return for arms from the United States while Sweden would make merely a noncommital request for such aid. If a formula can be found for a joint Scandinavian approach, the fate of the proposed Nordic defense union still will hinge on the answer by the United States.

Throughout the Copenhagen conference the Swedes have been playing for time, observers agree. Yesterday they moved to have the conference adjourned one week. The

move is aimed at consulting parliamentary opinion at home more fully in view of the threatening break-down.

TO STUDY ATLANTIC PACT DRAFT

It was also reported that the Scandinavian ambassadors who were called home from Washington for consultation carried the draft of the proposed Atlantic pact, and the recess would afford a chance to study the document thoroughly. As it is, the Oslo conference scheduled for Friday was put off one day as a concession to Sweden.

The Scandinavian statesmen are consoling themselves over the lack of progress in Copenhagen by saying that at least all political parties in the respective countries are now fully informed on all the problems arising out of the proposed pact.

The Scandinavian premiers and foreign and defense ministers in a joint communiqué said that agreement had been reached on two points. These were:

First, to achieve under certain conditions a mutually binding but outwardly independent Scandinavian defense group within the framework of the United Nations Charter. This would mean coordination of staffs, military forces, war production, and standardization of equipment among the three countries.

Second, that it should be ascertained whether the countries participating in a Scandinavian alliance would be able to obtain the equipment needed for reconstruction of their defenses within a definite period and on certain well-defined economic terms.

PREMIERS MAKE COMMENTS

After the conference each of the three Scandinavian premiers issued statements on the situation to the correspondents of their countries. The gist of this comment was that the difficulties of reaching agreement proved greater than expected and that to cite the Swedish Premier, Tage Erlander, "In reality we have not achieved much more progress on Monday than we did Sunday."

Norwegian Premier Einar Gerhardsen, for the Norwegian delegation, expressed the opinion that there was little hope of agreement on a Nordic Alliance being reached at the coming week-end meeting in Oslo.

Norwegian delegates have hinted at the possibility of yet another conference, this time in Stockholm, shortly afterward, since none of the Scandinavian countries wishes to bear the responsibility before home opinion for breaking up the present negotiations.

The Danish representatives maintained throughout discussions that the United States ought to show more understanding for the difficulties of Scandinavia's geographical position vis-ā-vis the Soviet Union. They also quoted the Swedes as being skeptical of United States ability to help Scandinavia materially, alliance or no alliance, in view of its present and ever-growing commitments. This was echoed in the highest Danish policy circles, where one recurring question is, "What will be Scandinavia's priority number with and without alliance? If we must trail the United States, Britain, France, Holland, and Belgium, maybe we are better off fending for ourselves."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we have arrived at the place in history when we must face the fact that peace is indivisible. Aggression or the threat of aggression anywhere in the world is of vital concern to the law-abiding nations everywhere in the world.

The Scandinavian nations, as well as the United States of America, are members of the United Nations. If this organization for collective security means anything, it surely means that its members will not sit idly by while an aggressor power overtly attacks its neighbors.

Within the framework of the United Nations Charter there is provision for regional security pacts. Our Nation has already become a signatory to one embracing the Western Hemisphere. Both historic background and geographic proximity make the prospective North Atlantic pact of equal importance to this Nation.

With the degree of collective security such a pact will furnish, it may be possible for the free nations of western Europe, with ECA funds from this country, to move on to the constructive settlement of their economic problems. We can hardly expect a long-term recovery when the fear of aggression hangs over the Continent.

When the North Atlantic pact comes before the American Congress the American people are going to be called upon to reverse their historic policy. They can hardly be expected to do so with enthusiasm, Mr. President, when nations with a closer proximity to the seat of potential aggression think they can remain neutral. Of course, they can do no such thing. If Soviet Russia moves to invade western Germany and western Europe, the other members of the United Nations must immediately act in their common defense or the whole collective security idea will perish then and there. If the United States and the Western World should be defeated by Soviet Russia, do the Scandinavian countries think they could remain as a free island in a world totalitarian sea?

In a real sense there can be no neutrals in the struggle to establish a free world of free men whose peace will be assured under a collective-security system based on international law and justice. No member of the world community can "sit this one out." It is a common responsibility, and no nation has the moral right to be a drone while its neighbors take all the risks.

The Netherlands, Denmark, and Norway, all of which were able to be neutrals in World War I, found that the choice was not theirs to make in World War II. Others should take judicial notice of this fact.

In this age of the airplane and the atom there will be no neutrals should there be a world war III. The only real hope any nation has to keep out of war is to prevent war from breaking out. This can best be accomplished by making the collective-security system so strong that no potential aggressor nation will dare take the calculated risk of making an overt attack upon a neighbor.

A heavy responsibility rests upon the Governments and people of the Scandinavian countries. If they refuse to join the North Atlantic pact against aggression, we may assume that they would likewise refuse to fulfill their obligations under the United Nations Charter. If this be so, though I sincerely hope it is not, then we must make our plans for economic and military aid accordingly.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk sundry amendments to Senate bill 249, and ask that they be printed and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the four amendments I submit are to the bill presented by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the purpose of which is to restore the Wagner Act and to repeal for the most part sections of the Taft-Hartley law. The effect of the amendments is to restore to the Wagner Act some 16 or 17 different provisions of the Taft-Hartley law. I may say that the committee has acted with such haste that revisions of these amendments may be necessary. We have made certain changes from the Taft-Hartley law, and I have made certain changes in presenting them. They are presented so that they may be before the committee in the hearings which are to begin on Friday and which are to continue until February 10.

Mr. President, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has adopted one of the most extraordinary procedures and one of the most extraordinary resolutions relating to procedure which I have seen in my experience in the Senate. I should like to read it to the Senate:

It is hereby resolved by this committee that the Taft-Hartley law be repealed and that the National Labor Relations Act, known as the Wagner Act, be restored as it existed at the time of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley bill with the single amendment as it stands in the Thomas bill (S. 249), which continues the National Labor Relations Board as a five-man body, as it now exists; that hearings begin forthwith on amendments to the Wagner Act consistent with the proposals made by the President; that said hearings be closed not later than February 10, 1949, and that the bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law be then reported to the Senate with such amendment or amendments to the Wagner Act as the committee may deem wise.

Apparently the drafter of the resolution seems to have thought that the committee could repeal the Taft-Hartley law, could restore the Wagner Act, and could then hold hearings on the Wagner Act; which, of course, is an utterly fantastic proposal. The purpose of the resolution could have been accomplished simply by saying, "We are going to hold hearings on the Thomas bill (S. 249)"; but in order to give the impression that in some way the Taft-Hartley law was being repealed first, in order to give the impression that this was a two-package approach instead of a one-package approach, this extraordinary language was adopted. The impression is given that the Taft-Hartley law, instead of being amended, is being repealed.

Of course, the effect of the whole resolution is that the committee contemplates an amendment of the Taft-Hartley law, a drastic amendment perhaps, but still an amendment. Of course, the President himself proposes the same course. He recognizes many of the good things of the Taft-Hartley law, and proceeds to say that they should be enacted. He says in his message to the Congress:

That act (the Taft-Hartley law) should be repealed.

The Wagner Act should be reenacted. However, certain improvements, which I recommended to the Congress 2 years ago, are

needed. Jurisdictional strikes and unjustifiable secondary boycotts should be prohibited.

The Taft-Hartley law did prohibit both of those types of strike. There may be some question as to the definition of secondary boycotts, and it may be necessary to amend it in some regard, but the President has thereby endorsed that provision of the Taft-Hartley law.

The President then goes on to say:

The use of economic force to decide issues arising out of the interpretation of existing contracts should be prevented.

That is what the Taft-Hartley law does. The President is endorsing the retention of that feature of the law.

The President then says:

Without endangering our democratic freedoms—

In the way in which they were endangered by the bill which he proposed in the case of the railroad strike—

Means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest.

That is what the Taft-Hartley law did.

There were various amendments recommended by our committee last year, and various ways of improving the law, and the President is endorsing that provision of the law. Of course, the talk about repealing the Taft-Hartley law is for public consumption and for the benefit of the labor union leaders who are demanding its repeal, but the actual purpose is to amend the law.

The resolution, however, in other respects is unwise and harsh. The time allowed for hearings on a matter of this importance is wholly inadequate. The hearings are to begin on Friday and will run for a period of approximately 2 weeks, approximately 10 or 11 days of actual hearings.

Two years ago, when we considered labor legislation, we threw the hearings open to the entire country. We permitted everyone to come and testify. We gave them as much time as they desired. The hearings extended over a period of approximately 6 weeks. The single issue of what is the best method of preventing strikes against the national interest and strikes which affect the entire country is a serious and difficult problem. It alone requires the best possible advice we can obtain. We have had no testimony on how the law has operated within the last 2 years. We have had no testimony on the specific objections which have perhaps properly arisen to the operation of the law. As a matter of fact, I suspect that the reason the hearings are to be so short is in order that labor representatives may not be questioned in detail as to what is the matter with this provision, or what is the matter with that provision, and be forced to make specific criticisms instead of engaging in the general name calling and vociferous denunciation which has characterized their campaign up to this time. In effect, the shortness of the hearings chokes off the expression of public opinion on what is perhaps the most important question before the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. President, as a matter of fact, the chairman of the committee has announced that he will present amendments such as the President has recommended. They are not yet prepared. We do not know what they are. The hearing will be begun, perhaps, without our knowing what the amendments are.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am a little surprised to hear the Senator from Ohio say that he does not have any general idea as to what the general scope of the President's proposals referred to in the resolution of Monday is. It was specifically stated in the resolution that the hearings would be upon amendments consistent with the President's proposals for the amendment of the Wagner Act. The President on more than one occasion has made specific recommendations to the Congress for amendment of the Wagner Act which are all a matter of record. So I am surprised that the Senator from Ohio, with his full knowledge of what goes on here, does not recall that the President set out the general subject of his proposals in his messages to the Congress, and that that is what the committee has reference to in its resolution of last Monday.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I regret that the Senator from Florida was not present when I read the President's proposals, one of which was that "Means should be provided for settling or preventing strikes in vital industries which affect the public interest." I suppose there are a dozen different ways in which that might be done. We do not know what the President's proposal is in that regard, or whether it is any different from the language of the Taft-Hartley law. So hearings are now being set, to be terminated on February 10, without our even knowing on what subject the hearings will be held.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not care to yield at this point.

Furthermore, Mr. President, it has been proposed to begin hearings forthwith on the proposals offered by the President. Apparently the men who wrote the bill intended to shut off hearings on any other amendments not consistent with the recommendations made by the President. Evidently the intention was to prevent hearings on various questions relating to the Taft-Hartley law. Apparently the effort of the committee is to limit hearings to amendments submitted by the President.

Of course, I do not think that can legally or otherwise be done, so I do not take the resolution very seriously. But it shows the arbitrary character of the majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in attempting to exclude public consideration of amendments.

I do not see how the chairman of the committee can refuse to hold hearings on amendments which are offered by other members of the committee or offered by other Senators. The subject, of course, is so complicated and involved that it is difficult to see how a witness who wishes to testify on one feature of the law can be excluded from testifying on some other feature. But, according to the resolution, that appears to be the intention of the majority of the members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Therefore, Mr. President, I wish to put on record my protest against the arbitrary action of the committee. During the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress, I know of no instance in which we did not give full and reasonable hearings; I know of no instance in which hearings were not given commensurate with the importance of the subject involved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am afraid the Senator from Ohio overlooks the fact that there was an important public hearing on the Taft-Hartley bill in the United States of America on November 2. The Senator from Ohio would naturally like to discredit the hearing which was held on this subject on November 2. Naturally, if it were within the power of the Senator from Ohio, he would like to prevent the decision made on the Taft-Hartley law by the American people on November 2 from being implemented by this Congress. But I think, Mr. President, it is the disposition of the Democratic majority to keep the pledges of the Democratic platform and, of course, to keep the specific pledge made to the American people, namely, to secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, this is not a new subject to most of us; it is not a new subject to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. We have held extended, prolonged, and protracted hearings and discussions of the subject. I am informed that the record comprises more than 2,700 printed pages of testimony. So, Mr. President, the Democrats on the committee, after consultation and consideration of the subject, did not deem it necessary to go back and repeat all that voluminous testimony. We are not cutting off anyone. They have already been heard.

Several of us on the committee filed a minority report when the Taft-Hartley bill was before the committee in 1947. We knew then what the bill contained. We knew then we were opposed to it. The President was opposed to it. He votoed the bill, and the Democratic platform pledged to the American people the unqualified repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. We did not say in that platform, Mr. President, that we advocated amendment of the Taft-Hartley law, as was implied, if not expressed, in the Republican platform. The American people knew that there was a sharp difference of opinion between the two major parties over the Taft-Hartley legislation; that it was one of the principal issues in the campaign settled by the election of November 2. They knew that if the Republicans were returned to the control of the Congress,

and if a Republican President were in the White House, the Taft-Hartley law, at best, would be amended only in minor and inconsequential and nonbasic particulars. But the Democratic platform, approaching the matter forthrightly and directly, as I believe that platform may be said to have done upon other important issues, pledged to the American people the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. President, what did that mean? It meant going back to the Wagner Act. It meant the reinstatement and the restoration of labor-management legislation as it existed when the iniquitous Taft-Hartley law was passed by the Congress, and made effective over the veto of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, let me read the resolution that was agreed to by eight, all the Democratic members, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

It is hereby resolved by this committee that the Taft-Hartley law be repealed.

Is it not good ethics to keep one's pledged word to his constituency, the electorate of this country? That is what we are trying to do. We attempted it on Monday of this week.

And that the National Labor Relations Act, known as the Wagner Act, be restored as it existed at the time of the enactment of the Taft-Hartley bill with the single amendment as it stands in the Thomas bill (S. 249) which continues the National Labor Relations Board as a five-man body as it now exists.

I interpolate, it was a three-man board prior to the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law. We do make a single exception in repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. We recognize the amendment in S. 249 to continue the board as a five-man board instead of reducing it to a three-man board.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be more generous than the Senator from Ohio was. I shall yield for more than one question.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to my distinguished friend that I have listened to his remarks as attentively as I could, and he is usually very clear in what he has to say, but I do not understand from its language whether or not it was the purpose of the resolution adopted by the majority of the committee to report a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act flatly, in those terms. Is that what the committee is purporting to do? Or what did it purport to do?

Mr. PEPPER. I think I can answer that by continuing to read the resolution to its conclusion. If the resolution does not speak for itself, I shall answer directly. I continue to read:

That hearings to begin forthwith—

Incidentally, they are to begin tomorrow, according to the notice of the chairman. This resolution was adopted Monday, to tomorrow is "forthwith" from Monday, I would take it—

on amendments to the Wagner Act—

That is what we regard as what we are going to consider in the hearings.

on amendments to the Wagner Act consistent with the proposals made by the President.

Which are matters of record. The President has not spelled out the proposals in literal terms; he has not drawn amendments and sent them here, although I think that today the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], as he advised the committee he would at the earliest possible opportunity, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor, has offered the specific amendment which would carry out the substance of the President's proposals, and I hold a copy of the amendments in my hand. I believe it has been offered in the Senate today by the Senator from Utah, therefore it is within the scrutiny of every Member of this honorable body or it will be shortly.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to finish the reading:

consistent with the proposals made by the President; that said hearings be closed not later than February 10, 1949—

Mr. President, the committee adjudged that that would afford time enough for public hearings. The committee felt that in that length of time, if the witnesses were properly organized and presented, the committee could hear all it felt necessary to add to the 2,700 printed pages of hearings already had by the committee on this general subject—

and that the bill for the repeal—

I call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to this:

And that the bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law be then reported to the Senate—

That means upon the conclusion of the hearings on February 10 and after the committee in executive session has had an opportunity to consider whether any amendments would be added to the Wagner Act. I continue to quote:

With such amendment—

Of the bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, which we resolved upon in the committee Monday afternoon by an 8-to-5 majority, that the bill repealing the Taft-Hartley law be reported to the Senate after the hearings concluded on February 10 and after consideration of the subject by the committee—

With such amendment or amendments to the Wagner Act as the committee may deem wise.

Mr. President, by a vote of 8 to 5 we resolved to remove from the neck of labor the galling yoke of the Taft-Hartley law, to consider the general area of amendments where the President had made proposals, and later, when the chairman has offered the specific proposals suggested by the Secretary of Labor, to consider them, and to consider any other amendment offered in that general area; and when the hearings are concluded February 10 to consider the testimony offered and the amendments proposed, then for the committee to add on to the bill repealing the Taft-Hartley law and restoring the Wagner Act such amendment or amendments, in the language of the resolution, "as the committee may deem wise."

Mr. President, it seems to me that is very clear and very forthright and very explicit, the keeping of a pledge by the Democratic majority in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, am I right in the assumption that it was apparently the intention of a majority of the committee to hold no hearings whatsoever upon the question of whether or not the Taft-Hartley Act should be repealed?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is explicitly correct. We have already made up our minds to get rid of the Taft-Hartley law, and we do not need any additional testimony on that issue.

Mr. BALDWIN. What was intended was to deny to the American people any opportunity whatsoever to be heard with reference to the question of the repeal of this law?

Mr. PEPPER. The American people were heard from, from one end of this country to the other, on November 2, and we are attempting to implement the decision the American people made.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to remind my distinguished friend from Florida that in the East, which is a great industrial section, the candidate for President on the Republican ticket carried State after State. Did the Senator's party get a mandate from them?

Mr. PEPPER——

Mr. LUCAS. I rise to a point of order, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator is overlooking the fact that this is the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is making a point of order. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I make the point of order against the kind of debate now going on. If we are to have orderly debate, the Senator from Connecticut has no right to interrupt the Senator from Florida without getting permission to do so. I intend to try to insist, as majority leader, that that rule of the Senate be carried out, so far as it possibly can be, because without enforcement of that rule there will be no order in the Senate, so far as proper debate is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am sure it is not necessary for me to suggest to the able Senator from Connecticut that the electoral process in this country contemplates the election of a President by a majority in the electoral college, and that the election of Members of Congress is in the respective States and districts of America. I do not need to give to the able Senator from Connecticut any lecture on political science as it pertains to the United States of America. All I wish to say is that this was an issue in the campaign; that our Democratic platform was unequivocal on that issue; that our President met it forthrightly; that our candidates for Congress, Senate and House, campaigned upon that platform, and met that issue squarely to the American people. We did not promise them an amendment to the Taft-Hartley law.

We did not promise them protracted reconsideration of the Taft-Hartley law. We said, "Give us the congressional power and we will repeal the Taft-Hartley law," which meant, of course, the restoration of the Wagner Act as it existed at the time the Taft-Hartley law was superimposed upon it over the veto of the President of the United States. And, Mr. President, it is a good example to the nations and peoples of the earth groping for democracy, to see the good democratic practice of the Democratic Party keeping its pledged word to the people of the United States.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Connecticut for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. May I come back to my original question? Do I understand the purpose of the resolution to be that the people of the United States, who might be interested in the question of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, are going to be denied any opportunity whatsoever to be heard in the hearings before the congressional committee with reference to that matter?

Mr. PEPPER. If it means that they seek to continue——

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, may I have a categorical answer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is within the jurisdiction of the Senator from Florida. It is not a matter for the Chair to determine.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure the able Senator would not do me the injustice of supposing that I shall not presume to answer the question according to my own good judgment and in my own manner. If he would like me to answer the question in that way I should be very glad to do so. But I am not his witness on the stand, unfortunately, no doubt, for the Senator, because I am sure he would conduct a very grueling, no doubt a very effective cross examination, and no doubt bring great delight to his clients in such a case. But if the Senator wants a real answer to his question I will say that if the matter involved is the question of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, in the opinion of the Democratic majority of the committee that is a closed question, and if anybody wishes to come before the committee and appear as a witness and argue that the Taft-Hartley law should be continued the committee, in its wisdom, and out of its experience and knowledge with the subject, has adjudicated that it is not necessary to hear further testimony on that subject, just as a judge often says to counsel, "I thank counsel very much, but the court does not desire to hear further argument upon that phase of the case."

Now the committee did adjudge that the President's proposals occupied a field which was new, and where advocates and opponents and modifiers should have a right to be heard fully. The committee proposes to give that right, and if anyone has any amendment in the general area of the President's recommendations which he desires to propose, he can certainly depend upon a fair and a full and a courteous hearing before the committee. But the resolution has limited the scope of the hearing.

Mr. President, we all know that hearings have to come to an end sometime, although there are those in this body, perhaps, who would not like these hearings to come to an end, because the longer the hearings are protracted the longer will be the continuity of the Taft-Hartley law; the longer it will gall the neck of labor and discriminate against the working people of America. Having considered the matter, we do not propose to allow this thing to be dragged out and drawn out and protracted and delayed, to serve the purposes of those who want only to keep the Taft-Hartley law either in toto or almost as it is.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Does not the Senator think it is only fair and just when a law was passed in the last Congress by such a substantial majority, and when such a substantial majority was present as to overrule the President's veto here in this very body, that as a matter of justice the people of this country and the Members of the Senate who desire to be heard with reference to the Taft-Hartley law should have an opportunity to be heard on the subject?

Mr. PEPPER. I can only say again, Mr. President, that there have been 2,700 printed pages of testimony already taken. There has been protracted debate in both Houses of Congress. It has been the subject of Presidential veto messages. It has been the subject of consideration by the two conventions of the two major political parties, and was especially provided for in the platforms of the two parties, and in the attitude of the respective parties. It was an issue bitterly contested in the campaign. Now, after all that, Mr. President, it does not seem at all unreasonable to the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—although I must say that all the Republican members seem to feel the other way about it—it does not seem at all unusual to the Democratic majority of that committee that we should fix February 10 as the time for the closing of these hearings, and that, as courts often do, we should narrow the scope of the hearings to the field and the area which is within the scope of the Presidential proposals on the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question as a matter of information?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I want to ask the Senator merely one question. There is a provision of the Taft-Hartley law which requires union officers to make financial reports to members. That is not included in the President's proposal. So far as I know, there has been no objection to it. Do I understand that the Senator proposes to refuse to let anyone testify as to the merit of that provision of the Taft-Hartley law which the Senator is proposing to repeal?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what may be the subject of the public hearings—that is, what subjects witnesses may be permitted to discuss—has generally been limited by the resolution adopted by a majority of the committee. But the Senator from Ohio well knows that there has been no limitation upon what committee members, or what any Senator might offer to the committee itself. Of course, the committee is going to consider any amendments that any Senator who is a member of the committee, or any other Senator, offers to the committee. No Senator is being shut off. But we are saying that when we come to the matter of public hearings we think the 2700 pages of testimony already taken, together with the additional testimony we will take beginning tomorrow and ending on February the 10th, will sufficiently advise the committee to permit it to act in executive session. So if the Senator from Ohio has any amendments he wishes to offer, that he wishes to submit to his colleagues on the committee, of course they will be respectfully heard and carefully considered. But we are limiting the time and the scope of the committee hearings in the interest of expediting this legislation, and because we think we have heard enough on the general field embodied in the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. TAFT. But does the Senator think that the committee is prejudging when it says "that the bill for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law be then reported to the Senate with such amendment or amendments to the Wagner Act as the committee may deem wise"; and if any Senator should offer the Taft-Hartley law in whole or in part as an amendment or amendments to the Wagner Act, the committee then has not foreclosed the consideration of the Taft-Hartley law in that way? Is that the statement of the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Ohio knows that his colleagues on the committee shall be considerate and courteous and attentive to any suggestions that he may make, and the committee will try to look him right in the eye and listen with a straight face just like a judge listens to a lawyer with whose arguments he does not agree. I would not want the Senator from Ohio to be sanguine in his confidence that he can expect any change of mind by the majority of the committee respecting the Taft-Hartley law, because he would not be likely to persuade the eight Democratic members of the committee to restore in whole or in part the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law as amendments to the Wagner Act.

Mr. TAFT. Even though there are things like the making of financial reports, to which there has been no objection so far as I know, from either labor or management.

Mr. PEPPER. What I have said is true in principle; and if there is an exception in detail, no doubt the exception proves the rule.

Mr. President, the committee wishes to be fair to itself, and, of course, to the Congress and the country. The committee felt that it should fix some time limit. If we do not fix some time limit to the hearings, they will run all

through this session of Congress. I am afraid that there are some who would like to see them run all through this session of Congress, so that the Taft-Hartley law would not be impaired in this session of Congress.

The majority feels that this subject should be considered with expedition. However, it is to be considered with care, and we are going to be just as considerate of any Senator's proposals or suggestions as we possibly can be.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to make a few comments on the very able political speech which the Senator from Florida has delivered. It is a speech which certainly would win loud applause in any labor temple of America. Certainly labor would be enthusiastic, so far as its first response is concerned, upon hearing the Senator from Florida say that steps have been taken to repeal the Taft-Hartley law.

But in fairness, the Senator's speech in any meeting of American labor ought to be supplemented by an explanation as to why the resolution which the Senator from Florida offered and sponsored before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is a clear disservice to American labor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In my colloquy a moment ago with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] I believe I stated that 2,700 printed pages of testimony had been taken on this subject. I now have the reports before me. I was in error. There have been only 2,424 pages, and not 2,700. However, I believe that an inspection of the volume of the testimony will indicate that the subject has already been adequately covered.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask the Senator from Florida a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield if I do not lose my rights.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask my distinguished friend from Florida, if he is going to foreclose any opportunity for hearings or testimony on the Taft-Hartley law, how he is going to rely upon the testimony to which he has referred for a repeal of the law, when that testimony resulted in the overwhelming passage of the law.

Mr. PEPPER. Perhaps it was a reading of the evidence wrongly, or seeing darkly through Republican eyes, which led to that unhappy result.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had just made the statement, before the interruption, that in my opinion the resolution offered by the Senator from Florida and adopted by the Democrats on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the other day constitutes a great disservice to American labor. I wish to express my reasons for holding that belief.

It is very interesting to hear the Senator from Florida say that the majority of the American people decided on November 2 that the Taft-Hartley law should be repealed. I say in all kindness to the Senator from Florida that any such deduction as that is one of the most glaring examples of a non sequitur that I have ever heard on the floor of the Senate. His claim about a mandate to repeal the Taft-Hartley law constitutes plain argumentative nonsense.

Mr. President, in my judgment, for the Senator from Florida to read into the Democratic victory on November 2 a mandate of the American people to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, along the lines of his resolution, is certainly beyond any possibility of establishment by proof. When we take into account the many issues involved in that campaign, and when we take into account the fact that one bloc of voters was interested in one issue, another bloc of voters in another issue, and other blocs of voters in other issues, the totality of which added up to a Democratic victory, it seems to me that for any Senator to stand on the floor of the Senate and say that the total vote constituted a mandate for a specific action on a specific subject is fallacious reasoning. It goes beyond my powers of credulity.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida, as I have said to labor audiences across the country, that today, if we were to put the Taft-Hartley law to a plebiscite of the American people, because of their lack of understanding of the facts about the weaknesses in the law, I am willing to venture the guess that a majority of the American people would vote to retain the law. I say that as one who is opposed to the law. I say that as one who voted against the bill, which the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] did not do, although in recent days he has been very anxious to speed up hearings on the law, apparently so that the law can be repealed according to the Democratic schedule. But what was the position of the Senator from Illinois when the bill was on the floor of the Senate to be voted upon? He voted for it. He is now the Democratic majority leader. Oh yes; he voted to sustain the veto; but I think it will have to be admitted that I took the leading part in the veto fight to postpone the debate long enough so that we could get a calm consideration of the veto message. I did not receive any help from the Senator from Illinois, the majority leader, other than his final vote to sustain my position.

Of course, this subject is charged with partisan politics. We ought to lift it above the level of partisan politics. Labor has a tremendous job to do in regard to the Taft-Hartley law. Let me tell labor what that job is. It is to stop calling the law names, and tell the American people, on the basis of the evidence that labor can advance—because the evidence is there—why the Taft-Hartley law should be so drastically changed that in effect it would constitute a repeal of it. But why get into an argument as to whether we are repealing or revising it?

Our job, on the basis of our experience under the Taft-Hartley law, is to get out of the law those things that are unfair to labor and industry, by reasonable amendments and revisions, based upon what? Based upon evidence. How are we going to get that evidence, under our democratic legislative processes, without full, fair, open public hearings?

In reply to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Florida gives assurance that if the Senator from Ohio wishes to offer any amendments, they will be considered. But he forewarns the Senator from Ohio that the Senator from Ohio will stand in the position of a man before the bar pleading a case before a judge who has already in his own mind rendered his decision if he attempts to offer amendments in committee.

The discussion of the Senator from Florida on this floor today in regard to the attitude which the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are going to take in considering labor legislation is not consonant with the record of the Senator from Florida for fairness and open-mindedness. In effect, he stated on this floor today that the Democrats on the committee have prejudged the question of what amendments should be adopted. Mr. President, if one had sat in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare the other day and listened to the Democratic members when we tried to obtain consideration of my motion for a timetable which would assure fair hearings, he would have seen that the question had been prejudged by the Democrats on the committee. It was a matter of political strategy with them.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, of course, the Senator from Oregon is not failing to recall that the Senator from Florida, both in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, to the very limit of his ability fought against the enactment of the Taft-Hartley law, and branded it as legislation very inimical to the public interest.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that in my judgment the arguments he made against the Taft-Hartley law at the time when the fight against the bill was occurring on the floor of the Senate, were sound. I joined with him then in those arguments. I join with him now in those arguments. But I say to the Senator from Florida that the way to get good legislation is not to follow the procedural course which the Senator from Florida is primarily responsible for in this matter. I say that because the Senator's procedure is going to result in a fight here on the floor of the Senate, resulting in an attempt to write a piece of labor legislation on the floor of the Senate. We cannot write good labor legislation here on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President. So I do not propose to let the Senator from Florida "get by," so far as American labor is concerned, with any representation that the committee procedure for which he up to this hour is chiefly responsible insofar as the handling of labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress is concerned, meets the best interest of American labor. I say to American labor here and now that

the weeks immediately ahead will demonstrate that the course of action for which the Senator from Florida is responsible constitutes a great disservice to American labor. I hope we can persuade the Democrats in committee meetings to change the timetable they have adopted so that we can have fair hearings on this issue of labor legislation. Whether I am right or wrong depends on whether or not we are going to consider the problems, issue by issue, which must be taken up in order to have a fair piece of labor legislation passed by this Congress. Mr. President, we cannot possibly have fair consideration of the issues I wish to raise here this afternoon by any such timetable as that which the Senator from Florida has been able to get the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to adopt.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Oregon has for a long time had intimate and friendly relationships with organized labor in this country, and he is an unusually well-informed Senator and citizen. Will the Senator from Oregon question the fact that practically every labor organization in this country has come out by overwhelming resolution at every convention for the unqualified and simple repeal of the Taft-Hartley law?

Mr. MORSE. Of course the Senator from Florida is correct; but what am I supposed to do about that? Am I supposed to jump through a labor hoop? My job here on the floor of the Senate, Mr. President, is to take labor's demands and weigh them carefully on the evidence, and vote with them when the evidence supports them, and vote against them when they are wrong. On some proposals, labor happens to be wrong. I think we ought to hear labor's arguments on various amendments to the Taft-Hartley law; and when the evidence supports their position, I think we should vote with them; and when the evidence does not support their position, I think we should vote against them. That is all I am pleading for.

Let me say to the Senator from Florida that I am perfectly willing to be judged, when I stand for reelection in 1950, by my record in the field of labor relations. If the support of labor in my State depends upon my supporting the resolution of the Senator from Florida, then I do not want its support, because I am never going to stand for what I consider to be unfair procedure, for unfair procedure never serves the best interests of labor or any other group in this country.

Now, Mr. President, let us take an issue and apply the procedure of the Pepper resolution to it. Let us take the issue of emergency disputes, the so-called national paralysis cases. What are we going to do about them? What are we going to do about them under the so-called resolution of the Senator from Florida? I wish to tell you, Mr. President, that in my judgment if we are going to appraise properly the results in the field of emergency disputes, as the record will show them to be since the Taft-Hartley law was passed, if we are going to give careful, statesmanlike consideration to reforms in the law which ought to be passed if we are to have emergency disputes legislation which will meet the public interest, we cannot handle that one issue alone in less time than the total time provided for by the Senator from Florida in his resolution for the full consideration of all of the democratic proposals on labor legislation.

The first thing we ought to find out, Mr. President, is what have been the results of the emergency disputes sections of the Taft-Hartley law? I think by and large the record would show that the results have not been good ones, and that the emergency disputes sections of the Taft-Hartley law ought to be drastically rewritten. But the American people are entitled to know those facts. Labor should have been giving the American people, through a sound public-relations labor-education program, the evidence and the facts in regard to the operation of the Taft-Hartley law. Unfortunately labor has failed to inform the public as to the facts about the dangers inherent in the Taft-Hartley law but rather has followed the strategy for the most part of calling the bill names and crying "Repeal. Repeal." That is a political pressure approach, Mr. President; but we are never going to write sound legislation in any field if the legislation is going to be just the result of political pressure. It is not our job to write pressure-dictated legislation. Our job, Mr. President, as I see it, as Members of this body, is to make a studentlike approach to the evidence, pro and con, in respect to all the results which have already flowed from the passage of the Taft-Hartley law. The American people are entitled to know what the results have been and what the dangers in the law really are. I am so convinced that such public hearings as I have urged would leave no question as to the unsoundness of certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley law that I am sure the American people would back us up in the drastic revisions which I think that law needs. However, I am not going before the American people, Mr. President, as apparently the Senator from Florida and his Democratic colleagues are, and say, "I have reached the conclusion that the law should be repealed. My mind is made up. I will not listen to evidence to the contrary; or, if I do, I will listen to it with two tongues in one cheek." I think that is a just and fair description of the attitude of the Democrats on this matter. What they are saying in effect is, "If you want to bring in amendments, come on and bring them in. We shall listen to them; but we forewarn you that we know right now how we are going to vote on them."

Mr. President, that is not my conception of the way a Senate committee hearing should be conducted. That is not my idea of the purposes of hearings held by Senate committees. I thought that the purpose of Senate committee hearings was to find the facts. It takes time to find the facts. I do not want to spend a single hour longer than is necessary in conducting labor hearings at this session of Congress in order to get the facts. I think my Democratic friends know me well enough to know that if at any hearings conducted by the Labor Committee of the United States Senate we ever reach the point where there is any clear evidence that a member of the committee is seeking to stall those hearings for the purpose of preventing the committee from making a report in reasonable time for action in this session of Congress, the junior Senator from Oregon will oppose such stalling tactics.

But, I say to my Democratic friends, the unfairness in the procedure which they have adopted is that they do not give adequate time for a full, fair hearing on the facts. I was not married to my resolution, Mr. President, which sought to conduct hearings through the month of February, until on or about March 1. If we needed that amount of time I felt we ought to take it; if we need a few days more, I felt we ought to take it. I refused to commit myself to any specific date, but I said our goal and our objective ought to be to try to do this job by about March 1. Then, knowing from past experience the differences of opinion existing within the committee, I know that the chances would not be very good, if we did a thorough job of exchanging points of view among ourselves in the committee, of getting a bill out of committee much before about April 1.

What are we going to do now as a result of the Pepper resolution? I say as a gesture to labor, we are going to hold some hearings, up until February 10. We are going to restrict those hearings to certain very specific issues, and we, or at least the majority of the committee, are going to say, "Now, if you want to bring in any other issues, as a Senator, we will hear you"—apparently as a matter of senatorial courtesy, Mr. President—"but we want to forewarn you, our minds are pretty well made up." What kind of labor legislation is that procedure going to produce? Well, Mr. President, I will tell you. When the committee bill reaches the floor of the Senate a fight against it will start, because the committee will not be in any position to give assurance to both sides of the aisle that fair, full hearings have been given to the merits of all the issues involved in the type of labor legislation which ought to be passed by the Eighty-first Congress. That is where the disservice to American labor inherent in the Pepper resolution is clearly evident. The real helpful service to American labor would be for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to conduct hearings so fair that the evidence presented in them would leave no room for doubt on the part of the American voters as to the desirability of drastic changes in the Taft-Hartley law. With that record behind us, men could not stand up on the floor of the United States Senate and say they have no confidence in the report of the committee, as I predict they will say in criticism of any report which is the product of the procedure adopted by the Democrats in the Pepper resolution. They would not be able, under my proposal, to say it, or at least carry any weight or influence with the argument, because the record would show, if the procedure I recom-

mended had been followed, that we gave to every person entitled to it his day in court, on the basis of the evidence that he could present.

So I say to American labor again—and do not forget, Mr. President, I am under tremendous criticism today from American labor—the Pepper resolution is a serious mistake. I understand there are people in the Democratic Party who are gleeful because I voted against the Pepper resolution, but I know not a one of them who can present to American labor a sounder position or record on labor policies than the junior Senator from Oregon. It is no new experience for me, Mr. President, to hear labor criticize me. I have had that experience before, when I rendered decisions which labor did not like, because in a given case in arbitration or before the War Labor Board labor failed to prove its case. I have had labor criticism in Oregon, Mr. President, when I refused on occasion to say that the Wagner Act was a magna carta for labor. It never was, because it never was a well-balanced act. It was an act that gave to labor some long overdue rights; and I support the rights which the act gave to labor, but it did not give to employers corresponding procedural rights and protection against the unfairness of labor. I want to say to those Democratic forces, who I understand think that the position I am taking on labor legislation in the Eighty-first Congress may help rejuvenate Democratic opposition to me in the State of Oregon, I will take my chances in 1950, even with the Democratic voters in the State of Oregon, so far as my record of impartiality and fairness on the evidence is concerned.

What position am I in as a member of the Labor Committee, in view of the speech made by the Senator from Florida this afternoon showing clearly the attitude the Democrats on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are going to take? I understand, from the Senator from Florida, that as a Senator I shall have the right to offer some amendments, whether those amendments deal with the limited issues which the Senator from Florida refers to in his resolution or not. Why should I bother to offer any amendments? Why should I offer amendments before a committee whose spokesman, as far as the Democratic side is concerned, on the floor of the Senate, this afternoon, has in all honesty and frankness—and I respect him for his forthrightness—confessed that the issues as to what is to be in the new labor bill to be proposed by the committee are pretty well prejudged anyway?

I may change my mind, depending upon what transpires in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in meetings starting tomorrow, but I want to say here and now, if the attitude of the Democrats on that committee is going to continue to be the attitude expressed by the Senator from Florida this afternoon, I shall offer no amendments in the committee, because I do not intend to be a party to any such farce as the Senator from Florida has outlined. I shall offer my amendments on the floor of the Senate in due course. And let me tell you, Mr. President, in my judgment, when I offer them, I shall back them up with argument and evidence which will make it rather difficult, in most instances, even for the Senator from Florida to vote against them. But that is not the way we ought to do it. That is not the way to write legislation on this important subject.

Mr. President, when you think of all the problems that face America, and when you think of the great resentment that exists today in the industrial life of America, I say it is a sad thing that at the very beginning of the Eighty-first Congress we have apparently gotten ourselves into a position where we are going to have to write labor legislation on the floor of the United States Senate. One of the things which America sorely needs is industrial harmony, and better understanding between employers and workers. I happen to believe that there are increasing numbers of employers all over America who have come to recognize that many of the amendments for which I fought on this floor during the historic debate of 1947 were much more in the best interests of American industry and labor and the public than provisions on the same subject which were incorporated in the Taft-Hartley law. We have a great opportunity in the Eighty-first Congress, Mr. President, to bring labor and management together before us in the Labor Committee, to let them present their points of view on the Taft-Hartley law; to strike those many provisions in the law which I think need to be struck out, revise some others, and to bring in a fair and workable bill I care not under what name. If the Democrats want a Democratic label on it, I shall be glad to vote to give them a Democratic label. I am interested only in the final result of the legislation. Mr. President, you are not going to get good legislation through the procedure advocated by the Senator from Florida.

I close, Mr. President, by saying to American labor leaders, "It is not too late for you gentlemen to reconsider the procedure which has been adopted, I think under your sponsorship, through the spokesmanship of the Senator from Florida. In the interests of the men and women who wear the working clothes in America the matter should be reconsidered. The steamroller tactics which are being used on the Eighty-first Congress in this instance will serve only to crush labor." It is not too late for a change in this labor strategy. So far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, before this debate is concluded I shall give labor leaders an opportunity to tell the country what is wrong with the amendments which I propose to offer on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, when I was making my remarks this afternoon on labor problems, I intended to ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, as a part of them, a very able speech by Prof. Edwin E. Witte, chairman of the Department of Economics, University of Wisconsin, on Recent Labor Legislation of Interest to Labor. I make that request now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Without objection, the speech will be printed as requested.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RECENT LABOR LEGISLATION OF INTEREST TO LABOR

*The Taft-Hartley Act*

The recent legislation in which labor is most interested is, undoubtedly, the Taft-Hartley Act. As Aaron has given you an excellent detailed analysis of that act—much better than I could do. To discuss the recent labor legislation of interest to labor without dealing with the Taft-Hartley Act, however, is like presenting Hamlet with the role of Hamlet omitted. So I shall deal with the Taft-Hartley Act in its broader aspects, skipping details as much as possible.

Giving you only general observations and making these in a summary manner, I have this to say about the Taft-Hartley Act:

1. The enforcement of the Taft-Hartley Act is still in an early stage:

(a) Important parts of the law are not as yet fully effective. The most important of these are the closed shop provisions. Closed shop contracts concluded before August 22, 1947, remain in full force and effect until their expiration date or until August 22, 1948, whichever is the earlier. A great many closed shop contracts were extended for 1 year immediately before August 22, 1947, and these contracts still have some weeks to run; others concluded before June 23, 1947, run until their expiration dates, which, in some cases, are several years from now.

(b) To date, the National Labor Relations Board has not decided even one unfair labor practices case which is premised upon the Taft-Hartley Act. The board has devoted its efforts mainly to disposing of cases which arose under the Wagner Act and were undecided when the new law took effect. It has adopted rules and procedures under the new law, which have been discussed by Mr. Aaron. It has decided important issues arising under the part of the law dealing with representation and election cases. But it still has to decide its first unfair labor practices case under the new law. In a speech delivered on June 11, Chairman Herzog said that 12 cases involving unfair labor practices charges against unions had reached the board, after examiner's hearings and reports, and that it would give these cases precedence. So we may expect board decisions ere long on some of the major issues raised by the new law, but these will be then, probably, appealed to the courts.

(c) District courts have passed upon some questions arising under the part of the act relating to unfair labor practices of unions, in injunction cases brought by the general counsel of the board, Mr. Denham. No decisions have come down from circuit courts of appeals and in the only two cases arising under the Taft-Tartley Act which have been decided by the Supreme Court—the National Maritime Union case, involving the Communist affidavits, and the Murray case, involving political expenditures by unions—the court did not decide the issues the unions presented.

In most respects, what the restrictions imposed by the Taft-Hartley Act upon unions means still has to be decided by the Board and the courts and will not be certainly known until the issues have been decided by the Supreme Court.

2. Thus far, the Taft-Hartley Act has proven more of an insult than an injury to the labor unions.

(a) It is clear that the law severely handicaps unions which fail to file the non-Communist affidavits and the financial reports which are prescribed as prerequisites the unions must satisfy to have any standing under the law. Three major companies—Remington-Rand, Caterpillar Tractor, Colt

Arms—which had contracts with left-wing unions have refused to have any further dealings with these unions and have gotten away with it. Noncomplying unions have lost two important strikes, the American Communications Association strike against the New York cable companies and the recent strike of the United Packing House Workers, CIO, against the major meat packers. No complying unions have sustained such reverses.

(b) Total union membership seems to have increased since passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. These gains have resulted principally from increased employment in plants which already were under union contracts. Unions have won a majority of the representation elections but a smaller percentage than prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. The southern organizing drive seems to have been slowed up to inching gains. The principal damage done to labor by the Taft-Hartley Act has resulted from a vague fear which it has produced among unorganized or, but recently, organized workers that there is something unlawful about what the unions are doing and that workers are liable to get into jail or be fined if they go along with the unions. To some extent, also, the interests of quite a few union leaders have been diverted from organizational efforts to the legal battles in the courts. But, thanks to nearly full employment, the injury to the unions from the Taft-Hartley Act to date has been a minimum.

3. While the Taft-Hartley Act has not damaged labor very greatly to date there are reasons to believe that it will prove more restrictive and injurious in the not very distant future. These reasons include:

(a) The restrictions upon union security will become fully effective in the near future. The National Labor Relations Board and the courts will before long decide many of the major questions raised by the act. That labor will win all of these cases is not in the cards.

(b) The interpretations of the Taft-Hartley Act given thus far by the National Labor Relations Board are far less restrictive than are the interpretations of Mr. Denham, the general counsel. The National Labor Relations Board has a 3 to 2 prolabor majority. The term of a member favorable to labor will be out and a new appointment will be made after the election. If the new appointee holds different views than does the present member, the law will be applied much more harshly than it has been to date. It should be noted also that Mr. Denham has fared much better in his extreme interpretations with the courts than with the trial examiners of the Board. Even if the Board renders decisions favorable to labor, there is a good chance of their being upset on appeal to the courts.

(c) The law has thus far functioned in a time of near full employment. Employers generally and particularly the large employers have thus far heeded, pretty well, the advice given them when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, by Mr. Bunting, the then president of the American Manufacturers' Association to go slow in their use of the new law. Whether they will adopt the same attitude when mass unemployment will give employers the upper hand in strikes remains to be seen, when the business cycle turns decidedly downward.

(d) This is an election year, in which many of those who were responsible for the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act have been anxious to avoid further offense to labor. With an election coming up, the many proposals before Congress to place further restrictions upon labor were all allowed to die without being voted on.

(e) That the next Congress will enact new labor relations legislation seems almost certain. The Taft-Hartley Act itself provided for a joint congressional committee to study and report upon further needed legislation in this field. That committee, whose chairman is Senator Joe Ball, held extensive hearings on amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act in May and June and then decided to postpone its report on these proposals until the new Congress meets in January. Most of the proposals presented to the committee were for further restrictions upon labor. What the new legislation which the next Congress will enact will be will depend upon the composition of the new Congress.

4. The Taft-Hartley Act is not the most extreme antiunion law imaginable and the new legislation which the new Congress may enact may be much more restrictive. The Taft-Hartley Act does not make unions unlawful. It does not require anyone to work when he does not want to work. Most strikes remain lawful and most of the things that unions have been doing are still legal. But the next Congress may further restrict what unions may lawfully do.

5. Even as it now stands, I believe the new law to be unwise legislation. I hold this view because:

(a) The new law, in many respects, leaves labor in a worse position than it was in before the Wagner Act was enacted. As an illustration, the closed shop may be cited. The closed shop was legal in nearly all States before we had a Wagner Act. That act did not make the closed shop legal but restricted its legality, providing that only closed-shop contracts made with majority unions should enjoy the protection of the law. In the Taft-Hartley Act, the closed shop is completely outlawed, as it never was before. In this entire law there is not even one provision which confers additional rights upon unions, while there are dozens of new restrictions.

(b) The act does not treat employers and employees alike. It does not treat corporations and unions in the same manner. Many acts are declared to be unfair labor practices when done by unions which are not unfair labor practices for employers. Corporations can restrict production as they wish, but restrictive rules of unions limiting production are an unfair labor practice for unions. Large corporations can exert pressure upon suppliers and smaller companies not to give labor more favorable terms than they do, but sympathetic strikes and boycotts are an unfair labor practice for unions. No corporation official has to file a non-Communist affidavit to prove his loyalty, as union officers must do. It is not true, as has often been stated, that employers are still subject to same restrictions as they were under the Wagner Act. The list of unfair labor practices of employers is the same as under the Wagner Act, except for the change in the provisions relating to the closed shop. The procedural provisions, however, have been altered to greatly weaken the protection enjoyed by the employees. Unfair labor practices charges are now outlawed unless they are brought within 6 months after commission. In hearings, strict rules of evidence apply, and upon review by the courts the Board's decision is to be sustained, not, as heretofore, if supported by creditable evidence, but only if sustained by the weight of evidence, as viewed by the court. When it comes to enforcement, it is mandatory for the General Counsel to apply for an injunction, in advance of any hearing, whenever he is satisfied that a union has engaged in a sympathetic strike or boycott. He may optionally use injunctions against employers when guilty of unfair labor practices. But up to June 15 the record was that the General Counsel had sought injunctions in 17 cases against labor unions since passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, as against but one case in which he sought an injunction against an employer. The Taft-Hartley Act attempts to change the law of agency applicable to employers to relieve them of responsibility for acts of foremen and other supervisors, while it makes unions responsible, at least under Mr. Denham's interpretation, for all acts of members during strikes and even for those of complete strangers.

(c) The Taft-Hartley Act represents a great extension of governmental interference in labor-management relations. The Wagner Act brought the Government into the picture to the extent of protecting the worker's right to organize and to require an employer to bargain collectively with representatives of a majority of his employees when they so desired. It left entirely free from governmental control the procedures to be followed in collective bargaining and, also what labor and management might agree upon. The Taft-Hartley Act retains all the restrictions which were in the Wagner Act. To them it adds many requirements as to how collective bargaining is to be conducted. Representing an even more serious extension of governmental interference, it contains many restrictions regarding what labor and management may agree upon. These apply to union security, employer contributions to pension, health and welfare funds, production standards, and still other matters previously left entirely to agreement between the parties.

How much governmental interference in labor-management relations has been increased appears most clearly from the increase in the number of NLRB cases. When the Taft-Hartley Act became effective on August 22, 1947, the Board had on its dockets the largest number of undecided cases it had ever had—a total of 3,933 cases. Since then it has labored valiantly to clean up these old cases and to dispose as expeditiously as it can of the many elections it has to conduct under the new law. It has received greatly increased appropriations from Congress and has doubled or trebled its staff. From this point of view, it has also been fortunate in that many unions have not been able to bring cases before it, because many have complied with the requirements for the filing of non-Communist affidavits and financial reports only recently or still have not done so. As late as July 1, 13 AFL international unions and also 13 CIO internationals, as well as three-fourths of all local unions had not met these requirements. Yet, month after month, the backlog of NLRB cases has grown. On April 30, the number of undecided cases totaled 14,467, compared with 3,933, 8 months earlier when the Taft-Hartley Act became law. It is to be noted, moreover, that not only does this act increase the work and authority of the National Labor Relations Board but also that of the courts. The increased resort to injunctions to settle disputes between labor and management is one of the striking consequences of the Taft-Hartley Act to date.

(d) The act has unsettled stable labor-management relationships which have long prevailed in many industries. The building construction industry will serve as an illustration. The Wagner Act never was applied to the construction industry. In the hearings on the Taft-Hartley Act representatives of the leading contractors' association opposed the restrictions on what employers and employees may agree upon in relation to union security and in other respects. The Taft-Hartley Act, however, not only has brought the building construction industry under Federal control but imposed many restrictions upon both employers and unions, with the result that more unfair labor practices have been started against building trades unions than any others. The printing industry is another in which good relations have long prevailed between employers and unions in which the Taft-Hartley Act has produced confusion and serious labor troubles. While that law may be valuable to employers who want to get rid of unions,

it complicates the problems of employers who want to get along with unions.

5. The Taft-Hartley Act, while it remains the law of the land, must be enforced and observed. It is entirely proper for unions to challenge in court parts of the new law which they believe to be unconstitutional. It is also in complete harmony with our democratic way of life to work for the repeal or modification of this law and to vote against Members of Congress who were responsible for its passage. But defiance of the law or a deluge of strikes can only result in further restrictive legislation.

*Other recent Federal legislation*

Having discussed the Taft-Hartley Act at such length, I can only very briefly deal with other labor legislation. Summarizing other recent Federal legislation, the following seem to me to be the high points:

Fair Labor Standards Act: Congress in 1947 amended the Fair Labor Standards (Wages and Hours) Act by passage of the Portal-to-Portal Pay Act. This act set aside the decision of the Supreme Court holding that workers are entitled to count as working time all of the time spent in preparation for actual work and while they are on the employer's premises, it provided that thereafter workers could claim pay for preparation and wash-up time only if such pay was specifically provided for in the contract. This rule was made retroactive, and the courts were instructed to dismiss all of the pending suits for portal-to-portal pay. In addition, Congress in the Portal-to-Portal Act broadened the exemptions from the Fair Labor Standards Act and inserted a 2-year limitation for the recovery of back pay under this law. It also made the Wage and Hour Administration independent of any control by the Secretary of Labor, although it remained within the Department of Labor for budgetary purposes.

In the last session of Congress all proposals for further changes in the Fair Labor Standards Act died in committee without being allowed to come to a vote. These included, on the one hand, several bills to further broaden the exemptions and to increase the hours of labor before overtime must be paid from 40 to 44 and 48. The same fate also befell President Truman's recommendation for increasing the minimum rate of pay from 40 to 75 cents per hour. A Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator Ball, held extensive hearings on this proposal and at one time was reported to be ready to recommend an increase to 60 cents per hour. In the end, however, it did nothing, and the minimum wage rate for employees in interstate commerce remains 40 cents per hour.

Fair employment practices legislation: The story with reference to fair employment practices legislation is very similar. In 1946 Congress allowed the Fair Employment Practices Commission, which was established in wartime by President Roosevelt, to die, although President Truman recommended its continuance. The President renewed this recommendation in the last session and thereby brought down upon himself the wrath of the southern Democrats. The Republican-controlled Congress did nothing.

United States Department of Labor: In relation to the United States Department of Labor, the recent record is one, not merely of doing nothing, but of destroying what already existed. When the Department of Labor was established it was intended to have the same status as other cabinet departments, with responsibility for all functions of the Government concerned with labor and industrial relations. That concept was departed from in the subsequent establishment of special governmental machinery for railroad labor and the organization of the National Labor Relations Board as an independent agency. Then, still in the Roosevelt administration, Congress took the Immigration Service out of the Department of Labor and transferred this service to the Department of Justice. As a wartime measure the United States Employment Service was attached to the War Manpower Commission. This scattering of the governmental activities relating to labor was roundly condemned in the Republican national platform of 1944.

The last Congress—the first Republican-controlled Congress in 16 years—however, not only continued this process but made crippling cuts in the appropriations for the administration of all labor laws other than the Taft-Hartley Act. President Truman, by Executive order, returned the United States Employment Service to the Department of Labor. Congress disapproved of his action and attached the Employment Service to the Social Security Administration. The Children's Bureau was assigned to the same agency. The Wage and Hour Administration was made an independent agency, except for budgetary purposes, in the Portal-to-Portal Act. The Conciliation Service was made completely independent in the Taft-Hartley Act. Left within the Department of Labor are only the Bureau of Labor Statistics and a few smaller bureaus, whose functions are exclusively research. The appropriations to the Department of Labor have been reduced to $14,000,000 in round numbers compared with above $560,000,000 for the Department of Agriculture and $170,000,000 for the Department of Commerce.

Social security: In the field of social security, Congress made one change in the prior law which may result in broadened coverage and made two changes narrowing coverage. It also weakened the Social Security Administration through drastic cuts in its budget. It did nothing with the President's recommendation for a national health insurance system or with those of the Advisory Council on Social Security for broadening and liberalizing old-age insurance.

The one bit of social-security legislation which can be described as a forward step was an amendment to the Social Security Act making it possible for States to contract with the Federal Government to bring their employees and those of their political subdivisions under the Federal old-age insurance system, without disturbing existing State and local retirement systems. Potentially, this might bring 3,500,000 workers, not now covered by the Social Security Act, under that law. But none of them will actually be covered unless and until the several States so elect. It is to their advantage that they do so, but whether State and local government employees will actually get the benefit of this legislation will depend upon the action of the next State legislatures.

Offsetting this potential extension of the coverage of the Federal old-age insurance, were two measures passed by Congress which removed the protection of the act from some 700,000 workers. These were the newsboys and the commission salesmen, both of which Congress declared to be independent contractors, after the Supreme Court had ruled that they are employees entitled to all the benefits of the Social Security Act.

Equally destructive was the action of Congress in cutting the appropriations for the administration of the Social Security Act. The bill passed by the House taking control of unemployment insurance away from the Social Security Administration died in conference. But even the conference-committee bill, which was enacted into law, abolished the regional offices of the Social Security Administration and its research and informational services.

Early in the last session the prospects appeared to be very good that Congress would enact long overdue legislation extending and improving our social-security system. At the beginning of the session, President Truman renewed his recommendation, presented twice earlier, for the establishment of a national system of health insurance and the extension and liberalization of old-age insurance and old-age assistance. A little later the Advisory Council on Social Security, created last fall by the Republican Senate Committee on Finance, made its report, in which it recommended making the coverage of the Federal old-age insurance system wellnigh universal, liberalizing benefits, and inclusion of permanent total disability benefits with old-age retirement benefits. At the same time a subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee began hearings on needed changes in old-age insurance. In the end, however, the entire matter of providing more adequate social security and health protection for the American people was left to the next Congress.

Insuring a continued high level of employment: This also was what Congress did in relation to full employment. After bitter controversy, Congress in 1946 passed the Full Employment Act. This provided for continuous study of all factors affecting the general level of employment by the Board of Economic Advisers and an annual economic report by the President, for consideration by a special joint congressional committee and action by Congress. The Board of Economic Advisers by this time has made two annual and several special reports in which it has stressed that inflation is the great danger to a continued high level of employment. The President in his economic report has presented to Congress the recommendations for the control of inflation made by Board of Economic Advisers. The joint congressional committee has employed experts of its own and has conducted extensive hearings. But it has never made even a report and Congress has done precisely nothing about checking inflation.

*State labor legislation*

Restrictive State labor relations legislation: The story of the recent State labor legislation, like that of the recent Federal labor legislation, centers around restrictions upon unions. Restrictive State legislation preceded the Taft-Hartley Act by nearly a decade. As long ago as 1939, six States enacted restrictive State labor relations acts, several of them to replace "Little Wagner" acts. More antiunion measures were adopted by the State legislatures in 1941 and 1943. But none of the major industrial States enacted such legislation prior to 1947. None of early restrictive State laws, moreover, were enforced except that of Wisconsin. Even in Wisconsin the enforcement of the restrictions upon the closed shop was so indifferent that the 1945 legislature deemed it advisable to validate all closed contracts which had been in effect illegally since 1939.

In 1947 no less than 30 States enacted laws restricting labor unions and their activities, many of them more than one such law. Included among these were many of the leading industrial States. This antiunion legislation took many different forms: prohibition or restriction of union security provisions in labor-management contracts; right-to-work laws; antipicketing and antiboycott laws, prohibition of strikes without notice, jurisdictional strikes, strikes of public employees and still other strikes; requirements for union registration and financial reporting; compulsory arbitration on public utilities; and still other restrictions upon what workers may do collectively. None of these laws are as comprehensive as the Taft-Hartley Act, but individual provisions are more restrictive. Thus, about a dozen States prohibit all forms of union security and the Taft-Hartley Act has the peculiar provision that in any State which has more drastic restrictions the State law shall apply, but not where the State legislation is less restrictive.

How seriously this mass of new restrictive State labor legislation will harm the labor unions and make it more difficult for workers to get increases or otherwise improve their lot remains to be seen. As has been noted, the earlier restrictive State legislation was little enforced. In many States this legislation fared poorly in the courts, being held unconstitutional. Whether this will prove true also of the 1947 legislation is anybody's guess. The adverse climate of public opinion toward labor, reflected in the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act and the mass of restrictive State labor legislation, seems likely also to result in more vigorous enforcement. It also may again prove true that the courts read the election returns, but here in California the courts have already invalidated the two antilabor laws enacted by the last legislature. Certain it is that the restrictive legislation which was enacted in 1947 was only a small part of the legislation of that character which was introduced in the State legislatures and failed of passage. Almost certainly, all this further restrictive legislation will again make its appearance in the 1949 sessions and whether it will pass will depend upon the composition of the State legislatures which will be elected this year.

Protective labor legislation: Until recently the term "labor legislation" was applied almost exclusively to protective labor legislation—legislation establishing minimum standards for the protection of the weakest among the workers. Such legislation did not directly benefit the organized workers but was always supported by the labor unions, as the champions not only of organized, but of all, labor. Now the very term means to most people legislation restricting labor unions and their activities, but protective labor legislation is still very important and very much in need of improvement. Since the war began we again have had a vast amount of child labor. Despite all progress made in accident prevention, more than 15,000 workers annually lose their lives in industrial accidents. The total man-days lost through strikes in 1946—the worst year we have ever had for strike losses—were 116,000,000, as reported by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, but the man-days lost because of industrial accidents in that year—not an abnormal one from a safety point of view—totaled 260,000,000 as estimated by the National Safety Council. Yet there is far more concern about strikes than about industrial accidents.

For 10 years now almost no progress has been made in protective labor legislation. The 1947 legislative sessions saw a few minor improvements in some States but no thoroughgoing revision of the protective labor laws anywhere. Such a revision is overdue. Many of the existing standards are now completely out of date. Child labor laws limiting the hours of labor of children to 48 per week, as do many of our present child labor laws, are of no protection to young child workers. Neither are minimum wage laws which fix even lower minimum wage rates than does the Fair Labor Standards Act. It is high time that thought be again given to protective labor legislation and not merely to restrictive legislation.

Social-security legislation in the States: In relation to social-security legislation, the record of the 1947 State legislatures was somewhat better. Many States liberalized their unemployment compensation benefits and there was also some improvement in the workmen's compensation laws. But the increase in unemployment or workmen's compensation benefits has not kept pace with the decreasing value of the dollar, so that today they represent a smaller percentage of normal wages than they did when enacted. No basic improvement has been made in our social-security legislation other than the enactment of the cash sickness compensation laws in Rhode Island, California, and New Jersey.

*Concluding observations*

Viewed in its entirety, the recent labor legislation is most disappointing. What labor should do about it is for your decision. Clearly, the Taft-Hartley Act and the restrictive State laws must be enforced and observed so long as they remain upon the statute books or until they are held unconstitutional. It is entirely proper for the labor unions to test in the courts all parts of the restrictive legislation which they believe to be unconstitutional. It is also in the democratic way of life for people who do not like what their representatives have done to seek to replace them by others who will be more responsive to the people's will. But defiance of law or indifference to public opinion will only lead to further restrictions.

The policy suggested is in accord with the traditions of American labor. Labor has ever been reluctant to engage in partisan politics. But there never has been a time when labor has not been interested in legislation affecting its interests. From its organization, the American Federation of Labor has maintained its headquarters in Washington and has favored and opposed measures pending in Congress. It has been always interested itself in protective labor legislation and, still more, in removing restrictions upon freedom of organization and action. In its early years it championed repeal of the conspiracy laws. Later it fought for legislation to curb the use of injunctions in labor disputes. It was instrumental in securing passage of the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the State anti-injunction laws. Long ago, under the leadership of Samuel Gompers, it adopted the policy of reward your friends and punish your enemies in elections. It has always applied this policy in congressional elections and has also advised its members of the stand taken on measures of concern to labor in national platforms and by candidates for the Presidency. In now entering politics to secure the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and the restrictive State labor laws, but doing so cautiously, labor is pursuing the same policy it has found successful in the past.

How badly the unions will be harmed by the recent restrictive legislation will depend, in large part, upon what they do and do not do from now on. On the one hand, labor needs to avoid further arousing hostile public opinion. It needs to tell its story to employers and the general public much better than it has done to date. It also needs to sell itself to the large number of workers among its own members now indifferent or hostile. Having attained maturity, it must act responsibly at all times. On the other hand, labor needs to continue its organizational efforts and its fight for improved conditions for its members and all workers, along with trying to get relief from the injustices of the recent labor legislation. Despite this legislation, it is lawful for workers to organize and they still enjoy governmental protection in doing so. Most everything that unions have done heretofore remains legal. Labor does not have to take it lying down and, if I correctly interpret its attitude, it is not yet licked, by a long shot. In fighting for its rights, it advances the welfare, not only of all working people, but of our great country and its democratic institutions.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong in any way the remarks which are being made with regard to the program of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which will begin its hearings tomorrow, but, in all fairness to everyone concerned, I think I should state that at the beginning of the hearings tomorrow we shall start with the testimony of the Secretary of Labor, and we hope to be able to accomplish certain things. What the committee did may be criticized, but the people of the whole country, from one end to the other, have been hearing much more than a political slogan in connection with the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It is true that in every hamlet, in every county in the United States, Democratic speakers from one end of the country to the other promised repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. What the Republican speakers did I do not know.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield at the present moment. There will be plenty of time later. I wish to explain exactly the position in which the committee finds itself.

Mr. President, it is easy to make a political slogan. It is easy to say, "We want to repeal the Taft-Hartley law." But everyone knows that the Taft-Hartley Act was an amendment to existing legislation, and that the Taft-Hartley provisions are so intertwined with the National Labor Relations Act that if we should attempt to go to the country on that simple slogan, we would wipe out the National Labor Relations Act, which is something that no one ever dreamed of doing, and we would have to start at the place where we began over a decade ago.

There are certain provisions in regard to the procedure which we undertook which could be settled readily by action of the committee. For example, there was no need of discussing the hearings, so far as the intent of the majority of the committee was concerned, having to do with the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which are to be repealed. If we happen to set the stage in such a way that one political party takes one side of the controversy and the other political party takes the other, that cannot be helped. But if, as a result of the action taken, the political party which made the promise to the people of the country can better comply with that promise, that is fair, open, and above-board. Probably never in the history of the United States, after an election in which people spoke so plainly as they spoke in this instance, has a political party been more strongly pledged to go through with the whole program. But in adopting any program, a start must be made. That is all we have done. We have not tried to modify the rules of the Senate or of the Congress in regard to hearings, excepting to put a limitation on their length. The reason for that is that we have, by the first proposition, closed the door to any discussion as to whether in the minds of the members of the committee it is wise to attempt to repeal the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act which were passed a year ago. That is a question which has now been decided. We do not have to hold hearings on that question. On that point we can save very much time. If we do not save it, each witness could come before the committee and say, "You cannot repeal the Taft-Hartley Act without

destroying a whole decade of experience under the National Labor Relations Act."

Our next step is to restore, in theory and in spirit, the legislation as it existed before the Taft-Hartley law came into existence, and then to attempt to change it in such a manner as will implement the original act to the extent that the President of the United States has already made recommendations which the people of the United States have heard. It may be said that his speech was not political because it was made in a message to the Congress of the United States on the state of the Union.

I think the time has come in the United States when if any President who has made promises from one end of the country to the other, and has made recommendations to the Congress as specific as are those which President Truman has made, can reasonably expect that his recommendations will receive attention.

Mr. President, I do not know how well our committee will hold together in making decisions, but in my mind, and, I think, in the minds of all members of the committee—and I know, in the mind of the junior Senator from Oregon, who has just finished speaking—we shall write an honest, good labor act. I know that the junior Senator from Oregon wants to write an honest, good labor act which will take care of the interests of labor and the interests of industry, so that we may move forward toward industrial-labor stability and industrial-labor peace. That is what all of us want.

We can criticize until doomsday the method of procedure; but since the method has been adopted, I, for one, shall not criticize it. I would rather have it in some other form. But let us be frank about things. If we can unite a majority of a committee of the Senate of the United States on a given method of procedure, we have accomplished something in the Senate which does not always happen.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I refused to yield to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and I do not wish to yield to other Senators until my statement is concluded.

So far as I am concerned, I shall not try to cut off debate. I am ready to meet all the issues as they develop, and I want to meet them fairly and squarely, not with a slogan, not based on what someone thinks or what someone is talking about. We want to be able to report to the Senate a proper type of bill so that we can debate it and tell the Senate what we have attempted to accomplish.

We shall begin the hearings tomorrow. Whether we succeed depends upon the action of every Senator, but we shall try to do our level best to carry through the program which we have attempted.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to one or two minor facts regarding the so-called mandate. Far be it from me, being a Republican, to say what the Democratic Party has promised to do or what it has not promised to do. But there is something about this mandate to which I should like to call attention.

In the first place, of the Members now sitting in the House of Representatives a majority were elected who favored the Taft-Hartley law.

Of the 32 Senators who were elected to the Senate this year, 18 were in favor of the Taft-Hartley law and 13 were against it; the position of one Senator I do not know. How can that be construed to be a popular mandate for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law? So far as the actual figures are concerned, I know that in 17 industrial counties in the State of Ohio Mr. Dewey ran stronger than he ran 4 years ago. In 71 out of 73 rural counties he ran weaker than he ran 4 years ago. He lost 150,000 votes in the rural counties. The results are practically the same. Four years ago he won by 12,000, this year he lost by 6,000, in a population of 3,000,000. He gained in the industrial counties, and lost in the rural areas. We made the best showing in the city of Cleveland we ever made since I have been active in Ohio politics. These are just a few sidelights. There are no doubt many other arguments which will be made as we proceed in discussing this question, but if the figures I have given do not disprove that the American people, in voting for Senators, Representatives, and for President and Vice President, in any way gave anyone a mandate to repeal the Taft-Hartley law, I do not know what better evidence there could be.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah be kind enough to answer one or two inquiries I may propound with regard to his remarks?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall be happy to do so if I can. The Senator from Missouri generally is so erudite that he is over my head, and I simply cannot answer his questions; but I shall do the best I can.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for that very direct response to my question. The first question I desire to ask the Senator is this: As bearing on the reasonableness of the length of time which is granted for the hearings, is it not a fact that the Senator from Utah himself, until the day on which the period up to February 10 was fixed, was himself in favor of a 30-day period of hearings?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thank the Senator for asking that question. I actually argued against fixing any limitation, from a practical standpoint, because I have always found, in my experience that when one is imposed, it is hard to keep to it, and I am pretty sure we are going to have difficulty in keeping to the time; but the committee decided on it, and we are going to try our best to carry out its decision.

Mr. DONNELL. So the Senator from Utah voted in favor of the action taken by the committee, did he not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. When the vote came, I voted with the other seven Democrats on the committee.

Mr. DONNELL. Prior to that meeting, however, the Senator from Utah, who is now on his feet, had favored a 30-day period for the hearings. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I favored no limitation.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator favored no limitation?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should be very much happier now if we had done what we were trying to work out in our discussion, namely to aim toward a limitation, instead of prescribing it. But the limitation has been imposed by the majority of the committee.

Mr. DONNELL. In fact, by all of the Democratic members of the committee, including the Senator from Utah. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I voted with my colleagues, and I am happy to do the best I can now.

Mr. DONNELL. I ask the Senator, further, did he not give out a statement to the effect that he favored a period of 30 days being granted for hearings?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, no statement that I know of. Undoubtedly, as every reporter asked after the meeting, when we were discussing the motion of the Senator from Oregon about attempting to stop on the 1st of March, I said that, judging from the discussion, it would probably take longer than the 1st of March.

Mr. DONNELL. That was because the Senator from Utah realized that the time fixed in the resolution presented by the Senator from Florida and adopted would expire on February 10. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true, and, as I said in my statement, whenever six of my colleagues, or seven of my colleagues, unite upon a program, it is not hard for the eight of the colleagues to go along, because that does not happen very often in our committees.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator a question also in regard to the length of time which will be actually available for these hearings under the resolution adopted by the 8 to 5 vote? We are to begin, I understand, tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. That is, on January 28. I have made a notation from which it appears that, excluding Sundays but including Saturdays, a series of hearings expiring February 10 will give us 12 days. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I would not dispute the Senator's figures, because if I worked them out I think it would be found they were correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not also true that it is provided in the LaFollette-Monroney Act namely, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, that "No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit, without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case may be, is in session." That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. That has already cut down the meetings of our committee, and we had discussion of that very point.

Mr. DONNELL. We have thirteen members of the Senate on that committee. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Absolutely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Does not the Senator anticipate that during the period between tomorrow morning at ten o'clock and the tenth day of February there will be sessions of the Senate, which, under this language, will preclude the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare from sitting except with special leave of the Senate? That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. All excepting the first part. I do not think there will be a meeting of the Senate between now and 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not say that. I said between 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and February 10——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The remainder of the Senator's statement is perfectly correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not say the first part of it as the Senator attributed it to me. I asked the Senator whether or not he anticipated——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I understood the Senator to start counting right from now until tomorrow, the time the Senate will be in session, and I merely wished to correct him, if that was what he said, by stating that it was not correct.

Mr. DONNELL. In the first place, I submit that the Senate is in session at this moment, if the Senator desires to start from this instant, and, in the second place, that the hearings concerning which we were talking do not start until tomorrow morning. Therefore obviously I was not referring to any session this afternoon.

I wish to ask the Senator if he does not anticipate that at least several days during the period from January 28 until February 10 will be consumed, at least in part, in sessions of the United States Senate itself?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I assume quite a few hours will be consumed.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it not also a fact that during the period which will expire February 10 there will be several days when, the Senator reasonably anticipates, some of the Republican members, in order to fill engagements relative to Lincoln Day celebrations, and the like, will find it necessary to be absent from Washington, D. C.?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I thought that by stopping on February 10 we would provide for not interfering with any of the goings and comings in connection with the Lincoln Day celebration, but if I am mistaken in that, and the Republicans have to leave on the 10th, then probably we have unfairly treated them, and should allow a little bit more time so that those Republicans who have to leave will have a chance to return. I think that will be granted almost as a matter of course.

Mr. DONNELL. The bill introduced by the Senator from Utah, if I may ask him the question, provides among its terms for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, does it not?

Mr THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. And was not that bill referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for consideration by that committee?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. The only consideration the committee has given to it was at the executive session held the other day, without the taking of testimony. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I would say that no consideration has been given to that bill, and ordinarily in the practice of the Senate the committees do not consider a bill until after hearings are concluded. Therefore we are starting in the orderly process, so that we can get to the consideration, and until the hearings are completed we cannot go into consideration of the bill. That was one reason why the majority of the committee decided we must rush the hearings.

Mr. DONNELL. Consequently we have the situation in which the reference of a bill to our committee—a bill which by the very opening portion of its provisions provides for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act—is not to mean that we are to wait until after we have heard the testimony, but we are to decide, as we did the other day, in advance of any testimony whatsoever, contrary, as the Senator has said, to the usual custom, for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I had hoped, and I still hope, that so far as the question of the repeal of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act is concerned, it does not have to be argued.

Mr. DONNELL. And the Senator, I believe, answered the other day in the committee meeting in response to a question, that he interprets the resolution adopted by the committee as providing that the only amendments which are to be considered by the committee in the public hearings are those which are consistent with the President's proposal. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that is correct. I do not believe that generally speaking in hearings amendments offered by various Senators on the committee become part of the hearing process unless we are building up legislation. Everything has happened, Mr. President, in our hearings. We do not follow an absolute rule. But generally speaking the hearings are held on provisions which are before us, or which are promised to be before us. There is no attempt to stop any Senator from discussing questions in committee. There is no attempt to stop any Senator from debating on the floor of the Senate. There is no way I know of to cut off debate without agreement in the Senate. There is absolutely a right to offer amendments from now on as long as the Senate will stand for that sort of thing. We are not attempting to cut off any of those procedures. We are merely attempting to get started, and we found that that was a real struggle in our committee. We found it was a struggle in our country, because of the agitation in regard to the subject. We are starting, and we trust to the gods for the finish.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator one or two concluding questions. I think the Senator from Utah heard the Senator from Florida——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am sorry to say that I did not hear my colleague from Florida, so probably the Senator from Missouri had better ask him the questions about what he said.

Mr. DONNELL. I remember well what the Senator from Florida said. I wanted to get the idea of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I will have to say that, being a good Democrat, as the Senator from Florida is, while I did not hear what he said I can stand up and testify that all he said was absolutely true [laughter], because I know the man. That is as far as I can go. But I hate to be asked questions by a great Senate lawyer respecting what the Senator from Florida said, because I did not hear him speak. But I can imagine what the Senator from Florida said.

Mr. DONNELL. I understand that the Senator from Utah is perfectly willing to take on faith what was said by the Senator from Florida, and I am not disputing his right to do so.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I take on faith what was said by the Senator from Florida. I used to trust implicitly even the present Presiding Officer of the United States Senate [laughter]. That is going as far I think as a man can go.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood the Senator from Florida to say that it would be perfectly proper, after the hearings are closed and the committee is in executive session, for a member of the committee to present an amendment. But, said the Senator from Florida, not in the public hearings. Now I think that is correctly quoting the Senator from Florida, who is listening as I speak, and sitting at his desk.

May I ask the Senator from Utah whether or not he thinks it is within the fair range of possibilities that our committee might possibly derive some benefit from testimony of witnesses in public hearings on an amendment that might be presented by a Senator, and whether or not the Senator judges it to be advisable to confine discussion behind closed doors at an executive session, free from the interposition of the testimony of the public, of amendments which have been so sacredly and silently presented behind closed doors?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the Senator knows that amendments are sometimes suggested by a witness, sometimes suggested by a Senator, without being formally submitted, but which in fact we very often discuss as ideas long before they are in the form of amendments. There is no way of stopping that and there is no intention to stop it. The Senator also knows that the complementary amendments, or the amendments which are to complement or fulfill the President's program, are at the present time in the state of being written, and not yet perfected. So that those amendments will be submitted in the Senate and formally referred as soon as they are ready. I am ready to confess, and I admit it to the whole country, that

the adoption of the motion, for which I voted, has hurried us probably on to a place where we are not completely prepared. But by the time we get going I am sure we will be wholly prepared to act on the matters which are being discussed.

Mr. DONNELL. May I ask the Senator whether the amendments which are to be prepared, which he says are in process of preparation, on which we are to open hearings tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, will be before our committee at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, or are they still unprepared?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. They may or may not be. They have not been perfected yet in time to submit them today. But they will be ready the first minute they become available.

Mr. DONNELL. So we are to proceed tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock to hear testimony on certain amendments, according to the Pepper resolution, as to the preparation and completion of which by 10 o'clock tomorrow morning the Senator from Utah cannot now give us assurance? Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. When the Senator comes into the hearings tomorrow morning, there will be before the committee a long bill providing for the repeal of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. DONNELL. But, the Senator said, the committee is not going to hear any testimony on that. Is not that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, we are not going to hear any testimony whether we will repeal it or not, but the bill will contain other provisions, and then there is the substitute, and in addition to that there is one provision which has to be decided, because there is a substitute for it. The bill carries an amendment, as the Senator from Missouri well knows, which is open to discussion, and which is something about which anyone may testify as to whether it is proper to continue the panelization, the 5-man board provided for in the present Labor Relations Act.

Everyone knows that when we call before a committtee a member of the President's Cabinet, the Secretary of Labor for illustration, we always give him a chance to do more than to make a simple statement and run away. If no member of the committee were to ask him any questions it would be the first time that has ever happened in my experience in the United States Senate. If such questions do not open up discussions, so that we can understand what the Secretary recommends to us, or the reasons why he makes the recommendations, I shall be very much surprised. I am pretty sure that there is enough material to keep—I was going to say even the Senator from Missouri going—but to keep all of us going tomorrow in the session we shall hold then. I say that because the Senator is asking me quite a number of questions, and I am hard put to answer every one, because I am the kind of fellow who is not used to answering questions.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator from Utah is always very expert in answering questions, and is very clear in his answers.

As I understand, however, the Senator talks about taking testimony on the panelization, that is, whether or not the board shall consist of five men instead of three. That, according to the resolution adopted by the committee the other day, is a matter which is already decided.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, Mr. President.

Mr. DONNELL. That is what the resolution provides, if I am not greatly mistaken.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No, that is not decided.

Mr. DONNELL. The resolution speaks for itself. At any rate the resolution provides that it is decided that the Taft-Hartley law shall be repealed. That is decided, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is decided, so far as the majority of the committee is concerned. I want the people of the country—every man, woman, and child who can read, listen to the radio, or watch television—to know that so far as Democratic Senators on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are concerned, they are trying their best to fulfill what nearly all of them who campaigned promised. That is all.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The resolution provides, does it not, that the Taft-Hartley law shall be repealed, except as to the point of panelization, to which the Senator refers?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. And the five-man board.

Mr. DONNELL. That is the panelization point.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The panelization question arose incidental to the five-man board. Panelization makes it possible for the board to divide up and hear several cases.

Mr. DONNELL. The action taken by our committee the other day, by a vote of 8 to 5, includes among its provisions the statement that the Taft-Hartley law shall be repealed, except as to the continuance of the five-man board.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. So we have already decided those issues in our committee by a vote of 8 to 5.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. We have also decided, by a vote of 8 to 5, that we are going to reenact the Wagner Act.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. So, according to the Senator's view, there is no occasion to have testimony on either the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law or the reenactment of the Wagner Act. Is not that true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I need no testimony; and I believe that if that were all there were to it, we could report the bill without any hearings whatever. But the Senator from Missouri very well remembers that in his message to Congress the President of the United States made other proposals, and those proposals have been placed before us by the President. I deem it our duty to pay attention to them. At least 3 or 4 weeks ago I put the various legal authorities in our Government to work to try to draft amendments consistent with those proposals. Everyone knows that we cannot simply repeal and restore. That is what I said in my opening statement. But we shall have amendments which I think the Senator from Missouri would say at least satisfy the President's message.

Mr. DONNELL. The language of the resolution, as to what our hearings are to address themselves to, is this, is it not:

> That hearings begin forthwith on amendments to the Wagner Act consistent with the proposals made by the President.

That is a correct statement of what is in the resolution, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. DONNELL. Those amendments, so far as the Senator from Utah knows, have not actually been completed. Is that true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. But I am pretty sure that the Secretary of Labor will talk about them, so that we shall at least have the theory. I am sorry that we have not the amendments now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have heard a great deal of discussion here this afternoon to the effect that on the 10th of February it is planned by the committee to terminate the hearings and to report a bill from the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Not to report a bill on February 10.

Mr. TYDINGS. But it is planned to terminate the hearings on February 10. In the event the committee, having set that date as a tentative target, should find on the 9th or the 10th that it is advisable to extend the hearings for two or three days or a week longer, is there anything in the Constitution of the United States, the laws of the Republic, the rules of the Senate, or the procedure of that committee, which would prevent it from doing so?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I know of nothing.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Even though it is true, of course, that we can extend the time, the language of the resolution adopted by a vote of 8 to 5 on January 24, I believe, is "That said hearings be closed not later than February 10, 1949." Is not that true?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is the aim.

Mr. DONNELL. That is the language, is it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Chairman of the Committee has appointed a subcommittee to direct the witnesses and to attempt to bring the hearings to a conclusion at that time.

Mr. DONNELL. The notice which the Senator from Utah has sent to various members of the committee states that the subcommittee is appointed to expedite the hearings. Is not that language used?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Congress can pass the Taft-Hartley law and then proceed shortly thereafter to repeal it or amend it, it seems to me that the committee, within its less confined authority, could change the date of the 10th either forward or backward. In that connection it could do anything it desired to do if it were supported by the majority of the committee.

So all this talk to the effect that the end of the world is coming on the 10th of February, and that if dire circumstances intervene to make it seem desirable the hearings cannot be prolonged for a week or a month, is just so much surplusage.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. We have got into such a maze of details that I think it should be pointed out to the Senate that we did not say February 10, 1949. So we can find a date which will be satisfactory to everyone when the time comes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think it has been most fortunate that we have had this debate this afternoon, because we are now 1 day in advance of schedule so far as hearings on the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law are concerned. I compliment the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for setting a time limit on the hearings.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. No; I decline to yield at the moment. The Senator from Missouri has had a long day. After having heard the Senator from Missouri cross-examine the Senator from Utah, I am convinced that I shall be more strongly than ever in favor of eliminating filibusters.

Mr. President, I have heard my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle grow rather vehement in attempting to convey to the public of America the idea that someone is going to be seriously injured because of the action of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in deciding that these hearings should be concluded by February 10.

If there is any one thing that the Congress of the United States needs in connection with hearings before committees, it is expedition and dispatch. If there is any one thing for which the Congress of the United States is consistently and properly criticized, it is the conducting of protracted hearings upon a subject with which every member of the committee is wholly familiar from beginning to end.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does it not occur to the Senator from Illinois that it is rather ridiculous for some Members of this body to insist that the rule of cloture be reenforced so that debate can be brought to a close, and then, with just the opposite purpose, find fault with a situation in the committee which is considering this bill?

Mr. LUCAS. It is wholly inconsistent.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I decline to yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I understood, Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President; I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if there is any one thing needed in the Congress of the United States, it is the expedition of hearings, so that the findings of a committee, in the nature of a report, can be brought to the floor of the Senate and the Senate may take action before the last week of the session. How many times has the distinguished Vice President sat in the seat I now occupy during the closing days of a session, when a great deal of pending legislation was piled high on the table before us, when we had to consider one bill after another, and yet not one Senator among 15 knew anything about the merits or demerits of the bills. At such times, Mr. President, we have had all-day sessions and all-night sessions, sessions beginning at 11 o'clock in the morning and continuing to midnight and on into the morning hours. However, Senators on the Republican side of the aisle now talk about attempts to cram something down the throat of the Congress, because of an attempt to expedite these hearings. Mr. President, everyone remembers last summer, the chaos and turmoil when we finally concluded our general session, with respect to the log jam of legislation which was here upon this desk. If I can do a single thing, as majority leader of the Senate, to expedite the hearings before our committees, I shall do so, the Senator from Oregon to the contrary notwithstanding.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Illinois will recall very well that on the last day of the session, when our friends on the other side of the aisle were in control, the eminent and able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] virtually wrote the farm bill—with no hearings on it at all—with a pair of scissors, right there at the clerk's desk.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to reply to such a ridiculous statement?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield to my good friend the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I had nothing to do with writing the farm bill at any time. The farm bill was considered at length in the Committee on Agriculture. It was approved by both the Democratic and Republican members of the committee, and then came to the Senate.

The only thing we did the last night was to agree with the House of Representatives that we would not put it into effect until 1950. That was the only change made the last night. However, I had very little to do with that, although I was glad to make that concession to the House of Representatives and go along with the members of the Agricultural Committee, who were really completely in charge of the bill. That is all I had to do with the farm bill.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that it was the housing bill that the Senator from Ohio had at the desk and operated on with a pair of scissors. I remember very well seeing the eminent Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] with a pair of scissors clipping out the paragraphs and pasting them together—with no hearings at all, but asking the country to accept a bill written in that way, and carrying with it several millions of dollars of expense.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, in order to make the record clear, although the Senator from Maryland did correct himself, and subsequently said that it was the housing bill that he had reference to, nevertheless I wish to state that the Senate Committee on Agriculture held hearings all during the fall and summer of 1947, in preparation of the material which was written into the farm bill; and the Department of Agriculture had the farm bill before it time after time, and made recommendations to the committee as to what should be incorporated into the bill. That is how the farm bill was written. I wish to be sure the record is straightened out in that connection.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. It was the housing bill that I should have referred to originally. However, inasmuch as the farm bill has come up for discussion, let me say that it was passed on the last night of the session, I understand, after a very important telephone call from Philadelphia, whence word came, not from Senators, nor Members of the House of Representatives, that "If we do not have a farm bill to go before the country with in the next election, we might as well stay home."

Well, Mr. President, they were partly right, even without the farm bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I dislike to be discourteous to my colleagues, Mr. President, so I yield once more. However, I do not care to say very much more about this matter.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I was on the conference committee, and I conferred closely with all the other members of the conference committee that last evening, and I know all that took place there. I wish to say to the able Senator from Maryland that so far as I was concerned, I was not "in" on the telephone conversation, if there was one.

Mr. LUCAS. That is understandable, inasmuch as the Senator is from Minnesota. [Laughter.]

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I only wish to say, in regard to the housing bill, that elaborate hearings were held on that bill over a long period of time. As the Senator knows, the trouble arose because of the difficulty in getting the House of Representatives to agree to various provisions and in enacting a bill at all. But so far as I know, we wrote in no provisions at

the last moment; and so far as I can recollect, every provision was given serious consideration by the committee.

As the Senator knows, at the last moment, in conferences between the House of Representatives and the Senate to try to eliminate differences, one does have to make concessions and does have to eliminate things which one would like to see included in the measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Illinois will further yield, let me say that is all very well, but my point is that we had 10 minutes of consideration of a conglomerated bill, and then passed that bill, on which no hearings were held.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

I wish to read for a moment what the Reorganization Act says in regard to the adjournment of the Congress. Every Senator knows this. Section 132 of the Reorganization Act is as follows:

> Except in time of war or during a national emergency proclaimed by the President, the two Houses shall adjourn sine die not later than the last day (Sundays excepted) in the month of July in each year unless otherwise provided by the Congress.

That is exactly what we have to do if we comply with the Reorganization Act. In view of all the legislation that is bound to come before the Congress, I ask now, from the floor of the Senate, each and every committee—not only the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, but every other committee—to do everything within its power to expedite its hearings; and if any Senator should object to having a Senate committee sit while the Senate itself is in session—which any Senator has a perfect right to do, of course—it is better now for the committees to work at night, rather than for the Senate of the United States to work day and night during the last 2 weeks of the session, for under those circumstances Senators will not know, half the time, what they are doing regarding important controversial issues and amendments which appear before the Members of the Senate for their determination.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. No, I cannot yield at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not wish to be discourteous to my friend the Senator from California, but I should like to finish what I have to say. I shall be through in just a moment.

Mr. President, there is not a single member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, even including the new members on the Democratic side, who would need to take longer time to consider what legislation amendatory of the Wagner Act is needed. Of course, so far as the present minority is concerned, all of the former members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare still serve on that committee. In view of all the hearings the committee has held and all the information it has, how can anyone say that the committee must take more time to consider what must be done with respect to legislation amendatory of the Wagner Act?

I do not say the matter we have been discussing is the only matter they will consider. I am not in control of that committee, Mr. President. As the Senator from Ohio said a moment ago, in the case of some portion of the Taft-Hartley law as to which there is no question at all or no controversy as between labor and management—for instance, some portion of it that has worked effectively—of course it must be obvious to all that amendments based on such important matters would be given consideration.

But the Presidential proposals are the basic things they are going to consider; and so far as the majority are concerned they are not going to be led astray by any long, dilatory tactics, attempting to defeat by that method what ought to be done with respect to the platform pledge that the Democrats made in their Philadelphia convention. I want to congratulate again the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, so far as the Democrats are concerned, in doing exactly what they have done, because it means expedition, it means dispatch, it means that the Senate will have a better opportunity on the floor of debating the issue, by bringing it to the floor as soon as that can possibly be done, rather than waiting until the dying days of the eighty-first session.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, apropos of the remarks recently made by the able majority leader, the Senator from Illinois, I want to take this opportunity of commending him on urging at least reasonable dispatch of the public's business. I may say for the information of the majority leader, though no doubt he has been adequately informed already, that we are very hopeful the Committee on Rules, of which the able Senator from Arizona is chairman, will be able to terminate its hearings tomorrow on the cloture rule amendment, and will have it up on the floor of the Senate. I hope we may have the full cooperation of the able majority leader to expedite consideration of the cloture amendment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad the Senator brings up that question. I made the sweeping statement a moment ago with reference to the chairmen of all committees that I hope every committee will attempt to bring legislation that is acted upon favorably to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible.

I know how very much interested the able Senator from California has been in attempting to report an amendment to the cloture rule from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have been following the subject in the newspapers, and I have seen the Senator from California make the headlines almost every day in demanding action, morning, afternoon, and night, and insisting that they bring something before the Senate. I wish the Senator had been as insistent on that position 2 years ago as he is now. He is a member of the committee, and as I recall the records show the committee after holding hearings on January 28, February 4, 11, and 18, finally on April 3, 1947, reported a resolution which was the same in character as the one now being considered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Illinois that I am perfectly willing to let the record speak for itself. The Senator from California, ever since he came to the Senate, and after he had an opportunity to observe the obstructionist tactics which can take place through the use of the filibuster, has consistently supported an amendment to the cloture rule of the Senate, and has been endeavoring to have it adopted just as rapidly as it could be done with the parliamentary situation facing us. I am willing to let the record speak for itself.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is probably correct, but he has never shown as much enthusiasm for it as he shows now. And I wonder why? The only Senator on his side of the aisle who ever demonstrated real enthusiasm, so far as I could find from the record, was the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Senator well knows that the rule which was reported by his committee in April 1947, 2 years ago, remained for 15 months on the calendar without the Senator from California ever raising his voice once to try to bring up the rule for debate before the Senate. Am I not correct about that?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Illinois that he is not correct in his statement. In the first place, let me remind the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from California proposed an amendment to the rules early in the session of the Eightieth Congress, and asked for early committee hearings. He did everything he could to secure action on the amendment we then had pending before the Senate, calling for majority cloture, a majority of the full membership of the Senate. The amendment was not reported favorably by the committee. A substitute amendment was brought to the floor of the Senate. At that time some of the Democratic members of the committee had indicated to the committee that if the more moderate resolution were reported, they thought there would be an opportunity of getting the support of Senators on their side of the aisle. So far as the Senator from California could discover, during that entire period of time, what he had at least hoped would be an indication of support never materialized.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not care anything about what the Senator believes about the support he was to receive from this side. The only thing I am talking about, I repeat, is that the Senator from California for some very unusual, peculiar reason, becomes overly excited about having brought to the floor the resolution now pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration. The Senator has been in the newspapers every day. He is demanding of the chairman of the Rules and Administration Committee

that hearings be held, morning, afternoon, and night. The Senator wants action. The Senator never showed such enthusiasm before. That is all right; I am not objecting to it. The only thing I am saying to the Senator from California is that today he is exhibiting for a cloture amendment an enthusiasm which he did not demonstrate 2 years ago, notwithstanding the fact that he was for it.

I do not want to be misunderstood upon this proposition, Mr. President. I hope and I know that the committee will act on this matter soon, and report it to the Senate, but I cannot control the actions of the committee. The Senator is on that committee, and he has something to do with it. When the committee reports the resolution, that will be the time to talk about it. But I am sure that if the Senator will just keep prodding he will finally get it to the floor of the Senate even though his position today is wholly inconsistent with his position when the Republicans were in power.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the able Senator from Illinois on that score that Members of the Senate, as do individuals elsewhere in the world, I think, learn a great deal through experience. The Senator from California in the 3 years he has been privileged to serve as a Member of this body has certainly learned that unless an amendment to the rules of this nature is brought before the Senate of the United States in the early days of the session, there is no opportunity of obtaining consideration for it. If the Senator from California seems to be a little aggressive along these lines, I can assure the Senator from Illinois that it is because of the experience I have gained in this honorable body, that action should be taken early in the session, and unless those who are advocating it are merely giving it lip service, they should join in getting early consideration by the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not think the Republican Party is fooling the country by the tremendous enthusiasm which some of its members are showing, because there was a proposed amendment to the cloture rule on the calendar for 15 months in the past 2 years, and I do not recall that the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee ever stood on the floor of the Senate and made a motion to have it considered so that some action could be taken with reference to it. That is the only point I am making. I do not want the Senators to become too discouraged about the matter. Do not push us and shove us too much, because I do not think the Senators are in a proper position to do that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that I support the statement of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The proposed change in the rule was placed on the calendar in February 1947, early in the session, but at no time after that could there be any assurance of an opportunity to consider the question without a lengthy debate, two or three weeks or a month, because at all times other matters came forward which had to be acted on for the best interests of the country. The most persistent Senator that I know of, because it was my measure that was on the calendar, and he was constantly talking about it, was the Senator from California.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is wonderful to see Massachusetts and California together.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, not withstanding the adjournment of the Senate today, the Vice President be authorized to sign the enrolled House Joint Resolution 112 making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes. I understand that the joint resolution has been passed by the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## COMMUTATION OF SENTENCES IN MALMEDY CASE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, in a news article released, apparently, on January 6, and which appeared in the New York Times, it was announced that an Army commission, headed by Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, recommended that death sentences be commuted to life imprisonment or less for 29 convicted Nazi war criminals, 12 of whom had taken part in the "Malmedy massacre" of American prisoners in 1944.

Under date of January 17 there appeared an article in Time magazine which is headed "War crimes," from which I should like to quote very briefly. The subheading of the article is "Clemency." I read as follows:

> The Malmedy massacre of captured United States soldiers, during the Battle of the Bulge in December 1944, was one of the most vicious atrocities committed by Germans in combat during the war. By the testimony of one survivor (who escaped by feigning death after he was shot in the foot), some 160 United States soldiers were lined up in a snow-covered field, 8 deep and 20 abreast, and raked by machine-gun fire for 3 minutes.
>
> The survivor heard the "agonized screams" of wounded and dying comrades, and single pistol shots—coups de grace administered by Germans who walked among the fallen victims after the machine-gunning stopped.
>
> After war's end, the Germans responsible for the massacre fell into Allied hands. Among them were two S. S. big wigs, Gen. Josef ("Sepp") Dietrich, commander of the Sixth Armored Division, and Col. Joachim Peiper, of the 1st Armored Regiment (known as "Peiper's Task Force").

The article goes on to say that the matter was brought up for investigation and that, as a result of an investigation, the commutations of sentence were granted.

I was interested in the matter, Mr. President, because one of the men who took part in the prosecutions and in securing evidence for the prosecutions of the Germans who committed this most heinous offense is a young man in the State of Connecticut. I have known him for a long time. He was admitted to the bar in Connecticut and went into the Army as an enlisted man in the last war. He finally rose to the rank of an officer and was assigned to the Judge Advocate General's department and saw a great deal of overseas service. A part of his duty overseas was to work in the preparation of cases having to do with the prosecution of the Germans who perpetrated the Malmedy massacre.

The article from which I have quoted goes on to explain that the reason why the sentences were commuted, apparently, is because of the methods used by the prosecuting investigators and officers in securing confessions from the Germans who had taken part in this vicious massacre of unarmed troops who had surrendered and were entitled to be treated as prisoners of war under all the rules which have been in force for many years governing the conduct of warfare. The implication is that this young man used improper, illegal, and vicious methods to secure the testimony and handle the prosecutions.

Under date of July 13, 1948, this young man wrote me a letter from which I shall quote briefly. He says:

> There were 74 who were tried in this case—

Meaning the case involving the Malmedy massacre—

> including the commanding general of the Sixth SS Panzer Army, Lt. Gen. "Sepp" Dietrich, and most of the subordinate commanders who were responsible for these atrocities against American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians. It is my recollection that there was only one acquittal. There were over 40 of the accused who were sentenced to be hanged. Quite a few were sentenced to life imprisonment. Some of those more remote in the chain of command were sentenced to relatively short terms.

I may say, Mr. President, it developed in the investigation of the matter that these commanding officers had been given orders by the German high command, and they had passed those orders down to their troops, that in this Battle of the Bulge not one single prisoner, military or civilian, was to be taken; that they were to be shot down ruthlessly, whether or not they offered to surrender, or whether they had surrendered.

Then the writer of the letter goes on to say:

> The trial took place two years ago. The officer who was appointed to defend the accused, a Colonel Everett, has been gaining a considerable amount of publicity through his efforts to discredit the investigation, prosecution, and trial of these murderers.

He has been assisted in this endeavor by German lawyers retained by certain of the individual defendants who were wealthy enough or had connections in Germany influential enough, to procure and pay for their services. Their efforts in this regard culminated in the recent appeal of these convictions to the United States Supreme Court on the grounds that the trial court committed error in admitting into evidence confessions which it was claimed were improperly obtained. These confessions were the basis of most of the convictions.

I should like to say here, Mr. President, that this young man has already prepared affidavits under oath, as have many others who were concerned with the prosecution, denying any improper, unfair, or vicious tactics in securing the confessions.

I read further from the letter:

The prosecution proved that orders were given by the commanding general of the German Army, which spearheaded this last desperate offensive and transmitted and elaborated upon by subordinate commanders, to the effect that prisoners of war would not be taken and that civilians would be given no quarter. It was also shown that subordinate commanders down to the last noncom transmitted these orders with their own embellishments and propaganda in order to incite their men to carry them out ruthlessly. The prosecution also showed that these orders resulted in the mass shooting of American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians. It was proved in this connection that in addition to the hundred or more American prisoners of war who were murdered at the crossroads in Malmedy, there were over 500 other American prisoners of war and Belgian civilians who were similarly dealt with by these fanatics.

Mr. President, when I received that letter I took the matter up with the Secretary of the Army, who assured me that it would be investigated. The Judge Simpson Commission had already been appointed and was in the process of looking into the case.

Meanwhile, this application for a writ of habeas corpus had been filed in the Supreme Court of the United States, accompanied by an affidavit setting forth what this young friend of mine tells me are utterly groundless charges as to the manner in which these confessions were procured. As a result of that the Secretary of War appointed another separate group to look specifically into the Malmedy situation.

Mr. President, what I ask for on behalf of these young officers, these Americans who had done the job of investigating the Malmedy massacre, and of preparing the prosecution and conducting the trials—and all that they asked me to urge in their behalf—is an opportunity to be heard before any final decisions are made in the reduction of these sentences. So far as I know some affidavits they sent were sent to the Simpson committee. Whether that committee paid any attention to them or not I do not know. I assume it did. But I do not believe that the commission which was specifically appointed to investigate the Malmedy phase of these prosecutions ever had opportunity to examine these affidavits. If it did, that commission and no other commission has ever had the opportunity personally to hear the testimony of these young officers, who have been charged, without an opportunity on their part to defend themselves, with conducting themselves in a vicious and highly improper manner.

Yet, Mr. President, as I understand, Colonel Everett who defended the Germans, and Mr. Lear, who I understand is a German lawyer, had on opportunity personally to appear before the commission and present their side of the case.

Mr. President, these men were in the performance of their duty, they were dealing with one war crime, which is the one in which our nationals were involved, our own soldiers, our own boys in uniform, men who now lie beneath the sod in France and Belgium, and have no one to speak in their behalf.

I think this matter should be thoroughly investigated. I should like to see a real survey and study made of the whole conduct of this situation. If these Germans were not fairly treated, if they were not treated as the fair conduct of war, according to its rules, requires, they are, of course, entitled to consideration. But in determining whether they were fairly treated or not the men who had charge of investigating their conduct, the men who had charge of prosecuting them, should themselves have an opportunity to appear and be heard in person to answer the charges, which I believe to be groundless, which were made against them in behalf of these convicted German war criminals.

So, Mr. President, if I may, I should like to secure unanimous consent to offer a resolution calling for such an investigation, and have it received and referred.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to advise the Senator that a similar resolution was submitted this morning. I offered one providing as follows:

That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration of military justice by courts operated by the armed forces of the United States in occupied areas, with a view to ascertaining (1) whether the conduct of trials and the treatment of prisoners in cases involving civilians (both citizen and noncitizen) as well as cases involving military personnel have been in accordance with American concepts of justice, and (2) whether any legislation is necessary or desirable for the purpose of improving the operations of such courts. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

I might add that there is another side to what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said. The situation is that when I submitted the resolution I had a statement printed with it. I am not sure the distinguished Senator was present at the time. I presented this statement to be included with the resolution:

The purpose of this resolution is to provide for an inquiry into the type of justice which is being administered by our forces overseas. There are now more than 100,000,000 people outside the United States and its territories who are liable to some sort of prosecution trial and punishment under the American flag.

These people may be tried and are tried on charges of war crimes, crimes against humanity, and crimes against the occupation forces. All of these charges, in case of conviction, incur heavy penalties.

Yet these courts and courts' systems are not subordinate, or have not been so far subordinate to any regularly established court of the United States. The theater commander in practice has the last word.

As one might expect in a system so far removed from popular constitution and control many abuses have crept in. These abuses have been compounded by the hybrid rules of procedure. They combine American, Continental, and Russian rules. As a result their rulings are a far cry from what would be demanded by American standards.

One of the most glaring abuses now exists in Germany. At the American Military Government Court at Dachau 1,672 persons were tried as of August 12, 1948, at the time of the latest figures reported by the Department of the Army, 1,416 had been convicted. Two hundred and ninety-seven death sentences were approved. Of these, according to subsequent newspaper reports, 217 have been executed. There remain 39 defendants still under death sentences.

(The Department of the Army reports only 29 and this number has been reduced to 14 by various commutations.)

This sounds like a record of justice done to the criminal members of a criminal conspiracy. But in fact it may well turn out to be, upon investigation, one of the most deplorable miscarriage of justice in history.

The distinguished Senator mentioned the Secretary of War, Kenneth Royall. Mr. Royall appointed a 2-man civilian board a long time ago, they made a survey of the trials at the request of Secretary Royall, and returned to the United States recently and reported. What did they report? These two men appointed by the Secretary of War said that the following methods were used to force confessions: Beatings and brutal kickings; knocking out teeth and breaking jaws; mock trials; solitary confinement; torture with burning splinters; posturing as priests; very limited rations; spiritual deprivation; promises of acquittal.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LANGER. Just a moment. I do not know whether or not these statements are true.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota does not have the floor. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor. He yielded to the Senator from North Dakota. This whole proceeding is out of order unless it be regarded as being conducted by unanimous consent. The Senator can yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. BALDWIN. I asked unanimous consent that I might submit the resolution, and the Senator from North Dakota is making a speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota reserved the right to object to the submission of the resolution.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under his reservation, I suppose he is entitled to proceed. The Senator from Connecticut still has the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LANGER. I assumed, when I reserved the right to object, that I had a right to say why.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair holds that the Senator may do so, within a reasonable limit.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wish to get the matter clearly before the Senate, because I do not think the Senator from Connecticut was present this morning when I submitted the resolution.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield so that I may say a word?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Charges are made against these young American officers who conducted the prosecution.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have not had an opportunity to make clear the purpose of my resolution. It is to give these men an opportunity to refute those charges, an opportunity they have never had. I submit that if they are to be charged in the public press, and in a magazine as important and as widely read as Time, with such heinous offenses, they should have opportunity to appear before the Commission in person and have their side of the matter told.

I say, Mr. President, that so far as my knowledge of this young man, who denies these things, is concerned, I know him to be a young man of the highest integrity, whose word is unimpeachable. In my humble judgment he has never had his day in court to answer these particular charges.

Mr. LANGER. The purpose of the resolution submitted today is to give such men an opportunity to answer such charges. That is the very purpose of the resolution. It is simply a duplication of the other resolution, and I thought I would call it to the attention of the senior Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that I am happy to have his collaboration in this matter, because if our troops use improper methods to secure convictions, I as an American citizen should like to know what they are, because I think it is important that we demonstrate to the world that in the administration of American justice we are fair, honest, and forthright. If the charges are not true, I should like to know that also, because I think these young officers are entitled to some consideration.

Mr. LANGER. I merely wanted to say that so far as these charges are concerned Judge E. LeRoy van Roden of Media, Pa., and Justice Gordon Simpson of the Supreme Court of Texas, who composed the board, recommended to Secretary Royall, after making these shocking discoveries, that a permanent clemency program be started for most of those convicted. They further recommended that 29 of those under death sentence be spared.

I wanted to mention the matter to the Senator so he might understand the purpose of the resolution I had submitted, and possibly we can combine our efforts in the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota object to the submission of the resolution?

Mr. LANGER. I do not object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and properly referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 42) was received and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of the action of the Army with respect to the trial of those persons responsible for the massacre of American soldiers which occurred during the Battle of the Bulge near Malmedy, Belgium, in December 1944, with particular reference to (1) the conduct of the investigation by the Army preliminary to the trial, (2) the conduct of the trial of the alleged perpetrators of the massacre, and (3) the action taken by Army officials subsequent to the trial, which has resulted in the commutations of the sentences of many of the defendants convicted at the trial.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

## PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CLOTURE RULE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the question of the amendment of the rules, some time ago a columnist made the statement that the rules were going to be amended because of what took place on the last night of the last session of Congress. He quoted particularly the speeches made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] and the senior Senator from North Dakota. I want to state now that when the matter comes before the Senate again I expect to bring to the attention of the Senate just exactly what took place, so far as the senior Senator from North Dakota is concerned, upon that occasion.

Mr. President, I want to ask any Senator upon the floor if it is filibustering when a Senator rises on the floor respecting a matter so important as the drafting of our boys, after the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress had for weeks and weeks adjourned the sessions of the Senate for a 3-day period, then for another 3-day period, then for a further 3-day period, and then still for another 3-day period, knowing all the while that the Philadelphia convention was going to take place in June.

Mr. President, 2 years before the junior Senator from California was a Member of this body I stood upon the floor of the Senate for 5 hours pleading that the draft law be not enacted. And yet when upon that occasion I asked the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] some questions, the RECORD shows that the Senator from California, then the majority leader temporarily, time after time proceeded to castigate the Senator from North Dakota and tell him what kind of questions he should ask.

I now ask the Senator from California or any other Senator whether it was filibustering when the Senator from North Dakota, or a Senator from any other State did what I did upon that occasion. I read upon the floor of the Senate letter after letter from the various churches of the State of North Dakota. I read letters from Methodist churches. Did they not have a right to protest? I read letters from Catholic churches. Did they not have a right to protest? I read letters from the Moravian church. Did its members not have a right to protest? I read letters from Baptist churches. Did they not have a right to protest? I read a letter from the Rotary Club of Devils Lake, N. Dak. Did not that club have a right to protest? I read letters from the Board of Higher Education of our State. Not one member of that board is a political friend of mine. The members of that board, representing every single institution of learning in North Dakota, unanimously adopted a resolution against the draft. I read that resolution upon the floor of the Senate. I resented then, and I resent now, the fact that the distinguished Senator from California rose on the floor of the Senate at the conclusion of my statement and said that Joe Stalin must be happy because the Senators had delayed fulfillment of action on the draft measure some few hours.

Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that I stood upon the floor of the Senate in opposition to that draft.

I read in a newspaper the other night that now a bipartisan group of Democrats and Republicans is getting a bill together which would repeal the draft. The article also said that what defeated the Republicans in the last election was the enactment of the draft.

Mr. President, when I spoke on that subject I did not speak in any political sense. Senators can go through my speech from one end to the other and they will find no political bias. There were no Bible quotations in it. I did not quote any poetry. I brought before the Senate the feelings of the various churches of the State of North Dakota, and of the Farmers Union and the various other farm organizations. That is a matter of record.

I want to say again that I resented the statements made at that time, and I continue to resent them. When the matter of change of the rules comes up in the Senate I am going to ascertain once for all whether there is going to be an attempt, by a change of the Senate rules, to keep a Senator from a small State from laying bare upon the floor of the Senate the feelings of the people of his State.

The late Senator Charles McNary said to me the very first time the question of cloture came up after I became a member, "I signed one cloture petition during the 22 years I have been here, and I never am going to sign another." He said "the only progressive legislation we have had was enacted because of the fact that Members of Congress who came from small States were able to get, perhaps not all they wanted, but were able to get a compromise. So, Mr. President, having made my position clear on that question, I wish to take up another matter.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I had not intended to mention this matter, but inasmuch as the Senator from North Dakota has seen fit to bring it to the attention of the Senate, I might as well get my oar in here, inasmuch as I was the other party to the filibuster which seems to have caused so much discussion in the past few days.

One can call it a filibuster if he so desires. It lasted only overnight. I believe that the rules which it is planned to adopt would allow much greater discussion than that before the debate was called a filibuster.

The other day the press stated that the Senator from Oregon had intimated that the Senator from Idaho had endangered the national security by talking against the peacetime draft. I do not know why he did not include the Senator from North Dakota, because I am sure he was not ashamed of his part in fighting against the peacetime draft. I wish to say only that I hardly feel that it is endangering the national security when a Senator rises on the floor of the Senate and makes it plain, as I did at that time, that he has confidence in the patriotism of young Americans to serve their country without compulsion. I stated that if we were to increase the financial rewards attached to service in our armed forces we could get men without drafting them. I pointed out that it was a procedure absolutely foreign to all our traditions to have a peacetime draft. If that is endangering the national security, it is a strange definition. When it said that a Senator endangers the national security, the only inference that can be drawn, of course, is that that Senator is disloyal to his country. I certainly am not.

Mr. President, is it endangering the national security for a Senator to exercise foresight and to look ahead and evaluate the facts as they really are? At the time I stated that the peacetime draft was unnecessary.

I have before me an article from the Washington Post, in an Associated Press dispatch dated January 20. The heading is Figures Indicate That Draft Law Will Be Discarded. Did the Senator from North Dakota see that article?

Mr. LANGER. I saw it.

Mr. TAYLOR. It states that the armed forces have reached the goal set by President Truman of 1,616,000 men in uniform by June of 1950. They have already enlisted 1,621,000 men, more than were called for by 1950. So the use of the peacetime draft has been discontinued.

But, Mr. President, I notice that the military authorities do not say, "Let us get back to the good old American principles of voluntary service, get rid of involuntary servitude, and repeal the draft." No; they do not need it and they are not using it, but they intend to keep it. I disapprove of such a policy. If it is being disloyal to my country to want to see us continue in the paths set by our forefathers, being freemen and acting as freemen, then I shall have to say, like Patrick Henry, if that be treason or disloyalty, make the most of it.

Inasmuch as the peacetime draft is not being used, and apparently not needed, according to the admission of the military authorities, I have today introduced a bill to repeal the peacetime draft. Did I correctly understand the Senator from North Dakota to say that a bipartisan group of Senators was introducing such a measure?

Mr. LANGER. The other day the newspapers stated that a bipartisan group was introducing a bill to repeal the draft.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to see that the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from Idaho now have allies who have come to realize that this is still a free country and should be kept that way.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Idaho imply that the Army has changed the rules, and that it now makes a man enlist for 3 years instead of 2?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes; I read today, I believe. They are making the men enlist for 3 years instead of 2. It seems that perhaps they want to revive the peacetime draft.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say to the able Senator from North Dakota, who mentioned the fact that 2 or 3 years prior to my coming to the Senate he was also opposed to the draft, that that was during the time I was serving in the Army of the United States as an enlisted man and officer.

I invite the attention of the able Senator from North Dakota to the fact that if prior to the outbreak of World War II some of our colleagues had put the defenses of the country in proper order, there might be many young Americans living today who are now buried on the islands of the Pacific and in the cemeteries of Europe, and whose bodies are just now being returned home.

This gives me an opportunity to say to the able Senator from North Dakota that only the other day I wrote to the Department of the Air Force and asked the Department to supply me with a list of the names of young American soldiers who have died in supplying the air lift into Berlin, where a very cold war, which sometimes blows very hot, is even now going on. I want to say to the able Senator from North Dakota that I do not believe there is a man in this body who desires to have peace more than does the junior Senator from California. I do not believe that there is a person in the country who desires to have peace more than do the men who served in the armed services of the United States during the late war or during the First World War. But I do believe that the best way of preserving the peace of this country and the peace of the world is to keep America strong in the air, on the land, and on the sea, because in this age of the airplane and the atom, in which we now live, when there is a power loose in the world which recognizes nothing but force, we are not serving the cause of world peace and we are not serving the cause of the security of the Government of the United States and the free institutions which we have all taken an oath to uphold, by making America weak.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter from the Secretary of the Air Force giving a list of 26 American citizens, officers of the United States Air Force, who have given their lives in order to uphold world peace and international obligations.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
*Washington, January 18, 1949.*

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Reference is made to a telephone conversation between Mr. Wilson of your office and a member of my staff, in which Mr. Wilson requested the names and addresses of personnel killed while performing duties on Operation Vittles.

Inclosed are the names and addresses of 26 personnel killed in Operation Vittles. This report is complete as of January 17, 1949.

If this directorate can be of any further assistance to you please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM T. SMITH,
*Colonel, United States Air Force; Executive, Directorate of Legislation and Liaison.*

---

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, JULY 1948

Leland V. Williams, first lieutenant, AO-686293; killed, July 8, 1948; branch of service, United States Air Force. Next of kin: Mr. Otis Williams (father), 1222 South Sixth Street, Abilene, Tex. Mrs. Edith Williams (wife), 1222 South Sixth Street, Abilene, Tex. (wife in field).

George B. Smith, first lieutenant, AO-794711; killed, July 8, 1948; branch of service, United States Air Force. Next of kin: Mrs. Harriet W. G. Smith (wife), 37 Coverdale, Tuscaloosa, Ala.

Mr. Karl V. Hagen, DO79463; killed, July 8, 1948; branch of service, Department of the Army (civilian). Next of kin: Mrs. Yvonne F. Hagen (wife), 67 Pod Bielski, Allee, Berlin, Dahlem.

Charles H. King, first lieutenant, AO27501; killed, July 25, 1948; branch of service, United States Air Force. Next of kin: Mrs. Natalie R. King (wife), 230 Orient Way, Rutherford, N. J.

Robert W. Stuber, first lieutenant, AO56312; killed, July 25, 1948; branch of service, United States Air Force. Next of kin: Mrs. Maxine Stuber (wife), 137 West Malbern Avenue, Fullerton, Calif.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, AUGUST 1948

Edwind C. Diltz, major, AO423920; killed, August 24, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Doris S. Diltz (wife), Fayetteville, Tex.

William R. Howard, captain, AO789573; killed, August 24, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Earlene C. Howard (mother), Gunnison, Miss. Mrs. Eleanor M. Howard (wife), 1615 North Patterson Street, Valdosta, Ga. (wife in field).

Joel M. DeVolentine, captain, AO53549; killed, August 24, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Edith E. DeVolentine (wife), 101 Northeast Forty-eighth Street, Miami, Fla. (wife in field). Mrs. Minnie DeVolentine (mother), 2326 Boulevard Drive, NE., Atlanta, Ga.

William T. Lucas, Jr., first lieutenant, AO715565; killed, August 24, 1948. Next of kin, Mrs. Sally B. Lucas (mother), 216 North Railroad, Wilson, N. C.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, OCTOBER 1948

Johnnie T. Orms, private first class, RA37222718; killed, October 2, 1948; branch of service: Department of Army. Next of kin, Mrs. Gwendline V. Orms (wife), Mortimer's Lane, Foxton Near Rayton, Herta, England; Mrs. Nellie G. Orms (mother), 1106 Cedar Street, Coffeyville, Kans.

James A. Vaughan, captain, AO862809; killed, October 18, 1948; branch of service: USAF. Next of kin: Mrs. Helene M. Vaughan (wife), 82 Perkins Street, New Haven, Conn.

Eugene S. Erickson, first lieutenant, AO568053; killed, October 18, 1948; branch of service: USAF. Next of kin: Mrs. Margaret Erickson (wife), 1205 State Street, Collinsville, Ill.

Richard Winter, sergeant, AF39203365; killed, October 18, 1948; branch of service: USAF. Next of kin: Mr. and Mrs. Bert Winter, 1126 Twenty-third Avenue, Seattle, Wash.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, DECEMBER 1948

Billy E. Phelps, captain, AO55141; killed, December 5, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Rubye Lee Phelps (wife), 3601 Gaviota Avenue, Long Beach, Calif.

Willy F. Hargis, first lieutenant, AO760457; killed, December 5, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Euzelia L. Hargis (mother), 112 Houston Street, Nacagdoches, Tex.

Lloyd George Wells, technical sergeant, AF-7060860; killed December 5, 1948. Next of kin: Mrs. Anna Lee Wells (wife), Route 487, North Kansas City, Kans.

Harry R. Crites, Jr., AD-3, 2945831; killed December 11, 1948; branch of service, Department of Navy. Next of kin: Mr. Harry Russell Crites, Sr. (father), 1119 North Ninth Street, Lafayette, Ind.

PERSONNEL KILLED ON OPERATION VITTLES, JANUARY 1949

Richard M. Wurgel, first lieutenant, AO-826341, killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Richard M. Wurgel (wife), c/o Ramey AFB, San Juan, Puerto Rico; Dr. Rena Wurgel (father), 1614 Palisade Avenue, Union City, N. J.

Lowell A. Wheaton, first lieutenant, AO-677371; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Dorothy N. Wheaton (wife), 3146 Austin Avenue, Corpus Christi, Tex.

Norbert H. Theis, corporal, AF-17191076; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mr. Nicholas Theis (father), Box 134, Cunningham, Kans.

Bernard J. Watkins, sergeant, AF-15101399; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mr. Ralph H. Watkins (father), 1723 Elmwood Avenue, Lafayette, Ind.

William A. Rathgeber, captain, AO-561871; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mr. Albert W. Rathgeber (father), 6347 SE Eighty-fourth Street, Portland, Oreg.

Ronald A. Stone, private, first class, AF-15199071; killed January 7, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Mamie Stone (mother), 236 West Locust Street, Mount Sterling, Ky.

Ralph H. Boyd, first lieutenant, AO-691225; killed January 12, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Wanda Boyd (wife), 2626 Travis Street, Fort Worth, Tex.

Craig B. Ladd, first lieutenant, AO-687483; killed, January 12, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Eleanor Ladd (wife), 6845 Newton Avenue South, Minneapolis, Minn.

Charles L. Putman, technical sergeant, AF-17146457; killed, January 12, 1949. Next of kin: Mrs. Irene Putman (mother), 416 South Pejon Street, Colorado Springs, Colo.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in response to what the distinguished Senator from California has said, I simply appeal to the RECORD. The Senator from North Dakota is proud that he offered his life to defend this country; and it comes with ill grace from any Senator—from California or any other State—to impugn the motives of the Senator from Idaho or the Senator from North Dakota, and, after we had stood on this floor and protested against a peacetime draft, which we had a perfect right to do, to say that Joe Stalin must be happy. I want the distinguished Senator from California and every other Senator to know that I yield to no man in patriotism. I voted for the 70-group air force. I am proud of the record I have made in voting to make this Government strong.

That is entirely beside the point. The point is that the distinguished Senator from California took it upon himself to impugn the motives of the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from North Dakota. I want to tell my distinguished friend that the people of North Dakota are just as patriotic as are the people of the State of California. The majority were opposed then, and they are now opposed, to a peacetime draft. It is the tradition of America not to have a peacetime draft. We had none until a short time ago. Certainly a man is not disloyal, and is not helping Stalin, when he rises upon the floor of the Senate and does his duty in bringing to the attention of the Senate the feelings of the people of his State, and when he quotes church after church, Rotary Clubs, the Farmers Union, and boards of higher education, and does not consume a single minute of time in talking about something else, and does not do anything which even savors of a filibuster.

That is what I wanted to make plain here today, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there are a number of nominations on the Executive Calendar. I do not think there is any objection to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). If there are no reports of committees at this time, the Clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Albert J. Loveland, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Marvel, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gilmore S. Haynie, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Miles N. Pike, to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas N. Curran, to be United States marshal for the district of Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Paul B. Messick, to be United States Marshal for the district of Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jack R. Caufield, to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations made today.

PETER MARSHALL

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the news of the sudden and untimely death of the Reverend Dr. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, comes as a shock to all of the Members of the Senate, whose wholehearted affection and admiration he enjoyed.

In his capacity as Chaplain of the Senate, he exercised a spiritual influence and moral guidance felt by every Member here. While he had no voice in determining policy and had no vote on any measure that came before us, his prayers carried weight in our hearts and many times moved us in the right direction.

He was a man of great piety and great wit, a man with strength of soul and fine personal charm, whose memory will be bright in the recollections of every Senator for many years to come.

His beautiful and eloquent prayers for the Senate were often remarked upon by members of the press, and often noted by our friends and visitors here. He put the whole power of his spirit into his beseechings of Almighty God, and he carried all of us with him.

In his youth, in Scotland, he worked with his hands in the steel mills. Later he felt the call of a religious vocation, and entered the Presbyterian ministry. He came to our country as a young man, and became a citizen of our Nation to work among us as a man of God.

We honor him today as he goes to the final judgment of his Maker, to give an account of his life upon this earth as a great human being, a great minister, a great American. He takes his place in the long line of distinguished Chaplains who have served the Senate.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to offer the resolution which I send to the desk and ask to have read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 43) was read, and the Senate proceeded to its consideration.

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and regret of the death of Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., late the Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to say just a few words in

regard to the resolution offered by the majority leader.

The minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], is unfortunately not able to be present here today to express his personal feelings and the feelings all of us share at the loss of our Chaplain. Peter Marshall was Senator WHERRY'S pastor. He officiated at the marriage of his daughter. I know he feels a great personal loss. So do we all.

Our Chaplain, Dr. Marshall, always opened our sessions with prayers that helped and inspired us all. They combined brevity with common sense. They always aptly expressed in religious terms the problems of the moment. Above all, they were inspired with deep spiritual feeling. I recall his words about the meaning of liberty:

Teach us that liberty is not only to be loved but also to be lived. Liberty is too precious a thing to be buried in books. It costs too much to be hoarded. Make us to see that liberty is not the right to do as we please, but the opportunity to please to do what is right.

Never shall we forget the morsels of thought that were contained in his prayers. They were replete with earthy phrases—phrases which caught the attention and made meaningful his spiritual message.

Most of us came to know our Chaplain only two short years ago. We immediately felt the impact of his prayers, so we wanted to know him better. I always found him full of humor, a man of ready repartee, and intensely human. Why shouldn't he be? He was a man who knew how to toil with his hands. He knew what it was to work hard for an education, and he had what we need so much in the world today—the inspiration to be a spiritual leader. So, with hard work and much sacrifice, he became one. We have been the beneficiaries of his toil and his inspiration. All of us will miss his daily words of guidance to us. Most of us on the day on which President Truman was inaugurated heard Dr. Marshall's prayer. It will remain in our minds as typifying the spirit of the man who said these words:

Give to them good health for the physical strains of their office, good judgment for the decisions they must make, wisdom beyond their own, and clear understanding for the problems of this difficult hour.

We thank Thee for their humble reliance upon Thee. May they go often to the throne of grace, as we commend them both to Thy loving care and Thy guiding hand. Amen.

These words and the memory of the man who said them will remain long with us.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, at a time like this words are of little consequence. Peter Marshall has made his record and it is indeed a brilliant one. A man above politics, he bowed to the needs and desires of this body. Would that God give all of us here in the Senate the strength and courage to live up to his simple, provocative yet easily understood prayers.

Peter Marshall was not born in this great land of ours. He was a native of Scotland, a nation that has sent many of her sons to our shores, who have made a real contribution to our democratic way of life. Peter Marshall was indeed among that illustrious group.

His early life was not an easy one. Working with his fellow man in the everyday world before becoming a minister of the gospel, he pursued the same hard road that many others have taken. Yet he remained the same unaffected man he had always been. Upon attaining what many of us would call a highly successful status, but with which he would disagree, Peter Marshall did not forget those he might have met along the way. As a Scotsman, his creed might well be expressed in a verse from Robert Burns, of whom Peter Marshall was an ardent admirer:

Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that,
That sense and worth o'er a' the earth,
Shall bear the gree[1] and a' that;
For a' that and a' that,
It's comin' yet for a' that,
That man to man, the world o'er
Shall brithers be for a' that.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Republican minority conference today. This resolution was submitted to the conference by me on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Almighty God in His infinite wisdom has taken from the United States Senate its beloved Chaplain, the Reverend Peter Marshall; and

Whereas he has rendered to the membership of the United States Senate through his daily prayers a spiritual service of great and lasting value; and

Whereas he was our affectionate friend, ever ready to give of himself, of his efforts, and of his judgment for our guidance in the ways of righteousness and Christian living: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, the Republican Members of the United States Senate, express our sense of loss at his passing; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Mrs. Catherine Marshall, that she may be assured of our deep sympathy and condolences upon the passing of our friend, her husband.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Washington Post of January 26, 1949, and the other from the Washington Evening Star of January 26, 1949, paying deserved tribute to the late Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Peter Marshall.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 26, 1949]

PETER MARSHALL

We deplore, as the Capital must, the untimely death of Dr. Peter Marshall, the 46-year-old Chaplain of the Senate who was also pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church. Till Dr. Marshall came to the Senate 2 years ago, the Senators had heard a more or less perfunctory sort of "grace" before they began their deliberations. The Presbyterian minister opened the ears of the bowed Senators to his words of prayer, and he put those words alongside their subsequent speeches. They were novel out of the mouth of a minister, pointed in their application to the business in hand, and charged with a hortatory spirit that carried conviction. His voice had a vibrancy, his words a Scot's tang, his presence a manliness, that enabled his allocution to linger in the senatorial memory. Only recently an American citizen, having been born in Scotland, he had a passion for America. His zest for life was as fresh and as real as his religion. He inspired the younger generation with sermons that, while without profundity, brought a living God into their lives. His is a loss that the Senate will not easily repair and that his growing congregation can ill spare.

[1] Have the prize.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 26, 1949]

DR. PETER MARSHALL

Living and working in Washington only eleven years, the Reverend Dr. Peter Marshall nevertheless has left his mark upon the whole city. He was a man of a contagious spirit, eager and alert, quick to see opportunities of service and to meet their challenge. Within a few months after coming here he had made himself an influence throughout the entire community. Wherever he went, whatever he did, the result of his presence was constructive. In classic language, he was a builder of the Kingdom of God on this earth.

Perhaps one explanation of Dr. Marshall's power might be found in the fact that he was a son of the people and kept his touch with them even when he had risen to high station. Born and reared against a bleak and uncongenial background, he earned his bread as a laborer in his youth. His formal education was limited to a mechanical and mining college at Coatbridge in Scotland and the Columbia Seminary at Decatur in Georgia. Most of his scholarly achievement he owed to his own inquiring mind. The magic of his eloquence was a native gift which he shared with Burns and Carlyle, Hugh Miller, and John Buchan. But he was a great preacher because of an inner genius, a force of faith which demanded expression in human ministry.

His decade at the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church was a period of progress which soon will find fulfillment in a new religious center on the site long ago hallowed by the presence of Abraham Lincoln. Dr. Marshall will not see the building program finished, but his association with its start will be an asset always. He is certain of remembrance, too, at the Capitol. Able interpreters of the Word preceded him in the chaplaincy of the Senate, and he contributed notably to the tradition which they established. His final prayer for government "above party and personality, beyond time and circumstance, for the good of America and the peace of the world" was a masterful utterance which well may be regarded as his testament to the country he adopted and dearly loved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

CATHERINE MARSHALL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit, out of order, Senate Resolution 44, for reference to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 44) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Catherine Marshall, widow of Rev. Peter Marshall, late the Chaplain of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Dr. Marshall, Chaplain of the Senate, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 27, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, N. Y., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury to fill an existing vacancy.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Karl T. Compton, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

MUNITIONS BOARD

Donald F. Carpenter, of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Hon. Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska. Judge Kehoe is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 7, 1948.

Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, district of Alaska. Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Frank C. Bingham, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 2, district of Alaska. Mr. Bingham is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 29, 1948.

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska. Mr. Arend is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1948.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Kehoe C. Shannon, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

TERRITORY OF ALASKA

Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, to be Governor of the Territory of Alaska. Reappointment.

Llewellyn M. Williams, of Alaska, to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska. Reappointment.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

TO BE ENSIGNS

Dewey G. Rushford, effective October 8, 1948.

Gordon D. Scott, effective October 21, 1948.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of Ithaca, N. Y., to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to fill an existing vacancy.

CONCILIATION COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

Mark Foster Ethridge, of Kentucky, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Conciliation Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations December 11, 1948.

PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

*To be major with rank from July 27, 1947*

Hikel, Theodore Roosevelt, AO29782.

*To be major with rank from August 22, 1947*

Edenfield, Marshall Calder, AO29805.

*To be majors with rank from July 1, 1948*

Abbott, Henry Eugene, Jr., AO41868.
Abbott, Nathan Merrill, AO35170.
Abbott, Thomas Wood, Jr., AO40654.
Abbuhl, Charles, Jr., AO40732.
×Abernathy, Louis Madison, AO40721.
Ackerly, Robert Allan, AO46020.
Adair, Archie Samuel, AO34455.
Adamina, Robert Eggers, AO34777.
×Adams, Alan Frederick, AO35195.
Adams, Hubert, AO51337.
×Adams, Joseph Varner, Jr., AO44571.
×Adams, Louis Charles, Jr., AO22616.
Adams, Nathan Jasper, AO39137.
Adams, William Brownlow, AO32687.
Adams, William Carrolton, AO23507.
×Adkins, William Herbert, AO43013.
Aertgeerts, Jerome Edward, AO51647.
Agnell Peter Walfrid, AO51319.
Ainsworth, Donald Hoadley, AO45926.
Airmet, Elliot Seaton, Jr., AO44590.
Akers, Marion Jesse, AO34490.
×Akin, Leroy, AO31775.
Albaugh, Harry Mendenhall, AO45905.
×Albright, Clay, AO45738.
Alden, Victor William, AO30762.
Aldridge, George Thompson, AO34338.
Aldridge, Richards Abner, AO24025.
Alexander, David William, AO33130.
Alexander, Donald Martin, AO22830.
Alexander, Jerome Cecil, AO52840.
Alexander, William Brinan, AO41917.
×Alford, David Gaston, AO53135.
Alford, Ray Wilbur, AO51796.
Alison, John Charles, AO51335.
×Allard, Charles Arthur, AO45974.
Allen, Barnett Stanford, AO45049.
Allen, Charles Gilpin, AO35223.
×Allen, Harry Berkley, AO40592.
×Allen, John Eugene, AO30120.
Allen, Robert Hamel, AO39820.
Allen, William Chandler, AO46155.
×Almand, Alexander James, AO40501.
Almand, James Lee, AO43553.
Alsobrook, James Ellington, AO45056.
Alston, Jack Holt, AO25173.
Altman, James Earnest, AO32475.
Ambrose, Elmer Elsworth, AO35224.
×Ambrose, Joseph Richard, AO23363.
Amen, Henry John, AO24139.
Amend, Frank Reid, AO53335.
Andersen, Milo Peter, AO43957.
Anderson, Colin Edward, AO45519.
Anderson, Dale Leroy, AO21644.
Anderson, Herbert, AO34612.
Anderson, Lynden Roland, AO44272.
Anderson, Nels Albert, AO35012.
Anderson, Wesley Alleyn, AO33963.
Andrews, Charles Comer, AO32498.
Andrus, Burton Curtis, Jr., AO24057.
Andry, Fernand Louis, AO30094.
×Anutta, Frederick Thomas, AO25180.
Ardis, Thomas Benjamin, AO45504.
Armold, Harold Arthur, AO43111.
Armstrong, Ben Kay, Jr., AO33984.
Armstrong, Frederick Martin, Jr., AO32841.
Armstrong, Jack Lawrence, AO30715.
Armstrong, Lorraine Farquhar, Jr., AO40736.
Arnett, Thomas Nelson, AO31706.
Arnold, James Carter, AO46239.
Arnold, Richard, Jr., AO22408.
Ascani, Fred John, AO23718.
Ashton, Thurlo Martin, AO32408.
Ashwick, Edwin William, AO29770.
×Asp, John Ellsworth, AO51298.
Atkins, Ernest Graves, AO41873.
Atkins, Henry Venton, AO56617.
Atkinson, Charles Walter Thomas, AO30592.
Atkinson, John Earl, AO24096.
Atwood, Robert Greene, AO43952.
Augustinus, Robert Herman, AO42431.
×Ault, John Willard, AO30403.
Ault, Richard Leroy, AO45630.
Austin, Oscar Eugene, AO34983.
Auten, Frank Caldwell, Jr., AO43941.
×Avery, Delwin Barton, AO33891.
×Avritt, Lester G., AO41867.
Babel, John Stanley, AO44503.
Baccus, Donald Arthur, AO33505.
×Back, Klair E., AO40317.
×Bacon, John William, AO51416.
Bacon, Lewis Harold, AO30591.
Bacon, William Corinth, AO34539.
Badger, Thomas, Jr., AO42630.
Baer, Charles Peyton, AO31401.
Bagby, Francis Key, AO53134.
×Bagwell, Ray Oscar, AO51764.
Baile, Kenneth Rex, AO33520.
Bailey, Bryson Robert, AO34303.
Bailey, Charles Ezekiel, AO45663.
Bailey, Edward Par, AO32027.
Bailey, Malcolm Archer, AO34795.
Bailey, William Bradford, AO34798.
Bailey, William Wallace, AO30523.
Baird, William Charles, AO51372.
Baker, Bazil Lee, AO33632.
×Baker, Francis Manly, AO42022.
Baker, Gordon Edwin, AO45819.
Baker, Lee Edward, AO43786.
Baker, Leonidas, AO53115.
Baker, Ralph Eugene, AO30021.
Baker, Robert Britton, Jr., AO30486.
Baker, Robert Norman, AO34648.
Baker, Warren Sears, Jr., AO33955.
Baldick, Carl Joseph, AO42282.
Ball, Alfred John, Jr., AO44598.
Ball, Clinton Field, AO23945.
Banbury, Richard Clair, AO34772.
Bane, Edwin Ronald, AO43998.
×Banks, John McMillan, AO22126.
Banks, William McGowan, AO33040.
Banks, Wilson Harper, AO33535.
×Barber, Charles Hill, AO41936.
Barber, Rex Theodore, AO35081.
Barlow, James Dudley, AO45413.
Barnard, Milton Carlton, 2d, AO23221.
Barnard, William Francis, Jr., AO53027.
Barnett, James Alex, AO33916.
Barnett, John Anderson, AO44111.
Barney, Robert Burns Smeaton, AO42042.
×Barney, Walter Perry, AO31803.
Barr, Bernice Stone, AO34074.
Barr, Sam Lacy, AO39077.
Barrere, Robert Andrew, AO44013.
Barrett, Henry Gordon, AO21411.
Barrett, Joseph Aloysius, Jr., AO34540.
Barrett, Richard Adrian, AO30014.
Barron, James Patrick, AO51382.
Barrow, Leonard James, Jr., AO33915.
Barrow, Robert Lee, AO51508.
Barrowclough, Robert Ivan, AO34519.
×Bartlett, John Donnington, AO51504.
Bartlett, William Lewis, AO42989.
Bartling, Wray Bacon, AO42226.
Bates, Paul E., AO43884.
Batten, Earl Edward, AO33125.
Battison, William James, Jr., AO34976.
Baugher, Phineas William, AO42177.
Baughn, Julius Henry, AO33322.
Bauley, James Edward, AO34389.
Baxter, Reuben Augustus, AO45602.
Beach, Rex Ward, AO43789.
Bean, Gerald Edward, AO30028.
Beard, Dearl Lee, AO34900.
×Bearly, James Henry, AO32947.
×Beasley, Henry Allen, AO52176.
Beattie, Aldridge Nelson, AO42636.

Beauchamp, Willard Augustus, AO44452.
Beaudry, Emil George, AO40594.
Beaver, Authney Wayne, AO43859.
Bechtel, Howard John, AO43094.
Beck, Howard Alfred, AO43537.
Beckham, Walter Carl, AO33480.
×Beckstrom, Kenneth Wellington, AO53314.
Beebe, James Allen, AO30070.
×Beeghly, Murray J., AO51378.
Beezley, Wilbur Barrett, AO33615.
Beightol, Willis Eugene, AO22607.
Bell, John Francis, AO53344.
Bell, John Howard, AO33639.
Bell, Leon Edwin, Jr., AO43400.
Bell, Maynard William, AO42152.
Bell, Raymond Lester, AO51602.
Belsma, Alfred Donald, AO34895.
Belville, Robert Edward, AO32291.
Bender, Frank Peter, AO33444.
Bender, Richard Carl, AO35013.
Benedict, Maurice Samuel, AO35185.
Benesh, Robert Horace, AO45711.
Benjamin, Walter Paul, AO52372.
×Benn, Robert Willallen, AO42295.
Bennett, James Whitt, AO33526.
Bennett, Thomas Marion, AO43820.
Bennett, William Albert, Jr., AO31655.
Bennett, William Thomas, AO30024.
Bennion, Karren Layne, AO34209.
Bentley, Jack Leith, AO23880.
Beran, Clayton Alfred, AO42137.
Berg, Gordon Howard, AO45373.
Berg, Russell Allen, AO25328.
Bergamyer, Roland Wilson, AO34376.
Berger, Jack Calvin, AO35040.
×Berger, Leon Herman, AO23845.
Berry, Austin Luther, AO34073.
Berry, Maurice Antony, AO34011.
Berryhill, Earl John, AO30000.
Bertram, William Ellert, AO35290.
Best, Everett William, AO33570.
Bethune, Albert Henry, AO23324.
×Bettinger, Sterling Peter, AO33168.
Betts, Curtis Francis, AO23818.
Beumeler, Wayne Marcellas, AO33897.
Bexfield, Frank William, AO33896.
Bickell, George Ross, AO45151.
×Bieging, Glen Phillip, AO45783.
Bigelow, Edgar Daugherity, AO40607.
Bilger, Donald Earle, AO40756.
Binford, Everett Eugene, AO42944.
Bird, Joseph Warren, AO45661.
×Birdsall, Charles Dale, AO33902.
Bireley, William Paul, AO42466.
Bishop, Edwin, Jr., AO34222.
Bishop, Samuel Worth, AO52966.
Bivin, Verne, AO45971.
Bixby, Orin Mills, AO34628.
Bjornson, Wallace Erwin, AO24606.
Blachly, Ross Lindley, AO40588.
Black, Vance Eugene, AO33669.
Blackledge, Roscoe Burr, AO45556.
Blackstone, John Everett, AO42557.
×Blackstone, Kenneth Lloyd, AO51374.
×Blaha, Elmer Carl, AO20662
Blair, Paul Kenneth, AO33338.
Bland, Edwin Allen, Jr., AO33267.
Blanton, William Smith, AO51208.
Blattau, Philip James, AO45912.
×Bledsoe, Hugh Harold, AO42708.
Blevins, Edwin, AO42644.
×Bleymaier, Joseph Sylvester, AO33252.
Blood, Gordon Fisk, AO46139.
Bloxsom, Clyde Harold, AO41987.
Blunda, Gaspare Frank, AO18405.
Bockman, Charles Eugene, Jr., AO39736.
×Bodenhamer, Ross Emsley, AO34323.
Bodine, Edmund John, AO32508.
Bodley, Harvey Hawley, AO41901.
×Boehme, Charles Stanley, AO51712.
Boger, Martin Kroninger, AO39744.
Bohan, Robert Emmett, Jr., AO52712.
×Bolender, Carroll Herdus, AO35146.
Bolt, William Thomas, AO34799.
Bonawitz, Norval C., AO32284.
Bond, Ralph Winston, AO31641.
Bonin, Dwight Edward, AO34328.
Booth, Leon, AO41886.
Borden, David Ben, Jr., AO42892.
×Borden, James Cochran, AO46158.
×Borowski, Edmund Joseph, AO31449.
Bosch, George Arthur, AO21114.
×Bostick, John AO41959.
Bostwick, George Eugene, AO24278.
Boucher, Paul, AO42038.
Bounds, Fred Howard, AO25238.
Bounds, R. G., Jr., AO45274.
Bourne, Evan Francis, Jr., AO33628.
Boutz, William Ray, AO21491.
Bowe, Hugh Heidy, Jr., AO34261.
Bowen, John Wesley, AO44782.
Bower, Robert Sharon, AO42056.
Bower, William Marsh, AO34210.
Bowers, Robert Dana, AO52549.
Bowie, William Allen, AO43946.
Bowman, Harry Guy, AO42234.
Bowman, Julian Holt, AO33629.
Boyd, James Moore, AO24168.
×Boyd, Raymond Gilbert, AO30659.
Boylan, George Sylvester, Jr., AO35269.
Braddock, Joel Quin, AO52306.
Bradley, Elbert J., Jr., AO42041.
Bradley, Theo Drake, AO33397.
Brady, Francis Thomas, AO45516.
Brady, Henry Grady, Jr., AO45695.
×Brady, James Franklin, AO34763.
Brady, Michael Joseph, AO44752.
Branch, George Harrison, AO44160.
Branch, Gerald Ellis, AO51615.
Brandeberry, Frank Elwood, Jr., AO52213.
Brandon, Hubert Arthur, AO25221.
Brandon, William Harold, AO34364.
×Brandt, Forrest Anthony, AO44733.
Branham, Ethel Bert, AO45636.
Brann, Ralph Austin, AO32131.
×Brannan, Rudolph, AO42629.
Brannock, Joseph Franklin, AO35186.
Bratton, Andrew Jackson, Jr., AO46219.
Bratton, Leslie Raymond, AO32859.
Brauer, Lloyd Walter, AO44948.
Brawner, Daniel Campbell, AO24545.
Brecht, Harold Marvin, AO46250.
×Breckenridge, John Preston, AO23376.
Brennan, Mortimer Campbell, AO44804.
Brett, Raymond Elliott, AO34440.
×Brewer, Joseph Cross, AO42740.
×Brewer, Samuel Martin, AO42032.
×Brewster, James Henry, Jr., AO29578.
Brickell, Harold Odell, AO40022.
Bridges, John DeGraff, AO22478.
Bridges, Lester, AO40569.
Brier, William Wallace 4th, AO23943.
Briggs, James Denison, AO34412.
×Briggs, Loran Dale, AO33995.
Briley, Joe Charles, AO33357.
Brill, Ray Samuel, AO42266.
Bringman, George Albert, AO51808.
Britt, Jimmie Weaver, AO32884.
Brock, Russell Keith, AO24128.
×Bronson, Fred Ford, AO33783.
Brooks, Allison Cochran, AO25258.
Brooks, Bascom Anthony, AO32339.
Brooks, Clyde Edward, AO44051.
Brooks, James McKinney, AO33327.
Brooks, John Adams 3d, AO23828.
Brooks, Nelson Sisson, AO32674.
Brown, Allen K., AO42185.
Brown, Bill Roe, AO30761.
Brown, Billy Ray, AO53198.
Brown, Bryan Wells, Jr., AO53455.
Brown, Charles Arthur, AO30453.
Brown, Edward Tompkins, AO42779.
Brown, Edwin Watson, AO23851.
Brown, George Evans, AO40709.
×Brown, George Scratchley, AO24021.
×Brown, Grover Cleveland, AO24141.
Brown, Harold Paul, AO43095.
Brown, Howard Eugene, AO34368.
×Brown, Isidore, AO51204.
Brown, Jack Orris, AO34456.
Brown, James Joseph, AO34959.
×Brown, Kenton Scott, AO42245.
Brown, Merle Clinton, AO33958.
×Brown, Norwood Joseph, AO53391.
×Brown, Paul Douglas, AO33961.
Brown, Preston, AO45930.
Brown, Robert Creswell, AO33467.
×Brown, Therman Deboise, AO33089.
Brown, Wilfred Elmer, AO29570.
Brownewell, John Landrum, AO52378.
Brownfield, Albert Warren, AO35172.
Bruce, Sidney Clyde, AO35288.
×Brumfield, Henry Anderson, AO30331.
Bryan, Calvin Mitchell, AO29579.
Bryant, Alexander Wilson, AO22495.
Bryant, James Basil, AO34576.
×Buchanan, Kenneth Wiley, AO56991.
×Buckey, Loren Elbert, AO33287.
Buckholts, Paul Omar, AO52664.
×Buckles, Galen Mills, AO43430.
×Buckley, Jack Lionel, AO45533.
Buckwalter, Raymond Earle, AO35077.
Budd, Hyme Allan, AO43759.
Beulow, Albert Gustav, AO42414.
Bugh, Leon Frank, AO43085.
Bulgin, Richard Gregory, Jr., AO46068.
Bull, Frederick Kemmerer, AO43838.
Bull, James Tryon, AO32731.
×Bunker, Theodore Chandler, AO31443.
Bunze, Harry Frank, AO23105.
Burbridge, Leo Miachael, AO33590.
Burden, Oliver Dudley, Jr., AO29774.
×Burge, Edward Longfellow, AO25248.
×Burhanna, Howard, Jr., AO32081.
Burke, Archie Maurice, AO34308.
Burke, Dracos Dimitry, AO46135.
×Burke, Leo Raymond, AO30533.
Burke, William, AO34736.
Burley, Charles Frederick, AO34864.
Burnett, John Coleman, AO33437.
Burns, Berton Harrell, AO34505.
Burns, Don Robert, AO41963.
Burns, Luther William, AO31612.
×Burns, Robert Theron, AO52653.
Burns, Robert Wiygul, AO24131.
Burnside, Barrie Charles, AO34834.
×Burnside, John Marion, AO42543.
Burrill, Wilson E., AO53353.
×Burris, Robert Francis, AO51389.
×Burroughs, Orval Neal, AO41859.
Busching, Richard Witt, AO34990.
×Bush, Eugene Edward, AO51790.
Bush, Joseph, AO32084.
Bush, Morris, AO39958.
Butler, Edward George, AO34276.
Butman, Paul Milton, AO53210.
Byerley, Sam John, AO34590.
Byerts, William Edward, Jr., AO25042.
Bynum, Richard Edward, Jr., AO40666.
Byrnes, George Goodrich, Jr., AO45367.
×Byrtus, Joe Robert, AO32663.
×Cage, Phil B., AO33157.
Cain, Clarence Cecil, AO30719.
Calderbank, John Jacob Birrell, AO52998.
Calhan, Robert James, AO34437.
Calhoun, Robert Thomas, AO33796.
×Cameron, Arthur Thomas, AO30267.
Camp, Kenneth Lee, AO43944.
Campbell, Arch Graham, Jr., AO21626.
×Campbell, Floyd Francis, AO44172.
Campbell, Francis Wilson, AO44379.
×Campbell, Ivan Earnest, AO42541.
Campbell, Murdoch William, AO39000.
Campbell, Roland Arthur, AO53172.
×Campbell, Thornton Wilson, AO33254.
×Campbell, William Haddock, AO45406.
Caple, Charles Edgar, Jr., AO33772.
Caples, James Stephen, AO42865.
Cardenas, Robert Leon, AO46224.
×Carey, Edwin Forrest, Jr., AO34001.
Carey, John Bernard, Jr., AO53338.
Carlberg, Lawrence Ferdinand, AO51514.
Carleton, Bert Maurice, AO45780.
Carlisle, Richard Thurman, AO33998.
Carlos, Bernard Cooper, AO30300.
×Carlson, Charles Lewis, AO30655.
Carlson, Francis Bernhard, AO22876.
Carlson, Thorgny Cedric, Jr., AO33973.
Carmack, Beverly Eugene, AO32182.
Carmichael, Walter Pendleton, Jr., AO45285.
Carnes, Sam Abbott, AO31455.
Carpenter, Clarence Coe, AO30114.
×Carpenter, Harold Gradey, AO42936.
Carpenter, Woodward Benoit, AO39132.
×Carr, John Kermit, AO22452.
×Carroll, Joel Allen, Jr., AO35073.
Carroll, Louis Orville, AO52225.
Carroll, William Brooks, AO25070.
Carson, Charles Edgar, AO31889.
Carson, James Harman, AO32524.
Carter, George Albert, AO33511.
×Carter, Robert Andrew, AO34404.
Carter, Sam Filson, AO43982.
Carter, Wendell Eugene, AO33173.
Carter, Wilbur Robert, AO51425.
Carter, William Alamath, AO43051.

Cartwright, Jack Arthur, AO46284.
Case, Harvey Lee, Jr., AO34810.
Casey, Edward Richard, AO22436.
Cassell, Raymond Walter, AO31510.
Cassity, Russell, AO34892.
Cate, Albert Murray, AO22551.
×Cathcart, Norman Ryan, AO42007.
×Cator, Bruce Campbell, AO24100.
Catt, Harold Jackson, AO34902.
×Catton, Jack Joseph, AO35249.
×Caviness, Roy Blair, AO34532.
Celio, Gove Clarke, Jr., AO34159.
Chaffin, Andrew Arrol, AO34277.
Chalek, William Dmitri, AO53243.
Chambers, William James Herbert, Jr., AO45290.
×Chambers, Walter Earle, AO33762.
Chaney, Louis Hasler, AO42814.
Chapman, James William, AO42043.
Chapman, John Ward, AO40609.
Chapman, Lloyd Douglas, AO34619.
Chapman, Wilson Alexander, AO32056.
Chappell, Frank Benjamin, AO34534.
×Charlton, George Randolph, AO51463.
Charron, Roland Bartholomew, AO42214.
Chase, George Humphrey, AO42401.
Chase, Kenneth Bryant, AO30821.
Chase, Linden, AO41336.
×Chatterton, David Henry, AO53067.
Cheever, Russell Elsworth, AO34620.
Chenette, Joseph Richards, AO42397.
Chisholm, Henry James, AO34578.
×Chitty, Charles Dean, Jr., AO25198.
Choniski, William John, AO33279.
Christ, Charles Milton, AO35109.
Christensen, John Albert, AO32368.
Christian, Shannon, AO34787.
×Christmas, Charles Horace, AO33560.
×Christopher, George William, AO42278.
Christy, Harrison Randolph, Jr., AO33624.
×Churchill, Randolph Emerson, AO51375.
Clark, Albert James, AO38748.
×Clark, Arthur Malcolm, AO31620.
Clark, Glen William, AO45833.
Clark, Jack Cameron, AO46136.
×Clark, James Walker, AO32179.
Clark, Joseph Thomas, AO51238.
Clark, Robert Myrl, AO45684.
×Clark, Theron Ogden, AO30142.
Clark, Thomas James, AO32781.
Clark, Walter Edwin, AO33374.
Clark, William Coombs, AO22475.
Clark, William Adam, AO53252.
Clarke, Leo George, Jr., AO45168.
Clarke, Owen Field, AO32463.
Clarke, Roy Laverne, AO41856.
Clarke, Worth Charles, AO43770.
Clausen, Leslie Conway, AO44008.
Cleary, Edward John, Jr., AO44661.
Cleven, Gale Winston, AO34258.
Clifford, Robert Lincoln, AO51868.
Clinkscales, Theodore Ross, AO22844.
Cloe, Keith DeLyle, AO45264.
×Close, Winton Ralph, AO25201.
Cloud, Howard Haines, Jr., AO34198.
Clough, William Rockwell, AO51417.
Cloyd, Virgil Mark, AO45750.
Cluxton, Donald Edwin, AO29685.
Coad, Hunter Sugg, AO45863.
Coate, Raymond LaMar, AO42535.
Coats, James Harold, AO44407.
Cobb, Elmon Redell, AO45969.
Cobb, Garth Cline, AO51849.
Cobb, James Opal, AO44784.
Cobb, Robert Hardin, AO33112.
Cochran, Lyle Horace, AO42808.
×Cody, Joseph Julius, Jr., AO45772.
Coen, Robert Brown, AO24145.
Cofer, Floyd Sturdevant, Jr., AO22920.
Cofield, Emory Woodfin, AO51556.
Cole, Clifford Elbert, AO23834.
Cole, James Lawrence, AO33994.
×Cole, Lawrence Elroy, AO29880.
Cole, Nester Evan, AO43848.
Cole, Richard Eugene, AO44591.
×Cole, Richard Herbert, AO33509.
Coleman, Charles William, AO32609.
Colligan, Robert Leonard, Jr., AO23095.
Collinson, William Samuel, AO33326.
Commenator, George O'Connell, AO45977.
×Compton, Joe W., Jr., AO33777.
Condron, John Eugene, AO42386.
Congleton, Boyd Ellis, AO34604.
Conlan, Douglas Mansfield, AO33363.
Conlin, Joseph Stanford, AO46218.
Connelly, Charles Hilton, AO33554.
Connors, Wayne Stephen, AO34932.
Conroy, Thomas Charles, AO24526.
Converse, William Winans, AO40572.
Cook, Bailey Cavenaugh, AO22570.
Cook, Earl Brown, AO22852.
×Cook, Eugene Glynn, AO29365.
×Cooke, Charles James, AO42915.
Coolidge, John Reid, AO30099.
Cooper, Edwin Branan, AO51699.
Cooper, Paul Thomas, AO46008.
Cooper, Robert Neville, AO33781.
Cooper, William Charles, AO29528.
Corbin, Thomas Goldsborough, AO24075.
×Cormier, Lionel Joseph, AO33695.
Cornett, Billy, AO34622.
Cornwall, Paul Revere, AO21156.
Corwin, Alexander, AO29945.
Cory, Albert Arnold, AO22837.
×Cosgrove, Charles Patrick, AO44153.
×Coss, Walter Leroy, AO35192.
Costello, Maurice Joseph, AO29980.
Cotter, Harold Eugene, AO33272.
Couch, Gerald, AO40426.
Couch, John Pinkney, AO45660.
Counselman, Orville Lewis, AO35150.
Coupland, Leonard Temple, AO42871.
Courtney, James Hiram, AO42207.
×Covert, Charles Betts, AO52264.
Covington, Fredrick Sturdivant, AO51418.
Cowan, James Albertson, AO29919.
Coward, James Smith, AO34596.
Cowart, William Slater, Jr., AO25306.
Cox, Albert Lyman, Jr., AO52368.
Cox, Andrew Lacock, AO24422.
Cox, Arthur Cornell, AO29614.
Cox, Chester Charles, AO33461.
Cox, Homer Mead, AO30506.
×Cox, James Isaac, AO23982.
×Cox, Robert Bruce, AO45545.
Coyle, Gervais Gibson, AO33310.
Crabtree, Corbett David, AO51274.
Crabtree, Martin Perdue, AO22854.
Craft, Robert Patterson, AO42022.
Craft, Winfred Owens, AO34023.
Craig, Ellis Bunting, AO32018.
×Craig, Richard Marion, AO33823.
Crain, John Campbell, AO29602.
Crakes, Joe Henry, AO30390.
Crandall, George Barclay, AO40277.
Crawford, Jack Lafayette, Jr., AO40644.
Crawford, John, AO29547.
Crawford, Marshall James, AO51524.
×Creech, Robert Morris, AO33036.
Crehan, James Anthony, AO32391.
Cresswell, Arthur Stanley, AO34580.
Cribbs, Jerome Highland, AO32753.
Crisler, Herbert LeRoy, AO42934.
Crisp, Dennis, AO46011.
×Crist, George Harvey, AO54496.
Critchfield, Richard Earl, AO32917.
Crocker, John Powers, AO33144.
Cromer, Daniel Hagan, AO44334.
Cronan, Robert Albert, AO44224.
Crook, William Ralph, AO40340.
Cropper, Eugene Charles, AO29970.
Crosby, Stephen Harmon, Jr., AO45763.
Cross, Cecil Calvin, AO30187.
Crowley, John Ennis, AO40047.
Crowley, William Francis, AO35006.
Crowson, Delmar Lester, AO45548.
×Crum, William Bailey, AO23513.
Crumly, Harold Jesse, AO34387.
Culberson, Virgil Bryant, AO51940.
Culbertson, Kline Downing, AO45620.
Culler, Harry Hillus, AO42165.
Culpepper, Claude Anthony, AO52284.
Cumbaa, Noel Thomas, AO33780.
Cummins, Tristram James, Jr., AO39898.
Cummins, William Kneedler, AO24007.
×Cunningham, Jack Edward, AO25287.
Curl, Lester Clarence, AO51311.
Curnutt, James Lee Roy, AO34574.
×Curran, James Richard, AO53358.
×Curren, Wayne Bertch, AO46141.
Curry, William Floyd, AO44925.
×Curtice, Raymond Leavitt, AO22507.
Curtis, Frank Mitchell, Jr., AO32115.
Curtis, Gwynne Sutherland, Jr., AO24008.
Curtis, Richard, AO33369.
Curtis, Victor Norman, AO53138.
Cutcher, Solomon, AO33862.
×Da Rosa, Elmer Garcia, AO42952.
Dacey, Timothy John, Jr., AO45649.
Dade, Lucian Alexander, Jr., AO33575.
Dahlstrom, John Robert, AO41890.
Daigle, Lewellyn Clifford, AO25347.
Daily, Edwin Bruce, AO32910.
Dale, Jack Delmar, AO33623.
Dallam, Welwyn F., Jr., AO35018.
×Dalton, Charles D'Orr, AO44105.
Daly, William Thomas, AO33388.
Dame, Frederick Russell, AO32811.
×Daniel, David Edwin, AO33905.
Daniel, Joe Rowan, AO33050.
Daniel, William Allen, AO24103.
Daniels, Edward Linden, AO34954.
×Daniels, Robert Frederic, AO51888.
×Dannel, Abram Baugh, AO34508.
Darby, George Clifton, Jr., AO34170.
Dart, Roy Whitman, AO51516.
Dash, Lawrence Peck, AO29858.
×Daugherty, James Ferdinand, AO42504.
×Daugherty, Jean Hamilton, AO39110.
×Davania, Richard Walton, AO30113.
Davenport, Dean, AO35020.
×David, Robert George, AO45742.
Davidson, Collier Hutchins, AO34459.
Davidson, Roy Alvin, AO29604.
×Davie, Robert Nelson, AO40190.
×Davis, Albert F., AO42143.
Davis, Alpheus Mallette, Jr., AO32599.
Davis, Edward Glendaw, AO43690.
Davis, Emmett Smith, AO45994.
Davis, Everett, AO33012.
Davis, Frank Lent, AO31940.
×Davis, Howard Allan, AO33193.
Davis, Joseph, Jr., AO53192.
Davis, Mercer Patton, AO23232.
Davitt, William John, AO34441.
Davoli, James Edward, AO34860.
Dawson, Robert Harrison, AO40327.
×Day, Robert Stanley, AO51466.
de Cisneros, George Jimenez, AO42390.
Degoes, Louis, AO32389.
×Degroot, Edward Burton, Jr., AO41991.
Degroot, Peter, AO41974.
Dehart, Edward George, AO21302.
×DeJarnette, Thomas Davis, AO40726.
de Jonckheere, Eric Thomas, AO23838.
×De La Vigne, Ferdinand Andre, AO51383.
Delacey, William Howard, AO34178.
×DeLapp, John Robert, AO32713.
De St. Jeor, Wallace Bramwell, AO41861.
de Tolly, Nicholas Semigradov, AO42292.
Dean, Charles Emmet, AO32790.
×Dechaene, Andre Jacques, AO22582.
Deems, Paul Schroeder, AO23056.
DeFord, Deane Corwin, AO41890.
Dehle, Alfred Hugo, AO51267.
DeHorn, John Gerrit, AO29734.
Delaney, Francis Robert, AO42627.
Demick, Robert Leslie, AO32493.
Dempster, Kenneth Crawford, AO34301.
Denison, Jack Alden, AO51640.
Denson, Bender Dowdell, AO20857.
Denton, Ashley Newton, Jr., AO45538.
Deppe, Howard William, AO30617.
Derey, Cloyd Harold, AO35156.
Derr, Roger Thatcher, AO42317.
Dervage, Minar Murry, AO53017.
Dessert, Kenneth O'Reilly, AO23730.
×D'Ettore, William Nicholas, AO29930.
Deverall, George Grace, AO42107.
Dewey, George Gould, AO34536.
×Dibrell, Charles Frederick, AO44708.
Dick, Chester Arthur, Jr., AO51663.
Dick, William Houston, AO34428.
Dickerson, Robert William, AO44186.
Dickey, Robert Russell, Jr., AO41946.
×Dickson, Marion Leonard, AO44033.
Dickson, Raymond Lawrence, AO29933.
×Diehl, Conrad Henry, Jr., AO20763.
×Dieterle, William Howard, AO39891.
Dietze, Herman Verne, AO42046.

Dillingham, Maurice Stanley, AO29944.
Dillon, John Michael, AO44512.
Dillow, Joseph Clinton, AO32232.
Dimmock, Charles, AO43466.
Disher, Raymond James, AO35001.
×Dishuck, John Joseph, AO43593.
×Dix, Gerald Johnson, AO34989.
Dixon, Jacob Wylie, AO35004.
Doan, Oliver Colling, AO39143.
Doddridge, David Edward, AO52848.
Dolan, Paul Gerald, AO29743.
Dole, Charles Rollin, AO46067.
Donahue, Vincent Joseph, AO34129.
Donalson, I. B. Jack, AO32964.
Donics, William, AO45515.
×Donley, John Bland, AO52231.
Dooley, Franklin Wayne, AO30067.
Doolittle, Glenn Alden, AO34077.
Dorn, Wilfred Charles, AO34367.
Dorney, Paul Arthur, AO40703.
Dorsey, Robert Sears, AO45063.
D'Orsi, Albert, AO42614.
Dougan, Eric, AO20615.
Dougherty, Clifford Alonzo, AO44005.
Douglas, Richard Maginis, AO30530.
Douglass, Charles Reid, AO30555.
Dow, Leonard Ferrell, AO43953.
Dowd, Morris Robert, AO30130.
Downey, Clyde Jackson, AO33839.
Downey, William Gates, AO44294.
Downing, Harry Lee, AO34438.
Downing, Leighton Ford, AO33090.
×Downs, Bruce Charles, AO33562.
Downs, James Albright, AO52282.
Downs, Walter Wellman, AO51300.
×Dowtin, Rex, AO34498.
×Doyle, C. Ervin, AO41899.
Dreiman, Paul Edward, AO43406.
Dreyer, Louis Edward, AO30334.
Driscoll, John Joffre, AO32903.
Driver, James Edward, AO40096.
Drum, Robert Craven, AO44828.
Drysdale, Taylor, AO32194.
DuBose, James Rembert, Jr., AO21585.
Dufour, John Guilvert, AO30010.
×DuVal, Robert James, AO34469.
×Dudney, John Frederick, AO43445.
×Duganne, John Andrew, AO40727.
Dulevitz, Alexander, AO29943.
Duncan, Earl Dean, AO35094.
Duncan, Glenn Emile, AO34220.
Duncan, Oliver Lynwood, AO45581.
Duncan, William Fowler, AO32975.
Dundas, Donald Sears, AO28721.
Dunham, Earl Herbert, AO22627.
×Dunkin, Robert Joseph, AO41852.
Durrance, Virgil Hayes, AO32302.
×Dusenbury, James Albert, AO46119.
Dustin, Roland Lewis, AO51364.
Dutrack, Dean William, AO45572.
Dvorak, Edward August, Jr., AO44069.
Dyas, John Robert, AO34768.
Dysinger, Leonard Stark, AO34254.
Eairley, John James, AO34754.
Eakins, William Wynn, AO34544.
×Earl, Gerald Mercer, AO40384.
Earle, Wilton Haynsworth, Jr., AO32598.
×Earthman, Henry Bivins, AO32650.
Easley, Horace Penrod, AO45055.
Easton, John Jay, AO23785
Eaton, Dudley Paul, AO33692.
Eaton, Robert Reynolds, AO45188.
Ebbeler, Harold Ray, AO33564.
Eberle, Adolph William, AO30031.
Edmonds, Melvin Thornton, AO32331.
Edris, Gordon Lavern, AO34299.
Edwards, Charles William, AO29658.
Edwards, Edward Daniel, AO33020.
×Egan, John Clarence, AO33050.
Egge, George Vernon, AO42632.
Eggleston, Donald Erskine, AO35115.
×Ehlers, Melville Virgil, AO44460.
Ehlinger, William Joseph, AO45245.
Eichel, Henry Herbert, AO34221.
Ekstrand, Carl Vernon, AO32680.
×Elder, Clarence Lewis, AO23814.
Elder, Robert Alexander, AO34523.
Eldridge, George Brooks, AO31705.
Eliker, Hadley Burres, AO44147.
×Ellert, Laurence John, AO20311.
×Elliott, Frank Bower, AO40636.
Elliott, Robert Douglas, AO31792.
Ellis, Clay Donald, AO30017.
×Ellis, Frank Wilby, AO34843.
Ellis, Herbert Sargent, AO43753.
Ellis, James Oldham, AO21543.
Ellis, Lewis Nathaniel, AO32928.
Ellis, Richard Nat, AO33491.
Ellis, Robert Rube, AO31495.
Elmore, Vernon Otis, AO44870.
×Elver, Carl Leonard, AO42005.
Ely, Lawrence Daniel, AO29659.
Emmens, Robert Gabel, AO24104.
Engelman, Elton Clarence, AO51318.
Engleman, Frederick Charles, AO40634.
England, James John, AO40428.
Engstrom, Melvin Verner, AO22058.
Ensley, William Tyrus, AO46195.
Enyart, Byron K., AO42016.
×Epperson, Elmer Harrison, AO32948.
Erb, Gilbert Elmer, AO34213.
Erb, Theodore Henry, AO46120.
Erdin, Robert Alexander, AO32246.
Ernst, Sol Eugene, AO32746.
Erwin, William Horace Bruce, AO32942.
Esau, Charles Gillies, AO23063.
Esmay, Carle Howard, AO52803.
Estrumse, Elmer Frank, AO44581.
Etchemendy, John Michael, AO34288.
Ettenger, Clayton Warner, AO51412.
Evans, Andrew Julius, Jr., AO23882.
Evans, Edwin Carlos, AO34215.
×Evans, Harry Lee, Jr., AO35230.
Evans, James A., Jr., AO32856.
Evans, John Lewis, AO32669.
Evans, Louis Edgar, Jr., AO44194.
Evers, John Clay, AO33967.
×Ewing, Clair Eugene, AO44614.
Exon, Arthur Ernest, AO33368.
Ezzard, Richard Francis, AO22840.
Fackler, Paul Henry, AO32828.
×Fahy, Albert Francis, Jr., AO33235.
Falletta, Charlie, AO34597.
Fandel, William Herbert, AO33675.
Fant, Murray Gibbes, AO46031.
Farber, Morris, AO30048.
×Faris, Julius Porter, Jr., AO22230.
Farnham, Sheldon Webster, AO35112.
×Farrell, Robert Howe, AO53215.
Farrior, William Owen, AO45683.
Faver, Dudley Ervin, AO33673.
Fawcett, Ralph Monroe, AO23386.
Fay, Fergus Cruse, AO35203.
Fazio, Frank Michael, AO32848.
Fee, Francis Raymond, AO38771.
Felknor, Robert Snoddy, AO30469.
Fellows, Paul DeWitt, AO42421.
Felton, George Boyd, AO32418.
×Fenn, Frank Lawrence, AO51777.
Fenske, Leslie Claude, AO51496.
Ferguson, Harvey Eugene, AO33700.
×Ferguson, Howard Eastin, AO52392.
Ferguson, Ivan Leonard, AO40710.
Ferguson, Marion Grey, Jr., AO29862.
Ferguson, Matthew Henry Taylor, AO45368.
Fernandez, Fernando Joseph, AO53225.
Ferrey, James Paisley, AO52596.
Ferrill, Harlan Benton, AO23313.
Ficke, Robert Hamilton, AO33847.
Fickling, William Arnold, AO45073.
Field, Eugene Hollister, AO42615.
Fielder, Leo Edwin, AO33545.
×Finan, Bernard Joseph, Jr., AO46023.
×Fincke, Robert Theodore, AO33017.
×Finnegan, Julian Pat, AO41967.
×Finney, Harris Edward, AO51310.
Fischer, John Joseph, AO43804.
Fischer, Milton, AO40141.
Fish, Robert William, AO34067.
Fisher, Charles Dillon, AO45812.
Fisher, John Logan, AO30416.
Fisher, Russell Fredrick, AO35254.
Fisher, Sydney Gilbert, AO23043.
Fisher, Thomas Legate 2d, AO23742.
Fite, Calvin Ward, Jr., AO39128.
Fitzgerald, Joseph Ordell, AO30705.
Fitzgerald, Maurice Joseph, AO52525.
Fitzsimmons, Joe, AO44845.
×Fizer, Elmer Parsons, AO43069.
Fjelstad, Kenneth Silas, AO45377.
Flanagan, James Lee, AO40731.
Flashman, James Derwent, AO43424.
×Fleming, Arch Charles, AO51306.
×Fleming, James Hilliard, AO43326.
×Fleming, John Daly, AO51212.
×Fletcher, Edward James, AO52275.
Fletcher, Joseph Otis, AO34659.
Fletcher, Thomas, Jr., AO22427.
Fling, Dean Arthur, AO53267.
Foerster, Frederick Henry, Jr., AO21859.
Foley, James Gleason, AO22650.
×Foley, Jesse Rush, Jr., AO52990.
×Follmer, Jacob, AO31804.
Ford, Edward Randall, AO22146.
Ford, John Taylor, AO39121.
Forrest, George, AO43799.
Forsyth, Allen Peter, AO32442.
×Foster, Byron Winton, AO34021.
Foster, Donald Calvin, AO25189.
Foster, George McKee, AO35017.
Foster, Neil Norman, AO43373.
Fountain, Willard Asa, AO22479.
Fouts, Thomas Allen, Jr., AO53146.
×Fowles, Charles Vernon, AO32470.
Fowles, J. Francis, Jr., AO40748.
Francis, Paul Hildreth, AO45092.
×Frandsen, Hugh Andrew, AO31662.
Franklin, Charles Francis, AO34175.
Franks, George Eben, AO43739.
Franz, Richard John, AO45575.
Franzen, Earl Leroy, AO32630.
Freeman, Edmund Frederick, AO52172.
×Freiburger, Paul Ignatius, AO42437.
French, John, AO35103.
Freshour, Beryl Harry, AO42448.
Friederichs, Gilbert Francis, AO32905.
Friedlander, Edward Allen, AO51572.
Friedman, Ivan Morton, AO52397.
Frisbie, Curtis Lynn, AO33446.
Frizen, John Edward, AO35244.
Fry, Richard Jefferson, AO44903.
Fryer, Rex Donald, AO34891.
Fulcher, G. H., AO32935.
Fuller, Benton Franklin, Jr., AO42559.
Fuller, Roger Garfield, AO31338.
Fullerton, Donald Joseph, AO51271.
Fulton, Charles Everett, AO42072.
×Fulton, Oscar William, AO30784.
Fulton, Wayne Lewis, AO45859.
Furman, William Baker, AO34449.
Gabreski, Francis Stanley, AO46026.
Gadler, Steve Joseph, AO51270.
×Gaffney, John William, AO44165.
Gahan, Theodore Patrick, AO38686.
Gaitley, Edward Donald, Jr., AO32802.
Galbreath, Samuel Cairnes, AO34346.
Gallagher, Francis Beraard, AO21668.
Gallagher, Raymond Keith, AO33855.
Gallagher, Robert Emmett, AO19250.
×Galligan, Clarence Joseph, AO34475.
Gallo, Frank Paul, AO42003.
Gamber, Karl Solmon, AO45621.
Gandy, Raymond Eugene, AO34482.
Garber, James Franklin, Jr., AO42334.
Garland, Ben Allen, AO34349.
×Garner, Robert Frank, Jr., AO24546.
Garrett, John William, Jr., AO33421.
Garrett, Kenneth Lee, AO24485.
×Garrett, Louis Henry, AO34944.
Garrigan, Robert James, AO35123.
Garrison, Edwin Herbert, AO24342.
×Gary, Willis Jewett, AO53193.
Gauss, William Henry, AO32093.
Gavares, Nicholas John, AO43917.
Geary, George Kenneth, AO42580.
Geffel, John Charles, AO43429.
Gehrig, Raymond Miller, AO35193.
×Geismer, Oscar Henry, AO39982.
Gell, Thomas Wesley, AO45022.
Genetti, Frank Victor, AO34089.
×Gentry, Elbert Bailey, AO29812.
George, Walter Russell, AO44858.
Gerdau, Walter Henry, Jr., AO52161.
Gerzin, Walter John, AO33713.
Gesell, Robert Charles, AO32365.
Getz, George Glen, AO32372.
Gibbons, Robert Joseph, AO33448.
Gibbs, Asa Ben, AO31595.
Gibson, Harold Clayton, AO34524.
Gibson, William Louis, AO41948.

Gilbert, Huntington Kerr, AO22424.
Gilbert, Lawrence Gaylord, AO34992.
Gilbert, Olin Edward, AO34494.
Gill, Alfred Riley, AO34814.
Gillanders, Bruce William, AO40176.
Gillespie, Joe Gill, AO32742.
×Gillespie, William Gregory, AO43727.
Gilliland, Gilbert Linzy, AO52550.
×Gillis, Charles Francis, AO31760.
Gillum, Virgil Monroe, AO32211.
Gilman, Mark Hulings, AO45345.
×Giuliano, Albert, AO51303.
Glaisyer, Herbert Bernard, Jr., AO34492.
×Glaser, Goodlett John, AO43431.
Glass, Burl Elijah, Jr., AO35025.
×Glassburn, Kenneth Lemuel, AO45826.
×Glasser, Otto John, AO25304.
×Glassman, George Henry, AO42155.
×Glenn, Jack Phifer, AO45724.
Glenny, Gale Spencer, AO34381.
Glessner, Milton Fager, Jr., AO32411.
Glomb, Ferdinand Frederick, Jr., AO24424.
×Glover, Walter Parish, Jr., AO25137.
Godman, Henry Clay, AO21664.
Goerder, Robert Louis, AO34287.
Golden, Bob Irving, AO42326.
×Golden, Ellington Douglas, AO43465.
×Goldinger, Milton, AO39923.
Golledge, Kenneth Kingman, AO42396.
Gomez, Eliseo, AO51863.
Good, Donald Edward, AO35248.
Good, John Carter, AO31710.
Good, Robert Beattie, AO34581.
×Good, Robert Ogden, AO32973.
Goodell, Howard Clarke, AO23713.
Goodhart, Morgan, AO42091.
Goodloe, John Hill, AO42080.
Goodman, Gilbert Ernest, AO33289.
Goodwin, George Robert, AO45457.
×Goolsby, George Stokes, AO33199.
Gordon, Andrew Fraser, AO45914.
Gordon, Donald Millard, AO25318.
×Goree, Richard Day, AO45996.
Gorham, John Durham, Jr., AO35212.
Gorman, George William, AO43058.
Gorman, George Daniel, Jr., AO33066.
Gosewisch, Guy Neil, AO45842.
Goss, Edmund Robert, AO43840.
Gough, Jamie, AO34167.
Gould, David, AO45532.
Gould, Elmer Mervin, AO31674.
Gould, George, AO33846.
Gould, Gordon Thomas, Jr., AO23743.
Gould, Robert Austin, Jr., AO43782.
×Goyt, Gordon Franklin, AO45694.
Grable, Francis Lorenz, AO34370.
×Grable, John, Jr., AO35023.
Grady, Frank John, AO31872.
Graeser, Richard Gordon, AO29914.
Graham, Donald William, AO25247.
Graham, Floyd, AO39977.
×Graham, Marion Richmond, AO51353.
Graham, William Robert, AO30116.
Granholm, Axel Viggo, AO51653.
×Grant, Thomas Joseph, AO42533.
Grashio, Samuel Charles, AO34516.
Graves, John Calvin, AO33659.
×Graves, Lewis Toliver, AO30190.
Graves, Vincent Joseph, AO46060.
Gray, Guy Bryce, AO53103.
Graybeal, James Mathewson, AO46134.
Greco, Joseph Alfred Lowry, AO44302.
Greelis, Don Kay, AO41855.
Green, Donald James, AO33671.
Green, Eugene Wendell, AO31994.
Green, Robert Alan, AO43507.
Greene, Edward Chace, Jr., AO51342.
Gregory, William Lyte, AO43449.
Greiner, Paul Earl, AO35209.
Greiner, Reginald Romine, AO29915.
×Grek, Robert Marshall, AO42648.
Gremmler, Paul Edward, AO32759.
×Gribble, James Thomas, Jr., AO44431.
Griffin, Goodman Griffith, Jr., AO42824.
Griffin, Joseph Henry, AO35090.
Griffin, Louis Gray, AO33970.
Griffin, Richard Varney, AO34263.
Griffith, Stebbins West, AO40549.
×Grimes, Lyle Clark, AO29924.
Grogan, Charles Edgar, AO22355.
Gross, Clarence Henry, AO33417.
Gross, Edward David, AO43779.
×Gross, James Oakland, AO34522.
Grossmith, Louis Bertram, Jr., AO34008.
Grove, Philip Pike, AO40593.
×Growdon, Laurence Arlin, AO44167.
Grower, Mason Henry, Jr., AO42672.
Grubb, William Franklin, AO31922.
Gruber, George Lincoln, AO32227.
Grumbles, Wilbur John, AO34365.
Gudgel, Floyd J., AO31549.
Gudjunis, Wasco Edward, AO44647.
Gugliotta, Philip Anthony, AO32135.
×Guilbert, Edward August, AO46108.
Gulick, John McMullan, AO20669.
Gunderson, Robert Stephen, AO32913.
×Gunnison, Justin Cofran, AO53415.
×Gunther, Rodney Edward, AO52616.
Gurnett, Thomas Edward, AO22593.
Gustafson, Roy William, AO22321.
×Guthrey, Edison Dale, AO45936.
Guthrie, James William, AO24129.
Haas, Wilford Norman, AO42657.
Haase, Charles Hermann, AO42018.
Habeger, Joseph Edward, AO34813.
Hadfield, Edward Snuggs, AO44967.
Hadwin, Arthur James, AO44509.
Haesler, John Dietrich Walter, AO33702.
×Haggard, Van Buren, AO52438.
Hagins, Newton Doris, AO30451.
Hahn, Clarence William, AO31505.
Hahn, Delbert Henry, AO22549.
Haile, James Ernest, Jr., AO22874.
Haile, Roland Reed, AO42240.
Hairston, Francis Booth, AO42517.
×Halberstadt, Harry Julius, AO45211.
Halderson, Oliver Kenmore, AO45075.
Hale, Russell Dean, AO33011.
Hale, Samuel, AO34188.
Haley, Albert Lawrence, AO45832.
Hall, Byron Eugene, AO25176.
Hall, Conway Scott, AO33966.
×Hall, Haywood, AO43951.
Hall, James Heard, AO34848.
Hall, Leonard Roger, AO32934.
Hall, Max Woodrow, AO23808.
×Hall, Robert Turnbull, Jr., AO35245.
Hall, William Jarvis, AO51628.
Halley, Oscar Thomas, Jr., AO45704.
Hallock, Judson, AO45038.
Hamberg, Walter, Jr., AO34372.
Hamby, Henry Gordon, Jr., AO33266.
×Hamilton, Edwin John, AO32569.
Hamilton, Harry Starr, AO30078.
Hamilton, McHenry, Jr., AO22553.
Hammond, Mahlon Bray, AO35C05.
Hamner, A. H., Jr., AO25342.
Hampton, John Alexander, AO30016.
Hampton, Thomas Kerns, AO21667.
Haney, George William, AO52191.
Haney, Otto Reed, AO33743.
Haney, Richard Paul, AO53371.
Hanford, Samuel Burton, AO40469.
Hanson, Bertil Everett, AO32353.
Harcos, Bela Alan, AO21617.
Harcos, Kermit Arpad, AO22450.
Hardesty, Wilmer Allen, AO31930.
Harding, Edwin Forrest, Jr., AO24097.
Harding, Frank Burkley, AO22819.
Harding, Richard Corrie, AO45439.
×Hardman, Charles Franklin, AO32637.
Hardwick, Walter Amile, AO42373.
Hardy, John Kay, AO45953.
Hardy, Otha Bennett, Jr., AO22524.
Hare, Robert Philip, 3d, AO42565.
Hargett, William Marion, AO33633.
Harlow, Henry Maynard, AO33572.
Harpole, Donald Clifford, AO42912.
Harrell, Irving Jackson, Jr., AO34866.
Harrell, William Sommerville, AO46288.
×Harris, Alexander Everette, AO52405.
×Harris, Bentley Hill, Jr., AO40752.
Harris, John Frederick, AO23691.
Harris, John Lanier, AO31434.
Harris, William Doyle, AO34579.
Harris, William Seth, AO43008.
Harrison, Ike Henry, AO39953.
Harrison, William Dean, AO51273.
Hart, Allen Gold, AO32729.
Hartman, Frank Althoff, AO42670.
Harty, William Edwin, AO32219.
Harvey, Clyde Lawrence, Jr., AO45670.
Harvey, Harry Canavan, AO24076.
Harwick, George Luerssen, AO45596.
Haskins, Charles Gregg, AO42369.
Hassler, Ira Edward, AO34509.
Hatch, Horace Eldredge, AO34352.
Hatfield, Douglas Hampton, AO35246.
Hatlem, John Carsten, AO51350.
Haveman, Allen Ernest, AO33552.
×Havey, James Halbert, AO44915.
Hawel, Leo, Jr., AO33770.
×Hawes, Ivan Ignatious, AO51485.
Hawkins, Gabe Coke, Jr., AO34400.
×Hawthorne, Harry James, AO33962.
Hayduk, Alfred George, AO23986.
Hayes, Jack William, Jr., AO34310.
Hayes, Thomas Lloyd, Jr., AO34362.
Haygood, John Calvin, AO45668.
Hazard, John Thomas, AO42347.
Head, Charles William, Jr., AO40660.
Healey, James Francis, AO35065.
Healy, John Patrick, AO22500.
Hearn, Bunn, Jr., AO52833.
×Hearn, John Vernon, Jr., AO34341.
Heath, Norval Kemp, AO34128.
Heatly, Ralph Orville, AO45918.
Heaton, Donald Haynes, AO23705.
×Heavner, William Stewart, AO30389.
×Heber, Malcolm McMillan, AO23370.
Hedleston, Robert Webb, AO30077.
Hedlund, Earl Clifford, AO33599.
×Heffner, Charles Ritchey, AO32164.
×Heinzel, Jack Herman, AO43680.
×Hemans, John Gullans, AO53211.
Henderson, David Louis, AO34668.
×Henderson, Harvey Earl, AO34473.
Henderson, Lykes Shelton, AO46013.
×Henderson, Richard Harrison, AO30058.
Hendrix, William Murray, AO23359.
×Henggeler, Francis Joseph, AO45483.
Henry, Fred Guyant, AO32222.
Henry, John Bailey, Jr., AO24107.
Henry, Stephen Wetherell, AO33292.
Henschke, John Miles, AO23780.
×Hensley, Harry Simpson, AO51909.
Herbes, Edward, AO25196.
Herbison, Robert, AO51573.
Herblin, William Leonard, AO45291.
×Herndon, John Minor, AO43707.
Herndon, Robert Elmore, Jr., AO33763.
Hernlund, Richard Thomas, AO45899.
Herrman, George Ross, AO32649.
Herron, Thomas Jackson, AO45941.
Hess, Ulysses Washington, AO40029.
Heuer, Henry James, AO31487.
Hibbert, Richard Blair, AO32133.
Hickey, Sanford Wayne, AO32978.
Hickman, Raymond Edward, AO45801.
Hicks, George Luther 3d, AO24053.
Hicks, William Benjamin, AO43735.
Hidden, Eugene Albert, AO41924.
High, James Russell, AO34603.
Hight, Fred Thomson, AO43668.
Hignett, Forest Edwin, AO33466.
×Hileman, Cecil Alpheus, AO51638.
Hill, Frank Ackerman, AO34262.
Hill, Joe Harry, AO52333.
Hill, Kenneth Everette, AO35028.
Hill, Lawrence Glenn, Jr., AO46090.
Hill, Preston Louis, AO45817.
Hilliard, Robert Christy, AO41889.
Hillman, Donald Edison, AO34601.
Hilpert, Arvis Laverne, AO46194.
×Hilt, William Myron, AO45872.
Hinch, Murrell Francis, AO42937.
Hines, James Payne, AO43839.
×Hinrichs, Clair Allen, AO51820.
Hinton, Bruce Houston, AO34182.
Hippler, William Paul, AO42393.
Hixson, Samuel Thurston, AO51481.
Hoerner, Le Roy Day, AO34450.
×Hoey, Charles Joseph, AO45666.
Hoffman, Arthur Elkin, AO33309.
Hoffman, Ward Gerald, AO31857.
Hogan, James Francis, AO53245.
Hogan, Patrick Joseph, AO42659.
Hogan, Raymond Eric, AO33110.
Hogg, James Arthur, AO32767.

Holbein, Fred William, AO51490.
×Holbert, Kenneth Warren, AO35084.
×Holbrook, Joseph Charles, Jr., AO34936.
Holden, Raymond Barnes, AO43075.
Holdiman, Thomas Alexander, AO20629.
Holland, Harold Laverne, AO29609.
Holland, Thomas Elbridge, AO51803.
Hollick, Thomas Charles, AO40345.
Hollingsworth, George Herbert, AO34019.
Holm, Florian A., AO32053.
×Holmes, Robert West, AO44711.
Holmquist, George William, AO45726.
Holsclaw, Gerald Reed, AO34246.
Holsey, Raymond Earl, AO34528.
Holst, John Bernt, AO38999.
Holstrom, Everett Wayne, AO33463.
Holt, Francis William, AO42238.
Holt, Harold Norman, AO52863.
Holt, James William, Jr., AO32817.
×Holt, John Franklin, AO52169.
Honeycutt, Dale Carter Lampkin, AO43489.
Hook, Fred G., Jr., AO33586.
×Hooker, George Brown, Jr., AO31341.
Hoover, Travis, AO34018.
×Hope, John Warren, AO30393.
Hopkins, David Linton, AO34203.
×Hopkins, James Iredell, AO34380.
Hopkins, Wallace Eugene, AO40694.
Hopper, William Falcon, Jr., AO43359.
Horgan, Maurice Chapman, AO43695.
Horn, Robert William, AO23889.
Hornby, David Alonzo, AO34014.
×Horner, Lawson Clifton, Jr., AO25225.
×Hornsby, Thomas William, AO33894.
×Hornsey, William C., AO38760.
Horras, Lawrence Edward, AO32994.
Horton, Franklin Wolfram, AO23283.
Hosken, Robert Thomas, AO40360.
Hotmann, William August, AO38786.
Houck, Colie, AO42856.
Houghton, Edwin Gordon, AO51896.
Howard, James Shuler, AO45692.
Howard, Rodger Lee, AO34928.
Howe, Everett Bo, AO34179.
Howell, John Douglas, AO30742.
Howell, Joseph Woodrow, AO34984.
Howell, Quincy Douglas, AO51439.
×Howell, Thomas Alexander, AO51407.
Hoy, William Astor, Jr., AO25308.
Hradel, Joseph Rudolph, AO42363.
Hreha, Joseph Albert, AO42701.
Hubbard, James Howard, AO32419.
Huber, Paul Martin, AO35287.
Hubler, George Oliver, AO46082.
Hudelson, James Lane, AO46255.
Huey, Sam Lee, AO35050.
Huff, Howard Chester, AO42964.
Hughes, Aquilla Ballard, Jr., AO23297.
Hughes, Harold Lee, AO44244.
×Hugos, Howard Francis, AO44737.
Hull, William Thomas, Jr., AO35075.
Humbrecht, George William, AO52480.
Humfeld, Harold Emmett, AO33190.
Humphreys, Lloyd Ronland, AO42987.
Humphreys, Robert Willis, AO42020.
Humphries, Bert Willis, AO33250.
×Hundt, George Raymond, AO45940.
Hunt, Edward Everhart, AO29754.
Hunt, Jack Stuart, AO42732.
Hunt, Leigh Hale, AO29620.
Huntington, Edward Marshall, AO44710.
Hunziker, Richard Overton, AO33586.
Hurley, Arthur Francis, AO29575.
Hurley, Charles, AO51390.
×Hurley, Robert B., AO51484.
Hussey, John Joseph, Jr., AO33514.
Hutchins, Frank Douglas Burlingame Greene, AO29742.
Hutchison, John Joseph, AO18743.
×Huthnance, Guy Thomas, AO51923.
Hydron, Clarence August, AO40595.
Hylton, John Thomas, Jr., AO32032.
Hynd, William Brown, AO42031.
×Ice, Thew Joseph, Jr., AO19505.
Imhof, Louis Patrick, AO43402.
×Imparato, Edward Thomas, AO45505.
Impson, Ivan Hurst, AO31678.
Inabinet, Clarence Jefferson, Jr., AO39021.
×Ingelido, Michael Joseph, AO33882.
Irby, Claude Hunter, AO40353.
Ireland, Loren Elsworth, AO33120.
Ireland, Russell Forrest, AO53092.
Irish, James Robert, AO53262.
Irish, Lynn Thornton, AO45328.
Irwin, Jesse Arthur, AO53393.
×Isbell, James Albert, Jr., AO32214.
Israel, Lawrence Joseph, AO51307.
Itz, Milford Felix, AO22866.
×Ivory, John Carroll, AO44099.
×Jack, Jean Albert, AO24178.
Jackson, Carl Edmund, AO44730.
Jackson, Clarence John, AO45669.
Jackson, Jerome William, AO43565.
Jackson, Willie Otto, Jr., AO34916.
Jacobs, Francis, AO52218.
Jacobs, John William, Jr., AO45836.
Jacobs, Kenneth Clarence, AO33745.
Jacobsen, Walter Vincent, AO29677.
Jacquet, Edward Milton, Jr., AO53284.
James, Albert William, AO33449.
Jamieson, Alex Cameron, AO32882.
Jamison, Marshall Verdine, AO33532.
Janney, Norman Douglas, AO31535.
Jantzen, Charles Donald, AO34790.
Jarek, Frank William, AO22425.
Jarnagin, James Leslie, AO32440.
Jarred, James Franklin, AO29553.
Jeep, Fred Thomas, AO52127.
Jeffries, Murrell Moore, AO42777.
Jenkins, Edward Lydick, AO32036.
×Jennings, Payne, Jr., AO33831.
×Jessic, Frank Saint, AO43453.
Jochim, LaVergne Claude, AO43540.
×Johannes, John Michael, AO33001.
Johnsen, Lester James, AO52709.
Johnson, Barney Lee, Jr., AO34809.
Johnson, Charles R., AO29709.
Johnson, Donald William, AO34434.
Johnson, Eschol Melvin, AO52180.
Johnson, Frederick Coolidge, AO51755.
×Johnson, Herbert Elroy, Jr., AO33231.
Johnson, James McLean, AO31929.
Johnson, James Kenneth, AO33510.
Johnson, Leo Holger, AO32485.
Johnson, Lorin Lavar, AO34064.
Johnson, Milton Wayne, AO34099.
Johnson, Morrell Shaver, AO43990.
Johnson, Oris Baker, AO34821.
Johnson, Oscar Graham, AO43822.
Johnson, Paul Adrian, AO29688.
Johnson, Roberts Poinsett, Jr., AO42833.
Johnson, Robert Dalton, AO44975.
×Johnston, Clifford Andersen, AO33081
×Johnston, Harry Cornealius, AO42781.
Johnston, Robert Reed, AO46080.
Johnston, Ronald Alexander, AO32263.
×Johnstone, Charles William, AO25224.
×Jones, Charles Oliver, AO35002.
Jones, Curran Littleton, AO34623.
Jones, Dailey Morgan, AO30463.
Jones, David James, AO34447.
Jones, Donald Theodore, AO42122.
Jones, Edelle Mason, AO45983.
Jones, Edward McWilliams, AO35079.
Jones, Edward Lindsey, AO35076.
Jones, George Lamar, AO25052.
Jones, Harry, AO42405.
Jones, Harry Henderson, AO41983.
×Jones, Jarvis Parnell, AO32652.
Jones, John Waldon, AO43034.
Jones, Osce Vernon, AO33649.
Jones, Paul Anson, AO35120.
Jones, Prentist Charles, AO52298.
Jones, Richard, AO33423.
Jones, Robert Stewart, AO51244.
Jones, Robert Herrick, AO39048.
Jones, Wayne Emery, AO51458.
Jones, William Woodruff, AO34563.
Jones, William Anderson, AO34169.
Jones, William, AO32661.
Jones, Wilson Tolman, AO34003.
Jones, Wingate Brewer, AO45085.
×Jordan, Charles Edward, AO35026.
Jordan, John Alton, AO42149.
×Jowdy, William John, AO32152.
Judkins, William T., AO40006.
Juhasz, Andrew Anthony, AO44943.
Junkermann, Howard Calvin, AO34168.
Jurkens, Edward Albert, AO34413.
Justice, Arthur Edward, Jr., AO53466.
Kable, Max Sanford, AO34479.
Kalberer, Karl Hubert, AO51510.
Kalberer, Klem Franklin, AO32763.
×Kale, James Stewart, AO34527.
×Kauffman, George Roland, AO42972.
Keach, Thomas Carroll, AO30064.
Keating, Robert Edward, AO33672.
Keator, Randall Denison, AO34507.
Keefe, Don Robert, AO51241.
Keeler, Raymond Hager, AO30314.
Keeling, Gerald Fay, AO33132.
Keene, George Francis, Jr., AO29548.
×Keilman, Myron Harold, AO34767.
Keller, Charles Richard, Jr., AO34162.
×Keller, Frank Jacob, AO45494.
×Keller, Ralph Waldo, AO33232.
×Keller, William Dean, AO32666.
×Kellogg, Joseph Warner, AO42731.
×Kelly, Albert Sidney, AO34924.
×Kelly, Earle Wellington, AO45712.
×Kelly, John Harris, AO43562
×Kelsay, Clyde Bruce, AO34028.
Kelsey, Straughan Downing, AO23779.
Kemble, William Hudson, Jr., AO33726.
Kemp, James Dudley, AO34173.
×Kenny, Thomas Francis, Jr., AO34327.
×Kent, Glenn Altran, AO52562.
×Kerbel, Walter, AO39818.
Kesling, Earl William, AO33744.
×Key, George Alexander, AO43742.
×Kiefer, Paul Clifford, AO51354.
Kieling, Harry Joseph, AO30063.
Kiley, Leo Austin, Jr., AO39091.
Kilgore, James Louis, AO30828.
Killgore, Earl Henderson, AO30163.
Killian, Carl Louis, AO45746.
×Kimball, James Nathaniel, AO51846.
Kimbrel, Claude Roscoe, AO35016.
×Kincade, Norman Theodore, AO34493.
×Kincheloe, Charles M., AO42444.
×King, Hall, AO38731.
King, Herbert Thompson, AO42673.
King, Kenneth Wilson, AO52179.
×King, Norman Elliott, AO45685.
Kingen, Elmer Fred, AO32897.
Kingham, Arthur Raymond, AO41964.
×Kingsley, Earl Roster, AO44082.
Kirby, David Joseph, AO43570.
Kirchner, Hans Kraft, AO29759.
Kirk, Tyrus Howard, AO40507.
Kirkland, Sanford Holmes, Jr., AO31588.
Kirkpatrick, Harold Cope, AO45577.
Kirtley, Robert Eberle, AO45638.
×Kirton, Edwin Malcolm, AO30380.
×Kiser, Edgar Lee, AO44116.
Kittel, Louis Richard, AO44947.
×Kittel, Robert Stewart, AO45476.
×Kjeldseth, Clarion Jonason, AO34941.
Klein, Edward Colburn, AO30356.
Klein, Frederick William, AO51258.
Kleinjan, Lyle Vernon, AO42793.
Klemovich, Joseph Thomas, AO52572.
Kline, John William, AO34925.
Kline, Richard William, AO23906.
Klos, Lawrence Balfour, AO31851.
Kneen, George Henry, Jr., AO33512.
Knierim, Charles Frederick, AO52338.
Knight, Gordon Bennett, AO31648.
Knobloch, Richard August, AO34792.
Knox, Jonathan Horace, AO33598.
Knox, Robert Burns, AO34769.
×Knudson, Albert, AO44779.
Knudson, Cecil Cephas, AO43497.
Kodis, John William, AO45120.
Kohlrieser, Francis Louis, AO42069.
Kolb, Lewis Jackson, AO52367.
Konosky, John Martin, AO45752.
Kontak, Emil Walter, AO44066.
Koontz, Ray Wilson, Jr., AO33003.
Korges, Woodrow Wilson, AO22583.
×Kracman, Miles, AO42140.
Kresslov, Russell, AO43863.
Krieger, Andrew Edward, Jr., AO35233.
Krieger, George Hubert, AO42881.
Kroeber, Adolf, AO42034.
Kruzel, Joseph John, AO34305.
×Kugel, Richard Charles, AO30629.
Kuhl, Philip John, AO23390.
Kuhn, Robert Belden, AO21307.
×Kunce, Lee Roy, AO43994.
×Kundrat, Andrew, AO33870.
×Kunkel, David Ernest, Jr., AO23805.
Kunkel, John Howard, Jr., AO40582.

Kuntz, Bernard Romayne, AO45309.
Kutschera, Walter Felix, AO34377.
×Kyes, William Bush, AO34893.
×LaBarr, William, AO51675.
LaBuda, Joseph Edward, AO29713.
LaClare, Edward Francis, AO34458.
La Grippo, Antonio Natle, AO41997.
×LaPlante, Robert William, AO32816.
La Rocca, Gerard Anthony, AO23948.
Lackey, Archer Evans, AO33803.
Lackey, John Herbert, Jr., AO25197.
Lacy, Albert John, AO33061.
Ladd, Avery Jackson, AO29613.
Lafrenz, William Arthur, AO45902.
Laking, Percy Albert, AO42087.
Lambert, Blake Wallace, AO34225.
Lambert, Jean Koke, AO24392.
Lambert, John Lincoln, AO34478.
Lambert, Joseph S., AO51787.
Lambeth, Benjamin Shadarach, Jr., AO44490.
Lamek, William Jacob, AO30697.
Lampley, Harmon, Jr., AO21792.
Lancaster, Charles Eugene, Jr., AO22384.
Landall, Lincoln Wilson, AO43059.
Lane, William, Jr., AO22547.
Lanford, Horace Whaley, Jr., AO34314.
×Lange, Harry Alfred, AO41996.
×Lansdale, Edward Geary, AO42180.
×Larkey, Isaac Farrand, Jr., AO34439.
Larson, Harold Vernon, AO45841.
×Larson, Lloyd Robert, AO46153.
Larson, Robert Hillman, AO34224.
Larson, Robert Sherman, AO43959.
Lassiter, Olbert Ferring, AO39106.
Latham, James Colson, AO53299.
Latiolais, Stanley Paul, AO34812.
Latshaw, Joseph Bruce, Jr., AO46056.
Laubrich, Herman Allan, AO34811.
Laughlin, Joseph Lyle, AO35321.
Lavell, Walter Wellman, AO23032.
Lavelle, John Daniel, AO25244.
Laven, George, Jr., AO33459.
Law, Henry Leland, Jr., AO32438.
×Lawrence, Henry Wells, AO34535.
Lawrence, John Charles, AO43640.
Lawrence, Reesor Mott, AO22377.
Lawrence, Rollo Charles, Jr., AO33356.
Lawrence, Samuel Eugene, Jr., AO22591.
Lawson, John Kercheval, AO31428.
Lawson, LeRoy Franklin, AO40462.
Lawson, Robert Morris, AO34584.
Lawton, Thomas Oregon, Jr., AO33860.
Laybourn, John Eugene, AO45561.
×Layton, Robert Fulton, AO32471.
LeBell, Arnold, AO42327.
LeMaster, Douglas Ray, AO41881.
LeMay, Lloyd William, AO51521.
×Leach, William Hinman, AO30127.
×Learnard, Arthur Trowbridge, AO31634.
×Ledford, Jack Clarence, AO46279.
Ledoux, Elzia, AO34931.
×Lee, James Lyle, AO43456.
Lee, Jay Smith, AO53167.
Leen, Gerald Adrian, AO33404.
Leffingwell, Samuel Dennis, AO41902.
×Lehman, Ted R., AO42154.
Lehnhard, Donald Frank, AO32123.
Leimbacher, Robert James, AO33293.
×Leisy, Roland Henry, AO53343.
Lemmon, Cyrus Jackson, AO40295.
Lemmon, James Coskrey, AO34113.
Leocha, Adolph John, AO24436.
Lerche, Andrew Olaf, AO21438.
Lesh, Newton Doremus, AO51322.
Leslie, George Adalord, AO33988.
Levering, John Robert, AO42166.
×Lewis, Archie Robert, AO44559.
Lewis, Daniel Moody, AO32139.
Lewis, David Lowell, AO22446.
Lewis, Earl Westlake, AO51205.
Lewis, James Thomas, AO34126.
Lewis, Leon Guilford, AO34797.
Lewis, Robert Clayton, AO33269.
Lewis, Lawrence Lee, AO31349.
Liebman, David Israel, AO35038.
×Lightner, Lawrence Scott, AO35155.
×Likes, David Henry, AO43983.
Liles, Robert Lee, AO35291.
Lilley, Clarence Wellington, AO42803.
Linder, Kenneth Albert, AO34062.
Lindgren, Richard Wendell, AO31951.
Lindley, William Cecil, Jr., AO46166.
Lindley, William Carey, AO34776.
Lindsey, Howard William, AO31538.
Lindstrand, Carl Barber, AO31373.
Lindstrum, Herbert James, AO51234.
Linehan, John Royal, AO23466.
Lingamfelter, Charles Brown, Jr., AO34460.
Lingard, Aldro Immanuel, AO53133.
Linsley, Scott Ellsworth, AO42625.
Lipscomb, Woodrow Wilson, AO34583.
×Lipsker, Martin Sigmund, AO40335.
Lister, Ralph Brown, AO21343.
Lively, Richard Thomas, AO32114.
Livesay, Earl James, AO34136.
Livingston, John Waters, AO33789.
Ljunggren, Ernest Nils, AO25232.
Locke, John Langford, AO23747.
×Lockman, John Murk, AO42008.
×Loesch, Lawrence Frederic, AO45466.
Logan, Arthur Lawrence, AO29545.
Logan, James Charles, AO43792.
Loggins, Lloyd Burnett, AO39851.
Loisel, John Simon, AO35133.
Lollar, William Houston, AO42065.
Long, Charles James 3d, AO21852.
Long, David Winston, AO51623.
×Long, Lewis Rex, AO42314.
Longino, Houston Walker, Jr., AO22631.
Longridge, Emmett Francis, AO32476.
Loomis, Oliver Demond, AO31827.
Loomis, Richard, AO30308.
Loomis, Robert Gillis, AO46249.
Louden, Edward Kimball, AO53214.
Lounsbery, Arthur Heath, AO42290.
×Lovenbury, James William, AO40661.
Lowman, Richard Cook, AO51774.
Lowry, Leon Lloyd, AO32788.
×Lucas, Walter Yeates, AO35422.
Luehring, Dale Wilferd, AO34642.
Lumpkin, William Lawrence, AO45510.
Lumsden, Reid Radford, AO30683.
Lund, Harold Gold, AO34909.
Lundquist, Gustav Edward, AO34386.
Luschen, Frank Leslie, AO45963.
Lutz, Charles Jean, AO33009.
Lutz, Simon Michael, Jr., AO42595.
×Lyle, James Perkins, AO34546.
×Lyle, Lewis Elton, AO33557.
×Lynch, Donald Hugh, AO34880.
Lyon, Edsel Lonnie, AO53361.
Lyons, James Raymond, AO24124.
Lyster, David King., Jr., AO34010.
Macdonald, Henry Gordon, AO33749.
×MacDonald, Daniel Venn, AO34298.
MacDuff, Francis Henry, AO21483.
MacKenzie, Norman Dexter, AO42874.
MacNaughton, Franklin H., AO24105.
Mack, Ingham Gallinger, AO41925.
Magid, Louis Borris, Jr., AO30104.
Magness, Woodrow Wilson, AO32718.
×Magruder, Eugene Ross, AO33160.
Mahon, Herschel Daniel, AO33288.
Mahon, James Eli, AO32872.
×Mahoney, Hugh, AO45855.
Mahr, Victor Montague, AO40696.
Main, Philip, AO45524.
Mainor, Andrew, AO29998.
Mallory, Robert Frank, AO46025.
Malloy, Verne, Henry, AO32716.
Manchester, Richard Easley, AO45098.
Mandt, William Frederick 3d, AO34396.
Mangan, James Harrison, AO46085.
Manion, Thomas Francis, Jr., AO42332.
Manning, George Max, AO25314.
Manss, Robert William, AO42413.
Mantoux, Lopez, Joseph, Jr., AO52575.
Marble, Hugh Higman, Jr., AO33277.
Marchant, John Chesley, AO42358.
Mariska, Ben Felix, AO43564.
Markham, Peter John, AO44640.
Marley, Frederick Harold, AO40440.
×Maroni, Robert James, AO34564.
Marr, Jack Franklin, AO25245.
Marsh, Charles Stewart, AO42440.
Marshall, Charles Sylvester, AO39038.
Marshall, Raymond H., AO30295.
Marston, Morrill Elwood, AO23220.
Martensen, John Kieth, AO52409.
Martensen, William Burke, AO33555.
Martin, Charles Patrick, AO29757.
Martin, Clarence Allan, Jr., AO34382.
Martin, John Byrd, AO43484.
Martin, John Robert, AO33435.
Martin, Joseph McClinnon, AO45884.
Martin, Lonnie Elwyn, AO31573.
×Martin, Vernon Paul, AO44732.
Martin, William Arthur, AO42488.
Martinoli, Frank Louis, AO41982.
Martinson, John McClure, AO33172.
×Marts, Kenneth Elliot, AO34005.
Marvel, George Bertram, Jr., AO53289.
×Marvin, Reinold Heman, AO42536.
Mason, Albert Joseph, AO42477.
Mason, Lassiter Albert, AO19060.
Mason, Regnald Hoyt, AO34414.
Mason, Vincent Elmore, AO45767.
Massengale, William Marcues, Jr., AO35024.
Massey, Donnell, AO34646.
Massion, John Wendel, AO22503.
×Masters, Robert Eugene, AO44195.
Matheson, Charles Fuller, AO24061.
Matthews, Ira Van Diver, AO40744.
×Matthews, Joseph Walter, AO42310.
Matthews, Luther Bailey, AO30457.
Matthews, Robert Lee, AO22476.
Matthews, Stanley Eldred, AO25203.
Mattia, Hugh John, AO42381.
Maull, Harold Vincent, AO45664.
×Maxwell, Donald Ward, AO32584.
Maxwell, Ernest Beverly, AO21972.
Maxwell, Hugh Durwood, Jr., AO40566.
May, Richard Henry, AO34374.
Mayall, Broun Hunt, AO29907.
Mayer, William Henry, AO34431.
Mayo, Ben Isbel, Jr., AO23735.
McAdams, Clayton Aubrey, AO42307.
McAfee, Harry Edwin, AO34503.
McBrayer, Cornelius Evans, AO32235.
×McBrayer, James Roy, Jr., AO45090.
McBride, James Lloyd, Jr., AO21762.
×McBride, William Peter, AO33625.
McCabe, Jerome Joseph, AO44874.
×McCafferty, George O'Day, AO34361.
×McCaffery, Lawrence Florian, AO40160.
McCall, Jim, AO52332.
McCalla, John Herman, AO45657.
McCampbell, James Monroe, AO30755.
McCants, Leland Stanford, Jr., AO32494.
McCartan, Arthur Austin, AO23062.
×McCarter, Elmer Heath, AO32694.
McCarthy, Fred Morton, AO51215.
McCarthy, James Francis, Jr., AO24225.
McChristy, Albert Jordan, Jr., AO32891.
McClelland, Harold Moody, AO35122.
McClenahan, Edward Franklin, AO30466.
McClernon, Glen John, AO35108.
×McClure, Jack Curtright, Jr., AO23771.
McClure, William Horace, AO51324.
McCluskey, Jack Lawrence, AO44924.
×McCollum, Hugh Archie, AO42540.
×McColpin, Carrol Warren, AO32591.
McComas, Edward Otis, AO35275.
McConahay, John Donald, AO30607.
McConnell, Landon Edward, AO32271.
McCool, Harry Clayton, AO45825.
McCorkle, John, AO43031.
×McCown, Dean Augustus, AO52735.
McCown, James Harlan, AO30452.
McCoy, Frederic Emerson, AO32730.
McCracken, Austin Ralph, AO44247.
McCrackin, Marion Riffle, AO32533.
McCrary, Robert Ryan, AO33324.
McCredie, Darwin Cromwell, AO31989.
McCrery, Robert Riley, AO32419.
McCroskey, Sam Earl, AO43483.
McCutcheon, Robert Haynes, AO24149.
McDaniel, Hervey Allison, Jr., AO35217.
McDaniel, John Thomas, AO42783.
×McDaniell, Samuel Ray, Jr., AO45986.
×McDermott, Charles Michael, AO51331.
McDonald, Audley Clifford, AO30570.
McDonald, Everett Arthur, AO35234.
McDonald, James Goulding, AO52313.
McFadden, James Neil, AO34994.
×McFarland, Earl, Jr., AO22909.
McFarland, Jack Boaz, AO43470.
McFarland, Thomas Stuart, Jr., AO42320.
McGary, Alvin, AO42197.
McGehee, Thomas Kendrick, AO33107.
McGinnis, Edgar Max, AO33314.
×McGlinn, Richard Morden, AO39800.

McGrath, Thomas Joseph, AO51410.
McGuire, William Henry, AO39910.
McIntire, Howard Jay, AO34800.
McKaba, Edward, AO43805.
×McKee, Daniel Deupree, AO35116.
McKee, Seth Jefferson, AO33851.
McKelvey, William Robert, AO45465.
McKenna, Charles Francis, 3d, AO33843.
McKenzie, James Beecher, AO25057.
McKenzie, Melvin Almon, AO25239.
×McKesson, Elmer Earle, AO22568.
McKinnon, Samuel Hawley, AO32328.
McKnight, David Thomas, AO31492.
×McKnight, Thomas Lanier, AO23455.
McKnight, William Louis, AO30456.
McKoy, Edwin Anderson, AO52142.
McLaughlin, John Arthur, AO33195.
×McLean, Michael Turner, AO42247.
McLeod, Robert Merritt, AO44821.
McNabb, John Malcolm, AO40676.
×McNamara, Eugene Addis, Jr., AO51465.
McNeal, Thomas Carl, AO22388.
×McNeil, Joseph Leonard, AO29866.
McRay, Edward James, Jr., AO46064.
McSwain, Alex Tracey, AO32035.
×McWhirter, Horace Bee, AO53350.
McWhorter, William Hugh, Jr., AO52475.
McWhorter, William Arther, AO33537.
McWilliams, Martin Cadenhead, AO25030.
McAllister, Gerald Bennion, AO34291.
×McTaggart, Elmer Ernest, AO34589.
Meador, John William, AO24017.
Mears, James Frank, AO35176.
Meeks, John Andrew, Jr., AO42509.
Meglemre, George Elden, AO41927.
Mehess, Gus John, AO52784.
Melcher, John Nelson, AO33207.
×Melton, Robert Elwin, AO32464.
Meng, Lewis Bruno, AO22610.
Meng, William Jones, AO34164.
Mengel, Herbert Osmes, Jr., AO44683.
Mercier, Alonzo Philip, AO42760.
Merritt, Ralph LeRoy, Jr., AO22875.
Messenger, Lester Charles, AO34300.
Messerschmitt, Kermit Day, AO31995.
×Mestier, Louis Jean Batiste, Jr., AO53069.
Metcalf, John Kenneth, AO42201.
×Metz, Cecil Clyde, AO44751.
Meyer, John Charles, AO34138.
Meyer, William Joseph, AO51563.
Michaelis, Ralph Leslie, AO24146.
Michie, Robert Edward Lee, AO34526.
Mickley, William Bowen, AO43810.
Middleton, Willard Rufus, AO29728.
Mignola, Harold Edward, AO32205.
×Mikulak, Michael Nicholas, AO31798.
Miles, Joe Douglas, AO39062.
×Millberry, Robert Ingalls, AO31724.
Miller, Alsey Coleman, Jr., AO42432.
Miller, Austin Luther, AO32092.
×Miller, Blake Charles, AO30343.
Miller, Clark Lorenzo, AO30653.
Miller, David Kenneth, AO42170.
Miller, David Vern, AO53360.
×Miller, DeWolfe Hugo, AO29831.
Miller, Donald Vernon, AO45103.
×Miller, Fred W., AO32144.
Miller, John Edward, AO46188.
Miller, Oliver William, AO51612.
Miller, Richard Wilson, AO15932.
Miller, Victor Burton, AO43598.
Miller, Walter Arlo, AO40312.
Miller, Warren Mahlon, Jr., AO44500.
Miller, William Edward, AO34630.
Miller, William Brumfield, Jr., AO42342.
Milling, John Butler, AO34551.
Mills, Morris Hammond, AO42264.
Mills, Ray, AO51334.
Mills, Robert Eugene, AO44681.
×Milne, Jack Gillespie, AO24112.
Milner, Victor, Jr., AO34915.
Milroy, Charles Knox, AO42613.
Mitchell, John William, AO32930.
Mitchell, Richard Randolph, AO45262.
Mitchell, Samuel Andrew, AO45005.
Mitchell, William LeRoy, Jr., AO23840.
Mitchim, Kelly Word, AO44405.
×Mize, Seth Albert, AO34530.
Mobbs, George Dalton, AO46231.
×Mogford, Ronald, AO51589.
Mohr, Clifford Frandsen Luck, AO51268.
Moir, Charles Louis, AO45343.
Monahan, John Daniel, AO46214.
Monroe, Henry Scaroboro, AO43511.
Montgomery, Emery Harry, AO53274.
Montgomery, Lee Ward, AO42409.
Montgomery, Robert Pearson, AO33618.
Moody, Joe Lytle, AO34500.
×Moomaw, Lorris William, AO30364.
Moon, Robert Sell, AO53057.
Mooney, Joseph Francis, AO25279.
×Moore, Alan Douglas, AO35271.
Moore, Andrew Dale, AO42651.
×Moore, Charles Edwin, AO46116.
Moore, Harold Elwood, AO34252.
Moore, Henry Neville, AO43876.
Moore, Hugh Campbelle, AO34865.
Moore, Lloyd Ewing, AO33256.
Moore, Lynn Ross, AO34127.
Moore, Malcolm Arnot, AO25200.
Moore, Porter Brake, AO51826.
Moore, Walter Leon, Jr., AO23890.
Moore, William Evans, Jr., AO43858.
Moore, Wilson, AO45321.
Moores, Howard Oliver, Jr., AO52187.
Moorhead, Jesse Jefferson, AO33103.
Moran, James Joseph, AO51470.
Moreland, Hugh Harold, AO32952.
Morgan, Chester Harvey, AO32057.
×Morgan, Francis Bell, AO44062.
Morgan, MacPherson, AO23495.
Morneau, Chester Henry, AO31901.
Morrill, Harry Eugene, AO40427.
Morris, Harold Thomas, AO51700.
Morris, William Wallace, Jr., AO45370.
×Morrison, Albert Morris, AO51388.
Morrow, James Daniel, AO51852.
Morton, Charles William, AO33650.
Moseley, Cuthbert Livingston, Jr., AO34009.
Mosher, Rowland Orson, AO45874.
Moss, Henry James Yancy, AO51220.
Mosse, Charles Edward, AO24351.
Mottern, Elmer McDowell, AO45067.
Moyer, Robert Franklin, AO44508.
Moynihan, William Laurence, AO51449.
×Mueller, Alvin John Henry, Jr., AO38819.
Muhl, Fred Joseph, AO34275.
Muhlbach, Robert Prins, AO31896.
Muhlenberg, David Dorrington Kress, AO40364.
×Muldoon, Bernard Richard, AO46179.
×Mulholland, Mitchell Joseph Bernard, AO46003.
×Mullen, John Joseph, AO44174.
×Mulligan, Martin Doyle, AO52423.
Mullins, James Athal, AO34330.
Mullins, William Pearlie, AO44800.
Mumford, Harry Griffin, AO34515.
Mundee, John Alfred, AO52650.
×Mundorff, John LeRoy, AO46161.
Munroe, George Bakewell, Jr., AO45802.
Munson, David Jerome, AO43899.
×Muri, James Perry, AO45954.
Murphy, John Hogan, AO53111.
Murphy, Robert Joseph, Jr., AO39929.
Murray, Charles Edward, AO39020.
Murray, Henry Franklin, AO53432.
Murray, James Timothy, AO32181.
Murray, John Edward, AO43920.
×Murray, Robert Hugh, AO33067.
Murrell, Carrell Thurman, AO23381.
Musgrave, Philip Cebern, AO30709.
Musgrove, Albert Millard, Jr., AO51351.
×Mutschler, Gustave William, AO51254.
Myers, Eugene Ekander, AO32319.
Nalewaik, William Joseph, AO29920.
Nance, Donald Wesley, AO32193.
×Nanney, Stancill McRae, AO43689.
Nash, Clifford, AO32613.
Natt, Theodore Manfred, AO42669.
Naugle, Harry Charles, AO42773.
Nay, Paul Franklin, AO30008.
Neal, Bascome Lagrone, AO32073.
Neal, Van Edgar, AO34483.
Neeley, Richard Cox, AO34260.
×Neer, Francis Owen, AO42728.
Neff, Edward Rudolph, Jr., AO33297.
Nelson, Carl Morris, AO34633.
Nelson, Charles Kofoed, Jr., AO31333.
Nelson, Harlan McKendra, AO39772.
×Neslen, Alfred Jack, AO34237.
Netcher, Thomas George, AO40635.
×Neuberg, Gustav Adolph, AO31422.
×Neuendorf, Charles William, AO31883.
Neuman, Bernard Albert, AO44432.
×Nevins, Hugh Jean, AO32971.
Newbauer, John Alvin, AO52437.
Newman, Frank Moulton, AO34435.
×Newman, Neil Arnold, AO44715.
Newman, Ralph Forrest, AO35104.
Newman, Wilfred Bernet, AO42880.
Newsome, James Wyatt, AO24123.
Newton, Preston Carnall, AO33716.
Niccolini, Mario Edward, AO45088.
Nicholas, Jack Day, AO40339.
Nicholas, Judson Dye, Jr., AO45756.
Nichols, Cranz, Jr., AO40017.
Nichols, Franklin Allen, AO34518.
Nichols, Guy, AO51321.
Nichols, John Donaldson, Jr., AO33652.
×Nickerson, George, AO52129.
Nigro, Edward Henry, AO34605.
Nims, Frank Leslie, AO24143.
Nix, William Elgin, AO34917.
×Noel, Dana Ellsworth, AO35301.
Nold, Woodrow Vincent, AO31746.
×Noonan, Thomas Michael, AO42243.
Norman, Roscoe Lee, AO44630.
Norris, Carl Edward, AO31591.
Norris, William Albert, AO34863.
Northamer, Kenneth Walter, AO24111.
×Northington, L. J. Dean, AO31330.
Norton, Harold Wesly, AO23863.
Norton, Malcolm Eugene, AO34248.
Norton, Paul Weddell, AO42359.
Norwood, James Maurice, AO45272.
×Nowell, Robert Bolling, AO52685.
Nugent, Richard Steffens, AO52135.
Nutt, Sidney, Jr., AO43295.
Nuttall, Lloyd Roscoe, AO34602.
×O'Brien, Frank Leo, Jr., AO25276.
O'Brien, John George, AO44616.
Ochs, Henry John, Jr., AO30280.
O'Connell, James Francis Xavier, AO31893.
O'Connell, Joseph William, AO29525.
O'Connor, George Brendan, AO19959.
O'Connor, John Peterson, AO29900.
O'Connor, Leo Nicholas, AO44270.
O'Connor, Roderic Dhu, AO24052.
×Odell, William Charles, AO33045.
Odom, Archibald Douglass, AO33559.
Odom, William Elijah, Jr., AO53182.
×Ogas, Bernard Vivian, AO34174.
O'Hern, Clyde William, AO42769.
O'Keefe, Timothy Francis, AO34259.
Ola, George Joseph, AO22858.
O'Leary, John Arthur, AO42582.
Oliver, Frank Everell, AO33593.
Olson, Arvid Eldon, Jr., AO45414.
Olson, Clifford Butris, AO45747.
Olson, Donald Albert, AO42864.
Olson, Harry Armand, AO30580.
×Olson, Robert Alroy, AO24197.
Olson, Sylfest Lester, AO44335.
O'Neal, Julius Elliott, AO34537.
O'Neill, John William, AO24205.
Orban, Henry Albert, AO34591.
×Orr, Daniel Bell, AO35263.
Orr, Richard Lowman, AO34457.
Orr, Robert Hutchinson, AO34783.
×Orris, William Lester, AO45432.
Ort, Rudolph King, AO25182.
×Osander, Edward Matts, AO34988.
Osborne, Thomas Fleet, AO25229.
Osgood, Richard Magee, AO23753.
Osher, Ernest Kermit, AO45808.
Ottinger, William Wolfe, AO25241.
×Overstreet, Charles Sylvester, Jr., AO33879.
Owens, Marcus Orlando, Jr., AO46281.
Packard, Walter Burt, AO43641.
Paden, Kenneth, William, AO51415.
Page, Harry Robert, AO32810.
Page, Roger William, AO34130.
Page, Thomas Ervin, AO45952.
×Paine, John Britton, AO34930.
×Palmer, Garnet Bruce, AO35135.
Palmer, Miles Russell, AO44939.
Pangburn, Clifton Walter, AO43300.
Panico, Fred Ralph, AO43071.
Pankey, Russell George, AO51634.
Pannis, William Walter, AO42086.
×Parham, Harry Crosswell, AO41943.
Parker, Ben LaRue, AO34312.

Parker, John Lowe, AO31600.
Parker, Rudolph Alvin, AO42301.
×Parkhill, William Henry, AO44762.
Parks, Oattis Elwyn, AO45887.
×Parks, Samuel Wilson, AO23964.
Parks, Wesley Holland, AO42121.
Parrot, Kent Kane, Jr., AO42838.
Parrott, Alonzo Wellington, AO53296.
Parsons, Albert Burchard, AO40693.
Parsons, Charles Erwin, Jr., AO45928.
×Parsons, Freeman Archie, AO53183.
Pascoe, Theodore Irvin, AO52331.
Pascoe, William Watson, AO29615.
×Patterson, James Theodore, AO33177.
×Patterson, Ralph Raymond, AO34257.
Patterson, Willard Adrin, AO34592.
Pattillo, James Louis, AO46269.
Pattison, John Barkley, Jr., AO21192.
×Paul, Joseph Herbert, AO23357.
×Paul, Leo Francis, AO33124.
Paulin, Harold David, Jr., AO32461.
Paulson, Gordon Leslie, AO40552.
×Paulson, Robert William, AO33227.
Paulson, William Dean, AO32432.
×Paxson, Charles Barger, AO46058.
Payne, Jack, AO29973.
Payne, John Daniel, AO51397.
×Payne, Joseph Ernest, AO45733.
Pearch, Lowell Dean, AO34160.
Pearson, Beverly Vernon, AO43392.
×Pearson, Ethan Roland, AO43434.
Pease, John Harold, AO34472.
Peck, Ben Jackson, AO30550.
×Peck, Gaillard Ray, AO33192.
Peck, Thornton Cecil, AO46230.
×Peddie, Joseph Scott, AO23949.
Pedersen, Gilbert Alexander, AO46260.
Pedrazzini, Harold Oliver, AO52501.
Peel, Robert Taggert, AO51685.
Pender, Preston Patton, AO21659.
×Penington, John Raymond, AO25134.
×Penn, Perry Harrison, AO40678.
Perego, Frank Smith, AO33546.
Perkins, Dale, AO32571.
Perkins, John Walter, AO32061.
Perna, Anthony Joseph, AO34307.
Perry, Arthur Clarke, AO24147.
Perry, Edward Allen, AO35142.
Perry, George Everett, AO43033.
×Perry, Gilbert Tracy, AO43515.
Perry, Leland Dale, AO33006.
×Perry, William Watson, AO32536.
Peters, Frederick Irving, AO42045.
Peters, Lester McCormick, AO32704.
Peters, Martin Fisher, AO44726.
Petersdorf, John Edwin, AO33522.
Petersen, Lawrence Albert, AO32555.
Peterson, Charles Oscar, AO32594.
Peterson, David Allen, AO43852.
Peterson, Lawrence Edwin, AO32486.
Peterson, Martin Francis, AO43754.
Petit, Robert Lindsay, AO53268.
Petrovich, John Robert, AO35117.
×Pettigrew, Paul Ales, AO45980.
Pfeiffer, George, Jr., AO40573.
Pfingst, William Kingsley, AO45410.
Phillips, Arnold Thielens, AO44480.
×Phillips, Charles Richard, AO34996.
Phillips, Eugene Wendell, AO44671.
×Phillips, Maurice Cossett, AO34135.
Phippen, Daniel Kirby, AO34844.
Pickens, William Hopkins, AO42427.
Pickering, Ralph Martin, AO45002.
Pickoff, Julius, AO34699.
×Pidgeon, Arthur Robert, Jr., AO38711.
Pidgeon, Sidney Sherrod, AO44834.
Pierce, Charles Howard, AO40757.
×Pike, Harry MacCulloch, AO24110.
Pike, Myron Hartley, AO31362.
×Pinnegar, Frederick George, AO42325.
Pinson, Ernest Alexander, AO31825.
Piper, Preston, AO44966.
Pirruccello, Joseph Salvatore, AO32896.
Pittman, George Henry, Jr., AO23920.
Pittsford, Jack Clement, AO31544.
×Plihal, Joseph Anton, AO51691.
×Ploetz, Frederick Ferdinand, AO32527.
Podolak, Stanislaw Joseph, AO45010.
Polking, Warren Anthony, AO45725.
×Ponder, Speers Gordon, AO41995.
Poole, Allan Eugene, AO43494.
Poole, Charles Robert, AO29585.
×Poole, Edgar Thornton, Jr., AO24065.
Poor, George Lovelace, AO30277.
Pope, Francis Joseph, AO33804.
Popovich, Taras Ted, AO35130.
Porter, Howard Joseph, AO53458.
Porter, Robert Arthur, AO34937.
Porterfield, Samuel Grisby, AO45656.
×Potter, Fred Olen, AO42146.
Potter, Henry Alpheus, AO45931.
Powell, Thomas Everett, AO20837.
Powell, William Kenneth, AO34875.
Powell, William Henry, Jr., AO35256.
Powers, Arthur Dennis, AO35036.
Prann, Bradley Foote, AO23027.
Prasse, Frederick Teseler, AO34265.
Pratt, Carlos Conrad, AO22601.
Prentiss, Vernon, AO45680.
×Preslar, Sanford Dee, AO44123.
Preston, Benjamin Sidney, Jr., AO33861.
×Preston, Lloyd Warner, AO53278.
Pribble, Holton Houston, AO42339.
Price, Frederick Eugene, AO45834.
Price, Galen Barger, AO33253.
Price, Oran Oscar, AO44215.
×Pricer, Donald Calvin, AO35462.
Prim, Kent James, AO40684.
Pritchard, Charles Henderson, AO41955.
Pritchard, Wilbur Dixon, AO43080.
Prochazka, Theodore Vincent, AO51400.
Proctor, John Peebles, AO22350.
Prodanovich, George, AO32834.
Propst, John Robert, AO34424.
Pruett, Ernest Clinton, AO44404.
Pruitt, Harold Angus, AO35226.
×Pruyn, Franklin Goodwyn, Jr., AO40157.
Puckett, Robert Stephens, AO25317.
Purinton, William Robert, AO22835.
Pyle, Clifton, AO33574.
Quayle, John William, AO33645.
Quincy, Arthur Joseph, AO52280.
Quinn, Elwyn Farney, AO52287.
×Quinn, Robert James, Jr., AO20285.
Quinn, Robert Sidney, AO22531.
Rafferty, Patrick Hugh, AO45062.
Ragland, Richard Milner, AO31440.
Rakestraw, Bryan LaVerne, AO42719.
Ramputi, Frederick Renaldi, AO45599.
Ramsey, Joseph Bunn, Jr., AO53097.
Ramsey, Woodrow Wilson, AO39131.
Randall, Heman Ward, Jr., AO22492.
Randall, Robert Jahraus, AO29855.
Randall, Wilmer Ammons, AO44555.
Randolph, John Peyton, AO33433.
Randolph, Richard Louis, AO32878.
Rasmessen, Edward Bernard, AO33339.
Rasmussen, James Holland Stephen, AO-23157.
Rath, George Edward, AO34819.
Raudabaugh, Albert Snyder, AO42676.
Rawl, Robert Clifton, AO34506.
Rawlings, Phillip C., AO33936.
×Rawlinson, Bolling Hall, AO34825.
×Ray, Clyde Asa, AO25199.
Raynor, Spencer Winthrope, AO29805.
Read, Elkins, Jr., AO40485.
Read, Jackson Yulee, AO33607.
Rector, Edward Franklin, AO33765.
Rector, Roscoe Garnett, AO43370.
Redburn, Ralph Albert, AO29681.
×Redd, Denny Lee, AO30246.
Redington, William Morris, AO32138.
Redmond, Miles Augustine, AO30147.
Reed, Darrell Leonard, AO39815.
Reed, David Weaver, AO31866.
Reed, Elliott Hartley, AO21647.
×Reed, James Franklin, AO44093.
Reed, Talmadge DeWitt, AO46261.
Reeder, Horace Greeley, 2d, AO51749.
Reeve, Ralph Amos, AO23395.
×Reeve, Roy Lynn, AO33068.
Regan, Harvey Wade, AO29524.
Regan, Ralston Byrnes, AO42151.
×Reichley, Roydon Leo, AO29873.
×Reid, Archibald Campbell, Jr., AO51480.
Reid, Charles Albert, AO34804.
Reid, John, AO42260.
Renick, Charles Robert, AO34803.
Reynolds, Alden Cooley, AO42747.
Reynolds, William LaFayette, AO45877.
Rhea, Fred, AO41978.
×Rheberg, Steven Candler, AO43306.
Rhinehart, Wicliff Grady, AO51210.
×Rhodes, James Mauran, 3d, AO42484.
Rhynard, Wayne Edgar, AO23765.
Rice, Arthur T., AO35243.
Richard, Newton Mansel, Jr., AO30441.
Richard, Septime Severous, Jr., AO32254.
Richards, Edmund Burke, AO44535.
Richards, John Rose, AO23776.
Richards, Lynn Adelbert, AO43666.
Richards, Milburn Loring, AO31917.
Richardson, Elmer Winston, AO33571.
Richardson, Guy Brooks, Jr., AO41958.
Richardson, Harold William, AO35218.
Richardson, John, AO42081.
Richardson, Lester Elwood, AO34133.
×Richardson, Orin Shelby, AO42355.
Richer, Marcel Andre, AO42645.
×Richmond, Luther Henry, AO24113.
Richter, Eugene Paul, AO30110.
Riddle, Samuel Stuart, Jr., AO35052.
×Ridgway, Charles Zimmer, AO51817.
Ridings, Donald Ellis, AO21657.
Rieske, Forrest Otto, AO42110.
Riggin, Francis Darryl, AO35011.
Riggle, Glenn Blaine, AO46074.
Riha, Amos Frank, AO35227.
Riley, Daniel Edward, AO52608.
Riley, Edward Thompson, AO51214.
Riley, William Bryant, Jr., AO42050.
Rinehart, Howard Elon, AO51441.
Riordan, Robert Polk, AO33538.
Rippere, John Brockway, AO20898.
Risher, James Franklin, Jr., AO40560.
×Ritter, Frederick Otto, AO52206.
Ritterbush, Milton Frederick, AO40279.
Rizon, Robert Lewis, AO43346.
Roadman, Charles Harvey, AO32415.
Robb, Harry Wilson, AO34247.
Robbins, Jay Thorpe, AO34752.
Robbins, Richard Barclay, AO30225.
Robert, Wade Hampton, Jr., AO34785.
×Roberts, James Frank, Jr., AO32087.
Roberts, John Alva, Jr., AO33914.
Robie, John William, AO35129.
Robinson, Calvin Victor, AO43405.
Robinson, Edward William, AO46114.
Robinson, George Lexemuel, AO29703.
Robinson, Gerald Graham, AO33088.
Robinson, James Dallas Caswell, AO34344.
×Robinson, James Cregg, Jr., AO34022.
×Robinson, James, AO41880.
×Robinson, Raymond Edward, AO43443.
Robinson, Robert Thompson, AO33162.
×Robinson, William Wallace, AO51488.
Rochte, Lucian Sebastian, Jr., AO34987.
Roessell, Jack, AO34789.
Rogers, Frank Astor, Jr., AO51912.
Rogers, Leland Theodore, AO42039.
Rogers, Norman Elliott, Jr., AO42669.
Rogers, Thomas James, AO46244.
×Rohrbough, Leonard Muir, AO21631.
Rohrich, Joseph, Jr., AO43811.
Rohrs, Leonard John, AO30396.
Roman, Maxwell William, AO53186.
Romberg, Edgar Allen, AO23382.
Romine, Robert Talbot, Jr., AO42840.
Ronka, George Raphael, AO30212.
Rooks, John Girard, AO51301.
Rose, Orville Vern, AO30186.
×Rosenfield, Walter Allan, Jr., AO44680.
Ross, Finlay Fuller, Jr., AO35061.
Ross, George Lee, AO33805.
Ross, Orville Bergier, AO40460.
×Ross, William Emmett, AO34232.
Rossoff, Isidor, AO33921.
Roth, Floyd Earl, AO34669.
×Rowden, Burton Houston, AO31676.
Rowlett, Allen Benjamin, AO32534.
Rowley, John Waterbury, AO32974.
Roylance, John Gunter, AO42168.
Ruark, William Ernest, Jr., AO35294.
Ruebel, Joseph William, AO23154.
Rumsey, Herman, AO34172.
Rundquist, Douglas LeRoy, AO31675.
Runyon, Theodore Henry, AO34626.
Ruoff, Herman John, AO31637.
×Rupert, Claude Kimberly, AO42767.
Rush, Arthur Clement, AO34371.
×Russell, Edward Patrick, AO44914.
Russell, Joseph Decatur, AO42855.

Ryan, Lloyd Frederick, AO51725.
Saad, John Ispiridon, AO34264.
×Sadow, Peter Thomas, AO29534.
Safley, Don Louis, AO45799.
Sager, Harvid, AO30092.
×Salisbury, Arthur George, AO33730.
Saltsman, Ralph Henry, Jr., AO33909.
Salvatore, Alexander Ralph, AO53408.
×Sammons, James Nile, AO32561.
Sampson, Raymond Donavon, AO34251.
Sampson, Roy Paul, AO30505.
Sams, Burton Kresge, AO44608.
Sander, George Myron, AO30664.
×Sanders, Edward Austin, Jr., AO34217.
Sanders, Frederick Armstrong, AO46103.
Sanders, Marshall Eugene, AO53067.
×Sanders, Norton Winston, AO45576.
Sandifer, Virgil Everette, AO45539.
Sands, Harry James, Jr., AO24143.
×Sands, James Edward, AO51735.
Sartz, Jacob Peter, Jr., AO34585.
Sass, Edward John, Jr., AO32804.
Satterwhite, Robert Bennett, AO45853.
×Sauer, August Peter, AO52141.
Sault, William Edwin, AO45850.
Savage, Columbus, AO32541.
Savage, Frank Stephenson, AO35032.
Savage, Lawrence Brownlee, Jr., AO51603.
Savoie, William Frank, AO24115.
Sawyer, Willis Bruner, AO23821.
Schaller, Ralph Howard, AO29750.
×Schee, Owen, AO45779.
Schenk, Peter Joseph, AO34982.
Scherrer, Arthur Burton, AO41980.
×Schilling, David Carl, AO34024.
×Schindler, Andrew Richard, AO34360.
Schinz, Albert William, AO34311.
×Schliecker, Charles Lenard, AO42430.
Schloss, Jeremy Karl, AO32773.
Schneider, George Elmer, AO45762.
Schoenfeldt, Paul John, AO30421.
Schoenfeldt, Verl Boyce, AO45557.
Schofield, Martin Benjamin, Jr., AO33748.
Schoggen, Elmer Guy, Jr., AO46163.
Schrank, Milton Arval, AO34670.
Schreiber, Harry Julius, AO43798.
Schrock, Ray Ebolin, AO30545.
Schroeck, Franklin Emmett, AO22441.
Schuck, Francis Joseph, AO34171.
×Schulze, Herbert Otto, AO39005.
Schwane, Henry Herman, AO38952.
Scollay, Loren Perry, AO29546.
Scott, Edward Walcot, Jr., AO33677.
Scott, Franklin Harold, AO34613.
Scott, John Joseph, AO43945.
Scott, Oliver McFarlane, AO44957.
Scott, Walter Graydon, AO51263.
Scott, Winfield Wolfe, AO42842.
Scruggs, Harold Woodrow, AO45278.
Seamans, Charles Sumner, 3d, AO23992.
Searles, Frederick Webster, AO32016.
Sears, Herbert Edward, AO42641.
Seashore, Malcolm David, AO30154.
Seawell, Charles Henderson, AO34919.
Seawell, William Thomas, AO23712.
Seeds, Dale Stimmel, AO35093.
Seeley, John Milton, AO31864.
Seiver, Frank Wilson, AO53029.
Selman, James Clarke, AO33999.
×Settles, Ben Hiestand, AO35114.
Sewart, Harold Yorke, AO43997.
Sexton, Robert Curtis, AO21553.
Shachtman, Hyman, AO42351.
Shaefer, Robert Rowland, AO35237.
×Shafer, Robert Earl, AO45556.
Shankle, Willard Mayes, AO33584.
Shapiro, Leonard, AO34065.
Sharp, Frank Allen, AO44044.
×Sharp, Frank Douglas, AO22587.
Sharp, John Ferrin, AO33993.
Shaw, Jay Bartley, AO51218.
Shaw, Leslie Burkett, AO39913.
Shayler, Walter Kenneth, AO44150.
Shead, Carleton Gregory, AO44333.
Shearer, Irvine Harrison, AO23292.
Sheehan, Larry Joseph, AO43514.
Sheeks, Robert Morrison, AO35089.
Sheldon, Benjamin Moe, AO52553.
Shepherd, Marshal Leroyce, AO42254.
Sheppard, William Alan, AO52815.
Sheridan, Alexander Paul, AO42960.
Sherrard, Wright Jacob, AO45573.
Sherrill, James Clement, AO34627.
Sherrod, Jesse Raymond, AO52604.
Shewmake, James Cranston, AO51763.
Shick, Robert Williams, AO35008.
×Shields, John Robert, AO34253.
Shingler, Herbert Ives, Jr., AO39156.
Shipley, George Wilbur, AO40346.
Shockley, Moir Lewis, AO30726.
Shofner, Emory Monroe, AO40202.
Shoop, Richard Raymond, AO35228.
Shoup, Harry Wesley, AO40669.
Shtogren, Anthony Thomas, AO34749.
Shuler, Cyril Ovierre, AO40216.
×Shulmistras, Joseph Andrew, AO52503.
Shultis, Donald Charles, AO34510.
Shy, William Malcolm, AO34290.
Shyer, George Joseph, AO42965.
Sidwell, Lowell Gene, AO34390.
Siebert, Fred William, AO42285.
Silk, Joseph Meryl, AO23757.
Silver, Richard Fordyce, AO30386.
Silvey, Owen Watson, AO33758.
Simeral, George Anthony, AO32453.
×Simmons, J. A. Jr., AO45498.
×Simmons, Mabry, AO40550.
Simons, William James, AO34805.
Simpson, Charles Cass, Jr., AO46096.
Simpson, Donald Pierson, AO46031.
Simpson, Harold Brown, AO35207.
Simpson, O'Wighton Delk, AO42905.
Sims, Harry Gay, AO43776.
×Sims, Jack Ahren, AO34802.
Singleton, Loy Alonzo, AO42094.
Sinton, Russell Luis, AO41850.
Sisk, Eugene Bounds, Jr., AO33703.
Skelton, John William, AO42192.
×Skinner, Eugene Elam, AO34853.
×Skinner, Gregory Jackson, AO24523.
Skinner, Leo Victor, AO51424.
×Skinner, Oramel Horace, Jr., AO45690.
Sladek, Robert Frederick, AO43043.
Slate, Melvin Howard, AO53100.
Sliney, Edgar Mathews, AO24084.
Sluga, Emil Lawrence, AO33109.
Smedley, Arthur Allan, Jr., AO33138.
Smedley, Robert Redmond, AO34139.
Smith, Alvin Lee, AO29738.
Smith, Arnold Livesey, AO42661.
×Smith, Arthur Edward, Jr., AO52625.
Smith, Calvin Hunter, AO45511.
Smith, Charles Henry, AO45584.
Smith, Clyde Allen, AO43954.
Smith, Cornelius Albert, AO32473.
×Smith, Derryfield Nathaniel, AO42222.
Smith, Donald Tharpe, AO52752.
×Smith, Douglas Richard, AO31552.
Smith, Eugene, AO32150.
Smith, Gilbert Glover, Jr., AO34923.
Smith, Hall Frank, AO43769.
Smith, Harry Russell, AO29825.
Smith, Herman Fount, AO35242.
Smith, Irvin Hardie, AO42704.
Smith, James Russell, AO52425.
Smith, John Joseph, Jr., AO23115.
×Smith, Joseph Columbus, AO44761.
Smith, Marion Charles, AO30320.
×Smith, Raleigh George, AO52414.
Smith, Robert Edward, AO32566.
Smith, Robert Nelson, AO33053.
Smith, Robert Radford, AO33496.
Smith, Vernon S., Jr., AO42164.
Smith, Walter Alvin, AO35019.
Smith, Weldon Halliwell, AO22363.
Smith, William Hightower, AO31529.
Smotherman, Robert Ellis, AO45798.
Smyser, Willis Michael, AO33101.
Snaith, William Gardner, AO52761.
Snell, Gale Elwood, AO35082.
×Snider, Albert Howell, AO23878.
Snyder, John Thorpe, AO34452.
Sogaard, Folmer Jensen, AO44391.
×Somers, Ross Aeron, AO52922.
Sonnkalb, Charles David, AO24121.
Soper, Ray Edgar, AO25179.
Sorensen, Blair M., AO45777.
Soukup, Reynold Anthony, AO33133.
Soulliere, Edward Joseph, AO31520.
Sowers, Louis Melvin, AO45804.
Sowle, Donald Edgar, AO44402.
Spahr, Paul Moses, AO41953.
Sparks, Harold Proctor, AO33189.
Spear, Robert Langdon, AO45909.
Spieth, Harry Edwin, Jr., AO32456.
Spitz, Charles Ernest, AO39906.
Spivey, Paulett, AO45564.
Splain, John Farley, AO24240.
Sponable, Edson Jay, Jr., AO45543.
Spratt, William Joseph, AO40454.
Spurgeon, Raymond Robert, AO52538.
Spurlock, Gerald Martin, AO43986.
St. John, Wilbert Elvin, AO45593.
×Stacey, Fred John, AO43459.
Stafford, Charles Leonard, AO33547.
Stafford, Robert Farrell, AO35247.
Staley, Harry Albert, AO53327.
Stalnaker, George Winfield, AO23784.
×Stambaugh, Edgar LeVan, AO31751.
Stansbury, Edgar Bryant, AO41909.
Stanton, LeRoy Moore, AO44961.
Stapleford, Zeb Vance, AO29679.
Stark, John Jacob, AO19383.
Stark, Smylie Cohn, AO34817.
Stark, William Reynolds, AO21670.
Starkey, James Fred, AO22439.
Steadman, Beverly Earl, AO33093.
Stears, Paul Aloysius, AO51461.
Stebbins, Luther Russell, AO51347.
Steele, Donald Dale, AO44289.
Steele, Kenneth Slusser, AO34219.
×Steely, Oscar Baker, AO20694.
Steeves, Jerome Irving, AO34442.
Stefansson, Ragner, AO51505.
Stefen, Le Roy Len, AO33913.
Steinemann, Frank Cable, AO45714.
Steiner, Wilfred Adolphus, AO29562.
Stemen, Roger Franklin, AO40699.
Stengele, Harry Everest, 3d, AO34737.
Stenglein, Joseph Arthur, AO33452.
×Stephens, Evans Grant, AO53397.
×Stephens, John Edward, AO45104.
Stepp, Richard DeWitt, AO44639.
Sterba, Richard, AO31954.
Stevens, Eugene Maurice, AO42818.
Stevens, Ronald Burdell, AO43344.
Stevenson, Ralph Lee, AO39155.
×Stevenson, Roger Armstrong, AO43550.
×Stewart, James Clifton, AO45276.
×Stewart, John Elkin, AO33850.
Stewart, Richard Reynolds, AO45652.
Stewart, Robert Wood, AO45672.
Stewart, Thomas Basil, AO51811.
Stiles, Joseph Ehrhart, AO34185.
Stillson, George Hamilton, Jr., AO23849.
Stimpson, Ritchie Pies, AO34502.
×Stoddard, Edward Forrest, AO35194.
Stogner, Ben T., AO29978.
×Stoliaroff, Nicholas Serge, AO40012.
Stoltz, Laroy Richard, AO42178.
×Stone, Maurice M., AO29692.
Stone, Rolle Edward, Jr., AO32907.
Storey, Thomas Barett, AO44187.
×Stoup, Hugh Clarence, AO42531.
×Stovall, Jack Neil, AO33506.
×Stover, George Edward, AO34606.
Stowell, Channing, Jr., AO23559.
Stradleigh, Norman Farrington, AO42572.
Strand, Wilbur Charles, AO21229.
×Stratton, Wilbur Harvey, AO20653.
Striplin, Charles Forrest, Jr., AO42592.
Stripling, Coleman, AO32985.
Strother, James French, AO46069.
Strozier, Buddy Alexander, AO34818.
Stuart, Robert Hartwell, AO45644.
Stubbs, Claude Maxwell, AO35197.
Stumpf, Carl John, AO43340.
Sturges, William Raymond, Jr., AO45988.
Sullenberger, Louis Edward, AO42887.
Sullens, James Alexander, AO46215.
Sullivan, Charles Edward, Jr., AO32667.
Sullivan, Charles Peter, AO32998.
Sullivan, Frank Edward, AO23477.
Sullivan, Harold Joseph, AO42523.
×Sullivan, Joseph Lewis, AO53173.
Sullivan, Robert Bernard, AO25321.
Summerfield, Ellison Saint Clair, AO42411.
×Summers, Paul Walter, AO41977.
×Summers, Thomas B., AO33161.
Sustrick, Edward Frank, AO53125.
Sutterlin, Howard Douglas, AO33454.

Sutton, George Ellsworth, AO45598.
Swan, Arthur Bernhardt, Jr., AO34233.
Swancutt, Woodrow Paul, AO32962.
Swett, Raymond Dailey, AO40450.
Swigart, John Kenneth, AO42583.
Sykes, Philip Avery, AO33191.
Sykes, Robert Brown, Jr., AO39144.
Symroski, Leonard Edward, AO23208.
Synnes, Roger Ansley, AO45236.
Syptak, Raymond Alfred, AO34684.
Szaniawski, Edward William, AO33062.
Taaffe, George Thomas, AO51420.
Taggart, Thomas Randolph, AO43263.
Talley, David Gordon, AO46098.
Tangen, Orville Clarence, AO42400.
Tarver, Benjamin Marcus, Jr., AO21081.
Tash, Earl Raymond, AO25240.
Tatum, Robert Philip, AO32501.
×Taute, August Franklin, AO45381.
Tavasti, Roy Emil, AO34313.
Taylor, Aubrey Delbert, AO44469.
Taylor, Charles Edward, AO35216.
Taylor, Charles Hendrie, AO42938.
Taylor, Frank Andrew, Jr., AO43767.
Taylor, Henry Sidney, AO25261.
Taylor, Henry Joe, AO51428.
Taylor, John Randolph, AO32379.
×Taylor, Kenneth Marlar, AO34533.
×Taylor, Peter Rutherford, AO34145.
Taylor, Powell Harrison, AO34149.
Taylor, Ray Ward, AO39862.
×Taylor, Roger William, AO44140.
Taylor, Tom Richards, AO34850.
×Taylor, William Barrett, 3d, AO46105.
Taylor, William Banks, AO46095.
Taylor, Willis Johnson, AO53131.
Teborek, Raymond George, AO45781.
Tedder, Irby Velle, AO45794.
Teed, Willard Golding, AO42275.
Templeman, Robert Berger, AO46145.
Templeton, Robert Frederick, AO43632.
Tempske, Paul Theodore, AO30556.
×Tenney, Frank Lee, AO33134.
Terhune, Charles Houston, Jr., AO22477.
Terry, Henry Warren, 3d, AO33824.
Tesch, William Arthur, AO46087.
Teschner, Charles George, AO33857.
×Tetiva, Ervin Joseph, AO40716.
Teusink, Philip J., AO31617.
Thackara, Paul Nelson, AO32313.
Thacker, John Marshall, AO34255.
Thacker, Robert Eli, AO35210.
×Thacker, Thomas Leonard, AO45897.
Thomas, Arthur DeCosta, AO34922.
Thomas, Gordon Frank, AO53385.
Thomas, Jay Paul, AO39049.
Thomas, William Jerome, AO29845.
Thompson, Arthur Calvin, AO43007.
Thompson, Clyde Arnold, AO23916.
Thompson, James Herman, AO33521.
×Thompson, John Archibald, AO51949.
×Thompson, Royal Seville, AO34511.
Thompson, Walter Alexander, Jr., AO42271.
Thomson, Robert Sidney, AO51291.
Thorington, William Patteson, AO45566.
×Thornhill, John James, AO44233.
Thornquest, Frank Purvis, AO25227.
Thornton, Robert Lee, AO34012.
Thorpe, George Wilson, AO45824.
Thorsen, James G., AO33399.
Thorson, Paul Anthony, AO44323.
×Thrift, John Childs, AO35251.
Thyng, Harrison Reed, AO33996.
Tice, Clay, Jr., AO34801.
×Tiede, Richard Edward, AO35267.
×Tillapaugh, Herbert James, Jr., AO32029.
×Tiller, Francis Eugene, AO45086.
Timlin, Francis Eugene, AO34369.
Timmons, Gordon David, AO35261.
Todd, Alfred Grady, AO44028.
×Todd, Thomas Marion, AO22870.
Todd, Walter Frantzen, AO34504.
Todd, William Edward, AO35169.
Todd, William Leroy, AO41684.
×Tolen, Adrian Woodrow, AO43274.
Toliver, Raymond Frederick, AO32592.
Toomey, Frederick Walter, AO29878.
Tootle, Columbus Edwin, AO52384.
×Tope, William Arthur, AO33866.
Topping, Raymond James, AO44343.
Torresson, Thomas Samuel, Jr., AO45338.
×Tortora, Bernardino Ornorfio, AO44148.
Tower, Donald Oren, AO34499.
Towler, Harry Hunt, Jr., AO24126.
Townsend, James Watson, AO30090.
Trachsel, William Henry, AO33563.
Travis, Richard Van Pelt, AO23859.
Treacy, James John, AO42927.
Treacy, Norbert Corcoran, AO45701.
Trexler, Carl Edward, AO38869.
Triolo, Jerome Manuel, AO44969.
Trippet, William Alexander, AO45500.
Trotter, John Turner, AO43038.
×Trueblood, Wayne Fay, AO33194.
Tschepl, Arthur Leopold, AO45479.
Tucker, John McKiney, AO51264.
Tudor, David Beemer, AO33015.
Tudor, William Lewis, AO34972.
Tunstall, Francis Paul, AO45512.
Turner, John Landon, AO45743.
Turner, William Lloyd, AO34781.
×Turner, William Milliard, AO30209.
Tuttle, Robert Merrill, AO23745.
Twilley, John Fougerousse, AO45458.
×Twitty, James Watson, AO30758.
×Tyler, Henry Samuel, Jr., AO25211.
Tyler, John, AO42433.
Tyler, Kermit Arthur, AO21499.
Urquhart, Lloyd Clarence Emerson, AO-51330.
Vail, Carl Joseph, Jr., AO52382.
Valle, Calixto Cecilio, AO38707.
Van Ausdall, Robert Loren, AO34631.
×Van Benthuysen, Max Elliott, AO44873.
Van Blarcom, Earl Bruce, AO39936.
Van Buskirk, Alden Lothrop, AO43809.
Van Der Heyden, Edward Eugene, AO40467.
×Van Deusen, George Hanchett, AO35096.
Van Dyke, Edward Allen, AO35137.
Van Hoozer, Alfred Vance, AO45707.
Van Mullem, Louis David, AO25183.
Vande Hey, James M., AO33370.
Vandiver, Ray, AO44688.
Vaughn, Virgil Allen, AO42338.
Valebny, Samuel, Jr., AO43336.
Vereen, Lindsey Hartford, AO24119.
Verner, Edward, AO22974.
Vernon, Wesley Harold, AO30316.
Vetort, Francis John, AO33664.
×Villars, Paul Emile, AO33877.
Vinzant, Mark Harvey, Jr., AO46138.
Vinzant, Warren Elmer, AO35039.
×Virden, John Marion, AO30062.
Vitek, Richard Darius, AO33432.
Vogt, John Edward, AO33405.
×Von Arb, George William, Jr., AO34373.
×Von Tungeln, Herbert Adolph, AO38840.
×Voorhees, Burton Kennedy, AO22561.
Vos, Calvin Miller, AO42847.
Vosper, Stanley Richard, AO23388.
Waddell, James Marion, AO42940.
Waddleton, Thomas Renan, AO40653.
Wadsworth, Joseph Franklin, Jr., AO46223.
Waesche, Harry Lee, AO25208.
Wagner, Frank Benjamin, AO23298.
Wahlstrom, Norman Oliver, AO34304.
Walborn, George Shaffer, AO33002.
Waldecker, Charles Duane, AO38993.
×Waldron, Clarence Loring, AO42361.
Walker, Arthur James, AO22462.
×Walker, George Alexander, AO33965.
Walker, Leland Arthur, Jr., AO34333.
Walker, Paul Kenneth, AO44494.
Walker, Peter Saville, AO25311.
Walker, Richard Lee, AO44909.
×Walker, William George, Jr., AO56908.
×Walkowicz, Teddy Francis, AO46235.
Wall, Clement James, AO41922.
Wall, James William, AO32791.
Wall, Wallace, Jr., AO35278.
×Wallace, Albert Louis, Jr., AO34512.
Wallace, John Braxton, AO34004.
×Wallis, Howard George, AO51371.
Walls, John Hancock, Jr., AO51627.
Walsten, Carl John Edward, AO42190.
×Walter, George Clarage, Jr., AO42455.
Walters, Edison Kermit, AO24056.
Walters, Ernest Lee, AO32146.
Walters, Rudolph Breece, AO32344.
Walther, Dale Lorraine, AO32641.
×Walton, Victor Emanuel, AO39019.
×Walton, Wallace George, AO40759.
Wanderer, Ralph Matthew, Jr., AO34016.
Ward, Rufus King, AO51313.
Ward, William Henry, AO51537.
×Wardell, Michael Edward, AO25029.
Warden, Clifford Vincent, AO44654.
×Warden, Henry Edward, AO33242.
Ware, Rodney Bradford, Jr., AO41846.
Waring, Francis Malbone, AO42624.
Warner, Charles Artemus, AO42194.
Warner, Roger Martin, AO45537.
Warren, Benjamin Calvert, AO33660.
Warren, William, AO44269.
Washington, Dudley Sherrill, AO41965.
Waskow, Frank Howard, AO31058.
Watkins, George Frank, AO40564.
Watkins, Harvey Joseph, AO22544.
Watkins, James Albert, AO35041.
Watkins, James Carson, AO52439.
Watson, Harold Francis, AO52817.
Watson, John Charles, AO45527.
Watson, Leroy Hugh, Jr., AO23798.
Watson, Ralph James, AO33513.
×Watt, John William, Jr., AO21981.
Watters, Harold Jesse, AO52193.
×Waugh, Richard Gordon, AO51450.
Wear, John Francis, AO45627.
×Weatherly, Edison Carlyle, AO44644.
Weaver, Lester Clark, AO42126.
Weber, Henry Loy, AO34908.
Webster, Harry William, AO42442.
Webster, Howard Elwyn, AO19004.
Webster, James Lloyd, AO43009.
Weigold, Lewis Barton, AO45715.
Weitzenfeld, Richard William, AO34285.
Welch, George Albert, AO31734.
Welch, William Leslie, AO46125.
×Welchner, Carl Ernest, AO51833.
Weldon, Thomas Franklin, AO34403.
Weldon, William James, AO44420.
Wells, Bradford Hayes, AO42549.
Wells, Selmon Willard, AO33472.
Welsh, Albert Michael, AO33343.
Welter, William Theodore, AO29773.
×Wemple, Neil Waldron, AO34788.
Wergin, James Robert, AO21377.
Werner, Wesley, AO34249.
Wert, Jack Emmert, AO38763.
Wertenbaker, George Leftwich, AO45452.
Wessman, Everett Cornelius, AO32795.
Wesson, Frederick Jefferson, Jr., AO46278.
West, Alden Edgar, AO33832.
×West, Ben Marshall, AO23970.
West, Frank Thornton, AO30249.
West, Jack C., AO40740.
West, Shelton James, AO34763.
West, Willard Allen, AO43090.
×Whaley, Gerald Edward, AO42148.
×Wheeler, Clermont Edward, AO45492.
Wheeler, Fred John, AO29666.
Wheeler, Merwin Benton, AO42216.
Wheeler, Warren Sanford, AO22846.
Whelchel, Robert, AO29564.
Whidden, Jack Davis, AO45658.
Whipple, Robert Clarence, AO22082.
White, Alpheus Wray, Jr., AO23829.
White, Donald Bates, AO32932.
White, Grover Cleveland, Jr., AO44911.
×White, John Milton, Jr., AO33617.
White, Joseph Dent, AO34214.
×White, Maynard Earl, AO35295.
×White, William Joseph, AO52140.
White, William Berry, AO51304.
Whitehouse, Bernard Patrick, AO32796.
Whiteman, Harold Jennings, AO45526.
Whitfield, Fitzhugh Ailis, AO33073.
Whitsitt, Samuel Joseph, AO32832.
×Wicker, Jamie Loran, AO51283.
Wickland, Daniel William, AO30083.
Widmann, Benjamin, AO46225.
Wigman, Edward William, AO30417.
Wignall, Paul Raysor, AO34686.
×Wikstrom, Floyd Edward, AO34302.
×Wilber, Stanley Roy, AO42806.
Wild, Hugh Eldon, AO34910.
×Wildes, Gordon Weber, AO42807.
Wildes, Thomas, AO19845.
Wilds, Harry, AO52811.
Wiley, James Reed, AO34453.
Wilging, Harold Arthur, AO45945.

Wilhite, Robert Theadore, AO42232.
Wilkerson, Steven Russell, AO33348.
Wilkins, Charles Howard, AO45518.
Wilkins, Sherman Warner, AO34938.
×Wilkinson, Robert Norman, AO33100.
Willard, Harry Edward, AO34451.
Willeford, Edward Owen, AO32441.
Wilies, Charles Gleeson, AO23873.
×Williams, Cecil Clinton, AO41985.
Williams, Francis Ward, AO41866.
Williams, Howard Wilson, AO34161.
Williams, James Robert, AO30218.
Williams, Joe Ross, AO32457.
Williams, Joseph Betha, AO44016.
Williams, Leon Flowers, AO29963.
Williams, Walter Ashley, AO34629.
Williams, Warren Cambler, AO39785.
×Williams, William Isaiah, AO35113.
Williamson, Hugh Lamar, AO44787.
Williamson, Walter Henry, AO33964.
Williamson, William Padgett, AO31950.
Williford, James Hobson, AO25210.
×Willis, Benjamin Grant, AO44652.
Willoughby, Earl, AO29731.
×Wills, Milton Eugene, Jr., AO32163.
Willson, Martin Eager, AO53227.
Wilmot, Woodrow Burton, AO43683.
Wilson, Charles Frederick, AO42204.
Wilson, Grover Lee, Jr., AO33080.
×Wilson, Harold Frederick, AO22883.
Wilson, Henry Brooks, AO21200.
×Wilson, Keith Stretter, AO22865.
Wilson, Olin Lloyd, AO32357.
Wilson, Thomas Norville, AO34405.
Wilson, Willard Wendell, AO32989.
Wimberly, Charles Leslie, AO34897.
×Windell, Albert Cecil, AO42726.
Wininghame, Rollin Murray, AO23369.
×Winkle, Lewis Albert, AO42999.
×Winter, Hugh, AO43032.
×Winterbottom, James McIndoe, AO25031.
Wintermute, Ira Francis, AO39033.
Wiper, Thomas Luther, AO33531.
Wise, John Walter, AO34608.
Wise, Jowell Clark, AO35284.
Wisman, William Woodrow, AO34794.
Witham, Bertram High, Jr., AO34131.
Withers David McNeil, AO34969.
Withycombe, Howard James, AO33489.
Witsell, Benjamin Fishburn, AO29778.
Witt, Theodore John, AO34229.
Wittrock, Howard Henry, AO33647.
Witzenburger, Edwin Jacob, AO34547.
×Wogen, Joseph Glenn, AO32919.
Wojick, Kenneth Charles, AO34463.
Wolfe, Donald Alexander, AO31340.
Wolfe, Thomas William, AO43747.
Wolke, Gerard George, AO23529.
×Wolslagel, Earl Woodall, AO43574.
×Wolters, Delevan Edward, AO42323.
×Wood, Allen Harry, AO33180.
Wood, Charles Norman, AO43800.
×Wood, Delmore Phillips, AO34529.
Wood, E. Garrison, AO32966.
Wood, Frank Preuit, AO33340.
×Wood, Harold Holloway, AO44704.
Wood, Harold Lee, AO44047.
Wood, Roy James, AO51386.
Wood, Wilson Roe, AO34176.
Woodard, Walter William, AO31345.
Woodbury, Willard Glenn, AO34607.
Woods, David Seavey, AO23708.
Woods, Robert Alfred, AO52663.
×Woodward, Lester Lee, AO31391.
Woodward, Wayne William, AO30405.
Woodyard, Donald H., AO51564.
Woodyard, William Truman, AO46070.
Wooley, Preston Bruce, AO35229.
Woolwine, Charles Carroll, AO43991.
Workman, Robert Herndon, AO40410.
Worley, Earl Wilson, AO25175.
Worley, Robert Franklin, AO34625.
Worrel, Albert Alfred, AO44249.
×Wright, Clifton Dukes, AO29888.
Wright, Donald McLarty, AO25213.
×Wright, Howard Thomas, AO23108.
Wright, Lewis James, AO34166.
Wright, Tilden Perkins, AO22026.
×Wursten, Ervin, AO45870.
Wyckoff, Elmer Rufus, AO51233.
Wyman, George Harvey, AO46046.
Wynn, Edward Henry, AO34114.
×Wynne, Edward Patrick, AO22965.
Wynne, John Douglas, AO33233.
Wys, Robert Andrew, AO33830.
Yarchin, Samuel, AO45761.
Yates, William James, AO34586.
Young, Donald Alexander, AO43048.
Youngblood, Lucian Nevelon, AO34791.
Yudkin, Richard Allen, AO46055.
Yurkanis, Paul John, AO22842.
Zaloudek, Charles Joseph, AO44307.
Zambon, Louis Basil, AO34378.
Zapponi, William Lawrence, AO44301.
Zimmerman, Legrand Otis, 29938.
Zoeckler, John Lewis, AO23510.
Zubko, Boris Michael, AO34076.
Zuerner, William Edward, AO43491.
Zumwalt, McLyle Gerald, AO34594.
Zwanzig, Samuel August, AO44058.

*To be captain with rank from March 24, 1947*

McElroy, Edgar Earl, AO32273.

*To be captains with rank from July 1, 1948*

Aaron, Thomas Richard, AO54612.
Abbott, Raymond J., AO35740.
Abbotts, Lloyd Ferdinand, AO53234.
Abdallah, William Paul, AO36435.
Abel, George LeRoy, AO40743.
Albellera, Thomas, AO47021.
Abercrombie, John Woodrow, AO44529.
Abington, Edward Gordon, AO44377.
Abney, Thomas Mitchell, AO33443.
×Abrams, James Simeon, AO45469.
Abramson, Charles Elmer, AO36056.
Accas, George Anthony, AO46660.
Acker, Halbert Hammond, AO32250.
Adair, Allan Percy, 3d, AO46910.
Adams, Albert Chester, Jr., AO35655.
Adams, Ben Millard, AO53295.
Adams, George Marvin, AO47537.
Adams, George William, Jr., AO47298.
Adams, Lawrence Augustus, Jr., AO24900.
Adams, Orville Glenn, AO39229.
×Adams, Peter Paul, AO47985.
Adams, William Alonzo, Jr., AO46909.
Adamson, Norman Francis, AO54441.
Adduci, Vincent James, AO36449.
Adkins, James Carl, AO40449.
Adelman, Julius J., AO44557.
Aenchbacher, Arthur Eugene, AO35388.
Agan, Charles Keith, AO47556.
Agin, Edward James, AO43892.
Agostinho, Robert Joseph, AO48986.
×Ahrens, William Carl, AO43741.
Aiken, Albert Shelton, AO35252.
Akins, Dudley Stephenson, AO44595.
Alba, Carmelo Vincent, AO36335.
Albritton, Jesse Tignor, AO40971.
Alder, Robert Trever, AO36968.
×Alexander, Andrew Jackson, AO47038.
Alexander, Donald, AO35703.
Alexander, Harry Strother, AO46381.
×Alexander, Lawrence Edward, AO33707.
Alexander, Robert Barlow, AO52536.
Alexander, Wiley Lee, AO35920.
Alford, James Strickler, AO44330.
×Allard, Charles Edward, AO32890.
Allbritton, John Leonard, AO36045.
Allen, Byron Donald, Jr., AO44577.
Allen, Clayton Forbes, AO53886.
×Allen, Ed Crow, AO52724.
Allen, Franklin Staples, Jr., AO34002.
Allen, John Thomas, AO44885.
Allen, Samuel Lawrence, AO32510.
Allen, Stanley Ernest, AO44481.
×Allenby, Donald Roscoe, AO48202.
Allensworth, Hubert Lasater, AO32556.
Allison, Royal Bertram, AO35675.
Allyn, Robert Howard, AO35674.
Alois, Frank James, AO46453.
×Althouse, Donald Irving, AO36592.
×Alton, Carol Wilson, Jr., AO33874.
Alworth, John William, AO47744.
×Amann, John Robert, AO53484.
Amos, Robert Farrish, AO47834.
Anderson, Homer Paul, AO44741.
×Anderson, Arlo Sell, AO43671.
Anderson, Arthur William, AO48116.
Anderson, Arvid Warren, AO33468.
Anderson, Bernard Elwood, AO52777.
Anderson, Bryant Yeck, AO40959.
Anderson, Clarence Emil, Jr., AO37030.
×Anderson, Delynn Edward, AO35336.
Anderson, Glenn Preston, Jr., AO21102.
Anderson, Holly Winfred, AO44227.
×Anderson, John Frederic, AO39263.
Anderson, John Munroe, AO24781.
×Anderson, John McLemore, Jr., AO44601.
×Anderson, Joseph William, Jr., AO48348.
Anderson, Leonard Ward, AO53497.
Anderson, Louis, Jr., AO48359.
Anderson, Millard Othello, AO26278.
Anderson, Milton Alphonso, AO47296.
Anderson, Oscar Shannon, Jr., AO47774.
Anderson, Rex Victor, AO145191.
Anderson, Truman Foster, AO45503.
Anderson, William Albert, AO46771.
Anderson, William Landis, AO47588.
Anderson, Windsor Temple, AO23891.
×Anderten, Irwin William, AO43546.
Andre, Louis Edward, Jr., AO47587.
Andreae, Andreas Arthur, AO46483.
Andres, Joseph Edward, AO36962.
Andrew, Stephen Wallace, AO32307.
Andrews, George Edward, AO45405.
Andrews, George Hamilton, AO37279.
Andrews, John Welker, AO36007.
Andrews, John Albert Cornelius, AO33175.
Andrews, Leon, AO36557.
×Andrews, Robert Louis, AO34543.
Andrews, Thomas Joseph, AO54289.
×Andridge, Herbert Wendell, AO52686.
×Angier, Frank Edward, AO45417.
Ansell, Norris Jacob, AO40855.
Anske, Ralph Dhelo, AO44440.
Anzelon, George Joseph, AO34962.
Appel, Charles Albert, AO36275.
Appold, Norman Carl, AO35673.
×Arakelian, Edward Jordan, AO54610.
Arbrogast, Thomas Joseph, AO35985.
×Arbuthnot, George Stanley, AO53904.
Archer, Oneal John Thomas, AO52330.
×Archibald, Thomas Gardner, AO52780.
Archuleta, Rubel Virgil, AO32506.
Arcuri, Michael Joseph, AO54170.
Ard, Roswell William, AO35414.
×Arduengo, Joseph Arnold, AO54742.
Ariano, Richard Angelo, AO35857.
×Armbrust, Carl William, AO35746.
Armstrong, George Harmon, Jr., AO45563.
×Armstrong, George Herbert, AO45177.
Armstrong, John Frank, AO40734.
Armstrong, Richard Elliott, AO43482.
Arnold, Carl, AO40839.
Arnold, Dixon Jay, AO33337.
Arnold, Richard Tribble, AO46736.
Arnold, Robert William, AO33318.
Arnold, Roy Addison, AO44277.
×Arnold, William Clyde, AO54682.
Artiglia, Aldo, AO35779.
Asch, Alfred, AO53805.
Ash, Allie Paul, AO44390.
Ash, Robert Preston, Sr., AO45021.
Ashley, Clower Franklin, AO36789.
Ashley, George Robert, AO33320.
×Asprey, William Palmer, AO40528.
Aszman, Burton Hughes, AO45423.
Atchison, Delmar Wallace, AO46580.
Atchison, Richard Bush, Jr., AO41025.
×Atkins, James Martin, AO44519.
Atkins, John Hugh, Jr., AO47964.
Atkinson, Paul Gregory, Jr., AO25973.
×Atkinson, William Joseph, AO46140.
Atterholt, Charles Wilson, AO52945.
Atwater, William E., AO40998.
Atwell, Lawrence Austin, AO43639.
Aubrey, Carl Lee, AO46465.
August, Jack William, AO48251.
Augustine, John Anthony 3d, AO45903.
×Austin, James Manning, AO52427.
×Austin, John Florea, AO33208.
×Austin, Orlo Lorraine, AO36540.
Avery, Edward Stephen, AO33418.
×Avery, Hamilton King, Jr., AO24032.
Avery, James Branham, AO48859.
Avery, Lyndall John, AO45866.
Avriett, Giles Croxton, AO45154.
Ayers, Jerry Houston, AO35904.
Ayles, Robert Lewis, AO36048.
Ayres, Langdon Ford, AO54411.
×Babb, Claude Andrew, AO43307.

Babb, Harold Thaddeus, AO22881.
×Bacalis, Paul Nicholas, AO47514.
Bachman, Lawrence Frederick, AO33351.
×Bachmann, Frederick Clemens, AO45731.
Bachtell, Robert Carithers, AO48461.
Baer, John Willard, AO25684.
Bagley, Ronald Dale, AO47095.
Bahler, George Paul, AO47872.
×Bailey, Don Warren, AO34487.
×Bailey, Harry Banks, AO52252.
Bailey, James Edmund, Jr., AO53402.
Bailey, John Robert, AO45705.
Bainer, John William, AO52551.
Baird, Julian Burton, AO53910.
×Baker, Ancil David, AO22474.
Baker, Carl Kraus, AO44894.
Baker, Charles Clare, AO47445.
Baker, Donald Ralph, AO44321.
Baker, Hollis Hershal, AO44808.
Baker, Merlin Wayne, AO54607.
Baker, Norman Nathan, AO47780.
×Baker, Roger Norman, AO45415.
Baker, Royal Newman, AO46476.
Balchunas, George Adam, AO47526.
Baldridge, William Holmes, AO52760.
Baldwin, Robert Percy, AO45693.
Balkum, Earl Thomas, AO45911.
Ball, Frank Putnam, AO26196.
Ball, Roger Clawson, AO26112.
×Ballard, Roy William, AO24798.
Ballard, Walter Paige, AO40556.
Ballew, John Marion, AO47888.
Balliet, William Edward, AO36974.
Bamburg, Horace Edvion, AO46893.
Banker, Robert Darrell, AO46768.
Banks, Jack Ralph, AO36049.
Banning, Richard Eldon, AO53673.
Barber, George Alva, AO33381.
Barber, James Luther, Jr., AO52694.
Barber, Zeneth O., AO52858.
Barbour, Walter Raymond, AO52837.
Barclay, Errol Dale, AO52794.
Barger, David Harvey, AO25794.
Barile, Anthony Peter, AO55018.
Barker, Darold Kieth, AO47073.
Barker, Paul Bernard, AO43517.
Barker, William Hamblin, AO44985.
×Barnes, John Woodward, AO35927.
Barnes, Richard Ward, AO41030.
Barnes, Roy Ivan, AO35876.
Barnes, Truman Sheldon, AO47994.
Barnett, Clyde Haywood, Jr., AO52905.
Barnett, Wendell Hines, AO33720.
Barney, William Shores, AO35934.
Barnum, Robert Alexander, AO45753.
Baron, Oakley Walter, AO40650.
Barr, Jennings Monroe, AO52246.
Barraclough, Robert Arthur, AO46900.
Barrett, Alfred William, Jr., AO52659.
Barrett, John Patrick, AO44081.
×Barrow, David Crenshaw, AO37052.
Barrow, Tom Lee, AO31886.
Barry, Billie Jo, AO37226.
Barthel, Carl Coulbourn, AO35736.
Bartol, Dominic Anthony, Jr., AO47476.
Barton, James Robert, AO36226.
Barton, John Richard, AO45895.
Barton, Richard Everett, AO48504.
Barton, Terry Reed, AO35701.
Barton, William Gerald, AO47209.
Basel, George Phillip, AO36539.
Bass, Earl James, AO48204.
Bass, Feris Achile, Jr., AO33121.
Bass, Thomas Edwin, AO37292.
Bates, Elbridge Campbell, AO48358.
Battalio, Samuel Thomas, AO45084.
Battle, Clarence Leonard, Jr., AO44397.
×Baucom, George Elmer, Jr., AO33237.
×Bauer, Christian Schmid, AO43585.
Bauer, Maurice Hatter, AO34429.
Baugh, Howard Lee, AO48048.
Baumgardner, Bruce Kennedy, AO35225.
Bausser, William Jerome, AO34991.
Baxter, Clifford Frank, AO52556.
Baxter, Wyley, Lovelace, AO24867.
Bazan, Edward Theodore, AO43837.
×Beahan, Kermit King, AO35413.
Beale, William Henry, Jr., AO35139.
Beall, Arthur Wilcoxen, Jr., AO44847.
Beal, J. Mac, AO35503.
Beall, Lewis Sherode, AO35869.
Beam, Edgar Stowe, AO53836.
Beam, James Carroll, AO34448.
×Bean, James Otto, AO44649.
Bear, George Harold, AO44518.
Beard, William Alton, AO35654.
Beasley, David Cadwell, Jr., AO48741.
Beasley, William Dawson, AO33013.
×Beaty, Sherman Randolph, AO45390.
Bebout, LeRoy, Jr., AO40388.
Beck, Abe Jack, AO43902.
Beck, Charles Joseph, AO37376.
Beck, Richard William, AO36404.
Beckelman, Jack Dwain, AO34548.
Beckett, Thomas Archer, AO26246.
Beckett, Walter Rae, Jr., AO26184.
×Beckley, Raymond Elmer, AO36276.
×Becnel, Joseph Richard, AO52753.
Bedford, John Peter, AO40910.
×Beerli, Stanley William, AO48402.
Beers, Robert William AO24910.
×Beery, Harold Floyd, AO35241.
Beeson, Thomas Henry, AO25510.
Begg, Charles Forsyth Henry, AO35707.
Behn, Milton Albert, AO25505.
×Behnke, William Charles, AO49032.
Behrens, Elton August, AO47618.
×Behrens, George Herman, AO43931.
Belcher, Delbert Ray, AO45081.
Belfield, Douglas Findlay, AO46848.
×Belgard, John Robert, AO44527.
Bell, Charles Austin, AO53367.
×Bell, Homer Clark, Jr., AO48166.
Bellman, Arthur Burton, AO45143.
Belongia, Blair Gerald, AO35757.
Belser, Joseph Henry, AO48099.
Bench, Herbert George, AO36465.
Benedict, William Pershing, AO54578.
Benner, John George, AO46490.
Benner, Stephen Otto, AO25525.
Bennett, Herbert Holinworth, AO31991.
Bennett, John Mark, AO54772.
Bennett, John Wray, AO47182.
Bennett, Robert Laster, AO47318.
×Bennett, Thomas Wiggin, Jr., AO55184.
Beno, Kenneth Richard, AO44198.
×Benson, Frank Tipton, AO32996.
×Bentley, Delwin Dale, AO46732.
×Benz, Walter Gottlieb, Jr., AO35896.
Beresford, Harry Edward, Jr., AO45054.
×Berg, Walter Warden, AO53088.
×Berg, William Wilson, AO37166.
Berge, Ralph Irving, AO48090.
Berger, Kenneth Stephen, AO52335.
Berger, Raymond John, AO40800.
Bergman, Harold Oscar, AO45121.
Bergmann, Charles Herman, Jr., AO53025.
×Bergum, Lester Norman, AO47605.
Berkow, Joseph Jeffrey, AO40719.
Berman, Robert Arnold, AO24912.
Bero, Francis, AO45039.
Berry, Edmund Burke 3d, AO45070.
Berry, Everett Ogden, Jr., AO36578.
×Berry, Frederick Dee, Jr., AO45448.
Berry, Gleneth Boyd, AO56903.
Berry, Kearie Lee, Jr., AO25736.
×Berry, Lon Bernard, AO52821.
×Bertling, Stephen Joseph, AO44857.
Bertsch, William Preston, AO33457.
Berube, Paul Gerard, AO48190.
×Best, Jack Raymond, AO46004.
Best, William McNeely, AO54534.
Bestervelt, Harold James, AO25545.
Beth, Elman John, AO33712.
Betts, Francis Arnold, AO43854.
Betts, Russell Wood, Jr., AO53249.
Betz, Albert Leslie, AO31953.
Bevan, Wendell Lowell, Jr., AO25535.
×Beville, Claude, Jr., AO44100.
Beyer, Johnson, AO32833.
Biberstein, Arthur Lester, AO35873.
Bickerstaff, Burt McCoy, AO41020.
×Bickford, Jack Cedric, AO46407.
Bickford, James Wendell, AO32803.
Bicknell, June E., Jr., AO45502.
Biddle, Maurice Francis, AO45289.
Biddlecome, Bruce Dutton, AO39104.
Bieck, Robert Barton, AO47343.
×Biggs, Bradley, AO36892.
Bilby, Bedford Bruce, AO54827.
Bills, Ralph Carmack, AO53913.
Birbeck, Richard Wellington, AO52700.
Bird, Charles H., AO53188.
Bird, Clement William, AO39159.
×Birdsong, George Purnell, Jr., AO40842.
Biretta, Algert Anthony, AO53976.
Biscayart, Jules Dominique, AO46584.
Bishop, Cleo Merton, AO25529.
Bishop, Edward Landes, AO37270.
Bjoring, Robert George, AO46277.
Black, Lee Charles, AO54674.
×Black, Shirley Norman, AO39078.
Black, Walter Edward, Jr., AO36471.
Black, William Morrison, AO35471.
Blackman, Richard Orchard, AO44679.
Blair, Alan Howard, AO53445.
Blair, Hubert Maynard, AO35892.
×Blair, Samuel Vernon, AO46337.
Blais, Lawrence Francis, AO46688.
Blake, Donald Frank, AO24870.
×Blake, Lynn Thompson, Jr., AO36482.
Blakely, Everett Ernest, AO35751.
Blakeslee, Donald James Matthew, AO36613.
Blalock, John Wilmer, AO32632.
×Blanco, Ira Joseph, AO45023.
Bland, Edward Cole, AO48055.
Bland, George Thomas, AO52618.
Bland, John William, AO46329.
Bland, Ruskin McArdle, AO45018.
Blank, Jonas LeMoyne, AO25994.
Blanton, Ernest Leroy, AO54261.
Blasingame, Benjamin Paul, AO24615.
Blass, Daniel Luther, AO45840.
Blatt, Seymour, AO53577.
Bledsoe, Joseph Vernon, AO45157.
Blehm, Harold Emanuel, AO53341.
Bliss, Charles Cushman, AO52478.
×Blitch, Harry Anthony, AO45488.
×Blood, Arlie James, AO44799.
Blood, Keneth Edward, AO52880.
Bloom, Edmund Stanley, AO53261.
Bloomer, Joseph Aloysius, Jr., AO46890.
Blum, Edward Francis, AO53478.
Blume, Frederick Julius, AO44250.
×Boardman, Robert Laurence, AO45989.
Boatman, Beryl Leon, AO48247.
Boatright, Lloyd Alvin, AO52759.
×Boddie, James Warner, AO40509.
Bodine, Francis Stephen, AO46273.
Boedeker, Charles Wilson, AO35208.
Bogan, John Wayne, AO48797.
Bogard, Wayne Columbus, AO47835.
Bogda, Michael Philip, Jr., AO40584.
Boggs, Aaron Jere, AO53929.
Bogren, Stanley Edward, AO44806.
Bogue, Jay Dean, AO40431.
Bohman, Thomas Spare, AO33197.
Boles, Homer Clem, AO46458.
Bolt, Jones Edward, AO36511.
Bolton, Willard Lewis, AO36693.
Bondhus, John O., Jr., AO52588.
×Bonebrake, Robert Raymond, AO35083.
Bones, James Clinton, AO35405.
Bonifant, Bern Monroe, Jr., AO44455.
×Bonneaux, William Karl, Jr., AO36244.
Bonnett, Donald Eugene, AO44553.
Bonnot, Carlos Durand, AO48122.
Bonvicin, Emanuel Frank, AO44079.
Booker, Brooks William, Jr., AO46356.
Boone, Harry Franklin, AO24827.
Boone, Lewis Perkins, Jr., AO33063.
Booth, Elmer Ellsworth, AO45830.
×Booth, Joseph Lawrence, AO37383.
Booth, Lionel Robillard, AO49080.
Booth, Robert Edwin, AO53203.
Borellis, William Francis, AO48391.
Bores, Albert David, AO47043.
Boreske, Andrew, Jr., AO25999.
Borman, Robert Clayton, AO39219.
Boselli, Theodore John, AO44714.
Bossardet, Charles Walter, AO48111.
×Boswell, Irving Ward, AO39115.
Bottoms, Robert Leland, AO32375.
Bouknecht, Robert William, AO45142.
×Bounds, John Earl, AO47776.
Bourgault, Samuel Peter, AO52874.
Bowden, Theodore Watrous, AO35181.
Bowden, William Martin, AO43834.
×Bowen, Jarrette DeLeslie, AO52888.
Bowen, John Edward, AO46817.
Bowen, William Douglas, AO48865.
×Bower, Deward Edward, AO39185.

Bowers, Donald Moar, AO45288.
×Bowers, William Henry, AO37068.
×Bowley, Albert John, AO25903.
Bowlin, Roy Lindsay, Jr., AO25637.
Bowman, Frank Michael, AO33407.
Bowman, George Abraham, Jr., AO54769.
Bowman, John Sterling, AO54277.
Bowman, Richard Elsworthy, AO44134.
Bowman, Sam William, Jr., AO44945.
Boyd, Edwin Iwin, AO44954.
Boyd, Howard Ted, AO47760.
Boyle, John Harold, AO36628.
Bozarth, Theodore Walter, AO48728.
Brackley, William Lowell, AO36262.
×Bracy, Carroll Harlan, AO44790.
Bradburn, Gordon Ferris, AO36447.
×Braden, James Savage, AO24983.
×Bradford, Carl Walker, AO44686.
Bradford, Earl Morse, AO32690.
Bradford, James Warren, AO37333.
Bradford, James William, AO54015.
×Bradford, Oscar Arthur, Jr., AO33534.
×Bradley, Francis Trenholm, AO52295.
Bradley, Jack Tarleton, AO36537.
Bradley, Raymond Andrew, AO35717.
×Bradshaw, Marion Augustus, AO47330.
Brady, Edward Leo, AO46735.
Brady, William Diebold, AO25694.
Bragg, Russell Merle, AO35874.
Brainerd, Jackson Wright, AO35745.
Brandau, Otto Henry, AO52356.
Brandon, William Dale, AO40796.
×Brannon, Cullen Albert, Jr., AO26114.
Branstetter, Lyle Roy, AO40920.
×Brantley, Joseph Ray, AO34842.
Brantner, James Andrew, AO44931.
Brasier, Carl Oscar, AO52854.
Bratcher, Douglas Howard, AO45846.
Brauer, William Henery, AO48254.
×Braun, Vincent Augustine, AO40853.
Bray, Clifton Leon, AO36605.
Bray, Jack William, AO52620.
Brazier, Harold William, AO48550.
Breathwit, Carl Edward, AO32875.
Breeeze, William Hughes, AO46883.
×Breindel, George Joseph, AO52781.
Brendle, George Robert, AO54795.
×Brennan, Gerald William, AO55071.
×Brenner, George Paul, Jr., AO40974.
Brewer, Edwin, Henry, AO47361.
Brewer, James Edward, AO40445.
×Brewer, Lonnie Carl, AO37137.
Brewster, John Howard, AO47339.
Bridges, Dewey Rogers, AO40781.
Bridget, Henry Bernard, AO47695.
Briel, Karl Lombard, AO35968.
Brierty, William Paul, AO26080.
Briggs, Arthur Flem, 2d, AO46247.
×Briggs, Leon Arthur, AO23967.
Brigham, Jex Moulden, AO44197.
Bright, David Morgan, AO44692.
Brill, Norris, AO40319.
Brinson, Milton Wilkerson, AO44438.
Brinson, Robert Francis, AO47899.
Brinson, Sheldon Smith, AO39198.
Briscoe, Carroll Dayle, AO40311.
Britt, James Oliver, AO46346.
Brittain, Gerald Frederick, AO43607.
Brittingham, Raymond Cecil, Jr., AO25650.
Broach, Richard Howell, AO25600.
Broaddus, Donald Austin, AO36643.
Brock, John William, AO40954.
Brock, Richard Crawford, AO44912.
Brocklehurst, Robert Lewis, AO34999.
Brockway, Gerald Marion, AO44471.
×Brodie, George Fontaine, Jr., AO35472.
Broich, Lee August, AO45112.
Brooking, George Robert, AO53480.
Brooks, Charles Llewelyn, AO37094.
×Brooks, Leo Cooper, AO26156.
Brooks, Philip, AO36024.
×Brooks, Robert Jordan, AO36685.
Brooks, William King, AO49104.
Broome, William Bohler, Jr., AO53254.
×Brosnan, Cornelius Gerald, AO47703.
Brothers, James Terry, AO37273.
Brown, Albert Kenneth, AO44960.
Brown, Alston Law, AO26191.
×Brown, Dean Bill, AO36849.
Brown, Elwin Olliff, AO45396.
Brown, Gerald, AO48125.
Brown, Harold Lovelace, AO46387.
Brown, Harold Rowe, AO34634.
Brown, Harvey Neal, AO53263.
Brown, Jack R., AO35866.
Brown, John Henry, Jr., AO45894.
Brown, John Robert, Jr., AO45407.
×Brown, Kenneth Elmo, AO32711.
Brown, Mark Josiah, AO53329.
Brown, Meade Marsh, AO33568.
Brown, Ralph Lindsey, AO35727.
Brown, Raymond Sedgwick, AO40626.
Brown, Robert Bruce, AO45544.
Brown, Robert Dale, AO48888.
×Brown, Robert Lee, AO47254.
Brown, Samuel Bradford, 3d, AO54568.
Brown, Ted, AO43499.
Brown, Thomas Huntington, AO26261.
Brown, William Francis, AO46314.
Brown, Winfield Henry, AO46551.
Brownell, Gerald Simpson, AO33565.
×Browning, John Robert, AO44685.
Broyles, Enoch Ernest, AO36875.
Brubaker, Thomas Franklin, AO48786.
×Brubeck, Edwin Howard, AO52441.
Bruce, Leroy James, AO52509.
Bruce, Robert Eugene, AO47565.
×Bruch, George Daniel, AO54020.
Brueland, Lowell Kermit, AO47822.
Bruey, Thomas Joseph, AO45025.
Brundage, Theodore Thompson, AO46503.
×Brundrett, Warner Morris, AO45721.
Bruner, Donald Hepburn, AO25664.
Bruner, Frederick William, AO40470.
Bruno, Sam, AO45235.
Bruns, Roy Henry, AO35658.
Brunson, William Percy, AO44980.
×Bryan, William Elmer, Jr., AO37095.
×Bryan, William Tagg, AO44673.
Bryant, Marion Floyd, AO46850.
Bryant, Perry Killian, AO46099.
Bryson, William Curtis, AO34780.
Bryson, William Francis, AO33484.
Brzuska, Edmund Earl, AO40492.
Bucher, Oliver Boone, Jr., AO26096.
Buchmeier, George Thomas, AO44265.
Buck, Arthur Wilbur, AO33567.
Buck, George Thad, Jr., AO24857.
Buckey, George Rufus, AO46081.
Buckey, James Howard, AO47331.
Buckingham, George Edward, AO44949.
Buckley, John Alden, AO44346.
Buckley, Russell William, AO44852.
Buckley, William Arthur, AO53238.
Buckley, William Gene, AO46787.
Buckner, John Hugh, AO25439.
Buechner, William Austen, AO52693.
Buel, Joseph Giddens, AO36483.
×Buer, Glendon J., AO47830.
Buford, William Meadows, AO52883.
×Bullock, Joe Ragland, AO34384.
×Bundgaard, Robert Clausen, AO48118.
Bunker, Walter Irvin, AO44231.
Burcky, Max Calvin, AO34582.
Burdett, Edward Burke, AO26295.
Burdette, Carlyle Blaine, AO43575.
Burdick, James Roland, AO45233.
Burgy, Eldred John, AO31842.
Burke, Mark John, AO24927.
Burke, Sylvester Vernon, AO46338.
Burkett, Bernard Julius, AO44191.
Burkett, Reinhold Erwin, AO53677.
×Burnett, Melvin Max, AO33494.
Burnett, Robert Leon, AO44517.
Burnette, Walter Neal, Jr., AO26118.
Burnor, Richard Harold, AO47991.
Burns, Charles Timothy, AO52186.
Burns, Harmon Eugene, AO46898.
Burns, Harold William, AO35520.
×Burns, Jackson Ralph, AO40274.
Burns, Robert, AO44565.
×Burnstedt, Lloyd Ellis, AO53332.
Burr, Frank Robert, AO40955.
Burris, Howard Lay, AO24862.
Burrus, Donald Edward, AO53625.
Burson, Thomas Lee, AO47019.
Burt, Braxton Stanfield, AO32574.
Burt, Joseph Autry, AO44693.
Burton, Charles Richard, AO46728.
×Busby, Douglas Ray, AO46000.
Bush, Edwin Richard, AO47354.
Bush, William Kenneth, AO52671.
Bushue, Bernard John, AO35744.
Buskey, Paul Gordon, AO36488.
Bussey, Carver Thaxton, AO24116.
Bussey, Donald Glenn, AO36211.
Bussing, Henry George, AO54005.
Butcher, Chester John, AO25784.
Butcher, William Andrew, Jr., AO40559.
Butler, Clifton Lewis, Jr., AO25604.
Butler, Earl Howard, AO46416.
Butler, Henry Forde, AO45032.
Butler, Herbert Irving, AO53890.
Butler, Richard David, AO47589.
Butler, Robert Andrew, AO52897.
×Butterfield, William Howe, AO48100.
Buttmann, Oscar, AO43783.
Button, Ervine Jerold, AO45164.
Buttrill, Harlan Crawford, AO52452.
Butts, Clyde Irving, AO46053.
Butts, Earl Adolph, AO35776.
Butts, Elliott Wilson, Jr., AO54497.
Byerley, Howard Lafayette, AO47517.
Byerly, Herman Frederick, AO52798.
Byers, Edward Franklin, AO46425.
Byers, Vic L., Jr., AO36546.
Byrd, Bacchus Bright, Jr., AO44992.
×Byrd, Herman Earl, AO46904.
Byrne, Eugene Watson, AO35690.
Cabell, John Kennedy, AO52655.
×Cabral, William Mervyn, AO33202.
Cade, William Albert, Jr., AO52584.
Cadger, Edward James, AO36750.
Cady, William Francis, AO56901.
Cafarelli, John, AO36614.
Cain, Walter Frank, AO45065.
Caldwell, Herman Bert, Jr., AO33239.
×Calhoun, Philip Clare, AO24611.
×Calhoun, William Rodwell, Jr., AO35370.
Call, George William, AO34273.
Callahan, Charles Augustine, AO40866.
Callahan, Walter, AO33526.
Callaway, Leonard Clifton, AO47004.
Callaway, Richard Dowdy, AO22371.
Calloway, Roy Lavert, AO32965.
Calof, Donald Robert, AO44625.
Cameron, John Whaley, AO40881.
×Cameron, William Roderick, AO36403.
Cammack, Vernon Kinney, AO37312.
Camp, Clyde Henry, Jr., AO37198.
Camp, Joseph Benjamin, Jr., AO44579.
Campbell, Chester McDonald, Jr., AO34609.
Campbell, Dick Martin, AO 44889.
Campbell, Edward Everett, AO46886.
Campbell, Herbert Maxwell, AO33315.
Campbell, James Milton, AO46708.
Campbell, James Maxwell, AO47083.
Campbell, Paul Welphley, AO33811.
Campbell, William Ayers, AO35829.
×Campbell, William Joseph, AO33123.
×Campion, Norman Woodrow, AO44132.
Cannon, James, AO47290.
Cannon, John Hinkle, Jr., AO53241.
Cannon, Walter Gary, AO32862.
Cape, Rolf Douglas, AO46243.
Caples Robert Osgood, AO40557.
Cappelletti, Francis Ronald, AO45653.
Cappucci, Joseph John, AO32175.
Cardarella, Vincent Carl, AO35994.
×Carey, John Audobon, AO35372.
Carey, Robert Henry, AO33478.
Carhart, Thomas Merrit, AO34841.
×Carlos, Lloyd Pearson, AO52248.
Carlson, Elmer Gus, AO47492.
Carlson, Ragnar Lodbrok, AO44853.
Carlson, Robert Ellis, AO54057.
Carlton, Paul Kendall, AO35912.
Carlton, Robert Nichols, AO46348.
Carmack, John Edgar, AO22560.
Carmack, Morton Campbell, AO25803.
Carmody, Richard John, AO35126.
Carney, Arthur William, AO53221.
×Carney, John Kilker, AO52234.
×Carpenter, David Erwin, AO35396.
Carpenter, Donald Charles, AO43551.
Carpenter, Harvey Benjamin, AO34774.
×Carpenter, John Woolsey, AO44712.
Carpenter, Neal Holton, AO52151.
×Carr, Richard Pendleton, AO22323.
Carrigan, Thomas Michael, AO36443.
Carroll, James Vincent, AO43471.
Carroll, John William, AO35652.

Carroll, John Aylth. Jr., AO47013.
Carroll, Robert William, AO54554.
×Carruth, Francis Sumner, AO45421.
Carson, Charles William, Jr., AO25958.
×Carson, William James, AO43831.
×Carss, Walter Lee, Jr., AO36216.
Carstensen, Dale Lafayette, AO32984.
Carter, Charles Ray, AO48364.
Carter, Clifford Gordon, AO46357.
Carter, James Richard, AO36279.
×Carter, John Davis, AO35d13.
×Carter, Roger Mills, Jr., AO40767.
Carter, William Parhan, AO36790.
×Cartwright, Everett Jackson, AO52726.
Cartwright, Philip Eugene, AO47026.
Carvalho, Henry Pacheco, AO47085.
×Carver, Charles Frank, Jr., AO52426.
Carwell, Ivan Leon, AO44465.
Cary Charles Muse, AO35725.
Casey, William Joseph, AO46379.
×Cassada, Randall Curtis, AO36467.
Cassady, Robert Ernest, AO47410.
Cassiday, Benjamin Buckles, Jr., AO26073.
×Castle, Vernon Henry, AO44734.
×Cathcart, Richard Earl, AO36009.
×Catington, James Douglas, AO46178.
Catledge, Richard Carroll, AO48593.
Catterlin, Richard Ryder, AO47162.
Caudill, Edwin Gene, AO54149.
Causey, Rufus Franklin, AO36653.
×Cavanagh, John Timothy, AO34808.
Cavender, Joe Judson, AO31931.
Cavender, John Proctor Knott, AO45639.
Ceely, William David, AO44489.
Ceuleers, George Ferdinand, AO46894.
Chadwick, Roscoe Lewis, AO33841.
Chairsell, William Spaulding, AO35730.
Chambers, Dale Richard, AO48154.
Champlan, John Dixon, Jr., AO32915.
Champlain, Daniel Dolph, AO45194.
Chandler, George William, AO44770.
Chandler, John Seymoure, Jr., AO25910.
Chandler, William Fletcher, AO36622.
Chapman, Benjamin Frank, AO53142.
Chapman, Carl Joseph, AO36680.
×Charlesworth, William Robert, AO53932.
×Chatfield, Stanley Edward, AO48005.
Chatterley, Archie Warren, AO54391.
×Chauvet, Jack Sydney, AO44722.
Cheatwood, John Harold, AO21666.
Cheney, James Spiers, AO46537.
Cherbak, Victor Anthony, Jr., AO25818.
Cherota, Frederick William, AO53070.
Chessington, James Buell, Jr., AO52841.
×Chiarella, James Santo, AO52634.
Chick, Lewis William, Jr., AO22403.
Chilcote, Charles Arthur, AO43705.
Childress, Hubert Mason, AO54443.
Childress, Peter Mills, AO33610.
Childress, Raymond Keith, AO46488.
Childs, Marvin Edward, AO26300.
Chilstrom, Kenneth Oscar, AO36739.
Christensen, William Robert, AO44624.
Christenson, Richard Andrew, AO52651.
Christie, Charles Philip, AO45851.
Christman, Harry William, Jr., AO45610.
×Claggett, Ellwood Tylor, AO24997.
Clark, Charles Henry, AO54537.
Clark, Delair Aubrey, AO40499.
Clark, Delbert McClain, AO36222.
Clark, Gordon Bartlett, AO35618.
Clark, James Dale, AO47560.
Clark, Robert Herman, AO26154.
×Clark, Thomas Matthews, AO47965.
Clarke, Clarence J., AO46193.
×Clarke, Thomas Thurman, AO32607.
×Clarke, Walter Campbell, AO44720.
×Clary, Lawson, Jr., AO45990.
×Clary, Ralph Leo. AO35630.
×Classen, Thomas John, AO45947.
Clay, Lucius DuBigon, Jr., AO25001.
Clay, Marvin Jones, AO47180.
Claytor, Roy Frank, AO34888.
Clement, Edwin Gustave, AO53739.
Clementson, Gerhardt Christopher, AO-24713.
×Clendenin, Robert Antone, AO54128.
Clerici, Henry John, AO33281.
Click, Benjamin Arthur Lee, Jr., AO53824.
Clifford, Robert Ralph, AO54500.
Cline, Harold Frank, AO35834.
Clinger, Dallas Adelion, AO33517.
Clocksin, Albert Julius, AO47563.
Cloer, Gilmer Woodrow, AO52272.
Cloke, Marshall, AO23310.
Cloud, Carlton, Jr., AO37033.
×Coade, William Arthur, AO44868.
Cobb, James Bernhardt, AO25515.
Cobb, John Tyrus, AO36075.
Cobb, Melvin Burdette, AO53424.
×Cobb, Phillip Gray, AO45394.
Coburn, Blaine K., AO44537.
Cochran, Wharton Clayton, AO24001.
Cocke, Charles Edward, Jr., AO44876.
Cody, Howard Eugene, AO47046.
Coen, Oscar Hoffman, AO35955.
Coffey, John Donald, AO32578.
Coffield, Peter Lewis, AO47417.
×Cofield, Gene, AO52153.
×Cogswell, James Stines, AO45619.
Coke, John Dunlavy, AO48267.
Coker, Elmo Ace, AO44313.
×Cole, Benjamin Harold, AO52738.
Cole, Charles Harold, Jr., AO53915.
×Cole, Edward Lee, AO33105.
Cole, Frederick John, AO34874.
×Cole, George Peyton, AO46804.
Cole, Heston Charles, AO26319.
Cole, Louis Biddle, AO54190.
Coleman, Harry Southside, Jr., AO31952.
×Coleman, Kenneth Donald, AO46380.
Coleson, Roger David, AO36010.
×Colgan, William Buchana, AO54837.
Collett, Charles Ellsworth, AO37106.
Collier, Ben Franklin, AO54130.
Collins, Donald Edward, AO52843.
Collins, Frank, Jr., AO36579.
Collins, Harold Colbert, AO52581.
Collins, Harold Douglass, AO40825.
Collins, Thomas Edward, Jr., AO56913.
Collinsworth, J. D., AO56910.
Collis, Edwin Martin, Jr., AO53177.
Colson, William Benton, AO34894.
Cometh, Lawrence, AO40854
×Commons, Enos Larrance, Jr., AO43606.
Compton, Gordon Bryan, AO46743.
×Comstock, Harold Elwood, AO54059.
Condon, Joseph Francis, AO44219.
×Conklin, Howard Elmer, AO46361.
Conklin, Joseph Edward, AO41002.
Conkling, Emmett Virgil, AO43648.
Conlee, R. C., Jr., AO52462.
Conley, David Morrow, AO34446.
Conn, John Frank, AO55113.
×Connell, James Spalding, AO48528.
Connell, Leonard Tilly, AO45061.
Conner, Alva Lewis, AO44436.
Conner, Hal Chaney, AO45571.
×Conner, William Fred, AO44793.
Connor, Edward Hanson, 3d, AO26160.
×Conques, Lawrence, AO47976.
Conrad, Chester Melvin, AO45623.
Conrad, John Hill, AO45868.
×Conway, Victor Cornelius, AO40770.
Cook, Edmund George, Jr., AO35007.
Cook, Emery Allan, AO45835
Cook, Harry Dean, AO37238
×Cook, James Rawdon, AO46378.
Cook, Leo Winford, AO35527.
Cook, Richard Henry, AO46511.
Cook, Thomas Roland, Jr., AO45960.
Cook, Walter Vaughn, AO35377.
Cook, William Joseph, AO25776.
Cooke, Guy, Jr., AO46203.
Cooke, Sherman Cecil, AO33429.
×Cool, Paul Edward, AO34066.
Coonan, Daniel Joseph, Jr., AO35483.
Coons, Walter Harold, AO53980.
Cooper, Harold Dalrymple, AO53715.
Cooper, James Howard, AO33438.
Cooper, Talmage Dewitt, Jr., AO45942.
Cooper, Theodore Louis, AO48221.
Cope, Stephen Jackson, AO54382.
Cope, William Samuel, AO43645.
Copeland, Lewis Anderson, AO43895.
×Corbin, Joseph Haymond, AO40810.
Cormany, William Franklin, Jr., AO48281.
Correll, Victor Crosby, AO43594.
Corrie, Wirt Haley, AO35942.
Costello, Edward Michael, AO25488.
Cotton, Jesse Francis, Jr., AO46191.
Cotton, Joseph Frederick, AO41074.
Couch, Alexander Pritchard, AO22373.
Couch, Benjamin John, AO44205.
Couch, Paul Frederick, AO49069.
Coursey, Richard Ray, Jr., AO25991.
Courtney, John Joseph, Jr., AO25584.
×Couser, Walter John, Jr., AO40722.
Cousins, Otie Columbus, AO44791.
Couts, Richard Lee, AO46491.
×Coverley, Edwin Dudley, AO45183.
Cowan, James Hill, AO44362.
Cowan, Marion Glenn, AO32412.
Cowdery, Burnham Webster, AO45323.
Cox, Edward Luther, Jr., AO39068.
×Cox, Eugene Wesley, AO45923.
Cox, Lucien Kozak, AO45585.
Cox, Richard Gordon, AO47559.
Cox, Robert Lewis, AO32520.
Crabtree, Frank Ray, AO46122.
Crabtree, Jean Ernest, AO47504.
Craddock, Reynold Cawaine, AO47661.
Cragg, Ernest Thorpe, AO26144.
×Crahan, James Edward, AO47863.
Crahen, Eugene James, AO48597.
Craig, Joe Congdon, AO43970.
Craig, Warren George, AO52884.
Cram, Reginald Maurice, AO52305.
Crandall, Thomas Oakey, AO53400.
Crandell, John Abner, Jr., AO34614.
×Crane, Russell Dale, AO48248.
Crane, Vincent Mercer, AO34306.
Cranfill, Niven Kendall, AO35407.
×Crary, Gerald Demarest, Jr., AO40633.
Cravey, John Thomas, AO44364.
×Crawford, Ben, AO54929.
Crawford, William, AO45617.
Crawford, William Adair, AO48746.
Creo, Andrew Bartholomew, AO33037.
Crick, James Monroe, Jr., AO48326.
×Crim, Harry Clay, Jr., AO46889.
×Crisi, Alfred Renato, AO46619.
Crispen, Marshall Freeman, AO54120.
Criss, George William, Jr., AO25672.
Cristadoro, Maurice Anthony, Jr., AO35131.
Crocker, Gage Houston, AO48973.
Cromie, Charles Codman, AO40960.
Crompton, Roy Clifton, AO53896.
Cronin, James Joseph, AO46686.
Cronin, William Russ, AO54225.
Crosby, James Erwin, Jr., AO24164.
Crosland, Roy Truett, AO35409.
Cross, Adelbert de Hart, AO39103.
Cross, Robert Douglas, AO52567.
Cross, Walter Winfred, AO22818.
Crossey, James Leo, AO46876.
Crossman, William Vaughton, AO48737.
Crosson, Norman Robert, AO33027.
×Crouchley, Edward Alfred, AO53628.
Crowder, Harlan Burrell, AO52861.
Crowder, Robert Graham, AO44843.
Crowell, Dick Merril, AO33755.
Crown, Richard Keith, AO36615.
Cruikshank, Arthur Waur, Jr., AO35383.
Crumley, James Perry, AO39199.
Crumm, William Joseph, AO35922.
Crutcher, Richard Lawrence, Jr., AO47005.
Crutchfield, James Oscar, AO40519.
Crutchfield, Wilfred Benjamin, AO37135.
Cruver, Harry Franklin, AO33458.
Cryer, Elmer Harold, AO40785.
×Cryer, James Magill, Jr., AO34728.
Culbertson, Omar William, AO44305.
Cullum, Felder Wilson, AO45600.
Culp, Chester Harold, AO44740.
Culp, Merle Heilman, AO36472.
Cumiskey, William Temple, AO40579.
Cummings, Earl William, AO36535.
Cummings, Louis Henry, AO37051.
Cunliffe, Richard King, AO39208.
Cunniff, Paul Joseph, AO45152.
Curlee, Robert Burnette, AO32846.
Curran, Emmett Eugene, AO46845.
Curran, John Hugh, AO44038.
Curry, James Hyter, AO35913.
Curtis, Ferd John, AO53376.
Curtis, Gilbert Lewis, AO34216.
Curtis, Jack Harry, AO40250.
×Curtis, Robert David, AO53417.
Curtiss, Philip Hildreth, AO52286.
Cushing, Arthur Leavitt, AO45257.
Cutler, Edward Wellage, AO26296.
Cutler, John Milton, AO25787.

Dacko, William, AO44609.
d'Acosta Uriel Pereira, AO40272.
Dacus, John Howard, AO47474.
×Dailey, Herbert Richard, AO45294.
Dale, Hugh Walter, AO37174.
Dale, James Roy, Jr., AO53519.
Dalto, John, AO43975.
Dalton, Bernard Vincent, AO52345.
Daly, Arnold Joseph, AO44373.
Dames, William Herman, AO34227.
Damico, Robert Howard, AO37038.
Daner, William Joseph, AO26215.
Daniel, Heston Charles, AO52963.
Daniell, Gerald, AO53361.
D'Annibale, Vincent James, AO44106.
Darby, James Addison, AO35696.
Darnold, Charles Reese, AO44110.
×Dascombe, Charles Burr, AO33848.
×Dattan, Howard Steinwinter, AO47100.
×Daubard, Weldon Stanley, AO44816.
Daughton, Glenn B., AO24574.
×Daughtrey, Buddy Rex, AO37196.
Daunt, John Joseph, Jr., AO46468.
Dauphin, Ray, AO35893.
Davenport, Ellie Everett, AO37644.
Davey, Kenneth William, AO43989.
Davidson, William Herman, AO35015.
Davies, Jack Talmadge, AO26108.
Davies, James Werner, AO44170.
Davies, William Velasko, AO43472.
Davis, Charles Larramore, AO36136.
Davis, Dale D., AO40763.
Davis, Edward Geurs, AO44356.
×Davis, Glendon Valley, AO46405.
Davis, Glenn Elmore, AO44473.
Davis, Green Robinson, Jr., AO34417.
Davis, Harvey Milton, AO46238.
Davis, Henry Pierce, Jr., AO35627.
Davis, Ira Robert, AO52952.
Davis, Jack Talmage, AO26108.
Davis, James Werner, AO44170.
Davis, Jerome Nicholson, AO45071.
Davis, Jesse Charles, Jr., AO52621.
Davis, John, Jr., AO48274.
Davis, John Kenneth, AO33524.
Davis, Joseph Franklin, AO47883.
Davis, Thomas Aubry, AO47939.
×Davis, Thomas Julian, AO45464.
Davis, Thomas Jeffrey, Jr., AO47030.
Davis, Thomas Martin, AO45208.
Davis, William McClure, AO36025.
Davis, William Osborne, AO53409.
Davitt, Ralph Gregory, AO45069.
Dawson, Harold Cleveland, AO31904.
Dawson, Peter Paul, AO35140.
Dawson, William Stone, AO53778.
Daye, John Frederick, Jr., AO25700.
de Bourbon-Condé, Bruce Alfonso, AO43716.
De Dera, Joseph Edward, AO36744.
DeGruchy, Oliver Williams, Jr., AO25652.
×DeMai, Nicholas, Jr., AO53294.
DeMelik, Andrew Arthur, AO45001.
DeMun, Earl Edward, AO44906.
DeVor, Nicholas, Jr., AO44892.
Deal, Douglas Lipp, AO25894.
×Dean, David Kennedy, AO43702.
Dean, Richard, AO45200.
×Deane, William Boyd, AO44700.
Deans, Edwin Gray, AO34773.
Dease, George Carl, AO45594.
Debons, Anthony, AO33410.
DeBriyn, Raymond Joseph, AO53725.
Dech, Robert Wagner, AO53365.
×Deck, H. A., AO34830.
×Deck, Leland Paul, AO44747.
Deck, William Lee, AO36574.
Decker, Lynne Ellsworth, AO37018.
Decker, Robert Young, AO43780.
Dedrickson, Lorin Ross, AO45847.
Deegan, Leo Francis, AO35310.
Deets, Jack Lester, AO47230.
Deffke, Donald Eugene, AO24970.
Dehner, Joseph Harvey, AO52691.
Del Missier, Bruno Carl, AO44046.
Delbridge, Thomas Edward, AO39245.
Delia, Andrew, AO23243.
Dell, Angelo John Andrew, AO44554.
×Dell, John William, AO33898.
Dempsey, Jack Donald, AO40416.
Dempsey, James Raymon, AO25452.
Dennis, Charles Gardner, AO52632.
Dennis, Harry Stutphen, Jr., AO47640.
Dennis, Larry Denton, AO44701.
Denson, Harvey Thomas, AO53383.
Denton, Harris Leonard, AO45078.
Denton, John Hartig, AO33004.
Deppe, Ralph Williams, AO44589.
Deppen, William Christian, Jr., AO32976.
×Dereskevich, Algert Stanley, AO44840.
Dern, Arthur William AO45606.
Derr, Herbert Odell, AO46309.
Deer, Howard Stanley, AO53333.
×Derussy, Rene Amedee, AO52982.
Des Portes, John Augustus, AO35443.
×Des Georges, Herbert Etienne, AO43681.
Desmond, Arthur Peter, AO52486.
Desper, Dale David, AO33946.
Deterding, Floyd Milton, AO33205.
Dettre Rexford Herbert, Jr., AO25514.
×Detwiler, Donald Alburtus, AO26054.
Devine, John Emmet, AO33499.
Dewey, Willis Alonzo, AO13597.
×Dice, Evan Adams, AO44077.
Dick, Robert Marcus, AO43488.
Dickens, Thomas Nolan, AO44498.
Dickinson, Jacob McGavock, 3d, AO53842.
Dickson, Lon Russell, AO33098.
Dieffenderfer, James Clark, AO35439.
Diekmann, Paul John, AO44435.
×Dienz, John Edmund, AO47478.
Dieterich, Virgin Conrad, AO36077.
Dieterle, Jack Woodrow, AO36082.
Dietrich, Calvin George, AO47156.
×Dillon, Stephen Patrick, AO46400.
Dillon, Walter Walton, AO24832.
×Dilly, Vincent Sylvester, AO53502.
Diltz, Theo Roy, AO46207.
Dimel, James Joseph, AO35940.
Dinker, William Richard, AO36434.
Dinsmore, Dwight Reginald, AO43923.
Dinwiddie, Robert Eddy, AO52500.
Disana, Joe Vincent, AO52201.
Disbrow, Bill Louis, AO52545.
Dixon, Brendan, AO44097.
Dobbs, Ross Ebbie, AO45141.
Dobney, Harold William, AO44411.
Dockstader, Daniel B., AO44901.
Dodd, Aulevian Minyard, Jr., AO33643.
Dodds, William Clarence, AO44268.
×Dodge, James David, AO48135.
Dodge, John Alfred, AO53116.
Doerr, George Robert, AO45118.
Doersch, George Albert, AO48545.
Dolan, Vincent William, AO51853.
Dolby, William Frederick, AO25805.
Dolk, Carl Edward, AO37090.
Dolph, Herbert Arden, AO40439.
Donnelly, William Allan, Jr., AO44341.
Donohue, Elwood Paul, AO21960.
×Donohue, Timothy Willard, AO53143.
Donovan, Joseph Nichols, AO36847.
Dooley, Benedict James, AO44287.
Doornbos, Philip Ogden, AO43775.
Dorff, Richard Woodrow, AO48374.
Dorondo, John Frank, AO52510.
Dougal, Robert Elliot, AO43766.
Dougherty, Russell Elliott, AO41045.
Douglas, Gene LeRoy, AO44856.
Douglas, Paul Page, Jr., AO35357.
Douma, Cyril Raymond, AO52806.
Douthett, Elwood Moser, AO44635.
×Douthwaite, William Thomas, Jr., AO37199.
Dowling, James Klemd, AO33258.
Downie, Archibald, Jr., AO52531.
Downing, Harry L., Jr., AO35653.
Dowswell, John Royden, AO46577.
Doyle, James Leslie, AO25667.
Doyle, Thomas Francis, Jr., AO48097.
Drafts, Lucius Griffith, AO22336.
×Draper, Frederick Arthur, Jr., AO40857.
Drees, Fred William, Jr., AO53779.
Dregne, Irwin Hendrick, AO35328.
×Dreier, Charles Neal, AO47752.
Dresser, Cornelius Sheldon, AO40538.
Dressler, Gordon Albert, AO45828.
Drew, Troy, AO52617.
×Driessel, Sylvester John, Jr., OA48570.
Driver, John James, AO52637.
Druhe, Hubert Kenneth, AO39004.
DuBose, Edward Ervin, Jr., AO35838.
DuBose, Robert Lee, AO38945.
DuMont, Harold Joseph, AO45095.
Duch, Walter Francis, AO36959.
Ducote, Marc Marmaduke, Jr., AO46485.
Dudley, William Bradford, AO26252.
Duff, David Dryden, AO36011.
Duff, Elmer Hayden, AO40546.
Duffie, Claire Alfred Pelton, AO24884.
Dufour, Jerome Pierre, AO35954.
Duich, Paul Anthony, AO52801.
×Duin, Robert, AO48821.
Duke, Claude Lavert, Jr., AO40808.
Duke, William Francis, AO52635.
×Dula, Mason Aurelius, AO45696.
Duncan, Charles Henry, AO34782.
Duncan, Edward Keytron, AO33631.
×Duncan, George Harlan, AO48119.
Duncan, Ivan Merwin, AO44932.
Duncan, Roy Roscoe, AO45629.
Dunham, William Douglas, AO35376.
Dunkelberger, Vance Eaton, AO45128.
×Dunken, Allen Grambling, AO53239.
Dunlap, Robert Richard, AO46622.
Dunmore, George Perry, AO47352.
Dunn, Bruce Collins, AO36012.
Dunn, Lamar Jackson, AO35642.
Dunn, Raymond Bennett, AO45736.
Dunphy, Earl Francis, AO48415.
Durbeck, Arthur George, AO35362.
×Durham, Benjamin Jasper, Jr., AO52369.
Durner, Dwight Edward, AO48434.
Dutcher, Richard Fields, AO52435.
Duty, William Burkett, AO52259.
Dwyer, Harry Robert, AO48079.
Dyer, Frederick Wolfin, Jr., AO40813.
Dyer, Richard Willerton, AO32778.
Dyser, Francis Edward, AO48629.
Eade, George James, AO47949.
Eagleston, Glenn Todd, AO47840.
×Eakes, Raymond Timothy, AO34063.
Early, Charles Law, AO52995.
Easley, Samuel James, AO52469.
Easters, Robert Douglas, AO37268.
Ebert, Rembert Albert, AO48517.
Eberts, Major David, AO53355.
Eby, Robert Roy, AO44415.
×Echols, George Blakey, Jr., AO33391.
Eck, Anthony Ignatious, AO45622.
Eckert, Clarence August, AO46650.
Eckert, Jacob Clayton, AO43604.
Eddy, Ernest Chauncey, AO34218.
Eddy, Leonard Arthur, AO36000.
×Edelen, Henry Hill, Jr., AO44655.
Edenbo, John William, AO45135.
Edgerton, Bruce Wilds Postlethwaite, AO24090.
×Edmisten, Herbert Wilbert, AO44179.
Edner, Selden Raymond, AO36629.
×Edney, James Sidney, AO46185.
Edwards, Allen, AO53388.
×Edwards, Edmund Barber, AO25555.
×Edwards, James Thomas, AO52715.
×Edwards, Kenneth Rhea, AO44675.
Edwards, Richard Gordon, AO47244.
Edwards, Robert Bruce, AO40309.
Edwards, Wilbur Hugh, AO40782.
Edwards, Wilson Victor, AO36660.
Eells, Irving Carl, AO35879.
×Egan, John Lloyd, AO34070.
Egan, Paul Francis Graham, AO44824.
Egerland, Arnold Victor, AO31978.
Ehlinger, Joseph Thomas, AO53412.
Eichholz, Jerome Charles, AO32425.
×Eichorn, John Dunn, AO52138.
Eickemeyer, Karl Frederick, AO48294.
×Eigenmann, John Christian, AO39141.
Eisenbrown, Walter Thomas, AO40822.
Elsner, Friedrich, AO44144.
Elam, Rhodes Mason, AO43997.
Elder, Harold Wyatte, Jr., AO33300.
Eldridge, Arthur Clarence, AO52744.
×Eldridge, Sheldon Flemming, AO44676.
Eliasen, Arnold Clarence, AO43801.
Elling, Milfred Otto, AO47515.
×Ellington, Edward Hamlet, AO46339.
Elliott, Charles Robert, AO44641.
×Elliott, Elmo Adams, AO36687.
×Elliott, William Wayne, AO46330.
Ellis, Bythel Laurence, AO44496.
Ellis, Frank Terry, AO25697.
Ellis, Jerome Pershing, AO24995.
Ellis, Joseph Woodrow, AO47356.
Ellis, Ollie McLaurin, AO52631.

Ellis, Robert Giles, AO46043.
Ellison, Lawrence Albert, AO47974.
×Ellsaesser, Hugh Walter, AO54979.
×Elston, Ernest Woodrow, AO44659.
Elvin, Malcolm Peter, AO45886.
×Elwell, Robert Lowell, AO45729.
Embrey, Leland E., AO47159.
Embrey, Ralph Curtis, AO36647.
×Emison, Ernest Egbert, AO44063.
Emmert, Benjamin Harrison, Jr., AO48054.
×Emmertz, Roger Nelson, AO43498.
Emory, Frank Norman, AO47592.
Engels, Anthony Mathias, AO45048.
Engle, Robert Thomas, AO53224.
English, Peter Franklin, AO54212.
Erben, James Betros, AO47543.
Erickson, Earl Monroe, AO54356.
Erlenbusch, William Christian, AO45528.
Estes, Chandler Bayard, AO46395.
Evans, Calvin Edmond, AO45827.
Evans, Clayton Edgar, AO46652.
Evans, David L., 3d, AO36619.
Evans, John Arthur, AO49029.
Evans, Philip Gordon, AO44200.
Evans, Raymond Eugene, AO48815.
Evans, Robert Ramsey, AO24908.
Evdokimoff, Dmitri, AO48463.
Everest, Frank Kendall, Jr., AO47299.
Everly, Delmer Dale, AO52676.
Ewbank, William Lancelot, AO48152.
Ewing, Donald Edwin, AO44071.
Ewing, Donald Walker, AO46472.
Eyres, William Gordon, AO44491.
Fackler, Robert Frederick, AO35906.
×Fahey, James Martin, AO46347.
×Fahlstedt, Alfred Arthur, AO44798.
Fahringer, John Conrad, AO36004.
Fain, Robert Snead, AO46410.
Fallon, Edward, AO52766.
Fallows, Albert Dunn, AO32002.
Falzgraf, Bryan George, AO52565.
Farley, James Vincent, AO45145.
Farley, Orville Boyd, AO34017.
Farnell, Leland Borden, Jr., AO34538.
Farnell, William Robert, Jr., AO52461.
Farr, Hugh Manson, AO45295.
Farrar, John Wynn, AO35335.
Farrell, Frank Joseph, AO54877.
×Farrell, Frederick Bernard, AO39069.
Farry, Albert Barrett, AO33682.
Farwell, Robert Harvey, AO46169.
Fatzinger, Charles William, Jr., AO33708.
Faught, Courtney LeMar, AO47025.
Faulk, Melvin Wilson, AO44815.
Fava, James Archie, AO53354.
Fawcett, Williard Ellis, AO32710.
Feallock, William John, 2d, AO23358.
Fears, James William, AO46440.
×Feeley, John MacGregor, Jr., AO53054.
×Feile, Clarence William, AO52580.
Feist, Robert Douglas, AO34593.
Fellenbaum, William Ramler, AO54334.
Feller, Frederick John, AO44448.
×Fellows, Walter Scott, Jr., AO45934.
Fenlon, James Wharton, AO40976.
Ferebee, Thomas Wilson, AO40816.
Ferguson, Clay Van Dalesem, AO34974.
×Ferguson, John Jacob, AO46296.
Ferguson, Robert Irving, AO35119.
Ferguson, Robert Munro, AO35355.
Ferran, Charles Gordon, AO45873.
Ferrel, Frank Ellington, AO33046.
×Ferrelle, Charles Harvey, Jr., AO52778.
Ferriss, Lester Ruthven, Jr., AO48060.
×Fertig, Norman, AO52824.
Fetters, Rolland Francis, AO37104.
×Fidrocki, Alfred Vincent, AO54476.
Field, Alexander Caldwell, Jr., AO40540.
Fields, Melvin Edwin, AO46495.
Filippone, Jack Carl, AO44463.
Filley, Oliver Dwight, Jr., AO37136.
Finan, George Keith, AO45125.
Fincher, William Walter, AO52678.
Findley, Harry Wilson, AO34993.
Finley, William H., AO38977.
×Finney, Drayton Kerr, AO44006.
Finney, William Leland, AO45592.
Fischer, Clarence Eugene, AO54006.
Fischer, Henry Arthur, Jr., AO35521.
Fisher, Irvin Arthur, AO54515.
×Fischer, Jerome Jerry, AO54377.
Fish, Vinton Alfred, AO44837.
Fishburn, James Butterfield, AO33587.
×Fishburn, Thomas William, AO25094.
Fishburne, Charles Carroll, Jr., AO24972.
Fishburne, Paul Lee, AO46245.
×Fishel, Robert Ralph, AO25459.
Fisher, Carl Byrd, AO45919.
Fisher, Franklin Lee, AO46715.
Fisher, Jack Charles, Jr., AO54068.
Fisher, Lowell Boyd, AO25483.
×Fisher, Philip Fitzgerald, AO44129.
Fisk, Harry Edward, AO47828.
Fiss, Robert Wendell, AO43897.
Fitch, Charles Root, AO46129.
Fitter, Philip Augustine, AO46106.
×Fitzgerald, John Edward, Jr., AO34015.
Fitzgerald, Raymond Leo, AO49085.
Fitzgerald, Vernerd, AO36064.
Fitzsimmons, Robert James, AO36673.
Flanagan, Richard William, AO44367.
Flannigan, Ralph Eugene, AO44920.
Flavin, Kenneth Arthur, AO48174.
Fleming, George Thomas, AO45374.
Fleming, Patrick Dawson, AO45754.
Fletcher, Arthur Amos, Jr., AO46033.
Flint, Raymond Leon, AO45190.
Flower, Frank Augustus, AO34489.
Flummer, George Allen, AO52891.
×Fly, Hugh Garrette, Jr., AO36729.
×Flynn, Charles James, Jr., AO54791.
Fogle, Melvin Woodrow, AO52552.
Foley, Robert Langdon, AO34223.
Foley, Robert Patrick, AO46353.
×Foley, Thomas Francis, AO45495.
Folts, John Lloyd, AO25181.
×Fontana, Robert Edward, AO33185.
Foote, Edward Potter, AO25603.
Forbes, Alexander Allison, AO52607.
Ford, Claud Edward, AO36650.
Ford, Louis William, AO34621.
Ford, Ross Clifford, AO48634.
×Ford, Wilson, AO52788.
×Forest, Stuart Vickery, AO53653.
×Fornal, Joseph John, AO52385.
Forrest, Edward Lester, AO52383.
×Forrester, James Randolph, AO44439.
Forsblade, Kenneth Dave, AO44556.
Forster, Bernard Francis, AO48351.
×Forster, Joseph Morelle, AO49025.
Forward, Ronald Bradley, AO53819.
Foster, Gilbert, AO32332.
Foster, Herbert Moffatt, AO31880.
×Foster, James Harry, Jr., AO46645.
Foster, James Oliver, Jr., AO47255.
Foster, James William, AO47753.
Foster, John William, AO44820.
Foster, Ross Johnson, AO43492.
Foster, William Wallace, Jr., AO35198.
Foulk, Tom Bond, Jr., AO26273.
Founds, Joseph William, AO53098.
Fouts, John Elijah, Jr., AO33303.
Fowell, Byron Ronald, AO32354.
×Fowler, Thomas R., AO46152.
Fox, James Henry, AO47117.
Fox, John Edward, AO43522.
×Fox, Robert Winston, AO40521.
×Foy, John Patrick, AO53614.
Frakes, James Fisher, AO25689.
Francis, Howard Champney, AO52666.
×Francis, Roderick Leland, AO46637.
Francis, Tim Benton, AO44757.
Frank, Donald Henry, AO36448.
Frank, Milton, Jr., AO46995.
Frank, Wallace Biddle, AO24922.
Frankosky, James Oliver, AO25460.
Frankovich, Joseph, Jr., AO47779.
Franz, Fred John, AO35329.
Franzel, Robert Thomas, AO47049.
Frarie, Wayne Merill, Jr., AO47333.
Frazier, Edwin Becton, AO46493.
Freeman, David Lloyd, AO36576.
Freese, Ralph Earl, AO23989.
×French, Russell Leroy, AO32991.
Freund, Albert Joseph, AO53446.
Frey, Robert William, AO45050.
×Frick, William Frederick, AO52557.
Fricks, Robert Owen, AO54463.
Friley, Kenneth Owen, AO53508.
Frink, Horace Everett, Jr., AO37009.
Frisbee, John Lee, AO53085.
Froman, Howard William, AO36795.
Frost, Joseph Harold, AO21795.
×Frost, Lyle Gooden, AO52668.
Fry, Howard Jackson, AO54740.
Fry, Robert MacDonald, AO37651.
Fryer, Milton, AO45967.
Fuchs, Marion Julion, AO53382.
Fuhrmeister, Ralph Stream, Jr., AO46331.
Fulcher, Kenneth Marks, AO37140.
Fulcher, Stanley Albert, AO46371.
Fuller, Edwin Wiley, AO36586.
×Fuller, Herbert Kaufman, AO45861.
Fulmer, Harold Glenn, AO36722.
Fulton, Raymond Andy, AO36263.
Funderburk, William Osler, AO52889.
×Funk, Carl Franklin, AO44628.
Furchner, Fred Thomas, AO35074.
×Fussell, James Glen, AO33212.
Futch, Kenneth Harlan, AO47112.
Gaddis, Albert Crawford, AO40399.
Gaff, John Wilson, Jr., AO34997.
Gaffney, George Preston, AO32909.
Gainer, Hubert William, AO44946.
Gaines, Robert Usher, Jr., AO24253.
×Gall, Elmer Charles, Jr., AO45051.
×Gallagher, John Vincent, AO43468.
Gallia, Jay Robert, AO48134.
×Gallup, Edward Francis, Jr., AO44449.
Galt, George Teasley, AO40826.
Gamage, Leonard Alfred, AO52795.
Gammon, Edgar Graham, Jr., AO32943.
Gammon, William John, AO40802.
×Gammon, Wilson Campbell, AO44220.
Gandy, Hilliard Leon, AO46363.
Gardiner, Paul Eugene, AO35460.
×Gardner, Laurence Ernest, AO32523.
Garland, Lloyd Hundley, Jr., AO32772.
Garland, William Carroll, AO24892.
Garland, William James, AO52783.
Garner, Gordon, Jr., AO37056.
Garner, Merritt Gerald, AO37129.
×Garrett, Leslie Fraser, AO33228.
Garrett, Skidmore Neale, AO22372.
Garrett, Thomas Simons 3d, AO26349.
×Garrison, Eskelle Victor, AO43698.
Garvin, Charles Howard, AO24794.
×Garvin, Earl John, AO54106.
×Garvin, Lloyd Clinton, AO37363.
Gaslin, Harold Earl, AO46945.
Gaston, Allen Berry, AO36402.
Gaston, Charles Crain, AO44474.
×Gates, Robert Woodrow, AO46887.
Gatewood, Moses Joseph, Jr. AO25613.
×Gattis, Robert Houston, AO34903.
Gatto, Victor Emmanuel, AO52585.
Gaudiani, Vincent Augustus, Jr., AO26011.
Gault, Charles Edward, AO45364.
Gaumond, Harry Joseph, Jr., AO52343.
Gay, Alex Henry, Jr., AO34465.
×Gaylor, Don Gordon, AO44718.
Gaylord, Donald Andrew, AO37227.
Gaylord, Lester Louis, AO44450.
Gaylord, Maurice Bailey, AO44408.
Gaynos, Nicholaus, AO47390.
Gazzaniga, Louis Anthony, AO54997.
Geanetos, George Stephen, AO44031.
×Geary, Leo Paul, AO35338.
Gebhart, Harold John, AO46979.
Gee, Howard Sherwin, AO47212.
Geer, John Henry, AO33358.
×Geer, Virgil Clyde, AO45632.
×Gelwix, Joe M., AO54963.
Genez, Victor Maurice, AO53687.
×Gentile, Don Salvadore, AO56912.
Gentry, Ralph Patrick, AO33636.
×George, John Louis, AO43796.
×Gerhart, Quinter Paul, AO24130.
Gernert, William Edgar, AO24906.
Ghram, Elmer Floyd, AO46358.
Gibbons, John Phillip, AO37335.
×Gibbons, William Lacey, AO48954.
Giblin, Richard Thomas, AO48037.
Gibson, Dick Finley, AO52807.
×Gibson, Richard Cushing, AO35944.
Gibson, Robert Duane, AO33131.
Gibson, William Herf, AO43973.
Giere, Henry Julian, AO37102.
Giffin, Charles Wallace, Jr., AO47088.
Gifford, George Donald, AO48516.
×Gilbert, John Holman, Jr., AO44552.
Gilbert, Raymond Arthur, AO35461.

Gilbert, Willard Russell, AO23897.
Gilbertson, Merle Jerome, AO36689.
×Gilchrist, William Thomas, AO48460.
Giles, Melvin Curry, AO33423.
Gill, John Edwards, AO43589.
Giller, Edward Bonfoy, AO53825.
×Gillesby, Fred Gearld, AO52907.
Gillespie, Calvin Eugene, AO33906.
×Gillespie, James Woodrow, AO32576.
Gillespie, John Paul, AO34200.
Gillmore, Lawrence John, AO48369.
Gilmore, Byron Harold, AO34820.
×Gilmore, George Washington, Jr., AO52266.
Gilmore, James David, AO53463.
×Gilmore, John Thomas, AO32589.
Gipson, Charles Hoover, AO39205.
Gire, Henry Lewis, AO44267.
Glaenzer, Charles F., AO52237.
Glaser, Leonard Tulare, AO35438.
Gleed, Edward Creston, AO53055.
Glenn, Charles Swyers, AO52791.
Glover, Donald Sheldon, AO35753.
Goddard, Guy Harold, AO23714.
Goddard, Lowell Wesley, AO45857.
Godfrey, Eugene Oakes, AO53804.
Godfrey, Stephen Mellotte, AO48120.
Godley, Lawrence Ely, AO36506.
Godwin, Jasper Lucas, Jr., AO53774.
Goetzke, Kenneth Herman, AO43911.
Goewey, Donald Charles, AO35419.
Goldner, Irving Abraham, AO47750.
×Gonye, Leonard Francis, AO36967.
Gonzalez, Horace Roger, AO34366.
Gooch, Ritchie Belton, AO45030.
Goodell, John Carleton, AO52238.
Goodfleisch, Don Marion, AO33634.
×Goodmanson, Murel Matthew, AO40303.
Goodrich, Earle Arthur, AO35010.
Goodwin, Howard Elton, AO47366.
Goodwin, Vaughn Kirk, AO43855.
Gordon, William Price, Jr., AO32240.
Gorman, John Jay, AO25615.
Gosling, Kenneth Reginald, AO43573.
Goss, Quentin James, AO25527.
Goss, Ralph Russell, AO53404.
Goss, Richard Royston, AO36925.
×Gossett, Ernest Eugene, AO46738.
Gossick, Lee Van, AO40843.
Gotchey, Robert Emett, AO44860.
×Gourley, Harold Harding, AO36634.
Gourley, Theodore Joseph, AO37360.
Govan, Claude Benjamin, AO52857.
Gover, Leroy, AO43882.
×Govocek, Joseph Glenn, AO33398.
Grace, James Dee, AO35953.
Gradwell, Burgess, AO48981.
Grady, William Robert, AO46785.
Graham, Charles Samuel, AO44705.
Graham, Edward, AO44178.
Graham, Gordon Marion, AO34907.
Graham, James Edward, AO43501.
×Graham, John Kessler, AO46396.
×Graham, Marshall Roberts, AO47287.
Gramm, Raymond Norris, AO52900.
Grashoff, William Henry, AO43477.
Grass, William Ellis, AO46035.
Graves, Irwin Lester, AO52390.
×Graves, Needham Warren, AO48234.
×Gravin, Irving Henry, AO43554.
Gravitt, Frank William, AO32631.
Gray, Jay Olin, AO54405.
Gray, Leon Walton, AO44665.
Gray, Lewis Howard, AO54920.
Gray, Russell Earl, AO52250.
×Greathouse, Harry Smith, AO46403.
Green, Charles Haunest, AO44424.
Green, Franklyn Thomas, AO22496.
×Green, Herschel Harper, AO35907.
Green, Louis Alpheus, AO47879.
Green, Norman Eldon, AO36524.
Green, Paul Douglas, AO47664.
Greene, Benjamin Olin, Jr., AO43939.
Greene, Grover Young, AO44921.
Greene, James Barrow, AO53518.
Greene, Russell John, AO44175.
Greene, William James, AO26092.
×Greensides, Lawrence Aubry, AO46820.
Greffet, Charles Vincent, AO47340.
Greger, Jack Joseph, AO52451.
Gregg, William Eugene, AO52464.
Gregory, James Madison, Jr., AO35380.
×Gregory, John Lewis, Jr., AO47044.
Grending, Carl Nelson, AO44744.
Gresham, Walter Vernon, Jr., AO36976.
×Greuter, Herbert Edgar, AO44324.
Grierson, Walter Hayden, AO33821.
Griffin, Charles Webster, AO43566.
×Griffin, Donald Ernest, AO25766.
×Griffin, Edmund Dorr, Jr., AO36963.
Griffin, Harry Norval, AO43966.
Griffin, Julious Columbus, AO43724.
×Griffin, Loyd Dean, AO34443.
Griffith, Frank Todd, AO44918.
Griffith, Frank John, AO47032.
Griffith, Hugh Albert, Jr., AO21797.
Griffith, Ole Curtis, Jr., AO39201.
Griffith, Richard Stanley, AO54243.
×Griffiths, Vincent Edward, Sr., AO40622.
×Grimm, Charles Burton, AO44123.
Grimmer, Philip William, AO32627.
Gromak, Anthony Edward, AO52242.
Grove, James Chisholm, AO52470.
Grow, Clyde L., AO53954.
Grubaugh, Boyd Lee, AO35099.
Grubaugh, Glover Porter, AO44916.
Grubbs, Wallace Elmer, AO53691.
Gruendyke, Richard Nelson, AO45453.
Gruetzemacher, Robert Oliver, AO35620.
Guerin, Merrill Robert, AO47171.
Gueydan, James Edmond, AO33718.
Guider, Herbert Neal, AO44510.
×Guilfoyle, Frank Joseph, AO46933.
Gulino, Vasco Edward, AO54780.
Gullette, Jesse Marcellus, AO44285.
Gunn, James Henry, AO40911.
×Gunn, Raymond Davis, AO54396.
Gustafson, Wayne Albert, AO44962.
Gustaves, Selmer, AO24764.
Gutierrez, Joseph S., AO47671.
Guyton, John Alexander, AO53598.
Guzak, Francis Watson, AO48389.
×Gwinn, John Wesley, Sr., AO44189.
Gwynn, Philip Simms, AO34851.
Haaf, Arthur Herschel, AO45060.
Haas, Chester Roy, AO44900.
Habeck, Carl William, AO44584.
Hackett, James Edward, AO52878.
Hackleman, John Leslie, AO36070.
Hackler, James Franklin, Jr., AO25767.
Hadley, James Alvin, AO47623.
Hadley, John Carl, AO45849.
Hagen, Alfred Dale, AO26105.
Hagin, William Van, AO45955.
Hagreen, Robert John, AO46316.
Hahn, Albert Peter, Jr., AO45156.
Haist, Glade F., AO52554.
Hajek, Raymond Rowland, AO52375.
Hale, Blair, AO36876.
Hale, Frederick Norman, AO48321.
Hale, Richard Eugene, AO45509.
×Hale, William Spencer, AO48160.
Hall, Charles E., AO44392.
×Hall, Charles Edward, AO52357.
Hall, James Newton, AO53089.
Hall, Joseph Andrew, AO40474.
×Hall, Mark Beardsley, AO53359.
Hall, Paul Morgen, AO37304.
Hall, Robert William, AO46059.
Hall, Thomas William, AO40525.
Hall, William Louis, AO40951.
Hallam, Louis Carlyle, AO43692.
×Hallam, Philip Glendon, AO46880.
Hallenbeck, Ralph, Jr., AO26219.
Haller, Roscoe Richard, AO36432.
×Hallmark, John Milton, AO45220.
Halloran, Robert Patrick, AO35337.
Halsey, Fryer Preston, AO33261.
Haltom, Charles Cleveland, AO53668.
Halton, William Timothy, AO35732.
Ham, Stephen Paddock, AO45473.
Hambleton, Bertram Leslie, Jr., AO48377.
Hamel, Albert George, AO48411.
Hamilton, Frank Alexander, AO44561.
Hamilton, George Burton, AO45302.
Hamilton, Herbert Orton, AO44427.
Hamilton, Joseph Coursin, Jr., AO46469.
Hamilton, Joseph Louie, AO25516.
Hamilton, Samuel Davis, Jr., AO33226.
Hamilton, William Merwin, AO48531.
Hamlyn, Raymond Emmett, AO54806.
Hammer, Elmer Heath, Jr., AO46014.
Hammett, George Francis, Jr., AO53956.
Hammond, William, AO52835.
Hancock, James Herman, AO53822.
Haning, William Frees, Jr., AO53362.
Hankin, Abraham, Louis, AO53430.
Hanley, Thomas James 3d, AO24810.
Hannah, George Lafayette, Jr., AO36536.
Hannah, Raymond Clifford, AO46165.
Hannigan, John Francis, AO36704.
Hannley, Vincent Paul, AO44864.
Hansen, Robert Peter, AO43625.
×Hansen, Robert Murdock, AO45601.
×Hansinger, Michael John, AO54450.
Hansley, Frank Woodrow, AO35835.
×Hanson, Robert Wallin, AO47481.
Hanzel, Thomas Charles, AO45165.
Harbour, David Frank, AO34934.
Hardaway, Ben Franklin, Jr., AO24725.
Hardee, Walter Robert, Jr., AO47040.
×Hardin, Ernest Charles, Jr., AO35448.
×Harding, John Barlow, AO35682.
Hardy, Arthur Jackson, Jr., AO47763.
Hardy, Kermit Wayne, AO44859.
×Hardy, William Lamar, AO25659.
Hardzog, Walter Aflin, Jr., AO40886.
Hare, James Clark, AO44929.
Hargrove, Clifford White, AO48829.
Harker, Chester Vernon, AO40973.
Harlow, Harold Frank, AO54867.
Harlow, Paul Norman, AO31590.
Harmon, David Noah, AO34718.
Harper, Harmon Hicks, AO44648.
Harrell, Hunter Hugh, AO52986.
Harrell, John William, Jr., AO24722.
Harrell, Mason Douglas, AO44441.
Harrell, William Hasel, AO44133.
×Harriger, Robert Lee, AO34806.
Harrington, Archibald Allan, AO43919.
Harrington, George Elliott, AO44024.
Harrington, John Daniel, AO44256.
Harrington, Ralph Herman, AO53781.
Harrington, Robert Edward, AO25681.
×Harris, Bert Samuel, AO54782.
Harris, Ernest Arnold, AO35080.
Harris, George Thomas, AO47746.
Harris, Glynn Lovette, AO39037.
Harris, Jesse LeRoy, AO40577.
Harris, Joe Leslie, AO39061.
Harris, Louis Eugene, AO36386.
×Harris, Richard Conant, AO47733.
Harris, Richard Clayton, Jr., AO52595.
Harris, Schuyler Spottswood, AO44253.
×Harris, Shelby Jackson, AO54468.
×Harris, Teague Gray, Jr., AO26132.
Harris, William Fortna, AO36421.
×Harris, William Bruce, AO46305.
Harrison, Morgan Randolph, AO45608.
Harrison, Thomas Daniel, AO25462.
×Harrison, William Franklin, AO46168.
Harrold, Frank James, Jr., AO25934.
×Harshbarger, Elmer Thomas, AO45486.
Hart, Edward John, AO48615.
Hart, Fred Lawrence, AO36915.
×Hart, Malcolm Detraz, AO44592.
Hartbrodt, Frederick Alexander Vincent, AO52326.
Hartless, William Elbert, AO44183.
Hartman, Herbert Arthur, AO46592.
Hartson, Stanley Wallace, AO40351.
×Hartwig, Robert Louis, AO52689.
Harvey, John Francis, AO40888.
Harvey, Julian Arthur, AO35698.
Harwell, James Armour, Jr., AO48188.
×Haselby, Johnnie Vernon, AO46892.
Hass, John A., AO44475.
Hassemer, David Warren, AO24144.
×Hassenmiller, Marshall Griffith, AO44822.
Hasson, Albert Nolan, AO33739.
Hastey, Raymond Lester, AO31966.
Hastings, Vernon Leroy, AO47473.
Hatch, Lewis Marvin, AO46456.
Hatcher, Nolan Creamer, AO46836.
×Hathaway, William Horton, Jr., AO40459.
Hatten, Frank, AO53000.
Hause, Milton Maynard, AO45127.
Hauser, Elmer Fred, AO36273.

×Hawes, Emil Franklin, AO23540.
Hawk, Keith Calvin, AO33899.
Hawkens, Edward Albert, AO44393.
×Hawkins, Larry Lowell, AO35297.
Hawkins, Steedly Pittman, AO54567.
Hawkins, William Brevard, Jr., AO35387.
Hay, Frank Olmsted, AO32855.
Hayden, James Hilary, AO47482.
Haydon, Edward Ross, AO48056.
Hayes, James Marvin, Jr., AO36018.
×Hayes, William Donn, Jr., AO25312.
Haynes, Nathan Clifford, Jr., AO35590.
Haynie, Frank Marion, AO37340.
Hays, John Bennett, AO43771.
Hays, Nathan Bourne, AO24127.
Hays, Norman Pershing, AO40686.
Hays, Reginald Lee, AO36210.
Haywood, Floyd Harold, Jr., AO54561.
Heaberg, James Hugh, AO47288.
Head, Willie Chester, Jr., AO36028.
×Heald, Edgar Henry, AO44155.
Heard, Wade Coleman, AO44812.
Hearn, James Andrew, AO48671.
×Heck, Frederick Brockway, AO40628.
Heck, Joseph Denis, Jr., AO45255.
Hedlund, Bryce Albin, AO46716.
Hedrick, Walter Russell, Jr., AO40941.
Hedrick, Wyatt Smith, AO52460.
Heene, Fred Lewis, AO44035.
Hefling, Robert James, AO40483.
Hegenberger, Albert Carl, AO26293.
×Hegseth, Orville Donald, AO47221.
×Hegyessy, Harold Maurice, Jr., AO47213.
Hehn, Earl LeRoy, Jr., AO25532.
Heikkinen, Risto Mikael, AO33578.
×Heino, Alfred Veikko, AO45107.
×Heiser, Sherwood Watkins, AO46553.
Heisler, William Foster, AO36145.
×Helfort, Albert Francis, AO44040.
Heller, Edwin Lewis, AO37105.
Hellriegel, William Charles, AO46872.
Helmantoler, Willis Lyndell, AO47933.
Helmick, George Herbert, 2d, AO46349.
Hemminger, George Carl, AO33331.
×Hemphill, Robert Frederick, AO36038.
Hemsley, Richard Tilghman, 3d, AO25859.
×Hench, Ralph Vale, AO35298.
Henderson, Walton Bronlowe, AO52818.
Henderson, William Dalton, AO44279.
Hendry, Augustus Mallory, Jr., AO46874.
×Henington, Henry Morell, AO48240.
Hennessy, Robert John, AO43985.
Henney, Max William, AO47493.
Hennigan, James Edward, AO45126.
×Henry, John Gilbert, AO48488.
×Henslee, Lem Paul, AO54420.
Hensler, John Anthony, AO33678.
Hensley, Gaston Means, AO53797.
×Hensley, Joseph Woodrow, AO32121.
Henss, Arthur Charles, Jr., AO40435.
×Heran, Paul James, AO44120.
Herbert, John James, Jr., AO54897.
Hereford, Joseph Pierce, AO45386.
Hergert, Thomas Malcolm, AO33871.
Herman, Boyd Francis, AO35660.
Herrick, Harold James, AO46417.
×Herring, John Henry, Jr., AO36019.
×Herring, Wilber Gunton, AO45901.
×Herrington, John Athol, AO52714.
Herrington, Russel McKee, Jr., AO25589.
×Hershenow, William John, Jr., AO24069.
Hertel, Edward Jerome, AO26230.
Herway, Loren Worrell, AO36637.
Hesler, Robert Austin, AO32992.
Hess, Frederick William, AO45119.
Hester, Thomas Jefferson, AO40772.
Hetzel, Robert Lewis, AO53496.
Hewett, Henry Baker, AO35915.
Hewitt, John Arnot, AO24667.
×Hey, Winston Snowden, AO35437.
Heydon, Thomas Aloysius, AO45131.
Hibbits, Francis Leonard, AO52236.
×Hibner, Edwin Lee, AO47327.
Hickey, John Joseph, AO49052.
Hickman, David Elwyn, Jr., AO44138.
×Hicks, Jefferson Pascal, AO52673.
Hicks, Roger Lee, Jr., AO36053.
Higginbotham, Harold Kenneth, AO52612.
Higgins, Donald Hugh, Jr., AO36850.
×Higgs, Richard Ellis, AO52732.
Highley, John Norgrove, AO40739.
Hight, James Lester, AO52649.
Hill, Albert Ray, AO44202.
Hill, Alvin James, AO53844.
Hill, Charles Henry, AO44976.
Hill, Clayton Craig, AO46996.
Hill, Jesse Gorham, AO31998.
×Hill, John Michiel, AO35071.
Hill, John Theodore, AO44763.
Hill, Landon Prescott, AO46548.
Hill, Robert John, AO45298.
Hill, William Campbell, AO47483.
Hill, Yates Michel, AO24668.
×Hiller, Martin William, AO52170.
Hillery, Edward Gerald, AO21615.
Hilley, William Allen, AO43622.
Hills, Kenneth Bruce, AO43633.
Hillstrom, Carl Milton, AO40908.
Hillyer, Roy Noyes, Jr., AO34462.
Hilton, James Bryce, AO54481.
Hinchee, Robert Lee, AO40753.
×Hinchliff, Edward Everette, AO44331.
×Hinckley, Robert Henry, Jr., AO24889.
×Hinds, Ernest, AO26181.
Hines, Wilfred Edward, AO54129.
Hinkel, George Marne, AO47771.
Hinkle, Carl Columbus, Jr., AO24829.
Hinkle, Wayne Keith, AO47309.
×Hinton, Joe Kinney, AO45906.
Hippenstiel, Charles Robin, AO45003.
×Hively, Howard Davis, AO33270.
Hnatio, Myron Mack, AO47896.
Hobaugh, John Henry, AO47334.
Hobbs, Gregory James, AO44251.
Hochstetter, Herman Eugene, AO54342.
Hodge, Dexter Lawrence, AO35432.
Hodges, Charles Grady, Jr., AO44350.
Hodges, Kenneth Sherrill, AO35030.
×Hodges, Lester Hall, AO52373.
Hoefler, George Edward, AO47238.
Hoeper, Paul Edward, AO46891.
Hoermann, Francis James, AO53538.
Hoewing, Ralph Clair, AO33582.
Hofmann, Thomas Charles, AO39272.
×Hoffman, George Pat, AO43725.
Hoffman, Harold Jefferson, AO40534.
Hoffman, John Matternas, AO35770.
Hoffman, Robert William, AO26026.
Hoffman, Theodore Caldwell, AO34445.
Hoffman, Carl David, AO46034.
Hoffmann, Robert Munroe, AO46679.
Hoffson, Wilbraham Arthur, AO44309.
Hofmann, Thomas Charles, AO39272.
Hogan, Henry Leon 3d, AO26143.
Hogg, Robert, AO43634.
Hoggatt, James Laure, AO36271.
Hohlaus, Kenneth Herman, AO45136.
×Hoks, Robert Leo, AO52230.
×Hoit, Zane Moses, AO44724.
Hoke, Peter Joseph, AO44550.
Holbury, Robert J., AO48443.
Holcombe, Richard Eugene, AO53492.
×Holden, Paul Cole, AO43636.
Holderness, Arthur William, Jr., AO25863.
Holdredge, Fred Ernest, Jr., AO24763.
Holland, Chaz Max, AO47484.
Hollier, Frederick Frank, Jr., AO44043.
Holman, Alvin Russell, AO46839.
Holmes, Capers Andrews, Jr., AO45525.
Holmes, Francis Sieg, Jr., AO84730.
Holmes, Merrill Dennis, AO43762.
×Holmes, Robert Greenwood, AO52422.
Holub, Richard Cecil-Adolph, AO48779.
×Hood, John Robinson, Jr., AO34958.
Hook, Leo, AO53377.
Hoover, Edward Franklin, Jr., AO23274.
Hoover, John Ralph, AO48001.
×Horne, Claude Gideon, AO54072.
Horne, John Erwin, AO46175.
Hornsby, Joseph D., AO47024.
Horridge, Richard Malcolm, AO24657.
Horton, Charles Wesley, Jr., AO31937.
Horvath, John, AO40370.
Hosman, Richard Sutton, AO34673.
Hostler, Charles Warren, AO53722.
Hotte, Eugene Theodore, AO45633.
Hough, Luther Walker, Jr., AO26307.
×Hounshell, Claude Eugene, AO52390.
×House, A. T., Jr., AO35394.
House, Richard Arthur, AO24786.
Houston, William Marshall, AO45875.
Hovatter, Elbert Troy, AO37069.
Hovde, William Johnston, AO25753.
Hovik, Clifford Selmer, AO34351.
Howard, Homer Bruce, AO33759.
Howard, James Paul, AO48185.
×Howat, Kenneth Walter, AO53973.
Howe, Charles William, AO39228.
Howe, Everitt Weir, AO52779.
×Howell, Ernest Melville, AO33251.
Howell, Henry Randolph, Jr., AO39163.
Howell, John Richard, AO45133.
Howell, Sylvanus Thaddeus, Jr., AO39298.
Howell, Winfred Dennis, AO46317.
Howenstine, Kenneth K., AO34181.
Howes, Francis Bradford, Jr., AO35468.
Howie, Loren Donald, AO45858.
Howland, Clark Boyden, AO32245.
Howle, Robert Paul, Jr., AO46923.
Howton, Harry Gwin, AO54032.
Hoyt, Robert Franklin, AO48751.
Hozier, George Chambers, AO24662.
Huau, Joseph Hipolito, Jr., AO26099.
×Hubbard, Edwin William, AO45501.
Hubbard, Raymond Marvin, AO40248.
×Hudson, Jere Howard, AO48678.
Hudson, John Bell, AO26237.
Hudson, John Henry, AO43950.
Hudson, Roland Lee, AO45898.
Hudson, Ulin Lee, AO25995.
Hudson, William Lee, AO45101.
Hueners, George William, AO47050.
Huey, Stanley George, AO25313.
Huffaker, Kenneth Ellsworth, AO32708.
×Huffman, Roy Edward, AO46172.
×Huggins, Charles Augustus, AO40458.
Hughel, George Kinley, AO35734.
Hughes, Arden Boyd, AO47861.
Hughes, Charles Edwin, AO47498.
Hughes, George Denny, AO24858.
×Hughes, Herschel Dement, AO26216.
Hughes, Maurice Laudelle, AO36608.
Hughes, Robert Bernard, AO45383.
Huie, Perry Len, AO36133.
×Hull, Arnold Robert, AO46614.
Hull, George Roswell, AO36649.
×Hull, James Jacob, AO44769.
Hull, Robert Richard, AO46094.
Humphres, Earl Cranston, AO45186.
Humphries, Donald Harrison, AO34495.
Hunn, Spencer Simmons, AO47837.
×Hunner, Paul Charles, AO43565.
Hunsaker, Ben Wightman, AO33637.
Hunt, Earl Gilbert, AO52697.
Hunt, Edward Herman, AO43559.
Hunt, Gilbert Wayne, AO44207.
Hunt, Marvin Louis, AO45987.
×Hunt, Robert Fletcher, Jr., AO43623.
×Hunt, Seaborn McDonald, AO44642.
×Hunter, Floyd Williams, Jr., AO35496.
Hunter, James Heggie, AO44829.
Hunter, James DeCourcy, AO47759.
×Hunter, Russell Bruce, AO52270.
Hunter, William Campbell, AO52196.
Hunter, William Austin, AO35867.
×Huntley, James Creelman, AO25802.
Huntley, William Henry, Jr., AO46391.
Hurd, Harlan Francis, AO44137.
Hurley, Edward Phillip, AO44216.
Hurley, Paul Joseph, AO26290.
Hurr, Arthur Pershing, AO25790.
Hurt, Wilbur Wellington, AO46021.
Huskey, Homer A., AO44893.
Huston, Laverne Francis, Jr., AO35747.
Huston, Sherman Leroy, AO44055.
Hustek, William Stephen, AO44637.
Hutchens, David Dale, AO37098.
Hutcheson, George Washington, Jr., AO49020.
Hutcheson, Jack, AO44398.
Hutchinson, Leonard Hugh, AO45624.
×Hutchison, Jacob Anderson, AO35397.
Hutchison, Leroy Clifford, AO33619.
Hutton, Leonard Jackson, AO34611.
Hutton, Terry George, AO52395.
Hyde, Frederick Weston, AO24923.
Hyde, Thomas Cecil, AO46977.
Hyder, Ralph Charles, AO53042.
×Hynes, Richard Joseph, AO25596.
×Hyslop, William Arthur, AO44387.
Imig, Paul Jacob, AO32835.
Ingham, George Howard, AO25954.
×Ingram, James Woodrow, AO45719.

Irby, John Jackson, AO34032.
Ireland, Clare Thompson, Jr., AO26006.
Ireland, Melvin J., AO44656.
Irons, Stanley Wilson, AO48288.
Irwin, Robert Bigelow, AO34315.
Isaacson, Clayton Merlin, AO36436.
Iverson, Leroy Cook, AO46654.
Iverson, Richard Junius, AO36532.
×Ivey, Maurey Herbert, AO44754.
Ivey, William Glenn, AO34632.
Ivey, William Holder, AO46306.
Jablecki, Leon Stanyslaw, AO45140.
Jack, Chester Arthur, AO35547.
Jack, William Alexander, AO37318.
Jackson, Arthur Copeland, Jr., AO47655.
Jackson, Arthur Vincent, AO25678.
Jackson, Elwin Henry, AO46018.
Jackson, Frank Dale, AO47847.
Jackson, Howard Edward, AO35429.
Jackson, Loren Elwood, AO53039.
Jackson, Melvin Thomas, AO54465.
×Jackson, William Cole, AO47449.
Jacobs, Herbert Milton, AO44788.
Jacobsen, Otto Frederick, AO39123.
Jacobsen, William Lee, AO48456.
Jacobson, Alden Dale, AO39067.
×Jacobson, James Louis, AO39040.
Jaegers, Alphonse William, AO52679.
James, Harold Clinton, AO44978.
×James, Newton Elder, AO22153.
×Jamison, Donald Calvin, AO53126.
Jamison, Eldon Maxwell, AO48449.
Jarman, James Theodore, AO45950.
×Jarratt, Jerry Devereux, AO48142.
×Jarrell, Robert Edward, AO44703.
×Jarvie, William John, AO53196.
×Jaynes, Jay, AO24813.
Jaynes, Roy Arnold, AO40582.
Jefferson, Harold Dakan, AO53505.
Jeffrey, Arthur Ferdinand, AO35893.
Jella, Leonard L., AO33859.
Jemmott, Herbert Kitchner Burton, AO32960.
Jenkins, Everett Kelley, Jr., AO40768.
Jenkins, Leaton Elbert, AO32184.
Jenkins, Ralph Clark, AO46734.
Jenkins, Robert Maxwell, Jr., AO52909.
×Jennings, Clifton Victor, AO44999.
×Jennings, Elton Jordan, AO33223.
Jens, Henry Paul, AO55062.
×Jensen, Dale Henry, AO45330.
Jensen, Ralph Soren, AO43835.
×Jensen, Ralph Albert, AO53169.
Jernigan, William Le Roy, AO46384.
Jespersen, Glenn Edward, AO36841.
Jindrich, Leonard Joseph, AO34550.
Jobanek, Wilbur Lewis, AO46513.
Jobe, Robert Cleveland, AO47685.
Johansen, Ernest Wortman, AO52786.
John, Ernest Falcon, AO41065.
Johns, Howard George, AO39284.
×Johns, Robert Gordon, AO32132.
Johnson, Andrew Everett, AO33500.
Johnson, Arnold Rudolph, AO44209.
Johnson, Clarence Trevitt, Jr., AO46359.
Johnson, Charles William, AO35382.
Johnson, Charles Wilburn, Jr., AO46835.
Johnson, Darwin Allen, AO44141.
Johnson, Frank Edward, AO46005.
Johnson, George Edward, AO32012.
Johnson, George Marvin, Jr., AO47029.
Johnson, Gerald Walter, AO35869.
Johnson, Grove Charles, AO53856.
Johnson, Howard, AO52440.
Johnson, James Robert, AO52825.
Johnson, James Troy, AO36295.
Johnson, Joseph Glen, Jr., AO48336.
Johnson, Leland Warren, AO34000.
Johnson, Lester Vernon, Jr., AO46101.
Johnson, Lycurgus Waldemar, AO44633.
Johnson, Merle, AO48622.
Johnson, Neil Richard, AO35514.
Johnson, Paul Esrom, Jr., AO46470.
×Johnson, Ralph Albert, AO48372.
Johnson, Ralph Arthur, AO36280.
Johnson, Richard Lee, AO36651.
Johnson, Robert Harland, AO36738.
Johnson, Robert Jay David, AO37150.
Johnson, Timothy Robert, AO36008.
×Johnson, William Melbourne, AO40493.
Johnston, Charles Harvey, AO44499.
Johnston, George Henry, AO35502.
Johnston, Henry Randolph, AO44337.
Johnston, James Eston, AO44879.
Johnston, Robert Donald, AO35610.
×Johnston, Robert Edward, AO44767.
Johnston, Robert Rex, AO47567.
Johnston, Warren Montgomery, AO32625.
×Johnston, William Edward, AO52243.
Joiner, Reese William, AO32699.
Jolissaint, John Mire, AO34890.
×Jolly, David Chester, AO53517.
Jolly, Hoyt Avery, Jr., AO45148.
×Jones, Allen Newton, Jr., AO43935.
×Jones, David Charles, AO48454.
Jones, David Reese, AO53479.
Jones, Dorrie Edwin, AO35938.
Jones, Felix Henley, Jr., AO34240.
Jones, Frank George, AO34165.
Jones, George Robbins, AO43948.
Jones, Grafton Kenneth, AO44965.
Jones, Hubert, Ledyard, AO44611.
Jones, Jack Jean, AO25481.
Jones, James Marion, AO52789.
Jones, John, Jr., AO44541.
×Jones, Joseph Anthony, AO44615.
×Jones, Lyle Merritt, AO46199.
Jones, Oval Wilbert, AO36627.
Jones, Richard Gordon, AO33366.
Jones, Russell Park, AO25098.
Jones, Thomas Quaite, Jr., AO45679.
Jones, Waldo Brigham, AO50465.
Jones, William Dibrell, AO45105.
Jones, William Joseph, AO35931.
Jones, William Orville, AO46110.
Jones, William Thomas, AO48049.
×Joos, Walter James, AO33186.
Joram, Louis Henry, AO47723.
Jordan, Hugh Fagan, AO25771.
Jordan, James Emmette, Jr., AO44351.
Jordan, Ralph Schaffer, AO52341.
Jordan, Sam Peal, AO34679.
Jordan, Wallace Robert, AO33819.
Jorgensen, Gerald Richard, AO47033.
×Jory, Jesse Frederick, AO46867.
Jose, Elmer Howard, Jr., AO53477.
Joseph, Franklin Arthur, AO52364.
Joyal, Philip Eugene, AO46354.
Joyce, Thomas Byron, AO53609.
Judy, James Donald, AO48448.
Kafer, Ernest Emanuel, AO52718.
Kalinski, Felix Andrew, AO26070.
Kandel, Alfred, AO35943.
×Kandel, Edward Robert, AO52195.
×Kane, Francis Xavier, AO25524.
Kane, Harold Edwin, AO47571.
Kane, Raymond Joseph, Jr., AO47080.
Kappeler, Frank Albert, AO43749.
Karably, Louis Stephen, AO33335.
×Karas, Christopher James, AO33402.
Karlin, Francis Joseph, AO46048.
Karsokas, Benjamin Anthony, AO25289.
Kaspereen, Frank Robert, AO53755.
×Kaufman, Alfred, AO46439.
Kaufman, John Eugene, AO44300.
×Kaufmann, Leonard, Jr., AO36446.
Kay, Charles Woodford, AO43521.
Kay, Kenneth Edmond, AO52458.
Kay, Marvin Edwards, AO35803.
Keating, Philip James, AO48478.
Keck, James Moulton, AO26002.
Keefe, Thomas William, Jr., AO35042.
Keefer, Norman Jay, Jr., AO26332.
Keefer, William Edward, AO35607.
Keeling, Gerald Grahm, AO53766.
×Keene, John Hardtner, AO36458.
Kegeles, Sidney Albert, AO44359.
Kehrer, Kenneth, AO43987.
Keim, Robert Phillip, AO48375.
Keithley, George James, AO33265.
Kelakos, Charles George, AO52555.
×Kell, John William, AO44797.
Kellams, Clinton Moore, AO32780.
Keller, John Crawford, Jr., AO47510.
Keller, Robert Weidman, AO36286.
Keller, Stevens, AO52514.
×Kellerman, Jack Hickman, AO52710.
Kelley, Edward Gaylor, AO48287.
Kelley, Glenn Davis, AO52476.
×Kelley, Gordon Milford, AO46029.
Kelley, Keith Patrick, AO53394.
×Kelley, Vernon Bradley, Jr., AO48777.
Kelley, Wendell James, AO46200.
Kellis, James George Loisos, AO47365.
Kellogg, David Neel, AO46908.
Kellum, George Glenn, Jr., AO43851.
×Kelly, Clyde Raymond, AO46977.
Kelly, Converse Beach, AO35350.
Kelly, Dennis Peter, Jr., AO45251.
×Kelly, Patrick Ledoux, AO54618.
×Kelly, Robert Lorenzo, AO36384.
Kelly, Thomas Clyde, AO34068.
Kelly, Walter Earle, AO53668.
Kelso, Charles Wayne, AO44378.
Kendall, Jimmie Winstead, AO45019.
Kendall, Paul Cross, AO46297.
×Kendig, Robert Elwood, AO35916.
×Kendrick, Bobbie Fae, AO47102.
Kendrick, Donald, AO44838.
Kendrick, James Bain, AO46088.
×Kennedy, Elmore McIntosh, Jr., AO44699.
Kennedy, William John, AO24106.
Kenney, Paul Harrington, AO39287.
Kent, Herbert William, AO34829.
×Kenworthy, Charles Clifford, Jr., AO46150.
×Keppler, Charles Nelson, AO46006.
Kerig, John Arthur, Jr., AO25551.
×Kerner, Robert Francis, AO43909.
Kernan, Robert Mills, AO52594.
Kerr, Ernest Lee, AO32739.
Kerr, Jean Louth, Jr., AO40488.
Kerr, Kenneth James, AO39239.
Key, William David, AO35557.
Keyes, Lawrence James, AO52755.
×Keyser, William Russell, AO52830.
Kiechel, Walter, Jr., AO46272.
×Kiegel, Albert Charles, AO44783.
Kilgore, Bishop Marvin, AO48239.
Killen, Leo William, AO35379.
Kilpatrick, William Joseph, Jr., AO25940.
Kimball, Clarke Charles, AO47494.
Kimbell, Earl Shadden, AO35317.
Kimsey, James Wayne, AO36909.
Kinard, Clinton Roy, AO47749.
Kincannon, Francis Chase, AO40695.
Kinder, Albert Earl, Jr., AO35739.
Kindig, Roger Edward, AO40892.
×King, Benjamin Hardin, AO48046.
King, Donald Harrison, AO35731.
King, Edward Calvin, Jr., AO36828.
King, James Porter, AO33365.
King, James William, AO36297.
King, John Rene, AO47233.
King, Walter Syler, AO37338.
×King, William Gregg, Jr., AO53631.
Kinney, George Romanta, AO25779.
Kinney, George Warren, AO35055.
×Kirby, Burton Moore, AO43624.
×Kirby, Edward Frank, AO40498.
×Kirby, Henry Hodgen, Jr., AO25735.
Kirby, Robert Leslie, AO46109.
Kirkendall, James Frederick, AO36294.
×Kirkpatrick, Charles Eugene, AO47257.
Kirkpatrick, Marshall Armine, AO32430.
Kiser, Ralph Wilson, AO48211.
×Kissick, Luther Cleveland, Jr., AO48149.
Klam, Louis Bernard, AO40944.
Klein, Raymond Paul, AO35367.
Klette, Immanuel John, AO36718.
×Klingbiel, Sherman Fredrick, AO40558.
×Klopfenstein, Alba Berten, AO44206.
Kluever, Arnold Frederick Adolph, AO22413.
Knabel, Lewis Julius, AO44867.
Knapp, Joseph Martin, AO46747.
Knapp, Robert Harold, AO54366.
×Knaus, John Vincent, AO36381.
Knepper, Frank Bernard, Jr., AO46229.
Knight, Archie Joyce, AO23236.
Knight, John Richard, AO23321.
×Knight, Perry Leroy, AO44575.
×Knoll, Jasper George, AO52482.
Knowles, Kenyon Leroy, AO52404.
×Knox, George Levi, AO35427.
Knox, Glen Edward, AO47732.
Koch, Harry Eugene, AO35951.
Kochel, Michael Joseph, AO44940.
Koehler, Leonard Frederick, AO48242.
Koehne, George Henry, Jr., AO45852.
×Koenig, Perier Arnold, AO43734.
Koenig, Sebastian Bernard, AO37264.
Koger, Harlis Raymond, AO44493.

Kohnert, Harold Alfred, AO47423.
×Kolander, Conrad Carl, Jr., AO46181.
×Kolodziejczyk, Walter John, AO54488.
×Kolpin, Shirley Andrew, AO32685.
Kolstad, Robert Francis, AO36303.
Kommers, William Westover, AO52590.
×Konin, David Harry, AO44777.
×Konopacki, Hubert John, AO22471.
Koontz, Thomas Gale, AO52388.
×Kortemeyer, Henry Alvin, AO47827.
×Koser, Jack Donald, AO34385.
Koszarek, Frank Andrew, AO52773.
Koval, Andrew Edward, AO47952.
Kowtko, Nicholas, AO44944.
×Krafka, Edward, AO52754.
Kraft, Eugene John, AO52619.
Kramer, Robert Herman, AO46782.
×Kramp, Joseph John, AO33135.
Kraus, Glenn Richard, AO47928.
Kraus, James Christian, AO48541.
×Kraus, Russell Bernhardt, AO44796.
Krause, George Joseph, AO54231.
Krause, Harris F., AO44687.
Krause, Lester Livingstone, Jr., AO35331.
Krebs, Laurence Francis, AO45170.
Kreidler, Howard Everett, AO36405.
×Kremer, Emil Albert, AO47453.
Kremer, Harry Darwin, Jr., AO52680.
Krogh, Laurence Bertram, AO44366.
Kronauer, Clifford John, Jr., AO40764.
Kruge, William Arthur, AO52730.
Kucheman, Henry Bernard, Jr., AO35596.
Kullman, John Roger, AO26220.
Kuntz, Chester Harlan, AO45361.
Kurowski, Walter Chester, AO52793.
Kursar, August, AO33569.
Kurz, Albert Adam, AO53543.
Kyer, Fred Earl, AO46126.
Kyle, William Donald, Jr., AO25780.
Kyzer, David Arthur, AO46518.
LaBarre, Louis Jay, AO33785.
LaCroix, Lucius George, AO53834.
Lamarre, Francis Harold, AO52547.
×Lavier, Eugene Clark, AO33243.
Lack, Wendell Douglas, AO52881.
Lacombe, Raymond Joseph, AO44243.
Lacy, Robert Ernest, AO25632.
Ladd, Chester Reed, AO24821.
Lafko, John William, AO36123.
Laitos, Jan Milan, AO40455.
Lamb, Hal William, AO47690.
Lamback, Charles Hett, AO44241.
Lambert, Floyd Aubrey, AO32129.
Lame, Roland Clayton, AO46597.
Lamm, Louis Joseph, AO40819.
Lamontagne, Ralph Stuart, AO48301.
Lancaster, Hartwell Charles, AO53835.
Lancaster, James William, AO34541.
Land, William Mordecai, Jr., AO45755.
Landry, Matthew Andrew, AO44308.
Landwehr, Virgil Henry, AO44895.
Lane, Albert Lossen, Jr., AO25724.
Lane, James Russell, AO53219.
Lanford, William Archibald, AO25178.
Langdale, Robert Hammel, AO34921.
×Langford, Karl Albert, AO44108.
×Langford, Robert Irving, AO53418.
Langley, Julius Roger, AO47276.
Langley, Samuel Firth, AO31906.
Lanning, George Richard, AO44514.
×Lanzoni, Silvio Disidero, AO46611.
Larkin, Robert Thomas, AO48170.
Larowe, John Simon, AO40472.
×Larrabee, Vance Henry, AO53313.
Larrick, Percie James, AO46462.
Larsen, William Arthur, AO36725.
Larson, Edwin Cecil, AO43871.
Larson, Harold Bert, AO35824.
Larson, Harold Jacobson, AO35423.
Larson, James Russell, AO48792.
Lash, Robert Louis, AO43467.
Lasly, Walter D., AO33019.
Latane, David Eaton, AO33390.
Latham, William Roberts, Jr., AO52729.
Latham, Allan Adale, AO53270.
Lathan, Noel Olin Elder, AO44495.
Lathrop, Neil Hill, AO48847.
Latson, Harvey Haroldson, Jr., AO25953.
×Laun, Wirt Adams, Jr., AO40913.
Laurents, Robert Blackburn, AO47258.
×Lavens, William Louis, AO35775.
Lawler, John Dean, AO47969.
Lawler, John Francis, AO52849.
Lawley, William Robert, Jr., AO37247.
Lawrence, Preston Herbert, AO48698.
Lawson, George Asbury, AO46605.
Lawton, Kenneth, AO44523.
Layhee, Harold Franklin, AO36469.
×Lazenby, James Elmer, AO40624.
LeFebre, Frederick Herman, AO36282.
Leach, George, AO33371.
Leaf, Charles Clay, AO54606.
Leahy, Edward David, AO46146.
Leary, Richard Edwin, AO35767.
Leaverton, George Buehler, AO35668.
Leavitt, William Job, AO43788.
Lebetter, Henry Franklin, Jr., AO34858.
Ledford, Otto Clarence, AO40713.
Lee, Carl Cris, AO46374.
Lee, Donald Edgar, AO56900.
Lee, Harold George, AO52885.
Lee, Orville Imonial, AO44406.
×Lee, William Wilson, AO47736.
Leet, Jonathan, AO32445.
Leetch, Donald Gordon, AO45139.
×Legg, Oliver Morton, AO25109.
×Legg, Paul Ashton, AO45659.
Lemley, Samuel Arthur, AO36058.
Lemme, William Philip, AO46204.
Lemming, Joseph Lawrence, Jr., AO37158.
Lemons, Joseph Pascal, AO52577.
Lenfest, Charles William, AO25478.
Lennox, Weston Monroe, AO39147.
Leverette, William Lawrence, AO38962
Levy, Robert Maurice, AO46989.
×Lewellen, Roger Merton, AO44515.
×Lewis, Armit William, AO46719.
Lewis, Charles Daniel, AO34807.
Lewis, Dwight Francis, AO43549.
Lewis, Glen, Jr., AO45968.
Lewis, Leo Coxwell, AO48509.
×Lewis, Richard Calvin, AO46367.
Lewis, Samuel Henry, AO32359.
Lewis, William Charles, AO46373.
Lewis, William Eugene, AO25728.
×Libbert, John Edward, AO47467.
Libbey, Richard Bell, AO46587.
Lichter, Carl Jerome, AO43878.
Lillard, James Warren, Jr., AO34316.
Lilley, Earl Amzi, AO49070.
Lilliedoll, Jarrold Donath, AO37151.
×Lind, Harold August, AO44114.
Lind, Marcel, AO32880.
Lindberg, Carl Donald, AO48547.
Lindberg, James Oscar, AO35752.
Lindell, Keith Gordon, AO25442.
Lindenmeyer, John Henry, AO44264.
Lindsay, Andrew Gowen, AO44689.
Lingo, Jack Wood, AO35644.
Linko, George Andrew, AO40513.
Linkous, William Lafayette, AO44338.
Linton, John Harvey, AO25828.
Lipp, James Pershing, AO46073.
×Lippard, John Albert, AO45764.
Lisack, John P., AO36601.
Lisecki, John Richard, AO44257.
×Liston, Walter Fillmore, AO52424.
×Little, Edward Leo, AO52931.
×Little, Edwin Loren, AO37191.
Little, James Walter, AO35378.
Little, John Preston, AO44470.
Livingston, Robert Paul, AO35966.
Locher, James Rend, Jr., AO33814.
Lockard, Chancy Hoyt, AO36041.
Lockhart, Russell Durward, AO44886.
Lockman, Daniel Barkley, AO43791.
Loftus, Joseph Francis, AO45031.
Lollar, Clarence La Verne, AO35102.
Long, Alan Guy, AO44573.
Long, Albert Ray, AO35403.
Long, Benjamin Franklin, AO35908.
Long, George Edward, AO47239.
Long, Joseph Edward, AO46422.
Long, Maurice George, AO36683.
Longino, Dick Randolph, Jr., AO43938
×Loomis, Richard Edward, AO33204.
Loughran, Harold Ray, AO45041.
Loughry, Robert Johnson, AO53536.
×Love, Thomas McAdoo, AO26051.
Lovell, Carl Erwin, AO49086.
×Lovett, John Rossignol, AO25788.
×Lovette, James Kimble, AO44185.
Loving, Lee Wall, AO52431.
Low, Andrew Stevenson, Jr., AO24734.
×Lowe, Jessup David, AO25649.
Lowell, Marlan Erwin, AO47608.
Lown, Franklin David, Jr., AO35666.
×Lozito, Vincent James, AO48764.
Lube, Harold Arthur, AO45541.
Lucas, Anthony Dean, AO47078.
Lucas, George Garland, AO44254.
Lucas, Henry Edward, AO35580.
Lucas, Lee Ronald, AO37316.
Lucas, Noel Alex, AO44468.
×Lucia, Raymond William, AO53076.
×Lucich, Stanley, AO36899.
Luck, Ellis Chester, AO52173.
Luckey, Michael Arthur, AO47036.
Ludwig, George Henry, AO45643.
×Luehring, Verl Dean, AO46113.
×Lueke, Kenneth Lincoln, AO44890.
Lulejian, Norair Melkon, AO43481.
Lumley, Jack Toupain, AO47675.
Lumpkin, William Hiram, AO44574.
Lunceford, Sigmon Austin, AO34985.
×Lund, Theodore Karl, AO52197.
Lundak, Edward Everett, AO32722.
Lundby, Roland Odell, AO46332.
Lundin, Robert Lloyd, AO49043.
Lupear, Cornell John, AO46427.
Lusby, Perry Minor, AO54728.
Lutman, Charles Carroll, AO36006.
Luts, John, AO52530.
Lutton, Lyle David, Jr., AO52490.
Lyman, Lawrence Roger, AO47941.
Lynch, Robert James, AO25414.
Lynde, Glyndon Lloyd, AO44384.
Lynn, Roland Raleigh, AO47766.
Lyon, Arthur Benjamin, Jr., AO46107.
×Lyon, Aubrey Glenn, AO36762.
Lyons, Charles Maxwell, AO43907.
×Lyons, James Thompson, AO52543.
×Lyons, Ralph, AO44811.
Maas, Charles Fundin, AO43999.
MacDonald, James William, AO44807.
×MacDonald, William Rees, AO48773.
MacGregor, Wallace Fletcher, AO44582.
MacKay, Neill Camp, AO35498.
MacNeill, Edward Henry, AO48739.
MacTaggart, Irving Paul, AO52448.
Macey, William Henry, AO32938.
×Machosek, John Joseph, AO52908.
Macklin, John DeWalt, Jr., AO40860.
Madeley, Arthur Claude, Jr., AO47059.
×Madison, Gayle Eugene, AO26151.
Madsen, Frank Martin, Jr., AO48717.
×Madsen, George Wessell, AO44766.
Maffry, Richard Wood, AO24799.
Magee, Ernest Maurice, AO44107.
Magee, William Francis, AO49099.
×Maggart, Robert Edward, AO36444.
Magrill, Arthur Edwin, AO44513.
Maher, William LeRoy, AO46365.
Mahon, August Charles, AO52865.
Mahone, John Rudd, Jr., AO41034.
×Mahurin, Walker Melville, AO35900.
Maiersperger, Walter Paul, AO45079.
×Malitz, Charles Clarence, Jr., AO54010.
Mallett, John Homer, AO53871.
Malone, Frank Cletis, AO46039.
Maloney, Edward James, AO44905.
Maloney, William Ralph, AO37003.
Maloney, Robert Seton, Jr., AO25521.
Manbeck, Lester Ernest, AO36336.
Manda, Francis Stewart, AO36595.
×Manes, Maurice Edward, AO44691.
Mangerich, Walter Edward, AO36125.
Manicom, William Caldwell, AO44380.
Mankin, Jack Cyril, AO36164.
Mann, Edward Milton, AO52297.
Mann, Herbert Raymond, AO46981.
Mannon, Willard Beattie, AO44981.
Mansell, Morris Enoch, Jr., AO34701.
Mansfield, Richard Miner, AO35531.
Manthos, Atlee George AO43984.
Manuel, Earl H., AO52636.
×Maples, Clyde Alexander, AO32953.
Mara, Thomas Dillon, AO47761.
Marchesi, William, AO35716.
Marek, Frank Edward, AO46649.
×Maritzen, Lyle Carl, AO44326.
Markham, Theon Edward, AO47440.

Markley, William Clyde, Jr., AO37222.
Markovich, George Michael, AO32426.
Marks, Leonard Peter, AO35375.
Marks, Mortimer David, AO53298.
Marks, Robert Joseph, AO52809.
×Marks, Russell Herbert, AO52394.
Marler, Maurice Edwards, AO46930.
×Marschner, Bernard Walter, AO54085.
Marsh, Frederick Hamilton, AO46847.
Marsh, Robert Allen, AO39266.
×Marshall, Leonard Samuel, AO24977.
Marshall, Prevost, AO45862.
Marshall, Tom Lee, AO46091.
Marshall, Winton Whittier, AO39308.
Marthens, George Walter, 2d, AO31928.
Martin, Bill H., AO40815.
×Martin, Cecil Stanford, AO49061.
Martin, Charles Abramson, AO33408.
Martin, Clyde James, AO52914.
Martin, Fred Arnett, AO35410.
×Martin, Gene Ivan, AO35035.
Martin, James Timmons, AO35277.
×Martin, John Landrum, Jr., AO34471.
Martin, Lloyd, Jr., AO35511.
Martin, Maurice Langhorne, AO26161.
Martin, Meredith Tansil, AO44297.
Martin, Metro, AO47196.
Martin, Patrick James, AO44942.
Martin, Ralph Gilbert, AO44866.
Martin, Rawley White, AO45388.
Martin, Robert Lynn, AO52499.
Martin, Sherman Fielder, AO48621.
×Martin, Stanley Everette, AO52589.
Martin, Thomas Edward, AO52898.
Martin, Urban William, AO54524.
×Martin, Wallace Steele, Jr., AO34587.
Martindale, Ward Wendell, AO36014.
Marvel, Alden Leroy, AO53695.
Mason, William Herman, AO48802.
Massengale, Herbert Williams, AO35726.
Masters, Elmer LaWayne, AO48433.
Mather, William Allen, AO33596.
Mathewson, Philip Lambeth, AO22578.
Mathison, Charles Glenn, AO49044.
Matsko, George, AO52869.
Matso, Wayne, AO35863.
Matthews, Donald Edward, AO46698.
Matthews, Edward Everett, AO45209.
Mattie, John Duane, AO52587.
Mattison, Robert Martin, AO32416.
Mattison, William Theodious, AO44072.
Mau, Fredric Eugene, AO47855.
Mauck, Fred George Douglas, AO47783.
Maul, Dwight Edward, AO47316.
Maupin, Jere Washington, AO24750.
Maurel, Anthony John, AO33613.
Maxwell, Jewell Clinton, AO46604.
×May, Britt Stanaland, AO25777.
May, Lomax Louis, AO45176.
May, Lowell Earl, AO47677.
Mayberry, Samuel Waller, Jr., AO40326.
Maynard, Ray Smith, AO45134.
Mays, Ivan Kenneth, AO53120.
×Mazur, Henry Joseph, AO25703.
×McAbee, William Howard, AO35411.
McAdam, Theodore James, AO24716.
McAdams, William Benton, AO36726.
McAllister, James Benedict, AO44453.
McAllister, Walter Lynch, AO40809.
McAndrews, Francis Corwin, AO52220.
McBee, Shannon Cleo, AO43475.
McBride, William Vincent, AO48936.
McCabe, Thomas Eugene, AO26315.
McCarthy, Eugene John, AO45864.
McCarthy, John Francis, Jr., AO32447.
McCarthy, John Francis, Jr., AO33344.
×McCarthy, Michael Christopher, AO48294.
McCarthy, Wayne George, AO24808.
McCarty, Billy Stewart, AO36046.
McCash, Donald Kendall, AO43964.
McCauley, Clarence Vernon, A022401.
×McClain, Howard Powers, AO39293.
McClanahan, William Arialal, AO47210.
McClatchy, Howard Lee, AO53493.
×McCleary, George Clifford, AO52896.
McCleary, Robert Joseph, AO40520.
McCleary, William James, AO46651.
McClellan, Howard William, AO34914.
McClellan, John Barclay, AO34943.
McClelland, Jack, AO46781.
×McCloskey, Richard Calvin, AO54311.
×McCloy, Edward, AO53749.
McClughan, George Walter, AO46602.
×McClung, Ray Swinfield, AO46709.
McClure, John Crile, AO46340.
McCollom, Francis Norman, AO44485.
McComb, William John, AO46298.
McCombs, Harold Kelly, AO43710.
McComsey, Robert Marvin, AO38995.
McConnell, Charles Henry, AO47055.
McConnell, Lhatt Ashley, AO43580.
×McConnell, William Scott, Jr., AO53162.
McCord, George Edward, AO35909.
McCord, Louis Broughton, AO34779.
McCord, Robert Ralph, AO35101.
×McCorkle, Howell Pinkard, AO35622.
×McCormack, Bailor Daniel, AO44707.
×McCormack, Lemuel Houston, Jr., AO48662.
McCoskrie, Roland Kenneth, AO47978.
McCoy, Charles Edwin, Jr., AO44409.
McCoy, Paul Leslie, AO53108.
×McCracken, Delmar Isaac, AO40880.
McCracken, Rufus LeRoy, AO43874.
McCredie, Cassius Milburn, AO44850.
McCroskey, Joseph Lee, AO23186.
McCulloch, Franklin Howard, AO52497.
McCulloch, Robert Clyde, AO37055.
McCullough, John Hiram, AO36267.
McCullough, William Edward, AO31999.
McCurdy, John William, AO45047.
McDaniel, Armour Green, AO33592.
×McDaris, Robert Akin, AO46968.
McDavid, Andrew Eugene, AO44229.
×McDermott, Joseph William, AO36072.
McDermott, Robert Francis, AO25540.
McDonald, Claud Wayne, AO31988.
McDonald, John Rudolph, AO35679.
McDonald, William Gerald, AO36929.
McDonnell, Heston, AO33031.
McDouall, Bradford Houghton, AO43584.
×McDowell, Glenwood, AO44551.
McDowell, Rex Wampler, AO52647.
McElhanon, William Edwin, AO47464.
McElhone, James Thomas, AO53454.
×McElrath, John Adam, AO53524.
×McElroy, Mansell Barrymore, AO52890.
McEvoy, Edwin Walter, AO33044.
McFall, Dana Floyd, Jr., AO48616.
×McFall, Silver Ray, AO45163.
McFarlan, Frank August, AO44583.
McFarland, Hugh, AO53174.
McFarlane, John Durell, AO48820.
×McFatridge, James Morgan, AO52406.
×McGarity, William Vernon, AO54917.
×McGarry, James Michiel, Jr., AO52377.
McGee, Donald Charles, AO35384.
McGee, Joseph Burgess, AO45011.
McGibeny, Arthur David, AO31932.
×McGinn, John Leon, AO45739.
×McGinnis, Paul Benedict, AO32590.
McGiverin, Francis, AO53624.
×McGlasson, Robert Bruce, AO52716.
McGlynn, Francis John, AO36248.
McGonnell, Owen John, AO55041.
McGough, Edward Alexander, 3d, AO25682.
McGovern, Marshall, AO52950.
×McGregor, Oris Eugene, Jr., AO33369.
×McGuigan, Thomas Harris, AO52734.
McGuire, Lawrence Francis, AO24860.
McGuire, Thomas Charles, AO44971.
McGuire, Troy B., AO35517.
McHale, Joseph Patrick, AO40934.
×McHale, Robert Vincent, AO33674.
×McIlroy, James Garfield, Jr., AO32525.
McIntire, Francis Percival, Jr., AO36366.
×McIntire, Ralph Oliver, AO52358.
McIntosh, Wayne Wesley, AO45053.
McIntyre, Clarence Edward, AO39154.
McIntyre, Joseph Douglas, AO44933.
×McKay, Chester Earl, AO48226.
McKean, Harold Louis, AO34545.
McKee, Jack Erwin, AO40996.
McKee, James Thomas, AO25230.
McKee, Ralph Dale, AO36648.
McKenzie, Harry Crane, AO45224.
McKinney, James Alfred, AO25536.
×McKinnis, Burdette Jones, AO35092.
McKinnon, Duncan, James, AO40949.
McLachlan, Joseph Julian, AO47889.
McLain, Damon Isaac, AO52293.
×McLaren, William Aiden, AO44672.
×McLaughlin, George William, AO36026.
McLaughlin, William Carr, AO53436.
McLean, Daniel Putnam, AO46697.
×McLean, Edward Ridley, AO39294.
×McMillan, Shubal King, Jr., AO40571.
McNally, Joseph Edward, AO52374.
McNally, Lawrence Mathew, AO36470.
McNamara, James Frederic, AO52911.
McNelly, Harold Lee, AO53406.
McNess, Richard Arden, AO36802.
×McNeese, Harold Graham, AO47240.
McNeely, Fred Wright, AO22878.
McPherson, Donald George, AO44340.
McPherson, William Ransom, Jr., AO36553.
McRae, Roland Lacy, AO36961.
×McRaven, Claude Coy, AO46467.
×McReynolds, Zachariah Aycok, AO54152.
×McWalters, Frank William, AO45253.
McWhirter, Darein Auburn, Jr., AO45313.
McWilliam, Calvin Edward, AO46881.
Mead, Henry Lowell, AO53288.
Meadville, Harry William, AO37004.
Mears, Forrest Eugene, AO52822.
Mecke, Harold Joseph, AO36508.
Medvedeff, Harold Cyril, AO35236.
×Meek, Arthur Morton, AO47923.
Meeker, Everett Roscoe, AO46423.
Mehaffey, Nathan Gene, AO34927.
×Mehalko, George Thomas, AO24458.
×Mellinger, Robert Thomas, AO32105.
×Mellor, Alfred Lionel, AO52263.
Melvin, Charles Warren, AO44320.
Mendelsohn, Irving Philip, AO44339.
Mennell, Robert Charles, AO48907.
Menth, Blaine Berlin, AO44883.
Meranda, Mark Donald, AO33714.
Merchant, Frank Barnes, AO53701.
Merkel, Ellsworth Leidy, AO47754.
Meroney, Virgil Kersh, AO36805.
Merrill, Charles Thomas, AO35151.
Merrill, Woodrow Taylor, AO52605.
Merten, Donald Herman, AO46183.
×Messman, Howard Arthur, AO45493.
Mestemaker, Joseph Earl, AO48948.
Metcalfe, Lee Edward, AO35085.
Metz, Robert Carter, AO52750.
Meyer, Charles Robert, AO45648.
Meyer, Robert Jeane, AO53831.
×Meyers, Charles Raymond, Jr., AO47321.
Michael, Pierce Baynard, AO43567.
Michel, Frederick Hayward, AO33876.
Michel, Theodore James, AO24696.
Middlebrook, Paul Louis, AO52652.
Middlekauff, Darwin Clyde, AO48016.
Middleton, Arthur John, AO47063.
Midkiff, Richard Lee, Jr., AO35891.
Mikolowski, Edward, AO54695.
Milburn, Walter Boothry, Jr., AO36302.
Milch, Lawrence Jacques, AO53285.
Miles, Charles Clinton, AO33016.
Miles, Frederick Earl, AO45697.
Miles, George William, AO32754.
Miles, Lee Ewing, AO46341.
×Milholland, George William, AO33075.
Milledge, Henry Lee, AO33929.
Miller, Burdsall Dunham, AO48334.
Miller, Carl Lee, AO33543.
Miller, Charles Lynn, AO36842.
Miller, Danforth Parker, Jr., AO33354.
Miller, Earl Charles, AO54540.
Miller, Edward Louis, AO36593.
Miller, Edwin Martin, AO44902.
Miller, Eugene Francis, AO46426.
×Miller, George Lyon, AO45839.
×Miller, Hubert Edward, AO45114.
Miller, Jean Baptist, Jr., AO36730.
Miller, Jerry Devroe, AO35678.
Miller, Jesse Mathew, AO37041.
Miller, Kenneth Robert, AO40482.
Miller, Lester Fred, AO47219.
×Miller, Lynus Parker, Jr., AO44743.
Miller, Paul Burwell, AO35800.
Miller, Robert AO55019.
Miller, Sidney Leonard, AO44211.
Miller, Thomas Aldred, AO43844.
Miller, Thomas Benton, AO37260.
Miller, Vaughan, Jr., AO48484.
Miller, Verlin Arthur, AO45162.
Miller, Walter Frederick, AO43962.
Miller, William Clinton, AO39151.
×Millin, John Andrew, Jr., AO35937.
Mills, Eugene Spencer, Jr., AO43784.

Mills, Thomas Harris, AO33056.
Millson, Edwin Harry, AO49011.
×Milowski, Walter John, AO54042.
Minahan, John Carroll, AO52321.
Mineur, George Edward, Jr., AO44908.
Minkler, Henry Charles, AO52851.
×Minnehan, Bernard Aloysius, AO47261.
×Minor, Marion Edward, Jr., AO46078.
Mirock, George Casimer, AO47546.
Mistrot, Joseph Frank, AO47777.
Mitchell, Harry Leonard, AO45137.
Mitchell, John Thomas, Jr., AO49847.
Mitchell, Mack Ashton, AO35363.
×Mitchell, Robert Herald, AO47303.
Mitchell, Ross Lynn, AO44344.
Mitterling, Robert Ostrem, AO36669.
Mixon, Carmel Astor, AO44230.
Mixson, Marion Clarke, AO46546.
Moberly, Caleb Powers, AO53843.
×Mocquot, Charles Marie, AO44084.
×Moe, John Gillette, AO44764.
Moffitt, Franklyn, Elwood, AO53476.
Moist, Robert Elrose, AO43627.
Molander, Stanley Vernon, AO54131.
Moler, John Edward, AO37239.
Moley, Charles Anthony, AO53217.
Moll, Robert Gustavus, AO34226.
Molland, Leland Phillips, AO36835.
Molyneaux, Silas Robarre, AO52829.
×Mona, Reuben Edward, AO44771.
Monaco, John, Jr., AO45024.
×Monroe, Shelton Wilson, AO52720.
Monroe, Thomas Guy, Jr., AO49071.
×Monsell, Charles Frederick, Jr., AO44760.
Montgomery, David F., AO45113.
Montgomery, Douglas Murray, AO39088.
Montgomery, Guilford Roland, AO22397.
Moody, David Bloom, AO34886.
Moody, Peter Richard, AO24710.
Moon, Leo Claire, AO45900.
Moon, Richard Hartley, AO32770.
Moon, Ryan Michael, AO40359.
Moore, Albert Kidd, AO52376.
×Moore, Clifford James, Jr., AO25593.
×Moore, George Brownell, AO54829.
Moore, George Eugene, AO44607.
Moore, Jack Edwin, AO34827.
Moore, John Alton, AO52365.
Moore, Robert Browne, AO54538.
×Moore, William Clarence, AO26014.
Moore, William Harold, AO34476.
Moore, William Hudson, AO53637.
Moore, William Paul, AO46349.
Moore, William Weatherly, AO44588.
Moore, William Wylie, AO44883.
Morales, Carl Henry, AO53634.
Morat, Charles David, Jr., AO32999.
Morehead, James Bruce, AO45242.
×Moreland, Charles Thaddeus, Jr., AO47075.
Morgan, Earl Adams, AO44447.
Morgan, Fred Arthur, AO52583.
Morgan, Roy, AO35083.
×Morgan, Russell Dodson, AO44758.
Morganti, Clyde Joseph, AO36451.
×Moritz, Gene Phillip, AO 40392.
Morris, Frederick Eugene, Jr., AO47438.
Morris, James Madison, AO39255.
Morris, Robert Carlock, Jr., AO35532.
Morris, Robert John, AO44274.
×Morris, Wesley Donald, AO33893.
Morrison, Bruce Lamont, AO53832.
Morrison, Harry James, AO43795.
Morrison, John Ellsworth, Jr., AO35693.
×Morse, Donald MacMillan, AO46307.
×Mortensen, Fred Neil, AO55117.
Moser, Alfred Leslie, AO46343.
Mosman, Ormond John, AO22341.
Mothersbaugh, James Forest, AO52522.
Mourer, Lester Charles, AO36734.
Moyer, Morgan Bernard, AO40451.
Muhl, James Howard, AO36896.
Mulcahy, Donald Max, AO48551.
Muldrow, Robert, AO25557.
Mullen, Peter Vincent, AO52334.
×Mullenniex, Thomas Eugene, AO40991.
Muller, James LeRoy, AO34933.
Mulligan, Robert Alexander, AO47169.
Mulligan, Walter Francis, Jr., AO52446.
Mulling, Eugene, Gregory, Jr., AO36132.
Mullis, Roy Winston, AO53205.
×Mulloney, Daniel Clifford, AO40625.
Munch, Christopher Henry, AO25988.
Munns, Edward Allan, AO24788.
×Munsey, Charles Wayne, AO45820.
Munsey, Ned Gaines, AO46256.
Munson, Charles Bright, AO47522.
×Murden, Charles Holt, Jr., AO44736.
×Murphy, Benjamin Styles, AO36675.
×Murphy, Bruce Crittenden, AO44955.
Murphy, Edward Aloysius, Jr., AO23286.
Murphy, James Herbert, AO34329.
Murphy, John Richord, AO24928.
×Murphy, Maurice Edward, AO45710.
Murphy, Paul Cashman, AO32766.
×Murphy, Robert Emmett, AO32853.
Murphy, Robert Marshall, Jr., AO52703.
Murrah, Idas Tolbert, AO45017.
Murray, David Hugh, AO34796.
Murray, James Edmund, AO36217.
Murray, James Lore, AO40730.
Murray, Norman Leroy, AO52631.
Murrey, John Stephen, AO44021.
×Murtha, Joseph William, AO54972.
Mustain, Ivan Farris, AO48564.
×Myers, Earle Russell, AO43748.
Myers, Henry Vernon, AO40775.
×Myers, Joseph, AO35884.
Myers, Joseph Robert, AO48722.
Myers, Lansing Heald, AO45350.
Myers, Lawrence Talbot, AO43617.
Myers, Raymond Bell, AO35564.
×Myers, Thornton Kise, AO21399.
Nacy, William Peter, AO36690.
Nading, William Donald, AO39200.
Naffke, John Henry, AO33139.
Nance, Nicholas Haywood, AO34947.
Napier, John Gilbert, AO46326.
Nash, Russell James, AO44813.
Nathe, Leonard Herman, AO47745.
Neafus, Paul Benjamin, AO48590.
Neal, John Robert, AO47544.
×Neal, Philip Andrew, AO46370.
Neece, Richard Davis, Jr., AO35400.
Neely, Russell Wayne, AO32542.
Neff, Charles Laban, AO52600.
Neffinger, George Gail, AO53325.
Neighbors, Lloyd Walsh, AO32741.
Neil, Charles Verne, AO35495.
Neill, Dennis Virgil, AO47385.
Nelander, Frederick James, AO34935.
Nelson, Arthur Lewis, AO40690.
Nelson, Conrad Nathaniel, AO35262.
Nelson, Gene Allen, AO54141.
Nelson, John Amos, Jr., AO33527.
×Nelson, Marshall Edwin, AO45961.
Nelson, Neelian Omar, AO33234.
Nelson, Raymond Edward, AO45655.
Nendell, Jack Arista, AO32312.
Nesmith, Joseph Frederick, AO45578.
Nesselbush, Louis Konrad, AO26063.
Nestor, Joseph Emmet, AO52763.
Nestor, Vergil Nick, AO35492.
Nettles, Jesse Eugene, AO43596.
Neuer, John Jacob, AO25897.
×Nevling, Gilbert, AO52702.
Newbury, Edward Stenart Elder, AO46313.
Newby, Richard Eugene, AO54428.
Newell, Edward Wilson, AO44987.
Newland, Martin Kenneth, AO46474.
Newman, Fred Haynes, AO46878.
Newman, Ralph Anderson, AO46270.
×Newsom, William Wheeler, Jr., AO53776.
×Newton, Everette Charles, AO44176.
×Newton, George Lucius, Jr., AO34600.
Nichols, Edward McIntyre, Jr., AO53444.
Nichols, Frederick Kenneth, AO35671.
Nichols, Philip Charles, AO46978.
Nichols, Steward Howell, AO36285.
Nichols, Thomas Brooks, AO40411.
Nichols, Willard Albert, AO47550.
Nichols, William Carl, AO36632.
Nickels, Loren Smith, AO40348.
Nickodem, Lowell Stanley, AO24793.
Nied, George John, AO31859.
Nielsen, Leonard Emery, AO53558.
Nielsen, Melvin Jesse, AO46121.
Nielsen, William Charles, AO46579.
Nielsen, Woodrow Everette, AO44462.
Nigra, Le Roy, AO36268.
Nixon, Robert Lee, AO46460.
Njus, Olav, AO44204.
Noel, William Honree, AO36951.
Nolan, John Aloysius, AO39221.
Nolan, Robert John, AO35602.
Nold, Ewell Kay, Jr., AO39113.
×Nollkamper, James Louis, AO36534.
Noonan, Robert Matthews, AO53636.
Noonan, Stephen Frederick, AO52573.
Norcia, Benjamin, AO43667.
Noriega, Virgil, AO46149.
Norley, Louis Herman, AO48652.
×Norman, William Roy, AO43726.
×Northup, Robert Lowell, AO45144.
Norton, Carl Ray, AO47670.
Norton, William Joseph, AO37234.
Norton, William Nicolson, AO52597.
Nothstein, Charles Lewis, AO22588.
×Nowark, Charles Glen, AO44827.
Nudell, Fred Wellington, AO52241.
Nugent, Paul Raymond, AO45468.
×Nunn, John Walter, AO35480.
Nunziato, Ralph Joseph, AO46992.
Nuthall, Alfred Jack, AO44979.
Nyblade, Walter Frederick, AO43877.
Nye, Francis Walter, AO35650.
×Nye, Richard Sadler, AO33128.
Nye, Robert Millard, AO53483.
Oakley, Harry Robert, AO52977.
×O'Bert, John James, AO44564.
×O'Brien, Frank Edwin, AO44166.
O'Brien, Raymond Ransom, AO52143.
O'Connell, John Francis, AO48361.
O'Connor, Denis Patrick, AO47061.
O'Connor, Edmund Francis, AO26340.
O'Connor, Frank Quinn, AO46700.
O'Connor, Squire Timothy, AO47307.
O'Connor, Virgil John, AO52566.
×Oder, Frederic Carl Emil, AO53405.
×Odom, John William, AO47874.
O'Donnell, John Thomas, AO44709.
O'Donnell, John Curran, AO34466.
Odren, Harry Melvin, AO35728.
Ofner, David Bernhard, AO52667.
Ogden, Harold Archer, AO24705.
Ogiba, Henry Stanley, AO47731.
Oglesby, Herbert Willis, AO36542.
Oglesby, Sam Russell, Jr., AO35389.
Oglesby, Stuart Roscoe 3d, AO40774.
Ogletree, Robert Clyde, Jr., AO37197.
O'Hara, Richard Kiernan, AO46118.
O'Hara, Robert Cannon, AO48215.
×O'Hern, Luther, AO33156.
Oholendt, Gene Frederick, AO54983.
Oldershaw, Douglas C., AO44472.
Olds, Robin, AO26046.
Oliver, Ralph Lorimer, AO25217.
Oliver, Robert Russell, AO32517.
Olmstead, Earl Oren, Jr., AO26107.
Olmsted, Charles Thaddeus, AO22502.
Olney, Richard Bartlett, AO34206.
Olsen, Sumner Merton, AO47486.
Olson, Royce Glenmore, AO34771.
Olson, Walter Ive, AO48831.
Olsson, John Shepherd, AO45674.
Omohundro, Thomas Tipton, AO35347.
Omsted, Kenneth Arnold, AO36250.
Ondo, Michael, AO44623.
O'Neale, Malcolm Lindsay, AO44182.
O'Neil, George Keith, AO53201.
O'Neil, Raymond Francis, AO43516.
O'Neill, James Leo, AO39022.
Opper, Clifford Raymond, AO36803.
Oppy, Paul Francis, AO53176.
O'Reagan, John Patrick, AO48507.
O'Rourke, John Bernard, AO45040.
Orr, George William, AO36735.
Orwat, Norman Stanley, AO39261.
Osborne, Earle Leon, AO37014.
Osgood, Lyndon Timson, AO52819.
Oskamp, Garry, AO44382.
×Oss, Louis Hinebaugh, AO45123.
×Oswald, Norbert Joseph, AO26131.
Ott, Walter Wesley, AO53632.
Otten, Leonard John, Jr., AO35206.
Otto, Robert Cushman, AO46104.
Otto, Stanford Joseph, AO35826.
Overbey, George Douglas, AO37382.
×Overdorff, Willard Boyd, AO52662.
Owen, James Calvin, AO36626.
Owens, Harris Richard, AO44217.
Owens, Verner Alva, AO44376.
Oyler, George Clinton, AO33302.
Pace, Stanley Carter, AO25874.

×Pace, William Norris, Jr., AO53821.
Packard, Peter L. M., AO34177.
×Paddock, Kenneth Quentin, AO44749.
Padgett, Cadman Vinton, AO45307.
×Paffel, Donald Westover, AO47308.
Paige, Ronald Albert, AO45521.
Pakenham, Thomas Francis, AO46777.
Palfrey, Campbell, Jr., AO24738.
Panko, Albert Robert, AO45108.
Papania, Ralph, Jr., AO35504.
Papik, Corwin Joseph, AO45301.
Pardee, Elliott Thomas, AO22498.
Parham, Bernard Francis, AO52398.
Parker, Clarence Shaffer, AO47692.
Parker, Dan Morey, AO25534.
Parker, Julian Wilsey, AO53572.
Parker, Stanley Elston, AO45150.
×Parker, Van Robison, AO44756.
Parkins, William Howard, AO43563.
Parks, Bernard Grant, AO52696.
Parks, Richard Watson, AO52864.
×Parmelee, David Burtis, AO45072.
Parr, Albert Thomas, AO43806.
Parris, Harry Neil, AO47897.
Parris, Howard Lindsey, AO35167.
Parsley, Wayne Mitchell, AO47023.
×Parsons, Herman Oscar, AO46973.
Parsons, Hershell Echoll, AO46870.
Parsons, Irvin Millard, AO46383.
×Parsons, James Wellington, AO46334.
Parsons, Samuel Polk, AO35442.
Partridge, Lewis Joy, AO33813.
Paschall, Benjamin Franklin, 3d, AO34849.
Pasero, Bernard Ben, AO47614.
Pash, Robert Norman, AO44525.
Paskvan, Paul Ronald, Jr., AO45149.
Past, Sheldon Joseph, AO54181.
Patch, Dwight Dresser, AO44934.
Patch, Horace Wendell, AO34477.
Patterson, George Arnott, AO44937.
Patterson, Warren Shaw, Jr., AO44696.
Pattillo, Leslie Gray, Jr., AO46833.
Patton, James D., AO36015.
Patton, John Murcer, AO47735.
Patton, Phil Manson, AO36952.
Patton, William Wayne, AO35332.
Paukert, Robert Shirley, AO48009.
Paulsen, Daniel Henry, AO53905.
Paulson, Myhre Elroy, AO35530.
Pavlick, Charles Raleigh, AO34195.
Pawlowski, Harold I, AO53891.
Paxton, Heyward Ainsworth, Jr., AO48673.
Payne, Carl Goolshee, AO46471.
Payne, Carl Wilson, AO35526.
×Payne, Carroll Herndon, AO32655.
Payne, Dolford Franklin, AO39027.
Payne, Gordon Lee, Jr., AO35783.
Payne, James Osborn, AO34345.
×Payne, Kenneth John, AO36797.
Payton, Theodore Franklin, AO44045.
Peabody, Prentice Bayan, AO52765.
Peake, William Kilbourne, AO40243.
Pearsall, David Williams, AO45904.
Pearson, Harvey Albert, AO45006.
Pearson, Ralph Jones, AO48966.
Peaslee, Jesse Clair, AO46049.
Peck, Douglas Montgomery, AO45609.
Peck, Fred Ross, Jr., AO35499.
Peck, George Stanley, AO47573.
Peck, John Clarence, AO24830.
Pedersen, Carl Emil, AO32280.
Pedersen, James Clinton, AO35758.
Pedone, Vito Santo, AO36301.
Pendergrast, Donald Waldean, AO46853.
×Pengue, Marcy Louis, AO52723.
Penn, Kirby Clement, AO46562.
Pennywitt, Glen Edward, AO44456.
Pepitone, Byron Vincent, AO47262.
Perkin, Irving Richard, AO23985.
Perkins, Lytle Ray, AO47535.
Perkins, Willis Howard, AO44218.
×Perlberg, Norman Nathaniel, AO53750.
Perron, Gregory Harris, AO48637.
Perry, Bruce Lee, AO35554.
Perry, Henry Buford, AO40939.
Perry, Horace Edward, AO40383.
Perry, Joseph Heinlein, AO48743.
Perry, Lucius Alvin, Jr., AO33792.
Perry, Robert Raymond, AO45218.
Persinger, Thomas Earl, AO53094.
Personett, Thomas Alvin, AO36833.
Personeus, Lester, Jr., AO47455.
Peters, Charles Kesmodel, AO41063.
Peters, Gilbert Arthur, AO48191.
Petersen, Tracy James, AO46972.
Peterson, Arthur Hews, AO36281.
×Peterson, Chesley Gordon, AO36633.
Peterson, Harry Graham, AO46335.
Peterson, Kenneth Dwight, AO45028.
Peterson, Lee Lieske, AO33589.
Peterson, Lyle Everett, AO22033.
Peterson, Marshall Ruth, Jr., AO36397.
Peterson, Martin Eugene, AO44996.
Petri, Fred Louis, AO40447.
×Petitt, Weldon Monroe, AO52227.
×Petty, Morris Edgar, AO36788.
Pezda, Edwin Felix, AO24724.
Phaneuf, Eugene Oscar, AO44570.
×Philippe, Hilbert Wayne, AO52672.
Phillips, Herbert Leslie, AO39160.
Phillips, John Thomas, AO32784.
Phillips, John Ernest, AO47487.
Phillips, Lewis Thomas, AO52936.
×Phillips, Robert Ernest, AO53195.
Phillips, Samuel Cochran, AO25413.
Phillips, Wayne Austin, AO47990.
Phillips, William Mack, AO54459.
×Pickett, Joe Williams, AO47918.
Pickett, Lawrence Jackson, AO46386.
Pigue, Munce Meadows, AO44396.
Pike, Robert Francis, AO44112.
Pilkington, Thomas Milford, AO44851.
Pinkerton, Charles Clifford, Jr., AO25499.
Pittman, Bernard Merrill, AO43820.
Pitts, Arthur Simmons, 2d, AO45093.
Pitts, Romaine William, AO45046.
Pitts, William Frederick, AO25593.
×Pitts, Younger Arnold, Jr., AO25633.
Plate, Stanley William, AO44283.
Player, George Carlton, Jr., AO45703.
×Pletcher, Gaylord Lorenzo, AO39251.
Plott, William Cloyd, AO24878.
Plourd, Webster William, AO44839.
Plumer, William Bowdin, AO52940.
Poe, John Everette, AO33196.
×Poland, Marvin Elmer, AO33769.
×Polivka, Emil Walter, AO44990.
Pollock, Keith Kermit, AO40375.
Pomeroy, Don Allen, Jr., AO22814.
Poncik, Victor Jerome, AO34501.
Ponder, Paul Holloway, Jr., AO34942.
Poole, George Irvin, Jr., AO44660.
×Poore, Green Berry, AO54403.
Popek, Albert Benedict, AO44286.
Popek, Edward Stanley, AO47880.
Poppell, James Marvin, AO52639.
×Porter, Clarence Woodrow, AO53317.
Porter, George William, AO25592.
×Porter, Lester William, AO33188.
Posey, John Cabell, AO44461.
×Potebnya, Orr Yurievich, AO54508.
Potter, Thomas Kennedy, Jr., AO54529.
Potter, Waldo Franklin, AO26203.
Poulson, Ernest Lester, AO37153.
Pournaras, Stephen William, AO48121.
Powell, Joseph Harlee, AO44014.
Powell, Russell, AO35761.
Powell, Sherrill Lee, Jr., AO48230.
Powers, Harold Milledge, AO54738.
Powers, John Francis, Jr., AO45634.
×Powers, John Joseph, AO47186.
Powers, Kenneth Henry, AO34929.
×Powers, Robert Bruce, AO45702.
Pozerycki, John Joseph, Jr., AO44289.
×Prather, Philip Bailey, AO54945.
×Pratt, Jean Gardner, AO52901.
Pratt, Leonard Edward, AO47781.
×Pratt, Ogden Nelson, AO23364.
Pratt, William Charles, AO48306.
Praul, Charles Lynville, AO44467.
Prenoveau, Emil Edward, AO52529.
Prevatte, James Osborne, AO44586.
Prewitt, Jack Kenneth, AO52348.
Price, Andrew Henry, AO44668.
Price, Jack Clayton, AO45888.
×Price, Robert Franklin, AO46327.
Price, Thomas Jefferson, AO35634.
Price, Thomas Llewellyn, AO52660.
×Price, Weston Hugh, AO47446.
Price, William Alec, AO46724.
Price, William Gray, 3d, AO46242.
Prickett, Donald Irwin, AO36437.
Prior, George Thomas, AO25785.
Proctor, Charles Nelson, AO44365.
Prodgers, John David, AO53269.
×Proudlove, Lloyd Earl, AO37048.
Prouty, Leroy Fletcher, Jr., AO34835.
Pryor, Charles Donald, AO43733.
Pryor, Daniel Franklin, AO33222.
Pucilowski, George Andrew, AO52411.
Pugh, William, AO44418.
Purcell, Charles Joseph, AO32377.
Purpus, Walter Ray, AO47961.
Puskar, Steven, Jr., AO37235.
Quattlander, Frank Paul, AO33184.
Query, Jack DeWitt, AO32406.
Quesada, Anthony, AO45053.
Quillen, Monroe Carl, AO46336.
Quilliman, Earl William, AO44266.
Quinlan, Francis Emmet, AO43616.
Quinn, Robert Francis, AO53426.
Quirk, Michael Joseph, AO47337.
Raaz, Dean John, AO44156.
Radetsky, Harold Arnold, AO35346.
Raebel, James Bernard, AO47235.
×Ragon, Dale Ambrose, AO33221.
Rahn, Gibert Frank, AO40769.
Raley, Claude Mason, AO43827.
Raley, James Andrew, AO40568.
Ralston, Wilson, AO45821.
Ramme, Ernest Lester, AO23421.
Ramsaur, Robert Tully, AO36812.
Ramsey, Glyn Wiburn, AO35371.
×Ramsey, J. W., AO37344.
Ramsey, Robert Lipscomb, AO36369.
Ranck, Nathan Hoover, AO22622.
Randall, Robert Duncan MacGregor, AO26267.
×Rankin, Robert James, AO48736.
Rankin, Warner Frank, Jr., AO35519.
Ransier, Harry DeLosse, AO45057.
Rappaport, Jerome Melvin, AO52526.
Rasberry, Dayle Howard, AO52506.
Rash, John Frederick, AO36441.
Rasmussen, Darwin Elmer, AO46934.
Rasmussen, Philip Martin, AO34521.
Rasor, Frank James Pierce, AO35095.
Rathbun, Edward Lyon, AO35352.
Rawlings, John William, Jr., AO26223.
×Rawls, Charles Alva, AO52764.
Ray, Robert Homer, AO43676.
Ray, Wilbur Richard, AO44482.
Raymond, William Henry, Jr., AO52614.
Raynolds, Ted Eugene, AO44928.
Reardon, John Charles, AO46092.
Reber, Carl Joseph, AO36793.
Reber, Marlen Elmer, AO35677.
Rector, Walter Stokes, AO33313.
×Reddell, William Harold, AO36083.
Redman, Russell Lee, AO34912.
Reece, Robert Carl, AO44290.
Reecher, Kenneth Aaron, AO35925.
Reed, Edward Blakslee, AO40547.
Reed, Everett, Gilmer, AO44930.
Reed, Henry Clay, AO46310.
Reed, Henry George, AO44560.
Reed, Jack Lester, AO33698.
Reed, Vincent Raymond, AO44809.
Reeder, D. M., AO52613.
Reeder, Vendor Harvard, AO52603.
Reese, James West, AO44562.
×Reeves, Elmo, AO52249.
Reeves, Ernest Arthur, AO40389.
Reeves, Vernon Houston, AO44401.
Regan, John Morgan, AO35748.
×Rehrer, Harvey Eugene, AO35072.
Reiber, Jack Burt, AO44163.
Reichal, Joseph C., AO33544.
Reichardt, Leslie Lee, AO47992.
Reichert, Earl Theodore, AO32679.
Reid, John Douglas, AO24773.
Reid, Michael Taylor, AO40978.
Reid, Robert Jesse, Jr., AO33553.
Reifsteck, Calvin David, AO45007.
Reinbold, Richard David, AO24875.
Reinburg, George Everett Adam, Jr., AO40799.
Reineck, Rollin Clark, AO47192.
×Reinhardt, Herbert Wilton, AO44748.
×Reising, Albert John, AO43730.
Relfe, Robert Wylie, AO35501.
Remaklus, John Phil, Jr., AO53213.
Remillard, David Harold, AO46240.

Renaud, Louis Clement, AO47513.
×Reney, Everett Ralph, AO52402.
Renfro, William Glen, AO45215.
Rennels, Fred Logan, Jr., AO53657.
Renwick, Donald Dean, AO35365.
Reppert, Leonard Brooks, AO36808.
Rethman, Vincent Carl, AO44910.
Retzer, Karl Nelson, AO24841.
Rew, George Robert, AO24994.
Rex, Edward Martin, AO46917.
Rex, John Leo, Jr., AO35917.
Rexroat, Larue David, AO48825.
Reynolds, Andrew Jackson, AO34778.
Reynolds, Harry Martin, AO44394.
Rhees, Gilbert Neal, AO53322.
Rhoads, Frank Hayden, AO45962.
Rhodarmer, Roger Kims, AO48472.
Rhode, Storm Charles, Jr., AO44621.
Rhodes, Arthur Douglas, AO31875.
Rhodes, Hugh Egbert, AO34566.
Rhodes, William John, AO35905.
×Rice, Carl Everett, AO45482.
Richard, Anthony Henry, Jr., AO26351.
Richard, Delos E., AO32879.
Richardson, David McCoy, AO52558.
×Richardson, Paul Ames, AO52474.
Richens, Kent J., AO45745.
Richey, Robert Harry, AO36612.
Richmond, George Mount, AO35918.
Rickert, Walter Kellner, AO47910.
Ricks, Carlyle, AO46047.
Ricks, Thomas Jesse, Jr., AO46112.
×Riddick, James Walter, AO44717.
Riddle, Charles Lewis, AO44563.
Riddle, Edmund Ross, Jr., AO52832.
×Riddle, Richard DeKalb, AO47202.
Rider, William Benjamin, AO41053.
Ridgell, James McLaurin, Jr., AO23197.
×Ridings, Charles Albert, AO45865.
Riepe, Quenten Albert, AO37091.
Rife, Raymond S., AO48012.
×Riggs, Carl Nelson, AO52684.
×Riggs, William Earle, AO46710.
×Rigney, Charles Edward, AO52258.
Riley, Earl Vaughn, AO46040.
×Riley, Joseph Richmond, AO52304.
Riley, Lewis Robert, AO45553.
Rinn, Frank Burton, AO44225.
Ripko, Joseph U., AO54025.
Rippin, James Alfred, AO25707.
Risher, John Randall, AO52601.
Ritchie, William Dee, AO35358.
Ritter, Herbert Waldemar, AO33201.
Ritter, James Harry, AO52504.
Ritter, Lattie Alonzo, Jr., AO35718.
×Riva, Daniel Francis, AO35351.
Rivers, William James, AO45201.
×Roache, Clarence Edward, Jr., AO53020.
Roath, Dean Gilbert, AO53685.
Robb, Stewart Wilsey, AO34520.
×Robbins, Carl William, Jr., AO44168.
Robbins, Harold Wendell, AO52813.
Robbs, Charles Eugene, AO24877.
Roberton, Eddie Joseph, Jr., AO46328.
Roberts, Allyn Edward, AO36590.
×Roberts, Ben H., AO35549.
Roberts, David Langston, AO45444.
Roberts, Donald Wilmarth, AO46610.
Roberts, Frederick Charles, Jr., AO35214.
Roberts, George Spencer, AO46696.
Roberts, Gore Frederick, AO32208.
Roberts, James Robert, AO44414.
Roberts, Joe Edward, AO52622.
Roberts, Sam Alfred, AO35509.
×Roberts, William Kennard, AO46633.
Robertson, Bennett Eugene, AO46618.
×Robertson, Edward Harold, AO54039.
Robertson, Gavan Carson, Jr., AO35593.
Robertson, John Aaron, AO46578.
Robertson, Lawrence Russell, AO47127.
×Robertson, Philip Owen, AO46492.
Robertson, Raynor Easterling, AO35399.
Robins, Nathaniel Bowman, AO35932.
Robinson, Donald Allister, Jr., AO34595.
×Robinson, Edgar Abram, AO46345.
Robinson, Floyd Irvin, AO24769.
Robinson, John Henry, AO44721.
Robinson, John William, AO35656.
Robinson, John Sidney, AO46375.
Robinson, Leo Hudson, AO33655.
×Robinson, Michel Andre George AO25523.
Robinson, Norman, AO44358.
×Robinson, William Bryan, AO36232.
Robinson, William Cyrus, AO39116.
Roby, Albert Wilson, Jr., AO53474.
Roche, Jean Rene, AO47518.
Rochez, Louis Arthur, 3d, AO36879.
Roddy, Edward Francis, AO35360.
Roderick, Walter Henry, AO33376.
Rodewald, Donald Lenore, AO36307.
×Rodzankas, John Frank, AO44151.
Roesch, John Edward, AO34293.
Rogers, Carleton Wayne, AO45111.
×Rogers, Dale Edward, AO44778.
Rogers, Daniel Townsend, AO44386.
Rogers, Felix Michael, AO37303.
Rogers, Glenn Elza, AO47979.
Rogers, Herbert Joseph, AO53552.
Rogers, Jack Mabry, AO44865.
Rogers, Robert Conant, AO35395.
Rogers, Thomas Eugene, AO36599.
Rogers, Woods White, Jr., AO44952.
Rohr, Loudin LaHugh, AO45012.
×Rohr, Louis William, AO45981.
×Romaine, Owen Wallace, AO44684.
Romstad, Rolf Norman, AO53331.
Root, George Raymond, AO44429.
Roper, Frank Adams, AO40950.
Rose, Howard Charles, AO48766.
Rose, James Leroy, AO46705.
Rose, John Boursiquot, Jr., AO24960.
×Rose, Ralph John, AO47906.
Rosebush, Kenneth Earl, AO36395.
Rosenbaum, Bert Stanford, AO24052.
Rosenthal, Herbert, AO34211.
Rosness, Joseph Henry, AO26306.
Rosno, Raymond Joseph, AO43621.
Ross, Amos Hodges, Jr., AO48784.
Ross, James Spillman, AO52960.
Ross, John Samuel, AO43821.
Ross, William Osmond, AO52520.
×Roth, John Y. Crawford, AO35349.
Rotkis, Walter Anton, AO43961.
Roubal, Joseph William, AO52542.
Roughton, Aurelian Ernest, Jr., AO47751.
Rowan, M. C., Jr., AO44088.
×Rowe, Everett Calvin, AO34029.
Rowe, William Matthew, AO53237.
Rowland, Thomas Jefferson, Jr., AO54376.
Royalty, William Saufley, Jr., AO45892.
Royce, Clare Howard, AO44505.
Ruby, Ishmael Elmo, AO44295.
Ruckman, Thomas Mayfield, AO53075.
Ruddell, George Inkerman, AO36054.
Rudolph, Bestow Reinhold, AO46941.
Rudolph, Ray Harding, AO44617.
Ruettgers, John Joseph, AO53447.
Rule, Richard Inman, AO37339.
Rundell, Francis Earle, 2d, AO25965.
Runyan, Samuel Harold, AO37031.
Rush, Donald Wesley, AO52202.
Rushforth, Robert George, AO46672.
Russell, Harold Gilmore, AO54364.
Russell, Leroy George, AO26043.
Russell, Roy Davis, AO34615.
Ryan, John Leonard, AO46299.
Ryan, Lloyd Murlin, AO36266.
Ryan, Paul Thomas, AO45189.
Ryan, Richard Eugene, AO34793.
Ryan, Thomas Stone, AO39174.
×Ryan, William George, AO54447.
Ryden, Donald Anderson, AO46311.
Rydstrom, Jean Frederic, AO35091.
Sabin, Flavel Provine, AO35500.
Sacknoff, David Arnold, AO54049.
Saehlenou, Hadley Vincent, AO22574.
×Sagebiel, Louis Walter, AO32887.
Sagert, Stanley Adolph, AO37301.
Salisbury, George Robert, AO32483.
Salisbury, Stanley Gordon, AO52648.
Salome, Richard Arlan, AO43963.
Salter, Richard D., AO34430.
×Salzarulo, Robert Louis, AO46159.
Sampson, Victor, Jr., AO40668.
Sams, Monroe Seabrook, AO37044.
Sams, Walter Birt, AO46280.
Sanborn, Bert Sumner, AO44891.
Sanctuary, Robert Harrison, AO48813.
×Sanders, Francis Arnold, AO53783.
×Sanders, Harry Glenn, AO39165.
Sanders, Roger Lowell, AO52483.
×Sanders, Roy Clifton, AO33059.
Sanders, William Breeding, AO45552.
Sandifer, John Douglas, AO52870.
×Sandman, George King, AO46265.
Sands, Warran Hyde, AO36885.
Sansone, Philip, AO37139.
×Sansone, Rocco, AO52366.
Sapp, James Franklin, AO34926.
Sargent, Hubert Eugene, Jr., AO48343.
×Sarosy, John Andrew, AO54135.
Sarte, Victor Joseph, AO44325.
Sartor, Samuel Oscar, AO36224.
Sather, Harley, AO35235.
Sather, Roy Oscar, AO53721.
Satterwhite, Albert White, AO36382.
Sauer, Robert Raymond, AO53481.
Saunders, Clason Bastablea, AO46707.
Saunders, Johnson Rawlett, Jr., AO44898.
Saunders, Patrick Henry, AO36958.
Savage, Cary Linthicum, AO37114.
Savage, Rollin Richard, AO52886.
×Saville, Wesley Thomas, AO52692.
Sawrie, William Ernest, AO43922.
×Sawyer, Charles Wesley, AO36365.
×Sawyer, Charles Willard, AO45490.
×Sayler, Henry Benton, Jr., AO25796.
Saylor, Henry Stephen, AO33656.
Scales, John Cayme, AO44896.
×Scarbrough, Ben Allen, AO35221.
Scepansky, Joe Thomas, AO34906.
Schaal, William Richard, AO40777.
Schaefer, Chris John Henry, Jr., AO48870.
Schaffer, Louis, AO37330.
Schaffner, William Joseph, AO40405.
Scheible, Wilbur Roy, AO52930.
Schenk, Norbert Rieder, AO52816.
Schenkein, George, AO48151.
Scherer, John Joseph, AO52862.
Schilke, James Frederick, AO37203.
Schillereff, Raymond Edward, AO33576.
×Schindler, John David, Jr., AO45790.
Schindler, Wilbur James, AO44927.
Schleeh, Russell Ellsworth, AO46640.
Schlie, Walter, AO47429.
×Schlosberg, Richard Turner, Jr., AO25675.
×Schlukbier, Alvin George, AO52804.
Schlupp, John Alexander, AO46524.
Schmidt, Ferdinand Rudolph, AO35604.
×Schmidt, Fred Carl, Jr., AO44794.
Schmidt, Herman James, AO53936.
×Schmidt, John Max, AO44152.
Schmoldt, Harold Dale Louis, AO45797.
Schmucker, George Cleland, AO32944.
×Schneider, Albert Henry, AO34531.
Schneider, Edwin Alden, AO47251.
×Schobel, Sumner, AO44678.
Schofield, Charles Stanley, AO52902.
Schold, George Bertie, Jr., AO44650.
Schonka, Jeo Mitchel, AO33498.
Schott, Carl Victor, AO33286.
×Schott, Murry M., AO33654.
Schou, Andrew James, AO44884.
×Schrack, Fred Richard, AO53060.
Schrader, Lawrence Wilford, AO52454.
Schratz, Robert Kress, AO53606.
Schudel, Charles Richard, AO43903.
×Schuknecht, Lowell Albert, AO45962.
×Schulherr, Richard Moglin, AO52695.
Schulstad, Louis Melvin, Jr., AO35749.
Schulte, Orville John, AO47393.
Schultz, Kenneth Walter, AO47323.
Schultz, Leonard Corwin, AO35106.
×Schultz, Melvin Rae, AO36040.
Schultze, David Rowland, AO52894.
×Schumacher, Richard Powers, AO21654.
Schupp, Ferdinand Francis, AO44371.
×Schuster, Robert Charles, AO36818.
Schutten, Bernard Joseph, Jr., AO37223.
Schuyler, Dean Hanson, AO35926.
Schwartz, David Gibbon, AO26313.
Schwartztrauber, Ernest Phil, Jr., AO52872.
Schwarze, Elroy Henry, AO47062.
Schweiger, Walter John, Jr., AO36494.
Schweitzer, John Henry, AO32316.
Schwellenbach, Thomas William, AO36301.
×Schwengels, Forrest Victor, AO44569.
Schwikert, Frank Donald, AO44419.
×Scofield, Frank Clark, Jr., AO24804.
Scott, George Edward, AO47051.
Scott, Richard Martin, AO24964.
×Scott, Robert Ray, AO35760.
Scott, Travis Moran, AO44451.

Scott, William Richard, AO52860.
×Scott, William Fontaine, AO26264.
Scroggins, James Harris, Jr., AO43814.
×Scruggs, John Alexander, AO43686.
Scullion, J. Donald, AO35724.
Scurlock, Reagan Andrew, AO45014.
Seab, Malcolm William, AO33530.
Seal, Earl Dunbar, AO56911.
Seale, Maxie Ben, AO47189.
Searles, De Witt Richard, AO37110.
Sears, Meldrum Lewis, AO32226.
Seay, William Woodrow, AO52827.
Sebille, Louis Joseph, AO33179.
Seemann, Karl Wilhelm, Jr., AO44314.
×Seiler, James Richard, AO46643.
Seith, Louis Theodore, AO25457.
×Selden, Littleton Cole, AO35469.
Selenger, Walter Kingsley, AO35540.
×Sellers, Coleman, AO52419.
Selling, Holger Arthur, AO53228.
×Sensenbrenner, Ralph Debald, AO44606.
Service, Robert Hubbard, AO40755.
Sevier, Coy T., AO54133.
Seward, Wayne Jack, AO34517.
Sewell, Virgil Roy, AO48950.
×Sexton, Ralph Eugene, AO44789.
Shaban, Zenon, AO43527.
×Shackelford, Walter Scott, Jr., AO46127.
Shadell, Kenneth Lee, AO53209.
Shaefer, Richard Francis, AO25866.
×Shaffer, Dale Lester, AO46655.
Shahan, Michael Elsworth, AO34898.
Shaka, Napoleon Athan, AO44117.
Shambeck, Clarence Herman, AO41037.
×Shankin, Donald William, AO46582.
Shanklin, William Frank, AO44239.
×Shapton, Leslie Douglas, AO46538.
×Sharp, Charles Elton, AO44802.
Sharp, Daniel Francis, AO35798.
×Sharp, William Eugene, AO45978.
Sharpe, Carl Lewis, AO47966.
×Sharpless, Thomas Frank, AO52593.
Shaver, Dale Anderson, AO35270.
Shaw, Charles Howard, AO34823.
×Shaw, Donald Adrian, AO40350.
×Shaw, Lauren Launder, Jr., AO53874.
Shay, Michael, AO44935.
Shay, Steve Cseh, AO52496.
Shea, Daniel Francis, AO26111.
Shealy, William Thomas, AO40297.
×Shean, John Paige, AO53952.
×Sheehan, Roy Hampton, AO44502.
Sheldon, Porter Farley, AO47273.
Sheley, Edward Lee, Jr., AO25438.
Shelton, Eldridge Gudeion, Jr., AO36047.
Shelton, Harvey Wirt Courtland, AO24886.
×Shelton, Lee Mereden, AO45243.
×Shelton, Orville William, AO46171.
×Shelton, William Mays, AO33760.
×Shepard, Charles William, AO46993.
Shepard, Ernest Berryman, AO36101.
×Sheppard, Chris Jewel, AO36016.
×Shepperd, Virgil Earl, AO44102.
Sherborne, Henry Hall, AO52301.
Sherman, Lenard, AO35121.
×Sherrill, Stephen Huntting, Jr., AO26318.
×Sherwood, Joseph Huling, Jr., AO46342.
Sherwood, Vernon Melvin, AO37269.
Shewbart, William Monroe, AO43555.
Shields, Benjamin Bayard, AO45477.
Shiely, Albert Raymond, Jr., AO25928.
Shiffrin, Benjamin Hankin, AO44315.
Shiner, Byron David, AO47581.
Shinnamon, Charles Wesley, AO52443.
×Shinners, John Wilford, AO54154.
×Shipley, Edward Vail, AO44713.
×Shirey, Clair Leo, AO36890.
Shirk, Harley Owen, AO52656.
Shirley, Fred Allen, AO45740.
Shirley, Paul, AO36100.
Shivers, Julius Dewitt, Jr., AO35327.
Shockley, Thomas Leon, AO54901.
Shomo, William Arthur, AO46706.
Shook, Carmel Monroe, AO37297.
Shook, Harold Graham, AO46351.
Short, Howard Earl, AO44530.
Short, Robert Bryan, AO24742.
×Short, William Walter, Jr., AO46312.
Shotwell, William Bedford, AO44950.
Showalter, Roy Russell, Jr., AO41042.
×Shubin, Murray Joseph, AO35809.
×Shumway, John Rollin, AO35597.
Sianis, Pete Chris, AO46198.
×Siler, Fred Le Roy, AO53460.
Silliman, Clifford Roger, AO39166.
Silva, John Joseph, AO46971.
×Silvester, Lindsey McDonald, AO26157.
×Simcoe, Desider Anthony, Jr., AO54368.
Simler, George Brenner, 4th, AO36453.
Simmons, Hal Francis, AO35605.
Simmons, Henry Caraway, AO47027.
Simmons, Joe Linn, AO32422.
Simmons, John Albert, Jr., AO46581.
Simmons, William Ballis, AO47150.
Simon, Edward Rudolph, AO40535.
Simon, Edwin Herman, AO44825.
Simonetti, Lino David, AO44534.
×Simpson, Charles Edwin, AO36288.
×Simpson, Robert Tennent, 4th, AO46174.
Simpson, Thomas Samuel, AO36456.
×Sims, Harold Hilson, AO48168.
Sinex, Charles Helm, Jr., AO52209.
Sinskie, Daniel Alexander, AO35603.
×Sipes, Richard R., AO35200.
Sipes, William Claude, Jr., AO47313.
Sipper, Joseph Robert, AO44425.
Sirney, John Ashton, AO44682.
Sisler, Orland Odell, AO34432.
Sittman, William Lewis, AO47839.
Skalak, Rudolph, AO44443.
×Skelton, Milton Bruce, AO45064.
Skinner, Ernest Harold, AO49001.
Skinner, Paul McDonald, AO44252.
Skipp, Francis Edwin, Jr., AO53924.
Skousen, Samuel James, AO35646.
×Slater, Herschel Harold, AO48027.
Slater, Ralph Phipps, AO44775.
Slaton, Howard Westley, AO24926.
×Sloan, William Alfred, Jr., AO36971.
Slocum, Paul James, AO35356.
×Slocumb, Clyde Buchanan, Jr., AO35034.
×Slough, Andrew Elmer, AO43736.
Slough, James Carl, AO44657.
Sluder, Amos Leslie, AO45662.
Slusher, John Thomas, AO48113.
Slusser, Hayden Colvar, AO48196.
Small, Arthur, AO35344.
×Small, Richard Dante, Jr., AO47328.
Smart, Howard Frederick, AO43532.
Smiley, Bert Nelson, AO34436.
×Smith, Alan Bronson, Jr., AO53152.
Smith, B. J., AO35107.
Smith, Brandon Corder, AO44446.
×Smith, Carroll C., AO34588.
Smith, Cecil Burnett, AO45939.
Smith, Charles Chesely, AO54243.
Smith, Claude Wesley, AO47348.
Smith, Clure Elton, Jr., AO53699.
Smith, Clyde Harrison, AO43787.
Smith, Cornelius Marcellus, Jr., AO36580.
Smith, Derwood K., AO46480.
Smith, Don Ansel, AO43576.
Smith, Earl Octavis, Jr., AO46825.
Smith, Edward Donald, AO46445.
×Smith, Elmer Frank, AO53551.
Smith, Everett Hensel, AO44531.
Smith, Forrester McLain, Jr., AO33706.
Smith, Frank Joseph, AO44361.
Smith, Gerald Thornton, AO33594.
Smith, Harvey Neal, AO46793.
Smith, James Gordon, AO47058.
×Smith, James Murray, AO36464.
Smith, John Edward, AO45187.
Smith, John Michael, AO53002.
×Smith, John Robert, AO53392.
Smith, Joseph Carlyle, AO47362.
×Smith, Kenneth Bates, AO25955.
×Smith, Leon Allen, AO47665.
×Smith, Leslie Albert, AO46176.
Smith, Lowell Blair, AO25920.
×Smith, Raleigh Delmer, AO40671.
×Smith, Ralph Lester, AO48965.
×Smith, Raymond Miller, AO46001.
Smith, Reet Poe, AO44237.
Smith, Richard Earl, AO52839.
Smith, Robert Emmett, AO46486.
Smith, Robert Elbert, AO52688.
Smith, Robert Chanell, AO44067.
Smith, Robert William, AO35078.
Smith, Rodney Ellsworth, AO44089.
×Smith, Roy Orval, Jr., AO24749.
Smith, Russell Jackson, AO25660.
Smith, Sidney George, AO44516.
Smith, Stanley, AO46593.
Smith, Sydney Philip, AO35870.
×Smith, Vernon Arthur, AO32117.
×Smith, Vincent Edgar, AO43534.
Smith, William Eugene, AO36820.
Smith, William Kenneth, AO46259.
×Smith, William Kirland, AO44936.
Smith, William Radcliffe, AO35637.
×Smith, Woodrow Wilson, AO45130.
Smoot, Oliver Reed, AO44236.
Smutko, Leonard Steven, AO47637.
Smyrl, James Arthur, AO37034.
Snaider, Himey Jones, AO44618.
Snavely, William Wayne, AO26254.
Snipes, Gilmer Lee, AO39157.
Snipes, James Cook, Jr., AO36206.
Snodgrass, Okey Warren, Jr., AO46796.
×Snow, David Joseph, AO46182.
Snow, Wilbur Deane, AO24737.
Snyder, Edgar Ernest, Jr., AO35334.
Snyder, Vincent Lucian, AO35148.
Snyder, Wayne Keith, AO48483.
Soha, Walter Michael, AO46596.
Solem, Herman Stanley, AO36721.
×Sommers, Norval Isom, Jr., AO40614.
Sorey, Robert Lexford, AO35633.
Sorrell, Larue Scott, AO52820.
Sorte, Martin Eugene, AO35505.
Souleyret, Kenneth, AO39310.
Sours, Lyle Samuel, AO46939.
Sours, Robert John, AO47450.
Souva, Raymond Francis, AO52491.
Sowers, Gordon Thomas, AO46290.
Spawn, Douglas Wilson, AO35240.
×Spear, Peter Holden, AO46813.
Spear, Sid Franklin, AO54197.
Speer, Maurice Edmund, AO33290.
Spelis, Tadas Joseph, AO47246.
Spencer, Charles Flavius, AO54168.
Spencer, Gordon Abbott, AO53256.
Spencer, Harold Melville, AO44511.
Spielan, Richard, AO45758.
Spieth, Charles, Jr., AO26334.
×Spieth, Robert, AO43869.
Spitler, Lee William, AO37286.
×Spohn, Clifford Adams, AO52731.
Spooner, Julius Leonard, AO43588.
Sporn, Martin, AO47756.
Sprawls, Philip Claudius, AO33051.
Springer, Ralph Robertson, AO47222.
×Spurrell, William Alfred, AO44263.
×Stafford, Gordon Howard, AO40476.
×Stafford, Robert Cottom, AO44786.
Stahl, Horst Adolph, AO54114.
×Stainback, Frank Pleasants, Jr., AO23801.
Staite, Robert Alfred, AO47093.
Stallings, Gordon Kenneth, AO54132.
Stallings, Guy Harrison, AO52628.
Stallings, McLendon Montgomery, AO40510.
Stambaugh, Claude Kendall, AO34097.
Stanley, Gregory Quinn, AO52770.
Stanley, Ralph Willard, AO52810.
Stann, Leon, AO24863.
Stansbury, Jay Wayne, AO35339.
Stanton, Carroll Lane, AO45587.
Stanton, George LaRue, AO40541.
Stanton, William Joseph, Jr., AO48604.
×Stapleton, Carl William, AO24740.
Starke, Eugene Clifford, AO47207.
Starr, Stephen Albert, Jr., AO32902.
Staskewitz, Benjamin Edward, AO43701.
Stay, Jesse Eldred, AO36368.
Steakley, Ralph Douglas, AO46437.
×Stealy, Edward James, AO45734.
Stebelton, Samuel Frederick, AO25081.
Steel, Byron Mevell, AO53982.
Steele, Richard Andre, AO52524.
Steele, William, AO32009.
Steen, Garland Creighton, AO45353.
Steere, Samuel Adams, Jr., AO25281.
×Stehling, Henry Joseph, AO40912.
Stein, Frederick Philip, AO54355.
Steiner, Irvin Carl, AO52834.
Steiner, William H., Jr., AO46677.
Steinhauer, Raleigh Fred, AO36927.
Steinle, Paul Leonard, AO26217.
Stell, Glenn Aswell, AO35430.

Stellenwerf, William Atkinson, AO46319.
Stephens, Allen Wright, AO45358.
×Stephens, Donald Alfred, AO45106.
Stephens, Lawrence Edward, AO54090.
Stephens, Raymond Dee, AO52492.
Stephens, Robert Winston, AO36694.
Stephenson, Ottis Virgil, AO46811.
Sterling, Edwin Leigh, AO40794.
Sterne, Paul John, Jr., AO40489.
×Stevens, John LuRae, AO52160.
Stevens, Kenneth Ray, AO34899.
×Stevens, Raymond Wesley, AO45082.
Stevens, William Fay, AO45334.
×Stevenson, Horace Adlai, Jr., AO47031.
Stevenson, John Thomas, AO47857.
Stevenson, Robert John, AO45169.
×Stewart, Carl W., AO33028.
Stewart, George Benjamin, AO34207.
×Stewart, James Thompson, AO35903.
Stewart, John Leger, AO52725.
Stewart, John Smith, AO35756.
Stewart, R. C., AO54048.
Stewart, Robert William, Jr., AO52495.
Stewart, Tom Benjamin, AO45959.
Stewart, William Robert, Jr., AO25741.
Stiefel, Max Allen, AO45100.
Stiglich, John Jack, AO52268.
Stiles, Kenneth, AO52288.
Stiles, Lowell Augustus, AO54031.
×Stiles, Richard Henry, AO52546.
×Stines, Harrison Oberdorf, AO52578.
×Stinson, Frederick Austin, AO53652.
Stinson, Floyd Harold, AO45956.
Stitt, Austin Walter, Jr., AO45615.
Stitt, Glenn Theodore, AO44041.
Stockett, John Clifton, Jr., AO32705.
Stockton, William Arthur, AO42921.
Stoddard, Richard William, AO26093.
×Stoffel, Nicholas Peter, AO46731.
Stokely, Joe Edwin, AO32987.
×Stone, Albert Wilson, AO53366.
Stone, Francis Marvin, AO52873.
Stone, Lynn Elden, AO52757.
Stoney, Paul Roberts, AO36278.
Strait, William Van, Jr., AO54140.
Strang, Charles Francis, AO48553.
Strathy, Charlton Graham, AO40533.
Strauss, William, AO44610.
Streete, Alec Beaver, AO35138.
Streeton, Jack Wesley, AO24571.
Strickler, Marshall Handy, AO35341.
Strihafka, Louis Francis, AO40545.
Stringer, Robert Dillon, AO33154.
Strode, Ross Dexter, AO36874.
Strom, Charles Walter, AO52381.
Stroud, Conley Burns, Jr., AO52882.
×Stroud, Herbert Ogden, AO46563.
Stroud, Walter Charles, AO45132.
Stuart, John Montgomery, Jr., AO43967.
Stuart, Joseph Alexander, Jr., AO25711.
Stubbs, Gail Lewis, AO36747.
Stubbs, James Marcus, AO47711.
Stubbs, Robert Reid, AO33533.
Suber, Stanley Edgar, AO54807.
Stubiarec, Michael Jack, AO33481.
Stulb, Joseph George, Jr., AO40638.
×Sturdevant, Donald Ernest, AO55050.
Sturges, Claude C., Jr., AO22537.
Sturgis, James Edwin, AO32234.
Stutzman, Robert Gordon, AO33865.
Sudbury, David Vincent, AO52494.
Suddeth, David Andrew, AO35201.
×Suehr, Richard Charles, AO45588.
Suggs, John Jacob, AO44645.
Suggs, Ralph Goodrich, AO35639.
Sullivan, Arthur Joseph, AO52654.
×Sullivan, Daniel Francis, AO32374.
×Sullivan, Edward Donald S., AO34202.
Sullivan, Frederick Edward, AO52320.
Sullivan, Woodruff Turner, Jr., AO35345.
Sullivan, William Charles, AO37332.
Sulloway, Alexander Mark, AO44036.
Summerfield, Leslie Francis, AO46286.
×Summers, Clarence Eugene, Jr., AO43978.
×Summers, Charles Leroy, AO35627.
Sun, Jack Klotz, AO32764.
Sunderland, Duane Oral, AO52912.
Suta, Nicholas Henry, AO44725.
Sutin, Nathan, AO52530.
Sutter, Marshall Royce, AO52997.
Suttle, Dale Davenport, AO52144.
Sutton, John Liggett, AO43718.
×Svejkar, Joseph, AO47140.
Svenvold, Harold Richard, AO36791.
×Svoboda, Milton Joseph, AO53074.
Svore, Ferdinand Luther, AO35482.
Swan, Clinton David, AO49062.
Swanke, Edwin Alden, AO53187.
Swann, Franklin Wilburn, AO34410.
Swanson, Charles Kenneth, AO43761.
Swanson, Darwin Earl, AO34353.
Swanson, Ralph William, AO53247.
Swanson, Richard Walter, AO44520.
Swanson, Theodore Benedict, AO44567.
Sweat, Dale Sidney, AO26279.
Sweeney, James Earl, AO47624.
Sweetland, Earle Everett, AO35769.
Sweigart, Bert LeRoy, AO44596.
Swenson, Shirl H., AO32953.
×Swindler, Harold, AO52630.
Swiren, Alfred Milton, AO35778.
×Swofford, John Forrest, AO34416.
Sydnor, Robert Austin, AO45741.
Sykes, George Kunkel, AO25487.
×Sylvester, Joseph James, AO46300.
Symes, Isaac Mathias Baker, AO52693.
Tainsh, Alexander Simpson, AO35354.
Talbot, Joseph Louis, AO54004.
Talbott, Carlos Maurice, AO25797.
Taliaferro, Walter Richard, AO25591.
×Talmage, Henry Gardner, AO40655.
Talmant, Alex William, AO47314.
Tanberg, Lawrence Frederick, AO35513.
×Tankersley, Carl Ray, AO45240.
×Tansel, Dave Collins, AO44651.
×Tapp, James Buckley, AO36246.
Tapscott, Wilbur Alan, AO37319.
Tara, Hollis Barker, AO36017.
Tarbet, Dale Fife, AO36507.
Tarbutton, Jean Dupuy, AO36786.
Tarver, William Head, Jr., AO53663.
Tarvin, Russell Wayne, AO35406.
Tatman, Paul Preston, AO33253.
×Tattini, Leno, AO44729.
Tatum, Theodore Penfield, Jr., AO36022.
Tatum, William, AO52846.
Tauscher, Robert Edwin, AO46292.
Taylor, Ben, AO44050.
Taylor, Charles Meredith, AO44629.
Taylor, Dayton Reed, AO40938.
Taylor, Edward Hamilton, AO54472.
Taylor, Emery Durell, AO37245.
Taylor, Fitzgerald, AO35567.
Taylor, Glenn Watson, AO46648.
Taylor, Henry Weston, Jr., AO52657.
Taylor, Joe DeLay, AO45020.
Taylor, John Peter, AO46595.
Taylor, Lester, George, Jr., AO25618.
Taylor, Ralph Gordon, Jr., AO35911.
×Taylor, Richard, AO35183.
Taylor, Richard Winn, AO46433.
Taylor, Robert Arthur, AO37000.
Taylor, Thomas Edward, AO40313.
Taylor, Robert Harold, AO46436.
Taylor, William Earl, AO33255.
Taylor, William Elton, AO22602.
Taylor, William Vaughn, AO52339.
Tebbs, Jim Reid, AO43518.
Teberg, Daniel Ernest, AO34826.
×Teller, J. Craig, AO26275.
×Telzrow, Thomas Eugene, AO45727.
Temple, Kenneth Leo, AO46733.
Templeton, Horace Arnold, AO40940.
×Tennant, Charles Willis, AO36245.
Tennis, Langdon Carlyle, AO40436.
Terhune, Claude Mitchell, AO45506.
Terry, Melvin Paul, AO52488.
Terzian, Roger Hornsby, AO45833.
Teubner, Harold Charles, AO35398.
Thabault, George Bernard, AO44548.
Thaler, David, AO52527.
Thayer, Arthur Linwood, Jr., AO32931.
×Theisen, Emmett John, AO46429.
Therrien, Patrick Elogius, AO52290.
Thiele, Harold Edwin, AO43872.
Thomas, Clarence Lamar, AO43886.
Thomas, Frank Leslie, AO53244.
×Thomas, Leonard Laughlin, AO53671.
Thompson, Alden George, AO24077.
×Thompson, Arthur John, Jr., AO44695.
Thompson, Charles Edward, AO47963.
Thompson, Dan Fox, AO35470.
Thompson, Dillard Norman, AO43862.
×Thompson, Donald Warren, AO25673.
Thompson, Donn Graydon, AO37288.
×Thompson, Francis Newton, AO53471.
Thompson, Glen Wilson, AO33738.
Thompson, Harry James, AO54559.
Thompson, Harry Melvin, AO45916.
×Thompson, Jesse Duncan, AO23952.
Thompson, John Arthur, AO46032.
Thompson, John Keller, AO36723.
Thompson, Kenneth Dean, AO35266.
Thompson, Lorenzo Maurice, AO45000.
Thompson, Milton Elmo, AO22826.
Thompson, Russell Bertel, AO40576.
Thompson, Shirley Boyd, AO36528.
Thompson, William Martin, AO25775.
×Thompson, Edwin Wesley, AO33377.
×Thorne, James Howard, AO35392.
Thorne, Walter Edward, AO53403.
×Thornton, Clark Olmsted, AO46523.
Thornton, Julian Roy, Jr., AO44019.
Thornton, W. Henry, Jr., AO52799.
Thrash, Joe Merriwether, Jr., AO40290.
Thurston, Joseph Walter, AO35952.
Tibbetts, Oscar Norland, AO44434.
Tibbs, Charles Edwin, AO35493.
Tidball, Dale Richard, AO44306.
Tiernan, Thomas John, AO47398.
×Tigner, Edwin Brown, AO43744.
×Tilghman, Marvin Hugh, AO44669.
Tillery, James Hightower, AO44068.
Tilley, George Franklin, Jr., AO35191.
Tilley, Reade Franklin, AO54390.
Tilley, Thomas Marshall, AO35343.
Tillman, Herman George, Jr., AO48710.
Tillman, James Dan, Jr., AO43865.
Timbers, George Theodore, AO36390.
Timm, Paul August, AO45052.
×Timmons, Herschel Marvin, AO52453.
×Tingwall, Robert Leon, AO40771.
×Tippen, Forrest Wade, AO35977.
Tipton, Richard Pike, AO35808.
Tisdale, Paul Arthur, AO35258.
Titus, Harold Jack, AO45376.
Todd, Robert Francis, AO46271.
Toland, Butler Bell, Jr., AO36300.
Toler, Richard Grant, AO35304.
Tomlinson, Franklin Eugene, AO34786.
Toole, Richard Allen, AO34618.
Toon, Charles Maxwell, AO52515.
Topper, Morse, AO44666.
×Tornes, Howard, AO45249.
Torr, Francis Evelyn, AO45066.
Tosti, Carlo Ralph, AO47108.
Totten, Jerry Mac, AO35856.
Tower, Archie Almond, AO44988.
×Towne, Raymond Lester, AO33827.
Townsend, Barry Baldwin, AO33319.
Townsend, Guy Mannering, AO47074.
Toye, Edward Eugene, AO43836.
Tracy, Henry Lewis, AO45045.
×Tracy, Joseph Francis, AO45027.
Trail, Charles Darwin, AO35180.
×Trask, James Edward, AO46739.
×Trask, John Alvin, AO54585.
Trautt, Edward Ambrose, AO44349.
Trearse, Albert, AO32988.
Treland, Oscar, AO47060.
Trenkle, Robert Anthony, AO44291.
Trexler, Troy Lee, AO45044.
Triantafellu, Rockly, AO36770.
×Tribble, Randolph Louis, AO44113.
Trimble, Harry White, AO24083.
×Trojanowski, Maurice John, AO43618.
Trotter, Claude Augustus, Jr., AO34998.
True, Oscar Harold, AO43942.
×Trzyna, Casimir John, AO46975.
Tucker, Albert Sidney Johnston, Jr., AO26270.
Tucker, Norman Percy, AO35528.
Tueler, Jack LeRoy, AO35755.
×Tunks, Emerson Ambrose Anthony, AO44118.
Turbak, Chester, AO44658.
×Turk, Laurel Agee, AO52705.
Turk, Wilbert, AO37042.
×Turnbull, John Frederick, AO34696.

Turner, Barney Ellsworth, AO35929.
Turner, Billy Markley, AO32600.
Turner, Egbert Snyder, Jr., AO52457.
Turner, Hiram Glenn, Jr., AO25543.
Turner, John Mac, AO34918.
Turner, Lewis Mack, AO53336.
Turner, Vernon Richard, AO26113.
Turnipseed, Felix Martin, Jr., AO53966.
×Turton, John Stephen, AO46902.
Tweedie, Roy Leonard, AO47317.
Twichell, Wallace Bruce, Jr., AO53563.
Tyler, James Otey, AO36399.
×Tyler, Joe Milton, AO46461.
Tyler, John Thomas, AO45881.
×Tyler, Morgan Seymour, Jr., AO35134.
Tyler, Robert Andrew, AO35219.
Tyrrell, Robert Louis Fredricka, AO54925.
Tyson, John, AO35623.
Uglow, Ray Daniel, Jr., AO45965.
Uhle, Richard Bauer, AO53548.
Uhrich, George Adams, AO35348.
×Uhrig, Robert A., AO40412.
Umoff, Alexis Paul, AO48518.
Underwood, Herbert Arthur, AO56038.
Upchurch, Jerry Emerson, AO46919.
Upchurch, Terrell Martin, AO52447.
Upson, Linus Frederick, Jr., AO53826.
Urbach, Leonard Henry, AO43947.
Urban, Emil Lewis, AO52611.
Utley, William Andrews, AO44154.
Vacca, Gerald Robert, AO43578.
Vail, Hugh Beugler, AO46062.
Valentine, William John, AO36686.
Valusek, John, Jr., AO32826.
Van Buskirk, Arthur Brown, AO38940.
Van Deusen, Clark Bedell, AO45074.
Van Duyn, John Edgar, AO25708.
Van Neste, Henry Irving, AO44311.
Van Patten, Isaac Toll 3d, AO45558.
Van Pelt, James Hillgoss, AO35043.
Van Sickle, Wendell Mac, AO33091.
Van Steenis, Loren Clifford, AO44549.
×Van Vliet, Charles Thrasher, AO44312.
×Van Wagoner, Robert Norton, AO44260.
Van De Car, Howard Thomas, AO34624.
Vanden Dries, William Peter, AO48398.
Vanden Heuvel, George Renzel, AO45641.
Vandeveer, Lawrence Edwin, AO36420.
Vaughn, Clare Ray, AO52347.
Vaughn, Jasper Melvin Paul, AO46713.
Vaughn, William Enoch, Jr., AO32877.
Vaught, Robert Harry, AO45773.
Veatch, Bernard Willmore, AO33581.
Veazey, Madison Arnold, Jr., AO40907.
Vega, Carl Emmanuell, AO44926.
×Velde, Robert Lee, AO34058.
Ventriss, Donald Edwin, AO47092.
Verbeck, Peter, AO32908.
Verbeek, Harry Peter, AO32268.
Verbruggen, George John, AO33294.
Vernon, Elmer Harland, AO53921.
×Vestal, Howard Lee, AO35895.
×Vetter, Fred William, Jr., AO48293.
Vick, John Oliver, AO44904.
Vickers, Laverne Delmar, AO35685.
Vickers, Roth Edward, AO43936.
Vickery, Benjamin Patterson, Jr., AO52329.
Victor, Henry Grant, AO45582.
Vignetti, John Lawrence, AO44506.
Vivian, Edward Alfred, AO35601.
Vivian, Jerrold Morris, AO47885.
Vivian, Lawrence, AO36487.
Vlcek, Donald Henry, AO25541.
Vogt, John William, Jr., AO35901.
×Vogt, Louis Richard, AO46635.
Voigt, Jack Parks, AO47184.
×Voruz, Herbert George, Jr., AO52836.
Voss, Nathaniel Reid, Jr., AO43976.
Vreeland, Robert William, AO43937.
×Wade, Robert Edwin, AO33070.
Wade, William Glenn, AO49031.
Wagner, Carl Emil, AO44995.
Wagner, Harry Alden, AO53053.
Wagner, Wilfred William, AO44670.
Wagnon, Manford Kinney, AO34525.
×Walck, Richard Eugene, AO35988.
Waldroup, Marvin Martin, Jr., AO46641.
Wallor, John Thomas, AO36159.
Walker, David Henry, AO22579.
Walker, Donald John, AO45204.
Walker, George Theodore, AO46213.
×Walker, Hal Tabb, AO47456.
Walker, James Harper, AO25987.
Walker, Joe, AO34461.
Walker, John Henry, AO44568.
Walker, Lewis Harold, AO47497.
×Walker, Ralph Lee, AO35009.
Walker, Richard Louis, AO47682.
Walker, Roy Ralph, AO43918.
Walker, Templeton S., AO32775.
Walker, Walter Bertram, Jr., AO44228.
Walker, William Allan, AO33122.
×Walker, William Jennings, AO52485.
Wall, Edward Martin, AO45277.
Wallace, Duane Galen, AO49056.
Walace, Eugene Dye, AO46360.
Wallace, Robert Davis, AO34901.
Wallace, Wesley Fillmore, AO45015.
Wallach, John Andrew, AO37134.
×Wallen, Francis Leroy, AO34418.
Wallen, Phil Jack, AO46695.
Waller, Walter Ralph, Jr., AO36806.
Walling, Robert John, AO25722.
Walrath, Richard Drake, AO45554.
×Walsh, David Ignatius, AO48146.
Walsh, George Henry, AO46477.
Walsh, Henry Joseph, AO52559.
Walsh, Howard Benjiman, AO35033.
Walsh, James David, AO52528.
Walsh, Martin Raymond, Jr., AO35368.
Walsh, Michael Joseph, AO52224.
Walter, Clarence Douglas, AO52598.
Walters, Harold Stephen, AO53546.
Walters, Joe Paul, AO35750.
×Walters, Robert Whiting, AO52808.
Walters, Therwin Stanley, AO36043.
×Waltz, Robert Wesley, AO36972.
Wambold, William Henry, AO48788.
×Wanamaker, Martin Eugene, AO52324.
Wansley, Theodore, AO32259.
×Ward, Albert McConnell, AO25008.
Ward, George Phillip, AO45097.
Ward, James Aubrey, AO44968.
×Ward, Joseph Lea, AO40875.
Ward, Oliver Clark, AO35706.
Ward, P. J., AO32762.
Warden, Wayne, Jr., AO45115.
Ware, William, AO43613.
Warfield, Allen, Jr., AO48128.
Warner, George Oliver, AO44848.
Warns, Thomas Francis, AO47917.
Warren, John Edgar, AO43993.
Warthman, Jack Dussel, AO44619.
×Washburn, Walter Raleigh, Jr., AO45455.
×Waslenko, Michael, Jr., AO53340.
Waste, Robert Jackson, AO53003.
Waters, Joseph R., AO47041.
Watkins, James Dudley, AO44913.
Watkins, James Howard, AO25921.
Watkins, John Raymond, AO44533.
Watkins, John Jefferson, AO35662.
Watkins, Loy Edwin, AO45531.
Watson, Dudley Malone, AO48347.
Watson, George Henry, AO36459.
×Watson, James Wyatt, AO54641.
×Watson, Lawrence Middleton, AO25945.
Watson, Oscar Lafayette, AO46530.
Watson, Richard Clark, AO44545.
×Watson, William Burdette, AO45035.
Watts, George Joseph, AO53141.
Watts, John Ruben, AO52361.
Watts, Ralph Kenton, AO53380.
Watwood, Louis V., AO44125.
Wayne, Byron Mitchell, AO49078.
Weart, George Spoor, AO25569.
Weatherford, Sydney William, AO35868.
Weaver, Frederick, AO32323.
Weaver, James William, AO36037.
Weaver, Marvin Eugene, AO44986.
×Weaver, William Joseph, AO44830.
Webb, Allen Sterm, AO53475.
Webb, Clarence Russell, Jr., AO47098.
Webb, Joe Slaughter, AO52787.
Webb, Rudelle Baxton, AO33591.
Webber, Paul Eugene, AO36255.
Weber, John Lerdy, Jr., AO25522.
Webster, Frank Russell, Jr., AO32337.
Webster, Lewis Frazer, AO26087.
Wedding, John Francis, AO36468.
Weddle, Owen Allen, AO47241.
Weeks, Howard Tolford, AO44803.
Weeks, James Bernard, AO47489.
Weeks, James Lew, AO35452.
Weems, Woodrow Wilson, AO47265.
×Wegenhoft, Victor Charles, AO40718.
Weide, Edward James, AO52879.
Weidner, Joseph John, AO24039.
Weigel, Andrew Hudson, AO24778.
×Weikel, Paul Wilson, AO43738.
×Weil, August Edward, AO48349.
×Weiner, Joseph, AO43732.
×Weir, Robert Adam, AO41073.
Weisbrodt, Charles Richard, AO52644.
×Weiser, Gus, AO48258.
Weiss, Sidney, AO45008.
Welch, Darrell Gail, AO53231.
×Welch, George Coleman, AO35128.
×Welch, James Edward, AO45973.
Welch, Rupert Carlton, AO45917.
Wellborn, Jeffery O'Neal, AO46206.
Weller, Russell Kenneth, AO36063.
Wells, George Louis, AO34411.
×Wells, John Pender, AO45362.
Wells, Ray Edward, AO36953.
Weltzin, Richard Fredrick, AO35440.
Weniger, Robert Lee, Jr., AO39235.
Wenk, Walter Rudolph, AO46093.
Wentz, Paul Norwood, AO48034.
×Wernlein, Frank Allen, AO44785.
×West, Howard Barnell, AO34379.
West, Howard Fletcher, AO44613.
West, Robert Willard, AO44276.
Westberg, Kenneth Charles, AO52850.
×Westbrook, Jasper Alton, AO45489.
Westbrook, Marston Thorn, AO26130.
×Westenhoff, John Hurst, AO24956.
Westfall, William Bryan, AO53565.
×Westmoreland, Lonnie Quitman, AO35871.
Westwood, John Raymond, AO32327.
Wethe, J. Duane, AO25889.
×Wetzel, Albert John, AO24582.
Wheeler, Frederick Grant, AO35773.
×Wheeler, Joe Dell, AO34896.
Whitaker, Keith Albert, AO26195.
White, Andrew Milton, AO56902.
White, Ernest Johnson, Jr., AO24961.
White, Jack Clement, AO34975.
White, Joe Ross, AO45878.
×White, Ralph James, AO24885.
×White, Richard Durwin, AO40332.
×White, Robert Harry, AO36401.
White, Thomas David, AO34513.
×White, William Roland, AO52698.
White, William Thomas, AO35804.
Whitehead, Chauncey Brownloe, AO44540.
Whitehorn, Kenneth Walker, AO35515.
Whitenack, George Minor, 3d, AO32688.
Whitfield, Joe Mangham, AO36265.
Whitker, Frederic Edward, AO53839.
×Whitley, Charles George, AO34557.
Whitley, Edgar Duer, AO40883.
×Whitlow, Floyd Bruner, Jr., AO34474.
×Whitlow, Robert Victor, AO25763.
Whitman, Edward Bostwick, Jr., AO45831.
×Whitmire, James Martin, Jr., AO46441.
Whitmore, Robert Alvin, AO36225.
Whitney, William James, AO53110.
Whitsett, Jack William, AO36247.
Whitson, Jack Henderson, AO25925.
Whitt, James Andrew, AO47945.
Whittaker, Roy Eugene, AO35361.
Whittingham, Douglas James, AO45637.
×Whittington, Riley Norwood, AO52493.
Whittle, Frederick James, AO43912.
Wickham, Wallace, AO37015.
Wicklund, Harold Alphonse, AO35807.
×Wiecks, Max Reid, AO52609.
Wiehrdt, Leonard Irving, AO46464.
×Wiener, Murray Arnold, AO52906.
×Wientjes, Gerard Francis, AO45550.
×Wiesner, Paul Francis, AO44192.
Wigbels, Lawrence Gerrard, AO43794.
Wigger, William Franklin, AO47507.
×Wight, Carroll Herbert, AO34468.
Wilcox, Frank Hurst, Jr., AO34082.
×Wilcox, Roland MacGowan, AO34072.
Wilde, Linn Erlon, Jr., AO45597.
Wilder, Harlan Cree, AO35296.
×Wildinger, Joseph Valentine, AO44124.
Wilfong, John Jay, AO47181.
Wilk, Jake Louis, Jr., AO53667.
×Wilkerson, William Frank, AO53557.
Wilkinson, Richard Gaddis, AO34878.

Willcox, Grover Cleveland, Jr., AO46639.
Willetts, David Leonard, AO35369.
Willey, Carl Raymond, AO35098.
×Willey, Clifford Alvoid, AO36828.
Williams, Augustus Forney, Jr., AO34775.
Williams, Coleman Osborne, Jr., AO37005.
Williams, Carl Felton, AO43879.
Williams, Charles Carter, AO35381.
Williams, Charles William, AO48206.
Williams, David Munroe, AO48010.
Williams, de Jack, AO35497.
×Williams, Donald Grant, AO32022.
Williams, George Vincent, AO34617.
Williams, George Pershing, AO36340.
Williams, Hilbert Baker, AO52707.
Williams, Jack Pryer, AO52866.
×Williams, Jack Wilford, AO45514.
Williams, James Madison, AO35340.
×Williams, James Willis, AO44122.
Williams, John Grenville, AO45260.
Williams, Lawrence Dale, AO53423.
Williams, Lee Roy, Jr., AO35759.
Williams, Leslie Benjamin, AO40394.
Williams, Richard Arnold, AO52623.
Williams, Todd Gill, AO54985.
Williams, Walter Pippen, AO35283.
Williams, William Allen, AO25209.
Williams, Willian Milburn, AO33497.
Williams, Yancey, AO52771.
Williamson, Laurence David, AO46997.
Williamson, Samuel Samson, Jr., AO54442.
Willis, Lloy Cecil, AO44881.
Willis, Milton Dean, AO45009.
Willis, Robert Franklin, AO36644.
×Willms, Gene Charles, AO47648.
Wilmot, Allan Eustis, AO45691.
Wilson, Campbell Ferry Monroe, AO52508.
Wilson, Charles Smith, AO44032.
Wilson, Edward Lewis, Jr., AO35632.
Wilson, Frederick William Hildebrand, AO32397.
Wilson, Harold Lewis, AO46388.
×Wilson, Harry Alvin, AO54613.
×Wilson, Irl Donaker, Jr., AO44731.
Wilson, James Arthur, AO39161.
Wilson, Jerald Bruce, AO52772.
×Wilson, John McLain, AO44096.
Wilson, Louis Locke, Jr., AO25623.
Wilson, Richard Ashby, AO54253.
×Wilson, Robert Alden Hamilton, AO47962.
Wilson, Vernon Eugene, AO53706.
×Wilson, Walter George, AO52240.
Wilson, Walter James, AO33635.
Wilson, William Ashley, Jr., AO36215.
Wilson, William Monroe, AO37108.
Wilson, Woodrow, AO44776.
Wimsatt, Joseph Francis, AO46882.
×Winberry, William Matthew, AO53482.
Wine, Chester Bolton, AO46201.
×Winebrenner, Louis Elmer, AO44801.
×Winfree, Isaac Owen, AO23836.
×Winfrey, Hal Cawood, AO46912.
Winget, Francis Edward, AO52540.
Winkler, John Moon, AO35512.
×Winn, Chasteen Guy, Jr., AO41091.
×Winn, Otis Ellsworth, AO48765.
Winneshiek, William Sherwood, AO47676.
×Winter, William Fredrick, AO48126.
Wintner, Bernard Godfrey, AO46591.
Wischmann, George Adolph, AO44444.
Wiseman, Joseph Lewis, AO48844.
Wiseman, Lee Verne, AO36455.
Wisniewski, Raymond Francis, AO36928.
Witt, Lynn Elwood, Jr., AO33416.
×Witt, Thomas F., AO36594.
Witters, Arthur George, AO53398.
×Wobbe, Roger Lawrence, AO53535.
Woida, Joseph Anthony, AO45180.
Woinowsk, Russell Kenneth, AO44528.
Wolcott, John Payne, AO52156.
×Wold, Leonard Reginald, AO46623.
Wolf, Charles Sebastian, AO52978.
Wolf, John Joseph, AO43943.
Wolfe, Gerald, AO48558.
Woltanski, Thaddeus Lewis, AO22834.
Wood, Griffin Howard, AO53253.
Wood, Jim Henry, AO47602.
Wood, Joseph Thomas, Jr., AO44255.
Wood, Lynn Frederick, AO52856.
×Wood, Marvin James, AO52683.
Wood, Thomas Donnelley, AO52299.
Woodring, Dugan V., AO45921.
Woodruff, David Terry, AO44882.
Woodruff, Harold Delmar, AO39222.
Woodruff, Laymont Venson, AO48646.
Woodruff, Roscoe Barnette, Jr., AO24074.
Woods, Everett Newton, AO44057.
Woods, James Russell, AO44199.
Woods, Jesse Leroy, Jr., AO36630.
Woods, Willie Green, Jr., AO35661.
Woodson, Harold William, AO26206.
Woodward, Paul Berkshire, AO24762.
Woody, Robert Elwood, AO34357.
Wooles, Marcellus Ronald, AO44381.
Wooster, Vernon Oliver, AO52592.
Wooten, Clyde Curtis, AO34554.
×Wooten, Edward Densmore, AO54259.
Work, Robert Ernest, AO45256.
Workman, Bryant Arthur, AO46390.
×Workman, Jack Blease, AO40915.
×Works, Le Eustis, AO52370.
×Worley, Ernest Lee, Jr., AO54283.
×Wormington, Jack Edwin, AO48076.
Worthington, Roy Henry, Jr., AO47144.
Worthman, Paul Emil, AO45392.
Would, William Jeffrey, AO45751.
Wray, Cletus, AO46450.
Wray, James William, Jr., AO36002.
Wray, Robert Alexander, Jr., AO45774.
×Wright, Edmund Augustus, Jr., AO26266.
Wright, Ellis William, Jr., AO34013.
Wright, Frank Edward, AO35003.
Wright, Fred Paul, Jr., AO47382.
×Wright, Julian Carleton, AO44585.
Wright, Lewis Walter, AO40300.
Wright, Robert James, AO48596.
Wright, Robert Lee, AO37275.
Wright, Theodore Roger, Jr., AO35385.
Wright, Wallace Ashley, AO33455.
Wright, William Jefferson, AO53786.
Wunderlich, Herbert Emmanuel, AO46303.
Wyatt, Harold Erskine, AO43870.
Wyatt, William Henry, AO52432.
Wydner, Clarence Stimson, AO37189.
Wyman, Frank Melvin, Jr., AO45626.
×Wymond, Gilbert Osborne, Jr., AO35366.
Wysocki, Chester Constantine, AO44805.
×Yancey, Gordon Allen, Jr., AO33775.
Yandoh, Thomas Roderick, AO47942.
Yarbrough, Walter Rudell, AO35533.
Yeater, James Wilbur, AO36933.
×Yoder, Harry David, AO52701.
×Yun, Pershing Lockey, AO46435.
×Yopchick, Michael Paul, AO54651.
Young, Franklin Frederick, AO33583.
Young, Gail, AO33396.
×Young, Hugh Denton, AO36308.
Young, William Blakey, AO52346.
Young, William Ross, AO46574.
Youngblood, Curtis Nolan, AO43980.
Youngman, Reginald Bunker, AO52274.
Younkin, Leland Alfred, AO36440.
Younkin, Richard Carl, AO47266.
Yount, Barton Kyle, Jr., AO25739.
×Yucker, Julius Lyman, Jr., AO36197.
Yundt, Robert Wellings, AO53491.
×Zachmann, Robert Francis, AO52737.
×Zeidler, William Xavier, AO52564.
Zeigler, Carl Emerson, Jr., AO53823.
Zeigler, Jack Spiers, AO46394.
Zeine, Merle Milton, AO36732.
Zell, Lucian Thompson, 2d, AO39277.
Ziegeweid, Eugene Joseph, AO44538.
Zielinski, Urban Joseph, AO45037.
Zink, Harry Johns, AO36495
×Zins, William Elmer, AO24140.
Zitar, Edward Robert, AO44284.
×Zohn, Bernard, AO52769.
×Zorka, Jack Carl, AO44677.
Zubon, Michael, AO26075.
×Zurek, Walter John, AO44738.
×Zweifel, Everett E., A45676.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ahern, Timothy Ignatius, AO38514.
×Atkinson, Obbie Orville, AO56669.
×Barish, David Theodore, AO50457.
Bellamy, Jack, AO56601.
×Black, Elmer Ellsworth, AO50466.
Black, William James, AO50428.
Blackmon, Waldo Neely, AO56663.
×Borchert, Francis William, AO56644.
×Bork, Ervin Francis, AO56671.
Bowers, Hurst Gray, AO50471.
Boyes, Peter Edwin, AO56667.
×Bradley, Ernest Elmore, Jr., AO38254.
×Brauneis, Ernest Frederick, AO56650.
Bryant, Melvin Harold, AO50449.
Cameron, Louis Jackson, Jr., AO56592.
Carter, James Baker, AO50439.
Castanza, Angelo Nicholas, AO56628.
×Cavnar, Bobbie Joe, AO50486.
Chapman, Harry Moulton, AO50474.
×Christensen, Swen Aage, AO56655.
Coates, Robert Eugene, AO50455.
Cobb, William Andrew, AO56626.
Coffman, William Frederick AO38499.
Collins, David Carter, AO38513.
×Collins, Harold Edward, AO38515.
Conner, Robert Walter, AO56596.
×Crawford, David Frank, AO56654.
×Cunningham, O. D., Jr., AO56668.
Curry, Hayden Charles, AO38495.
×Daoust, John Bulger, AO50503.
Davis, Marion McDonald, Jr., AO56651.
×Davis, Richard Lee, AO41348.
×De Vries, John Atwood, AO50488.
×Drury, George Francis, AO56640.
Duggar, Omar Paschal, Jr., AO56631.
Dukes, Joseph, Jr., AO50430.
Edmunds, Edmund William, Jr., AO38487.
×Ellis, Calvin Kemp, AO41350.
Embery, Robert Lee, AO50481.
Erwin, Max L., AO56597.
Ewing, Donald Edward, AO50510.
Fauth, William Ward, AO50485.
×Fellows, Charles Warrington, Jr., AO56648.
Fields, Jack Harold, AO50464.
Flanagan, Jesse Laddie, AO50469.
Fries, William Walton, AO50453.
×Frith, Thomas John, AO56662.
Garcia, Ray Joseph, AO41346.
Gillette, Harvey Wendell, AO38486.
×Girardin, Robert Laurent, AO50509.
×Glass, Lawrence Stuart, AO56670.
Gommel, William Raymond, AO41338.
×Graffunder, William Otto, AO50458.
Graham, Robert Paul, AO50460.
×Graves, Grover Cleveland, Jr., AO38268.
Graves, Norman Calvin, AO56630.
Griffin, Hiram, AO38502.
Grubbs, James W., Jr., AO50463.
×Guay, Georges Raymond Joseph, AO50491.
Guerny, Gene, AO41336.
Harbison, John Jeter, AO50432.
×Hardy, Charles Raymond, AO50487.
×Harer, Richard James, AO56646.
Heckel, Charles Clark, AO41344.
Hendricks, William Tillman, AO38267.
Hensz, Robert Louis, AO56622.
Hester, James Bert, Jr., AO56611.
Hislop, Sherman LeMoyne, AO50498.
Hodgin, Robert Howe, AO50450.
Holifield, Karl Louis, AO56658.
Holland, Thomas Marion, Jr., AO56673.
×Hummel, Richard Edward, AO50504.
Jackson, Stuart Lee, AO56589.
×Jacobs, Ralph Edward, AO56625.
Johannesen, Robert Fremont, AO56604.
Jolliff, Robert Charles, AO56637.
Jones, Forrest Phillips, Jr., AO56599.
Kamp, Walter Baird, AO39477.
Kaufman, Robert Joseph, Jr., AO56615.
×Keir, James McLaren, Jr., AO50436.
Kenworthy, Robert Barclay, AO41345.
×Koski, Raymond Julius, AO56666.
Kramb, John Henry, AO50515.
Kroman, George Franklin, AO38500.
La Casse, Wyndall, AO56623.
Lane, David Timothy, AO56605.
Larkin, Harold Joseph, AO56593.
×Laroche, Edward Arthur, AO56610.
×Laroche, Harold Douglas, AO50482.
Lawrynovicz, Casimer Paul, AO56627.
Lemon, Austin Cecil, Jr., AO50429.
Leonard, James Martin, AO50462.
Lewis, Theodore Shelby, AO50484.
Lind, Charles Louis, AO50423.
Lingo, John Ellis, AO56602.
Loepkey, Charles Rudolph, AO56603.
×Loesch, George Peter, AO50511.
×Lowry, Merlin Dolynn, AO56658.
Lucy, Robert Stanley, AO50454.

McCulley, Neil W., AO56643.
McKusker, Kent Marcus, AO56591.
Miller, James Micou, AO38490.
×Moore, Frank Grae, AO50492.
Mungenast, Andrew John, AO50446.
Nastoff, Daniel, AO50433.
Neal, Thomas James, AO38494.
Neiss, Ainsley Thomas, AO50448.
×Nelson, Thomas O'Neil, AO56670.
Newkirk, Mahlon Max, AO50431.
Newman, Robert Colea, Jr., AO38493.
Nissen, Jim Christian, AO50493.
×Norberg, Marcus Lynn, AO50483.
Odiorne, John McFall, AO50434.
Oliver, John Walthall, Jr., AO56642.
×Orlando, Michael Amato, AO56649.
Pakalka, William, AO50426.
Patson, George J., AO56629.
Payne, William Raymond, AO50479.
×Pelzel, Alfred Otto, AO56665.
Perry, William Edward, Jr., AO56618.
Peterson, Hilden Eugene, AO56624.
Pohlen, Paul Donald, AO56660.
Quinn, John Tietjen, AO38503.
Raine, C. O., 3d, AO38504.
Ratto, Stanley Nicholas, AO50461.
Robinson, Marion Moore, AO50459.
Rozelle, Vernon Lawrence, AO56614.
Rushlow, Frederick Edward, Jr., AO56609.
Scales, Lowell D., AO50424.
Self, David Anthony, Jr., AO50465.
Shadel, William Noel, AO56657.
Shearer, Wayne Gordon, AO38506.
Sinclair, William Donald, AO50513.
×Sizemore, Robert, AO56639.
Skiffington, Thomas Joseph, AO56595.
Slay, Alton Davis, AO50496.
Smith, Howard Persons, Jr., AO41347.
×Smith, Joe Hill, Jr., AO50444.
Smith, Roscoe Beverly, AO38508.
Stickney, Lawrence Mallory, AO50441.
Stockton, Glen William, AO38498.
Stukas, Robert Russel, AO50478.
×Switzer, John Wilbur, AO39476.
Taylor, Charlie Tilphord, Jr., AO50480.
Timmie, James Davis, AO50506.
×Unger, Edward Frank, AO56616.
Van Liere, William Peter, AO56620.
Vermeire, Virgil Louis, AO50452.
Walsh, Theodore Harold, AO56606.
×Warden, Rex Wall, Jr., AO50508.
Wareham, Samuel Arnold, AO50477.
×Warren, Willard, AO38510.
Webb, James Edward, AO39478.
Wiley, Miles Carter, Jr., AO41341.
Woolfolk, William Francis, AO56645.
Yeaton, Carl George, AO56608.

NOTE.—All officers named on this nomination received recess promotions during the recess of the Senate. Dates of rank for those officers nominated for promotion to the grade of first lieutenant are not indicated as these officers were promoted between July 2, 1948, and December 30, 1948.

PROMOTIONS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law. All others have been examined and found qualified for promotion.

*To be lieutenant colonels with rank from January 2, 1949*

×Alston, Robert Philip, AO29057.
Asch, William Waldo, AO50964.
Bankard, Roy Thomas, AO29049.
Bell, Charlie Hilliard, AO41516.
Bell, Lawrence Duffy, AO39574.
Breedlove, Clarence Henry, AO38618.
×Broadhurst, Richard Bishop, AO50968.
Clark, Kenneth Malcolm, AO41487.
×Cleveland, Sidney Eugene, AO41482.
×Clough, Ernest Lynwood, AO41492.
Collett, Wells, AO29016.
Craig, Harry William, AO41481.
Craig, Joseph Oliver, AO41488.
×Dean, Lloyd C., AO50996.
Dellinger, Olin Elbridge, AO41544.
Drittler, Frank John, AO50992.
Eckhoff, Harry Charles, AO41522.
Fackler, Homer Elmer, AO28934.
Fagan, Thomas Moulton, AO41515.
Faubion, Richard William, AO28972.
×Freeman, Cleon Eugene, AO51020.
Fuller, John Ray, AO50977.
×Garber, Gares, AO29059.
×Gribi, Sam Gotlieb, AO29000.
Gross, John Goodhart, AO29281.
Handwork, Bertrand A., AO41546.
Hawley, Ray Matthew, AO41519.
Herbine, Richard Gernant, AO41474.
Hillman, Edgar Kendall, AO29030.
Hinds, Paul, AO28986.
Hopkins, Philip Emmett, AO41570.
Howard, George Sallade, AO41509.
Hutchison, Clifton Cornelius, AO51000.
King, Marcus Randolph, AO41499.
×Kneussl, James Kenneth, AO39508.
Lansing, James Waggoner, AO41520.
Larsen, Arthur James, AO41541.
×Leuenberger, Harold Walter, AO41557.
Lewis, Gomer, AO41532.
Lewis, Jackson, Wesley, AO29006.
Light, Eugene Clarke, AO28995.
Logsdon, Krit Gibson, AO39582.
×Marshall, Stewart Andrew, Jr., AO41560.
×McKenzie, Arnold Edwin, AO41527.
Meserve, George Donald, AO41502.
Miller, Robert Samuel, AO41551.
Moreland, Lester Duane, AO41543.
Morris, James Bingham, AO50982.
×Moseley, Stuart Younger, AO41510.
Nabell, Edward Gordon, Jr., AO28929.
O'Keefe, Keefe, AO39566.
Potter, Merwin Elwood, AO50984.
Powell, Hubert Glenwood, AO50988.
×Purviance, Russell Alpheus, AO41567.
Ready, William Drennan, AO38617.
×Reverski, Harold Frederick, AO50961.
Sebode, Martin Fred Charles, AO41496.
Sheldon, Clifford Arthur, AO38615.
Sims, Robert D., AO50958.
×Stuart, Frank Bailey, AO41568.
×Thacker, Lloyd William, AO50991.
Todd, Harold Elworthy, AO38614.
Tunberg, Bertel Karl, AO41524.
Turner, Charles Marion, AO41511.
Williams, Frank Welbourne, AO50974.
×Yater, Moss, AO41564.

*To be majors with rank from January 2, 1949*

×Adams, Irving Winthrop, AO51616.
Alexander, Marvin, AO30501.
×Arietta, Frank, AO51619.
Badley, Burton Elmore, AO39974.
Barger, Walter Berl, AO42436.
×Barrett, Buford Russell, AO51686.
Batty, Paul Stewart, AO51738.
Berry, Ralph Clifton, AO30476.
Borecky, Antone, AO51565.
×Brown, Coke Fowler, Jr., AO51591.
Bullock, William Wilson, AO51692.
×Butt, Stanley Samuel, AO30387.
Carey, Eugene Courtney, AO42668.
Chioffe, Harry Vincent, AO51614.
Ciccone, Mario Augustus, AO51560.
Clarke, Charles E., AO51554.
Clist, Angus Southey, AO38800.
Cone, Charles Louis, AO42696.
Coursey, Harry, AO20026.
Crabbe, Gerald William, AO39930.
Davis, James Beatty, AO51636.
×Dillemuth, George Frederick, AO39928.
Downing, John Weaver, AO42653.
Elrick, Robert McCurdy, AO42465.
Fisher, Henry Bishop, AO20043.
Ford, Herman, Wendell, AO42450.
Gaffney, John Bedford, AO42459.
Galer, Michael John, AO51549.
Gephart, Harry Lane, AO42650.
×Gibbs, Howard Jefferson, AO42686.
×Gilland, William Flinn, AO51552.
Gordon, Edward Louis, AO51695.
Groves, Fergus Coleman, AO42478.
×Hall, Claude, Newton, AO51721.
×Hartley, Edwin Alexander, AO30368.
Heath, Lester Ellis, AO42723.
Heaton, Herman Shelby, AO42569.
Herndon, George Berry, AO42694.
×Hickox, Dan Whitney, AO51592.
Hodson, James Albert, AO51683.
Hooks, Claud Hardy, AO51649.
×Horseman, Reginald James, AO51585.
Jennette, John Henry, AO42529.
Klaas, John Henry, AO51601.
×Kolbus, Walter Benjamin, AO42469.
Linberg, Leif William, AO42709.
×Livingston, James Lee, AO51586.
Mandel, Samuel, AO42738.
Mandell, Leo, AO51568.
Matthews, William Stuart, Jr., AO42499.
McCaslin, Orval Howard, AO30375.
McNew, Glen Talmage, AO51610.
Mitchell, Howard Albert, AO42547.
×Monford, Harry Nirkirk, AO42675.
×Newman, Samuel William, AO51698.
Niskanen, William, AO42649.
×Noakes, Gilbert Fulton, AO30352.
Pocock, William Stephen, Jr., AO38796.
Quattlebaum, Arthur Cecil, AO42698.
×Ray, Hugh Jefferson, AO51716.
Rhoads, Donald Carson, AO51553.
×Richardson, Edward Charles, AO51625.
×Riggs, John Wesley, AO51583.
Roberts, Tracy Lloyd, AO51620.
×Rogers, Frank, AO42496.
×Ross, Robert Clement, AO51587.
Sargeant, Bliss Pilgrim, Jr., AO42684.
Schmidt, Eugene E., AO51681.
Sharp, Douglas, AO51630.
×Siemon, August Francis, AO51607.
Smith, Edward Cecil, AO42687.
×Smith, Ira Hyatt, AO42544.
Spence, George Gillies, AO42681.
Springfield, Robert Walter, AO51650.
States, Charles Adelbert, AO42548.
Steves, Fred Le Monte, AO30302.
Stickle, Horton Whitefield, Jr., AO51661.
×Strandberg, Earl Rodell, AO51719.
Tarson, Herbert Harvey, AO30568.
Terry, James Bell, AO51720.
Tolle, Carroll Keith, AO51726.
×Tucker, Almon A., AO42462.
Tucker, Temple Arthur, AO42717.
×Wheeler, Charles Alfred, AO51599.
Whiteside, Sam, AO42550.
Wine, Leonard Eldon, AO42305.
×Withington, Kenneth, AO42522.
×Yount, Dean Burdette, AO42652.

*To be captains with rank from January 2, 1949*

Abbitt, Charles Webb, AO46254.
Abernethy, Robert Joseph, AO35676.
Acebedo, Adrian Wood, AO46130.
Ackerman, Donald Leroy, AO46899.
Adair, Asa Andrew, AO46911.
Adams, Bill Russell, AO35312.
Adams, Charley John, AO45207.
Adams, John Clayton, Jr., AO24924.
×Adams, William Henderson, Jr., AO46775.
Addis, Walter Arthur, AO53986.
×Agne, Howard Charles, Jr., AO45400.
Aitken, John, Jr., AO39176.
×Akers, William Dale, AO45426.
Alba, Michael, AO53741.
Alexander, Arthur Kenneth, AO47116.
×Alexander, Woodrow Ervin, AO53059.
Allen, Arvol Duane, AO24795.
Allen, Hubert Eldridge, AO53975.
×Allen, Merle Francis, Jr., AO47141.
Allen, William Carroll, AO47045.
Allison, Eugene, AO46751.
Anderson, John Herman, AO35609.
Anderson, Ralph Richardson, Jr., AO54022.
×Anderson, Richard Roth, AO47242.
Anderson, Richard William, AO45315.
Anderson, Wyman Doyle, AO46905.
×Andresen, Malcolm Knapp, AO53760.
×Angevine, Frank Willis, AO47282.
×Arens, Herbert William, AO46653.
Armstrong, John Alan, AO53381.
×Arnold, Harold Mort, AO53046.
×Ash, Stanley James, AO45430.
Ashcraft, Gerald Scott, AO47037.
Ashley, Garland Olsen, AO47268.
Ashton, Morton Ross, AO53578.
Atkinson, Ivan Charles, AO46526.
Austin, Joe, Jr., AO53807.
×Ayers, Augustine William, AO53938.
Back, Charles Harold, AO45882.
Badgett, William Ross, AO46550.
×Badraun, Warren Wendell, AO53803.

Baker, Marvin Earl, AO53554.
Baker, Robert Gorden, AO53156.
Baker, William Virgil, AO35765.
Bakewell, Don Albert, AO47236.
Baldwin, Allen Edward, AO53250.
×Baldwin, Elwyn Seward, AO53086.
Baldwin, Garde Bowles, AO35058.
×Baldwin, Irl Edgar, AO53464.
Baliga, Joseph Robert, AO45329.
Ball, Fred George, AO53236.
Ballard, Herbert LaRoy, AO53530.
×Ballinger, Edward Paxton, AO47813.
Ballweg, Lawrence Henry, AO46355.
×Barker, Arthur Forbes, AO46276.
Barker, Glenn Snyder, AO46779.
×Barker, Stephen Ray, Jr., AO35722.
Barley, John Nicholas, AO36036.
Barnes, George Roy, AO46077.
×Barr, Robert Ray, AO53539.
Barrentine, George Thomas, AO47279.
Barrett, Harold Warren, AO53139.
Barrett, James Herman, Jr., AO46750.
Bartos, Edmund John, AO35928.
Bashant, Norman William, AO45158.
Bastian, Earl Lehne, AO35118.
Batie, John Samuel, AO33573.
Bauer, James Earl, AO46844.
Bauers, Frank William, Jr., AO53469.
Bean, Joe Merritt, AO33731.
×Bearden, Joe, AO53592.
Beary, Kermit Edwin, AO35872.
Beaty, William Emery, Jr., AO46102.
Beaven, William Morris, AO46442.
Beck, James Alston, AO45440.
Beckham, Vance Wesley, AO45223.
Beebout, Vance LeeRoy, AO46658.
Beeler, Robert Lee, Jr., AO47124.
×Behrens, John Nevin, AO46415.
×Bell, Gerald Benjamin, AO53711.
Bell, Jack Anthony, AO47103.
Bell, Roscoe Leonard, AO47028.
Bell, Thomas Angus, AO45419.
Bellan, Rudolph Alexander, AO47243.
Benner, Ralph Warren, AO46463.
Bennett, Warren Allen, AO53347.
Benoy, Harlan Hults, AO53627.
×Benson, August Gerald, AO53580.
Benson, Morrie, AO35946.
Benton, Roger, Gardiner, AO47158.
Beretta, Alessandro Harry, AO53859.
Berk, Irving Boris, AO40663.
Berman, Harold, AO46657.
×Berthiaume, Raymond Francis, AO46863.
Bickerstaff, Curtis Ergil, AO39183.
×Biggs, Ernest Edgar, AO36051.
Bilotta, Joseph Paul, AO35957.
×Bilyeu, Hal Errett, AO46802.
×Binks, William Porter, Jr., AO46147.
Binnell, Francis Elwin, AO39184.
Bird, Sidney Albert, AO53645.
Black, John Lewis, AO35877.
Black, William Howard, AO46805.
Blackwell, Anslum McLaurin, AO33711.
×Blackwell, Lynn Douglas, AO34784.
Blair, Duane Charles, AO45442.
Blair, Frank Sloan, AO53920.
Bledsoe, Samuel Black, Jr., AO53713.
Bock, Floyd Oscar, AO45161.
Bock, Harry, AO46496.
Bone, Marshall Baker, AO46918.
×Bonner, Thomas Woodrow, AO40619.
×Booth, Clifford Richard, AO46812.
Boren, Francis Terance, AO45326.
Boren, James Russell, AO46967.
Bortell, Charles Kelly, AO24943.
Boston, James Dwight, Jr., AO53009.
×Bounds, William Faye, AO35141.
Bowden, John Daniel, Jr., AO47111.
Bowen, Lewis Love, AO53490.
Bowers, Waldo, AO45282.
Bowers, William Robert, AO47089.
Box, Francis Marion, AO46295.
Boyd, Robert Watson, AO45314.
Boyd, Wilmer Ellsworth, AO53043.
Boyer, Max Weldon, AO35659.
Bradley, James Lewis, Jr., AO53907.
Bradley, Leonidas Cicero, Jr., AO53637.
Brady, Bernard John, AO46512.
Bralley, Walter Suvier, Jr., AO40788.
Brandon, Harold Edward, AO46984.
Brandstrom, Alfred Raymond Williams, AO53686.
Brant, Francis Arthur, AO46786.
Brantley, William Lawrence, AO53946.
×Brassfield, William Herbert, AO53944.
Brazil, Virgil Lee, AO47072.
Brazile, Berry Dee, AO46684.
Brengle, Paul Staley, AO45322.
Brennan, David Thomas, AO53676.
Bressan, Christopher, AO47119.
Brewer, James Franklin, AO45293.
Briery, Jack, AO53947.
Briggs, James Kay, AO25288.
Briley, Carlus Lindon, AO53066.
Brimberry, Will Olan, AO46799.
×Brimhall, Victor Owen, AO53916.
Brinegar, Marion Frederick, AO46826.
Britt, Jessie Willard, AO53648.
Britton, Wilbur Randall, AO35506.
Brockman, Warren Douglas, AO47048.
×Brooks, Clarence Rolland, AO46408.
×Brooks, Donald Leroy, AO45270.
Brown, Clarence Washburn, AO36158.
Brown, Claude Joseph, AO53756.
Brown, Clement Frazier, Jr., AO39212.
Brown, David Anthony, Jr., AO36094.
×Brown, John Harrington, AO39162.
Brown, John Todd, Jr., AO45317.
×Brown, Kimbrough Stone, AO46404.
Brown, Ned Halstead, AO52344.
×Brown, Robert Gardiner, AO46869.
Bruce, Avery Creedon, Jr., AO53533.
×Brundage, Robert Sayles, AO45481.
Brundydge, Henry Harold, AO46264.
Bruner, William Preston, AO34733.
Brush, Elvin Watson, AO46478.
Bryant, Donald Daniel, AO46321.
×Bryant, James Robert, AO33845.
Buckhiester, Wendell McCall, AO45341.
Buckwalter, John Stump, AO39197.
Budroe, George Leon, AO53689.
Burgeson, Darell George, AO35878.
×Burk, Marvin Franklin, AO53532.
Burke, Billy, AO46369.
Burns, Robert James, AO47247.
×Burris, John Franklin, AO34980.
Burt, George Washington 3d, AO47126.
Burtnette, Claude Sidle, Jr., AO53467.
×Burton, Herbert Clarence, AO53847.
Burwell, John David, AO53747.
Bush, Beverly Oliver, AO45318.
×Bush, John E., AO46857.
Bye, George Ewing, AO46588.
Byers, Howard Earl AO53698.
Byers, John Albert, AO46377.
Bynum, Clyde Holstun, AO53107.
Byrne, George Thomas, AO33686.
×Byrnes, Conley Henderson, AO53566.
Cain, James Walter, AO53736.
×Caldcleugh, Clarence Milton, AO45238.
Caldwell, John James, Jr., AO53649.
Callis, William Alexander, AO47167.
Calnon, Jack Fred, AO47183.
Campbell, Claude Whitner, AO46840.
Cannon, William Boyd, AO47227.
Cantor, Al, AO52919.
Caplan, Aaron Edward, AO46667.
×Carico, Robert Martin, AO45449.
Carr, George Theron, AO53555.
Carson, Charles Raymond, AO53593.
Carter, Walter Thomas, AO35921.
Caskey, James William, AO46915.
Cauble, Mark Waverly, Jr., AO45766.
Cavoli, William Joseph, AO46606.
×Champion, Patrick David, AO45221.
Chesmore, Emery Richard, AO46459.
Christiansen, Kenneth Paul, AO47035.
Christianson, Lyle Clinton, AO47120.
Clair, William Alonzo, AO46346.
×Clark, Cortis Anderson, Jr., AO45732.
Clark, Jack Wilson, AO45703.
×Clark, John Max, AO53806.
×Clark, Wallace Nichols, AO49929.
Clements, Manen Osco, Jr., AO45787.
Clymer, Harvey Claude, AO35930.
Coakley, Donald Virgil, AO53605.
Coe, Grover Krueger, AO35311.
Colchagoff, George Demeter, AO53727.
Coleman, William Woodrow, Jr., AO45635.
×Colley, Gordon Townsend, AO34409.
Collie, Robert Lucius, AO53534.
×Collings, Orval Dwain, AO45312.
Collins, Hamilton Purcell, AO52975.
Combs, Lloyd Donald, AO46960.
Compton, William Benjamin, AO34920.
Conley, Bruce Roff, AO33633.
Conners, Thomas Aloysius, AO46756.
×Cook, Edwin Jarecki, AO53501.
×Cook, Eugene Harry, AO53544.
×Cooney, Frank William, Jr., AO46823.
Cooper, Roy D., AO45296.
×Copley, Robert Edgar, AO45570.
Corcoran, Edward Lawrence, AO24853.
×Correll, Harold McCullough, AO53310.
Correll, Tommy Elbert, AO35702.
Cosby, William Lee, Jr., AO53845.
Cosel, Rirhard Morton, AO40667.
Cotter, James Daniel, AO45267.
Cottrell, Bert Maxwell, Jr., AO46012.
×Covell, Paul Michael, AO45436.
Cox, Luther Christian, AO46795.
Cox, Nicholas Henry, AO46729.
Cox, Omer Loraine, AO40601.
Craft, Albert Olaf, AO45284.
×Champton, William Cowles, AO53697.
Craven, Charles Waller, AO35404.
Crawford, John Douglas, Jr., AO46522.
Crawford, Richard Wallace, AO46862.
×Crawford, Robert, AO45261.
×Creighton, Crandell Charles, AO46790.
Crilly, James Calvin, AO36212.
Cronin, Harold Joseph, AO39178.
Cronkhite, John Lyle, AO35625.
Crosby, John William, AO35945.
×Cross, George Edward, Jr., AO46411.
Crowder, Noral Farrel, AO46678.
Crutcher, Robert Bryan, AO53346.
×Culp, William Kenneth, AO53318.
×Culp, Willis Powell, AO56905.
Culwell, Orrel, AO46888.
Cummings, Claude Harold, Jr., AO39158.
Curran, Arthur Ranger, AO36001.
×Curtis, James Edward, AO36052.
×Cushman, George Hawley, AO46455.
Czapski, Edmund, AO46723.
Dabolt, Robert Lewis, AO53488.
Dafler, Henry Arthur, AO46868.
Dahl, Norval Alfred, AO46508.
Dahl, Paul Warren, AO45972.
×Dailey, John Joseph, Jr., AO53941.
Dale, Theodore Roosevelt, AO34751.
Dannelly, Frank Porter, AO35565.
×Daugherty, Francis Leslie, Jr., AO53307.
Davis, Calvin Crawford, AO47129.
Davis, Charles Irving, Jr., AO33653.
×Davis, George Harrison, AO45915.
Davis, James Daniel, AO46842.
Davis, John Pharon, AO40728.
Davis, Paul Allen, AO46555.
Davis, Robert Emmett, AO40824.
Davis, William Francis, AO35663.
Davison, Walter Corwin, AO52993.
×Deangelis, John Jean, AO46501.
DeBord, Robert Louis, AO35125.
×DeCesare, Anaclethe, AO53971.
×DeGiacomo, Gene Michael, AO53608.
DePriest, Wilson Marshall, AO33863.
Devoe, Robert Charles, AO39214.
Devore, Ralph Nelson, AO53719.
×Deakyne, Howard Carl, Jr., AO53655.
Dean, Floyd Rhadamanthus, AO45607.
×Decker, Harold Raymond, AO46414.
Decker, John Allen, AO46315.
Dees, Robert William, AO45966.
×Deitch, Raymond Roland, AO46631.
Delanoy, Charles Wesley, AO40587.
Dent, George Herndon, AO53615.
Derck, Walter Frank, AO45472.
×Dibble, George Arthur, 2d, AO53576.
Dickert, James Ray, AO45461.
Dickey, Woodrow Wilson, AO48038.
Dillon, Francis Joseph, Jr., AO46718.
Donahue, Donald Augustine, AO53617.
Donohue, John William, AO53759.
Doolittle, James Harold, Jr., AO53465.
Dougan, William Page, AO47016.
Dougherty, Ralph Edwin, AO36116.
×Douglas, Robert Emmet, AO36709.
Downey, Robert John, AO34652.
Downing, Alvin Joseph, AO45185.
×Doyle, Lloyd George, AO40664.
×Draemel, Dean Harlan, AO53898.
Dubois, William Jay, AO35733.
Dufresne, Roland Joseph, AO35574.
Duckworth, Ernest Marion, AO33828.
×Duda, William, AO40603.

Dugger, James Ernest, Jr., AO46702.
Dumas, James Lee, AO35393.
Duncan, Cecil Charles, AO53646.
Durston, Glyn, AO46662.
Dzamba, John Pershing, AO35308.
Eberenz, Richard Joseph, AO34236.
Eckley, Paul Witherspoon, AO 53486.
Eddy, Harvey William, AO53575.
Edelen, Carroll Lee, AO53785.
Edwards, John Lee, Jr., AO53114.
Edwards, Joseph Ellison, AO47168.
×Egert, John, 3d, AO40610.
Eisert, Fred Joseph, AO45297.
Eldridge, George William, AO36256.
Eley, Carl Wayne, AO53909.
Elilfritz, Vernon, AO46323.
Ellis, Charles Justice, Jr., AO47177.
×Ellis, Samuel Wayne, AO46366.
×Ellis, Sherman Edward, AO53485.
Ely, Kenneth Eugene, AO45369.
×Emmons, Perry Chauncey, AO47163.
Epperson, Virgil Roland, AO45404.
Erspamer, Curtis Richard, AO52941.
Ervin, Davis Fletcher, Jr., AO39083.
Espinosa, Lorenzo, AO52938.
Evens, Bruce Harvey, AO45167.
×Everett, Phillip Eugene, AO47216.
Ezekiel, Thomas Clark, AO46076.
×Fancher, Robert Edwin, AO45474.
Farrell, John Edward, 2d, AO52942.
×Fassmann, LeRoy John, AO53461.
Favors, Marcus William, AO46988.
Fehrenbacher, Joseph Harold Thomas, AO46617.
Feicht, Edward R., Jr., AO46170.
Ferguson, Roy Eugene, AO35612.
Ferrari, Joseph Salvadore, AO53718.
Feser, Joseph Leonard, AO45359.
Fetterly, Donald John Walter, AO45310.
Fields, Lloyd Fondren, AO46644.
×Fife, William Paul, AO25085.
Filios, John Edward, AO45382.
Finton, James Robert, AO46132.
Firestone, Clinton Dewitt, Jr., AO46123.
Fisher, Max Leroy, AO53903.
Fisher, Norman Decatur, AO53235.
Fitz, Robert Ernest, AO45397.
Fiumara, James Martin, AO35772.
Fleming, David Thomas, AO53633.
Fleming, William Harry, Jr., AO45713.
Flentke, Donald LeRoy, AO47138.
Flesner, Eugene Edward, AO39211.
×Floyd, Percy Mellor, Jr., AO45251.
Flynn, Thomas Grover, Jr., AO46901.
Focht, Robert Henry, AO53876.
Foley, James Edwin, AO24624.
Fortner, John William, AO52949.
Foss, Joseph Aldridge, AO46164.
×Foster, Otis, Jr., AO46809.
Foster, Robert Lee, AO54026.
Foust, David Howard, AO53860.
×Fowler, J. Riley, AO46393.
Fowler, John Russell, AO46834.
Frawley, Allen Everett, AO24855.
Freed, Lyle Chambers, AO33679.
French, Joseph Elmer, AO53293.
French, Philip Nelmes, AO47042.
Friedline, George Jonathan, AO46556.
Friedman, Leon Jerome, AO46717.
Frink, Earl Eby, AO53015.
Fritchman, Curtis Clayton, AO53202.
Fross, Horton Lawrence, AO35766.
×Frost, Foy Benson, AO53674.
Frost, Jack William, AO39081.
Fuchs, William Robert, AO46428.
Fuerst, Robert Edward, AO53345.
Furbee, Charles Elbert, AO46589.
Furst, Howard Irving, AO53953.
Gaede, David Livingstone, AO45823.
×Gahl, Ralph Dana, AO46914.
Gallogly, William Francis, AO35541.
Gannon, John Ernest, AO35816.
Garber, Harold, AO46558.
Garcia, Abraham Gabriel, AO46980.
Gardinier, Russell John, AO35771.
Garfinkel, Bernard, AO53157.
×Garrett, William Alton, AO46438.
×Garrison, Harry Anthony, AO53638.
Garrison, John Henry, Jr., AO45399.
Gaspard, Richard Eddy, AO24727.
Gaston, Arthur Dale, AO35374.
Gault, James Andrew, 3d, AO36021.
×Gawthorp, Paul, AO46586.
Gay, Robert Eugene, AO53410.
Gay, William Marcus, AO47065.
×Gaygan, Jack Aloysius, AO53232.
Gebaur, Arthur William, Jr., AO54007.
Geck, John James, AO44832.
×Gentry, M. D., AO46397.
George, Arthur Franklin, AO53562.
George, Paul Ernest, AO45248.
Gervase, Edward Mark, AO46932.
Gessner, Harlan William, AO45625.
Gianatsis, James Arthur, AO45375.
Giannini, Jack Lloyd, AO54009.
Gibson, Orrin Lovewell, AO47067.
Giddings, Richard Elmer, AO46543.
×Giese, Edwin James, AO53873.
×Gilbert, Jack Clifford, AO40879.
Gilkerson, Harold Raymond, AO45179.
Gill, William Alexander, AO46927.
Gillett, Richard LeMar, AO39140.
Gillis, Jack Thomas, AO53848.
Gilmore, James Robson, AO53321.
×Gilpin, John Ashbrook, AO53526.
Girard, Henry John, AO36213.
Gisel, Clarence Paul, AO53735.
Gladstone, James Tatum, AO35631.
×Glettler, Bernard Urban, AO45408.
×Glickman, Emanuel, AO46402.
Glyer, John Robert, AO35364.
Godsey, Joseph Daughety, AO45342.
Gold, Joe Milton, Jr., AO46742.
Goller, Fred Franquet, AO46517.
×Good, Clyde Earl, AO47237.
×Goodbread, Jonah Eugene, AO53521.
×Goodson, Walter Cass, AO53509.
Goodwin, Dexter Beven, AO40765.
Gordon, Anyan Allison, AO45216.
Gordon, Benjamin, AO52968.
Gordon, Vincent Paul, AO53049.
×Gorgol, George Frank, AO53506.
Gosnell, Emmett, AO45385.
×Grady, Robert Joseph, AO36261.
Graham, H. Allen, AO53369.
Grant, John Clifford, Jr., AO35692.
Gray, Billy Cooper, AO35764.
Gray, Zack, AO40708.
Greenwood Thomas William, Jr., AO46854.
Gregg, Charles Robert, AO47056.
Griffin, Ira Lester, AO46791.
Griffin, Ralph Harvy, AO35782.
Grimwood, Don Milford, AO46252.
Grover, Roy Lee, AO53917.
Gshwandtner, Frank Joseph, AO53892.
Gudith, Roy Elmer, AO39168.
Guinnee, Robert Peter, AO47039.
×Gunning, Edward Joseph, AO46976.
×Gunther, Robert William, AO35788.
Guy, Carroll Wilson, AO53515.
×Guyer, Loren Ezra, AO35473.
×Halber, Alexander Dominic, AO33115.
Hale, Ivan Lee, AO33810.
×Hallett, Duane Hartley, AO53659.
Hamblen, William, AO35466.
Hamilton, Charles Edward, Jr., AO53427.
Hamilton, George Granville, O52971.
Hammer, Kenneth Merle, AO46498.
Hammett, Charles Edgar, AO47110.
Hancock, Jack Leland, AO35880.
Hanger, Harry Hunter, AO45391.
Hanlen, Joseph Richard, AO53800.
×Hanson, Marshall Everette, AO53034.
×Harb, Wallace Sylvester, AO46324.
Harchalk, George, AO53528.
×Hardison, John David, AO53561.
Hargis, Troy Alvis, AO53348.
×Harless, Leonard Jackson, AO53127.
Harmon, Clarence Lurlin, Jr., AO35582.
Harms, Warden Dana, AO46325.
×Harrelson, Jay Barnard, AO35268.
Harrington, Jasper Jackson, AO46566.
Harris, Charles Alexander, AO36219.
Harris, Howard Lee, Jr., AO47109.
Harris, Jack Hamilton, AO34946.
Harris, Wallace Andrew, AO45744.
Harris, Walter Raymond, Jr., AO45910.
Harris, William Patterson, AO53838.
Harrison, Charles Dean, AO53522.
×Harrison, Robert Clarence, AO39124.
×Hart, Gordon Lamar, AO46430.
Hart, Raymond Jay, AO47064.
Harvey, Luther Rockwood, AO33681.
Hasskamp, Harold Edward, AO53906.
Hathorn, Vernon Burkett, Jr., AO35253.
Hathway, James Ayers, AO46726.
Hau, Andrew Jerome, AO53970.
×Havens, John Jacob, AO45450.
Hawthorne, Cooper Franklin, AO46431.
Hayes, Burgain Garfield, AO35433.
×Hayes, Harold Carl, AO45467.
Hayes, Oliver Thomas, Jr., AO33883.
Hayter, Gerald Hargrave, AO47248.
Hearn, Walter Jackson, AO53827.
Heiman, Grover George, Jr., AO46457.
Heissenbuttel, William George, AO45247.
×Helvey, Hazen Dale, AO45999.
Henry, Charles Fogg, AO53752.
×Hensley, Harold Storey, Jr., AO46647.
Henton, Samuel Hampton, Jr., AO25006.
×Herbold, Robert Vernon, AO34765.
Herweg, John Bernard, AO54470.
Hessey, Francis Dodson, AO46054.
Hesterberg, Raymond Chester, AO46741.
Hickey, Rolet V., AO46376.
×Hickman, John Clark, AO45232.
Hicks, Lonnie Walton, Jr., AO47223.
Hicky, Dan McHenry, AO47020.
×Hill, Gordon, AO45393.
×Hill, John Kenneth, AO45155.
Hill, William Harris, AO46482.
Hilliard, Ray Lewis, AO53488.
Hilton, John William, AO53416.
Hinton, Jay Stephen, AO36223.
Hislop, James Stewart, AO46568.
Hitchcock, Charles Ivan, AO46030.
Hoagland, Edward Carl, Jr., AO46982.
×Hobson, Richard Eugene, AO46676.
Hockett, Chester A., AO35316.
Hodgkin, Myrl Norris, AO47185.
Hodgson, Charles Willis, AO46855.
Hoff, Burton Marvin, AO36555.
Hogan, Floyd Hyer, AO46827.
×Hoke, DeAlbert Southerland, Jr., AO46209.
Holden, William John, AO46567.
Hollinger, Llewellyin Earl, AO35887.
Hollingsworth, Dal Oliver, AO35401.
Holmes, Besby Frank, AO45722.
Holmes, Elwin Franklin, AO46711.
Holmes, John Hooper, AO45304.
×Holstead, James Rex, AO47057.
×Hooker, Freeman Fernando, AO54150.
Hopfenspirger, Thomas Warren, AO45640.
Hopkins, Harold Jessie, AO53071.
×Hopper, Roy James, AO35847.
Horn, Frank William, Jr., AO47153.
Horton, Harold Everett, AO46449.
Hostler, Gilbert Earl, AO53790.
×Houston, Cornell Clifford, AO47173.
Howe, Charles Elbridge, Jr., AO24782.
Howe, Robert Maitland, AO39134.
×Howell, James Ralph, AO53066.
×Huard, Norman Phillip, AO45398.
Hubbs, Edgar Henry, AO46620.
Hudson, Reed Olin, AO47143.
×Huebner, William Anthony, AO53585.
Huggard, Peter John, Jr., AO46920.
Hughes, William Evan, AO45214.
×Huguley, Edward Amos, AO52957.
Hull, Joseph DuBarry, AO46257.
Hume, Robert Adelbert, AO35742.
×Hunt, John Graham, AO46797.
×Hunt, Richard Hugh, AO53720.
Hunter, James Edward, AO35037.
×Hupperich, Herman Culrose, AO45896.
Hurt, Charles Clyde, AO36233.
×Husemoller, Kenneth Earl, AO39209.
Huston, James Leslie, Jr., AO53732.
Hutchins, Ralph, AO47096.
Illing, Richard George, AO46572.
Ingalls, Murray Harold, AO54008.
×Ingram, Sidney Oscar, Jr., AO46375.
Italia, Santo, AO53979.
Ivey, James Monroe, Jr., AO53065.
Jackson, Larkin LeRoy, AO46251.
×Jacoby, Joseph Harry, AO35273.
×James, Paul Carr, AO40773.
Jarrell, Howard Ray, AO46851.
Jarvis, Melvin Eugene, AO35889.
Jenkins, Donald Eugene, AO47131.
Jensen, Howard Warren, AO45299.
×Jensen, Willard Cecillius, AO35613.
Jenstrom, Eino Emil, AO53900.

×Johnson, Ferol William, AO53529.
Johnson, Frank Burtis, AO46624.
Johnson, George Wilburn, Jr., AO47018.
Johnson, Isham Marvin, AO46937.
Johnson, Perry Guess, AO53226.
Johnson, Ralph R., Jr., AO46246.
Johnson, Raymond Fredric, AO53456.
Johnson, Roland Stuart, AO46701.
Johnston, Kingsley Maxwell, AO35068.
×Jones, Elmer Douglas, Jr., AO53511.
Jones, Ernest Charles, Jr., AO53841.
×Jones, Fred Guy, AO35890.
Jones, Garland Maurice, AO46798.
Jones, Harry Arthur Lawrence, Jr., AO53787.
×Jones, James Sompayrac, Jr., AO36013.
×Jones, Jerome Judson, AO35862.
×Jones, Lewis Carriker, AO46494.
Jones, Martin Luther, AO53640.
Jones, Robert John, AO34464.
×Jones, Warren Harding, AO40882.
Jordan, Jay Julian, AO45535.
×Joyner, William Holloway, AO53899.
Junker, Jules Xavier 3d, AO35805.
Kampmann, Charles William, AO53351.
×Kanter, Merwin, AO53028.
Karhuse, Carl Andrew, AO46689.
Kearney, Clinton Charles, AO52892.
×Keating, Walter Franklin, AO53571.
Keene, Forrest Matthew, Jr., AO47200.
×Keene, Thomas James, AO35088.
Kehoe, Nicholas Bernard, Jr., AO35902.
Keith, Benjamin Martin, Jr., AO33614.
Kelleher, William Francis, AO53208.
×Keller, Howard Wesley, AO53537.
Keller, Russell Aristides, AO53885.
×Kelly, Doran Louis, AO53669.
×Kelso, John Malier, AO56308.
×Kemp, Otto Carl, AO45283.
×Kemper, George Alex, Jr., AO47081.
Kendig, Robert Lintner, AO40591.
×Kennedy, Clarence Charles, AO36181.
Kenney, Richard Frusher, AO36044.
×Kesler, Joseph, Jr., AO46409.
Kidd, Campbell Augustus, AO52987.
Kiel, Kenneth J., AO45275.
×Kiesel, Chester Gustav, AO45420.
Kilman, Ray Richard, AO45369.
Kilness, Kenneth Freeman, AO45159.
×King, Joseph Franklin, AO36050
King, Joseph Henry, AO53487.
×King, Lester Stanley, AO35786.
×King, Max James, AO35523.
Kingery, William Ward, AO36005.
×Kirby, Frank Ernest, AO45259.
Kirkland, Jack Manuel, AO53894.
Kirsner, Sheldon Weiss, AO47218.
×Kjelland, James Oliver, AO34698.
Klemme, Meade, AO35875.
Kleppinger, Paul Gribble, AO47195.
Klotz, Robert Charles, AO45431.
Klucarich, Stephen, AO53014.
Kluender, Carl Albert, AO52979.
Knauber, Leo Von Molkie, AO52956.
×Knauf, Albert Sledge, AO46212.
Knisely, James William, AO52927.
Knofczynski, Joseph John, AO46197.
Knutson, Bruce Barry, AO53875.
Koepp, Harry Jesse, AO35936.
Koerschner, William Frederick, Jr., AO40749.
Koller, Rudolph Carl, Jr., AO46943.
Kramer, Guy Maurice, Jr., AO47149.
Krebs, John Louis, AO35485.
Kreps, Conrad, AO52928.
Krier, Rene John, AO46532.
Kunde, Clinton Myhre, AO52958.
Ladner, Pat Harrison, AO33691.
Lake, Donald Jackson, AO45547.
Lake, Robert Schmidt, AO46669.
Lally, Glenn John, AO47234.
Lamb, Gordon Douglas, AO53707.
×Lambert, Dwight Arden, AO46554.
Lambert, Lee Roy, AO47069.
Lambertson, Norman Franklin, Jr., AO46948.
Lamburth, James Laurence, AO53500.
Lane, George Vondoehlen, AO36031.
Lantz, Roy Frederick, AO45689.
Larsen, Marvin Henry, AO40801.
×Larson, Leon Hubert, Jr., AO46401.
Larson, Milo George, AO46831.
×Lassiter, Charles Beers, AO35177.
Latkovich, George, Jr., AO53581.
LeGrand, John Joseph, AO53620.
Leqwin, John Hardy, AO46072.
Ledbetter, Llewellyn Harper, AO53796.
Lee, Merle Julian, AO33602.
Lehman, Hugh Roberts, AO46740.
×Leighten, George David, AO53038.
Leonard, William Robert, AO54018.
Lett, William Robert, AO53903.
Lewandoski, Joseph Walter, AO53935.
Lewin, Walter William, AO46569.
Lewis, George Dewey, AO46222.
×Lewis, Roy, AO54019.
×Lewis, Stanley Coryell, AO35510.
×Lewis, Warren Russell, AO47106.
Leyrer, Robert Joseph, AO53286.
L'Heureux, Harry Daniel, AO47152.
Lian, Elmer Theodore, AO35189.
Libby, William Albert, AO53751.
×Lichte, Martin Edgar, AO53337.
Lightfoot, Berl Everett, AO47208.
Lindahl, Thomas Burdick, AO46448.
Lindquist, David Max Wadsworth, AO53473.
Linebaugh, John Harvey Moore, AO46871.
Lipari, James Raymond, AO53950.
Little, Robert Dickson, AO46761.
×Littrell, William Leon, AO46765.
Livingston, George Laeton, AO46784.
Lloyd, Marion Gene, AO34995.
Lockhart, George Madison, AO47022.
Logan, Samuel Porter, Jr., AO53840.
Long, Walter William, AO47097.
×Longridge, Thomas Maxwell, AO45379.
Loomer, Perry Douglas, Jr., AO53737.
Lorino, Nash Earl, AO47001.
Lower, Charles, AO53031.
×Lowrance, Joseph Butler, Jr., AO32025.
Lutz, Charles Lester, AO53573.
Lutz, Reed Woodrow, AO53032.
Lynch, Clyde Melvin, AO39210.
Lyness, Charles Joseph, AO46936.
Lynn, Bert Hausmann, Jr., AO46762.
Lynn, William Jerome, AO35961.
MacAaron, Kenneth Abbott, AO45308.
×MacDonald, Earle Frederick, AO35990.
MacCombs, Robert, AO52933.
Machemer, Carl Conrad, AO52842.
Mack, Ernest Wilmer, AO46680.
×Mackey, John Joseph, AO53130.
Magers, James William, AO46924.
Magness, Ped G., AO35516.
Maier, Oscar Lee Walter, AO35060.
×Malley, John Davidson, AO45287.
×Malmgren, Victor Paul, AO52924.
Malmstrom, Donald Oscar, AO53372.
×Malone, Francis Mathew, AO53050.
×Manch, Jacob Earle, AO34973.
Manley, James Colby, AO53395.
Manlove, Clifford Thomas, AO46730.
×Mann, Linn Embry, AO53654.
×Mann, Roy Everett, AO47245.
Manning, Albert Henry, Jr., AO46755.
×Manship, Joseph, AO45231.
Manteuffell, Roger William, AO36039.
×Manthe, Frederick Laverne, AO53501.
Mapes, Byron Alvin, Jr., AO46681.
Marple, George E., AO47249.
Marr, Frederick William, AO53761.
Marshall, Henry Curtis, Jr., AO53459.
Marsiglia, Joseph Pasqale, AO35711.
×Martin, Ewell, AO46364.
Martin, Frank Herbert, AO46447.
Martin, John Gordon, Jr., AO46202.
Martin, Kenneth Robert, AO53849.
Martin, Richard Reinhard, AO53902.
Martin, William Albert, AO53784.
Martin, William Price, AO53978.
×Mastropaolo, Salvatore, AO53764.
Mathews, Gerald Arthur, AO45460.
Mathias, Albert Christian, AO53911.
Mathis, Charles Eugene, AO53734.
Mathis, William Howard, AO53948.
×Matthews, Allen Randolph, AO46683.
Matthews, Jewell, Jr., AO3444.
Matthews, Thomas, AO53257.
Matthews, Thurman R., AO46564.
×Maucher, Robert Allen, AO46487.
×Maurer, Paul Henry, AO52999.
Maxey, Horace Hagood, AO47091.
×Maxey, Robert Lafayette, AO52970.
×Mays, Harold Douglas, AO45434.
Mays, John Billy, Jr., AO45559.
Maze, Charles Leslie, AO35947.
Mazza, Vincent, AO46776.
×McAlister, Ira Norton, AO53011.
McAuley, Milton Kenneth, AO53726.
McAuley, Walter J., Jr., AO53716.
McBeth, Harold William, AO47128.
McCabe, James Selby, AO45441.
McCalpin, Robert Anthony, AO46828.
McCauley, Harris Kelley, AO34069.
×McClellan, John Markle, AO46412.
McClelland, Alva Lawson, AO53869.
×McClendon, Lee, AO46703.
McClure, Frank Leslie, A53559.
McColl, James Quentin, AO46051.
McCormick, Kenneth James, AO45243.
×McCurdy, Lauchlan Neil, AO52948.
McCutchen, Robert White, Jr., AO47259.
×McDill, James Nixson, AO53370.
McDonald, Donald Montrose, AO36237.
×McDonald, Paul Roger, AO45206.
McDowell, Bert, Jr., AO35202.
McElroy, Carroll Bernard, AO24426.
McGee, George Robert, AO47008.
McGill, John Raymond, AO35684.
×McGill, Paul Edward, AO54013.
McGrath, Thomas John, AO47127.
McHugh, John Francis, AO53961.
McIlhaney, Sam Frank, AO52925.
×McIntosh, Richard Kent, AO47071.
×McKay, Archie Leitch, AO40806.
×McKee, Eustis Ewart, Jr., AO53022.
McKee, Harvey Arthur, AO36042.
McKenny, Donald Charles, AO45182.
McKnight, Theodore, Jr., AO47250.
McLaughlin, Burl William, AO46216.
McLean, Lawrence Sylvester, AO45226.
McMaster, John Bruce, AO53622.
McMillin, Wallace Duke, AO36192.
McMurray, Robert Auburn, AO46694.
×McPherson, William Elwood, AO53882.
×McQueen, Verden, AO53556.
×McVeigh, Don Raymond, AO47174.
McVicker, Maurice Francis, AO53675.
Melendez, Ismael Felix, AO46507.
Melton, F. C., Jr., AO35975.
Menczkowski, John Marion, AO45789.
Mende, Robert Gerald, AO45234.
Mercer, Cassa Jay, Jr., AO45686.
Merritt, Herschel Roscoe, AO35619.
×Messall, Lawrence Emory, AO52965.
Meyer, Erwin Adolph, Jr., AO46042.
Meyer, James Hannon, AO47201.
Meyers, William Christopher, AO53564.
Mihailov, Nicholas Nicholas, Jr., AO34147.
Militefr, Lud James, AO46634.
×Millar, Harry Alvin, AO53744.
Miller, Carr Littleton, AO46954.
Miller, Clyde George, AO53616.
Miller, Daniel Jay, AO52918.
Miller, Emmett Hart, Jr., AO53604.
Miller, James Andrew, AO53728.
Miller, James Earl, AO45922.
Miller, Jesse William, AO33786.
Miller, Joseph Atlee, AO46692.
Miller, Raymond Laurence, AO24902.
Miller, Samuel Ford, AO46864.
×Miller, Victor Norman, Jr., AO53568.
Miller, William Alexander, AO45266.
Mills, Benjamin Lloyd, AO47260.
Milner, Robert Stanley, AO45863.
Mink, Wesley Stiles, AO46333.
Mitchell, Kirk Richard, AO45913.
×Mitchell, Max Oliver, AO40783.
×Mitchell, William Joseph, AO45423.
Mittelstadt, Frederick William, Jr., AO45332.
Mlotkowski, Henry Francis, AO53623.
Moberly, James Alfred, AO47099.
Modesitt, Walter Emmett, AO46907.
Moffatt, Robert, Jr., AO46757.
Moncada, Valdo Vincent John, AO53853.
Moore, Ballinger Bryan, AO33705.
Moore, Bryce Stearns, AO36325.
Moore, Earl Lester, AO53660.
Moore, Floyd William, Jr., AO40840.
Moore, James Merton, Jr., AO35416.
×Moore, Milton Randolph, AO35962.

Morhous, William Ree., AO45889.
Mork, John Henry, AO53007.
×Morris, James Harl, AO53056.
Morrison, Harry Bernard, Jr., AO47187.
Morrison, Marvis Charles, AO46350.
Moseley, Wendell Ford, AO46233.
Moultrie, Homer Howard, Jr., AO52954.
Moutier, John Louis, Jr., AO40760.
Moy, John James, AO52962.
×Mueller, Glen Edward, AO53401.
Murphy, Charles Louis, AO53851.
×Murphy, Dennis Everett, AO34707.
×Murphy, Lloyd Joseph, AO46419.
Murphy, Thomas Lavelle, AO46608.
Myrick, Morris Nichols, AO46830.
Mysza, John Edward, AO45459.
Nadler, Paul Oscar, AO46958.
Nash, John Fredrick, Jr., AO36156.
×Neal, George Clayton, AO33875.
×Neal, Robert Jack, AO53784.
×Neelly, Dale, AO35318.
×Neff, Warren Harding, AO46856.
Neie, Reuben William, AO47052.
×Nelson, Charles Leonard, AO53925.
Nelson, Douglas Towle, AO53702.
×Netherland, James Ollian, AO45487.
Netherton, Clyde Bryant, AO53729.
Newton, Dalton Francis, AO34714.
Nibouar, Grover Cleveland, Jr., AO52974.
×Nicholls, Walter Lee, Jr., AO46801.
Nichols, John Clark, AO53647.
Nicholson, Jack, AO53693.
Nicholson, William Stevens, AO45203.
×Nickols, Jess Ralph, AO46906.
Nixon, Horace Cecil, AO46769.
Noble, Daniel Joseph, AO33697.
North, Charles Anthony, AO35825.
Northcutt, George Carl, AO53129.
Nowinski, Will Michael, AO40861.
Nylen, Arthur Howard, Jr., AO53816.
×O'Brien, Gilbert Mouzon, AO52973.
O'Neil, Donald Edward, AO35704.
×O'Sullivan, Francis Joseph, AO53700.
Odom, Felton Harris, AO53629.
×Oshlman, Gene W., AO52967.
×Oldham, Nile William, Jr., AO35657.
Oliver, John Gordon Lindsay, AO47188.
Oliver, Paul, AO45365.
Olney, Richard Oscar, AO53987.
Olson, George Andrew, AO52988.
Oppelt, Alexander Leslie, AO53472.
Ostman, Byron Reynold, AO53768.
Overholser, Earle Long, Jr., AO47062.
Oxman, Jaffee Victor, AO46687.
×Paap, Donald Herbert, AO35715.
Paige, Harold William, AO35158.
Palmer, James Morton, AO35408.
Pappas, Thomas Robert, AO35984.
×Park, Lionel Ormandy, AO40590.
×Parkerson, Eugene Campbell, AO35864.
Parrish, Alexander Hoffman, AO36093.
Patten, Ronald Oscar, AO45263.
Patterson, Jerry Frank, AO45809.
×Paul, William Edward, AO33912.
Pautz, Martin Reinhardt, AO47151.
×Pearson, William Osgood, Jr., AO36027.
Pearson, William Paul, AO53704.
Peirson, Jean Saxton, AO53389.
Pelaez, Emmanuel Antonio, AO45351.
Pemberton, John Martin, AO47077.
Pennington, Donald Jeffris, AO35830.
Perkins, Richard Murray, AO47204.
Perry, Paul Lawrence, AO45324.
×Perry, William Dewey, Jr., AO45470.
Peterson, Conrad Reginald, AO45418.
Petscher, James Adolph, AO53887.
×Petway, Joseph Guy, AO53867.
×Philips, Verne Douglas Joseph, AO53302.
Phillips, Francis Theodore, Jr., AO47252.
Pickett, Thomas Marshall, AO46509.
Pirozek, Wasil, AO46961.
Pivarnik, Michael, Jr., AO46974.
Planey, John Anthony, AO40841.
Plattner, Milton, AO46745.
×Platz, Constant Victor, AO45225.
Plecha, Stanley Larry, AO53928.
Plocher, Martin Ernest, AO53678.
Plott, Paul Aril, AO46690.
Poe, William Edwin, AO46557.
Polio, Nicholas Samuel, AO53771.
Polve, James Herschel, AO54017.
Poole, Joseph Ray, AO45335.
×Pope, Fred William, AO53072.
×Porter, Vernon Davis, AO45611.
Poston, Denzil, AO53016.
Powell, Clarence Linton, AO46766.
Powell, William Howard, AO45605.
Powers, Clarence Arthur, AO25280.
Prarat, Victor Henry, AO53109.
Pratt, Dwight William, AO53316.
Pratt, Perry Harlow, AO53959.
×Price, Charles Trabert, AO46086.
×Price, Edward Carson, AO35313.
Proctor, Kenneth Earle, AO45845.
Purdom, Brooks Elbert, AO53740.
Putnam, Royal Augustus, AO53018.
Quenin, James Henry, AO33790.
Rader, Thomas Owen, AO46541.
Ragsdale, Roy Daniel, AO53883.
Rainwater, James Allen, AO53767.
Randall, George Floyd, AO53870.
Ray, Gerald Harmon, AO53045.
×Ray, John Arthur, AO53602.
Rea, Kenneth Ross, AO45580.
×Rea, William Robinson, AO53762.
Readhimer, Thomas Cecil, AO53670.
Rector, John Angus, AO53746.
Redden, George Alfred, AO53106.
×Redfield, Tyler Adams, AO53499.
Redman, Frank Owen, AO40807.
Reed, Donald Albert, AO35729.
Rees, John Edward, AO46609.
Rees, John Warren, AO36074.
×Reese, Harry Dee, AO53864.
×Rehm, Maurice Pate, AO54029.
Remele, Courtney Albert, AO53748.
Renz, L. Jay, AO34433.
Revere, Floyd, Jr., AO54023.
×Reynolds, William MacKenzie, Jr., AO53995.
Rice, Charles Sutton, AO45949.
Rice, James Harold, AO47263.
Rich, Robert Stewart, AO53758.
Riddle, Cecil Edward, AO46571.
Rieger, Jack Aaron, AO46938.
Riley, Martin Eldridge, AO34913.
Roath, William Roderick, AO53643.
×Roberts, Edward Theo, AO46406.
Roberts, Leo Paul, AO36214.
Robinson, James Bushfield, 3d, AO35434.
×Rodden, Jasper Aaron, AO53567.
×Roelofs, Milton, AO45480.
Rogers, Charles Wesley, AO45281.
Rogers, Frederick Albert, AO53222.
Rogers, Gerald Talbot, AO53494.
Rogers, James Morical, AO45269.
Rogers, Robert Charles, AO45213.
Rogers, William Blain, AO35910.
Rohrbough, Merrill Heaton, AO47176.
Roitsch, Clarence Alfred, AO46575.
Rollings, Raymond Sydney, AO46549.
Rood, Ralph Winton, AO35136.
Roper, Hilliard Marshall, AO45360.
Ross, Donald Harding, AO34048.
Ross, James Montgomery, AO53443.
×Ross, William Marion, AO53854.
Roth, Myron Alfred, AO35459.
Rowden, Stanley, AO53862.
Roy, Clyde, AO35314.
Royce, Ralph Scott, AO39171.
×Rudd, Robert John, AO39080.
×Rudig, James William, AO53574.
Rudolph, James Otto, AO46205.
Rulien, Donovan Waldamore, AO33809.
Ryden, Reinhardt August, AO46841.
×Saabye, Herbert John, Jr., AO46638.
Sackett, Carl Leroy, Jr., AO47286.
Sage, Wayne Philip, AO53297.
Saliba, Ernest John, AO35518.
Saltmarsh, Frederic Ashley, AO53893.
Saltzman, Stephen Ginns, AO34324.
Sampson, Allan Theodore, AO34961.
Sanders, William Allie, Jr., AO45603.
Sandusky, William Franklin, AO47229.
Sanford, Raymond Pape, AO35881.
×Satterfield, John Robert, AO46452.
Saxe, Richard Talbot, AO47054.
Saylor, David Wallie, AO46824.
Scanlan, John Francis, AO45907.
×Scariano, Frankie Roxie, AO36218.
Schaffer, Glenn Joseph, AO46283.
Schiltz, Glen Dale, Jr., AO46057.
Schleier, Erich Edwin, Jr., AO46625.
Schultz, Chester Martin, AO40821.
Schumacher, Otto Henry, AO45336.
Schwaderer, Willard Eugene, AO53723.
Schwartz, John Carroll, AO46928.
Scott, Charles Sidney, Jr., AO46691.
Scott, George William, AO47066.
Sculley, Raymond, AO46778.
×Sealy, Harry Haller, AO46760.
Searle, Maurice Ortiz, AO53782.
Sears, Aubrey Chester, AO45517.
Secor, Howard J., Jr., AO46590.
Seiverson, Forest Glenn, AO53912.
Sells, Orliff Vincent, AO46527.
Senecal, Robert Percy, AO45890.
Setterich, Jack, AO35919.
Shaw, Elmer Carl, AO46990.
×Shaw, John Blackshire, Jr., AO46421.
Sheffield, James Russell, AO46615.
×Shek, William, AO53033.
Sheldon, John Warren, AO46372.
Shellito, Robert Thomas, AO45237.
×Shepperd, William Morris, AO53582.
×Sherman, John Edward, AO46510.
Shimanek, Robert James, AO35774.
Shofner, Floyd Kelly, AO46489.
Shotts, Tom Daniel, AO53650.
Sickels, George Harrington, Jr., AO46659.
Siegismund, Robert Wentling, AO39186.
×Sifford, Lynn DeWitt, Jr., AO25986.
Sigler, Kerney Lee, AO46843.
×Silger, James Edwin, AO53078.
Sill, Leo Glenn, AO35124.
Simmons, Albert Durant, AO46221.
Simmons, Harlan Gilliam, AO53981.
Simmons, Herbert Walter, AO35906.
×Simonson, Sidney Arnold, AO45471.
Simpson, Drewry Narvin, AO35635.
Simpson, Jesse Ward, Jr., AO53974.
Simpson, Robert Howard, AO53934.
Sims, John Wendell, AO35031.
×Sjodin, Daniel LaVerne, AO34395.
Skaggs, Jesse Sparks, Jr., AO53802.
Skalomenos, Alcibiades, AO54000.
Skawienski, Theodore Louis, AO53775.
Skidmore, Lester Jay, Jr., AO36091.
Slade, Alliston, AO35721.
Smith, Alvin Wayne, AO53972.
×Smith, Charles Crowe, Jr., AO53596.
Smith, Charlie Martin, AO53940.
Smith, Clifford Earl, AO47118.
Smith, Earle Marshall, AO35027.
×Smith, Edward Douglas, AO45485.
Smith, Francis Henry, AO46957.
Smith, Franklin Quick, AO46616.
Smith, Fred Barton, AO45166.
Smith, George Allen, AO53868.
Smith, Harold Vincent, AO52946.
Smith, James Charles, AO46268.
Smith, John Whelan, AO54035.
Smith, Kenneth A., AO46720.
×Smith, Lawrence John, AO53923.
Smith, Leighton Clifton, AO45279.
Smith, Merton Vincent, AO53004.
Smith, Raymond Earle, AO33820.
×Smith, Robert Nelson, AO53846.
Smith, Willard Hurlan, AO33644.
Smith, William Arthur, AO45803.
Smith, William Dulty, Jr., AO46865.
Smith, William Henry, AO53754.
Snodgrass, James Pope, AO52964.
Soderberg, James William, AO35998.
Solomon, Joseph Lloyd, AO36030.
Sorenson, John Maxwell, AO39148.
Southall, Russell Melvin, AO34356.
×Sowerby, Theo James, AO53603.
Spears, Byron Polk, AO47626.
Specht, Leonard Harvey, AO45172.
×Speight, John Joshua, Jr., AO53710.
Spence, Aubrey Albert, AO47154.
Spence, Claude Pierce, AO46017.
Spencer, Donald Lee, AO47070.
Spencer, William Lewis, AO46629.
×Spiller, William Lacy, AO53407.
Sprague, Carl William, AO40844.

Sprinkle, James Frank, AO52976.
St. Clair, Carney Edward, AO35045.
×Staebell, Edward Franklin, AO35865.
Stalzer, Eugene Anthony, AO46970.
Stanch, Paul Martin, AO46522.
Standifer, Lee Roy, Jr., AO35157.
Stanley, Richard Edward, AO53712.
Staples, George Madison, AO45618.
Starkey, Earl Eugene, AO47087.
×Steigner, John Martin, AO45427.
×Steiner, Irwin Oscar, AO53817.
×Stemme, Robert Bolton, AO46497.
Stepelton, Mark Henry, AO53901.
Stephen, Gerald Leroy, AO47068.
Stephens, Glenn Frederick, AO53811.
Stephens, Marvin Leslie, AO47115.
Stephens, Sidney Alexander, AO35822.
Stephens, Valdane, AO47215.
Stephens, William Hoyt, AO46266.
Stetson, Alvin Elliott, AO33753.
Stevens, Robert Drake, AO33611.
Stevens, Vaughan Orvis, AO53520.
Stevenson, Dudley Wadell, AO46385.
×Stewart, Donald Sylvester, AO53063.
×Stewart, Harrie Lloyd, Jr., AO53495.
×Stewart, Raymond Ronald, AO52961.
Stoner, Lyle Wilson, AO47090.
×Story, James Benjamin, AO46156.
Stout, Thomas Edward, AO53703.
Stow, Kenneth Reeves, AO46528.
Stowell, Philip Musgrave, AO45612.
×Stribling, Robert Arris, AO46432.
Stroh, Benjamin Franklin, AO47264.
Sullivan, John Willys, AO46814.
Sullivan, Robert James, AO35595.
Sutton, John Lawrence, AO47224.
Swafford, Frederick Lee, AO46373.
×Swan, Frederic Ferris, AO52929.
Swanson, John William, AO46320.
Swickard, Jack David, AO36035.
×Switzer, Alfred Joseph, AO45357.
×Syslo, Benedict Francis, AO53621.
Szapiel, Stanley Vincent, AO45273.
Tacker, Lawrence James, AO46531.
Tally, William Sherman, AO35976.
Tanassy, Emil George, AO53553.
Tannen, Martin Robert, AO46083.
×Taylor, Daniel James, Jr., AO46594.
Taylor, Gerald Othel, AO46154.
Taylor, Oliver DeForest, AO35086.
×Taylor, Robert Floyd, Jr., AO47205.
Taylor, William Walter, AO46424.
Teasley, Joel Hunt, AO45346.
×Teeter, James Harley, AO45478.
Teliczan, Raymond Joseph, AO53589.
×Testa, John Joseph, AO46903.
Tharp, Thomas Gordon, AO47017.
×Thomas, David Bernard, AO46533.
Thomas, Glen, Jr., AO33735.
Thomas, Harry Jack, AO35592.
×Thomas, William Kirby, AO52955.
Thompson, Donald Melvin, AO45748.
×Thompson, Donald Vern, AO53852.
×Thompson, Joel Clay, Jr., AO46301.
Thompson, Raymond Gail, AO35491.
Thornton, John Mack, AO53024.
×Thrash, James Andrews, Jr., AO53073.
×Tietz, Edward Christian, AO45363.
×Tiffany, Robert Samuel, Jr., AO46451.
Tillotson, Floyd Merle, AO45422.
Tilton, Harvey Sparling, AO45311.
Timmons, Durward Earl, AO53584.
×Timms, George Deeson, AO45347.
Tisone, Albert Anthony, AO45854.
Tormos, Jose Ramualdo, AO53818.
Torpey, Robert Francis, AO54014.
Towne, Ralph Waldo, AO46098.
Townsley, Howard Beshoar, AO45352.
Trainer, Thomas Kennedy, AO24933.
×Travis, E. B., AO46704.
Treat, Mark Gilmour, AO34905.
Trefny, Milton Joseph, AO53880.
Trewitt, Harvey Sidney, Jr., AO45193.
×Trimble, Harry Burt, AO34940.
Truman, Robert Virgil, AO46838.
Trumble, John Bernard, AO47157.
Truscott, James Calvin, AO35211.
Tullock, Willard Donald, AO46115.
Turner, Charles Sheridan, AO46352.
Turner, Stevens Heyward, AO35638.
Tyson, James Leroy, AO35967.
×Umpleby, Arthur Norman, AO53283.
Urban, John Alexander, AO35667.
Van Dyk, William Cornelius, AO34095.
Van Epps, John Siegfus, AO40793.
Van Wingerden, Nicolas, AO45848.
×Vance, Zeb, Jr., AO46514.
Vandebogart, Warren Melendy, AO35579.
×Vaughan, William Rolland, AO35111.
Vaut, Bert A., Jr., AO45355.
Vehlow, Roy Charles, AO53990.
Venable, James Madison, Jr., AO46940.
Vernon, Damon Arthur, AO45462.
Vinson, Elmer Leroy, AO45591.
Vintson, Stonewall Pershing, AO53829.
×Vitunac, Walter Charles, AO46144.
Voyles, James Homer, Jr., AO45749.
×Wachendorfer, Charles, Jr., AO53372.
Wadley, Robert J., AO52994.
Waldmire, Henry William, AO35342.
×Walk, William Edward, Jr., AO53651.
Walker, Demelt Eugene, AO36115.
×Walker, Willie G., AO54011.
Wall, Risden Bennett, AO46999.
Wallace, Arthur Lee, AO46837.
Wallace, Robert Andrew, AO52080.
Walsh, Francis Robert, AO46479.
Walsh, John Joseph, AO46318.
×Walsh, Raymond Lee, AO53035.
Walsh, Robert Leslie, AO47193.
×Walter, Benjamin Burton, AO34025.
Waltman, William Smedley, AO45788.
×Ward, Rufus Alexander, AO45593.
Warden, Ray Sterling, AO46501.
Warwick, David Christy, AO24479.
Washburn, Jesse Eugene, AO46821.
Watkins, Miles Hunter, AO47179.
×Watkins, Thomas Greene, Jr., AO40627.
×Watson, James Wallace, AO52036.
Watters, John Furniss, AO34045.
Webb, John Davis, Jr., AO33752.
Weidman, Roy Andrew, AO45305.
×Weigand, Frederick Ellsworth, AO47011.
Weil, Melvin Simon, Jr., AO46295.
Weinheimer, Jacob, AO33806.
Weir, Gordon Thomas, AO53708.
Welling, William Brayshaw, Jr., AO35723.
Wells, Earl Muncey, AO45268.
Welti, Conrad Joseph, AO46807.
Wendell, Helmer Clifford, AO47104.
Wenzinger, Harlan Joseph, AO53010.
Werner, Crowell B., AO46539.
×Westmoreland, Ivey Teddy, AO53026.
Wettstein, James Daniel, AO54026.
Whalen, John Lester, AO53433.
Whipples, Donald Eugene, AO35754.
×White, Floyd, AO54016.
White, Foster Lee, AO35417.
×White, George Gillette, AO45435.
×White, George William, AO46949.
White, Harrison Gurney, AO53363.
White, John Adam, AO52863.
White, Oscar Edward, AO35021.
×White, Samuel Augustus, Jr., AO53895.
Whitescarver, John Thomas, AO45252.
Wickman, Robert John, AO46858.
Wiese, Keith Irvin, AO45344.
Wilemon, Max Walter, AO46754.
Wiley, Woodrow Jean, AO33884.
Williams, Charles Irwin, AO45266.
Williams, Daniel Boone, AO53399.
Williams, John L., AO53339.
Williams, Owen James, AO45171.
×Williams, Roger Allan, AO53084.
×Williamson, George Austin, AO35455.
Wilson, Billy Baldwin, AO46752.
Wilson, Carl Woodrow, AO53266.
Wilson, Gerald Phillip, AO33834.
Wilson, Richard Alvin, AO35617.
Windsor, Leon Joseph, AO46446.
×Wingfield, Roy Glenmore, Jr., AO47166.
Winham, Lucian Chesley, Jr., AO53626.
×Wisniewski, Stanley Joseph, AO53599.
×Whitsell, Edward Fuller, Jr., AO35529.
Wockenfuss, Wilbur Eugene, AO35681.
Wojdyla, Henry Edward, AO52943.
×Wolters, Elmer Henry, AO35325.
Womack, Jack Edwin, AO47034.
Wood, Melvin Clinton, AO40845.
Wood, Robert Edward, AO53977.
Wood, Thomas Lucas, AO34394.
×Wood, William Penn, AO35481.
Wood, Willis Herbert, AO45219.
×Woods, Durward Allen, AO39083.
×Worde, Marcus Howard, AO46913.
×Work, Byron Russell, AO46289.
Working, William Harrison, AO46925.
Worthington, William Jacob, Jr., AO45443.
Wright, Fred Arthur, Jr., AO46897.
Wright, Theodore Otis, AO47076.
×Wylie, Harold Greever, AO53757.
Yaden, Earl Noble, AO53922.
Yeates, William Edmund, AO35950.
Yelton, John Fred, AO46603.
Yeoman, Edwin T., AO45644.
Young, John Newton, AO53569.
Young, Robert Warren, AO45446.
×Zagorsky, Stanley Charles, AO35781.
×Zepp, Rex Elbert, AO47133.
×Zeuty, Edward James, AO53613.
Zick, Marvin Darrell, AO46500.
Zimmer, Robert William, AO53570.
Zipper, Harry, AO47094.
Zweig, Louis Emil, Jr., AO53012.

*To be first lieutenants*

Adams, Donald Dee, AO38525.
Bechtold, Louis Addison, AO50522.
×Blades, Leo Leslie, AO50519.
Chille, Peter Joseph, AO56674.
×Disharoon, Jerry Benton, AO50516.
×Draper, Russell C., AO56681.
Eger, Charles Henry, Jr., AO41355.
Eichelberger, William Rex, AO56680.
Flansaas, Glenn Arthur, AO50524.
Harris, Thomas Drextol, Jr., AO56635.
×Hench, Noel Joseph, AO38521.
Houck, Warren Putnam, AO56675.
Hoyt, Thurber, Lewellyn, AO41351.
Hughes, Robert Malcolm, AO38524.
Hyde, James Richard, AO53687.
Klingler, Ralph Reno, Jr., AO56682.
Laughlin, William Edward, AO38526.
Lavender, Emory Candler, Jr., AO41353.
×Linn, Julius, Jr., AO56760.
Melendez, Michael John, AO50520.
Nelson, Thomas O'Neil, AO56670.
Philips, Robert James, AO56684.
Schoonover, Orville Geralle, AO56678.
Shupe, Bennie Allan, AO39482.
Tarrant, Edward Wayland, AO56677.
Temple, Robert Joseph, AO56663.
Thompson, John Arnold, AO50521.
Troutman, George Glenn, AO50518.
Ventres, Robert Lee, AO38520.
Watson, Allan Ray, AO50523.
Winters, Melvin Percy, AO56686.
×Wolcott, Dean William, AO56676.
Wolf, Daniel Warren, AO50517.

NOTE.—All of the officers named on this nomination received recess promotions during the recess of the Senate, except those officers nominated for promotion to first lieutenant. The officers nominated for promotion to first lieutenant complete the required 3 years' service for promotion during the months of January and February. Dates of rank for those officers will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

The officers named herein for appointment in the National Guard of the United States of the Air Force of the United States under the provisions of section 38 of the National Defense Act as amended:

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Maj. Gen. George Griffin Finch, AO180570, Georgia Air National Guard, to date from November 22, 1948.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Coffin Ames, AO131519, California Air National Guard, to date from April 29, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Harry Crutcher, Jr., AO300841, Texas Air National Guard, to date from May 23, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Hillford Richard Wallace, AO224721, Washington Air National Guard, to date from April 13, 1948.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical and Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

*To be majors*

William A. Collins, Jr., MC, O340156.
George A. Peck, MC, O23567.

*To be captains*

Marvin D. Blackburn, Jr., MC, O447156.
Charles I. Bryans, Jr., MC, O464805.
Slater M. Dozier, MC, O436387.
Ian N. J. Eggeling, MC, O518418.
Kermit H. Gruberg, MC, O437490.
Royce E. House, MC, O391211.
James B. Hutchinson, MC, O1765131.
Fred E. Jenkins, MC, O470023.
Thomas P. Jernigan III, MC, O470996.
Frank H. Ketcham, DC, O469419.
Grady W. Phillips, MC, O1735667.
Frank K. Raymond, MC, O391287.
Albert K. Schoenbucher, MC, O440171.
William Stone, MC, O430283.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ellsworth C. Alvord, Jr., MC, O1727381.
Marshall B. Atkinson, MC, O1787024.
William P. Barron, MC.
George W. Blair, Jr., MC.
William J. Blake, MC.
Norman E. Brodeur, MC, O1704751.
James W. Carson, DC.
John J. Carter, MC.
Frank J. Cozzetto, MC.
Norman Fisher, MC, O947150.
Charles F. Ford, MC.
George E. Groleau, MC, O1727332.
Carl L. Hansen, Jr., MC, O935824.
Thomas L. Hendrix, MC, O1786167.
Ernest E. House, DC.
Laurence S. Jackson, MC, O1727035.
Albert R. Jones, Jr., MC.
Roger A. Juel, MC, O484893.
Richard L. Kasper, MC.
Marvin M. Keirns, MC, O1747040.
Evan L. Lewis, MC, O474583.
Frank W. Little, MC.
Harold T. McIver, MC, O1736104.
Robert D. McKnight, MC.
James L. McNeil, MC.
Richard E. Ogborn, MC, O1767593.
Gerald A. Orken, MC, O1736075.
Edwin E. Pontius, MC.
James A. Reilly, Jr., MC.
Robert W. Saunderson, Jr., MC.
Evan W. Schear, MC, O1746681.
Gene S. Smith, MC.
Martin A. Swerdlow, MC.
Lonis L. Schurter, MC, O1776295.
John B. Selby, MC.
John B. Sheffer, MC.
Ralph F. Shirer, MC, O1776174.
James G. Stouffer, MC.
William W. Thompson, MC.
Edward J. Tomsovic, MC.
Harry J. Umlauf, MC, O1727442.
William P. Walton, MC, O1786501.
John Watt, Jr., MC.
George C. Weinland, MC.
Edwin J. Westfall, MC.
John C. Wilsey, MC.
Kent T. Woodward, MC.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*To be first lieutenant*

Paul J. Kovar, O387604.

*To be second lieutenant*

Hubert M. Nicholson, Jr.

The following-named person for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, June 12, 1948. This person was previously given recess appointment in the grade of second lieutenant in error. Appointment of this individual will not exceed authorization for the Women's Army Corps, as established by Public Law 625:

Irma V. Bouton, L228827.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, in the grade specified, under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

*To be second lieutenants*

Primrose M. Gifford, N737952.
Sara C. Mooney, N763056.
Theresa R. Cardillo, N794154.
Marjorie R. Samson, N792133.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

| | |
|---|---|
| Paul Fremont-Smith | Brinton T. Darlington |
| John S. Benson | Andrew O. Fitzmorris |
| Leo A. Sapirstein | Roland T. Smith |
| Jacob K. Frenkel | Joseph F. Shanaphy |
| Clarence A. Imboden, Jr. | Bernard E. O'Malley |
| | Frederick C. Kuharich |
| Roger K. McDonald | William A. Walter, Jr. |
| Lynn L. Fulkerson, Jr. | McClain Johnston |
| Andrew Ranier | Paul Francke, Jr. |
| Ruth E. Dunham | Richard A. Malmgren |
| Fridolph E. Erlandson | Ralph F. Patten |
| Martin J. Gunter | Edward A. McNulty |
| Swan Burrus, Jr. | Walter M. White, Jr. |
| Lewis McLaurine Williams | James E. Hamill |

To be assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

| | |
|---|---|
| John H. Waite | William H. Sage III |
| James K. Conn | James R. Lewis |
| Ben Fisher | Paul K. Benedict |
| Ernest V. de Moss | Arthur P. Burdon |
| Sidney Ketyer | Charles W. Whitmore |
| Victor E. Archer | John F. Laws |
| Ernest G. Hanowell | Joseph A. Gallagher |
| Leland K. Dayton | Lawrence V. Hastings |
| Robert Hanan | Maurice R. Wingo |
| Carl C. Sansocie | John V. Osborne |
| Merlan E. DeBolt | Thomas F. Heighway |
| John B. Baldi | Jerold E. Phelps |

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Earl H. Arnold
Donald B. Stevens

To be assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

John B. Saxton

To be junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

| | |
|---|---|
| Howard C. Kellogg | Gordon E. Stone |
| John K. Brown | Donald M. Keagy |

To be senior assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Allen J. Brands, Sr.

To be assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Richard R. Sherwood

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

Leo Klugman
Paul H. Honda
Paul R. McDaniel, Jr.

To be senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance:

Mildred Jones

To be assistant nurse officers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance:

| | |
|---|---|
| Henrietta J. LeGrand | Hilda A. Nivala |
| Kathryn M. Meyer | Ruth S. Fitzgerald |
| Edith W. Campbell | Mary L. Hasty |

---

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 27, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

James E. Webb to be Under Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Albert J. Loveland to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

William Marvel to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware.

Gilmore S. Haynie to be United States attorney for the northern district of Indiana.

Miles N. Pike to be United States attorney for the district of Nevada.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Thomas N. Curran to be United States marshal for the district of Maine.

Paul B. Messick to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware.

Jack R. Caufield to be United States marshal for the district of Oregon.

UNITED NATIONS

MILITARY AND NAVAL STAFF COMMITTEE

Rear Adm. Bernhard H. Bieri, United States Navy, to be the senior naval member of the Military and Naval Staff Committee of the United Nations.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. David H. Clark, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Ships in the Department of the Navy, for a term of 2 years.

SELECTIVE SERVICE

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, United States Army, to be Director of Selective Service.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley, O3807, Chief of Staff (major general, U. S. Army) for appointment as general in the Regular Army.

Lt. Gen. Stephen J. Chamberlin, O3397, United States Army (major general, U. S. Army), for appointment as commanding general, Fifth Army, with the rank of lieutenant general.

ADVANCEMENT ON THE RETIRED LIST

Maj. Gen. Willard Stewart Paul, O5616, United States Army retired, for advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE GRADES INDICATED

*To be major generals*

Alexander Russell Bolling, O7548.
Edmond Harrison Leavey, O8559.
Bryant Edward Moore, O8633.
Doyle Overlton Hickey, O10123.
David Goodwin Barr, O10313.

*To be brigadier generals*

Vennard Wilson, O7207.
Paul Wolcott Rutledge, O7289.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

*To be brigadier generals*

Albert Pierson, O11838.
Joseph Pescia Sullivan, O5328.
Fenton Stratton Jacobs, O6931.
Letcher Ogle Grice, O8273.
Hugh Bryan Hester, O8405.
Kester Lovejoy Hastings, O12219.

APPOINTMENTS BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT SPECIFICATION OF BRANCH, ARM, OR SERVICE

First Lt. John Marshall Evans, O39493.
First Lt. James Rock Walpole, O38579.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 508 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

(Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (×) are subject to examination required by law.)

*To be first lieutenants*

Donald Wesley Alberti, O56695.
Douglas Albright Armstrong, O38527.
Bud L. Jones, O38522.
×Leo Thomas McMahon, Jr., O41352.
William Jeremiah McNeese, O41354.
Howard Deschler Rhodes, O50525.
Jasper Clyde Vance, Jr., O56715.
John Henry Von Der Bruegge, Jr., O38523.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 107 OF THE ARMY-NAVY NURSES ACT OF 1947

*To be first lieutenants, Women's Medical Specialist Corps*

Joyce Bodycomb, J22.
Francine B. Bundt, M10018.
Josephine Mary Burt, M10031.
Ruth Eleanor Clevenger, M10049.
Mae Augusta Engsberg, M10032.
Theresa Maria Ferrazzoli, M10080.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 510 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

The complete list of nominations of James Melvin Epperly et al., which were this day confirmed, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13, 1949, beginning with the name of James Melvin Epperly, occurring on page 229, and ending with the name of Foster LaMarr Watts, which appears on page 240.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 502 AND 518 OF THE OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

The complete list of the nominations of Francis Nicholas Miller et al., which were this day confirmed, may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 17, 1949, beginning with the name of Francis Nicholas Miller, appearing on page 324, and ending with the name of Dorothy Edith Fisher, appearing on page 402.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENT AS GENERAL

Gen. Carl Spaatz, AO3706, Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, for appointment as general, United States Air Force, with rank from February 11, 1945.

The nominations of Walter Francis Dix and other officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13, 1949, beginning with the name of Walter Francis Dix, which is shown on page 240, and ending with the name of James Joseph Connolly, which is shown on page 259.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS

Admiral Raymond A. Spruance for permanent appointment in the grade of admiral in the Navy as authorized by Public Law 791, Eightieth Congress.

The following-named officers to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of a vice admiral while serving under a designation in accordance with section 413 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

| | |
|---|---|
| George D. Murray | Donald B. Beary |
| Gerald F. Bogan | Felix B. Stump |
| Russell S. Berkey | |

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS TO THE GRADE OF REAR ADMIRAL

| | |
|---|---|
| Wesley M. Hague | Walter G. Schindler |
| Thomas H. Binford | George L. Russell |
| Walter E. Moore | Milton E. Miles |
| Burton B. Biggs | Harold D. Baker |
| Grover B. H. Hall | Thomas M. Stokes |
| Lorenzo S. Sabin, Jr. | Robert E. Blick, Jr. |

The appointments of Theodore C. Lonnquest et al. for permanent appointment in the Navy, which were this day confirmed, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 13, 1949, beginning with the name of Theodore C. Lonnquest, appearing on page 259, and ending with the name of Anna L. Welsko, which appears on page 261.

The appointments of Jimmie Allred, Jr., et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were this day confirmed, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for January 17, 1949, beginning with the name of Jimmie "B" Allred, appearing on page 322, and ending with the name of Sherwood H. Werner, appearing on the same page.

The appointments of Carroll A. Andrews et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were this day confirmed, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 17, 1949, beginning with the name of Carroll A. Andrews, appearing on page 322, and ending with the name of Carl Whittles, Jr., appearing on page 323.

The appointments of Arland A. Adams et al. for appointment in the Navy, which were this day confirmed, appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 17, 1949, beginning with the name of Arland A. Adams, appearing on page 315, and ending with the name of Frank D. Wilson, appearing on page 322.

---

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate January 27, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Jesse J. Gilbert of Ohio, to be Assistant Register of the Treasury.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Russell W. Lambert, minister, First Methodist Church, De Kalb, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose spirit moves within the humankind of all nations, and whose goodness has been ever availed to us, we pause for a moment at the beginning of these deliberations to give Thee our minds and hearts.

Cleanse them, renew them, shape them to Thy will. Guide them in high purpose and toward noble achievement, that these minds and hearts may serve our Nation and our world in new pathways of service that lead from a worthy past into a still greater future. Aware of the burden of responsibilities and acknowledging the manifold needs of the hour, we are conscious of our loyalties to Thee and our Nation, and we are filled with the hopes and dreams that stem from a precious heritage. The future of our country and the world rests with these minds and hearts, so fill them with Thy wisdom and love that Thy holy presence may breathe through us and Thy will may be known unto our land and unto all the world. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, January 25, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. TYDINGS a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, vice Mr. BRICKER.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. DOUGLAS a member of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, vice Mr. Ball, whose term as Senator expired.

REQUEST TO SUSPEND RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to recognize today a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what for?

Mr. McCORMACK. The bill intended to be brought up under suspension is a joint resolution from the Committee on Appropriations making an additional appropriation, as I understand, of $500,000 for disaster relief. There is a very emergent situation throughout the West and Middle West, that terrific storm disaster.

I make this statement as majority leader that if unanimous consent is granted this is the only bill that will be brought up under suspension.

The SPEAKER. The Speaker will make the same statement.

Mr. TABER. And it is very desirable that it be done immediately.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the information I have received.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 62) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective February 1, 1949, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $4,500 per annum for the services of an assistant cashier who shall be designated by the Sergeant at Arms of the House subject to the approval of the Speaker.

SEC. 2. That effective January 4, 1949, the compensation of the Deputy Sergeant at Arms in Charge of Pairs, Office of the Sergeant at Arms, and the compensation of the special employee, Office of the Doorkeeper,

shall be at the basic rate of $4,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 3. That effective February 1, 1949, the compensation of John Andrews and William F. Russell, designated by House Resolution 39, adopted January 10, 1949, as minority employees, shall be at the basic rate of $7,000 per annum, respectively.

SEC. 4. There shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum for the services of an assistant Journal clerk; compensation at the basic rate of $5,000 per annum for the services of an assistant tally clerk; compensation at the basic rate of $3,900 per annum for the services of an assistant enrolling clerk; compensation at the basic rate of $3,000 per annum for the services of an assistant bill clerk; all of whom shall be designated by the minority leader subject to the approval of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD explaining the purpose of the resolution just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it has long been recognized by the leadership of the House that it was desirous to have a corps of trained personnel to function in the various key positions under the service of the House. In order to accomplish that, the resolution creates four assistant clerkships which shall be taken out of patronage and filled by competent men who have proved their worth.

It has been recognized by all of the older members that the load-work of the House long ago justified additional clerical assistance in the various departments that this resolution contemplates.

If this resolution is not adopted at this time the men who held the jobs as head of these various departments will leave the service of the House and their experience and efficiency will be lost. It is desirable that they not only assist in training the top men of the various departments who will shortly be appointed but will aid appreciably in ameliorating the work of these departments.

It was contemplated in the Legislative Reorganization Act that career employees should be provided for in the staffing of committees but nothing tangible was done concerning the employees of the House directly. This resolution will take care of that need by providing a career service for the employees who have proved their worth.

In the unhappy event that the present majority of the House should become the minority in the Eighty-second Congress then the top men in the departments in this Congress would be designated by the next minority leader to fill the clerkships that this resolution provides, so that in the future there will always be majority and minority employees who are experienced and trustworthy.



FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES IMPORTED TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 88.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That section 2 of the joint resolution of June 25, 1948 (Public Law 769, 80th Cong.), entitled "Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1948" and by inserting in lieu thereof "March 31, 1949."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman to explain what this resolution means?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely provides that we extend the date to June 30, 1949. There will be an amendment offered to the resolution changing the date from March 31 to June 30.

On June 19 last year there was adopted by the House and by the Senate, and also signed by the President, a bill to provide for a Thank-You Train coming from France—a train of 48 boxcars containing merchandise which France was sending to this country as a gesture of appreciation for the Friendship Train we sent over there. This train was supposed to arrive in the United States last October. It is now loaded aboard the ship *Magellan* and is due to arrive in this country sometime next week. Unless we pass this bill, it will be necessary for the Government of France or for us to pay an import duty on these articles. The 48 or 49 cars, of the old 40-and-8 type that World War I veterans knew so well, will be left here, one in each State, as souvenirs. The merchandise donated by the people of France will be sold at public auction, the proceeds from which will go to charity.

For this reason, the administration is heartily in favor of the pending bill, and I sincerely hope we can pass it today.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORAND. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Is it not a fact that this resolution was passed unanimously out of the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. FORAND. It was passed unanimously yesterday by the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "March 31, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution (H. J. Res. 112) making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sum:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

Disaster relief: An additional amount for disaster relief, $500,000, subject to the limitations and restrictions under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, there is very little I can tell you about this item that you do not already know. The papers have been full of reports concerning the situation surrounding the cattle and sheep in storm stricken areas in about 10 of our western areas.

Realizing the urgency of the situation and on urging by many Members of the Congress the committee held a hearing yesterday afternoon to determine the need for financial aid. As a result the committee is recommending in the accompanying resolution an amount of $500,000 for the President's disaster relief fund. This amount is in addition to $500,000 appropriated for use of the President in case of emergencies and catastrophes in the current year.

According to information furnished the committee by the Department of the Interior it is estimated that there are around 3,000,000 head of sheep and 1,000,000 head of cattle snow-bound on public grazing lands and in jeopardy of starvation. Uncounted thousands of sheep and cattle are similarly snowbound on private lands. The President has already allocated the sum of $300,000 to alleviate the suffering, both human and animal.

The principal use to which these funds will be put is the opening of primary and secondary roads as well as for the creating of trails in order that food and water may be conveyed to the starving animals.

This catastrophe, as you might well realize, not only jeopardizes our food supply for the next 4 or 5 years, but threatens the entire economy of that portion of our country whose principal industry is cattle and sheep raising.

Adequate safeguards are provided for the expenditure of this money in that before any commitments are made by the Federal Government it is to see that reasonable expenditures are to be made by the governments of each State involved and the local governments therein as well as other agencies.

I cannot see reason for much debate on this matter, and I hope this resolution is adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations had presented to it yesterday the distress out in the range States in the far West resulting from the terrific snowfall. The roads are blocked, especially the back roads, and it has been impossible to get feed to the cattle on the back roads. It is also impossible for many of the people living in the small settlements to get out to get medical attention or anything else.

The President previously allocated $100,000 out of the disaster fund to help the situation. Yesterday he allocated $200,000 more, and placed General Fleming, the head of the Federal Works Agency, in charge of the operation as coordinator.

The Army has available a large number of trucks and bulldozers and various pieces of equipment that can be used for the purpose of opening the roads. It is not proposed that the farmers be supplied with feed for their animals, for they are expected to do that themselves, but it has been impossible for the local authorities with the equipment they have had available to open the roads and maintain traffic so that the farmers could get in to take care of their cattle and their feed.

Including what is presently in the disaster fund, which the President can use if it is necessary, this will make available a total of $750,000. I hope it will help in meeting that situation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. As I understand, this fund is to be added to the President's fund to be allocated to disaster areas when conditions requiring its use arise. Will this fund, with the amount here appropriated additionally to the President's fund, go entirely to the area in the West that is suffering from this terrific catastrophe?

Mr. TABER. I have no idea. I would expect the President to use it for that purpose insofar as it is desirable or necessary.

Mr. HARRIS. I am highly sympathetic with the situation in the West, but we had a terrific tornado at Warren, Ark., in which 56 people were killed and 175 were injured and millions and milions of dollars' worth of property was destroyed. I wonder if this fund would be available for any additional relief that might be necessary in connection with that disaster.

Mr. TABER. I would assume that whatever the President thought should be done with the fund could be done. It is not earmarked in any way. It is an open proposition for the President to deal with, and I would expect that he would handle it in such a way as to meet the situations that are pressing the hardest.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I feel that this resolution should be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is simply a supplemental appropriation, subject to the terms and conditions of the prior appropriation for the President's disaster fund?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman ask unanimous consent that all Members who are interested in this subject may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, along with the other States in the Rocky Mountain area, northern Arizona is receiving a large share of the suffering and hardship caused by the unprecedented snowfall of the past 2 weeks. I have just received word that in some sections of my State 100 inches of snow has fallen. I believe this is an all-time record, and it is easy to picture the paralysis that has resulted.

The Arizona National Guard is attempting to feed some of the cattle stranded in deep drifts near Williams, and other local efforts are being made. However, the fact that the blizzards are continuing makes it imperative that outside help be forthcoming soon if valuable livestock is to be saved.

I have also received word that the heavy weather is causing a great deal of suffering among the Indians who dwell on the plateau areas in northern Arizona. These unfortunate people are not prepared for this sort of weather, and many are in need of help today.

While we in Arizona welcome the snowfall and resultant run-off that will fill our reservoirs, we also realize that unless we receive some assistance the losses in livestock will more than offset those gains. Therefore, we urgently request that our State be included in the $500,000 joint resolution for relief of disaster areas.

THIS IS THE WAY TO ACT QUICKLY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on January 2 the snowstorm sweeping the West whirled into western South Dakota. It was accompanied by a wind of hurricane velocity, and continued for 4 days. Snowfalls ranged from 1 to 3 feet. Drifts of 20, 25, and 30 feet were created. All highways were blocked. Side roads were drifted full. All transportation came to a stop. Indeed, many people were unable to stir from their homes. Livestock on the open range drifted with the storm until fences stopped them or until they tumbled over snow-filled banks and gullies and were buried.

During the month there have been four succeeding storms of varying intensity, but each one more or less undoing the work of clearing roads that was accomplished between. The Milwaukee Railroad from Mitchell to Rapid City got in yesterday 26 days late. The first Northwestern got in only 13 days late, but after a 2-day run was snowed in again. Yesterday six locomotives were reported fighting to reopen a distance of 58 miles.

The State of South Dakota has spent over $425,000 in extra snow-removal efforts and has appropriated another $100,000. Counties are doing all that time and weather permit, regardless of their finances. One county, I learned today, is spending a thousand dollars a day. That is a county of only 6,000 people. Ten counties are severely hit in my district, 20 are badly affected. It is estimated that close to $750,000 has been spent locally in combating the storm.

Now, some people mistakenly have the idea that all of the Dakotas are a land of ice and snow in winter. That is not normally true in western South Dakota.

The average snowfall in these 10 counties is from 3½ to 4 inches for January, over a period of 40-year records. But in this January they have had from 25 to 60 inches of sharp, wind-driven snow.

Cattle have been isolated and stranded from feed. Homes have been isolated. Food and fuel are running short. One report yesterday was that over 400 families in an area 100 miles by 150 miles have not been heard from since January 2. What stories of suffering will eventually be told we can only guess at this time.

Yes, planes have been at work, carrying both food and medical supplies whenever they could fly. State and county highway crews have been working night and day. The time has come when more equipment must be brought in and thrown into the battle to reduce suffering, save lives, and to the extent possible, save some of the foundation herds of livestock in this a high-producing area for cattle and sheep.

The situation in South Dakota is not worse than elsewhere. The situation is catastrophic in at least seven States. Representatives from these range States were given a very generous hearing by the Appropriations Subcommittee, yesterday. This morning the full committee adopted the resolution now before the House.

No one pretends to say that this amount of money will do the job, but it will start the operation of extra bulldozers, weasels, and cats or half-tracks which can be secured from the Army or from private contractors. And it will keep the President's disaster relief fund solvent so that further allocations may be made as the battle goes on.

If more funds should be needed, as I believe they will, they can be added. But this resolution is the way for prompt, immediate action. I feel sure it will have the approval of the House today.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, we have no quarrel with the Committee on Appropriations who have made this recommendation and have made these funds available for the President's emer-

gency fund. The only complaint we have perhaps is that it is too little and very late and perhaps a little too late. I hope that the Members of the House are not going to be led to believe that this is a bill to make these funds available to feed anybody's livestock. That is not the case at all. This is simply to furnish sufficient funds to open roads and trails not only to the livestock but to isolated communities that have been isolated since the 1st day of January. The situation is still very urgent.

I, for one, shall certainly ask the President of the United States as time goes on to add to these funds if this emergency continues. We are certainly grateful to the committee for the speedy action they have taken. We hope that this money will be spent in the proper places.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course I am in favor of this resolution because this is a disaster which the people involved could not prevent. I also agree with the gentleman from Arkansas that funds ought to be provided to take care of situations where a flood, cyclone, or tornado destroys homes and public buildings and where the people are unable to take care of themselves.

Mr. GRANGER. You will never have any trouble on that score so far as I am concerned, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I am in sympathy with this resolution. I wonder if the gentleman will enlighten the House as to what action the States are taking in trying to alleviate conditions so far as feeding starving livestock and opening of roads is concerned.

Mr. GRANGER. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that that is a proper question. In nearly every instance in every one of these States emergencies have been declared by the various governors. Ten dollars has been appropriated and spent by the States to every one that is appropriated here. Much money has been spent in the counties and by the local organizations in those States.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. In response to the question raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I would like to state that while only about half of the State of Nebraska is involved in the most serious way, the Governor informs us that the local and State groups are stretching themselves to the breaking point. I believe it was the day before yesterday that the Nebraska Legislature provided $500,000 additional for this purpose.

Mr. GRANGER. I heard that testimony yesterday and I believe that that is the fact.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Utah has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I want to express my appreciation to the committee and the leadership for acting so expeditiously on this bill. I am constrained to say, however, that, in my judgment, the sum of $500,000 is wholly inadequate to bring any substantial measure of relief to the stricken area. The storms visited upon the West since the turn of the year, in my opinion, constitute a national disaster. Substantial parts of seven States have been fighting blizzard conditions of unprecedented severity, day in and day out, for nearly 4 weeks. Never in the history of the West have there been storms with 40 to 60 inches of snow, with subzero weather, for 26 straight days, sometimes ranging more than 30 degrees below zero, with blinding winds up to 70 miles an hour. The snow was so fine that roads were repeatedly opened one day and filled in the next. It was common to see drifts 20 and 30 feet high everywhere in the area. In the first 3 days of the storm, over 21 lives were lost in the intermountain area. It is impossible to estimate the livestock loss as it has been increasing daily. Many small farmers and ranchers have lost their entire herds. The sheep and cattle have lost weight each day and the exact extent of the losses cannot be determined for several weeks. The Denver Post of last Monday carried a headline at the top of its first page as follows: "Empire sheep industry faces total loss." It quoted Sylvan J. Pauly, of Deer Lodge, Mont., president of the National Wool Growers Association, to the effect that—

> The record-breaking series of January storms in the Rocky Mountain empire threatened the industry with annihilation.

About 10 days ago, a survey was made to determine the stock loss in Wyoming, and, Mr. Speaker, I desire to quote from an article in the Wyoming Eagle of a week ago:

> NINE MILLION DOLLARS STOCK LOSSES ESTIMATED
>
> The combined figures of two livestock experts indicated last night that Wyoming stockmen lost some $9,000,000 in dead animals in the big January blizzard.
>
> Federal-State statistician George Knutson and Russell Thorp, secretary of the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, released estimates which fixed stock losses in the storm at approximately 55,200 head of cattle and 105,000 head of sheep.
>
> Knutson said that cattle losses, based on $125 a head, would total about $6,900,000, and sheep, figured on $20 per head, would come to a loss of $2,100,000.
>
> Cattle losses were estimated on a 12-percent loss out of some 460,000 head believed to have been in the storm area, and on a 15-percent loss out of 760,000 head of sheep.
>
> Both men stressed that only rough estimates were possible at this time, since many more cattle and sheep may be dead or dying in the storm's aftermath.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Instead of calling it a storm, it is what you might call an unprecedented disaster?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I thank the gentleman. Never in the history of the West have storms of this severity and intensity lasted so long. The people of that area are wholly unable to cope with the situation. I may say the weather man has predicted another storm for this week end.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. While we have not had storms of such severity in Minnesota, it is true that this affects the whole United States in that if we can save some of this livestock it means that much in dollars and cents to the consumers next year. Is that not true?

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. That is quite true. In the storm area there are at least a million head of cattle and 3,000,000 head of sheep. Thousands of cattle were frozen standing on their feet. Many cases were reported of cattle losing their hoofs. Hundreds of ranchers have reported that their herds were stranded upward of 50 miles from the highways and railroads and, because of a lack of feed, the livestock was slowly starving to death. For areas of several hundred miles, the grass, and even the sagebrush, was covered completely with snow. In most cases it was impossible to get the livestock to the feed or the feed to the livestock. In days when it did not snow, the wind caused ground blizzards throughout the area. Practically every State, county, and town has appropriated money to fight the storms. The Wyoming Legislature appropriated $200,000, which was matched by the counties on a 60–40 basis. In addition, towns and private individuals spent unlimited sums in endeavoring to keep roads and trails open. The Bureau of Land Management did an excellent job in furnishing snow-fighting equipment of all kinds and character and supplied personnel to assist the States and counties. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Park Service, and other agencies of the Government have assisted materially in their efforts to open roads to isolated ranchers over the whole area. The Air Force, through the operation Hay Lift, furnished hay to cover extreme emergencies. Much has been done, but much more remains to be done if we are to save the thousands of farmers and ranchers from being completely wiped out. The herds of cattle and sheep in this area are the foundation of breeding stock which furnishes the feeder cattle and sheep for the Corn Belt year in and year out. If the herds are wiped out in this storm, the Nation will suffer a continuing loss of meat supply for years to come. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point a copy of a wire received from the Governor of our State on Monday last:

> CHEYENNE, WYO., *January 24, 1949.*
> Representative FRANK A. BARRETT,
> *Washington, D. C.:*
>
> Urgently request your interest in securing release of all available Federal equipment for use in opening roads in our storm areas to permit movement of feed to livestock and livestock to accessible feed supplies, and to open and maintain essential rural mail routes. Many such routes have been blocked

for more than 3 weeks. Our need for emergency use of snow-removal equipment is beyond our own resources. This emergency need is critical to the economic stability of many western areas. The exhaustion point of man and beast is rapidly being reached because of snowbound vital avenues of transportation.

A. G. CRANE,
*Governor of Wyoming.*

As I said in the beginning, Mr. Speaker, I think the committee should be congratulated in bringing this bill in, but I am compelled to state that, in my judgment, the funds provided are wholly inadequate to carry on the fight.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, what has been said by previous speakers regarding this disaster is also true in half of my State of Nebraska. I have been in constant communication with the Governor, who tells me there is 60 inches of snow on the ground; that he has asked the legislature to appropriate $500,000 to help in this disaster. He is pleading with us to pass some legislation immediately in order to bring relief.

The mayors of many towns have telephoned to me telling me that farm families have been isolated in many cases for 19 consecutive days. They cannot be reached because the roads are blocked by the heavy snowfall, drifts from a half mile to a mile long, 8 to 15 feet deep. Livestock has perished and human life is endangered. The doctors cannot reach these homes because the equipment which these towns have is not sufficient or heavy enough to break through these long snowdrifts. They are asking us for some jeep weasels in order to get over the top of these snowbanks, in order to bring medicine and succor to these suffering families.

One suggestion has been made that perhaps the Army could transfer some of our experienced troops from Alaska, who are experienced in this kind of weather, to come into Nebraska and these other stricken States and bring relief to these suffering human beings. It would be great psychology.

Mr. Speaker, with other members of the Nebraska delegation, I have introduced two bills. I favor this resolution and this appropriation, which is certainly not sufficient to take care of this gigantic problem. I ask unanimous consent that I may insert these two bills in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]?

There was no objection.

The bills referred to are as follows:

A bill making appropriations for disaster relief in case of snowstorms, blizzards, and other catastrophes

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following sum is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and to remain available until expended, to enable the President, through such agency or agencies as he may designate, and in such manner as he shall determine, to supplement the efforts and available resources of State and local governments or other agencies, whenever he finds any snowstorm, blizzard, flood, or other catastrophe in any part of the United States is of sufficient severity and magnitude to warrant emergency assistance by the Federal Government in alleviating hardship, or suffering caused thereby, and if the governor of any State in which such catastrophe shall occur shall certify that such assistance is required $3,000,000 to remain available until June 30, 1949, and to be expended without regard to such provisions regulating the expenditure of Government funds or the employment of persons in the Government service as he shall specify: *Provided*, That no expenditure shall be made with respect to any such catastrophe in any State until the governor of such State shall have entered into an agreement with such agency of the Government as the President may designate giving assurance of expenditure of a reasonable amount of the funds of the government of such State, local governments therein, or other agencies, for the same or similar purposes with respect to such catastrophe: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for departmental personal services: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for permanent construction: *Provided further*, That within any affected area Federal agencies are authorized to participate in any such emergency assistance.

---

A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby appropriated the additional sum of $10,000,000 out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and to remain available until expended, for flood control general (for emergency fund), for flood fighting and for the repair, restoration, and strengthening of flood control structures threatened or destroyed by floods pursuant to section 208 of Public Law 858, Eightieth Congress, second session.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING].

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, the state of emergency which has hit us in the Western States, especially in my own State of Nevada, and particularly in the eastern and central sections of the State, calls for an immediate emergency measure. This section of the country has seen the worst storm condition that it has had in years, and the livestock, sheep and cattle, are all in imminent danger. In this desperate situation which has arisen in the Western States, my own State of Nevada is one of the worst stricken. In many places the snow is measuring from 40 to 60 inches in depth. Continuous series of high winds and blizzards are drifting the snow to as high as 20 feet. This is causing intense human suffering and loss of life, as well as a grave loss to property and livestock. One hundred thousand sheep are involved in this desperate situation, 35,000 of which are in critical condition. These sheep will have to be shipped out or they will die. They will need feed and forage. Stockmen anticipate a 50-percent loss unless feed is forthcoming at once.

Mr. Speaker, in order to get the true picture, let me emphasize that the stricken cattle are range cattle—breeding cattle—and in many sections of Nevada there is not a fence within a hundred miles, so they cannot be herded into a corral or barn to be fed. These cattle range on public lands. Unless roads can be broken through, and feed taken to the livestock, they will perish, for there is no way that they can be sheltered. As I have already stated, this is the deepest snow on record in more than half a century, and even the large crawler-type tractors are unable to cope with the drifting snows. Some feed has been flown in by the "operation haylift" method. Equipment has not been able to reach the outlying stretches of county roads. Standard snow equipment cannot take care of the situation. Heavy tractors and trucks are needed to break through the roads so that feed convoys can reach the sheep and cattle herds.

The sheep can do without water longer than the cattle but owing to the fact that subzero temperatures have caused all of the water holes to be frozen over, all of the livestock are imperiled. The consistency of the snow is of a powdered variety and offers very little water content, so the fate of the sheep is extremely desperate.

Railroad rates should be made on feed and livestock to and from the stricken areas. Because of the fact that many areas are still isolated, we have not yet heard the true picture in actual figures.

All of the assistance that you can give us in obtaining relief in order to save our livestock will be greatly appreciated. Gentlemen, I urge that the emergency be taken care of today, for another 4 days will be too late.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I want to say only that this storm is probably the peer of all storms that has ever occurred in the Rocky Mountains and Plains State region. Only this morning we hear again that a bigger and more terrific blizzard is heading for the same area.

It is almost impossible to keep the roads open. When snow plows clear the highways, new winds have been arising to fill in the snow once again. It melts, then freezes and becomes almost solid ice and the next time it storms there are these terrible walls of ice on each side of the highway, making it necessary to take men with shovels to re-clear the highway. A most difficult task.

We are not asking for feed. I support this resolution and I hope the House passes it unanimously, because it deals with one of the most terrific disasters that has ever touched the northwestern part of these United States.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

STRIKES AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, we have a law which says that management and labor must above all recognize under law that neither party has any right in its relations with any other to engage in acts or practices which jeopardize the public health, safety, or interest. The law then defines and punishes practices on the part of labor and management which affect commerce and are inimical to the general welfare. These quotations are the voice of the Taft-Hartley law. Elsewhere, and to the same end, I hear another voice:

> Employers and workers must not rage against one another in struggle over pay and wage scales, damaging the economic existence of both, but must solve these problems jointly in a higher instance, which must above all constantly envision the welfare of the people as a whole and of the state.

This latter quotation is the voice of Hitler from the pages of Mein Kampf. These voices are alike and both blare forth the song of totalitarianism. This Congress should promptly repeal this law and reinstate our good American system.

### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tomorrow to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1660) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eighteth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for that date.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three separate instances and to include letters and resolutions.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a very interesting article which appeared in the Boston Herald of January 19.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the change in House rules and to include a letter from a former Member of the House, Mr. John O'Connor, on the same subject.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio message.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two articles from the Washington Post and a letter that he has written to the President of the United States.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

### BLUE STAR MOTHERS OF AMERICA

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the incorporation of the organization known as the Blue Star Mothers of America.

The objectives of this organization as set forth in its constitution are patriotic, educational, social, and for service; true allegiance to the Government of the United States; assistance to veterans and especially to those mothers who gave their sons or daughters in the service of our country; fostering of true democracy; alertness against un-American activities; upholding freedom, justice, and equal rights; and the defense of the United States from all enemies.

Those eligible for membership in the organization are mothers, adopted mothers, or stepmothers living in the United States of a son or daughter serving in our armed forces, or who have sons or daughters honorably discharged from our armed forces during the emergency of World War II.

Few of our people have displayed such heroism, have made such sacrifices, and have given so much of themselves in worry and heartache as the mothers eligible for membership in this organization. Here is a truly patriotic group, a potential as well as an active force with capacity to bind our people together by fostering those things that build a strong America, even as they will be a bulwark against the infiltration of those life concepts that contradict our American purposes and our ideals.

Mothers of service men and women, as represented by the Blue Star Mothers of America, should have this Federal recognition, so taking their rightful place beside such groups as the various service organizations that have been granted Federal charters.

I hope the bill will have early and favorable consideration, both in the Committee on the Judiciary and in the House.

### GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR IS BREAKING THE GIANT COMBINES OF JAPAN

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to represent the city of Little Rock, in which one of the great military leaders of modern times was born, just 69 years ago yesterday. Gen. Douglas MacArthur has spent little time in his native State, but we in Arkansas like to think that one characteristic which he has demonstrated in his direction of the affairs of Japan is associated with his knowledge of economic problems of the South and the West.

It was the feeling of the agricultural sections of this country that their relationship to the industrial power of the Nation, sometimes referred to as a colonial status, led to the passage of the Sherman Antitrust Act, and later to the Clayton Act, in an effort to break the hold which the big combines and the giant industries had fixed upon large segments of the Nation.

Japan, too, in the years before the war, had similar combines—in fact, a very large percentage of the industrial wealth of Japan was tightly held by only a handful of managerial families. These people were known as the Zaibatsu, or money clique.

One of the large problems in the reorganization of the Japanese economy at the end of the war has been to decentralize these combines so that the wealth which they produced might be more generally held and the people of Japan as a whole might cease to suffer from the monopolistic practices.

General MacArthur has been actively favoring this policy of reorganization of Zaibatsu power, and his efforts in that direction are appreciated by the citizens of the area which is proud to claim him as a native son.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

### THE GERMAN PEOPLE

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor to call to the attention of the House another of those decisions of the German-staffed denazification courts which are causing more and more concern to American citizens who can recall the unhappy lassitude with which the

world listened to the soft peace whines of the Germans following the First World War.

I refer today to the action of a German denazification court which set aside an earlier conviction of Count Franz von Papen and reduced his fine. A light touch to this aging and ailing man was the prohibition against participation in politics. Von Papen has been one of the most valuable men in Germany for 40 years, and he has never been openly in politics. He has been the master international fixer, the sly gray fox of Vaterland diplomacy.

Example could be piled on example. Fritz Thyssen and Hjalmar Schacht are among the most glaring examples.

More recently Walter Gieseking suddenly appeared on the horizon as a cleansed and purified artist, purged of his Naziphile record and perfumed for the delectation of music lovers.

Gieseking is admittedly one of the world's greatest living pianists, and I regret that I was forced by my convictions and my conscience to take the lead in forcing his expulsion from the country as an undesirable after the State Department had granted him a visitor's visa. As Dr. Hans Kindler expressed it, we have to draw the line somewhere; and in the flood of visiting pro-Nazi artists, musicians, journalists, scientists, lawyers, and what not, I chose to draw the line at Walter Gieseking, not only because I believe that he himself is a danger to the security of this country, but to dramatize the flow of whitewashed Nazi crows who are entering while the victims of Hitlerism are still confined to DP camps.

However, the most terrifying thing about this situation, both as to visiting Nazis and to those who stay in Germany, is the clue given as to the attitude of the German people and, perhaps, of our own Americans in Germany.

I do not wish to cast any intemperate reflections at the gallant Americans, military and civilian alike, who are manning our own farflung bastions of security in middle Europe, yet it cannot escape my mind that the denazification courts would not be so lenient to flagrant guilt if it were not well understood that the Americans are not mad at the Germans any more.

For almost 2,000 years the German people have been a constant threat to civilization.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let ourselves be lulled into forgetfulness of the death and horror and misery they have brought to Europe and America over the centuries. Let us not permit the German dream of empire to be brought to new and bloody reality.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each printed items.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer in reference to my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], who for 16 years has been one of the most distinguished Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Dr. Philip C. Jessup, United States representative of the Security Council in Paris.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by John M. Cummings, appearing in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include in each an editorial.

Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by a former Member of Congress.

INSTITUTE FOR RHEUMATISM AND ARTHRITIS RESEARCH

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would authorize the establishment in the United States Public Health Service of an Institute on Rheumatism and Arthritis. This bill follows in general, Mr. Speaker, the same type of research study that has been authorized in the mental health bill, cancer, tuberculosis, and heart bills.

I am happy to say that I have been joined in this effort by the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I hope that we can, with this approach, get some legislation passed soon that will be helpful in research in this field.

RHEUMATISM AND ARTHRITIS RESEARCH

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, we have introduced today a bil. to set up an institute within the Public Health Service to look into the research, the cause, and the cure of arthritis and rheumatism. Statistics show that arthritis and rheumatism are the greatest cripplers of all the diseases. There are 7,000,000 people who are now suffering from rheumatism and arthritis within the United States. One hundred and forty-seven thousand people today are immobilized in bed by reason of arthritis. It is not a spectacular disease. It does not attract the headlines. At the same time it is a very cruel and merciless disease, confining many people to lifetime of imprisonment, suffering, and torture. I say this not from any statistics, but from the personal experience of a member of my own family. Twenty-five years ago this man weighed 175 pounds and was a fine physical specimen. Today he weighs 108 pounds and his body is as rigid as a rail, completely ossified. It was a sad and tragic sight to watch this dread disease creep from his knees into his hips, up his spine, into his neck and shoulders, leaving them completely cemented. Today, arthritis is sealing his jaws and closing his eyelids—it does not kill, but it might be more humane if it did. He has been to every clinic and sanatorium of repute in the Western Hemisphere, and it is sad to report that no one knows anything about arthritis. Certainly a Government that gives millions to develop land and electricity and roads—a Government which gave $11,000,000 to make paths through forests last year—can and should get behind a movement to find out the cause and cure of arthritis, the Nation's great crippler.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman please tell us the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to. At the present time there is no specific program for next week. If, however, any bills are reported out of committee—and I cannot see any that will have to have the attention of the House on Monday, Tuesday, or probably Wednesday—and in order to have sufficient flexibility so that the House will feel I am keeping faith with them—I will give the House 24 hours' notice; for example, the reorganization bill. I do not know whether or not that bill or any other bill will come out of committee next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will have 24 hours' notice?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will give the House 24 hours' notice. With that flexibility, I have no program to announce for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL ARTHRITIS AND RHEUMATIC RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 crippler of our people is arthritis and rheumatic diseases. Strange as it may seem, basic research in this field has been exceedingly limited.

Seven million Americans are suffering from some type of arthritis or other forms of rheumatic disease. One hundred forty-seven thousand are completely disabled. Over 800,000 are partially disabled, and more than 6,000,000 others are subject to chronic or recurrent disability and pain. It is time that the resources of the Nation were mobilized to fight this destructive crippler of mankind.

Following the pattern set by the Congress in the National Mental Health Act, the Cancer Act, and the Heart Act, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the gentleman from Wisconsin who is now speaking have today filed identical bills proposing to establish a National Arthritis and Rheumatic Research Institute as a part of the Public Health Service. I sincerely hope that this legislation will receive an early hearing, and I am convinced that it will pass the Congress by unanimous consent and thus set in motion a program that will develop the scientific and medical resources of this Nation and the world in an effort to find the cause and a cure for this No. 1 crippler of our people. It is purely a bipartisan effort, conceived in the interest of the American people. I trust that every Member of Congress will become familiar with the provisions of this act and give it the same unanimous support that has been accorded similar legislation in the fields heretofore referred to.

OUR FATS AND OILS PROBLEM CAN BE AND MUST BE SOLVED

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the House a matter that affects every section of the United States and gives you an illustration of how delegations of powers to the departments of government can be misused either through ignorance or deliberate intent.

Congress was asked to give the different departments of government the power to control and allocate exports of various products. Among these products are fats and oils, produced from farm products in the United States. The importance of our fats and oils cannot be overestimated in thinking of national prosperity.

Mr. Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst of the Raw Materials National Council, through his studies of our national economy has revealed the fact that each $1 of gross farm production generates $7 of national income. Our production of fats and oils—butter, cottonseed oil, linseed oil, corn oil, soybean oil, peanut oil, tung oil, lard, tallow, and greases—approximates 10,000,000,000 pounds per year. Our annual production of fats and oils therefore is very important in our national economy. For each 10 cents per pound there is involved $1,000,000,000 of gross farm income and $7,000,000,000 of national income.

Fats and oils are the concentrated food product from much of our farm production. A pound of fat contains 4,080 calories as compared to 1,260 calories in a pound of lean meat. It is the most highly concentrated form of food to create human energy.

Using the control which we, the Congress, as a body gave them, the various departments have permitted the imports of fats and oils from world supplies. At the same time they have curtailed the allocations for exports to the extent that supplies have accumulated in the United States and have depressed the price. All told our imports were approximately 470,000,000 pounds greater than the exports which they permitted, even though we have this great surplus of fats and oils.

As a result of these indirect OPA tactics the price of lard in the past 12 months has dropped from 28 cents per pound to 14.5 cents. Other fats and oils have dropped in proportion. The packer knows when he buys hogs, cattle, and sheep that he will take a loss of at least 12 cents per pound on the lard and tallow, so to make up this loss he must charge several cents more per pound for the meat.

The effect can be easily estimated for different sections of the Nation. For example, the estimated cottonseed oil production from the 1948 cotton crop will approximate 1,650,000,000 pounds. Because of the price reduction of approximately 15 cents per pound the farmers of the South will lose approximately $250,000,000 if we permit this control to continue.

In the case of tallow, a part of a fat corn-fed steer, the price has been forced down to a price below that established under the days of the old OPA. In fact the price of all these fats and oils are rapidly reaching OPA levels.

As Members of Congress we should all realize that, if we are to meet the President's budget request of approximately $45,000,000,000, we must maintain a high national income. What right have we as a body to permit the different departments of Government to destroy the very income we need and destroy our primary income from agriculture.

In my opinion there is no excuse for this situation. Europe is being rationed at the rate of 1 pound of edible fat per month, or about one-fourth of our domestic consumption. Fats are the cheapest form of calories and the most vital for building up human energy. Yet here we find ourselves deliberately buying up world supplies, and refusing to permit Europe to have the necessary fats for a good diet because some bureaucrat is misusing powers which we have voted. Here is one place where the reciprocal trade treaty is beginning to hurt and hurt badly.

Under the circumstances I feel that the Congress should notify these departments to make increased allocations at once and that when legislation to renew these powers comes before this body we refuse to extend this control over the exports of fats and oils and misuse of authority. Congress in granting these powers did not intend that it should be used as price control.

In order that you may rest assured that various groups called this matter to the attention of those in control, I would like to insert in the RECORD as a part of my statement an analysis made by our friend Carl H. Wilken for the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. This analysis was presented to the Fats and Oils Branch of the Production Marketing Division on August 30, 1948. Therefore the blame rests directly upon the departments in charge. It looks as if it requires direct action by this body to remove this world monopoly over fats and oils which we have permitted through legislation.

If we wish to have meat production in the United States then we must prevent the penalty of low prices for fats and oils which curtails the feeding of livestock.

Our farmers and leading farm organizations are greatly concerned about this matter and they are insisting that it be corrected, and rightly so. Here is a letter from Mr. Howard Hill, president of the Iowa Farm Bureau, which I will also read to the House:

IOWA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
*Des Moines, Iowa, January 21, 1949.*

Hon. BEN F. JENSEN,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR BEN: The farmers of Iowa are very much concerned over the decline in lard prices, which, as you know, is being reflected in the price of live hogs. Current prices have dropped as low as 13 cents a pound. The reason for this decline in the price of lard is, of course, the supply. The supplies of lard in cold storage January 1 were 112,000,000 pounds as compared with a 5-year average of 105,000,000 pounds on that date.

One of the reasons for the increase in supply is the lower export allocations. The allocations made thus far for the January–March quota amount to 72,000,000 pounds. In the same quarter a year ago, exports were 96,000,000 pounds. Revised United States Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that we will produce 683,000,000 pounds for this current quarter.

The members of the Iowa Farm Bureau board of directors have asked me to write and seek your support for additional allocations for the European relief program. Recommendations concerning ERP shipments are made by the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Commerce. It is our understanding that the Department of Agriculture has recommended higher export allocations, but as yet these recommendations have not been approved by the Department of Commerce.

At the present price, lard is a very cheap source of food. We feel that it is one of the best commodities the Europeans could purchase since they have a need for animal

fats, and at this price I know of no commodity they could purchase to secure more food value for their money.

The per capita consumption of meat went down from 155.2 pounds in 1947 to 145.2 pounds in 1948. In the case of pork (including lard) the per capita consumption went down from 70.0 pounds in 1947 to 66.8 pounds in 1948. In 1939–41 average consumption of pork was 67.7 pounds per capita. The people want more meat and an increase in the exports of lard would encourage the production of hogs, which in turn would help relieve the grain situation when we run into a surplus grain problem.

I am calling this to your attention because we feel that the Department of Commerce may need some urging and because we feel that this is an opportunity to benefit both the recipients of the European relief shipments and the Midwest farmer.

If we can be of service at any time, please feel free to call on us.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

E. HOWARD HILL,
*President.*

---

ANALYSIS OF LIVESTOCK SITUATION, FATS AND OILS PRICES—PRODUCTION AND POTENTIAL GRAIN SUPPLIES

(By Carl H. Wilken, economic analyst)

Mr. E. F. FORBES,
*President, Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.:*

In making an analysis of the livestock situation and the relationship of fats and oils to the industry involves many factors not only from the standpoint of production of meats but also the attitude of national economic policies that affect the industry in many ways.

The present situation of fats and oils in the general price structure presents a distorted picture when compared with the long range of price relationship between meat products and fats and oils. This distortion, in my opinion, is entirely the result of governmental controls over the exports and imports of fats and oils and the failure of those in charge to analyze all the factors that enter into a realistic allocation of fats and oils for export.

RATIONING OF FATS AND OILS

Legislation which gives the different departments of Government the power to control exports of fats and oils indirectly carries with it the power to ration supplies to other nations. Failure to make proper allocations of lard, tallow, and other greases for exports can very easily increase the domestic supply sufficiently to reduce the price far below the normal price structure.

Too low a price for the fats and oils in turn affects all branches of the livestock industry, from the farm to the consumer.

For example, in August 1947, fats and oils reached a relatively low price as compared to the live cost of cattle and hogs. As a result the packer in buying heavy or lard hogs reduced the price to the farmer as much as $8 per hundredweight. The farmer in turn having taken a loss on his hogs because of their weight curtailed his productive efforts with the result that hog numbers January 1, 1948, were back to 1939 levels.

Even though the packer was able to protect himself to some extent by lower bids for heavy hogs, he was forced to pass on some of the loss on lard and tallow to the wholesaler and retailer of meat.

This branch of the industry in turn being confronted with losses on the sale of fats and oils trimmed from the carcass, were forced to pass it on to the consumer in a higher price for choice cuts such as pork chops and hams. It is interesting to note that in the period from May 1947 through August 1947, as the price of lard in the Washington retail market dropped 10 cents per pound, the price of pork chops increased 10 cents per pound This relationship was recognized by the OPA in their ceilings on meat products. During the era of price control the price of pork chops was approximately double the price of lard.

NO ONE GAINED

No one benefited particularly from the rationing of fats and oils by the departments, with the possible exception of the soap industry, which found it possible to buy relatively cheap fats for their soap products. Because of the buying power of the public the packer and retailer in most cases were able to pass on the loss on fats and oils to the consumer of meats. As a direct result the consumer has been forced to pay from 10 to 15 cents per pound more for steak, pork chops, hams, etc., than would normally be necessary. The packer, farmer, and retailer all were blamed for the high meat prices when in fact most of the blame should be placed directly on the unsound policies followed in making the proper allocations to maintain the price balance.

These departments will very likely state that they are not interested in the price, but by preventing exports and allocations they have controlled supply and indirectly the price, regardless of whether they intended to do so or not.

FUTURE SUPPLIES

In addition to the factors I have mentioned, excessive purchases of grains at critical periods in the market last year sent grain prices sky-rocketing. Widespread publicity of the shortage of grain and high price resulted in the liquidation of millions of head of livestock. Numbers of cattle and hogs as of January 1, 1948, indicate that meat production for 1949 will drop back to approximately 19,000,000,000 pounds. This drop of over 4,000,000,000 pounds, from the production of 1945, 1946, and 1947 is a drop of approximately 18 percent. The drop in production will in turn reduce the per capita consumption to approximately 130 pounds as compared to 155 pounds in 1947.

Unless the departments adopt a realistic attitude towards fats and oils prices, permitting them to rise to a level which will induce the farmer to feed to heavier weights, we will have future shortages of both fats and oils and meat products.

To illustrate, if a program were initiated to induce the farmer to add 50 pounds to the weight of each hog marketed, the 40,000,000 spring pigs available for market in 1948 and the early part of 1949, we could increase our meat production—live weight—2,000,000,000 pounds. In the process of producing the additional weight we would have an increase in both meats and fats and oils. But, after the experience of the last few years, the farmer is not likely to feed for additional weight if the present dislocation in fats and oils prices as compared to meat continues.

FEED SUPPLIES

Present crop estimates indicate the largest supply of feed grains in history, and the Nation could have the additional meat and fats by bringing the livestock and grains available together, the former as the factory and the latter as the raw material.

Unless such a program is brought into being, meat supplies will remain in short supply for several years. In fact, our expansion in livestock production has not kept pace with the increase in population since 1920.

In 1920 we had a population of 105,000,000 with a cattle population of 70,400,000, hog population of 60,159,000, and a sheep population of 40,743,000.

At the present time we have a population of approximately 145,000,000 with a cattle population of 78,000,000, a hog population of 55,000,000, and a sheep population of 38,571,000.

1948 MEAT PRODUCTION

It should be remembered that some of the 1947 and 1948 meat production was the result of liquidation of livestock numbers, With the large crop of feed grains and lower grain prices the tendency of the producer will be to replace some of the liquidation of livestock. In bringing this about breeding stock held back for expansion will reduce the marketable animals for 1949, thus decreasing meat production to that extent.

PRICE RELATIONSHIPS

In analyzing price relationships of fats and oils, hides, and meat products to live costs, it should be borne in mind that the producer cannot segregate these items and in the feeding process must produce all of them. The attitude of the departments toward the fats and oils situation indicates that they look upon fats, hides, etc., as byproducts and seem to forget that when a steer is purchased at $40 per hundredweight that this also represents the cost per pound of tallow and hides. Any reduction that the packer or distributor must take below the live cost has to be added on to some other part of the carcass in order for it to pay out.

As a result of this fact the price of lard, tallow, and hides to break even should be somewhat higher than the average live cost. To illustrate, you will note the tabulation below as to the average live cost of cattle, the price of hides, and the price of tallow. In the case of tallow, the price in the period 1925–29 which I have used was somewhat lower than the live cost of all beef steers. The low tallow price was the result of competition from two factors, first, the imports of coconut oil and, second, the fats or greases rendered from many sources.

| | Average price of all steers at Chicago | Price of hides at Chicago, heavy native | Wholesale price of tallow at Chicago |
|---|---|---|---|
| | *Per hundredweight* | *Cents per pound* | *Cents per pound* |
| 1925 | $10.16 | 15.96 | 9.7 |
| 1926 | 9.47 | 14.08 | 8.7 |
| 1927 | 11.36 | 19.28 | 8.1 |
| 1928 | 13.91 | 23.85 | 8.8 |
| 1929 | 13.43 | 16.98 | 8.5 |
| Average | 11.66 | 18.03 | 8.7 |

Using the 1925–29 prices as an index of 100, a comparison with live cost for 1947 of $25.83 per hundredweight for all beef steers, the increase was 121 percent. On this basis the average price of tallow in 1947 should have been 221 percent of the 1925–29 average or 19.2 cents per pound. It happens that this checks exactly with the average price in 1947 as given in the Fats and Oils Situation (BAE) for January–April 1948.

Applying the same index to hides, the average price of heavy hides at Chicago in 1947 should have been approximately 40 cents per pound.

The average price of cattle in the week ended August 21 at Chicago was $34.78 per hundredweight. This is approximately an increase of 200 percent from 1925–29 averages. At this price level, tallow should sell for 26.1 cents per pound and hides at 54 cents per pound.

The current price for prime inedible tallow is approximately 13.5 cents per pound and heavy hides 29 cents per pound. The loss on these two items, as compared to present live costs, is approximately $22 on a beef which has a live weight of approximately 950 pounds and a beef carcass of 500 pounds.

Marketing specialists in the United States Department of Agriculture estimate the suet, cod, and shop fat at 10 percent of carcass weight. Deducting this from the carcass weight of 500 pounds, it leaves 450 pounds of

meat. Deducting from this an estimated shrink and waste of 10 percent, the 500-pound carcass has 400 pounds of salable meat.

To absorb the loss of $22 from too low a comparative price on hides and tallow, the mark-up on the salable meat must be approximately 5.5 cents per pound. A choice beef carcass will yield roughly 25 percent of steak or 125 pounds. If the loss is recovered from a mark-up in the price of steak it would require an additional charge of 17.6 cents per pound.

In newspaper accounts of high meat prices steak is usually used as an illustration. The news items, however, do not point out that rationing of fats and oils and relatively low prices for fats and hides, as compared to live costs are responsible and that the packer or the retail butcher is being unjustly criticized for highjacking the public.

HOG PRICES

A similar condition exists in the relative price of lard, live costs of hogs, and retail prices. The tabulation below gives average hog prices and lard prices in the period 1925–29.

| | Average hog prices at Chicago | Average lard prices at Chicago [1] |
|---|---|---|
| | *Per Cwt.* | *Cts. per lb.* |
| 1925 | $11.81 | 17.9 |
| 1926 | 12.34 | 16.9 |
| 1927 | 9.95 | 13.7 |
| 1928 | 9.22 | 13.3 |
| 1929 | 10.16 | 12.9 |
| Average | 10.70 | 14.9 |

[1] Refined lard, wholesale.

In 1947 the average price of hogs at Chicago was $24.45. This represented an increase from the 1925–29 average of 129 percent. The price of lard to maintain the relative price to live costs in 1925–29 should have been 34.1 cents per pound.

The average price during the year 1947 was 25.6 cents per pound. Live costs at Chicago the week ending August 21, 1948, averaged $27.48 per hundredweight or 156 percent above the average of 1925–29. Current prices for refined lard should be 38.1 cents per pound. The current price is approximately 18 cents. In other words, the packer, wholesaler, and retailer must absorb a loss of 18 cents per pound on lard at present market levels.

Lard production (average 1942–46) is approximately 20 percent of total pork production. On this basis a good butcher weighing 250 pounds and dressing 178 pounds would yield 35.6 pounds of lard.

With the present price relationship between live costs and lard, the packer loss on lard is approximately 20 cents per pound or $7.12 for each 250-pound hog. This loss is passed on to the consumer in the sale of the dressed carcass weighing approximately 150 pounds after deducting the lard. The loss of $7.12 spread over the total salable meat is approximately 5 cents per pound if allowance is made for cutting shrinkage.

The loins and bacon combined represent approximately the same weight as the lard part of the carcass. With lard selling at a loss of 20 cents per pound, to make up this loss a similar number of pounds of pork chops or bacon or ham, bacon and pork chops must be sold at a higher price level. As I have pointed out, the price of pork chops advanced in direct ratio to the drop in lard prices. With pork chops or pork loins representing about 16 pounds of the carcass from a 250-pound hog, it is evident that about one-half of the loss is passed on in this way. The rest of the loss must be recovered from higher prices for hams, bacon, etc.

SUMMARY

Summarizing the effect of the price dislocation, no one has gained as the result of it, with the possible exception of the soap industry, which has had the advantage of cheap fats for their industry. The consumer has paid for the lower lard prices, the advance in choice cuts of meat having been used to offset the relatively low lard price.

The principal result has been to discourage the producer in feeding to heavier weights, thus curtailing the production of both fats and meat products. In addition, the farmer has suffered a direct financial loss. This loss can be quite accurately determined.

For example, if he markets 220-pound hogs at $30 per hundredweight, the approximate price in July for that weight, he receives $66 per head. In July the heavy hogs, 360 pounds, sold for $24.50 on the Chicago market and the farmer received $88.20, or an increase of $22.20 for the additional weight of 140 pounds. For this additional weight he received 15.85 cents per pound as compared to $30 per hundredweight for the hog sold at 220 pounds.

His comparative loss is approximately $22. This penalty for weight is not a good incentive for either the production of meat or fats and the shortage which has developed will continue.

That the price differential is entirely the result of too low a price for lard is revealed by heavy-hog and light-hog prices for the years 1925, 1927, 1929 and 1943 (OPA ceilings).

| | Prices at Chicago | |
|---|---|---|
| | Heavy hogs, 330 to 360 pounds | Light hogs, 200 to 250 pounds |
| | *Per cwt.* | *Per cwt.* |
| 1925 | $12.19 | $12.23 |
| 1927 | 10.16 | 10.45 |
| 1929 | 10.29 | 10.52 |
| 1943 | 14.41 | 14.66 |
| 1948 (July) | 24.51 | 29.66 |

The record indicates clearly that there is no great differential if lard prices are in proper ratio. This price balance has been upset by the unwise rationing of fats and oils to the extent of depressing the price.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The various departments should provide for larger allocations of tallow and lard for export. Fats are a very much needed food in Europe and represents an economical food. Fat is a highly concentrated food and there is no cost of freight for water content such as we have in meat, fruits, potatoes, etc.

In my opinion a supplemental allocation of 100,000,000 in the third quarter of 1948 would have corrected the price situation. Proper allocations should be made in the fourth quarter to restore the historical price balance which is an entirely natural one.

With a proper price ratio for fats, etc., to remove the penalty for weight, the producer should be encouraged to feed to heavier weights, thus overcoming some of the present shortage of fats and meats.

The estimated corn crop of 3,500,000,000 bushels can be turned into fat and meat, the only process we have to get increased production. Unless such a course is followed high meat prices and a shortage of fats and meat will continue and the stocks of corn will pile up as a surplus stock of raw materials for meat and fat production.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Omaha Herald.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from the Bristol Courier of January 3, 1949, entitled "The Year 1949."

ECONOMY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am very much grieved this morning to see in the statement of the Federal Treasury as of January 17 that, while last year we had a credit balance of $1,571,000,000 as of that date, today we have a deficit of $112,000,000. This means we should get down to brass tacks, talk economy and practice economy in our Government.

Think of what the President's messages to Congress were.

There were many proposals to spend and spend and spend. He did not say anything about economy in Government. It grieves me greatly to think that the President is not going to try to instill in the minds of the people of America, especially the Members of this Congress, that we have to economize in the many things we are doing in this Nation if we are to preserve our stability. Just look at the Government deficits we have had in the past few years.

In 1943 the deficit was $57,400,000,000.
In 1944 the deficit was $51,400,000,000.
In 1945 the deficit was $53,900,000,000.
In 1946 the deficit was $20,700,000,000.

In 1947, under a Republican Congress, we had a surplus of $754,000,000.

In 1948 the Republican surplus amounted to $8,400,000,000. It shows what the Republicans can do; besides, they cut the taxes of our American people. The Republicans believe in a solvent Government—a Government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

Look what the President has done in starting us off for 1949—he advocates spending to the extent that we have a deficit for 1949 of $873,000,000, and for 1950 a deficit of $2,700,000,000. All he thinks of is spending. Why does not the President and the Congress have some degree of sane, sensible sound business in Government operation§ With a debt of over $252,000,000,000, more deficit financing means ruin for Government, ruination for our people. Again I say to you,

Where in the world will you get the money for this ruthless spending?

Stop, look, and for goodness' sake, listen.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a series of editorials favoring statehood for Hawaii.

NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the naturalization of certain noncitizen parents of persons who served in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine, in World War I or World War II.

The sons and daughters of these noncitizens filled the ranks of our services. Many of them paid the supreme sacrifice.

They have rightfully earned for their parents the privilege of citizenship.

Through force of circumstance or economic necessity, in many instances, these parents of large families were denied the ready accessibility to citizenship.

They were occupied with the problem of rearing the future citizens of America. They should not be penalized for devotion to so noble a duty. Rather, a medal of citizenship should be struck and bestowed for meritorious service to this country.

There can be no loftier grant, no finer gesture, than the extension of the much-cherished privilege of American citizenship to persons whose moral, spiritual, and physical contribution to our greatness produced offspring citizens who have fought and bled and sacrificed and otherwise distinguished themselves as true Americans.

Can there be any hesitancy about accepting them for citizenship when they have so capably exhibited and proved by actual practice that they possess the prime requisities for graduation to actual and official Americanization.

Is this not one of those times when all minds concur to make this possible?

They fathered and mothered our manpower for the battlefields and for our arsenals at home, for the professions and the arts, and the businesses, and for every field of contributory endeavor that has brought us to our present position as a leading world power.

We would be grateful, for we are a grateful people, to do what is clearly obvious.

They qualify in every respect but one.

Shall we refuse to adopt them legally as our own simply because, unwittingly, and perhaps unintentionally, we had thrown a road block in their path to citizenship.

They have proved their worth; they have earned their fare. Their undeniable attachment to the principles of Americanism should impel us to remove that obstacle.

In this specific instance, the educational requirements should be waived.

The bill that I present today is meant to do just that. It is a reasonable move. It is an Americanlike attitude. It is the exercise of typically American virtues. Fundamentally, it is gratitude expressed as only America could express it.

It is my hope that on both sides of the aisle there is recognized the moral obligation incurred over the years and especially during the last two World Wars.

For in the process of building the greatness that is ours, theirs was a contribution no less patriotic, no less civic-minded, and no less devoted than ours.

The flesh and blood of these fathers and mothers were bartered for the sake of our preservation on Normandy's shore, on Gaudalcanal, on the seas of the world, and in the skies over lands far from the good old U. S. A.

I urge early and favorable consideration of this bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to a bill he is today introducing to establish an immigration quota for the state of Israel.

UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, there was spent for unemployment insurance last year $750,000,000 in a time of full employment. When I read in the papers that thousands of people are spending their winters in Florida on unemployment insurance, it suggests to my mind the old axiom, "Where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise." And this suggests the following more modern axiom, "When you can cheat the Government by not working and vacation in the sunny climes of Florida on unemployment insurance, why work?"

That is what is happening in thousands of cases, because the administration of unemployment insurance has been so loose that thousands of wage earners, when through with one job, refuse to take another one, claiming that the offered employment is not suitable.

In too many instances the Government agency obligingly agrees with the job applicant who goes on unemployment insurance. Many wage earners themselves refer to unemployment insurance as rocking-chair money. To some extent it has become a Nation-wide racket for the accommodation of loafers, at the expense of those who are willing to work.

Mr. Speaker, New York papers carry the story that over 1,000 New Yorkers on unemployment insurance are vacationing in Florida and escaping the more rigorous climate of the North.

From northern Illinois the papers say that over 200 of these so-called unemployed are rocking away their time, also basking in the sunshine of Florida.

The press in Washington carries the story that over 300 District citizens are receiving their unemployment compensation while spending the winter in Florida in a climate more to their liking.

These are only a few of the many thousands throughout the Nation who are taking advantage of the loose administration of this law.

The administration has recommended more weeks of unemployment insurance be granted the workers and, in some States, more pay per week. If such a bill passes, it is to be hoped that no over-indulgent Congressman will offer an amendment to it to include for the comfort of those who see fit to spend their winters in Florida, free beach chairs, or rocking chairs, also at the expense of the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the people generally want this act tightened up, so only those who are really in need and are entitled to unemployment insurance get it. That was the real intent of the law.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JUDD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances: in each to include extraneous material.

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD with reference to the production of strategic materials.

Mr. MACK of Washington (at the request of Mr. TOLLEFSON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

KEEPING HISTORY STRAIGHT ON CHARPENTRY, FRANCE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, much as I dislike to spoil a good story, I must correct the one related in the Washington Star of Saturday, January 22, 1949, for the sake of historical accuracy.

In substance the news story stated that Capt. Harry Truman, in command of Battery D, One Hundred and Twenty-ninth Field Artillery, "forgot" an order against firing across the division boundary separating the Thirty-fifth Division—Kansas and Missouri National Guard—and the Twenty-eighth Division—Pennsylvania National Guard—on the west side of the Aire River left of the Thirty-fifth Division in the Muese Argonne.

The story goes on to say that by forgetting the order, Captain Truman trained his guns on the village of Char-

pentry, knocked out six guns, and enabled the Twenty-eighth Division to capture Charpentry with little loss of life—thus saving the lives of many Pennsylvania men.

Those are not the facts.

Let us keep history straight.

The Twenty-eighth Division did not capture Charpentry.

The Thirty-fifth Division did that job.

Charpentry was in the Thirty-fifth Division sector a few miles north of Vauquois Hill, taken by the Thirty-fifth Division on the first day of the drive.

Charpentry was taken by the Thirty-fifth Division before noon September 28, by the One Hundred and Thirty-seventh Infantry of which I was a member. Some troops from the One Hundred and Thirty-ninth Infantry also participated in taking this objective.

These are the facts—not fiction. If there is any doubt about this the War Department, histories, battle maps, and other members of the Thirty-fifth Division will verify them all.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent and also a brief newspaper article.

Mr. HESELTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Reuben H. Markham.

Mr. HERTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a brief statement made by a Member of Congress.

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with reference to an extension of remarks which I requested yesterday, to include some extraneous material with reference to urban relations, the Public Printer estimates that it will cost $390. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD notwithstanding the extra cost.

The SPEAKER. Notwithstanding and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by a former Member of Congress, Captain Bradley, before the Baltimore Rotary Club.

Mr. HARVEY (at the request of Mr. NORBLAD) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from a Newcastle, Ind., newspaper.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of a bill introduced by 10 Republican Members on housing.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include certain excerpts.

Mr. GOODWIN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each case to include an editorial.

Mr. DAGUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Herman A. Love.

DR. PETER MARSHALL

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, not only is the Congress brought low in mourning for the spiritual leader lost, but his flock, the people of our National Capital, of our Nation, as well as many parts of the world, are united in grief as they lovingly recall the voice so recently stilled.

So young, fresh, strong, winsome, and thrilling, as he constantly gave the challenge to climb in the steps of his Master; so potent in prayer; our smiling friend, Dr. Peter Marshall, leaves a happier, better world because he lived; a clearer, surer hope because he still lives and beckons, where there is no death.

They that turn many to righteousness shall shine as the stars, forever and ever.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after all business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by inserting an article entitled "The Blockade of Berlin."

RESEARCH IN THE CURE AND TREATMENT OF RHEUMATISM AND ARTHRITIS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be able to join with my distinguished colleagues on the Democratic side, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and my distinguished colleague on the Republican side, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], in introducing the bill for research into the causes and cure of rheumatism and arthritis. I would like to underscore what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] has just said about the fact that this whole program is of a pattern and that it ties in very closely with the enlargement of the research facilities of our State universities, medical schools, and research centers around the country. I think this pattern is the most eloquent rebuttal of the idea that by undertaking this humanitarian program the Federal Government is engaged in discouraging private and individual enterprise. On the contrary, it is bringing out the best in our private economy and in private research. It is at long last doing justice to the millions of sufferers from heart disease, cancer, mental illness, tuberculosis, and now rheumatism and arthritis who have found no other adequate relief while they have seen billions expended—necessary as they are—for military weapons. A chart of the distribution of United States Public Health Service funds for these research purposes, follows:

*Distribution of United States Public Health Service funds, by types—fiscal year 1949*

| | Intramural research | Project grants-in-aid research | Teaching and aid to medical schools, fellowships | Grants-in-aid to States | Research construction grants | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| National Heart Institute | $257,009 | [1] $1,463,300 | [2] $226,600 | $175,000 | ---------- | $512,079 | $2,633,988 |
| National Cancer Institute | 2,760,000 | 3,200,000 | 2,995,000 | 2,500,000 | $8,000,000 | 2,445,000 | 22,000,000 |
| National Mental Health Institute | 57,600 | 470,000 | 1,530,000 | 3,550,000 | ---------- | 3,420,400 | 9,028,000 |
| Tuberculosis | 675,000 | [3] 601,666 | 7,900 | 6,790,000 | ---------- | 1,878,500 | 9,953,066 |
| Venereal | 678,763 | [3] 637,664 | 3,650 | 15,008,507 | ---------- | 1,589,338 | 17,917,922 |
| Arthritis and rheumatism | ---------- | 106,284 | 7,300 | (4) | ---------- | ---------- | 113,584 |
| Deaths associated with childbirth (maternal, stillbirth, neonatal) | ---------- | 62,971 | 3,600 | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | 66,571 |
| Dental Institute | 173,725 | 168,928 | 33,550 | ---------- | ---------- | 1,000,000 | 1,376,203 |

[1] Represents actual commitments at this time. Amount budgeted for this purpose is $1,875,000.
[2] Includes $51,600 for research fellowships awarded at this time. Amount budgeted for this purpose is $150,000.
[3] Plus antibiotics.
[4] Unspecified amount included in $11,214,666 of general health grants.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

THE LATE HONORABLE THEODORE CHRISTIANSON

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House with reference to the death of a former Member.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I report to the House the passing of a respected former Member of this body.

Theodore Christianson, three times Governor of Minnesota and a Member of the Seventy-third and Seventy-fourth Congresses from that State, died suddenly at his home near Dawson, Minn., on December 9, 1948.

Born in Lac qui Parle township of Lac qui Parle County, Minn., in 1883, he graduated from the University of Minnesota in 1906 and won his law degree there in 1909. He then started practice in Dawson, Minn., 9 miles from where he was born, and also acquired the Dawson Sentinel, which he published until 1925. He served in the State legislature from 1914 until his first term as Governor.

His many friends in Congress will remember him as a friend of the farmer and small business. While in Congress he opposed huge Government spending and centralization of power in the Federal Government and as Governor of our State gave the people of Minnesota a splendid administration.

After he left Congress he first became associated with the National Association of Retail Grocers and later in 1939 became public relations counsel for the National Association of Retail Druggists. In fact, he had just retired in October from the drug association and had planned to enjoy his retirement by spending his summers on his farm near Dawson and his winters in Florida, but fate decided otherwise.

Ted was a very scholarly man and was always seeking avidly further knowledge. He was a good customer of book shops, as evidenced by his large private library in which every book was well marked with notations and comments. His was not a superficial knowledge, for from his earliest college days he had dug deep into the study of history, politics, economics, and literature.

He was the author of Minnesota: a History of the State and Its People, which is one of the most scholarly histories of our great State. He also edited the National Association of Retail Druggists Journal and wrote numerous articles on government which were published in our foremost magazines.

He had two sons, Robert James and Theodore, Jr., by his first wife, Mrs. Ruth E. Donaldson Christianson, who died in 1944. He married his second wife, Mrs. Mayme B. Bundy, of Chicago, Ill., in 1946.

Last October he and Mrs. Christianson came to Washington to visit at the home of his brother, Mr. Curtis A. Christianson. He spent a whole day at the Capitol visiting all the haunts so familiar to him. His one regret was that Congress was not in session so that he could see his old friends. It is quite possible that he had a feeling that it might be his last visit.

I am sure his many friends in Congress will join in paying tribute to a great statesman and a great American.

I insert herewith three editorials, all printed in the Dawson Sentinel, which so aptly describe his outstanding career as a public servant:

TED CHRISTIANSON: A FRIEND

Newspapers all over the State of Minnesota will pay tribute to Theodore Christianson this week, most of whom will probably stress his public service. Other editorials on this page are expressions from the Twin City newspapers, each paying high tribute to the man who held the respect and esteem of men and women of all political faiths. Ted Christianson was no ordinary man, but like so many others who have achieved greatness, the bouquets come after death when his eyes can no longer read, nor his ears hear the praises and accolades.

His public service is well known to Sentinel readers, as is his ability as a writer and speaker. For many years Ted Christianson's opinions appeared in these columns while he was editor and publisher of the Sentinel, and from this chair he went on to fame and fortune. He was a self-made man, and his attainments came from his own efforts and abilities. He knew first hand the struggles and privations of pioneer life, and through that experience learned the valuable lesson of thrift and honesty, qualities which remained with him throughout his entire life.

His ability was recognized by others early in life, and it was the prediction of his minister during his confirmation days that Theodore Christianson would go on to greatness, becoming either a governor or a United States Senator. The first prediction came true, and Minnesota was given 6 years of State administration which set a pattern of achievement which has not been reached since. Economy and honesty in government was an imperative creed with Theodore Christianson, and though there were those among his political family who failed him, Theodore Christianson lived up to his pledges made during his first campaign. His was a political courage rare in the annals of State history.

We could devote this entire page in an attempt to pay just tribute to the career of Dawson's greatest citizen, but others, more able than we, will speak of nearly every phase of his life. We want to devote our tribute to the quality which we home folks knew better than anyone else—his friendliness.

We hope we will be pardoned for referring to our personal experience with Ted Christianson—we call him Ted, for no one around here called him anything but that. He was the kind of a man for whom one felt a personal friendship at the first meeting.

Back in 1916 Ted Christianson gave the commencement address to a class of six seniors at Belview. The writer was one of those six, and though we do not remember the message the speaker gave to us that night, we do remember that it exerted a powerful influence on us. We did not meet Ted Christianson again until in 1921. We were filling the position of superintendent of schools at Milan at that time, and, remembering the 1916 speech, we came over to Dawson to secure the services of Ted Christianson for our commencement exercises at Milan. We do not remember that speech, either, but we do recall that there was the same magnetic appeal. Our acquaintanceship ripened from that time on, and many were the times that an encouraging word or an inspiring conversation with him gave us a needed lift.

During our superintendency of the Dawson schools we felt the need for a change of profession. We discussed this with some friends, and Mr. and Mrs. Christianson heard of our plans and asked us to come and see them to talk over a proposition they had for us. Their genuine interest in our welfare and confidence in us influenced us to enter a profession entirely new to us, and their generosity gave us the opportunity of going into business for ourselves.

During our nearly 12 years as editor of this newspaper there have been times when we have been much discouraged, ready to throw in the sponge and try something else. However, encouraging letters and talks during Mr. Christianson's frequent visits gave us the needed impetus to keep going. He always maintained a keen interest in the paper he formerly published and never failed to visit the shop one or more times when here on a visit.

What Ted Christianson did for us is just one example of the influence his friendliness exerted. He was of the common people, and neither wealth nor fame made any difference in his treatment of his host of friends. His own success did not change him, and he was never so content as when spending his vacations in his home community and realizing some of the dreams and plans he had made for his declining years.

Ted Christianson was always planning for the future, and just a brief hour before his death was talking of plans he had for his home when he and his wife returned from their anticipated winter holiday in Florida. Had his plans materialized, the world would have been richer, for a part of his plans included the writing of several articles and possibly a book. His keen mind and sound philosophy of living won for him the kind of life most of us seek and never find.

Ted Christianson was a great man, and above all a great friend. We can think of no better way to express our feelings than to say that we shall sincerely miss him.

---

"MORE TED, LESS TAXES"

Theodore Christianson's first campaign for Governor of Minnesota was opened a quarter of a century ago by Gunnar Bjornson in the weekly Minnesota Mascot with an editorial titled "More Ted, Less Taxes." The slogan struck the popular fancy and helped Christianson win three terms as Governor. Economy was his platform and he carried it out with a consecration few men show in public office.

Christianson was a farm boy who worked his way through school to a law degree. He believed that self-reliance was a splendid asset for the individual and that thrift was a virtue to be cultivated in private living and government administration. Thus he found himself out of step with later political thought which held that a nation could spend itself out of difficulties.

Now Theodore Christianson has passed on and his philosophy seldom is heard in public places. Yet it still persists in the minds of men, like a voice of conscience, and some day may be brought into the open again.

The former Governor himself is not forgotten by any who knew him, for he was an able, honest, and friendly figure. He ran the Dawson Sentinel for many years and the loyalty of the country press to him was almost unanimous. As Governor and Congressman, he lived up to the responsibility this placed upon him. He served his State and his own ideals well.—Minneapolis Star-Journal.

---

HIS MONUMENTS ENDURE

Theodore Christianson, who died near his old home at Dawson, Thursday night, was the descendant of territorial pioneers, who came from Norway to settle in western Minnesota. He was the first native son of a native son to become Governor of the State. Editing a five-volume history of Minnesota, in 1935, Christianson paid tribute to the outstanding work in that field by the late William Watts Folwell, as "a monumental achievement by a man who not only wrote history but made it."

While the writing skill he displayed for years as editor of the Dawson Sentinel marked his effort as historian too, it is as a maker of Minnesota history rather than a recorder of it that Theodore Christianson will be remembered. Few men ever came to the governorship better prepared for its duties. Through 8 years in the House, much of that time chairman of its Appropriations Committee, he had an intimate, practical knowledge of State problems and governmental techniques.

It seems old-fashioned in view of more recent trends to recall his emphasis on economy as governor. But it was part of his concept of stewardship of a public trust. He believed government should abide by the same fundamental rules as to efficiency and economy which private business applies. And

he furthered that objective in the Reorganization Act of 1925, which rates as the greatest achievement in his 6-year administration as chief executive.

Institution of the preaudit system of budgeting and the maintenance of safeguards against spending State funds simply because it may be possible to spend them are fundamentals of reorganized State government that brought sweeping reforms when Christianson introduced them as Governor. They remained as time-tested essentials in such changes as the new reorganization act of 1939 brought.

The same traits of dependability and leadership marked Theodore Christianson's career in private business as had distinguished his work as State legislator, Governor and Congressman. The last public appearance he made in Minnesota was when called here to dedicate a memorial to the late C. M. Babcock, highway commissioner, at Elk River. He described as the most enduring monument to Babcock's career the State trunk highway system which he made a reality. Theodore Christianson leaves his own enduring monument in the high caliber of his civil leadership, and in technical phases of State government, reforms he fostered will endure, even long after their origins may have been forgotten. (St. Paul Pioneer Press.)

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Theodore Christianson. He was an outstanding and one of the ablest governors in the history of our State. As a member of the State legislature and as Governor of our State he left a magnificent record—in legislation and in his program during his service as Governor—which is a monument to his ability as a legislator and Governor.

Theodore Christianson was a man of outstanding scholarly attainments, an able speaker, a gentleman of culture and integrity.

The State of Minnesota has in my opinion lost one of its ablest sons and I join in tribute to an outstanding American who gave so many years of his life in the public service.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of knowing Governor Christianson for at least 20 years. He was one of the finest and best men I ever knew. He was not only an able and wise man but he was also a very intelligent man in every way. He was a good, genuine, public-spirited citizen; he was civic-minded and always working in the interest of his country; he was truly a great American.

Governor Christianson during his life was famous and outstanding as a lawyer, newspaper publisher, historian, State legislator, Governor, Congressman, publicist, organization worker, and militant protagonist of small business. His passing is a great loss to the entire country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in connection with my remarks an article which appeared in the journal of the National Association of Retail Druggists shortly after Governor Christianson's death.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The article referred to follows:

DEATH COMES TO THEODORE CHRISTIANSON

Theodore Christianson, editor emeritus of the NARD Journal, died on December 9 from a heart attack while en route to his farm home near Dawson, Minn. He was 65 years old on September 12.

Mr. Christianson was a former Governor of Minnesota and he had served two terms in Congress. He left behind an exemplary record of service, one that men in political positions today might well try to follow, for it was made through individual acceptance of the highest concepts of citizenship. He gave to public service the fullest measure of the abilities he possessed and conscientious recognition of the responsibilities that accompany election to an office of government. The ideals that guided him are the beacons of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America.

Mr. Christianson had been a stalwart fighter through the years for the basic values of a society built on the bedrock of freedom. Never once did he compromise on issues coupled to the fundamentals of liberty. He held fast to convictions he derived from intensive study of history. It pained him to see the people betrayed through the treachery of political leaders they had been induced to follow. He was troubled over the expansion of bureaucracy in government. "The consequence will be dictatorship," he often observed.

For a long time he had been much concerned anent the struggles of small business to survive. On numerous occasions he pointed to the onward march of monopoly. "It is bound to bring collectivism unless it is stopped before it is too late to save small business," he emphasized. He believed that it had become compulsory to enact legislation to make it illegal for corporate empires to purchase the assets of competitors. "Otherwise monopoly will continue to grow unchecked," he insisted. He also took the position that the laws against trusts must be modified to allow individual retailers to come together in concerted action to bargain with the manufacturers. He argued that now the small dealers were compelled to operate as best they could in an uphill fight against the unfair tactics of the producers.

Mr. Christianson joined the headquarters staff of the NARD as public-relations counsel in 1939. To the position he brought a thorough knowledge of economics and a background of experience that gave him familiarity with the force of public opinion. The programs he developed to help the independent retail druggists were realistic and in line with the problems of the individual retailers. He traveled over the country to arouse small business to the necessity for united action, and everywhere he went he stimulated militant activities against the destroyers of freedom of enterprise. He also wrote numerous articles to advance the cause of independent retail druggists and small business in general. To him it was an obligation of citizenship to strive for the preservation of the way of life that built the United States.

Then in 1945 he became editor of the NARD Journal. He continued in that position until he retired on November 1, 1948. The final contribution he made to the independent retail druggists was the farewell address he delivered at the golden jubilee convention of the NARD. It was published in full in the NARD Journal dated November 1.

Mr. Christianson was born on a farm in Lac qui Parle County, Minn. He was a son of Robert and Emma Christianson. They were of rugged stock and from them he first learned the great lessons of liberty. He clung with tenacity to the heritage of a pioneer society in the prairies of the Northwest.

After he was graduated from the high school at Dawson, Minn., he matriculated at the University of Minnesota and was graduated with the bachelor of arts degree in 1906. Then he served as principal of the public school of Robbinsdale, Minn., a suburb of Minneapolis, and at the same time studied law at the University of Minnesota to earn the bachelor of laws degree in 1909. Soon thereafter he purchased the Dawson (Minn.) Sentinel and he combined publication of the newspaper with the practice of law at Dawson.

One of the teachers on his staff in the public school at Robbinsdale was Miss Ruth Donaldson. They were married in 1907 and to them two sons were born, Robert James and Theodore, Jr. Both are attorneys; the former practices in Minneapolis, the latter in St. Paul. Mrs. Christianson died in 1944. Mr. Christianson was married again in 1946, to Mrs. Mayme Bunde, of Chicago.

Mr. Christianson was elected to the Minnesota House of Representatives in 1914 and he served six terms, during four of which he was chairman of the important appropriations committee. Then in 1925 he was elected Governor on the Republican ticket. He served three terms in the office and became recognized as one of the greatest chief executives in the history of Minnesota. For a time thereafter he was associated with a manufacturer in Minneapolis. In 1932 he was elected a Representative in Congress. After he had served two terms, he became a candidate for United States Senator but was defeated in the leftward swing of the majority of the people of Minnesota.

Mr. Christianson then accepted the managership of the National Association of Retail Grocers. He continued in that position until NARD's executive secretary, John W. Dargavel, induced him to join its headquarters staff.

It seems appropriate to quote the final words Mr. Christianson spoke in the farewell message to the independent retail druggists delivered at the golden jubilee of the NARD:

"Those who established this country had a dream, the finest dream ever conceived by man—

" 'Here on this soil began the kingdom, not of kings but men;
Began the making of the world again,
Where equal rights and equal bonds were set,
Where all the people equal-franchised met,
Where doom was writ of privilege and crown,
Where human breath blew all the idols down,
Where crests were naught, where vulture flags were furled,
And common men began to own the world!'

"That was the American dream. To make it come true must be your continuing objective."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, a great teacher once said, "By their fruits ye shall know them."

It was not my privilege to know well Governor Christianson, a former Member of this House, because I did not come to the State of Minnesota until about the time when he was leaving active public life; but, judged by the fruits he left, which are visible to all in Minnesota, the imprint he made on the hearts of his fellow citizens, the record on the statute books, in public works, and in

advancing every other good cause in the State of Minnesota, he was a truly great man. I can think of no person who has left larger footprints in the sands of time as the result of what he did. His record is what impressed a person coming along after him with the remarkable ability, integrity, versatility, and superior leadership he must have had. I know I am speaking for all the people of Minnesota. We pay tribute to one of her greatest sons, and certainly one of the ablest public servants it has been our State's privilege to send into public life.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Minnesota and the delegation from Minnesota in an expression of deep regret over the death of former Governor Christianson. He was a warm personal friend of mine; one whose friendship I cherished for many years. I knew him as a true friend, great public servant, a Christian gentleman, and a great American. We have all suffered a serious loss in his passing.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks three editorials.

I also ask unanimous consent that all Members so desiring may extend their remarks at this point on the life and character of the late Theodore Christianson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

MEMBERS ON THE COMMITTEE ON THE DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 63) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers provided for by section 5 of Public Law 115, Seventy-eighth Congress, shall consist of two members of the Committee on House Administration to be appointed by the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 63, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers the following Members of the House: Mr. GARMATZ, of Maryland; Mr. BISHOP, of Illinois.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 585, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. DURHAM, North Carolina; Mr. HOLIFIELD, California; Mr. PRICE, Illinois; Mr. KILDAY, Texas; Mr. JACKSON, Washington; Mr. COLE, New York; Mr. ELSTON, Ohio; Mr. HINSHAW, California; Mr. VAN ZANDT, Pennsylvania.

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 64) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committee of Congress:

Joint Committee on Printing: Mrs. NORTON, New Jersey; Mr. DEANE, North Carolina; Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa.

Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; Mrs. NORTON, New Jersey; Mr. REGAN, Texas; Mr. ALBERT, Oklahoma; Mr. LECOMPTE, Iowa; Mr. BISHOP, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF PALESTINE REFUGEES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 46)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed letter from the Acting Secretary of State and the accompanying draft legislation to authorize an appropriation for a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees. In submitting this proposed legislation, I wish to invite attention to the provisions of the resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations emphasizing the critical situation of these refugees and urging all States Members of the United Nations to make voluntary contributions as soon as possible to meet their needs.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 27, 1949.*

(Enclosures: Letter from Acting Secretary of State, draft of proposed legislation, general assembly resolution.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

A FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take advantage of this occasion to note an anniversary which has by now become indelibly stamped in the public consciousness as a day of commemoration and dedication.

In the American calendar of days for patriotic observance we are accustomed to the yearly recurrence of so-called name days. Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Jackson Day, Jefferson Day, Jeff Davis Day in the great Southland, and Columbus Day are typical of the holidays set aside for remembrance of great men whose figures loom large in the panorama of our national history.

January 30 of each year is also gradually taking its place in the roster of notable dates in American history.

For that date, Mr. Speaker, is one of no mean significance.

Entirely aside from the fact that it is the anniversary of the natal day of the lamented and revered Franklin Delano Roosevelt, it has become recognized as a rallying day in the fight of the American people against the dread disease which so sorely afflicted that superlative statesman.

Hence we do not have Roosevelt Day or Franklin Roosevelt's birthday—but instead, the President's birthday.

No greater detail, no more specific designation is needed.

The President's birthday means but one thing to all Americans.

It is a day of happy combination. At once a day of remembrance—the birthday anniversary of a magnificent American—and a day of devotion—dedicated to the drive to raise funds to combat infantile paralysis.

There is a peculiarly fitting tribute implicit in the term by which this memorable day is designated.

Of all our outstanding Executive leaders, only one has had his birthday anniversary set aside as that of the President's. But one man could aptly fill such a singular niche of specification. That man and that President is Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

As one who knew intimately his greatness of heart and soul, I like to think that such a simple yet unique designation for the birthday anniversary of Franklin Roosevelt is the eloquent tribute of a grateful people who recognized in him their leader, their champion, and, in a particular manner, their own beloved President.

The President's birthday, then, means Franklin Roosevelt's birthday—the birthday of the President of the people, and the remembered anniversary of the only man who so won their affection as to achieve the highest office within their gift for four consecutive terms.

The second meaning of the day is one which meant more to Franklin Delano Roosevelt than the anniversary itself.

Early in his career as President he sanctioned celebration of the day, not as one of personal glorification, but as a day of dedication to the humanitarian cause of relief of suffering.

Each year since has seen the setting aside of January 30 as the climax of a concerted annual national effort to conquer infantile paralysis.

Thus the anniversary of the birth of Franklin Roosevelt is not an idle commemoration but is a day of achievement for the betterment of the lot of man. He, more than any of his fellow citizens, was pleased that something of his could be devoted to such high purpose.

It is perhaps characteristic of such a selfless leader that so personal a thing as his own birthdate should be perpetuated primarily as an occasion for lessening the pain and sorrow of those with whom he felt a special kinship.

I say this because of all the splendid qualities with which God and nature endowed him, the most notable was his humanitarianism.

He conceived of government as an instrumentality for the service of man.

Every piece of the major legislation which marked the social revolution of his administrations was purposely designed to alleviate the social conditions of the masses he loved.

His enemies—which are those also of the commonalty—were fear, want, poverty, social injustice, physical suffering, and human indignity.

He battled them with the shining swords of charity, social justice, good will, humane philosophy, and democratic government.

In war and in peace, his sole concern was centered around the rights of man, both as an individual and as a member of society.

He subscribed wholeheartedly to the deathless principle that the salvation of the world lay in the recognition and effectuation of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

What is more, he acted, resolutely and courageously, upon that principle; and he did so to the extent that the most fruitful years of his energetic life were dedicated to the gradual attainment of that sublime goal at home and abroad.

He so lived in accordance with his high principles that at his death he bequeathed the pattern of them for the guidance of America and the edification of the world.

The impress of his greatness is all around us.

This nation is stronger and greater because he has lived in it, gave himself to it, and died in its service.

It is true that his beloved land and the community of nations which he struggled to bring into the sunshine of peace and prosperity have not yet attained the goal.

But the influence of his dynamic leadership still gives an impetus toward that goal, and the vanguard of the march of the peoples of the world toward it is led by the spirit of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It was his incessant prayer that mankind should so advance in understanding, friendship, and good will that discord would vanish from the face of the earth. That prayer is still our aspiration.

On Sunday next, if God had spared him to us, Franklin Roosevelt would have been 67 years old. The vibrant voice, the friendly smile, the warm handclasp, the generous heart—all these are no more. But the ageless spirit of the man abides with us.

That spirit is abroad today. It is a part of the spiritual fabric of America which holds the courage of his people to the great moral issues which beset the world today.

It is with the faith of that great spirit that those issues will be solved.

The name and memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt will live in the minds of people everywhere for all time.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

### THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS—SMALL BUSINESS—PRESIDENT TRUMAN ENTITLED TO COOPERATION OF CONGRESS IN EFFORT TO AID SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, small-business men have the right to expect a lot from the Eighty-first Congress. The plain people of this country, generally, have a right to expect a lot out of the Eighty-first Congress. President Truman is known as a friend of the small-business man. His every heart throb and every pulse beat have been on the side of small business and against monopoly. We have, too, fortunately, a fine Attorney General of the United States selected by President Truman to enforce the antitrust laws of our country. He is the Honorable Tom Clark from the State of Texas. The people of this Nation are proud of him because of the fine way that he has enforced the antitrust laws fearlessly, fairly, and impartially. He is alert; he is able; and he certainly is on the side of the people and small business and against monopolistic practices and monopolies. It is now up to Congress to do something. We must provide money and enact needed laws. The private enterprise system built our country. It is the finest and greatest system in the world. We want to preserve and protect that system. We do not want socialism, communism, or fascism. We want the American system, the democratic system.

### A DEMOCRACY IN A REPUBLIC

The question has been raised in this country about whether or not we have a democratic form of government. Some have suggested it is a republican form of government. Without discussing the matter in detail, it is true that under our Constitution of the United States each State is guaranteed a republican form of government, but at the same time there is nothing said about the kind of government that is guaranteed as a Federal Government. However our Government set-up is unquestionably a representative democracy. It will be remembered that a State cannot impair the obligation of contracts. That is prohibited by the Federal Constitution. But, the Federal Government is not restrained or prevented from impairing the obligation of contracts. There is a difference between the States and the Federal Government.

In 1918 the House of Representatives adopted what has been known and is known as the American's Creed. It was written by the Honorable William Tyler Page, a former Clerk of this House, and a very fine man. I had the pleasure and privilege of knowing him several years before he passed away. A prize was offered, at least, a premium was offered of $1,000 to the one who wrote the best American creed. The Honorable William Tyler Page won that prize of $1,000. The American's Creed is exactly 100 words. In that creed, that was adopted by this House of Representatives, our Government and our system and form of government is described as "a democracy in a Republic."

### WHO IS THE REAL SOCIALIST

In connection with small business, as I said a while ago, we want to continue to have the kind of business we have had in the past. Many people are disturbed. I am impressed with the fact that the people who seem to be disturbed the most and are making the most noise are the ones who are putting our country in the direction of socialism.

I ask the question, Who is a real Socialist in this country, the person who has nothing but a loud voice advocating socialism or the big man who is putting the units of an industry all in one package and making it ripe for Government ownership and control?

### SOCIALISTS BELIEVE IN MONOPOLY

Dr. Steinmetz was one of the most famous scientists and engineers in the world, I presume, before his death. He was the chief consulting engineer of the General Electric Co., quite a big company at that time as well as now. He was a Socialist. He admitted he was a Socialist. He believed in socialism, he advocated socialism, and he made speeches for socialism.

One day he was asked by an inquiring person in his audience, "Why is it, Dr. Steinmetz, that you are a Socialist, yet you work for one of the biggest concerns in the United States, that is more grasping all the time and getting larger all the time? How can you be consistent under those circumstances?"

He said, "That is easy. I am a firm believer in socialism and I know that the quicker you have monopoly in this country the quicker we will have socialism."

There is a very short step from monopoly in any industry to socialism in the Government. I think Dr. Steinmetz was right, I think he was very consistent in advocating monopoly for the purpose of arriving at socialism.

It has happened in other countries, in England recently, when only six companies had control of the steel production and the Government of Great Britain took over the steel production. It has happened the same way in other industries. When you get an industry in one package, it is almost invariably taken over by the Government.

If you will read the platform of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party for the past 50 years, you will see in practically every platform this or similar language, "Private monopoly is indefensible and cannot be tolerated." If you will read the Socialist platform, you

will find that they advocate that the Government should own the trusts. It is perfectly consistent with Dr. Steinmetz's teachings that the Government should own the trusts. So when a few people become the owners of the steel industry or the automobile industry or the electric industry or any other industry, that industry becomes ripe for Government ownership, and then it will be almost irresistible.

The plea is that the Government should own, that private monopoly is indefensible and intolerable and therefore we must prevent private monopoly. We must not allow a few people to own any one particular industry. It must be scattered and all people should be given an opportunity to engage in any business that they want to engage in and be protected from unfair competition.

I have a statement here which was delivered before our Committee on Small Business last November by the Honorable Wendell Berge, formerly in charge of antitrust prosecutions in the Department of Justice of the United States under the present Attorney General, Hon. Tom Clark. This is such an interesting statement I am going to insert it in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

He brings out some points such as this:

> We hear a great deal about the trust-busting policies of President Theodore Roosevelt, but even when you survey his 7-year administration you find that relatively few suits were instituted. The fame which he attained as a trust buster rests largely on several cases—the Northern Securities case, the Packers case, the Standard Oil case, and the Tobacco case. I do not mean to underestimate the importance of those cases. They were important as landmarks.

Then he says:

> In the Theodore Roosevelt administration the average number of lawyers in active service on antitrust matters was five. Five lawyers cannot do very much in policing against the monopoly practices of the whole industry of America.
>
> In the Wilson administration when the World War had caused prices to skyrocket, the number of lawyers engaged in this work rose to 18. In the 1920s, when corporate mergers proceeded at a fantastic pace, the number of lawyers engaged in antitrust enforcement did not exceed 25. Not until 1938 were as many as 50 lawyers actually employed in this work and not until 1939 did the professional personnel reach 200 lawyers and a half dozen economists. For almost its whole life, the antitrust division has been a kind of corporal's guard.

I call that to your attention and I hope you will read the entire statement by Hon. Wendell Berge at the end of these remarks so that you will realize the need for sufficient money for the Department of Justice to enforce antitrust laws of this country and I will add sufficient money for the Federal Trade Commission, too, because the Federal Trade Commission is engaged in important work in connection with the prevention of mergers, monopolies, and trusts, and for the protection of small business.

COSTLESS CAPITAL

There is something that has been brought up during the last few years in connection with the raising of capital for small businesses, which was unknown before. What chance has a young man now, a G. I., for instance, who goes out and borrows his money in the open market, and who must pay interest on it—what chance has such a young man against the huge concern that does not have to borrow its money, which has costless capital? What chance has the young man against that concern?

I want to explain to you about costless capital. That is a new thing that has been brought up in recent years. It is used to destroy small business. Last year the large corporations of this country earned more than $35,000,000,000. After the payment of taxes they had more than $21,000,000,000, which is about four times as much as they ever earned before in any one year prior to World War II.

STOCKHOLDER—FORGOTTEN MAN

Now, what did they do with that $21,000,000,000? Did they pay it to the stockholders as they used to pay it to the stockholders before World War II, when they paid 70 percent of their earnings to the stockholders? No, they did not do that. The stockholder in this country is becoming the forgotten man. Since World War II these corporations have been retaining 65 to 70 percent of their earnings, and only paying out 30 to 35 cents on the dollar to their stockholders. So that means out of these $21,000,000,000, $7,000,000,000 were paid to their stockholders, only. Fourteen billion dollars were retained as earnings to be used to acquire new plants, new equipment, unrelated business, and even their competitors, in some cases.

How did they get that money? By high prices. That is how they got it. When they needed capital they simply raised the prices. So, what chance has the average businessman in competition with these huge concerns who have gotten their capital from the consumers of America? It is absolutely costless to them. What chance has the small-business man in a case like that? I ask you.

So, who is really the Socialist in this country? The little fellow who honestly believes in socialism, who has not had the right break in life and is pretty noisy about what he believes? Or is it the big-business man, the big industrialist, who is putting industries together in one package, and making them ready for Government ownership? We will have Socialism in this country much quicker through monopoly than we will have any other way. We do not want it either way.

So, the way to prevent socialism is to enforce the antitrust law. That is No. 1. We must do that. We have a lot of people in this country in business and industry. Of course, generally they are very fine people, fine men and women. We all like them and respect them. We admire them. But in every business and industry we have some Captain Kidds who are not willing to play according to the Golden Rule. They are always taking an unfair advantage of their competitors and their customers. So to take care of them, the people who are not willing to just live and let live, but who want to get that unfair advantage, we have laws, and those laws, if properly enforced by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission, will give these small-business men a chance. They do not have that chance now.

So that is No. 1.

No. 2: We need some new laws. We cannot keep up with a growing country like it is today, a quarter of a trillion dollars—$250,000,000,000 national debt—without new problems arising every day. Those new problems have arisen now, and we must have new laws to take care of them.

For instance, in Illinois 2 years ago they had a famous case, known as United States against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. The judge there decided that the national corporate chains were harmful to the independent merchants of the country. It finally developed that this great concern sold goods at a loss in certain stores, for the purpose of destroying a competitor. Then, after the competitor was destroyed, of course the price would go up. We need a law to prevent that being done, and permitting the person doing it to get a tax advantage on it, like it is now. When the A. & P. sold at a loss in 29 percent of its stores it could take a tax deduction on those losses, and it did not lose so much. When it lost there, it was made up at other places. So under our present system the United States Government is, in effect, subsidizing the destruction of private independent business in this country. That should not be permitted. Our tax laws should be changed to prevent it.

USING PROFITS TO BUY COMPETITORS

Another law should be enacted to prevent these concerns from acquiring their competitors as they are doing now, and putting them out of business. The head of one of the biggest food companies in the United States testified before our committee, the Joint Committee on Economic Report, during November 1948, that his concern had spent undistributed profits amounting to $50,000,000 in the past 4 years to buy up a large number of industries, naming them, and some of them were competitors of that concern. Something should be done about that.

REGULATION W

Then we have a problem, which I think is serious, in the restriction of credit. I hope it does not go too far. You will recall we had a panic in 1920 because credit was restricted. It caused banks to call loans, and when you call one loan it causes repercussions not only in that community but all over that section of the country, dependent on the size of the loan, of course. That caused a big depression in 1929–32. The lack of credit contributed to this depression. The Federal Reserve Board doubled, or increased 100 percent, if you please, the reserve requirements of the banks in 1937, a very drastic action that almost threw our country into a tailspin and another depression. Finally we came out of that. A credit squeeze can cause a depression quicker in an economy such as our own, in a country like our own, than any other one thing that can possibly be done. I will admit that there are other things that may be more important, but it is very important at this time because it affects so many people,

that is regulation W. The Federal Reserve Board came before us last year and asked Congress to give them, the Board of Governors, power to place restrictions on credit, on goods sold on the installment plan; and we gave them that power with the understanding, we thought, that they would use it discreetly and with great caution, and they had no idea in mind of putting back these same drastic terms, for instance, on automobiles, that they had during the war; but after we gave them the power the old drastic terms were not exactly reimposed, one-third down and the balance to be paid in 15 months as under the old terms, but what is nearly as drastic, one-third down and the remainder in 18 months. This is causing a great credit restriction in our country today, and a lot of people who would like to have automobiles and who should own them in their own business, cannot get them because of these credit restrictions. Under present requirements a person must have an income of $5,000 a year before he is able to provide himself and family with a home and an automobile. First he must buy his home way out, or out in the country, and ordinarily to get there and back he must have some kind of motor-vehicle transportation. By the time he makes a down payment on that home and promises a payment of so much a month he does not have enough money left to buy an automobile for transportation unless he has an income of $5,000 or more.

CHARACTER BEST SECURITY

I am a firm believer in character as security as much as I am in money. Some of the best and finest people on earth are people who have character to use in the place of money—and oftentimes you would just as soon have character as to have money. We must encourage people with character. These people after building up a good character and fine reputation over a period of a lifetime want to buy something but find themselves restricted and denied that privilege because of regulation W. Others less deserving are able to buy anything they want.

RELAX REGULATION W

I have appealed to the Federal Reserve Board to relax that restriction and to make it at least 24 months instead of 18, but to no avail. They are always making a new study, a new investigation. It occurs to me that something should be done, and done quickly. The widespread reports could be the beginning and the danger sign of something more serious to come. I am inserting herewith a statement adopted January 25, 1949, by the NADA concerning regulation W. It is as follows:

NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
*San Francisco, January 25, 1949.*

REGULATION W

The following is the statement voted Tuesday, January 25, by the National Automobile Dealers Association executive committee and issued by President Ben T. Wright to voice the feeling of the national convention of automobile dealers meeting now in San Francisco, Calif.:

"Reports from throughout the Nation that regulation W is imposing grave hardships on persons of small incomes who must use a motorcar in their work or business greatly disturbed members of the National Automobile Dealers Association meeting here today.

"So serious did the association's executive committee regard the situation that it issued a special statement strongly urging the Federal Reserve Board anew to take remedial action immediately. The Board is authorized to ease the present time-payment terms of one-third down and the remaining two-thirds in 18 months whenever it sees fit. The Board now has before it a request from the association that the time-payment period be extended to 24 months.

"The statement said, 'The executive committee of NADA has heard with renewed concern from thousands of its 35,000 members attending its national convention here that the application of regulation W is hurting persons of small income who must have cars to help them earn a livelihood. Workers who must travel long distances to their employment and small-business men who use cars for making deliveries and other gainful purposes are being hit especially hard. Most of them are able to make the initial payment, but find it impossible in many cases to meet the subsequent 18 months' requirements.

" 'These payments, even on the smallest cars, now approximate $100 per month. Of course, persons in the low-income brackets simply cannot meet such terms.

" 'This is not a question of dealers being unable to move all the cars they can get. They can do that because there are enough customers with higher incomes ready and able to buy all available new cars. But the higher-income classes generally do not need cars to help them make a living. Therefore, the regulation puts pressure on the segment of car buyers least able to stand it.

" 'NADA has previously called the attention of the Federal Reserve Board to the situation as reflected by scattered reports and the Board has been investigating this limited number of cases and others brought to his attention. Since arriving here, however, your executive committee has learned from dealers representing all States that complaints against the harsh terms of the regulation are general.

" 'We, therefore, are again urging the Board to give the small buyers relief immediately.'

"Informal discussions looking to amendment of the regulation by congressional action in case the Board continues to decline to modify the terms of the regulation have been held. Thus far, however, NADA has made no direct appeal to Congress for legislative assistance."

MAN-MADE RECESSION UNJUSTIFIED

I was told by a member of the Federal Reserve Board that we should have a recession, that the quicker we have a recession the better off this country will be. That was the most shocking thing I ever heard come from a public official. It was very much like the statement made by the Federal Reserve Board in 1920 when this country went into a real panic.

MUST NOT DOUBLE NATIONAL DEBT

Why should we have a recession? We must have good prices, we must have good wages; otherwise we cannot support a $250,000,000,000 national debt. If it were possible for this Congress and the President or some power in our country arbitrarily to reduce wages one half and prices one-half we know that would have the same effect as doubling our national debt in what the people have to pay with. It would absolutely ruin this country. We must have good prices and good wages or we cannot pay the national debt in honest dollars. We must do that.

Who is going to say when prices are too high? Have we left that to the Federal Reserve Board? No, we have not left that to the Federal Reserve Board; but it seems like the Board is attempting to usurp that function, that duty, and that obligation, if you please. I think it is going too far and is having a very harmful effect on our country.

MUST HAVE HIGH NATIONAL INCOME

Mr. Speaker, this debt is a large one but it is not impossible. We can pay it in only one way, however, and that is with a high national income. We must have an income of over $200,000,000,000 a year, which means we will have to have a national product of between two hundred and twenty-five and two hundred and forty billion dollars a year. In order to have that high national income we must have good wages and good prices. There is no other way to do it. If the Federal Reserve Board or any other power takes upon themselves the obligation and purpose of arbitrarily reducing prices or wages, it is going too far and it is going against the interests of the people of our Nation.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. May I ask the gentleman how he accounts for small businesses increasing to the extent of 100,000 in the past year?

Mr. PATMAN. That is not unusual at all. You know small businesses go out of existence every night and a lot of new ones come into business the very next day. It depends upon the type of business in which they are engaged. Before World War II normally about 1,000 businesses went out every night and about 1,000 came in the next morning. There are many small businesses and many different types, so it is not unusual for them to increase in that manner.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. May I commend the gentleman. It is well known that he is the champion of small business and free enterprise in our country. He has made a splendid statement. He is also coauthor of the Robinson-Patman Act intended to give the small-business man, the small merchant, and the independent operator in this country a fair deal as against monopolistic enterprise. I want to commend the gentleman for the fine statement he has made.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman because I know of his interest in this subject and the fine work performed by him on the Federal Trade Commission before coming to Congress.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I should like the gentleman to know that I have watched his work as a member of the Small

Business Committee of the House and his frequent championing of the cause of small business in this House for the past 6 years. He has rendered, in my opinion, a very valuable service to our American economy. I trust that the Small Business Committee of the House will be re-created and does not meet the fate of a similar committee in another body. I also hope that the gentleman from Texas will become chairman of that committee and continue giving the Members of the House a place to come with their complaints from small business that is being rapidly ruined by the great monopolistic corporate interests of our country. Being a pretty good sized merchant himself he is very familiar with these problems.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I want to add to what previous gentlemen have already said in reference to my colleague's statement today and in reference to his work in the past on behalf of small business. I have the honor to represent a district adjoining that of the gentleman from Texas and I have therefore gone out of my way to observe his work on behalf of small business during the time he has been a Member of Congress. I remember when he first became chairman of the Small Business Committee at the time it was first organized. His people have a right to be truly proud of the fine work he is doing for small business and the small enterprises in his part of east Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman very kindly, and I want to express appreciation to him for his splendid cooperation on these small-business matters in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one other statement with reference to steel, which has resulted in a rather alarming situation. I was called up by a fabricator in the Southwest not so long ago who told me that he could not get steel from his supplier; that his business was over 50 years old, having been founded by his father. It was founded by his father and he and his brothers had kept it going since his father's death. They had been making septic tanks and other kinds of tanks out of steel, and all at once the steel company representative told him, "You cannot get any more." "Why?" "Well, we do not know; you just cannot get it." The following week a new industry sprung up in that town owned by that steel company, getting all the steel it wanted. It was a new industry. That is going on all over the country. That is the reason they want steel scarce so they can control it. We lack at least seven to ten million tons of steel a year now to supply the real domestic demand in this country. But they want it scarce; they want to keep it scarce so that they can control this business.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has brought out a very important point there, and that is known in the trade as the vertical set-up; a set-up of the manufacturer, the distributor, and the retailer of a basic product. That particular vertical type of a set-up was expanded during the war due to the scarce market and due to the fact that the producer of scarce articles had a tremendous advantage, and they could take it and distribute it themselves and get the additional profit. Now, that has not only occurred in the steel industry but it has occurred in the textile industry. Great vertical set-ups occurred there and have monopolized to a great extent some of our important lines of trade from the top to the ultimate consumer, or from the basic producer to the ultimate consumer. That is one of the great dangers the gentleman has pointed out, and it is through the use of undistributed profits that they are able to do that particular thing.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

## MONOPOLISTIC AND UNFAIR TRADE PRACTICES

(Thursday, November 18, 1948, House of Representatives, Subcommittee No. 2 of the Select Committee on Small Business, Washington, D. C.)

The subcommittee met in room 129, Old House Office Building, at 9:30 a. m., the Honorable William H. Stevenson, presiding.

Present: Representatives William H. Stevenson, R. Walter Riehlman, and Wright Patman.

Also present: Willis J. Ballinger, economic counsel.

Mr. STEVENSON. The meeting will come to order.

We will have as our first witness Mr. Wendell Berge.

### STATEMENT OF WENDELL BERGE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BAR

Mr. BERGE. Mr. Chairman, for the record I might say that my name is Wendell Berge. I am practicing law in Washington as a partner in the firm of Posner, Berge, Fox & Arent. I was first appointed to the staff of the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice in 1930, served as a member of that staff for about 10 years, and during that period I was alternate member of the Temporary National Economic Committee; and at the beginning of 1941 I was appointed Assistant Attorney General by the President and assigned to head the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice.

In the middle of 1943, August of that year, I was transferred by the Attorney General to head the Antitrust Division, and from August of 1943 until I resigned as of May 1, 1947, I was head of the Antitrust Division.

*Tradition against monopoly*

Mr. Chairman, there is a strong tradition in this country against monopoly. This tradition has been expressed in the Sherman Antitrust Act and numerous other Federal laws, as well as in State legislation. We repeatedly assert our faith in free enterprise. We believe in economic opportunity. We are against regimentation of business. We want businessmen left as free as possible to take risks, decide their business policies, and then to succeed in their ventures or fail according to their abilities and the whims of fortune.

This is the American philosophy. And yet despite the generality of its acceptance, it has not prevented monopoly from gaining ground. Indeed, concentration of economic control in a sense that a few companies together control the major output of an industry is today the standard pattern of American business.

I shall not burden you with statistics on this point. You are familiar with the many studies of economic concentration which have been made in recent years. The accumulated evidence in antitrust investigations, in the volumes of data which have been compiled by this very committee, by the temporary National Economic Committee, and by other congressional committees, reveals the vast extent of monopoly control in many of our largest industries—the metallurgical industry, the chemical industry, the electronics and electrical-equipment field, the production of pharmaceuticals, the manufacture of precision instruments and machines, the distribution of foodstuffs and tobacco, the petroleum industry, and even investment banking with its vast control over money and credit. This is just a sampling of the industries where monopoly controls are dominant, and it by no means exhausts the list.

*Concentration*

The war undoubtedly accelerated this trend toward concentration. More than two-thirds of all war contracts went to 100 companies. And the larger companies have shared well in the disposal of surplus plants and property. Since the war numerous corporate mergers have taken place which further emphasize the trend toward concentration and monopoly.

Nearly every political platform of both major parties since the passage of the Sherman Act has demanded its vigorous enforcement. Presidential candidates have almost invariably promised to outdo their rivals in enforcing the law. Even President McKinley, who is generally thought of as one of our more conservative Presidents, was vigorous in his vocal denunciation of monopolies. And, of course, the crusades of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson are part of our recent well-known history. But notwithstanding this ideological devotion to free enterprise, and our instinctive abhorrence of monopoly, we have done very little in a practical way toward effective antitrust enforcement.

Lack of vigorous enforcement accounts for the Sherman Act's ineffectiveness to stem the rising tide of monopoly control. During a large part of the act's history, enforcement was little more than a token. Only a small staff was possible under the paltry appropriation. Few cases were instituted and no attempt was made to apply the law on a broad front; to make it really effective, really significant as an instrument of economic policy.

*Trust-busting policies of President Theodore Roosevelt*

We hear a great deal about the trust-busting policies of President Theodore Roosevelt. But even when you survey his 7-year administration you find that relatively few suits were instituted. The fame which he attained as a trust-buster rests largely on several cases—the Northern Securities case, the Packers case, the Standard Oil case, and the Tobacco case.

I do not mean to underestimate the importance of those cases. They were important as landmarks in the judicial interpretation of the law and they were moderately successful, at least temporarily, in attaining economic results within the industries with which they were concerned. But when you consider that these cases were instituted over a 7-year period and that during this very period many of the industrial giants of the future were being formed in other industries which the Department of Justice of that day did not challenge, you cannot reach any other conclusion than that the Sherman Act was not being enforced on a broad front.

And how could it have been? In the Theodore Roosevelt administration the average number of lawyers in active service on antitrust matters was five. Five lawyers cannot do very much in policing against the monopoly practices of the whole industry of America.

In the Wilson administration, when the World War had caused prices to skyrocket, the number of lawyers engaged in this work rose to 18. In the 1920's, when corporate mergers proceeded at a fantastic pace, the number of lawyers engaged in antitrust enforcement did not exceed 25. Not until 1938 were as many as 50 lawyers actually employed in this work and not until 1939 did the professional personnel reach 200 lawyers and a half dozen economists. For almost its whole life the Antitrust Division has been a kind of corporal's guard.

*More suits last 10 years than 48 years before*

About 10 years ago there occurred something of an awakening as to the significance of the economic concentration that was occurring. The hearings of the Temporary National Economic Committee focused the problem. The Department of Justice adopted a more active policy. Congress appropriated larger funds, and for the first time in history an effort at broad enforcement was made. More antitrust suits have been brought by the Federal Government since 1938 than in the entire preceding 48 years of antitrust history. The war necessarily retarded the momentum of the new policy and hampered its effectiveness. Yet during the last 10 years there has been an increasing awareness of the fact that competition has been rapidly disappearing in many American industries.

But even so, I do not think that the American people or the Congress has been sufficiently aroused of the danger that this growing concentration of economic power presents to capitalism and democracy. The capitalistic system and democratic government developed together and in the long run they can exist only together. The historical development of this truth is interesting, but there is not time to sketch it now except to point out that throughout history wherever despotism has existed the economic life of the people has been organized along noncapitalistic lines. Political freedom has only existed for any length of time in countries having capitalistic economic systems. Webster defines "capitalism" as—"an economic system in which the production and distribution of wealth, the employment and reward of human labor, and the extension, organization, and operation of the system itself are entrusted to and effected by private enterprise and control under competitive conditions."

The alternative to this kind of system is an authoritarian economic system. The evolution of such a system would probably come about, first, by increasing private controls over production, prices, wages, and all other phases of distribution. These controls would gradually be superseded by Government controls, as popular demand would require that the Government take over. If we are going to have a controlled system, in the long run the people would not stand for private control. Control would ultimately be exercised by the Government itself taking over the regulation of monopolies, resulting in complete Government control of the economic life of the people.

I think that no demonstration is needed to this committee that we cannot have an authoritarian economic system without authoritarian government, and the civil and political liberties ultimately vanish when the government assumes direction of all industry.

Mr. BALLINGER. Is it possible to regulate a monopoly—I mean today we hear a good deal that you perhaps could regulate monopoly better than to allow competition to proceed.

Mr. BERGE. I don't think that it is, but I think that if we failed in antitrust enforcement and if the present trend went on, we would probably try it. I think the effort would be futile in that I don't believe that it is possible for government effectively to cope with the economic power that true industrial monopolies would exercise. I think that what would probably occur, and it is perhaps rather bold to undertake to make a prophecy, which I know is purely speculative, but taking a long shot into the future, I would suppose that over a period of years there would be a sort of a blending of Government and private control, with the monopolies in effect controlling the Government.

If you could assume that the techniques of regulation were sufficiently good to bring about a real control of monopoly by the Government, with Government actually in the saddle, it would take a bureaucracy of terrific proportions to do it, but my own guess would be that the gesture would be made without accomplishing real results, and you would really have industrial giants in the saddle both in Government and industry, with the inevitable result of a type of Fascist pattern developed in time.

Mr. BALLINGER. The issue today, then, is not to regulate monopolies, but to restore competition in those industries?

Mr. BERGE. Right; absolutely.

Mr. BALLINGER. Where it should work and can be made to work if we will take certain steps to restore it?

Mr. BERGE. Absolutely; and the theory of the antitrust laws is not to regulate monopoly, but the theory is to keep Government out of the regulation field to the maximum extent possible, leaving the important decisions of production, distribution, price, to businessmen themselves acting competitively.

I do, however, want to say parenthetically at this point, that I recognize the necessity of temporary Government controls in periods of emergency. What I say now does not apply to that problem. When a war, or other economic crisis, is thrust upon us resulting in an extraordinary demand which taxes the productive output of our resources, Government controls are necessary to insure equitable distribution and distribution that promotes the national economic policy. The unusual demands of war production necessitate direction of industrial output and that direction, of course, must come from the Government. You have to limit the volume of goods going into civilian channels and direct them into the wartime channels, and there has to be control in emergency situations like that, as I see it.

Similar temporary Government controls may be necessary from time to time in crises short of war, such as the great industrial depression of the early 1930's, or the unusual demands of a recovery program, such as the European recovery program. Where these governmental programs are necessitated by temporary crisis and not by a monopoly condition, the American people have demonstrated time and again their capacity to submit temporarily to such controls and to remove them when the crisis has passed. This we have proved can be done without any sacrifice of basic civil or political liberties. Nothing that I say today is to be construed as opposition to such emergency measures as may from time to time be required.

But that is quite a different thing from the permanent controls that we would ultimately be forced to adopt if the insidious growth of concentration and monopoly should undermine the vitality of a free enterprise system. If we accept the proposition, which I believe has been amply demonstrated that capitalism in the long run cannot survive except under conditions of free competitive enterprise, then it follows that as that enterprise is progressively eliminated from our sysstem regimentation of business progressively takes over. That regimentation, as I have already stated, may at first be private regimentation, but ultimately it would become Government regimentation.

*Economic power ignored*

I maintain that, notwithstanding the greater enforcement activity of the last 10 years, we have never broadly applied the Sherman Act to the concentration of economic power in American industry. The tools which have been given the Department of Justice are like slingshots—wholly inadequate as against the Goliaths of American industry. Admitting that the antitrust laws can in some respects be strengthened by legislative action, I do not think that the primary difficulty is with the laws themselves. There are new laws that ought to be passed, such as the Kefauver bill to amend section 7 of the Clayton Act. I also think there is great merit to the civil penalty proposal that has been advanced from time to time, but I do not think the fundamental trouble is in the law itself.

*More money needed to enforce*

The real reason, in my judgment, why the Sherman Act has not been more effective is that the annual appropriation for its enforcement has never been anywhere near adequate for the accomplishment of effective economic results. A statute such as the Sherman Act is not self-executing. It lives by appropriations. Not until the fiftieth year of the Sherman Act was as much as $1,000,000 appropriated annually for its enforcement. Between 1908 and 1935, the appropriation varied between $100,000 and $300,000 annually. In 1936 the figure was increased to $439,000. In 1939 it had increased to about $800,000; and for the fiscal years of 1940 and 1941, to an all-time high of about $1,300,000.

Between 1943 and 1946 the appropriation ranged, in round numbers, between $1,500,000 and $1,870,000; in 1947 it went up to a little over $2,000,000; in 1948 it went up to $2,400,000; and the current appropriation is about $3,400,000. I think I should have mentioned that in 1942, which apparently was skipped here in the text, the appropriation did reach in round numbers $2,300,000 and then was cut back during the war.

Although there has been some increase in the appropriation in recent years, it should be remembered that enforcement costs are now much higher. Whereas in 1938 it was possible to secure good lawyers at from $3,000 to $5,000 per year, and to get satisfactory law clerks at $1,800 to $2,000 per year, the Government now must pay on the average twice as much for the same type of legal talent. Other enforcement costs are also correspondingly higher. Therefore, the additional funds available for enforcement in the last few years do not accurately measure the additional enforcement effort that has been provided. You will find that the staff today is not much larger in terms of manpower than the prewar staff on a much smaller appropriation. I am informed that the professional staff at present numbers 329 lawyers and economists as against an average of 281 for fiscal year 1942.

As a result of our niggardly policy toward appropriations for antitrust enforcement, the resources available against all violators in 1 year were less than the sums expended by defendants in a single antitrust case. When I was in the Department, the Antitrust Division proceeded against the patent monopoly in the field of glass containers or bottles. That was the now famous Hartford Empire case. There were eight major defendant corporations.

I learned at that time that one of these corporations expended approximately $900,000 in the trial of the case in the district court and an estimated $500,000 more in prosecuting its appeal to the Supreme Court and in the final settlement of the decree. The expenditures of the other seven defendant corporations were not known exactly, but they exceeded a million dollars. These sums should be viewed in the light of the fact that the entire appropriation of the Antitrust Division for the years in which the Hartford Empire case was pending, except for the year 1942, had been less than $2,000,000 per year.

The Government willingly expends millions of dollars annually to conserve the fertility of the soil and on other conservation measures. No one should question the necessity of protecting our basic natural resources. But is it not equally obvious that the fundamental social resource of the American economy—freedom of economic opportunity—merits as much consideration. Neglect in conserving either our physical resources or our free competitive economy can have equally irreparable consequences.

I do not have the figures available but this committee has the means for readily making comparisons between the current appropriations for antitrust enforcement and those for administering other Government agencies. Such comparisons, I am sure, will show that many single agencies dealing only with a restricted field of the American economy, such as the ICC dealing with carriers only, are granted much larger appropriations than are given to the Antitrust Division which must police against uneconomic restraints virtually the whole of American industry.

A striking statement of the problem is found in one of the TNEC monographs entitled "Antitrust in Action" (Monograph No. 16, Antitrust in Action, by Walton Hamilton and Irene Till, p. 24, Government Printing Office, 1940), from which I quote the following:

"A brief comparison of antitrust with the metropolitan police is suggestive. As $1,325,000 is being used to police industry, break up restraints, enforce competition throughout the United States, a sum around $60,000,000 is spent to preserve peace and order within New York City alone. The Antitrust Division now has 200 attorneys";—this was written about 1940 I believe—"the police force of New York City runs to an aggregate of 20,000 persons. An analog between unlikes must not be pushed too far; but, niceties aside, here is evidence of basic weakness in giving effect to the Sherman Act."

*How much money needed*

How large an appropriation is needed annually for antitrust enforcement? It is difficult to answer this question in the abstract. I think it should be progressively increased each year until we begin to be satisfied with the results. I suspect that the job requires ultimately an annual appropriation of somewhere between $10,000,000 and $15,000,000. But as one who for several years was charged with the responsibility for antitrust enforcement, I realize that it would not be practical to grant such an increase all at once. The recruiting of qualified lawyers and economists, training them for their work, and organizing them into effective operating units requires planning and careful administration, and it cannot be done overnight. The present head of the Antitrust Division can best tell what are the immediate needs. I should suppose that the amount should be increased substantially each succeeding year until a point is reached where Congress believes the results are adequate.

What is the criterion of adequacy in antitrust enforcement? Today when our criminal laws are violated we have reasonable confidence that in most cases the violators will be apprehended and punished. Our criminal administration is not perfect by any means but we do have the confidence that on the whole our police forces, investigative agencies, and prosecuting attorneys are on top of their job. In the usual case persons who commit fraud or engage in other commercial crimes are apprehended and tried in courts of law. And the same can be said as to crimes of violence.

When the time comes that businessmen recognize the generality of antitrust enforcement to the extent that they refrain from entering into conspiracies, combinations, and agreements in restraint of trade, we will know that the Antitrust Division is attaining the potency that the job requires. When our monopoly-controlled industries have been deconcentrated to a point where new business organizations can form and enter the competitive picture without bucking artificially imposed barriers, we will know that the Sherman Act has been made effective. Technology must be freed from monopoly control. Monopoly control over basic materials, necessary for use in fabricating industries, must be terminated so that small business can get ready access to such materials. We should not seek to prevent efficient operating units from enjoying the advantage that comes from sheer efficiency; but we should deprive large corporate aggregations of any advantage that comes from artificial restraints of trade or from the power to exclude competitors from the market.

*Government should seek two objectives*

I should say that the Government ought to seek two general objectives under the antitrust laws:

1. It should attack by divestiture or dissolution actions those corporate structures which in and of themselves have attained the power to exclude competitors from the market. Effective legal actions of this type must be grounded upon thorough economic research and a full comprehension of the various ramifications of the industry involved. The preparation and trial of such suits takes a great deal of time and manpower, but the objective must be accomplished in many of our industries if independent enterprise is to have any future chances of survival. Successful preparation of such cases requires a competent staff of economists and experts as well as lawyers—men with specialized experience and knowledge of the particular industries under scrutiny.

2. It—that is, the Government—should provide a broader enforcement against conspiracies and agreements among nominal competitors to fix prices, limit production, and otherwise to refuse the public the benefits of real competition. This type of enforcement requires a large organization and many field offices throughout the country. It requires getting down to restraints which often operate only on a local level. A small-business man may be eliminated from the market in his community by the combination of local competitors with manufacturers or wholesalers to monopolize the distribution of a product locally. To the small-business man who is being squeezed out in such a process, the enforcement of the Sherman Act is extremely important, even though his operations may be infinitesimal in relation to the national picture. The point is that the accumulation of thousands of such restraints on the local level throughout the country has in the aggregate tremendous economic significance. Sporadic enforcement on behalf of small business accomplishes very little except for the few beneficiaries in particular cases. I know that the files of the Antitrust Division abound with complaints, many of which are meritorious, that the Division has never been able adequately to investigate. Investigation in many of these would reveal glaring violations of law which should be prosecuted. Moreover, many small-business men lack the resources to employ counsel or make a trip to Washington to present their complaints. A widespread system of field offices would help. The Antitrust Division has some field offices, but not enough.

There is a good deal of cynical discussion about the ineffectiveness of the antitrust laws. I have always felt that it was out of order to dismiss the Sherman Act as unenforcible before enforcement has been given a fair trial. It may be anomolous to say that enforcement has not had a fair trial when the law has been on the books for 58 years, but, in my judgment, that is the fact.

And no one within my knowledge has yet produced a workable alternative to the enforcement of the Sherman Act. The consequences to capitalism and democracy of doing nothing at all about the problem, I have already discussed. If the antitrust laws are not the proper approach, then what is? Self-regulation by industry is out. It is simply a gloss for monopoly control. The Government cannot escape its responsibility. If that responsibility is not to be exercised through the antitrust laws, then it would have to be performed through bureaucratic regulation of industry by boards or commissions. Without laboring the point, I want to say that I believe that a system of such regulation for all industry would be abhorrent to the American people, and furthermore, I do not think it would work. Effective regulation of industry by a board or a commission to prevent monopoly and restraint of trade would require a bureaucracy that would dwarf anything that we have ever contemplated. It probably would not work, and if it did it would be a menace to freedom.

So I come back to the basic proposition that the premises of the antitrust laws are sound. They contemplate that the vast area of American industry shall be free from bureaucratic regulation, but shall be subject to the prohibitions of the law against restraints of trade and monopolization. So long as business does not offend these prohibitions, it has freedom of choice in making the important decisions regarding production and distribution practices and policies. We must make the antitrust laws work if we are to escape the alternatives—which are socially, economically, and politically undesirable. The answer is to be found in strong, undeviating congressional demand and support for a vigorous antitrust enforcement policy.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Have you any questions?

Mr. BALLINGER. Mr. Berge, have you any idea how much it costs the Government in a big suit? You were speaking about the Hartford Empire case. They spent millions and the suit is very expensive for the Government. I have heard Mr. Wooden say that the FTC would take at least $150,000 of their limited appropriation to even go after one big concern.

Mr. BERGE. Yes; well, of course, there isn't any cost accounting or cost allocation system operating in a division like antitrust where you could accurately measure that, because one man may be devoting his time to several different cases, and it is possible, therefore, to have some doubling up. However, I would certainly say that the unit costs, if there were a cost allocation system in effect, I am sure it is a very safe statement to make that the costs for the Government are very much less than the costs that private industry pays to defend the suits. Just take two examples that come to me from memory. The so-called Socony Vacuum or the Madison Oil case up in Wisconsin. That trial lasted a long time, several months, as I recall. I think the Antitrust Division had not more than five lawyers up there, sometimes probably less, men whose salaries ranged from at that time the top was $7,500 down to maybe $3,000; perhaps not more in annual salaries involved in that case than $35,000 or $40,000; men living on a per diem of $5 or

$6 a day; so, it would relatively not count up to very much as against 65 defense counsel who were present. I am not in private practice, and I don't want to cast any aspersions upon the profession or its capacity to pull in good fees, but it is a safe general situation that the counsel for the various oil companies concerned, operating, of course, in a free market for professional services, which is quite proper, were very well paid for their services. And you can make similar comparisons down the line.

The Aluminum case. It was expensive in the sense that it ran several years, but the man in charge of that case was earning $7,500, and there were not more than, well, there was a large staff on that case for a Government case. I think there were perhaps 10 or a dozen men on that case, but there again the over-all cost of it might have run, well, this is just a shot in the dark, possibly $100,000. The case went over several years.

The conclusion that you draw from that is that antitrust enforcement is more expensive per case than the average criminal case, of course, because the economic data is complex and it requires long study and analysis, and it requires the type of men who have pretty deep grasp of problems. On the average, I think a good antitrust lawyer deserves a higher salary than any of the lawyers in Government service whose work is of a more routine character. To prosecute large suits against large combinations for divestiture or dissolution takes a relatively large staff, large in the sense of 3 to 6 or 9 lawyers, and considerable time. Maybe a year or two to a case.

On the other hand, in comparison with the savings to consumers that come out of these various cases and the long-range support that it gives to our private enterprise system, I don't think the cost is high, and it certainly is not high in comparison with what private industry pays to defend such cases.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Have you any questions?

*Basing point*

Mr. PATMAN. Your statement is a very fine one, Mr. Berge, and I appreciate it. I want to read carefully the part that I did not have the opportunity to hear before I came in. I wonder if you had given consideration to the basing point.

Mr. BERGE. When I was in the Department, when I was head of the Division, we instituted a suit against the cement industry which in many respects paralleled the Federal Trade Commission's action. I have no hesitancy in saying that insofar as the basing point system is carried out by agreement among competitiors, it is clearly illegal and should be, that is, if a particular company sells on a delivered price basis because its competitors are doing so, and it has agreed with them that it would be part of the system, that is a clear price fixing in my judgment.

As to what constitutes proof that they are doing that is something else, but I don't think there can be any question but what the Federal Trade Commission's findings in that respect are amply supported by the evidence according to the rules or proof of conspiracy that have been long accepted.

If a company doing business, say, in Washington in quoting prices for delivery in Washington, adds freight from New York because that is the basing point, and it has agreed with its competitors directly or indirectly that it would do so, that is price fixing just as much as anything else.

When you get into the Robinson-Patman Act phase of that case, it presents a little more complex problem, and I have not made the kind of study of it that would warrant my declaring myself with any deep conviction. The court, as you of course know, the committee knows, found that even the individual absorption of freight or utilization of such of system where it resulted in the quoting of different prices to customers was a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

All I can say is this: I have heard a great deal of discussion on that point. I attended the American Bar Association meeting and heard some very carefully considered papers in the section on corporation banking and mercantile law. They were all critical of the result that was reached in the decision. They were read by lawyers who were representing companies that had reason to complain of the result, who were, no doubt, quite conscientiously speaking as advocates of the point of view of their clients.

It did raise a question in my mind about this one point: Whether an absolute—and I want to reserve judgment because I have not recently read the opinion with this in mind—if the opinion has the effect of absolutely outlawing the individual absorption of freight to meet competition, I can see that in some instances it might have an effect of strengthening monopoly controls in local areas rather than promoting competition. A simple illustration: If you can't absorb freight to meet competition, it might bar you from some local market and tend to strengthen the monopoly position of the person doing business in the local market.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that the Government has never attempted either through the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission to prosecute any person, firm or corporation on the basing point unless there was collusion or conspiracy?

Mr. BERGE. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. BERGE. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. And you do not know of any person in the Government now, or will probably be in the future, who would attempt to prosecute anybody?

Mr. BERGE. No.

Mr. PATMAN. Unless there was collusion or conspiracy?

Mr. BERGE. I think that probably in that respect it is a tempest in a teapot, and that the question is not one—well, I think there is undue agitation about it, because I cannot conceive the Federal Trade Commission prosecuting an individual for meeting his competitor's prices, and I am sure that under the Sherman Act there would be no basis for it. Of course, the Department of Justice has no jurisdiction except in the presence of a combination or conspiracy or monopolization, so they would not have any interest in it anyhow.

The only theoretical question would be if the FTC enforcing the Robinson-Patman Act should decide to proceed against an individual. As a practical matter, I can't conceive of them doing it; and these corporation lawyers who are greatly concerned about it seem to put their concern on the theoretical basis that the language of the Supreme Court's opinion is susceptible to the interpretation that the individual use of the utilization freight absorption techniques is illegal, and, therefore, they can't advise their clients it is safe to do it unless the law is changed.

I, frankly, have not followed the thought entirely through but my instinctive reaction at this point is that we should not now enact any legislation to, in effect, overrule that decision, but at least give the thing a few years' try and see if that creates the confusion in business that they say it does. I think that while there might be room for intellectual argument and discussion on the point, I cannot feel that at present there is any real crisis that requires all of this agitation and hullabaloo. I would like to see the status quo preserved and see business operate for a few years under this decision and see whether the Robinson-Patman Act as applied to this industry is going to create confusion that they complain of. I doubt that it will.

Mr. PATMAN. I am apprehensive that some of them, not all of them, but a few of the more selfish ones, are taking advantage of this opportunity to try to use this decision as a springboard for the purpose of weakening or destroying our antitrust laws. I am just like you: I do not see where they have anything on earth to fear as long as there is no collusion or conspiracy.

Of course, we have to be careful in the House about speaking about Members of the other body. That is, on the floor, you know; but I notice where the distinguished and prominent member of the other party has said that he wants a law that will permit the absorption of any or all freights so long as conspiracy or collusion is not involved. Well, there is nothing to fight over. It is only where collusion or conspiracy, one or the other, is involved that any prosecution takes place. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. BERGE. Right.

Mr. PATMAN. And I cannot conceive of any officer with any department of the Government or any United States district attorney ever, under any circumstances or conditions, proceeding against any person on the basing point unless there is collusion or conspiracy or used for the purpose of destroying a competitor or an unfair trade practice or to create a monopoly.

Mr. BERGE. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I suspect we better add those in there, too.

*No need for legislation on basing point*

Mr. BERGE. Yes. I think that you are quite right about it, and I do not believe now that there is any need for legislation. I was very much concerned about the operation of the basing point system through collusion, any evidence that we had when I was head of the Division that moved me to recommend the institution of our cement case—of course, the Department cement case did not have any concern with the Robinson-Patman Act, and it was not involved in it. That was an additional point that only the Federal Trade Commission was concerned with. We felt that as the basing point system was operating, it was clearly a conspiracy and agreement in restraint of trade and that the evidence was sufficient to sustain that position.

*Unwitting tearing down of antitrust laws*

It has been so held in the Federal Trade Commission case. I have not kept wholly up to date on the progress of the Department's case since I left, but I think that is the problem, and I am concerned about any attempts to whittle down by seemingly plausible legislation the enforcement of the application of the Sherman Act, carving out exemptions here, there and elsewhere, and I can see that there is danger that the result of this inquiry now that is going on into the operation of the basing point system on the Capehart committee could result in an unwitting tearing down of the Sherman Act.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice out of the large number of volunteers to help the committee and whose names were listed in the newspapers, a large number of them were directly connected with the steel and the cement industries that are vitally affected in the decisions.

Mr. BERGE. Well, those are two of the principal industries that had operated under that system.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, the steel industry, I mean U. S. Steel, owns cement factories, cement mills, too, do they not?

Mr. BALLINGER. Owns the largest cement company in the world.

Mr. PATMAN. So evidently the tie-in there between the two.

You recall for the last 15 years or longer that the cement companies have made identical bids, and I understand while Mr. Ickes was Secretary of the Interior that when he was asking for bids on huge amounts of cement and they had all come in exactly the

same down to one-hundredth of a cent, that he was so irritated about it that he adopted the policy of accepting the bid of the one the greatest distance away from where it was to be delivered. Did you know that?

Mr. BERGE. No I was not aware of that. That is very interesting.

Mr. PATMAN. I suspect, though, that they had a way of handling that.

That is all.

Mr. BALLINGER. Thank you very much, Mr. Berge, for coming.

Mr. BERGE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extracts and inserts.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent address by the Most Reverend Richard J. Cushing, D. D., archbishop of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STEADY LONG RANGE AIRCRAFT PROGRAM ESSENTIAL TO KEEP SKILLED WORKERS AND TO MAINTAIN PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there have been many statements and speeches made by Members of the Congress on the subject of air power. Most of such remarks have been made by members of the special House-Senate Aviation Policy Board or by members of appropriate committees. Much of the content of these statements has been with special regard to the defense aspects of the size of the Air Force Department and the air arm of the Navy. I do not qualify as an expert in the field of advising Congress as to how many groups the Air Force Department needs nor the size of the Navy's air arm, although I have been a supporter of the air power programs advanced by those Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, who do qualify as experts in this field.

I have supported the movements to create for America an overwhelmingly superior air arm because I feel as most of you do, as indicated by past votes of this body, that air power is our first line of defense and also will continue to be our foremost offensive weapon.

But there is another and a special phase of this problem that I wish to bring to the attention of Congress today.

This problem is best dramatized by the fact that in the past week or two one aircraft manufacturer alone, the North American Co., has had to lay off over 2,600 employees. Those employees are residents of the Los Angeles area, a part of which I serve as Representative. Those craftsmen have skills that do not come easily and they are skills that are a vital national asset in these times of uncertainty.

The wanton, seemingly unthinking dissipation of our Nation's aircraft worker skills could very well contribute greatly to a national disaster if it is allowed to continue.

As you probably are aware, the loss of these skills results from the recent cutbacks in airplane production orders by the Air Force, which in turn is brought about by proposed budget cuts in airplane procurement and the resulting disruption of the 5-year air power plan adopted by Congress during its last session.

In addition to the loss of skills that is involved, there is an economic loss of $18,000,000 in annual pay roll in Los Angeles County and a loss of $3,000,000 in subcontracts with about 600 subcontracting firms, most of which are located in southern California.

These cut-backs and the lay-offs of thousands of aircraft workers bring up the whole problem of sound planning in our air-power program and the absolute necessity of achieving some kind of steadiness in the procurement of aircraft.

Steadiness is needed not only to avoid the costly and perhaps disastrous dissipation of aircraft worker skills, but also to provide more units of airplanes for less cost to the Government and its taxpayers, and to properly maintain aircraft manufacturing facilities in a state of readiness so that they can be vastly expanded when and if needed.

I do not plead here that any certain size air force department be maintained or that any certain size Navy air arm be put into being. There are others in this House whose job it is to recommend to us on such matters, and whose committee assignment and personal experience better qualify them to judge the claims of the various defense departments.

My plea is that Congress stick to its decisions as to what size that air arm should be with at least some degree of consistency. I had thought we made our decision last year when we made the down payment on a 70-group air force and a 14,500-airplane Navy. But this year we are presented with a budget which calls for a 48-group air force and about a 7,500-airplane Navy.

Therefore it is obvious that a long-range planning policy or policy of steadiness in aircraft procurement does not exist in any real or practical way. Instead, we are in effect operating under a short range, hit or miss, feast or famine policy that is uncertain, costly, and inefficient, and under which the aircraft industry and aircraft worker skills cannot hope to remain strong and able to perform their basic functions in any national security program.

The contributions of a long-term, carefully planned, steady program of aircraft procurement to our national security are many and of the highest importance.

In the first place a long-term steady program is essential to the defense of this country. According to the studies made by the President's Finletter Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board, it is only by such a program that we can be assured of keeping our air striking arms fully modern, up to date, and able to repel and then successfully attack any aggressor. The last war taught the truth of the adage that a second-best air force is worse than none, and that an air force that is not fully modern will always be second best.

Moreover, without adherence to a carefully planned long-term program our air striking arms will not have a sufficient quantity of modern equipment on hand to discharge their roles and missions in the national defense. The experience of the last two decades teaches all too graphically that hit-or-miss procurement programing, with procurement funds being expanded one year and then contracted the next, jeopardizes the very survival of a healthy aircraft industry. It is also true that without a healthy industry capable of rapid expansion in an emergency, our air forces will not be able to get the modern planes they need, in the quantities required, on time.

The important point here is that we as a Nation cannot cut back from a 70-group program one year to a 48-group program the next year without paying a tremendous financial penalty and without paying a tremendous penalty in the lessening of our production ability. Conversely, and more important, we cannot appropriate and plan for a 48-group program this year and then next year expect to be able to quickly expand to a 70-group program, when it is very possible that a 70-group program, or even a 150-group program, might be badly needed.

In the second place, a long-term program that assures continuity and steadiness in planning and production is the most important means of effecting economy in our national defense expenditures. Studies presented to the Finletter Commission and the Congressional Aviation Policy Board indicate that savings up to as much as 25 percent could be effected in aircraft procurement if our Nation will establish and then adhere to a long-term plan. Such savings alone would justify us in the Congress insisting that the National Defense Establishment develop and stay with a steady 5-year plan of aircraft procurement.

In the third place, it is extremely important that a long-term program be established and maintained if the industry is to be able to maintain a crew of skilled workers and trained engineers. Such a crew is the foundation on which the industry would expand in case of emergency and these workers must be retained and kept in the practice of production or the whole aircraft industry will disappear as a national asset—an asset absolutely vital in the event of an international emergency.

Twenty-six hundred skilled workers and trained engineers already have been lost to our national-defense program, and unless we insist that the program of aircraft procurement remains steady from here on out, there may be tens of thousands more laid off in my State of California and in many other States, too.

For it has been demonstrated time and time again that engineers and skilled workers such as we have in the aircraft industry simply will not remain—indeed, they cannot afford to remain in an industry subject to drastic fluctuations in production and jobs—fluctuations that must result when aircraft procurement

is expanded and then cut back suddenly without regard to a plan or a program.

The interest of aircraft workers in a long-term program is exemplified by the concern expressed in the subject by the workers' representatives. The International Association of Machinists, which holds the bargaining contracts at many of the aircraft plants, has long actively campaigned for a long-term, steady program. The activities in this field by this great union are summarized in the report submitted to the national convention held by the union last fall in Grand Rapids. I would like to quote three paragraphs from that report:

The recommendations of the President's Committee and the Congressional Committee strongly affirm our country's need for the prompt adoption of a program designed to give us air supremacy by 1953. That length of time is required to complete the over-all program based on an air force composed of 70 groups. Emphasis is placed on the need for a new aprpoach to aircraft production. Rather than Congress providing funds on a year-to-year basis, a long-range program is urged which will give adequate consideration to all phases of the problem.

In studying this industry, it is both interesting and reassuring to find that our organization, at the 1945 convention unanimously adopted a report prepared and submitted by the aircraft committee. This report, in substance called for a well-planned and full program for world peace, and for legislation that would enable the air forces to proceed with a postwar program embodying full experimental and continuing technological improvements in the latest type aircraft to keep this Nation always ahead in air power and to assure continued peace.

As we assemble here in this 1948 convention we are faced with the seriousness of our Nation's problems. Supremacy in the air is the first requirement for maintaining peace, and of meeting an attack upon the United States, Canada, and Newfoundland by another country. The interests of our countries require building and maintaining not only a strong air force, but one that will give us supremacy in the air at the earliest possible date.

Yet the cut-backs that have been so far announced in contracts held by California aircraft companies show that the warnings issued by the machinists union have been almost completely ignored. The Congress last year voted the funds to start the first year of a 5-year program of aircraft production. During the debates preceding the adoption of this appropriation, Congressman after Congressman of both parties emphasized that the intention was to initiate a long-term program that would provide assurance and steadiness to the air forces, the managers of the aircraft industry, and to the thousands and thousands of skilled craftsmen employed by the industry. The vote on the program was completely nonpartisan and was overwhelmingly carried with only three dissenting votes in the House and two nays in the Senate.

It seems to me most unfortunate, therefore, that not quite one year after Congress acted the 1950 budget is presented proposing to scrap the 5-year program, seemingly with little or no consideration or discussion of its merits and values. Nowhere in the budget do I find any mention of the need for steadiness and continuity in aircraft production and aircraft employment. There is no mention of the findings of the Finletter Commission or the Congressional Board. I regret to say there is no recognition of the dangers of dissipating the asset that is our skilled aircraft worker group.

There can be but one effect, and that is to make the skilled aircraft workers anxious to get out of the industry and to seek employment in other more stable lines not so subject to the vicissitudes of bad Government planning.

Workers in California are very much concerned over these cut-backs and layoffs, and they are wondering if a pattern is being set which will dislodge thousands more of them in the next few months. I believe that aircraft workers in California and elsewhere want to see a 5-year program of aircraft production and procurement continued so as to guarantee our Nation's leadership in the air.

I support their plea. And I strongly urge that this Congress give full consideration to the possible disastrous and very costly effects of short-term planning as represented by the present cutbacks, and that we give full consideration to the good effects that will come from steadiness in our planning for the aircraft manufacturing industry.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain excerpts.

### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JONES of Missouri, for balance of this week, on account of illness in family.

Mr. LYNCH, for balance of this week, on account of illness.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, January 31, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

114. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949, in the amount of $1,000,000, for disaster relief (H. Doc. 45); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

115. A letter from the Chairman, National Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a list of land acquisitions for parks, parkways, and playgrounds, cost of each tract, and method of acquisition, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

116. A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

117. A letter from the Director, Naval Petroleum Reserves, Navy Department, transmitting a copy of the amendatory and supplemental agreements entered into on December 22, 1948, by and between the United States of America, acting by and through the Secretary of the Navy and the Standard Oil Co. of California; to the Committee on Armed Services.

118. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a list of eligible institutions and organizations which have requested donations from the Navy Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

119. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades; to the Committee on Armed Services.

120. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting two copies of a dispatch forwarded by the Governor of American Samoa, embodying resolutions adopted by the Fono of American Samoa during its present session; to the Committee on Public Lands.

121. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

122. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a list of the lands exchanged under the provisions of the act of June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741, 43 U. S. C., sec. 869); to the Committee on Public Lands.

123. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report to the Congress of all reservations made in conformity with the provisions of section 13 of the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 858); to the Committee on Public Lands.

124. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, Government of the District of Columbia, transmitting the fourteenth semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia, covering the period July 1 to December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

---

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1660. A bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; without amendment (Report No. 8). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. FORAND: Committee on Ways and Means. H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will; with an amendment (Report No. 6). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; without amendment (Report No. 7). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 1879. A bill authorizing preliminary examinations and surveys of the streams, and their larger tributaries, flowing through the Austin-Washington soil conservation district, the Bastrop-Fayette soil conservation district, the Calhoun-Victoria soil conservation district, the Middle Guadalupe Basin soil conservation district, the Navasota soil conservation district, and the Copano Bay soil conservation district, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. THOMPSON (by request):

H. R. 1880. A bill to incorporate the Retired Officers Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 1881. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 1882. A bill to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1883. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 1884. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Manitowoc, Wis.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1885. A bill to provide for the acquisition of site and preparation of plans and specifications for a new Federal building and post office in Green Bay, Wis., to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CANFIELD:

H. R. 1886. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 1887. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 1888. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriation for disaster relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 1889. A bill to amend section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1890. A bill to provide for the granting of honorable discharges to certain persons who served in the armed forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1891. A bill making appropriations for disaster relief in case of snowstorms, blizzards, and other catastrophies; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1892. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to certain Indian lands in Lake County, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1893. A bill to repeal the wartime increases of taxes on telegraph, radio, and cable services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1894. A bill to repeal the taxes on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1895. A bill to repeal the taxes on transportation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 1896. A bill to amend section 124 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1897. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 1898. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to change the age for old-age and survivor benefits from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 1899. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 1900. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 1901. A bill to provide free postage for members of the armed forces of the United States while on active duty; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1902. A bill to provide gold star lapel buttons for widows, parents, and next of kin of persons who lost their lives as the result of serving in the armed forces of the United States in World War II; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 1903. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 1904. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 1905. A bill to provide compensation for veterans of World War II who have had pulmonary tuberculosis; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1906. A bill to amend section 6 of the War Claims Act of 1948, with respect to compensation payable to individuals who went into hiding in order to avoid capture as prisoners of war; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUBER:

H. R. 1907. A bill to provide that rural carriers in the postal service shall be appointed without regard to political affiliations and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the position; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1908. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 1909. A bill to provide a limited exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 1910. A bill to establish an immigration quota for Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1911. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. R. 1912. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1913. A bill to provide for the acquisition of sites and the preparation of plans for Federal public buildings outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1914. A bill to provide that the gain realized on sale of a residence shall, in certain cases, be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1915. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1916. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Westlake, La., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 1917. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 1918. A bill to authorize the furnishing of water to the Yuma auxiliary project, Arizona, through the works of the Gila project, Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1919. A bill to authorize mining, milling, or smelting loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 1920. A bill to amend the Columbia Project Act with reference to State lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1921. A bill relating to the amount of Federal payments to the States under the Social Security Act with respect to State payments to Indian wards of the United States of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1922. A bill to amend section 10 of the Reclamation Act of 1939; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 1923. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 1924. A bill to increase the rates of pay of Federal employees whose wages are set by wage boards or other administrative authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 1925. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Davis-Monthan Field, Tucson, Ariz.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1926. A bill relating to the amount of Federal payments to the States under the Social Security Act with respect to State payments to Indian wards of the United States of old-age assistance, aid to depend-

ent children, and aid to the blind; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 1927. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 1928. A bill increasing the immigration quotas for Italy for fiscal years 1949 and 1950, by amount equal to unused quotas for past 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 1929. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 1930. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. R. 1931. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 1932. A bill to provide increased retirement benefits for certain persons who served in the armed forces during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. R. 1933. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to provide for the naturalization of certain noncitizen parents of persons who served in the armed forces of the United States, or in the merchant marine, in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 1934. A bill providing direct Federal old-age assistance at the rate of $60 per month to needy citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 1935. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to support research and training in diseases of arthritis and rheumatism, and to aid the States in the development of community programs for the control of these diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 1936. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to grant a right-of-way; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1937. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 1938. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 1939. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 1940. A bill making appropriations for disaster relief in case of snowstorms, blizzards, and other catastrophes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 1941. A bill to provide for limiting participation as beneficiary under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 1942. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 1943. A bill to amend the income limitation governing the granting of pension to veterans and death-pension benefits to widows and children of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1944. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 1945. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 by providing that the Vice President shall be a member of the National Security Council; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 1946. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional circuit judge in the third circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1947. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional circuit judges in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1948. A bill to provide for the appointment of two additional district judges in the eastern district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1949. A bill to amend section 12b of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1950. A bill for the relief of certain consultants formerly employed by the Technical Industrial Intelligence Committee of the Foreign Economic Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1951. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1952. A bill to amend section 292 and section 293 of the Criminal Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1953. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1954. A bill to prohibit the transportation of obscene literature in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1955. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H. R. 1956. A bill to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 1957. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 1958. A bill to provide for a decennial census of radio broadcasting receiving sets; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 1960. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 1961. A bill to permit widows of officers and enlisted men of the Army to purchase from Army commissaries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. R. 1962. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 1963. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1964. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 1965. A bill to defer the repayment in full by States of certain loans made by the Federal Works Administrator; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 1966. A bill establishing a procedure by which the Administrator may assure veterans full educational and training opportunities commensurate with the tuition charges by educational and training institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 1967. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1968. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1969. A bill to encourage better management of privately owned forest lands and to increase the efficient production, processing, marketing, and utilization of forest products through making available technical services and assistance to forest owners, operators of wood-using industries, and consumers of forest products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1970. A bill to authorize appropriations for carrying out the provisions of sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 1971. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 1972. A bill to authorize grants to enable local school agencies overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments to increase school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 1973. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 1974. A bill to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KERR:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. J. Res. 113. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 114. Joint resolution to permit the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. J. Res. 115. Joint resolution to provide that any future payments by the Republic of Finland on the principal or interest of its

debt of the First World War to the United States shall be used to provide educational and technical instruction and training in the United States for citizens of Finland and American books and technical equipment for institutions of higher education in Finland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. J. Res. 116. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 117. Joint resolution to make January 30 a legal holiday dedicated to human freedom and dignity and known as Roosevelt Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 118. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election and term of office of the President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. J. Res. 119. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. J. Res. 120. Joint resolution to make it unlawful for members of the Communist Party to be candidates for Federal elective office and to provide for the immediate deportation of aliens found to be members of the Communist Party; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Con. Res. 20. Concurrent resolution to provide for an investigation of the life-insurance industry of the United States with particular regard to the applicable antitrust laws and to the extent to which the operations of such industry comply with such laws; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. Res. 65. Resolution to protest the summary arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 66. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. Res. 67. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate and study the recent reductions in the price paid to producers of Pennsylvania-grade crude oil; to the Committee on Rules.

---

### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVENPORT:

H. R. 1975. A bill for the relief of Rudolf A. V. Raff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 1976. A bill to authorize the sale of certain allotted inherited land on the Flathead Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FISHER:

H. R. 1977. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Ross Kennedy and Jane Rankin Kennedy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1978. A bill for the relief of Boehme's Butternut Bakery, a partnership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 1979. A bill for the relief of Soo Hoo Yet Tuck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 1980. A bill for the relief of Walter H. Houston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1981. A bill for the relief of Carolyn McMillan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 1982. A bill for the relief of Cumberland Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. R. 1984. A bill for the relief of Kazuo Minami, Mrs. Yoshiko Minami, and Tadao Minami; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 1935. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Tibor Jankai and Irene Alexander Jankai, his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 1986. A bill for the relief of Ella Speilman Geiger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 1987. A bill for the relief of Jeno Stern and Aranka Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 1988. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Fry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 1989. A bill to provide for the retirement with pay of Commander Nicholas T. Gansa; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 1990. A bill for the relief of Istvan Hedvig and Peter Paul Gulyas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 1991. A bill for the relief of Alexander Stewart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 1992. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Adelaide Dibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fadem; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H. R. 1994. A bill for the relief of Frank F. Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

28. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolutions adopted by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of New York, expressing condemnation of the Hungarian Government for its arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

29. By Mr. LYNCH: Memorial of the Assembly of the State of New York, urging that the Congress, the Secretary of State of the United States, and the President do everything in their power to bring about the immediate release of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

30. By the SPEAKER: Petition of members of the Puerto Rico Telephone Industry Workers Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution asking that their affiliate of the Puerto Rico State branch of the American Federation of Labor be given extension to Puerto Rico, in regard to the wages and hours law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## SENATE

### MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1949

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have entered upon a new week with tasks and responsibilities which are far beyond the wisdom of our own finite minds.

Grant that daily we may hold counsel with the God of all wisdom and yield ourselves unreservedly to the discipline and guidance of Thy Spirit.

May we also hear and heed the command which came to Thy servant in the long ago: "Stand thou still a while that I may show thee the word of God."

We pray that Thou wilt create within men and nations those finer feelings and nobler thoughts which are the progenitors of achievement in the building of a better world.

We thank Thee, O God, for the memory of Thy servant who ministered here in spiritual things. His sun went down while it was yet day, only to rise again in heavenly glory. We rejoice in the high and holy privilege that was ours to walk and work with Him for a little while upon this earth.

Hear us in the name of the Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On motion of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 27, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution:

On January 18, 1949:

S. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution making January 20 and 21, 1949, holidays for Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia in the metropolitan area of the District of Columbia.

On January 19, 1949:

S. 103. An act to increase rates of compensation of the President, Vice President, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 27th instant,

The Vice President, on January 28, 1949, signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk (Edward E. Mansur, Jr.) called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hoey | Mundt |
| Anderson | Holland | Murray |
| Baldwin | Humphrey | Myers |
| Brewster | Hunt | Neely |
| Bricker | Ives | O'Conor |
| Bridges | Jenner | O'Mahoney |
| Broughton | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper |
| Butler | Johnson, Tex. | Reed |
| Byrd | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Cain | Kefauver | Russell |
| Chapman | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Connally | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Cordon | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Donnell | Langer | Sparkman |
| Eastland | Lodge | Stennis |
| Ecton | Long | Taft |
| Ellender | Lucas | Taylor |
| Flanders | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Frear | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Fulbright | McFarland | Thye |
| George | McKellar | Tydings |
| Gillette | Magnuson | Vandenberg |
| Green | Martin | Watkins |
| Hayden | Maybank | Wiley |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Williams |
| Hickenlooper | Millikin | Withers |
| Hill | Morse | |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

## REPORT OF NATIONAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1949.*

NOTE.—The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

### REPORT ON CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report and recommendations (annex I) regarding legislation to enable this Government to effect settlement of certain outstanding claims against the United States; and (annex II) a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORT ON FOREIGN SURPLUS DISPOSAL

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the twelfth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, dated January 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### CHANGE IN FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting resolutions adopted by the Fono of American Samoa, relating to a change in the form of the government of American Samoa (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL MOTOR LAUNCHES TO STATE OF NEW JERSEY

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the State of New Jersey had requested the Navy Department to transfer two 40-foot motor launches to be used by the Shell Fisheries Division of the Department of Conservation of that State; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION TO AMERICAN BUSINESS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### PARKING OF VEHICLES ON PROPERTY OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES FOR POSTAL PURPOSES

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

### REPORT OF UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

### REPORT OF CAPITAL TRANSIT CO.

A letter from the president of the Capital Transit Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

### STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of that company for the calendar year 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

### BALANCE SHEET OF THE CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of that company, for the year 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

### REPORT OF ADMINISTRATOR OF RENT CONTROL, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Administrator of Rent Control for the District of Columbia, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

### REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fifth semiannual report of that Commission, dated January 31, 1949 (with an accompanying report); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

### UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

A letter from the representative of the United States, upper Colorado River Basin compact negotiations, transmitting a conformed copy of a compact entered into among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, to determine the rights and obligations of those States respecting uses and deliveries of water of the upper basin of the Colorado River (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A radiogram from the International Longshoremen's Association, local No. 1740, of San Juan, P. R., favoring the enactment of legislation to extend the Fair Labor Standards Act and social security to Puerto Rico on an equal basis with the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY:

A letter and 28 telegrams in the nature of memorials, from sundry citizens of the State of West Virginia, remonstrating against the enactment of Senate bill 248, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

"Legislative Resolution 5

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to defeat Federal aid to education

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill, Senate file No. 246, providing Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools of the United States; and

"Whereas, should this bill be enacted into law, there is reason to believe that it will lead inevitably to Federal control and supervision of the public schools of the Nation, thereby taking control out of the hands of the local districts; and

"Whereas the several States are now able through their own taxing powers to make ample provision for their elementary and secondary schools without Federal aid; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is already burdened with a staggering debt of more than $250,000,000,000, calling for retrenchment if the solvency of the United States is to be preserved: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That Senate file No. 246, or any similar legislation now before the Congress of the United States, be defeated.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from Nebraska."

## PARITY PRICES—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GEORGIA STATE ASSEMBLY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, relating to parity prices, and ask for its reference to the Committee on Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas the gross debt of the Government of the United States has increased from about 40 billion to approximately 252 billion dollars during the period of 1939 to 1949; and

Whereas interest must be paid annually and the debt gradually liquidated if the Government is to be saved from insolvency or bankruptcy; and

Whereas it must be self-evident that if we are to avoid lower living standards and if this debt is to be serviced and paid, it must be through the production of new wealth from the natural resources of the United States; and

Whereas the national income of the United States and the gross income of agriculture of this country have each only slightly more than doubled during the same time, and these must bear the chief burden of taxes (directly or indirectly) in maintaining the national solvency; and

Whereas our gross farm income represents about 65 percent in dollar value of our annual production of new wealth and in turn our national income regularly averages approximately seven times the dollar amount of gross farm income; and

Whereas a return to the 1939 price and income levels for farm products would reduce our national income about 50 percent: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the senate and the house of representatives concurring, hereby petitions Congress to pass permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 90 percent of parity on all basic farm crops, to protect such floor prices with commodity loans of like amount and to prescribe such import duties, excise taxes, or quotas on competitive imports as may be needed to maintain these price levels and our national income; be it

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to President Harry S. Truman, Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan, and to Senators and Congressmen from the State of Georgia requesting their cooperation and expressing the appreciation of the general assembly for same.

## AMENDMENT OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938—MEMORIALS

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I present a letter and 28 telegrams in the nature of memorials concerning proposed amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. I ask unanimous consent that a list of the names of these memorials be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The memorials will be appropriately referred, and, without objection, the list of names of the authors of the memorials will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list of the names of the authors of the memorials was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In accordance with the second paragraph of rule 7, Mr. NEELY presented a letter and numerous telegrams in the nature of memorials relative to proposed amendments of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 from the following: E. C. Jones, president, Jones, Inc., Fairmont, W. Va.; Dewey E. S. Kuhns, secretary and treasurer, West Virginia Retailers Association, Charleston, W. Va.; H. P. Reip, controller, the Parsons-Souders Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.; W. A. Pankey, general manager, Bluefield Telephone Co., Bluefield, W. Va.; the Merchants Cooperative Association, Wheeling, W. Va.; Raphael Malsin, president, Lane Bryant, Inc., 465 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.; J. W. Stokes, president, Hinton Chamber of Commerce, Hinton, W. Va.; John Morgan, chairman, retail council, Parkersburg Board of Commerce, Parkersburg, W. Va.; R. D. Kemp, W. T. Grant Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Dave Abrams, Modern Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Thomas J. Richards, president, Watts Sartor Lear Co., Clarksburg, W. Va.; E. E. Bibb, president, Beckley Hardware & Supply Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Nelson Clark, manager, chamber of commerce, Martinsburg, W. Va.; Paul F. Sheets, president, Clarksburg Trade Association, Clarksburg, W. Va.; E. D. Armstrong, Beckley, W. Va.; N. Joe Rahll, Beckley, W. Va.; S. C. Ballengee Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; C. T. Stromberg, Leader Furniture Co., Beckley, W. Va.; Cliff Holdren, secretary, Charles Town Ranson Board of Trade, Charles Town, W. Va.; T. W. Keffer, secretary-manager, chamber of commerce, Moundsville, W. Va.; W. B. Woolfe, president, and Chester J. Compton, executive secretary, Mineral County Chamber of Commerce, Keyser, W. Va.; Arthur C. Cundy, managing director, Beckley Chamber of Commerce, Beckley, W. Va.; Gordon W. Lewis, White Sulphur Dry Cleaners, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va.; Joseph W. Greer, president, J. M. Hartley & Son Co., Fairmont, W. Va.; Walter A. Hupp, American Laundry, Fairmont, W. Va.; R. J. Bryan, manager, Reilly Tar & Chemical Corp., Fairmont, W. Va.; Don Harper, president, Elkins Chamber of Commerce, Elkins, W. Va.; J. M. Bear, president, West Virginia Independent Telephone Association, Marlinton, W. Va.

## RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR RELATING TO AMERICAN FEDERATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a resolution dealing with a number of problems of interest to the Government employees was approved by convention of the Minnesota State Federation of Labor in September. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas Federal employees are an important and constituent part of the labor movement; and

Whereas the American Federation of Government Employees represents Federal employees; and

Whereas the American Federation of Government Employees is affiliated to the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas Lodge 364 of the American Federation of Government Employees is affiliated to the Minnesota State Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the American Federation of Labor, in its national convention in 1946, endorsed the 1947–48 legislative program of the American Federation of Government Employees: Be it therefore

*Resolved by Minnesota State Federation of Labor in regular convention, assembled at Hibbing, Minn.*, That the Minnesota State Federation of Labor endorses the following legislative program of the American Federation of Government Employees for 1948–49.

1. Legislation to effect a pay raise which will truly reflect the increased cost of living; that ceilings be eliminated from the pay scales, and a general revision of the salary schedules of the Classification Act of 1923.

2. Optional retirement at full annuity regardless of age after 25 years of service.

3. Optional annuity after 20 years of service for all employees engaged in hazardous occupations at rates provided in the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended February 28, 1948 (sec. 1–1).

4. Optional retirement after 20 years of service at a reduced annuity, if separated or demoted as a result of reduction in force.

5. Enactment of the Keating bill to increase compensation payments.

6. Legislation that will preserve competitive civil service for positions located in the Canal Zone for citizens of the United States.

7. Elimination of multiple taxation of Government employees' incomes by States or subdivisions thereof.

8. Legislation to exempt from income taxes any retirement annuities or pensions provided by the Federal, State, or other political subdivisions.

9. Legislation to provide employees of Government with complete uniforms, accessories, and equipment, where required, at the expense of the Government.

10. Increase in per diem and mileage rates of Government employees in travel status; minimum $10 a day for subsistence and 7 cents a mile for privately owned auto in official travel.

11. Legislation to secure for all Federal employees fair overtime pay not otherwise provided at rates in accordance with Fair Labor Standards Act.

12. Repeal of a law which places professional employees in Veterans' Administration outside Classification Act.

13. Unemployment compensation for Federal employees.

14. Legislation for payment of automatic within-grade increases on completion of respective periods of service required.

15. Reclassification of various positions of Public Building Administration guard force and that PBA guards be designated as United States Building Police.

16. Transfer to the Labor Department of the authority to fix local wage rates of per diem and unclassified employees; that all employees be given the right to appeal job classifications to the Civil Service Commission.

17. Medical and surgical treatment at Public Health Service hospitals for retired Federal workers.

18. That overtime be paid employees for work beyond 8 hours in any 1 day.

## RESOLUTION AND PETITION RELATING TO BANNING OF YELLOW COLOR FROM OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

a resolution which I have received from Mr. Al Stoldt, president of the Wisconsin Swiss and Limburger Cheese Producers' Association, of Monroe, Wis. This resolution expresses very well, I believe, the need for banning the yellow color from oleomargarine in order to prevent fraudulent competition with butter.

Along this very same line I have received a communication from several veterans who are receiving on-the-farm training under the GI bill of rights and who have commented on this same subject. I feel that their views represent true grass-roots sentiments, and I ask that their letter be printed in the RECORD at this point, following the resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OLEOMARGARINE

That whereas the principle of protection of the established identification characteristics of the products of the physical and mental labors of its citizens by the United States Government is evidenced by its laws pertaining to trade marks, brands, copyrights, patents, and similar subjects, designed to prevent others from profiting by indiscriminate imitation; and

Whereas the traditional yellow color of butter and the labor of all the dairy farmers who have created and maintained the high standards of the dairy industry are deserving of protection similar to that of other individuals and groups in our great country:

We recommend that if the present Federal tax is removed from oleomargarine, direct and effective Federal legislation be passed which will forbid the sale of any oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

---

PLYMOUTH, WIS., *January 26, 1949.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Chamber,*
*Washington, D. C.*

SIR: We, the undersigned, all veterans and students of institutional on-the-farm training and actively engaged in diversified farming, after due consideration of all facts, firmly believe that any change of the present oleo laws would be a death-dealing blow to the entire dairy industry as well as injurious to the welfare of the peoples of the Nation we love.

We believe that butter substitutes spread fraud and deception and should be sold only by their own colors and merits.

We believe that the 10,000,000 people directly gaining their livelihood from the dairy industry are entitled to protection because of their vital contributions to the Nation's diet and health, and to soil conservation. We believe what hurts the dairy industry hurts everyone, either directly or indirectly.

We believe that you, as the representative of America's dairyland, should and will do everything that is humanly possible to protect the interests of the dairy industry and the consuming public. We believe that the present laws should remain.

Very truly yours,

Carl E. Broph, Warren Lammers, Victor D. Last, J. Paul Tempas, Elroy Arndt, John H. Holbrook, Ray E. Richter, Harry Hortink, Irvin Arentsen, Roger Erneise, Howard J. Arentsen, Leonard J. Tauber, Reuben Arentsen, Alfred Verhulst, Homer Melvin, Instructor.

## RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY SOUTH CAROLINA NATIONAL GUARD ASSOCIATION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, four resolutions adopted by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled on January 22, 1949, at Columbia, S. C., relating to the National Guard, a long-range armory construction program, and universal military training.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution for the preservation of the integrity of the National Guard of the United States

Whereas the National Guard of the United States is the successor to the Organized Militia, which was brought into being by the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas democracy is the basic philosophy of the National Guard system, which is accomplished by keeping our Army close to the people through State control in time of peace; and

Whereas in its dual capacity the National Guard serves the States as a security force in time of peace, and the Nation as combat troops in time of war and by virtue of such dual status giving to the State and Nation the greatest amount of security for the least possible cost; and

Whereas the National Guard has preserved law and order in the several States of the Union on many occasions, and twice has gone to war, fighting with telling effectiveness all over the world and justifying the foresight and wisdom of the framers of the Constitution of the United States by its great contribution to victory in these two World Wars; and

Whereas at this time efforts are being made to destroy the National Guard by removing it from State jurisdiction and combining it with the Organized Reserves, another reserve component of the Army of the United States, to the end that the Army, including all components, will be organized and controlled in Washington; and

Whereas the South Carolina National Guard Association regards these efforts as far reaching in its impact on the political, economic, and military life of our country; and condemns strongly and without any reservation as unwarranted and down-right dangerous any movement designed to effect this radical change in the basic concept of our historic policy: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C.,* That the officers of the South Carolina National Guard Association are hereby instructed and directed to do all things which at their discretion they deem wise and necessary:

(a) To prevent the removal of the National Guard from State control,

(b) To prevent the interference in the slightest degree with the full command of the Guard by the Governors of the several States in time of peace,

(c) To prevent any change in the organization of the National Guard which would destroy or affect its integrity as both a State and National force, operating under the plan created by constitutional and statutory law; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the officers of this Association are directed to inform each Member of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives from South Carolina of this action and that they be fully informed of the background, the policies and purposes of the National Guard of the United States and our determination to see that the National Guard be not destroyed; be it further

*Resolved,* That the officers of this association are directed to bring this matter to the attention of the South Carolina General Assembly now in session in order that they shall have a full realization of the vital necessity of memorializing Congress, through the medium of a joint resolution, in opposing any attempt to change our present military system.

---

Resolution condemning that part of the report of the Committee on Civilian Components appointed by the Secretary of Defense recommending the destruction of the National Guard and substituting in lieu thereof a single Federal reserve or militia to be organized under the Army clause of the Constitution

Whereas on or about June 30, 1948, the Committee on Civilian Components that had been appointed by the Secretary of Defense charged with making an impartial study of the civilian components of the armed forces submitted to him its report embodying certain conclusions and recommendations affecting the National Guard, and which report included therein the following conclusions and recommendations:

1. National security required that all services each have one Federal reserve force.

This should be accomplished:

(a) by establishing the reserve forces of the Army under the Army clause of the Constitution.

(b) by similarly establishing the reserve forces of the Air Force under appropriate legal authority;

(c) by incorporating the National Guard and Organized Reserve Corps into the Army reserve under the name of the National Guard of the United States;

(d) by incorporating the Air National Guard and the Air Reserve into the Air Force reserve force under the name of the United States Air Force Reserve.

and in support of which recommendations the Committee on Civilian Components stated that it had arrived at its conclusions concerning the National Guard only after the most careful consideration: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C.,* That in common with the National Guard Association of the United States and the United States Conference of Governors, it condemns without reservation the report of the Committee on Civilian Components recommending the establishment of a single Federal reserve or militia as un-American and contrary to our concept and philosophy of life and government, and that the proposals made therein are not only ill-advised and illegal, but, if put into effect, would destroy the National Guard which, by the committee's own admission, has performed with effectiveness and brilliancy in two world wars and which has, in the brief space of 2½ years, organized more than 4,795 units with a strength of more than 320,000, contained in 27 divisions, other highly essential tactical units including Antiaircraft and Air Force units, all of which are a part of the M-day force and essential to the defense of the Nation; be it further

*Resolved,* That the South Carolina National Guard Association direct its officers to call upon and to write the Members of the Congress from South Carolina to resist this effort to centralize the military power in the hands of a few in Washington and to destroy the National Guard as it is today organized, and to forward each Member of the Congress from South Carolina a copy of this resolution; be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded the Governor of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

---

Resolution calling on the Congress to establish a system of universal military training

Whereas the National Guard Association of the United States, the Reserve Officers'

Association, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Disabled War Veterans, and numerous other veteran organizations, the Department of National Defense have consistently advocated the establishment of a system of universal military training to the end that there would not only be assured the greatest possible degree of national security, but that such responsibility would be recognized as a common duty, to be shared equally by all; and

Whereas the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training, after 6 months of exhaustive study and examination into the broad field of our national security, and the relation of universal military training to such a problem, has brought out a report of great significance on the subject, in which they urge universal military training as an integral part of our national security establishment on a par with Central Intelligence, research, and development, industrial mobilization, and an adequate Regular Establishment; and

Whereas this exhaustive study and the unanimous recommendations of the committee, in which it finds there is justified fully such a program in the interest and necessity of our national security, and emphasizes the urgency of such a measure, places great responsibility on the people and the Congress for passage of such an act as the fairest, most equitable, and most economical means of effecting national security; and

Whereas the mission of the National Guard as an effective component of the M-day force in being would be vitally promoted, the efficiency of the National Guard raised to a high level of training and its strength maintained so that the National Guard would be able to successfully meet its M-day missions; and

Whereas the findings of the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training were fundamentally and substantially those principles long advocated by the organizations above-mentioned: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association, in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949, at Columbia, S. C.*, That we endorse the stand supporting the principle of universal military training as advocated by the above-mentioned organizations and the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Military Training and directs its officers to so inform each Member of the Congress from South Carolina and that they be urged to exert every effort in securing the enactment of legislation designed to accomplish this purpose; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of the State of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

---

Resolution providing for the enactment of legislation incident to a long-range armory-construction program

Whereas the reorganization of the National Guard has progressed to the extent that at the present time we have in the federally recognized units throughout the Nation a total membership of more than 320,000; and

Whereas many States have a strength which now exceeds the armory facilities available. If the National Guard is to continue forward along the lines contemplated, it is imperative that the Congress provide, in line with approved War Department policies, the necessary legislation and the funds with which to construct new armories, and to add additions to present armories for the proper housing of contemplated strength of the National Guard: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the South Carolina National Guard Association in conference assembled this 22d day of January 1949 at Columbia, S. C.*, That the officers of this association are hereby directed to write to each Member of the Congress from South Carolina of the urgent need for legislation to provide for a long-range armory-construction program and to forward each Member a copy of this resolution; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of South Carolina and to the National Guard Association of the United States.

THE FARM PROGRAM—LETTER FROM MASSACHUSETTS FARM BUREAU FEDERATION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my statement, a letter from the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation, embodying two resolutions passed on November 18. I consider this letter so important that I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Waltham, Mass., January 26, 1949.*

Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR SALTONSTALL: There are two things which the Farm Bureau Federation in Massachusetts would particularly like at this time to call to your attention. These are resolutions adopted at our annual meeting November 18, 1948, at Worcester which read as follows:

"Whereas we realize that we cannot keep asking for favors and services without surrendering more and more of our independence: *Be it resolved*, That we favor legislation that will work toward the decentralization of both power and authority from Washington to the end that we shall have more and not less independence as the years go by."

---

"Whereas we realize the importance to the over-all national economy of some system of farm support prices until world conditions become more stable: *Be it resolved*, That we favor the continuance of a price support program at figures low enough to discourage overproduction and high enough to insure some protection in the event of price collapse."

The Farm Bureau in Massachusetts represents some 7,000 farm families in every county of the State. Our policy is arrived at by discussions of issues first within the county and second in State meetings. I think that the two resolutions are particularly important at this time when the question of a farm price support program is again becoming very controversial. Last year the farmers here favored the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948 and we see no reason at this time to change our position. We hope that you will do everything in your power to prevent a return to a rigid 90 percent of parity support price and to continue the act which would insure to agriculture a floor that would keep it from going into bankruptcy through its own high production and yet would not be high enough to call for governmental regimentation in our field.

We believe that this is no less important to our own economy than to agriculture. It seems hardly necessary to remind you of the severe attack farmers have been under in the metropolitan papers in Massachusetts because of such programs as the potato support program. Our organization wants no repetition of that sort of thing. Under a flexible support program such as is contained in the 1948 act, I am very sure that we will have provided against abuses and return the farmers to a freer market in most years.

Respectfully yours,

CARLETON I. PICKETT,
*Secretary.*

MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to announce that I have appointed, pursuant to law, the following Members of the Senate on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation:

TOM CONNALLY, of Texas; WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia; and H. ALEXANDER SMITH, of New Jersey.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 372. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 29).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 460. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; without amendment (Rept. No. 26); and

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will; without amendment (Rept. No. 27).

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 492. A bill to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."; without amendment (Rept. No. 28).

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION"

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 35, submitted by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on the 27th instant, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance 2,400 additional copies of Senate Document Numbered 208, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Recommendations for Social Security Legislation."

Mr. HAYDEN. I am advised by the printing clerk that the type has been saved and that the cost will be about $500.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 25)

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who is the chairman of the Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, I submit that committee's final report,

entitled "Oil Supply and Distribution Problems."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

SENATE DOCUMENT NO. 7

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Nebraska, who is unavoidably absent, I ask unanimous consent to submit and have printed as a Senate document the final report by the chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee entitled "Independent Business: Its Struggle for Existence."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and printed as a Senate document.

PERMISSION FOR SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business be allowed to file the remainder of its final reports with the Senate up to and including February 15, 1949.

This request is made because the commitee expires as of midnight tonight, and, although the reports are all prepared, we have not had the opportunity to have them approved by the committee members.

I want to make it clear that this request does not allow the committee to employ any personnel or incur any further expense. This is merely to allow the committee to have time to approve and print these final reports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 713. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. CHAVEZ also introduced Senate bill 714, to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States, and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 715. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 716. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to George Peters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 717. A bill to provide increases in compensation for members of the Police and Fire Departments and teachers in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, and Mr. BALDWIN):

S. 718. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and Air Force officers retired due to lack of funds and to correct injustices and inconsistencies; and

S. 719. A bill to correct injustices and inconsistencies in Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress, approved June 29, 1948, designated as the "Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 720. A bill for the relief of Vesa Reijo Luukkonen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 721. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina):

S. 722. A bill to create a Government corporation to operate cafeterias and conduct certain other activities in Government buildings and on Government property; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 723. A bill to authorize the transfer of certain agricultural dry land and irrigation field stations to the States in which such stations are located, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. FLANDERS (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. IVES):

S. 724. A bill to provide for direct Federal loans to meet the housing needs of lower-income families, to provide liberalized credit to reduce the cost of housing for such families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 725. A bill for the relief of Ralph E. Garlock; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 726. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees;

S. 727. A bill to provide that the Governors of the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska shall be elected by the people of those Territories, and for other purposes; and

S. 728. A bill to authorize the participation of States, Territories, and insular possessions in revenues from national parks, national monuments, and other areas subject to the primary administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service, to provide for the acquisition of land within certain areas administered by the National Park Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 729. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act so as to extend the time within which claims may be filed for return of any property or interest acquired by the United States on or after December 18, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 730. A bill to clarify the application of the tax on cabarets; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 731. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Edison Glenn a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 732. A bill providing for the taking of action in 1949 with respect to quotas for the 1950 crops of corn, wheat, cotton, rice, and tobacco; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. LUCAS):

S. 733. A bill relating to acreage allotments for certain farm products in 1949; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 734. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts;

S. 735. A bill for the relief of Leslie A. Connell:

S. 736. A bill for the reimbursement of Puget Sound Bridge & Dredging Co.;

S. 737. A bill for the relief of Henry A. Ninemires; and

S. 738. A bill for the relief of Earl B. Hochwalt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 739. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, to make the personnel ceiling provisions of such act inapplicable to employees of the Navy Department whose wages are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) also introduced Senate bill 740, providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 741. A bill to place certain restrictions upon the transfer of generating plants and electric transmission and distribution lines financed in whole or in part through loans made pursuant to the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 742. A bill for the relief of Robert Johanna Sorensen; and

S. 743. A bill for the relief of Lars Daniel Sorensen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 744. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 745. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Illinois, as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 746. A bill relating to the admission of attorneys at law to practice before departments and agencies of the Government;

S. 747. A bill relating to dismission of indictments, information, or complaints in criminal cases by the Attorney General or the United States Attorney;

S. 748. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Bishop;

S. 749. A bill for the relief of Ferd H. Gibler;

S. 750. A bill for the relief of Everett C. French;

S. 751. A bill for the relief of Olga Lengyel;

S. 752. A bill for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.; and

S. 753. A bill for the relief of Sisters Antoinette Cometti, Mary Gibin, Angela Pelosin, Emma Ghisleni, Elisabetta De Caterin, and Onorina Franzina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 754. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 755. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Shawneetown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 756. A bill making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER) introduced Senate bill 757, to provide an effective method for the construction of low-rent homes for low-income families with a minimum of Federal control and expenditure, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution establishing a commission to select a site and design for a memorial to the contributions of members of all religious faiths to American military and naval history; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. THYE, and Mr. HUMPHREY):

S. J. Res. 44. Joint resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of Leifr Eiriksson in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(Mr. FREAR introduced Senate joint resolution 45, to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. J. Res. 46. Joint resolution proposing to amend the Constitution of the United States to exclude aliens in counting the whole number of persons in each State for apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to suspend the operation of section 401 (e) of the Nationality Act of 1940 in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEM:

S. J. Res. 48. Joint resolution authorizing a study of certain matters looking to the better protection and preservation of migratory birds and game mammals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PUBLIC BUILDINGS

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill in which I believe the Senate will be interested. The bill provides for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia, and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 714) to provide for comprehensive planning, for site acquisition in and outside of the District of Columbia and for the design of Federal building projects outside of the District of Columbia, to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction over certain lands between certain departments and agencies of the United States; and to provide certain additional authority needed in connection with the construction, management, and operation of Federal public buildings, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CHAVEZ, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

## ALASKA RAILROAD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for the construction of a railroad to Alaska, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a letter I have received from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and a letter from the Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget to Mr. Willis T. Batcheller, executive vice president and chief engineer of the Canadian Alaska Railway Co., be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 740) providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President is authorized, through such channels as he may deem proper, to negotiate and enter into an agreement or agreements with the Dominion of Canada for the survey, location, and construction of a railroad of standard gage to connect the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving the Territory of Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, together with all branches and extensions of said new railroad system, and in cooperation with the Government of the Dominion of Canada, to cause a survey or surveys to be made to determine the most practicable route for such railroad, as well as construction plans and specifications and estimates of the probable cost thereof, and plans for financing its construction, operation, and maintenance.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized to designate such agency or agencies of the United States as he may select to carry on, either directly or under contract, the work of survey and location of the route for such railroad and, upon the completion of negotiations and the execution of the agreement or agreements herein authorized, to proceed either directly or under contract, with the construction, operation, and maintenance thereof after such route shall have been determined and approved by the President. Such agency or agencies are authorized and directed to cooperate directly with like agencies or officials to be designated by the Government of the Dominion of Canada for the purpose of coordinating and expediting the work of such survey, location, construction, operation, and maintenance thereof.

SEC. 3. The work of all existing agencies which may be engaged in like or affiliated activities in the Territory of Alaska and in western Canada shall hereafter be correlated with the work contemplated under this act.

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum as may be necessary, to be expended under the direction of the President, through such agency or agencies as he may designate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act: *Provided*, That no money shall be appropriated under this act for the construction of any part of such railroad outside of the Territory of Alaska until the agreement or agreements provided for in the first section of this act have been entered into.

The letters presented by Mr. MAGNUSON were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington 25, D. C., December 13, 1948.*

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington 25, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MAGNUSON: This will acknowledge your letter of November 24 to Mr. Webb concerning the construction of an Alaska railroad.

I believe you will be interested in the attached copy of my lettter of June 22 to Mr. Willis T. Batcheller on the subject. So far as I am aware, the fundamentals of the situation have not changed since that letter was written.

In the interval we have received the views of Secretaries of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State concerning House Concurrent Resolutions 214, 215, and 216 which are similar in many respects to your bill, S. 2867.

The Department of State has pointed out that negotiations with the Canadian Government on this matter would be likely to succeed only if they were based on specific and concrete proposals and that passage of these resolutions would be premature until the national defense and economic priorities of the project had been determined by the agencies concerned and until definite proposals were available concerning financing construction, operation, and related problems.

The Navy Department has indicated that it is sympathetic "to all measures which will facilitate the movement of freight and passengers to and from Alaska," but has pointed out that the Navy would not expect to be able to use the railroad transportation to any great extent in supplying their installations in the area.

The Army Department has indicated concern for the inadequacy of existing transportation facilities serving Alaska, but has pointed out that from a military point of view, a railroad to Alaska, "while being a valuable asset, is not sufficiently vital at this time to the defense of that territory or the continental United States to entitle it to priority over other projects. It cannot, therefore, be considered a military necessity. The Department of the Army is hopeful that the future development of the natural resources of Alaska will either warrant, for economic reasons, Government support of the proposed railroad project or will interest private enterprise therein."

The views of the Department of the Air Force are essentially similar to those of the Navy.

It is evident that the agencies primarily concerned with national defense and security do not advocate assignment of a high priority to the Alaska Railroad project. However, we feel that continuing study of economic prospects and development of the kinds of data suggested by the Department of State as requisite to negotiations with the Canadian Government are fully justified.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
*Director.*

---

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
*Washington, D. C., June 22, 1948.*

Mr. WILLIS T. BATCHELLER,
*Executive Vice President and Chief Engineer Canadian Alaska Railway Co.,*
*Mayflower Hotel,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. BATCHELLER: Your letter of May 15, 1948, in the interest of a Canadian-

Alaskan Railway project, addressed to the President, has been referred to me for consideration and acknowledgment.

The very real interest of the President in the affairs of Alaska has been freshly evidenced by his special message to the Congress under date of May 21, 1948. In this message, of which a copy is enclosed, President Truman, after urging early enactment of legislation granting statehood to the Territory, discussed at some length the transportation needs of Alaska and outlined several specific steps toward meeting these needs. As you will note the message also recommends other important measures with respect to housing, community facilities, land settlement, agricultural and industrial development.

In connection with the broad studies of Alaskan needs and opportunities which are now under way in various Federal agencies the idea of a Canadian-Alaskan Railway has been advanced and given such consideration as present circumstances appear to warrant. It is quite obvious, however, that this project, involving as it would governmental action by both Canada and the United States, requires much more study and analysis before any formal proposal could be placed before legislative bodies for their consideration. It is also felt that from the standpoint of immediate needs the measures proposed in the enclosed message represent the highest priorities and that their attainment would have important bearing upon final judgment as to the need, value, and economic merit of the railway project.

Your interest in this proposal and in the general acceleration of Alaskan development is much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
*Assistant Director.*

## ISSUANCE OF STAMP COMMEMORATING LIFE OF EMILY P. BISSELL

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill, prepared by me, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement presented by the Senator from Delaware will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to authorize the issuance of a stamp in commemoration of the life of Emily P. Bissell, introduced by Mr. FREAR was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement presented by Mr. FREAR was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FREAR

The contribution made by Emily P. Bissell in the battle against the ravages of tuberculosis can only be adequately measured in terms of human lives—lives saved because of Miss Bissell's notable efforts in promoting the sale of the Christmas seal, under the banner of the National Tuberculosis Society.

From 1907 when she founded the seal in America until her death in March of 1948, this gallant woman led the crusade for her little stamp until the name "Christmas Seal" became unanimous with the words "Fight Tuberculosis." Miss Bissell lived to see the battle against the disease being won—thanks in a large measure to the generosity of the American people who had faith in her idea and who supported her undertaking in ever greater degree.

Miss Emily P. Bissell was born in Wilmington Del., May 31, 1861, and was a native of her State all of her life. Her grandfather, John Bissell, settled in Windsor, Conn. Her father, C. A. Bissell (1829–1899) graduated from Yale in 1850. Her mother, Josephine Wales (1832–1919) was a daughter of John Wales who was born in New Haven, Conn., but later settled in Wilmington, Del. He was a United States Senator. Miss Bissell was educated in Delaware and New York. She attended Miss Charlier's Private School in New York City.

Pioneer work always interested her. She started the west-end reading room in 1889 and it had the first free kindergarten, the first children's playground in Delaware, the first better babies' demonstration, the first boys' brigade (forerunner of the Boy Scouts), and the first free gymnasium for boys. In 1913, it began the first Americanization work in Delaware, in its Italian Neighborhood House.

Miss Bissell was instrumental in putting through the first child labor law in Delaware, and served on the first child labor commission. She was one of the organizers of the Children's Bureau, and served on its board until her death.

She was the first president of the Consumer's League, and aided the passage of the first law limiting the hours of women in industry. At the request of the Hon. George Gray, she aided him in establishing the Delaware Chapter of the American Red Cross in 1904, and was its secretary for many years.

She was a director of the Associated Charities for many years, and was chairman of Social Service in the Federation of Women's Clubs for 8 years.

In connection with all these responsibilities came the raising of large amounts of money. The Christmas stamp of 1907 was not a momentary idea—it was the result of a great deal of practical experience, in starting and carrying forward new experiments in Delaware, applied to this Government idea from Denmark. The Story of the American Christmas Seal, written by Miss Bissell herself was published in booklet form in 1946 by the National Tuberculosis Association.

Miss Bissell's contribution to mankind has been acknowledged nationally and internationally. In December of 1936, she was honored in Wilmington, Del., at a Christmas seal birthday luncheon attended by 400 friends and health workers representing many sections of the country and several foreign countries. In December of 1937, the city of Wilmington, the State of Delaware, and two nations, again paid honor to Miss Bissell when the Tuberculosis Associations of the United States unveiled a bronze tablet which was placed on the main building of the Brandywine Sanatorium, Marshallton, Del., with this legend: "This tablet commemorates the founding of the first Christmas seal in this country by Miss Emily P. Bissell, of Wilmington, Del., December, 1907. From small beginnings, the annual Christmas seal sale has financed the development of the organized fight against tuberculosis in every State, resulting in saving thousands of lives. Erected by the Tuberculosis Associations of the United States, December 1937."

In 1942, Miss Bissell was awarded the Trudeau Medal of the National Tuberculosis Association, the first nonprofessional worker to receive this reward since it was inaugurated in 1925. The award is given annually to the individual who, in the judgment of the association, has made the most meritorious contribution to the cause, prevention, or treatment of tuberculosis.

In 1945, Miss Bissell was honored by the Delaware State Board of Health when the main building at Brandywine Sanatorium was dedicated in her honor, hereafter to be known as the Emily P. Bissell Building. Miss Bissell is the author of many poems, which have been collected in a volume entitled, "Happiness and Other Verses."

Miss Bissell was president of the Delaware Anti-Tuberculosis Society from 1909, until her death.

She was an honorary member of the National Tuberculosis Association, and in 1946 was again honored when her portrait appeared on each sheet of Christmas seals. Miss Bissell passed away on March 8, 1948.

## POLITICAL FEDERATION OF EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 12), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Europe, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby,

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress favors the political federation of Europe.

## EXTENSION OF TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FROM PRINCE GEORGE, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA, TO ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 13), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the development of the Territory of Alaska, its lands and resources, is essential to the economic welfare and security of the United States; and

Whereas such development is necessary to the defense of the Territory; and

Whereas adequate transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are essential to the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska; and

Whereas existing transportation facilities within the Territory of Alaska and between the Territory of Alaska and the United States are inadequate for the development of the resources and the defense of Alaska; Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the President is requested to commence negotiations with the Canadian Government with a view toward determining the desirability of extending the existing railroad system now terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska, and to cause surveys to be made and plans, specifications, and cost estimates be prepared covering the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska, with a railroad system extended from Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, to the Territory of Alaska; also including studies with the Canadian Government for reciprocal tariff and immigration arrangements in connection with this project.

SEC. 2. The President is further requested to report to the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate, within 60 days following enactment of this resolution, progress achieved in effecting the purposes of this resolution.

## INVESTIGATION OF MATTERS AFFECTING THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION AND SUCCESSION

Mr. GREEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 14), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That there is

hereby created a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The joint committee shall select a chairman from among its members. A vacancy in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original appointment.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of all matters connected with the election of the President and Vice President from the time of the nomination of the President and Vice President, through the time of their election and the time of their inauguration until the termination of their respective terms of office, with the purpose of making the law certain as to the Presidential election and succession. These matters shall include, but shall not be confined to, the following:

(1) Whether or not the President and Vice President should be elected by the electoral college, as at present, and if so whether or not the members should be legally bound to vote in accordance with their instructions.

(2) Whether or not provision should be made for the case where before the election of Presidential electors, or after such time but before the election of President and Vice President, a candidate for the Presidency or for the Vice Presidency dies, declines to run, or is found ineligible to take office if elected.

(3) Whether or not provision should be made for the case of the death of any of the individuals from whom the House of Representatives may choose a President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them, and for the case of the death of any of the persons from whom the Senate may choose a Vice President whenever the right of choice shall have devolved upon them.

(4) How it shall be determined whether the President, or individual acting as President, is unable to execute the powers and duties of the office, and how the duration of such inability shall be determined.

(5) Whether or not provision should be made for an individual to execute the office of President in case of removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice President, where by reason of removal, death, resignation, or inability there is no individual upon whom the powers and duties of such office would otherwise automatically devolve.

(6) Whether there are, or should be, any differences between the status, powers, duties, and privileges of an elected President and any other individual executing the office of President.

SEC. 3. The joint committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, including drafts of legislation recommended and of any proposed constitutional amendments considered necessary or desirable. The joint committee shall submit its final report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than May 2, 1949, and thereupon the existence of the joint committee shall terminate.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this concurrent resolution, the joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Congress, to employ counsel, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

## INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS PERTAINING TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 45), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas the United States merchant marine, allied industries, and trained personnel therein are indispensable to national security; and

Whereas the reduction in ships flying the American flag is proceeding at an alarming rate; and

Whereas this places in jeopardy the employment of men skilled in repairing, constructing, and manning the United States merchant marine and creates the risk that skills and facilities will be unavailable in the event of national emergency; and

Whereas geographical dispersion and utilization of repair and construction facilities and the skilled manpower related thereto is essential to national defense and economy; and

Whereas the transfer of American ships and those of other countries to flags of certain nations jeopardizes world-wide stability of the maritime industry; undermines seafarers' and safety-at-sea standards; and deprives the United States Treasury of substantial tax revenues; and

Whereas revival of ship construction and operation in occupied countries is of legitimate interest to the United States merchant marine; and

Whereas participation of American bottoms in transporting United States financed cargoes has been threatened: First by failure of certain Government agencies to give proper consideration to the importance of maintaining an adequate United States merchant marine, and second by actual or proposed use, directly or indirectly, of funds and scarce materials to build or acquire ships for foreign nations; and

Whereas United States tramp operators confront problems which may require Government assistance for solution; and

Whereas there exists in and among the several agencies having jurisdiction over maritime matters, serious problems of coordination and efficiency; and

Whereas Congress, agencies affected, and industry have found no long-range solution to the problems of water transportation to Alaska, and coastwise and intercoastal shipping; and

Whereas shipping operations of the Armed Services bear a definite relationship to the present and future welfare of the United States merchant marine; and

Whereas there is urgent need for congressional study and expression of policy on these and related problems: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all such matters pertaining to the merchant marine as it may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## IDA RAFFEL KLAFF

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 46), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Ida Raffel Klaff, daughter of Louis Raffel, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## AMENDMENT TO REVENUE BILL

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to a bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. THOMAS of Utah submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

## PRINTING OF REPORT ON UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT (S. DOC. NO. 8)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there was transmitted to the Vice President today by Harry W. Bashore, the representative of the United States in the negotiations for a compact among the upper Basin States of the Colorado River, a report which includes the compact, which was entered into on the 11th of October 1948, and the recommendations of Mr. Bashore.

I ask unanimous consent that these documents may be printed as a Senate document for the use of Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CHANGES OF REFERENCES

Mr TYDINGS. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 32, a joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States

Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, was referred to the Armed Services Committee. However, the same joint resolution was considered by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at the last session of the Congress. It is true that a report from the War Department was required, to give the committee full information about it; but the purport of the joint resolution shows clearly that it should have been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Therefore, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to which the joint resolution was referred, I ask that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the change of reference will be made as requested.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, Senate bill 529, to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy, a bill introduced at the last session of the Congress, and again introduced in the Eighty-first Congress, was referred to the Finance Committee. Upon examination, it appears that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on Thursday last, Senate bill 672, to amend part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide entitlement to educational benefits for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted prior to October 6, 1945, on a same basis as for those individuals who enlisted or reenlisted within 1 year after October 6, 1945, was referred to the Finance Committee. I am advised that that was an inadvertence, and that the jurisdiction of the bill is in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, on the day upon which the President delivered his first message to the Congress in this session, and following that message, I introduced Senate Bill 152, to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos (New Mexico) project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, a bill which was prepared at the request of the Atomic Energy Commision for the purpose of retroceding certain lands in New Mexico back to the jurisdiction of the State of New Mexico.

I had done some work on it last summer, at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission; and I have in my possession the various departmental approvals of that particular bill. I introduced that bill as Senate bill 152.

Thereafter the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced a bill known as Senate bill 210. It is identical in verbiage with the bill I had previously introduced. I have no pride of authorship or concern about the measure, except that it be passed in orderly fashion.

But at the last meeting of the Senate, I noticed that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] requested the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], to whose committee both bills were referred, to consent to the discharge of his committee from the further consideration of Senate bill 210, and the reference of that bill to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The Senator from Wyoming, with his usual courtesy, and realizing that the bill did relate to atomic energy, said he would give such consent; and the requested change of reference was made, with the result that the bill now has been referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

However, no mention was made of the previous bill, Senate bill 152, which I had introduced. As I have said, Senate bill 210 is a comma-for-comma, sentence-for-sentence duplicate. Of course, as to that I make no complaint. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Wyoming, in whose committee now reposes my bill, Senate bill 152, whether he would have any objection to having a similar change of reference made in the case of Senate bill 152, which is identical with Senate bill 210. In that case Senate bill 152 would be referred, likewise, to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I believe that should be done because I believe that at least duplicate pieces of proposed legislation of that kind and on that subject are properly lodged with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I have not seen the Senator from Wyoming before, today, and this is my first opportunity to present the matter to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in giving the consent of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to the change of reference of Senate bill 210 at the last meeting of the Senate, let me say that it was the purpose and thought of the chairman of the committee that all bills dealing with that subject should be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I am sure I speak for the entire committee in saying that we have no objection to the requested change of reference of the Senator's bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is that the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 152, and it will be referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

### THE FUTURE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Future of the Republican Party," delivered by him at the McKinley Memorial, Niles, Ohio, January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### INTEGRATION OF COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on American policy favoring the integration of the countries of western Europe, delivered by Senator LODGE before the Maryland Bar Association at Baltimore, Md., on January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ADDRESS ON ATOMIC ENERGY BY SENATOR HICKENLOOPER

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on atomic energy delivered by Senator HICKENLOOPER before the Association of Commerce in Baltimore earlier this month, which appears in the Appendix.]

### ADDRESS BY SENATOR KNOWLAND AT KANSAS DAY DINNER

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Kansas Day dinner at Topeka, Kans., on January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### MEMORIAL ADDRESS ON FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator KEFAUVER at a memorial dinner for the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt on Friday, January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### LIMITATION OF DEBATE—STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAYBANK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement issued by him on January 28, 1949, on the subject of limitation of debate, which appears in the Appendix.]

### CLOTURE IN THE SENATE—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Republicans in Senate Seen Making Mistake in Favoring Cloture" written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

### THE NATIONAL HEALTH PROGRAM—LETTER FROM PAUL R. HAWLEY AND STATEMENT BY SENATOR LODGE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Dr. Paul R. Hawley, chief executive officer of the Blue Cross, together with a statement prepared by Senator LODGE, commenting upon the letter, which appear in the Appendix.]

### COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD certain newspaper editorials commenting on the constitutional amendment proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 2, which appear in the Appendix.]

### NEED OF INCENTIVES TO INVESTMENT—ARTICLE BY MRS. FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mrs. Franklin Delano Roosevelt dealing with the

need of incentives to investment, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY LUCIUS E. BURCH, JR.

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Lucius E. Burch, Jr., a corporation lawyer, discussing the subject of labor-management relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY RENAH F. CAMALIER TO GRADUATING CLASS OF ANACOSTIA HIGH SCHOOL

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Renah F. Camalier to the graduating class of Anacostia High School, in Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

A NATIONAL PROSPERITY BUDGET—ARTICLE BY LEON H. KEYSERLING

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "For a National Prosperity Budget" published in the New York Times magazine of January 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY—EDITORIAL FROM OMAHA EVENING WORLD-HERALD

[Mr. SALTONSTALL (for Mr. WHERRY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "God Hates a Coward" published in the Omaha, Nebr., Evening World-Herald of January 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

POST OFFICE DEFICITS—EDITORIAL FROM THE TRENTON EVENING TIMES

[Mr. HENDRICKSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Good Suggestion," published in the Trenton Evening Times of January 14, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PETER MARSHALL—ARTICLE BY TRIS COFFIN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to Peter Marshall, late Chaplain of the Senate, written by Tris Coffin and published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOREWORD TO THE MEMOIRS OF GEN. CLAIRE LEE CHENNAULT

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Foreword to the Memoirs of Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, written by him, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL FISHERIES COMMISSION—EDITORIAL FROM SEATTLE TIMES

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD, an editorial entitled "Nations Pull Together So Everybody's Happy," published in the Seattle Times of January 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

OPERATIONS OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION—LETTER FROM FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION OF SPOKANE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated January 21, 1949, from the Farm Credit Administration of Spokane, correcting certain impressions in an article from Life magazine of December 6, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR RETRENCHMENT IN FEDERAL EXPENDITURE—EDITORIAL FROM THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Are We Promising?" published in the Christian Century of January 26, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?—EDITORIAL FROM MILES CITY (MONT.) STAR

[Mr. ECTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Just Who Does Pay the Taxes?" published in the Miles City (Mont.) Daily Star of January 29, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIAL OF COMMUNIST LEADERS—ARTICLES BY VIVIAN MEIK

[Mr. WATKINS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles written by Vivian Meik, discussing the New York trial of Communist leaders, published in the Deseret Evening News, of Salt Lake City of January 18 and January 19, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO TO INDEPENDENT BROADCASTERS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address recently delivered by him before a group of independent broadcasters at Chicago, Ill., which appears in the Appendix.]

NATURAL RESOURCES—STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement on the subject of natural resources, made by him before the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on January 31, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED DENIAL OF MARSHALL PLAN AID TO THE NETHERLANDS—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Missions Parley Urges ERP to Cut Off Dutch," published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, January 26, 1949, was the anniversary date of the birth of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. On that date a testimonial dinner in commemoration of the event was given at Hotel Astor in New York City. At that time a scroll was prepared and ordered sent to the general. The general was advised in advance of the dinner, and sent a communication to those participating in the dinner.

I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a copy of the scroll, and likewise a copy of the reply sent by General MacArthur to the Veterans' and Citizens' Committee.

There being no objection, the scroll and the reply from General MacArthur were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TO GENERAL OF THE ARMY DOUGLAS MACARTHUR, SUPREME COMMANDER FOR THE ALLIED POWERS, TOKYO, JAPAN

Who chose to remain at his post of command in Tokyo rather than return to his homeland to receive a hero's acclaim from a grateful people and place himself immediately available for the nomination to the Presidency of the United States of America.

His sincere and forthright reply to invitations to return to Washington to testify on serious conditions in the Far East is best exemplified by his own words, "It would be peculiarly repugnant to me to have it felt that I sought to capitalize to political advantage the public good will which might manifest itself upon my first return to American soil following the victory which countless gallant Americans, living and dead, contributed by unfailing and invincible devotion." That document typifies the honor, statesmanship, and discipline which has always guided his distinguished career. It was a tribute to the memory of and the spiritual devotion he felt for the men of his command who made the supreme sacrifice.

His fearless leadership against the encroachment of communism and other subversive manifestations in the preservation of the true American way of life will ever remain a matchless contribution to the welfare of our country.

To Americans, and to history, the name of Douglas MacArthur will ever be an inspiration for love of God, duty, honor, country.

Presented by the Veterans and Citizens Committee on the birthday anniversary of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, at Hotel Astor, New York, N. Y., January 26, 1949.

---

Following radiogram received from Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the Veterans and Citizens Committee birthday dinner in his honor on January 26, at the Astor Hotel, New York City:

"I am profoundly moved by this gathering of fellow Americans on the anniversary of my birth in welcome manifestation of the strength of their friendship, the invincibility of their trust, and the enduring quality of this support. I accept it in humble gratitude, not only as a mark of valued friendship, but more particularly as a reconsecration of tried and true Americans resolutely to advance the American cause. For that cause is imperiled by enemies both at home and abroad who, by misrepresentation and deceit, sow the seeds of distrust, contention, and discord as the means to undermine the public confidence in the integrity of American effort, American efficiency, and American personnel. In the resulting confusion they hope to destroy the traditional unity of the American people. If our cause in the preservation and advance of human liberty is to prevail, complete unity of purpose is essential, with the maximum support of which Americans are capable—a deep spiritual support such as prompted Stephen Decatur so eloquently to pledge himself to 'My country, right or wrong, my country.'

"Standing on this outpost far from America's shores, with the vast continent of Asia aflame before the Communist sweep to engulf civilization's gains in the liberty and the dignity of man, and charged to preserve here an impenetrable western frontier for the forces of human freedom, the trust and support of my fellow Americans is, indeed, the source of my greatest strength.

"While unable to estimate the military potentialities because of the many yet undetermined and imponderable factors beyond my assessment or control, I can and do give complete assurance that with the firm spiritual support of the American people, this frontier outpost of democratic freedom, regardless of the tide of conflict upon the adjacent mainland, will not yield to political or social pressure, communism, or any other concept of enslavement. For the Japanese people are now blessed with a way of life, patterned after our own concepts of freedom and justice, which provides them with moral values which communism can neither offer nor supply; they will not fail to cherish and do all in their power to preserve it. This is well known to the local sponsors of the Communist doctrine who, despite complete freedom to propagate their cause under the protection of those very concepts they seek to destroy, have failed to gain converts among Japan's responsible citi-

zenry. It is even better known to their mentors in Moscow who, in an increasing sense of frustration at being unable to gain an ideological foothold, are coming to see goblins in every nook and cranny of this well-ordered and peaceful land.

"To all my friends and comrades in arms present, I send my cordial and affectionate greetings, and I gratefully acknowledge their rededication of American support to this distant American effort. Without that support, the American cause here could not prosper—this frontier of freedom could not survive.

"MACARTHUR."

PRICE AID TO DAIRYMEN—ARTICLE BY ALFRED D. STEDMAN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the St. Paul Pioneer Press, and written by Alfred D. Stedman, be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks on the question.

The dairy farmers throughout the United States who are dependent upon an outlet for their dairy products through the process of manufacture—such as butter, powdered milk, and powdered buttermilk—are meeting with ruinous low prices, and unless something is done immediately the young farmers will go broke, more especially the veterans who have commenced farming in the past few years, assuming great financial obligations in the purchase of machinery, livestock, and feed. With milk prices decreasing as they are, they will not be able to meet their obligations, and that means financial foreclosure and disaster for the veteran who has gone into the business of farming in the past 3 years. The article by Mr. Stedman covers the question so clearly that I should like to have Senators, as well as Members of the other legislative body, read it. For that reason I ask that it be incorporated in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLONS JOIN DAIRYMEN IN PRICE AID DEMAND

(By Alfred D. Stedman)

Four hundred harassed dairymen were joined by Minnesota legislators here Thursday in demanding that the Truman administration make good its pledge that the farmers will not again be the first victims of a postwar depression.

Mincing no words, they called on two top dairy officials of the United States Department of Agriculture to assure immediate, emergency Government action to stop the present slump in milk prices and save co-op and other dairy plants having backs to the wall.

The two administration spokesmen, Philip Nelson and Don S. Anderson, were told bluntly by dairymen and legislators assembled in the Capitol Office Building auditorium that the farm vote in the dairy States swung the recent Presidential election against Dewey and to Truman.

The farmers voted in expectation that the Truman administration pledges of price protection would be fulfilled. Now, when the dairymen are being forced up against it, is the time to make those pledges good, the Federal officials were told.

STEPS OUTLINED

Responding to those demands, the two officials who are, respectively, Director of the Production and Marketing Administration's Dairy Branch and Chief of its Manufactured Dairy Products Section, told the mass meeting these three things:

First. They believe the Secretary of Agriculture has discretionary power to establish a separate parity for manufacturing milk, as distinct from bottled milk, as the dairymen demanded.

Second. That an official search now is on in Washington for funds to finance Government buying to support country milk prices up to 90 percent of that new parity. (A support price of $3.11 a hundredweight as against recent bottom prices between $2.50 and $2.70 was discussed.)

Third. That the way for dairymen to have permanent price supports is to get together on a long-time program which provides funds and disposal outlets through school lunches, stamp plan, or otherwise for Government purchased products.

THIRD POINT IS HOT

Clearly calling for new dairy legislation, this third point was a "zinger." It plunged dairymen into the coming congressional scramble over amendments to the Aiken-Hope Act, one of whose provisions strikes out three little words allowing Government dairy price supports at more than 90 percent of parity in a pinch. In fact, official warnings were sounded to dairy, wheat, and other farmers that the administration likes room for flexibility of any Government farm price supports, is against inflexible and mandatory supports, and also is against piling up huge surpluses in the Federal hands without having definite, legal methods of disposing of those surpluses.

Three Minnesota farm legislative leaders, State Senators Ancher Nelsen and Oscar A. Swenson, and Representative August B. Mueller, served notice that the Minnesota Legislature will take a hand in the budding fight for a better deal for dairymen.

TOO MANY PLEDGES

Also it was Senator Swensen, Fred Rohe, president of the Twin City Milk Producers Association, and Frank Stone, Land O'Lakes Creameries executive, who laid the Truman administration's political responsibilities to Midwest dairymen on the line.

"The situation is especially embarrassing to me," said Rohe, "because I happen to be a Democrat. We Democrats made altogether too many pledges before election. Now we've got to keep them. If this price drop had come before November 2 this whole thing could have been settled in 10 minutes."

"If these same farmers that elected Truman are going to repeat 4 years from now, there will have to be a dairy program to help them," warned Senator Swenson.

From W. A. Gordon, editor of the Dairy Record, and Harry R. Leonard, chairman of the board of the American Dry Milk Institute, both of St. Paul, who called the meeting, came these warnings:

The recent drop of farm prices for milk from $4.50 a hundredweight to $2.50 or $2.70 means that dairymen are face to face with a critical situation. A basic trouble, they said, is that the Government's present method of averaging in $6 eastern bottled milk prices with the Midwestern $2.50 prices and interpreting the average to mean that farmers are getting more than parity is a severe discrimination against this region. It is like averaging up a barefooted man with a man wearing $20 shoes and saying both are well shod on an average of $10 shoes.

NEED HELP QUICK

The Government help must be immediate if it is to save many dairies in Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Iowa, the meeting heard. But with quick action a good recovery is possible, dairymen said, because of basically sound demand for dairy products.

The situation now is such that Midwest dairymen have been heavily selling their cows to eastern dairymen. These in turn have been expanding production in response to the much higher prices there, and putting their surpluses into manufactured dairy products in competition with Midwestern dairymen who sold them cows in the first place. This is a process which is complicated by recent increases in railroad freight rates, and by steadily rising costs of production on farms and in creameries, cheese factories, and milk powder plants that buy milk for manufacturing.

BUTTER AID NOT ENOUGH

Speakers brought out that the Government practically forced dairymen to go heavily into powder production to meet war needs. So supporting powdered milk prices is the Government's moral responsibility now, dairymen declared. Just supporting butter prices alone won't do the protection job, they declared.

The frankness and unfailing good humor with which the two Federal officials answered questions made a hit with the crowd of very earnest dairy farmers and manufacturing plant executives.

Arrangements are being made now to carry the dairymen's case to Washington with representations at the White House, the Department of Agriculture, and Congress.

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further concurrent and other resolutions or routine matters, the morning business is concluded, and, under the unanimous-consent order of Thursday last, the Chair lays before the Senate as the unfinished business Senate bill 547, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me in order that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, without displacing the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) be taken up for present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the joint resolution for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That section 2 of the joint resolution of June 25, 1948 (Public Law 769, 80th Cong.), entitled "Joint resolution permitting the free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and for other purposes," is hereby amended by striking out "December 31, 1948" and by inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. The resolution was passed in the Eightieth Congress. It merely permits the

entry into the United States of the so-called Thank-You Train sent by the people and the Government of France. The joint resolution is simply to provide an extension of time. The train having been delayed, it is now expected to arrive in New York over the week end. The joint resolution was passed by the House unanimously, and was recommended by the Senate Finance Committee. I ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia requests unanimous consent, without displacing the unfinished business, that the Senate take up for immediate consideration the joint resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, let me ask the Senator from Georgia, in the event the joint resolution extends the time for entry, do the goods ultimately have to go out of the country again, or do they remain here permanently?

Mr. GEORGE. They remain permanently in the country, I may say to the Senator. The goods that come in are to be sent to the capitals of the several States, there sold, and the proceeds devoted to charity. Certain railroad cars in which the goods are loaded will remain in the country, but they cannot be disposed of to any commercial enterprise, and, under the terms of the resolution or of the report accompanying it, they are to be turned over to veteran organizations in the several States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Thank You Train is merely a good-will train; we have already passed one resolution, and the train was delayed. The present joint resolution is to extend the time?

Mr. GEORGE. That is all there is to the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## RELIEF OF STORM-STRICKEN AREAS IN THE WEST

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Without displacing the unfinished business, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it was necessary for me to be absent from the Senate at the last session when the bill was introduced and passed for the relief of the storm-stricken areas in the West. I want to add my hearty approval to the action which was taken by the Senate, and that which no doubt will be taken also by the House today. In the meantime, the President himself has come to the rescue of the people in the stricken area. I, for one, want to express my heartfelt approval of the action which was taken by the President in the issuance of a letter dated January 29, addressed to the Secretary of Defense, which I think should be made a part of the RECORD at this time. I may state that the storm damage still continues and is pronounced by everyone in that area who is familiar with it to be by far the most destructive storm the western country has ever experienced. There is no way to estimate the damage, but now that, through the orders of the President, the Army and all other Federal agencies are cooperating on the job, we feel that everything is being done that can be done to afford relief.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, January 29, 1949.*

The honorable the SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The disaster caused by the unprecedented storms in several of the Western States makes it imperative that the full resources of the Federal Government be mobilized immediately to furnish such emergency assistance as can be made available through the various Federal agencies.

Acting through any department, agency, officer, or employee of the National Military Establishment as you may designate, you are authorized and directed to utilize such resources of the National Military Establishment as are appropriate to the relief of this area, based on requests by the Federal Works Administrator, whom I have designated as the coordinator of Federal relief activities in the disaster area.

The departments of the National Military Establishment are authorized and directed to expend such sums as are required for this purpose from any funds now available to those departments, including funds available for river and harbor and flood-control works of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, without regard for existing apportionments. I will transmit to the Congress a request for such appropriations as may be considered necessary to replace such funds of the departments of the National Military Establishment as may be used for this purpose.

A copy of this letter is being furnished to General Fleming for his information and guidance.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

## IRVINE L. LENROOT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. Without displacing the unfinished business, I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I am asking the distinguished Senator to yield for a few moments, in order that I may say a few words in relation to the passing of a former distinguished Member of this body, Senator Lenroot; and I ask that the unfinished business be not displaced.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, for the purpose stated?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I rise to pay a few words of deep respect in tribute to a great former member of this body, the Honorable Irvine L. Lenroot, who has gone on ahead in the journey which all mortals must take. As Nancy Byrd Turner says—

Death is only an old door
Set in a garden wall.
On gentle hinges it gives, at dusk,
When the thrushes call.
Along the lintel are green leaves,
Beyond, the light lies still.
Very willing and weary feet
Go over that sill.
There is nothing to trouble any heart,
Nothing to hurt at all.
Death is only a quiet door
In an old wall.

The story of Irvine Lenroot, United States Senator from Wisconsin, who started as a grocery clerk in Superior, is truly an American saga. Irvine Lenroot, who would have been 80 years old today, could look back to a great career in the service of his State and his Nation.

I first knew Irvine Lenroot back home, 40 years ago, and in all my contacts with him during these years, I always felt a deep sense of pride that the Badger State had reared so great and self-made a statesman.

The late Senator Lenroot served in the Wisconsin State Assembly from 1900 to 1906; in the House of Representatives from 1908 to 1918; and in the United States Senate from 1918 to 1926. These are, however, the bare facts which can hardly tell the memorable saga of Irvine Lenroot's contributions to his Nation. The newspapers have recorded the closeness with which he approached nomination to the Vice Presidency in 1920. They have recorded how former Senator Lenroot, who served for many years with distinction as an able captain to the Honorable Robert M. La Follette, Sr., later broke with Senator La Follette over the war issue, and thereafter parted the ways with this other great son of Wisconsin. Theirs was a difference of opinion as wide and as deep as had been their friendship and harmony previously. But although they did part in political ways, these two great sons of Wisconsin showed how men can differ with one another in opinion, but still have a great respect for one another in the true American way.

Members of the Senate knew Irvine Lenroot as a splendid debater and able parliamentarian, a diligent worker, an independent in voting. It was he who led the successful fight for American adherence to the World Court. It was he who championed the St. Lawrence seaway for many years in this body.

Later, following his retirement from the Senate, he served with distinction in the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Mark Twain said, in answer to the question of how to take this life:

How to take life? Take it just as though it was—as it is—an earnest, vital, and important affair. Take it as though you were born for the task of performing a merry part of it—as though the world awaited your coming. Take it as though it were a grand opportunity to do and achieve, to carry forward great and good schemes, to help and cheer a suffering, weary, and, it may be, a heartbroken world.

Mr. President, I had the privilege of visiting with former Senator and later Judge Lenroot in his home in this city on a number of occasions. I knew him from the days when he was a young, vital, dynamic character in Wisconsin, working for those concepts which have since been called progressivism. As the years came and passed, he mellowed, and saw that in this world men with differing ideas could be right. His philosophy of life was of the kind we need in order to guide our own steps as we progress.

So it might be said of him:

Let us not think of our departed dead
As caught and cumbered in these graves of earth;
But think of death as of another birth.
As a new freedom for the wings outspread.

A new adventure waiting on ahead,
As a new joy of more ethereal mirth,
As a new world with friends of nobler worth,
Where all may taste a more immortal bread.

Senator Lenroot leaves behind him a great record of which his family and his State may be proud. Father of a distinguished daughter, Katharine Lenroot, Director of the Children's Bureau; uncle of another distinguished bearer of the family name, Arthur A. Lenroot, Jr., of Superior, State senator in Madison, Senator Lenroot also leaves behind him a brother, sister, and devoted wife.

Speaking of his passing, the Milwaukee Journal has stated:

In the traditional American sense, Irvine L. Lenroot was a self-made man. Without wealth, powerful friends, or formal education, he fought his way to the State legislature, to the House of Representatives, to the United States Senate, and almost to the Presidency of his country.

Irvine Lenroot was a strong man, an able man, and a friendly man. He was a brilliant debater, and excellent parliamentarian. On occasion he showed a remarkable independence. He rates in the upper bracket of men Wisconsin has sent to the United States Senate.

The Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter has stated:

Mr. Lenroot has long been away from the Wisconsin scene. But he was a native son of the Badger State, which loses one of its really great leaders in his death. * * * The Lenroot family helped to pioneer much of the legislation which has made Wisconsin a leader in the social-security field.

We bid hail and farewell only to his physical presence from this scene because we know that the spirit of devotion to the land to which his father and mother emigrated from Sweden, this spirit of faithfulness and loyalty to the American way of life, to the United States Congress, and to the American institution of government—this spirit of Irvine Lenroot will go on for all time to come.

If I could sing the song within my heart
Of loves immortal, gates of death and birth,
And sleeps and wakings; if I could impart
Some measure of my gladness to the earth,
And men could understand and know it true,
This consciousness that thrills me through and through.

This memory of never-broken being,
This vision seen and yet beyond all seeing,
More joy were mine than since the world began
Because of joy that I could give to man.

If I these sweet assurances could tell
And show how clear and certain is the truth;
If I could bring all souls beneath the spell
Of spirit in its never-ending youth;
If I could give what God to me has given
And prove it as it has been proved to me,
'Twould make the earth seem nearer unto heaven
Than ever it has seemed since Galilee.

And can I not? Will not the power divine
That works in other spirits as in mine
Help me to tell, and then to hear, the story
Until all earth is brightened with its glory?

## VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has considered S. 547, has reported favorably on that bill, and has recommended that the bill pass.

S. 547 would extend through September 30, 1949, section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress. This action provides that the President may consult with representatives of industry, business, and agriculture, with a view to making voluntary agreements providing, among other things, for "priority allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production."

After the approval of such agreements by the Attorney General, the President may request compliance with them and actions taken in compliance with such requests are exempted from the provisions of the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act.

The purposes for which these voluntary agreements may be entered into are, as stated in section 1 of Public Law 395—

to aid in stabilizing the economy of the United States, to aid in curbing inflationary tendencies, to promote the orderly and equitable distribution of goods and facilities, and to aid in preventing maldistribution of goods and facilities which basically affect the cost of living or industrial production.

The President, under Executive Order 9919, of January 3, 1948, delegated this authority under section 2 of Public Law 395 to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Defense Transportation.

The Department of Commerce has had considerable success in formulating and carrying out voluntary plans for the allocation of steel and pig iron for various essential purposes.

At the present time the Department of Commerce has 14 of these voluntary plans in effect, and is about to put into effect 2 more. These plans, and the tonnage of steel or pig iron allocated under them for February 1949, are as follows:

*Voluntary allocation plans*

| Purpose | Monthly tonnage (as of February 1949) | |
|---|---|---|
| | Steel | Pig iron |
| 1. Freight cars | 250,000 | ---- |
| 2. Atomic Energy Commission projects | 22,265 | ---- |
| 3. Warm-air heating equipment | 31,622 | ---- |
| 4. Housing products | ---- | 102,525 |
| 5. Factory-made steel houses (59,000 tons total) | [1] 9,835 | ---- |
| 6. Anthracite industry | 2,570 | ---- |
| 7. Armed forces | 102,505 | ---- |
| 8. Barges and towing vessels | 25,000 | ---- |
| 9. Tank and oil-field production equipment | 16,530 | ---- |
| 10. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 1,926 | ---- |
| 11. Oil tankers | 40,380 | ---- |
| 12. Merchant vessels | 15,415 | ---- |
| 13. Mining machinery | 26,400 | ---- |
| 14. Manganese ore cars (13,000 tons total) | [1] 2,192 | ---- |
| 15. Pipe line for Oak Ridge (25,500 tons total) | [1] 4,750 | ---- |
| 16. Farm-type grain storage bins (50,400 tons total) | [1] 8,400 | ---- |
| Total tonnage | 559,790 | 102,525 |

[1] Average.

In addition to these plans, the Department of Commerce has under consideration other proposals to set up plans for the allocation of steel to the Economic Cooperation Administration countries and to distressed municipalities needing steel for important public health and welfare needs, and possible additional provisions for housing and for the armed forces. The possibility of additional assistance to increase the production of such scarce materials as aluminum was discussed at the hearing.

While these programs have not by any means solved all the problems arising out of shortages of materials, they have accomplished very desirable results in directing scarce steel and pig iron to uses important to our domestic economy and to our national security.

At the hearing the committee inquired at length into the operations under section 2 of Public Law 395, and the way in which these voluntary plans have been formulated and carried out, with particular reference to the consideration given to small business and the effects on small business.

The testimony revealed that several steps occur in the formulation of these plans.

When the Department of Commerce, either on its own initiative or at the request of a steel-consuming industry, reaches the conclusion that a plan seems appropriate, it calls a general meeting of the consuming industry, to which all members, or a substantial cross section, of the industry are invited. The proposal is discussed generally, and if the sentiment of those present is in favor of the proposal, suggestions are requested from those present as to possible members of an industry advisory committee.

Industry advisory committees are selected by the Secretary of Commerce. The order under which these committees are set up provides that—

The committees are formed of representatives of the minimum number of companies necessary to represent a fair cross section of the industry from the standpoints of (1) large, medium, and small companies; (2) geographical distribution; (3) trade-association membership; and (4) segments of industry (types of products, degree of integration, etc.). In forming industry advisory committees, the Department of Commerce will be governed by the principles of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.) and the President's memorandum to heads of executive departments and agencies of December 12, 1947, with respect to the representation of small business on Government committees.

After a voluntary plan has been worked out by the Department of Commerce, in consultation with the industry advisory committee of the consuming industry and the industry advisory committee of the steel-producing industry, a public hearing is held to which the public is invited. Notice of these hearings is given in the Federal Register and by press release. Consideration is given to any changes needed in the light of the public hearing.

The plan is then forwarded to the Department of Justice, for the approval of the Attorney General. Representatives of the Department of Justice are invited to all the meetings, and work closely with the Department of Commerce in the formulation of these plans.

If the Attorney General approves the plan, written requests are made by the Secretary of Commerce for compliance with the plan. The plans, and the requests, are then published in the Federal Register in accordance with the law.

I have here a copy of the Commerce Department order setting up this procedure, which I ask permission to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the close of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, at all stages of the formulation of a plan, at the preliminary general meeting, the meetings of the industry advisory committees, and at the public hearings, full opportunity is given to small business to cooperate in the formulation and approval of the plan.

In the operation of the plan small business is also given a full opportunity to participate. Allocations are made by the Secretary of Commerce, after taking into consideration recommendations of a task committee of the consuming industry; these allocations are based on the capacity of the individual firm and its production plans for the product covered by the program, as well as its past production. An outstanding example of this principle was discussed at the hearing, the warm-air heating industry. In that case some 43 concerns, all small business with little or no historical base, did not apply for any steel at the time the plan was promulgated. The problem was presented to the Steel Products Committee and an additional 2,000 tons of steel a month was made available to these small firms.

I have here a table prepared by the Office of Industry Cooperation of the Department of Commerce showing the number of large and small firms receiving steel under 10 of the programs, showing the amount of steel going to large and small firms, and also showing the percentage of the amount requested which was allocated to the large and medium firms on the one hand and to the small firms on the other hand.

In terms of number of participants in these programs small business firms range from 28 percent, in the case of freight cars, to 86 percent in the case of the steel house program. In the case of six programs, 75 percent or more of the participating firms are classified as small business.

The tonnage going to small firms varies from 7 percent in the case of the anthracite program to 29 percent in the case of pig iron for housing products.

In the case of three programs small business received a larger proportion of the amount requested than did large or medium firms. In the case of four programs small firms received a somewhat smaller proportion of what they requested than did large or medium firms. In the case of three other programs the proportion was virtually the same.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or would he rather wait until the end of his statement?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should rather wait until I have concluded, if the Senator does not mind.

Mr. President, I ask that the table to which I have just been referring also be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the committee heard two witnesses, representatives of small firms receiving steel under the tank and oil-field production-equipment program, who testified as to the benefits they had received under the program, as well as the benefits of the program to the oil industry.

It appeared, therefore, that while the plans are designed to carry out programs essential to the domestic economy and the national security rather than specifically to assist small business as such, full consideration is being given to small business in the formulation of these voluntary plans and in their operation, and that many small firms have been benefited greatly by the operations of the program.

The voluntary agreements promulgated by the Department of Commerce provide, in accordance with the law, that they terminate on or before March 1, 1949. In accordance with a ruling of the Attorney General, however, provisions have been made for a wind-up period of 6 months under section 2 (f) of the law. This wind-up period is of limited effectiveness, as no amendments or modifications can be made during that period. This would reduce substantially the benefits of the existing plans. Furthermore, no new plans can be entered into under this provision, and it would be impossible even to consider the pending proposals for the Economic Cooperation Administration for municipal programs and for increased assistance for housing and the armed services.

I am advised that a broader stabilization program will be submitted to the Congress. Pending consideration of this broader program, the proposed temporary extension of section 2 of Public Law 395 should be promptly enacted in order that the important benefits of the voluntary program to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign pclicy of the United States may be preserved.

EXHIBIT 1

TITLE 15—COMMERCE

SUBTITLE A—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

*Part 11—Organization and functions of the Office of the Secretary*

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

SEC. 11.11. Voluntary agreements under Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress—(a) Consultation with industry and the public under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress: Under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, the President is authorized to consult representatives of business and agriculture with a view to making certain voluntary agreements and to approve and request compliance with such agreements. Executive Order 9919 (13 F. R. 59) delegates this authority to various officials, including the Secretary of Commerce. This Executive order also provides that consultation with industry may be through representative industry advisory committees and that an opportunity shall be given to industry, labor, and the public generally to present their views with reference to a proposed agreement or plan.

(b) Organization of industry advisory committees: As the purpose of industry advisory committees formed under this section is to give advice to the Department of Commerce on proposed voluntary agreements and plans affecting an industry, their members are selected so as to assure that the advice so obtained will represent the viewpoint of all parts of the industry. The committees are formed of representatives of the minimum number of companies necessary to represent a fair cross section of the industry from the standpoints of (1) large, medium, and small companies; (2) geographical distribution; (3) trade-association membership; and (4) segments in the industry (types of products, degree of integration, etc.). In forming industry advisory committees, the Department of Commerce will be governed by the principles of Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.), and the President's memorandum to heads of executive departments and agencies of December 12, 1947, with respect to the representation of small business on Government committees (appendix A attached). To promote free discussion, different levels of production and distribution are generally represented by

separate industry advisory committees consisting of customers and suppliers. The membership of industry advisory committees is checked with compliance proceedings of the Department of Commerce in accordance with the policy of suspending or removing from the committee members who are found in violation of Department of Commerce orders and regulations. Members of committees pay their own expenses and are entitled to no compensation for their services as committee members.

(c) Functions of industry advisory committees: The functions of an industry advisory committee formed by the Department of Commerce under this section are to furnish information, to give advice, and to make recommendations to the Department of Commerce, at regular committee meetings, on problems affecting the industry either in connection with the formulation of a proposed voluntary agreement or plan or in connection with an existing voluntary agreement or plan. In order to eliminate any question as to the propriety of the activities of these industry advisory committees under the antitrust laws, the activities of these committees are limited strictly to those specified (see the Attorney General's letter of January 29, 1948; appendix B). No other activities by these industry advisory committees or by their members are sponsored or authorized by the Department of Commerce under this section. These industry advisory committees are not authorized to determine policies for the industry nor are they authorized to compel or coerce any person to enter into any voluntary agreement or plan or to compel or coerce any person to comply with any request or order made by the Department of Commerce.

(d) Industry advisory committee meetings: Industry advisory committee meetings will be called by the Department of Commerce when a voluntary agreement or plan is under consideration or at any other time when the advice of an affected industry is appropriate in connection with a voluntary agreement or plan. The agenda of the meeting will be prepared by the Department of Commerce. Representatives of interested agencies of the Government will be invited by the Department of Commerce. If a member of a committee is unable to attend a meeting, he may suggest the name of another representative of the same organization to serve as his alternate for that meeting, and as a general rule the Department of Commerce will invite the suggested alternate to that meeting. A representative of the Department of Commerce will preside at every committee meeting. The Department of Commerce will keep minutes of each meeting, and will make summaries available to members of the committee, and the industry and the trade press, and will issue press releases concerning the meeting.

(e) Hearings on proposed agreements and plans: In order to carry out the requirement of Executive Order 9919 that an opportunity shall be given to industry, labor, and the public generally to present their views with respect to a proposed agreement or plan, the Department of Commerce has adopted the policy of holding a public hearing at which such views may be presented. Notice of such a hearing will be given by publication in the Federal Register, by press release, and by any other method considered appropriate by the Department of Commerce. The notice will include a statement of the time, place, and nature of the hearing, and either the substance of the proposed plan or agreement or a description of the subjects and issues involved. The notice will ordinarily provide that persons who desire to participate in the hearing must file in advance a written notice of appearance and that persons failing to file such written notice in advance will not be heard unless good cause is shown. The scope, time, or place of a hearing for which notice has been given may be changed when necessary. Reasonable notice will be given of the hearing and of any changes. Ordinarily the time set will not be less than 10 days nor more than 15 days from the publication in the Federal Register of the notice of hearing. The hearing will be conducted by an official of the Department of Commerce as hearing officer. The hearing officer will regulate the course of the hearing, including the order in which statements may be presented and the length of time to be allowed for making oral statements. He may adjourn or continue the hearing to a later date or different place and will receive written statements and memoranda at the hearing or within such time after the hearing as he may determine. Such statements and memoranda should be filed in triplicate. The hearing will be informal in nature. A stenographic transcript or summary will be made of the proceedings. After the close of the hearing, the hearing officer will prepare and file a report with the Secretary's office summarizing the statements made at the hearing and will file with his report all written statements presented in connection with the hearing.

(f) Requests for compliance with voluntary agreements and plans: When a proposed voluntary agreement or plan under section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, has been formulated by the Department of Commerce with the advice of the appropriate industry advisory committee or committees and after a public hearing has been held, the Secretary of Commerce may forward his favorable recommendation of the proposed agreement or plan to the Attorney General for the latter's approval, together with the statement of facts required by Executive Order 9919. If the Attorney General approves the agreement or plan the Secretary of Commerce, upon giving his final approval, will make written request to carry out and comply with the agreement or plan to each concern which is to take action under it. The agreement or plan and the requests will be published in the Federal Register and forwarded to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives by the Attorney General in accordance with Public Law 395. (Pub. Law 395, 80th Cong., Executive Order 9919, Jan. 3, 1948, 13 F. R. 59.)

Issued this 30th day of January 1948.

[SEAL] W. A. HARRIMAN,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

---

APPENDIX A

MEMORANDUM TO THE HEADS OF EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS AND ESTABLISHMENTS

Senate Concurrent Resolution 14 (80th Cong.) provided

"That the Congress recognize the valid claim of the small-business men of America to equal representation as an entity with labor, agriculture, and other groups, on those Government commissions, boards, committees, or other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected; and that the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, and other officers of the Government be, and hereby are, respectfully urged to accord the small-business men of America representation on such Government agencies including particularly policy-making bodies created by Executive appointment."

In determining whether a business is a small business for the purpose of this resolution, the appointing agency should consider the relative size and position of the business in relation to the industry, the nature of its area of operation, the size of the group supplying capital and holding ownership and control, and the independence of its management.

As an alternative guiding principle for the appointing agency, a business may be considered a small business if it is a business enterprise, or a group of business enterprises under common ownership or control, which is not dominant in its field and which:

(a) If a manufacturing enterprise, has 100 employees or less; or

(b) If a wholesale establishment, has less than $500,000 annual net sales volume; or

(c) If a retail, service, hotel, amusement, construction, or other enterprise not included under (a) or (b), has annual net sales or receipts of less than $100,000; or

(d) If engaged in two or more separate types of businesses, does not exceed the maximum applicable under either (a), (b), or (c) to any of such businesses.

The heads of the executive departments and establishments should bear in mind the will of Congress as shown by this resolution when asking appointments to commissions, boards, committees, and other agencies in which the interests of the American economy may be affected.

The appointment of representatives of small business should be made in such a manner as to provide the small-business man an equal opportunity for representation along with labor, agriculture, and other groups on those Government commissions.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*December 12, 1947.*

---

APPENDIX B

JANUARY 29, 1948.

Hon. W. AVERELL HARRIMAN,
*Secretary, Department of Commerce,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SECRETARY HARRIMAN: I have received the annexed procedures, which you propose to adopt in connection with the operations of the Department of Commerce under Public Law 395 and Executive Order 9919.

In my opinion, the procedures which you propose are appropriate under Public Law 395 and Executive Order 9919. Under such procedures the functions of industry advisory committees are limited to the furnishing of information and advice to your Department in connection with proposed voluntary plans and agreements and related matters at regular committee meetings. Such committees do not have any authority to determine policies for the industry. Neither the committees nor any of their members have authority to compel or coerce any person to enter into a voluntary plan or agreement or to compel or coerce any person to comply with any request or order made by the Department of Commerce.

I wish to advise you that the activities of industry advisory committees in conformity with your proposed procedures and within the limitations contained therein would not constitute a violation of the Federal antitrust laws. I believe it would be appropriate, however, to make clear to any persons whom you appoint as members of an industry advisory committee that their membership on such committee does not create any immunity under the Federal antitrust laws for any other activities which might be in contravention of those laws.

Sincerely yours,

TOM C. CLARK,
*Attorney General.*

(13 Federal Register 495)

EXHIBIT 2

*Approximate small-business participation in certain voluntary programs*

| Program allocation | Number of consumer participants | | | Allocations made (monthy unless otherwise noted) | | | | Allocations requested (monthly unless otherwise noted) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of large and medium firms | Number of small firms | Percent of small firms | Tons | Tonnage to large and medium firms | Percent of tonnage to small firms | Tonnage to small firms | Tonnage requests, large and medium firms | Tonnage requests, small firms | Percent of requests allocated to large and medium firms | Percent of requests allocated to small firms |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) |
| Steel houses | 1 | 6 | 86 | [1] 53,415 | 42,395 | 21 | 11,020 | 79,600 | 15,451 | 53 | 71 |
| Tank and oil-field production equipment | 6 | 18 | 75 | 18,530 | 14,469 | 22 | 4,061 | 18,492 | 4,467 | 75 | 90 |
| Warm-air heating | 74 | 268 | 78 | [1] 238,364 | 173,812 | 28 | 64,552 | 347,956 | 163,056 | 50 | 40 |
| Anthracite | 24 | 31 | 56 | 2,570 | 2,232 | 7 | 164 | 2,232 | 164 | 100 | 100 |
| Mining machinery | 51 | 79 | 61 | 26,400 | 22,430 | 15 | 3,865 | 23,767 | 4,500 | 94 | 86 |
| Housing products (pig iron) | 20 | 88 | 81 | 103,730 | 73,195 | 29 | 30,535 | 104,937 | 51,409 | 70 | 60 |
| Freight cars | 183 | 72 | 28 | 247,980 | 224,886 | 9 | 23,094 | 280,574 | 26,523 | 80 | 87 |
| Barges | 18 | 70 | 80 | 24,760 | 20,818 | 16 | 3,942 | 29,465 | [2] 6,745 | 71 | 58 |
| Tankers [3] | 9 | 10 | 53 | 40,380 | 34,745 | 14 | 5,772 | 36,024 | 5,983 | 96 | 96 |
| Merchant vessels [4] | 7 | 22 | 75 | 15,415 | 11,882 | 23 | 3,533 | 12,621 | 3,795 | 94 | 93 |

[1] Cumulative tonnage for program period.
[2] Tonnage applications were excessive in comparison with actual orders on hand by some small firms.
[3] Figures shown combine new construction firms and repair firms.
[4] Data combined for repair, reconstruction, and reconversion.

Source: Department of Commerce, Office of Industry Cooperation, Jan. 27, 1949.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to Senate bill 547. I move to strike out "September 30, 1949", in line 6, and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1950"; to strike out "September 30, 1949", in line 9, and insert in lieu thereof "March 31, 1950."

Mr. President, the purpose of the amendments is to continue the voluntary allocation controls for a full year from the expiration date of the present law. Senate bill 547 would continue them for a period of 6 months. Under the bill there could be an end of the program 6 months after the expiration of the authority to enter into the voluntary agreements.

When this matter was under consideration at the last session there was skepticism as to whether or not the plan would work. It was generally understood that the most imperative need was in the field of steel and steel production, the allocation of steel to various starved industries which were dependent upon steel in the fabrication and foundry business.

At the hearing on Senate bill 547 the Secretary of Commerce came before the committee and brought to our attention the fact that the voluntary allocation program has been working very effectively; that the Department is satisfied with the cooperation of industry, which was generally entered into the program; that the only program they have put into effect has been in the steel industry, that they are now studying the aluminum industry, the production and distribution of aluminum, to determine whether there is a desire or any need for the program in that field. Generally conditions have improved throughout the country, prices have come down, production has increased, and the result is that the only program put into effect has been in the steel industry.

Mr. President, the Secretary of Commerce testified that there is need for continuing the program as long as there is a shortage of steel. His figures were to the effect that this year there would be a shortage of 7,000,000 tons of production under demand in this country, taking into consideration the need for 4,200,000 tons in the export field.

Representatives from small business also came before our committee, particularly from the outlying sections of the country and the far West, which before this program was put into effect had been practically starved out of the field of steel production and steel processing. They testified that the voluntary allocation program under the Department of Commerce, administered through the industry generally, has been very effective, and as the result of the program they have had sufficient steel to establish or reestablish themselves in business and continue their production effectively.

The bill, S. 547, would continue the authority for a period of only 6 months. My amendment would continue the authority for a period of 1 year. At that time, March 31, 1950, the Congress will be in session. We would have the advantage of another year of production. We would then be in a position to know whether prices have actually stabilized, as it is indicated at the present time they are going to stabilize. We would know then what world needs might be.

As an indication of the fluctuations in the world's demands for steel in the past few years, it was estimated 2 years ago that there would be a need for 6,600,000 tons for the past year, 1948. The demand for steel in the export field dropped from the 6,600,000 tons in the year 1947 to 4,400,000 tons in 1948. The Department of Commerce estimated that there would be a need in the export field of only 4,200,000 tons in 1949. The production in Europe, in the Ruhr, in France, in Belgium and in England, is such as to give encouragement that the export need for the year 1949 will be even less than the figure of 4,400,000 tons estimated by the Secretary of Commerce.

With respect to the steel production in this country, some very significant facts are now apparent in the record to indicate that the steel industry may be able this year to meet practically the total demand not only in this country but for export purposes as well. The Secretary of Commerce, as I have stated, testified that there is a gap of 7,000,000 tons. His production figures were based upon an increase this year of 2,300,000 tons, as I recall. The industry generally believes—and these are the figures from the Steel Institute—that there will be an increase in steel production in this country this year of between three and four million tons if there is uninterrupted production. Of course the only thing that will interrupt the production of the steel mills which are now operating at actual capacity will be something in the nature of a strike, or may be the cutting off of the manganese supply without replacement of it, as is threatened at the present time. But in the absence of those factors entering into the full production program in 1949, the Steel Institute estimates that the steel industry will be able to produce steel ingots to the total capacity of 92,000,000 tons, and if the January production, for which we already have the records, shall be continued throughout the year, there will be a total production of 97,000,000 tons of steel ingots, an unprecedented production in the steel industry for all time.

Compare that with 1948. In 1948, 88,533,729 tons of steel were produced, as against 92,000,000 tons anticipated in 1949. There were 60,848,000 tons of pig iron produced in 1948, as against an estimated 68,000,000 tons this year, if there is uninterrupted production in the steel field. So we can look forward, I think, to a production that will within a year's time meet the demands generally, domestically and in the foreign field.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that by the end of the year there will be proof that there is no need for any compulsory controls, such as suggested in the committee, such as has been suggested by the administration, and that at the end of the year it will be perfectly apparent, if the present program of production is continued, if the present world-wide trend continues, and if increased production in foreign countries, in which there is the most imperative demand, con-

tinues as it is at the present time—and we have no reason to think that it will not continue—that by the end of the coming year, or by March 31, 1950, there will be no need at all for any kind of controls, either voluntary or compulsory.

So with that in mind, and with the Secretary of Commerce, the representatives of small business, and the administrator of the program testifying fully as to adequacy of voluntary allocation and its success in the field, I think that we in the Congress should continue the present arrangement for another year, until the Congress is in session, and that we may then take a look at the whole field of production and of world-wide demand, as well as the domestic demand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I wish to ask the Senator from Ohio one question. He said that the supply of steel might be stopped in two ways; first, by labor difficulties and, second, by shortage of raw material. Would the Senator be willing to go a little more in detail into the second phase, the possible shortage of raw material?

Mr. BRICKER. The raw material involved is manganese, and we are threatened at the present time with a cutting off of the supply from Russia. The supply coming from Russia is approximately 25 percent of the need for manganese in the country for the finished products. There are adequate supplies available in other places. It is a question whether they can be made available soon enough if the supply from Russia is cut off; whether there may be a slowing down or a drag on the production of steel between the time Russian supplies may be stopped and arrangements can be made, with the aid of the Government, to furnish an adequate and timely replacement of the Russian shipments if they should be cut off.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say in addition to my previous statement that the committee held hearings on the pending legislation only on the point of whether the voluntary arrangement should be extended through September 30. No hearings were held by the committee respecting whether the arrangement should be carried on for another 15 months. As the Senate well knows, the Department of Justice is concerned about this matter. The Tariff Act is also affected by it. Many other factors are involved in the subject. When we gave notice of public hearings on Senate bill 547 it was with the distinct understanding that the arrangement was only to be continued through September of this year. Had there been a suggestion of further extension, other witnesses might have appeared and testified on that point. Other testimony, no doubt, would have been made with respect to the matter.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I merely wish to ask a question. I notice in the report of the committee the following sentence:

> The committee finds that the existing voluntary plans have provided substantial benefits to the national interests.

That is a very conservative statement of what has been repeated here by the distinguished Senator from Ohio in wholehearted support of the continuance of this particular method of dealing with allocations. What I should like to ask my distinguished friend from South Carolina is whether or not any witness who appeared testified in any way that these voluntary allocations were not adequately and successfully meeting the situation? Was there any opposition to the extension of this method of allocation?

Mr. MAYBANK. There was no opposition to the extension of these allocations through September 30, but no one was asked a question as to extension of the program beyond that date. There was nothing but favorable comment respecting the voluntary allocations. I agree with the Senator from Ohio when he says that all those who testified had only the kindest word to say respecting the steel companies themselves and the voluntary plans in which they participated. There was one point brought out respecting fraud, a case which the Government is now prosecuting in New York, in connection with other things that might be taken up by the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice is investigating the matter. No one, however, testified against the voluntary allocations. I wish to reiterate that no one testified respecting the extension of the voluntary allocations beyond September 30. The meeting was called for the sole purpose of discussing the advisability of extending the voluntary allocations to that date.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. The voluntary allocations have been in force or in operation for more than a year. The provisions of the law are more than a year old. Can the Senator enlighten me, why, if the voluntary operations have worked as well as they have until now, there is something peculiar and mystical about the date, September 30, beyond which the operation should not be extended? Can the Senator state what those circumstances are?

Mr. MAYBANK. I can easily answer that. The majority of the committee felt that the committee should have an open mind and hear representatives of business firms and of the various departments, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and others, and then we should make up our minds whether or not these agreements should be continued, or whether other amendments to the bill should be offered. The administration believes that if these voluntary allocations are to be continued, they should be continued for 2 years, and not for 1 year. We should not have to go through all this again next January.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that these agreements ought to be extended for 2 years?

Mr. MAYBANK. The administration believes that these voluntary agreements, along with other agreements which are now being prepared, should be extended for 2 years.

Mr. BALDWIN. Why do we not cross that bridge now?

Mr. MAYBANK. We have had no hearings.

Mr. BALDWIN. The fact remains, does it not, that this program, laid down in the Eightieth Congress in December 1947, really has worked adequately and successfully? Is not that a fact?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should say that it has worked successfully in the case of steel. I would not say that it has worked successfully in other fields. The agreements are purely voluntary. The steel companies did a good job in their voluntary agreements. However, there are other fields which the administration wishes to consider—for example, aluminum, copper, zinc, and other products.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, the pending bill picks up section 2 of the anti-inflation act which was passed by the Eightieth Congress, and seeks to have it continued.

Mr. MAYBANK. Through September 30.

Mr. BALDWIN. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio would continue it for a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. It has already been in operation for a year; and all the testimony before the committee indicated that it has worked successfully. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. The Congress did a good job in enacting that legislation, and the administration and the executive departments have done an excellent job with business and industry.

Mr. BALDWIN. So the program has been an unqualified success to date.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should say so, but only insofar as the voluntary agreements are concerned, and insofar as those who were under such voluntary agreements are concerned. But the program is limited entirely to those who are willing to enter into such agreements.

Mr. BALDWIN. The voluntary agreements apply not only to steel but to other metals as well and to other shortages.

Mr. MAYBANK. They apply to some, for example, aluminum, manganese, zinc, and copper. I believe there is a list of approximately 20 products.

Mr. BALDWIN. So far as the other items are concerned, the voluntary allocation plan is working well, is it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator that, as I understood the testimony, other agreements, such as that relating to aluminum and other items have not yet been worked out or agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN. But they are in process.

Mr. MAYBANK. They are in the discussion stage; but they have not been concluded.

Mr. BALDWIN. The section which the Senator seeks to continue is section 2 of the Anti-Inflation Act which was passed in the Eightieth Congress, in December 1947.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, neither the committee nor the administration is yet prepared to present to the present Congress any anti-inflationary measures other than those contained in this bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not say that. The administration has been working on the problem for some time. Certain proposals will be presented by Senators on this side of the aisle, and perhaps other proposals will be presented by Senators on the other side of the aisle. I cannot say exactly when these proposals will be introduced, but it will be very shortly, perhaps in a week. We cannot do everything all at once. Congress has been in session for less than a month. We must consult the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and others.

Mr. BALDWIN. I remind my distinguished friend that the President of the United States suggested that we should deal with this and 17 other measures in 2 weeks. We have already been in session for 4 weeks. It is true, is it not, that so far as the administration is concerned, or so far as any of the Federal departments or agencies are concerned, they are not prepared with any anti-inflationary program other than the continuance of a measure which was enacted in a Republican-controlled Congress in December 1947. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. Unfortunately the administration has to go into what the Republicans did in the Eightieth Congress, and it takes a little longer, perhaps, to suggest some undoing in order to better the legislation.

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say to my distinguished friend that I understood that he and his colleagues had all the answers last fall in the campaign, and that this problem was to be taken care of immediately.

Mr. MAYBANK. We had the answers, but we did not expect to undo in 30 days everything the Eightieth Congress did.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator is not trying to undo something. He is asking that it be continued.

Mr. MAYBANK. We are asking that the program be continued for a few months, until we can handle the problem properly.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the Senator from South Carolina recall that Mr. Clark, representing Secretary Sawyer, stated, in answer to a question of mine, that if the Congress saw fit to extend the voluntary control system beyond the limitation date suggested by the Secretary, no harm of any kind would result?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not prepared to testify for Mr. Clark. I am not questioning the Senator's statement at all. The record may show that. I know that Mr. Clark stated that they would not object. It is understandable that a bureaucrat, or anybody connected with a bureau, is not going to object to the enactment by Congress of a law extending its powers, and which he feels is doing a good job.

Mr. CAIN. If I may be so bold as to suggest it, the question was more important than that. It was obvious to some of us that Mr. Clark and Secretary Sawyer simply had not given much consideration to a longer period of extension than was recommended by the Secretary, and he quite honestly said, "If that is what the Congress wants to do, it will give us no cause for concern."

I should like to be of assistance to the thinking of all Members of the Senate. Let me refer for a moment to page 3 of the hearings, and to a comment made in conclusion by Secretary Sawyer in his testimony. Secretary Sawyer said:

> In conclusion, I feel that the voluntary program, while not the complete solution to our stabilization problems, has been successful so far in overcoming many of the problems arising from shortages of goods and facilities and in contributing to mitigating inflationary pressures. Consequently, I will urge a longer-term continuation of the program when the broader stabilization program is presented to the Congress. Until that program is presented and acted upon, I believe that the current voluntary program should be kept on a going basis, and, for that purpose, strongly recommend prompt enactment of S. 547.

We, as members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, listened to Mr. Sawyer and were impressed by what he said, namely, that this voluntary system was working well. During the remainder of the day we listened to representatives of industry who stated that the plan had meant the difference between failure and success so far as they were concerned. They were most complimentary. So quite naturally we raised the question, Why should we jeopardize a good thing through a termination date which, logically enough, should be further in the future than the administration has recommended?

We want to cooperate with Mr. Sawyer, Mr. Clark, and the administration. Mr. Sawyer said that in due time—he could not answer the question as to when—recommendations for continuing voluntary agreements would be presented to the Congress.

I join with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] in thinking that we would be doing ourselves and the Nation a service by extending these agreements reasonably beyond the limitation of extension suggested by the Secretary of Commerce.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator from Washington read and quoted is exactly what I said. Secretary Sawyer testified in favor of Senate bill 547. It provides the September 30, 1949, date.

Mr. President, this matter concerns not only the Department of Commerce, but it concerns the Department of Justice. It concerns the oil allocations under the Department of the Interior. It concerns the Department of Agriculture. Those agencies must meet and combine their views, if the plan is to be a success.

A present distinguished Member of this body was formerly Secretary of Agriculture and served as such when this plan was in operation. He will bear me out in saying that the plan has not worked in agriculture. It has worked in the Department of Commerce in connection with the steel allocation program; but the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] knows it has not operated successfully in agriculture.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I do not know that we are bound by the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce in favor of the proposal, or that we are bound to conclude that the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce in favor of a 6 months' extension was an argument against a year's extension. He testified very clearly, I feel, that the voluntary program has been successful so far in overcoming many of the problems arising from shortages of goods and facilities, and in contributing to mitigating inflationary pressures. He also testified that there are investigations proceeding in other fields of production, as well as in the field of steel production, looking toward putting into effect a voluntary allocations program, if it is shown to be needed.

Mr. President, the extension time now proposed is not sufficient to take care of such investigation and to permit the program to be put into effect. We have the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce and the testimony of Mr. Clark, who is in charge of this program, the testimony of representatives of small business, who are extremely well satisfied with the operation of the program, and the testimony of witnesses from the oil fields that already there is an adequate supply of pipe and drilling material for the needs of the industry this year. That includes, because we expressly asked the question of the representatives of the industry in Texas and Oklahoma, the industry located there, which has tremendously increased its capacity in the last year. At the same time there is an application before the RFC for a loan of $65,000,000 to expand a steel production plant at Daingerfield, Tex. The testimony at the hearings was that already there is an adequate supply of steel products to take care of the needs in the great production areas in Texas and Oklahoma.

It was only toward the end of the last day of the hearings that it became apparent that the steel industry, within a year—and I think the figures thoroughly support this statement—will be able to meet the demands domestically and in the export field. As a result of that testimony and the statement by Mr. Clark that no damage would be done, I thought it would be advisable to provide a further extension. The only argument against the plan is that probably there would be a desire to have the present Congress put into effect a compulsory program of some kind. I wish to say here and now that I am confident that a majority of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, do not expect or anticipate a compulsory program, and do not expect to vote for one.

So we might as well face the issue, as it became apparent in the hearings, that a year's extension will be sufficient to take care of the need, and by the end of that time the steel supply will be adequate.

Congress will be in session on March 31 of next year, and then will be able to face the issue again. By that time we shall have the experience of a whole year's production and demand, and we shall be able to ascertain the needs of the country before we pass upon the matter at that time.

The program has been working well. It is continuing to work. There is no opposition to a year's extension.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that the steel industry has done a fairly good job. I wish to say to him further that when a proposal for a compulsory program comes up, there will be hearings and debate. No one knows what prices will be in the next few months, and no one knows what the armed services and the plants at Oak Ridge will need in the way of steel in the next few months.

So I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question. I still do not quite understand all the arguments for and against the different provisions.

If the extension is desired to run for a full year, instead of 7 months, is there any way the Senator from South Carolina knows by which the steel companies could continue the extension of time 5 months beyond the time proposed in the bill? I still do not see the difference between a 12 months' and a 7 months' extension of time. There must be some reason back of the proposal for an additional 5 months, and I should like to know what it is.

Mr. MAYBANK. There is no reason back of it, except it had been hoped the Congress would extend the present law for a few months until a complete study, through the Banking and Currency Committee, could be made of all legislation along these lines.

Mr. AIKEN. Why was the September 30 date taken?

Mr. MAYBANK. Because, as was explained to those of us on the committee, it seems that various firms make their business and earnings, statements, and reports on a quarterly basis. The September 30 date was taken merely because that is the nearest date to the ending period of the business concerns which make quarterly statements.

Mr. AIKEN. I asked the question for the reason that it seems possible that Congress may not be in session at that time. I think all of us hope it will not be in session then.

Mr. MAYBANK. That date was taken for the benefit of the various businesses and industries concerned. I may add that the Committee on Banking and Currency will have ample opportunity to consider other legislation along these lines before the end of this session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, as a part of the debate, I think Senators will be interested in an article on the steel industry which is pertinent to the discussion. It appeared in yesterday's New York Times. The article is by Thomas E. Mullaney, and the heading reads: "Demand for Steel Is Seen Dwindling—Cancellations are occurring and placement of any new orders is slackening."

I think all of us will have a deep concern as to the validity of such comments, so I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMAND FOR STEEL IS SEEN DWINDLING—CANCELLATIONS ARE OCCURRING AND PLACEMENT OF ANY NEW ORDERS IS SLACKENING

(By Thomas E. Mullaney)

Although high-level steel operations will be required of the Nation's mills for several months yet, the end of the acute postwar shortage of steel is in sight, several of the industry's leaders intimated last week after releasing their 1948 financial statements.

Steel executives say that demand and supply for steel products, except pipes and tubes and a few other items, may be balanced fairly well in 6 months. Some members of the industry are even beginning to wonder whether too much, rather than too little, steel capacity has been installed during the 41 months since the end of World War II.

These statements on the steel outlook were the most important development emanating from last week's quarterly meetings of steel company directors. Also significant, however, were the record profits for 1948 reported by many companies of the industry and the proposed three-for-one split of the common stock of the United States Steel Corp.

Up to now, the steel industry had seen only prospects for maximum operations for an indefinite period. Record tonnages of steel were being produced and yet backlogs of unfilled orders seemed to be increasing. Now, however, the backlogs are dwindling, order cancellations are occurring and the placement of new orders is at a slower pace.

PUNGENT VIEW BY GRACE

E. G. Grace, chairman of the Bethlehem Steel Corp. and one of the top steel officials of the country for many decades, made the most pungent observations on the steel-supply picture.

"There isn't any question but that there is a softening in many lines for steel," he said. "The household-goods lines are filled to the gunwales. There have been even some important cancellations of steel orders recently in both the capital-goods and the consumer-goods fields."

It is understood, for instance, that the demand for steel by oil-well drilling-equipment manufacturers has subsided somewhat. The demand for steel for shipbuilding and ship repair work is also considerably smaller as is the pressure for fabricated structural steel.

Mr. Grace said that his company would have full steel production schedules until the middle of 1949, but he refused to make any predictions beyond that. He also remarked that he considers steel supply and demand in "very good order right now" and indicated actual demand for steel "has been very much padded."

The head of the Nation's second largest steel company also disagreed with an estimate of the Department of Commerce that the shortage of steel at the end of 1949 would be some 7,000,000 tons.

Irving S. Olds, chairman of United States Steel, also disclosed a slackening in steel demand, but his statement was more conservative. United States Steel, the Nation's largest producer, now holds a volume of unfilled orders equal to "4 or 5 months' operations at the present rate," he said. In previous quarters, the estimate had been "5 or 6 months."

Another steel official likened the current situation to the 1920-21 period. He pointed out that in the middle of 1920 steel was still riding high on the crest of postwar orders from the peacetime economy—from the construction, automotive, and railroad industries. Orders vanished almost overnight, he added, and the industry did not get back to its former levels until 1925.

The records show that in 1920 the domestic steel industry produced 47,188,886 net tons of raw steel from operations averaging 75.7 percent of capacity. In August of that year, however, United States Steel noted a decline of 313,430 tons in its future business.

At that time, the decrease was ascribed to the following reasons: (1) New business was not coming in as rapidly as ordinarily because of uncertainty over prices for the following year; (2) shipments were moving faster because of the improved supply of freight cars; and (3) orders were being canceled, principally from the automotive companies. A little later, higher steel production in Europe reduced the need for American steel in foreign countries.

Today, steel orders are declining because many consumer lines are being filled, earlier estimates of steel demands in certain lines have proven to be inflated, and steel production in foreign countries is expanding rapidly.

It was in 1921 that the post-World War I bust came for the steel industry here. Companies such as Bethlehem Steel saw their operations decline to levels even below 20 percent of capacity, and the whole domestic industry operated at only 34.5 percent of capacity in turning out 22,157,853 tons. It was the worst steel-production year since 1905.

It is doubtful whether so drastic a transition would occur in this era, but the domestic industry is eyeing the situation closely and warning persistently against rash overexpansion of steel facilities, as some Government officials have been advocating.

With respect to steel earnings last year, the industry considers them only fair because of the decreased purchasing power of the dollar. Most companies reported record earnings for the year, but, because of heavy requirements for their expansion programs, much of the earnings had to be reinvested in the business.

The generous dividend action and proposed common-stock split-up of United States Steel has attracted considerable speculation in financial circles. The stock division will give broader distribution to the stock, as the company announced was its intention. But one observer wondered whether the dividend action and the plan for the split might not be the prelude to some new financing. Bethlehem Steel took similar stock action at the end of 1947 and then successfully accomplished $70,000,000 of stock and bond financing within a year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I hope Senators will study the article. It bears out what I have been saying, namely, that no one really knows what will happen between now and September. So why extend this plan for a full year? Let us first have the benefit of the experience of the next few months.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator asks why we should extend it beyond the date recommended by the administration. I think there is a good reason for doing so. Admittedly we are concerned about a good many features of the steel industry and other industries, but we are certain that the voluntary allocations system has been and is working well.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the case of steel.

Mr. CAIN. Yes; in the case of steel. With reference to that problem, there can be no possible harm, it seems to some of us, in extending the program into the future. If in the meantime we should find good, sound reasons for improving upon the legislation, I know of no reason why that could not be accomplished through an amendment.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, or I am glad to yield the floor.

Mr. FLANDERS. I simply wish to inquire whether there is any presumption of difficulty whatever in connection with extending for 13 months the date of this admittedly good arrangement, in view of the fact that the Senate can at any time between now and the end of this session modify the bill in any way it pleases. Is it not true that back of the proposal to shorten it to a 7 months' period is the presumption that there is something wrong with it? Is not that the presumption?

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, I do not think there is anything wrong with it, or is any presumption implied by the 7-month extension or compared with a 13-month extension. Just as the Congress could pass a 15 months' extension, and then cut it down, so the present Congress can pass an extension to September 30 and continue it for another year after September 30. If we want to extend the plan to June or July, that can be done. It works both ways.

Mr. FLANDERS. The question, it would seem to me, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina, is that, nevertheless, there remains a presumption unfavorable to the present working of the program. Is it quite 50–50 whether we extend and shorten, on the one hand, or whether we shorten and extend, on the other? It would seem to me, I may say to the Senator, that he introduced into this proposal an unfavorable presumption not warranted by the testimony.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only say to the Senator with respect to the 50–50 proposition to which I referred, as to whether it is extended for 13 months and is then cut down, or whether it is cut down to 6 months or 7 months, and later extended, we should keep in mind that the bill S. 547 extended the program only to September 30 of this year as it was introduced in the Senate. Hearings were conducted and the newspapers throughout the country carried accounts that the plan was to be extended by that bill only until September 30. There was never a word of testimony by qualified witnesses that we should extend voluntary agreements for 1 year. The Department of Justice, charged with enforcement of the antitrust laws, was not consulted about it. Neither the Department of Agriculture nor the Interior Department appeared. In the hearings I distinctly stated that the Secretary of Commerce told me he had discussed with the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and with the Attorney General himself the question of the agreements, and that the Attorney General had agreed upon the date of September 30.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut, who has been waiting some time.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator was on the floor on December 17, 1947, as I recall, when we were debating the previous bill. Does the Senator recall that at that particular time the distinguished minority leader, the present Vice President of the United States, offered an amendment calling for compulsory controls? Does the Senator from South Carolina recall that?

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall have to refresh my memory.

Mr. BALDWIN. My question is, Why is it, if that particular provision was so good at that time, that it is not offered now, instead of asking a continuance of the Republican control measure? Of course, the measure is working better than the compulsory method would have worked.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only answer the Senator's question as I did before, that it is going to take the Democrats a long time to undo some of the Republican measures enacted during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. I might remind my distinguished friend that in that day and time, December 17, they were here with an amendment that they said would provide adequately for the situation. Let me quote from what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky at that time said. Today, it has added authority to what it had then, because he is now Vice President of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am glad to yield for a question, but if anyone wants to make a speech I shall be glad to yield him the floor.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I again press my question, which is, why is it that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky when he was minority leader, which was represented at that time as something that would adequately take care of the situation, and in the place of this voluntary plan, is not offered now?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am not here to speak for the distinguished former Senator from Kentucky, who is now the distinguished Vice President of the United States and the Presiding Officer of the Senate. I feel certain that if he were still the majority leader, he could answer that question.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from South Carolina obviously has several reasons for opposing the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have three reasons.

Mr. CAIN. But it seems to me that the Senator's primary reason for objecting to the proposal is that he thinks, because there were no hearings with respect to any date other than the date recommended by the administration, we should adhere to the date recommended by the administration. Is that true?

Mr. MAYBANK. Not only that. I shall be perfectly frank with my friend from Washington in saying that was one of the reasons, but as I said in the committee, I had other reasons. We ought to keep the matter open. We ought to keep an open mind about it in deference to the people who on November 2 overwhelmingly chose Mr. Truman as President and Mr. Barkley as Vice President.

Mr. CAIN. But I may say in answer to the Senator's first proposition——

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want the Senator from Washington to understand for one moment that I have any controls in mind. I have only an open mind. All I want to know is what is proposed, and all I want to know is that I may be my own judge, in my own mind, of what is in the interest of my people.

Mr. CAIN. I think this question is fundamentally important. I assume from the Senator's opposition to this particular date that he conceives that whenever the administration, on a proposed piece of legislation, recommends a date, it must necessarily follow that that is the only date we can use.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator suggests an inference. I am sure he did not mean, if the administration were to send a measure to the Congress containing a certain date, that I would follow it blindly.

Mr. CAIN. Not the Senator; no.

Mr. MAYBANK. Because I never did and never intend to do such a thing.

Mr. CAIN. No, not the Senator from South Carolina personally; but I refer to his objection to the date, because we did not have hearings on any other date. I think my contention is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, because, as the Senator knows, I stated very definitely at the meeting that the Secretary of Commerce had told me he and the Attorney General had agreed on this date, in order that they might make a further study in the Justice Department in connection with antitrust suits, and the New York case, which is undergoing prosecution.

Mr. CAIN. But the Senator from South Carolina would agree that if the Senate saw fit to determine a different date, the Senate would have the perfectly sound ground, in its legislation, to call for any date it saw fit, would he not?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, to conclude my remarks in regard to the 1-year extension, I wish to call attention to an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on January 19.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator, if he will permit me to do so, I shall yield the floor to him,

since I stated I would yield only for a question otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the floor, unless the Senator has a question.

Mr. BRICKER. No, I have no questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield the floor.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish merely to conclude my remarks in regard to the matter by the insertion of this editorial in the RECORD:

No one, probably, would say that the allocations system has worked out perfectly or to the satisfaction of everyone. But, as Secretary Sawyer observes, it "has been successful within the limits inherent in any voluntary program" in overcoming some of the Nation's recent shortages in goods and facilities. It has been especially valuable in providing for the steel requirements of the armed services and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Those are two very important fields. This program has met the needs for the production of steel of atomic energy activities and the activities of the armed services.

Coming to the question of the Senator from New Hampshire as to whether or not there is an inference that the program is perhaps belittled by limiting its time, I think he is upon perfectly sound ground when he concludes there must be some inference of failure, if the program is to be limited to 7 months. At that time the Congress will not be in session. We hope we can conclude the program, as it has been laid out for us, in less time than that. Congress will not be here at the time, then, when the voluntary program ends. At any time, in the operation of this voluntary program, either industry or the Department of Commerce can cease to function under it, but there is no question, if it terminates in September 1949, that this perfectly wholesome and constructive and, thus far, successful program could be continued without a violation of certain of the statutes, particularly the antitrust laws.

But if we continue it until March 31, Congress will again be in session and can amend or discontinue the program if there is further need for it.

Furthermore, if the real reason for advocating a year's extension is that there is a demand for a compulsory program, such as that suggested by the President and the leadership on the other side, certainly such a compulsory program could be put into effect by the Congress, and it would override the voluntary program. Many faults may be obviated and many dangerous situations may be corrected if we continue the program until March 31.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete editorial from the New York Times of January 19, 1949, in regard to controls, be inserted in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS AND CONTROLS

Steps were taken yesterday, with the backing of the administration, to see that two of the Government's basic controls over shortage materials are continued in force pending congressional action on the eight-point program laid down by the President in his state of the Union message.

Chairman SPENCE, of the House Banking Committee, introduced two bills for this purpose. One of these calls for the extension for 6 months of the voluntary agreements anti-inflation law enacted by the Eightieth Congress. The other provides for continuing export controls for another 27 months, or through June 30, 1951. Almost simultaneously, Chairman MAYBANK, of the Senate Banking Committee, announced that his group would speed action on companion measures. Without such legislation both of these laws would expire automatically at the end of next month.

The so-called voluntary agreements program is the compromise plan worked out by the Republicans last year as a substitute for the stand-by price production controls proposed by President Truman. It authorizes industries to enter into agreements for the allocation of materials in short supply. Agreements of this kind have been employed by the steel industry: for example, to guarantee minimum quantities of steel for certain essential uses under Government-established priorities. The export-control law gives the Government authority to say what can and what cannot be shipped out of the country. Its principal purposes are: (1) to prevent domestic shortages from being aggravated by the export of items needed at home; (2) to safeguard supplies of materials required in the interest of national security; and (3) to see that, in the words of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, critically needed commodities are made available to "those areas where they will be used to promote world recovery."

Extension of these controls is obviously desirable and necessary until Congress has decided what, if anything, it wishes to do about Mr. Truman's recently proposed program, two of whose suggestions, at least, go further in the direction of Government control than the country has gone except when it was at war or on the fringe of war. No one, probably, would say that the allocations system has worked out perfectly or to the satisfaction of everyone. But, as Secretary Sawyer observes, it "has been successful within the limits inherent in any voluntary program" in overcoming some of the Nation's recent shortages in goods and facilities. It has been especially valuable in providing for the steel requirements of the armed services and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Demand for steel is still running ahead of current production, and probably will continue to do so for some time to come. But there are signs that this bottleneck is widening rather than narrowing. In situations such as these the market is usually a more reliable guide than personal judgment, and it is a noteworthy fact that gray-market premiums on steel, like black-market premiums on automobiles, have recently shown pronounced declines. In scrap steel, a sort of subbottleneck, prices are reported as beginning to crack under the weight of increasing supplies. At any rate, with present controls extended Congress will be in a position to consider, without feeling that it is under too great pressure of time, the wisdom of moving further in the direction of Government control.

Should voluntary allocations fall short of meeting the Nation's emergency needs, the next logical step would seem to be that indicated in the fifth of President Truman's eight points: namely, priorities and allocations of key materials in short supply. But the President's program goes on from compulsory allocations to price control, and from price control to a suggestion that the Government either finance the private expansion of certain shortage industries or build its own plants to compete with such industries.

It is interesting and encouraging to note that Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the President's chief economic adviser, has disassociated himself from the last-named proposal. Productive activities, Dr. Nourse pointed out in this city on Saturday, "are affected by conditions that can only be known by those right on the ground." But basically the chief criticism of Mr. Truman's program, as we see it, is that when it goes beyond compulsory allocations it moves into plans which presuppose a wartime economy and by the time it reaches point eight it is assuming the country is ready to try its hand at state socialism. The first of these assumptions is implausible; the second is, we think, virtually inconceivable.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have been very much interested in the question of inflation and high prices, as have all of us. At the two sessions of the Eightieth Congress I worked as vigorously as I knew how to get some legislation which would deal adequately with the existing situation. The subject matter is one which is very close to my heart. In the last campaign and during the first and second sessions of the Eightieth Congress, there was great tub-thumping on the part of the administration and those representing it regarding the whole subject of inflation and high prices and what a Democratic-controlled Congress would do to reduce high prices for the benefit of all the people.

I am surprised and astounded that the first measure which comes from the other side of the aisle to deal with the whole subject of anti-inflation is what? Is it a proposal for some new legislation to deal with the situation? Is it something that the administration or some of its many agencies worked out to deal with one of the most critical situations before the American people? No, Mr. President; it is not that. It is a request to continue on the statute books a measure to deal with inflation which was passed by the Eightieth Congress, a Republican-controlled Congress. That is the first step in the President's program—a continuation on the books of Republican measures which were passed to deal with inflation.

Why, Mr. President, is it asked to have this legislation continued on the books? Because witnesses from various agencies have testified that the act has been working successfully.

In the day and time when we were considering anti-inflation measures I remember that the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who was then the minority leader, offered an amendment and urged its adoption, and those on the other side of the aisle vigorously supported him in connection with that amendment. The amendment would do away with section 2, which it is now asked to have continued. It would place in effect compulsory allocations and compulsory controls. It was pointed out, with great vigor and great enthusiasm, that the Republican measure would not work, that there must be compulsory controls.

But, Mr. President, where is that provision now? Where is that amendment? Why did not the committee, which is controlled by members on the other side of

the aisle, bring forward that proposal which appeared to be so marvelous in December 1947? We are now asked to continue the Republican measure which was urged upon the Congress on the basis that it would work—a Republican measure, Mr. President, which has worked, according to the open testimony before the committee and by the admission which is implicit in the bill asking a continuance of these powers. Why will it not continue to work? What is the great difficulty with regard to it?

The bill now pending would continue voluntary allocations until the 30th of September. If we live up to the provisions of the Reorganization Act, the Congress will not be in session on the 30th of September. Then we could not do anything regarding inflation, Mr. President, if nothing is done in the meantime—and there is every indication that nothing else will be done about it in the meantime.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has offered an amendment to continue the law in operation for another year. According to the argument made by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the law's provisions have helped in large part to settle the situation as to one of the basic commodities of our economy. If it is desired in the meantime to offer some kind of substitute, let it be offered, debated, and considered on the floor.

Mr. President, I say I am surprised and astounded that the first step the administration and its representatives on the other side of the aisle take in dealing with the matter of high prices is a continuation of a Republican measure passed in the Eightieth Congress.

I should like to call attention also to the fact that this bill deals only with one provision of that legislation, section 2. So far as we know, up to date—and it is more than a month after the opening of the Congress—all the other provisions passed by a Republican-controlled Congress dealing with the subject of inflation will be continued on the books.

In the political campaign, we were given to understand that legislation which we had passed was fundamentally wrong, that we had committed a grave error in passing it. Yet, I repeat, Mr. President, the first suggestion that comes from the administration is for a continuation of one section of a Republican law to control inflation. Apparently the administration is perfectly satisfied to have all the remainder of the law continued; in fact, it has asked that it be further continued. That is a strange action, after all the talk about what a Democratic-controlled Congress would do. The answer to it is this, and it is being demonstrated day after day in the newspapers and over the radio, that prices are falling. This legislation, passed at the previous session, was wiser than we thought it was. It adequately dealt with the situation: it worked.

I am happy, indeed, to stand here and see the irrefutable proof of the fact that the legislation has worked, proof in the form of a bill introduced by a Democratic-controlled committee of a Democratic-controlled Senate, asking that one provision of the law expiring by limitation of time be continued in effect.

Mr. President, I looked over the record of the debate in connection with adopting the amendment offered by the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY. Some of that debate, Mr. President, I think would bear repetition here. I wonder why, in the face of the language used in that debate, our friends are now urging the continuance of what appeared to be such an iniquitous and unworkable piece of legislation.

Said the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on page 11501 of the RECORD:

> I think the Congress and the country appreciate any step toward meeting this very serious situation, but I think the country is going to be disappointed in the probable effectiveness of the program the Senator from Ohio is now outlining.

The Senator from Ohio being Mr. TAFT, then chairman of the committee, as I recall, who was proposing the particular legislation under consideration.

Has the country been disappointed? The supply of steel has risen tremendously, and we have been able adequately to meet the situation.

I continue reading what the distinguished Senator from Florida said at the time:

> The alternative action that might be taken, it seems to me, if the program were intended to be most effective, would be to give the President authority to fix prices in certain selective fields, either by forcing concurrence in a so-called voluntary agreement, or by prescribing what is a fair price, and simply to order that price put into effect, at least in the selective fields, in the case of steel, for example, and in the case of certain other commodities which might be regarded as key commodities. But if we continue without one of the emergency measures being adopted by the Congress in the present session, it simply means more time will pass and the situation will become far worse, and we shall still be tinkering with some sort of questionable procedure.

The distinguished Senator from Florida so described the procedure. Has that happened? I know the distinguished Senator from Florida is a great and able Senator, and I have high regard for him, but I say that in this particular instance he turned out to be a very poor prophet, indeed.

Then the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, the present great Vice President of the United States, in urging the adoption of an amendment which would impose compulsory controls, had this to say about the matter, as appears on page 11515 of the RECORD. He was replying to a statement by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the effect that what was proposed would make it impossible to pass the measure then pending before Christmas. I read from the RECORD:

> Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that. I am not sure that even the milk-and-water proposition we are now considering will pass before Christmas.

Now, Mr. President, what do the administration spokesmen ask us to do? They ask us to reenact and continue in force this Republican milk-and-water proposition about which they had so much to say a year and some months ago. Why do they ask that it be continued? Because time has demonstrated that it has worked well, that it has been effective.

Then the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], speaking in favor of the amendment which would put into effect compulsory controls, said:

> I think the Senator's amendment is entirely in order. Something of the kind is absolutely necessary if we are to do anything more than hand out a campaign document in an effort to show that we have done a great thing for the economy of the country.

Mr. President, I for one entertained some doubt at that time as to whether or not we were going far enough with the particular measure then being considered. But time has demonstrated to me that my doubts should have been completely dissipated, and, indeed, they have been by the adequacy with which the measure as passed has dealt with the situation.

I remember the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] saying:

> Mr. President, I should like to add a few words to those which have been said by the distinguished minority leader. I believe we are dealing with one of the most important and difficult questions ever presented to this Congress. That statement has been made several times in the last few years. That is because the world itself has been in turmoil.
>
> The issue which is now presented in section 2—
>
> The one which would be continued under the pending bill—
>
> between the bill reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency and the amendments which have been offered by the Senator from Kentucky, is simply the issue of whether we shall have an economic government in this crisis by those who have controlled our economic system, privately, or whether we shall have the Government in charge. It could be stated even more simply. It is an issue between private government and the people's government.

Mr. President, I am one who does not wish to see big business, or big labor, or big anything else, run this country or control our economy. But I was again surprised and astounded when the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, said on the floor of the Senate that he complimented the leaders of the steel industry for the fine, patriotic manner in which they had cooperated to carry out these voluntary allocations.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Why should the Senator be surprised if I said a good word for corporations?

Mr. BALDWIN. I know the distinguished Senator from South Carolina well enough to understand that he is most charitable, and that he always says a good word for everybody and everything. I grant him that. The point I wish to make is that we were told by spokesmen on the other side of the aisle

that big-business men would run away with the situation. On the other hand, we are now told from the other side of the aisle that which is uncontrovertibly true, namely, that these men have cooperated, that big business and little business have cooperated, and the law has been a great success.

I grant that my distinguished friend the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] is a great statesman and a great Senator, but I say that he, like the distinguished Senator from Florida, is a poor prophet in this particular situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for one question?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. There is only one question in issue in connection with the pending bill, namely, the fixing of a proper date for the termination of the program. Can the Senator from Connecticut tell the Senator from Illinois just why the Republicans chose March 1, 1949, for the termination of their program?

Mr. BALDWIN. No; I cannot.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I was not a member of the committee. Perhaps the Senator from Ohio can answer the question.

Mr. BRICKER. It was merely because the Congress would be in session then. That is the real reason why the date March 1 was recommended and chosen. The Congress would then have been in session long enough to see how the program was working. That was the date fixed from a practical standpoint, and it seemed to be the most reasonable and best date.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate passed the original bill in December 1947.

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. And the termination date fixed in that bill was March 1, 1949; was it not?

Mr. BALDWIN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. May I ask the Senator from Ohio if that is correct?

Mr. BRICKER. That is the correct date, as fixed in the original bill.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BALDWIN. That demonstrates that we have had more than a year of satisfactory operation under this particular measure, and my reason for supporting the amendment of the Senator from Ohio is that if we have had a year's experience with it, and with an improving situation, it is fair to assume that the program will continue to be satisfactory, and that we should continue the act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was informed that I was honored by some reference in the able Senator's remarks.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am always delighted to honor my distinguished friend from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I was greatly honored to receive even temporary recognition by my able friend, but naturally I should be even more pleased to hear him repeat what he said. He spoke about my being a poor prophet in what I said about the workability of the voluntary allocation program.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should be very glad to repeat what I said. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Eightieth Congress, page 11501, where the distinguished Senator from Florida is reported to have said:

> I think the Congress and the country appreciate any step toward meeting this very serious situation, but I think the country is going to be disappointed in the probable effectiveness of the program the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is now outlining.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The alternative action that might be taken, it seems to me, if the program were intended to be most effective, would be to give the President authority to fix prices in certain selective fields, either by forcing concurrence in a so-called voluntary agreement or by prescribing what is a fair price, and simply to order that price put into effect, at least in the selective fields, in the case of steel, for example, and in the case of certain other commodities which might be regarded as key commodities. But if we continue without one of the emergency measures being adopted by the Congress in the present session, it simply means more time will pass and the situation will become far worse, and we shall still be tinkering with some sort of questionable procedure.

In order that the Senator might be fully informed, I want to say that I questioned the Senator's ability as a prophet, although I paid the Senator high tribute in other respects, and then I went on to say that the first step in the President's program of combating high prices was a continuance in operation of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. That was the first step. I ask the Senator why we were asked to continue something that the distinguished Senator said was a "questionable procedure."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am perfectly prepared for the RECORD to indicate the accuracy or the inaccuracy of the prediction I made when the President's proposals were before the Republican majority of Congress and declined. I think if the Senator will make a canvass of small business in America, and of the little-business men, the little manufacturers, to see whether or not they have obtained under a voluntary allocation system steel in quantity comparable to what they should have had, he will find that the little manufacturers have not. I know of many instances in my own State where little manufacturers, the little fellows who are trying to secure a small quota of steel, have not been able to secure it because they are not on the favored list of big steel producers. I realize that sort of thing always occurs when there is a voluntary allocation system.

What the President was proposing, and what he repeated, as I understand, in his recommendations to the Congress in his state of the Union message, is authority to impose compulsory allocations when he finds that the public need requires it. I supported that proposal last year. I shall support it again when the matter comes up.

The Republican majority was opposed to the President having even an alternative authority that might be compulsorially exercised. But I go back to the basic proposition that if we are to have allocations, if we are to have rationing, the only way we can be assured that there will be a fair distribution of what is allocated and what is rationed is for some public authority at least to have supervision over it, if not direction of it. So I am perfectly prepared to let the small-business men of America who need steel to be the conclusive witnesses as to whether they have obtained the share of the Nation's output of steel they would have had if we had had a compulsory allocation and distribution system.

Mr. BALDWIN. I will say in reply to my distinguished friend that he apparently is prepared to ask the same question I am. If what he says is so, why do we not have reported from the committee a measure providing for compulsory control? Why does not the committee have the courage to report such a measure? Why has not the committee in a year and 3 months prepared the legislation necessary to deal with the subject on a compulsory basis?

Mr. President, I would not vote for it, but what I am wondering is why, if voluntary allocation has not worked successfully, some compulsory measure along the lines my distinguished friend urges, has not been presented to the Senate?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me state what the facts are.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to say a word more on this particular point.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut allow me one moment?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. So far as writing a program is concerned, I would have vested in the President the authority which might be compulsorily exercised when in the President's opinion the public need requires. The President asked repeatedly of the Eightieth Congress, and has asked the present Congress—and he asked the Eightieth Congress especially in the special session—for the power to allocate by authority, if the situation requires it, and the side of the able Senator from Connecticut has steadfastly and successfully opposed such legislation. Now today, while it may be that the measure now proposed is not all that some of us would like it to be, yet it is twice as good as that advocated by the Republican side of the aisle. The measure before us seeks only 6 months' extension of the temporary authority to allocate by the steel industry, but the Republican side of the aisle is insisting upon 12 months' extension. So our proposal, while defective, no doubt, and I think it is, and I think it

is inadequate, yet is twice as good as what the Senator from Connecticut now associates himself with on the other side of the aisle. He wants a year of immunity of the steel industry from any public control, whereas the bill before us suggests only the extension for 6 months of the voluntary control now in effect, until the matter can be more thoroughly investigated.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, if the Senator feels the way he has just expressed himself he should submit an amendment for the Senate to consider. Let the Senator offer such an amendment as the distinguished former Senator from Kentucky offered when section 2 was under consideration in December 1947. Let the Senator from Florida propose such an amendment, which provided for compulsory control. It was suggested at that time by spokesmen on the other side of the aisle that it would be adequate. If my friend from Florida is so anxious to have compulsory controls, let him offer that proposal again by way of amendment. What I am saying is that the majority party is attempting to carry water on both shoulders in this matter.

Replying now to the question as to why the President was not given authority to take compulsory measures, I call my friend's attention to section 6 of the act we are discussing. Section 6 happened to be an amendment which was incorporated in the bill as the result of the efforts of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and myself. It provides a method by which the President can require Congress to give him or to deny him the right to impose compulsory controls on specific selected items, and yet not once in all the time since the law has been on the books has the President attempted to exercise the broad powers he has had under this particular provision of the law. So, Mr. President, there are in the existing law provisions under which compulsory controls could be required.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am not the President's official spokesman in this body, and have no right to speak his mind, but I can imagine that it may be that the President is not asking for compulsory authority, although he did recommend stand-by power, because the President unequivocally recommended that additional steel-production facilities should be provided, and if private industry would not provide them, then that the Government of the United States should see to it that they were constructed. The President may have felt that if we could increase the steel output by new facilities—and that policy may be still under consideration by the administration—perhaps rationing of any sort might not be imperative. I hope the Senator from Connecticut, who I am sure wants every business and industry to have a reasonable and fair quantity of steel, will join us in supporting the President's proposal that provision be made for additional steel facilities in the country so that steel production may be increased. May I hope the Senator from Connecticut will take that attitude?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I may say in response, that the testimony before the committee—and like my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida, I was not on the committee, and so I had no opportunity to know what the testimony was until I read it and saw the report—was that the situation was being taken care of very adequately. My point is that if the situation is being taken care of very adequately in the absence of compulsions, we had better continue in that particular course rather than put into effect some other program when we do not know how it will work in this day and time.

Mr. President, there is no State in the whole Nation which for its size uses more steel than does Connecticut. I do not recall any particular pressure from any business people back home. As a matter of fact, I received a letter the other day pointing out that the particular small company represented by the writer could not obtain steel, and when I went to work on the subject and obtained a report on it, the company advised me that since they had last corresponded with me they had been adequately taken care of. So I assume in that particular situation at least that the present method we are using in dealing with the situation is working satisfactorily.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, if I correctly understood the Senator from Florida several minutes ago, he stated that he would be willing to call as witnesses small-business men, particularly in his State, to testify that the voluntary system was not working satisfactorily. Did I correctly understand the Senator?

Mr. PEPPER. I stated that in my State there were numerous instances which had been very forcibly brought to my attention, of little users of steel being unable to get it because they were not included in the voluntary allocation system. Obviously the steel companies favor their old customers; and if one were not an old customer or a favored customer—at least in my State—he could not get steel. Many small-business men complained that they were unable to get steel. The able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who is seated at my left, tells me that he has recently talked with representatives of the Department of Commerce, and that the Department had stated that there was not sufficient steel to satisfy the small users of the country; that it simply did not exist. Therefore they could not get it.

Mr. CAIN. The statement of the Senator from Florida was to the effect that small-business men generally believed that the voluntary allocation system was not working effectively.

Mr. PEPPER. I was simply saying that there is not sufficient steel for all the small steel users of the country. It is only human nature, as well as confirmed business practice, that when those who produce a commodity do their own rationing, they give it to their old customers or to their friends. That is not only human nature but business practice.

Mr. CAIN. It is an obvious fact that when there is a shortage of a particular commodity, we are by no means certain that a better distribution will follow from a mandatory, as opposed to a voluntary, allocation system. It is that question with which we are seriously concerning ourselves. Let me ask the Senator from Florida if he has read the testimony given before the Committee on Banking and Currency, which gives rise to the whole question now before us.

Mr. PEPPER. No. I am not a member of that committee and I have not read the testimony. But I know that during the war if all the allocation systems and all the quota systems had been left to voluntary judgment and conscience, a few would have been favored, and many would have been discriminated against. That is inherent in the voluntary system.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator has stated that he is not a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Some of us are. We therefore take it for granted that the Senator from Florida would like to know the character of the testimony before that committee, and by whom it was given. The Senator from Florida has just stated that small-business men would testify to the unworkability of the system which we are discussing. Let me state to the Senator from Florida that the witnesses before the Committee on Banking and Currency were small-business people. They said that whereas a year and a half or two years ago, in the absence of the voluntary system, they were rapidly going out of business, with the adoption of the voluntary system, they were today getting every ounce of steel they considered they were entitled to.

Mr. PEPPER. How many small-business men testified?

Mr. CAIN. Approximately half a dozen.

Mr. PEPPER. Approximately half a dozen small-business men. Unless they were elected to speak for the small-business men of America, or had made a survey of the small-business men of America, I do not believe that they could be regarded as decisive spokesmen.

Mr. CAIN. But we, as representatives of the Senate, were interrogating them. If the Senator does not care to consider that testimony as valid, does he feel that the reference which he has just made to small-business men in Florida as being out of harmony with this program should be considered as valid?

Mr. PEPPER. I was only saying that I had received numerous complaints. I could name those who made the complaints. Other Senators tell me the same thing. I know that the steel mills have been working at capacity. The President has found it necessary to propose additional facilities. I know that with a limited output and a voluntary system of distribution, the little fellow is going to get the least.

Mr. CAIN. But the testimony clearly indicated to us that conditions are becoming materially better, and that a con-

siderable degree of credit is being given to the very system the duration of which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], through his amendment, seeks to extend. That is important to us. If it is good, we must be very cautious about getting rid of it, in the absence of something better to take its place. Nothing better has thus far been advanced on either side of the aisle.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that we do not want to confuse the record. Is it not a fact that the simple question before the Senate is whether the voluntary method now in existence shall be extended for 6 months or 12 months? The Democrats are recommending an extension for 6 months, and saying that in that time we shall know more about what to do as a permanent policy. The Republicans are saying, "No; exempt the subject from consideration for a whole year."

Mr. CAIN. May I answer that observation for the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is leading the opposition, is chairman?

During the previous remarks of the Senator from Florida, he stated that the Democrats want to extend the program for 6 months, and that the Republicans want to provide immunity to the steel industry for a year. The Senator said essentially that, did he not? He stated that he thought the Republicans wanted to give immunity to the steel industry for a period twice as long as that recommended by the Democrats.

Mr. PEPPER. I stated that I thought the issue was whether the present voluntary method should be extended for 6 months, as provided by the bill reported by the Democratic leadership, or whether the whole subject should be sealed up for 12 months, so that we would not be able to reconsider the matter in the interim, and perhaps determine upon something else as a permanent policy. So, today we are not voting for compulsory control or voluntary allocation. We are merely voting whether we want voluntary allocation for 6 months or 12 months. That is all there is to it.

Mr. CAIN. I think the Senator from Florida will be interested in the testimony which came from the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer. He said, in substance, "We are asking for a temporary extension of this law because we are presently preparing a broader stabilization program to be presented to the Congress, in which we are going to recommend an extension of the voluntary system for not less than 2 years."

Mr. Sawyer stated that such a recommendation was to be included among the recommendations for a broader stabilization program. So it is a little difficult for us on this side to see any valid opposition to our recommendation for a reasonable extension beyond the time recommended by the committee, in view of Mr. Sawyer's declaration of purpose of an extension for 2 years.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that Secretary Sawyer did say that a 2-year extension was to be recommended in the over-all bill. I want the RECORD to show that as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I talked not only with the Secretary of Commerce and the Secretary of Agriculture, but with many others. If there be any fault in recommending this particular provision, it is mine, because I suggested to the various secretaries that I hoped that legislation on this subject would be considered piecemeal, bill by bill, considering separately the Federal Reserve legislation, agricultural legislation, and legislation affecting the Commerce Department. That is one of the reasons why there is no over-all bill at this time. If anyone is to be charged with responsibility for that situation, I am glad to assume the responsibility, because it is my thought that the legislation should be considered bill by bill.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield further?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. I merely wish to say to the Senator from South Carolina that there was no intention on my part to assess responsibility with reference to the presentation of the pending legislation. We merely take exception to the date. But what is so clearly familiar to members of the Committee on Banking and Currency on both sides of the aisle is not the information which was available to the Senator from Florida. It was for that reason that I wanted to clear in his mind, if I could, the details concerning the subject about which we are actually talking.

Mr. BRICKER and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be clear and that the Senator from Florida may have clearly in mind the facts as to the testimony adduced at the hearings, let me say that the chairman of the committee was very careful to ask every witness whether small business was being adequately considered by the Department and by the industry in the allocations program. The testimony was universal, from all the witnesses, that they were being adequately taken care of. There were present a small-business representative from the Middle West, one from the far West, and one from the Oklahoma and Texas area. Not only did they testify to that effect, but, likewise, the Department of Commerce, through Secretary Sawyer, testified that they were taking care of small business. The administrator of this program testified likewise.

Furthermore, in direct answer to an explicit question as to whether a man desiring to go into the steel business or into a fabricating business or a processing business could get an adequate supply of steel, the Secretary of Commerce testified that an adequate amount had been set aside, or adequate at least under the proportion that had been established and set aside for supplying new businesses, as well as supplying established businesses.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Ohio will not leave the floor until I have an opportunity to present a letter which is on its way here, and to which I should like to call attention.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, during the course of the argument on this matter on December 18, 1947, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming said:

> Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in order to exculpate myself for voting for a measure which contains section 2, I desire to say that I associate myself with everything the Senator from Kentucky has said. I wish to add that, in my judgment, it will be utterly impossible to carry out the provisions of section 2, and that the waiver of the antitrust laws in these circumstances is utterly improper. I wish to express the opinion that the President will find it impossible to approve any agreement drawn under the terms of this joint resolution. Although I am convinced of the impracticality of that portion of this measure, nevertheless, I think I am justified in casting my vote for the joint resolution in order that there may be an extension of the powers of the Government to control exports and to allocate transportation facilities.

Mr. President, I should like to point out that, as learned and distinguished a statesman as I think the Senator from Wyoming is, nevertheless he turned out to be a poor prophet in this case, because the plan has worked, because the President, through the various agencies, provided for the program under the legislation, and the agencies he has authorized to do so have approved the agreements, and they have been effective.

In response to one of the statements made by the Senator from Florida, let me point out that if he feels as strongly as he seems to about the need for compulsory controls to deal with the situation, then let me remind him that if we turn back to the debates of December 17, and 18, 1947, he will find that what was proposed by Senators on his side of the aisle at that time was an amendment which provided for compulsory controls. Feeling as strongly as he does, why does he not offer such an amendment now? I would not vote for it, but he would have an opportunity to do so. Why does not his party offer an amendment providing for the form of controls they urged upon the Congress so vigorously back in those days?

Let me add that the then Senator from Kentucky, Mr. BARKLEY, was the one who ably presented that side of the argument. He urged that the compulsory controls be imposed; and at the end of the argument Senator BARKLEY said this:

> Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I neglected to say that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], who has been called away from Washington because of the death and funeral of his secretary, has just advised me that he wishes to associate himself with the sentiments I have expressed here in regard to this measure; and for the same reasons which I have given as actuating me in casting my vote, he wishes to be recorded as voting for the joint resolution if he were present and voting.

Mr. President, in closing my remarks, I ask this simple question: Why is it that this administration, which now controls a majority of the Congress, which has had so much to say about the subject of high prices, and whose representatives in Congress voted in large part against everything the Republicans had to offer in the Eightieth Congress—why is it that they choose, as the first step in their program to combat high prices, the reenactment, the continuance in force and effect, of a vitally important provision of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress?

My answer to that question, Mr. President, if I may venture one myself, is that they have no better program than the one the Republican Party put through the Eightieth Congress, and which, on the testimony before the committee, and by the fact that they now ask to have it continued, is shown to have worked successfully.

Mr. President, I submit that the voluntary program having worked so successfully, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Ohio should be adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, when the able junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was listening to the debate and the discussion a moment ago, he said to me that he had on his desk a letter which pertained to the subject of the discussion. He has obtained the letter, and I now have it before me. It is dated December 21, 1948, and is from the J. Gruman Iron & Steel Co., by J. G. Meyers, of 537 Seventh Avenue North, Minneapolis 11, Minn. The letter is addressed to Mr. William Simms, 3204 Coquelin Terrace, Rock Creek Knoll, Chevy Chase, Md. It reads as follows:

J. GRUMAN IRON & STEEL CO.,
*Minneapolis, Minn., December 21, 1948.*

Mr. WILLIAM SIMMS,
*Rock Creek Knoll, Chevy Chase, Md.*

DEAR SIR: We have been attempting to purchase steel for warehousing purposes from several steel mills, but our efforts for the past 4 years have been unsuccessful.

Knowing that Senator-elect HUMPHREY is desirous of helping small businesses, I am taking the liberty of writing to you so as to acquaint you with conditions in the steel industry, and also in the hopes that perhaps you can do something to help us in obtaining steel. The picture briefly is as follows:

In order to obtain new steel in 1944 it was necessary to produce records of past sales, and the mills then permitted you to replenish your stock only to the extent of the amount of the sales. Since we were just getting started in the sale of usable steel, we naturally were only able to buy a small quantity at that time. By the time we were in a position to reorder, the mills adopted a system of allocations, using the years 1939 and 1940 as base years, and apportioning their customers steel on that basis. That left us out of the picture, as we did not handle any steel during those years.

I made several efforts by mail, phone, and personal visits to Inland, Carnegie, and Bethlehem Steel Co.'s, and others, but have been unable to purchase anything from any of them. Our only sources of supply have been other warehouses, and in some instances free-lance brokers, and, as a result, we have paid more for the steel than we would have had to were we able to purchase direct from the mill. Naturally, we have had to charge more than the normal warehouse price when we resold this steel.

I believe that the mills in refusing to sell us steel direct have discriminated against us and have been indirectly responsible for making it necessary for the veteran to pay more than he should have for the I-beam or other steel he needed to build his house. The blacksmith who needed steel to repair farm equipment, the small factory that manufactured farm equipment, and numerous others who needed steel in small quantities and who normally turn to a source like us for their needs had to pay more than they should have.

While I realize that there is a shortage of steel, I feel that, since we were able to get it in roundabout ways, it should have been possible for us to get some steel directly from one or more of the mills I contacted in the last 4 years. Our customers for the most part are contractors, blacksmiths, small factories, and generally people who need small quantities of steel for essential purposes. We are in a position to use from 500 to 1,000 tons per month, and if we were able to obtain the steel from the mills I believe it would be of great benefit to the people we deal with, and in some measure would help the economy of the country.

I would thank you to call Senator-elect HUMPHREY's attention to this letter, and perhaps something can be done to eliminate the discriminatory practice of the mills.

Yours very truly,

J. G. MEYERS.

Mr. President, in my opinion, that letter accurately and fairly depicts the situation. It is exactly the kind of thing that has been brought to my attention by a small steel user in Bradenton, Fla. What is said here about farm implements was brought to my attention by Mr. George Morrow, of Graceville, Fla., telling me about the high gray-market prices, which in substance are the black-market prices, they had to pay to get farm machinery and the steel for farm purposes.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it from what my distinguished friend says that he is very much concerned about the opportunity of small steel users to get steel.

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly am.

Mr. BALDWIN. If that be so, I press the same question I have asked before. When we were debating this subject in December 1947, the former distinguished Senator from Kentucky, who was then minority leader, offered an amendment which would have provided for compulsory controls. If my friend from Florida feels as strongly about it as he does, why does he not offer a similar amendment? Why is it that his party comes forward, not with an amendment calling for compulsory controls, but with one merely asking for continuation of an act already on the books, passed by a Republican Congress? If he feels so strongly as he does, if he believes in compulsory controls, let him offer the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I may say to the Senator he must realize, when he views this matter in perspective, that we had a rather effective allocation and price-control system in this country until mid-1946. In mid-1946, with Republican Senators voting almost solidly—and I regret to say, a few Democrats on this side of the aisle joining with them, but only a minority of the Democratic Party membership in Senate and in House—the control system was destroyed. In a little while it had to be eliminated entirely. That is when we had an effective and fair compulsory rationing and allocation system. The President of the United States vetoed the bill, which was designed to destroy those effective and fair rationing, allocation, and price-control provisions. Later on, the President made numerous recommendations for restoration of a compulsory control, allocation, and price system. They were all refused and denied by the Congress, and I may say, solidly, by the Republican membership of both Houses. Later on, when it appeared that that was the only thing he had any possible hope of getting, the President recommended stand-by controls, after the amendment of the then Senator from Kentucky, our present able Vice President, had been defeated. I, of course, voted for the amendment. I am afraid the Senator from Connecticut did not. His colleagues did not, but I certainly voted for it, and most of my colleagues on this side of the aisle voted for it; but it was defeated. The amendment of the Senator from Kentucky was defeated, and the Republican majority adopted the voluntary allocation system.

Now, the President comes back to the Congress. He recommends two things—first, that he have stand-by authority which could be used in case of necessity. I hope the Republicans are going to support us Democrats in voting to give the President such authority. The President also sees the shortage of steel in the country, to which this writer has referred, which had been a matter of common knowledge. The President says we must have greater steel production facilities if the economy of America and the world is not to suffer. We are required to limit the amount of steel exports, of course, because of the limited steel production here at home. So he says: "Give me stand-by authority, and give me the authority to bring about, through Government aid if necessary, the production of more steel by providing additional production facilities."

Then we come to this day, when the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, having before it the same evidence that our Republican friends have been able to observe and to hear, recommends a 6 months' extension of the voluntary provision which is now in effect in the law. But the Republicans say "No; we are not satisfied with a 6 months' extension, and giving the Government time and opportunity to study the proposal for new facilities, or to see, in the light of conditions 6 months hence, what may be necessary." They want to say, "No; we will do nothing for 12 months. We will let the Government do nothing for 12 months along the line of providing the steel which is necessary, and assuring its fair distribution to the people of this country." So today, as I say, we come back to a simple issue: Do you favo. this voluntary system for 6 months, with the Government having an opportunity in the meantime to determine what our policy should be thereafter, or are you willing to put the cloak of immunity around the subject for a guaranteed minimum of 12 months, and de-

prive the Government of the opportunity to review the policy, unless the law is set aside in a shorter period than that? So it seems to me the issue is very clearly drawn on the immediate question of what we should do. At the end of 6 months, it will be determined by circumstances as they exist at that time.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. CAIN, and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield first to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to call attention to the vote on the passage of the measure to which reference has been made. There has been much talk about the amendment offered by the then Senator from Kentucky. On final passage of the bill, the vote was 77 to 10. I do not see how any side can claim all the credit for this one section of the bill which was passed. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky was defeated by two votes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator from Florida is familiar with what has happened because of the fact that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky was not adopted. Today there are 23,000 miles of REA posts, for which steel cannot be obtained for use in the conductors. There are 23,000 farmers, therefore, who are unable to get power. That is only a small fraction of the number, because posts have been set for thousands of miles, and it is impossible to obtain the wire conductors.

Again, if one goes into a farming community like Minnesota and tries to buy a combine, he will find that a second-hand one costs $5,500. Every crook and grafter in the country has enriched himself by being a parasite on the farmers in the Great Plains States who had crops they had to harvest. They were unable to buy new combines. I myself telephoned to the heads of every manufacturing company engaged in the production and sale of combines or farm machines. In the little county of Hettinger, N. Dak., according to the sworn testimony of the county agent, the farmers lost more than $1,000,000 on crops, because they could not obtain repairs for the old binders and combines they had—$1,000,000 in one county.

Again, when it comes to well tubing, there is an institution that needs well tubing. The institution is connected with a veteran's home and with trailer camps. It took me over 3 weeks, with all the support I got from the War Assets Administration, to locate tubing for even a quarter of a mile.

Compare the prices of farm machinery with the prices the farmers are getting today for their products. On page 2 of the report it is stated that the President delegated his authority under section 2, of the law enacted by the Eightieth Congress, to the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce. How did the farmers fare? Let us take hogs. What happened to the price of hogs? The high during last year was $31.75 a hundred. A week ago, it was $20.50. Now it is less. Steers were $39. Two weeks ago they were $28.25. Heifers dropped from $35.50 to $25.50—$10. The price of cows dropped from $24.75 to $19. The price of oats dropped from $1.39½ to 65½ cents.

Mr. MAYBANK. What about the price of steel?

Mr. LANGER. I do not have the figures for steel. I think the price increased, as a matter of fact.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator is showing how farm prices have suffered. In the last half of last year United States Steel made as much profit as it made in the whole previous year.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Let us consider the price of eggs. The price dropped from 33 cents to 23 cents. The price of butter, in Chicago, dropped from 88⅜ cents to 57½ cents. The price of apples dropped from $3.83 to $1.12.

That is the situation which has developed so far as agriculture is concerned.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not true that the price of fats and oils has gone down by a very large percentage?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. President, in the Middle West it is not possible to buy automobiles promptly. They are sold with one hand under the counter, trying to get a few hundred dollars more.

As a Republican on this side of the aisle, I simply want to say that I agreed with the position taken by the Senator from Kentucky at the time his amendment was offered, so far as the farmers are concerned.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, much has been said regarding this so-called Republican measure. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] a few minutes ago rather took the majority of the Banking and Currency Committee to task for bringing forth a measure which seeks to extend only one provision of the law. I believe it might be well for us to consider why the committee has done that particular thing.

First, Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that this so-called Republican law was, as the able chairman of the committee has pointed out, passed by the vote of every Democrat with the exception of eight. Two Republicans voted against the bill, and eight Democrats voted against it. In other words, it passed with almost the unanimous support of this body, in spite of the fact that it contained a provision relating to the antitrust laws to which many Members were conscientiously opposed.

There were given to the President three powers which expire on a particular date. Section 2 expires on February 28, 1949; section 3 expires on that date; and section 4 expires on that date. Those are the only three provisions which have an expiration date.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Did not he and the other members of the committee believe that we should first take up those provisions which expired in February and March before going into the consideration of new legislation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is exactly correct. In accord with the suggestion of the chairman of the committee, I personally spoke to Secretary Brannan who, as I understood, would handle this legislation before the respective committees, and suggested to him that instead of waiting to bring all these measures forward in one package, we should act early on the particular measures which had an early expiration date. Of the two measures which came to us—and, as I recall, they both came at the same time—one related to voluntary allocations of scarce materials, and the other to export controls. We first took up the matter of voluntary allocations. There was a reason for considering that matter first. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, that power expires on February 28 of this year. Unless there is an early extension, the whole effectiveness of the program will be lost for a certain period of time. It requires about 60 days to work out one of these voluntary agreements, because certain notices are required and certain invitations are sent to members to come in and participate. A committee has to be established and notice given to the public in order that anyone who may be interested may appear and be heard.

If Senators will read the hearings before our committee it will be seen that the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, very pointedly said that if we are to avoid a delay, this extension must be made quickly.

That is the reason for our acting first on this particular measure. Other measures will be before the Senate before very long. The question of allocations of transportation facilities for grain will come up very shortly before our committee, and in ample time a bill will be reported to the Senate relating to that particular subject.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. As I understand, the first step of the President's program is to continue in force section 2 of a measure passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. The second step, as I understand, in the anti-inflation program is to continue in effect another section of a bill passed by a Republican-controlled Congress. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I do not say it is offered in such a sequence as the Senator suggests. I just finished stating that different members of the Banking and Currency Committee asked that this legislation be in a form in which it could be acted on quickly. Particularly we were interested in the voluntary-agreement legislation because of the 60-day period which is necessary to put any agreement into effect and make it operative.

If the Senator will allow me, I do not want to rest only on that statement; I should like to go on, because I think I know the next question which the Senator will ask is whether we could not extend it just as quickly for a longer period of time.

There are reasons why this stop-gap legislation is desirable at this particular time. I shall mention one. There are many things which have not yet been fully studied and cannot be fully studied by our committee and given the thorough consideration they should have, in order to have legislation perfected and passed before February 28. Even if that were done, there would be a 60-day drag, which I mentioned a few minutes ago.

For instance, on January 19 the Secretary of Commerce, I believe it was, issued a press release regarding the misuse of some steel which had been allocated under one of these voluntary agreements. He has referred that matter to the Attorney General. It is not yet known whether or not the party charged can be prosecuted under the law as it exists today for a very definite infringement of what was intended under such a voluntary agreement as that which has been approved by the Attorney General's office.

It was stated a few minutes ago that the Secretary of Agriculture has not yet given his opinion as to how the act has worked with reference to the farmers; that the Secretary of the Interior has not yet told us how it has worked with reference to many of the metals, minerals, and scarce materials, basic materials—our natural resources. In other words, we have not been able, and we will not be able before February 28, to give to this law the kind of careful study it should have before we take a step toward continuing it to some far distant future date.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. In regard to the extension of the particular section under discussion, section 2, granting that there are in contemplation all the plans he mentions to propose further legislation, what harm would come if the law were extended for a year? The other legislation could still be offered. The limitation date suggested by the bill would end the program when Congress presumably would not be in session. The limitation which the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio places on the program would make it expire when the Congress was in session.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me answer briefly, and then I shall yield.

We certainly do not plan to wait until Congress has adjourned and will have to be called back into special session, as was the case with the Eightieth Congress. We plan to act before the present session of Congress adjourns.

The Senator asked me why we should not do what is proposed by the Senator from Ohio. I might ask in the same language, why not do what the committee has suggested, and when the permanent program, or the regular program, comes before us, if that is not satisfactory to the Senator from Connecticut, then he can propose an extension to suit his wishes at that time.

I now yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have been asking myself the very question which the able Senator from Connecticut has just asked the Senator from Alabama, and I have resolved by own thoughts in support of the committee's position, for the reason that if we extend the program through to March 1950, and then find that the extension has been too long, and we desire to pass some other legislation, we will be in the position of having told the steel industry, for example, that up until March of next year this will be the plan upon which they can proceed to do business, whereas if we extend it only until September of this year, we have then the option of extending it still further if we think that is the desirable thing to do, or writing substitute legislation prior to September 1949, in either of which events we will not have told the industry it can proceed for a definite length of time, and then change the rules before that length of time has passed. So, in answering that question for myself, in complete sympathy with the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, I have found that I cannot support it because to do so and then vote for legislation which would take effect prior to March 1950 would be the equivalent of changing the rules after the steel industry had proceeded to act upon the basis first presented. Therefore, for that reason, it seems to me that as between the two alternatives, the safer policy and the fairer way in which to treat the subject would be to give industry a definite date when they can act in complete confidence that the rules will be thus and so, and subsequently to extend the time for six more months if that should be found to be desirable, or to curtail it beginning September 1949 rather than to take the other alternative, of extending the time for a full year, and then make a new policy before the full year has run out. I think for that reason the committee date is the preferable of the two proposed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I am certainly indebted to the able Senator from Maryland for what I consider to be an absolutely correct analysis of the situation.

Furthermore, suppose we extend the time to some date beyond September of the year 1949, and agreements are drawn up looking to that date, and those agreements, according to the provisions of the law, are approved by the Attorney General of the United States in the face of the antitrust laws; and suppose further that we find, or the Attorney General finds, that a party could not be prosecuted under one of those agreements; then we would have hanging over our heads every one of the commitments which had been entered into, and they would be fast commitments until March 30, 1950.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator by illustration has supported the exact point I raised, that Congress should not place itself in a position where it purports to tell business it can proceed under one set of rules, and then, if it desires to change the rules, and actually does change them, puts business in the position of having made commitments for the future which are canceled automatically by a change of the legislation fixing a date prior to the first date the Congress fixed.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In a moment. I do not care to get into a legal argument with the Senator from Maryland, with whom I am in agreement, but it seems to me we might find ourselves even more embarrassed than as he states it, because I am of the opinion that the agreements which are made will become commitments, will become obligations, contracts will be made under them which we cannot cancel, and they will become binding in the face of the antitrust statutes which we waive by this so-called Republican measure.

By the way, Mr. President, in that connection, I am delighted to see the Senator from Connecticut deriving so much pleasure out of one Republican measure that did work. I hope he will get full pleasure out of it. It is the first one that came out of the Eightieth Congress, I have yet heard of that he or anyone else on the other side, or anywhere in the country, could boast of, even though it was passed with almost the unanimous support of the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more observation? If so, I will not interrupt him again.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we make September 30, 1949, the termination date to which these voluntary agreements may run, and then desire to extend the time for six more months, we can do so, and thereby adopt what the so-called Republican measure purports to have done. On the other hand, if we extend it until March 1950 and find that we desire to contract it to a date within that period, we run into the very situation which the Senator from Alabama is discussing, namely, of having told business it can proceed under one set of rules and having business proceed on that expectancy, and then before the expectancy has terminated, have Congress say, "Notwithstanding you have made contracts and agreements upon the theory that you had a year to go, we are going to give you only 6 months," and thereby in the courts and in other places where controversies are discussed and settled bring into question our authority to curtail the time because contracts were made in good faith.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Maryland. By the way, there is another thing to keep in mind, too. In extending this stopgap legislation, as is proposed, for a period of 6 months, we are in effect bringing the cut-off date and the effective date to the same time. In other words, it is just a halfway extension, after all, because under the law as

it now exists these agreements can be entered into up to February 28, but deliveries may continue to be made under them until September 30, 1949, or during a 6-month period, so that what we are really doing is to bring the two dates together.

Mr. President, I said something a moment ago about the pleasure some of the distinguished Members across the aisle are deriving from the fact that a Democratic Senate now is asking for a continuation of a Republican measure, and there has been much said here about how well this measure has worked. I agree that so far as it has gone it has worked well. But how far has it gone? Only a very small number of agreements have been entered into, most of them dealing with steel and steel products.

It has been said here that small business has indicated its complete satisfaction. I do not want to be understood as agreeing to any such statement as that. As a matter of fact, we had two representatives of small business before our committee. We had one other witness from Arkansas who really presented the case of the failure of the agreement to provide pipe to enable the opening of the Jones Mill aluminum plant, designed to produce aluminum, which is certainly in critical shortage in this country, and he said the plan had not worked in that instance.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD the protest I had received from some small-business men in my State. It had to do with one of the things the able Senator from North Dakota mentioned, soil pipe, which is absolutely essential for any housing program that may be undertaken. I do not know whether it is generally known, but the great center of the soil-pipe industry of the United States, and in fact the greatest in all the world, is located in my State, in the Birmingham-Gadsden-Anniston-Tuscaloosa area. Sixty-eight percent of all the soil pipe produced in the United States is made there. So I believe I know something of what has been happening with respect to the soil-pipe manufacturers in connection with iron and steel.

Reference has been made at different times to one or two individual plants. Mr. President, I want to say that it has not been a small matter with me. Complaints have come in from small-business men engaged in the manufacture of soil pipe. I placed in the RECORD a short quotation from one of the letters I had received, in which the writer stated that the voluntary agreement, so far as he was concerned, simply would not work and that was all there was to it. I remember he came to my office and talked with me personally after he had attended the industry committee meeting here, and he told me the agreement was not going to work. I asked him why. He said, "The Big Steel boys first say how much we are going to receive. Then we are supposed to form a committee to see how that is to be divided among ourselves, and of course that committee will be made up of the large users, the regular customers of the big steel companies, and they are going to receive just what they have been receiving."

I submit, Mr. President, that the record in this case shows that very largely that prediction came true. For instance, a soil-pipe manufacturer in my State wrote me that, whereas some of the big producers of soil pipe were able to buy pig iron in the Birmingham area at $36 a ton, he could not buy it there. The allocation program was not helping him to obtain $36-a-ton pig iron. He was obliged to buy pig iron from Texas, and pay $75 a ton for it. Yet he had to go on the market and compete with the manufacturers or with the syndicate the members of which were able to buy their pig iron at $36 a ton. I have received many complaints on the subject.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] referred to the fact that many manufacturers in his State used steel and steel products, but that he had received no complaints with respect to the shortage of steel. I want to tell of a friend of mine in Birmingham who called me on the telephone not long ago, and said, "I am simply being starved out of business. I cannot obtain iron." He told me a story. I said, "I wish you would write me a letter to that effect. What you have told me are facts which I should like to see referred to the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, to the Small Business Committee, and to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I should like to make some use of this matter." He said, "Oh, no, I am not going to write you a letter. I do not dare do that. If I wrote you a letter and it got out I would not even receive the small amount of steel I am now receiving."

I was interested in the extension of a natural gas pipe line in my area of the State.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BRICKER. I should like to read a statement made by the administrator in charge of the program, as it appears on page 9 of the hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency on January 25, 1949. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] asked the question:

> Here is an elementary question:
> Once a firm has made its request known, does it automatically share in the allocation?
> Mr. CLARK. If it has made its request known, it does share, providing it qualifies in terms of the product required and the type of end product which is being produced. If they qualify, they are then taken care of.

I recall to the Senator's mind the testimony of Secretary Sawyer as it appears on page 6 of the record, wherein he mentioned cast iron pipe radiation, plumbing-drainage products, and cast-iron soil pipe particularly, which is manufactured largely in the Senator's State, and he said there were 40 participating firms, of whom 35 qualified as small business. That may not encompass the industry, but certainly it would seem that the small business in the soil-pipe industry has been taken into consideration, and sits as a part of the committee which makes the allocation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Sawyer said that they had the privilege of participating, and that a great many small businesses had participated. However, if anyone wants to see the extent to which small business has participated, I simply refer him to a table on page 48 of the hearings, and suggest that he compare the number of small businesses given there to the number of small businesses throughout the United States.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. No problem with which I have been confronted in the past year has caused as much work, worry, and concern as the shortage of steel to the small-business man. I honestly believe that if it had not been for the Small Business Committee functioning in Congress the small-business man would have had a greater problem than he actually did have. The Small Business Committee did a splendid job, as I observed it, in policing the affairs of the big steel companies to see that small business was given a certain amount of steel in every monthly allocation.

I do not care to hold a post mortem over yesterday. What I am concerned about is this: Do the facts, as the committee now finds them, show that the future will be brighter and that there will be more steel for the small-business men, or is there a necessity at this time actually to put into effect positive, rigid control? That is the question I think we are all wrestling with. Is it necessary to fix positive controls? If it is, we should be moving in that direction. If it is not, then surely we should extend the time through the interim, or the fall months, when we expect Congress to be in recess, into the next year when Congress will be back in session. In that view of the case, then an extension for a period of a year would be more reasonable than an extension for 6 months. So the whole question is: If we are going to have ample steel then we might as well extend the voluntary agreement provision for a year. If we are not, then we might as well talk about regimentation and doing something about it, rather than merely converse about it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for one question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it from what my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama, has said, that he considers the situation to be still critical and grave?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Does the Senator refer to the shortage of steel?

Mr. BALDWIN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I consider the situation critical and grave. I may call the attention of the Senator to the fact that Mr. Sawyer, in response to a question I put to him, said that he anticipated the shortage for 1949 would be 7,000,000 tons.

Mr. BALDWIN. If that is the case, I should like to recall to my friend's mind that when we were debating the subject in December 1947, an amendment was offered to section 2 of the bill, the extension of whose provisions we are discussing by the then minority leader the distinguished Senator from Kentucky,

Mr. BARKLEY, providing for a system of compulsory controls. That amendment is still in existence somewhere. My question is this: If my friends on the other side of the aisle feel that this is so urgent, and requires immediate attention, why do they not bring forward that amendment and let us have an issue on the question of compulsory controls now? Why postpone it? Why delay? Why not have a show-down now? The people of the country were given to understand that if control over the Congress were placed in Democratic hands, the matter of prices would be disposed of in short order. We have been in session for four weeks, and the first measure which comes before us to deal with the question of prices is the continuance of a Republican measure. Now my friend tells me that the next measure to come before us is to call for the continuance of another Republican measure. I ask my friend, if he is so disturbed about this thing, why he does not offer as an amendment the amendment which was offered a year and a half ago? It was most earnestly urged at that time that that amendment was the type of legislation needed to deal with this situation. Why does not my friend offer such an amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am very glad my friend the Senator from Connecticut asked that question. I am also glad to have the question of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. I believe that the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota are quite pertinent to the discussion we are having. There is a shortage of steel——

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I finish answering the question?

Mr. BRICKER. I merely wished to verify some figures.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Having to do with the tonnage of the shortage?

Mr. BRICKER. Yes. The Secretary of Commerce did say that, according to his best estimates, there was a shortage of 7,000,000 tons, including our European shipments, upon a production basis of 68,000,000 tons this year of finished products. That was based upon a production of steel ingots estimated at 92,000,000 tons. The production in January, if carried throughout the year, would give us 97,000,000 tons of steel ingots, which would raise the production of finished products to approximately 72,000,000 or 73,000,000 tons, an increase over the estimate by the Secretary of Commerce. Likewise, production in Europe is going up rapidly. Production in Germany, France, Belgium, and England is increasing, so there will be a more adequate supply there, which might cut down the amount estimated for export, of 4,200,000 tons, which would, of course, narrow the difference between supply and demand in this country. As the best proof of that, in 1947 foreign shipments were, *as I recall*, 6,600,000 tons. Last year they were 4,600,000 tons, and the estimate for this year is 4,200,000 tons. If our production of ingots remains where it was this month, there will not be a difference of 7,000,000 tons, but it will be appreciably smaller than that. Frankly, on the basis of the estimate and the production capacity, I believe that if there is no interruption by strikes or in the supply of some of the component parts, there will be almost an adequate supply of steel by the end of this year, if not quite an adequate supply to take care of the domestic and foreign needs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his suggestions. I certainly hope that his hope may be realized. I know of nothing that would be better for the economy of the country than for that to come to pass. However, I know that the Senator from Ohio would be one of the first to realize that the statement he has just made had six or eight different contingencies in it. It is one of the "iffiest" statements I have ever heard. I think it may very well serve as an answer to the question propounded by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. We do not know whether rigid controls are going to be necessary. A year ago last December I supported the amendment for rigid controls, and I have no apology for having supported the amendment. I still believe that had that amendment been written into law we would have been much better off from the standpoint of manufacture of steel and steel products, and all the various products of which steel is the basic material.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have listened nearly all afternoon to the debate upon this subject, and especially the questions which have been repeated over and over by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. At least five distinct times he has asked why some Senator does not offer the amendment which was offered by the distinguished Vice President when he was a Senator, 2 years ago. He has claimed all the credit for the measure which was enacted by the Republican-controlled Congress.

At this point I think it is well to remind the Senate that the only way the Republicans got back into session in 1947 was that the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, called Congress back into extraordinary session to do something about inflation after the Republicans had adjourned the Congress. It was through the efforts of the President that any legislation whatever was enacted having anything to do with the problem of inflation. I mention that in passing.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama that if the Senator from Connecticut can get any enjoyment out of this legislation he is welcome to it. Instead of criticizing and condemning us for trying to continue it for 6 months, he ought to be commending us and thanking us for going along with such a wonderful piece of legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress, which was Republican-controlled.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may say a word in response?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me point out to my distinguished friend that I am enjoying this discussion, because, as I stated in my previous remarks, I am not only surprised but I am astounded that after 2 years of debate on what the Democrats would do to combat high prices if they once got in control of the Congress the very first step is to continue in force and effect a Republican measure, and their second step is going to be to continue in force and effect another one.

If this problem is so urgent, why do we not have the legislation which we were led to believe we were going to have? Apparently we do not have it because what the Republicans did is working. That is demonstrated by the fact that the Democrats now ask to have it continued. It is demonstrated by the fact that the heads of the agencies downtown say that it is adequate and is working. I do not believe that we ought to allow this occasion to pass without taking some note of that fact.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say in response to my friend from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] that I have never seen anyone really excited or astounded who was also happy. The Senator from Connecticut may be happy about this measure, but he has also been astounded all afternoon by the fact that we dared bring in a proposal to continue something which the Republican-controlled Congress adopted 2 years ago. The only reason Republicans adopted any sort of an anti-inflation measure was, as I previously stated, that the President of the United States, Hon. Harry S. Truman, called the Congress back into session at that time and prodded it into action upon the serious question of inflation. It did nothing until the latter part of December of 1947, and then only in self-defense.

The Republicans took all the time they wanted in order to bring forth these few little popgun anti-inflation measures.

Now, because the President of the United States wants a little time, working with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and other agencies of the executive branch of Government who are vitally concerned with economic stabilization, we find this political criticism on the opposite side of the aisle. We are criticized because we do not rush in and do this, that, or the other thing. So far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, if I can only get my brethren on this side of the aisle to go along with me, we will control the date for the enactment of legislation instead of letting the Republicans do it.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, let me say a few words in my own time, and then I shall be glad to yield again. Particularly do I wish to yield to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who has been on his feet for some time.

Before we get too far away, I should like to correct the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] in connection with one statement which he made, in fact, in connection with several statements.

I admit that the measure which we are considering today was passed by the Republican-controlled Congress as a substitute for the anti-inflation program recommended by the President, and advocated in legislation introduced by the then able minority leader, who is now Vice President. But when the Senator from Connecticut talks about export controls being Republican legislation, I should like to call his attention to the fact that that legislation has been on the statute books since 1940, and all the Republican Congress did was simply to extend it. When it comes to the question of the allocation of transportation facilities for grain, I should like to call his attention to the fact that that was provided for in the War Powers Act of 1942. So I do not know but that perhaps he has been getting a little too much pleasure out of what we Democrats propose to do with this so-called Republican measure.

I say again that I am glad we did find a little good in one measure they presented. I do not agree with him when he says it was adequate. It was not adequate; it has not been adequate. It has accomplished some good, and I hope that when we have had an opportunity to study this measure in the light of testimony that will be given to our committee by the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and—do not forget—the Attorney General, and the Secretary of Commerce, we may be able to continue a voluntary system of allocations that will be workable. I am not saying that I believe we shall be able to do so. In 1947 I supported the amendment for compulsory allocations, and I think we could have done an adequate job under it. I do not think we have done an adequate job under the present law; but it may be that we can stop up enough loopholes to make it adequate, so that rigid controls will not be necessary. But today as a committee we are not in position to recommend to the Senate that that be done.

I should like to call the attention of the able Senator from Minnesota to the fact that recently it was discovered that one iron fabricator was obtaining iron for use in the manufacture of warm-air heaters, but, instead, was using it for the manufacture of shoeshine stands. That question has been submitted to the Attorney General. We are not at all certain that this Republican measure of 1947 will permit the Attorney General to proceed against that man. Certainly if we can stop up loopholes such as that—and we do not know how many more there will be—we can increase the amount of iron that can be allocated to the processors and the fabricators all over the United States. It may be that we can work out a system whereby we can obtain assurance that the 26,000 miles of rural electrification lines can be supplied with the necessary conductors, so that 100,000 or more farm homes can be supplied with electricity. It may be that we can stop up enough loopholes to make the law workable. If we can, I assure the Senate that the Banking and Currency Committee will be glad to return with a recommendation that it be continued, not only for 1 year, but for 2 years. The Secretary of Commerce indicated in his testimony that that is what he was talking about.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I followed the statement of the Senator from Alabama with respect to what the other side hopes to accomplish in the way of providing more steel for more purposes for more people. However, I cannot understand how the extension of the voluntary agreements act for an additional 6 months beyond September could prejudice that program in the slightest. Will the Senator please address himself to that question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I spent perhaps 10 minutes or more in talking about that matter some little time ago. There was an exchange of suggestions between the able Senator from Maryland and myself with reference to it. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon was unfortunately detained from the floor of the Senate at that time.

However, with the indulgence of the other Senators, I do not mind restating very briefly what was said at that time. Under the law as it now stands, the power to enter into these agreements expires February 28. However, there is a 6-month extension within which the agreements made may be effective.

All we are doing in this bill is to bring the first date up to the latter date, so that the whole thing would be extended to September 30, 1949.

Mr. CORDON. I understand that perfectly. But what happens within another 6 months?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator will keep in mind the fact that a part of this law is a waiver of the Antitrust Act with reference to these particular agreements. Suppose we extend the law to March 30, 1949, and suppose voluntary agreements are made before there is any change in the law, and assume that later a change is made. To my way of thinking—and I believe the Senator from Oregon will agree with me—every one of those agreements, voluntarily entered into, and approved by the Attorney General of the United States, would become a commitment. The Antitrust Act would be waived so far as those particular agreements were concerned.

Later on, after we have made the thorough study and have listened to the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and have taken their recommendations, even though we may decide that we want to stop up some of the loopholes, any proposals of that sort cannot be applied to the agreements which have been entered into prior to the enactment of the subsequent measure.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator know of any provision in the present law which requires the President to extend these agreements beyond any time which his pleasure and judgment dictate should be their limit? Let me call the attention of the Senator for a moment to the law itself. I am reading from page 3, section 2, subparagraph (b) of the original law:

> The President is authorized to approve any such agreement which he finds will carry out any of the purposes declared in section 1 of this joint resolution, except that he shall not approve any agreement unless such agreement specifically provides that it shall cease to be effective on or before March 1, 1949.

Does the Senator agree that that is authority for the President to make an agreement for the full period or one-half of the period or any other fraction of the period which in his judgment is proper?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I say to the Senator that that question has been submitted to the Attorney General of the United States.

Mr. CORDON. Does not the Senator understand the plain language?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Attorney General has held that whereas no agreement could be entered into subsequent to February 28, 1949, nevertheless, once the agreement is made, deliveries could continue to be made under that agreement for 6 months.

Mr. CORDON. The bill now before the Senate, as amended, contains an amendment to the provision in the original act, and it is to be found at the bottom of the single sheet, which is Senate bill 547. That proposed amendment is:

> (f) This section shall expire on September 30, 1949, and any requests made and voluntary plans adopted under this section shall have no force or effect thereafter.

The plain purpose of that is to require that the execution of all agreements be within the period of the maximum limitation, which here is set in September, and which some on this side prefer to extend until next March. If that be the case, is it not the Senator's opinion of this plain language that the President might well develop and properly make agreements to extend say from this or any immediate period to, let us say, the last of May, the last of June, or the first of July, the end of the year, or any other period, and thus maintain within himself the power not only to use any standby control which he may get, if he gets it, but also the power to make these agreements, which power will lapse at the time set in this amendment, or on the 1st of March, whichever date is taken? Would it not be better for the country if the President were given the power to use his judgment under, mind you, Mr. President, the approval of the Attorney General as to the wisdom and legality of his action, and let that power continue so that he may get voluntary agreements, if he can, with his reserved right, if he gets it, to use the whip?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the honorable Senator from Oregon, I think I was in error a few moments ago in saying that the Attorney General had given an official opinion to the effect that deliveries could be made until September 30, 1949, but it is my understanding that that is the opinion of the officials who are administering the act, and that the matter has been submitted to the Attorney General. But let me call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the

fact that on August 18, 1948, a letter went to Secretary Sawyer from the acting majority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], in which he stated his interpretation of the law. At that time, the Senator from Nebraska was chairman, if I remember correctly, of the Special Senate Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business, and he was writing in that capacity. He of course, as the able Senator knows, is now minority leader. He wrote to Secretary Sawyer, stating that his interpretation of the law had been checked with the Banking and Currency Committee—which, by the way, was under the control of the Republican majority and which had on it three members of the Small Business Committee—and his interpretation was that agreements made prior to March 1, 1949, could continue in existence for 6 months thereafter. He further stated, at the same time, that the Attorney General agreed with his view.

Secretary Sawyer, in reply to the Senator from Nebraska and the Small Business Committee, and the Republican Congress, said that he would abide by the interpretation, and would proceed on the assumption that agreements made prior to March 1, 1949, would continue to be in effect for 6 months thereafter, in accordance with the suggestion that came down to him from the Republican leadership of the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very briefly. I want to conclude.

Mr. CORDON. I regret that I have taken so much of the Senator's time. I am deeply appreciative.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not complaining. I merely said I would like to yield briefly, because I do not want to prolong my own remarks.

Mr. CORDON. I assure the Senator that with the few remarks I have made I shall not interrupt him further. I am deeply appreciative of the Senator's courtesy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have no desire to prolong the discussion further. The one point I think we should keep in mind is that we, the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, considered the pending legislation and voted for it. As I recall, at the time the vote was taken, there were 10 members present, and the vote was 8 to 2. Eight Democrats to two Republicans voted to report the legislation favorably. We realized it was a stop-gap measure. We were not asking for anything else. All in the world we were asking was that the voluntary agreement law, accomplishing whatever good it was accomplishing, be continued until we had a chance to hear from other interested persons regarding it, and could make a recommendation as to whether it should be continued for a longer period of time; and, if so, with what amendments; or, if not, what substitute legislation should be offered.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Was there any testimony before the committee with respect to continuation of the emergency legislation beyond the 6 months' period?

Mr. SPARKMAN. There were a few questions, I think, put to Secretary Sawyer, which may be said to bear upon it, but no direct testimony. We did not go into that question at all.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the question whether it should be continued for 6 months or a year arose at the conclusion of all the testimony, did it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. And in executive session.

Mr. LUCAS. Those who are now seeking to continue it for 1 year failed to produce a single material witness before the committee in support of that being done?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Or even to cross-examine the witnesses who had come before the committee for the purpose of recommending the 6-month stopgap legislation.

Mr. LUCAS. Did they ever give an excuse as to why they did not produce witnesses before the committee or present evidence bearing upon the continuation for a year?

Mr. SPARKMAN. None whatever.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. I wish to correct the Senator's statement that the bill was ordered reported to the Senate by a vote of 8 to 2. After the amendment was defeated by a vote, as I recall, of 8 to 2, the bill was then ordered reported favorably by the unanimous vote of the committee.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is correct. I meant that the question of the extension of time was decided by a vote of 8 to 2. The committee was unanimous in favorably reporting the bill, which is before the Senate today.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Connecticut asking the Senator from Alabama to yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. No. I request the floor in my own right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I can see no harm in continuing the method of voluntary allocation, which apparently has worked so successfully, for a longer period than September 30. Of course, the reason which has been advanced by the proponents of the measure for continuing the law to September 30—and I may say I intend to vote for it—is that it is desired to continue in force and effect the present law until something better is found. Presumably, they think they can find something better. I say that in the face of the fact that all the testimony before the committee, even including the agencies downtown having charge of such matters, was to the effect that this had worked very successfully.

I assume that what may be proposed ultimately is a method whereby the President may impose some real controls. I submit that provision is already in the act, and I call the attention of the chairman of the committee, and the attention of my distinguished friend from Alabama, to section 6, which sets up a procedure whereby the President can secure from the Congress legislation providing for the control of any specific commodity which he may find to be in short supply. It may be, Mr. President, that while the Congress was under the control of a Republican majority, the President or the administration may have anticipated that such approval would not be forthcoming.

But that is not now the situation. Under the provisions of section 6, a President who was elected as a Democrat could come to a Congress controlled by a majority of Democrats in both Houses and lay before them his program to establish compulsory controls and, I assume, secure very prompt action on it.

When we read section 6 of this act, which was passed by a Republican-controlled Congress, along with a provision for the extension of voluntary controls, there is a complete program to deal with the question. I take it that all of us would prefer to see private business and individual enterprise do the job. Many of us think that when it fails to do the job it should be prodded into doing it. Some of us may think that if private enterprise fails to do the job the Government should step in and supplement its controls.

I submit that the act as it presently stands is admirably designed to do that very thing. So, if we were to continue it for a period of years instead of for six months, there is still in the act a provision whereby the President could ask for the enforcement of specific controls on particular items.

So, Mr. President, I think that in order to have a well-rounded program we could well adopt the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, continuing the provision for a year.

I close by saying, Mr. President, that I am happy indeed that the first step in the President's program to control inflation is the adoption and the continuance of a measure enacted by a Republican-controlled Congress more than a year ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the subject has been rather fully debated, but it may be that not sufficient attention has been paid to the legal effect of the law as it now exists and of the powers which would continue if the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio should be adopted and an extension of the act thereby made.

There seems to be some misunderstanding as to exactly what the act means. It would appear to the Senator from Oregon to be perfectly clear. Perhaps it is not. The authority granted to the President to negotiate agreements in the public interest with private industry in the field of allocations is an added power granted to the President which would be, except for this act, nonexistent, because it permits agreements which, except for this authority, would be in con-

flict with and prohibited by the antitrust laws. When the act was drawn the language was made very specific, in that no agreement could be made until the President, as the Chief Executive of the United States, should find it in the public interest, and then only after clearance from the Attorney General. If both those protections were thrown around the power granted, even a Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress was willing to trust a Democratic President of the United States with that power, which no Congress had ever permitted except in an emergency, in time of war.

When that power was granted to the President, it was not in the form of a command. It was a power which the President might or might not exercise. That would depend on whether it was found by him to be in the public interest. It was a power that he might exercise for a short time or for any length of time up to the maximum limit provided in the act.

There is no requirement in the act that agreements made by the Chief Executive must extend for the full maximum period. That is a matter which is discretionary with the President. If the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio prevails and this power is extended until the end of March of next year, there is no requirement that the President shall use it at all. He may make agreements for 1, 2, 3, 7, or any other number of months that he feels will best serve the public interest, provided only that the agreement does not go beyond the last day of March.

The arguments we hear that if this extension be granted to March 31 of next year, the President may be administering another act and that private industry will not know where it stands, to me is twaddle. There is no basis for it in the law as it exists or in the extension which is suggested. If we grant the President this additional power he will simply be in the most enviable position in which any president of a republic could ever wish to be. He will have the power to negotiate a voluntary agreement. He will have the power to carry out agreements for a long period of time if he shall deem it necessary, or make no agreement unless, in his judgment, it should be made. In any case in which he may make an agreement which is not carried out he would be justified in using any other power he might have. On the other hand, if after such extension there be given stand-by control, there is nothing in the stand-by control that would in any way apply to any private industry which was already operating voluntarily under agreement.

Mr. President, I can see no reason under the shining sun why this extension should not be made. I cannot understand why Senators on the other side of the aisle would not gladly accept the amendment. It is certainly in line with all the ideas and ideals of self-government.

The very thought of stand-by controls is predicated upon the basic proposition that such controls are not now needed, but that they should be available some time in the future if they shall be needed. Certainly if my friends on the other side of the aisle believe in that philosophy—and I believe in it—they should welcome the opportunity for the Chief Executive, who is also of their political faith, to have an opportunity to carry out this allocation on a voluntary basis, by voluntary agreement, rather than to establish all the intricate machinery necessary to force industry, as has been done in the sorry past.

There is no political aspect in this matter, so far as I am concerned. To me it would appear that my friends on the other side of the aisle should accept this amendment and be glad to do so. There can be no prejudice either to industry, the public, or the standing of the President in accepting this amendment for the period of time stated. On the other hand, Mr. President, if we do not extend it, what will happen? My friend from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], in his presentation a little while ago, said, in substance—I do not claim to quote him exactly—that we do not know that stand-by controls will be used or that it will be necessary to use them. I say to my friend from Alabama that if the bill passes according to the way in which it was reported on the floor, so that the voluntary-control provision expires on the 30th day of September of this year, all he will do is to guarantee that the controls must be put on under authority of that reserve stand-by power, because he will have taken from his own President the right to make such an agreement beyond the 30th day of September. Certainly it is not intended to do that. Certainly no one desires to set up all the intricate machinery of control and allocation if it be unnecessary.

There must be some other reason for this limitation as of September 30, when we realize that September 30 would represent the day in all the year upon which we could be almost morally certain that Congress would not be in session. If this act be continued only to September 30, we are taking a permissive authority from the President at a time when we cannot give it back to him. If we pass the bill but leave that date in the act, then we shall hear the argument made, "We must give the stand-by controls, or after the 30th day of September there will be no power of agreement and allocation." I hope, Mr. President, that that is not what is sought. That is not in the public interest.

There has been offered a sound and constructive amendment, to increase the period of time until the last of March of next year. That entire period of time can be utilized by the President, or not at all, as he sees fit. That time goes sufficiently far into the next session of the Congress to afford Congress an opportunity to determine whether the time for voluntary agreements should be extended even further. Any stand-by control that may be enacted can go side by side without any inconsistency whatever with that power, and we may, and I hope we will, find in that event that the record made of voluntary agreements, and the administration of those agreements, the keeping of those agreements by industry, will make unnecessary any execution or use of any control power which may be vested as a mandatory authority in the President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I question not in the slightest the excellent motives of the distinguished Senator from Ohio in offering his amendment, and I think I understand, from the able arguments made, that there are some reasons why such an amendment should be considered. But I think that the philosophy followed by the committee is a preferable one in this case, for a reason which I should like to state into the RECORD at this time.

Let me first, however, commend the committee for keeping this subject, in its report, on an entirely nonpolitical basis, and insofar as the junior Senator from Florida is concerned, his debate will be confined to such a basis.

I commend particularly the wording of the report, which I read into the RECORD now:

> The principal activities under this section, up to the present time, have been those carried on by the Office of Industry Cooperation of the Department of Commerce with respect to existing and proposed voluntary plans providing for the allocation of steel and pig iron to various programs of importance to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign policy of the United States. The committee finds that the existing voluntary plans have provided substantial benefits to the national interests.

There is no question there of depriving anyone of the credit, and I am glad that such is the approach.

The committee report continues, a little later:

> The committee is advised that a broader stabilization program will be submitted to the Congress in the near future and that this program will include provisions for the allocation of scarce materials for essential purposes. Pending consideration of this more comprehensive program, it is the recommendation of your committee that the authority for the present activities under section 2, Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, should be extended, in order that the benefits of this program to the domestic economy, the national security, and the foreign policy should not be lost.

There is no claim at all that there have not been benefits under the act which is now in force, but a well-considered statement, in my view of the facts, that since a much more comprehensive program for stabilization of industry, critical supplies, and so forth, is on the way and will be here shortly, final action on that particular measure should preclude any great extension, in terms of many months, of the present law. Hence the recommendation for the limited extension of 6 months.

Mr. President, before coming to my principal point, I wish again to commend the completely nonpolitical approach made by the committee, by unanimous vote, as I now understand, and I think that is a sound approach to make in matters which do vitally affect the national economy. I think that the recommendation is based on good, sound

grounds, good business reasons, when a longer extension than 6 months is not recommended, because of the announced fact that in the early future this committee is expecting a more comprehensive program, and will expect to pass upon a program, so as to fit in any new enactment with the rather limited extension which is proposed under the bill now under consideration.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not for a moment, if the Senator please. I should like to complete my statement; then I shall be glad to yield.

I may say, Mr. President, that my own concern in regard to the pending measure arises because of some experience which I had about the time of the enactment of the present law, when serving on a subcommittee of the Small Business Committee of the Senate, and in trying to discover what was wrong with the steel industry. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that that subcommittee made a report, which appears in Senate Document 825, Eightieth Congress, which was agreed to by all members of the subcommittee. In other words, it was a nonpolitical report, in which the effort was to bring to the attention of the Senate and of the country the fact that certain things had caused grave concern to the members of the subcommittee in connection with steel. Some of the things I should like to quote out of the report for the RECORD at this time, if I may. First, from page 8 of the report I read this paragraph:

In addition to some steel mills withdrawing their distribution from areas previously served and refusing to ship steel where it is needed, the subcommittee has investigated other evidences of disruption to normal channels of supply marked by growths in horizontal and vertical integrations in the steel-producing industry. There is no question but that smaller steel producers and users are being forced out of business and their facilities either scrapped or taken over by the larger integrated companies.

Then, continuing on the same subject, on pages 9 and 10 of the report, I quote again:

Many complaints received by the subcommittee indicate that some of the integrated steel companies, which constitute the principal source of supply for crude, semifinished, and finished steel in this country, have refused to continue to supply old customers on the grounds that the steel is needed by the producer to take care of the requirements of his own wholly owned or controlled fabricating or manufacturing units.

I digress from the quotation simply to state that the committee was alarmed to find to what a degree the manufacturing companies had taken over the erectors and the fabricators, or had themselves organized competing erectors and fabricators, which were driving the little folks out of business.

I continue to read:

The supply of basic materials to the smaller units of the steel industry is one of the vital points in the relations between the large integrated producers and the small business of the steel industry.

Then there are several other statements to like effect. Instead of reading them at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my present remarks all of that portion of the report of the subcommittee beginning with the heading "Integrated operations reduce supplies to independents" on page 9 and continuing down to but not including the heading "Exports of steel" on page 10.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRATED OPERATIONS REDUCE SUPPLIES TO INDEPENDENTS

Many complaints received by the subcommittee indicate that some of the integrated steel companies, which constitute the principal source of supply for crude, semifinished, and finished steel in this country, have refused to continue to supply old customers on the grounds that the steel is needed by the producer to take care of the requirements of his own wholly owned or controlled fabricating or manufacturing units.

The supply of basic materials to the smaller units of the steel industry is one of the vital points in the relations between the large integrated producers and the small business of the steel industry.

Colonel Rockwell, of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., in testimony referred to above, has outlined the logical consequences of the continued development of integration of steel-producing and manufacturing facilities. He speaks with the authority of an experienced and eminent industrialist, and his words quoted below should carry weight:

"It is obvious that, if the steel companies continue to enter into competition with their customers in the fabricating and in the steel-consuming manufacturing industries, we shall soon be competing with vertical trusts of the type which existed in Germany.

"When there is a slowing down of business, such steel companies will try to obtain business from the independent steel barrel manufacturers and other consumers [of steel]; but, when business is expanding rapidly, such customers will be faced with a refusal to supply steel at the very time when it is impossible to buy from other steel companies who are considerate enough to take care of their established customers.

"As far as we know, this is the first time in history that some steel companies have had a sustained demand, and, at the same time, have been in competition with their customers. They have, therefore, cut off some established customers in order to build up their own business in the steel-fabricating or steel-consuming manufacturing industries."

One of the first complaints laid before the subcommittee was that of an independent steel erector, the Karl Koch Erecting Co., of the Bronx, N. Y. (p. 1904, hearings). This company testified that they were unable to bid on the erection of Government hospitals in New York State because the steel bids tendered by the only bidders, Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp. and Bethlehem Steel Corp., provided not only for the furnishing of the steel but its fabrication and erection as well. Under the limitations of the bidding form, the independent was unable to bid, due to the fact that he could not furnish the steel for the erection services he would perform. This method of bidding made a difference in the cost to the Government of $151,800 in the building of a veterans' hospital in Brooklyn, N. Y. (p. 1915, hearings.)

Mr. C. A. Johnson, general manager of sales, fabricated steel construction, Bethlehem Steel Corp., stated (p. 1931, hearings) in response to questioning by the subcommittee that his company would not bid on steel for these Government hospitals unless they could secure the complete job, which would include fabrication and erection. He also gave as his reason the need to keep the Bethlehem erection department busy.

As a result of these hearings, the subcommittee was able to secure for all the independent erectors a revision of the Government bid form which would enable them to bid on the separate services on Government construction, and require the integrated companies to bid, separately, on each service to be rendered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, as one member of that subcommittee, it was crystal clear to me that many of the small erectors and fabricators had actually been driven out of business already, and that the course of operations was designed to eliminate more and more of them from business. It was my fear that the legislation in December of 1947 was too weak to cope with that particular situation.

The junior Senator from Florida supported the motion made by the then senior Senator from Kentucky, Mr. Barkley, but, having failed in its adoption, he supported the bill, taking what he could to deal effectively with this problem.

But now, Mr. President and Senators, I am not satisfied that that particular acute problem in this field which relates to small business has been solved, and my reason is that during the time of operation of the current law I have had not one, but repeated complaints from small-business operators in my own State and elsewhere, because they have not been able to get their supplies of steel from the manufacturers, and because the manufacturers are sending those supplies in undue quantities, so these small people believe, to the fabricators and erectors who belong to the manufacturers. And, Mr. President, because of my having received a large number of complaints of that kind during the operation of this existing law, I am glad that the committee confines itself in its recommendations to a limited extension of 6 months and gives notice and warning that it proposes during that period of time to take up a more comprehensive program, and of course to make report and recommendation for the enactment of legislation in that more comprehensive program.

And here is something that makes me even more fearful that the present law is not meeting the situation. I quote from the printed report of the hearings of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the United States Senate on the subject of the bill to extend the voluntary controls agreement, on January 25, 1949. I quote from page 43 of those hearings. The sentence which I shall read comes out of the report of Secretary Sawyer. It is in response to questions during the course of the hearings as to how small business was affected by the operation of the present law. In candor I must say that the Secretary in his testimony stated that he felt that small business was being pretty well cared for. All I can say is that that feeling varies from the reports that have come to the junior Senator from Florida. But when he was asked to submit written recommendations and a written statement and a written report on its operation under this measure, he included this particular sentence, which I call to the attention of the Senate, and which, it seems to me, makes it wholly clear that the operation of the present

law, within the limited time that it has been afforded, has not been carried down the line to the point where it does serve to protect small users of steel and small business in the steel industry. I quote the sentence which appears as subsection (4) of section C on page 43:

All the present plans provide for shipments from producing mills, and it has not yet been possible to make arrangements for allocations for shipments by warehouse and other distributors. Therefore, the existing voluntary plans cannot take care of consumers who buy only from warehouses and other distributors.

That is the end of the quotation, Mr. President and Senators, and it would appear from the report of the Secretary of Commerce made to the committee but a few days ago, that he stated frankly to the committee that the operations of his Department, the operations of the Nation under the present law, had not been carried down to the consumers or to the small people, and that he made no pretense that such was the case.

Mr. President, in closing it seems to me that it would be very foolish for the Senate to create a problem such as that suggested by the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], by extending the law for a greater period than the 6 months, and that, to the contrary, the proposed action should be regarded as a stopgap extension, and I, for one, in view of the wholly nonpolitical position taken by the committee will be looking with confidence to the committee to bring in a much-farther-reaching report based upon the comprehensive recommendations which the committee tells us it will be in position to receive and to study within a very short period.

I think that is the cautious, that is the prudent, that is the common-sense, that is the businesslike way to approach the problem, and so far as I am concerned, I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is not the proper way to approach the subject, and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has read excerpts from the report of the Committee on Small Business, indicating that the handling of steel allocation was not satisfactory to small business. Does the Senator know whether that condition resulted from a failure of the Secretary of Commerce properly to administer an agreement, or from a failure of the President to make the right kind of an agreement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to make clear the statement I made. I thought it was clear before.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator had not touched that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. The report was made upon a study which was made by the subcommittee of the Small Business Committee just prior to the meeting of the special session of Congress in December, I believe it was, of 1947, and the report is dated in December of 1947, immediately after the enactment of the present law. Therefore the situation complained of in the report of the committee developed during the hiatus—during that time between the knocking out of all controls in the summer of 1946 and the time in December of 1947 when the new control measures were passed. But in addition to that definite knowledge which the Senator from Florida has as to the existence of that fact at that time, I also have ample showings from numerous small users that that condition has not been corrected. And then when I see in the report of Secretary Sawyer the statement which I read into the RECORD indicating that the program had not yet had time to be continued down to and to reach to the actual users of steel, it seems to me that there is a statement that should put me and should put the Senate on guard as to what has been done to small business under the operation of this particular law, and until we do know what has been done, after adequate studies have been made by the committee, which I think the Senator will agree has proceeded in a nonpolitical way—until we do know how small business now can say that it has been affected by the operations of this law, I think any approach to permanent or semipermanent legislation would be a mistake. That is the position I am taking here.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Ohio suggests that the extension of voluntary agreement be made to the 31st of March 1950 rather than the 30th of September 1949.

Is the Senator in agreement with the Senator from Oregon, that if that be not done, and the time limit be the 30th of September, as provided in the committee's bill, the Congress, in considering any legislation which may be presented, is faced with the proposition that it must take the administration bill or have nothing at all after the 30th of September? Is that the Senator's view?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is not the view of the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. CORDON. What situation would exist?

Mr. HOLLAND. On the contrary, if the Senator will allow me to make my own answer to his suggestion——

Mr. CORDON. I have not attempted to suggest an answer. I apologize for the second question.

Mr. HOLLAND. On the contrary, it is my view that this report, taken as a whole, makes it very clear that the committee proposes to study the question diligently and to make recommendations for legislation which can be passed while we are in session in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I think the report makes it very clear that the committee is hoping that much more effective legislation can be enacted to operate after September 30, which will allow a little time to prepare all the multifarious details of such a program, and which will not allow this relatively uncontrolled situation to continue into next spring.

If I felt that the committee was not willing speedily to make a study and report, and that the committee was not anticipating the passage of more effective and more comprehensive legislation while we are in session during the first session of this Congress, effective September 30, I would agree with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. But there has been nothing in the performance of the committee which indicates to my mind anything other than an intention to go ahead as rapidly as possible consistent with caution and the exercise of good judgment, and to come back with a comprehensive program for enactment before we get away from here, effective September 30.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. If the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] should be adopted, and the Voluntary Agreements Act should be extended to the last of March of next year, could not the President in his wisdom, having in mind as the Senator has, a comprehensive study of the whole problem, and the possible introduction of comprehensive legislation to meet whatever situation the committee should find exists—could not the President, under the extended terms of the act, the purpose of which is only to limit the time of his authority and not to require his exercise of it up to that time, go forward and make voluntary agreements extending only to September 30 of this year, or even a shorter time, if he thought it was in the public interest, and so keep more careful and complete control of the whole situation in his own hands pending enactment of other legislation, if it were to be enacted? Could not that be done?

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course it could be done; but the Senator overlooks the fact that the President is not the only one concerned in this question, or in the enactment of further legislation to supplement this legislation. I apprehend that there would be factors in the steel industry, and there would be Members of this body and of the other body of Congress coming from the areas where those industries are very powerful industrial agencies, who, if machinery were created which would operate until March 30 next year, would be much more insistent in their objection to machinery which I might feel and the majority of the Senate might feel would be much more adequate to deal with this problem than is the present law. I for one would not want to put the Senate or the Congress in the position of having created a law which would encourage some to oppose the enactment of a better law because they would have this law operative as to their businesses until March 30 next year. I think much the sounder approach is that suggested by the committee, which I approve.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has suggested, if I correctly understand him, that he not only does not want to encourage Senators who may disagree with the legislation offered to vote against it, but, in effect, by placing the September 30 limit on the voluntary agreements, if those Senators feel that any kind of allocation is necessary, he is going to coerce them into voting for the legislation

which comes up later. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator uses the word "coerce." I would not use it. The word "influence" would be better.

Mr. CORDON. I will accept "influence."

Mr. HOLLAND. A limitation 8 months into the future could hardly be called close enough to this date to be at all coercive in its effect.

Mr. CORDON. Would the addition of 6 or 7 months seriously affect anybody?

Mr. HOLLAND. My answer would be that it would bring the matter into the next Congress, and would encourage those who might be disposed to do so in this Congress to use all kinds of parliamentary procedure to hold onto what the majority might feel was a much less effective machinery, namely, the one under the present act, rather than to go to a much more effective machinery, which I hope will be suggested and recommended shortly by the able committee.

Mr. CORDON. If I follow the Senator, his view is that he would rather have permissive authority than no authority, but he does not want the permissive authority to go any further than September 30, solely because he wants an inducement to those who disagree with him to go along with the over-all legislation which may come forward, even though they do not believe in it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I would rather state my position in this way: The Senator from Florida sees no point in extending the authority for 12 months when he thinks an extension of 6 months will allow not only ample time, but several times the ample amount of time necessary to give serious and deliberate consideration to the more effective legislation, which I confidently expect to come from the committee shortly.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator does not expect the Congress to be in session on September 30, does he?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida joins the Senator from Oregon in his hope that we shall not be in session at that time, and thinks that that has nothing to do with the situation, because under the law, as the Senator understands, we may be here until the end of July. It does not seem to me that there could be any possible question of there being adequate time, and much more than adequate time between now and the end of July, to give full consideration to this important question, and to adopting much sounder legislation in this field than that which now exists.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there has been considerable debate of this subject. As the Senate well knows, the committee voted, with only two dissenting votes, to report the bill favorably. It seems to me that about all that is involved is the point that the amendment is designed to foreclose a study by the committee of the proposals for additional controls which the administration is considering, but which have not yet been considered in the committee. Of course the minority do intend to foreclose such a study. Regardless of how the House of Representatives and the Senate may in the long run decide on the question of additional controls, I think that at the very least the matter should be considered by the committee, and that is the purpose of the committee bill. So of course I intend to support the bill.

The Senator from Alabama in the course of his remarks made some reference to a difficulty that we are having in bringing into production part of the aluminum plant at Jones Mill, Ark. I wish to clarify that point for a moment, because at the hearings the other day I had considerable to say about that particular item. The fact is that the pipe to bring natural gas from the natural gas fields to that plant has been on order for some 2 years by the Arkansas-Louisiana Gas Co. Intervening and subsequent to the ordering of that pipe by that gas company, the Atomic Energy Commission has decided that as a supplemental and an auxiliary source of gas, it would like to bring gas, by pipe line, to the Oak Ridge plant. The Department of Commerce has, I believe, at least tentatively—and I think it expects to do so permanently—made the allocation to the Oak Ridge plant.

My objection is simply that the Oak Ridge plant does not need pipe line in order to operate. It simply would give the Oak Ridge plant an additional or auxiliary source of fuel; but that is not as critical, from the point of view of national defense, as is the bringing into production of the two pot lines that are not now producing in the Jones Mill plant. In other words, it is a question of judgment as to which is the more important in the national interest, and there was a difference of opinion as between me and the persons who are interested in the production of aluminum and the Atomic Energy Commission. That was the point referred to by the Senator from Alabama. Regardless of my difference of judgment on that point, I still think this bill should be passed.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 88) extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will, and it was signed by the Vice President.

## A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, some time ago I thought there was a possibility of promptly obtaining a vote on the bill relating to voluntary agreements and plans for the allocation of scarce materials, and therefore I did not obtain the floor to speak on the matter to which I am about to address myself. Since that time I have understood that several other speeches on the subject are scheduled. Therefore I wish to say a few words about an action which I think is extremely important. It does not relate to the bill which has been under discussion during the day.

In March 1947, joined by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], I introduced in the Senate a joint resolution which would have placed the Congress of the United States on record as favoring the creation of a United States of Europe, within the framework of the United Nations.

This, I might add, was several months before the Secretary of State, General Marshall, made his Harvard speech on June 5, 1947, which resulted in the Marshall plan and the European recovery program. It was also several weeks before the then Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, made his Cleveland, Miss., speech, which has been said to be the forerunner of the Marshall plan.

On April 7, 1947, when aid to Greece and Turkey was being discussed, I spoke at some length on the subject of European federation, saying this:

> I submit that unless we are able to create a different, a more sensible economic and political order in Europe, there is no hope for a prosperous or a peaceful solution to her difficulties. It is my belief that if all we are able to do is to recreate the prewar crazy quilt of jealous sovereignties, neither Europe nor the Near East is a good risk. If we persist in preserving an irrational and obsolete economic and political system in Europe, we can be sure that, for a third time, its internal frictions will supply the spark for world conflagration. No one can guarantee that a federation will absolutely prevent all sparks, but at least there will be a chance that it may.
>
> Unless we are willing to write off Europe as a friend and supporter of democratic principles, it behooves us to use our economic power and our talents of persuasion to induce Europeans to create a free and democratic federation of states. Under such a union the world may again see a renaissance of culture, of freedom, and of spiritual power which once before led the world out of the confusion and tyranny of the dark ages.

Mr. President, on March 3, 1948, when the Senate was debating the Economic Cooperation Act, I offered an amendment to the preamble of that act, to express the hope that the participating countries would exert efforts to achieve political unification.

During the course of the debate it became clear that although the then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the present chairman, and other members of the committee approved the objective and purposes of the amendment, at the same time they objected to its inclusion in the bill.

I then said:

> It is with reluctance that I withdraw the amendment; but in view of the opposition of the committee, and the probability that such a defeat would be interpreted as this Nation's disapproval of European unity, I feel compelled to follow this course. * * * I still feel that unless the CEEC countries can achieve political unification during the next few years, the ERP program not only will fail to bring peace and stability to Europe, but, on the contrary, if those countries succumb one by one to the Communists, it will actually result in a tremendous subsidy at our expense to the growth of Communist power.

Last June 11, when the Senate was considering the Vandenberg resolution, I asked the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee if, under paragraph 2

of that resolution, dealing with regional defense arrangements, a federation of the European countries might be contemplated.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] replied as follows:

Most emphatically, and I join the Senator from Arkansas in thinking that it would be one of the most hopeful possible evolutions that could be contemplated. * * * I think the emphasis in the present resolution upon the development of regional and other collective arrangements specifically includes the great idea of a United States of Europe, to which the Senator from Arkansas has been so devoted.

Upon this assurance, and the assurance of other members of the committee, that the concept of European federation was included in the language of the resolution, I did not press at that time for a more specific endorsement of the idea.

Mr. President, I give this background for the purpose of emphasizing that, although the Senate has not specifically recorded itself as favoring European federation, there is a great deal of legislative history on the subject, and there is reason to feel that many Senators believe in the necessity of European federation. I also wish to say I think that discussion is beginning to bear fruit.

In the New York Times of Saturday, January 29, 1949, there was a very interesting dispatch upon this subject, and I think it is perhaps the most significant move that has occurred in a long time with regard to progress under the ERP. Unfortunately the indication by Marshal Stalin of his willingness to talk things over has distracted the attention of most people from this action, which I feel has far greater significance. I wish to read only a selected paragraph or two, but at the conclusion of my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be included.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is dated January 28:

The Western Union powers agreed today to create a Council of Europe and thus fulfill a dream of centuries of European statesmen.

There will be a committee composed of government Ministers meeting in secret and capable of making binding decisions, which means—

And I emphasize this sentence—

which means the actual delegation of sovereign powers to a European body.

That is the crucial question which has been involved in the discussions of all international bodies since the creation of the League of Nations, and it is the very point upon which all of them have failed. In no previous case that I know of has any real delegation of sovereign power been given to any international body.

The next paragraph which I think is particularly important is:

These are not mere proposals; they are agreements made by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. The British Cabinet, for instance, held an emergency meeting this afternoon to approve these momentous decisions, which now commit the Government of Great Britain.

* * * * *

When the Foreign Ministers, who had been meeting in the office of Foreign Secretary Bevin, came out this evening at the end of their 2-day conference, they were visibly elated. They knew they had made history.

They had taken the first important practical step toward a goal that has beckoned European statesmen from the seventeenth century "grand design" of the French statesman Sully to Briand's "United States of Europe."

I think this is by far the most significant move by the European nations since the war.

I also notice in the same edition of the New York Times in a dispatch from Oslo that the Scandinavian Foreign Ministers endorse the plan. It is true that with regard to the Atlantic Pact, due to the pressure from Russia, the Norwegians did not see fit to participate; but apparently Norway endorses the creation of a Council of Europe. It is also my understanding that other countries in Europe will be invited to join the Council of Europe. The article mentions that:

Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza (of Italy) said today, "Italy will be one of the founding states" of the new Council of Europe.

Only a short time ago, Mr. President, it was assumed by many persons that the idea for the creation of a real political federation or council of Europe, using the terms that were used by the Ministers on last Friday, was entirely beyond any realistic hope at this time. In fact there was an article in the New York Times magazine of last week—that is, January 23—by Mr. Callendar, one of their staff writers, entitled "We Expect Too Much From the Marshall Plan." The thesis of that article, less than a week preceding the action on the part of the foreign minister of the Brussels pact countries, is that some of us expected entirely too much; in other words, we had expected it would promote a political federation of Europe, and that expectation was entirely beyond all reasonable possibilities at this time. I would say this action on the part of the foreign ministers on Saturday completely negatives Mr. Callendar's whole thesis.

There was one paragraph in Mr. Callendar's article which I think was entirely uncalled for, reading as follows:

Since the United States has accepted western Europe as both a financial and a military responsibility or liability, certain Americans have insisted upon urging and prodding Europe into a union that presumably would stand on its own feet and relieve the United States of its present responsibility for this Continent. This may not be precisely an isolationist attitude; but it is one that displays dislike of the huge international responsibilities that have been assumed by the United States and a desire to be rid of them as soon as possible.

I certainly, for one, would like to be rid of some, if not all, of these responsibilities, and would like to diminish the impact of those responsibilities upon our own economy. But I would not admit that that is, in the words of Mr. Callender, an isolationist attitude.

Mr. President, I think this action on the part of the Foreign Ministers of the Brussels Pact countries certainly deserves recognition by the Congress of the United States and by the people of the United States. Last fall, while I was in Europe, I stated that unless some progress were made toward political unification, unless they at least accept political unification as an objective of the present plan, I would find it extremely difficult to justify a continuation of the ERP program. The establishment of the Council of Europe, assuming the account which I have read from the Times is correct, I think is a justification for the continuation of the program. I might also call attention to the fact stated in an article in the New York Times of January 11, in which one of the prominent members of the British House of Commons stated that a United States of Europe would cut the Marshall plan costs by 66 percent.

That, of course, is a very extreme statement. I do not know how one would arrive at that exact percentage, but there is no doubt in my mind that it would certainly decrease the costs. That statement is from Mr. R. W. G. MacKay, who has written extensively on this subject.

Mr. President, I think the time has come when the Congress should specifically endorse the idea, particularly as we are about to consider the proposed North Atlantic Alliance and the renewal of the Economic Cooperation Act.

For this purpose, I have introduced today, together with the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the following resolution:

In order to encourage a peaceful and prosperous order in Europe, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people, it is hereby

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress favors the political federation of Europe.

I hope the Committee on Foreign Relations will give some consideration to this resolution when it holds hearings on the extension of the Economic Cooperation Act, and that it may give some expression of the belief that progress toward the goal of European federation should be accomplished with our assistance under the ECA.

At Harvard, Secretary Marshall said:

Any assistance that this Government may render should provide a cure rather than a mere palliative.

I believe that the revival of European economic prosperity alone, without some permanent form of political federation, is a mere palliative and not a cure. I do not believe that the relatively small and independent political sovereignties of Europe, as they now exist, can, under modern political and economic conditions, retain their independence or economic prosperity without aid for very long.

If the same old prewar Europe of many small, independent states is economically rehabilitated, I do not think we shall have achieved anything of lasting value, commensurate with the sacrifices that we

shall have made. Europe reconstructed can protect herself from neither alien domination nor internal quarrels. Standing alone none of the 16 nations can withstand the determined pressure of the Russians. While they may think they can take refuge in neutrality, the last war has proved how futile that is.

For centuries—from the grand design of Henry IV, in 1638, to Winston Churchill today—many of the greatest statesmen of Europe have called for European federation. It is no longer a philosophical longing or an idealistic dream. The ancient prejudices about sovereignty are beginning to dissolve, and a United States of Europe has actually become a matter of practical politics, as was demonstrated on last Friday.

I believe that we should promote the idea of European federation with all our powers of persuasion and, provided the Europeans are willing, with all our economic and industrial strength.

My efforts to obtain an expression of the Congress endorsing European federation have met with one consistent objection: that it is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of other countries. I think the announcement by the Brussels powers will do much to dispel this notion. I am not, by this resolution, attempting to force an alien notion upon the free governments of Europe. I am rather attempting to record this Nation's endorsement of a great movement, and to urge its further development before it is too late.

We have made, and probably will make, additional enormous loans and grants to the nations of Europe, and we are about to consider a program of military assistance and alliance. As a consequence we are faced with such a tremendous drain upon our national resources that we are forced to take stock of our wealth lest we impoverish ourselves in helping others. It would be strange if we did not take a selfish interest in the possibilities of a United States of Europe. But whatever malicious propaganda the Kremlin may spread to the contrary, the fact remains that the primary reason for our assistance is our wish to create a stable and orderly world in which we, and all peoples of the world, may live in peace. I am convinced that the federation of Europe is a fundamental pillar of a stable world order.

Our concern is not simply an idealistic dream of bringing relief to suffering Europe; nor is it the hard-shelled manipulations of economic imperialism. We have a deep and inescapable interest in the welfare of Europe—in its military, economic, and political strength. Twice in 25 years we have shed our blood and spent our treasure in world wars which grew out of European feuds and power politics. We know that our present well-being will be short-lived unless Europe recovers and carries on normal economic, social, and political relations with us. Rich as our country is, we cannot indefinitely subsidize an impoverished, dependent, Europe. That Continent must learn again under modern industrial and commercial conditions how to take care of itself.

Our interests are personal; they are immediate and they are real. But there is another very urgent reason for our interest. If western Europe were to succumb to the Russians, then the systems, institutions, and values which have made all North America great, would be imperiled. A healthy, prosperous, rehabilitated, and united Europe is one of the best guaranties that our country, that all free peoples, will remain free and strong.

We have today in Europe another interest and responsibility. As a result of the war, we are now for practical political purposes a sovereign nation on the European Continent. The United States actually governs a substantial and important part of western Europe. Where our troops are occupying parts of Germany, Austria, and Trieste, we must govern and protect Europeans. We have no intention of retaining these territories for our own, and, indeed, we are anxious to rid ourselves of their burden. But we cannot until we are certain that our withdrawal will not menace the peace of western Europe and hence the United States.

The German problem, and to a lesser degree, the problems of Austria and Trieste, cannot be settled irrespective of our desires and interests. Indeed it is our duty to promote settlements which in our judgment are in the best interests of Europe and America.

Now, as we have an interest in the military, economic, and political welfare of Europe, and as our interests are genuine, and our purposes are not imperialistic, do we not have the right even to express the hope that Europe may achieve political federation?

If the reason for our reluctance to express our desires is our fear of offending Russia, is it not absurd to think that military cooperation, joint maneuvers, advice, and even equipment are not equally offensive?

If our reasoning is that expression of our hope that federation may be brought about is an unwarranted interference in the affairs of other countries, how can we explain that our advice in military and economic affairs is not? No one yet has been able to determine successfully the line between the external and the internal affairs of nations, but as their federation involves internal affairs that is only incidental to its real purpose. If, as history proves, their external affairs are of vital consequence to us, are we not entitled to urge a remedy for the recurrent quarrels they create?

This criticism, that advocating a federation of Europe is officious intermeddling by Americans, is often made. At the same time, however, we are told that we have a responsibility to use our power, our knowledge, and our wealth to rehabilitate the stricken areas of the world. These views are inconsistent. If we grant that we have this obligation, then we must also be obliged to see that the rehabilitation is sensible and effective. There can be no obligation to reestablish the same old divided Europe, from which two world wars have emerged to afflict us. Surely we have a legitimate interest in the purposes for which the products of our land and the work of our people are to be expended. As we govern and support much of Germany, are we not entitled to propose a solution to the problems of Germany's future in keeping with Europe's needs?

If we reason that federation is too remote, what can we possibly lose by encouraging and urging federation? Even if it is not to be achieved can we take the chance that but for our reluctance, or timidity, in promoting it, it might have come about?

Of course, we cannot force this goal of federation upon Europe. Yet we may have the power to make it a reality, by encouragement and assistance. We must use the power tactfully, but this is not to say we must not use it at all.

The final responsibility which I believe attaches to the United States is that, in opposing Soviet Russia's initiative, we must offer some alternative which will maintain order in Europe. Negation—even of Russian domination—is not enough for this aggressive and restless world. We shall continue to be negative at our own peril. In peace, as well as in war, victory will not come to the negative defensive strategy. A certain boldness, a positive resourcefulness, is essential to win any battle, in war or peace.

The Germans in 1914 and again in 1939 to 1941 did not believe that the democracies of the west would go to war over the neutrality of Belgium or the indepence of Poland. We shall never know what course world events would have taken had they known, but we can be reasonably sure it would have been different and better. We were then given a period of months and years in which to make our decision and to prepare to follow it.

The world today wants to know where we stand. Many Europeans believe we may once again withdraw from Europe. The Russians believe it and are striving to bring it about in Berlin and Germany and all over Europe. They hope that we shall become so disgusted, disillusioned, and tired of the ever-intensified war of nerves that we shall give up and go home. We are trying to convince Russia and Europe now that we will stay.

I believe that we can, and will, stay—but only so long as we believe that by our defense and assistance we can accomplish something which gives hope of progress toward lasting peace. From our own experience we can, and do, believe in the principle of federation as a means of assuring domestic tranquillity, common defense, and general welfare. It is an idea which we have held to for 160 years, in which we have faith for the future, and which, I am convinced, the people of Europe can adapt to their own great security, prosperity, and happiness.

It is, I believe, of the greatest importance that the people of Europe be given a goal, a hope for the future. The unity of Europe, solid and permanent, is such a goal. It is a goal which I believe will inspire them to great creative acts and to great sacrifices, such as they have per-

formed in the past and which I am sure they can achieve again, to their own benefit and to the benefit of the world.

EXHIBIT A

COUNCIL OF EUROPE FORMED BY FIVE WESTERN UNION POWERS—TWO BODIES SET UP—SOVEREIGN RIGHTS GIVEN TO MINISTERIAL GROUP, WITH RULINGS BINDING—PUBLIC ASSEMBLY TO AID—OTHER COUNTRIES ARE INVITED TO JOIN—BRITISH CABINET QUICKLY APPROVES PLAN

(By Herbert L. Matthews)

LONDON, January 28.—The Western Union Powers agreed today to create a "Council of Europe" and thus fulfill a dream of centuries of European statesmen.

There will be a committee composed of government ministers meeting in secret and capable of making binding decisions, which means the actual delegation of sovereign powers to a European body.

Alongside this committee will be an advisory consultative body representing the national parliaments of Europe. This group will meet in public.

These are not mere proposals; they are agreements made by the Foreign Ministers of Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg. The British Cabinet, for instance, held an emergency meeting this afternoon to approve these momentous decisions, which now commit the Government of Great Britain.

ONLY DETAILS TO BE SETTLED

Only details remain to be settled. They are to be worked out by the Permanent Commission of the Brussels Pact Powers, which meets weekly in London. This commission is composed of the Ambassadors of the four continental countries plus Hubert Gladwyn Jebb, of the British Foreign Office.

When the Foreign Ministers, who had been meeting in the office of Foreign Secretary Bevin, came out this evening at the end of their two-day conference, they were visibly elated. They knew they had made history.

They had taken the first important practical step toward a goal that has beckoned European statesmen from the seventeenth century "grand design" of the French statesman Sully to Briand's "United States of Europe." Here is a relevant passage of the communiqué they issued after their meeting:

"After considering the most valuable preparatory work accomplished in Paris by the Committee for the Study of European Unity, the Council [the Consultative Council of Brussels Powers] agreed that there should be established a Council of Europe consisting of a ministerial committee meeting in private and a consultative body meeting in public."

OTHERS INVITED TO JOIN

"The Permanent Commission was instructed to study the detailed application of the decisions of principle taken by the Council. The Council decided to invite other European countries to take part in the negotiations for the establishment of the Council of Europe."

Although many of the proposed details remain secret and others are still to be worked out, it is possible to add some flesh to these bare bones.

It was agreed that the appointment of delegates to the consultative body and their voting powers should be left to the discretion of each country, which can satisfy its own constitutional practices.

France, for example, can elect her delegates by a majority vote of her National Assembly and thus exclude Communists. Britain could appoint delegates from the Labor Party or all three parties.

This is one of the compromises reached during the past 2 days because the French wanted delegates to the European assembly to be elected and Britain wanted them nominated by the Governments.

Britain originally wanted voting in the assembly, or consultative body as it is now called, to be compulsory bloc voting by nations. Mr. Bevin, as expected, yielded on this point and the decisions will be made by a majority vote of all delegates voting individually, not as national groups.

A British compromise proposal whereby the ministerial committee would control the agenda of the consultative body was accepted. Subjects for discussion by the consultative body can be determined on the initiative of either organization but the ultimate control of the agenda, which is to say the power of veto, will rest with the ministerial committee.

The principle on which voting will take place in both organizations has been decided but it is being kept secret. Guessing is that it will be by two-thirds vote in the ministerial committee and a majority in the consultative body. This would reflect the fact that the latter body is merely advisory whereas the former has executive powers.

Nothing is being said either about the weighting of representation, but it is presumed that the greater powers will have a proportionately heavy vote in the ministerial committee while each individual delegate will have equal weight in the consultative body.

NAMES WILL BE CHANGED

Incidentally the clumsy names used in tonight's communiqué—consultative body and ministerial committee—are only makeshift. In preliminary discussions they were called the European Assembly and the European Council, but as the combined organization is now called the Council of Europe, other names must be found.

The invitation to other European nations to join is what carries the new Council beyond the concept of the Western Union of the Brussels Pact Powers. The conference had hardly ended when Duke Tommaso Gallarati Scotti, Italian Ambassador, was called to the Foreign Office and informed that his Government would be invited to join the Council of Europe.

Portugal and the Scandinavian countries are doubtless being invited in on the ground floor. However, it was denied that all 19 European countries of the Organization for European Economic Cocperation would be invited or expected to take part from the beginning.

That is a goal to be achieved and western Germany will be a member in time, but the Brussels Pact Powers decided to start with a relatively small manageable council and expand it as time passed.

The permanent center of the Council of Europe will almost certainly be Strasbourg. It is centrally located and has a properly cosmopolitan European atmosphere.

For the time being the Western Union will remain in being. On its defense side it will soon merge into the projected north Atlantic defense pact. In other respects it will gradually expand into the Council of Europe. That Council, in its turn, will be integrated into the United Nations as a regional arrangement.

The Western Union also has important cultural and social relations now, which were discussed in a special communiqué. It was agreed, for instance, to hold courses for teachers on the Western Union, to hold exhibitions and issue pamphlets and films.

On the social side emphasis was placed on an exchange of views and information on public health, as well as exchanges of medical personnel, workers, and student employees.

Enterprises of this sort will not be abandoned for the Council of Europe cannot be formed overnight. The Permanent Commission should be able to work out most of the details by the time the Foreign Ministers of the Brussels Pact Powers meet again in April.

Four other governments will have to sanction today's agreement as the British Cabinet already has done. French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman, who alone might be expected to find difficulties, was confident tonight that he had won enough points from Mr. Bevin to get support in Paris.

The European movement, which Winston Churchill sponsored and which is headed by his son-in-law, Duncan Sandys, issued a statement enthusiastically welcoming the decision to set up the Council of Europe. It looks as if Mr. Bevin at home and Britain on the Continent have set many doubts at rest.

---

SFORZA SAYS ITALY WILL JOIN

ROME, January 28.—Foreign Minister Count Carlo Sforza said today, "Italy will be one of the founding states" of the new Council of Europe.

His brief statement, released by ANSA, semiofficial Italian news agency, indicated Italy already had been invited to take part in setting up the Council.

"European union is born," Count Sforza said, "and Italy will be one of the founding states. Italy will give all her efforts with full loyalty to the creation of the Council of Europe."

## JUDGE KNOX'S METHOD OF SELECTING JURIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on Thursday, I called to the attention of this body the statement made by Federal Judge John C. Knox that he handpicks the jurors in his district, and intends to keep on doing so. I expressed at that time my aversion to having jurors hand-picked by judges, or, for that matter, by anybody else, and I pointed out how historically miscarriages of justice have resulted from jury packing.

Since then I have taken a little time to look into the way Judge Knox handpicks jurors, and what the consequences of his selection are. As Senators know, Judge Knox is senior judge of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, which is our biggest and busiest Federal court. I felt that making this investigation was my simple duty as a United States Senator, as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and as a plain American citizen who happens to feel, along with the framers of our Constitution, that a fair and impartial administration of justice calls for juries selected, without hand picking, from a representative cross section of the people.

I was personally shocked by the facts that I learned in the course of this investigation. But beyond this, these facts are of such great concern to the integrity and reputation of our judicial system, and thus to our democracy itself, that it is time they were fully revealed to the Senate and to the American people.

But let me first disclose where the record of these facts can be found. Judge Knox's jury selection system is described in a memorandum of January 2, 1941, written for the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, by Leland L. Tolman, Assistant

Chief, Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics. On February 5, 1941, Henry P. Chandler, the Director of that Office, sent copies of this memorandum to all United States circuit and district judges, and I have one of them in my hand, over the signature of Mr. Chandler.

In addition to this, a statistical analysis has been made of this system in operation, verified by affidavit, in a petition filed recently in the United States Supreme Court by the attorneys for the 12 Communist leaders who are now on trial in New York.

Just so that there shall be no mistake, I repeat now what I said on Thursday, that I care not who a defendant may be, and what the offense alleged, whether it is murder, arson, or robbery, whether he be Democrat or Republican or Communist, he is entitled in a United States court to a jury that is impartially and honestly picked. If some think differently, remember that Judge Knox's handpicked juries serve in all jury cases in his district, civil and criminal, whether the parties are radical or conservative, or whatever you please, in their political and economic beliefs.

But to get back to Judge Knox's jury-selection system. It seems that about 10 years ago Judge Knox decided that the jurors serving in the southern district of New York were an inferior lot. The jury rolls, it seems, included a lot of relief workers and housewives. Of course, this is hardly cause for amazement. In those days there were many relief workers in New York City, and there were then and still are plenty of housewives. But to Judge Knox, apparently, relief workers and housewives, no matter how big a part of the population they are, are not suitable for jury service. Why, I do not know. Perhaps he thinks that poor people and housewives are just naturally inferior, or perhaps they did not convict enough defendants to suit him. Anyway, Judge Knox decided to get jurors of "better quality."

The first thing Judge Knox did to serve this purpose, says Mr. Tolman's memorandum, was to appoint as jury commissioner an attorney who "has good business and social connections." Then, says the memorandum, which I have here, "he also arranged for the appointment, as deputy jury clerk, of an energetic young man of pleasing manner, who is a good judge of character, and has a thorough practical knowledge of the social, racial, and economic groups of New York City and their geographic distribution."

These, then, were the men who were to carry out Judge Knox's endeavors to get quality jurors, and I call attention to what their assets for this job were—"good business and social connections" and knowing the geographic distribution of the "social, racial, and economic groups of New York City."

Judge Knox now had the right kind of people to do the picking. Now he had to see that they had the right kind of people to pick from.

Until then, in the southern district of New York, the names of jurors had been picked primarily from the registry list of voters. But to Judge Knox this was an unsatisfactory list. They are just the people who decide who shall be our President and who shall be our Senators and who shall be our mayors and our governors. They are just the people who pick the persons who pick our Federal judges. They are the people who pay our salaries, and Judge Knox's, too. They are the people the Government is supposed to represent. In short, they are the American people. But the people are not good enough for Judge Knox. He has to have the better quality for jury service in his district.

According to Mr. Tolman's memorandum, therefore, the voters' registry list was supplemented by drawing from more select materials. What were these? Who's Who in New York, Poor's Directory of Directors, the Engineers' Directory, the Social Register, and various college and university alumni directories. Note the various. Mr. Tolman does not tell us, but we can guess, that to Judge Knox the alumni directories of Princeton or Dartmouth are better source material than those of the City College of New York or New York University.

Even more important than these books of the aristocracy is the subscription edition of the New York City telephone directory, which is arranged by street numbers and location rather than alphabetically by names. This directory permits the deputy jury clerk—you remember, Judge Knox' energetic young man of pleasing manner—to use his thorough knowledge of the geographic distribution of the social, racial, and economic groups of New York City to pick out the names of those who live in higher-class residential neighborhoods. In addition, this young man adds names of citizens who are personally known or introduced to him as good potential jurors. Relief workers and women were simply eliminated as volunteer jurors. If anyone has any doubt about it, I have a copy of the original memorandum here in my hand.

Now of course this so-called system of supplementing the registry list of voters does not really supplement the list at all. Those residents of New York who are in Who's Who, the Directory of Directors, and even the Social Register, are, by and large, also on the voters' registry list. The fact is, then, that these names are not added to the list; they are selected for preferential attention.

But just to make sure that no unsuitable people slip through, the jury clerk calls in and interviews each person whose name he puts on the list of prospective jurors. Only those people whom he is satisfied with following the interview are finally qualified as jurors. At the same time the jury commissioner—the man with the good connections — persuades personnel officers of large corporations to allow their employees to perform jury duty without financial loss. In other words, Judge Knox is willing to have on his juries lesser employees than executives, provided they know they are being paid by their big corporate employers during their service.

The consequence of all this is that the selection of the juries in the southern district of New York represents a deliberate and systematic exclusion of all but a token few of the lower income groups and of those persons who are without social graces valued by Judge Knox, in favor of an elite class.

According to a verified petition filed with the Supreme Court, an analysis of the jury lists in the district over a period of 9 years shows that 54 percent of the jury panel were executives, although they represent only 9 percent of the population. Twenty percent of the panel were professionals or semiprofessionals, although they were only 11 percent of the population. Clerical and sales employees, largely drawn from a few big corporations, made up 30 percent of the panels; they were 25 percent of the population. Manual workers made up only 5 percent of the panels, although they were 55 percent of the population.

I quote from the document sent out through the Administrative Office, from the Supreme Court Building in Washington. What do we find? This document is dated the 5th day of February 1941. We find about 2 percent of the names in the wheel are unemployed or retired. Eighty-eight percent are business or professional men. Ten percent are women.

The same verified petition also shows that the juries were loaded with persons who resided in the most exclusive neighborhoods. The so-called "silk-stocking" district, the Seventeenth Congressional District in Manhattan, supplied 56 percent of the members of six panels which were studied, although the district cast less than 20 percent of the vote in Manhattan alone in the 1948 elections. These same panels drew only 10.2 percent of their membership from the Eighteenth, Nineteenth, and Twenty-second, Twenty-third, and Twenty-fourth Congressional Districts taken together, although these districts accounted for 42 percent of the vote from both Manhattan and the Bronx. These latter districts contain mostly working-class people, including Negroes, Jews, citizens of Italian descent, and Puerto Ricans.

Mr. President, this system is not only offensive because of its snobbishness. It is a conscious selection of jurors on class and racial bases, and the result is that the so-called justice which is handed out in that district may be characterized as class and racial justice.

It is only natural that jurors tend to place greater credence in the testimony of people of their own kind. The whole purpose of the constitutional guaranty of a fair and impartial jury, representative of the community, is to offset the prejudices or predilections of particular groups. Only a fair cross section of the community will assure a fair and impartial trial in which evidence will be weighed according to the common judgment of the people, on its merits alone. It is perfectly clear that the system prevailing in the southern district of New York, and perhaps in many other places, is calculated to avoid juries which are truly representative.

To the people of the world, Mr. President, we boast of the superiorities of our government. We claim we are a democracy in which all people are free and equal. We profess equal justice for all, regardless of race or creed or economic status. How can we reconcile these assertions with the fact that in our

largest Federal district, and perhaps elsewhere as well, our judiciary so blandly dispenses justice through hand-picked juries heavily weighted with the wealthy or well-to-do.

This situation is our problem and our responsibility. It is in the power of Congress to enact legislation which will guarantee the selection of fair and impartial juries in our Federal courts. It is fitting that the Senate should take the lead in this respect, since it is the Senate which confirmed the appointment of Judge Knox and all other Federal judges, and which therefore has some responsibility for their actions.

Hand-picked juries have no place in our democracy. They are a stench and are a disgrace to honest law enforcement. They result in there being no fair play either in criminal or civil cases.

## THE CONFIRMATION OF MR. ACHESON'S NOMINATION

Mr. BRIDGES obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. May I inquire of the Senator how long he expects to speak?

Mr. BRIDGES. Only a very few minutes I will say, on a very interesting subject.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Tuesday, January 18, the Senate confirmed the President's nomination of Dean Acheson to be Secretary of State. I was one of only six Senators to vote against that nomination. Once again I found myself among a small minority of Senators opposing a Presidential appointment for a high position in our Government. On previous occasions I have voted with the few against appointees to important Government posts later to have my minority opposition completely justified.

I made no statement when Mr. Acheson's nomination was before the Senate. But since the confirmation of that nomination, in reply to inquiries, I have defined my position.

In this uncertain time the post of Secretary of State is vitally important to the security of America and the peace of the world. I believe the eligibility of the man who occupies that post should be beyond any doubt. In my opinion, Mr. Acheson did not meet that test.

I have reasonable doubts about Mr. Acheson. The hearings conducted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not remove those doubts. My mind persisted in its severe questioning of Mr. Acheson's previous associations and expressed attitudes. My doubts became more profound.

Throughout my service in the Senate I have made it a policy to resolve such doubts in favor of my country rather than to gamble with my country's future. That is what I did with reference to the Acheson appointment. I have told others and I tell the Senate today that I hope my doubts regarding Mr. Acheson will not be justified by the events of passing time.

Yet I feel I should call to the attention of the Senate a news report which appeared in the New York Times of Friday, January 28.

The headline reads:

United States aid seen lost in China, Greece—Prof. E. C. Acheson also doubts money expended on Germany ever will bring results.

First of all, who is Prof. E. C. Acheson? He is the brother of Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States. The New York Times article says that during the war Professor Acheson served in the United States Embassy in China. The Times says further that Professor Acheson was President Truman's personal representative on an economic mission to Germany last year. He is now professor of foreign relations at George Washington University. The New York Times article about which I am talking and from which I shall quote says that Professor Acheson was expressing his foreign-policy views at a meeting in Washington on January 27.

Let me read from the Times article:

WASHINGTON, January 27.—Prof. Edward C. Acheson, brother of the new Secretary of State, has declared here that the United States has written off as practically a total loss its huge expenditures in Greece and China. He predicted that substantially the same thing would happen in the recovery program of western Germany.

I want the Senate to note the New York Times report of Professor Acheson's remarks interprets them as almost a statement of fact. The question arises, then, whether the professor's comments are based upon his own speculation or upon information which may have been given to him by his brother, the new Secretary of State. Can it be that the professor is voicing the opinions of the administration which have not yet been announced by the new Secretary of State to the Congress and the people? Can it be that the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan to try to halt the spread of communism in the world are to be abandoned? Just what connection is there, if any, between the firmly expressed views of the professor and the views of his brother, the new Secretary of State? I, for one, should like to know.

I realize that no man is his brother's keeper, but I say very frankly, Mr. President, that the minds of Senators were plagued only a few days ago by perplexing questions regarding Dean Acheson's attitude toward Russia, the stubborn roadblock in the way of peace. Most Senators found his statements to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee convincingly firm as regards Russia. But on January 28 we read in the New York Times that the new Secretary's professor brother—who at least implies some authority to his statements—"took an optimistic view regarding future relations with Russia." I ask the Senate whether such an optimistic view could be based upon some particular information available to the brother of the new Secretary of State but not to the Congress or the people? Or could it be based upon some special representations made to Professor Acheson which would lead him to believe that the American attitude toward Russia is to soften and our relations with Russia thereby made more smooth? It is natural that such questions should arise from profound statements of a man who has been close to the President and is the brother of our Secretary of State. Spread abroad, as the remarks of the brother of the new Secretary of State will be, they could well create grave suspicion in the nations which have joined us in the effort to stop the spread of communism, that we are about to abandon that fight, or in some way alter our major policies.

As another example of the potential danger to the position of the United States that the remarks of Professor Acheson constitute, let me quote further from the New York Times article:

If the Russians get into China, which I doubt, they will have the same miserable experience they had when they sent Michael Borodin there in the 1920's. Borodin got nowhere then, and I see little prospect of the Russians getting anywhere now. The basic conditions and factors in China remain unchanged.

Those are the remarks of a former State Department official, a confidant of the President of the United States, and the brother of the new Secretary of State at the very moment when the world is witnessing the forces of communism taking over control of much of China.

That is one of the very tragic things that is happening in the world, and which has happened in our day. The fact that we in this country have turned our backs upon China, our friend, who stood by us in the days of trouble, will some day come back to haunt the administration in Washington which has made such a thing possible, by reason of our policy in virtually selling China down the river to the Communists.

Again I ask the Senate, is there any connection between the profound opinions of Professor Acheson—implying authority as he seems to do—and the opinions of his brother, the new Secretary of State?

In the same article, the New York Times quotes Professor Acheson as accusing General Clay of employing Nazi-like methods in Germany, which is the same as accusing the United States Government of retaining nazism abroad. Couple this with the friendly attitude Professor Acheson seems to express toward our future relations with Russia, and what questions arise in Senators' minds?

Again I refer to the fact that it was the doubt regarding Dean Acheson's attitude toward Russia, and our program against communism in general, which led to the hearing on his appointment to be Secretary of State. To say the least, it is unfortunate that his brother should speak now as he did in Washington, with the authority he seemed to imply. It is particularly unfortunate because of the publicity it will receive all over the world.

I consider it appropriate, under the circumstances, to call upon Dean Acheson, the new Secretary of State, to speak out and give the people of our country the opportunity to hear his opinions with reference to the statements his

brother has already made. Will the Secretary of State tell the country whether there is any connection between his own views and those expressed by Professor Acheson? I feel that he should recognize the responsibility to reassure us all that there is no present intention or future possibility of any further compromise of American principles in Russia's favor. I urge the new Secretary of State to reemphasize firmly, with the influence of his high office, the American intention to promote peace on earth within the standards of American freedoms and the high level of American justice.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article of January 28, 1949, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES AID SEEN LOST IN CHINA, GREECE—PROF. E. C. ACHESON ALSO DOUBTS MONEY EXPENDED ON GERMANY EVER WILL BRING RESULTS

WASHINGTON, January 27.—Prof. Edward C. Acheson, brother of the new Secretary of State, has declared here that the United States has written off as practically a total loss its huge expenditures in Greece and China. He predicted that substantially the same thing would happen in the recovery program of western Germany.

Mr. Acheson voiced these views at a meeting of Williams College alumni of the District of Columbia. Now a professor of foreign relations at George Washington University, he served in the United States Embassy in China during the war, and last year was President Truman's personal representative on an economic mission to Germany.

"In a few weeks we will have to write off China as a 100-percent loss," Mr. Acheson declared, "and it is only a matter of time when we will have to do the same regarding Greece. In Germany, our military will continue their occupation duties, but we will find it necessary to abandon the inferior Nazi-type controlled economy which General Clay has been operating there.

"We cannot expect the world to believe we are spreading democratic concepts when we employ in Germany the same kind of system the Nazis used with far more efficiency than we have demonstrated. If we are going to keep on with that kind of system, which I doubt, we might as well restore Hjalmar Schacht to power and let him run it. He originated the system of differential currencies now operating in Germany."

Mr. Acheson cited a personal experience to illustrate his condemnation of United States economic policies in Germany.

"I was sent to Europe by President Truman to negotiate for $75,000,000 in Danish foodstuffs for the Allied zones in Germany," he related. "We had a treaty with the Danes on how we would pay for these supplies. We were to pay for them in pounds sterling, because Denmark is in the sterling area. But General Clay rescinded this treaty, in effect, the day before I was to begin my negotiations with the Danish Ministers. He ruled that all purchases in Germany would have to be paid for in dollars. That cut the ground out from under me. The Danes wanted German coal, but paying for it in dollars would have made it too costly for them."

Professor Acheson took an optimistic view regarding future relations with Russia.

"How the Russians feel about the inevitability of war and what they will do to wage war are two different things," he declared. "If the Russians get into China, which I doubt, they will have the same miserable experience they had when they sent Michael Borodin there in the 1920's. Borodin got nowhere then, and I see little prospect of the Russians getting anywhere now. The basic conditions and factors in China remain unchanged.

"The Chinese people are 95 percent agricultural and 90 percent illiterate. No ideology can cope with that. Even the Kuomintang, which has been running China for many years, has failed to make any inroads against this situation. I do not think that the Chinese Communists are Moscow Communists. Even if they were, they will still have their hands full administering the vast territories they have overrun. As the Russian empire keeps spreading out in Europe and Asia, it is beginning to rattle at the edges. Yugoslavia is a graphic instance of this. That's why I feel there is a definite possibility of better relations with the Soviets."

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I listened with interest, of course, to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire about the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, and his brother. I do not know his brother. I have never seen him. I have never heard of him, and did not know that Dean Acheson had a brother until the information imparted by the Senator from New Hampshire.

When the nomination of Mr. Acheson was before the Committee on Foreign Relations we held a public hearing, which is unusual in the case of Cabinet officers. The hearing was held not in the committee room, but in the caucus room, where everyone had an opportunity to come and look and listen, and speak if he wished to do so.

The Senator from New Hampshire did not ask to appear as a witness. I do not know what information he may have had at that time. But every witness except two who appeared was permitted to testify. The two who did not testify were persons who knew nothing about the case, but were permitted to file statements. Their statements are now in the files of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

In addition to holding a public hearing we held a secret hearing, because the subject touched a great many intimate, high level, confidential international matters. In that hearing, before every member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Mr. Acheson made a complete and full reply to all questions which were propounded to him. The Senator from New Hampshire says he thinks he ought to make a statement now showing that his attitude is different from that of his brother. The statement of Mr. Acheson was quoted in the Senate when his nomination was confirmed, making his position as to communism and totalitarianism clear beyond any question of doubt. His record in the Department and his record as a public officer bear witness to the fact that he has no sympathy with the evil doctrine of communism.

So, Mr. President, I do not think the Secretary of State is to be held responsible for what his professor brother may have said.

Was he in China when he said it, or was he here?

Mr. BRIDGES. He was here, close at hand, so that he had easy access to his brother.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did the Senator ever see him with his brother?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did he have access to his brother?

Mr. BRIDGES. I understand he had very close and intimate access.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume that if he had any contacts, they were of a brotherly or kinship nature. Certainly he did not undertake to tell his brother how to conduct his affairs. He was a brother, and brothers seem to tend to have independent views on various questions—not similar views, but independent views.

He does not say he was a Communist; does he?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does the Senator draw the inference that he is somewhat sympathetic to communism?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not draw the inference that he is sympathetic to communism, but I do draw the inference that he is certainly for a "soft" policy and for scuttling a good deal of the work this Government has been doing against communism in the world. When he says we must "write off" Greece, and then makes the same statements about China, and then makes very pointed remarks about the administration of General Clay in Germany, I say that at least, regardless of what the Secretary of State may have to say on this matter, it is unfortunate that he has a brother who at this time is making such remarks which will be so widely publicized all over the world.

Mr. CONNALLY. With the aid of the able Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely desired to clear up the matter.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, many persons will read what the Senator from New Hampshire says. They will not pay much attention to what Professor Acheson has to say; but the Senator from New Hampshire from his place in the Senate will give the statements widespread publicity which will carry a degree of conviction which Professor Acheson in his own right never could convey.

Mr. President, we have made various appropriations of money for China. I do not recall the exact amounts. It seems to me there was one appropriation of $680,000,000 and another appropriation of $125,000,000, which the Chinese could use for arms and equipment. We sold China millions upon millions of dollars' worth of war matériel for only a fraction, a small percentage, of what it cost—1 percent or 2 percent in some cases—amounting practically to a gift. The Senator from New Hampshire has been chairman of the Appropriations Committee for the past 2 years. If those appropriations were not adequate, why did not the Senator from New Hampshire make them adequate?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished Senator from Texas may not recall it, but the Senate of the United States did appropriate, on the 1st of last April, $125,000,000 which might be used for military supplies for the Chinese. However, up to the time, perhaps within 2

or 3 weeks ago, when the critical situation in China became so acute, only two shiploads of those materials had arrived in the Pacific waters; and up to that time none of the actual materials had reached the fighting forces of China. In other words, regardless of the intent of the Congress and the appropriations made by the Congress, the supplies did not reach the Chinese Nationalist armies.

Prior to that, for a period of almost 2 years, in spite of their dire need for small arms and cartridges and other munitions in order to be able to continue to fight, we turned our back upon Chiang Kai-shek and the Chinese Nationalists, and we virtually turned them over to the mercies of the Chinese Communists.

One of the things Mr. Acheson said in the article, if the Senator will read it, is that the Chinese Communists are not Moscow Communists. I wish the Senator would read the article carefully before he takes issue with me, because I think probably he would share some of the views I have expressed regarding it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire refers to an appropriation of $125,000,000. Let me say that appropriation was so framed as to give the Chinese the right to do anything they wanted with it. That was done in order to enable them to spend the money for arms, ammunition, and other supplies of a military character.

But the Senator from New Hampshire omits to state that prior to that time we had, on the islands in the Pacific, great masses of military equipment, which we diverted to the Chinese, and the Chinese used it. The information coming to us was that hundreds of thousands of cartridges which supposedly were reaching the Chinese Nationalist armies, actually were turned over to the Communists, either by the Nationalists or by some other Chinese officials. The Communists thus were using material, including arms and ammunition, which the United States had supplied.

Let me refer for a moment to Secretary Marshall. The Senator from New Hampshire is acquainted with him, of course.

Mr. BRIDGES. I am.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before he became Secretary of State, General Marshall spent 13 months in China, trying to give aid to the Chinese.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will permit me to interrupt him for a moment, let me say I do not think it is appropriate or correct to state that General Marshall spent 13 months in China attempting to give aid to the Chinese. I think he spent 13 months there in a rather futile effort to bring the Communists and the Nationalists together in a sort of coalition movement. But he accomplished nothing, and he returned very embittered. The result has been that China, to all intents and purposes, has been scuttled.

I have a very high opinion of General Marshall as Chief of Staff.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think he did a wonderful job during the war. But as an emissary of this Government to China, I think his efforts were of questionable value.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator from New Hampshire has so much confidence in Mr. Marshall as a general, it seems to me he might trust Mr. Marshall after he had 13 months' experience in China, with close contact with the situation there. Certainly under those circumstances, it seems to me, the Senator from New Hampshire might trust Mr. Marshall as well as he might trust some person who remained here in the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from Texas will yield to me, I should like to say to the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that I do not know whether his committee has yet had a chance to examine the directive under which Mr. Marshall went to China. Both on behalf of the Senate and on behalf of the people of the United States I certainly hope the Foreign Relations Committee will examine the directive under which Mr. Marshall went to China. They should determine whether that directive grew out of the discussions at Yalta, where the Chinese, our historic friends and our allies in a great war, were "sold down the river."

Certainly the results of what happened at Yalta are now being made clear in China today, where it looks as if the Communists will be able to overcome our historic friends and allies in China.

I know the able Senator from Texas will not lose sight of the fact that sitting in with the high Government officials, including the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and our high naval and military authorities, was a State Department official by the name of Alger Hiss.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, well, Alger Hiss. Every time something comes up here they get out a Communist and chase him all around.

Mr. President, I do not sympathize with the Communists. However, it seems that the only argument some persons can present is to holler about Alger Hiss, and then refer to Yalta. They seem to have to dig up something about the dead President of the United States, and they go back to Yalta. The trouble started with the first conference we had on Europe. I heard Secretary Marshall when he came back from his first journey. We heard him testify before the committee. He told us what the troubles in China were, and I shall refer to some of them. He made no charges against the personal character of Chiang Kai-shek. Chiang was surrounded, he said, by many Chinese officials who had been with him since he first emerged as a leader, but who had lost the confidence of their people. Chiang did not have the courage to dismiss them, because they were his old friends and supporters. I do not know whether it was true, but they were charged with graft and corruption, and it was claimed a large part of the funds we were appropriating never got to the people of China themselves. General Marshall endeavored to bring about a coalition government, which he thought was the best way out. He endeavored to have the——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Let me finish a sentence. I have yielded to the Senator several times. I shall yield again.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would like to ask the Senator a question, in a word, at that point.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me finish one little sentence, before the Senator interrupts. If the Senator will please bear with me——

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. General Marshall undertook to bring about a coalition government. We heard him report about it. We heard him tell how he had flown from one place to another, with little groups assigned to that area, and he thought when he first came back that progress was being made. He thought that a coalition government would be the best solution of the situation. Otherwise, armed operations would have to continue. General Marshall went to China a second time. He was not able to bring about what he desired. He came away with sadness, and with disappointment, but not with bitterness. He did not come back with bitterness toward the Chinese people. He did come back with disappointment and bitterness toward those officials in the nationalist government who were untrue to their trust and who had lost the confidence of the people of China. I now yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Those were the people who refused to join the Communists.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I do not know that that is true at all. The Senator may know. If he does, if the Senator will assert——

Mr. BRIDGES. I merely want to point out——

Mr. CONNALLY. If the Senator will assert on his responsibility as a Senator that that is true, I will accept it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe it to be true.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator believes. I want him to assert it as a fact. I do not want any belief. Some persons even believe in ghosts.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assert most things as facts, but I believe a good many things I do not know to be facts, but of which I may have a reasonably accurate knowledge. However, the Senator says that General Marshall's object was to bring the Communists together in a coalition government with the nationalists. I should like to ask the Senator if he can name any country in the world where the Communists have been brought into a coalition government, where within a reasonable time they have not undermined the government and taken over the country?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas is not going to undertake a historical research and lay before the Senator from New Hampshire all the scholarship of the past. The Senator comes from New England, where scholarship is just hanging around in gobs. The Senator should know his history, without referring to one who like myself comes from a bucolic area such as the State of Texas. Of course, the Communists are working at their job, just as every other cult and ideology is undertaking to advance its views—almost as vigorously as

the Senator from New Hampshire tried in the recent election and is trying at present to put forward his views and his ideology. We cannot all succeed. In China there was a realistic condition. General Marshall had to face conditions. He had to make the best of what was there. He could not wave a magic wand and convert all the Communists north of the Yangtze River. He could not wave another wand and bring all the Nationalists into a love feast with the Communists, or the Communists with the Nationalists. No, Mr. President, he could not do that. But in closing I simply want to say that I think the attack by the Senator from New Hampshire on the Secretary of State is wholly unjustified.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I made no attack on the Secretary of State. I merely referred to the remarks of his brother, and as to the new Secretary of State, raised the question whether it would not be very proper for him to reveal to the Congress and to the country whether his brother's views, so forcibly expressed, represented his own. It was not an attack on the Secretary himself.

Mr. CONNALLY. No; it was no attack at all—it was merely kicking him in the ribs, punching him in the nose, and pummeling him. It was no attack at all. Of course, it was an attack; not such an attack as a witness might make under oath in court. It was not an attack like that of a witness who must produce facts. But it is an attack by way of insinuation. "His brother thinks so and so, and therefore, if his brother thinks so and so, he is bound to think so and so. His brother's mind is reflected in his mind."

I do not doubt that the characters of the two men differ considerably. I know nothing about the man of whom the Senator speaks, but I do know Mr. Dean Acheson. I know that he appeared before our committee and that every Senator was invited to come before the committee in secret hearing to interrogate him. Senators did not come. When the vote came, every Senator who was at the hearing voted unanimously to report the nomination favorably. The committee held a public hearing, at which everybody was invited to be present, and it was attended by a large audience. So, Mr. President, I hope the Senator——

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes, I yield. I hope, not much further.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and no doubt he is familiar with the incident. Can he tell us why General Marshall, as Secretary of State, and other responsible Government officials suppressed the Wedemeyer report on China?

Mr. CONNALLY. I know nothing about the Wedemeyer report. I have never seen it.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator knows about it, does he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand there is such a document as the Wedemeyer report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Why does the Senator suppose we sent to China an outstanding general like General Wedemeyer, who spent much time in studying conditions and preparing a report, only to have the report treated as such a secret document that the whole power of the United States Government has been used to suppress it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I suppose one reason was, the report was not made to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. Had it been, it would have been published.

Mr. CONNALLY. Another reason was, it was not made to the Senate of the United States. I assume the report was made to the Chief Executive of the United States, under whom General Wedemeyer was serving. I do not know why it was not made public. I suppose it served its purpose. I suppose it advised the President of the United States of the things General Wedemeyer wanted to impart to him, and it probably was not deemed necessary or advisable or wise to publish the report. That is my answer.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does not the Senator, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, feel that was very vital, a very important report, and that it would have been only courtesy to him to show him that report?

Mr. CONNALLY. I was not chairman of the committee when the report came in.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator not think that as ranking minority member, he was entitled to see it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have been chairman only a very short time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator not think it would be a very nice thing if the Senator would call for it now?

Mr. CONNALLY. Why does the Senator not call for it? The Senator can offer a resolution. Let him submit a resolution calling upon the President to dig it up. Let him say in the resolution, "Cough up, Mr. President, the report of General Wedemeyer's." The Senator has his recourse. I was not chairman, and I was not responsible for the report, or for its publication. I know nothing of what is in the report.

There is a great deal of suspicion. It is as though someone were saying, "Let us find out something here, if we can, that we have not seen. Let us find something wrong here. I can smell it. Something wrong."

Mr. President, I do not want to indulge in such procedure.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator one further question. Inasmuch as the Senator has suggested that a resolution be introduced to call for the Wedemeyer report, and has recommended that be done——

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I have not recommended anything of the kind.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assumed that.

Mr. CONNALLY. No. The Senator makes too many assumptions. I said the Senator had his remedy, if he wanted to follow it. I have not recommended it. I have not suggested it.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anyone who suggests anything to the Senator from New Hampshire acts upon a great presumption.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Texas, who is chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, if I should offer such a resolution and it should be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, will the Senator assure me that it will be reported favorably?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; the Senator from Texas will not assure the Senator from New Hampshire anything of the kind. The Senator from Texas is only a member of the committee. The resolution might contain anything.

## VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS IN INDUSTRY, ETC.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Holland | Mundt |
| Anderson | Humphrey | Murray |
| Baldwin | Hunt | Myers |
| Brewster | Ives | Neely |
| Bricker | Jenner | O'Conor |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Pepper |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Cain | Kefauver | Russell |
| Chapman | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Connally | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Cordon | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Donnell | Langer | Sparkman |
| Ecton | Lodge | Stennis |
| Ellender | Long | Taft |
| Flanders | Lucas | Taylor |
| Frear | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Fulbright | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| George | McFarland | Thye |
| Gillette | McKellar | Tydings |
| Green | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Hayden | Martin | Wiley |
| Hendrickson | Maybank | Williams |
| Hickenlooper | Miller | Withers |
| Hill | Millikin | |
| Hoey | Morse | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, which the Clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK (Emery L. Frazier). On page 1, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "September 30, 1949" and to insert "March 31, 1950"; and on the same page, line 9, to strike out "September 30, 1949" and to insert "March 31, 1950."

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this amendment the yeas and nays have been requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nevada would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. If present, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from Michigan would vote "yea."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business and is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate, and is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH]. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 48, as follows:

YEAS—31

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Saltonstall |
| Baldwin | Hickenlooper | Schoeppel |
| Brewster | Ives | Smith, Maine |
| Bricker | Jenner | Smith, N. J. |
| Bridges | Kem | Taft |
| Butler | Knowland | Thye |
| Cain | Lodge | Watkins |
| Cordon | McCarthy | Wiley |
| Donnell | Martin | Williams |
| Ecton | Millikin | |
| Flanders | Mundt | |

NAYS—48

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hunt | Morse |
| Broughton | Johnson, Colo. | Murray |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | Myers |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Neely |
| Connally | Kefauver | O'Conor |
| Ellender | Kerr | O'Mahoney |
| Frear | Kilgore | Pepper |
| Fulbright | Langer | Robertson |
| George | Long | Russell |
| Gillette | Lucas | Sparkman |
| Green | McClellan | Stennis |
| Hayden | McFarland | Taylor |
| Hill | McKellar | Thomas, Okla. |
| Hoey | Magnuson | Thomas, Utah |
| Holland | Maybank | Tydings |
| Humphrey | Miller | Withers |

NOT VOTING—17

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Byrd | Gurney | Tobey |
| Capehart | McCarran | Vandenberg |
| Douglas | McGrath | Wagner |
| Downey | McMahon | Wherry |
| Eastland | Malone | Young |
| Ferguson | Reed | |

So Mr. BRICKER's amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR A COMMITTEE REPORT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be authorized to report during the adjournment following today's session Joint Resolution 31, providing for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## THRIFT IN THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the Treasury has recently undertaken to establish among the school children of the Nation what is called thrift week in connection with the sale of bonds. I have in my hand a letter from a friend of mine in Mason City, Iowa, the writer being Mr. F. C. Heneman, who sends me a news story from the Mason City Globe Gazette which indicates, at least, I believe, the expression of one portion of public sentiment with regard to the whole philosophy involved. I wish to read a few excerpts from this news story:

The request to Mason City's pastors to help with the observance of thrift week failed of a wholehearted response.

"Our National Government today is trying to solve the problem of having an unprecedented deficit by having the Nation's school children practice thrift while the Nation's political leaders waste with an arrogance and contempt that no story book ever presumed to portray," Dr. Roy C. Helfenstein, of the First Congregational Church stated.

"Somebody always has to pay the fiddler. In this case it is the taxpayers who have nothing to take the place of money when taxes take all the money they have.

"It would all come nearer making sense if the leaders in Washington, from the President on down, would set the example of thrift which our Nation and the world at large so sorely needs.

"It all sounds hypocritical, if not silly, for the National Government to ask all the children of the Nation who are in our public schools to practice thrift for 1 week while our Nation's political leaders go merrily on throwing the people's money to the four winds without thought for a single minute about the importance of thrift in high places as well as low."

Asking four billion additional taxes at this time is ridiculous, the pastor pointed out, adding that:

"Asking the people to practice thrift in order that the leaders in Washington may be able to spend with an abandon and prodigality which, if practiced by the citizenry of the Nation, would soon put the entire populace on the relief list—in the light of this—the request for their observance is absolutely out of place and grossly and unpardonably inconsistent," he said.

"The best observance that the public school could make of thrift week would be for the susperintendents, principals, and teachers to persuade every pupil or student to write a letter to the Federal thrift committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C., asking that the Nation's leaders set a good example before the school children of the Nation by practicing the principles of thrift."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal from Mr. Heneman and the entire news story be printed immediately following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF MASON CITY,
*Mason City, Iowa, January 28, 1949.*

The Honorable BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
*United States Senator,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HICKENLOOPER: As you probably know, the Treasury Department in connection with the sale of United States savings bonds, has been endeavoring to have a thrift week program put on through the school system of the country. At the same time they have asked the ministerial association to make thrift the topic of a Sunday morning service. I think you would be interested in some reactions that we have noticed in this town of a little more than 30,000 people. I am enclosing a clipping taken from the Mason City Globe Gazette of January 26, 1949, which represents a brief summary of points made by one of our leading ministers at his morning service.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter from our superintendent of schools, who is a man of high standing in this community, in which he sets forth very clearly the ideas he has in

connection with this type of move. I am sending these to you because I believe they are signs of our times and that you will find them of interest.

Sincerely yours,

F. C. HENEMAN, *President.*

---

[From the Mason City Globe-Gazette of January 26, 1949]

SAYS REQUEST FOR THRIFT IS HYPOCRITICAL

The request to Mason City pastors to help in the observance of thrift week failed of a wholehearted response.

"Our National Government today is trying to solve the problem of having an unprecedented deficit by having the Nation's school children practice thrift while the Nation's political leaders waste with an arrogance and contempt that no storybook ever presumed to portray," Dr. Roy C. Helfenstein, of the First Congregational Church, stated.

"Somebody always has to pay the fiddler. In this case it is the taxpayers who have nothing to take the place of money when taxes take all the money they have."

SHOULD SET EXAMPLE

"It would all come nearer making sense if the leaders in Washington, from the President on down, would set the example of thrift which our Nation and the world at large so sorely need.

"It all sounds hypocritical, if not silly, for the National Government to ask all the children of the Nation who are in our public schools to practice thrift for 1 week while our Nation's political leaders go merrily on throwing the people's money to the four winds without thought for a single minute about the importance of thrift in high places as well as low."

Asking four billion additional taxes at this time is ridiculous, the pastor pointed out, adding that:

IS INCONSISTENT

"Asking the people to practice thrift in order that the leaders in Washington may be able to spend with an abandon and prodigality which, if practiced by the citizenry of the Nation, would soon put the entire populace on the relief list—in the light of this—the request for their observance is absolutely out of place and grossly and unpardonably inconsistent," he said.

"The best observance that the public school could make of thrift week would be for the superintendents, principals, and teachers to persuade every pupil or student to write a letter to the Federal thrift committee, United States Congress, Washington, D. C., asking that the Nation's leaders set a good example before the school children of the Nation by practicing the principles of thrift."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa asked unanimous consent, I understand, and I was on my feet addressing the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The consent was granted, the Chair understood.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was on my feet addressing the Chair, because I desired to make a statement to be placed in the RECORD immediately following the article which has been read by the Senator from Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Wyoming reserve the right to object?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I reserve the right to object because I think the article is an extremely good illustration of the complete misconception which a great many people have of the expenditures of the Federal Government.

The Eightieth Congress, which went out of existence at the beginning of this year, made appropriations for the fiscal year 1949. Those appropriations were made after due consideration of the President's budget. Many members of the majority in the Eightieth Congress asserted over and over again that the expenditures of the Federal Government were wasteful, that they should be reduced, and while they were making the protestations that the President's budget was wasteful, they were themselves approving recommendations of the Budget Bureau and passing the appropriation bills. The reductions which were put into effect made very little difference in the total budget, and frequently were followed by deficiency appropriations.

Now the fact of the matter is that the expenditures of the Federal Government have been made very high because from 75 to 80 percent of them are for war-connected expenses which cannot be avoided. So I want the author of the statement, when he reads it in the RECORD, to read also the statement of at least one Member of the Senate that his criticisms are utterly without foundation.

The President of the United States, in submitting his budgets to the Congress of the United States ever since he assumed that high executive responsibility, has endeavored—and I think successfully—to cut expenditures to the bone. He has been faced, however, with the necessity of providing funds to take care of veterans' services, to maintain the Army and the Navy and the United States Air Force, to carry on international obligations, and to pay the interest upon the national debt, which amounts to $5,000,000,000 annually—an interest which must be paid if the national debt is to be serviced. All of what is expressed in the statement is based upon an entire misconception of the responsibility of the Government.

I may say that the Senate only last week passed unanimously an appropriation bill adding $500,000 to the disaster fund of the President of the United States, although in a previous Congress the President's disaster fund was seriously cut. This same Congress, without any dissent at all, passed a bill which was introduced by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] on behalf of the Senator from six Western States, authorizing the appropriation of some $3,000,000 for relief from the unprecedented blizzard which affects the entire West, from western Nebraska and western South Dakota to the Pacific coast. These expenditures of government are made on the recommendation of the President and on the approval of the Congress only because they have to be made to provide for unavoidable expenses devolving upon the Government of the United States.

CONSTRUCTION OF LOW-RENT HOUSES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, out of order I ask unanimous consent to introduce, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself, a bill dealing with housing. I also ask to have the bill printed in the RECORD, and to be permited to make an explanatory statement with respect to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and printed in the RECORD. And without objection, the Senator may proceed with his statement.

The bill (S. 757) to provide an effective method for the construction of low-rent homes for low-income families with a minimum of Federal control and expenditure, introduced by Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. BRICKER), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as "The Mutual Low-Rent Homes Construction Act."

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. Because a shortage of housing is contrary to the national interest, and because increased home ownership will promote the national welfare, it is the policy of the United States to assist in relieving housing shortages, and to foster and promote the increase of home ownership among the people of the Nation. Because the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families of low income is a matter of national concern and a prerequisite to the achievement of the freedom from want and freedom from fear which are among our national objectives, it is the policy of the United States to join with States and municipalities in providing a subsidy to make possible the construction of low-rent homes wherever they may be needed in any State. It is the policy of the United States to provide this assistance to home construction without doing violence to the traditional American preference for private enterprise under local rather than Federal control and supervision, and without unjustifiably increasing the size or powers of the Federal agencies. It is the purpose and intent of this act to carry out these policies.

LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUALS

SEC. 3. A local low-rent mutual, to qualify under this act, shall have (1) not less than 5 nor more than 7 trustees, each named for a term of 5 years, and each of whom shall have been individually appointed as such trustee by the local municipal or county government before the issuance of a State charter to the mutual, (2) a membership committee, appointed by unanimous vote of the trustees, which shall establish rules and procedure for the membership, and (3) members selected by the membership committee from families having family incomes in the lowest one-fifth of family incomes in the community.

GRANTS TO LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUALS

SEC. 4. (a) The Administrator of the Federal Works Administration is authorized to make grants to local low-rent mutuals to assist in the construction of homes projects undertaken by such mutuals. The amount of any such grant shall be equal to 25 percent of the estimated total development cost of the homes project involved. The aggregate amount of all such grants shall not exceed $1,750,000,000.

(b) A local low-rent mutual shall be eligible for a grant as provided in this section when (1) the municipality within which such mutual was formed shall have approved, by referendum or appropriate action of the local governing authority, establishment of a fund to be used for making grants equal to 12½ percent of the estimated total development cost of low-rent homes projects within such municipality, (2) such a grant from such

fund shall have been made to such mutual, (3) the plans for the mutual low-rent homes project and the site for such project shall have been approved by the local governing authority for the community within which such site is located, and (4) the State within which such site is located, or some appropriate agency thereof, shall have made a grant to such mutual equal to 12½ percent of the estimated total development cost of such projects.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 5. The Administrator of the Federal Works Administration is authorized to make necessary rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this act.

AUTHORITY FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 6. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including funds for making the grants provided in section 4. Not more than 10 percent of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available for low-rent homes projects in any one State.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 7. As used in this act—

(1) "Community" means a municipality;

(2) "Mutual homes project" means a project for the development and construction of low-rent homes sponsored by a local low-rent mutual pursuant to the terms of this act, and occupancy of which is limited to members of the local low-rent mutual;

(3) "Family" means a group of not less than 2 persons related to one another by blood or marriage and living within the same dwelling unit;

(4) "Family income" means the total of the combined annual incomes of the members of a family;

(5) "Local low-rent mutual" means a mutual association or non-stock corporation formed and chartered under State law and qualifying under section 3;

(6) "Local municipal or county government" means the mayor, city manager, town or city council, village board, board of aldermen, board of county commissioners, or other responsible administrative authority of a municipality, having appropriate jurisdiction under applicable local law;

(7) "Local law" means the currently existing law of a State or municipality;

(8) "Low-rent home" means a family dwelling unit for which total development cost is between $3,000 and $7,000;

(9) "Municipality" means a county, parish, city, town, village, or other municipal subdivision of a State, having an organized municipal government;

(10) "State" means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, or Alaska;

(11) "Total development cost" means the aggregate cost of development, including actual or allocable expenditures for land, planning, site preparation, roads, streets, and utilities not normally a municipal responsibility, and all construction costs;

(12) "Low-rent homes project" means a mutual homes project sponsored by a local low-rent mutual.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, it is my privilege, on behalf of the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and myself, to submit for the consideration of the Congress and the Nation a bill which will provide 1,000,000 housing units, if they be needed, which will rent for $30 per month or less, at a cost to our Federal Government not to exceed $1,750,000,000.

I should like to point out to the Senators that when compared with S. 138, which is designed to provide for 1,000,000 public housing units, our bill would mean a savings of $16,050,000,000 to the taxpayers of the Nation. In addition, our bill would provide for eventual home ownership for the occupants of the low-rent housing units so provided.

Mr. President, since coming to the Congress 2 years ago the junior Senator from Washington has been more perplexed and concerned by the Nation's low-rent question than by any other. I have been among those who have strongly resisted the efforts of the administration, and many Members of the Congress, to have the Federal Government create and administer a large-scale subsidized low-rent program throughout the Nation. I have willingly agreed with those who wish to foster such a program that there is a real need to create a substantial housing for a segment of our society which is economically unable to secure present-day housing at a price they can afford to pay, but I have vigorously opposed their belief that this objective can best or only be achieved through management, supervision, and almost complete subsidy by the Federal Government. My thought has been that management and supervision are proper prerogatives of local government, and that required subsidies must be jointly shared by local, State, and Federal levels of government.

Those who have shared my point of view, and there are a number on both side of the aisle, have likewise shared my conspicuous opposition weakness. We have up to this time been opposing something we thought to be wrong, with nothing. We have had nothing constructive to offer as an approach to the subsidized low-rent question. We have merely been against what we did not like. This negative position has brought us distress, and it has been often misunderstood by many who considered us to be obstructionists.

The bill which the Senator from Ohio and I have just sent to the desk is conceived by us to be a solid, reasonable, and constructive approach to the subsidized low-rent problem. All we hope is that serious students of the housing question, both in and out of Congress, will critically examine this new approach, for it has not previously been publicly considered. The Senator from Ohio and I have absolutely no pride of authorship. The idea we advance is not original with us. It has come partly from America and partly from abroad—certainly from Sweden. If others, after study, think it as good as we do we want to join with them in doing something about it.

From some points of view the bill has three surface weaknesses, none of which I conceive to be valid. When compared to every other present proposal before the Congress, the Cain-Bricker proposal does not cost enough. The bill is so simple in concept and words that it can be understood by everybody, and there are those who think that legislation must be complicated to be good. The proposal, if adopted, would return the low-rent problem to the American city and county, where it belongs. That many will fight the idea for this reason is clearly obvious. All the sponsors ask, Mr. President, is that the legislation be examined against the standard of writing legislation which serves the best interests of our citizens everywhere.

I should like to outline briefly what our bill proposes. It is designed to organize mutual low-rent-housing societies at the local level by providing grants-in-aid by local, State, and Federal Governments equal to 50 percent of the total development cost of the housing projects.

We feel that local influence and control must prevail if a project is to be successful. We provide for initiating the grants-in-aid by the local government through the medium of a local referendum which will assure 12½ percent of the total development cost of the project by the municipality. After the local community has voted upon the subject and pledged 12½ percent of the cost, the State in which the project is located would provide 12½ percent of the cost. Then the Federal Government would match these two grants-in-aid by local and State governments in the amount of 25 percent of the total development cost. Thus, with local, State, and Federal grants-in-aid, 50 percent of the cost would be assured.

The remaining 50 percent for the development would be secured from private first-mortgage sources with a long-term mortgage regularly amortized and with the lowest possible interest rate.

Mr. President, I mentioned a few moments ago that our bill, for comparison purposes, would provide the same number of low-rent housing units, namely 1,000,000, at a maximum cost of $7,000 per unit. That totals $7,000,000,000 for the total cost of 1,000,000 units. However, the Federal Government is obligated only to the extent of one-fourth of this total cost, or $1,750,000,000. I should like to point out that S. 138 provides for an annual subsidy of $445,000,000 for a 40-year period, which amount totals $17,800,000,000, and which, presumably, is to supply 1,000,000 public-housing units. Therefore, the difference, Mr. President, between the cost to the Federal Government in form of subsidy for 1,000,000 units under S. 138 and the Cain-Bricker proposal is $16,050,000,000.

Every Senator has heard much, Mr. President, about Federal aid to education, Federal aid to medicine, Federal aid for this, and Federal aid for that. The saving which could be realized in this one piece of legislation alone would more than pay for all of the other proposals—assuming, of course, Mr. President, that the Senate would approve those proposals.

Whereas a substantially large agency is necessary to administer the administration's legislation, our bill would require nothing but local administration. This is made possible by the fact that the bill provides for only one payment in the form of grants-in-aid and no Federal or State administrative agency, while the administration bill provides for a continuity of 40 years' administration through a Federal agency during the time provided for payment of the subsidy.

The maximum cost limit under this Cain-Bricker bill is $7,000 per house, including the land, while the administration bill limits the cost to $2,500 per room.

Taking the average two bedroom, five-room house, the maximum cost per house to the taxpayer under S. 138 would be $12,500 exclusive of land and other facilities. Mr. President, practically every city in this Nation has tax land already owned by the city. This could well be the nucleus for the start of a project as proposed in our bill.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this bill provides that only one-fourth of the total cost of the development of these projects be assumed by the Government. Under S. 138, the administration bill, a minimum of 90 percent of the total cost is borne by the Federal Government.

Home ownership is the eventual goal of our bill. The tenants who are participants in these mutual housing developments would eventually become owners of their own homes in which they live. This is impossible under the administration's housing bill, because it is set up to be rental housing at all times.

Although the administration bill refers to local public-housing agencies as the governing agencies, I know from my own personal experience that this is not true, because the plans, sites, tenants, and procedures are all screened and finally passed upon by Washington. Under the Cain-Bricker bill, full and complete control would be vested in the local community and local authorities. Neither Federal nor State Government would have any controlling influence.

Qualifications for admission to these mutual housing projects proposed in our bill are specifically limited to those families having an income in the lowest one-fifth of the family incomes in the community, as determined by the trustees who are appointed by the municipal or county government. Under S. 138 the local public housing agency must show the Washington office that a gap—and I quote from the bill, Mr. President—

> A gap of at least 20 percent has been left between the upper rental limits for admission to the proposed low-rent housing and the lowest rents at which private enterprise is providing (through new construction and available existing structures) a substantial supply of * * * housing toward meeting the need of an adequate volume thereof.

The only assurance that the lowest income groups can get into the housing provided for by the administration bill is that there shall be no discrimination against them.

The Cain-Bricker bill provides that the mutual housing projects to be constructed shall pay local ad valorem taxes to lessen the tax burden of the local community. The administration bill, however, specifically exempts the public housing units from paying local real-estate taxes, thereby adding to the burden of the community which must provide sewerage, water, police, and fire protection with no income from the project to assist in payment for these services. However, a token payment may be made in lieu of taxes.

The rents being paid in public housing projects today admittedly average over $30 per month. Rentals under the Cain-Bricker bill could be kept within a $13–$30 per month range. This would be possible because administration costs are confined to the local project and are not part of a superstructure of Federal agencies.

Mr. President, our bill recognizes States' rights. Under this proposal action must first be taken by the local community through local referendum before a project can be considered. In other words, the voters in every community in the Nation would have an opportunity to choose for themselves whether or not they want a mutual low-rent project in their community, as well as determine the extent of their need. Under the administration bill the local public housing agency deals directly with the Federal Government, bypassing the State. The extent of local determination is merely a request for assistance. The final decision rests in Washington. I have always contended, Mr. President, that Washington cannot foresee the requirements and needs of every community of this Nation. It must be a community-controlled-and-operated project to succeed.

While under this proposed bill the local community would participate in 12½ percent of the construction cost, the administration bill requires the community to pay 10 percent of the construction cost. But, Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senators that the community would recover, under the Cain-Bricker bill, its portion of the grant-in-aid in the form of real-estate taxes in 7 to 12 years. Under the administration bill no real-estate taxes are paid, except the possible token payments in lieu of taxes.

I should like to point out now that because of economic rents being paid today in public-housing projects surpluses have been accumulated, and these surpluses, under the administration bill, would accrue to the benefit of the Federal Government. Under the Cain-Bricker bill, however, any profits by reason of good management go to the tenants in lower rents.

I want to state here that we used the one million units figure only as a basis for comparison with S. 138, the administration bill. There is no specific number of units that may be constructed under our proposed bill, because, of course, that number must be determined by the local communities. And there is no number picked out of a hat based upon economic theories. This bill will provide incentive for home ownership and will give the tenant an opportunity to help himself by sharing responsibilities that are rightfully his and the community's.

Aside from the fact that this bill would save the taxpayers $14,300,000,000—which is quite a sizable sum—it does not set up a Federal bureau which, by reason of the legislation, would be continued for at least 40 years. It will provide better housing for the people for whom it is intended—those in the lowest income groups of their respective communities. And, finally, full and complete authority always is vested in the local community.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a detailed explanation of the bill which, because I think it will be of thought-provoking interest to every Senator, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCAL LOW-RENT MUTUAL HOUSING SOCIETIES

Five to seven trustees, 5-year terms.

Municipal or county government to appoint trustees.

State grants corporate charter.

Membership committee appointed by trustees.

Members selected by membership committee from lowest one-fifth family incomes in community.

Municipal referendum on establishment of fund to be used for making grants of 12½ percent of total development cost of various welfare homes projects.

Mayor or county commissioners approve plans and site, making project eligible for State and Federal grants.

State government makes grant equal to 12½ percent of total cost.

Federal Government makes grant equal to 25 percent of total cost.

Private lender makes long-term, low-interest, first-mortgage loan equal to 50 percent of total.

RESULTS

Secure long-term tenancy leading to home ownership. Monthly charges: Basic (principal and interest, common maintenance, taxes, and insurance), $13 to $30; plus charges for management and reserves established by trustees for units costing $3,000 to $7,000.

No local tax exemption.

Large element of self-help by lowest income families.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Edward H. Foley, Jr., of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of A. Lee M. Wiggins, resigned;

John S. Graham, of North Carolina, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Edward H. Foley, Jr.;

George B. Gillin, of California, to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif., to fill an existing vacancy;

Gilroy Roberts, of Pennsylvania, to be engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy;

Daniel A. Bolich, of New York, to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in place of Stewart Berkshire, resigned;

Ralph W. Cripe, of South Bend, Ind., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, to fill an existing vacancy;

John J. Fitzpatrick, of Connecticut, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut, to fill an existing vacancy;

John H. Alsmiller, of Kentucky, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky., in place of Harry M. Brennan, deceased;

William H. Burke, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (reappointment);

Charles F. Murphy, of Massachusetts, to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (reappointment); and

George McGill, of Kansas, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1954 (reappointment).

By Mr. GEORGE (for Mr. BYRD), from the Committee on Finance:

Stuart L. Crenshaw, of Virginia, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Finance:

Tully Garner, of Texas, to be collector of customs for customs collection district numbered 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex., vice Harry P. Hornby, deceased.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maurice J. Tobin to be Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ralph Wright to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William E. Willett to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the nomination by President Truman of Mr. William Edward Willett, of Maryland, as a Director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is one which seeks to retain in the service of the Government a thoroughly competent public servant who has proven his competence both in private industry and as an official and director of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Willett was for a number of years active in banking and the purchase and sale of securities before assuming his position with the Federal Government. It was because of his demonstrated capacity as assistant loan manager of the RFC and in other capacities that President Truman first appointed him a Director of the Corporation on June 19, 1948.

To say that he is eminently qualified for the position is encompassing in a few brief words the highest recommendation that I could give him. I sincerely trust that he will be confirmed promptly by this honorable body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The clerk will state the next nomination on the Executive Calendar.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank P. Douglass to be a member of the National Mediation Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Mitchell to be a Civil Service Commissioner.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. F. Ryan Duffy to be circuit judge, Seventh Circuit, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Paul P. Rao to be a judge of the United States Customs Court.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William T. McCarthy to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Patrick Thornton to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Roy W. Harper to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James T. Foley to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Wilson Warlick to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Hon. Angel R. de Jesus to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Luis Negron Fernandez to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph F. Deeb to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gerald A. Gleeson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Elliott Biermann to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin D. Bolger to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold K. Claypool to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl H. Fleckenstine to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I inquire what business will be considered next, and when will the Senate meet again?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senate will adjourn until Thursday next. At that time the only business coming before the Senate will be the bill reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, dealing with the continuation of the Freedom Train. That is a nonpartisan measure, and I anticipate that it will take only a short time.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 31, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean Rusk, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Jesse M. Donaldson, of Illinois, to be Postmaster General.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Walter Lee Dunham, of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a portion of the term expiring June 30, 1950.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John B. Dunlap, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas, to fill an existing vacancy.

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Lt. Col. Walter J. Renfroe, Jr., as professor of modern languages, United States Military Academy, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 28, 1946, and section 520 (a) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

NOTE.—This officer was given recess appointment on December 2, 1948.

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF OF ENGINEERS

Maj. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8096, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 11, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CHIEF OF FINANCE

Brig. Gen. Eugene M. Foster, O6228, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and for appointment as major general in the Regular Army of the United States under the provisions of section 9a, National Defense Act, as amended, and title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Billy J. Baggett
Robert A. Westropp

John E. Parsons, Jr. (Naval R. O. T. C.) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

| | |
|---|---|
| Robert S. Blake | Thomas A. Kamm |
| William J. D. Bradford 3d | Adair Miller |
| | Joseph J. Packo |
| William W. Davenport | Kenneth F. Pedersen |
| Benjamin Dillahunty | Neil A. Swartz |
| Edward J. Francois | Stanford J. Watson |

Lek K. Von Kaesborg (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

James H. Greene (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, to rank from date indicated after each name:

Erwin L. Aufdenkamp, June 3, 1949.
James H. Breunlin, June 4, 1948.

George L. Moreman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Ferris G. Hodge
Frederick S. Welham

LIEUTENANT

Eldon O. Schnoebelen

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| June V. Alvis | Martha J. Hennessee |
| Eileen M. Bartels | Laura M. Hoff |
| Violet E. Bors | Eva M. Jacobsen |
| Wanda C. Bowman | Louise F. Jakshe |
| Reba M. Bradford | Marie A. Johncola |
| Marjorie J. Brumit | Mary-Jeanne Lagano |
| Edith M. Cadman | Clara J. Leoni |
| Mary G. Cain | Leslie E. McBratney |
| Jacqueline M. Camp | Mary P. McCarthy |
| Mary Cerrato | Betty L. McDonald |
| Eleanor M. Chapman | Kathleen M. Malloy |
| Patricia E. Cresap | Marcella A. Mickiewicz |
| Nancy J. Crosby | |
| Dorothy K. Cummings | Constance A. Miller |
| Martha K. Daugherty | Doris M. Mortimer |
| Mary I. Dekenys | Geraldine L. Newstrom |
| Helen M. DeWitt | Regina M. Olko |
| Vivian M. M. Dicke | Celia Olshefski |
| Catherine R. Dupuis | Angie L. Pettit |
| Virginia C. Faeth | Joan E. Pollick |
| Mary J. Franco | Evelyn F. Przybylek |
| Maurine G. Frederick | Muriel E. Ramage |
| Dorothy L. French | Madeleine J. Ruppert |
| Ina A. Gibson | Carolyn J. Shearer |
| Dorothy F. Giorgio | Katherine Vagenas |
| Rebecca Gomez | Florence H. Volkering |
| Anna G. Hart | Genevieve E. Wagasky |

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Richard B. Phillips

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

| | |
|---|---|
| Alexander A. Bolton, Jr. | Carl W. DeOnier |
| | William W. Manson |
| William McG. Crafft | |

LIEUTENANTS

Sidney D. Bond, Jr.
John A. McAfoos
Carl E. Pruett

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

| | |
|---|---|
| Robert H. Lemmon | Eugene C. Stone, Jr. |
| John L. Reed | Roger K. Wallace |
| Anthony P. Rush | |

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Willard J. Goldring

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Allen L. McInturff
Syrus E. Tande

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

| | |
|---|---|
| Frederick E. Batterson | Ralph A. Sennott |
| Robert S. Leopold | Carroll M. White |

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William B. Hull
Willard J. Goldring

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Ethel J. MacNaughton
Mary J. Wolfe

Otto A. Fennig to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification engineering, in lieu of lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Engineering, as previously nominated, to correct spelling of name.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Franklin A. Hart

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

John T. Walker

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Lawson H. M. Sanderson

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Walter W. Wensinger

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

| | |
|---|---|
| Albert J. Keller | |
| Wayne H. Adams | Ralph M. King |
| Elliott E. Bard | August Larson |
| Nelson K. Brown | Harry S. Leon |
| Austin R. Brunelli | Richard C. Mangrum |
| Edward B. Carney | Francis J. McQuillen |
| John H. Cook, Jr. | Luther S. Moore |
| Harlan C. Cooper | Ben Z. Redfield |
| Edward J. Dillon | Charles D. Roberts |
| Robert E. Fojt | Charles J. Schlapkohl |
| Edward H. Forney | Walter T. Short |
| Harry G. Fortune | Clifford H. Shuey |
| Edmund B. Games | William B. Steiner |
| Bankson T. Holcomb, Jr. | Samuel G. Taxis |
| | John A. While |
| Lewis C. Hudson | Frederic L. Wieseman |

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

| | |
|---|---|
| Thomas J. Ahern | Arthur A. Poindexter |
| Darrell L. Cool | Bennet G. Powers |
| George E. Dooley | Charles O. Rogers |
| Carl V. Larsen | Eugene N. Thompson |
| David E. Marshall | Vernon O. Ullman |
| Arba L. Norton | Harry A. Waldorf |
| Edward L. Peoples | |

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

| | |
|---|---|
| Olin L. Beall | August F. Schonefeld |
| Robert E. McCook | Rupert E. Stone |

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

Donald R. Nugent

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

| | |
|---|---|
| Anthony A. Akstin | Robert I. Bryan |
| William E. Baird | Lyle E. Buck |
| William J. Barnatt | Roscoe E. Cole |
| John H. Blumenstein | Francis P. Dayton |
| Richard L. Braun | Frederic F. Draper |
| Joseph A. Bruder | Cecil D. Ferguson |

Herbert Gomes
Robert H. Hammond
Charles H. Horn
Roy N. Johnston
Bolish J. Kozak
George E. Leppig
Truman K. Lyford
Charles L. McIndoe
Carl A. Nielsen
Glenn E. Norris
William R. Ourand, Jr.
Albert L. Pope
Kenneth L. Reusser
Thomas H. Rogers, Jr.
John E. Shepherd, Jr.
Clyde T. Suttle
Edward C. Thoemmes
Harold Wallace
Warren E. Whipple
James S. Williams
Russell L. Young
John W. Zuber

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

George K. Acker
Emory L. Anderson
Max Berueffy, Jr.
Richard Burgess
Charles W. Case
Zadik Collier
Philip J. Costello
George R. Eargle
John H. Faggart
Thomas G. Fields
Harry D. Hargrave
Johnny Jennings
Samuel A. Johnstone, Jr.
Arthur L. Kent
Harry E. Kipp
Wilfred S. LeFrancois
Stephen Lesko
James D. Ludvigson
John W. Mace
Gilbert McConville
Doyle A. New
Frederick O'Connor
Fulton L. Oglesby
Harry C. Parsons
George S. Plantier
Lee E. Roberts
Charles Seiler
Frederick M. Steinhauser
Reuben S. Stoner
Vernon A. Tuson
John W. Webber
Lloyd O. Williams
William L. Williams
William L. Woodruff

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Arthur H. Ackerman
Howard K. Alberts
Philip R. Anderson
Stanislaus A. Antos
Wade W. Atkins
James P. Aynes
Billy H. Barber
Irvin "J" Barney
George F. Bauman
Herbert L. Beckington
Louis W. Benjamin, Jr.
William C. Benton
James L. Berard
Albert J. Bibee
Richard L. Bland
James D. Boldman
Raymond N. Bowman
Lawrence H. Brandon
William B. Buckner, Jr.
Robert H. Buettner
Clarence J. Busick
Warren A. Butcher
Raymond J. Butters
Robert O. Carlock
Nicholas Chernock
Richard W. Cline
Frank R. Collen
Ralph D. Coplan
Charles E. Crew
Calvin K. Currens
Eldon E. Davidson
Stanley Davis
William E. Deeds
Charles F. DeKeyser
Gerald T. Dixon
John J. Doherty
Charles E. Dole
James W. Donnell
William R. Duncan
Richard A. Flanagan
James G. Fox
Burnette R. Gallagher
Baylor P. Gibson, Jr.
George "M" Golleher
David T. Gooden
James B. Graves
Joe R. Greene
Harold K. Hall
Curtis F. Hamlin, Jr.
Merlin L. Hasley
Paul B. Henley
Thomas R. Hickey, Jr.
Robert W. Hoffman
Marvin K. Hollenbeck
Howard G. Holt
Odia "E" Howe, Jr.
James O. Huston
Joseph N. Irick
William C. James, Jr.
George E. Jenkins
Charles D. Jones
States R. Jones, Jr.
Joseph R. Kapsch
Theodore A. Kelley
George C. Knapp
Alexander Kositch
George A. Krumm
Eugene F. Langan
Stewart R. Lauer
George E. Lawrence
Harry Lee
Claude H. Lewis, Jr.
William R. Lobell
Edwin B. Long
Edward "H" Mackel
John H. Maher
Norbert C. Manley, Jr.
Kenneth L. Mann
William S. McCarson
James D. McGough
Oscar "J" Morel
Robert J. Morrison
Victor E. Myers
James R. O'Moore
Will S. Patee, Jr.
Uel D. Peters
Franklin N. Pippin
Eugene J. Pope
John G. Prestridge
Joseph Pultorak
Richard H. Rainforth
Raymond J. Rightmyer, Jr.
David Riley
John J. Rollins
Carroll D. Rowe
Leonard L. Schultz
Robert R. Scott
William A. Shepherd
Robert C. Shipp
Frank "A" Shook, Jr.
Almond H. Sollom
Ira E. Spieker
Parks J. Stallings
Elmo J. Stingley
Harold H. Stirling, Jr.
Marvin R. Stout
John B. Sullivan
Walter E. Sullivan, Jr.
Wilson "C" Terry
Nicholas G. W. Thorne
Eddie C. Torbett
Johnnie V. Townsend
Thomas B. Trammell
Marion G. Truesdale
Herman L. Ubbins
Eugene "A" Wailes
Herbert R. Waltz
Stephen G. Warren
Warren C. Watson
Robert J. Weaver
Warren E. Weinberg
Robert M. Wetzel
James L. Whitaker
Patrick E. Wildman
Frank E. Wilson
James E. Wilson, Jr.
Ray Woods
Robert P. Wray
Frank R. Young

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

George J. Batson, Jr.
Hersel D. C. Blasingame
Walter E. G. Godenius
Harry D. Hutchcroft
Francis L. Miller
James B. Seaton
Howard B. Smith
Ben W. White
Ellis R. Wright

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

James C. Alison
Eugene J. Ambrosia
Henry G. Ammer
William E. Androsko
Frederick L. J. Ashworth
Guy O. Badger
Lonnie P. Baites
John H. Barclay
Paul W. Barcus
Wallace C. Barrett
Raleigh E. Barton, Jr.
Richard Bell
George H. Benskin, Jr.
Joe R. Bibby
George G. Blair II
Donald M. Blomgren
Dorsie H. Booker, Jr.
James T. Breckinridge
John C. Breckinridge
Fitzhugh L. Buchanan, Jr.
Edwin B. Bucholz
Lyle W. Bullard
Edwin "A" Burns
Harrison M. Butler
John C. Butner III
Robert W. Calvert
Ira T. Carr
Michael P. Carroll
Frank A. Cassiano
Franklin R. Chambers
William E. Clark
David A. Clement
Stanford Cluggish
Thomas B. Collins
James G. Costigan
Robert E. Cox
Theodore T. Culpepper
Asa B. Culver, Jr.
William J. Cupelo
Clarence G. Dahl
Charles M. Darracott
John G. Demas
Edmund G. Derning, Jr.
Jack N. Dillard
Jack W. Dindinger
Thomas S. Dlugos
Donald W. Dorn
Robert E. Downen
Earl C. Dresbach, Jr.
LeRoy M. Duffy
William F. Dyroff
Edward W. Dzialo
Edward V. Easter
Paul M. Edwards
Harry D. Elms
Donald E. Estes
James D. Feltman
Henry Fischer, Jr.
Joseph R. Fisher
Thomas R. Freeman
Homer D. Frison
Robert W. Frye
Edward D. Gelzer, Jr.
Nolan R. Gibbons
Gerald W. Gibson
Hobson J. Gifford
Ronald L. Glendinning
Melvin K. Green
Richard P. Grey
Leo Gumienny
Arnold J. Hammons
Autrey B. Hammon
Frank W. Harris III
Howard H. Harris
Robert G. Harris
Lester Heinz, Jr.
Clayton V. Hendricks
Russell S. Hibbs
Norman W. Hicks
Joseph J. Holicky
Louis S. Hollier, Jr.
Thomas J. Holt
Frank H. Horn
Kenneth C. Ives
Curtis A. James, Jr.
Robert E. Jochums
Tracy N. Johnson
David G. Jones
Edward H. Jones
George P. Jones
Robert A. Jones
Robert W. Jorn
Timothy J. Keane, Jr.
Jack R. Kearney
John H. Keith, Jr.
Gene S. Keller
James P. Kelly
Edward B. Keyes, Jr.
Edwin W. Killian
Lee A. Kirstein
Harrol Kiser
Herbert J. Korstange
Orin D. Krone
Fred D. Kuhlmann
Robert J. Larsen
Harold V. Larson
Fred Lawton, Jr.
Thaddeus F. Lewandowski
Elmer "M" Lewis, Jr.
Harry M. Lindberg
James E. Machin
Fletcher B. Maddox
Reginald G. Martin
Jan Mason
Donald L. May
John R. McGuigan
Frederick C. McLaughlin
Clare R. McMahon
George C. McNaughton
Robert L. McNeely
Merrill J. Melton
John B. Melvin
George A. Merrill
Jack L. Miles
Frank N. Mitchell
Arthur B. Montagne
Clarence G. Moody, Jr.
Gail A. Newkirk
William J. Nietschmann
Richard F. Noble
Robert G. Parrish
Harold L. Parsons
William H. Peck
Jack B. Phillips
Brockman L. Plauche
Ray D. Pineo
Arthur J. Poillon
Linus F. Pottebaum
Robert G. Price
Elmore F. Ravensberg
James H. Reid, Jr.
Lester F. Reid
Knowlton P. Rice
Alvin R. Rieder
Glenn W. Rodney
Harold E. Roland, Jr.
John J. Roothoff
Maurice Rose
Ted J. Ryder
James R. Schoen
Gerald F. Schultz
Benjamin B. Selvitelle, Jr.
James F. Shea, Jr.
Donald A. Silva
John B. Sims
Frederick D. Singer
Perry T. Smith
Richard E. Smith
Harry A. Spaight, Jr.
Donald E. Spencer
Raymond B. Spicer
Clarence R. Stanley
Richard E. Stansberry
Thomas J. Stevens
Howard D. Stewart II
Hugh W. Stewart
Howard E. Stidham
Charles H. Sullivan
Theodore Summers
William Swanson
William E. Sweeney
Warren G. Tanzler
Alfred C. Taves
David S. Taylor
Jay "J" Thomas, Jr.
Robert J. Thomas
William L. Tipton, Jr.
Charles A. Turpin
Robert A. Underwood
Rollin F. VanCantfort
Robert N. Vance
Jo M. Van Meter
Floyd L. Vuillemot
John A. Wachter
Denzil E. Walden
Charles M. Wallace, Jr.
Henry M. Walter, Jr.
Ralph L. Walz
Alan J. Warshawer
Charles T. Westcott
Howard A. Westphall
Jack D. White
William A. Whitesell
Edward A. Wilcox
Loren K. Wildermuth
Wallace L. Williamson
Ralph C. Wood
Kermit M. Worley
John R. Wyatt, Jr.
Robert F. Young, Jr.
Vance L. Yount, Jr.

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

George M. Best
Jack F. Boles
Johnny L. Carter
Robert E. Follendorf
Russell T. Gorter
William J. Hamilton
James M. Haney
Raymond E. Logan
John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Kenneth R. Porter
Cluese T. Powell
James A. Tootle
Frank C. Trumble
Wilmon Varnado
Andrew M. Young

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Oscar W. Cargile
Thomas J. Chandler
Claude N. Harris
Paul H. Mikkelsen
John F. Pezdark

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Walter E. Anderson
Wilbur R. Barnes
Kennard F. Bubier
Ira Brock
James E. Buckle
Hall V. Cartmell
Harry E. Detwiler
Thomas H. Dougan
Frederick Dykstra
Grammer G. Edwards
Frank W. Ferguson
Wallace Henry
Harold R. Jordan
Norman D. Kent
Clyde H. Long
Francis J. Lutz
Edward J. McCabe
Lee Moberly
Eero Nori
Joseph F. Stepka
Samuel M. Trippe
Herman A. Zehngebot

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Herman T. Barbee
Leonard I. Beatty
Paul F. Brandenburg
Richard P. Brezinski
Willie W. Brock
James E. Brown
Good Burleson
Theodore R. Cathey
Frank J. Cermak
Francis L. Churchville
Robert J. Corbett
Thomas H. Cutler
Robert L. Dickey
Walter H. Eastham
Edward E. Elder
James W. Eldridge
Irvin H. Elrod
James P. Evans
Joseph R. Foster
Howard C. Frazer
Elwood E. Gebhart
Cletus K. Gibson
Walter R. Giles
Raymond F. Gotko
John P. Grando
Robert C. Gunsalus
James K. Harris
Milligan G. Hereford
Ralph H. Hobbs
Michael J. Hogan
Arthur L. Jackson
Boyd J. Jackson
George Jones
Albert H. Keith
Beldon Lidyard
Raymond L. Luckel
Floyd M. McCorkle
Thomas W. McNeely
Charles E. McPartlin
Arthur J. Noonan
Ronald J. Nourse
Frederick V. Osborn
Thomas C. Palmer, Jr.

Paul R. Paquin
Howard H. Parker
Frank G. Paul
George T. Perschau
Fred R. Philpot
Paul J. Preston
Caryll A. Price
Joseph J. Reardon
John F. Ricard
William B. Richards
Joseph C. Schwalke
William A. Searight
Frank C. Sheppard
Michael J. Sisul
Samuel L. Slocum
Robert A. Smith
Allen F. Stockdale
Robert G. Straine
James D. Swinson
Max C. Taylor
Harold M. Tupper
Robert E. Wall
William F. Watson
George L. Williams
Adolph Ziegler

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Oscar A. Bosma
Woodrow W. Brown
Alfred T. Coon
Felix L. Ferranto
Henry G. Goare
Bill E. Grimes
Dudley J. Hagen
Adolph J. Kutilek
Walter P. Landis
Lornie Leslie
Virgil R. Martin
William D. Miears
Adam A. Metz
Warren L. Mobley
Howard E. Morris
William L. Nolte
Bill L. Parham
Gerald L. Pines
William M. Rossiter
Kenneth M. Stayer
St. Clair Tant
Russell Tarver
John H. Tomlinson
Charles M. Whitley

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Raymond L. Amos
Everett L. Anderson
John T. Bates
Daniel M. Blue, Jr.
Louis J. Caminiti
Robert B. Dowdy
William A. Fiander
Allison G. Folsom, Jr.
Thomas F. Ford
Hollis W. Glass
Frank L. Howard
Stevan Iungerich
Lawrence W. Keenan
Homer King
Frederick J. Knack
Richard C. Laubach
Frank Lisi
Michael M. Marks
George M. Mathis
Glenn E. McComas
George E. McKain
John A. Mitchell
Louis A. Murphy, Jr.
Howard W. Pearson
Albert L. Protz
Estes N. Ratliffe
Leon C. Riley
Norman Rubin
Thomas J. Shaw
William H. Shuman
Edward Stallknecht
Clyde H. Stamps
Judson J. Swallow
James V. Valentour
Maurice S. Wahrer
Peter P. Yezierski
Albert J. Zlamal

The following-named woman officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Katherine A. Towle

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Julia E. Hamblet
Pauline E. Perate

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Pauline B. Beckley
Barbara J. Bishop
Margaret M. Henderson
Emma H. Hendrickson
Elsie E. Hill
Helen J. McGraw

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Kathleen J. Arney
Eunyce L. Brink
Ben A. Day
Frances A. Denbo
Mary J. Fischer
Jeanne Fleming
Mary J. Hale
Margaret S. Ordemann
Pauline F. Riley
Margaret L. Stevenson
Jeanette I. Sustad

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Hugh S. Aitken
Ralph M. Anderson
John R. Bigler
Joseph A. Borowski
Travis D. Brown
George Caridakis
Oliver W. Christianson
Harold L. Coffman
Wallace E. Crowder
Rodger I. Eddy
Robert F. Edgar
Wendall C. Endsley
John C. Fite
Jerry D. Fly
Clarence W. Friesen
John "J" Gates
Tom L. Gibson
Harvey A. Goss
Edward C. Hall, Jr.
Edmund W. Hanlon
Ray Heck
John J. Hess
Frederick W. Hopkins
John W. Hutchinson
Edwin G. Javor
Austin C. Jenson
James E. Johnson
Nicholas Kavakich
David D. Kelley, Jr.
Damon J. Larson
"R" Michael McCarthy
Joseph Mordente
Francis W. Muetzel
Edward S. Murphy
Earle W. Pye, Jr.
Robert O. Risinger
Alexander S. Ruggiero
Stanley J. Seward
Carl F. Shifflette
Emmett B. Sigmon, Jr.
Joseph V. Slawta
Robert H. Starek
Vaughn R. Stuart
Warren H. Taylor
Roy R. VanCleve
Wayne D. Walton
John O. Williams, Jr.
Leslie C. Williams
Henry S. Zdankowski

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Walter G. Ackerman
Harry L. Alderman
Merle W. Allen
Roscoe W. Anderson
Nickolas D. Arkadis
George L. Armitage
Milton S. Ashcraft
Dean C. Baker
John E. Baker
Harvey W. Baron
Donald F. Bays
Elbert "T" Bell
William J. Berlinguette
Frank W. Boules
Donald E. Bradley
Donald R. Brimmer
Dale L. Brown
Douglas L. Brown
Clayton O. Bush
Arnold F. Bynum
John J. H. Cahill
Richard E. Carey
Ray N. Carter
Dana B. Cashion
Charles A. Christiansen
John N. Christolos
William R. Clifton
Edward E. Collins
Orville D. Cooney
Manley H. Cosper, Jr.
John D. Counselman
Bert "R" Covert, Jr.
David R. Cowling
Richard J. Coyne
Lamar G. Crawford, Jr.
Ronald N. Davis
Paul E. Denny
Edwin A. Deptula
Richard M. Doezema
William K. Duryea
Raymond S. Eason
William S. Edler
David J. Ellington
Billy J. Elliott
Edward T. Emmelman
Tyler D. Evans
Richard G. Eykyn
Paul R. Fields
Bert Fisher
Basil L. Flannagan
Harry A. Florence, Jr.
Howard O. Foor
William C. Foster
Marvin D. Gardner
Joseph M. Glasgow
Raymond J. Glodowski
Frederic W. Golles, Jr.
Daniel J. Griffin, Jr.
James E. Hannan
Dale M. Henz
Jack M. Hermes
Roy E. Hess
Wallace A. Heyer
Willis T. Howland
John M. Jackson
Spencer H. Jarnagin
Richard M. Johnson
Donald R. Jones
Joris F. Kenyon
Ethmer W. King
John W. Kostnik
Eugene A. McGuire
Floyd H. McKay
Edmund C. McPoland
Joseph P. Mitchell, Jr.
Arthur R. Mooney
Edward C. Morris
Joseph E. Muir
Richard L. Musselman
Joseph Namesnik
Bud F. Nelson
Joseph A. Nevin
Rollie D. Newsom
Minard P. Newton, Jr.
Jack L. Nolan
Arthur A. Oakley
James P. O'Connell
Marion R. Ozburn, Jr.
Eugene J. Paradis
John M. Patrick
Peter M. Payne
Edward C. Post
Robert J. Post
Frederick K. Purdum
Wallace J. Reid
Patrick C. Roe
Raymond E. Roeder, Jr.
Paul J. G. Roosen
Victor A. Salvo, Jr.
Robert P. Scheunemann
Harold G. Schmidt, Jr.
Hugh C. Schryver, Jr.
Kenneth M. Scott
Donald W. Sharon
Stewart A. Shaw
George E. Shepherd
Michael J. Shinka
Van J. Simmons, Jr.
Frederick L. Simonson
Donald D. Sisson
Patrick G. Sivert
Louie J. Smith
Robert J. Smith
Taylor B. Smith
James W. Stemple
Gerald H. Stewart
Charles R. Stiles
Ralph E. Sullivan
Russell G. Swift, Jr.
Harold A. Thomas
Carl B. Thompson, Jr.
Robert P. Thomson
Ralph J. Tuley
Leon N. Utter
Edgar W. Wagner, Jr.
Wayne F. Wallace
Joseph A. Ward
Lars R. Wargin
Andrew T. Watt
Joseph R. Wayerski, Jr.
Richard P. Wells
Robert F. Werner
William W. Westphall
Kenneth C. Williams
Goode D. Wilson, Jr.
LeRoy K. Wirth

The following-named officers (civilian college graduates) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Nate L. Adams II, a citizen of Virginia.
Stanley "G" Alexander, a citizen of California.
Wendell O. Beard, a citizen of California.
Howard G. Blank, a citizen of Maryland.
John S. Carson, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
James L. Crutchfield, a citizen of New York.
Brian J. Cummings, a citizen of New Jersey.
Bruce F. Cunliffe, a citizen of New York.
Jack H. Davis, a citizen of Illinois.
Thomas J. Deen, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Joseph K. Gastrock III, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
John N. Guild, a citizen of Colorado.
Gordon S. Hosmer, a citizen of New York.
George J. Kleess, a citizen of New York.
Donald J. Krabbe, a citizen of Missouri.
Donald E. Marchette, a citizen of South Carolina.
Donald V. McCloskey, a citizen of California.
Francis E. McDonald, a citizen of Missouri.
Philip T. O'Hara, a citizen of New York.
Joseph R. Owen, a citizen of New York.
Laurence M. Phelps, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Charles B. Quinn, a citizen of New Jersey.
John A. Reames, a citizen of South Carolina.
Thomas C. Redfern, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.
Allan L. Reid, a citizen of California.
Edward W. Snelling, a citizen of South Carolina.
William A. Speer, a citizen of South Carolina.
Robert G. Staffney, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
John J. Swards, a citizen of New York.
Phillip F. Thomas, a citizen of Tennessee.
Francis W. Tief, a citizen of New York.
Robert G. Topp, a citizen of Mississippi.
John M. Walker, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Robert M. Winter, a citizen of California.
Cullen C. Zimmerman, a citizen of North Carolina.

The following-named officers (former contract NROTC students) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Mayhlon L. Degernes, Jr., a citizen of Minnesota.
Edwin W. Hakala, a citizen of Michigan.
Lawrence W. Hetrick, a citizen of Ohio.

The following-named officer (former midshipman) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Thomas H. Johnston

The following-named officers (former Regular officers) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Allan G. Copp
Raymond C. Damm
Billy C. Marks
Wesley E. Strauley
William P. Yerger

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 31, 1949:

### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Maurice J. Tobin to be Secretary of Labor.

Ralph Wright to be Assistant Secretary of Labor, United States Department of Labor.

### RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

William E. Willett to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a term expiring June 30, 1950.

COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Preston Delano to be Comptroller of the Currency.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Frank P. Douglass to be a member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring February 1, 1952.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

John M. Houston to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for a term of 5 years from August 27, 1948.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Hon. E. Ryan Duffy to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Hon. Paul P. Rao to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

William T. McCarthy to be United States district judge for the district of Massachusetts.

Thomas Patrick Thornton to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Michigan.

Hon. Roy W. Harper to be United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of Missouri.

James T. Foley to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

Hon. Samuel Hamilton Kaufman to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

Hon. Wilson Warlick to be United States district judge for the western district of North Carolina.

SUPREME COURT OF PUERTO RICO

Hon. Angel R. de Jesus to be Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

Luis Negron Fernandez to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph F. Deeb to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

John B. Tansil to be United States attorney for the district of Montana.

Cleon A. Summers to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

Gerald A. Gleeson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Frederick Elliott Biermann to be United States marshal for the northern district of Iowa.

Edwin D. Bolger to be United States marshal for the western district of Michigan. (Now serving under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

Harold K. Claypool to be United States marshal for the southern district of Ohio.

Carl H. Fleckenstine to be United States marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment and promotion in the regular corps of the Public Health Service:

SENIOR ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Abraham Wolfthal
William E. Dudley
Robert L. Capehart

ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Jean M. Lynch
Joseph J. Hackett

JUNIOR ASSISTANT PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Edward J. Vesey
Lowell R. Pfau
Adelbert E. Briggs

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Isaac M. Zigler
J. Howard Beard

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Charles M. Gillikin
Robert F. Wettingfeld
Harry R. H. Nicholas III
Edward B. Lehmann
Alan F. Thometz
Daniel M. Enerson
James V. Woodworth

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE JANUARY 1, 1949

Edmond G. Vanden Bosche
Tyler C. Folsom, Jr.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Charles L. Newberry, October 20, 1948.
Hildrus A. Poindexter, November 5, 1948.
Richard F. Boyd, December 29, 1948.

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Harold Heller, June 30, 1948.
Frederick G. Gillick, July 16, 1948.
Michael J. Clarke, November 20, 1948.
James G. Telfer, December 14, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN) EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Calvin W. Applewhite, June 29, 1948.
James B. Gilbert, June 29, 1948.
J. Carter Wright, June 29, 1948.
Frederick E. Phillips, June 30, 1948.
J. D. Leggett, June 30, 1948.
Eldis M. Christensen, July 1, 1948.
Ted E. Becker, July 1, 1948.
Allen N. Koplin, July 1, 1948.
Roland H. Corbet, July 1, 1948.
John H. Tuohy, July 1, 1948.
P. Councilman Morgan, July 1, 1948.
Edwin B. Thomas, July 1, 1948.
David M. Dumville, July 1, 1948.
R. Raymond Green, July 1, 1948.
Donald J. Ottenberg, July 2, 1948.
Harold H. Davidson, July 2, 1948.
Jules Glenn, July 2, 1948.
John J. Johnson, July 2, 1948.
Eugene V. Nininger, July 3, 1948.
William H. Gutstein, July 3, 1948.
Frederick A. Thompson, Jr., July 5, 1948.
Richard A. Reiss, July 6, 1948.
Gerald Giges, July 6, 1948.
Robert W. Mowry, July 8, 1948.
Reed M. Broadbent, July 14, 1948.
Andrew G. Morrow, July 15, 1948.
Paul W. Rogers, July 15, 1948.
Robert O. Scow, July 22, 1948.
John F. Montroy, July 24, 1948.
Victor A. McKusick, October 1, 1948.
Charles H. Fish, October 1, 1948.

ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Victor A. McKusick, July 1, 1948.
John M. Vogel, July 1, 1948.
R. Guy Lewis, July 1, 1948.
David S. Wilder, July 1, 1948.
Glenn M. Gordon, July 1, 1948.
Robert L. Price, July 1, 1948.
Stewart M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
McClain Johnston, July 1, 1948.
Richard A. Saavedra, July 2, 1948.
Arnold W. Pratt, July 2, 1948.
Edward A. Rogers, Jr., July 3, 1948.
Gordon L. Farrell, July 8, 1948.
Albert L. Patrick, July 9, 1948.
Milton Sheinbein, July 16, 1948.
John F. Lowney, July 23, 1948.

DENTAL SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

Harry G. Trautman, June 28, 1948.

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Hugh R. McCall, October 27, 1948.
Alfred H. Wieters, October 29, 1948.

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

M. Allen Pond, August 25, 1948.
Duncan A. Holaday, September 9, 1948.
Hayse H. Black, December 27, 1948.
Paul D. Haney, December 30, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Bernard B. Berger, October 7, 1948.
Frederick S. Kent, October 8, 1948.
Donald J. Schliessmann, October 9, 1948.
Samuel R. Weibel, October 11, 1948.
Ernest P. Dubuque, November 23, 1948.
Ralph J. Johnson, November 24, 1948.
Sheldon L. Lang, November 24, 1948.
Lawrence B. Hall, November 24, 1948.

ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Irwin P. Sander, October 1, 1948.
Robert L. Stenberg, October 7, 1948.
Ronald E. Bales, November 15, 1948.
Gerald N. McDermott, November 30, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Albert L. Platz, September 29, 1948.
Mary E. Rydberg, September 30, 1948.
Howard E. Ayer, October 1, 1948.
Frederick Nevins, October 1, 1948.
John G. Morris, October 2, 1948.
Leo Weaver, October 2, 1948.
Charles E. Sponagle, October 3, 1948.
Leland J. McCabe, Jr., October 3, 1948.
George W. Burke, Jr., October 7, 1948.
Dade W. Moeller, October 8, 1948.
John V. Miner, Jr., October 8, 1948.
George R. Shultz, October 28, 1948.
Robert A. Gerber, November 12, 1948.
James P. Sheehy, November 12, 1948.

PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Guy H. Trimble, November 1, 1948.
J. Solon Mordell, November 10, 1948.

SCIENTIST DIRECTORS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Lyndon F. Small, November 12, 1948.
Helmuth H. Schrenk, November 13, 1948.

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Clarence M. Tarzwell, June 29, 1948.
Leon Jacobs, December 30, 1948.

VETERINARIANS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

William T. S. Thorp, July 1, 1948.
Robert T. Habermann, December 30, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Mary E. O'Connor, October 29, 1948.
Marie D. Grant, December 27, 1948.

ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Mary E. Allen, November 2, 1948.
Albina A. Bozym, November 19, 1948.
Joyce B. Beveridge, December 13, 1948.
Mildred E. Barnett, December 27, 1948.
Ruth E. Anderson, December 27, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF SECOND LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Florence A. Canada, November 2, 1948.
Marion E. O'Neil, November 15, 1948.
Frances R. Donoghue, November 28, 1948.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Fortunat A. Troie, July 1, 1948.
Oswald F. Hedley, July 1, 1948.
Paul A. Neal, July 1, 1948.
Erwin W. Blatter, July 1, 1948.
George G. Van Dyke, July 1, 1948.
Waldemar J. A. Wickman, July 1, 1948.

Donald W. Patrick, July 1, 1948.
Calvin B. Spencer, July 1, 1948.
Victor H. Haas, July 1, 1948.
Bert R. Boone, July 1, 1948.
Carroll E. Palmer, July 1, 1948.
W. Palmer Dearing, July 10, 1948.
Alexander G. Gilliam, July 10, 1948.
Leonard A. Scheele, July 10, 1948.
Frederick J. Brady, August 20, 1948.
Thomas H. Tomlinson, Jr., August 22, 1948.
John R. Heller, Jr., October 15, 1948.
Henry A. Holle, November 1, 1948.
Arthur B. Price, November 3, 1948.
Paul E. Walker, December 1, 1948.
Theodore J. Bauer, December 1, 1948.
Thorburn S. McGowan, December 1, 1948.
Wilson T. Sowder, December 1, 1948.
John W. Hornibrook, December 1, 1948.
Seward E. Miller, December 1, 1948.
John E. Dunn, December 1, 1948.
Eugene A. Gillis, December 15, 1948.
Anthony Donovan, December 20, 1948.
John W. Cronin, December 29, 1948.
Havelock F. Fraser, December 29, 1948.
Jonathan B. Peebles, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Edgar W. Moreland, December 29, 1948.
Harry Heimann, December 29, 1948.
John B. Alsever, December 29, 1948.
Alexander A. Doerner, December 29, 1948.
Russell E. Teague, December 29, 1948.
Abraham Wikler, December 29, 1948.
Mabel Ross, December 29, 1948.
Lydia B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
Ira Lewis, December 29, 1948.
Carl M. Eklund, December 29, 1948.
Ladislaus J. Zbranek, December 29, 1948.
Erwin C. Drescher, December 29, 1948.
Marion B. Noyes, December 29, 1948.
John B. Hozier, December 29, 1948.
Virgil J. Dorset, December 29, 1948.
Curtis R. Chaffin, December 29, 1948.
Paul T. Erickson, December 29, 1948.
Eugene W. Green, December 29, 1948.
Hugh L. C. Wilkerson, December 29, 1948.
Robert L. Cherry, December 29, 1948.
Charles F. Blankenship, December 29, 1948.
Frederick J. Krueger, December 29, 1948.
Frank S. French, December 29, 1948.
Harold M. Janney, December 29, 1948.
Russell O. Settle, December 29, 1948.
Robert F. Martin, December 29, 1948.
Herman E. Hilleboe, December 29, 1948.
John R. McGibony, December 29, 1948.
Theodore L. Perrin, December 29, 1948.
Harris Isbell, December 29, 1948.
David J. Zaugg, December 29, 1948.
Howard D. Fishburn, December 29, 1948.
Rolla R. Wolcott, December 29, 1948.
James F. Lane, December 29, 1948.
John N. Bowden, December 29, 1948.
Ralph B. Hogan, December 29, 1948.
Waldo B. Edwards, December 29, 1948.
Henry W. Kassel, December 29, 1948.
Vernon B. Link, December 29, 1948.
Norman H. Topping, December 29, 1948.
James A. Grider, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Byron J. Olson, December 29, 1948.
Harold R. Sandstead, December 29, 1948.

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES AS INDICATED

Samuel C. Ingraham II, July 7, 1948.
David M. Gould, July 7, 1948.
Robert E. Miller, July 11, 1948.
Donald J. Birmingham, July 14, 1948.
Roland K. Iverson, December 18, 1948.
Bernard D. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Raymond Hofstra, December 29, 1948.
Will H. Aufranc, December 29, 1948.
James A. Hunter, December 29, 1948.
Burnet M. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Paul V. Joliet, December 29, 1948.
Gilcin F. Meadors, December 29, 1948.
William L. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
George A. Shipman, December 29, 1948.
John C. Cutler, December 29, 1948.
David S. Ruhe, December 29, 1948.
Carruth J. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
George W. Comstock, December 29, 1948.
H. Charles Franklin, December 29, 1948.
William C. Jenkins, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Randolph P. Grimm, December 29, 1948.
Elmer L. Hill, December 29, 1948.
Robert M. Foote, December 29, 1948.
James F. Maddux, December 29, 1948.
Eugene J. Gillespie, December 29, 1948.
Bertrand E. Bennison, December 29, 1948.
I. Ray Howard, December 29, 1948.
Robert H. English, December 29, 1948.
Edward T. Blomquist, December 29, 1948.
John B. Spriggs, December 29, 1948.
William H. Errgong, Jr., December 29, 1948.
James L. Elliott, December 29, 1948.
Willys M. Monroe, December 29, 1948.
John J. Davies, December 29, 1948.
Leon A. Heppel, December 29, 1948.
Arthur Kornberg December 29, 1948.
Andrew P. Sackett, December 29, 1948.
Fred W. Thyng, December 29, 1948.
Leroy R. Allen, December 29, 1948.
Theodore E. Hynson, December 29, 1948.
Glenn H. Algire, December 29, 1948.
Mary Walton, December 29, 1948.
John C. Hume, December 29, 1948.
Elton S. Osborne, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Robert W. Rasor, December 29, 1948.
William W. Richards, December 29, 1948.
Lewis C. Robbins, December 29, 1948.
Willoughby J. Rothrock, Jr., December 29, 1948.
James A. Salmons, December 29, 1948.
Frederic C. Bartter, December 29, 1948.
Herbert Tabor, December 29, 1948.
Milton I. Roemer, December 29, 1948.
Carl R. Kunstling, December 29, 1948.
Griffith E. Quinby, December 29, 1948.
Robert J. Huebner, December 29, 1948.
Jacob C. Wagner, December 29, 1948.
Fred W. Harb, December 29, 1948.
Arthur L. Koven, December 29, 1948.
Leo P. Krall, Jr., December 29, 1948.
William G. Hollister, December 29, 1948.
George J. Cooper, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Joseph Kovacs, Jr., December 29, 1948.
J. Frederick Bell, December 29, 1948.
William Roemmich, December 29, 1948.
Paulo do A. Pamplona, December 29, 1948.
James O. Davis, December 29, 1948.
Richard B. Stephenson, December 29, 1948.
Maurice L. Brodsky, December 29, 1948.
Raymond F. Corpe, December 29, 1948.
George Adams, December 29, 1948.
James T. Hearin, December 29, 1948.
Robert Guthrie, December 29, 1948.
Robert L. Faucett, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Raymond W. Herrmann, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL) EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Oscar Mikkelsen, July 1, 1948.
Ralph S. Lloyd, July 2, 1948.
John W. Knutson, July 2, 1948.
George E. Jones, July 2, 1948.
William P. Kroschel, July 2, 1948.
Bruce D. Forsyth, July 2, 1948.
Henry F. Canby, November 16, 1948.
Norman F. Gerrie, December 29, 1948.
Robert M. Stephan, December 29, 1948.
Herbert A. Spencer, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Charles H. Wright, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Howard J. Woodbridge, December 29, 1948.
Francis A. Arnold, Jr., December 29, 1948.
William W. Calhoun, Jr., December 29, 1948.
George E. Waterman, December 29, 1948.

DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Edward J. Driscoll, December 29, 1948.
George A. Nevitt, December 29, 1948.
Eugene H. Hess, December 29, 1948.
Howard K. Wyatt, December 29, 1948.
Dennis E. Singleton, Jr., December 29, 1948.
John C. Heckel, December 29, 1948.
Earl C. Hewitt, December 29, 1948.
Maurice S. Rodgers, December 29, 1948.
Carl E. Johnson, December 29, 1948.
John W. Holt, December 29, 1948.
David B. Scott, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEON (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

Frank W. Nelson, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Elmer J. Herringer, October 1, 1948.
Walter N. Dashiell, December 29, 1948.

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Russell W. Hart, August 1, 1948.
Malcolm C. Hope, September 19, 1948.
Frederick C. Roberts, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Harry G. Hanson, December 29, 1948.
Wesley E. Gilbertson, December 29, 1948.
Callis H. Atkins, December 29, 1948.
Edmund C. Garthe, December 29, 1948.
Chris A. Hansen, December 29, 1948.
Frank Tetzlaff, December 29, 1948.
Albert H. Stevenson, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Palange, December 29, 1948.
Richard S. Green, December 29, 1948.
Richard S. Mark, December 29, 1948.
Arthur H. Neill, December 29, 1948.
George D. Clayton, December 29, 1948.
Richard F. Poston, December 29, 1948.
Charles D. Spangler, December 29, 1948.
Hershel Engler, December 29, 1948.
Leonard M. Board, December 29, 1948.
Kaarlo W. Nasi, December 29, 1948.
Richard L. Woodward, December 29, 1948.
Elroy K. Day, December 29, 1948.
Gerald W. Ferguson, December 29, 1948.
Conrad P. Straub, December 29, 1948.
Henry L. Roahrig, December 29, 1948.
Ernest C. Anderson, December 29, 1948.
George L. Carley, Jr., December 29, 1948.
Donald L. Snow, December 29, 1948.
Roscoe H. Goeke, December 29, 1948.
Graham Walton, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Graber, December 29, 1948.
Herbert W. Haas, December 29, 1948.
William W. Payne, December 29, 1948.
Howard W. Chapman, December 29, 1948.
William E. Holy, December 29, 1948.
Richard Hammerstrom, December 29, 1948.
Henry N. Doyle, December 29, 1948.
Leonard B. Dworsky, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Howard L. Andrews, July 1, 1948.
Joseph M. Bobbitt, December 29, 1948.
Samuel W. Simmons, December 29, 1948.
Sidney H. Newman, December 29, 1948.
Harry J. Bennett, December 29, 1948.
John C. Keresztesy, December 29, 1948.

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Lewis J. Cralley, December 6, 1948.
Pope A. Lawrence, December 29, 1948.
Harry D. Pratt, December 29, 1948.
Roy F. Fritz, December 29, 1948.
Ralph C. Barnes, December 29, 1948.
H. Page Nicholson, December 29, 1948.
John A. Rowe, December 29, 1948.
Francis M. Middleton, December 29, 1948.
Don E. Eyles, December 29, 1948.
Raymond Fagan, December 29, 1948.
George A. Hottle, December 29, 1948.
William J. Bowen, December 29, 1948.
Falconer Smith, December 29, 1948.
Samuel B. Salvin, December 29, 1948.
William C. Frohne, December 29, 1948.
Harold B. Robinson, December 29, 1948.
Dohrman H. Byers, December 29, 1948.
Dale R. Lindsay, December 29, 1948.
Oliver R. Placak, December 29, 1948.
Marion M. Brooke, December 29, 1948.
William W. Smith, December 29, 1948.
David B. Lackman, December 29, 1948.
Howard W. Bond, December 29, 1948.
Elmer G. Berry, December 29, 1948.
John H. Hughes, December 29, 1948.

VETERINARIAN (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR), EFFECTIVE DATE INDICATED

James H. Steele, December 29, 1948.

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Loretta C. Parsons, July 1, 1948.
Viola E. Matheson, July 1, 1948.
Madge M. Neill, July 1, 1948.
Ruth N. Crawford, July 1, 1948.
Florence T. Thieman, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Brimberry, July 1, 1948.
Mary A. Rice, July 1, 1948.
Irma C. Thomsen, July 1, 1948.
Magdalene E. Roller, July 1, 1948.
Elizabeth C. Laczko, July 1, 1948.
Hazel E. Owen, July 1, 1948.
Katherine L. Tucker, July 1, 1948.
Mary Matthews, July 1, 1948.
Beatrice Zingle, July 1, 1948.
Adele L. Henderson, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude L. Anderson, July 1, 1948.
M. Lois McMinn, July 1, 1948.
Gertrude I. Miller, July 1, 1948.
Myra I. Johnson, July 1, 1948.
Helen Gertz, July 1, 1948.
M. Estelle Hunt, July 1, 1948.
Jean C. Feely, July 1, 1948.
H. Jean McIver, July 1, 1948.
Irma M. Lamberti, July 1, 1948.
Arne L. Bulkeley, July 1, 1948.
Dorothy G. Erickson, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Smellow, July 1, 1948.
Stella M. Williams, July 1, 1948.
Winifred M. Mendez, July 1, 1948.
Sally Wladis, July 1, 1948.
Flora Jacobs, July 1, 1948.
Henrietta Rust, July 1, 1948.
M. Elizabeth McBride, July 1, 1948.
Sylvia Simon, July 1, 1948.
Helen E. Enright, July 1, 1948.
Mary E. Ingle, July 1, 1948.
Marie F. Henzel, July 1, 1948.
Edna L. Easterday, December 29, 1948.
Anne J. Lello, December 29, 1948.
Genevieve T. Piette, December 29, 1948.
Helen A. Gentilman, December 29, 1948.
Latis M. Campbell, December 29, 1948.
Anne K. Buck, December 29, 1948.
Mary F. Callan, December 29, 1948.
Dorothy L. Connors, December 29, 1948.
Vivian L. Gibson, December 29, 1948.
Mary B. Krause, December 29, 1948.
Emilie S. Wilson, December 29, 1948.
Florence J. Ullman, December 29, 1948.
Jennie Rakich, December 29, 1948.

JUNIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS TO BE ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF FIRST LIEUTENANT), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Joan M. Norkunas, July 13, 1948.
Norma G. Russell, August 1, 1948.
Margaret M. Sweeney, October 20, 1948.

ASSISTANT DIETITIANS TO BE SENIOR ASSISTANT DIETITIANS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN), EFFECTIVE DATES INDICATED

Myrtle M. Morris, July 1, 1948.
E. Grace Gibson, July 1, 1948.
Engla J. Anderson, July 1, 1948.

SENIOR SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Reuben F. Reider
Clarence A. Smith
Richard H. Smith

SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Norman B. McCullough
Harold S. Barrett
Wade H. Etheridge
Marvin O. Lewis
Eliah M. Nadel
Birdsall N. Carle
Clinton C. Powell
J. Russell Mitchell
Pasquale J. Pesare
George A. Spendlove
Rheim M. Jones
Weldon C. White
R. Carl Millican

SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Robert M. Paine
Charles O. Metzmaker
Laurence Finberg
Keith H. Frankhauser
Gordon L. Farrell
John F. Lowney
Ralph S. Paffenbarger, Jr.
Arthur D. Fisher
Glenn M. Gordon
John P. Utz
Delmo A. Paris
Wendell L. Pierce
Milton Sheinbein
Carlyle F. Stout
Sidney Shindell
Richard A. Saavedra
Leonard J. Ganser
Norman G. Hepper
William H. Baker
Stewart M. Williams
Robert A. Sammons
Russell G. Lewis
John W. Cashman
Robert L. Price
David S. Wilder

SENIOR DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Harry G. Trautman
Arthur G. Malucky

DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Maurice Costello

SENIOR ASSISTANT DENTAL SURGEONS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

William J. Braye
Robert W. Anderson

SENIOR SANITARY ENGINEER (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF LIEUTENANT COLONEL)

Mark D. Hollis

SANITARY ENGINEERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Howard W. Spence
Floyd B. Taylor

PHARMACISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Ronald G. Esson
Reid M. Hovey
Francis R. Ellis
Robarts L. Proper
Arnold H. Dodge

SCIENTISTS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF MAJOR)

Milton Silverman
Louis J. Olivier
Alan W. Donaldson
Joseph Greenberg
Libero Ajello
Isadore Zipkin
Richard P. Dow
James E. Birren
Morris B. Ettinger
George R. Weber
Julius S. Youngner
Herbert A. Sober

SENIOR ASSISTANT NURSE OFFICERS (EQUIVALENT TO THE ARMY RANK OF CAPTAIN)

Anne Woudema
Mary M. Bouser
Enid L. Taylor
C. Vistula Lancaster

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou Eternal One, from whom all blessings flow, our times are in Thine hands. We implore Thee to help us to be diligent, lest we fail ere the setting of the sun. Give us a sane and reasonable faith, lest our fears conquer us; give us a sympathy that includes all suffering and distressed humanity; give us a religion that will stand every test, and a large measure of health, wisdom, and deep consideration for all men. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 27, 1949, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on January 28, 1949, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to authorize the United States to break through snowbound areas in western range States, to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms in such States, and to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms.

### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 31, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 27, 1949, the engrossed resolution (H. J. Res. 112) entitled "Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having been passed by the Senate on January 27, 1949.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on January 27, 1949, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that following authority granted the Chair on January 27, 1949, he did on January 28, 1949, sign the following enrolled joint resolution: House Joint Resolution 112, a joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

### GEN. COURTNEY HODGES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. As there is no legislative program for today, without objection that may be done.

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, today a great soldier will retire from the United States Army after more than 43 years of continuous service. I speak of Gen. Courtney Hodges, who rose from the enlisted ranks to become a four-star general and the great wartime commander of our mighty First Army.

He was born in Perry, Ga., on January 5, 1887. He was the son of John Hicks

Hodges and Katherine Norwood Hodges. His father was a newspaper publisher.

Ever since his boyhood, he was filled with an ambition to become a soldier. And so in 1904, at the age of 17, he entered the United States Military Academy at West Point. But misfortune overtook him in his first year as a result of his difficulties in geometry and he was forced to leave the Academy.

Undaunted and determined upon a soldier's career, he promptly enlisted as a private in the Seventeenth Infantry, United States Army, at Fort McPherson, Ga. He served 3 years as an enlisted man and then won a competitive examination for a commission as a second lieutenant of infantry. This was in 1909, when he was 22 years old. After 7 years of service at Army posts in the southwest United States and in the Philippines, he was promoted to the rank of first lieutenant in 1916. From March of that year until the following February he served in Mexico under General Pershing.

In 1918, now a captain, he was sent to France with the Sixth United States Infantry Regiment, Fifth Division. During World War I he received promotions through temporary grades to lieutenant colonel and fought as a battalion commander and later as a regimental commander in the Lorraine, Argonne, and St. Mihiel offensives. He rendered service with such distinction in these actions that he won the Distinguished Service Cross and the Silver Star.

During the long peacetime years after World War I, he devoted himself assiduously to the task of increasing his professional knowledge and abilities. He attended the Field Artillery School at Fort Sill, Okla., in 1920, and was promoted to the permanent grade of major in that year. Shortly thereafter he served as an instructor in the department of tactics at West Point. Tours of duty at the highest level service schools followed with his assignment to the Command and General Staff School at Leavenworth in 1925 and with later duties at the Infantry School, Fort Benning, Ga., and the Air Corps Tactical School at Langley Field. Finally, in 1934 he completed the course at the War College in Washington, D. C., thus completing his formal military education.

Following his promotion to lieutenant colonel in October of 1934, he served for 2 years on the general staff of the Philippine department, from 1936 to 1938. Thereafter he returned to the United States and was assigned as assistant commandant and later as commandant of the Infantry School at Fort Benning, Ga. There he laid the foundations for modern infantry training and the instruction of officers and men which later made possible the rapid wartime expansion of that important school. His work in this respect alone should earn him the undying gratitude of all Americans. But however important, it has been completely eclipsed by his later more illustrious accomplishments as a field commander in World War II.

With the expansion of the Army immediately prior to World War II, he was rapidly promoted to the rank of colonel and brigadier general. In March of 1941 he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Infantry in Washington, D. C., and soon thereafter he himself became in succession Acting Chief of Infantry and then Chief of Infantry. He was promoted to the rank of major general in May 1941. Because of General Hodges' recognized abilities as an able and experienced field commander, it was not long after the commencement of World War II before he was ordered to Texas to activate the X Corps, which was then a part of the Third Army, under Gen. Walter Krueger. In February 1943, after promotion to the rank of lieutenant general, he succeeded General Krueger. A year later he was ordered overseas as deputy commander of the First United States Army, under Gen. Omar N. Bradley, commanding general. From his headquarters in Bristol, England, he took up the task of directing the training and coordination of the various corps, divisions, and other units attached to the First Army in preparation for the coming assault on Fortress Europe.

On June 6, 1944, D-day, General Hodges landed in Normandy. A few weeks later, when General Bradley assumed command of the Twelfth Army Group, General Hodges took command of the First Army. That was in August of 1944, and under his leadership the First Army punched a hole through the German defenses at Avranches and Mortain, thus enabling Gen. George S. Patton's armor to make the famous breakthrough at St. Lo. General Hodges threw back a strong counter attack by five Panzer divisions at Mortain and rushed forward to meet the British Second Army, coming up from the west, thus creating the Falaise-Argentan pocket, where some 100,000 Germans were surrounded and captured, thus eliminating the German Seventh Army as a combat force.

General Hodges' First Army not only made the first landings on the Normandy Beach, and the first breakthrough at St. Lo, but was also the first to enter Paris on August 25, 1944. Following the capitulation of the French capital, General Hodges drove on to the Aisne and the Marne, reaching the Belgian frontier on September 2. He liberated Liége on the 8th of September, crossed Luxemburg, and on September 11 the First Army again checked off another first by being the first American troops to enter Germany.

The capture of Aachen and the battle of the Huertgen Forest followed in October and November. The stage was now set for the capture of the Roer River dams, the strategic key to any further advance across the Roer River to the Cologne plain. However, this planned operation was suddenly interrupted by the ferocious counterattack of Von Rundstedt, known as the Battle of the Bulge.

In 2 weeks of the bitterest fighting in fog, rain, snow, and freezing weather, the combat divisions of General Hodges' First Army halted Von Rundstedt's attack and resumed their own offensive on January 3, 1945.

Exploiting Von Rundstedt's failure, General Hodges took off again to the east early in January of 1945 and a few weeks later, on March 7, he reached the Rhine through the ruins of Cologne. At this point one of the most dramatic incidents of the war occurred, the crossing of the Ludendorff Bridge at Remagen before the Germans had time to destroy it. This opportunity was immediately exploited to its fullest extent as armor and infantry poured rapidly across the damaged bridge and established a firm bridgehead across the Rhine before the damaged structure finally collapsed.

Two and one-half weeks later, the First Army broke out of its Remagen bridgehead and raced on across Germany in its final drive to destroy the German forces. Some elements pushed on toward Frankfurt-am-Main and others sped forward to make contact with the United States Ninth Army, which by now had also crossed the Rhine and was driving eastward.

Finally at Torgau, on the Elbe, on April 25, 1945, 10 days after General Hodges had been promoted to the four-star rank of full general, First Army divisions were the first American troops to contact the Russian armies at the Elbe-Mulde River line. Thus the First Army was first on the Normandy beaches, first to break through at St. Lo, first to liberate Paris, first into Germany, first across the Rhine, and first to make contact with the Russians. The First United States Army had lived up to its name and its great accomplishments were due in no small measure to the leadership and ability of General Hodges, a soldier's soldier, whom Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower has referred to as sturdy and steady Hodges. Sturdy and steady he was, indeed, and at the same time a man so modest and self-effacing that, in spite of his gigantic accomplishments in World War II, he has not received the same public attention as some of our more widely proclaimed heroes. He is one of those quiet men of extraordinary competence whose very steadiness itself has kept him out of the spotlight of glamor. But history will recognize him among the ranks of our greatest soldiers.

It is sad, indeed, that this energetic man, whose blue eyes and vigor of movement belie his 62 years of age, must now enter upon retirement. May we wish him continued good health and a long and happy life and may we express to him the profound gratitude of all Americans.

MOHANDAS KARAMCHAND GANDHI

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was the anniversary of the death by assassination of Mahatma Gandhi, one of those rare ones who lived his belief in every hour of his days and nights, whose influence encircles the earth.

It was my privilege to be included among those invited by the Ambassador of India to the impressive and deeply moving memorial services held in the auditorium of the Department of the Interior. With great understanding the Indian Embassy recognized that here in Washington are many who revere this

great spirit that chose to serve mankind in this moment of universal need in the frail form of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, known to us as the Mahatma, to many of his followers as Bapu—an untranslatable name of love.

No one who was present could fail to have been deeply moved by the simplicity of the service. For myself I was lifted up as I have not been in many long moons. The reality of spiritual force pervaded me, the universality of truth enveloped me, and I came away renewed in body and soul. It is with deep appreciation that I take this method of thanking the Ambassador from India and Lady Rama Rau for this uplifting experience that has given me new courage and certain hope that one day all the people of the world will live together in complete understanding and demonstration of the nonviolence for which Mahatma Gandhi gave his life.

That there may be in the RECORD a less personal word of this memorial hour I am inserting a clipping of this morning from the Washington Post:

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR GANDHI ATTRACT MORE THAN 700 HERE—INDIAN AMBASSADOR CONDUCTS RITES IN INTERIOR AUDITORIUM

An impressive memorial service to Mahatma Gandhi, featured by prayers chanted and spoken by the Indian leader's personal physician, was held here yesterday on the first anniversary of Gandhi's assassination.

Conducted by Sir Benegal Rama Rau, Ambassador of India to the United States, the service was held at the Department of the Interior auditorium and was attended by more than 700 persons, including ambassadors and other high-ranking Washington representatives of many nations.

Gandhi's physician, Dr. Sushila Nayar, was attended in the prayer service by 11 ladies of the Indian Embassy, attired in flowing saris of white, as a symbol of the simplicity which was one of the spiritual leader's characteristics.

Explaining that Mahatma Gandhi respected all true religions, she opened the service by chanting a Buddhist prayer, and, after 2 minutes of silence, sang verses from the Hindu scriptures. Then followed excerpts from the Mohammedan Koran, from the Bhagavad-Gita, supreme scripture of Hindu India, from scriptures of the Sikh sect, and from the Sermon on the Mount, Gandhi's favorite part of the Bible.

Dr. Nayar, who is in this country for postgraduate work at Johns Hopkins and Columbia Universities, said the United Nations is not respected in some places because the big nations have violated one of Gandhi's principles, that of nonaccumulation of great material possessions. Accumulation of material power has made everyone want to be big, just as Gandhi insisted it always did, with individuals or with nations, she said.

Dr. Paul Douglass, president of American University, reviewed the high points of Gandhi's life, while Lady Rama Rau in a brief talk spoke of him as a great spiritual leader from the historical point of view, but a "man whom we loved" to "the humble Indians."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include a newspaper editorial in each.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by the chairman of the board of directors of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.

Mr. BREHM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a bill he is today introducing.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Expansion Estimates to 1960 for Pacific Northwest Industries." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $266.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. MADDEN asked an was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement with respect to William McKinley and the annexation of Hawaii.

PERMITTING UNINCORPORATED BUSINESSES TO BE TAXED LIKE CORPORATIONS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which will permit unincorporated businesses to be taxed like corporations. The bill will permit the business enterprise, if the owners so elect, to be treated as if it were a corporation, and amounts received from such business enterprise by the individual owners will be regarded as dividends. By treating such business enterprise as a corporation, it will be permitted to accumulate earnings for expansion and increased production purposes without being subject to any higher rate than the rate applicable to corporations.

At the present time, an individual in business is compelled to pay the full normal and surtax on any earnings left in his business. Of course, if the earnings are accumulated beyond the reasonable needs of the business enterprise, the provisions of section 102, relating to unreasonable accumulation of earnings for the purpose of avoiding individual surtaxes, will be applicable. Because of administrative difficulties, the relief is necessarily granted to businesses owned by not more than 10 individuals.

My bill becomes effective for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1949. It is introduced at this time so that it can receive full study and analysis by all persons interested in such a proposal.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has had a death in his family necessitating his return to Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that he be granted a leave of absence for 6 days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEES

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk House Resolution 68 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on District of Columbia: JAMES WADSWORTH, New York.

Committee on Un-American Activities: J. PARNELL THOMAS, New Jersey; RICHARD M. NIXON, California; FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota; HAROLD H. VELDE, Illinois.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INDEPENDENT OIL OPERATORS

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, the independent oil operators of our country are rapidly being squeezed out of business through two forces that our Government should do its utmost to correct.

These independent oil operators are composed of the real type of American pioneers that have made this country of ours great.

Men who go forth to risk their all in the discovery of new horizons and new wealth for the benefit and good of all and for the hoped-for reward and gain that their efforts and risks sometimes provide them.

During the recent war in which our country was engaged it was these men, the independent oilmen of America, that concentrated their energies and their means, their ability, and techniques to keep apace with our great increase in demand for petroleum and its products that played such a huge and all-important part in winning the war.

Since the cessation of hostilities these same men have found it increasingly difficult to pursue their business.

First, the black market and extreme scarcity of well pipe due to a large extent

to the export of great tonnage of this necessary commodity to the foreign fields of Iran, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia.

Now, following the exportation of this tremendous quantity of pipe the resultant production of foreign oil is reaching our shores to create a surplus and discourage, if not stop, further exploration drilling, discoveries, and production in our own country.

Are we to encourage and condone this procedure to the end that this vital industry shall further suffer and be killed?

I offer a telegram from my good friend, R. L. Wood, as one of the many expressions of protest received from representatives and members of the great fraternity of pioneers:

WICHITA FALLS, TEX., *January 28, 1949.*
Congressman KEN REGAN,
*House Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

Statement by the executive committee and State vice presidents of the Independent Petroleum Association of America at Wichita Falls, Tex., January 28, 1949:

"An increasing flood of foreign oil is jeopardizing our national economy, our national security, and resulting in the unemployment of American labor.

"Two world wars have proved that America cannot depend on foreign oil in an emergency. Foreign oil, thousands of miles away in troubled areas and under the insecure control of a combination of a few importing companies, is a slender thread on which to hang the security of the American people.

"Domestic oil producers since the war have increased the production of crude oil in the United States until they are now more than able to supply every need of the American consumer. The output of domestic oil can be further increased. It will not be increased if this market is absorbed by foreign oil, thus depriving the independent oil producer of the funds necessary to discover and develop adequate reserves in the United States.

"The few large importing companies, through short-sightedness, indifference, or selfish interest, are endangering the national security in their rush to produce and sell their foreign oil in the markets of this country. Most of their foreign reserves are in the Middle East. Less than 2 hours' bombing time from Russia.

"This revival of international cartels, which owe allegiance to no country, should not be permitted to monopolize or destroy American life.

"The Independent Petroleum Association of America insists that the Congress should protect the welfare and security of the American people by enacting such legislation as is necessary to restrict petroleum imports to only such quantities as may be needed to supplement domestic production."

BOB WOOD.

MIDLAND.

## OUR PRESIDENTS' HEALTH

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I recommend to my colleagues that they read a recent book, by Dr. Carl Wold, on the physical health of our Presidents. Dr. Wold has spent years on this research and tells how the health of our Presidents has affected great decisions of this country and the world. Look magazine for this week publishes one of the chapters of this book on the health of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. His paralysis, later illnesses, and unusually lengthy term of service, during an era of great national strain, focused more than usual attention on the state of the President's health.

Our Presidents carry a tremendous burden that at times seems more than the strongest man might be able to bear. Our Presidents, because of their tremendous responsibilities, need to divide these responsibilities so that part of them could be carried by a so-called Assistant President, and by a strong Cabinet.

I am certain that if the people had been properly informed of Franklin Roosevelt's health by competent, unbiased physicians, he, himself, never would have made the sacrifice of running for a fourth term, and indeed might be alive today. It seems to me that often selfish, greedy politicians, officeholders, and leeches on our political body use undue force and persuasion to keep their political advantages.

The world now knows that Franklin Roosevelt was an ill man at the end of his third term. His condition became worse when he was a candidate for a fourth term. In the early part of his fourth term he had important conferences with world leaders. He and his advisers made agreements with Joe Stalin that have cost this country billions of dollars and perhaps even a third world war. He gave his best and perhaps came to an untimely death because of the crushing burdens forced upon an ill man.

I have often recommended that Presidents be examined periodically by unbiased, well qualified medical men and that a report be given to the proper committee of Congress. I am also just as certain that no President should ever serve more than two terms. This Nation ought to profit by past mistakes.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. LANHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include three speeches that I made in this House in the last two Congresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.]

## COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 22, Rept. No. 9), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved,* That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 10 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government or Government owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the postwar problems of small business.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 2, strike out the word "ten" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine."

Page 3, at the end of line 6, after the period, insert the following: "The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file another privileged report, and possibly one other in addition thereto. One is a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency on which there has been a unanimous report. A request will be made for a rule at 2 o'clock on another bill, which also has the unanimous support of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what committee does that bill come from?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will deal with that matter in a moment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

COCKTAIL PARTIES

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I have read numerous reports in the press recently from individuals placed in high position by the electorate to the effect that the rounds of cocktail parties and the drinking in Washington have become so great that they cannot attend to their public business.

I am afraid that the publication of those statements in the press would be a reflection upon the hard-working Members of Congress of the United States who have the ability to withstand the invitations of those society climbers who would have the Members of Congress attend cocktail parties every day. But I want it said that as a result of 10 years' experience of my own here in this body it has been my observation that the hard-working Members of this body, and most of them are, are able to resist the temptation, if such a thing exists. I can say to those who are complaining that all they have to do is simply say "No." Let them not attend those cocktail parties that are interfering with their activities, and quit drinking cocktails if it interferes with doing business. The overwhelming majority of the Members of Congress have done so and are able to do so today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Times-Herald.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 50) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is requested to transmit to the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable time the following information, namely:

1. What does the Department know about whether Egypt and Transjordan, or either of them, has invoked its mutual assistance treaty with Great Britain?

2. Has the United States asked Great Britain for an explanation of the recent presence of its military aircraft over the battle zone between the Israeli and Egyptian forces on the border of Palestine and Egypt?

3. Has the United States asked Great Britain for an explanation of the recent shipment or proposed shipment of troops to the port of Aqaba in Transjordan, and the purposes for which said troops are proposed to be employed?

4. In the opinion of the Department, did the presence of British military aircraft over the Israeli-Egyptian fighting zone, or the arrival of British troops at Aqaba, infringe upon the resolutions of the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations adopted in 1948 with respect to Palestine?

5. What information does the Department have regarding British sales or shipments, if any, directly or indirectly, of arms or implements of war since April 17, 1948, to Transjordan, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, or Yemen?

6. If the sales or shipments referred to in question 5 have taken place, did such sales or shipments constitute, in the opinion of the Department, infringements upon the resolutions of the General Assembly or the Security Council of the United Nations adopted in 1948 with respect to Palestine?

7. What is the present policy of the Department regarding the continuance or lifting of the embargo, announced on December 5, 1947, on the shipment of arms or implements of war to Israel and the other Middle Eastern countries?

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk the adverse report of the committee, together with a memorandum report from the Secretary of State. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the committee, together with the memorandum report, be read, but that the excerpts accompanying the report from the records of the United Nations not be read, due to their length and in order to conserve the time of the House, but that such excerpts be printed in the RECORD, together with the other documents.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is not asking for the passage of this resolution now, is he? He is not attempting to bring the resolution up, is he?

Mr. KEE. Of course, the resolution is before the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I certainly am not willing to join in this war on Great Britain.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Mississippi will be patient, the Chair understands that a motion will be offered which will dispose of that question.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand; but I am not willing to join in this war on the British people. This Palestine proposition has developed into a satellite state of Soviet Russia. We need not kid ourselves any further. I am not willing for the Congress of the United States to join in making war on Great Britain or aiding Russia by financing or feeding or supplying her satellite state.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 50) to obtain information from the Secretary of State on the Palestine situation, having considered the same, reports unfavorably thereon without amendment and recommends that the resolution do not pass.

The recommendation of the committee is based on a communication received from the Department of State, the text of which is included in this report for the information of the House.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, January 26, 1949.*

The Honorable SOL BLOOM,
*Chairman, Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. BLOOM: Pursuant to our conversation this morning, I enclose a memorandum report on House Resolution 50, together with copies of the General Assembly's resolutions of May 15, 1947, and December 11, 1948, as well as the resolutions of the Security Council dated May 29 and July 15, 1948.

If I can be of further assistance to you, do not hesitate to make known your desires.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT MCCLINTOCK,
*Special Assistant to the Director, Office of United Nations Affairs.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF STATE MEMORANDUM ON HOUSE RESOLUTION 50, JANUARY 26, 1949

House Resolution 50, calling for information on the Palestine situation, comes at a time when very delicate and important conversations are in progress between the representatives of the Provisional Government of Israel and several of the Arab governments, looking toward the establishment of peace in Palestine. It would be unfortunate if information furnished pursuant to House Resolution 50 should become public during these negotiations. Furthermore, the United States Government is a member of the Palestine Conciliation Commission appointed pursuant to the General Assembly's resolution of December 11, 1948. This Government must use its utmost endeavor to preserve its position of strict impartiality as a member of the Palestine Conciliation Commission in order that its best efforts may be used on the Commission in an endeavor to assist the parties to the Palestine dispute to reach a peaceful and permanent solution of their problem.

---

UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION OF MAY 15, 1947

The General Assembly calls upon all governments and peoples, and particularly upon the inhabitants of Palestine, to refrain, pending action by the General Assembly on the report of the Special Committee on Palestine, from the threat or use of force or any other action which might create an atmosphere prejudicial to an early settlement of the question of Palestine.

Seventy-ninth plenary meeting, May 15, 1947.

---

PALESTINE: PROGRESS REPORT OF THE UNITED NATIONS MEDIATOR

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH PLENARY MEETING, DECEMBER 11, 1948

The General Assembly having considered further the situation in Palestine—

1. Expresses its deep appreciation of the progress achieved through the good offices of the late United Nations mediator in promoting a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine, for which cause he sacrificed his life; and

Extends its thanks to the acting mediator and his staff for their continued efforts and devotion to duty in Palestine;

2. Establishes a Conciliation Commission consisting of three states members of the United Nations which shall have the following functions:

(a) To assume, insofar as it considers necessary in existing circumstances, the functions given to the United Nations mediator on Palestine by the resolution of the General Assembly of May 14, 1948;

(b) To carry out the specific functions and directives given to it by the present resolution and such additional functions and directives as may be given to it by the General Assembly or by the Security Council;

(c) To undertake, upon the request of the Security Council, any of the functions now assigned to the United Nations mediator on Palestine or to the United Nations Truce Commission by resolutions of the Security Council; upon such request to the Conciliation Commission by the Security Council with respect to all the remaining functions of the United Nations mediator on Palestine under Security Council resolutions, the office of the mediator shall be terminated;

3. Decides that a committee of the Assembly, consisting of China, France, the Union of

Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, shall present, before the end of the first part of the present session of the General Assembly, for the approval of the Assembly, a proposal concerning the names of the three states which will constitute the Conciliation Commission;

4. Requests the Commission to begin its functions at once, with a view to the establishment of contact between the parties themselves and the Commission at the earliest possible date;

5. Calls upon the governments and authorities concerned to extend the scope of the negotiations provided for in the Security Council's resolution of November 16, 1948, and to seek agreement by negotiations conducted either with the Conciliation Commission or directly with a view to the final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

6. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to take steps to assist the governments and authorities concerned to achieve a final settlement of all questions outstanding between them;

7. Resolves that the holy places—including Nazareth—religious buildings, and sites in Palestine should be protected and free access to them assured, in accordance with existing rights and historical practice; that arrangements to this end should be under effective United Nations supervision; that the United Nations Conciliation Commission, in presenting to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly its detailed proposal for a permanent international regime for the territory of Jerusalem, should include recommendations concerning the holy places in that territory; that with regard to the holy places in the rest of Palestine the Commission should call upon the political authorities of the areas concerned to give appropriate formal guaranties as to the protection of the holy places and access to them; and that these undertakings should be presented to the General Assembly for approval;

8. Resolves that, in view of its association with three world religions, the Jerusalem area, including the present municipality of Jerusalem plus the surrounding villages and towns, the most eastern of which shall be Avu Dis; the most southern, Bethlehem; the most western, Ein Karim (including also the built-up area of Motsa); and the most northern, Shufat, should be accorded special and separate treatment from the rest of Palestine and should be placed under effective United Nations control;

Requests the Security Council to take further steps to insure the demilitarization of Jerusalem at the earliest possible date;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to present to the fourth regular session of the General Assembly detailed proposals for a permanent international regime for the Jerusalem area which will provide for the maximum local autonomy for distinctive groups consistent with the special international status of the Jerusalem area;

The Conciliation Commission is authorized to appoint a United Nations representative who shall cooperate with the local authorities with respect to the interim administration of the Jerusalem area;

9. Resolves that, pending agreement on more detailed arrangements among the governments and authorities concerned, the freest possible access to Jerusalem by road, rail, or air should be accorded to all inhabitants of Palestine;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to report immediately to the Security Council, for appropriate action by that organ, any attempt by any party to impede such access;

10. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to seek arrangements among the governments and authorities concerned which will facilitate the economic development of the area, including arrangements for access to ports and airfields and the use of transportation and communication facilities;

11. Resolves that the refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbors should be permitted to do so at the earliest practicable date, and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the governments or authorities responsible;

Instructs the Conciliation Commission to facilitate the repatriation, resettlement, and economic and social rehabilitation of the refugees and the payment of compensation, and to maintain close relations with the director of the United Nations Relief for Palestine Refugees and, through him, with the appropriate organs and agencies of the United Nations;

12. Authorizes the Conciliation Commission to appoint such subsidiary bodies and to employ such technical experts, acting under its authority, as it may find necessary for the effective discharge of its functions and responsibilities under the present resolution;

The Conciliation Commission will have its official headquarters at Jerusalem. The authorities responsible for maintaining order in Jerusalem will be responsible for taking all measures necessary to insure the security of the Commission. The Secretary-General will provide a limited number of guards for the protection of the staff and premises of the Commission;

13. Instructs the Conciliation Commission to render progress reports periodically to the Secretary-General for transmission to the Security Council and to the members of the United Nations;

14. Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to cooperate with the Conciliation Commission and to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of the present resolution;

15. Requests the Secretary-General to provide the necessary staff and facilities and to make appropriate arrangements to provide the necessary funds required in carrying out the terms of the present resolution.

---

RESOLUTION ON THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION ADOPTED AT THE THREE HUNDRED AND TENTH MEETING OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, MAY 29, 1948

The Security Council, desiring to bring about a cessation of hostilities in Palestine without prejudice to the rights, claims, and position of either Arabs or Jews—

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to order a cessation of all acts of armed force for a period of 4 weeks:

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to undertake that they will not introduce fighting personnel into Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan, and Yeman during the cease fire;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned, should men of military age be introduced into countries or territories under their control, to undertake not to mobilize or submit them to military training during the cease fire;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to refrain from importing or exporting war material into or to Palestine, Egypt, Iraq, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Transjordan, and Yemen during the cease fire;

Urges all governments and authorities concerned to take every possible precaution for the protection of the holy places and of the city of Jerusalem, including access to all shrines and sanctuaries for the purpose of worship by those who have an established right to visit and worship at them;

Instructs the United Nations mediator for Palestine in concert with the Truce Commission to supervise the observance of the above provisions, and decides that they shall be provided with a sufficient number of military observers;

Instructs the United Nations mediator to make contact with all parties as soon as the cease fire is in force with a view to carrying out his functions as determined by the General Assembly;

Calls upon all concerned to give the greatest possible assistance to the United Nations mediator;

Instructs the United Nations mediator to make a weekly report to the Security Council during the cease fire;

Invites the states members of the Arab League and the Jewish and Arab authorities in Palestine to communicate their acceptance of this resolution to the Security Council not later than 6 p. m. New York standard time on June 1, 1948;

Decides that if the present resolution is rejected by either party or by both, or if, having been accepted, it is subsequently repudiated or violated, the situation in Palestine will be reconsidered with a view to action under chapter VII of the Charter; and

Calls upon all governments to take all possible steps to assist in the implementation of this resolution.

---

RESOLUTION ON THE PALESTINIAN QUESTION ADOPTED AT THE THREE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-EIGHTH MEETING OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL, JULY 15, 1948

The Security Council taking into consideration that the provisional government of Israel has indicated its acceptance in principle of a prolongation of the truce in Palestine; that the states members of the Arab League have rejected successive appeals of the United Nations mediator, and of the Security Council in its resolution of July 7, 1948, for the prolongation of the truce in Palestine; and that there has consequently developed a renewal of hostilities in Palestine;

Determines that the situation in Palestine constitutes a threat to the peace within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter;

Orders the governments and authorities concerned, pursuant to article 40 of the Charter of the United Nations, to desist from further military action and to this end to issue cease-fire orders to their military and paramilitary forces, to take effect at a time to be determined by the mediator, but in any event not later than 3 days from the date of the adoption of this resolution;

Declares that failure by any of the governments or authorities concerned to comply with the preceding paragraph of this resolution would demonstrate the existence of a breach of the peace within the meaning of article 39 of the Charter requiring immediate consideration by the Security Council with a view to such further action under chapter VII of the Charter as may be decided upon by the Council;

Calls upon all governments and authorities concerned to continue to cooperate with the mediator with a view to the maintenance of peace in Palestine in conformity with the resolution adopted by the Security Council on May 29, 1948;

Orders as a matter of special and urgent necessity an immediate and unconditional cease fire in the city of Jerusalem to take effect 24 hours from the time of the adoption of this resolution, and instructs the Truce Commission to take any necessary steps to make this cease fire effective;

Instructs the mediator to continue his efforts to bring about the demilitarization of the city of Jerusalem, without prejudice to the future political status of Jerusalem, and to assure the protection of and access to the holy places, religious buildings, and sites in Palestine;

Instructs the mediator to supervise the observance of the truce and to establish procedures for examining alleged breaches of the truce since June 11, 1948, authorizes him to deal with breaches so far as it is within his capacity to do so by appropriate

local action, and requests him to keep the Security Council currently informed concerning the operation of the truce and when necessary to take appropriate action;

Decides that, subject to further decision by the Security Council or the General Assembly, the truce shall remain in force, in accordance with the present resolution and with that of May 29, 1948, until a peaceful adjustment of the future situation of Palestine is reached;

Reiterates the appeal to the parties contained in the last paragraph of its resolution of May 22 and urges upon the parties that they continue conversations with the mediator in a spirit of conciliation and mutual concession in order that all points under dispute may be settled peacefully;

Requests the Secretary-General to provide the mediator with the necessary staff and facilities to assist in carrying out the functions assigned to him under the resolution of the General Assembly of May 14, and under this resolution; and

Requests that the Secretary-General make appropriate arrangements to provide necessary funds to meet the obligations arising from this resolution.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. KEE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 101, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL WEDNESDAY AND LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I simply do this to inquire as to the program on Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad the gentleman made that inquiry, as I had intended to make a statement to the House. I had previously indicated there would be nothing on Monday and Tuesday, and that as far as Wednesday or any other day of this week was concerned I would give 24 hours' notice to the Members.

On Wednesday, if a rule is reported from the Rules Committee—and I am not specifying the order as I make this statement—we will call up H. R. 1660. That is a bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the same bill that we passed last year?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct.

This bill simply extends it until September 30.

Then there is House Resolution 22, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], creating a select committee to be known as the Small Business Committee. The older Members are familiar with that.

Then there is H. R. 128, a bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be considered in computing the cotton acreage for any ensuing year. I understand that has the unanimous approval of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That will be on Wednesday?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have scheduled those matters for Wednesday. If they are not completed then, of course they will come up on Thursday.

While I have no knowledge of any other legislation for the remainder of the week, I wish to announce that if any is reported out I reserve to myself the right to call up any such bills on Thursday and Friday. I know of none now. I will try to give the House 24 hours' notice, if I can, in connection with any other legislation. I give notice now that if they are reported out and they can be called up I shall call them up.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are simply serving notice so that everybody will be on the job Thursday and Friday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, but particularly Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Frank R. Kent; also to extend his remarks and include an article from the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include telegrams and resolutions.

### BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF WILLIAM McKINLEY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the birthday anniversary of William McKinley. Heretofore we have observed that with some fitting ceremony. The House not being in session, we could not do it this year.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and also I ask unanimous consent that any Member may have permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD with reference to McKinley and his achievements.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the requests of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday was the birthday of President McKinley.

For quite a number of years we have here in this House taken notice of McKinley's birthday by some kind of fitting observance. Because this date came on Saturday this year, when this House was not in session, we could not well hold one of our usual ceremonies, so we decided to distribute our red carnations today as we have done for a number of years. To our colleagues the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman McGREGOR, and the gentlewoman from Ohio, Congresswoman BOLTON, we are indebted for making the arrangements whereby the carnations were distributed.

We, the congressional delegation from Ohio, appreciate the fact that practically all of the membership are wearing one of these carnations here now, and this regardless of political affiliations.

The reason we from Ohio feel justified in holding these special observances is due to the fact that Mr. McKinley was, without any doubt, one of America's greatest Congressmen. We have had many great Presidents, but we have had very few Presidents who have been Members of Congress. From Lincoln, who had once been a Member of Congress, down to Mr. Truman, who had been a Member of the United States Senate, I think that Mr. McKinley and Mr. Harding were the only Presidents, except Mr. Garfield, who had ever been Members of Congress.

I have always maintained that the most important work of Mr. McKinley was the work that he did while he was a Member of Congress. He was a great Governor of Ohio after he left Congress, and he was a great President after the people of the country promoted him from the governorship to the Presidency, but he would never have been elected Governor except for his preeminent service as a Member of the Congress.

McKinley was a man of the highest character. His strength of character manifested itself when he volunteered to join the Union Army when he was only 18 years of age. This strength of character manifested itself when General Sheridan, in one of the fierce conflicts of the Civil War, complimented him for his heroism and his sensible generalship in that great battle.

McKinley was a man of great ability. He discharged his every responsibility with great fidelity.

McKinley was a great statesman. This fact will be attested to by all impartial persons who write history.

McKinley was a great Congressman, for his record made on this floor will prove it.

### WILLIAM McKINLEY AND THE ANNEXATION OF HAWAII

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on the lawn of Hawaii's largest high school stands an imposing statue of William McKinley. The school, which bears his name, is a living memorial to the twenty-fourth President of the United States.

To the people of Hawaii, President McKinley's name holds a place of honor and esteem. There is reason for this—it was he, on July 7, 1898, who signed the resolution which made Hawaii a part of the United States.

Soldier, statesman, teacher, and twice-elected leader of his country, William

McKinley was a man of great foresight and keen awareness of America's destiny. He saw Hawaii not as an isolated group of islands in the middle of the Pacific, but as a crossroads of trade and commerce and a new American frontier in the West.

President McKinley's role was not merely that of affixing his signature to a resolution. The annexation of Hawaii to the United States was to him a matter of deep personal conviction. He had the vision to see that the people of Hawaii, like the people of Texas, Oregon, and California, were pioneers who were forging a new frontier.

The move to annex Hawaii was not without opposition. In 1893, 4 years before McKinley became President, a treaty of annexation was offered in the Senate but action was not completed.

President McKinley took office in March 1897 and 3 months later another annexation treaty was submitted to the Senate.

In an accompanying message of support, President McKinley reviewed the history of American-Hawaiian relations and justified annexation on the grounds that it was a logical and legitimate step and not a departure in American foreign policy. He stressed the fact that the new Republic of Hawaii, founded on the will of the people, had demonstrated its stability and its fitness to become a part of the United States.

In spite of this, and the strong public support which annexation had received, there was a highly vocal group in the Senate, consisting chiefly of antiexpansionists and opposing commercial interests, that argued against the treaty. As a result the Senate again adjourned without taking action.

When Congress reconvened in 1898, the administration renewed its fight for acceptance of the treaty. President McKinley, aware of the growing tension over the issue both in the Senate and in the islands, had a joint resolution for annexation introduced in Congress in place of the treaty.

Although the President's move was dictated by practical statesmanship, it gave the House of Representatives a chance to express its will on this vital measure.

The strategy brought quick results. The House approved the resolution 209 to 91. In the Senate the issue continued to be debated heatedly, but largely as a result of President McKinley's dynamic leadership the resolution was approved in the Senate by a vote of 42 to 21. The President signed the bill on July 7, 1898, and Hawaii became an integral and indivisible part of the American Union. Two years later Hawaii became a Territory and, we of Hawaii believe, set on the road to statehood.

There are few people now who will question this great American's judgment. Today, a half century after annexation, the record of Hawaii as an American community and its contribution to the country can leave no doubt as to wisdom and foresight of our country's twenty-fourth President, William McKinley.

Today the students of McKinley High School in Honolulu will honor the memory of this great American whose statue serves as a constant reminder to the people of Hawaii of his faith in them and their role in the American Commonwealth.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a statement of the executive committee of the National Catholic Resettlement Council, asking for an impartial and effective administration of the Displaced Persons Act.

Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein a speech on displaced persons.

Mr. BOYKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two articles from his home paper.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### COCKTAIL PARTIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to hear the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] make the remarks he did. A lot of misinformation naturally goes throughout the country as the result of some unnecessary and unfortunate observations that have been made.

Members of Congress are a very hard-working group. We do not want to be praised for it; that is our duty. But on the other hand it is only fair that the people of the country realize, and this is what the gentleman had in mind, that there is very little activity of the nature referred to that received wide publicity, engaged in by the great majority of the Members of Congress. This is an 18-hour day job for any of us; and so far as I know, on both sides of the aisle, the Members of this body and of the other body likewise—a great majority of the Members of both bodies—devote themselves wholly to the duty of representing their people and trying to carry out their legislative duties as Members of Congress.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Leaving out religious bodies, I dare say that this is the soberest body of men on earth of its size.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's observation is absolutely correct; not only sober in the use of intoxicants, but sober in thought.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I have been invited to a great many of these cocktail parties but I have still to take my first drink.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, Mr. Speaker, somebody must have drunk my share, for I have not been asked to go to any cocktail parties.

Mr. McCORMACK. Other than the observation made by the gentleman from Wisconsin, I think perhaps the best thing to do is to ignore the matter. We simply want to stop the erroneous impression from going further.

This is a hard-working body, and the people of the country should know it. I know they appreciate it.

### ANNOUNCEMENT FROM COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have heard rumors and even received calls from Members of the House to the effect that the Committee on Education and Labor was not interested in testimony from interested witnesses. That is not a fact. We are trying to give everybody as much time as possible. That is the reason we are holding hearings forenoons and afternoons also when time is available.

I wish also to announce that yesterday you read in the press that repeal of the Taft-Hartley bill was introduced in the Senate in the nature of a substitute. I am today dropping the original bill in the hopper, in substance the same as the Senate bill.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the provisions of section 5 (a) of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *January 31, 1949.*

### JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 28, 1949.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
*The Speaker,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Con-

gress, I have this date appointed the following members to represent the Committee on Foreign Affairs on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation for the Eighty-first Congress: Hon. SOL BLOOM, New York; Hon. JOHN KEE, West Virginia; Hon. JOHN M. VORYS, Ohio.

Very sincerely yours,

SOL BLOOM, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC COOPERATION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 28, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In conformity with section 124 of Public Law 472, Eightieth Congress, I have this date appointed the following members to represent the Committee on Appropriations on the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation for the Eighty-first Congress: CLARENCE CANNON, Missouri; JOHN TABER, New York.

Very sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

The SPEAKER,
*The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public Law No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the year 1949: Hon. EDWARD J. HART, Hon. CLARK W. THOMPSON, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

The SPEAKER,
*The House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Public Law 301 of the Seventy-eighth Congress, I have appointed the following members of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy for the year 1949: Hon. EDWARD J. HART, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, Hon. ALVIN F. WEICHEL.

As chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I am authorized to serve as an ex officio member of the Board.

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND, *Chairman.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial comment.

Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. PATTERSON (at the request of Mr. SADLAK) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper editorials.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 4, Public Law 101, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. LESINSKI, Michigan; Mr. BARDEN, North Carolina, Mr. KELLEY, Pennsylvania; Mr. KENNEDY, Massachusetts; Mr. MCCONNELL, Pennsylvania; Mr. GWINN, New York, Mr. SMITH, Kansas.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 34, section 1081, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. SASSCER, Maryland; Mr. FALLON, Maryland; Mr. THORNBERRY, Texas; Mr. STEFAN, Nebraska; Mr. MILLER, Maryland.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 301, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BOGGS, Louisiana; Mr. LATHAM, New York.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 133, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BURLESON, Texas; Mr. PATTERSON, Connecticut.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COFFEY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE AIR FORCE

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to some remarks recently made by Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz, who was commander in chief of the Pacific Fleet during the last war, and whose brilliant contribution to victory over Japan is one of the most glorious in the history of that war.

While I join with every American in expressing the greatest admiration for Fleet Admiral Nimitz and his demonstrated ability as a naval strategist, I am alarmed by this grand old seadog's statement that the World War II land-sea-air team in any future war will have the same roles as in the last war. When we put our faith in the limited description of air-power effectiveness given us by the admiral, I am afraid that we may be following the fatal example of the French who placed their confidence in the Maginot Line philosophy of the generals of World War I. A later error equally fatal was made by the Germans when they concentrated on short-range tactical planes for their air force basing this decision on their earlier successes.

I feel that each of my countrymen, in view of the present world situation, must remain keenly aware of recent technical developments and their application in the development of new strategic concepts. Those of us more recently in touch with the latest techniques and technology of war think in terms, not just of orthodox bombing, as Admiral Nimitz expressed himself in a recent article, but rather as members of a nation living in an atomic age and possessing atomic weapons. I believe the present Air Force leaders have an acute understanding of this fact and have developed means and methods of delivering this new weapon to any place in the world.

Let us very briefly review a few of the basic and salient facts of the last war. For the first 2 years the Air Force, inadequate as it was, fought a delaying action characterized by the Battle of Midway and culminating in the beginning of the daylight bombing of Germany. Some of the action during this period was tactically offensive, but the strategic conception was a holding action, while our pitifully small Army and our Navy, all but destroyed at Pearl Harbor, prepared themselves for their later glorious achievements. The success of this mission was realized when our Army, Navy, and Air Force coequally shared in that great combined operation, the invasion of Normandy. This landing epitomized the triphibious warfare concept of Admiral Nimitz. Then plans were made ready for a similar combined offensive against Japan. The cost in lives anticipated by this offensive was made unnecessary, however, by the swarms of B–29's and escorting fighters over the strategic heart of Nippon and the coup de grace administered by one B–29 against Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

World War II has written indelibly the fundamentals of a new strategic concept. That which has astounded the world, particularly in the closing days of this war, will be vastly outmoded and outdated for any future war. In this the possibility of a future war and national protection against future wars lies the rebuttal to a triphibious cause.

Let us for the moment examine the portent of this statement.

The atomic bomb is at present nothing more than a very fine bomb, a thousand times more powerful than any before it, but nevertheless a bomb to be delivered to the target by its carrier, the airplane. This bomb gives to the aggressor nation an advantage so catastrophical in its implication that no defenses exist as such. If this aggressor should shoot first and

can shoot several times before we can shoot back, he will, in all likelihood, win the next war. To secure ourselves against any again-rising international gangster, we must be able to strike with greater power, almost simultaneously with his initial attack. The knowledge that we will be able to do this will best deter him from making this attack.

Let us look also at another aspect of this possible future war:

Where is it likely its theater will be? From where can any aggressor nation attack most swiftly with the least amount of warning at the heart of our Nation? Obviously, to meet these conditions, he will want to strike over the shortest possible route, along which it will be most difficult for us to place the radar nets and other warning devices which we have on hand. That is across the polar wastes. Just as obviously we must strike back in a similar direction. Now, I ask you, Is any war fought in this area an army, a navy, or an air war?

There appears to be some objection to this strategic plan on the grounds that triphibious success—as costly as it was—in this war leads to the conclusion that the land-sea-air team composed of each member in equal strength is now essentially sound. Admiral Nimitz's recent article in support of this balanced team challenges the arguments for the new strategic concept on the grounds that he does not believe it to be practicable to use orthodox bombs in the quantities necessary to inflict important damage on military objectives by air operations in excess of 3,000 miles involving a round trip of 6,000 miles. In other words, if we do not have bomber aircraft that can get to the target from fixed bases as they now exist and are available to us, let us move up the bases, let us advance the aircraft by means of carriers. But this is a tactical rather than a strategic argument. It is the frighteningly recurring Maginot-line-mind argument that we now refer to as triphibious operation. What the admiral calls an orthodox bomb is no longer a strategic weapon.

In any future war, the bombs for a strategic target will be the same, and we dare not have it otherwise, as imprinted Hiroshima so deeply in our minds. Furthermore, it is a fact that what the Air Force calls its "today" airplane has already made a round trip of just under 10,000 miles, employing refueling techniques now being rapidly developed. Such in-flight refueling methods are thoroughly practical. Some of you may recall that 20 years ago, in 1929, Maj. Carl Spaatz, Capt. Ira Eaker, and Lt. Pete Quesada kept a Fokker trimotor aloft over Los Angeles for 151 hours—over 6 days—by in-flight refueling. At present-day bombardment aircraft speeds of 300 miles per hour and over, their plane would have traveled over 45,000 miles without coming to earth. At this point it is interesting to note that the cost of one of the new mammoth aircraft carriers now planned by our Navy could provide for the construction and delivery of 150 modern, long-range strategic bombers and their operational cost for 2 years. Add to this the probable number of bombers that could be built for the initial cost and operation of the task force supporting one supercarrier—cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and a line of supply ships extending entirely across the ocean.

We can summarize our rebuttal with the words of one of the world's foremost aeronautical experts, Alexander D. Seversky, who, in his article, Peace Through Air Power, in the current Reader's Digest stated:

We need to be reminded that the triphibious strategy of World War II was an improvisation forced upon us by failure to provide air power with sufficient range to strike at the vitals of Japan from bases already in our possession.

This is the opinion of a man who has proven not only his technical ability but also his farsightedness time and time again. I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the RECORD.

The picture of air power in the atomic era is a frightful one, a fright no longer conceivable and interpolated into our past conception of military might. Similarly, if another war should come 20 years hence, the conduct of that war may be beyond our present imagination, but there is one thing we can be sure of—the weapons, projectiles, rays, or what have you, will come to us through the medium of air.

We, the representatives of our people, recognizing our responsibility for the security of our Nation, must stay alert to the new techniques, the new technology, and to up-to-date concepts of global stategy. Only thus may we utilize, with the wisest economy, our resources allocated to national defense.

Let us not suffer again the consequences of disinterest, or inaction, or, above all, wrong action. While paying tribute to the heroes of World War II, we must not allow our clear conception of the future to be clouded by the glories of the past.

[From the Reader's Digest of February 1949]

PEACE THROUGH AIR POWER

(Condensed from a chapter of a forthcoming book)

(By Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky)

In a world that has not yet learned to dispense with force, our ardent hope is that our military strength will prevent war. The important question is, What kind of strength?

Mere quantity in armed men and weapons will not serve. If war comes, the enemy will have at his disposal teeming populations, and possibly vast resources of the whole Eurasian Continent. American strategy must therefore gear to quality rather than quantity.

Fortunately, we have within our grasp a strategy that meets this condition. It is uniquely suited to American genius and capacity. It is the strategy of air power.

But what kind of air power? The assumption that a lot of indiscriminate planes—a 70-group air force, a huge naval air arm, a tactical air force supporting an army, marine aviation, Coast Guard aviation—add up to air power is wrong. A country may possess swarms of aircraft, yet be deficient in air power, as Hitler and Tojo learned too late.

True air power means a strategic striking force that can rise from our own American continent for direct assault against the industrial solar plexus of the enemy and return to its home bases. It means aviation freed from dependence on overseas bases. The creation of such an aerial force is fully possible. It calls for no new inventions; the necessary aircraft are already in the skies, but we are not building enough of them. What is more, this air power can be created as soon as, if not sooner than, the mountains of equipment on land, sea, and in the air now proposed.

Instead of continuing to spread our limited manpower and resources thin in all three elements, the proposed air strategy would concentrate on the decisive weapon for clean-cut superiority in the decisive element. By reducing sharply the roles of armies and navies, the fearful drain on men and materials can be stopped, the crushing burden of military expenditures can be eased.

With control of the air ocean enveloping the whole globe in our hands—the test and purpose of adequate air power—our position would be analagous to Great Britain's in the last century. A small island off Europe in effect gave mankind a century of peace, the Pax Britannica. It did this without militarizing or regimenting its people. This miracle was possible because Britain did not attempt to be strong on land and sea at the same time. Living in an era when water was the decisive medium for carrying destruction to enemies, Britain channeled practically its entire military potential into sea power, attaining command of the seas through an invincible fleet.

Today the air has become the primary medium of global power. An air force capable of commanding the skies can enforce its will on everything below. If we hold our effort on land and sea to a minimum and channel our resources into long-range air power, we likewise can be incomparably strong without the risk of military regimentation. When we muster the intellectual courage to face the new power equation, we can have a century of peace. Not a Pax Americana but a Pax Democratica, in partnership with all other free nations.

It sounds incredible today, but more than 2 years after the outbreak of World War II, and months after America was in it, bomber aircraft were still at the bottom of the priority lists. The men who were then—and for the most part are still—in charge of our military destinies looked on them as an unwarranted luxury. For these generals and admirals the unfolding struggle was merely a continuation, with modern trimmings, of the surface strategy of World War I.

That grim spectacle of stubborn inertia left airmen like myself no alternative but to speak out vigorously.[1] I believed an enlightened public opinion could serve as a corrective on the natural conservatism of a great military establishment rooted in tradition. That faith was amply justified.

Today it is again a deep anxiety for the state of our national security that moves me to write. The moment is crucial because we are now in the first stages of a large-scale rearmament. The plans now being shaped up, if allowed to congeal, cannot easily be undone. They will commit us irrevocably.

It would be against nature to expect the elder services to make a strategy decision amounting to an order for their own demotion to secondary roles. It is the American people who must determine the military course through their Congress and their President. They must choose between the profligate land-sea-air strategy of the recent past and the interhemispheric air strategy opened up by modern aeronautics.

Winning nations tend to glorify the methods and weapons that brought them victory. France at the end of World War I, flushed with triumph in the trenches, proceeded to construct a supercolossal de luxe trench: the Maginot Line. It was an engineering marvel, embodying all the latest scientific gadgets. But it was still a trench: a steel-and-concrete monument to the tragic belief that any new war would be as static as the last one.

[1] See Victory Through Air Power, the Reader's Digest, July 1942.

True, a young officer named Charles de Gaulle foresaw the advent of mobile and motorized warfare that would nullify supertrenches. But would France listen? Its illusions of safety were confirmed by such newly haloed heroes as Foch, Joffre, Pétain, Gamelin. To question their military wisdom at that time seemed close to treason.

The implications of the Maginot Line—a symbol of futility—have not been fully grasped. We Americans are at this very moment perpetrating a tragedy of the same order, for the same reasons, with the blessings of our own haloed heroes of recent victory. Having won the last war with triphibious task forces, Army-Navy-Air teams, we are proceeding to build supercolossal task forces which will embody all the latest technological innovations. Little gliders are being displaced by big gliders; tanks by supertanks. Assault barges firing primitive rockets are being replaced by superbarges firing V–2 rockets. Escort carriers are to be replaced by gigantic floating islands at a quarter of a billion dollars a throw. In America today, as in France a generation ago, legislators are overawed by the prestige of the five-star generals and admirals who delivered victory.

We need to be reminded that the triphibious strategy of World War II was an improvisation forced upon us by failure to provide air power with sufficient range to strike at the vitals of Japan from bases already in our possession. Such air power was technically possible but had been arbitrarily brushed aside by surface-minded planners. The land-sea-air team was an emergency device for carrying short-range aviation step by step, island by island, within striking distance of the ultimate target.

Indeed, as the range of available aviation was extended, those steps could be stretched, by-passing the intermediary islands where the enemy was entrenched. Every enlargement of range thus paid off in lives saved. In the final stage, our Superforts were planted within direct striking reach of Japan proper. At that point their surface teammates became in effect mere bystanders, as air power undertook the systematic demolition of the enemy sources of power.

Air power finished the job—and this is the key to an understanding of the events—with great Nipponese armies on the home islands and on the Asiatic mainland still intact, but impotent. Air power finished the job with a fantastic mass of American land and sea forces likewise intact and useless.

As late as June 21, 1943, General Marshall explained in a speech that "your adversary may be hammered to his knees by bombing but he will recover unless the knock-out blow is delivered by the army." Fortunately he was wrong. The knock-out blow was delivered by air power, sparing perhaps a million American and Japanese lives. Our actual invasion came after the surrender. A handful of American officers landed and took control of a country still possessing millions of fresh troops.

Most civilians could grasp the obvious lessons of this picture. But professional surface-strategists, innocent of the aeronautical facts of life, were bewildered. With few exceptions, they emerged from the war sold to the hilt on the triphibious team for securing outlying bases. They still remain blind to strategy based on victory without the orthodox show-down by foot soldiers on a battlefield. We are still witnessing the Maginot Line mentality at work. The current program of defense through balanced forces operating from a chain of bases means only one thing: the perpetuation of the methods of the last war.

Our projected 70-group air force is built around 20 groups of medium bombers of the B–29 and B–50 types—which is to say, around a 5,000-mile flying range, 2,000-mile striking radius. (Striking radius is about 40 percent of total flying range.) It provides for only 5 groups of long-range B–36 bombers, which have an effective flying range of 10,000 miles—with current modifications promising 13,000 miles—enough to blast any target in Eurasia from our own continent. Why do we thus continue to put our faith in an old-fashioned and technologically outmoded air force?

The telltale fact about the 2,000-mile radius is that it requires an array of overseas bases. Bases in turn call for large land and sea forces to hold and supply them. The over-all military pattern thus remains unchanged. Whether we have 70 groups or 700, the complex set-up on the surface remains indispensable. The more air power of this limited reach, the larger the land and sea forces required to make it operative.

Before the last war we had built and flown 32-ton aircraft with a flying range of some 8,000 miles. Did we put them into production to fight the war? Not at all. Instead, we produced 20-ton aircraft with a flying range of 2,000 miles. Today we have a few bombers of 150 tons with a flying range of 10,000 miles. But what are we building? Seventy-ton bombers with a flying range of 5,000 miles (combat striking range, 2,000)—just short enough to rule out transoceanic offensives.

True, we are now resorting to air-refueling and other tricks to extend the range of action. These will work under conditions of surprise, but I am convinced that sustained offensives cannot be maintained without planes of inter-hemispheric range. One can understand the present face-lifting improvisations by our Air Force. Its leaders have no alternative. Aircraft of inadequate range have been imposed upon them by military planners hell-bent on fighting from distant bases guaranteed by huge armies and navies.

The agruments advanced today for holding back the extreme planes are the same as those we heard when the 32-ton B–19 seemed extreme. The real explanation for freezing our strategy at the 2,000-mile radius is not technological but psychological. Military minds of the old stamp cannot admit the possibility of war without show-down land and sea battles, spearheaded by marines and supported by complex supply lines all over the world.

I do not hesitate to challenge the 2,000-mile-radius restriction. It is destined to join the Maginot Line in the limbo of outlived military notions. Even if a war should begin on this basis, it would inevitably be transformed into an all-out contest of inter-hemispheric dimensions before a decision could be scored. The logic of air power means an air force with enough range to strike from its own continent. The nation that is first in preparing for intercontinental aerial warfare will win the next war.

The United States should begin now. Tomorrow may be too late.

The advent of the atomic bomb does not alter this picture. The bomb is not a new military force, in the sense that the Army, Navy, and the Air Force are military forces. It is a new and horribly destructive explosive, as yet of finite scope. Before it can score a decision, it must be delivered, like any other explosive, by one or a combination of military forces to the right target at the right time. Thus it is not the stock pile of atomic bombs that will decide the issue, but superior means of delivery—and that means air power. Far from nullifying the art of war, the atom bomb puts a higher premium on correct strategy.

There are two possible strategies open to us. One, when air power can deliver the atom bomb only when provided with overseas bases. This demands a large army and a great navy. The national effort is split three ways so that none of the forces attains its maximum potential.

Two, when air power has sufficient range to deliver the atom bomb directly from this continent, without need of overseas bases. This reduces our Army and Navy to a minimum and allows us to put most of the national effort into the Air Force so that it attains its maximum potential.

There is nothing novel about the first strategic plan. That is how the last war was fought, and it is, unfortunately, the strategy underlying our present plans for national defense. But suppose that Soviet Russia possessed similar air bases in Cuba or Greenland—how long would they remain Russian after the start of hostilities? Obviously, we could kill them off by throwing against them the full weight of our bombing power. We would operate from the source of our strength and supplies, while the enemy could use only one segment of his and would have to depend on thousands of miles of vulnerable supply lines. The idea that Russia could hold Cuba or Greenland is fantastic.

But is it any less fantastic when we propose to hold bases on the periphery of the Eurasian Continent? Our projected air outposts in north Africa, Europe, the Near East, and the Far East are within striking range of Soviet air power. Most of these bases could be attacked not only by long-range bombers but also by great masses of short-range tactical planes, a type in which quantity rather than quality is the vital consideration. And we know that German and Russian factories are now producing thousands of tactical planes. The Soviet leaders can be expected to use these planes ruthlessly, considering them as expendable as so many shells. Finally, to hold these bases and keep them supplied would also mean challenging the 300 divisions of the Red Army.

The use of outer bases for initial surprise action is possible. But their permanent control for sustained strategic offensive is the stuff of dreams. Being within the orbit of the total hostile air potential, these bases will be captured or demolished, paralyzing the strategy dependent upon them. The ultimate decision will be postponed until we are ready to use long-range strategic aviation based on our own continent. Unless the enemy is ready with that kind of air power first.

Everything we have said about fixed bases applies a hundredfold to the floating bases called aircraft carriers. The only advantage they claim is mobility. But maneuverability reckoned in hundreds of miles becomes meaningless against aircraft covering thousands of miles. How a ship sailing 600 miles a day can evade detection by planes flying 600 miles an hour the admirals haven't explained.

In the last war carriers could not operate in the Mediterranean or North Sea within reach of the German Luftwaffe. Enlarging a carrier merely provides the foe with a larger target. The 80,000-ton floating islands on which our Navy has set its hopes are military monstrosities. They will be quarter-of-a-billion-dollar expendables, good at most for one limited sneak assault before they are annihilated. And their planes will be inferior to equivalent planes operating from the ground. I have no doubt that when military history is written these marine mastodons will be cited as a prime example of strategic folly.

If this strategy of carriers, overseas bases, and short-range aviation is allowed to stand, we would be called upon, in the event of war, to produce simultaneously the world's largest army, navy, and air force, while dividing our aeronautical effort between strategic and tactical planes, both in maximum numbers. Since our resources are not infinite, we could not hope for absolute superiority in any one of these forces. And, according to Government figures, we would be putting 10 dollars into surface elements for every dollar put into the skies. We don't need a calculating machine to realize that we are here dealing with strategy which, if it is to have the magnitude for victory over the

world's No. 1 land power, would bankrupt a nation 10 times as rich as the United States.

A recent press summary of the views of our high command stated that "the United States can develop overwhelming superiority in the air and at sea, but will find it hard to compete with Russia's land power." The allusion to sea superiority is frivolous. Soviet Russia, a self-contained and blockade-proof continent, has no navy, needs no navy, fears no navy. But if a contest on land is dangerous, if superiority in the air can be made overwhelming, why do we earmark a third of America's manpower and resources to face an admittedly superior land force and the near certainty of defeat? Why allocate another third to futile and irrelevant sea power? Why not convert the whole potential to the force recognized as our realm of supremacy—the Air Force?

Let us have the intellectual clarity and daring to break with the past. For a small fraction of the cost of conquering, maintaining, and supplying bases for short-range aviation, we can buy long-range aviation that nullifies the need for those bases and the huge surface forces that go with them.

The Air Force stated recently that "the possession of the B–36 will make it possible for us to operate against a possible aggressor anywhere in the world" from bases on the North American continent. Why, then, is the bulk of our money being put into 20 groups of medium bombers, while only 5 groups of the B–36 type are projected?

The answer is that our defense policy is shaped by men reared on surface concepts. Critics warn that the huge, unwieldy B–36 will be shot down. Of course some will. The medium-range bombers we plan to send from overseas bases will also be shot down. War without combat is a pipe dream.

We face today a crucial choice. Either we continue to divide our national potential three ways for land-sea-air operations tied to distant bases or we channel our strategy boldly into the skies for direct operations, with command of the whole air ocean as the objective.

That is the only strategy that will serve as a real deterrent to aggressors. It is the natural product of our way of life. No one will be able to challenge that kind of force. In order to create it—and more important, to exercise it properly—the challenger would have to possess talents equivalent to ours, and to acquire those talents he would have to adopt our way of life. But if he adopts our way of life, there will be no need for war.

The change called for is a bold reversal of prevailing concepts. Nothing less than an aroused public opinion can accomplish this. The pressure of the American people on their representatives in Congress can force revision of obsolete strategic plans.

The decision must be made quickly. Only the Nation as a whole can make it. Our people must choose between outmoded methods and an historic opportunity to win peace through air power.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include an editorial.)

INFORMATION, PLEASE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, without having consulted any Member of the Senate or the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and disregarding the truth of the statement that "fools rush in where angels fear to tread," because it is my desire to maintain friendly relations and a good-neighbor policy with the citizens of our sister Republic to the south, will endeavor once for all to settle a question as to my gender. Although fearful, I will endeavor to follow this suggestion as to the giving of advice to Mr. Dewey, which advice, I hope, will not involve us in any international entanglements, but which, if accepted, might aid in giving the American people an overdue opportunity to express their will on foreign and domestic policy.

From an individual who may be man or woman, spinster or bachelor, widow or widower, who gives the address of Medellin 184, P. B., Colonia Roma, Mexico City, Mexico, signed Lee Gandee, comes the following letter:

DEAR MRS. HOFFMAN: I noticed in the papers that you have been reelected and mentioned it to a friend of mine from Detroit. She said she knew that you had been reelected, but this chance remark led to a discussion that has grown into something of a dispute which you can settle perhaps better than anyone else.

My friend maintains that you are a spinster, and that you have been in Congress several years. She likes to speak of you as an example of the success that a liberated American woman can enjoy in a political career, by devoting her life to public affairs unencumbered by a husband and children. The Mexicans, who believe that woman's place is the home, find her opinions quite shocking. I maintain that you have had no such career, for I am quite certain that I remember a Mr. HOFFMAN having been in the House of Representatives not many years ago, and I think I read some time later that following his death, you as his widow, were selected to complete his term, as has been the case with other women in Congress. I have given this explanation to our mutual friends, who feel that there is a certain propriety in this situation which places you in a more favorable light than my friend's contention. It is a high compliment to your ability that the electorate of your district has returned you to office in your own right. Please accept my congratulations.

It is to be deplored that Mr. Dewey, due to his poor technique of campaigning, failed to enjoy the success that you have attained. It must be a bitter experience for him to be repudiated, when a mere woman, faced with the inherent obstacles attending female participation in public life, has been returned to office by her constituents. You ought to give him a little motherly advice.

I shall appreciate having you settle our contention by telling us your exact status, whether spinster or widow.

Yours very truly.

As so often happens, I cannot settle this argument with the simple statement that either party is right. As a matter of fact, both are in error. I am not, as Lee Gandee insists, a widow and, on the other hand, I cannot accurately be described as a spinster. I do not chew tobacco, smoke, or make a practice of drinking hard liquor, but those facts are no longer decisive on the question of sex.

Searching back into history, yes, even before man or woman began to write or print on paper a record of their doings, there is evidence that our ancestors, both men and women, had and exercised equal rights in the pursuit of many activities.

But judged by all the accepted standards of the modern day, as well as by those which prevailed in the horse-and-buggy days, it has been established that I at least belong to the male sex, though my good wife sometimes insists that I have never grown up, am still in some respects a child, that I have never attained the dignity which a Congressman, to say nothing of a Senator, should have. That is not due to the fact that time has not given me an opportunity to become either inactive or dignified. Sometimes pompousness is mistaken for dignity. As long as I am able to enjoy some of the pleasures of youth such as hunting and fishing and to act like a boy when such a trip appears possible, I will probably embarrass some of my friends by my lack of dignity and sedateness. In fact, figuratively speaking, I hope to be able to walk to my own funeral.

After giving the matter the usual consideration given by a Congressman or a Senator to a constituent's inquiries or requests, I wrote my Mexican correspondent that I was neither a spinster nor a widow; that I was twice a father, five times a grandfather, and still the husband of a long-suffering wife gifted with an unusually kind and tolerant disposition.

Thinking that my Mexican correspondent might be disappointed to learn that I am not a woman, attention was called to the fact that today we have in the House a number of women on both sides of the aisle who are not only a credit to their constituents, but who chart a course in decorum, legislative procedure, and domestic and foreign policy which might well serve as a guide for their less accomplished colleagues.

Attention was also called to the fact that a former Member of the House from Maine—and I trust this observation is not a transgression of the rules of the House—now sits in another body—the Senate—where it is certain other Members of that august body will have an opportunity to profit by watching her in action. Already in the Senate, as formerly in the House, she has outlined a sound domestic policy which the country may follow with profit.

But to get back to that part of the letter which refers to Mr. Dewey, my correspondent writes:

It is to be deplored that Mr. Dewey, due to his poor technique of campaigning, failed to enjoy the success that you have attained—reelection. It must be a bitter experience for him to be repudiated, when a mere woman, faced with the inherent obstacles attending female participation in public life, has been returned to office by her constituents. You ought to give him a little motherly advice.

Let me again quote that last sentence: "You ought to give him a little motherly advice."

Mr. Dewey has a wonderful mother, a typical American mother. Undoubtedly she has given him much good advice. Beyond question, she is, as she has a right to be, extremely proud of her son, who made an unexcelled record as a prosecutor in New York. Tom Dewey is known throughout the Nation as one who did a most remarkable job in exposing the activities of and convicting gangster criminals. Tom Dewey has a magnificent record as an administrator of the great State of New York. He has given that State a businesslike administration

and has earned the approval, as a governor, of the overwhelming majority of the citizens of that great State. No one has ever questioned his sincerity, his executive ability, and undoubtedly there lies before him brilliant success in his chosen field of the law and politics.

He has never asked and undoubtedly never will ask for my advice, for he has always had experts to advise him. However, believing in the good-neighbor policy, I am willing to do the best I can, and, on the suggestion of my Mexican correspondent, offer gratuitously to the Honorable Thomas E. Dewey a few random thoughts. I might, if it was to be motherly advice, advise him as mother advised me, by using the old, old words: "If at first you don't succeed, try, try again."

But, speaking as a Republican, I might quote to Mr. Dewey these words:

Like warmed-up cabbage served at each repast, the repetition kills the wretch at last.

I might use the old saying of the Danes:

The goose goes so often to the kitchen that at last she is fastened to the spit.

Thomas Fuller once said:

The pitcher that goes often to the well, comes home broken at last.

Bovee wrote:

A sound discretion is not so much indicated by never making a mistake as by never repeating it.

Then here is one more from the Universal Songster:

Hope tells a flattering tale,
Delusive, vain, and hollow.
Ah! let not hope prevail,
Lest disappointment follow.

Or, disregarding the words of others, think it permissible to suggest to Mr. Dewey that he and his associates, yes, and I might include certain other individuals who are presumed to have been the Republican leaders during the last few years, having gone to bat twice and whiffed on two occasions, the last time with three men on base and two out, Tom and some others might sit on the bench through at least one game and let someone else come up as a pinch hitter.

Of course, we have been told so many times that we almost believe it, that Senator TAFT just cannot get the votes. We learned to our sorrow that a group of Dewey's supporters and promoters gave Senator BRICKER, who looks, talks, thinks, and acts like a real American President, a basswood bat at a gridiron dinner, and so sent him back to the bench.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was at Omaha. Did Mr. Dewey win there?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman, in his statement relative to the soundness of officials in Ohio, is eminently correct. Anyone from Ohio always takes a sound position on governmental matters, especially the gentleman from the other body who was a candidate for President.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was speaking of Governor BRICKER. I regret very much that he was not the nominee of the Republican Party.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And so do I regret that Ohio's candidate, Senator TAFT, was not the nominee. I might also add, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry about Omaha, that if the gentleman's representatives on the committee from his own State of Michigan had followed the advice, counsel, and leadership of members of the national committee from the State of Ohio he would not be quite as embarrassed as I am sure he is at this moment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You are right again. They did it, but they will hear from some of us in Michigan. Do not think they will not. They can ride on the rear end of an old broken-down wagon, but I will not.

Mr. Dewey would make a great Senator from the great State of New York, and, as such, he could very effectively voice the desires of his New York City constituents that we go along with the Acheson foreign policy as announced by the President in his inaugural address, and increase our efforts to feed, clothe, and house the unfortunate peoples of the world. But as a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Dewey has twice gone to bat. Perhaps the pitcher in the first contest was a Bob Feller or a Dizzy Dean and hence the young man's strike-out was excusable. But on this last occasion, a soft, easy ball was tossed up to him and he just did not take his bat off his shoulder or start to swing until the catcher had it in his mitt.

No, in all fairness, Mr. Dewey, his "me-too" and international supporters, should get out of the batter's box, cease trying to carry the ball, and if they cannot run interference or do some minor job on the team, go back and sit down on the bench.

It is long past time when the American people should have an opportunity to vote upon the very simple issue as to whether the interests of this country are to be given first consideration or whether the ideas, the policies, and the practices used in other lands where they have been demonstrated to be failures, should be continued here without the people being given an opportunity at a national election to say whether they approve or disapprove. The rank and file of Republicans are tired of taking a New Deal remedy even though the bottle out of which it comes is labeled "Republican."

From the Niles Daily Star of Niles, Mich., comes an editorial of John R. Schamehorn, under date of January 25, which reads as follows:

TIME TO STEP DOWN

There are continuing signs that Thomas E. Dewey is still attempting to head up the Republican Party. If he continues in those efforts it will inevitably result in disaster for both himself and the party.

Dewey and his advisers were solely responsible for shaping policies during the last campaign and it resulted in failure, as it did 4 years ago. The whole thing seemed to be so much in the bag that he declined to put on a hard-hitting campaign.

His speeches were so indecisive, in fact, that he was continually criticized for not expressing his opinion on various issues of the campaign.

As a twice rejected candidate, Dewey should step aside as far as national politics is concerned and not pretend any longer to head the party. He had that chance a few days ago but failed to take advantage of it. Instead, he left the impression that he might be available again in 1952.

Mr. Dewey should know from past history that voters will not support him in a third attempt for the White House. Under the circumstances, he should make a prompt disclaimer of any further aspirations in that direction so that party leaders will not be hampered by the efforts of any of his faithful supporters in a die-hard struggle that could only result in further damage to the party.

That is typical of practically every editorial comment in southwestern Michigan.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## OLEOMARGARINE AND THE DAIRY INDUSTRY

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, the new dairy policy toward oleo is in harmony with the Democratic platform. The Democratic platform favored the removal of taxes on oleomargarine, but said nothing about allowing the unrestricted sale of the yellow product. The President has said that he wants the taxes removed. Leading dairy and farm organizations favor the same action.

However, the time is absolutely inopportune for placing a greater burden on dairy farmers. Numerous bills have been introduced to permit unrestricted sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter. Yet there is growing economic distress among the people who milk cows in the great dairy States. Why anybody would want to do anything to make their burden heavier, I am unable to understand.

I am speaking about the people in every congressional district in the country who build the county roads and maintain schools. Hay is now as high as $45 a ton and cottonseed cake fed to dairy cattle costs from $80 to $100 a ton, yet the oleo interests would make it still more difficult for these people to survive.

In the Western States it has been snowing intermittently since the first of January. Hundreds of thousands of cattle and sheep are marooned, and losses will be tremendous. This is one of the most devastating and unprecedented blows at our livestock economy within the memory of man. We cannot afford further to imperil our supplies of meat, as well as our source of milk and other vital food products, by striking at the dairy industry.

Members of this House who are also members of the Committee on Agriculture are well aware of the difficulties which face the southern cotton grower. It is necessary, we are told, to preserve the economy of the Cotton South. But, Mr. Speaker, it is even more necessary to preserve the family-sized farms of this country that depend upon dairying for their continued existence. To the more than 2,500,000 dairy farmers of this country, the dairy industry represents a regular source of cash income throughout the year, a decent standard of living for their families, education for their children, and increasing productivity for their land.

These things are important to the farmers of the South as well as to the

northern farmers—perhaps even more important. Dairy farming has made splendid progress in the South, to the enrichment of whole areas of land that had begun to lose its fertility under single-crop cultivation. The hard facts are that we cannot afford to sacrifice either southern gains or northern accomplishments in the development of a diversified agriculture merely to meet the selfish demands of a handful of oleomargarine manufacturers.

Oleomargarine is a substitute for butter, and therefore competes with butter in the market place. Ordinarily, substitutes do not differ greatly from the original in price, but through the years oleomargarine has maintained a price level approximately half that of butter, on the average. The price of butter has not been dragged down to the level of the substitute, because oleomargarine, colored or uncolored, has not been as acceptable to consumers as real butter. Moreover, colored oleomargarine—being less distinguishable from butter than the uncolored form—has been carefully regulated under Federal tax legislation. Finally, the dairy farmer has not been able to afford to produce butter at the price of oleomargarine.

Now it is proposed to repeal the restrictions on yellow oleomargarine, which will then be able to compete more closely with butter. Oleomargarine manufacturers may take advantage of this opportunity to increase their prices and profits, thus destroying the price differential. Or they may hold their prices unchanged and increase their profits through increased sales volumes, at the expense of butter. In any case, it cannot be denied that an improved competitive position for oleomargarine would result in reduced sales of butter.

INCREASED OLEO SALES HURT BUTTER SALES

In the past an increase in the sales of oleomargarine has usually been accompanied by a somewhat larger decrease in the sales of butter. In the 35 years from 1912 to 1947, there were 22 years when oleo consumption went up, and in 16 of those years, butter consumption decreased. On an average, over those 22 years the increase in oleo consumption per capita was approximately one-third of a pound, while the accompanying change in butter consumption was a per capita decrease of almost one-half a pound.

During 11 of the 13 years in which oleo sales showed a decrease, butter sales increased. The average oleo decreases were about one-third of a pound per capita, accompanied by an average increase in butter sales of slightly more than that amount.

It is clear that when oleo is sold as a substitute for butter, either fraudulently or because consumers made a conscious choice, the immediate effect on the dairy farmer is the same as though the supply of butter had increased. Naturally this lowers the price at which his butter can be sold. On the average, a 1-percent increase in the quantity of butter available tends to result in a 1-percent decrease in the selling price of butter. In other words, the loss of 1 percent of butter sales to competitive oleomargarine results in a 1-percent drop in the price of butter.

The experience of other countries shows that unrestricted competition in yellow oleomargarine demolishes the market for butter. In this country, under similar conditions, oleomargarine might very well take over from two-thirds to three-fourths of the total sales of spread fats, according to competent economists. The total annual consumption of oleomargarine in the United States would then be 1,500,000,000 pounds, as against 870,000,000 pounds in 1948. On a pound-for-pound displacement, the butter market would shrink to 900,000,000 pounds as against 1,500,000,000 pounds in 1948.

IMMEDIATE RESULTS OF INCREASED OLEO SALES

The first result of a possible 600,000,000-pound expansion in oleo sales would be a 20 to 40 percent drop in butter prices. In this connection, a 10-percent increase in butter production in the fall of 1948, over the corresponding months of 1947, was accompanied by an equal reduction in oleo sales on a 25-percent fall in butter prices.

Price reduction of 20 to 40 percent probably would protect butter against loss of sales, but dairymen could not stand any such decline in butter prices for long. Thus, as a second effect of increasing oleo sales, there would be a drastic decline in butter production, as dairymen in large numbers left the dairy business or sought other markets than butter. This decline in production would lead to some recovery of butter prices, but a decline of 5 to 10 percent over the long-run probably would liquidate milk production to the equivalent of 600,000,000 pounds of butter.

DAIRY FARMING WOULD VANISH IN SOME AREAS

These effects accounted for part of the 600,000,000-pound butter decline in production from 1941 to 1948. The declines would have been more drastic, and wider spread, if the artificially stimulated export trade in dairy products of 1941 to 1948 had not absorbed the annual output of approximately one million cows. Allowance also should be made for the increase in demand resulting from population growth.

It is reasonable to expect that the further displacement of 600,000,000 pounds of butter by oleo would lead to the displacement of another 2,000,000 cows. But 2,000,000 cows in butter areas produce only 360,000,000 pounds of butterfat annually, and a 600,000,000-pound loss of butter markets would mean 480,000,000 pounds of butterfat. Where would the other 120,000,000 pounds of butterfat go?

THE STRUGGLE FOR MARKETS WOULD ENDANGER DAIRY PRICES IN ALL CORNERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Some dairy farmers, rather than accept extinction, would struggle to dispose of their milk in the form of products whose prices already teeter precariously between too low for producers and too high for the market demand. Increased cheese, evaporated milk, ice cream, and fluid cream—even increased fluid milk—would overburden those markets and tear down the level of returns to every producer in the land.

Even the South would reel from the blow. There a thriving dairy industry has supported the most vigorously growing farm enterprise for more than two decades, yet the wrecking of price levels at the South's ice-cream plants, condenseries, and cheese factories would cripple dairying in that region. Factory dairy products other than butter now utilize 33 percent of the milk sold by farmers in the South Atlantic States and 45 percent in the South Central States. These markets in South, North, East, and West would react to the pressure of dairy farmers deprived of their butter market. The lowered level of all dairy prices then would force some dairy farmers out of business in every State—up to another half-million cows.

NET RESULTS TO FARM INCOME

It should be apparent that anything which would lead to a liquidation of 10 percent of the milk cows in the country would be a major disaster, yet there is another way of calculating the effect of increased oleo sales.

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics calculates that the farmer received 12.8 cents out of every pound of oleomargarine sold in 1947. The farmer received 59.7 cents per pound from butter. Thus, for every pound of oleo which displaced a pound of butter, the total income of American agriculture was reduced by 46.9 cents. If oleo replaced butter to the extent of 600,000,000 pounds, the loss to agricultural income in general would total more than a quarter of a billion dollars. This would occur even before reckoning the sizable side effects on other dairy products. It disregards the probability that increased demand for vegetable oils would be met by increased imports, with no benefit at all to domestic producers.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would protect the farmers of this country against the loss of more than a billion dollars. The bill is fair to the consumer, in that it makes it possible for the housewife to buy all the oleomargarine she wants in its most economical, uncolored form, without the payment of any taxes whatever. It is a fair bill in that it relieves the oleo retailer, wholesaler, and manufacturer from all license fees and reporting requirements. But most of all, my bill is a fair bill in that it protects the dairy farmer against a sure loss of income—a loss which a large part of our agricultural economy cannot afford at this time.

I am convinced that the administration does not intend to let farm income suffer in this country, and that no Member of this House would willfully sponsor any measure to that effect. By contrast, my bill is in complete harmony, as I have said earlier, with the Democratic platform on which the majority of this House was elected.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman will recollect that some Members of this House who favor the coloring of oleomargarine yellow have insisted that the dairy farmers of the country must yield to scientific progress. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to elaborate on that a little bit.

The scientific progress that has been made on oleo to make it taste and appear like butter results from a ruling made by Mr. McNutt, when he was head of the Pure Food and Drug Section, because he issued a regulation that the oleo industry could put in vitamins the equivalent to butter and he also ruled that they could use butter flavor and flavor the product to taste like butter. He also ruled that they could churn it in milk in order to give butter texture to the product so that it would taste like butter and have the same nutritive value as butter. I therefore contend that it was not as a result of scientific progress but it was by edict of a man in Government who issued a regulation permitting this apparent deception and fraud on behalf of a product in order to take the market away from the legitimate dairy farmers of the country.

Now, as the gentleman said, they want to color the product yellow to make it look like butter, thereby to not only destroy the integrity of two and a half million dairy farmers but also permit deception and fraud on the housewives of the country.

Mr. GRANGER. I think that is a fair statement. I do not want to argue the quality of margarine as compared with butter. But, now, we are getting down to what the issue really is in this fight. It is simply a question of color, and the oleo interests are determined to sell oleomargarine as butter. Make no mistake about that. If they are able to do that, it is going to mean that many of the dairy farmers of the country, and especially those in the South, will go out of business. I have been all over the South in the last 2 or 3 years. There has been great development down there in every line, and especially in dairying. While this bill is not sponsored entirely by people from that section of the country, undoubtedly they have a right to be interested in it.

It seems to me it would be a short-sighted policy to do anything to retard its development. The dairy farms and the dairy herds conform in every way with the preservation of our soil. As a Member said here the other day, one of the crying needs of our time is the preservation of our soil. The dairy farmer in his operations conforms in every detail with that program.

As I have said time and time again, these are little people that we cannot afford to run out of business. As a result of dairy farming, we have built up in every section of the country, in every congressional district, some activity connected with dairying. Either cheese making, butter making, or the preparation and delivery of milk to the home.

I dare say that in every congressional district of this country, regardless of where it is situated, there are more people who earn a living from dairying than there are who do from the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRANGER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] that the dairy farmers of his State are being punished a great deal worse by this one-way freight rate than they are by competition with oleomargarine. That applies to every dairy farmer west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio, outside of a few along the Pacific coast, where preferential rates are given to meet water competition.

I wonder if the gentleman will go along with us on the bill I have introduced to outlaw the one-way freight rates that the South and West have been punished with for the last 75 years, in order that those dairy farmers—and I will say to the gentleman from Missouri who is looking at me that I refer to farmers from Missouri and from every other State west of the Mississippi River—might receive something like justice in transportation rates for the dairy products and for other products they manufacture. I wonder if the gentleman will go along with me on that proposition?

Mr. GRANGER. I have always gone along with the gentleman in his fight for justice, for the South and West and other sections, with respect to how railroad rates should be handled, and certainly I would be willing to go along with him on that.

BUTTER VERSUS OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the splendid remarks made by the gentleman. I ask unanimous consent that the request I made earlier in the day be vacated and that I be allowed at this point in the RECORD to extend my remarks and include therein a very well written article by Louis Bromfield.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, Louis Bromfield, world-famed novelist and operator of the successful Malabar Farm in my district, recently prepared a keen analysis on the butter-oleo question which appeared in approximately 50 newspapers in 20 States through the Bell Syndicate. Mr. Bromfield's judgment is considered as most responsible in agricultural circles throughout the world. I introduce the text of this article into the RECORD at this point:

A VOICE FROM THE COUNTRY—ASK RESTRICTION ON MARGARINE PROFITS

(By Louis Bromfield)

The butter-oleomargarine fight has come into the open again and it might be well to analyze the true elements in a situation which affects every citizen far beyond the point of whether oleo is cheaper than butter or whether it be taxed or not. Probably no controversy in American history as presented has caused so much confusion in the minds of the people. This is so because the issue has been based, by the oleo interests, upon the easy political dodge of cheaper living costs and partly because many of the newspaper editorials on the subject have been written with perhaps incomplete knowledge of the whole question. Very great and even economically profound implications lie behind the battle.

Let me say at the outset that most of the butter producers have long since abandoned their fight to maintain the tariff tax which the oleo interests refer to as discriminatory.

The butter people seek only two things—the restriction of the oleo people's attempt to deceive by the close imitation possible and some sort of restriction upon the immense profit potentialities of the oleo and oleo-oil manufacturers. With the butter business, which can never create its product at a figure anywhere near the production costs of oleomargarine, knocked out by competition from big business and monopoly, there is no limit within reason to the profits of the industrially produced oleo.

Essentially the struggle is one between big business and tacit monopoly on one side and small private enterprise on the other and, as such, it touches the very foundations of our social economy and our political future.

Butter is produced largely by some 4,500 creameries, mostly individually or cooperatively owned, and by the thousands of dairy and general farmers who produce the cream from which butter is made. Oleomargarine, an assembly line industrial product, is concentrated in the hands of 28 companies, with 65 percent of production in the hands of only five gigantic industrial corporations such as Procter & Gamble and vast Lever Bros. interests.

PACKAGES SIMILAR

Since the very beginning, the whole purpose of the oleo interests has been to attempt the imitation of butter as closely as possible. Their slogan might well have been not "as good as butter" but "the same as butter" which oleo is not.

One only has to look about in a grocery to see oleo packaged exactly like butter, nearly always in yellow cartons, with dairy scenes for ornamentation, even to such deceptive trade names as "Churngold."

The obvious campaign is less to imitate than to deceive and plenty of us know even today how often in restaurants and dining cars, oleo is served as butter.

It seems to me that the element of unfair and deceptive competition in this respect is clear as crystal.

The oleo interests, down to the oil-refining plants, represent big business and the oleo interests have been very successful in dividing the dairy from the soybean and cotton elements in the farm bloc so that agricultural representation has become badly weakened and divided.

They have accomplished this by holding up phantom profits on the materials used in making their synthetic product to cotton and soybean farmers, who, largely speaking, represent the most destructive and greedy element in American agriculture and are already the most highly subsidized at the taxpayers expense.

Before the war, foreign vegetable oils, produced by labor in Asia and Africa, paid at what in this country could only be regarded as slave wages, were largely used in oleo manufacture.

During the war, the oleo manufacturing interests found these cheap foreign oils unavailable and were forced to use home-produced cottonseed and soybean oils, but once the same interests have won their fight, there is no reason, judging from the whole history of big business, to prevent them from shifting

back again to cheap labor materials produced abroad.

The American cotton and soybean people, left holding the bag, will then ask for another protective tariff to add to living costs.

LASTING BENEFITS DOUBTED

Protective tariffs are by no means dead and can never be until that incredible day when there is free trade and universal leveling off of wages and living standards to a point far below that to which the American people are accustomed.

In the meanwhile, there will be either tariffs on imported goods or internal subsidies and high prices, both paid inside the country by the average tax-paying citizen. The popular assumption that wholly unrestricted oleo production will provide a universally cheap table spread by which everyone will benefit is merely a silly oversimplification of a very complex and profound problem.

It is significant that the interest in tariffs generally has shifted from the big manufacturing interests to organized labor and small business because obviously American labor cannot compete with slave-labor wages in the more primitive parts of the world and small business cannot compete with the power of the price controls exercised by vast cartels and tacit monopolies.

The question of tacit monopolies and hidden understandings among a few enormous industrial producers is one which has consumed endless precious hours in the Supreme Court, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and other governmental agencies.

Where understandings among vast cartels and interests begin and end is a difficult problem, but even the average citizen knows that they operate.

The whole oleo question is one in which both organized labor and the Small Businessmen's Association might well take an interest, and the average citizen along with them. It is not as simple or as demagogic a question as the oleo interests have tried to make it.

Incidentally, I have in my possession an original letter circulated among the oleo interests pointing out the great advantages of pouring plenty of money into the advertising accounts of newspapers, especially in the butter areas, as mean an insult to the integrity of the American press as has been perpetrated in a long time.

I might also point out that great cartels and monopolies are the first step in the death of real free enterprise and in the direction of state socialism. There arrives a point when, as Europe well knows, they become intolerable and the state takes over.

Socialism arrives at the point where free enterprise has ceased utterly to exist and the big-business monopolies have taken over.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a memorial passed by the Legislature of Nebraska.

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Wednesday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found to be truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HESELTON (at the request of Mr. AUCHINCLOSS), for the week of January 31, on account of the serious illness in his family.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. J. Res. 38. Joint resolution to authorize the United States to break through snowbound areas in western range States, to take other necessary action to move in supplemental feed and otherwise care for livestock isolated by storms in such States, and to provide emergency relief for Indians in areas isolated by such storms; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, February 2, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

125. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $500,000 for disaster relief (H. Doc. No. 47); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

126. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $20,000,000 for the Philippine War Damage Commission in the form of an amendment to the budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 48); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

127. A letter from the president, Capital Transit Co., transmitting a report covering the operations of Capital Transit Co. for the calendar year 1948, with balance sheet as of December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

128. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the proposed transfers of two 40-foot motor launches to be used by the Shell Fisheries Division of the Department of Conservation of New Jersey; to the Committee on Armed Services.

129. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report and recommendation concerning certain claims against the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

130. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; U. S. C. 144); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

131. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 7, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Wood Island Harbor, Maine, and the pool at Biddeford, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 49); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

132. A letter from the president, Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting the report of the Potomac Electric Power Co., for the year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

133. A letter from the United States Atomic Energy Commission, transmitting the Fifth Semiannual Report of the United States Atomic Energy Commission, January 1949; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

134. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting proposed legislation to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

135. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

136. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the twelfth report of the Department of State on the disposal of United States surplus property in foreign areas, January 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

137. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

138. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1948 Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior on the Investigations of Synthetic Liquid Fuels, Parts I, II, and III; to the Committee on Public Lands.

139. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting the Tenth Annual Report of the Civil Aeronautics Board, 1948; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

140. A letter from the vice president and comptroller, Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., transmitting a statement of receipts and expenditures of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for the year 1948, in compliance with chapter 1628, acts of Congress 1904; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

141. A letter from the representative of the United States upper Colorado River Basin compact negotiations, transmitting a copy of a compact entered into on October 11, 1948, among the States of Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming, to determine the rights and obligations of those States respecting uses and deliveries of the water of the upper basin of the Colorado River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

142. A letter from the president, Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed statement of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co. together with a list of stockholders, for the year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

---

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study and investiga-

tion of the problems of small business; with amendments (Rept. No. 9). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year; with an amendment (Rept. No. 11). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 73. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 1660, a bill to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; without amendment (Rept. No. 12). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 74. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 128, a bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year; without amendment (Rept. No. 13). Referred to the House Calendar.

---

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. KEE: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Resolution 50. Resolution to obtain information from the Secretary of State on the Palestine situation; without amendment (Rept. No. 10).

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 1995. A bill making an emergency authorization of an appropriation for the purpose of erecting in Bluefield, W. Va., a post-office and courthouse building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 1996. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Opelousas, La., a post office and Federal court building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 1997. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 1999. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2000. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2001. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STOCKMAN:

H. R. 2002. A bill to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges near certain dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2003. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Lynchburg, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2004. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Smithville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 2005. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Woodbury, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2006. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2007. A bill to equalize annual leave and sick leave of postal employees with that of other Federal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2008. A bill to create a presumption of service connection for World War II veterans in certain cases of tuberculosis disease; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2009. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2010. A bill relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army and the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2011. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to support the price of milk at not less than 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2012. A bill to authorize the erection and operation of a museum at Klukwan, Alaska; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2013. A bill to make effective in the District Court for the Territory of Alaska rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2014. A bill to extend time for filing claim for pensions or other benefits withheld from persons residing in countries occupied by the enemy forces during World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2015. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey and exchange certain lands and improvements in Grand Rapids, Minn., for lands in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2016. A bill to amend section 2000 (c) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2017. A bill to amend section 2000 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to taxes on tobacco and tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2018. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 to authorize the admission into the United States of 500 displaced doctors and 1,000 nurses, to provide for their employment in Government hospitals, including Indian hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

H. R. 2019. A bill to amend section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, with respect to the establishment of branches by national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2020. A bill to enable certain former officers or employees of the United States separated from the service subsequent to January 23, 1942, to elect to forfeit their rights to civil-service retirement annuities and to obtain in lieu thereof returns of their contributions with interest; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2021. A bill to provide increased pensions for widows and children of deceased members and retired members of the Police Department and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 2022. A bill authorizing the Wyandotte Tribe of Oklahoma, through its business committee, to sell and convey, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, the Wyandotte Indian public burial ground in Kansas City, Kans.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2023. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2024. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2025. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KELLEY:

H. R. 2026. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2027. A bill to amend section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (39 Stat. 875–878; 8 U. S. C. 136); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2028. A bill to authorize the construction of a new post office at Bayside, Long Island, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2029. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to exempt payments under said act from taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2030. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities received by State, county, and municipal employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2031. A bill to stimulate exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and its Territories, to establish an Office of National Minerals Development, Production, and Conservation within the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 2032. A bill to repeal the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to reenact the National Labor Relations Act of 1935, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2033. A bill to provide for the amendment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2034. A bill to provide for the coinage of a 7-cent piece; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2035. A bill relating to the promotion of certain officers and former officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2036. A bill to increase the mileage allowances of civilian officers and employees for use of privately owned vehicles and to increase the per diem allowances of civilian officers and employees while traveling on official business; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2037. A bill to provide optional retirement for Government employees who have attained the age of 60 years or who have rendered at least 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2038. A bill to provide for the retirement of certain employees in neuropsychiatric hospitals of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2039. A bill to provide for promotion procedure within the executive classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2040. A bill to prohibit any carrier subject to part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, in transporting property between two points, from making a difference in its charges depending on the point of origin or destination; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2041. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2042. A bill to amend title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, to make clear the authority of the Administrator to negotiate rates of compensation for training in certain institutions; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2043. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2044. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1948; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2045. A bill to provide a program of assistance for the expansion and construction of medical colleges in the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 2046. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2047. A bill to stimulate the exploration, production, and conservation of strategic and critical ores, metals, and minerals and for the establishment within the Department of the Interior of a Mine Incentive Payments Division, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 2048. A bill to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948 with respect to retirement of certain officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2050. A bill to provide for a jury commission for each United States district court, to regulate its compensation, to prescribe its duties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2051. A bill to establish uniform qualifications for jurors in the Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2052. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 390, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide true time and one-half for overtime and true double time for Sunday and holiday duty and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNEY:

H. R. 2053. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to provide homes for veterans, through veterans' homestead associations, and the public facilities essential therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 2054. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Oberlin, La., a post office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LECOMPTE:

H. R. 2055. A bill to provide for the acquisition of a site for, and the construction of, a Federal building in Ottumwa, Iowa; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2056. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia", approved February 27, 1929; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2057. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2058. A bill to amend section 207 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to authorize payment of claims arising from correction of military or naval records; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2059. A bill relating to the furnishing of tools and equipment to veterans pursuing institutional on-farm training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2060. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1920; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2061. A bill for the benefit of employees involuntarily separated from the service of the United States, to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2062. A bill to create a United States Civil Service Board of Appeals; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2063. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2064. A bill to permit unincorporated businesses to be taxed as corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2065. A bill providing that certain real property, together with improvements thereon, acquired for military purposes, or for housing projects, national parks, or monuments, shall not be exempt from taxation by States and their political subdivisions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2066. A bill to provide special pensions for certain persons awarded medals for extraordinary heroism in combat; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2067. A bill to provide for the restoration of a monument of the former Speaker of the House, the Honorable Henry T. Rainey; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2068. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. J. Res. 121. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. J. Res. 122. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution relating to the high cost of living and shortage of housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. Res. 69. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. Res. 70. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. Res. 71. Resolution requesting the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Navy to urge the State of California to construct a tube and causeway across San Francisco Bay in accordance with the recommendations of a Joint Army-Navy Board; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 72. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation authorized by House Resolution 66; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their Resolution No. 19, asking that the tax on oleomargarine be repealed; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2069. A bill for the relief of Alton Bramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2070. A bill for the relief of Peter Konotopko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2071. A bill for the relief of John I. Malarin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2072. A bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattgno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2073. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2074. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2075. A bill for the relief of Frank G. Moore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2076. A bill for the relief of Cliff Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2077. A bill for the relief of Jack Getty Pinkerson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAMBLE:

H. R. 2078. A bill for the relief of Winston A. Brownie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2079. A bill for the relief of Emil Sbarbori; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2080. A bill for the relief of Anthony Perfetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2081. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred Aprea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2082. A bill for the relief of Lillian Taylor (nee Rose Mary Lillian Walker); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2083. A bill for the relief of Edna Perfetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 2084. A bill for the relief of Teiko Horikawa and Yoshiko Horikawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2085. A bill for the relief of Edit Hannach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2086. A bill for the relief of the Sun Laundry Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2087. A bill for the relief of Seaman Second Class Joseph T. Sypko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2088. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lula Wilson Nevers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of William Price; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2090. A bill for the relief of Sam Wooten, F. M. Maloy, and Mrs. Althea Arthur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 2091. A bill for the relief of Jack McCollum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2092. A bill for the relief of Flury & Crouch, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2093. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a quitclaim deed to property owned by Jacob F. Riedel; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2094. A bill for the relief of Romuald K. Mirzabekian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2095. A bill for the relief of the estate of Kenneth N. Peel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

31. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Chairman, Conservation Administration of Kewaunee County, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a Federal Government support price on butter; to the Committee on Agriculture.

32. Also, petition of executive vice president, Newspaper Guild of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to immediate record vote on the question of repeal of the Taft-Hartley Labor Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

33. By Mr. SADLAK: Resolution adopted by the officers and members of the United Societies of St. Catherine's Church, Riverside, Conn., expressing condemnation of the Hungarian Government for its arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign affairs.

34. By the SPEAKER, petition of chairman, legal committee, Palm Beach Post No. 12, American Legion, West Palm Beach, Fla., petitioning consideration of the resolution with reference to the passage of a bill to amend and enlarge the definition of treason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

35. By the SPEAKER, petition of Adrian Russo, German civilian, Wiesbaden, Germany, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the Malmedy case, and asking that hangings be discontinued in Germany; to the committee on the Judiciary.

36. By Mr. HART: Petition of New Jersey Retail Liquor Stores Association, urging stricter enforcement over the manufacture and sale of illicit alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

37. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the city of Bayonne, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

### COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Joseph O. Parker | Attorney | $5,164.98 |
| John J. Heimburger | Research specialist | 4,927.08 |
| Hugh H. Soper | do | 3,676.20 |
| George L. Reid, Jr. | Clerk | 5,164.98 |
| Katherine D. Wheeler | Assistant clerk | 2,861.10 |
| Mary Elizabeth Laxton. | Stenographer | 2,102.40 |
| Ruth B. Phillips | do | 2,067.90 |
| Lorraine Adamson | do | 1,688.58 |
| Fred H. Benham | Attorney (Apr. 26, to Aug. 10, 1948). | 846.18 |

H. Res. 298 and H. Res. 317 of the 80th Cong., 1st sess., authorized and appropriated $25,000 for the House Committee on Agriculture to conduct hearings, studies, and investigations by the committee acting as a whole or by a subcommittee. H. Res. 676, 80th Cong., 2d sess., appropriated an additional $5,000, making a total of $30,000. The funds so appropriated have been used for traveling expenses, hotel and other expenses of the committee in conducting hearings in the various parts of the United States. No personnel has been employed from these funds.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $30,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 19,267.63 |
| Amount expended from June 30, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 6,644.05 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 25,911.68 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 4,088.32 |

CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| George Y. Harvey | Clerk | $5,164.98 |
| Kenneth Sprankle | Assistant clerk | 5,164.98 |
| William A. Duvall | Second assistant clerk. | 4,992.90 |
| Corhal D. Orescan | Assistant clerk | 4,992.90 |
| Arthur Orr | do | 4,663.68 |
| R. E. Lambert | do | 4,663.68 |
| Robert P. Williams | do | 4,334.52 |
| Paul M. Wilson | do | 4,334.52 |
| Claude E. Hobbs, Jr. | do | 4,005.36 |
| Jay B. Howe | do | 4,005.36 |
| Bert J. Skinnard | Junior assistant clerk. | 1,618.77 |
| Lawrence C. Miller | do | 2,516.22 |
| G. Homer Skarin | do | 2,309.34 |
| Earl C. Silsby | do | 2,102.40 |
| Melvin E. Lefever | Clerk-stenographer | 1,895.52 |
| Watson L. Cormier | do | 1,481.70 |
| Robert M. Lewis | Messenger | 1,605.84 |
| Frank B. Avery, Jr. | Page | 1,481.70 |
| William H. Jahn, Jr. | Clerk to minority | 5,164.98 |
| Dorothy Davis | Clerk-stenographer to ranking minority member. | 1,895.52 |
| Lawrence A. DiCenzo | Clerk-stenographer to subcommittee chairman. | 1,895.52 |
| Molly J. Turner | do | 1,895.52 |
| Mary Jane Fisher | do | 1,895.52 |
| Helen Knechtel | do | 1,895.52 |
| Charlotte B. Plumley | do | 1,895.52 |
| Vivian I. Raber | do | 1,895.52 |
| Dorothy E. Henry | do | 1,579.60 |
| Graham W. Howe | do | 1,579.60 |
| David J. Phillips | do | 315.92 |
| Marjorie V. R. Dement. | do | 947.76 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $185,000.00 |
| Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 84,190.87 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 100,809.13 |

JOHN TABER,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS (INVESTIGATIVE STAFF)

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert E. Lee | Chief investigator | $4,992.90 |
| Harris H. Huston | Investigator | 4,005.36 |
| James J. Kerr | do | 3,676.20 |
| Harry S. Barger | do | 3,676.20 |
| Eugene F. Rinta | do | 3,676.20 |

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Benjamin S. Simmons | Investigator | $1,969.77 |
| Clarence Turner | do | 328.28 |
| Enid Morrison | Legal clerk | 2,309.34 |
| Mildred E. McGinnis | Clerk-stenographer | 1,232.73 |
| Lois Moore | do | 1,333.53 |
| Virginia S. Keep | do | 665.85 |
| Stella M. Mohr | do | 323.92 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $150,000.00 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 31,040.80 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 118,959.20 |

JOHN TABER,
*Chairman.*

---

ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert H. Harper | Chief clerk | $5,164.02 |
| James Deakins | Assistant clerk | 1,785.12 |
| John R. Blandford | Professional staff member. | 4,729.56 |
| Clinton B. D. Brown | do | 4,466.22 |
| Bryce N. Harlow | do | 4,729.56 |
| Robert W. Smart | do | 4,729.56 |
| Agnes H. Johnston | Secretary | 2,309.34 |
| Rosemary Curry | Stenographer | 2,102.40 |
| Berniece Kalinowski | do | 2,102.40 |
| Gladys E. Flanagan | Stenographer (investigation staff). | 1,813.88 |
| Townsend W. Hoopes | Assistant to the chairman (July 1 to Aug. 15, 1948). | 1,050.71 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $25,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 5,189.94 |
| Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 3,232.63 |
| Total amount expended from July 25, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 8,422.57 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 16,577.43 |

W. G. ANDREWS,
*Chairman.*

---

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Orman S. Fink | Technical staff director. | $4,532.04 |
| William J. Hallahan | Clerk | 4,268.64 |
| Elsie L. Gould | Deputy clerk | 3,544.50 |
| Margaret P. Battle | Stenographer | 2,309.34 |

JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
*Chairman.*

---

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 14, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Mabel G. Haller | Executive secretary (clerk). | $4,274.55 |
| William N. McLeod, Jr. | Minority clerk | 3,676.20 |
| Ruth Pingley | Stenographer | 2,309.34 |

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
*Chairman.*

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOME RULE AND REORGANIZATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 14, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Clarence M. Pierce. Profession, assistant staff director. Total gross salary, $3,728.20.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $30,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 20,773.81 |
| Amount expended from June 1 to Dec. 31 | 5,750.70 |
| Total amount expended, 80th Congress | 26,524.51 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 3,475.49 |

EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| W. Manly Sheppard | Chief Clerk | $5,000.00 |
| F. Albert Reiman | Assistant clerk (professional staff). | 5,000.00 |
| Irving G. McCann | Chief counsel (professional staff). | 5,000.00 |
| Frank S. McArthur | Investigator (professional staff). | 5,000.00 |
| Bingham W. Mathias | Minority clerk (professional staff). | 5,000.00 |
| Jennie Ward Carter | Clerk-stenographer | 2,433.96 |
| Mary Pauline Smith | do | 2,433.96 |
| Mary Ellen Sanders | do | 2,433.96 |
| Myrtle S. Locher | do | 2,433.96 |
| Frances A. Los | Clerk-stenographer (minority). | 2,433.96 |
| *Special employees pursuant to H. Res. 111* | | |
| John O. Graham | Special investigator | 5,000.00 |
| Raymond Davey | do | 2,666.67 |
| Agnes Ainilian | Clerk-stenographer | 2,433.96 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $115,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 70,793.33 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 37,592.29 |
| Total amount expended from February 1947 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 108,385.62 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 6,614.38 |

FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Annual base salary rate during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Douglas E. Alcock | Professional staff | $7,000.00 |
| Helen M. Balog | Clerk | 3,700.00 |
| Helen M. Boyer | Majority clerk | 7,000.00 |
| Dolores Fel'Dotto | Clerk-stenographer, July 1 through July 31, 1948. | 2,900.00 |
| Carl E. Hoffman | Professional staff | 6,000.00 |
| Hazel Huffman | Investigator | 6,200.00 |
| Francis T. O'Donnell | Professional staff, Nov. 1 through Nov. 30. | 6,000.00 |
| Martha C. Roland | Clerk | 3,700.00 |
| William A. Young | Professional staff | 5,000.00 |
| Annabell Zue | Clerk, Aug. 1 through Sept. 30. | 3,500.00 |
| | Clerk, Oct. 1 through Dec. 31. | 3,700.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $6,500.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 1,210.01 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 1,055.15 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 2,265.16 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 4,234.84 |

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
*Chairman, Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EXTRA-LEGAL ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

None (all-work done by staff of full committee).

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $40,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 10,384.60 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 5,117.62 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 15,502.22 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 24,497.78 |

CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
*Chairman, Subcommittee on Extra-Legal Activities of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.*

---

STATE DEPARTMENT SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Francis T. O'Donnell. Profession, counsel. Total gross salary for period July 1, 1948, to October 31, 1948, and December 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, $3,612.10.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $10,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 975.13 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 3,612.10 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 4,587.23 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 5,412.77 |

J. EDGAR CHENOWETH,
*Chairman.*

---

SURPLUS PROPERTY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Anna-Marie Hogin. Profession, stenographer. Total gross salary, July 1 to November 10, inclusive, $1,518.40.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $90,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | $88,578.32 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 1,793.30 |
| Refund of deposit on air travel contract | 425.00 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 4, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 89,946.62 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 53.38 |

ROSS RIZLEY,
*Chairman.*

---

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLICITY AND PROPAGANDA OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

JANUARY 14, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Oscar L. Hume | Staff coordinator | $3,939.54 |
| Elizabeth Voth | Clerk | 2,033.46 |
| Hayward G. Austin | Chief investigator | 1,721.66 |
| Alfred J. Watson | Investigator | 299.90 |
| Richard J. Hodson | do | 372.18 |
| Barbara Yeaple | Typist | 119.45 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $86,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 50,148.70 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 10,101.28 |
| Total amount expended from May 1947 to December 1948 | 60,249.98 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 25,750.02 |

FOREST A. HARNESS,
*Chairman.*

---

PROCUREMENT AND BUILDINGS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Brooks, Benjamin J. | Special counsel | $512.57 |
| Christerson, Mariella | Clerk-typist | 627.42 |
| Coleman, Peter | Sentographer | 1,978.26 |
| Cooley, Thomas, II | General counsel | 3,610.32 |
| Craft, Virginia | Investigator | 384.89 |
| Deem, Jane | Stenographer | 1,605.84 |
| Galland, Marion | Secretary to counsel | 2,148.41 |
| Glassie, Henry H. | Chief counsel | 4,935.28 |
| Judd, Betty L. | Typist | 715.95 |
| Lincoln, Virginia C. | Stenographer | 769.54 |
| Manual, Fritzie | Investigator | 3,676.20 |
| Stillman, Saul G. | Associate counsel | 3,676.20 |
| Terry, C. D. | Chief clerk | 3,676.20 |
| Weber, Gertrude | Investigator | 1,520.47 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures: | |
| First session | $40,000.00 |
| Second session | 40,000.00 |
| Supplemental | 15,000.00 |
| Total | 95,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 44,287.60 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31 | 33,725.40 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 10,562.20 |

Few outstanding bills remaining to be paid in January 1949.

GEORGE H. BENDER,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Boyd Crawford | Clerk and administrative officer. | $5,164.98 |
| Charles Burton Marshall. | Staff assistant | 5,164.98 |
| George S. Pettee | do | 5,164.98 |
| John W. Easton | do | 5,164.98 |
| Howard Piquet | do | 5,164.98 |
| June Nigh | do | 2,378.31 |
| Doris Leone | do | 2,378.31 |
| Winifred Osborne | do | 2,723.16 |
| Mabel Henderson | do | 1,964.46 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $125,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 39,423.01 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 5,285.22 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 44,708.23 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 80,291.77 |

CHARLES A. EATON,
*Chairman.*

---

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Marjorie Savage | Clerk, Committee on House Administration (standing). | $3,544.50 |
| Frank J. Specht | Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration. | 3,412.86 |

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Jack Watson | Assistant clerk, Committee on House Administration. | $3,412.86 |
| Irene Gilchrist | do | 2,102.40 |
| Gladys Riggs | do | 2,102.40 |
| Maureen B. Sandiford | do | 2,102.40 |

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures ..... $5,000
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 5,000

K. M. LECOMPTE,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| *Clerical staff* | | |
| Elton J. Layton | Clerk | $5,164.98 |
| Marjorie A. Biddle | Assistant clerk | 2,309.34 |
| Royice Reno | do | 2,309.34 |
| Georgia G. Glasmann | Assistant clerk-stenographer. | 2,185.14 |
| Julia Watterson | do | 2,185.14 |
| Roy P. Wilkinson | Assistant clerk | 1,619.64 |
| *Professional staff* | | |
| Arlin E. Stockburger | Aviation and engineering consultant. | 5,164.98 |
| Andrew Stevenson | Expert | 5,164.98 |
| Kurt Borchardt | Professional assistant. | 5,164.98 |
| John H. Frederick | Consultant | 3,807.84 |
| *Additional staff personnel* | | |
| Martha E. Schaf | Stenographer | 1,895.52 |
| Louis Berlinsky | Assistant clerk | 668.53 |

The above additional staff personnel is pursuant to H. Res. 163, transportation survey and their services terminated as of Jan. 3, 1949.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures ..... $55,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported. 12,159.24
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 12,843.19

Total amount expended from June 30, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 25,002.43
Balance unexpended as of Jan. 1, 1949 ..... 29,997.57

CHAS. A. WOLVERTON,
*Chairman, Eightieth Congress.*

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| C. Murray Bernhardt | Chief Clerk | $4,663.73 |
| Velma Smedley | Assistant Chief Clerk. | 4,334.55 |
| Walter R. Lee | Claims specialist | 3,676.20 |
| Walter M. Besterman | Clerk-stenographer | 3,056.51 |
| Anne J. Berger | do | 2,171.40 |
| Frances Christy | do | 2,171.40 |
| Harriet B. Lamb | do | 2,171.40 |

SCHEDULE A

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures since Jan. 1, 1947: | | |
| A. Unexpended balance July 1, 1948, preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46 | | $79.90 |
| B. Unexpended balance July 1, 1948, preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year) | | 101,730.71 |
| C. Revision of the laws, 1947 | | 8,000.00 |
| D. Revision of the laws, 1948 | | 10,000.00 |
| E. Revision of the laws, 1949 | | 10,000.00 |
| | | 129,810.61 |
| 2. Amount previously expended during period covered by prior reports: | | |
| A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46 | 0 | |
| B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year) | 54,419.08 | |
| C. Revision of the laws, 1947 | 0 | |
| D. Revision of the laws, 1948 | 4,959.54 | |
| E. Revision of the laws, 1949 | 0 | |
| | | 59,378.62 |
| 3. Amount expended from July to Dec. 31, 1948: | | |
| A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46 | 0 | |
| B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year) | 32,000.00 | |
| C. Revision of the laws, 1947 | 0 | |
| D. Revision of the laws, 1948 | 0 | |
| E. Revision of the laws, 1949 | 5,124.54 | |
| | | 37,124.54 |
| 4. Amount expended from Jan. , 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948: | | |
| A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46 | 0 | |
| B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year) | 86,419.08 | |
| C. Revision of the laws, 1947 | 0 | |
| D. Revision of the laws, 1948 | 4,959.54 | |
| E. Revision of the laws, 1949 | 5,124.54 | |
| | | 96,503.16 |
| 5. Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948: | | |
| A. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code, 1944–46 | 79.90 | |
| B. Preparation of new edition of U. S. Code (no year) | 15,311.63 | |
| C. Revision of the laws, 1947 | [1] 8,000.00 | |
| D. Revision of the laws, 1948 | [1] 5,040.46 | |
| E. Revision of the laws, 1949 | 4,875.46 | |
| | | 33,307.45 |

[1] Returned to Treasury.

EARL C. MICHENER,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Gus S. Caras | Professional staff | $3,939.54 |
| Elizabeth B. Bedell | Chief clerk | 2,999.04 |
| Leonard P. Pliska | Clerk | 2,171.40 |

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures ..... $50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported. 3,866.04
Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 7.75

Total amount expended Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 3,873.79
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 46,126.21

ALVIN F. WEICHEL,
*Chairman.*

POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| George M. Moore | Chief counsel | $5,164.02 |
| Frederick C. Belen | Counsel | 4,663.68 |
| Lucy K. Daley | Assistant clerk | 2,171.40 |
| Elayne Morelle | Secretary | 1,964.46 |
| Lillian Hopkins | do | 1,826.52 |
| Ann Hayden | Secretary (Oct. 1 to Dec. 31, 1948). | 809.82 |
| *Employed under H. Res. 176* | | |
| Edward J. McCormack. | Chief, Studies and Investigations (July 1, 1948 to Sept. 17, 1948). | 2,192.16 |
| Ann Hayden | Secretary (July 1, to Sept. 30, 1948). | 809.82 |

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures ..... $50,000.00

Amount of expenditures previously reported. 26,488.38
Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 4,585.13

Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 31,073.51
Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 ..... 18,926.49

EDWARD H. REES,
*Chairman.*

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| George H. Soule | Mining expert | $4,304.15 |
| Ernest A. Grant | Clerk | 5,164.98 |
| Claude A. Ragan | do | 2,861.10 |
| Nancy J. Arnold | do | 2,861.10 |
| Gemma M. O'Brien | do | 2,861.10 |
| Forrest Reeve | do | 238.42 |
| Edith C. Curtiss | do | 2,638.55 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures (H. Res. 94) | $25,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 13,711.75 |
| Amount expended from July 1, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 488.01 |
| Total amount expended from July 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 14,199.76 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 10,800.24 |

RICHARD J. WELCH,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Robert F. McConnell | Clerk of committee | $3,136.98 |
| Joseph H. McGann, Sr. | Professional staff member | 4,171.53 |
| Joseph H. McGann, Jr. | Minority clerk | 2,309.34 |
| Mrs. Vera Watts | Stenographer-clerk | 2,654.19 |
| Mrs. Elaine Jackson | do | 2,654.19 |
| Mrs. Violet Young | do | 2,654.19 |
| *Subcommittee investigating questionable trade practices* | | |
| John T. M. Reddan | Counsel | 5,164.98 |
| E. R. Ferguson, Jr. | Assistant counsel | 3,939.54 |
| Martin O. Hanson | Chief investigator | 1,531.74 |
| Charles F. Meany | Investigator-accountant. | 2,654.16 |
| Arthur Perlman | Investigator | 2,916.24 |
| Walton Woods | do | 3,150.72 |
| Joseph M. Mannix | do | 528.57 |
| Herbert J. Cooney | do | 1,787.84 |
| Jay S. Hartzell | do | 2,681.76 |
| William E. Davis | do | 2,100.48 |
| Doris M. Mahood | Stenographer-clerk | 1,992.06 |
| Catherine C. Hubbard. | do | 1,964.46 |
| Dorothy B. Hayward | do | 1,964.46 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $125,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 56,766.74 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31 | 42,826.33 |
| Total amount expended to Dec. 31 | 99,593.07 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31 | 25,406.93 |

GEO. A. DONDERO,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON RULES

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Lyle O. Snader | Clerk | $5,165.00 |
| Donald O. Montgomery. | Assistant clerk | 3,136.98 |
| Humphrey Scott Shaw | Minority clerk | 2,874.89 |
| Jane W. Snader | Assistant clerk-stenotypist. | 2,874.89 |
| Mildred M. McGuire | Stenographer | 1,536.88 |

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures, none.

LEO E. ALLEN,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

JANUARY 13, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from June 30, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| *House pay roll* | | |
| Robert E. Stripling | Chief investigator | $5,164.98 |
| Benjamin Mandel | Director of research | 4,663.68 |
| Louis J. Russell | Investigator | 4,564.92 |
| Donald T. Appell | do | 4,050.64 |
| John W. Carrington | Minority clerk | 4,038.42 |
| Ann D. Turner | File chief | 3,676.20 |
| Carolyn Graham | Assistant file chief | 2,585.27 |
| Juliette Joray | Clerk-stenographer | 2,309.44 |
| Margaret S. Kerwan | do | 2,484.22 |
| Rosella A. Purdy | do | 2,792.10 |
| *Voucher pay roll* | | |
| Virginia Allen | Clerk-typist | 2,309.44 |
| Jo Benisch | do | 2,309.44 |
| Jean D. Carey | Clerk-stenographer | 2,309.44 |
| Lucille Fitzgerald | File clerk | 2,309.44 |
| Lillian E. Howard | Research clerk | 2,539.22 |
| Mary E. McFerran | Clerk-stenographer | 2,309.44 |
| Lorraine M. Nichols | do | 2,309.44 |
| Thelma I. Scearce | do | 2,481.75 |
| Ruth Tansill | do | 2,263.36 |
| Peggy Shaw | Clerk-typist | 2,309.44 |
| Catherine Lee Crews | do | 2,309.44 |
| Sadie C. Cagle | do | 1,688.58 |
| Alice Elaine Walker | do | 2,309.44 |
| Lucille Lowther | do | 2,309.44 |
| Lois Marie Padberg | do | 1,688.58 |
| Helen Irene Mattson | Research clerk | 2,792.10 |
| Asselia S. Poore | do | 2,539.22 |
| Anne W. Kelliher | Clerk-typist | 2,309.44 |
| Mary Ann Moffett | Research clerk | 2,309.44 |
| Alvin W. Stokes | Investigator | 3,676.20 |
| William A. Wheeler | do | 3,807.84 |
| Robert B. Gaston | do | 3,807.84 |
| Walter Wieczerzak | do | 3,136.98 |
| Courtney Owens | do | 1,963.92 |
| Charles E. McKillips | do | 3,152.03 |
| Margaret Mattson | Clerk-typist | 1,143.98 |
| Sonia Martinez | do | 1,111.06 |
| Jeanette Craig | Clerk-stenographer | 239.51 |
| Joy Cockrell | do | 1,221.75 |
| Michael Carey | Clerk | 362.00 |
| Rose Sanko | Clerk-stenographer | 1,539.56 |
| Helen Boyle | do | 1,190.67 |
| Barbara Hampson | do | 1,319.79 |
| Marjory Amidon | do | 1,257.30 |
| Barbara Mallon | File clerk | 241.33 |
| Mrs. Bert Kelly | Clerk-typist | 459.12 |
| May S. McKay | do | 293.22 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | $300,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported (Jan. 1, 1947, to June 30, 1948) | 141,335.14 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 109,159.62 |
| Total amount expended from Jan. 1, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 250,494.76 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 49,505.21 |

J. PARNELL THOMAS,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Karl Standish | Clerk, Committee on Veterans' Affairs. | $5,164.98 |
| Bessie N. Kenyon | Assistant clerk | 4,005.36 |
| Louise M. Peter | Clerical staff | 1,924.45 |
| Frances Montayne | do | 2,309.34 |
| Mary C. Schmidt | do | 2,309.34 |
| George J. Turner | do | 2,378.28 |
| Casey M. Jones | Professional aide | 5,164.98 |
| Edwin B. Patterson | do | 5,164.98 |
| Ida Rowan | do | 4,611.34 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $25,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 11,864.91 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 1,320.86 |
| Total amount expended from March 1947 to December 1948 | 13,185.77 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 11,814.23 |

EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
*Chairman.*

### COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

DECEMBER 30, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Serge N. Benson | Tariff expert (P) | $4,663.68 |
| James A. Tawney | Social security adviser (P). | 777.28 |
| Charles W. Davis | Minority adviser (P) | 4,663.68 |
| Lynn L. Stratton | Tax adviser (P) | 4,260.22 |
| Gordon Grand, Jr. | Clerk (C) | 4,663.68 |
| T. Janet Schnitz | Assistant clerk (C) | 3,676.20 |
| Gladys Kullberg | Clerk-stenographer (C). | 2,309.36 |
| Donald Larsen | do | 2,171.60 |
| Susan Alice Taylor | do | 2,061.00 |
| Margie Halsey | Stenographer (C) | 687.00 |

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Virginia P. Turner | Stenographer (C) | $1,167.75 |
| Harry Parker | Messenger | 1,318.16 |
| Sam Hardy | do | 1,275.96 |
| Hughlon Greene | do | 1,275.96 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $25,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 2,463.53 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31 | 849.19 |
| Total amount expended from July 25, 1947, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 3,312.72 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31 | 21,687.28 |

HAROLD KNUTSON,
*Chairman.*

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NEWSPRINT AND PAPER SUPPLY

JANUARY 3, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to January 3, 1949, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

Name of employee, Alyce E. Warren. Profession, clerk. Total gross salary during 6-month period, $1,713.97.

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $25,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 7,608.41 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Jan. 4, 1949 | 1,724.51 |
| Total amount expended from Mar. 1, 1947, to Jan. 4, 1949 | 9,332.92 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 4, 1949 | 15,667.08 |

CLARENCE J. BROWN,
*Chairman.*

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| James W. Foristel | Chief of staff | $4,372.96 |
| Paul O. Peters | Staff investigator | 4,186.44 |
| Leo P. Cullinane | do | 3,676.20 |
| Hobart Cooper | do | 1,907.44 |
| Willis J. Ballinger | Economic counsel | 4,619.48 |
| Virginia F. Flatley | Stenographer | 1,610.42 |
| Arvilla Benson | do | 761.04 |
| Hilfred G. Wood | do | 1,605.25 |
| Bettie H. Henderson | do | 521.48 |
| Jean Hudson Ellis | do | 658.87 |
| Gertrude V. Tefft | Stenographer | $1,277.72 |
| Willie E. Foristel | do | 410.37 |
| Virginia Rice | do | 454.98 |
| C. J. Reynolds, Jr. | File clerk | 1,412.70 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $130,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 87,056.48 |
| Amount expended from July 1, 1948, to Dec. 31, 1948 | 40,716.34 |
| Total amount expended from Mar. 24, 1947 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 127,772.82 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 2,227.18 |

WALTER C. PLOESER,
*Chairman.*

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE COMMODITY TRANSACTIONS

JANUARY 12, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Golden N. Dagger | Chief counsel (July 1 to Sept. 15, 1948). | $2,775.70 |
| Charles D. Budd | Investigator | 3,379.04 |
| Bertram M. Long | Investigator (July 1-11, 1948). | 132.69 |
| Marie E. Wolff | Secretary | 1,564.46 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures: | |
| H. Res. 407, Dec. 19, 1947 | $25,000.00 |
| H. Res. 674, June 18, 1948 | 10,000.00 |
| Total | 35,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 12,263.00 |
| Amount expended from Jan. 1 to June 30 | 12,263.00 |
| Total amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31 | 9,562.12 |
| Balance unexpended as of Jan. 12, 1949 | 13,174.88 |

AUGUST H. ANDRESEN,
*Chairman.*

SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JANUARY 14, 1949.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| Frank T. Bow | General counsel | $5,164.98 |
| J. Robert Brown | Investigator | 3,171.42 |
| T. F. Simpson | do | 2,854.27 |
| E. E. Fine, Jr. | do | 2,142.55 |
| Dolores L. Fel'Dotto | Chief clerk | 2,675.06 |
| R. M. Thompson | Clerk | 1,010.68 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $25,000.00 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31 | 18,355.65 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 6,644.35 |

FOREST A. HARNESS,
*Chairman.*

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

DECEMBER 31, 1948.

To the CLERK OF THE HOUSE:

The above-mentioned committee or subcommittee, pursuant to section 134 (b) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it during the 6-month period from July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, inclusive, together with total funds authorized or appropriated and expended by it:

| Name of employee | Profession | Total gross salary during 6-month period |
|---|---|---|
| H. Ralph Burton | General counsel (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.). | $4,235.52 |
| William E. Murray | Chief investigator (July 1 to Nov. 30, inc.). | 3,282.95 |
| Robert B. Barker | Investigator (July 1 to Sept. 30, inc.). | 1,838.10 |
| Frank F. Evans | Investigator (Oct. 19 to Nov. 4, inc.). | 296.27 |
| J. V. Falvey | Investigator (July 1 to Nov. 30, inc.). | 2,614.15 |
| Edward E. Fine, Jr. | Investigator (Aug. 3 to 11, inc.). | 156.85 |
| Gomer A. Gibson | Investigator (Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.). | 331.12 |
| John L. Grabber | Investigator (Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.). | 331.12 |
| Robert A. Grosselfinger. | Investigator (Oct. 29 to Nov. 2, inc.). | 87.13 |
| John A. Kendrick | Investigator (Aug. 1 to 7, inc.; Oct. 17 to Nov. 4, inc.). | 453.11 |
| Paul F. Morrison | Investigator (July 14 to 26, inc.). | 226.55 |
| Walter K. Van Olinda | Investigator (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.). | 3,676.20 |
| Charlotte S. Crosson | Stenographer (Oct. 25 to Nov. 9, inc.). | 134.97 |
| LaRue Dickson | Typist (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.). | 1,619.64 |
| Anna-Marie Hogin | Stenographer (Nov. 11 to Dec. 31, inc.). | 584.00 |
| Kathryn E. Smith | Chief clerk (July 1 to Dec. 31, inc.). | 2,309.34 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditures | $40,000.00 |
| Amount of expenditures previously reported | 8,937.51 |
| Amount expended from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 30,291.47 |
| Total amount expended from Apr. 15 to Dec. 31, 1948 | 39,228.98 |
| Balance unexpended as of Dec. 31, 1948 | 771.02 |

ROSS RIZLEY,
*Chairman.*

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. C. Stanley Lowell, pastor, Wesley Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the Father of us all, wilt Thou grant in Thy goodness that as we enter this time-honored room we may leave behind all that which does not deserve to be here. Let all self-seeking and tainted motives remain without. Let false pride and lurking grudge set no foot within these walls. Let all that is ignoble and mean, all that is partial and prejudiced find no place in these solemn deliberations.

Yet, as we come may we bring with us all that edifies and ennobles. Let integrity of purpose here be joined with unwearying resolve. Let there be firmness in the right mellowed with the understanding of human frailty. Let there be a kinship of words and deeds for good. Let sharp division whet the edge of our common purpose. Thou knowest what we are. We would it were more. Yet let us bring the very best and all we have to the meeting of these sacred trusts.

As we bring our best, wilt Thou, our Father, make it better. Let others concern themselves, if they will, with the facade of power. Teach us the meaning of its substance—not of wealth, nor of arms, nor of things, but of the spirit. May our excellence be not in might nor in power but in virtue. Let our strength be as the strength of ten because our hearts are pure. We pray in the name of Christ the Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 31, 1949, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 547. An act to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

## EXTENDING TIME FOR FREE ENTRY OF CERTAIN ARTICLES IMPORTED TO PROMOTE INTERNATIONAL GOOD WILL

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JANUARY 31, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate on January 31, 1949, the engrossed resolution (H. J. Res. 88) entitled "Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will," attested by the Secretary as having been passed by the Senate on January 31, 1949.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

## ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on January 31, 1949, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on January 31, 1949, he did on that day sign the following enrolled House joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

## JOINT INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to authority granted by section 5001 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means did on January 14, 1949, elect the Honorable JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan, to be a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation to serve with the following other House Members who have previously been duly elected by the Committee on Ways and Means as members of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation: ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; JERE COOPER, of Tennessee; DANIEL A. REED, of New York; ROY O. WOODRUFF, of Michigan.

Respectfully yours,

ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means.*

## THE LATE HONORABLE HOMER HOCH

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow and deep regret I announce the death of Justice Homer Hoch, a former Member of this House. Justice Hoch passed away at Topeka, Kans., last Monday morning.

Homer Hoch was a member of this House during a period of 14 years, having been elected from the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas in 1918, and served until 1932.

As a Member of Congress he served with credit to himself and to the State he represented in this body. While a Member of Congress he was active in legislative matters, and for a long period of time was a member of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. He was coauthor of the Hoch-Smith resolution, which paved the way for general grain-rate reductions on middle western railroads. While serving in this body, he was called upon to preside many times as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Justice Hoch was the son of a former Governor of the State of Kansas. Prior to his election to Congress he was engaged in the newspaper business at Marion, Kans. After his service in Congress, he returned to Kansas and was appointed to the chairmanship of the corporation committee of our State. He was afterward elected to the Supreme Court of Kansas, where he was serving with distinction at the time of his death.

Justice Hoch's long career in public service kept him well abreast of the law, first as a lawyer, then a lawmaker, and finally an interpreter on the Kansas court bench. Justice Hoch was known to his colleagues on the high bench as one who felt that law should be interpreted in the light of its social effects upon the people of his State and Nation, rather than in narrow confines of strict legal construction.

In the passing of Justice Hoch the State and Nation mourn one of their foremost, outstanding citizens. He was a great man with a deep sense of justice toward his fellow men. He was indeed a Christian gentleman.

Well may he rest from his labors and may his State and Nation confer upon him the commendation, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the death of the Honorable Homer Hoch, of Kansas, practically coincided with the birthday of that great State. I think that fact symbolical in that Justice Hoch and his family were a part of the great State of Kansas and its great history.

Judge Hoch's father served with distinction as Governor of the State. He himself served with great honor in many public offices, his final one being that of justice of the supreme court of the State. He was recognized, not only by his colleagues and the State of Kansas, but by the legal profession and others throughout the country, as an able, conscientious, and sincere jurist. His quiet, yet courageous, manner caused him to be loved by all who knew him.

It is with deep regret that I have learned of this tragic end of Justice Hoch. His loss to Kansas is a loss to his Nation.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have learned of the death of Homer Hoch, who was, for 14 years, a distinguished Member of this House.

I had the privilege of serving with him in the House for 6 years. I am sure that all Members who were here at that

time will recall him as a most able, hard-working, and conscientious Member of Congress. During the time I knew him he was one of the leaders in the House, one of its ablest debaters, and a skilled parliamentarian and presiding officer. His public service did not end with his retirement from Congress in 1932, and since that time he has rendered great service to our State as chairman of the corporation commission, and as a distinguished member of its highest court. In all he spent over 30 years in the service of the public. Homer Hoch was a friendly man. He was very helpful to me when I first came to Congress as a new Member. I shall never forget the kindness that he showed me at that time. He was a man who in every respect could be called a good man, with everything which that term implies. He will be missed among all those who knew him. My deepest sympathy goes to his widow and his fine son and daughter.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my words to those already spoken in memory of this beloved Kansan, whose service to the public should be an example to every young man seeking to follow a public career.

Justice Hoch was a success in the finest sense of the word.

His passing is a great loss to the State of Kansas.

His accomplishments and service are reasons for the justifiable pride his family, his friends, and his neighbors had in him.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the price we pay for living is to see our dear friends pass from us. It is with great regret that I learned of the death of my good friend of many years, Homer Hoch. When I first came to Congress he was one of the outstanding men in this body. He was an able debater and a splendid parliamentarian. He served often with distinction as a presiding officer. He rendered a great service to his country here and later in his own State of Kansas.

The country has lost a great citizen, and I extend my deep sympathy to his family in their hour of bereavement.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, no news has brought more sadness to me than this report of the death of Homer Hoch, with whom I served in this House for many years.

Someone has said that the friendships that spring up between Members of the different parties in this House should be compared to the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

We went through some of the hardest battles together I have ever experienced; and I am not giving away any secrets when I tell you I have been through many battles in this House.

Homer Hoch and I were largely responsible for preventing the reapportioning of the House of Representatives under the census of 1920. Because it was taken at the wrong time of the year and at a time when large numbers of our soldiers had not returned from the first World War it would have discriminated against the agricultural States. I remember distinctly that we fought for an amendment that would have protected his State and mine, and other agricultural States, from having their representation taken away and given to people from foreign countries who had been in this country only a short time.

During the last few years of his services here we fought through an amendment to the Muscle Shoals bill that blazed the way for protecting the American people in the enjoyment of that vast wealth of water power this country possesses. When the Muscle Shoals bill was passed, Mr. Hoch being in the majority, we agreed that he should offer the amendment to have the Government fix the retail price of the power generated and not have the power trust plunder the people in the TVA area with exorbitant overcharges.

That amendment was adopted, the bill was passed, but was vetoed by the then President of the United States.

It was later written into the bill which Senator Norris and I sponsored, creating the Tennessee Valley Authority which, as I have often said, has wrought the greatest developments of ancient or modern times.

I never met a finer man in or out of Congress than Homer Hoch. He was a Christian gentleman, who put the welfare of his country above party politics.

I recall the old days when we lived together at Congress Hall. It brings back a good many other faces like Dan Anthony, Gordon Lee, and a large number of others who have now passed on.

When I remember all
The friends so linked together,
I've seen around me fall
Like leaves in wintry weather—
I feel like one
Who treads alone
Some banquet hall deserted,
Whose lights are fled,
Whose garlands dead,
And all but he departed.

Kansas has lost one of its greatest citizens; this country has lost one of our finest Americans in the passing of Homer Hoch.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, in the passing of Homer Hoch, I have lost a good friend—the State of Kansas has lost an able and devoted son. Mr. Hoch was a useful and patriotic citizen of our common country.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may so desire may extend their remarks at this point on the life and character of the late Homer Hoch.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret that I learned of the passing of Justice Homer Hoch. It was not my privilege to serve with him in the House. It was, though, my privilege to know him as a warm friend. I knew him well, and admired him profoundly because of his kindliness, his sympathetic understanding, and his gentleness. I knew him not only as a fellow publisher, but as an outstanding and useful citizen in the service of his community, his State, and the Nation. The entire country has lost a great and honorable man.

I join my colleagues in paying this tribute of respect to him, and expressing our deep sympathy to his family at his passing.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, Homer Hoch and I entered Congress at the same time. We immediately became acquainted and that perfunctory new Members' acquaintance soon ripened into genuine friendship, and that friendship has endured down through the years.

Mr. Hoch was an unusual man. Coming from a good family, the son of the Governor of his State, he was especially well educated. He was a cultured, friendly, Christian gentleman in every sense of the word. His passing will be a great shock to his splendid family. During his service in Washington, I was in his home many times, and his family life was ideal. Mrs. Hoch was a charming hostess, and the children just what children should be. Since Mr. Hoch retired from Congress, I have often heard from him directly and indirectly, and I do know that he carried on his traditional congressional record as a leader of men and a distinguished public servant.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with others who served in Congress with Mr. Hoch in these memorial exercises. I extend to the family my genuine sympathy.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve with Hon. Homer Hoch during the entire time he so ably served the people of the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas in the House of Representatives of the United States. The fine character of the man won for him the respect of his colleagues and of all who knew him. I can say that his service in the House of Representatives was that of a statesman of a very high order. The attribute of a statesman was once stated by Edmund Burke, "A disposition to preserve and an ability to improve, taken together would be my standard of a statesman." Measured by this yardstick, Hon. Homer Hoch, of Kansas, will always and rightfully be known as a true statesman. I extend my heartfelt sympathy to his bereaved family.

### MIDDLETON BEAMAN

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most prominent members of the House organization for many years—learned, scholarly, gentlemanly, devoted to his duties throughout the years—is Middleton Beaman, who was legislative counsel of the House of Representatives. For more than 30 years in different capacities, all responsible, he served with outstanding ability, with great devotion, this legislative body of which you and I have the honor to be Members. Congresses came and Congresses went,

but Middleton Beaman always continued, highly respected by all the Members of the House without regard to party, making powerful contribution to the drafting of legislation that we, who are Members of the House, well know about but which the people generally are little acquainted with.

After over 30 years of service he has retired. We regret very much to see the retirement of this outstanding member of the House organization. I will not say "employee" or "servant" because I do not like to use those words in relation to Middleton Beaman. I shall say instead outstanding member of the House organization.

My purpose today is to pay tribute to him and to the great contribution he has made, to let him know as he leaves the House organization that he leaves with the profound respect and admiration of every Member of the House who served in any Congress with which he was connected in his many years of service and to also express the hope that in retirement he will enjoy many years of happiness and contentment. I also hope that he will visit the House frequently, that he will not in retirement remain inactive, but will keep in touch with his many friends here and keep close contact with the many friendships he has developed in past Congresses.

I also hope that in retirement he will devote some time to the writing of a book with reference to his experiences, giving to the people of the country the benefit of his vast knowledge in the intricate field of legislation, a benefit that would be of great advantage not only to Members of Congress but to the people generally.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to concur in the remarks of the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], with reference to the services of Mr. Beaman, head of the legislative counsel. His position was one of great responsibility, which required great technical skill as well as a thorough knowledge of his work. He worked for our committee in drafting various pieces of legislation which were presented to the House in the past.

I have never known a man who performed his work more efficiently and more thoroughly or more satisfactorily. He was an indefatigable worker. He did not spare himself at all. He worked night and day in order to prepare legislation for the various committees to present to the House.

As I stated, I concur in the remarks of the majority leader in expressing the hope that Mr. Beaman may have many years yet in which to rest from his labors and to enjoy a well-earned rest that he richly deserves. In my experience of 38 years I have never known of any man connected with the public service and the work of the Congress who has discharged his duty more thoroughly, more efficiently, and more satisfactorily than Mr. Beaman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, as one who has had the opportunity to observe the work of Mr. Beaman, I appreciate the great loss that the House organization has had in his retirement. Mr. Beaman was faithful, conscientious, and loyal. He understood thoroughly the legislation that came before the House. I am delighted to join with the majority leader in wishing for him many years of happiness and good health.

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a happy privilege for me to join in expressing my very sincere tribute to Mr. Beaman, and I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished majority leader and others who have spoken. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, it has been my privilege to work with him very closely throughout the years, and I regard him as one of the most valuable men holding any position in the service of this Government. It is my conviction that many of the outstanding statutes have stood the test of constitutionality very largely because of the able assistance given by Mr. Beaman. He was one of the greatest lawyers I have ever known. It was my privilege to be a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means that worked for months in the drafting of the Social Security Act. I shall never forget the outstanding contribution made by Mr. Beaman in the drafting of that measure. It was my privilege to attend many conferences with the late President Roosevelt, with the Attorney General of the United States, and other officials who were working on that important measure. We found the advice and counsel of Mr. Beaman to be valuable at all times, and it is my conviction that that measure today has stood the test of constitutionality largely because of the valuable contribution made by Mr. Beaman.

I join in this tribute, and join in wishing for him many years of happiness in his retirement, although we regret exceedingly to see him leave the position in which he rendered such faithful service to the House of Representatives.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman, and I am in complete agreement with him, because I was a member of the committee that conducted hearings on social-security legislation which was drafted under the chairmanship of the able and distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that my friend, Mr. Middleton Beaman, has just retired as legislative counsel of the House of Representatives. I am sure that those who have known Mr. Beaman during his long career in this position feel that he has justly earned his retirement. There is no question that his extraordinary legal ability in drafting of intricate legislation has saved the Government, as well as litigants, countless millions of dollars and possibly billions. The exhaustless energy of this outstanding public servant has been something that could not be compensated for by any salary he has ever received. I doubt if there is a legal firm in the country which would not have welcomed Mr. Beaman to it as a member of the firm. Yet here we have a man who has dedicated his remarkable intellect to the service of his country at a nominal salary compared with what he might have earned outside of the Government. I have always looked up to Mr. Beaman as that type of citizen who stood for principles and yielded to no pressure or to no man who might seek to have him violate them. Those of us who have served with Mr. Beaman are well aware that he merits years of happiness, health, and prosperity, and that is what I am sure that all of us who know him wish for him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the younger Members of the House I should like to say that the person about whom we are talking is a man who has for years been the chief of those who provide the language and knowledge required to write complicated legislation. I think Mr. Beaman is one of the half dozen smartest men intellectually that I have ever met. Mr. Beaman has an incisive mind, the like of which is possessed by few men. In addition to this incisive mind he has a character that has stood up on all occasions. In his work he did not flatter or fear anyone. I am glad to take this opportunity to give my testimony and show my thankfulness for having had the opportunity to work with this wonderful man.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate the contribution made by the gentleman from Ohio, and I agree with him that Middleton Beaman is one of the half dozen ablest men I have ever met.

In conclusion I know that I speak the sentiments of all of the Members who knew him in the years that he was connected with the House organization by saying, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as part of my remarks a letter sent to Middleton Beaman on February 1 by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. The letter referred to is as follows:

FEBRUARY 1, 1949.

Mr. MIDDLETON BEAMAN,
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR BEAMAN: I have your letter of January 5, 1949. I want to express to you my deep regret that you find it necessary to resign your office as chief legislative counsel of the House.

I look back upon our long association with great pleasure and pride in the fact that I have had your confidence and you have had mine. You can always look back upon your 30 years here on the Hill with the assurance that everyone who has come in contact with you is your friend and is deeply grateful to you for your fine work, and the help that you

have given each and every one of us individually and collectively as Members of the House of Representatives. Your clear head and trained mind, combined with your love of the work you were doing, have made your service here outstanding.

For the years that are allotted to you I trust that you shall enjoy to the fullest measure the blessings of health and happiness.

With assurances of my high regard I am pleased to subscribe myself,

Your sincere friend.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure we are all sorry to know that Middleton Beaman, the legislative counsel, is retiring from active duty. I have known Mr. Beaman personally and well for more than a quarter of a century. I never knew of an individual in public life who was more interested in his work and more determined to do that work well.

Mr. Beaman thought and worked objectively. He always determined where he was going, and had the ability and the foresight to select the words and the language best suited to the accomplishment of his purpose. I have often marveled at his capacity for work. I have sat in conference committee with him early and late, and there was never a word of complaint because the hour of meeting was too early or the hour of adjournment too late. Others with whom Mr. Beaman has been associated in the Congress have discussed at length his unusual qualities and qualifications for the responsible position in the House which he filled so efficiently and acceptably. A gentleman and a patriot always, he has set a good example for the rest of us to follow.

Here is hoping that he may live long and enjoy his well-earned retirement.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for one-half hour.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE (at the request of Mr. KILDAY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. YOUNG) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short newspaper article.

Mr. JONES of Missouri asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the St. Francis levee district of Missouri.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. DELANEY) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I cannot refrain from taking this minute to pay my respects and appreciation to someone we still have with us, and to express the deep gratitude of the people of my district and the State of Utah to the President of the United States for his humanity and his ability to see and understand an emergency when it exists.

Long before the newspapers were full of the disaster that has stricken the West, the President of the United States had already taken action. He had directed every Federal agency available to lend every assistance possible to the stricken people of that area.

It is indeed gratifying for us as a people, and the people of the world, to know that we now have in the White House a man who understands humanity, a man of action, a man of courage, who will meet all the issues that arise in these troublous times.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to exempt from the provisions of the Selective Service Act of 1948 those merchant seamen who served in the United States merchant marine during World War II. My motive in presenting this bill is to eliminate a great inequity in the Selective Service Act under which merchant marine veterans are now being drafted after years of hazardous wartime shipping service all over the world—an inequity which does a grave injustice to these veterans by denying recognition to them for their great contributions to our victory over the Axis, and by requiring new sacrifices from those who have so willingly sacrificed before.

Our merchant marine veterans are the forgotten men of America's armed forces. These men chose this branch of the service in response to their Government's call for volunteers to carry the materials of war to the battlefields all over the world, yet they have been denied veterans' benefits, insurance and hospital services, and educational benefits under the GI bill of rights. The only gesture of recognition for their heroic services was given when the President issued merchant marine certificates of discharge.

The final unfair blow to our seamen veterans came during the last session when the Eightieth Congress refused to exempt from the draft seamen with wartime service—a repudiation of the provision of Public Law 87 of the Seventy-eighth Congress which relieved merchant seamen from further classification under the selective-service system. Now, our seamen veterans, who had their education and their life's work interrupted once by the call to service, find themselves drafted into the armed forces.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Eighty-first Congress to amend the Selective Service Act to grant draft exemption to these forgotten men of World War II, and thus grant them some measure of recognition for their sacrifices in the last war—recognition which they so richly deserve.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Ottumwa (Iowa) Courier on Federal grants.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial from the veterans' report.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INCREASING TREND TOWARD ACQUISITION OF TAX-EXEMPT PROPERTY BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the membership to a table which I intend to place in the Appendix of the RECORD, with the permission of the House. That table shows the extent to which the Federal Government is increasing the trend toward ownership of tax-exempt property in various States of this country.

It emphasizes that this is an extremely serious situation for many States and municipalities and for the property owners in those localities who own real estate subject to taxation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, sometimes during peacetime a Member places himself in some jeopardy when he speaks in favor of the veterans of any war. I am at this time, however, calling attention to that magnificent group of soldiery which went forth in 1917 and 1918 to the fields of France, and who sacrificed themselves in the defense of their country, the men who fought in World War I.

I want to call the attention of the House to the words of Rudyard Kipling when we consider an attempt to malign the veteran. Those words are:

It's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' "Chuck 'im out, the brute!"
But it's "Savior of 'is country," when the guns begin to shoot.
An' it's Tommy this, an' Tommy that, an' anything you please,
But Tommy ain't a bloomin' fool,
You can bet a dime he sees.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House today for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MEYER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include some excerpts.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

ACTION BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN IN STORM DISASTER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] in the words he has spoken about the prompt action taken by the President of the United States in looking after the disaster area in the far West and Midwest. I think President Truman should be commended highly for his action in our behalf in helping to save our cattle and in placing at our disposal all Government agencies so that these conditions can be alleviated at the earliest possible moment. We in Montana are grateful to the Congress and the President for their understanding of these problems of ours and their speedy action in our behalf.

DE JURE RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my bit to the chorus of praise which is ringing out all over the world for our great President, Harry S. Truman, in recognition of his statesmanship in granting full de jure recognition to the new state of Israel, that glorious new democracy in the Middle East which we who have long championed the Zionist cause believe and prophesy will be a bright luminary in the family of nations and demonstrate true democracy in the Middle East.

President Truman should be and will be hailed and commended for this courageous act, and for his generous attitude in choosing a time when no political advantage can accrue to him personally, while he sets the United States in the forefront of the great powers in granting to Israel every privilege and right of established government in international comity.

President Truman has given to peace, to democracy, and to freedom a precious gift of great value. He has proved to the world that the United States keeps its promises. He has proved to the people of Israel that America is a friend. He has given us reason for pride in a great President and a great Nation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, President Truman rightly shall receive the plaudits of thousands of loyal Americans of Jewish extraction for his most recent evidence of interest in and good will toward the new state of Israel. Our de jure recognition of Israel will do much to stabilize that noble country; will enable it to the better take its rightful place among the nations of the world; and will assist materially in settling conditions in that most important part of the world. The state of Israel has received a tremendous expression of confidence from the United States. We are sure it will continue to merit it.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the last day of January 1949 marked the first day of de jure or full recognition by President Truman of the state of Israel. This fulfilled the President's pledge made last year at the time of his conditional or de facto recognition when the state of Israel was carved out. At that time he promised full recognition by the United States when a permanent government in Israel would be established.

These elections were held on January 25, 1949, and less than one full week later Israel has seen President Truman fulfill that promise—a truly great and momentous decision in these times.

We are reliably informed that the news of President Truman's fair-minded decision was most amiably received throughout all Israel as soon as it was made known there.

It is sincerely hoped that this step will go a long way in effecting a better understanding toward a solution of our problems of today.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEIN. I yield.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, at long last, the people of Israel have been accorded by the United States the recognition they so richly deserve. Perhaps no nation in history has suffered so much or fought so courageously for the right to take its proper place among the democracies of the world. By its steadfast belief in the principles of democracy, and by its willingness to sacrifice life and property for its ideals, it has earned the recognition of full statehood by the United States. Through the United Nations, it will lend its efforts toward world peace for which there is a prayer in the hearts of all of us. President Truman as the leader of our great Nation has helped pave the way for a new Israel, and the Israelis will, with pride in their country, maintain and uphold those democratic principles which we realize must be fought for with all our ability and strength, if they are to survive.

The enemies of democracy are many—that a new nation, Israel, joins with us in our efforts for peace and freedom, is cause for rejoicing.

THE DEMOCRATIC PATH OF PEACE

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great satisfaction that I add a word to the fulsome but deserving praise of our courageous President, Harry S. Truman.

I believe that I can claim the unique distinction of having predicted the election of heads of two great governments. When I was in the state of Israel in September 1948 I called on Prime Minister David Ben Gurion.

During the course of our discussion he asked when our Government would extend de jure recognition to his government. I told him that there was not a doubt in the world but that President Truman would keep his promise—just as he did—and would extend de jure recognition to the state of Israel immediately following the establishment of a permanent government by means of a democratic election. He then asked what would happen if it were necessary to postpone the Israeli election until after our own. I told him that there would be no change because I was certain that President Truman would be reelected.

Upon my return to this country I visited President Truman and told him, among other things, that, in my opinion, the provisional government of the state of Israel headed by Prime Minister Ben Gurion would be elected as the permanent government by the Israeli citizenry in a free and popular election.

I rejoice that all of these things are now realities.

We are grateful to the President for his extension of de jure recognition to this new democracy because it is symbolic of stretching out the hand of friendly fellowship in the true tradition of brotherhood. It is further evidence that this country, under the leadership of our great President, is ready to teach the world by precept and example how to tread the democratic path of peace under the guidance of God.

The following poem by Sir William Jones, entitled "A State," is apropos:

What constitutes a state?
Not high raised battlements or labored mound,
Thick walls or moated gate;
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crowned,
Nor bays and broad arm ports,
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Nor starred and spangled courts.
Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride—
No!—men, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endued,
In forest, brake, or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude—
Men, who their duties know,
But know their rights; and, knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant, while they rend the chain,
These constitute a state.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the gentleman from New York and other friends of Israel in commemorating this historic occasion in which our great President of the United States lends his high office to the official de jure recognition of the establishment of Israel as a nation.

At long last, from a tumultuous beginning, the heroic men and women of Palestine have forged for themselves and their children for generations to come a new nation, a new homeland for the Jewish people in the Middle East. For generations these people of biblical times have been persecuted in many lands, but with tenacity, fortitude, vision, and wisdom they have clung to the belief that some day, somewhere in the land of their forefathers, they would reestablish themselves again.

President Truman, true to his pledge and in the name of the Government of the United States of America, has led the way for legal recognition for these deserving people.

In the interest of democracy as we know it, I am confident that this historic occasion will create a new era in the Middle East, where a dynamic and positive democratic program is so sorely needed.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman deserves and is receiving the plaudits of the democratic world for the recognition of the new state of Israel, not only by the United States but by Great Britain as well, for the British recognition is generally regarded as a result of the diplomatic influence of the President of the United States.

Historically, the Jew is a democrat and he is preeminently an individualist. Indeed, the persecution of the Jewish people throughout the ages and, most conspicuously, in the recent past, has come from totalitarian dictators and their minions, in an effort to crush the individualism of the Jew, which did not submit to the tyranny of totalitarianism.

It is a foregone conclusion that the new state will take its place among the democratic nations of the world and will join in the fight for freedom, individual liberty and the dignity of man throughout the future.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to join the chorus that has raised its voice in jubilation over the full de jure recognition of the new state of Israel by our courageous President, Harry S. Truman.

At long last, the dream of a homeless and oppressed people has become a reality. A promise has been fulfilled.

President Truman, by his immediate recognition of the state of Israel, has proved to the world that the United States keeps its promises. The President has proved that America can be a trusted friend, at a time when friendly relations through the world are so vitally needed to secure the peace for which we all yearn.

I feel confident that very shortly the state of Israel will be admitted as a member of the United Nations and will make a real contribution to the work of that great international body in bringing about a better understanding toward the solution of our present-day problems.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a memorandum concerning some important legislation under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

STORM CONDITIONS IN THE WEST

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as you all know, my State of Nebraska, together with the greater portion of the Western States, has been made practically helpless by a series of very bad blizzards. Through the cooperation of the Federal Government we were able only a few days ago to begin the movement by airplane of hay to several hundred thousand head of cattle which are starving in these beleagured areas.

This morning Mr. Bud Crawford, of Broken Bow, Nebr., who has maintained radio communications through his "ham" set with most of the ranchers in my State, telephoned me a serious complaint.

Mr. Crawford tells me that the price of hay has skyrocketed. Prairie hay that had been selling at from $12 to $15 a ton now is quoted at $30 and $40. And many of those owning the hay are holding it for still higher prices, according to Mr. Crawford's information. I have telegraphed Governor Peterson of Nebraska, demanding an investigation into this matter of profiteering on this animal misery. I may also ask prosecuting authorities to look into the situation with a view to prosecuting the offenders if this is possible.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to second the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. O'SULLIVAN] and the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER] who have spoken so well of the quick and effective work of the President on this relief program. I trust we will have quick action by the House on Senate Joint Resolution 38 which implements the work of relief. On Monday Secretary Krug told a committee what had already been done and yesterday Assistant Secretary Warne elaborated on it.

I find that the storms have extended farther south than most of us realized. They have touched northern Arizona and covered the Navajo Indian Reservation deep with snow. That reservation, including the Hopi Reservation, is as large as the entire State of West Virginia. I fear it is a great crisis for those Indians. It may be true of other Indians as well. Probably there will be loss of life as well as loss of livestock. Aviators flying over that region say they can detect Indian hogans at different places but they can find no tracks going out of them. Those Indians are snowbound and covered up. Undoubtedly there will be loss of life. I hope we will take quick action on Senate Joint Resolution 38. At this point I want to include a telegram just handed me.

FEBRUARY 2, 1949.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
*Washington, D. C.:*

Navy planes really did a job here today. With two Army ships, moved 35 tons of hay into reservation and to ranches along highway 66 Seligman area.

Fifty CAP planes in action out of Winslow, Prescott, made several flights over reservation, dropping food and spotting concentration of cattle, sheep, and Indians.

Red Cross dropped 10,000 pounds of food. Indian Bureau also flew into Bodaway Plateau 2,000 pounds firewood. Red Cross has ready for shipment Wednesday 50 pounds DDT for Navajo Mountain School. Increased food drop tomorrow.

Dr. Schulz, Fort Defiance, got into Navajo Mountain on Bureau chartered helicopter, plans to establish temporary hospital in school. Red Cross has 36 Army cots ready to be flown in Wednesday.

Fifteen planes standing by at Phoenix Skyharbor loading hay tonight, expect take off tomorrow first flight with 70 tons, hope to fly additional 100 tons tomorrow. Navy moving base to Litchfield Park Airbase to facilitate handling 150 men and officers, maintain air equipment. Winslow will be advance base. Hay train departed Phoenix

235 tons, arrives Winslow 11 a. m. tomorrow, where planes will pick up cargoes.

Bureau has arranged for handling cargoes there. Planes loaded here today by Indian students and 20 chain gang pupils from Phoenix Bastile. Drafting additional chain gangers for tomorrow.

Army has supplied four dozers from Yuma. Have secured 16 dozers from outside area altogether.

Established radio communication with Bennett Hyde at Cayenta through local HAM hook-up here, relayed through Marion, Ohio. Hyde reports food drop at Cayenta O. K. and asked for hay at Black Mesa.

Chartered helicopter returned Tuba City to pick up Bureau nurse who will be flown in there tomorrow at Schulz request. Food situation at Navajo Mountain school O. K., but fear measles, pneumonia, frostbite may be bad. Possibility of diphtheria unconfirmed at Tes Nos Pas, but likely.

John Osborne, Seligman, rancher, reported to Pierson that hay lift has saved most of his 1,200 head, only 8 dead so far.

New blizzard reported on way, but may miss reservation. Temperature in affected area predicted for tonight zero minimum. Snow still drifting on reservation.

Army surgeon attempted to fly into Gallup today in Army packet, but forced to return here tonight. Will fly into Shiprock tomorrow and will be transported by Bureau jeep to Tes Nos Pas tomorrow with Dr. Kassell.

DAUGHERTY.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert my remarks on this same subject at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with other western colleagues in the House of Representatives in commending President Truman for his speedy action in calling upon the agencies of our Government to lend every aid and assistance to the great mountain and plains region of this Nation, which has been suffering as a result of unprecedented snowstorms.

President Truman is to be commended for his splendid action, without which the economic and agricultural life of the West may have suffered irreparable damage.

It is hoped that the legislative branch of the Government will give continuing and substantial aid to these stricken areas in view of the urgency of the situation.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the privilege of elaborating on the situation in Arizona as it is at the present time. Not only is the condition serious from the standpoint of below zero weather, with more snow and cold predicted as of last night, but the latest reports verify the fact that cattle are starving. Even the antelope in the district north of Seligman where the wildlife range are subjected to weather so serious that they cannot survive. Certainly domestic animals, from which these people derive their livelihood, cannot be expected to survive without food and shelter.

To make the condition even worse—and something we have heard little about so far—we now find evidence of measles, pneumonia, and diphtheria on the Indian reservations. This necessitates medical supplies and doctors. We are not only concerned with their economy, but it is now a matter of life and death for the people living in those areas. It is imperative that additional aid be forthcoming immediately.

The people of Arizona extend their thanks to the Government and President Truman for the assistance that has already been given them and for the efforts being made here. But I would further like to state that the condition is such that it will continue to demand our close attention, since many areas will require assistance not merely for the time being. And it may be several weeks or even months before the people of Arizona in these areas are again placed on a stable economic basis where they can again resume their normal activities.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITAKER (at the request of Mr. CHELF) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

REPEAL OF ANTIMARGARINE LAW

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, an attempt is being made to persuade Members of Congress and others that the administration will be breaking faith with midwestern dairy farmers if it goes ahead with its plans for repeal of the Federal antimargarine law.

This attempt does not take into account the very plain facts of the situation.

The Democratic platform, adopted in June, carried a plank proposing repeal of the Federal taxes on margarine.

This was unequivocal and meant what it said—complete repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws.

Everyone, including the butter interests, apparently so agreed at the time.

At the time, the butter groups had not come forward with their proposal for repeal of the taxes and the substitution of a ban on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine.

This effort to further hamstring margarine was not made public until a few days before the November election. The statement explaining that the butter interests were willing to see the Federal taxes repealed in return for the ban on yellow margarine did not refer to the Democratic platform. Apparently the butter spokesmen felt that the Democratic plank on margarine meant outright repeal of the antimargarine laws—with no other crippling legislation to be substituted.

Obviously, the butter groups were counting on the election of Governor Dewey and there had been a good deal of quiet rejoicing in their ranks over antimargarine statements attributed to the Republican Presidential nominee.

But President Truman won the election. The farmers voted for Mr. Truman knowing that the Democratic platform carried the plank proposing repeal of the antimargarine laws and knowing that the President had been quoted at a press conference as saying that he would sign a repeal bill if one came to him from the Congress.

Furthermore, if any further proof is needed, the President in his economic message to the Eighty-first Congress, on January 7, 1949, again recommended repeal of the margarine taxes. Repeal of the taxes means that all restrictions on the sale of yellow margarine would be done away with.

In view of the circumstances related, I do not see how anyone can say that repeal of the antimargarine laws will be breaking faith with the midwestern farmers. I insist, that in view of their support of the President in the national election, complete repeal of the antimargarine laws will be keeping faith with them.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in the Chelsea (Mass.) Record; also, to extend his remarks and include a statement he made before the Ways and Means Committee recently.

NON-COMMUNIST OATH FOR MANAGEMENT

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the Taft-Hartley Act will be repealed.

Another labor-management-relations act will be passed to fill the vacuum.

We hope that it will strike a better balance in governing those conditions under which labor and management resolve their differences.

Taft-Hartley "put the finger" on labor by requiring union officials to swear under oath that they are not Communists.

By implication, this gives management a clean bill of health, while putting labor leaders under constant suspicion.

On a grave issue such as communism, which threatens our national well-being and the future of every man, woman, and child in the United States, we cannot afford to put any one group under the onus that it alone is subject to Communist infiltration.

To require one party to a controversy to take a loyalty oath while exempting the other party is weighing the scales in an un-American manner, which can only please the Kremlin.

Equal treatment before the law is the cornerstone of justice and security.

But this tenet is flagrantly violated by the terms of the Taft-Hartley Act.

We have been well warned concerning the Communist technique of infiltrating a labor union.

We have not been warned concerning the far more subtle technique of Communists in worming their way into management.

It would be far more effective for an agent to avoid all Communist affiliations, establish a thoroughly conservative viewpoint, and work himself into a responsible position all in readiness for the day when he could do the most harm without ever being suspected.

In fact, we must guard against both possibilities.

Therefore, in any labor-management-relations act that is passed by this Congress to replace the discredited Taft-Hartley Act, we must treat all alike when the question of our national security is involved.

As the Chelsea Record, of Chelsea, Mass., observes editorially in its issue of January 7, 1949:

> This is not a question of lining business up against labor or labor against business, in any sense of the word.
>
> It is a case of lining up American men and women, regardless of where they work, or what they work at, against a common enemy that is using every means, fair and foul, to break down our economy.

What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

If this House decides to retain that provision which requires union-labor officials to sign a non-Communist affidavit, the American people, actuated by a sense of fair play and the need for full security, will demand the same from the managers of industry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACK of Washington asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the Miles County News Review under date of January 20.

Mr. GOLDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial that exposes Russia's great source of our scarce materials and suggests a remedy.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances, and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in five separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article, Will the Minimum-Wage Law Decrease Unemployment?

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. VORYS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made by a distinguished alumnus of the Ohio State Alumni Club on January 18.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Cincinnati Inquirer.

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include certain excerpts from the Labor and Management joint report.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas (at the request of Mr. GWINN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCONNELL (at the request of Mr. GWINN) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

ISRAEL RECOGNIZED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the de jure recognition of Israel is of course deeply gratifying to all who have fought for justice for the small state, and for a place of sanctuary for the unhappy Jews of Europe. I have joined in this fight believing first in our American principle that justice to minorities is the key to the success of democracy, and second that Israel will be a bridgehead of democracy in a Middle East ridden with chronic depression, illiteracy, bad health, and feudal social conditions. Israel now has a great part to play in the recovery and modernization of this whole area which has long been a tinder box for war. By contributing to the recovery of the Middle East with Israel as a focal point we shall be safeguarding peace and our national security, while at the same time serving best the cause of the triumph of democracy in the world.

RECOGNITION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to commend President Truman for his prompt action in the fulfillment of his promises to give to the new nation of Israel full and complete recognition. I have long subscribed to the principle that there should be a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. Palestine is the home of two great religions, the Christian religion and the Jewish religion. The magnificent fight the people of Israel have put up for a national homeland certainly deserves the success they have now achieved.

We, who have fought so long for de jure recognition of Israel, are confident that this new nation will function on democratic principles. We are sure that the nations which are adjacent to Israel will profit through increased commerce and, most of all, by the example which the new nation of Israel will set in the practice of democracy.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Third Commonwealth." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $195.25, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, many of us have noticed with a great deal of interest the action of Veterans' Administrator, Carl R. Gray, Jr., as announced yesterday, eliminating the 13 branches of the Veterans' Administration as supervisory units and limiting these offices to operational activities in handling national service life insurance and death claims.

Mr. Speaker, I think this action of the Veterans' Administrator deserves the highest commendation as it perhaps sets an example in the executive department of our Government that may be worthy of wide emulation.

There has been much criticism and some justified that the Veterans' Administration was so big and bunglesome that it became very difficult indeed to obtain the service in many instances the veteran is entitled to receive. This action of the Veterans' Administration will, he believes, increase efficiency in operations, avoid the overlapping of responsibilities and make it possible to utilize personnel

more economically now that we have reached the leveling-off point in our operations.

I personally have never seen the advisability of having such a glorified organization with responsibility in so many places. While I strongly believe in decentralization of the governmental agencies insofar as possible, the experience of large intermediate branch offices apparently proves a more direct contact from the local and district level to the central office would produce better service and greater efficiency.

There is much consideration being given to reorganization in Government agencies, and I am sure much to be accomplished. I am sure General Gray in taking the initiative had in mind accomplishing the objectives to be sought in both economy and efficiency. As a result of this action, it is estimated the savings will mean approximately 2,500 people and $10,000,000, as well as better care for war veterans.

If after careful study and analysis the Veterans' Administrator can do what he says he can and I have every reason to believe he can, it should be a guiding star for others to follow and certainly is a fine display of administrative statesmanship.

EXTENDING THE AUTHORITY OF THE PRESIDENT UNDER SECTION 350 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight Friday, February 4, 1949, to file a report on the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to also propound a unanimous-consent request that the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee may have until midnight Saturday to file their report.

The SPEAKER. The minority views?

Mr. REED of New York. The minority views, yes.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina include that in his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Yes, I shall be pleased to include the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday next to consider under the general rules of the House the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; that the time for general debate be not to exceed 1 day, and be equally divided and controlled by myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much time is the gentleman going to allow for general debate?

Mr. DOUGHTON. One full day; not to exceed 1 day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The bill will be read for amendment the next day?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The bill will be read for amendment the next day.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will have general debate on Monday?

Mr. DOUGHTON. The bill will be called up under the rules of the House on Tuesday morning.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And read on Wednesday?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Read under the 5-minute rule on Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add my praise to that previously given today to President Truman for his recent de jure recognition of the state of Israel. I think those hardy pioneers in that country, who have literally turned a desert wilderness into a land of milk and honey, and who are basing their government upon the sound social justice preachings of the prophets of old, deserve the support of the people of the United States. I am hence happy that the President has taken this action.

The recent election in Israel is full proof that those people, many of whom have suffered under the evil practices of totalitarianism, have absolutely no use for totalitarianism in any form and indicates that they will establish an island of democracy in the Near East. Every American, every lover of democracy throughout the entire world, should hail the establishment of Israel as a landmark in the never-ending fight for human freedom.

RELIEF OF WESTERN STATES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on tomorrow for the Speaker to recognize Members to suspend the rules in connection with an additional bill in relation to relief for the Western States that have been visited with a terrible disaster.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us the program for the rest of this week; and if he can enlighten us any for next week, we will be happy to receive the information.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to. Tomorrow the bill on which unanimous consent has been given for the Speaker to recognize Members to suspend the rules will be brought up. On Friday we are hopeful that the first deficiency appropriation bill will be brought up. There has been a unanimous agreement made in relation to Tuesday and Wednesday of next week. If the Committee on Expenditures reports out the reorganization bill, and if a rule is obtained between now and Saturday, it is my intention to bring that bill up on Monday.

From Wednesday on there will be no further business for the remainder of the week, except such matters that can only go through by unanimous consent and which will require immediate consideration. By "unanimous consent" I mean only with the permission of the minority leadership, of course, as well as all other Members.

Under the agreement I have with the minority leader, I feel that we will have to continue the House in session on Wednesday until the reciprocal trade agreement bill is disposed of. I made a commitment to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that from Wednesday of next week and the following Monday there will be no controversial legislation. There may be some the following Monday of a noncontroversial nature. Many of the Members on the minority side are going to make speeches a week from Saturday in connection with Lincoln Day dinners. That same courtesy is extended to us as regards Jackson-Jefferson Day dinners. I have made that agreement, and that agreement will be carried out.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, it is under that understanding that we will have Tuesday and Wednesday, if we need that much, for the Reciprocal Trade Act?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. I am giving Tuesday and Wednesday for the Reciprocal Trade Act. As to the reorganization bill, I think we can dispose of that on Monday, because there will not be much opposition, as I see it, to that bill; there may be on one or two points, but as to the bill itself I do not think there will be much opposition to the purposes and objectives of such legislation.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I want to say that if the deficiency appropriation bill comes up, that it will probably have controversial items in it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for giving me that information, because that serves notice that the Members should be here. When the gentleman from New York makes that observation, I draw the inference that he is conveying to the House that there will probably be some roll calls.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] may have permission to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

INTERNATIONAL LABOR ORGANIZATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 51)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the House of Representatives of the United States:*

The constitution of the International Labor Organization provides in article 19 thereof, with respect to each convention and recommendation adopted at a session of the International Labor Conference, that "each of the members undertakes that it will," within a given period, bring the convention or recommendation "before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action."

In accordance with the above-mentioned obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith, for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the House of Representatives may consider appropriate, authentic texts of certain conventions, an instrument of amendment, and recommendations adopted at recent sessions of the International Labor Conference, as follows:

Convention (No. 81) concerning labor inspection in industry and commerce;

Convention (No. 82) concerning social policy in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to nonmetropolitan territories;

Instrument for the amendment of the schedule to Convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 84) concerning the right of association and the settlement of labor disputes in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 85) concerning labor inspectorates in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 86) concerning the maximum length of contracts of employment of indigenous workers;

Recommendation (No. 81) concerning labor inspection; and

Recommendation (No. 82) concerning labor inspection in mining and transport undertakings.

The Conventions and Recommendations listed above were adopted at the thirtieth session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva from June 19 to July 11, 1947. The Instrument of Amendment was adopted by the Conference at its thirty-first session held at San Francisco from June 17 to July 10, 1948.

I transmit also the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding the above-mentioned Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations and a letter of December 3, 1948 from the Acting Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State regarding those documents.

I am requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit the above-mentioned Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations to the Governments of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for the enactment of legislation or other action. I am transmitting those documents to the Secretary of the Navy for appropriate action and advice with respect to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory.

I am also referring the texts of the Conventions, Instrument of Amendment, and Recommendations to the Senate.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1949.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times.

EXTENSION OF VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 73 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1660) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except 1 motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order the bill H. R. 1660, which was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Banking and Currency and as I have been informed, has already been passed by the other body by a unanimous vote. This bill extends the act of December 1947 which provided for voluntary agreements up to March 1, 1949, to September 30, 1949.

The reason for this extension is that the committee has not had ample time to prepare legislation which they intend to recommend to the House which will broaden the act and also provide for and safeguard the interests of American business and the American people generally. I hope such a bill will be forthcoming in due time from that great committee and I hope that such legislation will be approved by the Congress.

The law that is being now extended contained the words "voluntary agreements." I feared when the legislation was enacted that American industrialists and big business would take advantage of that provision because they were not subject to the Antitrust Act or the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Of course, we were assured at that time that the intent of the legislation was to hold and reduce prices. But unfortunately, such was not the case, and the cost of living has gone up; that is, until the last election. Since that time, of course, the cost of living has gone down somewhat and I hope it will continue to go down, so that the American people will not be held up by high prices as they have been, especially during the last few years. There being no opposition to this legislation, I am not going to take up more time, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the distinguished gentleman from Illinois has explained to the House, this resolution, House Resolution 73, does make in order, under an open rule, the consideration of the bill, H. R. 1660, reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency by unanimous vote. This measure was introduced by the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. SPENCE.

I believe H. R. 1660 will have the unanimous support of the House. I know of no reason why any Republican should oppose this bill, because it is a continuation of a measure enacted by that often-discussed Eightieth Congress, the Congress which was condemned throughout the length and breadth of the land by the President of the United States—not that I agreed with him—as the second worst Congress in history because it enacted legislation exactly like this. So I am indeed pleased to see that one of the first legislative bills

brought in by the Democratic majority, by the administration now in power, is for the continuation of a law passed by the Republican Congress in December 1947, during the special session called by the President, to deal with the inflationary threat which either existed or was believed to exist at that time.

I understand fully that this measure extends the present law only for 7 months. If I understood my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] correctly, the 7-month period has been fixed in order to give the Eighty-first Congress time to bring in some sort of new legislative program, presumably to fix upon the American people a new system of controls. I am wondering whether 7 months will be a sufficient length of time for this Congress to pass legislation to control the economy of this Nation? While I would not for one moment question the sincerity or the honesty of the opinion expressed by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], I am of the conviction that perhaps he is in error. I feel rather certain in my own mind that when the 7 months have come and gone there will be no controls placed upon the economy of this country by legislation enacted by the Eighty-first Congress.

In fact, if I might be slightly facetious and yet deadly serious, I might add that if we can judge by that which has occurred thus far, there is grave question whether any legislation will be enacted in this Congress in the next 7 months. I am not unmindful of the fact that after the Eightieth Congress was in session for the first 30 days there were loud cries going up to high heaven that it was a "do-nothing" Congress; that it had not enacted any legislation; that it had failed to keep the promises and pledges which had been made to the people of the country in the campaign of 1946. Well, if the Eightieth Congress was a "do-nothing" Congress I am not at all sure what we can term the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As I recall the debates which took place at the time this measure was before the Eightieth Congress, it was asserted by many on the other side of the aisle, who were complaining of the inadequacy of the measure, that it would not work. Since the enactment of this legislation, my understanding is that it has worked and it has worked well and successfully; that it met the problem insofar as allocation is concerned. Of course, I can conclude nothing other than that it must have been so, by the fact that now we are being asked to extend the very same measure for a period of 7 months.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the distinguished gentleman very much for his remarks. I think they are very apropos. I had intended to refer later to that very same situation. The workings of this law, as the gentleman from Indiana has well pointed out, is proof of the contention of the Republican majority in the Eightieth Congress, and very well demonstrates, that you do not need compulsion or force to get industry and business here in America to cooperate with the Government. I think we can look back over the last few months and be proud of the way we have gradually worked our way out of the many difficulties that resulted from the world's greatest armed conflict. We can look back with much satisfaction to the way in which the free-enterprise system here in America, under a plan set forth and provided by the Eightieth Congress, has met the needs of this Nation for production. In almost every instance distribution of scarce commodities has been made in a fair manner.

I feel that those on the other side of the aisle can strike this particular piece of legislation from the so-called scoreboard of bad legislation passed by "the second worst Congress in the history of the Nation," because, seemingly, they are now agreed that after all the judgment and the wisdom of the Eightieth Congress was excellent in connection with this particular problem. At least they are now ready and willing to keep this legislation on the statute books for 7 months more. I predict that this Congress will never enact compulsory control legislation to take its place.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I have been much interested in the gentleman's statement. In that regard, I would hazard the opinion that there will not even be any extension of voluntary controls at the expiration of the 7 months' period, assuming that the country remains at peace. There has been a lot of talk around here about the Government going into the steel business. I am not so sure but what by the time this 7 months' period expires we may be wondering what to do with the steel then being produced under this free-enterprise system in our country instead of worrying about having the Government go into the business of producing steel.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I find myself very much in agreement with what the gentleman from Indiana has said; and perhaps I might go just a little further to say that if the Truman depression, which now seems to be well under way, goes as far and as deep as many people feel it may, that we will not long be talking about how to control production or how to distribute scarce commodities and products. Instead, we will be, by the time 7 months rolls around, discussing here what we can do to spur on, to implement, and to expand both industrial production and employment in this country, what we can do to give some help and some relief to the hungry. It is a situation we do not talk about very often or very loudly—but we all know that the economic condition of this country, as a result of the mistakes of the administration in power, is not any too good or too healthful. I am glad, therefore, to see that it is the judgment of the majority, at the present moment at least, that it is not wise to introduce any of the so-called mandatory controls legislation, or to establish in this country a controlled economy, as was suggested in the campaign, by the President and others throughout recent months because, as I said in the beginning, the American free-enterprise system has met the situation. Our supply pipe lines, as the gentleman from Indiana has said, have been filled. We already have an overproduction in many lines. It will not be long until we may be worrying with the problem as to how we can get rid of our surpluses, and how we can continue to give employment to those who are now working.

I hope every Member of the House will vote for this legislation. I am very sure every Republican Member will.

In closing, may I say again to those on the majority side that we are grateful to you for your endorsement of your open admission that our legislation was wise and of real benefit to the people of America. By its continuation, as long as conditions remain unsettled, you are acting wisely, and in order to act wisely you have been forced to give your approval to all that has been done in connection with this particular problem by "the second worst Congress in American history."

Mr. Speaker, there are no other requests for time on the minority side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I observe that the former majority leader [Mr. HALLECK] and the present minority leader [Mr. MARTIN] agree with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] that the Eightieth Congress was a great Congress; however, the vast majority of the American people disagreed with these gentlemen in the last election by the tremendous vote that they cast in reelecting our great President who has a great deal of power under this bill. Because of the power that he judiciously exercised the bill actually did work to some extent and some of the things that were feared were not permitted under his guidance and control.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1660) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1660, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that the prolongation of any acrimonious political discussion will be helpful to the consideration of this bill. I accept the compliment of the gentleman from Ohio that I selected the best piece of legislation

passed by the Eightieth Congress for the consideration of this Congress. I do not think anybody contends that there was no good legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress. Even a blind pig sometimes finds an acorn. But, the people by their votes said they condemned the record of the Eightieth Congress. I judge that was the issue in the last election, and I have aways thought the voice of the people was the voice of God. The people are the court of last resort. You have been tried and found wanting. We are at the bar of public opinion now, and I am confident we will make good.

I do not say that in any spirit of harshness to you gentlemen on the other side. Personally I feel kindly toward you, but the people have said you did not do a good job in the Eightieth Congress, and the people are the final arbiters. Now, I hope this controversy will not hurt this very meritorious bill which was passed by the Eightieth Congress and which will be continued, by the resolution offered, to September 30 this year, if passed.

This bill confers on the President the power to make voluntary agreements with industry, business, and agriculture, in the production, distribution, allocation, and transportation of strategic materials in short supply essential to our national economy. Its operation has been successful. Almost all of the voluntary agreements have been with reference to steel and steel products. It has not only helped industry in general but it has been very beneficial to the small businesses, because by the allocations they have obtained materials which they otherwise could not have obtained.

This is interim legislation. It only extends the operation of this act until the end of the first quarter of the next fiscal year. In the meantime I hope that we will have a bill that will meet, so far as legislation can, the conditions that now prevail, an over-all bill, incorporating the President's plans, in which there will be some controls.

I believe this is a democratic process. I believe we should always resort to voluntary actions if mandatory actions can be obviated by reason of that. Obedience is government, and lack of obedience is anarchy and chaos. Men will naturally obey the agreements they voluntarily make. I think this bill is based upon sound principles. It is good for industry and agriculture and business; good for both the producer and consumer if it is honestly and faithfully administered. It has been so administered by President Truman, to whom the authority is delegated.

The bill was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency unanimously, without going into executive session. I understand a similar bill has been passed by the Senate without objection. No witness appeared against the bill in committee and the opinion of the committee was very strongly in favor of the passage of this bill.

It continues the act in effect until the general program can be considered. To continue it to September 30 of this year will give us ample time for that consideration. Perhaps the provisions of this bill will again be considered and placed in that program. All phases of the grave conditions that confront us and the remedy for same must be considered, and it is just to give us time to give proper consideration to this bill that we take this action today.

I do not think it is necessary to go any further into the matter, and I hope the House will unanimously pass this bill.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in committee there was no particular opposition to the continuance of this authority to enter into voluntary agreements.

I might explain that the only reason why any legislation is necessary is that the agreements entered into by industry and business might be in violation of the Clayton and the Sherman Acts if we did not pass legislation to provide that the participants in these agreements should not be subject to the penalties of those acts.

All of the testimony and all of the facts show that the program has been more than reasonably successful. They have been able in conferences and through these agreements to do what otherwise might have been done by mandatory controls. I think the Congress should be quite proud that we did not enact mandatory controls a year ago, that we preserved the free-enterprise system, and that we took one more step away from the socialization of any segment of our industry when we enacted this legislation.

We understand that an issue will be framed later, not only on whether mandatory controls shall be legislated in the field of allocations and priorities to which this particular bill applies, but also on whether price controls and wage controls shall be enacted. As I understand the situation, it is because they expect to introduce such mandatory legislation, which will incorporate the provisions of this bill to all intents and purposes, that this extension is necessary. We will meet the major problem, the basic, fundamental issue of whether we shall socialize American industry, the American economy, when that question is presented to us in the long-range bill. For that reason, and the fact that this program has worked so successfully, there was no opposition whatsoever to the bill on the Republican side of the committee, and I do not believe there should be any opposition to it here on the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Out in our area we have a great deal of trouble every fall in getting enough freight cars and refrigerated cars to carry off our grape crop. Under this act would it be possible, pursuant to section 2 (a), subdivision 1, for the growers to get relief in trying to get the necessary freight cars to haul away their crops?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; the necessity for allocating freight cars was before the committee when we considered this bill last year. That was one of the reasons we enacted the legislation so that they could agree to meet any seasonal emergencies that might exist.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, my father was a Baptist minister. You know we Baptists believe in complete immersion. I recall a day many years ago when I was about 10 or 12 years old, when my father baptized me. We lived next door to the church and on Sunday afternoon, prior to the baptism, I went over to the church all alone and took off my shoes and stockings to test the water to determine whether it was too cold.

When I heard that the Democratic side of this House had introduced this bill, a Republican bill, I wondered if perhaps they were getting some Republican religion. I was reminded of the declaration of principles which the Republican Party adopted at the National Convention. It states that the Republicans believe in a maximum voluntary cooperation between citizens and a minimum dependence upon law, never however declining courageous recourse to law if necessary.

Then as events developed, when I found that this bill was for 7 months' duration only, and as I listened to the gentleman from Ohio a short while ago say that he doubted if any control bills were adopted by this Congress, voluntary or mandatory, I came to the conclusion that after all we must not hope for conversion on the part of our good friends, the Democrats.

As evidence of the fact that we have heard a great deal of conversation and no action on controls I want to point out that the special session last fall was called by the President, at the Democratic National Convention because of the emergency which existed with reference to inflation. At the special session over 100 speeches were made, and articles included, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on price control and inflation.

The Congress has now been in session longer than the special session—not one speech about price control or rationing has been made on the floor of this House or on the floor of the other body. Not one bill has been introduced in this House asking for price control. I ask you gentlemen what has become of the issue of inflation and price control? Was it merely political expediency?

As a matter of fact, I have been waiting expectantly for the charming gentlewoman from California to bring forth her market basket and talk about it, but she has not discussed nor introduced measures concerning price control. So I think we will hear discussion about it but nothing else. This bill is evidence of that fact.

I introduced a similar measure to the bill now under consideration. I introduced it before the Democratic side of the House introduced a bill. I believed it to be a Republican measure and I believed it to be a program upon which we could go to the country and say, "Here is a plan for voluntary cooperation to assist producers to do the job."

I do not believe that this measure will do the job. Why? It cannot do it be-

cause of the termination date. Seven months will not give sufficient time for the producers of these scarce materials to plan and to know what is ahead for them. Therefore, it becomes necessary, in my judgment, to allow additional time in which to continue the voluntary agreements.

In my bill I provided for 2 years so business then might be able to plan their operations for the future.

Voluntary cooperation, therefore, as I see it, is a Republican measure, upon which the Republicans stood in the Eightieth Congress.

Mandatory provisions may be proposed, but in my judgment will not be supported by the Democratic side of the House. Mandatory allocations would further throw industry into greater turmoil, not knowing how to plan in advance, and causing a freezing of production to such an extent that the very aims and objects which we hope to gain will be defeated.

I will vote for this bill because of the voluntary provision. Even with the defect I pointed out, it is better than the incentive-stifling red tape proposed by the Democrats.

In closing I want to say this one thing: We might suggest to the Democratic side of the aisle that they test further the baptismal water; that it is not quite as cold as they think. It is only invigorating. While they have just touched it with this bill they are unwilling to be immersed. We suggest that you Democrats continue along the path of maximum cooperation between individuals and a minimum of reliance upon law, instead of, as you have in the past, a maximum reliance on the law and a minimum cooperation among individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. COLE] has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, as you know, there are no printed hearings on the pending bill available to the Members at this time. Therefore I should like to call attention to two or three points recorded in my personal copy of the typewritten hearings.

I interrogated Secretary of Commerce Sawyer on these points, and I call your particular attention to the replies that were given. I refreshed his memory on the fact that Members were called back in extraordinary session in the late fall of 1947 to consider controls, not of a voluntary sort but controls by force. At that time the then Secretary of Commerce spoke especially about steel, which my distinguished and amiable chairman referred to in his speech a moment ago. Secretary Harriman said at that time that the most difficult problem he had to struggle with was the gray market in steel. Therefore, I interrogated Mr. Sawyer on how the voluntary program which we set up in late 1947 has worked and is working now with reference to the gray market.

I asked him: "What is the situation insofar as the gray market is concerned at the present time?"

Secretary SAWYER. It exists but is disappearing; it is much less.

And he, speaking as a good American citizen, agreed that the only complete answer to a gray market or a black market is adequate production of the commodity involved.

That is the contention the Republican Party has always made.

Then I inquired further about steel production. I wanted to know if our production as of the present time would be sufficient to meet our needs, if we shipped nothing abroad. My question was: "If none at all were shipped abroad would our domestic needs be met?"

Secretary Sawyer replied:

All I can do is to give you mathematics. Our estimate is, as I said a while ago, that production will be 68,000,000 tons. The steel people say tentatively that they think production will be 70,000,000 tons. Our estimate of consumption or demand is 70,000,000 tons. If our estimate of demand and their estimate of production are correct and there is no shipment abroad, the answer to your question is, "Yes."

That reply raises the question: What shall we do about shipments abroad? Historically, the heart of the heavy capital goods industry in Europe has been Germany. I wanted to know whether the dismantling of plants had been stopped and whether progress had been made in steel production there.

Secretary Sawyer said:

Germany produced before the war, I think, 14,000,000 tons of steel a year. Their production is now back to 7,000,000 tons.

Then I wanted to know whether the production of steel is increasing, standing still, or declining, in Germany. Secretary Sawyer replied:

It has been increasing.

Now, then, should the Government of the United States enter into the business of making steel as proposed in the President's message last month at a time when the estimates of the Department of Commerce and the estimates of the steel-producing people show that our needs can be met, if we send nothing abroad? I am not arguing that we should not send any abroad, but steel production abroad is rising; and as my very able colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] said a moment ago, we may soon be worrying about what to do with surplus steel instead of worrying about shortages.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very happy at this hour to be able to report that the voluntary program the Eightieth Congress set up in the fall of 1947 has worked so well—so well, in fact—that the majority party is now ready to embrace it without a single negative vote. It is further evidence that the American people can be led very successfully, but they cannot be driven.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I was a Member of the Eightieth Congress and I remember distinctly when that Congress had under consideration the very legislation which the present resolution proposes to extend for a period of 7 months. The Republicans were in the majority at that time as you gentlemen are in the majority now.

In order to be a guide for our conduct in this session of Congress, it might be well to just go back to that day December 19, 1947, when this very legislation was before the House for consideration. It was proposed by the Republican membership of the House Banking and Currency Committee. It was most violently opposed by the minority, led by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky who now chairmans that committee.

Listen to what the gentleman said. From the RECORD of December 19, 1947, I am quoting the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky with respect to the legislation that was then before the House, and which is the identical legislation before the House today:

Mark Twain said, "The weather is always discussed at length, but nothing is ever done about it." That is the attitude in which this Congress finds itself now. The discussion of this bill is mere conversation. It will have no effect. The die is cast.

The same gentleman is here today asking us to vote an extension of that very bill for a period of 7 months. He was ably supported in that attitude by some other Democratic Members. I remember especially the statement made by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] which appears on page 11733 of that same day's RECORD. This is what he said after a long discussion of the bill:

Mr. Chairman, this bill—Senate Joint Resolution 167—is a fraud and a hoax on the American people. It will no more stop the tides of inflation than Canute could have stopped the waves of the sea.

I wonder what the gentleman from Montana will say with respect to this legislation before the House today that he condemned in such violent language in the Eightieth Congress.

A gentleman who carried the laboring oar in that debate was my very distinguished friend from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. Listen to what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] said about the legislation then pending and which you are now asked to extend for a period of 7 months without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i":

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, aside from the label on this bill, which for some strange reason is called an anti-inflation bill there is very little good in the bill. I agree with my colleagues who have said it will have absolutely no effect on the present skyrocketing cost of living. It is sold to the country on that basis; it is completely a misnomer.

This bill is a straw man.

Therefore, you are not putting anything genuinely effective in the bill that we could not do here in 5 minutes when the House is in regular session.

You are sending Caspar Milquetoast out to combat the giant of inflation. You might as well know that the bill was doomed to failure in controlling inflation so far as the public is concerned before it was ever brought out.

And so I could go through the record of debates from what gentlemen on the

minority side, now the majority, thus described the bill that was presented to the Eightieth Congress, the identical bill which you are now asked to extend for a period of 7 months.

Is it not a very sad commentary upon the thinking of our people that in debates here on the floor of Congress we become so politically inspired in our thinking that we are sometimes unable to see the truth when it stands right up in front of us. If this bill was so bad on December 19, 1947, I wonder what has happened in the meantime to make it so good that the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee comes in and asks for a unanimous vote on both sides in support of this legislation? Is it not a fact, my friends, that when you were damning that legislation presented by the Eightieth Congress you were simply building a foundation to which you could make reference in the oncoming campaign, and thus mislead the American people as to at least one thing that the Eightieth Congress did in its efforts to stop inflation? Now, if the fires of inflation are still burning as vigorously as was described by you gentlemen when that bill was under consideration in the Eightieth Congress, what are you doing about it? You have been here for a month. You brought nothing in here but to ask for the extension of the bill you so vigorously denounced when the Republican Eightieth Congress brought it to your attention.

Oh, it is a little different story today than it was when you were out in the hustings arguing and speaking and making political speeches telling the American people what you are going to do to stop the rise of prices. Now those prices are coming down just as we told you they would at that time when this legislation was under consideration. You now find that the things you then advocated are no longer necessary. You now find that the things you talked about in the campaign have not come to pass. The chickens are coming home to roost. Thank God they are resting on your doorstep today.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. The thought just suggested itself to me—I am a freshman Congressman—that perhaps because we do have a Democratic majority in both Houses that big, bad business has decided to be good and has begun to cut the prices down and that we have a sufficient club over their heads; that if they do not be good we can enact probably the very necessary legislation which will make bad business good.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, the club that you are raising over their heads is the old man Milquetoast that was so beautifully described by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. That is not very much of a club to hold over anybody's head, and you are not kidding anybody, and you are not ultimately going to kid the American people, and that sort of an argument will not have very much of an appeal, in my humble judgment, even in the minds of business or in the minds of the American people. They will get smart after awhile when they read the record of these proceedings and see that you are now again advocating the very remedy that the Republican Eightieth Congress wrote on the statute books over your violent protests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST].

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to get into a political discussion on this issue.

I am for the resolution. I think it should be passed. I do not think that it has accomplished in every way all that was hoped for when the bill was passed. Certainly it has not accomplished all that its most ardent sponsors had hoped for. I rise at this time simply to say to the Committee on Banking and Currency that I hope in the 7 months ahead during which this act will be in operation, that this committee will give particular attention to the effect of this plan with reference to the small-business operator who desires and needs steel for his operations. I have had a great many complaints from small operators. I have not had the opportunity to investigate whether all these complaints are justified. I know in one case in my own State in which a manufacturer of milk cans, a very important item to the agricultural economy of that area, has been unable to get steel for the manufacture of his product. I know of several other instances that have come to my attention, and I have investigated sufficiently to be convinced, in a way, that this program, perhaps, has been too much dominated by the large operators.

I am aware of the fact that perhaps any voluntary plan eventually will run into that sort of difficulty but I do hope the committee will give some attention, as a follow-up to the passage of this bill today, to the effect that it may have on the small operator who has been unable in many instances to get a proper allocation of steel.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman could tell us just how soon the Committee on Banking and Currency is going to bring out a new OPA bill.

Mr. PRIEST. I will have to refer my distinguished friend to the members of the committee.

Mr. HALLECK. There were a lot of promises along that line made during the campaign, and recent messages have indicated quite a bit of favorable opinion, apparently, on the gentleman's side of the aisle for a revival of OPA. I know a lot of small-business men who would look upon that as the last straw. I hope the committee takes that into consideration, too.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure this great committee will take that into consideration and will dispose of it in a way that will be in the public interest. I feel that we can place full confidence in the committee in that respect.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did it not take the other side a very long time last year to get out even this "milquetoast" proposition?

Mr. PRIEST. I recall it was very near Christmas.

Another situation developed very recently in my own State in connection with an agreement entered into under the terms of this act for steel allocation that not only affects a vital industry in that State, but also affects the national security, because it is related to some developments at Oak Ridge, Tenn. Up to this time the allocation under the voluntary-agreement plan has not been carried out in this case. I do not care to go into details on the matter, because it is purely a local matter, but I simply take this time to urge the committee to look into this situation as we go into the months ahead to see if it might be possible for a little more attention to be given to the needs of small operators who need steel, and who are not worried at all about what we might do with the surplus, as was suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

They are worried about getting some plan that would give them steel to keep their plants operating today so that they can carry on their legitimate business, meet their pay rolls, and prosper to some degree.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten us as to the present thinking of the committee, as to whether or not we need ceilings on prices more than we need floors under prices.

Mr. PRIEST. The gentleman knows, of course, that I am not a member of this great committee, and I would not presume to attempt to enlighten anybody about the thinking of this committee. I am sure members of that committee are doing some thinking.

Mr. Chairman, all of us, I am sure, desire voluntary allocations in preference to compulsory controls, so long as the public interest is protected and no segment of our economy is unduly burdened. I do not question the good faith generally of the industry in carrying out the voluntary allocations program. But I repeat that the Congress must be diligent and vigilant in guarding against domination of such a program by the larger operators at the expense of small business.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That subsection (b) of section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress (61 Stat. 945), is hereby amended by striking out "March 1, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1949."

Subsection (f) of said section 2 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) This section shall expire on September 30, 1949, and any requests made and voluntary plans adopted under this section shall have no force or effect thereafter."

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments?

There being no amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1660) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, pursuant to House Resolution 73, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2, of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans, and that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I assume the Senate bill is identical to the House bill?

Mr. SPENCE. It is identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That subsection (b) of section 2 of Puolic Law 395, Eightieth Congress (61 Stat. 945), is hereby amended by striking out "March 1, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30, 1949."

Subsection (f) of said section 2 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) This section shall expire on September 30, 1949, and any requests made and voluntary plans adopted under this section shall have no force or effect thereafter."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 1660, was passed were vacated and that bill was laid on the table.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 74 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 74 makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 128 which was reported out of the Committee on Agriculture. In brief, it would make it possible in the allocation of cotton acreage in 1950, if the Secretary of Agriculture saw fit, to exercise his authority to require cotton quotas so that whatever cotton was planted in 1949 would not be considered in the historical background upon which quotas are based.

In other words, the purpose of this bill is simply to say that if it becomes necessary to impose quotas in the future, as the Secretary of Agriculture has the power to do, that the cotton planted and produced in 1949 will not be considered in that allocation. The question of the merits of the allocation program is not involved. The purpose of this bill is to discourage, as I understand it, the production of cotton in 1949. I am informed by those who have the statistics at hand that there will be an approximate carry-over of 6,000,000 bales of cotton this year. Those who make a study of this problem and whose responsibility it is are apprehensive that if this bill is not enacted into law there will be a great rush on the part of the cotton farmers throughout this country to plant cotton this year in order to secure their proper quota when and if quotas are invoked by the Secretary of Agriculture.

So it merely has as its purpose a deterrent to increased production of cotton in 1949.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. When is cotton planted? I am sorry to say I do not know.

Mr. COLMER. Cotton planting, of course, varies in the various sections of the country. Ordinarily, in a few weeks in the South the farmers will begin to prepare to plant their cotton.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the great authority on cotton, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. From the lower Rio Grande, reports are that they are planting now.

Mr. COLMER. Of course, the gentleman is very familiar with the facts. Cotton is produced on the west coast also, in California, and down in the Rio Grande, as was pointed out by the gentleman, and they are now beginning to plant there.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Would this be a deterrent to increased planting if it is passed immediately?

Mr. COLMER. That is the purpose of the legislation, as I understand it. In other words, it is to prevent increased production of cotton and an additional carry-over, with the possible resultant necessity for the Government, under the support-price program, to purchase this additional cotton.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] is necessarily detained and has asked me to handle the time on this side in his absence, there being no other member of the Rules Committee present at the moment. I may say there are no requests for time on this side, and if the gentleman is prepared to move the previous question, we can proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE], member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I speak at this time with the hope that I may clarify in my own mind, and in the minds of many of my colleagues, the issue or issues involved in passage of H. R. 128. This measure had the unanimous consent of the Committee on Agriculture after hearings and consideration. That alone, of course, is persuasive of favorable consideration.

Its introduction by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] resulted in much confusion, uneasiness, and uncertainty upon the part of many farmers throughout the Nation. They were not able to anticipate its effect upon them and their plans for the future. I can well understand this confusion and uncertainty. The most casual investigation will convince anyone that few people of the United States, including the trained experts of the Department of Agriculture and the able and qualified members of the Committee on Agriculture, are able to predict and anticipate with any degree of certainty, the effect this legislation will have upon the cotton industry.

In order to cast an intelligent vote upon it, and to be able to explain its effect to the farmers of my district, I have spent these past several days in a sincere effort to analyze it. One thing, and one thing only, can be said with any degree of certainty about this measure; that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 will not be considered in the future for marketing and quota provisions in the event of the invocation of restrictions by the Secretary of Agriculture. Outside of that, no one can say what this legislation means.

I am sure that all of you will agree that the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and subsequent amendments, and particularly the marketing quota provisions of such act, are difficult for the average one of us to understand.

The passage of H. R. 128 and its subsequent interpretation, based upon the present Agricultural Adjustment Act, will, unquestionably, work hardship upon many famers in south and west Texas, in California and New Mexico and Arizona.

During the past years and presently, thousands of acres of land that have heretofore not been subject to cultivation have been cleared, broken, and put into farm lands. It is my judgment that such farms and farmers by this act will be placed out of competition with farmers and farms which grew cotton prior to and since 1942. However, to add confusion to an already confused situation, I am reliably informed that this measure, H. R. 128, cannot be interpreted in relation to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and amendments, for the reason that this basic act will be changed before 1950, and that a new system for acreage allotment and marketing and quota provisions will be enacted.

I cannot question the necessity for a national plan for the influencing of, if not the control of production and marketing of a product such as cotton, which so vitally affects our entire economy. The large surpluses now on hand and those which may reasonably be anticipated as a result of the 1949 harvest, are dangerously large and will inevitably affect the future price of cotton. The costs of producing cotton per acre have increased out of proportion to its basic price and a material drop in the basic price of cotton would be a great shock to the industry and to our economy. There must be, of course, some intelligent manner of keeping a reasonable balance of production and use. None of us would care to go back to the memorable days when the price of cotton put many of us on starvation incomes. I can personally remember the days when cotton sack was difficult to sell for 5 or 6 cents a yard and farmers had difficulty in buying overalls at 98 cents a pair.

Nevertheless, I would caution against hasty consideration of any legislation so vitally affecting so many of our people. Particularly would I be hesitant to enact any legislation which would discourage young farmers and new farmers from entering into the great field of agriculture. The future, not only of our own country, but that of the world, may well depend upon a vital, progressive, and prosperous agricultural economy in America. Millions of acres of new land must be considered in any long-range agricultural program. It would not be wise, in my judgment, to enact legislation which would freeze out new farmers for the protection of the old, and which would make it impossible for young farmers to compete with those who have been in business longer. Nor would it be wise, in my judgment, to penalize progress.

During the past 18 or 20 years, cotton has materially declined in the economy of Texas. This resulted from many factors. From 1930 to 1940 in Texas, harvested acreage of cotton dropped to approximately 50 percent, from approximately 17,000,000 acres to 8,500,000 acres. In 1946 we harvested approximately 6,000,000 acres of cotton. It is interesting to note, however, that the value of the cotton crop harvested on the 6,000,000 acres in 1946 was considerably higher, by $100,000,000, than that crop harvested off of 16,000,000 acres in 1930. The production of cotton in Texas has been discouraged. The cost became high, the labor scarce, and it was thought in the interest of our economy, State and national, to divert our land to other uses. During the war, and subsequently, we have attempted to produce on our farms a great diversity of crops more vital and necessary to the Nation generally than cotton. We do not anticipate a return to the kingship of cotton, for it would not be good business. We do not feel, however, that we should be placed out of competition by legislation.

There were many farms in south Texas, comprising thousands of acres, that produced cotton prior to the war but which have been better utilized for other crops. Many of them have valuable equipment, suitable for cotton farming. The passage of this act will say to them, "You will be relegated to not more than 2 percent of the State acreage allotment in the event restrictions are put into effect by the Secretary of Agriculture in 1950 under provisions of the present Agriculture Adjustment Act." It will say to the farmers who have put in new land, subsequent to the war, and many of them are veterans, "If you have not planted cotton, you cannot compete with those who have."

The committee amendment has some saving grace. The amendment which reads, "Provided, That any farm on which cotton was not planted in 1947 or 1948—or regarded as planted in 1947 under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, because of the production of war crops or of serving in the armed forces of the United States—shall be regarded as having a 1948 planted acreage equal to the 1942 farm acreage allotment" will make it possible for farms which were alloted cotton acreage in 1942 to be considered old growers if they have grown war crops.

At this point I wish to quote the regulations promulgated in March 1945, by the Department of Agriculture pursuant to Public Law 12:

War crop determination for the protection of cotton allotments: That in establishing cotton-acreage allotments under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for any farm for which a cotton-acreage allotment was established for the 1942 crop, if the total acreage of war crops grown on the farm during 1945 or any subsequent year during the present emergency is in excess of the total acreage of war crops grown on the farm in 1941, the cotton production history for the farm for any such year will not be considered as representative of the normal history of the farm and the farm will be considered as one on which cotton was planted in such year. For the purpose of this determination, the following are designated as war crops: Soybeans for beans, peanuts picked and threshed, flax for seed, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, dry edible beans, grain sorghums, sugar beets, sugarcane, rice, tomatoes for processing, peas for processing, snap beans for processing, sweet corn for processing, oats, barley, sweet sorghums, Sudan grass, biennial and perennial legumes, and mixtures containing biennial and perennial legumes.

In connection with this the Department of Agriculture tells me that it will be a man-sized job to determine war crops in relation to cotton and acreage allotment under provisions of the old act, and this amendment we are considering today, for they have little or no history of the war crops. They had not anticipated the problem of considering war crops in cotton acreage allotment under restrictions.

I call these matters to your attention that you may know how difficult it is for you to make an intelligent decision on this present measure. I am sure the Committee on Agriculture had in mind that the immediate passage of H. R. 128, as amended, would discourage the planting of cotton in 1949 and would, therefore, lower the surplus that is accumulating. Notwithstanding the great respect I have for their judgment, I question this conclusion. Acreage will be planted in cotton in 1949, in my judgment, in the relation to the prospects for a profit. The price of cotton will, in large measure, control the amount of acreage planted. Because of the lack of storage for grain last year, many farmers became disgusted with the program of loans and support prices on grain, which were not available without adequate storage, and are turning again to cotton.

Planting is beginning in south Texas. The Department of Agriculture has not announced a support price program for grain. No adequate provisions have been made for storage. We do not know what to anticipate. Many are returning to the basic crop of cotton.

This legislation will not discourage their planting cotton. It will penalize them if they had no farm history as of 1942, or have not subsequently planted cotton.

I have no more intelligent solution to the problem, and consequently I cannot ask you to follow my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] and me in voting against the passage of the bill, but I did feel that I should, as intelligibly as I could, call your attention to the difficulty of reaching an intelligent decision upon this important measure.

It is quite possible that a completely new basic law will erase much of the hardship, or, perhaps I should say, much of the apparent restriction that this measure will place upon growing and expanding communities and upon farms and farmers who have diverted their acreage to crops more needed than cotton.

I shall not oppose the rule, but I do find it necessary to vote against the passage of the measure because of the uncertainty of its effect and because of its seeming discrimination against a large part of south Texas.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 128 to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be

used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 128, with Mr. MONRONEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY]

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, the issue involved in this bill is one that requires hasty action, which, in part, accounts for your Committee on Agriculture, reporting the same as its first bill in this Congress. It is supported by a unanimous vote of the Committee. I think it well to bring to your attention certain facts which make it imperative that the bill pass.

During 1948 there were 23,300,000 acres of land in the United States planted to cotton. This acreage produced one of the largest crops in history. The crop was so large that by August 1 this year it is estimated that the carry-over will approach 6,000,000 bales. You might say that we will have a 6,000,000-bale surplus. Controls and quotas were barely averted for 1949. It is the opinion of almost every one connected with the cotton industry that quotas will be invoked next year.

If quotas are invoked next year the allotment of acreage will, under the present law, be based upon the acreage which the individual cotton farmers put to cotton during the preceding years, that is, 1947, 1948, and 1949. It is only natural that every farmer desires to have the largest allotment possible. In order to secure the largest allotment possible he would be inclined to plant cotton this year, as the saying goes, "up to the doorsteps." If that should happen, then the 1949 crop would undoubtedly add several million bales to the present surplus, and that would leave cotton under a burden similar to that which existed before the war. The effect of overplanting this year would be disastrous.

So, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is simply to discourage overplanting in 1949. Even though the bill becomes law, it is the opinion of the cotton experts around the country that cotton acreage this year will show some increase over 1948. This of itself could and might add to the surplus. If the bill should not become law the acreage will be further increased. So, it is our responsibility to discourage, as much as possible, overplanting in 1949, and this bill will do just that.

We realize that the bill on its face appears to work a hardship against the man in the new brushland areas of my distinguished colleague from Texas, Mr. LYLE. His problem is with regard to land upon which a single stalk of cotton has never been planted. It is new land. But already we have too much cotton land. That is the very thing we have tried so hard to get away from throughout the last 15 years. More and more cotton land does not solve cotton's problem of surplus production. It only aggravates the situation. On the other hand, the present law provides that 2 percent must be set aside for allotments to new land. I am sure that this or a similar provision will be retained in the new quota law, if one is written. Furthermore, under any program which might be hereafter adopted the great State of Texas will receive approximately 7,500,000 acres of cotton land, which is a third or more than will be allotted to all remaining cotton States. Based on a 7,500,000-acre allotment, 150,000 acres will be set aside in Texas for new land. I sincerely believe this will care for the new-land problem out there. I have a very high regard for my distinguished and able colleague from Texas. So do the other members of my committee. None of us would want to do him or his constituents the slightest injustice. We respect his opinions and views and I personally wish to give assurance that I will work with him on this problem, which I know is an important one to him.

Cotton faces a very sick economy. We are trying to do something about the situation before it is too late. We are compelled to view the situation in the light of what is best for all cotton growers, not just a few but all of them—whether they be old, new or would-be growers. Cotton's present position approaches that of 1937 when almost every grower in the belt planted cotton "up to his doorsteps" and produced a surplus which would never have been disposed of had the war not come on. We learned our lesson in 1937. At least, I thought we did. With the unexpected and most undesirable help of a war, cotton's economy has improved. But God forbid that we should ever again be forced to endure similar experiences.

This bill has the support of the Department of Agriculture, the American Farm Bureau, the National Grange, the Farmers Union, the cotton industry in general and cotton farmers in general. It is further supported by a unanimous vote of the Agriculture Committee. It is in the interest of the cotton farmer in general. If it were not, certainly someone on our committee would have dissented.

The cotton farmer is again at the cross roads. It will not profit him anything to repeat what happened in 1937. He can very easily produce another very large crop in 1949 but what will it profit him without a price? You can help him by passing this bill. By the bill, we simply ask you to eliminate 1949 acreage planted to cotton in determining allotments in future years should quotas be invoked. By so doing you will remove the incentive and the desire which now prevail to overplant in 1949 in order to have a larger historical base for determining future acreage allotments. The bill is short, simple, and treats all growers alike. You will be doing them a favor by voting "aye."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. I think it is a bill which serves a useful purpose at this time. It is thought, and I think with good reason, that because of the possibility of cotton quotas and acreage allotments within another year or two, a great many farmers might be tempted to expand their acreage this year beyond what they otherwise would contemplate planting. It is a very natural thing to do. The purpose, of course, would be to insure that they have a base for future allotments and quotas which would be in line with that secured by their neighbors. The committee felt that in view of these considerations and the fact that it is not desirable to increase cotton acreage this year, that the bill should be passed. I do not see a need for any prolonged discussion of it, because it is a rather simple bill, easily explained, and easily understood. I shall, therefore, not take any further time.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I trust that this bill will be enacted into law. In the year 1948, cotton planting amounted to 23,000,000 acres of land. The testimony before our committee has been to the effect that there would be some 12 to 15 percent or more increase in planted acreage to cotton in the crop year 1949. That being the case, there would be an estimated 15,100,000 bales of cotton produced in 1949.

If this bill is enacted into law, it is believed by many that a large number of farmers who anticipate planting in 1949 would not do so because they would feel that it would not in any way give them a high base for their 1950 crop year and for the years ahead. To say the least, cotton farmers throughout the belt would probably reduce their cotton acreage in 1949 if this legislation is enacted.

In 1937 the cotton farmer was cut loose, free to plant as much as he saw fit to plant in acreage to cotton. As a result of that, there were produced in America in that year 19,000,000 bales of cotton. It took the cotton farmer almost 10 years and a world war to get rid of the surplus that accumulated as a result of such excessive planting.

This is a great psychological move, but speed is essential because of the fact that, as has been stated here in debate on the rule, they have already started planting cotton this year in the Rio Grande Valley. I hope and trust the bill will pass without a single vote against it.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TACKETT. Should it become necessary to place a quota on cotton in 1950, what years would be used upon which to base the quota?

Mr. GATHINGS. That matter is now under most serious consideration. The Subcommittee on Cotton of the Committee on Agriculture is holding hearings at this time. It will be another few days before those hearings will be concluded. Then the committee will go into executive session and consider the years that will be placed in the base period for the 1950 crop year and the years ahead of 1950.

Mr. TACKETT. Is there a law in existence at this time which would govern such controls, should it become necessary to have controls? That is, would the 3 years prior to 1950, excluding 1949, be considered under the present law?

Mr. GATHINGS. It is going to be necessary to revamp that law, because under the law now on the statute books, the 1938 Triple A Act and the amendments thereto, the farmers could not plant less than 27,000,000 acres to cotton. If that were to happen, of course, the surplus would just be insurmountable. We would not know now just exactly how to answer the gentleman's question until the committee has concluded the hearings and has gone into executive session to determine the years that should be used.

Mr. TACKETT. Is it possible that the larger cotton farmers within the States of Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and the other States that raise a considerable amount of cotton, could have foreseen the possibility of the enactment of this bill so as to give them a break under the controls by virtue of knowing that 1948 cotton-crop acreage would be used as a basis?

Mr. GATHINGS. I do not believe the gentleman should be disturbed. Nineteen hundred and forty-eight is a very good year to consider, because then it was wide open. The farmer could do what he wanted to do. He could plant or he could not plant. The man who is already established in the cotton business, who has his implements, his labor for cotton-production purposes, his seed, and is ready to go, of course, should be continued in the business of planting cotton.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wanted to state that the pending proposal to exclude the 1949 cotton acreage from future calculations comes to the House with the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture, the recommendation of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Farmers' Union. It was unanimously reported out by the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 128, as now presented to the House, has asked that the 1949 cotton crop not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year. It is realized that one of the reasons for the initiation of this bill is that the growers will not feel obliged to plant all their land in cotton this year in order to assure themselves of a good cotton allotment on their land in future years, as the allotment would be based perhaps on several years' average. I think the purpose of the bill is a most commendable one, but I believe that the manner in which it tries to achieve its objective can result in serious inequities unless, in the final agricultural bill which is presented to Congress, allowances are made to provide fair allotments to these men who have not planted cotton before. If this bill becomes the law without this session of Congress and the final agricultural bill making allowances for these new cotton farmers, then these men who have recently cleared and put into use for production lands of Texas would be seriously penalized in future years. It is difficult to evaluate the full significance of this bill at this time without knowing on what basis future quotas will be based. I have been told by members of the Agriculture Committee that efforts will be made to see that these new cotton farms receive equitable allotments, and if such is done, then the present bill would be beneficial in discouraging a large crop this year. We already have almost a 6,000,000,000-bale surplus carry-over from last year.

At the encouragement and recommendation of the United States Government many returning war veterans of south Texas have taken lands of very low economic value and at a high cost have cleared the brush and put them into cultivation to grow cotton and feed crops. On return from the service, it took some time for these young men to become adjusted, to establish themselves, and then, after they had purchased this land, it was a long and arduous process clearing off mesquite and ebony trees to put it into shape where it was suitable for cotton growing. Many of them have just accomplished this in the past year, and 1949 will be the first cotton crop they have planted on this land. Their improvement of this land has taken property that was on the tax rolls at values of $2 and $3 and increased their valuations tremendously, resulting in immense benefit to the counties and the State of Texas. Many of these young men have incurred heavy debts and mortgages so they were able to purchase this land. Much of this land has been cleared by their own labor in order that they might provide themselves with an agricultural livelihood and help produce materials and food for a hungry world. Thousands of tenants and small farmers have also made this move, now to see this dry land with its limited uses further restricted by law which would seriously curtail any cotton quota that they might obtain, say in the year 1950.

Probably an attempt will be made to, in part, take care of these new farms by setting aside for example a 2 percent of the Nation's quota for such new lands, and this 2 percent to be allocated by the county bureaus, but because of the large number of acres that have been cleared in south Texas, west Texas, and many of the Western States, I believe that this 2 percent will be inadequate.

It is my hope that this percentage will be increased to 3 or 4 percent, which would take relatively little away from the quotas of the old cotton growers but would greatly increase the quotas for new cotton farmers. If the Agriculture Committee is determined to keep this at a figure of 2 percent, then I think that this percentage, and its allocation, should be administered from Washington, and that those States in the Southeast who do not use their full part of the 2 percent, having insufficient new lands, that the balance of their 2 percent will be applied to States such as Texas and other Western States where they will probably have more than 2 percent set aside for new lands. Unless this is done, new farms could easily obtain quotas far below the county average.

As further assistance in making a fair distribution of the cotton quota, I believe a 10 percent of the State quota should be set aside in each State to be administered by a State agency as a bank to be given to those counties which have increased their production and taking it from those counties which have decreased their production, thereby giving consideration to trends in cotton planting. Many counties of central and east Texas have decreased their cotton planting and would perhaps receive higher quotas than the land that they were actually planting to cotton and this quota could be distributed to counties such as we have in the fifteenth district who have materially increased their planting to cotton.

I believe consideration should be given to States which find that they can more efficiently and economically produce cotton and who have been increasing their acreage. Otherwise, you will find that anything similar to our old system of quotas will perpetuate inefficient and uneconomical growth of cotton in some States in the Union at the expense of those areas which can produce it at less cost and more efficiently. The objective of the Government should be to encourage these people who cannot efficiently and economically produce cotton to gradually turn to other crops to which they are more adapted.

It is not my purpose to see these people economically dislocated and their quotas drastically slashed, but I definitely believe that the eventual net decrease in cotton quotas, as set by the Government to maintain an economical price support, should be the same for all areas, regardless of whether they are old or new cotton-producing areas.

If 1949 is not allowed in future cotton quotas and the cotton-quota law, as yet to be drafted, does not provide a means of giving them quotas substantially up to the county average, it will bankrupt a number of men, including many World War II veterans who are planting new lands to cotton this year for the first time, since they would have their cotton allotment appreciably decreased in 1950. Much of this new land cannot be profitably farmed unless a large percentage of it is planted to cotton. Passage of the bill in its present form could result in favoritism for the benefit of cotton-growing States at the expense of those veterans who were fighting overseas and have only recently returned to enter farming.

I make this statement as a word of caution and a request that if the bill is adopted in its present form that then, certainly, some means should be set up along the lines I have suggested to protect those States and veterans who have materially increased their cotton acreage.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding the provisions of title III of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotments for cotton for any year after 1949 shall be computed without regard to acreage planted to cotton in 1949.

With the following committee amendment:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotments and yields for cotton for any year after 1949 shall be computed without regard to yields or to the acreage planted to cotton in 1949: *Provided*, That any farm on which cotton was not planted in 1947 or 1948 (or regarded as planted in 1947 under Public Law 12, 79th Cong., because of the production of war crops or of serving in the armed forces of the United States) shall be regarded as having a 1948 planted acreage equal to the 1942 farm acreage allotment.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONRONEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 22 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of 10 Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of the problems of small business, existing, arising, or that may arise, with particular reference to (1) whether the potentialities of small business are being adequately developed and, if not, what factors have hindered and are hindering the normal operation of established small business and/or its development and enterprise; (2) whether agencies, departments of the Government or Government owned or controlled corporations are properly, adequately, or equitably serving the needs of small business; (3) whether small business is being treated fairly and the public welfare properly and justly served through the allotments of valuable materials in which there are shortages, in the granting of priorities or preferences in the use, sales, or purchase of said materials; and (4) the need for a sound program for the solution of the postwar problems of small business.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to borrow from Government departments and agencies such special assistants, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, strike out "10" and insert "more."

Page 3, line 6, insert the words "The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Speaker, this resolution reestablishes a select committee that has rendered valuable services in the past to the country and to the House. In view of the service rendered and the need for legislation to protect, safeguard, and aid small business, the Speaker and the minority leader entered into an agreement which is in conformity with the amended resolution and provides for a select committee of nine members.

The Small Business Committee has been in existence since 1941 or 1942. During these years they have penetrated many, many matters which tend to protect small business from being completely eliminated and absorbed by the various large industrial organizations. I was pleased with the work which that committee rendered 4 or 5 years ago, which, due to its splendid investigation, resulted in action by the Department of Justice against one of those large chain stores, the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which was found guilty of violating the law to the disadvantage of the small-business men by receiving rebates and discounts that were not forthcoming to the small-business men and which inured to the benefit of them. What applies to that concern applies to many of the other chain stores and the mail-order houses. Between those two groups the small-business man is gradually being forced out of existence.

This committee has been endeavoring to the best of its ability to bring about the elimination of the special favors that are granted to and are taken advantage of by these large corporations and industrialists, of course mainly controlled from Wall Street, to the disadvantage of local people and the small-business men. I am therefore in favor of this resolution to create this committee. I am in favor of having it continue the splendid work it started years ago. It should not hesitate for one moment to investigate the biggest and most powerful violators of decency and justice; and I hope it will do so. As you have observed and are aware, this committee threw the light of publicity on the gray market in steel. I do not know why they call it gray because it has been and is the blackest of all black markets that I know of. The steel trust for nearly 2 years, notwithstanding the efforts of the committee and Congress to insure fair distribution of raw materials, allocated steel only to their favored few, to the disadvantage of the small manufacturer, thereby forcing many of them out of business. Not only that, but where a small manufacturer had contracts to fulfill and was obliged to obtain steel, he was held up by the black marketeers controlled by the steel trust to such extent that he was obliged to pay from $250 to $275 a ton for steel that originally sold for only $60 or $75 a ton. I have heard of cases where they were obliged to pay $300 a ton. Outrageous. And what applies to the steel trust and steel companies has been practiced by many other manufacturers. I hope that such practices will be prevented in the future and that this committee, though it has no legislative power, will shortly recommend legislation that will stop these abuses that are destroying the independent and small merchant and businessmen in our Nation.

I am of the opinion that notwithstanding the terrific load of these mail-order houses and the chain stores that control nearly 80 percent of the business, whose profits have been tremendous, and who have accumulated great surpluses in their Wall Street vaults and banks, that this committee will not hesitate to continue to ferret out abuses on the part of these men and corporations; that it will recommend legislation and that the Congress will pass such legislation as will safeguard the interests of the little fellow, the small country merchant. Just look at it. These big houses have hundreds, yes, thousands of stores. They spend millions of dollars a year for advertising in all the magazines and newspapers. A small business having one store or two stores cannot compete with them. We have aided and still are aiding these mail-order houses to the tune of nearly $200,000,000 a year by absorbing the actual cost of mail transportation on their catalogs and the cost of mail transportation of newspapers and magazines in which they advertise.

I have urged legislation which would force these people to pay the fair mailing cost of their catalogs and other

advertising in these magazines. So far I have not succeeded in my efforts, but I shall not give up. I shall continue. I am going to ask the committee, in which I have confidence, to see to it that the contribution on the part of the Government to these corporations, an avaricious group, ceases immediately and that we make them pay for the transportation of their catalogs, magazines, and newspapers, and thereby, to some extent at least, protect the little fellows all over the Nation. This should be done without undue delay because, as it is, every year thousands of these small and independent businessmen are being driven out of business because of these concerns and because the big Steel Trust and other raw-material dealers or producers play favorites and refuse to furnish the little manufacturer raw materials, allocating them to a favored few to the disadvantage of the many little fellows.

Mr. Speaker, I favor the pending resolution. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as I am sure the Members of the House who have been here some time know, as an individual, I have long had a great and active interest in the problems of small business. It is an interest that arises very naturally, I think, from the desire of all right-thinking people in the country to preserve and protect the interests of small business—recognizing, as we do, the importance of small business in the economic and industrial structure of our country.

I hope my friends on the other side of the aisle will indulge me when I say that my personal interest and the interest of those on our side of the aisle were expressed in the early fall of 1941 when, under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who is now our minority leader, we created a small-business committee made up of members on our side of the aisle. This committee of 20 was charged with the responsibility of doing what it could to protect and promote the interests of small business. I was very proud to be named chairman of that committee.

I well recall some of the meetings we had in Indianapolis, Ind., Columbus, Ohio, New York State, and various other places, where we heard from the small-business people themselves something of their problems and their recommendations as to what they thought the Government might do. At that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who has himself had a long-time interest in the problems of small business, and being then in the majority party, as he is today, introduced a resolution for the creation of a small-business committee. I joined with him in bringing about the adoption of that resolution. I argued for it on the floor. I was happy at its adoption. I was happy that thereupon the leadership on my side of the aisle appointed me to serve on that committee as the ranking Republican member.

I well recall those very difficult days when we were getting into the war effort and those of us who were familiar with the situation saw that the interests of small business were not being properly protected and promoted, and that for the maximum war effort the capacities of small business needed to be utilized. We saw the effect of the war effort on small business all across the land and we worked diligently and energetically, and I think with wisdom, to help solve those problems. I think the committee did contribute much to their solution.

In my experience on the committee—and I shall not take any issue with any of the things that have been said by my dear friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who expressed here quite forcibly some contentions that he has about certain types of business organizations in the country—I have never prejudged any of them and I do not intend to prejudge them now. I do not think that it is necessary in order to protect and promote the interest of small business that anyone in a somewhat larger business needs to be destroyed just because he is big. Certainly it is well within the province of the Congress of the United States, charged, as we are, with promoting the best interests of the Nation as a whole, that we work along as best we can in the determination of all these problems and not engage in witch hunts, or in the promotion of any particular prejudice against any activity that any one of us might have, but rather as in a forum in which the small-business men of the country may make their voices heard and their influence felt. And then, of course, we should follow up that action with any sort of legislative action or advice to administrative agencies that might seem to be proper under the circumstances.

So, I am glad to add my voice today to those who urge favorable action on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana has correctly stated the history of the Small Business Committee. The Small Business Committee was organized in the House about a week before Pearl Harbor in 1941. Very soon thereafter we realized the plight of small businesses in trying to get war contracts. A very few concerns were getting the contracts. At this time we have a huge national defense program going on. It is necessary that some agency of our Government be charged with the duty and the responsibility of seeing that small concerns are given a fair opportunity to obtain the contracts that they are capable of filling. That will be one of the objects of this committee, as I understand it.

Next, the sources of credit in this country are drying up. Small business cannot borrow money like it could have in the past to go into business initially or to extend or operate after going into business. Something should be done about that. Recommendations should be made and possibly laws should be passed.

Another reason this committee is needed is on account of scarce materials. When materials are scarce, the first concerns that are hurt are the small-business concerns. The big fellows can look after themselves, but the little fellows are the first to be hurt when materials are scarce.

The Small Business Committee during the war served a very good purpose in helping people a distance away from the Nation's Capital. The big people had their lobbyists here and their public-relations people to help them. They did not need any Small Business Committee, but the small-business man far removed from the Nation's Capital needed someone to appeal to to help him. He had that help in this committee during the past 8 years.

I believe the committee that is to be set up under this resolution, if it is adopted by the House of Representatives, and I hope it is, should, as one of the first things it does, try to coordinate the different agencies of our Government having to do with small business, for instance, the Department of Justice, the Federal Trade Commission, the Department of Commerce, the Small Business Division of the National Security Resources Board, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other agencies. There is a lot of valuable information in these different agencies, and we can get valuable suggestions from them if we will only coordinate our efforts and work together; and I believe this committee should do that.

We should also make sure that the smaller concerns are protected against monopoly and unfair competition. If the laws are not sufficiently strong to safeguard small business in that respect, this committee should recommend the kind of legislation that this Congress should pass in order to give them the protection from monopoly and unfair practices to which they are entitled in a free country like ours under the private-enterprise system. We cannot have private enterprise and monopoly, too, so we must protect small business from monopoly.

Next, we must provide equality of opportunity for small-business men, independent merchants, and give them a fair chance to live and let live, not to get any unfair advantage over any others but to have a fair opportunity or equality of opportunity themselves.

REGULATION W

When I appeared before the Committee on Rules in support of this resolution the members of that committee asked me what I thought about regulation W. I told the committee very frankly that I felt that the matter should be gone into carefully to make sure that small businesses are not discriminated against and that the small man is not discriminated against by regulation W.

I presume you know what regulation W is. Congress passed a law to permit consumer-credit regulation to be administered by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. We did not

contemplate that a harsh and rigid rule would be placed in effect immediately similar to what we had during the war. For that reason, no one seriously objected to that power being given, and I think power should be given that way, but I think it should be used discreetly and not abused.

Very much to my surprise and disappointment, very soon after the Board of Governors was given this power it imposed not exactly the same restrictions concerning automobiles, for instance, that we had during the war, but almost the same restrictions. During the war the purchaser of an automobile was required to pay one-third down in cash and the remainder over a period of 15 months. The regulation the Board of Governors put into effect just last fall, after getting this authority again in peacetime, was one-third down and the remainder over a period of 18 months—very little difference.

In the first place, I do not think much of regulation W. I think it is undemocratic.

I do not think we need it in a country such as ours right now, although I am willing for someone like the President—or some board—to have the power, say in an extreme case, or an emergency. But generally I am not in favor of it. It certainly is undemocratic according to the way I look at things. We have been trying to get the Board of Governors to change that regulation to at least give 24 months' time to the purchaser of an automobile. A young man now with a family wanting to get settled in a home is compelled to go out in the suburbs of a city or out in the country to obtain a home at a fair price. In that case an automobile is a must. After he buys a home, if he is required to pay for that automobile within 18 months, unless he makes $5,000 or more a year, it is just impossible for him to buy that automobile.

I do not feel as if that is exactly right. Furthermore, I think that character is the poor man's capital, and we should encourage that kind of capital. Character, if you please. When people have character, their credit is good and they are going to pay these bills and debts.

Why should some arbitrary rule or restriction prevent that man from purchasing an automobile which he needs in his business and must have in order to make a living for himself and family?

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. One of the difficulties confronting small business as it appears to me is this matter of short-term capital. They want to go into business, they want to borrow money for a very short time. Under the tax structure on a short-term loan, they are not permitted to pay back the loan and pay their taxes and accumulate anything for operating expenses. Are you considering problems of that nature?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. LYLE. They need to have made available to them longer term capital perhaps and larger basis over which they could pay their taxes so that they could accumulate some development capital.

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman.

May I state that in compliance with the suggestion of the Committee on Rules I believe it was the unanimous opinion of the committee that we should go into regulation W. If I am a member of the committee and if I have any influence with the committee, I think it should be of the first order of business to try to get regulation W changed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I realize that with the approval of the Speaker of the House, and the approval of the majority and minority leaders, and the powerful Committee on Rules together with a large number here on the floor, that this resolution setting up a Committee on Small Business will undoubtedly pass.

I am a small-business man myself, and I recognize and realize the problems that small-business men have. I realize and recognize the splendid work that has been done by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, and the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, and others who have served on the Small Business Committee for a number of years.

The point I would like to make today is that in passing any special committee resolution, we are deviating from the proper, effective, and efficient organization of the committee structure of the House of Representatives.

I sincerely hope that with the passage of this resolution establishing one special committee that the Committee on Rules then will stand firm against this special committee process which saps, confuses, and confounds the carefully worked out jurisdiction of the regular standing committees of the House.

It is always easy to make a case for almost any kind of special committee, and particularly one where so many thousands of people are extremely interested in setting up a committee to deal with their particular problems. I am frank to admit that little business has many, many of these problems. But if we establish a small-business committee now, and next week we establish a newsprint committee, then the week following that the committee to investigate Federal communications, and so on, we then sap and tear down the jurisdiction of the standing committees of the House.

How much better would the organization of Congress be if we were to establish these matters as specialized jobs for subcommittees of the standing committees of the House. They have the power under the standing committees, not only to investigate and study the specialized problems, but they have the jurisdictional right to bring in corrective legislation and to do something about it. I sincerely hope that with the improved staffing of the standing committees and perhaps lessening the burden on the standing committees, that these specialized problems, such as small business and other requests that will be brought to us in the future, can be handled within the framework of our regular standing committee structure.

I wish to serve notice on the House that I will fight every single item for the establishment of special committees from this one on. I regret very much that the leadership has found it necessary to solve this problem by the establishment of a special committee here today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EBERHARTER). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to urge the adoption of this resolution. Having had the privilege for a number of years of serving as a member of the select committees on small business which preceded this one, I think I can assure the membership of the House that those committees, as will this one, if created, have sought, in a completely nonpartisan, constructive way, to direct their attentions and energies and ability to the vast and numerous problems of small business.

I feel that in the adoption of this resolution we have an opportunity to effectuate the planks of both major political parties with respect to small business. It is with trepidation that I take issue with our distinguished Member the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY]. His monument that will live for generations after him, in the form of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, is assured. However, I cannot subscribe to his thinking that, having set up within that act the organization of the Congress, thereafter there should not be any select or special committees created. I submit that the Congress should organize itself to accommodate the public and its needs. A select committee on small business has been the only forum before which the small-business men, singly and organized, have been able to come and to receive a sympathetic and attentive hearing. This is not a legislative committee. It is, however, a funnel through which the problems facing small business may logically and concisely be presented to the proper standing committees.

Mr. Speaker, small business in this country needs such a committee, and so does this Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, all over the United States small units of industry are folding up because they are running out of orders. The first thing this committee should do, and this committee is certainly in a position to do it, is to see that small-business units in this country which have plants ready to

operate, staffs ready to work, employees—now being thrown off the pay roll—buildings, machinery, and machine tools tuned up, should be given a portion of these Government orders for the production of war goods. That is the first job this committee should do. I am going to support this resolution on the assumption that this committee will lose no time in approaching the proper officials to allocate these contracts to small industry, and see that the intent of Congress as set forth in the appropriation bills to finance this rearmament program are carried out, namely, that these orders shall be given to small industry, a part of them, and that the material be provided so that the orders may be filled after they are placed with small industries.

The charge is being made almost every day by the administration, from the President down, to the effect that private industry is not willing or cannot provide the production of the goods that this country needs. I challenge that statement and call upon the administration to use all of its powers to utilize those buildings, the machines, and the machine tools, and the workers who now stand ready but who are being thrown out of employment. All over the State of Michigan these small industries are closing up and there is no excuse for it, because the Government is going to have these goods produced anyway. Little business is entitled to a substantial amount of those contracts.

In my extension of remarks I shall set forth, in detail and specifically, how the operation of letting contracts is handled in Michigan and show how utterly impossible it is for the small companies to get a proper cut of this business.

We are moving into this rearmament program and the thing for us to do is to utilize, first, the machinery and the tools that we have before we further authorize the Government to go into a great governmental financing and construction program with funds provided by the taxpayers and bond buyers. Let private industry have a chance at this instead of permitting the machinery of Government, along with the cooperation of big industry, crowd out small business and get all of the contracts. The little man is entitled to a share. There is a job for this committee to do now and with its proper staff it can do this work and begin its work within 10 days after the passage of this resolution. I hope the chairman of the committee will look after that.

THE SITUATION IN MICHIGAN

We are now reentering military production. This production will have to be produced by facilities now existent and those to be placed in operating condition by (a) private industry or (b) the Federal Government.

There are those, from the President himself down, who argue that the Federal Government must provide funds for the building and erection of productive facilities and they use, in support of this must, that private industry cannot or will not do it.

What percentage of the total war goods for which orders are now being placed will be produced by private facilities, (a) so-called big industry, (b) so-called little industry?

The answer to the above question can be found in the almost impossibility of little industry obtaining a cut on this Federal Government business and here are the basic reasons why little industry which now stands ready with substantial capital, organizations, machinery in good repair, and an absence of business at this particular moment on their books, cannot fairly participate in the war orders. I shall give an illustration applicable to Michigan.

Company A, or a consolidated group of companies, A, B, C, D, and E, wish to acquire a Government contract. Insofar as they know, they must proceed along the following lines: Have prepared their calling card. This calling card is presented to the chief of the Detroit ordnance district, Colonel Cone, and in reply they are told, "They are not a registered company," due to the fact they are not in Dun & Bradstreet or Thomas' Register, but Detroit ordnance district will process their brochure putting them on the register as a subsidiary to some large manufacturer who is registered. In addition to above statement, the general procedures of the Detroit ordnance district to obtain competitive bids from manufacturing facilities is to examine Dun & Bradstreet or Thomas' Register and mail inquiry sheets to firms listed therein. Should any one of these manufacturers appear as 3A or 4A–1—by this, a company with financial capital running anywhere from $1,500,000 up to $3,000,000—they are eligible for receiving these bids. Consequently anyone having a net worth of $200,000 to $1,500,000 has not been contacted to send any competitive bids.

In connection with the National Emergency Act I think the RECORD will show there was a statement made by the President, and is believed by this speaker to be in writing: that there shall be no plant too small and none too large for the Department of Industrial Mobilization Plan to talk to. But specifically, in the case of the State of Michigan, industrial mobilization planners were only called upon to visit and survey 86 different manufacturing facilities. Initially, Detroit Ordnance District, Detroit, Mich., in helping the Munitions Board, so-called, prepared a manufacturers' facility register and only sent in 125 Form 59's—this form is used for the purpose of getting the name and address of the manufacturing facility on the alphabetical register which is in turn used by the Industrial Mobilization Planning Board in locating various manufacturing facilities so as to be able to talk to management and make a preliminary survey of the facilities—out of a potential estimated number of probably three to five thousand manufacturing firms in the State of Michigan. Not more than 86 manufacturing facilities were visited. A conference was held in Colonel Cone's office, Detroit, as to why more manufacturers were not on the facilities register and the question was raised as to the procedures used in getting these manufacturers on this particular alphabetical register. Did Lieutenant Colonel Cone and Mr. Deloria use or have for their use any World War II information as to who manufactured what and how much of, so as to arrive at a decent decision?

Lieutenant Colonel Cone stated there was no particular procedure used in deciding what manufacturers to turn in to the Munitions Board for them to register them as a manufacturing facility. The question was raised "what should be done with the uses of manufacturers outstanding in the State, perfectly competent of manufacturing various war items"? Lieutenant Colonel Cone replied in substance that at some later date, we would unofficially visit these manufacturing facilities and try tying them in somewhere as a possible facility for manufacturing. Later it was decided by the military department that in the case a manufacturer could not manufacture an end item—completed article—this particular manufacturer would not be contacted as a possible manufacturer.

It is thought a much better procedure would be to have the properly qualified personnel group the manufacturers in such a manner as to be able to comply with the requisite of the various military departments. To date no one has given such a procedure any consideration so far as practical results are concerned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that the law providing for appointments to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy and the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy was changed by enactment late in the last session of Congress. Unfortunately, the Chair on Monday last announced the appointment of certain members on the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy under the provisions of the old law. Without objection, therefore, the appointments made last Monday will be vacated and the Chair will later make the appointments under the new law. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy the following members

on the part of the House: Mr. SHEPPARD, of California; Mr. SASSCER, of Maryland; Mr. STEFAN, of Nebraska; and Mr. MILLER of Maryland.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON THE RECONSTRUCTION OF CEILING AND REDECORATION OF HOUSE CHAMBER

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on Plans for Reconstruction of the Ceiling, Redecorations, and other improvements to the House Chamber the following members of the House: Mr. BLOOM, of New York; Mr. TRIMBLE, of Arkansas; Mr. SMATHERS, of Florida; Mr. MCGREGOR, of Ohio; and Mr. GOODWIN, of Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, Seventy-seventh Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee to Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures the following members of the Committee on Ways and Means: Mr. DOUGHTON, of North Carolina; Mr. COOPER, of Tennessee; and Mr. REED, of New York; and the following members of the Committee on Appropriations: Mr. CANNON, of Missouri; Mr. KERR, of North Carolina; and Mr. TABER, of New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 715a, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri, and Mr. BREHM, of Ohio.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS DIRECTORS OF COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of the act of June 10, 1872 (17 Stat. L. 360), the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Hospital for Women the following Members of the House: Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, and Mr. MILLER, of Nebraska.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SERVE AS DIRECTORS OF COLUMBIA INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 4863, Revised Statutes of the United States, the Chair appoints as directors of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf the following Members of the House: Mr. BLOOM, of New York, and Mr. GRAHAM, of Pennsylvania.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE OLIVER WENDELL HOLMES DEVISE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 124, Seventy-fifth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Committee on the Oliver Wendell Holmes Devise the following Members of the House: Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Mrs. WOODHOUSE, of Connecticut, and Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES TERRITORIAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 32, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. SULLIVAN, of Missouri, and Mr. BARRETT, of Wyoming.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 203, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as Commissioners of the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission the following members on the part of the House to serve with himself: Mr. BLOOM, of New York, Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas, and Mr. HORAN, of Washington.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF COMMISSION TO CONSIDER A SITE AND DESIGN FOR A NATIONAL MEMORIAL STADIUM

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 523, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Commission to consider a site and design for a national memorial stadium to be erected in the District of Columbia the following members on the part of the House: Mr. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina, Mr. SASSCER, of Maryland, and Mr. SIMPSON, of Illinois.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A WASHINGTON-LINCOLN MEMORIAL-GETTYSBURG BOULEVARD

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 19, Seventy-fourth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the United States Commission for the construction of a Washington-Lincoln Memorial-Gettysburg Boulevard the following members on the part of the House: Mr. LIND, of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BEALL, of Maryland.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered for today, I may have permission to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COOLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include two brief editorials.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE ARKANSAS PLAN FOR CIVIL-RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein copies of bills which I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, today marks the passing of a full year since the President sent to the Congress a message on civil rights. I wish to discuss the significance of events related to this controversy beginning with the most noteworthy fact of all, namely, that not a one of the President's major recommendations has been approved. It seems to me that it is appropriate to take a second look both at the President's message and the report of the Commission on Civil Rights upon which the message was based. The proponents of the civil rights program would surely concede that failure to win congressional approval of a single item signifies that there are valid and substantial objections to that program. At the same time, as one who has joined generally in the resistance, I am prepared to concede that there are some meritorious features in the report. Furthermore, I concede that the continued agitation for these proposals should be convincing on one point, namely, that the problems do exist, but it should be just as clear that they do not yield to categorical solutions.

The Commission's report itself carries a misleading label. It deals not primarily with civil rights, although the proposals dealing with antilynching legislation are directed to the basic and fundamental right of every man to a trial according to the great traditions of our judicial system. This is a civil right, but the others deal with social aspirations, some of which are entirely proper, and are receiving consideration by the leadership of the respective States and communities.

Today I want to propose to the House that we consider compromises based upon those maximum concessions which each side is willing to make. I do not expect any Member to abandon principles, but I would be less than frank with you if I did not urge in specific terms that this is a compromise, that it springs from a conviction entertained by many of us that the controversy is divisive, that it tends to weaken the Nation in an hour when the need for cooperation and unity is great.

Southern representatives have been the most prominent ones in opposing this proposed legislation. Perhaps our reaction has been too emotional. Perhaps we have been inaccurate in some of our judgments. I note, for example, that on the question of segregation views sometimes attributed to the President are not contained in his message at all and we may not have been meticulous in distinguishing his message from contents of the Commission report. I am not pleading that our case as presented to this date has been a perfect one and I

assume my own share of the responsibility for these deficiencies. I would be glad to recall some of my own inaccurate statements but I can assure the House now that having read and studied not only the message but the report itself I am prepared to apply a more rigid standard to my presentation. I am aware of the occasional misunderstanding of an approach of this kind. That is, the presentation of a southern point of view. I do not mean to offend but because the South lives in such proximity to the problem of our largest and most important racial minority—certainly the most important when civil rights issues of this type are considered—I believe it is entirely fair and proper to present as a background of my own thinking the traditional Southern viewpoint. Yet I am just as sure that the answer we should seek is not the conventional Southern answer nor, indeed, the non-Southern answer. We seek and must find the right answer.

If an answer to the difficult problem involved in the proposals is found we must study the problem in sections. It is regrettable that the recommendations have been submitted as one proposal—impinging as they do upon an infinite variety of human relations and involving widely different legal questions.

The South does not ask any exemptions from a statute soundly conceived and based upon judicial principles applying to our national community of 145,000,000 people. Furthermore, we have no intention of disregarding the legitimate rights of our minority citizens, and we deny that our opposition to some of the proposals contained in the civil rights report is due to an uncharitable attitude toward the Negro race or any other race. This is not the time nor place to speak as we of the majority group often like to speak; namely, of the happy relationship that exists generally in the South between colored and white groups. But one reason for our warnings is the obvious deterioration of the condition of mutual respect and cooperation which has resulted from political agitation.

The civil rights report, stripped of features not related to sectional and intergroup differences, contains four controversial matters: Segregation, poll-tax repeal, antilynching legislation, and the FEPC. Let me speak of these in order.

It is my opinion that congressional action is not necessary in order to achieve the President's objective as to nonsegregation in interstate travel as outlined in his message, although he probably had in mind some clarification and minor extensions of Federal policy based upon the Supreme Court decision invalidating a Virginia statute requiring segregation of passengers. The Supreme Court in effect sustained a nonsegregation policy for common carriers in all interstate travel. The nonsegregation aspects of civil rights discussions have doubtless grown out of language in the report of the President's Commission, intimating that steps should be taken to outlaw segregation policies as now generally enforced in many States. Certain statements in the report justify the fears of those who are concerned with avoiding friction and upheavals in thousands of communities where the races are accustomed to existing patterns of life.

It would help a lot for proponents of civil rights legislation to renounce any purpose of projecting Federal authority into purely local situations, particularly where such authority might be exercised to discard the existing relationships to which we are conditioned. On these issues, there is not an open mind. Everyone who knows anything at all about group relations knows that to invoke the power of law for social intermingling would meet the stiffest resistance and the only result of an attempt by Federal action to change the thinking of our people on this score—and I include Negroes as well as white persons—would be to destroy the dignity and prestige of Federal law. Surely, we learned from our experience with Federal prohibition that some social and individual habits and attitudes defy Federal regimentation. It is well to be frank on this score. Not even the most liberal of Southerners has any other thought, if wisdom and experience direct his thinking at all. I use the words "social intermingling" rather than "social equality" because this phrase more accurately expresses the basis for the customs of our region. Present patterns are maintained with personal good will and without preventing the necessary and desirable relations which interracial groups must maintain for the progress of both races.

If we could agree, Mr. Speaker, that no legislation should be adopted on the subject of segregation, it would be the first step in a proper compromise.

Now let us look at the poll tax. Here, I think, we of the poll tax States should give ground. We will not withdraw our objections to a statutory repeal by Congress, but I do concede that the rest of the country has concluded that as a matter of policy, the payment of a poll tax should not be required for voting in our elections. I do not agree with this judgment. I mean by that that while I do not like the tax, I think it is a reasonable exercise of States' rights and I do not think that there is any substantial impairment of citizen rights to vote. It is a policy that might well be left to the determination of the respective States. This is my own judgment—I am not arguing it. I have heretofore presented it in the debates in the House, but I realize that we have not won many adherents and that the rest of the country wants the seven States retaining the tax to get rid of it.

But repeal should be by constitutional methods. The payment of a poll tax as a voting qualification is permitted under the provisions of section 2, article 1, of the Federal Constitution, and is a matter solely for the States to determine. It is asserted, however, that it is an impairment—not a qualification—but it is clear from more than one decision that the Supreme Court of the United States does not consider the poll tax as constituting an impairment. Nothing less than a constitutional amendment can accomplish in a legal and proper way what the adherents of poll-tax repeal have in mind, but if the constitutional amendment is offered—if statutory repeal is abandoned—I think there will be no trouble at all in inducing the people of the poll-tax States to accept defeat gracefully.

The two most difficult aspects of the civil-rights controversy are the antilynching proposal and the so-called fair-employment practices plan.

The lynching evil has been virtually extinguished. It is not a national problem. We agree, of course, with the authors of the Commission report that one lynching is too many, but lynchings are so rare and the other problems of criminal law enforcement so tremendous that the agitation over this particular question hardly seems fitted to the conditions of 1949.

To advance their cause, the proponents of civil rights have invoked words that have a rich meaning in American life—justice, democracy, equality, opportunity—and yet the proposed application of these concepts is not only vague and unconvincing but, if implemented by Federal law, would actually obstruct the realization of many of these great principles. In grounding their appeal for antilynch legislation upon the guaranties of our judicial system, however, the proponents have some good arguments. In the realm of economics, the references to equality seem out of place since individuals are not equal in productiveness, but in the realm of law and in the quest for justice there is an authentic ring about the claim of equality. One would have to know something of the abuses of Federal intervention in State and local affairs wherever race relations have been involved to understand fully why the invasion of judicial functions reserved to the States and communities is resented. This is not legalistic and it is not due to any indifference to the terrible evil of mob violence. I know from actual experience. I have lived in communities where lynchings have occured, first as a boy 40 years ago and as a young man in another community about 25 years ago. I have had an opportunity to observe the aftermath of mob violence. Every sensitive person could feel the pall of anxiety and fears. Residents of States that have experienced lynchings know enough about this to verify our principal point that lynchings are committed by lawless people and are in such violent conflict with our ideals that gradually the processes of law have been fortified and violence put down. The passage of a Federal law would have little if any effect, in my opinion, on the continuing struggle to eliminate the evil altogether. The final crushing out of mob violence, the depriving of persons suspected of crimes of the precious right of a trial will not be accelerated by a Federal statute. Nevertheless, I can see the basis for arguments that have been advanced by the President's Commission. There are many people in Southern States who recognize the soundness of some of these arguments.

I have written to a number of newspaper editors in the South who, as a group, are generally alert to social problems and free from prejudice and political considerations. I have been impressed by what some of these editors have said about working out, if possible, a Federal statute that would strengthen the laws against this evil without creating counter-influences that would retard the movement to eliminate it altogether. I refer, for example, to the distinguished editor of the Louisville Courier Journal, Mark Ethridge, formerly of Georgia, widely known and widely respected. Mark Ethridge writes me as follows:

Our failure to have a national policy on lynching affects us most adversely all over the world. The Russians use it with great effect. I personally can't see any excuse we can make to ourselves for not having a national policy on it and for not making prosecution the business of the Federal Government where State law enforcement breaks down. Don't you think it's anachronistic that we are willing to legislate about motor-vehicle stealing, about kidnaping, and about crossing State lines with a woman for immoral purposes, and yet as a Nation we cannot bring ourselves to say that the right to life is sacred enough that it ought to be protected by the Federal Government? I think a declaration by the National Government in the form of effective legislation would have tremendous effect on people all over the world. It's something we owe ourselves in good conscience, but beyond that we do owe it to the world as its leader.

One does not have to agree with this point of view to recognize the fairness and the social vision of the author and the relevancy of his comment. The question of lynching laws tends to become altogether a moot question, but since the whole question enters so substantially into the civil rights controversy I recognize reasons quite outside the practical considerations of law enforcement for a declaration by the Congress. The absence of such a declaration may be misunderstood abroad. If by yielding on this point for the purpose of presenting a solid front to the nondemocratic world we can symbolize our devotion to the ideal of "equality under law," I, for one, would be glad to attempt to work out such a declaration.

I do not like to begin with the proposition that racial groups in other parts of the world feeling a kinship with certain minority groups in America are imposing unfavorable judgments upon us or that because the Communists abroad are exploiting imperfections in our American social structure, we must legislate. It is true, of course, that the Communists are exploiting isolated incidents, but our emphasis should be on the fact that the harmony which prevails among the races here is much greater than that in any country with a comparable situation. The rights and privileges accorded the racial minorities are so much greater here than in any other part of the world that I regard the argument as to anti-Communist strategy as secondary. I do, however, see value in assurances to members of minority groups in the United States that every available power will be extended to protect all civil rights. Consequently, if it can be done constitutionally, and I am convinced that it can, and if a proposed statute carrying the declaration I speak of can be so phrased as to leave unimpaired the primary responsibility of the States themselves to deal with the evil complained of, I see no reason why we should not grant to the racial minority in this instance the Federal buttress they regard as essential.

Here is how I think it can be done. Add to chapter 13, relating to crimes involving civil rights, of title 18 of the United States Code, a simple statute making lynching a Federal crime, but avoid vagueness in defining the crime so that only a person who knowingly participates in a lynch mob shall be subject to the penalty. Leave out all references to property, limit the jurisdiction to offenses involving violence upon an individual either in the custody of a peace officer or suspected of a criminal offense, and require the Government to show that such violence was for the purpose or consequence of taking the life of such individual. If such violence results in the person's death, then the motive is immaterial. Otherwise, violence to become a Federal offense must be committed for the purpose of taking the person's life. This will avoid bringing gang fights and rioting under Federal jurisdiction. The extensive hearings by the Judiciary Committee of previous Congresses should be convincing on the point that the Federal Government should not be involved in minor disturbances associated with race antagonism. Leave out of the Federal statute all penalties upon the innocent people living in the locality where the crime occurs. Stripped of these extraneous matters, a statute would provide assurances that the Federal Government will be concerned with the essential guaranties of organic law.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, in order to project Federal authority into only those situations where State instrumentalities are not functioning, I would add to the statute a limitation that the Government shall not have jurisdiction of an offense in States authorizing the attorney general or the governor or an attorney acting under the direction of the governor to direct prosecutions for lynching and authorizing the State authorities to conduct such prosecutions in a local government subdivision other than that in which the offense was committed. If any State agrees to exercise its sovereignty to this extent by moving into a vacuum that has been permitted to exist in areas where pressures and fears in a decentralized judicial system have prevented effective prosecution, then that State will be free from any interference by the United States authorities. In States having this kind of statute the Federal courts should not be given authority to institute proceedings unless the Government could show that the prosecution has been impaired by willful failure of the attorney general of the State or the governor to exercise authority with respect thereto, and, if sufficient time has elapsed since the offense was committed, to enable the State law-enforcement officer to begin the prosecution. Thus, we would be able to say to any State complaining of Federal intervention in this type of offense that if intervention shall become intolerable, all that the people of that State would have to do would be to adopt the statute as described.

Mr. Speaker, this represents some research and I have consulted with many students of the problem in an effort to work out a sound approach, one that can be defended. In previous debates on the subject we have had presented only the question of a simple Federal declaration. Under such statutes, it would be possible for the Attorney General of the United States to become involved in local situations no matter how bona fide the local prosecution. That should not be permitted by the Congress. Its political implications are apparent, and I will not dwell upon them. On the other hand, my suggestion does not impair our time-honored provisions for State responsibility in criminal prosecution. It simply provides for a criterion in determining whether or not Federal action is justified by reason of failure of the States to act. This could in all probability be administratively achieved anyway but there is every reason in this instance for Congress laying down the limitations upon action by the Federal Department of Justice.

Finally, there is the recommendation of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission, embodying penalty provisions and giving Federal authorities power to enforce regulations, invading as no statute in our history has attempted to do, the intimate relations that are inherent in our free society. There are basic and fundamental objections to this type of legislation and the objections transcend all racial or sectional considerations. The Congress cannot afford to take this step toward statism, regardless of the purposes back of the proposal. The good faith of the proponents is not questioned. But this is a principle in government which cannot be compromised.

Considering, however, the problem of discrimination, to the extent that it exists, there is a basis for action that does not involve compromise of principle—action that involves no legal sanctions, but a legitimate exercise of governmental powers in the field of education and human relations. Patterns are already established in the Department of Labor. We may perhaps do as much for members of a minority suffering from discrimination in employment as we have done for physically handicapped workers, whose condition has been greatly improved without breaching the principles of our economic system. I see no objection to the creation of a division within the Department of Labor, operating under congressional mandate, to counsel with management and labor for the elimination of discrimination and to work toward wider employment opportunities for all groups. In previous discussions of the problem, I have commended the wartime FEPC for its

handling of the Sun Oil Co. case, in which a satisfactory adjustment of grievance of Negro workers was reached without imposing penalties or threatening prosecution.

Some of the complaints are understandable. I think I can illustrate by referring to a situation that probably has been corrected. It involves a Negro mechanic—a skilled instructor of apprentices in a certain plant, the location of which is not important to this discussion. It was the mechanic's duty to train young white workers who came into the plant. He must have done a good job, because having completed their instruction, the trainees moved immediately into assembly line jobs and began to receive more than the instructor, although everything they knew about their job had been acquired from him. We do not have to have a coercive law to become sensitive to an injustice of that kind. But I submit to the Congress that it would be quite in order for a Federal division to counsel for the correction of such a grievance and this without retreating from our insistence that nongovernmental procedures are far more effective in the long run in working out such maladjustments.

There is nothing wrong with the contention often advanced by proponents that there should be equal pay for equal performance. It is hard enough, however, to achieve this ideal, for example, for certain feminine workers and handicapped workers, and if we should invoke the great instrumentalities of the Federal Government for situations involving indefinable elements such as race prejudice and religious preferences, the powers of the Federal Government will have been prostituted. Equality of opportunity is an ideal to be cherished and the pursuit of the ideal should continually engage us, but it is better to leave every man free to think himself and his group superior and be wrong than as a matter of law proclaim him or his group to be the equal of others in economic activities.

In a few days we will celebrate the birthday of the Great Emancipator. Surely Abraham Lincoln would not be accused of race prejudice, yet in his Peoria speech on October 16, 1854, he said in discussing the slavery question and proposals based upon certain equality concepts:

> My own feelings will not admit of this and if mine would, we well know that a great mass of the whites will not. Whether this feeling accords with justice and sound judgment is not the sole question, if indeed it is any part of it. A universal feeling, whether well or ill-founded, cannot be safely disregarded.

In my opinion, no utterance of Lincoln's is more timely in its application to the disregard of the thinking of the people.

In closing let me quote Mark Ethridge again, having indicated from his statement on antilynching that he does not discard the civil rights program in its entirety. On the FEPC case, however, he is emphatic, and Mark Ethridge knows this subject, for he was one of the policy makers of the wartime fair-employment program.

> If anything at all is to be done about FEPC, it ought to be put as a minor section in the Labor Department. It ought not, however, to have any coercive powers. It would be, therefore, very largely an information section which might provide manufacturers and others with information, and this information as to the experiences of States in handling the problem will be valuable all over the country.

It appears, Mr. Speaker, that a majority of the people who are familiar with this problem are opposed to a permanent FEPC.

In the interest of harmony and economic justice to all, the civil rights controversy should be settled and I believe this can be achieved without sacrifice of principle by either side by, first, limiting Federal nonsegregation policies to interstate movements; second, repeal by constitutional amendment of poll tax requirements for voting; third, a modified antilynching bill leaving primary responsibility with the States; and, fourth, abandoning all proposals for coercion in employment but establishing a counseling service to work for nondiscrimination in industry.

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. DEANE. As a southerner I certainly appreciate the attitude expressed by the gentleman from Arkansas.

May I make this observation. Perhaps undue criticism has been lodged against one member of the President's Commission from North Carolina. He does not need any defense by me. I refer to President Frank Porter Graham, of the University of North Carolina. I do not need to speak for Dr. Graham and neither do I know what may have been in his mind as a member of the President's Commission. The chances are that he did not agree with the entire report, but from time to time I have heard statements made on the House floor which perhaps have been most unfair to this great southerner, this great liberal.

I believe that in the not distant future the liberal movement in this country is going to stem from the southern part of our great country.

Going back to Dr. Graham, I am sure we noticed in the press of Saturday night, I believe it was, the award to him of the Sidney Hillman trophy for outstanding meritorious service. One speaker in referring to Dr. Graham, stated:

> He has never asked, "Is it safe?" His only concern has been, "Is it right?"

I believe that is the key thought that we as southerners must face as we come to grips with this serious legislation.

Upon the scroll awarded to Dr. Graham I note these lines so characteristic of this distinguished gentleman:

> Frank Porter Graham has earned the affection and regard of all those who love freedom and justice. Where racial differences have been used as an excuse for discrimination and oppression, he has exemplified a brotherly understanding. Where economic greed has enriched the few while impoverishing the many, he has championed the cause of the people. Where temporary expediency and social responsibility have made conflicting demands upon him, he has dared to serve the common good.
>
> To him the test of a community is the condition of the citizens who compose it and the test of a citizen lies in his capacity to quicken the conscience of his community.

On Monday, January 31, I inserted in the RECORD an outstanding editorial, The Task of the South, from the pen of Jonathan Daniels, the brilliant editor of the Raleigh News and Observer. The Members are invited to read this editorial, which in a most forceful way comes to grips with this subject of civil rights.

Of further interest is the fact that this editorial received first-place award in the best editorial division, as voted by the North Carolina Newspaper Institute, during the past week.

As indicated by the gentleman from Arkansas, it is to be hoped that we can honestly come to grips with this perplexing subject. We cannot evade the issue.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from North Carolina, whom I admire very much.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would like to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas for his very illuminating discussion of a very difficult and perplexing problem. In my own district I may say that perhaps we are not confronted with the difficulties which exist in some other parts of the country. Recognizing, however, that this is an acute and difficult situation which must be met, I appreciate all the more the proposals made by the gentleman from Arkansas.

I would like to ask the gentleman if he will elucidate a little further upon this advisory proposal which he suggests in connection with the fair employment practices matter. I am not clear what he has in mind.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I may say in answer to the question in reference to the nonpenalty FEPC that in certain measure it follows a suggestion of Senator TAFT, of Ohio, who said in the early days of the discussion that the only proper way to approach the problem would be through a nonpenalty provision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, if it is not inconvenient to those having special orders following, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have the next 10 minutes and I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think the gentleman is entitled to the at-

tention of every Member of the House for the statement he has made.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate the comment of the gentleman from Michigan very much.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would like to ask the gentleman one question, speaking of FEPC, which would bar discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, or state of origin. I recall that several years ago when the bill was up I offered a similar bill but added to it that there should be no discrimination in one bill because of sex and in another bill, which was more important, because of membership or nonmembership in any union, but I could not find any vociferous advocate of FEPC who was willing to accept that amendment. Has the gentleman any explanation of why, as long as they wanted to do away with discrimination, they would not let the fellow who wanted to work go to work, in other words provide that there should be no discrimination against him?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I would like to say in that connection I think that it is a good illustration of the difficulty of invoking law in these matters of employment. It touches many of the fields which the gentleman from Michigan has mentioned. I think one of the best illustrations of the efficacy of the counseling service is what we have done with the handicapped workers. We have not said that any plant must employ a person who is handicapped. We have not said it must employ him, but we have demonstrated to a lot of employers that certain handicapped groups are exceptionally productive and efficient. It is quite impressive to study the statistics of productiveness of the handicapped workers. It is remarkable what they have done, often excelling people who are not handicapped. That is not done by forcing a nondiscrimination policy, but counseling by skilled Government employees who know how to bring people together and induce management to do things which, when convinced, they are glad to do.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. Because of my personal association and very close friendship with the gentleman from Arkansas, I have been aware for quite some time of the very studious and serious effort he has been making in a study of this proposal. I think we can all appreciate the contribution the gentleman has made in attempting to approach this subject from a broad, unbiased, unprejudiced viewpoint, recognizing the fact that it does present a great many very serious problems; recognizing the fact, as he stated a few moments ago, that in this report there may be some proposals that were objectionable to various sections of the country, but in it also there is the problem, or series of problems, that we must face. The gentleman, I think, in his study and in his proposal has compromised and has made a very valuable contribution to our consideration of this problem. I compliment him on his very calm and unimpassioned presentation of the situation. In considering the problems presented in the President's message and in the so-called civil-rights program, if we can approach them and consider them in that same unimpassioned, calm, deliberate spirit in an effort to arrive at what is best for the country, I think we can make some very good progress.

I commend the gentleman from Arkansas for his presentation today.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate the gentleman's statement very much.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's address today and I believe that it is a new approach to a very old problem. I remind him, however, that it is much older than a lot of people think. My father told me—and he lived in Newport, R. I.—that in various places in the East, when he was a young man, particularly in Massachusetts, they had signs posted which read, "Men wanted. No Irish need apply." But as time went on it seems the Irish have solved their own problem, and they are sending them now to legislative halls and putting them in high positions, because they sought to benefit themselves and work out their own salvation instead of looking for helpful legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Well, they are doing the hiring themselves now, are they not?

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Knowing the gentleman from Arkansas as I do, I know of his deep sincerity in what he has had to say. I gather that his approach is on the theory that you can get the most good out of the civil rights proposal with the least emotional strain. Is that what the gentleman advocates?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to the gentleman for stating it just that way.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I, too, would like to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas for the dispassionate way in which this issue has been discussed here today. If we can only go through this session with an open-minded attitude or willingness to try and resolve the differences, I think we will get a lot closer to solving this problem than we will by the heat of debate or incriminations that have often taken place on this floor in the past.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to the gentleman for that comment.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I too wish the opportunity of congratulating my colleague from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] upon his attitude in his efforts to compromise the serious and complex civil rights issues, even though he is willing to go much farther than I could either commit or permit myself.

The arguments usually advanced by the proponents and opponents of such legislation are comparable with the often expressed view that "to prominently promulgate the congregated diversions of an abstainer of intoxicants is to dissimilate his true character." For the northern and eastern proponents of such proposed legislation to pick out only the adverse racial relations and occurrences within the South, and for the opponents to, in turn, counteract with like charges against and within the North and East—each such group failing to give a true picture of the racial problem as it actually exists and its effects in each locality of our Nation, offers no solution.

However, I want to state that because of my inherent and fundamental belief in States' rights, I could not and would not go along with my colleague in his compromise efforts with such proposed Federal legislation.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BIEMILLER. I have always had a very high regard for the ability and the temperate approach of the gentleman from Arkansas. Today my regard goes even higher. I agree with those who have spoken ahead of me and said that if we can approach this civil rights question in a temperate and easy-mannered way we may reach a solution for it. The only point I should like to add at this moment is that I do not think any of us should assume that the civil rights question is peculiarly a problem of the South. I think it is a question that exists throughout the entire 48 States. That should never be lost sight of.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to have that comment. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman very much.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I realize that this country does need unity. I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Arkansas has approached this matter not only from the attitude of a Congressman but as a Christian.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very grateful to all the Members for what they have said.

In yielding the floor I should like to say that my primary purpose was to undertake to state, in a dispassionate way, a position which I believe is typical of a vast number of our people, and, secondly, to give the House the benefit of the study I have made of the technical side. It will all be in the RECORD.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Unfortunately I did not hear all the gentleman's discussion. I yield to no one in my very high appraisal of the gentleman from Arkansas. I know that whatever he said was said with the great sincerity that symbolizes his usual conduct upon the floor of this House. Since I did not have the benefit of hearing all the gentleman's address, may I ask if I am correct in assuming from what I have heard here on the floor that the gentleman thinks this is a matter that cannot well be solved by legislative edict, that it is a matter that will have to be worked out?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I think that reflects a portion of my comment. The problem will continue; no matter how skillful our craftsmanship, no matter how good our performance, there will be a continuing problem in the realm of human relations; but we can, however, since the Nation has focused attention upon the problem, find a degree of legislative authority that might be required. That is the thing I have pointed to in the desire to find the basis for a compromise. I think it is possible for us to find it. But I agree with the implication of the gentleman that it is not primarily a legislative problem.

I am very grateful to the House.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, I include the following bill to permit the prosecution of lynching in Federal courts when the governor or attorney general of the State concerned lacks authority to direct the prosecution in State courts, or such prosecution is impaired by his refusal to do so:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That chapter 13 (relating to crimes involving civil rights) of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"245. Lynching.

"Whoever willfully instigates, incites, organizes, aids, abets, or commits a lynching by any means whatsoever, or is knowingly a member of a lynch mob, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both.

"As used in this section:

"The term 'lynch mob' means any assemblage of ____ or more persons which, without authority of law, commits or attempts to commit violence upon the person of any individual in the custody of a peace officer or suspected of, charged with, or convicted of the commission of any criminal offense, with the purpose or consequence of taking the life of such individual.

"The term 'lynching' means any violence by a lynch mob upon the person of any such individual, with the purpose or consequence of taking the life of such individual."

SEC. 2. The table of contents of chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof

"245. Lynching."

SEC. 3. Section 3231 (relating to jurisdiction of district courts) of title 18 of the United States Code is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a district court of the United States shall have jurisdiction of an offense against section 245 of this title only if the court finds, with respect to each State in which the offense was committed, that—

"(1) the act or acts constituting the offense do not also constitute, under the laws of the State, an offense which may be prosecuted (A) by the attorney general of the State or an attorney acting under his direction or the direction of the governor of the State, and (B) in a local governmental subdivision other than that or those, as the case may be, in which it was committed; or

"(2) the prosecution of the offense against State law has been impaired by the willful failure or refusal of the attorney general of the State or the governor of the State to exercise his authority with respect to such prosecution; and a sufficient time has elapsed since the offense against section 245 was committed to enable State law-enforcement officers to begin the prosecution of the offense against State law."

SEC. 4. This act shall take effect on January 1, 1950.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LYLE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include two newspaper articles.)

## POLL TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call your attention to two articles which show that it does not make very much difference what the Congress or any committee of the Congress may do. Neither the Congress nor its committees will ever get full public approval from a certain section of the press.

There will always be the knock, "Why did you do it? Why didn't you do it? You are a publicity seeker. You are a witch hunter. You are covering up for your political friends." For years the Dies committee and its successor have been pilloried by the Communists and their friends and, worse yet, by its friends because forsooth its hearings were unduly spectacular. Comes the new committee and announces that newsreel cameramen, photographers, radio, and television technicians are to be barred and all heck is to pay—read the news story from last night's Times-Herald—then get the editorial from this morning's issue. Here they are:

RED PROBE BANS PHOTOGRAPHERS—RADIO, TELEVISION ALSO BARRED AT HEARINGS

(By Ed Nellor)

Members of the House Un-American Activities Committee last night banned newsreel cameramen, photographers, and radio and television technicians from all future hearings—but reaction was loud, strong, and immediate.

In the unprecedented move, designed to add decorum to spy-hunting probes, only newspapermen were left untroubled—for the time being.

Representative WOOD, Democrat, of Georgia, new chairman of the committee, casually made the announcement following the organization session. He acted like a man whose scalp already was tingling.

The first response came from the House radio gallery, whose chairman, Albert L. Warner, quickly declared, "Radio has a fight on its hands."

His rallying cry was echoed by George M. Dorsey, head of the White House News Photographers Association, who represents both still and motion picture cameramen.

A visit to Attorney General Clark also was decided upon by the House Communist hunters and a three-man subcommittee was appointed to confer on mutual problems today.

Naming Representatives WALTER, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, HARRISON, Democrat, of Virginia, and NIXON, Republican, of California, for this chore presages another new approach—cooperation with the Justice Department. During the Eightieth Congress the committee and Clark swapped insults at regular intervals.

---

STAND UP OR FOLD UP

The newly organized House Committee on Un-American Activities took its first step toward oblivion Monday in barring radio recorders, newsreels, television and news photographers from future hearings.

Its members have clearly shown they do not have the guts to carry on the program that has grown to be the most important phase of congressional effort in these times, namely to put the finger on communism.

By cutting down on their own publicity weapons, the committee has left the field wide open for the Communists to go ahead spreading hate and poison with little if any fear of rebuttal from Congress.

SCARED OF THEIR JOB

What is the committee afraid of? Of course, congressional investigating committees are created to find out whether new legislation is needed. But every investigating committee learns, sooner or later, that recommendations of law are not worth a hoot unless the people understand the basis for the committee's proposals.

Hence, publicity is a vital weapon in lawmaking.

A classic example was the Senate Banking Committee's investigation of 1933. It was interesting and exciting stuff from the start, but rather complicated and tough to understand. The public was not getting it at all. But a circus press agent walked into the dignified realms of the Senate caucus room one day and planked a midget down on the knees of none other than J. P. Morgan.

HEADLINES BY EXPERTS

Did the committee pale and fold up and run for cover? It did not. Instead, it played for the headlines with every art and trick while it had the public's attention and the

public in turn soon grabbed at every piece of information they could get concerning the committee's basic program.

For another example of how tough a congressional committee can get, we refer you to the case of Howard C. Hopson, another top financier.

It was 1935 and both Senate and House committees were investigating lobbies. Both wanted Hopson.

Hopson hid out. The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate, employees of the House, and the District police chased him all through this city, with newsreels and all the attendant agents of publicity invited along. The whole country was fascinated by the man hunt and learned much about lobbies, in consequence. Hopson got 5 years in the "jug" before it was all over.

The men who operated congressional committees in those days were ruthless, tough, and smart. They knew they had to be, to get anywhere.

And if the present members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities are scared before they start by the mere accusation that they're publicity seekers, they aren't tough or smart enough to ever do anything effective with such 10-minute eggs as the Reds.

The press has just been yelling—not the reporters so much as the caption writers and the editors, the columnists, and radio commentators—that the House Committee on Un-American Activities was all the time looking for publicity, using circus methods, and the moment the committee takes effective action to do away with what the critics said was an evil or a bad practice, they jump on the committee.

Permit me to comment on the subject which was discussed so ably and so fairly by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] who just left the well of the House.

He is absolutely right about this poll-tax matter. I think I am the only Republican who since 1935 has consistently voted against that poll-tax legislation every time there has been a roll call.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I would like to advise the gentleman that others have voted against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right; thanks. I stand corrected. Perhaps there are others.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that I have consistently voted against it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Thanks again. I find myself in better and better company all the time.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman from Missouri and the gentleman from Minnesota both stated on the floor that they voted against the bill. Now the gentleman says that he is going to check. Does he mean that he is going to check whether they are making a true statement or not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, no. I am just going to check my own records and make the correction. Having been corrected by my distinguished colleagues I thank them and hasten to apologize and extend my congratulations to the gentlemen. Perhaps there are other Republicans present who wish to repeat their statements of adherence to the good old Constitution.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. FELLOWS. I have spoken against that three times.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, here on the floor at this time are at least four of us who have not followed this political football on its unconstitutional meandering.

Mr. FELLOWS. After hearing the speeches today, I wonder if I am going to be left as the only Republican from Maine, and the only man against that proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Against what?

Mr FELLOWS. I wonder after hearing these speeches if I am going to be left.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The citizens of Maine are sound-thinking individuals. In the past, they have recognized merit when it came their way, and I have not the slightest doubt that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] will be here as a plain-spoken, effective guardian of the Constitution long after some of those who think it is outmoded have left the national scene. That is my hope and the hope of the gentleman's colleagues.

If the advocates of this repeal of the poll-tax legislation really want to get that repealed, all they have to do is to submit the issue to the States as a constitutional amendment. Unless I am mistaken, when the women wanted to vote it took them something less than 2 years to have the States approve a constitutional amendment giving them what they demanded. The States could, and would, approve the amendment within a year. That is the way it should be done. Again, I may be mistaken, but in my opinion that is the only fair, legal way to do it.

Let us go next to the antilynching bill. Am I wrong? Did you gentlemen vote against the antilynching bill, or was I one of the few Republicans on that? How about it?

Mr. SHORT. I voted against the poll tax, against the antilynching bill, and FEPC, and I will vote that way again.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. As a primary opponent once said, "HOFFMAN is only 100-percent right. I am 300-percent right."

I said, "Yes; but we are figuring on a thousand-percent basis, so you are not so good, after all."

But my beloved colleague the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], to my sorrow the only Republican from that State—we have one too many Democrats in the White House—is, as usual, 100-percent right—perhaps his foresight and wisdom are the reason he is here.

Now, to get down to this antilynching bill, the purpose of that is good. I will vote for an antilynching bill, if in defending lynching they will include mob violence in labor disputes and strikes. For every case that they can point to where someone has been lynched in the South during the last year, I can cite two cases where someone has died from violence in a labor dispute in the North. For every case where someone was beaten in the South because of race or some crime committed there, other than in a labor dispute, I can cite 10, from sworn testimony, where someone was beaten in a labor dispute or strike in the North. For every home wrecked in the South by a mob I can cite a half-dozen instances where, during strikes, the homes of men, whose only offense was that they wanted to work for a livelihood and not join a union or pay union dues, were maliciously damaged by missiles being thrown in the windows or paint being thrown on porches or against the siding.

These advocates of the antilynch bill I do not believe can match this one, which happened on the 1st day of December in the adjoining county of Kalamazoo, in the Third Congressional District of Michigan, Mr. PAUL SHAFER'S district, where goon squads went in, two or three hundred of them, with CIO buttons on them, and some in the mob grabbed a young lady by the hair of her head this way and shoved her head that way, slapped her in the face, first on one side, then on the other, knocking her this way, then that way, or where they chased a fellow up to the second floor and three of them beat him until the bones on the left side of his face were broken, knocked him down and kicked him. I have a picture of a pool of blood two and one-half feet across on the floor, where they left him after they got through with him. Do these hot advocates of the antilynching bill want to include a provision against that kind of activity in the antilynching bill? Oh, no. The President is as silent as the grave on that one. Oh, no. If the CIO, his political ally—not the ally of you gentlemen but of the New Deal Party—wants to carry on with goon squads, that seems to be all right, we hear no demand that rioting-mob violence by labor goons be barred either by labor legislation or by an antilynching bill, but give the South a dose of Federal law, let the CIO, the Communists and the racketeers, by force and violence, make the nonunion stand and deliver. If we are to have an antilynch bill, let us have it cover mob violence of all kinds, even when it comes from a labor union in the North. Let us have it the country over.

Do you know in the packing house strike involving 20 States, mobs burned freight cars; obstructed railroad tracks? There is no Federal law against it, as far as Federal statutes go, unless it is a mail train. They can do all they want

to along that line without violating a Federal law. Now, let us be fair about this. You can talk calmly about it, but I have to shout about it, because it really makes me out of patience when people who want to work cannot go to work and are discriminated against because they do not belong to a union and helpless are beaten, kicked, assailed in their homes—their property destroyed or damaged. Our hearings disclose that the rank and file of the unions do not approve of that—the paid professional goons do that.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I hope the gentleman is not displeased with some of his colleagues on this side because we agree with him 100 percent on both the civil-rights program and on this mob violence.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, I am like a gentleman I admire very much, a great eradicator of gangsters, a most efficient administrator, Tom Dewey, who I hope some day will be the Senator from New York. Like Mr. Dewey I am getting now, as an aristocratic lady said, the approval of the better people, only there are not enough of them.

Now, so much for the antilynching bill.

What about FEPC? Into my office there came a gentleman from my district, a colored gentleman, Mr. Ampey. In fact, his brother or his cousin, I do not remember which, campaigned with me in my first primary campaign. I get along with the colored folks all right. The other day he came in and he said, "CLARE, we don't like your view on this FEPC bill." I said, "I know you do not, but that is the way I feel, because no one has ever yet been able to tell me when or where preference ended and discrimination began." So I said, "You do not have any trouble in Paw Paw"—that is where he lives—"do you?" "No," he said, "only with one barber." The farmer, the businessman, they treat me all right." "But," he said, "one place they did not."

I said, "When you ride on the train that runs from Chicago to Detroit, the New York Central, you do not have any trouble, you can go in any car you wish?"

"Yes, sir."

I said, "Lige, why would you not go along with this proposition: That is a big road, they have plenty of money, they can afford it; why can we not have one car for colored folks, one car for white folks, and one car for mixed folks? I do not mean mixed folks, I mean a car where everybody can go and sit or eat or sleep, whether he be black or white or brown or yellow?"

"Oh," he said, "that would not be right, that would not be fair."

I cannot see why it is not fair. That arrangement ought to please everyone. Why is that not all right? Why would it not be all right? Then people could go where they wanted, associate with the people of their choice. A few of the colored folks in my district do not like me, those who come from Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, and Pittsburgh, but the home folks do; they are all right and they think I am all right; we treat each other as equals. As a matter of choice, we do not discriminate; we put into practice the Golden Rule; and we do not need any professional agitator to force on us a law to make us do something we are now doing. Why not fix it so everybody can choose his associates? Do you see the point? Extend equal facilities; yes. But do not discriminate against the majority by imposing upon them obligations granting special privileges to minorities.

I would go one step further. The mayor of one of the cities in my district talked to me one time and said, "What do you think about this; you have been in Washington a long time and you ought to know everything; just tell us what to do."

I said, "All right, I have been in Washington and I should know everything. What do you wish to ask me about?"

"Well," he said, "we are having some trouble with the bathing beach; trouble between the colored folks and the whites, they get mixed up sometimes," he said. "What can we do?"

I said, "Why do not you divide that beach, not according to population,"—the colored folks there were only 10 to 15 percent of the population, maybe not that much. I said, "Do not divide it on that basis; split it even, 50-50. Then call the leaders of the colored organization in and say, 'All right now, here, Mr. Jones, Mr. White, Mr. Smith, you just take your half; choose the half of the bathing beach you want, north or south half.' Give them equal facilities, better even; give them more because they have not had as many years of opportunity as the whites have had; give them the long end of the lever. Why not? It is all right. Let them have it. And then when they have taken that let them stay over on that side and let the white people stay over on their side, and if you want to give them another beach where they can mix up if they want to, give them that, divide the beach into three equal sections if they wish and make everyone happy by letting everyone into the third division."

But why force business by an FEPC to employ this one, that one, or the other one? Where will we get? Suppose you have a Catholic hospital, a Catholic publishing house; under this law if along comes an atheist who wants a job or a Communist who says there is no God, still if he or she is qualified under the proposed bill you have got to take him or her as an employee.

Would you not have to take in an atheist, would you not have to take a Lutheran, as I am, into a Jewish religious establishment, a publishing house? Of course you do not want that. Suppose you are a Christian and along comes an atheist Communist, you have got to take her in under the FEPC and teach your children in a public or parochial school.

Let me give you a hint of what may be behind this. Massachusetts, I think, has an FEPC, New York has it; I think New Jersey has it. They are losing a lot of industry up in the Northeast because of some of these restrictive laws. They have no great supply of gas, oil, coal or ore, hence, are dependent upon industry. Having swallowed this trouble-making FEPC which may force some of their industries south they would like to fix you folks in the South so you will not offer quite so much competition. Do you get it? That is what they may be up to. They swallowed something that has given them industrial indigestion and they do not want it, they cannot get rid of it so they want you to have a dose of the same so they can compete on more equal terms. That may be what they are after—why they are so insistent that it become a national policy.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVENPORT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

### CARDINAL JOSEPH MINDSZENTY

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, no incident of recent months has stirred up such world-wide reactions as the arrest of the primate of Hungary, Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty.

The flood of official and private protests from all parts of the world are ample evidence of that.

The imprisoned cardinal is generally regarded as the champion of basic human rights and religious liberty. He is regarded as the Hungarian champion of those rights which are guaranteed to every American citizen by the Constitution of the United States.

The Hungarian Government prepared a yellow book against the cardinal in which he is accused of high treason and espionage.

The Hungarian Government also announced the full confession of the cardinal to above charges.

His trial is to start tomorrow.

But public opinion refuses to recognize the validity of the charges and refuses to believe that the trial will serve the cause of justice.

In the name of the American Catholic hierarchy, Archbishop John T. McNicholas, of Cincinnati, called upon the Catholics of the United States to observe next Sunday, February 6, as a day of prayer and protest over the arrest, imprisonment, and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. In his letter the Archbishop of Cincinnati made this poignant statement:

> The public opinion of our country and the whole noncommunistic world may not influence the despotic rulers of Hungary. The trial of the cardinal will be a travesty of justice. The political court will do the bidding of the tyrannous rulers. We must be prepared to have the torturers and jailers of the cardinal employ every inhuman means to break down the physical and mental powers of his eminence before he appears in the trial. In vain will the Hungarian Government set up false fronts to deceive the world regarding the fantastic charges made against the cardinal primate of Hungary. The Hungarian people will not be deceived.
>
> They know the despotic treatment to which they are subjected. They are conscious of their utter inability at present to resist the brutal and degrading power of those who have seized the control of government under the aegis of the Soviets.
>
> Hungary is an occupied country. The right of occupation is vested in the Soviet Union.

But according to newspaper reports the head of the Soviet State is willing to come to an agreement with the United States on the great issue of peace.

If the Soviet leader, Mr. Stalin, really means what he reportedly said, then here is the opportunity. He, as chief of the occupational forces in Hungary, should prevail on the Hungarian Government and secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty and of all those who together with him were imprisoned.

Such an act would prove to an anxious world that the Soviet Union is ready and willing to fulfill her obligation as a member of the United Nations, and guarantee the freedom of thought, speech, and religion everywhere in the world.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVENPORT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I commend the gentleman for the remarks he has just made on this distressing incident. It is too bad that in these days of enlightened civilization such incidents occur which shock the conscience of all the rest of the civilized world. May we hope that the reign of terror which exists in many of these countries behind the iron curtain may soon come to an end and that democracy may again raise its head so that people everywhere in the world will have at least freedom of religion and freedom of speech.

Mr. DAVENPORT. I thank the gentleman.

### COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 22, Eighty-first Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Select Committee To Conduct a Study and Investigation of the Problems of Small Business the following Members of the House: Mr. PATMAN, of Texas, chairman; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; Mr. HARDY, of Virginia; Mr. MANSFIELD, of Montana; Mr. EVINS, of Tennessee; Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana; Mr. HILL, of Colorado; Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York; Mr. LICHTENWALTER, of Pennsylvania.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SMITH of Ohio, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

### JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On January 28, 1949:

H. J. Res. 112. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

On January 31, 1949:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 3, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

143. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 involving an increase of $375,000 for the Housing Expediter (H. Doc. No. 50); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

144. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of officers above the rank of major of the Army or lieutenant commander of the Navy, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers during the 6-month period preceding the date of January 27, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

145. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting financial statement of the District of Columbia National Guard Armory Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

146. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of Ding Soy Hing or Ting Swee Heng or Ding Say Hing, or Ding Fot Hing or Sing Say Hing, file No. A-6286624, CR 22025, involving suspension of deportation, be withdrawn from the cases now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

147. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of William Gregory Kelsall, Jr., file No. A-1546967, CR 22616, involving suspension of deportation, be withdrawn from the cases now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a letter requesting that the case of Gabriel Morales, file No. A-1687430, CR 21860, involving suspension of deportation, be withdrawn from the cases now pending before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

149. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the Annual Report of the United States Maritime Commission, covering the activities and transactions of the Commission during the fiscal year 1948; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

150. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists or schedules or parts of lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by various Government agencies; to the Committee of House Administration.

151. A letter from the Chairman, Displaced Persons Commission, transmitting the First Semiannual Report of the Displaced Persons Commission, for the period ending February 1, 1949; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

152. A letter from the assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

153. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

154. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

155. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

156. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix; to the Committee on Public Lands.

157. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cove Harbor and Cove Pond, Conn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

158. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 13, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of St. Ignace Harbor, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on June 20, 1938, and of harbor at St. Ignace, Mich., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

159. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Crystal River, Fla., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

160. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 15, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Townsend Inlet, N. J., requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, adopted on May 18, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

---

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNSIDE:

H. R. 2096. A bill to authorize the erection of a Federal office building in Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2097. A bill to repeal the war tax rate on the retail sale of furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2098. A bill to discontinue in effect certain war excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2099. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii," approved April 30, 1900, as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2100. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2101. A bill to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2102. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2103. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina (by request):

H. R. 2104. A bill relating to orders to banks doing business in the District to stop payment on negotiable instruments payable from deposits in, or payable at, such banks; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2105. A bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges of the municipal court for the District of Columbia and prescribe the qualifications of the judges of such court; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2106. A bill to amend the act of July 1, 1902, as amended, to provide exemption from payment of personal property tax in the District of Columbia for veterans' organizations incorporated by acts of Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 2107. A bill to authorize the transfer of the Federal Government's interest in certain defense housing to the States and their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2108. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide increases of compensation for certain veterans with service-connected disabilities who have dependents" to define the term "wife" to include "dependent husband"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2109. A bill to provide that all employees of the veterans' canteen service shall be paid from funds of the service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2110. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the eightieth anniversary of the incorporation of Abilene, Kans.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2111. A bill to grant equitable compensatory time to postal employees for holidays which fall on Saturdays and Sundays; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2112. A bill to increase the compensation of all postal and classified employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2113. A bill to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations for Government employees, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2114. A bill for the benefit of employees involuntarily separated from the service of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2115. A bill to provide for promotion procedure within the executive classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2116. A bill to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate and assist in the prosecution of cases involving the killing or assaulting of officers of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2117. A bill to repeal wartime tax rates on telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2118. A bill to provide for standards to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture governing imported agricultural food products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2119. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to immediately make effective the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2120. A bill to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2121. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey abandoned school properties in the Territory of Alaska to local school officials; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2122. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2123. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Kensington, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2124. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Lonaconing, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2125. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Woodsboro, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2126. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Western Port, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2127. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Brunswick, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2128. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Emmitsburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2129. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Williamsport, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2130. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Thurmont, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2131. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Silver Spring, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2132. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Hancock, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2133. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Gaithersburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 2134. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2135. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2136. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2137. A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands and resources in and beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 2138. A bill to repeal paragraph (4) of section 15 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 2139. A bill to amend the Immigration Act of 1924 to provide a nonquota status for the unmarried dependent grandchildren of certain immigrants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2140. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," approved May 29, 1944; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 2141. A bill to provide rest rooms in certain post offices; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2142. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the eightieth anniversary of the birth of Booth Tarkington; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2143. A bill to require Federal district courts and State courts to enforce certain support orders of courts of other States, and to confer jurisdiction on Federal district courts to make support orders in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2144. A bill to create a Committee on Capital Clearance for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2145. A bill to grant recognition for wartime service in the United States merchant marine and to provide that persons who served in the wartime merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2146. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest

years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 2147. A bill to provide for the preparation and distribution of booklets of information relating to Members of, and Delegates to, and the Resident Commissioner in, the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2148. A bill to repeal certain excise tax rates on watches and clocks and cases and movements therefor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2149. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to contract for certain investigation reports in connection with insurance claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. R. 2150. A bill to extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of alien fiancees in cases where the failure to enter within the period heretofore prescribed was the result of causes beyond the control of the parties to the proposed marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 2151. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2152. A bill granting pensions to veterans of World War I and World War II who are 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2153. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the county of Culpeper, Va.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 2154. A bill to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2155. A bill to grant recognition for wartime service in the United States merchant marine and to provide that persons who served in the wartime merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BATES of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2156. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2157. A bill granting exemptions from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2158. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2159. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of Dauphin Island Bay, Ala.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 2160. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2161. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2162. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2163. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of June 18, 1934, relating to the establishment of foreign-trade zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2164. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2165. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2166. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2167. A bill to amend the Sherman Antitrust Act with respect to the application of the antitrust laws in the case of certain agreements; to the Committe on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2168. A bill to amend title 18, entitled "Crimes and Criminal Procedure," and title 28, entitled "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 2169. A bill to provide increases in compensation for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2170. A bill declaring children of competent Crow Indians to be competent members of the Crow Tribe; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2171. A bill relating to the disposition of permanent housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2172. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2173. A bill to incorporate the Blue Star Mothers of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2174. A bill to amend section 3804 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to the time for performing certain acts postponed by reason of war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANT:

H. R. 2175. A bill to amend sections 613, 624, 625, 631 of the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (60 Stat. 1042, 1045–1047); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2176. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act), to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2177. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2178. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the nine hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of America by Leif Erikson; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2179. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2180. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide hospital and medical treatment for persons who have performed 25 years of service as seamen; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2181. A bill to grant pensions to veterans of the war with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, or the China Relief Expedition who served less than 70 days; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2182. A bill to permit the prosecution of lynching in Federal courts when the governor or attorney general of the State concerned lacks authority to direct the prosecution in State courts, or such prosecution is impaired by his refusal to do so; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2183. A bill to facilitate the admission to the United States of alien spouses, alien minor children, and alien fiancées or fiancés of World War II veterans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2184. A bill to amend section 113 (b) (1) (B) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to the adjustment of the basis of property for depreciation, obsolescence, amortization, and depletion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 2185. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 2186. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2187. A bill to provide that certain disabled veterans be entitled to special parking privileges in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2188. A bill relating to the promotion of Government employees who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2189. A bill to create additional Secretaries of the Armed Services for Reserve components; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 2190. A bill to provide for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians under the jurisdiction of the Sisseton Indian Agency, South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2191. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2192. A bill to establish minimum space requirements for post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2193. A bill to provide for the waiver of certain physical requirements for Federal positions in the case of certain disabled veterans who have efficiently discharged duties comparable to the duties of the position for which they are being examined, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2194. A bill to authorize the annual admission of 100,000 immigrants of Italian nationality for a period of 5 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2195. A bill to authorize the President to make available for immigration purposes certain unused immigration quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2196. A bill to authorize the elimination of lands from the Flathead Indian Irrigation Project, Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2197. A bill to authorize acquisition by the county of Missoula, Mont., of certain lands for public use purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2198. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended, to make the personnel ceiling provisions of such act inapplicable to employees of the Navy Department whose wages are fixed by wage boards or similar administrative authority; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2199. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2200. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2201. A bill granting equipment allowances to postmasters at offices in which post-office fixtures and equipment are furnished by the postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2202. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, as amended, to include administrative reorganizations within the provisions of the act relating to reduction in personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2203. A bill to provide for a decennial census of housing; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2204. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the United States Maritime Commission to dispose of certain materials to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2205. A bill to facilitate the admission into the United States of alien relatives of members and honorably discharged veterans of the United States armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAND:

H. R. 2206. A bill to provide for a new Federal building in Bloomington, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2207. A bill to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to execute and deliver to present owners of certain real property quitclaim deeds to minerals in or under such property; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota:

H. R. 2208. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2209. A bill to increase from $3,000 to $7,500 the maximum amount that a retired commissioned officer and certain other Federal employees may receive as combined retired pay and compensation from a civilian office or position under the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 2210. A bill to authorize the credits to certain public agencies of the United States for costs of construction and operation and maintenance of flood protective levee systems along or adjacent to the lower Colorado River in Arizona, California, and Lower California, Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2211. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2212. A bill to change the name of the Gatun Locks, the Gatun Dam, and the town of Gatun in the Canal Zone to "Sibert Locks," "Sibert Dam," and "Sibert" respectively, in memory of the late Maj. Gen. William L. Sibert, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 2213. A bill to provide for centralizing certain wage rates to the supervision of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2214. A bill to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway in the State of Maryland as extensions of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2215. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2216. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STIGLER:

H. R. 2217. A bill to dispense with the maximum income requirements necessary to establish eligibility for pensions for widows and children of veterans of World War I; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2218. A bill to provide that pensions shall be extended to the widows and children of deceased World War II veterans on the same conditions as they are now extended to the widows and children of deceased World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 2219. A bill authorizing a completion of the improvement of the Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2220. A bill to provide for the national security of the Nation by requiring that all qualified young men undergo a period of training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VURSELL:

H. R. 2221. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2222. A bill to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good faith delivered price systems and freight absorption practices; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHEELER:

H. R. 2223. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. J. Res. 124. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALLECK:

H. J. Res. 125. Joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Grand Army of the Republic; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. J. Res. 126. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. J. Res. 127. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Denver, Colo., as "Edward W. Combs Veterans Facility Hospital"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. J. Res. 128. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for the adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. J. Res. 129. Joint resolution designating the first Sunday in June of each year as

Shut-In's Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to provide for designation of the Veterans' Administration hospital to be constructed in St. Louis, Mo., as the John J. Cochran Memorial Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. J. Res. 132. Joint resolution to name the Chain of Rocks improvement the Cochran Canal and Locks; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 134. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Con. Res. 21. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the pamphlet entitled "Manual Explanatory of the Privileges, Rights, and Benefits Provided For Persons Who Served in the Armed Forces of the United States During World War I, World War II, or peacetime (After April 20, 1898), and Those Dependent Upon Them, With Special Reference to Those Benefits, Rights, and Privileges Administered by the Veterans' Administration"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the 7th day of March of each year be known and designated in the several States as Friendship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution relative to reform in procedure before congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. Res. 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 76. Resolution investigating certain matters pertaining to the United States merchant marine; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 77. Resolution providing for expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1); to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WOOD:

H. Res. 78. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 3, in relation to the effect of the recent freezing weather conditions on the agricultural industry of California; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of Legislative Resolution 5, and asking that Senate bill 246, providing Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools of the United States, or any similar legislation now pending before the Congress, be defeated; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of Senate Concurrent Memorial No. 1, dealing with the existing labor-management dispute between the Kennecott Copper Corp., Utah copper division, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

## PRIVATE BILLS ANL RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2224. A bill for the relief of the Winona Machine & Foundry Co., a corporation, of Winona, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2225. A bill for the relief of William B. Buol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2226. A bill for the relief of Victor C. Kaminski (also known as Victor Kaminski); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2227. A bill for the relief of William Alexander Blum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2228. A bill for the relief of Paul B. Herrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2229. A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes; Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster; William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders; and John S. Bantham, station examiner; at Albany, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2230. A bill to reimburse Arthur S. Horner, Leah B. Horner, and Maude Brewer, partners composing a firm doing business as A. S. Horner Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEANE:

H. R. 2231. A bill for the relief of Marie E. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 2232. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Solveig Normanson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2233. A bill for the relief of Ewa Plantation Co., a Hawaiian corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2234. A bill for the relief of Gladys J. Senyohl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FURCOLO:

H. R. 2235. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Armand Ribeiro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Merman A. Bennink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2237. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Wadlow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2238. A bill for the relief of Robert L. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2239. A bill for the relief of the estate of W. M. West; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2240. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James M. Cooper; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2241. A bill to record the lawful admission of Ibrahim Wadie Harb to the United States for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2242. A bill for the relief of Rufus H. Grant; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2243. A bill for the relief of Constantine N. Perkins; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2244. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Hunter; Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 2245. A bill for the relief of First Lt. Henry S. Watcke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2246. A bill for the relief of John DelGatte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LODGE:

H. R. 2247. A bill for the relief of Ethel S. Wakeman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 2248. A bill for the relief of Wataru Kitagawa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 2249. A bill for the relief of Al W. Hosinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2250. A bill for the relief of Pietro Fazzalari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2251. A bill for the relief of Marie Cataldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2252. A bill for the relief of Orren J. Lucht, Mora, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2253. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Arthur Earl Troiel, Jr., a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2254. A bill for the relief of Osmore H. Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2255. A bill for the relief of Kwan Hon Cheun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY:

H. R. 2256. A bill for the relief of Angelina Marsiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 2257. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, by including therein the name of Gustaf E. Lambert; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Antonio M. Opisso and family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Ewing Choat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Chagra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Angelo Miletto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2263. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gee Yee Shee, Mrs. Wong Tew Quey Gee, Ruth Shue-Kim Gee and Joseph Doo-Keung Gee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H. R. 2264. A bill for the relief of C. H. Bolling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 2265. A bill for the relief of Thomas Nicholas Epiphaniades and Wanda Julia Epiphaniades; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2266. A bill for the relief of Morris Tutnauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2267. A bill for the relief of Anna Constantios Nicourezou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIER:

H. R. 2268. A bill for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

38. By Mr. MACK of Washington: Petition of Northwest Rivers and Harbors Congress urging Congress to specifically exempt the Corps of Engineers from any legislation which will transfer civil-works functions of the corps to any other agency; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

39. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thomas D. Leadbetter, city clerk, city of Detroit, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to establishment of aerial gunnery areas in Lake Huron and the establishment of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

# SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1949

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we are again approaching Thy throne through the old and familiar way of prayer which is never closed to those who come with a humble spirit and a contrite heart.

May this be a moment of insight and of inspiration. Grant that the whole day may be glorious in the realization of Thy presence, Thy peace, and Thy power.

We pray that Thou wilt transform our lives from what they are to what they ought to be. Establish within us those loyalties and those integrities which cannot be shaken.

Guide us by Thy spirit as we seek to minister to the needs of all the members of the human family who are finding the struggle of life so difficult. Show us how we may release the hidden splendor of humanity and bring to fulfillment those ideals and capacities which Thou hast planted in the soul of man.

To Thy name we ascribe the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 31, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 126) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. LANGER proceeded to address the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota will understand that remarks are not in order at this time.

Mr. LANGER. I thought I had 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; there is no 5-minute rule which operates during the transaction of the routine morning business. Under the rule speeches of any length are not in order. The 5-minute rule applies when the Senate is considering the calendar during the morning hour, not during the transaction of the routine morning business.

Mr. LANGER. Then I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

[Mr. LANGER's remarks appear elsewhere in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.]

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I think, in order to save time, that I should suggest the absence of a quorum, and I do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Holland | Murray |
| Anderson | Humphrey | Myers |
| Baldwin | Hunt | Neely |
| Brewster | Ives | O'Conor |
| Bricker | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Pepper |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Reed |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Cain | Kem | Russell |
| Chapman | Kerr | Saltonstall |
| Chavez | Kilgore | Schoeppel |
| Connally | Knowland | Smith, Maine |
| Cordon | Langer | Smith, N. J. |
| Donnell | Lodge | Sparkman |
| Douglas | Long | Stennis |
| Eastland | Lucas | Taft |
| Ecton | McCarthy | Taylor |
| Ellender | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Flanders | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Frear | McKellar | Thye |
| Fulbright | McMahon | Tydings |
| George | Magnuson | Vandenberg |
| Gillette | Martin | Watkins |
| Hayden | Maybank | Wiley |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Williams |
| Hickenlooper | Millikin | Withers |
| Hill | Morse | |
| Hoey | Mundt | |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PETER MARSHALL

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a certified copy of prefatory remarks made by the chaplain of the Ohio State Senate regarding the death of Rev. Peter Marshall, late the Chaplain of the United States Senate, which, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The United States Senate is without a Chaplain. A brilliant life came suddenly to an end yesterday in Washington. The Reverend Peter Marshall has had a distinguished career as Chaplain of the Senate, if my information is correct, following that of the late Dr. ZeBarney T. Phillips, of Springfield, Ohio. He was popular with the Senators, being as he was an outspokenly honest man who challenged them constantly to be outstanding leaders in the high office to which the American people had elected them. He was pastor

of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, where Abraham Lincoln worshiped while President of this great Nation. We shall remember him and his loved ones in their bereavement today in our prayer:

"In the midst of life we are in death: of whom may we seek for succor, but of Thee, O Lord, who for our sins art justly displeased?"

Let us pray:

"O God whose days are without end and whose mercies cannot be numbered, accept our prayers on behalf of the soul of Thy servant departed and grant him an entrance into the love of life and joy, in the fellowship of Thy saints. Defend the members of his bereaved family with Thy heavenly grace that they may continue Thine forever and daily increase in Thy Holy Spirit more and more until they too come into Thine everlasting Kingdom.

"May the souls of the faithful by the mercies of God rest in peace.

"May he rest in peace." Amen.

This is to certify that this is a true and correct copy of prefatory remarks made by the Rev. John I. Byron, chaplain, Ohio State Senate, Columbus, Ohio, January 26, 1949, regarding the death of Rev. Peter Marshall, Chaplain of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DWIGHT L. MATCHETTE,
*Clerk of the Senate.*

## TEXTS OF CERTAIN CONVENTIONS, ETC., OF INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE (H. DOC. NO. 51)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*To the Senate of the United States:*

The Constitution of the International Labor Organization provides in article 19 thereof, with respect to each convention and recommendation adopted at a session of the International Labor Conference, that "each of the members undertakes that it will," within a given period, bring the convention or recommendation "before the authority or authorities within whose competence the matter lies, for the enactment of legislation or other action."

In accordance with the above-mentioned obligations of the Government of the United States of America as a member of the International Labor Organization, I transmit herewith, for the enactment of legislation or such other action as the Senate may consider appropriate, authentic texts of certain conventions, an instrument of amendment, and recommendations adopted at recent sessions of the International Labor Conference, as follows:

Convention (No. 81) concerning labor inspection in industry and commerce;

Convention (No. 82) concerning social policy in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to nonmetropolitan territories;

Instrument for the amendment of the schedule to convention (No. 83) concerning the application of international labor standards to nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 84) concerning the right of association and the settlement of labor disputes in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 85) concerning labor inspectorates in nonmetropolitan territories;

Convention (No. 86) concerning the maximum length of contracts of employment of indigenous workers;

Recommendation (No. 81) concerning labor inspection; and

Recommendation (No. 82) concerning labor inspection in mining and transport undertakings.

The conventions and recommendations listed above were adopted at the thirtieth session of the International Labor Conference at Geneva from June 19 to July 11, 1947. The instrument of amendment was adopted by the Conference at its thirty-first session held at San Francisco from June 17 to July 10, 1948.

I transmit also the report of the Acting Secretary of State regarding the above-mentioned conventions, instrument of amendment, and recommendations, and a letter of December 3, 1948, from the Acting Secretary of Labor to the Secretary of State regarding those documents.

I am requesting the Secretary of the Interior to transmit the above-mentioned conventions, instrument of amendment, and recommendations to the governments of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands for the enactment of legislation or other action. I am transmitting those documents to the Secretary of the Navy for appropriate action and advice with respect to Guam, American Samoa, and the trust territory.

I am also referring the texts of the conventions, instrument of amendment, and recommendations to the House of Representatives.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 2, 1949.*

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Acting Secretary of State; (2) letter from the Acting Secretary of Labor; (3) authentic texts of conventions, instrument of amendment, and recommendations.)

## RATIFICATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Governor of the State of South Dakota, transmitting a certified copy of a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the term of the office of the President, which was ordered to lie on the table.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### REPORT ON WAR CONTRACT TERMINATIONS AND SETTLEMENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eighteenth quarterly report on war contract settlements for the period October 1 through December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### FLIGHT PAY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, reporting, pursuant to law, the number of officers above the rank of lieutenant commander on duty involving flying, by rank and age groups, with the average monthly flight pay authorized by law to be paid to such officers, during the 6-month period ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

### REMOVAL OF LIMITATION ON COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948, to remove the present limitation on the compensation of certain officers and employees (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Three letters from the Attorney General, withdrawing the names of certain persons from reports relating to aliens whose deportation he suspended more than 6 months ago, heretofore transmitted by him to the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORT ON SYNTHETIC LIQUID FUELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on operations under the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of April 5, 1944 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### REPORT ON VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF STATE OF CALIFORNIA ON CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the views and recommendations of the State of California on the central Arizona project (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST CROIX, V. I.

Four letters from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws passed by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John and St. Croix, V. I. (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### REPORT ON SOLANO COUNTY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and findings on the Solano County project in the Central Valley Basin of California (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Commission for the calendar year ended December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORT OF DISPLACED PERSONS COMMISSION

A letter from the members of the Displaced Persons Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first semiannual report of that Commission for the period ended December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the tenth annual report of that

Board, for the year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PROGRESS REPORT OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the War Assets Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a quarterly progress report of that Administration, for the period October–December 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES PHILIPPINE WAR DAMAGE COMMISSION

A letter from the director, Washington office, of the Philippine War Damage Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the fourth semiannual report of that Commission, for the period ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT OF POTOMAC ELECTRIC POWER CO.

A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that company for the year ended December 31, 1948, together with a list of the stockholders (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO.

A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of the business of that company, together with a list of stockholders, for the calendar year ended December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ARMORY BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the District of Columbia Armory Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONFIDENTIAL SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON STOCK-PILING PROGRAM AND STATISTICAL SUPPLEMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Munitions Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential supplement to the semiannual report on the stock-piling program and a confidential statistical supplement for the operations covering the period up to June 30, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers in various departments and agencies of the Government, recommended for disposition, which appear to have no permanent value or historical interest (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER as the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUTLER on January 31, 1949 (p. 667), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Senate Concurrent Memorial 1

"Concurrent memorial urging the congressional delegation from the State of Utah to introduce a resolution in the Congress of the United States requesting President Truman to use his good office in securing the appointment of a fact-finding board to investigate and recommend a basis for settlement of the existing labor-management dispute between the Kennecott Copper Corp., Utah copper division, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, such as was recommended by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Industrial Commission of the State of Utah on November 6, 1948; copy attached

*"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein)*:

"Whereas the economy of Utah is substantially stifled due to a prolonged industrial dispute at the Kennecott Copper Corp., Utah copper division; and

"Whereas the national security of the United States requires a stock pile of 90,000 tons of copper by June 30, 1949; and

"Whereas the open-pit mine at Bingham Canyon, Utah, of the Kennecott Copper Corp., produces approximately 30 percent of the national output of newly mined copper; and

"Whereas the Kennecott Copper Corp. and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen have been unable to settle the current dispute through direct negotiations: Be it therefore

*"Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of Utah approve the adoption of this concurrent memorial urging the congressional delegation from the State of Utah to introduce a resolution in the Congress of the United States requesting President Truman to use his good offices in securing the appointment of a fact-finding board to investigate and recommend a basis for settlement of the existing labor-management dispute between the Kennecott Copper Corp., Utah copper division, and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, such as was recommended by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and the Industrial Commission of the State of Utah on November 6, 1948; copy attached; be it further

*"Resolved*, That copy of this concurrent memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each member of the Utah delegation of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, and the Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the effect of the recent freezing weather conditions on the agricultural industry of California

"Whereas recent and unprecedented freezing weather has occurred in the State of California and, particularly in the southern portions thereof, has caused the outright destruction of a large part of the crop of citrus fruits and avocados and has caused damage to the trees bearing such crops to an extent the magnitude of which cannot at this time be definitely ascertained but which well may reach calamitous proportions; and

"Whereas the practical destruction of the citrus fruit and avocado industry of California, coupled with the impairment of production of other types of agricultural products not so severely affected, bids fair to result in a serious impairment of the economic structure of the State of California, affecting not only the individual ranchers but successively affecting the communities in which they live, the State of California, and the United States as a whole; and

"Whereas it is probable that when the full extent of this disaster becomes known its scope will be so great that it will be beyond the power of the State of California to take the remedial steps necessary to alleviate the conditions caused thereby; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California deems it appropriate officially to advise the United States Government of the situation that now exists and probably will exist in this State: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to make a thorough investigation of the conditions resulting from the recent freezing weather in California and the results thereof on the agriculture of the State and to take such steps as may be necessary, by providing subsidies or otherwise, to alleviate the situation and to ameliorate the condition of the persons who have suffered because of the destruction resulting from such freezing weather; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

---

"Senate Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to funds for the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease, a major and devastating disease of livestock, is present in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America have joined forces to control and eradicate the disease in Mexico; and

"Whereas the chief instrument for the control of the disease is the joint commission established for that purpose and supported by the two nations with financial, scientific and general ways and means; and

"Whereas great strides are being made in the Republic of Mexico by the efforts of the joint commission toward the control and eradication of this disease, which is not known to exist elsewhere in North America; and

"Whereas it is in the general welfare of the two contracting nations to continue the work of the joint commission without any slackening of effort or loss of research, program or planning: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to approve an appropriation of funds, and such other enactments as are necessary, to continue without interruption the work of the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico, and commends the commission for its excellent work; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Sena-

tor and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

---

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Relative to the Federal livestock-disease research laboratory

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for the livestock-disease research laboratory, with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease; and

"Whereas neither a site for such laboratory has as yet been selected nor have funds been appropriated for it; and

"Whereas the need for such a laboratory is very great in view of the outbreak of the foot-and-mouth pestilence in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas, because of the large movement of livestock east from the Pacific coast, the establishment of the laboratory on the Pacific slope would be least desirable because of the greater possibility of wide dissemination of the foot-and-mouth disease in the event of its escape from the laboratory; and

"Whereas several years will be consumed before it will be possible to construct and equip a laboratory during such time research could be greatly furthered by sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States immediately to make provision for the construction of a livestock-disease research laboratory, with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease, other than on the Pacific slope, and during the interim prior to the completion of such laboratory, to make provision for sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories in the accomplishment of scientific research with respect to the control of foot-and-mouth disease; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Assembly of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Resolution 46

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will enable the Civil Aeronautics Administration to prohibit the taking off of aircraft from airports during periods of poor visibility

"Whereas there have recently occurred several serious aircraft accidents in Seattle, Wash., Portland, and other areas during periods of poor visibility; and

"Whereas these accidents have resulted in the deaths and injuries of many persons, thereby causing tremendous losses to the air transportation industry due to lack of public confidence in air transportation because of such accidents; and

"Whereas it is believed these accidents were caused by take-offs from airports during weather conditions of poor visibility; and

"Whereas the Civil Aeronautics Administration does not have authority under the presently existing laws to prevent aircraft from taking off during periods when visibility is below the legal minimum; and

"Whereas, if granted such authority it is believed that many of the recent tragic aircraft accidents could have been prevented: Therefore be it

*"Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California*, That the President and the Congress of the United States be memorialized to effect and enact legislation authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Administration to prohibit the taking off of aircraft from airports during periods when visibility is less than the legal minimum; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Ruth Bishop, of Covington, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Purdue Aeronautics Corp., Lafayette, Ind., signed by Grove Webster, director, relating to legislation pertaining to a separate air academy (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., requesting that certain areas in Lake Huron be designated as aerial gunnery areas; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Kentucky Margarine Consumers Committee, favoring the enactment of fair margarine legislation; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Whittier Council of Church Women, Whittier, Calif., favoring world peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Community Councils of the City of New York, N. Y., protesting against Foreign Secretary Bevin's Palestine policy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., praying that the delegates of the United States to the United Nations take the lead in proposing that Italy be assigned the United Nations trusteeship of her former possessions in Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 4, relating to the Colorado River compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Letters and papers in the nature of memorials of sundry citizens of the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide for a single Resident Commissioner in Congress to represent both Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Weber County Canning Crops Association, Ogden, Utah, favoring the enactment of legislation to permit persons of Japanese ancestry to become citizens of the United States on the same basis as other nationalities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Polish-American Congress, Maryland Division, Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to correct some of the alleged deficiencies in the present displaced persons law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Council of the City of Rochester, N. Y.; Common Council of the City of St. Paul and the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, both in the State of Minnesota; the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich.; and the City Council of the City of New Bedford, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming that October 11 of each year be designated as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Resolution 17

"Whereas no segment of the American people has made a greater contribution, in peace and in war, to the welfare of our Nation than have the working men and women of America; and

"Whereas this magnificent contribution was made possible through the long struggle of organized labor to secure for the workingman recognition of certain fundamental rights; and

"Whereas Public Law 101 of the Eightieth Congress, otherwise known as the Taft-Hartley Act, attempts to abridge labor's fundamental rights and to set the cause of the workingman back a generation; and

"Whereas the Taft-Hartley Act not only adversely affects organized labor but jeopardizes the peace and prosperity of the entire country, because whatever hurts labor hurts the Nation: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois*, That the Congress of the United States now assembled be urged to take immediate steps to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and to restore to the working men and women of America the rights to which they are entitled and the respect they so richly deserve; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Members of the Congress of the United States from the State of Illinois."

Adopted by the house, January 25, 1949.

By Mr. MILLER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States through appropriate budgetary and legislative action to continue a plan of expansion of local service air transportation facilities as recommended by the President's Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board, by extending to 5 years the term of experimental or temporary certificates of convenience and necessity for such air transportation now in effect, including that of Empire Air Lines, Inc., now serving Idaho

"Your memorialist, the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Idaho, now convened in regular session, respectfully represents to the President and Congress of the United States:

"That Empire Air Lines, Inc., of Boise, Idaho, is a temporarily certified local (feeder) service air line now operating air-mail route No. 78 under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity which will expire September 28, 1949, unless extended by the Civil Aeronautics Board;

"That the air mail, passenger, and express service rendered by said Empire Air Lines, Inc., is a valuable asset to the State of Idaho in that such service overcomes the existent geographic barriers against convenient and speedy surface transportation, which have heretofore resulted in dividing our State politically, socially, and economically;

"That the continuation of such air service is vitally needed in the promotion of the unity and welfare of Idaho and its people;

"That the President's Air Policy (Finletter) Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board have concurred in recommending that the present experimental 3-year certificates of

convenience and necessity issued to and held by local or feeder air lines be extended to 5 years;

"That the present and planned development of the Snake River area and its water resources for power, irrigation, and other beneficial uses will substantially increase the population, commerce, and trade within the area now served by Empire Air Lines, Inc.;

"That your memorialist, being deeply concerned with the future growth of Idaho, believes that it is in the public interest for the United States to foster and further develop feeder and local air service, particularly in the Western States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the senate of the thirtieth legislature (the house of representatives concurring)*, That the President and Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are urged and requested, through appropriate budgetary action and financial support, to provide for the extension of the term of experimental or temporary certificates of convenience and necessity of local or feeder air lines, including that of Empire Air Lines, Inc., from 3 to 5 years; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be and is hereby ordered to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States of America and the Members of the Idaho delegation and the Congress of the United States of America.

"This senate joint memorial passed the senate on the 25th day of January 1949.

"This senate joint memorial passed the house of representatives on the 27th day of January 1949."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## GENERAL PULASKI MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF NEW BEDFORD, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the City Council of New Bedford, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress.

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1946 to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day, in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of New Bedford, State of Massachusetts, in session assembled—*

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States, to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

In city council, January 27, 1949: Received, placed on file, and resolution adopted.

CHARLES W. DEASY, *City Clerk.*

A true copy, attest:

CHARLES W. DEASY, *City Clerk.*

## AMERICAN MILITARY TRIALS IN GERMANY—TELEGRAM FROM PAUL H. MUELLER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a telegram received by me from Paul H. Mueller, publisher of the Abendpost, Chicago, Ill., dealing with United States military trials in Germany.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., *February 2, 1949.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

In view gravity of charges against prosecuting staff, investigators, and United States military officials participating military trials at Dachau, Germany, I urgently suggest that you try to get subcommittee with fullest investigating powers to its work on spot, i. e., Dachau und Landsberg, Germany. Catholic bishops in western zones of Germany, also Protestant Bishop Dr. Worm, Wuerttemberg, condemned trials repeatedly and demanded investigation of methods American military justice, particularly in connection with so-called Malmedy massacre. Highly probable that third degree, even outright torture, used to obtain confessions to acts, crimes never committed. Death sentences pronounced on basis of such confessions. Believe depositions should be obtained from Germans subjected to these methods, and American investigators, etc., participating in these cases should be sharply questioned by Senators.

PAUL H. MUELLER,
*Publisher, Abendpost.*

## TRANSFER OF BUSHNELL GENERAL HOSPITAL NEAR BRIGHAM CITY, UTAH—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 170) to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 30) thereon. The committee's report was unanimous. I want to ask, either now or at the conclusion of the morning hour, unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill by reason of the urgency of the situation covered by it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and the bill will lie on the table.

## IDA RAFFEL KLAFF

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 46, submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma on January 31, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. This is the usual resolution adopted in similar cases.

There being no objection, the resolution was considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Ida Raffel Klaff, daughter of Louis Raffel, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS RELATING TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 51), which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1949, and ending on February 15, 1950, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed $15,000 for studying intergovernmental relations with the States and municipalities or $18,000 for studying relations with international organizations) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

## HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS RELATING TO GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 52), which under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1949, and ending on February 15, 1950, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and

such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 189, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1948, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

## REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, conforming with the practice followed over the past 6 years, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit the report on civilian employment in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of December 1948, with the request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

In view of the fact that this report is for the last month of the calendar year 1948 and the sixth month of the fiscal year 1949 the following observations will be of interest to Members of Congress in connection with the facts which the report develops.

The number of Federal employees in the executive branch increased 108,987 during the calendar year 1948—the net increase averaging 297 for every day in the year.

This was revealed today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the basis of its compilation of personnel reports certified to the committee by each of the Federal agencies.

The new report covers civilian employment by all Federal agencies for December 1948, and it shows the total for the month—both inside and outside continental United States—was 2,104,456 as compared with 1,995,469 a year ago.

### INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Inside continental United States total employment increased 137,407, a daily average increase of 375 for the year. In December 1948 the total was 1,910,589. A year ago the total was 1,773,182.

### OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

Federal agency personnel employed outside continental United States in December 1948 totaled 193,767, as compared with 222,337 a year ago. The decrease during the year totaled 28,570, or a daily average decrease of 78.

### CIVILIAN AGENCIES

Exclusive of the Military Establishment, Federal civilian agencies at home and abroad increased their personnel during the year by 47,992, rising from 1,166,236 a year ago to 1,214,228 in December 1948. The daily average increase for these agencies was 131. There was a net increase both inside and outside the country.

### MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The number of civilian employees in the Military Establishment increased during the year at an average of 166 per day. The number in December 1948 was 890,228, or 60,995 more than it was a year ago.

The military agencies employed additional civilian personnel at the rate of 246 a day during the year inside continental United States, but showed a decrease averaging about 80 a day abroad.

The total employed inside the country in December 1948 was 750,734, as compared with 660,745 a year ago. Civilians employed by the military agencies outside the country in December 1948 totaled 139,494, as compared with 168,488 a year ago. Much of the decrease abroad was among the so-called industrial employees.

### NOVEMBER–DECEMBER

There was a net decrease of 141 in all Federal civilian employment during December, as compared with the previous month, due largely to heavy reductions in Army civilian employment overseas, to reductions by the War Assets Administration which is in liquidation, and to reductions in the Agriculture Department, where employment is seasonal. There were heavy increases in the Military Establishment employment inside the continental United States and the Post Office Department, which had the Christmas rush.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, NOVEMBER–DECEMBER 1948, AND PAY OCTOBER–NOVEMBER 1948

### NOTE WITH REFERENCE TO PERSONAL SERVICE EXPENDITURE FIGURES

It should be noted that the latest expenditure figures for personal service shown in table I of this report are for the month of November, and that they are compared with personal service expenditure figures for the month of October, whereas the latest employment figures covered in this report are for the month of December and are compared with employment figures for the month of November. This lag in personal service expenditure figures is necessary in order that actual expenditures may be reported.

(Figures in the following report are compiled from signed official personnel reports by the various agencies and departments of the Federal Government. Table I shows total personnel employed inside and outside continental United States, and pay, by agency. Table II shows personnel employed inside continental United States, by agency. Table III shows personnel employed outside continental United States, by agency. Table IV gives by agency the industrial workers employed by the Federal Government. For purposes of comparison, figures for the previous month are shown in adjoining columns.)

### PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for December 1948 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

| | Civilian personnel in executive branch— | | | Pay roll (in thousands of dollars) in executive branch— | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | In December numbered— | In November numbered— | Increase (+) or decrease (−) | In November was— | In October was— | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
| Total | 2,104,456 | 2,104,597 | −141 | 535,303 | 525,487 | +9,816 |
| 1. Agencies exclusive of National Military Establishment | 1,214,228 | 1,214,182 | +46 | 316,094 | 312,488 | +3,606 |
| 2. National Military Establishment | 890,228 | 890,415 | −187 | 219,209 | 212,999 | +6,210 |
| Within National Military Establishment: | | | | | | |
| Office of Secretary of Defense | 1,190 | 1,132 | +58 | 415 | 392 | +23 |
| Department of the Army | 367,365 | 369,016 | −1,651 | 84,443 | 87,144 | −2,701 |
| Department of the Air Force | 156,679 | 157,799 | +1,120 | 39,136 | 35,711 | +3,425 |
| Department of the Navy | 363,874 | 363,588 | +286 | 95,215 | 89,752 | +5,463 |

Table I, on page 3, breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number of employees inside continental United States, the number outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further break-down in tables II, III, and IV does not include pay figures because pay-roll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

### INSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table II)

Federal personnel within the United States increased 3,804 from the November total of 1,906,885 to the December total of 1,910,689.

Exclusive of the National Military Establishment there was an increase of 676 from the November total of 1,159,279 to the December total of 1,159,955.

Total civilian employment within the United States for the National Military Establishment for December was 750,734, an increase of 3,128 over the November total of 747,606.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense increased 58 from the November total of 1,132 to the December figure of 1,190.

The Department of the Army civilian personnel within the United States increased 1,186 from the November figure of 295,863 to the December figure of 297,049.

The Department of the Air Force civilian personnel within continental United States increased 1,302 from the November figure of 129,644 to the December figure of 130,946.

The Department of the Navy within the United States increased 582 from the November figure of 320,967 to the December figure of 321,549.

### OUTSIDE CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES

(See table III)

Outside continental United States Federal personnel decreased 3,945 from the November total of 197,712 to the December total of 193,767.

A decrease of 630 was reported in the overseas civilian employment of the departments and agencies, other than the National Military Establishment, from the November total of 54,903 to the December total of 54,273.

Total overseas civilian employment for the National Military Establishment decreased 3,315 from the November total of 142,809 to the December total of 139,494.

The Department of the Army reported a decrease of 2,837 in overseas employment from the November figure of 73,153 to the December figure of 70,316.

The civilian personnel of the Department of the Air Force overseas decreased 182 from the November figure of 27,035 to the December figure of 26,853.

The Department of the Navy reported a decrease of 296 in overseas employment from the November figure of 42,621 to the December figure of 42,325.

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYMENT

(See table IV)

Total industrial employment during the month of December decreased 2,485 from the November total of 576,932 to the December total of 574,447.

The departments and agencies other than the National Military Establishment decreased their industrial employment by 846 from the November total of 20,172 to the December total of 19,326.

The National Military Establishment decreased its total industrial employment 1,639 during the month from the November total of 556,760 to the December total of 555,121.

The Department of the Army decreased its industrial employment 1,721 from the November figure of 208,326 to the December figure of 206,605. Inside continental United States there was an increase of 389, while overseas industrial employment decreased 2,110.

The Department of the Air Force industrial employment increased 304 during the month of December from the November figure of 94,944 to the December figure of 95,248. Inside continental United States the Air Force industrial employment increased 649, while outside continental United States it decreased 345.

The Department of the Navy decreased its industrial employment 222 from the November figure of 253,490 to the December figure of 253,268.

The term "industrial employees," as used by the committee, refers to unskilled, semi-skilled, skilled, and supervisory employees paid by the Federal Government, who are working on construction projects such as airfields and roads, and in shipyards and arsenals. It does not include maintenance and custodial employees.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948; and pay for November 1948, and comparison with October 1948*

| Department or agency | Pay (in thousands of dollars) | | | | Personnel | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | October | November | Increase | Decrease | November | December | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 19,582 | 18,419 | | 1,163 | 76,767 | 74,963 | | 1,804 |
| Commerce | 12,276 | 12,195 | | 81 | 40,381 | 40,139 | | 242 |
| Interior | 13,197 | 13,496 | 299 | | 50,447 | 49,484 | | 963 |
| Justice | 8,913 | 9,178 | 265 | | 26,279 | 26,195 | | 84 |
| Labor | 1,062 | 1,131 | 69 | | 3,481 | 3,507 | 26 | |
| Post Office | 124,068 | 125,072 | 1,004 | | 501,854 | 508,321 | 6,467 | |
| State | 5,375 | 5,649 | 274 | | 19,932 | 20,001 | 69 | |
| Treasury | 25,070 | 26,578 | 1,508 | | 88,714 | 88,567 | | 147 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | | | | | |
| White House Office | 124 | 85 | | 39 | 218 | 214 | | 4 |
| Bureau of the Budget | 234 | 248 | 14 | | 537 | 538 | 1 | |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 12 | 15 | 3 | | 64 | 64 | | |
| National Security Council [1] | 9 | 9 | | | 19 | 19 | | |
| National Security Resources Board | 145 | 170 | 25 | | 378 | 390 | 12 | |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 21 | 23 | 2 | | 39 | 39 | | |
| Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation | 15 | 12 | | 3 | 40 | 40 | | |
| Postwar agencies: | | | | | | | | |
| Displaced Persons Commission | 22 | 32 | 10 | | 106 | 116 | 10 | |
| Economic Cooperation Administration | 738 | 800 | 62 | | 2,491 | 2,852 | 361 | |
| Office of the Housing Expediter | 1,530 | 1,585 | 55 | | 4,810 | 4,837 | 27 | |
| Philippine Alien Property Administration | 31 | 32 | 1 | | 137 | 134 | | 3 |
| Philippine War Damage Commission | 210 | 217 | 7 | | 936 | 937 | 1 | |
| War Assets Administration | 4,153 | 4,155 | 2 | | 10,241 | 7,349 | | 2,892 |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 13 | 14 | 1 | | 138 | 135 | | 3 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 1,825 | 1,682 | | 143 | 4,890 | 4,835 | | 55 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 244 | 260 | 16 | | 666 | 664 | | 2 |
| Civil Service Commission | 1,189 | 1,247 | 58 | | 4,109 | 4,118 | 9 | |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 58 | 60 | 2 | | 125 | 123 | | 2 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 481 | 503 | 22 | | 1,360 | 1,354 | | 6 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 352 | 371 | 19 | | 1,025 | 1,031 | 6 | |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 184 | 198 | 14 | | 379 | 377 | | 2 |
| Federal Power Commission | 307 | 353 | 46 | | 829 | 831 | 2 | |
| Federal Security Agency [2] | 8,935 | 9,321 | 386 | | 35,048 | 34,972 | | 76 |
| Federal Trade Commission | 230 | 244 | 14 | | 636 | 634 | | 2 |
| Federal Works Agency | 6,019 | 5,751 | | 268 | 22,924 | 22,853 | | 71 |
| General Accounting Office | 2,717 | 2,887 | 170 | | 9,443 | 9,411 | | 32 |
| Government Printing Office | 1,995 | 2,099 | 104 | | 6,986 | 6,953 | | 33 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 3,677 | 3,636 | | 41 | 11,780 | 11,678 | | 102 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 6 | 6 | | | 11 | 11 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 825 | 872 | 47 | | 2,297 | 2,286 | | 11 |
| Maritime Commission | 1,723 | 2,099 | 376 | | 6,773 | 6,530 | | 243 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 1,975 | 1,816 | | 159 | 6,780 | 6,887 | 107 | |
| National Archives | 158 | 105 | | 53 | 371 | 380 | 9 | |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 68 | 70 | 2 | | 306 | 306 | | |
| National Capital Park and Planning Commission | 7 | 9 | 2 | | 20 | 20 | | |
| National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 3 | | |
| National Gallery of Art | 76 | 80 | 4 | | 319 | 317 | | 2 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 543 | 574 | 31 | | 1,827 | 1,661 | | 166 |
| National Mediation Board | 59 | 53 | | 6 | 104 | 107 | 3 | |
| Panama Canal | 4,355 | 3,290 | | 1,065 | 23,051 | 22,918 | | 133 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 649 | 683 | 34 | | 2,401 | 2,388 | | 13 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 1,836 | 1,832 | | 4 | 4,801 | 4,623 | | 178 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 462 | 467 | 5 | | 1,159 | 1,159 | | |
| Selective Service System | 970 | 1,075 | 105 | | 5,933 | 5,979 | 46 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 157 | 166 | 9 | | 560 | 555 | | 5 |
| Tariff Commission | 98 | 103 | 5 | | 241 | 239 | | 2 |
| Tax Court of the United States | 54 | 54 | | | 124 | 124 | | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 4,171 | 3,510 | | 661 | 14,307 | 13,982 | | 325 |
| Veterans' Administration | 49,282 | 51,501 | 2,219 | | 214,585 | 215,078 | 493 | |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 312,488 | 316,094 | 7,292 | 3,686 | 1,214,182 | 1,214,228 | 7,649 | 7,603 |
| Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment | | | 3,606 | | | | 46 | |
| National Military Establishment: | | | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 392 | 415 | 23 | | 1,132 | 1,190 | 58 | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | [3] 71,697 | 71,312 | | 385 | 295,863 | 297,049 | 1,186 | |
| Outside continental United States | 15,447 | 13,131 | | 2,316 | 73,153 | 70,316 | | 2,837 |

[1] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Includes personnel and pay for the Columbia Institute for the Deaf and Howard University.
[3] Revised.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948; and pay for November 1948, and comparison with October 1948*—Continued

| Department or agency | Pay (in thousands of dollars) | | | | Personnel | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | October | November | Increase | Decrease | November | December | Increase | Decrease |
| National Military Establishment—Continued | | | | | | | | |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 30,747 | 33,800 | 3,053 | | 129,644 | 130,946 | 1,302 | |
| Outside continental United States | 4,964 | 5,336 | 372 | | 27,035 | 26,853 | | 182 |
| Department of the Navy | 89,752 | 95,215 | 5,463 | | 363,588 | 363,874 | 286 | |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 212,999 | 219,209 | 8,911 | 2,701 | 890,415 | 890,228 | 2,832 | 3,019 |
| Net change, National Military Establishment | | | 6,210 | | | | 187 | |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 525,487 | 535,303 | 16,203 | 6,387 | 2,104,597 | 2,104,456 | 10,481 | 10,622 |
| Net change, including National Military Establishment | | | 9,816 | | | | 141 | |

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948*

| Department or agency | November | December | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | |
| Agriculture | 74,958 | 73,101 | −1,857 |
| Commerce | 37,141 | 37,138 | −3 |
| Interior | 44,895 | 44,325 | −570 |
| Justice | 25,810 | 25,725 | −85 |
| Labor | 3,445 | 3,471 | +26 |
| Post Office | 500,121 | 506,585 | +6,464 |
| State | 7,462 | 7,608 | +146 |
| Treasury | 88,067 | 87,919 | −148 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | |
| White House Office | 218 | 214 | −4 |
| Bureau of the Budget | 537 | 538 | +1 |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 64 | 64 | |
| National Security Council [1] | 19 | 19 | |
| National Security Resources Board | 378 | 390 | +12 |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 39 | 39 | |
| Emergency war agencies: | | | |
| Office of Defense Transportation | 40 | [2] 40 | |
| Postwar agencies: | | | |
| Displaced Persons Commission | 42 | 45 | +3 |
| Economic Cooperation Administration | 838 | 854 | +16 |
| Office of the Housing Expediter | 4,784 | 4,813 | +29 |
| Philippine Alien Property Administration | 2 | 2 | |
| Philippine War Damage Commission | 7 | 7 | |
| War Assets Administration | 10,150 | 7,326 | −2,824 |
| Independent agencies: | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 7 | 7 | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 4,887 | 4,832 | −55 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 646 | 644 | −2 |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,103 | 4,113 | +10 |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 123 | 121 | −2 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,323 | 1,318 | −5 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,025 | 1,031 | +6 |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 379 | 377 | −2 |
| Federal Power Commission | 829 | 831 | +2 |
| Federal Security Agency [3] | 34,084 | 33,994 | −90 |
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | |
| Federal Trade Commission | 636 | 634 | −2 |
| Federal Works Agency | 22,463 | 22,394 | −69 |
| General Accounting Office | 9,443 | 9,411 | −32 |
| Government Printing Office | 6,986 | 6,953 | −33 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 11,738 | 11,634 | −104 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 11 | 11 | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,297 | 2,286 | −11 |
| Maritime Commission | 6,734 | 6,492 | −242 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 6,780 | 6,887 | +107 |
| National Archives | 371 | 380 | +9 |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 306 | 306 | |
| National Capital Park and Planning Commission | 20 | 20 | |
| National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission | 3 | 3 | |
| National Gallery of Art | 319 | 317 | −2 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,815 | 1,648 | −167 |
| National Mediation Board | 104 | 107 | +3 |
| Panama Canal | 484 | 635 | +151 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,401 | 2,388 | −13 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 4,788 | 4,610 | −178 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 1,159 | 1,159 | |
| Selective Service System | 5,773 | 5,819 | +46 |
| Smithsonian Institution | 555 | 550 | −5 |
| Tariff Commission | 241 | 239 | −2 |
| Tax Court of the United States | 124 | 124 | |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 14,307 | 13,982 | −325 |
| Veterans' Administration | 212,998 | 213,475 | +477 |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 1,159,279 | 1,159,955 | +7,508<br>−6,832 |
| Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment | | | +676 |
| National Military Establishment: | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 1,132 | 1,190 | +58 |
| Department of the Army | 295,863 | 297,049 | +1,186 |
| Department of the Air Force | 129,644 | 130,946 | +1,302 |
| Department of the Navy | 320,967 | 321,549 | +582 |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 747,606 | 750,734 | +3,128 |
| Net increase, National Military Establishment | | | +3,128 |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 1,906,885 | 1,910,689 | +10,636<br>−6,832 |
| Net increase, including National Military Establishment | | | +3,804 |

[1] Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Revised.
[3] Includes personnel of the Columbia Institute for the Deaf and Howard University.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1948, and comparison with November 1948*

| Department or agency | November | December | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | |
| Agriculture | 1,809 | 1,862 | +53 |
| Commerce | 3,240 | 3,001 | −239 |
| Interior | 5,552 | 5,159 | −393 |
| Justice | 469 | 470 | +1 |
| Labor | 36 | 36 | |
| Post Office | 1,733 | 1,736 | +3 |
| State | 12,470 | 12,393 | −77 |
| Treasury | 647 | 648 | +1 |
| Postwar agencies: | | | |
| Displaced Persons Commission | 64 | 71 | +7 |
| Economic Cooperation Administration | 1,653 | 1,998 | +345 |
| Office of the Housing Expediter | 26 | 24 | −2 |
| Philippine Alien Property Administration | 135 | 132 | −3 |
| Philippine War Damage Commission | 929 | 930 | +1 |
| War Assets Administration | 91 | 23 | −68 |

TABLE III—Continued

| Department or agency | November | December | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Independent agencies: | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 131 | 128 | −3 |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 3 | 3 | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 20 | 20 | |
| Civil Service Commission | 6 | 5 | −1 |
| Export Import Bank of Washington | 2 | 2 | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 37 | 36 | −1 |
| Federal Security Agency | 964 | 978 | +14 |
| Federal Works Agency | 461 | 459 | −2 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 42 | 44 | +2 |
| Maritime Commission | 39 | 38 | −1 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 12 | 13 | +1 |
| Panama Canal | 22,567 | 22,283 | −284 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 13 | 13 | |
| Selective Service System | 160 | 160 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 5 | 5 | |
| Veterans' Administration | 1,587 | 1,603 | +16 |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 54,903 | 54,273 | +444 −1,074 |
| Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment | | | −630 |
| National Military Establishment: | | | |
| Department of the Army | 73,153 | 70,316 | −2,837 |
| Department of the Air Force | 27,035 | 26,853 | −182 |
| Department of the Navy | 42,621 | 42,325 | −296 |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 142,809 | 139,494 | −3,315 |
| Net decrease, National Military Establishment | | | −3,315 |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 197,712 | 193,767 | +444 −4,389 |
| Net decrease, including National Military Establishment | | | −3,945 |

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during December 1948 and comparison with November 1948*

| Department or agency | November | December | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | |
| Commerce | 1,360 | 1,237 | −123 |
| Interior | 4,250 | 3,935 | −315 |
| State | 363 | 359 | −4 |
| Treasury | 4,283 | 4,305 | +22 |
| Independent agencies: | | | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 175 | 157 | −18 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 2 | 1 | −1 |
| Panama Canal | 1,964 | 1,887 | −77 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 7,775 | 7,445 | −330 |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 20,172 | 19,326 | +22 −868 |
| Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment | | | −846 |
| National Military Establishment: | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 158,474 | 158,863 | +389 |
| Outside continental United States | 49,852 | 47,742 | −2,110 |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 74,814 | 75,463 | +649 |
| Outside continental United States | 20,130 | 19,785 | −345 |
| Department of the Navy | 253,490 | 253,268 | −222 |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 556,760 | 555,121 | +1,038 −2,677 |
| Net decrease, National Military Establishment | | | −1,639 |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 576,932 | 574,447 | +1,069 −3,545 |

TABLE IV—Continued

| Department or agency | November | December | Increase (+) or decrease (−) |
|---|---|---|---|
| National Military Establishment—Continued | | | |
| Department of the Navy—Continued | | | |
| Net decrease, including National Military Establishment | | | −2,455 |

## COMPILATION OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT RECORD OF AGENCIES IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, among the services rendered the Congress and the public by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is the compilation of the civilian employment record of the agencies in the executive branch of the Federal Government.

Due to the recess 6 months have elapsed since the last monthly report of the committee on this subject was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I submit two tables which set forth the changes in the personnel situation since that time.

The first table sets forth the changes in the number of employees in the various agencies of the executive branch. The second table sets forth the changes in the costs of personal service in these agencies.

It may be noted also that the first table is broken down to show total employment, employment inside continental United States, employment outside continental United States, and industrial employment.

I request publication of this material in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I-A—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1948, with comparison by months*

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Comparison, June–December: Increase | Comparison, June–December: Decrease |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 85,103 | 86,749 | 84,839 | 81,027 | 79,399 | 76,767 | 74,963 | | 10,140 |
| Commerce | 40,935 | 40,523 | 40,729 | 40,577 | 40,382 | 40,381 | 40,139 | | 796 |
| Interior | 56,338 | 57,218 | 55,918 | 52,380 | 50,736 | 50,447 | 49,484 | | 6,854 |
| Justice | 26,288 | 26,244 | 26,026 | 25,891 | 26,015 | 26,279 | 26,195 | | 93 |
| Labor | 4,514 | 3,556 | 3,425 | 3,470 | 3,382 | 3,481 | 3,507 | | 1,007 |
| Post Office | 498,415 | 508,834 | 514,020 | 517,482 | 492,090 | 501,854 | 508,321 | 9,906 | |
| State | 21,919 | 20,737 | 20,249 | 20,029 | 19,857 | 19,932 | 20,001 | | 1,918 |
| Treasury | 89,386 | 87,395 | 87,333 | 87,603 | 88,412 | 88,714 | 88,567 | | 819 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | | | | | | |
| White House Office | 214 | 218 | 219 | 218 | 218 | 218 | 214 | | |
| Bureau of the Budget | 582 | 536 | 521 | 521 | 530 | 537 | 538 | | 44 |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 60 | 92 | 66 | 63 | 85 | 64 | 64 | 4 | |
| National Security Council [1] | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 19 | 19 | | 3 |
| National Security Resources Board | 232 | 265 | 288 | 322 | 326 | 378 | 390 | 158 | |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 44 | 42 | 42 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | | 5 |
| Office of Government Reports [2] | 17 | | | | | | | | 17 |
| Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation | 54 | 52 | 51 | 47 | 41 | 40 | 40 | | 14 |
| Postwar agencies: | | | | | | | | | |
| Displaced Persons Commission [3] | | | | 34 | 74 | 106 | 116 | 116 | |
| Economic Cooperation Administration | 571 | 954 | 2,042 | 1,995 | 2,458 | 2,491 | 2,852 | 2,281 | |
| Office of the Housing Expediter | 4,568 | 4,618 | 4,679 | 4,726 | 4,760 | 4,810 | 4,837 | 269 | |
| Philippine Alien Property Administration | 142 | 141 | 139 | 138 | 138 | 137 | 134 | | 8 |
| Philippine War Damage Commission | 908 | 928 | 926 | 925 | 934 | 936 | 937 | 29 | |
| War Assets Administration | 17,129 | 15,981 | 14,165 | 11,754 | 11,014 | 10,241 | 7,349 | | 9,780 |

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Liquidated June 30, 1948.
[3] Established pursuant to Public Law 774, 80th Cong.

TABLE I-A—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1948, with comparison by months*—Continued

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Comparison, June-December | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 121 | 132 | 133 | 134 | 138 | 138 | 135 | 14 | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 5,030 | 5,064 | 5,058 | 5,041 | 4,964 | 4,890 | 4,835 | | 195 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 632 | 625 | 634 | 653 | 663 | 666 | 664 | 32 | |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,106 | 4,152 | 4,116 | 4,099 | 4,101 | 4,109 | 4,118 | 12 | |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 125 | 128 | 131 | 127 | 128 | 125 | 123 | | 2 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,380 | 1,385 | 1,373 | 1,362 | 1,364 | 1,360 | 1,354 | | 26 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Commission | 1,095 | 1,001 | 1,001 | 1,022 | 1,023 | 1,025 | 1,031 | | 64 |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 383 | 376 | 380 | 372 | 381 | 379 | 377 | | 6 |
| Federal Power Commission | 809 | 825 | 828 | 827 | 828 | 829 | 831 | 22 | |
| Federal Security Agency [4] | 34,552 | 35,184 | 34,926 | 34,998 | 34,812 | 35,048 | 34,972 | 420 | |
| Federal Trade Commission | 574 | 594 | 615 | 623 | 626 | 636 | 634 | 60 | |
| Federal Works Agency | 22,565 | 22,798 | 23,090 | 23,049 | 23,002 | 22,924 | 22,853 | 288 | |
| General Accounting Office | 9,170 | 9,177 | 9,191 | 9,229 | 9,368 | 9,443 | 9,411 | 241 | |
| Government Printing Office | 7,074 | 7,034 | 7,041 | 7,024 | 6,980 | 6,986 | 6,953 | | 121 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 11,734 | 11,690 | 11,637 | 11,683 | 11,652 | 11,780 | 11,678 | | 56 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,301 | 2,290 | 2,277 | 2,266 | 2,287 | 2,297 | 2,286 | | 15 |
| Maritime Commission | 7,219 | 6,706 | 6,603 | 6,717 | 6,809 | 6,773 | 6,530 | | 689 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 6,279 | 6,670 | 6,687 | 6,670 | 6,700 | 6,780 | 6,887 | 608 | |
| National Archives | 341 | 350 | 354 | 364 | 365 | 371 | 380 | 39 | |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 282 | 290 | 290 | 297 | 302 | 306 | 306 | 24 | |
| National Capital Park and Planning Commission | 20 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 20 | | |
| National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission [5] | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | |
| National Gallery of Art | 322 | 321 | 321 | 317 | 319 | 319 | 317 | | 5 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,992 | 2,107 | 1,953 | 1,911 | 1,833 | 1,827 | 1,661 | | 331 |
| National Mediation Board | 109 | 106 | 98 | 103 | 102 | 104 | 107 | | 2 |
| Panama Canal | 23,477 | 22,647 | 23,042 | 22,956 | 23,340 | 23,051 | 22,918 | | 559 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,599 | 2,545 | 2,492 | 2,443 | 2,391 | 2,401 | 2,388 | | 211 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 5,382 | 5,184 | 5,017 | 4,891 | 4,801 | 4,801 | 4,623 | | 759 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 1,149 | 1,148 | 1,151 | 1,153 | 1,161 | 1,159 | 1,159 | 10 | |
| Selective Service System | 758 | 772 | 3,508 | 5,122 | 5,725 | 5,933 | 5,979 | 5,221 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 516 | 535 | 555 | 554 | 553 | 560 | 555 | 39 | |
| Tariff Commission | 219 | 227 | 234 | 241 | 240 | 241 | 239 | 20 | |
| Tax Court of the United States | 126 | 125 | 125 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 | | 2 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 15,223 | 15,110 | 15,148 | 14,657 | 14,352 | 14,307 | 13,982 | | 1,241 |
| Veterans' Administration | 205,451 | 207,179 | 209,883 | 210,236 | 212,682 | 214,585 | 215,078 | 9,627 | |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 1,220,567 | 1,229,611 | 1,235,624 | 1,230,563 | 1,205,063 | 1,214,182 | 1,214,228 | 29,443 | 35,782 |
| Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | | −6,339 |
| National Military Establishment: | | | | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 984 | 995 | 1,019 | 1,054 | 1,104 | 1,132 | 1,190 | 206 | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | | | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 275,239 | 280,092 | 286,979 | 288,514 | 291,640 | 295,863 | 297,049 | 21,810 | |
| Outside continental United States [6] | 126,733 | 121,470 | 116,547 | 108,918 | 76,819 | 73,153 | 70,316 | | 56,417 |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | | | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 121,103 | 123,182 | 124,259 | 125,969 | 128,361 | 129,644 | 130,946 | 9,843 | |
| Outside continental United States [6] | | | | | 27,391 | 27,035 | 26,853 | 26,853 | |
| Department of the Navy | 347,687 | 351,911 | 356,442 | 359,976 | 361,815 | 363,588 | 363,874 | 16,187 | |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 871,746 | 877,650 | 885,246 | 884,431 | 887,130 | 890,415 | 890,228 | 74,899 | 56,417 |
| Net increase, National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | | +18,582 |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 2,092,313 | 2,107,261 | 2,120,870 | 2,114,994 | 2,092,193 | 2,104,597 | 2,104,456 | 104,342 | 92,199 |
| Net increase, including National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | | +12,143 |

[4] Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[5] Established pursuant to Public Law 203, 80th Cong.
[6] Under the Unification Act the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force personnel reports for civilian employees outside continental United States were separated as of Oct. 1, 1948. The figures above for these departments indicate separate reports accordingly.

TABLE I-B.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1948*

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Comparison, June-December | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 83,249 | 84,800 | 82,987 | 79,220 | 77,549 | 74,958 | 73,101 | | 10,148 |
| Commerce | 37,953 | 37,225 | 37,389 | 37,270 | 37,100 | 37,141 | 37,138 | | 815 |
| Interior | 50,310 | 50,781 | 49,347 | 45,985 | 45,021 | 44,895 | 44,325 | | 5,985 |
| Justice | 25,852 | 25,800 | 25,572 | 25,441 | 25,559 | 25,810 | 25,725 | | 127 |
| Labor | 4,431 | 3,519 | 3,390 | 3,436 | 3,348 | 3,445 | 3,471 | | 960 |
| Post Office | 496,822 | 507,211 | 512,389 | 515,776 | 490,377 | 500,121 | 506,585 | 9,763 | |
| State | 7,685 | 7,618 | 7,783 | 8,960 | 7,393 | 7,462 | 7,608 | | 77 |
| Treasury | 88,730 | 86,751 | 86,690 | 86,957 | 87,771 | 88,067 | 87,919 | | 811 |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | | | | | | |
| White House Office | 214 | 218 | 219 | 218 | 218 | 218 | 214 | | |
| Bureau of the Budget | 582 | 536 | 521 | 521 | 530 | 537 | 538 | | 44 |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 60 | 92 | 66 | 63 | 85 | 64 | 64 | 4 | |
| National Security Council [1] | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 19 | 19 | | 3 |
| National Security Resources Board | 232 | 265 | 288 | 322 | 326 | 378 | 390 | 158 | |
| Council of Economic Advisers | 44 | 42 | 42 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 | | 5 |
| Office of Government Reports [2] | 17 | | | | | | | | 17 |
| Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation | 54 | 52 | 51 | 47 | 41 | 40 | 40 | | 14 |

[1] Exclusive of the personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Liquidated June 30, 1948.

TABLE I–B.—*Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30 through Dec. 31, 1948*—Continued

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Comparison, June–December | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Postwar agencies: | | | | | | | | | |
| Displaced Persons Commission [3] | | | | 19 | 36 | 42 | 45 | 45 | |
| Economic Cooperation Administration | 492 | 690 | 790 | 743 | 767 | 838 | 854 | 362 | |
| Office of the Housing Expediter | 4,542 | 4,592 | 4,652 | 4,699 | 4,733 | 4,784 | 4,813 | 271 | |
| Philippine Alien Property Administration | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |
| Philippine War Damage Commission | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | | |
| War Assets Administration | 16,772 | 15,642 | 13,887 | 11,511 | 10,828 | 10,150 | 7,326 | | 9,446 |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 3 | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 5,027 | 5,061 | 5,055 | 5,038 | 4,961 | 4,887 | 4,832 | | 195 |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 612 | 605 | 614 | 633 | 643 | 646 | 644 | 32 | |
| Civil Service Commission | 4,101 | 4,147 | 4,111 | 4,094 | 4,096 | 4,103 | 4,113 | 12 | |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 123 | 126 | 129 | 125 | 126 | 123 | 121 | | 2 |
| Federal Communications Commission | 1,341 | 1,346 | 1,336 | 1,323 | 1,327 | 1,323 | 1,318 | | 23 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 1,092 | 1,001 | 1,001 | 1,022 | 1,023 | 1,025 | 1,031 | | 61 |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 383 | 376 | 380 | 372 | 381 | 379 | 377 | | 6 |
| Federal Power Commission | 809 | 825 | 828 | 827 | 828 | 829 | 831 | 22 | |
| Federal Security Agency [4] | 33,215 | 33,943 | 33,950 | 34,023 | 33,861 | 34,084 | 33,994 | 779 | |
| Federal Trade Commission | 574 | 594 | 615 | 623 | 626 | 636 | 634 | 60 | |
| Federal Works Agency | 22,112 | 22,351 | 22,642 | 22,595 | 22,535 | 22,463 | 22,394 | 282 | |
| General Accounting Office | 9,170 | 9,177 | 9,191 | 9,229 | 9,368 | 9,443 | 9,411 | 241 | |
| Government Printing Office | 7,074 | 7,034 | 7,041 | 7,024 | 6,980 | 6,986 | 6,953 | | 121 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 11,691 | 11,650 | 11,606 | 11,638 | 11,608 | 11,738 | 11,634 | | 57 |
| Indian Claims Commission | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 2,301 | 2,290 | 2,277 | 2,266 | 2,287 | 2,297 | 2,286 | | 15 |
| Maritime Commission | 7,128 | 6,664 | 6,565 | 6,680 | 6,770 | 6,734 | 6,492 | | 636 |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 6,279 | 6,670 | 6,687 | 6,670 | 6,700 | 6,789 | 6,887 | 608 | |
| National Archives | 341 | 350 | 354 | 364 | 365 | 371 | 380 | 39 | |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 282 | 290 | 290 | 297 | 302 | 306 | 305 | 24 | |
| National Capital Park and Planning Commission | 20 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 21 | 20 | 20 | | |
| National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission [5] | | | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | |
| National Gallery of Art | 322 | 321 | 321 | 317 | 319 | 319 | 317 | | 5 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 1,983 | 2,098 | 1,942 | 1,900 | 1,823 | 1,815 | 1,648 | | 335 |
| National Mediation Board | 109 | 106 | 98 | 103 | 102 | 104 | 107 | | 2 |
| Panama Canal | 643 | 641 | 646 | 638 | 641 | 484 | 635 | | 8 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 2,599 | 2,545 | 2,492 | 2,443 | 2,391 | 2,401 | 2,388 | | 211 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 5,366 | 5,170 | 5,001 | 4,877 | 4,788 | 4,788 | 4,610 | | 756 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 1,149 | 1,148 | 1,151 | 1,153 | 1,161 | 1,159 | 1,159 | 10 | |
| Selective Service System | 742 | 755 | 3,368 | 4,983 | 5,586 | 5,773 | 5,819 | 5,077 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 510 | 529 | 549 | 549 | 548 | 555 | 550 | 40 | |
| Tariff Commission | 219 | 227 | 234 | 241 | 240 | 241 | 239 | 20 | |
| Tax Court of the United States | 126 | 125 | 125 | 124 | 124 | 124 | 124 | | 2 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 15,223 | 15,110 | 15,148 | 14,657 | 14,352 | 14,307 | 13,982 | | 1,241 |
| Veterans' Administration | 203,855 | 205,599 | 208,306 | 208,653 | 211,099 | 212,998 | 213,475 | 9,620 | |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 1,164,608 | 1,174,772 | 1,180,184 | 1,176,779 | 1,149,755 | 1,159,279 | 1,159,955 | 27,475 | 32,128 |
| Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | | —4,653 |
| National Military Establishment: | | | | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 984 | 995 | 1,019 | 1,054 | 1,104 | 1,132 | 1,190 | 206 | |
| Department of the Army | 275,239 | 280,092 | 286,979 | 288,514 | 291,640 | 295,836 | 297,049 | 21,810 | |
| Department of the Air Force | 121,103 | 123,182 | 124,259 | 125,969 | 128,361 | 129,644 | 130,946 | 9,843 | |
| Department of the Navy | 303,627 | 308,577 | 313,344 | 316,889 | 318,880 | 320,967 | 321,549 | 17,922 | |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 700,953 | 712,846 | 725,601 | 732,426 | 739,985 | 747,606 | 750,734 | 49,781 | |
| Net increase, National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | | 49,781 |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 1,865,561 | 1,887,618 | 1,905,785 | 1,909,205 | 1,889,740 | 1,906,885 | 1,910,689 | 77,256 | 32,128 |
| Net increase, including National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | | 45,128 |

[3] Established pursuant to Public Law 774, 80th Cong.
[4] Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[5] Established pursuant to Public Law 203, 80th Cong.

TABLE I–C.—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1948*

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Comparison, June–December | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 1,854 | 1,949 | 1,852 | 1,807 | 1,850 | 1,809 | 1,862 | 8 | |
| Commerce | 2,982 | 3,298 | 3,340 | 3,307 | 3,282 | 3,240 | 3,001 | 19 | |
| Interior | 6,028 | 6,437 | 6,571 | 6,395 | 5,715 | 5,552 | 5,159 | | 869 |
| Justice | 436 | 444 | 454 | 450 | 456 | 469 | 470 | 34 | |
| Labor | 83 | 37 | 35 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 36 | | 47 |
| Post Office | 1,593 | 1,623 | 1,631 | 1,706 | 1,713 | 1,733 | 1,736 | 143 | |
| State | 14,234 | 13,119 | 12,466 | 11,069 | 12,464 | 12,470 | 12,393 | | 1,841 |
| Treasury | 656 | 644 | 643 | 646 | 641 | 647 | 648 | | 8 |
| Postwar agencies: | | | | | | | | | |
| Displaced Persons Commission | | | | 15 | 38 | 64 | 71 | 71 | |
| Economic Cooperation Administration | 79 | 264 | 1,252 | 1,252 | 1,691 | 1,653 | 1,998 | 1,919 | |
| Office of the Housing Expediter | 26 | 26 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 26 | 24 | | 2 |
| Philippine Alien Property Administration | 140 | 139 | 137 | 136 | 136 | 135 | 132 | | 8 |
| Philippine War Damage Commission | 901 | 921 | 919 | 918 | 927 | 929 | 930 | 29 | |
| War Assets Administration | 357 | 339 | 278 | 243 | 186 | 91 | 23 | | 334 |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 117 | 128 | 129 | 129 | 131 | 131 | 128 | 11 | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | | |
| Civil Service Commission | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | | |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | |

TABLE I–C—*Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1948*—Continued

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Comparison, June–December | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Independent agencies—Continued | | | | | | | | | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 39 | 39 | 37 | 39 | 37 | 37 | 36 | | 3 |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 3 | | | | | | | | 3 |
| Federal Security Agency | 1,337 | 1,241 | 976 | 975 | 951 | 964 | 978 | | 359 |
| Federal Works Agency | 453 | 447 | 448 | 454 | 467 | 461 | 459 | 6 | |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 43 | 40 | 31 | 45 | 44 | 42 | 44 | 1 | |
| Maritime Commission | 91 | 42 | 38 | 37 | 39 | 39 | 38 | | 53 |
| National Labor Relations Board | 9 | 9 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 4 | |
| Panama Canal | 22,834 | 22,006 | 22,396 | 22,318 | 22,699 | 22,567 | 22,283 | | 551 |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 16 | 14 | 16 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 | | 3 |
| Selective Service System | 16 | 17 | 140 | 139 | 139 | 160 | 160 | 144 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | | 1 |
| Veterans' Administration | 1,596 | 1,580 | 1,577 | 1,583 | 1,583 | 1,587 | 1,603 | 7 | |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 55,959 | 54,839 | 55,440 | 53,784 | 55,308 | 54,903 | 54,273 | 2,396 | 4,082 |
| Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | 1,686 | |
| National Military Establishment: | | | | | | | | | |
| Department of the Army [1] | 126,733 | 121,470 | 116,547 | 108,918 | 76,819 | 73,153 | 70,316 | | 56,417 |
| Department of the Air Force [1] | | | | | 27,391 | 27,035 | 26,853 | 26,853 | |
| Department of the Navy | 44,060 | 43,334 | 43,098 | 43,087 | 42,935 | 42,621 | 42,325 | | 1,735 |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 170,793 | 164,804 | 159,645 | 152,005 | 147,145 | 142,809 | 139,494 | 26,853 | 58,152 |
| Net decrease, National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | 31,299 | |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 226,752 | 219,643 | 215,085 | 205,789 | 202,453 | 197,712 | 193,767 | 29,249 | 62,234 |
| Net decrease, including National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | 32,985 | |

[1] Under the Unification Act the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force personnel reports for civilian employees outside continental United States were separated as of Oct. 1, 1948. The figures above for these Departments indicate separate reports accordingly.

TABLE I–D.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during the period June 30, 1948, through Dec. 31, 1948*

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | December | Comparison, June–December | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | | | | | | | |
| Commerce | 1,605 | 1,427 | 1,445 | 1,401 | 1,313 | 1,360 | 1,237 | | 368 |
| Interior | 7,770 | 7,745 | 6,670 | 5,664 | 4,673 | 4,250 | 3,935 | | 3,835 |
| State | 380 | 378 | 395 | 374 | 363 | 363 | 359 | | 21 |
| Treasury | 3,630 | 3,835 | 4,001 | 4,097 | 4,175 | 4,283 | 4,305 | 675 | |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 217 | 212 | 213 | 210 | 187 | 175 | 157 | | 60 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 1 |
| Panama Canal | 2,007 | 2,012 | 2,001 | 2,082 | 2,086 | 1,964 | 1,887 | | 120 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 8,437 | 8,349 | 8,387 | 7,971 | 7,827 | 7,775 | 7,445 | | 992 |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 24,048 | 23,960 | 23,114 | 21,801 | 20,626 | 20,172 | 19,326 | 675 | 5,397 |
| Net decrease, excluding National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | −4,722 | |
| National Military Establishment: | | | | | | | | | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | | | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 144,503 | 148,190 | 153,038 | 154,267 | 156,137 | 158,474 | 158,863 | 14,360 | |
| Outside continental United States [1] | 94,387 | 89,893 | 85,157 | 77,992 | 53,130 | 49,852 | 47,742 | | 46,645 |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | | | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 71,086 | 71,944 | 72,208 | 73,197 | 74,254 | 74,814 | 75,463 | 4,377 | |
| Outside continental United States [1] | | | | | 20,721 | 20,130 | 19,785 | 19,785 | |
| Department of the Navy | 242,558 | 245,326 | 248,502 | 251,830 | 252,866 | 253,490 | 253,268 | 10,710 | |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 552,534 | 555,353 | 558,905 | 557,286 | 557,108 | 556,760 | 555,121 | 49,232 | 46,645 |
| Net increase, National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | | +2,587 |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 576,582 | 579,313 | 582,019 | 579,087 | 577,734 | 576,932 | 574,447 | 49,907 | 52,042 |
| Net decrease, including National Military Establishment | | | | | | | | | −2,135 |

[1] Under the Unification Act the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force personnel reports for civilian employees outside continental United States were separated as of Oct. 1, 1948. The figures above for the industrial employees of these Departments indicate separate reports accordingly.

TABLE II.—*Table of pay, in thousands of dollars, of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Nov. 30, 1948*

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | Comparison, June–November | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive departments (except National Military Establishment): | | | | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 18,807 | 19,233 | 19,898 | 19,712 | 19,582 | 18,419 | | 388 |
| Commerce | 11,050 | 11,989 | 12,151 | 12,338 | 12,276 | 12,195 | 1,145 | |
| Interior | 15,824 | 14,445 | 15,288 | 15,283 | 13,197 | 13,496 | | 2,328 |
| Justice | 8,209 | 8,916 | 9,011 | 9,049 | 8,913 | 9,178 | 879 | |
| Labor | 1,133 | 1,090 | 1,132 | 1,157 | 1,062 | 1,131 | | 2 |
| Post Office | 102,600 | 121,622 | 122,263 | 121,850 | 124,068 | 125,072 | 22,472 | |
| State | 5,392 | 5,282 | 5,666 | 5,365 | 5,375 | 5,649 | 257 | |
| Treasury | 24,529 | 25,361 | 25,840 | 26,420 | 25,070 | 26,578 | 2,049 | |

TABLE II.—*Table of pay, in thousands of dollars, of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during the period June 30 through Nov. 30, 1948*—Continued

| Department or agency | June | July | August | September | October | November | Comparison, June-November | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | Increase | Decrease |
| Executive Office of the President: | | | | | | | | |
| White House Office | 83 | 82 | 83 | 87 | 124 | 85 | 2 | |
| Bureau of the Budget | 272 | 254 | 254 | 247 | 234 | 248 | | 24 |
| Executive Mansion and Grounds | 11 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 15 | 4 | |
| National Security Council [1] | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | | |
| National Security Resources Board | 80 | 96 | 118 | 127 | 145 | 170 | 90 | |
| Council of Economic Advisers [2] | 22 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 21 | 23 | 1 | |
| Emergency war agencies: Office of Defense Transportation | 17 | 16 | 26 | 14 | 15 | 12 | | 5 |
| Postwar agencies: | | | | | | | | |
| Displaced Persons Commission [3] | | | | 9 | 22 | 32 | 32 | |
| Economic Cooperation Administration | 133 | 442 | 525 | 757 | 738 | 800 | 667 | |
| Office of the Housing Expediter | 1,456 | 1,441 | 1,570 | 1,582 | 1,530 | 1,585 | 129 | |
| Philippine Alien Property Administration | 26 | 31 | 34 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 6 | |
| Philippine War Damage Commission | 144 | 181 | 215 | 215 | 210 | 217 | 73 | |
| War Assets Administration | 9,193 | 6,314 | 6,187 | 6,172 | 4,153 | 4,155 | | 5,038 |
| Independent agencies: | | | | | | | | |
| American Battle Monuments Commission | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 1 | |
| Atomic Energy Commission | 1,553 | 1,664 | 1,666 | 1,711 | 1,825 | 1,682 | 129 | |
| Civil Aeronautics Board | 226 | 247 | 246 | 248 | 244 | 260 | 34 | |
| Civil Service Commission | 1,080 | 1,203 | 1,249 | 1,250 | 1,189 | 1,247 | 167 | |
| Export-Import Bank of Washington | 56 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 58 | 60 | 4 | |
| Federal Communications Commission | 486 | 495 | 511 | 509 | 481 | 503 | 17 | |
| Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation | 367 | 367 | 369 | 364 | 352 | 371 | 4 | |
| Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service | 177 | 185 | 189 | 193 | 184 | 193 | 21 | |
| Federal Power Commission | 289 | 309 | 321 | 322 | 307 | 353 | 64 | |
| Federal Security Agency [4] | 8,443 | 8,672 | 9,056 | 9,168 | 8,535 | 9,321 | 878 | |
| Federal Trade Commission | 176 | 235 | 300 | 268 | 230 | 244 | 68 | |
| Federal Works Agency | 5,022 | 5,608 | 5,701 | 5,821 | 6,019 | 5,751 | 729 | |
| General Accounting Office | 1,764 | 2,709 | 2,830 | 2,567 | 2,717 | 2,887 | 1,123 | |
| Government Printing Office | 2,254 | 2,140 | 2,166 | 2,103 | 1,995 | 2,099 | | 155 |
| Housing and Home Finance Agency | 3,240 | 3,545 | 3,249 | 3,257 | 3,677 | 3,636 | 396 | |
| Indian Claims Commission | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | | |
| Interstate Commerce Commission | 822 | 840 | 869 | 862 | 825 | 872 | 50 | |
| Maritime Commission | 1,974 | 2,075 | 1,726 | 1,721 | 1,723 | 2,099 | 125 | |
| National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics | 1,825 | 1,985 | 2,065 | 2,069 | 1,975 | 1,816 | | 9 |
| National Archives | 92 | 96 | 100 | 103 | 158 | 105 | 13 | |
| National Capital Housing Authority | 59 | 65 | 67 | 67 | 68 | 70 | 11 | |
| National Capital Park and Planning Commission | 7 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 2 | |
| National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission [5] | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | |
| National Gallery of Art | 70 | 75 | 76 | 79 | 76 | 80 | 10 | |
| National Labor Relations Board | 500 | 574 | 585 | 571 | 543 | 574 | 74 | |
| National Mediation Board | 52 | 50 | 41 | 39 | 59 | 53 | 1 | |
| Panama Canal | 3,507 | 3,484 | 3,120 | 2,232 | 4,355 | 3,290 | | 217 |
| Railroad Retirement Board | 651 | 688 | 690 | 698 | 649 | 683 | 32 | |
| Reconstruction Finance Corporation | 1,949 | 2,024 | 1,965 | 1,926 | 1,836 | 1,832 | | 117 |
| Securities and Exchange Commission | 499 | 447 | 461 | 450 | 462 | 467 | | 32 |
| Selective Service System | 145 | 164 | 234 | 1,254 | 970 | 1,075 | 930 | |
| Smithsonian Institution | 126 | 158 | 170 | 171 | 157 | 166 | 40 | |
| Tariff Commission | 91 | 95 | 99 | 101 | 98 | 103 | 12 | |
| Tax Court of the United States | 56 | 49 | 56 | 71 | 54 | 54 | | 2 |
| Tennessee Valley Authority | 3,961 | 3,933 | 3,723 | 3,913 | 4,171 | 3,510 | | 451 |
| Veterans' Administration | 45,376 | 48,366 | 51,737 | 51,932 | 49,282 | 51,501 | 6,125 | |
| Total, excluding National Military Establishment | 285,994 | 309,468 | 315,970 | 316,590 | 312,488 | 316,094 | 38,868 | 8,768 |
| Net increase, excluding National Military Establishment | | | | | | | +30,100 | |
| National Military Establishment: | | | | | | | | |
| Office of the Secretary of Defense | 312 | 347 | 369 | 392 | 392 | 415 | 103 | |
| Department of the Army: | | | | | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 68,496 | 70,027 | 72,111 | 74,231 | 71,697 | 71,312 | 2,816 | |
| Outside continental United States [6] | 23,459 | 20,596 | 20,605 | 16,364 | 15,447 | 13,131 | | 10,328 |
| Department of the Air Force: | | | | | | | | |
| Inside continental United States | 30,439 | 31,235 | 31,772 | 30,841 | 30,747 | 33,800 | 3,361 | |
| Outside continental United States [6] | | | | 3,807 | 4,964 | 5,336 | 5,336 | |
| Department of the Navy | 87,528 | 88,257 | 91,255 | 93,056 | 89,752 | 95,215 | 7,687 | |
| Total, National Military Establishment | 210,234 | 219,462 | 216,112 | 218,691 | 212,999 | 219,209 | 19,303 | 10,328 |
| Net increase, National Military Establishment | | | | | | | +8,975 | |
| Grand total, including National Military Establishment | 496,228 | 519,930 | 532,082 | 535,281 | 525,487 | 535,303 | 58,171 | 19,096 |
| Net increase, including National Military Establishment | | | | | | | +39,075 | |

[1] Exclusive of the pay of employees of the Central Intelligence Agency.
[2] Liquidated June 30, 1948.
[3] Established pursuant to Public Law 774, 80th Cong.
[4] Includes personnel of Howard University and the Columbia Institute for the Deaf.
[5] Established pursuant to Public Law 203, 80th Cong.
[6] Under the Unification Act the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force personnel reports for civilian employees outside continental United States were separated as of Oct. 1, 1948. The figures above for these departments indicate separate reports accordingly.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 758. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to venereal disease rapid treatment centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 759. A bill for the relief of Mina Mauricides, formerly Asemina Kokkinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 760. A bill for the relief of Hakiam Uddin; and

S. 761. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 762. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 763. A bill to further amend the United States Code, title 28, section 239, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 764. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Forest Lumber Co.;

S. 765. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Algoma Lumber Co. and its successors in interest, George R. Birkelund and Charles E. Siddall, of Chicago, Ill., and Kenyon T. Fay, of Los Angeles, Calif., trustees of the Algoma Lumber Liquidation Trust; and

S. 766. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and

render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 767. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 768. A bill for the relief of Gerald G. Smith; and

S. 769. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be commenced against the United States by Mike Boskovich, of Midvale, Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 770. A bill for the relief of Henry Dankowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 771. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 772. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gordon; and

S. 773 (by request). A bill authorizing the naturalization of Peter You Lo Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 774. A bill authorizing financial assistance to disabled veterans in obtaining an automobile or other conveyance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 775. A bill to provide for payment of compensation for disability caused by chronic or tropic diseases presumed to be service connected under the act of June 24, 1948 from the time when the disability was first incurred; and

S. 776. A bill to provide that no interest on an income tax deficiency shall be collected if the deficiency is the result of an honest error of the taxpayer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 777. A bill for the relief of Calvin D. Lynch & Son, W. Thomas Lockerman; Sudlersville Supply Co.; George C. Moore and H. A. Moore; J. McKenny Willis & Son, Inc.; Hobbs & Jarman; C. S. Thomas; and Royse R. Spring; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 778. A bill to provide for the development, administration, and maintenance of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and the Suitland Parkway in the State of Maryland as extensions of the park system of the District of Columbia and its environs by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 779. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the naval establishment appointed to permanent grades; and

S. 780 (by request). A bill for the relief of Commander Edward White Rawlins, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 781. A bill authorizing the construction of certain works of improvement near Kendrick, Idaho, in the interest of flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 782. A bill for the relief of William S. Meany; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 783. A bill to provide for the payment of a disability retirement annuity to Joseph J. O'Loughlin; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. GURNEY):

S. 784. A bill for the relief of the First, Second, and Third National Steamship Cos.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 785. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Fred A. Fletcher; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. CORDON):

S. 786. A bill to authorize improvement of navigation facilities on the Columbia River, and completion of alterations to the Hood River Bridge, made necessary by Bonneville Dam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 787. A bill for the relief of William (Vasilios) Kotsakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 788. A bill to aid the States in establishing and maintaining scholarship and loan programs for the purpose of enabling individuals to obtain education in the eleventh year of school grade or above; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr BREWSTER):

S. 789. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of public agencies for the damage to their air-navigation aids and air markers caused by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCFARLAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr HUNT):

S. 790. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the Upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 791. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Karl Frederick Kucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 792. A bill to repeal paragraph (4) of section 15 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 793. A bill to repeal the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such act of June 29, 1936, is applicable; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 794. A bill for the relief of certain contractors employed in connection with the construction of the United States Appraisers Building, San Francisco, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 795. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. REED:

S. J. Res. 49. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the eightieth anniversary of the founding of the city of Abilene, Kans.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. J. Res. 50. Joint resolution for the relief of certain creditors of the Norwood Pulp & Machinery Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 52) to authorize the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

## NATIONAL HOUSING OBJECTIVE—AMENDMENT

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. NEELY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 138) to establish a national housing objective and the policy to be followed in the attainment thereof, to provide Federal aid to assist slum-clearance projects and low-rent public housing projects initiated by local agencies, to provide for financial assistance by the Secretary of Agriculture for farm housing, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

## AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I submit a resolution and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 47) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is hereby discharged from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) relating to cloture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will lie over for one legislative day.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like an appropriate opportunity to discuss the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish recognition?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is not now in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will not come up today for action.

## INVESTIGATION OF CONDITIONS AT ARMY DISCIPLINARY TRAINING CENTER AT LOIRE, FRANCE

Mr. LANGER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 48), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of conditions prevailing at the Army Disciplinary Training Center, at Loire, France, with particular reference to the charges made by James H. Schaffner, of Cheektowaga, N. Y., including the circumstances under which he contracted tuberculosis and what, if any, steps the Army took to determine whether or not the said James H. Schaffner had tuberculosis at the time of his discharge.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

## GOVERNMENT LOANS ON WHEAT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 49) was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the President has made the following statement:

"Our national farm program should be improved—not only in the interest of the farmers, but for the lasting prosperity of the whole Nation. Our goals should be abundant farm production and parity of income for agriculture. Standards of living on the farm should be just as good as anywhere else.

"Farm price supports are an essential part of our program to achieve these ends. Price supports should be used to prevent farm price declines which are out of line with general price levels, to facilitate adjustments

in production to consumer demands, and to promote good land use. Our price-support legislation must be adapted to these objectives. The authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide adequate storage space for crops should be restored"; and

Whereas the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Army Quartermaster Corps are using United States dollars to buy foreign agricultural commodities which are in excess supply in the United States; and

Whereas export restrictions are being maintained which prevent the exportation of agricultural commodities including corn and wheat other than through the Department of Agriculture at the same time that the Department of Agriculture is offering to purchase corn and wheat at prices far below the support prices therefor; and

Whereas such activities of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Army Quartermaster Corps and such export restrictions tend to undermine price-support programs for agricultural commodities: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation of any and all actions of Government agencies which tend to undermine price-support programs for agricultural commodities.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem desirable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, inasmuch as the resolution calls attention to something which is very questionable, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for approximately a minute to make a statement with reference to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Information has come to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that certain agents of the Government, especially ECA, are using funds appropriated for the cooperative movement in making purchases abroad. For example, they are now purchasing 120,000,000 bushels of wheat from Canada, at $2 a bushel. That means an expenditure of $240,000,000. That is not all. Because of such purchases, farmers owning wheat will have to put their wheat in the loan, and that will require approximately another $240,000,000. So this one illustration is costing the taxpayers approximately half a billion dollars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks a brief statement and copies of three letters which give information with respect to the resolution.

There being no objection, the statement and letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since the last date the farmers could obtain Government loans on wheat (December 31) basic commodity prices have been declining at an alarming rate, much more rapidly than the cost of what the farmers buy. Wheat and corn are both well below 90 percent of parity, the Government loan or support price. This sharp drop has caused widespread alarm in agriculture which could well plunge this Nation into a depression. Freedom from fear of a depression is absolutely necessary to keep the farmer buying the goods he needs that in turn keeps full employment in the factories and with labor.

Senator YOUNG, of North Dakota, has made charges against the ECA who administers the Marshall plan which are in effect an indictment. He has asked the Senate Agriculture Committee to immediately investigate ECA's plan to allocate some quarter billion dollars to England for the purchase of 120,000,000 bushels or more of Canadian wheat at a base price of $2 per bushel, free on board Fort Williams, Canada. This plan, he claims, winks at the law which requires the dollars we grant under the Marshall plan be spent in the United States when they go for commodities of which we have a surplus.

Upon a brief investigation of these charges it appears that ECA dollars are being used to buy Canadian wheat at prices equal to or higher than United States wheat now being grown. Also, I am informed that Burmese and Indochina rice is being shipped to China in preference to United States rice of which we have a surplus. During my cursory examination I am informed that the Army Quartermaster Corps is buying linseed oil from Canada while at the same time flaxseed is being placed under Government loan because the price of linseed oil is too low to allow processing the seed that is now flowing into Government loan.

If these practices are in effect, as indicated, and continue, they will destroy not only our agriculture-support program but our entire economy. Yesterday, the price of wheat was $1.93 at Wichita, Kans., which is 11 cents below the Government-support price. Wheat at Kansas City, Mo., for immediate delivery is 14 cents below the loan and for September delivery was quoted at $1.91 per bushel, which is 29 cents below the existing loan. If this ECA plan goes through, it will probably cost the United States Government a half billion dollars as we will be required to not only grant a quarter billion to England to buy the wheat but another quarter billion advanced under the loan.

I am also informed that the CCC's offer to buy wheat is based on the Chicago May futures price which yesterday was some 13 cents per bushel below the loan. At the same time the CCC prohibits all exports by producers and the private grain trade, requiring all buyers to buy from the CCC. Some commercial buyers, like the Belgian grain trade, object to buying from the CCC because no one ever knows what wheat costs until after shipment is made. I understand the same restrictions on exports also apply to corn of which we have a huge surplus and the price is far below the loan level.

I have been in hopes that the ECA, Department of Agriculture, and the Army Quartermaster Corps were coordinating their efforts to a common goal. If, as reported, the ECA is granting United States dollars to buy foreign commodities instead of our basic commodities in surplus supply, it should be investigated and stopped.

If the Army Quartermaster Corps has a policy to buy foreign commodities to the detriment of our agriculture producers and processors, that should be stopped. If one branch of the Department of Agriculture is restricting exports of wheat and corn while the other branch is accumulating surpluses, that should be coordinated. If these evils are not corrected immediately, it may require legislation.

The problem is so serious and the charges are so grave I have presented a resolution to the Senate which will authorize an investigation and hearings will be held by the Senate Agriculture Committee, at which time the ECA, Department of Agriculture, and the Army Quartermaster Corps, and other interested parties will be heard.

JANUARY 25, 1949.

Mr. PAUL G. HOFFMAN,
*Administrator, Economic Cooperation Administration,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: I have been reliably informed that ECA has advanced $55,000,000 to the United Kingdom for the purchase of wheat in Canada.

Such an agreement, in my opinion, is entirely contrary to the purpose of the ECA program. I voted for the program and for the appropriations which were requested, but it was my belief that this appropriation contained every necessary safeguard to assure the purchase of food supplies in the United States. While Canada may be deserving of assistance, I did not understand that this country was considered eligible under the Marshall plan for assistance.

There are other reasons why I would question the advisability of such an agreement. When $7,000,000,000 is given as grants and loans for European aid and the purchases are largely made in the United States, a tremendous benefit accrues to the people of the United States through increased production and through the employment of labor in that production. On the other hand, when United States dollars in grants or loans are used for purchases in foreign countries the final and real cost to our over-all economy is far greater.

To purchase wheat in another country at the same time that we are accumulating vast surpluses of farm commodities, and particularly wheat, in the United States, all eligible for price support, just does not make sense to me. I understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation has under loan or purchase agreement approximately 300,000,000 bushels of wheat and that, in all probability, the Federal Government will suffer at least some loss in the operation of this price-support program. It is entirely possible also that within the next year or two many farm commodities, because of accumulated surpluses, will have to go under quotas and acreage control. The result would be a vast decrease in the United States farmers' income which would also greatly reduce their purchasing power.

With respect to accumulated farm surpluses in the United States and the resultant cost of this program, I was informed yesterday by Secretary Brannan that it is entirely possible by next year that all of the $4,750,000,000 borrowing authority given to the CCC to support farm commodities will be committed. In view of all this, I hope that no further agreements similar to this one with the United Kingdom and Canada will be entered into.

May I also request that you prepare for the Appropriations Committee, of which I am a member, figures showing the amount of ECA purchases of food within the United States and purchases in offshore countries.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours,

MILTON R. YOUNG,
*United States Senator.*

---

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, D. C., February 1, 1949.*

HON. MILTON R. YOUNG,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: This is in reply to your letter of January 25, expressing concern about the purchase by the United Kingdom of $55,000,000 worth of Canadian wheat with funds made available to the United Kingdom by ECA.

From April 3 through December 31, 1948, ECA has authorized the purchase of food and agricultural commodities valued at $1,799,000,000. Of this total, $1,184,400,000 have

been authorized for purchases in the United States, $354,200,000 for purchases in Canada and Newfoundland, $164,800,000 for purchases in Latin America, and $95,700,000 for purchases in other parts of the world. Total authorizations for this period amounted to $4,044,800,000, including $336,700,000 for ocean freight. Of the authorizations for purchase of food and agriculture products in Canada and Newfoundland, $256,400,000 have been purchased of bread grains.

During the earlier part of the 9 months ending December 31, 1948, purchases of bread grains in Canada were necessitated by the lack of availabilities from the United States. More recently, authorizations for purchase in Canada have been limited to purchases by the United Kingdom where, because of the existence of an agreement between these two countries, prices paid have been $2 a bushel, in store, Fort William. Currently, participating countries are paying about $2.43 a bushel for hard red winter wheat at the Gulf and higher prices for spring wheat at Atlantic ports. Prior to August 1, 1948, the price United Kingdom had been paying for Canadian wheat was $1.55 a bushel, in store, Fort William, whereas hard wheat at the Gulf was costing from $2.50 to $2.75 a bushel. During the 9 months ending December 31, the wheat purchased by United Kingdom from Canada and paid for with ECA funds, has cost at least $50,000,000 less than it would have cost if purchased in the United States.

However, this saving has not been the sole or even the main reason for authorizing the use of ECA funds for these purchases; nor have these purchases been made in disregard of the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act. The Act provides that the Administrator shall not authorize the use of ECA funds for offshore procurement for commodities for which supplies available in the United States are sufficient to meet the requirements of the participating countries. To date, we have not felt that the supplies of wheat available in the United States were sufficient to meet the requirements of the participating countries as well as all of the requirements of nonparticipating countries. As a consequence, it appeared to us to be most desirable to authorize the use of ECA funds for the purchase of low-priced wheat under the Canadian-United Kingdom wheat agreement, thus saving the American taxpayers money, rather than to require all purchases of wheat for the participating countries to be made from the United States when prices are uniformly substantially above $2 a bushel and thus forcing the nonparticipating countries to shift at least a major portion of their purchases to Canada.

The assistance which Canada has obtained under the Marshall plan is, as I am sure you realize, wholly indirect. This indirect assistance has been, I believe, considered to be a major incidental advantage of the entire program. ECA's responsibility is to furnish recovery assistance to the United Kingdom. This assistance is given when it allots funds for the purchase of the wheat needed to maintain bread distribution in that country. When these funds are spent in a country other than the United States, as for example Canada, that country is thereby benefited. It should be pointed out, however, that the American dollars which the United Kingdom pays to Canada are in turn spent by Canada in the United States so that the United States ultimately gets the benefit of the increased production and employment of labor that grows out of the expenditure of funds authorized by Congress for European recovery even though some of the dollars thus expended return to the United States via a third country. Incidentally, the expenditure by the participating countries with ECA funds in Canada has sufficiently improved the dollar position of that country to permit it to relax many of its restrictions on imports from the United States. These restrictions formerly applied to a long list of agricultural commodities.

I am enclosing a copy of a letter that the Director of our Food and Agriculture Division recently wrote to Mr. Charles Dewey on this same subject which contains additional information thereon. We recognize that a potential development of agricultural surpluses in the United States may create many problems for all of us and we shall, of course, want to do everything possible to contribute to a solution of these problems, consistent with the specific responsibilities assigned to us by Congress of encouraging and assisting European economic recovery. Perhaps you would like to discuss this matter, particularly as it affects wheat, with Dr. FitzGerald. If so, he will be delighted to make himself available at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL HOFFMAN, *Administrator.*

---

JANUARY 28, 1949.

Mr. CHARLES S. DEWEY,
*Agent General, Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. DEWEY: This is in reply to your letter of January 26, regarding the sale to Great Britain by Canada of some 702,000 tons of wheat valued at about $55,000,000 for which ECA funds were being provided.

The answers to your specific questions with respect to the matter, insofar as it is possible to answer them, are as follows:

1. The term "carry-over" when used with reference to wheat usually refers to the stocks of this grain which are carried over from the end of one season to the beginning of the next. It includes, of course, as an irreducible minimum, the necessary working stocks in the distribution system. Since it is now the middle of the season, rather than the end, there is no current carry-over of wheat in the usual use of the term.

According to the Department of Agriculture, stocks of wheat in all positions as of January 1, 1949, amounted to 857,000,000 bushels. This stock is available to meet domestic requirements for food, feed, and seed, for export and for meeting minimum end-of-season carry-over requirements. Of these January 1 stocks, 381,700,000 bushels were held by farmers and would not, of course, be immediately available for export. Ignoring this fact for the moment, it may be assumed that a very large proportion of the January 1 stocks, perhaps 90 percent or more, would be suitable for export. It would, of course, be most unwise to attempt to export such a quantity of wheat since it would leave no supplies for any domestic uses.

2. The export allocations for the first quarter 1949 announced by the Department of Agriculture, together with all supplemental export allotments to date and expected exports in the same period to the Western Hemisphere and Philippines, amount to 126,000,000 bushels. This total covers both participating and nonparticipating countries. About 12,000,000 bushels allocated during October–December 1948 had not been exported on January 1, 1949, and were included in January 1 stocks. These also will be exported in the first quarter of 1949.

The volume of exports to participating countries, including overseas territories, in the April–June quarter of this year may be estimated at 68,000,000 bushels, and those to nonparticipating countries at 25,000,000 bushels. In both instances, these estimates include the wheat equivalent of anticipated flour exports.

3. In addition to these exports, domestic requirements for wheat which will need to be met from January 1 stocks are estimated to be as follows:

Food 240,000,000 bushels, feed 60,000,000 bushels, seed 26,000,000 bushels, or a total of 326,000,000 bushels. Thus, the June 30, 1949, carry-over of wheat is expected to be about 300,000,000 bushels.

4. The exportable surplus of Canadian wheat for the 1948–49 crop season is estimated to be about 300,000,000 bushels, of which 60,000,000 bushels may be considered as a necessary year-end carry-over. Of this quantity, 140,000,000 bushels have been sold to the United Kingdom at a price of $2 per bushel for No. 1 hard northern wheat, in store, Fort William.

5. Three years ago the United Kingdom and Canada entered into a 4-year wheat agreement which provide that Canada would sell and the United Kingdom would buy 160,000,000 bushels of wheat a year during the first 2 years of the agreement and 140,000,000 bushels a year during the next 2 years of the agreement. This agreement is now in its third year. During its first 2 years the price at which Canada sold wheat was $1.55 per bushel for No. 1 hard northern, in store, Fort William. During the current year, as previously stated, it is $2 per bushel, and a recent announcement indicates that this will also be the price for the last year of the agreement, that is, 1949–50 crop year. Over the 4 years of the agreement provision was made for exporting 600,000,000 bushels of wheat. As of this date, approximately 370,000,000 bushels have been exported.

6. The recently announced authorization for the purchase of $55,000,000 of Canadian wheat covers payment for about 26,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, which is roughly 20 percent of the total quantity covered by the United Kingdom-Canadian wheat agreement for the current crop season. ECA is paying for this wheat on the basis of $2 per bushel, in store, Fort William. The current price of United States wheat at Gulf ports is about $2.43 per bushel. The use of ECA funds to purchase Canadian wheat for the United Kingdom, in addition to helping meet the essential United Kingdom requirements for its bread ration, also helps the Canadian dollar position. It might be noted in passing that as a result of the improvement of the Canadian dollar position growing out of this ECA programing, Canada has been able to relax materially its previously existing restrictions against United States imports.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. FITZGERALD,
*Director, Food and Agriculture Division.*

## INVESTIGATION OF FINANCIAL CONDITION OF THE AIR-LINE INDUSTRY

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Whereas commercial air-line operations have a direct bearing upon the national defense of the United States; and

Whereas the maintenance of the domestic and international air-lines operations of the United States in healthy financial condition is indispensable to the national security; and

Whereas financial distress has been experienced by many such air lines during a period of general business prosperity, and reasonably may be expected to be further aggravated in the event that general levels of business activity should decline in the future; and

Whereas the Congress, the Government agencies concerned, and the air-line industry have not agreed upon a long-range solution which would effectively insure the continued operation of such domestic and international air lines upon a sound financial basis; and

Whereas there is urgent need for a comprehensive study of this and related problems by the Congress to the end that sound policies for their solution may be evolved and

embodied in such legislation as may be found to be necessary: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems relating to the financial stability and operational efficiency of the air-lines industry as it may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, and recommend such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, (1) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, (2) to perform such travel, and to authorize such travel by such assistants, as it deems advisable, and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

PRINTING OF FIFTH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McMAHON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 53), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed as a Senate document the fifth semiannual report of the Atomic Energy Commission and that 500 additional copies be printed for the use of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

SERVICE ON JOINT COMMITTEE ON LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I am no longer a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I ask to be relieved from further service on the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

With the resignation from the joint committee of the Senator from Louisiana there are now two vacancies, the other being caused by the retirement from the Senate of Senator Ball, of Minnesota. Under the law, the requirement is that members of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations shall be members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate or of the similar committee in the House. Therefore the Chair appoints, in pursuance of that law, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to fill the two vacancies on the joint committee.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. BALDWIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate after 1 o'clock today.

Mr. MILLIKIN asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate until February 16.

PUBLICITY CONCERNING CERTAIN PHASES OF ATOMIC ENERGY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McMAHON

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the Economic Club of Detroit on Monday, January 31, 1949, respecting publicity concerning certain phases of atomic energy, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA AND MILITARY PREPAREDNESS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Myths That May Mean Mass Suicide," prepared by him and published in the February 1949 issue of the magazine The Reserve Officer, which appears in the Appendix.]

OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK AND OLYMPIC NATIONAL FOREST, WASH.

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two related impartial reports made recently by him to citizens of his State relative to the Olympic National Park and the Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, which appear in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY DR. JOSEPH F. THORNING BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CLUB OF HOOD COLLEGE

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of The Americas and World Affairs, delivered before the International Relations Club of Hood College, which appears in the Appendix.]

A TAFT-HARTLEY MANDATE?—LETTER FROM THOMAS W. PARRY

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter headed "A Taft-Hartley Mandate?" written by Thomas W. Parry, and reprinted from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN—STATEMENT BY JUDGE ADRIAN BONNELLY

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by the Honorable Adrian Bonnelly, judge of the municipal court of Philadelphia on January 20, 1948, at the time of the inauguration of President Truman, which appears in the Appendix.]

A LANDLORD LOCK-OUT—EDITORIAL FROM THE PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Landlord Lock-out," published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of January 27, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BEVIN BEATS A STRATEGIC RETREAT ON PALESTINE ISSUE—EDITORIAL FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bevin Beats a Strategic Retreat on Palestine Issue," published in a recent issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, morning business is concluded.

THE MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an article entitled "MVA Plans Redrafted," which appeared on the front page of the Bismarck Tribune of Saturday, January 15, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, it is somewhat strange to see this naive attempt on the part of three Democratic Senators to help their party to get the credit for the establishment of the Missouri Valley Authority, or, as they now call it, the Missouri Valley Administration, or Missouri River Basin. Everyone knows that it was a Republican, the late Senator George Norris, who was responsible for the first of the great so-called authorities—the Tennessee Valley Authority. It was the Republican administration of Theodore Roosevelt that led the first big fight for the conservation of the natural resources of our country. Naturally I want to congratulate the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who has just been reelected after serving one term in the Senate, for going with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to the White House and getting the President once again to restate and reiterate the views with which all of us have long since been familiar. But I want these three distinguished Senators to know that for over 20 years at different times in North Dakota, under the Republican administration, the fight has been going on for the development of the Missouri River Basin and for the St. Lawrence waterway, and many legislatures of North Dakota have for over 20 years appropriated money for preliminary surveys of these projects. As the head of the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party, I wish to assure these three Democratic Senators that when they finally get their bill drafted they can count upon my full support of the measure and, I believe, of many Republican Senators, and that as a Republican I shall be delighted to join in the sponsorship of the Missouri Valley Administration bill, and if the measure does not meet my views entirely, I shall endeavor to get it amended on the floor, because I have not been consulted in the drafting of it, and only know in general terms what it contains.

EXHIBIT 1

MVA PLANS REDRAFTED—DEMOCRATIC SOLONS REVEAL PLAN AFTER WHITE HOUSE VISIT

WASHINGTON.—Three Democratic Senators said after a White House call Friday that President Truman voiced his support again for unified development of the Missouri River Basin.

The Senators said they were redrafting the old Missouri Valley Authority bill so as to leave construction of dams and other facilities under the Army engineers and other existing Federal agencies rather than give it to a new authority. The measure would give the name "Missouri Valley Administration" to the general directing agency instead of calling it the Missouri Valley Authority.

Senators MURRAY (Democrat, Montana), GILLETTE (Democrat, Iowa), and HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), called on the President.

"We want to get away from the use of the word 'authority' because of the kind of odium which has been attached to that name in connection with this proposed development," MURRAY told reporters. "Opponents

pretend to see spies, socialism, and other evils attaching to that name."

The Senators said the President, long an advocate of unified development of the Missouri and its tributary system, is as strong for it as ever.

They said he told them he was having studies made and getting reports from Government agencies.

A reporter told MURRAY that the President had observed at his recent budget seminar that 9 out of 10 States in the Missouri Basin were against a Missouri Valley Authority.

MURRAY said that probably the President meant that a number of governors of States were opposed to the separate authority since the people in all the States are for it.

He said that the people demonstrated they were for the measure when they reelected him in Montana after he was denounced by some of the newspapers for his support of it.

"The President said he feels that the operation of the MVA should be coordinated by a single authority."

MURRAY said that a decision would be made later on whether to propose three or five directors for a Missouri Valley Administration.

In a joint statement, the three Senators asserted:

"The inadequacy and infeasibility of present plans for development of the Missouri River Basin are today widely recognized. It has become apparent here in Washington, as it is to the people of the valley, that there is not sufficient water in the basin for both the Pick flowing channel navigation scheme and irrigation projects already authorized.

"It also has become apparent that there has been inadequate consideration of hydroelectric power production to stimulate industry and development of resources now urgently needed by the Nation."

They added:

"As quickly as our bill can be completed, we, together with other Members of the Senate, will offer a measure to create a Missouri Valley Administration. The first work of such an administration will be engineering examination of present programs. It will serve the interests of the prompt action called for by the President, and now urgently needed, by providing immediate continuity between the examination of present programs by the MVA engineers and the execution of revised plans as rapidly as they are approved by the Congress."

They said there is need for immediate study of the feasibility of using low-grade manganese ores of South Dakota and expanding manganese production elsewhere to help meet shortages.

## AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to refer to the resolution submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from further consideration of a resolution relating to cloture which has been referred to it by the Senate. The clear implication is that the Committee on Rules and Administration has not been diligent in performing its duties as a servant of the Senate. As chairman of that committee, I think it would therefore be appropriate for me to address the Senate briefly and to state just what is the situation.

The resolution relates to an amendment to rule XXII of the Senate, which makes it possible for two-thirds of the Senate to close debate on any pending measure. Rule XXII was adopted not quite 32 years ago, on March 8, 1917, as the result of the work of a committee of five appointed from the Republican side of the Senate and the Democratic side. It was then realized that there should be some limitation on debate in the Senate. A resolution agreed to by both the Republican and Democratic conferences was brought up by unanimous consent by the Democratic leader, Senator Martin, of Virginia, and was debated all during the day of March 8, 1917, and adopted about midnight by a vote of 76 to 3.

The rule was found to be defective, first, on November 22, 1922, when repeated amendments were offered to the Journal of the previous day and were decided to be in order. At a later date a second equally serious fault was developed when it was determined that a cloture petition could not be filed until after a bill had become the unfinished business of the Senate. The result is that a motion to proceed to the consideration of a measure may be debated indefinitely.

In the last Congress there were submitted four resolutions to amend rule XXII, all of them being introduced on January 6, 1947. The Committee on Rules and Administration held hearings beginning on January 28 and ending on February 18, 1947, a period of nearly 3 weeks. A proposed amendment to rule XXII by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] provided that a mere majority of the Senate might impose cloture. The committee, after careful consideration, changed the amendment to rule XXII so that the two-thirds limitation would remain, just as it is, but provided that debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, could be closed by the adoption of a cloture petition.

The Saltonstall amendment to the rules was reported to the Senate on April 3, 1947, 43 days after the hearings had closed. It was placed upon the Senate Calendar, and absolutely nothing was done with it during the entire session of the Eightieth Congress. It died on the calendar at the close of the Congress last December.

This year similar resolutions were submitted and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration on January 6. On January 24 the committee opened hearings on the five resolutions then pending. In order to save time, it was agreed that only the testimony of Senators would be taken, because it was felt that they knew better than anyone on the outside what changes should be made in the rules of the Senate.

Hearings began on January 24 and were concluded last Monday, the hearings extending over a period of approximately 8 days.

Yesterday the committee met to determine what to do about the several cloture resolutions, and, after discussion among the members, it was evident that a number of the Senators had not yet made up their minds as to exactly what procedure they wanted to follow, and a reasonable time was asked in which they might give further consideration to the subject.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] embarrassed me somewhat by moving on yesterday that the committee favorably report a resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself which proposed that cloture may be applied in all instances by a two-thirds majority; but I felt justified in voting for a motion to adjourn the committee for 1 week in order that members of the committee, particularly the new Senators, might have an opportunity to determine what they should do.

I will say frankly to the Senate that I am well satisfied that of the committee of 13, at least 7 are opposed to any change in the rule which would permit a mere majority of the Senate to impose cloture.

There are two resolutions pending before the committee—one by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] and another by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] providing that a mere majority may bring debate to a close. Another resolution, submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], is in identical language with the resolution as finally reported from the committe to the Senate last year. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and I in a resolution submitted by us also proposed that the Senate shall consider the text of the resolution which was favorably reported to the Senate last year, making possible cloture by a two-thirds vote.

Not only does the committee have the problem of considering what it shall do, but it also has the problem, as I pointed out in a statement made to the committee at the opening of the hearing, of giving consideration to what the Senate will do after an amendment to rule XXII is reported to the Senate. There is a great divergence of opinion as to just what should be done.

Let us first consider the procedure in the Senate when a motion is made to proceed to the consideration of an amendment to the rules. That motion is debatable indefinitely under the present rules. So it is quite certain that there will be discussion for some time as to whether the Senate should consider the proposal at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Arizona agree with me when I say that if there is to be a change in the rule, it is proper that the question should be brought up early in the session, in order that the Senate may take advantage of the change of the rule, if a change is to be made, and in order, if there is to be no amendment of the rule, that we may know it and go ahead with the ordinary business of the Senate? In other words, should not we act on the matter as speedily as possible, one way or the other?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Massachusetts will agree with me, I am sure, that up to now the Committee on Rules and Administration has acted as speedily as possible. My protest is that we have been accused of a lack of diligence, an accusation not justified by the facts.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am sure the Senator from Arizona will agree with me that it has been the custom in committees, in the case of absent Senators or new Senators, to give them 2 or 3 weeks' additional time for the study of important matters before the committee; in other words, when requests for additional time are made under those circumstances such requests have been granted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, we were faced with that situation in the committee. But I wish to state that the Senators who are members of the committee gave up their other business, held consecutive hearings which were concluded within 8 days, and no other Senator who desired to testify failed to have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. LANGER. But has it not been the rule, during the last 8 years, at least, in connection with committee consideration and proceedings, that if a new member of the committee or a member who had been absent wished to familiarize himself with the testimony in regard to a particular measure, as a matter of courtesy he has been allowed 1 or 2 weeks within which to do so?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct as to that. Usually such courtesy is extended.

I have described the way our committee has proceeded. Now, to get back to the situation in the Senate when the question of whether the amendment to the cloture rule is to be considered at all, that question, as I have said, is debatable; and we do not know how long the debate on it will last. It has been suggested that if the occupant of the chair at the time were to reverse the established precedents of the Senate, and were to decide that a cloture petition could be filed on a motion to proceed to the consideration of a measure, then some time might be saved.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I wonder whether the very simple solution the Senator suggests would be an appropriate subject of a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not care to have the Chair take up my time at the moment.

The situation I have described remains true, to the extent that no one now knows whether the Senate would sustain such a ruling, if it were made by the Chair. That would have to be developed, after some discussion, perhaps, upon a motion to lay on the table an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Nevertheless, assuming all that were done, then the Senate would again be faced with the fact—and there is no escape from it—that in order to bring such a proposed change in rule XXII to a vote in the Senate, under the present rules it would be absolutely necessary for two-thirds of the Senators present to vote in favor of cloture. That is where we encounter a great deal of difficulty, as Senators can appreciate, because I find the feeling to be quite general among Senators that they do not wish to have any proposal become a Trojan horse which would bring before the Senate an amendment to the rule, ostensibly on a two-thirds basis, but, once cloture was adopted for its consideration, would then be open to an amendment in the Senate to reduce the number to a mere majority. I doubt whether two-thirds of the Senators present will vote for cloture on any amendment to rule XXII unless they thoroughly understand that it means two-thirds cloture, and not a majority cloture, because the general sentiment in the Senate, as I understand it, is decidedly opposed to majority cloture.

If some feasible way could be found whereby it might be known that a majority of the Senators are opposed to majority cloture then I think perhaps it might be possible for the Senate to adopt such a cloture rule as is provided in Senate Resolution 15. But until some understanding of that kind is developed, I am quite sure that there will be very great difficulty in bringing the debate to an end. There certainly will be very great difficulty in finding a two-thirds majority in the Senate willing to vote for cloture, so that anything at all can be done about it. That is my judgment. Senators can take it for whatever they think it may be worth.

I am making this statement today, Mr. President, because I can see no occasion at this time for the adoption of the resolution presented by the Senator from California, and I hope it will not prevail when it comes before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Arizona has undertaken to defend himself against what he says are charges of dereliction that are implied by the filing of the resolution offered by the Senator from California. I wish to take the other side of the matter, and with profound regret criticize my friend, the Senator from Arizona, for the speed with which he has hastened the committee's consideration of the cloture resolution. There is certainly nothing more important that can possibly come before the Senate of the United States than the matter of changing the rules of this body. Every additional day a member of the Senate remains here, he attaches more importance to the rules and the precedents which guide our deliberations.

I think the Senator from Arizona has rushed this matter along. I know he gave all of us an opportunity to be heard; but in the committee there was a feeling that we were somewhat imposing upon it; and out of deference to the committee I did not make a very lengthy statement.

Not only did the committee take much longer in its deliberations in the Republican Eightieth Congress, as the Senator from Arizona has stated, but this year we have had an inauguration, which we did not have 2 years ago, and none of the committees could begin functioning until after the inauguration of the President of the United States.

The Republican Congress not only gave the proposed changes longer consideration in the committee, but after reporting it to the Senate permitted it to languish on the calendar for 2 years without ever making a simple motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Now the same men who had control of the last Senate, and who did not make any effort to press the change in the rule, bitterly complain because they cannot rush the matter to a quick conclusion.

The Senator from Arizona has handled this resolution with his usual diligence. He has brought it to a conclusion in the committee, and threatens to bring the resolution to the floor at some time in the very near future. I do not believe the Senate will discharge so diligent a committee. As has been correctly said, it is a matter of fundamental courtesy always shown Senators to allow them a reasonable time in which to read the hearings, for example, or refresh their minds, or make some collateral investigation of a matter brought before a committee.

Certainly the Senator from Arizona has not been derelict in his duty. He has expedited the committee's consideration of the resolution at such a pace that some of us who are opposed to it feel we have almost had it rammed down our throats. Of course, he did not accept the rather unusual proposition that a matter of this importance be presented to the Senate without any hearings at all, but he went as far as he could in that direction and confined the hearings to Members of the Senate. Only Senators could appear as witnesses. He has now closed the hearings, and because he has allowed Members who wished it a week's time to study this important matter, he is threatened with a resolution to discharge his committee. I would that the parliamentary situation under the rules of the Senate permitted me to file some kind of resolution that would force the committee to go into this important question more thoroughly. The Senator is always fair. In this instance I think, if he has erred at all, it has been on the side of pressing this matter, rather, to this point.

Mr. HAYDEN. It may be a habit of mine to try to perform as soon as I conveniently can any work that may be assigned to me in order that I may take up other duties. I felt in this instance that the Senators were busy with their work on other committees, and that they should not be asked to devote more time than was absolutely necessary in attending the sessions of the committee. I will say that the hearings were most interesting and should be read by Members of the Senate who could not find the time to be present.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would ask whether the Senator from Arizona has concluded?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have concluded.

## ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The next order of business is the calling of the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORITY TO REPORT BILL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be authorized, during the adjournment following today's session, to report the export control bill (S. 548), and that it may be taken up for consideration Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGULAR ARMY AND AIR CORPS NOMINATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to report from the Committee on Armed Services numerous routine promotions in the Regular Army and in the Air Corps. The Air Corps is the new arm of the Military Establishment, and has had to be reorganized in the last 2 years.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports will be received.

Mr. TYDINGS. I also ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that these routine promotions be confirmed, and that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand from the chairman of the Armed Services Committee that there was no objection in the committee, and that so far as the chairman knows there is no objection to any of the nominations?

Mr. TYDINGS. The committee reported them unanimously, and there was not a single objection to any of them. Moreover, they are all routine promotions to fill up the Regular Army and the Air Corps, as provided by Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed, as in executive session, and the President will be immediately notified.

ELECTION OF CHAPLAIN

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, out of order, I send to the desk a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 54) as follows:

*Resolved*, That Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., of Washington, D. C., be, and he is hereby, elected Chaplain of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the resolution is agreed to, and Dr. Harris is chosen as the Chaplain of the Senate.

SUPPORT PRICE ON MILK

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, someone has stated that the politicians seem to have selected profit as public enemy No. 1. I can assure those who listen to me that profit is fast going out of the milk picture. In Wisconsin and in many other States, this is becoming so evident that recently there met in Chicago the representatives of seven different milk-producing States, namely, Kentucky, Tennessee, Missouri, Wisconsin, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois. Those participating in that meeting came to the conclusion that the Government must immediately take action to support milk prices. Let me, as I have done on other occasions, state the situation concretely. In Wisconsin the milk prices at the present time are about $2.80 a hundred pounds. There are approximately 48½ quarts of milk to the hundred pounds, which makes the price about 6 cents a quart. When it is considered that we have a 60-cent dollar, it means that the farmer receives about 3.6 cents per quart, based on the 100-cent dollar.

Mr. President, we are very much concerned about labor; we are very much concerned about repealing the Taft-Hartley Act, and we are very much concerned about taxes. Yes, I know that some folks are very much concerned about giving China several billion dollars more, and of course we are concerned about continuing our $6,000,000,000 or $7,000,000,000 appropriation for Europe. What I am asking, Mr. President, is not that we shall fail to give appropriate evaluation to these subjects, but we should evaluate them in view of the fact that the States I have mentioned constitute, along with several others, the backbone of this country, the Mississippi Valley; and in view of the well-established fact that the prosperity of the farmer means the prosperity of the Nation, we had better make sure we do not injure the Nation's backbone. If we want economic health, we had better see to it that the milk farmers, comprising the largest segment of the farm industry, do not have their incomes sabotaged. It may be said the State of Wisconsin is about 50-percent industrial and 50-percent agricultural. Everyone knows the economic health of the villages and cities of my State, as well as of other States, depends upon the good, sound, economic health of the farmer. It depends upon the economic current flowing from the farm to the cities and villages, and from them, back to the farm.

So, today I ask, What is the Government going to do about it? I read in the newspaper last night an intimation that the Secretary of Agriculture was going to do something. I hope he will. I have no criticism. I have on my lips a prayer of hope that he will take immediate action, pursuant to the authority he has, to support the price of dairy products, to the end that the farmer may at least obtain the cost of production and a reasonable return for his investment and labor.

Let me repeat what I have many times said before on the floor of the Senate, that there is good Scriptural authority for what I am asking at this time. Paul, the great metaphysician, said:

> If any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than the infidel.

So, while it may be well to look after strangers and look into distant continents and see the problems there, we had better get a new set of glasses and look at our local problems. It might be well for us to pause and consider our obligations to "our house" and how to build it strong morally, economically, and spiritually, instead of constantly looking into distant lands for an opportunity to do good.

Mr. President, the time is not far distant when there may be restated in this country the fact that persons who look to their own are not all to be placed in the category of "damned isolationists." After all, the best market in the world is in America, if we keep our economic current sound and healthy. There is no reflection on those who want to be good Samaritans abroad. There is a reflection, however, on those who do not sustain their own, who will not look after their own.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. McCARTHY. Am I correct in the statement that if we should support milk production at 90 percent of parity we actually would not add 1 cent to the milk bill of the citizens? Milk is now selling at retail for 18 or 20 cents a quart, so that a support of the milk price at 90 percent of parity which would be about 3.11 per hundred or less than 7 cents per quart would not add 1 cent to the milk bill of the consumer. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. I think it is substantially correct. Of course the question of parity is one which I do not care to enter into at this time, because there is a question of a restatement of it. There is a question of whether it is possible later to evaluate parity, taking into consideration market prices on the east coast, where the farmer is receiving from $4.50 to $5 a hundred, whereas in Wisconsin, he is receiving but $2.80. We send our powdered milk, rich in butterfat and ice-cream fats, to the East. I am thinking of the common-sense rule that "the labor is worthy of his hire." I know of no one who labors more diligently and industriously than does the farmer; and for his labor he should receive at least the cost of production, plus a reasonable return.

I have further comments to make——

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. First, let me say that I think the dairy farmers are fortunate in one respect, in that we now have a Secretary of Agriculture who seems to have an intelligent grasp of the problems of the dairy farmers. Is it not a correct statement that, while there is a temporary surplus of manufactured milk products, unless the price is supported many farmers will be forced to sell their dairy herds for beef, and that when that happens, ultimately persons in the cities who are buying cheese, butter, and milk will have to pay much more than would be the case if we were now to adopt a sensible support program? Would the Senator say that is correct?

Mr. WILEY. I think my colleague has made a substantially correct statement, except that I would not say that there is a surplus of milk products. I would say that there is a fault in our distribution system.

A short time ago I was present at a reception and was told by persons from

New York and from this great city that they had gone from store to store and could not obtain Wisconsin cheese. There is something wrong about that situation. It may have something to do with the present prices.

I am speaking for the farmer. He must have relief, because, considering the 60-cent dollar, and the costs amounting to $2.80 a hundred, we can see what the farmer is receiving. The farmer's problem is not simply failure to get a good price; his problem is in failing to obtain labor. It is further complicated by the fact that for everything he buys, his machinery and supplies, and other items, he must pay increased prices. The cost of labor has increased 400 percent over what he used to pay, and in order to meet that change in the situation, he must have machinery. I used the illustration several days ago, of the tractor which could be bought for $1,000, including some other equipment, but which has gone up in price to approximately $2,600. He is thus caught in a squeeze, which may mean, as suggested by my colleague, a lessening of the milk herds of the Nation. That means not only depletion of the soil but also ruinous devaluation of farms, a loss in taxable property, and more and more of a centralization of population in the cities. So it is a vicious circle. We are asking that the Government take action in connection with that downward trend.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the price to the Wisconsin farmer has decreased from $4.50 to approximately $2.80, but in spite of that tremendous decrease, of 35 or 40 percent, actually the price to the consumer of liquid milk has not changed at all. The individual buying 1 or 2 quarts of milk a day is not benefited at all by the reduction in the price. All the dairy farmers are asking is that their business be stabilized to at least the same degree as that at which other branches of farming are stabilized. In other words, we have placed a support price under corn, flax, wheat, and other commodities but not under milk. The dairy farmers are merely asking for the same consideration. Is that correct?

Mr. WILEY. I again say that the statement of my colleague is substantially correct. In some places the price of milk to the consumer has been reduced 1 cent a quart. In other words, the price may have been 19 cents, and it has gone to 18 cents, the farmer receiving approximately 5 cents for his milk. That is a point which was never made clear to many people in the cities, who did not comprehend the problems of the farmer. Particularly in the last campaign, the farmer was held up as a gouger in certain places, and he was also told that his prices would be kept up. Both statements have proved to be fallacious.

Mr. President, the first point my colleague made was as to the price, and I have answered that. What was the second point?

Mr. McCARTHY. The dairy farmers are not asking for anything which the other branches of agriculture have not already received. In other words, our dairy farmers are merely saying, "You have stabilized the price of corn, the price of wheat, the price of tobacco; we merely ask now that you do the same for the dairy industry you have long since done for other branches of agriculture."

I should like to make it clear that what I am saying is not intended as criticism of our present Secretary of Agriculture. I think he has a more intelligent grasp of the problem of the dairy farmer than any Secretary of Agriculture has had for a long time—excluding, of course, the junior Senator from New Mexico, who was Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in speaking on this subject I am not merely speaking for the dairy farmer. I am speaking for what might be called the public interest. I have already stated, first, that the backbone of the Middle West is the dairy farmer, and when the farmers of Illinois met a few days ago—and I see the distinguished senior Senator of Illinois smiling—they joined in the demand for the constructive action I have asked to have taken by the administration.

Mr. President, I am not merely speaking for the dairy farmers. I say that when there is any segment of our society that is very ill, the disease transmits itself to every other segment; and when such an important segment as the dairy farmers, who, by virtue of their industry being what it is, have no control over their prices, cannot fix their prices, it might be said they are in a hole; and in view of the dairy industry being the largest segment among the farm industries of the United States, and in view of the fact that it produces the food that is best for human kind, it is not asking favoritism of the Government; it is merely asking a "fair deal," and that, I understand, is the slogan of the new administration. I would say give it a square deal, and see that adequate prices are provided.

Mr. President, I shall now return to the remarks I had prepared, which will not be long.

We now have an opportunity to do good for our own—and I am using the phrase so often employed among the do gooders—for the dairy farmer is of our house, and I am not one of those who want to deny the faith and be worse than an infidel. Oh, I know it probably does not have very much noise appeal, as do some of these other ideas that are being thrown into the political jackpot to gain the attention of the electorate, but I know, Mr. President, it has in it a thing of substance that goes to the question of maintaining the vitality of the Nation.

Mr. President, recently there appeared in the Evening Star an editorial entitled "Mr. Truman Pays a Debt." It was a very good editorial, which I ask to have printed at the end of my remarks. It relates to what lengths the administration is willing to go to pay its obligation to the labor leaders of this country. If any Senators have not read this editorial, they should because it is very pertinent to this issue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, there was a segment of our dairy farmers that voted for Mr. Truman because they had been made to fear that "if the Republicans get in it will result in a deterioration of dairy prices." I know whereof I speak, because many in my own State, while they voted the State Republican ticket, had been made to fear on this subject and voted for Mr. Truman. The farmers are asking in this case for no special privilege, they are asking that they get at least the cost of production out of the goods they produce and which mean so much to the health and the vitality of the Nation.

Mr. President, if one could think of producing anything for 6 cents a quart or less—that is, a whole quart, not a fifth, as in the case of something else I might mention—could one think of producing anything comparable to milk for 5 cents a quart, or 6 cents a quart? Yet here is the best food in the world, nature's food, full of the rich substance of butterfat, full of the great mineral and food requirements that we must have in our bodies, and it is all for 6 cents. Of course, purchasers pay more, because of handling charges and distribution charges. They pay anywhere from 18 to 21 cents.

Now, my good friends of the opposition, if you feel you owe a debt for that fear propaganda that was interjected into the campaign—no, I will not say that, I will say if you feel that the producers of this great food have a right to the cost of production and a little bit in addition, is there not more involved than even paying a debt? There is a question of maintaining the national economy.

Mr. President, I do not want to see a return of that condition, a condition which really resulted in my being sent to the Senate, a condition when there were foreclosures, when I sold the milk from my own farm at from 95 cents to $1.25 a hundred, when farms were being foreclosed by the thousands, by governments and by insurance companies, when men were cracking up because they saw what they had accumulated go out the window. Mr. President, that was from 1933 up to the time when the war came on this Nation, and that farm situation continued. I do not want to see a repetition of that. The Government owes an obligation, and I want to see that obligation discharged.

EXHIBIT 1

MR. TRUMAN PAYS A DEBT

The President's version of a new labor law, drafted in consultation with union lawyers, reveals a distressing willingness to bow to the demands of the labor bosses.

This bill makes a mockery of any rights which employers might be supposed to have. Except in one tiny area, it gives the green light to unions to take whatever they can get by the use of economic force, and, finally, it does not protect the public against strikes designed to attain a union objective by depriving the Nation of some essential commodity or service. Small wonder that the administration men in the Senate are trying to railroad the bill through without adequate hearings, for it is not a measure which can meet the test of full and honest scrutiny.

The Taft-Hartley Act, which has been condemned in emotional terms because it cannot be substantially discredited by any factual showing, tried to bring about some balance between unions and industry. It sought to equalize the one-sided relationship that grew out of the original Wagner Act. This new bill repeals the Taft-Hartley Act and revives the Wagner Act in an amended form which promises to be more unjust to industry than was the original law. The Taft-Hartley Act assumed that employers and employees were entitled to equality under the law. The President's bill clearly repudiates that assumption, and stands on the premise that unions should have special and favored treatment. As an illustration, the President will lift all restraints on political spending by his union political allies. But the ban on political contributions by corporations and banks would be continued in effect.

The President's bill recognizes only two improper union practices. These are certain types of jurisdictional strikes and secondary boycotts designed to maintain a proscribed jurisdictional strike, and even in this drastically limited area the remedies proposed are so time-consuming that, for practical purposes, they are apt to prove ineffective.

On the larger issue of strikes which threaten the life of the Nation the President's bill is deplorably inadequate. In this respect the Taft-Hartley law offered little enough—at best, an 80-day stay of a crippling strike through resort to the unjunction process. The President's bill knocks out any appeal to the courts. It provides only that when a dispute threatens the national health or safety the President may issue a proclamation calling upon the parties to stay on the job for 30 days. It says that the parties "shall" observe this proclamation, but there is nothing which requires them to do so. It is further provided that the President appoint a fact-finding board which would investigate the dispute and make recommendations for settlement. The bill does not require either party to accept the recommendations.

In practical effect this would mean that the White House would be back in the business of mediating major labor disputes. We have had unhappy experience with that procedure in the past, and if this bill becomes law we will have more unhappy experiences in the future. Presumably, the Government could bring enough pressure to bear to compel an employer to accept a fact-finding body's recommendation. But it has been amply demonstrated that the Government, without the aid of the Federal courts, cannot similarly coerce a strong union. So, as a practical matter, what Mr. Truman proposes is that the Government be disarmed as the representative of all the people when their welfare is threatened by a strike.

There are a variety of other things wrong with the President's bill. Among these are the devices to return the Conciliation Service to the Labor Department, to knock out State bans on the closed shop, to cut down the general counsel of the Labor Board, and to lift the curbs on Communist domination of unions. Fortunately, however, the bill cannot be fastened on the country without Senate approval. As it stands, it represents a handsome payment by the President of his political debt to organized labor. But the Members of the Senate are not under the same political obligation. They are free to examine all of the provisions of the measure and to debate them fully. This will be done, and that debate will be one which the people of this country would be well advised to follow with close attention.

## THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN CENTENNIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 5, there will be observed throughout the world, by alumni of the University of Wisconsin, founders' day—honoring that day 100 years ago when the first university class assembled for instruction at Madison.

I feel that I would be remiss if I did not invite the attention of my colleagues and of the Nation to the 100 candles in the birthday cake of this great State university. It is not only a natural pride that any legislator would feel for the State university of his own particular State, his alma mater, which prompts these remarks. Rather, it is the fact that the University of Wisconsin has achieved a fame for pioneering in higher education, which is the pride not only of the citizens of the Badger State but of all the 48 States.

The brilliant achievements of the university in the field of education, of science, of the arts, of political science, of technology, of agriculture, are so many in number and so diverse, that it would require volumes for me to give them appropriate description. In this connection, Mr. President, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the Sunday, January 30, 1949, centennial section published in the Wisconsin State Journal and in the Madison Capital Times—a brilliant edition of which any American newspaper might well be proud.

To the faculty and students of the University of Wisconsin, we bid Godspeed in celebration of this one hundredth anniversary and in entering the second century of progress for the good of mankind. As far back as last June, I pointed out the many celebrations which are being and have been held in connection with this centennial, and I am glad to add these few additional words of comment in tribute to a great university, a leader among universities, and a great educational tradition of freedom, of adventure, of going forward—the University of Wisconsin.

## TRANSFER OF BUSHNELL GENERAL HOSPITAL NEAR BRIGHAM CITY, UTAH

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I reported favorably, earlier today, Senate bill 170, with an amendment. The bill authorizes and directs the Administrator of the War Assets Administration to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, for use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians for off-reservation employment and placement, the property known as the Bushnell General Hospital, near Brigham City, Utah. The Indians in question are Navajo Indians. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill. I may say again that the bill was reported from the committee unanimously. There was no objection to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand from the Senator that time is of the essence; that if the bill is not acted upon promptly it will be of no particular value?

Mr. HOEY. That is true. Unless the transfer is made in time so that an appropriation can be made to take care of the school this year, it will not be of any benefit to the 22,000 Navajo Indian school children who will be served by this transfer and by converting the property into a vocational school property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 170) to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the word "Interior," to insert "without reimbursement or transfer of funds."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Administrator of the War Assets Administration is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Secretary of the Interior, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, for use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as a vocational school for Indian children and a center for housing and training adult Indians for off-reservation employment and placement, the property known as the Bushnell General Hospital near Brigham City, Box Elder County, Utah, comprising 298.5 acres, more or less, together with roads, buildings, and other betterments thereon.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to take over the property as soon as Congress has appropriated the necessary funds to provide for alterations, maintenance, and operation.

## TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY, PRIMATE OF HUNGARY

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, more than a month ago the Communist-dominated Government of Hungary announced the arrest of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of that country, on suspicion of plotting against the Government, spying, treason, and black-market dealings.

On December 29, 1948, the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, the then Acting Secretary of State, denounced the arrest as "a sickening sham," terming it the culmination of a long series of oppressive acts by the Hungarian Government against personal freedoms, human freedoms, and now religious freedom.

Mr. Lovett declared that the charges upon which the cardinal's arrest allegedly were based were patently false, and that the unwarranted arrest indicated what the attitude of the Hungarian Government is toward the liberties to which the rest of the world attaches the greatest importance.

In a statement issued on December 28 by the National Lutheran Council, in New York, the Reverend Dr. Paul C. Empie, executive director, asserted that the cardinal's arrest was consistent with the policy of the Hungarian Government, which seeks to dominate and control every area of church life in that country. Lutherans throughout the world, Dr.

Emple added, deplore this additional instance of persecution of the Church of Hungary, and sympathize sincerely with the unfortunate victims of persecution behind the iron curtain.

Mr. President, now the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is to begin. From advance notices already made public it is a foregone conclusion what the verdict will be. As a sequel to a travesty of justice it can be expected that the sentence will be either death or a lengthy term of imprisonment.

No stone is being left unturned, from all available accounts, in the efforts to remove this defender of democracy permanently from the Hungarian scene. The "sickening sham" of his arrest, so vigorously protested on behalf of our Government by Acting Secretary of State Lovett, will pale into insignificance, foreign sources tell us, in comparison with the shameless mockery of justice now starting to function.

Mr. President, the program of suppression against the Hungarian primate has followed a familiar pattern. First, a policy of attempted intimidation, culminating in the arrest of his secretary, followed by the merciless "questioning" of that unlucky person to obtain a "confession" that would involve his superior. Then the arrest of the cardinal, on trumped-up charges of suspicion—suspicion, mind you—of plotting against the Government, of spying, treason, and, ridiculous to relate, of black-market dealings.

It must be admitted that the Communist leadership made frantic efforts to avoid arresting the outstanding religious figure in the nation. They had tried to still his voice by forbidding him to appear at public gatherings, except in church; they had banned the Catholic Youth groups; they had arrested his priests; they had prohibited religious processions, and ordered the discontinuance of all but a few minor church publications.

Was it for plotting, or treason, or black market operations, that Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested? Or was it because, as the correspondent of the London Times reported, that "The only surviving center of opposition (to the illegal Communist government) was the Catholic Church under the leadership of the primate of Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty"?

Was it because the Moscow-trained occupation officials found him, as the Nazi occupation forces earlier had found him, a focal point and unyielding symbol of resistance to despotism, when they, too, were forced to carry him off to prison to still his potent denunciation of tyranny?

The world knows by now how to evaluate correctly the "confessions" gained from Communist prisoners, by their unique and ingenious methods. Already, it is reported, the cardinal has "confessed" and talk of drugs is heard, new drugs that deaden the consciousness, and make the person under questioning ready to admit anything the torturers demand of him.

Now, the news from Hungary says, petitions are being circulated among workers and peasants demanding the utmost in punishment for Cardinal Mindszenty. Thousands undoubtedly will sign them, for to disobey would involve serious, even tragic, consequences.

Further these accurate reports say, a special tribunal is set up for the trial, composed entirely of judges whose hopes for future preference rest solely upon their subservience to the Communist regime. Indeed, a meeting of influential Communist leaders already has been held, we are told, to determine upon the sentence to be imposed at the conclusion of the farcical proceedings.

The end of this latest attempt to eradicate, by violence, all opposition to the illegal government of Hungary may be foreseen. The very violence used is a confession of fear and of impotence on the part of Hungary's oppressors. Instead of stilling the voice of justice and freedom, however, it will engrave indelibly on the hearts of freedom-loving people everywhere, we may be confident, the unforgettable words of courage and good will with which he addressed the people of his country in his final pastoral, which was broadcast to the people of Hungary by the Voice of America when suppressed by the Communist officials.

I stand for God, church, and my country—

The intrepid cardinal declared.

I pray for the world of justice and brotherly love; I pray for those who, in the words of my Master, know not what they are doing. I forgive them with all my heart.

Every American, who values the freedoms which are his precious birthright, will protest this latest Communist move to crush all opposition and particularly to still the voice of religion, the only vocal force abroad now standing in the path of complete Communist conquest. We must condemn such an attack on free institutions.

Because it depicts so clearly the true meaning of events in Hungary revolving around Cardinal Mindszenty, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an excerpt from an editorial in America, issue of January 8, 1949, entitled "The Challenge of Mindszenty."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHALLENGE OF MINDSZENTY

In arresting Cardinal Mindszenty, the Communists are clearly making a test of strength. They have done what Hitler dared not do in Germany. If their brazen action passes uncensured by a world-wide movement of revulsion and protest, the Communists will know that they can affront the conscience of the world and get away with it. The whole world must rally to Mindszenty's defense. Said the cardinal himself in his statement of November 16: "Two of my predecessors fell on the field of battle; two were dispossessed of all they had * * * John Vitez (fifteenth century) was thrown into jail; Martinuzzi fell at the hands of assassins, hired by the mighty ones of his day (1551) * * * and Pazmany (1616–37), the greatest of all, was sent into exile. * * * But of all my predecessors, no one stood as bereft of means of defense as I do." This is not a juncture where any believers in justice can say it is none of their concern. Here is a question of a naked show of force—godless tyranny against man's spiritual nature. Through Cardinal Mindszenty communism is striking at the spiritual nerve of the West—at those religious values which are the West's strongest defense against totalitarian atheism. All who believe in these values will join with the world's Catholics to protest the injustice which is being staged in Hungary today.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

William McChesney Martin, Jr., of New York, N. Y., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; and

John B. Dunlap, of Texas, to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Dean Rusk, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Louis F. Blanchard, of New Mexico, and several other Foreign Service staff officers, for appointment as consuls and a Foreign Service officer; and

Ralph H. Ackerman, of California, and sundry other persons for appointment and promotion in the Foreign Service.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Paul Fremont-Smith and sundry other candidates for appointment in the regular corps of the Public Health Service.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Dewey G. Rushford and Gordon D. Scott, to be ensigns in the Coast and Geodetic Survey; and

George F. Hicks and sundry other officers for promotion in the United States Coast Guard.

By Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of Ithaca, N. Y., to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund to fill an existing vacancy.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Donald F. Carpenter, of Connecticut, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate; and

Karl T. Compton, of Massachusetts, to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

### NOMINATION OF JESSE M. DONALDSON TO BE POSTMASTER GENERAL—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service I report favorably the nomination of Jesse M. Donaldson, of Illinois, to be Postmaster General. The committee decided unanimously that Mr. Donaldson's nomination should be confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—NOMINATION PREVIOUSLY PASSED OVER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James M. Mitchell to be a Civil Service Commissioner, which nomination had been previously passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### TREASURY DEPARTMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward H. Foley, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John S. Graham to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George B. Gillin to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gilroy Roberts to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George McGill to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel A. Bolich to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Fitzpatrick to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ralph W. Cripe to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stuart L. Crenshaw to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John H. Alsmiller to be collector of customs for district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William H. Burke, Jr., to be collector of customs for district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Tully Garner to be collector of customs for district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

### COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles F. Murphy to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

The VICF PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

### ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR DISASTER RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report favorably House Joint Resolution 136, making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The joint resolution calls for an additional appropriation of $500,000 for the relief of sufferers in the storm-stricken areas of the West.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 136) making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign, after the adjournment of the Senate today, bills and joint resolutions which have been examined and found truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I inquire what is expected to be taken up on Monday next?

Mr. LUCAS. We hope to take up on Monday next a bill which is expected to be reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, dealing with export and import controls. I am sure that the committee will file the report. It has already obtained unanimous consent to file the report during the adjournment, in the hope that the Senate can consider it on Monday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask also when the majority leader expects the calendar to be called?

Mr. LUCAS. I presume that sometime next week the calendar will be called.

I now move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 7, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 3, 1949:

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Saudi Arabia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

### IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Cecil E. Anderson

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William Fellner

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William H. Howard

The following-named citizen (contract NROTC student) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Raymond R. Rall, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The following-named midshipmen for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Samuel E. Englehart

William F. Saunders, Jr.

The following-named former Regular officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Warren J. Skvaril

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Harold K. Jackson

---

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 3, 1949:

### CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

James M. Mitchell to be a Civil Service Commissioner. (Appointed during the last recess of the Senate.)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Edward H. Foley, Jr., to be Under Secretary of the Treasury.

John S. Graham to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

MINT OF THE UNITED STATES

George B. Gillin to be Superintendent of the Mint of the United States at San Francisco, Calif.

Gilroy Roberts to be Engraver in the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

George McGill to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for a term expiring June 16, 1954.

BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Daniel A. Bolich to be Assistant Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

COLLECTORS OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John J. Fitzpatrick to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Connecticut.

Ralph W. Cripe to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Indiana, to fill an existing vacancy.

Stuart L. Crenshaw to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Virginia, to fill an existing vacancy.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

John H. Alsmiller to be collector of customs for customs collection, district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

William H. Burke, Jr., to be collector of customs for customs collection, district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (Reappointment.)

Tully Garner, to be collector of customs for customs collection, district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex. (Now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

COMPTROLLER OF CUSTOMS

Charles F. Murphy to be comptroller of customs, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical and Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.) and title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.):

*To be majors*

William A. Collins, Jr., MC. O340156.
George A. Peck, MC O23567.

*To be captains*

Marvin D. Blackburn, Jr., MC, O447156.
Charles I. Bryans, Jr., MC, O464805.
Slater M. Dozier, MC, O436387.
Ian N. J. Eggeling, MC, O518418.
Kermit H. Gruberg, MC, O437490.
Royce E. House, MC, O391211.
James B. Hutchinson, MC, O1765131.
Fred E. Jenkins, MC, O470023.
Thomas P. Jernigan III, MC, O470996.
Frank H. Ketcham, DC, O469419.
Grady W. Phillips, MC, O1735667.
Frank K. Raymond, MC, O391287.
Albert K. Schoenbucher, MC, O440171.
William Stone, MC, O430283.

*To be first lieutenants*

Ellsworth C. Alvord, Jr., MC, O1727381.
Marshall B. Atkinson, MC, O1787024.
William P. Barron, MC.
George W. Blair, Jr., MC.
William J. Blake, MC.
Norman E. Brodeur, MC, O1704751.
James W. Carson, DC.
John J. Carter, MC.
Frank J. Cozzetto, MC.
Norman Fisher, MC, O947150.
Charles F. Ford, MC.
George E. Gorleau, MC, O1727332.
Carl L. Hansen, Jr., MC, O935824.
Thomas L. Hendrix, MC, O1786167.
Ernest E. House, DC.
Laurence S. Jackson, MC, O1727035.
Albert R. Jones, Jr., MC.
Roger A. Juel, MC, O484893.
Richard L. Kasper, MC.
Marvin M. Keirns, MC, O1747040.
Evan L. Lewis, MC, O474583.
Frank W. Little, MC.
Harold T. McIver, MC, O1736104.
Robert D. McKnight, MC.
James L. McNeil, MC.
Richard E. Ogborn, MC, O1767593.
Gerald A. Orken, MC, O1736075.
Edwin E. Pontius, MC.
James A. Reilly, Jr., MC.
Robert W. Saunderson, Jr., MC.
Evan W. Schear, MC, O1746681.
Gene S. Smith, MC.
Martin A. Swerdlow, MC.
Lonis L. Schurter, MC, O1776295.
John B. Selby, MC.
John B. Sheffer, MC.
Ralph F. Shirer, MC, O1776174.
James G. Stouffer, MC.
William W. Thompson, MC.
Edward J. Tomsovic, MC.
Harry J. Umlauf, MC, O1727442.
William P. Walton, MC, O1786501.
John Watt, Jr., MC.
George C. Weinland, MC.
Edwin J. Westfall, MC.
John C. Wilsey, MC.
Kent T. Woodward, MC.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

*To be first lieutenant*

Paul J. Kovar, O387604.

*To be second lieutenant*

Hubert M. Nicholson, Jr.

The following-named person for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, in the grade of first lieutenant, under the provisions of Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, June 12, 1948. (This person was previously given recess appointment in the grade of second lieutenant in error.) Appointment of the individual will not exceed authorization for the Women's Army Corps, as established by Public Law 625:

Irma V. Bouton, L228827.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Army Nurse Corps, Regular Army, in the grade specified under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress:

*To be second lieutenants*

Primrose M. Gifford, N737952.
Sara C. Mooney, N763056.
Theresa R. Cardillo, N794154.
Marjorie R. Samson, N792133.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The nominations of Leland Francis Adair and others for promotions in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 24, 1949, beginning with the name of Leland Francis Adair, O41473, appearing on page 499 and ending with the name of Marian York, N81, which appears on page 512.

IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for appointment to the positions indicated under the provisions of section 504 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Lt. Gen. Elwood Richard Quesada, AO16731, Air Force of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Air Force), to be special assistant to the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, for Reserve forces, with the rank of lieutenant general, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Lt. Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, AO17917, Air Force of the United States (major general, U. S. Air Force), to be commanding general, Strategic Air Command, United States Air Force, with the rank of lieutenant general, with rank from October 1, 1947.

Col. Reginald Carl Harmon, AO28796, Air Force of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Air Force), for appointment as Judge Advocate General, United States Air Force, with the rank of major general, for the period of 4 years beginning September 8, 1948, under the provisions of Public Law 775, Eightieth Congress.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 515, OFFICER PERSONNEL ACT OF 1947

*To be major generals*

Richard Cox Coupland, AO9792.

Kenneth Perry McNaughton, AO16491, Air Force of the United States.

Thomas Sarsfield Power, AO17854, Air Force of the United States.

Robert Whitney Burns, AO17961, Air Force of the United States.

Carl Amandus Brandt, AO18171, Air Force of the United States.

*To be brigadier generals*

Abraham Robert Ginsburgh, AO9747.
Wallace Gordon Smith, AO11471.
James Francis Joseph Early, AO15212.
James Elbert Briggs, AO17103.
Howard Graham Bunker, AO17200.
Walter Campbell Sweeney, Jr., AO18080.
Millard Lewis AO18163.
Robert Broussard Landry AO18868.
Pierpont Morgan Hamilton AO900788.
John Bevier Ackerman AO18706.

(NOTE.—Prior to being placed on their present assignments, Lieutenant Generals Quesada and LeMay were assigned as commanding general, Tactical Air Command, and commanding general, United States Air Forces in Europe, respectively. All of the officers named on this nomination received recess appointments to the positions and/or grades indicated, except Col. John B. Ackerman AO18706, United States Air Force.)

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The nominations of Robert Philip Alston et al., for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 27, 1949, beginning with the name of Robert Philip Alston, AO29057, appearing on page 633, and ending with the name of Daniel Warren Wolf, AO50517, which appears on page 638.

The nominations of Theodore Roosevelt Hikel et al., for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 518 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, which were confirmed today, may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 27, 1949, beginning with the name of Theodore Roosevelt Hikel, AO29782, appearing on page 604, and ending with the name of Carl George Yeaton, AO56608, which appears on page 633.

THE OFFICERS NAMED HEREIN FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE AIR FORCE OF THE UNITED STATES UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF SECTION 38 OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT AS AMENDED

*To be major general*

Maj. Gen. George Griffin Finch AO180579, to date from November 22, 1948.

*To be brigadier generals of the line*

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Coffin Ames AO131519, to date from April 29, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Harry Crutcher, Jr., AO300841, to date from May 23, 1948.

Brig. Gen. Hillford Richard Wallace, AO224721, to date from April 13, 1948.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of mankind, amid the contradictory currents of this day, teach us that faith which will keep us strong and patient; which will lift us above the need of praise, and stresses works rather than words.

Make manifest unto us the wonder of our privilege of working together for the common good. Under all conditions, may our country be first on the honor roll of the world. O sustain us by Thy strength, inspired by the ageless truth that right makes might, and eternal truth is the only sword. In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### THE LATE DEAN M. GILLESPIE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who served with the Honorable Dean M. Gillespie in the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses heard with profound sorrow of his untimely death on February 2, 1949.

Mr. Gillespie was elected to the House March 7, 1944, at a special election held in the First District of Colorado to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Lawrence Lewis. Mr. Gillespie was reelected to the Seventy-ninth Congress, and served as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

I knew Mr. Gillespie for many years. He was a great business and community leader. He truly represented the personal opportunity and private-enterprise efforts offered to young men everywhere under our form of government. He organized and managed many business enterprises—all of them successfully. He was a tireless worker with abundant energy—a friendly man who respected and appreciated those with whom he worked and cooperated. He had great courage and boldly stood foursquare on great issues which he knew and understood could not be compromised.

Mr. Gillespie was born in Salina, Kans., May 3, 1884, a son of a pioneer physician. He moved to Denver, Colo., in 1905 and went into business for himself. At his death he was president of the Dean Gillespie & Co.; vice president and treasurer of Bluhill Foods Corp. of Denver; president, Motoroyal Oil Co., Denver, He was a member of the Denver Rotary, Denver Athletic Club; member of Society of Automotive Engineers, Society for Research of Meteorites, and Society of American Military Engineers. He also was an Elk, Mason, and a Shriner.

Greatly appreciating his high qualities of citizenship, loving and admiring his character and personality, all of his friends and associates of the Congress pause a moment to pay tribute to this great American. And to his daughters and grandchildren we extend our deepest and most sincere sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARSALIS].

Mr. MARSALIS. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deep regret yesterday of the death of Dean Gillespie, a former Member of this body. While it was not my privilege to have had a personal acquaintanceship with Mr. Gillespie during his lifetime, I did know him as one of the outstanding business and political leaders of the State of Colorado. His business activities reached into nearly every section of the State and in my district there were large billboards that advertised the Dean Gillespie & Co. His friendships also extended over the entire State. Many of his friends in my district have frequently referred to his ability, his fine character, and his human qualities.

Colorado has, indeed, lost an outstanding leader and citizen and his family has lost a devoted husband and father.

I join with the other members of the Colorado State delegation in paying tribute to his memory and in offering my deepest sympathy and condolences to his family.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, Dean Gillespie came here with great business experience. He was a fine character and very able citizen. He was on the Committee on Appropriations in the Seventy-ninth Congress and served very effectively on the Committees on the State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Treasury and Post Office. He was diligent. He was forceful; he was effective on the floor. That kind of man is one that this country can ill afford to lose. I wish to extend to his State of Colorado and to his family my sincerest and deepest regrets.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the death of my good friend Dean Gillespie came to me as a great shock. In his demise the country lost one of its most patriotic and able citizens. A successful businessman, he brought that viewpoint into the political life. He served with distinction and great ability as a Member of Congress and his retirement brought universal regret. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy. A great American has passed away.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we certainly have lost a great friend in the passing of Mr. Gillespie, a former colleague of ours. We mourn his passing because we realize that he was a man who was honest in his convictions. He was sincere in the things that he tried to do. He was capable and able. The Government has lost a great citizen. The State of Colorado has lost a man whom I am sure all the Members of Congress respected during his tenure of office. He certainly will be missed, not only by those who knew him but all those who have come to realize and appreciate the things he stood for and that he did in his lifetime. Those things are going to remain with us as a life of energy and accomplishments. Certainly he was a man who had great influence for good and for the things that make this world a better place in which to live.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow that I learned of the passing of Dean Gillespie. As a Member of Congress privileged to serve with him, I can only say that on every occasion I found him to be a man of the highest principle and of deep sincerity. He had a fine understanding of the problems that came before the Congress and the country.

He was a man of courage, intelligence, and conviction. I am sorry indeed that he has been taken from our midst. Every one of us who knew him and were privileged to serve with him can say that for his being among us and for his having served in the Congress of the United States the country and the world is a better place in which to live.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I learned yesterday of the passing of one of Colorado's foremost citizens. His sudden death comes as a distinct shock, both to me and the other members of the Colorado delegation, and also to the many other friends in this body with whom he had served.

Dean M. Gillespie served as a Member of the House of Representatives from the First District of Colorado during the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. He was elected to Congress on March 7, 1944, after the death of Lawrence Lewis, who had represented the district many years.

Dean Gillespie brought to this body the viewpoint and convictions of a successful businessman who, through his own industry and ability, had reached a place of high stature in the business life of the city of Denver and the State of Colorado. His record in the House of Representatives was clear and consistent, and he never deviated from the principles in which he believed. His warm personality and his sincerity made him many friends during his service in Washington.

Although I was not intimately acquainted with Dean Gillespie, and although it fell to my lot to replace him in this body, it can be truthfully said that in all of our personal dealings he showed a spirit of friendliness and generosity which was characteristic of this fine American.

I know that the friends of Dean Gillespie in this body and the members of the Colorado delegation will join with me in expressing sincere regrets and deepest sympathy to his two daughters on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the remarks of the senior Senator from Colorado, Hon. EDWIN JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The remarks of Senator JOHNSON are as follows:)

Dean M. Gillespie was one of the most useful citizens of this country whom I have ever known. In fact, he was a great American from every standard of measurement. His parting is a distinct loss to his State and his Nation. As a very close personal friend, I feel his loss keenly.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert following the remarks of Senator JOHNSON, the remarks of the junior Senator from Colorado, Senator MILLIKIN.

The SPEAKER. Withou objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The remarks of Senator MILLIKIN follow:)

I would like to join my colleague, Senator EDWIN JOHNSON, and the Members of the Colorado delegation in the House of Representatives in paying tribute to former Congressman Dean M. Gillespie, who represented the First District during part of the Seventy-eighth and the Seventy-ninth Congresses. His sudden death came as a shock and has saddened all of us.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, it comes to me as a shock to hear of the death of our former colleague, Dean Gillespie, of Colorado. It was my happy privilege to be associated with him as a member of my Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary. I knew him intimately. He was a sober, able, and industrious man. He set a splendid example in his travels with me to many parts of the world.

Dean Gillespie's passing is a loss to this Nation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, another milestone along the highway of life has become a monument to a departed friend.

About 2 or 3 days ago my friend Mr. Dean Gillespie called me over the telephone and, failing to reach me, dictated a short statement to my secretary, praising the work I had done in trying to protect America against the subversive elements in this country. I will not quote what he said, but I considered it the greatest compliment I have ever received.

Dean Gillespie was one of the finest Americans who ever served in this House. We did not belong to the same political party. We did not agree on those issues that divide the two great political parties, but on those questions that go to the preservation of our form of government and our American way of life we did agree.

I cannot express my sorrow at learning of the death of Dean Gillespie, as I said, one of the greatest, finest, most patriotic men with whom I have ever served.

Goodbye, dear friend.

"And flights of angels sing thee to thy rest."

Thou'rt gone, the abyss of heaven
Hath swallowed up thy form; yet, on my heart
Deeply hath sunk the lesson thou hast given,
And shall not soon depart.

He who from zone to zone,
Guides through the boundless sky thy certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
Will lead my steps aright.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my deep sympathy to the family of Dean Gillespie and to the people of the State of Colorado at his untimely passing. I know of his great work here in the Congress. He was a tireless worker for his State and his country. He had business interests in my State for a matter of 25 years. He was well known and highly regarded throughout the entire State of Wyoming. We will miss him in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the news of the passing of our former colleague came to me as a distinct shock.

One of the inestimable privileges of service in this House is that it is the only means known to a citizen of this country whereby he may have the privilege of knowing intimately and enjoying the friendship of men worth knowing from every section of this great country. Dean Gillespie was a typical American. Nature cast him in a big mold. He was great of mind and heart. He loved people, he loved his family, his friends, and his country. There was in this House no more generous man. He delighted to talk to his friends, to entertain them, and to be with them. He was eminently successful in his business. He was a diligent, able, and effective Member of this House. His passing is a grievous loss to those who knew and loved him, and to his country which he served so well while a member of this body.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, we who served with Dean Gillespie knew the sterling qualities he possessed and the attributes which made up his splendid American character.

It was my privilege to pass through Denver last year. I stepped into a haberdashery store and talked with a clerk. I asked him about Dean Gillespie. We often measure a man by what his neighbors and associates say of him. This clerk spoke very highly of him and told me that the people of the city of Denver felt that he was one of the finest friends they had ever known in public life.

I came to know him well in the brief period he served here. While he was a Member of this House, he pursued his duties with sincerity of purpose. He always voted his convictions and was devoted to the truth.

Dean Gillespie helped build the better America in which we live today.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Like my colleagues, I, too, received the news of the passing of Dean Gillespie, my good friend, with deep regret and sorrow. It was my privilege to know him well. I was his guest in Denver, Colo., a few years ago. We visited on several occasions about the great West of early days because he was a friend of the old West. He was one of very few people still living in this country who knew of conditions in the early days of the West. He was a personal friend of Col. William F Cody—Buffalo Bill.

As a businessman, and as an American, Dean Gillespie had no peer in this country. When the type of man Dean Gillespie was no longer lives in the United States the Republic of which we are citizens will no longer exist. He was a man of generous impulses. He was a strong and stalwart American, an able legislator, a good man. I have lost a warm friend and our country a distinguished citizen.

I extend my sympathy and sorrow to his family and to his many friends. Someone years ago appropriately said that "as the years go by the milestones become headstones and beneath every one a friend."

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the others in paying tribute to the life and character of the late Representative Dean Gillespie of Colorado. Mr. Gillespie's service in the House was not long, but he did a good job in the time that he was here. He came to Congress with the background of a successful businessman. As I understand, he started from scratch and made his own way. It is often said that there are not enough businessmen in Congress. Well, Dean Gillespie was the best example of the fact that a good businessman in Congress is a genuine asset. He was soon recognized for his true worth, his courage, his fairness, his kindliness, and his practical approach to all legislative matters.

Few men succeed in obtaining a place on the powerful Appropriations Committee in as short a time as did Dean Gillespie. He was an ideal worker and made a splendid impression on all of us. In short, I think all who knew him liked him, regardless of our political affiliations.

I did not have the privilege of being acquainted with his family, but I do want to join with the others in this tribute to the memory of a distinguished colleague.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have

the privilege of extending their remarks at this point in the RECORD in reference to Mr. Gillespie.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I read in the paper today of the death of Dean Gillespie, a former Member of the House from Colorado.

It was my great privilege to have been a close friend of Dean, and I say without reservations that we have lost a real American. I visited Dean in his home in Denver and I know how well the people regard him in Colorado.

Dean Gillespie is a fine example of what this country offers in opportunity to the man who has initiative, courage, and integrity. He was successful in all ventures he undertook. He had all the attributes which make up a real man, such as character, generosity, and kindness.

Therefore I take this opportunity to pay my humble respects to the late Dean Gillespie.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the fact, very distressing, that my good friend Dean Milton Gillespie died on Tuesday. It is unnecessary for me to say that he served his State with notable ability as one of the great men Colorado has furnished the Nation and was one of the most distinguished members of the Seventy-eighth and Seventy-ninth Congresses. The record proves that.

Dean Gillespie was my next-door neighbor on the fourth floor of the Old House Office Building. I knew him intimately and very well.

As I judge men, he possessed in a very real and rare degree those outstanding qualities and elements of character we Americans esteem and apprize in others most highly.

It was interesting for me, from my standpoint as an old member, to watch him grow in mental stature to fill the great frame which carried his heart and brain. He illustrated that capacity inherent in man to outgrow such restrictions as are imposed by environment and local usage. He legislated for the whole country.

His frankness was compelling. His business honesty, which had spelled for him great success therein, made him hate hypocrisy and sham and deceit, and he saw through every such curtain as if it were glass.

He believed and he justified the statement that a public office is a public trust.

We mourn his passing. We cannot afford to lose such men of diamondlike integrity as was he, for his honesty of purpose, fixity of conviction, definiteness of decision, businessman as he was, made him a very great asset to those with whom he closely associated and to all his colleagues.

Colorado and the country lost a great son when, as Bunyan said of Valiant for Truth, Dean M. Gillespie—

> Passed over as all the trumpets sounded
> For him on the other side.

## FURTHER APPROPRIATION FOR DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. KERR moves that the rules be suspended and the joint resolution making further appropriation for disaster relief and for other purposes, House Joint Resolution 136, be passed.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read House Joint Resolution 136, as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sum:
>
> FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT
>
> Disaster relief: A further amount for disaster relief, $500,000, subject to the limitations and restrictions under this head in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, the pending resolution before you is similar to the one enacted last week and involves relief for the disaster-stricken areas in the West. Much headway has already been made in relieving the suffering of both human and animal life; however, the continuation of the snows and blizzards has made this additional amount of $500,000 necessary. This will complete in full the President's request for this purpose of $1,000,000. In addition to this, the President has authorized from funds made available for the current year the amount of $300,000 for relief purposes. I also wish to state that the President has directed the National Military Establishment to expend such sums as may be required for this purpose from any funds which may be available to the armed services.

To summarize, the following has now been allocated for disaster relief:

| | |
|---|---|
| Original allocation | $300,000 |
| H. J. Res. 112 | 500,000 |
| H. J. Res. 136 | 500,000 |
| Total | 1,300,000 |

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I would like to ask if any of this money may be used in flood disaster relief. We have a very serious flood situation bordering on 100 miles of river front in southern Illinois in my particular district. There is great devastation. The State is trying to get some relief. There is an attempt being made to pass a bill, I believe, to get relief from the State. I introduced a bill for general disaster relief with reference to floods yesterday, and I am wondering if it is contemplated that any of this money might be used where it was imperatively necessary to alleviate suffering by reason of flood disaster, or is this for the sole purpose of the blizzard condition in the Northwest?

Mr. KERR. Frankly, I think this resolution and the items I referred to can only be used for blizzard and storm relief.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. This is an emergency fund and could be used in the discretion of the President.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. For the benefit of the gentleman from Illinois, the committee report states that this fund is for use in the storm-stricken areas of the Midwest and West. I assume the report of the committee constitutes, while not binding, a direction.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The whole thing goes to the President. While the storm has been in the Midwest and the West—and which condition has been the driving force behind this appropriation—nevertheless this goes to the President with the authority to use it in his discretion, and he could go beyond it. He also has a small balance left out of this fund that he could use for any emergency item.

Mr. KERR. If you consider it as an emergency item then I think the gentleman from New York is probably correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. If that is so, then some of this money could be used up in New England in connection with the flooded areas.

Mr. TABER. It could be used out of this fund. There is money in this fund that is not covered in this appropriation.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think we ought to have the record clear so that the people in other areas will not be disappointed. As I understand, this is in connection with the storm-stricken areas in the Midwest and the West. Inasmuch as what the gentleman from New York says is probably correct, I think the President would feel constrained—I know I would if I were President—to use this money in connection with the disaster that visited the Midwest and the West. As much as I would like to make appropriations in other directions, I think in all fairness to the gentleman from Illinois you better concentrate on that directly.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I quite agree with the majority leader that the intention was to allow the President to use this money principally for the stricken areas of the Midwest and the West, but technically the gentleman from New York may be correct; that he does have the power to use it elsewhere. I want to make clear, however, that it is my understanding that this money is sent to the States by the President to

be used almost exclusively for the relief of human suffering and it is not to be used to open roads and trails, and to transport hay and feed to the suffering livestock in the West. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that several of the departments of the Government, particularly the Bureau of Land Management, have spent a large amount of money in opening roads to cities and towns and out to the ranches so that hay and feed could reach the stranded livestock. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina, Judge KERR, if the committee proposes to bring in legislation that will reimburse the various departments including the Army for the expenditures that they have made from the funds appropriated in the last Congress.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. As to reimbursing the various departments of the Government, that could be done by action of the President. Under the direction of the President, some of the departments of the Government, especially the Army, have been told to exert their effort.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. If the gentleman will yield further, all these departments, particularly the Army, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service, have spent considerable sums of money on their own initiative. I insist, therefore, that the President has no way to reimburse these various departments. As I understand, several proposals have gone to the gentleman's committee asking that action be taken to reimburse the departments for the expenditures they have already made and are making pursuant to directions from the President.

Mr. RABAUT. Nothing has come to the committee with reference to reimbursing the various departments. These reimbursements would come up at the request of the President. The President is giving the orders to those departments under his powers.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I wonder if the gentleman was right in that statement. The departments, as the gentleman from Wyoming has said, especially the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service, have exhausted funds that should be spent now. How does the gentleman propose that these departments continue to run?

Mr. RABAUT. In the regular course of business they will go to the budget to justify their expenditures and ask for a deficiency. It is up to the departments to do that. The budget is in the Executive Office. It will then come to the Congress, and find its way to the Deficiency Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GRANGER. Are we prepared to say that appropriations will be made to cover the expenditures that have already been made by the departments?

Mr. RABAUT. We could say that individual Members of Congress are very much interested in the actions the departments have taken, and it can be a matter of record when the question is later taken up, but it will depend on how much those appropriations have been depleted and what is needed to carry them on. If they desire reimbursement for the funds expended, they may make such a request to the budget, and that is in the executive department. We take the short cut of saying it is up to the President. Is that clear to the gentleman?

Mr. GRANGER. The gentleman is not saying now that any of the funds in the appropriation that is being made today will be used for that purpose?

Mr. RABAUT. That is entirely within the discretion of the President.

Mr. GRANGER. Does the gentleman mean to say that the President can use emergency funds to reimburse departments that have spent money?

Mr. RABAUT. He could if he wished. I am not saying he is going to do it. We are not tying the President's hands.

Mr. GRANGER. I understand that this money goes direct to the States and they are the ones who put it out.

Mr. RABAUT. No; this money goes to the emergency fund of the President.

Mr. GRANGER. It has been the practice in connection with funds of this kind that they have been distributed and expended through State agencies.

Mr. RABAUT. Yes. He can do that. The gentleman knows that the committee has been very sympathetic to his request. He is the Member who originally brought the matter to the attention of the committee. In deference to the gentleman, I want him to understand that no one is at all opposed to it here. He is asking for an explanation of how this fund is used and then trying to say how it is used. This fund goes to the President's emergency fund, and the President has indicated that he wants to help relieve the disaster in the West.

Mr. GRANGER. Of course, I am in favor of that. I am also in favor of relieving the people who have already spent money and who do not have anything to operate on until we make funds available to them.

Mr. RABAUT. They have a right under our system of government to present their case for reimbursement to the Budget.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the committee should be commended for what they are doing today, but I have a serious doubt if this is enough to do the job. May I call the attention of the House to the fact that year after year we make an appropriation for emergency flood relief, rescue work, sandbagging, and the like. Without a doubt this fund ought to be increased, and increased now. When this great snow commences to melt, we are going to have added to our present floods, floods throughout the length and breadth of the country that might be most severe.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. I do not believe that even $1,000,000 will be sufficient money to carry out the program that the President and his aide or coordinator have in mind in the Middle West. Every day letters and telegrams pour in saying that it is too little and too late. I, for one, think that the President ought to have the authority to handle the funds in keeping with this resolution. I believe that every cent of this money will be used in the storm-stricken areas of the West and Middle West and that it probably will not be enough.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's statement, I would say that the President will have had, including this $500,000 appropriation, $1,300,000 in all. Over and above that he has delegated work to be done by the various agencies, as I said before, for these agencies to go out and assist in this relief work. Therefore, the amount expended is much in excess of $1,000,000 if this is to be measured in dollars and cents. Whether it is enough—whether what has been done is enough or not enough, only time will tell. It all depends on the weather. You must go back to Mark Twain's famous saying, "Everybody talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been brought to the floor of the House with the unanimous vote of the Committee on Appropriations. The whole problem has been approached on both sides of the aisle with the utmost sympathy for the situation that exists in the Middle West and the Northwest and with the desire in every possible way to be helpful. We have provided the full amount which the Bureau of Public Works asks for. If occasion arises where we have to consider this again, I am sure that the committee will be sympathetic.

On the other hand, the million dollars which has been appropriated, that is, with this resolution, and the $300,000 which was in the disaster relief fund of the President, which he used, are but a small part of the funds which are being used in connection with this operation. It is only fair that the folks in the West and Northwest should realize this. There are $50,000 in the President's disaster fund besides this particular set-up which can be used for an acute emergency in other directions if it is needed. I am sure that it is being approached on a broad scale and being approached sympathetically.

What will be done with this particular money is almost entirely an allocation to the States to operate with.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I am sure we all appreciate the sympathy that has been expressed by the committee and the action that they have taken, but many of us from the West have urged these departments, every one of them in the storm areas, to get busy and help with the job. They have done it, but many of them have exhausted the funds that they already have to do their normal work.

We feel some responsibility in seeing that that fund is replenished. What is the committee going to do about that?

Mr. TABER. They will consider it when it is presented to them. I think I may speak for the committee in that connection. I am sure that is their disposition. I am sure that as soon as the departments have exhausted their funds and they are out of money that they will come. I have never known a department to be backward about doing that, and I do not think they will be in this particular instance.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from New York. As I said before, I understand the fund provided by this appropriation is sent to the States to be used practically entirely for human relief. In my own particular State the legislature has already appropriated $200,000 which was matched by the counties, and provided a total of $330,000 most, if not all, of which has been expended. They are presently considering an additional appropriation of $300,000, and when appropriated the State of Wyoming and the counties will have expended a total of $300,000 in fighting the storms. The people themselves have expended considerable money on their account and so considerably in excess of a million dollars has been spent in our State exclusive of Federal funds, if you take into consideration the expenditures by private individuals in fighting this storm. The various departments of the Government that helped immeasurably in opening roads and trails and transporting feed have exhausted most of their appropriations. I think some action ought to be taken in the very near future to reimburse those departments.

Mr. TABER. I do not have the slightest doubt but that any of those departments will come before the committee with a budget estimate as soon as they feel that their funds are down to a point where they need replenishment. I am sure that where funds have been used for this purpose and the appropriation is close to exhaustion or it looks like it is going to be because of what has been done to relieve the trouble due to the snow, the committee will give it very earnest consideration. I think I may say that, may I not, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. KERR. Yes; the gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I was much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT]. The last part of his statement was that we would reimburse the States and counties——

Mr. TABER. No. That is not what the gentleman said at all. He said he hoped we would reimburse the treasuries of the Federal agencies that have spent their money in connection with this storm item.

Mr. RICH. I am glad I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the evidence clearly shows that the people of a number of the Midwest and Western States will have been visited in recent weeks by storms that they have never encountered before.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior Warne, in a letter dated January 27, 1949, to Senator O'MAHONEY, said in part:

> The storms that have swept the region repeatedly since December 22 are without precedent since the white man has penetrated the high plains in the intermountain area.

The case is very clear that immediate action certainly is necessary to bring relief to the people of this blighted area, or the area visited by these unprecedented storms; also, to do everything else possible to protect property, whether real, personal, or mixed, particularly the herds of animals in that great area which mean so much not only to the people living in the area but to the people of the entire country. To me, this action is a most refreshing incident on the part of the Congress. It shows how far we have advanced in our thoughts that the crying problems of any section are the problems of the people of all sections of the country. This is the true nationalistic spirit, and I use "nationalistic" in the sense that when a section of the country has problems such as the people of the Midwest and West have now, all sections should realize that it is their problem and the problem of the Federal Government to participate in either solely or in conjunction with the States affected to bring about the greatest relief possible to the people of the blighted area.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I agree fully with the remarks of the gentleman. I have had the opportunity to see some of the blizzard-swept States of the West recently. The situation is serious. It is an act of God that has developed into such a catastrophe that the United States Government certainly should come to the aid of the people in those regions. The President, I am happy to say, has already answered the appeal received from various governors of Western States. It is being handled in a nonpartisan manner and should continue to be so handled.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I thank him for the contribution. It is fully nonpartisan. The President certainly has acted with sound judgment and courage; and the Congress is supporting him in his action. It will be remembered that last Saturday the President ordered the use of military funds to speed Federal relief in the western blizzard area. He sent a letter to Secretary of Defense Forrestal to have the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force spend whatever funds were needed without regard to existing apportionment. We can expect that the departments that have done so will ask the Congress to have the funds so used reappropriated, or that they be reimbursed by congressional action. I have no doubt but that Congress will do that. I have no doubt that the Appropriations Committee will not view too critically the action of the department heads in the spending of money on the Federal level to help the people of the States affected because action was necessary and it is not a question of consideration of what the Federal Government should do over weeks, it had to be done immediately; and when action has to be taken immediately we have got to view the judgment of the officials who take that action in the light of the necessities of the situation and not in the light of having plenty of opportunity to investigate, inquire, and marshal facts, and then sit back calmly over a reasonable or protracted period of time and form a judgment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

If no more time is desired, the Chair will put the question.

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (on a division demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 123, noes none.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce in addition to what I stated yesterday as the schedule for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, that if a rule comes out of the Rules Committee extending the February 15 date on the legislative budget to May 1 I shall call that matter up on Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if this matter is to be called up it might as well be called up on Monday and be disposed of, but I would like to observe that the requirement for the determination of the legislative budget by February 15 was enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress. In the Eightieth Congress we struggled with that problem and in the second session came to an agreement within the time of determination.

I rise only to express regret that the spirit and the letter of the proposed Reorganization Act adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress is not being followed in this Congress. It does seem to me that if there ever was a time when the legislative branch of our Government should sit down and try to figure out what receipts can reasonably be expected and then try to cut the cloth of expenditures to fit the pattern of receipts, now is the time. Of course, if it goes over until May 1, I assume that many of the appropriation bills will have been disposed

of, possibly most of them will have been disposed of. If that is true the original purpose, as I understand it, of the determination of the legislative budget will have been lost.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the members of the Ways and Means Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the Members of this House should determine how much money we have and how much money we are going to spend. A lot of the things that have been proposed by the Chief Executive would never be enacted into law if we did that because we cannot afford it. The people of this country ought to know that and the sooner they know it the better.

It seems to me it is wrong to continue beyond the 15th of this month action by the responsible heads of this House. In my opinion, you ought to determine that before the 15th of February and not continue on until April or May or June. You will not have anything to stop you. You will be worse than a lot of spendthrifts. That is the only thing to stop you from doing it.

I hope that the Ways and Means Committee, including the gentleman from North Carolina, and the Appropriations Committee, including the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], will get together and determine before the 15th of February just what amount of money is necessary to spend, and then put the brakes on.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The action of the committee during the last Congress did not serve as a deterrent to the House in this respect. It did not stop action of the House at all. It did not have any effect on the action of the House in making appropriations.

Mr. RICH. We had a balanced budget last year. You are not going to get anywhere near a balanced budget this year. There is no one in this House I have a greater regard for than I do for the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I simply rose to announce an additional program. I have been listening with interest to my friend from Pennsylvania and on some later occasion I shall undertake to convince him of the errors of his way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

PENSION BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of making an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans' Committee of the House instructed me to announce to the House that Members of Congress will be heard by that committee on the pending pension bills on next Tuesday morning at 10:30.

Those of you who would like to appear before the committee and make statements are invited to do so. But any of you who want to insert statements in the record, if you will supply those statements to the committee on or by next Tuesday, they will be made a part of the record.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the gentleman does not mean to say that he is going to bring in a bill here now to provide pensions at the rate of $100 a month for veterans after they become 60 years of age? It seems to me that there are lots of veterans that will not want legislation of that kind.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania evidently has not read the bill. I am inviting him to come over and be heard before the committee next Tuesday or send over a statement to be inserted in the hearings.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I was not on the floor when the majority leader explained the situation as to legislation. The Committee on Rules met this morning to consider granting a rule on the first deficiency appropriation bill, but came to no conclusion because of the absence of certain facts which I hope will be forthcoming this afternoon at 2:30 o'clock when the committee will meet again. There has been an application for a rule on House Concurrent Resolution 23, namely, the budget resolution, extending the time from February 15 to May 1. I think the Committee on Rules in all likelihood will approve that concurrent resolution this afternoon so that the same can be considered tomorrow if there is no other business before the House. There may be two investigating resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, and that may give the House something to consider tomorrow or the first of next week.

MERCI SHIP

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the French ship *Magellan* steamed into New York Harbor yesterday carrying 49 railroad cars filled with French treasures, one for each State and one for the Capital. This is the gracious manner in which the French people say "merci" to the people of America for the Friendship Train conceived by the worthy journalist Drew Pearson. The *Magellan* is called the Merci Ship. Among the rare museum pieces are a Lafayette chair, a hat of Napoleon, a Louis XV sedan chair. President Auriol has sent 49 precious Sèvres vases. All are heartfelt gifts from France to the United States. These acts are great symbols of the long years of amity and accord between our two Nations. It is significant that 64 years ago another French ship, the S. S. *Isere*, sailed into New York Harbor carrying a bulky yet wondrous token of friendship and democracy, the Statue of Liberty, that now graces the port of New York and raises the torch of liberty for all. France again rewards us with her good will and friendship. Merci ships and friendship trains are excellent means of breaking down barriers and establishing good will among nations. We accept the gift of France with heartfelt thanks.

I also salute the distinguished French Ambassador Bonnet who has done so much to cement friendliest relations between our countries. He is a tower of strength to France as well as to the United States.

We salute our sister republic, France.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. WOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include four resolutions adopted by the 23 associations of the Women's Patriotic Conference.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances, and include in one a radio address, and in the other a letter.

Mr. STIGLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MULTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $177.50, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

ELECTIONS IN NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, an election has been called for the 10th of February, to be held in the six counties of Northern Island. The unexpected announcement of these elections was made on January 20, and the candidates were given until January 31 to file their nominations. No reason has been given for calling this election, other than the statement of Sir Basil Brooke to the

effect that it has become necessary to ask the people to reaffirm their determination not to desert the people of Great Britain in these hard times.

The haste with which this election has been called is in reality due to the alarm, which Sir Basil feels, concerning the growing sentiment in the northern counties of Ireland for union with the rest of Ireland. By calling these elections now, the old register, which was established in February of 1946, will be used, and anyone who has attained voting age since January 31, 1946, will not be entitled to vote in this election. Were the election to be held some 6 weeks later, the new register would be in effect and all who have recently turned 21 years of age would be eligible to vote. By eliminating these younger voters, Sir Basil hopes to be able to point to the results of this election as a proof that the people of Northern Ireland do not desire to be united with the rest of Ireland.

Because of the undemocratic methods being employed in this election, Mr. John A. Costello, the Prime Minister of Ireland, called for a conference to be held in the Mansion House in Dublin last Thursday, January 27. At this conference to study means of assisting the antipartition candidates of Northern Ireland, the leaders of all the parties in the Irish Parliament at Dublin, including the leader of the opposition, were present. Those attending the conference were: Mr. John A. Costello, Prime Minister, Fine Gael Party; Mr. W. Norton, Deputy Prime Minister, Labor Party; Gen. Richard Mulcahy, Fine Gael Party; Mr. Sean McBride, Clann na Poblachta; Mr. Joseph Blowick, Farmer's Party; Mr. James Everett, Labor Party; Mr. James Dillon, Independent Party; Mr. Eamonn de Valera, Mr. Frank Aiken, and Mr. Patrick Smith, all of the Fianna Fail Party.

Following the conference a statement was issued, which I believe to be worthy of the careful reading and consideration of all the Members of the House. With the permission of the Speaker I desire to include that statement in my remarks. It reads as follows:

Efforts are being made to represent the results of the forthcoming elections in the six northern counties as justifying the continued unnatural division of our country. We, representing the overwhelming majority of the Irish people, assert that the continuance of partition is a flagrant denial of the democratic right of national self-determination and is bitterly resented by the Irish people. The partition of Ireland was effected by a British Parliament in 1920, in defiance of the clearly expressed wishes of the Irish people, and no Irish vote, north or south, was passed in favor of it. We assert once more the right of the Irish people to the ownership and control of all the national territory and we repudiate the right of Britain to carve up the Irish nation or to occupy any portion of it, even though a local majority against unity can be procured in the area which was deliberately selected for that purpose by the British Parliament.

Elections in that artificially selected area, based as they are on gerrymandered constituencies and an out-of-date register, are a violation of democratic principles. They are calculated only to serve the interests of the privileged group, who by electoral manipulations in Derry City, the counties of Tyrone and Fermanagh and many other areas, have not hesitated to make one partitionist vote equal to two or more antipartitionist votes; the result of elections in these circumstances must be a foregone conclusion.

Efforts are being made to arouse sectarian hatreds and to create intolerance; we appeal to our fellow countrymen in the northeast, irrespective of creed or politics, not to allow such efforts to blind them in their common interests and duty as democrats and Irishmen. The continued domination of a small and privileged ascendancy in a portion of our island can hold out the prospect of nothing but bitterness and strife—a united Ireland could make what a divided Ireland never can; an effective contribution to the causes of world peace based on democratic institutions, and Christian principles. The candidates in the forthcoming election which stand for the unity of Ireland vindicate the just demand of the Irish nation in this regard, and as such, deserve the support of the united Irish Nation.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. JAVITS (at the request of Mr. BOGGS of Delaware) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous material.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one a newspaper article and in the other a newspaper editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an excerpt.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a table.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and include in one a letter from the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, in another a list of national associations adopting resolutions supporting statehood for Hawaii, and in the third an address he delivered to the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include in one some correspondence he had with the president of the Wisconsin Farmers Union.

### FARM PROGRAM

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have just been granted permission to insert in the Appendix the text of some correspondence I had with the leader of one of the farm organizations of my State.

During the campaign of 1948 we sort of expected to be subjected to unfair criticism and to incomplete truths and insinuations regarding the farm program of this country, but that campaign ended 3 months ago. It seems to me that of this date the energies of our political opponents could much better be expended in developing a real, sound, long-term farm program than in uttering recriminations against the Eightieth Congress for either the real or the fancied ills of our national granary.

I think perhaps the farmers of the Middle West ought to be reminded that it was the Republicans of the Middle West who stood as the bulwark against the repeal of the oleo taxes as pledged by the Democrats, and that the farmers ought to be reminded that the Eightieth Congress provided more funds for rural electrification than any other Congress and more than the President has requested of this Congress for the next fiscal year.

It might be well to remind them, too, that the Democrats, and not the Republicans, must bear the responsibility for the declining prices of milk and other farm products in the Dairy State. A year ago they asked for another OPA to roll back farm prices. Now that prices are descending too rapidly, the same group is blaming the Hope-Aiken bill, which is not yet in effect for parity purposes, for that. If it were so, would anyone on the other side of the aisle be so false as to deny that the Hope-Aiken bill was the Truman administration's program, supported by Secretary of Agriculture Brannan and others high in the administration?

### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

### UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, are graduates of the fourth Federal academy to be continually harassed by the selective-service system?

That is a question being asked by the graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, N. Y., and it is a question we in Congress might well consider.

Because a strong merchant marine is necessary to national defense and security, we have appropriated money to establish this fourth Federal academy,

and each year we appropriate funds for the training of merchant marine officers there. We spend money each year to aid in the building of merchant marine vessels. Yet we are permitting the men trained at this academy, with Federal funds—the men necessary to officer the ships we want built—to be drafted under the Selective Service Act.

A cadet at the Merchant Marine Academy is militarily trained from 2 to 4 years, as a specialist in the Navy and merchant marine, at a cost of approximately $9,000 of the taxpayers' money. This training, so valuable in both war and peace, is wasted when he is inducted into the Army under selective service. A graduate of Kings Point is ready for immediate service under section 7 of the Selective Service Act, and he can be called to active duty by the President at any time, so we are not increasing our Reserve components, but we are sacrificing special skills, when such graduates are inducted.

Induction of a graduate of the United States Merchant Marine Academy could cost the taxpayers $24,000, and would not enhance the security program. It costs $9,000 to train this graduate originally at Kings Point, $6,000 to train him in the Army after induction, and another $9,000 to train a replacement merchant marine officer in event an emergency does arise.

We have been prone to do too little for the men of the merchant marine while expecting them to do much for us in time of war. Seamen have received little or no rewards for the sacrifices they made during the last war. One of the least things we can do to show some consideration for that service, and at the same time aid national security, is to pass legislation deferring graduates of the Merchant Marine Academy—the fourth Federal academy—from the draft.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution from the Farmers' Cooperative.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

CHINA

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I take this minute to call the attention of the Members to an article which I think is of the greatest significance. It appears on page A457 of the Appendix of the RECORD and was inserted by Senator BRIDGES. The article is the foreword of a book The Way of a Fighter, written by Gen. Claire Chennault, and has just been published this week.

For those who are confused with regard to the situation in China—and who is not—this man can shed real light. He knows more about it, perhaps, than any other living American, because he has been working at the problem from the inside out rather than standing on the outside giving moral lectures and advice. I think every Congressman owes it to himself and to his constituents to read carefully at least this foreword and get Channault's analysis and constructive suggestions for our policies in China in the immediate future. His record as a fighter for freedom and for our country's interest in China long before other people woke up, and his repeatedly demonstrated ability to retrieve situations which the experts said were hopeless, must command the respect of every responsible person who realizes the seriousness to our own country's future of what is happening in China.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight and midnight tomorrow to file reports.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, for what bills is the gentleman making this request?

Mr. SABATH. On those bills on which the Committee on Rules will grant rules. That is on the resolutions that it will report this afternoon.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] be repeated for the benefit of the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has asked unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules, if it reports any rules, may have until midnight tonight or midnight tomorrow night to file such reports.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Mansfield Advertiser by the editor, Edwin S. Coles, entitled "How Much Do People Know?"

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include certain excerpts.

REBURIAL OF OUR WAR DEAD

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly call to the attention of the membership a matter which may very sadly affect someone in each of our districts.

Many American lads are now overseas. Unfortunately, some of them have died or have been killed, or will die or be killed while serving outside the continental limits of this country. The present method of returning their bodies, employed by the War Department, is shockingly slow. I have called this to the attention of the War Department as emphatically as I know how, but apparently I have not been convincing.

It would be unfortunate, I think, if it should be necessary for this Congress to change this policy by legislation. It can and should be done administratively. This will, of course, entail the expenditure of money and will involve change and effort.

There can be little more compelling reason, however, for the change and the expenditure of money than the comfort it would bring to the hearts and minds of those Americans whose loved ones have died in the service of their country.

You understand, of course, that I do not speak of those who died in the war—only those who have died since the war.

A period of 6 to 8 weeks required for the return of these bodies is an unconscionable delay, and, I believe, an unnecessary delay. It would be well for each of you to check with the War Department and see if we may not remedy this matter through administrative change.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of February 1.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

REPEAL OF TAX ON OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that I might address the House on a question of grave importance to the State of Wisconsin, and particularly to my district which is one of the leading producers of butterfat in the Nation. I am opposed to the removal of the tax of 10 cents per pound on colored oleomargarine. This tax has been somewhat of a protection to butter producers in preventing oleo colored yellow from being sold in imitation of butter whose natural color is yellow. This has also been a protection to the consumer who wants butter and not an imitation.

I understand that leading dairy and farm organizations are agreed on the suggestion that oleo taxes and license fees be repealed. This is being misinterpreted to mean the repeal of all restrictions on the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine. This movement which threatens the very existence of the dairy industry is sponsored and financed by the oleomargarine manu-

facturers, a small industrial group that seeks to remove all restrictions on the sale of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation of butter.

The fight between oleo and butter is an economic battle. On the one hand you have 2,500,000 dairy farm families, 40,000 small dairy plants and their employees as against 28 large oleomargarine manufacturers. The dairy farmers are a vital part of our national economy, they pay substantial taxes and also provide the Nation with vital and nutritious food. They merely want the synthetic product called oleomargarine to be sold for what it is and not to permit it to be disguised as an imitator of butter by coloring it yellow.

I believe it is very conservative to say that the relationship between the producers of cotton and the oleo and crushers of cottonseed has not been conducive to a sound economy. The cottonseed oil industry sets the market price—they make the money, not the cotton farmer.

The dairyman is in an economy in which butter is the balance wheel; more than 25 percent of all milk produced goes into butter. The consumers of the Nation are dependent on dairy farmers for 40 percent of their beef and veal, and all of their milk.

From year to year the dairyman, by reason of rigid State requirements and voluntary usages relative to sanitary requirements, has invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in more modernized farm equipment; built new or remodeled old barns and silos, bought milking machines, and so forth, fertilized the soil so as to produce more and better feed. In most areas, he has carried on soil conservation work, has prevented, in part, soil erosion. All of this has been done because he anticipated that this greatest of all agricultural industries, namely dairying, and, I might say at this point that most of this work was done under the guidance of the State and Federal Government—at least with their approval. Farm boys have attended the universities in ever-increasing numbers, so that they in turn can take over, and in an intelligent way carry on the work so well done by their parents. They have the intellectual and technical ability to carry on in this worthy endeavor. They are literally the backbone of the Nation. Shall their future be jeopardized by the Congress permitting this synthetic product to be sold in imitation of their natural and wholesome product?

The family-sized farm is doomed if this terrible economic blow is dealt to the dairy industry.

Competent economists have shown, and it has not been questioned, that to sell yellow oleo unrestricted would take away an additicnal 600,000,000 pounds a year in butter sales. The cost of this loss in sales to the dairy farmers would be a quarter of a million dollars in cash income. The long-term result would be liquidation of dairy herds on a large scale. The small farm unit would not be able to operate any longer. This terrible economic readjustment is threatened because the oleo interests of the Nation, who are making handsome profits now, want to expand their business by being permitted to color their product yellow in imitation of butter, whose natural color is yellow. Their object is to fool the consumer and break down a natural sales resistance.

The dairy farmers welcome the expansion of dairying in the cotton areas, and it is of vital interest to you from cotton States that the status of butter be preserved. The cotton producer realizes, I believe, that the farmers of the Nation are their best customers by buying edible vegetable oils in shortenings for salad and desserts, and for spreads; likewise cottonseed meal is used for feed, which is bringing at the present time between $85 and $100 a ton; and also cotton products.

It must also be recognized that there is a critical shortage in edible oil in the manufacture of shortening and salad dressing. In fact, in each of the years 1935–37, it was necessary to import as much as 100,000,000 pounds of edible cottonseed oil from outside the country to satisfy their needs. The increased demand for cottonseed oil that would be created by the unrestricted sale of oleo colored yellow would create a further acute shortage.

It must also be borne in mind that any break in the economy of the dairy farmer would severely impair the soil-conservation program which is making wonderful strides in the voluntary conservation of our soil. A break in that economy would also affect adversely our rural-electrification program which, with its further expansion, will accomplish more to raise the standards of living of those in the rural areas than any one other factor. A blow to the dairy economy would also endanger our farm-credit program which is doing much to help our farm economy. In fact, a blow to our dairy economy would have severe repercussions to the entire agriculture set-up.

This is a most inopportune time to be considering this type of legislation, with dairy prices on a sharp decline, and legislation in the hopper for further farm-price supports. With all somewhat in accord that we must cooperate in an effort to help one another, in come the oleo interests to completely—if they are successful—upset the best of our plans with a scheme which is as destructive as it is deceptive.

Oleo manufacturers are guilty of trying to mislead the public to believe that their product is naturally yellow, and that they are compelled by Federal restrictions to remove this yellow color by bleaching or pay the 10-cent tax per pound. They also say that butter is colored with the same dyes with which oleo is colored and to restrain their use of yellow color is unjustified discrimination.

The natural color of oleo is white or gray, and, I understand, must be bleached in most instances to make it white. The natural color of butter is yellow, except during the winter months when the cows are off pasture. Then a coloring is used to make the color uniform the year around. But it is not put in to deceive the consumer.

I am reliably informed for the year 1947 that the oleo manufacturers spent $6,600,000 for advertising directed in part toward the repeal of oleo restrictions. In 1948 they spent an additional $5,400,000 to mislead the American housewife on the question of yellow oleomargarine.

Perhaps there are people whose incomes are so low that it may be necessary for them to eat oleomargarine instead of butter, but it is not fair for them to be deceived by the yellow color into thinking they are buying and eating butter.

Fraudulent substitution of yellow oleomargarine for butter must be prevented. This can be accomplished by a flat ban being placed on the imitation of butter through the commercial manufacture or sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Under such a prohibition, the housewives could obtain all the oleo they wanted to buy uncolored and tax-free. At the same time, the ban on imitation butter would curb unfair competition for the butter market.

My people are alarmed; they know what happened to agriculture from 1920 to 1929. They are fearful that this latest unwarranted attack may have the same disastrous result—not merely the collapse of the great dairy industry but likewise the disintegration of our entire economic structure, for agriculture is our basic industry.

If the taxes are repealed, then there should be an effective prohibition of the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. If I recollect correctly, the gentleman was at La Crosse, Wis., on October 18 at the National Catholic Rural Life Conference attended by a couple of thousand people when Dr. Carlson and I had a debate of some 3 hours on this subject. Dr. Carlson, of the University of Chicago, is the official mouthpiece of the Oleo Trust. The gentleman will probably remember also that Dr. Carlson said that day that filled milk was equal to natural milk, which is the next step if they are able to pass this oleo legislation, is that right?

Mr. WITHROW. That is right. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. As I understand it, the gentleman would be perfectly willing to take off the tax on oleomargarine provided they would arrange the legislation so that this inferior grade of foodstuff could not be disguised to take the place of butter, is that right?

Mr. WITHROW. That is exactly it, so that there is a real prohibition against the manufacture and sale of yellow oleomargarine.

Mr. BURDICK. The gentleman would let them have all the oleo they want without tax, if they did that?

Mr. WITHROW. That is correct. I thank the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I compliment the gentleman on the fine presentation he has made.

Mr. WITHROW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JENSEN. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that wherever we find a good dairy section in America or the world, a section in which there are plenty of dairy cows, we find good, healthy people and good, healthy soil; but, to the contrary, where they do not have sufficient dairying you will generally find a poorer class of people and poor soil; is that not right?

Mr. WITHROW. That is correct.

Mr. JENSEN. For that very reason most of the Southern States which are clamoring for this oleo bill should be the ones protecting the dairy industry lock, stock, and barrel; is that not right?

Mr. WITHROW. I believe that is so; yes. I thank my colleague.

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WITHROW. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GOLDEN. I would like to have some information. Under the bill that the gentleman is advocating, if white oleo is sold to the housewife, would the bill permit the coloring matter to go along with the package of oleo and let the housewife do her own coloring?

Mr. WITHROW. Yes; I understand it would. The bill I have in mind is the bill introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I understand that that bill permits the housewife to buy uncolored oleomargarine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until 12 o'clock midnight Saturday to file a report on H. R. 1661.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENSEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include House Resolution 17, adopted by the Sixty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois on January 5, 1949, a photostatic copy of which was submitted to him by Hon. Edward J. Barrett, secretary of state.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DR. FRANK P. GRAHAM

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, a strange incident has bobbed up in the news involving the good name of the great State of North Carolina.

However, before discussing this I want to make it clear that I deplore the fact that it becomes necessary for me to bring this matter to the attention of this House because I do not come from North Carolina. In doing so I do not in any sense or suggestion cast any reflection on the great State of North Carolina, or its loyal, patriotic citizens; nor do I in any way suggest that the Members of the North Carolina delegation in this House are in any way responsible for this unfortunate situation. The Members of the North Carolina delegation in this Congress are all distinguished gentlemen who have demonstrated on numerous occasions their devotion and their loyalty, not only to their State, but to their Nation. Any State could well be proud of such representation in the National Congress.

Not only has the State of North Carolina given to this body a distinguished group of men, but the roster of outstanding Government officials who have come to Washington in years past, and who are at present in Washington, includes the names of those who claim the State of North Carolina as their own.

The problem of the State of North Carolina is well the problem of my own State of Louisiana or any other of the 48 States. I approach the discussion of this situation on a national, not a State, level. In the far Northwest one great university, the University of Washington, has already publicly accepted its responsibility of the challenge to this menace, and has picked up the gauntlet in the fight to keep our universities clean of any misdirected instruction, attachment, or association, whether given wittingly or unwittingly.

With this explanation behind me I now call your attention to an example of how a great State university and its president can be used by forces of evil which would destroy the system of government which so many of us are trying so desperately to maintain.

The Security Board of the Atomic Energy Commission has decided that Dr. Frank P. Graham, president of the University of North Carolina, ought not, for security reasons, be permitted to come near the atomic secrets. If he cannot be entrusted with our atomic secrets, why is he trusted with the education of thousands of young Americans in these times of peril? What is he doing at the head of the University of North Carolina?

The Board that branded him as a bad security risk is not a collection of village red baiters. It is headed by former Justice Owen J. Roberts, of the Supreme Court of the United States; Joseph P. Grew, former Under Secretary of State; Dr. Karl Compton, former head of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Henning Webb Prentiss, Jr., president of the Armstrong Cork Co.; and G. M. Humphrey, president of the Hanna Coal Co., of Cleveland. Not only that but Admiral John Gingrich, security officer of the Atomic Energy Commission, on his own authority, has similarly barred Dr. Graham from atomic secrets. But Mr. David Lilienthal has overruled both these authorities, because he has already opened the atomic secrets to Dr. Graham.

But what is Dr. Graham doing prying into atomic secrets at Oak Ridge? Well, he is president of the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies. It is supposed to be interested in promoting the activity of southern colleges in atomic research. But how does it come about that Dr. Graham bobs up in that spot?

Dr. Frank P. Graham, aside from being president of the University of North Carolina, has another more dubious claim to fame. The Communist Party, being highly unpopular, does most of its work through so-called front organizations, bearing seemingly respectable names, such as the American League for Peace and Democracy. The game is to get into these organizations Americans who are gullible enough to allow the use of their names in order to hide the Communists in the organization who pull the strings behind the scenes. A good example is this American League for Peace and Democracy. The live spirits in this front were such persons as Earl Browder; Lewis Merrill, Communist labor leader; Ben Gold, Communist editor; Abram Baxer; Muriel Draper; Max Yergan; Donald Ogden Stewart; and other Red stooges. The Attorney General of the United States has officially branded this as a Communist-front. Now what was Dr. Frank P. Graham doing in that company as one of their sponsors? Yet there he was until the Attorney General's attack broke up the organization. And, of course, he was billed as president of the University of North Carolina. The prestige of this great institution was used to exploit this flagrant Red agency.

Of course, Dr. Graham could be fooled once. After all, peace and democracy are alluring words. But Dr. Graham is not a simple-minded man. And so what must we say when we find him in half a dozen similar organizations? Did the Commies fool him six times in a row? Well, it is a little worse than that. The Committee on Un-American Activities lists him as being either a director or sponsor of 18 Communist-front organizations or causes.

Dr. Graham joined these groups, he says, to defend civil rights and freedom of speech. These are fine causes, to be sure. But is not the Communist Party a strange place to go for comrades in the fight for freedom of speech? Could Dr. Graham find no better allies than these American agents of the most tyrannical government in the world? Is Dr. Graham that simple-minded?

However, he insists that he could see no wrong in teaming up with Communists when Russia was our ally in a great war. This is the defense he made to Fulton Lewis, Jr., who denounced him over the radio. But this will not hold water. The doctor was in a number of these Communist fronts before the war started and nobody dreamed of Russia being an ally. He was in the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, the International Labor Defense, the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, all Communist fronts, before 1939. Russia was not our ally then. But it is worse than this. He was one of the sponsors of the American Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born in May 1940. Of course, that sounds like a good cause, too. But this was a Communist-organized committee to prevent the deportation of Reds. At that time Russia was not only not

our ally, she was the ally of Hitler and the President of the United States had denounced the Russian dictatorship as one of the most brutal in the world. At that moment Russia had invaded and terrorized Poland and Finland and was supplying Hitler with war materials.

In his defense of himself, Dr. Graham points out how he was opposed to Mussolini, Hitler, and Franco. Of course he was. So was Stalin. But if he was so much opposed to dictatorships and so much in love with free speech, why is it that he could be found in 18 organizations opposed to Hitler, Franco, and Mussolini, and to various American activities, yet not in one opposed to Stalin?

And, if he joined these Red-front organizations because he saw nothing wrong in teaming up with Communists while Russia was our ally, what is he doing in so many of these organizations now? Is Russia still our ally? Have these organizations ceased to be Communist fronts? And who does Dr. Graham think he is kidding?

When the war in Spain started, Communists in this country tried to sell the idea that this was a war between the democratic Republic of Spain and the Fascist rebels. But that was a fraud. The Republic was originally launched by true republicans. But the Commies got control of it. In the Spanish war which followed it was a war between the Fascists and the Communists. The Communists in America organized the American Friends of Spanish Democracy and another front called the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo. President Roosevelt had induced Congress to prevent the shipment of arms to both sides—Fascists and Communists. But there was Dr. Graham in the Commie-formed committee to lift that embargo so that arms could be shipped to the Reds in Spain. And if he had had his way there would now be a Red dictatorship in Spain as well as in Yugoslavia.

The serious point in all this is that this man was being courted by the Reds because they could advertise his support as that of the president of the University of North Carolina. These Communist fronts require two things: They need money, and they need the prestige of prominent names. They manage to get plenty of money from rich Americans who have inherited it and are ashamed of the system under which they become rich. And they get the prestige of respectable names through these front organizations from Americans with prominent names in Hollywood, the theater, social work, and the colleges. The president of a State university paid for by the people of North Carolina is a prize catch. But one wonders how such a man ever bit on that hook.

Earl Browder, then head of the Communist Party in America, was in jail. Of course a Citizens Committee to Free Earl Browder was organized by the Communists. Elizabeth Curley Flynn, a notorious party member, was secretary of the committee. And there was the inevitable Dr. Frank P. Graham on the list and of course the title president of the University of North Carolina. The Communist Party has been exploiting the prestige of the university for years through the activities of Frank P. Graham.

Of one of these organizations Dr. Graham was president and is now honorary president. This is the Southern Conference Council for Human Welfare. How can Dr. Graham be in any doubt about this strange affair? The Committee on Un-American Activities reports that the conference actually is being used in devious ways to favor basic Soviet and Communist policy. And the Communist Party not only admits this but boasts that it started the organization.

Robert Hall, secretary of the Communist Party in Alabama, wrote in January 1939:

> We can say that the Southern Conference was a brilliant confirmation of the line advanced by Comrade Browder at the tenth convention * * * Our party contributed in a modest but constructive manner to the success of the conference.

Earl Browder testified before a congressional committee under oath that the conference was one of the party's transmission belts. William Weiner, former treasurer of the Communist Party, testified that a subsidy of $2,000 was paid to the Communist Party of Alabama when the conference was organized. Robert Hall has described how resolutions were prepared by the Communist Party and then adopted by the conference. James Dombrowski, executive secretary of the conference, signed a statement in March 1941, while Stalin and Hitler were allies, defending the Communist Party. And he helped launch a joint Socialist-Communist united front movement in the South in 1935. During all this time Dr. Graham was the president or honorary president of this organization. Is there no way of aiding the cause of the Negro in the South save through the Communist Party? Can anyone imagine that the Communists here wanted to improve the lot of the Negro and make him more contented in America? The Communist revolutionaries have only one object in moving amongst Negroes and that is to arouse them, to urge them on to inconsiderate action in order to produce an angry reaction in their white neighbors. Their purpose is to set Negro against white man, worker against employer, Christian against Jew, North against South, East against West, town against country. They work ceaselessly for division and disorder and chaos in our society. What is Dr. Graham doing lending the prestige of the University of North Carolina to a Red front organism working among southern Negroes? He has headed this organization for over 10 years, before the war, during the Hitler-Stalin alliance, and since the war when the whole vicious pattern of Communist disruptive activity has become known.

Now we have the crowning episode of this disquieting incident. The atomic enterprises of the Government have attracted a swarm of Red agents and American dupes eager to penetrate the dread secret of this terrible weapon. In Canada a member of Parliament and a distinguished British scientist were caught red-handed giving secrets to the Russian Embassy. It is difficult to believe such a thing could happen in America. Yet here we have been shocked at the recent disclosures as a result of which Alger Hiss is under indictment for perjury for denying under oath his connection with the supplying of secret information to Russian spies—Hiss, who sat with President Roosevelt at Yalta as one of his advisers when he was dealing with Stalin and who was, until indicted, head of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Now an organization is formed called the Oak Ridge Institute of Nuclear Studies. Its announced purpose is to promote the cooperation of southern universities in nuclear research. And who should pop up at its head but Dr. Frank P. Graham. And immediately the question arises whether the head of this institute should be admitted to the atomic secrets. In order to protect our country on this dangerous front, the Government Atomic Energy Commission has named a security officer—Admiral John Gingrich—to investigate all persons approaching this guarded secret. Admiral Gingrich investigated Dr. Graham and reported that he should not, for security reasons, be admitted to these secrets. Then the matter went to the board headed by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts. That board, composed of five eminent and very sober-minded citizens, also held that Graham, for security reasons, should not be allowed near the atomic secrets. I do not suppose Dr. Graham is a Communist or a Red agent, but it is disgraceful that a man in so great a position should so conduct himself that he cannot be trusted in any situation involving his country.

The facts in the case of Dr. Graham, his long record of association with Reds and Red agents and now this decision of the security officer of the Commission and the security board, cannot be ignored by the trustees or regents of the University of North Carolina. The gravity of this situation is actually increased by the fact that David Lilienthal, whose own views and sympathies have been called in question, prevailed upon this board and against the opinion of his own security officer, Admiral Gingrich, and admitted Graham to these atomic secrets.

What can we expect of the youth in our colleges when the trustees of a great American university permit these bedfellows of American Reds to preside over this institution of learning? Of what avail will all the warnings to our impressionable youth be when conduct such as Dr. Graham's is known and approved by permitting him to remain at the head of one of our leading universities supported by the taxes of the citizens of North Carolina who hate everything that Dr. Graham has been playing with these 10 years. Dr. Graham enjoys under our Constitution the great right of freedom of mind and speech. No one proposes to deprive him of it. But when he uses it to support the revolutionary activities of the most hated and condemned organization in America today, he has no right to remain at the head of a great university and use the prestige of his position to promote the designs of the

greatest enemies this country has had in its existence.

This is a State-supported institution. It is entirely probable that the people of the State do not know the truth about Dr. Graham. It is possible the members of the State legislature are not informed about it. It may be that the regents of the university are not fully informed. But there can no longer be any excuse. The university should be relieved of the incubus of this man's operations and he should be freed in order to ply his activities as the ally and front of any organization he wishes without involving the university in the deal.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman has not told the worst part of the story yet. It developed that there was a Communist organization inside the student body of the University of North Carolina, which institution is presided over by this man Frank Graham. Everybody knows that it is the object of the Communist Party to overthrow this Government and to destroy the American way of life; yet this man who has been connected with all these Communist fronts, which have been and are now being used by the Communist Party, is now the president of a great university that has a Communist organization, an organization of members of the Communist Party, inside its student body as the records of the Committee on Un-American Activities will show.

Mr. HÉBERT. I think the gentleman also knows from his many years of activity in attacking this menace that the infiltration of the Communist line and the breaking down of our system of government and our institutions of higher education is one of the most dangerous things in this country today as exemplified by Elizabeth Bentley, who attended both Columbia University and Vassar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one more statement? And then I will not interrupt him further.

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield

Mr. RANKIN. I want to say that if every American knew how recklessly our atomic secrets were being handled today they would be shocked beyond measure. This country is not safe, in my opinion, and in the opinion of Members connected with the Committee on Un-American Activities who have investigated it, for these secrets are being slipped out to our potential enemies with the ultimate purpose of destroying America.

Mr. HÉBERT. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he agrees with the philosophy, thinking, reasoning, or logic, that it takes only lawyers to find unpatriotic people in this country?

Mr. RANKIN. No; I may say to the gentleman from Louisiana that such an excuse was used to dupe some of the present members of the Ways and Means Committee into keeping the gentleman from Louisiana off the Committee on Un-American Activities. If that were the law, if that rule had been adopted at the beginning of our Government, Benjamin Franklin could not have served on such a committee; George Washington could not have served on it; U. S. Grant or Robert E. Lee could not have served on it; neither could Jefferson Davis or Herbert Hoover. That was one of the most stupid things I have ever known Members of Congress to do.

Mr. HÉBERT. I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi that those responsible for removing me from the committee did not have to go so far; they could have laid down the rule that only Members of the House with two eyes could be eligible for service on the committee; that would have left me out for I have only one eye.

Mr. RANKIN. This move to curtail the membership of that committee has been going on behind the Communist line for years. I am not kicking, for I will be here on the floor of the House to carry on this fight as long as I am a Member of this body; but I have never known a more stupid piece of asinine performance than that by the alleged Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee in the way they juggled their resolutions in order to cripple the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It seems to me that the people who took the gentleman from Mississippi and the gentleman from Louisiana off the committee were Democrats, were they not?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not surprised that the gentleman thought that was the case.

It was the hand of Esau and the voice of Jacob.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand an official report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in connection with Dr. Graham. It consists of four and a quarter pages of single-spaced typewritten matter. I ask unanimous consent to include it at the end of my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to have the gentleman tell us why it is that during all the years of the activities of this Un-American Activities Committee we have not been able to convict someone of subversive activity. In the State of California during the early twenties we were harassed by people of this kind. The Industrial Workers of the World were out there. They were destroying property, they were preaching violence, and they were practicing violence. We indicted some of them in my county. It was my duty to try them. We spent 3 months on it and convicted four of them, putting them in the penitentiary, where they belonged. For over 15 years we never heard one word from those kinds of people.

I wish the gentleman would tell us why it is not possible for us to take some of these individuals who are advocating the overthrow of our Government, find a way to indict them, convict them, and put them out of the way?

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman from California has put his finger on a very important subject. I cannot answer the question. The Attorney General of the United States is the only one who can answer it, if he would.

During the hearings last year on the so-called Mundt-Nixon bill—this is a very enlightening thing—the Attorney General of the United States appeared before the committee and denounced communism. He gave a very fine statement; we all agreed with him, but he did not discuss the bill. So I asked the Attorney General: "Mr. Attorney General, I am very much interested in what you say, but tell us about your opinion of the bill now before us?" He replied in substance: "Oh, I cannot give an opinion now. The Department has not given an opinion." I asked him what the Department's opinion had to do with his opinion, that he was the Attorney General, and he replied in effect that he would not desire to give an opinion because the Department might be influenced by what he thought.

Are those the kind of opinions we are getting out of the Department of Justice, whether it is the law we get or what an individual thinks? We asked the Attorney General repeatedly to give us his own opinion on how to strengthen existing laws which he said were inadequate or else forward us his own bill. He said that the statutes on the books at the present time were not sufficient to successfully prosecute these people. He placed himself in the position of the doctor who said that the medicine is no good, but who refused to administer the medicine to find out whether it was any good or not. Then when we asked him and practically begged him to come up with some type of a bill that would have teeth in it, what did we get? I personally asked him to do it. Up to the end of the Eightieth Congress he did not come up with any bill on any request of the committee, though repeatedly, on many occasions, he declined the assistance of the committee and said that they had never come up with anything toward offering an effective means of combating subversive elements in this country. He repeatedly said the committee never got out an effective bill, but he failed to say that he, the Attorney General, had failed to offer any suggestions in spite of our requests.

Mr. JOHNSON. Then this is the effect of the gentleman's opinion, that after 10 years of continual investigation we have not any law on the books to effectively handle these people.

Mr. HÉBERT. In the matter of espionage, no. The laws are ineffective, according to the Attorney General. As to present laws there are the Smith Act and the Vorys Act and acts of that type, but the Attorney General claims that they are not adequate and for that reason has not made use of them. It is for the courts to rule if they are adequate enough. How can we tell if the medicine is any good unless we try it? It is his

duty to prosecute under the existing laws, and he has failed in his duty.

Mr. JOHNSON. I will accept the gentleman's word for it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Every person the Committee on Un-American Activities has cited, and that has been tried, has been convicted. Today they are trying a group of Communists in New York for attempting the overthrow of this Government, and the Communists are picketing the court. They even sent down thousands of people here the other day to try to influence Congress, in order to bring about the intimidation of the courts of New York.

We uncovered the greatest spy ring in history in the Hiss case and exposed a group that was perpetrating treason at a time when our boys were dying by the thousands on every battle front in the world. What was our reward? It was called a red herring.

Mr. HÉBERT. To continue with the gentleman from California, let us take the so-called Hiss-Chambers affair. It is perfectly obvious to a schoolboy that either Hiss or Chambers was lying. One or the other had to be a liar, and perjury before a congressional committee is a crime. It is a crime to lie before a congressional committee. What did the Attorney General or the Department of Justice do, with that absolute crime staring them in the face? It was not the responsibility of the committee to determine which one of the two was lying. That was the responsibility of the Department of Justice, the enforcement agency, the prosecuting agency. And, with that crime produced in full view, with the corpus delicti at their feet, they refused to do anything about it. It took a civil action in Federal court to finally bring about an indictment of one of the two men. If Hiss had not filed civil action against Chambers, nothing at all would have been done. As a matter of fact the Department of Justice has done nothing yet about perjury before the Un-American Activities Committee. Hiss is under indictment for alleged perjury before the New York grand jury which indicted him and not for alleged perjury before the Committee on Un-American Activities.

JANUARY 22, 1949.

A check of the files, records, and publications of the Committee on Un-American Activities has revealed the following information concerning Frank P. Graham:

Letterheads dated September 22, 1939, January 17, 1940, and May 26, 1940, as well as the Daily Worker of March 18, 1939, page 2, reveal that Frank P. Graham was a member of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom. This affiliation is also shown by a leaflet, Citizens Rally, which was held by that organization on April 13, 1940, at Carnegie Hall, New York City.

The American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom was established on Lincoln's birthday, 1939, with the announced purpose of preservation and extension of democracy and intellectual freedom. Its establishment was featured on page 1 of the Daily Worker. (Daily Worker, February 13, 1939.) In Report 2277, dated June 25, 1942, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities found that the line of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom has fluctuated in complete harmony with the line of the Communist Party. The organization was again cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944, as a Communist front which defended Communist teachers.

A letterhead of March 15, 1940, and the letterhead of the Fourth Annual Conference, Hotel Annapolis, Washington, D. C., March 2–3, 1940, lists Frank P. Graham as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born. The program of the Fifth National Conference of this organization, held at the President Hotel, Atlantic City, N. J., March 29-30, 1941, lists Frank Porter Graham as a sponsor.

Of this organization, the Special Committee on Un-American Activities stated: "Numerous witnesses who have appeared before our committee have given testimony indicating that the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born is a Communist-dominated front. In particular * * * the testimony of Humberto Galleani * * * that the Communist Party, of which he was once a member, assigned him to work in the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born and that there was no doubt about the party's complete control of the organization." (Report 2277 of June 25, 1942, p. 13.)

The organization was again cited as one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States in the committee's report of March 29, 1944. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born has been cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished by him for use of the Loyalty Review Board. (See press releases of the U. S. Civil Service Commission dated May 28, 1948, and September 21, 1948.)

Frank P. Graham was a member of the Committee of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, according to a letterhead of February 21, 1938, and was one of those who signed this organization's petition to lift the arms embargo as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). New Masses, January 5, 1937 (p. 31), discloses that he was a general committee member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy, medical bureau.

In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy. (Rept. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944, p. 82.)

Frank P. Graham has been affiliated with the American League for Peace and Democracy as a signer of a statement on the international situation which that organization issued. (See New Masses, March 15, 1938, p. 19.) According to a letterhead of May 18, 1938, and another of June 11, 1938, and the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2), he was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy.

The American League for Peace and Democracy has been cited as a Communist front organization in three reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities: reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944. The league was established in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism, and was designed to conceal Communist control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International. (Attorney General Francis Biddle, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, part 6, p. 7443.) The American League for Peace and Democracy has been cited as subversive and Communist by the present Attorney General. (Press releases of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, dated May 28, 1948, and September 21, 1948, respectively.)

A folder of the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder, which was issued in 1942, names Frank P. Graham as one of the prominent American educators who favored Presidential clemency for Earl Browder.

When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder. * * * Elizabeth Gurley Flynn, one of the few outstanding women leaders of the Communist Party in this country, headed it. (Report 1311, Special Committee on Un-American Activities, March 29, 1944.) The Citizens' Committee to Free Earl Browder was cited as a Communist organization by Attorney General Francis Biddle. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, part 6, p. 7446.)

The affiliation of Frank P. Graham with the Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo as a representative individual is shown by a booklet, These Americans Say, page 7. The Coordinating Committee to Lift the Embargo was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as one of a number of front organizations, set up during the Spanish Civil War by the Communist Party * * * through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation. (Report 1311, March 29, 1944, pp. 137–138.)

According to Equal Justice, publication of the International Labor Defense, Frank P. Graham sent greetings to the National Conference of the International Labor Defense. (Equal Justice, July 1939, p. 4.)

The International Labor Defense was cited by Attorney General Francis Biddle as the legal arm of the Communist Party. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, part 6, p. 7446.) The organization has been cited as a Communist front in three reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities: reports of January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944. The organization has been cited as subversive and classified as Communist by the present Attorney General. (See press release of the U. S. Civil Service Commission, dated May 28, 1948, and September 21, 1948.)

Frank P. Graham, according to a letterhead of July 6, 1938, was a national sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy. A letterhead of the Michigan Chapter, dated February 2, 1939, also reveals that he sponsored this organization. The Medical Bureau and North American Committee to Aid Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311, dated March 29, 1944. (See paragraph 2 on page 2 of this memorandum concerning the Spanish relief organizations.)

The Prospectus and Review, page 3, of the Lawyers Committee on American Relations with Spain discloses that Frank P. Graham supported the Conference to Lift the Embargo. When it was the policy of the Communist Party to organize much of its main propaganda around the civil war in Spain, this Communist lawyers' front organization supported the movement. (Report 1311 of March 29, 1944, Special Committee on Un-American Activities.)

Frank P. Graham, according to Soviet Russia Today, February 1943 (p. 34), sponsored the Soviet Russia Today dinner which celebrated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army. The publication, Soviet Russia Today, has been cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in two reports—reports of June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

A letterhead of February 7, 1946, a letterhead of June 4, 1947, an official report of the organization, and an announcement of

the third meeting, April 19–21, 1942, at Nashville, Tenn., reveal that Frank P. Graham was honorary president of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare. An official report of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare lists Frank P. Graham as chairman, and the program of the conference held in Birmingham, Ala., November 20–23, 1938, reveals that he delivered the opening address. The Call to the Second Southern Conference for Human Welfare, Chattanooga, Tenn., April 14–16, 1940, reveals that Frank P. Graham participated in that conference. According to a letterhead dated August 13, 1940, Frank P. Graham sponsored the League of Young Southerners, Youth Division, Southern Conference for Human Welfare. Frank P. Graham was one of the signers of a statement issued by the Southern Conference for Human Welfare which appeared in the Daily Worker of May 29, 1947, page 5.

In a report on the Southern Conference for Human Welfare dated June 16, 1947, the Committee on Un-American Activities found: "The most conclusive proof of Communist domination of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare is to be found in the organization's strict and unvarying conformance to the line of the Communist Party in the field of foreign policy. It is also clear indication of the fact that the real purpose of the organization was not human welfare in the South, but rather to serve as a convenient vehicle in support of the current Communist Party line" (p. 8). The Southern Conference for Human Welfare had previously been cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Report 1311 of March 29, 1944.

It is noted that Frank P. Graham was one of the signers of a statement issued by 87 American liberals which includes an attack on the Communist Party of the United States. This statement appeared in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 11, pages A2459–A2460.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 547. An act to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Monday, February 7, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

161. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a report on claims paid during the calendar year 1948 under the Federal Tort Claims Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

162. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Eighteenth Quarterly Report on Contract Settlement, covering the period October 1 through December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

163. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 in the amount of $8,274,500 for the legislative branch, Architect of the Capitol (H. Doc. No. 54); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

164. A letter from the Chairman, Munitions Board, transmitting the semiannual report on the stock-piling program and a confidential statistical supplement; to the Committee on Armed Services.

165. A letter from the Administrator, War Assets Administration, transmitting the quarterly progress report of the War Assets Administration for the period October-December 1948; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

166. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 301 of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employee Salary Act of 1948, to remove the present limitation on the compensation of certain officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

---

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KERR: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 14). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Concurrent Resolution 22. Concurrent resolution suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 15). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 66. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 75. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the House Calendar.

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2269. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2270. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2271. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2272. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2273. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code (Crimes and Criminal Procedure) to make unlawful the transportation or importation of false and defamatory statements designed to arouse intergroup conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PICKETT:

H. R. 2274. A bill to amend section 5 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2275. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 654); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2276. A bill to encourage better management of privately owned forest land and to increase the efficient production, processing, marketing, and utilization of forest products through making available technical services and assistance to forest owners, operators of wood-using industries, and consumers of forest products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2277. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code to provide for a minimum wage; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2278. A bill to extend the statute of limitations with respect to suits by certain immigrant inspectors and employees for extra pay for Sunday and holiday services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 2279. A bill to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2280. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act with reference to the general powers of Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2281. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2282. A bill to make certain Government-owned facilities available for international broadcasting in the furtherance of

authorized programs of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2283. A bill to provide for the construction of the Hartwell Reservoir on the Savannah River, S. C. and Ga.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 2284. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committe on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2285. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights," with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyright of foreign works; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 2286. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COMBS:

H. R. 2287. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2288. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Hubbell, Nebr., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2289. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works at Beatrice, Nebr., for flood control; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2290. A bill to provide for cooperation by the Smithsonian Institution with State, educational, and scientific organizations in the United States for continuing paleontological investigations in areas which will be flooded by the construction of Government dams; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2291. A bill to provide more adequate and effective rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2292. A bill to provide that enlisted personnel of the Fleet Reserve and the Fleet Marine Corps Reserve who served in World War I or World War II or both be entitled to receive reserve or retired pay as provided in the Navy Appropriations Act of July 1, 1922, on the basis of enlisted service actually rendered; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2293. A bill to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2294. A bill to vest title to the Laguna project lands in the pueblo of Laguna of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2295. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of Government employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2296. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 2297. A bill to provide for the construction of a veterans' hospital in Broome County, N. Y.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 2298. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in wildlife-restoration projects, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2299. A bill to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2300. A bill to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union as a State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2301. A bill to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2302. A bill granting to veterans of World War I and their widows and dependent children pensions equivalent to the pensions granted to veterans of the war with Spain and their widows and dependent children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2303. A bill to amend the Public Health Act to provide for research and investigation with respect to the cause, prevention, and treatment of multiple sclerosis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2304. A bill to raise the minimum wage rate; to the Committe on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2305. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2306. A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2307. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Dassel, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2308. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2309. A bill to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2310. A bill to adjust the rates of pension and compensation payable under the laws and regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration on the basis of the cost of living in the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2311. A bill establishing a presumption of service-connected disability in the case of disease or injury existing within 5 years after discharge from service in the armed forces during the present war; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2312. A bill to provide for the sale of certain submarginal lands owned by the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2313. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2314. A bill to amend the act of December 5, 1945, entitled "An Act granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the war with Spain and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippine Islands"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2315. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act to provide a secondary market for farm loans made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2316. A bill relating to compensation for veterans of World War II who have a service-contracted or a service-aggravated tuberculosis condition; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2317. A bill to permit any veteran of both world wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2318. A bill to increase to $1,500 the income limitation upon the payment of compensation under the act of June 28, 1934, to widows without children, and to children, of World War I veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2319. A bill to increase the salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2320. A bill to increase the salaries of assistant superintendents in the Metropolitan Police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2321. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system under voluntary agreements to employees of State and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2322. A bill to provide pay increases for employees of the Federal Government and of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2323. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide the same benefits for husbands and widowers under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system as are provided for wives and widows; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2324. A bill to terminate certain wartime and other excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 2325. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSALIS:

H. R. 2326. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2327. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H. R. 2328. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2329. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2330. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2331. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2332. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 2333. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2334. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 2335. A bill to extend the date for application for terminal-leave bonds; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 2336. A bill to authorize the Maritime Commission to convert certain vessels to types suitable for use on the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2337. A bill to provide for an examination and survey of the rivers of the New England States to further the program for the generation of electric energy in such States; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2338. A bill to extend the maximum-hours provisions of section 207, title 29, United States Code, to employees of common carriers by railroad; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2339. A bill providing for the construction of a railroad connecting the existing railroad system serving the United States and Canada and terminating at Prince George, British Columbia, Canada, with the railroad system serving Alaska and terminating at Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2340. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building in Enumclaw, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2341. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building in Kirkland, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2342. A bill for the purpose of erecting a Federal building in Gig Harbor, Wash.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 2343. A bill to authorize medical and hospital service for those employed in the maritime service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. J. Res. 137. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. J. Res. 138. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 139. Joint resolution making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution to provide for a suitable and adequate system of timber access roads to and in the forests of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. J. Res. 141. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the making of treaties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. J. Res. 142. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. J. Res. 143. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the period from March 15 to December 15, 1949, inclusive; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANE:

H. J. Res. 145. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. Res. 79. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to investigate and study the spread between the prices received by producers of goods and commodities and the prices paid by consumers; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. Res. 80. Resolution requesting the Secretary of National Defense to transmit to the House a report with respect to the progress which is being made in carrying on the national defense program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Federal Livestock Disease Research Laboratory; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to effect legislation which will enable the Civil Aeronautics Administration to prohibit the taking off of aircraft from airports during periods of poor visibility; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to funds for the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to reconsider the closing of the airfield at Kearney, Nebr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to continue a plan of expansion of local-service air transportation facilities as recommended by the President's Air Policy Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2344. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2345. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Waline; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2346. A bill for the relief of Guy Albert Wheaton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2347. A bill for the relief of P. S. Cook Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 2348. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Dalton; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GORSKI of Illinois:

H. R. 2349. A bill for the relief of Col. Wlodzimierz Onacewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL:

H. R. 2350. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion M. Martin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2351. A bill for the relief of Allen L. Sherwood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2353. A bill for the relief of Joel W. Atkinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2354. A bill for the relief of William F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Anna Der A. Wing Jee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2356. A bill granting to Frank S. Howell certain pay and allowances for his travel from the Philippine Islands to the United States following his discharge from the Army in such islands in 1900; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2357. A bill for the relief of Lazar Gartenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2358. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Blasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN (by request):

H. R. 2359. A bill for the relief of the estate of Robert W. Listman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER (by request):

H. R. 2360. A bill for the relief of Theodore Papachristopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

40. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of 160 residents of Cincinnati, Ohio, urging an amendment to the Selective Service Act which would grant exemption from the draft to graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point; to the Committee on Armed Services.

41. By the SPEAKER: Petition of manager, Local 62, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the immediate repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law and restoration of the Wagner labor-regulations law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

42. Also, petition of manager, Local 62, International Ladies Garment Workers Union, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to enactment of legislation for a $1 Federal legal minimum wage; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

43. Also, petition of the clerk of the Common Council, city of South Bend, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the resolution entitled "General Pulaski's Memorial Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of the living and the living dead: In the midst of life we are in death; yet when the throb of eternity is felt within us we know that life is not measured by heartbeats nor by figures on a dial. We give Thee thanks for the witness of Thy servant who ministered in holy things to this Chamber, now gone so suddenly from our side and sight to a larger sphere but still in the radiant presence of the Master of all good workmen. Knowing that we will not pass this way again and that the sands of our brief years are so swiftly falling, may we so number our days as to apply our hearts unto wisdom, putting into the fugitive fragments of every day such quality of work as shall make us unashamed when our little day is over and all the days are done. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hoey | Murray |
| Anderson | Holland | Myers |
| Baldwin | Humphrey | Neely |
| Brewster | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Bricker | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Reed |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Russell |
| Cain | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Connally | Langer | Sparkman |
| Cordon | Lodge | Stennis |
| Donnell | Long | Taft |
| Douglas | Lucas | Taylor |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ecton | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Ellender | McFarland | Thye |
| Ferguson | McGrath | Tobey |
| Flanders | McKellar | Tydings |
| Frear | McMahon | Vandenberg |
| George | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Gillette | Malone | Wherry |
| Gurney | Martin | Wiley |
| Hayden | Maybank | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Withers |
| Hickenlooper | Morse | Young |
| Hill | Mundt | |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

## ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 3d instant,

The VICE PRESIDENT, on February 3, 1949, signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, which had been previously signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 547. An act to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans; and

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

## REPORT OF A COMMITTEE FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 3d instant,

Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments, on February 4, 1949, and submitted a report (No. 31) thereon.

## REPORT OF AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 59)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 7, 1949.*

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

### TRANSFER OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of naval vessels to certain institutions and organizations, under authority of section 1 of the act of August 7, 1946, chapter 804 (60 Stat. 897); to the Committee on Armed Services.

### DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS

A joint letter from the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, and the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States (with accompanying papers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

### COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF COTTON STATISTICS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the collection and publication of cotton statistics (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### REPORT OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that Commission relating to the general management of the executive branch, dated February 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

### OFFICE BUILDING AT SUITLAND, MD.

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

### CONSTRUCTION OF GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE BUILDING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on Square 518 in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

### REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the first semiannual report of that Commission for the period July 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

### REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all tort claims by that agency for the period January 1, 1948, through December 31, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

### REPORT OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that corporation, for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Legislative Resolution 2

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States with respect to a national compulsory sickness-insurance program

"Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the best standards of scientific medical care, and the finest medical institutions ever attained by any major country in the world; and

"Whereas these accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free people working under a system of free enterprise; and

"Whereas, the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care, to the detriment of the health of the people: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the Legislature of the State of Nebraska respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this Nation any form of compulsory insurance, or any system of medical care designed for national bureaucratic control.

"2. That Nebraska Senators and Representatives now in the Congress of the United States be, and are hereby, respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

"3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Congressman from Nebraska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 17

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to consider flood control needs in California

"Whereas recurrent floods in California have caused loss of life and property, disruption of commerce and transportation, and the wasting of water detrimental to the health, safety, and welfare of the people of the State; and

"Whereas the local agencies concerned in flood-control works have joined together in the California Flood Control Conference and developed a coordinated program for construction of authorized Federal flood-control projects; and

"Whereas the State Water Resources Board has held public hearings on and carefully screened the requests for appropriations presented by the California Flood Control Conference, and determined an urgent need for appropriations for the following projects and amounts:

"Project:

| | |
|---|---|
| San Francisco engineering district: Salinas River | $1,000,000 |
| Los Angeles engineering district: | |
| Upper Los Angeles River | 2,000,000 |
| Tujunga Wash | 3,000,000 |
| Compton Creek | 2,268,000 |
| Whittier Narrows | 12,000,000 |
| Sawtelle - Westwood (lower) | 3,917,000 |
| Live Oak Wash | 500,000 |
| San Antonio flood-control basin | 2,500,000 |
| Stewart Canyon (Ventura County) | 880,000 |
| Carbon Canyon (Orange County) | 1,000,000 |
| San Diego River | 3,500,000 |
| Sacramento engineering district: | |
| Black Butte Dam | 500,000 |
| Cherry Valley | 1,500,000 |
| Farmington Dam | 2,000,000 |
| Folsom Dam | 5,000,000 |
| Isabella Dam | 6,000,000 |
| Merced group | 500,000 |
| Pine Flat Dam | 12,500,000 |
| Sacramento River major and minor tributaries | 1,000,000 |
| Sacramento River (old project) | 6,000,000 |
| San Joaquin River levees | 1,000,000 |
| Success | 500,000 |
| Terminus | 500,000 |
| Total | 69,565,000 |

and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California demonstrated its concern in the flood-control problems of the State and the authorized Federal program by appropriating $25,000,000 to pay the cost of local participation in these projects; and

"Whereas the President's budget for the fiscal year 1950 provides $430,287,600 for flood control general which would complete the general flood-control program of the United States in 10 years; and

"Whereas the proposed general flood-control appropriations for California projects contained in the President's budget represent about half the amount required to complete California's program on a 10-year basis: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to consider the flood-control needs of California on a basis of equality with the national program and to that end provide appropriations commensurate with the need as justified in the program developed by the State water resources board; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the establishment of a support price for black-eyed beans

"Whereas the Federal Government has established and pursued for some time the policy of providing support prices for agricultural products to the end that the agricultural industry of the Nation should be stabilized, and that the effects of fluctuation of prices for agricultural commodities below the cost of production may be eliminated and the hardships on the farmers resulting from such lowered price levels avoided; and

"Whereas the production of black-eyed and all varieties of dried beans has become an important segment of the agricultural industry of the State of California but no support price for such products has been established and the market price for such products has fallen below the cost of production; and

"Whereas the producers of black-eyed and all other dried beans in this State and in the other States should be given the same consideration and protection as have been given to producers of other agricultural products, and unless such protection is afforded to them they will suffer an immediate loss which in turn will be reflected in the general economy of the State because of the lowered purchasing power of such producers: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary for the establishment of an appropriate support price for black-eyed and all varieties of dried beans; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed international animal quarantine station on Swan Island

"Whereas the people of this State remember with the direst apprehension of the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in 1924 and 1929 and the paralyzing effect each of these outbreaks had upon the economy and welfare of California; and

"Whereas the bulwark of protection against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into the United States or this State has been subdivision (a) of section 306 of chapter 497 of the United States Statutes of 1930, providing that if the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country is prohibited; and

"Whereas restrictions on importations have from time to time been issued pursuant to the authority of Congress and by that means foot-and-mouth disease has been kept from the United States or any part thereof; and

"Whereas chapter 592 of the United States Statutes of 1946 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to establish and maintain on Swan Island, situate in the Caribbean Sea, an international animal-quarantine station and permits the Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, but subject to regulations prescribed by him to prevent the introduction into the United States of communicable diseases of animals, to permit animals to be brought into the Swan Island Quarantine Station from any country, including those in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists and to permit the same to be subsequently imported into other parts of the United States under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

"Whereas on December 7, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States gave notice of his intention to issue regulations relating to the Swan Island Quarantine Station, which regulations permit ruminants and swine to be shipped into the quarantine station if they originate in an area in a foreign country which has been free from foot-and-mouth disease for at least 60 days immediately preceding the date of movement of the ruminants and swine therefrom and after quarantine at Swan Island for not less than 90 days may be brought into the United States; and

"Whereas the report on foot-and-mouth disease made to the Senate of California on March 18, 1948, by the Senate Interim Committee on Livestock Diseases, created by Senate Resolution No. 145 of the 1947 session of the California Legislature, shows that 316 Cebu bulls were landed on Sacrificios Island in April of 1946 and were removed from said island to the vicinity of Vera Cruz, Mexico, on the 28th of September 1946, and were thereafter inspected by two veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture and found to be free from foot-and-mouth disease and 3 weeks thereafter foot-and-mouth disease broke out in the vicinity into which the Cebu bulls had been imported; and

"Whereas the regulations for the operation of the Swan Island Quarantine Station proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture can therefore not give any assurance that Swan Island will not become the avenue through

which foot-and-mouth disease will be introduced into the United States; and

"Whereas the California State Board of Agriculture at its meeting on January 17, 1949, attended by representatives from the California Farm Bureau, the California Cattlemen's Association, the California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce, adopted a resolution with the unanimous concurrence of those in attendance, that the regulations for the Swan Island Quarantine Station should prohibit the importation into the United States of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in which it is determined that foot-and-mouth disease exists: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture thereof that no action be taken for the use of Swan Island as a quarantine station with respect to the importation into this country of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in any part of which exists foot-and-mouth disease, and respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to this effect; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Resolution 5

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to changing present Federal laws pertaining to the employment-security programs of the States, and to providing sufficient funds to permit proper administration of the public employment service and the unemployment insurance programs of the State of California

"Whereas this legislature believes firmly in the continuing value of the traditional principle that ours shall be a government of laws and not of men; and

"Whereas although it may be expedient at the beginning to vest broad powers in an administration to legislate by interpretation in order to work out practical methods and corollary principles in the development of a new concept in government, this legislature believes that discretionary administrative powers of interpretation of law should be reduced progressively by more specific law as rapidly as experience permits; and

"Whereas it appears that there is now enough accumulated experience with the employment-security program for Congress to be able to put more into specific provisions of law many of the standards and prescriptions to which a State must conform in order to receive Federal approval, many of which are now so general as to be, for all practical purposes, at the discretion of the Federal Security Administrator; and

"Whereas this legislature believes firmly in the principle that the national interest is best served by permitting each State to experiment with and develop its individual solutions to its own particular problems, insofar as the results are not clearly harmful to the interests or other States or of the Nation as a whole; and

"Whereas the present system, under which the administration of a State's employment service and unemployment-insurance programs is financed fully with Federal money and so is subject to purse-string influence and control by the Federal Government, is inconsistent with a sound State-Federal partnership in solving what is partly a State and partly a National problem; and

"Whereas the present method now prescribed and used by the Federal Security Administrator for budgeting State requirements and apportioning Federal appropriations among the States for administration of the States' own programs offers no incentive to a State to reduce its cost of administration, effectively controls the emphasis which a State may place on any phase of its own program, effectively prevents a State from experimenting in any direction of which the Administrator does not happen to approve, and tends to reduce administration of employment-security programs to a dead level of mediocrity throughout all of the States; and

"Whereas the Federal Unemployment Tax Act now effectively prevents a State from using certain methods of reducing its tax rates for contributions to its unemployment fund to less than the maximum 2.7 percent of subject pay rolls permissible for offset against the Federal tax, whether or not such methods will provide revenue sufficient to maintain the solvency of its unemployment fund; and

"Whereas this legislature believes firmly in the principle that, because ignorance of the law is no excuse for violation of the law, it is a responsibility of government to put the law into such form that a person can find out what provisions of law are effective without a major research effort; and

"Whereas substantive provisions of Federal law which pertain specifically to employment security are scattered through a number of different Federal acts, frequently without indication of what provisions of one act have been amended by another act; and

"Whereas there is now no provision for emergency funds to finance additional administrative costs of employment-security programs due to unforeseen conditions creating overloads; and

"Whereas in the 11 years from July 1, 1936, to June 30, 1947, since which time accurate figures have not yet been published, the Federal Government has made a profit of $49,900,000 from the difference between the $97,900,000 it has collected from California's employers under the unemployment tax and the $48,000,000 it has returned to the State of California in grants for administration of the State's employment-security programs; and

"Whereas because the total amount appropriated by the Eightieth Congress for employment-security administration was substantially less than the amount recommended to be appropriated by the Federal agencies, the Federal grant for administration of the employment-service and unemployment-insurance programs of the State of California for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, is about $4,000,000 less than the $18,300,000 recommended by the Region 12 office of the Federal Security Agency and is insufficient to enable the State properly to serve its citizens and to protect its unemployment fund, as required by State law: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as are necessary to bring about the following results:

"1. Wherever practical reduce to more specific standards and prescriptions, stated in law, the requirements to which a State's employment security laws and practices must conform to receive Federal approval, and cut down present broad powers of the Federal Security Administrator to legislate by interpretation of law.

"2. Change the present method of financing administration of State employment security programs to insure that each State may receive a fair proportion of the contributions of its employers for such administration and to reduce the purse-string control of the State's administration by the Federal Security Agency. Amend Federal law to provide that the present 0.3 percent part of the unemployment tax not subject to offset shall be divided between the Federal Government and the State whose employers contribute it, and thereafter that State administration shall be financed by a combination of appropriation by the State and a Federal grant-in-aid.

"3. Amend Federal law to provide that a State may use any method of experience rating or other form of reducing its own unemployment tax rate that it sees fit to use, without loss of the additional credit privilege in computing tax offset against the Federal unemployment tax, provided only that the resulting State tax will maintain the solvency of its unemployment fund, in accordance with specific standards of measurement stated in Federal law.

"4. Rewrite and reenact Federal laws related specifically to employment security activities to consolidate all their provisions into a single act, in logical sequence and without obsolete provisions.

"5. Provide for an emergency fund for State administration of employment security programs, from which additional funds will be available to a State within a fiscal year in unforeseen circumstances which create an administrative overload not contemplated in its original budget.

"6. Provide an immediate emergency supplemental Federal grant to the State of California, for administration of its employment service and unemployment insurance programs, of $2,387,000 to make up the deficit of $500,000 unavoidably incurred in the first half of this current fiscal year as a result of the drastic cut in the expected Federal grant without forewarning, and to restore to the State the $1,887,000, the difference between the amount indicated to be recommended by the Federal agencies and the actual grant for the second half of this fiscal year; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate shall prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States from California."

---

"Senate Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to repealing the transportation tax

"Whereas for the purpose of meeting wartime emergency necessity, the Congress of the United States enacted as excise taxes a 15-percent levy upon the transportation of persons and a 3-percent levy upon the transportation of property; and

"Whereas one of the principal purposes of levying such tax upon the transportation of persons was to discourage unnecessary wartime travel, the need for which no longer exists; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California that excise taxes should not impose an unfair burden on the long distance shipper and the long distance traveler as does the present tax on

the transportation of property and persons; and

"Whereas it should be a principle of Federal taxation to levy taxes in such a manner as to prevent them from falling as an unequal burden on citizens residing in different areas of the country; and

"Whereas the distances to, from, and within the West impose an unfair burden on the western traveler and shipper; and

"Whereas the present transportation tax on property is unfairly burdensome upon the State of California as it adds what is in effect an additional tariff on the goods shipped from California to the eastern markets, with the result that those goods are not able to compete freely with the goods originating in more closely adjacent southern areas; and

"Whereas the State of California is particularly interested in preserving the eastern market as an open market in which the agricultural products of California, in particular, may compete freely with southern produce without the hindrance of artificial barriers such as the present transportation tax; and

"Whereas the State of California is particularly interested in protecting and developing its vacation and tourist travel on an equal basis with other vacation travel areas; and

"Whereas the transportation of both persons and property plays such a vital role in the economic life of this country to the extent that the costs of transportation should always be kept at the lowest possible level; and

"Whereas transportation is in no sense a luxury but is a vital necessity and there is, therefore, sound reason for distinguishing between the transportation taxes and other excise taxes that are imposed upon luxury items; and

"Whereas it is the opinion of the Legislature of the State of California that the best interest of the country and particularly the Western States, who are now discriminated against by the present transportation taxes, would be served by a repeal of those taxes; and

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States H. R. 205 which would repeal the tax on transportation of property and H. R. 208 which would repeal the tax on transportation of persons: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact into law H. R. 205 and H. R. 208 or any other bill or bills which would accomplish the same purpose; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Four joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to two irrigation canals to supply water from the Sacramento River to areas in northern California

"Whereas the great Central Valley of California consists of two connected valleys, the one to the north comprising the watershed of the Sacramento River and the one to the south comprising the watershed of the San Joaquin River; and

"Whereas the State water plan of California developed from a series of comprehensive investigations conducted principally in the decade following 1920 and envisioned, among other things, a plan for the transfer of large quantities of water from the northern area where water was plentiful to the southern area where it was acutely needed; and

"Whereas the Central Valley Project Act of 1933 had for one of its principal purposes such a large-scale transfer of water from the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley; and

"Whereas the State water plan also envisioned the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River within the Sacramento Valley but the original Central Valley Project Act, while it provided that no watershed or area wherein water originates should be deprived of water required for its needs, nevertheless made practically no provision for the utilization of water within the Sacramento Valley; and

"Whereas in 1941 the California Legislature recognized that the project should include some provision for the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River in the area in which it originates and added to the project two units, one, called the Tehama-Colusa conduit, extending from the Sacramento River near Red Bluff through the counties of Tehama, Glenn, and Colusa west of the river, and the other, called the Tehama-Butte conduit, extending from a point near Red Bluff through the counties of Tehama, Butte, and Sutter east of the river; and

"Whereas the United States had theretofore taken over the Central Valley project as a Federal project and the two units have not been added to the project as now being constructed; and

"Whereas in the 1949 session of the Congress of the United States a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressmen CLAIR ENGLE and HUBERT SCUDDER of California will be under consideration which provides for the inclusion in the Central Valley project of two new features, one called the Tehama-Colusa conduit and the other the Chico conduit; and

"Whereas the conduits provided for in the Engle-Scudder bill will effectuate the same general purposes as the two units above referred to which have already been added to the project as described in the California act; and

"Whereas the Engle-Scudder bill further safeguards the interests of the people of the area affected by requiring that the relevant documents of the State water plan be considered and that local interests affected be consulted; and

"Whereas the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River for the purposes contemplated will not affect or jeopardize any of the other features of the project but, on the contrary, will bring the project into closer conformity with the State water plan, and provide an additional water supply in areas where it is needed: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the Engle-Scudder bill hereinabove referred to, or to take whatever steps may be necessary to provide in such other manner as may be suitable for the construction of the same or similar conduits for the same or similar purposes; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to establishing a 10-year experimental range program

"Whereas there are approximately 15,000,000 acres of land in California recognized to be grazing land and not suitable for purposes other than providing forage for livestock; and

"Whereas the value of these lands for grazing purposes is subject to the encroachment of noxious weeds and the growth and spreading of useless brush which cause a serious detriment to the value of such lands for grazing purposes; and

"Whereas the United States Forest Service for a period of years conducted a series of studies all relating to rodent damage to pasture lands, the control of rodents, the use of fertilizers, and the planting of new or different types of grasses to improve and preserve the productivity of such grazing lands; and

"Whereas the experiments of the United States Forest Service were conducted at what is known as the San Joaquin Experimental Range, which is located in almost the exact geographical center of the State and is typical of the grazing lands throughout the State; and

"Whereas the work of the United States Forest Service and the benefits derived therefrom have been augmented by a series of studies made by the University of California to determine the value of the grasses as cattle feed, and the value of feeding concentrates as auxiliary to the feeding of such grasses in order to produce more beef value at a lower cost; and

"Whereas the desirability of increasing the productivity of the millions of acres of California grazing land is apparent and a very slight proportionate increase throughout the State would produce millions of dollars in additional values; and

"Whereas the State of California is rapidly developing and increasing in population and all possible steps should be taken to increase the value of the grazing lands of California and the production of livestock to meet the needs of the growing population; and

"Whereas a long-range program of 10 or more years designed to improve the productivity of California's grazing lands would be very desirable and would return many times the cost of such program: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for a 10-year experimental range program to be conducted within the State of California, and preferably at the San Joaquin Experimental Range, and to make available sufficient funds so that such program can be conducted upon a scale commensurate with its potential value in increasing the productivity of California grazing land; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

---

"Senate Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the Forestry Service special-use permit fees

"Whereas the new Forestry Service fee schedule now being executed by the Federal

Forestry Service is based upon a percentage of gross revenue of the permittee; and

"Whereas a fee based upon a percentage of gross revenue in practical effect taxes the permittee on the capital investment he has added to the unimproved lands; and

"Whereas this would discourage the investment of capital to improve our public lands, thus retarding its development and reducing facilities available to the vacationing public; and

"Whereas there is no relationship between the value of land before improvement by the permittee and the fees charged; and

"Whereas the new fee schedule will cause great hardship in many cases by increasing the fees charged by many hundred percent; and

"Whereas the increase of fees for the use of lands appears entirely inconsistent with the Federal rent-control laws; and

"Whereas increased fees will necessarily raise the cost of services to the vacationing public, thus lessening the volume of business for the permittee, and consequently reducing the revenue for the affected countries: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully urges the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to suspend the new fee schedule pending a full investigation of the conditions, and to revise the schedule so that it will bear a reasonable relationship to the value of the lands, and the use being made of such lands; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate shall prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States from California."

---

"Senate Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution respecting memorializing Congress to enact legislation for the relief of gold mining

"Whereas under War Order L-208, effective October 1942, an unusual and unprecedented hardship was inflicted upon the industry of gold mining causing a general suspension of gold mining throughout the United States, thereby seriously injuring many gold-mine operators and ruining many others; and

"Whereas many fine communities in California have been for nearly a century almost wholly dependent upon gold mining and are now threatened with becoming ghost towns, because enforced abandonment of these gold mines is imminent under existing circumstances; and

"Whereas gold mining was the industry which originally founded the prosperity of California and has continuously been one of California's major industries and sources of new wealth up until the said L-208; and

"Whereas the injury and injustice to gold mining has not been remedied but on the contrary becomes more acute, causing poverty and dislocation among the many communities of California's extensive mining regions threatening excessive and unnatural unemployment with the great costs and expense incident thereto a heavy burden upon the State: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of California (now in regular session)*, That the Congress of the United States be petitioned and urged to take early and effective action toward remedying the distress caused by the said L-208 and to effectuate ways and means of restoring, rehabilitating and preserving in its former circumstances prior to the said L-208, the gold-mining industry; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and the Congress and to each Member of the Senate and the Representatives from California."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois favoring repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley Labor Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. LUCAS on February 3, 1949 (p. 783), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A resolution adopted by the Little Popple Grange, Iron Mountain, Mich., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a support price for butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A resolution adopted by the Women of the International League for Peace and Freedom, Boston, Mass., favoring repeal of the Selective Service Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the national headquarters of Enlisted Veterans of America, Minneapolis, Minn., mourning the death of Josephus Daniels, and favoring the enactment of legislation to create an investigation and adjustment board of the military services (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Chad F. Calhoun, of Washington, D. C., relating to the Federal Reserve Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from W. T. Smith, of Louisville, Ky., relating to taxation of mutual and reciprocal insurance companies; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Morocco Post, No. 1, the American Legion, Casablanca, Morocco, stating their position with reference to treaty violations that threaten American business in Morocco (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Charles Rozmarek, president, Polish American Congress, Inc., relating to the liberalization of the displaced-persons law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a memorial, signed by Mary Anderson, chairman, of the National Committee on the Status of Women in the United States, remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called equal-rights amendment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the Common Councils of the Cities of Toledo, Ohio, and South Bend, Ind., and the City Council of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Navajo Assistance, Inc., Gallup, N. Mex., signed by Bert Pousna, managing director, relating to direct assistance to the Navajo Indians (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A petition of sundry American citizens residing in Puerto Rico, Salinas, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the extension of social security to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A radiogram in the nature of a petition from members of the Puerto Rico Telephone Industrial Workers, San Juan, P. R., praying for inclusion of Puerto Rico in the provisions of the wage-and-hour law and other social legislation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Telegrams in the nature of memorials from the American-Virgin Islands Civic Association, New York City, N. Y., signed by Ashley L. Totten, president, and the Liberal Party of St. Thomas, V. I., remonstrating against the enactment of the so-called Butler bill to create a single resident commissioner for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of Chelsea, Mass., relating to Federal aid to schools in urban communities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley Labor Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the American Council of Christian Churches, Wilkinsburg, Pa., signed by W. O. H. Garman, president, remonstrating against repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Letters and telegrams in the nature of memorials, of sundry citizens of the States of Ohio, Kentucky, North Carolina, Maryland, New Jersey, Montana, Pennsylvania, and New York, remonstrating against repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter and a telegram in the nature of petitions from the Italian Cloak, Suit, Skirt, and Reefer Makers' Union, Local 48, and the executive board of Local 66, International Ladies Garment Workers, both of New York City, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing a Federal minimum wage of $1 per hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Union de Choferes de Trailers y Trucks, Union Local No. 1, Ponce, P. R., favoring the enactment of legislation providing minimum wages of 75 cents per hour for workers in industry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition of sundry members of the Committee of Low-Grade Mail Clerks, Council Bluffs, Iowa, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 107, restoring automatic four-grade pay raise to postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Herman Edelsberg, legal counsel, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, Washington, D. C., favoring the adoption of a cloture rule to prevent filibusters (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution adopted by the Society of Medical Consultants of World War II, in the State of Maryland, relating to the medical departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Concurrent Resolution 4

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine

"Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the finest standards of scientific care and the best quality of medical institutions thus far achieved by any major country in the world; and

"Whereas the great accomplishments of American medicine are the results of a free profession working under a free system unhampered by Government control; and

"Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical care has been progressive deterioration of the standards and quality of that care to the serious detriment of the sick and the needy: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Arkansas, a majority of all the members elected to each house agreeing thereto:*

"1. The Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized not to enact any proposed legislation the effect of which will be to bring the practice of medicine in this country under Federal direction and control, either through a form of compulsory insurance or any system of medical care designed for national bureaucratic control.

"2. The Senators and Representatives from Arkansas now in the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully requested to bend their every effort and utilize all facilities at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

"3. Copies of this resolution shall forthwith be transmittted to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Senator and Congressman from Arkansas."

By Mr. MILLER:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Joint Memorial 1

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in its thirtieth session, do respectfully represent: That—

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has favorably recommended the construction of a series of four dams with locks to provide slack-water navigation from the mouth of the Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho; and

"Whereas the site locations are, namely, Ice Harbor Dam, at mile 10.2 above the mouth of the Snake River; Lower Monumental Dam, at mile 44.7; Little Goose Dam, at mile 72.2; and Lower Granite Dam, at mile 113.1; and

"Whereas these dams are to be enduring structures, constructed for the welfare and benefit of the people of the United States; and

"Whereas the names and works of many of our early explorers and missionaries are indelibly written in the history and development of the Snake River and the entire Pacific Northwest: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the name of the Ice Harbor Dam be changed to Whitman to commemorate the deeds of Dr. Marcus Whitman, who was martyred in the performance of his missionary works among the Indians of the Northwest; that the name of the Lower Monumental Dam be changed to Lewis, honoring and perpetuating the name of Capt. Merriwether Lewis, who led the first expedition to explore and open the Northwest country; that the name of the Little Goose Dam be changed to Clark in honor of Capt. William Clark, who so ably assisted Capt. Merriwether Lewis; and that the name of Lower Granite Dam be changed to Spalding, honoring and commemorating the name of Rev. Henry Harmon Spalding who, after 1836, taught the Christian faith and better ways of living to the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians until his death; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state of Idaho be hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States, to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives of Idaho in the two Houses of Congress."

By Mr. BUTLER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Legislative Resolution 9

"Whereas in Thurston County, Nebr., there are 183,622.5 acres of deeded land on the tax books; and

"Whereas there are 18,990 acres of Indian land that is taxed in Thurston County which is known as the Leaming allotments; and

"Whereas there are two Indian reservations containing 41,285 acres of land subject to taxation if rented, and not being leased by an Indian; and

"Whereas on account of this large acreage amounting to nearly 25 percent of all land in Thurston County being tax exempt, Thurston County is having a difficult time to raise sufficient funds with which to adequately improve and maintain highways; and

"Whereas the allotments under the Federal aid road program should be increased to the State of Nebraska to provide a program and make it possible to assist Thurston County in improving and maintaining county highways: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the Commissioner of Public Roads in charge of the Federal aid road fund increase the allotments to Nebraska for the purpose of improving and maintaining roads in Thurston County.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States, and in the House of Representatives of the United States and to the Commissioner of Public Roads in charge of the Federal aid road fund."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Legislative Resolution 8

"Whereas there has been established at Kearney, Nebr., an airfield by the United States Air Forces; and

"Whereas the United States Air Forces has notified the commanding officer and persons in charge that such airfield is to be closed and equipment and personnel will be moved from the State of Nebraska; and

"Whereas this airfield means much to the people of Nebraska, and especially to the ones living in and around Kearney, Nebr., who generally will suffer from the security and prosperity enjoyed if this airfield is closed down: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in sixty-first session assembled:*

"1. That the United States Air Forces reconsider the order to close the airfield at Kearney, Nebr., and move the equipment and personnel from Nebraska in order that this field may be retained at Kearney by the Air Forces.

"2. That copies of this resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted by the clerk of the legislature to the Vice President of the United States as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the commanding officer of the United States Air Forces."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## THE TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a telegram from Mrs. John Roberge and family, regarding the unjust trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. I have before me 128 other telegrams and 15 letters dealing with the same subject, which have been received by me, but which I shall not ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIDDEFORD, MAINE, *February 7, 1949.*

Urge your kind support in protesting against unjust trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.

MRS. JOHN ROBERGE AND FAMILY.

## ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL STAMP—RESOLUTION OF BOARD OF ALDERMEN OF SOMERVILLE, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the city of Somerville, Mass., regarding the issuance of a special stamp, which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Resolved,* Where the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the event where General Gage seized the powder at the powder house in Somerville (then a part of Charlestown) was one of the acts that precipitated the Revolution, and where this was more than an ordinary occurrence: Be it therefore

*Resolved,* That in keeping with our educational and psychological campaign to preserve our liberties, we can look with an artistic view to the possible design of the old mill, or as we know it, the powder house, and realize that it would make a decorative stamp of rare beauty, with the background of being one of the choicest antique relics of the United States: Be it therefore

*Resolved,* That this board of aldermen do hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to take the proper action to formulate the printing of a stamp depicting the afore-mentioned event; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be spread upon the records of this board of aldermen, and copies shall be sent to each congressional Representative and United States Senator, the President, and the Postmaster General.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 77. A bill to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69); without amendment (Rept. No. 32);

S. 629. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 33);

S. 630. A bill to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 34);

S. 632. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 35); and

S. 673. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear

admiral, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 36).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 128. A bill to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year; with an amendment (Rept. No. 38).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Public Works:

S. 713. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 37).

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 790. A bill to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact; without amendment (Rept. No. 39).

## JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I desire to announce the appointment of the following Senators to be a part of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget:

Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY.

## ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on February 3, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 547) to continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. I propose to submit a concurrent resolution. I should like to make about a 10-minute address in connection with the concurrent resolution. Is it necessary for me to submit the concurrent resolution now and reserve my address on it until later in the day?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The order of submission of concurrent resolutions will be reached in a few minutes. It will not, however, be in order to make a speech with regard to it until the morning business has been concluded.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 796. A bill to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. TYDINGS also introduced Senate bill 797, to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain of December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been granted; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 798. A bill for the relief of Christian Davids; and

S. 799. A bill for the relief of Spero Carconen known as Sam Carson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 800. A bill to provide for the reestablishment of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission with the same functions which it had prior to the time Reorganization Plan No. 2 became effective; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 801. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, so as to provide certain benefits for the widows of employees who died, prior to February 28, 1948, and for other purposes; and

S. 802. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps to encourage the mailing of good-will letters between citizens of the United States and those of foreign countries; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

S. 803. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a tract of land in Prince George's County, Md., to the State of Maryland for use as a site for a National Guard Armory; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. 804. A bill authorizing the completion of certain works of improvement in the Red River of the north drainage basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUNT:

S. 805. A bill to amend section 5 of the act approved July 10, 1890, as amended, relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming, so as to permit the leasing of school lands within such State for mineral purposes for terms in excess of 10 years; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

S. 806. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to Sacajawea; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 807. A bill authorizing financial assistance to blind veterans of World War II in obtaining an automobile or other conveyance; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. McMAHON):

S. 808. A bill for the relief of Walter Paterson, doing business as the Paterson Steel & Forge Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 809. A bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, operation, maintenance, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. IVES, and Mr. O'CONOR) introduced Senate bill 810, to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 811. A bill to adjust the effective date of certain awards of pensions and compensations payable by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 812. A bill to protect scenic values along Oak Creek Canyon and certain tributaries thereof within the Coconino National Forest, Ariz.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 813. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 814. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Emma Spotted Eagle Tinneil and Andrew Spotted Eagle, heirs of John M. Paul, to certain lands;

S. 815. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Mrs. Avena M. Chips-White Bull a patent in fee to certain land;

S. 816. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Mrs. Anna Richard Lone Dog and other heirs of James Richard, deceased, to certain lands; and

S. 817. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Paul High Horse and his wife, Anna High Horse, a patent in fee to certain land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 818. A bill authorizing the transfer of certain lands in Putnam County, Fla., to the State Board of Education of Florida for the use of the University of Florida for educational purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 819. A bill for the relief of Herman L. Weiner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

S. 820. A bill to provide dispensary treatment and hospitalization in Army, Navy, and Air Force hospitals for retired personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHAVEZ (by request):

S. 821. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 822. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and the tax on transportation of property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 823. A bill to amend section 304 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, with regard to interest rates on premiums for reinstated United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARTIN (for himself and Mr. MYERS):

S. 824. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station

in northwestern Pennsylvania for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 825. A bill to reduce juvenile delinquency by providing for the care and prompt return home of run-away, transient, or vagrant children of juvenile age, going from one State to another without proper legal consent, through the use of funds appropriated under the provisions of the Social Security Act for aid to dependent children, under certain conditions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 826. A bill authorizing the Grove Petroleum Co. to obtain consideration of its claim for refund of income taxes for the taxable years 1935 through 1941; and

S. 827. A bill to amend the act of June 16, 1934, to provide for allowances to the heirs, representatives, and assigns of Frank J. Boudinot, deceased, in the event of favorable determination by the Indian Claims Commission of certain claims of the Cherokee Indians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 828. A bill for the relief of James R. Frazer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 829. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 830. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Gross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. MORSE):

S. 831. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 832. A bill for the relief of the J. B. Kendall Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. CONNALLY (by request) introduced Senate bill 833, to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. KERR, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. MORSE, Mr. McFARLAND, and Mr. HILL):

S. 834. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. 835. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to James Madison Burton; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 836. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Clarence M. Scott; and

S. 837. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Irene Scott Bassett; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 838. A bill providing for investigations and experiments into problems relative to maintaining productive meadows at high altitudes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 839. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli;

S. 840. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Trebing;

S. 841. A bill for the relief of Michele Bartolomeo Marchisio;

S. 842. A bill for the relief of Jewett M. Branaum;

S. 843. A bill for the relief of S. M. Price;

S. 844. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Jacques Kurickis and Brigitte Kurickis;

S. 845. A bill for the relief of Bretti Bruno;

S. 846. A bill for the relief of Satirios Christos Roumanis;

S. 847. A bill for the relief of Maria Berta;

S. 848. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo Buira Sarrate;

S. 849. A bill for the relief of certain persons who, while serving as members of the Army Nurse Corps, were commissioned as officers in the Army of the United States but were not paid the full amount of pay and allowances payable to officers of their grade and length of service; and

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MILLIKIN):

S. 850. A bill conferring United States citizenship posthumously upon Vaso B. Benderach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 851. A bill to promote the settlement and development of the public domain in the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 852. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act (U. S. C., title 49, sec. 3 (1)), so as to prohibit the segregation of passengers on account of race or color; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 853. A bill to provide for the admission into the United States of persons of the Korean race, to make them racially eligible for naturalization, and for other purposes; and

S. 854. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 855. A bill to authorize a program of useful public works for the development of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. MAGNUSON introduced Senate bill 856, to provide for an adequate and balanced flow of fish and fish products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## WITHDRAWAL OF SOVEREIGNTY OF UNITED STATES OVER ISLAND OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill which I have introduced in the last two preceding Congresses, to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence. I think the bill should be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill (S. 797) to provide for the withdrawal of the sovereignty of the United States over the island of Puerto Rico and for the recognition of its independence; to provide for notification thereof to foreign governments; to provide for the assumption by the Government of Puerto Rico of obligations under the treaty with Spain of December 10, 1898; to define trade and other relations between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the calling of a convention to frame a constitution for the government of the island of Puerto Rico; to provide for certain mandatory provisions of the proposed constitution; to provide for the submission of the constitution to the people of Puerto Rico and its submission to the President of the United States for his approval; to provide for the adjustment of property rights between the United States and Puerto Rico; to provide for the maintenance of military, coaling, and naval stations by the United States on the island of Puerto Rico; to continue in force certain statutes until independence has been granted; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a bi-partisan national commission on intergovernmental relations, in which all levels of government are represented, to study problems in Federal, State, and local governments which make for overlapping services, duplication of effort, and sheer waste in tax dollars.

I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement with reference thereto.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am constrained to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The Senator understands that under the morning business procedure, remarks are not in order except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a statement incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, and also to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 810) to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, introduced by Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. IVES, and Mr. O'CONOR) was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That there is hereby established a national bipartisan commission, in which the various levels of government are represented, to be known as the National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (hereinafter referred to as the Commission). In view of the constantly increasing complexity, during the last century and a half, of a vast network of relationships among the Federal, State, county, and municipal governments in the United States, this Commission is established for the purpose of studying and making recommendations to the Presi-

dent and the Congress, in an effort to bring about:

(1) The finding of ways and means of establishing a more orderly and less competitive fiscal relationship between the several levels of government. Major aspects of this problem include the overlapping and confused systems of taxation and the increasing demands made upon the Federal Government and the States for tax-sharing and grants-in-aid, without following any consistent over-all pattern.

(2) The elimination of duplication and overlapping services, activities, and functions, and the securing of a better coordination of such services, activities, and functions among the several levels of government.

(3) The attainment of such an allocation of governmental functions among the several levels of government as will contribute to economy in governmental administration on the one hand, and maximum service to the public on the other.

(4) A reduction in the total governmental expenditures to the lowest possible level consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions.

(5) The development, within the existing constitutional framework, of a governmental structure, and such cooperative policies and procedures as will tend to overcome existing obstacles to efficient governmental administration, and to lay a sound foundation for future development.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of 14 members as follows:

(1) Five appointed by the President of the United States, two of whom shall be officers of the executive branch of the Government, and three of whom shall be private citizens, all of whom shall have had experience with or knowledge of major problems in the field of intergovernmental relations;

(2) Two appointed by the President of the Senate, who shall be Members of the Senate;

(3) Two appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, who shall be Members of the House;

(4) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be State officials, from a panel of at least four, submitted by the Council of State Governments;

(5) Two appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be municipal officials, from a panel of at least four, submitted jointly by the American Municipal Association, the International City Managers Association, and the United States Conference of Mayors;

(6) One appointed by the President of the United States, who shall be a county official, from a panel of at least two, submitted by the National Association of County Officials.

(b) Of the members enumerated in paragraph (1) of subsection (a), not more than three members shall be from any one political party; of each class of members enumerated in paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from any one political party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

(e) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 3. It shall be the duty of the Commission:

(1) To make a thorough and comprehensive study of the subjects listed below, and of any related subjects, with a view to determining what changes in existing relationships, in its opinion, are necessary to the accomplishment of the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act:

(A) The origin and development, and present status, of the relations and interrelations of the Federal, State and local governments of the United States.

(B) The allocation of governmental functions among the Federal, State, and local Governments of the United States.

(C) The problem of geographical areas as related to governmental functions, field administration, and metropolitan communities.

(D) The gradual encroachment upon our Federal system of current and impending developments in the fiscal relations of the Federal Government with the States, and of the States with their political subdivisions.

(2) To submit its final report and recommendations to the President and the Congress on the subjects indicated above, and suggest plans and procedures for carrying these recommendations into effect, not later than February 1, 1952.

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission may, in carrying out this act, hold such hearings and take such testimony, sit and act at such times and places as it deems advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission. The Commission may delegate the powers conferred by this subsection to any member or to a group of members of the Commission.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(c) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of a director of research and all other necessary personnel without regard to the civil service laws, and without reference to political affiliations, solely on the ground of fitness to perform the duties of their office.

SEC. 5. (a) Members of the Commission, other than those to whom subsections (b) and (c) of section 2 are applicable, and within the provisions of subsection (c) of section 5, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission, and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(b) Members of the Commission who are Members of Congress shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

(c) Each member of the Commission from the executive branch of the Government shall receive, in addition to the compensation for duties performed in the executive branch, $50 per day for each day he is engaged in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission: *Provided, however,* That his total aggregate annual salary shall not exceed $12,500; and shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of his duties as a member of the Commission.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. The Commission shall cease to exist at the end of the fiscal year during which its final report to the President and the Congress is made.

The statement by Mr. HENDRICKSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

This bill, Mr. President, represents the views and expresses the considered judgment of many Members of this body who have served in State government. It is the result of their experience at local and State levels of government that it now comes before us for study, consideration, and appropriate action.

The distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] has already introduced a resolution to the same effect and purpose. The distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] has introduced similar legislation. The distinguished Congressman at Large from Delaware, Mr. CALEB BOGGS, is introducing a counterpart of this measure in the House today. The able Governor of my own State, Alfred E. Driscoll, keynoted the proposal at the biannual convention of the Council of State Governments in January 1947. The activities and the deep interest shown by the members and the experts of the Council of State Governments in this matter over the past years demonstrates clearly that there is a definite need for the study established by this bill.

In presenting a very able report on the coordination of Federal and State taxes to a Senate committee last April, our very distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Ohio [Senator BRICKER] said: "The committee was fully aware that these recommendations do not in any sense offer a comprehensive solution of the present problems of intergovernmental fiscal relations."

This bill, Mr. President, as I have indicated, provides for the establishment of a bipartisan, or better still, a nonpartisan, Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which will examine all aspects and phases of National, State, and local government with special attention to the serious fiscal problems which threaten to overwhelm us today. It is true that there have been many studies in this general field in the past—but none of them have had the full participation of our National Government.

Under this bill, the commission will represent all of the parties at interest, both public and private, Federal, State, and local; legislative and executive, and where necessary, judicial. It will be given the opportunity and the responsibility to report its findings to the people of the Nation.

It is not intended that this group shall lend itself to any criticism of the basic structure of government levels as we know them or to their general purposes, but it is our intention that we improve the services of government at each level and at the same time stretch the value of the tax dollar in respect to the rendition of those services.

When he introduced the bill to establish the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts said:

"This is not a job which Congress alone, working through congressional committees and using its own staffs, can do. We in Congress have not the time. There is no use deluding ourselves about that. We have not the time to do the job that needs to be done. We would have to leave it to our staffs; and our staffs would not have the standing which the members of this Commission would have in relation to the departments. All sorts of expert knowledge would be required, including the services of industrial engineers and management experts. It would take time and money."

I most heartily agree that such an undertaking requires full-time work from many experts of proven ability in the several fields we propose to study.

Since this bill envisages a full-scale investigation on all levels of government, it is necessary to include the representatives of local and State governments, Members of Congress, administrative officials, and men and women from private life.

The purposes as stated in the bill itself open exciting vistas for tremendous progress in efficient and effective government. To me they spell new opportunities to employ sound and scientific business methods in public operations.

The entire world watches us day by day as we conduct our public affairs. To friends and foes we are the outstanding example of the democratic processes of government. If we are to prosper and be worthy of the hopes of those who trust and rely upon us, we must be eternally vigilant that our system does not become fatally enmeshed in coils of its own construction.

The time is ripe for such an undertaking as this—indeed our present situation demands positive and definite action.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks which have just been ordered printed with relation to the bill of which I am a cosponsor, I may have the privilege of having printed in the RECORD a statement which I have prepared.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

COINTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. President, I am introducing today on behalf of myself and others, a companion bill to a very important measure prepared by and being introduced today in the House of Representatives by the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS, Congressman at Large from the State of Delaware. The purpose of this bill is to establish a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations along the lines of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

Congressman BOGGS has devoted nearly a full year of study in cooperation with many prominent individuals and groups preparatory to introduction of this legislation. He has kindly invited members of his own Republican and of the Democratic Party to join with him in co-sponsoring similar legislation and I am happy to do so here on the Senate side for myself and others.

*Hodge-podge of duplication*

The purpose of this bill is to study the slap-happy, hodge-podge of duplication of authority and functions between Federal, State, and local governments; to analyze the jig-saw puzzle of overlapping taxes between Uncle Sam, the States, and localities; to prepare a comprehensive survey of "grants-in-aid" which have become used to a tremendous extent in recent years; to analyze the increasing centralization of power of the Federal Government and of its fiscal authority.

Congressman BOGGS is preparing a very comprehensive statement on this subject in the House today and I respectfully commend his statement to the attention of my colleagues.

*Jumble-jungle-jangle of duplication*

I, personally, have been deeply interested in this subject since my coming to the Senate in 1939, and I have introduced my own decentralization legislation on several occasions. I feel that there are few more important subjects for active interest of Congress and of our people than this matter of straightening out the haphazard, jumble, jungle, and jangle of Federal, State, local work.

Undoubtedly, the Hoover Commission will itself be making preliminary recommendations for a survey of this very field, and I feel that by our consideration of this legislation in the early future, we will be that much more advanced toward solving one of the really pressing problems of our times.

*Problem in Wisconsin and other States*

I can state personally that in my own State of Wisconsin, the fact that the Federal Government has pre-empted many sources of tax revenue, has served to "dry up the tax spring," so to speak, in many localities, and this has resulted in a staggering burden on our financially overburdened villages, municipalities, and State Government. The same is true throughout the Nation.

The Council of State Governments, to name but one of many prominent organizations, has been intensely active toward a resolution of this problem. I feel that this national commission being recommended today could go a long way in making a monumental contribution to restoring governmental and fiscal sanity at all levels of American political administration.

I feel, too, that if this legislation is approved by the Congress, as I hope it will be, it will mark a historic turning point at which a gradual decentralization of authority may be begun. Considerable economies may be expected as a result of recommendations which will come from such a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

## AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill. It is introduced by request, because it relates to the ECA. It is quite technical in some of its provisions, and we have not had an opportunity thoroughly to digest some of its provisions. We want to start hearings on the bill tomorrow, and it is necessary to have some form of bill before us.

The bill (S. 833) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ADEQUATE AND BALANCED FLOW OF FISH IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide an adequate and balanced flow of fish in interstate and foreign commerce, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me, together with statistical and summary data taken from Senate Document No. 51 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, entitled "Fishery Resources of the United States," be printed in the RECORD. These data demonstrate in a summary fashion the importance of fisheries to our economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the remarks and statistical and summary data will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 856) to provide for an adequate and balanced flow of fish and fish products in interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The statement by Senator MAGNUSON, together with the statistical and summary data, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

This bill proposes to create a Fisheries Stabilization Corporation in the Department of the Interior. It proposes to capitalize this Corporation for $5,000,000 and give it a borrowing power of $75,000,000. My bill authorizes and directs the Corporation to conduct operations aimed at stabilizing the price of fish to the producer—our fishermen.

There are approximately 150,000 fishermen in this country. These men are dependent for their livelihood upon the size of their catch, but even more so, upon the price they get for the raw fish. The price paid the fisherman for his product is subject to extreme fluctuations. Just as the farmer is receiving Government assistance through price-support activities, as carried on by the Commodity Credit Corporation, so this bill proposes similar operations for fishermen.

I frankly state, I do not consider this bill a finished product. I think, however, it will serve as an excellent starting point for the committee as it considers the problem of our fishermen, and how to extend to them the benefits of a stabilized industry. Legislation to assist the farmer is familiar to all of you. There are before the Congress now numerous proposals to raise the minimum wages of our workers to 75 cents an hour. I have supported all measures of this character and request all of you who have consistently advocated farm price supports and adequate minimum wages to study my bill carefully, give me the benefit of your thinking on it and lend me your assistance in enacting legislation to stabilize the fisheries industry.

ECONOMICS OF THE UNITED STATES FISHERIES

In an average prewar year with purse seines, 13,000 fishermen caught 2,100,000,000 pounds; with otter trawls, 11,000 fishermen caught 700,000,000 pounds; with lines, 24,000 fishermen caught 500,000,000 pounds; with gill nets, 19,000 fishermen caught 200,000,000 pounds; with pound nets, 6,000 fishermen caught 400,000,000 pounds; with all other types of gear, 19,000 fishermen caught 500,000,000 pounds. Total production, 4,400,000,000 pounds of fish.

These fish were processed thus: 1,500,000,000 pounds were canned, 340,000,000 pounds were fillet-packaged, 150,000,000 pounds were cured, 130,000,000 pounds were frozen whole, 680,000,000 pounds were sold fresh, 1,600,000,000 pounds were made into fish meal and oil and other byproducts.

Statistics on fishermen: 31,900 fishermen worked regularly on vessels of over 5 tons net; 33,400 fishermen worked regularly on smaller boats or from shore; 59,500 fishermen worked casually on smaller boats or from shore.

THE 1943 VALUE OF FISH AND FISHERY PRODUCTS

The initial value of the fresh fish to be canned was $60,800,000; canning added $96,200,000; wholesaling added $15,700,000; retailing added $57,500,000; for canned fish the United States public paid $230,200,000.

The initial value of the fresh fish to be made into oil, meal, and byproducts was $12,000,000; manufacturing added $42,900,000; distributing added $5,500,000; for oil, meal, and byproducts the United States public paid $60,400,000.

The initial value of the fish to be sold as fresh fish was $60,400,000; primary wholesaling added $22,100,000; secondary wholesaling added $20,700,000; retailing added $34,400,000; for fresh fish the United States public paid $137,600,000.

The initial value of fish to be filleted and packaged was $23,600,000; processing added $40,400,000; wholesaling added $16,000,000; retailing added $26,700,000; for packaged

fillets the United States public paid $106,700,000.

The initial value of fish to be frozen (other than filleted) was $6,700,000; processing added $2,300,000; primary wholesaling added $3,200,000; secondary wholesaling added $3,000,000; retailing added $5,100,000; for frozen fish (other than filleted) the United States public paid $20,300,000.

The initial value of fish to be cured, smoked, and pickled was $10,800,000; processing added $7,200,000; primary wholesaling added $6,500,000; secondary wholesaling added $6,200,000; retailing added $10,200,000; for cured, smoked, and pickled fish the United States public paid $40,900,000.

Total initial value, $174,300,000; total paid by United States public, $596,100,000.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

These are the conclusions to be drawn from the facts given:

1. The United States fishery resources are a very important part of the national wealth. Their money and employment value, their unique food properties, and their universal recreational appeal make them worth whatever effort is necessary to maintain them at high productive level. Like any other form of wealth, this inheritance of ours can be abused, misspent, and ruined from want of care. It can be wasted as much by a miserly failure to use it fully. This book has given us examples of fishery resources that were once great and valuable but which now are reduced to insignificance through bad management (Great Lakes ciscoes and whitefish of Lake Huron; Atlantic salmon, among others); and it has given us other examples of fishery resources that are still hardly touched (Pacific coast anchovies, cod, pollock).

2. From a conservation viewpoint, the fisheries are perhaps the most poorly managed of all our national resources. Legislative regulations governing them, where they exist at all, are piecemeal, localized, and often based on lay opinion, superstition, or snap judgment, rarely on knowledge. Yet there is a science of fishery conservation, which is highly specialized and exact. That it has not been more fruitful in this country is no reflection on the science or the scientists but rather on the public's failure to back them up. True, fishery science is costly. It has to be costly if it is to be properly done; but it more than pays for itself in increased value and security of wealth which it strives to protect. Nevertheless, Federal and State conservation agencies have everywhere been required to do their fishery conservation work on a financial shoestring. Small wonder that they have obtained shoestring results. There is only one example of a fishery resource that has been successfully studied and conserved over most of its range; that is the Pacific halibut, administered by the International Fisheries Commission since 1930. This is the only fishery conservation agency that has come even close to being adequately supported in money and personnel.

3. However much the American public might treasure its fish for the food and recreational value they afford, it shows little respect for the water they must inhabit. It defiles its streams and lakes with sewage and industrial wastes; it draws from them for irrigation and for domestic and manufacturing purposes; it uses them for transportation, and it blocks them off with high dams. These uses all involve modifications in the water courses of one sort or another, which are too often antagonistic to fish life. In addition, all sorts of other human activities serve to destroy fish habitats. Yet there is no reason why man's uses of water need be inimical to maintaining fishery resources. That they have been so is largely the consequence of the lack of coordination among the many agencies—Federal, State, municipal, private—which are separately concerned with the various uses of water, and the lack of representation by conservation agencies in the designing and operation of water-use plans.

4. The commercial fisheries, taken as a whole, are among the least progressive industries in the United States. They are generally slow to improve their products, to develop new ones, to exploit virgin resources, to correct wasteful fishing methods or to utilize the whole of their raw material. This backwardness is not the fault of the industry, but rather the consequence of its widespread, diffuse character. The fishing industries are composed of small, independent enterprises, widely scattered throughout the country and along extended coast lines; they are concerned with a great diversity of local fisheries, and they are beset by a notoriously unstable supply. Most fishery companies must be conservative to survive and are too small to carry on technological research for developing new fields, except at best on a very limited scale. In most States public agencies have not been equipped or staffed to help them, and the Federal Government gives them only a fraction of the aid it affords other food industries.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there further bills or joint resolutions? If not, the next order of business is concurrent and other resolutions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, concurrent resolutions are now in order. As I understand, the resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 15 is not yet in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is not now in order. It comes up automatically at the end of the morning business. Following the order under which the Senate is now operating, namely, concurrent and other resolutions, that resolution will be laid down automatically.

## THE INDONESIAN SITUATION

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution. Associated with me in it are also the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. This resolution deals with the Indonesian situation. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a statement of facts of the situation, the speech of Ambassador Philip C. Jessup in the Security Council on January 11, 1949, and a further statement of facts, together with a series of questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD, and the matters referred to by the Senator from Maine will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 56) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Royal Netherlands Government, on December 19, 1948, in violation of her sworn commitments under the Renville agreement, signed by the Netherlands and the Republic of Indonesia aboard the U. S. S. *Renville*, January 17, 1948, under the auspices of the United Nations Good Offices Committee, did willfully and without warning launch a military attack against the Republic of Indonesia; and

Whereas the United States delegation to the Security Council of the United Nations did join with the delegations of Colombia and Syria to introduce a resolution in the Security Council, at Paris, December 22, 1948, stating that the Security Council "* * * considers such resumption of hostilities (in Indonesia) to be in conflict with the resolution adopted by the Security Council at its one hundred and seventy-first meeting of August 1, 1947 * * *" and "* * * calls upon the parties (a) to cease hostilities forthwith; and (b) immediately to withdraw their armed forces to their respective sides of the demilitarized zones established under the truce agreement (Renville) of January 17, 1948 * * *"; and

Whereas the United Nations Security Council, on December 24, 1948, did order the Royal Netherlands Government to cease hostilities forthwith and "immediately to release the President [of the Republic of Indonesia] and other political prisoners arrested since December 18, 1948 * * *"; and

Whereas the Royal Netherlands Government did ignore these orders of the United Nations Security Council and did ignore further orders of the Security Council, issued on December 27, 1948, calling for release of the political prisoners within 24 hours: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That, in full support of the foreign policy of the United States and in support of the United Nations, the President is hereby urged to cause an immediate cessation of all financial aid, through the Economic Cooperation Administration or any other United States Government agency, directly or indirectly, to the Royal Netherlands Government, in Europe as well as in Indonesia, until the Royal Netherlands Government ceases hostilities against the Indonesian Republic, withdraws her armed forces to her side of the demilitarized zones established under the Renville Agreement of January 17, 1948, releases all Indonesian Republican Government leaders arrested since December 18, 1948, and opens bona fide negotiations with the Indonesian Republic under the terms of the Renville agreement.

The matters presented by Mr. BREWSTER were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACTS OF THE CURRENT INDONESIAN SITUATION

1. The Dutch have received more than one billion dollars since VE-day: $350,000,000 lend-lease and UNRRA, $290,000,000 World Bank, $195,000,000 Export-Import Bank, $400,000,000 ECA.

2. The Dutch are asking for $600,000,000 in ECA funds for next year.

3. The Dutch have maintained 150,000 troops in Indonesia for the past two years at an expense exceeding $1,000,000 per day.

4. The Dutch own $4,000,000,000 in Indonesia; the Indonesians $15,000,000. United States investments total $250,000,000 in Indonesia. By and large, the Dutch have shut American business out.

5. The Dutch, for 30 years, have taken at least $200,000,000 a year clear profit out of Indonesia—the fact is that 70,000,000 Indonesians average 15 to 30 cents a day as family income (an average family of five). In brief Indonesia is a gold mine.

6. For the past 40 years, a national independence movement has existed in Indonesia, led by moderate Republicans who have consistently fought all radical tendencies and within the past year have suppressed by force of arms a small Communist uprising.

7. Following VJ-day the Dutch promised full independence to Indonesia and made two

agreements to this effect, the Linggadjati and Renville Agreements, the latter agreement being negotiated under the auspices of the UN Good Offices Committee.

8. On December 19, without warning, the Dutch attacked the Indonesian Republic and took prisoner its leading officials.

9. The State Department on December 22 condemned this act of aggression in the Security Council meeting at Paris and by resolution asked that (a) a cease fire order be issued, (b) the Indonesian Republican leaders be released immediately, and (c) the Dutch troops withdraw from Republican territory.

10. Points (a) and (b) were adopted by the Security Council; the Dutch refused to comply with the order of the Security Council.

11. Nehru of India promptly called a conference of 19 Asiatic and African nations (including Australia and New Zealand) to take action against the Dutch.

12. Moscow has seized upon the situation and its radio is proclaiming day and night that the United States is hypocritical, pointing to the fact that we have financed the Dutch and are continuing to do so.

---

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR PHILIP C. JESSUP IN SECURITY COUNCIL ON JANUARY 11, 1949, ON INDONESIA

The United States Government can find no adequate justification for the military action taken by the Netherlands in Indonesia. In many important respects, the reasons put forth by the Netherlands representative at the meeting of the Security Council on December 22 in Paris and again here last Friday as to the justification for their action are not supported by the reports of the Committee on Good Offices. In our view, the Netherlands military action is in conflict with the Renville agreement and with the Security Council's resolutions of August 1 and November 1, 1947.

As the United States delegation has frequently made clear, it is our opinion that these two Security Council resolutions were adopted under the provisions of article 40, chapter VII of the Charter, and that, therefore, in accordance with article 25 of the Charter, the Netherlands Government was and is under obligation to comply.

On the initiative of the United States, the Security Council was called into session in Paris to consider the emergency created by the military action of the Dutch authorities. The United States, joining with Colombia and Syria, introduced a resolution which called upon both parties to cease hostilities forthwith and immediately to withdraw their armed forces to their respective sides of the demilitarized zones under the Renville truce agreement of January 17, 1948. Unfortunately, the paragraph calling for the withdrawal of forces was not adopted by the Council. The Council on December 24 passed the resolution calling upon the parties to cease hostilities forthwith and to release the political prisoners which had been arrested since the 18th of December. Later, on December 28, the Council passed an additional resolution calling upon the Dutch authorities to release the political prisoners within 24 hours. The Netherlands representative has assured the Council that his Government has complied with the cease-fire and release of prisoners order of the Council. Neither my Government nor the Committee on Good Offices consider they have done so. The Committee has reported on this as follows:

"The Committee is not in a position to report that there has been satisfactory compliance with subparagraph (A) of the resolution of December 24, which called on the parties to cease hostilities.

"(A) The telegram dispatched to territorial commanders in Java by the chief of staff of the Royal Netherlands Indonesian Army at 1700, December 29, 1948, is, according to its terms, for information and cannot be construed as an order to 'cease hostilities forthwith.' (Par. 9 above.) The dissemination of the order of the commander in chief to territorial commanders in Java which confirmed the fact that hostilities in Java had ended at 2400 of December 31 was begun at 1845 Batavia time, January 2. (Par. 9 above.) In Sumatra where a 'special emergency situation' existed, the parallel order disseminated late on January 4 had an effective time of 1200, January 5, 1949. (Par. 10 above.)

"(B) It is noted that these orders were issued at a time when the 'operational phase' of military activities presumably had been completed. (Appendixes I and II of Netherlands letter of January 3, par. 4 above.) The orders noted respectively that hostilities had terminated on December 31, 1948, in Java and on January 5, 1949, in Sumatra, but charged the troops to 'carry out action against roving groups, bands of individuals, who attempt to cause unrest or, as was stated by our representative to the Security Council, to act against disturbing elements, who either individually or collectively endanger public security or interfered with or prevent the supply of food and other essential commodities to the needy population.'

"The orders permit the continuation of the very type of military action that would be required against the guerrilla resistance likely to be offered by regular or irregular Republican forces (pars. 5 and 9 above).

"(C) As a result of the immobilization of its military observers the committee has no first-hand information as to the effect of the order discussed above.

"(D) The committee is of the opinion that these orders issued more than a week after the adoption of the resolution of December 24, and expressed as they were, cannot be looked upon as satisfactory compliance with subparagraph (A) of the resolution.

"(E) There is no channel available to the committee for dissemination of the resolution of December 24 to the Government or to the commanders of the Republican Army (par. 8 above). Subparagraph (b) of the Security Council's resolution of December 24, calling for the immediate release of the President of the Republic and other political prisoners, has not been implemented. So far as the committee is aware, President Sukarno, Vice President Hatta, and the other members of the Republican Government, who were captured by Netherlands forces on December 19, are still under detention."

Despite the statements to the Security Council by the Netherlands representative on December 27 and 29, the committee has not been in a position to make independent investigations of any kind in the field for the purpose of carrying out its functions under the resolution of December 24. It has been heard unofficially and informally that certain military and naval liaison officers attached to some of the consular officials in Batavia took advantage of a Netherlands offer to conduct them on a tour of some of the military areas on January 5–6. These officers are not the military observers of the Committee of Good Offices and their observations are not available to the committee, even if their tour was the type of field investigation and observation required by the functions of the committee.

The continuance of military action of the Netherlands authorities after the Security Council resolution of December 24 was clearly an act of defiance on the part of the Netherlands authorities. No excuses offered by the Dutch Government can conceal the fact that they have failed to comply with the Security Council demands, both in refusing to cease-fire immediately and in refusing to release the political prisoners immediately. In the opinion of the Government of the United States, the representative of the Netherlands has failed to relieve his Government from the serious charges that it has violated the Charter of the United Nations.

The purpose of the Security Council cease-fire order of December 24 was to stop the fighting in Indonesia immediately so that the dispute could be settled not by force, but by the processes of peaceful settlement enjoined by the Charter on member states.

Even though members of the Council were well aware that it was the Netherlands authorities which had initiated the resumption of military action, the resolution of the Security Council called on both parties to order a cease-fire. In such situations this is an appropriate form of Security Council resolution since the cessation must be mutual no matter who was responsible for starting the fighting.

It must be assumed therefore that in ordering a cease-fire, the Council could only have intended that such an order would apply equally and simultaneously to both sides. The Council could not have expected one side to comply unilaterally while the other considered itself free to comply at such a time and in such a way as it saw fit. The continuance of military action by the Netherlands forces until all military objectives have been taken cannot be regarded as compliance with the cease-fire order. Certainly the reservation of the right by one side to use its own forces in the territory of the other side to eliminate armed adherents of that side, which may so far have escaped destruction, cannot be regarded as compliance with the cease-fire order. Taking these factors into account, I am sure that the Security Council has no intention of approving action consolidating military victories which themselves were gained as a result of open defiance of an order of the Council.

Probably the most striking and clearest disregard of the orders of the Security Council is to be found in the refusal of the Dutch authorities to release President Sukarno and Prime Minister Hatta and the other leading officials of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia. Quite aside from the disregard of the Security Council's resolution of December 28, which required that these prisoners should be released within 24 hours, there is the present fact that these persons are still not at liberty. The Security Council cannot be expected to accept the view of the Netherlands Government that these prisoners have been released because they are given a certain liberty of movement on the Island of Banka. In an archipelago comprising thousands of islands, liberty of movement which is restricted to a single island, one which, I might add, was under Netherlands control even under the Renville truce agreement, cannot be regarded as being in conformity with the Council's resolutions of December 24 and 28. The clear intent of these resolutions was that the high officials of the Republican Government should be restored to a position in which they would be free to exercise their governmental authority. The minimum which would seem to be called for at this moment is that the President and other interned officers of the Republic should be allowed to return to their capitol and to exercise their appropriate functions there free from the constraint of any occupying army. They should be free to establish and maintain contact with other officials of their government. They should also be free to provide their own forces for maintenance of law and order in Jogjakarta.

Further, my government in considering the Netherlands-Indonesian dispute cannot but recall a history of noncooperation on the part of the Netherlands in the work of the Good Offices Committee in Indonesia.

The failure to achieve political settlement and the protracted negotiations which followed the signing of the Renville agreement in January 1948 brought about in Indonesia an increased tension between the Netherlands and the Republic with a consequent increase in provocative incidents which sorely strained the truce. The bill

of particulars for these actions has, over a period of months, been reported by the GOC to the Council. From these reports it appears that even prior to the resumption of military action against the Republic, the Netherlands pursued a policy which had the effect of weakening the Republic; working unnecessary hardship on the population; isolating the Republican Government economically and politically, and presenting it with a prefabricated interim administration for Indonesia with which it was to associate itself but which it had no part in forming. My government considers these actions and the Netherlands failure to enter into *bona fide* negotiations since May of last year to be indicative of a reluctance to utilize the procedure for pacific settlement made available by the United Nations, and to be in conflict with both the spirit and letter of the Linggadjati and Renville agreements.

From a purely pragmatic point of view it should be pointed out that the quick military successes of the Netherlands forces will not effect a solution of the Indonesian problem. The United States Government cannot associate itself with any aspect of the Netherlands military action. The use of force in this situation makes the solution of the problem far more complex and difficult. The problem remains a matter of international concern with which the Security Council must continue to deal. It cannot be solved if we begin on the basis of acceptance of the fruits of the illegal use of force.

The Republic of Indonesia represents the largest single political factor in the projected federation and should therefore have a voice in the formation of the federation. The Republic has a twofold nature. Firstly, it is a political entity and secondly, it is the heart of Indonesian nationalism. This latter attribute cannot be eliminated by any amount of military force. The Netherlands Government may find that far from assuring law and order in the Indies the action they have embarked upon may instead let loose forces of terror, chaos and sabotage. It may well be that the only victory will be that of the forces of anarchy.

My government is of the opinion that real peace in Indonesia can be expected only if there is a settlement of the political issues on the basis of the principles and procedures agreed to by the parties in the Linggadjati and Renville agreements and under the auspices of United Nations machinery.

The responsibility for the future rests in the first instance on the Netherlands authorities. The Security Council has a right to assume that the Netherlands Government will in accordance with its obligations bring to an end its defiance of the Security Council and give its full cooperation toward a fair and reasonable solution of the Indonesian question.

My Government has over a substantial period of time devoted serious thought to the problem and to its proper solution. Our views are contained in the plan which our representative on the Good Offices Committee submitted to the two parties on September 10 of last year and which was accepted by both of them as a basis for the resumption of negotiations. If Indonesian leaders were restored to their rightful position as the responsible representatives of the Republic of Indonesia, free to conduct the affairs of their Government and to negotiate freely with the Netherlands Government concerning the future of Indonesia, and if these two Governments could proceed to negotiate on the basis of this proposal in accordance with their earlier undertakings this would be a notable contribution to the ultimate solution of the Indonesian problem.

A first and fundamental step in this direction should be the fixing of a definite date for the holding of elections throughout all Indonesia with a view to establishing the foundations of the United States of Indonesia. Secondly, and also of fundamental importance, is the fixing of a firm date for the transfer of sovereignty from the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United States of Indonesia.

The elections should be for the purpose of choosing an assembly to represent the people of Indonesia as a provisional legislature and at the same time as a constituent assembly for the purpose of drawing up a constitution. The elections should be held by secret ballot with all the safeguards necessary to insure a vote free from any coercion. Freedom of assembly, speech, and publication must be guaranteed as provided in the Renville agreement. This program contemplates a termination of the type of military occupation of the country which has been brought about by Dutch military action. The withdrawal of the Dutch armies should commence at the earliest possible date and as rapidly as the need for the preservation of law and order permit. The occupation must be completely terminated before an effective transfer of sovereignty could take place.

My Government believes that the length of time which should elapse between the present and the date when elections should take place, and also the date of transfer of sovereignty, should be calculated in terms of months and not in terms of years. As soon as elections have been held and a provisional regime set up, authority should be turned over progressively to the new regime by the Netherlands Government, and the transfer should have been completed by the time when sovereignty is assumed by the United States of Indonesia.

As I have stated earlier, the problem of Indonesia remains a matter of international concern with which the Security Council must continue to deal. The carrying out of the steps necessary for the ultimate transfer of the sovereignty of the United States of Indonesia should, we believe, be accomplished under the auspices of the United Nations and with the help of the machinery it affords. The Good Offices Committee in its report of January 7 has appropriately pointed out that it does not wish to be put in a position of seeming to approve by its participation or even its authentication any settlement based on force rather than on true negotiation. The Good Offices Committee was created at the outset as an instrument to further free negotiations between the parties. The Dutch action has temporarily suspended the Committee's ability to carry out that function. But the Council's agencies in the field remain in existence ready to carry out any task assigned to them by the Security Council. No temporary suspension of the functioning of an agency of the Security Council can operate to remove an established interest of the United Nations in dealing with a situation to which the Security Council has already addressed itself. In this connection it is necessary to call attention to the report of the Good Offices Committee which indicates that the Netherlands authorities took upon themselves the authority to question whether the military observers were reporting to the Consular Commission or the Good Offices Committee. This is not a question which concerns the Netherlands authorities. The Security Council can utilize any agency which it considers appropriate, and it is the obligation of a member of the United Nations to cooperate with any and all agencies operating under Security Council instructions.

It cannot be denied that despite the efforts of some governments of states which are members of the Security Council, this body has not yet succeeded in overcoming the obstacles which have been placed in the path of achieving a peaceful settlement in Indonesia. The responsibility of the Netherlands Government for this lack of success has already been made clear. Another obstacle has been created by the action of a member of the United Nations which has in many parts of the world sought to obstruct the successful operation of the United Nations. I refer to the Soviet Union.

When this question of Indonesia was being discussed in the Security Council in Paris, the Soviet Union speaking both through its own representative and through the Ukrainian representative followed its familiar procedure of endeavoring to cloak its own improper actions by seeking to place the blame on someone else. The representative of the Soviet Union and the representative of the Ukraine both insinuated that the Government of the United States was in some way responsible for the action of the Netherlands in resorting to hostilities against the Indonesian Republic. It thus becomes necessary to point out again certain salient facts. In the first place, it was the Government of the United States which took the initiative in convening an urgent meeting of the Security Council when it became apparent that the Dutch were resorting to military action. It was the Soviet Government that prevented the Security Council from acting promptly by insisting that the Council meeting should be deferred for 3 days. Every other member of the Council attended the meeting on December 20 except the two Soviet representatives. The United States also took the initiative in conjunction with the representatives of Colombia and Syria in proposing a resolution to the Security Council to deal with the situation, but the Soviet representative refused to support this resolution. He later tried to cover up this further attempt to prevent the Security Council from acting by introducing a resolution of his own which he knew could not be adopted by the Council.

More fundamental, however, than these obstructionist tactics in the Security Council is the fact that the Soviet Union is fundamentally opposed to the government of the Republic of Indonesia and has itself through the Communist Party, which is, of course, its mouthpiece throughout the world, sought to undermine and overthrow this government. No one doubts that the Communists in Indonesia like the Communists throughout the world are responsive to and act in accordance with instructions from Moscow. The Communist revolt against the government of President Soekarno and Premier Hatta was thus an effort on the part of the Soviet Government to overthrow the Indonesian Republic. Furthermore, when the resumption of hostilities by the Netherlands Government against the Indonesian Republic took place, the official Communist line as printed in the Communist press instead of deploring this action, openly gloated that this action was a punishment for the government of President Soekarno and Premier Hatta who had successfully put down the Communist revolt. The Communist line, which I again repeat means the line of the Soviet Government, accused that distinguished statesman of the Indonesian Republic, Dr. Hatta, of being a traitor to his country. At the very time when editorials were appearing to this effect in the Communist Party organ in Paris, the Soviet representative on the Council sought to cover up the actual policy of his government by identifying himself with the Council's endeavors to ensure the release of Dr. Hatta and other political prisoners. These are the facts on the record which are known to the world and which reveal that the Soviet Government has no interest in supporting the government of the Indonesian Republic or of restoring peace to Indonesia. On the contrary, it is following its familiar tactics which it has used in Korea, in Greece, and Berlin,

and again now in Indonesia, and which have been described in the speeches of many delegates in the last session of the General Assembly, namely, seeking to overthrow a lawful democratic government and to undermine its authority. The Soviet Union does not want an independent Indonesia. It wants an Indonesia under the domination and control of a Communist minority taking its orders from Moscow. Anywhere in the world when a Communist government climbs in through the window, independence is kicked out of the door.

The Government of the United States on the contrary has viewed with admiration the efforts of the Indonesian people both in the Republic and elsewhere to gain their independence and has steadfastly sought to support them. It still takes that position and it is for this reason that it has taken the lead in endeavoring in the Security Council and in the Good Offices Committee to bring about a peaceful adjustment of the difficulties between the Indonesian Republic and the Netherlands Government and to establish the United States of Indonesia as one of the fully sovereign and independent peoples of the world.

---

IT'S 1776 IN INDONESIA

December 19, 1948, Holland invaded the Republic of Indonesia with a crushing, sneak attack like Japan's on Pearl Harbor, like Nazi Germany's on Holland itself.

The UN-negotiated Renville agreement was trampled. Solemn international discussions were used as cover-up for weeks of Dutch preparation.

Holland, home of Kris Kringle and good cheer, timed its murder for Christmas. World leaders were conveniently dispersed. The UN General Assembly had adjourned. So had the United States Congress.

In Indonesia itself, the Dutch first cut off the UN delegation's telegraph lines, then notified it. Elaborate deceptions kept republicans off guard.

Then the Dutch struck without mercy or honor, but with American-manufactured planes, tanks, guns.

The Netherlands lately and always has promised Indonesia independence in words, brutally suppressed it in fact.

THE RENVILLE AGREEMENT, JANUARY 17, 1948

Promise: Free plebiscites within 6 months to a year in areas claimed by both sides; a constituent convention; an all-Indonesia legislature; voluntary Dutch-Indonesia union. On February 3, 1948, Queen Wilhelmina broadcast to the world: "Colonialism is dead."

Deed: All-out invasion on December 19, 1948; complete sea blockade of republican trade for 2½ years, even on essential imports like medical supplies.

THE LINGGADJATI AGREEMENT, MARCH 1947

Promise: A sovereign United States of Indonesia by January 1949; guaranty of Indonesian rights in interim period; voluntary Dutch-Indonesian union.

Deed: All-out invasion on July 20, 1947, stopped short of complete destruction of the Republic only by Security Council cease-fire order; refusal to implement agreement because of reinterpretation; sea blockade.

POSTSURRENDER PERIOD, AUGUST 1945

Promise: Constitutional reform; new era.

Deed: Immediate mobilization of war-starved Dutch reservists for invasion service in Indonesia; dispatch of 120,000 troops over the next year or two.

QUEEN WILHELMINA'S WARTIME PLEDGE, DECEMBER 6, 1942

Promise: A postwar conference leading to "a commonwealth in which the Netherlands, Indonesia, Surinam, and Curaçao will participate."

Deed: Prewar refusal to train Indonesians militarily for their own defense; postwar use of armed force to restore Dutch power.

The direct Hitlerlike rupture of the Renville agreement is the most recent case in point.

Promise: The Renville agreement, January 17, 1948, reached through the UN Good Offices Committee, with especial United States encouragement, stipulated in particular; "10.) This agreement shall be considered binding unless one party notifies the Committee of Good Offices and the other party that it considers the truce regulations are not being observed by the other party and that this agreement should therefore be terminated."

In general, it provided a military truce and a set of 18 political principles as a basis for final settlement.

Deed: The Dutch notified the committee and the Republic of their December 19 invasion just as it began. Telegraph facilities of both were cut in advance, eliminating UN communications.

The Linggadjati agreement, March 1947, was likewise breached by a bloody, unheralded invasion during negotiations on its implementation.

Promise: After hysterical, false denunciation of the Republic as Japanese created, terror by Dutch forces and establishment of Dutch-controlled independent states outside the Republic had all failed to break it, the Dutch next tried negotiation.

The Linggadjati agreement, which resulted, guaranteed Indonesian freedom, with something like dominion status. It also provided an interim period during which a mixed Dutch-Indonesian administration would prepare for the transfer of power. Furthermore, it gave formal Dutch recognition of the Republic as the de facto authority in Java, Sumatra, and Madura, the three main islands.

Deed: The agreement reached was 90 percent Dutch, but the Republic accepted it to facilitate a quick settlement. This was in June 1946. Republicans were assured Dutch ratification was a matter of a few days or weeks. Actually, it was March 1947 before Dutch signatures were affixed. The intervening months were occupied with Dutch obstruction and attempts to force new proposals on the Republic.

Both before and after signing, Holland repeatedly ignored the agreement, occupying major republican cities, bringing in 120,000 troops, 30,000 more than previously agreed. Dutch interpretations of their commitments were so extensive that even after the signing, implementation was impossible. Negotiation continued.

At midnight July 20, 1947, while republican leaders awaited reply to their latest formal communication, they were abruptly notified of suspension of the agreement. Simultaneously, full-scale war was launched. It ended only when the Security Council issued a cease-fire order some days later.

By that time, Holland had what it wanted most, the richest producing areas of the Republic.

Before, during, and just after the war, Holland volubly promised freedom, belied itself in action.

Promise: The famous Visman report of 1941 supposedly laid the technical base for it; Queen Wilhelmina's speech of December 1942, pledged it; Dutch utterances just after the surrender of Japan seemed to assume it.

Deed: The Visman report provided excuse for years of delay, while being made; Dutch administration and weakness left Indonesia defenseless before Japan. After the war, Holland left no effort undone to thwart, then destroy the universal vehicle of Indonesian independence—the Republic.

These infamies against 70,000,000 peaceful, long-suffering Indonesians—and against the United Nations—spring inevitably from the faithless Dutch repression of 3 centuries.

Dutch double talk notwithstanding, the cornerstone of all democracy, universal literacy, was effectively prevented. Funds were never assigned, teachers never developed for mass education. Pleading poverty in the world's richest colony, Dutchmen developed only specialized schools for Indonesian aristocrats' sons and daughters, who learned obedience along with their three R's and in higher education.

Mass organizations were unceasingly harassed. Nationalist leaders, including those who head the Republic today and many others who did not survive, were exiled for years at a time to remote swamps and jungles, often killed.

A nominal People's Council or Volksraad before the war was subject to the veto of both Governor General and the Dutch Parliament. Even then a high proportion of its members were appointed, not elected. And on top of that, those elected were chosen by a system of suffrage so indirect as to be meaningless.

Brutality like that of the Nazis at Lidice was meted out when the cup of slavery ran over and an uprising occurred. In 1926 whole districts of villages in Java were burned to the ground, the inhabitants murdered by fully equipped Dutch troops. In 1947 some 30,000 Indonesians were massacred in Macassar, Celebes.

Under its masquerade of paternalistic colonizer, Holland's program was extremely simple—self-enrichment.

Indonesia was a vast treasure house and workshop where 70,000,000 lived at subsistence level, their output streaming to the profit of a minority in Holland's 9,500,000 population: 15 percent of Holland's national income; $200,000,000 per year in straight profits (which made up annual Dutch foreign exchange deficit); $4,000,000,000 invested Dutch capital in Indonesia; the average income of a family of five Indonesians was 15 to 30 cents per day; 400,000 Dutch persons possessing a vested interest in Indonesia as a colony; complete Dutch monopoly of Indonesian trade, excluding the United States and others.

---

QUESTIONS

1. Is our State Department engaged in international double talk?

2. Will the Dutch withdraw from the Atlantic Alliance? And what difference will it make if they do? And where will they go?

3. By our continuing to support the Dutch, are we not throwing all of Asia to Moscow

4. If the Dutch have $4,000,000,000 in assets in Indonesia and are shutting out American business, why are we financing the Dutch at the rate of $500,000,000 a year?

5. Why has the President and the State Department attempted to kill the proposed Senate resolution?

6. Has the State Department been telling the Dutch to go ahead—privately, of course?

7. How long do we propose to pour American money into countries whose governments take actions that create the exact opposite of what our policy intends to accomplish?

8. Do we intend to support nineteenth century Dutch-British-French imperialism in Asia which will create a climate for the growth of communism? Or do we intend to support the moderate republican nationalists throughout Asia?

9. Does the United States intend to uphold the UN or not?

10. Does the Senate intend to take dictation from the executive department on all foreign-policy matters? Has the Senate relinquished its right to ask questions regarding our foreign spending policy?

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS—AMENDMENT OF SENATE RULE

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and myself, I submit for appropriate reference a resolution to amend the Senate rule by creating a standing committee on small business.

The resolution (S. Res. 58) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That section (1) of Rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(p) (1) The Committee on Small Business, to consist of 13 Senators, to which shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the problems of American small business enterprises.

"(2) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research all the problems of American small business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation.

"(3) The provisions of section (4) of this rule shall not be applicable with respect to membership on such committee."

Mr. WHERRY subsequently said: Mr. President, I should like to have the RECORD show that I have been permitted to join with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] in the resolution asking to set up a business committee as a permanent standing committee of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am very happy to have it so appear.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

INVESTIGATION OF SHORTAGES IN ALUMINUM AND ALUMINUM CONDUCTOR

Mr. BUTLER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 59), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Whereas there exists in the United States a serious shortage of aluminum conductor; and

Whereas such shortage is seriously hampering extension of rural electrification; and

Whereas it appears that the rural electrification program may not be receiving its fair share of the supply of aluminum conductor available; and

Whereas there is further an over-all shortage of virgin aluminum metal; and

Whereas it appears that much of the available metal is being used for nonessential purposes; and

Whereas the full facts with respect to the shortage of aluminum and aluminum conductor have not been made available to the general public, nor has any effective action been taken by any Federal bureau or agency to alleviate the disastrous results of the shortage: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of the causes of the existing shortage in the supply of aluminum and aluminum conductor, and of the effects of such shortages in hampering the extension of rural electrification, and the committee is further authorized to recommend a course of action to be taken by the Congress or the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of fostering the rapid extension of rural electrification. The committee, or a duly authorized subcommittee, shall include within the scope of such study and investigation a consideration of (1) the possibility of securing for the extension of rural electrification a large proportion of the available output of aluminum conductor; (2) the possibility of securing for the manufacture of conductor and other electrical equipment a larger proportion of the available supply of aluminum material; (3) the possibility of securing additional power for the manufacture of an increased quantity of aluminum; (4) the possibility of securing increased imports for a temporary period from Canada or other foreign countries; (5) the possibility of curtailing shipments of aluminum to Europe without hampering the program of the European Cooperation Administration so as to make larger supplies available for use in this country for extension of rural electrification.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practical date the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF ARMY RESERVE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 60), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration, plans, policies, and status of the Army Reserve and the administration of the Army Reserve program by the Department of the Army and the United States Army.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem advisable.

INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF THE AIR FORCE RESERVE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 61), which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the administration, plans, policies, and status of the Air Force Reserve and the administration of the Air Force Reserve program by the Department of the Air Force and the United States Air Force.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its investigation together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable.

INVESTIGATION OF DOMESTIC LAND AND WATER TRANSPORTATION CONDITIONS

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. MYERS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 62), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of all domestic land and water transportation to determine:

A. Whether existing conditions conform to the national transportation policy as declared in the Interstate Commerce Act; and

B. The effect of large expenditures of public moneys and private capital upon transportation charges and to what extent such expenditures are reflected in costs of production and prices to consumers; and

C. Generally to consider and make legislative recommendations to the Congress as to all other matters and things necessary in its judgment in meeting the purposes of the studies herein specifically set forth and the general public interest.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the service, information, and facilities of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $ , shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN MATTERS RELATING TO RADIO, TELEGRAPH, AND TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. TOBEY) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 63), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to radio, telegraph and telephone communications including (a) the problems relating to American common carriers operating in the domestic and international fields, including the relationship of these problems to the national security of the United States; (b) the problems presented by requirements of international treaties and conventions in relation to such revisions as may be necessary to the Communications Act of 1934; (c) the problems arising from unprecedented demands for frequencies for such communication services as television; safety and special services, including aviation, railroads, busses, trucks, taxicabs; common-carrier uses; and industrial uses; and the policies which the Congress should adopt for the granting of such allocations; (d) the manner in which the Federal Communications Commission exercises its licensing authority with respect to radio applications; (e) the extent to which the Federal Communications Commission examines the qualifications of applicants for licenses or renewals of licenses in order to determine that only qualified persons are licensed to operate radio stations or other licensed facilities; (f) the extent to which the Federal Communications Commission examines the operation or proposed operation of radio stations in order to assure that such stations have been or will be operated in the public interest; (g) and generally to consider and make legislative recommendations to the Congress as to all other matters and things necessary in its judgment in meeting the purposes of the studies herein specifically set forth and the general public interest.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such

hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The Committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the service, information, and facilities of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $15,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF FISHING RESOURCES

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 64), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters pertaining to the fishing resources of the United States as it may deem proper.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date but not later than March 15, 1950.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, and is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

INVESTIGATION OF PANAMA CANAL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 65), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof is authorized to make a full and complete study and investigation of the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally.

Such study and investigation shall include (1) a review of the operations of the Panama Canal for the purpose of ascertaining what, if any, additional facilities or improvements are needed to provide safe and speedy transit for vessels;

(2) Consideration of the matter of tolls levied for the use of the Panama Canal;

(3) Consideration of the construction, ownership, maintenance, operation, and defense of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans adequate to meet the future needs of interoceanic commerce and the national defense.

SEC. 2. The committee shall report its findings, and recommend such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized, during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congres, (1) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable, (2) to perform such travel, and to authorize such travel by such assistants as it deems advisable, and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, factilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

LABOR DISPUTES BURDENING OR OBSTRUCTING INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. MUNDT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORT ON THE IMPROVEMENT AT ALBENI FALLS ON PEND OREILLE RIVER, IDAHO (S. DOC. NO. 9)

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated November 29, 1948, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the report on the improvement at Albeni Falls on Pend Oreille River, Idaho, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE HEARING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the Committee on Foreign Relations to hold hearings in the afternoons as well as in the mornings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MEDICAL CARE OF PERSONS NOT ORDINARILY INSURABLE—LETTER FROM DR. PAUL R. HAWLEY

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have been in correspondence with Dr. Paul R. Hawley, chief executive officer of the Blue Cross, whose address is Associated Medical Care Plans, 330 South Wells Street, Chicago 6, Ill. As the Senate knows, he is one of our foremost medical statesmen, having been the chief medical officer for the European theater operations during the war and the chief medical officer of the Veterans' Administration.

I asked him in a recent letter what could be done to help a man with chronic heart disease whose condition could not be insured under sound insurance principles. I inquired whether help could not be given to such a man by having the Government assist him in making available expensive medicines and X-ray. I received a reply which I think is so interesting and constructive that I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

The Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: In reply to your question about the medical care of people who are not insurable by agencies operating upon sound insurance principles, there is a way, other than open public charity, by which they can be provided with essential medical care. This is by issuing such persons Blue Cross and Blue Shield cards which entitle them to exactly the same benefits as regular subscribers to Blue Cross and Blue Shield.

The financing of the protection of such people, however, differs from that of regular subscribers in that no subscriptions, or premiums, are paid for such cards. Instead, when in need of medical care, such people apply to a physician or hospital with their cards, the care is given exactly as to a regular subscriber, the Blue Cross and/or Blue Shield plan is billed for such care, and the bill is paid by the plan. Then the plan bills the proper welfare agency for reimbursement of the exact amount of the bill plus a very small percent to cover the actual cost of administration of the transaction.

Such an arrangement has been tried in one or two areas, and has proved most satisfactory to all parties concerned. First, it conceals all outward evidence of charity. The medically indigent person holds the same kind of Blue Cross or Blue Shield card that paying subscribers hold. He gets exactly the same service—in semiprivate or even private accommodations in the hospital, instead of charity ward, if the welfare agency so desires.

Second, the cost of Blue Cross administration is far below that of government administration; and the administrative overhead of such a program would be less than if the government—local, State or Federal—undertook to operate a similar plan. Furthermore, the wider the application of this principle, the lower the per capita administrative cost would be. While I cannot commit any Blue Cross or Blue Shield plan to any course of action, I have reason to believe that most of these plans would write off a considerable part of the administrative cost as their contribution to a public service.

As to the financing of such a program, there seems to me to be no good reason why the Federal Government should not offer subsidies to States, somewhat as provided in the Taft bill of the last session. This would permit low-income States to offer the same program as the wealthier. And the cost of such subsidies should be very, very much less than the amount from its general revenues that the Federal Government would be forced to put into the Ewing program.

The objection may be raised that neither Blue Cross nor Blue Shield offer a complete medical-care program, including all home and office calls, spectacles, artificial limbs, false teeth, wigs, and other such appurtenances, the provision of which appears to threaten the solvency of the present British scheme. My reply to such an objection would be that both Blue Cross and Blue Shield recognize that their present benefits are, in certain areas, not as broad as they should be; and you may expect both organizations to extend their benefits as rapidly as actuarial experience justifies. Both Commissions are committed to extend coverage to the limit of financial stability of plans.

One cannot escape the fact that no plan for the prepayment of medical and hospital care, which is operated upon insurance principles, can survive 1 month if it pays $1.01

in benefits for each dollar of income. Mr. Ewing's plan would have to be subsidized heavily from the general revenues of the Federal Government. He probably will not agree with me, but my own investigation of the problem has convinced me that the income from his suggested pay-roll deductions will cover less than 40 percent of the cost of his program—even when such deductions reach his suggested maximum—and that general taxation must furnish more than 60 percent of the cost. I find some confirmation of my figures in the estimates, not published for obvious reasons, of an agency supporting compulsory health insurance that such a program as Mr. Ewing's would, if supported by contributions of the insured, require pay-roll deductions of at least 12 percent.

Let no one be deceived that Mr. Ewing's plan is, as he categorically states in the Nation's Health that it is, "a thoroughly American system, resting upon insurance principles which have been part of our national fabric for generations." The only kind of insurance that has been part of our national fabric for generations is insurance resting upon the two principles that the premium charged bears a direct relationship to the risk involved, rather than to the income of the insured, and that the premiums collected are adequate both for the payment of losses and for the administration of the business. Certain proponents of compulsory health insurance have advised me that Mr. Ewing's plan is not intended to be "regular insurance" but "social insurance," which operates upon very different—and apparently very weird—principles. My reply is that "social insurance" has not been part of our national fabric for generations, and that the only insurance that has is the regular insurance with which we are all familiar.

The press reports that Mr. Kingsley was very upset by my statement to you that the Nation's Health was, for the most part, a book of truth; but that its truths were interlarded with palpable untruths. If the foregoing quotation from the Nation's Health is not an untruth, we must now redefine "truth" as well as "insurance principles."

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

PAUL R. HAWLEY, M. D.,
*Chief Executive Officer, Blue Cross-Blue Shield Commissions.*

GENERAL PICK'S PROMOTION—EDITORIAL FROM THE OMAHA (NEBR.) EVENING WORLD-HERALD

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "General Pick's Promotion," published in the February 1, 1949, issue of the Omaha (Nebr.) Evening World-Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL PICK'S PROMOTION

The people of the Missouri Valley will receive the nomination of Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick to be Chief of Engineers with mixed feelings.

Naturally, they will regret to see the general go. Since he came into the valley, a stranger, and fired the imagination of the people with his magnificent conception of river development, they have adopted him as their own. They will regret, too, that he cannot stay on as Missouri River Division Engineer, to carry forward the gigantic projects he initiated.

But they will be pleased to see the general honored by promotion to the Army's top engineering job—a particularly unusual promotion since he is no West Pointer.

And they will know that in Washington the general will keep a friendly eye on the great development of the Missouri Valley, now well under way. More than that, all of the country now will have the benefit of his soaring imagination, his uncommon ability to inspire others, his organizational and executive talents, and his engineering skill.

Mr. Truman made a very fine choice.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOSEPH W. KEHOE TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 2, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 15, 1949, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Joseph W. Kehoe, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 2, district of Alaska. Judge Kehoe is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired December 7, 1948. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ANTHONY J. DIMOND TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 3, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, February 11, 1949, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, district of Alaska. Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948. At the indicated time and place, all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman; the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

TVA AND THE GOVERNMENT POWER PROGRAM — ADDRESS BY SENATOR KEFAUVER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "TVA and the Government Power Program," recently delivered by him before the seventh annual meeting of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association at the Commodore Hotel, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF GEORGE J. BURGER BEFORE THE TRADE POLICIES SUBCOMMITTEE OF SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement made on December 6, 1948, by George J. Burger, director in charge, Washington office, National Federation of Small Business, before the Trade Policies Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROBLEMS AND PAY OF STATE LEGISLATORS — ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the problems and pay of State legislators, written by Richard L. Neuberger, and published in This Week magazine of January 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HOLLAND TO THE BALTIMORE REAL ESTATE BOARD

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator HOLLAND on February 5, 1949, before the members of the Real Estate Board of Baltimore, Md., at their thirty-third annual banquet, which appears in the Appendix.]

INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY GOV. ADLAI E. STEVENSON, OF ILLINOIS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the inaugural address delivered by Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson, of Illinois, before a joint session of the General Assembly of Illinois at Springfield, on January 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONDITIONS IN CHINA—STATEMENT BY SENATOR McCARRAN

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Senator McCARRAN regarding conditions in China which appears in the Appendix.]

RADIO REPORTS BY SENATOR CAIN ON THE TVA AND THE PROPOSED CVA

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD reports recently made by him over the radio to citizens of the State of Washington regarding the Tennessee Valley Authority and the proposed Columbia Valley Authority, which appear in the Appendix.]

EDWARD W. ALLEN, "FISHERIES STATESMAN"—ARTICLE BY VICTOR B. WESTPHAL

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Fisheries Statesman," relating to Edward W. Allen, member of the International Fisheries Commission, written by Victor B. Westphal, and published in the Seattle Times of January 30, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—STATEMENT BY REV. DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, AND EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate, and an editorial from the New York Times of February 6, 1949, dealing with the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, which appear in the Appendix.]

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD telegrams received by him in protest of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary and the text of the sermon of Cardinal Spellman of New York on February 6, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPORT ON NITROGENOUS FERTILIZER

[Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report by John Pillsbury, staff member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations on the subject of nitrogenous fertilizer, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release by his office concerning an amendment submitted by him and Senator HOLLAND relative to the national school lunch appropriation, which appears in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL DENTAL CARE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release from his office relative to a bill introduced today by himself, Senator MURRAY and Senator AIKEN to provide Federal assistance to the States in developing and maintaining dental health programs, which appears in the Appendix.]

BOOTLEGGING MENACE SPREADS—ARTICLE FROM THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bootlegging Menace Spreads," written by Roscoe Drummond and published in the Christian Science Monitor of February 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL ACTIVITIES—ARTICLE FROM THE HANOVER COLLEGE BULLETIN

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Camel's Nose," dealing with the subject of extension of Federal activities, published in the February 1949 issue of the Bulletin of Hanover College, Hanover, Ind., which appears in the Appendix.]

E PLURIBUS UNUM—ARTICLE BY JESSE B. HORNUNG

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the motto of the United States of America, E Pluribus Unum, by Jesse B. Hornung, published in the February 1946 issue of the Reminder of Our National Heritage, which appears in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR RURAL ROADS

[Mr. STENNIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him relative to Senate bill 244, together with a copy of the bill, which appear in the Appendix.]

PRESERVATION OF WOODLAWN ESTATE AS HISTORICAL SHRINE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by him relative to the preservation as an historical shrine of the Woodlawn estate on the Potomac River, which appears in the Appendix.]

PORTRAIT OF BENITO JUAREZ—ARTICLE FROM THE ALBUQUERQUE TRIBUNE

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Albuquerque Journal entitled "Benito Juarez," together with a biography of Benito Juarez, which appear in the Appendix.]

THE TWO VOICES OF SOVIET RUSSIAN POLICY—LETTER BY JULIUS EPSTEIN

[Mr. MUNDT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dealing with Soviet Russian policy, written by Julius Epstein, and published in the New York Sun of January 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution to create a Senate special small-business committee, to be composed of 12 Members of the Senate, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution, Senate Resolution 55, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a special committee to be composed of 12 Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study, by means of research and investigation, of the existing or future problems of American independent small business, including but not limited to the following problems:

(1) Supply and distribution of basic industrial materials with particular reference to whether or not independent small business is obtaining its fair share of such materials under existing or future distribution methods and patterns.

(2) Policies of Federal Government departments, agencies, and corporations with respect to inclusion of independent small business in their present programs and future planning with particular reference to the procurement activities of such departments, agencies, and corporations.

(3) Prices charged for materials needed and utilized by independent small business to determine whether they are fair and equitable in relation to prices charged their larger competitors.

(4) Pressures of vertically and horizontally integrated combinations to eliminate independent small business in the American industrial distributive system.

(5) Inability of both new and old independent small business to adequately finance itself from its own earnings due to tax structure and effect of such tax structure on the merger movement.

(6) Participation of independent American small business in foreign-aid programs and adequacy of representation of independent American small business by diplomatic and consular officials abroad.

(7) Development of program to adequately insure independent small business a fair share of raw and finished materials and services produced on and from publicly owned mineral resources, forest reserves, and irrigation and reclamation projects.

(8) Development of a sound program to safeguard the place of independent small business in the American economy.

The committee shall begin its study as soon as practicable and shall continue and prosecute such study expeditiously and with all possible dispatch and shall report to the Senate as soon as practicable with recommendations for legislation.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate during the Eighty-first Congress, to employ such experts and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to request such information from any departments and agencies of the Government, to require by supena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report the educational material and data on such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per 100 words. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any properly designated chairman of a subcommittee thereof, or any member designated by either of such chairmen, and may be served by any person designated by the person over whose signature the particular subpena is issued. The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. To what standing committee has the resolution been referred?

The VICE PRESIDENT. To the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair, and I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the appeal debatable at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator as to the reasons for his appeal. Before he proceeds, the Chair would like to make this comment on the reference of his resolution:

The Committee on Rules and Administration, with respect to the contingent fund of the Senate, is not a legislative committee. It is not a substantive committee for the consideration of resolutions providing for investigations. Therefore the Committee on Banking and Currency, which would otherwise have jurisdiction of the matters involved in the question of small business, is the appropriate legislative committee to which it should be referred. That is the reason for the reference by the Chair.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator will withhold his discussion until we dispose of concurrent and other resolutions in the morning hour.

Mr. WHERRY. If I do so, it will be some time before we finish consideration of the appeal. As I read the Reorganization Act, it is now in order to debate the appeal. I should like to present my observations as to why I feel this resolution should go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield. The Chair will state to the Senator that if he wishes to withhold his remarks for the accommodation of other Senators, until concurrent and other resolutions can be disposed of in the morning hour, the Chair will recognize him then to speak upon the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. When I was seeking recognition I was about to ask the distinguished Presiding Officer if I might be recognized after the other matters were disposed of under the pending order of business, so I will not at this time present my observations on the appeal,

but will hold whatever right I may have so far as the floor is concerned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is entitled to recognition now; but for the accommodation of other Senators he may withhold his remarks.

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

ARREST AND TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and myself, I submit a resolution, and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate condemns as unjust the arrest, confinement incommunicado, and trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the resolution.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I shall be forced to object. I am as much in favor of that resolution as anyone could be, but I have been forced to follow the rule. I think that if we are to lay down rules, we should follow them, so I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard.

The resolution will lie over under the rule.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Is it appropriate at this time to submit an amendment to a resolution which I previously introduced on January 5?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ordinarily, unanimous consent is required.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish for a moment to vary from the rule. If unanimous consent is required, I shall wait until an appropriate time for offering an amendment to the resolution.

Will the Chair inform me when it will be appropriate to offer an amendment to the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The offering of amendments to resolutions or bills which have previously been submitted or introduced falls under no particular category of the morning business. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Oregon when the morning business is concluded, to permit him to submit amendments to his resolution.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify Senate Resolution 12, on page 2, line 11, to strike out "two hours" and insert "one hour", and that the resolution be reprinted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. WHERRY'S appeal from the decision of the Chair referring Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, we are now debating the appeal taken from the decision of the Chair. Am I correct in my understanding that we are not operating under the 5-minute rule, but that we can debate this matter as long as we wish to do so?

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no 5-minute limitation on debate on an appeal from a decision of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. Even though it arises during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. The resolution submitted by the junior Senator from Florida immediately prior to the submission of the resolution just referred to would call for the creation of a Senate Small Business Committee as a standing committee. My question is, To what committee was that resolution referred?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT subsequently said: The Chair wishes to make a correction in the statement which he made a while ago regarding reference of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. The Chair stated that the resolution would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, but the Chair was mistaken, because the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida proposes a permanent amendment in the rules of the Senate, and therefore must go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is my opinion that the Committee on Rules and Administration is the standing committee of the Senate which should consider the resolution which I have already submitted, and also that it is the committee which should consider the resolution previously submitted by the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Since the Congress convened I have been contacted by businessmen throughout the country asking that I lend every possible assistance to securing an extension of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business. I wish the RECORD to show that I have done, and will do, everything possible to see to it that such a committee is provided for so that the work of the Special Committee on Small Business may be continued.

Recently the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] submitted a similar resolution. It was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. That committee has not seen fit to report it to the Senate calendar. In fact, it is my understanding that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee voted favorably regarding the creation of a Small Business Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, which of course they have a perfect right to do. But as of this date, the Banking and Currency Committee has not taken favorable action on the so-called Murray resolution providing for the extension of the Special Committee on Small Business.

It is my feeling that the Senate of the United States should not delay longer in creating a new committee or extending the old Special Committee on Small Business. I also wish the RECORD to show that I am in favor of the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana; and if it is reported favorably by the Banking and Currency Committee, I shall support it not only with my vote, but with any observation I can make in the interest of continuing the Special Committee on Small Business.

So strongly do I feel that the work of the Senate Special Committee on Small Business should continue that I believe the time has come when a resolution so providing should be presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I contend has proper jurisdiction of the matter. It is my hope that the members of that committee will look with favor upon the proposal for the creation of a new or the extension of the old Special Committee on Small Business, and will report the resolution favorably, at an early date, for Senate consideration.

It is for that reason that it becomes necessary for me to make an appeal from the decision of the Chair. The Chair has ruled that the resolution should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, but my appeal is that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, because it is my opinion that if the resolution goes to the Banking and Currency Committee, it will meet the same fate as that of the so-called Murray resolution which now is before that committee.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WHERRY. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded these remarks, and then I shall be very glad to yield.

Mr. President, it is with regret that the first action I take as minority leader is in opposition to the former majority leader of the Senate, who now is the distinguished Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate. So it is with profound regret that I have taken the appeal from the decision the Chair has just made. But I feel so strongly that the Committee on Rules and Administration should be the standing committee of the Senate to consider the resolution that, notwithstanding my affection for the President of the United States Senate and my respect for his opinion and judgment and for the decision he has made, I am forced to disagree with the Chair's decision and to appeal from it.

I may say to the Members of the Senate that there is a precedent for referring to the Committee on Rules and Administration the resolution creating a Special

Committee on Small Business. In the Eightieth Congress, Senate Resolution No. 20, a resolution creating a Special Committee on Small Business, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, at my request, without opposition, and was reported favorably by that committee, and was adopted by the Senate. So there is a precedent. Therefore what I ask today is not unusual. What I ask is not in contradiction of what the Senate has done on prior occasions in respect to an exact duplicate of this resolution, in which case the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I prefer not to yield until I have concluded my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration is the proper committee to which such a resolution should be referred. If this were a resolution providing for changing the rules of the Senate, as is being attempted, apparently, by the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida, which calls for the creation of a new standing committee, in my opinion the resolution would be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration without question. I think there can be no doubt as to that. The special committee authorized by the resolution just submitted by me is in fact a committee of such broad authority that only its lack of legislative power and continuity from Congress to Congress makes it different from one of the standing committees of the Senate. Therefore, it naturally follows that such a resolution falls more nearly under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration than under the jurisdiction of any other of the standing committees of the Senate.

There appears to be some misunderstanding or confusion regarding the terms of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Some persons have said, and have told me, and some Members of the Senate have said, that special committees are prohibited by that act. Mr. President, that simply is not so; such a prohibition is not to be found among the provision of that act. When the legislative reorganization bill passed the Senate, it contained a provision prohibiting the creation of special or select committees. I say it contained that provision when it passed the Senate; but many of us, including the junior Senator from Nebraska went along with such a provision in order to get the entire act passed because of the fact that time was running out. It will be remembered that when consideration was given to the bill on the floor of the Senate, time was running out, and we took the bill as the Senate passed it, with that provision included. But section 101, subsection (b) gives full right to the Senate to change its own rules, one of which recognizes the committee-forming power of the Senate. However, when the bill went to the House, the provision prohibiting the continuation or creation of special or select committees was stricken from the measure. In conference, the House insisted on its amendment. The House amendment provides for the creation of such committees.

One of the authors of the bill, former Senator La Follette, of Wisconsin, seated where the Senator from Kansas is now seated, voted to accept the House version of the bill, and in this form it was enacted into law. Therefore, from a legal standpoint there is no prohibition against the creation of a special committee either by Senate resolution, or by joint resolution, or by an act of the Congress itself.

That is the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. I supported that act. I voted for its passage, and I did it with that full understanding. At that time I was a member of this special committee, and even though when the Senate passed the bill I voted for the provision against the creation of special committees, yet when the conference report came back it pleased me very much, and the bill passed the Senate by adopting the conference report, which did not prohibit the creation of special committees. Indeed, this is amply evidenced by the creation or the continuance of many joint committees by this body, such as the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations, the Joint Committee on Housing, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, which were created in 1948. The fact that these committees have been created by an act of Congress or by a joint resolution rather than by Senate resolution in no way changes their status.

Distinguished Members of the Senate have told me they recognize it is not a violation. One of our best constitutional lawyers tells me it is not a violation of the provisions of the Reorganization Act. Some of those who oppose special committees say, "No, their creation does not violate the law, but does violate the spirit of the act." Certainly Senators who feel that way will agree with me that the joint resolutions and acts of Congress creating the various special joint committees I have enumerated have been passed by their votes, and they have not moved to abolish those committees since they were created. So if those who oppose this resolution on the theory that it violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act continue to appropriate money and to set up special joint committees as they have done, then they are doing exactly what is sought by the resolution I have offered and asked to have referred to the Rules and Administration Committee. There is no difference. The legal status is the same. There is no violation of the spirit of the act; if one is right, so is the other. If we continue to create such committees, if we continue them in existence, if we continue to appropriate for them, we are doing nothing more, there, than I am asking the Senate to do, in this instance. It involves neither a violation of the act itself nor a violation of the spirit of the act.

There is no reason to dwell upon this, for it is my strong conviction that neither the creation of those joint committees nor the creation of the special committee sought by the resolution violates the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

The reason for the passage of the Reorganization Act, as I understand, was to simplify the operation of Congress, and with that I am in total agreement. The original provision contained in the Senate version of the act prohibiting the creation of special committees was designed to prevent creation of special committees when a standing committee had jurisdiction of the subject matter. That was the principal argument used. It was said "Here is a standing committee which has jurisdiction. Therefore, a special committee that assumes the same jurisdiction, duplicates the work." I can remember the arguments so ably presented by the then Senator from Wisconsin. He certainly made a convincing argument on that basis, and that was one of the reasons given, if I recall correctly.

When the Reorganization Act went into effect, the Senate had, I believe, 33 committees. We reduced the number to 15 standing committees. The reason the then Senator from Wisconsin continued to argue in support of the Reorganization Act and against special committees was the fact that many such committees had exceeded the jurisdiction confided to legislative committees. It was a sound argument. But that is not the situation here. The committee proposed by this resolution covers such a wide range of problems, both specifically and generally, that it reaches into the jurisdiction of nearly every standing committee of the Senate. I am sure all Senators will agree with my statement if they will read the record, and review the activities of this committee for 6 years, first under the able leadership of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and during the past 2 years under the leadership of the junior Senator from Nebraska. If they will review the record, if they will read the reports, if they will be fair in their estimates and judgments, they cannot refrain from saying that the work the committee does cuts across the work of each and every standing committee of the Senate.

Obviously any special committee to investigate the problems of American small business must have broad authority to explore all its problems, else such committee would be of little if any value to the independent-business men of America. But this broad authority permits research, investigations, and recommendations only. All recommendations for legislation by the special committee will in turn be considered by standing committees having jurisdiction over the particular subject matter. We have abided by that. The Small Business Committee has not attempted in any way to assume legislative authority in the enactment of legislation. We have time and time again pointed out on the floor of the Senate legislation that, after consideration by the legislative committee, should be proposed. That is its purpose. This makes the special Senate Committee To Study the Problems of America Small Business a valuable adjunct to the work

of the Senate and of its standing committees. It does not duplicate, it does not take away from the work of any standing committee. Instead, it supplements that work by pinpointing the problems of small business and calling them to the attention of the proper standing committee for inclusion in its over-all consideration. That has been its purpose. That has been the thing we have attempted to do. We have kept the faith within the provisions of the act. Certainly, Mr. President, this is in accord with the spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act and is not violative of it in any manner.

The resolution just offered authorizes the creation of a special Senate Small Business Committee composed of 12 Senators. The committee is authorized and directed to study by means of research and investigation the existing and future problems of American independent small business. While the resolution specifies certain problems important to the continuation of a healthy, independent small business, the committee is not limited to the investigation of such specific problems.

Here is the first problem which the committee is directed to study. Let me quote this particular provision:

> Supply and distribution of basic industrial materials with particular reference to whether independent small business is obtaining its fair share of such materials under existing or future distribution methods and patterns.

That is the first provision of the resolution and it covers supply and distribution. The Senate and the House can go a long way in their study of the supply and distribution problems of small business, but unless they are corrected the small-business man will go out of the picture. There can be no doubt about that.

I want the Members of the Senate to know, as one who has worked on this problem—I think I have given 75 percent of my committee time to the work of the Small Business Committee—that thousands of applications have come to me from men who are depending upon this committee. The question of whether they will continue as future small-business men will depend upon the help and the aid that such a committee can give them in the Senate and in the House.

The time has come when, if we are to protect the corner grocery store, the family doctor, and the banker in small communities, they must have a proper distribution of materials. They do not have anyone representing them in legislative bodies at this time.

So, Mr. President, the first provision of the resolution is one to which each Member should give consideration, because of the observation which I am about to make. Nothing can be more important than is this problem. Industrial materials are the food for the manufacturing industry. Cutting off the supply of industrial materials or inequitably distributing them results in business mortality, just as surely as starving a human being would bring about his death. One is as important as the other. The smaller the businessman the easier it is to put him out of business by cutting off his materials and his supplies. It is like the very food which is required to supply the human body.

This is a study which might fall within the jurisdiction of one of three committees. This first provision might fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or the Committee on Banking and Currency. But from the standpoint of the small-business man's problems in this connection, a special committee studying the particular needs could go into the question more thoroughly and then recommend appropriate legislation.

The second problem to be studied and investigated is very important. The President of the Senate has been across the water and knows something regarding procurement for the agencies, departments, and corporations. There should be a study of the policies of Federal Government departments, agencies, and corporations with respect to the inclusion of independent small business in their present procurement and future planning, with particular reference to the procurement activities of such departments, agencies, and corporations.

Mr. President, there exists a vast Federal bureaucracy. That word is used by me merely as one of description. Many of these bureaucracies have within them offices through which small business is supposed to be aided. I can think of two or three of them at this time. Moreover, the Federal Government, directly and indirectly, is today one of the largest, if not the largest, purchaser of commodities in the world. I think it is the largest purchaser. It is important to determine whether small business is being adequately and equitably treated by those agencies and whether the agencies are operating effectively so that they will carry out administratively what Congress has directed them to do.

As chairman of the Special Small Business Committee I offered an amendment to the National Selective Service Act in 1948 to require that small-business men be given their fair share. This should be done also, by other procurement agencies, and the Special Small Business Committee should see that it is done. That should be one of its jobs.

Such a program might fall within the purview of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or the Committee on Armed Services, or possibly the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; possibly the Committee on the Judiciary. But the independent small-business man's interests can be protected only by a committee which has that as its principal objective, and not have it divided as it would be if it were assigned to all those committees.

The next point is the prices charged for materials and supplies used by independent small-business men to determine whether they are fair and equitable. That is something which needs investigation. This is a problem for small business in either an inflationary or a deflationary economy. The solution of the problem falls within the purview of both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Judiciary Committee. Shifts in our economic system hit the small-business man harder than they hit anyone else. A committee authorized specifically to study the impact on small business, which must report to the Congress with legislative recommendations which are referred to the standing committee having legislative jurisdiction, is the only effective course, to my mind, to pursue.

The next specific problem set forth in the resolution is pressures by vertically and horizontally integrated combinations, starting at the beginning, when a product is taken from the soil and moves through to the consumer level. This should receive the utmost consideration of every Member of the Senate. This is the only Nation in the world which actively avoids the creation of industrial and distributive cartels. It is the only Nation which feels that the independent small-business man is the balance wheel of our economy. In this field the Committee on the Judiciary, which has jurisdiction over antimonopoly legislation, or the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has jurisdiction over interstate and foreign commerce generally, might conduct a study of the problem. But, again, the special Small Business Committee can best serve the interests of small-business men and of the Nation as a whole when it makes a study of the situation and makes recommendations to a standing committee having legislative jurisdiction.

The next problem, Mr. President, is found in the fifth paragraph of the resolution. It has to do with the inability of the independent small-business man adequately to finance himself from his own earnings, due to tax structures, and the effect of such tax structures.

The Special Small Business Committee will directly file a report on the question of taxation and its impact on small business.

Sufficient consideration has not been given to this problem. During the Eightieth Congress an expenditure of $5,300,000,000 was authorized for the European recovery program. This appropriation and the materials purchased with it affected every man, woman, and child in the United States. It affected every one of us in connection with the price structure. It has obviously had an effect on the availability of materials to the independent small-business man in the United States, and no one can deny it. So the resolution includes the authorization of the following studies:

Participation of independent American small business in foreign-aid programs and adequacy of representation of independent American small business by diplomatic and consular officials abroad.

Certainly when these commitments are made the impact comes back on the domestic economy, and those making them should know, through an investigation, if in no other way, what the impact upon the small-business man, in this community, and the other communities of the Nation, will be. Certainly that

comes within the purview of such a committee. Certainly the small-business man should be assured the right to a fair participation in the foreign-aid programs which we are financing today.

But what are the facts? I shall give one example. From the beginning of the European recovery program up to and including December 3, 1948, about 2 months ago, there was a total authorized purchase, out of ECA funds, of 103,641,571 pounds of cotton. Remember that figure, about 103,000,000 pounds of cotton. Now this is the important fact; one company received 71.2 percent of that entire cotton business. That is something for the record.

In the case of tobacco—and no doubt the President of the Senate is interested, as are many other Senators, in tobacco—up to December 3, 1946, the total authorized purchases amounted to $13,075,101. In this case, again, one company received 80.98 percent, four-fifths, of the business; and that company was not even an American company, but, instead, was British-owned.

On good authority I have been informed that less than 500 firms participated in ECA commitments up to December 3, 1948, on authorizations for $4,000,000,000 of expenditures, and that of these 500 firms to which the commitments were made approximately 150 were foreign firms.

Obviously, American independent small business is not getting fair participation in the foreign-aid program, and the one who suffers most is the small-business man. The Small Business Committee has held preliminary hearings on this matter, but was not able to go into it as thoroughly as should be done.

This is a problem falling within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee, I imagine, and the so-called watchdog committee, which was authorized, and which, incidentally, is a special joint committee set up by the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, section 124–A, and has no different status legally, or within the spirit of the act, from that of the special committee we are attempting to authorize by the resolution I am discussing. There is no difference. If one is legal, if one is within the spirit of the act, so is the other.

The next problem of particular interest to small business which is directed to be investigated by the resolution is:

(7) Development of programs to assure independent small business fair share of raw and finished materials and services produced on and from publicly owned mineral resources, forest reservations, and irrigation and reclamation projects.

The special Small Business Committee, during the past 2 years, investigated several phases of this problem. A Newsprint Subcommittee checked into the possibility of national forest reserves in Alaska being developed as a source of newsprint for the small independent newspaper. A Mining and Minerals Subcommittee was set up, devoted, in part, to the intelligent and fair development of our mineral resources so as to assure small-business participation. The committee also assisted small-business firms which had contracts for the construction of vital portions of irrigation and reclamation projects, as well as helping independent small-business enterprises to obtain electrical power produced as an adjunct to such reclamation projects.

I recall that the committee went to Kansas City, Mo., where steel was fabricated and that it was the Small Business Committee which was the final committee to which the parties seeking relief came for relief. It was the work of the Small Business Committee which took the matter up with the agency involved and showed how necessary it was that the necessary materials should be supplied; otherwise we would not keep pace with the power development so badly needed in that area. There is need for further study and many recommendations for legislation which, in this case, would ultimately be passed upon by the Public Lands Committee.

Finally, the last specific task authorized to be studied under the resolution is this: Development of a sound program to safeguard the place of independent small business in the American economy.

It is not necessary to go into detail about this. Certainly Senators have had enough complaints so that they know how the economy is being affected. Suffice it to point out to the Senate that a program of this nature could conceivably involve the jurisdiction of every committee mentioned thus far, all of them, and possibly the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Committee on Appropriations, and even the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It cuts across those committees. So one committee cannot take the jurisdiction. The Committee on Banking and Currency has jurisdiction, according to the Reorganization Act, as interpreted by the Parliamentarian, from whom I made inquiry, over financial matters, and I agree with that. Anything we could do to help the committee, or any subcommittee, should be done. But the Committee on Banking and Currency has no more jurisdiction over the other items I have mentioned than has any other committee. Therefore, if we are to have an over-all committee which is to be the mouthpiece of small business and the place where it can go, there must be a special committee cutting across lines. I think it should be a permanent committee, if legislative authority could be given it, but that is a different question, and until we arrive at some decision on that point, the special committee should be continued because it does cut across lines.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I have asked that Senators do not request me to yield until I have concluded. Then I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

In addition to all these studies and investigations, it has been an important function of the Senate Small Business Committee to assist individual small-business men in many ways. The committee has helped small-business men who became lost in the maze of Government agencies. If Senators think that some of the people who have sought relief have not been lost, they should hear some of the stories that have been told us, of cases where they have not only had difficulty in finding an agency set up to help them. Small business did not know where to go or what to do.

We have even presented their cases—and I say this modestly—in hundreds of instances, to suppliers and producers of materials, so as to keep them from going out of business. That has been a part of the work of the Small Business Committee, to take individual cases and send the parties to those who could help them get needed materials.

I now ask all Senators on the floor, is there any Senator who served in the Eightieth Congress who did not have constituents helped in some instances by the Small Business Committee? I have here a list of Senators whose constituents have been helped. I can refer to the Senator from Maryland, who a year ago, in the winter time, presented a plea for oil. Ask him who got the oil. I can refer to the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], representing a State where a great deal of industry is centralized, one of the greatest producing areas of this Nation, if not in the world. Time and time again representatives of small business have come from Chicago and other communities in Illinois asking the Small Business Committee to help them secure materials so that they might remain in business—not alone oil, but steel.

I have in the files covering the past 2 years thousands of letters from the 48 States of the Union asking for help in order that small businesses might keep their doors open, and continue to get what they needed in order to fabricate their products and thus continue in business.

I have heard many Senators say that it is not the function of a Senate committee to secure relief for individuals, and that it is beneath our dignity to do such a thing. But, Mr. President, the small-business men of America cannot be convinced that it is not the function of the Senate Small Business Committee to do just that, and I will tell the Senate why. The legislative branch is just as vital a part of this Government as is the executive branch, and any way in which the Congress can be of assistance to and help in the preservation of the small-business man, be it by legislative aid or be it by immediate spot assistance, is important and appropriate. It does not make any difference whether the assistance is rendered through a legislative committee, a subcommittee of a legislative committee, or through a special committee. It requires the work of all such committees to provide the aid so desperately needed at this time by small-business men.

Certainly the House of Representatives when reviving, by unanimous vote, its select Small Business Committee last week thought it was both important and appropriate to do so. As a matter of fact, the House of Representatives did not feel that what it was doing was a violation of the spirit of the Reorganization Act. The House helped to create that act.

As a matter of fact, if for no other reason than that the small-business man

should have a place to come to in the legislative branch of the Government, this Small Business Committee should be continued.

During the past 8 years the Small Business Committees of the Senate and House have been the mediums through which the small-business man, who finally did get up courage to come or write to Washington, sought and obtained relief.

Small business has grown to depend upon these committees as the ones to which they could come for relief, and as their spokesman in the legislative halls. Certainly, as long as we continue the commitments abroad, and there are material shortages, the small-business men will depend more than ever upon this special committee to aid them in all those problems that confront them—problems that cross over legislative committee jurisdictional lines.

Mr. President, it is said that a standing committee, or some subcommittee thereof, can do the same thing the Small Business Committee can do. I will agree with that statement. In fact, some standing committee might do a better job. It can, provided it goes outside the jurisdiction granted to it by the Reorganization Act. That is the point I am making. If the work previously done by the Small Business Committee were to be turned over to one of the standing committees, or a subcommittee, it would be necessary for the committee or the subcommittee to go outside the jurisdiction granted it under the Reorganization Act. But for a standing committee to go outside of its jurisdiction is certainly a violation of both the letter and spirit of the Legislative Reorganization Act. So why not continue the committee that has already been built up over the years.

It has been said in some quarters the investigations of the Senate Small Business Committee can go on indefinitely—and that it is high time that most of the problems of small business be brought to the point of legislation. Perhaps that is a good criticism. I submit the record of what has been done, and Senators can vote on that record.

There is no question that there are many problems of smaller business upon which legislative action should be taken at once—based upon the facts which the Senate Small Business Committee investigations and surveys have brought out.

But there is no break-off point in the problems of small business—there is no place at which we can say, "Now we have finished with the American small-business man. Let us close up shop."

For example, many of us thought that when controls over price and distribution were lifted in the fall of 1945, the increased production resulting thereby would adjust most supply problems. Production has increased in most strategic lines.

But the pattern of distribution for many vital materials has shifted as crazily as a patch-work quilt, particularly as our international policies have develped.

An important consideration in determining whether to create a committee especially to handle the problems of small business is the flexibility and rapidity with which such a committee can operate. In the past 2 years, there have been many times when the need for prompt action on conditions affecting small business has been amply demonstrated. For example:

First. A smaller, independent erector of steel construction came to the Steel Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, stating that he was unable to bid on the erection of Government buildings, due to the fact that the Government bid form required that he bid on furnishing the steel for the job as well. With steel in short supply, and faced with competition from large integrated steel companies which have erection subsidiaries, the smaller man was out of luck. This committee worked out, with the Government agencies involved, a revision of the bid form, which now makes its possible for the independent erector to bid on Government construction without requiring him to bid upon furnishing the steel. That revision is in force today, and many a small steel erector has been saved and his company has been saved because we absolutely provided that the agencies change the bid form upon which contracts with Government agencies can be made.

Second. The continuous protests which this committee has made, and its hearings and investigations on the export of large quantities of steel from this country, have resulted in both legislative and administrative action to strengthen export controls and curtail the export of strategic materials. When the Steel Subcommittee began its investigation of the export situation with respect to steel in May 1947, only a few steel products were under control and there was no knowledge as to destination or end use. By December 1947, 95 percent of all steel products were under export control and more realistic quotas were being set. At the end of 1948, exports of steel were reduced 2,000,000 tons under 1947 exports—a sizable contribution to the domestic economy—effected by administrative action influenced by this committee.

Third. Similarly this committee's recommendations to correct licensing procedures and policies in the Office of International Trade have been acted upon favorably by the Department of Commerce, and have resulted in reducing errors in export licensing and trafficking in licenses which had permitted millions of dollars worth of short-supply materials to leave the country illicitly.

Fourth. An independent survey made by this committee on the amount of steel going to smaller, independent manufacturers of farm machinery has resulted in hardship aid for hundreds of smaller manufacturers. For instance, in the harvesting season just past the committee was successful in getting a shipment of steel chain to a manufacturer of corn pickers in Kansas, which enabled him to complete delivery of 500 pickers through the Middle West.

I could cite hundreds of cases. Hundreds of smaller dealers and distributors of petroleum products in the Illinois area and throughout the Middle West were saved from complete extinction in a price and distribution squeeze which they experienced in 1947. The major oil companies were cutting off independent customers in favor of their company-owned outlets. I do not think anyone can deny that. They were stifling other channels of distribution. Let anyone go to Illinois and examine the record and talk with any distributor, large or small, and he will find that the situation which I have described existed.

The tangible results of the research and investigations of the Senate's Small Business Committee could be detailed for hours. The committee is now nonexistent. It never had the personnel or the time to permit it to make a compilation of all the requests which have been made by Senators and by various legislative committees to alleviate the troubles of small business generally, and help individual small business enterprises.

An examination of the appropriations and a check of the personnel will disclose, I think, that the total personnel of the Small Business Committee at the time it folded up was 14. That was the highest number during the past 2 years. I will check that figure. It never had the personnel to do the job we would like to have done. However, if the work of the members and personnel of that committee be compared with the work of any other committee, I challenge anyone to show a committee, legislative or otherwise, which has done more for the benefit of the taxpayers with the amount of money which was spent. It is a safe and conservative estimate to say that thousands of cases were handled. Furthermore, the constitutents of many Senators have been helped by the Small Business Committee. I can furnish many comments which have been made in letters to the Small Business Committee.

Mr. President, if the Senate fails to revive the Small Business Committee, the result will be the folding up of an agency to which the small-business men of the country look for assistance.

I have made the statement on the floor of the Senate that I would not seek the continuation or revival of a special Senate Small Business Committee whenever a standing committee was able to take over its functions. However, I am convinced, after looking into the record and considering the spirit of the act itself, that there is no existing standing committee which can take over those functions and do so effectively. If it should do so, it would violate the very spirit of the act, as it is claimed that this resolution, if adopted, would do.

Mr. President, I refuse to stand idly by and see this committee fumbled out of existence. If this resolution is not referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which I think it should go under established precedent, as I have indicated by the observations which I have already made, then I intend to submit a resolution seeking to create a permanent Small Business Committee, in order to cover adequately the urgent needs of independent small business. This committee is a part of our economy which must be preserved at all costs if we are to maintain our private-enterprise system.

Mr. President, I very respectfully ask for a reversal of the Chair's reference of this resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TOBEY and Mr. MAYBANK rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I agreed to yield to two or three Senators. One was the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK]. The other was the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. I shall be glad to yield the floor unless they wish to ask me questions.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no questions to ask.

Mr. WHERRY. If no other Senator has any questions to ask me, I am glad to yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like, for the information of the Senate, to read the rule under which he referred this resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, not in an argumentative way, but as a basis for his ruling.

Prior to the enactment of the Reorganization Act, as Senators all know, there was a specific rule in the Senate that when any resolution was submitted which fixed a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate, such resolution must first go to the committee having jurisdiction of the legislation involved in the resolution. Therefore, for many years prior to the Reorganization Act, when any resolution was submitted providing for an expenditure from the contingent fund of the Senate, the resolution was referred to the appropriate standing legislative committee, and if that committee submitted a favorable report, the resolution then went to the old Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate to determine the amount of money involved in the expenditure, or whether there would be any.

When the Reorganization Act was passed creating the committees and establishing their jurisdiction, as set forth in rule XXV in the Manual, in prescribing the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the second item read as follows:

> 2. Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aids which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

That means to other standing committees. The Chair has been unable to find, in the jurisdiction of any other standing committee under the rules, any reference to financial aid to commerce and industry. There may be some indirect reference to that subject in the jurisdiction of other committees, but the Committee on Banking and Currency is specifically given jurisdiction over legislation providing financial aid to commerce and industry.

In the rule on page 39 of the manual, setting forth the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the following is found:

> Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same; except that any resolution relating to substantive matter within the jurisdiction of any other standing committee of the Senate shall be first referred to such committee.

Inasmuch as the Committee on Banking and Currency obviously has specific jurisdiction over aid to business and industry, and inasmuch as the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska provides for a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate, it is obvious that in the adoption of the Reorganization Act no substantial change was made in the previous rules of the Senate, requiring that any such resolution involving an expenditure from the contingent fund must go to the standing committee having jurisdiction of the substantive matter involved in the resolution. Therefore, to all intents and purposes, the rule is the same now as it was prior to the enactment of the Reorganization Act.

It is true that the Senator from Nebraska submitted a resolution a couple of years ago which, by unanimous consent, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. However, as a former Vice President once said, the Senate can do anything by unanimous consent—a comment to which the Chair does not completely adhere. However, that related only to one resolution. It did not change the rule of the Senate. It could not affect any other resolution, and it could not operate as a precedent for the guidance of the Chair under the rule which has just been read, under which the Chair feels that he had no alternative except to refer this resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The Chair probably should have made this statement when he made the ruling; but not knowing that the Senator intended to appeal from the decision, the Chair did not do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the observations made by the President of the Senate. I am in total agreement with the interpretation which has just been made relative to the requirement that a resolution must first be referred to the committee having jurisdiction, and then must go to the Committee on Rules and Administration if it provides for the payment of money from the contingent fund. But the entire point I am making is that although it is said that the resolution has been referred to the committee which has jurisdiction of the substantive matter, nevertheless, as I maintain, there is no standing committee which has jurisdiction over the 12 problems which are presented by my resolution. That is my point. In a sense, therefore, I am asking for a change of the rules, because I am asking that one of the standing committees take charge of the resolution, and make investigations in connection with it and hold hearings regarding it; and yet the scope of the resolution is so broad that no one of the standing committees has complete jurisdiction. That is the point I make, and I think it is well taken.

I agree with the distinguished occupant of the chair that, in the ordinary course, resolutions similar to the ones which have been mentioned have eventually come to the Committee on Rules and Administration for appropriations. But I submit to the Chair, because I know no one is more interested in small business than is he, that after 6 years of hard work on the part of this special committee, our point of view should receive some consideration. Of course, no personal matter is involved in the request for continuation of the committee, because we on this side of the aisle know that we shall not be in charge of the committee. I hasten to add that I am sure I shall be satisfied with whatever selection is made for the membership of the committee. But I say it is not proper to refer this resolution to any of the other standing committees, because the subject matter of the resolution exceeds the limitations of the jurisdiction of any of the other standing committees. I said that 2 years ago when I asked unanimous consent that a similar resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I repeat it now.

I agree that a resolution providing for financial aid to industry, or similar matters, should properly be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee; but I submit that in this resolution there are 10 provisions which go away beyond the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. I so stated to the distinguished occupant of the chair when I pointed out that the time has come to make a ruling on this matter.

Mr. President, when the legislative reorganization bill was before the Senate I supported it. But the Legislative Reorganization Act is not infallible. Apparently it does not specify the committee to which an all-encompassing resolution should be referred. If it were agreed that all the problems I have included in the resolution relate to financial aid, then of course I would agree that the resolution should be referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, and then there would be no argument about the question of reference of the resolution. But I point out that the complaints which have been made are combined complaints; they relate to finance and to distribution and to allocations and to prices and to various other matters. So it cannot correctly be said that all the matters encompassed by the resolution are properly within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the Banking and Currency Committee. There is no Member of the Senate for whom I have a higher regard than the chairman of that committee; and if that committee properly had jurisdiction of the resolution I would not be making this fight.

Knowing the feeling of the Chair about small business, I humbly suggest now that, even though the Chair has indicated that the decision of the Chair is based on the only course the Chair can follow, nevertheless a proper consideration of the various provisions of the resolution will certainly show that it should be referred to the committee which properly has jurisdiction of all the matters which are to be considered in connection with small business.

Therefore I would ask unanimous consent, although I suppose such consent would not be given, that my resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. At any rate, I submit that the resolution, which is similar to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Florida, which I did not know he was to offer, should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

In concluding my statement, Mr. President, I wish to announce that if the resolution is not referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, then I shall submit a resolution providing for the creation of a standing committee on small business.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, why cannot what I am requesting be done in view of the provisions of the resolution?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not wish to argue the matter with the Senator from Nebraska. However, the difference, as the Chair sees it, is that the resolution of the Senator from Florida would change the rules, by establishing a new permanent committee.

On the other hand, the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska proposes the establishment of a special committee. Even though the Committee on Banking and Currency might not have jurisdiction over everything affecting small business, nevertheless some committee must be given jurisdiction of the resolution; and under no conditions could the resolution go to the Committee on Rules and Administration without first going to some other committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let me inquire whether the Chair feels that all resolutions providing for the establishment of special committees must first be referred to some other legislative committee before they are referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is a question which the Chair is not prepared to pass upon just now. However, the Chair will give his opinion on the question under discussion. There may be other committees which might have some jurisdiction over some matters affecting small business; but as the Chair sees it, in accordance with the practice of the Senate heretofore, the Banking and Currency Committee has had jurisdiction and has exercised jurisdiction over most of the resolution's legislative proposals affecting small business, and it is the only committee which has in the statement of its jurisdiction any reference to aid to industry and commerce, whether large or small, so far as that is concerned. No distinction is made under the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I appreciate the observation the Chair has made, and I shall propound no further interrogations. It is not my purpose in any way to oppose or obstruct the ruling of the Chair. But the very observation just made by the distinguished occupant of the Chair is the basis of the argument I submit to the Senate. None of the standing committees has jurisdiction of the subject matter of my resolution, because the resolution includes matters going outside the jurisdiction of all of them. Under these circumstances, it might be argued with equal force that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or the Commitee on Armed Services or the Committee on Foreign Relations, because the various functions covered by the resolution cannot be separated.

Therefore, Mr. President, the only committee that I know of that could properly be given jurisdiction of the resolution is the Committee on Rules and Administration. Of course, if it is agreed that a change of the rules is necessary, then let us change them. All I know is that I shall continue to fight for an extension of the work for small business in the United States. I shall support the resolution of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], or any other resolution providing for continuing the Special Committee on Small Business.

Inasmuch as the House of Representatives has already set up a committee of like character, regardless of the provisions of the Reorganization Act, I hate to see the Senate fold up the Special Committee on Small Business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The attention of the Chair has been called to another rule which has some bearing on the subject. It refers to controversies over the jurisdiction of committees.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Chair please state the page of the Reorganization Act to which he refers?

The VICE PRESIDENT. This rule is to be found on page 24 of the Reorganization Act.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that it is section 137.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The provision reads as follows:

> In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee which has the jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation; but such a decision shall be subject to an appeal.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Therefore, so far as the rule giving specific jurisdiction to committees is concerned, which was one of the objects of the Reorganization Act, undoubtedly the preponderance of jurisdiction—even though that might not include all the jurisdiction which could be conceived of in that connection—would be in the Banking and Currency Committee; and the rule even seems to preclude debate on that subject. However, of course the Chair is anxious to extend every courtesy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished President of the Senate. Of course we are now arguing as to the appeal, which is subject to debate.

I realize the present occupant of the chair has done exactly what the rule provides, and that in referring the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency he has referred it to that committee because in his opinion he feels it has jurisdiction. I am not quarreling with the fact that it is assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency. If I were the occupant of the chair I would not know to what committee to refer it, because if the RECORD is examined it will be found that possibly the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or possibly the Committee on the Judiciary, has more of the subject matter within its province. I would not know where to refer it. So I think the present occupant of the chair in carrying out the provisions of the act, referring the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, has at least referred it to one committee having some jurisdiction over the problem. But that is the very point I make. It cannot be assigned to any one of the committees, because it cuts across all committee lines, and in that respect it should be referred to a committee that can give it the consideration that would be given if the rule were changed, as provided by the rule suggested by the Senator from Florida. I have asked for it in the resolution. If it is desired to send it to the Committee on Rules and Administration, I see no difference, whether the resolution I offer is accepted or not, or whether it is sent to a standing committee having jurisdiction.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I have listened to the remarks of my friend, the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], with great interest. To me, after listening for some time, I think they form a perfect illustration of Milton's reference to "Linked sweetness long drawn out." I think the Senator from Nebraska had his fingers crossed in some of the points he made, and I propose to uncross his fingers for a few minutes.

Let us review the situation very briefly. The question before the Senate is, Shall the present incumbent of the chair, the distinguished Vice President, the Presiding Officer of the Senate, be overruled by the Senate, on a ruling he has made to send the resolution to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency? I think the Chair was correct in his ruling. I think he has made a good case, but as a further aid to him, "to make assurance double sure," let me point out to the President of the Senate as to every other Member, that for many years, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency has had referred to it by the Presiding Officer of this branch of Congress, all proposed legislation on prices, on allocation of supplies and distribution, in addition to the financing of industry.

Now a word about the special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business. There is a Latin proverb, "de mortuis nil nisi bonum," which, as of course every Senator knows, means "concerning the dead, nothing but good." Far be it for me to impugn that committee, rather I would commend its work in the past, but I want to add that the Senate, on no less authority than that of the Senator from Nebraska, who has spoken, was assured 2 years ago, when I fought in an hour's speech

against the continuance of special committees, that he would never ask for any further extension of this committee.

The point I want to make, Mr. President, is that the Committee on Banking and Currency is charged, in my judgment, with this jurisdiction, and the President of the Senate has so made his ruling. I will not believe that any Member of the Senate would, because of a secondary motive, vote against sustaining the decision of the Chair on this matter, merely because of a partisan aspect. I would not be a party to that, of course. I believe the President of the Senate has done the right thing.

Speaking now of the Committee on Banking and Currency, we have already, last week, started to hold hearings to aid small business, when we had before us the distinguished Secretary of Commerce, when we made a very thorough, a very earnest seeking out of allocations for steel, metals, and supplies to small business. It is in our hearts. It is our purpose. Small business will not suffer one jot or one tittle by this reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency. We will have a staff just as good as, if not better than the previous one. I intend no reflections on them. We will be thoroughly staffed as a committee of nine members headed by the distinguished chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] himself. I am "one of the least of these my brethren," and I would not sanction this thing, if I believed for one moment that the small-business men of the country would be jeopardized or put under a handicap or behind the "eight ball" in any sense or to any degree.

When the Senate wrote the Legislative Reorganization Act they wrote into it, and it passed the Senate, a prohibition of all special committees. It went over to the House, and the House struck out the prohibition. Then under the duress of conference and the inability otherwise to get the bill through, in their judgment, the conferees on the part of the Senate yielded, remonstrating they did not believe the prohibition should be stricken out. So the Senate of the United States is on record, and wisely so in my judgment, as opposed to special committees to handle the business of the Senate. Here is a standing committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, charged by precedents, with respect to allocations, prices, supplies, and distributions, and in the law with aid to financing business. I ask Senators on both sides of the aisle to stand by the President of the Senate and uphold his decision.

I make one reference now to my friend, the Senator from Nebraska. Last year, I was asked to start an investigation of the great Textron matter, a $30,000,000 corporation. That was not small business. At the request of Wallace White, then chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I accepted chairmanship of the subcommittee. We went to Nashua and began hearings. I cite this as a concrete example of how a small-business committee should not act. Up there came a gentleman from the Small Business Committee. His name was Mr. Dickey, and he gave press interviews. He impugned in the press the motives of the standing committee of the United States Senate, and the members of the Subcommittee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It was not according to Hoyle. It was below the belt. We rose above it, but I rebuke that practice now, and I can name it if it is desired. But I say that by the rules of reason, by the precedents of the Senate, this resolution should go where the Vice President sent it, to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate. We will do a goob job for the little people of this country.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely want to concur in what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has said. I had intended for the RECORD to read section 137 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and also the sections relating to financial aid, the Federal Reserve control of prices, and the many other things committed to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The distinguished Vice President himself was a member of that committee when I first went on it in 1941. No one knows better than the present occupant of the chair the enormous amount of work done by that committee. In recent years practically 90 percent of the legislation suggested by the Special Committee on Small Business has been acted on in one way or another by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I realize there are some matters that should go to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and some, perhaps, that should go to the Committee on Finance. I am perfectly willing to rely upon the decision of the Vice President in sending to the appropriate committees resolutions and bills when they are presented.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I want to remind the Senate that we passed a bill last week relating to voluntary allocations and allotments. A large part of the time consumed by our committee was in connection with small business. Matters were discussed by the distinguished Senator from Florida, in connection with small business.

Last week I obtained unanimous consent to report a bill during the adjournment of the Senate, Senate bill 548. We held hearings all last week on the bill, which deals principally with small business. If Senators will examine the bill, it will be found that we wrote into the bill section B, in the interest of small business concerns, who must be taken into consideration. In fact, section B, line 21, page 3, of Senate bill 548, shows the interest of the Committee on Banking and Currency in small business. I can only say to the Senate I recognize well the fact that the Special Committee did excellent work in investigating. The Senate may rely upon the Committee on Banking and Currency to do equally as well, if not better, with respect to the subject under discussion, because after that committee investigates, it can legislate. The special committee can only investigate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, statements which the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] made 2 years ago, in which they advocated the continuance of the Small Business Committee until a regular standing committee could be properly organized. It was for that reason, and that reason only, that the resolution providing for the special committee was adopted by the Senate by only two votes.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Two years ago, when the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] was arguing for the continuation of the Small Business Committee, he rested his argument upon the contention that the standing committees were not yet properly organized under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. Addressing himself to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], he asked:

"Does not the Senator further feel that until the standing committees of the Senate are properly organized, when perhaps other procedure shall be established, the present Senate special committee should continue, at least during the present session, to be the advocate of the small-business men, and to be the one committee where the small-business man can come, in view of the fact that he has heretofore been taught to come for aid to that committee during the past 6 years?"

To which the Senator from Montana replied:

"Mr. President, I think the Senator from Nebraska has stated the situation exactly."

Toward the close of the debate the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] stated:

"Mr. President, I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee. I see no reason why, in the future, the Senate cannot use for such purposes the Banking and Currency Committee and the other committees which otherwise would handle such problems. For instance, I refer to the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate Commerce Committee as well. When those committees are properly organized they can take care of the subject matter, and then the Senate can terminate the work of the special committee which is proposed by Senate Resolution 20. Because of that fact I have amended the resolution so as to provide for the continuation of the special committee for only 240 days."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to say to the Senate that we are now proceeding under the heading morning business, and when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives the morning hour will terminate. If it is the desire of the Senate to have a decision on the question today, it must be done before 2 o'clock; otherwise morning business will be concluded and the Senate will proceed with something else.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I think every Member of the Senate who has heard the discussion has been greatly impressed with the earnestness of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] who has spoken with such vigor regarding the encouragement and preservation of small business and the solution of its problems. There has been mentioned once or twice during the course of the discussion a fear that if the resolution should be referred to a committee other than the Committee on Rules and Administration it would suffer a fate similar to that which was suffered by an

earlier bill. Reassurance has been given by one or two Senators that upon the consideration of the subject by the Committee on Banking and Currency there will be an adequate, complete, and fair treatment of the subject by that committee.

I assume, as I am sure every other Senator does, that every member of the committee will endeavor to give a fair, full, and adequate consideration of the subject.

I rise for two purposes, one, to suggest most respectfully that the question before the Senate should not at all be determined on the basis of whether the resolution will have a better chance of success before one committee than before another committee. I take it that it is entirely a question of the proper construction of the rules of the Senate as to whether the appeal which is now pending should be sustained or should not be sustained.

In the second place, to my mind, the ruling of the Chair is unanswerable. In my judgment, the Chair has made a proper ruling. It would appear to me that the resolution could be referred, and I understand it is sought to be referred by the Senator from Nebraska, to the Committee on Rules and Administration, only on one theory, namely, that included in the jurisdiction of the committee are matters concerned with the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon it, and that there is no standing committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the resolution.

It occurs to me that the resolution may have numerous facets and points which do not at all detract from the right of the Chair to refer it to the committee which section 137 provides has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates. That section obviously contemplates that there may be matters over which more than one committee has jurisdiction. Otherwise section 137 would not have used the significant language to which I have reference, and which I quote "jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation."

The resolution which is before the Senate does raise the question as to which subject matter predominates. It would seem perfectly clear to me, Mr. President, that the mere fact that the resolution calls for payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creates a charge upon the same is not the subject which predominates in the resolution. Obviously, to my mind, the subject which predominates is one of financial aid to commerce and industry, as the Chair, I think, has very properly pointed out.

So, Mr. President, in the first place, while paying tribute, which I think is properly deserved, to the Senator from Nebraska and to his associates on the special committee which has heretofore functioned, and paying a tribute to others who have cooperated, I should, in fairness, say that in my judgment, whether this resolution should be referred to any given committee is not at all to be determined by the committee before which the resolution will stand the best chance, but, clearly and obviously, to my mind, under the rules of the Senate, the subject matter which predominates in the resolution is one which is under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am, therefore, in favor of affirming the decision by which the Chair has made the reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the hour is drawing near to 2 o'clock. I hope we can get unanimous consent to continue the debate. I am asking consent now for the debate to continue until after the hour of 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and in view of the statement made by the junior Senator from Oregon——

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want the Senator's argument to continue after the hour of 2 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no control over the clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall have to object because of the statement made by the junior Senator from Oregon that he wanted to have notice of unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to lay the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That motion is not debatable.

Mr. LUCAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the vote be taken after the hour of 2 o'clock?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is simply a matter of unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. Then I submit we are not making any progress.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hoey | Murray |
| Anderson | Holland | Myers |
| Ba'dwin | Humphrey | Neely |
| Brewster | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Bricker | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Reed |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Russell |
| Cain | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Connally | Langer | Sparkman |
| Cordon | Lodge | Stennis |
| Donnell | Long | Taft |
| Douglas | Lucas | Taylor |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ecton | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Ellender | McFarland | Thye |
| Ferguson | McGrath | Tobey |
| Flanders | McKellar | Tydings |
| Frear | McMahon | Vandenberg |
| George | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Gillette | Malone | Wherry |
| Gurney | Martin | Wiley |
| Hayden | Maybank | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Withers |
| Hickenlooper | Morse | Young |
| Hill | Mundt | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour is concluded.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. McMAHON addressed the Chair.

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the special order, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47, and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the motion in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is in order. The resolution has gone over 1 day, and therefore the motion of the Senator from Illinois is in order. The clerk will state the resolution by title.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 47) to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 15, relating to cloture.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

Mr. TAFT. I inquire what is the vote on, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the motion to take up Senate Resolution 47.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Illinois yield for an inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, the motion is to take up the resolution. After the motion has been voted upon, if the vote is favorable, the resolution will be open to debate and discussion, will it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a debatable question. Does the Senator from Illinois ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to take up the resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion that the resolution be taken up for consideration.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in the process of voting.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The result has not yet been announced, has it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. The Senator from California is entitled to the floor to speak on the motion, is he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is debatable.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McMAHON. The Senator from California is entitled to the floor if he gets recognition. The Senator from Connecticut has been here for 2 hours seeking recognition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from California understood he had been recognized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that in spite of the fact that the Senate was in process of voting viva voce, the Senator from California is entitled to recognition.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the question before the Senate today is whether Senate Resolution 15 shall be withdrawn from the Rules Committee and placed on the Senate Calendar. Senate Resolution 15, submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] for himself and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], reads as follows:

*Resolved*, That subsection 2 of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, relating to cloture, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"If at any time, notwithstanding the provisions of rule III or rule VI or any other rule of the Senate, a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by a yea-and-nay vote the question:

"'Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?'

"And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

"Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate, or the unfinished business, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion, or dilatory amendment, or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate."

Mr. President, in regard to this matter of the Senate securing an effective cloture process against an unlimited filibuster, we are faced, as President Cleveland once said, "With a condition and not a theory."

The cold, hard facts of the situation are that there is little hope, if any, of amending the rules of the Senate in this regard unless the matter is acted upon in the first 60 days of a legislative session. Both the proponents of a change and the opponents to any change recognize this fact. It is for this reason, with the full knowledge that each day's passage of time makes more difficult the problem, that I offered the motion to withdraw resolution 15 from the committee.

Certainly no disrespect for the Rules Committee, of which I am a member, was intended or implied by this action, nor was there intended any disrespect for the able chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Arizona, for whom I have a very high regard and a personal affection. He is one of the few present Members of either House of Congress who was serving in the House of Representatives during a part of the 12-year period my father served in that body.

The basic question we must face is whether the unlimited use of the filibuster is something that should be corrected. Do we believe that any man or small group of men should have the power to obstruct the legislative process? The fundamental issue is whether this body should be in such a vulnerable position that its legislative functioning can be blocked to such an extent that the security of our Republic and the peace of the world may at some future date be placed in jeopardy.

If this be the problem, then it seems to me clear that all those who prudently wish to lock the barn door before the horse is stolen and not afterward should be willing to meet this issue without evasion.

Certainly I admit that on this as on other great public questions there is an honest difference of opinion. I wish to commend the very able presentation made by the opponents of a change in the cloture rule. With sincerity and ability they presented their case before the Rules Committee, as they no doubt will present it at length to the Senate itself when the matter is before us.

In fairness I will also state that I believe they have made a very strong case against any change in the rules that would permit cloture by majority vote. It is not my intention today to make any prolonged statement in regard to this matter. When the issue comes before the Senate, as inevitably it will come, I shall have more to say.

This issue is so fundamental that it is not going to be allowed to die, nor are we going to permit the question of the correction of this defect in the rules to be brushed under the carpet of legislative procrastination as a poor housekeeper might brush dirt under the rug.

It is my very strong belief that this issue must be met frankly and that the Senate is entitled to vote upon it. Whatever action is taken here today will not end the matter. It shall be brought to the Senate for action in one form or another "again and again and again."

The very able junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and a number of his colleagues recognize the fact that in time of a national emergency it is conceivable that the functioning of the Senate could be effectively blocked by a small handful of Members. We have been informed that an amendment will be presented to take care of that phase of the situation. Such an amendment, I believe, has merit not as an alternative to the two-thirds rule but in addition thereto. Majority cloture is not the issue here at this time.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], and the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] jointly submitted Senate Resolution 13 which is identical with Senate Resolution 15 submitted by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], which in turn is identical with the resolution favorably reported to the Senate by the Rules Committee during the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. President, the charge has been made before the committee, in the public press and on the floor of the Senate that the resolution reported to the Eightieth Congress was not acted upon while the Republicans were in control.

I am not one of those Republicans who believes that all the virtues are to be found in my party and all the faults in the opposition. I believe that a serious error was made on this side of the aisle in not pushing to a show-down early in the last session an amendment to the rules. However, Mr. President, two wrongs do not make a right.

I would not make an issue of the point, Mr. President, that the Democratic Party, which has been in control of the executive branch of the Government for the last 16 years, and of the legislative branch for 14 of those 16 years, was also a bit lax in acting on civil rights and other legislation in which the administration segment of that party now professes such keen interest.

The present rule 22 dealing with cloture reads as follows:

If at any time a motion, signed by 16 Senators, to bring to a close the debate upon any pending measure is presented to the Senate, the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate and direct that the Secretary call the roll, and, upon the ascertainment that a quorum is present, the Presiding Officer shall, without debate, submit to the Senate by an aye-and-nay vote the question:

"Is it the sense of the Senate that the debate shall be brought to a close?"

And if that question shall be decided in the affirmative by a two-thirds vote of those voting, then said measure shall be the unfinished business to the exclusion of all other business until disposed of.

Thereafter no Senator shall be entitled to speak in all more than 1 hour on the pending measure, the amendments thereto, and motions affecting the same, and it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to keep the time of each Senator who speaks. Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time. No dilatory motion or dilatory amendment or amendment not germane shall be in order. Points of order, including questions of relevancy, and appeals from the decision of the Presiding Officer, shall be decided without debate.

This was adopted in the Senate on March 8, 1917, by a vote of 76 yeas and 3 nays. It grew out of the filibuster in the previous session on a bill which had

been proposed by the Wilson administration to arm merchant vessels.

Referring to the defeat of that bill President Woodrow Wilson said:

It would not cure the difficulty to call the Sixty-fifth Congress in extraordinary session. The paralysis of the Senate would remain. The purpose and the spirit of action are not lacking now.

The Congress is more definitely united in thought and purpose at this moment, I venture to say, than it has been within the memory of any man now in its membership. There is not only the most united patriotic purpose, but the objects Members have in view are perfectly clear and definite.

But the Senate cannot act unless its leaders can obtain unanimous consent. Its majority is powerless, helpless. In the midst of a crisis of extraordinary peril, when only definite and decided action can make the Nation safe or shield it from war itself by the aggression of others, action is impossible.

Although, as a matter of fact, the Nation and the representatives of the Nation stand back of the executive with unprecedented unanimity and spirit, the impression made abroad will, of course, be that it is not so, and that other governments may act as they please without fear that this Government can do anything at all. We cannot explain. The explanation is incredible.

The Senate of the United States is the only legislative body in the world which cannot act when its majority is ready for action.

A little group of willful men, representing no opinion but their own, have rendered the great Government of the United States helpless and contemptible.

The remedy? There is but one remedy. The only remedy is that the rules of the Senate shall be so altered that it can act. The country can be relied upon to draw the moral.

Certainly in 1917 the Members of the Senate thought that they were providing an effective way to control the unlimited use of the filibuster. To take any other position is to affirm that what they did was an empty gesture and of no consequence. It is to say in effect that they agreed to this amendment with tongue in cheek for the purpose of kidding either themselves or the American people. I do not believe that such is the case. Nor do I believe that any reasonable reading of the record will support any such thesis.

Yet under the precedents of the Senate now existing this present two-thirds cloture rule is meaningless. In the narrow interpretation of the word "measure" it has been held that the rule does not apply to motions. Since no measure can be brought before the Senate except by motion it is apparent that there is at the present time no cloture whatsoever. Not even by two-thirds of the Senate. Indeed, not even by nine-tenths of the Senate.

The present rule was presented to the Senate by the then majority leader Senator Martin, of Virginia. On the day the amendment was passed Senator Pomerene said; as found on page 20 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 8, 1917:

Mr. President, I had hoped that this rule might be so drawn as to make it a little more drastic during the last few days of a session.

My belief has been that a majority or at least a two-thirds vote of the Senate should have the right to further limit or conclude debate in the closing days of a session. I am satisfied, however, and I have talked the subject over with a number of Senators, that the rule presented by the Senator from Virginia is perhaps the best that can be obtained now. For this reason I earnestly hope that the proposed rule will be adopted, if we can get nothing better.

On the same day Senator Curtis said:

Mr. President, I am very heartily in favor of this resolution which proposes to amend rules of the Senate so that debate may be closed. In 1911, when certain Senators on the other side were filibustering against certain measures which were then pending, I offered an amendment to the rules providing that two-thirds of the Senators might close debate after a certain time. That proposed amendment was not reported from the committee. In May 1916, an amendment to the rules substantially like the one now proposed was reported unanimously from the Committee on Rules. That resolution, which enabled two-thirds of the Senate to close debate was on the calendar from May 1916 to March 4, 1917, but was not taken up. The change proposed by the resolution was agreed to by a joint committee of the majority and the minority. I therefore hope this resolution may be adopted.

These statements and many more like them, any fair reading of the rule itself, and common sense indicate that the two-thirds cloture was meant to be something and not a dead letter and an empty gesture. That clever men found a loophole in the rule that permitted them to destroy it does not relieve us of our obligation to correct it. That is all that we are trying to do.

There are some who make the statement that this change in the rule is timed so that it will affect legislation on which one section of our country is in violent disagreement. Such is not the case. This amendment to the rules would and should be presented even if there were no civil rights legislation pending before Congress and recommended by the President of the United States.

While the amendment we are discussing is only intended to make effective the two-third cloture adopted by the Senate in 1917 by a vote of 76 to 3, I would certainly not deny that the defeat of the temperate proposal we have submitted will make certain the defeat of the entire civil rights program presented by the President of the United States. If that be the desire of the majority leadership, let them make their record here today.

I believe that it is contrary to orderly legislative procedure for any small group to prevent the Senate of the United States from voting on legislation of importance to the country after there has been full debate and two-thirds of the Senate has expressed its own desire that debate be brought to a close. There still remains the additional safeguard that each Senator has an hour to discuss the legislation after cloture is voted before the final vote is taken. I can understand how some of our colleagues who are sincerely opposed to Federal legislation in the field of civil rights can and do object to any change whatever, but Mr. President, I cannot understand how those who purport to support the civil rights program can join in the processes of delay when every Member of this body knows that each day's delay makes less likely any change in the rule.

Time is priceless in the atomic age in which we now live. The use we make of it may well determine not only the strength of our own Republic, but of western civilization as well. Need I remind the Senate that in World War II Holland was overrun by Nazi Germany in 5 days, Yugoslavia in 12 days, Belgium in 19 days and Poland in 28 days. There have been filibusters in the Senate that lasted longer than it took these nations to lose their independence and their people their liberty. One of the longest filibusters in the Senate took place in 1893 over the repeal of the purchase clause of the Sherman silver law. This filibuster consumed 42 days. In 1846 the Oregon bill was filibustered for 2 months.

To permit one person or a small group to obstruct the legislative process even after two-thirds of the Senate have in their judgment determined that the time had come to act and not just to talk is to place in the hands of one Senator more power than the Constitution gives to the President of the United States. The President's veto can be overridden by a two-thirds vote.

Some of the opponents of any change try to raise the issue that this moderate proposal is in some way in conflict with the Constitution. Such, of course, is not the case. Section 1, article I of the Constitution provides:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 3 of article I as amended by the seventeenth amendment provides:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for 6 years; and each Senator shall have one vote.

When the unlimited filibuster is used, less than 5 percent of the Senate can effectively prevent 95 percent of the Senate from ever exercising their constitutional right to represent their States by casting a vote on issues which they too believe to be in the public interest and in conformity with the Constitution.

It was not we, the farmers and the merchants, it was not we, the employees and the employers, it was not we, the gentiles and the Jews, it was not we, the Protestants and the Catholics, it was not we, the Caucasians, Negroes, and orientals, but it was:

We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

The preamble does not refer to part of the people. The Constitution does not say that the Senate shall be elected by a segment of the people. The fifteenth amendment is no less valid than the nineteenth amendment or any other amendment or original article of the Constitution.

Both amendments state: "Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation." It is clear

that while it is not mandatory that Congress enact any specific legislation it is likewise clear that Congress is given the power to legislate on the subject. The unlimited use of the filibuster deprives the Senate of its constitutional power in this regard. Section 5, paragraph 3 of article I provides—

> the yeas and nays of the Members of either House on any question shall, at the desire of one-fifth of those present, be entered on the Journal.

Yet the unlimited use of the filibuster can prevent the yeas and nays from ever being entered and the people learning how their Senators stand upon questions of vital interest to the people and to the States.

Section 8 of article I sets forth the powers of Congress. Yet an aggressive use of the filibuster by a small number of Members can completely veto the ability of Congress to exercise any of those enumerated powers in a manner as effective as the abuse of the veto by the Soviet Government in the Security Council.

This then is the issue which confronts the Senate of the United States. It confronts it today, it will confront it tomorrow, and every day the Senate remains in session.

Is it not, therefore, a wiser solution for the Senate to proceed diligently to discuss this question now and reach a conclusion before other legislation of importance is ready for action by this body? We have been in session now for more than 33 days. We have been recessing for 3-day periods. For those who want time for ample discussion, now is the time and here is the place. No one will have any desire to cut off a full and free discussion of the merits of the issue on the part of any Senator who desires to discuss them.

After the merits pro and con have been discussed, if there are those who desire to exercise the unlimited right of filibuster for the purpose, not of discussing the merits, but of blocking the right of the Senate to act on the measure, then now is the time and here is the place to meet that issue head-on.

For the reasons I have enumerated, and for many others that will occur to other members of the Senate, I have felt that a good purpose would be served by bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate as expeditiously as possible. Because of the vital importance to the Senate and the country of making the existing two-thirds-cloture rule effective, I have no apologies to offer for my motion or for other parliamentary moves that will follow in the very near future.

The Senate, of course, is the sole and final judge of what action it shall take. Each Senator in the light of all the facts must vote according to his conscience on the merits of the issue. I certainly have no quarrel with any legislator regarding how he votes on this or any other issue. I only ask that each Senator vote his convictions and not deny me the right to do the same.

### PROPOSED MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND MARSHAL STALIN

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, there is a very simple method by which to test the sincerity of Mr. Stalin's statement that he honestly desires a meeting with President Truman to discuss a pact for peace.

In view of the conditions attached to this latest so-called peace bid by Mr. Stalin, I believe the American Government acted wisely and well in its rejection.

But the attainment of peace is still the supreme task of this generation. The peoples of the world, including the Russian people, ardently wish for peace. In fact, the penalties of failure are so dreadful that a moral obligation rests upon this Government and every other government to test and explore every pathway which has a reasonable chance of opening the way to understanding.

From the experience of the past 3 years, however, we have learned the salient fact that another meeting in itself will add nothing to the cause of peace unless the conditions for such a meeting are radically changed in advance. In recent years there have been constant meetings between representatives of the democratic countries and Soviet Russia, both inside the United Nations and elsewhere. Many of these meetings have taken place within the boundaries of the Soviet Union. Even the bravest optimist would hardly assert that these meetings have produced anything else than bitter fruit.

Because of this record, I believe another such meeting would be worse than futile unless we employ a new and radically different method of approach. Not only have prior meetings proved abortive, but the records show that the Soviet Union has consistently violated the solemn pledges made to this Nation and to other nations over the past several years.

Why is this true? What are the causes of failure, and how can they be corrected?

The reason for failure is clear and obvious. It is that the Soviet Government has no responsibility and no accountability to the Russian people. By means of the iron curtain, the Soviet Government has persistently and deliberately deceived the Russian people as to the peace aims and aspirations of the United States and the other democratic governments.

If the Russian people were to know the truth as to our aims and purposes and intentions, I cannot believe that they could ever be led into a war of aggression upon us or upon any of the nations of Europe.

This latest alleged peace gesture by Mr. Stalin is a perfect illustration of Kremlin methods. While Mr. Stalin was telling the world of his wish for a peace pact with President Truman, the Politburo was busy informing the Russian people that the warmongers of the democratic nations would never consent to such an agreement. This is the same two-edged propaganda thrust so often employed in the past.

The press and radio of America were used to tell our people of Mr. Stalin's peaceful intentions; the press and radio of Russia were used to falsify the peace aims of the American Government.

This proves conclusively what every thinking person knows to be true—namely, that the greatest peace menace in the world is the iron curtain rigidly maintained by the Soviet Government.

The very fact of its existence is evidence that the Soviet Government will not permit the truth about world affairs to penetrate to its own people. And where there is no truth, there is no hope of peace.

The iron curtain proves not only that Mr. Stalin is suspicious of the democratic countries; it proves beyond reasonable doubt that Mr. Stalin does not trust the Russian people. Only a government afraid of its own people would erect a barrier to block the passage of truth across its own borders.

Few people realize that the iron curtain blocks the pathway to peace by other means than the suppression and distortion of news and information. On the record, we are justified in asserting that the desire to maintain the iron curtain is the primary reason, if not the sole one, why the Soviet Government has refused to accept the plan for effective international control of atomic energy.

This plan of control is now the official plan of the United Nations. It has been accepted by all the nations except Russia and her satellites. Under this proposal, the United Nations would have the right to send impartial inspectors into Russia to make certain that the terms of peace were being carried out. In the same way, the United Nations would send impartial inspectors into the United States, and every other country.

Let us make no mistake, about it, Mr. President: this plan for the effective control of atomic energy is the most practical peace plan ever devised, and Premier Stalin could accept it tomorrow if he would. We need no personal meeting of the heads of states to carry it into effect. Soviet acceptance of the United Nations plan would be a major victory in the cause of permanent peace.

But Russia has stalled its acceptance for more than 2 years in the councils of the United Nations. The reasons advanced publicly for this refusal to cooperate are so transparent that they can surely be dismissed as frivolous. Behind these objections lies the stubborn refusal of Soviet authorities to admit inspectors of the United Nations behind the iron curtain. And so the Russian people, as well as ourselves, are victimized because truth must be suppressed to protect the political security of the Politburo.

From this situation we may arrive at this conclusion—there will be no durable peace while the iron curtain remains in existence. To remove this obstacle to understanding should be the primary task not alone of the United States but of the United Nations as well.

The cause of peace is so paramount, the mounting dangers of the cold war so apparent, that I believe a peace meeting between Premier Stalin, President Truman, Prime Minister Bevin, and Premier Queuille, is vitally urgent.

But as an evidence of good faith I believe the iron curtain should be voluntarily lifted by the Soviet Government as a precondition of that meeting. I be-

lieve that what the heads of democratic government wish to say to Mr. Stalin, they should be permitted to say to the Russian people as well.

What I am proposing is a direct radio talk by President Truman and the other heads of government to the Russian people on the eve of formal negotiations. The talks should set forth plainly the proposals of the democratic governments for peace. There should be guaranties in advance for adequate translations into the Russian and other Soviet languages. Mr. Stalin, in his turn, should be invited formally to address the American people either by radio or through the press, whichever method he prefers.

In fact, negotiations for this entire public exchange of information should be handled in detail by officials of the United Nations. In carrying out its functions the United Nations could perform no higher duty. It is well equipped to monitor radio stations, to interpret news stories—in short to make certain that conditions for the exchange of information are carried out in absolute good faith.

It is obvious that a single series of talks by the heads of democratic governments to the Russian people will not produce a permanent breach in the iron curtain. But in the peace negotiations to follow the democratic nations should insist upon the right of the United Nations to operate radio stations in each of the Big Five nations, including Russia. Only through the permanent breaching of the iron curtain in this fashion can the cause of peace be served.

In my opinion, if President Truman is accorded the right to address the people of Russia, it will be an evidence of Soviet good faith, and this fact in itself will be a great step forward along the path of peace. But if the right is denied, we may rightfully assume the Soviet attitude is less than frank, the iron curtain is still the greatest stumbling block to peace.

There are many facts which President Truman could tell the Russian people—facts which have been denied them by the iron curtain. He should be able to tell them of our offer to share atomic secrets and that acceptance of this plan will banish the horrors of atomic warfare and lay the foundations for eventual peace.

President Truman should be permitted to tell the Russian people we have poured out our lives and our treasure in two world wars, and that as a result of these victories, we have not taken a single foot of territory belonging to another nation. President Truman should be permitted to tell the Russian people about the billions of dollars which we are spending to succor not only our former allies but our former enemies as well.

And, above all, President Truman should be permitted to tell the Russian people about the deep-seated yearning of the American people for permanent peace.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McMAHON. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator also feel that the President of the United States should be permitted to tell the Russian people just what material contribution we made to their armies during the recent war?

Mr. McMAHON. I am glad the Senator from Oregon reminds me of that, because I know he realizes we spent some $11,000,000,000 or $12,000,000,000 to send matériel to the Russian people, only to find that much of the matériel had our name plates removed and Russian name plates substituted.

For three long years the Soviet propaganda agencies have employed the press and radio of the United States and other democratic countries to brand our people as warmongers and imperialists. During the same period, the Russian people have remained as remote from us as though they existed on another planet.

The proposal I have made certainly goes beyond the limitations of orthodox diplomacy. But the traditional patterns of statecraft are inadequate to meet the existing situation. We must be as bold and imaginative in winning the peace as we were in winning the war.

I believe the heads of democratic governments should propose a peace meeting with Mr. Stalin—under rigid conditions that what they propose shall be made known fully and factually to the Russian people. The Soviet Government, which erected the iron curtain, can end it at will.

Certainly, the place of meeting is secondary. We may accept in sincerity Mr. Stalin's statement that his health will not permit him a lengthy air or sea voyage. But a trip to nearby Stockholm could be made without endangering his health. Or, if he prefers, the place of meeting could be limited to his choice, provided always there is guaranteed the right of access to the Russian people.

In my judgment, it would be a tragic error to close the door entirely. There are many thoughtful people who believe the democratic countries have not gone far enough to meet what they consider to be a peace bid by Mr. Stalin. We would simply be deceiving ourselves if we overlooked the propaganda value of this latest Soviet peace offensive. There will be more of the same to follow.

Once again, Mr. Stalin has made use of the American press and radio to make known his willingness to discuss a pact for peace.

Is not it about time we had a chance to make known our peace aims to the Russian people? And if we are denied that right, should we not inform the world the reason why?

Mr. President, I have a concurrent resolution which I ask unanimous consent to offer, out of order. The resolution carries forward certain of the thoughts contained in the remarks I have just made.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the policy of certain countries in keeping their people uninformed on the true issues relating to present day international problems is not conducive to world peace; and

Whereas the policy of such countries in propagandizing the people of other countries with half truths and untruths leads to confusion and misunderstanding among the people of the world; and

Whereas all the people of the world desire peace and good will among men; and

Whereas such peace and good will will never be achieved until said people are informed of the international problems of their respective countries and the true facts underlying such problems: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President of the United States hereafter refuse to meet with the heads of other countries for the discussion and settlement of international problems unless the head of each country attending such meeting agrees prior thereto that the proposals and objectives of the respective countries, together with the underlying facts therefor, will be disseminated to the people of each such country through press and radio facilities in such country prior to, during, and at the conclusion of such meeting.

It is also the sense of the Congress of the United States that the United Nations, at its next session, take suitable and appropriate action to provide for the dissemination everywhere throughout the world of factual reports of the proceedings of said United Nations.

## AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 47). The resolution will be debatable if the Senate takes it up.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator want to debate the motion, or the resolution itself?

Mr. HAYDEN. I hope the Senate will make it the unfinished business, so I can discuss it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for what I consider to be a very constructive contribution which he has just made to the problem of defining the issue which exists between the Soviet Union and the United States. I think it of great importance that certainly the American people and the peoples in those countries where free press and free speech still exist should understand clearly the position the United States is taking in connection with its differences with the Soviet Union.

I want to commend the Senator from Connecticut, not only for his remarks, but for the introduction of the resolution, because I hold to the view, Mr. President, that we cannot continue indefinitely with the relationship that now exists between the Soviet Union and our country and arrive at our goal, which is peace. Therefore, I think now is the time to do everything within our power to try to impress upon the Russian leaders and, to the extent that they will permit us, to make available to the Russian people, information as to our sincerity in seeking to reach a peaceful understanding with the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, I make those comments quite independently of the subject matter which I rose to discuss, which deals

with the motion now pending before the Senate and with the comments of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I do not think that now is the time to debate the merits of various cloture proposals pending before the Senate, but we should endeavor to decide whether we want to take up at this time the motion to proceed with consideration of the resolution of the Senator from California. In that connection, Mr. President, I want—and I am sure that the Chair knows that I mean no disrespect—to discuss a previous ruling of the Chair today, because I think that ruling illustrates very well the point I want to make.

That ruling deprives Members of the Senate of an opportunity to file, during the morning hour, without asking for unanimous consent, amendments to resolutions they have previously introduced. Under that ruling we may find ourselves frequently in the situation in which I now find myself, that of being faced with other action by the Senate on the same subject matter, without having had any opportunity to get on file an amendment to my own resolution pertaining to the same subject matter.

So I most respectfully, Mr. President, wish to address myself for a moment to the ruling which the Chair rendered earlier today, under rule VII, dealing with morning business. I want to commend the Presiding Officer for the position he has taken in urging upon the Members of the Senate the necessity of following strictly the order of business as set out in the rules of the Senate. I think the efficiency of the Senate will be greatly improved. I think we shall be able to transact our business in a much more orderly fashion if we give to the Presiding Officer of the Senate our full cooperation in following the rules of the Senate and the order of business as set out in those rules, and confine ourselves, step by step, under those rules, especially during the morning hour, to the transaction of business which is permitted at a given time under the rules. Of course, Mr. President, in our effort to adhere strictly to the rules we must always be subject, as we all understand, to the exceptional case and where there is some good reason why an exception should be asked for, by way of unanimous consent, we should be ready to take something out of order rather than to insist on slavishly following the steps set forth in the rule. I recognize that that is not only the right of the Senate, but it is a right which we ought to exercise if, in our honest judgment, the circumstances merit it.

However, I want to point out to the Presiding Officer what I think one ruling will do to some of us if it is to be considered a precedent. I do not want it to become a precedent, and I do not think it will, with this protest. Certainly the Presiding Officer, and possibly the Parliamentarian, should look into the question as to whether the junior Senator from Oregon is correct or is in error in the position he now takes.

I refer to rule VII, on page 9 of our Senate Manual.

The first section of it reads as follows:

> After the Journal is read, the Presiding Officer shall lay before the Senate messages from the President, reports and communications from the heads of Departments, and other communications addressed to the Senate, and such bills, joint resolutions, and other messages from the House of Representatives as may remain upon his table from any previous day's session undisposed of. The Presiding Officer shall then call for, in the following order:
>
> The presentation of petitions and memorials.
>
> Reports of standing and select committees.
>
> The introduction of bills and joint resolutions.
>
> Concurrent and other resolutions.
>
> All of which shall be received and disposed of in such order, unless unanimous consent shall be otherwise given.
>
> Senators having petitions, memorials, pension bills, or bills for the payment of private claims to present after the morning hour may deliver them to the Secretary of the Senate, indorsing upon them their names and the reference and disposition to be made thereof—

And so on. I could go on and read the rest of the entire rule, Mr. President, and I submit that we would not find in it any language which prevents the Chair from ruling that when he calls for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions during the morning hour an amendment to an existing bill or to an existing resolution is to be interpreted as a bill or a resolution. Otherwise the Senator who wishes to offer such an amendment, under the Chair's ruling, will have no opportunity during the morning hour to offer such an amendment; he will have to wait until the morning hour has passed. He then will be in the position, Mr. President, of having to take his chances of securing the floor, and he may find that before he can secure the floor, other Senators have put before the Senate proposed action on the very subject matter with reference to which during the morning hour he may have wished to serve notice in regard to an amendment.

As I go through rule VII, Mr. President, I do not find in it any language which supports the Chair's ruling that it requires unanimous consent, during the morning hour, to introduce an amendment to a bill or a resolution. To the contrary, Mr. President, I submit that if the Chair will read rule VII from its four corners, taking into account the purpose of the rule, he cannot escape the conclusion that the purpose of the rule was to expedite the transaction of all business of the Senate which is encompassed in the introduction of memorials, bills, resolutions, and petitions, so that it can be done in a regular fashion, step by step. I say, Mr. President, it is certainly a highly literal interpretation, to take the position that, whereas rule VII specifically provides a step for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, it does not encompass the introduction of amendments to bills or resolutions previously introduced.

Let me show how easily the ruling could be changed from one of substance into one of mere form.

If I had not wanted to offer my amendment to a resolution today, a resolution previously existing, I could have gone through the formality of submitting a new resolution containing the identical language I wished to offer by way of my amendment, and I would then have been in order without requiring unanimous consent. I do not think those who wrote our rules had any intention of requiring that a Member of this body should be put in the position of having to follow that kind of a formality, but they clearly had in mind that when we got to the order of bills and resolutions, at that point a Member of the Senate should be in a position where he could offer whatever perfecting amendment he might wish to make to a previously introduced bill or resolution.

Mr. President, since the Chair's ruling this morning I have read the rule very carefully, and I think it is a rule which sets out in general language the order of procedure which shall be followed in connection with the introduction of resolutions, petitions, and memorials, as well as amendments thereto. If the framers of these rules meant any such limitation as the Chair has ruled today—and which I submit is going to become a very unfortunate precedent unless reversed—they could have said so very simply. But I think the general term "bills and resolutions" certainly carries with it the intention to permit the introduction of amendments thereto without any unanimous-consent requirement.

Let us apply my criticism of the Chair's ruling to what has actually transpired since the close of the morning hour. During the morning hour I sought, within the rule, and without requiring unanimous consent—because I agreed with the Presiding Officer that we should sparingly use the unanimous-consent device in order to do things on the floor of the Senate which at that time would be out of order except for unanimous consent—I sought to offer an amendment to Senate Resolution 12, which resolution deals with my cloture proposal, my proposal to adopt cloture in the Senate of the United States by majority vote rather than a two-thirds vote. I wish to say to the Senator from California, without at this time debating the merits of our differences, that my only difference with the Senator from California, the Senator from Massachusetts, and others who support the two-thirds requirement in their cloture petition, is this matter of whether cloture should be brought about by a two-thirds vote or a majority vote.

I take the position, as I have taken it before the Committee on Rules, that the two-thirds vote requirement is not going to accomplish the results which needs to be reached, because the statistics of the history of cloture in the Senate of the United States show that only four times since 1917 has it been possible to garner a two-thirds vote of the Senate to apply cloture.

Therefore it is my position that if Senators really desire to have an effective cloture rule in the Senate then we ought to have a rule that would permit the Senate by a simple majority vote to

get itself into such a position that we could pass legislation in the public interest. There is no reason that we should not be able to stop debate by the same vote by which we pass such major legislation as I cited in the committee, such as lend-lease, the Marshall plan, labor legislation; yes, Mr. President, even a declaration of war, that is by a simple majority vote.

If it is desirable to pass important legislation by a majority vote, then I say it is equally desirable to have a rule which will get the Senate in position so that we can pass that legislation by the application of a majority vote cloture rule.

When I introduced my resolution on January 5 of this year, I was of the impression that if we are to have cloture by a majority vote rule there should be a guaranty to the minority that after cloture has been adopted each Member of this body shall have 2 hours in which to debate the merits of an issue, with the right to farm out all or part of his 2 hours' time. But since offering the amendment I have made further research into this subject matter, because I try at least to render my decisions on the basis of objective data dealing with a given controversial issue, and I find that the statistical material which I have analyzed shows that, after cloture had been adopted, not once, so far as I can find, has the Senate used up the total 96 hours which would be permissible under the existing cloture rule, which provides, as the Presiding Officer well knows, for 1 hour of debate for each Senator after cloture has been adopted. I was greatly impressed with what I found in my statistical analysis.

Mr. President, I am therefore satisfied that after cloture has been adopted 1 hour is sufficient for each Senator, provided we can get an agreement on an acceptance of the view that the principle of farming out the time ought to be adopted. As I said before the committee, I think senatorial courtesy is adequate to guarantee to any Member of this body whatever time he may wish to take on the merits of an issue, if he can satisfy his colleagues on the floor that he is confining himself to the merits of the issue. If he wants 10 hours, or 15 hours, or 20 hours, to debate the merits of an issue, I have not any doubt that even Senators holding opposing views to his on the merits of the controversy would gladly give him their time, and I think there are plenty of instances in the history of the Senate which bear me out in this observation.

So, Mr. President, I sought today, during the morning hour, as I told the Committee on Rules I would do, to offer an amendment changing the 2-hour provision in my resolution to a 1-hour provision. But the effect of the Chair's ruling is that during the morning hour, unless there is unanimous consent, a Member of this body cannot offer amendments to bills or resolutions previously introduced by him, but will have to wait until after the morning hour is closed.

I say, Mr. President, with all respect, that that ruling, in my judgment, just cannot be reconciled with the purpose of rule VII. The purpose of rule VII was to expedite the introduction of resolutions and bills, and I think it carried with it the introduction of amendments to resolutions or bills.

Practically the first thing that transpired here on the floor of the Senate today after the morning hour, or almost the first thing, was the presentation of the motion by the Senator from Illinois to take up the Knowland resolution. I happen to be in favor of taking up the Knowland resolution; but that is not the material fact. It is within the realm of possibility that on some other occasion, or even at this time—and I am speaking hypothetically—the very introduction of an amendment during the morning hour might have a direct bearing upon the position a Senator might take subsequently, after the morning hour, when action was proposed on some phase of the same subject matter. I do not have to tell the Presiding Officer that a great many extenuating circumstances may develop in the Senate which may keep a Senator off the floor at the very time that subject matter is being brought up, and there would be no notice in the RECORD of the Senate, there would be nothing pending at the desk, in respect to an amendment which he had offered as a perfecting amendment to a resolution or bill previously introduced by him.

It is quite possible in this instance, certainly hypothetically possible, that some Senator might have his mind made up entirely on the question as to whether or not, under a majority-vote rule for cloture, a Senator should be allowed only 1 hour instead of 2 hours, because there are Members of this body who have said to me——

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Not at this time. I shall yield later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Senators have said to me, "We think your 2-hour limitation is too long. If you make it 1 hour, we might be more favorably inclined to your resolution." That is as far as anyone has gone, Mr. President, in speaking to me with respect to support of my resolution, although I may say to my good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] that with this amendment my resolution differs now only in respect to the farming-out provision, and unless the Senator from Pennsylvania is opposed to the idea that after cloture each Senator ought to have the right to farm out his time, or part of his time, if he does not want to use it, to some colleague, I ought to find him as an enthusiastic colleague and supporter of my resolution. Or, to put it in reverse, I will be very glad, as I have said to the Senator privately, to join with the Senator from Pennsylvania in support of his resolution, which is based upon the majority vote rule principle, if he in turn will accept the amendment which I sought to offer today, but which the ruling of the Chair prevented me from offering until after the morning hour, in the absence of unanimous consent.

I close, Mr. President, by assuring the Presiding Officer of my sincere desire to cooperate with him in every way possible in following the order of business set out in the rules, but I respectfully say to him that, in my judgment, his ruling today establishes a very unfortunate and, I think, unsound precedent, and I respectfully urge him to give it further consideration, and in due course of time advise the Senate as to whether or not he thinks rule VII really supports the ruling he has handed down today, because should that be the Chair's final ruling, I shall myself respectfully appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Oregon permit the Chair to ask him a question?

Mr. MORSE. If I can answer the question I will be very happy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Obviously under the order of business the offering of an amendment would not be in order under the heading of "Petitions and memorials." It would not be in order under "Reports of committees."

The next order is the "Introduction of bills and joint resolutions." An amendment is not a bill, although it proposes to amend a bill which has been introduced; and it is not a joint resolution. The Chair might interpret a bill to include any amendment that the author of the bill desires to offer to it and have considered in the committee. Of course, it is not necessary to offer in the Senate an amendment to a bill that has been referred to a committee. It can be done in the committee itself, or it can be done on the floor if the bill should come before the Senate for consideration.

The next order is "Concurrent and other resolutions." Well, an amendment is not a concurrent resolution. It is not any other kind of resolution. And the Chair would have to interpret one of those orders of business—for instance "Bills and joint resolutions"—to include amendments, which the language does not provide, in order to allow an amendment to come in under that heading.

The Chair appreciates the difficulty to which the Senator from Oregon has referred, and the Chair shares the view that if the Senator wants to offer an amendment to a bill which has been previously introduced it looks like there ought to be some place to do so, without securing unanimous consent, but unless I can interpret a bill to mean an amendment, it could not be done under that item of business.

The Chair will be glad to give further consideration to the suggestion of the Senator, and I hope the Chair is not so hide-bound as to sustain any ruling he has made if he is convinced that the contrary should be the ruling.

I appreciate the Senator's viewpoint, and I thank him for his expression.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, all I ask for is a reconsideration by the Chair of his ruling, because the difference between us is a difference growing out of the Presiding Officer's observation that he cannot interpret an amendment to a bill as business to be transacted at the time bills are to be introduced, or the Chair's ruling that an amendment to a

resolution previously introduced cannot be interpreted as a resolution under that section of the rule that deals with resolutions.

I submit that if the Chair will read the entire rule, in the light of its background and its purpose, that the most logical conclusion to reach is that when the Senate arrives at the point where the business is the introduction of bills and joint and other resolutions, in view of the fact that a bill or a resolution which has previously been introduced can be resubmitted with changes or amendments, that is with the perfecting language added, amendments to a bill which has already been introduced can be offered, or when a resolution has once been introduced, amendments to the resolution can be offered. It certainly must have been intended that amendments to bills can be submitted at that time, and that amendments to resolutions can be submitted at that time, because it is not to be presumed that the writers of the language intended such literal construction as the Presiding Officer has given to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47. Unless there is some objection to proceeding to the consideration of the resolution, the Chair will declare that by unanimous consent the motion is agreed to. The resolution itself is debatable.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. HAYDEN rose and addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to oppose the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have sought recognition to speak on the resolution itself. As chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to discuss the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator from Arizona is entitled to recognition, if the Senator wishes to discuss the resolution now. The Chair wishes to expedite the matter by getting the resolution before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, the resolution is now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, the resolution is not before the Senate. The motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is still pending. Does the Senator from New Hampshire object?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been trying to secure recognition here for several hours, and I have been taken off my feet, and a few more Senators are going to be taken off their feet, too, if I do not secure recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not taken the Senator off his feet. From a legislative standpoint the Senator has not been on his feet. The Chair is trying to expedite the business of the Senate. The resolution is debatable after the motion is agreed to. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona if he wishes to speak on the motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to be overly technical, but I certainly question whether recognition of any Senator should depend on whether he desires to address himself to the subject-matter under discussion. I am sure the Presiding Officer does not mean that recognition of the Senator from Arizona is to be given on that basis. What the Presiding Officer has suggested is that he would recognize the Senator from Arizona if the Senator from Arizona proposes to speak on the resolution. I would have to raise a point of order if that is the intention of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. HAYDEN. In order to settle the matter——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona if he wants recognition.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I may say first——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What is the question now before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47, the Knowland resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. That motion has not yet been put to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been put.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the question of considering certain other legislation had been before the Senate, and as much time had been spent in debating the motion to take it up as has been spent on the motion now before the Senate, there would not be enough printer's ink to proclaim a filibuster to be in progress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Hampshire.

### JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the conscience of the free peoples of the world is shocked by the diabolical trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary. Especially does the heart of America reach out to this new martyr on the tragic list of those who have been bitterly persecuted by the Communists. Once more we witness the torture of a friend of freedom because he dared speak out with the courage of his convictions.

As Cardinal Mindszenty sits alone in his cell awaiting the verdict of a court which mocks at justice, I for one would like to have him know that those who represent the people who champion liberty are thinking of him in grateful admiration. I should like to have him believe that here in America we accept his unfaltering stand as a true symbol of men everywhere who have freedom in their hearts.

The fraudulent trial in Budapest should be for our Government and people another grave reminder that although our wars in defense of decency and justice have been valiant, we have failed pitfully in what we intended would be our moral leadership of the world. In speaking out for the right since the ending of World War II the Government has sometimes displayed a squeamishness which does not compliment our country.

I am aware that there are those who are sensitive to any reference to America's failures in the field of foreign relations. But the horrible truth stares us in the face nevertheless. It was America which led in the appeasement of communism. It was America which led in the compromise of the principles which inspired freemen to win the war. It was America which first dampened the postwar ardor of those who have continued uncompromisingly the struggle against totalitarian abuse.

Yes, our dollars have been poured out by the billions, and our resources have been distributed by the millions of tons. But all too often the burning desire of the American people to augment their material gifts with a firm moral leadership has been denied.

If we lack the courage to speak out for freedom in such an hour as this, then all of our dollars and all of our goods will not keep the torch of liberty aloft in the world. If those whom we would save from Communist slavery are to know that our gifts come from our hearts, then we must let our hearts speak out when they are about to lay down their lives in our common cause. From his cell of torture Cardinal Mindszenty sends his quiet but eloquent message to remind us again that freedom cannot be bought with gold, and that men who believe in freedom must live for it and sometimes die for it, if it is to survive.

Perhaps our protest will not save the life of Cardinal Mindszenty, but it will put Communist forces on notice that America is marking down the Cardinal's plight for what it is—another shocking Communist offense against decency and against the free nations of the world.

Our protest should give to us and to the American people a new hold upon the principles we consider fundamental to our own liberty, a new hold upon our hope for a just peace in the world. The Senate's condemnation of the unjust, torturous, shocking treatment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty will be notice to those whose lack of moral principle is obvious that America is still a Christian nation and intends to continue as a bulwark of Christianity in the world.

The act against which my resolution is directed is not an isolated offense, Mr. President. It is a part of the design for world conquest which has its origin in Moscow. Let there be no mistake about that. And let there be no mistake about the awful truth that the day may come when mere protests on the part of free America will not be enough, when as a result of the Communist hatred of freedom and love for power all the world may again be caught up in the terrible holocaust of war.

I see only one real source of hope for avoiding a clash of arms between those who believe in freedom and those who embrace the Communist philosophy. It

is an uncompromising stand by our own Government and our own people for justice and decency. If we continue to hesitate to give voice to the things we know to be true and continue to hesitate to speak out against the things we know to be false, then we shall encourage those who seek the downfall of free nations the world over.

The eyes of free men everywhere are focused upon a prison cell in Budapest, Hungary, today. One of our number is probably about to lay down his life for all of us. The attention of Communist Russia and her satellites is focused upon that same cell, but also upon those who stand opposed to their slave philosophy. We shall add to the tragedy of Cardinal Mindszenty's plight if we keep our silence today. I therefore submit my resolution, by the passage of which the United States Senate would condemn the Cardinal Mindszenty trial, but even more would condemn before all the world unprincipled, un-Christian communism. We should speak out for freedom in an hour like this or accept as inevitable another fight for it later on.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that I appreciate the opportunity he gave me to join in the sponsorship of this resolution condemning as unjust the arrest, confinement, and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. Like him, I come from a section of our great country which was founded by those who believed in the free practice of religious worship, and who were willing to suffer in order to worship God in the manner they deemed best. The condemnation, without a fair trial, of a great religious leader who has the courage to guide his people in the practice of their faith, and his sentence to death or other terrible punishment must not be condoned or passed over by us.

I am glad that the Senator allowed me to join in the sponsorship of this resolution.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am glad to say that I have identified myself with this resolution. Nothing has shocked me more than what I read in the newspaper today regarding this terrible miscarriage of justice, the condemnation of an innocent man who, because he believed in his God and what his religion stood for, must pay the penalty. I think we are justified in this great body in expressing our strong objection and our condemnation of any such action by an autocratic state.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator permit me to join as a sponsor of this resolution?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. TOBEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from New Hampshire for having submitted this resolution. I associate myself with him and with the Senator from Connecticut in what they have said regarding the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty.

In December, when I first heard of the proceedings against him, I addressed a protest to the State Department and received a reply which indicated complete sympathy with the viewpoint which I expressed. It is interesting to note in the press this morning a statement by Rev. Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, who is the Chaplain of the Senate. I read from the press account:

He told the congregation of Foundry Methodist Church, of which he is pastor, that the trial is also the "signal for war between an anti-Christian colossus and any church which refuses to submit to its supremacy and regimentation."

"This trial," he continued, "is only the first in a series of onslaughts that may be expected. In this fear-haunted world the battle is drawn between Christ and anti-Christ."

TRIAL OF CHRISTIANITY

"The cardinal is really on trial for defending the things which every Christian steadfastly believes. The plain fact is that he is simply anticommunistic and that is the unpardonable sin with the present masters of the Kremlin and the puppet police states which they control," Dr. Harris declared.

Dr. Harris said the trial has been "following the usual Soviet pattern," in which the victim confesses, "at least partial guilt."

"One shudders to think of what diabolical torture wrings such false admissions from human lips which before have spoken so uncompromisingly," he continued.

NEW DAY OF TERROR

"So-called Christian churches who will agree to let 'politics' alone," he continued, "will not be molested. Silence and acquiescence may buy temporary safety. But to defy communism and its godless implications is to court martyrdom in this new day of terror," Dr. Harris declared.

"Every Christian minister who has eyes to see the sinister significance of the cardinal's trial stands with him and for him as he sits in the prisoner's dock before the modern Pilates. With him in the dock is Christendom.

"This fight is not just between Roman Catholicism and communism. It is between a godless communism and any type of Christianity worthy of the name," he concluded.

I believe that those views may be fittingly described as expressing the opinion of Christians everywhere.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to make a very brief observation on the address of the Senator from New Hampshire. I agree with the remarks which have been made concerning the complete horror of the Christian world, our world, at the situation which exists in Hungary today. Anyone who looks at a picture of the man who is now in what is called a trial, and a picture of the same man taken 2 years ago, cannot help concluding that they have persecuted and tortured him shamefully. It is a spectacle which disgraces civilization, and I heartily and strongly join in the protest which has been made here today. Cardinal Mindszenty may be killed by those who wish to enthrone communism in the place of God, but the things for which he stands will survive eternally.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, at about 3 o'clock tomorrow morning Washington time, the world will know what the Communist masters of Hungary have determined to impose as a sentence on Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. That it will be harsh is taken for granted. That it will be in complete defiance of the facts and the truth and human decency is also taken for granted by all civilized people.

All over America, decent people of all faiths, of all political views except one—the Communist—and of all races and creeds, have reacted to the arrest and kangaroo-court trial of the Hungarian primate, first with shock, then disbelief, then utter disgust. Millions of voices have been raised in protest, but so far, under the sorry state of world affairs and of widening totalitarian influence, these voices can be raised only to one authority able to do anything effective about the situation, and that authority, of course, is the Supreme One, the ultimate source of all justice.

Meanwhile, however, it is my earnest hope that the United Nations can be enlisted in some way, perhaps through the instrumentality of the Hungarian peace treaty, in conducting a thorough investigation into the depraved manner in which "justice" is being accorded an outstanding world figure in a state so recently liberated from one type of totalitarianism only to fall into another.

Mr. President, typical of the comments which informed Americans are making on the sickening sham of justice as it operates under Communist totalitarianism are several editorials which I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks. The Pittsburgh Press refers to this trial as an obscene travesty on a court of law. The Philadelphia Inquirer says that not only were impartial foreign observers excluded but that justice has also been excluded. The Washington Star makes similar comments. These are but a fraction of the angry and sorrowful editorials throughout America on this inhuman spectacle in Budapest.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Press of February 6, 1949]

TRIAL BY TERROR

The Budapest trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty cannot prove either his guilt or innocence of treason, espionage, and black marketing, or of any other charges.

It cannot be a fair trial or a legitimate judicial proceeding for the obvious reason that it is held under a reign of terror.

Not only the defendant is the victim of that terror. All connected with the exhibition, including prosecutor and judge, whether willing or unwilling participants, are subject to a law which puts itself above the laws of man and God. That is the law of dictatorship.

In the eyes of that lawless rule all men of honor and conscience who oppose it forfeit their right to live. Whether they are ignored or shot or tortured to death or sent to a prison camp, or whether they are used as drugged or terrorized puppets in an obscene travesty on a court of law, depends solely on the will of the dictatorship.

Even the chief executioner himself is not immune, as shown by the unnatural deaths of succeeding heads of the Russian secret police.

The cardinal's alleged confessions and testimony are as worthless as the charges—as he warned they would be in his prophetic letter to Hungarian Roman Catholics written before his expected arrest by the dictatorship.

---

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 5, 1949]

RED TRIAL OF CARDINAL GRIM TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

It is cause for wonder that even the Hungarian Communist bosses have had the effrontery to stage such a trial as that in which Cardinal Mindszenty is declared to have confessed that he is guilty in principle to charges of treason and black marketing.

This so-called trial is proceeding according to a Red pattern now wearisomely familiar: the people's court presided over by a judge who is also prosecutor; the incredible confessions and the certainty that the cases were settled and the sentences fixed before this Red farce opened.

If there had been even some slight departures from Communist routine the Budapest trials might not be so utterly suspect to logical men. The Catholic Church has charged, and the belief is reiterated by former Premier Ferenc Nagy, now in this country, that Cardinal Mindszenty's alleged confessions are the result of torture.

We must not forget that in the Red sphere opposition to communism is treason. Cardinal Mindszenty has been a bitter opponent of the Red regime that has grabbed Hungary.

Before his arrest Cardinal Mindszenty wrote to the Hungarian Board of Bishops: "I have participated in no conspiracy whatever. I will not resign my episcopal see. I will make no confession. If after this you should hear that I have confessed or resigned and that this is authenticated with my own signature, consider that to be only a consequence of human frailty and, in advance, I declare it null and void."

That, and the fact that he wrote a letter, which was intercepted by the Communists, appealing last week to United States Minister Selden Chapin to assist him to flee the country, strengthen the belief that Mindszenty's admissions in court are not those of a man speaking according to his free will.

The events of this spectacle, from which foreign government observers have been barred, increase the suspicions of torture and the use of drugs to obtain "confessions." This trial, from which justice has also been excluded, is a stern reminder to all of us that the Communists will go to every length to destroy those who oppose them.

---

[From the Washington Star]

THE MINDSZENTY TRIAL

Under totalitarian regimes, prosecutions for alleged offenses against the state follow an invariable pattern. This has been true of Soviet Russia ever since the Bolshevik revolution more than 30 years ago. It was likewise consistently true of Nazi Germany, the notorious Reichstag fire trial occurring in the early years of Hitler's Third Reich. And the Soviet satellite governments set up since the late war are running true to form.

The basic feature of all such trials is that they are political in character rather than juridical, as we understand the processes of justice. They are held before a special tribunal known as a people's court, with its own rules of procedure. The prosecution always alleges major crimes against the state tantamount to treason, usually coupled with alleged offenses such as black marketing which tend to discredit the character of the accused. Furthermore, the defendants are often charged with seditious relations with the representatives of foreign powers. The case against the main defendants is usually strengthened by confessions made by minor defendants who turn state's evidence. Indeed, in many cases, the chief of the accused voluntarily confesses his own guilt, either wholly or in part. Finally, it may be significant that accredited foreign correspondents have not been permitted to attend and report the Mindszenty trial.

It is against this background that the current trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, should be evaluated. The cardinal had long since made himself a marked man to Hungary's totalitarian rulers by his vigorous opposition to measures depriving the Roman Church of its historic rights and privileges in that country. For it is a basic tenet of totalitarianism that all opposition to its limitless authority must be broken. Such a trial, once started, is a major political test which can have only one outcome. An acquittal would dangerously compromise the prestige and power of the totalitarian regime, which, in the last analysis, must always be right.

Under these circumstances, every development of the Mindszenty trial adverse to the cardinal should be regarded with skepticism. This certainly applies to the qualified plea of guilty voluntarily made by the cardinal in open court. It likewise applies to the genuineness of incriminating documents allegedly found in his possession, notably the letter purporting to involve our legation in Budapest in a plan to spirit him out of the country.

Unless this trial turns out to be the proverbial "exception which proves the rule," the only uncertain factor is the severity of the penalty imposed on Cardinal Mindszenty after the verdict of guilty has been pronounced by the people's court. And we may be sure that the degree of punishment imposed will be determined by political rather than factual considerations. Justice, in our meaning of the word, will play no part.

## AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. LUCAS' motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47, to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) relating to cloture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 47.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, now that the resolution submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is before the Senate, I should like to discuss it.

I construe the resolution as an indictment of the Committee on Rules and Administration for dereliction of duty. I should like to have the Senate itself pass upon the question of whether a committee which conducted hearings and completed them in less than 10 days has been derelict in its duty, when 2 years ago a similar committee in considering a similar resolution required more than 20 days to accomplish the same result.

With respect to the hearings, I wish to say that the members of the committee were diligent in their attendance. A quorum was always present. The Senators who appeared and testified before the committee did so at inconvenience to themselves, in that their presence there interfered with the performance of their other duties. A Senate committee which acts as promptly as that should not be criticized or condemned in this manner.

Furthermore, I should like to have the Senate pass judgment upon whether it is unreasonable for the members of any committee to take a brief time to determine what position they shall take on an issue of such grave importance, an issue which vitally affects what they may do or may not do upon the floor of the Senate. It is but fair that every one of them individually should have a reasonable time in which to make up his mind as to what he should do.

Following completion of the hearings, all that the committee did was to vote that 1 week—and only 1 week, a postponement of that length of time—be taken before the committee would again take up consideration of the cloture resolution.

I have no definite means of knowing what the committee will do on next Wednesday. It will meet then, and will take up the resolution to amend rule XXII, which is the unfinished business before the committee. If the resolution should be reported to the Senate next Wednesday, I wish to assure Republican Senators who have made engagements to make Lincoln Day addresses that they can plan to go away and will not be required to come back and be in their seats in this body before a cloture rule comes before the Senate. No debate on it will occur in that interval. I am glad that we on this side of the aisle can extend that courtesy to Republican Senators, because we know it will be returned to us in full measure when Jefferson Day comes around, and that regardless of what business is then before the Senate, they will permit Democratic Senators to go out to make their addresses.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator from Arizona realizes, of course, that that is in consonance with a great Republican doctrine of long standing, originated by McKinley—namely, reciprocity.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am glad to give reciprocal assurance to the Republican Senators that they can go away next Saturday and there will be no cloture resolution brought before the Senate before they can return, because undoubtedly it will take a little time—if I am honored by the committee by being asked to write the report—to prepare it.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am reminded, of course, of what the able Senator from California has said—namely, that in the event immediate action is not taken, he will again and again file a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of this matter. So, in view of the statement of the Senator from California, I doubt whether the Senator from Arizona can count on such an interval.

Mr. HAYDEN. I doubt whether the Senate would sustain any such renewed motion. I can positively state no Sen-

ator has suggested to me that there should be a delay of 15 months before such a resolution is even indirectly considered by the Senate. Yet that is exactly what happened in the last Congress.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me preface my question with a brief statement: I heard what the Senator from California had to say about the motion. I wish to hasten to tell my friend the Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the committee, that as I heard the remarks of the Senator from California, I did not understand them to imply any criticism whatever of the chairman of the committee.

I wish merely to add this inquiry: Can the Senator from Arizona give us any assurance as to when we shall have an opportunity to vote on this particular matter?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am the despair of some of my good friends, the newspapermen, who are much more interested in what is going to happen than in what has happened, because I refuse to make predictions. All I can say is that the committee will meet on next Wednesday, and that as, if, and when the resolution is reported, I am quite sure there will be no 15 months' delay in bringing it before the Senate.

Mr. BALDWIN. I take it from what my friend says that the present state of the matter is such that it is even beyond prophecy—and of course prophecy is rather an easy thing. The Senator from Arizona would hesitate even to make a guess about it, then; would he?

Mr. HAYDEN. I simply do not engage in predictions. In that way I keep myself 100 percent correct.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona yields for a question.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator yield only for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, that is all the Senator from Arizona can yield for at this time. However, the Chair would point out that this debate has been running along, by unanimous consent, in violation of the rule; so the Chair will not clamp down at this time and enforce the rule as against the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. I appreciate the Chair's position. Nevertheless I shall attempt to abide by the rule, by framing the statement in question form: Does the Senator from Arizona remember the statement of the Senator from California that two wrongs do not make a right? I refer to the Senator's statement that the Republicans by their delay had made a mistake, and we recognize the mistake, and we do not want the mistake to occur again and to cause, by unwarranted delay, a continuation of such a mistake or a repetition thereof?

Mr. HAYDEN. Does the Senator from New York insist that up to this moment there has been any unwarranted delay?

Mr. IVES. Yes; I do. However, I have not the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have asked a question of the Senator. I should like to know what delay has been unwarranted.

Mr. IVES. The 10-day delay when the hearings were delayed from the 14th to the 24th.

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, we should have conducted hearings during the period of the Presidential inauguration; is that the point? I am entirely willing to let the Senate pass judgment on that delay.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. Let me point out to the Senator that the time I referred to, in saying that the hearings should have begun on the 14th, was not during the inaugural period. There was ample opportunity on the 14th and 15th, at least, and perhaps on the 17th and 18th.

I wish to point out to the Senator from Arizona that we already have an excellent precedent for Saturday hearings because of what is going on before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

To my mind, the delay which occurred in this case was inexcusable, and it may eventually prove to have been disastrous.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me again state that no motion was made at any time during the entire life of the Eightieth Congress to take up for consideration the cloture resolution reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration on April 3, 1947. The only reference ever made to that resolution occurred at the time when an entirely different proposal was under consideration.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I do not think the Senator from Arizona quite understood what I was driving at. I tried to indicate that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] pointed out to the Senate in his preliminary remarks, the first he made today on this question, that the Republicans had erred in that delay; and we admit it, but we do not want to see a repetition of it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Be that as it may, what happened was, as we all well remember, that the President of the United States, after the Democratic and Republican National Conventions had adjourned, called Congress into extraordinary session. In a message to Congress the President suggested there were certain bills which had passed one House or the other, that could be considered and passed, and if that action were taken, it would redeem pledges made in both the Democratic and the Republican national platforms. The Republican leadership of the House decided the particular bill which should be taken up, among all subjects mentioned by the President, was an antilynching bill. They well knew when they made that decision, that a similar bill had been rejected by the Senate on at least five different occasions. They also knew that the Senate had twice in 1938 and again in 1946 refused to vote cloture on a very similar bill.

What happened was exactly what the Republican leadership expected to happen. The antilynching bill caused a filibuster to take place in the Senate. The debate was unlimited. It went on and on until an attempt was made to file a cloture petition to close debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of the bill. Then, the President pro tempore, the very able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], ruled, and properly so, that the present rule XXII did not apply to a situation of that kind. Very shortly thereafter the Republican leadership determined it was useless to carry on discussion with respect to that bill. It was at that late date that notice was served upon the Senate that immediately upon the convening of the Eighty-first Congress an effort would be made to adopt an amendment to rule XXII, which would correct it to conform to what many Senators believed to be the original intent at the time that the rule was adopted in 1917.

That announcement was made, that pledge was given, on the assumption the Republicans would continue in control of the Senate. Let us suppose there had been a Nation-wide landslide, that the Republican Party had gained the Presidency and had retained control over both Houses of Congress. Let us imagine for a moment what the situation would have been at the beginning of this Congress, in January 1949. The very able Senator from Michigan undoubtedly would have been reelected President pro tempore of the Senate. If a motion had been made to proceed to the consideration of a resolution to amend rule XXII, no one would have expected him to reverse his ruling that the motion to proceed is debatable indefinitely. It is also reasonable to expect that extended discussion would take place on the floor of the Senate.

I assume therefore that if an effort had been made to rush the consideration of a cloture resolution we would have been faced with this dilemma: Could the Senate have attended the inauguation of President Dewey, if a filibuster were going on at that very time in this body?

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I may point out to the able Senator from Arizona that under such circumstances we certainly would have been very glad to attempt to do so.

Mr. HAYDEN. Furthermore, it is very doubtful whether the Republicans would have attempted to take up a change in rule prior to the inauguration, any more than the Democrats did. They would have known how the President pro tempore of the Senate would rule, and that debate could not be cut off. They might well have preferred to wait until after January 20, and then see whether Vice President Warren might be persuaded to modify the ruling made previously by President Pro Tempore VANDENBERG.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. At this very moment, with the resolution of the Senator from California pending, do we not have an excellent opportunity to see how the distinguished Vice President of the Democrats would rule on the same motion? Perhaps, if my friend were to press it, we might have that opportunity now.

Mr. HAYDEN. The question pending before the Senate at the time is whether or not the resolution offered by the Senator from California shall be adopted. The motion to take it up has been disposed of so there is no occasion for a ruling by the Vice President.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A few moments ago the distinguished Senator remarked that the cloture resolution would come up for consideration before the Committee on Rules and Administration next Wednesday.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. The distinguished Senator stated he did not know what action would be taken, in the event the resolution is reported favorably to the calendar. The resolution in question is the Hayden-Wherry resolution; is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is true, and the resolution offered by the Senator from California reads:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Rules and Administration is hereby discharged from further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) relating to cloture.

Senate Resolution 15 is the particular resolution which the Senator from Nebraska and I have offered.

Mr. WHERRY. In the event the meeting is held by the Committee on Rules and Administration next Wednesday and favorable action taken, does the Senator from Arizona now say it will be immediately taken up for consideration in the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. I assured the Senate that such action would not be taken, because Republican Senators are entitled to be away from the Senate in order to deliver their Lincoln Day addresses.

Mr. WHERRY. How about next Monday? If it is reported Wednesday, would it be ready for debate next Monday?

Mr. HAYDEN. Whenever the resolution is reported to the Senate and placed upon the calendar any Senator may move to proceed to its consideration. I do not want to indicate that such a motion will be made on Monday. I do not want Senators to be hurrying back after they have been away to deliver their addresses. I do not think Democratic Senators who had been away for Jackson Day would want to be hurried back. All that I am trying to impress upon the Senate is that I know of no one who would expect that there should be any such delay in the consideration of a cloture resolution as occurred in the previous Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. I thought I understood the Senator to say there probably would be extended debate. But I was very greatly pleased with the statement he made, that if the resolution were favorably reported it would be taken up immediately for debate. I hope the Senator meant that he would not only report it to the calendar, but would move to take it up.

Mr. HAYDEN. I certainly would have to consult with the Senator from Nebraska and other Senators about what would be the proper time to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the Senator from Arizona to know I am ready to have the resolution taken up at any moment, and the sooner the better. So if we can do it next Monday, that would be perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not anticipate, once the resolution is placed upon the calendar, there will be any interminable delay in its consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Arizona concluded?

Mr. HAYDEN. I conclude by saying I hope the Senate will at this time vote down the Knowland resolution and reject any implication, any condemnation of the Committee on Rules and Administration, which committee I insist has been diligent in the service of the Senate, and will continue to be so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

## THE WORK OF THE COMMISSION ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I should like to address myself today to the subject of governmental reorganization and the work of the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, popularly known as the Hoover Commission. Today seems an appropriate time to offer a few remarks because ex-President Hoover has just released the first official recommendations of the Commission, and many more will shortly follow.

I wish to take this opportunity, Mr. President, to place myself in principle squarely behind the recommendations which the Hoover Commission has made, and will make in the future. I can think of no comparable objective from which the people of the United States can benefit more in the long run, than a thorough and meaningful reorganization of the Federal Government. Whether we like it or not, Mr. President, big government is with us to stay, but it behooves the people's elected representatives to grant the necessary authority, to allow the President and his executives to make it run efficiently, with an absolute minimum of overlapping jurisdictions, duplications of functions, and unaccountable waste.

A historic battlecry of both political parties in their campaigns for many years has been the reduction of Federal expenditures. A just concern over this subject has often resulted in negligence of well-considered programs of minimum proportions. How much more logical it would be, and how much more in keeping with our tremendous national responsibilities, if the Congress would adopt, with a minimum of qualification, the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I would venture to say that millions of dollars would be saved, and unmeasurable benefits in increased efficiency would be realized.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that the time is propitious for favorable action. Consider the makeup of the Commission. It is composed of 12 highly qualified men, 6 from each political party. It is headed by a man whose mature years have been spent in public service for his fellowmen. Since the Commission is nonpartisan, neither party can logically nor legitimately line up against its recommendations. The resolution sponsoring the study by the Commission was initiated in this body by that keen student of government, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. The President of the United States, a Democrat, publicly endorsed the work of the Commission, after the recent campaign, in spite of its being headed by a former Republican President. Surely no more favorable political and psychological setting could be found.

But I am frankly worried, Mr. President, in spite of this apparent fortunate climate. The history of proposals for reorganization of the Government has been a dismal one. Rather than burden the Members of the Senate with a detailed summary of this history, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have an article written by Mr. James H. Rowe, a member of the Hoover Commission, in yesterday's Washington Star, made a part of my remarks at the conclusion of my remarks. This scholarly article is well written and to the point, in recognizing the difficulties inherent in any governmental reorganization, and is well worth the attention of the Members of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. TOBEY. Let me say, Mr. President, that I want to serve notice here and now, as one individual Senator, that I will strenuously oppose any efforts by well-meaning Government administrators and their clientele to undermine the efforts of the Commission. It is a well-known occupational disease of all administrators, whether public or private, to seek to avoid the curtailment of privileges and prerogatives which have long been theirs. However, it is clearly evident to me that the burden of proof in the proposals to come before Congress will fall almost prohibitively on those who seek to retain the status quo.

The need for a thorough and complete reorganization of the machinery of government has been recognized for years.

The Hoover Commission is now ready to make its report. The time to meet and adopt these recommendations is now. It would be a tragedy if the long and sincere efforts of this committee to meet the need should die, or be shunted aside.

The responsibility to meet this need in the people's interest devolves upon the Congress. It has a great opportunity and a great privilege.

There is nothing that Congress could do, which, in my judgment, would meet with more universal approval by the people of this country than to carry out the recommendations which the Commission will make.

As always, when somebody's toes are stepped on, or some power is abridged, logrolling begins. Those of us who have been familiar with government down through the decades, recognize that this matter will be no exception. Just as in tariff legislation or tax legislation, those who in their judgment are being asked to give up some prerogative, seek to place the burden of the change upon the other fellow, so it will be with this.

Congress must rise to great heights. It must refuse to be led aside by these specious appeals; in other words, to use the language of Farragut of Mobile Bay, "Damn the torpedoes; go ahead!" And people will commend us for so doing.

The magnitude of the task is beyond the comprehension of any one man. I, for one, am willing to place my faith in the expert hands of the nonpartisan Hoover Commission, subject to a careful study on my part in each instance.

The time for constructive action is now. In my judgment, a similar favorable psychological and political climate will never be found.

The Members of Congress owe to their constituents an overwhelming obligation to apply logic and reason to the octopus of big government.

The Members of Congress owe to their constituents assurance that they recognize the attendant evils in administration of government. They propose to do something constructive about it, something more than merely to assail extravagance and inefficiency in government.

Here is the way. May we not be found wanting.

EXHIBIT I

FEDERAL REORGANIZATION LONG BUT FUTILELY SOUGHT—INDIFFERENT SUCCESS AT HANDS OF CONGRESS WAS THE FATE OF SIX MAJOR ATTEMPTS MADE BEFORE THE HOOVER REPORT

(By James H. Rowe, member of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government)

This week the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government will send to Congress the first of a series of reports containing its recommendations for the reorganization of the Federal Government.

More familiarly known as the Hoover Commission (its chairman is the former President of the United States), this 12-man body is, at least in form, a new technique for an old problem: The task of bringing order out of governmental chaos, of making that hardy perennial, the Federal "bureaucracy," responsive, efficient, and economical. It is not the first time this has been tried, nor will it be the last. Our history is littered with the corpses of other bodies politic which have perished in similar adventures.

POLITICALLY BALANCED GROUP

Created by the Eightieth Congress in 1947, this Commission, however, is at least in membership a new departure. It includes legislators (two Senators and two Representatives), public administrators from the executive branch itself and six private citizens who have had previous Government experience. Although such bodies, named royal commissions, have long been used to study specific major problems in England and Canada, this is their first appearance in the United States. The sponsor of the act in the House, CLARENCE BROWN, of Ohio, is a member of the Commission. Secretary of State Dean Acheson was a private citizen when made Vice Chairman of the Commission.

To quell partisan political suspicions, which flower easily enough in the governmental arena, its sponsors provided that six members be Republicans, six Democrats. Although its Chairman, is, of course, a Republican, President Truman has consistently and publicly encouraged the group's work. The heads of the Government agencies, particularly the President's own staff advisers such as the Budget Bureau, have gone far beyond mere lip service in their cooperation and have been really helpful in every instance. Both the Eightieth Congress and its successor have been generous with money and support.

Such an agreement on all sides indicates general awareness on the part of the people and their servants, the public officials, that there is a problem. There is.

What is its nature? What are the chances of improvement?

Until the Commission has reported its findings to the Congress its conclusions cannot be discussed. The nature of the problem can, however, be outlined, previous attempts to meet it can be indicated. Success or failure of the Commission will depend in part on the merits of its proposals but also in part on the inherent difficulties of any thoroughgoing governmental reorganization in a democracy.

HODGEPODGE OF 1,800 UNITS

However one approaches it, reorganization is not a new problem. It may be more difficult, more complex, even more pressing. But it has been with us for a long time. Since 1900 the steady growth, in size and in variety, of Federal functions, have made the Government almost impossible to direct and coordinate. Its machinery has gradually become more disorderly and complex. For governmental growth is never at a steady, or even pace. It takes place in fits and starts caused by conditions Government itself does not control. The impact of two world wars, of several severe depressions, of new and compelling desires by the people it serves, has skewered the structure out of shape. And each need, once accepted as real by the Congress, was handled as it arose. Congress viewed only its particular solution with little or no concern for its relevance to an over-all pattern. Worn as it is, the most apt description is that the Government has just grown like Topsy.

Today it is a "combined hodgepodge" of more than 1,800 different units. The budget for the fiscal year 1950 is $45,000,000,000—$7,000,000,000 more than our entire national income in 1939. More than a third of today's budget, almost a tenth of our entire national production, goes to the military establishment alone.

After each sudden growth in governmental functions an inevitable attempt has been made to make the structure more business-like, more efficient and more economical. Almost all Presidents and Congresses have been increasingly concerned with reorganization. After each crisis of war or depression, proposals were made to rationalize the new agencies or bureaus into the over-all structure.

All serious recommendations were designed to repair three major flaws:

1. Activities had been placed in agencies which had no relation to the major purpose those agencies should perform.

2. Related agencies, which performed the same or similar functions, were put in different departments.

SIX OTHER ATTEMPTS MADE

3. The executive branch as a whole lacked definite direction and control.

Every major study of governmental reorganization has emphasized these defects. The one consistent thread which has run through all proposals to bring order out of this chaos is the constant reassertion of these three principals. Those of the Hoover Commission will be no exception.

It has been said that George Washington was the first President to try to reorganize the Government.

Certainly sporadic attempts were made in the nineteenth century to tamper with the Government structure. But it is only during the twentieth century, particularly since World War I, that the attention of public administrators, political scientists, and legislators has been scientifically fixed on this problem.

There have been six previous major efforts to reorganize the executive branch.

In 1912 President Taft presented to the Congress the report of his Commission on Economy and Efficiency, but no action was taken.

In 1923 President Harding sent his suggestions for improvement to a Joint Congressional Committee on Reorganization of the Executive Departments. Several of his most far-reaching changes were not accepted by the joint committee, which recommended its own plan instead. It, too, did not receive congressional approval.

The Institute of Government Research, a private organization interested in public administration, also in 1923 submitted a reorganization proposal, but Congress again took no action.

TWO SIMILARITIES

In 1932 President Hoover was granted broad powers to reorganize the executive branch by executive order with the provision that either house could nullify it by disapproval within 60 days of the transmittal of such order to the Congress. President Hoover submitted a wide-scale reorganization, but the House of Representatives disapproved his proposals.

The last major attempt to reorganize was the twofold effort in 1937. The Brookings Institution made a lengthy report to a select committee investigating the executive agencies, but no legislation resulted.

The report of the President's Committee on Administrative Management, a group of political scientists appointed by President Roosevelt, also made its report in 1937. Most of its recommendations did not become law.

If one reviews these past recommendations, he will be immediately struck by two things:

1. They have met with indifferent success at the hands of Congress.

2. All proposals center around several major problem areas. And although succeeding Congresses have refused to accept the suggested solutions, they are made time and time again. Once more the recommendations of the Hoover Commission will prove no exception to this general rule.

Why did Congress react so indifferently in the past to reorganization? The experienced members of the Congress are better informed and more concerned about our sprawling bureaucracy than any other group of American citizens. They struggle with its intricacies daily and they are sincerely appalled by their own inability to control it through legislation, investigation, and appropriation. They are intelligently disturbed, far more than the individual citizen.

NOT A JOB FOR CONGRESS

Past experience suggests there are several reasons.

For one thing, the Congress is unable to legislate every detail or to examine every one of the departments and agencies with sufficient precision to complete an over-all plan. Probably the hardest working body in the world, it is necessarily immersed in day-to-day problems which require immediate answers.

Also each Congressman is for many reasons more aware and more interested in the activities of one department or agency than in

the many others. Each agency has its friends, its sponsors on the hill.

Students of the Federal Government have therefore long been convinced that only the President can really reorganize the Government on an over-all basis. He can do this only if Congress wil give him the power. For that reason a new technique was created in 1939 especially for reorganization. First suggested by Secretary of Commerce Hoover, this power eventually was granted to President Roosevelt. It allows the President to draw up and submit to Congress a plan for reorganization. If both Houses of Congress do not disapprove the plan within 60 days it becomes law. Since this is clearly a legislative function the Congress was long loathe to give up such a power. But over the years it too had grown to realize that this was the only way. Led by such able students of government as Senator James Byrnes, later Justice of the Supreme Court and Secretary of State, and Representative Lindsay Warren, now Comptroller General, the Congress temporarily granted this power to President Roosevelt in 1939. This power was once renewed but again expired in 1948.

Last month the Hoover Commission formally requested both Houses to grant it once more to President Truman and hearings on such a bill are now being held in both Houses.

Inevitably certain Government agencies will ask that they be exempted from the provisions of the new reorganization bill. Some have been so exempted in the previous acts. Once exempted that is the end of it, as a practical matter. Then the only way to reorganize such agencies is by the regular legislative method. Since 1939 no agency which has acquired an exemption has been reorganized by congressional statute.

EXEMPTIONS WILL BE ASKED

The trouble with exemptions is that if several of the most important segments of the Government can take themselves out of the reorganization game it is most difficult to create the necessary coherent pattern for the entire executive branch. This has been the big stumbling block since 1939.

Everyone believes in reorganization—for the other fellow. Every public administrator can, and will, give countless examples of duplication in effort, unnecessary waste, and ridiculous expenditure. But it is always the agency down the street, not his own. And every official knows various agencies pulling at cross purposes with each other or the President—but they are always two other agencies.

This is a natural, indeed human, quality. Each administrator, of course, knows much more about the flaws and virtues of his particular work than any commission however expert. It is not very surprising that he finds faults in an over-all plan because it has not been able to master all the detailed knowledge at his fingertips. But he forgets that such a commission sees the over-all pattern, something he does not.

And every agency has its clientele—citizens who as general taxpayers are properly horrified by cost and inconsistent administration of the Government, but who also derive special service from one particular agency. They, too, favor reorganization—but not of their pet agency.

The consequences are always the same. The particular department and the influential group who support its activities for their own specific reasons want to be untouchable. They sincerely think they are a special situation, so they make their views known to the Congress. Multiply each agency and its own group by the total number of agencies and groups, some of them far stronger throughout the Nation than others, and the opposition to reorganization is clear.

PRESIDENT HAS OVER-ALL VIEW

The only person on the other side of the fence is the President. He has a national, an over-all point of view. He is held responsible for making this "combined hodgepodge" work. So he wants it to be an efficient, businesslike, nonwasteful organization.

Standing with him—theoretically, at least—are all of us, the great mass of taxpayers and citizens.

It is unfortunately notorious that taxpayers and citizens while they complain bitterly about cost and inefficiency in Government, do nothing more than that. They fail to make their views known to the Congress.

In general, these are the reasons that reorganization proposals of the past have met with the indifference they have. The same fate awaits the Hoover Commission unless the attitude of the general citizen has changed remarkably.

There is good reason why he should have changed. The growth, the size, and the cost of the executive branch over the past few decades is apparent to him.

Perhaps Presidential reorganization plans should be sent to the Congress only on March 15—income-tax day.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 47), which is as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Committee on Rules and Administration is hereby discharged from the further consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 15) relating to cloture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution of the Senator from California, Senate Resolution 47.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to address myself for a few brief moments to the resolution which is now before the Senate.

I am a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and I also have a resolution on the same subject which is before the Committee on Rules and Administration for consideration. That committee met on the twelfth of January, and during the course of its deliberations it was suggested that the committee should fix a date for hearings on these cloture resolutions. It was suggested that the committee should meet on the 14th, which was a Friday, and continue hearings to the 15th. We realized that we could not finish our hearings at that time. We well knew that the week of inauguration would intervene and we endeavored to get the committee to agree amicably that hearings would begin on the fourteenth of January. I was a good deal surprised to hear it said that a delay of 2 days might well be disastrous. We know that cannot be true. We cannot stretch our imaginations to such an extent as to think that a delay of 2 days would in any way destroy that resolution or its effect.

Committees do not usually sit on Saturdays, but the suggestion was made that the committee sit on Saturdays.

Several Senators asked the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to waive a roll-call vote, but the Senator from California was adamant; he wanted to put the committee members on record as to whether they were in favor of beginning hearings on the 14th or on the 24th of January. In view of the record of the last Congress, it seems to me that was rather ludicrous. It was amazing. I felt that there was some reason, some purpose, for the suggestion other than merely having hearings 10 days later. So the question was put to a vote, and we had a party vote. The eight Democrats voted that the hearings should commence on the 24th of January. The five Republicans voted, in effect, to commence hearings on the 14th of January. We began hearings on the 24th, Mr. President, and we had hearings all that week. Then we had hearings on Monday and Tuesday of last week. Then the committee met on Wednesday. Some members of the committee wanted more time. There had been 7 or 8 days of hearings. Two of the committee were new Members of the Senate, and another was a new member of the committee. Although he had previously served in the Senate, and was somewhat familiar with the legislation in question, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], too, asked for further time to consider the resolution, or all the resolutions.

As has been said, I have offered a resolution providing that the Senate may impose cloture by a majority vote. My resolution is the first measure pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration, because I offered it as an amendment to the Hayden-Wherry resolution when it was brought up last Wednesday. But some of the Senators asked for another week. I said to the committee that I had been close to this subject for a long period of time, that I did not think I needed any further time to consider the resolution, that I had heard much of the evidence, was familiar with it. But we had to have a vote then, so I voted against continuing the matter until the coming Wednesday. But I certainly think when the chairman of a committee and some of our colleagues in the Senate ask that more time be granted by a standing committee of the Senate to consider legislation, that much courtesy is due them, and they should be given at least 3 more days, today, tomorrow, and Wednesday, in which to consider the testimony and the entire subject.

Mr. President, I see no reason for the pending resolution. I see no reason whatsoever for bringing the resolution before the Senate, and I am sure the author of the resolution and those on the other side of the aisle know that the committee is going to meet on Wednesday, and undoubtedly—I cannot predict, but I am quite convinced—the committee will come to a vote, and will vote on the pending resolutions. Although I can give such assurance to no one, personally I am convinced we will reach a vote. In view of that situation, I cannot quite understand the reasons or the motives for insisting that the committee be discharged.

One may say he has the greatest love and affection for the chairman of the committee, but I do not think the present move shows courtesy toward the chairman of the committee, and I think it is a discourtesy, too, to some other Senators who asked for a few days, and whose committee gave them the few days, which will expire on Wednesday.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely trust that, in view of the record, the pending resolution will be voted down, and I hope we will not again be told, when we vote it down, that such action

will be disastrous, for certainly a delay for these few days will not change anyone's mind and will not mean life or death to this cloture resolution.

I am convinced the committee will reach a vote, and I am convinced, too, that the Senators on this side who asked for just a few days should certainly be granted that time. I do not know of an instance in the history of the Senate when a committee has been discharged after 7 days of hearings when it could not come to a vote immediately on the day following the close of the hearings. I do not think there is of the Senate precedent for such action.

I repeat, I am for the resolution offered by myself, I am for a resolution pending before the committee to cut off debate, and to make cloture applicable to all motions; I believe the rule should be changed, as I have always believed; but, nevertheless, I think that the pending resolution should be voted down, and that the Committee on Rules and Administration, a standing committee of the Senate, should itself be given an opportunity on next Wednesday to determine this question.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Pennsylvania has referred to something that happened before the Committee on Rules and Administration with respect to the pending measure. I should like to know whether what I have heard is true or false, viz: that the proponent of the resolution to discharge the committee even requested in the beginning that no hearings whatsoever be held, that no Senator be permitted to testify before the committee, and that a vote be had immediately to report the resolution favorably.

Mr. MYERS. I hesitate to give a categorical reply to the question, but I do know that discussion was had in the committee, that hearings were held, lengthy hearings, complete hearings, and that there was no necessity for any further hearings. Then when it was said, "Senators should at least be permitted to testify," several times members of the committee desired to cut off their testimony and to give them only 2 or 3 days, and at the end of those 2 or 3 days cut off the hearings. That question arose several times, but fortunately it never came to a vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand that no Senator who desired to testify was denied the privilege of testifying before the committee?

Mr. MYERS. That is very true; every Senator who indicated a desire to testify was given opportunity.

Mr. IVES and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MYERS. I think the Senator from New York first asked for recognition, and I yield to him.

Mr. IVES. I appreciate the views of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I appreciate fully the situation with which he has been confronted, and I appreciate his interest in the proposed action, which I know is sincere. However, I wish to ask the Senator whether he does not believe that the sooner this matter is handled the more likelihood there will be that it will be handled successfully from the standpoint of the proponents.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, I believe that the sooner proposed legislation before the Congress is handled the better it will be for Congress and the country.

Mr. IVES. I refer to the particular resolution we are discussing.

Mr. MYERS. I thoroughly agree with the Senator that the sooner we can get to the consideration of this question, the better.

Mr. IVES. May I ask the Senator another question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. MYERS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. IVES. Does the Senator believe that as soon as a resolution is reported by the committee, whether it be the Senate Resolution 15 or his own resolution it should have a position of priority on the Senate Calendar for consideration on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MYERS. I would rather the Senator would address that question to the majority leader, but it is my understanding that at the moment there is nothing on the calendar. Something may have come in during the last day or so, but there is little on the calendar that would precede the resolution, I believe.

Mr. IVES. I know the sincerity of the Senator from Pennsylvania in this matter, and I am wondering if he does not agree with me that the best and the quickest way to handle this question is to handle it first and get it out of the way.

Mr. MYERS. Of course, the more expeditious attention we give to the resolution, the better. But that is not the question before the Senate. The question is, Should a standing committee of the Senate be discharged from consideration of a resolution after 7 days of hearings because it refused to vote to report the resolution a day after the hearings closed? That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. IVES. That is the question before the Senate, but it does not happen to be the question I raised to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania. Does the Senator agree with me that a question of this kind, this particular question should be given any priority on the floor once a resolution is reported by the committee, or once it is before the Senate, whether it be by report of Senate Resolution 15, or of some other resolution?

Mr. MYERS. I believe the sooner we can get to this resolution, the better, if we expect to have it adopted during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe that the subject matter of this resolution is more or less complicated than the subject matter pending before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on labor legislation?

Mr. MYERS. I will ask the Senator to repeat the question.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe that the subject matter of the resolution on cloture is more or less complicated than the subject matter of the labor legislation pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare?

Mr. MYERS. That will depend on the definition of the word "complicated."

Mr. MORSE. I will take the Senator's definition.

Mr. MYERS. I would say that it is less complicated, probably, than the labor question, although feelings are just as deep and men on both sides have just as sincere convictions on this question as on the labor question.

Mr. MORSE. Then, in view of the answer of the Senator from Pennsylvania to that question, does he share the view of the Senator from Oregon that more time should have been allowed by the Democrats on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for extensive hearings on labor legislation?

Mr. MYERS. No; I think just the opposite; that the Republicans have been insisting upon more and more time on labor legislation, but have been insisting that we cut off debate on this legislation. It probably all depends on how the shoe fits, I may say.

Mr. MORSE. We will discuss that for a moment by way of questions and answers. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania believe that February 10 is a proper date to fix for the closing of hearings on labor legislation?

Mr. MYERS. Well, I think that the committee itself is probably more competent than I to give an answer to that question. I am satisfied with the date, February 10, if that is a sufficient answer, although I am not a member of the committee, and therefore was not present when all the arguments were advanced for closing off hearings on February 10 and all the other arguments were advanced for extending hearings beyond that date.

Mr. MORSE. But the Senator from Pennsylvania is not satisfied that the length of time which has elapsed in the consideration of the cloture resolution by the Rules and Administration Committee has as yet been adequate.

Mr. MYERS. I did not say that. I said that so far as I was concerned I did not need that week's time. But I did say that three or four Senators asked for that additional time, and when the committee voted to postpone consideration of that resolution 1 week, I thought that the Senate and the members of the committee should extend that courtesy to the chairman and to those members of the committee who had asked for additional time since the committee itself by majority vote had so determined.

Mr. MORSE. Now with reference to the observation of the Senator from Pennsylvania as to what foot has what shoe on it, does the Senator from Pennsylvania think that the same courtesy should have been extended Senators who felt that a longer period of time in the Labor and Public Welfare Committee for the consideration of the very complicated subject of labor legislation, should have been granted beyond February 10?

Mr. MYERS. The committee determined not to grant such time. The Committee on Rules and Administration determined to grant that additional time. The Committee on Rules and Administration having so determined, having so acted by majority vote, then I would think the Senate should sustain the Committee on Rules and Administration. On the labor question, the committee itself, by a majority vote, determined not to grant such additional time.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true then that what the Senator's argument reduces itself to is that the Senate ought to approve whatever action the Democratic majority takes on any committee on which they have a majority?

Mr. MYERS. Oh, I would not hope that all votes would be along party lines. I would think that we would be able many times to cross the party lines. I do think there is too much of politics in this particular resolution before us today. Since the Senator from Oregon has brought up the question, I will say that I think there is too much politics in that resolution.

Mr. MORSE. I want to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania that I certainly share his hopes. I would like to join with him in eliminating partisan politics, and I most respectfully suggest to him that if the Democrats really want to eliminate party politics on the labor issue they will proceed to lift the February 10 ban, because the legislation cannot possibly be considered on its merits in that period of time.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. STENNIS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MYERS. I yield to the Senator from Florida, because I believe he has an observation to make somewhat in line with what the Senator from Oregon has been saying.

Mr. PEPPER. Obviously, Mr. President, there are some of us who are on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who think the Senator from Oregon might more properly discuss the subject with his colleagues, with whom he has heretofore discussed it, than with the Senate as a whole, the Members of which are not so well acquainted with the details of what has happened as are the members of the committee.

I think it might be observed for the benefit of the Senator from Oregon that, if I understand the situation correctly, in the Committee on Rules and Administration all the Senators who desired to be heard were heard. I do not believe the public was heard at all. Senators were heard for 8 days. I understand that the print of the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration has not yet become available to Senators. However, the matter is being now considered by the committee, following the conclusion of the hearings, if I understand the situation correctly. I do not know that any limitation has been imposed by the committee on when they shall have to come to a final decision about reporting the resolution or not reporting it, although I am informed that the committee is going to act upon the matter when they next meet.

I suppose they will give consideration to it, and it is my assumption that whenever the committee feel that they are prepared to do so, they will report the resolution. Certainly my own vote, in voting against the resolution of the Senator from California does not indicate that I am not in sympathy with the two-thirds cloture rule applicable to any pending question in the Senate, but it means that I do not believe it is quite appropriate to demand the discharge of a committee which has had 8 days of hearings, which hearings have not yet been printed, and when the committee has only had a few days to deliberate upon the results of the hearings. I mention that because I want to contrast it with the situation in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which the Senator from Oregon spoke. That committee, by a vote of 8 to 5, resolved to limit the public hearings, but specifically indicated that any Senator, of course, at any time could be heard before the committee, and made no limitation at all upon the period when the committee itself could deliberate upon and debate the matter in committee.

So I want the situation very clearly understood. It will be only fair to the committee if it be clearly understood that although the Labor and Public Welfare Committee fixed a limitation upon the time in which the public could be heard, until February 10, there has been no suggestion of a limitation as to the length of time the committee itself should take to debate upon or deliberate upon the subject of the hearings on the whole matter before the committee. As I understand, in this instance there remains the mere matter of the committee itself deliberating upon the subject to determine what action it will choose to take. I thought it was only fair to distinguish the cases.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the Senator from Florida for his statement.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is on his feet, and I yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at the time the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was making his observation the idea came to my mind that possibly the matter could be settled by postponing the question to a date after the committee might have an opportunity to pass upon the matter next Wednesday. I happen to be a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I have worked faithfully with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to try to have resolutions and other matters before the committee disposed of speedily. If the motion to discharge the committee should prevail not much can be done before next Thursday. If the motion to discharge the committee should fail not much can be done until Thursday.

Mr. President, I submit to the Members of the Senate a mechanical solution to the problem, which is that we postpone further consideration of the resolution until next Thursday at 2 o'clock p. m. That will give the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which I am a member, an opportunity to do what I have been led to believe the chairman thinks might be done, and that is that the resolution be reported favorably. If that meets with the favor of the Members of the Senate, I suggest that it would be a satisfactory solution. I propound the question to the majority leader whether he does not believe that it would be a satisfactory solution of the problem to give the Committee on Rules and Administration a chance to report the resolution favorably on Wednesday. If it does not report it on Wednesday, the junior Senator from California, who is very anxious to have the resolution brought before the Senate, would lose but very little time. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if he will yield to me further so I may again submit the question to the majority leader.

Mr. MYERS. I think it might be better if I were to yield the floor, and the Senator from Nebraska could then discuss the matter with the majority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. I propound that question to the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the adoption of Senate Resolution 47. That motion is open to debate.

Mr. STENNIS rose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi wish to be recognized?

Mr. STENNIS. I do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough so that the majority leader may answer my question? Will the Senator defer his remarks until the majority leader has had an opportunity to answer?

Mr. STENNIS. I do not care to debate the question, but I want to make a statement in regard to the facts, and will take but a few minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi declines to yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration has been too modest in his statement of the actual facts as they occurred during the conduct of the hearings. Hearings were set for January 24. I do not think there was as much as 1 minute's delay in the start of the hearings each day. There was a good attendance of committee members. Senators who came there and testified apparently laid aside all other business and gave preference to this subject matter. Senators waited until their turn came to testify. I know that the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] had to return on the second day in order to have an opportunity to be heard. The chairman was always present, and the hearings were continually in progress.

Two days were taken by the proponents, and 4 days were taken by those who were opposed to one resolution or the other. I do not believe that anyone testified for longer than 30 minutes, except the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the time which he took was well taken. I believe also that the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] took a little more than an hour. There

was not much cross-examination. It was very brief and limited. The junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] had to condense his testimony to a great extent. He was pressed for time, and he waived the opportunity of extending his remarks further.

I believe that the record will show that all the testimony given on every day by all the witnesses was strictly on the merits, and to the point. I feel that the entire record will indicate that the chairman has been far too modest in his representations about the way the hearings were conducted. I know that other Senators wished to be heard, but could not find time within the limit of 6 days during which the hearings were conducted, and therefore waived their opportunity to be heard. There was no disposition on their part or on the part of any member of the committee to ask that the hearings be extended in order to give those Senators an opportunity to be heard, because they had not been able to obtain a hearing within the limited time.

In answer to the charge of unwarranted delay, let me say that I was greatly impressed with the very fine evidence which was brought out on both sides of this controversy. I was further greatly interested by the way in which the four new members of the committee were impressed. Members of the press who attended the hearings were impressed by what was said there.

Mr. President, I believe that there will be much food for thought in this record when it is finally printed. I know that particularly the four new members of the committee had their minds aroused. Points were brought to their attention that they had not previously considered. They have been wrestling with the question of what action they should take on this matter. I believe that their request for a little more time to weigh the evidence and think it over comes from their hearts.

It has been stated that we lost 10 days at the beginning. I believe that the great brevity and dispatch with which the chairman conducted the hearings under the circumstances I have outlined far more than outweigh the loss of the 10 days because of the inauguration ceremonies. The chairman of the committee and the ranking Republican member of the committee were both on the inaugural committee and were charged with official and specific duties in connection with that occasion.

I do not care to argue this question; but with due deference to everyone, it seems to me that instead of debating about discharging the committee, we ought to be considering a resolution of commendation praising the chairman for the fine example which he has set before the Senate in disposing of the business of the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is with some reluctance at this late hour that I rise to address the Senate on the motion of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution No. 15, relating to an amendment to the cloture rule. However, in view of the debate which has taken place today, I believe that as majority leader I must say a few words.

Since the distinguished Senator from California has become a Member of this body, I have formed a very warm affection for him. I do not underestimate his ability. He is very gracious, and very personable. However, I confess that I have been a little disturbed and somewhat disappointed because of the procedure he has chosen to follow, which to my way of thinking is most unusual. It is very unusual to attempt to discharge a standing committee from the orderly transaction of its business.

Mr. President, committees of Congress have been with us as long as the Republic has been in existence. Standing committees are at the base of parliamentary rule. Unless the prerogatives and power of standing committes are protected, there can be no orderly business in the Senate of the United States or any other parliamentary body. The integrity of the orderly transaction of business is deeply involved in this motion to discharge the committee. A committee should not be discharged from its duties unless there is gross and palpable neglect on the part of the committee in delaying a report on important legislation which it is considering, or unless the committee, through arbitrary action or through some whim or caprice, or for some other unjustifiable reason, refuses to report a measure. The precedents show that it is only then that the motion to discharge a committee from further consideration of a measure has been used.

What are the facts in this case? We have heard the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, as well as other Members of the Senate who are members of that committee, disclose to the Senate exactly what happened by way of testimony before the committee. The sole question for the Senate to determine, if we want to be fair and honest about our decision, is whether or not the committee is guilty of lack of diligence in the consideration of the evidence adduced before the committee, and whether or not the committee has failed to report the resolution as soon as it should have done so. That is really all there is to this controversy before the Senate. If we want to decide it as fair and impartial jurors should decide the issue, that is the only question before us.

The evidence demonstrates beyond the shadow of a doubt that the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee have been extremely diligent in hearing the testimony and in scheduling hearings upon this measure. So far as I am concerned, I wish to have the RECORD show that I commend the chairman of the committee and the committee as a whole on the diligence they have exhibited in the consideration of this measure.

Mr. President, the present overzealousness on the part of my good Republican friends on the opposite side of the aisle is in sharp contrast to the inactivity and the lethargy they exhibited 2 years ago. Now those on the other side of the aisle want someone to specify the exact hour and minute when we shall begin debate on this matter. Yet the same Senator from New York, who a few moments ago was propounding questions to the Senator from Pennsylvania, was then and is now a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration. He was a member of that committee 2 years ago. With all the enthusiasm for action bubbling from every pore of the Senator from New York and the Senator from California, yet for weeks and months—yes, for almost 2 years—those Senators who now crave action sat silently by during that period of time and never once made a motion to take the then pending resolution from the calendar and have it debated.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In just one moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield for the present.

Mr. LUCAS. But now Mr. President, they complain—even the Senator from New York complains to the Senator from Pennsylvania—because the committee has not acted more promptly. Mr. President, I wonder what the Senator from New York would have done upon this issue, had his friend Mr. Dewey been elected President of the United States. Immediately before the inauguration, no doubt, the Senator from New York would have been conferring with Mr. Dewey insisting that the proposal to amend the cloture rule be taken up immediately upon the convening of the Senate, just as he is doing now.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I can imagine the Senator's following that enthusiastic course of action, and I know other Senators can imagine the same thing. The Senator from California no doubt would have again, again, and again insisted that Governor Warren, had he been elected Vice President, should call upon the Senate to take up his resolution and eliminate all the other business of the Senate from consideration. The Senator would have said, "Oh, let's postpone action on housing legislation, rent-control legislation, export-control legislation, labor legislation and everything else, but for God's sake get this resolution to the floor of the Senate, so we can debate it." I can imagine how the able Senator from California would have done that very thing if Mr. Warren were now in the chair of the President of the Senate.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. In a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I know what is behind this matter. No one can make me believe that Republican politics is not involved in this insistence and this enthusiasm for the setting of an exact date and time for the consideration of this matter. Republican Senators can use this point in the 1950 campaign if they choose to do so, Mr. President; they can do all they want to do on the question of civil rights; but whatever those on the other side of the aisle

do, they will never take from President Harry Truman, in the White House, the credit for what he has done about civil rights, and what he believes, and he is the Chief Executive for another 4 years. As a result of the Republican lethargy and inactivity for the past 2 years, the people know that what the Republican Senators are doing here in insisting that we name the hour and minute, the exact time, when the committee will report and the Senate will take up the subject is political poppycock.

Let me say to the Senator from New York and the Senator from California that the Senators on their side of the aisle are not going to arrange the timetable of the Senators on the Democratic side, so long as we are in control. We shall take up the subject when we get ready to do so. We shall take it up in due course. Do not misunderstand me on this issue; everyone knows where I stand. Everyone knows how the people of my State stand upon the issue of civil rights and all other problems. The Democratic majority will handle this situation in the way we believe to be proper, and we do not propose to be pushed around for political reasons. Those who are truly interested in this great question understand fully our intention and our position—and yours. The Senator from California can file another resolution tomorrow if he wishes to do so, and can do the discourteous thing to the Senate of the United States and the comity which exists between committees, and we shall again debate that on the floor of the Senate.

I think the pending resolution is utterly unfair and unwise. During all the time the cloture resolution of 2 years ago remained on the calendar throughcut the life of a Republican-controlled Congress I did not see a single move or motion from the Republican side of the aisle to do anything about it.

Now, Senators on the other side say two wrongs do not make a right; they advise us they have learned a great lesson as a result of the past 2 years—a great political lesson, Mr. President. But what they are doing now will not result in what they hope for in the 1950 campaign, which they loudly proclaim to the country they have already started. We shall meet not only this but all other issues in proper manner here, Mr. President, and we shall meet them with another Democratic victory again at the polls.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief reply to the Senator from Illinois.

I wish to say that in my judgment the record of the Senate of the United States for some years past on the whole question of civil rights and cloture is a record where the Democratic Party has made very fine speeches about civil rights, but has made no record of really trying to pass some civil-rights legislation. My reply to the Senator from Illinois is briefly this: It is perfectly obvious what his floor generalship on this matter really seeks to accomplish. In my judgment, the Senator from Illinois is trying to keep in the background for a good many days and, I think, weeks, civil-rights legislation, on which the President of the United States has made so many fine speeches.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to extend to the Senator from Illinois the same courtesy in that regard that he extended to Members on this side of the aisle.

I wish to say that the Democrats in the Senate of the United States have not made a record of delivering on their promises in the field of civil rights. I wish to say that if the Democrats in the Senate of the United States want to make a record, then let them come forward now with civil-rights legislation. My opinion is that they dare not do so because that would split that side of the aisle wide open, and they know it.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I decline to yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that so far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, ever since I have been in the Senate, time and time again I have pleaded for action on both sides of the aisle; and last summer when the Republicans at their convention adopted the resolution pledging to the American people that they would proceed immediately in this field, that was our answer to the Senator from Illinois. Had we had control of the Senate of the United States in January 1949, our position would have been to press for the enactment of civil-rights legislation.

I say from this desk this afternoon to minority groups in America: You have heard another fine speech from a Democrat in the Senate of the United States in terms of promises, but in my judgment you are going to have to make very clear to the Democratic Party that you are tired of their speeches, and that you want some action on civil-rights legislation taken in the Eighty-first Congress; and the best time to take action to break the filibuster is at the beginning of the session, because, as the Senator from California has pointed out, it is almost physically impossible to break a filibuster at the end of a session.

I say to the majority leader that if he really wants to make good on his assertions about where he stands on civil-rights legislation, let him take such action that he can as majority leader in getting some civil-rights legislation before the Senate now, and see what happens.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I will not yield.

The Democrats in the Senate of the United States, with such legislation before the Senate, would very soon put on a spectacle, I predict, a spectacle that would show there is no unity on the part of the Democrats in this country to put through the President's recommendations on civil rights.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MYERS addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I merely rise for a moment to answer my good friend from Oregon on some of the implications he has made with respect to my leadership, with which I wholly disagree. My people in my section of the country know me, and they know my record. They will know where I stand when the roll is called, or when debates are in progress, and they will not call on the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to find out where I stand from day to day.

When the Senator from Oregon speaks about unity, I should think he would feel a little guilty in attempting to lecture the Democratic Party on that issue. If I read the newspapers correctly the Young Turks of whom he is one, have been trying to tell the Old Guard of the Republican Party what they should or should not do. Consequently it ill behooves the Senator from Oregon, as a result of the split that has existed on the other side of the aisle ever since I have been in the Senate, to try to lecture us or give us a lesson as to what we should do with respect to unity or disunity.

I heard a good many unity speeches in the last campaign. The Democrats did not have unity in that campaign. We had a lot of folks against us in the South and we had a lot of folks against us in the North. The Republicans had unity, but the Democrats with all of the disunity, won the election. I would rather have honest disunity than the phony unity I saw in the Republican campaign, and what I am seeing in this Chamber when I listen to some of the good speeches being made.

I wonder, Mr. President, since we are talking about unity, just what some of the Senators on the other side of the aisle will do on next Tuesday night when Mr. Dewey comes down to address the folks in Washington on Lincoln's birthday. I hope he continues to speak on unity, but not the kind of unity we recently saw at Omaha, Nebr., during the wonderful peace conference the Republicans held there, from which my friend, the minority leader, Mr. WHERRY, has just returned. Was that unity? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. There was much snow in Nebraska, but I got out from under it, and now I want to say that the meeting about which the Senator is talking manifested that honest disunity which exists in the Democratic Party. We had our family differences, but we had one of the finest meetings I have ever attended. In fact, a little disunity once in a while proves that a party is alive and ready for business. We are ready to go to work. For the life of me, I cannot see that all this argument has a thing to do with the vital legisla-

tion we are here to consider. Why talk about campaigns that have been won and lost? Why talk about unity and disunity? We should be talking here today about civil rights.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am not yielding for a speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois does not yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. We have been violating the rules all afternoon, Mr. President. The Chair indicated he would be rather lenient with Senators during the remainder of the afternoon.

Mr. LUCAS. The Chair has been lenient.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is within the province of the Senator to decide how long he will yield, without a violation of the rule.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for 2 minutes more, in order that I may finish?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not want the Senator to make a speech.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, or does he not?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I want the Senator from Illinois to show the unity he has been talking about. The Senator will agree with me, the only sensible thing to do in considering the question is to forget politics. Let us continue this matter until 2 o'clock Thursday, to give the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration a chance to call his committee together. Let the committee take action. Let them report the resolution favorably, and there will be no need of further speeches on unity or disunity in the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I am not ready to agree to it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is merely a proposition.

Mr. LUCAS. I cannot agree to it. When the Senator talks about extraneous, immaterial matters that we are discussing, I agree with him. But I listened to the Senator this afternoon on his appeal from the decision of the Chair. That was strictly a legal proposition. The Senator took 2 hours to debate the power of the Small Business Committee instead of debating the ruling of the Chair. So the Senator is not in a very good position to tell me I should stick to my text. The Senator departed from his text considerably in the early part of the afternoon.

Mr. President, I merely want to conclude by saying that so long as I am a Member of the Senate, regardless of whether I am in the majority or in the minority, I shall never vote to take a matter from a standing committee unless there is a justifiable reason. Under the Legislative Reorganization Act, we have 15 committees with vast, unusual powers in connection with the handling of legislation. Once resolutions to discharge committees are freely permitted, the orderly transaction of business in the Senate will have been absolutely broken. If continued, it would ultimately destroy parliamentary law. Every Senator knows that.

There is no particular haste, Mr. President, unless we decide to play into the hands of Republican politics. The committee intends to meet on Wednesday and I am certain the Members will act with expedition and dispatch.

Your hustle and bustle, your stir and fuss amazes Republicans, as well as us.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution, on which the yeas and nays have already been ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Holland | Myers |
| Anderson | Humphrey | Neely |
| Baldwin | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Brewster | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Bricker | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper |
| Bridges | Johnson, Tex. | Reed |
| Broughton | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Russell |
| Cain | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Connally | Langer | Sparkman |
| Cordon | Lodge | Stennis |
| Donnell | Long | Taft |
| Douglas | Lucas | Taylor |
| Eastland | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ecton | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Ellender | McGrath | Thye |
| Ferguson | McKellar | Tobey |
| Flanders | McMahon | Tydings |
| Frear | Magnuson | Vandenberg |
| George | Malone | Watkins |
| Gillette | Martin | Wherry |
| Gurney | Maybank | Wiley |
| Hayden | Miller | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Morse | Withers |
| Hickenlooper | Mundt | Young |
| Hill | Murray | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 47, offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from further consideration of the cloture resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a vote "yea" means to discharge the committee, and a vote "nay" means the contrary, does it not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—31

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hendrickson | Smith, N. J. |
| Baldwin | Hickenlooper | Taft |
| Brewster | Ives | Thye |
| Bricker | Knowland | Tobey |
| Bridges | Lodge | Vandenberg |
| Cain | Malone | Wherry |
| Capehart | Martin | Wiley |
| Cordon | Morse | Williams |
| Ferguson | Saltonstall | Young |
| Flanders | Schoeppel | |
| Gurney | Smith, Maine | |

NAYS—56

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hunt | Mundt |
| Broughton | Johnson, Colo. | Murray |
| Byrd | Johnson, Tex. | Myers |
| Chapman | Johnston, S. C. | Neely |
| Chavez | Kefauver | O'Conor |
| Connally | Kem | O'Mahoney |
| Donnell | Kerr | Pepper |
| Douglas | Kilgore | Reed |
| Eastland | Langer | Robertson |
| Ecton | Long | Russell |
| Ellender | Lucas | Sparkman |
| Frear | McClellan | Stennis |
| George | McFarland | Taylor |
| Gillette | McGrath | Thomas, Okla. |
| Hayden | McKellar | Thomas, Utah |
| Hill | McMahon | Tydings |
| Hoey | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Holland | Maybank | Withers |
| Humphrey | Miller | |

NOT VOTING—9

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Butler | Green | McCarthy |
| Downey | Jenner | Millikin |
| Fulbright | McCarran | Wagner |

So Mr. KNOWLAND's resolution was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the Members of the Senate start to leave the Chamber, I wish to announce that there will be a session of the Senate tomorrow, at which time we will take up the export control bill, and will also perhaps call the calendar for the first time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill to which the Senator has referred, which was made the special order for today, was displaced to take up the resolution just voted on.

REGULATION OF EXPORTS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 548, to provide for continuation of

authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, is the Senator going to explain what the bill provides?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator want to have it taken up tonight?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I merely wish to have it made the unfinished business.

Mr. WHERRY. With that in view, I should like to ask the majority leader whether there will be an adjournment this evening and a morning hour and morning business tomorrow, or will the Senate take a recess today?

Mr. LUCAS. I had planned to move to adjourn.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is an adjournment tonight there will be a morning hour tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with amendments.

THE RACE QUESTION IN THE SOUTH

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at a time when a contemplated change in Senate rules to limit debate is before the Senate Rules Committee for consideration, I think it appropriate to read into the RECORD a United Press dispatch, date lined East St. Louis, Ill., February 1.

The headlines read as follows:

WHITE PUPILS WALK OUT IN RACE PROTEST

I quote the story:

The Rock Junior High School here was closed today when about 400 white pupils walked out of classes when they learned Negro children were in the building attempting to enroll.

Small groups of students at East St. Louis High School also walked out of classes when six Negroes renewed attempts to enroll there. Classes, however, were not interrupted.

Ten Negro children, accompanied by adults, walked into the Rock school before classes began and were seated in a vacant classroom. The pupils, accompanied by scores of parents, immediately walked out and many of them, carrying signs urging the Negroes out, paraded around the school.

Two squads of police were on hand to keep order. The Negroes remained in the classroom.

The attempt to enroll the Negroes at three East St. Louis public schools, now restricted to whites, began yesterday when groups of them tried to register but were turned down. Miss Bernice Goedde, president of the board of education, said the policy of segregation would continue.

William Jones, Negro attorney, said Illinois law makes no provision for segregation in public schools and he would seek a writ of mandamus in circuit court to force enrollment of the Negroes.

Mr. President, my purpose in calling this report of an unfortunate incident in Illinois to the attention of the Senate is not to reflect adversely on the great State of Illinois.

I desire by calling attention to this case to point out specifically that so-called racial discrimination is not restricted to one region of this country, namely, the South. Quite frequently I see in the press of the Nation reports of this and other occurrences, many of them brutal and horrible. Never, however, do I observe the press of this country giving the same prominence of display to a story of racial strife that originates in New York, Michigan, California, the District of Columbia, Illinois, or some other area outside the South, as it does to the reports of infrequent instances below the Mason and Dixon's line.

I take this opportunity to again urge the Senate to deliberate a long time before it forces through a rule change which would permit drastic limitation of debate and thus pave the way for legislation which is designed to accomplish by coercion that which can only be rightly accomplished by education, patience, and persuasion.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works:

Harry Alfred Curtis, of Missouri, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the remainder of the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1948.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations of the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jesse M. Donaldson to be Postmaster General.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dean Rusk to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William McChesney Martin, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Southard, Jr., to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

MUNITIONS BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald F. Carpenter to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Karl T. Compton to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Dunlap to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dewey G. Rushford to be ensign.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gordon D. Scott to be ensign.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

Without objection, the President will be notified at once of all confirmations of today. That completes the executive calendar.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 7, 1949:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Greece, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Greece, to

which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Waldemar J. Gallman, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Poland, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Nepal, to which offices he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Joseph E. Jacobs, of South Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Czechoslovakia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

George Wadsworth, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of of America to Turkey and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Chief of the American Mission for Aid to Turkey, to which offices he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Edward S. Crocker 2d, of Massachusetts, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iraq, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Australia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Stanton Griffis, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Egypt, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Richard C. Patterson, Jr., of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Robert M. Scotten, of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Laurence A. Steinhardt, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Canada, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

Edward R. Dudley, of New York, to be envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Liberia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

James Grover McDonald, of New York, to be special representative of the United States of America to the Provisional Government of Israel, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

### United Nations

Gerald A. Drew, of California, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Special Balkan Committee established by the General Assembly of the United Nations October 21, 1947.

Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be the United States member of the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Good Offices Committee of the Security Council of the United Nations on Indonesia, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

W. Averell Harriman, of New York, the United States special representative in Europe, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America on the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

John J. Macdonald, of Missouri, a Foreign Service officer of class 3, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine which was established by resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations April 23, 1948, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

### World Health Organization

Dr. H. van Zile Hyde, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the executive board of the World Health Organization, to which office he was appointed during the recess of the Senate.

### Foreign Assistance Administration

The following-named persons to be members of the Public Advisory Board, established under title I, of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Sarah Blanding, of New York.
James Barron Carey, of the District of Columbia.
Jonathan W. Daniels, of North Carolina.
Albert S. Goss, of Washington.
Robert Henry Hinckley, of Utah.
Eric A. Johnston, of Washington.
Allan Blair Kline, of Iowa.
Herbert H. Lehman, of New York.
Arlon Everett Lyon, of Illinois.
George Houk Mead, of Ohio.
George Meany, of New York.
James George Patton, of Colorado.

### Displaced Persons Commission

The following-named persons to be members of the Displaced Persons Commission for terms ending June 30, 1951, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

Ugo Carusi, of Vermont
Edward M. O'Connor, of New York.
Harry N. Rosenfield, of New York.

### National Security Resources Board

Mon C. Wallgren, of Washington, to be Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

### United States Assay Office

Charles L. Singer, of New York, N. Y., to be Superintendent of the United States Assay Office at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

### Collector of Internal Revenue

James S. Lamb, of North Dakota, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of North Dakota, in place of Hector H. Perry, retired.

### Collector of Customs

Harris Walthall, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex. (Reappointment.)

### Appointment in the Army of the United States

Brig. Gen. Hubert Don Hoover, O7924, United States Army, retired, for appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

### Appointments in the Regular Army

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade and corps specified, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress; and Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress:

*To be lieutenant colonels*

Robert M. Coats, MC, O310996.
Lyman C. Duryea, MC, O283287.
Franklin H. Grauer, MC, O261176.
Harry C. McClain, MC, O283769.
John O. McKissick, MC, O274605.
Cecil G. Stillinger, MC, O287001.

*To be majors*

Donald M. Alderson, MC, O323693.
Robert D. Anderson, MC, O419558.
George C. Bess, MC, O328852.
John F. Breslin, MC, O284499.
Harold E. Dilley, DC, O303417.
Fred C. Dye, MC, O314380.
Juan Gonzalez-Rodriguez, MC, O215224.
I. Louis Hoffman, MC, O296988.
Charles E. Hollingsworth, MC, O350130.
Parker B. Hollingsworth, MC, O317630.
Thomas W. Howell, MC, O374247.
Albert E. Montgomery, MC, O283474.
Arthur C. Neeseman, MC, O308606.
James B. Neil, DC, O400175.
Robert B. Newell, MC, O344343.
Ross Owens, MC, O263873.
Stephen W. Ranson, MC, O400856.
Mathias F. Regner, MC, O360660.
James T. Rogers, MC, O325024.
Vance M. Rothrock, MC, O436556.
Horace W. Shreck, MC, O332055.
Allen D. Smith, MC, O355613.
Arthur Steer, MC, O294814.
Robert C. Stokes, MC, O291507.
William J. Wilson, MC, O323058.

*To be captains*

Charles P. Alexander, MC, O381897.
Joseph H. Allen, MC, O547135.
Thorwald R. Anderson, MC, O1765038.
Kenneth L. Artiss, MC, O936873.
Curtis P. Artz, MC, O959035.
Dean B. Becker, Jr., MC, O470622.
Patrick X. Bienvenu, DC, O482287.
Ernest M. Bralley, Jr., MC, O1774759.
James N. Brien, Jr., MC, O1735080.
Robert E. Broaddus, MC, O470773.
Kenneth W. Brown, MC, O496503.
Ralph E. Brown, Jr., MC, O367870.
Franklin Brundage, MC, O460297.
Samuel J. Camarata, MC, O389004.
Ralph P. Campanale, MC, O1716217.
Leonard H. Campbell, MC, O1775441.
Roy E. Campbell, MC, O468727.
Layne E. Carson, MC, O470589.
James R. Compton, MC, O409922.
Bernard I. Copple, MC, O291445.
James M. Davis, MC, O541570.
Linus M. Edwards, Jr., DC, O353452.
John P. Fairchild, MC, O508344.
Herbert G. Giddens, MC, O472355.
Thomas K. Goodman, DC, O364556.
Edwin S. Grantham, MC, O474346.
Ruben P. Groom, DC, O1735488.
Alfred Hamilton, MC, O1774777.
Harold F. Hamit, MC, O479981.
Richard A. Hayden, MC, O460743.
Thomas H. Hewlett, MC, O386246.
John G. Higgins, MC, O524808.
Walter E. Horn, MC, O542157.
Robert F. Horseman, MC, O476126.
Carl W. Hughes, MC, O471013.
Wendell T. Jackson, DC, O1765247.
John R. Jameson, DC, O1726009.
Russell R. Jauernig, MC, O443237.
Whedon Johnson, MC, O474893.
Edmund R. Kielman, MC, O470074.
Paul J. Kowallek, Jr., MC, O1745849.
Marvin M. Kuhn, DC, O479803.
Leo J. Leonard, DC, O479178.
Lloyd Lister, DC, O1685995.
Vincent Marchese, MC, O480762.
Howard W. McCall, DC, O1735409.
Ashton A. Moody, DC, O368427.
Donald S. Myers, MC, O547270.
Alfred S. Nelson, MC, O542292.

Arthur G. Nugent, MC, O503004.
Walter G. Olin, Jr., MC, O1775107.
Harold G. Page, MC, O1704831.
Howard K. Pedigo, MC, O470708.
Edgar T. Pfeil, Jr., MC, O1724821.
Thomas F. Puckett, Jr., MC, O1785726.
William L. Reed, MC, O1726983.
Wallace K. Reese, Jr., DC, O401456.
Robert P. Reynolds, DC, O397674.
Van R. Richmond, MC, O368203.
John G. Ritzenthaler, MC, O473257.
George W. Rock, DC, O1689532.
Daniel H. Rowe, MC, O463701.
John F. Schlechter, MC, O1689722.
Francis W. Shaffer, DC, O1755456
George W. Smith, MC, O1767145.
Robert C. G. Stanley, MC, O382859.
Donald W. S. Stiff, MC, O1704985.
Thomas W. Taylor, DC, O1702453.
Joseph W. Thomas, MC, O431639.
Roy B. Turner, MC, O1727264.
Jay F. Tuttle, MC, O371685.
Kryder E. Van Buskirk, MC, O381911.
Walter B. Watson, MC, O480182.
Hamilton B. Webb, MC, O498101.
George S. White, MC, O378378.
William M. White, MC, O481641.
William E. Wilson, MC, O339921.
Louis E. Wolford, MC, O472120.

*To be first lieutenants*

William A. Abele, MC.
Arthur W. Adams, MC.
Ernest F. Adams, MC, O945336.
David W. Aiken, MC, O935217.
Joseph Allison, MC.
James D. Amos, MC, O1786614.
Carl H. Anderson, DC, O1767560.
Saul B. Appel, MC.
Sherman L. Armstrong, ChC, O932956.
Harry D. Arnold, Jr., MC.
Clifton W. Arrington, MC.
Frank H. Austin, MC, O1767227.
Theodore Bacharach, MC, O1718966.
Robert E. Baird, MC.
Robert H. Baker, MC.
Stewart L. Baker, Jr., MC, O1725275.
Davis A. Baltz, MC.
Harry Banoff, MC.
George R. Barnes, Jr., MC.
John C. Bates, MC, O1764751.
James C. Bell, MC.
James S. Berger, MC, O1718453.
John H. Bickerton, Jr., MC, O1786813.
Robert H. Bickford, MC.
Frederick C. Biehusen, MC.
Edward O. Bierman, MC.
Raymond W. Blohm, Jr., MC, O945334.
Alan I. Blumberg, MC.
John G. Boutselis, MC.
Dale C. Bowers, DC, O1746759.
William R. Breg, MC.
Edward S. Brezina, MC, O945339.
Arnold J. Brody, MC.
Walter Z. Brown, DC, O945468.
Paul J. Bruel, DC, O938187.
Robert D. Buchanan, DC, O1706054.
Charles E. Buck, MC.
John W. Burkett, MC, O936824.
Bruce L. Bushard, MC, O1786383.
John M. Cahill, MC.
Sebastian J. Campagna, DC, O945447.
Robert E. Campbell, MC, O935692.
Charles A. Cashman, MC, O1775011.
Jose Cerra-Quinones, MC.
George H. Chambers, MC, O1765051.
Robert L. Chancey, MC, O1735731.
John J. Coffey, MC, O1767003.
Norman J. Cole, MC.
Ray G. Cowley, MC, O935215.
Morton C. Creditor, MC.
Charles B. Crow, Jr., MC.
Arthur J. Crumbley, Jr., MC.
Warren T. Culver, MC, O1714755.
Hugh P. Curtis, MC.
Paul W. Dale, MC.
Charles A. DeKovessey, MC, O1718814.
Frank R. DeLuca, MC.
Donald F. DeMarse, MC.
Stephen H. Deschamps, MC.
Robert L. Devine, MC, O1784796.
James L. Donahue, DC, O946748.
James F. Donovan, MC, O1764805.
Joseph J. Downing, MC, O935982.
Eugene L. Dybowski, DC, O1746060.
Warren D. Eddy, Jr., MC, O935825.
Bert E. Eldred, DC, O1786992.
James P. Elkins, MC.
John T. Elston, MC, O1766651.
Franklin H. Epstein, MC.
Robert J. Fanning, DC, O937340.
Joel C. Fink, MC, O945353.
Francis E. Foley, MC, O478346.
Paige B. Follo, MC.
Richard M. Fox, MC.
Albert S. Freed, Jr., MC, O1725931.
John W. Frye, MC.
Donald H. Giesler, MC.
Robert G. Gildersleeve, MC.
Frederic S. Glazener MC, O945036.
Norman Goldstein, MC.
Arthur Goldwyn, MC.
Paul M. Gowan, DC, O1736700.
Fay B. Graves, MC, O945338.
Stuart Graves, Jr., MC.
Lloyd J. Gregory, Jr., MC.
Harold L. Guard, MC, O1767416.
Edward F. Gudgel, MC, O937026.
Paul F. Guerin, MC, O1725174.
Ben D. Hall, MC.
Charles I. Hamilton, Jr., MC, O1785711.
Charles W. Hanford, MC.
Walter W. Hannah, MC.
Robert V. Harroun, MC.
Frederick A. Helig, DC, O1727407.
Richard L. Howard, DC, O1786105.
Robert F. Hufner, MC.
David J. Hughes, MC.
Kenneth W. Hughes, DC, O945363.
Samuel W. Hunter, MC.
Glenn W. Jamieson, DC.
Gerriet A. Janssen, MC.
Francis W. Jeffords, MC.
John A. Jenicek, MC, O1756753.
Kenneth E. Johnson, MC.
Lester D. Johnson, Jr., MC.
Merlin H. Johnson, MC.
Robert E. Johnston, MC, O1726829.
Augustus B. Jones, Jr., MC, O935677.
Eugene H. Jones, DC, O1746673.
Lewis E. Jones, MC.
Blackburn S. Joslin, MC.
David C. Kellsey, MC, O945351.
John S. Kelly, MC.
John F. Kendrick, Jr., MC.
James V. Kennedy, MC, O1718013.
Eldon G. Ketring, MC, O1756916.
Allen F. Kingman, Jr., MC, O945443.
Robert R. Koefoot, MC.
Edward J. Kollar, MC, O1755023.
Edward A. Langdon, MC, O1746265.
Robert V. Larrick, MC, O1746847.
Charles H. Lasley, MC.
John K. Leach, MC.
Carter H. Lewis, Jr., DC, O1727345.
Sherman Lewis, DC, O938156.
Joseph N. Lionti, MC, O1704828.
Roderick L. Lister, DC, O945448.
David I. Livermore, MC, O955535.
Albert B. Lorincz, MC, O935828.
John F. Loyd, MC, O1746723.
Charles L. Lynch, MC.
Richard J. Maloney, DC, O945444.
James W. Mankin, MC.
Robert A. Markelz, MC.
Oliver A. Mays, MC, O473791.
Kenneth L. McEwen, MC, O1705333.
Worthy W. McKinney, MC, O1776185.
John R. McLelland, MC, O1736056.
Campbell A. McNicol, MC.
John C. Mebane, MC, O943979.
Charles H. Meeks, MC.
John J. Meyerdierks, MC.
Eugene V. Meyerding, MC.
Clarence S. Miller, MC, O1725994.
Frank L. Miller, MC, O1725000.
Joe E. Mitchell, MC.
Charles F. Moller, MC, O1706257.
Alfred E. Moore, MC, O1716323.
Si F. Moorehead, Jr., MC, O1736154.
Robert B. Mullins, MC, O936821.
William M. Mutch, Jr., MC.
William J. Natoli, MC, O1716031.
Joseph R. Newton, MC.
Robert F. Newton, MC.
John A. Norman, MC, O958831.
Edward T. O'Dell, MC.
John W. O'Grady, MC.
Walter M. Ormes, Jr., DC, O954817.
Venedict M. Osetinsky, MC, O479890.
Ellis Oster, MC, O1767351.
Howard W. Owen, MC, O1766706.
Fred D. Ownby, MC.
John M. Palmer, MC.
James F. Parker, DC, O1786021.
Marvin E. Perkins, Jr., MC, O475247.
Jack D. Pigford, DC, O937685.
Charles C. Pixley, MC.
Thomas R. Plowright, MC, O1705360.
Warren E. Porter, MC.
Robert W. Puckett, MC.
Bela R. Rieger, MC.
John E. Roberts, MC, O935763.
Alexander L. Sadowski, DC.
Thomas L. Robbins, MC, O945341.
Joseph A. Roy, MC.
Henry T. Russell, MC.
James H. Sands, MC.
George E. Schafer, MC, O1746940.
Lionel A. Schwartz, MC, O1766948.
Norman M. Scott, Jr., MC, O1705500.
John J. Sheridan, MC, O1736002.
Robert A. Simenson, MC.
Charles B. Smith, MC.
Walden R. Smith, MC, O1746523.
Albin J. Sowka, MC.
Robert W. Spaulding, MC.
James F. Stagg, MC, O945335.
Richard U. Stern, MC, O1718192.
Herbert P. Sube, MC, O1757084.
Yiwen Y. Tang, MC, O959440.
Donald R. Taylor, MC, O933224.
Vann S. Taylor, MC, O1776470.
George E. Thoma, Jr., MC.
Miles E. Thomas, MC.
Ralph G. Thomas, MC.
Edgar M. Thomason, MC, O1775563.
Acors W. Thompson, MC, O483178.
Willis H. Thornburg, MC.
Walter R. Tkach, MC, O1725691.
William W. Tucker, MC.
Francis L. Van Veen, MC, O1784867.
Willard R. Warren, MC, O1717495.
Donald R. Watkins, MC, O958307.
Herschel J. Wells, MC, O1776253.
Dick D. Wetzel, MC.
Glenn R. Weygandt, MC.
Daniel C. Wilkerson, Jr., MC, O945342.
Donald S. Wilkins, MC.
Harold E. Wilkins, MC.
Fred C. Williams, MC, O1787172.
David H. Wilson, MC, O945344.
Howard R. Wilson, Jr., DC.
Norris A. Wimberley, Jr., MC, O945345.
Dean F. Winn, Jr., MC.
Samuel P. Wise, III, MC, O936529.
Walter M. Wolfe, MC, O1727075.
Vladimir A. Yaholkovsky, MC, O936835.
John B. Zaontz, MC, O945346.
Henry L. Zak, DC.
Branko K. Zec, MC, O932777.
Reginald J. M. Zeluff, MC, O1786121.

*To be second lieutenant*

Marian A. Tierney, ANC, N744675.

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

The following-named persons for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army, under the provisions of Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army:

*To be majors*

Anita H. Ashmead, L300308.
Elizabeth G. Bell, L501093.
Elizabeth W. Bianchi, L201120.
Geneva H. Bobbitt, L500027.
Elizabeth C. Boltwood, L600233.
Helen H. Bouffier, L200002.
Florence B. Boush, L115030.
Mildred C. Burgess, L220008.
Magdalen I. Crum, L906060.
Mercedes O. Cubria, L305435.
Sara F. Dodge, L603063.

Cloe E. Doyle, L600335.
Nell E. J. Farnham, L903087.
Dorothy S. Farrand, L1005150.
Norma F. Flachsland, L215405.
Cora M. Foster, L215397.
Lillian F. Foushee, L803243.
Irene O. Galloway, L702007.
Emily C. Gorman, L215008.
Dolas M. Grosjean, L510110.
Mary A. Hallaren, L115009.
Selma L. Herbert, L200080.
Ruby E. Herman, L200051.
Anna K. Hubbard, L603442.
Rosalyn J. Kaiser, L600325.
Charlee L. Kelly, L802502.
Mary J. Key, L125287.
Wilma H. Key, L401180.
Frances M. Lathrope, L701001.
Beatrice D. Levin, L302094.
Pauline V. Linch, L304011.
Virginia M. Mathew, L401624.
Clara M. Matthews, L607770.
Rosalie N. McClary, L200940.
Ruth E. Meyers, L1001447.
Alice M. Miller, L203020.
Edna R. Miller, L708303.
Anne C. Moe, L1000340.
Harriet N. Moses, L602037.
Helene V. Novak, L305700.
Rebecca S. Parks, L801246.
Alice A. Parrish, L303722.
Esther P. Pulis, L204870.
Julia L. Regan, L117238.
Charlotte E. Rhodes, L215697.
Beatrice I. Ringgold, L200018.
Elizabeth A. Rutledge, L220013.
Laura M. St. Clair, L400875.
Beatrice E. St. Helens, L701158.
Mary E. Savage, L705171.
Arlene G. Scheidenhelm, L225017.
Vera A. Sievers, L903048.
Elizabeth C. Smith, L502016.
Katherine Stull, L803004.
Sara L. Sturgis, L502734.
Eleanore C. Sullivan, L115602.
Margaret M. Thornton, L900088.
Hattilu C. White, L806617.

*To be captains*

M. Frances Aman, L215707.
Mary O. Anderson, L502512.
Edith A. Ayers, L400965.
Harriett C. Bendfelt, L610361.
Martha M. Bonner, L803191.
Hortense M. Boutell, L704000.
Margaret E. Brewster, L502948.
Hazel B. Bundy, L115615.
Miriam L. Butler, L903857.
Maribeth T. Cardinal, L400028.
Florence M. Clark, L803007.
Kathryn D. Cleveland, L304026.
Margaret W. Condon, L120243.
Eunity F. Elderdice, L302009.
Robin Elliott, L1000225.
Patricia E. Elwell, L100091.
Lillian R. Faust, L801572.
Eda J. Flanigan, L700758.
Helen K. Foreman, L500141.
Annie V. Gardner, L100005.
Merle M. Gardner, L704069.
Florence P. Gibbons, L117823.
Arlenne H. Goodridge, L115007.
Ruth R. Gorton, L705008.
Lillian Harris, L302057.
Catherine L. Hart, L406256.
Helen H. Hart, L703010.
Elizabeth S. Hazen, L105000.
Helen H. Hickman, L604349.
Muriel J. Janikula, L909362.
Mary J. Kunz, L909272.
Cecile M. Lane, L600327.
Mary C. Lane, L1000920.
Margaret A. Long, L200079.
Sue Lynch, L903935.
Catherine J. Lyons, L304041.
Marie J. Madigan, L116093.
Billie M. McConnell, L800255.
Mary G. McDonald, L809134.
Mary L. Milligan, L300004.
Olive E. Mills, L305449.
Bertha G. Moser, L304350.
Mary K. Moynahan, L800305.
Ethel C. Munson, L216942.
Billie L. Murray, L808694.
Lucile G. Odbert, L115871.
Elaine M. Olmsted, L918013.
Margaret E. Onion, L800016.
Mercedes M. Ormston, L203510.
Jane H. Parsel, L401005.
Mary J. Regan, L115005.
Frances W. Rice, L607004.
Helen M. Roy, L116972.
Kathryn J. Royster, L400018.
Sarah C. Seawell, L400132.
Irene M. Sorrough, L200216.
Nora G. Springfield, L819573.
Mary W. Stephenson, L600903.
Ariel E. Stout, L900485.
Mary L. Sullivan, L703039.
Anne E. Sweeney, L903080.
Ruth D. Thompson, L500033.
Evalyn Tonsfeldt, L205302.
Irene A. Van Houten, L909258.
Dale A. Van Vacter, L802007.
Mary B. Warner, L1000885.
Lois A. Wassom, L805643.
Ruth S. Westbrook, L400683.
Margaret R. Wharton, L807860.
Adeline G. Wheatley, L202779.

*To be first lieutenants*

Onolette Apley, L505149.
Imogen E. Averett, L303063.
Doris L. Ayers, L303585.
Mary J. Bailey, L604791.
Maxene M. Baker, L702082.
Susan E. Bastion, L801835.
Mary R. Bell, L200438.
Mary O. Boggess, L501238.
Elizabeth H. Branch, L125014.
Evelyn C. Brown, L225010.
Kathleen Burns, L115158.
Hedwig J. Cadell, L215401.
Miriam A. Cameron, L116969.
Lane Carlson, L703403..
Anna E. Colgan, L202406.
Virginia R. Deady, L202258.
Jimmie B. Dollahite, L403016.
Ellen V. Dunbar, L501001.
Katherine J. Flaherty, L100011.
Mary K. Flannery, L117456.
Margaret M. Franko, L502060.
Dorothy P. Frome, L304330.
Ruth Fuchs, L201629.
Neva G. Gillis, L901464.
Clara Goldman, L900113.
Patricia E. Grant, L803206.
Dorothy Gray, L403287.
Mary J. Guyette, L310942.
Marcelette L. K. Hall, L504285.
Elizabeth P. Hoisington, L909193.
Alice N. Howes, L225174.
Mary O. Kennedy, L306085.
Dorothy A. King, L401024.
Marie S. Knasiak, L602998.
Constance D. Kolokotrones, L912029.
Sylvia C. Levy, L220233.
Elizabeth A. Machen, L304611.
Ethel M. Martin, L600171.
Agnes A. Mashidlausky, L115658.
Helen B. Meisner, L115436.
Martha L. Mills, L405372.
Barbara A. Nelson, L803014.
Lenore M. Price, L903257.
Josephine L. Redenius, L225657.
Ruth S. Reece, L502003.
Veronica A. Reilly, L200676.
Barbara E. Root, L903071.
Alice V. Sawyer, L117959.
Iona B. Sherman, L703031.
Margaret E. Sinclair, L502353.
Faye Sloan, L413899.
Mary E. Stanton, L400008.
Betty J. Truax, L807615.
Sue B. Trulock, L410001.
Betty J. Venable, L811809.
Carol M. Williams, L906068.
Charlotte I. Woodworth, L215676.
Hope Wray, L701127.
Frances M. Yoniack, L200394.

*To be second lieutenants*

Fannie L. Davis, L527823.
Norma J. Fischer, L926381.
Lillian V. Jones, L930005.
Virginia H. Kaufmann, L206918.
Marie L. Malone, L915468.
Florence B. M. Newlen, L609394.
Frances A. Pesmenski, L600259.
Lucille D. Schneider, L201658.
Clara M. Zunker, L600529.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army in the grade specified, under the provisions of Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army:

*To be first lieutenants*

Daniel J. Costello, O2049782.
Joseph M. Kelly, O866530.
John A. Macomber, O1049965.
Francis G. McDonald, O387161.
Leonard Petkoff, O569748.
Joseph P. Ramsay, O353177.
Harry J. Salsbury, Jr., O1039892.
James S. Talbot, O2079196.
Clayton B. Tasker, O1576724.
Carl E. Winkler, O392805.

*To be second lieutenants*

William J. Andrews.
Paul L. Applin, Jr., O946845.
Donald A. Beardsworth.
Robert L. Bewley, O957032.
William P. Binger, O958711.
Robert L. Bryant.
Vernon W. Bryant, O947783.
George J. Buckley, O955001.
John A. Burdick.
Richard F. Burns, O957065.
John D. Caldwell, O1113624.
Adelbert L. Campbell.
Orel D. Choate, O949892.
Abraham E. Cohen, O955791.
William M. Cole.
Sidney H. Cook, Jr., O954672.
John T. Coughlin, O553946.
Charles R. Darby.
Henry D. Doiron.
Henry B. Edwards, Jr., O955559.
Richard O. Eiler, O954869.
Harold N. Elliott, O957052.
Charles H. Fisher, O954879.
Ralph H. Girton, O1536501.
Ray M. Golden.
Charles E. Green.
Monroe M. Gregory, Jr.
Strather W. Hawkins, O949503.
Martin D. Hecht, O957771.
William B. Hill, O956293.
Ernest A. Hinojosa, Jr., O1948757.
Jackson H. M. Holbrook.
James L. Hundemer, Jr., O958037.
Kenneth F. Jackson, O949645.
John M. Jenkins.
Roderick W. Kallgren.
William O. Keeling, Jr., O956264.
Robert A. Kimbel.
Robert R. J. Koch, O949368.
Wheeler E. Laird, O953732.
Renn M. Lawrence.
Eldredge R. Long, Jr., O955080.
Kenneth S. Mackenzie, Jr.
Richard M. McBride.
Robert I. McCreight, O954870.
Norman B. Newcomb.
Thomas E. Oberley, O948417.
Manuel Olivera-Barroso, O1282402.
Clyde H. Patterson, Jr.
Vernon W. Patterson, Jr.
George E. Peck, O947779.
Alva W. Pendergrass, Jr., O956302.
Fred W. Peters, Jr., O955769.
Duane E. Raph, O2020464.
John E. Reed, O947838.
William H. Rhodes, O948418.
Jorge F. Roach, O949543.
George H. Rosenfield, O955503.
David R. Rosson.
John J. Sarazen, O1319863.
Alfred Sasser, Jr., O955004.
Thomas S. Schreiber, O411401.
Tommy E. Sidebotham, Jr., O949370.
Ralph W. Spence.
Joel E. Stone, O956383.
John E. Stringer, Jr., O927198.

Robert M. Stump, O960373.
Norman E. Sudnick, O1536512.
Charles H. Underwood.
Lyle H. Wharton, O957339.
Jesse E. White.
Richard V. White.
Charles R. Whitfield, O980003.
Joseph O. Wintersteen, Jr.
Gus A. Wolman, Jr., O519213.

NOTE.—These persons were given recess appointment on June 30, 1948, July 17, 1948, August 18, 1948, September 4, 1948, September 22, 1948, October 20, 1948, November 13, 1948, December 1, 1948, December 10, 1948, December 11, 1948, December 16, 1948, December 17, 1948, and December 18, 1948.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Griswold T. Atkins | Peter H. Horn |
| Oscar M. Browne, Jr. | Frederick J. Ilsemann |
| John F. Delaney, Jr. | Leonard T. Morse |
| Harry B. Dodge | Stanley G. Nichols |
| Harry W. Englund | Robert E. Perkins |
| William B. Epps | Manley H. Simons, Jr. |
| James H. Hean | Paul B. Tuzo, Jr. |
| Harold M. Heiser | Frank I. Winant, Jr. |
| Wellington T. Hines | Sanford B. D. Wood |
| Ephraim P. Holmes | |

---

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 7, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Dean Rusk to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF THE CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

| | |
|---|---|
| Ralph H. Ackerman | Karl L. Rankin |
| David McK. Key | Howard K. Travers |

CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

| | |
|---|---|
| H. Lawrence Groves | Archibald E. Gray |
| Stephen E. Aguirre | Robert M. Taylor |

CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

| | |
|---|---|
| Charles W. Adair, Jr. | Sherburne Dillingham |
| Frederick J. Cunningham | Harrison Lewis |
| | Charles Gilbert |
| H. Francis Cunningham, Jr. | George Lybrook West, Jr. |

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 3, CONSULS, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert Alexander
Charles R. Enlow

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 4, CONSUL, AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

William Kling

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF CLASS 6, VICE CONSULS OF CAREER, AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

| | |
|---|---|
| James F. Amory | Daniel J. Meloy |
| Raymond J. Barrett | Richard B. Parker |
| Jack B. Button | John B. Root |
| Stuart B. Campbell, Jr. | Robert W. Ross |
| | John A. Sabini |
| Thomas F. Conlon | Michel F. Smith |
| Robert W. Eastham | Karl E. Sommerlatte |
| Benjamin A. Fleck | Christopher T. Talcumis |
| Jackson E. Heffner | |
| Jack T. Kilgore | George E. Tener 2d |
| James F. Leonard, Jr. | Sidney Weintraub |
| Ralph J. McGuire | |

CONSUL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Don A. Gribble

SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mallory Browne
George Kenneth Holland
William R. Tyler

CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

| | |
|---|---|
| Ernest L. Eslinger | James R. Riddle |
| Arnlioth G. Heltberg | Louis F. Blanchard |
| Frederick C. Johnson | Louis B. Mazzeo |
| Ernest V. Polutnik | |

FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS 6, A VICE CONSUL OF CAREER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Robert C. Brewster

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

William McChesney Martin, Jr., to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

POSTMASTER GENERAL

Jesse M. Donaldson to be Postmaster General.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

MUNITIONS BOARD

Donald F. Carpenter to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Karl T. Compton to be Chairman of the Research and Development Board.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

John B. Dunlap to be collector of internal revenue for the second district of Texas.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

*Senior assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

| | |
|---|---|
| Paul Fremont-Smith | Brinton T. Darlington |
| John S. Benson | Andrew O. Fitzmorris |
| Leo A. Sapirstein | Roland T. Smith |
| Jacob K. Frenkel | Joseph F. Shanaphy |
| Clarence A. Imboden, Jr. | Bernard E. O'Malley |
| | Frederick C. Kuharich |
| Roger K. McDonald | William A. Walter, Jr. |
| Lynn L. Fulkerson, Jr. | McClain Johnston |
| Andrew Ranier | Paul Francke, Jr. |
| Ruth E. Dunham | Richard A. Malmgren |
| Fridolph E. Erlandson | Ralph F. Patten |
| Martin J. Gunter | Edward A. McNulty |
| Swan Burrus, Jr. | Walter M. White, Jr. |
| Lewis McLaurine Williams | James E. Hamill |

*Assistant surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

| | |
|---|---|
| John H. Waite | William H. Sage III |
| James K. Conn | James R. Lewis |
| Ben Fisher | Paul K. Benedict |
| Ernest V. de Moss | Arthur P. Burdon |
| Sidney Ketyer | Charles W. Whitmore |
| Victor E. Archer | John F. Laws |
| Ernest G. Hanowell | Joseph A. Gallagher |
| Leland K. Dayton | Lawrence V. Hastings |
| Robert Hanan | Maurice R. Wingo |
| Carl C. Sansocie | John V. Osborne |
| Merlan E. DeBolt | Thomas F. Heighway |
| John B. Baldi | Jerold E. Phelps |

*Senior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

Earl H. Arnold
Donald B. Stevens

*Assistant sanitary engineer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

John B. Saxton

*Junior assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

| | |
|---|---|
| Howard C. Kellogg | Gordon E. Stone |
| John K. Brown | Donald M. Keagy |

*Senior assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

Allen J. Brands, Sr.

*Assistant pharmacist (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

Richard R. Sherwood

*Junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

Leo Klugman
Paul H. Honda
Paul R. McDaniel, Jr.

*Senior assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance*

Mildred Jones

*Assistant nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance*

| | |
|---|---|
| Henrietta J. LeGrand | Hilda A. Nivala |
| Kathryn M. Meyer | Ruth S. Fitzgerald |
| Edith W. Campbell | Mary L. Hasty |

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE ENSIGNS, EFFECTIVE FROM INDICATED DATES

Dewey G. Rushford, October 8, 1948.
Gordon D. Scott, October 21, 1948.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

TO BE CAPTAINS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

George F. Hicks, March 20, 1945.
Alexander L. Ford, March 20, 1945.
Stephen H. Evans, March 20, 1945.
John A. Glynn, March 20, 1945.
John E. Fairbank, March 20, 1945.

TO BE COMMANDERS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

John S. Merriman, Jr., October 20, 1942.
William H. Snyder, November 18, 1942.
Peter J. Smenton, January 1, 1944.
Thomas R. Midtlyng, January 1, 1944.
John B. Oren, January 1, 1944.
Harry E. Davis, Jr., January 1, 1944.
Joseph Howe, January 1, 1944.
George W. Holtzman, January 1, 1944.
William W. Childress, January 1, 1944.
John H. Wagline, January 1, 1944.
John J. Hutson, Jr., January 1, 1944.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

Warren L. David, October 1, 1942.
Victor E. Bakanas, May 15, 1943.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

Robert S. McLendon, December 31, 1942.
Vincent J. Cass, May 15, 1943.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

Robert O. Bracken, December 31, 1942.
Charles Wayne, April 1, 1944.
Robert H. Roberts, May 1, 1945.
Albert G. Jones, November 15, 1946.
Donby J. Mathieu, November 15, 1946.
Donald E. Ullery, January 1, 1947.
Robert N. Rea, January 1, 1947.
John G. Milosic, January 15, 1947.
Theodore L. Roberge, January 15, 1947.
Francis Twarog, January 15, 1947.
Thurston L. Willis, January 15, 1947.
Bernard B. Wood, January 15, 1947.
Samuel W. Branin, January 15, 1947.
Jack E. Stewart, January 15, 1947.
Norman P. Weinert, January 15, 1947.
James A. Emery, January 15, 1947.

Paul L. Anderson, February 1, 1947.
William C. Carber, February 1, 1947.
Rubin E. Young, Jr., February 1, 1947.
Fred J. Michalson, February 1, 1947.
Richard C. Green, February 1, 1947.
James B. Reynolds, February 1, 1947.
Wesley J. Quamme, February 1, 1947.
William C. Akers, February 1, 1947.
Philip S. Bell, February 1, 1947.
Donald D. Davison, February 1, 1947.
Ivan C. McLean, February 1, 1947.
Edward G. Taylor, February 1, 1947.
Louis E. Price, February 1, 1947.
Franklin F. Bohlk, February 1, 1947.
Samuel H. Yearta, August 22, 1948.
Russell W. Lentner, August 22, 1948.
William H. Yates, August 22, 1948.

TO BE ENSIGNS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

William C. Wallace, January 15, 1947.
Henry G. Cassel, January 15, 1947.
Harley B. Shank, January 15, 1947.
Raymond M. Miller, January 15, 1947.
Charles A. Haley, January 15, 1947.
Everett B. Kopp, January 15, 1947.
Philip G. Ledoux, January 15, 1947.

TO BE PROFESSOR, WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1942

Robert E. Reed-Hill.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

Elvin C. Hawley, June 5, 1943.
Emery H. Joyce, June 5, 1943.
Frank McLaughlin, June 14, 1943.
Allan V. Falkenberg, June 24, 1943.
Russel O. Foster, July 7, 1943.
Frank T. Burtle, July 29, 1943.
Arnold J. Larsen, December 1, 1943.
Lionel H. DeSanty, December 1, 1943.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS, TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

David H. Douglas, May 15, 1943.
Theron H. Gato, May 15, 1943.
Paul F. Foye, July 1, 1944.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM DATES INDICATED

George A. Philbrick, March 1, 1944.
Henry W. Stinson, Jr., March 1, 1944.
John W. Day, January 1, 1947.
Thomas G. Condon, January 1, 1947.
Maurice W. Tiehen, January 1, 1947.
Leo M. Bracken, January 1, 1947.
Paul S. Hofmeister, January 1, 1947.
Albert P. Hartt, Jr., January 1, 1947.
George E. Tooloose, January 1, 1947.
William E. Sale, January 1, 1947.
Andrew B. Christensen, January 1, 1947.
Harold A. French, August 22, 1948.
Sam Pisicchio, September 15, 1948.

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), DATE OF RANK TO BE COMPUTED UPON EXECUTION OF OATH

Walter J. Felton
Harry G. Kosky
Richard W. Bagnell
Edward P. Sawyer
Leonard A. Wardlaw, Jr.
Leonard J. Knight, Jr.
Jerry Komorech
Enoch A. Poulter
Douglas D. Vander Meer
Charles D. Zettler
Frank A. Klafs
Hugh C. McCaffrey
Owen B. Smith
Eric G. Grundy
Merle L. Harbourt
Harold L. Appleton
Gordon Crymes
William A. McCreary
Francis J. Bell

TO BE ENSIGNS, DATE OF RANK TO BE COMPUTED UPON EXECUTION OF OATH

Robert E. Ogin
Roger J Dahlby
Nelson W. Allen

TO BE PROFESSOR (TEMPORARY), WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM JULY 1, 1944

Raymond J. Perry

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, TO RANK FROM JUNE 3, 1943

Carl A. Anderson

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Love divine that stoops to human needs, hear us when we call. We come to Thee with our cares, our problems, and our limitations.

We ask for wisdom and for grace that this day may be fruitful with good works for our country. Our land cannot fulfill its great mission without reverence for those institutions which make secure its perpetuity—reverence for authority, for law, for Thy church of whatever name, and for the rights of the individual.

Do Thou regard our prayer, as we pray in our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 3, 1949, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 3, 1949, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution extending the time for free entry of certain articles imported to promote international good will.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes.

### REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order today to consider the bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, that all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein be waived, and that there shall be not to exceed 2 hours of debate, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and the ranking minority member of that committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does that include also that the bill will be read under the 5-minute rule?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. It will be read under the 5-minute rule in the regular way?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. That was not included in the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McCORMACK. That automatically follows. My unanimous-consent request provided for 2 hours of general debate. Of course, after that, if it is necessary, consideration under the 5-minute rule will follow.

Mr. HALLECK. I am not going to object to the request, and I trust there is no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman mean today, or when?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is for today. It is just to permit a brief meeting to report out formally the bill for the consideration of which unanimous consent was just obtained.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If they have a bill on the floor they ought to be here.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is just so they can meet and report the bill out officially.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### DISASTER RELIEF

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
*House of Representatives.*

SIR: Pursuant to the authority heretofore granted, the Clerk of the House received from the Secretary of the Senate on February 3, 1949, the engrossed resolution (H. J. Res. 136) entitled "Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes," attested by the Secretary as having been passed by the Senate on February 3, 1949.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
*Clerk of the House of Representatives.*

### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had on February 3, 1949, examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on February 3, 1949, he did on that day sign the following enrolled House joint resolution:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the events that have transpired during the past few days at the anti-Christian trials in Hungary should awaken the whole world to the true menace of communism.

While we all have great compassion for His Eminence, the cardinal, and his codefendents, at the same time we realize that something bigger than any individual or group of individuals is being drawn through the Red furnace. Here is the final struggle. Here it will be decided whether the conduct of men and nations in the future will be governed by a civilization that traces its beginnings to the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount or whether the governing philosophy shall spring from irreligion, paganism, materialism, and lust.

Mankind must decide once and for all whether the pernicious doctrine of Marx and Lenin with its godless philosophy rejecting the dignity of man is to be the rule of conduct for the world. If we are to accept this immorality, then civilization is through and the anti-Christ has triumphed. No longer will there be any such thing as a free man with a free mind. No longer will there be such a possession as human dignity. No longer will there be such a thing as honor and word between men and nations. Courts of justice will be cesspools of iniquities. The established order of life will be anarchy.

Since this is the future that the Communists would foster upon us and our children, let us quickly accept their brazen challenge. Let Catholic, Protestant, and Jew, all of us whose social and political philosophy springs from a common source, march under the one banner—civilization—to battle until the death the monster that would destroy morality.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] has expired.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARRISON] is detained in his district on business. I ask unanimous consent that he may be granted leave of absence for today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include three articles pertaining to Cardinal Mindszenty, notwithstanding the fact that the estimate of the Public Printer is that matter will cost an additional $213.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit today while general debate is in process, during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to receive that request, but the Chair is not going to receive many requests for committees to sit during the sessions of the House hereafter.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio message by Evangelist Dale Crowley.

Mr. KARST asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. PRICE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a resolution adopted by the Illinois House of Representatives.

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. DURHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GRAHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by his colleague [Mr. LICHTENWALTER].

INCOME-TAX EXEMPTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO CHARITABLE, RELIGIOUS, AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which will raise the limitation for charitable, religious, and educational contributions from 15 percent to 20 percent.

Under the existing law, gifts to charitable, religious, and other institutions are deductible only to the extent that they do not exceed 15 percent of a taxpayer's income.

My bill raises this limit to 20 percent, and thus encourages more contributions.

The loss in revenue will be inconsequential. The bill will encourage private contributions, and thus lessen the demand from the Federal Government for additional grants. I feel that we ought to do all we can to encourage private contributions to our schools, colleges, charities, and religious institutions.

The bill applies to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of intergovernmental relations.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill in which every Member of the Congress and all other persons concerned with efficient and effective government should be keenly interested. This bill provides for the establishment of a temporary bipartisan Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in the United States, with attention directed especially to the serious fiscal problems with which all levels of government are now so sorely beset.

I want to make it unmistakably clear at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I am fully cognizant of the fact that with the development of our great Nation government at all levels must assume greater responsibilities with respect to the general welfare of the people. The purpose of my bill, however, is to study these needs and to settle upon and establish a logical and equitable pattern or plan by which government, with a proper division of functions and authority, may best discharge its responsibilities to the people.

It is my earnest hope and my request that Members of both Houses of the Congress, and regardless of political affiliation, will join with me in sponsoring this critically needed legislation.

UNITED STATES HELP TO CHINA

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for half a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the situation in China has reached another critical hour of decision in which the United States cannot be anything but the deciding element as the Central Government will not be able to continue its resistance to and battle against the Communist forces without our help. Granted that China's vastness gives seeming strength to the argument behind the questions: Do you want to bankrupt the United States? Where will you get the money and the goods? But how can we who have declared to the world that we will help those countries that fight for their freedom fail the greatest of them all, especially when so very little will do so very much?

Are we still so naive, so unable to recognize the Communist propaganda to

which we are so subtly subjected for what it is? There is no shadow of a doubt about the nature of this army that has reached the Yangtse River, nor of the land reformers with them. They are regular offshoots of Moscow, spreading chaos as they take over. Yet people in high places try to tell us otherwise.

What area in the world is more important to peace, to freedom, and so to the United States as China? What area is more important to Soviet plans for world control? There is no country that has suffered so much from the vacillations and mistakes of our changing policies and our ignorance than this great land of China. Are we going to fail her in this extremity? And more than that, are we going to fail ourselves?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article on the machine-tool industry and national defense.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include two editorials.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and include newspaper articles.

Mr. LEMKE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Col. Charles L. Hall, which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of Sunday, January 30, 1948.

Mr. REES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered by Chancelor Mallott, of Lawrence, Kans.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from a Richmond paper.

Mr. TALLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a broadcast he made over the Mutual network last Thursday.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to remind the House of the great need for additional security for our elder citizens, and to request that action should be taken at once to provide better old-age pensions.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that a majority of the people in our respective districts are expecting us to give immediate attention to this matter. Both major political parties committed themselves, during the national compaign last year, to provide adequate old-age pensions and social security. Both parties, and perhaps nearly every spokesman for each party, stated time and again that our old-age pensions should be increased. This problem, Mr. Speaker, is not a partisan matter. Republicans get just as hungry, and just as cold, as Democrats, and vice versa. Republicans and Democrats are working together in this Congress to do something about this pressing matter. There are many questions, Mr. Speaker, on which we may disagree. But on this question there is no partisanship. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been in session here over a month. We are waiting for committee action for work on this floor. Why not bring forth a bill to provide a decent, uniform, American old-age pension? Why not act on it now? I think we all agree that the need is very acute. It is entirely justified. It is not a partisan question. Then why not let us have action? In the last session of Congress we acted with rapidity to appropriate billions of dollars to afford relief to the stricken people of the world. Why cannot we take action with equal rapidity to provide for our aged people who in the declining years of their lives need our help.

Mr. Speaker, why cannot we have action now?

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement by the Iowa Creameries Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

[Mr. TALLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes today following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to make an announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I first ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit during the session of the House providing there is general debate or the House is not in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object; for how long?

Mr. LESINSKI. For this week, for 1 week.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may sit during general debate only if the House is in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the House is in session and there is general debate.

Mr. LESINSKI. During general debate, and I want to provide also when the House is not in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I also wish to announce that we will continue hearings on the minimum-wage bill this week, including Wednesday. On Thursday we are going into executive session and will attempt to bring out H. R. 858, dealing with the question of overtime on overtime, which is a burning question. We want to forestall any coal strikes that may be pending now or which may happen in the future.

VETERANS' PENSIONS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to renew my invitation to Members of the House who desire to be heard on the pending pension bill to appear before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs tomorrow morning at 10:30 a. m. or to send whatever statements they have to make.

I know there is a great hue and cry against pensioning the old men who went through the First World War and who have now reached the same age, and in the same condition, that Spanish-American veterans had reached when they were pensioned and the same age and in the same condition as the veterans of the Civil War were when they were pensioned.

If we can feed and clothe every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuktu out of the American taxpayer's pocket and continue to finance the satellite states of Soviet Russia that are dedicated to the destruction of this Government, then we can certainly look after our own veterans, the men who fought the Nation's battles in time of war and sustained its institutions in time of peace, and who are now old and unable to take care of themselves.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If we take care of all of these countries the gentleman is talking about, from New York to Timbuktu, how are we going to be able to take care of our own veterans? We are going to have a hard time taking care of the American soldiers if we take care of all of these foreign countries.

Mr. RANKIN. All right, get on my side and stay there. I am opposed to financing every other country in the

world, and leaving our own disabled veterans out.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a sermon delivered by the pastor of a Presbyterian church.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include memorials from the Montana House of Representatives and Senate urging the early construction of the Yellow Tail Dam.

Mr. FALLON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by a former attorney general of Maryland.

Mr. GILMER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a brief article from a national magazine.

Mr. GORE (at the request of Mr. SUTTON) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Denver Post.

Mr. IRVING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper article in reference to Hon. CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri.

Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in four instances and include newspaper articles, editorials, and a speech.

Mr. WOLVERTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it is fitting that I should make my first speech on the floor of this House in protest against what appears to be one of the most flagrant violations of human rights in modern history. I rise to reflect the indignation and sorrow of thousands of loyal Americans in my district at the cruelty and travesty on justice of the so-called trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. I shall urge and support a resolution of inquiry as to why our Government should not denounce the cruelty, inhumanity, and injustice of that trial in the name of the rights of man.

THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up for consideration House Concurrent Resolution 22.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules, having had under consideration this concurrent resolution, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that it pass.

For the benefit of the Members who have come to the House since the Seventy-ninth Congress, and for the benefit of those of us who were here but whose memories, like mine, are clouded, I would briefly review the original legislation and the reasons that are persuasive of the proposed change. The Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress filed a report during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress strongly recommending a provision whereby the House, soon after its organization each session, could have a comprehensive and clear picture of the proposed expenditures and the probable income of the Government. It would, perhaps, be helpful to quote briefly from that report:

> Control of the purse for all Federal governmental activities is one of the major functions of Congress. Numerous witnesses appeared and recommended various changes designed to strengthen the position of Congress in relation to fiscal affairs.
>
> These recommendations stressed the need for the adoption each year of an over-all fiscal policy that would consider both the income and expenditures of Government. It was pointed out that the control over revenues and expenditures is divided not only between the House and Senate, but also within each House between its revenue and appropriations committees. Neither of the two appropriations committees imposes any over-all limitations upon its total appropriations before the individual supply bills are voted on by the Houses. Nor do they attempt to coordinate appropriations with revenues so as to fix an over-all fiscal policy for the year.
>
> With this divided authority existing not only between the appropriation committees of each House, but also among their many subcommittees, and among the revenue-raising committees, how could Congress have a general fiscal policy or follow it if it had one?
>
> Other recommendations called not only for strengthening the staffs of the important appropriation committees and their subcommittees, but made several suggestions for basic changes in methods of controlling expenditures, improving auditing procedures, and developing better administrative management in Government agencies.
>
> Your committee agrees that primary responsibility rests with Congress to improve legislative control over governmental expenditures and that means must be provided to permit a closer scrutiny of them, and not only by the committees charged with this duty but also by the individual Members and Congress itself.
>
> Your committee believes that Congress has not adequately equipped itself to resist the pressure of departments and agencies in behalf of larger expenditures. We have equipped the agencies with ample funds to collect and present evidence to support their appeal for larger sums or to forestall reductions. But we have failed to implement Congress with adequate facilities for scrutinizing these justifications.

It becomes increasingly difficult for a Member of Congress to maintain a clear picture of expenditures and income, and because of this difficulty it is often impossible to make the intelligent decisions on legislation that our responsibilities require.

The House very wisely adopted a provision in the Reorganization Act—now Public Law 601—which requires:

> The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.
>
> The report shall be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget, and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year. If the estimated expenditures exceed the estimated receipts, the concurrent resolution shall include a section substantially as follows: "That it is the sense of the Congress that the public debt shall be increased in an amount equal to the amount by which the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year exceed the estimated receipts, such amount being $———."

Subsequent to the adoption of the Reorganization Act, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations found it impractical, if not impossible, with the information at hand, to intelligently comply with the act of February 15. They were relegated to a speculative figure which could not be helpful to the Congress. During the last session of Congress considerable heat was generated as a result of an effort to comply with the above provision, and because of the haste and the lack of adequate information the figures arrived at provoked considerable criticism.

It is unnecessary, I think, at this time to consider this from a political standpoint, but it is perhaps inevitable, and while there will be no serious opposition to adoption of this resolution there will likely be considerable debate about the manner in which the legislative budget report was handled during the Eightieth Congress and is presently being ap-

proached. Certainly, however, it is very impractical for the joint committee to bring in a conclusive and accurate report by February 15. This is the experience of both parties. The date should be set back.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] introduced this resolution, which, as you see, provides that the date of reporting the legislative budget shall be postponed until May 1 of this year. He expresses the hope of the joint committee that by that time a useful and comprehensive report may be brought before the House, outlining a fiscal framework within which we may work.

It is of particular importance to our economy and the proper discharge of the functions of this Congress that we do not totally disregard this important part of the Reorganization Act. The earliest possible date should be agreed upon for the reporting of the legislative budget as set forth in section 138, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

As so very ably presented by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] on many occasions, the Congress should not abandon its quest for a sound fiscal policy to guide us in our work. We are attempting by this measure to find a workable date, one that will be timely and useful to the Members of Congress, and we are attempting to give the joint committee an opportunity to work it out in good order.

There can rightfully be no politics in the consideration of this resolution and there should be no opposition to its adoption. I believe that I express the majority view when I say it is in the interest of orderly and effective procedure that we adopt the resolution. Experience alone will permit us to agree upon a permanent, timely date.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded to me in connection with this resolution be transferred to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], the ranking minority member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has explained, House Concurrent Resolution 22 would amend section 138 of the Reorganization Act so as to make the effective date for the filing of the so-called legislative budget for the coming fiscal year May 1.

I think perhaps it may be well for us in considering this legislation to recall just a little bit of recent history. When the Reorganization Act was before the House, the purpose of section 138 was explained rather thoroughly and I think very well by the sponsors of that legislation, to the effect that by filing such a legislative budget or an estimate of receipts and expenditures early in each session of Congress we would then at least have some figure to shoot at in connection with both revenue raising and tax spending.

In practice, it has worked out that it was rather difficult to make anything like an accurate appraisal of either our revenues or our spending program, because February 15, the day provided in the original act, was rather early. It was impossible in many instances to know what revenues would be coming in, and certainly impossible to know what action Congress might take on the appropriation bills, or even what appropriation bills the Committee on Appropriations might report. As a result, back in the first session of the Eightieth Congress, in 1947, no agreement was reached by the joint committee set up to create and to submit this legislative budget as to what the budget should be.

The joint committee was severely and soundly and roundly criticized—actually denounced, as it were—for failing to meet the requirements of the Reorganization Act. The Republican majority of the Eightieth Congress was, in fact, openly accused of trying to sabotage and destroy the Reorganization Act. The leader of that denunciation, the man who made, should I say, the most rabid speeches against those charged with the responsibility of attempting to work out a legislative budget, was none other than my very good friend and namesake, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who rather peculiarly now happens to be the author of this House concurrent resolution—wanting to do the very thing for which he condemned his Republican colleagues in the House just two short years ago. It is very, very peculiar what changes just a little bit of time will make in people's viewpoints and attitudes. If I may let you in on more or less of a legislative secret—and I do not want to call it that because I am sure the gentleman did not mean to be secretive—now and then humorous things often happen, even in that terrible Committee on Rules, which has been chastised recently by the Congress.

By mistake, Mr. Majority Leader—for I presume it was by error, and I am sure also that it was not your responsibility in any way—House Concurrent Resolution 13, introduced by the gentleman from Missouri, was presented to the committee. Lo and behold, it provided to just do away entirely with the legislative budget, and not to have any at all, or to just strike out or repeal that section of the Reorganization Act. If I may get confidential with my colleagues, I am not so sure but that that is not the best way to meet the situation. I am certain of one thing: it is the most honest way of meeting it, because when you pass the pending resolution, all you are doing is circumventing—as I am certain the gentleman from Oklahoma will tell you if he speaks on the measure—the intent and purpose of the Reorganization Act by saying, "Oh, we will set up a budget after we know what the tax income is going to be, and after we have passed out most of the appropriation bills and have decided what we are going to spend."

Well, that was not the idea, purpose, or intent behind this provision of the Reorganization Act, I am sure. The purpose and intent of the Reorganization Act, section 138, was to at least attempt to hold down public spending and to hold down taxes and to give the Congress an opportunity, before it acts, to take an over-all look at the annual great, gigantic spending program to see what it is we are going to spend and what we are going to have available to spend.

It is proposed here to make the date May 1, and that is after the horse is out of the barn, as it were.

I hope and I believe it would just be a matter of fair play, if I may express it that way, that the gentleman from Missouri who is the sponsor of this legislation will offer his apology to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]—and I am sorry that Mr. Knutson is not here—and to all those who were charged with this responsibility back in the Eightieth Congress, and say to them in substance, at least, "Well, boys, I was wrong, and I am sorry that I criticized you, because now that the responsibility is mine, I realize that I cannot meet it any better than you could meet it when it was yours. I am here to admit to you that I was playing just a little bit of politics back in the Eightieth Congress."

Of course, I can understand why the gentleman from Texas said to you that we should not discuss this in a political vein. Of course, I am not discussing it from a political angle. But, nevertheless, it was discussed from a political viewpoint, purely and simply, back in the Eightieth Congress.

Here is No. 2 on the list of peculiar legislative flip flops by our Democratic friends. Oh, I remember somebody keeping score on us, Mr. Majority Leader, back in the Eightieth Congress. So, perhaps it is a good time to set up another score board and to start keeping a little score and a little record. But this is back-pedaling bill No. 2 to come before the House. It is either the third or fourth piece of legislation of any kind which we have had before us. But it is the second bill or resolution that has come before the House that in fact approves something the Eightieth Congress did in connection with some particular piece of legislation. It admits that the Eightieth Congress and those leaders in that Congress who were charged with the responsibility of handling the legislative budget were right at the time they were being so soundly and so roundly criticized by my good friends on the Democratic side of the aisle.

In order that we may have a picture of what is occurring here, I have attempted to describe to you what has gone before, including the peculiar past actions of some of our colleagues. As far as the legislation is concerned, I hope that if we are going to take any action at all we will be absolutely honest and actually do the thing that this resolution attempts to do by circumvention or evasion of the Reorganization Act—just repeal the whole section. We either ought to live up to that section or, if it is not workable, then we ought to have the legislative manhood and womanhood, and honesty of purpose

and forthrightness with the general public, to say, "We have found out that section 138 of the Reorganization Act is not workable, and instead of trying to kid you or mislead you a bit by setting a date so that the legislative budget means nothing, we are just admitting that the section will not work and we are repealing it." That action would be honest and forthright, but what is done, of course, depends upon the wishes and the will of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly said on the floor of the House, and I repeat it, that I consider the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] the best Republican politician in the House of Representatives. That does not mean to say that there are not other good ones on that side, but his versatility, of course, is known to all of us who have served with our distinguished friend.

In his remarks he overlooked one important factor, however, that 2 years ago the Democrats attacked the arbitrary manner in which the Republican Party undertook to comply with section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Lest they forget, let me refresh the memory of my friend from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], that instead of meeting it in an honest way, as we are meeting it now, his party brought in a resolution calling for a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget recommendations. Now, if the Republican leadership had approached it the way we are approaching it, and we had then opposed it, the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], would be pertinent. But we took the position that a $6,000,000,000 cut was arbitrary; that it disregarded the equities and the necessities of specific items included in the President's budget. Of course, every bit of evidence in the Eightieth Congress confirms our position. After the House adopted this arbitrary $6,000,000,000 cut, and, of course, that was done by the then majority party, the resolution went over to the Senate; and the Senate majority party voted a $4,500,000,000 cut. Then the resolution went to conference, and of course it never saw the light of day again. At that time when the resolution was reported to the House and was pending in the House if a resolution along these lines had been introduced, a different situation would have existed; and if we Democrats opposed, I repeat, then the gentleman from Ohio in his "nonpolitical" speech that he says he has just made would have been on more tenable grounds. The best answer is that the gentleman himself admits that this is the honest approach to a situation that we know is difficult for both branches of Congress to work out in accordance with the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act at the present time; to wit, action on or before February 15.

As we construe the remarks of my friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]—and there is no Member of the House more adroit in expression and in drawing the lines of differentiation between logical debate on the proposition and political argument—the remarks of the gentleman are in complete support of the resolution that is now pending before the House. I respect the gentleman in his further statement that he believes that the time limit should be completely eliminated. That may be so; I am not prepared to agree with that today. I think we ought to have one more year's experience, at least; but certainly in his frank way he has told the House and told the country just how he feels; that it is not a resolution, in his opinion, that goes far enough. I am not prepared to challenge that now; but, in any event, this resolution is based upon the necessities of the situation that confront the Congress; and the gentleman's remarks are certainly in support of the particular resolution, which, so far as this particular year is concerned in determining the budget limit for the fiscal year 1950, is a decided step in the right direction, according to his way of thinking.

I rose, however, to set the record straight and to show that our opposition to the resolution in the first session of the Eightieth Congress was based on the arbitrary cut, and that an approach of this kind would have been an honest one and probably would not have incurred our opposition.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, America today is facing a very serious situation. Federal tax collections from the people of the United States in the current fiscal year will run between $42,000,000,000 and $44,000,000,000. State and local tax collections will run nearly $15,000,000,000, and the total will run somewhere around $57,000,000,000. The expendable income, money that can be spent by the people, not the gross income that you hear talked about, but the expendable income, is less than $150,000,000,000. What does this mean? That we are paying today in this country for taxes 35 percent of what is taken in. Is it not about time that we begin to take into consideration what is going on instead of proposing additional taxes to ruin the country?

Mr. Speaker, as far as this particular resolution is concerned, I do not believe it will make the legislative budget provision of the Reorganization Act work. It could not be made to work last year, although we gave of ourselves all the time that it was possible to give in an effort to make it work satisfactorily. Instead of bringing in a subterfuge like this, I am wondering why the majority of the House does not have the courage to bring in a repealer? Every time that we suggested a reduction in over-all appropriations last year and the year before the spenders—those with special projects and other spenders—began to holler. They said that what we were trying to do was to cut down on particular projects that they had in mind.

Why do we not be honest with the House of Representatives and the people of the United States if we are going to do anything about this matter other than to try to make it work the way the reorganization bill provided? Why do we not have the courage to bring in a repealer of that provision?

I could not support this proposition when it was up for consideration before. I stated then just how it would work when the bill was on the floor for consideration. Let me ask again, Why do you not have the courage to face the music?

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor at this time to express my opinion that the postponement of this date for filing the legislative budget until May 1 this year is not in contravention or subterfuge to violate the intent of the legislative budget.

I also would like to answer the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and the distinguished gentleman from New York that we should in all honesty abolish the legislative budget.

In the first place, there is nothing sacred about any date or any particular time mentioned in the Reorganization Act. The Congress is a fluid organization and any Member of Congress must know that no one can possibly write a bill and the Congress cannot pass a bill that must not be looked at in the light of experience and of trial and error.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman misquoted me.

Mr. MONRONEY. I would not want to do that for the world. I thought I had quoted the gentleman correctly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No. My statement was that we should be honest about this, if this will not work, that instead of circumventing the law we should be honest about it and say it will not work and repeal it. We should take one step or the other. We ought to keep it as it is or we ought to repeal it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Perhaps I erred and should not have said that the gentleman from Ohio takes the same position as the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York has been on record consistently since the legislative budget was first proposed in opposition to any legislative budget idea.

The original date in the Reorganization Act for filing the legislative budget, I believe, was April 15. At the request of the Appropriations Committee of the other body that was moved forward to March 15, then at the suggestion of the Appropriations Committee leaders over here, and in an effort to reach a compromise, it was finally made February 15. So this extension now to a later date more or less bears out the original idea that a quick consideration of the important items of a legislative budget are apt to mislead the country and the Congress on the attainment of a factual and a definite budget that Congress can live within.

So I do not think it is going to hurt the congressional reorganization a bit to postpone the date for this year only and try at a later date—I would much rather have a later date—to get closer to hitting the target of the legislative budget.

The accuracy of the budget is more important than to just keep the February 15 date and miss it by $6,000,000,000, as was done 2 years ago. If this mechanism of the legislative budget is to work and to be helpful to the country, then I think it must be as nearly accurate as possible in the light of carefully considered congressional estimates on appropriations and on revenue for that year.

I would like to express myself now on the abolishment of the legislative budget. Its abolishment would tear out the second most vital part of the reorganization of Congress. This was one of the principal things that gave hope to the people of the country that Congress would meet its most important task, and that is, the controls over the power of the purse.

People look to Congress as the guardian of the purse strings, and why the gentleman from New York would stand up here and ask that this mechanism be torn out of the Legislative Reorganization Act without giving it a fair trial, I simply cannot understand.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that we did not give it a fair trial last year or the year before?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that the bringing in of a $6,000,000,000 cut in the President's budget on February 15, 2 years ago, was not a fair trial. Even though I was one of the sponsors of the legislative budget, I voted against that $6,000,000,000 cut, because I knew from my experience it was unrealistic and impossible of attainment.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman really believe in saving a dollar?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do.

Mr. TABER. It is about time somebody did.

Mr. MONRONEY. If you will work and perfect this legislative budget as it was intended to be worked, if you put a staff on the legislative budget and study the budget requests of every single department, and follow from the time the desire of appropriation brings glint into a bureau's eye, and follow that request through the budget office of the President down to the time it comes to Congress, you will be aproaching the financial responsibility of the job Congress has to do.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Does the gentleman know that the testimony before the subcommittee of the War Department last year developed that they had $5,270,000,000 in 1946 and prior years' funds available for expenditure which the President did not include in that very budget the gentleman is talking about?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the gentleman that we should have the very finest staff that money can employ for the Congress to know and understand every single budget item as it comes from these departments and from the President and the failure of the legislative budget has been largely because we have not had a proper staff employed for the legislative budget organization.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. And $4,000,000,000 of that amount remains in the Treasury today.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. The one thing, I think, that we have to realize as Members of Congress is that there are two ends to every budget:

First. How much are you going to spend; and

Second. How much are you going to take in?

In a simple analysis of legislative budget we ask that the Congress do exactly as every individual in business does, try and estimate his over-all expenditure and his over-all income, and try at one point in our congressional session to put these two important items in focus.

If we ignore the amount of revenue that we are going to have coming in at the time we try and fix an over-all budget ceiling on expenditures, then I think we are ignoring one of the principal tasks of this job. The Committee on Ways and Means before the Civil War used to handle both appropriations and also the matter of taxation, and they had control at both ends of the important fiscal job of Congress.

Now we have two committees operating in an airtight, hermetically sealed compartment. Under the legislative budget they must meet together and discuss the matter of revenue and appropriations. These two items, and their relationships of income and outgo, are problems that the people of the United States want to know and understand.

They want to know how are we going to balance the budget and how much revenue are we going to have to meet the necessary total expenditures?

The legislative budget should not be abolished; it should be made to work.

I do not yield to any man in my opinion of the ability of this great legislative body. We can, if we try, make a sound and reliable budget, just as capably as the executive department can. We only need to put the best efforts forward in this approach to an improved fiscal control by Congress.

I am tired, as one Member, of seeing our appropriations total grow haphazard as the result of many loosely connected subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. Our total expenditure figure should be one that is in line with our ability to pay—and only by a legislative budget, taking into consideration both income and outgo, can we do our job.

The suggestion made that May 1 will be too late for any use, is not in line with the facts. A leading member of the Appropriations Committee informed the Rules Committee when this measure was before them, that three-fourths of the appropriations would not have been passed by both Houses before the May 1 date. My own opinion is that not much more than one-third of the money bills will have passed even one House before that date.

It is far more important to set the date forward to May 1 than to abandon the legislative budget. It is more important to change the date than to put up with meaningless budgets hastily arrived at without due consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Oklahoma. He said that any business concern wants to determine how much money it has to spend and how it is going to spend it. I agree with him 100 percent on that. But he said so much more that I do not agree with much of his arguments. Those in charge of any business do not wait until they have spent all their money and then come with recommendations for new features to their business. They decide what they have and what they want before they start any venture. Those responsible for the operation of any good, sound, business concern first sit down and try to analyze just how much it is going to cost them to run their business, new things they want in their business, and then find out how much money they have to spend in order to determine just what they can do. They determine it almost to the penny. If they do not have the money themselves, they want to know where they are going to get it, in order that they can carry out the proposals they are going to inculcate into their business. They do not start new improvements to cost great sums without knowing where the money is coming from.

Why is not that the sensible thing for this Government to do? That is what this law as it was adopted was intended to do. The Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Appropriations, and other Members of the House and Senate were to get together and try as best they could to find out exactly what was going to be required in the way of spending for the year, then they were going to analyze the new things they had, that the President had proposed in his messages to Congress and that the Members of Congress were going to propose in way of legislation. If you propose so much legislation that you are not going to have the money to finance it, and you are going to have deficit spending, then is the time to call a halt, and the report of this committee would be a deterrent to deficit spending.

The gentleman says the Members of this Congress are bright enough, smooth enough, and sweet enough that they are not going to ask for a whole lot of things, but every Member of Congress wants to have something for his own district that costs much money. He is more interested in that than he is in the welfare of the country as a whole. At least it looks that way. He wants to see if he can get appropriations through the Committee on Appropriations and through the Congress, because that will help him in his district.

What has been proposed in the President's budget? The President has proposed some new things. Military pay

adjustments are going to require over $300,000,000. Before we start on that, just remember that you have a $252,000,000,000 debt. The President has asked for $41,800,000,000 for next year. He realized that he is not going to get that money, that he is going to be short $855,000,000 from a balanced budget, when he presented all these requests. Someplace, somewhere, sometime, you will have to cut the cost of government and the President's recommendations.

This committee ought to come in here with these things and tell us just what we are going to have to cut out. Then we ought to be big enough to say that we are going to have a stable, sound Government, and are not going to spend any more than we have to spend. It would be a deterrent to too much legislation if this committee would come in here and make such recommendations to cut out a lot of the President's recommendations, or recommendations of Members of Congress.

Universal military training as proposed by the President is going to cost anywhere from $600,000,000 to $3,000,000,000 per year. Changes in the employees' accident compensation rates are going to cost per year from three to four million dollars. Slum clearance and housing are going to take $210,000,000 to $545,000,000 additional per year. Research and administration and losses on loans, although there has been no official estimate as to the cost, are thought by some people in Government to run as high as $2,000,000,000. That is a lot of money.

For Federal aid to education they want $300,000,000 the first year. The second year it will take $500,000,000. The third year it will take a billion dollars at the least. That is a lot of money. Where are you going to get it?

The National Science Foundation will take from $2,000,000 to $100,000,000 per year. Grain storage will take from $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year. The international wheat agreement will take from $55,000,000 to $70,000,000 a year.

Flood control on Missouri River Basin $4,000,000, and no one knows the final cost; probably like the TVA, it might be a billion dollars.

Health insurance or socialized medicine will run into hundreds of millions of dollars annually.

Unemployment compensation, higher rates and broadening the base.

Steam power plant on TVA—Government in business competing with private enterprise, $75,000,000. Oh, foolish legislation and proposals by the President.

Bureau of Reclamation—rehabilitation and betterment as required by the President will take from $4,000,000 to $12,000,000 a year.

The construction programs that he has asked for, such as the St. Lawrence seaway project, are to take $93,000,000 the first year up to a sum total in 7 years of $3,573,000,000—survey and educational building needs and study for scholarships and fellowships will take a million dollars a year or more.

Then there are grants for scholarships and so on. This thing is enormously important; this ought not to be delayed 1 minute, this report should be here by February 15. It can be done; it should be done. You ought to defeat this resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for an observation?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was very much interested in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] wherein he suggested that this measure was in complete compliance with the spirit of the Reorganization Act. Being a man of peace and one who loves harmony, I would like to suggest to the gentleman that inasmuch as all of the appropriation bills of the House will probably be through the House by May 1, which would, of course, mean that the budget would mean nothing—in order to be certain that he will know exactly what he is going to do that he might well make this August 1 or September 1, or even January 1 of next year, so that he could be quite certain in knowing just where he was.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who claims the great distinction of being one of the authors of the reorganization bill, in an attempt to justify his position on this resolution, which to my mind very surely represents a desertion of the very principle for which he originally fought, made the remark that the Congress is a fluid body. I am quite sure since he has so characterized all of us collectively as being a fluid body that he would not object to my suggesting that perhaps his position on this matter of the legislative budget is a little fluid.

Let us just take a look at the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act. Great numbers of right-thinking people in the country thought that the Congress of the United States needed to be streamlined, that it needed to be brought up to date in its procedure. So we in the Seventy-ninth Congress, a Democratic Congress, enacted the Reorganization Act. There were three things principally outstanding in that measure which were supposed to be helpful to the country. One of them was that we were to shrink up the committees from 48 to 19 in the House and make a like reduction in the other body. The second was that we were to give adequate staffing to those committees in order that they might have the benefit of expert advice and not be dependent upon the executive branch of the Government for all of our information. Thirdly, we were to adopt a legislative budget.

The Congress, may I suggest to the gentleman from Oklahoma, is in truth and in fact the guardian of the purse strings of the Nation. The Congress itself was to take 45 days to sit down, the House cooperating with the Senate, to determine first of all what the revenues could reasonably be expected to be during the coming year, and then to say, "Here is what we propose to spend."

It was assumed, I am quite sure, that those targets would be set and that then the Congress would go to work to try to fit the cloth to the pattern.

Now, what have we already seen? First of all, it fell to the lot of the Eightieth Congress to put the Reorganization Act into effect. I have said before, and what has here transpired today lends additional strength to my statement, that if the Eightieth Congress had not been a Republican Congress the provisions of the reorganization bill would never have been put into effect. You would not have had a shrinking up of committees; you would not have provided for an adequate staffing of those committees, and you would not have undertaken to comply with the requirements for a legislative budget.

In the Eightieth Congress we did put the Reorganization Act into effect. We did not change it in any one single essential feature. We strove to comply with all of its provisions, including the legislative budget.

It is true that in the first session the House and Senate did not finally agree in conference, but the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate at least had courage enough to grapple with the problem and to each state its views as to what the revenues would be and what the expenditures should be.

In the second session we did get out a legislative budget. We did say what we expected would be taken in and how much we should cut expenditures. And let me say to the membership, many of whom were not here in the Eightieth Congress, unfortunately, that we not only announced a legislative budget in the second session, but we lived up to that legislative budget, and we saved billions of dollars to the taxpayers of this country by cutting out unnecessary waste and extravagance.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Coming back to the statement that I made when the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] yielded to me, I have in my possession a detailed statement which I obtained from the War Department after 2 years of work with investigators. This statement shows that the War Department had $5,270,000,000 in 1946 and prior years funds available for expenditure at the time when the budget was submitted to the Legislative Budget Committee by the President. That budget which was submitted by the President to the Legislative Budget Committee did not contain this $5,270,000,000 which was available to the War Department for expenditure. Four billion dollars of that sum remained in the Treasury, either through rescission or refusal to reappropriate. The balance of $1,270,000,000 was obligated by the War Department. Part of these funds were used by the War Department in building those $74,000 houses for Army officers in Alaska.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, may I say that in my opinion the legislation before us today is a subterfuge, a face-saving device, calculated to permit my friends on the majority side from meeting the responsibility that they themselves im-

posed on themselves when they had control in the Seventy-ninth Congress. I do not think it is an honest attempt, and this is why it cannot be honest, and the argument of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], amazes me: By May 1, if I understand the timetable correctly, most of the appropriation bills will be through the House of Representatives and will have been acted upon. If that is true, what is the use of kidding ourselves by saying that making this May 1 we are going to make a determination. The fact of the matter is you have not even had a committee meeting to try to arrive at a legislative budget. You have not turned a wheel to try to meet the responsibility that you imposed on yourselves.

May I say further——

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I cannot refrain from yielding to my good friend from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is well informed that in very few sessions have we been able to get out a majority of the appropriation bills, and when we did they would remain in the other body for an additional 2 months; so that there is ample time.

Mr. HALLECK. Now, you see, that is just some more of the earlier apology for this completely indefensible action you are taking here today.

May I say to the gentleman from Illinois that while action may not be completed in the other body on appropriation bills we over here have the first responsibility on appropriations and we ought to have before us the legislative budget in order that we may proceed to cut the cloth to fit the pattern. If there ever was a time when we ought to have that guidance it is now when we are confronted with demands for additional expenditures of billions and billions of dollars. I am afraid that too many of my Democratic friends are already demonstrating that they have no real intention to cut expenditures or balance the budget. Somewhere a line must be drawn on what we can take out of the economy and not destroy it. If the Democratic majority were not busy welching on its responsibility to determine the legislative budget, a good beginning could be made.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain newspaper excerpts; and to include in 7½-point type remarks made at the time of the adoption of the law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Reorganization Act was approved by the President in 1946. It provided for reduction in the number of committees, for increased congressional personnel, for the abolition of investigating committees and special committees, for the transfer to other agencies of private bills, for the control and registration of lobbyists, for the discontinuance of executive hearings by committees, for committee procedure in the consideration and reporting of bills, and for budgetary control through a joint Committee on the Legislative Budget consisting of the two taxing committees and the two spending committees of the two Houses.

No action of the Seventy-ninth Congress met with wider acclaim or more general approval. The bill passed both Houses by an overwhelming vote and was warmly endorsed by the press of the Nation.

But from the beginning the statute was singularly ineffective. In no instance, and in no respect, did it realize expectations and in no instance did it achieve the objective for which it had been drafted.

Now in its third year we can look back and appraise its effect in the light of comprehensive experience.

Through the association of frequently the most incongruous jurisdictions, it drastically reduced the 81 standing committees of the House and Senate to 146 subcommittees. As the United Press said, "The Senate instead of having 33 full committees as it had before the consolidation now has 15 committees and God knows how many subcommittees." The Senators who complained of having so many committees meeting at the same time now have more subcommittees meeting at the same time.

The Act was especially intended to eliminate special committees. But special committees have been created by both Houses in violation of both the spirit and letter of the law. The Senate after extended debate began by perpetuating the War Investigating Committee as a special group outside the committees authorized by the Reorganization Act and continued the practice. The House voted 269 to 100 to establish a seven-man committee to study the shortage of newsprint and later voted 270 to 92 to set up a nine-member committee on small business. The Commitee on the Disposition of Executive Papers with all its onerous duties followed.

So, in effect, this provision of the Reorganization Act which was perhaps stressed as strongly as any in the entire bill has been completely nullified.

It still exerts, however, one untoward effect. There are 47 men now serving in the two Houses, 29 men in the House and 18 in the Senate, who have been deprived of chairmanships which they have earned and to which they are entitled. And the same number of men on the other side of the aisle have been denied ranking minority assignments on committees through the operation of the act. They do the work and carry the responsibilities of a full committee. They have rendered efficient and distinguished service and are entitled to a chairmanship. But submerged in a subcommittee they are denied the recognition which they and their constituencies should have. Under this system able men may come to Congress and work for years and then retire without ever having reached a chairmanship. It is not only unjust to the Member but it does not contribute to the best interests of the Congress or the Nation.

And we were to be relieved of "trivia." Section 121 of the Reorganization Act was designed to relieve the membership of the burden of handling private bills. Such bills were to be delegated to administrative and judicial agencies. How has it worked? On the first day of last June the House had passed 187 private bills and 167 public bills. And the House, after 2 years, is still carrying the private calendar and in the last session was calling up private bills every 2 weeks.

The Reorganization Act also carried provisions prohibiting legislation by conference committees, the reporting of bills by a committee without majority vote, dictatorial action of a committee chairman contrary to the wishes of his committee, and similar well-established procedures. All such provisions are mere padding as all of them have been embodied in the law and practice of the House from a time when the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.

The act banned closed sessions. Open hearings were to be the rule. And yet both the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Appropriations, for example, have continued closed sessions. I do not recall a single open session by the committee, or any subcommittee, of the Committee on Appropriations since the law was enacted. Like all other provisions of the act the inhibitation of executive sessions is honored by its breach.

Another of the reforms to be instituted by the Reorganization Act was the control of lobbyists. They were to be required to register and in that way the evil was to be eradicated or at least reduced to inoccuous proportions. The newspapers report that during the entire Eightieth Congress, and with increasing activity in the Eighty-first Congress, the lobbyist has flourished as a green-bay tree. There are said to be more high-powered, high-priced lobbyists in Washington today with larger expense funds at their disposal than ever before. And so far as can be noted by the casual observer they have not been affected by the Reorganization Act in the slightest.

The National Legionnaire, in commenting on this section of the Reorganization Act, said:

> American Legion legislative representatives registering under the new Lobbying Act describe it as a weak and flexible measure denying the public a true picture of expenditures and they proposed legislation requiring complete financial statements such as those furnished by the Legion for decades.
>
> John Thomas Taylor, national legislative director of the American Legion, one of three to register, condemned the section of the act as being a "camouflaged works which is an insult to the intelligence of the American citizen, whom it would deceive."
>
> "This section," Director Taylor charged, "is a farce, which enterprising lobbyists must praise as they gleefully behold the many loopholes.

Although the Reorganization Act was launched with the universal approval and commendation of the press, the failure of the law to effect economy or increased efficiency has been so marked that its most ardent editorial advocates have become critical.

For example, the United States News, which strongly championed its enactment, says:

BRAKES ON SPEED-UP PROGRAM AS SUBCOMMITTEES RISE, BUDGET LAGS—LITTLE CHANGE IN OUTPUT OF LAWS DESPITE $5,000,000 A YEAR FOR EXPERT ASSISTANCE

The Eightieth Congress is remodeled and streamlined for efficiency. It has $5,000,000 a year in new experts and technicians, all sorts of new controls and machinery designed to put lawmaking on a scientific basis. But a careful study of its work indicates that Congress is going along in about the same old way.

An investigation shows:

Legislative output is about on a par with that of other Congresses.

The legislative budget, designed to bind together governmental income and outgo controls, is caught in a dispute and all but forgotten. Appropriation and tax bills are moving as usual.

A streamlined committee system is now filling the Capitol with subcommittees, and, in some cases, this new committee system is adding another layer of red tape to the legislative processes. More red tape, no greater output.

Lobbyists, who were to be controlled, still are busy in committees and at the nightly social affairs of the Capital.

BUDGET TANGLE

The legislative budget was designed to bring the spending and taxing committees of Congress together for a study of the Nation's fiscal situation and for agreement upon over-all spending and taxing policies. A figure for total spending would be set and appropriation bills cut to fit that total. Taxes would be fixed accordingly.

But House Republicans demanded a $6,000,000,000 cut in the budget President Truman submitted, so as to assure tax reduction. Senate Republicans wanted a smaller cut, and there was dispute over how much should go toward retirement of the national debt.

In the midst of that row, the legislative budget mired down. It now rests in a joint committee of Senators and Representatives. Meanwhile, taxes are going in one direction and appropriation in another.

FROM COMMITTEES TO SUBCOMMITTEES

Streamlining trimmed off about three-fifths of the old committees. Each committee was expected to do whatever investigating was needed in its own field.

But the streamlining left 47 Senators and Representatives who otherwise would have been committee chairmen without any committees to head. The first breaks in the reorganization plan came with the creation of special investigation committees; for national defense and small business in the Senate; for supply of newsprint and small business in the House.

After the committees were organized, the dam broke. The new committees were large, and dealt with many subjects. And there were about 40 chairless would-be chairmen. The committees broke into huddles of subcommittees. In the House, some committees have 10 or 12 subcommittees. Members who used to go from one committee meeting to another now go from one subcommittee meeting to another.

This new technique in some cases is tending to add another layer of red tape to congressional procedure. Under the old system, the committee that prepared a bill brought the measure to the floor, directly. Now the first group to handle a bill usually is a subcommittee, and the product has to be approved by the full committee before going to the floor.

If the chairman insists upon a meticulous study by the full committee before approval, the work of the subcommittee is gone over from end to end, amounting to a double job.

In like vein the Washington Times-Herald commented:

Congress is bidding fair to reorganize itself into a state of utter confusion. If it continues to streamline and simplify at its present pace, it will become so complicated and unwieldy that another city will have to be built just to house the overflow subcommittees.

The major idea behind reorganization was to cut down the committees to a practical minimum; to avoid overlapping and duplication of effort. This was very laudible, because there was almost as much duplication hereabouts as duplicity.

The actual result, however, seems to be that Congress has merely gone from confusion to chaos. Although the regular standing committees have been reduced materially, five subcommittees now bloom where only one was a blooming nuisance before.

Take the House Army and Navy Affairs Committees as a notable example. Theoretically, they have been merged into one committee on the Armed Services. But whereas there were these two committees before, now this merged committee has 12 subcommittees.

The Army and Navy Committees had a room each under the old order. The merged committee now takes up two committee rooms and nine suites—practically one entire corridor of the old House Office Building.

The number of standard committees in the House was cut from 49 to 19, but there is less room now than ever before. In fact, nearly a month after the reconvening of Congress, upwards of 20 members still are without offices and are forced to transact their business at make-shift desks stuck in the corners of caucus rooms or storerooms.

These officeless statesmen have literally been reorganized out of a joint they can call their own. It seems every possible bit of space around the Capitol and environs is occupied by a subcommittee on something or other.

Unless something is done, very few members will ever have any clear idea of proposed legislation. It used to be that a bill was threshed out in its entirety before the full standing committee. The committee then was able to present it in fairly clear form to the entire body. Every member of the committee, if he had listened carefully and intelligently, had a good idea of the picture as a whole.

Let us again take the merged military committee as an example. Its twelve subcommittees are composed of 10 members each, who consider various phases of the proposed bill. The net result is that the full committee never gets to hear the full legislation.

But of all the unworkable and impracticable provisions of the Reorganization Act, the section providing for a legislative budget is the most unworkable and impracticable.

And may I say, Mr. Speaker, that the legislative budget has had a fair trial. I want to extend my compliments to the gentleman from New York, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations last Congress, and Senator BRIDGES, chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the Senate, on their efforts to make it work. They gave it a fair trial and they made every effort to get results.

So far as I am personally concerned, let me say that I have not changed my position as was intimated here. In the last Congress I introduced this same resolution, and it was pigeonholed.

I introduced also in this session a resolution providing for the suspension of this section pending further study and I am glad to note that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] agree with me that the section should be taken out of the law.

Why did we not press that resolution instead of the pending resolution? Because the leadership on that side of the House has repeatedly issued releases to the press in the last 2 or 3 weeks in which they said emphatically they would fight to the death any effort to abolish the provision. Rather than engage in a partisan contest, on a matter on which there should be no partisanship, we then proposed this resolution with the thought that it would meet with general approval.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I regret that I do not have the time, but I shall be glad to entertain an interruption by my beloved friend from Pennsylvania at some other time.

Mr. Speaker, of all of the unworkable and impracticable provisions in the Reorganization Act none is so unworkable and impracticable as the legislative budget. We have tried it. We gave it every opportunity. It cannot be made effective. We can no more expect success, Mr. Speaker, with this well-meant but hopeless proposal than we can expect a verdict from the jury before it has heard the evidence.

How can we judge the correctness of this mass of estimates? The Government has been working on its preparation for more than a year. It is a book the size of an unabridged dictionary. It is possible there are proposed expenditures in there which ought to come out. It may be there are others which should be included. But, how can we tell without studying them? How can we reach a dependable over-all figure? It is absolutely impossible. It cannot be done, gentlemen, try as we may.

If under the proposed system you fix the date early enough to affect expenditures there is no time in which to hold hearings and arrive at a dependable conclusion. If on the other hand you delay the date until after hearings have been held the bills will already have been passed and it is too late to affect them.

Let us take up the bill itself with this problem before us.

Section 138 created a Joint Committee of Congress on the Legislative Budget consisting of the two taxing committees—Ways and Means of the House and Finance of the Senate—and the two appropriating committees of Congress—Appropriations of the House and Appropriations of the Senate. The combined membership of these four committees is 104.

The law requires this joint committee to report to the respective Houses of Congress not later than February 15 of each year a legislative budget for the next year including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures. They are also required to report a recommendation as to the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in the next year with a reserve for emergencies if deemed necessary. If there is an estimated surplus, the joint committee has to make a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Nothing is said about a decrease in taxes. The law leaves

no choice to the joint committee as to the disposition of the surplus; it ties their hands in favor of debt reduction.

The controversial nature of the action under section 138 comes from the requirement that the joint committee accompany their report with a concurrent resolution proposing adoption of the legislative budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated by Congress at that session for expenditure in the next fiscal year. Nothing is said about a limit on appropriations for the subsequent fiscal years which might conceivably be an important factor in the financing program of those years. If there is an estimated deficit instead of a projected surplus, the concurrent resolution is to contain a declaration that it is the sense of Congress that the public debt should be increased by the amount of the deficit. Again it ties the hands of the joint committee as to the manner of meeting the deficit. A recommendation for new taxation or partial new taxation and partial increase in debt would not suffice.

There is no clarity as to what Congress intended in section 138 by the legislative budget. Did it envision the complete make-up of the present appropriation bills in final detail? Did it hope for one consolidated appropriation bill? Did it contemplate only a schedule of the items in general? Or did it intend simply an allocation of available revenue in general lump to each of the departments and other agencies? The only definite expression in the section is that it shall be a legislative budget and include the estimated receipts and expenditures and recommend a maximum limit on the total to be appropriated for expenditure in the ensuing year.

The outside date fixed for reporting the legislative budget is February 15 of each year. This automatically precludes a detailed budget because it could not be made ready by that time. If it envisioned only schedules of items or allocations by agencies those could only soundly be reached by consideration of the details which comprise the whole and again the dead line of time defeats practical compliance. A consolidated appropriation bill is ruled out for the same reason. The upset date contributes to make section 138 action the vehicle of the cleaver instead of the scalpel.

As will be noted, the over-all budget figure, even when finally adopted, is not mandatory. It is not binding in any respect. It establishes no statutory limitation on the Federal budget or on the amount appropriated by Congress or on expenditures. It is merely the expression of a pious hope, which Congress may disregard, and which Congress has invariably disregarded.

The plan is wholly impracticable. A figure was finally adopted in the last session. But has any Member of the House ever heard it referred to in connection with any appropriation bill? After the legislative budget was adopted in the Eightieth Congress we passed all the supply bills carrying innumerable items and billions of dollars. Was the over-all figure ever considered or referred to at any time during the consideration of these bills? After its adoption by the House and Senate it was never heard from again. If adopted in this Congress it will not be taken into consideration in the preparation and passage of a single appropriation bill. It is wasted time and effort. Try as we may, give it our wholehearted support, and it is still a dead letter. It cannot be made effective.

We take the time of a committee of 104 busy men, at a particularly busy time in the session and we expend, in printing and other expenses incident to the passage of a legislative budget, over $31,000, as we did in the last Congress. And at the end of the session there is no advantage of any kind to compensate for the expenditure of time or money.

Permit me to quote from men whose opinion should have some weight in such matters: Here are comments taken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

OPINIONS

Mr. BROWN. The provision is of no great value. We cannot fix this early in any congressional session with any accuracy just what the spending requirements will be. If we wait until later there will be no necessity of fixing the ceiling because it will already have been fixed by the votes on appropriation bills.

Mr. TABER. Impossible to take the figures herewith submitted and arrive at any conclusion which will jibe with appropriations that so far have been made and which will be made in the rest of the session. That part of the Reorganization Act was a mistake. It is not binding on the Congress and is not a satisfactory guide to what might result. The whole thing is a stab in the dark.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This requirement has proved itself to be impracticable.

Senator BRIDGES. The Legislative Reorganization Act became a law August 2, 1946. It directed the four House and Senate Revenue and Appropriation Committees to recommend to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year. Such report to contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in that year.

As the act is now written I do not believe that the legislative budget will ever be more than a pregame guess at the final score. It asks the Joint Budget Committee to give its estimates of a multitude of new facts, figures, conditions, and requests with which it has had little or no time to become acquainted.

Actually, long and detailed hearings are necessary if we are to have a realistic picture of the proper relationship between revenues, appropriations, expenditures, and debt reduction.

Senator TAFT could claim no more for it than an intelligent guess, while Representative RAYBURN, of Texas, House Democratic leader, said all that was done was to "pick a figure out of the air."

These comments do not come from men lacking responsibility. From the joint committee's report, many are from men in positions of high responsibility and leadership. They do not want deliberately to confuse, yet they are required by law to perform a duty which leads nowhere.

The press of the country is in a large measure in agreement with this view. The Washington Star, one of the great papers of the Nation, which has consistently supported efforts to achieve a workable legislative budget, said editorially:

BUDGET CUTTING BY GUESSWORK

The manifest irresolution with which the Senate resolved to cut President Truman's budget by two and a half billion dollars is understandable. The Senate was making a necessary gesture, in accordance with provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but the report of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee makes it plain that the gesture should not be taken too seriously.

The committee, for its part, tossed its budget reduction recommendation into the Senate's lap with a warning that it was little more than a figure grabbed out of a hat. Chairman BRIDGES of the joint committee put it this way in his report: "As the act is now written, I do not believe that the legislative budget will ever be more than a pregame guess at the final score." The law, he pointed out, requires the committee to give its estimate "of a multitude of new facts, figures, conditions, and requests with which it has had little or no time to become acquainted."

When the legislative budget plan was first tried out last year, the committee made a sincere effort to get the facts, holding hearings at which the Budget Director was a witness. But Senate and House were unable to agree whether the President's budget should be slashed six billions or four and a half billions, and the plan ultimately failed. This year the committee did not even bother to hold hearings. Not even the Budget Director was questioned. The committee just made a guess and handed it to Congress on a take-it-or-leave-it basis.

It would not be fair, however, to criticize the committee for this casual attitude toward a matter of such moment to the country. As Chairman BRIDGES stressed in his report and as others at the Capitol have said before him, it is just expecting too much to require a newly constituted group of more than a hundred legislators to submit an intelligent report before the February 15 dead line fixed by law. This cumbersome group of changing membership has found it impossible to study, analyze, and report on a fifteen-hundred-page budget in the few weeks allowed.

The Star also carried an article analyzing admirably the entire situation:

Although the La Follette-Monroney Act reorganizing the Congress is properly regarded as a forward-looking piece of legislation, it is becoming increasingly clear that at least one of its provisions is of dubious value. This is the section directing Congress to establish a legislative budget.

Under this portion of the act the committees which handle revenue bills and the committees which handle appropriation bills in each House are required to meet at the beginning of each session of Congress. After consultation and consideration of the budget recommendations of the President these committees are directed to report to their respective Houses an estimate of receipts and expenditures. The difficulty with this section is that it requires this report to be filed on February 15 and to contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated. The recommendation is to be accompanied by a resolution adopting the budget and fixing a ceiling on the forthcoming appropriations.

Until the passage of the La Follette-Monroney Act the preparation of the Federal budget was considered a purely executive function. The itemized list of proposed appropriations for each department and agency of Government is transmitted by the President to Congress on the day after his message on the state of the Union. This, of course, does not mean that the executive budget is binding upon Congress since in

passing appropriation bills either House can revise or reject any item contained in it. It did mean, however, that with respect to any reductions made by Congress the agency affected had been afforded an opportunity for a hearing before both the House and Senate Appropriation Committees and a consideration of its case on the merits. The only aspect of finality to the President's recommendations is that no agency may ask its subcommittee on appropriations for an amount in excess of his budget estimate.

As a result of the limited period available to Congress to frame a budget, the joint committees are now compelled to act without an opportunity for scientific appraisal of the merits of the particular items. Consequently the budgetary proceedings in the House and Senate and in the Republican caucuses have been distinguished more for partisan prejudice than for sober legislative thought. While informed persons would agree that with the cessation of hostilities it became incumbent upon the President and Congress to adhere to a budget which would bring about a significant reduction in the national debt, apparently the majority leaders in Congress have given little or no thought to the question of whether the best way of attaining this was to cut expenditures or to increase the tax rates. Instead the Republicans accepted as party gospel the theory that Federal expenditures were much too high and that the President's budget could be reduced anywhere from $6,000,000,000 to $4,000,000,000.

Inasmuch as the Republican leadership in both branches took the position that the joint legislative budget committees were justified in making such a recommendation without disclosing specific items in the present budget which are to be reduced or omitted, it is apparent that both the six billion and the four billion figures were picked out of the air. The only approximation which either of these figures bears to the arithmetic of the problem is that if Representative Knudsen, the new chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, is permitted to carry out his pledge of a 20-percent reduction in income taxes, the estimated loss to the Treasury would be close to $4,000,000,000.

Of course, it is understandable that after long years of frustration, apostles of economy in government are naturally resentful of a budget of $37,000,000,000. But to strike out blindly without considering the merits of the functions which the Federal Government would necessarily have to abandon under the proposed legislative ceiling is to pursue a course which would defeat the underlying policies of the La Follette-Monroney Act. By and large the purpose of this legislation was to enable Congress to act upon information and mature consideration, rather than upon passion and prejudice. To realize this objective, the act not only limited the unwieldy size and number of committees but also made provisions for staffing them with expert advisers. But before placing this scientific committee machinery to work on the highly technical problem of putting our fiscal house in order, Congress is now acting in a vacuum on a question having tremendous repercussions upon our fate abroad as well as upon our domestic economy.

Mr. Speaker, the section should be suspended and opportunity afforded to substitute a method through which an accurate and dependable budget can be determined and determined in time to affect the appropriations and expenditures of the annual budget. As that is impossible at this time, the only alternative is to adopt the pending resolution and provide time in which to make the best computation possible under the circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I revert to remarks on this subject when the adoption of the Reorganization Act was under debate:

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is the heart and soul of the American system of government. Destroy or nullify its functions and you have left but the shell of free government. Any influence which tends to reduce the confidence or the regard in which it is held by the American people militates to that extent against the effectiveness of the Government, if not the preservation of the Government itself.

Mr. Speaker, wherever dictators and usurpers have climbed to autocratic power in any country, their first care has been to strike at the representatives of the people in the legislative branch of the government. Oliver Cromwell, in proroguing the English Parliament, pointed his sword at the mace lying upon the table of the House of Commons and cried, "Take away this bauble." When it was carried out there went with it representative government in all England.

Again, Napoleon, stalking into the French Chamber of Deputies at the head of his grenadiers, cried, "Follow me. I am destiny. I am the divinity of the day." As his bayonets drove out the representatives of the people, some of them climbing through windows to escape, they drove out civil and religious liberty.

From that day until the end of the Napoleonic dynasty, France, and all Europe controlled by France, was without representative government.

Again, so recently, Hitler, endeavoring to seize the reins of government in Germany, as the first step toward world domination, burned down the Reichstag Building, so that Germany's House of Representatives, unable to meet, was scattered in confusion, and before it could reassemble, a large number had been proscribed or were in concentration camps, and free government in Germany had been destroyed, and free government was in peril throughout the world.

Here in America, whenever any man or group of men has sought to establish autocratic control, whether political, economic, or industrial, they have struck, either directly or by innuendo, at the influence of the Representatives of the American people on this floor. Of course, the American people have long ago advanced beyond the stage of armed interference with the legislative branch of the Government by military authorities. That would be impossible in America today. Our state of civilization does not countenance the political prison or the concentration camp. But there are other ways of undermining the standing and influence of the Congress in the regard and confidence of the people, which, whether with or without sinister motives, can be just as effective when carried to their ultimate conclusion.

The Congress has been subject to criticism—as it should be—ever since the establishment of the Republic. One of the most priceless prerogatives of every American is the right to criticize Congress and the Members of Congress, and that right has been widely and fully exercised from the First Congress down to the Seventy-ninth Congress now in session. At times that criticism has been more virulent and more undeserved than at others. And that is as it should be. Better that Congress and Congressmen be unjustly accused on many occasions than that they should escape merited stricture on any single occasion.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the last 2 years such a flood of unwarranted and unsupported abuse and castigation has been loosed against Congress and its procedure as has no equal in the annals of congressional condemnation.

Newspaper columnists and radio broadcasters have vied with written and spoken jeremiads delivered here on this floor to an extent that at times transcend even the bounds of truth and good taste. The abuse of Congress, criticism of the Congress and its membership and its procedure, has been without precedent since the stormy days of the Sixtieth and Sixty-first Congresses when the House Rules were a national political issue.

Effort has been made to convince the American people that something is so wrong with congressional procedure that dire disaster menaces the country, its form of government, and its democratic institutions, unless immediate and drastic action is taken to save the Nation and its democratic practices from onrushing ruin and destruction. In order to foster this propaganda a campaign of abuse and disparagement of Congress individually and collectively has been waged. Let me quote from just a few of many such castigations. Here is a summarization of such criticism epitomized by one of the distinguished Members of the other body and published in the Pageant magazine:

> The trouble with Congress is, briefly, Congressmen. Their two main interests have been getting reelected and lining their pockets. Short of everything else they are lazy and overpaid. They have it soft. The lobbyists write our laws, and in a way that is fortunate for Congressmen are numbskulls, they are windbags, obstructionists, and worse. Only a vigilant press deters them from raiding the Treasury.

Here is a quotation from a statement made on our own floor:

> The people think we are a bunch of clowns.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Maybe the gentleman who made that statement has heard from his home folks and he does not know about the rest of us.

Mr. CANNON. That is quite possible.

These statements reflect not only on Congress and Congressmen but on the American people. Here is a statement from a national magazine, Life:

> Like the American people, they—

That is the Congressmen—

> Like the American people they represent, they are indeed often ignorant, provincial, and greedy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. There are good people, honest people, patriotic people, who lack sufficient experience to be able to weigh those statements. Especially is that true when they see those statements in books or pamphlets.

I have received many letters stating, "If the charge is not true, why do you not sue him?" But the gentleman knows how futile and how expensive that sort of procedure is. When a charge is made against the House as a whole, it does occur to me that the makers of the charge should be brought before the bar of the House.

Mr. CANNON. I would hardly favor bringing in the publisher of any magazine or newspaper. As I have said, it is better that Congress be accused untruthfully a hundred times than not to be accused one time when we should be accused.

I think we should demonstrate, as we have demonstrated, and as we are demonstrating, on the floor here, the untruthfulness of these statements.

Mr. Speaker, here is another statement appearing in Reader's Scope:

> Washington's great Capitol dome covers a lot of statemanship and a lot of skulduggery and bungling inefficiency.

Again, here is an editorial appearing in one of the great newspapers of the Nation:

> Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, is bogged down in red tape.

You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that there is no distinction here between the Congress and its membership. They do not make that statement with reference to some one or two Members of the House. They make the broad statement that the Congress is unintelligent, lacks courage, and is bogged down in red tape. It is in the deadliest form in which it could be put in order to affect the sentiment of the country. There is no differentiation between the institution and its membership.

Then I include a statement from the Saturday Evening Post, in one of the most astounding articles I have ever read in a national magazine, a number of copies of which have been sent to me from different parts of the United States:

> Congress has been ridiculed by the public and kicked around by the executive departments until a groveling inferiority complex has brought wide conviction to its Members that the future is without hope.

An astonishing statement in a great national magazine, that all hope is gone. These statements have appeared in newspapers and periodicals in every city in the United States, not merely once, but systematically and serially. They are not merely attacks upon the House and its membership, but the idea intended to be conveyed to the people is that a serious situation obtains today which, if not remedied in the immediate future, is fraught with catastrophic disaster.

The impression is given that the situation amounts to a national crisis in which the liberties and the integrity of the Government itself are at stake. As an example, in this article in the Saturday Evening Post the situation is represented as "an issue as grave as any in the history of federalization."

Now that is covering a wide territory but that is the phraseology of the statement. The article goes on to say this supreme and transcendent issue is "whether Congress can modernize its archaic machinery and thoroughly regain its historic position of power without which the democratic process will fail."

It will be noticed that the unmistakable inference is that Congress has lost its powers, and that unless some miracle of recovery can be achieved, democracy is dead, and this in face of the fact that Congress in this session has brushed aside any conflict with other branches of the Government, has maintained its position and power under the Constitution as never before, and has just administered victoriously, without error or scandal, the greatest war in history—a record unapproached in that respect by any Congress since the establishment of the Republic.

Another Member of the coordinate body of the Congress make this statement: "Upon a stronger and more effective Congress may well depend the preservation of democracy in the United States."

You cannot imagine a statement of a more serious tenor.

And another Member of the same body says that something should be done "to see that the American Congress does not wither away."

Another Member of this body says: "Unless the representative system is strengthened, Congress will fade out as an effective control by the people of their Government."

And, again, this: "Situation means a concentration of Government power in one branch of Government. It is a threat to the basic liberties of the people."

And, by another Member of the other body: "We must have a reorganization of Congress to the end that the Congress of the United States may reclaim its lost powers and prestige, and may once again become a truly coordinated branch of the Government."

These Jeremiahs insist that it is not merely a problem; that it is a danger. For example, here is a quotation from the floor:

> Rule by the people must surely end if the Federal Legislature is abolished or reduced to relative unimportance. Both friends and foes of Congress agree that has in a measure already come.

Mr. RANKIN. I wonder how they ever got the idea that the friends of Congress agreed to any such proposition.

Mr. CANNON. I think anybody who is familiar with the actual situation here will appreciate the absurdity of it.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, the gentleman from Missouri who is now addressing the House knows more about parliamentary law and parliamentary procedure than any other man alive today. I say that advisedly. I knew him when he was a Parliamentarian. I knew him when he first came to Congress. I believe I am as familiar with CANNON'S precedents as any other man in the House. I am sure the gentleman from Missouri will agree that the rules of the House of Representatives as they now stand constitute the greatest system of parliamentary procedure the world has ever known. Am I right in that?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman is unfortunate in his premise but he affirms the opinion of every constitutional authority in his estimate of the rules of the House.

Our system of procedure is the product of more than a thousand years of legislative experience. Some objection has been made that it is not up to date, that like a woman's hat or a man's necktie, it ought to change every year. As a matter of fact, parliamentary procedure is based upon fundamental rules of decorum which do not change any more than the fundamental rules of human conduct as set forth in the Ten Commandments change. It has been built up through centuries of experience in various legislative bodies, beginning with the Anglo-Saxon Witenagemot, continuing down through the development of parliamentary government in the colonial legislatures in this country and under our own system of government for more than 150 years.

The tenor of these statements is that the Government faces a crisis. That the threat is serious, the danger is real, the life of representative government is at stake. I ask you seriously, if there is any basis for these statements so industriously disseminated over the country.

Continuing, here is an editorial from one of the great newspapers of the Nation, a newspaper which probably ranks as 1 of the 10 great papers on the American Continent. This is what it says, referring to the situation supposed to have brought about the appointment of the streamlining committee:

> The crisis is a challenge to do something before it is too late. It is an alarming situation.

"Do something before it is too late." Too late for what? "An alarming situation." What is it that is so alarming?

This Congress has been tried as no other Congress has been tried. It has had to meet situations no other Congress has been called upon to meet and it has met them effectively and successfully. Still they say that the situation is so alarming that before it is too late something must be done or chaos will follow.

Every once in a while a messiah arises to predict the end of the world, but the world keeps on going, and despite these tongues of Thersites, Congress keeps on doing a good job—the best it has ever done—but these prophets of calamity say that something must be done, must be done quickly, must be done before it is too late.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 30 minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I will use another 30 minutes.

Continuing, this statement says:

> Congress has largely abdicated its legislative as well as its supervisory functions and duties.

Gentlemen, anyone visiting the House on any day it is in session would be surprised at that statement. What has Congress abdicated? What right or prerogative has it relinquished? What function has it waived? Wherein has it failed in any duty or responsibility?

I have read some of the testimony adduced before the streamlining committee. The committee invited all Members

of the House and Senate and anyone else who had a grievance and felt that something was wrong and ought to be remedied, to appear before them. Much of the testimony adduced before the committee borders on the ridiculous. One of the first Members of the other body who appeared before that committee began his statement with an excoriation of the acoustic properties of the Senate Chamber. It has been claimed here that the liberties of the Republic were at stake, and when he was called in and asked how and why they were at stake, he said he could not be heard when he spoke in the Senate Chamber and something ought to be done about it. Another mentioned in his opening statement that he had received a request from a constituent as to where colored feathers could be sold. He was irked because a constitutent who wanted to dispose of commodities which he was in a position to produce inquired of him where a market could be found. He was advised to stand on his dignity and refuse to answer.

Mr. Speaker, we invite every legitimate criticism. But many of the statements that have been so widely circulated in order to whip up interest over this question, are without any foundation of fact.

For example, the statement has been made on the floor here and copied in most of the metropolitan papers of the country, and one of the great newspapers of the country carried it in a box on its editorial page, day after day, week after week, and month after month, as follows:

> Not since 1893 has the machinery of Congress been overhauled.

Largely on that one statement they based their demand for a change of congressional procedure.

Now, that situation, even if it were true, might not be so serious, because the fundamental rules of procedure in a deliberative body do not change from year to year. There are no fashions in legislative procedure. We do not have to have a new set of rules every spring. But the thing I am calling attention to is that the statement which has been so widely publicized, and upon which most of the objection to our procedure has been founded, is utterly without a basis of fact. It simply is not true.

For example, instead of going back to 1893 for a revision of our procedure, the greatest revision of the rules of the House of Representatives of all time was in the Sixty-second Congress, 1911–12. There are Members still on the floor who participated in that revision. We had just come through a political campaign in which the issue was the rules of the House, and, in particular, the control of the Speaker over the House, and the country had, by its vote at the polls, demanded a change in the rules and curtailment of the power of the Speaker. When the House assembled that was the prior item of business.

Accordingly the revision of 1911–12 was the most drastic in the history of the Congress. Committees were established and discontinued. That is the piece de resistance before us today—as to whether we will have new committees or retain old committees or consolidate committees, or what we are going to do about it. In the revision of 1911–12 many committees were changed. Committees were created and abolished. The control of the Speaker over the House, which had become autocratic, was broken. The Speaker's power of recognition, which had been one of his great prerogatives, was circumscribed by the establishment of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, the Discharge Calendar rule, provision for Calendar Wednesday, and restriction to the minority of the right to offer a motion to recommit.

The House took away from the Speaker those powers which had given him autocratic control over legislation. Reference of bills to committees was standardized by the rigid enforcement of the rule of jurisdiction. Recalcitrant committees and managers of conferences were rendered subject to summary discharge. The Holman rule was permanently incorporated in the rules of the House—a provision which has saved more money than any other one provision in the rules. The right to appoint committees, perhaps the greatest source of his power, was taken from the Speaker. Previously he could put a man on a committee or could take him off. If a man did not do what he was told to do, he was taken off the committee, or was sometimes put on a committee with the understanding that he would take some particular action. That power—a power which had been in effect since the beginning of the Government—was taken from him. The Speaker was made ineligible to membership on the Committee on Rules. I remember when the Committee on Rules consisted of three members: John Dalzell, of Pennsylvania; Speaker Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois; and the gentleman from Mississippi, one of the most distinguished Members of this House of all time, John Sharp Williams. The committee would bring in a rule providing for the consideration of such legislation as they wanted. John Sharp Williams would rise and protest vigorously against the "outrage." Finally, when they wanted a meeting of this committee, John Dalzell would go over to Mr. Williams on the floor and say, "Come on, John, we are going to perpetrate another 'outrage.'" No bill could be brought up unless the Speaker approved it.

All this was changed in 1911–12. For the first time in the history of the House, its rules were completely democratized. It constituted the most important and farthest-reaching revision in the annals of parliamentary government in the United States; numerous other changes have been made in subsequent revisions; and yet the country is told that nothing has been done in the way of revising the rules since 1893. In other words, this statement, which has been used more than anything else to bolster up the claim that our procedure is antiquated, out of date, and inadequate, is based upon a statement that is utterly without foundation.

Among the statements lacking in accuracy but advanced as a reason for revision of House procedure is the statement that bills are referred to committees in consideration of the attitude of the chairman toward the proposed legislation. As you know, the Parliamentarian actually refers the bills by authority granted to the Speaker under the rules of the House. The inference is that the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the man who so enjoys the confidence and affection of this body as to be elected its Presiding Officer, will, if he is opposed to a measure, refer it to the committee where the chairman is hostile to that measure, or if he favors it, will refer it to a committee where the chairman is favorable to the legislation. I have here the book and page on which this charge is set forth.

As a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the facts. Never has the oldest Member of this House ever heard, much less known, it to be so much as intimated that the Speaker was governed by his attitude on a bill in its reference to a committee.

Then I think there is no charge that has been made more frequently, and more inaccurately, in an endeavor to secure public approval of some notion that something is seriously wrong with the procedure of the House than the statement that committees have overlapping and duplicating jurisdiction. As a matter of fact, the jurisdiction of the committees of the House is so definitely established and has been for so many years that the question of the reference of a bill never arises on the floor. There is no overlapping committee jurisdiction in this House.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not a fact that the rules of the House provide that, if any Member has an objection to the reference of a bill, he can make a point of order and bring the matter to the attention of the House and the Speaker and have a ruling by the House itself?

Mr. CANNON. I appreciate the gentleman's suggestion, because I was just proceeding to make the statement the gentleman has made. If a bill should be referred to a committee which does not have jurisdiction, there is every provision for its rereference to the committee properly having jurisdiction. If it is a private bill, as the gentleman very well says, a point of order can be raised by any Member. I ask you, when did you ever hear a point of order raised on the floor against the reference of a bill to a committee? I do not recall that in recent years anybody has ever made a point of order against the reference of a bill. Still they would have the country believe that we have such confusion here and so many committees have jurisdiction of the same subject matter that it interferes with the transaction of the business on the floor of the Congress.

The committees of the House are jealous of their jurisdiction, and if anybody, at any time, by the improper reference of a bill should infringe upon their jurisdiction, that committee would immediately protest. The rules provide that if a public bill is improperly referred there are three methods of rereference to proper jurisdiction.

First. By unanimous consent. A Member may rise on the floor and say, "This bill has been referred to the wrong committee. My committee has jurisdiction. I ask unanimous consent that the bill

be rereferred." The fact that you have heard no such request in many years is convincing proof that jurisdiction of the committees is well established and understood and there are no conflicting jurisdictions which would give rise to any dispute between committees as to the reference of any of the thousands of bills which are referred every session.

Second. Rereference may be made on the authorized motion of the committee claiming jurisdiction. If any committee thinks a bill to which it is entitled has been improperly referred, they may come in here and ask for a rereference. Have you heard in recent years of a rereference on the motion of a committee claiming jurisdiction of a bill assigned to another committee?

Third. A rereference may be made on the motion of a committee to which a bill has been erroneously referred. Motions for change of reference are privileged, and yet there has been no contest over jurisdiction of committees on motions or change of reference since I can remember. There can be no more convincing proof of the lack of interference between the jurisdictions or the lack of overlapping jurisdictions between the committees of the House. In other words, the widely publicized charge that there is overlapping jurisdiction is without foundation.

Every facility is given for a change of reference if there has been an improper reference, even on appeal. And the fact that none of these facilities have been invoked in recent years is conclusive evidence that there is no foundation for the charge of overlapping jurisdictions so often reiterated through the columns of the press.

It is seldom that a bill is introduced in the House which does not contain matter falling within the jurisdiction of one committee, other matter within the jurisdiction of a second committee and still other matter under the jurisdiction of a third or fourth or fifth committee. In the same bill may be several provisions each of which comes within the province of as many different committees. However, the rule which always applies, and the rule which is always followed by the Parliamentarian, and the rule which has always been satisfactory to the House, is that the bill goes to the committee which has jurisdiction of the major matter in the bill. No change in rules of jurisdiction that you can suggest will prevent that. That is not a conflict of jurisdiction. It is the way in which the bill was drawn, and no change that you can make in the rules would affect it in the slightest.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. No matter how many committees you set up or how you outline the jurisdiction of the particular committees you set up, the same thing would occur in the future at all times?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly. It could not be avoided by any provision of the rules.

So far as departmental officials coming before several committees on the same subject is concerned, the repetition of evidence before different committees is highly salutary. The members of the committee have an opportunity to review the data submitted by the witness on former appearances and are in better position for cross-examination; the witness goes back to the department with a larger cross section of congressional opinion; and the executive and legislative branches of the Government have been each time a little more closely associated. The more frequently the departments are subjected to congressional inquiry the better—and the more carefully they will watch their step in administration and the greater care they will exercise in the expenditure of public funds.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, there are other instances of misstatements made in order to inflame the people against Congress and congressional procedure. One such instance, for example, is the statement that 95 percent of the bills passed by Congress are drafted in the departments. We had the testimony of the legislative drafting authorities of the Senate and House on that matter. In the House they testified that 23 percent of the bills introduced, and practically all the major legislation which passed the House, passed through their office. On the Senate side, they testified that 50 percent of the bills enacted passed through their office. Any member of the Committee on Appropriations can testify that no department has ever written any appropriation bill that ever came to the floor. In other words, the country is led to believe that a situation exists here which is completely different from what actually exists and that this situation makes it imperative that the procedures of the House be radically revised.

Here is still another misrepresentation: A Member of the House last week reprinted an editorial in the RECORD from a newspaper in his district which said that because he was a new Member he was not allowed to speak and had no opportunity to express himself on the floor. We all know that the newest Member of the House stands on equal footing with the oldest Member of the House, in that respect.

The Committee on Appropriations, like the rest of the committees of the House, frequently has bills on the floor, and any Member who applies can get all the time he wants. No distinction in recognition for debate is made between Members on the ground of length of service. If this gentleman had applied, he could have talked as frequently and as long as the oldest Members of the House, either in point of age or service, or previous condition of servitude.

Another charge which will not bear the test of accuracy is that the men who serve as chairmen of committees have ex officio the power to report legislation or to kill legislation. On the face of it the charge cannot be sustained. Nothing could be further from the truth. The committee of which I happen to be a member has 45 members and the chairman has 1 vote in the 45 and no more. He cannot report a bill unless a majority of the other 44 members approve and he must report a bill if a majority of the committee directs him to report it no matter how unalterably opposed he may be to the measure. The myth that the chairman of a committee has any more power than any other member of the committee is another fabrication calculated to disturb the people and shake their confidence in the one institution which is the safeguard of their liberties and the guaranty of their right of free government.

In the brief time remaining let me say just a word about the much-mooted question of seniority. It is a matter that is not included in the report but it has been so widely discussed I would like to scatter just a few grains of truth and reason on the subject.

To begin with, the importance of the chairmanships is greatly exaggerated. There may be a little glamour connected with the chairmanships but that is about all. Some chairmen have extra rooms and patronage, but as chairman of one of the House committees I do not have even these modest perquisites. I have no more personal clerks and no more office space than I had before I became chairman, and I pay for all my own stationery.

Furthermore, the rule of seniority does not always obtain in the election of a chairman. The rule of seniority is in that respect neither absolute nor invariable. In my own committee there have been notable instances in which the rule of seniority was disregarded. For example, in the Fifty-eighth Congress, although Henry H. Bingham, of Pennsylvania, was ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, James A. Tawney, of Minnesota, was elected chairman. Again, in the Sixty-seventh Congress, although Charles R. Davis, of Minnesota, was the member of longest service on the committee, Martin B. Madden, of Illinois, was made chairman.

The House, under its system of procedure, may elevate a member from the foot, or from any intervening position, to the chairmanship of a committee—and has done so, the seniority tradition to the contrary notwithstanding.

But, regardless of the effect of its application, why should the rule of seniority be deprecated in the Congress of the United States, when it is followed implicitly in every other major activity and industry in the United States?

In the armed forces, in the Army and the Navy, the rule of seniority obtains and has been followed from the days of Gen. George Washington and Commodore Barry. Here is a quotation from a recent editorial in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat:

Regular Army promotions up to brigadier general are traditionally automatic, predicated on seniority.

It is the rule in the War Department and in the Navy Department, and has been so in all armies and navies for time immemorial.

It is likewise the rule in the labor unions of the Nation. Quoting from the International Teamster:

Members of labor unions rank according to seniority. War veterans are assured they will be given their seniority rights when they return from the service.

The rule of labor seniority has been affirmed in two recent decisions in the Federal courts—one by Judge Lederle, in the Federal Court of the District of Columbia, and the other by Judge Briggle, of Springfield, Ill.

Commenting on the decision of Judge Lederle, the CIO News said:

"A veteran is rehired in accordance with his seniority, and continues to work in accordance with his seniority," the CIO veterans' committee pointed out in interpreting Judge Lederle's ruling. "Seniority under union contract is the controlling factor, and if operations are curtailed the veteran may be laid off in line of seniority just as any other worker."

With reference to the Briggle opinion, Labor, the official organ of the railroad brotherhoods, said:

A returning serviceman should regain his old job rights and seniority plus accumulated seniority for time spent in uniform. Thus, a veteran should have the same seniority standing as though he had never left his job.

The rule of seniority is followed in international relations and the dean of the diplomatic corps is always the ambassador of longest service, irrespective of the size or standing of his country.

In keeping with that long-established precedent, the United Nations organization follows the rule of seniority. In order to be elected to the International Court of the UN, a candidate must secure a majority vote in the 57-nation Assembly and also in the 11-nation Security Council.

Here is the rule:

If more than one citizen from the same country gets a majority, only the eldest can become a member of the Court.

The new Russian Constitution, direct and dynamic in its approach to the administrative problems of the day, recognizes the rule of seniority and under its provisions the first sessions of the Supreme Soviet of the U. S. S. R. are always opened by the oldest deputies of each chamber.

Just today President Truman himself emphatically voiced the importance of long service in Congress.

I quote from an Associated Press dispatch just released:

President Truman said today he believes it is a good general policy for Senators of long service to remain in the Senate rather than take other jobs.

He made this observation at his news conference in response to a question bearing on his recent action in urging Senator MCFARLAND, of Arizona, to remain in the Senate rather than take a Federal judgeship in his State. The questioner wanted to know if the President thinks this is a good general policy.

The President replied affirmatively, asserting that a Senator with lengthy service is invaluable to his State and should remain in the Senate.

In matters spiritual and ecclesiastical, as well as civil and temporal, the rule of seniority is observed, notably in the Holy Roman Catholic Church and the Church of England. In both, recognition and advancement are by seniority.

St. Peter himself admonishes:

Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility, for God resisteth the proud and giveth grace to the humble.

In every department of the economic life of the world—national and international—the rule of seniority obtains, and has obtained for time immemorial. Why should Congress be made the exception to the rule?

Directly associated with the diatribes against seniority is the charge that age and experience accumulated in the service of the House disqualify for further usefulness as a Member of the Congress.

Since when has age become a disqualifying factor in human endeavor and accomplishment? Between the ages of 70 and 83, Commodore Vanderbilt added $10,000,000 to his fortune. Verdi at 85 produced his magnificent Ave Maria, his Stabat Mater, and his Te Deum. What a loss to the world if he had been retired at 80. Oliver Wendell Holmes at 79 wrote his Over the Teacups, and Tennyson at 83 wrote Crossing the Bar. Samuel Gompers was head of organized labor in his seventy-fifth year and John Cardinal Glennon, of St. Louis, was elevated to the cardinalate in his eighty-fourth year. President Roosevelt's war Cabinet was made up of Hull at 72, Jones at 70, Ickes at 70, Knox at 70, and Stimson at 76—the Cabinet that won the greatest war in history—and Henry Ford at 82 came back from retirement to make an incalculable contribution to industry and American victory.

Carried to their ultimate conclusions, these critics of seniority propose, in effect, to demote General MacArthur and put a second lieutenant in command, to retire William Green and substitute a husky young hodcarrier, to superannuate His Holiness Pope Pius XII and elevate a parish priest, to fire Eugene Meyer and install a young police-court reporter, to supersede Speaker RAYBURN and put a young two-termer in the chair. They badger men grown old in honored service in the House, men who have made supreme contributions to the Nation in the most critical period in human history with the taunt: "Yeah, yer gittin old." It is the philosophy of the aborigine; the culture and finesse and good taste of the jungle.

It is a philosophy repudiated by a thousand years of experience in the parliaments of the world. The situation is well summarized in a speech delivered by President Taft before the Ohio Society of Washington:

We are told by Edmund Burke himself that it was by slow degrees and constant discussion that Charles James Fox became the greatest parliamentary debater the world ever saw. Fox entered the British Commons before he was 20 years old. He remained a member of that body until his death.

Had Fox been an American and a Member of our Congress, he would have been fortunate if he had been chosen to and served in 10 Congresses—20 years. Sam Randall was not bred a statesman, but he became one of our great parliamentary leaders by reason of his long service. Had John G. Carlisle been English born, he would have served in the House of Commons, at the least, 50 years. Gladstone was in the Commons 50 years. Had he been an American, it is doubtful if the whim of a single constituency would have allowed him 12 Congresses.

There is a truth as profound as political experience can make it.

It is further expressed by a speech delivered by Speaker Clark on the floor of the House during his speakership:

A man has to learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor.

The best rule is for a district to select a man young enough to learn and to grow, with at least fair capacity, industrious, honest, energetic, sober, and courageous, and keep him there so long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House.

But the young man must be willing to learn, and grow, and should be content to rise gradually. We can all appreciate his impatience. We have all been through it ourselves, to a greater or lesser degree. After a spirited campaign we were finally elected to Congress—the culmination of a life's ambition. The newspapers of our district and State had daily featured our speeches and activities. An enthusiastic delegation with a brass band saw us off on our train to Washington and our friends freely predicted that we would wake Congress up. In fact we rather encouraged that idea.

I recall a Congressman who came to Washington a few years ago assuring his constituents that when he got here he would start Congress off at 9 o'clock in the morning instead of waiting to meet at noon and wasting half the day. Some years ago I happened to be walking behind a new Congressman and his wife on their way over from the House Office Building to attend his first session and his charming little wife said nervously, "Oh, I do hope they will not call on you the very first day."

So, as we all recall, it is something of a disappointment when we reach Washington not to find a delegation and a brass band at Union Station to welcome us to the National Capital. And by some oversight there is no note from the President asking us to hurry down to the White House before unpacking. Most surprising of all, there is nothing in the morning papers about our arrival on the national scene. And when our committee meets we are not elected chairman. It is then we discover there is some sort of conspiracy by the old fellows who have been hanging around the Capitol for several years to keep a young man down. They refuse to recognize ability. And we immediately perceive that the system is all wrong. Let me assure these ardent young Members we have all been through it. It is an old story. Do not take it too hard.

These "old duffers," like you, have come up the hard way. They have not only been through your experience but they have repeated it many times—the

odds against them growing heavier each time as they gradually accumulate from year to year inevitable opposition and antagonism growing out of requests for services they are unable to render and the unreasoning slogan, "It is time for a change." In the average congressional district there are at least a hundred able men who every 2 years covertly appraise their chances of defeating the sitting Congressman. Everyone of them would file in the primary if he thought he had a chance to win. They have many advantages in such a contest. The Congressman is constantly on the rack. He must vote on every controversial question before the Nation. On every roll call he must alienate large numbers of his constituents who disagree with him. He must daily confess his inability to find jobs, to secure discharges, to modify the mail service, to provide appropriations for roads, dams, and Federal buildings in his district. In a thousand ways he must fall short of the expectations of his friends and constitutents in failing to accomplish the impossible and then must so ably serve his district and his country as to be able to overcome this growing handicap at every election. And yet there are those who in the press and over the air and on this floor insist that because he has had the capacity to retain his seat in Congress over all actual and prospective competitors through many elections, he is an incompetent moron and disqualified from presiding over a committee.

Time and experience are necessary to give the Nation effective service in Congress. James R. Mann, of Illinois, universally conceded to be the greatest and most effective Parliamentarian who ever sat in the American Congress, said: "I did not open my mouth for the first 2 years I was a Member of the House." On the other hand, William Murray—"Alfalfa Bill"—of Oklahoma, a man of exceptional native capacity who had served his State as president of its constitutional convention, speaker of its house of representatives, and Governor, convulsed the House with derisive merriment when he attempted to debate a point of order a short time after he came to Congress.

Let our impatient young friends, who are so eager to take over the ship of state, serve an apprenticeship as Webster and Calhoun and Lincoln and Truman and Rayburn did before dismissing all the elder statesmen and heading the old ship out to sea in these critical times. Let them serve for a time as seamen "before the mast" before essaying to push the admiral off the quarterdeck.

Seniority, based upon the capacity of men to demonstrate such a high order of statesmanship as to warrant their return to Congress over growing oposition, election after election, offers the only practical system of priority in House and committee procedure.

Seniority settles harmoniously the problem of priorities without dispute or controversy and without jeopardizing morale. Abolition of the rule would be followed by logrolling, factional fights, and political trading on a grand scale.

And I am reading from a recent book on the subject:

The danger that committee places would go to those who were chosen with specific bills or policies in mind would be real and would be suspected even when it did not exist. The bitter personal feeling engendered by an open contest would complicate party management and there would be a delay in beginning work until personal and sectional quarrels could be smoothed out.

It is difficult to conceive of anything that would have a more disastrous effect on the work of a committee than a continuous potential rivalry between half a dozen members of the committee as to which of them would be made chairman in the next session, or in event of a sooner change. The entire membership of the committee would be immediately divided into factions. There would be such continuous maneuvering for position and such suspicion of every move by any faction, however inconsequential, as to seriously impede the work of the committee and prejudice its conclusions. No chairman, however qualified, could secure maximum results in such an atmosphere.

On the other hand, the present system of seniority has been in effect so long no one gives any particular attention as to who is presiding, or who will preside in the future. The system is understood and respected. Attention is concentrated on the work of the committee. The difference between the seniority system and any alternative system is the difference between order and chaos.

But let us take up the one issue on which all reformers of Congress and all streamliners and renovaters of congressional procedure are agreed—the number of committees. We are told that the foundations of free government, the preservation of democracy, and the maintenance of American institutions rests on the number of committees. According to newspaper and magazine statements, if the number of committees is reduced the Republic is safe; if the number of committees is not reduced all hope is gone.

Now what would be accomplished by the reduction of the number of committees? Would there be less work? No. Would the reduction of the number of committees reduce the number of men required to do the work of the committees? No. The reduction of the number of committees would neither reduce the amount of work nor increase the number of men to do the work. In other words, whether you have 10 committees or a hundred committees, you have the same amount of work and the same number of men to do the work. And you would follow the same system of handling the work.

The only difference would be that instead of doing the work in committees, as at present, it would be done by subcommittees made up of the same men. As soon as you combine the 48 committees of the House into 18 committees, you immediately appoint 48 subcommittees. For example, one of the stock arguments in favor of consolidation of committees is that we have three committees dealing with pensions. They fail to note that each of the three committees deals with an entirely different phase of pensions, deals with a different class of beneficiaries, different periods of service, different statutory enactments. The three do not conflict or overlap in any way. So when you consolidate, instead of having three committees and three chairmen, you have one committee and three subcommittees and three subchairmen. The same would be true of every consolidation of committees in the reform.

Now, if a man does the work why should he not have the credit? A chairman of a subcommittee will have to do identically the work he now does as chairman of a committee. Why should he not have a chairmanship?

A manufacturer who operated his plant successfully during the war was awarded an E, and it was conferred with great ceremony. A scholar who has distinguished himself in his particular field is given a doctor of laws degree. An Army or naval officer serving creditably at his desk here in Washington is awarded a bronze star or a promotion. Why should not a man who has served faithfully and effectively through the years here on this floor have some slight recognition? Why should he not have a chairmanship? Under the proposed change—with only 18 committees—men will come here and serve a lifetime, and though they give the Nation the most distinguished service, will never reach a chairmanship. They will do the same work, their subcommittees will do the same work, but there will be no recognition.

"Oh," they say, "one Member is serving on half a dozen committees. He cannot attend them all." He can at least choose those in whose work he is most interested. If he was on one or two, he would be confined to the work of those committees. As a matter of fact, conflicts between any two committees to which a Member may be assigned can usually be arranged if he requests it. Assignment to a number of committees gives him a wider range of work and usefulness than if he is limited to one or two.

And much is made of the statement that some two or three men from the departments have been called to testify before a number of committees on the same subject matter. The more often they are called to testify the better—the closer the relation between the executive and legislative branches, the better opportunity for the executive to judge the reaction to his testimony and the more searchingly the committee can scrutinize the operations of the bureaus of the Government. The complainers complain because the representatives of the executive branch are called to testify so frequently and then they complain because there is not a closer relation between the two branches of the Government. The time of the representatives of the departments is not so valuable that they cannot come before the congressional committees and subcommittees whenever requested—and the more frequently the better.

So all this hullabaloo about the number of committees is pointless and misleading. Reduction of the number of committees would not affect the situation. The same men would still do the same work and do it no better and no worse. There would be no advantages to offset the disadvantages.

Connected with the question of committee structure is the proposal to make further unnecessary and more expensive additions to committee staffs. In this connection the report reflects on the system which has been in use by the Committee on Appropriations for more than three years. The system has been too often discussed here on the floor to require further justification. Suffice to say it has met every requirement. No information has been requested which it did not supply and its cost of maintenance in comparison with service rendered has been the smallest in the history of congressional investigations. The Drafting Service of the Congress has met every requirement. I have never yet heard of a request for service which they have failed to supply. The Legislative Reference Service of the Congressional Library has likewise supplied every need. If any of these research services has failed in its functions, no one has called it to the attention of the House. I have frequently asked on the floor, and in the committee, when complaint was made of lack of research facility, "What information does the gentleman desire? What does he want investigated?" And in no instance has the complainant ever been able to specify any date desired or any particular subject or agency he wanted investigated or on which needed information could not be obtained. If they happen to need further funds at any time, the Committee on Appropriations will provide them in the future, as in the past, on the authority of the legislative committees having jurisdiction, without the report of a special committee. The recommendation for a stenographic pool and an $8,000 assistant for each Congressman borders on the preposterous.

The recommendation that salaries of Members be increased and privileges of retirement be provided has a somewhat more sinister connotation. We witnessed here yesterday the extrordinary spectacle of a determined effort by members of the streamlining committee to restrict all proposals relative to salaries and retirement annuities of Congressmen to the bill recommended by the streamlining committee—for the frankly announced purpose of baiting and sugarcoating such a bill to the extent that Congressmen would be induced to vote for all committee proposals in order to secure larger pay and retirement privileges for themselves. Surely there must be a dearth of merit in the committee proposals if the committee feel that it is necessary to resort to such questionable means of securing consideration of their recommendations, and the streamlining committee does not encourage a very flattering opinion of the membership of the House in suggesting so broadly that Congressmen can be cajoled into supporting its measures for a remunerary consideration—in order to get an increase in pay.

Perhaps the most extraordinary recommendation by the streamlining committee is that relating to fiscal control:

Recommendation: That by joint action the revenue and appropriations committees of both Houses submit to the Congress within 60 days after each session opens (or by April 15) a concurrent resolution setting over-all Federal receipts and expenditures estimated) for the coming fiscal year. If total expenditures recommended exceed estimated income, Congress should be required by record vote to authorize creation of additional Federal debt in the amount of the excess. All appropriations, excepting those of a permanent nature, interest on the public debt, veterans' pensions and benefits, trust expenditures, and public-debt retirement, would be reduced by a uniform percentage in case total appropriations exceeded the amount of the approved budget figure.

Let us consider the effect of such a recommendation. If observed, it could only mean committing the Congress to a budget in advance of detailed consideration. It would be physically impossible to conduct adequate hearings in the time proposed.

Following the committee's recommendation through, after having voted more or less blindly on a ceiling, there would be lessend interest in affecting reductions in the estimates for the several Federal agencies on the part of the committee and the House. It is difficult to appraise such a proposal in any other light than that of discouraging economies rather than that of contributing to economies.

The provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act are much more practical and effective:

If the estimated receipts for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the budget, on the basis of laws existing at the time the budget is transmitted, plus the estimated amounts in the Treasury at the close of the fiscal year in progress, available for expenditure in the ensuing fiscal year, are less than the estimated expenditures for the ensuing fiscal year contained in the budget, the President in the budget shall make recommendations to Congress for new taxes, loans, or other appropriate action to meet the estimated deficiency.

As to supplemental or deficiency estimates, it further provides:

Whenever such supplemental or deficiency estimates reach an aggregate which, if they had been contained in the budget, would have required the President to make a recommendation under subdivision (a) of section 202, he shall thereupon make such recommendation.

This is the law today. It leaves the door open to reductions determined upon after searching inquiry, and it carries the incentive to so curb appropriations as to avoid the need for new taxes, loans, or other means of avoiding deficit spending.

The tendency of the proposal carried in the report of the streamlining committee would be to lessen the interest of Members of the Congress generally in appropriations other than those particular items in which there was a direct interest.

There is too great a tendency in this direction as it is. Appropriation bills go through too quickly. There is too much reliance on the committee reports and too much dependence on the recommendation of the committee. Under the rules the committee merely reports its recommendations as an agent of the House. The presumption is that these recommendations will be sharply scrutinized and subjected to critical analysis when taken up for consideration on the floor. Every bill reported by the Committee on Appropriations should be carefully reviewed and, if necessary, amended by the House. In the last analysis it is the responsibility of the House and the country profits to the degree that responsibility is exercised. The House works through its committees, but committees may, and do, err at times, and the House should not rely too implicity on its committees' recommendations. The final responsibility is here on this floor. The suggestion of the streamlining committee would not emphasize this responsibility. Under its proposal, Members of Congress could without compunction vote against all tax bills and for all appropriation bills. And it would always be possible under such procedure to include in any appropriation for popular projects, such as flood control, a provision that the amount provided for such purpose be not included in the list when the percentage reduction is applied.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the time to dwell too long on these questions of technical procedure. They are comparatively inconsequential. The frenzied vituperation of sensationalists to the contrary notwithstanding, the Congress can be depended upon to do its work and do it well—as it has been doing it with particular efficiency during the war sessions.

The important thing is to stop all this byplay and stop alarming the country. If there are minor defects which need adjustment, let us make them—preferably on consideration and recommendation by the committee having jurisdiction—and have the matter over with and stop prejudicing the public against the legislative branch of the Government and against their Representatives in the House and Senate.

It would be unfair to the press and the country not to include here, along with the unbridled criticisms which have been quoted, some of the sane appraisals of the Congress in general, and this Congress in particular.

Here is one by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor:

Anything that brings Congress into disrepute weakens the fabric of American democracy.

Mr. Speaker, nothing in recent years has so disturbed the public and so shaken their confidence in, and their regard for, their Government as this campaign to capitalize on the general lack of knowledge of the minutiae of congressional procedure.

Here is a comment from Fulton Lewis, Jr., one of the most reliable of the commentators of the day:

The Seventy-eighth Congress adjourned sine die last night. It was a good Congress, a very good Congress, probably the best and most courageous Congress that we have known since the days of the last World War, and perhaps for even longer than that. It did more to revive and restore the dignity and integrity and the prestige of the legislative branch of the American Government than any other Congress in many, many decades. We might well give it a salute of a job well done, and we might dub it, in congressional history, the Great Seventy-eighth.

Let me also include a pertinent comment from Labor, one of the prominent labor journals of the Nation:

We shouldn't make radical changes without mature reflection and until we are certain we have a better system. Labor still believes that the best way to streamline Congress is to elect the right kind of men to the House and Senate. They will always find a way to enact desirable legislation.

And here is a considered opinion by one of the outstanding historians of our times, Prof. Charles A. Beard:

After studying the operations of the First Congress of the United States and the operations of the Seventy-sixth Congress, I am convinced that for the absence of corruption and concern with the public good, the present body is of the highest order.

Mr. Speaker, in 1944 the United States Government collected more money, borrowed more money, spent more money, and created a greater deficit than any government in any country has ever collected, borrowed, spent, or owed in human history. It is a world record. And in 1945, Congress rescinded more appropriations, reclaimed more money, and made greater reductions in expenditures than was ever effected by any government before in fiscal history. That likewise is a world record. And in all this accumulation and disbursement of wealth—in amounts beyond the capacity of the finite mind of man to comprehend—there has been less unwarranted expenditure, diversion, and waste in proportion to the amounts involved, and results secured, than ever before since government was established among men.

In all the annals of the past there is no parliamentary body which has borne such heavy responsibilities, administered such vast empires of production and distribution, and discharged its duties so faultlessly as the war Congress of the United States. The American people are to be congratulated on the efficiency and integrity with which their representatives in Congress have successfully met the problems created by a war of extermination with the mightiest war machines modern science and military proficiency could create.

It is a great Congress—and it could not have operated so satisfactorily without a great system of procedure.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 230, nays 142, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 4]

YEAS—230

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Fugate | Noland |
| Addonizio | Furcolo | Norrell |
| Albert | Garmatz | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Allen, La. | Gathings | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Andrews | Gilmer | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Aspinall | Gordon | O'Neill |
| Bailey | Gorski, Ill. | O'Sullivan |
| Barden | Gorski, N. Y. | O'Toole |
| Baring | Gossett | Pace |
| Barrett, Pa. | Granahan | Passman |
| Bates, Ky. | Granger | Patman |
| Battle | Grant | Patten |
| Beckworth | Green | Perkins |
| Bentsen | Gregory | Peterson |
| Biemiller | Hardy | Pickett |
| Bland | Hare | Poage |
| Blatnik | Harris | Polk |
| Boggs, La. | Havenner | Preston |
| Bolling | Hays, Ark. | Price |
| Bolton, Md. | Hays, Ohio | Priest |
| Bonner | Hedrick | Quinn |
| Bosone | Heffernan | Rabaut |
| Boykin | Herlong | Rains |
| Breen | Hobbs | Ramsay |
| Brooks | Holifield | Rankin |
| Brown, Ga. | Howell | Redden |
| Bryson | Huber | Regan |
| Buchanan | Irving | Rhodes |
| Buckley, Ill. | Jackson, Wash. | Ribicoff |
| Burke | Jacobs | Richards |
| Burleson | Javits | Rodino |
| Burnside | Jones, Ala. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Burton | Jones, Mo. | Rooney |
| Camp | Jones, N. C. | Sabath |
| Cannon | Karst | Sadowski |
| Carlyle | Karsten | Sasscer |
| Carnahan | Kelley | Sheppard |
| Carroll | Keogh | Sikes |
| Cavalcante | Kerr | Smathers |
| Chatham | King | Spence |
| Chelf | Kirwan | Staggers |
| Chesney | Klein | Stanley |
| Christopher | Kruse | Steed |
| Chudoff | Lane | Stigler |
| Clemente | Lanham | Sullivan |
| Coffey | Larcade | Sutton |
| Colmer | Lesinski | Tackett |
| Combs | Lind | Tauriello |
| Cooper | Linehan | Teague |
| Cox | Lucas | Thomas, Tex. |
| Crook | Lyle | Thompson |
| Crosser | Lynch | Thornberry |
| Davies, N. Y. | McCarthy | Trimble |
| Davis, Ga. | McCormack | Underwood |
| Dawson | McGrath | Vinson |
| Deane | McGuire | Wadsworth |
| DeGraffenried | McKinnon | Wagner |
| Delaney | McMillan, S. C. | Walsh |
| Denton | McSweeney | Walter |
| Dollinger | Mack, Ill. | Welch, Calif. |
| Donohue | Madden | Welch, Mo. |
| Doughton | Magee | Wheeler |
| Douglas | Mahon | White, Calif. |
| Doyle | Mansfield | Whitten |
| Durham | Marcantonio | Wickersham |
| Eberharter | Marsalis | Wier |
| Elliott | Marshall | Williams |
| Engle, Calif. | Mills | Willis |
| Evins | Mitchell | Wilson, Okla. |
| Fallon | Monroney | Wilson, Tex. |
| Feighan | Morgan | Winstead |
| Fernandez | Morris | Wood |
| Fisher | Morrison | Woodhouse |
| Flood | Moulder | Worley |
| Fogarty | Multer | Yates |
| Forand | Murdock | Zablocki |
| Frazier | Murray, Tenn. | |

NAYS—142

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Byrnes, Wis. | Fenton |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Case, N. J. | Ford |
| | Church | Gamble |
| Anderson, Calif. | Clevenger | Gavin |
| Andresen, August H. | Cole, Kans. | Gillette |
| | Cole, N. Y. | Golden |
| Angell | Corbett | Goodwin |
| Arends | Cotton | Graham |
| Auchincloss | Crawford | Gross |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Cunningham | Hagen |
| Bates, Mass. | Curtis | Hale |
| Beall | Dague | Hall, |
| Bennett, Mich. | Davis, Wis. | Edwin Arthur |
| Bishop | D'Ewart | Hall, |
| Boggs, Del. | Dolliver | Leonard W. |
| Bolton, Ohio | Dondero | Halleck |
| Bramblett | Eaton | Hand |
| Brehm | Elston | Harden |
| Brown, Ohio | Engel, Mich. | Harvey |
| Burdick | Fellows | Heselton |
| Hill | McMillen, Ill. | Rogers, Mass. |
| Hinshaw | Mack, Wash. | St. George |
| Hoeven | Martin, Mass. | Sanborn |
| Hoffman, Mich. | Mason | Scrivner |
| Holmes | Merrow | Scudder |
| Hope | Michener | Shafer |
| Horan | Miller, Md. | Short |
| Hull | Miller, Nebr. | Simpson, Ill. |
| Jackson, Calif. | Morton | Simpson, Pa. |
| James | Murray, Wis. | Smith, Kans. |
| Jenkins | Nelson | Smith, Wis. |
| Jennings | Nicholson | Stefan |
| Jensen | Nixon | Stockman |
| Johnson | Norblad | Taber |
| Judd | O'Hara, Minn. | Talle |
| Kean | O'Konski | Tollefson |
| Kearney | Patterson | Towe |
| Keating | Pfeiffer, William L. | Van Zandt |
| Kilburn | Philbin | Velde |
| Kunkel | Phillips, Calif. | Vorys |
| LeCompte | Phillips, Tenn. | Vursell |
| LeFevre | Plumley | Weichel |
| Lemke | Potter | Werdel |
| Lodge | Poulson | Wigglesworth |
| Lovre | Reed, N. Y. | Wilson, Ind. |
| McConnell | Rees | Withrow |
| McCulloch | Rich | Wolcott |
| McDonough | Riehlman | Wolverton |
| McGregor | | Woodruff |

NOT VOTING—61

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Gwinn | Norton |
| Allen, Ill. | Harrison | Pfeifer, Joseph L. |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hart | |
| Blackney | Hébert | Powell |
| Bloom | Herter | Reed, Ill. |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Hoffman, Ill. | Rivers |
| Bulwinkle | Jenison | Sadlak |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Jonas | Scott, Hardie |
| Canfield | Kearns | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kee | |
| Celler | Keefe | Secrest |
| Chiperfield | Kennedy | Sims |
| Cooley | Kilday | Smith, Ohio |
| Coudert | Latham | Smith, Va. |
| Davenport | Lichtenwalter | Somers |
| Davis, Tenn. | Macy | Taylor |
| Dingell | Martin, Iowa | Thomas, N J. |
| Ellsworth | Meyer | Whitaker |
| Fulton | Miles | White, Idaho |
| Gary | Miller, Calif. | Whittington |
| Gore | Murphy | Young |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Canfield against.

Mr. Whittington for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.

Mr. Bennett of Florida for, with Mr. Jonas against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Meyer against.

Mr. Harrison for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

Mr. Whitaker for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Young for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Hart for, with Mr. Kearns against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Macy against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Hardie Scott against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Gary for, with Mr. Sadlak against.

Mr. Powell for, with Mr. Chiperfield against.

Mr. Kilday for, with Mr. Jenison against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Rivers with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Keefe.

Mr. Somers with Mr. Herter.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Martin of Iowa.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Gore with Mr. Fulton.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may have five legislative days to extend their remarks in the RECORD in connection with House Concurrent Resolution 22.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

AIR COORDINATING COMMITTEE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 59)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith for the information and consideration of the Congress the Report of the Air Coordinating Committee for the calendar year 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 7, 1949.*

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that that committee may have permission to sit during general debate for the balance of this week while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2361) providing for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2361, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under unanimous consent agreement, debate is limited to 2 hours, one-half of which will be under the control of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and the other half under the control of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, Members of the House of Representatives, it becomes my duty and responsibility as chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to present at this time for your consideration H. R. 2361, a bill for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes. I consider it a high privilege to stand before you in this capacity, first, because of the nature and the composition of the committee of which it is my good fortune to be the chairman. To my mind there is no more hard-working committee in all this Congress. As I think of its membership, with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our majority leader, a member thereof; with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], the ranking minority member, a member thereof; with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] a member thereof, I say I think it is a high privilege to present the report of such a committee. Your committee has worked long and hard on this bill and has heard many witnesses. We believe we have brought to you a bill calculated to render to the people of this country one of the greatest services this Congress could afford, the reorganization of its Government agencies.

In the last 20 years, our Government has grown from about 350 agencies to over 1,800 bureaus and agencies. The number of employees has increased from five-hundred-and-seventy-thousand-odd to over 2,100,000. Expenses have grown from $3,600,000,000 to more than $42,000,000,000.

We have heard many speakers on the floor of this House during the last few years talk about the vast cost of our Government to the taxpayers of this country. When you gaze at the condition of the executive department, you can appreciate that a realining of its agencies, the cutting down of its personnel, and the streamlining of its business, can and will result in a great saving of millions of dollars to the taxpayers.

This plan of reorganization giving the President of the United States the power to take the initiative in bringing out a reorganization plan is nothing new. This type of reorganization has been tried in the past and has been responsible for some great gains. In bringing this bill to you, we are profiting by the experiences and the trials and errors of former bills. We believe that if this bill is adopted by the Congress and becomes a law it will be one of the greatest steps forward we have promulgated in the history of the Congress.

There is at present no law empowering the President to take the initiative in the reorganization of the executive departments. That authorization expired in 1948. So if we mean business let us get busy and give him the power to give us a reorganization plan in time for it to be considered and acted upon by the time the Congress adjourns. We ought to pass this legislation as speedily as possible.

There are certain provisions in this bill that are not found in other bills. I think the best way to present it to you, since we have had the Reorganization Act of 1945, is to call to your attention some of the differences.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. First of all, I want to thank the gentleman for the nice things he has said about the committee, including me, and to say here and now that I am happy to be on that committee and serving with the gentleman from Illinois.

The gentleman has referred to the fact that if this legislation is adopted we ought to be able to proceed expeditiously with the reorganization of the Government. I agree with the gentleman in that regard. I am wondering if the gentleman would agree with me that with the basic work that has been done by the so-called Hoover Commission, with the enactment of this legislation, and with the fact that the Congress is now Democratic, as is the Chief Executive, this job ought to be accomplished in the next 2 years.

Mr. DAWSON. I think we ought to get reorganization plans submitted to this Congress within a very short time.

Further, I wish to say concerning our committee that there has never at any time been any question of partisan politics raised. Every member of the committee went about the job of attending to the business of the Congress as that job presented itself to him.

I refer now to page 7 of the report, setting out the major differences from the Reorganization Act of 1945. By and large the bill follows the 1945 act which, in turn, was largely based on the 1935 act. The major differences between this legislation and the 1945 legislation are as follows: First, that the legislation here proposed would be permanent, while the 1945 act operated for a limited time. In that connection, I want to refer to the hearings. On page 6 of the hearings there is found an excerpt from the message from the President of the United States to the Congress. That excerpt is as follows:

> First, the reorganization legislation should be permanent rather than temporary. While the work of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government makes such legislation especially timely and essential, the improvement of the organization of the Government is a continuing and never-ending process. Government is a dynamic institution. Its administrative structure cannot be static. As new programs are established and old programs change in character and scope to meet the needs of the Nation, the organization of the executive branch must be adjusted to fit its changing tasks.
>
> The impracticability of solving many problems of organization by the regular legislative process has been frankly recognized for many years by congressional leaders.

On page 137 of the hearings we have this statement made by Hon. Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States:

> Mr. HOOVER. My opinion is that it ought to be permanent legislation because the executive branch of the Government is a constantly changing body. We need no better proof of that than the growth in the number of agencies from 350 to 1,800. I would expect a constant shift in the focus of government, giving emphasis to first one type of action and then to another, with the development of new phases of such action, all of which must be constantly refitted into the whole pattern of the executive branch.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the purpose of this bill to create the over-all machinery under which the Hoover report may be worked into the affairs of government?

Mr. DAWSON. You are right. So that that part of the Hoover report—for which we are spending so much money—where the need is shown, may be presented to the Congress by the President. So that the President will have the power to incorporate it into his plan and present it to the Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Without this kind of implementation the Hoover report could not be used?

Mr. DAWSON. It could not be used in the light of the experiences of the past.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. VORYS. Under the saving provisions of the bill on page 9 it is provided that any statute or regulation shall have the same effect as if a reorganization act had not been made except by or under authority of law by the abolition of a function.

My question is this: Could there be any change in the substantive law of the country by the abolition of a function, or by the abolition of a function would it merely mean a change in who might be required to carry out the law? It is not quite clear to me what abolition of a function means. As I understood it, this Reorganization Act is not intended to change the laws, except the organization which might enforce the law. Can the gentleman answer that question?

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. I think there is no question but that the act does not permit the President to submit a plan that changes the basic law. But the abolishment of a function means that where two organizations have been discharging the same function, if that function is given to one of the organizations it may be abolished as far as the other organization is concerned.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. For instance, if two or three agencies were authorized to make loans, the combining of those functions by the abolishment of the function for a number of the agencies could not repeal the authority to make loans? Am I correct?

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VORYS. So that we are not changing any substantive law in voting for this?

Mr. LANHAM. Not at all.

Mr. VORYS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAWSON. I would like to say further on that point of the permanency of the legislation, this bill is supported by the views of the only two people in the world who have had experience on the subject. The present President has had the experience of his past term. The former President had the experience of his term in office. We all know from history that no man was more interested in reorganizing the agencies in the executive department than was the former President of the United States, Mr. Hoover. So on the question of the permanency of the legislation, we have the testimony, in no undecided terms, of the only two men who have had actual experience. It gives the incoming President the opportunity and the power, as he becomes experienced, to suggest to the Congress any legislation combining agencies and bureaus, or for the reorganization of departments, for the good of the country that presents itself to him.

No. 2, reading from page 7 of the report:

> No executive agency is exempted under this bill, while under the 1945 act a number of agencies were exempted. It is felt that exemptions, even of major regulatory commissions, would seriously hinder the reorganization effort. Many of the regulatory commissions have nonregulatory functions which appropriately might be assigned to a different type of agency.

That takes care of what has been one of the great faults in past legislation. The exempting of so many agencies and the inclusion in the bill itself of language which was not capable of clear interpretation prevented the Executive from initiating many reforms that were needed because, in his judgment, if made, it would be the occasion of many lawsuits which might continue through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

On page 7 of the hearings we have this statement in the President's message:

> Second, the new reorganization act should be comprehensive in scope; no agency or function of the executive branch should be exempted from its operation. Such exemptions prevent the President and the Congress from deriving the full benefit of the reorganization-plan procedure, primarily by precluding action on major organizational problems. A seemingly limited exemption may in fact render an entire needed reorganization affecting numerous agencies and functions wholly impractical. The proper protection against the possibility of unwise reorganization lies, not in the statutory exemption from the reorganization-plan procedure, but in the authority of Congress to reject any such plan by simple majority vote of both Houses.

That quotation is taken from the President's message.

On page 135 we have the testimony of Mr. Hoover on the same subject:

> I might add to this statement what I proposed that I have given here, that I strongly support the idea that there should be no exceptions in this legislation. The reasons for that view are that I do not know any method by which the Congress can make a differentiation of executive and quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions in these agencies. It might be possible to arrive at such a definition with regard to them, but we have to bear in mind that there are such functions—quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative—in practically every department of the Government. We immediately get into difficulties if we try to make definitions. On the other hand, it would seem to me that Congress has an ample check on any action that would undermine those judicial and legislative functions when the President makes his proposed plans.

So upon that change in the bill you have the testimony without question and without equivocation of the only two men who have had opportunity to try out these reorganization plans.

Continuing with the major differences from the Reorganization Act of 1945, I quote from the report of the committee:

> (3) This bill will permit a type of reorganization not authorized under the 1945 act—the granting to any officer of authority to delegate any of his functions. The main purpose is to make it possible for top officials to delegate routine functions which are vested in them by law in such manner as to prevent delegation.
>
> (4) The bill omits the provision of the 1945 act relating to quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative functions of independent agencies. The omission of this provision is in line with the recommendation of the President and the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.
>
> (5) The bill permits submission of reorganization plans with respect to the government of the District of Columbia.
>
> (6) The bill grants broader authority to create offices made necessary by a reorganization. Under the 1945 act the new offices which could be created were only those of "heads" and "assistant heads" of agencies. The change will permit a plan to provide for the appropriate type of officer in each case.
>
> (7) The bill differs from the 1945 act with respect to the limitation on the rate of compensation applicable to offices created by a reorganization plan.

This makes no change in salaries but merely enables the President to name salaries in compliance with executive law.

We have had the 1945 act, we have had the 1939 act. The bill under consideration differs from them only in the manner that I have stated here in talking over the matter at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Illinois, the chairman of the Expenditures Committee, on the outstanding presentation he has made of this legislation. In bringing in this H. R. 2361 the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments are indeed entitled to a great deal of commendation, particularly by reason of the complicated and complex nature of the legislation. It is a subject that should have been presented to the Congress before this session. I hope the Congress will reward this committee and also the taxpayers of the Nation by passing this legislation. I again wish to compliment the chairman of the committee for bringing in this bill.

Mr. DAWSON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. DAWSON] correctly stated, this bill came out of the committee without any previous political discussion. No one has greater respect for the sincerity and honesty of former President Hoover than have I. Beyond question, in recommending this legislation Mr. Hoover was expressing his own ideas, being sincere and honest. And the same may be said of our present President. They both have assumed that every other President, every President who might succeed Mr. Truman, would have the same degree of sincerity and honesty.

Without in any way being personal, it might be suggested to the House that some day we might get a Wallace with a Wallace Senate or a Wallace House. The results that might then come out of this legislation if left in its present form might not only be surprising but astounding to the people of the country.

There is no question but that a reorganization of the executive department is needed. It may be assumed that the failure of previous Congresses and of the present Congress up to this time to enact legislation similar to this is due—and please note this—either to the lack of ability, the lack of information, or the lack of courage on the part of the Members of Congress. Something has always been lacking, because everyone concedes that there must be a reorganization.

Starting with the premise that to serve the people we must have reorganization, and assuming that the Congress will not act if left to itself, where do we go from there? I am in favor of everything this proposed legislation seeks to do, but I want it done in a constitutional way. I do not want to surrender the powers of the Congress to accomplish something that is vitally needed, unless it is necessary to save our national security. Unless our national security is presently threatened, I cannot support the proposed legislation unless we can preserve the legislative powers of the Congress.

This bill, as previous reorganization acts, provides that the President of the United States may submit a plan to the Congress, that upon the expiration of 60 consecutive legislative days the plan so submitted to the Congress shall become the law of the land unless within the 60 days both Houses of the Congress have vetoed it.

This plan not only ignores the constitutional provision that the legislative power is vested in the Congress, but goes farther than that. It reverses the legislative procedure. This plan provides that the President shall submit, and his ideas and his suggestions become the law of the land unless each House within 60 days overrules, vetoes, if you please, what he sends down here. Now, is there any necessity for that? None at all. But, say the advocates of this bill, the Congress will not act if left to itself. Well, assume that to be true. It is not necessary that we leave the Congress to itself to refuse to act.

When this bill comes before the House under the 5-minute rule an amendment will be proposed which will state—and it follows the language of the bill on page 7, section 6—that the plan submitted by the President must be acted upon by both Houses of Congress within 60 days, and that to become the law of the land it must receive the sanction of the two Houses of Congress.

Is there any reason why, having been elected as the people's representatives, having taken the oath here before the Speaker when we were sworn that we would uphold the provisions of the Constitution, that we should not follow that procedure?

It is quite true that section 3 of article II provides that the President shall annually advise the Congress on the state of the Union and that he may on any occasion recommend to the Congress the measures which he considers necessary or good for the national welfare. But the Constitution also says in the very first sentence of section 1 of article I that the legislative power is vested in the Congress which shall consist of a House of Representatives and a Senate.

Section 7 states in no uncertain terms that no bill shall go to the President until it has received a majority of the votes of the Members of each House.

Now, my colleagues, I ask you: Are we to follow through and perform the duty which our constituents impose upon us, and which is marked out sentence by sentence in the Constitution itself? Or are we to delegate our legislative power to the President reserving to ourselves only the right of veto?

If there were a great national emergency threatening immediately the security of our Nation we might waive the constitutional provisions on the ground of necessity.

Assuming that, in order to preserve our constitutional form of government, we must overcome this waste, this inefficiency, it is not necessary that we do it in an unconstitutional manner.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. Under the provisions of the pending legislation a bare majority of the two Houses could reject within 60 days after receiving the President's proposal any proposal that he might make, but once the proposal is accepted and it becomes law, then it would require a two-thirds majority in both Houses in order to overcome the President's veto.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is true and is just an added reason why we should amend the bill, but do it now. There is not a schoolboy who has ever taken a look at the Constitution, if you ask him the question: "How does a bill become law when a bill is presented to the Congress?" but who would say: "Well, it must pass the House of Representatives, it must have a majority vote in the Senate," would he not? Sure. Then it goes to the President and he may veto it, he may pocket it, and then the procedure of two-thirds follows, and it becomes the law of the land.

I want to go along with this legislation. We need the reorganization. The Congress, as stated before, and I repeat it, has heretofore lacked either the ability, the courage, or the inclination to do the job. It has not been done. I am willing to have the President send down any plan he may wish—and I do not care whether you make any exemptions in this bill of this or that department, or agency. I care nothing about that. I am not so particularly concerned about whether the legislation is limited or permanent. All that I ask is that we do not delegate the power specified in the Constitution as belonging exclusively to the Congress to the Executive or any other grantee.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], whom I respect highly, has stated that Congress lacks the ability, the courage, or the inclination to do the job of reorganization. While I do not care to endorse that statement, I do say that in 160 years of historical record Congress has failed to take affirmative action for the type of reorganization which all of us, including the gentleman from Michigan, admit is desirable in the executive branch. So notwithstanding any technical assertions that Congress should do the job, the fact remains that Congress has not done the job, and every attempt on the part of Congress to take affirmative action to do a good job, a complete job of reorganization of the executive branch, has miserably failed.

Ex-President Hoover, in appearing before our committee, pointed out the reason for that. He said there are 1,800 agencies in the executive branch, and he pointed out that it is clearly impossible for Congress, with all of its other duties, to go into the highly technical and complicated structure of every department and agency of Government and do the job of reorganization that has been found to be necessary.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it should be pointed out, as distinguished from the present situation, that when Mr. Hoover submitted those recommendations Congress was not of his political faith. Of course, that situation does not prevail now, as far as the Chief Executive and Congress are concerned.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not see where that has any bearing on the record of 160 years of the failure of Congress to do a reorganization job, nor do I see where it has anything to do with the size of the job that needs to be done.

We all realize that reorganization plans are desirable. We realize that Congress has not been able to do it by affirmative action. So I consider that it is highly constitutional for the Congress to delegate within certain limits the job of reorganization. We merely say to the President, "Avail yourself of the tremendous value of the 24 task-force reports to the Hoover Commission, and whatever subsequent reports and recommendations the Hoover Commission will make based on those 24 task-force reports. Then, after considering all this material, the procuring of which was endorsed by the Eightieth Congress when we set up the so-called Hoover Commission. The Hoover Commission has been in session now for over 18 months and

has spent over $1,000,000, with over 300 of the finest technicians in Government that we could procure, sending up to the Congress plans, not one plan, but several plans." Then, I say we will have a firm base upon which a worth-while reorganization of the executive branch of Government can take place.

When the President sends up a plan the Congress then has 60 days in which to consider the plan. If we find out that there is something bad about the plan we have in title 2 of this bill a highly privileged resolution which can be offered on the floor by any Member of the Congress who is in favor of a resolution to disapprove the plan. Any Member of Congress can arise under high privilege and ask that a vote be taken on a particular plan and provision is made for 1 hour of debate on that question. Any committee that is affected by this plan, let us say that it is a plan with reference to the Department of Agriculture, immediately the Committee on Agriculture is on guard concerning this plan to reorganize the Department of Agriculture. Thus the Committee on Agriculture can consider that plan. It can ask for hearings. The hearings can be had in the Committee on Executive Expenditures. The chairman or any member of the Committee on Agriculture can come before that committee and present its case. Then, if the committee itself refuses to bring forward a resolution of disapproval, any member of the Committee on Agriculture can bring to the floor of the House for the consideration of the House a concurrent resolution of disapproval and the House at that time can hear the arguments pro and con and vote it up or down.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is quite true, I assume, as the gentleman said, that any Member of the House can arise and propose the disapproval of a plan submitted. Assuming that the House does disapprove, unless we can get the other body to go along, the proposal still becomes the law of the land, does it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. If we pass a bill in this body it has to go to the other body and they have to consider it. If they do not take it up, what can we do? Furthermore, this provision that any Member can call it up as a matter of high privilege within 10 days after the reorganization plan comes up will apply to the other body the same as it applies to the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But the difference is that the reorganization plan still becomes the law of the land without the action of one body while in the case of a bill it must have the approval of both Houses to become law. You gentlemen realize the difference.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I would like to point out, however, that that approval is a majority approval. In the case of a bill which has been vetoed by the President and sent down here, it takes two-thirds vote of the House to override the veto. It seems to me this is a very well-balanced arrangement, that only a majority of each House is necessary to disapprove a plan. I point out to you that if a plan is so highly undesirable, certainly the Congress of the United States can at that time exercise its responsibility and by a majority vote of each House disapprove such a plan. I point to the record. Such a thing did occur six times out of seven in the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, that particular provision is nothing new in a reorganization bill, and it was in the one which expired in April.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly so. That is the one I just referred to. Seven reorganization plans were sent to the House by the President under the Reorganization Act of 1945, and six of them were disapproved by majority action of both Houses. There is no use bringing up a straw man here and then knocking it over. We have the best bill that has ever been presented to the Congress, so far as reorganization is concerned. It gives the President, for the first time in history, the power to go ahead and use this great mass of information compiled by the Hoover Commission, and bring before the Congress plans for our approval or disapproval. Plans which we cannot originate in the House with all of the business that we have to attend to and with all of the logrolling and pressure from groups which are concerned with every facet of every bureau of the great sprawling bureaucracy of government.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORRIS. Assuming that this bill should become law, the Congress could later repeal the law if it decided it should do so, could it not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Exactly. Any part of this plan which becomes law can be nullified. I point out that in the Reorganization Act of 1932 it gave to President Roosevelt great powers, and that later on, in 1933, such action was taken and a limitation was placed upon his power.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Another outstanding contribution in the progress of the history of this legislation—and I want to congratulate the members of the committee on both sides—is the fact that it is permanent legislation, recognizing that this is a problem not for a matter of a year or 2 or 3 or 4 years, but one that is constantly arising, and in which we, the majority party—I speak for myself—have complete confidence. We may disagree with the President of the United States, but I have complete confidence in whoever may be the President of the United States, recognizing the serious responsibility of that office, that any man in that office would carry on to the highest degree humanly possible in the exercise of his best judgment in the interest of the country. I think it is a marked contribution in the progress of legislation of this kind.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The Congress has delegated to the President broad authority to reorganize the executive branch of the Government five times in the past 17 years. The bill which we present to you today is the sixth presentation of a reorganization bill within the past 17 years. Under all of these reorganization acts, Congress has delegated to the President power to reorganize, on the grounds of economy and efficiency, the sprawling, complicated structure of Government in the executive departments. We have delegated this authority because we have been forced to come to the conclusion that Congress has neither the time nor the ability for unified action to successfully accomplish a reorganization in the executive branch. This principle of lack of ability to execute a real reorganization has been well established and we are setting no precedent today.

The administration of the laws which Congress has passed has become more complicated and burdensome as bureau after bureau has been established and expanded, and as the personnel of the executive branch has multiplied from a few thousand to nearly 2,000,000 governmental employees.

The reorganization acts which Congress has passed have varied in some degree over the years, but one prime purpose has been contained in each of these acts: That purpose has been to delegate to the President authority to do a job which we in the Congress admit that we cannot do. Congress, however, has been fearful in the delegation of this authority, that such delegation would be abused. The Congress has in the past, also, yielded to its fears, and in some instances has been influenced by the tremendous pressures which have been brought on Congress to exempt certain agencies of Government completely from the President's delegated power to reorganize.

In the 1939 Reorganization Act, we exempted 21 agencies of the executive branch from Presidential reorganization; in the 1945 Reorganization Act, we exempted 11 agencies from reorganization. All students of government recognize that these exemptions have crippled the President and have tied his hands in his effort to set up an economical and efficient structure of Government in the executive departments.

Experts in governmental organization have assured us, after careful and objective analysis that these exemptions have prevented, to a lesser or greater extent, the main purpose of a reorganization act.

The present Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has had the same experience as previous committees charged with the responsibility of reporting a reorganization act. Witnesses have appeared before our committee from outside the Congress, and from inside the Congress, making pleas for the exemptions of special departments of Government. We have listened to their pleas, and, in some instances, our personal feelings have been

sympathetic to their arguments, and to their positions. We have also had before our committee, some very notable witnesses, who have insisted that this time the Congress give to the President the power to reorganize the executive branch of Government and to send to the Congress his plan of reorganization, in order that we may curb the sprawling, overlapping, duplicating bureaus of Government which have grown Topsylike in the executive departments of our Government.

President Truman, in his state of the Union message, and in his special letter to the committee, has requested that we give him complete power to present to the Congress, efficient plans of reorganization, which will bring the economy into our Government functions that public opinion is clamoring for. He has asked that we make no exemptions in the pending bill.

The only living ex-President of the United States, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, has also appeared before our committee, and has asked this committee to report a bill without exemptions. He has testified that it is only in this way that a real reorganization can be accomplished. The testimony of ex-President Herbert Hoover bears additional weight at this time because, as chairman of the so-called Hoover commission, which was instituted during the Eightieth Congress for the express purpose of studying our Government structure and reporting back to the Congress, is now ready to start making its report to the President.

I understand that 24 separate task forces have made their reports to the Hoover commission. The Hoover commission will base their report to the President on these 24 task-forces reports. President Truman will, in turn, no doubt, base the reorganization plans which he will send to Congress on the reports of the Hoover commission. In the establishment of the Hoover commission, Congress acknowledged the weight of public opinion on this pressing problem. Approximately 18 months' time has been consumed and upward of a million dollars spent on objective analyses of the different departments of Government. Following these objective analyses, the task forces have made their reports to the commission. The commission, as you know, is completely bipartisan in its approach to this great problem. If we are to cash in on the value of the most extensive study which has ever been made of our sprawling Federal bureaucracy, now is the time.

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has presented to this Congress a good bill—a bill which we believe will give the President the power to proceed in an orderly fashion—prepare the reorganization plans to present to the Congress for approval or disapproval.

Today's bill does not contain the exemption of any executive department or agency of Government. We have, however, recognized the great concern felt by many Members of the Congress in changes in certain very important executive departments. We have, therefore, prepared what we believe is a fair compromise approach between those who want no exemption and those who want exemptions.

We have provided that any plan affecting the National Defense Establishment, which everyone admits needs reorganization, be sent to the Congress in a single reorganization plan. This will enable the Congress to review such a plan without having to consider the merits or demerits of any accompanying reorganization plan. We can then, in the exercise of our judgment, either accept or reject such a plan. This provision, we believe, will meet the fears and the concern which many Members have expressed regarding changes in the status of the Marine Corps or in the civil function of the Army engineers or the Navy air arm or other related matters to our national defense.

We have extended this same separate treatment to three other agencies of the executive branch: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

In the opinion of the committee, these three great bureaus can be considered to be the vital keystones to our financial and business structure. Upon them rests the economic welfare of our Nation. We, therefore, believe that these three agencies should have separate treatment. Many other agencies of Government are vitally important and there will be many who believe that these should also be considered separately. However, it was the opinion of the committee that the functions of the other agencies were not so widespread nor as important as the three bureaus or agencies named, and it was also believed that in many cases more than one agency could be handled by the Congress in the same reorganization plan.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the committee has worked diligently and certainly with expedition in bringing this matter to the floor. I think it is obvious to all of us that this is basic legislation and must be enacted if the proposals that we hope will be forthcoming for the reorganization of the Government may be adopted.

Of course, those proposals that have been the subject of study by the Hoover Commission for months and months are the direct result of action taken by the Eightieth Congress in setting up that commission, recognizing that basically a job had to be done.

I assume, of course, that this legislation will be passed and that it will become law in some final form that will be effective.

May I say to my friends on the right side of the aisle and my friends on my side of the aisle that, as these recommendations of the President begin to come up, we are going to find that we have a great responsibility before us. Certainly, to those of you who hold the majority power, the matter is up to you, and may I say the baby is going to be on your doorstep. Certainly those of us who think that we need reorganization badly are going to look to you to meet the issue and the challenge with courage and with wisdom and with fair consideration to the people of the country who pay the bills.

I have asked for this time partciularly because there is one thing that has disturbed me. It has disturbed me ever since these matters of reorganization to be initiated by the executive branch of the Government have been before the Congress. That has to do with the way they may affect the great quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative agencies of the Government. By that I refer to such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the United States Tariff Commission, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Civil Functions of the Army Engineers, and a number of others that could be mentioned. Those agencies are primarily, in my view, the creatures of the Congress of the United States. Theirs is the responsibility to administer in the public welfare legislation enacted by the Congress.

The members of those commissions are appointed for a term. The members of the commissions do not change when the administration changes. Since they are appointed for a term they go on. There is a continuity of their operations. They deal with the very lifeblood of the country; with the economy of the country. If there is, for instance, in the Interstate Commerce Commission a continuity of pattern and determination about the rates involved in transportation then, of course, the people of the country may know and understand from time to time what those operations are to be and what the action ought to be. Certainly, it seems to me that it would be disastrous indeed if we were to bring about a situation under which the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of this great agency should be brought into the executive branch of the Government in such manner that their operations become political instead of nonpolitical.

Take, for instance, the matter of the Federal Communications Commission. You may say that this is a completely far-fetched proposition, but it could happen. Suppose that the functions of the Federal Communications Commission were transferred to the Department of Commerce; you might have a situation under which radio licenses issued to stations might, on a pure political basis, be changed. People build up great businesses on the issuance of a license. They are to have that license as long as they use it in the public interest. And that is the value and the merit and the function of such a commission. As I say, it would be inconceivable to my mind that any such result would be brought about, but certainly there are some in the country and I am afraid some in the Government who would argue that even the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions of those great agencies should be brought within the realm of the executive branch of the Government and, hence, subjected to political control. In the previous reorganizations that we have considered some of those agencies have been specifically exempted. It is argued, and I can understand with what force, that it is difficult in respect to any agency to

distinguish the executive functions from the legislative or judicial functions. I recognize that and certainly I, for one, want to write the kind of basic legislation that will make effective reorganization possible. But the fact that there was concern about what might happen to these agencies under this system by which in effect, unless the provision is amended, legislation is written by the executive branch and one branch of the Congress, not two, there should be some safeguard. So some of these agencies in the past have been exempted. In the act passed in 1945 there were certain exemptions. I think probably it has been pretty well agreed on the advice of Mr. Hoover and others that such exemptions should be kept out of this bill. It is said that no President would think of transferring to the executive branch of the Government these great legislative and judicial functions performed by these agencies. But it has been urged, and I find myself in that school of thought, that the pattern that is provided in this legislation under which the reorganization plans regarding four such independent agencies must come up separately and independent of the plans effecting any other reorganization might well be extended to some of these other agencies.

This does not mean that reorganization plans in respect to those agencies cannot be presented here by the President to be acted upon in whatever manner may be finally prescribed in the House. It simply would require that that plan as it affected one of these great independent agencies should come up here standing on its own bottom. You understand that if this legislation is adopted and a reorganization proposal comes up it might have five or six titles. One of them may be bad; all the rest of them may be good, but you cannot pick the good apples out of the barrel and leave the bad ones; you have got to take the whole barrel or leave the whole barrel.

I cannot see how it really would interfere with the effective functioning of this legislation to extend to some of these other agencies the same protection that is contained in the bill on page 7 in subsection (b).

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If a situation like the gentleman said should occur, where five different plans are treated within the same reorganization plan, four of them being good and one of them being bad in the judgment of Congress, would it not be possible for the Congress to take affirmative action to nullify that part of the plan later on after the whole plan had been passed or accepted as law? Could not the Congress exercise its responsibility by taking affirmative action as to that particular agency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Indiana two additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; I may say to the gentleman from California, I suppose if a plan came up here with five titles, that might be done. Of course, it could not be the Interstate Commerce Commission because that is included in the four. But take the case of the Civil Aeronautics Board which regulates air carriers like the Interstate Commerce Commission regulates surface carriers. We could adopt the whole thing, then turn around and start legislation through the mill to reestablish the independence of the Civil Aeronautics Authority. But, may I say to the gentleman from California, it seems to me that that begs the question. First of all, such action would be subject to a Presidential veto. The damage done in the meantime might be irreparable. As I say, I want above everything else to have effective legislation that will work. I would like to be optimistic about what the final results are going to be. We have had this sort of scheme on our books for quite awhile and not a lot has happened. Yet I am still optimistic about it. At the same time, I cannot remove completely from my mind the responsibility that I believe is mine to try to see to it that there is a scintilla of safeguard of the independence for these great quasi-legislative and qausi-judicial agencies. Many of them are bipartisan.

Why is that? Because it is expected that in the administration of the basic law passed by the Congress, in which minority and majority combined, there will be expression of the minority viewpoint, whatever that may be, so far as that particular agency is concerned and to avoid political control. Of course, to transfer it to the executive branch of the Government would entirely do away with the whole concept of these independent agencies as that concept has developed through the years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the Democratic and Republican members alike, has approached the consideration of this question from a very fine angle. There are only two differences of opinion, one expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] and the other by the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

In relation to the observations made by the gentleman from Indiana, may I refresh the memory of my colleagues of the furor that developed in 1940 when the Civil Aeronautics Authority was put under the Commerce Department, though the board was expressly made independent of the Secretary. It was put in there for budgetary reasons. Instead of having that and a number of other agencies floating around and making up their own budgets, the Bureau of the Budget thought it advisable to put them in with certain other departments, yet maintain an independent status. Some Members of Congress honestly expressed the fear that the independence of the CAA would be taken away, that politics would enter into the matter, that planes would crash on account of lack of safety rules, that the pilots would operate the planes through the skies in a negligent manner. Yet none of that has happened. The independence of the agency still exists. It is in the Department of Commerce for budgetary purposes and mainly for that purpose.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, in that transfer the Congress had already effected a separation of the administrative functions from the quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial function, and the only part of the operation that was transferred to the Commerce Department was the Office of the Administrator which did include the executive functions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, that is true, but you remember back 8 years ago the fears that were expressed as to the effect, and they have not materialized.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman indulge me in one further observation?

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly.

Mr. HALLECK. I have talked to some of the folks who are running that branch of the Government, and they are not quite sure whether the Secretary of Commerce is running it or the Civil Aeronautics Administrator, so I do not know what we finally accomplished as a result of it. Maybe we just put a few more people on, but I am not quarreling with the essential fact the gentleman has stated.

Mr. McCORMACK. Now, we have 1,800 agencies in the Federal Government; most of them executive, one distinctly legislative—the General Accounting Office. Then we have these independent agencies.

Former President Hoover made an able presentation, and both he and President Truman are in agreement in relation to this bill; as a matter of fact, they both felt there should not be any exceptions at all or, rather, even any exceptions in the nature of a separate reorganization plan. President Hoover—and he speaks with the voice of experience—has testified that there are over 30 agencies engaged in lending money and making guaranties and in insurance activities. There are 23 activities engaged in major construction work competing against each other for labor and material. They are scattered over 11 departments of the Government. There are 10 agencies dealing with major transportation questions; that is, not connected with regulatory functions, that are scattered through 8 departments and independent agencies. There is the question of the agencies reporting to the President. He had three lists before him. One list showed 65 such agencies. Another computed 94 such agencies. Another computed them as 101 agencies reporting to the President. As the former President said, "The discrepancy in the lists is a difference of opinion as to how much responsibility the President may have in each case. Most of them exercise some executive function." The gentleman from Indiana presents a very interesting question and I am very glad he did. I have some observations to make which, I think that, as realists and legislators, we

cannot escape considering. We must face the realization of what has developed in the growth of so-called administrative law. At the outset of our country we were an agricultural nation. While the framers of the Constitution, as well as the later Congresses amending the Constitution, recognized the necessity of constitutional flexibility to meet changing conditions, particularly in the powers delegated to the Central Government under the general welfare clause, and the power to regulate interstate commerce, it is quite probable that they never contemplated the growth of our country into the great industrial Nation it is today. In order to try and meet the perplexing and trying problems arising from our intense economic system, which is a combination of our industry and agriculture, Congress, through necessity to try and meet the complicated situation, brought into being, which is now highly developed and will undoubtedly increase as necessity demands, a system through the establishment of many agencies, most of them independent, with quasi legislative power, authorizing them to enter into the field of detailed regulatory legislation as well as delegating to them quasi judicial powers to function effectively in carrying out the intent of the Congress, Congress resorted to the device of establishing independent agencies in the executive departments. That is where they are located. The Interstate Commerce Commission was the first instance, but the increase since its establishment has been rapid. The legislation that created them usually consisted of a declaration of the policy of the Congress, the promulgation of broad rules to govern the acts of individuals and corporations in a particular field, and a commission established with the authority to implement and enforce the policies and principles stated by the Congress. The theory is that the Congress did not advocate or even delegate its legislative functions, but it exercised that function of broad, general declarations leaving the application of its policy in a particular instance to an agency of its own creation.

The rules and regulations can only be set aside by an act of Congress or by decisions of the court, if any rule in the latter case goes beyond the authority granted to the agency. Until such action takes place, they have the force of law.

Such agencies have broad quasi-judicial powers in their given fields, with a limited review by the courts. Such agencies were born of the necessity that faced the Congress in meeting the important public questions, the recognition from a practical angle by the Congress of its inability to pass detailed regulatory legislation and also conduct necessary quasi-judicial hearings. That question of necessity arose in accomplishing its legislative purpose and objective.

But these agencies also have functions that are purely executive. In addition, the heads or members of the boards or commissions are appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, the same as strictly executive agencies. Their executive functions have increased tremendously. No matter what the intent of the Congress was in their creation, that they were intended as arms of the legislative branch, the very necessities of the operations of these agencies, the ever-growing questions that arise in their field, the large increase in the number of employees as a result thereof, and the many other demands made upon them, have brought about a sharp change in the character of these agencies and their operations and the original intent of the Congress in creating them.

Confining myself to the question of this bill, which is a reorganization bill, we must face the practical situation. There is no reason why these agencies should not be the subject of reorganization consideration. The very growth of their jurisdiction and duties, they being not responsible directly to the people, really makes them a fourth department of the Government. That is what they constitute. That is what it has developed into. We never intended that, but they have really developed into a fourth department of the Government. As they are now constituted, this raises some very serious questions as to whether the Congress should continue to consider them as arms of Congress or parts of the executive branch.

This question is not directly involved in this bill, but the fact does remain that if we exclude them or provide for a separate reorganization in so many agencies, we are not facing the realities of the situation. To provide in the case of every agency that a separate reorganization plan must be submitted by the President would seriously cripple the effectiveness of any reorganization of the executive branch. There are too many such agencies in existence.

I will admit that if I had my way we would not have made the exemptions we did, but this bill is the best bill that has ever been reported out of any committee. The first reorganization bill not so many years ago had 21 exemptions. The next one had 12 or 14 exemptions. In this bill there are no exemptions. We only provide that in the case of three agencies and one department a separate reorganization plan shall be submitted to the Congress.

These independent agencies have developed for all practical purposes into a fourth department of the Government, and the very serious implications arising therefrom cannot be overlooked by you and me as legislators. They cross the lines of the legislative, executive and judicial branches of government. They include all of the jurisdiction of the legislative, executive and judicial branches which were expressly established by the Constitution. Congress, through necessity, created them. We know, as experienced legislators, that Congress cannot, through necessity, successfully reorganize them. The very fact that we are considering this bill and the fact that Congress has in the past enacted into law reorganization bills is a frank admission of the inability of Congress to effectively reorganize the executive branch of the government, not to mention the so-called independent agencies. The many complicated questions involved make that very difficult from a practical angle. I think we have the courage. There is no question about it. But just think of the vast scope of the executive branch of the government and think of these independent agencies and how they are interrelated. That is a very delicate and technical subject which Congress, from a practical angle, finds it difficult to approach. I cannot conceive of any President in reorganizing the independent agencies doing so in a manner which would affect the intent of Congress insofar as quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions are concerned, so that such agencies retain either an independent or an autonomous position—either independent as now, or autonomous within some other agency or department. Furthermore, we possess under this bill the right to refuse to approve any reorganization plans submitted to us. The gentleman from Indiana has done a very constructive piece of work in bringing this up. I make these observations for your consideration. Our independent agencies have gone far beyond the intent of Congress. They constitute, in fact, a fourth department of government. We will not reorganize them. This is the only way it can be done, by conferring upon the President the power. That will bring them back under one responsible head at least and not take them further away from the people than either the President or you or me as Members of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, it is my intention to vote for this legislation as it was reported from the Committee on Expenditures, of which I am a member. Ever since I have been in Congress reorganization of the executive branch of our Government has been a subject of keen interest to me. With the Reorganization Act of 1939, and again in 1945, there has been no recommendations of magnitude which would lend toward more efficient and economical operation of the executive branch of our Government. As at the present time, there is a tremendous overlapping and duplication of the functions of many of the agencies and bureaus of our Government, I cite just a few: Lending Government funds, 29 agencies; acquisition on land, 24; wildlife preservation, 16; welfare matters, 28; gathering statistics, 65. Is there any wonder that there is a lack of efficiency and economy and overall direction with so many agencies dealing with the same subjects? If we are ever going to curtail the unnecessary expansion of our Government, we must start now to consolidate and abolish those bureaus and agencies which are not necessary to the service of our people.

I feel that the President should be given the authority at this time to make whatever recommendations that are necessary for the reorganization of the executive branch of our Government with all agencies and bureaus coming within the scope of this plan. It would, however, exclude the General Accounting Office and the courts of the District of Columbia. I am in wholehearted

agreement with the testimony given before our committee by Comptroller General Lindsay Warren. I questioned him as follows:

Mr. Warren, I have been greatly impressed today with the sincerity and the earnestness of your presentation with regard to this legislation. I followed it through carefully and I believe it is your earnest feeling that, if this legislation is enacted, there will be greater efficiency in the departments of our Government, and also there should be a tremendous amount of economy.

Mr. WARREN. I certainly do think that, Mr. RIEHLMAN. I would like to say this—and I weigh my words when I say it: If this fails, then we might as well close up the shop for good regarding hopes of ever reducing the size of this Government or eliminating waste and extravagance and useless functions. I say that very sincerely. I think this is just about the last chance. It is almost the last chance I will have coming up here on it.

Mr. Warren is not alone speaking as Comptroller General but with the background as a Member of Congress for many years.

Mr. Hoover, appearing before the committee, made this remark:

This is a step in the right direction and a step which should and must be taken without delay.

I feel, with this authority granted to the President by the Congress, there should be no reason why he cannot carry out the recommendations set forth in his letter to Congress asking for this authority. Therefore, if proper recommendations are not made, there will be no question as to where the responsibility can be placed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, at this time I should like to state that I deem it an honor and a privilege to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments under the chairmanship of that able and distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON].

I am in favor of a reorganization of Government agencies, and I hope this proposed legislation will provide the efficiency and economy that we think it will.

I recognize that there are no exemptions for any agencies in this proposed legislation, but I would be remiss in my duties if I did not point out to the Members of this House that I have received a great many letters and telegrams from my constituents urging that the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, be exempt from reorganization under this legislation.

Since George Washington's time the civil functions have been historically performed by this highly trained, nonpolitical branch of the Army, on a nonpartisan and very efficient basis. They have performed with great credit in peacetime the river and harbor work especially where it involves the big multiple-purpose projects, such as navigation, reclamation, power, flood control, and in my district, particularly, bounded by two of the Great Lakes—Erie and Ontario—containing the Niagara River, and many small harbors, they have been of immeasurable assistance to the area. These peacetime duties have contributed greatly to the success of our war efforts in the last two great world wars.

I would hate to see the functions now performed by the corps transferred to some other Federal agency, which may have tremendous political influence by virtue of a Secretary having Cabinet status, and to have these duties performed on the basis of politics rather than of high professional competence.

I hope, however, that the proposed legislation, which provides that a reorganization plan providing for reorganization affecting the National Military Establishment will have to be submitted to Congress in a so-called "one package" plan, will afford this great corps the protection it so richly deserves.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to congratulate the gentleman from Massachusetts who just left the well of the House upon the acceptance by the now mapority of the proposition offered by Mr. Hoover so many years ago, and upon their final belated recognition of his great services to our country.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the House is to support this resolution and I do commend it to the House. I think it should pass. I say I support this resolution—I am supporting the principle of the resolution. It was my own experience at the State level to serve in the capacity of attempting to help reorganize the State government. The general assembly made two or three rather futile attempts and finally passed a bill which in effect delegated that authority to the budget committee, of which I happened to be chairman at that time. I know the blood, sweat, and tears that came out of that particular type of effort. I say that this effort which is now before us is certainly a most laudable one because in comparison the need for reorganization at the Federal level is far, far greater than any that might be in existence at the State level.

For the last 20 years we have needed this. There have been a number of attempts made to reorganize the executive, most of which have achieved little general benefit, not only so far as the people are concerned but the efficiency of those who are empowered within the Government itself.

The Congress has not accomplished this very necessary task, and evidently will not. The present plan seems to be the very best hope to do so. While it does not provide the usual approach for the enactment of legislation, in that the President inaugurates the resolution and the Congress either votes it up or down, nevertheless the plan has already been used. There remains some doubt in the minds of Members of the House, particularly those who are constitutional lawyers, as to the constitutionality of this act. Not being an attorney, I am not attempting to pass on it. I do say, however, that the positive approach would seem the most logical one, but in the event that it is not adopted, certainly I can say that this approach does provide all the necessary safeguards it would seem to me. For the final power is invested in the representatives of the people.

I want to congratulate the chairman of the committee, who I think has made a very valiant attempt to try to get a good resolution before the House. This has not been an easy task.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say I am very happy the gentleman from Indiana is a member of this committee because of the long years of experience he has had with this kind of problem. There is no limitation on the number of Government employees who can be employed at any particular time in this bill, is there? There is no provision at all to limit Federal employees?

Mr. HARVEY. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Does not the gentleman think that is one of the greatest weaknesses of the bill? Does not the gentleman feel that there should be a limitation placed in this resolution or in some bill which would provide that no more than so many Federal employees could be on the pay roll at any one time? I am afraid that this legislation will permit them to shift employees from one department, agency, or bureau of the Government to another, and we will get no reduction in the administrative personnel cost to the Government.

Mr. HARVEY. I thank the gentleman. And I wish to say that his point is well taken. However, due to his long experience in the field of appropriations, I would suggest to him that primarily the responsibility for reducing Government employees should be resolved in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. JENSEN. I think the gentleman is right, except that I think that sort of thing could be placed in this bill. I wish to say to the gentleman that the subcommittee on the Interior Department in the Appropriations Committee, of which I was chairman last year, limited the amount of funds which could be spent by the Bureau of Reclamation to $48,000,000.

Mr. HARVEY. May I congratulate the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. HARVEY. I may say that Mr. Lindsay Warren, our present Comptroller General, who testified before our committee and who was a Member of the Congress during the time when the 1939 act was placed on the books, said that it was defeated by the great army of "butters"; that everybody who came and testified before the committee said, "We are for this legislation, but," and then proceeded to ask for the exemption of some particular department. By the time the bill was through the Congress, two-thirds of those affected by the bill had sneaked out from under, so that when you start making exemptions in a

bill of this nature you will nullify its benefits.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARVEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that it is impossible to write a specific limitation into a bill, in view of the fact that government is not static; it is dynamic and a constantly changing function of service to the people, and by the very fact that Congress itself creates new services and new functions, it would be impossible to prescribe a definite limitation of personnel?

Mr. HARVEY. I might say to the gentleman that it was perhaps best described by the gentleman from Illinois as a fluid condition.

I shall conclude briefly by saying that I feel that the responsibility under this act will be placed directly on the President. I hope he will meet the obligation under the privilege we are giving him with no strings attached to it, and that he will perform this much-needed task for the improvement, efficiency, and economy of our Government.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, in discussing this bill I wish to do so under three headings: First, the necessity for reorganization; second, the plan or method of reorganization; and, third, to touch briefly on the constitutionality of the proposed legislation. Under the latter head I need not take very much of the time of the Committee because I believe it is rather late to be raising the question of the right of Congress to delegate legislative authority. We have been doing it for the past hundred years, and so long as we set up proper standards to guide the person to whom the delegation of authority is made it is constitutional.

I am extending in the RECORD at this point a detailed argument for the constitutionality of this bill.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE REORGANIZATION BILL

Some question was raised at the hearings on H. R. 1569—Eighty-first Congress—as to the constitutionality of turning over to the Executive the legislative function involved in reorganization of the executive branch. The bill proposes authority to transfer, consolidate, or abolish agencies and/or functions of the Federal establishment, the President's orders or plans for such purpose to become effective only after they have lain before Congress in session for 60 days without the adoption by the two Houses of a concurrent resolution of disapproval.

From one point of view there is no delegation at all. That is, as suggested at the hearings, there is merely a reversal of the legislative process, the Executive acting first, and the Congress completing the legislative action by declining to negate the propositions. This is not, however, tenable, because the legislative process requires—Constitution, article I, section 7, clause 2—that both Houses concur separately on each enactment; under the plan of the present bill a reorganization plan will become law notwithstanding one House may vote its outright disapproval.

Rather, it seems more in order to regard the plans as legislation by the Executive, under authority delegated in the present bill, subject, as a safeguard, to veto if both houses disapprove during the 60-day waiting period. Is such delegation authorized?

It is far too late to raise a question whether the legislative function may be delegated. What was sanctioned by over a hundred years of decisions—*The Brig Aurora* (7 Cr. 382 (1813)), *Field* v. *Clark* (143 U. S. 649 (1892)), *Intermountain Rate cases* (234 U. S. 476 (1914))—of the Supreme Court was not intended to be overturned by the two decisions in the NRA cases 14 years ago—*Panama Refining Co.* v. *Ryan* (293, U. S. 388), *Schechter Poultry Corp.* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 495). The latter gave direction, but did not call a halt. That this, on reflection, is obvious, is demonstrated by the more recent delegations of legislative power now fully sustained on topics and subjects far more essentially legislative in their nature and incidence, for example, devaluation of the dollar, tariff adjustments by reciprocal trade agreements, price fixing by OPA, rent control, as still in effect, and many others—*Yakus* v. *U. S.* (321 U. S. 414, 64 S. Ct. 660), *Bowles* v. *Willingham* (321 U. S. 503, 64 S. Ct. 641). What was given point by the NRA cases was the requirement that Congress fulfill its function by delineating the policies to be followed, demarking the guides for Executive action, and detailing the standards which the President must follow. It is believed the first five sections of the bill comply with these requirements admirably. They set forth the aims to be sought, the methods to be used, the objectives to be reached to effect the aims, and the limits and restraints which may not be encroached upon. Thus while it has been objected that the bill proposes to abdicate the legislative power of the House to the President and to the Senate—since the joint approval of the latter could effectuate a plan turned down by the House—it seems more correct to say the House is now, by the adoption of this bill, exercising its constitutional function and giving force in advance to whatever plans of the Executive are promulgated under its authority—and, more importantly, pursuant to its provisions—and are not disapproved by the Senate.

Two authorities seem to be so closely in point as themselves to be determinative. While the concurrent resolution veto was called for by the 1939 and 1945 acts, no tests were possible under the former because Congress approved each plan affirmatively by what amounted to a new statute in each case—Fifth United States Code 133s–u–v—and no court cases on the question have been noted under the 1945 act.

But in two cases the constitutional issue was directly raised under the previous but quite similar Reorganization Act of March 3, 1933. It is notable that that act was much broader than the present bill, in that there were no exempt agencies or single-plan method called for. There was less detail in the way of guides and standards, and while the Executive orders were required to lay before Congress for 60 days, there was no provision for a congressional veto other than by the enactment of new legislation. Certain sections of the Government-wide reorganization effected under that law—Executive Order No. 6166 of June 10, 1933—were questioned upon the basis that the delegation of authority was unwarranted under the Constitution. The case came up before a statutory three-judge court, composed of Circuit Judge Chase, District Judge Bondy, and District Judge Robert P. Patterson. The reorganization was fully sustained in the decision of the court, the opinion stating, Congress "elected to have the President investigate and decide what should be done in this regard in the furtherance of efficiency and economy and then adopted his decision. The result was to abolish a board whose existence was dependent upon the will of Congress and to delegate to the Department of Commerce the same powers and duties the board had possessed. This seems in accord with correct standards as to delegation of authority to act within proper limits prescribed by Congress"—*Isbrandtsen-Molter Co., Inc.* v. *United States et al.* (14 F. Supp. 407 (1936)).

That opinion was adopted and given full approval by a similar three-judge court in the District of Columbia, composed of Appeals Justice Groner, District Judge Wheat, and District Judge Proctor, in *Swayne & Hoyt* v. *United States* (18 F. Supp. 25).

While the two cases were later affirmed in the Supreme Court, the decisions did not turn on this issue because in the meantime Congress had given express sanction to the reorganization by means of later legislation. However, in one subsequent case the Supreme Court referred with apparent approval to the method of reorganization contained in the 1939 act with its provisions, as here, for the plans to become effective unless a concurrent resolution disapprove them—*Sibbach* v. *Wilson & Co.* (312 U. S. 1, 15 (1941)).

Also, it is worth while to be noted that the method of reorganization proposed by the present bill to be readopted has been fully approved by the commentators on this subject. See, for example, a symposium on Federal executive reorganization in volume 40, American Political Science Review, at page 1152, and the article entitled "The Legislative Veto and the Reorganization Act of 1939," by Millett and Rogers in volume 1, Public Administration Review, No. 176, 1941. It is suggested also, as a most significant and persuasive authority, that the Congress itself has already fully examined the constitutionality of this identical procedure, and after extended debate has approved and adopted it. See seriatim, the debates in the House and the Senate on the 1945 Reorganization Act.

As to the necessity for the legislation it seems that it is hardly necessary that I say very much. We are all, I believe, agreed that there ought to be reorganization in principle, as somebody said before our committee; and then somebody suggested that we must in this case rise above principle and exempt certain agencies. We all agree in principle that there

should be reorganization; the trouble is that every agency of the Government wants to be exempted. Reorganization is needed not only for efficiency and economy but that we may give to the Executive some real power. He has a responsibility to execute the laws of the land, but we have so hedged him about that it is sometimes very difficult for him to do so. I saw the statement credited to him in the newspapers a few days ago to the effect that it had gotten to the point where he had to kiss some of these officials on both cheeks before he could get them to do what was their plain duty; kissing them on one cheek was not enough. I am sure some of you have had the experience that I have, that you almost feel you have got to kiss some other portion of their anatomy to get any consideration. This situation demands correction.

As to the necessity for economy in government, I was struck by what Mr. Hoover said in his testimony. Somebody asked him about taxation and the raising of more revenue for the Government. He said that we had reached the saturation point in taxation; and I am inclined to agree with him. We cannot cut down our appropriations for national defense. We are embarking, or we say we are going to embark, upon a program of additional service to the people which will cost money. There is but one place left, then, where we can economize, and that is in the actual operation of the machinery of our Government, and here is a chance for us to do it not only in principle but actually. How shall it be done? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] proposes that instead of doing it this way we do it some other way. Everyone agrees that for the past 150 years it has been impossible or impractical for the Congress itself to do this reorganizing job. We have not done it and there is nothing to indicate that we are in any better condition to do it now than we were then. The gentleman from Michigan says that we are overturning our constitutional procedure, and I have great respect for the gentleman's views on the constitutionality of this question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have the greatest respect for the gentleman's judgment. Will he tell us why in his opinion the Congress has not done it?

Mr. LANHAM. Yes, I will tell the gentleman why. It is because, as Mr. Lindsay Warren said, of the ganging up process.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with the gentleman and we have been complacent enough to go along.

Mr. LANHAM. That is right. The departments have ganged up on us and we cannot do the job. I do not say the President will do it; however, I think he will try to do the job. He will certainly have no excuse if he does not do it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the primary object of the legislation before the House today is efficiency and economy in government and, goodness only knows, every Member of Congress realizes that that should take place.

There are two things about this legislation that I do not like. The first is that there is no termination date in this bill. It seems to me there ought to be a time limit. There should be 2 or 3 years within which to act and then we ought to stop, because we should not be subject to a President bringing in legislation whenever he wants to, regardless of who the President might be, when he thinks there ought to be a change in government. I have seen Presidents who wanted to change the Government a whole lot when I did not think it ought to be changed. Sometimes they get enough enthusiasm worked up for a particular thing that it goes through and after it is passed we are sorry it happened. Many of you have experienced those changes yourself.

I listened very intently to the testimony of Lindsay Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, in which he made his recommendations. There is no one in Government I hold in higher respect than I do Lindsay Warren. He knows more about the operation of Government, in my opinion, than any living man, at least since I have been a Member of Congress. It is his job to study our Government. He has vision and he makes recommendations as he sees them for the best interest of Government economy and efficiency.

If you will turn to page 37 of the hearings you will see there the examples of overlapping and duplication which occur in Government in the following table:

| | *Agencies* |
|---|---|
| Lending Government funds | 29 |
| Insuring deposits and loans | 3 |
| Acquisition of land | 34 |
| Wildlife preservation | 16 |
| Government construction | 10 |
| Credit and finance | 9 |
| Home and community planning | 12 |
| Welfare matters | 28 |
| Forestry matters | 14 |
| Examination of banks | 4 |
| Gathering statistics | 65 |

When you think of 65 agencies of the Government sending out requests to the business people of this country asking for information, it is no wonder that the business people of the country are sick and tired of making out reports. It is time to stop it.

When we have all of these duplications in Government certainly there is need for consolidation, a need for efficiency. We want to get the operation of our Government down to the point where the affairs of Government are conducted without so much red tape, without so much cost. When you look back to 1932 you will find that it cost $4,600,000,000 annually to run the Government, while today it is costing $41,858,000,000. In other words, in 1932 the per capita cost of running our Government was $37.49, while today the per capita cost has risen to $282.82. The thing has just gone up by leaps and bounds. It is wrong. I tried to stop it but was unable to do so.

Do you know that in 1932, when we had a President who said, "I am going to consolidate the bureaus and eliminate waste in Government" that there were only about 300 agencies of Government, and now we have 1,800 agencies of Government. Why, the thing has grown in leaps and bounds. I will never forget that as long as I live, and I do not want to see it happen again. Then we had Mr. Hoover and his committee, and on that committee there was the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Mansco, who were helping to make the recommendations that are going to go to the President of the United States. Now we have men of that caliber trying to make recommendations to the President, and he should bring something in here that will simplify Government. Of course, the President does not have to follow out the recommendations made by the Hoover Committee. But, I feel this way: The thing has gone so far we are headed for the rocks, and while this legislation is not the way I want to do it, I am willing to accept it, because I know it is about as good as you can get. If you get something that is about as good as you can get, and you think it is going to try to stop wrongs in Government, you better grab hold of that or else you are going to swamp or drown in Government red tape and confusion, and I am not ready to drown yet. So I will accept this as the best legislation you can get at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it has been an exceedingly fine experience to serve on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the House of Representatives. It has been my good fortune to have had an opportunity to observe the operations of Congress here in the Capitol for 24 years; 16 years of this time from outside, from the gallery, and from around in the corridors as a secretary, and for 8 years or a little better as a Member of the House. I have watched the expansion of the Federal Government. I have watched what we call and what we term the bureaucrats and the "brass" coming in and taking charge, and looking over the tops of their glasses and telling the secretary from your office this, that, or the other, and then when they report and you go down they tell you this, that, or the other. So, why, Mr. Chairman, are they so untouchable? This Congress was created with, and this House and the other branch of the Congress are delegated with, power to carry out the public business. Every 2 years the Membership of this House and every 6 years the Membership in the other body are called on to give an account of their stewardship. The public, the voters if you please, are the check and balance of Congress. But here someone rises up and says, "Oh, you must not touch this agency; you must not touch that agency." They are sort of holy affairs. They are created for a special and

a specific purpose. They are delegated to do this, that, or the other. Well, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that any agency, any private business, any Government, or any other functions should run without a balance wheel and in this legislation we prpose to add the balance wheel to the Government. We propose in this legislation to set forth a form by which they should be audited and checked and made to come in and give an account of themselves, and if they are found superfluous, then to be amalgamated with some other agency so that the machinery can go on in a better fashion and not require so much oiling. In the bill we have under consideration there are only three controversial matters.

Since I have become a member of the committee I have spent quite a bit of time reading the debates on this subject in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back through the years. I recall the debate in 1939 when this floor was packed and jammed, when the galleries were packed and jammed, and when the corridors were full. The able gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] participated in the debate, which went on for days and days. The former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], participated in the debate. The present Speaker of the House participated in the debate. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] was a great participator, as was the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

It is very noticeable and apparent here today that this question has been debated so much, and every one of the three phases that are in controversy here today have been discussed so much that the seasoned Members of this House and the country as a whole have come to the conclusion that there is nothing further to say about the matter and that further debate is unnecessary; that this Congress should go forward with a program similar to this program, which is the best that can be had, this program which has been thrashed out by the committee, the Members on both sides agreeing to present the matter to the floor of the House, reserving in the legislation that we are passing today a part of the responsibility in reorganizing the Government. The part is that in effecting the law we reserve the right here in the House to say whether it shall be done or shall not be done as proposed by the Chief Executive.

Mr. Chairman, I would not enter into debate with any constitutional lawyer here on the floor of this House, but it has been interesting to me to read about the constitutional question which was debated in 1939, in 1945, and in other years. I think some of the gentlemen on the floor here today participated in those debates. I believe those who participated in the debate in 1939 and those who read that debate will agree that the provision laid down in this proposed legislation, reserving the right in this body to say whether the proposal shall be in effect, is not the constitutional question. The constitutional question is taken care of in the law we propose to pass here today, and it has so been discussed in connection with the act of 1939 and other acts, and evidently by the large favorable vote sustained.

I think it is beyond a question of doubt that with the passage of this bill we will have an opportunity to reject or accept such proposals as will come to the Congress. Whether they are money saving or not is not the question. The question is whether the Government will function better under the proposals as sent down or as the Government is functioning today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration, according to its sponsors, is to give authority to the President for reorganization of executive agencies, and, further, according to the sponsors of this bill, it is hoped that by reason thereof the executive department may run more efficiently and with more economy.

It is at least interesting to observe that the duplication and multiplication of effort, as well as waste and extravagance, have come about largely through administrative practices, and because agencies that have been created have taken power and authority under themselves that was never intended by Congress. So you are saying today that even though Congress did not intend to provide all of the duplication and multiplication of effort in the Government, it takes an act of Congress to correct it. Independent agencies have, of course, extended and expanded far beyond the intent of Congress.

Those of you who have served in Congress during recent years know that I have put forth a special effort to bring about more efficiency and less extravagance in the Government, and have tried to deal with the question of duplication and multiplication of effort that has spread itself far and wide throughout our agencies.

I submitted to this House on two occasions legislation to deal in a constructive manner with this problem. My legislation would have provided for an arm of Congress that would constantly study the problems we are discussing today and would make recommendations to Congress as to how and wherein the Government could be made to operate more efficiently and economically.

Examples of some of the overlapping and duplication of effort are set forth in the committee hearings in support of this legislation. For example, there are 29 agencies dealing with lending of Government funds. There were 34 agencies during the war dealing with acquisition of land. There are 16 agencies dealing with wildlife preservation, 10 with Government instructions. Home community planning seems to be a popular thing to do. We have 12 agencies dealing with that problem. There are 28 agencies that deal with welfare matters, and 14 agencies with forestry. There are 65 agencies gathering statistics. It is no wonder that people are confused.

I think one of the best authorities on this subject matter, and one who has given the problem a great deal of study, and one who has tried to deal with it realistically and in a practical manner, is our Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren. Let me quote briefly some of the things he had to say, and you find his statements in the hearings:

> This unsegregated, sprawling crop of Government functions and functionaries cannot hope to operate efficiently or to do well the job the taxpayers are paying for unless someone can assume the burden of putting like functions together, to make only one or two bureaus grow where dozens grew before. What is more, reorganizing is not just reshuffling; it is also abolishing agencies and functions. A tree expected to grow must be carefully pruned, for new branches to have life we must cut off those no longer bearing fruit.

Let me quote further from his statements:

> I reiterate that the present set-up is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with their attendant extravagance. It is probably an ideal system for the taxeaters, but it is bad for those who have to pay the bill.

Ex-President Hoover has been quoted many times on both sides of the aisle today. It is rather interesting that President Hoover, after 16 or 18 years out of Government, should be called upon to assist in dealing with this question. Of course, I am in favor of legislation that will bring about more economy, more efficiency, and less waste and extravagance in our Government. Whether the enactment of this proposed legislation will do the job is yet to be determined.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES. In just a minute, if I have time. The distinguished gentleman from California who is now on his feet was a member of the House Committee on Civil Service and is presently a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. He is one of the active working members of that committee and gives of his time and energy in the study of the problems that come before that committee. He will recall I submitted legislation, the intent and purpose of which was to deal with this problem in a constructive and effective manner. I believe if that proposed legislation had been enacted into law, a great share of the waste, extravagance, and duplication and multiplication of effort to which the majority floor leader has called attention would not have been as big as it is today.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce to the Republican Members that the conference which was to be held this afternoon following the session has been postponed until tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this is a far-reaching and an important measure. Far be it from me to intimate that something should not be done about this situation in which we find ourselves. We

all seem to be agreed and nobody would dispute the proposition that we do have too many agencies. Many of them are overlapping. Many of them are pyramided, one above the other. There are many duties and functions of government that are duplicated, that are performed by people whose services are not necessary. However, it occurs to me—and I say this with all due deference to the gentlemen who have studied this matter and have spent days in its consideration—that you and I have just been handed this measure upon the spur of the moment. I would like to have had time to read this proposal and the hearings, but this proposal and the hearings were not available until today. It is a reversal of the traditional methods of legislation. Ordinarily, when an end is to be accomplished by the enactment of law, the law is written before it is submitted to the House.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. No; not now. I am seeking the light and I am afraid when the blind lead the blind they will both fall into the ditch.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman would not say that applies to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. JENNINGS. Oh, there is nothing personal about this. I am just being impersonal and making an observation which, if my good friend will take to heart and meditate upon it, it may be a salutary thing for him.

Mr. McCORMACK. I always listen to my friend with a great deal of interest.

Mr. JENNINGS. I appreciate the fact you do, and I always listen with interest and profit to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. JENNINGS. I could not refuse to yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. My friend probably did not know it, but a copy of the hearings and a copy of the bill now before us, together with the report of the committee, was sent to every Member of the House so that they were received last Saturday.

Mr. JENNINGS. Well, I did not get it. I do not know whether it came to my office or not. I am not angry. I am not laboring under any sense of having been disregarded or neglected. I know that the gentlemen involved are all my friends, but I am just talking about the magnitude of this task and the magnitude of this proposal.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Now my friend will be gracious enough to yield to me, will he not?

Mr. JENNINGS. Yes; I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to yield the gentleman one additional minute to talk on the bill.

Mr. JENNINGS. Perhaps the gentleman from California and I should have a private conversation on this question.

All I am undertaking to say is that it is proposed to delegate to the President these vast powers, yet everybody here knows that the President will not have a thing in the world to do with it; somebody else will work it out. I do not know who will write this proposed reorganization plan affecting all these agencies. I am saying that when a measure is brought in embodying such far-reaching effects that it should spell out, within its pages, exactly what is being provided. I cannot see why this is not done. If you have not had time to write a measure, if you have not had time to abolish agencies, if you have not had time to consolidate their powers or abolish their powers, now is a good time for you to do it and bring in a bill so clear and specific that we will know exactly what we are voting on. We will know exactly who is going to carry out the proposed measure. We all know the President is not going to do this thing personally; he will simply give it his sanction when those to whom he delegates the power we delegate to him have written their report; when they have written the law we alone should write. It looks to me as though this is a delegation of power upon a delegation. You are inaugurating a new system of multiplication, overlapping, duplication, and pyramiding here when you adopt this proposal. You delegate to the President the power to redelegate that power to someone whose identity you do not know and may never know.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, as I am sure many of you know, I am one of the two Members of the House who, under the provisions of H. R. 775, the law which created the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, represent this body on that important Commission. The Commission, just to review for one moment, is a bipartisan commission. It is made up of 12 members, 6 from public life and 6 from private life. Four members were named by the Speaker of the House, one Democrat and one Republican being Members of the House and one Democrat and one Republican being private citizens; four were named by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life, on a bipartisan basis; four were appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life. The Commission has been meeting for approximately 18 months on a night and day schedule. We have used some 28 task forces in the work of studying the possibilities for helpful reorganization in the executive branch of the Government. These task forces were named on a nonpartisan basis. Some three hundred outstanding citizens of America have contributed their time and their efforts as leaders of these task forces, or as members of the special committees and special commissions that have been set up to study some particular problem of government—some function, some activity, or perhaps, in some cases, some single department or agency of the Government.

I am very happy and very proud to be able to say to the House today that never once in all of the meetings of the Commission, nor in all of the various considerations given to the work of this Commission by the task forces, has there ever been a division along party lines or between the civil members, the private citizens, on the one hand, and the so-called official group on the other. If there has ever been an honest effort made to do a job for the benefit of all the people of America, it has been done by your Commission under the able and splendid leadership of the only living ex-President of the United States. I am also proud to say that the President of the United States, the occupant of the White House at the present time, has aided materially in many, many ways the work of this Commission. The heads of the various departments of government in the executive branch have also cooperated. So I can assure you I approach this legislation entirely from a nonpartisan angle.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will be enacted into law. I may say, and I have to say this to you in all honesty, that when the question of requesting of Congress the enactment of a reorganization act came before the Commission I had some reticence in my own mind as to just how we should approach the problem, and as to just what sort of reorganization act we should adopt. Yet I became firmly convinced, as we considered the matter, that if we want to accomplish the great purposes for which the Commission was created by the Congress by unanimous vote—and approved by the President promptly—we must give some single authority, to wit, the President of the United States, the power to put most of the Commission's reorganization plans into effect. I was rather concerned about the section of the proposed bill which seemingly sets aside the old well-established constitutional procedure, or at least my understanding of it, whereby it is the legislative branch which legislates, and the President or Chief Executive who acts as the braking power or the controlling power to veto any measure which the Congress may pass, so that Congress must reconsider its position before taking final legislative action.

This provision in this bill, which sets up the requirement whereby each branch of Congress must veto or vote down in any reorganization plan the President may submit, did give me serious concern. Yet I was willing to accept it. Finally I agreed, in the Commission, to accept that section providing we had one other safeguard in the bill. We do have the understanding in the Commission, by the way, that any of us may dissent on any matter, be free to express our own opinion. As I stated, I am willing to accept the section requiring both Houses of Congress to vote down a reorganization plan providing we would have this one safeguard—that there be no permanent authority granted to the President or to his high office to reorganize the Government anytime he wants and in any way he wants.

I am truly sorry that I cannot agree with some of my colleagues on the Commission and with some of my colleagues in the House in support of the provision for a permanent power to be placed in the hands of the President to reorganize the Government. In fact, I think if a time limitation were put on his power to reorganize, if we set a date by which action must be taken, the result will be that the Chief Executive will more rapidly put into effect the recommendations this Commission may make.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. The gentleman probably knows more about this problem than most anyone in the House. Is this a correct analysis of it: That what we are doing is not delegating legislative power; we are merely giving wider administrative power, including the power to unite and eliminate agencies, and so forth, to make for better administration, and we are merely reserving the right to negative that administrative action by legislation?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. No; I do not want to go that far with the gentleman. Under the Constitution, and under the law, the President of the United States, regardless of what we may do, does have a great deal of power to put into effect a large part of the recommendations and the findings that the Commission will make from time to time to the Congress. But in other instances the President must have this legislative authority and power to make the program comprehensive, and to really do the job of reorganizing. In some instances under the Constitution and statutes already effective we will have to have legislative enactments to accomplish the purpose of the Commission.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Is it not a truer statement to say that we are not in this bill delegating reorganizing powers to the President; we are delegating to the President the authority to prepare a plan, as our agent, because he is in a better position than we to prepare a plan of reorganization, which then comes back to us, and we either disapprove it, or, by doing nothing, allow it to become the law and he can then issue orders carrying it out?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think there is much to what the gentleman says. There is a very fine point involved. We are authorizing the President to make and submit certain reorganization plans subject to our possible disapproval. That is actually what the bill provides.

Mr. JUDD. Not to our disapproval of the actual orders given but to our disapproval of the plan. He cannot issue an order to carry out this reorganization until the 60 days have gone by without adverse action by us.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. That is right.

Mr. JUDD. So that we do not veto a reorganization; we veto a plan which he has prepared as our agent.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It would be a plan of reorganization.

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do want to say to the House that the great Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on which I had the honor and pleasure of serving in the last Congress, has, in my opinion, acted wisely and well in bringing this legislation to the floor. Certainly we cannot accomplish the reorganization of the executive branch of the Government, for the purpose of bringing about greater efficiency and economy in its operation, unless reorganization powers, such as contained in the bill, are given to the President. However, there is one dangerous provision in the bill. I can readily accept all other provisions, as I said a moment ago, although I am not too happy about one or two of them. I certainly do not want to see established, as a pattern by which we will be guided in the future in our legislative meditations, either that Congress should act only as an agency to veto actions of the President or that he be given permanent authority to reorganize the Government. Rather than lose the great good that can come from this reorganization, I am willing to accept this bill, if necessary, but I do think we should keep the power in our own hands over the organization of the executive branch of the Government by placing a limit upon the length of time the President can exercise the great power this measure confers. I do not know who may be President 10, 20, or 30 years from now. As much as I respect the President and the Presidency, I would rather always trust the future of the country to the people's representatives in the Congress than to any one individual who may rise to power as President of the United States in the future.

What I say here today is not a reflection on the gentleman who now occupies the White House, as I am sure, from conversations and from the interviews we have had as a commission with him, that he is just as much interested in seeing these reforms go into effect as the Commission which has worked upon them.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is of course making a most valuable statement. I, who have served with him on the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments for the last 2 years, know the valuable service he has rendered on that committee and also on the Hoover Commission, on which he is now serving.

In regard to the limitation of the time, I think the gentleman certainly makes a point there. However, I would ask him if it would not be possible that the Congress by affirmative action at any time could place such a limitation of time upon this program.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes; I agree with the gentleman, but that is a dangerous method to pursue, I am afraid, because we can grant a power to the Chief Executive by a simple majority vote of this Congress, but, under our constitutional processes, if a President does not wish to surrender a power, we cannot take that power away from him by legislative action unless we have a two-thirds majority. That is the one great danger I see in the present bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Moreover, we have been assured by the gentleman from Illinois, the distinguished chairman of the committee, that the President could bring about these reorganizations not within 2 years but within a few months, so why extend it indefinitely.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I do not know whether he can do it all in just a relatively few months. I think we have to give him a couple of years, at least, to be fair. However, I do believe that the placing of a time limitation on his authority will act as a spur or a prod to get prompt action—so that there will not be any delay—whereas if the President is given permanent power it may be said, "Oh, there is plenty of time to do that." It is a human failing to put things off, and this governmental reorganization should not be put off. The people of America want action quickly, and I think the President wants action.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I thank the gentleman for his very, very valuable contribution to this matter. It comes from long experience. We know that his interest in this subject matter is great, and we know of his work with the committee.

I said that we would expect some form of reorganization action upon the different phases as they were presented to us within a few months, but not on the entire reorganization plan, which must necessarily spread over the years.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. May I say in answer to the gentleman that the Commission will file its reports soon. I believe the first report was filed today at noon. That was our schedule. Other reports will be filed every 2 or 3 or 4 days between now and March 13. Of course, the President cannot possibly get all of these matters before him before that time. It will take many months for him to act, but, in my opinion, he should not have permanent power to reorganize, because we want quick action.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER].

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote in support of the reorganization bill, H. R. 2361, but I am going to do so with full knowledge of the fact that we are passing on to our President a job that Congress has repeatedly tried to do and failed.

I am supporting the measure because I think the recommendation of the committee ought to be carried out in the interest of economy and better service.

The only thing that gives me concern in the enactment of this bill is the knowledge that no matter what kind of reorganization measure the President may propose he is sure to be condemned by part of the people on the ground that it does not go far enough and by everybody else on the ground that it goes too far. In other words, whatever measures are offered will lead only to criticism.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. KARSTEN].

Mr. KARSTEN. Mr. Chairman, for the past 15 years I have been connected with the Executive Expenditures Committee in one capacity or another. During that period I have seen many reorganization proposals, but in my opinion the bill we have before us today is the best reorganization legislation that has ever been presented to the House.

In the strict sense of the word, this bill is not in itself a reorganization bill. Rather, it is the mechanical device with which a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government can be accomplished. The bill sets up a simplified method for revising the organization of the Government through the cooperation of the President and the Congress. The legislation authorizes the President to submit to the Congress plans for reorganizations of agencies and functions of the executive branch. These plans will become effective after 60 days unless they are rejected by a majority vote of the two Houses. In adopting this legislation we reserve to the Congress the right to veto any proposed reorganization plan with which we may not agree. The advantage of this mechanical device is that it enables the President, who has the immediate responsibility for effective administration, to initiate improvement in organization, subject to the review and rejection by Congress. The passage of this bill is the first step that must be taken to bring about any reorganization of the 1,800 offices, bureaus, commissions, administrations, and departments, which make up our Government today.

A year and a half ago the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments reported a resolution to the House providing for the establishment of a Commission To Study the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government with the view of recommending improvements. This resolution was passed unanimously. The Commission was set up and chose as its Chairman, former President Herbert Hoover. It is composed of two Representatives of the Congress, two Members of the other body, two administrators of the executive branch, and six private citizens. The Commission has made an extensive study of the administration of the Government and within the coming weeks will submit many recommendations for improving the Federal structure. The committee had the privilege of hearing Mr. Hoover and he pointed out that passage of this bill is absolutely necessary if we are to bring about a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. His testimony made clear that many of the most important recommendations of this Commission can be accomplished only if Congress adopts legislation as provided in this bill.

I believe all of us will agree that keeping the executive branch of the Government in good order is a continuing operation. Reorganization of the Government is not a one-time undertaking. Almost every administration for the past hundred years has urged Federal reorganization but none has brought any major overhaul of the executive agencies.

At the present time agencies of related objectives are scattered all over the Government. There are many Government offices duplicating the same type of work as other agencies. Perhaps not all of such activities can be concentrated in one agency, but we can certainly improve the existing governmental structure.

Practically all of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee felt that this bill should be passed. Of course, we have had the same requests for exemptions that have heretofore been made in connection with legislation of this character. In writing this bill, however, we made no exemptions. The history of this type of legislation shows that where one exemption is made that exemption becomes the basis for others. To make all of the exemptions that would ordinarily be requested in connection with a bill of this kind would destroy its effectiveness. Instead of a bill to facilitate governmental reorganization, we would simply wind up with a bill of exemptions.

In writing this bill, however, we have recognized the desirability of adopting the single reorganization plan method insofar as the National Military Establishment is concerned as well as the major quasi-judicial agencies. The bill does not exempt these agencies from reorganization, but simply provides that any plan for their reorganization must be submitted singly rather than in a general proposal that might affect other Government offices. In this way, Congress will have the opportunity to vote separately on the controversial fields of Federal reorganization.

Suppose, for example, that the Corps of Engineers of the Army is involved in a reorganization plan. That plan can relate only to the National Military Establishment, of which the Engineers is a part. It cannot be tied in with a plan to reorganize some other Government agency. This will certainly assure adequate protection for the so-called controversial agencies.

I do not want to engage in a constitutional discussion, but in my opinion this bill certainly creates no dictatorial powers. In proposing that the President take the initiative and originate plans for the redistribution of executive agencies, Congress reserves a veto power over such plans that he may submit. As you know, the President also has the power of veto. This idea is not a new one. It was first recommended in 1931 by former President Hoover and it has been passed in this House in several reorganization bills since 1939. It is true that the constitutional authority to legislate is vested in the Congress, but this bill does not in any way divest Congress of its legislative prerogative. The bill contains no ban nor limitation on the Congress or its right to legislate. Rather than a limitation, this legislation is an implementation of the legislative prerogative of the Congress.

I hope that the House will adopt this bill and that it will be passed without adding a lot of exemptions. We have the opportunity now to make a major contribution in bringing about greater efficiency in the operation of our governmental offices and departments. It is our responsibility to see that these departments and agencies are as efficient as they can be made, which in turn will be reflected economy and savings to the people we represent.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK].

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in support of this measure, the Reorganization Act of 1949, and to go on record as saying that I am in full accord with its objectives and provisions. The House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has submitted this bill to the House and recommended its passage only after extensive hearings, careful study, and deliberation, and I am convinced that it offers a workable method of executive-legislative cooperation for making changes in the Federal administrative organization to promote efficiency and economy in Government.

This is a simple bill—it contains no bugs or hidden jokers—its provisions can easily be understood by everyone. The purposes of this bill now under consideration are to reduce expenditures and promote economy in Government—to provide better service to the American people at less cost to the American taxpayer. This end is to be achieved through the regrouping and consolidation of agencies and functions into a more orderly and integrated administrative organization, and in this way eliminate the overlapping of functions and duplication of effort in our Government.

The procedure established by this bill to bring about a reorganization of the administration is simple and workable—it merely provides that the President shall examine the administrative set-up from time to time from the viewpoint of obtaining more efficient and economical execution of Federal policy, and present recommendations for any adjustments in the form of reorganization plans for the consideration of Congress. Such plans shall go into effect after 60 legislative days unless Congress, through concurrent resolution passed by both Houses, rejects said plan. In other words, the President initiates plans for reorganization, and the Congress reviews, ratifies, or rejects such plans. This is a democratic procedure to which there should be no objections.

The need for a general overhauling of our administration has been recognized

by every President since Theodore Roosevelt, and by every responsible student of government. Today the Federal administration is a great sprawling labyrinth of agencies—there are over 1,800 of these bureaus, departments, commissions, divisions, administrations, and offices which have accumulated by legislative and executive actions throughout the years. Within this maze of agencies there is considerable overlapping of functions, conflicts of jurisdiction, competition between different agencies, waste, and working at cross-purposes. As a result of this multiplicity and overlap of agencies, there is a great deal of red tape, confusion, and inefficiency.

Now, I am not blaming anyone for this condition. The fact is that our huge administrative mechanism has, as a result of the needs of the people for new services and the demand of two world wars, been built up without plan or design, like the barns, shacks, silos, toolsheds, and garages of an old farm, to become a veritable jungle of unrelated units and services. As a result the President cannot properly execute the laws for which he is held responsible—he is forced to waste his time dealing with some 45 to 80 agencies which report directly to him, and which prevent him from concentrating on the more important duties of his office.

Mr. Chairman, Congress is obligated to take action to remedy this disorganized state of affairs, and the path to follow has been well defined. As the result of research, investigation, and practical experience in business and government, certain well-established principles of organization have developed, and are now generally accepted as the fundamentals of sound public administration. These guiding principles said to be basic in the reorganization of government may be summarized as follows:

First. The functions of government should be grouped into a few orderly departments, with each department being responsible for carrying out all related functions contributing to one major objective;

Second. Each major department should be headed by an administrator appointed by and responsible to the President, thus giving the Chief Executive power to effectively control and direct the administration;

Third. The President should not have more than 20 agency heads reporting to him directly, thus freeing him from the mass of administrative detail, and permitting him to devote his time to major questions of policy;

Fourth. The lines of authority within the departments should be clearly defined and direct from the upper to the lower levels of the administrative hierarchy; and

Fifth. Purely administrative functions should be separated from quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions, with the latter being placed under the jurisdiction of autonomous boards and commissions.

These are the standards of sound public administration, and the goals toward which we move in seeking more efficiency in government. This reorganization bill is the first step—the enabling step—toward sound management in our Federal Government. I am sure that its passage will provide better service and more efficient management at less cost to the people of the United States, and I call upon the Congress to enact it into law.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, for a great many years the question of reorganizing the executive agencies of our Government has been a matter of concern, not only to the Congress but to every taxpayer. The subject is not new but the need for reorganization is continually getting more acute.

The number of executive agencies has increased with every Congress and their fields of activity have been expanded.

This situation has brought about many instances of overlapping jurisdictions and duplication of effort which have been accompanied by inefficiency, wastefulness, and ineffectiveness.

Everyone who has any contact with the Federal agencies recognizes the existence of the situation and sees an urgent need for better utilizing the manpower on the Federal pay roll.

The subject has been much discussed but few worthwhile results have been achieved. This is a problem of tremendous magnitude which the Eightieth Congress recognized. Two years ago we passed legislation which resulted in the establishment of the Commission headed by former President Hoover. That Commission has been at work for nearly 2 years making exhaustive studies of our governmental set-up and soon its reports will be submitted to us and to the President with recommendations for remedial action.

The bill before us today will provide a vehicle for the effectuation of recommendations based on the studies of the Hoover Commission. Without this legislation much of the value of the work the Commission has done will be lost.

During the hearings conducted before our committee, many people denounced the existing situation and spoke of "deadwood" in the executive agencies. It is significant, however, that many of the witnesses, while espousing the cause of reorganization, sought exemptions for specific agencies in which they or their constituents were personally interested. This brings into point the need for giving to the President the authority to make recommendations of corrections under legislation which will assure prompt and positive action.

In the testimony it was frequently stated that Congress increases agencies and authorizes additions to the Federal pay roll, but seldom finds it expedient to eliminate an agency or to reduce the number of Federal employees. It is difficult for us who are charged with overall legislative responsibility to visualize specific needs for reorganization and the very nature of the legislative process makes it essential that the President be given a freer hand in revamping the agencies he administers and in eliminating such agencies as are unnecessary, or the functions of such agencies when they are duplicating services performed by other agencies.

In the past we have had similar authority conferred upon the President, but in each instance it has been so circumscribed by exemptions and provisions for special treatment to specific gencies that it has made the problems of the President extremely difficult. In the legislation before us no exemptions are provided and the President will be enabled to recommend reorganization plans in keeping with the needs which are obvious to him and without regard to special interests.

Even so, the legislation provides ample safeguards for the protection of the legislative functions of Congress through the provision by which the Congress can disapprove a plan recommended by the President and thereby make it inoperative. In order to prevent undue delay, the legislation provides for a 60-day period within which the Congress must act if it disapproves of the reorganization plan.

I think it should be pointed out that under this legislation the President can merely transfer agencies or functions of agencies or abolish agencies or functions of agencies. He cannot broaden the authority of any agency beyond that which has already been provided by law. Neither can he establish or abolish completely any executive department whose head has Cabinet status.

We talk efficiency and economy. We all know that it is urgent, especially during this period of international unrest when it is necessary that we make large expenditures in the interest of national security. Our internal economic conditions require maximum efficiency. Let us therefore proceed speedily to pass this legislation in order that the effectiveness of our domestic agencies may be increased, that the expenditures for essential services to our people may be reduced, and that our gigantic governmental activities may be put on a more businesslike basis. I hope this legislation will pass in its present form. I hope that the Members of this body will view the subject from its broadest aspects and will vote for this legislation without seeking to incorporate amendments to give special treatment to pet agencies. If we are in earnest about desiring efficiency and economy in Government, about reducing the Federal pay roll, and making better utilization of the services of Federal employees, we will act speedily to pass this legislation as it has been recommended by the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I speak in favor of the passage of this bill to provide for the reorganization of the Government agencies, and for other purposes.

After a careful reading of the hearings before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, a copy of which hearings is furnished us with a

copy of this most important bill, I conclude that Congress itself must recognize that Congress itself is not qualified, because of lack of time, opportunity, and training, to itself enter into the field of reorganization of Government agencies in the executive or administrative branches thereof. This being true, the President of the United States and his associates must have the power.

Evidence shows that for several years Congress has undertaken to pass a reorganization bill from which would flow savings of the taxpayers' money and increased efficiency; but in this bill it appears plainly to me that here is the opportunity for the best piece of legislation in this field yet enacted, or considered.

For instance, it provides no exemptions; it provides no time limit; and there is no limitation either to begin or to end, so that the President has opportunity to come before Congress with his planned reorganization at such time as he is ready to do so. The bill provides that he must examine and reexamine the reorganization of all agencies of Government and must determine what change shall be necessary to accomplish six worthy objectives, which are:

First. To promote the better execution of laws.

Second. To reduce expenditures and promote economies to the fullest extent consistent with operational government.

Third. To increase the efficiency of the operations of government.

Fourth. To group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of government according to major purposes, as nearly as may be possible.

Fifth. To reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of government.

Sixth. To eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

Mr. Chairman, if we were operating our own private business establishments or if we were in the employ of any of the great successful American corporations, these six objectives would be continuously called to our attention as worthy and essential. And, just because we are employed by the American taxpayers is no reason that these same six objectives should not be continuously before our great Government. Efficiency and operation of major objectives at a minimum of expense is not less essential in government than it is in private business.

The two living men best qualified to tell us their considered opinion have given us their joint opinion on the objectives of this bill—President Herbert Hoover, who happens to be a registered Republican, and President Harry Truman, who happens to be a registered Democrat. These two great Americans have joined forces and have made a recommendation to us as representatives of the people. If experience ever talks, here is where it should talk; and these two great leaders of American executive responsibilities, both past and present, tell us plainly that this bill is the bill which should pass. I am willing to take the strong recommendations of these two men. Their interests have been and are the interests of the American people in these matters.

The bill clearly protects the interests of the American people by providing that the President shall first submit proposed changes to the United States Congress; and, then, the bill gives us, as representatives of the taxpayers, a 60-day period within which to state in writing our objections. This certainly is time enough for us to act and is fair to Congress and does not hold the President up too long.

I shall vote for the bill as the committee has reported it and desires it to be enacted. This is in the interests of the public welfare.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2361. It is apparent to me after a careful reading of the testimony of the witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the interest of this legislation that there is a drastic and immediate need for the passage of this type of reorganization legislation.

I have paid particular attention to the testimony of a fine American and may I add one of the few Americans who has had actual experience and, with the exception of our present President, is best qualified to speak in behalf of this measure. I refer to former President Herbert Hoover. I realize, of course, that Mr. Hoover has presented not only his own views, but, as chairman of the so-called Hoover Commission, he is speaking for all of the outstanding men who comprise that Commission. In addition to his opinion, we have the benefit of the experience of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, who has served as a Member of Congress and has spent many years following the subject of this legislation with extreme care. His past position, coupled with the high position he now holds, lends great weight to the force of his testimony.

The constant and steady growth of the Government of this great Nation has produced overlapping and duplication to such an extent that it is not only wasteful from a monetary standpoint but has produced great inefficiency and in many instances we have found Government departments working at odds with one another.

Every Member of Congress should read carefully, not only the testimony of these two important witnesses but the majority report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The passage of this bill will and should pave the way for more efficient government and for greater economy.

It is obvious, as we witness the increase in the national budget from year to year, that we must exert every effort to streamline our Government, eliminating waste in the interests of economy and for the benefit of taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,—*

TITLE I

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This act may be cited as the "Reorganization Act of 1949."

NEED FOR REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) The President shall examine and from time to time reexamine the organization of all agencies of the Government and shall determine what changes therein are necessary to accomplish the following purposes:

(1) to promote the better execution of the laws, the more effective management of the executive branch of the Government and of its agencies and functions, and the expeditious administration of the public business;

(2) to reduce expenditures and promote economy, to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of the Government;

(3) to increase the efficiency of the operations of the Government to the fullest extent practicable;

(4) to group, coordinate, and consolidate agencies and functions of the Government, as nearly as may be, according to major purposes;

(5) to reduce the number of agencies by consolidating those having similar functions under a single head, and to abolish such agencies or functions thereof as may not be necessary for the efficient conduct of the Government; and

(6) to eliminate overlapping and duplication of effort.

(b) The Congress declares that the public interest demands the carrying out of the purposes specified in subsection (a) and that such purposes may be accomplished in great measure by proceeding under the provisions of this act, and can be accomplished more speedily thereby than by the enactment of specific legislation.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 3. Whenever the President, after investigation, finds that—

(1) the transfer of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, to the jurisdiction and control of any other agency; or

(2) the abolition of all or any part of the functions of any agency; or

(3) the consolidation or coordination of the whole or any part of any agency, or of the whole or any part of the functions thereof, with the whole or any part of any other agency or the functions thereof; or

(4) the consolidation or coordination of any part of any agency or the functions thereof with any other part of the same agency or the functions thereof; or

(5) the authorization of any officer to delegate any of his functions; or

(6) the abolition of the whole or any part of any agency which agency or part does not have, or upon the taking effect of the reorganization plan will not have, any functions,

is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a), he shall prepare a reorganization plan for the making of the reorganizations as to which he has made findings and which he includes in the plan, and transmit such plan (bearing an identifying number) to the Congress, together with a declaration that, with respect to each reorganization included in the plan, he has found that such reorganization is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes of section 2 (a). The delivery to both Houses shall be on the same day and shall be made to each House while it is in session. The President, in his message transmitting a reorganization plan, shall specify with respect to each abolition of a function included in the plan the statutory authority for the exercise of such function.

OTHER CONTENTS OF PLANS

SEC. 4. Any reorganization plan transmitted by the President under section 3—

(1) shall change, in such cases as he deems necessary, the name of any agency affected by a reorganization, and the title of its head; and shall designate the name of any agency resulting from a reorganization and the title of its head;

(2) may include provisions for the appointment and compensation of the head and one or more other officers of any agency

(including an agency resulting from a consolidation or other type of reorganization) if the President finds, and in his message transmitting the plan declares, that by reason of a reorganization made by the plan such provisions are necessary. The head so provided for may be an individual or may be a commission or board with two or more members. In the case of any such appointment the term of office shall not be fixed at more than four years, the compensation shall not be at a rate in excess of that found by the President to prevail in respect of comparable officers in the executive branch, and, if the appointment is not under the classified civil service, it shall be by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

(3) shall make provision for the transfer or other disposition of the records, property, and personnel affected by any reorganization;

(4) shall make provision for the transfer of such unexpended balances of appropriations, and of other funds, available for use in connection with any function or agency affected by a reorganization, as he deems necessary by reason of the reorganization for use in connection with the functions affected by the reorganization, or for the use of the agency which shall have such functions after the reorganization plan is effective, but such unexpended balances so transferred shall be used only for the purposes for which such appropriation was originally made;

(5) shall make provision for winding up the affairs of any agency abolished.

LIMITATIONS ON POWERS WITH RESPECT TO REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 5. (a) No reorganization plan shall provide for, and no reorganization under this act shall have the effect of—

(1) abolishing or transferring an executive department or all the functions thereof, establishing any new executive department, designating any agency as "Department" or its head as "Secretary," or consolidating any two or more executive departments or all the functions thereof; or

(2) continuing any agency beyond the period authorized by law for its existence or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(3) continuing any function beyond the period authorized by law for its exercise, or beyond the time when it would have terminated if the reorganization had not been made; or

(4) authorizing any agency to exercise any function which is not expressly authorized by law at the time the plan is transmitted to the Congress; or

(5) increasing the term of any office beyond that provided by law for such office; or

(6) transferring to or consolidating with any other agency the municipal government of the District of Columbia or all those functions thereof which are subject to this act, or abolishing said government or all said functions.

(b) A reorganization plan providing for a reorganization affecting any agency named below in this subsection may not provide also for a reorganization which does not affect such agency; except that this prohibition shall not apply to the transfer to such agency of the whole or any part of, or the whole or any part of the functions of, any agency not so named. No provision contained in a reorganization plan shall take effect if the reorganization plan is in violation of this subsection. The agencies above referred to in this subsection are as follows: National Military Establishment, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Interstate Commerce Commission, and Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 7, after line 20, insert a new section as follows——

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman is offering a new section. I have an amendment that I want to offer to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Do I understand the gentleman from Michigan is offering a new section?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am offering a new subdivision under section 5, following subsection (b).

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the Chair advise me whether or not the offering of the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan adding a new section or paragraph will preclude me from offering my amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Not if the gentleman's amendment is otherwise in order.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 7, after line 20, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"(c) No reorganization specified in the reorganization plan shall take effect unless the plan is submitted to Congress before January 20, 1953."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment which would bring about a limitation upon the power; that is, instead of its being permanent legislation it would be limited to January 20, 1953, which would be the date of the expiration of the President's term of office.

I may say that this amendment was drawn by legislative counsel from the Comptroller General's office. This language is word for word, period, comma, and semicolon the same as the previous law. There should be some limitation upon this legislation, although some Members will probably reply that Mr. Hoover said that is not so. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I hear you gentlemen on the Democratic side quoting Mr. Hoover. I wish in previous years, in other campaigns, other elections, along in some October, all down through October and up to election day in November, you gentlemen had quoted Mr. Hoover with a little more appreciation than you did.

Many, many times from the well of the House I have heard members of the party to which the gentlemen who are now quoting Mr. Hoover with approval, who are now citing him as the embodiment of all wisdom and all patriotism, charge that almost everything disagreeable that happened to this country between January of 1928 and the day of the convening of the Eighty-first Congress was due to the mistakes, the lack of wisdom, the unsound policies, of this same Herbert Hoover.

Had Mr. Hoover's reorganization plan been accepted by a Democratic Congress, some of the evils which you seek to cure now might have been ended years ago.

Had his views been given just a little of the consideration which you now claim for them, it might not only have helped some of us on this side, but the country might have been saved billions of dollars, given greater efficiency, and the executive department might have been now operating in an efficient, economical way.

But we are willing to forget your previous criticism of our former President and his views. Many of us are happy, are thankful, to know that, at this late day, you are now recognizing the ability, the straightforwardness, of our great former President, who was so unmercifully pilloried during the years which have elapsed since he left the office.

If some of you now appreciate Mr. Hoover and his service to his country, there should be at least as much rejoicing as there was over the finding of the sheep which was lost and returned to the fold. You know what they said about that fellow who was saved at the last moment. I am glad so many have been converted to at least some of Mr. Hoover's views. Enough of that.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman means Mr. Hoover who appeared before the committee?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BONNER. I am thinking of Mr. Hoover as the Chairman of the Commission. I am not thinking of Mr. Hoover as a political candidate or as a former President. I take it that Mr. Hoover was not expressing entirely his own views with respect to reorganization. I take it he brought to the committee the joint views of the members of the Commission. It was a nonpartisan Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot yield any more.

Mr. BONNER. I just wanted the RECORD to show that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. My only point is that today so many Members of the House, so many people in this country, have recognized that there is something good in some of Mr. Hoover's views. It is an acknowledgment of a great service which has been too long delayed. That is the only point I was trying to make at this time. Conversion long delayed is a good thing, even if it comes a little late.

If the gentleman knew as much about the workings of this Commission as some other folks he would know that it was not altogether a body of but one mind, and I think Mr. Hoover has from time to time changed his views as the matter went along.

Let us get down to the pending amendment. Some day the gentleman who holds the office of President at the present time will die. He will no longer be President. He may not even be elected to a third term. No one knows who is going to be President in the future, and I want to know what you gentlemen on the other side of the aisle are going to do and where you will be if along comes a President as has a previous President and sends down a reorganization plan which takes over so many of these agen-

cies, for example the USES, and puts it in the Labor Department. The House killed that one twice.

What are you going to do if you should get a President like Mr. Wallace, for example, or some other man, or even the present President who apparently gets his views on labor legislation from the Labor Department, from Phil Murray and from the CIO, and he should send down here a reorganization plan putting the Conciliation Service, the Labor Relations Board, and all of their functions in the Labor Department? What are you going to do if you have a filibuster over in the Senate and a plan like that is not acted on in 60 days? You are going to swallow it lock, stock, and barrel. We ought to think about that.

There should be some limitation on the President's power. There should be an opportunity for the House as well as for the Senate to vote on any plan he sends down here. Both House and Senate should be forced to act. You see where you are getting? You have Phil Murray sitting here on one side, John Gibson of the CIO, and Tobin of the Labor Department sitting on the other side of the President and from that combination down comes a plan, as came down this demand that we repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and go back to the old Wagner Act—a plan which the House does not like, which the House rejects unanimously, but which under this bill may still become the law of the land, either because a majority of the Senate does like it or because of a filibuster which prevents action by the Senate.

Just as sure as you adopt this plan, you some day may have a bill which neither the House nor the Senate would pass becoming the law of the land, rammed down your neck, and you will not like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would make the bill in that respect just like all of those that have gone before. Nothing has been done under the other bills so far. We speak of Mr. Hoover with reverence because we believe that from his experience as President of these United States he did learn some very valuable lessons that can serve us in this day. The House must have believed that when he is serving now as chairman of one of the greatest commissions this Congress has ever authorized. I do not believe there is any greater patriot in this country than our former President. We look upon him equally with all other great patriots. But he has something that no other man has; that is experience. He has been the President. He has gone through this. He asked for reorganization in his day. One of his last acts was to request that a reorganization measure might be passed in order to enable his successor to do the things that he never had an opportunity to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I did not disturb you, sir. I will not yield at this point.

So, he gave us his experience, and this committee used it. The same way with our present President. We do not question his patriotism. We do not question his love of country. I do not believe that he can be influenced by any outside influence any more than any Member of this House can be influenced by outside influence. Had you been a member of this committee you would know how much influence has been brought to bear upon the members of this committee by various agencies in order to take themselves out of the workings of this bill. But, we are bringing in a bill that we believe is the best that can be had and that we believe will do the job.

If you are going to question the integrity of somebody, then perhaps we ought to start off with a President and a former President. If you are going to agree that they have equal love of country with us, then we ought to use the valuable experience that they have gained, in arriving at a determination which brought this bill about.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. DAWSON. I do not yield at this point.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But you are misquoting him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DAWSON. So, both the present President, whom you are going to charge with this responsibility, and a past President, who has had experience and can talk to us from the viewpoint of experience, ask you to take off that handicap, ask you to make this permanent legislation, ask you to give every President the responsibility of a power to do the thing which you say is necessary to be done and that only a President can do. Sure, you have had this argument in past reorganization plans, and the thing that you did then has been one of the handicaps in bringing about new organization plans.

So, I am going to ask the members of this committee, in the light of past experience, in the light of testimony of these witnesses, in the light of the job to be done for the people of this Nation, that is, setting in motion machinery that can wipe out this overlapping, that can do away with these unnecessary functions, that can streamline the operations of government, even as big business must do today, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] said, to accept the bill as recommended by the committee. Big business has streamlined its own affairs. Gone are the methods of yesterday. No good businessman would stand for his organization to be in the shape that our executive department is in today.

So, I am asking you to stand back of this committee which has given a good deal of thought to this thing, heard witnesses upon it, and have brought you their sober judgment that permanent legislation is necessary in order to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statements made by the chairman of our committee. I agree in a great measure with those statements. However, during the discussion of this legislation I asked that we set a termination date that this legislation might expire on. When I asked Mr. Hoover whether it should not expire in 8 years, he made the statement that he hoped it would not be necessary to continue it that long. I spoke to our committee about the 8 years, and they thought that it was too long. I was under the impression all the time that we were going to have this legislation expire in not over 4 years.

The situation is just this: We have built up this great organization of government for 150 years, and now we are going to try to readjust it. This commission has spent a couple of years getting ready the suggestions upon which the President will act, and under this amendment the President will have 3 years from this time to see that they are consummated. It seems to me it is only wise that a termination date be placed on this legislation, regardless of whether you make it 3, 4, 5, or 6 years. The amendment the gentleman has offered provides, I think, for 3 years. I cannot for the life of me see why it would not be the wise thing to do.

I quite disagree with my chairman on that one point. Otherwise, he has been handling the affairs of this committee in fine shape and has been doing a good job. I admire the way he has handled the committee. I take my hat off to him. But I do think we could put a limitation on the time for which this legislation is to extend and it would be in the best interest of the country. Speaking for myself, I shall vote for this amendment, and I hope the Members of the House will see fit to terminate this power at some time. If you pass this legislation and have no termination date, you will always be in turmoil. You will never know when a reorganization plan might be sent down from the White House, regardless of who the President might be, and at some time it will catch somebody napping and they will not be prepared for it. However, as long as we have the chairman we have now, and as long as we know there is something coming, we will be expecting plans to come in here in the next 2 or 3 years, so that if we are on the anxious seat and are waiting for something, and do not want it to pass, we will take action and see that it does not pass. However, if we let this thing ride along, I can see where damage might happen to this Government that might be irreparable.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. Assuming the bill should pass as it is, without the amendment, could not any future Congress or could not this present Congress repeal it if it wanted to?

Mr. RICH. Yes, sure; we have lots of laws. That same thing applies to just

what is trying to transpire here now. The Congress can change it, but we will not do it; that is the point. You can get action when you have a termination date or have something to do and you know you are going to do it. If you know you are going to die in 2 weeks from now you will make a will, if you do not have one already; but you say, "Oh, I can make a will any time," and you just let it ride on and on, and then you do not do it. That is the point I am trying to bring out.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this matter I would say is not of tremendous and vital importance. It is a matter of policy. It is a matter which, if decided either way, would not vitally ruin the bill or vitally make the bill. It is a matter of policy which has been decided, on mature consideration, by the members of the committee after having heard testimony before the committee.

In the first place, the President has asked for this power to be made a matter of permanent legislation, and I will get to the points supporting permanent legislation in just a moment.

In the second place, the chairman of our committee asked this question of Mr. Hoover when he was before the committee, and you will find this testimony on page 137 of the hearings:

The CHAIRMAN. This bill, Mr. Hoover, is to be permanent legislation? There has been some discussion as to whether or not it should be limited to the term of the President and then a new bill drawn as a new President comes in. Can you give us your opinion on that subject, sir?

Mr. HOOVER. My opinion is that it ought to be permanent legislation because the executive branch of the Government is a constantly changing body. We need no better proof of that than the growth in the number of agencies from 350 to 1,800. I would expect a constant shift in the focus of government giving emphasis to first one type of action and then to another, with the development of new phases of such action, all of which must be constantly refitted into the whole pattern of the executive branch.

This is not just one action of one administration or one President, it is a continuous operation. As long as the Congress has the veto, I do not see that there is any great danger in conferring such a power.

I want to point out to you that in the 1932 Reorganization Act we gave to President Roosevelt a permanent type of legislation. This is an answer to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who is my colleague on the committee, when he said that Congress would not do this. In the amended 1933 form, however, the Congress did take away the permanent type of legislation and set a limitation upon the time. That shows that Congress can, has, and could in the future function in regard to the termination of the power. The reorganization of the government is not a one-time undertaking. It is conceived as a continuing problem. Our Government is not a static type of government. It is a constantly growing and changing type of government. Every action which the Congress takes and every law which is passed by the Congress which changes the administrative function or adds to or takes from such functions, creates a different situation in administrative powers. Therefore, there is constantly before the President the need of reorganization. That is why we are asking for permanent legislation. If at any time the President misuses that type of power, we can limit it by legislative enactment. We can speed up his action by bringing before the Congress an act which says that by a certain day he shall take such-and-such an action or the power shall be taken away from him.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. In the hearings on page 143 I asked Mr. Hoover the following question:

How long do you think it will require the present President or any future Presidents to accomplish everything that should be attained in this legislation?

Mr. Hoover replied:

Well, Mr. RICH, there are two steps here. One of them is to get a definite plan and have it approved by the Congress, or, rather, have the Congress leave it alone; and the other is the taking of a number of individual steps that will each require specific legislation. I take it that we will be in the throes of reorganization even with the utmost cooperation for at least over a year before we will get the machine working and in a position to give us the subsequent benefits. This is no easy task.

Then I asked him this question:

Therefore, it is going to take a lot of time; even 6 or 8 years would not be too long for the Chief Executive to have his organization get things in preparation to make suggestions, would it?

Mr. Hoover said—and this is the point I want to make:

It certainly is quite a period. I hope it is not that long because I would like to live to see the end of it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Hoover, of course, was referring in that conversation, as I take it, to the Hoover Commission reports, and it is not conceded that the Hoover Commission reports will be the last attempt to reorganize the administrative part of our Government machinery.

Mr. RICH. I have been trying my best to make it clear that what I wanted to know was how long it would take the President to effect this organization.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the gentleman does not want the House to think that once action is taken on the present Hoover Commission reports that that will end for all time the necessity for continuing scrutiny of government and continuing reorganization.

Mr. RICH. Oh, no; I would not want to try to fool anybody any place anytime. I want to be straight, open, and aboveboard, and tell them just what I think. If anybody has the idea that I am trying to fool anybody I wish that they would get that out of their mind.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know the gentleman is not trying to fool anyone, but I just wanted to clarify a point in the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize there is a great deal of good in the Hoover Commission report and a great deal of good in this bill. I recognize the imperative need for reorganization in Government and greater efficiency in Government and for more economies and for the reduction of expenses; but I want to take this time to voice this serious thought with reference to the Army engineers:

This bill goes as far as the committee felt it should go with reference to assisting in the demand which I hear voiced in this Congress regarding the administrative integrity of the Army engineers. This bill separates the program of reorganization so that any plan involving the national defense will come back separately to the Congress and therefore receive a separate vote. However, I feel that the Army engineers have done such a grand job, both in peace and in war, that no reorganization of the Army engineers should occur. I wanted to take just this moment to voice this opinion. I have made a study of the work, as I am sure have a great many other Members of Congress. The Army engineers have done a wonderful job and they are now doing a magnificent job.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Does not the argument which the gentleman is advancing with reference to the Army engineers apply equally to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps?

Mr. BROOKS. In a sense it applies equally; but in another sense I do not think it does apply equally. The Army engineers are in a peculiar position. The Army engineers perform in time of war as a part of our national defense. In time of peace the Army engineers perform as a part of our peacetime set-up. They perform differently from any other agency of Government. That is the reason I felt that I should take this brief opportunity to voice the serious concern which I feel in reference to any effort to change the Army engineers, in the handling of their civil functions as given to them by the Congress.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. As the gentleman may know, there is a provision in the bill, on page 7, which would require that in respect to four named agencies, any reorganization proposal must come up in respect to them apart from and independent of any other proposal. One of those so referred to is the National Military Establishment.

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HALLECK. It has been represented to me by some members of the Committee on Armed Services that that definition is broad enough to include the civil functions of the Army engineers. I am wondering if the gentleman so interprets it, or the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] so interprets it.

Mr. BROOKS. That is my interpretation. I will say I have discussed the bill with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and with other Members, and I personally feel it is broad enough to cover the civil functions of the Army

engineers. But I cannot fail to feel some serious concern regarding any proposal that would seek to change the set-up by which the Army engineers handle the civil functions of the War Department.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder, for future use in determining the legislative intent, if some members of the committee on the majority side would say whether the language includes the Army engineers.

Mr. BROOKS. I trust the Members, by exercising use of the time they have in the course of debate, will express themselves. I am sorry that time does not permit at this time for them to express themselves. I want to continue to say that I have seen the work of the Army engineers in time of war and I think they must continue to have peacetime work to train them for emergencies. They must have "civil functions work" in time of peace, in order that they be an efficient, hard-working force in our national defense organization in time of war. I hope that no plan of reorganization coming to this body will take any present powers from them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana who has just spoken has raised a very important question, and our distinguished former leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has tried to clarify that. I think this is the right time to have an expression from the chairman of the committee, because, if this does not include the civil functions of the Army engineers I am sure the temper of this House is such that we can insert language that will do that. I would like to hear the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs on this proposition.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I suggest to the Committee in the interest of orderly procedure that we dispose of the Hoffman amendment and then later deal with the question that has been raised by the gentleman from Louisiana as well as the gentleman from Ohio. We are beginning to get just a little bit confused. The question raised by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is whether this legislation should be permanent or whether it should terminate in 1953. When we come to the section dealing with the Military Establishment we will have a clear opportunity to debate the question.

Mr. JENKINS. I may say to the gentleman from Georgia that I agree with him that that will be the logical place to discuss this, but, inasmuch as it has been injected into the debate, I think it should be clarified now. What I want is that the Army engineers be not disturbed in the work they do for civil activities of the Government. We all know that the Army engineers are one of the most efficient agencies of the Government, and I am sure that Congress will not do this group any injustice. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will introduce the proper amendment at the proper time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in relation to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] I hope that the Committee of the Whole will vote the amendment down. There are certain compelling reasons which prompt me to oppose his amendment. Experience has shown as a result of the passage of certain reorganization bills during the past 16 years or so that the fears we have entertained in the past need no longer be entertained by us. Furthermore, the reorganization of the executive branch is a continuing affair. I have no fear about a future President of the United States. I have no fear of a President after 1953; if it is not President Truman I have confidence that the man who will be in the White House will perform his duty in accordance with his trust and to the best of his ability, having in mind the best interests of our country and our people. I might disagree with him, but that is different from impugning his motives.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not saying that the gentleman does, that is not raised in the gentleman's amendment and I know it does not exist in the gentleman's mind, but I am expressing my thoughts as to why I oppose the amendment. In no way do I want my remarks to be construed by anyone as a thought on my part that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] entertains any opposite view to the one I have expressed in relation to confidence in the present or any future President. But I think we have had the experience that justifies us now in making permanent legislation out of a reorganization bill.

President Truman, in his message to Congress, specifically on two occasions emphasized that he hoped the Congress would pass a bill of a permanent nature; and former President Hoover, the only living ex-President we have with us today—and let us hope that he will be with us for many, many years to come—also is in complete agreement with President Truman. Each is in agreement with the other. Here we have one, the present President, one a former President, one elected as a Democrat, the other elected as a Republican, both urging the Congress of the United States to make this type of legislation permanent. I appreciate the fears entertained by those who want a limitation, and in disagreement I want any Member to know that I thoroughly respect his views and his right to entertain the views he has; but I think in the light of the evidence, in the light of the situation that confronts us now, and with our experience that we can take this step with permanent legislation particularly when two such eminent Americans as the President of the United States and a former President of the United States, both men of experience as Chief Executive of this country, are agreed on it.

One is the leader, from a party standpoint, of the Democratic Party. Notice I did not say as President, but as leader. As President he is President of all the people. He is a leader of the Democratic Party. No one will disagree with the statement that former President Hoover is one of the outstanding leaders of our country today and probably the recognized leader of the Republican Party. I think we can accept their judgment in the light of their past experience with confidence and vote to have this legislation permanent in nature.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. I concur in the estimate the gentleman has made of the two individuals of whom he has been speaking. If when the act expires we have a President in whom everybody has confidence there will of course be no difficulty in extending it. But if the day comes when we have a President in whom we do not have confidence, we cannot easily end the power granted. He would veto our action and it would require a two-thirds vote. A doctor hopes for the best but prepares for the worst. If we should someday get a man as President that we cannot trust, we have given away our chance of bringing this power back to the legislative body. It is just when we might want to take it back that we would find we cannot.

Mr. McCORMACK. I stated that I respect the views of those who disagree with me; however, I think my friend is reacting to fear.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment conclude in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, the only proposition involved here is whether or not we are going to make this a law of men or a law of the country. As I see it, under this proposal we are making the President of the United States supreme. It is my duty, after swearing to uphold the Constitution of the United States, to make this a country of laws and not of men. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this does not make it a country of laws but a country of men.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON. Does the gentleman appreciate that if there ever should come a time when we have a President in whom the Congress does not have confidence, and he sent down a reorganization plan to the Congress, the Congress could reject that plan?

Mr. NICHOLSON. We probably could.

Mr. DAWSON. Is it the gentleman's understanding of the bill that the power to reject is always in the Congress?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not think it is in the Congress. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan there is a limitation, namely, 1953. Under the bill as it is presently written they have an opportunity to keep it there forever, so far as he is concerned.

Mr. DAWSON. The President submits a plan to the Congress and the Congress can reject under the method provided by this bill. Is that the gentleman's understanding of the bill?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I know what the bill provides, but I have seen bills work. If a party is in control all the time, then they go along with the President, or I assume they do.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], hit the nail on the head when he said that we are placing a power in the hands of the President which in order to get back would require a two-thirds vote of the House and a two-thirds vote of the Senate in order to get it back into the hands of the Congress? Therefore we ought to have a time limit on this legislation. It seems to me that is most important. A lot of times some of you gentlemen have voted for legislation to give power to the Chief Executive and then have later regretted it. You had better be careful that you are not going to give away your birthright again.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I also agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD]. I am afraid of giving one man control of anything, and as long as we have an opportunity I think we ought to take advantage of it and go along with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. I have heard a great deal about putting a lot of trust in the Chief Executive. Does the gentleman not feel that we ought to have the same trust in this body 4 years from now; that it might be possible to extend the time if it was found necessary to be extended?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I want a law written on books so that we will know what the law is, and not depend upon whether a man is honest or dishonest or whether he is a good executive or a bad one. If you want to put something in the law, write it in there so that the people will know what it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: Page 7, line 20, after the word "commission" strike out the period and insert the following: "National Mediation Board, National Railroad Adjustment Board, Railroad Retirement Board, Federal Communications Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, United States Tariff Commission, National Labor Relations Board, Federal Trade Commission, and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, in general debate I spoke on this matter at some length and I do not know as it is necessary to repeat too much of that now. I recalled then and I think probably I should recall now, because some of you may not have been here, that as these basic reorganization proposals have come up here from time to time there has been experienced on both sides of the aisle a great concern about the possible threat to the independence of action of the great quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial bodies of the Government. They are the creatures of the Congress. They are to carry out the will of the Congress. They should not be subjected to political control and certainly their actions and their decisions which so vitally affect the economy of the country should not be in the realm of political action. That is why many of us through the years have sought to protect their independence. That generally took the effect of specific exemptions in the legislation that we passed. Most recently, in 1945, there were a number of specific exemptions, and there was also language in that act that undertook to prohibit the limitation of the exercise of the independence of these agencies in respect to their quasi-legislative and quasi-judicial functions. Also in the 1945 act was a new device. It was a device that did not provide for exemption, and this amendment that I have provides for no exemption, but that device simply said that in respect to these great agencies any reorganization proposal affecting them shall come up here independent of any other reorganization proposal.

That is just simply so the Congress could act on that proposal without any reference to any other proposal, and make its determination. I say it does provide some fair safeguard for the continuing independence of those agencies and at the same time can affect in no way the effective operation of this legislation.

If you have before you a copy of the bill, you will find on page 7, in subsection (b), in the last of that paragraph, four different agencies are so treated. They are not exempted, but it just simply is provided that separate plans shall come up for them. They are the National Military Establishment, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. My amendment would simply add to that list a list that I assume is in this legislation with administration approval—in fact, I know it is in there that way because it has been so stated in the papers.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is included in the list of four presently in the bill. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is the same kind of an agency. It regulates the air carriers just as the ICC regulates the surface carriers.

As I said earlier in the debate, I want to support this legislation. I am supporting it. I worked on the committee in support of it. I offered this amendment in the committee. If any of you thinks that someone in some agency has pressured me into offering this amendment, may I disabuse your mind. No one has spoken to me about it. My action in this regard comes only from a deep conviction about the matter and a deep sense of the responsibility that I feel I owe the country in respect to the preservation of the independence of action of these great agencies.

I trust that this amendment can be adopted. As I say, it is no exemption, let us understand that. It simply provides that in respect to any one of these agencies the matter would come here free and clear of any sort of an entanglement, before the Congress could act on it.

I recall how the gentleman from Georgia came before the committee to get in there the language "National Military Establishment." He was quite vehement and vigorous in his contentions before the committee. He said, "All we want is our day in court in the Congress of the United States. All we want is the right to come in before the Congress and debate whatever plan may be up there affecting the Military Establishment, and not have it involved with other considerations."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for one additional minute, so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I am very much interested in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Does the gentleman's amendment include that?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes, it does.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think that should not be disturbed.

Mr. HALLECK. That was given the same treatment in the 1945 act. Also the Railroad Retirement Board, the Mediation Board—I have that language here before me, but they were given the same treatment.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I certainly do not want this agency to go into the Federal Reserve.

Mr. HALLECK. I know many people have had concern about that.

This treatment in the 1945 act was accorded the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Veterans' Administration. I did not include the Veterans' Administration.

I might also add that there was specific exemption in the 1945 act for the National Mediation Board, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the civil functions of the Army engineers.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I congratulate the gentleman on leaving the Veterans' Administration out of the provisions of

his amendment because the Commission is making a special report to the Congress on the Veterans' Administration alone. The Veterans' Administration will be considered by the President and by the Congress as a single entity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have another illustration by the offering of this amendment of an experience in connection with this legislation. In the first bill there were 21 exemptions. That was due to fear. In a later bill there were 12 or 14 exemptions and they were based on fear. Of course, it was honestly entertained at the time. But as time passed on and we gained experience we realized that in many cases some of our fears were unjustified. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana will add a number of other agencies to the formula established by this bill in relation to the four agencies. The adoption of the amendment will only hinder reorganization and not help it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, this is not an exemption to begin with. But does the gentleman contend that the inclusion of the four agencies named in the bill is a hindrance to reorganization?

Mr. McCORMACK. I did not say that those were exemptions. I said they were additions to the formula already in the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. If the additions will hinder reorganization, then will the gentleman say that the inclusion of the four agencies hindered reorganization?

Mr. McCORMACK. They hinder it much less than if the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana is adopted. We are very practical men. We realize there were 21 exemptions in the first bill which were placed in the bill because of practical considerations. Then as we gained experience because of practical considerations there were 12 or 14 exemptions. Then we have had several more years of practical experience. As a result of that, we have had no exemptions, but specific reorganizations in the case of four of our agencies; that is, three agencies and one department. Again that is the result of practical experience. Now, what does former President Hoover say in his testimony on this particular subject?

The reasons for his views against any exemptions are:

> I do not know any method by which the Congress can make a differentiation of executive and quasi legislative and quasi judicial functions in these agencies. It might be possible to arrive at such a definition with regard to them, but we have to bear in mind that there are such functions—quasi-judicial and quasi-legislative—in practically every department of the Government. We immediately get into difficulties if we try to make definitions. On the other hand, it would seem to me that Congress has an ample check on any action that would undermine those judicial and legislative functions when the President makes his proposed plans, and I should not imagine he is going to propose to do otherwise than to remove purely executive functions.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Speaking of the matter of hindrance, the gentleman earlier referred to the reorganization proposal in respect to the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. As I remember it, that was carried through to a successful conclusion, and it came up here as an order standing by itself, and affecting nothing other than the Civil Aeronautics Administrator. So there was accomplishment under this very formula in respect to that agency.

Mr. McCORMACK. And the gentleman will remember the furor that was raised at the time, and the fears that were entertained that it was going to put the agency into politics and that decisions would be made along political lines, and that it would lose its independence, although it was given independence within the Department of Commerce. None of the dire predictions has resulted.

Earlier in the day I called attention to a situation where the intent of Congress in the establishment of independent agencies has outgrown itself. It is not a question of one or two agencies that are arms of the Congress. We now have many of them. They are performing both quasi-legislative, quasi-judicial, and executive functions. We have established for all practical purposes—and this has no application to the Department of National Defense, because that is a department in itself—we have established in these independent agencies, for all practical purposes, a fourth department of government, and it is not enumerated in the Constitution.

The adoption of this amendment now, in the light of the experience we have had, in my opinion, would be a serious hindrance to real reorganization, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this time is taken to state that if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON], speaking previously, intended to say that I had some distrust of the motives of either former President Hoover or the present occupant of the White House, he was completely mistaken. I am not distrusting anybody, and I want that made perfectly clear.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. DAWSON. I wish the gentleman to know I have the highest opinion of him and that no word of mine was intended to impute to the gentleman anything but the highest motives. My words were not calculated to state a feeling as stated by the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is very kind, and I thank the gentleman very, very much.

This amendment is not a move to exempt these agencies, neither the four nor the additional ones proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. If you will read the section, you will notice that all that section requires is that these plans, as to this, that, or the other department, come up one at a time; just one at a time, so that the Congress may have an opportunity to act intelligently on the plan.

You will all recall that some time ago the President sent up three or more reorganization plans. One of those plans included three separate and distinct proposals, and it was rejected. It was rejected because of the inclusion, with two good ones, of one that the Congress, both the House and the Senate, considered inadvisable. That is why I think the committee accepted the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], with reference to the Military Establishment. And then the others were added.

Now, the present amendment proposed by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] merely asks that these other departments be considered in the same way. If the President wants to send up a plan, he should send it up in one package—not two, but one—so that the Congress will have an opportunity, both Houses, to act. We can get along with this thing very quickly.

When he was on the floor before the gentleman from Indiana asked the gentleman from Illinois to yield, the gentleman from Illinois yielded. Then the gentleman from Indiana said:

> I am wondering if the gentleman would agree with me that with the basic work that has been done by the so-called Hoover Commission with the enactment of this legislation and with the fact that the Congress is now Democratic as is the Chief Executive, this job ought to be accomplished in the next 2 years.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] replied:

> I think we ought to get a reorganization plan submitted to this Congress within the next few months.

There you are. In the revision made by the gentleman I notice the gentleman said, "Within a very short time."

So if these plans will come up one at a time, one agency at a time reorganized, the Congress can very easily pass upon that one simple question; so I think we should have this amendment.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. As I understand it, these agencies named in the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] are agencies that have been created by this Congress and that in the

discharge of their duties they are independent of the control of the Chief Executive, just like a court would be to act upon a lawsuit brought before it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. JENNINGS. But if they are included within this reorganization plan, then the President could reduce them to mere automatons or people who could be pushed about and whose decisions might be controlled by the Executive.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not only that but I venture to bring it up here, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] insisted with reference to the armed services—and I remember he appeared before the committee and there were 45 votes he told us on his committee. I do not think that was with any intimation that we ought to watch out for those 45 votes, but anyway he told us of those votes.

There is no reason at all why these other agencies should not come up in the same way. They are entitled to just as much consideration, I say, as the one that comes before the committee of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I notice he has nodded his head. I wish he would get up and make a talk.

Mr. VINSON. I will in a minute.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Make a talk now before my time runs out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a brief statement?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Would not this amendment, if adopted, prevent these railroad agencies from being absorbed, or taken up by some other agency or department, without having their day in court, without giving them a right to be heard? I am particularly interested in the Railroad Retirement Board, the Railway Mediation Board, and the National Railway Adjustment Board. I would like to see them if possible have their day in court before they are absorbed into some other agency. These organizations are self-supporting and do not cost the taxpayers one cent for administration or any other purpose.

Mr. DAWSON. The answer to the gentleman's question is "No"; they would have their day in court under the bill as written.

Mr. BREHM. They would?

Mr. DAWSON. They would.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HALLECK) there were—ayes 86, noes 151.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 7, line 20, after the words "Securities and Exchange Commission", strike out the period, insert a comma and add "Railroad Retirement Board, National Mediation Board, and National Railroad Retirement Adjustment Board."

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, these agencies were included in the amendment that has just been defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that this is a different amendment in that in the previous amendment there were additional agencies included. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, despite the action taken on the previous amendment I want to press for the adoption of the present one. I predicate my position on the assumption that the committee which studied this legislation and reported it to the House must have had some sound, basic reasons for extending preferential consideration to the National Military Establishment, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission. I submit, Mr. Chairman, there are sound basic reasons why the Railroad Retirement Board, the National Mediation Board, and the National Railroad Adjustment Board should be extended this same preferential treatment.

May I call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the Railroad Retirement Board is not a Government functioning body. There are no governmental tax moneys involved. This is a Board created and financed by assessments against the wages of the individual workers in the railroad industry and the railroad companies. The Government only functions in the status of a trustee. I never heard tell of a trusteeship being dissolved except by some order of the court. I thought a trusteeship once set up was sacred. Yet we are proposing to bring this in under one of the other departments of our Government which may drag these agencies into politics. If there is one thing you can say about its administration and its functioning in the past it has been free of politics. What is said about the Railroad Retirement Act can also be said about the Railroad Mediation Board. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there has been less trouble between labor and management in the functioning of that Board than in all the other labor legislation.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. I entirely agree with my distinguished friend. A large number of railroad employees from my home town of Knoxville brought that very question up to me as I came in this Chamber this morning. It would be a blunder, and I think a grievous blunder, to interfere in any manner with the independent, impartial status of those agencies.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. I also agree with the gentleman. A bit ago I asked the question if they would have their day in court, and the chairman of the committee assured me that they would have. Now, would it not be possible, if this legislation becomes a law, to group these railway agencies in with other legislation which might have some good features in it, and then have the railway organizations become lost in the shuffle and become part of the Labor. Department?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes.

Mr. BREHM. Which we do not want.

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BREHM. I will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BAILEY. In addition, let me say that I assume the object of this reorganization bill is one of economy. I remember that there was a tremendous amount of savings stressed when the committee proposing this legislation reported it. The assumption is that you will be able to let out hundreds of thousands of Federal workers. I want to say to you that there are probably less than 150 or 200 employees involved in all three or four of these railroad boards for which I am asking this preferential treatment. You will not effect any savings to speak of, because there are only a few employees attached to each one of the functions. I would also like to ask the consideration of the House that we keep, so far as possible, just as many of our governmental functions out of politics as possible. I believe it can be said of these railroad functions that they are not now and have not been matters of party politics, and I strenuously object to their inclusion in one of the ordinary functions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say to the gentleman that he realizes that the Railroad Retirement Act sets up the Railroad Retirement Board and that the function thereof is basic legislation; that no change could be made in the death benefits or the pensions or any other functions of that act. It would require enabling legislation to be sent to the Congress, and if any administrative economy could be performed within the Board itself, the gentleman certainly would not object to the President, who is deeply concerned with the rights of labor, presenting a plan for the Congress to decide upon that would recommend certain economic or efficiency measures within it without changing any of the basic provisions.

Mr. BREHM. How about the Social Security Administration?

Mr. BAILEY. I will answer the gentleman by saying that regardless of what action we may take, it is still a trust fund and I do not think that Congress should have any business dealing with it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend any remarks that I make on the floor today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For a question.

Mr. BREHM. I just want to say that in my opinion it would be a shame to put any of the railroad boards under the Social Security Administration, which could happen if this legislation passes as it is now written.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It would be worse if you put it under the Labor Board.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been wondering what position the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] are going to take on this amendment. As I said a moment ago, I do not distrust or challenge the motives of the President or of any former President nor, I may add, of any Member of the House or the other body, but I try to be a realist. But it is strange indeed that all the trust must be on one side. If we should not and if we do not mistrust the present President, why should not the President trust the present Congress, or at least trust a majority of the 435 Members of this body, a majority of the 96 Members of the other body?

Why not mutual trust? Why not require the other body and the House, or at least one body entrusted with the legislative power, to act, as the Constitution contemplated, affirmatively upon any matter presented to it before the matter became the law of the land? I am wondering now, when from the press, at least, yes, when from a committee of the other body, the Labor Committee, come reports that the Secretary of Labor came up and asked for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, and if I understood correctly, the reenactment of the Wagner Act. He asked for the transfer of the Mediation Service over to the Department of Labor. He is going to make the National Labor Relations Board, if he gets the legislation he wants, a part of the Department of Labor.

We notice in the press that organized labor is saying to the President, "We elected you," and let me add that they are saying that to the Members of the House and I assume to the Members of the other body. "We elected you; now, come on. Give us what we say you promised during the campaign."

The CIO is only one segment of labor. The railroad men are laborers and workers, too. They are saying, "If this railroad legislation and the railroad organizations are going to be at the mercy of the President, if he wants to send down a plan sticking them over in the Department of Labor, reject it. We do not want that." Do you gentlemen in the majority want these independent agencies or their functions, their duties, transferred to the Department of Labor, which is under the control of or is favorable—and rightly so—to organized labor? But to all of it—not just to the CIO as it seems to assume.

Of course, the Labor Department speaks for organized labor, but unfortunately at the moment it is speaking for one segment of organized labor. The CIO assumes that it elected the President and a majority of the Members of Congress, so they are demanding now—not only asking, they are demanding now—that the Congress come across and pay for that election by legislation favorable to it. Put some of these agencies like the Railway Retirement Board in Social Security or the Labor Department and soon you may find CIO again raiding the A. F. of L. and perhaps the railway unions.

I agree with the gentleman who just left the well of the House that labor legislation which applies to the railroad workers has worked exceptionally well over the years. No one has found any particular fault with it. So if it is to be tampered with—let us say, if it is to be improved, let it come up as the gentleman then proposed, in one package, so that the Congress, this House and the other body, may have the opportunity of saying whether we want that labor organization to be transferred over to and put under the jurisdiction of the Labor Department or the Social Security Agency.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is just some of the procedure that the Congresses have faced in past years and have yielded to, and by virtue of having yielded, have passed bills that did not enable the President to do the job they were hoping he would do.

You saw these organizations or these branches or agencies named here included in an amendment a few moments ago. You saw them voted down. Then you saw them come to us once again standing by themselves, on the theory that we are going to do something to them, that this bill does something to them.

This bill is not going to put any agency anywhere. This bill is not going to interfere with any agency, to take anything from them or give them anything. This bill is plainly enabling legislation in order to give the power to the President to do a job of reorganization that must be done.

All these agencies that come and ask us now to make special provision for them are but the creatures of ourselves, the creatures of the Congress. Any plan the President submits or draws up or presents must come back to the Congress once again.

The legislation provides that the plan must be sent to the Congress. After the plan comes to the Congress, the Speaker of the House will refer it to the appropriate committee. There the committee is given a certain length of time to take action on it. Then a friend of any agency that is affected by that plan—not by this legislation but by that plan which the President submits—may file a resolution to reject it. That goes to the committee. If they do not act on it, then any member who is in favor of that resolution can move to discharge the committee and bring it to the floor of the Congress. Therefore, this bill makes adequate provision to protect every agency. The President cannot do anything to any agency unless it comes back to the Congress. What are we going to do here today? Are we going to pass a bill which is going to do the job which should be done? If any of these agencies are examined and if any of the Executive powers can be changed to the benefit of the taxpayers, should not that be done? In 1 minute we hear talk about the size of the Government and how the agencies are eating up the taxpayers money. I have heard Members standing here telling us about some of these same agencies which now do not want to be included in this bill. They tell us that they have grown so big that no Congressman can talk to them any more.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. Under the decision recently rendered by the Chair, if this amendment carries, then it will follow that each item which was defeated in the so-called Halleck amendment can come up one by one and other items can come up one by one. Thus you will be here all afternoon voting on separate agencies when they have all been beaten collectively in the so-called Halleck amendment.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, may I say further, we have had our public hearings. Every agency had an opportunity to appear before us. If there were any reasons then to do the thing which they seek to have you do now, your committee would have acted thereon. Therefore, I am saying that this is but an instance of how former Congresses have failed to do the thing we are now trying to do. We have endeavored to bring to the Committee of the Whole a bill that will work. We have tried to bring to this committee a bill under which the President can reorganize the executive departments and do all the things that we have been talking about. The terms of the legislation are clear. There are no exemptions in it, and there should be no exemptions in it.

The President is not going to interfere with any agency that is functioning in the best interests of the people. If the President did interfere, do you not know that officials of that agency would immediately alert the very Members who are standing here now?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was not the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] limiting debate granted by the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is referring to a request made concerning the previous amendment and which does not apply to the pending amendment.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my purpose is to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. The gentleman has made very much of a point of the fact that exemption of this railroad retirement group would prevent a great deal of money being saved to the taxpayers. I would like to have you show me how in any way, if you cut down the

amount of money that is spent by that organization, cut it in half, how you would in any way help the taxpayers, bearing in mind that of the money that is paid to the Railroad Retirement Board, 6 percent comes out of the employee and 6 percent from the employer. How would you save the taxpayers any money? This is truly an independent function.

Mr. DAWSON. Are there any administrative workers there at all? Do they exercise any functions of the executive department at all?

Mr. WITHROW. They are all paid out of the money that comes into the fund by reason of the 6 percent that is taken from the employee's wages, and the 6 percent that is paid to the Railroad Retirement Board by the railroad companies.

Mr. DAWSON. This bill does nothing to destroy any function set up by law, nor can any reorganization plan of the President do that; but if there are any executive functions, either in itself or related to other agencies, then the President can combine them, in order to have them work more efficiently, or for the sake of economy, and then it will be brought down in a plan, and if it is not a good plan, you and the others in this Congress, including myself, will reject that plan.

Mr. WITHROW. The gentleman has not answered my question. My question is: How will the taxpayers be saved any money, if you cut the railroad retirement administration 50 percent?

Mr. DAWSON. If you cut it in two, you would be bound to save some money.

Mr. WITHROW. Where would that money go? It would go back into the fund, would it not?

Mr. DAWSON. Certainly.

Mr. WITHROW. And how would it save the taxpayers any money?

Mr. DAWSON. If in its administrative function any of the personnel can be cut down which are paid for by the Government, then that will be a saving to the taxpayers. Your question has nothing to do with the Government. You seek to intimate that this legislation can affect basic legislation where we set up an agency. That cannot be done under this bill and that cannot be done under any reorganization plan proposed by the President.

Mr. WITHROW. You are attempting to place me in a position that I will not be placed in.

Mr. DAWSON. And you are attempting to put words into my mouth.

Mr. WITHROW. No; just a moment. I am in favor of this legislation. I have confidence that the President of the United States will do a good job, but I do object to your saying that it is going to save the taxpayers any money when the taxpayers do not have anything to do with this Board.

Mr. DAWSON. There are some of its functions that are executive. Then those employees must be paid by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. WITHROW] has expired.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] made the very point which has disturbed me so much. The gentleman said that if we now pass this amendment relating to the railroad boards, then each of the others previously voted down in the Halleck amendment will come up in turn, and you will be voting on all of them all over again. That is exactly what can happen to the Railroad Retirement Board, the Mediation Service, and the Adjustment Board. They can be lost in the shuffle. They can be pushed into another agency, say, like Social Security, and be brought up here and thereby lose their identity. What is wrong in permitting those agencies to be brought up here separately and acted upon? You bring them up in one large package and there may be incorporated in that particular package something which may be good; and you will destroy them. That is exactly what I am fearful of. You will vote for the good in the package and take the evil along with it.

Mr. DAWSON. That very thing would prevent the President from ever putting a bad plan in with a good plan.

Mr. BREHM. Oh, he is still a human being and subject to the frailties of human nature. A person can be sincere and still make mistakes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BREHM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Just a moment ago the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] made a statement that we wanted to vote on this bill tonight and therefore we should not fool around with quite so much debate, or words to that effect.

Mr. BONNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield.

Mr. BONNER. The gentleman is not correct. Now, let us get it straight. The question that is now being debated has been debated and has been voted on. By a ruling of the Chair, the question has arisen again individually, or in this case with two or three other organizations thrown in.

Mr. BREHM. It is not going to cost anyone a penny nor is it going to save a penny for anyone if this amendment prevails. However, it may save a most essential service to the railway brotherhoods for which they and their employers have been paying for the past 10 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; all right; and under——

Mr. DAWSON. So it is just a repetition of the debate and a repetition of the decision which the committee has already made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I admire the gentleman very much. I am sorry I cannot agree with him in this instance. We should have some opportunity to debate the bill. If you expect to finish this bill tonight, do not force us too much.

Neither in the committee nor in the House has anyone on the minority side raised the slightest objection or done anything to delay matters, but we do want to discuss some of these items; and, if you go to strict parliamentary procedure and gag us, you cannot possibly vote on this bill tonight if somebody wants to object; not tonight. All we want is a little consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 122, noes 99.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Page 7, line 20, after the period insert the following: "No reorganization plan containing any provision affecting any civil function of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army or of its head, or affecting such Corps or its head with respect to such civil functions shall take effect until the two Houses of Congress pass a concurrent resolution which states in substance that the Congress favors such new reorganization plan."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am not an enemy to this legislation; this is a friendly amendment and I am supporting this bill because I believe this Congress should approve of anything that would bring economy in our Government, less spending, and more efficient Government, and the doing away with duplication and overlapping.

I am sure none of us has had any criticism of the Corps of United States Army Engineers. They are doing a wonderful job. They have been in existence for 174 years and I do not know of any organization plan that could better the operations of this particular branch of our Government.

I am not asking by my amendment that the Corps of Engineers be exempted from any reorganization plan. In the act that we passed in 1945 that organization was exempted and I have used the same language in this amendment as was used in section 5, subsection (e), of the reorganization bill passed in 1945.

We are all satisfied with what the Army Engineers are doing. They work in peacetime taking care of our floods, taking care of our rivers and harbors, and taking care of a lot of our problems that are particularly interesting to our local governments.

I do not see how anyone can have any possible objection to my amendment. My amendment says that before any reorganization plan in reference to the Corps of Engineers shall go into effect the Congress must approve by concurrent resolution. In other words, it is affirmative action instead of negative action. If we take it as it is and they are involved in some reorganization plan, then we have to act within a period of 60 days, else the plan becomes effective.

The Corps of Army Engineers is primarily for the people. This is something you ought to be interested in. I do not want any plan to go into effect, whether proposed by the President or anybody else, until the Congress has had an opportunity to scrutinize the program and the purposes therein. When the Congress has it up for consideration, the Congress could say: "Mr. President, you have done a good job, and we approve it. The Corps of Engineers ought to be

changed." When that happens and the Congress agrees, good and well. The organization itself is not exempted.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. If the Corps of Engineers are not taken out of the bill where do they go and how do they function?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I cannot answer that question because I do not know where they are going. But if we adopt this amendment, before anything is done, before any plan becomes operative and effective, this Congress by affirmative vote must say it is a good plan and we must affirmatively adopt it by a concurrent resolution of the Congress. It takes action on the part of both Houses. If we get some plan that is not good we can reject it. This is simply a question of whether we are going forward or backward.

Mr. DONDERO. I agree with the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman said that he could not answer the gentleman's question in regard to where the civil functions of the Army Engineers would go. I think I have the answer. Those functions could be taken over by the United States Bureau of Reclamation, insofar as reclamation projects are concerned, or flood control, in areas where reclamation, irrigation, power, and flood control go together, and they certainly should be combined.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Nothing could be done so far as the Army Engineers are concerned, and no plan could become effective until the House and Senate by affirmative action stated it could be. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request the attention of the committee while I try to explain what is meant by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida, and what is proposed in subsection (b). The distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] asked if by using the words "National Military Establishment" it included the civil functions. I respectfully call his attention and the attention of the committee to the Security Act of July 26, 1947, which specifically sets out what constitutes the National Military Establishment. It states:

> The National Military Establishment shall consist of the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, together with all other agencies created under title I of this act.

So there can be no doubt, wherever used in the law, the words "National Military Establishment" do include all component parts of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Then there can be no doubt in the gentleman's mind that the civil functions of the Army Engineers is a secondary matter with them, and that their connection with the Army itself brings them within this bill.

Mr. VINSON. Absolutely; there is no doubt about it. This amendment was prepared by the Drafting Service not only of the Armed Services Committee but by the Drafting Service of the House, so the House can fully understand that wherever used in here, "National Military Establishment" means the civil functions of the Army Engineers.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and I want the RECORD to show that in putting the National Military Establishment in here, that the committee intended that that included the United States engineers within this formula.

Mr. VINSON. If there is any doubt in any man's mind, and to make it doubly sure, after the words "National Military Establishment," someone could offer an amendment to put in brackets "including the civil functions of the Department of the Army." But there is absolutely no need to do so because the words "National Military Establishment" mean all components of these services.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, is it not true that the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts was at one time a member of the committee from which this bill originates, and is now?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am a member now.

Mr. VINSON. To set the record straight, I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments if he does not interpret the words "National Military Establishment" to include the civil functions of the Department of the Army.

Mr. DAWSON. That was the understanding of the committee, and the language was used with that in view.

Mr. VINSON. That is it exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. Would this give the President the power to delimit the jurisdiction of the Engineers? For instance, one of the members suggested that they should not build any more stands. Could the President take out that part and the rivers and harbors part?

Mr. VINSON. In 2 or 3 minutes I will explain what this amendment does. I appeared before the committee and suggested that an amendment along this line be considered. The committee after considerable debate reached the conclusion to draft it in the language set out in the bill.

Now, what does it do? I am addressing this strictly to the Military Establishment. It simply means if the President of the United States wished to submit to the Congress a reorganization plan to take the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers away from the War Department and put it in the Interior Department, he would have to send that up here in a reorganization plan separate and distinct. It could not be tied in with any reorganization plan with reference to any other civil agencies or functions of different departments. It would have to come here so that the Congress could determine that sole cut issue, and, of course, as a Member of the House, if such an issue comes up, I would be very much opposed to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. There is still this question: Could they take part of the jurisdiction of the Engineers away from them?

Mr. VINSON. He could not touch the Corps of Engineers or any agency of the National Military Establishment and mix it up with any other function of the Government. They have to come here separate and distinct. This language is so written that he cannot take one thing away. However, he can do this: He can add some other agencies to the Military Establishment without sending it separate, but he cannot take one iota of the power or authority from the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force without sending it here as a separate proposition. That is all it does.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that my amendment is in accord with the bill?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's amendment would disturb the whole situation, because he would require it to be an affirmative act instead of a negative act. He would require that the Congress would have to approve it in a particular resolution by a vote of the House and Senate, and the bill is based on a different basis.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Is it not true that they would have to do that anyhow, according to the statement made here? Before the organization could do anything there would have to be a plan?

Mr. VINSON. The provisions of the bill are such that when it comes in here the committee taking jurisdiction of it must act within a certain time. If one House disapproves it and the other House approves it, it becomes a reorganization plan. The gentleman's statement provides that before it can become a reorganization plan it must have the sanction of both Houses.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does it not also mean that if this amendment is adopted the President could not take the Corps of Engineers or the civil functions and place them over in the Department of the Interior, and then say to that Department, "From now on you shall have charge of all the river and harbor work of this country"?

Mr. VINSON. He would have the authority to do so. He would have the authority to take the Marines and put them in the Army. He would have the authority to take Naval Aviation and put it in the Air Force. But when he would do it, he would have to send it to Congress on that one issue and then Congress could debate it. I am perfectly willing on any reorganization plan to have an opportunity to present the reasons why certain things should not take place.

Mr. DONDERO. But only in case the gentleman's amendment passes this House.

Mr. VINSON. No. His amendment would disturb it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman is the chairman of the committee on which I have the honor to serve. May I say that I am, of course, deeply concerned that the status of the Engineers be not changed.

Mr. VINSON. So am I.

Mr. BROOKS. I am happy to hear the gentleman say that.

Mr. VINSON. I am very much opposed to taking them away.

Mr. BROOKS. Is not the proper interpretation of the amendment offered by the gentleman that no reorganization can occur but what every Member of the House of Representatives will have the right, in the event the committee fails to report it, to call it up for a vote before the House?

Mr. VINSON. That is right. I am merely safeguarding this organization by saying that when you propose to reorganize it you cannot mix it up, you must send it in in a separate package, and any Member of Congress, under the bill, has a right to call it up and let a majority of Congress determine what is the proper thing to do about it.

Mr. JOHNSON. If the gentleman will yield further, the Rogers amendment would not do that; it would just muddy the waters.

Mr. VINSON. The amendment would accomplish just exactly what I have said. It is as plain as the nose on your face.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it the Rogers amendment about which the gentleman is talking?

Mr. VINSON. I am talking about what is in the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. Yes, but the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has offered an amendment.

Mr. VINSON. His amendment in the first place is not necessary, because the Corps of Engineers is within the purview of the committee bill.

Mr. JOHNSON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. VINSON. Yes, exactly. Therefore, I am asking this Committee to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] because it is not necessary. The Corps of Engineers is amply protected. We will have a separate vote on it whenever it comes in here. That is not the only thing in the reorganization of the Department of National Defense that might come up. There are other important items that might come up.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. Under the present law which you favor, if there were a reorganization proposal for the National Military Establishment set down which provided for something that the House did not approve of and the House rejected the proposal, it would still go to the other body and if approved there, the reorganization plan would take effect, would it not?

Mr. VINSON. That is the provision in the bill and it not only relates to this, but relates to everything else in the bill.

Mr. PICKETT. Therefore, the language of the present bill does not actually take care of the situation that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is directed to.

Mr. VINSON. I believe that if we could justify a negative decision on a proposal, the other body would probably go along with our viewpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto end in 10 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if there was a demand for a reading of the engrossed copy, would there be a vote on this bill tonight?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would advise the gentleman from Michigan that such a question would arise in the House and not in the Committe of the Whole. Therefore, the Chair cannot pass on the gentleman's inquiry at this time.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER].

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, of course, the committee realizes what discussion can be made about this matter in 1 minute, but I will use that 1 minute to make this brief statement.

If the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, and others profess a great respect for the Army engineers that we all entertain, then why not adopt this amendment and end this question now as to whether or not the Army engineers ought to be disturbed. I would much prefer to go further than this and write a direct exemption here with reference to the Army engineers because it's the one arm of this Government which enjoys the confidence and respect of every Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE].

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to address you as a member of the Committee on Public Works to say that I regret very much that the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the committee, Hon. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON, whose judgment is respected so highly by the Members of the House, and who has taken such an active part in flood control and rivers and harbors work in the Congress for the last 20 years and who has been dealing with the Corps of Engineers during all of that time, was called away for a flood-control meeting in St. Louis, and as a result I know that he is missed in this debate by the Members of the House. Had it not been for the fact that our chairman made a previous engagement several months ago, he would have been here today. However, I do want to say that I have contacted the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] in regard to the section with respect to the Corps of Engineers under discussion, and that it is his opinion that, under the provisions of this legislation the Corps of Engineers are protected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I will yield my 1 minute to the next speaker.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] is recognized.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Rogers amendment. I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] stated the case exactly a moment ago when he said this issue ought to be decided now. Under the proposed bill, as it is presented by the committee and as it will be passed unless the Rogers amendment is adopted, you have a situation where if a reorganization plan involving the Corps of Army Engineers is submitted, you must take positive action to reject that proposal in both Houses, else the proposal will become operative and become a part of the reorganization plan. Under the Rogers amendment you are required to act affirmatively, in both bodies, upon the proposed reorganization plan. So you have this situation under the bill as the committee wants it passed: A proposed reorganization plan involving the Corps of Engineers might be deemed to have no merit and be rejected by the House, but the other body may not do so. Then the proposed plan becomes operative as a reorganization plan though the House has rejected it. The Rogers amendment corrects that situation and requires affirmative action by both Houses approving it before such a proposed plan can become operative. The amendment then is a guaranty that no amalgamation of the Corps of Engineers to the detriment of its performance can be effected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKETT] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I have already spoken on this amendment. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply sensitive of the need for reorganization legislation. At the same time, I am not unmindful of the magnificent work which has been performed by the Corps of Army Engineers. I express the deep concern which I feel that some misguided reorganization plan may affect this great organization. I think any plan which may affect the organizational integrity of the engineers would be a serious mistake and may hurt our defense establishment.

I have seen the Corps of Engineers work, both in war and in peace, and I feel that we have just the set-up which is most conducive to a well-trained and efficient Corps of Engineers. The country generally is satisfied that they are doing the job efficiently and wants no change.

I recognize that the Committee in drafting this measure was compelled to follow fundamental rules. The Committee did not wish to exempt any agency from the operation of this bill. But the Committee did prescribe that the engineers and other military organizations, if they are subject to reorganization under this measure, should be placed in a separate plan so that this body may cast a separate vote upon the plan submitted. I personally would like to go further and entirely exempt the Corps of Engineers. Since this is not now practical, I am going to accept the present language of the bill with the hope that the Senate may go much further in the degree of protection which it may give to an organization which has functioned since the very beginning of this Government with superb credit to itself and to our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House, with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to have to make a preferential motion, but, as stated once before, neither in committee nor on the floor of the House has there been the slightest inclination by anyone on this side to in any way delay or hinder consideration or passage of this legislation.

As a matter of fact, if I judge the sentiment on our side correctly, I know of no one who opposes the principles laid down in this bill. There are those of us who do object to the method but we are not disposed to start a filibuster, but here is an amendment that has been offered. Some of the Members want to talk about it—but are being denied the opportunity. Now, what does this amendment provide? Who now is afraid? And of what?

I spoke earlier, and I will speak later on, if occasion requires, about an amendment which will not only enable but will force the House and the other body to act one way or the other, vote up or down, any and every plan which may come down from the Executive Office.

This particular amendment seeks to make it certain that the engineers cannot be put out of business without the consent of the Congress. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]—and I have the highest respect for his judgment and for his opinion—he, it may be said, if I might use such language on the floor, has been the daddy or the guardian of the Navy. Now he has assumed the same role, and I know of no man better qualified to take it, of all the armed forces. What he was afraid of was that if this bill went through without the amendment which he put in during consideration by the committee—requiring that any plan having to do with the armed services should come up in one package—he was afraid that by the inaction by either branch of the Congress it might go through and something might be taken out of the National Defense Establishment.

I fear he may wake up some fine day—I believe he will, if he does not watch his step—and learn that legislation affecting the Engineers, putting them out of their civil functions, will come up to the House. Then what happens? One Member of the House can bring it up and we will all vote on it. But suppose someone in the other body starts a filibuster or that no one there wants to take it up; there is nothing that can force them to take it up. We can vote the plan down; every Member in the House can vote against it; but unless we find some way of making the other body act, the plan will still be the law of the land and the Engineers or any other agency or function of an agency will be out of existence. It is that situation, it is that danger, that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] seeks to avoid.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Is not what the gentleman says true of every other reorganization plan?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course it is; and that is why I want to preserve the constitutional method of legislating. I propose to offer an amendment which will compel this body and the other body to act before a plan can become a law.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Do I understand that this amendment if adopted would provide for this one agency of the Government an entirely different method of procedure as far as Congressional approval or disapproval is concerned?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I dislike to answer that because the answer will mitigate against the amendment I am going to offer later on applying the same procedure to all plans which may be sent down.

The situation is this: The first love of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is the Navy, his second love is the Army, the third is the Engineers, and the Engineers, like the Marine Corps, have worked perfectly. No one wants to see the Engineers put out of business; but if we do not watch our step, and if perchance the other body should fail to act or not act in concert with us, then the civil functions of the Engineers might in some reorganization plan go out of the Department.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Does not a Senator have the same right to bring up legislation on the floor of the Senate that a Member of the House has in this body?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; sure. But will he?

Mr. VINSON. Why should we treat the Corps of Army Engineers by a separate method of determination from the others?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is just what you did with your amendment inserted by the Committee at your request as subdivision (b) of subdivision 6 of section 5 of the bill, when you provided for consideration of any plan affecting the "National Military Establishment."

Later, three other agencies were also given special treatment in reorganization plans.

I favor this amendment, because if I cannot get all I want I am willing to take what I can get to save one of our best agencies, the Engineers. Certainly any Member of the Senate could bring it up, but I ask the gentleman how long has the civil rights program been under consideration over there? Both parties are pledged to that program but strange, strange indeed, it has not been acted upon in that body.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute to answer a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state that on the preferential motion there are 5 minutes in support of the motion and 5 in opposition.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, the Corps of Army Engineers was started by George Washington, and was continued by every President of the United States right on down the line through Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, all having acquiesced in the good judgment of the first President. That is the reason for this furor here; that is the reason we want to see something done about the Corps of Army Engineers. We realize that it is necessary to keep these officers

busy in peacetime as well as in times of war. The peacetime accomplishments of these men are most beneficial to the Nation in an emergency

What would result if the Corps of Army Engineers were to be thrown over into the Public Works Bureau? I will tell you what that would mean. It would mean a mammoth organization with one big head possessing more power than any official in the executive branch of this Government should have. So, Mr. Chairman, we ought to support this amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. Let us write his amendment in.

It is an affirmative expression on the part of the Congress. Should the President send over a proposal to consolidate the Corps of Engineers with some other department we, in each House, would have only 60 days to reject such a plan. The 60 days pass in a hurry sometimes and because of other important matters pending in both Houses it is difficult to obtain a vote in both Houses. I trust that the amendment of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, while I must confess I do not exactly like the approach of the gentleman from Florida to this problem, I am going to support his amendment.

The Corps of Army Engineers has earned the gratitude and respect of all Americans. I am fearful of the pressure which has been exerted in the past and which is now being exerted to absorb the Corps of Army Engineers into some super-duper department of public works or to consolidate it with various agencies in the Department of the Interior. I am fearful of such a move. If it did happen I do not believe it would promote either economy or efficiency. The Corps of Engineers has accumulated an experience which is invaluable to the flood control and protection of this country.

I support, with reservation, his testimony insofar as the Corps of Army Engineers is concerned. I am naturally particularly concerned about the Corps of Army Engineers because I live in the city of New Orleans which is at the mouth of the Mississippi River, which drains about two-thirds of the United States of America.

We know first hand what floods are, what devastation can be wrought by the forces of nature when they are on the loose. We have lived with the Mississippi River since we have been a community and we are eternally grateful to the Corps of Army Engineers. In my judgment, there is no finer group of men in this great country of ours. They have been efficient; they have been capable; they have performed their duties without political favor or favoritism of any kind. They have been on the job in emergencies and they have accumulated, over a period of years, a tremendous amount of knowledge and experience.

I realize that we are faced with a quandary here when we talk about reorganizing the Government. Inevitably, someone appears before the responsible committee of Congress and asks that certain agencies be excluded.

I, too, favor—certainly in principle—all that this committee is attempting to do. It seems to me that the sprawling, overlapping functions of the Government must be consolidated in the interest of efficiency and economy; but in doing so I think that we must be careful not to interfere with agencies which have demonstrated, over a period of many years, their complete and total efficiency; and to my way of thinking there is no economy that could possibly be achieved by consolidating the Corps of Army Engineers with any other agency of the Government.

I do not know of anything else that I could add, Mr. Chairman, except again to say that we who have lived with the problem of flood control are immeasurably proud of the Corps of Army Engineers and we would be gravely alarmed if we felt that the Congress did anything which might jeopardize their efficiency.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I favor the adoption of this amendment. I do not believe that the Army engineers in the performance of their civil-functions work have been influenced by political considerations whatsoever. If this civil-functions work should be transferred to some other agency, as it has been rumored was in contemplation, I greatly fear that thereafter, such work would be subject to political considerations and political influence.

So far as I know, word has not come to Congress from the executive department as to what agencies or departments will be reorganized, changed, or abolished. I do know that rumors have been current that the civil-functions work of the Army engineers may be transferred to a new department to be created.

My own opinion is that this bill should provide that either House of Congress should be able to reject a reorganization plan, and that it should not require the concurrent action of both bodies. This bill, as it now stands, would require that it be rejected by both. That reverses ordinary legislative procedure. Today the civil-functions work may not be removed from the Army engineers except by affirmative action on the part of both Houses of Congress. If this bill passes in its present form, that will no longer be the case. The House may vote to reject such a plan, but mere failure to act on the part of the other body will result in a reorganization plan going into effect.

This seems to me to be an acknowledgment that Congress is no longer able to perform the functions belonging to it under the Constitution.

The Rogers amendment will require that both Houses must concur in order to remove these functions from the engineers, and I favor this requirement.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE].

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have found myself in a happier position than I am at the present time. I am told by the chairman of the committee handling this bill and by the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and by the majority leader that the Corps of Engineers is safe. I am also told by the sponsor of this amendment that if it passes they are also safe.

I have a very high regard for the Corps of Engineers and its ability. The members of that Corps are not only builders but in building they learn in peacetime the things that stand them in such good stead in war. Regardless of whether this amendment is passed or not, I feel that the Corps is safe under any interpretation. I hope so, and the civil functions will remain in their hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned with the Army Corps of Engineers and we believe it has been adequately taken care of under this bill that we have brought to the committee today for consideration. We know that the legislative language is good and we ask the House to stand by the committee and vote down this superfluous amendment because it is unnecessary. We urge the House to stand by its committee.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this bill if a reorganization plan is returned to the Congress and if the House approves it and the Senate disagrees, then we cannot interfere with the reorganization plan; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PICKETT) there were—ayes 82, noes 143.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TACKETT: On page 7, line 8, strike out subsection (b).

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is intended to provide the administration with power to reorganize the various agencies of our Government by grouping, consolidating, coordinating, and abolishing any of the agencies and bureaus so as to eliminate overlapping and duplicating efforts in the hope of reducing Federal operating expenditures and promoting economy to the fullest extent consistent with the efficient operation of our Government.

Section 5 (b) of this bill is intended, in effect, to exclude four privileged agencies from the general operation and purpose of this proposed legislation. My amendment seeks to strike section 5 (b) so as

to make every Federal agency subject to the provisions of the reorganization plan.

During our campaigns this last summer and fall, most of us promised to come here and support a tremendously needed reorganization bill, and I had understood by the introduction of this bill that we would be afforded the opportunity to carry out that campaign promise. However, we are now finding that our reorganization bill has the same faults and defects as the 1939 and the 1945 reorganization bills—meaning that our pet agencies and bureaus are excluded from the provisions of this bill just as they have been excluded by former bills introduced for the same purpose. Of course, the Expenditures Committee uses more technical language and advises us that these four privileged agencies are not excluded, but explains that these four pets just do not come under the same kind of set-up. At the same time, we know that when these four particular privileged pets are allowed to come under the provisions of subsection (b), they are not to be treated as these other agencies of the Government under the reorganization plan; and, therefore, it can well be expected that there will be no reorganization of the, first, National Military Establishment; second, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; third, Interstate Commerce Commission; and, fourth, Securities and Exchange Commission.

Now, if I had a pet to be excluded from the provisions of this bill by being placed along with the four agencies under section 5 (b), it would be the choice of a majority of us—the civil engineers. This would be my pet because the civil engineers have petted the people of my country more than the other agencies. However, I can assure you that I have no Government-agency pets to be considered foremost to the people I represent.

It is my opinion that if we want to reorganize our Federal agencies, attempt to save money for the taxpayers of this country, and reduce the number of employees that we have on the payroll who are doing nothing more than drawing pay, we should make a straightforward attempt to do so at this time. All of us realize that there is nothing more permanent in Washington than temporary employment with the United States Government. We get up on the political platforms throughout our sections of the country and each of us holler to the top of our voices, "If you will send me up there to replace that fellow who has been representing you in Congress, I can assure you that I will lower the cost of our Government." As an attempt to live up to our promises, we come forth with a reorganization plan that should cover all Federal agencies; I am at a loss to know how four Federal executive department agencies have managed to become excluded by that great committee of ours known as the Committee on Expenditures. A few minutes ago when someone offered an amendment for the purpose of adding his pet agency to be included in the exclusions, the chairman of that committee said:

Is this Congress going to pass a bill that will get the job done; or are we going to put in exclusions that will prohibit the President from having any power to reorganize the executive department of this Government?

My amendment adds no agencies to the list of exclusions that will cripple the efforts of the President and his administration to properly reorganize the executive agencies of our Government; but, to the contrary, this amendment, if adopted, will remove the four stumbling blocks that can only be classified as "privileged pets" of the Expenditures Committee with no more right to be excluded from the provisions of this bill than any other Federal agencies that we could mention.

Now, friends, if we want to vote for a reorganization plan, let us vote for it and not a subterfuge. You have a chance here now. By taking out subsection (b) of section 5, you will be treating every Federal agency just exactly alike.

I want to ask you: Why is the Securities and Exchange Commission left in here under subsection (b) as an exclusion to the provisions of this bill? Why is it excluded under subsection (b)? Is it more important than the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, or many other Federal agencies that we could mention, or is it just somebody's pet?

Why is the Interstate Commerce Commission excluded from the organization purpose of this bill by being placed as a privileged agency under subsection (b)? This is the first time that I ever knew that organization had any political friends, but I can readily see that it has some friends somewhere on the Expenditures Committee.

Of course, it is not hard to see why the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is listed among the privileged few because that all-powerful organization spreads its politics throughout the Nation.

The National Military Establishment is excluded as a privileged agency, I presume, under the theory that someone might be criticized by some person back home who might think we were trying to hurt his organization.

All Federal agencies, including the Military Establishments, could stand some reorganization, if the voters and taxpayers are to be considered. The hiring of civilian employees in the Military Establishments is now and has been during the past 12 months increasing more than 166 persons per day. Exclusive of Military Establishments, the daily average increase for the Federal civilian agencies during the same time is 131—a total of 297 new Federal employees each day the sun rises.

Mr. Chairman, it is known by all, regardless of party affiliations, the ever-present need for making the changes suggested by this bill in the reorganization of the executive agencies of the Government, hopeful of limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions, but more than anything else, eliminating a duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions. Such need is not exclusive to all Federal agencies except four privileged ones—but is needed as much so in one agency as the other. If an agency be perfect, needing no reorganization, why would that particular agency fear being scrutinized by the reorganization commission?

Mr. Chairman, it does not take debate on this amendment issue. If you actually want to curtail expenditures of the Federal Government, which the Republicans have gone out and declared the Democrats were not attempting to do; and if the Democrats want to retaliate with some sound action and bring about a saving of needless Federal expenditures, we have a chance to do it now. If we merely want to appease the people with a camouflage, then vote against my amendment. After viewing the success of other efforts to amend this piece of proposed legislation, I do not expect you to pass the amendment anyhow because I see that the Expenditures Committee is certainly running the show here now.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TACKETT) there were—ayes 58, noes 149.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that the bill be open to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON]?

There was no objection.

The remainder of the bill is as follows:

TAKING EFFECT OF REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 6. (a) Except as may be otherwise provided pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, the provisions of the reorganization plan shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of 60 calendar days, of continuous session of the Congress, following the date on which the plan is transmitted to it; but only if, between the date of transmittal and the expiration of such 60-day period there has not been passed by the two Houses a concurrent resolution stating in substance that the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan.

(b) For the purposes of subsection (a)—

(1) continuity of session shall be considered as broken only by an adjournment of the Congress sine die; but

(2) in the computation of the 60-day period there shall be exluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days to a day certain; except that if a resolution (as defined in section 202) with respect to such reorganization plan has been passed by one House and sent to the other, no exclusion under this paragraph shall be made by reason of adjournments of the first House taken thereafter.

(c) Any provision of the plan may, under provisions contained in the plan, be made operative at a time later than the date on which the plan shall otherwise take effect.

DEFINITION OF AGENCY

SEC. 7. When used in this act, the term "agency" means any executive department,

commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government, and means also any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof. Such term does not include the Comptroller General of the United States or the General Accounting Office, which are a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

MATTERS DEEMED TO BE REORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 8. For the purposes of this act, the term "reorganization" means any transfer, consolidation, coordination, authorization, or abolition, referred to in section 3.

SAVING PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) (1) Any statute enacted, and any regulation or other action made, prescribed, issued, granted, or performed in respect of or by any agency or function affected by a reorganization under the provisions of this act, before the effective date of such reorganization, shall, except to the extent rescinded, modified, superseded, or made inapplicable by or under authority of law or by the abolition of a function, have the same effect as if such reorganization had not been made; but where any such statute, regulation, or other action has vested the function in the agency from which it is removed under the plan, such function shall, insofar as it is to be exercised after the plan becomes effective, be considered as vested in the agency under which the function is placed by the plan.

(2) As used in paragraph (1) of this subsection the term "regulation or other action" means any regulation, rule, order, policy, determination, directive, authorization, permit, privilege, requirement, designation, or other action.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the head of any agency or other officer of the United States, in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of any reorganization plan under the provisions of this act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within 12 months after such reorganization plan takes effect, showing a necessity for a survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the successor of such head or officer under the reorganization effected by such plan or, if there be no such successor, against such agency or officer as the President shall designate.

UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 10. The appropriations or portions of appropriations unexpended by reason of the operation of this act shall not be used for any purpose, but shall be impounded and returned to the Treasury.

PRINTING OF REORGANIZATION PLANS

SEC. 11. Each reorganization plan which shall take effect shall be printed in the Statutes at Large in the same volume as the public laws, and shall be printed in the Federal Register.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in such House in the case of resolutions (as defined in section 202); and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far relating to the procedure in such House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

SEC. 202. As used in this title, the term "resolution" means only a concurrent resolution of the two Houses of Congress, the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That the Congress does not favor the reorganization plan numbered —— transmitted to Congress by the President on ————, 19—.", the blank spaces therein being appropriately filled; and does not include a concurrent resolution which specifies more than one reorganization plan.

SEC. 203. A resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be referred to a committee (and all resolutions with respect to the same plan shall be referred to the same committee) by the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives, as the case may be.

SEC. 204. (a) If the committee to which has been referred a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan has not reported it before the expiration of 10 calendar days after its introduction (or, in the case of a resolution received from the other House, 10 calendar days after its receipt), it shall then (but not before) be in order to move either to discharge the committee from further consideration of such resolution, or to discharge the committee from further consideration of any other resolution with respect to such reorganization plan which has been referred to the committee.

(b) Such motion may be made only by a person favoring the resolution, shall be highly privileged (except that it may not be made after the committee has reported a resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan), and debate thereon shall be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. No amendment to such motion shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(c) If the motion to discharge is agreed to or disagreed to, such motion may not be renewed, nor may another motion to discharge the committee be made with respect to any other resolution with respect to the same reorganization plan.

SEC. 205. (a) When the committee has reported, or has been discharged from further consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, it shall at any time thereafter be in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) to move to proceed to the consideration of such resolution. Such motion shall be highly privileged and shall not be debatable. No amendment to such motion shall be in order and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which such motion is agreed to or disagreed to.

(b) Debate on the resolution shall be limited to not to exceed 10 hours, which shall be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. A motion further to limit debate shall not be debatable. No amendment to, or motion to recommit, the resolution shall be in order, and it shall not be in order to move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution is agreed to or disagreed to.

SEC. 206. (a) All motions to postpone, made with respect to the discharge from committee, or the consideration of, a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan, and all motions to proceed to the consideration of other business, shall be decided without debate.

(b) All appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, to the procedure relating to a resolution with respect to a reorganization plan shall be decided without debate.

SEC. 207. If, prior to the passage by one House of a resolution of that House with respect to a reorganization plan, such House receives from the other House a resolution with respect to the same plan, then—

(a) If no resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee, no other resolution with respect to the same plan may be reported or (despite the provisions of sec. 204 (a)) be made the subject of a motion to discharge.

(b) If a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan has been referred to committee—

(1) the procedure with respect to that or other resolutions of such House with respect to such plan which have been referred to committee shall be the same as if no resolution from the other House with respect to such plan had been received; but

(2) on any vote on final passage of a resolution of the first House with respect to such plan the resolution from the other House with respect to such plan shall be automatically substituted for the resolution of the first House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

On page 8, line 5 strike out the words "the two Houses a concurrent" and insert in lieu thereof "either House a."

On line 6, strike out the words "the Congress" and insert in lieu thereof, the word "it."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, even at my age, there is no law against indulging in what might be termed a little flirtation if it be harmless. I have been listening to what might be termed either the orders, the blandishments, or the advice of some Members who, I hope, are my friends, and who sit to my right. They found some fault with the broader amendment which I proposed to offer and they persuaded me—or at least I am doing it—to offer this amendment. All this amendment does is to preserve half of the Congressional power to legislate. All it requires is that when the President sends a plan here it will not become the law of the land if either House of the Congress puts through a resolution disapproving it, saying that it does not approve of the plan. I hope my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle have not led me astray and that they are not going to leave me out on a limb.

I hope—I would almost say I pray—that they will remember the words of advice which they have been giving me during the past week and again today when some suggested that this amendment would probably go through the House and that the prerogatives of the House would be preserved and that the duty of the House to legislate would still rest upon us to act on a plan within a certain time after the President sent it to us.

I hope—oh, I hope—that I have not been deceived, gentlemen. I hope you are going to go along with me on this amendment.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment merely provides

that any reorganization plan goes through unless the House votes that it should not go through.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the same thing applies to the Senate.

Mr. VORYS. That is it, is it not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. VORYS. That is all it provides. It leaves it to the House, and the reorganization plan will go through unless the House says it should not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. VORYS. In that way the Members who have been fearful concerning favored organizations will have their chance if their organization is to be damaged to have their say before the House and we can thus preserve the responsibility of the House in legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. If the friends of the Engineers or of any other group think that something is going to be done to their pet, if you want to describe it that way, or if you want to express it more accurately, if something is going to be done which they think should not be done, then the House can vote it down. It can just say, "We do not approve of that legislation."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. In the absence of this amendment, any plan proposed by the President, approved by the Senate, or a plan in respect to which the Senate took no action whatever, would become the law of the land, even if every Member of this body were opposed to it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. The House might vote unanimously to reject a plan and yet unless this amendment goes through it would be the law of the land if the other body did not act.

I am just asking for half a loaf, and for the support of those who advised me to take this course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to tell a story that I think will illustrate the point that this amendment simply ruins the effectiveness of this bill.

A certain colored man down in Georgia had caught a large channel catfish. Let me say to you that unless you have eaten a channel cat, freshly caught and fried in deep fat, and unless you have had some hushpuppies to go along with it, you do not know what real eating is. Well, this colored gentleman had caught a big catfish and he was trying to skin that catfish. The catfish was floundering around, and finally finned him. The colored man said, "Catfish, what are you trying to do?" He said, "Quit that floppin' around." He said, "I ain't trying to do a thing but gut you."

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is not trying to do a thing but gut this bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, after he guts the catfish nobody is going to eat it.

Mr. LANHAM. Now, my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], asked me in the debate earlier in the day why it was that Congress itself could not reorganize the executive agencies of the Government, and he agreed with me that I was right when I said that these executive agencies and their friends gang up on them. Now, you are making it possible for them to gang up now, and they will not have to fool with us in the House at all. They will simply gang up over in the Senate where there are only 96 men to try to influence, and they will give us the go-by sure enough.

If you want to hinder reorganization, if you want to block it and stop it, although you say you are for it, then you should vote for this amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. In my opinion, irrespective of the fact that the gentleman from Michigan has offered his amendment in good faith, in my opinion the adoption of this amendment for all practical purposes, would mean the ineffective operation of any reorganization bill. This amendment was very seriously considered in the committee. Furthermore, the last reorganization bill carried substantially the same provision as is contained in this bill. Agreeing with my friend in his unique story about gutting the catfish, this amendment, while not intended as such, will bring about the result that this bill will be gutted. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. LANHAM. It will be gutted just the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in this amendment we are faced with the real question of whether or not we want to continue the long-standing and tested legislative procedure, whereby no action under the authority of Congress is taken without the approval of both Houses of the Congress. Nothing else ever becomes law or goes into effect unless both Houses of Congress approve. Why should a reorganization plan? A hundred bills a year are passed by this House which are not adopted by the other body, and, of course, they do not become law. The same is true of bills passed by the other body but not by us. But under this bill as it now stands the President and one House of Congress can legislate, even though the other House expressly disapproves. It seems to me that as a matter of principle that is an extremely unwise thing to do. I do not believe any piece of legislation ought to be put into effect if one House disapproves. Do you? Does anybody really want a piece of legislation to go through that one House of Congress is opposed to?

Under this amendment the President sends down his bill with a plan for reorganization. After 60 days it automatically goes into effect unless one House passes a resolution disapproving. If one House passes such a resolution, that does not kill the plan; it merely returns it to the President for him to make such modifications as will remove our objections. The debates here will tell him what part of the plan we do not like. He revises it and sends it back to us. It is precisely like the way we handle a conference report. If we do not like any part of a conference report, we reject it and it goes back to conference; the conferees revise it and bring it back until we can let it become law.

Three years ago, when I was privileged to be a member of this great Committee on Expenditures, I offered this same amendment in the last Reorganization Act, and it came within 14 votes of winning. It came up late in the session, later even than today, and we did not have a chance to explain it fully. I do not see how anybody can rightly object to this when he understands it. Surely we do not want to delegate to one House of Congress and the President the power to enact laws.

Under this legislation we do not authorize the President to reorganize; we authorize him to prepare a plan of reorganization. He is in better position than we to prepare a plan. We want the President to take the lead—he has to—in suggesting specific reorganization steps. But reorganization is a legislative function and therefore our responsibility. We cannot rightly delegate to somebody else that responsibility without having a chance to look at it and have the final say before he can issue orders to put it into effect. Under the amendment, if either body for whatever reason seems to it adequate decides to pass a resolution within 60 days disapproving the particular plan the President has submitted, it goes back to him, he reworks it, brings it back in better form and it goes through.

The amendment cannot possibly gut the bill. It merely sticks to the basic system of government that we have had in this Republic for more than a hundred and fifty years whereby the two Houses of Congress and the President legislate, not the President and one House of Congress. What is wrong with that?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. If the amendment is not adopted it means, does it not, in effect that one House of Congress and the President alone can legislate without the other House?

Mr. JUDD. Precisely; and that is exactly what I believe ought not to be done. If I felt sure the President would always send us what I personally would regard as the best reorganization plans ever devised, I still would be opposed to a system where the House could not hold it up if a majority should think it unwise.

I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time this particular amendment has been presented to the House, when a reorganization plan was proposed. This language which we have in the pending bill is the same language that was passed in the 1939 Reorganization Act and the 1945 Reorganization Act. Now, I am going back further, to the act of 1932, when Mr. Hoover was the President and his Attorney General was William B. Mitchell. In discussing this particular amendment which has been offered here today, it said:

If either branch of the Congress within such 60 calendar days shall pass a resolution disapproving of such Executive order or any part thereof, such Executive order shall become null and void to the extent of such disapproval.

In discussing that particular amendment, he said:

It must be assumed that the functions of the President under this act were Executive in their nature or they could not have been constitutionally conferred upon him; and so there was set up a method by which one house of Congress might disapprove Executive action. No one would question the power of Congress to provide for delay in the execution of such an administrative order, or its power to withdraw the authority to make that order provided the withdrawal takes the form of legislation. But to attempt to give either house of Congress by action which is not legislative power to disapprove administrative acts raises a grave question as to the validity of the entire provision in the act of June 30, 1932, for executive reorganization of the governmental functions.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. But the situation he was describing was not at all comparable to the one we are discussing. He ruled that it was probably unconstitutional for one house of Congress to make null and void an Executive order issued by the President, and I agree. But this bill does permit Congress to nullify Executive orders, it does not in the first instance authorize the President to issue orders effecting reorganization and then submit the orders to Congress for approval or disapproval. It authorizes him to prepare a plan and submit that to Congress. He will have issued no orders. We will merely be enacting or not enacting into law the plan he submits. Only after 60 days have gone by without disapproval of the plan by the Congress does the plan become law and he have authority to issue Executive orders. We debated that when reorganization was under consideration in 1945, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Sumners, the eminent jurist who was chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, said the two situations were not alike. He said:

Attorney General Mitchell rendered an opinion that an Executive order made under the grant of legislative power could not be vacated or set aside by any congressional action short of legislation. It is perfectly apparent to the Membership of the House that this bill was drawn with the view of naming the President as the ministerial agent of the House rather than vesting in him legislative power, and therefore the provision contained in this bill whereby Congress may vacate any action taken by the President by concurrent resolution is perfectly valid, because it is a condition subsequent and is a part of the law itself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize the gentleman's position and he has had 5 minutes to sustain it.

Mr. JUDD. But the situations are not similar.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is some question as to the constitutionality of the amendment which has been offered. The House by its action today will confer upon the President certain powers, delegating him to do certain things within limits. No one has attacked the constitutionality of that. Likewise when the plan comes back to the Congress the action of two Houses in disapproving it is just as important as the action of two Houses in approving. The gentleman's amendment does exactly what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] said, in my opinion. You know, you can always get one side of the Congress to agree for certain reasons to obstruct an act.

Mr. JUDD. Does the gentleman believe it is wise for legislation to be passed that one House of Congress disapproves?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That one House of Congress disapproves?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; the amendment provides that the President will be empowered to carry out the plan and to issue directives and orders under the plan only if within 60 days neither House has disapproved. If neither House has disapproved, it goes on its way. If one House disapproves within 60 days he has to take the plan back.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You are conferring upon one House legislative functions in fact.

Mr. JUDD. No; we are preventing one House alone from exercising legislative functions.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Under the bill presented by the committee it requires the action of both Houses to disapprove.

Mr. JUDD. That is true. But many of us believe we should stick to the basic system in our Constitution under which action can be taken under the authority of the Congress only if both Houses approve—that is, if neither disapproves. Let me read you what the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] said when this was before us previously:

If it is within the competency of Congress to provide for vacating a plan that might be submitted under the bill by the President, by a concurrent resolution; it is of course equally within the right of Congress to provide that the order might be vacated by a simple resolution of either body.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Committee of the Whole stand behind the committee on this and vote down the amendment as it will nullify the whole act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell my colleagues a little story, about an occasion that happened, I think in 1940, in connection with what was then Reorganization Plan No. 3. That reorganization plan, among other things, abolished what was known as the Air Safety Board. Very shortly thereafter occurred a series of air accidents, something like 28 or 30 in number. In the course of that time the House appointed what was known as the Select Committee of the House of Representatives to Investigate Air Accidents. I believe I am the only Member of the House today who was a member of that select committee. The accident near Atlanta, Ga., in which our own beloved colleague and friend, Bill Byron, of Maryland, was killed, and Capt. Eddie Rickenbacher seriously injured, pointed the need for a congressional investigation.

We proceeded to investigate 28 air accidents. It was considered at first by that committee, and I concurred in the thought, that abolition of the Air Safety Board had nothing to do with the accidents, but the further we went into it the more we became convinced that its abolition did have something to do with it. I bring that up only for one reason. When that reorganization plan was brought before the House of Representatives, the House by a very substantial majority voted its disapproval of that plan. I cannot now just remember whether the Senate did not concur with the House or whether no action whatever was taken in the other body. But, at all events, with the complete disapproval of the House, that plan nevertheless became law. Since then we have tried to arrive at some reasonable conclusion in our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that would provide for a new Air Safety Board. The difficulties have been great. Perhaps, administratively, it is now being corrected. I trust it is. But, there was one serious instance when the House of Representatives by a considerable majority disapproved of a Presidential plan for reorganization largely because of the abolition of the Air Safety Board, and it became law nevertheless. We believed in our select committee unanimously that the Air Safety Board should not have been abolished. We could not do a thing about it in the House, because while we had disapproved its abolition, the plan nevertheless became law.

It seems to me that the House of Representatives is capable of judging the rightness or the wrongness of any plan for reorganization just as well as any other body in the Congress, and I think for myself that we should retain here the right to approve or disapprove any of those plans, regardless of any other agency of the Government. I think if we do not do that, that we will be giving away a very important part of our rights as representatives of the people of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JUDD) there were—ayes 95, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee may return to page 6 of the bill in order that I may offer a correcting

amendment which is not at all hostile to the purposes of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 6, line 1, after the word "for" strike out the words "winding up" and insert the word "terminating."

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepts the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. Since debate will undoubtedly not change any votes, I ask for a vote on the amendment upon the conclusion of its reading.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 8, in line 3 of subsection (c) of section 6, after the semicolon following the word "it", strike out the words "but only if" and insert in lieu thereof the words "provided that" and in line 5, strike out the word "not" and in line 6 strike out the word "not." In line 7 after the word "plan" strike out the period, insert a semicolon and add the following words, "provided further that the Congress shall, within such 60-day period, either approve or disapprove of such reorganization plan."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith with the following amendment: On page 8, after the word "by" strike out the words "the two Houses a concurrent" and insert the words "either House a"; and in line 6 strike out the words "the Congress" and insert the word "it."

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 358, nays 9, not voting 66, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—358

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Crawford | Hays, Ark. |
| Addonizio | Crook | Hays, Ohio |
| Albert | Crosser | Hébert |
| Allen, Calif. | Cunningham | Hedrick |
| Allen, Ill. | Curtis | Heffernan |
| Allen, La. | Dague | Herlong |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Davies, N. Y. | Heselton |
| Anderson, Calif. | Davis, Ga. | Hinshaw |
| Andresen, August H. | Davis, Tenn. | Hobbs |
| Andrews | Davis, Wis. | Hoeven |
| Angell | Dawson | Hoffman, Ill. |
| Arends | Deane | Holifield |
| Aspinall | DeGraffenried | Holmes |
| Auchincloss | Delaney | Hope |
| Bailey | Denton | Horan |
| Barden | D'Ewart | Howell |
| Baring | Dollinger | Huber |
| Barrett, Pa. | Dolliver | Hull |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Dondero | Irving |
| Bates, Ky. | Donohue | Jackson, Calif. |
| Bates, Mass. | Doughton | Jackson, Wash. |
| Battle | Douglas | Jacobs |
| Beall | Doyle | James |
| Beckworth | Durham | Javits |
| Bennett, Mich. | Eberharter | Jenison |
| Bentsen | Elliott | Jenkins |
| Biemiller | Elston | Jennings |
| Bishop | Engle, Calif. | Jensen |
| Blatnik | Evins | Johnson |
| Boggs, Del. | Fallon | Jones, Ala. |
| Boggs, La. | Feighan | Jones, Mo. |
| Bolling | Fellows | Jones, N. C. |
| Bolton, Md. | Fenton | Judd |
| Bolton, Ohio | Fernandez | Karst |
| Bonner | Fisher | Karsten |
| Bosone | Flood | Kearney |
| Boykin | Fogarty | Kearns |
| Bramblett | Forand | Keating |
| Breen | Ford | Kelley |
| Brehm | Frazier | Keogh |
| Brooks | Fugate | Kerr |
| Brown, Ga. | Furcolo | Kilburn |
| Brown, Ohio | Gamble | Kilday |
| Bryson | Garmatz | King |
| Buchanan | Gathings | Kirwan |
| Buckley, Ill. | Gavin | Klein |
| Burke | Gillette | Kruse |
| Burleson | Gilmer | Kunkel |
| Burnside | Golden | Lane |
| Burton | Goodwin | Lanham |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Gordon | Larcade |
| Camp | Gorski, Ill. | LeCompte |
| Cannon | Gorski, N. Y. | LeFevre |
| Carlyle | Gossett | Lemke |
| Carnahan | Graham | Lesinski |
| Carroll | Granahan | Lind |
| Case, N. J. | Granger | Linehan |
| Cavalcante | Grant | Lodge |
| Chatham | Green | Lovre |
| Chelf | Gregory | Lucas |
| Chesney | Gross | Lyle |
| Christopher | Gwinn | Lynch |
| Chudoff | Hagen | McCarthy |
| Church | Hale | McConnell |
| Clemente | Hall, Edwin Arthur | McCormack |
| Clevenger | Hall, Leonard W. | McCulloch |
| Coffey | Halleck | McDonough |
| Cole, Kans. | Hand | McGrath |
| Cole, N. Y. | Harden | McGregor |
| Colmer | Hardy | McGuire |
| Combs | Hare | McKinnon |
| Cooley | Harris | McMillan, S. C. |
| Cooper | Hart | McMillen, Ill. |
| Corbett | Harvey | McSweeney |
| Cotton | Havenner | Mack, Ill. |
| Crawford | Hays, Ark. | Mack, Wash. |
| Crook | Hays, Ohio | Madden |
| Crosser | Hébert | Magee |
| Cunningham | Hedrick | Mahon |
| Curtis | Heffernan | Mansfield |
| Dague | Herlong | Marcantonio |
| Davies, N. Y. | Heselton | Marsalis |
| Davis, Ga. | Hinshaw | Marshall |
| Davis, Tenn. | Hobbs | Martin, Mass. |
| Davis, Wis. | Hoeven | Merrow |
| Dawson | Hoffman, Ill. | Michener |
| Deane | Holifield | Miller, Calif. |
| DeGraffenried | Holmes | Miller, Md. |
| Delaney | Hope | Miller, Nebr. |
| Denton | Horan | Mills |
| D'Ewart | Howell | Mitchell |
| Dollinger | Huber | Monroney |
| Dolliver | Hull | Morgan |
| Dondero | Irving | Morris |
| Donohue | Jackson, Calif. | Morrison |
| Doughton | Jackson, Wash. | Morton |
| Douglas | Jacobs | Moulder |
| Doyle | James | Multer |
| Durham | Javits | Murdock |
| Eberharter | Jenison | Murphy |
| Elliott | Jenkins | Murray, Tenn. |
| Elston | Jennings | Nicholson |
| Engle, Calif. | Jensen | Nixon |
| Evins | Johnson | Noland |
| Fallon | Jones, Ala. | Norblad |
| Feighan | Jones, Mo. | Norrell |
| Fellows | Jones, N. C. | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Fenton | Judd | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Fernandez | Karst | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Fisher | Karsten | O'Neill |
| Flood | Kearney | O'Sullivan |
| Fogarty | Kearns | O'Toole |
| Forand | Keating | Pace |
| Ford | Kelley | Passman |
| Frazier | Keogh | Patman |
| Fugate | Kerr | Patten |
| Furcolo | Kilburn | Patterson |
| Gamble | Kilday | Perkins |
| Garmatz | King | Peterson |
| Gathings | Kirwan | Pfeiffer, William L. |
| Gavin | Klein | |
| Gillette | Kruse | |
| Gilmer | Kunkel | |
| Golden | Lane | |
| Goodwin | Lanham | |
| Gordon | Larcade | |
| Gorski, Ill. | LeCompte | |
| Gorski, N. Y. | LeFevre | |
| Gossett | Lemke | |
| Graham | Lesinski | |
| Granahan | Lind | |
| Granger | Linehan | |
| Grant | Lodge | |
| Green | Lovre | |
| Gregory | Lucas | |
| Gross | Lyle | |
| Gwinn | Lynch | |
| Hagen | McCarthy | |
| Hale | McConnell | |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | McCormack | |
| Hall, Leonard W. | McCulloch | |
| Halleck | McDonough | |
| Hand | McGrath | |
| Harden | McGregor | |
| Hardy | McGuire | |
| Hare | McKinnon | |
| Harris | McMillan, S. C. | |
| Hart | McMillen, Ill. | |
| Harvey | McSweeney | |
| Havenner | Mack, Ill. | |
| Hays, Ark. | Mack, Wash. | |
| Hays, Ohio | Madden | |
| Hébert | Magee | |
| Hedrick | Mahon | |
| Heffernan | Mansfield | |
| Herlong | Marcantonio | |
| Heselton | Marsalis | |
| Hinshaw | Marshall | |
| Hobbs | Martin, Mass. | |
| Hoeven | Merrow | |
| Hoffman, Ill. | Michener | |
| Holifield | Miller, Calif. | |
| Holmes | Miller, Md. | |
| Hope | Miller, Nebr. | |
| Horan | Mills | |
| Howell | Mitchell | |
| Huber | Monroney | |
| Hull | Morgan | |
| Irving | Morris | |
| Jackson, Calif. | Morrison | |
| Jackson, Wash. | Morton | |
| Jacobs | Moulder | |
| James | Multer | |
| Javits | Murdock | |
| Jenison | Murphy | |
| Jenkins | Murray, Tenn. | |
| Jennings | Nicholson | |
| Jensen | Nixon | |
| Johnson | Noland | |
| Jones, Ala. | Norblad | |
| Jones, Mo. | Norrell | |
| Jones, N. C. | O'Brien, Ill. | |
| Judd | O'Brien, Mich. | |
| Karst | O'Hara, Ill. | |
| Karsten | O'Neill | |
| Kearney | O'Sullivan | |
| Kearns | O'Toole | |
| Keating | Pace | |
| Kelley | Passman | |
| Keogh | Patman | |
| Kerr | Patten | |
| Kilburn | Patterson | |
| Kilday | Perkins | |
| King | Peterson | |
| Kirwan | Pfeiffer, William L. | |
| Klein | | |
| Kruse | | |
| Kunkel | | |
| Lane | | |
| Lanham | | |
| Larcade | | |
| LeCompte | | |
| LeFevre | | |
| Lemke | | |
| Lesinski | | |
| Lind | | |
| Linehan | | |
| Lodge | | |
| Lovre | | |
| Lucas | | |
| Lyle | | |
| Lynch | | |
| McCarthy | | |
| McConnell | | |
| McCormack | | |
| McCulloch | | |
| McDonough | | |
| McGrath | | |
| McGregor | | |
| McGuire | | |
| McKinnon | | |
| McMillan, S. C. | | |
| McMillen, Ill. | | |
| McSweeney | | |
| Mack, Ill. | | |
| Mack, Wash. | | |
| Madden | | |
| Magee | Philbin | Stefan |
| Mahon | Phillips, Calif. | Stigler |
| Mansfield | Phillips, Tenn. | Sullivan |
| Marcantonio | Pickett | Sutton |
| Marsalis | Poage | Tackett |
| Marshall | Polk | Talle |
| Martin, Mass. | Poulson | Tauriello |
| Merrow | Preston | Taylor |
| Michener | Price | Teague |
| Miller, Calif. | Priest | Thomas, Tex. |
| Miller, Md. | Quinn | Thompson |
| Miller, Nebr. | Rabaut | Thornberry |
| Mills | Rains | Tollefson |
| Mitchell | Ramsay | Trimble |
| Monroney | Redden | Underwood |
| Morgan | Reed, Ill. | Van Zandt |
| Morris | Reed, N. Y. | Vinson |
| Morrison | Rees | Vorys |
| Morton | Regan | Vursell |
| Moulder | Rhodes | Wadsworth |
| Multer | Ribicoff | Wagner |
| Murdock | Rich | Walter |
| Murphy | Richards | Weichel |
| Murray, Tenn. | Riehlman | Welch, Mo. |
| Nicholson | Rodino | Werdel |
| Nixon | Rogers, Fla. | Wheeler |
| Noland | Rogers, Mass. | White, Calif. |
| Norblad | Rooney | Whitten |
| Norrell | Sadowski | Wickersham |
| O'Brien, Ill. | St. George | Wigglesworth |
| O'Brien, Mich. | Sanborn | Williams |
| O'Hara, Ill. | Sasscer | Willis |
| O'Neill | Scrivner | Wilson, Ind. |
| O'Sullivan | Scudder | Wilson, Okla. |
| O'Toole | Sikes | Wilson, Tex. |
| Pace | Simpson, Ill. | Winstead |
| Passman | Simpson, Pa. | Withrow |
| Patman | Sims | Wolverton |
| Patten | Smathers | Wood |
| Patterson | Smith, Kans. | Woodhouse |
| Perkins | Spence | Woodruff |
| Peterson | Staggers | Worley |
| Pfeiffer, William L. | Stanley | Yates |
| | Steed | Zablocki |

NAYS—9

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Mason | O'Konski | Short |
| Nelson | Rankin | Taber |
| O'Hara, Minn. | Shafer | Wolcott |

NOT VOTING—66

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Harrison | Sabath |
| Bennett, Fla. | Herter | Sadlak |
| Blackney | Hill | Scott, Hardie |
| Bland | Hoffman, Mich. | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Bloom | Jonas | Secrest |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Kean | Sheppard |
| Bulwinkle | Kee | Smith, Ohio |
| Burdick | Keefe | Smith, Va. |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Kennedy | Smith, Wis. |
| Canfield | Latham | Somers |
| Case, S. Dak. | Lichtenwalter | Stockman |
| Celler | Macy | Thomas, N. J. |
| Chiperfield | Martin, Iowa | Towe |
| Coudert | Meyer | Velde |
| Cox | Miles | Walsh |
| Davenport | Murray, Wis. | Welch, Calif. |
| Dingell | Norton | Whitaker |
| Eaton | Pfeifer, Joseph L. | White, Idaho |
| Ellsworth | Plumley | Whittington |
| Engel, Mich. | Potter | Wier |
| Fulton | Powell | Young |
| Gary | Rivers | |
| Gore | | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Gary with Mr. Kean.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Macy.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Kennedy with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Meyer.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Potter.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Jonas.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Cox with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Harrison with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Somers with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Whittington with Mr. Engel of Michigan.
Mr. Young with Mr. Case, of South Dakota.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Velde.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Welch of California.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Herter.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Keefe.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Murray of Wisconsin.
Mr. White of Idaho with Mr. Hill.
Mr. Davenport with Mr. Fulton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, let us no longer tolerate the bestial, uncivilized conduct of the Soviets and their puppets. We cannot afford longer to appease and temporize with palpable conspiracies against this Nation and the cause of human freedom everywhere.

Shall no voice of protest be raised by this Government against this latest outrage against Christianity and democracy? We should officially protest this persecution, this unspeakable cruelty. If protests are unheeded, we should promptly withdraw diplomatic recognition. The time has come to act in defense of our freedoms and security.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution and an editorial.

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts and resolutions.

Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution

Mr. SHORT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include three editorials.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement from the Executive Office of the President.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. HORAN and Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin (at the request of Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Gen. Jonathan Wainwright.

OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 84) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That effective February 1, 1949, there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional basic compensation per annum to the following employees in the office of the majority leader:

1. Additional clerk, at the rate of $100.
2. Assistant clerk, at the rate of $300.
3. Stenographer, at the rate of $100.

The resolution was agreed to.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, American agriculture needs a slightly different gearing toward better adjustment, but let us not strip the gears in the process. We must decide on an approach that will not ignore such important things as national economic security, the conservation of our agricultural resources and keeping them intact for any eventuality, and the social well-being of every American.

I shall from time to time point out some of the hazards of the present law governing price supports on basic farm crops. We should not become complacent after removing certain features of this legislation, such as the provision that permits support of basic farm prices at less than 90 percent of parity after January 1, 1950. That is only the beginning. Following that, we must provide a program that will help and encourage and be an incentive to the farmer to carry on genuine soil conservation practices, to adjust his production so that we can have high production, high agricultural income, along with protection against excessive imports to insure a high national standard of living, and a secure national economy.

We need the continuance of a 90-percent parity price support, especially on basic farm crops, to provide an incentive for the farmer to produce. But at the same time, we must provide the farmer the right kind of assistance so that he can make the needed adjustments for continued fuller balanced production but which will not necessitate huge expenditures to support prices.

With that in view, I have today introduced a bill which I am confident will provide the framework to do this, legislation which will direct the United States Department of Agriculture to move ahead in the only sane way there is to help the farmer solve these problems. This legislation does not provide for reduced production, but rather for a better balance of production.

It provides for the farmer to receive technical and financial assistance so that he can convert his poorer, now uneconomic producing land to a safe, long-time economic production use. He will be able to increase the fertility of his land so that he can produce more and better crops at cheaper cost, and at the same time give his land the protection it needs for maximum conservation and profitable continued production.

This legislation does not call for new agencies. It provides for the Secretary of Agriculture to use the same agencies, namely, Soil Conservation Service, Extension Service, and PMA, and also enables him to direct such manpower for more concerted action in soil conservation and for balanced farm production.

What will it cost the taxpayer? Definitely not one cent more than is now being appropriated. In all probability in due time it will cost less than is now being appropriated for benefits to agriculture and in addition will save untold millions we will need otherwise to support farm prices. This legislation provides that the money being appropriated for agricultural conservation payments—between two hundred and fifty to three hundred million dollars a year—be used for genuine conservation and balanced production purposes.

Let us glance momentarily at some of the beneficial adjustments these payments could bring about. Farmers are now growing about 11,000,000 more acres of wheat than they did on an average from 1937 to 1946. Half of this increased acreage was made possible by using land which previous to that was in grass, and should go back to grass. The other half was made possible by using land which formerly was used for hay, and moisture conserving practices. At the same time, livestock numbers have gone down. We have 11,000,000 fewer head of sheep than we did in 1942. We have 5,000,000 fewer head of beef cattle. This does not account for the livestock losses occurring from the recent subzero weather and blizzard conditions which have attacked our western cattle country in the past few weeks. These are just two items in our maladjusted agriculture. We today have 5,000,000 more acres of soybeans than we had in the 1930's, more acreage in cotton, corn, and other basic crops—and all at the sacrifice of either our soil resources or other production. Is it any wonder we have an erosion problem and an unbalanced agriculture? And these are but a very few of the out-of-adjustment crops we are confronted with.

This needed adjustment could be brought about by an expenditure of but one-third of present conservation payments—or approximately $100,000,000 a year, leaving the rest of these funds to serve additionally for conserving our soil resources and rebuilding the productivity of the rest of our land for any eventuality and making full economic use of every acre, whether it be for crops, livestock, fruit, or timber.

In brief, this legislation also provides for the joining together for a unified purpose the conservation work now be-

ing done by certain agencies of the United States Department of Agriculture—a recommendation being made by all persons who have investigated present conditions and understand the erosion and production problems in agriculture. This bill ties together the conservation payments of the Production and Marketing Administration and the excellent technical services being offered by the Soil Conservation Service to farmers in soil conservation districts embracing over three-fourths of our farmland. Furthermore, this legislation strengthens the necessary and proper approach by helping farmers work out their own farm problems through their soil conservation districts which are organized by farmers themselves under State law. The district activities are supervised by locally elected farmers. The Federal Government does not spend anything for salaries or expenses of these supervisors. Where such financial help is given directly to districts, it is being done by the various States in cooperation with this phase of our national conservation efforts.

All of us know that on a large share of our land its long-time economic and safe use demands carefully planned rotations. Bypassing these rotations is one of the chief contributors to today's agricultural maladjustment.

The 1945 census shows that about 403,000,000 acres of land was being cultivated annually. In addition, the census reported that there are about 47,500,000 acres of plowable pasture making a total of about 450,000,000 acres currently classified as cropland. According to our best authorities in agriculture, about 61,000,000 acres of this land are not suitable for cultivation. This land is now being bled of its fertility and topsoil and land we must save for a type of production which will not destroy it.

Of the total acreage now or potentially available for safe cropping in the United States—approximately 460,000,000 acres when certain conversions are made—around 25 percent is now being damaged at a rapid rate of erosion. On another 110,000,000 to 120,000,000 acres of cropland, erosion is proceeding at a less rapid but still serious rate.

If we allow this land destruction to continue for another 25 years at its present rapid pace, continue present rate of increase in population, how strong will we be agriculturally by 1975? Obviously, we will be much weaker. What if we are again faced with a world conflict at that time and are called on to feed ourselves and our allies? If an overflowing arsenal of food is as important at that time as it was in World Wars I and II, we will definitely fail unless we take more aggressive action to stop the loss of our irreplaceable soil resources.

In view of all of these factors, I consider that for a logical approach to this problem of helping farmers balance their production we must begin with the proper use and conservation of our soil and water resources. Using the facilities we already have in the Department of Agriculture, and making full use of the incentive program of conservation payments, in the legislation which I am introducing, I request that in addition to the needed basic national land policy which most of us have discussed before and favor, the following be enacted:

That the funds appropriated for conservation payments be divided into three groups of payments.

First. That there be class A payments to be used to encourage farmers to convert the use of land after it has been in grain, row, or other soil-depleting crops two or more previous years. These payments shall be used to help the farmers convert this land, for a reasonable time, to non-soil-depleting uses such as meadow, hay, pasture, and woodland. This conversion will encourage the production of more livestock and less grain but will not reduce the farmers' income. At the same time, it will encourage better land use, help to reduce erosion, and will greatly help to rebuild the fertility of our priceless soils. The payment shall be largest on the first year of conversion and on a reduced basis for the succeeding 5 years.

Second. That there be class B payments which shall be made for practices and other improvements of a permanent or semipermanent nature, such as terrace systems, drainage and irrigation installations, retirement of eroded cropland, farm ponds, range water diversion systems, and for other practices as may be needed to prevent permanent loss to the productive capacity of the land.

After 1952, class A and B payments shall be made only when land conversion or when such practices or improvements are carried out as part of a complete farm or ranch conservation plan on the basis of a cooperative agreement between a soil conservation or other conservation district and the landowner or operator.

Third. That there be class C payments which shall be made for recurring practices that will retard depletion of soil fertility, such as liming, fertilizing, grass seeding, crop rotation, cover cropping, mulching, and prevention of stubble burning. Such payments shall be made annually.

In brief, the foregoing and following are the major features and basic consideration which have brought about the introduction of this legislation. By its enactment, we will—

1. Establish a national land policy which will provide as a basis for agriculture's balanced production the conservation and proper use of our agricultural resources.

2. Achieve success in adjusting agricultural production for a high standard of living.

3. Protect our agricultural and national economy against bankruptcy.

4. Recognize the interdependency between a productive agriculture and a productive industry for national prosperity.

5. Help farmers to achieve greater success in soil and water conservation which will contribute extensively toward the agricultural security of our Nation.

6. Give to the American farmer the type of assistance he wants and needs—technical help he cannot obtain otherwise—and make it available through his locally farmer organized and administered soil conservation district.

7. Enable the Secretary of Agriculture to obtain greater farmer and national benefits from conservation payment funds.

8. Bring about a new era in American agriculture, which will lead to a more productive agriculture and industry, and give a permanent insurance for the preservation of our form of government.

### OBJECTORS' COMMITTEE ON THE DEMOCRATIC SIDE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce the appointment of the objectors' committee on the Democratic side. The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE], and the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL]. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], being the ranking member, is chairman of the objectors' committee on the Democratic side.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

### FINANCIAL SOLVENCY OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, numerous references have been made to alleged mandates growing out of the recent election. I think an analysis of the issues and the vote clearly show that no specific mandate on legislation was voted by the people.

Mr. Speaker, there is, however, one continuing and compelling mandate and responsibility resting upon this Congress which demands highest priority over any so-called legislative mandates from the November election. That mandate placed imperative responsibility upon the members of this Congress to keep this country sound financially.

It far transcends the call for additional billions of dollars for new legislation by the pressure groups. If they were made to understand their requests for constant greater appropriations may jeopardize the financial solvency of this country, they would cease to exert such pressure.

The Communists within our gates are the only ones who want to wreck the Nation financially, destroy the value of all of our Government bonds, wreck the banks, insurance companies, and destroy the credit of the Nation which would bring about chaos and the triumph of communism in this country.

That mandate and responsibility, when this Government was formed, was written into the Constitution of the United States at Philadelphia in 1787 and was regarded as one of its most important provisions. It is still in there, and its importance has grown with age.

Mr. Speaker, the mandate I refer to placed upon the Congress, and not upon the Chief Executive, the responsibility

and the sole power to levy taxes with which to finance our Government. That provision was so important it provided that all tax legislation should originate in the House of Representatives, the Members of which were regarded as being the representatives subject to the most immediate control of the people. Their terms of office were fixed at 2 years so that if they failed to properly represent the people, they could be turned out of office at the next election.

The members of the Constitutional Convention all regarded the taxing power of great importance to the financial solvency of the Government. Thomas Jefferson well defined the thinking of those who wrote the Constitution on this particular subject when he made the statement, "The power to tax is the power to destroy."

That immortal statement is as true today as the founders of our Constitution held it to be at that time. Our responsibility to maintain a sound fiscal policy in these chaotic times when we are carrying a national debt load of $252,000,000,000 should rest more heavily on the conscience of each Member of this Congress today than ever before.

Nothing is more important to the well-being of the people of this Nation and of the world today, than that this Congress, with the cooperation of the Chief Executive, see to it that this Nation is kept in a sound financial condition.

Fifteen billion dollars appropriated in this session of Congress for national defense, $6,000,000,000 for compensation and care of veterans, almost $2,000,000,000 for agriculture, billions for social security, and all of the $42,000,000,000 we are asked to appropriate will mean nothing unless we keep the Government sound financially. We must keep this Nation strong against any eventuality.

Mr. Speaker, Lenin, the founder of communism, 30 years ago proclaimed the philosophy that capitalistic forms of government would eventually spend themselves into financial bankruptcy and become an easy prey to communism. Stalin in recent years has predicted that the United States would spend itself into financial bankruptcy. They have been anxiously waiting for this to happen. The Communists in this country have the same fervent hope and expectation.

May I emphasize this point: The Members of this House who face legislation to constantly expand the cost of Government, not only have the responsibility, but they have the power, and it is their duty, to stop the enactment of unnecessary legislation which will add billions of dollars of expense to the cost of Government each session. They also have the power, and should use it, to greatly reduce the cost of Government. I hope, in this session, the Members of this Congress will rise to their responsibility and prevent every possible waste in Government. We should reduce appropriations, rather than increase them.

With the tremendous debt hanging over the people, and the possible threat of another war, it seems most unfortunate that the President has recommended to the Congress a volume of new legislation which, if enacted into law by this Congress, will add several billion dollars annually to the present debt load, and will increase as the programs are put into operation, billions of dollars each year. Some have estimated that the legislation recommended by the President will require possibly $10,000,000,000 additional each year in taxes. We cannot carry such an additional tax load.

The President has asked a direct tax raise of $4,000,000,000, plus about $2,000,000,000 more money for social security. His budget request for $42,000,000,000, if it can be held to that for the coming fiscal year, amounts to $283 for each man, woman, and child in America.

Mr. Speaker, it is not a question of the desirability of any of the requests for new legislation. Even though some of them may be justifiable and desirous, little if any legislation requested is absolutely necessary. Take, for example, proposed legislation for socialized medicine, federalized or socialized housing; great expansion and extension of river valley power developments; the spending of $500,000,000 to develop the St. Lawrence seaway; universal military training costing more billions; and many other projects. None of them are absolutely necessary at the present time. We grew to our present strength, fought and won the last war without any of them.

The Federal Government is being called upon for billions of dollars for grants-in-aid to States, when the State treasuries are generally in much sounder condition than is the Federal Government.

WHO IS THE GOVERNMENT?

One hundred and forty million people and their property make up the Federal Government. It consists of some 40,000,000 families. The Government is not some particular agency in Washington that is supposed to take care of the people and support them; the people support their Government with the $42,000,000,000 in taxes asked from them by the President for the coming year.

The Government should operate like a family. If the farmer is heavily in debt and has a Ford car for the family's use, his son may want him to buy him a new Cadillac; the wife and daughters might like to have a new piano, additional and more expensive electrical appliances and clothes. They do not have to have them, but it would be nice if they could. The conservative, sensible farmer will think of his debts that he must reduce, and he will refuse to be pressured into increasing his debts by a few thousand dollars more, but will take his surplus cash and reduce his debts or mortgage. The Congress must protect the Government in the same sensible way; we must not spend billions for things we can do without. We must reduce the national debt instead.

Mr. Speaker, the Government is in debt today as never before. Millions of our people have loaned the Government billions of dollars through their purchase of Government bonds. We need to reduce the debt and keep those bonds at par value. We cannot do it if we permit the many pressure groups to get their hands into the Federal Treasury and take more and more billions out of the Government. This thing has got to stop before it is too late; this Congress can and should stop it.

Unfortunately, the President promised too much in additional services and extra hand-outs to the people during the heat of the recent campaign. Nearly all of the promises made by the President are now being formulated into legislation which, of course, will keep his political campaign promises. If they are kept, some will benefit temporarily; yet, all of the people eventually will lose.

This Eighty-first Congress will have to decide whether it will enact into law a volume of new legislation recommended by the President which will add to the cost of government many billions of dollars annually for years to come, or whether it will adopt a policy of economy in government, refuse to enact any unnecessary legislation, cut the cost of government, and reduce the Federal debt by many billions of dollars annually. I believe a great majority of the people want us to embark upon a policy of economy, rather than to vote additional unnecessary billions which will make it necessary to increase taxes. We can well afford to wait until we are better able to pay for additional projects and services.

Mr. Speaker, it seems significant that the President in his message to the Eighty-first Congress put no emphasis on economy in Government. Instead he recommends a broad legislative program that able economists who have made a study of it claim will cost the Government over $100,000,000,000 within the next 10 years; that it will compel an increase in taxes of between 19 and 27 percent. They claim that it will increase taxes by 1950, if all legislation is approved, by $26,000,000,000, which added to the present $42,000,000,000 would make the annual tax load $68,000,000,000 for 1950.

The $42,000,000,000 budget for the coming year requested by the President will cost the taxpayers and residents of Illinois alone $3,300,000,000 for its share in the cost of the Federal Government. This will take from my State, seven times all property taxes collected for all State and county governments in Illinois in 1948. It will take from the taxpayers of Marion County, where I live, $14,358,000. This is nine times as much as the $1,788,000 paid in Marion County in 1948 to cover the cost of all schools, city, and county governments.

It will take from Saline County in my district $9,603,000 as that county's share of the $42,000,000,000 budget requested by the President. This is over nine times as much as the $1,001,000 paid in Saline County in 1948 to cover the cost of schools, city and county government. It will penalize all counties in my district in the same way.

The Eighty-first Congress has before it two great opportunities for service to the people. The first is to refuse to enact all proposed new legislation not absolutely necessary that will add extra billions to the cost of Government.

Its second opportunity is to reduce the cost of Government by $4,000,000,000 and to defeat any attempt to increase taxes.

Unemployment is increasing every day. This proposed new legislation to increase taxes is one of the major reasons for the increase in unemployment. Businessmen will not risk their capital, stay in business, and expand it when they are threatened with a constant increase of taxes by the Federal Government. A tax policy that chokes the rewards of enterprise will destroy our prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest services that could be rendered to the laboring people of the Nation, and to everyone, would be to drastically cut the cost of Government at the present time, and reduce, rather than increase, our taxes. In fact, excise taxes such as the 25 percent tax on telephone and telegraph communications, and dozens of such taxes on items that are not luxuries should be greatly reduced, or wiped out completely. We should be reducing taxes, rather than even considering raising tax rates.

This is certainly not the time to spend additional billions on new legislation. This is not the time to add 4 or 6 billion dollars additional taxes onto the taxpayers and the economy of our Government. If we do, we may prove that Jefferson was right when he said "the power to tax is the power to destroy." If we do, and pass additional new and unnecessary legislation that will cost many billions annually for the years to come, we may destroy the financial solvency of this Government to the great delight of Stalin, Molotov, and their Communist followers in our country.

This Congress, if it has the courage to stand up against the pressure groups and do the things they know within their own conscience is right, can cut the cost of Government and effect other economies by over $4,000,000,000.

Senator BYRD, of Virginia, has repeatedly called for a reduction of many thousands in Federal pay rolls. For the past 7 or 8 months, pay rolls have constantly increased. If we pass the legislation requested by the President, countless thousands of additional new pay-rollers will be added to the sprawling bureaucracy of this country. Their salaries will be a constant cost against the Government. Bureaucratic pay rolls should be reduced in this session of Congress by over 200,000 people at a saving of $600,000,000.

This is a time when the Congress, yes, and the Chief Executive ought to be calling for a reduction in spending, instead of calling for an increase in spending and taxes.

The Hoover Commission authorized by the Congress to make a thorough study and bring in recommendations for the reorganization of the executive department of Government in an effort to stop waste and overlapping of bureaus and greater efficiency and economy in government, will soon make its final report.

The Commission has given out several partial reports. Every report indicates that billions of dollars can be saved, and greater efficiency accomplished if the full report, soon to be made to the Congress, is adopted.

Instead of enacting a broad and expensive program of new legislation that will add countless thousands to this bureaucracy, why not wait till the next session of Congress until we have put the executive departments on an efficiency and economy basis, rather than add additional rooms and wings to the rambling bureaucratic structure we have today?

Comptroller General Lindsay C. Warren last week, in testifying before the House Executive Expenditures Committee in Washington, had this to say:

The Federal bureaucracy—

Now numbering over 2,000,000 persons—

is a Frankenstein monster, and an ideal system for tax eaters—attached to the public teat.

Further he said:

Our present Federal set-up is a hodgepodge and crazy quilt of duplications, overlapping, inefficiencies, and inconsequences.

As I have testified before—

Stated Mr. Warren—

at times it (the bureaucracy) arrogantly snaps its fingers in the face of Congress and openly defies it.

This comes from the Comptroller General of the United States, incidentally a Democrat, who is the agent of the Congress and a part of the legislative branch of the Government.

We can cut billions out of this bureaucracy in salaries and waste, and I for one want to see the Congress move in that direction instead of increasing the taxes. The President's proposed new legislation will increase pay rolls and make more taxes necessary.

Mr. Speaker, every segment of the American people now in my opinion are carrying as heavy a tax load, from the humblest to the highest, as they should be compelled to carry. If this Congress follows the recommendation of the President to increase taxes in the higher brackets and on corporations, the little taxpayers and a part of the laboring crowd who approve such a policy, will find that they who earn and pay taxes on less than $5,000 a year will have to pay at least two-thirds of this extra $4,000,000,000 in taxes.

Big business is paying war times taxes now like all of the rest of us. When additional taxes are placed on business and the corporations, the cost of these taxes will be added to the cost of goods bought by the little fellows earning up to $5,000 a year.

The millions of small taxpayers will pay about 64 percent of the $42,000,000,000. This is true because there are so many more of them.

In addition to income taxes, they will continue to pay hundreds of hidden taxes that go into the cost of the clothes they wear, the houses they live in, or the food they eat, and never know the tax is being passed on to them in the price of merchandise after it is loaded on to business or the corporations in taxes by the Federal Government.

May I close my remarks by expressing the hope that the 435 Members in the House of Representatives will realize in this session of Congress, as never before, that they will serve their constituents best, and that they will serve themselves and the Nation best, if we will reduce Government spending and prevent an increase in taxes.

The national defense of this country depends on keeping the Nation in a sound financial condition. If we fail as a nation financially, we cannot defend ourselves against any foe from within or without.

We cannot fully discharge our duty unless we reduce spending and cut the cost of Government. The time to act is now. It is later than we think. It is the responsibility of the Eighty-first Congress. It is the greatest challenge before you and the people that can come to this Congress. It may well mean the protection of your freedom and liberty for the future, and the preservation of our representative form of Government.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE UNITED STATES RICE INDUSTRY

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include statements, statistical material, and other matter in relation to the rice industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, last week the Members of Congress from the three southern rice-producing States—Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas—held a meeting with the officials of the Economic Adjustment Administration and the Department of Agriculture, and a statement was issued by those attending the meeting stating that in their opinion there was not too much cause for alarm in regard to the situation obtaining in the rice industry at this time.

The meeting was held largely to ascertain whether or not there was prospect of the Economic Adjustment Administration making purchase of approximately 1,000,000 pockets of rice from the United States under their allocation to China, and it was learned that because of the precarious situation existing as a result of the reverses of the nationalist government in China, these purchases have been deferred.

There are approximately 5,000,000 bags of rice of the 1948 crop in the hands of the growers and millers in the States of Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas. The Economic Adjustment Administration deferring the purchase of the allocation for China, and the fact that it is estimated that more than 50 percent of the remaining rice stocks in the States mentioned is of an inferior grade and poor milling quality, presents a major problem of distribution, and many of our growers and millers are becoming somewhat disturbed as to the sale of the remainder of the stock on hand, and while the world-wide demand for rice is in excess of the available supply at this time, the deferment of the purchase of rice for relief purposes in China by the Economic Adjustment Administration is deplored as the industry had anticipated the utilization of a large portion of the low grades in that program.

In previous years the Government has taken all of the low-grade rice and exported it on a price basis that would return to farmers approximately the same price that they received for the better grades; however, it must be borne in mind that conditions have changed and the Asiatic countries, which produced the major portion of the world supply prior to the war, were forced to reduce their production during the war to a point where the United States was called upon to expand their production in order to make up some of the deficit, and as a result of the scarcity of this product, prices for rice, like all other scarce commodities, increased in price comparable with prices prevailing during the First World War.

Other factors have now further changed the picture. Not only has the United States increased its production but a number of South American countries have expanded their production, and the Asiatic countries are now being rehabilitated, and they also are rapidly increasing their production, and from this time on the United States producers can look for a competitive market.

I think one of the best discussions of the situation in respect to commodity prices, including grains, hogs, and livestock is that by J. H. Carmical, in an article in the New York Times of Sunday, February 6, 1948, which I am quoting, as follows:

Under the weight of huge supplies, commodity prices—particularly domestic farm products—are going through their second readjustment in the postwar period. Coming just a year after the first price break, which was followed with only moderate and intermittent rallies, the present decline generally has wiped out the sharp rises in the immediate postwar period and has brought a number of commodities even below the level fixed by the Office of Price Administration during the war.

Despite the intervention of the United States Government with its price-support measures, the trend of commodity prices seems to be following those of every major war in the last two centuries. A sharp upward trend for a year or two until production again could get under way always has been followed by a sharp decline. Because of this Government's activities, including its aid program abroad, most people and especially the farmers had been led to believe that there would not be any sharp deflationary trend after World War II.

The huge supplies and prospects of large yields this year are among the factors in the present price trend. On January 1 last stocks of the six major grain crops in the United States were 1,372,600,000 bushels larger than a year earlier. When this was announced on January 25, it caused the grain trade to wonder if the Government's support program could remain effective in the face of another near-record yield this year.

Under the present Agricultural Act, the United States Government is committed to make nonrecourse loans to farmers at 90 percent of parity. Normally, the loan level would be the "floor" price on any farm product. However, with corn, and also wheat in recent months, dropping below the loan level, the trade realized that it was not safe to count on Government support prices as the absolute bottom.

STORAGE SPACE SCARCITY FELT

Among the reasons why prices have not held at the loan levels is the lack of storage space. This has caused some distress selling during the heavy marketing periods. In addition, many of the smaller farmers have sold their products in the open market rather than take the trouble involved in obtaining a Government loan. In some instances, the quality of a product is such that it will not qualify for a loan with the result that it is disposed of in the regular commercial way.

Another reason why support prices do not work in cases of abnormally large crops is that once a commodity has passed from the farmers' hands it enters the "free" supply and becomes subject to demand influences. Under the law the producer is the only person who may obtain a nonrecourse loan from the Government.

Probably the most important influence is the knowledge that there are excess supplies of all grains. The trade realizes that these ultimately will be made available, at least at loan redemption costs, and consumers are in no hurry to anticipate requirements very far in advance. Also, there is the further uncertainty as to when and at what price the Government will dispose of its loan holdings.

SUPPORT POLICIES A FACTOR

Further uncertainty involves the question of future farm price-support policies. The present support program of 90 percent of parity expires at the end of this year. Although a new plan providing for a sliding scale ranging from 60 to 90 percent of parity then is scheduled to apply, an effort is being made in Washington to set future price-support levels at a rigid 90 percent of parity. However, there are reports that some compromise arrangement may be worked out that would satisfy those of the farm bloc who are insisting on a rigid 90 percent loan level.

Despite all the efforts being made to hold farm-product prices and the billions of dollars that are being expended directly and indirectly for that purpose, the action of the grain markets over the past year indicates that it requires more than Government support to stem an economic trend.

In January 1948, May wheat in Chicago reached $3.06½ a bushel. In September, the May 1949 delivery sold at a low of $2.11⅜ when the post-harvest movement of wheat to terminals was at its height. Subsequently the price recovered moderately, but recently declined to around $2.15. However, July and September 1949 wheat have broken through the $2 level.

BREAK IN CORN SPECTACULAR

The break in corn price has been more spectacular. From a high in 1948 of $2.70¾ a bushel, May 1949 corn futures late in the year dropped to $1.39½. In the recent break, the price receded to around $1.27, or less than one-half of a year ago. The record corn crop last year and the heavy post-harvest movement to market have resulted in that cereal dropping sharply below its loan level of $1.56 a bushel at Chicago.

The heavy snows recently in the West, which have been accompanied by unseasonably low temperatures, have resulted in the deaths of a vast number of livestock, which will mean a lessened demand for corn for feeding purposes in the months ahead. In addition, the added moisture has improved the outlook for the present winter wheat crop.

For the first time since the end of the war, there are heavy surplus supplies of all important grains and the market simply is adjusting itself to the changed conditions. Had it not been for the support program, the decline probably would have been more drastic.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to quote a portion of an editorial from the Washington Post, also of date Sunday, February 6, 1948, entitled "Turn in the Tide" which also discusses prices for basic farm products, and which also states that the downward movement of commodity prices is no cause for alarm, as follows:

TURN IN THE TIDE

Government officials have been quick to point out that the current drop in employment and the downward movement of commodity prices is no cause for alarm. So far, certainly, there is nothing to worry about in the rise in unemployment, which, judged by prewar standards, is still at low levels. Prices for basic farm products have already undergone a sharp deflation that has been salutary rather than otherwise, while the much-advertised drop in retail prices has been extremely limited, bringing living cost indices only three points below the peak level reached a few months ago.

The prevailing uneasiness is due chiefly to a belief, supported by an abundance of confirmatory evidence, that the period of scarcity and consequent booming prices is coming to an end. That had to happen sometime and there is good reason to be thankful that it seems to be taking place while employment and consumer incomes are still at high levels. However, the shift from an economy characterized by scarcity to a more normal peacetime economy of comparative abundance in which the seller no longer has the upper hand entails some hazards. As backlog demands for durable goods are satisfied, for instance, some industries have to curtail their operations, others feel the effects of seasonal declines in buying that were once taken for granted, and marginal high-cost firms may be forced out of business by inability to market their products at profitable prices.

Many of our farmers do not realize that, in respect to rice, the United States normally produces approximately 1 percent of the world supply of this commodity, and, in this connection, I wish to submit a table showing the production of rough rice for the 1947–48 crop year from the Commodity Yearbook as follows:

*Production of rice, 1947–48 crop year, from Commodity Yearbook*

| | *Bushels* |
|---|---|
| United States | 79,000,000 |
| India | 2,050,000,000 |
| Burma | 269,000,000 |
| China | 2,348,000,000 |
| Japan | 545,000,000 |
| French Indochina | 210,000,000 |
| Philippines | 109,000,000 |
| Korea | 129,000,000 |
| Java and Madura (1946–47) | 250,000,000 |
| Siam | 143,000,000 |
| Brazil | 111,000,000 |
| Estimated world total | 7,086,000,000 |

In addition to the countries included in the above and foregoing table, two other countries produced a large amount of rice. The figures given are for Mexico, which had a rough-rice production—1946–47—of 6,760,000 bushels; 1947–48, 7,300,000 bushels; 1948–49, estimated, 7,350,000 bushels. Guatemala produced in 1945, 544,000 bushels, and in 1948 produced 14,000 short tons.

Egypt and other countries are also increasing their production to a substantial degree. With these facts staring us in the face, it must be realized that we must evaluate the situation as it now confronts the United States rice industry.

With the end of the war and with changed world-wide conditions, while it is anticipated that the balance of the United States stocks of rice will be utilized at a price above the present parity price, we must realize that in the future, with increased production from the

Asiatic and other countries, the United States industry will find itself in a competitive market, and it is a known fact that we cannot produce rice to sell in competition with the Asiatic countries whose standard of living and cost of production is so far below that of the United States. Therefore, the question arises, What is the future of the rice industry in the United States?

The consumption of rice in the United States is only about 50 percent of the amount of rice produced in the United States, and the United States is able to produce a better grade of rice than are our competitors—the long-grain variety. Our principal export customer is Cuba and Cuba prefers long-grain rice rather than the lower grades. Therefore, the answer is hypothetical. We must either increase domestic consumption or reduce our production and plant only the higher quality of rice which is preferred not only by Cuba but by our domestic market. We will be unable to compete in a competitive market against the Asiatic countries as stated before due to the cost of production in the United States, even on the lower grades. Even at this time, the Asiatic countries can deliver a ton of rice to Canton, China, for $190 per ton, whereas it costs $225 per ton for United States rice.

Another question also arises in connection with our opportunity to export rice—as well as many other commodities. That is, many of the countries which might prefer to buy our products are now impoverished and do not have the dollars with whch to buy. Notwithstanding all of this, in view of the information which we have from the Government officials and other informed sources, it is hoped that the United States industry will be able to dispose of the remaining stock of the 1948 rice crop at a price above the present parity price, as rice is selling in the present market at approximately 122 percent of parity, and there is not enough rice in sight to meet the world demand, and even though a major portion of the remaining crop is of a low and inferior quality, it is believed that customers will be found to buy and pay for the remainder of the 1948 crop on hand.

For the future some predict that it will be 2 or 3 years before Burma, Siam, and Indochina will be able to reach normal production; however, it is my opinion that those countries will increase production to such a degree by next year that this fact will affect the demand and sale of United States rice next year, and the only salvation for the United States industry is to curtail production of, and grow only the higher quality and best grades of rice this year and in the years to come. It has been proven that cattle can well and profitably be produced on rice lands, and since the same situation as respects competition does not exist in the cattle industry as will exist in the rice industry, it would seem a good idea for the rice farmers of the United States to hedge and play safe and reduce rice production and increase cattle production.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COUDERT (at the request of Mr. LEONARD W. HALL), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. ABBITT (at the request of Mr. BLAND), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. GARMATZ), on account of illness.

### SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 170. An act to authorize the transfer of certain property to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

### JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did, on February 3, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

167. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the first report of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, relating to the general management of the executive branch (H. Doc. No. 55); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

168. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting the first semiannual report of all educational exchange activities carried on from July 1 to December 31, 1948, pursuant to Public Law 402, Eightieth Congress (H. Doc. No. 56); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

169. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

170. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

171. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

172. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of $2,500 for the judiciary, Court of Claims (H. Doc. No. 57); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

173. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revised draft of a proposed provision and revised estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1949 involving a decrease of $4,265,500 for the Department of Agriculture (H. Doc. No. 58); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

174. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

175. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to disposal of dangerous weapons in certain cases; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

176. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting an amendment, a request, and the letter of compliance relating to the voluntary plans for the allocation of steel under Public Law 395; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

177. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a report of claims paid by the Federal Security Agency during the period January 1 to December 31, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

178. A letter from the secretary, United States Department of Justice, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting the Annual Report of the Directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the Fiscal Year 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

179. A letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

180. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on Public Works.

181. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md."; to the Committee on Public Works.

182. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

183. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

184. A letter from the Chairman, United States Maritime Commission, transmitting the sixteenth report to Congress by the United States Maritime Commission of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

185. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the collection and publication of cotton statistics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 1661. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REED of New York: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 1211. A bill to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 19, pt. II). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRISON: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. House Joint Resolution 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 20). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. NORTON: Committee on House Administration. H. R. 1243. A bill to amend the Hatch Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 21). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 1432. A bill to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."; without amendment (Rept. No. 22). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2361. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 23). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 24. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 25. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 669. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Shirley Leinwand; without amendment (Rept. No. 26). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 773. A bill for the relief of Engelbert Axer; without amendment (Rept. No. 27). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1052. A bill for the relief of Lawrence G. McCarthy; without amendment (Rept. No. 28). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1700. A bill for the relief of Ezra Butler Eddy, Jr., and wife, Marie Claire Lord Eddy; without amendment (Rept. No. 29). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1993. A bill for the relief of Samuel Fadem; without amendment (Rept. No. 30). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2361. A bill to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2362. A bill to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 2363. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 2364. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 2365. A bill for the relief of the city of Chester, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2366. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits and to reduce the age requirement for old-age and survivors insurance benefits from 65 to 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANNON:

H. R. 2367. A bill relating to the disposition of war housing acquired or constructed by the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 2368. A bill to provide for establishment of a soil- and water-conservation policy, the coordination of soil- and water-conservation activities of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2369. A bill to authorize an appropriation to complete the International Peace Garden, North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. McGUIRE (by request):

H. R. 2370. A bill to extend to the veterans of the Mexican border service of 1916 and 1917 and their widows and minor children all the provisions, privileges, rights, and benefits of laws enacted for the benefit of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2371. A bill to extend the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to the self-employed, employees of nonprofit institutions, and, under voluntary agreements, employees of State and local governments, increase the benefits payable under such system, lower the age requirements for female beneficiaries, and liberalize the eligibility provisions of the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2372. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air-mail field railway post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2373. A bill to amend the act establishing the Hot Springs National Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 2374. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army and Air Force officers retired due to lack of funds and to correct injustices and inconsistencies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2375. A bill to provide for the per capita distribution of certain funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 2376. A bill to increase the deduction from gross income allowable for charitable and other contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUTTON:

H. R. 2377. A bill to amend the National Housing Act so as to authorize the Federal Housing Commissioner to insure construction advances on single-family dwellings; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2378. A bill to prevent retroactive checkage of retired pay in the cases of certain enlisted men and warrant officers appointed or advanced to commissioned rank or grade under the act of July 24, 1941 (55 Stat. 603), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2379. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 2380. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2381. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2382. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 2383. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. R. 2384. A bill to declare and protect the rights of the public when labor disputes result in, or threaten to result in, danger to public health or safety; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 2385. A bill providing for the construction of Federal buildings at Mount

Hope, W. Va., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARING:

H. R. 2386. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a rare and precious metals experiment station at Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2387. A bill authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2388. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights and authorizing appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2389. A bill to establish a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2390. A bill to exempt graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy, or from any State maritime academy, who hold commissions in the Naval Reserve from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CHUDOFF:

H. R. 2391. A bill relating to eviction of tenants from publicly operated housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2392. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. D'EWART (by request):

H. R. 2393. A bill to repeal section 9 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), relating to the Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2394. A bill to create the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Redwood Forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2395. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2396. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2397. A bill to provide for the retirement of any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and any judge of the circuit courts of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 2398. A bill to authorize for a limited period of time the admission of displaced persons into the United States for permanent residence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 2399. A bill providing for the construction of Federal buildings at Mount Hope, W. Va., and Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2400. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2401. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and enter judgment upon the claims of the State of California for reimbursement for moneys advanced and expended in aid of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2402. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2403. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28 of the United States Code with respect to certain tort claims against the United States of persons who are minors or insane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2404. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 in respect to rates of wages in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MICHENER:

H. R. 2405. A bill to further amend the United States Code, title 28, section 239, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2406. A bill to stimulate exploration, development, mining, production, and conservation of strategic and critical minerals and metals within the United States and its Territories; to establish an Office of National Minerals Development, Production, and Conservation within the Department of the Interior; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2407. A bill to exempt air carriers from statutory provisions requiring payments for compensation for customs employees' overtime services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. R. 2408. A bill to authorize the Federal Security Administrator to assist the States in the development of community recreation programs for the people of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts (by request):

H. R. 2409. A bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2410. A bill to limit and restrict the ownership and use of radio broadcast stations in chain or network broadcast service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2411. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a waterway to connect Philips Inlet, Fla., with the intracoastal waterway; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2412. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2413. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a waterway to connect Basin Bayou and Choctawhatchee Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2414. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of constructing a boat basin and channel along Wayside Park at Thos. A. Johnston Bridge in Pensacola Bay, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2415. A bill to provide for the transfer for State park purposes of the land on which Fort Gadsen, Fla., is located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2416. A bill to authorize a preliminary survey to determine the feasibility of extending the channel in the dock area at Carrabelle, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2417. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to improve recreational facilities at Eglin Field, Fla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2418. A bill to authorize restocking, propagation, and conservation of game in the Eglin Field Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 2419. A bill relating to the disposition of moneys received from the national forests; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2420. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2421. A bill to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 so as to provide for the reduction of the public debt by at least 10 percent of the estimated over-all Federal receipts for each fiscal year; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 2422. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2423. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2424. A bill to provide for the purchase, construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, including armories, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2425. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Establishment appointed to permanent grades; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2426. A bill relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2427. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2428. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2429. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to provide a standard for determining the continued absence of parents from home in cases of aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2430. A bill to change the method of computing Federal grants-in-aid to States for aid to dependent children, to authorize such grants-in-aid for aid to needy relatives who provide homes for such children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2431. A bill to amend section 202 (c) (2) of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to increase children's insurance benefits payable thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2432. A bill restoring to tribal ownership certain lands upon the Colville Indian Reservation, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2433. A bill to amend the Federal Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2434. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 2435. A bill to amend sections 210 and 209 (f) of the Social Security Act so as to increase the benefits payable to veterans of World War II and their survivors, and to remove the 3-year limitation upon survivors' insurance benefits in the case of deceased World War II veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2436. A bill to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H. R. 2437. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved July 7, 1947; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2438. A bill providing equal pay for equal work for women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 2439. A bill to provide for renewal of and adjustment of compensation under contracts for carrying mail on water routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

H. R. 2440. A bill to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md., Greendale, Wis., and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2441. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 2442. A bill to increase the amount of deduction allowed, for income-tax purposes, for medical and dental expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2443. A bill to authorize the payment of additional compensation to special assistants to the Attorney General in the case of *The United States* v. *Doheny Executors;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H. R. 2444. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in northwestern Pennsylvania for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAND:

H. R. 2445. A bill exempting admissions to activities of elementary and secondary schools from the tax on admissions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2446. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 and to preserve the equities of permanent classified civil-service employees of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2447. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the United States Tax Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2448. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. J. Res. 146. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for the adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution providing for closer cooperation between the legislative and executive branches of the Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. J. Res. 149. Joint resolution to authorize the temporary admission to the United States as agricultural workers of students and leaders in countries receiving assistance pursuant to the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. J. Res. 152. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 25. Concurrent resolution protesting against the prosecution and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. Con. Res. 26. Concurrent resolution favoring the political federation of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. Res. 81. Resolution providing that, effective January 4, 1949, the compensation of the clerk of the official committee reporters shall be at the basic rate of $4,000 per annum; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 82. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 22; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING:

H. Res. 83. Resolution to instruct the Banking and Currency Committee to undertake study of the effects of rent-control laws and formulate legislation granting financial relief, in the form of subsidies, to landlords of residential rental units suffering financial loss from effects of inflation and rent ceilings; to the Committee on Rules.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 2449. A bill for the relief of Tom R. Hickman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2450. A bill for the relief of William Bergen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 2451. A bill for the relief of Christ Nick Vans, alias Christos Nick Ventouras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2452. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis D. Papapanagiotou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 2453. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to bestow the silver star upon Michael J. Quinn; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R 2454. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna McCarthy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2455. A bill for the relief of Harry B. Landers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Charlie Hales; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2457. A bill for the relief of Helen Morren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2458. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfonso Vidal y Planas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Rene Belbenoit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2460. A bill for the relief of Anna and Solomon Lagstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2461. A bill for the relief of Irene Senutovitch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2462. A bill for the relief of Miju Iseri Tsuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2464. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2465. A bill for the relief of John Keene; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

H. R. 2466. A bill for the relief of Zygmunt Pakula (also known as Pakuta); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2467. A bill for the relief of Hieronim Henry Kolodziejczyk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2468. A bill for the relief of Lester John Skiba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2469. A bill for the relief of Mario Tiberi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. R. 2470. A bill for the relief of Clarence J. McDonald; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 2471. A bill for the relief of Walt W. Rostow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2472. A bill for the relief of R. Wallace & Sons Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2473. A bill for the relief of Virgil L. Hesterly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2474. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2475. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell to Albert M. Lewis, Jr., certain land in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2476. A bill to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

---

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

44. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to enact legislation appropriating money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

45. By Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois: Resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, urging the Congress to take steps to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

46. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Chicago, to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

47. By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the Congress of the United States not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

48. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Jersey City, N. J., memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

49. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Walter C. Peterson, city clerk, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to the adoption of legislation now pending before the Congress relative to granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

# SENATE

## TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, hallowed be Thy name. In our wayward hearts Thou hast implanted a love for truth and beauty and goodness. May Thy truth make us free—free from pride and prejudice, and from all the ugly sins of disposition that do so easily beset us. May the lure of Thy beauty lift us above the mud and scum of mere things to the realm of the excellent and the lovely. In a deceitful world which offers its cheap and empty prizes, where each ounce of dross counts its ounce of gold, enrich us with those durable satisfactions of life, so that the multiplying years may not find us bankrupt in the things that matter most, the golden currency of faith and hope and love. We ask it in the Name that is above every name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 7, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hoey | Murray |
| Anderson | Holland | Myers |
| Baldwin | Humphrey | Neely |
| Brewster | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Bricker | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Reed |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Russell |
| Cain | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Connally | Langer | Sparkman |
| Cordon | Lodge | Stennis |
| Donnell | Long | Taft |
| Douglas | Lucas | Taylor |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ecton | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Ellender | McFarland | Thye |
| Ferguson | McGrath | Tobey |
| Flanders | McKellar | Tydings |
| Frear | McMahon | Vandenberg |
| George | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Gillette | Malone | Wherry |
| Gurney | Martin | Wiley |
| Hayden | Maybank | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Withers |
| Hickenlooper | Morse | Young |
| Hill | Mundt | |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

VOLUNTARY PLANS COVERING ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to section 2 (e) of Public Law 395 (80th Cong.), an amendment, a request, and the letter of compliance with the amendment and request, to the voluntary plans for the allocation of steel products for United States Atomic Energy Commission projects, the requirements of the armed forces, and the requirements of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF MARITIME COMMISSION ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

A letter from the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on action taken by that Commission under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska favoring increase in the allotments to Nebraska for the purpose of improving and maintaining roads in Thurston County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. BUTLER on February 7, 1949, p. 826, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the Congress not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See concurrent resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN on February 7, 1949, p. 825, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relating to a series of four dams on the Snake River, Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by Mr. MILLER on February 7, 1949, p. 826, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized as follows:

"Whereas the building of the Eden project would increase to double its present size this farming community; and

"Whereas the completion of this project would provide farm homes for some 80 new farmers, preference being given to veterans of the World War; and

"Whereas this increased acreage could contribute to the need of the agricultural products in a world already short; and

"Whereas this coal-mining community provides an excellent market for the products raised in Eden Valley, we at the present time being dependent for our milk supply on adjacent States and communities far distant, when Eden Valley has proven its suitability for dairying; and

"Whereas considerable sums have already been expended on this project which now lies idle; and

"Whereas because of existing conditions, that is, lack of drainage and the possible deterioration of the irrigation system should the Government withdraw its support therefrom, there is no agency which will make real-estate loans on property lying within the irrigation project; and

"Whereas, the Federal Land Bank of Omaha, because of conditions as aforesaid, suspended the making of all loans to anyone within the district in the year of 1937: now, therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to appropriate money for the completion of said irrigation project; be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and LESTER C. HUNT, Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT and the Honorable Secretary of the Interior."

Approved, January 26, 1949.

LESTER C. HUNT, *Governor.*

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 1

"House memorial to the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman; Senator James E. Murray, Senator Zales N. Ecton, Congressmen Mike Mansfield and Wesley D'Ewart; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands; Julius Krug, Secretary of the Interior; and Michael Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing that sufficient appropriations be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the immediate construction of Yellowtail Dam located in Big Horn County in southern Montana

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located in Big Horn County, in southeastern Montana, and Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River, about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon—35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont.; and

"Whereas Big Horn Canyon is the passageway of the Big Horn River between the northern end of the Big Horn Mountains and the Pryor Mountains. For more than 50 miles Yellowtail Reservoir will lie within the rugged, inaccessible canyon, the steep walls of which tower hundreds of feet above the narrow and winding river bed, forming a natural damsite of unique splendor that will in future years provide Montana and Wyoming with one of the greatest lake-recreation areas in the Western Hemisphere; and

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as a part of the Missouri River Basin project, to prepare preliminary surveys and construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has practically completed preconstruction work at the site of Yellowtail Dam. Design specifications for the Dam and power plant have been started. Surveys have been made of the irrigable area, and transmission line location, and plans are ready or completed for construction of access roads, construction camp and other essential base work necessary before actual construction is undertaken; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam is being designed to provide for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, flow control, silt retention, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development and other related beneficial uses of value to all mankind; and

"Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam will make possible the irrigation of 45,000 acres of new land along the Big Horn River from the Big Horn Canyon to approximately 10 miles north of the city of Hardin, and supplemental irrigation water for large areas now inadequately served will be also provided. Because irrigation of lands along the Big Horn, Powder and Yellowstone Rivers is dependent upon pumping, a source of low cost power is prerequisite. Construction of Yellowtail power plant will make possible the irrigation of many proposed and desirable projects along these three valuable but presently little utilized rivers; and

"Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam offers a priceless solution for the equitable interstate use of the waters of the Big Horn by the creation of the Yellowtail Reservoir on the Montana-Wyoming State line; and

"Whereas power generating facilities to be constructed at the Dam will have an installed capacity of at least 120,000 kilowatts, and will produce about 712,200,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. The said power produced at Yellowtail Dam will be used for irrigation pumping, and will serve as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's power system constructed to provide power for construction of other developments and to supply surplus power to principal load centers to permit its use by new and old industries and residents of the area; and

"Whereas the Big Horn River is the greatest silt offender in the entire Yellowstone River system. Retention of silt behind Yellowtail Dam will be of material benefit; and

"Whereas fish and wildlife resources will gain by the dam, fishing and hunting, as well as the many allied recreational opportunities that will follow, will be of immense value to Montana and Wyoming; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam as planned will be a concrete arch-type structure towering some 499 feet above the river bed, and will have a crest length of 1,480 feet, and will have a storage capacity of 1,366,000 acre-feet; and

"Whereas the construction of said Yellowtail Dam will attract new industries into southern Montana, and thereby be of great benefit to the entire State of Montana, as well as the entire Nation, by supplying cheap electricity for industrial and home use, and this postwar period is the time to develop such industries: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana*, That the Congress of the United States of America be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available immediately for the construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southern Montana; be it further

*"Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the presiding officers of both Houses of the National Congress—ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Commissioner of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of the State of Wyoming, and the presiding officers of both houses of the Wyoming State Legislature, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the States of Montana and Wyoming."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Resolution 73

"Resolution memorializing the Federal Government to preserve the forests of sugar pine growing in Tuolumne County, Calif.

"Whereas hundreds of giant sugar pine trees of Tuolumne County have grown to great height and size, in the 500 or more years of their lives, and exist today only in the State of California and southern Oregon; and

"Whereas these beautiful and majestic monarchs of the forest that can never be replaced are threatened with complete destruction within the next few months at the hands of a midwest lumber company, notwithstanding that there is no valid commercial requirement for their cutting; and

"Whereas it is represented that the present financial condition of the government of the State of California may be used to delay fatally the immediate acquisition of this sublime forest as part of a great State park now proposed to be created as a permanent memorial to those who gave their lives for us in the World Wars: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved, by the Assembly of the State of California*, That these sugar pine forest areas ought, in spite of all obstacles, to be preserved for the enjoyment, pleasure, and cultural enrichment of the present generation and all posterity; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the assembly, on behalf of the people of the State of California, hereby memorializes and urges the United States Government to take immediate action pursuant to title 16, section 494, United States Code, which statute grants to the United States Secretary of Agriculture full authority, at his discretion, to take possession of these forest lands by allowing the present private owners the right to select, in lieu thereof, within 60 days, other forest lands belonging to the United States Government; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That when this immediate and most feasible emergency action has been taken to preserve the forests from destruction by logging operations, that chapter 368, United States Statutes at Large, be amended to permit the State of California to acquire title to the sugar pine forest areas in Tuolumne County in addition to the 1,200 acres of land in this immediate vicinity already offered to the State of California for State park purposes; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly at once send copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the United States Secretary of Agriculture."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 16

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to the mooring of surplus vessels in the northern waters of San Francisco Bay and the waters connected therewith

"Whereas the United States has caused a large number of surplus vessels, both naval and merchant marine, to be moored in the waters of the northern part of San Francisco Bay and in waters connected therewith; and

"Whereas the presence of such surplus vessels in such waters seriously interferes with commercial fishing therein and creates a

hazard to navigation, particularly the navigation of fishing vessels; and

"Whereas while it is recognized that it is necessary that these surplus vessels be moored at some suitable place, there is no apparent reason why they could not be moored at places where no interference with commercial fishing would result and where such vessels would not constitute any menace to navigation; and

"Whereas the difficulties and inconvenience caused by such mooring of surplus vessels is particularly acute in Suisun Bay, Broad slough, and the waters off Stake Point, and the removal of such vessels from such waters would eliminate a large part of the difficulties involved in this situation: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to take such steps as may be necessary to cause the surplus vessels now moored in the northerly waters of San Francisco Bay and waters connected therewith, and particularly those vessels moored in Suisun Bay, Broad slough, and in the waters off of Stake Point, to be moved to some other mooring place where such vessels will not interfere with commercial fishing nor constitute a hazard to navigation; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and President pro tempore of the Senate, each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California, the Secretary of the Navy and the Maritime Commission of the United States."

Three joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 2

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to two irrigation canals to supply water from the Sacramento River to areas in northern California

"Whereas the great Central Valley of California consists of two connected valleys, the one to the north comprising the watershed of the Sacramento River and the one to the south comprising the watershed of the San Joaquin River; and

"Whereas the State water plan of California developed from a series of comprehensive investigations conducted principally in the decade following 1920 and envisioned, among other things, a plan for the transfer of large quantities of water from the northern area where water was plentiful to the southern area where it was acutely needed; and

"Whereas the Central Valley Project Act of 1933 had for one of its principal purposes such a large-scale transfer of water from the Sacramento Valley to the San Joaquin Valley; and

"Whereas the State water plan also envisioned the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River within the Sacramento Valley but the original Central Valley Project Act, while it provided that no watershed or area wherein water originates should be deprived of water required for its needs, nevertheless made practically no provision for the utilization of water within the Sacramento Valley; and

"Whereas, in 1941, the California Legislature recognized that the project should include some provision for the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River in the area in which it originates and added to the project two units, one called the Tehama-Colusa conduit, extending from the Sacramento River near Red Bluff through the counties of Tehama, Glenn, and Colusa west of the river, and the other, called the Tehama-Butte conduit, extending from a point near Red Bluff through the counties of Tehama, Butte, and Sutter east of the river; and

"Whereas the United States had theretofore taken over the Central Valley project as a Federal project and the two units have not been added to the project as now being constructed; and

"Whereas in the 1949 session of the Congress of the United States a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressmen CLAIR ENGLE and HUBERT SCUDDER, of California, will be under consideration which provides for the inclusion in the Central Valley project of two new features, one called the Tehama-Colusa conduit and the other the Chico conduit; and

"Whereas the conduits provided for in the Engle-Scudder bill will effectuate the same general purposes as the two units above referred to which have already been added to the project as described in the California act; and

"Whereas the Engle-Scudder bill further safeguards the interests of the people of the area affected by requiring that the relevant documents of the State water plan be considered and that local interests affected be consulted; and

"Whereas the utilization of the water of the Sacramento River for the purposes contemplated will not affect or jeopardize any of the other features of the project but, on the contrary, will bring the project into closer conformity with the State water plan, and provide an additional water supply in areas where it is needed: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration to the Engle-Scudder bill hereinabove referred to, or to take whatever steps may be necessary to provide in such other manner as may be suitable for the construction of the same or similar conduits for the same or similar purposes; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

---

"Assembly Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States in relation to the waters of the Colorado River

"Whereas more than 3,500,000 inhabitants of this State are dependent upon the Colorado River as a source of supplemental water supply for domestic purposes; and

"Whereas the metropolitan areas of southern California, including those within approximately 2,200 square miles of coastal plain and foothills extending from Los Angeles to Riverside and San Bernardino and those in San Diego and vicinity, are dependent upon the Colorado River as a source of supplemental water supply for municipal and industrial purposes; and

"Whereas over 1,000,000 acres of lands of this State are solely dependent upon the Colorado River as a source of water supply for irrigation purposes; and

"Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate a bill (S. 75) which, if enacted, would authorize the central Arizona project; and

"Whereas there is insufficient water available in the lower basin of the Colorado River to supply the central Arizona project without depriving the people of California of their right to use that water and jeopardizing their investment in distribution facilities, which amounts to more than $500,000,000; and

"Whereas the States of California and Arizona have been unable to agree as to their respective rights to the use of the water of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas resolutions (S. J. Res. 4 and H. J. Res. 3) are now pending before the United States Congress which would, if adopted, authorize a suit in the United States Supreme Court to determine the respective rights of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California to the use of the water of the Colorado River; and

"Whereas the authorization of the central Arizona project prior to an adjudication of water rights would greatly intensify the dispute between the States of California and Arizona and result in the possible expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars of public money to construct a project for which there would be an inadequate water supply: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the United States Congress is respectfully memorialized and urged to adopt one of the resolutions authorizing a suit in the United States Supreme Court to adjudicate the respective rights of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California to the use of the water of the Colorado River; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the United States Congress is respectfully memorialized and urged to suspend further consideration of the proposed central Arizona project pending the determination of the respective rights of the States of Arizona, Nevada, and California to the use of the water of the Colorado River; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

---

"Assembly Joint Resolution 15

"Joint resolution relative to the tidelands and submerged lands adjacent to the coast of California

"Whereas the United States has recognized that all the States since July 4, 1776, or since their admission to the Union, have exercised full powers of ownership over all lands beneath navigable waters within their boundaries and of all natural resources within these lands and waters; and

"Whereas each State has maintained full control of its natural resources with the acquiescence and approval of the United States and in accordance with numerous decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States and the executive departments of the United States that these lands and resources were vested in the respective States as an incident to State sovereignty and that the exercise of these powers of ownership and control did not and will not impair or interfere with the exercise by the Federal Government of its constitutional powers in relation to the control and regulation of commerce, navigation, national defense, and internation relations; and

"Whereas large sums of money have been expended by the several States, their subdivisions, and persons lawfully acting pursuant to State authority in improving and reclaiming lands, and in developing the natural resources in the lands and waters relying upon the recognized rule of State ownership; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the Federal Government has certain paramount powers in respect to a portion of these lands and natural resources without reaffirming or settling the ultimate question of their ownership and control; and

"Whereas this decision of the Supreme Court recognizes that the question of the ownership and control of these lands and natural resources is within the 'congressional area of national power' and that Congress will not execute its powers 'in such way as to bring about injustices to the States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission': Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That it is in the public interest that title and ownership of the lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the States be confirmed in these States by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States recognize, confirm, and establish title to these lands in the States so concerned; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States release and relinquish to these States all right, title and interest which the United States has in these lands; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 6

"Joint resolution relative to California water projects

"Whereas it is evident from past experience in California that the cycle of dry years has not ended and in all probability will continue at least until 1950; and

"Whereas the underground water table in California has been receding year after year; and

"Whereas California farmers depend to a great extent upon underground water for the irrigation of specialty crops; and

"Whereas in some parts of the State the underground waters have already been polluted by the intrusion of salt water; and

"Whereas this condition is growing more serious each year and much of the land will be ruined unless the water supply is soon replenished; and

"Whereas Governor Warren has repeatedly stated that not a drop of water which can be conserved for a beneficial use should be wasted into the sea; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has recommended to the Congress that $113,000,000 be appropriated for the Central Valley and other water projects as authorized or to be authorized in California to be expended during the next fiscal year by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Army Engineers; and

"Whereas such an appropriation to California would go far to continue the prosperity of the State and would also stabilize the economy of the Federal Government in that such an appropriation at this time would be more or less in the nature of a loan, a large part of which would be returned to the Government by repayments and by continued large tax returns from California: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to appropriate the amount recommended by the President for expenditure for water projects in California during the next fiscal year to make possible the preservation of California lands through the replenishment and augmentation of its water supply at the earliest possible date; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

---

"Assembly Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to providing a veterans' hospital at San Diego

"Whereas the population of the city of San Diego includes the largest proportion of veterans of any California city; and

"Whereas existing Federal hospital facilities are not available to veterans except in case of emergency; and

"Whereas it was heretofore proposed to construct a 200-bed hospital in the Linda Vista section of the city of San Diego for the use of veterans, but funds were not made available for that purpose; and

"Whereas an acceptable site for a veterans' hospital in San Diego is presently owned by the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the President and the Congress of the United States are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to make funds available and to provide for the construction of a 200-bed hospital for veterans in the city of San Diego; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 13

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States in relation to establishing parity prices for California products

"Whereas in order to lend stability to the agricultural industry of the United States, Federal legislation has been enacted providing for support prices for a number of agricultural products; and

"Whereas such legislation operates to provide a floor below which the level of prices paid to the producers of products covered by such legislation will not fall, and thus assures to such producer a minimum payment designed to effect a parity of income between such producers and other classes of citizens as calculated for a prescribed base period in certain years preceding World War I during which the relationship between agricultural, industrial, and other income was in what is considered to have been a desirable condition; and

"Whereas such support prices are provided for a number of basic and staple products and operate as insurance to the producers of such products against the effects of fluctuations of the market prices thereof below the level necessary to provide an adequate income to such producers; and

"Whereas the State of California, by reason of its climatic conditions, is suitable for the production of specialty crops, notably fruits and vegetables, which are extensively produced in the State, the farm value thereof in 1947 being more than $700,000,000; and

"Whereas the producers of such specialty crops must compete with the producers of crops protected by such support prices in the purchase of farm supplies, the recruitment of farm labor, and in all other services or supplies necessary for farm operations; and

"Whereas the need for the protection afforded by support prices does not depend upon the nature of the crop produced but rather upon a number of conditions to which farming operations are subject and over which the individual farmer has no control; and

"Whereas the same facts that justify support prices for producers of basic commodities equally justify support prices for all agricultural commodities produced in commercial quantities: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes and requests the President and the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the extension of congressional legislation relating to support prices and parity payments to cover all agricultural commodities produced in commercial quantities and to provide uniform standards of eligibility for such support-price assistance for all agricultural commodities commercially produced; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the chief clerk for the assembly is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Member of the House of Representatives from California in the Congress of the United States."

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Mayor James B. Pettit (by Richard Lamb), of Pomona, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide relief for the citrus growers of California (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Virgilio Brunet, president, the Puerto Rico Teachers Association, San Juan, P. R., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the inclusion of Puerto Rico in the bill for Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Charles F. Gerhard, president, Philadelphia district Central Verein of America, Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation granting members of the Philippine Army the same rights and privileges granted to other veterans under the veterans bill of rights (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial from Rt. Rev. Msgr. Anthony A. Tralka, pastor, Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Bayonne, N. J., remonstrating against the trial and conviction of Cardinal Joseph Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Council of Binghamton and the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, both of the State of New York, and the City Council of the City of Bethlehem, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

"House Concurrent Resolution A

"Concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to enact permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops

*"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein):*

"Whereas it must be self-evident that if we are to avoid lower living standards and if this national debt is to be serviced and paid, it must be through the production of new wealth from the natural resources of the United States; and

"We therefore recommend that the Eighty-first Congress enact legislation in 1949 which will first provide a new parity formula which is fair to farmers and to the consumers of the Nation. We recommend that support prices be established pursuant to this fair parity formula under which farmers shall be assured not of fractional parity but of 100 percent of the parity prices. These prices should be consistent with the objective of abundant production. We believe that in the new legislation account should be taken where they have an opportunity for decent living standards, including adequate health protection, good housing and better educational opportunities for farm children: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*, That we hereby petition Congress to pass permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops, to protect such floor prices with commodity loans of like amount and to prescribe such import duties, excise taxes, or quotas on competitive imports as may be needed to maintain these price levels and our national income and to equalize the differential between the dollar value of our production and that of foreign countries; be it further

*"Resolved*, That copies of this resolution properly authenticated be forwarded by the secretary of state to the Presiding Officer of each House of the National Congress and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from North Dakota, and the Departments of Agriculture and Labor at Washington, D. C."

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 11

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas:*

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Arkansas."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## INFLATION—RESOLUTION OF NORTHERN BERKSHIRE MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Northern Berkshire Ministerial Association of Massachusetts, concerning the problem of inflation, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD. The resolution is interesting, and I hope it will be read by Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH ADAMS, MASS., *February 3, 1949.*

Mr. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
*The Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SALTONSTALL: The Northern Berkshire Ministerial Association of Massachusetts, at its meeting on January 3, 1949, adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas we are deeply concerned about the evils resulting from the present-day period of inflation in the United States—the fact that millions of people suffer great hardships and are the victims of ever-deepening anxieties because of the disastrously high cost of living; and

"Whereas we are certain that excessive inflationary prices for all the basic necessities of life are a serious menace to our entire economic and political system and bring our United States free-enterprise ideals into jeopardy or disrepute: Therefore be it

*"Resolved*, That we urge the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the officers of the National Association of Manufacturers, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, the United Mine Workers, and the press to cooperate in doing immediately whatever is possible to lower the cost of living for every person in the United States, believing that no greater service could be done for our entire Nation at this time of bewilderment and anxiety than to help the United States to a wiser and safer basis for our cost of living; and be it furthermore

*"Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Harry S. Truman; to our National Congress; to the officers of the National Association of Manufacturers; to William Green, of the American Federation of Labor; to Philip Murray, of the Congress of Industrial Organizations; to John L. Lewis, of the United Mine Workers; and to the editor of the North Adams Transcript."

PHILIP L. FRICK,
VICTOR B. CHICOINE,
ELMER N. HALEY,
*Members of the Committee.*

## WATER POWER DEVELOPMENT—RESOLUTION OF NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, last week the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association met in New York, about 4,000 being present. The association adopted a resolution specifically endorsing the Missouri Valley Authority, the Columbia River Authority, and the St. Lawrence waterway project. I ask for its proper reference, and that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We support early, unified development of all of America's river basins for the fullest possible production of economic hydroelectric power consistent with other purposes.

We support the recommendations of the President and his Council of Economic Advisers, submitted to the Congress in the Economic Report and Review, for immediate action on the St. Lawrence, the Missouri, and the Columbia Rivers, construction of the TVA steam plant and other power facilities.

We are disturbed by reports that the Missouri Basin plans include less than half of feasible economic hydroelectric power, indicating that construction is proceeding without even a total survey of potentialities, or without a basin-wide plan for water operation and management in future years.

While supporting the specific projects calendared by the President and his advisers, we also urge prompt action on other basin developments which have been suggested throughout the Nation. A Nation-wide power development program is necessary at once to meet present shortages and increasing demand.

## NATIONAL PARKS AND MONUMENTS—RESOLUTION OF PORTLAND (OREG.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Portland, Oreg., Chamber of Commerce, relating to national parks and monuments.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the national parks and monuments constitute one of the great resources for public recreation and the study of natural history in the United States; and

Whereas the 174 areas of the national park system attracted last year 25,250,000 visitors; and

Whereas Crater Lake, Rainier, Olympic National Park nearby, and Yosemite, Lassen, Yellowstone and Glacier at a somewhat greater distance, have a special appeal to the people of Portland; and

Whereas of the $115,000,000 needed for physical improvement of the national parks, Congress has appropriated for such purpose only $1,652,350, of which $762,350 was earmarked for specific purposes, thus leaving for the physical improvement of all other national parks only $690,000; and

Whereas for maintenance of roads and trails in the national parks $3,500,000 was estimated, of which $3,100,000 was appropriated, but of which only $2,500,000 can be allotted for maintenance: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce urge the congressional delegations of the Western States united effort in obtaining for the national parks such appropriations for maintenance, protection and improvement of existing buildings, highways and scenic trails as will make them more valuable to the tourists of the Nation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to each of the Senators and Representatives representing the Western States, and that copies be forwarded to Newton B. Drury, Director, and Frank A. Kittredge, Chief Engineer, of the National Park Service, Washington, D. C.

NATIONAL FOREST RECREATION AREAS—RESOLUTION OF PORTLAND (OREG.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce, relating to the national forest recreation areas, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the four principal resources of the national forests are: (1) timber, (2) water, (3) recreation and (4) forage; and

Whereas no funds have been provided in the budget of the United States Forest Service by Congress specifically and regularly for recreational development; and

Whereas many of the campground facilities provided by CCC labor and others, have deteriorated to the point where they are no longer usable, nor even subject to repair because of lack of maintenance money; and

Whereas the National Forest Service is badly in need of men and money to care for existing facilities and to install the additional ones made necessary by tremendously increased public use; and

Whereas the business establishments whose livelihood is dependent upon recreationists' patronage and whose income and other taxes largely contribute to repaying such Federal expenditures: Be it

*Resolved*, That the Portland Chamber of Commerce urge the congressional delegations of the Western States united effort in obtaining recognition of recreation as a principal resource of the national forests and in making available sufficient funds to assure proper rehabilitation of existing camp and picnic facilities and to install the additional ones made necessary by the increased public use; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to each of the Senators and Representatives of the Western States and that copies be forwarded to Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan and Chief Forester Lyle Watts.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 135. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; without amendment (Rept. No. 40).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution for the authorization of a special contribution by the United States to the United Nations for the relief of Palestine refugees; with amendments (Rept. No. 42).

INVESTIGATION OF PRICES OF AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER COMMODITIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. From the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 31, to investigate prices of agricultural and other commodities, submitted by me on January 13, 1949, and I submit a report (No. 41) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. MAYBANK. I now ask unanimous consent that following my remarks in the RECORD there appear clippings from various newspapers in connection with retail prices and the decline in agricultural prices throughout the Nation.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 5, 1949]

PRICE TRENDS—COFFEE, CORN, SCRAP, AND STEERS—COMMODITIES—ARE MOVING DOWNWARD—FUTURES MARKETS HINT SLIDE MAY CONTINUE; FOODS ARE AMONG WEAKEST STAPLES—FUEL OIL, LUMBER, COAL OFF

Commodity markets sputtered warnings of further deflation this week.

From coffee to corn, from steel scrap to steers, prices dipped nervously. It was a continuation and quickening of a price trend noticeable all last month.

Basic foodstuffs have been among the pace setters in the downhill race. For instance, glance at what's happening to steak-on-the-hoof. A steer worth $30.50 a hundred pounds in Chicago barely a month ago was priced at only $24.50 a hundred yesterday.

Corn, the principal feed that makes meat, milk, butter, and eggs, sold in Chicago yesterday at $1.27 a bushel, the lowest in 2 years. A month ago corn was worth $1.50. A year ago it sold for $2.52.

At 42 cents a dozen in the big Chicago wholesale market yesterday, eggs were 7 cents a dozen cheaper than 4 weeks ago and nearly 20 cents cheaper than at the end of 1947.

FURTHER IN THE FUTURE?

Prices in the futures markets demonstrated an expectation of cheapening of the cost of supplying a dinner table. The Dow Jones Commodity Futures Index, which reflects prices commodity men think will prevail 5 months hence, closed the day yesterday at the lowest level since mid-1947. It has dipped steadily and steeply since early December.

But the price trend is far broader than the food field. Worth $43 a ton at Pittsburgh a month ago, heavy steel scrap is now quoted there at $39 a ton. In other cities it has dropped even more. Steel scrap is a basic raw material in making finished steel, which has been one of the last lingering scarcities in the Nation's economy.

In other metals—copper, lead, zinc, tin—official price quotations thus far hold firm. But, significantly, the premiums that were paid above official quotations not long ago have faded from the scene. And out of Waterbury, Conn., the Nation's brass-producing center, came the report this week that big brass makers had found their January new orders falling 20 percent below the December level. The brass industry is a major consumer of copper. On top of this, a labor tie-up of the vast Kennecott copper mines in Utah is apparently nearing its end. Its ore could be refined in about 90 days.

BUILDING MATERIALS

Sky-high building materials, which have kept many a would-be home owner from buying or building, are also weakening. Lumber, the bellwether, in the past 2 months has had its sharpest price spill since the war's end.

In lumber, as in most other materials of home and industry, the story is one of huge production catching up with or passing demand. Lumber mills poured out about 38,000,000,000 board feet of lumber last year, half again as much as was milled in prewar 1939.

While this lumber flood was rising, the number of new homes put under construction started slipping last June, and has been falling ever since. In the latter part of 1948 the mills found themselves producing more lumber than they were selling. Lumber that had sold in New York for $120 a thousand feet in late 1948 was down to $105 a thousand by late January.

Fuel prices, too, are joining the downward slide. Heavy production of bituminous coal, helped by a light winter in the East, is bearing down on the cost of that major food for furnaces. Some coal has changed hands recently at prices 20 to 25 percent below the level of a few months ago.

OIL GOES DOWN

And what's happening in coal is happening in fuel oil. With supplies burdensomely high, four successive cuts within the past 2 months lopped about 30 percent from the cost of heavy fuel oil in the big east coast consuming area.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 5, 1949]

FOOD PRICES CONTINUE TO DECLINE FOLLOWING DIP IN FUTURES; NOURSE CALLS CROP PROSPECTS KEY TO TREND

WASHINGTON.—Food prices generally continued their slide yesterday following new sharp declines in commodity prices. But Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, believes there is nothing disturbing in the situation.

Dr. Nourse said the recent downward trend reflected last year's large crops rather than any basic trend. He added that whether prices start up again depends on prospects for this year's crops.

Long-range economic prophets reexamined their predictions, however, on the reports of new declines.

Statistics of the National Industrial Conference Board indicated that the downward inclination was sharp even in December. The board's consumer index showed food prices were off 1.2 percent in that month from December. The board's general index, which includes housing, clothing, fuel, house furnishings, and sundries in addition to food, dropped only 0.6 percent during December.

EGG, MEAT PRICES DOWN

Two big eastern grocery chains yesterday announced they were passing on to their customers immediately the fall in some commodity prices. One, Grand Union Stores, cut grade A white eggs from 65 cents to 63 cents, and grade A large brown eggs from 61 cents to 59 cents. This followed a 1-cent decline in the wholesale market. The reduction in retail price for both brown and white eggs totals 6 cents since February 1.

The New York City Markets Department reported retail meat prices in the city dropped 2 to 4 cents a pound in the past week.

Despite Dr. Nourse's reassurances, and an opinion by Agriculture Secretary Brannan that the sag was only an adjustment, some observers showed marked concern.

Charles W. Holman, secretary of the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, said the collapse in prices paid to Midwest dairy farmers is threatening future milk and meat production.

He asserted that milk prices have fallen far below production costs and that some farmers are selling their cows. "Dairy cow numbers are at the lowest point since 1940," he said, "and the decline last year was the sharpest in history.

"With our added losses in the recent western storms, this will be reflected in shortages and higher prices for milk and meat."

Mr. Holman held that lower dairy prices are unwarranted, and result from temporary surpluses. He said current prices of milk used in making dairy products have

fallen as low as $2.45 for 100 pounds, compared to over $4 in June last year.

MILK, BUTTERFAT PRICE SUPPORTS

In Washington, meanwhile, the Agriculture Department announced it was working on plans to support the price of milk and butterfat. Butterfat prices have slumped down near levels at which the Government is required to support them.

A Department official said an announcement may be made soon on the support program for butterfat at 90 percent of parity. He declined to say exactly what method would be used, but he indicated the most feasible way would be to buy butter itself at a price which would lend strength to butterfat.

Representative HOEVEN (Republican, Iowa) said there are disturbing signs of weakness in the farm-price picture, with the demand for meat down a half pound per person per month. He said individual consumption of bread, cereal products, and potatoes also is on the down grade. Mr. HOEVEN's conclusion was that consumers aren't willing to spend as much of their income for food as they did during war days.

---

CANADA LIVING COSTS HIGHER

OTTAWA.—The official cost of living jumped seven-tenths of a point during December, bouncing back to its high of 159.6, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics.

This increase erased exactly the seven-tenths of a point drop—the first in 23 months—which had taken place during November.

---

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 7, 1949]

EXPERTS STILL WORRIED ABOUT INFLATION DESPITE SHARP MARKET BREAK

Despite the sharp break in stock and commodity prices last week, some Washington officials say inflation rather than the threat of a depression still is the Nation's most immediate economic problem.

While losses of some stock shares were being extended as much as $3 in Saturday's trading, Secretary of Labor Tobin and Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, chorused that they were not alarmed. And Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, said "the postwar boom has not ended," and that prices still are higher than they ought to be.

The Senate-House Joint Economic Committee, of which Senator O'MAHONEY is chairman, called a public round-table session to open tomorrow. It invited in both agriculture and economic experts to ascertain whether the break in prices and increasing unemployment presages a general depression or is nothing more than a postwar adjustment.

CONSUMER PRICES STILL HIGH

In addition to the sharp price breaks, January employment was reported to be off 700,000, but Senator O'MAHONEY said the 57,500,000 persons employed last month were more than were employed in the first 3 months of 1948.

"We still have a problem in inflationary pressure," he said, "because as long as the Government and people who are employed are buying things they want, the pressure is upward. Wholesale prices have not dropped halfway down to the level they occupied in 1947. Consumer prices haven't dropped nearly as far as wholesale prices."

Although the week ended with grain prices on the Chicago Board of Trade showing some rallying tendency, cash corn was at its lowest price since December 1945, and 35 cents under the Government support level. With steers and heifers at the lowest price since 1947, some corn belt farmers were reported losing money on their operations. Hogs were at the lowest price since October 1946, except the January 3 quotations.

PRICE BREAK FAIRLY GENERAL

The week's price break was fairly general all along the line at the wholesale level. It included cotton, fats, oils, eggs and butter, with corn and cotton suffering the sharpest setbacks.

Cotton lost as much as $1.30 a bale in Saturday's trading, while the losses of up to $3 in stock shares were in addition to the Friday drops which ranged up to $5.

But the Agriculture Department said some recovery in the prices of meat and meat animals was in prospect within the next month or two and CIO research experts called a conference this week to assemble data which might be the basis for demands for a fourth-round wage increase.

The recommendations by the experts will be considered by the 51-member CIO executive committee March 2. The CIO convention last November declared itself in support of a fourth-round wage increase.

---

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 5, 1949]

NEW SOAP PRICE CUTS

Two more top-soap manufacturers reduced wholesale prices yesterday on major household soap products.

Procter & Gamble Soap Co. and Lever Bros. followed Colgate-Palmolive-Peet Co. in announcing 6-percent reductions.

As a result two large grocery chains in the East trimmed price tags as much as 2 cents. Bohack & Co., operating in Brooklyn and Long Island, and Grand Union Co. with stores in New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Vermont, announced lower prices on soap flakes, powder, cakes, and synthetic detergents.

## REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. TYDINGS introduced Senate bill 857, to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 858. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Sanford Pruitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 859. A bill to authorize all Federal agencies to donate surplus property for educational purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 860. A bill to authorize Sacramento Valley Irrigation Canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committe on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

S. 861. A bill for the relief of Chen-Kya Hahn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself and Mr. DOWNEY):

S. 862. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; and

S. 863. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

S. 864. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 865. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to, or on account of, the children of persons who served in the active military and naval service; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marie Y. Mueller; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

S. 867. A bill for the relief of Theodore Papachristopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 868. A bill to provide for the dissemination of technological, scientific, and engineering information to American business and industry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 869. A bill for the relief of Leon Haim and his family; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. AIKEN):

S. 870. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to provide assistance to States in developing and maintaining dental health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 871. A bill to provide military status for women who served overseas with the Army of the United States during World War I; to the Committee on Armed Services.

## REVISION, ETC., OF ARTICLES OF WAR—UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War and the Articles of the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard, and to reenact and to establish a uniform code of justice.

In connection with the introduction of the bill, I ask to have printed in the RECORD a release by Defense Secretary Forrestal, concerning the need for uniform military justice. The release is submitted by him for the consideration of the Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 857) to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a uniform code of military justice, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

There being no objection, the release by Secretary Forrestal was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

Secretary of Defense James Forrestal today submitted to Congress a proposed uniform code of military justice for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard.

The proposed code, based on a study by a special committee, would supersede the Articles of War, including the amendments effective February 1 which were made by the Selective Service Act of 1948, under which the Army and Air Force courts martial systems operate, and the Articles for Government of the Navy. It would be uniformly applicable to all the armed forces in time of war and peace.

Secretary Forrestal asked the committee, appointed last August, of which Prof. Edmund M. Morgan of the Harvard Law School is chairman, to prepare a code, uniform in substance and in interpretation and application, that would protect the rights of those subject to it and increase public confidence in military justice without impairing performance of military functions.

In providing for uniformity, the proposed code makes all punishable offenses identical for all the armed forces, sets up the same system of courts for each and the same procedures, including those for a Board of Review in each Department and a single Judicial Council which is the court of last resort for each of the forces.

This single Judicial Council, composed of civilians, would make final decisions on all questions of law and also act with the Judge Advocates General of the three Departments as an advisory body to secure uniformity in policy and in sentences and to correct any defects discovered in the system and its administration.

The courts provided for each Department are: (1) General, for capital and other serious offenses; (2) Special, for less serious offenses; (3) Summary, for minor offenses.

Chairman Morgan, in a summary of some of the more important provisions of the proposed code, points out those designed to provide for uniformity in administration, those designed to assure the accused a fair trial, those designed to prevent undue control or interference with the administration of justice, and those designed to preserve appropriate military functions.

Outstanding among the provisions in the proposed code are those made to give added legal protection to enlisted men and other accused persons and to prevent discriminations between enlisted persons and officers. These include certain limitations of command authority, provision for enlisted men to sit as members of general and special courts martial, the right of the accused to peremptory challenge of a member of a court martial and the right to be represented by defense counsel equally qualified with trial counsel.

While the commanding officer would appoint the court martial and it would make its findings under his command, appeals would be reviewed concerning law and fact in higher echelons not under his control. Voting on challenges, findings and sentence also would be by secret ballot of the members of the court martial.

A commanding officer is forbidden to censure a court martial, or any member or officer, because of any judicial action. Any attempt improperly to influence action by anyone in any aspect of a trial or its review is also forbidden.

Provisions concerning general courts martial require a pretrial investigation, which the accused may attend, with counsel, to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses. Trial is prohibited on any charge which does not state an offense or is not supported by sufficient evidence. It also is mandatory that the defendant be provided with competent, legally trained legal counsel and enlisted men have the privilege of having enlisted men as members of the court. A law officer, who is not a member of the court, with the duty to instruct the court on questions of law, is also provided.

A stenographic record of a general court martial must be made and review of the record for errors of law and of fact by a board of review is automatic, with the right of the accused to be represented by legally competent counsel on appeal. Review by the judicial council, for errors of law, is automatic where a death sentence or dismissal is involved and may be obtained by petition showing probable error of law where sentence imposes more than 1 year's confinement or a discharge.

In special courts martial it is not required that the defense counsel be a lawyer unless the prosecuting counsel is. Both must be equally qualified, however. Enlisted men may have enlisted men as members of the court. If a bad-conduct discharge is imposed, a full stenographic transcript must be made and the case reviewed in the same manner as a general court-martial record.

Peremptory challenge of a member of a special court martial is provided, as in a general court martial; also voting by secret ballot. Review by the judge advocate or legal officer is required.

Provision is made for permitting an accused person to refuse trial by a summary court (trial by a designated officer) if he prefers to be tried by a special court martial. He then would have the privilege of counsel and of having enlisted men on the court if he were an enlisted man. Review by a judge advocate or legal officer is required.

Among the provisions to prevent interference with due administration of justice are:

1. The convening authority may not refer charges for trial until they are found legally sufficient by the staff judge advocate or legal officer.

2. The staff judge advocate or legal officer is authorized to communicate directly with the Judge Advocate General.

3. All counsel at a general court martial trial are required to be lawyers and to be certified by the Judge Advocate General as qualified to perform their legal duties.

4. The law officer—a competent lawyer—rules on all questions raised at the trial, except on a motion for a directed verdict and on the issue of the accused's sanity.

5. The commander, who is the convening authority, must not act on a finding or sentence of a general court martial without first obtaining the advice of his staff judge advocate or legal officer.

6. The board of review, located in the office of the Judge Advocate General and removed from the convening authority, is composed of legally trained men and reviews the trial record for errors of law and of fact.

7. The judicial council is composed of civilians and passes finally on all questions of law.

8. When counsel appear before the board of review and the judicial council, both parties must be represented by qualified lawyers.

9. Censure by a commanding officer of a court martial or any member or officer thereof because of any judicial action of the court or any member or officer is forbidden and any attempt improperly to influence official action in any aspect of a trial or its review is prohibited.

Among command functions the proposed code would retain are:

1. Commanding officers refer the charges in general, special, and summary courts martial and convene the courts.

2. Commanding officers appoint the members of the courts.

3. Commanding officers appoint the law officer and counsel for the trial.

4. Commanding officers retain full power to set aside findings of guilty and to modify or change the sentence, but are not permitted to interfere with verdicts of not guilty nor to increase the severity of the sentence imposed.

5. The powers of commanding officers at mast and company punishment are retained for minor offenses which require prompt action and for which comparatively light punishments can be imposed. The procedural safeguards in this type of nonjudicial punishment are considerably less than in the courts martial but are believed to be reasonably adequate.

In addition to Chairman Morgan, the members of the Committee on a Uniform Code of Military Justice are Under Secretary of the Navy W. John Kenney, Assistant Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray, and Assistant Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert.

Felix E. Larkin, assistant general counsel, Office of the Secretary of Defense, acted as executive chairman of the committee and as chairman of a working group composed of representatives of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with an unofficial observer representing the Coast Guard, which in time of war operates as part of the Navy.

## APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—AMENDMENT RELATING TO SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, fiscal year 1950, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page —, lines —, strike out the words "To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School Lunch Act (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), there is hereby made available $——— of the funds appropriated for the current fiscal year 1950 by section 32 of the act approved August 24, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 612 (c)), such amount to be without regard to the 25 percent limitation contained in said section 32, and to be exclusive of funds expended in accordance with the last sentence of section 9 of the National School Lunch Act: *Provided*, That no part of such funds shall be used for nonfood assistance under section 5 of said act." And substitute therefor the words "To enable the Secretary to carry out the provisions of the National School-Lunch Act of June 4, 1946 (42 U. S. C. 1751–1760), $150,000,000.

## HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 2361) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and myself, I submit for ap-

propriate reference a concurrent resolution providing for a single appropriation bill, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement by me of the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) Commencing with the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, all general appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act of —— (the blank to be filled in with the calendar year in which the fiscal year for which such appropriations are being made ends). As used in this paragraph the term 'general appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill, and each deficiency or supplemental general appropriation bill, shall show in tabular form by items and totals (A) each item of appropriation, (B) the amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from such appropriation, (C) the amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from all other appropriations made in prior years for the same purpose as the item of appropriation referred to in clause (A) is made, (D) the total amount to be expended in the ensuing fiscal year from such appropriations, and (E) that part of the item of appropriation referred to in clause (A) which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the ensuing fiscal year.

"(3) Amendments to any general appropriation bill which would have the effect of changing any figures required to be shown by paragraph 2 of this subsection, shall contain a provision changing such figures to conform to the proposed amendment.

"(4) No general appropriation bill and no amendment thereto shall be received or considered in either House unless it conforms with this rule."

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. BYRD was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Under present procedure neither Congress nor the American public has an opportunity intelligently to analyze fiscal legislation. If such an analysis could be made, I believe it would be a measurable deterrent to nonessential Federal expenditures. For this reason a joint resolution was introduced in the United States Senate today to provide for consideration of all regular appropriations in one bill each year.

Sponsors of the resolution were: Senators BYRD, BUTLER, BRIDGES, O'CONOR, KNOWLAND, and GILLETTE.

The Federal Government of the United States is the biggest financial operation on earth and nothing is as economically important to as many people as the fiscal situation of this country. Yet, we attempt to finance vast domestic and world programs through legislative processes in which it is impossible to know whether income and outgo are in balance until after the budget is enacted.

Most of the difficulty in comprehending budgetary action arises from confusing language and archaic procedure. In these days of huge multiyear programs and projects an appropriation may be available for expenditure in more than 1 year. Most of an appropriation adopted in a year when revenue is high may actually be spent in a year when revenue is low.

There may be vast difference between appropriations and expenditures in a given fiscal year. But spending legislation is always considered in terms of appropriations, while revenue must be comparable to expenditures—not appropriations. There is no readily available facility for either Congress or the public to translate current and previous appropriations into terms of annual expenditures either by items or by totals.

As Congress passes spending bills under present procedure it has no idea as to what the over-all total of either appropriations of expenditures will be. Under the system the President submits a budget message requesting appropriations and revenue, and after that the budget picture is never seen again as a whole until after it has become the law of the land.

Congress breaks down the appropriation side of the budget message into a dozen or more bills each dealing with a group of activities. Each bill is handled separately by a different subcommittee in each House of Congress. They are brought in one by one for passage over a period of 6 months. They are not accompanied by an expenditure estimate. There is no way of telling what total appropriations or expenditures are, and there is no way of comparing the effect of action on the bills with the revenue situation.

It is impossible to consider appropriation items by relative merits, importance, or cost in view of the whole fiscal situation. The bills are passed as separate and unrelated pieces. If the public knew what was in these money bills as they are considered I am confident its demand for elimination of at least the obvious nonessentials would be vigorous.

A long initial step toward this end would be accomplished by adoption of a single appropriation bill which would consolidate and total all appropriation items into one act and specify how much of each item could be obligated in the ensuing year. And such a bill would be accompanied by a report translating appropriations into expenditures. It would be considered as a whole and in full view of the revenue side of the budget.

This would be accomplished under the resolution introduced today which actually would require only a simple change in the rules of congressional procedure. The facts that the resolution would simplify procedure and facilitate proper consideration of fiscal legislation should justify adoption of the resolution. If it serves as a deterrent to nonessential items, that was never more urgently needed.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. KILGORE (for Mr. MCCARRAN) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 66), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional professional staff members and three additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947.

CERTAIN HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 67), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, the report of such hearings and of making investigations, as authorized by section 134 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Eighty-first Congress to make such expenditures and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution shall not exceed $10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

SEC. 3. Upon the termination of the special committee, authorized pursuant to Senate Resolution 20, Eightieth Congress, to study problems of American small business and enterprises, those files and records of such committee relating to small business and enterprises falling within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, as defined in part I, section 102 (j) Public Law 601; shall be transferred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ARREST AND TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 57) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate condemns as unjust the arrest, confinement incommunicado, and trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CONNALLY. What is the status of this matter?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, unless some other disposition is made of it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Does it not go to the committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does not, except on motion or request. A resolution coming over from a previous day automatically comes before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Was this resolution considered yesterday at all?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution was submitted yesterday, and under the rule had to lie over for 1 day.

Mr. CONNALLY. Then it is simply before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is before the Senate. The question is whether the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that Senate Resolution 57 be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BALDWIN subsequently said: Mr. President, as I understand the action just taken by the Senate, the resolution

submitted yesterday by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], calling for some action on the part of the Senate expressing its sentiment in the Mindszenty case, has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. It seems to me Mr. President, that if the sentiment of the Senate is going to be of any use in this particular matter, we should have an opportunity to vote on it today on the floor of the Senate. I regret that when the subject came up on the floor of the Senate today, the Senator from New Hampshire was not here. I assume he did not anticipate it was going to be taken up so early.

I wish to explain that my vote was not a vote in opposition to the resolution, but I voted "no" against a reference of the resolution to the committee, because it seemed to me that if we in the Senate were going to take any action which would be in any way helpful in that case, by expressing the sentiment of this body as to the inhuman treatment the cardinal has received, today is the day we should take it. I regret very much that the resolution has been referred to the Foreign Relations Committee, so that we cannot have an opportunity to act on it today.

NOTICE OF HEARING BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had planned to hear Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator of the ECA, further this afternoon at 2 o'clock. On reconsidering the matter the committee determined that it would hold a hearing tomorrow at 10:30, in the caucus room in the Senate Office Building, and that it would be open to the public. I make this anncuncement for the information of the press and others who may be interested.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ANTHONY J. DIMOND TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION NO. 3, DISTRICT OF ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, February 15, 1949, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, of Alaska, to be United States district judge, division No. 3, District of Alaska. Judge Dimond is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired February 10, 1948. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address in relation to the Taft-Hartley law, delivered by Senator DOUGLAS on February 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KERR TO THE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NORTH CAROLINA

[Mr. HOEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator ROBERT S. KERR to the Young Democrats of North Carolina at their State meeting in Southern Pines, N. C., February 5, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHY THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT MUST BE REPEALED—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MYERS

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Why the Taft-Hartley Act Must be Repealed," delivered by him on Friday, February 4, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1948—STATEMENT BY E. H. AGNEW

[Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. E. H. Agnew, president, South Carolina Farm Bureau, with respect to the Agricultural Act of 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MARSHALL PLAN—ARTICLES BY MORLEY CASSIDY

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a number of articles with respect to the operation of the Marshall plan, written by Morley Cassidy, and published in the Philadelphia Bulletin, which appear in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN SALESMANSHIP—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hot Tip From CAPEHART," published in the Washington Times-Herald of January 28, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR PRODUCTION—QUESTIONS ON THE TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Arcadia (Wis.) News-Leader relative to the need for production, and questions by the National Small Businessmen's Association on the Taft-Hartley law, which appear in the Appendix.]

SHORTENING THE ODDS—EDITORIAL FROM THE PROGRESSIVE

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Shortening the Odds," relating to President Truman's program, published in the Progressive for February 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—EDITORIAL FROM THE BALTIMORE NEWS-POST

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial with respect to the case of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, published in the Baltimore News-Post of February 7, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

MORE HASTE, LESS SPEED—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to read three sentences from an editorial published in this morning's Washington Post, and then ask to have the full editorial inserted in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks. Is it appropriate for me to do so?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Strictly speaking it is not, but the Chair——

Mr. MORSE. I would not want to do it if in doing so I did not comply strictly with the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has sought to emphasize the fact that under the Senate rule no speeches of any length are in order at this time.

Mr. MORSE. I do not wish to make a speech. I simply want to read from material which I wish to place in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reading extracts from the editorial would constitute debate.

Mr. MORSE. Then Mr. President, I ask unanmious consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "More Haste, Less Speed," published in this morning's Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE HASTE, LESS SPEED

If the Senate Labor Committee holds to its announced schedule, hearings on the proposed substitute for the Taft-Hartley Act will close on Thursday. It is now unmistakably evident that the committee cannot in the next 3 days hear more than a small fraction of the witnesses demanding an opportunity to state their views. Nor will it have before it all the information it will need for the delicate task of rewriting the law controlling labor-management relations. A Senate committee cannot act on so momentous an issue with such haste without opening itself to the charge of substituting the rubber stamp for full inquiry and legislative deliberation.

This unreasonable haste will not work to the advantage of labor, the Administration or the committee. No organic labor-management legislation can work well or last long unless it wins general public support, and that will be forthcoming only if the public believes that the legislation has been shaped with deliberation and in a spirit of sensible compromise. The Administration ought to be aware of the fact that legislative tempers are already frayed because of this unreasonable haste. Thus the executive-legislative unity that is so essential to carrying out the President's program is in danger of being undermined for no good reason. Another week or 10 days of hearings would go a long way toward convincing both legislators and the people that the Administration is seeking legislation in the public interest and not merely to pay a political debt.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from all over my State I have received letters and resolutions voicing the indignation of the people of Wisconsin of all faiths against the trial and sentencing of courageous Cardinal Mindszenty.

I have issued today a statement in protest against this shocking procedure.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a gracious letter which I have received from Mr. J. Marlowe Boyle, of Milwaukee, regarding the trial, and that there be printed following Mr. Boyle's letter my statement supplementing my previous comments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGREGATION OF ST. ROSE,
*Milwaukee, Wis., February 6, 1949.*

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: Only a cause justly serious and far-reaching in its implications could induce us to add to your burden of legislative duties with a request for your official and personal favor.

Your intimate knowledge of the deeply religious nature and innate dignity of the people of Wisconsin will enable you to fully understand and appreciate the great consternation aroused in us by the wholly unjustified arrest and imprisonment, on fabricated charges, of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary, by the Communist puppets who rule his nation through the voice of the Kremlin.

If the espousal of human rights and the dignity of man be crime; if the voice of a great spiritual leader raised in suppliance for the right of his people to worship their God be treason; then Cardinal Mindszenty is a criminal and a traitor, and is deserving of no outside help.

Since we know, however, that communism is in itself traitorous to the free individual and to his free democracy, then we must also conclude that his eminence is guilty only of being a churchman in a Communist controlled state.

It is on this basis, therefore, that we respectfully entreat your good offices for the purpose of lodging, through the Department of State and its official diplomatic channels to Budapest and Moscow, a vigorous protest against the most barbarous usurpation of human rights, epitomized in the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. It is our earnest hope that you will lend the influence of your office to the efforts to obtain the release of his eminence.

Respectfully yours,
ST. ROSE HOLY NAME SOCIETY,
J. MARLOWE BOYLE,
*Catholic Action Chairman,*
(On behalf of our 1,200 members.)

---

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY

RENEWED PROTEST AGAINST TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

The civilized world has been shocked and outraged by the fraudulent trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. The faked confession, based quite clearly upon the drugging of the courageous primate, the phony justice, and all the other elements of the trial have violated the conscience of men of good will of all religious faiths throughout the world.

Every decent individual throughout the globe, whether or not he or she is of Catholic faith, can say, "There but for the grace of God stands my minister or rabbi or spiritual leader." Cardinal Mindszenty represents the forces of man's spirit, the moral force of enlightened humanity against the fanatic hords of atheistic Communists; against the antichrist which has arisen in the form of the Communist International.

The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is a fraud, a farce, a fanatic demonstration of the depravity of the leaders of the Communist state and their satellites.

The American Government must redouble its efforts to register with the Hungarian authorities the absolute indignation of all of its citizens of every faith against this shocking and sinful proceeding. This trial mocks the pious statements of Premier Stalin regarding his desire to see President Truman and work out a peace settlement.

Cardinal Mindszenty stands before the Red fanatics as a symbol of the ideological war between our way of life and the Red way. The sentence which will be imposed upon him tomorrow will be one more bar against any basis for real understanding between ourselves and the Red authorities.

How can we possibly negotiate with these depraved men who utilize every means to destroy the light of freedom and the light of spirit? How can we possibly talk with them around the conference table when they stand ready to crucify man's spirit?

The American Government has always spoken out against the persecution of religion, as I stated in my remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10. It must do so again and right now.

The persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and Lutheran Bishop Ordass must be protested by every means at the command of our Government.

We had coddled the Red governments abroad. We have dealt with them with kid gloves. We have pampered them so that they believe they can get away with anything, regardless of how venal it may be.

The persecution of church leaders in Hungary must be condemned by the American Government and by all the western governments in the most vigorous, direct, and forthright terms and in the most meaningful way if we are to be worthy of our obligations as the upholders of the light of civilization.

The persecution which stems from the Marxian doctrine that religion is the opiate of the people must be branded by our Government as one of the most shocking demonstrations of Marxist materialism that any human being has witnessed on the face of this planet.

## DATE FOR REPORTING LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday the House passed Concurrent Resolution 22, postponing the date for reporting the legislative budget, as provided in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, until May 1, 1949. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a House concurrent resolution, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I object to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the concurrent resolution will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

## LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to be excused from attendance on the Senate on February 10, 11, and 12, 1949.

Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on February 10 and 11, 1949.

Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on February 10, 1949.

Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on February 14, 1949.

Mr. LANDERS asked and obtained leave to be absent from the Senate on February 9, 10 and 11, 1949.

## THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is concluded. Under the rule, the next order of business is the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hoey | Murray |
| Anderson | Holland | Myers |
| Baldwin | Humphrey | Neely |
| Brewster | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Bricker | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Reed |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Russell |
| Cain | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Connally | Langer | Sparkman |
| Cordon | Lodge | Stennis |
| Donnell | Long | Taft |
| Douglas | Lucas | Taylor |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ecton | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Ellender | McFarland | Thye |
| Ferguson | McGrath | Tobey |
| Flanders | McKellar | Tydings |
| Frear | McMahon | Vandenberg |
| George | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Gillette | Malone | Wherry |
| Gurney | Martin | Wiley |
| Hayden | Maybank | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Withers |
| Hickenlooper | Morse | Young |
| Hill | Mundt | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The clerk will proceed with the call of the calendar.

## BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 130) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities, was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

## LOSS OF OR DAMAGE TO PROPERTY DEPOSITED BY ALIEN ENEMIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 29) to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, on page 2, in line 2, after the figures "1707)", to insert "the possession of which property was not prohibited by law prior to said promulgations."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? I should like to know how much money, if any, is involved in this commitment.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, we do not have an exact estimate of the amount, but the bill limits the amount which may be paid to any one person to $1,000. The idea is that the claims must come in under existing law, but that if such claims are in amounts of $1,000 or less, they can be settled without the enactment of special bills. Formerly that was prohibited by law.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the next amendment reported by the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 5, after the word "ancestry", to strike out "with local police authorities."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 13, after the word "prescribe", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Attorney General to pay or settle any claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property which had been used for espionage or for other illegal purposes on or before December 7, 1941."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, in line 22, after the word "any", to insert "decision or."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Attorney General is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay in an amount not in excess of $1,000, when accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction and final settlement, any claim against the United States arising on or after December 7, 1941, for damage to, or loss or destruction of, personal property, the use, operation, possession, custody, or control of which was prohibited by proclamation No. 2525, dated December 7, 1941, and proclamations No. 2526 and No. 2527, dated December 8, 1941 (55 Stat., pt. 2, pp. 1700, 1705, and 1707), the possession of which property was not prohibited by law prior to said promulgations and which was deposited by alien enemies or United States citizens of Japanese ancestry in the manner provided in the regulations promulgated by the Attorney General on February 5, 1942, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 844; 28 C. F. R. 30.1–30.16): *Provided*, That the damage to or loss or destruction of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and that the claim is substantiated in such manner as the Attorney General may by regulation prescribe: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the Attorney General to pay or settle any claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property which had been used for espionage or for other illegal purposes on or before December 7, 1941.

SEC. 2. No claim shall be considered unless presented in writing within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 3. Any decision or settlement made by the Attorney General under the authority of this act and such regulations as he may prescribe shall be final and conclusive, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

SEC. 4. The Attorney General may report such claims as exceed $1,000 to Congress for its consideration.

SEC. 5. Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under this act are hereby authorized.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN BASQUE ALIENS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 27) for the relief of certain Basque aliens, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 14, after the name "Salvador", to strike out "Vizcar" and insert "Viscay"; in the same line, to strike out "Recaide" and insert "Recalde"; and in line 22, after the word "quotas", to insert a colon and the following proviso: *"Provided*, That if the Attorney General finds that Cipriano Aznarren Udi is otherwise entitled to the benefits of this act, he is authorized and directed to accord him such benefits, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, insofar as it relates to illiteracy", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Jose S. Algarra de Carlos, Domingo Asiain Hualde, Patricio Asiain Hualde, Cipriano Aznarren Udi, Gracian Azparren Gazcue, Pedro Aspiroz Echechuri, Anastasio Barbarena Elizegaray, Melchor Burusco Domench, Pedro C. Cemborain Garmendia, Angel Dufur Iturri, Bernardo Dufur Iturri, Primitivo Egozcue Seminario, Modesto Elgorriaga Exposito, Felipe Errea Huarte, Esteban Erro Inda, Ambrosio Esnoz Recalde, Lino Goicoa Arozerena, Alberto Ibarregui Iriberri, Pablo Inda Sagardoy, Felipe Itturri Castilla, Francisco Jorajuria Andiaarena, Joaquin Juanarena Dufur, Francisco Larrea Ibarrola, Manuel Lecumberri Barber, Silvestro Martinex Exposito, Serpio Mendiguia Lerumbe, Jose Moulian Mendia, Jose Narvarez Berendiain, Antonio B. Nuin Exposito, Jose Ochandorena Petricorena, Jose M. Ochandorena Petricorena, Primitivo Olondriz Echeverria, Mateo Pedroarena Barberena, Leandro Urrutia Villanueva, Pedro Valencia Llorente, Prisco Villanueva Montoya, Marcelino Villanueva Urrutia, Salvador Viscay Oroz, Demetrio Zubiri Uriz, Pedro M. Recalde Iribarren, Celestino Arozarena Elizagaray, Jose Betelu Zubiriaga, Dionisio Betelu Zubiriaga, Fermin Jorajuria Andiaarena, Tomas Iriarte Lerindegui, Miguel Redin Equiza, Miguel Inda Juandeaburre, and Jose Zubiri Coni, as of the respective dates of their lawful temporary entry into the United States in 1944, if they are found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws other than those relating to quotas: *Provided*, That if the Attorney General finds that Cipriano Aznarren Udi is otherwise entitled to the benefits of this act, he is authorized and directed to accord him such benefits, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, insofar as it relates to illiteracy. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number for each alien named herein from the quota of the appropriate country of the first year that the said quota is available.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD KIM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 90) to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Richard Kim, who served as a member of the armed forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8. The Secretary of State is directed to instruct the proper quota-control office to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that said quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PREVENTION OF PURCHASE AND SALE OF PUBLIC OFFICE

The bill (S. 15) to amend the act entitled, "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. May we have an explanation, please?

Mr. KILGORE. The bill is drawn at the request of the Civil Service Commission, to strengthen the law against attempts of persons, for fees, to procure appointment to any civil position in the United States Government. In other words, the endeavor is to prevent a person from being able to say, "For so much money I can get you an appointment as a clerk in the post office."

The bill would make it much easier to administer the law, and would fix the penalty.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act of December 11, 1926, entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office" (44 Stat. 918), is amended by adding the following new paragraph to section 2:

"SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to solicit or receive any sum of money or thing of value whatsoever in consideration of aiding or assisting any person to obtain any appointive office or employment under the Government of the United States, either by referring his name to any executive department, agency, or independent establishment of the United States for consideration, or otherwise, or to require the payment of a fee from any person because such person has secured any appointive office or employment under the Government of the United States."

JOSE BABACE

The bill (S. 26) for the relief of Jose Babace was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby author-

ized and directed to cancel any deportation proceedings which might arise in the case of Jose Babace (Irigoyen), Minden, Nev., legally admitted, but who has remained in the United States longer than permitted by law and regulations, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

MILO JURISEVIC AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 32) for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the aliens Milo Jurisevic; Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, wife of the said Milo Jurisevic; Svetozar Jurisevic and Radmila Jurisevic, son and daughter, respectively, of the said Milo Jurisevic and the said Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, all of Fresno, Calif., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, on October 23, 1946, to the United States for permanent residence.

LT. JOHN T. McDERMOTT

The bill (S. 279) to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), shall be advanced to the grade of lieutenant commander on the retired list effective for all purposes from the date of his retirement.

PAYMENTS ERRONEOUSLY MADE TO RETIRED OFFICERS OF NAVAL RESERVE

The bill (S. 278) to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the term "Reserve components" as used in section 6 of the act approved February 21, 1946 (60 Stat. 27; 34 U. S. C. 410b), shall include officers on the honorary retired list of the Naval Reserve or Marine Corps Reserve established by section 309 of the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended (34 U. S. C. 855h).

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective from February 21, 1946.

DR. CHUNG KWAI LUI

The bill (S. 315) for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Dr. Chung Kwai Lui as having entered the United States in 1936 for permanent residence, upon the payment by her of the visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any warrants of arrest or orders of deportation which may have been issued, and to discontinue any deportation proceedings which may have been commenced, in the case of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui. The Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for the first year that a quota number is available.

GHETEL POLLAK KAHAN AND OTHERS

The bill (S. 331) for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old), as having entered the United States on August 21, 1945, for permanent residence. The said Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old), shall not be subject to deportation by reason of such entry.

CLARIS U. YEADON

The bill (S. 335) for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration laws, relating to the issuance of immigration visas for admission to the United States for permanent residence and relating to admissions at ports of entry of aliens as immigrants for permanent residence in the United States, that provision of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 136 (c)), which excludes from admission into the United States persons who have been convicted of or admit having committed a felony or other crime or misdemeanor involving moral turpitude, shall not hereafter be held to apply to Claris U. Yeadon (nee Claris U. Davis), the wife of Cecil S. Yeadon, an American citizen. If she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, an immigration visa may be issued and admission granted to the said Claris U. Yeadon under this act upon application hereafter filed.

ENGEBERT AXER

The bill (S. 307) for the relief of Engebert Axer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Rev. Engebert Axer, Society of Jesus, as of September 26, 1937, the date on which he was originally admitted to the United States as a student.

JOYCE VIOLET ANGEL

The bill (S. 485) for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Joyce Violet Angel, a resident of Alexandria, Egypt, shall be deemed to be a native of Great Britain.

STAMPS COMMEMORATIVE OF THE THREE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF ANNAPOLIS, MD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md., was announced as next in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to submit an observation in respect to this measure.

This is the first of the measures at this session ordering commemorative stamps. All of us are familiar with the fact that so many commemorative stamps for so many different purposes, and sometimes for highly doubtful ones, were ordered during the last session that the value of almost all commemorative stamps was diluted to a pathetic degree. Furthermore, the wholesale practice of ordering commemorative stamps resulted in very general condemnation throughout the country, not only among philatelists but also among those who are interested in preserving the value of the use of the postal service for commemorative ends.

Obviously, the objective of the joint resolution which is now before the Senate is a completely justified one; but it occurs to me that at the beginning of this session we should accommodate curselves to some type of procedure by which to put under some sort of discipline the business of the issuance of commemorative stamps. My own hope has been that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service would hold back all measures providing for the issuance of commemorative stamps until well toward the end of the session, assess the relative value of the purposes sought to be commemorated, and then in one final bill present to the Senate a budget of commemorative stamps, held within a reasonable number, and confined to the major events sought to be commemorated.

I have no desire to interfere with the authorization of commemorative stamps in connection with the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis. I may ask the Senator from Maryland whether there is any such urgency in this matter that it would interfere with his hopes and aspirations in this connection if the joint resolution were to go over until the whole subject might have some collaborated consideration?

Mr. O'CONOR. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan, I may say there is such urgency. The celebration is scheduled for this spring, and arrangements for it have already been made by civic leaders and organizations, officials of the Naval Academy, St. Johns College, and of other individuals in and around Annapolis. The joint resolution was actually passed by the Senate last year, but, at the end of the session, it failed of passage in the House.

It is thought this is an exceptional case. Agreeing entirely with all that has been said in the general connection

by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I can give assurance there have already been expressed in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service sentiments which I am confident will result in a more coordinated program, although we do think this is an exceptional case.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My position in regard to making any exception is that one exception invites others. However, I hold to the statement of my friend from Maryland in connection with Annapolis, because this is so obviously justified, and I am not going to object. But I think I shall object to other bills providing for commemorative stamps, which may be brought forward one by one, and I should like to give such notice now. In fact, I think we should look to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without any order of the Senate, to create some sort of procedure which will bring the whole thing into one package at the end of the session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired. The Senate is now operating under the five-minute rule.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object I wish to make it plain that, as a matter of fact, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service cannot prevent the Post Office Department from issuing commemorative stamps. The Postmaster General has full discretion. Last year, after the committee turned down two proposals for stamps, the Postmaster General issued them any way. That is the law.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator not think, however, there is congressional responsibility at least for those we do approve, and that when we approve 20 or 30 commemorative stamps in 12 months, it simply reduces the whole process to a fantastic degree?

Mr. LANGER. I agreed fully. We cannot solve the problem here unless we change the law, because the Postmaster General can go ahead and issue such stamps anyway.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest to the Senator we can at least by our own procedure reach a concentrated result at the end of the session with respect to the commemorative stamps we recommend, so that we at least recognize our responsibility.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not understand, or did not hear, the explanation made by the Senator from Maryland as to the urgency of this particular measure.

Mr. O'CONOR. I said there is urgency, in our opinion, because of the fact that the celebration is to be observed within the next month or two, and that, inasmuch as all plans have been perfected by the chamber of commerce and by civic organizations at Annapolis, the home of the Naval Academy and St. Johns College, for the commemoration of the three hundredth founding, it is important the joint resolution be passed at this time in order that completed arrangements may be made.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I observe that Calendar No. 21, Senate bill 492, likewise relates to the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two-hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va. I am wondering whether or not in that case the Senator knows, or if either Senator from Virgina may advise me, whether or not there is a similar emergency.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, Alexandria is in exactly the same category as Annapolis. It is about to celebrate the two hundredth anniversary of its founding in 1749. Preparations are now being made for it. Alexandria is one of the most historic cities in America, as the Senator knows. It was George Washington's home, Robert E. Lee lived there, and among other things, the city was once a part of the District of Columbia. Preparations are now being made for the celebration in 1949, within 60 or 90 days.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I merely want to concur in everything the senior Senator from Michigan has said with reference to the issuance of stamps, here, there, and everywhere. The committee discussed the subject when these two measures came before it. It was thought under the circumstances, because Annapolis was at one time the Capital of the United States, that on its three hundredth anniversary, when a big celebration is to take place, it would be well to issue the stamps.

In regard to the stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, the senior Senator from Virginia has already expressed the reason why the committee favorably reported that bill. But I want to assure the Senate that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service in the future intends to take such matters up with the Post Office Department and obtain clearance before reporting similar measures to the floor of the Senate. That I believe will expedite matters in regard to this subject.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should think, under the Senator's statement and under the statement of the able Senator from Virginia, that these are two perfectly legitimate objectives. I am not going to object to either one, on the basis of the assurance of the able Senator that the committee will undertake some sort of rationalization in connection with other requests of this nature for the remainder of the session.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. This is not merely the statement of the chairman of the committee. The committee discussed the subject when the two measures were before it. We assure the Senate something will be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 22) to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to prepare for issuance in May 1949 a special series of 3-cent postage stamps, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

## MARCUS GEORGE VETERANS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 372) to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital in Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words regarding this bill. I think it is a magnificent thing for the Senate to pass it and provide that the United States veterans' hospital in Americus, Ga., shall be known as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital. It is well known that Lieutenant George died a heroic death in the North Atlantic while endeavoring to rescue other aviators who were imperiled. Senators are more or less familiar with the account of his exploits and of his failure to return from the flight he was ordered to make.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Finance be printed in full in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report (No. 29) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 372) to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

The official record of service of the late Lt. Joseph Marcus George, United States Naval Reserve, active, is as follows:

1911, November 16: Born in Vienna, Ga.

NATIONAL GUARD SERVICE

1935, January 21: Enlisted in Company L, One Hundred Twenty-first Infantry, Georgia National Guard. February 2: Promoted to rank of sergeant.

1936, June 15: Discharged.

ENLISTED UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE SERVICE

1938, July 13: Enlisted in United States Naval Reserve. October 10: Enlistment terminated.

OFFICER UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE SERVICE

1938, October 11: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as aviation cadet, United States Naval Reserve, to rank from October 3, 1938. October 30: Reported to United States Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., for active duty undergoing training.

1939, September 18: Designated naval aviator (heavier-than-air). October 20: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as ensign, A-V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to rank from October 15, 1939. Detached United States Naval Air Station, Pensacola, Fla., and transferred to Patrol Squadron 53 for active duty involving flying. Reported November 9, 1939. Further transferred to Patrol Squadron 83 for duty involving flying.

1942, January 23: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as lieutenant

(junior grade) A–V (N), United States Naval Reserve, for temporary service. June 27: Accepted appointment and executed oath of office as lieutenant A–V (N), United States Naval Reserve, to rank from June 15, 1942, for temporary service.

1943, February 7: Detached Patrol Squadron 83 and transferred to a bombing squadron for duty involving flying. Reported February 18, 1943.

Education: University of Georgia.

Medals: American Defense Service Medal, Fleet Clasp, Purple Heart.

Died: Presumptive August 8, 1944. Officially reported to be missing in action as of August 7, 1943, when the plane which he was aboard was lost in the Atlantic area. In compliance with section 5 of Public Law 490, as amended, death is presumed to have occurred on the 8th day of August 1944.

Place: Atlantic area.

Cause: Plane lost (enemy action).

According to the records on file Lieutenant George was listed on the records of the Navy Department in the status of missing in action as of August 7, 1943. He was on board a plane which took off from the naval air station, New York, on an antisubmarine patrol flight. Several minutes after the plane took off, it was instructed by its base to proceed to position 37° 35′ north latitude and 71° 20′ west longitude, in order to investigate that area and to stand by a plane which had landed to pick up survivors of another plane which had been shot down by an enemy submarine. The last message received was an acknowledgment of the receipt of the above message. Weather conditions in the area at the time included excellent visibility and a calm sea with light swells. Extensive but unsuccessful search operations were conducted. Reports received state that the reason for the failure of the plane to return is unknown but its loss is believed to have been the result of enemy submarine gunfire.

The committee is in accord with the purposes of the bill and recommends its enactment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Lieutenant George was a son of our colleague the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], chairman of the Committee on Finance. The United States, through the Congress, does a most appropriate and gallant thing in making this public recognition of our admiration for Lieutenant George's heroism, his patriotism, and his great achievements in his chosen work.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the proposed United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., shall be known and designated on the public records as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital.

## RECONVEYANCE OF LAND TO HELENA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 460) to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land in the city of Helena, Mont., was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, in my judgment, the bill is an exceedingly meritorious one in that it does not violate the general principle in regard to the disposal of Federal property, which I in times past have sought to protect. But because controversy will undoubtedly arise in the future in connection with other transfers of Federal property, I wish to make a few comments on the pending bill.

As the committee's report shows, it relates to a piece of property, valued at between $10,000 and $15,000, which was transferred to the Veterans' Administration by the Helena Chamber of Commerce for the specific purpose of erecting on the property a Veterans' Administration regional office. The transfer was for that purpose, and that purpose only, with the reservation, of course, in the conveyance that if the property were not used for that purpose, it would revert to the Helena Chamber of Commerce. The committee report shows that it has now been decided that the property will not be used for the purpose originally intended, because the Veterans' Administration has agreed upon a consolidation program which will make possible the use of an office building in another vicinity. Therefore, under the terms of the conveyance itself, the Federal Government is not entitled to the retention of the property, and consequently the bill is a meritorious one.

I make that statement because I want to lay down the distinction between this case and cases which, I surmise, may arise in the future as they have in the past. So far as the junior Senator from Oregon is concerned, he will not give unanimous consent to making gifts of Federal property to cities, counties, and local governmental units of States without just compensation paid to the American taxpayers who own the property.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in addition to what the Senator from Oregon has stated, I desire to say that the Federal Government has incurred no expense in the improvement of this property. The transfer will be made without cost to the Federal Government.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 460) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to reconvey by quitclaim deed to the Helena Chamber of Commerce, a corporation, two parcels of land in Helena, Mont., commonly designated as lot numbered 10 and the south 55 feet of lot numbered 9 of the Henry Thompson placer mining claim in Lewis and Clark County, Mont., which parcels were conveyed to the United States of America by the Helena Chamber of Commerce by deed dated February 7, 1947, and recorded among the land records of said county, in Book 140 of Deeds at page 63.

## STAMP COMMEMORATIVE OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF FOUNDING OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

The bill (S. 492) to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.," be amended to read as follows:

"That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during 1949, a special 6-cent air-mail postage stamp, of such design as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va."

## REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That bill is the unfinished business before the Senate, and will go over until later.

## COTTON ACREAGE PLANTED IN 1949

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or of any other law, State, county, and farm acreage allotment for corn, wheat, cotton, and rice for any year after 1949 shall be computed and apportioned without regard to acreage planted, or to yields, in 1949.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is a House bill, dealing with cotton. When the bill came to the Senate committee, it was decided to include wheat, corn, and rice. The amendment provides that the acreage planted this year to the production of cotton, wheat, corn, and rice shall not be used in future years in computing the acreage applicable to any farmer.

The purpose of the bill is to discourage production after this year, for the reason that we now have a surplus of some 6,000,000 bales of cotton. The record shows approximately 300,000,000 bushels of wheat at the end of the year, and we shall also have a large supply of corn and a reasonable supply of rice. Having these large supplies on hand, it was the recommendation of the Department that we should not consider the acreage planted this year in computations for allotments for production and marketing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, do I correctly understand from what the Senator has said that it will tend to cut down the amount of subsidies which the Government may be expected to pay?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Obviously so. The reason for this proposed legislation, as I understand and believe, is this: Farmers, knowing they will have a high support price for this year's acreage, 90 percent, believe they can plant and raise a large crop and get a higher

support price. That is one reason. Another reason is that by an increase in their acreage they thought that perhaps they could increase their parity. So the bill is designed to curtail or eliminate those two points.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to add to what the Senator from Oklahoma has said, that when a quota of acreage is established it is usually on a historic basis as to what the particular producer has had over the years. The great increase in wheat and cotton acreage naturally would distort the quota.

I think it is highly desirable that some control be had over the acreage. Excluding this increase in acreage of cotton, and, to some extent, applying it to other production, is a desirable thing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would not the necessary effect be to result in more planting of cotton this year, 1949?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The cotton season has not started yet. Some has been planted in the Southern States. The reason for offering the bill is to serve notice officially on all cotton planters that they cannot have considered their acreage for this year.

Mr. TAFT. I see. It is to have the opposite effect.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary be authorized to correct the title to conform to the body of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 713) to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the provisions of Public Law 533, Eightieth Congress, approved May 18, 1948, limiting the cost of the General Accounting Office Building to $22,850,000 be, and the same are hereby, amended to increase such limit of cost to $25,400,000.

### REPEAL SECTION 509 OF TITLE 34, UNITED STATES CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 77) to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69).

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to repeal an act passed by Congress in 1876, which prohibited the Navy Department from employing any person within 60 days of an election, unless the Secretary of the Navy issued a certificate that the employment was necessary, and the certificate was published. That statute is entirely archaic now, in view of the civil-service system, and other laws.

The bill S. 77 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69), is hereby repealed.

### DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN PERSONAL PROPERTY

The bill (S. 629) to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, are hereby authorized to dispose of by sale or otherwise, 1 year after date of receipt, all lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property which is now or may hereafter come into the possession, custody, or control of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, as the case may be: *Provided*, That an effort shall be made to determine and locate the owner or owners thereof, or their legal representatives, and that in all cases where the owner thereof, or legal representative, has been determined the property shall not be sold or otherwise disposed of for a period of 90 days after written notice has been sent to his last known address.

SEC. 2. The net proceeds received from the sale of any such property by the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 3. Claims for the net proceeds, if any, of such property so disposed of may be filed with the General Accounting Office by the rightful owners or their legal representatives at any time prior to the expiration of 3 years from the date of the disposal of the property and, if not so filed, are barred from being acted on by either courts or the accounting officers.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force, respectively, are authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of this act.

SEC. 5. Any property coming within the provisions of this act which may be delivered to the Soldiers' Home under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army or the Secretary of the Air Force shall be limited to papers of value, sabers, insignia, decorations, medals, watches, trinkets, manuscripts, or other articles valuable chiefly as keepsakes.

SEC. 6. This act shall not be construed as amending or repealing the act of March 29, 1918 (40 Stat. 499); article 112 of section 1, chapter 11, of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 809); the act of February 21, 1931 (46 Stat. 1203); the act of December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 662), as amended; or the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 846-847), as amended.

### AGE LIMIT FOR APPOINTMENT IN SUPPLY CORPS

The bill (S. 630) to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted etc.*, That section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 19. No person shall be appointed to a commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy who will be less than 21 years of age on July 1 of the calendar year in which appointed and until his physical, mental, and moral qualifications have been established to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy."

### AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT CERTAIN GIFTS

The bill (S. 632) to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following-named members and former members of the naval service are hereby authorized to accept such gifts as have been tendered them by foreign governments as of the date of approval of this Act: Rear Admiral Harold M. Martin, United States Navy; Captain William R. Brust, United States Naval Reserve; Captain Bennett W. Wright, United States Navy; Captain George C. Wright, United States Navy; Captain Richard W. Ruble, United States Navy; Commander Robert F. Carmody, United States Navy; Commander James I. Cone, United States Navy; Commander Jack Dean, United States Navy; Commander Gordon Fowler, United States Navy; Commander Richard L. Fowler, United States Navy; Commander John E. Hausman, United States Navy; Commander Draper L. Kauffman, United States Navy; Commander James A. Knowlton, United States Naval Reserve; Commander John P. Lunger, United States Navy; Commander Robert M. Milner, United States Navy; Commander Frank G. Raysbrook, United States Navy; Commander Frederick M. Stiesberg, United States Navy; Commander William A. Stuart, United States Navy; Commander Richard S. Rogers, United States Navy; Commander George R. Lee, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Raymond A. Boyd, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Laurenca B. Green, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Melvin C. Hoffman, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Victor A. Moitoret, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander John C. O'Connor, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Henry Nelson, United States Naval Reserve; Lieutenant Commander Norman L. Paxton, United States Navy; Lieutenant Commander Bryon G. Shepple, United States Navy; Captain James J. Bott, United States Marine Corps; Lieutenant Irwin J. Vanderswag, United States Marine Corps; Lieutenant George H. Beik, United States Navy; Lieutenant Samuel Hopkins, Junior, United States Navy; Lieutenant Jack Scott, United States Navy; Lieutenant (junior grade) La Verne W. Brown, Junior, United States Navy; Lieutenant (junior grade) Leonard B. Di Napoli, United States Navy; Lieutenant (junior grade) Thomas L. Neilson, United States Navy; Lieutenant (junior grade) Horace A. Thomsen, United States Navy; Ensign Robert P. Armstrong, United

States Navy; Chief Boatswain Anthony S. Ciccone, United States Navy; Boatswain Earl L. Hause, United States Navy; Joseph G. Pardovich, chief boatswain's mate, United States Navy; Robert D. Clendenon, chief musician, United States Navy; Carl F. Heine, chief machinist's mate, United States Navy; Gilbert H. Dobler, chief photographer's mate, United States Navy; Myrl A. Yeaman, chief photographer's mate, United States Navy; Crisanto Dolor, chief cook, United States Navy; Master Sergeant Lionel E. Simmons, United States Marine Corps; Willie F. Maguire, chief signalman, United States Navy; Donald K. Lobdell, chief radioman, United States Navy; Gorman "T" Perry, motor machinist's mate, first class, United States Navy; Jack O. Montgomery, boatswain's mate, second class, United States Navy; Charles R. Dickinson, boatswain's mate, third class, United States Navy; Lawrence H. Wasser, musician, third class, United States Navy; Gordon C. Wyman, fire controlman, third class, United States Navy; Robert Charles Vail, shipfitter, third class, United States Navy; Delmere B. Blackburn, private first class, United States Marine Corps; Paul Hermann, seaman, first class, United States Navy; James E. McCall, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Charles H. Kilpatrick, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Clifford E. Kintner, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Bernard I. Landau, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Harold A. Masters, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Kenneth Karl Hrabal, seaman, first class, United States Navy; Nicholas Vignovich, seaman, first class, United States Naval Reserve; Leonard Stanley Tur, fireman, first class, United States Naval Reserve; L. R. Weedle, fireman, first class, United States Navy; R. N. Young, fireman, first class, United States Navy; and Michael Strusinski, coxswain, United States Naval Reserve.

SEC. 2. The following-named members of the naval service are hereby authorized to accept such awards as have been tendered them by foreign governments as of the date of the approval of the Act: Rear Admiral Edward W. Hansen, United States Navy; Captain Albert E. Fitzwilliam, United States Navy; and Lieutenant (junior grade) John E. Nichols, United States Navy.

SEC. 3. Dr. Mina S. Rees, a civilian employee of the Navy Department, is hereby authorized to accept and wear the King's Medal for Service in the Cause of Freedom which has been tendered her by the Government of Great Britain.

## PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF OFFICERS OF THE NAVAL RESERVE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 673) relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wonder if we may have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this bill is reported by the committee in an effort to eliminate any injustice done certain Reserve officers of the Navy.

Rear admirals of the Navy for pay purposes are divided into the upper half and lower half. Those in the lower half numerically draw the same pay and allowances as a brigadier general of the Army while those in the upper half that of a major general.

Under a ruling of the Comptroller based on the wording of several laws, certain Reserve rear admirals on active duty cannot draw the pay of the upper half regardless of relative rank and length of service. This bill provides that a Reserve rear admiral on active duty will be entitled to upper-half pay when the Regular Navy rear admiral next junior to him draws upper-half pay. The immediate effect of this bill is that one Reserve rear admiral now on active duty will draw upper-half pay instead of lower-half. This difference in pay amounts to approximately $2,200 a year.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall not object. My purpose for asking an explanation was that during the war we found existing a situation in which Reserve officers would be commissioned as rear admirals, and it was never intended that Reserve officers, prior to the passage of the so-called Reserve Act, would be in the upper brackets, which were for men who had devoted their lives to the Navy and who were presumably more expert. We found men coming in from civilian life who would finally be rear admirals, and then they wanted to be in the upper brackets. Now that the component of the Navy is so large and we must rely on a great many Reserve officers who will probably make a career of the Navy to a much greater extent than heretofore, I suppose it is all right to allow them to get into the upper brackets.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill involves only one, but I see no reason for discriminating against a reserve officer who is on active duty and serves for a long time, to the extent that he cannot under any circumstances get into the upper half. As it is now, the regular officers, the Annapolis graduates, who are rear admirals, can pass over the reserve officer and get into the upper half, and as it is now the reserve officer cannot under any circumstances get into the upper half and attain the rank of rear admiral. The bill applies to only one man, who is a specialist, and the Navy Department is very anxious to have it passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Reserve officers remain in the Navy long enough to become rear admirals, they should be a part of the Regular Navy.

Mr. RUSSELL. The man affected by the bill is a specialist, and, as I have said, the Navy Department is anxious that the bill should be passed. But I may say that for my part I have never been in favor of discriminating against a man because he is a Reserve officer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That any officer of the Naval Reserve serving in the grade of rear admiral shall receive the pay and allowances prescribed by law for rear admirals of the upper half when any officer of the active list of the line of the Regular Navy, junior to him, is in the upper half of the list of rear admirals: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to officers of the Naval Reserve while on any lineal list established pursuant to title III of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947: *Provided further*, That no back pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued under the provisions of this act for any period prior to the date of its approval.

## UPPER COLORADO RIVER BASIN COMPACT

The bill (S. 790) to grant the consent of the United States to the upper Colorado River Basin compact was announced as next in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over. My colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], is out of the city on official business, and his office has requested that the bill go over. We certainly have no objection to early consideration of the proposed legislation, but we merely desire to be sure that there is nothing in the bill that will adversely affect the lower-basin waters.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I merely wish to state for the RECORD that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs instructed its staff yesterday to advise the office of the senior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] of the fact that the bill had been reported, so that if he desired to have it held up, he would be on notice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under objection, the bill will be passed over. That completes the calendar.

## REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Committee on Banking and Currency has considered S. 548, has unanimously reported the bill, as amended, and has recommended that the bill do pass.

Exports of commodities from this country have been controlled by law since the power was first requested by President Roosevelt in 1940. From that time to the present this authority has been renewed periodically by the Congress. However, the nature, scope, and purposes of the controls exercised under it have been modified to meet the changing needs of the national interest.

In 1940 export controls were being used to strengthen the national defense. During the war they were used to prevent supplies from getting to our enemies and to direct goods to our fighting allies, while at the same time protecting our own scarce supplies.

Since the end of the war they have been used and at the present time they are being used, first, to cushion the domestic economy from the inflationary effects of abnormal foreign demand for some of our supplies which are still short; second, to direct such goods as we can spare to those countries where need is greatest and where world recovery will be speeded up; and finally, to check exports of industrial commodities which might affect our national security.

In other words, these controls are necessary now, and are being used, to protect the domestic economy by limiting exports of scarce materials, and to channel exports to countries where the need is greatest, and where our foreign policy and national security interests would be served best.

President Truman, in his State of the Union Message, emphasized the need for continuation of these controls, and asked for renewal of the present legislation, together with provisions for more adequate enforcement, which have been

included in the pending bill. The testimony of the Secretary of Commerce, the Under Secretary of Agriculture, and other Government witnesses, as well as witnesses invited from the trade, who appeared before the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee, was very convincing as to the need for maintaining export controls throughout this period of unsettled world affairs.

As pointed out in the committee report, a number of witnesses urged a shorter extension, of only 16 months, not because they questioned the need for the longer extension, but only in order to provide for an annual review by the Congress. Such a review is not precluded in S. 548. On the contrary, specific provision is made for quarterly reports to the Congress of operations thereunder, and for termination of the controls at any time by simple concurrent resolution. The evidence at this time is fairly clear as to the need for these controls for at least two years to come.

In this connection, it should also be observed that the Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which had made an exhaustive survey of the program during the last Congress, stated in its report of December 18, 1948:

> The failure to maintain adequate export controls at this time can have extremely harmful effects upon our national security and domestic economy. The national security aspects of our export control program are of transcendent importance. * * * The economic phases of the export control program are also important.

Generally speaking, S. 548 makes no substantive changes from the present law. The legal authority is continued for the control of commodities, the licensing of specific exports, and the exercise of destination, end-use, price and other pertinent licensing standards and criteria to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or would he rather that I wait until he concludes his remarks?

Mr. MAYBANK. I have no objection to yielding.

Mr. BALDWIN. I notice in the committee report that the controls which the Senate is being asked to extend by the pending legislation, are substantially the same controls and continued in the same language by which they were continued in section 3 of the joint resolution of December 30, 1947. Was not that the so-called Anti-inflation Act which was passed in the fall of that year? And was not that section 3 of that act?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. That was after certain items had been controlled. It was during the administration of President Roosevelt, in 1940, that these controls were begun. The controls became greater and greater during the war. In the year to which the Senator referred some decontrols were put into effect. They were considered at that time by the Committee on the Judiciary, by the Commerce Committee, and by other committees. The controls then dealt substantially with materials which were scarce at that time, and which apparently are scarce now.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, this is a continuation of section 3 of the act setting up anti-inflation measures adopted in a Republican-controlled Congress in December 1947. The other day we continued in force and effect section 2 of that act. Now we continue section 3.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BALDWIN. So, what we are asked to do now is to continue in force and effect a section 3 in substantially the same form as it was passed in a Republican-controlled Congress?

Mr. MAYBANK. After control had, of course, been commenced by President Roosevelt in 1940; yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. What is the justification for extending this control for 2 years and 3 months? Why is not 1 year enough? Why cannot we reasonably hope that a year from this time there will no longer be need for export control.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am very hopeful that it will not take a year. That is why we have the provision in the bill that the control can be ended by the adoption of a concurrent resolution at any time.

The principal additions to the present law are the provisions which are designed to improve enforcement of export controls. These are contained particularly in sections 3 and 6. The report of the investigations subcommittee, previously mentioned, pointed out the necessity for such a stronger compliance program. The President emphasized the need for strong enforcement measures, and the Secretary of Commerce has made a similar recommendation. In order to give effect to these recommendations, which are discussed more at length in the committee's report, specific authority is provided in this bill for undertaking all necessary enforcement measures.

The determination of what commodities shall be decontrolled and the fixing of export quotas have been delegated by the President to the Secretary of Commerce, but the decisions on such matters are made only after an extensive review by an interagency committee on which all interested departments are represented.

The committee felt that the Secretary of Agriculture should, because of his general responsibilities in the field of food and agriculture, be given final responsibility for determining the total amount of agricultural commodities, including fats and oils, which are in excess of our own needs and which could, accordingly, be authorized for export.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. As a matter of fact, I understand that the European prices for fats and vegetable oils are higher than those in the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. The statement is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. We have a surplus of such fats and oils in the United States, and yet permission is not granted to export the surplus to Europe.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator from Texas that we have prepared an amendment, the purpose of which is to leave that matter entirely to the Secretary of Agriculture. I may say that the President himself spoke to the chairman of the House committee, Mr. SPENCE, and also to Representative BROWN, of Georgia. The Secretary spoke to me, authorizing me to say that he would not object to having the matter turned over to the Department of Agriculture.

I am glad the Senator from Texas is present on the floor of the Senate at this moment. I wish to say to him that I think the fats and oils situation, as the testimony will show, has in the past been handled miserably. We undertook a full investigation of that subject. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], who asked about similar language, that the law which permits the Secretary of Commerce to have a veto with respect to export of agricultural products is, to my way of thinking, all wrong. The price of cottonseed has gone down. The price of lard has gone down. As every western Senator knows, the price of soybeans has gone down. The latest figures we have received, since the hearings were closed, show that the price of soybeans is still declining. To illustrate, let me for a moment compare the prices of soybean oil and cottonseed oil at the beginning and end of last year. The price of soybean oil, for instance, in January 1948 was 26.6 cents. The price in December 1948 was 17.3 cents. The price of cottonseed oil in January 1948 was 28 cents as compared with 17.08 cents in December 1948. Last Thursday's quotation on cottonseed oil, crude in the valley, was 13.75.

I want the Senator from Texas, who has a wide knowledge of cotton and of agriculture, to help us, if he can, so far as ECA is concerned. The ECA has not bought sufficient cottonseed oil, nor has the ECA bought sufficient soybeans, nor has the ECA bought the inedible fats and the edible fats which are selling for almost nothing in this country, and which could be used, particularly in the region where General Clay has jurisdiction, as the testimony shows. The Senator is correct in his statement. This matter has been poorly handled. I hope it will be handled better under the Secretary of Agriculture. I hope the ECA will take an interest in the program. The farmers of the country are in dire need of such help.

Mr. CONNALLY. Has the Senator from South Carolina any assurance that if control of the matter should be placed under the Department of Agriculture it will be handled better than it is now?

Mr. MAYBANK. No; but that is the only suggestion that was made.

Mr. CONNALLY. The authority ought to be trimmed down quite materially before it is placed anywhere.

Mr. MAYBANK. We trimmed it down.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say a word respecting ECA. My information is that vegetable oils are selling in Europe for higher prices than they are selling for in the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator, I believe, is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. So we could very easily help the objectives of the ECA by shipping more vegetable fats to Europe, and bringing down the price in Europe, rather than spending our money by paying the higher prices here at home.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is eminently correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I certainly hope the committee will do something to relieve the situation. The present policy seems to me to be foolish. It benefits no one.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator that inedible fats have already been decontrolled.

Mr. CONNALLY. Not entirely.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. An allocation was made the other day for the first quarter of the year.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; inedible fats have been decontrolled.

Mr. CONNALLY. How about edible fats? Inedible fats cannot be eaten. If we are going to relieve Europe, we ought to give its people something they can eat. There is no use attempting to relieve them by giving them inedible fats, and leaving the edible fats under control.

Mr. MAYBANK. With respect to edible fats, additional allocations amounting to 35,000,000 pounds each of lard, cottonseed and soy beans, were issued last week. The Department is now considering the subject. I feel that as soon as authority is vested in the Department of Agriculture—it is vested in the Department of Commerce now——

Mr. CONNALLY. I understand.

Mr. MAYBANK. As soon as it is vested in the Department of Agriculture, I hope the Department will decontrol them.

The question is whether ECA could not render a great service by providing Europe with more inedible as well as edible fats, because, as the Senator says, ECA is paying higher prices for European fats than our farmers are receiving for theirs. Not only that, Mr. President, but the same situation is true with respect to Canada and South America.

Mr. CONNALLY. Speaking of edible fats, wholesome food needed by the people of Europe and by the people of all the world, we have now more of them than we need in the United States, and those in control of the exportation of such fats have placed a fence around them and will not permit them to be exported. The difficulty about vesting the authority in any of the Federal departments is that the Secretary himself cannot personally examine every application. The Secretary of Commerce receives 10,000 applications a week.

Mr. MAYBANK. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. Some clerk in the Department smells around and secures reports. He knows nothing about inedible fats; he knows nothing about cottonseed oil; he knows nothing about soybean oil. He simply makes some sort of a calculation and fixes the quota that shall be allowed to go abroad.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in thorough accord with the Senator. That is the reason why we talked with the President and were assured that the responsibility for the determination of export quotas, exportable surpluses of agricultural commodities would be turned over to the Department of Agriculture. That is the reason for the amendment. I intend to follow it up to the limit of my ability as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, and I feel certain that my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will help us out with ECA.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will help the Senator and his committee if they will do their part. It is proposed to turn the administration of this subject over to the Department of Agriculture. If that is done, I hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will be fully informed as to what has transpired.

Mr. MAYBANK. I talked with him only this morning.

Mr. CONNALLY. That will do no good unless the Senator talks with him tonight and tomorrow and the following night, and the next day and the next night.

Mr. MAYBANK. At least, he will be responsible.

Mr. CONNALLY. What does that amount to? The Secretary of Commerce is now responsible, but what does it amount to? All it amounts to is that we rise in the Senate and make little speeches, and that is the end of it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not agree with the Senator in that respect. We listened to more than a week of testimony. I feel that agricultural products do not belong under the Department of Commerce, and have no place there.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think it would be helpful to the discussion to point out to the senior Senator from Texas that we were informed that the allocations of edible fats and oils are not being taken up at the present time. The export licenses are not consuming all the allocations available. So it would make little difference if the controls were removed.

Mr. MAYBANK. The trouble is the great shortage of dollars outside this country.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. It will not do any harm if they cannot buy the goods and pay for them. No one will be hurt. But if the products are dammed up and cannot be exported, our own producers are hurt.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator was eminently correct as the situation existed last fall. What went on was outrageous. But since the present Congress has been in session both inedible and edible fats and oils have been available. Since we held the hearings quotas have been increased to the point where we are informed that they cannot all be taken up.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to confirm what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said about the zeal with which we went into the subject. On the Committee on Banking and Currency there are members who are not bankers. Some of them come nearer to being farmers than bankers. We are very much interested in what affects the farmer. We went into the subject very fully. We feel that we have amended the language of the bill so as to protect the situation. We have the assurance of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Commerce that the intent and purpose of this amendment will be carried out.

I wish further to say to my distinguished colleague from Texas that we shall make it our business to keep in touch with this problem, to see that there are no unnecessary restrictions, red tape, or delays which will result in banking up unconsumable surpluses of edible and inedible fats and oils in this country.

On the first of March a new allocation quota will go into effect. The authorities are now at work liberalizing the quota with a view to moving all the accumulated surpluses for which there are proper markets. I feel that no Member of the Senate need have any uneasiness about the steps we have taken and plan to take to protect the producer, the processor, and the distributor of fats and oils in this country.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TAYLOR. Does the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency feel that the main reason for keeping allocations and export licenses is to control the destination of edible fats and oils, and to keep them from going to certain countries? As I understand, that is the only reason for keeping controls at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I will say to the Senator from Idaho that I understood that some of the controls are designed to keep certain products from going to certain countries. However, I do not believe that was the chief reason for keeping fats and oils under control. I have heard that the only reason why edible fats were selling at such high prices in Europe was that they were being held back here. Why should our farmers be punished and have their goods stocked up in this country when there is a shortage in Europe, and fats and oils are bringing such high prices? As the Senator knows, inedible fats go largely into soaps and products of that kind.

Mr. TAYLOR. But that is not true of edible fats. If the purpose is not to control the destination, then I am at a loss to see any reason for retaining controls.

Mr. MAYBANK. In my opinion there should be no controls on edible fats and oils. As the Senator knows, during our hearings, the allotments on lard, cottonseed oil, and soybean oil were increased by 35,000,000 tons a quarter. The Senator also knows that because of the facts which we brought out with respect to inedible fats, the price of soap was reduced a few cents by the soap manufacturers of the country who have been stocking up on much of the inedible fats at sacrifice prices.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to make a brief statement. Export controls certainly do not promote trade and commerce, so far as the sale of our own products is concerned. Red tape and delay certainly militate against the rapid and orderly carrying on of trade and commerce. These controls have been extended for a period of more than 2 years, and they seem to me to be wholly unnecessary. It is not the policy of the United States to use export controls except under certain emergency situations.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what the law provides.

Mr. GEORGE. The general policy of the United States is to do away with export controls, tariff restrictions, exchange restrictions, and all other restrictive measures which impede commerce. There is no doubt that any exporter in this country must go through certain red tape procedure in order to obtain a permit. All such restrictions operate against the rapid passing into trade of our own products. Here the emphasis is placed upon oil, and that is important.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was emphasized only because the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] had asked specifically about oils.

Mr. GEORGE. The amendment itself emphasizes fats and oils. It provides as follows:

(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

I presume that all vegetable and animal fats and oils must receive attention from the Secretary of Agriculture if this bill is passed.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. But there are other agricultural products, as the Senator from South Carolina well knows, which are not absolutely prohibited from entering interstate and foreign commerce under the present law. I refer, for example, to naval stores. However, the red tape and the long delays involved make it quite impossible to export them. There would seem to be very little reason for continuing these export controls, which are contrary to the general policy which this country has followed for a long time. Such controls should not be used except in case of necessity.

Let me invite the Senator's attention to a further fact. It would be quite impossible, I believe, for anyone except an international trader to do much trading in a commodity such as cotton.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree.

Mr. GEORGE. He must make his quotations, but he does not know how long it will be before he will get a permit to enable him to export. It is pretty difficult for him to protect himself.

Mr. MAYBANK. That question was discussed over a period of 1 or 2 days with Dr. McIntyre. He is the Assistant Director of OIT. I believe the hearings will show that the procedure has been expedited and that at the present time it is being handled satisfactorily. Even those who had been opposed to it testified that it had been greatly improved in the past 2 months.

Mr. GEORGE. No doubt it has been greatly improved; but the point I am making is that a continuation of export controls necessarily will hamper, to some extent and in some way, our foreign trade.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. So the controls should not be extended, in my opinion, 1 day beyond the actual necessity.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, by concurrent resolution the Congress can do away with the controls. However, the Senator will admit, I am sure, that some commodities, such as steel and other very scarce articles, including manganese, must be controlled.

Mr. GEORGE. I suppose there are yet some scarce articles. However, my observation is that the pipe lines in this country are filling up.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree.

Mr. GEORGE. And we are approaching a period when surpluses are ahead of us—in many lines, at least.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the situation as regards cotton, wheat, corn, and other commodities; and that is why declines have occurred. But I say to the Senator from Georgia that there are scarcities of strategic metals and minerals, the list of which is printed in the hearings.

Mr. GEORGE. I think there should always be export control of critical and strategic metals and minerals. But our policy with respect to ordinary commerce and trade certainly should be one of complete liberty and freedom, and not one of restrictions. So, to continue this act for 2 years and 3 months strikes me as too long a time. I would much rather vote for it if it would continue controls for only 1 year.

It is true, as the Senator has said, that Congress can get rid of it by concurrent resolution, but it is very difficult to get Congress to act, sometimes. Once a law is placed on the statute books, it tends to remain there. Something in the nature of inertia often affects the Congress in that respect, and we do not move very fast.

Mr. MAYBANK. I say to the Senator from Georgia what I said at the hearings, namely, that I have reference to a long list—some three pages in extent—of strategic and critical materials and metals, including soil pipe made of cast iron, and so forth.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree that there should be some control of strategic materials; but in peacetime I think controls should be removed from ordinary commerce as rapidly as possible.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question, if the Senator will yield to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that under the bill the Department of Commerce will be able to decontrol any commodity which it sees fit to decontrol?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also true that the Department has already decontrolled fats and oils?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; and also lumber.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not also true that last year, when the Congress was asked to appropriate more than $5,000,000,000 for aid to the Marshall plan countries, the charge was made that the expenditure of that sum of money abroad would have an inflationary effect upon our economy, and is it not said that this export control is merely an over-all attempt in foreign policy to aid the countries of Europe and at the same time to avoid a serious effect in regard to items which might be in short supply in this country?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does not the Senator from South Carolina also agree that, with world development and as the possibility of peace becomes more nearly a reality, the sooner we can drop all these controls the better it will be?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes. I do not know how many commodities have already been decontrolled, but I know a large number of commodities have been.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Of course, no one would contend that such controls do not hamper and restrict and to some extent burden foreign commerce, but certainly not so much as it was claimed a little sawmill in the mountains of Virginia burdened interstate commerce under the wage-and-hour bill, because apparently anything anyone does nowadays will burden interstate commerce.

However, these restrictions do have some burdening effect; and naturally we shall urge, insofar as we have the privilege of doing so, the dropping of all export controls on items that are not vital in our over-all policy.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course, the extreme scarcity of so many of these articles is, as the Senator from Virginia knows, what has caused high prices.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As the Senator from South Carolina knows, I personally would favor going further into the matter of decontrols than this amendment does.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; I talked with the Senator yesterday.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am constrained not to object too much to this amendment, because I think perhaps it is the best decontrol provision we can obtain. But I wish to call the attention of the Senator to one provision of subsection (c), on page 3, which is the decontrol amendment on fats and oils.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; it is the farm amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the particular language there, which is a requirement that the Secretary of Agriculture make an affirmative finding of the existence of a surplus. Did the Senator or did the committee consider language

which would provide that the decontrols would not apply unless the Secretary of Agriculture were to make an affirmative finding that there was not sufficient amount of the commodity in this country to meet the demand?

Mr. MAYBANK. We did not. No; that was never brought up in the committee, I may say to the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Under this amendment, the Senator from South Carolina and I might agree among ourselves that there was an excess supply. The price might and many other factors might indicate it. But if we could not get the Secretary of Agriculture to make an affirmative finding of the existence of a surplus, the commodity would still be under controls.

I wonder whether it would be better to provide that the commodity would be removed from controls unless the Secretary of Agriculture made an affirmative finding of the existence of a short supply in this country. Of course it is a difficult matter to phrase.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand the Senator's point of view, and we discussed it yesterday. However, that point was not discussed in the committee.

The amendment which is now set forth was thoroughly discussed in the committee, and I am hopeful that it will be adopted.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in thorough agreement with the statements heretofore made to the effect that the objective must be to get rid of controls as quickly as possible and to return to a balanced economy. But I think the objection in the past to most of the controls has arisen from the fact that the Department of Agriculture might say, "We would like to decontrol this commodity, but the Department of Commerce will not agree, and we must obtain their consent," and the Department of Commerce might say, "We would like to decontrol this commodity, but we cannot obtain the consent of the Department of Agriculture."

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is entirely correct; that was the testimony.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. However, this amendment represents an improvement, because it would fix the responsibility in one agency.

Personally, the amendment would appeal more to me if it provided for the decontrol of agricultural commodities, and only permitted controls to be imposed when the Secretary of Agriculture, acting under his own responsibility, said, "We do not have enough in this country to go around. Therefore I will reimpose export controls." I would feel better if the amendment read that way, rather than the way it does. Nevertheless, I believe the amendment constitutes a forward step.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator's position, and I can understand from his remarks just the way he feels about the matter. I say to him that we did not discuss the so-called negative approach.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In other words, I believe we had better take the view of keeping the economy going and letting the public official take the responsibility of closing it down, rather than of closing down the economy and then letting the public official on his own responsibility say it should be opened up. I think an important matter of public policy is involved in that connection.

However, I shall not oppose the amendment. I have no amendment to offer at this time. I believe this will substantially accomplish what the Senator is seeking.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I hope at least this step forward will not permit any such situation to exist again in the United States as has existed in the South and West during the past three months with respect not only to fats and oils, edible and inedible, but soybeans and their by-products, as well as cotton. The amendment we just discussed will, I believe, go a long way to prevent any such similar situation from developing.

Mr. President, your committee was particularly concerned and carefully looked into the effect of the export control program upon small business. It should be noted that specific provision is made in this bill, section 4 (b), that in granting licenses for export, consideration shall be given to the interests of small and merchant exporters among others. Provision is also made that there shall be trade consultation with respect to the determination of licensing practices and standards.

In this connection your committee noted with approval that the Department of Commerce had announced sometime ago, in its order providing for the establishment of trade advisory groups, that it will be governed by the principles announced in Senate Concurrent Resolution 14, Eightieth Congress, regarding small business. The committee was also furnished with information indicating the distribution of licenses in a number of commodities among small business, merchant exporters, and new exporters, and was generally impressed that by and large a fair distribution had been made. It was further noted that it was chiefly due to present-day abnormal conditions in foreign trade that small-business men were having difficulty in obtaining a larger share of export business.

Your committee was also concerned to determine how export controls have affected the farmers. During our hearings evidence was presented as to the growing surpluses of inedible and edible fats and oils and the serious drop in their prices. Accordingly, action was taken by the Department of Commerce to decontrol inedible fats and oils for export, and to authorize larger export quotas for cottonseed and soybean oils and also lard.

I ask to have inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the releases issued by the Department of Commerce giving the larger quotas and decontrolling certain articles, while our hearings were under way.

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELEASE FROM UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Controls will be removed effective February 7 from the export of most inedible fats and oils, the Department of Commerce announced today through its Office of International Trade.

Among the inedible fats and oils removed from the positive list of goods requiring specific licenses for export are all soaps, flaxseed, linseed oil, fish oil, olive-oil foots, inedible tallows and greases, stearic acid, oleic acid, neat's-foot oil, fatty acids of vegetable origin, vegetable-oil foots, and soap stock. These products were decontrolled because of generally improved supplies. United States prices of these products are lower than they have been at any time since the removal of OPA price ceilings and the prospects for increased production during the next half year are good.

OIT officials pointed out that existing regulations governing all shipments to Europe remain in effect for these commodities.

Following is a list of the commodities that have been removed from the positive list:

| *Commodity* | *Schedule B. No.* |
|---|---|
| Neat's-foot oil | 080300 |
| Lard oil | 080901 |
| Inedible animal oils, n. e. s. (report oleo oil in 005600) | 080998 |
| Fish oils (report medicinal in 811910, 811950, and 811990) | 081900 |
| Grease stearin (include lard stearin) | 084300 |
| Oleic acid, or red oil | 084700 |
| Stearic acid | 084900 |
| Tallow, inedible (report ring grease in 085898) | 085700 |
| Pig's-foot grease (formerly 085805) | 085898 |
| Other hog grease (formerly 085805) | 085898 |
| Beef suet | 085898 |
| Ring grease | 085898 |
| Other inedible animal greases and fats, n. e. s. (report lubricating greases in 504100) | 085898 |
| Flaxseed | 222003 |
| Linseed oil | 223200 |
| Fatty acids of vegetable origin | 224801 |
| Vegetable-oil foots, except olive-oil foots (report olive-oil foots in 224913) | 224805 |
| Vegetable soap stock (include vegetable tallow if used for soap stock) | 224898 |
| Olive oil, inedible, except sulfured or foots (formerly 224915) | 224913 |
| Olive oil, sulfured or foots (formerly 224803) | 224913 |
| Soap: | |
| Toilet, fancy, and medicated (include gift sets of toilet preparations where value of soap exceeds value of other items) | 871100 |
| Laundry and household soap in bars: | |
| White (formerly 871300) | 871310 |
| Yellow (formerly 871300) | 871350 |
| Other (formerly 871300) | 871390 |
| Laundry, chips and flakes, bulk and packaged (formerly 871600) (include Lux, Fab, Chipso, Ivory Flakes, etc.) | 871610 |
| Laundry, granulated, powdered, beaded, and sprayed, bulk and packaged (formerly 871600) (include Ivory Snow, Rinso, etc.) | 871650 |
| Industrial soap powders (formerly 871600) | 871690 |
| Shaving creams, in bulk only | 871800 |
| Shaving powders, in bulk only | 871900 |
| Nonabrasive types of pastes, powders, and household washing powders (fat content not over 25 percent) (formerly 872400) (report household washing powders, fat content over 25 percent, in 871650) | 872450 |
| Abrasive types of soaps (fat content above 10 percent) other than pastes and powders (formerly 872400) | 872490 |
| Other soaps | 872900 |

RELEASE FROM DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Supplemental export allocations totaling 105,000,000 pounds of edible fats and oils for the January–March quarter of 1949 were announced today by the Production and Marketing Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture. These allocations consist of 35,000,000 pounds each of cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and lard.

Department officials stated that the allocations announced today have been made possible by the availability of somewhat larger supplies of edible fats and oils than had been anticipated when the first quarter of 1949 allocations were determined. Production of lard and butter has been larger than expected, and domestic disappearance of edible fats and oils in general has been somewhat smaller. Specific information on domestic disappearance and January 1 stocks of edible fats and oils was made available by the Bureau of the Census on January 28. The increased availability of edible fats and oils makes it possible to meet more of the continuing needs abroad.

United States production of edible fats and oils for the current crop year ending September 30, 1949, is estimated to be about 550,000,000 pounds larger (7 percent) than the 7,170,000,000 pounds produced in 1947–48. Export allocations for edible fats, oils, and oilseeds issued to date for the period October 1948–March 1949 (including the allocations announced today) total 729,000,000 pounds, oil equivalent, compared with 425,000,000 pounds allocated during the corresponding period in 1947–48.

The following table shows in thousands of pounds, the distribution by countries, and type of procurement of the allocations announced today:

| Country | Cottonseed oil | Soybean oil | Lard | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cuba | [1] 1,000 | [1] 500 | [1] 3,000 | 4,500 |
| Bizone, Germany | [2] 5,500 | [2] 8,000 | [3] 13,200 | 26,700 |
| Italy | [1] 6,600 | [1] 6,600 | [1] 6,600 | 19,200 |
| Austria | [2] 6,600 | [2] 6,600 | [4] 4,400 | 17,600 |
| French zone, Germany | ---------- | ---------- | [1] 2,400 | 2,400 |
| Netherlands | ---------- | [1] 4,400 | ---------- | 4,400 |
| Canada | [1] 6,600 | [1] 4,400 | ---------- | 11,000 |
| Philippines | [1] 500 | ---------- | ---------- | 500 |
| Uruguay | [1] 880 | ---------- | ---------- | 880 |
| Greece | [2] 2,200 | ---------- | ---------- | 2,200 |
| United States commercial projects abroad | [1] 400 | [1] 500 | [1] 1,000 | 1,900 |
| Contingency | [1] 4,720 | [1] 4,000 | [1] 5,000 | 13,720 |
| Total | 35,000 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 105,000 |

[1] Commercial.
[2] Production and Marketing Administration.
[3] 1/5 commercial and 4/5 Army.
[4] Army.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, among other things, the export controls aided farmers with respect to our supplies of farm needs, seeds, fertilizers, barbed wire, baling wire, binder twine, jute and burlap bags, and milk cans, have been protected through export controls. If the rest of the world had free access to the United States market, it is clear that farmers would have had to pay more for their supplies and operate with smaller quantities.

Export controls have further benefited farmers by reducing exports of materials they buy in competition with other consumer groups. Examples of these are petroleum products, steel products, electrical equipment, and some machinery, the supplies of which are allocated for export with due regard for the needs of the farmer and other consumers.

For a program that is so complicated; that affects in such a direct way the financial interests of so many exporters; that affects the economic and social welfare of every country in the world; I must say that I, and I believe I speak for the membership of the committee, was impressed with the fact that the complaints and the criticisms were comparatively few and of relatively small consequence. I am confident that with the experience already gained by the Office of International Trade and with the benefit of the review our Subcommittee on Small Business intends to provide, we can look forward with confidence to a, sound intelligent, and efficient administration of this program, which is so important to the welfare and peace of the world.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the pending bill is the first of the bills which continue certain of the controls which were imposed during the war and which have since been continued. Last year, I supported the bill to extend export controls, and I am willing, rather reluctantly, to support the pending bill. I feel very strongly that the general policy of controlling exports and imports is a mistake, that it interferes with foreign trade and with the initiative of men to develop American industry, as well as foreign industry. Whether it is exercised by the Department of Commerce or by the Department of Agriculture, a great deal of red tape is involved in the process. A man who tries to make a contract with somebody abroad to sell him something cannot be certain he will be able to get a license.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to say that, in the main, I agree with the Senator in his views, but does he not think there should be an exception made in the case of strategic materials necessary for our security and national defense? We exerted ourselves during the war, and before the war, spending millions of dollars to acquire such materials. The necessity for acquiring them continues.

Mr. TAFT. I do not quite agree as to the Senator's statement regarding strategic materials, because we are dealing with them.

Mr. CONNALLY. I withdraw my agreement to the Senator's general principles, then.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; I understand. I am not going to oppose the enactment of the pending bill, although in the case of strategic materials we are asked this year to give $550,000,000 or more to the Army and Navy for the purpose of enabling them to accumulate the strategic materials they need. I feel sure they certainly are able, by and through the general voluntary allocation power we have given, to get the proper allocation of domestically produced materials.

I merely want to emphasize the fact that the application of controls is a check on the economic development of all countries. I was in Europe in November and December, when, as a matter of fact, international trade hardly existed in the sense even that it exists here, because of the restrictions upon imports and exports being so tight. Every country in Europe is trying to increase its exports and decrease its imports. The controls are so strict that a man in Europe simply cannot buy something where he finds it cheap, and try to sell it where he can make a reasonable profit on the sale, because he is subject to so many restrictions that he simply cannot undertake such an activity. His operations are so involved in restrictions that he cannot do it.

A typical example of the condition may be found in Holland, for instance. The purpose of their controls is to get more goods exported, which is the particular thing they desire to bring about. If one goes to Holland and tries to buy china to take to his home in another country, the people in the stores say, "The restrictions are so great, and it is so difficult, that unless you carry this china in your hand with you, we doubt if we ever can get it to you from here, either to the steamer in France or to the United States." Every country in Europe is operating in a kind of water tight compartment. I feel very strongly that as soon as we can get rid of that condition, we should get rid of it.

My principal reason for hesitating to oppose the pending bill is our situation with regard to Russia. There may be many things that should not be shipped, not only to Russia, but perhaps to other countries to be reshipped to Russia. So long as that situation exists, I do not like to oppose a bill giving the power. Yet I hope the Administration will remove controls from everything possible, everything that does not have some direct bearing on national defense.

I think the first reason given for enactment of the bill is hardly justified, except perhaps as to a very few materials. I refer to the argument with respect to protecting the domestic economy against an excessive drain of scarce materials, and reducing the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. That was a very good reason a year ago. In 1946 there was a total export surplus of approximately $3,000,000,000. We were exporting $3,000,000,000 worth of goods and services more than we were importing. In 1947 approximately $11,000,000,000 more goods and services were exported than were imported. They did not all go to Europe, by any means. In the second quarter of 1947 there was an extraordinary export period in which we exported at the rate of $13,000,000,000 worth of goods in excess of imports, more than half of it going to countries outside Europe. That particular situation has come to an end rapidly. The truth is, the rest of the world has exhausted the dollars they accumulated during the war. They have exhausted the power to buy goods here and thereby acquire dollars.

The President's Economic Report for January says:

> The only major component of the Nation's economic budget which did not increase between 1947 and 1948 was net foreign investment; it declined from 8.9 billion dollars to approximately 1.8 billion. Net foreign investment represents the portion of our excess of exports over imports of goods and services that is financed by loans and investments and by net liquidation of foreign dollar assets and gold. It does not include the portion financed by grants, gifts and other unilateral transfers made by the United States Government and by private citizens.

So the total export surplus has dropped down from $11,000,000,000 in 1947 to $6,500,000,000 in 1948. In 1949 it may well be reduced further. So the situation now is that we are in balance, except to the extent that under the ECA we finance 5 or 6 billions dollars' worth of exports. Of course, so far as those exports are concerned, the ECA has the power to say what they shall be. It has the power to say whether they shall include short-supply commodities, such as steel. One great difficulty is that persons who wish to export must procure a license from the Department of Commerce, and practically a license from the ECA, so that the ordinary small-business man says, "What is the use? Let us sell this stuff in America and not try to do any export business."

I am willing to vote for the bill, but I do think that the administration should take export controls from everything from which it can possibly remove them. So far as I am concerned, at the present time, except for a few things I think controls should be removed from everything except those affected by the situation which now exists in relation to Russia.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not the Senator's judgment that the lack of dollar credits and the lack of dollars in Europe will militate against our exports? The only way we can help them at all is through ECA. Is not that correct? The tight economy in Europe is caused by the lack of dollars, or by a limited amount of dollars, perhaps I should say.

Mr. TAFT. It is caused by the fact that today there is no reserve. They have used it. They do not seem to be making articles that can be exported. But from the rest of the world we are buying more goods in dollars than we have ever bought before in the history of the United States. I think our imports amount to approximately $8,000,000,000 or $9,000,000,000. I have the figures somewhere, but I cannot refer to them at the moment. The large imports result in the rest of the world having $8,000,000,000 or $9,000,000,000 which they can use to buy our goods. It is not as if there were a dearth of dollars. We are doing our share by importing a tremendous amount of goods from all over the world. We are dealing through the ECA. Except for the Russian situation, the question of what shall be exported, it seems to me, might be left to such control as is exercised by the ECA. Persons who are able to do so are selling us goods. The use of preexisting dollars, which they were using 2 or 3 years ago, is coming to an end.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from South Carolina a question. Before I do so I should like to say that inasmuch as the distinguished Senator from Ohio has expressed generally my views on the bill which is now being considered, it is unnecessary for me to make a statement. I also was in Europe. It was my feeling, when I was there on two or three different occasions, that the Department of Commerce was not sensitive to the impacts of commitments which we had over there, not only those that raised prices but those that lowered prices, and relief was not given in many instances as quickly as it should have been given.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is my understanding.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator spoke of decontrolling inedible fats. In the Small Business Committee there has been request after request from rendering plants with reference to that subject. There will be a terrific loss of livestock in the Western States where inedible fats can be processed and used. There has been such a quantity that the price of lard, which was as high as $30 a hundred pounds, is already down to $11 a hundred pounds. Now there comes a terrific amount of fats that might be processed as inedible, which should be decontrolled. The question has been taken up with the Department of Commerce time and time again. Today I received a statement from the Department of Commerce. I suppose the Senator from South Carolina is well aware of it. Only this past week an order was issued which will become effective, I believe, today. All the inedible greases and tallows have been completely deallocated and can be shipped without license to any place in the world. Is that correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. I am not certain whether these products can be shipped to any place in the world.

Mr. WHERRY. When was that order issued?

Mr. MAYBANK. When the Senator was absent, last week.

Mr. WHERRY. It was effective yesterday, was it not?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I approve the order. The President had the power to delegate authority to the Secretary of Commerce. If that department had been more sensitive to the situation at home, possibly we could haxe exported some of the surplus.

I desire to ask: Is the reason for placing the operation of this proposed legislation in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture because the Senator feels, or the administration feels, that the Department of Agriculture will be more sensitive to our domestic economy in helping to facilitate exports under decontrol, or vice versa?

Mr. MAYBANK. I cannot answer as to what reason the administration may have. I think it would be better to place the authority in the Department of Agriculture than in the Department of Commerce. When the Department of Commerce had a veto, it was always passing from one Department to the other. The Senator knows my feelings on farm matters. I think this is a step forward.

Mr. WHERRY. That is really the purpose, I take it, for the Secretary of Agriculture's being included under congressional authority to carry out the provisions of the bill. I am not speaking for the administration, but I interpret the administration as feeling that the Secretary of Agriculture is acquainted at all times with the situation and is close to it, and that Department will be more sensitive to the impact on our domestic economy, either of high prices or low prices, and therefore orders will be put into effect probably more quickly than has been done, not only to alleviate shortages but also long supplies.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. With respect to the orders issued by the Department of Agriculture, I wish to say that, speaking for the Small Business Committee, I feel it is a step in the right direction. Certainly we are going to be confronted with a surplus of fats and oils in the low brackets so that it will hardly pay to transport them unless some provision is made to see that they are sold and something is done to help the producers who are now going to have such an impact upon them.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may add to what the Senator has said that I brought this matter to the attention of the committee before I was chairman of the committee. I make no criticism of the committee; the matter was handled I think wonderfully well. I am hopeful that there will be no repetition of what has happened.

Mr. WHERRY. One more question.

Paragraph (c) of section 3, the amendment we have been discussing, reads as follows:

(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

If the Senator will bear with me and refer to section 2, I should like to ask a question or two about that, especially since the Senator from Ohio has said on the floor that exports could be sent to any country in the world, including Russia. What do clauses (b) and (c) provide?

Mr. MAYBANK. I did not understand the Senator from Ohio to say what the Senator has just repeated.

Mr. WHERRY. Perhaps I am mistaken. I will ask, then, Does this amendment provide that the exports of fats, or whatever the Secretary may determine, exports of items which are decontrolled, can be shipped to any country in the world?

Mr. MAYBANK. Not necessarily.

Mr. WHERRY. What are clauses (b) and (c) on page 2, in section 2, intended to provide? I suppose ECA operates only in the countries which are parties to the program.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. What about the other countries, the satellite countries? The Senator remembers the long debate we had one afternoon during the consideration of the ECA bill, when some of us asked whether or not it would be possible to furnish the satellite countries with materials.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say that when materials are completely decontrolled, so far as I know they can go to any country.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. FLANDERS. As I understand, clause (b) relates to such conditions as the administration desires to retain control of in connection with American exchange furnished the 16 countries by ECA. It leaves the administration with some control over what that American exchange shall be used for. Clause (c) of course relates——

Mr. WHERRY. It relates to the stock piling, does it not?

Mr. FLANDERS. For instance, suppose we furnish dollars to France, we will say, and France desires to buy a quantity of goods which we do not think are necessary for her recovery. We want to keep control of the dollars.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct; we desire to keep control over the dollars.

Mr. WHERRY. I am going further than dollars. I should like to ask either of the Senators whether the Department of Agriculture has control in any way over scarce materials or surplus materials which are sent out of the country without any control at all. Do we say to what countries they shall go?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator said "scarce materials." When fats and oils are decontrolled, I do not know any law against that.

Mr. FLANDERS. If a thing is decontrolled, it is decontrolled.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that, but what I am asking is, even though it is decontrolled, does the Government still have any jurisdiction over it, any right to impose a prohibition in regard to it?

Mr. FLANDERS. No.

Mr. WHERRY. Are we to assume that, in regard to any of the surplus fats and oils, they can be shipped to any country in the world, including Russia.

Mr. MAYBANK. No, I have just reread the release of the Department of Commerce on the decontrol of inedible fats and oils, and I note that they are careful to point out "that existing regulations governing all shipments to Europe remain in effect." In other words shipments of any inedible fats and oils to Russia, or its satellites would still be subject to control. So they are not really completely decontrolled.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. In clause (c), section 2, page 2, line 10, the language is "to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security." That gives the administration the right, if it cares to exercise it, to refuse to ship any fats and oils to Russia or to any other country, if our security might be affected.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana. My interpretation of that provision is that it refers to control over dollar exports, and also that it has to do with stock piling in the interest of national security.

I do not know that the question I have raised is very highly important, because certainly in carrying out international responsibilities, no doubt what is covered in the bill will be done. But I go back to the argument made here 2 years ago when the question was asked, What are we to do with these materials; are the satellite countries to get them; are we going to let them finally get to countries which are endangering the peace? We finally get back to the question of peace, and keeping the peace is what ECA is for. It seems to me that when the Government is decontrolling, it should step into the picture and say that fats and oils which are desperately needed across the water shall find their way into the hands of friendly countries under ECA, and others to which we want them to go, and not go to the satellite countries, which might export them to Russia. In view of what Senator Maybank has said I assume this type of control can be maintained.

Mr. MAYBANK. I agree with the Senator.

## INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND POLICIES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, 2 years ago I read into the RECORD a portion of an editorial from the London Economist of August 28, 1945, which warned the victor powers that "There is no other cure for the German sore on the body of Europe than to heal it."

I might say, Mr. President, that the people of the Middle West, and of some States such as New Jersey and California, were vitally interested in what the London Economist of that date had to say. Here was a newspaper which could not possibly be charged with being biased in favor of Germany.

The editorial went on to say in firm and prophetic words:

> The conviction that the peace proposal at Potsdam is a thoroughly bad peace is not based on any sentimental softening toward Germany. It is based upon belief that the system proposed is unworkable. It offers no hope of ultimate German reconciliation. It offers little hope of the Allies maintaining its cumbrous controls beyond the first years of the peace. Its methods of reparations reinforce autarchy in Russia and consummate the ruin not only of Germany but of Europe. Above all it has in it not a single constructive idea.

Mind you, Mr. President, this is the London Economist, one of the leading newspapers of England, which says:

> Above all it has in it not a single constructive idea, not a single hopeful perspective for the postwar world. At the end of the mighty war to defeat Hitlerism the Allies are making a Hitlerian peace.

Mr. President, I bring up this matter because these prophetic words have merely confirmed the futility of the policies we have been following in central Europe, and the necessity for the American Government now earnestly to reorient its policies on the basis of the obvious truth that "the only way to cure the German sore on the body of Europe is to heal it." It must be clear now to the American people that there can be no hope of peace whatever, until this Government abandons its role of a hate-happy hangman and restores some semblance of sanity to our relation with the vanquished peoples in central Europe.

Mr. President, I know of no more urgent or crucial problem confronting the American people, and crying for solution, than this problem of how we shall abandon the role we are continuing to play in this victor-and-vanquished drama.

Is it not all the more astounding then, Mr. President, to find that on January 20 President Truman in his inaugural address, deliberately omitted—I say it was done deliberately—any reference whatsoever to this crucial problem. Mind you, Mr. President, he omitted it after he had been told by his various military leaders that Germany was our first line of defense in any war with Russia. He omitted it after it had been made plain by the military leaders and by the various leaders of churches that it was most important to save Germany from communism. President Truman did deal with five specific matters including communism, the United Nations, our program for world economic recovery, the North Atlantic pact and his "bold new plan" for raising the standards of living of all the freedom-loving people around the world.

Again, Mr. President, let me call attention to the fact that any hope whatever of achieving any constructive solution to the problems involved in putting these five programs into effect is absolutely dependent upon, and inseparable from, our healing of the German sore on the European body politic. But the President did not one single time mention this most important problem during his entire inaugural address.

The President's deliberate omission of any mention of this most pressing problem is obvious for two reasons. The first I shall refer to but briefly, with the intention of dealing with it in great detail in the near future. It is the glaring contradiction between the President's professed desire to raise the standards of living of impoverished freedom-loving peoples around the world and the economic insanity which is involved in the policy he is continuing to pursue in Germany, 3 years after the end of hostilities.

The President cannot reconcile, nor can any Senator on the other side of the aisle reconcile, what the administration has done on the one hand and what it is continuing to do on the other.

For his bold new program he is asking $1,000,000,000 to make available skilled engineering and scientific personnel to undeveloped agrarian peoples. Yet, at the same time, he is spending $1,000,000,000 a year carrying out that murderous blueprint for destruction called the Morgenthau plan, which calls for exactly the opposite policy, namely, for the pastorilization of one of the most highly industrialized nations on earth. Could anything be more savage or moronic, Mr. President, than for this Government to proclaim to the world out of one side of its mouth "a bold new program" for developing the industrial capacity and standards of living of the undeveloped agricultural nations of the

world and then, at the same time, to demand that those nations which have become highly industrialized nations, upon which Europe is absolutely dependent even for maintaining a minimum standard of living, be reduced to the agrarian misery which we are professing to alleviate?

This could only happen in an atmosphere where the truth has been suppressed.

Nowhere is the effective suppression of the true facts by American authorities more glaringly obvious than in the continued suppression of the report on German industry prepared by the Collison Commission last summer, at the specific request of the President. This report, along with the Wolfe report and the Humphrey report, also prepared at the request of the President, are still top secrets denied to the American people. They are just as secret, Mr. President, as were some of the agreements I called for a year ago, some of them only in the possession of the President of the United States and of the Department of State, agreements which even the Foreign Relations Committee of this body had not seen up to that time and have not yet seen.

Yet the Collison report clearly proved that if we continue our senseless policy of destruction of German industry, it will take 180,000 man-years to dismantle and reassemble those plants, all at an incalculable cost to the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, there is an even more obvious reason for the President's omission of the German problem from his inaugural address, namely—the President knows only too well that his program for strengthening freedom throughout the world can only be accomplished by the restoration of national and international law among the peoples concerned. He and no one else in the world can do it without the restoration of national and international law among the peoples concerned.

Important as the solution of the economic problems of the world is, it is of secondary importance to the moral and spiritual struggle which we must win. Nowhere is this so important as in the case of the German-speaking peoples. If we are not able to convince them that our American form of government and way of life provide safeguards of human dignity, human decency and human freedom—security for individuals under a system of law that guarantees his rights, not only the war and the peace but the whole cause of human freedom will be lost to communism, in Europe, as well as in Asia.

Mr. President, how are we succeeding in this struggle? Even Mr. Justice Jackson himself, who helped to formulate the procedures under which the War Crimes Trials are being conducted, insists that the most important function of these trials is to show the German people what happened under the savage repudiation of all human values under their own totalitarian regime, and the vast difference between that system of law and our own magnificent system of legal justice.

Are we succeeding in this objective? The record of what has transpired is becoming more contradictory, and more disgraceful to America day by day. The steady deterioration of our attempts to administer American concepts of justice, and to restore a legal basis upon which human dignity and the security of personal rights may be restored in Germany, becomes more of a mockery of our own traditional principles of jurisprudence with every day that passes.

Mr. President, slowly but surely the whole question of what constitutes the legal basis upon which we are carrying out our conqueror's role in Germany becomes more of a frightening enigma. I ask my colleagues on the Senate floor if there is a single one of them who knows just what basis our continuing actions in Germany have in constitutional or international law? I ask them further just what people are going to do if they awaken some day to discover that instead of Administering our interests and American principles of justice in the occupied countries, we have been playing the role of a hate-happy hangman in violation of the plain mandates of the Constitution, in prostitution of our own standards of justice, in violation of the Hague Convention of 1908, which guaranteed the inviolability of personal rights and property, and in violation of the Geneva Convention's safeguards of the rights and interests of prisoners of war.

Mr. President, these questions are all now pointing up the larger question of just what constitutes the legal foundation upon which we are carrying out our international programs.

Does any Senator know? Does any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations know?

When we look into this matter, we find that the war crimes trials themselves were set up under the authority of the London four-power agreement of August 8, 1945, which set up the Nuremberg trial procedures.

Since then we have been parties to 10 additional trials, which were based on the authority of the Allied Control Council law of December 20, 1945. This Control Council Law No. 10 thus is also derived from the authority of the four-power agreement.

Yet all these procedures have been based on the executive order which authorized Justice Jackson to represent the American people at the Four-Power Conference.

The basis of this Executive order is found in the secret conference which produced the Moscow Declaration in 1943.

These facts become all-important because of the fact that our own Supreme Court has now become divided against itself on the question of similar procedures which have been followed by this Government in the Far East.

On December 16, the International Tribunal which has tried the Japanese war crimes cases was attacked before the Supreme Court by Mr. Walter Logan, of New York, as an illegal creation of this Government. This body was described as a rare creation of the executive branch of our Government and the military authority thereunder, and it was contended that this action was carried out without a treaty, which must be approved by Congress.

This international tribunal was set up by order of General MacArthur, on February 15, 1946, under the authority of the Potsdam Declaration and the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers, to which I previously referred.

The confusion which surrounds these issues is best revealed by the tie vote of the Supreme Court on the question of whether it even had the power to hear Mr. Logan's petition. I want every Senator to realize this; and I hope that some Senator on the other side of the aisle will answer it if he can.

Mr. Justice Jackson broke the tie which brought the case before the Court because he admitted that for us to let the convictions of the Japanese stand by a tie vote, while it would embarrass the United States to review the matter, "would leave a stain on our record in the oriental mind forever."

Mr. Justice Frankfurter further revealed the confusion which continues to mount when he admitted that under our present international agreements:

> Something may be illegal and still be international, and so be something over which this court has no jurisdiction.

The ominous prospects for the future, which are being strengthened by every day we let this whole matter go unchecked, are revealed in the Government brief which was prepared on this case, which warns that—

> Once it is suggested that American courts may review the judgments of an international court, or pass upon the actions of an international authority's agents, most unhappy consequences can be anticipated in the development of international affairs.

That is the very best that the lawyers for our Government could do in that case.

Mr. President, in spite of the gathering evidence to prove the questionable and dangerous legal basis upon which we are conducting our international relations—evidence which continues to mount—we now find that the President, instead of taking constructive action to review this extremely important matter, has now asked the Senate to get in even deeper by ratifying the Inter-American Charter which was signed by our American representatives at the Bogota Conference last year.

Yet the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], has himself become aroused over the legal implications of our international policies.

I want every member on the opposite side of the aisle to reflect upon this. The Senator from Georgia has attacked this Inter-American Charter as "fantastic and ridiculous" and charges that it would violate United States principles of State and municipal rights in the fields of education, labor, and racial matters.

I am delighted to note that the Senator from Georgia is present. I commend him for the fine, honest statement

which he made in connection with this agreement of a year ago.

He has declared that he was astonished by the scope of the details of this Charter, which amounted almost "to the detailed regulations of a local police force."

Mr. President, I raise this whole question as to the legal basis for our present international policies at this time because it has become perfectly apparent that if Congress does not now assume full responsibility for investigating this over-all problem, we may find some day that we have acted too late to stop the destruction of our American concepts, principles, and safeguards of justice.

Mr. President, I intend, also at a later date, to go into this whole subject exhaustively. Yet, as proof of the possibility that such prospects lie in store for us, I want again to refer to specific charges that have been made against the administration of justice by the military courts conducted by American authorities in Germany. I wish to call attention to developments that have transpired since I submitted on the Senate floor, last Thursday, January 27, Senate Resolution 39, which calls for an investigation of these charges.

These charges were made by Col. Willis N. Everett, a distinguished American lawyer who had served as defense counsel for the 74 Germans accused in the famous Malmedy case. These charges stated that American investigators at the United States court in Dachau, Germany, used brutal, vicious, Nazi methods to obtain confessions from men who are being hanged by American prison authorities.

In response to these charges, Secretary Royall last spring appointed Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, and Judge Edward Van Roden to investigate these trials. The report of the investigators is contained in a recent article written by Judge Van Roden, appearing in the February issue of The Progressive, which I now ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN ATROCITIES IN GERMANY

(By Judge Edward L. Van Roden)

(Edward L. Van Roden, a Pennsylvania judge, served in World Wars I and II, in the latter as Chief of the Military Justice Division for the European Theater where he saw service in Normandy, Belgium, the Rhineland, the Battle of the Bulge, and in the Ardennes. In 1946 he was reassigned to active duty and served on several important court martial trials in Germany. In 1948 Secretary of the Army Royall appointed him to an extraordinary commission charged with investigating the Dachau war crimes program.)

I

American investigators at the United States Court in Dachau, Germany, used the following methods to obtain confessions:

Beatings and brutal kickings.
Knocking out teeth and breaking jaws.
Mock trials.
Solitary confinement.
Posturing as priests.
Very limited rations.
Spiritual deprivation.
Promises of acquittal.

Complaints concerning these third-degree methods were received by Secretary of the Army Kenneth Royall last spring. Royall appointed Justice Gordon Simpson, of the Texas Supreme Court, and me to go to Germany and check up on the reports. Accompanied by Lt. Col. Charles Lawrence, Jr., we went to Munich, Germany, set up offices there, and heard a stream of testimony about the way in which American atrocities were committed.

But first, a bit of the background:

Last spring the Supreme Court refused the habeas corpus petition of Col. Willis N. Everett, Jr., an American lawyer, who had served as defense counsel for the 74 Germans accused in the famous Malmedy case. Everett is a very able lawyer, a conscientious and sincere gentleman. He is not a fanatic.

In his petition, Everett charged that the Germans had not received a fair trial. Everett did not claim that all the German defendants were innocent, but since they did not have a fair trial, there was no way of telling the innocent from the guilty.

The tragedy is that so many of us Americans, having fought and won the war with so much sweat and blood, now say, "All Germans should be punished." We won the war, but some of us want to go on killing. That seems to me wicked.

If Everett's shocking charges were true, they would be a blot on the American conscience for eternity. The fact that there were atrocities by the Germans during the war against Americans, or by Americans against Germans, would not in the least lessen our disgrace if such peacetime atrocities were to go unchallenged.

Our specific assignment was not only to examine Colonel Everett's charges, but also to examine the cases of the 139 death sentences, which at that time remained unexecuted; 152 Germans had already been executed.

The 139 doomed men who were still alive fell into three groups. They were accused of involvement in the Dachau concentration camp crimes, in the killing of American fliers, or in the Malmedy massacres. Let me say that I believe the crimes for which these Germans were tried actually took place, and that some Germans were guilty of them.

But we should not let the indiscriminate hate of all Germans that was generated during and after the war blind us to the necessity of punishing the guilty ones only.

After this investigation, and after talking to all sides, I do not believe that the German people knew what the German Government was doing. I am convinced the German populace had no idea what diabolical crimes that archfiend, Himmler, was committing in the concentration camps. From the atrocities we learned about, he must have been the very prince of devils.

But as for the Germans at large, they fought the war as loyal citizens with a fatherland to support, and a fatherland to defend.

Some American fliers, shot down on bombing raids over Germany, were killed by German civilians. These Germans felt that the American fliers were the murderers of their defenseless wives, mothers, and children who were in the bombed cities—just as the English felt that German fliers were their murderers. That's war.

I felt deeply about these fliers. I had two sons in the Air Force. Jimmy made 35 missions over Germany and returned safe, thank God! Dick made 32 missions and was finally shot down over Italy. He spent 12 months in a German prisoner-of-war camp and was fairly well treated. He is now in a sanitarium in Arizona recovering from TB he contracted in the camp.

II

The Malmedy massacres, in which a group of American prisoners of war were mown down after being captured during the Battle of the Bulge, actually happened. But can't we distinguish between the assertion that these atrocities did happen, and the assertion that they were committed by these 74 Germans who had been in or near Malmedy at that time?

Because some wicked, sadistic German individuals did it, are we doing the right thing by saying any and all Germans we lay our hands on are guilty and should be destroyed? I personally don't believe that. That's not the way of thinking I learned in my church, or you learned in your church.

On Russian insistence, the Americans couldn't retry these men. The Russian philosophy in these matters is that the investigators determine the guilt or innocence of the accused, and the judge merely sets the sentence. We accepted the Russian formula of no retrial, but we won out on the presumption of innocence before trial.

The American prohibition of hearsay evidence had been suspended. Second- and third-hand testimony was admitted, although the Judge Advocate General warned against the value of hearsay evidence, especially when it was obtained, as this was, two or three years after the act.

Lieutenant Colonel Ellis and Lieutenant Perl of the prosecution pleaded that it was difficult to obtain competent evidence. Perl told the court, "We had a tough case to crack and we had to use persuasive methods." He admitted to the court that the persuasive methods included various "expedients, including some violence and mock trials." He further told the court that the cases rested on statements obtained by such methods.

The statements which were admitted as evidence were obtained from men who had first been kept in solitary confinement for 3, 4, and 5 months. They were confined between four walls, with no windows, and no opportunity of exercise. Two meals a day were shoved in to them through a slot in the door. They were not allowed to talk to anyone. They had no communication with their families or any minister or priest during that time.

This solitary confinement proved sufficient in itself in some cases to persuade the Germans to sign prepared statements. These statements not only involved the signer, but often would involve other defendants.

III

Our investigators would put a black hood over the accused's head and then punch him in the face with brass knuckles, kick him, and beat him with rubber hose. Many of the German defendants had teeth knocked out. Some had their jaws broken.

All but two of the Germans, in the 1939 cases we investigated, had been kicked in the testicles beyond repair. This was standard operating procedure with American investigators.

Perl admitted use of mock trials and persuasive methods including violence and said the court was free to decide the weight to be attached to evidence thus received. But it all went in.

One 18-year-old defendant, after a series of beatings, was writing a statement being dictated to him. When they reached the sixteenth page the boy was locked up for the night. In the early morning Germans in nearby cells heard him muttering, "I will not utter another lie." When the jailer came in later to get him to finish his false statement he found the German hanging from a cell bar, dead. However, the statement that the German lad hanged himself to escape signing was offered and received in evidence in the trial of the others.

Sometimes a prisoner who refused to sign was led into a dimly lit room, where a group of civilian investigators, wearing United States Army uniforms, were seated around a black table with a crucifix in the center and two candles burning, one on each side. "You will now have your American trial," the defendant was told.

The sham court passed a sham sentence of death. Then the accused was told, "You will hang in a few days, as soon as the general approves this sentence; but in the meantime sign this confession and we can get you acquitted." Some still wouldn't sign.

We were shocked by the crucifix being used so mockingly.

In another case, a bogus Catholic priest (actually an investigator) entered the cell of one of the defendants, heard his confession, gave him absolution, and then gave him a little friendly tip: "Sign whatever the investigators ask you to sign. It will get you your freedom. Even though it's false, I can give you absolution now in advance for the lie you'd tell."

Our final report on these trials has been turned over to Secretary of the Army Royall. In spite of the many instances like those I have described, we found no general conspiracy to obtain evidence improperly. With the exception of 29 cases, we saw no reason why the executions should not be carried out. For the 110 others, there was sufficient competent evidence obtained from other sources to warrant the death penalty, exclusive of the evidence obtained by the third degree.

The 29 men whose sentences we recommended for commutation certainly did not have a fair trial by American standards. Twenty-seven of them were to have their terms reduced to life, one of them was to get 10 years, and one would get two and one-half years, according to our recommendations. We also recommended a permanent program of clemency for reconsideration of the sentences of other prisoners convicted in war crimes cases.

Secretary Royall has saved our national conscience. Could we as Americans ever have held our heads up, if he hadn't looked into it? He has saved our national prestige and our international reputation.

However, in spite of Secretary Royall's action in this matter, there is little real room for complacency on the part of Americans. Rather our report reveals, by implication, that we still have a serious situation in Germany to clear up. Moreover, five of the men for whom we recommended commutations have been hanged since we turned in our report. In all, 100 of the 139 we set out to investigate are now dead.

IV

The American investigators who committed the atrocities in the name of American justice and under the American flag are going scot free.

At this point there are two objectives which should be aimed for:

1. Those 39 prisoners whose death sentences have not been commuted and who have not yet been hanged should be saved, pending full judicial review.

2. American investigators who abused the powers of victory and prostituted justice to vengeance, should be exposed in a public process, preferably in the United States, and prosecuted.

Unless these crimes committed by Americans are exposed by us at home, the prestige of America and American justice will suffer permanent and irreparable damage. We can partially atone for our own misconduct if we first search it out and publicly condemn and disavow it. If we wait for our enemies to blazon our guilt abroad, we can only bow our heads in shamed admission.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, suffice it to say, these findings were accompanied by recommendations for clemency and judicial review of 29 cases because of the third-degree methods used by the American prosecutors, a fact which has been admitted by a certain Lieutenant Perl, one of the prosecutors, as the article states.

In all fairness, let us also admit that certain Americans connected with the trials have protested that these charges are not true and are demanding the right to answer them, as the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] pointed out on the Senate floor on January 27.

In other words, Mr. President, this is a general statement of developments in this particular matter up to last Thursday. In spite of the gravity of these charges, neither the accusers nor the accused nor the victims have been able to have a chance to present the facts or to justify their own actions before an impartial court of review.

Yet since then events have transpired which make action by this body all the more imperative if we are to see that American concepts of justice are not to become an international disgrace.

It now develops that the Protestant churches of this country have become so aroused that, on January 19, Dr. Franklin C. Frye, president of the United Lutheran Church, and Dr. Samuel Cavert, of the Federal Council of Churches, visited the Attorney General, seeking to expedite a review of these charges. They were informed, however, that while the Department of Justice admitted responsibility for the general procedures under which these trials are being conducted, it would not accept any responsibility for specific procedures subsequently conducted, and that complete jurisdiction lay in the hands of the military.

Then, Mr. President, on January 29, 2 days after I submitted my resolution, a Democratic Senator and two Members of the House of Representatives visited Secretary Royall and obtained a 60-day reprieve for 12 of the German soldiers condemned to death in these trials. According to the Detroit Times, these legislators "protested bitterly that the executions would be a blot on American justice before the entire world and might vitally affect international relations with European countries."

Yet, Mr. President, it further develops that General Clay has also acted, granting Colonel Everett 30 days more in which to bring his petition for review before the International Court at the Hague. Such action is a direct and deliberate evasion of the recommendations of the investigating committee appointed by Secretary Royall that the whole procedure be reviewed by American courts.

Now, Mr. President, in spite of all the promises and recommendations of the authorities, we learn that last Wednesday six more Germans were hung at Landsburg prison.

Mr. President, a man who is determined to see justice done, and who is determined above all else to preserve the integrity and the principles upon which our whole American system of jurisprudence depends, cannot let this continuing outrage go unchallenged. Where there is so much smoke, there must be a fire raging. If these fires are destroying innocent victims, it is an international crime. If these fires are destroying the reputation and injuring the character of American personnel, who have been entrusted with carrying out these orders, it is a national disgrace. If the military authorities continue to insist on ignoring their promises, or evading the full responsibility for what has happened by diverting review of this matter to an international court, they insult our whole American judicial system and flaunt their power in the face of Congress itself.

Mr. President, I am pleading now for an American investigation of this whole tragic affair, because as matters have developed, it becomes more and more apparent that unless Congress now steps into the picture and puts its full power into a determined effort to clear up not only this affair but the whole question of the legal basis upon which we continue to administer occupied countries, we may be found guilty, in the course of the passing years, of having permitted, by our silent acquiescence, the destruction of constitutional and international law, upon which our future as a free people is absolutely dependent.

In closing, Mr. President, I feel it my duty to call the attention of the members of the Senate and the attention of the American people to additional evidence of the vengeful spirit which only hate-happy hangmen would exhibit as representatives of the American people in the administration of justice.

I offer this information because I believe it reveals the extent to which hate has gripped many of those who are carrying on American interests, a hatred which breeds only hatred, which prolongs and intensifies mutual jealousies, bitterness, and a burning desire for revenge—hatred which goes even so far as to despoil the graves of victims of its own perverted delight. In saying this, Mr. President, no one is more determined than I to see stern justice meted out to those who have been guilty of indescribable crimes against humanity. But I cannot forget the greatest heights that have ever been reached by an American statesman, when Abraham Lincoln pleaded in his Second Inaugural Address for justice administered "with malice toward none, with charity for all."

Mr. President, I am about to read from a letter written to General Clay on December 6, 1948, by Johann Neuhausler, Catholic auxiliary bishop of Munich. Mr. President, if the other Members of the Senate read nothing else of what I have to say at this time except this letter, I shall be satisfied. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR GENERAL: I would like to call to your attention two deplorable incidents which have happened at Landsberg.

On December 2, the guards tore down the Christmas wreaths, which the prisoners had put up in their cells, and kicked them to bits.

I was astonished to hear this because I never experienced anything like it or so shocking during the 4 years, and Christmas I spent as prisoner at the concentration camp at Dachau. There the Christmas wreath was never taken from us.

The second matter is much more important. In recent weeks in the Spoettinger graveyard, near Landsberg, the crosses and tablets with the names of those buried there were taken away. The graves of those are the graves of men executed at Landsberg. In the place of the crosses little tablets with the numbers of the prisoners were put up.

Even if one actually believes that after death, even the names of the condemned men must be wiped out, it is still incredible, from the Christian standpoint, to take away from them the cross that priestly hands have put over them with the words: "May the Cross of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, who has redeemed you in this sign, be shown above you. Peace be with you."

When the church speaks over such graves these words of grace for law-breakers, it only follows the example of its founder who promised paradise to a sinner on the cross. And on His grace we are all dependent.

Formerly, when the Nazis tore down the crosses in graveyards, as at Munich, Catholic men and women rose up and put the crosses back in spite of all danger. Priests were sent to concentration camps for many years for doing this, for instance, Father Martin Rohrmeier of Affertig.

Christians of many professions see also in the removal of the crosses from the graves, a contempt of the cross itself and a violation of the dead. These Christians will not and cannot be silenced, so deeply do they resent and condemn what was begun by the Nazis.

I am sure that the general will condemn this behaviour of the prison authorities at Landsburg and will order restoration of the crosses at once.

(Signed) JOHANN NEUHAUSLER,
*Auxiliary Bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Munich.*

In conclusion, Mr. President, I say when administrators of American justice have to stoop to these levels to wreak their hate and vengence even on the dead, it is time the American people demanded to know if this is what American justice has come to be, so grand a name for so mean a thing.

So I say once more, Mr. President, the resolution offered last Thursday by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut and the resolution I offered on the same day deserve favorable consideration by the Senate, so that the American people may know once and for all whether the charges made by Lutheran and Catholic, the charges made by Judge Simpson and Judge Van Roden, two men appointed by the President, are true or whether they are false.

## REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendments will be stated.

The first committee amendment was, in section 2, on page 2, in line 9, after the word "and", to strike out "fulfill" and insert "to aid in fulfilling," so as to make the section read:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 3, subsection (a), on page 2, in line 21, after the word "financing", to strike out "carriage" and insert "transporting"; and on page 3, after line 2, to insert the following:

(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

So as to make the section read:

AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) To effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 hereof, the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions, of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

(b) The President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 4, subsection (a), on page 3, in line 15, after the word "department" to insert a comma, and after the word "agency" to insert a comma and "or official"; and in subsection (b), on page 4, in line 5, after the word "agency", to insert a comma and "or official", so as to make the section read:

CONSULTATION AND STANDARDS

SEC. 4. (a) In determining which articles, materials, or supplies shall be controlled hereunder, and in determining the extent to which exports thereof shall be limited, any department, agency, or official making these determinations shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports.

(b) In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters, and provisions shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end. In addition, there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department or agency, or official to carry out the policies of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 6, subsection (a), on page 5, in line 4, after the word "court", to insert "of the United States"; and in subsection (c), in line 17, after the word "department", to insert a comma and "or official", so as to make the section read:

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this act, the head of any department or agency exercising any functions hereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person. In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any such person, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(b) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (27 Stat. 443), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(c) No department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 8, on page 6, in line 7, after the word "agency", to insert a comma and "or official", so as to make the section read:

QUARTERLY REPORT

SEC. 8. The head of any department or agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall make a quarterly report, within 45 days after each quarter, to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next committee amendment was, in section 11, on page 7, in line 5, before the word "regulations", to insert "rules", so as to make the section read:

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect February 28, 1949, upon the expiration of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended. All outstanding delegations, rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under said section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, shall, until amended or revoked, remain in full force and effect, the same as if promulgated under this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in my judgment, the time has come to take off all limitations and restrictions on exports

of agricultural products, except those necessary from the point of view of our national security and our diplomatic position.

On the basis of our experience during the last few months with the administration of these controls on exports, they have been used to a large extent to beat down the prices of many of our principal agricultural products. During the last few days in particular, the cattle market has been in a tailspin. All the grain markets generally have been falling further, and the fats and oils have suffered worst of all. The price of lard has actually fallen to a point lower than at any time since 1942. In the face of these facts, the administration is still holding down sale of our surpluses to foreign markets of most of these products.

In section 2 of this bill, the declaration of policy under (a), it is stated that the purpose of the bill is "to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand." Translated into plain language, I presume that means that it is the purpose to push down the prices of the controlled commodities. Certainly that is what has been done, very effectively. A manipulation of these controls has pushed the price of lard down almost to prewar prices. Apparently some administration officials feel that the cure for inflation is to push farm prices down to prewar levels. That policy simply will not work today. It is out of the question for the farmer to operate on the basis of prewar prices for the products he produces when his living costs, his costs of operation, his hired man, and everything else he must pay have gone up about double and have stabilized at a new high level.

On the side of agricultural prices there is no longer a problem of inflation. The real problem is deflation. That has been true for some months, and it is more true than ever today. Apparently many officials of this administration do not realize that fact.

The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from South Carolina, has said frankly that in his judgment the controls on fats and oils have been miserably handled. Certainly that is the case. Although controls have been taken off the inedible fats and oils, our exports of edible fats, such as lard, are still under control in spite of the extreme slump in the markets. Under these circumstances, I cannot see why our Government should continue to restrict our export outlets. If we do extend this authority, we can only expect that the controls on lard and other agricultural products will continue to be "miserably handled," as the distinguished Senator has put it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there are no further amendments, the question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. O'CONOR. The expected has happened. True to their predetermined plan the Communist government of Hungary has imposed a sentence of life imprisonment on Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. His "crime" was that he remained true to his convictions and refused to be intimidated by oppressors who are bent upon spreading the doctrines of Soviet Russia.

The sentence is worse than death. The tortures, to which this helpless individual has been subjected, will now be continued.

Of course, the individual considerations of any one person, serious though they may be, might not be of world-wide importance. But, in this instance, the real issue is not one man. No better description of it could be given than in the words of the reverend Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, when he said:

> This fight is not just between Roman Catholicism and communism. It is between a godless communism and any type of Christianity worthy of the name.

We protest this outrageous treatment of an outstanding religious leader. If allowed to remain unchanged, it offers proof that conditions behind the iron curtain are abhorrent to American concepts. Because it is the climax of continued and uninterrupted persecution and oppression of free institutions, it stamps Communist leaders everywhere, taking orders from Moscow, as determined to uproot the basic principles from which democracy springs.

Most significant is the statement made today by the so-called judge in imposing the sentence on Cardinal Mindszenty. This morning in citing three alleged extenuating circumstances in the case, he specified one, as follows:

> The United States through its Minister here, Selden Chapin, made him (the Cardinal) hope that the United States of America would start a war and this war would help him attain his aims.

That is an excellent sample of the integrity, the truth, and the justice of this disgraceful court. The news dispatches declare that the presiding judge severely criticized the United States for meddling in Hungarian affairs. Such criticism is praise, indeed. America will continue to cry out in protest against godless men who are engaged in a vain effort to abolish religion from the hearts of men.

I respectfully urge that the State Department, voicing the feelings of the American people as revealed so definitely these past few days, convey to the Hungarian Government the sense of outrage and shock which has been the reaction of the American people to the arrest and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.

I urge that the State Department present as vigorously as possible to the representative of the Hungarian Government the conviction that immense good could be accomplished toward the improvement of relations between Hungary and the United States if this sentence of life imprisonment could be suspended.

## TWO-YEAR CRUSADE—BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, one of America's great agencies, the Boy Scouts of America, which operates under a Federal charter granted by Congress, is this week observing its thirty-ninth anniversary. Since it was founded, in 1910, over 15,500,000 Americans have been members, a segment of our population large enough to exert a real impact on our national life. The Boy Scouts of America are inaugurating what they term a 2-year crusade, under the slogan Strengthen the Army of Liberty.

The purpose of this campaign is to stimulate a better understanding of the principles of liberty and democracy, symbolized by the great Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor, and specifically to give training to boys in citizenship and those vigorous qualities of character which we like to believe are typically American.

The Boy Scouts of America have announced that as an appropriate celebration of their fortieth anniversary next year they propose to present to America by the end of 1950 a Scout movement surpassing in its outreach and program anything that has been previously achieved.

I am sure that all American citizens will wish the Scouts well in this ambitious undertaking. I hope that Members of the Senate will go further, and lend our support and leadership to them, both in our home communities and on a national basis.

## SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished minority leader submitted a resolution which he requested be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The resolution dealt with small business. The Chair held that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, from which ruling the able Senator from Nebraska took an appeal. At the close of the morning hour we were still debating that appeal. It is now on the table, as I understand the parliamentary situation, and I should like to move that the Senate proceed further to consider the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is unnecessary for the majority leader to move to bring up the resolution. If he wants to consider it at this time, I should be glad to grant consent. I have already stated to the majority leader that I wanted to work with his program, as I understood it. As I understand the situation, a vote was not taken and the resolution is now at the desk or on the table, and has the same status as would a bill. It can be raised by unanimous consent or by a motion. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the calendar. It may be taken up either by motion or by unanimous consent.

Mr. WHERRY. Yesterday we considered the resolution offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and this subject was the unfinished business. I do not wish to delay the proceedings. I should be glad to grant unanimous consent to proceed to debate and a vote on the appeal.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Nebraska, and I ask

unanimous consent for the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the appeal from the ruling of the Chair taken by the Senator from Nebraska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The Senator from Illinois made a motion that the appeal be laid on the table. That went over with the resolution.

Mr. LUCAS. I will withdraw that.

Mr. WHERRY. Does it require unanimous consent to withdraw a motion to lay on the table?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, it does not, no action having been taken.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hoey | Murray |
| Anderson | Holland | Myers |
| Baldwin | Humphrey | Neely |
| Brewster | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Bricker | Ives | O'Mahoney |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Pepper |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Reed |
| Butler | Johnston, S. C. | Robertson |
| Byrd | Kefauver | Russell |
| Cain | Kem | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Connally | Langer | Sparkman |
| Cordon | Lodge | Stennis |
| Donnell | Long | Taft |
| Douglas | Lucas | Taylor |
| Eastland | McCarthy | Thomas, Okla. |
| Ecton | McClellan | Thomas, Utah |
| Ellender | McFarland | Thye |
| Ferguson | McGrath | Tobey |
| Flanders | McKellar | Tydings |
| Frear | McMahon | Vandenberg |
| George | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Gillette | Malone | Wherry |
| Gurney | Martin | Wiley |
| Hayden | Maybank | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Withers |
| Hickenlooper | Morse | Young |
| Hill | Mundt | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the appeal of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] from the ruling of the Chair referring his resolution, Senate Resolution 55, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, before the vote on the question now pending, I desire to address the Senate briefly in reply to the argument that was made by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] yesterday.

I think it goes without saying that the distinguished Vice President, in his answer to the able Senator from Nebraska, said all that could be said with respect to the merits of the controversy pending before the Senate at this time. The sole question is whether or not the Senate will approve the position taken by the Chair in referring Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency, or will sustain the appeal from the decision of the Chair, which would mean that Resolution 55 would be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Any Senator who has carefully examined the Reorganization Act, and studied the jurisdiction of the various committees which are created by the Reorganization Act, must reach the conclusion that the Committee on Rules and Administration has no jurisdiction whatsoever of the subject matter of Senate Resolution 55. In my judgment the Committee on Rules and Administration is the last committee of the Senate which has any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in the resolution. I agree with the able Senator, and agree with the position taken by the distinguished Vice President, that many committees do have jurisdiction over some of the questions which are involved in the problems of small business, but by and large, when consideration is given to all the bills which have been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee with respect to finance, the allocation of materials, controls, and all other similar questions, obviously this resolution must go to the Committee on Banking and Currency if it is to be decided strictly upon a legal basis.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I have been following the distinguished Senator's argument for the past 2 or 3 minutes, and I ask him if the issue is not whether the problem of small business is of such consequence and importance in our country today, by reason of a number of different factors, that it warrants the creation of a special, separate committee. That being the case, it seems to me it is not a question of whether the particular subject to be dealt with by the committee falls under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but rather, it is an administrative question. That is, in the organization of the Senate, in order for the Senate to carry on its business, is not the problem of the small-business man so important that it warrants being dealt with through the services of a special committee? Is not that really the issue?

Mr. LUCAS. I would not agree with the Senator from Connecticut that that is the issue so far as the pending question is concerned.

I do not want to be misunderstood, Mr. President, with respect to my interest in small business. Members of the Senate will recall that the Senator from Illinois, before the Reorganization Act came into being, was chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate of the United States. As chairman of the Senate Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate from 1941 through 1946 it became my duty to pass upon the amount of funds to be allotted to carry on the activities of the Small Business Committee during that year.

Mr. BALDWIN. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. Let me finish, please. From 1941 to 1946, as chairman of the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I saw to it that $380,000 was appropriated by the United States Senate to carry on the activities and the functions of the Small Business Committee. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] at that time was a minority member of that committee, and we worked together with respect to the amount of funds that we believed to be necessary in order for the Small Business Committee to carry on in an efficient manner.

Mr. President, I relate the early history of the Small Business Committee created in the United States Senate so that the Senate and the country may know that the Senator from Illinois is just as interested in finding a way here in the Senate to help small business, as is any other Senator. But what I am arguing today is not that question at all. I am merely presenting the argument before the Senate with respect to the wording of the resolution which is before us; and the merits or the demerits of the Small Business Committee have nothing to do with the parliamentary situation with which the Senate is now confronted.

Let me say a word, Mr. President, with respect to parliamentary law and procedure. I undertake to say that the Senate of the United States must adhere rigidly and strictly to parliamentary procedure if we are to handle the business of the Senate in an orderly way.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LUCAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. Does he believe—and I base the question upon his representation, which I know to be sincere, of his wide interest in small business—does the Senator believe that the problem of the small-business man is so important and so peculiar that it warrants the creation of a separate committee to deal with it?

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator mean a separate standing committee?

Mr. BALDWIN. A separate committee, standing or otherwise.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to my friend that this question is not before the Senate at this time. The question is not germane to the issue here at all. And while I know the rule of germaneness does not apply, and that a Senator can ask another Senator almost any question he desires, the only reply I am going to make to my able friend is that small business will not suffer one iota under the Democratic administration here in the United States Senate, whether it functions through a special committee, whether it functions through a standing committee, or whether it functions through a subcommittee of a standing committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. I submit, Mr. President, that my good friend is trying to carry water on both shoulders on this matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no.

Mr. BALDWIN. I did not ask the Senator whether the small-business man is going to suffer under the Democratic administration. I asked the simple question whether my distinguished friend from Illinois thinks that the importance and the complications of the problems of small business warrant a separate committee. That, it seems to me, Mr. Presi-

dent, is what we are dealing with here. It is an administrative question. In carrying on the business of the Senate is this problem so important and so complicated that it requires a special committee? That is really the point. I know that my distinguished friend has obligations, as majority leader, but I am asking him for his own opinion as to whether he thinks that the difficulty in which the small-business man now finds himself requires separate treatment? Personally, I think it does. What does the Senator from Illinois think about it?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Connecticut has made quite a speech in my time. I do not object to that at all. I think we should get away from that as much as we possibly can, however, under the strict interpretation of the rules.

Mr. BALDWIN. All my friend has to do in order to quiet me down is to answer my question and I shall be satisfied. I shall be satisfied if he answers "Yes" or "No."

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Connecticut does not quiet down I will have to ask the Vice President to invoke the rule, because I did not yield to him for a long speech. The only thing I am going to say to my good friend from Connecticut is that if I must ever carry water on both shoulders I know exactly the person to whom to go in order to give me accurate information respecting how it is done. I will always turn to my friend from Connecticut if I need information as to how that performance can be accomplished.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield in a moment. But what the Senator from Connecticut asks has nothing to do with the issue here. I am not going to answer the Senator from Connecticut on that point at all, because it is not before the Senate. I will answer that question at the proper time, and there will be no doubt as to what I stand for when that time comes, Mr. President. My vote will be recorded. I will be here on the floor of the Senate when that issue is raised, and I will debate the issue at that time with my good friend. The great trouble with my friend, the Senator from Connecticut, is that he is an expert in what he is now doing. He always wants to bring in extraneous questions. He does not want to hew to the line.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. No, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois declines to yield to anyone.

Mr. DONNELL. I did not know whether the Senator objected to a query.

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. I have always found it to be true that when a Senator is making a point, some other Senator rises and asks, "Will the Senator yield?" because he does not want the first Senator to finish the argument he is making. That is an old trick.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a query?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Missouri for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the able Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator for yielding. In order that he may not feel disturbed by my request, I will say that it is not my purpose to disturb him. Indeed, I agree with him quite heartily.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. In the first place, the question now before the Senate is not on the merits of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska, is it?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. It is merely the appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. DONNELL. Therefore the only question is a question under the rules of the Senate, as to whether the Chair has or has not complied with the rules of the Senate in determining to which committee the resolution should be referred.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri has correctly stated the position of the Senator from Illinois, and he has correctly stated the question with which we are dealing. This is really a technical parliamentary argument, and nothing else.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will not be carried away by the eloquence or any other persuasion of my friend from Connecticut upon some extraneous, irrelevant matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. I am going to address myself to the point before the court, so to speak, just as I would do in arguing a demurrer before a court in a lawsuit. I will say to my good friend from Missouri that there will be plenty of time to discuss the merits or demerits of the question as to how a small-business committee should be handled in the United States Senate when that issue is raised. But that is not the present issue; and I am not going to be taken away from the issue.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to complete my inquiry?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. In other words, I take it that the Senator from Illinois takes the view that the merits of the pending resolution are not before the Senate at this time for consideraion. The only question is whether or not the Chair was correct in his ruling that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency rather than the Committee on Rules and Administration. Therefore the question is solely a question to be determined under the rules of the Senate, and not on the basis of the merits of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska. Is not that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Missouri states my view exactly, and I think he is eminently correct. That is the only point before the Senate. The merits are not involved. The substance of the resolution is involved, of course——

Mr. DONNELL. Only as determinative of the committee to which reference should be made.

Mr. LUCAS. Only in making a final determination, from the subject matter contained in the resolution, as to whether it should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency or some other committee. However, the question raised by my good friend from Connecticut is another issue, to be decided on another day.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Connecticut has raised a question as to the merits of the resolution, rather than the legal question before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. TOBEY and Mr. BALDWIN addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I suggest to the distinguished majority leader, and to the Senator from Connecticut in response to his suggestion, "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Let me put into the form of a resolution the question now before the Senate:

Whereas, a resolution was submitted in the United States Senate; and

Whereas, by decision of the Presiding Officer, such resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency because that committee traditionally has considered all matters of costs, distribution, and production, plus the La Follette Act suggestion that all matters pertaining to financial aid to industry should be referred to that committee: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That such action on the part of the Presiding Officer is fully justified.

It is beyond my understanding how anyone can attack the action of the Vice President in referring this resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. So far as small business is concerned, let me say that there is not a member of that committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who would permit any letting down of the bars so far as concerns help to small business, by virtue of our handling of the subject.

Mr. BALDWIN and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BALDWIN. Let me state the issue as I see it——

Mr. LUCAS. I ask the Senator not to take too long in stating the issue.

Mr. BALDWIN. The Senator says that we have before us a technical parliamentary question. The question is, Which committee is going to pass upon the question of whether or not there is to be a small-business committee? That is the issue. My point is that that issue is an administrative issue.

We have in the Senate a Committee on Rules and Administration. Therefore, that committee should pass upon that particular administrative question. It is

not a question of the substance of the resolution at all. It is a question of determining in what way the Senate shall function. I submit that it is the job of the Committee on Rules and Administration to determine through what committees the Senate shall function. In determining that question, ultimately we must pass upon the question whether or not the problem of the small-business man is so important and so peculiar that it warrants a special committee. In approaching the question from that angle, we have a question of rules and administration, which I submit should properly be decided by the Committee on Rules and Administration.

That is the point I wished to make, in order to make my position clear. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. LUCAS. I congratulate the Senator for at last confining his arguments strictly to what is before the Senate. I appreciate that. The Senator has his viewpoint on the question, and I respect it, although I wholly disagree with him. I do not believe that his argument would be sustained in any fair and impartial court; and I know that the distinguished Vice President is a fair and impartial individual.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Early in the session a resolution was submitted by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] to continue the Select Committee on Small Business. That resolution was referred—and properly referred, in my opinion—to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is my understanding—and I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois if I am correct—that this is a similar resolution. The effort is now being made to have one resolution to continue the Small Business Committee before the Committee on Banking and Currency and another before the Committee on Rules and Administration. Is not that the issue?

Mr. LUCAS. To all intents and purposes, the resolutions are the same, in my opinion. I have examined Senate Resolution 55, submitted by the able Senator from Nebraska. It is much longer and contains more material, more substance, than the Murray resolution.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But its purpose is to establish a select committee to aid small business. Was there any objection to reference of the Murray resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency? If not, why is the issue raised now?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator will have to ask my good friends on the other side of the aisle, who are now raising the issue.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois for information. Does he remember to what committee the original resolution by which the Small Business Committee was established was referred?

Mr. LUCAS. I do not. That was before the Reorganization Act was passed. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Vermont referring to the original resolution?

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. If my memory serves me correctly, that resolution was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor in 1940 or 1941. At that time I happened to be a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as was the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. FLANDERS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is not much more that I can add to what has already been said.

It seems to me that the United States Senate must sustain the position taken by the distinguished Vice President.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator discuss his views as to the difference between a resolution for the creation of a Special Committee on Small Business, on the one hand, and a resolution for the creation of a standing committee of the same type, on the other hand, with respect to the standing committee which should consider and report such a resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall not go into that question, I say to my friend the Senator from Oregon, because to my way of thinking that question is not now before the Senate. So I shall not be drawn into a discussion of it. It is an important question, I say to my friend, but I shall not be drawn into an argument on that point at this time, because if I am drawn into arguments on points which I do not consider germane to the issue before us, I shall be talking all afternoon.

The issue before us, as I see it, is based on the fact that the President of the Senate has ruled that the resolution should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, whereas certain Senators believe it should be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. In my study of the Reorganization Act and the precedents involved, I am certain that there cannot be any question about the correctness of the decision of the Chair in this matter.

I sincerely hope that all Democratic Members of the Senate will vote to sustain the decision of the Chair; and as a matter of good parliamentary practice and a matter of keeping straight our precedents regarding important matters of this kind, I appeal to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle also to vote to sustain the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. I wish to ask my friend the Senator from Illinois this question: Is it true that already the Banking and Currency Committee has indicated by its action that it will not report this resolution to the floor of the Senate? In other words, I understand that the Banking and Currency Committee has set up a Subcommittee on Small Business. Am I correct as to that?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is correct, according to my information, but that answer may be subject to qualifications.

Mr. BALDWIN. Under those circumstances, the Banking and Currency Committee has already judged the case, for that committee has created a subcommittee to deal with this matter. I submit to my friend the Senator from Illinois and I also submit to the President of the Senate that that is perfectly within the province of the committee and is perfectly proper procedure; but under those circumstances can my friend, the Senator from Illinois, assure me if the Senate ever will have an opportunity to vote on the issue whether there should be a separate standing committee to deal with the important question of the small-business man and all his complicated problems?

I submit that if the resolution is referred to the Banking and Currency Committee, as the Chair has ruled that it should be, the Banking and Currency Committee will never report it. It is not in the nature of things that the committee should do so, for it already has taken the step of creating a special subcommittee, which, as I have previously stated, it is within the committee's province to do, and is a perfectly proper thing for it to do. But my question is, When shall we have an opportunity here in the Senate to vote on the question of whether there shall be a separate committee to deal with the small-business man's problems?

A consideration of that question will give my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, an opportunity to express his feelings, as he has previously indicated he wishes to have a chance to express them, toward the problems of small business. But I submit that, under these circumstances, the question is whether the resolution will ever be reported.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I have the floor, but other Senators are still making speeches in my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that every Senator has a right to protect himself against an invasion of the rules, but if Senators do not feel inclined to protect themselves in that way, the Chair will attempt to do so himself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I dislike to attempt to apply the rule strictly as against other Senators, unless a serious question is involved. However, I should say that my good friend, the Senator from Connecticut, could have made a speech much more effectively in his own time, rather than in mine.

Mr. BALDWIN. I tried to ask a question, but perhaps it was too long.

Mr. LUCAS. The question was about as long as from here to the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. It was an argument, rather than a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. ROBERTSON. What I have to say will not strictly be a question, but the Senator may be assured that it will be brief.

We discussed this matter in the Banking and Currency Committee this morning, and all of us in the committee agreed that if the resolution comes to us, it will be reported. I do not say it will be reported favorably, but it will come out of the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a moment ago, when I began to answer the question of the Senator from Connecticut, he immediately proceeded to go into another question, and I never had an opportunity to tell him that I do not know, any more than he does, what the Banking and Currency Committee will do about the resolution. The Senator is a member of two committees, and if he can tell what the committees of which he is a member are going to do from day to day, he can do more than most Senators can.

Yet he wishes me, as majority leader, to advise him what members of the Banking and Currency Committee will do with the resolution. Obviously, I do not know what the committee will do. The Senator could file a motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution, if he is so interested in it, and thus get it on the floor, if such a resolution were agreed to. Such an attempt on another resolution was made yesterday.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In connection with what the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] has said, I should like to say that Senate Resolution 29, submitted by Senator MURRAY on January 15, was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee. Question regarding the resolution came up this morning at the meeting of the committee. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] was there, and also the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] and other Senators.

I then suggested that no action be taken on the resolution in the committee at this time, in view of the issue now before the Senate. Of course, I do not know what the Banking and Currency Committee will do so far as the resolution is concerned; but at any rate, at the meeting of the committee this morning we postponed taking action on the resolution, pending the determination of the issue, now before the Senate, regarding the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the reference of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], which is similar to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and which is pending before our committee.

Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that in the Banking and Currency Committee there has been a Subcommittee on Small Business ever since I have been a member of the committee, and two-thirds of the legislation enacted for the benefit of small business has been handled by the Banking and Currency Committee. For instance, it has handled all the legislation regarding the meat problem and all the legislation relative to war assets, as affecting small business.

I do not know whether the committee will act favorably on the resolution; but I can state, at any rate, that it met this morning, and at that meeting I asked that action on the resolution be withheld until the issue now before the Senate is determined.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair state the pending question. The question is on the appeal from the decision of the Chair referring the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. Therefore, when the vote is taken, the question will be, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute or two of the time of the Senate.

For 4 years I have been a member of the Special Committee on Small Business. I am very anxious, as I am certain all other Senators are, to have the Senate select some sort of committee to which the small-business man may bring their problems.

We now have before us three proposals: First, that we continue the special committee; second, that a standing committee on the subject be created to handle the matters affecting small business; and, third, that a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee handle all matters which heretofore have been handled by the special committee, with a special staff, with additional appropriations, and that the subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee take over the files and the staff of the special committee.

I do not know that I particularly care which way the matter is handled, so long as a good job is done; and I believe either the special committee, a standing committee, or a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee can do a good job.

I presume my preference might well be for a standing committee. Of course, that is something which would take a little time to decide, and I am certain that the Senate would wish to give considerable thought to the question of the creation of an additional standing committee.

I feel confident that a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee can and will do a good job. That is particularly true if the Committee on Rules and Administration will allocate additional funds to it.

I am inclined to agree with the majority leader that at the moment the question is not whether we should or should not have a small-business committee; but I should like to ask this question, if it is in order: Would it be possible by unanimous consent to suspend the rule, in order that this question may be decided? I understand the staff of the Small Business Committee are not at the moment able to draw any pay. The authority of the committee has expired. It is therefore unable to function. The staff members I presume are quitting, because they are not being paid. I ask, when can this matter be settled? Can we have a statement from the majority leader at this time, that either a special committee, a standing committee, or a subcommittee within the Banking and Currency Committee, with sufficient funds and with a sufficient staff, will be created to handle the small-business problem?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the question is a fair one. It is hardly germane to the discussion.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate that, but I think we are entitled to know.

Mr. LUCAS. As majority leader of the Senate, I may say to my able friend from Indiana, I shall make it my business to try to take constructive action with respect to the creation of some sort of small-business committee, with all convenient speed.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, it is not the intention, is it, to eliminate entirely some sort of committee having to do with small business, either standing or special or a subcommittee within Banking and Currency?

Mr. LUCAS. No. I know of no Senator on this side of the aisle who favors doing without a small-business committee of some kind. It is solely a question of how such a committee should be established, and of who should be in charge of it. That is about all there is to it. We will endeavor to work it out.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel certain the Senate should be able to handle the problem or to come to a decision with respect to it within the next week.

Mr. LUCAS. I may say to my friend, if there is one resolution on the question of small business pending before the Banking and Currency Committee, and another resolution goes to the Committee on Rules and Administration, nothing will be accomplished as a result of the exercise of divided authority upon two similar resolutions to speed up the matter in line with what the Senator from Indiana is trying to accomplish.

Mr. CAPEHART. I may say in closing, I am most anxious to see a continuation of some sort of committee which will help small business. I hope the particular question now under discussion may be resolved, and then, within the next few days, the Senate may decide exactly what it intends to do. With such a decision, I am certain, whether it be to continue the special committee or to constitute a standing committee or a subcommittee of Banking and Currency, either one of the three, a good job will be done on behalf of the small-business men of America.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I merely feel that inasmuch as a few observations have been made and questions asked, which I think have not been answered, I should like to make a very brief statement in what I hope will be the closing argument on this matter.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield for a question.

Mr. DONNELL. I merely wanted to say I should like to be heard briefly on

the matter. The Senator is proceeding upon the theory that his remarks will be the concluding remarks. I should like to have the Senator understand I expect to say a few words.

Mr. WHERRY. I waited briefly. I thought everybody was through. If the Senator desires to speak, I shall be glad to yield the floor to him. On the other hand, I would just as soon go ahead and sum up my observations at this time.

Mr. DONNELL. Certainly, but I want it understood I expect to make a few remarks after the Senator has spoken.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the question has been raised as to what is involved in this debate, and the statement has been made that it is only a question of procedure, that the merits of the resolution are not involved. There is no other way I know of to get a resolution or a bill referred to another committee except to appeal from the decision of the Chair after an order of reference has been made. Merely because the President of the Senate has made his decision, even though I respect it, and although I have a deep affection for the occupant of the chair, does not preclude me from asking that the resolution be referred to another committee. It is no reflection at all upon the present occupant of the chair if I avail myself of the only procedure I know of to seek to have the resolution referred to another committee where, in my opinion, it will receive more favorable consideration than in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The distinguished Senator from Connecticut hit the nail on the head when he said it is a matter of procedure. In the final analysis what it really is, and what the businessmen of the country know it to be, is the question of whether the Congress is going to establish a special committee or a standing committee to help solve the problems of small business. That is what is involved. So when the distinguished occupant of the chair in his wisdom—and certainly he has sound argument to support his position—assigns the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, he does so on the ground, as stated, that the committee predominantly has jurisdiction over the subject matters involved in the resolution. I ask the majority leader, or any other lawyer in the Senate, on that basis, how in the world are we to determine the jurisdictional question unless we make a study of substantive law? That is imperative. That is why I presented in the argument yesterday nine points showing that the provisions of the resolution go completely outside the province of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to say as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, when the President of the Senate refers the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as he did the resolution offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], we shall take action. I do not know what type of action it will be, but we shall take action. I want the Senator to know that since January 1 we have been doing everything we could for the small-business men. We have already had controls removed from oils and fats.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have already studied steel.

Mr. WHERRY. That is fine.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have obtained some allotments for small producers in the steel business, and so forth. I may say to the Senator, the Eighty-first Congress is going to do a great deal more for small business than was done by the Eightieth Congress, whether the matter is considered in the Banking and Currency Committee or in the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, there has been much said here, not about the merits or demerits of the proposition, or even about procedure, but about what is to be done for the small-business man. I appreciate that. I am glad to have all those declarations. But one of the first things to be done, and it should be done now, is to give the small-business men a place to come. In the event a small-business committee is set up as a subcommittee of Banking and Currency, what would happen? In order to do that, it would be necessary to go completely beyond the jurisdiction set by the Reorganization Act. The committee does not have jurisdiction of matters pertaining to monopoly. The committee would be given authority to go into questions of interstate commerce, which again is not within its province. I could stand here and cite case after case involving problems of small business, subjects entirely beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is what I object to. I may say now in defense of the decision of the present occupant of the chair, when he referred the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency, he thought that committee had predominant jurisdiction; but he knows, and the majority leader knows, that if the matter is assigned to Banking and Currency, and a small-business subcommittee is set up in the Banking and Currency Committee, we shall be attempting illegally to give to a subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee matters over which that committee does not now have jurisdiction. Senators may argue from now till doomsday, but that is the fact.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. If the Senator had absolute power, to what committee would he assign the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. I answered that question yesterday. I said that if I were the present occupant of the chair I would not know to what committee to refer the resolution, for the very reason that the resolution I introduced cuts across every committee line. I think there are predominantly more subjects involved in it that are judicial in character than subjects which would be under the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, or any of the other committees, because, in my humble opinion, if I may say so to the Senator from New Hampshire, the most vital problems involving small business today hinge around the Judiciary Committee, such as the question whether we will eliminate vertical competition which is centralizing industry in the hands of the few, whether we will provide protection for the rights which are being encroached upon in the small-business field, and whether we will permit small-business men to procure materials necessary to enable them to produce. Those questions involve consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary; they involve monopoly.

So, Mr. President, my answer is that I would not know to what committee to refer the resolution, because one standing commitee has as much jurisdiction as another. For that reason I asked to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration. The question was asked, "Why was the resolution creating a permanent committee assigned to the Committee on Rules and Administration?" The answer was the creation of a standing committee involved a change in the rules of the Senate. The statement was made very eloquently yesterday by a distinguished Senator that the creation of a special committee was in violation of the spirit of the Reorganization Act. Every Senator has a right to his own opinion. I agreed when the reorganization bill was considered by the Senate to the inclusion of a provision which would ban special committees. The bill went to the House in that form, and that provision was eliminated. I submit to the President of the Senate and to every Senator that establishing special committees does not violate the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

As I say, I would not know where to send the resolution, so far as the standing committees are concerned.

Mr. TOBEY. If we should continue the committee, the Senator would be, to use the vernacular, "reneging" on his convictions of 2 years ago. The Senator from Nebraska is opposed to special committees, is he not?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. TOBEY. The Senator gave as his dictum last year that he would never ask for a continuance of the Small Business Committee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a great deal has been said with regard to my not asking for a continuation of the committee. My statement was always predicated on the premise that if and when a standing committee or committees would take over the work of the Small Business Commitee, I would not ask for a further continuance of that committee.

Mr. TOBEY. That time has arrived. It is here.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, at this point I should like to read the statement which I made on March 15, 1948, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 2806. The statement is as follows:

Mr. President, if the Senator making the objection will withhold it for a moment, I should like to explain the purpose of the resolution. It is very necessary that the

resolution should be agreed to if the Small Business Committee is to be extended for the remainder of the session. The life of the committee terminates on the 1st day of April. If that is to occur, and if that is what the Senate wants, it is imperative that the personnel of the committee be notified now. The resolution asks for a continuance of the committee for the remainder of this Congress. When this Congress terminates, the committee likewise would terminate. It is not requested that it be extended into the next Congress.

I know that there are those who feel that because it is a special committee it should not be continued. But the Members of the Senate will recall that when the resolution was considered at the last session, a compromise was reached under which the date of termination was fixed at April 1.

At that time I stated—

Here is what I said—

that while I felt the committee should be continued until the termination of the Congress—

That is the Eightieth Congress—

if there were no need for it, and if a standing committee had in the meantime taken over the work, I would not ask for its continuance.

Mr. TOBEY. Now, Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment. I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The then minority leader, Mr. BARKLEY, asked this question:

If this resolution should be agreed to, either at this time or under a motion to take it up, which the Senator can make at any time, may we have the assurance that no effort will be made to extend it beyond this Congress?

That meant the Eightieth Congress.

Here is my answer:

It so happens that my term as United States Senator will terminate this year, and it would be rather embarrassing for me to answer that question, inasmuch as I may not be in the Senate next year.

Certainly everything I had to say at that time referred to the Eightieth Congress, not to the Eighty-first Congress. It would have been rather embarrassing for me to answer the question before I went through the campaign.

I read further:

But the same question was raised by some of the Republican Members, and I believe I can say, with assurance, that several Members are in the same position in which the Senator from Kentucky finds himself. They feel that if the committee is to continue it should not be as a special committee; that if it is to continue at all, it should come under the provisions of the Reorganization Act, by action of both Houses.

Some Members took that position, which I think is tenable, to a certain extent.

Personally, I feel it involves a great deal of work, and so far as I am concerned, if it be the will of the Congress to terminate the committee—

I was speaking of the Eightieth Congress—

I should like to have an early vote on it. I personally feel that it should be continued. I again call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky to the fact that I voted for the reorganization plan and that I share in his belief relative to the existence of special committees under the provisions of that act.

I want to say, as sincerely as I possibly can, that there is no standing committee which can take up the work of the Small Business Committee at this time and serve the purpose needed to be served for the small-business man. I should like to see the committee continued until this Congress shall terminate. There will be no more requests from me for any further extension.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I refuse to yield until I finish my remarks. The Senator is not questioning my integrity, is he?

Mr. TOBEY. Oh, no; certainly not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, a question of privilege.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No Senator can interrupt a Senator on the floor without the Senator's consent.

Mr. WHERRY. I said there would be no more requests from me for any further extension of the special committee. My interpretation of what I said, in view of everything I said before, in all the paragraphs of my statement, is simply that if the work of the Special Small Business Committee could be taken over by some other committee I would not ask for the continuance of the Small Business Committee. That time has not yet arrived. The more I have gone into the question, during the past 2 years especially, the more I have become convinced, regardless of any statement to the contrary, that we need a special committee or a standing comittee which will handle the problems of small business. That is my opinion.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire at this time.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, what I took exception to was the side-remark of the Senator. He inquired if I was trying to challenge the sincerity of his remarks. I want to read something which the Senator did not read. It is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 7, 1949. This is the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] speaking:

Mr. President, I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee. I see no reason why, in the future, the Senate cannot use for such purposes the Banking and Currency Committee and the other committees which otherwise would handle such problems. For instance, I refer to the Judiciary Committee and the Interstate Commerce Committee as well. When those committees are properly organized they can take care of the subject matter, and then the Senate can terminate the work of the special committee which is proposed by Senate Resolution 20. Because of that fact I have amended the resolution so as to provide for the continuation of the special committee for only 240 days.

The time limit is up. The Senator said only 5 minutes ago, Mr. President, that when a standing committee was ready to take over the work, it should take it over. The Committee on Banking and Currency is the very one to do so. That committee was organized, and its godfather is on the bench and it will begin functioning in very short order for the benefit of small business.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska has been very lenient with his time in yielding to the Senator from New Hampshire to make a speech on his interpretation of my remarks.

Mr. TOBEY. I have merely read the Senator's speech.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me comment about my remarks. I said:

Does not the Senator further feel—

And so forth. Then we start in with the quotation:

I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee.

I never asked that until I joined a few days ago with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and that was after I felt that this resolution would not go to the Committee on Rules and Administration as I had hoped it would, and as it should under the precedent already established. I do not care whether it goes by unanimous consent or by motion or in what way it goes.

Two years ago a similar resolution went to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and its reference to that committee established a precedent as to where the pending resolution should go. Whether it is by unanimous consent or otherwise makes no difference at all. The precedent is established.

So I said, in answering the question:

I see no reason why, in the future—

And I see no reason now—

the Senate cannot use for such purposes all of its standing committees if they would set up a subcommittee, each and every one of them, to carry out the work of the special committee.

Let any Senator read the RECORD. Anyone who would interpret it any differently is prejudiced.

Mr. President, I did not intend to take so long, but I am glad to answer these arguments. We may argue about procedure, we may argue about merit, we may argue about the jurisdictional question, but let me tell the Senate that the interpretation of the small-business man will be that if this resolution goes to the Committee on Banking and Currency it will meet the same fate the Murray resolution met. The Murray resolution has been here for several weeks, and not longer ago than a few hours, I was contacted and asked if I would sign a petition to discharge the Committee on Banking and Currency because it failed to act on that resolution.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator himself well knows that there has been such a movement on the other side of the aisle, and some of us have been solicited to go along with it. I waited for a month and a half. I tried my level best to have the Murray resolution reported; but nothing has been done about it. So the only thing I could do, as chairman of the committee that has been folded up

because it terminated, was to submit a resolution asking that it be continued.

I knew when I offered the resolution that it would be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, because that is where the administration here wants it to go.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I was merely going to make a suggestion because I know the Senator would wish to be correct. The Murray resolution has not been before the Committee on Banking and Currency for a month and a half.

Mr. WHERRY. I said several weeks.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was offered on January 19.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. About 2 weeks ago. We have had two regular meetings since, and it was brought up this morning at the second regular meeting, and it was determined to defer action, in view of the appeal pending before the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not disagree with the Senator. I have much respect and affection for the Senator from South Carolina, and I will say to him that if a standing committee of the Senate is to have a small-business subcommittee, that is all right with me.

I know something else that has been done. Request has been made that the committee files of the special committee be turned over to the Senator's committee because they want to proceed with the work, and if that is done, in those files will be found communications, applications, problems, which belong to every other standing committee besides the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Of course we want the special committee files.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator raised a very important question, with respect to the files. The special committee is dead. Just who has the files?

Mr. WHERRY. Until it is either permanently dead, or is reorganized, it will be up to the Senate to dispose of the files in whatever way the Senate desires to dispose of them. I brought out the fact that the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency expects to take complete jurisdiction of what the Special Small Business Committee has been doing, and that it has asked for the files.

Talk about setting a precedent as to special committees. A precedent is being set here this afternoon, by authorizing one standing committee to reach over the lines of all the other standing committees.

Mr. LUCAS and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield and if so to whom?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to whoever desires to speak.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has to indicate to whom he yields.

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. I raised a question a moment ago about the files. The committee expired on the night of January 31, and somebody has asked for the files. I was asking who would have the files.

Mr. WHERRY. When the Senate takes action and directs that the files should go to any committee, we will be glad to send them.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it is perfectly proper for the Senator to turn over the files.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me complete my remarks.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to comment on what the Senator said about the Small Business Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency asking for the files. We asked for the files in view of the legislation we were being called upon to study and were studying. If there were any that belonged to the Committee on the Judiciary, certainly the Committee on Banking and Currency would be the first to pass them on.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, all this argument, summed up, is complete support of my position. I realize it is very difficult to override the decision of a distinguished Presiding Officer on an appeal, but if this appeal is lost, there will be no other procedure whereby I can have this resolution referred to any other committee. It will be gone, and to my mind I think it is through now. I appreciate what the Chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has said, but in my opinion it is through.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President——

Mr. WHERRY. I do not yield now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska declines to yield further.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senate today sustains the ruling of the Chair, then what the Senate really is doing is permitting a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency to be given authority to continue the work of the Small Business Committee in all its various fields, and when that is done, it either by assumption or by acquiescence gives to a standing committee more authority than ever was intended in the Reorganization Act. So I have asked that the resolution go to the Committee on Rules and Administration. I agree with the Senator from Connecticut that it is an administrative matter. I think it should go there, because a resolution was submitted by the Senator from Florida, setting up a permanent standing Small Business Committee, in submitting which he permitted me to join as a cosponsor last night, and that resolution was sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and properly so.

Of course that must be the rule, if we want to be technical about the matter, but in this instance there is no other way to have the resolution referred to another committee except by taking the course I have pursued. In doing so I cast no reflection upon the President of the Senate, none whatever. Whatever decision he makes, of course, that is his decision.

Mr. President, the businessmen of the country are looking to what the Senate is going to do this very afternoon with respect to continuing the special Committee on Small Business. My opinion is that a vote to sustain the appeal means that the committee is killed, and a vote not to sustain the appeal means that the resolution will be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration, where it will receive favorable consideration and have a chance to be reported to the Senate, and then, either as a special committee, or as a permanent committee under the Holland resolution, we can go forward with a committee which is duly authorized, which has the authority to handle the problems of small business. That is the whole thing in a nutshell.

Senators can speak about procedure; they can speak about politics; they can speak about anything. All I want is to have the Small Business Committee continued. I have said I will support the Murray resolution; I have said I will support the Holland resolution; and, of course, I shall support the resolution I have submitted.

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. TOBEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Before recognizing any other Senators the Chair wishes to make a statement in response to a suggestion by the Senator from Nebraska a moment ago in debate when he stated that the Chair referred the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency because the administration wanted it sent there. The Chair does not know just what implication was in the Senator's mind when he made that statement. But the administration as such, either outside the Senate or in the Senate, has made no suggestion to the Chair as to how he should rule on the resolution. The Chair made his ruling on his own interpretation of the rules, and after consultation with the Parliamentarian of the Senate, for whom the Chair is sure every Senator has respect. No administration representative, inside or outside the Senate, has the slightest influence or would have the slightest influence on the Chair in passing upon a rule of this sort.

Mr. DONNELL and Mr. TOBEY again addressed the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I reply to the statement just made by the Presiding Officer?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair for calling the matter to my attention. I did not mean for one moment that the present occupant of the Chair had been asked by the administration to send the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that he complied with such a request. It is my opinion that the administration wanted the resolution sent to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the administration had any such desire it never communicated it to the Chair.

The Senator from Missouri is now recognized.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, it seems to me that the argument that the

resolution should be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration because it would be more favorably received there than in the Committee on Banking and Currency is not a proper consideration for either the Presiding Officer or the Senate. The same point was made yesterday. For instance, at page 839 of the RECORD the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the minority leader, said:

My appeal is that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, because it is my opinion that if the resolution goes to the Banking and Currency Committee, it will meet the same fate as that of the so-called Murray resolution which now is before that committee.

A few minutes ago the Senator from Nebraska again in substance said that the only way that he could get the resolution before a committee in which he would obtain favorable action is the course which he is now following, which is to appeal from the ruling of the Chair and seek to cause the resolution to be sent to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Earlier this afternoon the Senator from Nebraska in substance said that he is asking that the resolution go to the Committee on Rules and Administration where, as he said in substance, the resolution will receive more favorable consideration.

Mr. President, before addressing myself to what is the real question in this matter, I would like very briefly to express myself as being in opposition to the view that the reception that is to be accorded by a particular committee to a given resolution shall determine which committee it is to which the resolution shall be referred. As I see it, the Presiding Officer should not base his position upon any such question as that. The rules of the Senate presumably direct the Presiding Officer as to the committee to which reference should be made. Of course he realizes, as do we all, that in numerous instances it is difficult to determine to which committee the reference should be made. There are many cases, as was pointed out last year by the preceding Presiding Officer of the Senate, in which more than one committee may well be argued to have jurisdiction. The La Follette-Monroney Act clearly recognizes, as the Chair pointed out yesterday, and as was pointed out in debate, that cases may arise in which there will be controversy as to which committee shall have the resolution referred to it. Section 137 of that act of the Congress, the La Follette-Monroney Act, provides:

In any case in which a controversy arises as to the jurisdiction of any standing committee of the Senate with respect to any proposed legislation, the question of jurisdiction shall be decided by the Presiding Officer of the Senate, without debate, in favor of that committee—

Which committee?—

that committee which has jurisdiction over the subject matter which predominates in such proposed legislation.

So, Mr. President, clearly the La Follette-Monroney Act, under which we operate, namely, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, recognizes the probability of cases arising in which a reference may be made, or may be claimed to be subject to being made, to more than one committee.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the question involved here is comparatively simple. The Chair has referred the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. An appeal has been taken from the action of the Chair on the ground that the reference was improper, and the proponent of the appeal has taken the view that the reference should have been made to the Committee on Rules and Administration. On yesterday he said at page 838 of the RECORD:

I should like to present my observations as to why I feel this resolution should go to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

And again on page 839 he said:

I believe the time has come when a resolution so providing—

That is, providing as his does—

should be presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration, which I contend has proper jurisdiction of the matter.

Now, Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the same question that was before the Presiding Officer before he ruled, and that is, under the rules of the Senate to which committee should the reference be made? We are not undertaking here this afternoon to decide the merits of the resolution; not to decide whether a special committee should be set up; not to decide whether the functions of that special committee should embrace the various projects and purposes set forth in the resolution. The only question now before the Senate is that with which the Presiding Officer was confronted, namely, to which committee, under the rules of the Senate, should the reference be made?

I have studied as best I could, after hearing this question raised, the contents of the rules as I see them that are applicable to the situation. I have studied as best I could the provisions of the Senate's rules in the endeavor to find out to which committee the resolution the Senator from Nebraska has submitted should have been referred. I have been aware of the proposition asserted by the Senator from Nebraska, as I have indicated from the RECORD, that it is the Committee on Rules and Administration to which reference should be made. I have searched the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act to ascertain the particular portion of the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration which, in the opinion of the Senate, could justify sending this resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration, or make mandatory such reference.

A great variety of subjects is embraced in the rule relative to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration. Obviously, many of them have no applicability whatsoever—for illustration—

Matters relating to the Library of Congress and the Senate Library; statuary and pictures; acceptance or purchase of works of art for the Capitol; the Botanic Gardens; management of the Library of Congress—

And a number of others which I need not detail, which clearly have no possible connection with the resolution now before us.

There are two provisions in the rule relative to jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration to which I have addressed myself—I trust with reasonable care. One of those items of subject matter embraced in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration is:

Matters relating to parliamentary rules.

It seems to me that the resolution now before us clearly is not one which is embraced within the term "matters relating to parliamentary rules." I see nothing in the resolution which could bring it within the term "matters relating to parliamentary rules."

I searched further in the provisions of the La Follette-Monroney Act to see what other basis of jurisdiction the Committee on Rules and Administration could have. The only thing I could find, by a somewhat careful search of the rules, is this:

Matters relating to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate or creating a charge upon the same.

I observe that in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nebraska there is a sentence which reads as follows:

The expense of the committee, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

It may be that at first glance one would say that the Committee on Rules and Administration has jurisdiction over this subject matter because there is a provision in the Wherry resolution which relates to the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate, or creating a charge upon that fund. But when we study the resolution, as was so eloquently and clearly described and set forth yesterday, and argued by the Senator from Nebraska, it seems to me that clearly the matter of the payment of money out of the contingent fund of the Senate, or the creation of a charge upon that fund, is not the predominant subject matter of the resolution.

In the first place, the resolution, as set forth in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, consists of language which covers substantially one entire column of small type. The entire portion which relates to a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate is contained in one sentence in that entire column. I believe that from the standpoint of the mere matter of space, there is at least a hint that the charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate is not the predominant purpose of the matter contained in the resolution. That hint is well justified and corroborated by reading the resolution. I shall not read it because it would take too much time; but I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the committee

which the resolution undertakes to create, and to which various authorities and directions would be given, is—

To conduct a study, by means of research and investigation, of the existing or future problems of American independent small business, including but not limited to the following problems.

Then follows a series of eight specific problems which are set forth. I mention only two or three of them.

(1) Supply and distribution of basic industrial materials with particular reference to whether or not independent small business is obtaining its fair share of such materials under existing or future distribution methods and patterns.

(2) Policies of Federal Government departments, agencies, and corporations with respect to inclusion of independent small business in their present programs and future planning with particular reference to the procurement activities of such departments, agencies, and corporations.

(3) Prices charged for materials needed and utilized by independent small business to determine whether they are fair and equitable in relation to prices charged their larger competitors.

Now that I have gone thus far, I may be permitted to mention the remaining purposes which this committee, if it should be created, would carry out.

(4) Pressures of vertically and horizontally integrated combinations to eliminate independent small business in the American industrial distributive system.

(5) Inability of both new and old independent small business to adequately finance itself from its own earnings due to tax structure and effect of such tax structure on the merger movement.

(6) Participation of independent American small business in foreign-aid programs and adequacy of representation of independent small business by diplomatic and consular officials abroad.

(7) Development of program to adequately insure independent small business a fair share of raw and finished materials and services produced on and from publicly owned mineral resources, forest reserves, and irrigation and reclamation projects.

Finally—

(8) Development of a sound program to safeguard the place of independent small business in the American economy.

Is it not too clear to require further argument that the provision about the payment of expenses from the contingent fund is merely minor and incidental—although very important, of course—to the larger purposes the consummation of which the appropriation of such money is intended to effectuate?

It seems to me that every one of the provisions which I have read relates to financial aid to commerce and industry, particularly, and perhaps almost, if not entirely, exclusively, with relation to small business. The language of the rule relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency is:

Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

Financial aid to commerce and industry, to which I have referred, is a subject matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency, as set forth in rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate, under the La Follette-Monroney Act.

So if it be contended—as it has been by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska—that more than one purpose is set forth in the resolution, if we come to that question, I say that certainly it cannot be successfully contended that the mere charge of the expense of all these purposes to the contingent fund of the Senate is a predominating subject matter of the resolution.

So, Mr. President, we have a case very clearly for applicability of section 137 which makes it the duty of the Presiding Officer to decide the question of jurisdiction in favor of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It may be that some of the subject matters to which reference is made, and which I have read this afternoon, constitute matters which may properly come within the purview and jurisdiction of other committees of the Senate. But obviously every one of them comes within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The question raised by the Senator from Nebraska in his own mind is as between the Committee on Rules and Administration on the one hand and the Committee on Banking and Currency on the other. It seems perfectly clear to me that under the contention of the Senator from Nebraska it is undoubtedly true that the subject matter which predominates in his resolution is that which comes clearly within the jurisdictional matter placed within the functions of the Committee on Banking and Currency by the La Follette-Monroney Act. So, Mr. President, it seems to me, first, that the question whether or not this resolution would fare better in one committee or the other is not the question before the Senate, any more than it was the question before the Presiding Officer.

Second, the real question, and the only question before the Senate in connection with this particular resolution, is, To what committee should the Presiding Officer have referred the resolution? Should he have referred it to the Banking and Currency Committee or to some other committee? It seems to me, Mr. President, most respectfully, that none of the arguments adduced tend even remotely, to convince one that the Chair erred in referring this resolution to the Banking and Currency Committee. I earnestly believe, and shall support that belief with my vote, that the President of the Senate ruled correctly in referring the resolution to the Banking and Currency Committee; and I submit that the appeal which has been respectfully presented by the Senator from Nebraska with all the earnestness he commands, and in view of his great interest in small business, in which so many of us join, should not be sustained by the Senate.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. The Senator from Missouri has eloquently summed up the situation, and I concur 100 percent in his remarks.

In all kindness to my friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], I wish to quote statements made by him on two occasions, one when a few minutes ago he said, if I correctly jotted down his words:

If you do away with the special committee, you will be giving a standing committee more power than it should have or ever has had before.

That is his statement regarding the dire effect which he anticipates if we take that step.

Yet here is the Senator from Nebraska speaking of the effect, in another instance:

Mr. President, I also wish to say that I am not asking that the special committee be made a permanent special committee. I see no reason why, in the future, the Senate cannot use for such purposes the Banking and Currency Committee and the other committees which otherwise would handle such problems.

* * * * *

When those committees are properly organized they can take care of the subject matter, and then the Senate can terminate the work of the special committee which is proposed by Senate Resolution 20.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly to the subject, because I suspect that the way I shall vote on this little matter will please few of those who have been writing to me, and will displease more.

Let me say that it seems to me one would need the wisdom of Solomon to correctly refer this resolution. I likewise, as did my friend the Senator from Missouri, examined the Reorganization Act, and found myself in somewhat more doubt as to where the resolution should be referred, because it seemed to me that the question is, not whether the subjects covered by the resolution shall lie in the purview of the Banking and Currency Committee, but how they should be handled. So the issue presented by the reference to the Banking and Currency Committee is not a clear-cut one.

Furthermore, if I correctly understand the situation, the chair is perhaps in the somewhat embarrasing position of having referred three resolutions relating to this matter, two of them to the Banking and Currency Committee, and one to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Out of this somewhat confused situation, it seems to me that my own course in voting is clear, and it has been made clear by the assurance of the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that the resolution will not be allowed to languish behind the closed doors of that committee, but will be brought back to this floor within a very short period of time.

That being the case, Mr. President, it seems to me that most of the time we have spent in talking about this matter has been—and I do not say this in criticism of anyone—largely wasted, for this resolution will be presented on the floor of the Senate; it will come back here, perhaps with a report which will be either favorable or unfavorable; but at any rate we shall have a chance to decide here, within a very few days, what shall be done.

Since the President of the Senate has made his reference of the resolution and since it seems to me, in view of the as-

surances given, that the question of the committee to which the resolution should be referred is not too important, and since we can do with the resolution what we will when it returns here, I shall vote to sustain the decision of the Chair.

Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia.

He is not in the Chamber. The Chair promised to recognize him for a moment.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to take only a few minutes of the time of the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I did not catch the Chair's observation in regard to having promised to recognize some Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] was seeking to introduce a bill, and the Chair persuaded him to wait until the debate concluded, or at least until the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Vermont concluded their remarks. The Chair was merely seeking to carry out that obligation.

Mr. MORSE. Is the junior Senator from Oregon correct in his understanding that the rule is that Senators should be recognized in the order in which they address the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator is not correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield for the purpose of permitting the propounding of a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very anxious to complete my remarks and be able to leave the floor of the Senate. If the Senator from Oregon will indulge me, I should prefer not to yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the greatest threat to American democracy is the concentration of economic power in the hands of a few giant corporations. There has been a constant increase in the importance of these huge corporations, and there has been a decline in that of small-business concerns. More than 500,000 small-business men were forced out of business during the war years. Today the 250 largest corporations in the United States own about two-thirds of the Nation's usable manufacturing facilities. At the beginning of 1948, 113 manufacturing companies, each with assets of more than $100,000,000, owned 50 percent of the Nation's entire manufacturing property, plant and equipment. Seventy thousand others owned the other 50 percent. About 2 percent of our manufacturing concerns employed 60 percent of all the industrial workers.

So, Mr. President, I thoroughly believe in the re-creation of the special Committee on Small Business, which has done such excellent work since its establishment in 1940, at the instance and by the initiative of the able senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], my esteemed neighbor in the Senate Chamber.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a list of publications issued by the Special Committee To Study the Problems of American Small Business, dated October 10, 1946. This publication will show altogether almost six entire pages of various publications which were issued by the Senate Special Committee on Small Business during its tenure. So I ask unanimous consent that the list may be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in addition, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD, following the printing of the list of publications to which I have just adverted, a statement by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] of reasons for the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, that document states ably and succinctly the justification for the continuance of the Special Committee on Small Business, which has served very well not only the Senate but the country in the more than 8 years of its existence since its establishment in 1940, as I have said, as a result of the initiative and farsightedness of the Senator from Montana. So, Mr. President, I very strongly believe the Senate should recreate a Special Committee on Small Business. I believe when a small-business man living in any of the States thinks in terms of somebody in Washington who might be able to help him with his small-business problem he primarily thinks of one of the special committees in the Congress on small business, the Special Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, under the able chairmanship of Mr. WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, who was, I believe, the author of the resolution creating the special committee in the House, and the Special Committee on Small Business of the Senate. If a businessman of small stature gets into trouble and writes a letter to Washington to the Small Business Committee of Congress, that letter would go to one or the other of those special committees. But, Mr. President, if the only agency of the Senate—because the House has already re-created its Special Committee on Small Business—if the only agency in the Senate dealing with that subject is a subcommittee, that troubled small-business man in the country does not know whom to write. I merely believe he will have a feeling that a source of help upon which he has depended, and with considerable confidence and credit to the committee in the past, will be taken away from him.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the able Senator from Florida feel that a committee within the Committee on Banking and Currency with the same number of dollars, with the same sized staff, manned by five or seven Senators, would be able to do just as good a job as a special committee?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think in the debate the answer has already been given to that question. In the first place there is no single committee in the Senate which has exclusive jurisdiction over the problems of small business. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee might with almost equal propriety be said to have the same problems before it, and the Senate Committee on Finance has one of the important aspects of the matter within its jurisdiction, namely, the tax feature with respect to small business.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to finish the answer, if I may. That is the first answer. The second answer is that a special committee, while it no doubt has its vices, has also its peculiar virtues. The members who are on such a committee ordinarily have a considerable interest and sometimes zeal for the prosecution of problems with which the committee was created to deal. I am sure that would be true of the able Senator of Montana, if he were to continue as chairman of it, as he was under the Democratic regime in the Senate. No doubt Senators specially interested in the problem would make request for appointment by the President of the Senate to membership on the committee.

In the third place, a special committee not restricted to a particular jurisdiction is seldom limited to a particular point of view. It realizes this problem is one which concerns almost every general committee in the Senate. It would take a broad perspective of the problem, and would try to formulate a comprehensive program which might be the subject of recommendation to appropriate committees thereafter. So, while as I say, I think special committees are not to be too much encouraged, and while, as a member of the Reorganization Committee of the Congress, I was in accord with the recommendations first made by that committee to exclude special committees altogether, yet, since the Congress did not see fit to adopt the committee's recommendation, and since there was no such inclusion in the final law, due to the fact that the House of Representatives did not concur in the prohibition that was in the version of the bill passed by the Senate, of course Congress itself chose to leave the respective bodies free to set up special committees when in their respective wisdoms they might see fit to do so.

While opinions might differ, those are the general reasons which impel me to believe on that question alone in the desirability of the continuity of the special committee on small business. I do not hesitate to say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that since the Democrats, recognizing this problem, initiated the special committee, I do not see any

inconsistency in our continuing it, now that we are again in the majority in the Senate. As I said, the House has already created a special committee on small business. But, as much as anything else, the special committee is a symbol to the small-business men of the country. For more than 8 years the small-business man has repeatedly turned to a special committee on small business in the Senate or House, and he has obtained a considerable measure of relief, because this was a general matter which a special committee could approach with a little more perspective than any standing committee might have the opportunity to do.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I am anxious to allow other Senators to be heard, but I shall yield to the Senator again, because I certainly do not want to deny him an opportunity to ask any other questions. I shall appreciate it if the Senator will ask what he started to ask a moment ago.

Mr. CAPEHART. I simply wanted to ask, is it not a fact that the special committee has no legislative authority and therefore cannot initiate legislation?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct; and, if the Senator will allow me to answer, no general committee in the Senate has legislative jurisdiction over the whole matter that needs to be attacked.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is very true. All the special committee can do is to hold hearings and investigate. That is all in the world the special committee can do, besides answering letters from small-business men and giving them personal help. I have been a member of the committee for 4 years. I know of its plans, I know of its work. Under no circumstances would I ever vote to discontinue the Small Business Committee of the Senate. But my position is that it can be handled equally well, possibly better, by a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, providing the subcommittee is given the same amount of money and has the same staff, and provided there is the same interest in it as there is on the part of members of a special committee; which I am certain there would be.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I should like to make this observation: As I said, there are perhaps a score of things at the moment that should be done to afford additional relief to small business.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just one moment? It will not take 30 seconds.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I merely want to point out to my friend from Florida the fact that 2 years ago he was one of the Senators on the other side of the aisle who voted against a continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is absolutely correct. I am glad he brought that up, because I was going to bring it up myself, so I would not appear in a contradictory or inconsistent position. But, if I may, I shall finish my answer to the able Senator from Indiana. I say, let us suppose there are at a minimum 20 different things that should be done in the near future to aid small business. It is unlikely it seems to me that the standing committees of the Senate, 15 in number, are likely to carry on a contemporaneous inquiry into what should be done to aid small business. It is very unlikely those committees would take up this subject at even anything like the same time. It is unlikely that a comprehensive program would come from a standing committee of the Senate, which will tend to meet the challenging problems of small business. Especially is that so, if it is more or less generally recognized that one of the committees, namely, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, is taking the initiative in that field, and——

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. Excuse me; let me finish my sentence—and that any other committee might perhaps be infringing a little bit or encroaching somewhat upon the initiative and jurisdiction of the committee. I now yield to the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 100 percent with the able Senator, unless the Senate gives the subcommitee of the Committee on Banking and Currency the same amount of money which would be given a special committee, and unless the Senate gives them the same kind and type of staff as is given to a special committee. Unless we do that, I should be opposed to a subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency handling the matter, but there is no reason why the Senate should not be just as willing to give a subcommittee as much money and as large a staff as it gives to a special committee.

Mr. PEPPER. But would not the Senator have to add one more condition? The Senator has said the standing committee should have the same amount of money as the special committee, it should have a staff of the same size and caliber. Would not the Senator have to ask also for the same breadth of jurisdiction as the special committee would have?

Mr. CAPEHART. My opinion is the Committee on Banking and Currency at the moment could make the same sort and type of inquiries that the Senate Small Business Committee could make. I think they have that authority at the moment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have expressed the idea that the other committees would be a little hesitant about initiating an inquiry if one committee had already announced that it had received a special allocation of funds for the making of such an inquiry or investigation. I have been addressing myself to a matter which I want to make very clearly of record, and that is that I favor the principle of a continuation of the Special Committee on Small Business in the Senate.

Let me advert to what was suggested by the able Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. Two years ago I was one of the Senators who voted against a continuation of that special committee. We were in the midst of our first session of the Congress after the enactment of the Reorganization Act. I wanted to preserve as much as possible the spirit as well as the letter of the Reorganization Act. But we have learned by experience. In 2 years' time some things have caused us to take a different attitude from the one we took 2 years ago. For example, it was discovered in the Democratic council a few days ago that it was not feasible to report a legislative budget by the 15th of February, as the Reorganization Act requires. I have heard of no opposition from the minority side to the position of the majority that it was not found feasible to report a legislative budget by the 15th of February. So that led us to defer the filing of the legislative budget until a later time. I do not know what date has finally been fixed. If that matter had come up 2 years ago, I venture to say a different position would have been taken, because we did not know at that time whether it was altogether feasible and practicable to observe the literal requirements of the Reorganization Act. I think that in 2 years' time a Senator should be open to learning something. I should not care to have it said that I had not learned something in the past 2 years.

In view of the fact that the House struck out the prohibition in the Reorganization Act excluding special committees, now that the House has continuously had a special committee on small business, now that the Senate, against my vote 2 years ago, continued the special committee, I am not disposed now to cut them off.

So, Mr. President, I think the Senators who voted the other way 2 years ago are not at all to be charged with improper inconsistency. I am sure we shall not find applicable the admonition of the sage of New England, who said:

> A foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds, adored by little statesmen and philosophers and divines.

Mr. President, I want to make it clear as to how I stand upon this issue, but it does not lead me to favor the position of my distinguished friend the minority leader in this matter. I think the Chair has ruled correctly. I think a reading of the rule which defines the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration makes it obligatory for the Chair to refer the resolution to the Committee on Banking and Currency. In view of the fact that if the special committee is created it will be a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate, it would be equally necessary for the Chair to refer the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration. So certainly not only shall I not hope to override the Chair, but I shall welcome an opportunity to confirm the rightness of the Chair's ruling. However, I go further and say that if the Banking and Currency Committee should not report the resolution favorably, and the subject comes up again, I certainly shall vote on the floor to create a committee on small business as a special committee. But I think attention should be called to the fact that before the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska was offered, the resolution offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who was the original sponsor of the special committee

on small business, had already been offered and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It certainly would not be proper or consistent for the Chair to have referred an identical resolution to another committee.

So, Mr. President, I am hopeful that we shall get what the Senator from Nebraska has in mind. On the merits of the matter I am very much in accord with him and the Senator from Montana. I think that probably another opportunity will be afforded. I am sure it can be worked out in some way for the Senate to continue its Committee on Small Business as a special committee.

EXHIBIT A

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS ISSUED BY THE SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 28 (79TH CONG.) EXTENDING SENATE RESOLUTION 298 (76TH CONG.)

SENATE COMMITTEE PRINTS

*Seventy-seventh Congress, first session*

No. 1. Small Business Problems in the Nursery Industry.[1]

No. 2. The Supreme Court in Relation to Small Business and the Sherman Act.

No. 3. Small Business Problems of the Tire and Rubber Manufacturers and Retailers.

No. 4. Small Business Bibliography.

No. 5. Small Business Bibliography. Chain Store Reference, 1920–30 (appendix to Committee Print No. 4).

No. 6. Small Business and Defense.[1]

No. 7. Small Business Research and Education.

*Seventy-seventh Congress, second session*

No. 8. Small Business Loans and Risk Capital.[1]

No. 9. Digest of Bills To Aid Small Business Introduced into Congress, 1939–41.

No. 10. Survey of Private Automobile Passenger Car Needs of Major War Plant Areas.

No. 11. Record Keeping for Small Stores. (Revised and reprinted, 79th Cong., 1st sess., as Senate Committee Print No. 2; October 1, 1945.)[2]

No. 12. Pooling for Production.

No. 13. Small Retailers Face the War.

*Seventy-eighth Congress, first session*

No. 14. The Fate of Small Business in Nazi Germany.[1]

No. 15. Small Business: Access to Capital.[1]

No. 16. The Federal Agencies and Small Business.

No. 17. Small Business Wants Old-Age Security.

No. 18. Effect of the War on British Retail Trade.

*Seventy-eighth Congress, second session*

No. 19. Buyer's Guide for Surplus Property. (Second revised edition, December 18, 1944.)

*Seventy-ninth Congress, first session*

No. 1. Construction, Small Business and Employment. September 12, 1945.

No. 2. Record Keeping for Small Stores. (Revised Edition, October 1, 1945.)[2]

No. 3. Maintaining Free Competitive Enterprise. December 6, 1945.

*Seventy-ninth Congress, second session*

No. 4. Small Business Opportunities in FM Broadcasting. April 10, 1946.

No. 5. Operations Under the Federal Reports Act. May 16, 1946.

No. 6. Economic Concentration and World War II, June 14, 1946. (Reprinted as S. Doc. No. 206.)[3]

No. 7. Farm Construction. May 30, 1946.

No. 8. Standards for Measuring Housing Needs. June 4, 1946.

No. 9. Sustained-Yield Capacity for American Forests in Relation to Postwar Requirements for Lumber. June 6, 1946.

No. 10. Progress Under the Federal Reports Act—International Statistical Coordination. July 22, 1946.

No. 12. Antitrust Cases in the Construction Industry. September 12, 1946.

SUBCOMMITTEE PRINTS

*Seventy-eighth Congress, second session*

No. 6. Survey of the Nation's Critical and Strategic Minerals and Metals Program.

No. 7. Future Problems of the Nation's Critical and Strategic Minerals and Metals Industry. January 16, 1945.

*Seventy-ninth Congress, first session*

No. 1. Disposal of Surplus Consumer Goods by the Treasury Department. February 27, 1945.

No. 2. World Markets for Small Business. March 17, 1945.

No. 3. American Small Business in Foreign Trade. June 18, 1945.

No. 3a. Disposal of Surplus Machine Tools. May 21, 1945.

No. 4. The Gold-Mining Industry. August 7, 1945.

No. 5. Future of Light Metals. September 10, 1945.

*Seventy-ninth Congress, second session*

No. 6. Barkley-Bates Amendment and Other Factors Affecting Operation of Meat-Packing Industry. April 24, 1946.

No. 7. Export Insurance Act of 1946. May 13, 1946.

No. 8. Premium Price Plan for Copper, Lead, and Zinc. February 1, 1946.[4]

No. 9. OPA Shortening and Vegetable Oil Price Policy. May 3, 1946.

No. 10. Discussion of Contract Settlement for the Critical and Strategic Minerals and Metals Industry. May 21, 1946.

No. 11. Small Business and the Webb-Pomerene Act. August 21, 1946.

No. 12. The Veteran in Small Business. July 10, 1946.

No. 14. Transportation Program for Small Business. September 16, 1946.[5]

SENATE REPORTS

*Seventy-seventh Congress, first session*

No. 479, part 1. A Report on the Federal Reports Act of 1941. June 26, 1941.

*Seventy-seventh Congress, second session*

No. 479, part 2. Recommendations on Effective Participation and Protection of American Small Business in the War Effort; and On Its Preservation and Extension in the American Economy After the War. S. 2250. February 5, 1942.

No. 479, part 3. Recommendations for the Relief of Dealers in Rationed Commodities. S. 2315. February 25, 1942.

No. 479, part 4. Recommendations for the Effective Utilization of Existing Stocks of Rubber Tires, etc. S. 2560. June 1, 1942.

*Seventy-eighth Congress, first session*

No. 12, part 1. Report to Congress on the Work of the Committee. January 18, 1943.

No. 12, part 2. Small Business in War and Essential Civilian Production. March 11, 1943.

No. 12, part 3. Poultry Market. July 6, 1943.

No. 12, part 4. War Contract Termination Legislation. July 1943.

*Seventy-eighth Congress, second session*

No. 12, part 5. Preparing Small Business for Postwar. July 14, 1944.

No. 12, part 6. Commercial Rent Control. October 1944.

No. 12, part 7. Progress Under the Federal Reports Act. November 17, 1944.

*Seventy-ninth Congress, first session*

No. 47, part 1. Senate Small Business Committee—Its Record and Outlook. February 12, 1945.

No. 47, part 2. Two Years of Progress Under the Federal Reports Act. March 20, 1945.

No. 47, part 3. Impact of Reconversion Policies on Small Business. July 27, 1945.

*Seventy-ninth Congress, second session*

No. 47, part 4. Small Business Price Problems and Government Stabilization Policies. May 14, 1946.

DOCUMENTS

*Seventy-ninth Congress, second session*

No. 135. Small Business and Civic Welfare. February 13, 1946.

No. 206. Economic Concentration and World War II. June 14, 1946. (Committee Print No. 6, 79th Cong., 2d sess.)[3]

HEARINGS

*Seventy-seventh Congress, first session*

Part 1. Small Business and the War Program; December 15, 16, 17, 18, 1941.

*Seventy-seventh Congress, second session*

Part 2. Tire Dealer and Rebuilder Problems; March 3, 4, 5, 6, 1942.

Part 3. Conference of Retail Automobile Dealers; January 9, 10, 1942.

Part 4. Small Business Conference, Bozeman, Mont.; September 21, 1942.

Part 5. Small Business Conference, Miles City, Mont.; September 14, 1942.

Part 6. Small Business Conference, Helena, Mont.; September 17, 1942.

Part 7. Small Business Conference, Billings, Mont.; September 18, 1942.

Part 8. Economic Background and Tendencies; September 29, 1942.

Part 9. Adjustment of Obligations—Long-Term Capital—Public Morale—Independent Packers—Food Distribution; September 30, October 1, 6, 7, 1942.

Part 10. Smaller Concerns in War Production: I; October 13, 14, 15, 1942.

Part 11. Smaller Concerns in War Production; II; December 3, 4, 7, 1942.

Part 12. Smaller Concerns in War Production: III; December 8, 15, 16, 1942.

*Seventy-eighth Congress, first session*

Part 13. Critical, Strategic and Essential Materials; January 13, 1943.

Part 14. Problems of Small Distributors; January 19, 20, 21, 1943.

Part 15. Long-Term and Equity Capital; February 23, 24, 1943.

Part 16. Smaller Concerns in War Production; IV; March 4, 1943.

Part 17. Effect of Exchange Services on Retail Trade; March 16, 17, 1943.

Part 18. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials; II; March 30, 31, April 1, 1943.

[1] Copies no longer available.

[2] Supply limited. Can only fill individual orders. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 35 cents per copy.

[3] Committee allotment exhausted. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 50 cents per copy.

[4] Committee allotment exhausted. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 35 cents per copy.

[5] Supply limited. Can only fill individual orders. Copies may be purchased from Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., at 25 cents per copy.

Part 19. Tire Dealer and Rebuilder Problems: II; April 5, 6, and 8, and May 6 and 13, 1943.

Part 20. Rationing Problems of the Baking Industry; April 9 and 12, 1943.

Part 21. Maritime Procurement: I; May 4, 5, and 14, 1943.

Part 22. Price Practices of OPA; May 11, 1943.

Part 23. Quota for Florida Livestock Industry; June 1, 1943.

Part 24. Poultry Market Situation; June 11 and 15, 1943.

Part 25. Maritime Procurement: II; July 19, 1943.

Part 26. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials: III—Tucson, Ariz., April 5; Phoenix, Ariz., April 6; and Prescott, Ariz., April 7, 1943.

Part 27. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials: IV—Riverside, Calif., April 7; Sacramento, Calif., April 15; and Los Angeles, Calif., April 16, 1943.

Part 28. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials: V—Las Vegas, Nev., April 9; Grants Pass, Oreg., April 10; Reno, Nev., April 13; Pioche, Nev., April 20; Salt Lake City, Utah, April 24; and Deming, N. Mex., April 21, 1943.

Part 29. Critical, Strategic, and Essential Materials: VI—Helena, Mont., August 2; Missoula, Mont., August 4; Spokane, Wash., August 5; and Seattle, Wash., August 7, 1943.

Part 30. Navy Yard Subcontracting and the Type C Contract; October 26, 1943.

*Seventy-eighth Congress, second session*

Part 31. Small Business in the Changing War Programs; April 25, 1944.

Part 32. Small Business in the Changing War Program: II; April 26, 1944.

Part 33. Small Business in the Changing War Program: III; April 28, 1944.

Part 34. Small Business in the Changing War Program: IV; May 3, 1944.

Part 35. Small Business in the Changing War Program: V; May 9, 1944.

Part 36. Businessmen's Views on Reconversion Needs: I—Indianapolis, Ind.; May 24 and 25, 1944.[1]

Part 37. Businessmen's Views on Reconversion Needs: II—Fort Wayne, Ind.; May 26, 1944.

Part 38. Businessmen's Views on Reconversion Needs: III—Boston, Mass.; June 22, 23, and 24, 1944.

Part 39. Commercial Rent Control; July 14, 1944.

Part 40. Developing the West Through Small Business: I—Kalispell, Mont.; July 24 and 25, 1944.

Part 41. Developing the West Through Small Business: II—Seattle, Wash.; July 26 and 27, 1944.

Part. 42. Developing the West Through Small Business: III—Portland, Oreg.; July 28, 1944.

Part 43. Developing the West Through Small Business: IV—San Francisco, Calif.; July 31 and August 1, 1944.

Part 44. Developing the West Through Small Business: V—Los Angeles, San Diego, Calif.

Part 45. Developing the West Through Small Business: VI—Phoenix, Tucson, Prescott, Ariz.; August 7, 8, and 9, 1944.

Part 46. Surplus War Property Disposal; December 12, 14, and 15, 1944.

*Seventy-ninth Congress, first session*

Part 47. Future of Light Metals; February 27, 1945.

Part 48. Future of Light Metals; February 28, 1945.

Part 49. Future of Light Metals, March 1, 5, and 6, 1945.

Part 50. Future of Light Metals; March 7 and 20, 1945.

Part 51. Future of Light Metals, March 21, 1945.

[1] Copies no longer available.

Part 52. Future of Light Metals; March 22, 1945.

Part 53. Future of Light Metals; March 27, 1945.

Part 54. Future of Light Metals; March 28, 1945.

Part 55. Future of Light Metals; March 29, 1945.

Part 56. Future of Light Metals; March 30, 1945.

Part 57. Future of Light Metals: The Shipshaw Contract I; March 30 and April 10, 1945.

Part 58. Future of Light Metals: The Shipshaw Contract II; April 11, 1945.

Part 59. Future of Light Metals: The Shipshaw Contract III; April 12, 1945.

Part 60. Future of Light Metals: The Shipshaw Contract IV; May 14, 1945.

Part 61. World Markets for Small Business: I; April 17, 18, 20, and 25, 1945.

Part 62. World Markets for Small Business: II; May 18 and 21, and June 5 and 6, 1945.

Part 63. Machine Tools Industry; April 25, 26, and 27, 1945.

Part 64. Construction Industry; May 8, 9, and 10, 1945.

Part 65. Impact of Reconversion Policies on Small Business; June 15, 18, and 19, 1945.

Part 66. Investigation of Textile Problems; July 10, 1945.

Part 67. Surplus Machine Tools; July 27 and August 3, 1945.

Part 68. Restaurants and Foods: I, July 30 and 31, 1945.

Part 69. Restaurants and Foods: II, August 7, 1945.

Part 70. Fats and Oils, Margarine; August 6 and 7, 1945.

Part 71. Postwar Adjustments of Domestic Mining Industry; August 7 and 8, 1945.

Part 72. Sugar Supply Problems and Their Impact on Small Business; August 22, 1945.

Part 73. Butter, Oleomargarine, Fats, and Oils, and Meat Distribution; October 22, 1945.

Part 74. Problems of Housing Shortage, Construction and Housing Price Controls: I; October 23 and 24, 1945.

Part 75. Problems of Housing Shortage, Construction and Housing Price Controls: II; October 25, 1945.

Part 76. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: I; December 4, 1945.

Part 77. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: II, December 5, 1945.

Part 78. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: III; December 6, 1945.

Part 79. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: IV; December 11, 1945.

Part 80. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: V; December 12, 1945.

Part 81. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: VI; December 13, 1945.

Part 82. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: VII; December 17, 1945.

Part 83. Impact of Price Controls and Stabilization Policies on Small Business: VIII; December 18 and 19, 1945.

*Seventy-ninth Congress, second session*

Part 84. Problems of Smaller Users of Steel Products as a Result of Recent Steel Strike; February 7 and 8, 1946.

Part 85. California Looks to its Economic Future: I; San Diego, Calif.; February 20 and 21, 1946.

Part 86. California Looks to its Economic Future: II; Fresno, Calif.; February 25, 1946.

Part 87. California Looks to its Economic Future: III; Los Angeles, Calif.; February 26, 27, and 28, 1946.

Part 88. Nylon and Rayon Hosiery Production and Distribution Problems; April 10 and 11, 1946.

Part 89. Food Shortages and World Relief as Related to Small Business; April 15, 1946.

Part 90. OPA Shortening and Vegetable Oil Price Policy; April 25, 1946.

Part 91. Nylon Hosiery Wholesale-Retail Distribution Problem: May 25, 1946.

Part 92. World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: I; June 3, 4, and 5, 1946.

Part 93. World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: II; June 6, 7, and 10, 1946.

Part 94. World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: III; June 11, 12, and 13, 1946.

Part 95. World Food Supplies in Relation to Small Business: IV; June 14 and 15, 1946.

Part 96. Effect of Current Surplus Property Disposal Policies on Veteran in Small Business: I; June 12 and 13, 1946.

Part 97. Effect of Current Surplus Property Disposal Policies on Veteran in Small Business: II; June 18, 1946.

Part 98. Effect of Current Surplus Property Disposal Policies on Veteran in Small Business: III; June 19, 1946.

JOINT HEARINGS

*Seventy-ninth Congress, first session*

Parts 1 to 5, inclusive. Aluminum Plant Disposal (Revised); October 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1945. (Together with Surplus Property Subcommittee of Committee on Military Affairs and Industrial Reorganization Subcommittee of Special Committee on Postwar Economic Policy and Planning.)

LEGISLATION SPONSORED BY THE COMMITTEE

Public Law 549 (77th Cong.): An act for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States.

Public Law 603 (77th Cong.): An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

Public Law 831 (77th Cong.): An act to coordinate Federal reporting services, to eliminate duplication and reduce the cost of such services and to minimize the burdens of furnishing information to Federal agencies.

Public Law 47 (78th Cong.): An act to provide for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States (including the Territory of Alaska).

Public Law 349 (78th Cong.): An act providing for the suspension of certain requirements relating to work on tunnel-site mining claims.

Public Law 457 (78th Cong.): An act to aid the reconversion from a war to a peace economy through the distribution of Government surplus property and to establish a Surplus Property Board to effectuate the same, and for other purposes.

Public Law 157 (79th Cong.): An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to modify provisions of a contract for purchase of power plant for use in connection with San Carlos irrigation project.

LEGISLATION UPON WHICH THE COMMITTEE EXERTED A SUBSTANTIAL INFLUENCE

Public Law 395 (78th Cong.): An act to provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, and for other purposes.

Public Law 458 (78th Cong.): An act to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide a national program for war mobilization and reconversion, and for other purposes.

Public Law 88 (79th Cong.): An act to permit the continuation of certain subsidy payments and certain purchase and sale operations by corporations created pursuant to section 5d (3) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXHIBIT B

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

REASONS FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

*Independent and small businesses need this committee because of present abnormal economic conditions*

As changing conditions in the Government and the economy have required, the Senate Small Business Committee has focused its work on the solution of those problems which affect the survival and growth of independent and small business. Consequently, it has come to mean a great deal to the independent business community in every State of the Nation. Today when business hazards are mounting, these businessmen need the Senate Small Business Committee as never before. Here are some illustrations:

1. The Federal Government is the biggest single buyer in the country. All its experience, bureaucratic tradition, and the desire to get the job done the easiest way point toward big purchases from big business. For example, the Defense Establishment will buy some $15,000,000,000 of goods this next year. It has no adequate machinery for contracting with small and independent businesses. On its own it apparently is not inclined to do so. Yet at least $5,000,000,000 of all its purchases should go to such businesses, which would spell the difference between a healthy situation and one where many of these smaller business firms will sustain losses or fail.

The Senate Small Business Committee has proven by its wartime efforts in forcing the services to establish purchasing practices equally fair to small and big business, and in continuing to police these practices and to break bottlenecks as they occur, keeping the procurement program constantly under scrutiny, that this is the only practical way of insuring a square deal for independent and small business. Experience has shown that only the surveillance of a Senate Committee having a full-time staff and possessed of the powers of subpena and public hearings gets the job done well.

All but a very few of the Members of the Senate have used the specialized service of the Senate Small Business Committee in behalf of their constituent small businesses. This saves the Senators much time and gives them expert help. Because of the respect of Government agencies for the effectiveness of the committee, the work has received high commendation. The practice has developed of not only getting action on individual cases, but of using them to illustrate the need for correct procurement and contracting policies, to the end that the Government agencies eventually establish them.

2. Major shortages continue to menace independent and small business. For example, thousands of fabricators of steel and aluminum products cannot get their normal amounts of these basic raw materials, and are prevented from developing prosperous expanding businesses during good times, laying up the needed reserves against any eventualities—all because of raw-materials shortages entirely beyond their individual control.

The Senate Small Business Committee has held hearings and conferences over several years, repeating them as necessary, to get a better break for these small concerns from their suppliers who are at the same time their competitors. Often only the threat of publicity, and possible imposition of compulsory controls, suffice to bring about fairer treatment. Pressure has to be kept on almost continuously to force some big-business operators to dribble out supplies of raw materials to these independent and small concerns. The files of the committee and the remarks of many Senators give ample proof that this service is a most important tangible help to American small business during these times of abnormal scarcities of needed raw materials.

3. Large integrated companies are in a position to put the "squeeze" on small or independent suppliers during these days of full use of resources, which an alert Senate Small Business Committee can and does prevent. An example of such effort is the recent case of the independent oil companies in California whose crude oil can only be processed if refineries operated by the large integrated corporations will process it. In normal times this is no problem. But now the large corporations refused to accept more than a small fraction of the usual amount of crude oil from the independent companies. The Senate Small Business Committee was asked to investigate and take appropriate action. A 1-day hearing was sufficient to force the big corporations to halt their detrimental action and reinstall former practices, resulting in savings of many thousands of dollars to the small independents.

4. Grey and black markets are a serious menace in these times of materials shortages. The Senate Small Business Committee uncovered an active grey market in steel, and its hearings and watchful oversight of the situation have materially reduced such harmful activities, to the lasting benefit of many small businesses.

5. A large export program is underwritten by the Government through the European recovery program. American independent and small business has never received its rightful share of attention in the procurement programs which use our taxpayers' dollars. Only a beginning effort has been made by the Senate Small Business Committee to insure fair procedures and practices in such purchases. Much yet remains to be done in this connection if the remaining 3 years of ECA are to benefit our independent business community as they should.

6. Export controls and policies have never been developed with the peculiar problems of small and independent business in mind. These important elements in our business community are discriminated against by the Government and the purchasing missions of foreign governments. The Senate Small Business Committee has begun an investigation of such conditions, and if allowed to complete its work will force through changes in policies and procedures which will give small business fair treatment.

7. A substantial program of plant expansion is now contemplated in the interest of national defense, urged by the administration and particularly advocated by the President. Included are programs to develop vastly more hydroelectric power, steel, aluminum, and strategic metals such as copper, chrome, and manganese. Special consideration should be given, also, to the need for an increased supply of wood pulp for newsprint.

Much of the preliminary work of investigation to establish the need for such expansion has already been done by the Senate Small Business Committee. Its steel investigation, and the report, Steel Supply and Distribution Problems, made by Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, the first chairman of the committee, have been a major factor in focusing attention on this situation. The work has only been partly done. The committee contemplates further study and active participation in the formulation of any proposed legislation to carry out the recommendations of the President. It intends that such legislation will not increase the concentration of economic power but provide for a wider degree of competition as the only business atmosphere in which small and independent business can operate successfully. Therefore, it is imperative to have the Senate Small Business Committee continued during the Eighty-first Congress when these decisions on plant expansion will be made.

*The administration and the Democratic Party are pledged to the continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee*

The President of the United States, in his campaign for election, pledged his administration to a vigorous program specifically directed toward the peculiar and particular needs of independent and small business. The National Committee of the Democratic Party established an Independent Business Committee for Truman and Barkley and the Democratic Candidates, and issued literature directing the attention of the business people of the Nation to the record in their behalf as made by the Democrats. That record was pointed up largely in terms of the work of the congressional Small Business Committees. The Democratic Party pledged itself to continue these efforts in behalf of independent and small business. This effort played no small part in the successful outcome of the November elections.

After the election, Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, long-time chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, called upon the President to ascertain his views concerning the continuance of the committee. President Truman was emphatic in his endorsement of the committee and insistence that it be continued during the Eighty-first Congress.

Senator HOWARD MCGRATH, who, as Democratic National Committee chairman, had set up the independent and small business committee referred to above and has testified to its great contribution in the campaign, has informed Senator MURRAY that he unequivocally endorses the Senate Small Business Committee and urges its continuance as a partial fulfillment of the party's pledge to the voters. Numerous other Senators have indicated their support for continuance of the committee.

*The continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee does not contravene either the spirit or practice of the reorganization bill*

Mention has been made that continuance of the Senate Small Business Committee might be in contradiction to the Reorganization Act. That act contemplated keeping special committees to a minimum, permitting subcommittees of standing committees to do particular tasks of short duration for which special committees are usually set up.

The Senate Small Business Committee's work overlaps the legislative interest of several standing committees. That work does not primarily, nor necessarily, lead directly to legislation. When it does (as witness the record of its accomplishment in the passage of such substantial contributions as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Surplus Property Act, and the Full Employment Act, and several other measures designed to aid small business directly, such as access roads to small mines, and stock piling of strategic materials), the investigating work done by the committee is made use of directly in the hearings on proposed legislation held by the appropriate standing committees. This is not duplication of effort, but on the contrary speeds up the legislative process, for a phase of legislation, that of the investigation of the problem in all its ramifications, has already been done and a considerable understanding has developed upon which specific legislation can be built and hearings conducted.

But the peculiar importance of the Senate Small Business Committee is that the independent business community of the Nation knows it has a committee in the Senate avowedly concerned with its manifold problems. In this day and age, when the encroachments of large corporations into all fields of economic endeavor threatens the very life of the free competitive-enterprise system which is the foundation of our cherished American institutions, it is not too much to expect that the Senate of the

United States would be sufficiently interested in the problems of independent and small business to maintain a committee devoting full time to investigating these problems and their solution.

The work of the Senate Small Business Committee, while often leading to legislation, is in very considerable measure concerned with the effectiveness of legislation already passed and being administered by the administrative branch of the Government. This work, as has been pointed out above, overlaps the special province of any one standing legislative committee. Moreover, and this is of substantive importance, it is of a character that is considerably beyond the scope and experience of standing committees or their staffs. It calls for specialized experience and requires experts trained in investigation and negotiation in a broad field of business, economics, and government administration, all of which is pointed up in terms of the specific interests of independent and small business. To include such work as a part of the effort of a standing committee would be to overshadow that committee's customary effort, for the volume of work done by the Senate Small Business Committee, the demands on its time and staff, are considerably greater than that required by the usual standing committee in the course of its legislative work.

The work of the Senate Small Business Committee does not duplicate in any noticeable way any work now being done or contemplated by standing legislative committees. It has an important field all to itself, and over the years the dependence of the business community at large upon it furnishes ample proof that this is a field of congressional activity very much in the public interest and demand. If the committee should be discontinued, and some subcommittee of a standing committee be given its assignments, not only would it distort the work of the standing committee, but no savings in time of Senators, or in funds would be made, unless it is the intention by such action to deliberately destroy the effectiveness of the program being carried on in behalf of independent and small business. That has never been suggested as a purpose behind any move to discontinue the Senate Small Business Committee and tuck its effort away as a subcommittee activity of a standing legislative committee. But American business men and women who have contacted the members and staff of the Senate Small Business Committee view with alarm any such move, for they fear that this is just another way of curtailing, stifling, and eventually killing the program in behalf of independent and small business.

The Reorganization Act has been in effect long enough now to have settled into the fabric of congressional organization. Consequently, no rash of new special committees will break out if the decision is made to continue the Senate Small Business Committee. For it is widely recognized that this committee is of a very special character and therefore does not fit into the pattern of subcommittees of standing committees, whereas all the special investigations sought can be organized expeditiously that way.

The House of Representatives is continuing its Special Committee on Small Business. If the Senate Committee is not continued, there results a lopsided arrangement, where Members of the Senate will have to refer the problems of their small-business constituents to the House for action, action which is entirely beyond their control and cannot be fitted into their own efforts in behalf of their constituents. The House of Representatives sees nothing in the continuance of its Small Business Committee which is disturbing to the effectiveness of the Reorganization Act.

*Proposed program of the Senate Small Business Committee during the Eighty-first Congress*

The work of the committee is practical—it is aimed to make certain that independent and small business comes through this unnatural postwar period of inflation and shortages as well as is possible, to the end that competitive business will survive and grow strong. This work is divided into two, not completely distinct parts: (1) Those investigations, negotiations, hearings, and meetings which result in independent and small business receiving fair and equal treatment with big business competitors in relationships with the Government, and (2) an investigation of those fundamental and long-range problems which restrict competition and strengthen monopoly practices to the detriment of independent business.

Specifically, the Senate Small Business Committee intends working in the following areas:

1. Small business participation in Government procurement (military, research and development, and normal procurement programs).

2. Small business participation in international trade (ECA, export-control policies, etc.).

3. Breaking the bottlenecks of scarce materials for small business (steel, aluminum, newsprint, power, etc.).

4. Small business participation in the plant expansion and development program launched by the Government as a defense and economy plan.

5. Small business participation in the program of development and stock piling of strategic metals and materials.

6. The antitrust laws and practices of the agencies (Federal Trade Commission, Department of Justice, Department of Commerce, and Department of Labor) as they affect small business.

7. Accounting, statistics and reports required by the Government and their effect on small business.

8. Transportation problems of small business.

9. Small business interest in the surplus property disposal program.

10. Financial problems of small business (equity, capital taxation).

*The continuance of the Small Business Committee has widespread support*

Any attempt to discontinue the Senate Small Business Committee, or to tuck it away as a subcommittee of a standing legislative committee, will meet with the greatest disfavor of many thousands of American businessmen scattered widely over the Nation. They have come to expect its services as necessary in their behalf, as one small means of balancing the scales in comparison to their powerful big business rivals. They have repeatedly given the finest commendations of its work. Its continuance has been pledged them by responsible leaders in the Congress and the administration.

No attempt has been made to assemble any pressure, or to allow any pressure to be exerted in behalf of continuance of the committee, for that has such obvious merit that no such pressure would appear to be required. It is recommended, therefore, that full support be given the resolution being introduced to continue the committee during the 81st Congress.

## ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, COAUTHOR OF BILL

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, on the 10th of January I introduced Senate bill 287 to provide for grants to assist the States, Territories, and dependencies in the construction of elementary and secondary schools. That bill is now before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted for the sole purpose of having the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] joined as cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## APPLICATION OF RULE XIX

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish very respectfully to refer to the application of rule XIX of the Senate. The rule reads as follows:

> When a Senator desires to speak, he shall rise and address the Presiding Officer, and shall not proceed until he is recognized, and the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him. No Senator shall interrupt another Senator in debate without his consent, and to obtain such consent he shall first address the Presiding Officer.

The rule goes on to cover other matters not germane to the point which I wish to raise.

A few minutes ago the Presiding Officer recognized the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], who was not at the time even on the floor, although at that time the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] was seeking recognition. The junior Senator from Oregon raised the question, by way of a parliamentary inquiry, as to the propriety of the course of action of the Presiding Officer under that rule. As the RECORD tomorrow will show, as a result of the exchange between the junior Senator from Oregon and the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Oregon found himself in a position in which the senior Senator from Florida would not agree to yield for any further raising of the parliamentary inquiry.

I want to assure the Presiding Officer, because I think he knows, on the basis of his relationships with the Senator from Oregon, that the Senator from Oregon holds the Presiding Officer in very fond affection. I meant it when I said some days ago that I think the Presiding Officer is a great inspiration to the liberals of the country, and that his record has been a great record of social service. But my extremely high regard for the Presiding Officer must be considered quite independent of my duty to protect my rights and the rights of other Senators who have since this occurrence this afternoon conferred with me and expressed complete agreement with the point of view I am now expressing that rule XIX should be applied by the Presiding Officer in accordance with its clear meaning and without any understandings or arrangements entered into between the Presiding Officer and any Senator whereby he will recognize some other Senator in preference to a Senator who first addresses the Chair, is standing on the floor, and is seeking to be recognized.

This is not the first time in the history of the Senate that the Chair—not the present Presiding Officer, but another Presiding Officer—has recognized a Senator who was not even on the floor at the time. I remember quite clearly a couple of years ago an occasion when the then Presiding Officer recognized the junior

Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], because, on the basis of a list that was being kept at the desk, he was supposed to be the next Senator to be recognized, but he was not on the floor at the time, and after some little exchange a Senator who was on the floor at the time was finally recognized.

I wish to say, in all courtesy and with deep respect, that I think that we must insist that the present Presiding Officer and every other Presiding Officer of the Senate, see to it that our rights under the rules are protected, and I submit that the type of ruling the Chair handed down this afternoon may, by accretion of further misrulings, eventually reach the point where our rights are in fact seriously jeopardized. We cannot start varying the letter as to our rights under the rules of the Senate without soon finding ourselves in the position of finding that our rights are seriously interfered with.

I have been moved to comment on a recognition which occurred on the floor when I was acting as minority leader, and which I protested at the time, and I turn to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, page 854, the first column on the page, starting with the language in which the RECORD says:

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. HAYDEN rose and addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arizona wish to oppose the resolution?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have sought recognition to speak on the resolution itself. As chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I should like to discuss the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks the Senator from Arizona is entitled to recognition, if the Senator wishes to discuss the resolution now. The Chair wishes to expedite the matter by getting the resolution before the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. As I understand, the resolution is now before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No, the resolution is not before the Senate. The motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of the resolution is still pending. Does the Senator from New Hampshire object?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have been trying to secure recognition here for several hours, and I have been taken off my feet, and a few more Senators are going to be taken off their feet, too, if I do not secure recognition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not taken the Senator off his feet. From a legislative standpoint the Senator has not been on his feet. The Chair is trying to expedite the business of the Senate. The resolution is debatable after the motion is agreed to. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona if he wishes to speak on the motion.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. I do not want to be overly technical, but I certainly question whether recognition of any Senator should depend on whether he desires to address himself to the subject matter under discussion. I am sure the Presiding Officer does not mean that recognition of the Senator from Arizona is to be given on that basis. What the Presiding Officer has suggested is that he would recognize the Senator from Arizona if the Senator from Arizona proposes to speak on the resolution. I would have to raise a point of order if that is the intention of the Presiding Officer.

I think the remarks of yesterday speak for themselves, and as a Member of this body, Mr. President, I most respectfully urge that at all times rule XIX be strictly complied with at this session of the Congress.

I find myself in opposition to a practice which I have heretofore protested time and time again on the floor of the Senate, namely, of keeping a list at the presiding officer's desk, which list should be followed in recognizing Senators on the floor of the Senate. I respectfully submit that rule XIX was put into the rules to protect each and every one of the 96 of us, insofar as we are first on our feet, and asking for recognition, to be so recognized by the presiding officer, whoever he may be. I respectfully submit that this afternoon when the presiding officer announced the recognition of the Senator from West Virginia when the Senator from West Virginia was not here to be recognized, rule XIX was violated.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels compelled to make an observation, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon. The Chair is as sincere in his belief that rule XIX should be observed by the Presiding Officer, whoever he may be, as any Senator could possibly be. As we all know, from time immemorial Senators who wanted to be recognized sometimes came to the Chair and indicated their desire for recognition. I have for many years protested the keeping of a list at the desk by private arrangement, made in the order in which Senators approached the Chair and desired to be recognized.

The Chair recognizes the full force of the rule that the Chair should recognize the first Senator who rises and asks for recognition. But when two or more Senators rise at the same time it is not always possible for the Chair to tell just which one rose first, and therefore he must exercise some discretion in determining which Senator he will recognize under the circumstances.

What has happened today is not serious. The Senator from West Virginia came to the Chair and said that he desired to reintroduce a bill, and asked me if I would recognize him. I asked him to await the conclusion of the debate on the pending appeal, and especially await the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and told him that if he were on his feet asking recognition then, the Chair would recognize him.

When the Senator from Vermont concluded his remarks the Chair looked over on the right to see whether the Senator from West Virginia was on his feet asking recognition, and made inquiry whether the Senator from West Virginia were in the Chamber, and was advised that he was not, whereupon the Chair recognized the Senator from Florida. So that it is not a serious infraction of the rule.

If the Senator from West Virginia had been in the Chamber and on his feet asking recognition to do what he has since done, namely, reintroduce a bill, the Chair would have recognized him. The Chair did not recognize the Senator from West Virginia in his absence from the Chamber. The Chair inquired whether the Senator from West Virginia was in the Chamber, and on being advised he was not, recognized the Senator from Florida, who was on his feet.

Calling the attention of the Chair to rule XIX has served a purpose, and the Chair thanks the Senator from Oregon. The Chair has long insisted that a Senator need not yield to any other Senator for any purpose while he has the floor, unless he is guilty of misconduct or violation of the rules himself so that he is called to order and is compelled to take his seat. A Senator is not required to yield to another Senator to make a point of order, to make the point of no quorum, or for any other purpose, and even when he yields he can yield only for a question, under the rule.

In view of the importance of legislation of all sorts, which will be controversial, that is likely to arise in the Senate at this session, the Chair hopes he will have the complete cooperation of Senators in observing and enforcing all the provisions of rule XIX, and not merely one provision.

The Chair felt he was called upon to make these remarks in view of the observations of the Senator from Oregon, in explanation of why the Chair had indicated to the Senator from West Virginia that if he were present and on his feet asking recognition to do what he did the Chair would recognize him at a certain point.

## SPECIAL SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

The Senate resumed the consideration of Mr. WHERRY's appeal from the decision of the Chair referring Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is——

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, the question before the Senate is whether the Senate will vote to sustain the Chair in his reference of the resolution of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] to the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is also my understanding that a resolution establishing a special committee on small business has been referred to the Banking and Currency Committee and is now in the hands of that committee. It is further my understanding, which I should like to have confirmed, that the Committee on Banking and Currency expects to act upon that resolution at a very early date, probably sometime next week, and to report it back to the Senate, either favorably or unfavorably, so that the matter of establishing a special Small Business Committee will be before this body within the next few days. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if my understanding is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, of course, the only question before the Senate, as the Senator from Vermont knows, is the question of the appeal from the decision of the Chair on the reference of the pending resolution. Speaking for myself, and I think the committee will agree with me, we should consider this resolution and the one previously referred to it, and they should be reported to the Senate either favorably or unfavorably. Now whether or not that will be done this week, or the next week, or whether it will be done the following week, I cannot say. All I can say is that I urge it be done as soon as possible, and I am certain that the committee will report the resolution within 2 weeks. I do not say it will be done this week, because our regular meeting day has been on Tuesdays.

Mr. AIKEN. What I wanted to get clear in my mind is whether we would very soon have a chance to discuss the establishment of a special committee for small business on the merits of the question.

Mr. MAYBANK. I can only say that the Committee on Banking and Currency will report the two resolutions, the one by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the other by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], if it should be referred to it, within a reasonable time, and I believe it would be certainly within 2 weeks.

Mr. AIKEN. With that understanding, Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senate could have an opportunity to act upon the matter itself as early or earlier if the Committee on Banking and Currency would report the resolution back to the Senate within a week or so, than it could if such a resolution were referred to an entirely different committee, which probably has not considered the matter at all up to this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. While I now speak only for myself, the consensus of opinion of the Committee on Banking and Currency it seemed to me was that the resolution should be reported within a reasonable time.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to ask a question with reference to the latter part of the remarks just made by the Chair, with particular reference to paragraphs 2, 3, and 4 of rule XIX. As I understood the Presiding Officer's remarks, it is not in order for any Senator to interrupt another Senator while he is speaking, except for a question, and with his consent—not even for points of order. My inquiry of the Presiding Officer is: If a Senator does transgress the rules as outlined in paragraphs 2 and 3 and refuses to yield for a point of order, is there not a way that a Senator can, under those circumstances, call the other Senator to order, if the Presiding Officer does not do so?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator who has the floor makes some remark that reflects upon the integrity or the good faith—the Chair is not quoting verbatim the language of the rule—of some other Senator, he may be called to order and required to sit down, whereupon he may be permitted to proceed in order. Otherwise a Senator is not required to yield the floor for any purpose, so long as he does not violate the rules of the Senate in his own conduct, or misconduct, as the case might be.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Inasmuch as the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has now made a positive statement that within 2 weeks one of the resolutions will be reported back to the Senate, if I heard him correctly——

Mr. MAYBANK. I was speaking for myself as chairman of the committee, and I believe the other members of the committee feel the same way I do. I have no right to bind any other member of the committee.

Mr. WHERRY. I realize that, Mr. President. That is quite right. The chairman has said that he will do everything within his power to report back one of the resolutions within 2 weeks.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said I hoped to.

Mr. WHERRY. Well——

Mr. MAYBANK. Now, Mr. President, I wish no one to misunderstand me. I have only my own vote in the committee. I cannot pledge any other member of the committee. No member of the committee has given me any statement that I could use here. I represent only my own vote. But I thought it to be the consensus of opinion in the committee that within a reasonable time we would report the resolution. However, I cannot pledge any other member.

Mr. WHERRY. I will make this request then. In view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, in whom I have absolute confidence, I will say that I shall have accomplished the purpose I had in mind if either resolution be reported favorably by the committee. In view of the statement by the chairman of the committee, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my appeal.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object, because I do not desire the charge to be made that I, as chairman of the committee, have been speaking for the committee. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the ranking minority member of the committee, was not at the meeting held today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate in referring Senate Resolution 55 to the Committee on Banking and Currency? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Nebraska have the parliamentary right to withdraw his appeal if he so desires?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and it cannot be done after that. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DONNELL. A vote "yea" is a vote to sustain the Chair. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. A vote "yea" is a vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair. A vote "nay" is a vote to overrule the decision of the Chair.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business at Government departments.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired on this question with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is paired on this question with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired on this question with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this question with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea," if present.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from

New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "nay" and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—57

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Hill | Miller |
| Anderson | Hoey | Myers |
| Broughton | Holland | Neely |
| Byrd | Hunt | O'Conor |
| Cain | Johnson, Colo. | O'Mahoney |
| Capehart | Johnson, Tex. | Pepper |
| Chapman | Kefauver | Robertson |
| Connally | Kerr | Russell |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Donnell | Langer | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Long | Sparkman |
| Eastland | Lucas | Stennis |
| Ellender | McClellan | Taylor |
| Flanders | McFarland | Thomas, Okla. |
| Frear | McGrath | Thomas, Utah |
| George | McKellar | Tobey |
| Gillette | McMahon | Tydings |
| Hayden | Magnuson | Williams |
| Hendrickson | Maybank | Withers |

NAYS—20

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Baldwin | Lodge | Taft |
| Brewster | Malone | Thye |
| Ecton | Martin | Watkins |
| Ferguson | Morse | Wherry |
| Hickenlooper | Mundt | Wiley |
| Ives | Saltonstall | Young |
| Knowland | Schoeppel | |

NOT VOTING—19

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bricker | Gurney | Millikin |
| Bridges | Humphrey | Murray |
| Butler | Jenner | Reed |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | Vandenberg |
| Downey | Kem | Wagner |
| Fulbright | McCarran | |
| Green | McCarthy | |

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

## INFLATION AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the sessions of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to consider at a public meeting the recommendations made by the President began this morning in the caucus room in the House Office Building. Problems of inflation, production, purchasing power, and employment are under consideration. The testimony which will be offered there will be of vital importance, I think, to the people of the United States.

Mr. Leon Keyserling, vice chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, testified this morning. Mr. Keyserling will be followed tomorrow by Dr. John D. Clark, also a member of the Council of Economic Advisers. Thereafter testimony will be presented by the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Charles Sawyer; the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. John W. Snyder; the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Maurice Tobin; the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Julius A. Krug; and the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Brannan.

Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency; Federal Security Administrator Oscar R. Ewing; Assistant Secretary of State Willard L. Thorpe; and Chairman Thomas B. McCabe, of the Federal Reserve Board, will conclude the presentation of the testimony which has been organized by Secretary Brannan on behalf of the administration.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report has invited a panel of nationally known economists and experts in the various problems which will be under consideration. Representatives of agricultural organizations, labor organizations, and business organizations have also been invited to attend the hearings, which will be concluded with two round table discussions, one by each of the groups which I have mentioned. These round table discussions will be conducted in public before the committee, in order to develop the best possible consensus of opinion regarding the economic situation.

In order that this information may be made available to as many readers as possible, I have had prepared a summary of the testimony which was offered this morning by the Vice Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Mr. Leon Keyserling. I ask unanimous consent that this summary of his statement, together with a table which shows the state of employment in the United States from January 1946 to 1947, and a table on consumers' prices for the period 1939 to 1948 may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

### INFLATION AND EMPLOYMENT

TESTIMONY OF LEON H. KEYSERLING, VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The Employment Act of 1946 has two basic objectives—economic stability and a continuing growth of the economy. At present the economic condition of the country is good, but there are maladjustments which if not stopped by appropriate action may produce unemployment and lower national income. While the prices of some farm products and foods have gone down in some areas, there are many strategically important parts of the economy in which prices are continuing to rise. Industrial prices have reached an all-time peak. The same contrast and imbalance between managed industrial prices and low farm prices that caused so much unemployment in the 1929–33 depression is beginning to appear again and could have similar consequences unless the danger is quickly recognized and firmly met.

There are six basic maladjustments in the current economic situation that require attention.

1. The cost of living has risen 74 percent since the middle of 1939, and 29 percent since the middle of 1946. The down-turn in the cost of living in recent weeks has thus far been only about 2 percent. At current costs clearly more than a fifth and probably a fourth of the families in the country do not have sufficient income to maintain what by scientific standards has been indicated as the minimum standard for maintenance of health and decency. People in the lowest income brackets have been hit hardest. Of those getting as little as $2,000, more than one-fourth suffered decreases in money income last year compared with 1947, and an additional 45 percent had no increases at all. On the other hand most of those already in the upper income brackets got further increases.

2. The relationship between industrial prices and farm prices has operated to the detriment of the farmer since the middle of 1946. "Since the last prewar year 1939, farm prices and incomes have risen more than most oher prices and incomes. This helped to redress the unfortunate position of the farmer in the prewar economy. But since the middle of 1946, industrial prices and incomes have been outpacing agricultural; since then, wholesale prices of farm products have risen 22 percent and of industrial commodities 45 percent * * * with per capita net income of persons on farms estimated at $909 in 1948, contrasting with $1,569 for persons not on farms, we again face the emergence of the traditional problem of maintaining agriculture in balance with the rest of the economy. The farmer's share of the consumer's dollar has dropped constantly since 1946." The cost of living can and should be reduced without driving farm income further downward. This can be accomplished by lower distributor margins, and by a comprehensive program of increased farm efficiency.

3. There are "sharp and continued increases in prices of certain vital industrial products. * * * On top of earlier price increases, during the second half of 1948 there were further increases in such significant categories of wholesale prices as fuel and lighting materials and house furnishings." Prices of metals and metal products increased 6.7 percent in the second half of 1947, 4.6 percent in the first half of 1948, 9.7 percent in the second half of 1948, and 2.2 percent during January 1949. In the second half of 1948, the price of zinc increased 44.4 percent and of lead 22.9 percent. "These continuing price increases, although selective, are at vital spots where they influence the whole economy. An unchecked upward trend of these prices, when farm prices have been falling and other prices softening, may lead to even more serious maladjustment than when almost all prices were rising together."

(4) "Consumer expenditures or demand have dropped from 76 percent of total output in 1929, and 75 percent in 1939, to only 70 percent in 1948. * * * Correspondingly compensation of employees as a share of total national income has dropped from 65.9 percent in 1939 to 61.5 percent in 1948, thus moving close to the undesirably low 58.1 percent of 1929; while business and professional income and corporate profits as a share of total national income are much higher than in 1929 and even more above the 1939 level. Readjustment in the current ratios, which cannot be sustained permanently, is essential if we are to maintain full demand for an increasing output of about 3 percent per year without a large and continuing increase in Government expenditures."

(5) "The aggregate of corporate profits has been running higher than needed to maintain current or even somewhat increased levels of business investment. Between 1947 and 1948, corporate profits after taxes increased by $2,700,000,000 and undistributed profits increased by $2,000,000,000, while there was a decline of $2,000,000,000 in corporate uses of funds." At the same time that small businesses are earning less profit in 1948 than in 1947, the larger corporations are able to finance a phenomenally high proportion of their operations from internal sources. Corporate stockholders received in dividends but 36.5 percent of net profits after taxes in

1948, contrasted with 69 percent in 1929 and 76 percent in 1939.

(6) "Some basic industries are not increasing their capacities sufficiently to attain the production levels required for the steady growth of a maximum employment economy." Instead, they are gearing their capacities to the assumption that in the future as in the past there will be a sharp drop in the business cycle. This assumption of recession or depression, in turn, increases the likelihood of the very evil against which reserves are being amassed. * * * The road to more production in the main is not higher prices and profits later on, but, instead, a rounded policy which adjusts prices and profits and capacities to a long period of stability and growth."

The easiest time to correct these maladjustments is before a crisis appears, that is now. The hardest time will be later on when neglect has actually produced the crisis. Those who are intelligent and conservative have long realized that a "stitch in time saves nine," but, unfortunately, sometimes the shiftless counsel of drift and do nothing is allowed to bring on damage that is irreparable.

*Labor force, 1946–49*

[Thousands of persons, 14 years of age and over]

| Month | Total labor force, including armed forces [1] | Civilian employment | | | Armed forces [1] | Unemployment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Total | Nonagricultural | Agricultural | | |
| 1946—January | 59,490 | 51,020 | 44,300 | 6,720 | 6,170 | 2,300 |
| February | 59,130 | 51,240 | 44,300 | 6,940 | 5,240 | 2,650 |
| March | 59,620 | 52,460 | 44,930 | 7,530 | 4,470 | 2,700 |
| April | 60,300 | 54,120 | 45,950 | 8,170 | 3,850 | 2,330 |
| May | 60,570 | 54,850 | 45,970 | 8,880 | 3,410 | 2,310 |
| June | 62,000 | 56,360 | 46,350 | 10,010 | 3,070 | 2,570 |
| July | 62,820 | 57,840 | 47,870 | 9,970 | 2,710 | 2,270 |
| August | 62,200 | 57,690 | 48,550 | 9,140 | 2,450 | 2,060 |
| September | 61,340 | 57,050 | 48,300 | 8,750 | 2,220 | 2,070 |
| October | 61,160 | 57,030 | 48,410 | 8,620 | 2,170 | 1,960 |
| November | 60,980 | 57,040 | 49,140 | 7,900 | 2,010 | 1,930 |
| December | 60,320 | 56,310 | 49,100 | 7,210 | 1,890 | 2,120 |
| 1947—January | 59,510 | 55,390 | 48,890 | 6,500 | 1,720 | 2,400 |
| February | 59,630 | 55,520 | 48,600 | 6,920 | 1,620 | 2,490 |
| March | 59,960 | 56,060 | 48,820 | 7,240 | 1,570 | 2,330 |
| April | 60,650 | 56,700 | 48,840 | 7,860 | 1,530 | 2,420 |
| May | 61,760 | 58,330 | 49,370 | 8,960 | 1,470 | 1,960 |
| June | 64,007 | 60,055 | 49,678 | 10,377 | 1,398 | 2,555 |
| July | 64,035 | 60,079 | 50,013 | 10,066 | 1,371 | 2,584 |
| August | 63,017 | 59,569 | 50,594 | 8,975 | 1,352 | 2,096 |
| September | 62,130 | 58,872 | 50,145 | 8,727 | 1,346 | 1,912 |
| October | 62,219 | 59,204 | 50,583 | 8,622 | 1,327 | 1,687 |
| November | 61,510 | 58,595 | 50,609 | 7,985 | 1,294 | 1,621 |
| December | 60,870 | 57,947 | 50,985 | 6,962 | 1,280 | 1,643 |
| 1948—January | 60,455 | 57,149 | 50,089 | 7,060 | 1,241 | 2,065 |
| February | 61,004 | 57,139 | 50,368 | 6,771 | 1,226 | 2,639 |
| March | 61,005 | 57,329 | 50,482 | 6,847 | 1,236 | 2,440 |
| April | 61,760 | 58,330 | 50,883 | 7,448 | 1,236 | 2,193 |
| May | 61,660 | 58,600 | 50,800 | 7,861 | 1,238 | 1,761 |
| June | 64,740 | 61,296 | 51,899 | 9,396 | 1,261 | 2,184 |
| July | 65,135 | 61,615 | 52,452 | 9,163 | 1,293 | 2,227 |
| August | 64,511 | 61,245 | 52,801 | 8,444 | 1,325 | 1,941 |
| September | 63,578 | 60,312 | 51,590 | 8,723 | 1,366 | 1,899 |
| October | 63,166 | 60,134 | 51,506 | 8,627 | 1,391 | 1,642 |
| November | 63,138 | 59,893 | 51,932 | 7,961 | 1,414 | 1,831 |
| December | 62,828 | 59,434 | 52,059 | 7,375 | 1,453 | 1,941 |
| 1949—January | 61,546 | 57,414 | 50,651 | 6,763 | 1,468 | 2,664 |

[1] Excludes about 150,000 members of the armed forces.

NOTE.—Detail will not necessarily add to totals because of rounding.

Source: Department of Commerce.

*Consumers' prices, 1939–48, for moderate-income families in large cities*

| Period | All items [1] | Food | Apparel | Rent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1935–39=100 | | | |
| Monthly average: | | | | |
| 1939 | 99.4 | 95.2 | 100.5 | 104.3 |
| 1940 | 100.2 | 96.6 | 101.7 | 104.6 |
| 1941 | 105.2 | 105.5 | 106.3 | 105.2 |
| 1942 | 116.5 | 123.9 | 124.2 | 108.5 |
| 1943 | 123.6 | 138.0 | 129.7 | 108.0 |
| 1944 | 125.5 | 136.1 | 138.8 | 108.2 |
| 1945 | 128.4 | 139.1 | 145.9 | 108.3 |
| 1946 | 139.3 | 159.6 | 160.2 | 108.6 |
| 1947 | 159.2 | 193.8 | 185.8 | 111.2 |
| 1948 | 171.2 | 210.2 | 198.0 | 117.4 |
| 1939—June | 98.6 | 93.6 | 100.3 | 104.3 |
| 1946—June | 133.3 | 145.6 | 157.2 | 108.5 |
| 1947—June | 157.1 | 190.5 | 185.7 | 109.2 |
| 1948—January | 168.8 | 209.7 | 192.1 | 115.9 |
| February | 167.5 | 204.7 | 195.1 | 116.0 |
| March | 166.9 | 202.3 | 196.3 | 116.3 |
| April | 169.3 | 207.9 | 196.4 | 116.3 |
| May | 170.5 | 210.9 | 197.5 | 116.7 |
| June | 171.7 | 214.1 | 196.9 | 117.0 |
| July | 173.7 | 216.8 | 197.1 | 117.3 |
| August | 174.5 | 216.6 | 199.7 | 117.7 |
| September | 174.5 | 215.2 | 201.0 | 118.5 |
| October | 173.6 | 211.5 | 201.6 | 118.7 |
| November | 172.2 | 207.5 | 201.4 | 118.8 |
| December | 171.4 | 205.0 | 200.4 | 119.5 |
| | Percentage Increases | | | |
| Since June 1939 [2] | 74 | 119 | 100 | 15 |
| Since June 1946 [2] | 29 | 41 | 27 | 10 |
| Since June 1947 [2] | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 |

[1] Also includes housefurnishings, fuel, electricity, and refrigeration, and miscellaneous goods and services.

[2] To December 1948, latest data available.

Source: Department of Labor.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington to fill an existing vacancy, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McGRATH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

## TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry Alfred Curtis to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to make an announcement for the benefit of Members of the Senate. When the Senate concludes its business today, it is planned to adjourn until Thursday next. I see no reason why we should be here for any considerable length of time on Thursday. At the conclusion of business on Thursday, it is planned that the Senate shall adjourn until Monday.

I now move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 8, 1949:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington to fill an existing vacancy.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 8, 1949:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Harry Alfred Curtis to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority for the term expiring 9 years after May 18, 1948.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dale Crowley, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, God of all mercy and grace:

With grateful hearts, we acknowledge that Thou hast wonderfully blest our Nation. We ask that Thou wilt give to all Thy servants a sense of true thanksgiving, and with this an awareness of our stewardship before Thee. Grant that every man in this Chamber today, and every day, may think not merely of his responsibility to his constituents, but especially of his high trusteeship under God. Like Daniel Webster, exemplary statesman that he was, may our foremost thought be our accountability to God.

Give wisdom, so that we may be able to discern between the right and the wrong. Give courage, that we may ever stand for that which is true. Give humility, that we may walk before Thee

acceptably; and give devotion, that we may serve Thee faithfully. We ask it in the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANDERSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. SHAFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

RENT CONTROL

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill on the controversial subject of rent control.

It is a bill that preserves the basic fundamentals of free enterprise. At the same time it prevents tenants from being gouged by the small percentage of landlords who might with justification be termed "unscrupulous and selfish." The bill provides for decontrol, but at the same time it permits any tenant who is about to be gouged the right of appeal to a local board composed of citizens in his own county. I recommend that the Members of this body study this particular measure. It will allow free collective bargaining between individual tenants and landlords with the local board acting as the final arbiter if the landlord refuses to be fair and just. We must remember that rent is merely the wage of the people who have been thrifty enough over the years to save sufficient funds to own an equity in real property. Under the present rent-control law and under the administration's proposed bill, the Government sets the rent and there is no attempt made to allow a gradual relaxation of rent control. Instead controls are to be extended for 27 months and the regulations are to be more stringent. My bill will act as a steam valve to protect the many tenants, but at the same time it will preserve the fundamentals of free enterprise.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DAGUE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in the first to include an editorial from the Philadelphia Enquirer, and in the second to include a letter from Time magazine.

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution on statehood for Hawaii.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was granted permission to extend her remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a magazine article written by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. LYNCH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR MEN AND WOMEN

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 I introduced House Joint Resolution 68, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

This resolution is nonpartisan. It has been a plank in the Republican national platform in 1940, 1944, and 1948.

It has been a plank in the Democratic national platform in 1944 and 1948.

It was also a plank in the Progressive Party's national platform in 1948.

For these reasons many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have joined me as cosponsors of the resolution and we hope that the two major parties will live up to the promises, oft repeated in their platforms.

The following Congressmen are cosponsors of this resolution: FRANK BUCHANAN, J. HARRY MCGREGOR, WILLIAM LEMKE, ERNEST K. BRAMBLETT, A. L. MILLER, THURMOND CHATHAM, EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, THRUSTON B. MORTON, ROBERT F. RICH, CLARE MAGEE, ROBERT T. SECREST, TOBEY MORRIS, GORDON L. MCDONOUGH, F. EDWARD HÉBERT, CHESTER A. CHESNEY, CHARLES B. DEANE, HENDERSON LANHAM, FRANK W. BOYKIN, WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, HOMER D. ANGELL, JAMES F. LIND, DANIEL A. REED, CHARLES E. BENNETT, HOWARD W. SMITH, EDWARD A. GARMATZ, FRANK A. BARRETT, ANTHONY CAVALCANTE, M. G. BURNSIDE, JACK Z. ANDERSON, ROBERT J. CORBETT, WAYNE L. HAYS, THOR C. TOLLEFSON, BOYD TACKETT, BRENT SPENCE, CHRISTIAN A. HERTER, DONALD L. JACKSON, RALPH W. GWINN, CLINTON D. MCKINNON, HARRY L. TOWE, W. G. STIGLER, WILLIAM T. BYRNE, WALT HORAN, JAMES S. GOLDEN, FRANCIS CASE, MORGAN M. MOULDER, CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, B. W. KEARNEY, PAUL CUNNINGHAM, ABRAHAM J. MULTER, JAMES G. FULTON, CLIFFORD DAVIS, EDWARD JENISON, JOHN PHILLIPS, JAMES G. POLK, EARL WILSON, WILBUR D. MILLS, WILLIAM P. BOLTON, E. H. HEDRICK, TOM B. FUGATE, CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, H. R. GROSS, G. R. WITHROW, RICHARD NIXON, RICHARD W. HOFFMAN, CLAIR ENGLE, JOHN R. MURDOCK, EDWIN ARTHUR HALL, ISIDORE DOLLINGER, DWIGHT L. ROGERS, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, CHARLES P. NELSON, TOM STEED, IVOR D. FENTON, A. S. HERLONG, JAMES T. PATTERSON, OTTO E. PASSMAN, CECIL M. HARDEN, DAYTON E. PHILLIPS.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H. R. 2389, a bill providing for the establishment of a National Commission on Governmental Relations. At that time I emphasized the vital need for such a Commission and for a study such as the bill directs it to make, especially with respect to the fiscal problems existing among the various levels of government.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I urged that other Members of the Congress, without respect to political affiliation, join with me in sponsoring this legislation. Consequently, it is with real pleasure and deep gratitude that I am able to report to the Members of this House that a bill identical with H. R. 2389 was introduced in the other body of the Congress yesterday by eight distinguished Members. S. 810 was introduced by Senator HENDRICKSON, of New Jersey, for himself and for Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin; Senator BRICKER, of Ohio; my colleague, Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware; Senator SMITH, of New Jersey; Senator SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas; Senator IVES, of New York; and Senator O'CONOR, of Maryland.

Let me say again, Mr. Speaker, that I very much appreciate the interest of those distinguished Senators in this important matter. I also reiterate my statement of yesterday in the House, to the effect that I will welcome the introduction into the House of identical bills by any of the distinguished gentlemen in this Chamber.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the legislative business of the day and any other special orders I may address the House today for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may sit today during the general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

THE TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the world stands aghast at the accusation, trial, and punishment of the martyr, Cardinal Mindszenty. We are filled with horror and anger at this travesty of justice. Not only is the cardinal on trial, but all free men are being tried; all religions are on trial. The dignity of man is trampled upon. The honor of the church is defiled. Today it is a Catholic prelate that communism lays foul hands upon. Tomorrow it is a rabbi, and the next day a Protestant minister.

The lesson that burns into our consciousness is the need to purge the world of communism and its poison. The antidote is vigorous protest, followed up by appropriate economic sanctions, if necessary, by free nations, headed by the United States, if Hungary continues her dreadful and dreaded practices against the cardinal.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WALTER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARING, Mr. GARMATZ, and Mr. COLE of Kansas asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances, in one to include an address by Governor Sparks, of Alabama.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech on health insurance.

Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the American magazine of December 11, 1948, on Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. COOPER, Mr. MILLS, and Mr. REED of New York asked and were given permission to revise and extend the remarks they expect to make in the Committee of the Whole today and to include excerpts of material to which they may refer.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a statement he made this morning before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a report from the welfare board of the county in which the Sioux Indians reside.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and to include extraneous matter.

UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, 75,000,000 people now own United States savings bonds. Plans are now being made for the spring campaign to stimulate even greater participation in bond-buying. Meanwhile the Savings Bond Division of the United States Treasury is seeking an official bond song to be sung and played on all appropriate occasions. The peace-time song will replace Irving Berlin's great war-time song, Any Bonds Today? As a member of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., I am proud to announce that the Treasury's quest is assured of success. The Treasury turned to the SPEBSQSA's 26,000 members, and invited them to produce the song. Entries are pouring in to International Secretary Carroll P. Adams in Detroit headquarters of the Society, and many more entries are expected before the competition closes February 15. Two thousand barber shop quartets have volunteered their services to the Treasury to sing the song at rallies scheduled in every State in the Union. Ed Place, of the Washington, D. C., chapter, whose 100-man singing capital chorus recently entertained the society's No. 1 member, President Truman, at the inaugural gala, is in charge of the savings bond song competition for SPEBSQSA. He has extended an invitation to a Congressional quartet to introduce the winning song, and I am sure that this body can supply the necessary harmonizers and harmony to assist the savings bond campaign in such a manner. The SPEBSQSA motto, Keep America Singing, will soon be augmented by Keep America Saving. It is gratifying to know that this rapidly growing public-spirited organization of male harmonizers will hold its annual midwinter meeting in the District of Columbia in January 1950. There is no finer recreation or hobby than lifting our voices in song, and it is pleasing to know that the Nation's Capital is leading the way in this great pastime.

DECISIVE FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, as we open hearings today on the European recovery program it becomes clearer than ever that our own national security and world peace are far from being a certainty. The European recovery program has saved Europe from communism, but democracy is losing China, and the United States seems impotent to even try to stop it. We must develop an immediate, vigorous, and affirmative program in Asia, and we must at the same time further fortify democracy's position in Europe and the Middle East. We are learning in Europe that a recovery program without economic and even political unity—is recovery without a point.

Mr. Speaker, our foreign policy must take the logical next step and insist that the regional groupings organized in recovery programs become regional economic and political federations—this is the true intent of the Vandenberg resolution—and the basis for an ultimate world federal government, man's hope for permanent peace.

There are appended two articles from today's Washington Post bearing on this very question:

EUROPEAN UNION

(By Sumner Welles)

SHADOW INSTEAD OF SUBSTANCE

I wonder if there is much justification for the enthusiastic reception which public opinion in the United States has given the announcement that the five Brussels pact countries have agreed upon a project for a Council of Europe.

The present plan is unquestionably a weak compromise. It rejects the French contention that a powerful European parliament should be constituted. It accepts the British thesis that nothing should now be done beyond the creation of machinery to facilitate inter-governmental cooperation between the western European countries.

So far nothing in fact has been settled except for an agreement that a constitution is to be drafted which will provide for a ministerial committee meeting in private, in which every country will have a veto power, and a consultative body meeting in public, which will be given no authority whatever. The British suggest that the council should hold its first meeting in Strasbourg before 1950 and the five Brussels pact countries have also agreed that Italy and other European countries are to be asked to join as founding members.

The project makes no provision for the limitation of national sovereignties. It possesses no real vitality. It responds to no overwhelming popular demand for a people's union. It ignores the eloquent and urgent warnings of the handful of statesmen that Europe still possesses, such as Churchill, Herriot, Reynaud, Blum, and Sforza, that Europe's only hope of salvation lies in political and economic federation.

Outside of the cooperative measures required by the European recovery program the only practical steps that have so far been taken to lay the foundation for such a federation are the economic agreements between Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg, and the agreement between France and Italy for a customs union.

There are several reasons for Britain's obstinate refusal to acquiesce in the demands

of the continental countries for the establishment of a European parliament possessing wide powers.

The British delegate on the permanent commission, Hugh Dalton, alleged that Britain opposed a European parliament which could overside national governments.

The continental governments have now learned that the British Labor Party is determined to reject any plan for European union which might hamper its ability to carry out its own internal policies or limit its capacity to impose economic controls and pursue its present course of rigid bilateral trading.

The British Government also differs radically with France and with Germany's other western neighbors concerning the kind of Germany we are to see in the future.

The basic British viewpoint is succinctly expressed in the Economist's recent complaint that the French "strain at the gnat of German nationalism but are willing to swallow the camel of European instability." In other words, the British feel that the French should acquiesce in the resurrection of German power as a bulwark against Soviet Russia.

It is the viewpoint of the 1920's all over again. The fact that France, after the First World War, was so tragically right in her fear of German nationalism and the English-speaking powers so tragically wrong in their insistence that there was no cause for apprehension seems to count for nothing in Downing Street.

It is also a strange anomaly that the cartels and vested interests in the continental countries that are out to sabotage any kind of European union which could deprive them of the benefits they have so long derived from customs barriers and exchange controls should now be joining hands with Britain's Socialist government in impeding, if not permanently blocking, the creation of that form of European union with Clement Attlee himself only 2 years ago officially proclaimed to be Europe's one chance for survival.

The United States until now has limited itself to a few platitudinous expressions of pleasure that plans for a European union should be under way. Yet is such a shadow of a European union as that now projected likely to be of any practical benefit to the United States or to become a regional bloc capable of strengthening the foundations of the United Nations?

It is generally admitted here in Washington that western Europe will still be a long way from recovery when the European recovery program ends in 1952. It is also believed that only a far-reaching political and economic union can make western Europe self-supporting. The negotiations for the North Atlantic defense pact have clearly shown that in many parts of western Europe there is already a trend toward regional isolation rather than toward a pooling of sovereign rights in the common interest. It would certainly seem to be plain that only a real and vital European federation, such as that envisaged by Mr. Churchill, could prevent a return to such a fractionized western Europe as that which made possible the catastrophe of 1939.

The State Department has properly refused to use the European recovery program as a means of influencing the national policies of the Marshall plan countries. But is there any valid reason why the countries which are receiving help under the European recovery program and which will obtain arms for self-defense as a result of the North Atlantic defense pact should not be frankly told that one of the principal ends sought by the American people in return for their sacrifices on behalf of western Europe is a real federation of the western European countries.

Might it not be the better part of wisdom for us to adopt before it is too late a less negative attitude with regard to this vital issue?

---

PARTNERS OR ALLIES

Only in the last few weeks has it dawned on the world that the United States and the Soviet Union are locked in a deadly struggle for allies in the next war. This is the lesson of the tug-of-war over Norway. The Soviet refuses to accept the Norwegian answer as the clarification that it sought of Norway's stand on the Atlantic Pact. And assuming that Moscow had any right to call for any such clarification, the answer was indeed cryptic. Norway said she would not permit the establishment of foreign bases on Norwegian soil "as long as Norway is not attacked or subjected to threats of attack." Russia rightly construes the explanation as leaving the Norwegians a free hand to determine the conditions which would persuade them to put bases in Norway at the disposal of the United States.

Moscow, however, chooses to ignore the fact that Norway is already bound solemnly under the United Nations to keep the peace. If the Soviet would be reassured by another pledge, it is doubtful whether Norway would. For a nonaggression pact in the Soviet lexicon has become the entering wedge of aggression. Cases in point are all the peace treaties that Moscow signed with the Balkan states. The fate of Czechoslovakia, in particular, makes a mockery of the Soviet request. Before the war the Soviet was the first to recognize that a nonaggression undertaking by Nazi Germany meant nothing, and first Litvinov and then Molotov insisted on spelling out all the phases of aggression, both internal and external; and then demanded guaranties. Stalin has taken a leaf out of Hitler's copybook. The plain fact, as the world no less than Norway sees it, is that as a result of Soviet postwar actions there is absent in relations with the Soviet Union the basic ingredient of what is now called a nonself-operating agreement, viz, good faith. It could thus be taken for granted that even if Norway were to sign a nonaggression pact with Soviet Russia, she would not thereby be deterred from seeking closer association with the Atlantic nations.

However, the occasion might be taken to reexamine the nature of the particular kind of Atlantic association under discussion. Why limit the association to a military alliance providing for the acquisition of bases, for arms consignments, and for a pledge to wage war together? If we feel a sense of association with western Europe, why not offer an association for peace as well as for war? Metternich said after the Napoleonic wars that "a unifying idea" was the foundation of postwar reconstruction and pacification. The "unifying idea" of his day was legitimacy of government. Today it is freedom and union—as the free peoples all recognize in their dreams, though their governments are not guided by it. Specifically, before this country sets its hand to a military alliance and embarks on a course that all history teaches will infallibly lead to war, let us issue a call for a constitutional assembly for the consideration of a grand Federal Union.

Such a call from the United States—the "music maker" for the free world—would lift the present discussions onto a new plane. It would reach peoples as well as governments, and inspire them to lift up their voices in an irresistible demonstration. In their hearts they want to relate themselves to other peoples. They know that distance has been annihilated, that what affects one affects evedybody; yet they see their governments building up vested and nationalistic interests in such things as fighting currencies, state trading systems, and other forms of anarchy. It must seem to them defeatist as well as senseless. They cannot be encouraged, either, by the spectacle that this reversion to pathological nationalism is being financed under ERP, though, to be sure, the ERP ideal is eventually to create interdependence out of a sturdier independence.

Is it not remarkable that the first thing to be forgotten in time of peace is our war aims? Cannot we see that in all the postwar schemes of pacification and reconstruction we have undershot the mark? Partnership is the effective alliance, and the only one. Before the reaction to a mere military alliance gets altogether crystallized, an effort to realize the aspirations of the men who have had to fight a couple of world wars in the last 35 years ought to be explored, and the idea of a great community taken out of the hearts of mankind and given some form and substance.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he delivered before the thirtieth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, February 7, on the subject, A Sound Program of Flood Control and River and Harbor Improvements Must Be Maintained.

THE PANAMA CANAL

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress now has before it a question of national and international significance—the Panama Canal.

An important contribution to the many discussions of this subject was published in the Proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers, January 1949, volume 75, No. I, pages 143–145, in the form of a technical discussion by Harry Outen Cole, a consulting engineer of Morgantown, W. Va.

Mr. Cole is an engineer of great distinction who knows the Panama Canal and the problems related thereto, based upon his own personal knowledge as resident engineer of the Pacific division of the Canal, including the Pacific locks. His words will carry great weight.

I urge that every Member of the Congress and all others who are interested in the Canal question read his illuminatory discussion, which should go a long way toward clarifying the issues.

TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1949

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1211, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] is recognized.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, since erroneous charges have appeared in the press that might lead some Members of the House to conclude that there was inadequate opportunity to be heard on this bill, it may be helpful to compare the background of the present bill with the procedure adopted by the Republican majority in the disposition of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948.

Last year, a subcommittee conducted the hearings on this important legislation. This year, hearings were held by the full committee.

The 1948 hearings were held behind closed doors with the press and public barred, and with a number of people deprived not only of the opportunity to be heard, but also of the right to know what other witnesses were saying before the subcommittee. In contrast, the hearings on H. R. 1211 were open to press and public and everyone who sought an opportunity to be heard was permitted to testify. Last year, although hearings were held for 6 days from May 3 to May 8, 1948, a bill was not introduced in the House until May 24. In contrast, the committee this year has had from the beginning of the hearings the benefit of knowing precisely the terms of the bill upon which the hearings were being held.

Last year the time allotted between proponents and opponents of the reciprocal-trade program was divided equally, that is, 3 days to a side. This year, the opposition had 4 days while the proponents had but 3 days. Even the terms of debate on the floor are more advantageous to the present minority than those prescribed by them when they were in control of the Eightieth Congress. Under the agreed procedure any Member will have an opportunity to offer an amendment to H. R. 1211 while last year the Republicans brought their bill to the House under a closed rule under which there was no opportunity for amendment whatever. If ever there has been a full, fair, and free hearing, discussion and deliberation of any legislation, it has been provided for the pending bill.

The bill under consideration by the House to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended, and for other purposes, will, if enacted into law, restore and unshackle the authority of the President to enter into foreign trade agreements. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, Eightieth Congress, was written by the foes and not the friends of the reciprocal trade method of dealing with tariffs and international trade. It was proposed and sponsored by those who on every previous occasion had opposed and voted against the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act beginning with 1934 and continuing to 1948.

The reciprocal trade method of dealing with tariff problems had proved so popular with the people of the country that its opponents would not risk an open effort to wipe it off the statute books, but attacked it by flank movement by the substitution of a bill which weakened, emasculated, and crippled the original act.

When the President reluctantly signed the 1948 act he protested that—

> The act prescribes a new complicated, time-consuming, and unnecessary procedure for the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements. This change in procedure will necessarily hamper and obstruct the negotiation of new agreements, a defect which is particularly undesirable in view of the act's limitation to a single year.

However, the President, loyal to his constitutional duty, proceeded to schedule reciprocal trade negotiations with 13 foreign countries, beginning in April. In his letter to me of January 8, 1949, the President requested that the Committee on Ways and Means take up the extension of the Trade Agreements Act, without hampering amendments, at the earliest possible date. He further stated:

> The restrictive provisions and limited extension of the present trade agreements law materially hamper the effectiveness of United States participation in this effort. That is why it is so important that the existing Trade Agreements Act be promptly repealed, and that the act as it existed on March 1, 1948, be extended for a further substantial period. I suggest that this period be until June 12, 1951.

ORIGIN OF RECIPROCAL TRADE PROGRAM

In order to view the reciprocal trade program in its proper perspective, we should never forget that it was conceived by the eminent, respected and revered world statesman, Hon. Cordell Hull. Of the many magnificent contributions Mr. Hull has made to his own country and to the world community of nations, no star of his achievement shines more brightly than his reciprocal trade program. Cordell Hull, in my judgment, will be rated by future historians as one of the greatest statesmen America has ever produced. If Cordell Hull in all his long public career ever said or did an unwise thing, I never heard of it.

I distinctly remember his appearance before the Committee on Ways and Means on March 8, 1934—the same committee on which he had served so illustriously for 18 years. In his appearance on this occasion he soundly advised our committee as follows:

> Extreme obstructions to international trade inevitably result in serious economic controversies or wars, the minimum of commerce between nations, constant over-production through lack of facilities for distribution, together with every sort of artificial device to deal with the domestic price situation, vast idleness of labor, and emigration of capital into thousands of foreign industrial plants, to say nothing of the difficulties of effecting transfers of debt service due from one country to another. The alternative policy would appear to comprise a liberalization of the existing obstructions and restrictions by degrees and over a period of time through careful trade arrangements, to a more moderate and reasonable basis.

That was 15 years ago. The wisdom of his advice was appreciated and followed by the Committee on Ways and Means and the bill was approved on June 18, 1934, which was the first Trade Agreements Act.

HISTORY OF THE OPERATION OF THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Trade Agreements Act brought forth a basic change in our tariff philosophy. In the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930, and other high tariff measures, the ruling philosophy was that the determination of the United States tariff was solely and exclusively a matter of domestic concern. Rates were fixed at inordinately high levels to conform to the wishes of domestic producers with little or no consideration given to the importance of our export trade or the American consumer.

It will be remembered that when the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was under consideration it was opposed by the Tariff Commission, although our friends who opposed the Hull tariff policy now seem to lay great weight on the opinion of the Tariff Commission.

It may be helpful to remember that more than one thousand eminent economists throughout the country warned those in charge of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill that, if it should be enacted into law, serious economic consequences would ensue. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, although heralded as a harbinger of national prosperity, was followed by the worst economic catastrophe in the history of our Government. Although it was proposed as a means of abolishing poverty and spreading prosperity throughout the land, the country experienced exactly the opposite. Under its operations industry was bankrupt, agriculture paralyzed, labor pauperized, banks failed by the thousands, and the economy of the country was shattered almost beyond belief or description, almost to the point of a revolution.

The Trade Agreements Act policy, on the other hand, recognized that tariffs are a proper subject for discussion and negotiation between and among countries interested in either import or export trade, or both.

The act, up to 1948, authorized the President to reduce excessively high tariffs up to 50 percent, not arbitrarily, but in return for concessions from foreign countries when it could be done to the mutual benefit of each. It is a repudiation of economic isolation.

Since 1934 agreements have been consummated with more than 40 foreign countries, which together with the United States account for the preponderant part of world trade. Tariffs and other barriers to trade have been progressively and selectively reduced or removed so as to facilitate the flow of profitable trade and thereby improve the standard of living and enhance the prosperity of the many countries concerned. Our many agricultural and industrial producers whose output is in excess of domestic requirements must find a profitable outlet abroad for their surpluses and in return take foreign products which are necessary either as raw materials to keep our industrial machine running or as consumer goods to supplement our own production.

How can opponents of the reciprocal trade program seriously contend that our national economy has been impaired when national income has increased from $48,600,000,000 in 1934 to $224,000,000,000 in 1948? Has business been hurt,

or seriously threatened, when income from manufacturing has increased sevenfold? When agriculture, which relies heavily upon foreign markets for disposal of surplus crops, has increased its cash income from six and one-half billion dollars in 1934 to more than 31 billions in 1948?

Of course sole credit is not claimed by the friends of reciprocal trade for all these achievements, but it can be truthfully asserted that the Trade Agreements Act has played a major part in our prewar economic recovery. While no law can make us immune from the horrors of war, it is a significant fact that in World War II we did not engage in conflict with a single reciprocal trade agreement country.

Department of Commerce figures show that United States exports to trade agreement countries for the 2 years 1934–35, as compared with the 2 years 1938–39, increased 63 percent with trade agreement countries as against an increase of only 32 percent with nonagreement countries. Imports into the United States increased but 12½ percent from nonagreement countries in comparison with an increase of 27 percent from agreement countries. Our total exports for 1948 amounted to nearly $17,000,000,000 while imports totaled slightly more than $10,000,000,000. The balance in our favor in our foreign trade at present is being made up largely by grants and loans to foreign governments, but every sound thinker knows this cannot continue without national bankruptcy. Consequently, if we are to sell abroad the surpluses of our farms, mines, and factories we must take in payment goods from other countries in such quantities and on such terms as will not seriously affect or injure our domestic producers.

PROCEDURES PRIOR TO 1948 COMPARED WITH PRESENT LAW

Under the Trade Agreements Act, prior to the 1948 amendments, the following procedures were in effect:

The Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, just as under existing law, served as the agency through which the President obtained advice and information before negotiating a trade agreement. The broadest interests of American agriculture, industry, and labor, and of national security were represented on the Trade Agreements Committee by a member of the Tariff Commission and by persons designated by the Secretaries of State, Treasury, War, Navy, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor. The information and advice submitted to the Trade Agreements Committee were from three principal sources:

(a) Interested persons, including, of course, domestic producers, might either submit statements or briefs or appear in person at public hearings. I have heard of no complaint in the hearings that interested parties have been denied courteous and impartial treatment.

(b) The Tariff Commission made a study of the imports and the effect of possible concessions.

(c) The Department of Commerce made a similar study with respect to each export item considered for inclusion in a trade agreement. The Trade Agreements Committee then made its recommendations to the President, who made the final decision respecting the items included for negotiation and the extent of concessions to be offered. If any member of the Trade Agreements Committee dissented, the President was provided with a full report giving the reasons for the dissent.

The foregoing procedure provided an adequate opportunity for all interested parties to be heard before a trade agreement was negotiated. The interest of specific producers was balanced against and considered along with the over-all interest, first of the general public, then of industry, labor, agriculture, and our military, financial, and foreign policies.

The above procedures were found to operate effectively and efficiently in enabling the United States to take the initiative toward reduction and elimination of barriers to world trade. Since 1942, moreover, domestic industry has had the protection of both the careful preparation before actual negotiation of a trade agreement and also of the insertion of an "escape clause" in each agreement. Under this escape clause, concessions made with respect to any article may be modified or withdrawn if, as a result of unforeseen developments and of a concession in the trade agreement, any article on which a concession has been granted is being imported in such increased quantities and under such conditions as to cause or threaten serious injury to any domestic industry.

I am advised by the Acting Chairman of the Tariff Commission that, as of January 31, 1949, only three applications had been filed under an escape clause. Two of the applications—one on marrons and one on whisky—have been dismissed, while the third, on spring clothespins, is still pending.

Apparently domestic industries have not considered themselves seriously injured or threatened with serious injury, else they would have invoked the escape clause procedures more frequently.

Despite the great benefits to our national economy and the maintenance of our leadership in international trade, and the safeguards to domestic producers, a hostile majority in the Eightieth Congress skillfully and deliberately set about hamstringing that program that they did not dare attempt abolish.

Despite overwhelming public sentiment to the contrary, the House passed a bill so bad that Secretary of State Marshall advised me in a letter that "our national interests would be better served to permit the Trade Agreements Act to expire than for H. R. 6556 to be enacted."

Despite modification in the other body of the deadly restrictions voted by the House, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, as finally enacted, and reluctantly approved by the President, imposed the following hampering limitations upon the tried and tested procedures previously in effect:

First. The Tariff Commission could no longer be represented on the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee to advise and consult with the President in preparing for trade-agreement negotiations.

Second. The President was prohibited from negotiating any trade agreement until he had received a report from the Tariff Commission fixing a peril point, or minimum tariff level, on each article to be considered for possible modification of duties, or until 120 days had elapsed.

Third. On the firing line of actual negotiation with experts of foreign countries, the President was denied the participation and assistance of some of the best qualified personnel in our own Government—the members of the Tariff Commission and their staff.

Fourth. If in the over-all national interest, the President negotiated a reduction in tariff rates below the minimum recommended by the Tariff Commission—whose only concern under existing law is the interest of the specific domestic industry—then he must be subjected to the spectacle of a public justification of his actions to the Congress.

The bill under consideration would remove the restrictions of the 1948 act and would clear the path for the negotiations with 13 countries scheduled to begin in April, and would eliminate the doubt created by the Eightieth Congress whether the United States has definitely and permanently turned away from economic and political isolationism.

ENACTMENT OF H. R. 1211 ESSENTIAL TO OUR FOREIGN POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

Every interested representative of the executive branch of the Government—the President, the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of Agriculture, Secretary of Commerce, Secretary of Labor and Economic Cooperation Administrator—have advised that the revival and extension of the reciprocal trade program for another period of 3 years from June 12, 1948, without the crippling amendments contained in the present law, is essential to the success of our foreign economic policy.

Assistant Secretary of State Thorp testified:

> The trade agreements program is an integral part of our over-all program for the world economic recovery.
>
> * * * Viewed in that perspective, it is perfectly clear to me that the trade agreements program must continue in the form which will render it most effective; namely, the form introduced in H. R. 1211, the form which has stood the test of experience for 14 years.

Secretary of the Treasury Snyder wrote on January 24, 1949:

> Far-reaching developments in world economic relationships require that we plan for a changed basis for international economic stability, if our friendly partners in the world community are generally to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The careful and selective study and progressive elimination of trade barriers must go hand in hand with the programs of financial assistance we are administering. For this reason, I consider the reciprocal trade agreements program to play a vital role in supporting our foreign financial policies.

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan reported the direct interest of the American farmer as follows:

> The farmers of this country normally produce many commodities in greater quantities than are required for use in the United States. Any acceptable United States farm program, therefore, must be associated with a program for keeping open the channels of

international trade in a manner that will permit United States agricultural products to compete abroad. The American farmer must not have his products excluded from foreign markets by excessive tariffs and other barriers or discriminated against through preferences and other special deals between foreign governments.

Secretary of Commerce Sawyer observed in a letter dated January 25, 1949, with regard to American producers and consumers that—

The tariff adjustments which have resulted have benefited our consumers at a time when supplies were short. The concessions received from other countries have also been of significance to some of our exporters.

Secretary of Labor Tobin wrote on January 28, 1949:

I need not dwell at length on the interest of American workers and their families in the continuation of the trade-agreements program. High levels of world trade mean high standards of living at home, making available to labor those materials and products that can be produced most efficiently abroad, and making available to workers abroad, both for consumption and for economic development, what we produce in the United States.

Economic Cooperation Administrator Hoffman warned:

ECA's interest in reciprocal trade agreements legislation stems from the basic objectives for the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 which are to furnish materials and financial assistance to the participating countries in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this title * * *.

An increase in the world volume of trade is not only desirable but vitally necessary if the other countries are to recover their ability to pay their own way.

Opposition witnesses and members of the minority have recklessly asserted that the reciprocal trade program has jeopardized our national security by threatening, or injuring, domestic industries essential to the defense of our country.

It is argued, at page 6 of the minority report, that the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission should be continued so that the findings of the Commission as to the point below which tariff reduction might endanger our vital industries will be known to the President.

Of course, there is nothing whatever in the 1948 act that requires the Tariff Commission to consider anything more than the private interests of domestic producers. There is not a single word in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 that requires the Tariff Commission to consider the national defense in fixing its peril point. If this factor is so important why was it not written into the 1948 act?

In a deliberate effort to becloud the issue by attributing to the trade-agreements program perennial financial embarrassment of one manufacturer of jeweled watches, the minority report reprints a letter addressed to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] by Lt. Gen. LeR. Lutes, Director of the Staff of the Munitions Board.

This letter states, in brief, that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the American jewel-watch industry is vital to the defense of the United States.

In order to clarify the record finally and permanently, insofar as the watch industry is concerned, I wrote Secretary of Defense Forrestal, the member of the President's Cabinet whose uppermost consideration at all times is the maintenance of our national security, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In the recent hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act there has been some conflicting testimony whether the reciprocal trade authority has been administered in such a way as to impair the important role of the domestic watch industry in our program of national defense.

Will you please give me your opinion on this question? Inasmuch as the bill H. R. 1211, to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, is scheduled for debate in the House early next week, your expeditious consideration of this inquiry will be appreciated.

On February 4, 1949, Secretary Forrestal replied as follows:

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of February 3, 1949, requesting my views on the question of whether the reciprocal trade authority has been administered in such a way as to impair the important role of the domestic watch industry in our program of national defense.

The domestic jewel watch industry has fulfilled its role in our program of national defense, and I am not aware that its capabilities have been adversely affected by the reciprocal trade authority.

It is true, as General Lutes pointed out in his letter of February 1, 1949, to Representative THOMAS E. MARTIN, a copy of which I sent you the other day, that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the American jewel-watch industry is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved. I believe, however, that the trade agreements program is so designed as to permit adequate protection in this regard. For example: The program offers an excellent means of protecting those industries considered vital to the national security by the retention of tariffs. The National Military Establishment member on the inter-departmental committee which administers the law has frequently made representations of this nature in the interest of national defense.

As I stated to you in my letter of January 28, 1949, the National Military Establishment believes that the Trade Agreements Act should be renewed. It is considered that such a step is in the interest of national security both in the immediate and in the long-term sense.

Now, perhaps the opponents of the reciprocal trade program will stop using the cry of national defense behind which to cloak their hereditary high-tariff protectionism.

OVERWHELMING SUPPORT OF H. R. 1211 BY REPRESENTATIVES OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, CONSUMERS, INDUSTRY, AND LABOR

The overwhelming desire of the vast majority of the American people in private life is also to restore unimpaired the original Hull reciprocal trade program. The people understand and concur in such statements made to the Committee on Ways and Means as the following:

First. Mr. Russell Smith representing the National Farmers Union:

Our farmers still believe that the senseless race of self-sufficiency among nations which the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act chiefly incited was among the principal causes of World War II. They still believe that a prosperous world cannot be achieved without free exchange of commodities. They still believe that dilution of the Trade Agreements Act will be construed by the world at large as proof that American deeds do not accord with American professions.

Second. The American Farm Bureau Federation, with a membership of 1,325,000 farm families in 45 States strongly favors the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without crippling amendments, as testified before our committee by Mr. Allan B. Kline, president. Among other things Mr. Kline said:

No group in the United States has a greater stake in maintaining a high level of exports than American farmers. The American farmer needs foreign markets. In 1948 the production of agricultural products was 38 percent above the prewar level. In the case of some products the increase in production was much greater.

* * * That is why they are so vitally interested in the success of the reciprocal trade agreements program, which seeks to remove the barriers to trade so that trade can expand.

We, therefore, support the continuation of the Trade Agreements Act for another 3-year period and the elimination of the restrictions enacted in the 1948 Extension Act which tend to hamper the successful operation of this program.

Third. Mrs. C. D. Wright, chairman, legislative department, General Federation of Women's Clubs:

The general federation strongly endorses the legislation now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee providing for a restoration of the 1934 act and a return to the 3-year cycle which has operated with such success in the past.

Fourth. Mrs. Margaret F. Stone, chairman of legislation, National Women's Trade Union League, who also appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means for the American Home Economics Association and the National Council of Jewish Women:

The women of this country, in large numbers, are for the trade-agreements program and want to see it made permanent, without shackles. They are for it as housewives interested in the family budget and making the dollar go as far as possible. They are for it as workers, whether in industry, in offices, or in other occupations. They are for it, above all, as humanitarians who want to see every pillar in the foundation of world peace made as strong as possible.

Fifth. Mr. Charles P. Taft, speaking for the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America:

On March 25, 1947, the executive committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, on recommendation of the commission on the basis of a just and durable peace, reaffirmed its endorsement of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program and deplored any course by Members of the Congress which might cast any doubt upon the continued adherence of the United States to the fundamentals of this program.

The development of the European recovery program lends added importance to the increase of multilateral exchange of goods and services. As the Federal Council of Churches executive committee said in this connection on January 13, 1948:

"If the United States is to fulfill its long-term responsibility in the world economy it must help enable other countries to manufacture and sell their own goods and services in order to buy what they need.

"Therefore, the European recovery program should be linked with long-range planning to increase American imports so that European economic life as well as our own may be maintained at a high level."

Sixth. Mr. Walter J. Mason, national legislative representative, American Federation of Labor:

The chief instrument by which this Nation can contribute toward a progressive reduction in world trade barriers is the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. * * * Because of our stake, as workers in a free society, in developing a peaceful and prosperous world, we firmly support a 3-year extension of this program.

Seventh. Mr. Stanley H. Ruttenberg, director of education and research, Congress of Industrial Organizations:

It has been alleged that the trade-agreements program, by reducing American tariffs, will reduce American wage levels to the wage levels of foreign countries. * * *

High productivity, rather than the American tariff, accounts for the American wage level. If our labor productivity were low, we would not have high wages even if our tariffs were raised a thousand times. Many foreign countries have much higher tariffs than the United States, yet their wage levels are lower than ours. The plain truth is that foreign countries worry about their ability to compete with us.

* * * * *

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is an important cog in our complex domestic economy. But the importance of the act does not stop there. Reciprocal trade agreements play an equally important part in enabling us to carry out our tremendous world responsibilities and commitments under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 to reduce trade barriers.

CONCLUSION

It is my considered judgment that international trade conducted on an equitable, live-and-let-live, just-and-fair, Golden Rule basis will do much to promote prosperity and international good will among the nations of the world. In my opinion, peace, freedom, and world trade go hand in hand.

I do not question the motives nor the sincerity of those who differ with me on this very important legislation. What I do question is the logic of their reasoning and the soundness of their conclusions.

I will make my position plain on the subject of the tariff. I am not a free-trader in the generally accepted meaning of the term and would oppose any lowering of the tariff that would inflict serious injury upon any legitimate, efficiently managed domestic industries. On the other hand, I am not an apostle of a high, panic-producing, monopoly-sheltering, trade-throttling, enemy-making tariff. Truth never abides in extremes—a safe, middle-of-the-road course, free of extremes, is the highway we should travel in tariffs, as well as in all public matters. This bill keeps us well within that course, and I trust and expect the House will give it an overwhelming approval.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington, January 8, 1949.*

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In my message on the state of the Union I asked the Congress to act promptly to extend the Trade Agreements Act without the hampering restrictions placed on it by the last Congress.

As you know, negotiations will begin in April to extend the benefits of the general agreement on tariffs and trade to 13 countries that did not participate in the original agreement. This general agreement, concluded in the autumn of 1947, is the most important and comprehensive trade agreement in history. Under it the United States and 22 other nations agreed to reduce their tariffs, or to maintain low tariffs, or none at all, on a wide variety of products. The products affected accounted in 1938 for over half of the world's international trade. In addition, the participating countries agreed to curb the use of other trade restrictions, such as import quotas, and to limit various kinds of discrimination, such as preferential treatment of imports from one country as against those from another. Never before have so many nations combined in such an intensive effort to reduce barriers to trade.

The extension of the benefits of this agreement under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act is a practical cooperative effort to remove unnecessary obstacles to the building of a stable and prosperous world. The restrictive provisions and limited extension of the present trade-agreements law materially hamper the effectiveness of United States participation in this effort. That is why it is so important that the existing Trade Agreements Act be promptly repealed, and that the act as it existed on March 1, 1948, be extended for a further substantial period. I suggest that this period be until June 12, 1951.

Unless nations can sell each other the products of their agriculture, labor, and industry to the greatest possible extent, there can be no sure foundation for economic peace. Unless world trade is increased, the tremendous investment we are making toward world economic recovery will be largely wasted. Unless trade restrictions are relaxed, the lot of the private trader in international trade will become increasingly difficult.

In the achievement of these objectives, United States leadership and United States action is a decisive influence.

The trade-agreements program has proved itself to the people of the United States. It has justly earned their overwhelming support. We must be in a position to press that program forward with vigor.

I know that I can count on your continued support in securing necessary action to this end at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

---

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have today signed H. R. 6556, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948. Unfortunately, this act extends for only 1 year the authority to enter into reciprocal trade agreements. It also makes unwise changes in the procedure for negotiating such agreements.

I regret very much that the Congress has not seen fit to renew this authority for the customary 3-year period. There is no valid reason for a 1-year limitation, which appears to cast some doubt upon our intentions for the future.

Moreover, the act prescribes a new, complicated, time-consuming, and unnecessary procedure for the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements. This change in procedure will necessarily hamper and obstruct the negotiation of new agreements, a defect which is particularly undesirable in view of the act's limitation to a single year.

The reciprocal-trade-agreements program has long occupied a key position in our foreign policy and in our endeavors to assist world recovery. As I pointed out in a special message to the Congress last March, the program is a tested and practical means for achieving the benefits of expanding world commerce for the United States and other countries and a continuing evidence of the determination of the United States to contribute its full share to the reconstruction of a sound and growing world economy as a basis for enduring world peace.

As part of the European recovery program, the participating countries have agreed to work together to lower barriers to trade. The United States can surely do no less than show its determination to support the same principle, which is so important to an expansion of world markets and world trade.

It is so essential that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program should not lapse that I have signed this act in spite of its serious defects.

I will do my best to make the new procedures work. As a first step, I intend to proceed in the near future with plans for bringing other countries into the general agreement on tariffs and trade signed with 22 countries at Geneva in October 1947.

The reciprocal-trade-agreements program is one of high national policy. When the act is again extended next year, I trust that the defects contained in this year's extension will be corrected, in order that the act will be restored as a fully effective instrument of permanent United States policy.

JUNE 26, 1948.

---

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
*Washington, January 24, 1949.*

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,*
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On March 1, 1948, the President addressed a message to the Congress recommending that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, then due to expire on June 12, 1948, be extended for a period of 3 years from that date without change. Despite this recommendation, the Eightieth Congress enacted the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, extending the authority for entering into reciprocal trade agreements only for a period of slightly more than 1 year, and prescribing new procedures which in fact constituted obstacles to the negotiation of such agreements. The interested agencies of the executive branch of the Government advised strongly against these changes. The President reluctantly approved the bill, since the only alternative was to permit the program to lapse.

On June 2, 1948, while the Senate had under consideration H. R. 6556, Eightieth Congress, which later became, with amendments, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, I set forth the views of the Treasury Department on the bill in a letter to the then chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate. At that time I wrote:

"The bill purports to extend the reciprocal-trade-agreements authority in the Executive for an additional period of approximately 1 year; but, in the judgment of this Department, its provisions are such as to disrupt the present smoothly operating interdepartmental machinery and to render the reciprocal-trade-agreements program unworkable."

A detailed report on the difficulties encountered in administering the program in accordance with the procedural requirements set forth in the 1948 act is being put before you by the Department of State. The Treasury Department, which shares responsibility for the administration of the program, has been furnished with an advance copy of the statement which is to be placed before your committee today by the State Department, and is in full agreement with it.

However, there is one aspect of the question which I particularly wish to bring to the attention of your committee. Under the provisions of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, I serve as Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, the interdepartmental body which has responsibility for coordinating the policies and operations of this Government in the foreign financial, exchange, and monetary field. Currently, the Council is giving its primary attention to a series of far-reaching programs involving financial assistance for other countries of the world. In carrying out these functions, the Council has constantly borne in mind the policies enunciated by the Congress in this connection, calling for the progressive reduction of trade barriers, the elimination of unfair trade practices, the expansion and balanced growth of international trade, and the establishment of stable international economic relationships (Bretton Woods Agreements Act, sec. 14; Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, sec. 102 (a)).

The achievement of these aims and the restoration of a healthy international economy cannot be accomplished merely by looking backward toward a restoration of prewar conditions. Far-reaching developments in world economic relationships require that we plan for a changed basis for international economic stability, if our friendly partners in the world community are generally to achieve economic self-sufficiency. The careful and selective study and progressive elimination of trade barriers must go hand in hand with the programs of financial assistance we are administering. For this reason, I consider the reciprocal-trade-agreements program to play a vital role in supporting our foreign financial policies.

The President, on January 8, 1949, repeated the recommendation he made on March 1, 1948, that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program should be extended for 3 years from June 12, 1948, without the limitations on the Presidential authority contained in the 1948 legislation. A bill has now been introduced (H. R. 1211) to accomplish this purpose. I strongly urge that your committee give favorable consideration to that bill.

This Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Very truly yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER,
*Secretary of the Treasury.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
*Washington 25, D. C., January 24, 1949.*

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: I am writing in connection with the hearings being held by your committee on H. R. 1211, a bill to extend the authority of the President (to negotiate foreign-trade agreements) under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. This Department favors the passage of H. R. 1211.

On May 6, 1948, I appeared before the Committee on Ways and Means to advocate the extension of authority provided in the bill under reference. The Trade Agreements Act granting that authority had been in effect without significant alteration for 14 years. I stated the basic interest of agriculture in the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. That program is the necessary foreign counterpart of a long-term domestic agricultural program.

The farmers of this country normally produce many commodities in greater quantities than are required for use in the United States. Any acceptable United States farm program, therefore, must be associated with a program for keeping open the channels of international trade in a manner that will permit United States agricultural products to compete abroad. The American farmer must not have his products excluded from foreign markets by excessive tariffs and other barriers or discriminated against through preferences and other special deals between foreign governments.

Agriculture is interested in the trade-agreements program not only in connection with agricultural exports but also in connection with industrial exports. Agriculture needs a wide and dependable market in the United States for American farm products. Sales abroad of products of the American factory result in greater employment and consequently greater domestic demand for products of the American farm. This is particularly true of products which are consumed increasingly as incomes rise, such as dairy and poultry products, meats, fruits, nuts, and vegetables. But a high level of American industrial exports can be maintained only in a climate of world prosperity, a climate which can prevail only when there is extensive interchange of goods and services between countries. The trade-agreements program is designed to facilitate such an interchange.

In order that foreign countries may pay for our farm and factory products, they must obtain dollars. For the time being, of course, conditions resulting from the war have made it necessary to supply many of our exports as gifts or on credit. However, this cannot be continued indefinitely. The most important continuing source of dollars for our foreign customers is their sale of goods to us; that is, our imports. Under the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, we have developed a mechanism whereby we can reduce the barriers against imports into the United States in such a way as to increase those imports without causing injury to established United States industry.

The imports thus obtained tend to raise our living standards. The large block of our population represented by farm people is an important group of consumers. They know that the benefits of trade do not lie merely in getting rid of a maximum amount of goods. They want to get as much as possible in return. The trade-agreements program is designed to facilitate that.

As a long-term program, the trade-agreements program can be of aid in the immediate problem of European recovery. Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, the United States has launched on a program of direct aid so that the other participating countries may carry their recovery to the point where they are enabled to join us as partners in a going international economy. The reduction of trade barriers now can help assure progress toward such an economy.

Despite the difficult circumstances of international relations which prevailed between the original adoption of the Trade Agreements Act in 1934 and the beginning of the war, experience under the program in that period showed a consistent advantage to the American farmer. Our farm exports to countries with which we had trade agreements increased more than exports to other countries. Moreover, the exports of items on which tariff reductions had been obtained increased more than exports of other products. There was also an increase in imports. The agricultural commodities involved in the increase in imports were those needed either because they are not produced in the United States or are not produced here in sufficient quantity for United States needs. The importation of items directly in competition with American agricultural products increased relatively little.

On the basis of experience under the program, there has been worked out a method of dealing with cases of unforeseen injury or threat of injury to domestic industry. This is the escape clause, which enables us in any case where producers sustain or are threatened with injury due to operation of the agreement to suspend or withdraw the concession made. This clause will be included in all reciprocal trade agreements to which the United States become a party.

The previous Congress changed the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in a way that makes it more difficult to operate. These changes do not improve the procedures under the act either from the point of view of accomplishing its objectives or of preventing injury to United States producers. I should like to support H. R. 1211, which would restore the legislation substantially to its previous form.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
*Secretary.*

---

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, January 25, 1949.*

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: I understand that your committee has begun public hearings on H. R. 1211, the reciprocal-trade-agreements legislation. Although I do not care to appear before the committee to speak on the bill, I do wish to have the views of the Department of Commerce included in the record of the hearings.

The history of this legislation is well known to your committee and the policies it represents need not be elaborated. There is no doubt but what the disturbed conditions of world trade arising from World War II and the conditions which have existed since then have not been peculiarly favorable toward securing the fullest benefits from these policies. However, it does seem clear that the tariff adjustments which have resulted have benefited our consumers at a time when supplies were short. The concessions received from other countries have also been of significance to some of our exporters.

I should like to urge that the authority to conclude trade agreements under this legislation be extended for at least 3 years from June 30, 1948. I also endorse the proposal that this extension be in substantially the same form as the act prior to the 1-year renewal last spring. The former act was tested in practice and enabled the administration to carry out effectively the intent of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

---

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
*Washington, January 28, 1949.*

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
*Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to offer a statement of the position of the National Military Establishment in connection with the hearings which your committee is presently conducting on the extension of the Trade Agreements Act.

The Military Establishment considers that the Trade Agreements Act should be renewed. It is considered that such a step is in the interest of national security both in the immediate and in the long-term sense.

The stated position is the position of the Munitions Board. For greater detail, I attach a staff analysis by the staff of the Muni-

tions Board, prepared at my request, which considers the various interests of the Military Establishment in the extension of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL.

STATEMENT PREPARED BY THE STAFF OF THE MUNITIONS BOARD

NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The extension of the Trade Agreements Act in 1945 provided that the War and Navy Departments should be represented on the Trade Agreements Committee. The extension in 1948 substituted representation by the National Military Establishment. Experience since 1945 has proved that this representation has proved valuable by providing a direct expression of opinion on national security in trade-agreement negotiations. It has also emphasized the importance of the trade-agreement program to national security.

1. The trade-agreements program helps the United States meet its problems in strategic commodities: The National Military Establishment has an obvious and well-recognized interest in strategic commodities. Some of these commodities are produced in adequate quantities in the United States but for others we are dependent in whole or in part upon supplies from foreign countries. For those which are produced in the United States it is sometimes necessary to balance the desire for a large-scale current production to maintain a strong domestic industry with the conflicting desire for adequate emergency reserves. World War II seriously diminished our reserves at the same time that it made clear that the demands of war upon strategic commodities have greatly increased and that the problems of overseas transportation may be serious. As a result the Congress provided for stock piling and later that the expenditures for Economic Cooperation Administration be used in part to aid the stock piles.

Negotiations under the Trade Agreements Act can and have been used to reduce United States tariffs on strategic commodities where it was desirable to increase supplies from foreign sources and in a few cases to reduce or eliminate the export duties or restrictions of other supplying countries. It is desirable that the authority to take similar action in the future be preserved.

2. The trade-agreement program helps keep our national economy strong: The United States is fortunate enough to possess a large domestic market which allows many commodities to be produced efficiently on a large scale. These strong domestic industries frequently produce commodities which other countries like to buy if they have the dollar exchange to do it, since they can purchase them from us more economically than they can produce on a small scale for their own more limited market. Often they can in turn sell us other commodities which they can produce efficiently because they possess the natural resources or the type of labor required. Even at present, and to a greater extent when the emergency programs of assistance come to an end, our ability to export will be limited by the ability of others to sell to us.

Our national security planning is largely based on our industrial capacity. Its size and its ability to be mobilized quickly and effectively for the production of supplies and equipment needed by the armed forces form one of our greatest bulwarks. Our machine-tool industry, our automobile industry, and our radio industry are all cases in point. They are also examples of industries which are in part dependent upon exports and which have benefited from the trade-agreements program in the past.

The trade-agreements program is so designed as to permit flexibility in operation. It can be used to encourage exports and imports and can also be used to limit the amount of goods received from foreign countries. For example, the program offers an excellent means of protecting those industries considered vital to the national security by the retention of tariffs. The National Military Establishment member on the interdepartmental committee which administers the law has frequently made representations of this nature in the interest of national defense. Natural rubber has long entered the United States free of duty, but in trade agreements this country has retained the right to restrict imports of natural-rubber products in order to protect synthetic-rubber production. Through the efforts of the Military Establishment provisions of this nature with respect to rubber have been included in the ITO charter as well as the general agreement on tariffs and trade.

3. The trade-agreement program is an aid to friendly countries: The United States is today a strong proponent of multilateral world trade on a nondiscriminatory basis. Many countries which formerly favored such a policy are lukewarm toward it at present because of their postwar difficulties in trade and exchange. Our trade-agreement program buttresses our policy position, strengthens the economies of countries friendly to us and offers them an avenue of escape from the maze of international discriminations into which the world economy might so easily deteriorate.

The United States, by implementing the Marshall plan, has proved itself willing at considerable cost to aid the economies of friendly countries. But this is a temporary expedient looking toward their getting firmly upon their own feet again. That result will depend in no small part upon their access to our market, which is aided by the trade-agreement program. A healthy world economy is of interest to the United States for national security as well as for other reasons.

---

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
*Washington, January 28, 1949.*

Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
*Chairman, Ways and Means Committee,*
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington 25, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOUGHTON: As one of the departments which have been directly involved in the administration of the Trade Agreements Act, the Department of Labor would like to place its views before your committee in connection with consideration of the act's extension.

I need not dwell at length on the interest of American workers and their families in the continuation of the trade-agreements program. High levels of world trade mean high standards of living at home, making available to labor those materials and products that can be produced most efficiently abroad, and making available to workers abroad, both for consumption and for economic development, what we produce in the United States. If we are to participate in the development of productivity and living standards abroad in the manner outlined by the President in his inaugural message, we must surely visualize a continually expanding stream of multilateral trade.

In the opinion of the Department of Labor, an immediate extension of the Trade Agreements Act is desirable to facilitate the negotiations for which the administration is now preparing, and thereby broaden the coverage of the general agreement on tariffs and trade. The present duration of the act is too brief to assure reasonably adequate accomplishment within its term.

It is also the Department's opinion that the 1948 amendments to the act which established the "peril point" mechanism should be removed, and that the method for the negotiation of agreements should revert to the procedure of fully cooperating interdepartmental machinery previously in use under the statute. The Department of Labor believes that, insofar as tariffs are concerned, the well-being of workers and their families in the United States can be adequately protected through such machinery.

I should also like to call your attention to one other respect in which the language of the act might be improved. It is now provided that the President shall seek information and advice, in connection with the negotiation of a trade agreement, from several Government agencies specifically named, and from "such other sources as he may deem appropriate." The Department of Labor has been added by Executive order to the group of agencies specifically mentioned by name. Since 1947 the Department of Labor has been represented on the Interdepartmental Committee on Trade Agreements, and since 1948 on the Committee for Reciprocity Information. The inclusion of the Department of Labor among the agencies specifically mentioned in the statute would make clearer to the general public the broad base upon which the trade-agreements program is administered.

It has been impossible to effect clearance of this letter with the Bureau of the Budget prior to its transmittal to you.

Yours very truly,

MAURICE J. TOBIN,
*Secretary of Labor.*

---

ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington 25, D. C., January 27, 1949.*

The Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON,
*Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, New House Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. DOUGHTON: Enclosed please find a statement of ECA's views on the trade-agreements legislation now before Congress.

Sincerely,

PAUL G. HOFFMAN, *Administrator.*

---

ECA'S POSITION IN REGARD TO THE FORTHCOMING RECIPROCAL-TRADE-AGREEMENTS LEGISLATION

ECA strongly supports the trade-agreements legislation now before Congress. In line with the over-all objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, ECA is especially concerned with accelerating the export of goods from European countries to all foreign markets, including the United States, as a means of enabling these countries to balance their international payments and so reduce the assistance they require from the United States. We support the legislation now pending before Congress in that it aids in this effort.

ECA's interest in reciprocal-trade-agreements legislation stems from the basic objectives of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 which are to furnish materials and financial assistance to the participating countries "in such a manner as to aid them, through their own individual and concerted efforts, to become independent of extraordinary outside economic assistance within the period of operations under this title, * * *."

An increase in the world volume of trade is not only desirable but vitally necessary if the other countries are to recover their ability to pay their own way. The reciprocal-trade-agreements legislation now pending before Congress is a basic means to the expansion of world trade, for this legislation will give the President authority to adjust tariff rates and enter into tariff agreements (subject to definite limitations and procedures) for an extended period of time, thus affording continuity of action.

Six countries now receiving ECA assistance are already parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, a comprehensive tariff agreement entered into by the United States under the authority of the Trade Agreements

Act. Four additional countries which now receive ECA assistance will participate in tariff negotiations this coming April, looking toward accession to the agreement. The potential for recovery inherent in these negotiations depends upon favorable action by Congress in establishing the proposed trade-agreements legislation now pending before Congress.

---

[From the Christian Science Monitor of January 26, 1949]

EDITORIAL

IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be restored to normal health as soon as possible. Indeed, in the interest both of a sound national economy and of international peace the State Department should be encouraged to engage in even more vigorous efforts to reduce trade barriers.

This newspaper has steadily supported the Hull policy of carefully exploring specific measures for broadening mutually beneficial trade. The method of permitting the State Department to investigate, hear objections from domestic producers, and negotiate reciprocal agreements has seemed to us vastly superior to the politics-ridden, logrolling, tariff-making Congress has too often indulged in. The old system generally resulted in higher and higher barriers because favors were granted to one local interest after another as against the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

One of the greatest advances under the reciprocal policy was made in 1947 when the United States signed an agreement with 22 other nations covering tariff rates on 45,000 items. Then last summer Congress reversed the whole trend. It extended an emasculated act for only 1 year—to await further attention when the Republicans had taken over both White House and Capitol and had reconciled their differences. The last three Republican Presidential candidates had supported the reciprocity idea—which had good Republican antecedents. But a majority of Republicans in Congress had clung to protection.

We opposed the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. It reflected the division and confusion within the Republican Party and could be regarded only as a most unsatisfactory expedient. Its very temporariness made planning and negotiating most uncertain. And in the main it expressed the old protectionist doctrine. It harked back to the idea that foreign goods should not be allowed to enter the country if they undersold a domestic producer—no matter whether they benefited American consumers or enabled foreign consumers to buy goods other American producers had to export. It appeared to give no weight to over-all national interest or to trade's effects on international peace.

Congress never had any popular mandate for this backward step. It would be well now to return promptly and firmly to the policy of promoting trade. We welcome President Truman's request to Congress to renew the Trade Agreements Act for 3 years. We trust the House Ways and Means Committee will not be thrown off by the efforts of a few Republican die-hards to cast suspicion on the State Department and to link the Hull policy with communism. We hope the extreme nature of its unworthy effort only reflects weakness in the protectionist position.

For the necessity of lowering trade barriers has become increasingly clear as America's new creditor position has become clear. The interests of farmers and of much of the business community are now directly lined up behind efforts to find foreign markets for American goods. An intelligent tariff policy is required to supplement the Marshall plan in easing the dollar famine abroad. It is equally essential to undergird with economic cooperation the political and potential military cooperation outlined in the Atlantic security pact.

---

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register of January 31, 1949]

INDEED PUBLIC SENTIMENT APPROVES HULL-TYPE RECIPROCAL-TRADE POLICY

House Ways and Means Committee hearings are scheduled to be resumed Monday on legislation to free the reciprocal-trade-agreements program of the shackles placed on it by the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress.

Meanwhile Representative ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, North Carolina Democrat, gave pointed answer at week end to charges by Representative DANIEL A. REED, New York Republican, that the Democratic majority on the committee has engaged in "steamroller tactics."

Mr. DOUGHTON is chairman of the committee, and Mr. REED is the top-ranking Republican member.

According to International News Service, Chairman DOUGHTON said with respect to his Republican colleague's criticism:

"These baseless attacks appear to be an attempt to camouflage the historic and consistent Republican hostility to the reciprocal-trade program, which is now thoroughly understood and overwhelmingly accepted and approved by the American people.

"In contrast with the procedure of the Committee on Ways and Means in the Eightieth Congress, when a subcommittee allotted 1 week for hearings behind closed doors, all interested persons have been granted the opportunity to be heard in open session, with the public and press present. * * *

"There is absolutely no foundation for the charge that unfair tactics are being used in our committee."

Congressman DOUGHTON can find confirmation in every direction for his statement that reciprocal-trade policy has overwhelming approval of the people. Republicans in the Eightieth Congress who had a hand in hamstringing the trade program cannot justifiably feel proud of their performance.

Urging prompt removal of the handicaps fashioned by the preceding Congress, the Christian Science Monitor says:

"The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act should be restored to normal health as soon as possible. Indeed, in the interest both of sound national economy and of international peace, the State Department should be encouraged to engage in even more vigorous efforts to reduce trade barriers.

"This newspaper has steadily supported the Hull policy of carefully exploring specific measures for broadening mutually beneficial trade. The method of permitting the State Department to investigate, hear objections from domestic producers, and negotiate reciprocal agreements has seemed to us vastly superior to the politics-ridden, logrolling tariff-making Congress has too often indulged in. The old system generally resulted in higher and higher barriers because favors were granted to one local interest after another as against the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

"One of the greatest advances under the reciprocal policy was made in 1947 when the United States signed an agreement with 22 other nations covering tariff rates on 45,000 items. Then last summer Congress reversed the whole trend. It extended an emasculated act for only 1 year—to await further attention when the Republicans had taken over both White House and Capitol and had reconciled their differences. The last three Republican Presidential candidates had supported the reciprocity idea—which had good Republican antecedents. But a majority of Republicans in Congress had clung to protection.

"We opposed the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. It reflected the division and confusion within the Republican Party and could be regarded only as a most unsatisfactory expedient. Its very temporariness made planning and negotiating most uncertain. And in the main it expressed the old protectionist doctrine."

As the Wall Street Journal sees it, "What looks like the preliminaries to an old-fashioned wrangle over tariff protectionism are going on in hearings of the House Ways and Means Committee."

The Journal goes on to comment:

"This newspaper believes that tariff protection, as a principle or a theory, has outlived most of its usefulness. We think the part it plays in maintaining high living standards in this country has been much exaggerated.

"Industries which have been built up in the shelter of a tariff wall can be injured, at least temporarily, when the wall is removed or lowered. But by and large, neither our employers nor their employees, fortified as they are with the world's best power tools and production methods, should fear the competition of cheap foreign labor."

And the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin says in commenting on reciprocal trade:

"One of the misdeeds of the Eightieth Congress was to throw doubt on the continuance of our policy of lowering excessive tariffs by reciprocal-trade treaties. The Republican Congress did not kill the Trade Agreements Act but it renewed it only for 1 year, and added complications in procedure which make the conclusion of trade treaties with other countries more difficult."

The action taken by the Eightieth Congress was indeed a blundering step in the field of trade policy. The present Congress can render a genuine service by correcting the error.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. To keep the agricultural picture straight, did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that all farm organizations are in favor of it?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not say all of them. I do not know how many there are. The National Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and a number of them, I will say the preponderance of them, and of their members, favor this policy. I do not think the gentleman will dispute that, and I know he cannot refute it.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I just want to keep the discussion factual. The Grange says we had better keep what we have until we get something better.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This policy has been proven by 14 years of successful operation. The gentleman knows that. Compare the national income of the United States now with what it was in 1934. The income of agriculture has increased over fivefold under the reciprocal-trade policy. Every occupation and business in the United States has prospered. Manufactures have increased sevenfold. What more proof does the gentleman want?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The only proof that is, is that we should be in a war all the time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; that is the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is a fact, too. I read their testimony, and the Farm Bureau is for it, but they want to keep section 22 of the Triple-A Act so

they can put an embargo on any time they want to, which your administration has done time after time for products raised south of the Mason and Dixon's line.

Mr. DOUGHTON. What does my friend want to do, abandon the reciprocal-trade program and go back to the Smoot-Hawley logrolling, back-scratching program, whereby the beneficiaries of the high tariff wrote the schedule?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The reciprocal-trade policy as well as the tariff policy, from the viewpoint of international relationships, is deader than a dodo bird, because so many things have happened since we started out with the reciprocal-trade program.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Would my friend abandon it and go back to the old system, or would he continue it with such amendments as might be demonstrated by experience to be necessary?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would leave the situation the way it is at the present time. We have a tribunal, the Tariff Commission, to which you can go and tell your story. I do not believe in delegating the power to the President to give away the rights of the people and to have control over every grocery bill in this country and over every farm income in this country.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Neither do I, but under this Tariff Act the farmers are given an opportunity to present their case. And if they are injured, or even threatened with injury, then under the escape clause they can have the matter reconsidered and have the agreement modified, or have the whole thing rescinded. The gentleman knows that. Every single safeguard under Heaven was provided in this bill. Those who believe in the old law are, like Ephraim of old, "joined to their idols." They cannot be convinced. You just cannot ever convince them that their idea of the old logrolling tariff is not sound policy.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. What the gentleman says may be so.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I have not yet found where my friend stands.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I told you where I stood. I stand for leaving it alone the way it is at the present time.

Mr. DOUGHTON. You mean the way it was changed by the 1948 act, or the original act?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I mean the way it is right now in the 1948 act. You had better leave it alone.

Mr. DOUGHTON. That expires in June.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. All right, then you had better extend that act the way it stands now.

You say the farmers know what is happening down here. How many farmers know right now that they recently held hearings to lower the duty on foreign types of cheese? How many farm organizations were represented at the hearings?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Everyone had an opportunity to be heard. If they were not heard it is their own fault. The public were invited to attend these hearings and an open invitation was extended by publication in the press and elsewhere so that everybody could be heard.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Suppose they do not read the Washington papers.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Why were you not at the hearings? You did not come.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I was there.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I beg the gentleman's pardon. You mean you attended the hearings of the Committee for Reciprocity Information—not the hearings of our committee.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Surely I went there, and testified about lowering the duty on cheese. I surely did.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Oh, you talk about cheese. You talk about this, that, and the other things. You never consider the innocent American consumer. You never consider our surpluses. You never consider any of those things. The interests of all groups must be considered together. The domestic consumer, the exporter, the importer, and the American public.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Do you mean to tell me it is part of the Golden Rule policy to have this administration during all this time talking about Golden Rule and the good-neighbor policy and all that goes along with that to erect the most vicious—now get this—the most severe and most vicious trade barrier ever erected in the history of our country and that is when your administration passed a bill which is on the books today which says that you cannot even send a handful of tobacco seed out of this country? Is that part of the good-neighbor policy?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No. That was an act of Congress. That was not done under the reciprocal-trade authority.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did you see anything in the paper about any opposition by the Secretary of State?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I do not see everything that is in the paper, and I do not suppose that my friend does.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Possibly that was part of the Golden Rule program of the present administration.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Of course the gentleman knows that we remember things that we want to remember, and the things that we do not want to remember we shut our eyes on.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right; and until this administration takes the tobacco-seed embargo off the books there is no use of President Truman talking about reciprocal trade.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman would seem to know more than the people of the country know. The people of the country, by the November election, showed what they believe. I do not say that they were so enthusiastic about the Democratic Party, but they just would not have the Republican Party. They remembered how they were wrecked under the Hoover administration, and what happened in the Eightieth Congress. The people remembered what they lost, and how they suffered under Hoover, and they realized what they had gained and what they enjoyed in 1948. There is no question as to what their position was.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is the second point, and I want to give you an answer now so that it will be in the book. If your administration does not watch its step it is going to give the people some Truman prosperity that is going to be similar to the Hoover prosperity you complain about.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman talks about my administration. It is not my administration, it is the people's administration. It is the administration of the American people by an overwhelming majority. And when the gentleman talks like that, he is jumping in the face of the enlightened judgment and intelligence of a majority of the American people.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. President Truman is a minority President.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the bill H. R. 1211 here for consideration is dangerous to the safety of our economy and to our national security.

It comes to the House with vital facts suppressed. I say this because the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee flatly refused our request to invite the Military Establishment to appear before the committee and state whether or not the jeweled-watch industry, together with its respective skilled precision technicians are vital to our national defense.

We, the Republican minority, know that our domestic jeweled-watch industries have been destroyed by foreign competition to such an extent that today only two of them remain solvent. Therefore we tried, even by a record vote, to have a representative of the Military Establishment invited or requested to appear and testify before our committee touching on the importance of the jeweled-watch industry to our national defense, but our motion to obtain this vital information from this official and authoritative source was defeated by the Democrats.

There are known to be more than a hundred other strategic and critical industries located throughout the United States. The products of these industries are absolutely necessary to the defense of our country. I claim that such strategic and critical industries must not be destroyed or even so crippled that they will be inadequate for our defense purposes. Many of these industries are new and in need of every possible assistance to insure their continued success and solvency. I say with all the force and sincerity at my command that the life of these strategic and critical plants must under no circumstances be placed in jeopardy, whether from enemies within or from enemies without the United States. These vital plants and skilled workmen must not be sacrificed for political or diplomatic purposes. Alleged trade advantages, whether export or import, must not take priority over national security.

We all know that enemies from without will use every means to cripple, weaken, or destroy our long list of strategic and critical facilities. I say that when legislating, as we are today, relating to the preservation of our national

security, it is no time to remove the safeguards to our national defense which H. R. 1211 proposed to do.

We hear much about the necessity of making tariff concessions in trade agreements to build up exports. But, if we weaken or sacrifice our critical and strategic defense industries to gain a temporary increase in exports, we strike a blow at the very heart of our national security. We must not let the heat of political debate blind us to the reckless folly of such a disastrous course upon which the Democratic majority now appears to be embarked.

Heretofore this Nation has been blessed with a strong foreign relations policy free from political bickering. One of the principal architects of that policy was Republican Senator VANDENBERG, of Michigan. Other prominent Republicans in the Congress played dominant roles in cementing such a policy. But since his recent election the President has evidenced a desire to abandon this bipartisan program. In the past few weeks important decisions have been made respecting our international affairs without the customary Republican participation or advance knowledge. Mr. Truman has stated that his proposed extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act is one of the cornerstones of the administration's foreign policy. He neither encouraged nor accepted Republican cooperation in the formulation of that trade policy. It becomes obvious that he is scrapping the desirable bipartisan handling of foreign affairs and that henceforth the Nation's national and international policies will be dictated by one man in the White House who increasingly refers to himself as the Commander in Chief.

Obviously also, because the New Deal needed a commander in chief, Mr. Truman feels that the Fair Deal needs one, too. A commander in chief is much more important in one-man government than is a mere President, and it is much easier for a commander in chief to assert nonexistent inherent powers over the Nation and its people such as Mr. Truman asserted in connection with his right to deal with labor-management strife without specific congressional authorization and without expressed constitutional authority. During the past 16 years we have witnessed scores of attempts to circumvent the Congress. Apparently these attempts are to continue, and during the next 4 years we may expect to see a new Commander in Chief riding around on a rejuvenated donkey looking for more inherent powers.

As a direct consequence of H. R. 1211, the President will be deprived of the most effective bipartisan fact-finding machinery ever created by law to serve the President and other governmental departments in the conduct of our foreign trade agreements program.

A trade-agreement concession based upon inaccurate or incomplete information as to its possible impact on domestic producers will be a menace to the stability of our economy and to our national defense.

I wish to call to your attention that when the trade-agreement legislation was under consideration in 1934, the proponents of it urged its adoption as a means of increasing exports. The adoption of it, however, did not increase exports.

The failure of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 to increase exports came as a shock to its advocates. They were stunned and exasperated at their failure. But next came Hitler, then Mussolini, and finally Japan to their rescue. Hitler needed war materials to build up his military establishment for war. To his surprise he found there would be no objection on the part of the New Deal administration to his purchasing steel, refined copper, scrap copper, iron, and steel scrap.

The raid on our essential war material, in an attempt to justify the State Department's trade agreements, started in 1936 with the shipment of enough steel plate to enable Hitler to build more than 150 destroyers, or 3,000 tanks, and innumerable jeeps. No wonder Hitler thought the United States would remain neutral. But if not fully convinced of the neutral and friendly attitude because of the steel shipments to him, could he doubt the sincerity of the New Deal administration when it suffered and permitted the export to him during the years 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939 of refined copper amounting to over 330,000,000 pounds.

"See how our exports are increasing under the trade-agreement program," said the State Department officials.

Then followed the exports to Hitler by the United States during the years 1936 to 1939, inclusive, of scrap copper amounting to over 72,000,000 pounds. When bragging about the growth of exports, the character of the exports was suppressed but the amount of the exports in dollars was emphasized.

We were getting short of iron and steel scrap, yet the administration group had to show exports to uphold the purpose of their trade agreements, so there was also exported to Hitler during 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939 a total of over 340,000 tons of iron and steel scrap. Our boys came in personal contact with these export materials on many a battlefield in Europe.

The zeal of the State Department in the early days of the trade-agreement program knew no bounds. Exports was the only battle cry for freedom. The other propaganda slogan was perpetual peace throughout the world under the leadership of the State Department, promising peace to all who would crusade for the trade-agreements program. Yet, at the very time this hope was being held out to gain support from numerous organizations of women and anxious mothers seeking world peace, more than 10,000,000 long tons—2,240 pounds—of United States iron and steel scrap was exported during the years 1936 to 1940, inclusive, to Japan. How well I remember the day the State Department officials went into an urgent huddle with the Ways and Means Committee and asked to have the tariff removed on some of these materials. Why? Because the United States had made itself so short of these essential war materials that we had to immediately comb every inch of Central and South America and the islands in the Carribean to collect old track, old sugar mills and junk piles, wherever they could be found, to replace the exports to our enemies.

During the years 1936 to 1941, inclusive, when World War II was slowly creeping upon us, could the Army, the Navy, the Department of Agriculture, or Commerce, or any other executive department of the Government, check this madcap policy to the public by the State Department and sold under the honeyed words of "reciprocal trade." Yet today in the very period which may be leading to the fatal hour of all mankind, the Democratic majority would destroy the Tariff Commission now charged with the duty of advising the President, and hence the State Department, of the point below which tariff reduction would imperil the effectiveness of our own industries. The Democratic majority would turn from the bipartisan expert Tariff Commission to the State Department as the alpha and omega in the conduct of our trade-agreement program.

Who organized and propagandized the Citizens Reciprocity Committee to put pressure on Congress to defeat the 1948 Trade Agreements Extension Act in which every safeguard to our industries and our national security was included?

This organizer of the country-wide citizens' pressure group was, and is no other than one Alger Hiss, now under indictment for perjury. Have there been any charges made of an infiltration of spies and Communists in the State Department?

I want to call your attention to one matter because the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means called attention to the wonderful attributes of character of one Charles Taft which, of course, I do not question; however, in his zeal he said that Alger Hiss was not connected with the State Department, that he was not employed by it. Yesterday I asked for copy of a report from the Un-American Activities Committee on a few of the Communists who helped write our trade agreements and I want to read some of these to you at this point.

First as to Victor Perlo:

VICTOR PERLO

Testimony of Victor Perlo, August 9, 1948: "I think I was officially an alternate member on the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Trade Agreements Committee, which were identical or substantially identical in membership. These were interdepartmental committees which took care of all of the technical work in the preparation of trade agreements under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act and also to a certain extent a lot of preparatory work for the International Trade Organization."

On the same day, Miss Elizabeth Terrill Bentley, a former member of the Communist espionage ring, confronted Mr. Perlo and identified him as a member of this ring while she was active. When questioned on these charges Mr. Perlo refused to answer charging that his rights under the first and fifth amendments were being violated and that such answer "might tend to incriminate or degrade me." Perlo was also identified as a member of this ring by Whittaker Chambers on August 3, 1948.

We go next to Henry J. Wadleigh:

HENRY J. WADLEIGH

Testimony of Henry J. Wadleigh, December 9, 1948: "I was in the Division of Trade Agreements from 1936, until the war in Europe broke out * * * (superiors were) Henry Grady in the Trade Agreements Division, then Harry Hawkins, then Leo Pasvolsky, special assistant to the Secretary of State, and in Italy, Henry Grade * * * Mr. (Francis B.) Sayre was Assistant Secretary in charge of the Trade Agreements Division when I first was employed there. Mr. Acheson later took Mr. Sayre's place."

On December 6, 1948, in an executive meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Whittaker Chambers identified Julian Wadleigh (Henry Julian Wadleigh) as a source from which the former received documents for transmission to representatives of the Soviet Military Intelligence. When questioned by the Committee on Un-American Activities on December 9, 1948, Mr. Wadleigh refused to answer all questions dealing with such activity on the ground that such testimony might tend to incriminate him. Mr. Wadleigh has since been a witness before a Federal grand jury in New York and it is our understanding that he has been a cooperative witness.

We come now to Alger Hiss, as to whom Mr. Taft referred as not employed in the State Department:

ALGER HISS

On December 23, 1948, Mr. Francis B. Sayre, former Assistant Secretary of State, who was in charge of the Department's Division of Trade Agreements, testified that on April 23, 1936, he recommended that Alger Hiss be appointed as his assistant in the Department of Trade Agreements. He further testified that Mr. Hiss' duties included the legal preparation of trade agreements. Hiss was transferred to another division of the State Department on January 16, 1942.

Attached herewith is the second report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on Soviet Espionage Within the United States Government. A study of this report which contains facsimiles of State Department documents emanating from the Department of Trade Agreements and, according to Mr. Chambers, furnished to him by Alger Hiss and Julian Wadleigh for transmission to the Soviet Military Intelligence agents, will disclose to some extent the proportions of this leakage of information.

Alger Hiss is now under indictment by a Federal grand jury in New York for perjury.

I have, of course, a bound volume from the same source, which I have not the time to read now, but anybody who wants to protect the United States of America and its security can get that report and read it and see just where this whole plan is taking us.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman has indicated that he has given this matter a great deal of study. Now, quite a number of representatives of the State Department appeared before our committee, and some of the things that the gentleman has stated in his statement here came out before the committee. I want to ask this: Did the gentleman see any effort on the part of anybody connected with the State Department or anybody connected with the majority party in this House that would indicate that they ever intended to get rid of those people down there, or make any effort whatever to get rid of them, and is it not a fact that the only people that they have gotten rid of are the people uncovered by the Committee on Un-American Activities of this House?

Mr. REED of New York. I thank the gentleman for that inquiry. The State Department has known of the situation since 1937. When I asked Mr. Clayton before our committee how many experts he was taking abroad to the Geneva negotiations, he has said there were either 101 or 102, I have forgotten which, and I asked him to put in the record the names of the 101 or 102 with their addresses. I had those checked by the department to which I turned on this subversive proposition, and nine of those people were going over there, and yet Mr. Clayton said at the time that they could not let us have the information that we wanted with reference to the things that we were going to trade on.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman please name the committee, the department, to which he turned to obtain this information?

Mr. REED of New York. The FBI.

Mr. MILLS. Do I understand that the FBI informed the gentleman that there was some question concerning the nine men at the Geneva Convention?

Mr. REED of New York. They had all been connected in some form or other with the Communist Party.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman identify for the RECORD the names of those individuals?

Mr. REED of New York. No; I would not.

Mr. MILLS. Has the gentleman submitted any statement involving any one of the nine to the State Department?

Mr. REED of New York. I have not.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has not given the State Department the benefit of that information?

Mr. REED of New York. I have not, and for a very good reason.

Mr. MILLS. I would certainly like to suggest to the gentleman that he do that at his earliest convenience.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I would just like to interpolate this much. Why would it not be the duty of the State Department to find out?

Mr. REED of New York. They should. They can find it out if they wish to, but they just do not care.

I want to point out in that connection that of all the spots in the United States absolutely vital to our security, the very heart of it, is in this question of the State Department. Any country that wanted to upset or overthrow this country can spend any amount of money, make any amount of effort to get people in there to write down the tariff on our vital and critical defense materials.

Mr. JENKINS. I am sure the gentleman does not want to give the impression, and I do not either, that everybody in the State Department is wrong.

Mr. REED of New York. Not at all.

Mr. JENKINS. All the gentleman is trying to say, I dare say, to the committee, is that there are a lot of people down there that are not true Americans, especially in connection with the ideas of commerce.

Mr. REED of New York. I will say this, that in the State Department there are any number of fine, splendid, patriotic Americans, and it is not fair that they should be permitted to be smeared by what everybody in this country is beginning to know, that they have been harboring subversive elements there and passing out information that is vital, and nobody will ever know how many of our boys went to their death on the battlefields of Europe because of the information peddled out by these subversive elements.

Is the State Department per se a fact-finding body? Should the State Department be legally clothed with the attributes of infallibility in furnishing information and advice to the President in negotiating trade treaties involving the national economy of our country?

Yet, this is what H. R. 1211 would do.

I call attention to the membership of the House that the 1948 act, which the Democratic majority has been called upon to repeal, made only procedural changes in the conduct of our trade-agreements program despite all false accusations to the contrary. Furthermore, let me say that we stand squarely behind these procedural changes which are centered around the so-called peril-point report. The peril-point report is nothing more than a report made by the Tariff Commission specifying the points below which it would be perilous to our domestic economy to go in reducing tariffs. The peril-point report was the outgrowth of exhaustive study and thought and was specifically designed to assist the State Department in adhering to the policy of not injuring any segment of our domestic economy in the conduct of the trade-agreement program. The reasons which dictated the creation of the peril-point report have been justified by subsequent events.

We of the Republican minority feel that it is urgent, as a bare minimum, to preserve this peril-point feature of the 1948 act by an amendment to H. R. 1211. No thinking patriotic American can oppose such an amendment which is essential to the preservation of our national economy and our national security.

In the Republican minority's proposed peril-point amendment to H. R. 1211, the only requirement is that the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission be submitted to the President for his guidance. He should have it prior to negotiating a trade agreement. He can completely ignore it and will not have to tell the Congress that he has done so. It will be submitted for his confidential information only.

Why is it so essential that the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission be made available to the President in his

trade-agreement negotiations with foreign nations? It is because there is no other fact-finding agency of the Government that is so well equipped by ability and long experience, operating in a strictly bipartisan, scientific capacity as the Tariff Commission to give this important information to the President.

Since the organization in 1916 of the Tariff Commission with this special provision for bipartisan representation, the Commission has furnished to the President, to the Congress, and to the general public impartial facts and unbiased information on all tariff, foreign trade, and foreign-trade policy questions affecting the United States and other countries of the world. In doing so over the past 32 years it has established a high reputation as a scientific fact-finding agency. Its reports are accepted by representatives of both political parties in Congress and by whatever President representing either party happens to be in the White House. This basic and essential information makes it possible to establish the policy for the Government on a more sound and adequate foundation and has proved quite satisfactory to both political parties.

The Commission, as is well known, had developed and has available a vast fund of information and rather complete files of statistical and technical information collected and analyzed and summarized over its 32 years of operation on each of the items of importation under the more than 800 paragraphs of the Tariff Act. Such information has been made available in published reports of the Commission not only to the President and to the Congress but to all other agencies of the Government. These reports show the conditions affecting the competition between the many thousands of imported articles under the various tariff rates in the Tariff Act and the like or similar articles of domestic production.

Any prudent President would welcome such a report from the Tariff Commission pointing out the proposed danger to our economy and national security that might result from reducing certain tariff rates below specified points.

The President and all members of the administration testifying before the Ways and Means Committee have said that they would operate the trade-agreements program so as not to injure domestic industry. This provision merely helps them to comply with their own stated objectives. It seems peculiar that if they are really serious in stating that they will operate the program so as not to injure domestic industries that they should in any way resent having the help of this well-established bipartisan fact-finding agency. Do they object to having the Tariff Commission make findings on these matters because they themselves, the President and the State Department, expect to make findings that will injure domestic industries and threaten the security of millions of our workers from Maine to California? Are they unconcerned by the fact that day by day more American industries are operating only part time? Unemployment is mounting; exports diminishing; competitive imports increasing?

Every thinking American who has any concern for the continued prosperity of our domestic economy, the well-being of millions of workers and the fulfillment of our international commitments to the freedom-loving peoples throughout the world must support two amendments to H. R. 1211.

Because we realize that we cannot save the 1948 act, we urge that one feature of this act be maintained. This is simply the requirement that the United States Tariff Commission furnish the President for his confidential guidance a report of its findings specifying the points below which it would be perilous to our domestic economy to go in reducing tariffs.

No one can claim this amendment to be a hampering restriction, and I accuse those who oppose this amendment with the deliberate attempt to sacrifice our domestic producers and the security of millions of our workers. Accordingly, I urge that H. R. 1211 be amended to retain the peril-point report, established by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948.

I also urge that an amendment to H. R. 1211 be made providing that all existing trade agreements that do not now contain an escape clause to the same general effect as article XIX of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade be modified so as to incorporate such a clause.

The reason for this second amendment is that at the present time many industries whose tariff protection has been seriously reduced in agreements prior to 1943 are unfairly discriminated against because they are denied the privilege which other industries have of appealing for relief under the escape clause. All industries should, of course, have equal treatment and a chance to have their day in court. This inequitable situation is spotlighted by the plight of the jewel-watch industry. There is no escape clause in the Swiss trade agreement made in 1936. However, there is an escape clause in all trade agreements made subsequent to 1943.

The sole purpose of these two amendments is to better the procedure leading to the negotiation of foreign trade agreements to the end that our domestic economy will not be injured in accordance with the stated policy of the President.

I charge those who oppose these two amendments with the responsibility for the economic evils which will beset us by any ill-advised tariff reduction.

I want to repeat that essential facts relating to the issues involved in the whole trade-agreements program were suppressed by the action of the Democratic majority. The Republican minority sought to have the whole Ways and Means Committee, through its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, Representative DOUGHTON, extend an invitation to the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Tariff Commission to appear to testify with reference to the role of the Tariff Commission to our domestic economy in the trade-agreements negotiations. This the Democratic majority refused to do, even by a record vote. This is an astounding perversion of representative government. Thus, the Ways and Means Committee, the Members of the House, and the public are deprived of pertinent facts relating to the preservation of our domestic economy as well as our national security.

The testimony from a long list of witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee representing a large segment of our economy urged the retention of the peril-point report, and asked for an escape clause in all trade agreements. This testimony fell on the deaf ears of the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee. What is the Democratic majority saying to the country when it ignores the peril-point amendment? The Democratic majority is saying, in effect: "We are not concerned with the conduct of our trade-agreements program. We have our must orders to obey."

If the peril-point report amendment to H. R. 1211 is disregarded by the Democratic majority, then every workingman who has a stake in the continued prosperity of our Nation should hold the Democratic Party strictly accountable for the economic evils and disastrous consequences which will beset our national economy as a result of any ill-advised tariff reduction.

The Democratic majority may make light of the attempt to salvage the peril-point report and the proposed escape-clause amendment and vote against these two imperative safeguards, but devastating consequences will follow. This story illustrates my point; it was told by the distinguished lecturer John B. Gough:

"I remember riding from Buffalo to Niagara Falls, and I said to a gentleman: 'What river is that, sir?' "

"That," he said, "is Niagara River."

"It is a beautiful stream," said I, "bright, smooth, and glassy. How far off are the rapids?"

"Only a few miles," was the reply.

"Is it possible that only a few miles from us we shall find the water in the turbulence which it must show when near the rapids?"

"You will find it so, sir."

"And, so I found it, and that first sight of Niagara Falls I shall never forget. Now, launch your bark on that river; the water is smooth, beautiful, and glassy. There is a ripple at the bow of your boat, and the silvery wake it leaves behind adds to your enjoyment. You set out on your pleasure excursion. Down the stream you glide; oars, sails, and helm in proper trim. Suddenly, someone cries out from the bank: 'Young men, ahoy!' "

" 'What is it?' "

" 'The rapids are below you.' "

"Ha, ha! We have heard of the rapids, but we are not such fools as to get into them. When we find we are going too fast, then we shall up with the helm and steer to the shore; we will set the mast in the socket, hoist the sail, and speed to land. Then on, boys, don't be alarmed, there's no danger.

"Young men, ahoy there!

"What is it?

"The rapids are below you!

"Ha, ha! We will laugh and quaff; all things delight us. What care we for the future? No man ever saw it. Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. We will enjoy life while we may; we will catch pleasure as it flies. This is enjoyment—time enough to steer out of danger when we are sailing too swiftly with the current.

"Young men, ahoy!

"What is it?

"Beware, beware! The rapids are below you!

"Now you feel them! See the water foaming all around! See how fast you pass that point! Up with the helm! Now turn! Pull hard; quick, quick! Pull for your lives! Pull till the blood starts from the nostrils and the veins stand like whipcord upon the brow. Set the mast in the socket, hoist the sail! Ah, ah, it is too late; faster and faster you near the awful cataract, and then, shrieking, cursing, howling, praying, over you go."

Mr. Chairman, this proposal before us today vitally affects all Americans—the farmer, the working man, the consumer. It may well determine whether we go forward to a higher standard of living with high wages, full employment, and more production; or whether we blunder into another recession or depression with production curtailed and workers on relief. America's trade policies are too vital to the Nation's welfare to trust to the whims of one man however well-intentioned that one man may be.

And so we go on, and we strike the rapids, and we go over the cataract, as we have time and again, as result of these low tariffs. We had low tariffs in the Democratic Underwood bill. And when we got into the last war what happened? Six million men out of work. Not a bit of smoke coming from a smokestack in this country. They were putting up their soup kitchens everywhere all over this Nation. What was done? The Republican Party came into power. They had these low-tariff rates revised—not as low as you have got them now. We put in a tariff bill to protect our farmers, our workmen, our industries. It was not long thereafter until we had 6,000,000 people at work again and the smoke was coming out of the smokestacks.

We have been through this disastrous mill once. When you Democrats draw a picture of 1929 why do you not look back to the time of your Underwood low tariff and see what happened. I tell you this is an American question. It is not a political question at all. It is our own national defense and our own security that is the issue. When you see the type of people who are writing these trade agreements sitting on the inside, and you know the subversive infiltrations, and the evidence is so overwhelming I cannot understand why any person who loves America should wish to support H. R. 1211, and thus permit these subversive agents to barter away our safety. We know that for years Communists have infiltrated into our departments of Government, especially into the vital spots where they can drive a dagger into the heart of Uncle Sam.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I would like to ask you if, in 1932, when I was selling wheat for 35 cents a bushel, corn for 14 cents, and hogs for 3 cents a pound, and butterfat for 9 cents a pound, and eggs for 6 cents a dozen, and when a good milk cow would bring only $15, if those products were right then and there being protected—and I said "protected"—by the highest tariff duties in the history of this country.

Mr. REED of New York. Let me tell you, sir, that was the aftermath of a Democratic war.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Oh, sure. You have always got to go off like that. You will not stand hitched.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield for a question.

Mr. LYNCH. I would like to know, after the gentleman has finished his discourse, in view of the fact that he has spoken against reciprocal trade agreements, and in view of the fact that he has spoken in favor of them, whether or not you are today in favor of or against reciprocal trade agreements as a principle.

Mr. REED of New York. Just as long as the State Department, like a nest of vipers—Communists, which I am sure you do not love—are on the inside, writing the trade agreements, I shall always be against them. When they are written by real Americans, as they should be, patriotic men like the gentleman who is addressing me, then it will be a different question.

Mr. LYNCH. I can understand the gentleman's point with respect to Communists, but, after all, has there been any evidence produced before the committee that Communists actually wrote or had any part in the writing of any reciprocal trade agreements, to the knowledge of the gentleman?

Mr. REED of New York. You heard what I read today.

Mr. LYNCH. Yes; I heard what you have said, but I have asked you whether or not there is any definite evidence that they actually had anything to do—these people who you say are Communists—actually were the persons in whose hands is placed the obligation of writing reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. REED of New York. According to their own testimony. You do not need to have it in this record at all. The gentleman knows, and I have taken that position since 1934, that they should not have part in these agreements. I voted against them.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Is it not a fact that if the gentleman knew of any particular person who was associated with the Communist Party or with a Communist-front organization, if the gentleman knew that any such persons had to do also with the writing of the reciprocal trade agreements, does he not think in all fairness to the Congress that he should give the names of those persons?

Mr. REED of New York. Let me tell the gentleman that in the hearings in the Senate every effort was made to let them see the minutes, and they refused. That is in the hearings; a refusal by Mr. Clayton to let them see what was in the minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to speak every time this subject has been considered here in the House. Realizing that time is limited and that many Members desire to speak, I shall ask your indulgence for a short time only on this occasion.

The pending bill, H. R. 1211, is in response to a message of the President of the United States and is a very important administration measure. It was favorably reported by a vote of 17 to 8 by the Committee on Ways and Means. I shall endeavor briefly to cover the provisions of the bill and then as time may permit to discuss the trade-agreements program. As will be observed by a reading of the bill, it contains six sections.

Section 1 embraces the title of the bill: The Trade Agreements Act of 1949.

Section 2 repeals the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, this Republican measure to which they point with such pride on the other side of the Chamber. Section 2 repeals that act.

Section 3 of this bill provides that the period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign-trade agreements under Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended is extended for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1948. This means it will be extended for the customary period of 3 years from the time the last extension expired.

Section 4 deletes from the preamble of the act of 1934 certain language which is no longer applicable and is not necessary to be included.

Section 5 simply provides that the Military Establishment shall be substituted for the War Department and the Navy Department as is provided in the previous act for the reason that the act which was passed by Congress unifying the military services now provides for the Military Establishment instead of War Department and Navy Department.

Section 6 applies only to Cuba and would enable the United States to raise rather than lower certain tariff rates. That covers the provisions of the pending bill.

The trade agreements program was adopted by the act of June 12, 1934, and has been extended by the acts of 1937, 1940, 1943, 1945, and 1948. As I have said on previous occasions while discussing this program, in its far-reaching consequences to the future happiness and welfare of the people of this country and the world, it is probably the most important measure that could challenge the thoughtful attention of this Congress.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 conferred discretionary authority upon the President of the United States to negotiate and enter into trade agreements

with other countries of the world. There has been so much confusion injected into this subject and so much discussion that is entirely irrelevant and has no application to the matter now under consideration that it might be well for us to remind ourselves of the provisions contained in the 1934 act, which is the real subject of consideration here today because all the pending bill proposes to do is to extend the provisions of the act of 1934 as it has been modified by the different extension acts since that time.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. As I understand the gentleman, actually the extension is only for 2 years from next June; is that right?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. It is extended for 3 years, the customary period that has been usually done in the past, from the time it should have been extended last year when our Republican friends were in the majority and did everything they could to try to kill the program. They have opposed it all the way through and realizing that they could not go before the American people in the campaign of 1948 with a record of having completely killed the reciprocal trade-agreements program they tried to do all they could to accomplish that purpose and still be able to say that they had extended the program.

Mr. GRANGER. Going back to the last extension, the authority under the act is not changed at all with respect to the limitations of these trade agreements; is that right?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. The purpose of this bill today is to extend the original Cordell Hull reciprocal-trade-agreement program for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1948.

Mr. GRANGER. Under this bill we would be acting according to the limitations on the power of the President to make trade agreements?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. By briefly referring to the act of 1934, it will be observed that the act provides, among other things:

> For the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States * * * by regulating the admission of foreign goods into the United States in accordance with the characteristics and needs of the various branches of American production so that foreign markets will be made available to those branches of American production which require and are capable of developing such outlets by according corresponding market opportunities for foreign products in the United States.

For that purpose—

> The President, whenever he finds as a fact that any existing duties or other import restrictions of the United States or any foreign country are unduly burdening and restricting the foreign trade of the United States and that the purpose above declared will be promoted by the means hereinafter specified, is authorized from time to time—
>
> (1) To enter into foreign trade agreements with foreign governments or instrumentalities thereof; and
>
> (2) To proclaim such modifications of existing duties and other import restrictions, or such additional import restrictions, or such continuance, and for such minimum periods, of existing customs or excise treatment of any article covered by foreign trade agreements, as are required or appropriate to carry out any foreign trade agreement that the President has entered into hereunder.

Now, bear this in mind:

> No proclamation shall be made increasing or decreasing by more than 50 percent any existing rate of duty or transferring any article between the dutiable and free lists.

In other words, this simply confers upon the President of the United States, the duly chosen representative of all the people of this country, the authority to negotiate these trade agreements. It simply means in practical application that we realize that we produce large surpluses of products in this country. In normal times about 55 or 60 percent of our cotton is surplus; about 40 percent of our tobacco; about 50 percent of our packing house lard, as well as vast quantities of other agricultural products are surplus. We produce that much more in this country than we normally consume.

There are countries throughout the world that need those products. If they are not sold and exported to those places throughout the world, where they are needed, and are left here on the American market, they can have only one effect, and that is to beat down the prices that our farmers receive for the products of their toil. There are vast surpluses of many industrial products, and this program simply means in practical application that the President of the United States is authorized to sit down around the table, through his chosen representatives, and say to the other countries of the world, "We have certain surplus products in this country. Many of them are needed by you. You have some products in your country that are needed by our people. Let us sit down and see if we cannot work out a trade, a trade that will be to the advantage and in the interest of the people of both countries." That is the purpose of this program, and it has worked remarkably successfully up to this time.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. When the gentleman says, work out a trade, he means, does he not, that there would be a working-out or elimination of the various trade barriers that have been erected as the result of tariffs in the various countries; is that not a fact?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct; to stimulate the flow of trade between our country and these other countries of the world.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. The gentleman spoke of commodities produced in surplus in the United States. Is it not also true that in instances where we have a less quantity produced than we consume, such as sugar, that special provisions, such as the sugar quota acts, have been enacted to take care of that situation, too?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. In the Trade Agreements Act a direct approach was made to the trade-barrier problem. Foreign trade increased, and the increase was on a sound basis. Congress has carefully reviewed the program periodically and has approved it by extending the act. Between the years 1934 and 1935, and the years 1938 and 1939, our exports to trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent, while our exports to non-trade-agreement countries increased by only 32 percent.

Our imports from these agreement countries increased by 22 percent, and imports from nonagreement countries by only 13 percent.

Trade agreements have been negotiated with 42 countries, and 39 of them are still in effect. Hundreds of concessions have been obtained for the benefit of products of this country and, of course, concessions have been made by us for the benefit of products of other countries. Over 65 percent of our normal foreign trade is carried on with trade-agreement countries. These countries have made concessions on something like 75 percent of their agricultural imports from this country and on something like 50 percent of imports of industrial products from this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Will the gentleman explain what position the Tariff Commission will assume in this picture if this bill passes?

Mr. COOPER. The Tariff Commission assumes the same position that it did under the original act. It participates in all the hearings, all the consideration, and even in all the negotiations, which is not true under the act of 1948.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Not in a single instance has the Tariff Commission as such had anything to do with it.

Mr. COOPER. That just shows how little the gentleman from New York knows about it.

Mr. REED of New York. I know absolutely, sir, and the gentleman knows that I do.

Mr. COOPER. That just shows how little he knows about the program. A man who has always opposed the trade-agreement program, a man who stood right here and voted for the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill, a man who has opposed all of our international program, now gets up here and tries to tell you what ought to be done with an important program like this.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman did not answer my question.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is evidently a difference of opinion here between two members of the committee. May I ask the gentleman to point out the section of the bill that gives the authority to the Tariff Commission to continue this authority under the bill?

Mr. COOPER. The original act contains that authority, and this pending bill extends the original act that has been in existence throughout the years.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I hope my question will not interfere with the logic of the gentleman's presentation and the manner in which he is presenting it to the House. Will the gentleman address his remarks to this wording in section 6:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to preclude the application to any product of Cuba (including products preferentially free of duty) of a rate of duty not higher than the rate applicable to the like products of other foreign countries (except the Philippines), whether or not the application of such rate involves any preferential customs treatment. No rate of duty on products of Cuba shall in any case be decreased by more than 50 percent of the rate of duty, however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress).

Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. COOPER. As I endeavored to state earlier, section 6 applies only to Cuba. It would enable the United States to raise rather than lower certain tariff rates. It comes about in this way: There are certain products that are covered in the general agreement on tariff and trade upon which United States duties were increased. By reason of the application of that situation to Cuba, which the gentleman understands occupies a peculiar position of its own, some of the rates that were included in agreements with other countries result in an advantage to the same products coming in from Cuba. Section 6 would enable these rates to be equalized. That is all it means.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will this affect products of Mexico in like manner as those coming from Cuba?

Mr. COOPER. I do not recall any illustrations given about Mexico.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. The gentleman will realize that I represent a district where they have a great deal of winter farming, where we raise many products. The products of Cuba and of Mexico come in competition at the full bloom of our production.

Mr. COOPER. I do not think this has anything to do with that. The illustration given the committee was this: There were certain parts of chronometers originally included in the 1938 trade agreement with Great Britain, which was superseded by the Geneva agreement of last year. The result is an effective rate on British chronometer parts higher than can be applied to parts for chronometers imported from Cuba. This bill would merely enable the same rate to be applied to such Cuban imports.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is it not true that William McKinley was considered one of the early tariff experts and that in the last speech that he made before he was unfortunately assassinated he advocated reciprocal-trade agreements, saying that the tariffs had gone as far as they could in the purpose for which they had been originally enacted and he thought that we should begin to have reciprocal-trade agreements?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman tell me whether in his opinion there are as many restrictions today in international trade as there were in 1934 prior to the reciprocal-trade-agreements program?

Mr. COOPER. Certainly not.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman tell me whether any have been removed other than reductions in tariffs on our part?

Mr. COOPER. Yes, and the gentlemen well knows that.

Mr. Chairman, concessions were obtained on thousands of individual products which enter into the export trade of the United States. For example, over 1,400 concessions were made in our favor in the agreement with the United Kingdom, while over a thousand were made by Canada. Some 400 concessions were made by Cuba, and many concessions by other countries of the world. Every State in the Union produces some of the products on which concessions were obtained.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Out in my State we have this problem both directly and in reverse. We ship a great deal to Europe—dried fruits and things of that kind. Those who are apprehensive about the reciprocal-trade program are the people who raise nuts, such as the walnut and almond growers, of whom there are a large group in my district. The one complaint they make to me, the one complaint that they reiterate time and again is this: they say that they come to the hearings prepared with their data and submit it. They claim they have no way of knowing whether the Reciprocal Trade Committees pay a bit of attention to what they submit. Can the gentleman comment on that, please?

Mr. COOPER. I can say to the gentleman that I have heard every witness who has ever testified before the Committee on Ways and Means on this program. It has been my privilege to be a member of the committee longer than any other man on it, except our distinguished chairman. I have heard every witness who testified before our committee on this subject, and I say to you that it is my honest conviction that no American industry has been seriously injured by any of these trade agreements which have been negotiated. But more specifically answering your question, every American interest has full, ample and complete opportunity to appear before the responsible authorities of this Government, who are engaged in this important work of assembling material and information, to be considered during the negotiations on these agreements. All of them have full, ample, and complete opportunity to be heard. The original act so provides. That program is to be continued. This program is administered with the most painstaking care of anything I have ever known to be undertaken by this Government.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would also like to have the gentleman's comment on the clause in the proposed change in the act where it provides that the United States Tariff Commission's information and data shall be considered by the President. Is it working out that way, that the President does in fact consult the Tariff Commission?

Mr. COOPER. Absolutely, and the original act provides that. The Tariff Commission is to furnish data and information and material to the Interdepartmental Committee, and to the President of the United States. Under the old program which we are seeking to continue by the pending bill, the Tariff Commission itself has representatives on these various committees, and participates all the way through, even to the negotiation of the trade agreement itself, whereas, under the act of 1948, sponsored by our distinguished former colleague who is unfortunately not with us any longer, Mr. Gearhart, the Tariff Commission was taken out of all of that participation, and set apart, separate and apart to make a study and finding, without the benefit of going through all these considerations that are given by these various committees, and then was authorized to make certain reports to the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. Does the Tariff Commission hold exhaustive hearings itself, so they have ample data to give and to advise?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, the Tariff Commission is a constantly continuing agency that gives every possible thought and consideration to tariff matters.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield briefly.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman indicate to what extent, if at all, the Tariff Commission has appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, either this time or in previous years, and expressed its views with respect to the procedure by which these agreements are made?

Mr. COOPER. Members of the Tariff Commission, at least the chairman of the Tariff Commission, and I think other commissioners, have appeared many times in the past. None of them appeared this time.

Mr. COLE of New York. Were they critical of the program?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, they have always appeared in support of the program. The chairman of the Commission has more or less always taken the attitude: "I am

here to give you any information, any counsel that I can"; but he has always supported the program.

We have heard considerable discussion about the value of the trade-agreement program to agriculture. Coming from an agricultural district, I am intensely interested in the welfare of our farmers, and have worked for and supported all agricultural legislation since I have been privileged to serve in this body. It is my conviction that this program is of greater value to agriculture than most any part of the life of this country. I invite your attention to the hearings, and especially to a statement by Mr. Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who appeared before the committee in support of the pending legislation. Among other things he said:

No group in the United States has a greater stake in maintaining a high level of exports than American farmers. The American farmer needs foreign markets. In 1948 the production of agricultural products was 38 percent above the prewar level.

Then, passing on to another point in Mr. Kline's statement, I quote:

We therefore support the continuation of the Trade Agreements Act for another 3-year period, and the elimination of the restrictions enacted in the 1948 extension act, which tend to hamper the successful operation of this program.

A great deal has been said from time to time on the subject of wage scales in this country and other countries of the world. I invite attention to the fact that it should be remembered that unit costs, not wages, determine the competitive position of the manufacturers. Information from our Department of Commerce shows that the output per man-hour in our factories is more than 50 percent greater than in Canada, and more than twice that in the United Kingdom. It is generally conceded that in many industries we have the lowest production costs in the world. This is confirmed by the volume and diversity of our exports to markets in which we compete on an equal basis with other manufacturing nations.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. GRANGER. I hate to take the gentleman's thought off his present subject matter, but going back to this question of the exception made in the case of Cuba; that is a departure from the favored-nations provisions of the act, is it not? Do we make other exceptions?

Mr. COOPER. We have given certain consideration in the case of Cuba for many years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I wish very briefly to touch upon one phase that is frequently mentioned and discussed, and that is the most-favored-nations policy. You will recall that this was initiated by that former distinguished Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes. It has been followed throughout the application of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. Some time ago a special study was made by the State Department and the Tariff Commission of the generalization of concessions, and also the other side of the question. Those investigations show that the generalizations that we made to other countries amounted to about $30,000,000 in trade. On the other hand, by that very generalization policy we protected something like $250,000,000 worth of our own export trade. The ratio stands about $9 in benefits that we have received for every $1 of concessions we have granted. A 9-to-1 advantage is considered to be a pretty good trade.

Mr. Chairman, we realize, of course, that at this critical time in the affairs of the world this program is of greater importance than it has ever been in the past. We realize that we are now spending billions of dollars in the great European recovery program. This cannot continue indefinitely. We must try to see to it that international trade is restored to the extent that those countries now receiving financial aid from us will be able to stand on their own feet. In the European Recovery Act it is provided that the countries receiving benefits thereunder shall make an effort to reduce tariffs and trade barriers between themselves and with other countries of the world. Certainly, it is very important that we continue this program that makes it possible for us to carry on foreign trade with other countries throughout the world.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Does the gentleman feel that the European recovery program, which requires the reduction of trade barriers between European nations, can possibly succeed unless we in this country encourage that by the adoption of this program?

Mr. COOPER. The gentleman is correct. This is a very vital part of our international program. It perhaps means more than any one particular part of it and certainly we must go forward with this program as it was originally conceived by the man who stands out in bold relief as one of the greatest statesmen of all the world, our former colleague in this House, the distinguished Cordell Hull.

The purpose of this bill is to extend this program that has been tried and found beneficial to the people of this country as well as the other countries of the world, and it should receive the support of those in this Chamber who have favored our international program. This is perhaps the most important part of our effort to bring about a proper degree of recovery throughout the entire world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, for a few minutes I should like to reply to some of the arguments advanced by my very distinguished friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] sought to leave the impression that all the agricultural organizations in the land are in favor of the pending measure. As far as I am concerned, I think the most representative organization among the farmers of the United States is the Grange.

We had Mr. Goss, the distinguished president of the Grange, before us and here is what he stated, summing up his appraisal of the situation:

We would much prefer to see the committee—

Meaning the Ways and Means Committee—

devote its time to the enactment of such legislation and let the present law stand until a sound and effective tariff measure can be passed.

By the words "present law" he means the law passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress.

There is in clear language what the president of the Grange stated.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. He also testified that the Grange had a membership of 813,000 farmers?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right. I think it is the oldest and largest of all the farm organizations. I should also like to reply to the argument of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] when he recited to us the wonderful and beneficent effects of these trade agreements. Here is a question I should like to direct to anyone on the majority side. Is it not a well-established fact that the tariffs and trade barriers are higher against us now in every country than they were when we began to negotiate them?

Here is another thing I should like to stress. It has been brought out before our committee time after time, year after year, that the tariff authorities have never negotiated any rate upward. They have always negotiated them downward. There was a witness the other day who said, "Yes, they have negotiated one rate upward." That was on sardines. They have negotiated the rate on sardines upward. But under questions from one of our members he divided the sardines into four groups and said that they raised the rate on only one group, so three-fourths of the sardines are in the same class as everything else. They have never raised a single tariff anywhere. I can't see how it could be consistent with fair play or even the law of averages how these fellows who make these agreements could possibly claim that they were fair with our country when they could not find where they could not in one single instance give to our country a little increase in protection duties.

Why is this not reciprocal? Why is it we have to pay what they all ask every place? We take the short end of the stick all the time and every place, and if I am not stating the true facts in reference to that, I invite you to recite one single instance where these activities have raised the duty at any time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not only are those rates higher but in addition—I want to see if the gentleman agrees with this—they impose currency controls against us which have the effect of blocking the movement of goods into those countries.

Mr. JENKINS. I cannot answer this positively that all the countries have manipulated their currency against us, but in the majority of the cases it has been done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And our State Department continually proceeds with a program which encourages them in doing that.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, the gentleman is absolutely right. Take Mexico. The Mexican escape clause is considered the prize agreement of all. That is considered the model escape clause. What has Mexico done? Just deliberately walked out of it. I do not think any country in the whole world has kept this agreement with us. We keep all our agreements all the time, but they renege and run out, and they change their currency and do anything they please to render the agreement nugatory.

Let me say to my good friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] I am proud of him, because he always extols his fellow Tennessean, Cordell Hull. But, you know, I served with Cordell Hull, and I served with Mr. JERRY COOPER. To my mind the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] far surpasses Mr. Hull both intellectually and as a statesman.

Now, let us talk a little about these negotiations. Someone asked the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] the question about how these negotiations are entered into. His reply was such that I cannot agree with it. These negotiations are such that I am reminded of the statement in the Bible where speaking of man it says that he was "fearfully and wonderfully made." My friends, I want to leave this thought with you. We questioned dozens of men who went down before these tariff committees, and we never found anybody yet who has been satisfied. Without exception every person who discussed the experiences that he had before these trade committees said in effect that their appearance before those committees was absolutely unsatisfactory. Now I would like to ask my good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], who has been a member of the Ways and Means Committee for a long time, did he ever see anybody or hear of anybody that ever appeared before us that said he was satisfied with the treatment he received down before the trade committees?

Mr. MILLS. I will answer the gentleman by saying this——

Mr. JENKINS. Well, just answer me positively "Yes" or "No" without making a speech.

Mr. MILLS. Those who appeared before our committee in opposition to the program——

Mr. JENKINS. In opposition or in favor. Answer me the question that I asked you. Did the gentleman ever hear anybody say that he was satisfied, or defended the program in any way at any time?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman will remember Mr. Kline's statement, the head of the American Farm Bureau, when he said that they had been treated all right. The gentleman will remember the statement of Mr. Casey, representing the glove industry, where he said that they had been received properly.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes, but the gentleman knows that Mr. Casey was one of the most ardent opponents of this measure which the gentleman supports, that ever appeared before our committee.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman, of course, knows that the man who has protection does not want to give it up.

Mr. JENKINS. Certainly, and he ought not to be compelled to do so if it will destroy his business. But he told you at the same time that if he did not get some protection, he was going to go out of business. That is exactly what he said. Now, if you want to take the responsibility for putting him out of business, that is your responsibility.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman quite well remembers that Mr. Casey was concerned about imports from Japan; the program of exporting from there conducted by our own Army.

Mr. JENKINS. But this gentleman, Mr. Casey, made a very fine statement and came voluntarily. He made a statement against the program that the majority is now favoring and he was bitterly against it.

Now then, let me talk to you further about these negotiations. This system employed by these trade-agreement boys of the State Department is about the most un-American program that I have ever heard. I repeat to you, we had dozens of fine men, lawyers, agriculturists, and businessmen come before us at different times, and all complained against the treatment accorded them and not a single person at any time ever said he had fair treatment and not a single person ever knew who considered the statements and arguments made by them, or ever knew who decided against them and why the decision was made and they got no advice or information of any kind. They all said, "We go down there and a couple of nice looking fellows come out, and they are suave, and they are nice. They sit there and we tell them our story. They do not even pay much attention to it. When we are through they say we can go. We never hear another thing about it. We do not know what became of it."

That is not right, that is not treating our American taxpayer right, and it cannot be made right until some change is made.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I remember the old days under the tariff programs back in the twenties when I was trying to help the clay-products industry of our State, with the cooperation of our then colleague from Ohio, Mr. Murphy. The gentleman may remember him.

Mr. JENKINS. He was a great protectionist if there ever was one. You did well to get his help.

Mr. McSWEENEY. We tried to get his help in connection with the brick, the clay-products industry, which is an important industry in our State. We could not get anywhere at that time, as the gentleman may remember.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right.

Last week one of the big brick industries in my section suspended operation temporarily, leaving 500 men out of employment. That is the result all over this country because of this program. You may wonder why I am a little zealous about this. I have hundreds of fine men in my own district who make their living working at brick and tile plants. I am interested in them.

Mr. McSWEENEY. They were not protected under the old system.

Mr. JENKINS. I will come to that a little later, when I talk about what is on the free list. But I will say to the gentleman that the duty on brick importations is now only about one-half of what it was at the time the gentleman refers to.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If this thing goes through, will it not hurt the man who labors with his hands in this country?

Mr. JENKINS. Most assuredly. Everybody knows that the gentleman is right in his viewpoint in that connection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman advise me just how high the tariff would have to be to protect this brick concern about which he is talking?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know. I cannot give the gentleman the exact figures. But, as I have already said, the duty on brick has been reduced about 50 percent under these agreements. However, I would do this, if I could. I would go down there and ask them about it, or somebody should, for if I went they would not tell me. I would never find out anything about it. Some of the brick people out there just had to quit. It was no use for them to come to Washington. Oh, I know this is a free-trade program. This is a free-trade Cordell Hull program. Cordell Hull is probably the greatest free-trader America ever produced. This is Cordell Hull's program. There is no use to come to Washington. Everybody says you cannot get any satisfaction in Washington.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman is such an able member of our committee, and I mean that seriously, that I am certain he could obtain that information from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. JENKINS. If I could relieve the situation that I am talking about, if I could bring to the American people the justice to which they are entitled in connection with these matters and correct the shameful conditions that go on down

there, I would quit this House today and go down there and do that job. I would be doing the greatest service for millions of our people that anybody has done for a long time.

Mr. MILLS. Would the gentleman be entirely satisfied if the House should adopt the two amendments referred to in the minority report on page 1? Would the gentleman be entirely satisfied with that program?

Mr. JENKINS. I would be satisfied with that for 1 day's work, tomorrow. I hope we get it done. That will be a fine day's work for 1 day, but I would not stop at that. I would do many other things against which our people are complaining. Many businessmen in the country are afraid to make their protests down here in Washington because they fear reprisals.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman might be satisfied on Wednesday, but he might not be satisfied on Thursday?

Mr. JENKINS. I would go further. I would do good on Wednesday, and then do more on Thursday.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman would have some more amendments on Thursday?

Mr. JENKINS. That is right; we agree.

Mr. NICHOLSON. If the gentleman will yield further, may I say that I am for anything that will help industry or the people who work in this country. If anybody is going to walk the streets, I would prefer that they walk in foreign countries, not in our country.

Mr. JENKINS. We both agree exactly.

May I take up now, the allusion that was made to Mr. McKinley's position. I do this in all humility because there is no question about Mr. McKinley's great ability and his position on the question of protective tariff. There is no question but that Mr. McKinley was the greatest tariff expert of his generation.

Mr. McKinley gave us the word "reciprocity." This is where it came from. Then as now, sometimes, I think we talk too much about the tariff, because 65 percent of all the commodities that come into the country come in free. Sixty-five percent of all our trade with all the nations comes in free of any tariff at all. That percentage was very great in Mr. McKinley's time, also, but Mr. McKinley advanced a program and said something to this effect: If we are going to let these people come in free with all their goods from all over the world, why not demand a little reciprocity? And we did demand a little reciprocity.

McKinley's theory always was—and even up to the day that he was assassinated at Buffalo, he had never retreated from that position—that reciprocity was advisable if it would be reciprocal by both parties and also that the measure of the tariff should be the difference between the cost of production in our country and the cost of production in the country from which the goods came. That was his policy all the time. That is our policy and that is my policy today. The only change is a change due to the change of world conditions. It was our duty to help some of the war-torn countries to reestablish themselves but when they became reestablished it is not necessary for us to admit free their products in competition with our products.

Let me answer if I may a few of the arguments made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. I yield to no one in paying my respects to this distinguished gentleman who has lived and worked among us many, many years. He has been in Congress probably longer than some of our new Members have been on earth. But the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] laid great stress on, and so many Members speaking on the Democratic side talk so much about, the Smoot-Hawley law. Some of our new Members have come here and have heard people talk about that law. You have made speeches against the Smoot-Hawley law year after year and year after year. Do you not know that nobody on your side ever since the Smoot-Hawley law was passed has ever come up here with a bill to repeal it? No, you have not. Why does not somebody come up with a measure to repeal this nefarious monstrosity?

Nobody ever has had the temerity to do it. Why, today in practically all of the procedures under which the Tariff Commission operates they operate under that law.

What is the use in hashing up things that are of no consequence at all today, because if there is anything wrong about it, why do you not take it out? Nobody has ever tried to do it.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. CAMP. Does not the gentleman know that the very purpose of the act which we are extending here is to permit the President to reduce the rate in the Smoot-Hawley bill where he thinks it is for the benefit of trade?

Mr. JENKINS. May I say to my friend that that is what I have been complaining about. The President and the Commission have a right to reduce these rates and they have been reducing and reducing and reducing.

He also has the right to increase the rates, but he has never increased them in a single instance.

Mr. CAMP. But his action has been on the basis of McKinley's policy of reciprocity of which you are in favor.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; but that reciprocity applies to us as well, as I said before. When we give our market, which is by far the greatest market on earth, to the world and when we say to the whole world that 65 percent of everything that comes in can come in free, when we give them something, do you not think that they ought to give us something?

Mr. CAMP. Of course I do. And that is why we have reciprocal trade so we can get some benefits.

Mr. JENKINS. That is right, and that is what I think, too. But we do not have an organization that can give us that and we never have had.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman confuses me somewhat. He complains of the fact that we have not repealed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act and in the next breath he complains because the tariff rates in the United States are equal to or under the Underwood Tariff Act rate. It seems to me that we have not only repealed the Smoot-Hawley tariff rates, but repealed other rates.

Mr. JENKINS. Yes; but you are repealing all the time without any consideration of the consequences. That is the way you have drawn your agreements and when they commence to pinch these foreign countries, they squeal out of it. You do nothing about it and our industry has had to bear the brunt of it and take the consequences.

Mr. MILLS. Does the gentleman contend that nothing can be done about it?

Mr. JENKINS. Why certainly, if this bill passes. Our amendments would help a great deal.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I remember what the distinguished Henry Rainey, who was leader on that side of the House many years ago, said on the floor. He said, "You talk about repealing the Tariff Act. Why, the Republicans will not do it, and we do not dare."

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENKINS. I yield.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Has not the demonetization of the dollar made effective tariffs on an ad valorem basis much more effective than they would have been before the demonetization of the dollar?

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know how that would work out in figures, but I just know how they do in other parts of the world. I know how they manipulate their currency. They make the contract with us first and then they manipulate the currency to suit the contract. That is the way they do it. And do not forget that. That is one of the greatest factors in business activity in the world today—the manipulation of currency in foreign countries.

If I may proceed. I have listened to some pretty spurious arguments. I want to answer them, because I think I have the answer right here in the book.

Nearly every New Dealer who discusses the reciprocal-trade agreements says something to this effect, "Well, is it not true that business between our country and the foreign countries increased in every case as we made these trade agreements?"

They say that in every case, when we made a trade agreement, business increased with that country and it did not increase with other countries.

Now, let me give you the facts with reference to Norway and Sweden for instance. We made a contract with Sweden and we did not make one with Norway. Our business with Norway increased more than it did with Sweden, in the same time. Now, why do you make such arguments as that when they are absolutely not borne out by the facts?

Let us take Argentina and Brazil. We make a contract with Brazil and we do not make a contract with Argentina. Our trade with Argentina far surpasses

our trade with Brazil in the same time. Let us go to Venezuela and Colombia. The same thing applies there. We make a trade treaty with Colombia and we do not make one with Venezuela. Business with Venezuela increased far more than it did with Colombia.

So why do you make such arguments? Why do you make arguments with reference to certain periods of inactivity? They say, "Mr. Hoover's time. Mr. Hoover's time." His time terminated in 1932. We had a Democratic Congress in 1930. When did WPA come into existence? Who ever heard of WPA up until that time?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. JENKINS. The Hull reciprocal-trade agreements were in effect in 1935, 1936, and 1937, when WPA was in effect and employed more people than any other industry. What good did the trade agreements do to the country when they were first passed? I do not say that WPA came on because of these agreements, but I say that these agreements did not do for the country what you claim they did. Mr. Chairman, I hope to develop some of these matters further as this debate progresses. I am sorry that my time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, you will recall that during the very first days of this session, I introduced a resolution providing for a permanent delegation to the President of authority to enter into trade agreements with foreign countries. Under my bill, it would no longer have been necessary for Congress to press legislation every 2 or 3 years to keep the Reciprocal Trade Act alive. However, the Congress would have continued to keep a close eye on the President's exercise of this authority through investigatory supervision.

I still maintain that there is considerable merit in my resolution. However, as a result of the hearings held by the Ways and Means Committee and of the important revelations that were made there by the technicians and experts in charge of the day-to-day operations of the trade-agreement program, I have decided to support in full the committee bill.

I am supporting the committee bill for three important reasons:

First. The Hull reciprocal-trade program was one of the vital issues in the recent election. The people have repudiated the crippling amendments made by the Republican Eightieth Congress by refusing to reelect both the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Tariff and Reciprocal Trade. The author of the Gearhart bill and many who sustained him have been defeated at the polls. The plunderbund of Smoot-Hawley high-tariff boys, the American Tariff League and the Grundyites of reactionary republicanism, has been decisively checkmated.

The farmers, the housewives, and the labor unionists—all those members of the consuming public who played their part in bringing about this repudiation at the polls—have a right to expect prompt action on our part to restore the Hull program. I would be the last one to stand in the way of such positive action. Perhaps at a later date, when there is more time, the merits of my resolution can be discussed at greater length.

Second. Time is of great importance in regard to this legislation. Early in April very extensive tariff negotiations are scheduled to commence in Annecy, France, close to the Swiss border. It is essential that the United States play its full and unfettered part in these negotiations. Thirteen additional countries have indicated a desire to participate in the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade, concluded in the autumn of 1947 between the United States and 22 other countries.

The general agreement is the most important and comprehensive trade agreement in history. By this agreement 23 nations agreed to reduce their tariffs or to maintain low tariffs or none at all on a wide variety of products. The products affected accounted in 1938 for over half of the world's international trade. In addition, the agreement includes commitments to curb the use of other trade restrictions, such as import quotas, and to limit various kinds of discrimination, such as preferental treatment of imports from one country as against those from another. Never before have so many nations combined in such an intensive effort to reduce barriers to trade.

The extension of this agreement to 13 new countries is consequently a very important step in the series of moves which the United States is making to remove barriers which stand as unnecessary obstacles to the building of a more stable and a more prosperous world.

We know that unless nations can sell each other products of their agriculture, labor, and industry to the greatest possible extent, there can be no sure foundation for economic or political peace. We know that unless trade restrictions are relaxed, the lot of the private trader in international trade will become increasingly difficult. We know that unless world trade is increased, the tremendous investment we are making in the European recovery program will be largely wasted.

Preparations for tariff negotiations take time—particularly when a large number of countries are involved. Planning for the April negotiations has been going on for over 6 months. The effectiveness of United States participation in the negotiations has been drastically hampered, despite the best efforts of the technicians, by the restrictive provisions and limited extension of the present trade-agreements law. Faced with uncertainty as to the status of the law after June 30, foreign countries unquestionably have been more reluctant to plan important and far-reaching commitments than they otherwise would have been. Faced with the prospects of niggardly offers, limited by the United States Tariff Commission's overcautious peril points, foreign countries must be contemplating niggardly offers in turn, which would result in a niggardly attempt to reduce world trade barriers.

This is no time for niggardly attempts to solve basic world problems. Bold and imaginative steps, offset by reciprocal action, must be taken and taken now, not next year or the year afterward. Realizing this as I do, and recognizing that the April negotiations should not be postponed until we decide upon a new basic trade-agreements law, I am willing to defer consideration of my resolution for a permanent trade-agreements act until a more suitable time.

Third. There is still one last reason why I am supporting unchanged the committee bill at this time. It has to do with the attitude of people throughout the world toward the United States. They are wondering how quickly and to what degree the Eighty-first Congress can reverse the reactionary isolationist trend started by the unlamented Republican Eightieth Congress. Today we face the first test. We can show the world the temper of this new Congress, and by the number of votes cast for this resolution we can make a concrete demonstration which will be talked about in Moscow, in New Delhi, in Cairo, and in all of the capitals of the earth. By this vote and by the speed with which we act we can show again that America is alive to the grave economic problems facing the peoples in most of the world outside our frontiers and that we are prepared to do our fair share toward helping to solve these problems. We can effectively take the wind out of the sails of those who keep propagandizing the colonial peoples, to the rising younger nationalities, and to the poverty-ridden everywhere. We can say with reason and with confidence, pointing to this law and the action that will be taken under it, that this country will continue to do its share and more than its share to the end that men everywhere will have a better chance for economic as well as political freedom in the years immediately ahead. We will thus assure the peaceful and economic future of America; of this there can be no doubt.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to read into the RECORD a statement by the Detroit Board of Commerce. It constitutes unchallengeable and documentary evidence the value and effectiveness of which cannot be refuted.

DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
*Detroit, Mich., February 4, 1949.*

STATEMENT ON EXTENSION OF THE RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT ON BEHALF OF THE DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE

*To Members of the House Ways and Means Committee:*

The world affairs committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce has always, in the past, strongly supported the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. In conformance with the traditional policy, the world affairs committee respectfully urges that H. R. 1211 be favorably reported by your committee and be passed by Congress.

DETROIT AND MICHIGAN'S INTEREST IN WORLD TRADE

The city of Detroit and the State of Michigan both have a vital interest in a successful trade-agreements program. The following facts indicate the paramount importance

of a healthy world trade to the economy of this area:

1. The Detroit area is the world's largest producer of industrial products for export.

2. Over 900 Michigan firms are actively engaged in some form of world trade.

3. It has been estimated that one out of every seven dollars spent in this area was derived from foreign sales.

4. More than 300 imported items are necessary for the production of automobiles in Detroit.

5. Many chemical, pharmaceutical, paint, machinery, and other industrial firms in this area are dependent upon imported raw materials.

6. Over 100 oceangoing steamship companies maintain offices in Detroit.

7. During the navigation season oceangoing vessels ply the waters between the port of Detroit and the ports of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium, England, Venezuela, and Colombia.

8. Air lines connect Detroit with nearly every major commercial center in the world.

Michigan fathered modern industrialization with the development of mass production methods in the automotive industry. With this development came the need of mass consumption and mass markets. A decline in consumption or a limitation of markets wreaks havoc upon our industrial society. Thousands of workers become idle, expensive equipment and machinery lies useless, purchasing power declines, and the resultant economic stagnation creates a tremendous burden for the city, State, and Federal Governments. Both agricultural and industrial interests suffer. Detroit industries believe every effort must be made for the expansion of world trade and the maintenance of world markets. A workable reciprocal-trade-agreements program can contribute to the realization of this goal.

The catastrophic effects of the last war have made it difficult for many nations of the world to compete in the world's markets or to purchase the products we produce. Dollar shortages have appeared in every corner of the globe giving an impetus to the demand for increased tariff walls, quota restrictions, preferential tariffs, regional trade systems, bilateral trade agreements, exchange controls, and other types of trade barriers. These are largely designed to limit United States participation in the exploitation of world markets. We believe the reciprocal trade agreements program is an effective method of combating the present trend.

Opponents of the reciprocal trade agreements program argue that the curtailment of our export trade would have little effect upon our economy as it represents only about 10 percent of our total production. They claim that increased imports of products produced by cheap labor will cause unemployment and economic hardship to both labor and industry groups in the United States.

Though our exports may represent only about 10 percent of production, that 10 percent may often be the difference between profit and loss. It may represent an increased volume of production making possible a lower per unit cost. It affords stability to Detroit manufacturers and labor by mitigating the effects of slack periods in the domestic market. During severe depressions in the domestic market, export has made possible the continued operation of a number of Detroit industries that might otherwise have had to close down operations.

The claim that the importation of products produced by so-called cheap labor will be injurious to employment in this country is fallacious. Foreign labor is not cheap. Productivity as well as wages determines value of labor. The employees of Detroit industries, as a result of the heavy investment in equipment, tools, and machinery and improved techniques of production, are competitive with other labor groups all over the world. On the other hand, the undue protection of uncompetitive labor in other domestic industries results in a lower standard of living and the limitation of markets to the detriment of the more economic industries.

CONCLUSION

Trade agreements executed in the past have been beneficial to a great majority of Detroit and Michigan industries. Agricultural interest has also benefited from the reciprocal trade agreements program.

Never before in history has the need for a healthy world economy been as apparent as it is today. Nations throughout the world need the products and the production know-how available here in Detroit for the rehabilitation and the reconstruction of their war-torn Communist-threatened economies. We cannot afford to refuse their demands. On the other hand, we cannot afford to continue indefinitely the process of giving away the bulk of our exports without receiving payment as has been the case in the past. It is imperative that markets for the world be opened to Detroit and Michigan industries and that the means of payment for these products be available, thus relieving the American taxpayer of the burden of paying for our own exports.

Therefore, the world affairs committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce urges the Ways and Means Committee to favorably report on H. R. 1211 and it be passed by Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

WORLD AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, DETROIT BOARD OF COMMERCE,
RICHARD B. FROST, *Secretary.*

VERIFICATION

STATE OF MICHIGAN,
*County of Wayne:*

Personally appeared before the undersigned authority, Richard B. Frost, who being first duly sworn, deposes and says that he is secretary of the world affairs committee of the Detroit Board of Commerce, Detroit, Mich., and that he executed the foregoing instrument and that the allegations of fact therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge and belief.

RICHARD B. FROST,
*Secretary, World Affairs Committee, Detroit Board of Commerce.*

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 4th day of February 1949.

NICHOLAS J. RINI,
*Notary Public, Wayne County, State of Michigan.*

My commission expires November 23, 1952.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP].

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Chairman, the present joint resolution to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, which, if passed, will enable the President through the Secretary of State, to continue for another 3-year period to enter into foreign-trade agreements or reciprocal trade agreements, is as important legislation as will come before this session of Congress. It affects the prosperity of every American. To my way of thinking, it is the greatest hope we have of keeping up our present high levels of employment as well as the high income of farms, mines, and factories.

There was a time when our foreign trade was of such proportions that the specter of unemployment was unknown and the worry of our cotton and grain farmers was not the question of markets but the problem of supplying the world demand. Ships bearing cargoes of American manufactured goods and agricultural products sailed the seven seas, our ports were beehives of commercial activity, and our people enjoyed a firm and stable prosperity.

In other words, we traded with the world. We brought to our country goods from all over the world, and we sold to the world our entire surplus of manufactured goods and agricultural products.

In 1933 the new administration at Washington began a study of the causes of the loss of our world trade. The President had called to his aid as Secretary of State a statesman who had given many years of his life to the study of world trade and tariffs and who had foreseen the inevitable result of the iniquitous tariff policy of the Government under the Republican administrations. This quiet and studious man from the rugged State of Tennessee, Hon. Cordell Hull, believed that by making reciprocal treaties with the foreign countries much of our trade could be revived and prosperity gradually brought back. So the Congress passed the act of June 12, 1934, empowering the President to make these reciprocal trade agreements.

What are these trade agreements? They are nothing more nor less than a method of breaking up the log jam and opening up the trade channels between our country and the other countries of the world.

Some people have an erroneous idea of the meaning of foreign or world trade. They seem to cling to the idea that trading with the world means selling the rest of the world our goods without buying any of theirs. Trading means the exchange of goods for goods—just as the farmer takes his produce to town and exchanges it for the supplies he needs, as the trapper on the frontier used to exchange his furs for food and clothing. So we see that if we will have world trade we must take the goods and products of other countries in exchange for ours. We must buy as well as sell. To revive this trading a Democratic administration devised these reciprocal trade agreements. These agreements made it easier for the foreign buyers of our goods to find a market for their goods here. Each one provides increased opportunities for a country to expand its purchases of our goods; provides that the trade of one country shall be treated fairly by the other country to the agreement relative to the trade of a third country, thereby preventing discrimination.

These trade treaties became necessary because as we built high tariff walls in this country, other countries of the world retaliated by building high tariff walls against our goods and these tariffs became formidable barriers to world trade. It was found to be impossible to get rid of all these trade barriers at once, but these trade agreements, by reducing our tariffs on some goods in exchange for an agreement on the part of another country to reduce its tariffs and other restrictions on our goods, encouraged trade instead of discouraging it.

These trade agreements are openly and fairly made. A clear description of the method of their negotiation is as follows:

Before we enter into trade-agreement negotiations with a country, public an-

nouncement is made of our intention to do so. The trade-agreements work is conducted by the Trade Agreements Committee, an interdepartmental undertaking in which participate the Departments of State, Treasury, Agriculture, and Commerce, and the Tariff Commission. This committee is made up of nonpartisan experts, men of experience and judgment in foreign trade, who have no interest in anything except what is best for the country as a whole.

As a result of study of the trade and products of the two countries, there is published at the time announcement is made of intention to negotiate a trade agreement a list of products in respect of which we will consider making concessions to the other country.

When these products have been announced in this open and aboveboard manner, so that everybody who produces or deals in these products may know about it, then a date is set when all interested persons may be heard. If you do not think a product in which you are interested should be included in these negotiations, you have a full chance to say so. You can appear before the Committee for Reciprocity Information at public hearings in Washington and state your case, or you can file a written brief of your arguments and have them carefully considered. In one way or another everybody affected has a chance to be heard—an equal chance. There are no back-door methods; no chances for lobbyists to exert political pressure; no secret deals or swaps.

Why has the trade agreements program become so universally accepted? Even men who have made a career out of fighting the program no longer speak of outright repeal of the Trade Agreements Act. They only dare use the back door and try to weaken the program through crippling amendments.

The reason why trade agreements are today so universally acclaimed is not hard to find. Trade agreements make a vitally important contribution both to our domestic prosperity and to the success of our foreign policy. Let us consider how this is so.

First, as to our domestic prosperity. America is now the world's largest foreign trading nation; our domestic economy is geared into the world economy. We need to export to keep our present high level of production. A falling off of exports of just one product has effects which reverberate throughout our economy. But if we want to continue our exports we must also be willing to import. We cannot sell unless we buy. Furthermore, imports are valuable in their own right because they raise our standard of living and supply us with raw materials on which our production depends. A large volume of both exports and imports is therefore essential to our domestic prosperity. What is the best way to insure that this volume will be large? Obviously by reducing trade barriers and allowing the forces of competition to determine the flow of goods among nations. Trade agreements are designed to accomplish just this.

There is another reason why trade agreements are vitally important to our domestic economy. We in America believe in the system of free competition. We know that America owes its economic strength to that system. Trade among nations today is not free, but is largely regulated and controlled by governments through bilateral agreements, exchange controls, and quotas. When nations regulate and control their foreign trade in this fashion, they sooner or later find it necessary to control their domestic trade as well. If our system of free competition is to survive and if our own prosperity is to continue, we must convince the world of the value of reducing and eliminating these governmentally-imposed barriers to trade. The trade agreements program has been invaluable for teaching this lesson to the world. With its aid, we have led in the fight to reduce and eliminate controls and barriers on international trade. We must continue to lead in this fight if we want to convince the world of the superiority of our economic system.

No one can question, therefore, the value of trade agreements to our domestic economy. This alone would be sufficient reason for renewal of the act. But it is when we turn to foreign policy that the case for trade agreements becomes overwhelmingly convincing.

Our foreign policy aims at the establishment of a peaceful world in which democratic, free institutions flourish. Our economic foreign policy supports this ultimate goal by creating the prosperity and economic stability which is the surest foundation upon which to build a peaceful, democratic, and free world.

The great depression and World War II made the goals of our economic policy difficult to achieve. The depression left a heritage of economic controls. The war added to these controls and left many other scars on the world economy. The industrial plants of many nations were nearly destroyed, transportation and normal business channels were disrupted, and basic commodies were in severely short supply. Faced with such conditions, war-torn nations could take no other source of action but to invoke controls, make barter deals, and resort to a host of other restrictive devices. When trade is artificially channeled, the volume of trade falls off and the flow of goods slows down to a trickle. Most of these countries recognized that the controls which they imposed were not going to assist them in the permanent solution of their problems but they were not in a strong enough economic position to take any other course of action.

American economic policy is aimed at breaking down these depression-born and war-fostered barriers which block the flow of goods and deny to the world the prosperity which comes from a mutual sharing of goods. We are in a strong enough economic position to take the lead. We have obtained, in the last few years, some very important commitments to remove these controls just as soon as it is economically practicable and possible to do so. Trade agreements have proved to be one of the most effective weapons in this battle against trade barriers and in obtaining these significant commitments.

Furthermore, trade agreements have stood the test of time; they have been in successful operation for 15 years. Trade agreements are concrete and down to earth; they face the problem squarely by reducing specific barriers on specific goods.

Trade agreements are not the only means we are using to achieve the goals of our economic foreign policy. We also have the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank, the vitally important European reconstruction program and the proposed International Trade Organization. The trade-agreements program is interlocked with these programs. The success of one depends upon the success of the other.

The International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development are designed to establish financial conditions that will contribute to a maximum expansion of world trade. The function of the fund is to prevent abnormal fluctuations in exchange rates. The bank reinforces the efforts of the fund by granting long-term loans to war-devastated and economically underdeveloped countries. Thus, both institutions supplement each other and assist in expanding trade.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 provides that nations participating in the recovery effort must cooperate to reduce trade barriers. The United States should be the leader in carrying this out. By enacting strong trade agreement legislation, we can show that we mean business when we talk about reducing trade barriers. Furthermore, the long-run success of the European recovery program hinges on reduced trade barriers. The goal of the program is to make the countries of Europe self-supporting. If they are to pay for what they buy, they will have to earn by selling to other countries. Such selling would be impossible if the channels of trade are clogged with barriers.

The proposed International Trade Organization is another vitally important arm of our foreign economic policy. We have been the leaders in persuading the world to accept the code of fair trade practices embodied in the ITO Charter, and that charter stresses that member countries shall negotiate for reduction of trade barriers. We need a workable and effective Trade Agreements Act as the authorization to carry out this undertaking.

But trade agreements do more than help us establish world prosperity and economic stability. They contribute to the ultimate goal of our foreign policy —the establishment of a free and peaceful world, in which democratic institutions flourish. Trade agreements help in two ways. First, they contribute to peace by reducing and limiting the use of trade barriers which are a major source of friction among nations. Second, they contribute to freedom and democracy by bringing the internal prosperity which is the best antidote to communism.

It is this, in the last analysis, which is the most compelling reason for the continuance of a strong trade agreements program. We have become the rallying point for the free nations of the world.

The free world looks to us for leadership. Every move we make is watched. If we make one faltering step, incalculable harm may be done. In the eyes of the world, a weak Trade Agreements Act is such a faltering step. A strong 3-year Trade Agreements Act, on the other hand, would be a clear sign that we are continuing resolutely on the course we have set for ourselves and our friends.

I have listened with interest to some of the arguments of those who do not favor the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. I have heard them say that the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930 had not been repealed. I cannot understand why they protest for under this reciprocal-trade-agreements program it has been effectually and properly repealed.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I wish to ask the gentleman why it is that we have to pay 35 and 40 cents for a package of Piedmonts, Camels, or Lucky Strike cigarettes up in Canada. The gentleman is talking about reciprocity. Will he tell me why we have to do that?

Mr. CAMP. I do not know anything about the price of things in Canada or how the prices are made up. I do know that our trade agreement with Canada has given us great concessions, and that we are now exporting to Canada a great quantity of agricultural products from my section of the country that we did not export to them before our trade agreement with them. I do not know what part of the price of cigarettes in Canada is tax, but I do know that when you buy a package in the United States some three-quarters or more of the price is made up of tax.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CAMP. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman; but remember I do not have very much time, and I do not want to spend it all in a dialogue with one Member.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I do not desire to take any of the gentleman's time because I believe that tobacco, cotton, and the other commodities that we raise here should be protected in these United States. Furthermore, if the gentleman ever went into a foreign country he would know that we cannot sell tobacco, cotton, or anything else because there is no reciprocity in the other countries.

Mr. CAMP. I do not know what countries the gentleman refers to; but we are trying our dead level best to get reciprocity with all countries. If you kill this bill you will destroy the only means you have of obtaining reciprocity.

Now, my good friend whom I respect very greatly, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] asked my colleague from Arkansas if he has ever seen anybody satisfied who came before our committee. I will ask him this: Have you ever heard any of these people who came before us who did not start off just like our constituents back home used to talk to us about the price-control bill: "Oh, I am in favor of price control but—"? They say, "Oh, yes; I am in favor of the Trade Agreements Act, but—"; and we are all in favor of it; are we not?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. I am surprised at the gentleman because he is one of the brightest men in this House. I did not say anything about them being dissatisfied with coming before our committee. I said they were dissatisfied with going down to the tariff people.

Mr. CAMP. Oh, I am talking about the reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

Mr. Chairman, last Christmas a year ago I wanted to give my wife some dishes. She had asked for some chinaware a month or two before, and I thought I would kill two birds with one stone by giving them to her on Christmas. So I went into a store here in Washington and asked for chinaware. They were very nice to me. They took me over and introduced me to the head of the department. He said, "Mr. CAMP, I am ashamed to take you into our department. We do not have anything." So I went over to another large store and told the lady clerk that I wanted to give my wife some nice china for Christmas. "Oh, well," she says, "we have got just one set." So you see that one of the largest department stores here in Washington had only one set to offer.

Well, I thought that was bad. I thought there must be a good demand for chinaware in Washington, and perhaps I could get it in Atlanta. So I went into a store in Atlanta and the same thing was told me.

Yet here last year when we had hearings, the chinaware men came before us scared to death of this trade agreements act. I asked one the question, "Are you selling your product?" "Yes." "Do you have any unfilled orders?" "Oh, yes, for a year or two." "Well, what is the matter with you?"

Mr. Chairman, the whole trouble is fear. We recently had a great man in this country who used to say that fear was the greatest enemy of mankind. These people are afraid that in some 5 or 10 years from now or maybe in 3 years from now they will catch up on the backlog of orders and some Frenchman might send in a little beautiful chinaware and it might be sold to a man who wants to give his wife a Christmas present, who could not otherwise find the china. If we will take some of this product that can be sold here and not hurt our chinaware manufacturers, and ship them some bales of cotton over there, or some cheese, or something else we can spare, we will be helping the American farmer and at the same time satisfying the man who wants to give his wife a present.

I cannot understand how anybody can possibly oppose a program so fairly administered. You talk about not getting satisfaction from the Tariff Commission or the Trade Agreements Administration. Why, under this law the Tariff Commission, the Army and Navy, the military establishments, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce jointly with the Secretary of State hold hearings. They meet and work out each item on the list and before they will negotiate an agreement they publish to all the manufacturers of products to be included or, if an agricultural product, to all of the producers of it a list of the articles they are going to talk about. They invite those people to appear before the committee.

There was a time when people came to America in search of every product we produced. There was a time when my great State of Georgia had British agents going over it begging our farmers to plant more acres of cotton so they could get the cotton. That same thing brought about the greatest expansion of trade that any State has ever enjoyed. During that time when we could sell all we could produce and the world market would take everything we had to offer, my State built the first railroad that was ever built in the United States. Fifty miles long, and later the first one that was 100 miles long. We built in our own docks with Georgia money the first steamship that ever crossed the Atlantic Ocean. The reason was we had a market for what we produced. But when times changed, and our surplus crops could not be sold abroad it stagnated the home market, and no section of this land has suffered more from the loss of export markets than my section.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMP. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. GRANGER. I just want to say this to the gentleman and to the committee. The question has been raised here by the gentleman from Ohio, who refused to yield to me, and I think there is some substance to that, as to the reception that is given to Members of Congress down before the Reciprocal Trade Committee. It seems when you go down there that they are not interested; they are just about as warm and responsive and receptive as a frozen Eskimo. They evidently do not care anything about what you say there, or, at least, that is the way you feel. I think it is wrong and I think it is subject to criticism. Perhaps you people who have not been down there have not had the experience, but that is the feeling I have.

Mr. CAMP. Well, I have been down before them. I have raised sand about some of the items they were considering but I think that the program is not to blame. I think that the administration may be a little wrong. Let us correct the administration if it is wrong, and not disturb this great program.

Under this program I think our President can and will perform our greatest act in bringing about world peace, and that is by reviving world trade. People that are trading with each other do not hate each other. Trade will prevent war because it will keep people at work. Trade will bring on prosperity because it will give to us in the foreign countries a market for our surpluses. It is that great fear of unsold surpluses that hovers

over our economy today and keeps us from going forward as we should.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that if my good friend and able committeeman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], has not as yet procured for his wife the fine set of dishware he sought a year or two ago, he might do so now. I suggest he go to one of the great department stores downtown and he there will find he has a wide choice of chinaware. If his experience should be anything like the experience of my wife within the past week, he will return to his home and upon opening the package discover that he has bought some chinaware which was made in England. Or, possibly, in Czechoslovakia. Then, if he should continue his trip on out into the western part of Pennsylvania, or specifically into the eastern and southern part of Ohio, he will there find on the unemployment rolls American workmen who can and should be making that chinaware which would be sold here in these stores. Instead, the American skilled worker sits idly by as the cheap labor overseas produces china. That has taken place in the chinaware industry and it is taking place in some half dozen other industries right now, today, in the United States. It is taking place because goods are imported from overseas for sale here at prices less than the American workingman can or will produce those goods for sale here. Part of the reason is that the tariffs are so low that the American workingman in these industries to which I refer is not protected.

Earlier in the day the statement was made that the Tariff Commission under the law as it existed prior to 1948 did sit upon the various committees which are charged with preparing the trade agreements. That is not correct. That is not in accordance with the hearings. As has been testified by Mr. Ryder, Chairman of the Tariff Commission, members of that Commission do meet with the various committees in the preparation of trade agreements, but they do so unofficially. They do not; they never appear and speak for the Tariff Commission.

It is the purpose of those of us on this side of the House to offer an amendment to the bill (H. R. 1211) tomorrow which will impose upon the Tariff Commission the continued duty of determining just what the peril point is with respect to any commodity which is up for negotiation. The peril point is the Tariff Commission's finding as to that rate below which any reduction in tariff would damage or threaten serious damage to an American industry. I shall not argue the merits of that amendment at the moment. I hope to do so tomorrow. But I cannot conceive of anyone in this great body opposing the President's having the knowledge and advice of the Tariff Commission, that highly valued and respected branch of the Congress, as to just what they believe to be a point below which a tariff should not be cut. We will be doing a service to the President, we will be doing a great service to this Congress, and we will be doing a greater service to the American workingman and to industry in general if we do provide that the President be given that information. The Tariff Commission is the only group in all the United States that has the ability, the background, and the courage, if you please, to do its duty and to say, "Here is the level below which, if American industry is to be protected, you must not go in cutting tariff."

I think it is most unfortunate that we do not have the benefit of long hearings by the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill we are now considering. No one appeared before our committee other than at his or her personal request. The committee did not invite anyone to appear. The committee took the position that anyone who chose to come before the committee and to talk about the bill H. R. 1211 might do so, and the committee would be glad to listen.

Whoever heard of an investigation being made in that way? We are all familiar with the fact that when you want to learn something about a subject you usually ask the people who do not rush forward volunteering information. In our congressional committees we request representatives of various departments of the Government to come before the committee and present their case. That is the way to get the information; that is the way to learn about the bills that are up for consideration. But our committee chose only to hear volunteers.

We went further than that, as you have been told, and we specifically voted that we would not invite to come before our committee members of the Tariff Commission, that group which I have previously said has the most information about tariff cuts, and incidentally the group that is affected more than any other group by the bill we are now considering.

Incidentally our committee would not invite the group who are affected by the bill we are considering more than any other group. Our committee would not invite them to come and be heard and they did not see fit to volunteer. Likewise we did not have before us the military in the face of repeated statements that our strategic materials and our very national security is jeopardized by the operation of parts of this reciprocal-trade-agreements program. In view of that and in view of the allegations that this trade-agreements program is a most important part in our international program today, I submit it was not proper that we come before you today without complete hearings on those subjects.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Would the gentleman mind telling the committee how long the hearings lasted last year, and whether or not the press or the public were permitted to participate in those hearings.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am very happy to tell the gentleman that they lasted only a short time and I would also point out that the extension was only for one year. I admit it was contemplated that there would be hearings again this year. Perhaps undoubtedly we were wrong as to who might be in charge of the hearings this year, but the fact remains that it was contemplated that hearings would be held again this year.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Were the hearings open?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The subcommittee hearings were not open.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Were the full committee hearings open?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. They were not open.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to ask the gentleman if he remembers that I came before the committee and was not allowed to say a word.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I seem to recollect that, yes.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would not like for that to remain in the RECORD, without a clarification. The gentleman appeared before the committee and he said, "My position is the same as the position of the gentleman who just testified before the committee." I believe that that was the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

He also said, "I take the same position that the gentleman does, and I have no further statement to make." If I am wrong about that, I would like to be corrected.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not want to get involved in any controversy between the two gentleman. I appreciate what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] has put in the RECORD.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not like for any Member of the Congress to say on the floor of the House that the Committee on Ways and Means has not given them an opportunity to be heard, because that simply is not in conformity with the fact or the policy of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I rise at this point so that there would not stand in the RECORD a statement which I believe was based on a misunderstanding of the question posed by the gentleman from Louisiana. He inquired as to whether or not the committee hearings during the Eightieth Congress were open hearings. I remind the gentleman that beginning on March 26, 1947, the committee held hearings up to May 9. Those hearings are published and available to the gentleman from Louisiana. They consist of over 1,731 pages of testimony, all of which was in open hearings.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. In the past in considering these trade agreements, I am convinced the committee had in mind the fact that industry in

our country should be protected. They did not go out and trade them down the river. In accordance with the testimony before our committe any industry which was seriously damaged, or threatened with serious damage would have the right to come before an appropriate committee and make a protest and at least hope to have some measure of relief. But there was an element spoken of as Yankee ingenuity or Yankee trading, if you please, which was the then announced basis upon which our negotiators worked with the negotiators for foreign countries. We came back from these trade-agreement meetings and at one time and another we claimed success. We sought to measure our success, and we seemed to glory in the fact that we were getting the better of the bargain. I submit to you that as of this day there is a new consideration found in the minds of our negotiators as they travel the world over considering reducing tariffs.

The new factor may be called a political consideration. Indeed Mr. Thorpe, in appearing before our committee, stated in effect that the protectionist idea was no longer a controlling matter with respect to the cutting of tariffs. There were other considerations, and under questioning he stated that conditions throughout the world in general was one of the other factors.

So I submit that no longer is the welfare of industry the only or the principal consideration as to whether or not tariff cuts should be made. Today the consideration that, in my opinion, dominates, is the matter of political wisdom as to whether cuts should or should not be made.

We are told that the trade-agreements program is part of the greater American program to improve the stature of the other nations of the world and that as such we must support our Government's policies. The great foreign relief program we are using today is the European recovery program, headed by Mr. Paul Hoffman, a great industrialist of our Nation. Undoubtedly he is doing an excellent job. My plea to you as Members of Congress is this, that in considering this trade agreement we should see its place in the over-all picture, which includes the European recovery program.

In that connection I would like to point to a statement by Walter Lippmann, wherein he points out that American industry must prepare itself to take a loss, to make sacrifices, if the European recovery program is to work.

Then I have a statement from Mr. Paul Hoffman, and this is enlightening to a Member of Congress today, one who has not particularly thought about what the European recovery program might mean to a business in his or her congressional district. He says:

> The hope of European economic recovery does not lie in piling up a greater deficit in trade with the Western Hemisphere. What we hope to see is a gradual reduction in Europe's dependence on Western Hemisphere supplies and a marked increase in its exports to the Americas. That way lies Europe's hope of long-range solvency.

Then he goes along and he says this:

> If this must be done—

That is, if more imports must come here and fewer exports go abroad, he says:

> If this must be done at the expense of American exporters, I would remind you it it the only way for European creditors and debtors to settle their accounts.

The countries of Europe that are in the Marshall plan have recently filed a report with Mr. Hoffman. In that report they make no bones about this fact, that it is their deliberate purpose to do all the trading they can within the confines of the various countries participating in the European recovery plan. They do not plan to trade with the United States at all, so far as purchases are concerned, if they can avoid it, and they will not take our surpluses if they can get the surpluses somewhere else. However they do plan to sell us more and more of their products. That is all in black and white in this official report which has been made and which states that in 1952 and 1953, when the 4 years of the Marshall plan shall have been passed, there will then nevertheless be an adverse trade balance against the United States from a European viewpoint. In other words, Europe will not then be entirely self-supporting, but will owe the Western Hemisphere one or two billions of dollars.

So those of us who may be inclined to think that the Marshall plan will provide more moneys which will in turn purchase our supplies which are in surplus, have another guess coming. Europe will do all she possibly can to buy from within the zone represented by the member nations of the European recovery program.

Indeed, in Great Britain, in accordance with their report not yet made public, it is their plan to cut purchases from the United States over 1947 by some $997,000,000. It is Great Britain's announced plan to ship into the United States $794,000,000 more goods than she did in 1947 and to reduce imports from our country by $997,000,000, a difference of $1,600,000,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman in sympathy with the European recovery program?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am; I supported it and I am in sympathy with it; I hope to continue to do so. My point is that the American producer must be realistic and realize that there is a sacrifice required of every industrialist in this country.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman consider that the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is needed as an active part of the Marshall plan?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not. We must remain strong if we are to continue to be the source of these assets which presently are so vital to the recovery of Europe; we in this country must remain strong or we will not be able to help overseas.

Mr. PERKINS. In other words, the gentleman believes we should pursue the same path that we followed after World War I; is that correct?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. That does not follow. I submit that today in making gifts to Europe we are imposing a burden upon the American citizen by sending some of the products of his work to help the people overseas just as in the 1920's we did that, only at that time we sent it over disguised as loans.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman's position is like mine that when foreign recovery reaches the point where the foreign countries are able to compete with us disastrously then it is time to do something else.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes; and the long-range program does not contemplate the free-trade markets between the United States and Europe that we did have after the last war when the European trade balance was favorable to us; they took so much more from us than we took from them that at the end of the year they had to settle with us in gold. That has been against us from their standpoint, they have not been self-supporting. It is a trend which has existed in European international trade for many, many years; hence, it must be an accepted fact that to help Europe recover we are to be deliberately discriminated against. Under present policies through the use of import licenses, only selected exports from the United States may enter the British Isles. These controls will be closer and closer as time passes. Soon we will sell nothing to Europe she can make herself, and we will be expected to open our doors for all the surplus manufactured goods Europe can produce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I am thoroughly in accord with H. R. 1211, introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. DOUGHTON]. It is a bill that will, when enacted, be of tremendous value in again setting in motion the machinery for reducing world trade barriers. It was this machinery that our Republican colleagues, when they were in the majority in the Eightieth Congress, sought to sabotage with crippling restrictions. Although some damage was done to world trade by the hampering restrictions of the 1948 Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, fortunately for this country and the countries of the world who are adhering to the capitalistic system, we, by the passage of the present bill, will be able to repair the damage. Trade barriers have long been a cause of war, and therefore it is in the interests of world peace and

our own national security that, as far as possible, these barriers be eliminated.

We cannot and should not confine our products and our industries within the limitations of unscalable tariff walls. We cannot isolate ourselves today economically any more than we can do so militarily. Economic isolation is a thing of the past and I hope will never again be revived. We need markets for our surplus foods and goods. Unless this surplus is made salable in foreign countries, it means an excess at home that will eventually mean overstocked food supplies and excess inventories that will eventually lead to the ruin of the farmer, the bankruptcy of our industries, and the unemployment of our workers.

New markets mean more avenues over which our surplus may be shipped to the benefit of business and agriculture in the United States. This bill will help keep our foreign markets open to us until at least June 12, 1951, when the Congress will take another look at the world picture and determine whether we shall again extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act.

I recall in 1945 when our Republican colleagues were agreeable to the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of 1 year. It seemed to me that if reciprocal trade agreements are correct in principle, then our colleagues of the minority should cease, each time the act comes up for extension, their obstructive tactics.

We are asking today for the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act in virtually the same way we advocated in 1945; in fact, we are advocating the continuance of the scientific approach to the whole tariff question established in 1934 and its successful and unhampered operation, until the 1948 extension forced through the Congress by the Republican majority.

Our distinguished ranking minority Member has called attention to the fact that there are 800,000 farmers who are members of granges and he concludes that they are opposed to this legislation. Let me suggest to my distinguished friend that the results of the 1948 elections in the agricultural States give little support to the contention that the farmers are opposed to the Democratic concept of reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, so much has been said in the minority report and by Members of the minority speaking on H. R. 1211 that it is difficult for one in support of the legislation to decide just where to begin in arguing its merits. For some time I have been very seriously concerned with the charges which my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has made. As I recall the first time he made that statement was on May 21, 1947, in connection with the introduction of a resolution creating a select committee to investigate the loyalty of certain associates and advisers to the Under Secretary of State for many years. The gentleman today stated that he has upon a reliable basis information that some nine individuals out of approximately 101 who attended the Geneva Convention in 1947 were either Communists or Communist fellow travelers. I have asked the gentleman, and I think it is his duty, to report such information as he has and the source of that information to those people in the State Department who are charged with the responsibility of conducting these loyalty tests. It is my understanding that every man who attended the Geneva Convention from all of the departments representing our Government, as the result perhaps of the original charge of the gentleman from New York, has been very, very carefully screened, not only by the heads of the departments employing those individuals but by the FBI itself.

I have a letter addressed to me, dated February 3, 1949, from Mr. John A. Peurifoy, one of the Assistant Secretaries in the State Department, which I shall include as a part of my remarks, and I hope and trust the gentleman will read it in the RECORD.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
*Washington, February 3, 1949.*

The Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS,
*Committee on Ways and Means,*
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. MILLS: I understand that Mr. Charles Davis, clerk of the House Committee on Ways and Means, has requested the Department for a statement in connection with a question pertaining to the loyalty or security of certain members of the United States delegation to the International Conference on Trade and Employment held in Geneva, Switzerland, in 1947.

When this matter was originally brought to my attention, I requested the Division of Security to recheck the files of all officers and employees of the Department who attended that Conference. This Division advises me that:

1. All officials or employees of the Department listed as attending that Conference have either been investigated by the Department or checked with the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In most instances they have been investigated by the Division of Security in addition to being checked with the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

2. In no case has information come to the attention of the Division of Security either from the Federal Bureau of Investigation or other sources which would support the conclusion that any such person is either disloyal or a security risk.

I have also requested and received from the Secretaries (or other responsible officials) of the Departments of War, Navy, Treasury, Commerce, Interior, Agriculture, Labor, and the United States Tariff Commission, certificates or other written assurances as to the loyalty of their delegates to this Conference.

Needless to say, if any member of the committee will advise me of the nature of any derogatory information relating to any official or employee of this Department, I will personally undertake to see that the matter is thoroughly and completely investigated.

I shall be happy to make available to you any further information which may be of use to you in connection with this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. PEURIFOY,
*Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I may say to the gentleman that I will include a letter from Mr. Hoover himself that the gentleman may read.

Mr. MILLS. I will be glad to do so, but I want him to put in the RECORD the names of the individuals, if the gentleman knows that there are Communists in the State Department. I believe it to be his duty in upholding the Constitution of the United States to divulge those names.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman can get that information from the executive department if he wishes to have it.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman did not get it from the executive department. The gentleman said he got it from the FBI. If he did, why does he not make that information available, not only to us but to those in the departments of Government that employ these individuals? The gentleman knows he voted for legislation establishing the President's authority to conduct loyalty investigations. He did that. Now, if he has this type of information, I beseech him to give it to those departments that are charged with the responsibility of employing these people; otherwise I must assume the gentleman injects this argument in connection with reciprocal trade agreements because he and his colleagues have run out of valid objections to the program.

Mr. REED of New York. I may say to the gentleman that when you get a lead on these people and you give out their names it interferes with the operations of the FBI and the gentleman knows that.

Mr. MILLS. Well, the gentleman mentioned the name of a Mr. Wadleigh. The gentleman also mentioned the name of a Mr. Perlo.

Mr. REED of New York. I got those from the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. MILLS. In what connection did they serve the trade-agreements program?

Mr. REED of New York. That was put in the RECORD today.

Mr. MILLS. Have they ever in any capacity been connected with the reciprocal trade-agreements program?

Mr. REED of New York. The RECORD shows the facts and I put them in and the gentleman knows it. It is in the RECORD for the gentleman to read and for all the world to read.

Mr. MILLS. I am asking the gentleman, in anticipation of my reading it, whether or not they have ever had anything to do with the reciprocal trade-agreements program?

Mr. REED of New York. Read the RECORD and the gentleman will see it.

Mr. MILLS. Were they at Geneva in 1947?

Mr. REED of New York. Oh, perhaps not, but they were the legal advisers of the people who were helping write the trade-agreements program and knew all the details.

Mr. MILLS. Will the gentleman put in the RECORD in connection with his remarks when these gentlemen were employed and in what capacity they served?

Mr. REED of New York. It is in the RECORD. They were read into the RECORD and the gentleman heard it.

Mr. MILLS. I did not hear it.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman should have been here.

Mr. MILLS. I was on the floor but I did not hear the gentleman say that these gentlemen had anything whatsoever to do with this program.

Mr. REED of New York. I tell the gentleman that it is in the RECORD.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The statement that was read on the floor, and I paid careful attention to it, was that these men named in their own testimony before the Senate committee stated that they had things to do with these reciprocal trade agreements.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman said that themselves?

Mr. MASON. Yes. They themselves said it in testimony before the Senate committee.

Mr. MILLS. Does my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, know whether they are now employed with the Department of State or not?

Mr. MASON. I do not.

Mr. MILLS. Well, it has come to my attention that they are not and have not been since 1944, and that the gentleman that they complain about the most was not even in the Department when the Swiss agreement was negotiated in 1935. They were not at the Geneva Conference in 1947 and had nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It appears to me that some on the opposition side to this measure have come to the conclusion that they should oppose the measure because perhaps some fellow travelers are in favor of it. That is about the argument they are using.

Mr. MILLS. Of course, they know and you know and I know that there is no program that has been conceived by our Government to which the Communists in Russia or in the United States so vociferously object as the European recovery program and the reciprocal trade agreements program. Now, is there any argument about that? The Russian Government did everything that they could do to prevent the success of the Geneva Conference.

Does the gentleman from New York know whether or not these nine men he complains of participated in the movement to scuttle the Geneva Conference?

Mr. REED of New York. I do not know a thing about that, but I know exactly what this record shows here, which I read, and if the gentleman will yield time to me I will read it to him again.

Mr. MILLS. I am just as much concerned about this situation as the gentleman from New York is.

Mr. REED of New York. The gentleman seems to be very much concerned.

Mr. MILLS. Because of this: I cannot understand my friend's reluctance in divulging these names. If I had them, I would give them up to the State Department, or whoever employed them.

Mr. REED of New York. You cannot divulge the names of individuals when the FBI is following leads in its investigation. That has been the rule of the Government for a long time.

Mr. MILLS. How in the world did the FBI divulge the names to the gentleman then, if that is the rule it follows?

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. This charge has been made several times in the past; is that not a fact?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes; it has been made in the past.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. I have been informed that the State Department sent a representative to the office of the gentleman from New York and asked to get these names.

Mr. MILLS. A gentleman by the name of Wilson, so I am informed.

Mr. REED of New York. That I do not deny, sir.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman did not give the names to him, however.

Mr. REED of New York. Why should I give them out when they were making an investigation? Not at all.

Mr. MILLS. But the gentleman did not give the names to this State Department representative, did he?

Mr. REED of New York. I did not.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. PHILBIN. Why did they not go to the FBI and get the names?

Mr. MILLS. They have canvassed with the FBI just as much as the gentleman would if he were the head of the Department. They have been screened. The State Department has asked that everyone of them be investigated. I am not trying to defend anybody who is a Communist or fellow traveler, but what I want to know is why, at this late hour, when Mr. Perlo had something to do with the trade-agreements program from 1936 for a while—why at this late hour, when they have run out of arguments, just to find opposition to this program, the allegation of Communists among the administrative personnel now has to be injected.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I do not know why the gentleman would want to bring the name of Wilson into this discussion. I know nothing about any of it. But, if Mr. Wilson wanted to find out, he is a representative of the State Department, as I understand.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Wilson has talked to the FBI about every one of these people, and he did not receive the information that the gentleman from New York says he has received.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman did not let me finish my question. Why did not Mr. Wilson, if he is an attaché of the State Department, talk to the FBI and find it out himself?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman has made a very diligent effort to do that but he did not receive this information. I hope the gentleman from New York will help us in our effort to ferret out these communists, and not keep these names to himself when matters like this come to his attention. I am interested in seeing all of them dismissed, and I know my friend from New York is. The easiest way to do it is to let the folks who employ them know the facts such as he has at his disposal.

I have read the report which has been filed by the minority members of the committee. I have attempted to analyze this report as best I can. I have even called on some of the minority members to advise me as to what they had in mind, and they have been nice enough to tell me what they did have in mind. I shall read the first paragraph of the report:

> We of the Republican minority of the Committee on Ways and Means are opposed to H. R. 1211 for the reason that H. R. 1211 repeals, rather than extends, the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, thereby eliminating the existing procedural safeguards to domestic producers and to our national security in the conduct of the trade-agreements program.

The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 makes no special provision for safeguards to national security; in fact, it does not even make reference to national security. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 simply directs the Tariff Commission to determine the lowest tariff rates that can be established without causing serious injury or threat of injury to domestic industries, without regard to whether the industries are essential to national security or, for that matter, without regard to any other consideration. Even if the Tariff Commission were of the view that our national security dictated the lowest possible duties on imports of those strategic and critical materials which we have not produced in adequate volume—the Tariff Commission would still be obliged, under the present law, to be governed solely by considerations of injury or threat of injury to individual industries. Of course, the President is not legally prevented under the present law from disregarding the Tariff Commission's findings, but if he elected to do so, he would be placed on the defensive and would be forced to explain to the Congress the reasons for his nonobservance of the Commission's findings.

I wish the Members who signed that report would advise me in what particulars the 1948 act accomplishes that purpose of safeguarding the domestic producers and our national security.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Under the 1948 act, the Tariff Commission would find what we term a peril

point, a point below which a cut in the tariff would endanger or seriously damage an American industry. The President in preparing his trade agreements thereafter would not be bound to follow that recommendation. He could if he saw fit cut below that recommendation, and thereafter the President would have to report to the public, to the Congress, that he had cut below the level recommended by the Tariff Commission. That information would be available to the industry and would show the industry just what this administration saw fit to do, if the President by any presumed carelessness would cut the tariff below the recommended amount. That would provide a protection to the American industry.

Mr. MILLS. To the American industry, but would it provide any protection to our American economy, or would it provide any protection to our national security?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The American industry and American economy are more or less synonymous.

Mr. MILLS. I understand from the gentleman's point of view they are, but American industry is only one segment of our American economy, of course. If the present law actually required the Tariff Commission to relate its findings to what would be perilous to our domestic economy, it would be a far better law than it is. The Commission would then have to take into account such considerations as national security, the interests of the domestic consumer, and the cost to the Federal Treasury. But under the present law, the Tariff Commission must relate its findings solely to what would be perilous to individual industries. The interests of individual industries are not at all synonymous with the interests of our domestic economy.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman asked me two questions. With respect to national security, that information would be available to the public, and public opinion would rise up against any individual who would flout a recommendation of the Tariff Commission. I call to the gentleman's attention the matter of watches in this country.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; I want to discuss watches, if the gentleman will permit me, a little later. But the Tariff Commission is not instructed to report with regard to national defense.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. With respect to national defense, they are strategic and essential. Certainly if the tariff is to be cut to their harm, the American public should know it.

Mr. MILLS. Let me reason with the gentleman a few minutes, if I may. He insists upon the retention within the 1948 act of the authority of the Tariff Commission, acting as a commission, to determine peril points.

The premise on which the amendment is offered is that the peril-point procedure contained in the present act can achieve the objectives claimed. Under present law the Commission is considering 400 items. The Commission is allowed only 120 calendar days in which to establish peril points, which means that if the Commission devoted every day of the week, and had nothing else to do, it would have to cover these items at the rate of over three a day. This is manifestly impossible if the Commission is to arrive at judgments which could be useful. In ordinary investigations, the Commission would seldom determine a rate for a single item in less than a month or two, and on occasions has taken over a year or more. The Congress cannot both require that the Commission shall make a scientific study of an indeterminate number of items and report in an interval of 120 days. Moreover, and perhaps a more serious objection, is that the whole concept of a peril-point is misweighed. The Commission is in effect asked to isolate just one of the many factors, and often one of the less important, which bear on the economic prosperity of a domestic industry. We deny that an industry which is protected from imports is automatically assured of prosperity.

Moreover, what constitutes a peril point? Any industry which has competition from imports has in it some "weak sisters." Marginal producers are those most vulnerable to competition, and there is never a time when an industry is receiving competition from imports that a reduction in duty does not hit someone. The question is, How far down the line do you want to go—what are criteria of serious injury? A peril point for a single industry may not be such for all other like competing industries but they will attempt to use it to obtain greater protection than they had ever before thought necessary.

The whole concept is one injected for the purpose of sabotaging the trade-agreements program, and the best evidence is that it is advocated and introduced by those who had always voted against renewal of the act. The fact that in response to public pressure they found they had to endorse continuation of some sort of trade-agreements program tempted them to inject into that program a lethal measure, and this is it. The Tariff Commission, as such, has never passed on the wisdom of the peril-point procedure, as evidenced in the Commissioner's testimony before the Senate last year. Commissioner Ryder's views are no different now than when he appeared and testified before the Senate in 1948, as follows:

> I doubt the advisability of transforming the Commission into a policy-making agency and thus subjecting it more than in the past to political vicissitudes. The attempt to determine the degree to which duties may be reduced without injury to domestic producers or impairment of the national defense would require the making of such difficult and fundamental judgments that the Commission would in effect be making major policy decisions.
>
> The element of judgment, of course, enters into the various phases of the Commission's present work. This is especially true of the duties which have been assigned to it under the escape clause in trade agreements. In cases under that clause, however, its findings as to whether serious injury to domestic industry has occurred or is threatened will be based on actual observation of the imports after the trade-agreement concession has come into force.
>
> In contrast, the findings required under H. R. 6556 would have to be based to a large extent, especially under present abnormal conditions, on assumptions and estimates as to future probabilities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten additional minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I want to know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his colleagues want a scientific study of the Tariff Commission, or a snap judgment.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman implies that the Tariff Commission cannot do the job. The Tariff Commission was given the burden in the 1948 act. They have never complained nor said they would not do it. The assumption is that they will carry out the law, and the gentleman and the members on this side of the committee refused to invite members of the Tariff Commission to come before us so that we could ask them, and they could tell us, whether or not they could carry out the law.

Mr. MILLS. I can assure the gentlemen that we were not calling for the press, when the gentleman and his colleagues last year refused to let the press in. The gentleman, I am sure, realizes fully that the Tariff Commission in the past has spent as much as a year in attempting to determine the effect of imports upon a single item. I do not believe that the information that the 200 people employed by the Tariff Commission have, enables the Tariff Commission to advise the President within a period of 120 days of the effect of any import on any commodity about which there may be some doubt in the minds of anyone.

Oh, yes, you say it is nice to have this information given to the President. You say it is going to be in confidence, and that the Tariff Commission is acting to serve the President, so that when these individuals who negotiate these agreements come to him with the work done, he can put that alongside of the work done by the Tariff Commission and decide whether or not he will approve the agreement. It would not be so bad if a scientific study could be made, and if the President could really receive helpful information. The danger of it is this, and I wonder if the gentleman has considered this factor. The gentleman and I have been in Washington long enough to know that very, very seldom does a report or a statement of findings made by a department of the Government to the President fail to leak out. If it is going to leak out and if the Tariff Commission, on the basis of snap judgment, establishes a point below which it is dangerous to the industry, then to whom is this information going to leak? It is going to leak to the industry that is interested, and to the producer who is interested, and who wants that information. In what position, then, does that put the Tariff Commission? May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in the event that this producer should come to the Tariff Commission at some subsequent date under section 336 or 332 and ask for an investigation or study of injury

to him, would not the Tariff Commission already have committed itself?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Certainly if the industry knew that those making the agreement were willing to sell his industry out by cutting below the peril point, that industry should come before the Congress and complain and undertake to safeguard it.

But may I ask the gentleman this question: Is it, or is it not, a fact that scientific study is made today before the cuts are made in tariffs?

Mr. MILLS. Not under the 1948 act.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Well, I mean in the past.

Mr. MILLS. Under the old law, yes. So far as the law in effect prior to the act of 1948, the gentleman is correct. The Tariff Commission could do this job in all probability if the gentleman would permit them sufficient time. But the gentleman wants them to establish a peril point on 400 items in 120 days at the rate of less than 3 hours per item. I would like to know how many employees the Tariff Commission would have to have in the gentleman's opinion in order for any of them or all of them to think that fast.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I do not know, and I do not care. But I do say the industry should be heard.

Mr. MILLS. Is this not the gentleman's concern—that it is not possible for industry to be fully advised during the course of negotiations as to the cuts that may be in prospect for that industry? I think that is the concern of the gentleman and those who oppose a continuation of the old law. Does the gentleman realize that there is not one individual who sits on a trade agreements committee who can tell me or anyone else how much of a cut will be made in any tariff affecting any item until the negotiation has occurred? You say nobody knows how they have been received before the committees on reciprocity information. Nobody knows what impression he has made. Yes, they do. If there has been no reduction in the tariff affecting them, if there has been a very moderate reduction in the tariff, if the committee has not gone below the levels which the industry pointed out, is it not logical to assume that their arguments were considered? Certainly they were considered. The gentleman knows that.

If the gentleman had a valid position I would be perfectly frank. If it were practicable to establish a scientific peril point I cannot see any harm in it. But I do not want the President of the United States to be bound, in negotiating these agreements, on the basis of anybody's snap judgment. But now let us consider the second amendment relating to the escape clause. The gentleman's argument for an escape clause, which will be made tomorrow, I am sure will sound very plausible. Well, here we are. The administration has declared it to be the policy, and it has been the practice since 1942, to insert escape clauses in every negotiation under this act. Some trade agreements negotiated a few years ago did not contain escape clauses. It was thought very wise by the Congress earlier to include section 332, so that, in the event an industry could actually show threat of injury or existing injury, it might have an opportunity to go before the Tariff Commission, the whole body, acting officially, and if it made a case, the Commission had the responsibility under the law—and they have it now—of making that fact known to the President of the United States, and he can terminate, modify by agreement or otherwise, everything that is in any reciprocal trade agreement.

What is the purpose of the Annecy meeting in France in April? The purpose of that meeting is to negotiate with 13 countries, 8 of which we already have agreements. If there are any new agreements arrived at at Annecy, every one of those agreements will have an escape clause. There will be some 10 agreements left without escape clauses. Now, what is the purpose that the gentleman expects to accomplish by a directive from the Congress that an escape clause be included in these agreements, when it is already the policy of the administration to include an escape clause in every one of them, and efforts will be made in the future to include such a clause in those that do not now have it? The only way in which such a clause could be included in these agreements is by negotiations; it cannot be done by congressional legislation. The United States cannot unilaterally insert such a clause in agreements which do not contain them. This recommendation therefore amounts to a request for the renegotiation of a number of trade agreements including the Swiss trade agreement. It is doubtful that such action is warranted at this time inasmuch as the United States is already in the process of renegotiating the outstanding trade agreements which do not contain an escape clause; all new agreements must, of course, incorporate such a clause.

Furthermore, if the executive is required to obtain the consent of these 10 countries to the insertion of the clause in our agreement with them, even without a rigid time schedule, a situation might easily come about in which the only alternative would be to denounce the agreement, thereby losing valuable concessions for United States exporters. Continuation of the present course of renegotiations on an over-all basis appears in general to be the most feasible procedure.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. After the Annecy agreement in April, there will be more discrimination than there is today, because certain nations, notably Switzerland, will not have any escape clause, which we propose to require.

Mr. MILLS. I am sure the gentleman is thinking in terms of the great hardship that has come to the Waltham Watch Co. That company did not have any great success in years past under a protective tariff. It has not gone any deeper in the red under the reciprocal trade-agreements program. The gentleman knows the testimony before the committee by a gentleman representing the Gruen Watch Co., to the effect that he tried to buy Waltham Watch Co. plant but only on terms, which were turned down, that he could modernize the antiquated plant. What is he doing? He is going out to Cincinnati and putting in a new plant out there, lock, stock, and barrel. If only imports were hurting Waltham, would the Gruen Watch Co. manufacture its own parts in the United States?

The minority report, on page 5, asserts:

> Alarming evidence was presented to the committee, showing that several of our industries which manufactured vital military equipment in World War II are in a critical condition as a direct reason of tariff concessions. The most publicized, but by no means the only example, is that of the jeweled-watch industry. The importance of this industry to our national defense is shown by the following letter from Lieutenant General Lutes.

I do not find that Lieutenant General Lutes' letter at all substantiates the charges made by the minority. The letter reports some employment data based on information supplied by Mr. Generazzo, an independent labor organizer who now represents the employees of three domestic companies. Lieutenant General Lutes' letter states further that the skilled manpower of the watch and clock industry is highly important to our National Military Establishment and that—

> The maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the American jeweled-watch industry is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved.

I am not aware that any member of the majority has expressed a contrary opinion. Actually there is no dispute about this point at all. Lieutenant General Lutes does not say that there is any need to limit imports of Swiss watches or that the present domestic watch and clock industry is inadequate to meet the needs of our military services in the event of a national emergency. So far as I have been able to ascertain, neither Lieutenant General Lutes nor any other officer of the military services has ever officially advocated any restriction whatsoever of imports of Swiss watches. I respectfully invite the minority members to submit any evidence to the contrary.

The current controversy about the watch industry centers principally about bankruptcy of the Waltham Co. and the efforts of that company to reorganize on the basis of loans from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and from others, including employees of the Waltham Co. The evidence submitted to the Ways and Means Committee at our hearings which ended last week indicates clearly that the Waltham Co. failed, not because of excessive competition from Switches, but primarily because of the inefficiency and incompetence of its management and the obsolescence of its plant. Three other American companies that also make wholly domestic watches have been able to sell profitably all of the watches they have been able to make; and a fourth American company, which now imports all its watch movements, is in process of building a plant to manufacture movements in the United States. If competition from Switzerland were so foreboding, why would the Waltham Co. alone go bankrupt? And why would Elgin, Hamilton, and the domestic Bulova plant make such handsome profits? And why would a leading importer of Swiss movements

erect a watch movement plant in this country at this time?

I should like to clarify one other matter. In recognizing that the watch industry is essential to our national defense, we do not want to lose sight of the fact that it is not the only such industry. There are hundreds of others. Undoubtedly we could have used during the last war many more persons with watchmaking skills, but we could also have used many more mechanics, opticians, doctors, aviators—and soldiers—and for that matter, many more janitors, street cleaners, handymen, and housemaids. The fact is, we were so much shorter of persons who knew how to make electric meters—and many other articles needed by the military—than we were of watchmakers, that our military had our watch industry manufacture many articles that it was no better equipped to produce than the manufacturers of electrical instruments, camera equipment, typewriters, and toy trains. If the situation had been just the opposite, that is, if electric meter makers, for example, had been obliged to turn to making watches, there might then be a concern about a possible shortage of watchmakers in a future emergency. Actually the domestic watch- and clock-making facilities in this country are now at an all-time high. The plants devoted to making these articles are still in process of enlargement and modernization, and thousands of GI's as well as others, have been trained in watchmaking skills since World War II.

I submit, Mr. Chairman that the reason the complaining domestic watch producers have not received relief from Swiss imports that they have not been injured by them, and not because the Swiss trade agreement lacks an escape clause. If the domestic watch industry were in fact being jeopardized by imports from Switzerland, I am confident that our military services would so advise and that the State Department or the Tariff Commission would take appropriate action. If need be, the Swiss trade agreement could even be terminated.

Only a short time ago the Tariff Commission made a thorough study of the watch industry at the request of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and the Committee on Finance of the Senate. Its report is almost 200 printed pages. Nothing that appears in that report and nothing that has transpired since that report was written indicates—so far as I am aware—the need for the kind of restrictive action advocated by the three domestic complainants and Mr. Cenerazzo.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I think we have witnessed the greatest display of deep concern for the Communists. I brought the subject into this debate here today so that you people would not go blindly into this question of turning everything over to the State Department to be run and handled, because as I pointed out in my speech we have a hundred critical industries in this country producing critical materials for war, and we are building up these types of industries all the time in this country as far as we can. These are vital to the defense of this country; they must not be traded away. As I pointed out today the purpose of the peril point is to see that they are not traded away under any circumstances. The greatest fact-finding commission we have in this Government is the Tariff Commission. Everybody knows it, every department of the Government turns to it, but not once during the existence of these trade agreements—and my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] said, the Tariff Commission had taken part in the making of these trade agreements. They have had individuals that sat in on these agreements, but as a commission it is never called on for findings on these peril points. That is a matter of record that cannot be disputed, because the record shows that never has the Tariff Commission as such been asked for its report on peril points.

Now, for the benefit of my friend from Arkansas who has become very excited in regard to the Communists: He wants nothing disclosed; he wants to stop all further investigations in regard to Communists in the State Department, and it is to be essential always that the names should not be disclosed. But here we have a report from a department that has investigated, a committee created by this Congress to aid them in knowing something about the Communist infiltration into this Government. I want to read from the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, what they had to say. Here is their report on Victor Perlo:

VICTOR PERLO

Testimony of Victor Perlo, August 9, 1948: "I think I was officially an alternate member on the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the Trade Agreements Committee, which were identical or substantially identical in membership. These were interdepartmental committees which took care of all of the technical work in the preparation of trade agreements under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and also to a certain extent a lot of preparatory work for the International Trade Organization."

On the same day, Miss Elizabeth Terrill Bentley, a former member of the Communist espionage ring, confronted Mr. Perlo and identified him as a member of this ring while she was active. When questioned on these charges Mr. Perlo refused to answer charging that his rights under the first and fifth amendments were being violated and that such answer "might tend to incriminate or degrade me." Perlo was also identified as a member of this ring by Whittaker Chambers on August 3, 1948.

Then we have this report from the Committee on Un-American Activities on Henry J. Wadleigh:

HENRY J. WADLEIGH

Testimony of Henry J. Wadleigh, December 9, 1948: "I was in the Division of Trade Agreements from 1936, until the war in Europe broke out * * * (superiors were) Henry Grade in the Trade Agreements Division, then Harry Hawkins, then Leo Pasvolsky, special assistant to the Secretary of State, and in Italy, Henry Grade * * * Mr. (Francis B.) Sayre was Assistant Secretary in charge of the Trade Agreements Division when I first was employed there. Mr. Acheson later took Mr. Sayre's place."

On December 6, 1948, in an executive meeting of the Committee on Un-American Activities, Whittaker Chambers identified Julian Wadleigh (Henry Julian Wadleigh) as a scurce from which the former received documents for transmission to representatives of the Soviet military intelligence. When questioned by the Committee on Un-American Activities on December 9, 1948, Mr. Wadleigh refused to answer all questions dealing with such activity on the ground that such testimony might tend to incriminate him. Mr. Wadleigh has since been a witness before a Federal grand jury in New York and it is our understanding that he has been a cooperative witness.

Another is Alger Hiss. They had this to say:

ALGER HISS

On December 23, 1943, Mr. Francis B. Sayre, former Assistant Secretary of State, who was in charge of the Department's Division of Trade Agreements, testified that on April 28, 1936, he recommended that Alger Hiss be appointed as his assistant in the Department of Trade Agreements. He further testified that Mr. Hiss' duties included the legal prepation of trade agreements. Hiss was transferred to another division of the State Department on January 16, 1942.

You will recall that Mr. Charles Taft in testifying stated he was not employed in the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself two additional minutes.

Continuing:

Attached herewith is the second report of the Committee on Un-American Activities on Soviet espionage within the United States Government.

A study of this report which contains facsimiles of State Department documents emanating from the Department of Trade Agreements and, according to Mr. Chambers, furnished to him by Alger Hiss and Julian Wadleigh for transmission to the Soviet military intelligence agent, will disclose to some extent the proportions of this leakage of information.

Alger Hiss is now under indictment by a Federal grand jury in New York for perjury.

If the gentleman from Arkansas is so concerned about these Communists and feels nothing should be said on the floor when they have had parts in this transaction why, then, I have nothing more to say. He seems to be wanting to defend these people, he seems to want to criticize me for bringing this to the attention of a group of citizens who are entitled to the facts.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. The criticism of the gentleman, if I have any criticism of my beloved friend, is the fact he does not name nine men so that they can be fired from the State Department like all of these individuals he has just read have been.

Mr. REED of New York. I am not at all questioning the patriotism of the gentleman from Arkansas but he knows as well as I do and as every Member of this House knows, that you cannot interrupt

an investigation that is going on, and I have been told that often, when I have asked for certain investigations to be made. They do not disclose anything until the investigation is complete. I am telling you that investigation is going on now. It should continue until all the facts are disclosed and before we continue this reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

Mr. MILLS. I hope they get them all.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say to the gentleman from New York that this spy ring was operating during the war, passing out these secret documents to our enemies at a time when our boys were dying by the thousands on the battlefields of Europe.

Mr. REED of New York. Undoubtedly thousands of our boys were killed as a result of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the hearings on this bill I asked a representative of the State Department to name the foreign countries that have been helped by the reciprocal trade agreements, to list the countries and then for each country that was helped to list the industries that were specifically assisted, also the number of people that were restored to the pay roll in that industry. I did not get the information. I wish that someone on the majority side, if he has the facts and figures showing that any foreign nation has been helped by this program and can prove it with proper statistics, would put them in the RECORD so that we will have them tomorrow.

A great deal has been said about the evils of the old method of writing tariff legislation. We have heard a great deal about log-rolling tariff bills. It is my honest opinion, Mr. Chairman, that the action of the majority, the partisan position they have taken in regard to this matter, will do more to return this country to log-rolling tariff acts than anything that has been done in a generation.

Their determination to repeal the 1948 act and their refusal to call the Tariff Commission and the military department to testify were unjustified.

The Eightieth Congress extended the Trade Agreements Act. They attempted to try to throw around it some rules and some safeguards. Many of us believe in genuine reciprocity. We want some of that so-called Yankee trading. It would be foolish to say that the old tariff days were without fault and without evil. No one is arguing to go back. We want to go forward. If certain amendments are added I will support this measure.

The State Department should clean house with respect to the men connected with the trade agreements. Take this man Alger Hiss. The gentleman from New York made reference to his activity in regard to trade agreements. In the fall of 1945 in this Hall I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement asking the State Department to have the FBI investigate Alger Hiss and make that record known. It was not done. The statement of the gentleman from New York that Mr. Clayton journeyed to Switzerland to negotiate trade agreements and took nine Communists with him was not challenged in the committee. The State Department never denied it. Now, if there is anything in the world that the Communists want it is a depression in America and a weakening of our national defense. That can happen under the present system. You can call it a red herring if you want to.

I want to call as my witness the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], who on January 25 stated on this floor:

> Mr. Speaker, over this week end we have learned the extent of the disaster that has befallen China and the United States. The responsibility for the failure of our foreign policy in the Far East rests squarely with the White House and the Department of State. The continued insistence that aid would not be forthcoming unless a coalition government with the Communists was formed, was a crippling blow to the National Government.

Now, that is the crowd that is going to write your tariff law. That is the crowd that is going to determine the future of industries in this country that are so vital to our welfare. That is the group that is going to write the tax law that means the life or death over industries essential to our national defense.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I cannot yield right now. When I finish I shall be glad to yield.

Again, I say, the State Department in the hearings never denied that they took nine Communists and fellow travelers to Geneva to help plan world trade. It is quite evident that they took them to San Francisco. Anyone who reads Mr. Hiss' record knows that.

I would like to see this legislation amended so that I can support it. I would like to see an escape clause. The peril-point procedure should be retained. I would like to see some safeguards thrown around this law so that the national defense of this Republic could not be bartered away by men who either do not know or do not care.

I was one of those people who had hoped that we would have here in America following the war a growing, expanding synthetic rubber industry. We could have lost the last war if it had not been for the great strides we made in synthetic rubber production. That industry is very essential to our national defense. What has the State Department done in regard to it? Among other things, they have frozen rubber on the free list. We cannot impose a tariff against natural and synthetic rubber without violating our agreements. And that is not all. At the present time we are maintaining a synthetic rubber industry through the power that this Congress delegated to the President to issue directives requiring a certain percentage of our rubber to be synthetic. The State Department bound this country not to increase that formula in favor of synthetic rubber production. Did they ask Congress about it? Did they come to the Committee on Armed Services? No, they did not.

It was not so many months ago that the chief champion for trade agreements that came before our committee was none other than Henry Wallace. About the last official functions of Alger Hiss were in connection with trade agreements. Again, I remind you that Mr. REED's charges were never denied by the State Department.

Now I want to say something about this great American watch industry of ours. Where would we be in America if we did not have that pool of trained workers, those experts whom it takes at least 10 years to develop, some of them, to make the timing instruments, these precision instruments so necessary to make machines of war? Our own Military Establishment sent up a letter stating that the maintenance of the watch industry is necessary for the national defense.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call attention to a portion of the testimony of Mr. James G. Shennan which is found in the hearings:

> The 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland reduced the tariffs on watches, and thereafter the American industry's share in the American market fell sharply. Subsequent to the 1936 trade agreement, four factors, in addition to the reduction of tariffs, operated to reduce further the tariff protection which remained to the industry.
>
> First, in 1934, the United States reduced the value of the dollar. This is one of the reasons given in the Tariff Commission's digest of trade data on the trade agreement with Switzerland, for reducing watch tariffs by the Swiss trade agreement in 1936. Four months after consummation of the agreement, the Swiss devalued the franc by approximately 35 percent, but no compensating increase was thereafter made in the reduced tariffs.
>
> Two, the tariff duties on watches are specific, that is to say so many dollars and cents per watch. The subsequent inflation has operated to reduce further, on an ad valorem or percentage basis, the protection left by the trade agreement and the devaluation of the Swiss franc.
>
> Three, the duty on "adjustments," which was intended to afford progressively greater protection the higher the quality of the watch, has been rendered completely ineffective by the marking of imported watches as "unadjusted," regardless of the fact.
>
> Four, the cost of watch-movement manufacture, which is practically all labor, has more than doubled in this country since the beginning of the war.
>
> The dollar increase here has been disproportionate to that in Switzerland, inasmuch as we started from a higher base cost because of the much higher labor rates in this country. Our labor rates are approximately 2½ times those of the Swiss for comparable jobs.
>
> Over 55,000,000 jeweled watches and movements have been imported into this country since 1941; the high point being 1946 when imports of jeweled watches exceeded the 9,000,000 mark.
>
> During the first 11 months of 1948, the latest statistics available to us, the imports of jeweled watches exceeded 7,100,000. This is an average of almost 7,000,000 jeweled watches annually over the years beginning with 1941, as contrasted to an average of about 2,600,000 from 1936 through 1940, and an average of less than 1,000,000 for the years 1930 through 1935.

All of these watches are advertised and sold as jeweled watches, and are competitive with the products of this industry.

Waltham has already felt the full impact of this competition, and any weakening of the watch market in this country could have serious repercussions on the remaining companies in the industry. The break-even point of the American watch industry has steadily risen, during the war and since, and this requires a larger volume to sustain profitable operations than ever before.

Price increases were granted to the importers of Swiss watches by OPA during the war, and their profits were not subject to renegotiation. This, and their continued heavy volume during our reconversion, has enabled the importers, during and since the war, to more extensively advertise their brand names than ever before.

In addition to this advertising of brand names by the importers, the Swiss watch manufacturers themselves, within the last year, for the first time, have gone into a tremendous institutional advertising campaign promoting the Swiss watch in this country in an effort to enhance the already dominant position they hold in this market.

The trade agreement with Switzerland has been in effect since 1936, 12 years next month. During this period inflation and other influences have operated on the specific duties of the watch tariffs to completely obsolete them. In addition, the war took the American industry completely out of the market, and imposed on the American industry a difficult reconversion problem.

It is our opinion that this agreement, when it was entered into 12 years ago, was not intended to create an inflexible situation. But the agreement has never been changed in that entire 12-year period. Furthermore, the agreement does not contain an escape clause, as do the more recently negotiated or renegotiated agreements, and as is now required by Executive order.

Mr. Shennan went on to say:

We have been told by the National Security Resources Board that they anticipate Switzerland will be completely cut off in the event of another war.

Additional tariff protection, designed to equalize the cost of movement production in this country and the cost of movements to the importers, is necessary to insure the future of this industry as a matter of national defense, if for no other reason.

A great many governments are attempting to reduce imports by quota or exchange restrictions. We are not asking this. Under the conditions that exist today we do not think this is the answer to the industry's problem.

The American jeweled-watch industry is not seeking an advantage in the American market. Gentlemen, we ask only for equality at the border of the United States; we ask for realistic duties which will equalize the cost of a movement to the importer with the cost of a comparable movement made in America by American labor. From this point on, the material, labor, and other services required are, and should be, on a competitive basis.

Correct these tariff inequities by giving us equality at the border. It will stimulate American-movement production. It will attract others to the business. It may well attract Swiss importers to set up factories here. This we would welcome. It would stimulate competition. And furthermore, it would strengthen the defenses of this Nation by preserving and enhancing the skills necessary for the production of precision time mechanisms.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of record that the Swiss watch industry sold their timing instruments to our enemies in the last war. Perhaps it will be said they were a neutral and had a right to do that. It must be borne in mind, however, that during that same time the American jeweled-watch industry went to war totally. Without it, we could not have attained victory. Since the war the Swiss have refused to ship watch-making machinery to the United States and have done everything they could to establish a world monopoly. I again want to call your attention to the testimony of Mr. Shennan.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the situation in regard to the past existence of an embargo on the export of watch-making machinery by the Swiss?

Mr. SHENNAN. The situation which arose in 1946 and still obtains is that we cannot buy any watch-making machinery from the machine builders in Switzerland except on a lease arrangement called machor, which has certain conditions in it that are very repugnant to the American theory of business which is to do the best you can and compete but not agree not to compete.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the Swiss watch industry pretty much of a controlled operation? How do they operate; do you know?

Mr. SHENNAN. Well, sir; it is rather complicated but in general there are several principal watch trusts that control and direct certain branches of the industry. There is one trust for watch manufacturers and one for parts, which includes the tool builders, one for the jewel makers and one for case makers. They are tied at the top by two organizations called the Superholding and also the Swiss Watch Chamber.

There is Government representation, or at least considerable interest, I am not too familiar with that. There is joint and central Government research, there is Government training of the engineers and tool makers, and in general I think that you can say that the trust, with Government blessings, controls everything they do.

That is a matter of public record, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. That interest of the Swiss Government continues on in their negotiation with foreign countries on watches?

Mr. SHENNAN. I would say they were very skillful negotiators.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose the other two jeweled-watch industries in this country were to go the way of Waltham, and we hope that Waltham recovers, but in the event they do not, would that lead to pretty much of a world monopoly of the jeweled-watch industry?

Mr. SHENNAN. I would say that it would be virtually a complete world monopoly; yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. How long has it been since a new jeweled watch company was organized in the United States?

Mr. SHENNAN. A great many years. It has been a great many years since a new company was organized. However, the Bulova plant was started in 1931, if I am not mistaken, 1931 or 1932, and has been operating since that time.

Mr. CURTIS. That is carried on by a company that is also in the business of import, is that true?

Mr. SHENNAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, your battle has been to hold your own without much hope of expansion, speaking for the industry generally?

Mr. SHENNAN. Yes, sir; that is true.

I might say this about the plant which is built by an importer. He may have the same reason to be worried about watch production as the United States Government. He may wish, therefore, to hedge his investment in his brand name by having some manufacturing on both sides of the ocean which I think is a reasonable sensible thing to do if you can afford to do it.

Mr. CURTIS. Now, if a more helpful climate could be created for the watch industry, that would have some degree of permanence and would not only protect the watch industry, that we have, but would make possible some expansion, would that be to the advantage of the American consumer and be of advantage to our Government from the standpoint of national defense?

Mr. SHENNAN. Yes, sir; I think it would. We do not believe in suppressing competition. I think in order to keep the industry on its toes, there must be a degree of competition but there comes a point when it is overwhelming. I do feel that if the industry had a chance to compete and grow, that eventually there would be benefits to both the consumer and to the national defense very definitely.

Mr. CURTIS. In other words, growth is a much better trend of things than mere maintenance of the status quo?

Mr. SHENNAN. I think if you stand still you very likely might go backward.

Mr. CURTIS. But from the standpoint of defense, we would not only be building up the factories and the machines to turn to but it would mean a new crop, a new-age group, of skilled workmen in more and new communities, would it not?

Mr. SHENNAN. That is the most important thing, as I see it, sir.

Testimony was submitted in our committee with reference to one particular type of watch movement that could be made in Switzerland, sent to this country, the reduced tariff paid on it, and the watch would still sell for $4.40 cheaper than it could be made here in America.

Some of these importers took the witness stand. I asked one of those gentlemen about his production costs. He said he did not know. He was the treasurer of a company manufacturing watches in Switzerland. I asked him about his wage rates. He said he did not know. Throughout the hearings, you will find question after question put in an effort to find out the facts, and they said they did not know.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I do not have the current information, but not long ago we were receiving from 1 to 3 plane loads of watch parts per week from Switzerland, amounting to something between 5 and 10 tons of watch parts. Watch parts are very small and they make an awful lot of watches out of 10 tons of parts.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. The latest information on the importation of Swiss watches is that they are coming in now at the rate of 9,000,000 watches a year.

Mr. CURTIS. I would like to have the attention of those Members who are interested in what the agricultural witnesses had to say. It has been said that the Farm Bureau favored this act. They did appear and speak generally in favor of trade agreements. I asked Mr. Kline:

Would you favor the reduction of tariffs on agricultural commodities in exchange for reduction of a foreign country of their tariffs on our industrial products?

Mr. KLINE. Well, the question taken just by itself, I would say "No."

I then asked:

In carrying out the trade-agreement program in the Western Hemisphere, does not that problem enter into it?

Mr. KLINE. Yes, sir.

I asked him:

Has the Farm Bureau any position with respect to further action by trade-agreement negotiators with respect to any one of the commodities such as butter, cheese, wheat, wool, and so on down the line?

Do you have any position with respect to any particular commodity?

Mr. KLINE. We have made here a statement of the general position, and within that position we reserve the right to take a look at things as they come along.

Mr. Goss, of the Grange, testified, and I want to give you a word or two from his statement. He said:

We do not believe H. R. 1211 will provide the type of tariff system the Nation needs.

Then he goes on to say:

In the Trade Agreements Act we made two basic changes—the abandonment of the principle of protection and surrendering the making of tariff rates to the executive branch of the Government.

First, we abandoned the protection policy and adopted a trade promotion policy. We adopted no rules to go by except to promote trade. We assumed that all trade is beneficial without regard to its effect on our producers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. May I also suggest that you examine the testimony submitted by the representative of the independent oil producers. That gentleman pointed out that concessions made allegedly to foreign countries were made to large oil companies, most of them being American companies, that the companies received the benefits, and they were not passed on to the country where this oil was produced.

A representative of the fruit and vegetable people from Florida gave to us the benefit of his own investigation in Mexico, he told how we reduced the tariff and an American company on the American side of the line produced those vegetables in Mexico and got the benefit of our tariff reduction and none of that benefit was passed along to the many Mexican people who did that work.

This act should be amended to prevent the growth of monopolies and trusts. Benefits intended for foreign workers should actually help them and not further exploit them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I wish the membership would keep in mind that the minority report listed only two objections to the present measure. One objection was to the effect that the bill before us does not provide that every agreement shall immediately contain a so-called escape clause.

Now the true fact about the matter is that every agreement that has been entered into by this country since the year 1942 contains an escape clause and all future agreements will contain it. The State Department, the Interdepartmental Trade Agreements Committee, including the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the National Military Establishment, and every other agency of the Federal Government concerned with the making of these agreements, have negotiated or are now negotiating, so that 18 out of 728 of our past agreements will contain this clause. The rest will be changed as soon as practicable.

Mr. Chairman, I wish the membership would also keep in mind that this act—this great Cordell Hull reciprocal-trade-agreements program—was first passed in 1934. It was renewed in 1937, renewed in 1940, renewed in 1943, and in 1945, and in 1948.

In other words, on six different occasions this question has been debated on the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate. We have gone through the agony in many instances of hearing the complaints of specific industries which were always afraid that they might be hurt. They always have the fear in their minds that the State Department and these other departments of the Government would negotiate concessions so that they would be put out of business; yet the record clearly discloses, Mr. Chairman, that in no single instance was any industry seriously hurt or damaged by any concession made under these reciprocal trade agreements. Every organization in the country that has, one might say, no special interest to plead is in favor of this great program.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to call the attention of the Members, now, to the fact that in 1934 the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee voted against this program, they voted solidly; they were against it; they were high protectionists; they were high-tariff people. In their minority report they listed 24 reasons why the act would practically ruin the American economy. But, mark you, Mr. Chairman, at that time they did not say the Communists were behind this. There was no "Beware, the Communists are behind it." On five different occasions this question has been debated on the floor of the House for days and days at a time and on the floor of the other body, yet never did they bring up this red herring. They bring it up today because all of the 24 reasons they had advanced in previous debates have been shown to carry no weight. They are throwing a lot of dead cats, if I may use that expression, Mr. Chairman, at the present renewal of this act in unrestricted and unhampered form. It was even charged in the hearings, Mr. Chairman, that these reciprocal trade agreements were largely responsible for the oil monopoly enjoyed throughout the world by five or six oil companies. It was even charged with failure because it had not prevented a Second World War. That was charged on the floor.

It was even charged in the committee hearings that the reciprocal trade agreements program was responsible for our not building up a sufficient stock pile of strategic materials; and on and on they go, trying to find excuses.

Why, they charged time and time again that the act was unconstitutional. That comes up at every hearing. The charge is made that the act is unconstitutional; and yet last year the Republican majority passed the act in practically the same form, insofar as constitutionality is concerned, as we passed it in 1945 and previous years, and as we are trying to pass it now.

Mr. Chairman, they pleaded last year in the hearings—in fact, it was pleaded here today—that we should return to the old logrolling days of the Smoot-Hawley tariff. They contended in previous debate on the floor that studies should be made of the difference in wages, studies which would probably take a couple of years to complete. They contend that we should obliterate the most-favored-nations clause.

Finally, we are down here today to the proposition that they have only two criticisms, each one of which evaporates after it is studied, by anyone not having a special interest to plead. So the only thing to do is to pass this bill as it has been presented to the House by the Committee on Ways and Means.

Last year the Republicans, of course, were in the majority, and it being an election year they were afraid to go before the great American voting public and say, "No; we are going to kill the reciprocal-trade-agreements program." But what did they say? They said, "We will renew it for 1 year." But then they hung so many dead weights around that program that it could not work. This is the testimony of those who were in charge of the operation of the program; and it was so stated by the President. The President has told us that the reciprocal trade program cannot be effectively and efficiently consummated because of the dead weights that were hung around it in 1948. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that had there been a different complexion of the House today the matter of the reciprocal-trade-agreements renewal would not be on the floor of this House, because the high protectionists, the high-tariff lobbyists and the high-tariff Members of Congress wanted to kill the program. They were afraid to kill it outright last year but they thought they could do it and fool the American public by hanging these dead weights around it.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. Why is it that the gentleman and his entire party, when they were in full power back in the heyday of the New Deal, never had the courage to extend it more than 3 years? Why did not the gentleman's party extend it and why do you not extend it now and make it permanent if it is so good? You have the votes, you have the power; why do you not do it?

Mr. EBERHARTER. When this great program was presented to the country and to the Congress of the United States,

Cordell Hull asked for a certain time. He thought it would be a good thing for the economy of the country, for the betterment of world conditions and he thought it would be a helpful aid to peace. He was of the opinion it should be tried for 3 years. So we just got into the habit of renewing it every 3 years in order to review it to see whether it is being properly administered. Every Congress since 1937, when the first act expired, has seen the wisdom of renewing it up until the Eightieth Republican Congress, at which time they thought they could kill the program, but, thank goodness, the wisdom of the American public is such that that scheme of theirs did not go through.

When the 1948 Republican platform was first presented to the resolutions committee in Philadelphia, it contained two paragraphs unequivocally endorsing the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, but after the platform was looked over they changed the wording to a vague phrase: "The Republican Party favors a system of reciprocal trade." They did not say anything about agreements. They just favored reciprocal trade. They were beginning to hedge.

Mr. JENKINS. Of course, we talked about reciprocal trade because we are the originators of it. As I said in my remarks this afternoon, the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is a Republican matter, but we managed it under a system by which the officials down here in the Washington departments were responsible to the Congress. That is where it ought to be.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will tell the gentleman what you did last year. You reported a bill out of the Ways and Means Committee unanimously supported by the Republican membership. You reported it under a gag rule so that no amendments could be offered and with only 3 hours of general debate. No amendments could be offered, as I said. That bill was passed by the House under the whip of the Republican majority, and the bill was so bad that Secretary Marshall said he would rather have no bill at all because the bill was so bad nothing could possibly be done. There was such a protest throughout the country at the terms of that bill that the other body, after studying the matter a little bit, improved it to a great extent. There is no question but what the Republican membership was committed to killing the program and the act they passed would have killed the program if it had not been for the other body and we would not have been able to start the negotiations that have already been held.

Mr. JENKINS. If this is such a terrible thing we did, why did President Truman sign the bill?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I said what the House passed was so terrible the Secretary of State made the unequivocal statement in writing—it is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—that he would rather have no measure at all than the one passed by the House. The other body made some improvement and corrections in it which were accepted because we had a little foresight. We thought perhaps we could start preliminary negotiations and in the fall of the year we could correct it. That is what is coming about, Mr. Chairman, we are correcting the dark deeds that were done last year.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is this bill open to amendment? Is the bill subject to amendment on the floor of the House?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Oh, yes. We Democrats follow the policy, of course, of having free and open debate, as many hours as you want today, then tomorrow you will have all the opportunity you want to offer amendments, provided they are in order. We made it an open rule in order to give all of the Members, including the gentleman from Massachusetts, if he wants to, an opportunity to offer amendments. We did not do anything like was done last year.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania remembers that the bill brought in last year by the Republicans was under a closed rule, with no amendments permitted except those offered by the committee.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Yes. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will remember that. I assume, perhaps, that he wanted to offer an amendment last year, but his leadership would not permit him to do it by reason of the gag rule that was in effect.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The rules were broad enough to protect our interests. I want to know whether this bill will be subject to amendment that will give us a chance to protect our fishery, and boot and shoe, and watch industries.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am glad the gentleman mentioned fisheries. Let me tell you something about that poor fishing industry. I think I have it here. The fishermen came down from New England. That is the section where the gentleman from Massachusetts comes from. They painted a very dismal picture about the flood of fish that were being imported. The whole industry was simply being ruined. It was a pitiful situation; pitiful. Well, Mr. Chairman, we wanted to get the facts on this problem of fish, and we asked a few questions. We asked them how many additional boats would be needed by the New England fishermen to bring in the fish that were being imported. What do you suppose the answer was? Six boats would bring in all the fish that were being imported, that were ruining the fishing industry. Afterward they reduced that figure. But, you know, if six boats can ruin a fishing industry, it is a pitiful situation, I will say to my colleague from Massachusetts.

There is another point I want to bring out.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the gentleman is well acquainted with some of the fishery-industry men that came down and testified.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I am sure the answer was incorrectly given or accepted. Even six vessels will not bring in 54,000,000 pounds of fish a year. I think the gentleman will agree to that.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I do not know how many fish there were. It depends on how big they are. Of course, there are different sized fish. Some member of the committee—I think it was the gentleman from Tennessee here—asked about the average annual income of these fishermen. I hope my colleague from Massachusetts will listen to this. You know, the crews of these fishing vessels are not paid wages; they are paid a share depending upon how many fish are caught. The answer was that the average earnings were around $5,000 per man per year last year. Of course, in 1945 they only made $4,500 a year—these poor fishermen. Now they are making about $5,000. Then the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] asked about their production. The production, Mr. Chairman, has doubled over what it was before the war. So, they certainly need a lot of tariff protection.

Oh, I have a lot of other instances here, Mr. Chairman. Here is one industry representative—I do not want to mention his name because it might embarrass the whole industry—but he was just weeping about what the imports were doing to their particular industry, or the industry he was speaking for. "We have the competition of these cheap imports from abroad," he said. "One manufacturer felt the competition so he had to do something he had never done before." We waited and waited and waited for the answer, and what do you suppose this manufacturer had been forced to do? He had been forced to advertise. That is the first time he had ever been forced to do that in all the history of his business. So he had been forced to advertise because of these serious imports that were coming in here.

They bring in this question of communism. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] said that these Communists are the ones that are forming this State Department policy; that they are the ones that are going to make up these trade-agreement programs. I suppose if there are any Communists to be found in the Government, that will be justification for every Republican Member to take a stand against every bill that is recommended by the President of the United States and by the departments down here—merely because somebody accuses somebody else of being a fellow traveler or having communistic leanings. It is easy to find a reason, you know, if you just point to somebody's name, Alger Hiss or somebody like that. Then we should oppose these programs, it is argued.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the United States Chamber of Commerce, the United States associates of the International Chamber of Commerce, the National Foreign Trade

Council, the National Council of American Importers, the National Farmers Union, the American Farm Bureau Association, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the American Federation of Labor, and about 80 percent of the people of the United States are in favor of this program, so this flank attack, this attack by these special pleaders that come down here time after time, pleading especially the fear that something might happen to their industry—I think we should just about consider their true value and remember that they are special pleaders and pay no attention to them, because in the entire history of this act, since 1934, which is 14 years, at least, there have been only three complaints filed in the Tariff Commission. Two of the complaints were dismissed by the Tariff Commission itself as having no evidence to support their contention that they might in the future be injured, and the third complaint is still being investigated and has not been decided.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope that on tomorrow, when some of these amendments are offered which really have no merit to them whatever, at least our side of the aisle will stand fast and send to the other body the measure which the President of the United States asked for, which the Democratic Members ran on their platforms when they campaigned for reelection to this body and for new election to this body. Let us go on in such a manner that we can show the European countries and all the rest of the world that we really mean it when we say we want to remove trade barriers, we want to have more international good will. We not only want to help raise the standard of living of the people of the United States but we want to help Europe recover. Let us go forward in a more peaceful world and not throw up barriers and set a bad example to all the rest of the world.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, the Eightieth Congress passed a 1-year extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and placed in the law a provision that in effect reestablished the United States Tariff Commission as an agent of the legislative branch of the Federal Government. The 1-year extension was made in order to have the law expire at the same time the charter of the International Trade Organization will come before this Congress for consideration, so that these closely knit Siamese twins, the ITO and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, might be considered by Congress at one and the same time.

The Tariff Commission, when first set up, was an agent of the Congress, bipartisan in make-up, composed of experts. In 1934, when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed, the Tariff Commission was buried in and subordinated to the executive department. Many of its findings and reports thereafter were made to the President and kept from the Members of Congress. The Eightieth Congress, in extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, in substance reestablished the Tariff Commission as an agent of the Congress, but provided that the Commission make a report to the President for his guidance in making future trade agreements. If for any reason he disregarded the findings of the Tariff Commission as to peril points, then the President would be required to make available to the Congress the Tariff Commission's Report, along with his reasons for disregarding the recommendations of the Commission as to peril points.

H. R. 1211, now before the Congress, proposes to repeal the 1948 act; to extend the period for 3 years from last June 12; to bury or subordinate the Tariff Commission again within the executive department; and to divorce it from the legislative department. Is that what we want to do?

Mr. Chairman, the United States adopted its reciprocal trade program in 1934. The program has been in operation 14 years. Its objective is to reduce or remove world trade barriers and permit the free flow of goods between countries, thereby removing one of the principal causes of war. That is an excellent objective, a very worthy purpose. How has it worked out? Testimony given before the Ways and Means Committee at recent hearings brought out the following very disappointing facts:

First. After 14 years, world trade barriers are greater today than ever before.

Second. We have experienced World War II, and the world today is in greater fear of war than when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was adopted.

Third. American industries are being injured, American workers have lost their jobs, even though the full impact of the program upon our American industries has not as yet fully materialized.

Dr. Clair Wilcox, formerly Director of the Office of International Trade Policy of the State Department, and one of the best-posted men in America on our foreign-trade program, in commenting on the results of the 14-year record of our reciprocal-trade-agreements program, made this statement before the United States Chamber of Commerce Institute on June 15, 1948:

> The trade of the world today is more tightly regimented than it ever has been before in history, in time of peace. The tariff is the old-fashioned method of restricting trade. It is the mildest method of restricting trade that exists at the present time. As a matter of fact, a nation that confines trade restriction to the use of a tariff today can be said to be pursuing a liberal trade policy.

The June 1948 monthly letter of the National City Bank of New York contained the following statement:

> Foreign producers criticize our protective duties on certain articles. Nevertheless, the United States market generally is freer of access today than practically any other market in the world.

Mr. Chairman, embargoes, quotas, preferences, import license restrictions, currency manipulations, subsidies, state trading, and other restrictive trade devices have been adopted by foreign nations to control the movement of trade. They are much more restrictive than simple tariff barriers. Our feeble tariff barriers are as nothing when compared with the trade barriers set up by governments that have entered into reciprocal trade agreements with us.

Mr. Chairman, we have built up a watch industry in the United States that gives employment to scores of thousands of workers. These workers are paid a reasonably high wage that enables them to live decently upon a standard of living that is the highest in the world. Switzerland, under our reciprocal-trade-agreements program, has been dumping millions of watches on our American market at far less than it costs to manufacture them here. This has forced our factories either to go out of business or to go on part-time production. What is the difference between importing cheap labor to compete with our American labor—which our immigration laws forbid—and importing the products of cheap labor to compete with the product of our factories—which our reciprocal trade program permits—thereby robbing our factory workers of their jobs?

Before World War II—1931–35—47 percent of the American market for jeweled watches was supplied by imported watches from Switzerland, and 53 percent of the American market was supplied by our own American jeweled watch industries. In 1936 we negotiated a reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland. Later our American watch factories were retooled and converted for war needs, making precision instruments for the Army and Navy. Switzerland then took over the American market for jeweled watches to such an extent that by 1946 Switzerland supplied 86 percent of the jeweled watches sold in America.

Since 1941, when we entered the war, a total of 59,000,000 Swiss watches have been imported. During the last 4 years, 1945–48, an average of more than 9,000,000 Swiss watches were imported each year. This importation of Swiss watches under our reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland has seriously damaged our American-watch industry. Today there are only three American-jeweled watch companies left in the United States, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, and the Waltham Watch Co. is already bankrupt and in the hands of a receiver.

Mr. Chairman, the serious question concerning the American-jeweled watch industry is the important part it plays in national defense. It is absolutely essential that a pool or reservoir of skilled watchmakers be maintained, to be drawn upon in time of war to make precision time instruments—chronometers, fire-control watches, time fuses, aircraft instruments, jewel bearings, etc.—without which not a battleship nor a warplane can be operated, not a bomb can be dropped, not a torpedo nor a rocket bomb fired, until a delicate timing instrument to operate it has been installed. There is no other source for the kind of skill needed to make these precision instruments other than the jeweled-watch industry. Yet our reciprocal trade agreement with Switzerland has almost destroyed our American jeweled-watch industry, an industry so essential to our national defense.

Switzerland has captured the world trade in jeweled watches. Even the

American market has been taken over to the extent of 80 percent. Switzerland furnished practically all of the precision instruments used by Germany in the last war. She also furnished most of the precision instruments used by our European allies. She could do this because she was a neutral in the war. Do we want to become dependent upon Switzerland in time of war for precision instruments? Dare we risk such dependency?

Mr. Chairman, after 14 years of experimentation with reciprocal trade agreements, it is time for us to "stop, look, and listen"; it is time for us to analyze, to weigh, and to measure the results of the reciprocal trade program before we extend it for 3 more years, without the safeguards that were placed in it by the 1948 act. A careful analysis of the results of our 14 years' experience convinces me of the following:

First. The program has not contributed to international goodwill.

Second. The program has not removed nor reduced world trade barriers with the exception of our own.

Third. The program has neither prevented war nor removed the threat of war.

Fourth. The program has already damaged some American industries and thrown some American workmen out of work, even though the impact of the program upon our economy has not as yet fully materialized.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the passage of H. R. 1211 without proper and necessary safeguards being incorporated in the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, I intend, in what I am going to say, to deal principally with the question of the jeweled watch industry as affected by our reciprocal-trade agreements, which subject has been discussed by two or three preceding speakers, including the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Before doing that, however, I want to talk just briefly on two other points discussed by preceding speakers.

The opposition to this bill has repeatedly discussed the peril-point proposition—that provision of the law of 1948 whereby the Tariff Commission is authorized to make a finding of that point below which, in its judgment, tariff rates cannot be lowered without injury to particular commodities. Instead of that provision being to the benefit of the manufacturer, it so hamstrings our representatives in negotiating trade agreements as to work against the American manufacturer. Let us follow that thought a little further. The theory of reciprocal trade is that the representatives of our country and other countries will sit around the table, and that mutual concessions will be made. In return for a concession made by us in respect to an article the negotiating country will make some concession with respect to the admission of American goods. In some instances instead of keeping out or reducing imports by high tariffs which would increase the cost to the American consumer, an agreement is negotiated whereby we limit imports.

It is necessary that our negotiators shall be free at the conference to make adjustment in return for concessions made to us by other countries. The peril-point theory as injected into the law by the act of 1948 removes the Tariff Commission from negotiations and requires it to sit back as a sort of separate entity to make a finding before the negotiation begins as to the point below which a rate cannot be lowered. That is an invitation to the American negotiators to go down to that point. Mr. Thorpe, testifying for the State Department, said that in many instances the negotiators had not gone as far in the reductions in certain tariffs as they would have been authorized to go by the findings of the Tariff Commission. From 1934 on to last year the members of the Tariff Commission with their expert knowledge and information sat in the negotiations. They could express then and there their view concerning the peril point, and lend their expert advice and assistance in the negotiations. But the effect of the restrictive amendment of the act of 1948 is to take them completely out of the negotiations, forbid them the right of attending the sessions where these agreements are negotiated. They are left in this country. Thereby our negotiators are deprived of the advice and expert help, counsel, and judgment of the Tariff Commission. In the second place, we talk about the danger of imports. Among nations, as among men, no nation can purchase more abroad than it can sell; it cannot long buy more than it sells without bankruptcy. If other nations are to buy our goods and pay their debts to us, they must sell us their goods and services. All over the world, from World War I on down, the world has maintained an uneasy sort of economic unbalance in which we have kept up world trade by grants and loans and the purchase of foreign gold which we buried at Fort Knox while the economy of the other nations languished. At long last we came to the viewpoint that trade is not a one-way street. That world prosperity depends on world trade. We came further to the viewpoint that we could not long maintain the prosperity and the freedom of our own Nation as a little island of prosperity and peace in a worldwide sea of rags and misery. That is the basis of the whole reciprocal trade agreements program.

A while ago the gentleman from New York, for whom I have the greatest respect, was tracing our downward decline toward a Niagara of destruction, as a result of reciprocal trade. I could not help but reflect that last year the profits of the American economy, the corporate profits of our Nation after the payment of taxes reached the highest peak in the Nation's history. Where is the Niagara? It does not exist except in the imagination of those who oppose the program that has worked so successfully for 14 years.

One other thing the gentleman from Nebraska referred to the grave harm done to the synthetic-rubber industry by the policies of the State Department. This happens to be something I know a little about, for the biggest synthetic-rubber plant in the world is located in my district, at Port Neches, Tex. It has a rated capacity of 125,000 tons of synthetic rubber a year. Right now it is operating at more than 50,000 tons a year above its rated capacity, turning out the synthetic rubber that goes to your tire plants in Ohio and other places. It is turning out this rubber for several cents a pound cheaper than you can import the natural rubber. It has increased the life of automobile tires more than double. They are now installing a new process, making "cold rubber," which will add one-third longer life to passenger-car tires. Because of this industry, which has been fostered by the policies of our Government, we have kept the price of automobile tires away down below what other comparable products have gone to in this period of inflation. At no time has the synthetic-rubber industry flourished as it is flourishing today. The gentleman from Nebraska was without his facts when he said that the policies of our Government have injuriously affected the synthetic-rubber industry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that we have bound ourselves never to impose a tariff on rubber?

Mr. COMBS. I do not know about our binding ourselves. I know that our agreements have escape clauses. I know we have the rubber and we have it cheap and we have the best rubber and our rubber plants are operating successfully. So why worry?

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that we have bound ourselves not to increase the percentage of synthetic rubber that is required to go into our domestic consumption?

Mr. COMBS. There may have been some agreements with local industries. I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. No, with foreign countries.

Mr. COMBS. With foreign countries?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. COMBS. The agreements we have so far may have been made to protect the American synthetic rubber industry. I'm not familiar with the agreements you refer to, but I do not think our synthetic rubber plants are operating at capacity production. The agreements may have been to protect against foreign imports.

Mr. CURTIS. That is not borne out in the hearings by testimony of the State Department.

Mr. COMBS. We will not argue that now.

Now let us go to the watch question. First of all, considerable argument has been made that the policies of our Government are completely wrecking the jewel watch industry and that this is going to sabotage our national defense. For fear some of you may overlook it, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means placed in the RECORD this morning a letter from the Hon.

James Forrestal, head of our defense establishment. I want to read you one paragraph of that letter:

> The domestic jewel watch industry has fulfilled its role in our program of national defense, and I am not aware that its capabilities have been adversely affected by the Reciprocal Trade Authority.

During the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee it became evident that opponents of reciprocal trade extension would use the Waltham Watch Co. as a horrible example of the great injury they contend is being done American manufacturers in general, and the watch industry in particular, by foreign imports under our reciprocal trade program. Much interesting testimony on this subject came out during the hearings. But knowing the opponents of the pending bill would use the alleged injury to the watch industry by Swiss imports, and that the present difficulty of the Waltham Watch Co. would be used as an example, I decided to pursue a little research in an effort to discover what the real trouble with the Waltham Watch Co. is. Several witnesses, including Hon. Charles P. Taft, made the statement that Waltham's difficulty is not due to foreign competition but to mismanagement. I shall shortly submit some facts that I think support this view beyond question. But before doing this let me make these observations.

The Waltham Watch Co. is about 100 years old. Its product bears an honored name in the American watch business. The company is now in financial difficulties and is undergoing a reorganization that I sincerely hope will put it back on its feet as one of the fine and prosperous industries of this country. The mayor of the city of Waltham and the entire citizenry of the community and the 2,300 employees of the Waltham Watch Co. have banded together and are digging into their savings, mortgaging their homes, and pledging portions of their future pay in order to raise a part of the capital needed to get the company on its feet again. I may add that the employees at Waltham have foregone requests for two pay raises that have been received by employees of other companies, and in one instance took a cut in their wages. The people of Waltham and the people of all Massachusetts, for that matter, are proud of the name and prestige of the Waltham watch. And I am sure the people of all America recognize with pride the efforts the employees and citizens of Waltham are making to rehabilitate their great industry. It is the same fine spirit the members of the Massachusetts community exhibited nearly 175 years ago. I am sure that every one of us wants our Government to do everything it can to assist these valiant Americans, and I am sure that it will be done. As a matter of fact, I am advised that RFC has agreed to extend a loan in the amount of several millions of dollars to assist in the modernization and rehabilitation of the Waltham Co. conditioned upon a reorganization that will insure successful operation.

But today we are debating a bill which would restore and extend the reciprocal-trade-agreements plan first inaugurated in 1934. And we are here met with the argument that the troubles at Waltham are caused by foreign competition. Is Waltham a case where a successful and prosperous company has been wrecked by imports under reciprocal trade? Or is its present plight the result of the failure of its management to use sound and modern methods of manufacturing techniques, sales, and financial policies? Well, let's see what the evidence is.

Mr. Cenerazzo, the president of the union representing the watchmakers in the plant, stated during his testimony before the Ways and Means Committee that mismanagement—and he emphasized financial skullduggery as well as poor choice of equipment, lack of advertising, improper distribution methods and other errors—was the primary difficulty at Waltham. A statement from the mayor of the city of Waltham read before the committee quoted the findings of two surveys of the situation to the effect that mismanagement and lack of working capital were the reasons for Waltham's condition.

Unfortunately, this condition seems to be nothing new at Waltham.

In the last day or so I have had the opportunity to examine a book entitled "Timing a Century"—history of the Waltham Watch Co. It was prepared by Mr. Charles W. Moore and published in 1945. It seems the study was suggested by the president of Waltham, and the Waltham Co., according to the preface in the book, provided financial assistance in publication. Now here are a few of the many interesting facts revealed by the book. Waltham Watch Co. was founded in 1850. But in 1857, only 7 years after it was established, it went through bankruptcy, was sold by the sheriff at auction for $56,000, and the proceeds prorated among its creditors. The company was promptly reorganized but was forced to close in September of that same year. It was reorganized and from 1859 to 1882 the company prospered in large part because of the demand which developed for watches during the Civil War. In 1864 the Elgin Watch Co. was organized and later two other companies were established. These companies began a strong competition and in 1891 Waltham found itself again in difficulties. It barely survived the panic of 1893. By 1901, however, the Waltham Co. was again prosperous. It seems that a sort of working agreement, or trust if you please, had been worked out among the American watch manufacturers so that they sold their products to the American people at a much higher price than they sold on the foreign market.

I recall reading, when I was a child, a statement, from William J. Bryan who was fighting high tariffs, in which he stated among other things that he had purchased a Waltham watch at a jewelry store in London for about one-half of what the same watch would cost him at an American jewelry store. This was around the turn of the century. But by 1904 President Theodore Roosevelt began his trust-busting crusade and the Waltham profits began to decline. And during the panic of 1907 declining earnings of the company, decay of management, and manipulations of securities sales caused a stockholders' revolt. The company again went through the wringer and was reorganized in 1910. It then began to diversify its production by adding traveling clocks, automobile clocks, time fuses, and automobile speedometers. Sales to the Government during World War I contributed to the company's earnings and it seems to have done very well until the depression of 1921 when Waltham again faced bankruptcy. This time, incompetence of the managing executives was a controlling factor. The company was saved from collapse at that time by liberal loans from banks, and the banks took it over. Their management was not successful and the Waltham Co. was again reorganized in 1923. The new management recognized that Waltham had not been producing what the market wanted, that the Swiss was setting the pace and style, particularly in small wrist watches. There was also recognition that the Swiss had developed superior watch-making machinery, and that Waltham prices were too high.

Waltham seems to have done very well until the begininng of the depression in 1930 when it again found itself in difficulties. It then spearheaded the move to curtail imports of watches and along with other domestic watch companies, Waltham was successful in getting into the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, the highest tariff rates on watches that this country has ever had. But instead of helping the situation it caused bootlegging of watches into this country and other difficulties. The outbreak of World War II produced war orders which enabled Waltham to keep going. But by 1944 it was in difficulties again, and changed presidents. It went into bankruptcy early this year.

These facts, it seems to me, establish beyond question the truth of the observation of Mr. Taft and other witnesses that Waltham's trouble is internal and is not due to foreign competition. There are many other facts that could be submitted in support of that view. For example two other American watch manufacturing companies, Elgin and Hamilton, have just completed the best year in their history—selling more watches, making as much or more profit as ever before. They did almost as well in 1947. Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., has supplied the committee with information as to the combined sales, combined net profits, and the percentage of profits on sales made by three American watch manufacturing companies, Elgin, Hamilton, and Waltham, for the years 1940, 1941, 1946, and 1947. I want to read these figures to you:

| Year | Combined sales | Combined net profit | Percent of sales |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1940 | $25,857,000 | $2,724,000 | 10.53 |
| 1941 | 33,413,000 | 3,060,000 | 9.16 |
| 1946 | 39,902,000 | 1,950,000 | 4.89 |
| 1947 | 49,131,000 | 1,830,000 | 3.72 |

Elgin and Hamilton have been working at capacity since they reconverted from war work and, according to a statement in the National Jeweler of December 1948, page 274, made by W. H. Samelius, the director of Elgin Watchmakers Col-

lege, the demand for watchmakers is so great that all students are placed even before graduation, and there is a waiting list for entrance. Mr. Samelius expects the demand for watchmakers to far exceed the supply for at least 2 to 5 years.

Now, these facts speak for themselves. If other plants are working at capacity, selling more watches, making as much or more money as before, is it reasonable to believe that the one plant that has failed was the victim of foreign competition? It would not be reasonable to say that even if Waltham had fallen behind the others in the market. But the simple truth is that Waltham made sales in 1947 that were almost double any prewar year, and the second highest in the company's history. Yet, Waltham managed to turn in a deficit of nearly $400,000 that year. And, if further proof were needed that Swiss imports are not destroying the American industry it is to be found in the expansion program presently going on at some of the American plants. The president of Elgin stated before our committee that about 20 to 25 percent increase is contemplated. The Gruen Watch Co. is erecting in New York a domestic manufacturing plant to supplement its import activities at a cost of about $5,000,000. The Bulova Watch Co. now manufactures in this country about one-half of the watches it sells here. Would these companies be using their reserves to go into or increase their participation in the domestic market if they felt they would be put out of business by foreign competition under our reciprocal trade program?

No, it was not foreign imports that brought about Waltham's difficulties. The evidence is overwhelming that it was mismanagement of the plant and its facilities. The company itself in its bankruptcy petition, recently filed, stated:

> The debtor is an old and established manufacturer of watches, whose name has for many years been associated in the retail market throughout the United States with quality watches; the debtor's present financial condition is due primarily to lack of working capital. The debtor believes that the enterprise is fundamentally sound and that its stability will be restored as a result of reorganization.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I wonder whether the gentleman remembers the statement made in the hearings that the annual consumption or sale of watches is approximately 9,000,000, whereas the entire American watch industry can produce only 3,000,000, so that we need the importation of about 6,000,000 works in order to supply the American market.

Mr. COMBS. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBS. Let us take a moment out to consider this. The demand for watches in America has increased by leaps and bounds. The present American companies could not supply one-half the demand. Suppose we shut off these Swiss importations and create a monopoly in four manufacturing companies in the United States, with the present demand, where would watch prices go? I have here a Hamilton watch which was presented to me in December in my home town. The jeweler told the purchaser that it was the last one he had in stock and was complaining that his consignor had not been able to get a sufficient supply of high-grade American jeweled watches to supply his customers. There is no evidence at all of any shortage of markets for the products of this country in the watch business.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It was testified in the hearings that if there were no importations of works, that the prices of watches and wrist watches to the American public would be two or three times as much as they are today.

Mr. COMBS. That is correct.

Mr. EBERHARTER. It is practically impossible for a man to buy a good watch today. It is impossible for an ordinary workingman to buy a good watch today unless he saves for a considerable number of weeks so as to get enough money to buy one.

Mr. COMBS. That is correct. I want to point out another thing. Even the American watch manufacturers have come to value competition. Under the spur of competition the Elgin Watch Co. 2 years ago invented a watch spring, revolutionizing the business. Another concern invented an electronic machine for testing watches. Theretofore it took 4 to 6 months to test and regulate a watch after it was made. Now they have electronic machines which will do it in 2 minutes. That is by the application of the American know-how. In that fashion we will get more watches and better watches for the American people, and at the same time pay higher wages to the people making them. One other thing: these watch-importing companies that import the works into this country have to have cases, straps, boxes, and many other things. These are all made in this country. And the men and women who work in these assembly plants are just as skilled and just as highly paid as those who work in the places that manufacture completely their own watch works in the United States.

Mind you, these American companies that make their own watches import certain parts from Switzerland. If you were to shut out Swiss imports today, you would wreck every American watch company in the country. That reminds me of one other thing. These imports from Switzerland thus far have been reasonable. They can be handled under this adjustable plan of reciprocal trade. I would remind you that the Swiss people are a free people who maintain a high standard of living. The testimony before us was that there is very little difference in the cost of a Swiss movement and a comparable movement made in this country after the payment of the present tariff.

Otherwise, these companies having factories in both places would not have an American factory in this country. Our great watch business is developing because first we went to Switzerland and established factories there and then took the skills that we learned there and transferred them to this country, thus building up one of the great industries of the world, the watch industry of America.

Now, these Swiss people are free people. Switzerland is the oldest Republic in the world. Should we fail and refuse to exchange our goods for theirs and shut the doors of import in their faces, what would we be saying to the rest of the world that we are encouraging to adopt our kind of free life? Why, it is ridiculous.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. PATTERSON. I happen to represent one of the largest watch industries. I know that right now in Waterbury, Conn., the United States Time Corp. is closing. Why? Because we are importing from Switzerland. Are we going to take the welfare of other countries and the welfare of their people ahead of the welfare of our own country and of our working people? I think our people should be No. 1 on the list.

Mr. COMBS. I do, too, sir. I think that they are No. 1 on the list. Permit me to make this observation.

I have not studied the Waterbury situation. But they make clocks, and clock-type watch movements as I understand it.

Mr. PATTERSON. They make clocks and watches.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman from Connecticut refers to a company that makes the pin-lever or clock watch. The importations from Switzerland are of jewel-lever watches only.

Mr. COMBS. That is right.

Mr. MILLS. We do not import the watches that the gentleman refers to, thus I cannot see how he can associate imports into the United States, imports which do not exist, with the laying off of men in the plant to which he refers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS].

Mr. COMBS. Now I will be as brief as I can.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COMBS. I am sorry. I cannot yield now. I must finish.

RFC has agreed to furnish $6,000,000 if the trustees can raise another $5,000,000 from private sources to put the Waltham Co. back on its feet as a going concern. The workers in the plant have agreed to raise $1,000,000 themselves. I understand they have already pledged more than $400,000 of that amount. The businessmen and citizens of Waltham feel certain they can get the remaining $4,000,000 from other sources. So, it would seem that the problem of

Waltham will be solved within the near future. I trust that the efforts of the workers and other citizens of the city of Waltham will be rewarded with the establishment of a fine, going concern. As the first, and in many respects the most highly respected manufacturer of fine American jeweled watches, the Waltham Co. is a great representative of the American watch industry. Its rehabilitation and successful operation will be a real American achievement by the people of Waltham. They will share the general prosperity that has come to this country as a result of our reciprocal trade agreements.

We have to look at this question of reciprocal trade agreements with the understanding that by it we are able to sell our surplus products to other countries and they can sell their products to us. The Swiss purchase many kinds of our products, such as machine tools, heavy industrial machinery, textiles, and many others. These goods bought from our country are made by our own workmen. It is in the sale of our manufactured products of that nature that we are able to sell the labor of our own people and to maintain our high standards of American living. So let us not sabotage this act that has worked so successfully for 14 years by hamstringing it with crippling amendments.

I have been surprised to see, with 2 weeks of hearings, that so few complaints have been made against the operation of this law and that no one came before the committee in those 2 weeks and expressed the idea that it should be abandoned. It has been endorsed by one Congress after another, and has demonstrated its great value.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] has again expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. PATTERSON].

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, just in order to get the record straight on these watches, I realize that the United States Time Corp. does not make a jeweled watch, but it does make a wrist watch. It makes the Mickey Mouse watch, for one thing, and it makes a regular wrist watch which we use every day and which is not jeweled. But the imports from Switzerland in the lower bracket of watch movements have caused a great deal of trouble in our own domestic market. People will go into a store, for instance, and there is an American-made watch, which is not jeweled, on the counter, and there is one from Switzerland which is a jeweled watch. It is easier for the salesman to sell the one from Switzerland. It is in a low bracket. It sells for about $16.95 or $19. That brings up the case of great unemployment in my district, not only in the watch industry, but in others as well. That brings up a situation that I am confronted with right now, and I know a majority of the Members from New England are faced with the same situation in connection with shoes, textiles, and our clock industry, the Waltham clock industry, for example.

What will it be next? It will be the rubber industry; and, again, I represent United States Rubber and employees in Naugatuck, Conn. How can we here in America compete with countries like Czechoslovakia, which today is dominated by the Russian Government as its satellite and where there is slave labor? Shall we let the product of that labor come in to compete with the free labor of our country? Again, there is Switzerland, a country where labor costs are low. The Swiss have a system of home industries whereby different parts of a watch are made in individual homes. They are not set up on a scale like we are; it is peacetime work within the home. How can we expect our manufacturers and working people to stay in the watch industry when they have to compete with situations like that?

Mr. Chairman, I think this House should certainly take under consideration every protection we can possibly give to our own domestic industry. Let us take the brewers of our country today. I am just taking a circle of industries that are being affected by imports. The breweries are working 4 days a week. Or take the clothing industry—and the gentleman from New York may be interested in this. What is their workweek? They are working 3 days, sometimes 3½ days a week. And I can go right on down the list of our industries that are affected by imports.

I personally believe—I am qualifying my statements, I am not trying to sum up to a jury, believe me; I am clarifying my position. I believe in reciprocal trade but not beyond the point where it is going to be injurious to my own industry here at home; because, No. 1: Charity starts at home. I believe no one on the floor of this House will disagree with that statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut yields back 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the tendency seems to have developed in this country within the past several years immediately to label as Communist anything with which you are in disagreement, to label it Communist or Communist-inspired. The charge has been hurled in this debate this afternoon, and I consider it not only a completely illogical argument but a thoroughly ridiculous one, that this program of promoting free trade rather than high protectionism is one that is either Communist-inspired or that it is aided and abetted by the Communists. No more ridiculous or illogical argument could possibly be advanced, because in promoting free trade, which we are attempting to do through this legislation, we are promoting something which is the antithesis of communism and planned economy. I cite the testimony before the committee of Mr. Charles P. Taft, the able brother of the senior Senator from the State of Ohio. He testified before the committee representing the Federal Council of Churches. He made this significant statement:

> The other group of opponents of the reciprocal-trade-agreements policy are those of the left, who advocate a planned economy at home. They must oppose the broadening of the base of multilateral trade because that kind of freedom is not compatible with domestic controls. In both instances, therefore, the reciprocal-trade-agreements stand for the free enterprise system, however inconsistent with that system other policies during recent years have been.
>
> Some of the opponents of the policy have taken the position that multilateral trade is no longer possible in the world of today, and that we should therefore adopt a pattern of bilateral closed agreements, Yankee barter deals.
>
> This was the program of the Nazis, and they certainly demonstrated what it could do to world trade. It is not a policy for which the American people will stand when they understand its character and effects.

In other words, here is a great American who made, in my humble opinion, the most forceful statement before the committee, asserting that this program is not only opposed by the Communists but that it is completely incompatible with their philosophy of a planned economy.

The Communists oppose this program for other reasons and other equally commanding reasons. We have adopted the European recovery program which has for its cornerstone the unification and the cooperation of the divided nations of Europe and has for its ultimate goal the rehabilitation of Europe so that the free nations of Europe working together cooperatively can stand on their own feet and again unifiedly oppose the encroachment of communism.

The cornerstone of the Marshall plan is economic cooperation, and that economic cooperation, it is our hope and belief, will ultimately lead to political cooperation; therefore, the Communists who have always attempted to dominate Europe by picking off the nations one by one, piecemeal, if you will, can see the danger to their program by continuation of the reciprocal-trade-treaty program. As a matter of fact, in my humble judgment, the Marshall plan was adopted as a direct answer to the Communist threat of picking one nation off at a time. You will recall that in March 1947, I believe it was, the President came here and delivered his message on the Greek and Turkish situation. We supported that program because it was a necessary program; it was something that had to be done; but the point was made, and I think with justification, that we had to adopt an over-all foreign policy, a policy for all of the free nations of Europe. Out of that thinking and out of that great debate developed the Marshall plan, which has created tremendous ire and apprehension on the part of those in the Kremlin.

As a direct result of the Marshall plan we are seeing in Europe today something about which statesmen have dreamed for many centuries. We are seeing a peaceful unification of that great continent. One week or so ago there was announced in London the formation of the Council of Europe, which is a direct outgrowth, in my opinion, of the adoption of the Marshall plan. The reciprocal-trade-treaty program in the mind of any fair-minded economist must be considered as an economic cornerstone of the Marshall plan in the European recovery program.

How any man who is a Member of this House can consistently support the Marshall plan and then turn around and vote against this program is beyond my comprehension, because he is denying with his right hand what his left hand is doing, and without the trade program, without the incentive to destroy barriers to trade and to commerce and to the movement of goods and materials, the Marshall plan cannot possibly succeed.

All of the arguments which have been advanced here today—and I have listened to most of them, and I do not pretend to be an authority on the history of this great debate which has been before this body for many, many years—all of the arguments advanced against this bill have been the old high-protectionist arguments. There has not been a new argument advanced here, and the only other idea pulled across the trail has been the completely illogical, ridiculous red herring that this is a program advocated and sponsored and fostered by the Communists.

Let us examine the high protectionist argument for a moment. For how many years has the argument been made in this historic body that if we fail to protect American enterprise and American goods by a high tariff we would wreck our economy? How many times have Members stood in this well, as the gentleman from Connecticut did here a moment ago, and said, "I favor the reciprocal-trade-treaty program, but I am first for my own district and for my own enterprise"? I venture to say that is the oldest, the most discredited argument which has ever been made in the House of Representatives.

What are the facts? Let us examine our economy as it stands today, the overall picture of our economy. Let us not pick out one industry here and another industry here and another one here, all of which are subject to special treatment for many and various reasons, as the gentleman from Texas has so ably stated in the case of the Waltham Watch Co., and as someone might equally ably state in the case of certain other luxury items in which production is now catching up with demand. But let us examine our entire economy, because that is what this program is.

In 1929, the Congress of the United States adopted the highest tariff in the history of our Nation, the Smoot-Hawley tariff. There followed after the adoption of that tariff the greatest tariff war in the history of modern civilization, and in place of our business increasing, in place of these great enterprises growing and increasing their domestic markets and increasing their domestic pay rolls, what happened? We had the most devastating depression that this Nation has ever known, and after the enactment of that tariff there were more people out of employment, there were more bankruptcies, there were more hardships in America, there was more social unrest in America than at any time in the history of our great Republic. That followed the enactment of the highest tariff in the history of our Nation, and the same arguments which have been advanced here today in opposition to this program were advanced in favor of the Smoot-Hawley tariff in 1929. In 1934 a great Secretary of State appeared on the scene; a man revered not only in this country but throughout the free world today. He proposed that men and nations sit down and negotiate, that we import what was good for us to import and that we export what was good for us to export, judging the entire economy.

Through his great leadership and the leadership of the Democratic Party, and the leadership of President Roosevelt, we adopted the reciprocal-trade program.

Today, after that program has been in effect for 14 years or thereabouts, American production is at the highest level in all of our history. As a matter of fact, our production has exceeded the fondest wishes of even our greatest economists. I do not recall the exact figures of the Federal Reserve Board, but I remember seeing last year, while serving on the Committee on Banking and Currency, that our production in many industries was three time, four times, five times, what it was in 1929 and 1930.

If all of these dire predictions had any merit, then would our production be at the level at which it now stands in our country? I say to you that the proof of the reciprocal-trade-treaty program is self-evident, and stands as a great symbol of the economic advancement and prosperity of this country. Anyone who doubts it has only to compare what happened after 1929, when we listened to the high protectionists and when we enacted the highest tariffs in the history of the United States, and we had a depression, with the situation today, after 14 or 15 years of the operation of this program, and look at the vast producing enterprise of the United States of America. When you add to that the further important, commanding, paramount consideration that this program is intimately connected with the entire foreign policy of the United States, that this program is fought and feared by the Communists in the Kremlin, that this program has within it the seeds for the reestablishment of free trade and free enterprise all over Europe, it seems to me the height of inconsistency on the part of those who oppose communism to oppose this program.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I have just heard the very forceful remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana, who has made a very fine presentation of the old free-trade, destructive arguments. I have heard them many times and they are published in many books. Still, we are here as the United States of America. Washington was interested in the first protective-tariff bill, and the tariff policy has underwritten free enterprise of the United States. It was recommended by Hamilton. We built this Nation on that plan of keeping our markets as far as we could here in this country for our people and for the benefit not of few but all of them. Of course, I have heard this old free-trade argument, which is to buy in the cheapest markets in the world. The gentleman stated in his remarks, and very able remarks, that H. R. 1211 is a free-trade proposition. Well, you are down pretty low on the list. The other nations have all the world for their market, and they have over 60 percent of our market. Well over 60 percent of our imports come in free of duty.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to argue over the question of whether the trade agreements program has accomplished or has not accomplished some of the things that have been said here this afternoon. I often, however, do become somewhat amused when I listen to some of the proponents of free trade condemn those who might desire to give some degree of protection to our domestic economy when they themselves insist, not upon tariff or duty protection, but upon even more severe protection as the interference to the free flow of trade may be concerned. I call attention to the fact that the gentleman from Louisiana has just made a very fine address advocating great freedom of exchange of goods between the various countries of the world. I believe in the freest possible exchange, but I wonder if he would answer this question for me. Will he agree today to the elimination of the quota on sugar imports into this country? No; the gentleman comes from an area which produces sugar. There is an import quota on sugar. That is the maximum restriction that you can possibly have on any commodity. It is not a matter of just making the sugar competitive with American sugar as far as the protection of his industry is concerned—absolutely not. His protection is a quantitative restriction against the importation of sugar. What about our tobacco boys and various other of these people who come here and condemn those of us who want to see our industries have at least a fair degree of protection in the world markets? Let's take tobacco for example.

You cannot export one single seed of tobacco. Why? Because, if you do, it might mean that that tobacco might be produced elsewhere in the world and that that production might compete with our American-produced tobacco.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman from Wisconsin may not want to overlook the Louisiana rice industry, which enjoys a tariff protection of a modified rate of 2 cents per pound or $2 per 100 pounds. I join with the gentleman in criticizing southern people who ask for tariffs on what they produce and then deny the same protection to northern agriculture and northern industry. You cannot justify it in any way.

Protect all of us, North, South, East, and West. Then I will go along with you, but I will not go along with you on this idea of protecting one little section such as tobacco, rice, sugar, and so forth, and destroying the rest of us.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. But, as I say, it is not my intention to go into the various ramifications of free trade versus protectionism and so forth. I think this afternoon we have gone around

in a pretty big circle and have covered quite a large field and a great deal of territory.

As, if, and when we come down to the basic issue involved in the bill, H. R. 1211, I want to say it is not nearly as complicated as we have tried to make it appear this afternoon. I would like to refer those Members present to the minority report. I would like to read one of the introductory statements in that report, because I believe it gives to us what, basically, is the issue involved in this debate, and which will be involved tomorrow when we consider this matter under the 5-minute rule. I quote:

> We favor the extension rather than the repeal of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948. We appreciate, however, that as the result of false political characterizations, the 1948 Act is destined to fall.

That is certainly apparent from the orders that have come down from on high to you gentlemen on the majority side.

> In our opinion, however, such action is a manifestation that political emotionalism has triumphed over judgment and reason. Under such conditions, even the preservation of existing constructive legislation is unlikely. In view of this, and without retreating from principle, we urge that, as a bare minimum, H. R. 1211 be amended to provide—
>
> (1) for the continuation of the "peril point" report of the Tariff Commission established by the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948; and
>
> (2) for the insertion of an "escape clause" in all trade agreements which do not now contain such a clause.

The fundamental issue before us today and tomorrow is whether or not in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act we have those two provisions which are safeguards to the domestic economy.

I have not heard one single Member, speaking from the majority side, tell us what is wrong with those two protective features proposed by the minority. Not one.

We have been referred to the position of various groups that appeared before our committee in the study of the Trade Agreements Act. I think for the most part most of them believe sincerely, as I do, that we must continue some kind of negotiated agreements with foreign countries, in order to make possible the free flow of trade; but many, many of them say and feel that there should be certain limits, certain safeguards, so that those people who do the negotiating, when we enter into such agreements, do not exceed the bounds of propriety and the bounds that are necessary in order to maintain our domestic economy.

I would like to refresh the memory of those who sit on the committee and to call to the attention of those who do not serve on the committee and who did not have the benefit of the testimony of those who appeared before the committee, to some of the points made by representatives of these organizations.

I take, for instance, the American Federation of Labor. They did say that they believed in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. I do not question that at all. They are for it and I am for it. But they put in a word of caution, and let me quote Mr. Mason, the spokesman for the American Federation of Labor. Let me quote also from a resolution which was passed at the American Federation of Labor convention in Cincinnati:

> In supporting the trade-agreements program we recognize the need of safeguarding American labor in some industries, especially where the wages are a relatively high factor in the cost of production, against competition that threatens to undermine our labor standards.

Gentlemen, that is just what the minority members of the Ways and Means Committee want to do. That is the identical purpose of these two amendments that will be offered tomorrow.

Let me say further, I asked Mr. Mason during the course of the proceedings, and I am quoting from page 179 of the hearing, this question:

> You know under the act passed last year one of the basic requirements, and the thing we hear the most complaint about, is that it is required by law that the Tariff Commission do establish what we call peril points——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin (continuing reading):

> do establish what we call peril points; in other words, the point below which the domestic industry might be imperiled and the workingman in this country and his standard of living be imperiled, so you agree with me that is advisable procedure and the advisable thing to do?
>
> Mr. MASON. That is right. We favor that. We favor the continuation of those findings.

That, Mr. Chairman, is all that the amendment pertaining to peril points which will be offered by the minority pretends to do; and that is all it does.

We have the National Farm Bureau Federation, which said it believed in the extension of the Trade Agreements Act. Let me point out their position on this matter. I call attention to page 694 of the hearings. Mr. Kline, representing the American Farm Bureau Federation, said:

> We have not taken a specific position in which we took up the matter of peril points and said: "This is our position with regard to the Trade Commission as regards establishing peril points." At the same time, we have taken a position which makes it clear that we would oppose a proposition which made it possible for the Trade Commission to use this point or some other point to delay the development of a reciprocal-trade-agreement program. We certainly want that information available, and we certainly want it taken into consideration as the sort of machinery for the development of the reciprocal trade that we have suggested.

In other words, if the procedure desired does not delay the entering into agreements, Mr. Kline, in so many words, says they want that information and believe that that machinery should remain a part of the act.

We also find, Mr. Chairman, that the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Federation, another large agricultural group, took a stand on this matter at its thirty-second annual convention. Let me read from page 258 of the hearings an excerpt from a resolution adopted by that organization on November 11, 1948:

> We favor a further extension of the Trade Agreements Act, but only on condition that adequate safeguards are written into the law to govern the exercise of the powers therein conferred. Such safeguards should include a procedure before the Tariff Commission similar to that provided in the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 to determine the safe limits within which tariff modifications can be made.

That is a great farm organization speaking and I think, Mr. Chairman, that it states the basic issue involved in the discussion here today.

What is wrong with the two safeguard provisions that the minority asks be put into the extension of the Trade Agreements Act? There is the issue, Mr. Chairman, and I hope sincerely that this problem can be approached with a reasonableness of heart and mind in order that we may arrive at what is right and just for the American people instead of being guided by false propaganda and by political considerations that should have no place in the discussion of a bill of this kind.

The gentleman from Arkansas criticized the peril-point theory when he addressed the Committee this afternoon. He said that the Tariff Commission could not study 400 individual items. Mr. Chairman, if the Tariff Commission cannot do so, how, pray heaven, can the State Department do so? I certainly would rather trust the Tariff Commission with its staff of experts, with its experience in this field over the years to do the job in a limited time, than I would the State Department.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman from Wisconsin will listen closly to what I have to say, for I agree with him in part that there has not been much discussion directed toward the issues that the minority has raised; but I should like to suggest to him that the majority of the committee and the majority Members of this House are not opposed to the peril-point system, the majority Members are not opposed to the escape-clause provision. The great difference is one of timing, and if the gentleman will permit me to continue for just a short time I will develop this matter further, then yield to him.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset I ought to clarify the statement that appears in the RECORD here as to where the American Federation of Labor stands. It is true that some Members of the minority attempted to put words in the mouth of the witness, but when he was questioned again the representative of the American Federation of Labor stated that he was in favor of H. R. 1211, that he was not in favor of the amendments which are here submitted by the minority party.

I want to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin in discussing what I consider to be the real issues in this debate. The minority party says: "We favor the extension rather than repeal of the Trade Agreements Act." So I assume now all of the Republicans have ac-

cepted the principal of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program. However, it is stated in the minority report that, "We desire to modify this in two respects." It is toward that end I desire to direct my remarks.

First of all, may I say the peril-point amendment that will be submitted tomorrow is one involving a difference of opinion. For one, I believe in the peril-point theory, but I do not agree with your timing. You want to put the peril point into operation before we have had the benefit of experience. Insofar as I am concerned, I want the peril-point theory to operate after we have had the benefit of experience, using the escape clause.

To amplify my remarks I want to call the attention of the Members of this Chamber to a letter addressed to the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, on May 17, 1948, which I think so clarifies the issue that every argument that has been presented here against it will fall of its own weight. This letter was submitted to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] at the time the Republicans passed the 1948 bill and was submitted by the Chairman of the Tariff Commission in response to a letter written to him by the gentleman from North Carolina. I shall now read for the RECORD the answer of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission. First of all I will put the question of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]:

Do you think the procedure established by H. R. 6556 would enable the Commission to render a better public service than it now performs?

H. R. 6556 was the Republican measure of 1948.

Here is the response by a member of the Commission which you gentlemen have been eulogizing all afternoon and all through the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee. The Chairman stated:

The Commission was established in 1916 in order that the Congress and the Executive might have a reliable source of objective information on tariff matters, information which could be accepted as authentic by all sides in any tariff controversy.

Continuing, he says:

Thus, from the very beginning its primary function has been to find the facts, leaving policy decisions to the Congress and the President. I doubt the advisability of transforming the Commission into a policy-making agency and thus subjecting it, more than in the past, to political vicissitudes.

My fear is that the attempt to determine the degree to which duties may be reduced without injury to domestic producers or impairment of the national defense would require the making of such difficult and fundamental judgments that the Commission would, in effect, be making major policy decisions. The element of judgment, of course, enters into the various phases of the Commission's present work. This is especially true of the duties which have been assigned to it under the escape clause in trade agreements. In cases under that clause, however, its findings as to whether serious injury to domestic producers has occurred or is threatened will be based upon actual observation of imports and domestic production after the trade-agreement concession in question has come into force. In contrast, the findings required under H. R. 6556 would have to be based to a large extent, especially under present abnormal conditions, on assumptions and estimates as to future probabilities.

I say that the answer of the Chairman of the Tariff Commission is the real difference, and I want the record to show the real difference in the thinking between the majority of the committee and the minority.

The majority viewpoint is that the Tariff Commission, or its representative, should participate, along with other agencies of the executive department, giving facts, advice, and the benefit of its judgment in the negotiation of trade agreements. This has been the policy since the law was first enacted in 1934. The Republicans in 1948 changed that policy by specifically prohibiting this important Commission from giving the benefit of its experience, advice, and judgment to the interdepartmental agencies charged with the formation and negotiation of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

The Republicans in 1948 set that important Commission aside in an effort to use it as a political and policy-making instrument for the possible purpose of embarrassing and acting as a block upon the President of the United States. Moreover, under the 1948 act, the Commission was required to give its judgment based not upon actual fact nor upon actual experience, but required as a bipartisan Commission to enter into the field of conjecture, to speculate, if you please, upon what might happen to some industry under certain conditions which might not ever arise. You said, "Give us your idea of what the peril point will be." Now I submit that in any endeavor of life, experience is the best teacher and, in the bill which you have before you today for consideration, requires the Tariff Commission to function as it has for many years past. We want it to return to its former position as a fact-finding body and not a policy-making body. We want to take it away from the political vicissitudes which the Chairman mentioned in his letter to Chairman DOUGHTON. At the same time it ought to be clearly understood, and I believe I am correctly stating the viewpoint of a majority of the committee, we are in favor of the inclusion of an escape clause to be included in every trade agreement hereafter negotiated. There is nothing new in this, for the history of trade agreements since 1942 indicates that has been the policy of the State Department.

Further than that, the policy of the State Department has been ratified and confirmed by the President of the United States in his Executive order issued in the early part of 1948, and which is in effect at the present time. This is the policy that is followed in all trade agreements now. But does this satisfy my Republican friends. Most certainly not, for tomorrow they will advocate an amendment to the present bill making it mandatory upon those charged with the negotiation of trade agreements, the people to whom we have delegated our authority, making it mandatory upon them to negotiate and renegotiate agreements which have heretofore been agreed upon but do not include the escape clause. I submit to you that such an amendment is not timely nor wise and it is not good business judgment to compel those who are negotiating trade agreements to be handcuffed by such an inflexible policy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. CARROLL. I am indebted to the gentleman from Wisconsin for raising the fundamental issues which will be made tomorrow as the bill is read. As a matter of fact, only this afternoon I discussed this matter with a gentleman in the State Department. That is one of the reasons I take your time this evening to put this in the RECORD, so perhaps the Swiss themselves will read the RECORD. I am one of those who believe that the Swiss ought to, out of good faith, agree to immediate negotiation of an escape clause in the Swiss agreement.

It is my understanding that all efforts will be directed by the State Department toward that end. But I am not going to vote to put into legislation a mandatory provision which will handcuff our bargainers.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Let us start working backwards. There are a number of things the gentleman has covered about which I want to inquire.

Mr. CARROLL. I cannot yield too much of my time. I am limited.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I should like to inquire about the escape clause provision. If the gentleman believes the escape clause provision is sound, why does he have objection to inserting it in all trade agreements?

Mr. CARROLL. I think the gentleman misconstrues my position. While I speak only for myself, I think it is the viewpoint of the majority members of the committee. Every person now, in the light of experience, is in favor of an escape clause in all trade agreements, and that has been the policy of the State Department; it is now the policy of the President of the United States, by Executive order, so it is now the policy of this Government, and such a clause will be in all future trade agreements. The gentleman knows that in all the agreements negotiated at Geneva, in every single one of those multilateral agreements, was included the escape clause.

The gentleman asks, why do I object? I thought I stated it very simply. I say it is not good for the Congress to amend this bill to handcuff your negotiators, because you put them in a position that is not flexible enough.

Let me give you one illustration. As a new member of this committee I have been trying to follow through with some consistency, with some desire for understanding, the problems which affect the American watch industry. I was very much impressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] who made such a brilliant presentation in behalf of the people of his district. I have been trying to find out if there is not

some way to help the people of Waltham. I find that if you amend this bill and create a mandatory situation there is a possibility—and I did not learn that until this afternoon—that the Swiss might come in, if we renegotiate under a mandatory provision of this law—I did not learn until this afternoon that on the 21-jewel watch movements, actually the present tariff operates as an embargo. There are many factors that the Members of this Congress cannot know, and, therefore, by general legislative mandatory action it is not good to freeze a situation which ought to remain fluid in the interest of good bargaining.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. What the gentleman is really trying to say is that in view of the fact that the proposal to incorporate escape clauses in all agreements is a Republican motion to amend a Democratic bill, therefore, it is bad.

Mr. CARROLL. No. I have tried to make my position very clear. I am trying to make a fair presentation. If you want to make this a partisan discussion, I say to you, based upon my experience in the last session, and based upon the experience I have had now, I believe the arguments presented by the minority here are specious. I believe the great majority of your group are not in favor of the reciprocal-trade program. I think you are using this as a device to emasculate it. That is what I really believe. You asked me my opinion, and I give it to you for what it is worth.

I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Certainly the escape clause provision is not any product of the Republicans. It was voluntarily established by the administration administering the program.

Mr. CARROLL. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee, when I heard of this discussion about Communists and Communist writings in these trade agreements, I found that the State Department, itself, was the one that instituted the escape clause provision for the protection of American industry and it was the President of the United States who later carried it into effect by Executive order. I think then the issue is pretty clear on the question of the peril point. We on the Democratic side are anxious to protect American industry. Let us take a look at the logic of our position. If the Tariff Commission is to function, it will function best under the escape clause theory. It will function best when it has the evidence upon which to act, the facts and experience upon which to render judgment. In the event of damage or injury to American industry we may use the Tariff Commission through the escape-clause proviso in three ways. First, a complaint from an industry; second, an investigation initiated by the Tariff Commission itself; and, third, the President of the United States may call upon the Commission for guidance.

Labor, the A. F. of L. and CIO, the workingmen, and the farmers of the Nation want this program. Why? Because labor knows that if they are going to have high living standards, they must have full employment. We on the Committee on Ways and Means know that if we are going to get revenue to have a foreign-policy program, the Nation must have full employment. We have to have people making money so that we can get revenue to carry on the foreign program in the interest of peace. We cannot be appropriating five and six billion dollars in support of our foreign policy unless we have full employment. Labor knows that this sort of program will stimulate the flow of goods in international trade. It is my hope that the majority party members will reject overwhelmingly the two amendments which will be offered on the floor tomorrow as indicated by the minority report.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the Reciprocal Trade Treaties has always been intriguing to me. I have always hoped that I would live long enough to see it operate south of the Mason and Dixon's line as well as north of it. The Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act is a fine instrument for the peanut-growers of the South. Oh, they love it. Yes, because they have a 7-cent duty on peanuts, which, incidentally, is more than 100 percent ad valorem and more than the product ever brought for 25 years in any year before the war. They also like it as was brought out here with reference to sugar. They have not changed the Smoot-Hawley tax on sugar. They like that down in Louisiana. They also like it on the rice.

Then we get into the cotton business. Oh, that is a real one. Oh, surely. Oh, we just believe in reciprocity and the good neighbor policy, and now the distinguished chairman of the committee is getting the Golden Rule in on it. We will not have any of these bad tariffs. What we will do, we will just put an embargo on it and say you cannot import cotton. You tell me any commodity that the Republican Party ever put an embargo on in the United States. I know you can't do it. An embargo was put on so that one could bring in only 135,000 bales of cotton while we produce 10 or 12 million bales a year.

They were not satisfied with that. The long-staple cotton fellows wanted to get in it. So they got Mr. Truman to put a quota on that too. This one is not quite so much of an embargo.

Then we will take wheat out in Colorado and down in Texas. Oh, sure. We are for reciprocal-trade agreements. We must have this good neighbor policy. We must have this Golden Rule, but we will put an embargo on wheat. Only 800,000 bushels of wheat can come into the United States out of over a billion bushels produced here. Such hypocrisy. When it comes to talking about looking after the people in your own district, I do not make any excuses for saying that in the short time I have been here I have figured out that I had better be looking after them, because I do not see anybody in the New Deal who would look after them and I have not seen anybody in the Fair Deal who is going to look after them.

But going back to this tobacco seed proposition. That is a honey. Oh, we believe in reciprocity. Oh, we believe in the good-neighbor policy. Oh, we believe in the Golden Rule. Under this set-up, I guess the Golden Rule means, "Do all you can for the big fellows and let the little fellows take care of themselves."

We passed the most vicious, the most serious trade barrier ever erected in the history of this country. I will yield at this time to anybody who will tell me when the Republicans ever put a trade barrier compared to the act to prohibit the exportation of tobacco seed from this country. I know you cannot show one such thing.

And to think you would have the effrontery to get up here and say the things you are saying today, with the history you have of erecting the worst trade barriers ever erected in the history of the country.

Today I wanted to confine my remarks to just trying to bust a few bubbles floating around here. I have a chart here that shows many things, among which was that when we had these reciprocal-trade treaties during these years we had the biggest agricultural imports we ever had in the history of this country. It shows another thing. It shows that today, with all the talk about what we are doing to the world, we are still importing more agricultural products than we are shipping out of the United States. To put it in less elegant language, we cannot give it away as fast as they are dumping it on to us. Does that mean anything? Are we going to sell out American agriculture so that somebody in Detroit can sell automobiles to somebody down in Timbuktu? That is the way it has worked out. If you like this program, I would like to see you try it south of the Mason and Dixon's line just once. Put it in operation down there. We do not like it. We do not want any more of it. So you help yourselves to it. When you do that, then I will believe that you mean what you say.

This chart shows that this last year we are importing more agricultural products than we are exporting. So you know and I know that what we are trying to do is give away the earnings of the American farmers so that you can sell a few industrial goods.

I really wished to talk to you today about five things that have happened. I do not want to get into a discussion about the wonders or lack of wonders of the reciprocal-trade program. I appeared before your committee and asked you to take the duty off altogether on feed grains in 1943 or 1944. You remember that winter of '43 and '44.

The duty was removed. I am not embarrassed, never having voted for the Smoot-Hawley tariff or against it, and I do not think the Smoot-Hawley tariff has much to do with anything we are discussing here today; nor do I really believe that the reciprocal treaty program does. The reason I say that is that many things have happened in the last 15 years. Let us stop and consider one, that is, state trading. What effect has state trading had on the economy of the United States? Two or three years ago what happened? The Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Wallace, sent a delegation

over to Russia. I am not just saying this here to you today, this is in a printed report before the Committee on Agriculture. In this report a man from the Department of Commerce made the statement the United States asked Russia to dump millions of dollars' worth of furs into this country; and today we have the fur farmers of America hanging on the economic ropes. If that is a part of the foreign policy of this administration, then I surely do not subscribe to it. That is point No. 1.

No. 2: The individual producer—I do not care whether he be a farmer or a worker in a factory—when he goes to bed tonight is in danger of having his business ruined by state trading. As good an example of that as I can give you is Mr. Perón. Mr. Perón has the opposite program in connection with his farmers; he buys the products as cheaply as he can and he sells them for whatever he wants to. Mr. Perón can ruin any farm producer in the United States any day he wishes to do so. Although our distinguished chairman does not want me to talk about the cheese business, I advise you that cheese is produced in my district. They are going to lower the duty again on Italian cheese. I do not know what they will pay for Italian cheese, but when Mr. Perón gets done with it he can put all these Italian cheese makers in the United States out of business whenever he wants to. We are talking of state trading. That is No. 1.

Then, to come back to No. 2, we have the United Nations and we have the FAO. I voted for the FAO; as a matter of fact, I voted for the United Nations. The reason I voted for the FAO was because to me the FAO was the instrument whereby we could funnel the surplus agricultural products of this world to the places of the world that need them and we would benefit out of this trading in the long run. I am not talking about the Tariff Commission in connection with this, but I am speaking of agriculture. That is an objective of the FAO. We must safeguard the United Nations and the work which they have done. But how many of you have been down before the Committee on Reciprocity as I have, time after time after time, a hopeless and futile thing? I like to feel when I go before a commission that there is somebody on the commission that has had experience in the field the commission is working in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield for a question.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does not the gentleman believe that the welfare of the farmer and the prosperity of the farmer depends upon the welfare of the workingman and the producers in the factories and the mills of the country? In other words, if there is unemployment in this country the farmer suffers more than the industrial worker. If we do not have a large export market then we will have in the industrial areas unemployment, and the farmer himself will be the worst sufferer. That is the way I look at the program anyhow.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The answer to that is that the gentleman may not live long enough to see agricultural exports equal to imports because ever since the twenties we have been on an importing basis. Way back in the twenties, before we ever had the Smoot-Hawley tariff, we were on an importing basis. Look here at the curves on this graph and see where it begins.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield five additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Anyone realizes, and I think the gentleman himself does, that the welfare of the people depends on a high level of employment, and without markets you are not going to get a high level of employment. That leads me right to the third point, that is the minimum wage. If we raise the minimum wage, I do not care whether it is to 75 cents or a dollar, or what figure we put it at, has anyone figured out what it will do to our employment; because if we are going to accept goods from the rest of the world that is not bound by any minimum wage, but goods which are made at as low a wage as the manufacturers can force the laborers to accept, how are we going to protect the American worker against that kind of product? How are we to protect American jobs?

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think one of the main factors of keeping the American workman employed, that is the industrial worker, is the fact that we will have plenty of manufactured goods to export. If we do not have an export market as an outlet for this surplus of goods that we produce, it will entail more unemployment than the fact of a little bit of imports coming in here. That is the theory.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The gentleman says a little bit of manufactured goods being imported. I go back to the old story, "Sell out the American farmer so somebody up in Detroit can sell a car to somebody in Timbuktu." That is the circle we are in.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I think the economic history in the last 15 years will show that the farmer has suffered the most whenever our exports were small. When our exports were large and in great amounts the farmer was better off because the worker in the mine, the mill, and the factory, in the cities and in the industrial plants, was employed and therefore able to pay for the farm products a good price. The farmer was more prosperous at that time because of the export business that American industry engaged in.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Of course, the answer to that one is we had 10,000,000 unemployed in 1940 and by 1940 our exports on agricultural products had dropped down to practically nothing, whereas our imports rose and at the time Henry was shooting the little pigs was the time we were bringing in the highest amount in quantity of agricultural products we ever did in the history of our country.

I wish I could spend a longer time on each one of these issues, because to me it is a serious matter. It is something which has to do with the lives of the great bulk of the average people in this country. I do not worry about these Golden Rule fellows, or that chap down in the State Department. I am not worrying about him. You know who I mean. He went over to Geneva last year and fixed up this deal.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman mean Mr. Clayton?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think he will get along all right. I do not know what is going to happen to the cotton farmers in Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi when Mr. Clayton gets that $7,000,000 farm going out there in California because he can raise many bales of cotton on it.

Mr. REED of New York. He has been doing the same thing down in Mexico. He went down there to teach them how to raise cotton.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He went down to Mexico, too, but I do not like to bring in personalities.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? Did I hear the name of Will Clayton mentioned in the colloquy?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman knows he is a great American, he is a sound businessman.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He must be.

Mr. McCORMACK. He is a very good American.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. He can keep the embargo on so far as cotton coming into the United States is concerned and can keep the American market for his own cotton. Yes, he must be quite a fellow. He seems to do pretty well for Mr. William Clayton. Then we have the price-support program.

We are in difficulty on this support program. In that connection I would like to correct the majority leader, too, if I had the time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is the gentleman opposed to the support program?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sorry the gentleman asked such a question. I regretted when President Truman killed it. I did not want him to kill that program.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a Democratic measure.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, no.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman says it is somebody else's measure?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Now, be careful.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is not the gentleman's measure, is it?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Oh, no; I would have had a better one and I would not have had it killed like President Truman did.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman's measures are always better than anyone else's, but let me ask again, he is not opposed to a support program for agriculture?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. How can the gentleman ask such a question?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman is not.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I was not for the kind of deal that the Fair Deal administration tried to put over in the name of the Aiken bill either.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is now drawing a line of distinction. He is putting himself in the position where his farmers may think he is opposed to it and I do not want the gentleman to get into that position. I want to save my friend from himself. I have a very friendly feeling for the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I will try to save myself.

Now stop and analyze this support program. All major agricultural products that do not have an import embargo on them, like these southern products, or that do not have the protection of the Smoot-Hawley tariff have a world price and a duty that is less than our domestic support price. What are you going to do? Are we going to have an abnormal granary or a normal one? You better start telling the people right now if you think we are going to support prices all over the world. For example, I will show you this chart, as an example of what is happening to our wool. We are supporting the price of wool. Our good friend from Colorado did not say anything against that awhile ago. He kind of likes that protection that his farmers get, because it is in the Aiken bill. They get 42 cents. But we in the Midwest are not sitting so good at the present time. We are trying to iron it out. But, the gentleman has 42 cents on his wool.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. I am sure the gentleman is aware that the wool growers of America can only produce 50 percent, or thereabouts, of the consumption of this Nation.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Can or do.

Mr. CARROLL. We do.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, but we could if the New Deal had not run around and knocked all these sheep in the head. They killed the sheep off, because they were afraid of what you were going to do with them, and consequently you have not got as many sheep today as we had 50 years ago.

Mr. CARROLL. The gentleman's argument is that the Government destroyed the sheep and that is why we have not more wool.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mordecai Ezekiel went all over the country and said we should not raise sheep.

Mr. CARROLL. There was some testimony which came before the committee, some gentleman from Massachusetts, who was objecting to woolens coming into the country; that the tariff on them was too low.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. CARROLL. But, they said they were imposing a double penalty because the tariff on wool was too high. The gentleman knows that Australian wool comes in here in great amounts.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. A friend from Boston came down here, and he did not like the 42 cents that the Aiken bill gave the wool grower.

Mr. CARROLL. But the gentleman knows that the production of wool in this country is not sufficient to meet the demands of the consumers.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. It is not, but I say it could be.

Mr. CARROLL. At the present time it is not sufficient.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. No; because we import twice as much as we produce.

Mr. CARROLL. Therefore it is necessary to bring in other wood to keep pace with the demand.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. We will not have anything produced in this country pretty soon if you fellows stay in power.

Mr. CARROLL. Oh, the gentleman made that argument in November.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. But I did not do so badly. The people were pretty good to me. I told them the truth. I did not tell them falsehoods and bedtime stories. There are 600,000,000 pounds of wool imported and only 300,000,000 pounds produced in the United States and we have to support 900,000,000 pounds in this program from here on in.

We are going to be in one awful mess if we are going to support all the agricultural products in the world, because as I showed you on this chart, even at this hour we cannot give it away as fast as they are bringing it in here. For the fellow that has any respect for the United States Treasury, if we are going to keep the country anywhere near solvent, my position is that somebody has got to do something about those imports. Then we have the Marshall plan that I also voted for so I cannot blame anybody else that did, but we have to watch out in the Marshall plan that we do not subsidize the people, the farmers, the men in the factory, and subsidize their production, and then lower the duties here and bring other products into the United States. If I had the time, I could give you a very good example of just exactly that, where we have sent millions and millions of pounds and bushels of feed to a certain country, and they are sending their products into the United States and asking for a lower duty so that they can get more and more into the United States. When you take into consideration all those factors, I say first that those European countries should lower their own trade barriers between themselves, and then let us start, because you know how that is, if a chicken flies across the line over there and they want to shoot somebody about it, let them get their own house in order first; let them remove their own trade barriers, and my hope is that they are attempting to do it. Benelux, as I say, is an example, but before they ask us to give our markets to them, they have to first of all feel that their obligation is to get their own house in order.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I believe that a large majority of the people of this country favor the reciprocal-trade-agreements program as such, and believe that the President's authority to make concessions should be extended. The basic issue before this Congress is the precise form in which such continued authority should be granted. As the elected representatives of the people, bound by oath and solemn duty to watch over the welfare, we must scrutinize with great care any change requested in the terms of that granted authority, to be sure it does not plunge our constituents into a morass of difficulties far beyond any benefits it may bring to them.

The last Congress enacted a provision under which the President was, in effect, required to notify the United States Tariff Commission as to the commodities for which he intended to negotiate for reciprocal reduction of tariff and other trade barriers. Upon receipt of such notification the Tariff Commission was required to conduct hearings and to make an investigation to determine the point to which duties could be reduced without seriously injuring the domestic industry. Within 120 days after the notification the Commission was required to inform the President as to its findings.

The so-called peril points so established by the Commission were solely for the information of the President, and did not restrict him in any way in the granting of concessions. He was specifically permitted to disregard the peril points and to grant concessions below such points if he felt that the concessions to be gained from foreign countries, and other circumstances, made it advisable to do so. The only proviso was that he was required to report to Congress any concessions granted by him which were below the peril point recommended by the Tariff Commission, together with his reasons for doing so.

The President has now requested that this entire peril-point procedure be eliminated and the bill, H. R. 1211, now under consideration complies with this request. Before acceding to this request, it is highly proper for us to examine into the reasons for it. Congress has a great responsibility to the people of this country to make certain that any delegation of its powers over tariff matters is properly administered, and we cannot, without completely disregarding this responsibility, lightly issue to any President or any administrative body a blank check without at least inquiring into the question of what use is to be made of such blank check.

In negotiating trade agreements the President acts through the State Department and it may be safely assumed that the President's request emanated from, or at least meets the unqualified approval of, the State Department. It is thus highly pertinent to inquire into the State Department's official explanation of the reasons for the President's desire for elimination of the peril-point procedure.

This explanation was made by Mr. Willard L. Thorp, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, at the hearing conducted by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Mr. Thorp

stated that such peril points would be set without regard to any national or international considerations, and would disregard benefits to be obtained by other countries, long-term needs of the economy for expanding markets, the necessity of obtaining the best possible use of domestic resources, possible strategic considerations, or the possible repercussions of our action upon the policies of other countries toward us.

He further stated that the peril-point procedure returns to the old protective theory that only the prosperity of an individual industry is affected by a tariff or a quota, and practically makes such narrow protectionism the sole criterion for determining the concessions which may be made by the United States in trade agreements.

In order that the basic explanation may become apparent, let us analyze Mr. Thorp's statement. In effect he says that the peril points established by the Tariff Commission do not take into consideration all of the factors which must be considered in making trade concessions. He then concludes that the establishment of these peril points practically makes the prosperity of individual industries the sole criterion for determining the concessions which may be made by the United States in trade agreements.

While it may be granted that in establishing peril points the Tariff Commission is primarily concerned with protection of domestic industries, Mr. Thorp's conclusion does not necessarily follow. If the President and through him the State Department, were bound by the peril points and could not grant concessions below such points when other considerations warranted such action, then Mr. Thorp's conclusion would be correct. However, that is not the situation. The State Department is not bound by such peril points and is specifically permitted to disregard them when other considerations, such as those mentioned by Mr. Thorp, indicate a need for such action.

There is no question in my mind that Mr. Thorp is correct in stating that benefits to be obtained by other countries, long-term needs of the economy for expanding markets, and so forth, are factors which must be taken into consideration in determining what concessions should be granted. However, I feel very strongly that protection of domestic industries is at least one other factor which should be considered. The peril-point procedure is designed solely to bring the needs of domestic industries to the attention of the President and to the State Department so that such needs may be weighed in the light of other considerations.

By demanding the elimination of the peril-point procedure, the State Department has in effect said, "We do not want to know the needs of individual domestic industries. We do not want to be told that if we grant a certain concession the effect will be to injure an individual domestic industry. We want to make our decisions without being influenced by any such considerations."

In other words, the State Department wants authority from this Congress to grant trade concessions without any regard to the effect which such trade concessions will have on domestic industry. It wants to close its eyes and ears to any information which would demonstrate the effect on domestic industry. This fact is further illustrated by the effort which has been made to rush this bill through this Congress. The present authority does not expire until June 30, 1949, and yet we are told that it is imperative that the extension be passed immediately. We are not given time to carefully consider the bill or to assemble the information which we should have before acting upon such an important measure, but are told that we must act now, merely because the State Department has demanded it.

Frankly, the only conclusion I can reach as to the reason for such pressure is that the State Department wants a complete free hand in connection with the pending trade negotiations to be held in Geneva in April. It wants to be able to grant concessions during the course of such negotiations without any regard for the effect on American industry.

Perhaps I am being unduly suspicious. However, anytime I am told that the department charged with the responsibility of making decisions which may affect the livelihood of countless thousands of American citizens, does not even want to receive the advice of a nonpartisan body, like the Tariff Commission, which was set up for the express purpose of compiling the pertinent facts and figures, I am suspicious, and it will take a lot to convince me that my suspicions are unfounded. We may be told that under the proposed bill the State Department will receive the advice of the Commission since section 5 instructs the President to seek such advice before concluding any agreement. This is quite true, but it does not explain why the State Department is unwilling to have the Commission make a real investigation and determine peril points. Unless the Commission conducts hearings and makes the investigations now required, it will not be in a position to advise the State Department fully as to the needs of domestic industries affected.

I can see no possible explanation for the State Department's demand, made through the President, other than that he wants blanket authority immediately to grant concessions in the Geneva negotiations in April without giving any consideration to the possible injury to domestic industries, and without having to explain to anyone the reasons for such concessions.

I feel that it is the responsibility of this Congress to make certain that adequate consideration is given to all factors, and that one of the most important of those factors is the effect on domestic industry. While I am completely sympathetic to the importance of encouraging the importation of foreign merchandise in order to improve the living standards abroad and to enhance the purchasing power of foreign countries, I do not feel that we should completely disregard the effect which such importations will have on domestic industries. Our first responsibility is to the people of this country and my responsibility is to the working men and women of my district, and we cannot ignore that responsibility.

At this point I will give you a concrete example of what gives me concern in the administration of the trade-agreements program. In my district are located a number of plants engaged in the manufacture of pottery and chinaware. They employ thousands of workers who depend upon this employment for a livelihood.

Before the last war imports of china and earthenware were very heavy, amounting to 35 to 40 percent of total consumption in the United States, in terms of number of pieces. During the war imports declined very sharply. Production in this country increased. Since 1946 imports began to increase. In that year imports of chinaware amounted to 198,000 dozen pieces, valued at $1,600,000 on the basis of foreign valuation. In 1948, through November, the quantity imported rose to 1,747,000 dozen pieces, or almost ten to one compared with 1946. Value of the imports went up to $6,202,000, representing an increase of nearly three to one.

In 1948 imports from Japan and Germany have shown the sharpest increase. In 1947 Japan sent us 205,000 dozen pieces of china, household, and tableware. In 1948, through November, this quantity had increased to 926,000 dozen. Germany sent us 118,000 dozen pieces in all of 1947 and 429,000 dozen in the first 11 months of 1948. In both instances the increase in value between the 2 years was even more striking. Together, Japan and Germany shipped us over $3,300,000 worth of chinaware in the first 11 months of 1948. In both cases the trend of imports was still distinctly upward.

If the pottery industry were a giant such as the automobile industry, imports of this magnitude could be contemplated with cool assurance that no threat was implied in them. However, our own production of household china has been estimated at only $10,000,000 for 1948. In other words, imports during the first 11 months of the year amounted to over 60 percent of the domestic production for the entire year.

Other branches of the pottery industry are also affected by a sharp rise in imports. Earthenware imports in 1948 amounted to more than $4,500,000, and imports of pottery artware amounted to approximately $3,500,000. Total pottery imports thus exceeded $14,000,000 in 1948.

Is there any wonder why we want to know where we are headed? The State Department minimizes such results of their action. They point to the escape clause as a remedy. This is a wholly unsatisfactory recourse.

It would be much sounder procedure to gain a better idea beforehand than to await damage that will be difficult to repair. The way to meet this situation is to have a competent agency make adequate investigation before action is taken.

What would we say if the Army or Navy proceeded on the theory that it is better to wait until we are defeated in battle before obtaining as full intelligence reports as possible? Certainly if

information is a proper guide to action in all other fields of human endeavor, this also applies to cutting the tariff, unless it is assumed that the welfare of industry and its employees is of no importance.

We have another example of how little the State Department is concerned with our industrial welfare, including the standard of living of our workers. This very day Czechoslovakia, which went under Russian control a year ago, enjoys the benefit of a trade agreement with us. During the first 11 months of 1948 we imported $475,000 of table and art glassware from Czechoslovakia.

This was more than we imported from any other country—nearly twice as much as we imported from Italy, Germany, and Japan combined. The entire glass industry of Czechoslovakia has been nationalized. By helping Czechoslovakia we give economic support to the countries behind the iron curtain, and we do this at the expense of employment in our own factories.

It is for these and similar reasons that I am not satisfied to rest the administration of the trade-agreements program wholly in the hands of the State Department. That Department has a legitimate and proper place in the program. We must look to it for all contacts and negotiations with foreign powers; but that does not mean that it should have a free hand to do as it pleases without guidance from the legislative branch in matters for which Congress is directly responsible to the people.

The most effective way of assuring this lies in lodging with the Tariff Commission the power to give authoritative guidance to the State Department on the basis of studies and investigations. With proper liaison between these two agencies, while maintaining the independence of the Commission, we could face with greater confidence the future course of the trade-agreements program.

The facts I have just given you in connection with the pottery industry are the facts about which the State Department wishes no information when negotiations are carried on next April at Geneva and thereafter until June 12, 1951. They are the facts which the Tariff Commission would consider in establishing peril points under the provision in the existing law, and the State Department has said that it does not want to know what those peril points are. I do not think the State Department or the President should be permitted to be without this information, or to ignore it when they have it. I think they should be required to consider the effect on American industry, along with other factors involved, and if they then decide to make concessions which may jeopardize the future of an American industry, the responsibility is on the President, and he should be required to explain the reasons to Congress.

We are entitled to know the facts. If an American industry is to be jeopardized in order to provide a market for foreign goods, or to provide a foreign market for the goods of other domestic industries, we are entitled to know the considerations which prompted the concessions which bring about such a result. We were elected for the purpose of representing the people who will be affected, and we are the ones who are going to have to explain the reasons why it was necessary to destroy the industries which have provided their livelihoods.

Why the State Department is unwilling to furnish us with the reasons I cannot understand. Perhaps they feel that in 4 years all will be forgotten and forgiven. It may be possible that people who are thrown out of their jobs as a result of concessions granted by the State Department next April, may have been able to get other jobs and be willing to forget and forgive 4 years from now, but I seriously doubt that they will have forgotten or forgiven 2 years from now when you and I are called to account.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, the pottery workers—those splendid craftsmen who produce chinaware—in the southern and eastern sections of my State of Ohio to whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] adverted as being jobless because of the import of dishes from England—are employees of pottery manufacturers who have been operating highly profitable businesses during the past 14 years. These workingmen are my constituents. An overwhelming majority of them gave to the President of the United States and to me as candidate for Congressman at Large their votes last November, and I am serving this fine constituency and the people of this Nation with fidelity and zeal when I urge the passage of this bill. These workers were jobless and these potteries were closed back in 1932 following the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley prohibitive tariff which had stifled international trade and paralyzed our commerce.

Mr. Chairman, may I now explain briefly, just why the administration opposes the present legislation passed by the Eightieth Congress last June, and why it is considered imperative that the original Trade Agreements Act, in operation since 1934, should be restored in its entirety.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934, fathered by this Nation's former great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, one of this Nation's most farsighted and greatest statemen, is a tried and tested piece of legislation. It has been subjected to the anvil of public criticism for 14 years. It has been renewed in almost its original form four successive times. Only in 1945 was an important modification made in the original act and that was to provide a different base year upon which changes in tariff rates could be made. No significant procedural changes have been found necessary in all these years provided, and this is an important proviso, provided there is agreement on the basic purpose of the act.

Last year, and let no one misunderstand this, last year, there was no agreement on the basic purpose of the act. There was disagreement. Procedural changes were introduced, not for procedural reasons, but because the authors of the procedural changes were not in agreement with the basic underlying philosophy of the trade-agreements program. They sought through the introduction of procedural changes to alter and deflect the operation of the entire program—their protests to the contrary notwithstanding.

They did not attack the program and the act head on. They masterminded a flank attack under the guise of procedural amendments. These innocent appearing changes in procedure fooled a lot of people because they seemed so plausible and so innocuous. The only way the true significance of these changes could be quickly evaluated was to examine the records of the authors—records that indicated consistent and bitter opposition to the trade agreements program for fourteen long years.

The purpose of the Trade Agreements Act is to expand the international trade of both the United States and other countries. The act has been the cornerstone of our economic foreign policy. It is the legal authority for the trade-agreement program and is continuing evidence of the determination of the United States to contribute its full share to the reconstruction of a sound and growing world economy as the basis for permanent peace.

Mr. Chairman, a Republican majority, now a minority, did not further the expansion of international trade by introducing procedural restrictions into the basic law which is the keystone of our economic foreign policy. Mr. Chairman, you will agree that we did not strengthen the trade-agreements program by limiting the extension of the act to 1 year rather than the customary 3 years. On the contrary, last spring we weakened the trade-agreements program and we loaded the act with a lot of unnecessary restrictions—totally and absolutely unnecessary. These restrictions are today hampering the very people to whom we delegated the job of expanding our foreign trade and who are about to conduct negotiations with other countries looking to the reduction of trade barriers. It does not make sense.

Let us look at these new restrictions foisted upon our people last year by a protectionist minority and which we would like to eliminate and which we will eliminate by the passage of the pending bill.

The extension was only for 1 year compared with 3 years as was the case in the past. This makes foreign countries feel that we are vacillating, are not sure of the policy ourselves, and do not mean business.

It also makes other countries dubious about our efforts under the Economic Cooperation Act to get them to reduce their own tariff barriers against each other. The Economic Cooperation Act, section 115 (b) (3)—approved by both Republicans and Democrats in the Eightieth Congress—requires each ERP country, as a condition of obtaining aid from the United States, to conclude an agreement with the United States, under which it pledges its efforts toward cooperating with other participating countries in facilitating and stimulating an increasing interchange of goods and services among the participating countries and with other countries and cooperating to reduce barriers to trade

among themselves and with other countries.

The present trade agreement law, which we are preparing to change, permits the United States Tariff Commission to supply statistics and facts to the State Department and the other agencies which must make the decision on trade agreements, but it specifically forbids the Tariff Commission from giving advice. This is a serious defect because the Tariff Commission with its accumulated knowledge of tariff matters acquired since 1916 and with its bipartisan complexion—three Republicans and three Democratic Commissioners—is able to give very good advice. The Tariff Commission was a vital part of the entire interdepartmental machinery in the 14 years prior to June 1948.

Instead of advice, the Tariff Commission is directed to report to the President within 120 days on each item upon which the United States contemplates tariff negotiations. It is required to estimate in advance the exact point beyond which tariff cuts might cause or threaten injury to a domestic industry.

Because there is no scientific method of ascertaining such a hypothetical point which would hold true for 1 year, let alone 5 years, the Tariff Commission is forced to bend over backward in the direction of caution. No calculated risk can be taken. The effect, of course, is what the authors wanted, protectionist to the extreme.

The present law permits the President to go further than the Tariff Commission's so-called peril points, but if he does so he must give his reasons to Congress within 30 days. Let us not fool ourselves. This means as a practical matter that the limits set by the Tariff Commission are the controlling factors and the last say in tariff negotiations regardless of the viewpoints of other agencies.

The Tariff Commission cannot take account of the interests of our exporting industries in coming to its decision. The Commission cannot take account of the interests of consumers and the interests of industries using imported raw materials in coming to its decision. The Commission cannot even take into account the interests of the United States economy as a whole. No, the only factor to be taken into account by the Tariff Commission is the protection of domestic producers against threatened—not actual, but threatened—injury.

The so-called peril-point system is not only an impediment to the coming tariff negotiations but it is completely unnecessary. Every trade agreement negotiated by the United States in the last 6 years has contained an escape clause which specifically states that if after a tariff cut is made it results in abnormal imports that cause or threaten injury to domestic producers, the Tariff Commission shall investigate such cases, report to the President, and the President may withdraw the tariff concession without even having, in critical cases, to consult with or obtain the consent of the other parties to the agreement.

The advantage of this escape clause is that it can be utilized when injury is a fact or about to become a fact. It does not prevent concessions from being made, or an entire agreement from being made, because 10 years from now injury might be threatened by a rate which is cut today.

In all the 14 years of the operation of the trade agreements program the fear has been constantly expressed that modifications in the tariff would bring ruin to this industry and to that industry. No concrete evidence has been put forth to substantiate actual injury but much has been said about the future.

Mr. Chairman, we do not propose to formulate the basic economic foreign policy of this great country of ours upon a foundation of fear. We must and shall take a more positive, a more affirmative position. We shall be prudent like the pioneer who helped build this Nation, but we shall not strangle our future prosperity or the peace of the world because of a refusal to take a carefully calculated risk. We would not be able to look our children or our grandchildren in the eye let alone the people throughout the world who are struggling with poverty and the Circe call of a tyrannical collectivism that promises them the earth.

I hope the membership of this House, realizing the importance of this legislation, will vote affirmatively on the bill as reported from the Ways and Means Committee.

In the interest of a sound national economy and international peace, the State Department should be encouraged to engage in even more vigorous efforts to reduce trade barriers. International trade is not a one-way street.

The method of permitting the State Department to investigate, hear objections from domestic producers and negotiate reciprocal agreements is vastly superior to the politics-ridden, logrolling tariff making Congress has too often indulged in under the old order before 1934. The old system generally resulted in higher and higher barriers because favors were granted to one local interest after another as against the welfare of the Nation as a whole.

One of the greatest advances under the reciprocal policy was made in 1947 when the United States signed an agreement with 22 other nations covering tariff rates on 45,000 items. Then, last year a Republican Congress reversed the whole trend. It extended an emasculated act for only 1 year—to await further attention when the Republicans had taken over both White House and both branches of the Congress.

Under the Republican Smoot-Hawley Act, with the prohibitive tariff of early 1930, our international trade was destroyed. We built a wall around our country and other nations retaliated. Farmers became bankrupt. They could not make enough money to pay interest on their mortgages and to pay their taxes, and city workers were thrown out of employment by the millions. This largely because of the old protectionist doctrine that foreign goods should not be allowed to enter this country if they undersold a domestic producer—no matter whether American consumers benefited or whether foreign consumers were enabled to buy goods other American producers had to export. The old policy of special privilege to a favored few gave no weight to over-all national interest or to trade's effects on international peace.

We must not adhere to the old order. We must not turn back. We must go forward.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, a meeting of the contracting parties to the general agreement on tariffs and trade is scheduled for April 11 at Annency, France.

Therefore, we are being asked to rush through a bill which would extend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act without proper safeguards.

To promote international trade and cooperation, the Congress is supposed to step aside and permit the State Department to have full freedom of action in this matter.

H. R. 1211 throws all precautions overboard and places the whole American economy at the mercy of the State Department.

I submit that such a blanket delegation of power without check is dangerous. It is a surrender by the Congress of its watchdog functions to an agency of the Government which is not primarily interested in domestic problems and is not prepared to cope with them.

I believe in the theory and the application of reciprocal trade, but not in a reckless fashion. We cannot achieve it overnight without losing our shirts. There is such a thing as being too generous, which leads to bankruptcy.

Why are so many nations concerned about developments within the United States? It is because they recognize us as the steadiest factor in a world economy. If we should falter, they will suffer. Remembering the high and rigid tariffs of another generation which were responsible for contraction of trade leading to global depression, they would have us go to the other extreme of free trade. But I contend that we can go too far and too fast in this direction. Great as our resources are, they are not limitless. If we go on giving and giving and giving we can exhaust ourselves and become absorbed by a world whose general level of economic activity is insufficient.

Reciprocal trade, to work, must be a two-way street. There is no use in helping others unless they will respond by making some effort to help themselves. And not as parasites sucking the lifeblood from our productivity.

There are other and undeveloped markets of the world where they can sell their goods without competing with our own manufacturers on our own home grounds.

We can help these nations with American technical know-how and with genuine loans, but not at the expense of our domestic market. There are raw materials and certain products which we need from them without inviting competition in those goods which we produce in abundance.

Duplication serves no purpose, even in the name of competition, unless both parties are somewhat evenly matched. That is the basis of our concern over

monopolies. An American industry, with all its financial strength, its managerial, technical and labor skills, cannot compete with foreign goods which are manufactured at slave wages without some tariff protection. The only other alternatives are:

First. A lowering of the American wage rate and standard of living, which is inconceivable; or

Second. An upward revision of wages paid in foreign industries, to put competition on a fair basis.

The latter is the crux of the whole problem, and I maintain that we should make tariff concessions only to those countries which raise the true wages of their industrial workers. Such tariffs should be graded downward to the extent to which such wages approximate those paid in a like industry in this country. In time, we might even work out a transport differential. Then competition would be truly free and fair.

The bill under our consideration ignores such necessities.

In order to comprehend the dangers in H. R. 1211, we must keep in mind the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934 and the present act, which was passed in June of 1948, to extend for 1 year the original act with amendments.

The Trade Agreements Act of 1934 was for the purpose of expanding foreign markets for the products of the United States as a means of assisting in the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and in establishing and maintaining a better relationship among the various branches of American agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce.

Times have certainly changed since 1934.

We have no national economic depression and there is no surface evidence, at least, that agriculture, industry, mining, and commerce are feuding and fussing with one another.

Under the proposed bill, however, the President may enter into agreements solely for the purpose of expanding foreign markets, even though such agreements result in the practical destruction of existing domestic markets, with a consequent impairment of the American standard of living and a depletion of the purchasing power of the American public.

Existing legislation provides that the Tariff Commission shall determine the peril points beyond which tariff deductions will injure particular American industries and that, if the President disregards these peril points, he must explain to Congress the reasons for his action or inaction.

By inserting this provision, Congress recognized that officials who are preoccupied with our international relations are not the best judges of problems on the home front.

They have not demonstrated that the procedural requirements of the 1948 act are unworkable. In trying to remove present precautions, they indicate a fear of the facts. What other interpretation can be given to the rush tactics employed on this legislation, which is being steam rollered through as a top-priority bill? The present law does not prevent the President from acting in disregard of the findings of the Tariff Commission; it merely provides that when he does so, he must advise the Congress. The proponents of this new measure apparently believe that if the Congress is not given time to get at the facts, the negotiators of trade agreements will be given full and arbitrary power to do as they please. Their sole concern is to expand foreign markets at any cost—even at the sacrifice of some American industries.

Last year, Congress prudently limited the extension of the trade agreements to 1 year, knowing that economic conditions are not fixed and rigid. In the leveling-off period which we are entering, trying to find the balance between inflation and deflation, it is necessary that we give first consideration to the needs of American agriculture and industry. This requires a flexible rather than a dogmatic approach to economic problems. We cannot afford to jettison our textile plants and workers who clothe us for the sake of favored industries who might want to sell out American textiles so that they can fatten on foreign markets.

There are many who oppose the steadily increasing power of our Federal Government. But how about the further centralization of power within the National Government itself? I consider this to be the real danger. The Congress has already delegated too many of its responsibilities to executive agencies. Shall we continue this process to the point where we wash our hands of all responsibility to American industry and American workers? In my book the answer is "No."

I maintain that the United States Tariff Commission, a Government body of nonpartisan character as appointed by Congress, should be the chief agency for such fact finding in foreign trade negotiations. If you decide for the purpose of efficient administration to delegate the power to change trade treaties, such delegation should not be absolute. It must be given only to those whose public duty it is to constantly consider the effect of such proposals on the American industries involved. And they should report frequently to a watch-dog subcommittee of this House.

I represent a district which is the center of woolen and worsted manufacturing in the United States. In the 125,000 population area of greater Lawrence, Mass., over 12,000 people are out of work, and the situation is reminiscent of depression days. And English woolens and worsteds are on sale in Lawrence at prices lower than the same type of goods which are manufactured in the local mills.

This is coincident with the announcement that such goods have been lifted from the rationed list in England, which indicates that they have a sufficient supply for their own use and have a surplus to export.

Perhaps there are some consumers who would be willing to buy goods manufactured in a foreign sweatshop, because they can buy them cheaper, without giving a thought to the fact that they may be putting American textile manufacturers and textile workers out of business.

Again, there may be some American manufacturers and workers who may be short-sighted on this score. As long as they can do a little international log-rolling with foreign industries and through the medium of governments, they care not about those American industries such as textiles which are lost in the bargaining process.

A point falsely advanced to cover up such manipulations is that some American industries, chiefly those using metals, have no tariff protection. It is claimed that they do not fear imports in their line, even though they pay high wages for short hours. They assert that their productive skill will more than offset imports which are manufactured at low wages abroad.

The real point is, however, that foreign nations are not producing such goods in quantity and must import them from the United States. Incidentally, such types of metal goods as machinery will enable those foreign countries to become active competitors, with a definite low-wage advantage in the American domestic market.

It may sound like heresy to state this, but in the one field where we consider ourselves supreme—the automotive field—we note a beginning of a reverse trend. Thousands of lower-priced, smaller, and more-economical-to-operate English cars are being sold in this country.

Most of the raw material—wool—of the woolen worsted industry comes from outside the United States. The metal, or nonprotected industries like automobiles and typewriters, get nearly all of their main raw materials from within the United States.

These metal industries are strong supporters of no tariff or low tariff so that they can get dollar exchange in England where they sell their goods. Now this is fine for them, but at a reciprocal sacrifice of American woolens and worsteds which must then meet the unfair competition of English fabrics which are manufactured at one-third the labor costs of American goods. And there are many countries which pay lower wages to their textile workers—far lower even than those prevailing in England. Need I mention, for example, the alleged peace price by the Kremlin, the price of which will be a huge gift of machinery from the United States to set up a most formidable slave-wage competitor?

Russia, with modern American-made textile machinery and its slave labor, might sell woolens and worsteds in Detroit at a price with which our manufacturers of the same goods could not compete. The Detroit automobile worker might think he is getting a bargain. But how could he prosper, once this downward chain reaction begins? He would soon find himself out of work for the reason that displaced wollen-worsted workers of the United States, and those dependent on them, would be unable to buy the cars which he produces.

We cannot raise the world-level of prosperity by pulling our own level down.

The only way is to keep our standards high and to make tariff concessions only

to those nations which raise their living conditions and only to the degree in which they do so.

Let us export incentives to other countries, but not export the jobs of New England's woolen and worsted workers.

This textile industry, so vital to the American economy and to our national security, has been pushed back to the peril point by the overgenerous concessions of our reciprocal trade policy.

The supporters of H. R. 1211 point to the President's assurance than an escape clause will be incorporated in each trade agreement. I believe that this should be required by law to express the intent not only of the President but of Congress as well. I further believe that it should be so worded as to make it function immediately to protect any American industry which is threatened under a rate prescribed by a trade agreement. The escape clause heretofore used is inadequate. It must be so amended as to be mandatory, with provisions for its immediate and effective enforcement.

The Congress should maintain continuing interest in the manner in which supervision of tariff rates is used or abused. The Tariff Commission is an agency of the Congress, created to help us in our constitutional responsibility of regulating foreign commerce. But our first duty is to represent the people and the industries of our respective districts and to harmonize those interests with the needs of our Federal union.

Having given up to a request that certain of these functions be delegated to the executive branch of the Government, we should not abandon our responsibilities completely. We must insist on hearings and reports from the Tariff Commission, acting jointly with the Committee for Reciprocity Information. And we should require that the Executive report to us directly when he acts contrary to these tariff recommendations. This is our right and our duty.

Gentlemen, I beg you to make these reasonable amendments to H. R. 1211 before our great woolen and worsted industry, among others is bargained into a depression.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman the matter that brings me before the Congress, today, is not new. As a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1945, and as a rank tyro in legislative procedure I endeavored to establish certain safeguards under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for some of the major industries of my district and my native State of West Virginia.

Aside from the dubious honor of calling attention to the so-called escape clause in the Mexican agreement of 1945, I failed to obtain any relief. The manner in which this escape clause is being administered in existing reciprocal treaties leads me to wonder if I even won anything—even though the escape clause has been written into all agreements since 1945. I never like to criticize unless I offer constructive substitutes.

While the years subsequent to 1945 have added more gray to my fast-thinning hair, I sincerely hope they have also given me greater information and wisdom with which to plead the cause of these much harassed industries.

What, in the war year of 1945, was described by one of my opponents in debate as a mere skin irritation on our economy bids fair in these postwar years to break out into festering sores that will blight great sections of our industrial life, thereby causing unemployment, reduced purchasing power and destroy the economic well-being of thousands of America's skilled workmen.

Once more I crave your attention while I endeavor to depict not only what is happening to the woodworking, pottery, and hand-made glass industries of our Nation but what is sure to happen to these sorely pressed trades if H. R. 1211, now before you, is approved in its present form.

I am unofficially informed that the State of Oklahoma is greatly worried where State revenues derived from a production or severance tax on oil are dwindling and threaten to hamper governmental operations.

Mr. Chairman, it is clearly apparent to the Members that this protest is not just an isolated instance. Were it not for the apparent haste by which this pending legislation is being rushed through the Congress, I could place in the RECORD scores of instances to show where other of our basic industries are being and will be affected by this legislation.

In formulating a tariff policy, we have to contend with a problem peculiarly our own—the high standard of American life—which, expressed in terms of any money in comparison to an ounce of gold, shows we are willing to pay more for services and merchandise than any other country in the world.

Such a status is an invitation for the rest of the world to sell its goods, produced by means of cheaper labor, in our higher-priced markets, and of necessity, for the protection of our industry and our labor, we must adopt a tariff plan to cope with that situation.

I realize full well that I am treading on somewhat sacred ground—in that my party—the Democratic Party—is pledged to the theory of reciprocal trade agreements as a necessary function in expanding world trade. I, personally, made no such commitments. On the other hand, I stated clearly my determination to defend the interests of my State and district should the demand for continued reciprocal agreements be made in the Eighty-first Congress. I shall not again be misled into supporting any legislation so obviously injurious to my constituents.

One major fault, if I may make bold to suggest, in our tariff making policy is that import duties are based on foreign costs of production and not on American. On foreign standards of value, not our standards.

Our State and Commerce Departments and even our Tariff Commission compile their import data on the basis of import volume and not on a basis of import value. This policy supplies valuable information insofar as statistics go, but it affords no picture of the impact on our economy because it is not "spelled out" on a dollar and cents basis. To avoid these sudden fluctuations in foreign money standards and exchange rates would necessitate rewriting all of our tariff schedules—a huge task—but a task that some future Congress could well undertake.

Before speaking directly to the subject that brings me to the floor of the House I would like to browse around a bit and see how this panacea for all our economic ills is working in industries other than the pottery, woodworking, and hand-made categories. I was much impressed by testimony, given this past week before the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I have the honor to be a member, by some of the South's outstanding textile producers who complained of competition from Mexico, Chile and Haiti where American capital was used during and since the war to build textile plants that are now exploiting the cheap labor of those nations and making and shipping into this country, under the favorable terms of existing reciprocal trade agreements, both finished and unfinished goods. In one instance men's shirts were being imported but without collars and cuffs. Those necessary appendages were put on after they were past our customs. A glance at paragraph 919 of the Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930 will explain the device used to take advantage of our adjusted rates to comply with the terms of a reciprocal agreement with that particular country.

The operators of the sponge industry in Florida are complaining of the mounting imports of sponges that are being reshipped under the Marshall plan to Germany and the United Kingdom for polishing hand-made china in the pottery plants.

Here is one that should interest my colleagues from Oklahoma and Texas who are just recovering from the solar plexus blow caused by the recent drop of approximately 75 cents per barrel in the price of crude oil. They can find the answer in recent Commerce Department reports on the importation of crude oil from Venezuela and Mexico. Already the impact of 600,000 barrels daily is being felt on the economy in the Red River Valley and on the Osage plains where domestic production is greatly curtailed and in some instances suspended.

Despite our Economic Cooperation Administration program, aimed primarily at rehabilitating war-ravaged western Europe, trade conditions remain unsettled. Already we have seen devaluation and repudiation of the value of money standards in these nations. In other nations, with which we have reciprocal relations, we see total disregard for their treaty obligations. In others, we see import quotas imposed that put American industry at a disadvantage. We cannot escape the observation that those charged directly with the administration of our Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act are lax in enforcement or totally disregard the rights

of American commerce through means of the escape clause in existing agreements.

Under our present tariff system there has grown up in this country mass production in many lines of industry. Whether this system is beneficial or not I am not discussing, but it must be apparent that under this system, with our present economic set-up, we will be impotent to provide necessary employment for all returned war veterans and other workers who will be out of employment when the cold-war emergency passes. Particularly will this be true if we sacrifice one American industry in an effort to give other nations buying power to enable them to purchase the exported products of some other American industry. My native State of West Virginia, now the leading glass-producing State in the Union and a large producer of pottery products and clothespins, protests being made the guinea pig for such an experiment.

The present trade agreements do not limit the amounts of any given article that can be imported, and in many cases we have observed that, due to this fact, we are uncertain regarding the quantity a foreign exporter of a given commodity will throw on our markets. Very often as little as 10 percent or less of an imported competitive article ruins the price structure of both the imported and the domestically produced equivalent article.

At present, under the terms of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1945 and as amended in 1948, we find deplorable conditions existing in the industries for which I plead. Lack of a backlog of orders or no orders at all has brought unemployment, forced lay-offs or resort to share the work plans. In view of this situation I question the wisdom of the Eighty-first Congress giving a free hand to either our State Department or even to the Tariff Commission any further authority to negotiate probable reductions in tariff rates on the clothespin, pottery or hand-made glassware, crude oil, textiles, shoes and many other industries of the Nation.

The situation, as it affects the glassware and pottery production, is further complicated by the actions of our military authorities in the occupied portions of Germany and Japan and by the Marshall plan administrators in England and Belgium, where millions in American tax dollars have been expended in rebuilding and rehabilitating pottery and glass plants from which the flow of imports threatens to close our American factories. Every effort on my part to get the details as to how many such plants have been rehabilitated and the cost of such work has been met by Army officials with the excuse—"Sorry we do not have the details." It occurs to me Congress might well be interested in knowing these details as a prerequisite to a safe and sane tariff policy.

I have information, the source of which I am not at liberty to disclose, to show that ECA has expended in England alone the sum of $1,250,000 in 1947 and 1948 for rehabilitation of pottery plants alone. Twelve million dollar program under way in Italy. How much of this is Marshall fund money?

Under the favored nations clause, these occupied territories are accorded the same reciprocal treatment as is accorded the other 21 nations party to the Geneva agreement in 1947, one of which nations is Czechoslovakia—behind the iron curtain—where good American dollars used in the purchase of glassware products are going to build up Soviet Russia's economy.

When I pleaded with you in 1945 conditions were bad in both the pottery and glass industry. Only because of the fact the rest of the world was gripped by war were they able to operate, producing ware for domestic consumption. Today their troubles are multiplied by the upward spiraling of foreign imports as other nations resume full production and must find a market in America for their surplus products.

CLOTHESPIN INDUSTRY

I desire to call the attention of the House to the subject of wooden spring clothespins. One of the largest plants making this product is located at Richwood, W. Va., and employs approximately 200 workmen, whose jobs are menaced by a form of competition they are unable to meet because of high production costs.

America is still geared to a wartime economy. Production costs per gross for these pins have mounted, on an average, from 31.4 cents in 1931 to 69.9 cents for bulk and 86.5 cents for packaged goods in 1948. Sweden and Denmark furnish most of the competition. They are responsible for 85 percent of all imports. Compared to our production costs the most recent estimate of production costs in Sweden show they are able to manufacture, pay the ocean freight, insurance, brokerage, and the 10 cents gross import duty and offer these pins for sale at New York for 59.3 cents per gross.

Swedish imports in 1935 were less than 100,000 gross. For the first 11 months in 1948 these imports were 909,865 gross worth $498,611 and are estimated to reach a total for the year of 1,140,000 gross. Figures obtained from our own Commerce Department show Sweden produced, in 1948, a total of 2,500,000 gross in excess of her normal domestic needs. She must find a foreign market for this surplus. One Swedish firm alone is prepared to offer 1,000,000 gross for sale. The price is 47½ cents per gross in lots of 10,000 gross or more.

It is estimated that the normal demand for spring clothespins in the United States is from 3,500,000 to 4,000,000 gross annually. Current average domestic production is at the rate of approximately 400,000 gross per month, or approximately 4,800,000 gross annually. For a variety of reasons current production is not up to capacity. Imports of 1,140,000 gross annually is more than 25 percent of domestic production. Domestic production capacity is more than adequate to supply the normal demand in the United States without importation of any foreign spring clothespins.

Because of high costs of manufacturing in the United States, there is little or no market for American spring clothespins in foreign countries, so that domestic producers are entirely dependent on the domestic market. Total exports during 1948 were less than one-half of 1 percent of domestic production.

In 1931, under the Hawley-Smoot Act, the import duty stood at 20 cents per gross. Today, under the 1945 Reciprocal Trade Act in conformity with the Geneva agreement of 1947, the duty has been reduced to 10 cents. Under the proposal now pending (H. R. 1211) it will be possible for a further reduction downward to 5 cents per gross.

Sweden is listed as one of the 13 nations for further reciprocal trade discussions at a conference to be held in Geneva in April of this year. She is asking for further concessions on clothespins, which if granted will apply to all other nations. If this is done, it will be at the expense of our American economy. I suggest that the Congress consider a restoration of the original 20 cents duty as provided in the original act, rather than permit further reduction of the present 10-cent rate of duty.

HAND-MADE GLASS INDUSTRY

I want to make clear to the Congress that I am not pleading the case of the American manufacturers of window glass and plate glass. It is common knowledge that the four large concerns in this country producing this type of glass have a virtual monopoly on their product through the means of cartel arrangements with Belgian producers which prohibit imports into this country.

United States manufacturers of handmade glassware are fully cognizant of the necessity of stimulating foreign trade. They are not interested in creating tariff barriers just for the purpose of eliminating competition. All they are seeking is the equal opportunity of selling ware made by American workmen at American labor rates as is provided foreign manufacturers using foreign labor at low foreign wage rates.

In 1948 the hand-made glass table, ornamental, and stemware industry in the United States was estimated at $42,000,000. There are 78 companies which employ 35,000 workers. Most of these employees are highly skilled. They are wholly unfitted for work in other industries unless it would be using a pick and shovel.

Most of the plants making this type of ware are located principally in the States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, New York, New Jersey, Oklahoma, and California, but there are a few plants scattered in other States. The majority of these glass plants are located in small communities and contribute very substantially to the economic life there. Only 10 of these plants are in or near cities of over 50,000 population, while the other 68 support smaller towns, of which 37 are the important industries in their communities of less than 10,000 people. Therefore, in the great majority of these plant locations the very existence of workers and their families, merchants, service business, and the entire area economy depends on the pay rolls and continued operation of these glass plants.

In order to avoid misunderstanding, I wish to state that the large variety of glassware referred to is produced by all known glass-manufacturing methods;

that is, first, entirely free hand; second, hand-blown or hand-pressed with the aid of molds; third, by semiautomatic blowing or pressing; and also by, fourth, full-automatic pressing or blowing. In hand plants the principal cost is in highly skilled labor while in automatic machine production expensive machinery and wages of skilled operators and mechanics represent the principal cost of production.

The hand-made glassware industry is in much greater danger from low-cost foreign imports. In spite of this, I have no thought of eliminating foreign competition. I only oppose tariff reductions on hand-made glassware, when the nature and extent of the proposed reduction will make it difficult for an American glass plant to operate with a reasonable profit and to maintain current high wages which our labor is entitled to and now receives. All this industry asks is the opportunity of selling its products in a fair competitive market in which foreign glassware will not have an advantage due solely to the cheap labor by which it is produced.

The Congress must realize the seriousness of the situation when I point to the fact that hand-made glass and artware is only 4 percent of the total domestic production which has a value of $904,000,000. On the other hand, since there are no imports of window glass and plate glass, all of the competition is against hand-made articles, where the imports of $5,556,000 are 13 percent plus of our total domestic production for 1947. Due to our Army and ECA activities this percentage is sure to rise and by the end of the year will reach the prewar level when imports were 23 percent of the domestic production.

It is all the more apparent why these industries need protection when you compare the imports of table and kitchen glassware in 1937 with the imports of 1947. The real story of their plight is found in comparing the imports of 1947 with the first 10 months of 1948 when imports from Sweden, United Kingdom, Belgium, Germany, Czechoslovakia, Italy, and Japan show an alarming upward spiral. A total of 70 percent of all imports of this type of glass comes from Czechoslovakia, the United Kingdom, and Sweden.

Since such a large volume of hand-made glassware could be shipped into this country so soon after the war and during the third year after hostilities ceased, we surely must expect considerably more in the near future, when more normal conditions will exist abroad. I can see no reason why we should share our own domestic markets with central European countries, when, because of our necessarily higher prices we would be prohibited from recapturing elsewhere in the world market this lost domestic-market volume.

The glass-producing countries abroad have always built and expanded their industry for export and not for home consumption. Here in America we have seen a steady growth of the whole glass-producing industry in step with our steadily growing domestic economy. While we have had a greatly increased export business during the recent war years, this can only be of a temporary nature. Particularly exports of hand-made glassware will soon shrink to insignificant low levels as soon as our very limited export markets can be loaded with cheaper products from European factories. Up until now, shipping facilities all over the world have been far from normal. However, steady improvements are being made and to the same extent to which they are made possible, our export volume is shrinking.

The war-torn countries of Europe as well as many other countries in this world which were isolated by the war, are in great need of all kinds of glassware. In some cases glass items are actually so scarce that an emergency exists. It is reasonable to conclude that in these places an abundant market exists for all foreign glass producers. Any increase in volume of their production, by all good reasoning, should go there, and not to the United States of America. It would be well if these countries would lower or even drop their import tariffs in order to attract glass imports.

For the same reason, it is not logical to divert the foreign trade in glassware from those who actually need it, toward our highly competitive markets in America by lowered tariffs and all kinds of special trade agreements. To help with every means at hand to expand the glass industry in Czechoslovakia, Sweden, and many other countries at the expense of our own prosperity is quite illogical to me. With importations at present high levels, foreign credit balances are enabling our competitors abroad to purchase glassmaking machinery and other glass plant equipment which they so urgently need. This in turn will surely make them more competitive than ever before, and only shorten our own chances of survival in an already highly endangered situation.

I cannot agree to a policy of selling out, nor relinquishing our chances to progress, to expand and contribute to the prosperity and future of America. Our State Department officials, who are soon to begin negotiating in Geneva, should most certainly be made aware of the fact that they are about to ruin the future of the handcraft industries in America, if they insist on further lowering tariff rates, and particularly do we desire to have them impressed with the fact that any reduction in tariff rates on hand-made glass items will shortly cause our industry to be face to face with oblivion.

We here in America with our high standard of living, high wages and favorable working conditions can not meet this "cut-throat" competition. Our hourly wage rate in the United States averages $1.42; the rate in Belgium is 31 cents; in France it is 33 cents; in Czechoslovakia, 20 cents; in occupied Germany it is 35 cents; in Japan it is 7 to 10 cents; in the United Kingdom it is 52 cents, and in Italy 24 cents.

So that I might give the Congress a true picture of what faces this particular industry, I have secured from my own personal representative in the area affected some startling facts. Here they are, taken from his communication to me:

You asked me about the condition of the number of plants in your district. It follows:

West Virginia Glass Specialty Co., Weston, W. Va.: Running full but very little backlog and scraping the barrel for new business.

Louie Glass Co., Weston, W. Va.: Opened last Monday, having been closed for 3 weeks because of no backlog or new orders.

Weston Glass Co., Weston, W. Va. Closed.

Lewis County Glass Co., Jane Lew, W. Va.: Opened last Monday after 2 weeks' lay-off because of no orders, and they report no backlog.

C. A. Borchert Glass Co., Weston, W. Va.: Running part time for lack of orders.

Colonial Glass Co., Weston, W. Va.: Running part time.

Mountaineer Glass Co., Weston, W. Va.: Running part time.

Ludwik Glass Co., Glenville, W. Va.: Opened last Monday after a 3-week shut-down because of no orders.

McBride Glass Co., Salem, W. Va.: Closed, no orders.

Mid-Atlantic Glass Co., Ellenboro, W. Va.: Closed, no orders.

Pennsboro Glass Co., Pennsboro, W. Va.: Running slow, part time. No orders.

Reports for other localities in West Virginia and Ohio are that business is very poor. Huntington Glass Co., at Kenova, W. Va., is closed.

On Tuesday of last week I contacted the chief of the United States Employment Service who has offices in the city of Clarksburg. He advised that his unemployed rolls are mounting. More than 2,000 men have been added in the past 30 days. These figures do not include the city of Weston, where hundreds more are idle. In one small town of 2,500 population, where a plant recently closed, 225 men have applied for work.

These startling facts force one to wonder whether now or in future years our Congress would be justified in legalizing reciprocal trade relations with nations in which the living standards, hours and wages and working conditions are so much at variance with the standards we have set up in America.

There now exist four active trade agreements in which the tariff rates on hand-made glassware have been reduced. They are the trade agreement with Sweden, made on August 5, 1935, in which the tariff on glass having a value of $4 or more in the country of origin was cut from 60 to 30 percent; the United Kingdom trade agreement, effective January 1, 1939, in which table and ornamental glassware, cut or engraved, having a value of $1 or more in country of origin, was cut from 60 ad valorem to 45 percent; the Mexican trade agreement, effective January 30, 1943, in which the tariff rate was cut from 60 to 30 percent; and the Geneva agreement of September 1947, which authorized the several reciprocal rates now in effect.

We now face the strong possibility that the glassware industry will suffer even more in the proposed Geneva Conference which is to convene in April of this year. Several of the 13 nations who will attend this conference are asking for further concessions which, if granted, will apply not only to the 13 nations attending the proposed conference, but under the "favored nations clause" the

same reduction would automatically apply to the 21 nations that participated in the original Geneva agreement of 1947. This would include all of the major nations now importing hand-made glass, table, and ornamental ware into the United States.

When I appeared before the House as a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1945, pleading the cause of the hand-glass industry, you were kind enough to protect this industry to the extent that all future reciprocal negotiations affecting imports of hand-made glass from Czechoslovakia were to be predicated on the import duty schedules as contained in the original Hawley-Smoot Act of 1930 and not on the schedules as they appeared in the several Reciprocal Trade Agreements Acts between 1930 and 1945. I sincerely hope that this Congress, in justice to this much harassed industry, will write similar safeguards against the importation of hand-made glassware and decorated-ware articles, not only from Czechoslovakia but from any other nation importing this type of ware that is a participant in any reciprocal agreement. An import quota on a percentage basis is indicated.

POTTERY, TABLEWARE, AND CHINA

Pottery, table, and kitchen articles, used in preparing, serving, and storing food and drink, fall roughly into two groups: Opaque pottery known as earthenware, and translucent pottery known as chinaware. Chinaware is of two types, hotel china and household china. Before the war practically the entire hotel china market in this country was supplied by domestic production, but nearly all the household china was imported. The bulk of the household earthenware consumed in the United States was produced here. Although earthenware imports were substantial, the greater volume of competition with domestic earthenware came from imported chinaware, especially the cheap chinaware imported from Japan. In the 1920's, taking all types and grades together, imports came chiefly from Germany and other central European countries; in the 1930's chiefly from Japan. In both decades, the United Kingdom was the principal source of imports of the expensive grades of household china and earthenware.

Pottery production is technically more efficient—that is, owing to the use of improved mechanical equipment, fewer over-all man-hours are required per unit produced—in the United States than in any other country, although in all countries such efficiency has increased in recent years. So far as costs are concerned, however, the greater efficiency in the United States has continued to be more than offset by the lower wages in the pottery industries in foreign countries.

In 1930 domestic production of household chinaware, porcelain, table, and kitchenware was 160,000 dozen. The *estimated* 1948 production, based on the first 11 months is 880,000 dozen and for the same year, 1948, estimated imports are 1,768,000 dozen. The domestic production for 1948 has a total value of $9,800,000, while the foreign value of all imports is $6,245,000, which when measured on the American standard of money value would be approximately $12,500,000. Here we face the shocking fact that the value of the imports, measured in American dollars, exceeds the value of all domestic production.

I am particularly alarmed, and this Congress should be alarmed, by the mounting imports of pottery and chinaware products from both Germany and Japan. The Congress will recall my earlier reference to the activities of the Army in rehabilitating and rebuilding Germany and Japan's pottery plants. This action accounts in a large measure for the sudden tripling and quadrupling of imports in recent months. In 1947 Germany imported 118,468 dozen pieces, worth $370,967. For the first 11 months of 1948 Germany imported 427,888 dozen, worth $1,592,708. In 1947 Japan imported 240,994 dozen, worth $414,303 and in the first 11 months of 1948 her imports had skyrocketed to 915,054 dozen, worth $1,755,836. As proof of the statement that most of this dangerous competition is coming from the occupied areas of Germany and Japan, let me call attention to the importations from the United Kingdom which were 182,516 dozen in 1947 and 221,000 dozen for 1948.

Total importations of china dinnerware in 1946 amounted to 203,000 dozen pieces, valued at approximately $1,600,000. In 1947 total imports amounted to 592,000 dozen pieces, valued at $3,200,000. This is up over 100 percent.

In earthenware tableware 1946 imports amounted to 930,000 dozen pieces, valued at $3,000,000; and in 1947 1,175,000 dozen pieces, valued at $4,300,000.

To show the rate of increase during the past year, we find that in the month of October 1947 total imports of china dinnerware amounted to 70,000 dozen and in October 1948 they amounted to 200,000 dozen pieces.

Regarding imports from Japan in comparative periods, we find that during the year 1946 Japan exported to us 67 dozen of decorated china dinnerware. In 1947 she exported to us 214,000 dozen of the same item. In the month of October 1947 Japan exported to us no decorated household earthenware, but in October of 1948 the figure amounted to 28,000 dozen.

Germany's exports to us of china tableware in 1946 were 241 dozen. In 1947 the figure was 131,000 dozen.

In 1937, before there were any restrictions on trade with Japan, she was importing into this country 86 percent of all the dinnerware of all kinds that came to us from all foreign countries. This amounted to close to 40 percent of all the dinnerware that was sold in this country, both domestic and foreign. The prices on the Japanese competing products in our industry were, in many cases, at that time less than one-half of the factory cost for producing comparable articles in American factories. This, you will note, was under the tariff rate of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill of 1930 and before any reductions were made under the recriprocal trading program. The rates that were then in effect have been substantially decreased on certain types of both china and earthenware dinnerware in our trading treaties with Great Britain, Mexico, and Czechoslovakia and under the favored-nations clause Japan would be accorded the same consideration as all countries who were parties to the 1947 Geneva Conference. What future has this industry if Japan is given further advantage under the favored nations clause at Geneva?

I have in my files numerous telegrams and letters from both industry and labor protesting any action that will further endanger their livelihood, and of the estimated 20,000 workers in the pottery industry, based on statistics for 1948, more than 1,000 of these workmen are employed in one of the largest plants located in my home city of Clarksburg.

I submit that when the percentages of imports in any one industry from any one country vary from 300 percent to 400 percent in a space of 2 years, no domestic industry can meet such competition. The protection afforded this industry in the original Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930—an ad valorem duty of 60 percent—is meager enough and I suggest that this Congress take steps to stabilize rather than to confuse the economic future of these 20,000 workmen. Again an import quota is indicated.

I feel I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to call to the attention of the Congress the growing practice of industrial concerns in this country setting up similar plants abroad for the purpose of getting advantage of lower wage rates and less working restrictions. Many of the finished products of these foreign-owned plants are being imported into the United States and sold in competition with similar American goods and at a lower price. Reciprocal relations on such products should be forbidden regardless of the nation of origin.

In face of the unwarranted action of our War Department in diverting large amounts of its regularly appropriated funds for administration and national defense to the building and rehabilitating of foreign industrial plants, this Congress cannot avoid taking cognizance of the effect on American industries making articles on the reciprocal lists. Neither can the Congress afford to recommend legislation that will legalize trading with the enemy in this cold war between our economy and that of the nations that only last week were collaborating in an effort to destroy our Marshall-plan efforts in western and central Europe.

The avowed course of our Department of State at the approaching Geneva Conference will certainly and only result in the immediate displacement and ultimate unemployment of tens of thousands of America's most highly skilled artisans and craftsmen. Glass, china, kitchenware, clothespins, pottery are but a few of the product classifications slated for possible tariff-rate reductions in Geneva. Truly the matter we here discuss today is a far-reaching and most important one.

The industries I desire to protect are helpless. They have failed to secure State Department assurances that they would not be harmed in the coming

Geneva negotiations. I am hopeful that your interest, courtesy, and attention today is evidence of our intention to try to help them. Their very future is in your care. They ask only justice, not charity. I fear that easier and "cheaper" access to our markets can mean only economic ruin to industry and insecurity to the thousands of workmen that will be affected.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is in favor of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program, as I understand it. It is my understanding that he is up here to get a little special protection for the pottery interests and the chinaware interests in his territory. The matter of the employees is incidental. Generally the country is not of sufficient importance to the gentleman that he is able to go along with a program as envisaged by his party and as presented by the President of the United States.

Mr. BAILEY. I have not stated I was for the program. I did vote for the previous reciprocal trade treaties program.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman in the hearings stated he was for the program generally but insofar as his particular area was concerned he wants something special. I therefore placed him in the category of the special pleader for that reason.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to say also at this time that the first escape clause written in any agreement prior to 1945 was written in a half-hearted manner in the Mexican agreement, the last one drawn prior to the action taken by this Congress in 1945.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the consideration of this bill, I desire to call attention to the fact that the importation of foreign oil is becoming a matter of serious concern to Oklahoma and the oil industry. I am advised that foreign oil imports have increased 150 percent in the last year and that this oil is coming in at the rate of 600,000 barrels daily at the present time.

I also am advised that the surface storage of oil has increased 105,000,000 barrels during the last year and has now reached a point where additional storage is not available.

As a result of this situation, the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, in an order issued in January, curtailed the production of oil in Oklahoma by 40,000 barrels daily. Further curtailment will be necessary if the present rate of foreign importations is continued.

This not only works a hardship upon the oil industry but is beginning to threaten a large portion of the tax structure of the State of Oklahoma. For instance, on the basis of the present price of oil, the January curtailment order caused a loss of about $5,000 a day in Oklahoma tax revenues from its oil production.

Supporting this statement, I have a resolution passed unanimously by the Oklahoma Legislature, which is now in session, and dated January 31. I also have a copy of a resolution passed by the Oklahoma Corporation Commission on January 26 setting out the same facts.

I think it important these facts not only be called to the attention of the department controlling oil imports, but that Congress ought to take them into consideration with a view of limiting such imports to a point where they do not upset or harm one of America's most vital and important industries, and one without which we cannot have national defense.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting since noontime to get in my 2 cents' worth, so I would like to make a few remarks at this time.

I am one of that group that was referred to several times today as "in favor of this bill but," and it has been insinuated that those members represent special interest. If you call representing the people with whom you were born and raised representing special interests, I do represent them. It is my duty and my responsibility as their Congressman to present their views regardless of party affiliation or the walk of life they may represent.

In the Second Congressional District of West Virginia which I represent are located several of the finest hand-made glass industries to be found in the United States. I, as well as many of my constituents believe that the present reciprocal trade bill will seriously impair and endanger their means of livelihood unless their situation is taken into consideration. Not for a moment would I oppose the assumption of world economic leadership by the United States; economic isolationism is dead, and intelligent assistance to our less fortunate sister democracies is in line with our own self-interest. Wisely administered foreign cooperation carries with it a commitment to purchase reasonable quantities of foreign merchandise. Trade is a two-way street and we cannot expect continuously to sell goods and to lend capital abroad unless we are prepared some day to accept payment in the form of people and services.

In my mind and my view that much is elementary economics and plain common sense.

Fear alone is not adequate justification for remedial action. When we fail to recognize those rights and to protect them we might as well say we are behind an iron curtain of our own as far as the rights of the people are concerned; and I am speaking primarily of Czechoslovakia. Continued trade with Czechoslovakia which is located behind the iron curtain now, as we call it, and that primarily is one of the factors that is endangering the hand-made glass industry in my district. With men and women now only on 60 percent of their time I think something should be done. At least I think the treaty with Czechoslovakia should be canceled.

Looked at from such an over-all point of view the problem seems simple. From such a distance imports are a vague concept and no difficulties appear.

But the problem becomes more complicated when we get closer to it. This is a big country which we live in and the interests of one section are quite different from the interests of other sections. Some of our industries are healthy and prosperous and quite able to take care of themselves in world markets without fear of, or favor from, Government. Others are less favorably situated and every so often find themselves imperiled by well-intentioned, but dangerous, acts on the part of Government officials.

Some of us, like myself, who happen to come from districts in which numbers of producers are not able to withstand unrestricted foreign competition find it more difficult than some of our colleagues who represent districts in which there is no such threat from competitive imports.

It so happens that in my district, in West Virginia, a leading industry is the making of hand-blown glassware, tableware and artware. In terms of the economy of the country as a whole this is a small and relatively high-cost, industry. To my constituents, however, its survival and prosperity means their daily existence.

Many years ago the skill of glass blowing was brought to this country from Bohemia. The skill has survived down to this day, notwithstanding severe and growing competition. The lower-priced products find it difficult to compete against the domestically machine-made glassware. The more expensive, decorated ware competes with imports from Sweden and Czechoslovakia.

The Department of State has included the high-priced ware for bargaining with Sweden next April. Such glassware is valued at $8 each abroad and is now dutiable at 30 percent. This is the glassware that retails for $25 or so per piece and represents only a small part of the total output. If it were all that we had to worry about I would not feel as alarmed as I do today.

What troubles me most is the action that has already been taken—at Geneva in 1947—when our delegates signed the so-called general agreement on tariffs and trade. For there the rate was reduced from 60 percent ad valorem to 50 cents per piece with a proviso that the rate is to be not less than 30 percent or more than 50 percent. At present prices the new rate is equal to about 35 percent.

American labor is high-priced labor. For that let us be thankful since it means that, by and large, we are more productive than other lands. It means that we get more real income for our work. I would not advocate that we do anything that would lower the wages of our glassworkers, who receive $1.42 per hour compared to those in Czechoslovakia, who receive about 20 cents per hour. In part, at least, the prevailing high wage rates in the United States are accounted for by large-scale production to satisfy large-scale markets, here and abroad.

We should not be dealing at all with any country that is dominated by Russia, inasmuch as they are not cooperating

with us and the money does not go to their working people but to build up the Russian military machine, which is certainly poor policy at the expense of our own people.

But what troubles the workers in my district is whether adequate care is being taken by the administration to make sure that in the cutting of tariff duties they will not be sacrificed unwittingly. The industries in my district have already experienced serious damage from the importation of Czechoslovakian glassware. They are now operating at about 60 percent of capacity. In my opinion this is due to the fact that the duty was cut on this product in Geneva in 1947.

Fear alone is not adequate justification for remedial action. When we fail to recognize those rights and to protect them we might as well say we are behind an iron curtain of our own as far as the rights of the people are concerned.

The national interest, of course, is all-important. But, gentlemen, we are still a democracy, and minorities, thank God, still have rights.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, due to an error, the supplemental statement of Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., did not get printed in the committee hearings. For that reason, I would like to extend it into the RECORD at this point.

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN JEWELED WATCH MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY ON THE BILL (H. R. 1211) TO EXTEND THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

This statement supplements the testimony of Mr. James G. Shennan, president of the Elgin National Watch Co., on behalf of the American manufacturers of jeweled watches—Elgin National Watch Co., Hamilton Watch Co., and the trustees of Waltham Watch Company—before the Ways and Means Committee of the United States House of Representatives on January 31, 1949, during the hearings on H. R. 1211 to extend the Trade Agreements Act.

The statement is filed to supply certain information not available to the witness at the time the testimony was given (transcript, p. 1083), and to correct certain inaccuracies in the brief filed, and the testimony given by the witnesses who appeared on behalf of the American Watch Assemblers' Association.

Mr. Shennan was asked to supply information as to the profits of the Elgin and Hamilton companies. The witness supplied the information for his own company, but did not have the comparable information for the Hamilton Co. The information is now available for both of these companies and the Waltham Co., combined, and is as follows:

| Year | Combined sales | Combined net profit | Percent of sales |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1940 | $25,857,000 | $2,724,000 | 10.53 |
| 1941 | 33,413,000 | 3,060,000 | 9.16 |
| 1946 | 39,902,000 | 1,950,000 | 4.89 |
| 1947 | 49,131,000 | 1,830,000 | 3.72 |

Mr. Shennan was also asked (transcript, pp. 1089–90) if the representatives of the United States at the forthcoming trade agreement negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland, next April could not "open up this matter of proper protection (tariff), including the inclusion of an escape clause for the watch agreement." In addition to the answer given by the witness at the hearing, it is desired to point out that Switzerland has not, as yet, become a party to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, and is not to be a party to the negotiations in April. Therefore, the Swiss trade agreement, and watches, will not be under review at that time.

The memorandum filed with the committee by the American Watch Assemblers' Association bases most of its argument on the assumption that the American jeweled watch manufacturers desire a quota. Actually, as stated to the committee by Mr. Shennan, the American manufacturers do not desire a quota, they desire only tariff rates which will afford them equality at the border. If this was granted to them, there would be absolutely no difference in the related economic activity which flows from the sale of watches in this country. All of that business, which the importers claim to create, would continue to remain here since the American-made movements require the same labor, the same material, the same services, as imported movements, to complete their manufacture and distribution. The real difference, and the one which is vital to the national defense, is that more facilities for the manufacture of movements, and more people trained in the skills required to make them, would be created and available in the event of another emergency; and it is timepiece movement manufacturing capacity which is essential to the national defense. Even the representatives of the assemblers' association who testified at the hearings conceded that neither they, nor any other industry in this country, could manufacture watches, and by watches they meant time measuring mechanisms.

In this connection it is significant to note that the representative of the Bulova Watch Co., who testified on behalf of the importers, stated that it took from 8 to 10 years before Bulova was able to get its plant at Woodside, Long Island, into production (transcript, p. 1344), and that it took 20 years to get it on a paying basis (transcript, p. 1346). He also stated that producing a watch is far different from producing other things (transcript, p. 1346). The other witness who testified on behalf of the importers stated that it was the intention of his company to manufacture movements in this country, and that they began setting up a pilot plant at Long Island a year ago which is ultimately to be moved to Cincinnati, where they now case their imported movements. But here again the difficulty of getting into movement manufacture is demonstrated by the fact that he also stated that they had not "as yet," after a year's time, made any movements in this country, not even in a pilot-plant operation, let alone on a production basis. This time element is the thing that is so vital to our national defense, and is the thing which gives us on whom the defense agencies are relying in the event of another war so much concern.

The spokesmen for the importers tried to minimize the significance of movement manufacturing in this country by asserting that the importers had also done a considerable amount of defense work during the last war. But in addition to conceding that they made no time measuring movements, only one item was specifically mentioned and that was "an electrical indication measuring instrument" (transcript, p. 1440). It was stated that instruments for ships, planes, and tanks were made by the importers but, aside from the above, no specification of them was given. A further statement was made to the effect that there was an adequate labor pool for defense work in the "watchmakers" being graduated from the various trade schools which could be readily converted to watch-movement manufacture. This completely ignores the fact that the manufacturing facilities are not available even if the statement were correct, and the statement itself is not correct. The training given to students in the watchmaking schools is to prepare them for the work done in the jewelry stores which maintain watch-repair departments. There is no training given in this country to prepare men in watch engineering, watch designing, watch machine building, watch tool and die making, watch manufacturing supervision, which are the critical skills.

The importance of American movement manufacturing facilities was also questioned by indicating that the American manufacturers of movements were all, to some extent, dependent on Swiss parts. With the single exception of jewel bearings the statement is simply not correct, and it should be remembered, jewel bearings were made by this industry during the last war. It is, therefore, not correct to say that the American manufacturers are in any sense dependent on the Swiss.

There was a sharp conflict with respect to the differential in the cost of making movements here, and importing Swiss-made movements. The committee was fortunate to have before it a representative of the Bulova Watch Co. who, although appearing on behalf of the assembler's association, is the treasurer of the one importer who also manufactures movements in this country. However, this witness would not indicate, even on a percentage basis, the difference in movement manufacturing costs between their American and Swiss plants and, as a matter of fact, claimed not to know, although he indicated, from a document on Swiss labor rates to which he made reference, that the top figure in Switzerland was about 60 cents an hour (transcript, p. 1343). If this is true, it more than supports the American industry's statement that the labor rate difference is about 2½ to 1. Nor was the testimony of the other witness for the importer much more specific on either of these points. Not having yet manufactured any movements in this country he was unable to say what his American costs would be, and on labor rates he indicated a 50–60 cents an hour differential (transcript, p. 1443). The schedule of wage rates in the Swiss watch industry is a matter of published information, and is available to anyone. This same witness readily conceded the importance of American movement manufacturing companies to the national defense (transcript, p. 1440). We call attention to this testimony to high light the necessity of determining the actual facts, particularly in view of the national defense importance of the American manufacturers, which is the reason we feel that this committee itself, through a subcommittee, should study the situation. We stand ready to submit audited production cost figures in confidence to such a subcommittee, as well as our labor rates.

In this connection, however, we wish to definitely clarify the assertion that Elgin's costs cannot be as high as was indicated by witnesses for the American manufacturers, because it sells watches at as low a price as $12 net (transcript, p. 1442). The reference was to a watch which retails at $29.75 and which the Elgin company actually sells for $15. It is a 15-jewel watch, whereas the testimony being commented upon related to 17 jewel, higher quality watches. Elgin has only two models at this price, one man's and one lady's, and is selling them at a low margin of profit in order to stay in the low-price category. This is the lowest-priced watch in the Elgin line.

One further comment on the testimony on behalf of the importers would appear to be in order. They blame the present financial difficulties of the Waltham Watch Co. entirely on bad past management. This has been the stock answer of the importers to the fact that there are so few remaining movement manufacturers in this country, and has been asserted time and again before this committee. Obviously, no one reason is the whole answer. Nevertheless, it is apparent to those of us who have actually

faced the importer's competitive advantage resulting from lower costs, that this factor is an important reason for the Waltham situation. Some one American company is always going to be the marginal producer, and the status of the industry now is such, from the national-defense considerations, that we cannot afford to lose the facilities of a single manufacturer.

May we reiterate that the American manufacturers of jeweled-watch movements are not suggesting any quota restrictions? We feel confident that with an equalization of cost factors this industry can successfully compete with the importers, which means that it can grow in an expanding economy. It is essential to the national defense that it do this, because it is presently not of sufficient size to meet the minimum requirements of a full-scale emergency. In view of its importance to the national defense, its present size and the competitive situation, and in view of the failure of the industry's efforts over the last 5 years to obtain relief from the agencies administering the trade-agreements program, it seems to us that the situation must be given study on the national policy level, and that this committee of the Congress is the only agency of the Government that is in a position to carefully investigate all phases of the problem.

This is not simply a matter of whether one or two or more business concerns in this country shall remain commercially vigorous. It is that consideration, plus the building of a highly essential defense facility. This is the aspect of the problem which we emphasized in the statement we made at the hearings. It is the aspect of the problem which we feel not only justifies, but necessitates, an investigation of the matter by a congressional committee. It is the reason why we have suggested a special subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee to give it attention.

Respectfully submitted on behalf of:

ELGIN NATIONAL WATCH CO.,
HAMILTON WATCH CO.,
WALTHAM WATCH CO.,
By JAMES G. SHENNAN,
*President Elgin National Watch Co.*

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, there appear to be no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949."

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

## MANUFACTURE OF COTTON TEXTILES IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, South Carolina, my State, has long since been recognized as the leader of the Nation in the manufacture of cotton textiles. I call your attention to the following newspaper article appearing in the Greenville News on February 7, 1949, from which you will observe South Carolina is also the leader in the consumption and manufacture of other fibers in the textile industry.

In South Carolina we manufacture every kind of textiles—from the most delicate and beautiful patterns of fine dress goods used to make women's garments to heavy woolen materials used for the manufacture of men's suits as well as duck and tarpaulin of unparalleled strength and durability. Time will not permit me to enumerate the thousands of types of textiles we manufacture.

STATE'S SPINDLES TOP NATION IN CONSUMING OTHER FIBERS—DOMINANT POSITION AS COTTON TEXTILE STATE INCREASED

COLUMBIA, February 6.—South Carolina is the Nation's leader in the consumption of fibers other than cotton on cotton-system spindles, Director H. W. Bishop, of the State research, planning, and development board, revealed today.

"The fact that the State's cotton-system spindles and its textile employees have sufficient versatility to produce other yarns is a highly important factor in diversifying textiles," he noted, and added:

"Management has been able to modernize and improve equipment in order to produce yarns without any loss in training new employees.

"Federal Department of Commerce figures for December showed that South Carolina had 498,000 of the entire country's 1,267,000 cotton-system spindles consuming materials other than cotton.

"The State had 39.3 percent of the Nation's total and 9 percent of all the cotton-system spindles in the State were consuming other fibers.

"The high productivity of South Carolina textile employees further is demonstrated by the fact that the State had 42.2 percent of the total spindle-hours for 1948 of cotton-system spindles working on other fibers."

Bishop said the Federal figure showed North Carolina ranked second with 319,000 spindles, followed by the combined New England States with 267,000 and Georgia with 91,000.

"A recent compilation of Federal figures showed South Carolina increased its dominant position as the No. 1 cotton-textile State with 28.39 percent of the Nation's active spindle-hours in 1948," Bishop recalled.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SANBORN (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. JENSEN (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. REED of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include a statement and two newspaper articles.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

## SPECIAL ORDER VACATED

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to cancel the special order that I had for today, which has been taken care of through an extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was objection.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SECREST (at the request of Mr. YOUNG), on account of burial in Ohio of his brother, who lost his life in action overseas in the war and whose body was transported home for final burial.

To Mr. TEAGUE, for 2 days, on account of attending a funeral in Texas.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject the Reciprocal Trade Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## AMERICAN JOINT COMMISSION TO ASSIST IN THE UNIFICATION OF IRELAND

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress I introduced a resolution to provide for the creation of an American Joint Commission to assist in the unification of Ireland. Because of the pressure of other problems it was not possible for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs to give consideration to my resolution. I have therefore again introduced this resolution, which is House Joint Resolution 59 and is now before the House committee, where I hope that hearings will be given and careful consideration devoted to this vital issue, which today clouds the horizon of good will between the peoples of Ireland and Great Britain.

Under the terms of House Joint Resolution 59, the President would be authorized to appoint a commission of 10 members, to be known as the American Joint Commission. This Commission would be authorized to consult with the British Government and its representatives to consider and to recommend an immediate and final settlement of the Irish question leading to the abolition of the border between the north and south of Ireland, and to sign such settlement in behalf of the people of the United States. By the establishment of such a commission, this country would be offering its services to act as a mediator between the Irish and the British in an effort to terminate the arbitrary and useless border which has been imposed upon the Irish countryside and which has served to divide Ireland into two separate countries, when in fact it is and can be only one nation, and served likewise to divide the Irish people and engender bitterness between the Irish and the British nations.

Throughout all Ireland today the demand for the removal of the northern border is constantly growing stronger and stronger. This sentiment in behalf of the unification of all Ireland cannot be ignored. The restoration of the six counties of the north to the bosom of the Irish nation cannot be impeded by propaganda nor prevented by edicts emanating from Sir Basil Brooke or his puppet Government of Northern Ireland. Not even the holding of special elections on February 10 in northern Ireland will in any way slow the demand of the Irish people that their entire country be united once again as a free and independent nation.

The elections in northern Ireland only serve to call the attention of the world to the nefarious scheming by which the Government in the six counties of the north is maintained. The sentiment of the people in the six counties is divided between those who desire union with Britain and those who desire the national unity of all Ireland. By an elaborate system of gerrymandering the boundaries of parliamentary districts, voters favoring British union are given a majority of the seats in the Stormont Parliament. Districts favoring union with all Ireland, in many cases, contain twice as many voters as do adjoining districts which favor British union. In the southwestern corner of northern Ireland, for example, the county of Fermanagh is divided into three parliamentary districts, two of which are partitionist in sentiment and the other antipartitionist. The county as a whole opposes partition by over 5,000 votes, but these votes are all enclosed within one heavily populated district, which votes antipartition by 9,000 votes. The other 2 districts scrape through with about 1,200 and 800 partitionist majorities. The result is that in elections one-half the population of the county elects two British-union candidates, while the other half of the population can only elect one Irish-nationalist member. Thus, here, as elsewhere in the northern six counties, two unionist votes are equal to one Nationalist vote.

In the current elections, hastily called by Sir Basil Brooke in an effort to silence the growing popular demand for unification of Ireland, not only is this system of gerrymandering of districts being employed, but also a 3-year register of voters will be in effect. As a result, those voters who have come of age during the past 3 years will be denied an opportunity to vote, as well as many others, who by change of residence or similar reason, have had their names dropped from the old register. Within 6 weeks after the holding of this election, the new register will become effective, and it is to avoid the possibility that the new register might affect the results in the old gerrymandered districts that this election is being rushed through. Evidently it would not require any very large change of residence on the part of the voters within the three parliamentary districts of Fermanagh County to completely change the results of an election there. The same situation holds forth in Derry City, in Tyrone County and elsewhere.

Throughout Irish history heroic patriots have frequently chosen death or imprisonment rather than submit to loss of their liberty or to foreign domination of their land. That spirit is not dead within the Irish. It never will die. The undemocratic processes of the present elections in Northern Ireland could well become the occasion to enkindle the flame of ardent patriotism within so many Irish hearts as to light the torch of riot and rebellion against the domination of the present government there and against the British subsidization of that government.

It is because this situation exists in Ireland today and will continue to exist as a threat to world peace until the only Irish border is the entire coastline along the sea that I have offered my resolution before this body. The democratic nations of the West cannot long tolerate the existence in their midst of any nation or part of a nation, however small, subject to the outside domination and control of a foreign country. The right of Ireland to freedom and self-determination is just as vital on the international scene as are the rights of Indonesia, of Israel or any other nation. It is in an effort to protect those rights and to eliminate the Irish question at least, that I have offered my resolution.

This Congress is in a position to take the first step in bringing about a new era of friendship and good will between the British and the Irish peoples. With each step won by the Irish in their march toward freedom, the ancient antagonisms and animosities toward Britain have been lessened and to a great extent eliminated. The northern border is the last vital barrier to a complete and full understanding between these two great races. By the passage of my resolution, we will make it possible for Great Britain to enter into negotiations for the elimination of this border in a dignified and gracious manner. The voluntary action of Great Britain, which the passage of my resolution will instigate, will tremendously strengthen the good will between Ireland and Great Britain. On the other hand, should this situation be much longer ignored, then we can anticipate that efforts will be made to force the elimination of the partition of Ireland, and as always, the use of force will leave in its wake a feeling of bitterness and ill-will. So in the interest of international good will and the peaceful arbitration of disputes, I urge the prompt consideration of my resolution both by the Committee of Foreign Affairs as well as by the House itself.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 9, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

186. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

187. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Thirteenth Annual Report of the National Labor Relations Board, for the year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

188. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a uniform code of military justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

189. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project; to the Committee on Public Lands.

190. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provisions with respect to the participation of the United States in such organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

191. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system in view of the increased cost of living; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

192. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting revised estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 involving a decrease of $1,139,440 for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 60); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

---

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 54. A bill to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commis-

sion; without amendment (Rept. No. 31). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 164. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the Churntown Elementary School District, California; without amendment (Rept. No. 32). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1401. A bill relating to the disposition of certain recreational demonstration project lands by the State of Michigan to the Mount Hope Cemetery Association of Waterloo, Mich.; without amendment (Rept. No. 33). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1998. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, 80th Cong.), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein; without amendment (Rept. No. 34). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 1997. A bill to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 35). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

---

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2477. A bill to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2478. A bill to amend the act providing for the appointment of court reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2479. A bill to provide automobiles for veterans of World War I who are entitled to compensation for the loss of use of one or both legs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEGRAFFENRIED:

H. R. 2480. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to pay service charges for cashing veterans' checks; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2481. A bill to terminate certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2482. A bill to amend title II of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2483. A bill to provide retirement annuities for retired fourth-class postmasters with 30 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 2484. A bill to authorize grants to Ferry and Okanogan Counties, Wash., in lieu of taxes on certain lands restored to tribal ownership; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H. R. 2485. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2486. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Air Force Reserve Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2487. A bill to create a medal to be known as the Army Reserve Medal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENSEN:

H. R. 2488. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2489. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 2490. A bill to amend subparagraphs (k) and (l) of paragraph II, part 1, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide increased compensation for certain specific disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2491. A bill to provide salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2492. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McKINNON:

H. R. 2493. A bill to provide equal treatment to disabled enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard on parity with existing law pertaining to disabled enlisted men of the Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 2494. A bill to permit the prospecting, development, mining, removal, and utilization of the mineral resources within the national forests and all public lands withdrawn for power development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

My Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2495. A bill to provide salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2496. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2497. A bill to provide veterans' hospital construction at Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich., and to authorize appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2498. A bill to unify, consolidate, revise, and codify the Articles of War, the Articles for the Government of the Navy, and the disciplinary laws of the Coast Guard and to enact and establish a Uniform Code of Military Justice; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2499. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of a proposed extension of the New Iberia Commercial Canal; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2500. A bill to amend section 9 of the Farmers Home Administration Act of 1946; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2501. A bill authorizing and directing the United States Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of the Interior to undertake a continuing study of the shad, alosa sapidissima, of the Atlantic coast with respect to the biology, propagation, and abundance of such species to the end that such Service may recommend to the several States of the Atlantic coast through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission appropriate measures for arresting the decline of this valuable food fish and for increasing the abundance and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 2502. A bill appropriating to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service the sum of $75,000 for a continuing study of shad, alosa sapidissima, of the Atlantic coast, with respect to the biology, propagation, and abundance of such species to the end that such Service may recommend to the several States of the Atlantic coast through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission appropriate measures for arresting the decline of this valuable food fish and for increasing the abundance and promoting the wisest utilization thereof; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LANE (by request):

H. R. 2503. A bill to limit working hours of Government employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2504. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2505. A bill to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Maryland:

H. R. 2506. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Snow Hill, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2507. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Princess Anne, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2508. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Federalsburg, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2509. A bill to authorize the purchase of a new post-office site at Berlin, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PICKETT (by request):

H. R. 2510. A bill to provide retirement annuities for certain former rural letter carriers; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2511. A bill to restore the rights of vessels engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States to pass through the Panama Canal without payment of toll; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2512. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of Illinois:

H. R. 2513. A bill to amend subdivisions d and e of section 58 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2514. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. R. 2515. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the city and county of San Francisco; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2516. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2517. A bill directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to Palm Beach County, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 2518. A bill to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act to provide adjusted compensation for provisional, probationary, and temporary officers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2519. A bill relating to the use and occupation of certain lands acquired by the United States in connection with flood-control projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 2520. A bill to amend subsection 602 (j) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 2521. A bill to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by establishing a publicly supported labor extension program for wage and salary earners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2522. A bill to increase the compensation of all postal and classified employees of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2523. A bill to provide relief for veterans erroneously required to reimburse the United States for overpayment on their adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2524. A bill to provide a program of assistance for the expansion and construction of dental colleges in the several States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 2525. A bill to provide for dental education and assistance; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FORD:

H. R. 2526. A bill to provide Federal hospital construction at Detroit and Grand Rapids, Mich., and to authorize appropriations therefor; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2529. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WERDEL:

H. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORSKI of Illinois:

H. J. Res. 154. Joint resolution to provide for the extension of patents whenever the use of the same has been prevented by war or other causes and providing for the extension of patents for persons who serve in the military or naval forces of the United States during the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that the issues raised by the action of the Government of Hungary in trying and sentencing Josef Cardinal Mindszenty should be referred to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution to protest the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinatz of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. Res. 85. Resolution to sever diplomatic relations with the Government of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Kansas:

H. Res. 86. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the Missouri Basin; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. Res. 87. Resolution protesting the prosecuting of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Res. 88. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by rule XI (h) (1) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. Res. 89. Resolution requesting the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prepare a revised edition of pages 1 to 369 of House Document No. 106, Seventy-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Public Works.

---

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their House Concurrent Resolution 4, asking not to federalize the practice of medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of Assembly Joint Resolutions 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, and 15 adopted by the California Legislature during January 1949; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolutions 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, and 17 adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to the Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southern Montana and requesting that funds be made available immediately for its construction; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to Legislative Resolution 9, requesting that the Commissioner of Public Roads in charge of the Federal-aid road fund increase the allotments to Nebraska for the purpose of improving and maintaining roads in Thurston County; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to their House Joint Resolution 2, ratifying a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of the office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Enrolled Joint Memorial 1, asking for the passage of legislation appropriating money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to renaming of various dams in the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works.

---

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2527. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Forrest J. McDermott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Costas Zavou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 2530. A bill for the relief of James R. Frazer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Elza Friedrych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (by request):

H. R. 2532. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Peter You Lo Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2533. A bill for the relief of Commander Edward White Rawlins, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. R. 2534. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Gary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

---

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

50. By the SPEAKER: Petition of shop 91, Local 19, UOPWA, CIO, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to repealing the Taft-Hartley Act immediately and restoring the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

51. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of citizens of Harper, Iowa, urging the inclusion in the Federal aid to education bill of health and welfare services for non-public-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

52. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William Heller, president, Air Line Pilots Association of the Phillippines, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting Uncle Sam's stand in the case of three United States civilian citizen pilots being held in prison in the Indonesian area; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

53. Also, petition of James W. Mockler, acting city clerk, city of Buffalo, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to asking the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

54. By Mr. HART: Memorial proposed by Mayor Frank H. Eggers, of Jersey City, and adopted by the board of commissioners of that city, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution pending in Congress at present time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

55. Also, petition of members of Capt. Clinton E. Fisk Post, No. 132, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Jersey City, N. J., urging that the Members of Congress enact legislation to prevent the displaced persons of Europe from coming to this country to make their homes for a period of not less than 10 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Most Holy God of our salvation, for the glory of Thy name, purge away our sins and endow us with a chastened sense of the liberties of all men.

These are times which try men's souls; minds are perplexed and hearts are sad and heavy. A consecrated servant of a great church has been outrageously judged in the name of a godless state. O bore into the ruthless minds of the leaders the deathless truth, that a nation that sows to the wind shall reap to the whirlwind, and whatsoever it sows, that shall it also reap. Teach them that right, and not might, that Christ, and not Caesar, speaks the final word by which nations live. O continue to work Thy great purpose, and Thine shall be the praise. In the name of a merciful and just Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 128. An act to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 15. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926;

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace;

S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens;

S. 29. An act to authorize payments of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies;

S. 32. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic;

S. 77. An act to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69);

S. 90. An act to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim;

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes;

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander;

S. 307. An act for the relief of Engebert Axer;

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui;

S. 331. An act for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old);

S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon;

S. 372. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital;

S. 460. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.;

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel;

S. 492. An act to amend the act approved June 29, 1948, entitled "An act to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Alexandria, Va.";

S. 548. An act to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes;

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes;

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to the commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy;

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Navy Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments;

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes;

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; and

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. NEELY and Mr. HUMPHREY as members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations.

## ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement. Those committees that have consent to sit during the sessions of the House during general debate are not supposed to sit this afternoon, and they have no authority to do so; so I trust that all chairmen of committees will take notice.

## FEDERATION OF EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of talk about a proposed federation of western Europe. There will be some action taken, I presume, very shortly upon the proposed North Atlantic Pact. It is my belief that if we are going to have a federation of Europe—and I think we should—the component parts of that federation should be strong. I am, therefore, today introducing a concurrent resolution in order to encourage the development of a peaceful and prosperous order in Ireland, but with no intention of imposing any particular form of political or economic association upon its people. Under this resolution it will be resolved by the House of Representatives—the Senate concurring—that the Congress favors the political federation of northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. There is no reason why this vexing problem of partition should not be solved so that the Irish Nation can once again become united to the end that Ireland, as a full-fledged republic, can again take its rightful position among the family of nations.

## FARM ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton-acreage allotments for any subsequent year, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, PACE, POAGE, HOPE, and AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

## COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 80) from the Committee on Armed Services, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary for National Defense is hereby requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the House of Representatives at such time as may be convenient prior to the adjournment of the present session of Congress such factual information as may be definitely available showing administrative action on the program of preparedness for national defense.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL]. Since a letter from the Secretary contains the information called for in the resolution, and that information has already been sent to the gentleman from New York, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 313) to amend title 26, United States Code, so as to make the provisions thereof applicable to service personnel, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TEAGUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous material.

Mr. GRANAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include a letter to the Secretary of State from the Catholic War Veterans, protesting against the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter and a resolution from the water project authority of the State of California.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a very fine editorial from the Cincinnati Post entitled "Trial by Error," and also a very fine editorial from the same newspaper entitled "Our Norwegian Ally."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to register my personal disapproval and indignation at the sham trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary. He is a true man of God, a devout Christian whose only crime has been to preach the religion of Jesus Christ, and he faces life imprisonment only because the tenets of Christianity are incompatible with communism. I wish to publicly state that in my opinion his imprisonment will be an indelible blot on the record of his country and a challenge to Christians everywhere.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Congress, I also want to raise my voice in protest at the infamous and outrageous trial that was just held in Hungary and the conviction and sentence of Cardinal Mindszenty. This trial was a travesty on justice, involving a high dignitary of the church. It is not so much that it happened to be a high dignitary of the Catholic Church, because today it is Cardinal Mindszenty and tomorrow it may be a high dignitary of some other Christian denomination. Certainly this is a challenge to the Christian world. We as Christians should accept this challenge and raise the torch and carry it forward in our fight to eradicate these Godless men who have just completed this outrageous trial. Let us stand up and fight these ungodly forces who are trying to destroy Christianity throughout the world.

I am appending two articles from newspapers of my home city of Buffalo bearing on this very important question:

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express of February 8, 1949]

COMMUNIST "JUSTICE"

Technically, Cardinal Mindszenty is awaiting the verdict of the Budapest "people's court" trying him on a charge of treason. Actually he is awaiting sentence. A verdict of "guilty" was determined by Hungary's Communist masters before the cardinal's trial began. The only question now is whether a death sentence or one of imprisonment is to be imposed. The choice between the two penalties will be made entirely on political and propaganda grounds, of course, without regard for principles of justice.

There has been much speculation as to how the cardinal's captors induced him to make certain statements at his trial which conflict with his pretrial utterances. There are suggestions of torture, drugging, and even of hypnotism. Whatever the explanation, there is nothing new about "confessions" in Communist-dominated courts. Going back to the first persecution of an internationally famous church leader in the Communist "courts"—that of Patriarch Tikhon, of the Russian Orthodox Church, in 1922 and 1923—we find some parallels with the Mindszenty case.

Because Tikhon had resisted Soviet attacks on the Orthodox Church in particular and on religion in general, he and a number of his clergy were brought to trial on charges of refusing to turn over church property for famine relief. Two archbishops and a number of priests were condemned to death, but Tikhon's trial was postponed. He was brought before a Communist-dominated "conclave," however, at which he was "unfrocked" and "expelled" from the church—but he denied the "conclave's" authenticity and continued to function as Orthodox primate of Russia. Later Tikhon was temporarily released and was quoted officially as making a proposal for Orthodox compromise with the Soviet government—a proposal completely in conflict with his earlier public pronouncements and policies. Then Tikhon's name disappeared from Russian dispatches until announcement of his death (presumably in imprisonment) in 1925. The circumstances surrounding his death never have been cleared up.

A more recent instance of Communist jurisprudence can be found in the purge trials of the old Bolsheviks a dozen years ago.

Among the prominent Communist leaders on trial were men with long and eminent records in overthrowing the old Czarist regime and then in establishing the Soviet system. There also was Marshal Tukhachevsky, once second in command of the Red army.

Most of these old Bolsheviks had been followers of Trotzky, who had been exiled and was later to be assassinated in Mexico. Trotzky was still attacking Stalin for compromising on the simon-pure gospel as handed down by Karl Marx and Lenin, and the outside world suspected strongly that Stalin was simply purging domestic opponents to solidify his position.

The charge was conspiracy with a foreign nation, which meant Nazi Germany. Yet in 1939 Stalin was to sign a treaty of alliance with that same Nazi Germany.

The accused admitted on the witness stand the complete truth of the charges against them—upbraided themselves as arrant traitors to Russia and to the working class of the world—insisted they were confessing voluntarily. Still the world wondered.

For one thing, their whole careers and their innermost convictions made it out of character for the accused to line up on the side of Hitlerism (several were of Jewish extraction). For another thing, the Soviet government was quite capable of inflicting excruciating torture and reprisals on families of the accused men.

---

[From the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of February 8, 1949]

THE INQUISITION AT BUDAPEST

The Communist People's Court at Budapest has pronounced the sentence of life imprisonment on Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary; in doing so it was simply echoing the decree of the high command at Moscow. From first to last, the issue was decided there. No one can doubt that it was at the instance of the Kremlin that the cardinal was arrested, tried, and convicted; that by the Kremlin his fate was determined. But one may believe that world opinion, voicing a sense of outrage at the proceedings, was at least effective to prevent the imposition of the death sentence.

The atmosphere of the trial is indicated in this acclamation by a leader of the Communist Party in Hungary:

"A new god has come to you, my people. * * * The new god is born from earth and blood. He strides ahead, and under the thunder of his steps the globe trembles from east to west. This is the Red god. The Seine shudders at his impact and tries to break its banks. Westminster trembles before him like Jericho, and across the green ocean his red shadow falls on the walls of the White House."

Therein was the inspiration for proceedings against Cardinal Mindszenty, the inspiration for everything that has followed. There was no semblance of a trial in such terms as democratic people know and respect. Under their system a man is regarded as innocent until he is proved guilty. Under the Moscow dispensation an accusation carries with it guilt. So it was with Cardinal Mindszenty; he was foredoomed. The so-called trial was farcical; it was pure sham.

As we understand it, Cardinal Mindszenty had opposed nationalization of the Catholic church in Hungary, where 60 percent of the people are Catholic; he had opposed communization of the schools, had maintained international relations—for instance, he had solicited and obtained American dollars in carrying on his work.

If he went further than this—if he did, indeed, challenge the Communist regime politically—this can be said in his defense that the Communists showed a strength of only 17 percent in the popular elections and had gained control of the government by a series of coups. But the Kremlin regarded the continuance of his international relations as his greatest offense. Such relations, beyond the Red influence, are held to be treason in the Kremlin code.

Moscow has manifested hatred of Christianity upon many occasions; it has committed itself to a relentless campaign against the Christian faith. The proceedings at Budapest were just another manifestation of this madness, proceedings which have shocked the whole Christian world. Cardinal Mindszenty in prison for conscience' sake will be an even greater force for Christianity and against communism than he has been in the exercise of his churchly office.

ANOTHER MILESTONE FOR SAM HARDY

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, today the ever good and faithful servant of the Committee on Ways and Means, Sam Hardy, completes the first year of his fifth decade of service—41 years altogether. There is today in the House of Representatives only one Member, the gentleman from Illinois, who was a Member of Congress when Sam Hardy embarked upon his career as an employee of the House. When I was elected to Congress in 1911 Sam was already a veteran of 3 years' service.

I can truthfully say that I have known of no employee during the 24 years that I have been privileged to serve with the Committee on Ways and Means upon whom the committee has relied more heavily in its daily manifold duties. From dawn until midnight, if need be, he has been always available to provide the needed references that any member of the committee might require in the consideration of the legislation before our committee. Service in terms of years is perhaps not so graphic as a quantitative record of the work-load of our committee during the period that Sam Hardy has been employed. He has seen 28 major tax bills enacted into law; 4 tariff bills and, counting the bill to be debated in the House today, 6 laws relating to the reciprocal-trade-agreements program.

I wish for Sam many more years of happy, useful service as a loyal Government employee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in paying tribute to Sam Hardy, a very faithful and efficient employee of the Government. He is a man who enjoys the confidence, respect, and esteem of all the members of our Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the remarks that have been made with reference to Sam Hardy. I doubt if there is any man in the Government who has a better knowledge of all the documents and papers pertaining to the work of the Committee on Ways and Means over the last 30 or 40 years. He is a splendid outstanding public servant. If we were ever to lose him, it certainly would be a tremendous loss.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I join in what has been said in complimenting Sam Hardy. He is not only an efficient worker, but I compliment him for his innate constant courtesy. He is always courteous and ready to serve.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I trust that Sam will have many years ahead of him to serve the committee and serve the Congress and the country as well as to enjoy life.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITTINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Lt. Gen. R. A. Wheeler, Chief of the Engineers, United States Army, at St. Louis, Monday, February 7, 1949, before the thirtieth annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association.

FEDERATION OF WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me conditions in Europe are becoming more serious. The recent trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and the pressure on Norway are symbols of a grave situation. I have therefore introduced the Fulbright resolution in the House, which calls for the approval of the new federation of western Europe. I think the action of Congress approving this newly formed federation may give it the strength and the courage necessary to carry on and to resist the spread of communism in the world.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a very interesting article which appeared in the last issue of the Boston Sunday Post.

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H. R. 325) to amend the act of September 7, 1916, referring to the Employees' Compensation Commission, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. GATHINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by Mr. Joseph C. Harsch on January 30, 1949.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from Fortune magazine entitled "ECA Cannot Do Everything." Because it is beyond the limit allowed for printing such documents, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in spite of the cost which the Public Printer has estimated to be $248.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Sunday News.

THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am including an article from the Saturday Evening Post by Mr. Richard Tregaskis, famous war correspondent, whose dispatches from the combat theaters of the war brought him widespread and well deserved recognition. Certainly no contemporary newsman is better qualified by virtue of experience and keen insight to more adequately appraise the United States Marine Corps than is Mr. Tregaskis.

The article entitled "The Marine Corps Fights for Its Life" throws a bright spotlight upon what must be considered by any objective observer to be a subtle and unceasing attack upon this great fighting organization, an attack which has as its goal the dismemberment and the eventual abolition of the corps as an effective and highly efficient arm of our National military and naval establishments. It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that if the facts of this matter are known to the American people there will be such a widespread protest as to render ineffective any move which would threaten the integrity of this famous fighting organization. For that reason I bring to the attention of the Congress this important contribution by Mr. Tregaskis. We in the Congress who have had the high honor of service in the United States Marine Corps serve notice that we will not stand idly by in the way of thinly veiled threats against the corps.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MERROW asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in each to include an editorial.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made by Mr. Walter W. Cenerazzo, president of the American Watch Workers Union.

Mr. LATHAM asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "The Freedom Road," notwithstanding the fact that the Government Printing Office estimates the cost will be $230.75.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a portion of the inaugural address of the Governor of the State of South Dakota.

Mr. TAYLOR asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Troy Record.

Mr. GROSS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial from the Waverly (Iowa) Independent.

Mr. HALE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted yesterday by the Republican conference.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. STAGGERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include proceedings of the American Society of Civil Engineers.

### COMMUNISM—THE FORCES OF ANTICHRIST

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in a few minutes we are going to vote on a resolution providing $200,000 for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I hope there will not be a dissenting vote. That committee has done more to expose the enemies within our gates, who are here plotting the overthrow of this Government and attempting to undermine and destroy everything for which our country stands, than any other agency of this Government.

I am no longer a member of that committee; but I am still giving it my wholehearted and unqualified support. For I am firmly convinced that unless that committee continues the great work in which we have been engaged, these enemies of our Government and our American way of life will continue their brazen efforts to destroy everything for which the Christian people of America stand.

The persecution of a great religious leader in Europe seems to have awakened some men in this House to the dangers that now confront us. Some of them waited, however, until the Communists had murdered 30,000,000 Christians in Europe.

Atheistic communism is largely composed of a racial minority that has swarmed into Europe through the Urals in the last 100 or 200 years, and has now swarmed into this country and constitutes three-fourths of the membership of the Communist Party in America. They seem to be more akin to Pharaoh than they are to Moses.

Sixty percent of the members of the Communist Party in this country are foreign born.

It is the same old gang that composed the fifth column of the crucifixion. They hounded the Saviour during the days of His ministry; persecuted Him to His ignominious death; derided Him during the moments of His dying agony; and then gambled for His garments at the foot of the cross.

They have been for 1,900 years trying to destroy Christianity and everything that is based on Christian principles.

They have overrun and virtually destroyed Europe.

They are now trying to undermine and destroy America.

God save our country from such a fate.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

### AMENDING THE HATCH ACT

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 1243) to amend the Hatch Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill that was passed by the House last year but not acted upon in the Senate?

Mr. STANLEY. I believe this is the same bill that was passed in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it was unanimously reported out of the committee?

Mr. STANLEY. It was unanimously reported from the committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield—and the purpose of the bill is to give discretionary power to the Civil Service Commission rather than the mandatory direction now that punishment must be imposed in the most minor of cases.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 9 (b) of the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious activities," approved August 2, 1939, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) If in the case of any person violating the provisions of this section it is found by the United States Civil Service Commission that such violation warrants removal he shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by any act of Congress for such position or office shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. If the Commission finds that the violation does not warrant removal, a lesser penalty shall be imposed by direction of the Commission: *Provided*, That in the case of any person who has heretofore been removed from the service under the provisions of this section, the Commission shall upon request reopen and reconsider the record in such case. If it shall find that the acts committed were such as to warrant a penalty of less than removal it shall issue an order revoking the restriction against reemployment in the position from which removed, or in any other position for which he may be qualified."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### FUNDS FOR CONDUCTING STUDIES AND INVESTIGATIONS WITH RESPECT TO GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 88, Rept. No. 37) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of conducting the studies and investigations with respect to Government operations authorized by rule XI (1) (h) incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed $50,000, including employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### FUNDS FOR EXPENSES OF INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY HOUSE RESOLUTION 22

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 82) to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized in House Resolution 22 (Rept. No. 38) with amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the expenses of the investigation and study to be conducted by the select committee created by House Resolution 22, not to exceed $125,000, including expenditures for the employment of investigators, attorneys, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

With the following amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "$125,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 78), with an amendment, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the further expenses of conducting the studies and investigations authorized by clause (1) (Q) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Un-American Activities, acting as a whole or by subcom-

mittee, not to exceed $200,000, including expenditures for printing and binding, employment of such experts, special counsel, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by said committee and signed by the chairman of the committee, and approved by the Committee on House Administration.

SEC. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

That the funds granted may be expended retroactive to January 4, 1949.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "printing and binding".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope there is not a quorum present. Then we can have a roll call on this resolution. This is a real test.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not announce that a quorum is present unless there is.

Mr. RANKIN. I know that.

The SPEAKER. Obviously there is not a quorum present.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be read again so that the Members of the House will know what they are voting on.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution may again be reported.

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread House Resolution 78.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 353, nays 29, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 6]

YEAS—353

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Beall | Buckley, N. Y. |
| Addonizio | Beckworth | Burdick |
| Albert | Bennett, Mich. | Burke |
| Allen, Calif. | Bentsen | Burleson |
| Allen, Ill. | Biemiller | Burnside |
| Allen, La. | Bishop | Burton |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Blackney | Byrne, N. Y. |
| | Bland | Byrnes, Wis. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Boggs, Del. | Camp |
| Andresen, August H. | Boggs, La. | Canfield |
| | Bolling | Cannon |
| Andrews | Bolton, Md. | Carlyle |
| Angell | Bolton, Ohio | Carnahan |
| Arends | Bonner | Carroll |
| Aspinall | Boykin | Case, N. J. |
| Auchincloss | Bramblett | Case, S. Dak. |
| Bailey | Breen | Cavalcante |
| Barden | Brehm | Chatham |
| Baring | Brooks | Chelf |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Brown, Ga. | Chesney |
| Bates, Ky. | Brown, Ohio | Chiperfield |
| Bates, Mass. | Bryson | Christopher |
| Battle | Buckley, Ill. | Church |
| Clemente | Hull | Pfeifer, Joseph L. |
| Clevenger | Irving | |
| Cole, Kans. | Jackson, Calif. | Philbin |
| Cole, N.Y. | Jackson, Wash. | Phillips, Calif. |
| Colmer | Jacobs | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Combs | James | Pickett |
| Cooley | Jenison | Poage |
| Cooper | Jenkins | Polk |
| Corbett | Jennings | Potter |
| Cotton | Jensen | Preston |
| Cox | Johnson | Priest |
| Crawford | Jonas | Quinn |
| Crook | Jones, Ala. | Rabaut |
| Cunningham | Jones, Mo. | Rains |
| Curtis | Jones, N. C. | Rankin |
| Dague | Karst | Reed, Ill. |
| Davies, N. Y. | Karsten | Reed, N. Y. |
| Davis, Ga. | Kean | Rees |
| Davis, Tenn. | Kearney | Regan |
| Davis, Wis. | Kearns | Ribicoff |
| Deane | Keating | Rich |
| DeGraffenried | Keefe | Richards |
| Delaney | Kelley | Riehlman |
| Denton | Kennedy | Rodino |
| D'Ewart | Keogh | Rogers, Fla. |
| Dondero | Kerr | Rogers, Mass. |
| Donohue | Kilburn | Rooney |
| Doughton | Kilday | Sadlak |
| Doyle | King | St. George |
| Durham | Kunkel | Sanborn |
| Eberharter | Lane | Sasscer |
| Engel, Mich. | Lanham | Scott, Hardie |
| Engle, Calif. | Larcade | Scrivner |
| Evins | Latham | Scudder |
| Fallon | LeCompte | Shafer |
| Feighan | LeFevre | Sikes |
| Fellows | Lemke | Simpson, Ill. |
| Fenton | Lesinski | Simpson, Pa. |
| Fernandez | Lind | Sims |
| Fisher | Linehan | Smathers |
| Flood | Lodge | Smith, Kans. |
| Fogarty | Lovre | Smith, Wis. |
| Forand | Lucas | Somers |
| Ford | Lyle | Spence |
| Frazier | Lynch | Staggers |
| Fugate | McCarthy | Stanley |
| Fulton | McConnell | Steed |
| Furcolo | McCormack | Stefan |
| Gamble | McCulloch | Stigler |
| Gary | McDonough | Stockman |
| Gathings | McGrath | Sullivan |
| Gavin | McGregor | Sutton |
| Gillette | McGuire | Taber |
| Gilmer | McKinnon | Tackett |
| Goodwin | McMillan, S. C. | Talle |
| Gordon | McMillen, Ill. | Tauriello |
| Gore | Mack, Ill. | Teague |
| Gorski, Ill. | Mack, Wash. | Thomas, Tex. |
| Gorski, N. Y. | Macy | Thompson |
| Gossett | Mahon | Thornberry |
| Graham | Marsalis | Tollefson |
| Granger | Martin, Iowa | Trimble |
| Grant | Martin, Mass. | Underwood |
| Gregory | Mason | Van Zandt |
| Gross | Merrow | Velde |
| Gwinn | Michener | Vinson |
| Hagen | Miller, Calif. | Vorys |
| Hale | Miller, Md. | Vursell |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Miller, Nebr. | Wadsworth |
| | Mills | Wagner |
| Hall, Leonard W. | Morgan | Walter |
| | Morris | Weichel |
| Hand | Morton | Welch, Calif. |
| Harden | Moulder | Welch, Mo. |
| Hardy | Murphy | Werdel |
| Hare | Murray, Tenn. | Wheeler |
| Harris | Murray, Wis. | White, Calif. |
| Harrison | Nelson | Whitten |
| Hart | Nicholson | Whittington |
| Harvey | Nixon | Wickersham |
| Hays, Ark. | Noland | Wigglesworth |
| Hays, Ohio | Norblad | Willis |
| Hébert | Norrell | Wilson, Ind. |
| Hedrick | O'Brien, Ill. | Wilson, Okla. |
| Heffernan | O'Brien, Mich. | Wilson, Tex. |
| Herlong | O'Hara, Minn. | Winstead |
| Herter | O'Konski | Withrow |
| Heselton | O'Neill | Wolcott |
| Hill | O'Sullivan | Wolverton |
| Hinshaw | O'Toole | Wood |
| Hobbs | Pace | Woodhouse |
| Hoeven | Passman | Woodruff |
| Hoffman, Ill. | Patman | Worley |
| Holmes | Patten | Young |
| Hope | Patterson | Zablocki |
| Horan | Perkins | |
| Howell | Peterson | |

NAYS—29

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Barrett, Pa. | Douglas | Javits |
| Blatnik | Granahan | Kee |
| Bloom | Green | Kirwan |
| Buchanan | Havenner | Klein |
| Celler | Holifield | Madden |
| Chudoff | Huber | Mansfield |
| Marcantonio | O'Hara, Ill. | Sadowski |
| Marshall | Price | Wier |
| Mitchell | Ramsay | Yates |
| Multer | Rhodes | |

NOT VOTING—53

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Halleck | Redden |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hoffman, Mich. | Rivers |
| Bosone | Judd | Sabath |
| Bulwinkle | Kruse | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Coffey | Lichtenwalter | |
| Coudert | McSweeney | Secrest |
| Crosser | Magee | Sheppard |
| Davenport | Meyer | Short |
| Dawson | Miles | Smith, Ohio |
| Dingell | Monroney | Smith, Va. |
| Dollinger | Morrison | Taylor |
| Dolliver | Murdock | Thomas, N. J. |
| Eaton | Norton | Towe |
| Elliott | Pfeiffer, William L. | Walsh |
| Ellsworth | | Whitaker |
| Elston | Plumley | White, Idaho |
| Garmatz | Poulson | Williams |
| Golden | Powell | |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Towe.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Short.
Mr. Williams with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. McSweeney with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Lichtenwalter.
Mr. Monroney with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Meyer.
Mr. Redden with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Golden.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Judd.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Rivers with Mr. Poulson.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, due to adverse weather conditions my plane arrived too late for me to answer to my name on the appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities. Had I been present I would have voted "No."

## TRADE AGREEMENTS EXTENSION ACT OF 1949

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1211, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose yesterday, general debate had been completed, and the first section of the bill was read. That section is now open to amendment.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this bill on final passage. With economic

conditions as they exist in the world today, the huge sums which we are sending abroad under the European recovery program may well be down the drain unless by increasing our imports we make it possible for friendly nations to get on their feet and thus reduce their dollar shortage.

Since World War I, except for a short period in the twenties when American bankers made ill-advised loans abroad, our export trade has largely been financed by the American taxpayer.

Today the $5,000,000,000 excess of our exports over our imports is still being financed by the American taxpayer. This cannot continue indefinitely.

During the war our farmers and our industrial plants greatly increased their productive capacity. If we are going to maintain prosperity here we must export our surpluses. The chief way in which we must receive payment for these surpluses is by purchasing more of what the world produces.

I quote from an editorial which appeared in the New York Times on February 3, 1949:

> Since we already possess most of the world's gold, the only way in which they can repay the loans which we are making is in the form of goods.

I also quote from an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune, a Republican newspaper, on February 4, 1949. This is quoted in the minority report signed by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HOLMES] and myself:

> The explicit purpose of the Marshall plan is to free Europe from its bondage to the dollar shortage by 1952; but the dollar shortage will never end unless Europe is given reasonable opportunity to acquire dollars by the sound and straightforward way of sending us goods in honest exchange for them.

The administration has surrounded the trade-agreement program with sham and camouflage. They have given a different reason why they wish it renewed every 3 years. They claim that for every concession which we gave, we have received equal concessions. This is just not a fact. Hindrances to trade by foreign nations are greater now than they were before the trade-agreement program was even suggested.

I do not think it is necessary to fool the American people as to the necessity for this program. I believe that they are adult minded and I have confidence in their good sense. In spite of our failure to receive concessions equal to those which we have granted, the bare fact remains that to keep our country economically sound we must increase our imports, and it is for this reason that I expect to support this bill.

There is nothing in the law now in effect passed by the Eightieth Congress which would have hampered continuation of the program if it were administered in a bold and courageous manner. However, I can understand how a weak and vote-conscious executive department might fear the political implications of publicity of the peril points and that under these circumstances negotiations might be hampered. I, therefore, believe that omission of this publicity might be wise.

Though I will support this bill, this does not mean that it could not be improved.

I believe that all trade agreements should include the escape clause, not merely those negotiated in the past few years. Why should some industries have the benefit of the escape clause, while others do not?

I also agree that it should be mandatory for the Tariff Commission to supply the President with the so-called peril points in confidence. Negotiators should not negotiate blindly. State Department officials may be able negotiators, but they should have the tools with which to do the job properly. And if they wish to take the calculated risk of reducing tariffs below the peril point found by a nonpartisan body of experts they should do so with their eyes open.

However, from the attitude of the Democratic majority I gather that they are not going to allow any amendments, no matter how wise, to be added to this bill. And so in spite of the probable failure of passage of the amendments which I desire, I will vote for the bill as written because I feel that the continuation of this program is an important item in carrying out the present foreign policy of the United States which I am supporting.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, reciprocal trade agreements are generally acknowledged as essential. No one can honestly quarrel with pacts that stimulate trade and improve the economy of all nations.

And, of course, we want to aid in the rehabilitation and restoration of Europe and Asia. That makes good sense and is necessary if we are to have peace. Communism breeds where there is distress and poverty.

In the making of these treaties it must not be forgotten that we must also consider the prosperity of the American worker and the American businessman. The great industrial world of America produced the goods and materials that won two world wars; it has brought to the people of the United States a high state of happiness and prosperity never achieved by any other people. It must not be destroyed by our own Government officials. It is the administration of this act which will determine whether or not it is to be good for the American people.

I recall very well in years past a solemn promise being made that no agreement would be entered into which would destroy any American industry. During the war and the months immediately following an unprecedented demand for goods prevented any harm being done. Now it is a different story. Watchmakers, cotton and woolen textile workers, the jewelers, the silversmiths, the workers in the shoe factories, the hard-pressed pottery industry, the leather shops, the glassware and crockery are all deeply concerned. They see forces being curtailed; thousands losing their jobs. They see overtime shifts being discontinued and short-time schedules established, and in some instances factories closed. The newspapers have lately carried the story of the tragic fate of the once-famed American watch industry—only two left, one in Illinois and one in Pennsylvania, that are able to continue with their own resources. And one of them is also engaged in the manufacture of precision tools. A third, the Waltham Co., located in Waltham, Mass., is a Federal supplicant, seeking Federal funds to continue. The fate of 2,500 workers is in the hands of their Government; whether they shall lose their homes and be forced to wander away seeking a place to work. Those close to the situation frankly state that the future of these concerns is threatened by unfair competition from Switzerland. The jeweled watches from Switzerland can be sold here for less than half the cost of an American-made jeweled watch.

I know some of you will say if they cannot compete let them perish or do something else. That, I submit, is rather harsh treatment in these days when there is so much consideration for social welfare.

That the imports are to blame has been admitted to me by a high-ranking official of the administration.

The watch workers brought their case to the President. He expressed sympathy, so it is reported, and said he did not have the power to give relief. It was to Congress they must go and suggested a study committee in the Ways and Means Committee. Now a study committee is all right but what the 2,500 idle workers of Waltham need is action not study—and now is the time to give them a chance for their day in court.

Let me divert for a moment by saying this is not simply a watch-workers' case alone. Twelve large New England factories must get an RFC loan if they are to continue. Two factories—one in New England and one in Texas—are to be dismantled and shipped to Burma. Puerto Rico beckons with a factory and free taxes for 10 years, cheap labor, and a free import into the United States.

The factory workers have first felt the iron hand of adversity. It will not be long before the cotton grower, the wheat and corn farmer, and the potato grower will find they are in a similar plight.

I repeat my alarm is not against reciprocal trade. It can and must be administered on a fair basis.

Now what is offered in the two amendments of the Republican members of the Ways and Means Committee.

One is that all items to be negotiated shall be studied by the Tariff Commission—a Commission appointed and controlled by the President. If these studies indicate any industry is placed in peril that fact shall be reported to the President. The report is secret; there is no publicity. The information is given to the President for his guidance. What is wrong with that? Where is there any crippling of the act. The answer is that there is nothing wrong about a President getting all sides of a question before he acts.

The other amendment is the so-called escape clause. This clause has been in-

corporated in recent treaties; it will presumably be incorporated in the new treaties. But it was not included in the early Swiss treaty. To ever do anything for the watch workers this amendment must be adopted. Let me again remind you it is not compulsory; it gives the administration the right to act if it so desires.

You give here the President broad powers. I am not complaining about that because I realize we are in a dangerous world situation; where other countries have embargoes, quotas, and stop trade by refusing to allow money to leave the country, there is need for broad latitude to our own Government. All we ask in this second amendment is we give the President a chance to act if he so desires to aid a crippled industry like the Waltham watch or others who come into real peril.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the matter we have under consideration today is one of tremendous importance to the economic and military security of this Nation. It is indeed unfortunate that the American people know so little about our trade relations with other countries of the world. Because of the fact that the whole subject of reciprocal trade is couched in more or less technical language, the daily and weekly press have held it to be of scant interest to the average newspaper reader. Yet the administration proposal we have under consideration this afternoon affects directly or indirectly the good health of our American industries and the job security of our American workmen.

Essentially what the President and his leaders in the Congress ask us to do is to rubber stamp one-man authority to negotiate and consummate treaties with other nations respecting the raising or lowering of tariff rates on goods shipped in from abroad. The President, and the President alone, wants the power to determine how much goods shall be imported into this country, the amount of tariff the importers will pay, and the extent to which these cheap imports will compete with American goods and American markets. Abuse of this power, wittingly or unwittingly, could destroy American industry and cause widespread unemployment among our workers. I submit that no one man, even the President of these United States, should possess such unlimited power over our national economy.

Mr. Truman, in submitting his recommendation for extension of the existing Trade Agreement Act, referred to crippling restrictions imposed by the last Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress. That Congress directed the Tariff Commission to study our trade agreements with specific reference to the so-called peril points—that is the point where the influx of foreign manufactured goods under lower tariff rates would unfairly compete with our own production and place our own industries at a great disadvantage. The Commission was directed to advise the President when a dangerous peril point was reached. If, despite the Commission's warning, the President persisted in further lowering of the tariff rate, he would have to explain to the Congress his reason for such action. These restrictions in nowise crippled, nor did they impede the successful conclusion of trade treaties with other nations. They were designed to protect and operate in the best interests of American industry and the American workingman. We Republicans in this House believe that this protection is not only desirable, but is vitally necessary for the preservation of our own national economy.

These elements of safety are what the President, in a bid for more personal power, seeks to have this Congress remove. In presenting the administration's case before the Ways and Means Committee, administration witnesses failed to show that the safeguards provided by the Eightieth Congress adversely affected the successful negotiation of trade agreements and that they have not operated in the best interests of these United States. Many of us in this House regard the President's attitude on this matter as additional evidence that the grab for executive power we have witnessed under 16 years of the New Deal is to continue unabated under Mr. Truman.

Unless the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act is administered to the advantage of this country, we are in for serious economic difficulties. In entering into agreements with other nations, we must constantly bear in mind that the paramount interests of the United States comes first. This does not imply that we should take unfair advantage of friendly nations in our relations with them. On the contrary, we should negotiate and consummate trade pacts that will promote a healthy flow of trade between the democratic nations of the world. It is through our trade policies that we can build up the tottering economies of our sister nations. But in so doing, we must not tear down or do irreparable harm to our national economy. We must remember that, through our economic recovery program and through other means, such as the Export-Import Bank and the World Monetary Fund, we are pouring literally billions of American dollars into European recovery.

We are rebuilding the industrial might of those nations participating in the Marshall plan. At our own expense we are providing the mass-production machinery which will enable them to mass-produce goods for sale in this country in competition with goods produced in America. These foreign industries employ cheap labor. The wage rates and the conditions under which their employees work are far below the wage and labor standards of the American worker. Their production costs are a mere fraction of the production costs of our industries here in the United States.

Under the stimulus of American aid, these foreign industries are recovering at a rapid pace. The only outlet for their mass production will be world markets, the most attractive of which is in these United States. It is only common sense that, if our tariff barriers are inadequate and our tariff rates are too low, these cheap foreign goods will flood this country, undersell our own products, cause curtailment of American production and result in widespread unemployment among our own workers. To hold our markets, we necessarily will have to reduce our costs of production, which means, of course, that wages must be reduced. The ultimate result will be that our boasted American standard of living will disappear. Anyone who believes we can, through the means of this bill, bring the whole world up to our standard of living is indulging in wishful thinking. We in the Congress are charged with the responsibility of protecting ourselves against such raids and such consequences.

We are already beginning to feel the ill effects of this administration's trade policies. The proceed-with-caution signal is already apparent. This should serve as a warning to go slowly and to be diligent in our future negotiations. Here, Mr. Chairman, are the danger signs: Our New England textile industry is in extremely bad shape. Some plants have closed down completely, others have curtailed production, some are moving to offshore areas, unemployment is steadily rising. Our glass industry is likewise in bad shape, so is our clock and watch industry. I am reliably informed that the Hamilton Watch Co. is the only company operating on a successful basis today. At one time we had 22 watch companies. Now we have three, and only one of the three is operating. The Department of Commerce has just reported that the total number of jobless soared 700,000 in the first week of January, to a total of 2,650,000 unemployed. That is the highest figure since March 1946, when war factories were reconverting to peacetime production. The Commerce Department's report on unemployment was ominous. It said, and I quote:

> Although unemployment ordinarily rises between December and January, with the customary seasonal reduction in trade and outdoor work, the change this year was considerably larger than can be explained by this factor alone.

Other official Government reports disclose that claims for unemployment compensation have increased steadily every week since October. In November, $62,200,000 was paid out in jobless compensation and claims were coming in at the rate of 185,000 a week. By December 25, claims were coming in at the rate of 281,300 a week. In the first week of January new claims were at the rate of 338,677 a week.

The administration knows that its trade policies are contributing to this alarming situation. We find, upon examination, that some of the raw materials exported from this country to other countries of the world as part of our various recovery enterprises, are coming back as finished products and are underselling their American counterpart. Italy, for example, is receiving American cotton and sending it back to us in the form of cotton garments which are competing with our own cotton and textile manufacturers. Foreign-made glassware is abundant in the United States.

There is another disturbing phase to the watch and clock industry. That industry is essential in times of national emergency, and we are literally destroying it through our unrealistic trade policies. During the past war skilled technicians from the watch and clock industry produced delicate precision instruments without which our Nation would not have been able to conclude the war so speedily and so successfully. These instruments were used in our aircraft and other weapons of war.

The watch and clock industry made a major contribution to the creation of the atom bomb. In letters introduced into the record of hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, an Army lieutenant general and a Navy rear admiral stated that this industry is vital to the successful conduct of future wars. Industry witnesses testified that they were told by the National Security Resources Board and other agencies of the national defense establishment that they must be equal to the needs of another emergency. The American jeweled-watch industry is the only major source of supply, outside of Switzerland, for ships' chronometers, navigation watches, stop watches, and so forth. Yet, because of our trade policies, these witnesses testified that they are not equal to the needs of another emergency. They pointed out that the 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland reduced the tariffs on watches and that thereafter the American industry's share in the American market fell sharply. Subsequent to the 1936 agreement, four factors, in addition to the reduction in tariffs, operated to reduce further the tariff protection for the industry. They were:

First. In 1934 we reduced the value of the dollar. This is one of the reasons given in the Tariff Commission's Digest of Trade Data on our trade agreement with Switzerland for reducing watch tariffs in 1936. Four months after the agreement the Swiss devalued the franc by approximately 35 percent, but no compensating increase was made thereafter in the reduced tariffs.

Second. Tariff duties on watches are specific—a definite sum per watch. The subequent inflation has operated to reduce further, on an ad valorem or percentage basis, the protection left by the trade agreement and the devaluation of the Swiss franc.

Third. The duty on adjustments, which was intended to afford progressively greater protection the higher the quality of the watch, has been rendered completely ineffective by the marking of imported watches as unadjusted, regardless of the fact.

Fourth. The cost of watch movement manufacture, which is practically all labor, has been doubled in this country since the beginning of the war. The dollar increase has been disproportionate to that in Switzerland, inasmuch as we started from a higher base cost because of the much higher labor rates in this country. Our labor rates are approximately two and one-half times those of the Swiss for comparable jobs.

Over 55,000,000 jeweled watches and movements have been imported into this country since 1941. The highest point was in 1946 when imports exceeded 9,000,000. During the first 11 months of 1948 imports exceeded 7,100,000. All these watches are advertised and sold as jeweled watches and are competitive with our own products. The Waltham Watch Co. has already felt the full impact of this competition. The plant is closed, its employees out of work, and it is a question whether it will ever resume operation.

Mr. Chairman, the instances I mention are danger signals, and if in our future trade relations we ignore these signals our entire national economy will suffer and our national defense will be endangered. If we proceed to build up the resources of other nations at the expense of our own, we will be well on the road to that recession or depression we are all striving so mightily to avoid. I am not crying "wolf" when there is no wolf. I am not an undue alarmist seeking to disrupt or abolish America's trade relations with other lands. I believe in a healthy trade intercourse with other nations on a fair and equitable basis. But I also believe that our high standard of living should be adequately protected against an influx of cheap goods from abroad which would afford devastating competition with our own high-standard industry and our own highly paid workers.

I believe that the protections contained in the extension measure passed by the Eightieth Congress were necessary to safeguard our national interests. If, by refusing to continue any of those protections, the Congress forces the United States into an economic tailspin and retards our ability to defend ourselves and the Nation in another national emergency, then this Democratic Congress and the Democratic President must be prepared to assume full responsibility for the consequences. And I am most certain, Mr. Chairman, that, when the American people realize what this administration is trying to put over on them, they will demand an accounting. I suggest that the Democratic leadership be prepared with a good answer for its actions—that the answer be better than those given here today for the continuation of a foreign trade program which totally disregards American industry and the American workingman.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in face of the fact that our bipartisan foreign policy now calls for the making of large loans as well as straight grants to key democracies abroad, with the obvious intent of strengthening their economies and battling communism, it seems to me the part of wisdom and enlightened self-interest that we receive some payments on the grants and loans through imports. Such is the only feasible basis upon which we can get back some of the outlay for the European rehabilitation program. The great role this country is playing in its huge creditor position is an increasingly large and more vital economic problem for this country to face on an international basis. If we should isolate ourselves from payments in kind, we would assure very little repayment of the debt we have created in our huge European outlays.

I believe the reciprocal-trade-agreements also will afford a good vehicle through which to restore our export and import business to private channels of trade at the expiration and termination of the European program. I likewise feel they will facilitate the handling of surpluses which seem to be becoming quite obvious in some industrial and agricultural products. However, I believe that the legislation contained in H. R. 1211 could be materially bettered by placing into its content a call on the President to incorporate an escape clause whereby this Nation could renegotiate a specific duty found to be injurious to American industry after a pact was negotiated. This will lead to a more fair and uniform treatment as all new trade agreements have automatically incorporated in them an escape-clause provision.

I also believe that the legislation could be bettered by calling on the President to furnish to the United States Tariff Commission a list of articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duty in a trade agreement. Upon receipt of such a list, the Tariff Commission should make an investigation and report findings to the President. This would serve as a guide to the President and negotiating agencies, first, to limit the degree of modification of duty; and, second, to serve as a guide to increase a duty or additional import restrictions, if required, to avoid serious injury to domestic industry.

The above-mentioned suggestions for bettering the legislation were made in the form of amendments by the minority and supported by me, but were not accepted by the majority members of the committee. Nevertheless, I believe that reciprocal trade agreements must continue with extension to 1951, in the face of the present international situation. I believe such action is recognition of reality.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is something that very vitally affects many of the people whom I represent. In my district are raised a number of special types of crops, such as walnuts, almonds, cherries, and so forth. These same kinds of products are raised in several foreign countries. In the past it has frequently been proposed to make trade agreements with countries raising one or more of these products. In each instance, those who have their life savings invested in our specialized crops are apprehensive that the agreement which is made might be destructive of the prosperity and stability of the particular industry and crop which might be affected. Consequently, I feel it my duty to state, although it must be in more or less sketchy form, my reasons for voting for the Trade Agreements Act.

I have gone into this matter with a view of trying to determine what is the

proper thing to do in order to adequately protect the people and the property in my congressional district, and also to support a policy which will be proper for the welfare of the Nation as a whole. The underlying idea of the tariff principle is that, because of our high standard of living, and especially the high price paid for labor in America, it is utterly impossible for us to compete in some lines of production, with similar products made abroad with cheap labor, both as to things raised on the farms and as to others that are processed in the factory or the cannery. The basic idea of every tariff has been to equalize the cost of production. But the inevitable result has been, at least in the last two tariff revisions by the Congress, that the schedules have been placed higher than was necessary to adequately protect the difference in the cost of production. This comes about by the fact that the so-called log-rolling process finds full sway in such legislative procedure. One group will ask for protection and it will promise another or many other groups protection for receiving support for itself from the various groups. This vicious circle of trading benefits causes the rates to be set way above what is necessary to adequate protection. This result has followed time and again, despite the protests of Presidents and others that the proposed rates are entirely too high to equalize the difference in the cost of production.

For this reason, I have come to the conclusion that the Congress must protect itself against this inevitable result. Behind some of the tariff walls that we have made has grown up monopoly. The end result is that the consumer pays more for the things that he eats and wears, and uses in other ways, than he should.

Therefore, some years ago, after much discussion of the matter, the reciprocal trade agreement principle was enacted by the Congress. By this method, agreements are made with various countries in which tariff schedules are reduced and they may theoretically be increased, although I do not know of any case where they have been increased. Under the tariff law on books by the Trade Agreements Act, the State Department is authorized to negotiate such agreements.

The State Department, acting for the President, has set up certain machinery to arrive at what is considered fair adjustment. We have been told time and again that consideration is given to every phase of the subject and to the effect of any proposed reduction in tariffs on the economy of the particular product involved. A Committee for Reciprocity Information has been established. Opportunity is afforded to interested persons to appear before the committee and give information. It is stated that every consideration bearing on the problem is taken into account. For instance, it should be noted that in crops like almonds, walnuts, and cherries, that the soil is committed to that kind of a crop. That the investment is tremendous because the first 4 to 7 years are unproductive. It is to be noted that, if a man has a failure in either of these crops, he cannot without tremendous expense transfer to another crop, as it would require the pulling out of the trees which would probably cost more than the cost of the land. The effect of various other factors are alleged to be considered in the fixing of the rate. However, I must say that in all my contact with this matter, I have yet to learn conclusively, to my satisfaction, that the important and major factors are ignored by those who are to make the agreement. In other words, the recommendations are such that, in the opinion of those who are recommending the reduced tariff, the reduction will not affect our economy adversely. I have, therefore, come reluctantly to the view that our negotiations, regarding trade agreements, do in fact consider our American economy and the particular economy in each specific case, and try to adjust the rates so as not to affect it adversely, but simply subject it to reasonable and fair competition.

There is one point that I think should be considered seriously by the Congress in this connection. The ones who do the work are largely State Department officials, although in the present act it is stated that the Tariff Commission is to furnish necessary data in order to arrive at a proper and appropriate conclusion. This is purely optional and not mandatory. It has been charged that the State Department is more interested in building up good will than they are in protecting the American producer. I doubt whether this bald and broad statement is the real fact, but there is this peculiar situation that those who are affected sometimes feel that the State Department does, in fact, give more weight to building up good will abroad than it does to giving protection to the American economy involved.

It would seem to me that an independent agency, whose data should be considered, should make the study involving this single question: Will the proposed tariff reduction by means of a proposed trade agreement adversely affect the economy of the particular product concerned? Will the proposed schedule introduce ruinous competition that may destroy an American industry? The one to make that study is the Tariff Commission. On this Commission are men of great ability and they are supported by a technical staff, many of whom are devoting their lives to a study of tariff problems. These people would have only one objective, and that is to find out as accurately as possible how a proposed trade agreement would affect our economy and, especially, if it would have an adverse effect. I believe that this would give more weight to this conclusion and give more weight to the determination of the State Department as to the specific rate which should be placed in any trade agreement.

Another matter that harasses the minds of those who are affected by these trade agreements, as evidenced in correspondence and conversations with myself, is that they do not know what is the exact basis of the conclusion arrived at. They get no statement in the form of a report as to just what elements were taken into consideration when the conclusion was made. To the persons affected, a reciprocal trade agreement may be likened to a judgment of a court. It is a final determination of a rate on imports and it may be that this rate could or would adversely affect the particular segment of our economy involved. They are bound by it and there is nothing that they can do to change it, except get the trade agreement modified or amended, if there is an escape clause in the agreement. They should be entitled, since their economic life is involved, to a statement giving the reasons which motivated the decision as to the specific schedule entered into in a trade agreement.

I realize that California, in particular, is interested in foreign trade. Many of our agricultural products are produced in surplus, and we must find outlets for these products in foreign countries. Our agricultural economy in the past has been based on the assumption that we would have certain foreign outlets. The British Empire, the Scandinavian countries, Germany, France, the Netherlands, and others were excellent customers for our dried fruits, some types of our grapes, pears, and so forth. Therefore, it is to our advantage that we replenish the channels of international trade. The world is closely knit together, and we must find some way, in our expanding economy, to find outlets abroad for our products. Our ever-increasing production is bound to produce surpluses. At the present time we are not harassed particularly in this regard. The European recovery program is funneling off a great deal of our agricultural production, as well as a good deal of our manufactured goods. But we cannot live forever in this fool's paradise of inflation and short supply and high prices. Inevitably, if the European program works, it will redevelop the economy of Europe, and its people will find it necessary to send us some of their goods. We will also be plagued by surpluses, especially in good years, and we will have to have an outlet in foreign countries. As I see it, anything which tends to stimulate the channels of trade, without lowering our standard of living, is a good thing. An increase of the standard of living abroad to the extent that foreigners use and continue to expand the use of our products will help American prosperity. These are some of the things that have impelled me to vote for the reciprocal trade-agreements bill.

I intend to vote for the reciprocal trade bill now before us. However, I also intend to vote for the amendment requiring that in the process the Tariff Commission's data be the data that is used in determining the effect on the American economy of any proposed agreement. Whether the amendment passes or not, which I am convinced would be beneficial to everyone concerned, I intend to vote for the bill. No system which we devise can give complete justice to every single segment of our economy. But by and large, I believe the reciprocal trade program will replenish our foreign trade, will be administered so as to adequately protect producers and manufacturers in our localities in California and will result in the increase in foreign trade which will be desirable and beneficial to our overall economy.

Also, the escape-clause principle should be applied to all reciprocal trade agreements, past as well as future ones.

I also wish to state that, if any proposed trade agreement is suggested affecting any of our goods in California, I will do everything I can to help those who wish to appear to present a good case and also to receive fair trade treatment by the agencies involved in considering whether or not the proposed agreement should be entered into and what the rate should be in order to properly protect our local industry in California.

Another aspect of this matter is that I believe a healthy international trade situation will promote national security. It has been my privilege to study security problems intimately in each session of four Congresses. Nothing is more important than to try to build our security and to develop world peace. I believe that this general program will move in that general direction. It is impossible to accurately determine how much effect this will have on bringing about a stable and peaceful world. That it will have some effect, I am certain. This, likewise, weighs in my mind in favor of continuing the reciprocal trade-agreements program.

These are some of the thoughts that go through my mind which I wish my constituents to know as the impelling ones which move me to vote for this program. It was a difficult problem to decide, but I have convinced myself that I would be unworthy to those who elected me, as well as to my own conscience, not to follow the conclusions that I have arrived at after much thinking and serious deliberation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the adoption of the so-called peril-point amendment, the so-called escape-clause amendment, and any other amendment which may be offered to protect American labor.

I rise particularly to support the so-called escape-clause amendment which will shortly be offered, and to express the hope that the Democratic majority of this House will see fit to accept it.

This amendment will permit renegotiation by the President whenever an industry may be jeopardized under any trade agreement.

Frankly, I cannot see why or how any Member of this House, regardless of party affiliation, who has at heart the best interests of the great body of patriotic, hard-working men and women in this country who compose our labor force, can oppose this amendment.

I appreciate fully the importance of international trade. Under present world conditions, and the task which we have set for ourselves, confronted as we are by the menace of world-wide communism, international trade is vital.

But surely, Mr. Chairman, we have the right; yes, we have the obligation to safeguard American labor from the loss of its means of livelihood—from being thrown into the army of the unemployed—if the administration misjudges the effects of any particular trade agreement under existing policy.

We talk of a reciprocal-trade-agreement policy. That policy, Mr. Chairman, has never been reciprocal, in my opinion. But whatever it may be termed, every man and woman in this House today knows that once a concession is made to one country, that concession, generally speaking, applies to every other country on the face of the earth which produces the commodity in question.

Who can tell what the adverse effects under any trade agreement may be under these conditions?

The distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], has referred to the painful situation in the watch industry at this time. Please bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, that this industry has been certified by the military authorities as essential in terms of precision instruments in times of war.

A few years ago there were over 20 firms in this country commanding about 55 percent of the domestic market. Today there are only three firms commanding about 18 percent of that market. Of the three, one, the Waltham Watch Co., is in the State of Massachusetts. Recently it closed its doors, and today it would be without hope were it not for a helping hand recently extended by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The workers in that concern and their families comprise, I am informed, about 25 percent of the population of the city where it is located. It is a tragic situation; others may follow.

This country has been flooded with watches imported from Switzerland, produced by underpaid labor, at prices with which we cannot compete.

Again and again in recent years this situation has been brought to the attention of the Truman administration through the State Department and Tariff Commission. Nothing effective whatsoever has been done by the administration.

Why? Largely, Mr. Chairman, because there has been no proper escape clause in the applicable agreement with the Government of Switzerland.

A proper escape clause has been included in certain agreements from the outset. Still others have been renegotiated for the purpose of including that clause.

The amendment which will be offered will simply make it mandatory that every trade agreement hereafter shall include a proper escape clause.

I am for international trade, Mr. Chairman, but I am also for the protection of the men and women in this country who labor in our plants and contribute to the industrial success of this Nation.

In the name of American labor, in the name of American industry, essential in time of war, I appeal for the unanimous approval of the escape-clause amendment when offered and for the approval of any other amendments which will safeguard the jobs of the rank and file of labor.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, while I am not a member of the committee reporting this bill, this particular subject is one in which I have been very much interested for many years.

It seems to me there are two important points which have been brought up during yesterday's debate and again today, but which have not yet been sufficiently clarified. The first point is that section 5 of the proposed bill, as reported by the committee and on which we are now to vote, expressly provides, with reference to the powers and duties of the President, as follows:

> And before concluding such agreement, the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, from the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate.

I read that especially in view of the comments of our distinguished minority leader, whose remarks seem to imply at least that, even though the President did appoint the Tariff Commission, he need not consult the Tariff Commission if he did not so desire. But the language I have just read makes it mandatory upon the President so to do.

I call the attention of the committee to the fact that it is compulsory in the bill before us today as written that the President shall seek information and advice from the Tariff Commission which he himself appoints. There is no need for the amendment proposed by the Republican minority that the Tariff Commission shall give the President information and advice. The committee bill as drawn already so provides.

And because I realize that many Members of the House have probably not had the time to read the full text of the voluminous hearings before the committee, and I having done that, I call attention to the fact that on page 751 of the printed hearings before the committee there is a letter dated in January of this year from the committee on commercial policy, United States Associates, International Chamber of Commerce, New York, which states:

> The United States Associates strongly urge the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act for a period of not less than 5 years.
>
> The world now needs more than ever the assurance of a continuing and resolute foreign economic policy and strong leadership by the United States. If the act were to be extended for a period of not less than 5 years, this assurance of itself would be an act of leadership.
>
> In April 1949 at Geneva the United States will participate in trade negotiations with 13 countries which have not yet subscribed to the 1947 general agreement on tariffs and trade. We should not be prevented there from securing and giving real concessions out of which can come a substantial incentive for further revival of international trade.
>
> Instead, our team of negotiators at Geneva should be supported by a reciprocal-trade-agreements act permitting them to exert dynamic leadership. For that reason the crippling Gearhart amendment to the 1948

renewal of the act should be eliminated and the act should be extended early in 1949 before the Geneva negotiations begin.

JOSEPH M. HARTFIELD,
*Chairman, Committee on Commercial Policy.*

I call the following sentence to the particular attention of the gentleman on the Republican side of this House:

For that reason the crippling Gearhart amendment to the 1948 renewal of the act should be eliminated and the act should be extended early in 1949 before the Geneva negotiations begin.

Now, I call attention to page 756 of the same hearings before the committee, on which there appears a letter dated January 24, 1949, to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of this House. It is from the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. I read this letter in part only to save time, but I think that the Members of Congress generally understand and believe that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States speaks loudly and primarily for the business, industrial, the manufacturing, and the commercial interests of our Nation. This is primarily what the chamber of commerce is organized for in each community and in the Nation, and they are not to be criticized for it. But, with this understanding, gentlemen, of their purpose, I read only one of the important portions of the rather lengthy letter printed in the hearings, as follows:

The policy of the Trade Agreements Act should be continued. * * * This policy, which was reaffirmed in 1946 through referendum of the chamber's membership, by a vote of 2,443 to 17, represents the present position of the chamber on the trade-agreements program.

In the spring of last year, preceding passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, the chamber presented testimony at House and Senate hearings in opposition to proposed amendments being considered at that time. * * * We recommended that the legislation and the procedures as they then stood should be continued without alteration for a period of at least 3 years. * * *

The provisions of H. R. 1211, now before your committee, calling for the repeal of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, and extension of the act as it existed before passage of that legislation for a period of 3 years from June 12, 1948, are in accord with chamber policy. We urge that the committee and the Congress approve the measure.

Sincerely yours,
EARL O. SHREVE, *President.*

It being a recognized fact, then, that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States speaks for the chambers of commerce all over the United States—and there are hundreds and hundreds of them—we have a right to assume, do we not, from this letter dated January 24, 1949, that the business, the commercial, the industrial, the manufacturing interests of our Nation want H. R. 1211 passed as submitted by the committee and without either of these amendments which the Republican minority have now submitted. Certainly, gentlemen, the United States Chamber of Commerce, under such recent date as January 24, 1949, and having had express knowledge of the pending consideration of reciprocal-trade agreements before our distinguished committee in this House, would never have written this official letter, received by the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee less than a month ago, if the business, industrial, shipping, fishing, commercial, manufacturing interests of the Nation had communicated through their respective chambers of commerce in their own localities opposition to the proposal of this Democratic administration to carry out the wishes and purposes of our distinguished President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, who communicated to our distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina, Hon. ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, under date of January 8, 1949, his message asking that the crippling provisions of the Trade Agreements Act inserted by the Eightieth Congress be removed from the act. I call your attention to the letter of the President of the United States as it appeared on page 2 of the printed hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In my message on the state of the Union I asked the Congress to act promptly to extend the Trade Agreements Act without the hampering restrictions placed on it by the last Congress.

As you know, negotiations will begin in April to extend the benefits of the general agreement on tariffs and trade to 13 countries that did not participate in the original agreement. This general agreement, concluded in the autumn of 1947, is the most important and comprehensive trade agreement in history. Under it, the United States and 22 other nations agreed to reduce their tariffs, or to maintain low tariffs or none at all, on a wide variety of products. The products affected accounted in 1938 for over half of the world's international trade. In addition, the participating countries agreed to curb the use of other trade restrictions, such as import quotas, and to limit various kinds of discrimination, such as preferential treatment of imports from one country as against those from another. Never before have so many nations combined in such an intensive effort to reduce barriers to trade.

The extension of the benefits of this agreement under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act is a practical cooperative effort to remove unnecessary obstacles to the building of a stable and prosperous world. The restrictive provisions and limited extension of the present trade-agreements law materially hamper the effectiveness of United States participation in this effort. That is why it is so imporant that the existing Trade Agreements Act be promptly repealed, and that the act as it existed on March 1, 1948, be extended for a further substantial period. I suggest that this period be until June 12, 1951.

Unless nations can sell each other the products of their agriculture, labor, and industry to the greatest possible extent, there can be no sure foundation for economic peace. Unless world trade is increased, the tremendous investment we are making toward world economic recovery will be largely wasted. Unless trade restrictions are relaxed, the lot of the private trader in international trade will become increasingly difficult.

In the achievement of these objectives, United States leadership and United States action is a decisive influence.

The trade-agreements program has proved itself to the people of the United States. It has justly earned their overwhelming support. We must be in a position to press that program forward with vigor.

I know that I can count on your continued support in securing necessary action to this end at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Therefore, gentlemen, this bill should pass without either of these crippling amendments being adopted for three reasons, amongst others:

First. The President of the United States, who is charged by law, custom, and position with such matters, has clearly called our attention to the fact that the reciprocal-trade agreements are an established part of our national and international policy in such matters, and he further clearly reminds us that the condition of the world demands its extension as provided in this bill and that the essence of this bill has already proved beneficial to our Nation and to world trade.

Second. The official speaking unit or committee for the business, industrial, shipping, fishing, mercantile establishments of our Nation, as represented by the United States Chamber of Commerce, by its official letter to Congress, disproves the claims of the Republican minority, who are fighting this bill and who threaten to try to put back into it the two crippling features which were written into it during the Eightieth Congress.

Third. The expressed desire and hope and wish of the American people in the November 2 election was clearly to the effect that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as campaigned for by the President of the United States in his talks with the American people and his campaign by the Democratic records in the House and Senate of the United States, was to the effect that the American people again wanted the good will and the trade, on a reciprocal basis, to be extended between the nations of the world.

This can only be most promptly and adequately accomplished by the passage of the bill before the House without either of the emasculating amendments proposed by the minority being adopted.

I submit that the expressed opinion of the industrial, the commercial, and the manufacturing interests of the United States is not represented by the present opposition in the House to this bill.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman referred to the action of the New York Chamber of Commerce. Of course, I do not know everybody in the New York Chamber of Commerce, but I know one most distinguished member of that chamber of commerce. He has issued a pamphlet directly opposed to what the chamber says in the resolution which the gentleman has just read.

Mr. DOYLE. Of course he did it as an individual, but here we have the official action of the United States Chamber of Commerce itself as shown in its letter printed in the hearings.

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican Party's No. 1 ghost has walked again. He has even talked again.

Last night, with the same self-assured, cocky air that has characterized him through two Presidential campaigns, Thomas E. Dewey came around to tell the few Republicans who are interested in his views what is wrong with the Republican Party. He revealed both his lack of political know-how and his innate bad taste. Why he ever accepted the invitation to speak again, this soon after his second debacle, only Dewey and his group of so-called advisers could tell.

News reporters were around, as usual, asking him if he would run again. If there are any reporters or members of the Republican Party who think that Dewey has one chance in ten billion in ever again being the Presidential standard bearer of the Republican Party, let me right now disillusion them. Thomas E. Dewey is through. Washed up. Finished.

And, now that he is through—finished—washed up—there is little need for him to go around the country pointing the finger of scorn at anyone else. There are only two men in the United States responsible for Thomas E. Dewey's defeat.

The No. 1 is Thomas E. Dewey. The other is Herbert Brownell, who was Dewey's campaign manager during the 1944 debacle and during the 1948 rout. In each instance, Brownell and Dewey forgot the first principles of political campaigning in this country. They went out of their way to alienate the politicians who had won elections for years and they searched frantically high and low for so-called public relations and advertising specialists. These advertising specialists were good at selling soap, Arrid, Tums, toothpaste, and other commodities you may eat, wear, or with which you may perfume yourself, but they had not the faintest conception of how to sell the people a man or an idea. They failed miserably in two campaigns, under the tutelage of Dewey and Brownell, but I did not see any notice of his mentioning them last night.

Mr. Chairman, I did not have a chance to get down to hear Dewey in person last night. I had another engagement, and, to tell the truth, I was not interested. I mean nothing personal against him, of course.

But I did glance over the newspapers this morning, and if he was correctly quoted he is so punch-drunk after two successive defeats that he does not know what hit him. In fact, he is so groggy that he seems to be taking cracks at his old self.

He told the Republican Party for instance, according to the newspapers, "to tell the people where it stands and why." O Lord, Mr. Chairman, Dewey is just about 4 months too late in learning this bitter lesson. He is the only man in American history to campaign for office of President and not take a single decisive stand on any issue whatsoever. Several of my friends remarked on that fact to me before the election. One of them stated flatly: "I suppose Dewey will win. But if so he will be the only man in American history ever to be elected President without taking a stand on a single, solitary issue."

Then Mr. Dewey started talking about liberals, progressives, and reactionaries. He did not define these terms. Oh, no; that would have been fatal, for then he would not have been able to talk any longer. There has been more bull spouted about liberalism, conservatism, progressivism, and reaction during the New Deal than in any other era in world history. Dewey still thinks it is an issue. By now he should have learned that these are symbols, carefully planted in the minds of the people by those who would confuse and divide America. The Republicans must quit falling for these symbols of the opposition. They must develop their own smear words and symbols. If we are going to have political wars let us have them fought out by two equals, not between a propaganda giant such as the New Deal represents and a propaganda pigmy such as Dewey and the Republican Party represented in the recent elections.

If the pepole are ruled by symbols—meaningless symbols in most instances—why should Dewey use the symbols cultivated and implanted by the New Deal to describe his own defeat? Because, as I often have maintained, Dewey is a New Dealer but he just does not know it. I am telling him. Instead of reading anyone else out of the Republican Party, which this self-styled elder statesman has no right to do, the officials of our party ought to invite him either to follow their leadership or move over to the opposition. Let no Republicans get angry and leave the party because of what Dewey has said. He has chalked up new losing records for this century and it is time for us to forget him once and for all.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I had intended to offer an amendment to put fisheries in this bill so that the people whom I represent would have a fair chance with the people from Canada, Newfoundland, and the other countries that are in these so-called trade agreements. However, I am not going to offer that amendment because I am afraid if you turn that down you might turn down the other. I want you to have in mind when you vote on it what you are doing, because, under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the former Speaker of this House, the people of this country, whom I represent and whom you represent, will be put on a square and fair deal with other countries so far as tariffs are concerned.

I was in the First World War and I was in England and France. You could not buy any American tobacco then. You cannot buy any American tobacco there today. If you go to your neighboring country, Canada, you pay 35 or 40 cents for a package of cigarettes. The only thing you can buy there is a package of cigarettes—I have forgotten the name of them now—but it was something that they put pictures in when I was a little boy. So there is only one thing that we have to consider as I see it, and that is whether or not we are going to protect the American workingman or the man who invests his money in tobacco, in cotton, or whatever it is. That is the only thing I think we are supposed to do here—to look out for our own. When we do that we will have peace with the world. It is all right from the top to talk about reciprocal trade. The only reciprocity there is is the United States of America. We get no reciprocity from any foreign country and we have not gotten it. If you want to ship something to some foreign country you just see what the tariff is on it, whether it is cotton, tobacco, watches, or any other thing that we produce in this country. If people are going to walk the streets, I want them to walk the streets somewhere else than in my district, and I think you do also.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NICHOLSON] has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having an opportunity to make a general statement at this time regarding the legislation now before the House. I will speak more specifically regarding amendments that are to be offered later on.

I wish to tell the House at this time that my particular interest in this legislation springs from my interest in national defense. But as I see the legislation outlined in this bill, it places the volume of trade first and national defense very much in second place.

An amendment to be offered will protect us in letting the President know where the peril points are. Without an amendment to this legislation you have no assurance that the President has any place to go for that information when it is most needed.

I have given more time to strategic and critical materials than any other phase of national defense, but I have also given considerable time to the matter of pools of skilled workers, and that is the reason for my interest in the health and welfare of the watchmaking industry.

To those of you who have mining interests, I suggest you read the prepared statements by Mr. Long and his associates on pages 420 and 422 of the hearings. If you have mining interests, if you are interested, as I am, in the health and vigor of the mining industry domestically, as a safeguard in our national defense, read those statements and ponder long and well before you support the legislation now before you without some investigation and without some analysis of the effect of the proposed amendments to this legislation and what they will do for you and your mining industry.

There is testimony in the hearings regarding the importance of a stock pile of strategic and critical materials. Let me tell you a healthy and vigorous mining industry is of far greater importance than the stock pile itself.

Let me call Forrestal's attention to the fact that, in his answer to the position I took in the committee during the hearings, at no time did he discuss the point

in this legislation that is vital to national defense. I did not ever maintain that the reciprocal-trade program was a threat; no, I maintained that a reciprocal-trade program where you march forward in the dark without a knowledge of the peril points is a step dangerous to national defense.

I look to the Tariff Commission to keep the President informed of when we are up to any kind of a peril point. That is not an argument for or against reciprocal treaties; that is an argument, I hope, to build a bigger and better reciprocal-trade program, one that is safe; and for me I will always put national defense ahead of mere volume of trade. To me this proposed legislation puts volume of trade ahead of national defense. National defense is told to go sit down in a corner. Forrestal did not discuss the need for the peril point determination in his letter. I wish he had given me a concrete and definite statement on that point, but he did not do it.

I am holding Forrestal, however, responsible for the caliber and the adequacy of our national defense; that is his responsibility. It is no cure to turn back to the days of 1940 and preserve that particular number of skilled watchmakers, because I sweat blood in the Committee on Military Affairs wondering whether we were going to get an adequate number of skilled workmen. It is time Forrestal was giving some attention to building up a better stock pile of skilled workers than we had in 1940, because we may not be given 2 years to get ready for any future war. That is his responsibility.

The reciprocal-trade program can by proper amendment be made safe for adequate national defense. Without those amendments you move forward at your peril. I will have more to say on that when the amendments are offered.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to elaborate on what the distinguished gentleman from Iowa has said. There was something that happened in connection with the last World War that illustrated to me how important certain materials are. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] admonished us to be careful with reference to the mining industry. I am sure every Member of the House will remember that in the last World War there were five German spies arrested off the coast of Florida. It was discovered that those five had come to do damage to a very strategic industry that even I, brought up in the section where that industry flourishes, did not know was so important. Anyone who knows anything about the making of steel and iron knows that the white-hot molten product flows through a small opening in the bottom of the furnace. Everyone knows who knows anything about the steel industry that the hole in those furnaces is sealed or stopped up with a certain kind of clay. That clay is produced in a limited number of places in the United States. These spies were going to those places where that kind of clay was produced to destroy the clay plants there; and if they had been successful they could have stopped practically every furnace in the United States in a short time. Very few people in the whole country did or could know about how strategic this material was.

We cannot expect the President to know all about what commodity is important and what is vital; we cannot expect him to know the peril there will be to all industries in the admission of commodities. But we have a commission down there that does know and ought to know; I refer to the Tariff Commission, and that Commission ought to have a chance to have a say in such important matters. We propose to try to see that it does.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Tobin, urges revision of trade pacts to help United States watchmakers in an Associated Press article of this date. I read as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Secretary of Labor Tobin said he thought that too many Swiss watches have been imported, and urged swift revision of reciprocal-trade agreements to help domestic watchmakers.

Mr. Tobin, former mayor of Boston and Governor of Massachusetts, recently intervened in an effort to save the Waltham Watch Co. plant at Waltham, Mass., from closing down.

He praised the effect of the reciprocal-trade agreements generally, but said that the large inflow of watches was an example of how it could affect a domestic industry adversely.

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Labor is to be congratulated upon his forthrightness, his honesty, and his loyalty to the workers of the United States and for his interest in the defense of this Republic.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Will the amendment which the gentleman proposes to offer later in the afternoon to provide for an escape clause in all trade agreements give some protection?

Mr. CURTIS. It will give some protection and it can give a great deal of protection. I want to be very frank about this. There are two things that are required, an escape clause and a forthright, honest administration. The escape clause is important because the act being passed today will be effective in trade agreements for years and years to come and it should be written into law. It will make possible a certain amount of relief.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. What form will that escape clause take and what will the procedure be that we have to follow in order to get the benefit of the escape clause in the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. The escape clause procedure is quite cumbersome. The affected groups, of course, will have to appear before the Tariff Commission and present their case. The Tariff Commission makes their finding and reports to the President. The President may or may not take action under the escape clause. The President may issue a directive at once taking advantage of the escape clause. But if he cannot get the foreign country to agree, that foreign country may withdraw equivalent concessions. It is a bit cumbersome and without the proper kind of administration it will not do what it ought to do, but we are legislating perhaps for many, many years to come and that is why it is important.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, everything related to the American concept of liberty and justice stands condemned to contempt and ridicule by minions of the Kremlin who have committed the basest of all crimes—the assassination of decency itself.

Men everywhere are horrified at the perfidy of Moscow, the epitome of deceit and treachery. While hirelings of the Kremlin mouth fancy phrases having to do with peace and democracy, the Moscow-dominated government of Hungary condemns to a living death the champion of truth and justice in that country.

In the conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty the rulers in the Kremlin have pronounced themselves irrevocably opposed to the American concept of liberty and justice. Not content with merely insulting the Catholics of the world, with malice aforethought, they conjured up a deliberate insult to the United States of America. With their bleatings of Yankee imperialism they have made their purpose clear. It is not only the Vatican Russia despises, it is these United States which they are also bent on destroying. And this great Nation of ours has fallen upon sad times if it permits this insult to justice and decency to go unanswered.

Committees of this Congress have before them resolutions denouncing the conduct of the Government of Hungary. I implore the chairman of our Foreign Affairs Committee to bring the House resolution to the floor. Let us set the record straight. We stand for honor and truth and justice. We revolt at this crime against humanity, which has been dictated by the Moscow overlords of Hungary. This is not merely a matter of the internal affairs of Hungary. This is conduct which shocks the hearts of all men. I insist that our Government must take formal action. This matter must be presented formally to the United Nations. The Government of Hungary and the men in the Kremlin must understand there is a limit to what we will stand for.

Unless this Congress acts now, I shall, though I am but one Member of this House, appeal to the Secretary General of the United Nations personally to bring this matter up at the very first opportunity.

In the meantime, the United States Minister to Hungary should be recalled immediately.

The Foreign Affairs Committee of the Congress needs his advice and counsel.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the arguments presented here in the last 10 or 15 minutes are an indication of how the minority is trying to becloud the issue before us today. They are pointing out the case of the Waltham Watch Co., which is a company that, since the turn of the century, has gone into bankruptcy at least three times because of the inefficiency of its management, because it has not kept in step with the progress of other companies in America manufacturing watches and because of some financial manipulations in which the controlling personnel of that corporation has engaged. The simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the other two big watch companies in this country have been exceedingly prosperous. The American watch industry is in a very healthy condition. The American watch industry right now produces and is capable only of producing at its maximum effort 3,000,000 jeweled watches. Now the demand of the American people for watches is 9,000,000 jeweled watches a year. So the American watch industry is incapable of producing enough watches to supply the American demand.

They talk about national defense. Yesterday the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], read into the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of Defense which stated in effect that the American watch industry took its full share of the responsibility during the war period, and that he is not aware that the capabilities of the watch industry have been adversely affected by the reciprocal-trade authority.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing at all to this matter. These gentlemen on the minority side ask us to pass special legislation to take care of an industry that after the First World War went into bankruptcy, and before the First World War went into bankruptcy, and after the Second World War is asking the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a loan of $6,000,000, when the Elgin Watch Co. and the Hamilton Watch Co. in this country are each making handsome profits.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is really his argument to finally kill this industry so vital to national defense?

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is surely talking about a single company—not the watch industry. Sufficient testimony has been presented to show the inefficient management of the Waltham Co. that it has shown in wartime and peacetime, and it is not keeping up with the times. It is only a matter, Mr. Chairman, of trying to becloud the issue. If the membership will turn to page 986 of yesterday's RECORD, you will see where the Secretary of National Defense says that the domestic jeweled-watch industry has fulfilled its role in our program of national defense, and that he is not aware that its capabilities have been adversely affected by the reciprocal-trade-agreement program.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman's argument in regard to the watch industry and what its troubles amount to is not supported by the testimony taken before our committee, with the exception of the testimony of the Swiss importers who have a financial interest in this legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, that is just the opinion of the gentleman from Nebraska. Just the reverse is borne out by the record.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The gentleman is correct. And, I want to say this also for the information of the gentleman from Nebraska and the other Members, if they will turn to the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS] yesterday on this very subject, he referred to a book that was written by a man who was paid by the Waltham Watch Co., in which the history of the Waltham Watch Co. is detailed. This book indicates that the company had been inefficiently managed, and that its finances have been juggled around so that the company could never prosper under its present management and under its present financial situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, we have been exceedingly liberal here. We have allowed an hour of general debate. Not a single amendment has yet been offered. I think we ought to make some progress with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the first section of this bill and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts and Mr. NICHOLSON objected.

Mr. COOPER. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 1 of this bill and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no financial interest in the Waltham Watch Co. and know nothing about the company, but I deprecate the attack upon the laboring men of that company who produce the Waltham watches. I have in my hand a Waltham watch that I have used for over 30 years. It has kept better time than the clocks in the House. Therefore I hope that those who are now making an attack upon the integrity and skill of the American laborers in the Waltham watch factory will feel more kindly toward them when they consider the future welfare of these American workers.

As a Member of this House I have always felt that it is up to Congress to legislate for the welfare of the people when it comes to the question of tariffs. I thought that we as an elected body could do that in better manner than to leave it to some agency which is not responsible to the people. We have been elected and should do our constitutional duty instead of delegating it to the President.

I recognize that the magnitude of the business done by the United States Government and the multiplicity of policies we have in operation over the world makes things confusing not only to Members of the House but also for the people. I thought I would mention just one or two items that confuse the issue and are involved in reciprocal trade.

You remember that we are supporting the price of potatoes in this country. The United States Government will spend more than $200,000,000 to support the price of potatoes from the 1948 crop. We will buy over 32,000,000 bushels of potatoes in Maine. We will buy about 38,000,000 bushels in New York State at a cost of around $30,000,000. During the time that we are buying these surplus potatoes, because of the fact that the duty on potatoes from Canada was reduced from 75 cents to 37½ cents for 3,000,000 bushels in the reciprocal-trade agreements, more than 5,000,000 bushels of the Canadian crop have come into the United States and have been sold in the cities along the eastern coast at a price below the support price. Therefore, in fact, we in this country are compelled to spend more money for potatoes produced in the United States in order to provide a market for Canadian potatoes under the reciprocal-trade law, and it is going to cost the American taxpayers over $200,000,000 this year.

Another thing, although it may not directly relate to the reciprocal-trade program, is this. You will recollect that we had one of the biggest wheat crops in the history of our country in 1948. We consume about 800,000,000 or 900,000,000 bushels in this country, and we have to sell or give away the rest in the world market, and we want to get rid of our surplus to avoid crashes in the commodity market such as are taking place today.

To keep the record straight on wheat, I saw a few days ago that the Economic Cooperation Administration, or the Marshall plan, had turned over $55,000,000 to England to buy wheat in Canada. I thought it was rather strange that the American taxpayer should be taxed to give money to England so that they could buy wheat in Canada, when we have a large surplus in the United States. Before coming to the floor, I thought I would check on it, and, lo and behold, a report came from the ECA that it is not $55,000,000; that for the 12 months beginning April 3, 1948, we are turning over to England $300,000,000, to buy nearly 160,000,000 bushels of wheat in Canada, when we have a surplus here.

The wheat price has been going down the full 10 cents a day for the last 2 or 3 days, and nobody knows when it is going to hit the bottom.

Now these are matters that confuse me. Here the American people are paying taxes to give the money away to some other country so that they can buy something from still another country

while we are sitting here with a surplus of the same commodity that this other country, to wit, England, is purchasing today. That seems a little funny, does it not? And does not that potato deal seem funny?

We buy $200,000,000 worth of potatoes to destroy them and at the same time we provide a market for the Canadian farmers who can come to this country and sell potatoes at a lower price than the Government here is supporting them.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. In fact the gentleman from Minnesota, now speaking in the well of the House [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], is one of the most distinguished agriculturists in the United States, and it just illustrates the point that even he cannot get an answer on this question from the Tariff Commission.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the gentleman for his kind observation.

I favor support prices to encourage production of food in the United States, but the folly of the Truman administration's policy, as I have outlined, will require larger appropriations to support the price of wheat and potatoes produced in this country. We are, in fact, supporting the price of Canadian wheat and potatoes and providing a market for these products in the United States or some other country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON].

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I support the principles of H. R. 1211, the reciprocal-trade bill, which is before the House today. However, I do want to bring to the attention of the Members the situation which involves the employment of several thousands of workers in the Pacific Northwest area who are employed in the plywood, the fishery, and the fruit industries. It is my firm belief that we should write this legislation in such a way as not to destroy these industries which play such a vital part in our economy. It is true that from the broader viewpoint we must encourage world trade, and act upon trade barriers in such a way as to make possible the freer flow of goods between nations. In light of world conditions we are all aware of the tremendous task which is ours to stimulate world recovery from the effects of the late war. But let us not enter upon that task blindly. Let us recognize that to do an effective job we must ourselves be economically strong, otherwise we will fail in what we are trying to do. If we recklessly pass legislation without due regard to all the factors, we may in the process destroy certain segments of our economy. If enough segments are destroyed the whole economy may be so weakened as to make it impossible for us to attain our ultimate objective.

Should not those who are charged with the authority to negotiate trade agreements be given to understand that Congress does not intend that segments of our industry shall be destroyed? Should not they be asked to give due and serious consideration to the interests and problems of each industry affected by the particular agreement entered into with other nations? Is it asking too much for Americans to say to them, "Don't sell us down the river when you are negotiating trade treaties"? I do not believe so. Thousands of workers in the industries I have referred to are concerned because they know that when their products can no longer compete with foreign imports their jobs will be gone. Mr. Chairman, I urge the most serious consideration of this legislation now before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am taking this time to talk to my Democratic friends and to tell them what I had intended to tell my Republican friends in our Republican conference yesterday morning when I did not have the time. The over-all question before the Eighty-first Congress, as I see it, is this: "Shall the Eighty-first Congress go down in history as the repudiating Congress?" We have already repudiated the good work that was done by the Rules Committee of the Eightieth Congress when we emasculated that committee because it had prevented from coming to the floor of the House $21,000,000,000 worth of authorizations which we did not want to face. When we repudiated the work of the Rules Committee of the Eightieth Congress we tactily admitted to the people of the Nation that President Truman was right when he characterized the Eightieth Congress the worst Congress in history. We are going to be called upon to repudiate the action of the Eightieth Congress in passing the Taft-Hartley bill. I am told by my friend from Michigan that we are going to do that. If we do we will be repudiating the work of the Eightieth Congress and tacitly admitting that the President was right in his characterization of the Eightieth Congress. We are going to be called on to repudiate the action of the Eightieth Congress on the tax-reduction bill which we passed. If we do that, again we will be tacitly admitting to the people of this Nation that the President was right in his characterization of the Eightieth Congress.

We are going to be asked to repudiate the action of the Eightieth Congress on the Aiken bill, the long-term agricultural bill, with its flexible support prices. If we do that, again we will be tacitly admitting to the Nation that the President was right in his characterization of the Eightieth Congress.

Today we are being asked to repudiate the record of the Eightieth Congress in placing safeguards around the administration of the reciprocal-trade agreements, and that is all we did. We have no quarrel with the theory of the reciprocal-trade agreements; it is the way they are being administered that we criticize and want to correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] has expired.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER] yesterday, I thought, spoke rather scornfully and sarcastically about the tens of thousands of American fishermen who engage in the hazardous employment of going down to the sea to bring food for the American people.

When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] expressed concern over the future of the fisheries of New England the gentleman from Pennsylvania ridiculed the thought that anyone should entertain any concern about fishermen.

"Why," said the gentleman from Pennsylvania, "the average fisherman last year had earnings of $5,000." Then the gentleman from Pennsylvania added, "of course, in 1945, they only made $4,500." And then he remarked, I thought, rather sarcastically, "the poor fisherman." I gathered from his remarks that he looks upon fishermen as the aristocracy of labor and, therefore, in his opinion, entitled to very little consideration by the Democratic majority of this Congress.

It may be true, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, that the average American fisherman in 1948 made $5,000. It may be true that the fisherman made $4,500 in 1945. But what about 1946 and 1947? The gentleman did not mention fishermen's earnings for those years. It may be that in those years the average fisherman did not make much more than enough money to pay for his groceries and the gasoline to operate his fishing craft.

In all the businesses in which the risk capital of Americans is employed the fishing industry is the most hazardous. A fisherman has a good year and he may make $5,000. Then he may have one, two, or three bad years in which he does not earn enough for the upkeep of his boat. If it were not for a good year now and then no one would be engaging in commercial fishing.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, yesterday, in discussing the annual fish catch of the United States remarked that the American fish take is now double what it was in the prewar years. Then he added, rather sarcastically, I thought, "So they"—meaning the fishermen—"need a lot of protection." By this, I took the gentleman from Pennsylvania to mean that American fishermen are entitled to no protection whatever. Since the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a member of the Ways and Means Committee I am wondering if it is the position of the Democratic Party that our American fishermen are entitled to no protection whatever against the low-wage, low-living standard competition of foreign nations.

Now, it is probably true that fish production is considerably higher than in the prewar years. There are many reasons for that. During the war years, due to heavy naval operations, many foreign fishing boats were destroyed. There has not yet been time to rebuild these foreign fishing fleets. The foreign fishermen have not yet gotten back to prewar production and had time to create these prewar surpluses which they formerly dumped in the United States.

If, when they do get back into full production, no protection is afforded our American fishermen the great fishing industry that has been built up in this country during the war years will be greatly reduced. If that happens, the

millions of dollars Americans have invested in canneries and other millions that thousands of little fishermen have invested in fishing boats and fishing gear will become largely worthless

This bill gives to the State Department the right to pass a life and death sentence upon every business and every community in this country that may be adversely affected by foreign imports. This bill gives to the State Department the right to say what businesses shall be destroyed and what businesses shall be permitted to live. This bill gives to the State Department the power to say what workers shall be permitted to continue in their present employment and what workers will be forced to give up their jobs and go and seek work elsewhere in other fields than those in which they are now engaged.

When such vast powers are given to any executive department of the Government they should be surrounded with every safeguard to protect the welfare of the people. One of the safeguards that should be provided is that of permitting the Tariff Commission to establish peril points below which, in the interest of the well-being of our American economy, no tariff should be reduced. Another of the safeguards needed is the escape clause.

If these reasonable safeguards are placed in the reciprocal-trade-treaty bill I shall vote for this bill. If they are not placed in this bill I shall, in the interest of thousands of fishermen of the Pacific coast, of nut growers, shingle mill employees, pulp and paper mill employees and others, be compelled to vote against it.

THE CRAB INDUSTRY

Let me tell you of what has happened to one fishing industry of the Pacific coast, that of crab fishing.

Prior to December 7, 1941, of all canned crab marketed in the United States 85 percent was imported from Japan. Our American crab fishermen and American cannery workers could not compete with the low-wage, low-living standards of Japanese cannery workers and Japanese fishermen.

When the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor they blasted themselves out of the American crab market. Americans built boats in American yards giving employment to American workers. In 1948 the crab-fishing business of the Pacific coast was 18 times what it was in 1941 and in the years prior to 1941. Thousands of American fishermen and cannery workers are now engaged in catching and processing crab.

If, through unwise treaties negotiated by the State Department, the Japanese are permitted to reenter the American crab market, then the time may come when Japanese canned crab again will control 85 percent of our American market.

If that is permitted to happen, the millions of dollars Americans have invested in crab-fishing boats and crab-fishing gear will be largely useless and worthless. Our American fishermen and cannery workers can no more compete with Japanese low wages and low living standards today than they could in 1941. If Japan again takes over our American crab market as she did in the years prior to 1942, our crab canneries will be idle and thousands of cannery workers out of employment.

What may happen to the crab industry may happen to many other fishing enterprises, our American tuna, bottom fish, salmon, and pilchards.

These fisheries ought to be protected at least to the point of giving them an opportunity to be heard by the Tariff Commission in establishing what are peril points, below which tariffs on fish should not be reduced. They ought to be protected at least to the point where if a treaty entered into begins to prove ruinous to an industry that there is an escape clause under which the United States Government may withdraw from such a disastrous treaty arrangement.

FILBERT NUTS

For the last half century Oregon and Washington have been a one-industry region, dependent almost solely on one industry—forest products. This dependency upon one industry frequently has led to severe booms and busts. To overcome this disadvantage our people have sought with vigor and intelligence to diversify their economic structure. Among the new diversified industries which have been developed are cranberry raising, bulb growing, and filbert raising.

Within recent years 850 filbert orchards have come into bearing in western Washington alone and more orchards, of later planting, are reaching year by year the bearing stage. These filbert orchards have progressed so far toward meeting the domestic demand for these nuts that the price on filberts, which was 27.5 cents a pound to growers in 1945, by 1948 had declined to 13.5 cents a pound, or less than half the price of 4 years ago.

If, under reciprocal-trade treaties, the duty on filberts or other nuts sold in competition to them, were to be lowered many of these orchards would be cut down and the trees, which required years of cultivation to reach a productive stage, would be converted into fuel, with tremendous financial loss to the orchardists and unemployment for their employees.

This bill, as a very minimum, should provide the safeguard to the nut growers that would exist if we maintain the Tariff Commission as an agency to set peril points below which no tariff reduction should go and an escape clause that will let us withdraw from any tariff agreement that time and experience proves is ruinous to any American industry.

CEDAR SHINGLES

We on the Pacific coast are familiar with how ruinous and unwise tariff arrangement may be to an industry. From time to time, we have seen thousands of our shingle weavers thrown into enforced idleness because through unsound and unwise treaties we had given away our shingle market to the Canadians.

The Canadians were permitted to export large shingle quotas into the United States under a treaty agreement.

When building was brisk and the demand for shingles so great that United States mills could not meet the demand our shingle-mill employees had jobs. However, whenever building slows down, it is the Canadian mills which supply the bulk of the American market with shingles while our own American shingle-mill workers walk the streets and they and their families go hungry.

The shingle weavers, like our American fishermen, cannot compete with the lower wages that prevail in Canadian shingle mills and Canadian logging camps.

With the wages in the Canadian lumber industry today 40 percent below those prevailing on the United States side of the border, it is impossible for our American shingle weavers to compete with the Canadian shingles.

Before we grant any concessions to Canada on shingles we ought to first consider what effect these concessions will have upon United States employment. Maintenance of the Tariff Commission to fix peril points below which no tariff should be reduced will help to do that.

If the majority permits some amendments to this bill and thereby will give our American industries and American workers assurance that they will not be sold down the river by the State Department I will vote for this bill. If the majority will not approve such amendments I shall be compelled in the interest of thousands of workers whom I represent to vote against it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] is recognized.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield for a question.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to have the gentleman from Massachusetts tell the House about how many fishermen owed the boat money previous to 1939 when they came in from their catch.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the 4 minutes allotted to me to discuss the very important matters affecting the industries of New England is entirely too short a time. We heard much said yesterday about gag rule. If this is not gag rule, restricting to 4 minutes a Member of this House, representing as many of us do, the great industrial areas of this country that need protection in years to come if this bill should become law, I do not know what is a gag rule. I shall not therefore be able to answer every question that will be asked in regard to this matter; but I am very interested, of course, in answering the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER], who yesterday in a very slighting way referred to the fishermen and the occupation they follow in their hazardous work on the high seas. He said yesterday that in the testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means, notwithstanding the tremendous imports of fish in the last 50 years, that the sum total of all the imports of fish brought into this country could be brought in in six boats. Now, of course, as I said to you yesterday, there must have been some misunderstanding of the question and there was a misunderstanding in the giving of the answers.

The facts are, Mr. Chairman, that since 1939 imports of fish—and let me emphasize fish because it is an important part of our food supply—very vitally affect many of the communities along the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Gulf coasts. In one particular city in my district alone over 60 percent of the industrial wages flow from that particular industry; namely, in the city of Gloucester, Mass., the oldest fishing port in the United States. In 1939 when they had remonstrance meetings in the city of Gloucester, when parades were the order of the day in protest of the heavy imports of fillet fish, that year the imports amounted to a little over 9,000,000 pounds and constituted only 10 percent of the total output of the New England fishing industry. But last year, 1948, instead of being 9,000,000 pounds it was 54,000,000 pounds; instead of being 10 percent of the total output last year it was 38 percent of the output of the New England fishing industry.

A similar situation applied a few years ago in the shoe industry when so many shoes were being imported from Czechoslovakia. Out of 28 factories in one city in my district making that particular type of shoe, 18 had closed their doors and the other 10 were in various stages of liquidation; and it was only as a result of the German march into Czechoslovakia in the spring of 1938 that we saved that shoe city where 70 percent of all the wages flowed from that industry.

Are we going to permit the same situation to arise again? Or are we going to have some protective clauses in this bill whereby the industry itself as well as the industry and the officials of those communities may come to Washington and plead before some agency of Government—not the Committee on Reciprocity Information, but some committee which will take notice of what they are saying and of their effort to save this industry in that part of the country?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired. All time on section 1 has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 (Public Law 792, 80th Cong.) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. The period during which the President is authorized to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended and extended, is hereby extended for a further period of 3 years from June 12, 1948.

SEC. 4. Section 350 (a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, is hereby further amended by deleting the following therefrom: "In the present emergency in restoring the American standard of living, in overcoming domestic unemployment and the present economic depression, in increasing the purchasing power of the American public, and".

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I heard the gentleman from Pennsylvania talk about the Waltham Watch Co. This concern is not located in my district but it is in the United States; and during the war, Mr. Chairman, that company did precision work for the United States Government in connection with dropping bombs and everything on our enemies. Then we allowed the Swiss who did not do anything for anybody to come in here and grab the watch companies' business. Now, I am not crying about them and I am not crying about any other unfair thing we have done in our tariff acts. I am sold, Mr. Chairman, on a protective tariff that takes care of the workingmen in this country and I am going to do that as long as I am here and as long as I am alive. I am working for the interests of the laboring man, not for the so-called labor leaders who come in and try to scare us to death by telling us we will not get elected again. Most of us do not care anything about them. We serve our country first.

The gentleman from Massachusetts told you about the fishing industry. I can remember when those fellows who went out there and sacrificed their lives to give you food owed the boat money when they came in. Certainly in 1943, 1944, and 1945 they made a lot of money.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. And those fishermen are not restricted to the 8-hour day or the 40-hour week. It is every day in the week and mostly every week in the month.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for adding something that I was about to say. Every time they go out they take their very lives in their hands. They come in with ice on their boats 10 inches thick to give you and me something to eat. They are entitled to everything they can get.

Mr. Chairman, I do not object to anyone standing up here on the floor and making his point, but when they talk about domestic things and the safety of the public, and when a company goes out and does everything that the United States Government asks them to do, then you allow a foreign country to send in parts of watches or anything else at half the price we can produce, we just cannot understand that. I do not believe anyone, whether he comes from California, Texas, Florida, or Massachusetts, believes any differently.

All we are asking here is that you see that the man who works for a living in this country gets a break. That is all we are asking. If you vote for that principle you will not be hurt in your district and I will not be hurt in mine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. Section 4 of the act entitled "An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930," approved June 12, 1934, as amended (U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 19, sec. 1354), is hereby amended by striking out the matter following the semicolon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and before concluding such agreement the President shall seek information and advice with respect thereto from the United States Tariff Commission, from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Commerce, from the National Military Establishment, and from such other sources as he may deem appropriate."

SEC. 6. Section 350 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (U. S. Code, 1946, title 19, sec. 1351 (b)), is amended by changing the colon to a period, by deleting the proviso, and by adding the following: "Nothing in this act shall be construed to preclude the application to any product of Cuba (including products preferentially free of duty) of a rate of duty not higher than the rate applicable to the like products of other foreign countries (except the Philippines), whether or not the application of such rate involves any preferential customs treatment. No rate of duty on products of Cuba shall in any case be decreased by more than 50 percent of the rate of duty, however established, existing on January 1, 1945 (even though temporarily suspended by act of Congress)."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania: At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

"SEC. 7. Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commission") with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment. Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission."

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, this is the proposed amendment which you have heard described as the peril-point amendment. It is designed to provide by law that the President shall request of the Tariff Commission the findings of what we describe as a peril point before the President or his negotiators proceed with the negotiation of any future trade agreements. Each of us must know that there is a point below which any tariff cut can lead to serious damage or injury, or actual injury, to any domestic industry presently protected by a tariff. The peril point is that point. There is no way at all under existing law by which the President can ascertain that particular point. The only group in the United States with long experience in doing just exactly this work is the Tariff Commission. They can find as a fact whether or not a tariff cut is apt to be disadvantageous or advantageous to our country's economy.

The Tariff Commission is, as you all know, in reality, an agent of the Congress. It is set up to provide the Congress—and specifically the respective committees of the Congress—with detailed information for the benefit of the Congress in determining our position upon tariffs and other matters affecting

imports and exports. The Tariff Commission is able to do the job. The Tariff Commission is today doing the job, and I submit that for the protection of American industry, for the assistance of the President and the negotiators, this amendment should be adopted. With its adoption, our negotiators, when going abroad to practice their skill at Yankee trading, will have had established as a guide a figure which a group of nonpartisan, independent experts in tariff matters have agreed is the point below which any cuts, if made, would threaten or actually cause damage to a particular industry in our country.

I submit, gentlemen, that those of you who are interested in protecting American industry cannot logically refuse to support this amendment. If interested in protecting American industry, this is the very minimum amendment that should be included in this bill. Such a person cannot logically oppose it. After the peril point is determined, cuts should not be made below it in tariffs. However, if made, we will do so with our eyes open. If for political or other considerations the peril point is disregarded, great damage will be done to American industry.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the gentleman state whether or not this was the real gist of the measure which was passed in 1948, H. R. 6556?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. This was a part of the act of 1948.

Mr. CARROLL. But this is the real issue at stake in this whole thing?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. We were entirely unable to get before our committee those men who could have answered the gentleman's question more exactly as to just what the purpose of the act this year is. However, in the act of 1948, the finding of those facts is required. As the gentleman knows, under the act of 1948 the President had to make public the amount recommended by the Tariff Commission as the minimum below which we should not cut, if he saw fit to go below that point. Under the proposed amendment, the fact of the finding will be secret to everyone save the President. He will have the information. He will never have to disclose it. Consequently, our negotiators in the future will not be embarrassed by publicity having been given to the findings of the Tariff Commission.

To those of you who want this trade-agreement program continued, to those of you who want the President to have the true facts found by a group of nonpartisan, independent, capable members of the Tariff Commission available to the President as a guide, I say that I can see no reason why you should oppose this amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, of course the real purpose of this amendment is to kill the pending bill. That is the only practical purpose it could serve, and it is designed and intended for that purpose.

The act passed by our Republican friends last year contained just two things, for all practical purposes. One was that it continued the trade-agreements program for just 1 year when it should have continued it for 3 years, and the other was that it provided this so-called peril-point procedure, which was for the purpose of hamstringing and making the program unworkable. That is what it was intended for and that is the purpose it serves.

There is no practical reason for placing this provision in this bill or in this program. Every step of the way in the negotiation of a trade agreement affords an ample peril point. Every care and caution is exercised in the negotiation of these trade agreements under the original program, which the pending bill seeks to reestablish. The members of the Departmental Committee, the members of the Committee for Reciprocity Information, and those engaged in the negotiation of the trade agreement, have all of the data and information and material available before them all the time, and use extreme caution and great care in every step that is taken to see to it that no American interest will be seriously affected by any trade agreement that is negotiated.

Under the pending bill, providing for the original procedure to be again established, a member of the Tariff Commission occupies a position among those who actually negotiate the trade agreements. All of the material that is available to him as a member of the Commission is there considered by all of those engaged in these negotiations.

Certainly there is no reason for making this requirement except to so far hamper and restrict the negotiations as to make it impossible for any desirable results to be accomplished. The member of the Tariff Commission who serves with those negotiating the agreement, as well as any other member of the committee, has the duty and is required, if he disagrees with the majority opinion, to file his minority view. Those views have to be submitted to the President when he passes on these things. So from every practical and reasonable standpoint, a thoroughly adequate peril point is provided every step of the way. There is no reason for including this amendment in this bill and no purpose could be served by including it except to restore the provisions of the act of 1948. That is the only thing that could be accomplished by it. The Chairman of the Tariff Commission himself, appearing before the Senate Finance Committee on the bill considered last year, made the statement in effect that this plan proposed by this amendment was unworkable and undesirable. Therefore, there is no reason for giving favorable consideration to this amendment and to include it in this bill. I simply say that the only purpose to be served by it is to kill the pending bill and restore the Republican act of 1948. The very reason for our being here today is to try to remove the restrictive amendments imposed at that time and thus make it possible for us to go on with this program as it was originally designed and intended and which has meant so much to the people of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, someday I am going to get the answer to a question which bothers me a great deal, and that is why the majority Members must always feel that every amendment submitted to a piece of legislation by the minority side has as its only purpose and principal design the killing of the measure under consideration. I say to the gentleman who preceded me, and to the Democratic Members of the House, that my support of this amendment is in no way designed to interfere with the proper carrying out of a trade-agreements program. It is in no way designed to kill the legislation. In fact, my individual position is that I want us to be in a position to continue to negotiate agreements with other countries. Unless, however, there is at least this little protection, this little consideration given to our domestic economy, I cannot support the program. I say to the gentleman that if this amendment is adopted, if this little concern is shown for our domestic economy, I will support, and support vigorously, the passage of H. R. 1211.

So I resent personally, and for my fellow members on the Ways and Means Committee who share my views, the intimation of the gentlemen who say that our only purpose in introducing this amendment is to kill the legislation. That is absolutely not correct.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the gentleman is so concerned about these amendments, will the gentleman explain to the committee why it was that this bill was brought before the House last year with a gag rule prohibiting any amendments?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. May I say to the gentleman we are not debating what happened last year. We are debating a specific proposal before us today. We have an issue now confronting us. It is nice to live in the past, but, as for me, I would rather live today and for the future. We have committed sins, of course. But who among us is there who has not?

Now, let us go to the fundamental proposition involved in the peril-point amendment, the position of the Tariff Commission in relation to the trade-agreements program. The basic issue is whether we are going to eliminate the Tariff Commission completely from any real part in the determination of our policy in negotiating with other countries on trade agreements. The contention is made that the Tariff Commission today is part and parcel of the negotiations; that they are members of the Trade Agreements Committee; that they have membership on the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Yes. They

do have members there, but the Commission at no time, as a commission of six men appointed on a bipartisan basis—at no time does that Commission act as a commission in any determination with regard to the rates of duty. Surely, they have a member, but that member never has spoken as the spokesman for the Commission. I refer you to hearing after hearing, and particularly you can look at page 51 of these hearings, where we quote the testimony of Mr. Ryder, Chairman of the Commission, in previous hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, in which he states, as Chairman of the Commission and as a member of these various committees, that he did not speak in the name of the Tariff Commission as a group. There has been no such thing as a determination by the Commission. That is what we are asking. We have this Commission; why not use it? Why not have them give this advice to the President? They say the negotiators have all this information that the Tariff Commission might find. I will agree that the negotiators do, and the Committee on Trade Agreements have all of the material that the Tariff Commission can furnish to them. But it is not made available to the President of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] has expired.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to object, but I thought it was understood we would try to move along and not ask for additional time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I was not aware of that. If you had such an agreement, I will withdraw the request.

Mr. COOPER. We did not have a definite agreement, but I thought that was understood. I do not say there was any definite agreement, but it was my understanding that we would try to move along and not ask for additional time. I will not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. As I said, there is no question but what all of the facts and information that are available to the Tariff Commission are made available by them to the Committee on Trade Agreements, and also to the negotiators; but the point I want to make, and the point that I think is very important in the procedure to be followed in entering into these agreements, is the fact that the President of the United States does not have available any determinations by the Tariff Commission. Why? Because the information that goes to the President goes to him from the Trade Agreements Committee. Under the procedure, the Trade Agreements Committee meets, and they find out various phases of the problem, and then they submit it to the President prior to going over and actually entering into negotiations with foreign countries. The right is given to members of the Trade Agreements Committee to file dissenting opinions with the President, but there is nothing there which provides that any impartial agency of this Government such as the Tariff Commission shall give to the President of the United States the facts which he can balance against the advice and opinions given to him by the Committee on Reciprocity or the Trade Agreements Committee.

There is nothing in the procedure contemplated under H. R. 1211 that will provide such information. By the amendment under consideration, we call upon the Tariff Commission, a bipartisan, factual agency, and we say to them, "Help the President to the extent of establishing what your facts, your information, lead you to believe is the peril point." There is a big difference, a very big difference, between the provisions of this act as we propose to amend it today and the provision which was contained in the 1948 act. In the 1948 act we required that the peril points established by the Tariff Commission be made public upon those occasions when they were exceeded by the President or by the negotiators. That has been removed. The purpose of this amendment is entirely to make available and put before the President information of an unbiased, unprejudiced nature. There is no question in the world but that—and anybody who has studied the operations of this program at all will admit it—this program is dominated from top to bottom today by the State Department. In my judgment and in the judgment of the minority members of the Committee on Ways and Means, provision should be made for an impartial agency to determine on a factual basis the extent to which our rates of duty can be lowered in order that the program can be carried out on a sound, sane basis for the protection of our country, with particular reference to our economy and our national defense and security.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JENKINS. The gentleman knows—everybody does—that the Constitution provides that the Congress shall have the sole responsibility of laying and collecting tariffs, does it not?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. That is right.

Mr. JENKINS. Under the present practice, the Congress has very little to say. Is that right?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. In practice we really do not have anything at all to say.

Mr. JENKINS. We have practically nothing to say. The effect of the amendment on which the gentleman is speaking will simply be that the Tariff Commission, which is an agency constitutionally set up by the Congress of the United States, is bypassed entirely and is given no consideration.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Yes; it is our purpose to see to it that we have some agency which is not bound up with international diplomacy and international politics; some agency that has no concern except the economy of our own country, our own industry, and our own labor; an agency that will give to the President unbiased information as to where we should stop in the matter of lowering a duty.

May I say, too, that this proposal is not entirely restrictive. There are occasions when it is to the advantage of the negotiators to know how low they can go. There may be a situation whereby the findings of the Tariff Commission would give the Trade Agreements Committee and the President reasons to believe that they could reduce the duty much lower than they themselves thought they could. It thus increases their bargaining power; it is not just a one-way street.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will not be guided by some of the prejudices that have entered into this debate, but will look at it from an honest, practical viewpoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let us assume, for the purpose of argument, that my friend from Pennsylvania and my friend from Wisconsin are very sincere in offering the amendment which they have discussed and that they desire to improve the reciprocal-trade-agreements program as a result of this amendment. I have no desire to impugn the motives of these friends; I can, however, I believe, take issue with their judgment. I believe I know what they have in mind accomplishing. I want to point out as best I can that the very purpose they intend to accomplish here is provided for already. The action they now propose to us and this committee is unnecessary and absolutely unworkable.

Why do I say it is unnecessary? Their amendment would require the Tariff Commission to report to the President within 120 days on the so-called peril point of each item being considered in negotiations with other countries. There is nothing in the present law, there is nothing in this act, which prevents the President, if he desires to have that information, from calling upon the Tariff Commission under H. R. 1211 to supply him with the information.

Every bit of information that could be made available to the President of the United States under this amendment is made available at all times to those who engage in this matter of negotiating trade agreements. Nothing will be accomplished and it is absolutely unnecessary.

How is it unworkable? Let us take the present situation. The Tariff Commission has under consideration right now 400 items that were included in the President's list of those to be considered in April. The act of 1948 required that the Tariff Commission report back to the President within 120 days how low these items could be cut without injuring the industries of the United States—120 days to consider 400 items. How many items does that mean the Tariff Commission must consider in one day? Approximately three items per day, if they work Saturday and Sunday. The Tariff Commission has only 200 employes, including elevator operators, the folks who

clean up around the Tariff Commission, stenographers, and a very, very few economists. There are very few people in the Commission who are sufficiently skilled to consider this particular point. How many of them would be available within 120 days to determine peril points? Notwithstanding how many staff personnel might be available, the Commission would have to turn out three decisions a day. What this amendment requires in connection with the Annecy negotiation is for the six members of the Tariff Commission to be able to make up their minds within 120 days on 400 items. The next time we may have a thousand items, but still the decision would have to be made in 120 days.

My argument and my objection to the amendment are that you require the Tariff Commission to do something physically impossible. You want a scientific investigation made, but you force the Tariff Commission to give a snap judgment. I think I heard you Republicans complaining in the 1948 campaign that snap judgment had been used. Now you are trying to force this administration into the position of using nothing but snap judgment.

It will not work. This is what would happen if the pending amendment were adopted. You and I know, all of us who have been here any length of time know, that there is never a report or a statement of findings made to the President of the United States that does not leak out in some way. To whom does it leak? It leaks out to the very people who want most to know the information. So what do they do? They awaken to the fact that the Tariff Commission has said that a reduction in duty below this point may injure us. They go back to the Tariff Commission, after the negotiations and the approval of the agreement, and they say, "Our case is made, Mr. Tariff Commissioners. You have already decided ahead of time what the peril point is. So now grant us the relief we ask."

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of a peril point is not going to bring relief to the watch industry, if it needs relief; it is not going to bring relief to the fishing industry or to any other industry in the United States. It is merely going to becloud the whole situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin, a moment ago expressed considerable chagrin and personal feeling because the thought had been advanced here that these amendments were being offered for the purpose of killing the legislation now before us. Without questioning his good faith, I think we might examine the record of his party insofar as reciprocal-trade programs are involved to acertain whether or not any representative of the Republican Party is genuinely sincere in saying that he favors the program if certain amendments are adopted.

Many of you Members were here and participated in these debates, but I would like to refresh your memory on the legislative history of the reciprocal-trade program. The first vote was in the year 1934. In that year 269 Democrats voted aye and 2 Republicans voted aye. In 1937, when the first extension came up, the Democrats made real progress. They brought in one more Republican. Three Republicans voted for the reciprocal-trade program, 278 Democrats voted for it, and 81 Republicans voted against it. In 1940, however, we lost ground. We slipped back. Again, only two Members of the Republican Party voted for the reciprocal-trade program with 212 Democrats voting for it. In 1943, under the exigencies of war, we secured some temporary converts. One hundred and forty-five members of the Republican Party lapsed from their old doctrine of high protectionism and voted for the reciprocal-trade program, but not for long, because when it came up again in 1945, the number dropped back to 33, with 205 Democrats voting for the program. Never have there been more than 12 Democrats, in the 15-year history of this program, opposing it.

Now, it seems, too, that the gentleman from Wisconsin, when he protests injury to his feelings, should have his memory refreshed just a little bit. The gentleman from Wisconsin sat on the Gearhart subcommittee last year which brought out the so-called extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act in this House. It came to this floor under a gag rule whereby no amendments were permitted, and the bill as it passed the House was described by the then Secretary of State, the great General Marshall, as being worse than no bill at all. So, it seems to me that in light of the record it can very well be said that those who sponsor this amendment are actually attempting to destroy and discredit this great reciprocal-trade program, and it is in line with Republican principles over the entire history of that party.

Let me cite from the platform of the Republican Party of a few years ago. Here is what was said:

> We will repeal the present Reciprocal Trade Agreements Law. It is futile, and it is dangerous. Its effect on agriculture and industry has been destructive. Its continuation would work to the detriment of the wage earner and the farmer.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I leave to the good judgment of the members of the committee the question of who is in good faith on the extension of the reciprocal-trade-treaty program.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Chairman, I belive in and will vote to extend the trade-treaties program that is now before us. But I do believe that in granting the powers requested for the executive department of our Government, that the Congress of the United States should reserve some power of review to study and analyze their effect upon the trade and commerce of the United States. I believe it would be wise and prudent for this body to insist that the Tariff Commission, at the request of Congress, be authorized to find the limits within which tariff reductions may be made without injury to our American producers.

The pottery producers of my district are disturbed and alarmed at the increased importation of household china that is now taking place.

In 10 months of 1948, these importations regularly increased in volume, as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| January | $312,300 |
| February | 234,200 |
| March | 337,200 |
| April | 297,000 |
| May | 368,000 |
| June | 406,900 |
| July | 335,700 |
| August | 549,500 |
| September | 456,400 |
| October | 536,400 |

The difference in the amount of wages and the standard of living in the various countries being so great and uncertain makes it impossible to meet this threat to American industry by specific duties applied to all foreign countries alike, as was done in former tariff laws.

It becomes necessary to have a tax that is not specific, but a tax system that can be applied to imports from every such import country in a fair and impartial manner, so as to apply to each of said countries equally, and this can only be accomplished by a separate trade treaty with each export nation.

In the whole world there are not three countries where our rates of duty apply equally to the cost of production. When duties are set at a point which sell merchandise of some countries at a higher rate than others, our rate does not protect us or even any other country who sells us goods and who pays its workmen better than starvation wages.

An example will show what this bill will do to protect our trade and commerce against the dictator nations of the world who have no interest in international integrity or fairness with other than totalitarian nations who depend on money and currencies without value and employment at a fixed and dictated wage.

Compound duties, ad valorem and specific rates, if applied in a case where we assume the American wholesale price to be 75 cents and imports from one country 50 cents, a compound duty of 30 percent, plus 10 cents, would suffice and equal the American price, 75 cents.

However, if this compound duty were applied to a 25-cent cost of same article in some other country of import, the effect would be to bring it to only 42½ cents. This bill would equalize by adding the difference in any advantage given to such country by debased moneys and currencies by an increased tariff tax to place such imports on an exact footing in a competitive market.

TARIFF

The rational view of the tariff today is to secure only tariff for protection. As a revenue measure, it is of minor significance. The sole question is to learn the degree and methods of determining the amount of protection and the selection of industries and items which need protection against excessive imports.

We are the largest and greatest producer in the world; therefore, our tariffs should be adopted to protect these interests, as a large majority of our people are engaged in production, with a rate of duty high enough to protect the average producer. But to protect all producers under such a theory of tariff is impossible, because it has been found that technological progress is not uniform.

The largest firms, of course, are in the forefront in the installation of the most modern equipment and process. Small firms may lack the advantage of larger and better-equipped factories, and therefore may be in need of greater protection. These and other various items create a great problem in determining the average or normal producer.

Then again there are yet greater problems in the items of import. The cost of production differs largely in the various countries, also the relative parity of the moneys of the different countries from which imports are brought to the United States.

In the year 1947, decorated household china was shipped to us by 32 countries, of which four accounted for 80 percent. These were Japan, Germany, France, and China. Two were European countries and two Asiatic, represented by distinct standards of living and unequal competitive levels, yet the rate of duty was the same for all.

A single rate of duty in such instances frustrates the very function of a protective tariff. There can be no individual rate of duty equally applicable to all countries exporting their goods to America.

Of course, we assess our duties on the foreign invoice value of imports. We should substitute domestic value, but this alone would not take care of the difference in the value of foreign currencies, when compared to the value of the American dollar, nor would it always meet the problem of competitive differentials.

EQUALITY OF COMPETITION

In our tariff legislation, heretofore we enacted equal tax rates, that applied to all countries alike, regardless of the low standard of wages in most of them.

It seems to me, tariff rates, if they are to protect producers from such low-standard countries, must be fixed to equalize the equality of competition, rather than equality of rates. Of course, the most simple and direct method of producing equality of competition among the countries that export to us is to apply different rates of duty, depending upon the competitive level of such countries.

Since it has been the accepted theory in all countries that tariffs are only enacted to safeguard producers who are in need of protection against competition based on low wages and low standards of living, we must recognize the fact that this can only be done by a tariff rate that will fit the competitive factors prevailing among the different countries that export goods to us. Such a tariff, of course, would require detailed data and proper study of all conditions entering into the production in such countries.

TRADE AGREEMENTS

I believe the State Department, as an instrument of foreign policy, should continue to have the right to enter into trade treaties with foreign nations, but I also believe that an amendment to the trade agreement should be added that would enable the Tariff Commission to find the limits within which further reductions are to be held if we desire to prevent injury to domestic industry.

The Tariff Commission is a creature of Congress, and is the only organization of the Government that was set up and staffed with specialized and technical knowledge and training to adjust the tariff within prescribed limits authorized by Congress. It is the only agency in a position to make necessary inquiries and investigations for the purposes of proper tariff enactments and adjustments of the tariff that become necessary because of shifting economic conditions.

The results of our trade agreements made within the past 10 years should be reviewed. The Tariff Commission is the proper Government organization and the only Government body competent to review and report on the effects and changes necessary in all the trade agreements heretofore or hereafter entered into by the State Department with foreign nations.

And we should amend our tariff law of 1930, so that the valuation of imported goods should be taxed solely on the wholesale value of such merchandise in America and not on the value of the inflated yen.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 15 minutes after the gentleman from Michigan concludes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that personally I regret very much that partisanship has been injected into this issue by the gentleman from Louisiana. This is an important implement of foreign policy, and I feel that it is entitled not to be treated as a political football.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, it has been my great privilege to live in different sections of this country. I think I know what it means to the man who grows wool, mohair, beef and hides, pecans, peanuts, rice, and sugarcane, all in the Southern States, to have protection for his enterprise. As one who has southern blood in my veins, I can think in terms of protecting southern commodities the same as western and northern commodities. But in no way do I overlook northern agriculture and industry. I know what it is to have industry in the Northern States and to participate in farming in the West and the Northwest, which I think needs a little protection now and then, so I can look at this picture, I think, from about as many angles as any Member who sits on this floor.

This is not a political question so far as I am concerned, but I take the position that it is more important to protect all the industry, and all the jobs of all our people, than it is to protect any policy which may be promoted by this Government if that policy runs contrary to the interests of our people and the general welfare. Certainly Members of Congress and Congress as a whole and the President can get off on the wrong road once in a while, and when we are on the wrong road we can have the wrong policy. Many fine and capable workers are now losing their jobs as the administration continues to ask for billions of dollars to continue gifts to other nations in the name of defense.

My friend from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] has argued that this amendment would impose on the Tariff Commission an impossible job with respect to the 120 days. I have no sympathy whatever for that kind of an argument. If the Tariff Commission is not sufficiently informed on these major commodities and major issues, which the President may propose from time to time, to give a report of that kind within 120 days, then we had better fire the Tariff Commission and get somebody on the Commission who is on the job and knows what is going on. But I am sure the Commission can do the job.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. If the Tariff Commission cannot do it, how, pray, can the State Department or the Committee for Reciprocity Information do it?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly I think the argument of the gentleman from Arkansas is absolutely unfounded, and without substantial foundation.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. The Tariff Commission has over 200 experts, and they practically have their job done ahead of time now.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course they do. You would not have a Tariff Commission worth a tinker's darn if it could not do that.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The Tariff Commission at the present time is turning out three and more such findings per day.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Why, sure.

Those who supported the foreign policy of this country the last few years, and I refer specifically to the Marshall plan as well as lend-lease, have gotten themselves over a barrel with respect to this trade-agreement program.

When the Bretton Woods agreement was before the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I am not sure my friend the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] was then a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. William Green, of the A. F. of L., was before our committee, recommending the approval of Bretton Woods agreement. You will find several pages of cross-examination where I put right straight to him cold-blooded this kind of a question. I said:

Mr. Green, when the goods produced in other countries start flowing back into this country against your workers and your union members, throwing them out of job, what do you propose to do?

His reply in substance was, and you will find this in volume 2 of the hearings, which I read only yesterday afternoon, that the Government of the United States must guarantee to the workers of this country that their standard of living, and this relates to their wages, will not be reduced.

I inquired:

What is your formula for effectuating such a guaranty?

Mr. Green had not had time to work up the formula.

Of course, if you collect back these advances that you are making to these other countries, you will have to do it through the importation into this country of work in the form of goods by those who work in other parts of the world. When you begin doing that, you will close industries, create unemployment, and destroy the flow of national and social income in this country, and you will throw your Secretary of the Treasury charged with the management of a quarter of a trillion dollar debt, into a very bad predicament. That is what you will face if you expect to collect for these gifts which you know you are making. I do not think you are going to collect substantially from any of the countries. That is a reason, only one reason, that I have not supported this give-away program because there is a bottom to our meal barrel. This is not a limitless cornucopia that we are operating here in the United States. I am in favor of the amendment and hope that it will be adopted. We shall find in the coming months it is necessary to have jobs and production in this country if we are to meet budgets and our obligations, internally and externally.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I am glad that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] raised the question as to partisan politics being brought into this debate by some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. May I say at the outset that I am wholeheartedly supporting the President's European foreign policy of the Government of the United States. I am one of those who early supported it, and appreciated its value, not only insofar as the economic recovery of the western states of Europe is concerned, but also insofar as the future security of this country is concerned. This is a matter that cannot in any way be tied up with the foreign policy of our Government in a partisan manner. It seems to me that what we ought to do is to approach this question from the point of view of what is the over-all good for both our domestic and our foreign policy. With the support of the Marshall plan and the benefits that we hope will flow from that plan for the recovery of the 16 states of western Europe we also hope that we can sustain a high state of production and employment in this country.

This bill affects the very vitals of our own economy and the welfare of our own industry and of our own workers, our own pay rolls and our own purchasing power. The economic life of the Nation is involved in this measure which we are considering here today. In the State of Massachusetts in the past year, 1948, over $50,000,000 was paid out in unemployment compensation. That is $50,000,000, and the reserve fund is growing lower and lower every year. The reports that we are getting from many parts of the State are that unemployment is steadily on the increase.

This amendment simply provides that before any trade agreement is executed, that the Tariff Commission shall make a complete investigation and study of all the economic effects relating to the agreement that is to be considered and the adverse effects, if any, it would have upon our own domestic industries. We know that under the present Trade Agreements Act the benefits of the so-called most-favored-nation clause will now flow to all the Communist states of the world. We know that in those states behind the iron curtain they are developing so-called central export agencies in order to pool the resources of all the industries of those individual countries and then get the American dollar through the American market by sending their goods here, whether it be shoes, textiles or any other type of product which needs to get down below the selling price in the American market. That is a matter we should be deeply concerned about. This amendment, in my opinion, will be helpful in the protection of our own industries and the workers in the factories throughout the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has expired.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am the only member of the House today who took part in the conference between the House and Senate in 1939 on the strategic and critical materials stock pile, the original legislation in that field. From that day down to this I have been watching some phases of the national defense effort, that I had particular opportunity to look into during the 8 years I served on the Military Affairs Committee.

If the Simpson amendment is adopted, I could go along with this legislation. I want that safeguard, a determination of the peril points, because I have seen enough of the action of the State Department so far in handling reciprocal trade programs that I am not willing to subordinate national defense to their judgment, when that judgment is based on their diplomatic negotiations, rather than on the health of our essential industries, for our own national defense self-sufficiency.

I have looked carefully through Mr. Forrestal's statement in answer to my position in the committee, and he has not answered this point. I wish some Member on the majority side of the committee would get for me a specific statement from Forrestal that the peril point is not needed for national defense—specifically that statement; and then I will reserve my judgment as to whether he is sound in thus subordinating national defense, even if he should make that statement later.

We have a serious point. Some people argue that the escape clause is an adequate provision, yet, if it is adequate, why do you not put the escape clause in the Swiss agreements? There we get right down to a very vital point in national defense. Why do you not put the escape clause in the Swiss agreements? They are not there and you know they are not there. Then, when you get the escape clause in the Swiss agreements, let me admonish the Committee on Reciprocity Information to make some adequate use of that escape clause. Just read the statement by the mining industry on page 425 of the hearings:

In the experience of the mining industry, however, the escape clauses have been found to be of no practical value whatever, and no remedial action under these clauses has ever been taken, even where all the conditions specified therein have been shown to exist. So far as we can learn, out of the many hundreds of reductions in duty which have been made under the trade-agreements program, the escape clauses have been successfully invoked only in two minor instances, involving silver fox furs and embroidered handkerchiefs.

In the case of tungsten, in hearings held before the Committee for Reciprocity Information in January 1947, the committee assured industry representatives that their case was excellent and that they should have no fear of a tariff cut; nevertheless, the cut was made. Although further appeal was made 6 months after the cut, the Tariff Commission took the position that insufficient time had elapsed and that testimony could not be considered. It would appear that the industry must die completely before its case can be taken up.

Now that is a severe indictment. All I want is a proper system to give us effective protection when we approach the peril point, and then make effective use of the escape clause when we get it into the agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON] for 4 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON]. Those who favor this amendment and who oppose the bill before the House as written may have been converted to the principles of the reciprocal trade method of dealing with tariffs and foreign trade; but if they have—and I do not question their motives—but I will say, if they have, that conversion is as mysterious and as sudden as that of St. Paul. I fear, by the

arguments they offer in support of the amendment, the scales have not yet fallen from their eyes.

Let us for a moment consider a little of the history of this reciprocal trade program. In the last Congress, when the present law was enacted, it will be remembered that the then majority, both in the Committee on Ways and Means and in the House, did not take the first step, if my memory is correct, to extend the reciprocal trade-agreements program. Instead, they waited until I, the ranking Democratic member on the committee, introduced a bill to extend the original law for another 3 years. Then they went into secret conclave behind closed doors, with the public shut out and the press excluded, and wrote the 1948 version of the reciprocal trade program.

In my humble judgment had we not taken that step of introducing the bill to extend the original reciprocal trade program, so that the Republicans could clearly see that the sentiment of the country was so overwhelmingly in favor of the reciprocal trade program, they would have just let the whole thing die. That is my opinion. But the sentiment of the country was so overwhelmingly in favor of the reciprocal trade method of dealing with tariffs that they did not dare do it after the question was raised.

As far as the question of sincerity is concerned, my good friend the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the committee, resents the suggestion that the majority members are not sincere. I do not pass on their sincerity, but I may say that one who lives in a glass house should not throw stones. His skin was so thin about some intimation that they might not have been sincere that, toward the end of his remarks, he turned to the majority and enjoined this side of the House not to be controlled or motivated by prejudice. While pleading for us to accept the sincerity of the minority, he suggests that we of the majority may be controlled and motivated by prejudice. It is not a question, Mr. Chairman, of sincerity; it is a question of what is right, what is just, what is fair, what is best for the economy of the American people.

As far as the peril point clause is concerned, the Chairman of the Tariff Commission, Mr. Ryder, in testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, said that the Tariff Commission was not constituted to formulate policy; they were constituted to furnish information; and the peril-point procedure required by the 1948 act meant the imposition upon them of the duty and the responsibility of formulating policy; consequently, he said, it was not practical; he said it was not workable.

Mr. Chairman, if we want a real, genuine reciprocal trade-agreements program let us realize that the program will not work if emasculated by crippling amendments and placed in a strait jacket. If you want a man to do a job, if you want the President of the United States to carry out this reciprocal-trade-agreements program, you must implement it the way he has asked that it should be implemented, the way the State Department says it should be implemented. We must write the law so it will work. It will not work under these amendments that are offered. The only thing to do, Mr. Chairman, is to pass this bill as it is written, not as it would be so severely crippled by such amendments as have been proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, in 1934 I opposed the bill giving to the President sole authority to enter into trade agreements with other nations because I felt that such reciprocal trade agreements were unconstitutional. The Constitution provides that the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senators present concur."

I also was opposed to it because it was an illegitimate child. Its daddies were the international manufacturers and bankers. In 1934 these "one-worlders" were out in the open and flooded Congress with their literature.

Here are a few of the original promoters of the reciprocal trade agreements: The Chase National Bank, the National City Bank of New York, General Motors, General Electric, Westinghouse, and scores of other corporations and individuals. All these were, and are, engaged in buying and selling foreign bonds and in selling American-manufactured products to foreign nations.

These wish the American people—especially the American farmer and laborer—to surrender their domestic market to these nations in order to service the foreign debt. In other words, so that these nations can buy their bonds and goods with the proceeds they get from the products they sell on our domestic market—products that can be, and should be, produced by our own people.

I have opposed this legislation and shall continue to. It is against the best interest of the laborer and the farmer. These two groups consist of the largest number of our people. I still believe that that is best which is for the best interest of the greatest number.

The original bill provided that the President could reduce the tariff 50 percent. Since then, it has been amended so that the President can lower the tariff 75 percent. Every agreement that has been entered into since the passage of this resolution has been favorable to the international manufacturer and banker and against the best interest of agriculture and labor.

It is true that the State Department will hold hearings on the proposed agreements, but they are a deception. The Department will listen to the opposition, but, invariably, their final decision will be the original agreement without a single change.

In the past chickens have come home to roost. They are again coming home. During 1936 and 1937 there were so many Canadian cattle shipped to the south St. Paul market that the farmers of North Dakota and surrounding States could not get their livestock marketed for even as low as 6 or 7 cents a pound. The market was absorbed and taken over by the Canadian producers.

Of course, the farmers protested, but it was too late. The agreements were in effect. Permit me to suggest to labor that in the campaign of 1936 most of the donkeys that many of my Democratic friends wore on the lapels of their coats were manufactured in Japan by labor that worked for 4 or 5 cents a day.

The California nut growers are now protesting against foreign nuts shipped into this country by the international profiteers. This while the people of the countries that produce them are hungry.

Soon the same will be true of citrus fruit. The citrus-fruit farmers of California and Florida and other States are already losing their farms by mortgage foreclosures because of the low price of their products. I am aware that fruit is still high enough in many parts of the Nation, but that is because of the high transportation charges. The producers of grapefruit a year ago in Florida got as low as 10 cents for a 60-pound crate.

Last fall the Department of Agriculture fixed a support price of $2 per hundred on domestic potatoes. Then under the reciprocal-trade agreements, the Canadians began shipping their potatoes into North Dakota, Maine, and other States, and sold them below the support price, with the result that the Canadian potatoes were consumed, and the American potatoes were piled up.

This forced the Secretary of Agriculture to lower his support price. Because of this performance—a support price on one hand and a reciprocal-trade agreement on the other—the American taxpayer, and the American housewife that purchased Canadian potatoes, will have to help pay millions of dollars in taxes to the producers of the American potatoes.

I will leave this warning with my friends. The time is here that we should use better judgment. I know that you are going to pass this resolution. I am confident when enough chickens have come home to roost, that then we will get rid of this international lunacy of destroying ourselves to enrich a few internationalist "one-worlders" for a profit under the pretense that we are doing something for other nations.

The time is not distant when we will reestablish the American system of protecting our own people—of continuing to have our American standard of living. This without tearing down any other nation, but by showing them how they too can have a higher standard of living if they will get rid of the internationalists—the parasites—that are always playing both ends against the middle.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 114, noes 154.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. DOUGHTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 167.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for the motion to recommit, and shall vote for the bill to extend the Reciprocal Trade Act on final passage. It is probable that conditions beyond my control may prevent my presence here in the Chamber at the time final vote occurs on the passage of the bill and I desire my position on this measure be clearly set forth.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Add a new section 7, as follows:

"SEC. 7. The President shall, as soon as practicable, but in any event not later than 90 days from the date of this act, institute such proceedings as are necessary to incorporate an escape clause to the same general effect as article XIX of the General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade in all trade agreements to which the United States is a party."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, at the present time we have trade agreements with some 33 or 34 countries. About half of those agreements, perhaps, maybe a little bit more, have what we call the escape clause. The escape clause is the procedure that has been adopted by the administration. I think it is a good thing. I have every reason to believe that the majority ought to accept this amendment. This amendment provides that the President shall institute such proceedings as are necessary to have the escape clause inserted in all agreements to which the United States is now a party.

May I first define what we mean by an escape clause? It is provided in article XIX that "concessions may be withdrawn or obligations suspended if in view of unforeseen developments they result in increased imports so substantial as to cause or threaten serious injury to home producers. There must, however, be consultation with the affected countries either before or immediately after withdrawing the concession with a view to reaching an agreement. If the agreement is not reached and the action is nevertheless taken, the parties affected by the action can then withdraw equivalent concessions."

I want to say at the outset we feel the adoption of this amendment alone will not necessarily bring relief to everyone adversely affected by trade agreements. It must be coupled with an honest, fair, and considerate administration and a desire to protect American workers and industries and our national defense. This law runs for but 3 years. Under it trade agreements will be entered into which will extend for many years. Therefore it is important that now we insert not only in all future trade agreements, but that we have inserted in the trade agreements already made an escape clause.

In presenting this amendment, I have no desire to plead the case of any industry or any group. It is prompted by the desire that we should extend equal treatment to all foreign countries. If the trade-agreement law is going to be an instrument to promote good will and friendly relations around the world, how can we say to one country, "You will have to have an escape clause in the agreement that we have with you"; and say to another country, "Your agreement will not have an escape clause." In the interest of equal treatment of all foreign nations, certainly the friends of this program should support this amendment.

The second reason why we should have this amendment is that it would extend equal treatment to all segments of our own domestic economy. Certain industries and certain groups of workers are affected by a trade agreement with a country where there is an escape clause. They have that protection and concessions can be withdrawn if it becomes wise and for the best interests of our country. Other industries and groups of workers do not have that protection. In the interest of equal treatment of all of our people and equal treatment of all foreign countries I urge you to adopt this amendment.

I hope that this bill is amended so that I can vote for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] has expired.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to prolong this discussion except to bring up again a point that has not been discussed during the present debate on the Trade Agreements Act, and which never has been discussed over the period of the last 16 or 18 years when we have had trade agreement legislation under consideration.

In the past we have dealt with industry agreements. In the future we are going to deal with national agreements. By that I mean that all of the benefits of the so-called most favored nation clause, within the provision of the Trade Agreements Act, will flow to every communized state in the world. When we stop to think that in these Communist-controlled states—10 of which are in eastern Europe behind the so-called iron curtain—all industries in those countries are thoroughly nationalized. We know they are under the complete domination and control of the Communist governments of those countries. We know that in each of those countries they have set up central export agencies for the purpose of controlling exports. We know that all those industries that are not paying industries—as we understand it in private enterprise—will be subsidized by the government. We know that those countries are desperately in need of the American dollar in order that they may carry on world trade. We know that in order to get that American dollar they must get the American market. It therefore becomes easy to understand, in order to flow their goods into the American market, whether it is shoes or any other type of products coming from these industries in the communized states, they are going to subsidize the production of those products in order to get under the American selling price of the American-made product.

Mr. Chairman, we know that the industries in Czechoslovakia in 1938 were able to undersell the shoe industry in our section of the country. They specialized in a particular type of shoe that was made in larger volume in our section of the country than in any other.

We know that that one industry, the largest of its kind in the world, manufactures over 50,000,000 pairs of rubber and leather shoes. That is the so-called Bata factory which has now been taken over by the Czech Government. We know that once the bars are let down and the American market is free for them they will deluge our markets with their products. They are going to destory the market on which the products of our own working men and women must depend. I believe we ought to have protection in this bill so that American industry and our workers can come here to the seat of government and make a plea in the interest of their own industry and their own communities.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 20 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, when the reciprocal trade treaties were first discussed by the New Dealers in Congress, the top New Dealers everywhere back in 1934 contended that above all else it was the best insurance to keep America out of war and to keep the whole world at peace. But in spite of these claims we got right in the middle of World War II, the most terrible in history; so that claim has fallen flat. Also, it was claimed that it would be good for the economy of America. Facts and figures show that between the time the Reciprocal Trade Treaties Act passed in 1934 and the time we started producing for war we had on an average in America over 10,000,000 people unemployed. Then came the war, then the postwar era which we are now experiencing. Now, I challenge any Member on either side of this House to point out any 10-day period, or any 15-day period, or any 60-day period, or any period however short or long since the reciprocal-trade-treaty program of this administration went into effect that shows the agreements have been good for America or for the world. I am waiting for someone to rise in his place and challenge that statement. I see no one on

their feet. So when you claim all these wonderful things for this reciprocal-trade-treaty program there is nothing to substantiate your claims whatsoever. At a meeting here in Washington, D. C., last spring which was called at the instance of Mr. Clayton himself, just a few days before we voted on this thing during the last session, I put the same challenge up to him as I have just done to any Member of this House and Mr. Clayton had to admit, with a red face before 25 Members of Congress, about half Republicans and half Democrats, that due to the fact that ever since the act was passed in 1934 we have experienced an abnormal economy in America.

Now Mr. Chairman, I have listened to a number of speeches yesterday and today on these so-called reciprocal trade treaties which of course are only reciprocal in favor of other nations.

The community market and stock market slump should be a warning to every one of us, that the New Deal honeymoon of the past and present is rapidly coming to an end, and that our give-away program must stop now to save the skins of the American farmer, labor, and industry and all Americans.

How can we expect to hold prices and wages up to a proper point when the party in power threatens to make it tough for everybody who has money to invest? One year ago today the price of corn with a 24-percent moisture content was selling at the midwestern farmer's crib for around $2 per bushel; today the same quality of corn is selling at the farmer's crib for around $1 per bushel. It is true that a lot of corn was sealed at around $1.40 per bushel, but the market is far below the Government support prices now, as are a number of basic farm crops, and still going down.

Now, what will the effect of this decline be on our national income and hence our ability to pay this extravagant administration budget request. If present prices for farm products are to be the average for the year 1949 the total gross farm income will be approximately $21,000,000,000 which will generate a gross national income of approximately $147,000,000,000, for the reason that the national income is always just about exactly seven times the farm income. That being a proven fact, I ask in all sincerity what will happen to the American taxpayers—who are to a great extent the ultimate consumers, for they pay the bill in the final analysis—and that includes the laborer, the farmer, the businessman, and all, when they are called upon by the local, county, State, and Federal Government to pay a total tax bill of between fifty-five and sixty billion dollars for 1948 out of a national income of $147,000,000,000 which they will be forced to pay if President Truman's request for funds is approved by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, unless we maintain the annual farm income of our Nation at a level of around $30,000,000,000 until such time when the running expense of the Federal Government is drastically reduced, national bankruptcy will be our harvest for the whole New Deal give-away program. A full 90-percent support on basic storable farm crops for years to come is the best and only insurance against national bankruptcy, and all the misery that will come with it.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Chairman, I arise to call the attention of the House to the fact that under the trade programs of this administration, the filbert-nut industry of the Pacific Northwest is virtually bankrupted, and the important bottom-fisheries industry in my part of the country is almost entirely closed down.

Filbert imports, which have been coming into this country since the war, have exceeded 400 percent of prewar and placed our growers in a position where they will have to completely go out of business unless these imports are restricted. While these increased importations have been coming into our country, the costs of production have arisen just about the same percentage.

We do not ask that these foreign imports be completely cut off, but we do feel it only fair to ask that they be restricted to the same rate as before the war. If such a step is not undertaken by this Government, we will see the complete ruination of one of our important, stable Northwest industries—and such ruination will not be long in coming.

Our fishing fleets, which have produced for our American markets large quantities of bottom fish, are unable to compete with the extremely heavy imports from Newfoundland, Iceland, and Great Britain. This business was a very profitable one for our fisherman a few years ago, but they have suffered so greatly from these imports that the bottom-fisheries fleet stands idle in our ports most of the time. These men have investments in their equipment which is sizable and can be compared exactly to the investment a businessman makes in his store. Unless they are given some reasonable protection, they stand to lose a substantial part of their investments. I know many of these men and have seen them acquire their boats and gear over a period of years through good, honest labor and hard work, and it is lamentable to see them sitting idle most of the time. I ask that this Government take steps to see that these people are given fair and reasonable treatment—they do not ask for more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, the subject before us today known as the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949—H. R. 1211—vitally affects all Americans, the farmer, the workingman, and the consumer. It may well determine whether we go forward to a high standard of living with higher standards of wages, or whether we blunder into another depression or recession with vast unemployment. My candid opinion, Mr. Speaker, is that American-trade policies are too vital to the Nation's welfare to trust to the whims of one man, however well intentioned that one man may be. H. R. 1211, as it is now written, would give to the President of the United States the right to lower or raise tariff rates as he sees fit. In my opinion, the present bill will legislate, regulate, and finance the abolishment of hundreds of thousands of American workers' jobs. This legislation will allow products to be brought into this country from foreign nations where the living standards are much lower than ours in this country. Our farmers will also be forced to compete with the prices of farm products of foreign nations, which certainly are at a lower level because of the foreign wage element involved. I firmly believe that this act should be amended so that the peril point will be protected. The peril point is nothing more than a report made by the Tariff Commission specifying the point below which it would be perilous to this country to go in reducing tariff. Certainly no thinking and patriotic American should object to the inclusion of an amendment which is essential to the preservation of our Nation's economy and our Nation's security; and certainly the President should be willing to allow the Tariff Commission to submit this full report to him for his guidance. If this provision is not included in the law, may I call to your attention, that there is no other fact-finding agency of the Government with such vast experience, operating strictly on a bipartisan basis, as the Tariff Commission, which can give this information to the President. Surely this amendment would not hamper restrictions and it would most assuredly let the President know whether or not the importation of certain articles would definitely hinder our living standards.

I also urge that an amendment be included in H. R. 1211 to provide an escape clause. The reason for this is that at the present time many industries whose tariff protection has been seriously reduced are unfairly discriminated against, because they are denied the privilege which other industries have of appealing under the escape clause. I contend that all industries should have equal treatment and a chance to have their day in court.

If these two amendments are not incorporated in this bill, certainly the working people and all those who have a stake in the continued prosperity of our Nation should hold the Democratic Party strictly accountable for the economic evils and disastrous consequences which will beset our national economy, which would be the result of any ill-advised tariff reduction. When the time arrives when factories are closed and many millions are out of work, those directly affected should remember who is to blame.

May I reiterate my former statements, Mr. Chairman; when you reduce the tariff on products from other countries you are allowing products to be brought into this country made by low-income labor, which makes it impossible for the American worker to match. We all believe in reciprocal trade, Mr. Chairman, but let us make sure it is reciprocal, taking into consideration the welfare and living standard of our own people.

I hope the amendments I have referred to will be accepted so that we can show to our workers, our farmers, and all of our people, that we are sincerely trying to protect their interests.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JENKINS. I have received a letter this morning from a small community in my district, a district of about 5,000 people, stating that 1,500 are out of work today.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is a concrete example of what is taking place and what is going to take place.

May I assure you, and I think the people of America will assure you, that the blame is entirely on your shoulders when you pass this type of legislation.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SADLAK. There are at the present time some 45,000 unemployed in the State of Connecticut and the lay-offs are increasing each day.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusets.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. May I say that in Massachusetts last year, according to the statistics I have received from the Social Security office, 240,000 workers receive a total sum in unemployment compensation of $50,000,000 and the condition is getting steadily worse.

Mr. McGREGOR. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I read into the hearings a letter to me dated February 1 from Lieutenant General Lutes, Director of the staff of the Munitions Board, to establish once and for all that these skilled workmen from the watchmaking industry are extremely important in our national defense as a source of skilled workmen for the making of small gears, pinions, and other control parts for the guided-missile program and for the making of compasses, time fuzes, watches, clocks, tachometers, navigational instruments, aircraft instruments, and time-delay devices. Instead of drawing comparisons between 1949 and 1940, Mr. Forrestal should take steps to build up our national defense in these skills to a point far beyond our present inadequate condition. An inadequate tariff, the denial of authentic and timely information provided by the Simpson amendment, or a trade-agreement program that provides no escape clause have all forced our own national defense to take second place to trade expansion.

Testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means revealed that it will require from 2 to 10 years to train men of these various skills. It is generally conceded that we will not have that time available for training these workers in event of another war.

Proponents of the bill now before us state that any industry adversely affested by reciprocal trade agreements can appeal to the Committee on Reciprocity Information for relief, but in this very watchmaking industry our trade agreements provide no escape clause and there is no disposition shown as yet by any responsible Government official to renegotiate those trade agreements and to place in them the escape clause so badly needed by our watchmaking industry.

Until the majority side of the House brings out better proof of their interest in national defense and gives us an escape clause in the Swiss trade agreement, I will condemn them for placing national defense in second place to trade expansion. As for me, I cannot approve such action, and unless this amendment is adopted, I will have to oppose this present legislation. I cannot see the reason or sense in denying our national defense that safeguard. I have listened carefully throughout all the proceedings of the Committee on Ways and Means, but I have not heard any argument that justifies keeping the Swiss agreement in effect without an escape clause.

Does the gentleman have the answer?

Mr. LYNCH. I think I have. I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 8, 1949, page 936, and the authority is none other than Secretary Forrestal whom I imagine the gentleman will concede knows something about national defense. He said:

> The domestic jewel watch industry has fulfilled its role in our program of national defense, and I am not aware that its capabilities have been adversely affected by the reciprocal trade authority.

I think that answers the question.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Forrestal does not tell you that we had an inadequate stock pile or pool of skilled workmen in 1940, and he does not tell you that we have an inadequate number of them today as is clearly the case. Let him get down to the fundamentals of this legislation and tell us why he does not stand up for a more adequate preparedness program. Positive action is needed. It is not sufficient preparedness merely to preserve an inadequate pool of skilled workers. The Simpson and Curtis amendments would safeguard our defense and at the same time they would help to build a sound reciprocal trade program. Without these safeguards our national defense is weakened and threatened and Mr. Forrestal's statement is merely a statement of his own unawareness of our peril in this phase of our preparedness.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely glad the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] spoke as he did. Only 4 or 5 days ago I telephoned one of the Departments of National Defense and asked them how they felt about having the watch companies of the United States closed down and the workers of this country go to other countries, so that we would lose their skill. I remember his horrified answer at the thought of our skilled precision workers going to other countries when the need for a strong national defense is vital. The gentleman from Iowa has spoken truly. I for one will not vote for the trade-agreements program unless there is an escape clause in this bill. We in Massachusetts, in fact in all of New England, for I can speak for New England, too, realize just what we are facing today. I remember what the cotton industry faced at the time of the Japanese competition. People in the State Department were saying to me, "Oh, my dear Mrs. ROGERS, how can you hurt the feelings of the dear Japanese?" The dear Japanese stabbed us in the back and one of those very officials was calling for help from the United States from Corregidor before help came.

I think we are going through somewhat the same situation today. Some of you older Members remember the fight I and others made against the importation of Czechoslovakian shoes, against the construction of the shoe factory at Belcamp, Md., by the foreign Bata Shoe Co., where they were buying into slavery the children of our own United States, the families not realizing what they were doing. The administration was against me in that fight in the beginning. I want to tell the Members of the House, and I have the records of it, as the Department of Justice turned over findings regarding the illegal entry of the Czechoslovakians into this country under the pretense of being instructors, men who were operating under Nazi-dominated Germany.

I know in Massachusetts the recession that is taking place today, that is already taking place in the wool industry, the cotton textile industry, and the Waltham Watch and many other companies. Do you want to have a very large number of workers in the United States on unemployment relief? Do you not think they would prefer good wages and comforts instead of practically a dole or unemployment relief? How can the country stand paying all the unemployment relief the United States will have to pay if the recession in industry goes on?

The General Electric in Massachusetts, I am told reliably by workers and others, is curtailing its work in Massachusetts. Industry is receding in employment all over the country. I feel, Mr. Chairman, that if you do not vote protection in this bill you are putting nails in the coffin of our prosperity and the happiness of our workers and the welfare of our country. It would be a national calamity not to have skilled workers in our industries necessary for national defense. Soon after World War I, I introduced the first bill in Congress, and finally years later the bill was enacted providing for the War Department to educate American industry in the production of military items. We cannot permit foreign nations to control our industries or take them from us.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time primarily because the subject under discussion is of vital concern to the 2,300 watch workers and their families, of Waltham, Mass., whom I have the honor to represent in this body.

However, it is my conviction that it also should be of paramount interest to every Member of the Congress because,

by authoritative admission, it involves the question of adequate national defense.

In substantiation of this point, I am going to quote to you the exact words of Rear Adm. F. C. Denebrink, United States Navy, Director of Procurement, Manpower and Utilities, acting in behalf of the United States Munitions Board. These remarks are contained in a letter Admiral Denebrink recently sent to Mr. Harley Hise, Chairman, Board of Directors, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, in answer to an inquiry from Mr. Hise. The admiral stated, and I quote:

The Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. were employed to 100 percent of their capacity in Government work from December 1941 to August 1945. During this period they manufactured jewel bearings, chronometers, fire-control watches, time fuses, aircraft instruments and other essential products. Most of these items could not then nor could they now be produced by other domestic watch companies.

It is considered that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the Waltham, Hamilton and Elgin Watch Cos. is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved.

At this moment 2,300 workers, in an American community, a large portion of them veterans, are out of work. The substantial reason for this catastrophe is that these skilled precision-instrument workers were 100 percent engaged in war production and, while they were at war against the enemy, the watch manufacturing business of this country went to Switzerland.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to submit, here and now, for conscientious deliberation by each Member of this House, this question—is it your intention that an American industry shall be penalized to the point of extinguishment because of its whole-scale participation in the recent war effort?

I well recognize that the time period is limited this afternoon and it is not my intention to overburden you with extended recitation of comparative figures and tables of computation already of record.

In this respect I would like to refer you to the speech I made on this matter, on the floor of the House, last June 21, 1948, and the report of the recent hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means on the dates of January 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, and February 1, all 1949.

A study of the testimony at these hearings reveals a graphic picture of the developments leading to the gradual strangulation of a vital American industry through no fault of its own.

Here is an American industry, employing American labor, paying American wages, trying to sell American products to the American people—and they are being deprived of an equal opportunity in their own American market.

Now, yesterday I listened carefully to the well-meaning words of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COMBS], for whom I have the greatest admiration. In substance, he attributed the present financial difficulties of the Waltham Watch Co. as entirely due to bad management, and went on to state that the two other American watch-manufacturing companies, Elgin and Hamilton, just completed the best year in their history, selling more watches, making as much or more profit than ever before. Let us see if this is so. On page 491 of the hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means on H. R. 1211, we find the testimony, on this point, of James G. Shennan, president, Elgin Watch Co. Chairman DOUGHTON asked Mr. Shennan this question, "How are your profits now, compared with profits before the war?" This is Mr. Shennan's answer, and I quote:

The dollar profits are lower now than they were before the war. In 1940–41, for example, Elgin had net earnings, after taxes, of $1,540,000, and in 1947 we had $1,387,000. The figures for 1948 are not yet available but would not be substantially different. The percentage of net earnings to sales in 1940 was 12.4; in 1941 it was 9.4; and in 1947 it was 6.3. It has been said that 1946 was the year in which Elgin had the greatest earnings in its history. That was said at this hearing, and that is not true, sir. We made $1,130,000 in 1946 and earned 6½ percent of the net earnings through sales. Personally, I think that is too low to be healthy.

I submit that this testimony of Mr. Shennan clearly reveals that Elgin—and Hamilton is in a similar position—has so far managed to struggle against the financial strain imposed by Swiss importations, but is existing on a marginal line of security so vulnerable that a slight decrease in sales would plunge both Elgin and Hamilton into serious difficulty. If Waltham should go out of business, Elgin or Hamilton will inevitably be next, depending upon which one of them gets into trouble first.

The facts show that the jeweled-watch industry of the United States has done everything possible to meet the difference in cost of manufacturing watch movements here and abroad, and is not trying to hide behind a tariff wall. They wish no stifling of competition, they seek no monopoly in business, they ask only to be accorded the fair treatment they patriotically deserve.

The 1936 trade agreement with Switzerland reduced the tariffs on watches, and thereafter the American industry's share in the American market fell sharply. Subsequent to the 1936 trade agreement, four factors, in addition to the reduction of tariffs, operated to reduce further the tariff protection which remained to the industry.

First. In 1934, the United States reduced the value of the dollar. This is one of the reasons given in the Tariff Commission's digest of trade data on the trade agreement with Switzerland, for reducing watch tariffs by the Swiss trade agreement in 1936. Four months after consummation of the agreement, the Swiss devalued the franc by approximately 35 percent, but no compensating increase was thereafter made in the reduced tariffs.

Second. The tariff duties on watches are specific, that is to say, so many dollars and cents per watch. The subsequent inflation has operated to reduce further, on an ad valorem or percentage basis, the protection left by the trade agreement and the devaluation of the Swiss franc.

Third. The duty on adjustments, which was intended to afford progressively greater protection the higher the quality of the watch, has been rendered completely ineffective by the marking of imported watches as unadjusted, regardless of the fact.

Fourth. The cost of watch-movement manufacture, which is practically, all labor, has more than doubled in this country since the beginning of the war.

The dollar increase here has been disproportionate to that in Switzerland, inasmuch as we started from a higher base cost because of the much higher labor rates in this country. Our labor rates are approximately 2½ times those of the Swiss for comparable jobs.

Over 55,000,000 jeweled watches and movements have been imported into this country since 1941; the high point being 1946 when imports of jeweled watches exceeded the 9,000,000 mark.

During the first 11 months of 1948, the latest statistics available to us, the imports of jeweled watches exceeded 7,100,000. This is an average of almost 7,000,000 jeweled watches annually over the years beginning with 1941, as contrasted to an average of about 2,600,000 from 1936 through 1940, and an average of less than 1,000,000 for the years 1930 through 1935.

All of these watches are advertised and sold as jeweled watches and are competitive with the products of this industry.

The trade agreement with Switzerland has been in effect almost 12 years and has never been changed during that entire period; that agreement does not contain an escape clause as the more recently renegotiated agreements do.

There was a negotiation between our State Department and the Swiss Government in 1946 by which the Swiss agreed to voluntarily restrict their exports to the United States, but the figure of 7,700,000 movements arrived at was practically the same as they were exporting at that time.

Now, throughout these years, the jeweled-watch industry has been unable to obtain satisfactory cooperation of the State Department even after repeated efforts and presentation of their case.

It is my information that Switzerland has not, as yet, become a party to the general agreement on tariffs and trade and will not be a party to the coming negotiations at Geneva in April.

Therefore, it appears clear there is no hope of relief to this industry without direct action of the Congress.

At the recent hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means a suggestion was made that a special subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means be appointed to study this whole problem and I wish to emphasize today my endorsement of that suggestion.

I consider it the patriotic duty of this Congress to exert every means at our disposal to afford the jeweled-watch industry of the United States an equality of opportunity in the domestic market.

I am not speaking in opposition to the bill which is before the House, nor am I personally opposed to the cooperative economic theory at the basis of the trade-agreements program, as a whole.

I am, however, of the heartfelt conviction that, in the midst of our charitable generosity throughout the world, it is obligatory upon this body to be particularly concerned with the community problems of our own people here in the United States. When the problem involves the preservation of irreplaceable skilled craftsmanship and an essential contribution to our national defense needs, then I say it is mandatory that we take appropriate action now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL].

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that I think there is a great deal of misunderstanding concerning the effect of this amendment.

Since 1942 the policy of our Government with reference to trade agreements has been to include the escape clause in all trade agreements.

In 1947 the President of the United States by Executive order set forth the rule which in substance directs that every trade agreement contain an escape clause.

Actually, the pending amendment is a most serious one. It is more dangerous than the peril-point amendment which this body has just voted down, for the reason that this amendment by law makes it mandatory upon the President of the United States to renegotiate existing trade agreements with a number of countries.

Not long ago at Geneva we entered into multilateral trade agreements with 22 other countries. In each of those agreements was included the so-called escape clause. Within the next few months this Government and a number of other countries are going to hold a conference at Annecy, France, for the purpose of negotiating and executing multilateral trade agreements in which also will be included the escape clause. The countries attending the conference at Annecy will be Colombia, Salvador, Haiti, Nicaragua, Sweden, Peru, and Uruguay. I mention the Annecy conference to you for the purpose of showing that with time, patience, and understanding the policy of this Government is dedicated to the inclusion of the escape clause in all existing trade agreements.

It is clear to everyone familiar with the history of the trade-agrements legislation that in 1934 Congress delegated to the executive branch of the Government the power to negotiate and enter into trade agreements with foreign countries. We have given the President wide latitude in this respect. As I have indicated before, the President, both in deed and in fact, since 1942 has set up a system of procedure which is designed to safeguard and protect American industry in the event of threat or injury to our economy. The present amendment, however, if it becomes law, makes it mandatory upon the President of the United States to renegotiate existing trade agreements with a number of countries. This mandate of the Congress would not only restrict the power of the President but it would place our negotiators at a definite disadvantage with a number of these countries with whom we now have trade agreements. There are a number of countries, for example, who will probably not attend the conference at Annecy, France. We have trade agreements with these countries which do not include the escape clause, although I am informed that every effort is being made and will continue to be made to have these countries accept the terms of the escape clause proviso. It would be well at this point to insert the names of these countries into the RECORD. They are: Argentina, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Iceland, Iran, Switzerland, Turkey, and Venezuela. Suppose these countries refused to renegotiate? Suppose they refused to insert the escape clause? Would the mandatory provisions of this amendment force us to break off trade relations? Clearly, this is too serious a question to be disposed of in such a short time.

But there is another reason why we should not pass this amendment. It is not wise—it is not sound to place restrictions upon the President to whom we have delegated the power to negotiate trade agreements. This amendment unquestionably would tie his hands in many ways. In dealing with able negotiators such as the Swiss and those of Argentina by the approval of this amendment we would set the standards against your own traders and negotiators—not against the opposition. You place the executive branch of government in an unfavorable bargaining position. Such a practice would not only be unsound but would be detrimental to our foreign economic policy.

Yesterday during debate I stated that I hoped that the Swiss, in good faith, would agree to include the escape clause proviso in their trade agreement with us, but may I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that that in itself would not solve the problem confronting the American watch industry. Such an escape-clause provision merely provides that one of three methods may be used to determine whether or not an American industry has been damaged as the result of a trade agreement. Under the escape-clause proviso, an industry such as the Waltham watch industry may call upon the Tariff Commission to make an investigation to determine whether the industry has been endangered by a trade agreement, second, the Tariff Commission itself could initiate such an investigation; or, third, the President could call upon the Tariff Commission for such a report in the event he so desired.

Again I repeat—in addition to the unfavorable position in which we would place our negotiators, we must also consider whether an amendment such as this may vitiate or abrogate certain existing trade agreements.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARROLL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. This amendment does not carry any penalties; does not withdraw any power from the President. It does not abrogate the existing trade agreements. It merely puts the Congress on record as asking the President to try to do it.

Mr. CARROLL. I say that this is a legislative mandate requiring the President to take positive action, and, if this amendment passes, you will be placing at a disadvantage and handcuffing the negotiators to whom the Congress has heretofore delegated its authority. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CURTIS) there were—ayes 119, noes 154.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed Mr. DOUGHTON and Mr. CURTIS to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 159.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAND: Add a new section, to be known as section 1, as follows:

"SEC. 7. No such foreign trade agreement shall become effective until such agreement shall have been filed during a session of Congress for a period of 60 days with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and with the Secretary of the Senate. If during such period of 60 days, the Congress shall, by joint resolution, disapprove the agreement, it shall for all purposes be void."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very simple one, and I doubt that I will require 5 minutes to speak briefly on it. In my opinion it does not interfere in any way with the powers asked for by the administration in connection with these reciprocal trade agreements. It does not put the Congress back into the business of writing detailed tariff legislation, which I would oppose. The power which is retained by the Congress under this amendment would be used but seldom, and only in the event of a real emergency. If an agreement were negotiated which was considered to be extremely detrimental to some segment of our economy or industry, or to the national welfare, the Congress under this amendment would have the retained power to interfere with the execution of that agreement.

I have always felt very strongly about this matter. It is my position that the Congress must not and should not abdicate its constitutional and historical prerogative to exercise ultimate control over tariff questions. It seems to me that those who believe in reciprocal trade in theory, and in this legislation, but who also believe in retaining in the Congress its constitutional and historical power

which it has had in the past and which it should retain in the future can vote for this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the committee give this serious consideration, because now that we have rejected the other two amendments, it seems to me this is the last chance to safeguard, in this reasonable fashion, the national economy.

Danger points are even now evident. The time will come when the industries of my district, particularly glass manufacture and fishing, will require some protection from foreign imports. Other industries throughout the country someday will suffer. Labor will suffer. When the day of reckoning comes I can say that I tried to help.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. Chairman, the very purpose of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program is to avoid the very thing this amendment would create. Certainly we know historically that there is very little chance to secure congressional approval of agreements of this kind. Although quite a number have been submitted throughout the years of the past only three were approved. So the adoption of this amendment would be about the most effective way to kill the program as a whole.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. This does not require congressional approval. It requires the Congress to disapprove. The gentleman's party is in control of that situation.

Mr. COOPER. For all practical purposes it amounts to the same thing and the same result would follow.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we will shortly be called upon to vote for a continuation of the so-called reciprocal trade agreements. In the past I have voted against this legislation because, in my opinion, it was not reciprocity in the true meaning of the word, and because I felt that if this program was continued that it would eventually produce unemployment for my friends in the Eleventh Ohio District who work in the glass factories, the potteries, and perhaps in the paper factories, to say nothing of the further hardships which this unemployment would bring to industrial owners and all others dependent upon a constant and equitable pay roll.

It is difficult to understand how we are going to compete with foreign workers who are receiving 7 cents in wages for making an identical glass tumbler for which our American workers are receiving 60 cents in wages. It is also hard to explain how the workers in the shoe factories in my congressional district can compete with a foreign-made shoe which comes into America duty-free just because the heel has not been tacked on. This puts the shoe in the class of unfinished products which are permitted to enter free. It requires just a minute to tack on the ready-made heel and the shoe is then put on the American market to retail at a price which is less than it costs to manufacture the same shoe in the United States.

In the past when this legislation was before us the local unions, as well as the employers, have contacted me requesting that I oppose this extension. Now, I notice, though not contacted, that both the A. F. of L. and the CIO leadership are asking that the present bill be passed. Furthermore, not one manufacturer of shoes, glassware, clay products, paper, or any other product in my district has contacted me, either for or against this proposed legislation.

Therefore, it appears that only one course is open to me. If labor wants it and management does not oppose it, then who am I to set myself up as being superior in judgment to those who should be most affected by the act? This does not mean that I have abdicated principle in favor of expediency, but it does cause me to wonder if I have been correct in my previous deductions.

Personally, I think that if the escape-clause amendment which will be offered is adopted, it will materially strengthen the bill. But regardless of whether it is approved or rejected, I am fearful that a program as outlined in this proposed legislation will, if not properly administered, produce idle factories and men walking the streets looking for work, just as it has resulted in closing the Waltham Watch Co. If that time should come—and I pray that it does not—then I just want the men and women who work in the above-named industries in our congressional district to know that their labor leaders endorsed the program and asked for its passage.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: On page 3, after line 8, amend by adding a new section to be designated as a new section:

"SEC. 7. No reduction in duty under the Tariff Act of 1930 rates shall be made on imports competing directly with articles produced by handicraft industries in the United States. Handicraft industries are defined as those in which the salaries and wages or direct and indirect labor constitute 50 percent or more of the costs of production and include only those groups of manufacturers, excluding contractors, producing by recognized handicraft methods, like or similar products, from which the Bureau of the Census can obtain and publish industrial statistics. The Tariff Commission shall make the final determination of these qualifications."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against that amendment until I have examined it.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because I realize that the Seventy-first Congress in 1930, which drafted and passed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, must have considered this handicraft industry of china and glassware as being a rather delicate industry and needing a high degree of protection.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close 2 minutes after the gentleman from West Virginia finishes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Again, let me say that they must have considered this handicraft industry as being in need of a large degree of protection, because they provided a 60 percent ad valorem import duty. I make the point that the reciprocal-trade agreement of 1934 and all subsequent agreements were wrong in that they lowered that rate of duty down to an ad valorem duty of approximately 30 percent. If H. R. 1211 is passed, it will be possible at the coming Geneva negotiations to reduce the major part of those rates from 30 percent ad valorem to as low as 15 percent ad valorem on certain grades of this material.

I would like to make the point that no relief was secured by these people when they called on the State Department or the other people who held hearings in preparation for the Geneva conference. I got no results in my plea before the Committee on Ways and Means. My only thought was that the House might accord relief when we could not get relief from any other source.

I would like to point out, if you please, that back when the first reciprocal-trade agreement went into effect, the importation of hand-made glass from Czechoslovakia alone for the year 1938, under the reciprocal-trade treaty, equaled 23 percent of the total domestic production of that kind of ware in this country. Only the war saved us, and, now that we are out of the war period, within 1 year the importations of that glass will exceed what they were in the prewar period. We were getting along all right during the war period, but now, because of the impact of the postwar period, these industries must have some protection. We must realize that they do not involve enough of our economy to ruin the reciprocal-trade-agreement program.

Let me quote a few figures. The chinaware industry domestic production of this grade of hand ware amounted to $9,800,000 and the imports amounted to $1,245,000. In the case of glassware, the total production of hand-made was $42,000,000 and imports were $4,506,000.

You can afford to exclude these two handicraft industries without hurting any of your over-all program.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman from West Virginia quoted imports from private industry from Czechoslovakia before the war. Now what he is quoting is imports from nationalized, Government-owned, Government-controlled industries in Czechoslovakia that will be subsidized, if necessary,

to get under the market price of the products manufactured in the gentleman's State.

Mr. BAILEY. I thank the gentleman for the information.

I should like to say that right now the trouble with this industry is brought about by the activity of the Army in Germany and Japan, particularly in Germany, in rehabilitating and rebuilding these plants. They have even brought displaced persons from Czechoslovakia, skilled pottery workers, and they have them today working in the pottery plants in Germany. We cannot stand that kind of competition.

I trust the good will and the good judgment of the House to exclude the products of these handicraft industries.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane. It imposes duties and requirements upon the Bureau of the Census which are certainly not within the scope of the pending bill or the original act which is sought to be amended by the pending bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BAILEY. Not if the Chair intends to support the gentleman from Tennessee; it would be a waste of effort.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, the Chair will not prejudge this matter, but if the gentleman has no more confidence in the amendment than he has indicated, the Chair will rule that the point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 3, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. During any calendar year after 1948 the total amount of imported wood wire spring clothespins, or the total amount of any article of china, hand-made glassware or tableware, which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse in the United States for consumption, shall not exceed 25 percent of the production within the United States during the preceding calendar year of clothespins, or of such article of china, hand-made glassware or tableware, as the case may be."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment. It is certainly not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from West Virginia desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BAILEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I based this amendment on the supposition that there were some sound basic reasons why the Congress in the past imposed an import quota on the shipment of Cuban sugar into the United States for the benefit of sugar producers in the State of Louisiana. I assume that the reason for doing that was predicated on the assumption that there was too much competition coming from Cuba and the other sugar-producing countries and that those producers in the State of Louisiana needed protection. I insist there is too much competition against the handcraft glass and pottery industries and that they need similar consideration from this Congress. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia might have been germane to another statute, but it certainly is not germane to the bill under consideration.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer a third amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BAILEY: Page 3, after line 8, insert the following:

"SEC. 7. No foreign-trade agreement concluded after the enactment of this act pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, shall apply with respect to articles produced or manufactured by an American-owned factory in any foreign country. For the purposes of this section, the term 'American owned factory' means any factory (1) which is owned by citizens or residents of the United States, by a corporation or partnership created or organized in the United States or under the law of the United States or of any State or Territory, or by a foreign corporation the majority of the voting stock of which is owned by any of the foregoing, and (2) in the case of which such ownership was acquired after 1930."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in not to exceed 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should most certainly interest the gentleman on the left of the center aisle.

If this amendment is not adopted, you stand to destroy a vaunted and boasted American economy by reducing it to the level of a world economy. Instead of keeping before us the idea that we should bring these people up to our level, the continuation of these reciprocal-trade agreements with the tendency of American capital to move their industries abroad as in the case of the Underwood Typewriter people going to Italy, Remington Rand going to Scotland, and the textile people going to Mexico, Colombia, Italy, and Haiti, and I could enumerate at least a dozen other instances.

If that is kept up, it is plain what is going to happen. It is obvious that they are going there for the purpose of exploiting cheap labor and cheaper working conditions than the standards we have here in America. It is time to break up that practice. If they were there before 1930, it would be perfectly all right to consider that they were legitimate. If they built a factory in another country since the first Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, they should not take advantage of the reductions in reciprocal-trade rates for the simple reason that it is premeditated. If you do not call their hand now, you can figure that in future years we will cease to have an American economy and it is going to be a world economy because we are going to drag down our cost of living to the level of the cost of living of these people abroad. I do not think there is any danger in it. I think it is a matter of good judgment and common sense that the amendment be approved. It is time that we stopped the migration of American capital and industries abroad so that they can manufacture on a cheaper basis and import those products, just as the gentleman, who testified before the Labor Committee only this past week, said a textile company was producing in Haiti. The shirts were manufactured with the collar and cuffs left off so that they could get by our customs, and then they put the collars and cuffs on after they came into this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wonder if the gentleman's amendment would help protect American enterprise located in other countries, which are financed under this new proposal whereby the Government is to guarantee investments in other countries.

Mr. BAILEY. It would help your watch industry that has gone to Switzerland since 1930. It would help your fishing industry which you were complaining about. That is why I said you people on that side should be interested in this amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman think we should maintain a tariff in order to protect American labor and American enterprise so that that glass factory in your district would be able to operate?

Mr. BAILEY. My presence on the floor answers that.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. I yield.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Why don't you come over here and sit down with me? I agree with everything you say.

Mr. BAILEY. Then you will probably vote with me.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the President has again asked Congress for a 3-year renewal of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Under the Trade Agreements Act, as it existed up to 1948, the President, by an act of Congress, was given authority to adjust downward tariffs in consideration that other countries make the same reciprocal concessions for the purpose of expanding our foreign trade and bettering our foreign relations.

This act which is now before Congress prescribes limits of authority beyond which the President cannot go. It provides safeguards for our domestic industries inasmuch as there is a careful study made by the interdepartmental branches of our Government before any concessions are made, and every trade agreement is executed with the provision that the United States reserves the right to withdraw or modify any concessions which threaten serious damage to any domestic industry.

The membership of this body are not so young but what they remember conditions in this country prior to the enact-

ment of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. Most of the countries of the world had barriers against our commodities. We recall the enactment of the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act and other high tariff legislation which brought about an ill feeling between nations in the economic field.

From our past experience, it is apparent that a sound world-trade program is an indispensable factor in international economic cooperation. We must not forget that we are living today in a sick world—a sick Europe—other nations looking to these United States for leadership.

In the circumstances we cannot afford to be persuaded by minority interest or be deceived by the false doctrines of economic nationalism into following the same path that we pursued after World War I.

This law that is before Congress today for enactment worked splendidly for 14 years. It is obvious that the 3-year extension is necessary in order that our Government may negotiate sizable trades with other nations.

An extension for 1 year, as was enacted last year, would imply to the other nations that we are not interested in a long-range trade program, and a betterment of living standards abroad. Such a limitation will frighten other countries and cause them to look with disfavor upon our product. We cannot go forward and be isolationists.

H. R. 1211 eliminates another objectionable feature that was enacted by the Eightieth Congress. In that bill the functions of the Tariff Commission were limited to report its findings on minimum tariffs and other import restrictions or the increases in tariffs, necessary to avoid the mere threat of injury to domestic industry, protecting any article up for consideration for trade-agreements concessions by the United States.

The guiding star in the 1948 law was the mere threat to that particular domestic industry, and not the welfare of this Nation or any other nation. Such findings were made without regard to any national or international consideration.

These crippling amendments were put in the bill to serve temporarily a few selfish interests without any consideration for the welfare of this Nation, or any benefit to be obtained by other countries. They were put in the bill for the purpose of carrying out the old theory, that only the prosperity of the industry is affected by the tariff, and make that the sole base in deciding what concessions the United States may make in trade agreements.

H. R. 1211, if enacted as drafted, will put into operation an effective world trade program that will go a long way in curing the economic ills of other nations.

We all know that the recovery of other nations is not dependent alone upon the enactment of the reciprocal-trade-agreements bill as written, but we do realize that this legislation will serve as an effective stimulant to bring about international cooperation and good will among the various nations. We know from experience that a high level of world trade means a high living standard at home, and insures the same living standard abroad.

H. R. 1211 should be enacted as reported to this House by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia would have a tendency to destroy the reciprocal-trade-agreement program, and I ask that it be voted down without any further debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BAILEY) there were—ayes 74, noes 144.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAYS of Ohio: On page 3, after line 8, amend by adding a new section to be known as section 7:

"SEC. 7. No foreign trade agreement shall be concluded after the enactment of this act pursuant to section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, with any country wholly or partly in Europe which is not a participating country (as defined in sec. 103 (a) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948). Any foreign trade agreement concluded with any such country prior to the enactment of this act shall be terminated, in accordance with the agreement, as soon as practicable."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in not to exceed 7 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment not to destroy the Reciprocal Trade Act or to hamper it in any way. However, there has been a great deal said in the brief period I have been in this House about the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the job that it is trying to do.

I am simply asking in this amendment that we dry up the source of dollars for the countries in Europe that are trying to destroy this Economic Cooperation Administration. That source of dollars is the means that they use to disseminate their propaganda in the friendly nations which we are trying to reconstitute in the pattern of American democracy.

I had the privilege of being in Italy a few days after the Italian elections this spring; and I want to say to you that the Communists in Italy were well supplied with funds with which to propagandize the Italian people. All of their bills and accounts were paid in dollars. Where did those dollars come from? They came from countries which have industries which are nationalized and which sell products in this country and take those dollars and turn them over to the nationalized government to be used to undermine the program of this country not only in Europe but, if you please, even right in the United States to undermine our very Government.

This House today on the recommendation of the House Administration Committee of which I am a member granted $200,000 to the Committee on Un-American Activities; yet one little industry in a nationalized gangster-dominated country in Europe took out three times that much money in dollars last year under a reciprocal-trade agreement. I refer to Czechoslovakia. Let me say at this point that there are many people in my district of Czech nationality groups; they are fine people. I think I can say with authority that the Government of Czechoslovakia today, which is not the Government that negotiated the treaty, does not represent more than 2 or 3 percent of the people; it is a gangster government imposed on that country from without by threat of invasion and force. I think anyone on either side of the center aisle can conscientiously go along with this amendment. The adoption of this amendment will not harm the theory of reciprocity; nor will it tie the hands of our negotiators in the coming agreements. It will simply prevent American dollars from being siphoned into Russia from Soviet satellite countries for use in financing espionage and propaganda both here and abroad.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I know, of course, the good intentions of the gentleman from Ohio; but the fact is that the adoption of this amendment would greatly restrict and hamper this program and make its administration extremely difficult, if not impossible. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. Why would it tie the hands of those who are to carry out this program to have Congress state that they may not consider a deal with those who are against the fundamental principles of democracy?

Mr. COOPER. This amendment imposes mandatory requirements in the negotiation of these trade agreements affecting countries which themselves are affected by the economic recovery program. The amendment is much more far reaching than appears on the face of it. It will greatly restrict the operation of the program and make it much more difficult of administration.

I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HAYS of Ohio) there were—ayes 77, noes 147.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill (H. R. 1211) back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania moves to recommit the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Ways and Means, with instructions to report same back to the House of Representatives forthwith with the following amendments:

"SEC. 7. Before entering into negotiations concerning any proposed foreign-trade agreement under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the President shall furnish the United States Tariff Commission (hereinafter in this act referred to as the "Commission") with a list of all articles imported into the United States to be considered for possible modification of duties and other import restrictions, imposition of additional import restrictions, or continuance of existing customs or excise treatment. Upon receipt of such list the Commission shall make an investigation and report to the President the findings of the Commission with respect to each such article as to (1) the limit to which such modification, imposition, or continuance may be extended in order to carry out the purpose of such section 350 without causing or threatening serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles; and (2) if increases in duties or additional import restrictions are required to avoid serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or similar articles the minimum increases in duties or additional import restrictions required. Such report shall be made by the Commission to the President not later than 120 days after the receipt of such list by the Commission.

"SEC. 8. The President shall, as soon as practicable, but in any event not later than 90 days from the date of this act, institute such proceedings as are necessary to incorporate an escape clause to the same general effect as article XIX of the the general agreements on tariffs and trade in all trade agreements to which the United States is a party."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire may have permission to extend their remarks on the pending bill at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, by leave granted I include herewith the statement made by Mr. O. R. Stockbein, executive secretary, America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, before the Ways and Means Committee during its hearings on extension of the Trade Agreements Act, which is self-explanatory:

The question has been raised what relations the Tariff Commission should bear to the State Department and its negotiators in the steps leading to a trade agreement.

This is a question that requires an analysis of the time element involved in such preparations and also of the coordination of efforts between two official groups that collaborate to bring about a single result.

In the first place, someone must decide which country or group of countries should be approached about a possible agreement. In reaching such a decision production and trade statistics offer the best guide. Here there is room for consultation between the State Department, the Commerce Department, and possibly the Tariff Commission. Appropriate liaison between such departments and agencies could readily pave the way.

The next step would consist of conversations with the representatives of the foreign countries to determine their willingness to enter into an agreement. This step would, of course, fall to the lot of the State Department.

The third step would call for the preparation of a list of items to be considered for concessions by this country. In preparing such a list collaboration between the State Department, other interested executive departments, and the Tariff Commission would certainly be in order. The Tariff Commission has issued a number of informational reports that would be available for this purpose. Proper liaison would permit the consultation of the commodity experts of the Commission. It would not be necessary for the Tariff Commissioners themselves to act as a body in making such information and assistance available except in the form perhaps of general instructions to the staff.

After appropriate sifting, the State Department would issue for distribution a list of the items on which hearings are to be held. A single hearing by a single agency would be sufficient. Such a hearing should be open to all interested parties, including exporters and importers.

The question now is who should hold the hearings, the Tariff Commission or an interdepartmental body with Tariff Commission representation.

Since this whole question has been raised because of the change brought about by the amendment of 1948, it will be appropriate to consider the situation under which the Tariff Commission would hold the hearings.

No one questions the competence of the Commission in this field. The objections that have been raised relate to the exclusion of the interdepartmental representatives from the procedure. Another objection goes to the amount of time consumed under such a procedure. Objection has also been made that the State Department would lose the value of the Commission's judgment.

There is no reason why the interested executive departments could not detail representatives to sit in the hearings of the Commission. The transcript of the hearings could be made available to them. There need be no loss of contact with the information produced in the hearings.

Up to this point there seems to be nothing at stake beyond departmental prestige.

From this point on we come to the merits of the principal objections. One of these objections, to repeat, is the amount of time consumed between the completion of the hearings and the findings of the Tariff Commission. During this period, it appears, the State Department is locked out, so to speak, from contact with the Tariff Commission.

It should be kept in mind (1) that the State Department and the interdepartmental personnel would have copies of the transcript and other accumulated data that might occupy some of their time. The real difficulty is caused by the fact that the Tariff Commission may find it necessary to supplement the hearings by inquiries of its own. If the hearings themselves provided sufficient information there would be no greater delay in the Commission's proceedings than in the same procedure as carried out by the committee for reciprocity information in the past.

Even during this period there is no reason why Tariff Commission experts could not give technical information and assistance to the representatives of the State Department and other agencies.

To say that the State Department would suffer from delay at this stage is like saying that a judge must hurry his consideration of evidence in order not to waste time. It is a question of adequacy of information, of its proper digestion, and of care in its consideration.

It has been said that the finding of peril points involves an act of precision that is beyond the competence of the Tariff Commission or of any other body. Yet, all State Department concessions also come down to specific points. They end up with precise figures in terms of ad valorem percentages or specific duty rates.

Some concern has been expressed that the Tariff Commission would act in too narrow a field of considerations. This objection carries some weight, but it is not fatal to the quality of the results.

The Tariff Commission having made its findings, these would be communicated to the President (for transmission to the State Department). The State Department would now be ready to negotiate.

Here the question arises whether Tariff Commission personnel should participate in the negotiations. There appears to be no good reason why they should not act in an advisory capacity. Presumably the State Department representatives are the best equipped to do the actual bargaining and it would seem unnecessary that Tariff Commission personnel take part in this function.

Once the negotiations had been completed and the President had proclaimed the agreement the Tariff Commission would issue a public report of its findings.

*Chinaware and porcelain household table and kitchen articles—United States imports for consumption, by principal sources and by quarters, January 1947 to November 1948*

QUANTITY (1,000 DOZEN PIECES)

| | Total | Japan | United Kingdom | Germany | Czechoslovakia | France | China | All other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1947 | | | | | | | | |
| Jan.–Mar. | 87 | ----- | 37 | (1) | 12 | 6 | 11 | 21 |
| Apr.–June | 159 | 77 | 53 | (1) | 3 | 9 | 10 | 7 |
| July–Sept. | 139 | 29 | 43 | 35 | 4 | 9 | 10 | 9 |
| Oct.–Dec. | 270 | 99 | 55 | 83 | 3 | 5 | 21 | 4 |
| Total | 655 | 205 | 188 | 118 | 22 | 29 | 52 | 41 |
| 1948 | | | | | | | | |
| Jan.–Mar. | 340 | 144 | 79 | 81 | 6 | 5 | 17 | ---- |
| Apr.–June | 440 | 233 | 64 | 92 | 4 | 5 | 31 | ---- |
| July–Sept. | 538 | 288 | 63 | 145 | 2 | 12 | 18 | ---- |
| Oct.–Nov. | 450 | 261 | 56 | 111 | 1 | 5 | 11 | ---- |
| Total | 1,768 | 926 | 262 | 429 | 13 | 21 | 77 | ---- |

VALUE (IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1947 | | | | | | | | |
| Jan.–Mar. | 540 | ----- | 319 | 1 | 38 | 52 | 51 | 79 |
| Apr.–June | 773 | 143 | 463 | 2 | 15 | 84 | 33 | 33 |
| July–Sept. | 763 | 75 | 393 | 124 | 24 | 80 | 29 | 38 |
| Oct.–Dec. | 1,014 | 196 | 429 | 244 | 15 | 37 | 61 | 32 |
| Total | 3,090 | 414 | 1,604 | 374 | 92 | 253 | 174 | 182 |
| 1948 | | | | | | | | |
| Jan.–Mar. | 1,432 | 361 | 638 | 263 | 28 | 47 | 58 | 37 |
| Apr.–June | 1,589 | 483 | 571 | 363 | 15 | 34 | 66 | 57 |
| July–Sept. | 1,792 | 489 | 563 | 523 | 10 | 99 | 53 | 55 |
| Oct.–Nov. | 1,432 | 429 | 434 | 450 | 7 | 43 | 30 | 39 |
| Total | 6,245 | 1,762 | 2,206 | 1,599 | 60 | 223 | 207 | 188 |

[1] Less than 500.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. BLATNIK. This bill, H. R. 1211, now under consideration by the House is designed to extend the trade-agreements program until June 1951 and to free the President from the shackles placed upon his authority to negotiate trade agreements by the high-tariff boys in the Eightieth Congress. Its passage will represent a repudiation of the false philosophy of economic isolationism and extreme protectionism which characterizes the thinking of many members of the minority party—its passage will make a return to the commercial policies of enlightened self-interest formulated by two great American statesmen, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull.

During last year's debate on the trade-agreements program I opposed its emasculation by the Republican majority, and today I am happy to support this measure which will repair the harm done to this program in the Eightieth Congress and which will again place American trade policy on a rational and sane basis.

There are, in my opinion, two major considerations which justify the passage of H. R. 1211. In the first place, the extension of the trade-agreements program is required to expand American export trade, and an ever-increasing export trade is necessary to help guarantee domestic prosperity. It is a well-known fact that the United States must export 8 to 10 percent of its total production to maintain full employment—that this percentage makes the margin between prosperity and depression.

There can be no doubt but that the reciprocal-trade program has proven its worth as a policy for expanding our foreign trade. Department of Commerce statistics show that during the 4 years following the passage of the original Trade Agreements Act, export trade with trade-agreement countries increased by 63 percent as compared to an increase of only 32 percent to nonagreement countries. Likewise the imports from trade-agreement countries to the United States showed a greater increase than imports from nonagreement countries, the effect of which was to give trade-agreement countries more dollar credits to buy a still greater volume of American goods. Thus we see that the trade-agreements program played a major role in the prewar recovery program by stimulating foreign trade in general and American exports in particular, and thus contributing to prosperity in America and in the world.

In the second place, the passage of this measure is a step toward world peace. It is a generally accepted fact that the major cause of war is the economic rivalries between the Great Powers—that economic considerations far outweigh ideological differences as the root cause of war. Trade wars, tariff wars, and the struggle for markets and raw materials lead to shooting wars. On the other hand, the trade-agreements program has as its major purpose the abolishment of tariff wars by mutual consent of the nations of the world, and the creation of the conditions to permit the free flow of goods and services across State lines, and to make possible the distribution of raw materials through the regular channels of foreign trade. Such a program makes for world peace as it tends to eliminate the economic causes of war—its passage represents a step in building the economic foundations of lasting peace.

Finally, I want to point out that my State of Minnesota has a vital stake in an expanded American export trade, and therefore the people of Minnesota are in general accord with the trade-agreements program. The pattern of Minnesota's economy is most sensitive to changes in the level of foreign trade. The State's agricultural, mining, transportation, and manufacturing industries thrive when American exports increase, and suffer when such exports fall.

A considerable percent of Minnesota production is exported to foreign countries. Minnesota wheat, corn, meat, and flour flows into the channels of foreign trade. My State produces much of the iron ore which is used in the production of farm machinery, trucks, tractors, and automobiles, which are shipped abroad in considerable quantities. Minnesota produces condensed milk, asphalt roofing, rubber goods, and many other items for the export market.

Therefore it is possible for me to say without reservation that Minnesota has profited from the growth of our foreign trade under the trade-agreements program, and that my State has a vital stake in the increased trade which will result from its extension.

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that the passage of this bill will represent a real contribution to world peace and international prosperity, and that it is necessary to continued prosperity and full employment in the United States. These are ends which we all seek, and I call upon the Members of the House to enact H. R. 1211 into law.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many historians have maintained that the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1929, which erected the highest trade barriers of history around this Nation, and which started tariff wars throughout the globe, contributed directly to the economic collapse here and abroad, and sowed the seeds for the rise of Hitlerism and World War II.

The reciprocal agreements recognize the fundamental fact that trade is a two-way business. We cannot go on forever exporting more than we import. Other countries must be able to sell their goods to us if they are to get dollars to buy our products and to repay our loans. When we import foreign goods we improve the standards of Americans as consumers, and at the same time we make it possible to maintain foreign markets for our products. The lowering of trade barriers encourages private trading and free enterprise as distinct from Government trading.

For the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act has been a key part of our dealings with other nations for the past 14 years. Its fundamental purpose has been to promote a freer flow of world commerce, to eliminate retaliatory tariff walls, and to serve peace by stimulating a mutually enriching international exchange of goods on a fair quid pro quo basis. In short, it has been an integral part of our foreign policy—an indispensable economic support to the political aspects of that policy.

Indeed, with our reciprocity program, we have given the economic lead to all nations. Thus, as far as the postwar era is concerned, we have preached the principles of that program in taking the initiative to establish the World Bank and the World Monetary Fund. We have preached them, too, in connection with our successful effort last year to get 22 governments to join with us in the historic and far-reaching Geneva tariff agreement, and they constitute the animating spirit of the 53-nation charter of the International Trade Organization recently negotiated at Havana. Above all—and this is of very great importance—they have been written into the legislation enacted by Congress for the European recovery program, under which the 16 participating countries are expected to pledge themselves to reduce barriers to increase the exchange of goods among themselves.

In such circumstances, when Congress failed to properly renew the reciprocity program, it was telling the world, in effect, that we do not believe in practicing the good things we have preached. Worse, by thus committing a supreme act of inconsistency and backtracking, it was spreading confusion among all our friends abroad, upsetting the operations of the ERP, and planting the impression everywhere of an American drift back to the days of high protectionism; in other words, despite our political internationalism, our economic role was taking on a distinct isolationist slant.

But it is not only for reasons of this sort that the Trade Agreements Act should be renewed without crippling amendments. In the modern world such an act is essential. Without it there can only be tariff wars in which everybody will ultimately be the loser. From the standpoint of our own self-interest, strictly in terms of dollars and cents, we need reciprocity for the sake of American markets abroad. If we do not have it, if our overseas customers run up against protectionism here, then they will not be able to sell enough to us to acquire the money they must have to buy from us. And that is the kind of process that leads to factory shut-downs and deep economic depression.

Accordingly, looked at in any light, either as an instrument of foreign policy or as an instrument to promote our own prosperity, the reciprocal-trade program—which includes escape clauses guarding against serious injury to our domestic producers—must be renewed substantially in the form existing prior to the Eightieth Congress.

AMERICAN FARMERS, THE TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM, AND H. R. 1211

The American farmer has a bigger stake in prompt passage of H. R. 1211, providing for renewal of the reciprocal-trade-agreements program authority in a workable form, than has any other unit of the American economy. This program has helped and will help to maintain and enlarge markets, abroad and at home, for both our farm products and our industrial goods. Adequate markets for all he can produce are even

more vital to the farmer than to the industrialist. A farmer, unlike a big industrialist, cannot shut down his factory, lay off his employees, and live on his reserves when his market goes bad. In order to make a decent living American farmers have to grow and sell more wheat, cotton, tobacco, fruits, and many other crops than this country itself can buy and use. Unless we sell that extra production in other countries the American farmer either suffers or has to have a subsidy from the American taxpayer—and he does not like either alternative.

Since the turn of this century economic changes here and elsewhere have been tending to diminish the relative importance of our agricultural exports. But piled on top of that trend, especially since World War I, there have been rigid restrictions and insuperable barriers imposed by foreign countries against our exports to them. It is this development which the trade-agreements program is designed to cure.

It is nonsense to say that the trade agreements have sold American farmers down the river for the benefit of big industrialists. Through the agreements the United States has obtained as many or more foreign concessions on important farm exports as on industrial exports. Second, no industrial enterprise, under normal conditions, depends so heavily on foreign markets as do some of our major farm crops. Third, the American farmer's biggest and best market is an American market filled with customers who have jobs and are therefore able to buy meat, vegetables, milk and butter, and other farm products. A factory hand with a job making something that can be sold overseas can buy and pay for American farm products. If he loses his job because the foreign market for his product is closed, he cuts down his purchases of cotton overalls and shirts, woolen suits, cigarettes, meat, fresh vegetables and fruits, milk, and butter. That hurts farmers.

Before the war about 10 percent of total American farm production was actually exported, but for some of our most important farm crops the proportion ran far higher. The annual averages in 1934 and 1935 were 39 percent for tobacco, 56 percent for raw cotton, 16 percent for lard, 30 percent for prunes and plums, 34 percent for apricots, 29 percent for raisins, 13 percent for apples, 19 percent for pears, and so on. In 1937 and 1938 the figure for wheat was 12 percent—drought and other factors had held exports down in the earlier period, but since the war they have greatly increased.

All agricultural exports increased during and after the war, of course. In 1946 and 1947 they accounted for 13 to 14 percent of cash farm receipts. But when foreign production recovers from the devastation of war the American farmer will, more than ever before, need a good home market and, at the same time, benefit from the removal of the greatest possible number of barriers to his foreign markets.

Because they simply cannot pay for them, most foreign countries are, at present, strictly limiting their purchases of such things as fruits and tobacco, which are relatively less essential to them. That hurts American growers and the only way in which our foreign markets for these things can be restored or expanded is to enable foreign countries to pay for them and to remove the restrictions on their importation.

This leads to another aspect of the trade-agreements program which is just as important to American farmers as to industry. The American farmer likes to grow all he can, sell all he can, and be paid for it in the market place. He does not want to give his crops away or be paid a Government subsidy for growing them. That is just as true about the products sold in foreign markets as those sold in the home market.

If the United States is going to sell its products in foreign countries it must, in the long run, accept foreign goods and services in payment. During and since the war we have sent abnormally large quantities of goods overseas, but we have been giving many of them away or, at best, selling them on credit. Before the last war about 80 percent of our exports were paid for by imports, but from 1942 to 1947 we have been getting from abroad only about half as much as we have sent abroad. That is not good business for the national economy.

Our Marshall plan is designed to help friendly foreign countries get back on their feet and able to produce goods both for themselves and to exchange for the things we want to sell them. By reducing our own excessive tariffs through trade agreements we can increase the opportunity for other countries to sell their goods in our market. If we don't use the agreements for that purpose, foreign countries will simply be compelled to cut down on their buying of American goods. If they do that, American crops will again pile up in unsalable, price-breaking surpluses, American factories producing for export will shut down, and American workers as well as foreigners will drop out of the American farmer's market. We saw that happen back in the early 1930's. It meant that our living standard and our national income dropped—and the farmer is always the first to feel the pinch when national income goes down. Farm prices fall quicker and farther than other prices.

Some people claim to fear that if United States tariffs are reduced American farmers will suffer from competition with the products of farmers in other countries where living standards and wages are lower than in this country. The record does not show any grounds for such fears. A favorite saying of these people is that the American farmer is entitled to the American market, and so he is if he can supply that market adequately and at reasonable costs. But the size of the home market and the price it offers are far more important to the American farmer than is the exact percentage of it which he supplies. Eighty percent of a big market is better than 100 percent of a collapsed market.

The trade-agreements program is a mechanism for promoting a lively flow of sound trade among nations and helping to give each country a better chance to produce the things it is best fitted to produce and to trade them for goods which other countries can produce to better advantage. Trade agreements help that kind of trade—which is what the American farmer needs—by clearing away unnecessary and excessive governmental restrictions and obstacles to international commerce.

On the direct issue of opening foreign markets to American exports, the trade-agreement concessions obtained by this country from other countries apply to practically every important export product of the United States, agricultural or industrial. Agriculture is benefiting from foreign concessions on wheat, corn, barley, oats, and rice, and on fresh, frozen, dried, and canned fruits and vegetables. We have obtained concessions on various dairy products such as dried and evaporated milk. There are relatively few high foreign tariffs on raw cotton but a number of countries having colonies which they might wish to build up as sources of cotton have nevertheless bound cotton on their free lists or at low tariff rates. Many countries have made concessions on tobacco. There have been other concessions—many of them—on meat products, nuts, seeds, lumber, naval stores, and other things which we export.

Hundreds of American industrial products also benefit from foreign concessions. Those concessions are good for American farmers too because, as has been pointed out, foreign sales of American machinery, typewriters, electrical equipment, radios, automobiles, and other manufactured goods will mean greater demand in this country for farm products.

Next April 13 more countries are to meet to negotiate with each other and with the 23 countries already parties to the general agreement negotiated at Geneva in 1947, for further mutual reduction of trade barriers. The 36 countries, combined, account for much the greatest portion of the world's international trade. Passage of H. R. 1211 will greatly facilitate these negotiations and the United States preparations for them.

The 1948 legislation which this bill will repeal would hamper the President and his helpers in making effective trade agreements. When that legislation was passed the President pointed out its defects and its obstructionist provisions but he said he would do his best to make it work. It is up to this Congress to give the President a legislative implement which will work, to the benefit of the entire national economy.

American farm leaders are, themselves, fully alive to what the trade-agreements program means to this country's agriculture and why it must have a workable legislative basis. During its hearings on H. R. 1211 the Ways and Means Committee received statements from the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Farmers Union, and the Secretary of Agriculture, strongly supporting the bill and giving reasons for their support. Secretary Brannan said, in part:

> That program is the necessary foreign counterpart of a long-term domestic agricultural program.

To sum it all up, the reciprocal trade-agreements program benefits the Ameri-

can farmer in his capacity as a producer by helping to maintain both his foreign and his domestic markets; it helps him as a consumer by helping to make available, at more reasonable costs, more adequate supplies of things he needs and wants from abroad and things which keep American industry in operation; it helps him in his capacity as a part of the national economy because he prospers when the country prospers and when the rest of the world prospers.

H. R. 1211 provides for a workable trade-agreements program and the interests of American farmers demand its immediate passage.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE RECIPROCAL-TRADE-AGREEMENTS PROGRAM—MAY 1948

LOUISIANA

On October 30, 1947, the United States joined with 22 other countries of the world in concluding a General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. This agreement was put into provisional effect on the part of the United States on January 1, 1948, under the authority of the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade is the most comprehensive international instrument ever negotiated for the reduction of barriers to world trade, having regard both to the scope of its provisions and to the volume of trade which they affect. The 23 countries participating in the negotiations were Australia, the Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union, Brazil, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, France, India, the Customs Union of Lebanon and Syria, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Southern Rhodesia, the Union of South Africa, the United Kingdom, and the United States. These countries accounted in 1938 for approximately three-quarters of the international trade of the world.

The schedules of tariff concessions apply to products which are estimated to account for approximately two-thirds of the import trade of the negotiating countries and for substantially half of total world imports. The concessions include the complete elimination of certain duties and preferences, reductions of duty and preference, the binding of duties at existing levels, and the binding of duty-free treatment.

The general provisions of the agreement are comparable to the general provisions of past reciprocal trade agreements and are necessary to safeguard and make effective the tariff concessions. The provisions of the general agreement have been adapted to present conditions and to the fact that this is an agreement among several countries rather than merely between two countries.

The agreement was put into effect provisionally on or before January 1, 1948, by Australia, the Belgian-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union, Canada, Cuba, France, the United Kingdom, and the United States, which represent over 80 percent of the foreign trade of all negotiating countries. Other participating countries have until June 30, 1948, to put the agreement provisionally into effect. The agreement will enter definitively into force upon deposit with the Secretary General of the United Nations of formal acceptances on behalf of countries making up 85 percent of the foreign trade of all negotiating countries.

The agreement is a demonstration of the kind of constructive work that the United Nations can do in the economic field. Announcement of the agreement created an auspicious atmosphere for the opening of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment which convened at Havana on November 21, 1947, and within the long-term framework which the agreement establishes it should be possible for the reconstruction of Europe under the Marshall plan to proceed with more confidence that efforts to restore world economy will not again be defeated by commercial warfare between the great trading powers.

*What the United States got in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade*

Tariff preferences affecting a significant part of United States trade with countries in the British Commonwealth have been substantially reduced, and preferences on a considerable list of products which the United States exports to the various countries of the Commonwealth have been eliminated entirely. Under the terms of the agreement no new preference may be created and no existing preference may be increased, whether or not on products listed in the schedules of the agreement.

Total United States exports in 1939 of products covered by the new concessions amounted to over $1,400,000,000. Regardless of whether or not the agricultural and industrial products actually produced in Louisiana entered foreign trade in large quantities, the prices Louisiana producers received were directly improved by the fact that similar products were simultaneously being exported from the United States in considerable amounts, and, consequently, were not put on the domestic market in competition with Louisiana products as most certainly would have happened if the entire supply had to be consumed within this country. Some of the principal Louisiana products for which concessions were obtained from other countries are:

Rice and rice products: The United Kingdom reduced the duty on husked and unhusked rice.

The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union bound milled rice duty-free and placed a ceiling on the monopoly fee.

Cuba bound the existing rates on imports up to 325,000,000 pounds or more of rice annually.

France reduced the duty on husked rice in the whole grain and on breakfast cereals of rice.

Canada also made concessions on certain rice and rice products.

Strawberries: Canada, which before the war was by far the largest foreign market for United States strawberries, made a seasonal reduction on fresh strawberries.

Cotton: The United Kingdom, the Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union, Canada, Cuba, Czechoslovakia and Norway bound raw cotton on the free list.

France bound raw cotton, linters and wastes on the free list.

Australia bound certain raw cotton on the free list and granted a substantial duty reduction on all other raw cotton, eliminating the preference.

Cottonseed and cottonseed products: Canada eliminated the duty and preferences on cottonseed.

The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union bound the monopoly fee on cottonseed oil if for industrial purposes.

Cuba bound the duty on cottonseed oil.

Cotton broadwoven goods: Cuba, Chile, Canada, and Newfoundland granted concessions on cotton broadwoven goods.

Hosiery: The United Kingdom, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa granted concessions on hosiery.

Wood and wood products: The United Kingdom granted three concessions in the lumber schedule covering wood of the coniferous species. Concessions were also granted on square sawn hardwood and sawn staves.

Australia removed the duty and preference on certain undressed staves and reduced the duty and preference on other undressed staves. Australia also reduced the duty and cut the Canadian preference in half on a number of timber items.

China bound the duty on sawn softwood lumber.

South Africa reduced the duty and preference on unmanufactured softwood.

Czechoslovakia bound the duty-free treatment of non-European wood.

Norway bound hickory and oak lumber on the free list.

Canada reduced the duty on wood furniture.

Paper and paper products: China reduced duties on several kinds of writing and printing paper, and bound rates on numerous paper products such as paper napkins, towels, office forms and paper handkerchiefs.

New Zealand granted a reduction in the duty on paper.

Newfoundland reduced rates on certain types of paper and stationery products.

Cuba lowered the duty on cardboard containers in which goods are imported.

Petroleum refinery products: The United Kingdom bound the rate on paraffin wax and petroleum jelly.

France granted reductions on gasoline and lubricating oil.

Southern Rhodesia and the Union of South Africa bound their duties on lubricating oil.

Czechoslovakia granted reductions on paraffin and petroleum jelly.

The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union bound paraffin and petroleum duty free.

Lebanon bound lubricating oil at the existing rate.

Brazil reduced the duty on certain petroleum oil.

Chile reduced a duty on lubricating oil, on lubricating grease and on paraffin.

China granted duty reductions on lubricating oil and grease.

Sulfur: The United Kingdom bound sulfur on the free list.

France bound raw sulfur duty-free.

Czechoslovakia bound sulfur duty-free.

The Belgium-Netherlands-Luxemburg Customs Union bound crude sulfur duty-free.

Norway bound sulfur duty-free.

Carbon black: The United Kingdom bound the rate on carbon black.

France bound carbon black free of duty.

Australia eliminated the duty on carbon black.

*What the United States gave in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade*

Concessions were made to other countries on products accounting for $1,766,000,000 or 78 percent of total United States imports in 1939. However, bindings of the tariff status at the 1945 levels accounted for $1,259,000,000 of this total and reductions in duty were made on products the imports of which into the United States were valued, in 1939, at only about $500,000,000.

Some of the principal Louisiana products on which reductions were made by the United States:

Sugar: The duty on sugar was reduced 25 cents per 100 pounds. During the war quotas, which have regulated imports of sugar into the United States since 1934, were suspended. As of January 9, 1948, quotas again became applicable pursuant to special sugar legislation passed by Congress in 1947. Under this legislation the Secretary of Agriculture is required to determine annually the year's sugar requirements of the United States and this quantity is allocated to the different supplying areas according to a formula provided in the statute. It is this stipulated quantity available for consumption which determines the United States price of sugar and the tariff under this system thus loses much of its importance, as a protective device.

Unfinished petroleum oils: The excise tax on imports of unfinished oils was reduced from one-half cent to one-fourth cent a gallon. In 1939 taxable imports of unfinished oils, including topped crude, were valued at $4,541,000, nearly all from the Netherlands West Indies. However, more than half of the reported imports consisted of topped crude

on which the excise tax was reduced in December 1939. In 1946 taxable imports amounted to $30,000, nearly all from Canada; during the first 8 months of 1947 they amounted to $365,000, nearly all from Canada. Since unfinished oils are products not ready for use, most of the shipments which appear in published statistics are intracompany transfers or transactions between affiliated companies.

All concessions made by the United States were formulated within the limits and according to the procedures specified by the Trade Agreements Act. This Government is exercising its right under the agreement generally to withhold concessions which are of primary interest to those countries which were represented at Geneva until they have put their new tariff schedule into effect.

ADDENDUM, SEPTEMBER 1948

Since preparation of the accompanying material certain developments have significantly altered the facts presented there.

1. Twenty-two of the twenty-three countries (all except Chile) participating in negotiation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1947, signed the Protocol of Provisional Application before June 30, 1948, and tariff concessions provided for in the agreement are now in effect as regards those countries.

2. The Congress in June 1948 enacted Public Law 792 (approved June 26, 1948) extending to June 30, 1949, the President's authority to negotiate trade agreements and providing for certain changes in the procedure heretofore followed in such negotiations.

The new law:

(a) Prohibits the Tariff Commission from participating in any decision regarding the terms of an agreement or in negotiations for an agreement. The Commission will, however, continue to furnish factual data to other Government agencies for use in formulating and negotiating agreements. The agencies which, under law or executive order, now advise the President on trade-agreement matters are the Departments of State Commerce, Agriculture, the Treasury, and Labor, the Military Establishment, and the Economic Cooperation Administration;

(b) Requires the President, before negotiating an agreement, to submit to the Tariff Commission a list of all products on which possible United States tariff concessions may be considered;

(c) Requires the Tariff Commission, not more than 120 days after receiving the above list, to conduct hearings and an investigation and to advise the President as to (1) the limit to which tariff concessions may go without causing or threatening serious injury to domestic industries, and (2) the minimum tariff increases or additional import restrictions, if any, required to avoid such injury;

(d) Requires that the President, if he concludes an agreement involving greater tariff concessions than those specified in the above report, or failing to include increased import restrictions recommended by the Commission, must report the agreement to Congress not more than 30 days after it is concluded, together with a statement of his reasons for not following the recommendations of the Commission, which thereupon must file with the Congress a copy of its previous report to the President.

Existing procedure, under which the Committee for Reciprocity Information holds public hearings on all aspects of a trade agreement before its negotiation, is provided for in executive orders and will continue unchanged, except that the Tariff Commission will no longer participate in these hearings or in decisions based on information and views of interested parties presented there.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, having been unable to gain the floor during the consideration of the Trade Extension Act, I wish to make the following comments and observations with respect to that legislation.

For years the question of tariff was the outstanding issue between the two parties, and it was made a political football. The vast majority of the American people, however, demanded that the issue of tariffs be taken out of politics, and after many efforts, a Tariff Commission was created, with a nonpolitical soul, notwithstanding the opposition who for years thrived on high tariffs.

Upon the urgent recommendations of business and the American people as a whole, with the end pointed toward the increasing of our foreign commerce and enabling the United States to export its great surpluses in many commodities, we succeeded in passing the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934.

A brief review of the history of tariff legislation recalls to our minds the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill—the Republican high tariff bill—which produced, as a result of its unfair provisions, uncounted and wholesale trouble for our industrial and economic establishment. With the passage of this legislation which created a barrier of economic goods against a necessary trade-amongnations policy, our country aroused counterattacks against our foreign economy of goods, and as a result, barriers were raised against American goods which could easily have found markets throughout the world. Under this Republican measure, infant industries which had no reason for securing governmental assistance, were subsidized to the extent that they were permitted to compete with foreign products, which could have been imported by the American people at a cheaper price and sometimes at a better grade.

The record will also show that our foreign trade fell as a result of this unfair legislation, which was directly responsible, in part, for our falling into a depression out of which it required a Democratic administration to lead us. Profiting by this mistake, the Democratic Congress, led by that great sage and statesman, Cordell Hull, brought about a necessary reversal of this policy of closing our market doors to a world anxious to receive them.

There was then enacted a group of reciprocal trade agreements which recognized the strength and weaknesses of our industrial and agricultural products. It was inevitable that we should admit that we could not manufacture all the goods which the American people needed due to climatic and labor conditions, since many countries could raise products and manufacture them at a cost much less than our farms and factories permitted. As a result, the American people were brought face to face with the realization that trade with the peoples abroad begets understanding and friendliness, as well as a profitable exchange of goods. The Hull reciprocal trade agreements, always opposed by the Republicans, who still bask in the shadows of a high-tariff policy, which today is outdated and antiquated, proved an immediate success. An examination of the records of our import and export trade during the period of their existence speaks strongly for their continuance.

H. R. 1211 entitled "The Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949," now under consideration, in effect does three things, namely: (a) repeals the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, (b) extends for 3 years from June 12, 1948, the authority of the President to enter into foreign trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act, (c) and effects three minor changes in the original Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended. The effect of section 6 of the new bill, enables the United States to raise, rather than to lower, certain tariff rates, pursuant to the general agreement on tariffs and trade, negotiated at Geneva in 1947.

This bill effects a return to the procedures that were followed from 1934 to 1948, under the then existing Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, which as you know, resulted in the successful completion of some 42 agreements. Under the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948, as passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the President was bound by a hampering procedure in administering this law. The new act will return us to the procedures which have effectively been proven in the past.

The trade-agreements program insures us against a possible loss of the huge investment that we have made in the European recovery program, by putting into effect a powerful and practical method of expanding our international trade. By allowing other countries to sell us a greater portion of their raw material and other essential materials, we make available purchasing power which is used to obtain more of our own export products on a paying basis, and not as gifts. Business, labor, farming groups, and the consumer, are all vitally interested in the maintenance of these trade agreements, as they point toward the very essence of our national and international well-being.

I have observed that Great Britain, due to financial aid that we have been and are giving her, has been and is extending its exports. In the last few days, however, she has complained bitterly that Germany, through its cartels, is competing unfairly with Britain's exports. She also complains that Japan, due to its cheap labor, is underselling Great Britain in many quarters of the world.

With the United States aid given to Germany, Japan, Great Britain, and other countries, we are building up a great source of competition for our own export trade. Nevertheless I am certain that this Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1949 will not effect or retard our own exports or our own economy, and further, will not deprive us of the foreign trade which is so badly needed for our own great surpluses.

Since the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, as amended, is the arch of our bipartisan foreign economic policy, a failure to enact legislation such as this, would in effect, be making our American leadership in world economic affairs subservient to the interests of a few producers. The foreign relations of the United States are interdependent upon and directly related to the doctrines of

peace and freedom, for which mankind is constantly striving. The delusive and artificial Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 that seriously affected and disabled the Reciprocal Trade program, will be remedied by the passage of this bill.

The issue is that again of isolation-in-trade attempting, to be self-supporting, which we are not and cannot be, as against recognition of the fact that in just, fair, and equitable trade agreements, we can, as Americans, play an important part in the rehabilitation of the world's economy, as well as benefiting our own industries and our own social and industrial life.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the Waltham Watch Co. in its financial report for last year, which was issued yesterday, reveals that company had a deficit last year of $1,610,000. In 1947, the company reported a loss of about $300,000. A company that year after year loses money cannot long stay in business. It cannot continue to employ people.

One speaker today probably gave the reason why the Waltham Watch Co. has been losing money. That reason was that the Swiss shipped 9,000,000 watches into the United States last year under trade treaties that had greatly reduced the tariff on Swiss watches.

I spoke earlier in this debate about the harm that might be done to the crab industry, the filbert-nut industry, and the shingle industry if trade treaties are negotiated too hastily and without all members of an industry, labor and management alike, having a full opportunity to present their case.

This bill by eliminating the Tariff Commission as an agency to investigate how any tariff may affect any industry, certainly does not safeguard the interest of either workers or manufacturers.

This noon I had lunch with a western lumberman. I asked him if lumber was now being shipped into the United States from Canada. He told me that lumber imports from Canada, particularly of low-grade lumber, have increased enormously during recent months. If this importation of lumber from Canada continues to increase it certainly will throw many of our western sawmills out of operation and cause many western sawmill workers to lose their jobs. This is particularly true of the smaller mills, the mills that operate with crews of 10 to 40 men each.

We should not sell these little sawmill operators and the men they employ down the river. Surely, we should not sell them down the river without providing them their American right to be fully heard by appropriate committees or commissions of the Federal Government. Under this bill these operators and these workers will get adequate hearings. This bill makes the Tariff Commission a bipartisan, nonpolitical Commission a dead duck. Under this bill, when an industry and its employees are about to be liquidated by the State Department on the auction block of foreign trade, neither its management nor its employees are afforded any adequate, impartial hearing. This is not fair. This is not just.

I have lived all my life in a lumbering community. Many is the time I have seen most of the lumber mills of my home town idle while those in Canada were operating at full capacity. These Canadian mills operated while our American lumber mills were idle because the price of labor and of logs was much lower in Canada than in the United States.

The same threat that exists in this bill to the lumber industry also exists in this bill for the plywood.

During the past year, large eastern building material jobbing houses, hoping to profit by becoming agents for Canadian and Mexican concerns, have made a strenuous effort to persuade Congress to remove the present tariff on Canadian and Mexican plywood.

Were this plywood tariff to be reduced more than 13,000 American plywood workers who are employed in 43 plywood plants in Oregon, Washington, and California would be the principal sufferers.

The wage rates paid by Canadian plywood manufacturers are about 6 percent lower than those prevailing on the American side of the line. Also, log prices in Canada are much lower than in the United States. The differential between Mexican labor and American labor is even greater than that which exists between Canadian and United States labor.

If tariffs on plywood should be reduced more foreign plywood will invade the American market, our American plants will be forced to curtail operations or our American plywood workers eventually will have to accept lower wages in order to meet this foreign competition.

None of these eventualities should be permitted to happen. Our American plywood industry has been doing a good job in increasing production, in meeting building material demands.

In 1945, the production of fir plywood in the United States was 1,200,000,000 square feet; in 1946, it was 1,400,000,000 square feet; in 1947, it was 1,600,000,000 square feet; and in 1948, it was an estimated 2,000,000,000 square feet. It is now contemplated that the plywood output for 1949 will be 2,700,000,000 square feet or about two and one-half times the production of 4 years ago. Certainly, with such a record, the plywood industry has done a good job.

The plywood industry's management and workers should not be penalized by the adoption of new tariff policies in plywood, certainly not without giving the industry and its workers the fullest opportunity to be heard. This bill does not provide full hearings for the plywood industry, either its management or its workers, in the event the State Department should undertake to wipe out the present tariff that is imposed on Canadian and Mexican plywood workers.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for H. R. 1211, for extension of reciprocal trade treaty powers of the President, after voting for the motion to recommit to include in that act a means of determining the so-called peril points—and to require escape clauses to be incorporated in trade treaties negotiated with other countries. I believe it is important that the Federal Trade Commission be given direction to establish these so-called peril points or tariff rates below which it is dangerous to go in the protection of American industry and agriculture from cheap labor and slave labor foreign competition. I also believe it highly important that all trade treaties include an escape clause, because we are entering upon an era dangerous to the welfare of the American people in matters of foreign trade.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, it is well known or should be well known that the most important agricultural crops are protected absolutely. They are protected not by tariffs under the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act, but by quota import limitations established by Executive order of the President under the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Soil Conservation Act. The principal agricultural products so protected are short staple cotton, wheat, rice, cattle, dairy products such as butter and milk, and perhaps one or two others. There is also provision in the law which will enable the President even to grant export subsidies on agricultural products. This arises under authority of law contained in the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Soil Conservation Act. They are still in effect. These authorities are as follows:

United States Code, title 7, section 608 (a) ?—the AAA:

"Subject to the provisions of subsection (1) of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall make payments, out of any moneys available for such payments, in such amounts as he finds, upon the basis of the investigation made pursuant to subsection (1) of this section, to be fair and reasonable and best calculated to effectuate the declared policy of this chapter:

"(a) To remove from the normal channels of trade and commerce quantities of any basic agricultural commodity or product thereof;

"(b) To expand domestic or foreign markets for any basic agricultural commodity or product thereof;

"(c) In connection with the production of that part of any basic agricultural commodity which is required for domestic consumption."

United States Code, title 7, section 624:

"624 (a). Whenever the President has reason to believe that any one or more articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such condition and in sufficient quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective or materially interfere with any program or operation undertaken, or to reduce substantially the amount of any product, processed in the United States from any commodity subject to * * * he shall cause an immediate investigation to be made by the United States Tariff Commission. * * *

"(b) If, on the basis of such investigation and report to him of findings and recommendations made, in connection therewith, the President finds the existence of such facts, he shall by proclamation impose such fees on, or such limitations on the total quantity of, any article or articles which may be entered or withdrawn from warehouse * * * provided, that no limitation shall be imposed on the total quantity which may be imported from any country which reduces such permissible quantity to less than 50 percent of the average annual quantity of such article which was imported from such country during the period from January 1, 1929, to December 31, 1933, both dates inclusive."

Under authority of these sections of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the Soil

Conservation Act, the import of short staple cotton is limited to approximately one-fourth of 1 percent of the amount of short staple cotton raised in the United States. That is almost a complete embargo against importation of that product. The import quota restriction on wheat permits the importation of approximately one-tenth of 1 percent of the amount of wheat grown in the United States, which is an even more perfect embargo against the importation of wheat into the United States. While the quota restrictions on the importation of cattle are not quite so severe, nevertheless under another section of the code relating to agriculture, no cattle or unprocessed meats can be imported from countries where foot-and-mouth disease exists, and among those countries are our chief competitors in the growing of cattle, Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico. Our own cattle growers are, therefore, almost 100 percent protected, not by tariff under the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Act, or even the so-called Smoot-Hawley Act, but under quarantine restrictions established under the Agricultural Code. During the war, the Quartermaster Corps of the Army purchased great quantities of Argentine beef for the use of our soldiers abroad. Recently they have offered to purchase additional large quantities of canned beef for our troops that still remain abroad, and in spite of the high price of meat in the United States, our domestic growers of beef cattle have seriously protested the use of such beef by the Army.

In addition to the embargoes which I have mentioned, we have another law on the books which protects completely, not by tariff, but by a curious type of embargo, the importation into the United States of Virginia-type tobacco. As I have indicated, that embargo arises in a peculiar way. In the thirties it was found that Virginia-type tobacco seed when planted in regions such as south China, would produce crops of Virginia-type tobacco just as good as that grown in our Piedmont sections of the central and South Atlantic States, mainly Maryland, Virginia, and North and South Carolina. However, if the seed from the plants grown elsewhere were again planted, then the second crop was not as good as the first, and the third crop so grown was not as good as the second. Therefore, it was necessary in those regions of the world, for tobacco growers there to purchase Virginia-type tobacco seed in the United States. Under an act sponsored by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], the Congress prohibited the exportation of tobacco seed and live plants. In so doing we shut off completely production of Virginia-type tobacco elsewhere in the world, and consequently, not only protected the foreign markets from any competition whatever in that type of tobacco from competition of foreign-grown Virginia-type tobacco but at the same time, protected absolutely the domestic market from the importation into the United States of Virginia-type tobacco.

Hence, through laws enacted by the Congress in the 1930's—laws which are wholly unrelated to the Reciprocal Trade Treaty Acts and which the present Trade Treaty Act in nowise affects, we have on our statute books not merely protection in the form of tariff, but outright embargoes against the importation of agricultural products of the type I have named from any competition whatsoever by foreign producers of such products. It is easy enough for Representatives from areas growing tobacco, cotton, cattle, rice, and wheat to support the Trade Treaty Acts, if they are only interested in their own districts; they themselves while generally professing a desire to free the trade channels of the world through reduction of American tariffs, have no need for tariff protection themselves. They are just completely protected by laws and Executive orders pursuant to these laws which puts embargoes against any competitive products coming into the United States. They can rest easy, knowing that their districts are 100 percent protected. It is a curious thing how so many of these people can advocate tariff reductions on items produced in other parts of the United States, and wax enthusiastic over freeing the channels of trade, when the channels of foreign trade for their own district's products are protected by embargoes which are the equivalent of the highest tariffs that can possibly be placed on these products. It is a travesty of the highest order.

But even further than this, Mr. Speaker, there are other ways in which certain agricultural products are protected. There is for example the Cuban sugar agreement, which establishes an import quota on sugar, and which sets up in the several sugar-beet and cane growing States, acreage limitations. The States of California, Louisiana, and Florida, to say nothing of certain other States capable of growing sugar, want very much to see less Cuban sugar imported into the United States, and larger quotas established for domestic production. These people would like to have the domestic sugar market entirely to themselves, but certain powerful interests in the United States likewise have interests in the sugar plantations and cane mills in Cuba and Puerto Rico and are able to maintain a considerable share of the domestic market for what is called off-shore sugar, but the battle between the domestic growers and the domestic owners of off-shore production results in a compromise each year and quota limitations placed on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, one can go on to describe in further detail how the important single crops in terms of production and the millions of persons engaged in the growing or processing of such crops are completely protected from serious competition without benefit of tariffs. They do not need tariffs—they are not interested in tariffs. They have protection a lot better than any tariff could provide. In most cases they just embargo the importation of these crops altogether but under a different set of laws than the laws applying to tariffs or trade treaties. They talk glibly of tariff reductions, because tariff reductions do not apply to them, and cannot apply to them so long as the mile-high wall of protection under the import-quota system stands as their fortress. To my mind it is completely unfair to the users of other kinds of agricultural products not so protected by import quotas for these people who are protected to cry for tariff reductions. These other products are, of course, produced in relatively small quantities in the United States and in limited areas, but these products are just as important to the United States and to the growers of these products, small in number as they are, as the greater crops grown in wider areas. Apparently protection is offered, not on the basis of protection per se, but on the basis of how many people are engaged in the business. I could mention the fact that in my own State, California, the growers of walnuts, almonds, olives, and other nut crops, as well as certain fruit crops which result in dried fruit, are completely bare of import-quota protection, and yet serious tariff reductions on these products have been made. It seems there are not enough of these growers to raise a voice of such volume as to be heard in the nooks and crannies of the State Department in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to discuss the foreign trade program of the United States from a different angle. The mass-production industries of our country at the present time have no fear of foreign competition, because mass production was developed in the United States and, practically speaking, exists only in the United States. Hence, the mass-production industries, these industries which have made possible the millions of radios, typewriters, telephones, automobiles, electric lights, and gadgets of all kinds at prices so low that nearly everyone in the United States can afford them, do not today have any fear of foreign competition for their products. Naturally, they are quite anxious for tariff reductions on any and every product of the United States, because they know very well that in order for them to be able to sell also in foreign markets, the foreigners must be able likewise to sell in American markets. These people, as I say, do not need tariff because they are the lowest cost producers in the world in their respective lines, but they do need dollar credits established abroad which they can absorb by exporting their articles. So we have two large groups pressing for tariff reduction. On the one hand, the five or six principal agricultural crop producers are protected by import quota restrictions, and on the other hand, the mass-production industries which are protected by virtue of the fact that they are the world's lowest cost producers. In between these two groups, we have all the lesser crops of agriculture and all of the smaller more personalized industries of the United States. Are we to permit producers of the lesser agricultural crops and the smaller manufacturers to be run out of business, just because they do not have a strong enough political voice—or are we to look at the United States as a whole? If we do not do that, we may someday wake up to find that these lesser producers are out of business, and they also involve in the aggregate millions and millions of people. The net result will be that we will have in the United States a few large mass-production industries employing millions

of people, and the large agricultural producers employing millions of people. But the small farmer and the small-business man will have departed into the limbo of the forgotten. Big industries and big agriculture are important, Mr. Speaker, but to my way of thinking, little agriculture and little industries are more important, because they constitute the backbone of America, the backbone of freedom and individual enterprise. When they are gone, where will the young man turn to find a place where he may establish himself and exercise that vaunted freedom of opportunity which we say is a birthright of every American?

To conclude this dissertation, Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that not since 1939 has it been possible for the trade treaties negotiated pursuant to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, to have an opportunity to demonstrate forcibly to the American people the full consequences of the program thus initiated. Since September 1, 1939, the most important producing sections of the world have been at war, and since 1941 the United States has been at war. No peace has yet been declared, although hostilities have ceased as such in the western world. Nevertheless, no one will deny that while the hot war has been turned off, for the time being at least, we have been engaged in a cold war all over the world. During hostilities there was in effect the well-known lend-lease program. Trade treaties were of no effect during that period. It may be recalled that at the same time we were engaged in Government purchasing of strategic materials and Government free distribution of arms, ammunition, food, and clothing all over the world. If any private business whatever was done, such business was accomplished under the export-license system. Since the end of hostilities, the United States has been spreading largess throughout the world, first by postwar loans to our ex-war allies, and through the Latin-American good will program, initiated by Nelson Rockefeller. Now we are engaged in spreading it even more thickly, through the so-called Marshall plan or the European recovery program or the Economic Cooperative Administration, or whatever you want to call it, but, nevertheless, to the tune of about $8,000,000,000 per year. Through this program, we have distributed our surpluses to foreign countries, meaning to foreign governments, thereby taking the surpluses off the American market—thereby removing the safety valve on prices. How long can the American people bear this burden, and what will happen when it stops?

Let us take a look at the present picture and what the results may be in the future, of our actions today. By giving our surpluses away and giving them away for free, Mr. Speaker, we are sustaining high prices at home. High prices cause labor to ask for and get higher wages. It is proposed that we now increase the minimum wage of the American people to 75 cents an hour in most cases and $1 per hour in some others. That is practically double the present minimum-wage provision. Wages are the highest in our history today. On the other hand, we have agriculturists who are protected by the so-called parity formula—a formula which establishes a price for farm production for the five or six principal crops in the United States based upon the costs of those industrial products which the farmer must buy. These crops are also protected against foreign competition by import-quota restrictions, as I have pointed out before. These farmers also have a floor built under themselves by virtue of laws which permit them to borrow from the Government up to 90 percent of the parity prices established for their crops. The higher industrial prices go, the higher parity prices go, and, of course, the higher 90 percent of parity is, and so we ask ourselves that ancient question: Why is a mouse when it spins? and the answer is: The higher the fewer. We think also, Mr. Speaker, of that fable we learned in childhood about the Pied Piper of Hamlin, as we see our children's natural fortitude debauched by something-for-nothing propaganda at every turn.

When the Marshall plan stops giving away American surpluses without charge to foreign governments—when minimum wages have been established at twice their former values, when the prices of agriculture's principal crops have been pegged at similarly high value, when tariff protection no longer exists for the lesser crops and industrial products, when Europe has recovered its productive capacity and starts exporting to the United States in earnest, I wonder what is going to happen in the United States. Think it over.

I support the present bill because it can be of little effect so long as the Marshall plan is in effect. But I demand that we have escape clauses which will permit us to defend ourselves, our small industries, and our small farmers against the products of cheap labor abroad, and in some cases, not cheap, but slave labor, and I think that it is necessary that the Tariff Commission stand guard, ready to tell us what the peril points are, so that we may know how to act when the avalanche of foreign goods buries employment in the United States.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, on leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to discuss H. R. 1211, now under consideration. As I view the pending bill, it is designed to accomplish three things: Repeal the peril-point report of the bipartisan Tariff Commission; repeal the escape clause from the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1948; and extend the Reciprocal Trade Act for a period of 3 years.

The Tariff Commission is a bipartisan commission appointed by the President to hold hearings and make investigations of all proposed tariff revisions. The President must seek advice and obtain expert knowledge in arriving at conclusions in reducing tariff rates to be sure that our domestic economy is not in jeopardy. The duty of the Tariff Commission is to make investigations and hold hearings to be able to determine to what length adjustments may be made in our tariff structure so as not to injure the domestic producers of the commodities concerned.

The Tariff Commission in rendering their report to the President must take into consideration any elements such as the wage schedules in the country involved as against our American standard, cost of transportation, accessibility of raw material, and whether or not these trade agreements might be at a disadvantage to our national defense.

Before the President could reduce tariffs below the peril point of the industry involved, he would be compelled to submit his recommendations to the Congress for their approval.

Many thousands of treaties are now in effect, the most of which do not carry an escape clause. On November 7 and December 17 the President submitted lists of commodities on which concessions would be negotiated with 11 countries. On December 7 the Tariff Commission began hearings, and on March 5 the peril-point report will be completed and ready for use in the pending negotiations in April.

Arguments were presented that the process was cumbersome and caused delay. This was offset by reports to the contrary, and that work in preparing information setting forth these "peril points" was well in hand. The tariff on some 400 articles will be considered at the April 1949 trade conference. A few of the articles which this conference will consider are: olive oil, cherries, nuts, canned tomatoes, sugar, fish, hides and skins, wallboard, plywood, box shook, matches, and so forth. A reduction in tariff on these commodities could adversely affect the economy of my district. We should have the advices of the Tariff Commission to establish the "peril point" in each of these articles under consideration, and also should have the escape clause in the event experience would show that the industry was being harmed by the negotiations entered into.

If the past can be an indication for what might happen in the future, these conferences usually result in the lowering of the tariff thereby placing the farmer, industry, and the laboring man at a further competitive disadvantage. The almond, filbert, and walnut growers are producing a surplus. A tariff reduction might bring chaos to these growers. The fish industry and fishermen cannot stand more discrimination. Many of our lumber mills have shut down. I am informed that lumber imports from Canada have increased enormously during recent months. If this continues, it will close more of our mills and throw many of our men out of work. A movement is on to try and have the tariff removed on Canadian and Mexican plywood. Should this be accomplished, more than 13,000 American workers in plywood plants on the Pacific coast would be in jeopardy. Plywood production in the United States is a comparatively new industry. The output of these plants in 1949 will be 2,700,000,000 square feet, or two and one-half times the production 4 years ago. Fifty-five million jeweled watches have been imported since 1941. The watch industry in this country is about ruined, and thousands of employees are out of work. The glass industry of West Virginia is almost out of business, causing great hardship and unemployment. No

escape clause is provided for these industries.

During the hearings on this bill, 63 organizations appeared in support of maintaining the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission contained in the 1948 Act. Among them were The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, National Council Farmer Cooperatives, United States Hop Growers Association, California Fish Canners Association, Inc., Mining industry of California, farm organizations, manufacturers, labor organizations, trade organizations, and many others.

In his testimony before the committee, Albert S. Gross, master of the National Grange, said:

We do not believe H. R. 1211 will provide the type of tariff system the nation needs. We would like to see sound tariff legislation far more comprehensive than anything contemplated in this bill, and we fear the enactment of such a measure would merely serve to assure the continuance of an unsound and objectionable situation for another 2 years—a period of readjustment in trade when we will probably need a sound tariff policy more than at any time in recent years. We would much prefer to see the committee devote its time to the enactment of such legislation and let the present law stand until a sound and effective tariff measure can be passed.

Mr. Ray B. Wiser, President of the California Farm Bureau Federation, states that—

Further tariff reductions should be made only after careful consideration of effects which such reductions may have on the industry affected. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1948 contained provision for a tariff commission investigation and study of commodities for which tariff adjustment was contemplated and the establishment by the commission of a range within which adjustments could be made without severe adverse effects upon the industry involved. * * * We would therefore respectfully recommend your participation in efforts to obtain retention of the present provisions of the 1948 act providing for tariff commission investigation and reporting on the effects of proposed adjustments prior to the actual negotiations of trade agreements.

I cannot countenance the American taxpayer lending $300,000,000 to Great Britain to buy wheat from Canada when our warehouses are bulging, and no buyers; or to see our Government support a potato deal with a $200,000,000 loss for 1948, and permit Canadian potatoes to be imported and sold under our support price.

During the hearings and various debates, evidence has been brought out concerning the loyalty of the employees in the State Department charged with the responsibility of trade negotiations, which makes me feel doubly strong that the Tariff Commission should establish the peril point and that the escape clause should remain in the bill. It seems to be a foregone conclusion that our efforts are futile in trying to amend the pending bill to include the peril-point report and the escape clause. I shall vote for their inclusion and be one of a loyal opposition to vote against the final passage of the bill, and in so doing, express my feeling that our American industries, farmers, and workmen are not adequately protected, and that the American people should be warned to stop, look, and listen, lest it be too late.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 151, nays 241, answered "present" 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 7]

YEAS—151

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Hagen | Michener |
| Allen, Ill. | Hale | Miller, Md. |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Hall, Edwin Arthur | Miller, Nebr. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Hall, Leonard W. | Morton |
| Andresen, August H. | Hand | Murray, Wis. |
| Angell | Harden | Nelson |
| Arends | Harvey | Nicholson |
| Auchincloss | Herter | Nixon |
| Bailey | Hill | Norblad |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Hinshaw | O'Hara, Minn. |
| Bates, Mass. | Hoeven | O'Konski |
| Beall | Hoffman, Ill. | Patterson |
| Bennett, Mich. | Holmes | Pfeiffer, William L. |
| Bishop | Hope | Philbin |
| Blackney | Horan | Phillips, Calif. |
| Boggs, Del. | Hull | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Bolton, Ohio | Jackson, Calif. | Potter |
| Bramblett | James | Reed, N. Y. |
| Brehm | Jenison | Rees |
| Brown, Ohio | Jenkins | Rich |
| Burdick | Jennings | Riehlman |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jensen | Rogers, Mass. |
| Canfield | Johnson | Sadlak |
| Case, S. Dak. | Jonas | St. George |
| Chiperfield | Kean | Sanborn |
| Church | Kearney | Scott, Hardie |
| Clevenger | Kearns | Scrivner |
| Cole, Kans. | Keating | Scudder |
| Cole, N. Y. | Keefe | Simpson, Ill. |
| Corbett | Kennedy | Simpson, Pa. |
| Cotton | Kilburn | Smith, Kans. |
| Crawford | Kilday | Smith, Wis. |
| Cunningham | Kunkel | Stefan |
| Curtis | Lane | Stockman |
| Dague | Latham | Taber |
| Davis, Wis. | LeCompte | Talle |
| D'Ewart | LeFevre | Taylor |
| Donohue | Lemke | Tollefson |
| Engel, Mich. | Lodge | Van Zandt |
| Fellows | Lovre | Velde |
| Fenton | McConnell | Vorys |
| Fisher | McCulloch | Vursell |
| Ford | McDonough | Wadsworth |
| Gamble | McGregor | Welchel |
| Gavin | McMillen, Ill. | Werdel |
| Gillette | Mack, Wash. | Wigglesworth |
| Goodwin | Macy | Wilson, Ind. |
| Graham | Martin, Iowa | Winthrow |
| Gross | Martin, Mass. | Wolcott |
| Gwinn | Mason | Wolverton |
| | | Woodruff |

NAYS—241

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Burke | Davis, Ga. |
| Addonizio | Burleson | Davis, Tenn. |
| Albert | Burnside | Dawson |
| Allen, La. | Burton | Deane |
| Andrews | Byrne, N. Y. | DeGraffenried |
| Aspinall | Camp | Delaney |
| Barden | Cannon | Denton |
| Baring | Carlyle | Dollinger |
| Barrett, Pa. | Carnahan | Doughton |
| Bates, Ky. | Carroll | Douglas |
| Beckworth | Case, N. J. | Doyle |
| Bentsen | Cavalcante | Durham |
| Biemiller | Celler | Eberharter |
| Bland | Chatham | Engle, Calif. |
| Blatnik | Chelf | Evins |
| Bloom | Chesney | Fallon |
| Boggs, La. | Christopher | Feighan |
| Bolling | Clemente | Fernandez |
| Bolton, Md. | Coffey | Flood |
| Bonner | Colmer | Fogarty |
| Boykin | Combs | Forand |
| Breen | Cooley | Frazier |
| Brooks | Cooper | Fugate |
| Brown, Ga. | Cox | Fulton |
| Bryson | Crook | Furcolo |
| Buchanan | Crosser | Garmatz |
| Buckley, Ill. | Davenport | Gary |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Davies, N. Y. | Gathings |
| Gilmer | McCarthy | Rankin |
| Gordon | McCormack | Redden |
| Gore | McGrath | Regan |
| Gorski, Ill. | McGuire | Rhodes |
| Gorski, N. Y. | McKinnon | Ribicoff |
| Gossett | McMillan, S. C. | Richards |
| Granahan | McSweeney | Rodino |
| Granger | Mack, Ill. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Grant | Madden | Rooney |
| Green | Magee | Sabath |
| Gregory | Mahon | Sasscer |
| Hardy | Mansfield | Sikes |
| Hare | Marcantonio | Sims |
| Harris | Marsalis | Smathers |
| Harrison | Marshall | Somers |
| Hart | Merrow | Spence |
| Havenner | Miller, Calif. | Staggers |
| Hays, Ark. | Mills | Stanley |
| Hays, Ohio | Mitchell | Steed |
| Hébert | Morgan | Stigler |
| Hedrick | Morris | Sullivan |
| Heffernan | Morrison | Sutton |
| Herlong | Moulder | Tackett |
| Heselton | Multer | Tauriello |
| Hobbs | Murdock | Teague |
| Holifield | Murphy | Thomas, Tex. |
| Howell | Murray, Tenn. | Thompson |
| Huber | Noland | Thornberry |
| Irving | Norrell | Trimble |
| Jackson, Wash. | O'Brien, Ill. | Underwood |
| Jacobs | O'Brien, Mich. | Vinson |
| Javits | O'Hara, Ill. | Wagner |
| Jones, Ala. | O'Neill | Walsh |
| Jones, Mo. | O'Sullivan | Walter |
| Jones, N. C. | O'Toole | Welch, Mo. |
| Karst | Pace | Wheeler |
| Karsten | Passman | White, Calif. |
| Kee | Patman | White, Idaho |
| Kelley | Patten | Whitten |
| Keogh | Perkins | Whittington |
| Kerr | Peterson | Wickersham |
| King | Pfeifer, Joseph L. | Wier |
| Kirwan | Pickett | Willis |
| Klein | Poage | Wilson, Okla. |
| Kruse | Polk | Wilson, Tex. |
| Lanham | Preston | Winstead |
| Larcade | Price | Wood |
| Lesinski | Priest | Woodhouse |
| Lind | Quinn | Worley |
| Linehan | Rabaut | Yates |
| Lucas | Rains | Young |
| Lyle | Ramsay | Zablocki |
| Lynch | | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Plumley

NOT VOTING—40

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Golden | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Battle | Halleck | Secrest |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hoffman, Mich. | Shafer |
| Bosone | Judd | Sheppard |
| Bulwinkle | Lichtenwalter | Short |
| Chudoff | Meyer | Smith, Ohio |
| Coudert | Miles | Smith, Va. |
| Dingell | Monroney | Thomas, N. J. |
| Dolliver | Norton | Towe |
| Dondero | Poulson | Welch, Calif. |
| Eaton | Powell | Whitaker |
| Elliott | Reed, Ill. | Williams |
| Ellsworth | Rivers | |
| Elston | Sadowski | |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Plumley for, with Mrs. Norton against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. Sadowski against.

Mr. Meyer for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Judd against.

Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Golden against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Monroney against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Poulson against.

Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Welch of California against.

Mr. Short for, with Mrs. Bosone against.

Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Bennett of Florida against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair; however, I voted on the last call. I withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 69, answered "present" 1, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 8]

YEAS—319

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Donohue | Keefe |
| Addonizio | Doughton | Kelley |
| Albert | Douglas | Kennedy |
| Allen, Calif. | Doyle | Keogh |
| Allen, La. | Durham | Kerr |
| Andrews | Eberharter | Kilburn |
| Angell | Engel, Mich. | King |
| Arends | Engle, Calif. | Kirwan |
| Aspinall | Evins | Klein |
| Auchincloss | Fallon | Kruse |
| Barden | Feighan | Kunkel |
| Baring | Fernandez | Lanham |
| Barrett, Pa. | Fisher | Larcade |
| Bates, Ky. | Flood | Latham |
| Beall | Fogarty | LeCompte |
| Beckworth | Forand | LeFevre |
| Bennett, Mich. | Ford | Lesinski |
| Bentsen | Frazier | Lind |
| Biemiller | Fugate | Linehan |
| Blackney | Fulton | Lodge |
| Bland | Furcolo | Lovre |
| Blatnik | Gamble | Lucas |
| Bloom | Garmatz | Lyle |
| Boggs, Del. | Gary | Lynch |
| Boggs, La. | Gathings | McCarthy |
| Bolling | Gavin | McConnell |
| Bolton, Md. | Gilmer | McCormack |
| Bolton, Ohio | Gordon | McDonough |
| Bonner | Gore | McGrath |
| Boykin | Gorski, Ill. | McGuire |
| Breen | Gorski, N. Y. | McKinnon |
| Brehm | Gossett | McMillan, S. C. |
| Brooks | Graham | McMillen, Ill. |
| Brown, Ga. | Granahan | McSweeney |
| Bryson | Granger | Mack, Ill. |
| Buchanan | Grant | Madden |
| Buckley, Ill. | Green | Magee |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Gregory | Mahon |
| Burdick | Gwinn | Mansfield |
| Burke | Hale | Marcantonio |
| Burleson | Hall, Edwin Arthur | Marsalis |
| Burnside | Hall, Leonard W. | Marshall |
| Burton | Harden | Martin, Mass. |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Hardy | Merrow |
| Camp | Hare | Michener |
| Canfield | Harris | Miller, Calif. |
| Cannon | Harrison | Miller, Md. |
| Carlyle | Hart | Miller, Nebr. |
| Carnahan | Havenner | Mills |
| Carroll | Hays, Ark. | Mitchell |
| Case, N. J. | Hébert | Morgan |
| Case, S. Dak. | Hedrick | Morris |
| Cavalcante | Heffernan | Morrison |
| Celler | Herter | Morton |
| Chatham | Heselton | Moulder |
| Chelf | Hill | Multer |
| Chesney | Hinshaw | Murdock |
| Christopher | Hobbs | Murphy |
| Clemente | Hoeven | Murray, Tenn. |
| Coffey | Holifield | Nixon |
| Cole, Kans. | Holmes | Noland |
| Cole, N. Y. | Hope | Norrell |
| Colmer | Horan | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Combs | Howell | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Cooley | Huber | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Cooper | Irving | O'Neill |
| Corbett | Jackson, Calif. | O'Sullivan |
| Cotton | Jackson, Wash. | O'Toole |
| Cox | Jacobs | Pace |
| Crook | James | Passman |
| Crosser | Javits | Patman |
| Cunningham | Jennings | Patten |
| Davenport | Johnson | Patterson |
| Davies, N. Y. | Jonas | Perkins |
| Davis, Ga. | Jones, Ala. | Pfeifer, Joseph L. |
| Davis, Tenn. | Jones, Mo. | Pfeiffer, William L. |
| Davis, Wis. | Jones, N. C. | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Dawson | Karst | Pickett |
| Deane | Karsten | Poage |
| DeGraffenried | Kean | Polk |
| Delaney | Keating | Potter |
| Denton | Kee | Preston |
| D'Ewart | Kelley | Price |
| Dollinger | Kennedy | Priest |
| Dolliver | Keogh | Quinn |
| Dondero | Kerr | Rabaut |
| Douglas | Kilburn | Rains |
| Doyle | King | Ramsay |
| Durham | Kirwan | Rankin |
| Eberharter | Klein | Redden |
| Engel, Mich. | Kruse | Regan |
| Engle, Calif. | Kunkel | Rhodes |
| Evins | Lanham | Ribicoff |
| Fallon | Larcade | Richards |
| Feighan | Latham | Richlman |
| Fernandez | LeCompte | Rodino |
| Fisher | LeFevre | Rooney |
| Flood | Lesinski | Sabath |
| Fogarty | Lind | Sasscer |
| Forand | Linehan | Sikes |
| Ford | Lodge | Simpson, Ill. |
| Frazier | Lovre | Sims |
| Fugate | Lucas | Smathers |
| Fulton | Lyle | Somers |
| Furcolo | Lynch | Spence |
| Gamble | McCarthy | Staggers |
| Garmatz | McConnell | Stanley |
| Gary | McCormack | Steed |
| Gathings | McDonough | Stefan |
| Gavin | McGrath | Stigler |
| Gilmer | McGuire | Stockman |
| Gordon | McKinnon | Sullivan |
| Gore | McMillan, S. C. | Sutton |
| Gorski, Ill. | McMillen, Ill. | Tackett |
| Gorski, N. Y. | McSweeney | Talle |
| Gossett | Mack, Ill. | Tauriello |
| Graham | Madden | Taylor |
| Granahan | Magee | Teague |
| Granger | Mahon | Thomas, Tex. |
| Grant | Mansfield | Thompson |
| Green | Marcantonio | Thornberry |
| Gregory | Marsalis | Tollefson |
| Gwinn | Marshall | Trimble |
| Hale | Martin, Mass. | Underwood |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Merrow | Van Zandt |
| Hall, Leonard W. | Michener | Velde |
| Harden | Miller, Calif. | Vinson |
| Hardy | Miller, Md. | Vorys |
| Hare | Miller, Nebr. | Wadsworth |
| Harris | Mills | Wagner |
| Harrison | Mitchell | Walsh |
| Hart | Morgan | Walter |
| Havenner | Morris | Welch, Mo. |
| Hays, Ark. | Morrison | Wheeler |
| Hébert | Morton | White, Calif. |
| Hedrick | Moulder | White, Idaho |
| Heffernan | Multer | Whitten |
| Herter | Murdock | Whittington |
| Heselton | Murphy | Wickersham |
| Hill | Murray, Tenn. | Wier |
| Hinshaw | Nixon | Wigglesworth |
| Hobbs | Noland | Willis |
| Hoeven | Norrell | Wilson, Okla. |
| Holifield | O'Brien, Ill. | Wilson, Tex. |
| Holmes | O'Brien, Mich. | Winstead |
| Hope | O'Hara, Ill. | Withrow |
| Horan | O'Neill | Wolverton |
| Howell | O'Sullivan | Wood |
| Huber | O'Toole | Woodhouse |
| Irving | Pace | Worley |
| Jackson, Calif. | Passman | Yates |
| Jackson, Wash. | Patman | Young |
| Jacobs | Patten | Zablocki |
| James | Patterson | |
| Javits | Perkins | |
| Jennings | Pfeifer, Joseph L. | |
| Johnson | Pfeiffer, William L. | |
| Jonas | Phillips, Tenn. | |
| Jones, Ala. | Pickett | |
| Jones, Mo. | Poage | |
| Jones, N. C. | Polk | |
| Karst | Potter | |
| Karsten | Preston | |
| Kean | Price | |
| Keating | Priest | |
| Kee | Quinn | |
| Kelley | Rabaut | |
| Kennedy | Rains | |
| Keogh | Ramsay | |
| Kerr | Rankin | |
| Kilburn | Redden | |
| King | Regan | |
| Kirwan | Rhodes | |
| Klein | Ribicoff | |
| Kruse | Richards | |
| Kunkel | Richlman | |
| Lanham | Rodino | |
| Larcade | Rooney | |
| Latham | Sabath | |
| LeCompte | Sasscer | |
| LeFevre | Sikes | |
| Lesinski | Simpson, Ill. | |
| Lind | Sims | |
| Linehan | Smathers | |
| Lodge | Somers | |
| Lovre | Spence | |
| Lucas | Staggers | |
| Lyle | Stanley | |
| Lynch | Steed | |
| McCarthy | Stefan | |
| McConnell | Stigler | |
| McCormack | Stockman | |
| McDonough | Sullivan | |
| McGrath | Sutton | |
| McGuire | Tackett | |
| McKinnon | Talle | |
| McMillan, S. C. | Tauriello | |
| McMillen, Ill. | Taylor | |
| McSweeney | Teague | |
| Mack, Ill. | Thomas, Tex. | |
| Madden | Thompson | |
| Magee | Thornberry | |
| Mahon | Tollefson | |
| Mansfield | Trimble | |
| Marcantonio | Underwood | |
| Marsalis | Van Zandt | |
| Marshall | Velde | |
| Martin, Mass. | Vinson | |
| Merrow | Vorys | |
| Michener | Wadsworth | |
| Miller, Calif. | Wagner | |
| Miller, Md. | Walsh | |
| Miller, Nebr. | Walter | |
| Mills | Welch, Mo. | |
| Mitchell | Wheeler | |
| Morgan | White, Calif. | |
| Morris | White, Idaho | |
| Morrison | Whitten | |
| Morton | Whittington | |
| Moulder | Wickersham | |
| Multer | Wier | |
| Murdock | Wigglesworth | |
| Murphy | Willis | |
| Murray, Tenn. | Wilson, Okla. | |
| Nixon | Wilson, Tex. | |
| Noland | Winstead | |
| Norrell | Withrow | |
| O'Brien, Ill. | Wolverton | |
| O'Brien, Mich. | Wood | |
| O'Hara, Ill. | Woodhouse | |
| O'Neill | Worley | |
| O'Sullivan | Yates | |
| O'Toole | Young | |
| Pace | Zablocki | |
| Passman | | |
| Patman | | |
| Patten | | |
| Patterson | | |
| Perkins | | |
| Pfeifer, Joseph L. | | |
| Pfeiffer, William L. | | |
| Phillips, Tenn. | | |
| Pickett | | |
| Poage | | |
| Polk | | |
| Potter | | |
| Preston | | |

NAYS—69

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Ill. | Hand | Philbin |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Hays, Ohio | Phillips, Calif. |
| Anderson, Calif | Herlong | Reed, N. Y. |
| Andresen, August H. | Hoffman, Ill. | Rees |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Hull | Rich |
| Bates, Mass. | Jenison | Rogers, Fla. |
| Bishop | Jenkins | Rogers, Mass. |
| Bramblett | Jensen | Sadlak |
| Brown, Ohio | Kearney | St. George |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Kearns | Sanborn |
| Chiperfield | Kilday | Scott, Hardie |
| Church | Lane | Scrivner |
| Clevenger | Lemke | Scudder |
| Crawford | McGregor | Simpson, Pa. |
| Curtis | Mack, Wash. | Smith, Kans. |
| Dague | Macy | Smith, Wis. |
| Fellows | Martin, Iowa | Taber |
| Fenton | Mason | Vursell |
| Gillette | Murray, Wis. | Weichel |
| Goodwin | Nelson | Werdel |
| Gross | Nicholson | Wilson, Ind. |
| Hagen | Norblad | Wolcott |
| | O'Hara, Minn. | Woodruff |
| | O'Konski | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

McCulloch

NOT VOTING—44

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Golden | Rivers |
| Bailey | Halleck | Sadowski |
| Battle | Harvey | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hoffman, Mich. | Secrest |
| Bosone | Judd | Shafer |
| Bulwinkle | Lichtenwalter | Sheppard |
| Chudoff | Meyer | Short |
| Coudert | Miles | Smith, Ohio |
| Dingell | Monroney | Smith, Va. |
| Dolliver | Norton | Thomas, N. J. |
| Dondero | Peterson | Towe |
| Eaton | Plumley | Welch, Calif. |
| Elliott | Poulson | Whitaker |
| Ellsworth | Powell | Williams |
| Elston | Reed, Ill. | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Bennett of Florida for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Meyer against.

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Plumley against.

Mr. Sadowski for, with Mr. Shafer against.

Mr. Battle for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Lichtenwalter against.

Mr. Golden for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Ellsworth against.

Mr. Harvey for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Welch of California for, with Mr. Peterson against.

Additional general pairs:

Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.

Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Paulson

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Short.

Mr. Williams with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Monroney with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. BURDICK changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I voted "no." I have a live pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HARVEY. I therefore withdraw my vote of "no" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 19.

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce before this resolution comes up for consideration that if there is prolonged discussion and the offering of amendments or any attempt to call the roll, the resolution will not be passed today.

The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on September 18, 1946, Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, Roman Catholic primate of Yugoslavia, was arrested on charges of committing "crimes against the people" and of "being the center of terrorist opposition" to the Government of Yugoslavia; and

Whereas on October 11, 1946, the said Archbishop Stepinac was sentenced to imprisonment for a term of 16 years and deprived of his civil rights for 5 years; and

Whereas the conduct of the trial of the said Archbishop Stepinac which resulted in such sentence was a travesty on justice and a violation of the fundamental rights of man; and

Whereas on December 26, 1948, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was arrested on "suspicion of treason, attempting to overthrow the democratic regime, espionage, and foreign-currency abuses" and has been held incommunicado since such date; and

Whereas the charges upon which the said Cardinal Mindszenty was arrested constitute distortions of truth and justice: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the arrest and imprisonment of the two eminent Roman Catholic primates, Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, and Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, (a) constitute persecution on account of political and religious beliefs, (b) violate the declaration in the preamble to the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men * * *", and (c) violate the third purpose stated in article I of the Charter of the United Nations, namely: "To achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." It is further the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by such violations should be submitted by the United States to the United

Nations at the next meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 16, after the period, strike out all of lines 16 down to and including line 20 and insert the following: "It is further the sense of the Congress that these issues shall be raised by the United States, either in the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate."

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the whole civilized democratic world has been shocked again by the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. Here again we see the totalitarian technique of using the hollow form of legal procedure to ruthlessly destroy the civil rights of an individual. Here again we see the dignity of a human being violated. We see every principle of democratic procedures, respect for human rights, respect for protective legal procedures, ruthlessly swept aside before the lust for revenge of a totalitarian state.

In view of the demonstration which has recently been perpetrated in Hungary, Catholics and non-Catholics alike must register their disapproval before the bar of world public opinion.

I wish to compliment the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for presenting to the Congress this resolution upon which we are about to vote, which condemns in no uncertain terms this terrible travesty committed against the two outstanding religious leaders, Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution heartily. I have repeatedly said that communism aims at the destruction of every vestige of the Christian faith. What has happened in this case is merely a part of that effort to destroy Christianity. It is not a fight against any one church. It is backed by the same satanic power that challenged the deity of our Lord in the beginning and that has tried to destroy the soul of man through the ages. Here we see the fruition of the effort to destroy the will and dignity of man. In this mad communistic campaign the fate of all that is near and dear to us is at stake. This is a move to crush light, liberty, and conscience. Wherever religious liberty and Christianity are attacked, it is the direct concern of every Christian in the world. Mr. Speaker, as a young man I took my stand on the side of Christ and Christianity and there I stand.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I strongly favor the present resolution. The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty was, in my opinion, a farce. It represents a new low in human relations for the Soviet and for communism. In this trial there was a denial of freedom of speech, a denial of freedom of the press. The courts have been distorted and justice has become a hollow mockery. This Congress has a right to be upset over the anti-God attitude of the Soviet and I hope this resolution will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I favor this resolution condemning the endeavor by terror to suppress religious freedom in Hungary. This threat to religious liberty affects equally people of all faiths everywhere. By this resolution the democratic world will be enabled to make clear to the Communist world the critical importance which it attaches to the trials of Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindszenty. Men who love freedom everywhere will applaud this act by this House.

I append hereto House Resolution 65 which I offered to the same effect as the resolution now being adopted and I am satisfied that the resolution now being adopted accomplishes the same result.

House Resolution 65

Whereas the democratic world and people everywhere who believe in justice have been profoundly shocked by the summary arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, and by his being held incommunicado since December 23, 1948; and

Whereas the said arrest and confinement constitute persecution on account of political and religious bias and violate the declaration of the United Nations Charter of "respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms" (article I of the Charter of the United Nations): Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the arrest and imprisonment of the Roman Catholic Primate of Hungary, His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and his continued confinement incommunicado, amount to deliberate persecution on account of conscience and faith and violate a fundamental freedom guaranteed by the United Nations Charter and by the requirements of justice. It is further the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by such violations due to the actions of the Government of Hungary should be submitted by the United States to the United Nations at the next meeting of the General Assembly of the United Nations for appropriate action.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, in these days when a shocked world is awakened by a horrible example of injustice invading the rights of freedom of religion and speech, as was evidenced in the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, it is most properly fitting that I have secured permission to include at this point the sermon of Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle, of Washington, on the trial of the cardinal delivered in St. Matthew's Cathedral, on Sunday, February 6, at the 12:30 o'clock Mass. I take from his words a caption for his sermon:

THE MIMICRY OF JUSTICE

Just 1 month ago I came before you to voice a protestation against the indignity heaped upon a prince of the church in the arrest and imprisonment of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary. During nearly 6 weeks of imprisonment, not a word about him had come to the wondering world, and no one but his accusers had seen him until he was brought to what is referred to as a trial early last week.

My purpose in returning here today has been determined by the events of that trial and the weird reports that have been coming to us through our only means of communication. That purpose is to warn you insistently against misjudgments, born of the confusion worse confounded that has been produced with malice aforethought, by the sole sources of the news regarding this mimicry of justice now being staged in Hungary. For the fault certainly does not lie with our magnificent American press at all.

This so-called trial had hardly begun when headlines screamed in American newspapers that the cardinal was making "confessions." He was described as repudiating his famous letter written before his imprisonment in which he warned that any future "confessions" must be treated as frauds or wrung from him by torture, and were, therefore, to be disregarded entirely. The story of the trial so far is of a piece with the pattern of the infamous Moscow trials, and courts of justice wherever communism has triumphed. The queer spectacles of Moscow and Warsaw, to cite only two, have long since been stamped as fraudulent farces, travesties upon law and justice among civilized nations. Such trials would indeed be worthy of some laughter if they did not involve human lives and liberties, which were the precious things at stake in such courts of justice.

I cannot help but think to myself of the comparison between this trial in far-off Hungary and that which is presently being conducted in the city of New York. The contrast is enough to embitter a man, for the American principle is affirmed and upheld that a man's innocence must be sustained until beyond reasonable doubt his guilt has been proven on the basis of irrefutable evidence. There has been no secret prison cell for these well-cared-for defendants—there has been no use of drugs to dissolve human personality and wrest confessions as of men in a hypnotic dream—there have been no leading and illegal questions from the presiding judge to the defendants—and there has been no violence or refusal of choice of counsel. Instead there has been the spectacle of a judge leaning over backward to render justice according to American law, uncontaminated justice, even when the very dignity of his court has been outraged by the vocal recklessness of the massed array of legal counsel which fortifies the lines of the defense. It does not make pleasant reading, this exhibition of trifling with American liberality and gracious justice, but it does at least manifest the splendid willingness of American justice to take every single precaution and exhibit patient procedure so that justice may be done and man's rights safeguarded under the law of the land.

Now, consider that outrageously misnamed "trial" in Hungary under Communist inspiration and direction. Its features long ago were prophesied in a bluntly honest American press. Papers here in Washington, in New York, in Boston, and other cities were unanimous in openly ridiculing the future "trial" which would be merely an opportunity provided the cardinal for assenting to his guilt, however that consent was wrung from him by methods worthy of oriental dungeons. The trial, they said, would be the public confirmation of the "guilt" and nothing more.

The cardinal was not unaware of these Communist methods and prepared himself accordingly beforehand in the writing of the letter which bade his hearers to ignore what happened after he had been hurled into prison. The former Premier of Hungary, now a resident of our country, speaks of tortures which conceivably were inflicted upon the cardinal after his arrest—the drugging and the rest of the mistreatment which forced "confessions" from others, followed by a reconditioning to prepare him for public appearance at his "trial." A writer in one of our leading dailies yesterday gave a clear-cut analysis asserting that the use of drugs upon the cardinal was obvious, and based his assertions upon the voice, the manner, and the language of his eminence as the "trial" was broadcast from the courtroom to the nation of Hungary.

Now, unfortunately, these confessions have produced enough confusion during the past week in the minds of American readers, enough to make the Kremlin satisfied with its methods. For what is important to them

is not the rightness of their action but the success which it achieves. There has been confusion resulting from these headlines.

First of all, be it well remembered that there is only one American correspondent at this trial. The Hungarian regime refused visas to all other American correspondents. The British Legation of Budapest was denied the courtesy of a representative at the trial. The United States Legation in Budapest was refused the courtesy of an observer. The National Catholic Welfare Conference News Service, which has been accredited to cover news even in Moscow and Warsaw, was also denied admission to the trial. The only news we received during the past week, with one sole exception, comes from Hungarian writers alone, citizens of that stricken country, whose livelihood, whose families, and whose very lives are in jeopardy if they try to report this trial truthfully while writing under the shadow of a Government which is the implacable foe of religion. Do you wonder why, when the iron curtain was drawn around the trial, our news was slanted and the American newspaper could not do much else but print what their only sources sent, leaving it to the wisdom and intelligence of the readers, with editorial direction, to weigh the value of what was set forth in their columns.

It is the old story of the fear of truth, of a free press. But it has produced some confusion which demands a word of clarification at least. For apart from weighing the sources, the truly poisoned and biased sources of this Hungarian news, one has only to contrast the well-known figure of the eminent cardinal before and after this trial began. Only a few short weeks ago, he stood before the world as a giant figure and a thundering voice challenging injustice and violation of human rights. He was marked with a forceful personality, fearless, defiant when he was conscious of a duty to speak and be unafraid. He was well aware, too, of the consequences of his daring to impugn the Government for its lawlessness and indecency toward its citizens. Now, all of a sudden, he appears out of the hidden prison confines, no longer the dominating prince of the church, speaking as a man unafraid, but almost to say as one cringing and exhibiting the indignity of weakness and craven confessions to the most startling crimes, and calmly calling down upon his head the vindictive justice of a cruel and godless Government, the inhuman host of enemies whom before he had assailed as men who were a shame and dishonor to the name of man.

Now the very obvious aim of this Government and the whole vile business of the rigged and fixed trial is to discredit the cardinal in the eyes of his people and of the world. The scheming minds of the Kremlin have succeeded in some measure in throwing dust into the eyes of wondering humanity, who are left gaping at what the truth must actually be. But, for the most part, nobody has been fooled, either by the charges or the sensational revelations of the trial, which to say the least, are outrages upon common sense itself, if not silly obscenities unworthy of intelligent consideration. Unfortunately, they suffice for a Communist government to commit a man to prison or even to death itself as providing the legal basis for doing so. I think, on the whole, the world has not been misled by these atrocious lies and the heartless and unholy defamation of the character of the cardinal—I think, too, that nobody in his right mind can fail to perceive the utter fraud of the whole fearful farce which moves on to the end of destroying the utility of the cardinal as a God-given spokesman of the people in the defense and vindication of their human rights.

I have no intention of criticizing the fine American press alert to the fraud and infamy of the whole procedure. Its headlines state what the dispatches from Communist sources contain but for those who do not read beyond the headlines, there is danger that misunderstanding may ensue, and that would be ruinous.

To those who know the cardinal—I have met him myself three times—there is the recollection of a strong and fearless man, undaunted, and filled with a violent sense of justice. The change which must have taken place in such a man is a revelation, not of weakness in him, God knows, but of the unknown terrors or drugs to which he must have been subjected and which to all appearances have left him another kind of man from the one who braved the penalties invoked against him for the sake of the truth and for the victory of justice. We cannot allow ourselves to forget that stark and well-considered statement of his that no confession made after his arrest was to be considered his word—his truthful and free word—for he knew the diabolical malice and treachery he was soon to meet in the hidden silences of the prison. What went on there no one can say; but it is not difficult in the light of past performances of the same kind to know what the cardinal in silence endured.

The last sorry word came yesterday with the closing of the defense and the ludicrous apology of the defense counsel for the errors of his eminent client and the "hurts which he brought upon his country." That is the last straw in a great pile of foul straw. It is the descent to the lowest of indignities, but it is strictly conformable to Communist administration of justice, which has as its primary purpose the ridicule of a person and his degradation in the eyes of his fellow men, and then heaping insult upon injury, to thrust him forth as a coward and weakling for the defamation of his fellow citizens. It is nothing less than the moral destruction of an individual carried out in public and fortified by what is described as the process of law.

The Vatican has called this a pathological performance. That is a splendid name for the whole sorry mess. It is indeed a diseased and cancerous manifestation without legal health or human values. We know the lies and the deceits and the treachery, we Americans, for we have also been the subjects of Communist fraudulence. We have learned it, alas, when it has been written for us in the blood of every man who has died in the airlift to stricken Berlin, the attestations in blood and life of Communist trickery and Communist lies. We have our trustfulness as a people and a nation of freemen, and we have no desire to become distrustful when trust is warranted by every rational sign. But there is not one basic cause for trusting Communists on anything that has to do with virtue or moral principle—they have none; in what concerns basic law and just juridical process they acknowledge none; in safeguarding human rights and dignity they are worthy of no trust at all. It is as if reason itself has been dethroned to make way for the triumph of the Father of Lies. These are harsh words, but stern truth, and they can be documented from day to day in the history of the last few years of experience with Communist governments.

In conclusion, I remind you again that what happened in Budapest was not a trial, for a trial is a proceeding justly conducted in accordance with law as recognized by the civilized world. This proceeding violates the preamble and article I of the Charter of the United Nations and also the Hungarian Peace Treaty for it amounts to persecution for religious beliefs. This mock trial is a brazen attempt to conceal the ultimate purpose of destroying all organized opposition of the Communist Party in Hungary by hypocritically using the device of the judicial process, and to discredit abroad a friend of the United States and a prelate of the Catholic Church.

Cardinal Mindszenty is not guilty of any crime nor of any moral wrong. Press reports that he had pleaded guilty or partly guilty did not mean under Hungarian legal procedure that he had admitted criminal guilt, as would have been the case under Anglo-American law. It meant that he had courageously reiterated his defense of Christian principles and his fierce opposition to a philosophy that every right, moral and legal, proceeds from the state. It meant that he proclaimed his unshakable belief in basic human freedoms, freedoms which have given us the priceless heritage of our American civilization. The employment of empty legal forms and a legalistic vocabulary unrelated to the concept of justice will avail the Red terror in Hungary naught.

Like St. Thomas More, St. John Fisher, and other great heroes of old, who fell victims to the ruthless hand of political power, which admitted no higher law than its own unbridled will, Cardinal Mindszenty will stand forth in the memory of mankind, both now and in the future, as a symbol of great moral courage, a champion of justice, and a defender of the faith.

Americans and all lovers of democratic government may well shudder in revulsion at such travesties as this trial. For us Catholics, there remains the practical spiritual duty of lifting up our voices against oppression wherever it may be—and lifting up our hearts in prayer for those who suffer injustice for justice's sake—in prayer for the shamefully disordered world in which such heroism for the love of man and the love of Christ must still be exacted.

Pray then for this magnificent servant of God and the church and mankind. For he is a brave citizen known to all the world, and the world suffers in his silent passion. And remember—as you look upon his face in the daily papers, standing in the dock, while, not far away from him, millions of oppressed people rot in concentration camps, his fellow victims for whom he fought the good fight, remember that he represents in his person, thus dishonored and defamed, human dignity that is crowned with thorns, justice that is scourged at the pillar of infamy, and human liberty that is nailed upon a cross.

And now, Mr. Speaker, under the same permission granted me, I conclude with Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle's statement to the press on Josef Cardinal Mindszenty's sentence:

The Hungarian court crucified justice. The craven cowards in the face of world protest were afraid to pursue the premeditated murder of Cardinal Mindszenty. A great champion of human freedom and human rights had no chance with a government that acknowledges neither the majesty of God or the rights of man. May our Divine Lord and His Blessed Mother sustain the cardinal with fortitude in the face of the unknown trials still before him. We shall always remember him in our prayers and we respectfully ask all to pray for him.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I extend my compliments to and sincerely thank the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for his splendid cooperation and prompt work in bringing this resolution to the floor of the House for a vote.

I have been concerned for a long time now with the imprisonment of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac after a trial which was a travesty on justice and offensive to democratic ideals of freedom and fair play and in complete disregard of the preamble and purposes of the Charter of the United Nations. On the

opening day of the Eightieth Congress, in January of 1947, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 4, expressing disapproval of Archbishop Stepinac's trial, held in Zagreb, Yugoslavia, on October 11, 1946, which resulted not only in the imprisonment of the archbishop for a term of 16 years but of other priests of the Catholic Church for varying terms of years. Although I diligently persisted in trying to obtain action on that resolution during the entire term of the Eightieth Congress I was unsuccessful in my efforts. I cannot help but speculate that if prompt action had been taken at that time we might not be here this evening considering the pending resolution insofar as it applies to the horrible injustice done to Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary.

On the opening day of the present Congress, January 3, 1949, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 9, protesting the barbarism of the Communist government of Yugoslavia in the case of Archbishop Stepinac and also on the same day introduced a resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 8, protesting the arrest and imprisonment of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty by the Communist government of Hungary.

I am pleased to be able to say that we did not have to wait as long as in the last Congress for action on either of these resolutions. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] was kind enough on January 18, 1949, to introduce a resolution covering both the Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindszenty matters which was marked House Concurrent Resolution 19 and which is now before us for consideration.

I have discussed this matter with Secretary of State Acheson and commend him for the statement that his Department is fully aware of the significance of the ruthless attacks occurring in Hungary and Yugoslavia against religious and political liberties, which have culminated in the persecution of the two eminent church dignitaries. As far back as October 11, 1946, as Under Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson expressed the concern of our Government over the impairment in Communist Yugoslavia of freedom of religion and worship and other civil liberties, in connection with the trial and conviction of Archbishop Stepinac.

The citizens of America are aroused over what has been done to religion and the religious in these Communist-dominated countries. I have received thousands upon thousands of communications from Protestants, Jews, and Catholics protesting the vicious acts of the murderers and cutthroat gangsters who now rule Hungary and Yugoslavia.

It is apparent that the war between Christianity and atheism is on. I am sure that not a single Member of this House will fail to take up the cudgels against the destruction of religion and the spread of atheism by objecting to unanimous passage of the pending resolution.

The thoughts in the minds of the people of Brooklyn on this subject are reflected in the following editorial which was published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, February 7, 1949, entitled "Reds' Trial of Cardinal Is a Travesty on Justice":

REDS' TRIAL OF CARDINAL IS A TRAVESTY ON JUSTICE

The "trial" of Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary deserves the impartial attention of every man and woman in the world. From the circumstances of the case and the contentions of reliable sources the prosecution of this leading anti-Communist leader seems to be little short of diabolical.

The Reverend Gedeon Peterffy, rector of the Hungarian Pontifical Institute in Rome, declared, in a recent dispatch from that city, that the so-called confession of the cardinal is so crude and filled with grammatical inaccuracies that it could not possibly have been written by the prelate except under duress.

The absurd suggestion of the indicted cardinal in the courtroom that the trial should be called off so that he might now work for a peaceful collaboration with the Communist-usurped government lends weight to the presumption that he had been drugged and was still acting under the influence of an abnormal condition.

To assent to such a possibility would under ordinary circumstances seem to be a surrender to the melodramatic in the hope of satisfying one's search for an answer to the riddle. The word will not down, however, that torture and drugs have been used upon the cardinal.

The first reports of his apparently normal appearance and seeming normal responses in the courtroom are not so clear in the light of later dispatches. The correspondent of the New York Times, who was allowed into the trial only in its closing hours on Friday night, did not verify the earlier dispatches. To him the cardinal had deep rings under his eyes and his words were uttered in a listless way like one repeating something memorized and spoken over and over again. Normally he was a man of vigor—almost theatrical in his speech.

Knowing the character and the reputations of the two parties concerned—the Communist judges and the one man who now stands between them and complete subjugation of the Catholic population of Hungary, one cannot casually accept the garbled and confused bits of information so far available as evidence.

This man has stood up against, not only the Communist usurpers, but their Nazi prototypes. He has suffered valiantly under both regimes. He had warned his fellow bishops to discount any confession that might possibly be extracted from him in the future. The Vatican, which undoubtedly knows the true convictions of its Hungarian representative, stands by the original statements of the cardinal and refuses to accept the recantation as anything but a forced, involuntary admission.

On the other hand, there is no evidence that any Communist regime in any of these public trials has ever followed the norms of justice. The verdict is already sealed before the trial begins. The presiding officer is judge, jury, and prosecutor.

From all the accounts of the trial we cannot fail to reach the conclusion that it is a Communist frame-up—and it is certainly in line with the Reds' long record of deceit, barbarism, and injustice. The Mindszenty case is a travesty on justice.

On the same day the Brooklyn Eagle also contained the following article headed "The world after the war," by Constantine Brown, which shows the low degree of depravity to which the officials of the Soviet Union have descended:

THE WORLD AFTER THE WAR

(By Constantine Brown)

POWERFUL DRUG BELIEVED GIVEN MINDSZENTY TO GET CONFESSION

A powerful drug known as actedron is believed to have been administered to Cardinal Mindszenty by the Soviet-organized Hungarian secret police. This drug paralyzes all will power and the person thus drugged says anything he is told to say.

It is definitely established that the people's court set up by Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia used the same drug to make Gen. Draja Mihailovich, the nation's hero, admit that he had been a traitor to his country.

According to the testimony of those who attended the trial—and the Yugoslavs were more liberal with permits for foreigners than the Hungarian Government is—the Chetnik leader stated after a hearing: "I do not know what has come over me. Whenever I want to say 'No,' I find myself saying 'Yes.'"

The Soviet Union's MVD (secret police) takes credit for the development of this drug and its employment in state trials. It became known to the various intelligence services of the Western Powers during the spectacular purge trials in Moscow in 1936, when many of those who helped found the Soviet state worked against the Soviet government and confessed that they worked against the Soviet government and plotted with Leon Trotsky for its overthrow.

The drug was later used with even greater effect by the Gestapo, not in public trials but in obtaining important admissions from its victims.

Cardinal Mindszenty fought openly against Moscow's puppets in Hungary. This he admitted before being taken into custody by the Hungarian secret police. The Hungarian Government—even the present one, which is entirely under the domination of Moscow's agents—hesitated to arrest a prince of the church, against whom there was not the least evidence of treason, in the accepted meaning of the word.

Moscow decided, according to well-founded reports received in Washington, to proceed against the cardinal only after it found that the Cominform had stuck its neck way out in its conflict with Marshal Tito, of Yugoslavia.

The Communist government in Budapest tried to warn him of what would happen to him, in the hope of quieting the eloquent cardinal. But these warnings were answered with the words: "There is no time limit for martyrdom for the faith and well-being of the human race."

Because it was essential, according to the Soviet system of justice, to expose the enemies of the state by confessions from their mouths, the actedron treatment was given the cardinal. The effect has been gratifying to the U. S. S. R. secret police.

With his will power broken by the drug, the cardinal admitted everything he was told to admit and made a number of reservations about his activities in keeping with the wishes of his torturers, who wanted to give the appearance of a fair trial to their masquerade of justice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, although the pending resolution does not go as far as I would like it to go, I am confident that it is the first worth-while step in a matter in which every American citizen is vitally concerned. I personally feel that we should immediately sever all diplomatic relations with the Communist Government of Hungary. Again permit me to commend the gentleman from New

York [Mr. BLOOM] for his prompt and kindly cooperation and for the time he has given me personally in connection with this matter. When all the Members of this House this evening pass this resolution, as I know they will, they notify all the peoples of the world of their righteous indignation over the barbaric treatment accorded Archbishop Stepinac and Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the farcical trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, Hungarian primate, presents a graphic picture of atheistic materialism ruthlessly challenging every concept of Christian American democracy.

It is factual evidence of a determined, godless assault, by anti-Christian tyranny, against any church or people refusing to accept communistic dictatorship.

This latest outrage appears to be one more example in revelation of a resolute program to either completely extinguish Christianity in eastern Europe or accomplish its ineffectualness, in a moral sense.

For us in America, it should serve as another warning that the survival of personal dignity and human rights, in the Christian tradition, is the question mark of modern world developments. For our own protection we must remain constantly alert to detect insidious communistic undermining in our country and unite, in protest, against their pagan perpetrations abroad.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the voice of the American people rises in its freedom to protest this Communist crime against religion and humanity. Let this be a clarion call for a new international crusade against communism. Were it not for the fact that the results of this despicable trial will echo down through the corridors of time as one of the great infamies in the history of the world, then indeed this stage-managed trial, with all of its ridiculous, but tragic details, would have been truly a farce. Let it be said here and now that the chief, and the first, and the primary object of atheistic communism is the destruction of Christianity. This infamous trial was used by the Russians and their Hungarian satellites as a weapon in a determined effort to intimidate the Hungarian people and to break the power of the Catholic Church in Hungary. Every other means that could come to their perverted minds, having failed to conquer the brave Hungarian people, the Russians now are fully embarked on a campaign of terrorism to destroy their existence.

In this great forum of freedom let me call to your attention once again the great moral and ethical principles that catholicism upholds, and that communism is trying to undermine. Let us tear aside the veil of mystery that has surrounded many of the aspects of the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. By this disregard of personal, political, and religious liberty in Hungary, the Soviet controlled Hungarian authorities have violated the peace treaty which calls for the observance of human, political, and religious rights and freedom.

It has been written: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." But in this Communist-dominated state, this true saying has been tortured to read: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto Caesar the things that are God's."

There is no reason to ignore what is going on behind the iron curtain, for the evidence is overwhelming.

This evidence is provided not only by the faith of Cardinal Mindszenty, but also by the faith of those who preceded him. By Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, by the priests, and pastors of many denominations, not only Catholics, who have been executed or thrown into prison in both states under Communist domination. Additional evidence is given by the numerous diplomats, consuls, and officials, who have resigned their posts abroad in protest against the policies of their home government, including the nine Hungarian officials, headed by the consul general in New York, who this week resigned from their government service. The evidence piles up and increases one upon the other. There is the vast wave of refugees from behind the iron curtain who are now numbered by the hundreds of thousands. They have fled and are still fleeing at the risk of their lives to escape a terror which many of them have experienced in Communist prisons and concentration camps. The democratic world can no longer ignore such evidence.

The Communist Hungarian Government has undertaken to conduct a campaign hoping to cause the people of Hungary and of the surrounding nations to lose faith in their religious leaders and in religion. Trials of this nature are a mockery of truth and justice.

It must be remembered that when Cardinal Mindszenty was free he had warned intimates and members of the clergy not to believe statements that he might make if and when he was arrested. As long as 2 years ago, when on a visit to the United States, the cardinal made this clear, for at that time when asked why he was returning, he declared because it was his duty to his people and his God. The cardinal said further, "I am going back to be crucified." And again, "My enemies can take from me no more than my life and that has already been given to God."

In assurance that we will not be lulled again into a false sense of security or a general apathy, let us not forget that we speak also of the case of Archbishop Aloysius Stepinac, who was sentenced by Yugoslavia in 1946 to 16 years in prison. This action we demand in his behalf as well as Cardinal Mindszenty's. Before the councils of the nations of the world, these sovereign powers must bear full responsibility for their actions. There should be no procedural problem in bringing this question before the United Nations. It should be the privilege of the United States delegation to bring this matter to the attention of the United Nations. This could be done in any one of three ways, in my judgment. First, through reference to the International Court of Justice, although it may be true that Hungary is not a member. Another possibility is reference to the Economic and Social Council or its subsidiary commission on human rights. A third possibility is the General Assembly itself, which meets again this year in April in New York. But regardless of these procedural suggestions, there is still the fact that the terms of the Hungarian peace treaty itself provides the best solution, for that treaty contains specific provisions on guaranties of human rights and democratic processes and the Hungarian Government is under obligation to obey.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the privilege and the high honor of serving for some years in this Congress, and during these years of being of other service to my community, my State, and my country. But may I say that nothing in my private or public life ever incensed me as much as the shameful and degrading action of the Government of Hungary in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. The charge involving our own American Minister, Mr. Chapin, is a direct insult to the Government of the United States and is a cause for diplomatic action.

I realize full well that it is not always good diplomacy, and sometimes not advisable for our sources of information, to break relations with foreign nations. However, under the circumstances of this case, so extenuating, the resignation of Hungarian diplomatic officers in this country is evidence to the world that even they cannot stomach the disgraceful and bestial action of their own government for which they are accredited.

These two facts alone should constitute ample grounds for the withdrawal of our representatives in Hungary and the absolute severance of diplomatic relations with that country.

This is not just a problem for the United States. The whole world is shocked and astounded at this unjust and improper trial. This religious persecution is an outrage against people of all faiths everywhere. This is an indication of what may be anticipated in Communist-controlled countries and is a stark warning of the spread of tyranny and oppression among free people.

It it admirable that these men of God are sacrificed as the victims of their faith. Contrast this with the unenviable lot that is doomed to be that of their tormentors. To die before the wrath of Almighty God as rebuke of their own ambition. How great was the set-back for communism in these proceedings is graphically illustrated by the fact that comparatively few knew who Josef Mindszenty was until his arrest and trial. Today his name is a household word, honored and respected as his persecutors are debased and despised. Mr. Speaker, well it can be said "who falls for the love of God shall rise a star."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WILKES-BARRE, PA.,
*February 6, 1949.*

Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FLOOD: The following resolution was passed at regular monthly meeting of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, division 37, Wilkes-Barre, meeting at Redington Hotel, Wilkes-Barre, Sunday, February 6, 1949:

"The above-named organization protests violently the indignities suffered by Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of Bucharest, Hungary, and six other codefendants being tried by a Russian Hungarian people's court. Also we protest the denial by Hungarian Government of the presence of United States official representatives at this said trial."

Kindly employ your potent influence to present this protest in the Congress of the United States.

Yours truly,

JOHN J. KANE,
*Secretary.*

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the mock trial, conviction, and sentence to life imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty is without parallel in history. No happening of our time more clearly indicates the determination of the Communists to attempt to obliterate their real enemy—Christianity.

His supposed trial violates every elementary principle of justice. It resembles in all details the purge trials held in the Soviet Union sometime back. The Communist government in Hungary has not even permitted American correspondents or observers to witness the trial. This means that the reports are slanted to suit the Communist propaganda line. However, I was extremely gratified that the State Department instructed the American Minister at Budapest to protest the exclusion of observers. I am further gratified by the strong and straightforward expression of yesterday by the Secretary of State.

No greater contrast between democracy and communism can be found than in this farce trial of a great leader of Christianity and in the trial of the 12 Communists in the city of New York. The latter group, leaders of a movement dedicated to the destruction of our Government, has been afforded all of the protection of the great American system of justice, while an outstanding leader of Christianity is denied the rights accorded a common criminal in our country.

The statements which have been reported through the Hungarian censor give every evidence of the accuracy of the charge that the cardinal has been maltreated. This trial is clear warning of the fate of Christianity under communism.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include editorial comments and news stories:

[From the New Orleans Item of February 8, 1949]

BUDAPEST TRIAL

The pattern for Sovietland trials of those under charges of conspiring against any Kremlin-controlled regime is by now pretty well fixed. It was set in the middle thirties by the Russian blood purge. It followed the same dreary routine in the cases of Gen. Draja Mihailovich and Archbishop Stepinac in Yugoslavia, or Zoltan Tildy in Hungary.

That Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, would be found guilty of treason was, therefore, a foregone conclusion. The imposition of a life sentence rather than the death penalty may well have been a concession to world opinion, already incensed over so obvious a mockery of judicial procedure.

In this instance suspicion about the conduct of the trial was strengthened by the refusal of Matias Rakosi's puppet government to permit any outside and presumably unprejudiced newspapermen or any foreign diplomatic observers to attend. No such efforts to conceal what is going on are likely to be made unless there is something important to hide.

Much was made of the assertion that the dispatches sent out about the trial by the Budapest correspondent of the Associated Press were uncensored. This correspondent is a Hungarian national, subject to the inexorable discipline of a Cominform-controlled administration. Citing that as evidence of a free flow of information is like boasting that what Ilya Ehrenberg writes from Moscow is uncensored.

We don't know whether Cardinal Mindszenty was guilty or innocent of the charges lodged against him by the Ragosi administration. But we feel certain that his trial was a farcical mockery of judicial procedure, and not a dispassionate inquiry into the truth of the accusations.

---

[From Time magazine of February 14, 1949]

REBELLION TO TYRANTS

Last Sunday was set aside by American Catholics as a day of "prayer and protest" against the Communists' trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. In Manhattan's St. Patrick's Cathedral, Francis Cardinal Spellman—who received his red hat with Mindszenty at the 1946 consistory—delivered a remarkable sermon:

"'A new god has come to you, my people. His fiery eyes do not flash through clouds of incense or from altar candles. * * * This new god is not a stone statue worn smooth by the kisses of the faithful—he was not born in heaven. * * * The new god is born from earth and blood—he strides ahead, and under the thunder of his steps the globe trembles from east to west. This is the Red god. The Seine shudders at his impact, and tries to break its banks. Westminster trembles before him like Jericho, and across the green ocean his red shadow falls on the walls of the White House. Hosanna! New god.'

"My dear friends, [these] are words of a Hungarian Communist,[1] words that echo the thoughts of men depraved and deranged—men who do not know truth, love, justice, or faith. * * * These lines * * * are taught to the youth of Red-enshackled lands * * * where everybody is afraid of everybody else, where even a son fears his father and fathers fear their own blood-sons, as all become serfs and victims of the relentless god of Baal! * * * They are wild words of warning, and, unless we listen well and realize that we must counteract them by concerted, constant prayer and action, then these words but foretell America's and the whole world's doom.

"May 8, 1945—VE-day! On that day I delivered from this pulpit a prayer of thanksgiving for the victory of the hour, begging peace with justice. * * * The peace that came was not God's peace; and because in the ensuing postwar years men's hearts have not been won back to God, I must this day—as a protest against the crucification of humanity—entreat your prayers for persecuted, tortured, victimized Cardinal Mindszenty.

IT IS FULL TIME

"From the very hour he was taken away in the black of night from his home, his flock, his aged mother, Cardinal Mindszenty became the victim of torturings and druggings that put him beyond the reach or realm of human help. It was he himself who said to me, when he was the honored guest here less than 2 years ago, 'My enemies can take from me no more than my life, and that has already been given to God.'

"No, the physical Cardinal Mindszenty can no longer be saved. It is the spiritual Cardinal Mindszenty in his martyrdom of mind and body that we can fortify by our prayers, that in his soul he may know that in another part of the world other men are holding high God's torch of justice. * * * and in our own dear land each free man * * * must protect and fight to keep his own integrity of conscience, his own God-given freedoms * * * to save America and the rest of the democratic, God-loving world from trickery, torturings, disasters, and defeat. * * *

"I shall never cease to pray and labor to protect America, and warn and work against Communism and all the evils growing from out its rotted roots, for I believe that 'rebellion to tyrants is obedience to God.'

"I [have] witnessed the sufferings of men in a world trapped by fear, famine, and madness called communism * * * I avow that unless the whole American people, without further ostrichlike actions and pretenses, unite to stop the Communist floodings of our own land, our sons, for the third and last time, shall be summoned * * * to bear arms against those who would desecrate and destroy them. Yea, it is full time that a strong and vigilant America unite in prayer and protest.

IF THIS BE TREASON

"Therefore, I beg you, my beloved people, let us not confuse prudence with lack of vision * * * as we watch nation after nation fall victim to communism, for prudence is often but an excuse for silence, procrastination, and compromise. Even today, as we read newspaper releases from the Communist-controlled press of Budapest * * * about a cardinal priest, whom, so little time ago, we took unto our own hearts and homes, millions of Americans refuse to recognize that we ourselves are faced with these same merciless dangers. * * * The Communists believe the American public is * * * willing to be drugged into believing whatever leaves them their own comforts. * * * But are we * * * the tools and the fools for which the Communists take us?

"When the cardinal confessed to treason against the government in Hungary, he but professed his loyalty to his country. If this be treason, to deny allegiance to an atheistic Communist government—then thank God Cardinal Mindszenty confessed to treason, as would I, if this free land of America were ever conquered."

---

[From the New Orleans States of February 8, 1949]

THE TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

The trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty is over and the verdict has been brought in by the Communist-dominated government of Hungary.

Whether that verdict will ultimately stand will not be known until the appeals are decided.

What is already known is the farcical manner in which the trial was conducted.

Consider these points:

No outsider was allowed to cover the trial. All extra news-service reporters were refused entry. The Associated Press man covering the trial is a Hungarian.

[1] Arpad Toth, a journalist and music critic.

No American observer was allowed to be present. The United States had requested three seats.

Evidence was offered that the cardinal had conspired with Selden Chapin, United States Minister at Budapest, to hire a plane and escape Hungary. Both Mr. Chapin and the State Department have denied this.

The cardinal, while on trial, repudiated a prior letter which warned that if any confession were extracted from him it would be due to "human frailty."

The testimony of the cardinal, as printed here, was obscure even in its self-accusations.

The reports made a particular point of stressing the cardinal's health, well-being, and bearing. Yet as long as 3 weeks ago, this newspaper carried a New York Times exclusive story that the cardinal doubtless would be drugged so that he would be spiritless and malleable.

And just Saturday, a dispatch from John MacCormac, of the Times, reported that listeners in Vienna who were familiar with the cardinal and other defendants "have no doubt that all are under the influence of drugs."

"This," he wrote, "is deduced from the tone of the voices; frequent lapses of memory, faulty grammar used by men who would ordinarily be incapable of it, and by comparison of the cardinal's handwriting as reproduced in the yellow book (the Hungarian charges) with his ordinary script."

Trials such as these are not uncommon in totalitarian lands. During 1936-38, a number of Communist leaders went on trial for treason. Among them was Marshal Tukachevsky, once second in command of the Red army.

They were charged with conspiring with Nazi Germany—with which Stalin himself signed a nonaggression pact in 1939—to overthrow the Russian Government. Most of the old Bolshevik leaders were followers of the exiled Trotsky, later murdered in Mexico. Opinion at that time was that Stalin was simply consolidating his own power by liquidating his domestic opponents.

At the trial, the accused admitted their guilt, upbraided themselves as traitors to Russia and the proletariat. But their manner of confession and self-accusation was completely out of character for these once self-sufficient men. They attempted no defense, they were clay in the hands of the potter.

Even earlier, in 1933, the Nazis tried a Dutch Communist, Van der Lubbe, for firing the Reichstag. During his trial he acted as though drugged. He agreed to everything told him.

There is similarity in all these trials, and a difference. Van der Lubbe's was the German internal warfare between nazism and communism. Tukachevsky's was dissension in Russia. Cardinal Mindszenty's is a bold challenge of the godless to all faiths and all other creeds.

---

ACHESON HITS CONVICTION OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

(By John M. Hightower)

Secretary of State Dean Acheson yesterday coldly condemned Hungary's conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty as wanton Communist religious persecution which has sickened and horrified the free world.

The United States, he disclosed, is already considering possible action through the United Nations.

Britain and France are being consulted on the next move.

On Capitol Hill, the House Foreign Affairs Committee formally demanded intervention by the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate.

Later the House unanimously adopted a resolution urging that the United States protest Hungary's treatment of the cardinal either through the United Nations or by other appropriate means.

The resolution goes to the Senate.

Acheson's blunt and angry condemnation of Hungary, setting forth the official American position, came at a news conference.

NOT MEMBER OF UN

Diplomatic officials said it was one of the most extensive indictments of a Russian satellite country ever to come from an American Cabinet member.

Acheson noted that Hungary is not a member of the United Nations. But he said the Soviet-controlled country is definitely bound by the obligations set forth in article 2 of the treaty of peace with Hungary.

And on the basis of this treaty, which guarantees freedom and human rights, Acheson said the United States may bring violation charges in the United Nations.

In a terse 300-word statement, Acheson made these salient accusations:

1. Hungarian authorities are Soviet controlled and are seeking to discredit and coerce religious leadership in Hungary in order to remove this source of moral resistance to communism.

That was one of the strongest charges yet made by responsible American officials that the hand of Moscow is manipulating Hungary's actions behind the scenes.

2. In the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, Hungarian authorities apparently employed all the usual methods practiced by a police state and therefore carried out not the administration of justice but wanton persecution. That was as close as Acheson came to subscribing to accusations of torture, use of drugs, and other tactics with which the Hungarians have been charged in the Mindszenty case.

3. The Hungarian Government must bear full responsibility for its action in the case. This laid the basis for future, more vigorous action by the United States against Hungary, possibly the appeal to the UN.

4. The Mindszenty case and the cases of other Communist-convicted church leaders fit into a deliberate pattern of the suppression of freedom and the extension of totalitarian controls over the country during the past 2 years.

The Hungarian people "have been divested of any real independence," Acheson said.

SICKENED AND HORRIFIED

"The people of the United States," he continued, "and, without question, peoples of other freedom-loving nations, are sickened and horrified by these developments and fully comprehend the threat they constitute to free institutions everywhere."

Acheson referred also to the recent persecution of Lutheran Bishop Lajos Ordass and other church leaders whom he did not name.

Bishop Ordass was arrested September 8 last year and sentenced 21 days later by a workers' court to 2 years in prison and loss of civil rights for 5 years. He was bishop of the Lutheran Church in Hungary and had been accused of violating currency laws.

Mindszenty, the Roman Catholic primate of Hungary, was accused by the Communist government of treason, black marketing, and other offenses.

Acheson volunteered his statement to State Department newsmen. He read it slowly—a cold, bitter condemnation of one of the final acts in a tragic series which he views as having smashed the freedom of an entire people.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we are proud of our heritage. A heritage is something we inherit. It descends upon us like an inheritance. Freedom of speech and religion and the right to criticize even our highest officials are part of our priceless heritage. Our Bill of Rights is our inheritance. It was given to us by inheritance, we must preserve it for our descendants as a priceless gift. We often take this gift too much for granted. It is part of our everyday existence. It is unto us like the free air we breathe. We realize its real value when someone or a group bent upon mischief takes it from us. Then we make outcry—as we should.

Upon these rights and freedoms depend our dignity as men. Life would hardly be worth while without them. We would be like serfs without them. We would become slaves of the state or dictator. Even the wealth of a Croesus could not compensate us for bending the knee to the dictator, be he cruel or benevolent.

Are these our precious rights of freedom imperiled if freedom is attacked anywhere? Yes. Anything or anyone anywhere who strikes at freedom of conscience or expression is like a virus that cannot be confined. The plague must be destroyed wherever it may be, otherwise it will overtake us. "Never send to know for whom the bell tolls. It tolls for thee." Therefore, the impact of Hungarian cruelties against Cardinal Mindszenty is felt even in the United States, although the scene of the travesty of justice is far away. Today it is a Catholic prelate, tomorrow a Protestant minister, and the next day a rabbi. All religions are under the pale and the conscience of mankind is threatened. The danger signals are up.

The three great religions cannot fail to take heed. They must defend and attack. We cannot take these blows against faith passively, nor can there be appeasement. I recall the doggerel: "Appease a rascal as you will, he was and is a rascal still." The rascality of the Communist regime that thus imperils these cardinals is quite apparent. The means at hand must be invoked, and I refer to the United Nations. Our Government must not only protest but must induce the United Nations to invoke sanctions. The pending resolution does that, and I am, therefore, whole heartedly in favor of this resolution.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, many people have already protested the treatment of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Government, but I want to add my voice to voices of those who are shocked by this flagrant violation of justice and human rights. Americans of every creed are indignant, and many are concerned over the effect of such actions on the world's hope for peace.

From early youth Americans are imbued with the doctrines of justice, fair trials, free speech, and the right to criticize those holding political office. We learn the importance of these civil liberties in assuring that our Government will always deal fairly with its citizens and will always govern with the consent and for the good of the governed. We accept that as the normal and proper procedure. It comes as a shock, then, when we learn that there are countries which regard the rights of their citizens as of no importance whatsoever, and where it is a crime to criticize or oppose in any manner the policies of the rulers.

The effect of such a revelation on American public opinion is tremendous. It makes it difficult for us to think of

ever having friendly relations with a government of this type, and makes the prospect of continued peace seem dim indeed. It tends to focus our minds on the cold war and on the threat of communism rather than on the necessity to continually strive for peace and understanding in the world, no matter how discouraging the outlook.

The effect of the Mindszenty affair on public opinion in the United States should not be allowed to go unnoticed by the governing officials in Hungary. I therefore urge the Secretary of State to inform the Hungarian Government in the strongest possible language of the effect their unjust actions have had on American public opinion, and, since they have had no experience with it, of the importance of public opinion in a democracy. If they realize that a series of actions like these may inevitably bring on a war in which small nations like Hungary will be crushed between the colliding great powers, perhaps they will modify their policies and cease their persecutions.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in favor of the pending resolution.

The trial of Cardinal Mindszenty was obviously an attempt by the Communist-dominated Hungarian Government to suppress freedom of religion. The trials of ministers of religion in Hungary and in Bulgaria, in Slovakia, and in Russia, are a grim warning that American principles of religious freedom have no meaning in the Soviet sphere of influence.

The mockery of the so-called trial is apparent when it is noted that no foreign correspondents, nor official representatives of any of the non-Soviet-dominated countries, were permitted to be present.

It seems to me that the Government of Hungary was either incredibly stupid or absolutely callous to the opinion of the world in permitting this farcical trial to take place.

I join with my colleagues in denouncing the trials of ministers of religion on trumped-up charges.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the people of our own land and throughout the world have been shocked and grieved at the travesty, called a trial, of Cardinal Mindszenty at Budapest. Catholics, Protestants, and Jews have joined in a world-wide protest of this dastardly and brazen challenge to religion and human freedom. Cardinal Mindszenty is the victim today—who can say where or when this vicious Communist-inspired attack will strike tomorrow?

This infamous trial of a great churchman should bring to the hearts and minds of decent people everywhere the ruthlessness of atheistic communism and the necessity of destroying it wherever and whenever it rears its ugly head.

What happened at Budapest can happen here if we fail to heed the warnings of those countries which have fallen under the heel of Stalin and his criminal gang.

Let there be no mistake about the so-called trial of the cardinal. We must recognize it as a heinous threat to all religions and to free men everywhere. We Americans who have been so abundantly blessed should lead in a world crusade to destroy communism. It should be the responsibility of each and every one of us to preach the gospel of human freedom and the dignity of man—that come what will, God helping us, we will protect this freedom, regardless of the cost.

It has often been said that out of evil sometimes comes good. If this be true, perhaps the cruel, inhuman, physical, and mental tortures suffered by Cardinal Mindszenty may bring to the world a realization of the necessity of crushing this tyranny called communism before it strikes again.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, I strongly approve this resolution. I protest the arrest, trial, and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty. This travesty on justice has dramatized the Communist system for all the world. I stand with a feeling of humility before the martyrdom of this great religious leader.

Having filed an earlier protest with the Secretary of State in this matter, I am proud that, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I voted to bring this resolution before Congress. It expresses our indignation and asks that the issues raised by the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, and Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, be raised by the United States either in the United Nations or by other appropriate means. A unanimous vote of the House of Representatives will show that with one voice our Nation condemns this travesty of justice.

The forces of decency cannot be quiet, even though nothing that the Communists do surprises us. This is not the first such trial under a system of slavery. It is a familiar story. In Russia and all the satellite nations, the pattern is the same: torture, public exhibition, faked confessions, perfunctory defense, a judge who does the bidding of the Kremlin. Persecution wears the mantle of justice.

The fight is not the fight of Catholics alone. It is the fight of all decent people of whatever race or creed who believe in God, freedom, peace, the dignity and value of the human being. To hold such ethical concepts under communism is treason.

Out of Hungary and before the world, Cardinal Mindszenty is innocent. This prelate emerges as a man who was willing to sacrifice his life so that right should prevail over wrong, to be a free man rather than a slave, to live with God instead of existing in darkness, to be a martyr rather than allow his people and religion to crumble.

History will show that Cardinal Mindszenty was the victor, Russia the loser. His defiance of tyranny was a clarion call. It awakened humanity to the creeping danger of the Red tide.

Religion is persecuted behind the iron curtain. Six hundred Catholic and Protestant clergymen are now in Hungarian prisons. In Rumania, the Government has decreed to put regulations on all religious groups. Bulgaria has indicted 15 Protestant ministers for espionage. Having taken over economic and political control, the elimination of religion is the next step in consolidating eastern Europe.

We in this Nation who love truth and justice think of Cardinal Mindszenty deeply. It warns us that if decency and justice are to prevail we must always be vigilant against tyranny. This protest of indignation by our country should reaffirm our resolve to never allow communism to get a hold in America. Our stand must be uncompromising. Shall it be justice, decency, and democracy, or slavery, tyranny, and communism? We should speak out for what we believe in and speak out against what we despise.

The Cardinal Mindszenty case is an alarm. The Communist Party is a world-wide organization. Twelve countries are under its complete control. Trained units, blindly following the Kremlin's bidding, are in every other country of the world. Communism is playing for keeps. Let us heed before it is too late.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted to the Honorable SOL BLOOM, of New York, for Members of the House to extend their remarks on the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 19, I desire to include the following comments and pertinent editorials which express the indignation of the people of my district, who have written me thousands of letters protesting the mockery of the trial and the shocking sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty.

These letters are not only from people of the Catholic faith, they are the letters of all righteous, God-fearing, and fair-minded people who have been schooled in democratic processes of fair play and who respect the rights of man. They are letters filled with pleas and protests against this abhorrent and shocking treatment. And they call for united action against these inquisitors of Cardinal Mindszenty and legitimate action in contrast to the base and godless action of these men of the Communist-dominated Hungarian Government. I am happy to have been privileged to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 27 on February 8, 1949. But I am happier that our House of Representatives, by unanimous vote, showed its united stand against the persecution of and the violation of the rights of man, in adopting House Concurrent Resolution 19, which was introduced by the Honorable SOL BLOOM.

It is indeed of moment that we should not forget that those who would violate the men of God would not hesitate to trample upon the rights of all humans.

And I am certain that an outraged world will raise its voice so high that these men who have no respect for the fundamental rights of man will take heed.

For no matter what subterfuge may have been employed by the men of the Hungarian Government, they could not hide the fact that this action was not against Cardinal Mindszenty, the man, but against Cardinal Mindszenty, a courageous leader in a fight against a system which violates inalienable rights, and against Cardinal Mindszenty, a symbol of democratic beliefs as opposed to Communistic dogma. It is the treacherous action of the false prophets against the prophets of truth, democracy, and God.

The editorials which follow—the first from the Newark Evening News, entitled

"Sentence at Budapest," and the other from the Newark Star-Ledger, entitled "They Dared Not," both of February 9, 1949, very ably present the Mindszenty story:

[From the Newark Evening News of February 9, 1949]

SENTENCE AT BUDAPEST

When Archbishop Stepinac, Catholic Church head of Yugoslavia, was sentenced to 16 years' imprisonment at forced labor in 1946, the unofficial Vatican reaction was that Yugoslav authorities had decided to soft pedal the ending of the trial through avoidance of the punishment of death. The principal charge against Archbishop Stepinac was that he had aided the Axis during the war.

The sentence imposed at Budapest on Cardinal Mindszenty is a life sentence. As in the case of Archbishop Stepinac, whatever he possesses is confiscated and his civil rights are forfeited. The general charge against him was treason.

Axis collaboration and treason, these are the most serious charges that it is possible to bring against a citizen, going to the welfare and the survival of the state. Yet in neither case, although conviction was secured according to the predetermined Communist technique, was the death sentence imposed. The motivation of the trial, in both cases, was political; the charges were political, and the sentences bear a strong political impress.

In neither case did the Communist court consider it expedient to order execution. That much did the protest of church authorities abroad and of general western opinion accomplish. Cardinal Mindszenty has appealed the veridct. This means, under Communist court procedure, that the appeals court can impose a more severe sentence, if it wishes, or reduce the sentences of the Hungarian primate and the other defendants who appealed. In the cardinal's case, the prosecutor had demanded death. In actual effect, under the Soviet system, the difference between a life sentence and a sentence of death is negligible.

Communist dogma in all countries derives its form and content from the Kremlin. The Kremlin will not tolerate religion as a practical moral force operating in the lives of men on an equal plane, as it were, with the ideological drive of the Communist state. To discredit religion as a working moral force, communism uses political means, being unwilling or unable to meet the religious impulse in the free competition of ideas or in the field of conscience.

That is the broad background of the clouded legal proceedings conducted at Zagreb, Yugoslavia, in 1946 and now duplicated, on a still more elevated hierarchical plane, at Budapest. The persons of the two prelates can be imprisoned, their voices can be stilled, but no tactic, however clever, however cruel, can seclude or silence the intimations of the spirit that arise in the hearts of men.

---

[From the Newark Star-Ledger of February 9, 1949]

THE EDITOR'S OPINION

THEY DARED NOT

The Communist rulers of Hungary have not dared to order the execution of Cardinal Mindszenty. They feared to startle world opinion into a clear and unbearable realization of the true nature of the Communist menace.

The Communists' retreat from their goal in the Mindszenty case is spectacularly clumsy. Failure to order the death sentence is explained on the ground that the cardinal, not being a worldly man, could not have understood the full implications of treasonable conduct. Yet the whole purpose of the Communist campaign against religious organizations and leaders is to discredit them and prove them to be worldly conspiracies.

HAD TO SHIFT TACTICS

The Communists have not only modified their plans for the disposal of Cardinal Mindszenty, but have changed their whole position in their assault on the Catholic Church. Afraid that the execution of the cardinal would alert the world as no other act could, the Communists have had to conform their whole campaign against the church to the new premise that the cardinal is not a worldly man. Thus, the cardinal is now represented as a rather foolish dupe of the United States and its diplomatic agency in Hungary, which becomes the chief villain of the piece.

Henceforth, because the Communists hesitated to defy world opinion, they will no longer be able to brand the Catholic Church as an archconspirator. Instead, the Communists will have to content themselves with picturing the church as the dupe of American imperialism.

MAY TRY IT AGAIN

The Communists, in retreating in the Mindszenty case, have not suffered a defeat. It is only a set-back. They may try again. Hitler found that world opinion could be worn down by administering a series of shocks, no single one of them startling enough to make the world fighting mad. The Communists almost went too far for their own safety in the Mindszenty case, and have had to change their tactics for the present.

The propaganda goal of the Communists now may be to render world opinion less sensitive through a long series of dulling treatments. If the people of the free world can remain alive to the moral issue, no matter how deviously clever the Communist psychological campaign, the free peoples will win the battle for the world. If it ever comes to pass that the world is left unexcited by the framing and execution of a great religious leader, then our cause will have died.

Mr. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under general leave granted for extension of remarks on the case of Cardinal Mindszenty, I wish to express the horror and indignation of my constituents, of every race and creed, at the threat to religious freedom which his imprisonment and so-called trial represents. The whole world knows, regardless of what the purported charges were, that the cardinal was tried because he was the head of the Catholic Church in Hungary and because he refused to bow down to communism. What has happened to him could happen to any other religious leader.

To us, in this country which was founded because men were willing to risk their lives in order to have the right to worship God as they wished, any threat to religious freedom is especially repugnant. We must show by word and deed to those nations which have been enslaved by communism the great importance which we attach to the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and our righteous indignation against this threat to religious freedom. The House has recorded its righteous wrath and the resolution which it has adopted has my wholehearted approval and support.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly in accord with House Concurrent Resolution 19, now before us, condemning the arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary, and Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia. In voting for the resolution, I do so with a deep feeling of satisfaction, as to me it is an evidence on the part of our own great Government that our voice will be heard wherever and whenever freedom of religion is denied by tyrants. I congratulate the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee [Mr. BLOOM] and all the members of his committee who have unanimously reported out this resolution.

I feel that the committee amendment stating that it is "the sense of the Congress that these issues shall be raised by the United States, either in the United Nations or by such other means as may be most appropriate" makes crystal clear the firm determination of our Government in this matter.

It is, of course, most regrettable that men of the high character and extraordinary attainments of these two prelates of the Roman Catholic Church should be made to suffer unspeakable tortures because of their religious beliefs. Yet in this whole picture the scene is not entirely black. Far better it is that two outstanding and heroic priests such as Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac be the martyrs so that the world will focus its attention, not only upon their martyrdom, but rather upon the evil cause of their persecution.

Thousands upon thousands of Roman Catholics behind the iron curtain are being persecuted because of their religious beliefs, but it has taken the farcical trials and unjust imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac to at long last arouse not only the governments of the western world, but the average citizen, responsible for these governments, to the dangers of communism.

Although those who are now suffering most at the hands of the various communistic governments today are Roman Catholics, their persecution is only a part of the pattern of the general aggressive atheism that would destroy all religion. Tomorrow it will be the Protestants and the next day the Jews will be the victims. Communism shows no favorites in its persecution of those who believe in God and the natural rights of man. If the sufferings of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac will bring the world to a realization of the evil force of communism that is sweeping both to the east and west, and galvanize the democratic nations into united opposition against it, I firmly believe that both Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac would willingly and uncomplainingly endure their torture.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many communications from my district relative to the unjustified arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac. I am glad to so state, for I believe that in the past Americans have been just as apathetic toward communism as have the people of the rest of the world. "It can't happen here," so many people have said.

We know that it can happen here unless the people back home are alive to the situation as well as those of us who are legislating here today. We know that Communists have attained places in our own Government. We know also

that when efforts are made to oust them, they scream for the protection of those laws that were enacted to safeguard the rights of the people who live under them, and not to give refuge to spies, traitors, and conniving, scheming agents of hostile governments. These latter, if they could subvert our Government, would deny the protection of law to those who disagree with them. It is because our democratic form of government is meticulous in its protection under law of all people within our country that these subversive agents and groups, aided by innocent, but misguided individuals, have wormed their way into labor and government.

I have confidence in the sound judgment and good sense of our American people. They are slow to be aroused. They are generous and kindhearted and it is because of these national traits that frequently they have been taken advantage of by those engaged in subversive activities. Once aroused, they follow a straight line, unswerving in their determination. They are now aroused. They will continue to be so until they have removed every trace of the Red peril that threatens our democratic institutions and the great American Government, under which we live and to which the eyes of a despairing world are hopefully turned.

I gladly vote for the resolution.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I trust there will not be a single vote against the pending resolution. The alleged trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is a complete farce and a travesty upon justice as it is understood by all real believers in democracy. The Hungarian Government is guilty of an infamy that can never be erased. People throughout the entire world who believe in justice and fair play will join in condemning the arbitrary actions of the cruel dictators who are now forcing their will upon the Hungarian people.

This latest action in the long list of arbitrary and ruthless steps taken by the Communist dictators of Moscow and its satellite countries is abundant proof that there can be no compromise with those who espouse the doctrines of totalitarianism. I insert with my remarks an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal of February 7, which I think clearly expresses the views of the overwhelming majority of the people in my district.

"TRIAL" OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Cardinal Mindszenty, whatever his fate may be, and whatever activities he may have carried on, is the victim of two forces, both evil. He is a casualty of one of the most ruthless movements in history.

The first force was the seizure of a nation against the will of its people—the coming in of a foreign dictatorship to take over. The second and present force is the desire of that regime, as a part of the plans of Moscow, to strike back at the western powers and the United States.

There was nothing legal in the Soviet-sponsored coup that seized power in Hungary. There is nothing legal in the terror by which the Soviet puppets maintained power. There was treachery, in every sense of the word, in the procedure by which the Soviet puppets took power.

Once again, no matter what the accused cardinal may have dreamed, thought, advised, or done, it is an insulting mockery of justice, as conceived by civilized man, to have the present Soviet-supported regime in Hungary going through the motions of "trying" Cardinal Mindszenty—or of "trying" anyone else.

And for a regime that seized power illegally and by arch treachery to accuse anyone else of being a traitor is nothing more than a manifestation of the duplicity and depravity long characteristic of Communist thought.

"A people's court"—what a mockery! It is not the people of Hungary who are trying Cardinal Mindszenty but the dictators in Moscow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to unanimously.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the resolution just agreed to at the point in the RECORD before the adoption of the resolution on Cardinal Mindszenty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in extending my remarks in the RECORD on the resolution just agreed to I may include two editorials from the Brooklyn Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that I was unavoidably detained when the roll call on House Resolution 78 was taken. I am a member of the subcommittee that reported this bill out of the committee and voted for it. Had I been here at that time I would have voted "yea" in favor of this resolution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the resolution pertaining to Cardinal Mindszenty and to include a speech of the archbishop of Washington.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the resolution pertaining to Cardinal Mindszenty and to include a telegram.

Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. FLOOD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana asked and was given permision to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the resolution in reference to Cardinal Mindszenty and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. DOLLINGER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the New York Times.

Mr. HAVENNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks made early today and include two editorials.

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a summary of testimony delivered before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report by Dr. Clark.

Mr. BLOOM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by the Honorable James Farley.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in connection with the resolution just adopted, and include the text of a resolution that I introduced in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in connection with H. R. 1211 and include certain quotations.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include excerpts appearing in the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a case study of international espionage in the Far East prepared for release by the National Military Establishment, irrespective of the cost. May I say, Mr. Speaker, in explanation, that I endeavored to get an estimate of the cost, but time did not permit.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address delivered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

EXPLANATION

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that official business prevented me from reaching the floor of the House today in time to vote on House Resolution 78, providing

a $200,000 appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities.

I am strongly in favor of this resolution, and had I been present I would have voted "aye."

TRADE AGREEMENTS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at the outset let me state that in general I favor the principle of the reciprocal-trade agreements. It is my view that both from the standpoint of wholly desirable world improvement, the recovery of world prosperity, world peace, and also our own enlightened self-interest, we should promote by every reasonable means not detrimental or injurious or damaging to our own prosperity and the welfare of our industries and people, trade and commerce between the nations.

As a logical corollary to this principle, I believe that such agreements ought to be entered into only after careful negotiation and impartial, nonpartisan, scientific inquiry, and investigation to determine whether such agreements are injurious or destructive of American industry. In brief, enabling legislation should contain appropriate and adequate safeguards to insure limitations and definite fixed conditions upon the powers of the administrative agencies concerned.

In the first place, it is clear to me that no lasting prosperity in America can be predicted upon the extension of loans and grants to foreign nations in order to enable them to purchase American goods and services. It is obvious that this Nation cannot afford indefinitely, if indeed we can afford it to such a substantial degree, to make loans and grants to other nations over and above our present commitments connected with the fulfillment of the Marshall plan and the national security. I think it cannot be successfully asserted that there is anything more than a fair assurance that outstanding loans can be repaid. Of course there is not enough money in the Treasury, or in fact available from the resources of the people, to warrant continued grants beyond those contemplated by these programs. There may be certain serious questions raised as to how long we can extend even these particular programs without very serious consequences to the economic well-being of our own citizens and financial maladjustments of our own budgets and economic capacity. I mention these points because, like many here and throughout the Nation, I am disturbed about our national finances.

Secondly, the reduction of trade barriers to permit the influx of cheaply produced foreign goods will bring many American industries to stagnation and ruin and will cause widespread unemployment and the loss of our high American standards of wages, living and free opportunity which are understandably the envy of the whole world. Upon these high standards the future prosperity, welfare, and happiness of the American people will surely depend.

Thirdly, in my view, there should be definite restrictions placed upon the power of any agency of this Government to permit foreign producers to pour a stream of cheap goods and commodities into this country and thereby cause the impairment or collapse of our industries and force idleness for millions of worthy and faithful American workers.

Because of the limited time allotted me, I cannot develop extended consideration of the general principles which may be applicable to this particular question. I desire, however, to allude to some pertinent facts of our present industrial situation in my own section of the country as well as in the Nation generally which have definite bearing upon the nature of present and future reciprocal trade agreements. As I scrutinize the list of those appearing before the committee in opposition to unlimited trade-agreement powers, it impressed me as being very much like the roster of all the industries in my district and State, indeed it comprises a cross section of our industry. Great textile industries, cotton and woolen manufacturers, paper and pulp producers, leather, boots and shoes, seafood products, toy manufacturers, wire-cloth producers, publishing concerns, and representatives of a great many other industries appeared to record their opposition to this unlimited bill in whole or in part. The record of the hearing is replete with examples and illustrations of the baneful effects that have already been worked, or that will be worked, by the operation of this law.

Already there are alarming signs of a present recessionary trend in our industrial and economic life. The unemployment rolls have materially increased within the past few weeks. Industry and business has undergone and is undergoing curtailment and retrenchment. A substantial number of concerns are working on part time while others have shut down or liquidated. This situation is a great threat to America, coming as it does at a time when we are beset by foreign troubles and problems and can ill afford to have our economy weakened in any respect. There are undoubted psychological factors of fear, apprehension, and uncertainty concerning the future responsible for the present unwillingness of businessmen, large and small, of every class, to go forward at this time without tangible assurances that they are not going to be overwhelmed and destroyed by oppressive taxation and regimentation. This is a very pronounced and weighty factor in what we hope is but a temporary stalemate of business activity. But, as has been testified before the committee and demonstrated in this debate, the importation of cheap foreign goods which are produced at a fraction of the American competitive cost has in a large number of instances undermined the American market and brought about business collapse and unemployment.

You have all heard the story of the Waltham Watch Co., which is more or less typical of the American watchmaking industry in the effects it has suffered from foreign competition. No history of the financial vicissitudes of this concern can cloak the fact that it patriotically stopped producing watches to take part in the war effort by making time-electronic devices and other delicate mechanisms essential to our large-scale military operations. During this period foreign watchmakers moved in and took over the American market. When victory was gained the Waltham Co. had to start all over again against resourceful and powerful competition which had been set up against it during the wartime. And let me state categorically in this connection that the public interests of that beleaguered concern and its unemployed workers have been admirably represented and advanced in this body and elsewhere by my very able colleague from Massachusetts within whose district this company is located, the able, distinguished, and zealous gentleman, my friend, Congressman DONOHUE. All other Members of the Massachusetts delegation, including our esteemed, able, and beloved majority and minority leaders, have likewise rendered conspicuous service to try to reopen this plant. The voice of the laboring people who are the real sufferers in a situation of this kind because they have lost their jobs and livelihood due to the closing of this great factory, has been powerfully and capably raised by their leaders, particularly the head of their own union, Mr. Walter Cenerazzo, a forceful, able young man who has worked unselfishly and tirelessly to adjust the affairs of this company and make it possible for thousands of fine, faithful, skilled workers to go back to their jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the conditions to which I have referred are steadily growing more serious not only in New England but throughout the Nation. I do not believe that the American Congress can or will remain indifferent to the plight of millions of our workers who are threatened with unemployment and its attendant hardships. We must tackle and solve these great problems or they will surely result in a descending spiral which will plunge the Nation into another depression.

It seems entirely reasonable to me that the Congress should be interested in the peril-point reports which contain the findings of the Tariff Commission. There is nothing complicated or abstruse about this proposal, nothing inconsistent with the trade-agreements policy. It merely requires the Tariff Commission after careful study, to point out the danger signs of our trade-agreements policy in operation so that appropriate action can be taken to stave off and prevent cut-throat competition from abroad injurious to American industry and labor and destructive of our economic system.

It is likewise appropriate that we should adopt the escape-clause provision which will permit readjustment from time to time of our position in foreign trade whenever it becomes untenable because of the type of competition I have referred to above which is working a detriment and threat to industrial employment and stability.

These are minimum safeguards, in my opinion, which we should provide in this

legislation to protect American industry and American workers and American producers against the impact of foreign goods produced under substandard wages and conditions. The need of the hour is a strong, healthy, thriving American economy, a nation adapted and adaptable not only to its peacetime needs, not only to its social welfare which is so vital and important, but also to the emergencies of another and more fearful kind which could well befall us, like a bolt from the blue, in this disordered and chaotic world of ruthless communism, oppression, and unrest.

I hope this bill is amended to provide these safeguards and thus furnish adequate and urgently required protection for our business structure, our industrial prosperity, and the welfare of our faithful workers and producers who, after all, are the very richest resource of the Nation.

The following organizations, all of which represent industrial and employee interests in my district and State, appeared before the committee in support of maintaining the peril-point report of the Tariff Commission:

National Association of Wool Manufacturers.

America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference.

New England Industries.

Massachusetts Fisheries Association, Inc.

Sea Food Producers of New Bedford.

Gloucester Fisheries Association.

Textile Industry of Massachusetts.

Atlantic Fishermen's Union of Boston.

The Cotton Textile Institute, Inc.

Raw Materials National Council.

American Paper and Pulp Association.

Association of Knitted Glove and Mitten Manufacturers.

National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers.

Crompton Co., textile manufacturers.

National Council Farmer Cooperatives.

International Longshoremen's Union.

American Jeweled Watch Industry.

American Watch Workers Union.

Waltham Watch Co.

The National Federation of Textiles, Inc.

Toy Manufacturers of the United States of America, Inc.

Industrial Wire Cloth Institute.

American Cotton Manufacturers Association.

The National Economic Council.

Pacific Mills.

Lithographers National Association, Inc.

Greater Lawrence Chamber of Commerce of Lawrence, Mass.

The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc.

### SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. NOLAND, for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

To Mrs. NORTON, for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. SMITH of Virginia (at the request of Mr. HARDY), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

### SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 15. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent purchase and sale of public office," approved December 11, 1926; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 26. An act for the relief of Jose Babace; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 27. An act for the relief of certain Basque aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 29. An act to authorize payments of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 32. An act for the relief of Milo Jurisevic, Mrs. Jelena Jurisevic, Svetozar Jurisevic, and Radmila Jurisevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 77. An act to repeal section 509 of title 34 of the United States Code, approved June 30, 1876 (ch. 159, 19 Stat. 69); to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 90. An act to provide for the naturalization of Richard Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 278. An act to prevent retroactive checkage of payments erroneously made to certain retired officers of the Naval Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 315. An act for the relief of Dr. Chung Kwai Lui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 331. An act for the relief of Ghetel Pollak Kahan, Magdalena Linda Kahan (wife), and Susanna Kahan (daughter, 12 years old); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 335. An act for the relief of Claris U. Yeadon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 372. An act to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Americus, Ga., as the Marcus George Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 460. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to the Helena Chamber of Commerce certain described parcels of land situated in the city of Helena, Mont.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 485. An act for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 629. An act to authorize the disposition of certain lost, abandoned, or unclaimed personal property coming into the possession of the Treasury Department, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, or the Department of the Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Navy Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 713. An act to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. J. Res. 22. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of Annapolis, Md.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 10, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

193. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report showing withdrawals and restorations of public lands as required by Thirty-sixth Statutes, page 847; — United States Code, section 471; Forty-third United States Code, section 141, et seq.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

194. A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting the final financial statement for the period ending December 31, 1948; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

195. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Commodity Corporation Charter Act with respect to strategic-materials stock piling; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

196. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of certain individuals formerly stationed in the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

197. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill relating to Coast Guard and nonpropelled seadrome ocean station; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

---

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 88. Resolution providing for the expenses of conducting the studies and investigation authorized by (h) (1) of rule XI incurred by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 37). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 82. Resolution to provide funds for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 22; with an amendment (Rept. No. 38). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STANLEY: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 78. Resolution to authorize the expenditure of certain funds for the expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; with amendments (Rept. No. 39). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 2402. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Adminis-

tration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 40). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 92. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 60). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. House Concurrent Resolution 19. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac, of Yugoslavia, and Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary; without amendment (Rept. No. 61). Referred to the House Calendar.

---

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 555. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district No. 10, Yuba County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 41). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 574. A bill for the relief of Fred E. Weber; without amendment (Rept. No. 42). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of the estate of James Patrick Hackett and Charles L. Stover; with an amendment (Rept. No. 43). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BRYSON: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 577. A bill to correct possible inequity in the case of a certain application for letters patent of William R. Blair; without amendment (Rept. No. 44). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 576. A bill for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson; without amendment (Rept. No. 45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 578. A bill for the relief of Carlton C. Grant and others; without amendment (Rept. No. 46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 581. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 583. A bill for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 591. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson; without amendment (Rept. No. 49). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 592. A bill for the relief of James W. Keith; with an amendment (Rept. No. 50). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 594. A bill for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley; without amendment (Rept. No. 51). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 595. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 52). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 596. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of John E. Parker, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 609. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mathew C. Cowley, deceased, and the estate of Louisa Cowley, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 54). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 610. A bill for the relief of Lorenzo H. Froman; without amendment (Rept. No. 55). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 611. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Kentucky to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of certain property owners adjacent to Fort Knox, Ky.; without amendment (Rept. No. 56). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 697. A bill for the relief of Samuel W. Poorvu; without amendment (Rept. No. 57). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1813. A bill for the relief of Edward Woolf; without amendment (Rept. No. 58). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1870. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; without amendment (Rept. No. 59). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

---

ADVERSE REPORT

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. House Resolution 80. Resolution requesting the Secretary for National Defense to transmit to the House a report with respect to the progress which is being made in carrying on the national defense program; (Rept. No. 36). Referred to the House Calendar.

---

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 2536. A bill to incorporate the Twenty-ninth Division Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio:

H. R. 2537. A bill to amend section 114 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide percentage depletion for limestone, when calcined or when used by metallurgical or chemical industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2538. A bill to authorize completion of the land development and settlement of the Angostura unit of the Missouri Basin project notwithstanding the limitation of time; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 2539. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947, with respect to the maintenance of actions to recover possession of publicly operated housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2540. A bill to authorize payment of claims based on loss of or damage to property deposited by alien enemies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 2541. A bill to amend section 3045 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2542. A bill to extend Veterans' Administration benefits to disabled retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without impairment of their right to receive retired pay which they had earned for stipulated service prior to reentry into the service in World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2543. A bill to repeal the tax on transportation of persons and the tax on transportation of property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2544. A bill to amend the veterans' regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2545. A bill to reclassify assistant postmasters and other supervisory positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 2546. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based airwarning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2547. A bill to amend section 2883 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2548. A bill to amend certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on distilled spirits, modify loss allowances for distilled spirits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 2549. A bill to further amend section 5 of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 by extending the time for making application for unused leave to September 1, 1951; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 2550. A bill to exempt from estate tax national service life insurance and United States Government life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2551. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 so as to permit certain payments to be made to the estates of former members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALE:

H. R. 2552. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide that pensioners be paid a minimum pension of $50 per month; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2553. A bill to provide pay, allowances, retirement, and survivor benefits for members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, Public Health Service, the Reserve components thereof, the National Guard, and the Air National Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2554. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Credit Unions Act of 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2555. A bill to establish the United States of America Patriotic and Charter Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2556. A bill to establish a commission to promote exchange visits of American and French citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2557. A bill to extend further the period during which the admission into the United States of alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States may be facilitated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 2558. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to certain employees of the railway mail service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2559. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 with respect to mutual savings banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2560. A bill to repeal certain miscellaneous excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 2561. A bill to extend and liberalize World War I marriage delimiting date for the purpose of payment of compensation or pension under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2562. A bill to provide disability and death compensation or pension in the case of members of the Enlisted Reserve of the Army who have received or are receiving training under the Army specialized training program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2563. A bill for the relief of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BREHM:

H. R. 2564. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2565. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of the act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2566. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2567. A bill to amend the Hospital Survey and Construction Act (title VI of the Public Health Service Act), to extend its duration and provide greater financial assistance in the construction of hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2568. A bill to provide credit for salary purposes to carriers advanced from the status of village delivery; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2569. A bill to abolish the village-delivery service of the Post Office Department; to transfer village carriers to the city-delivery service; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 2570. A bill to provide for the naturalization of former citizens of the United States who lost United States citizenship by voting in a political election in Italy after October 12, 1943, and before August 7, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Georgia:

H. R. 2571. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 2572. A bill to extend to commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey the provisions of the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2573. A bill to promote the general welfare by scrapping the unsound and ruinous monetary policy which is wrecking our domestic economy and creating chaos throughout the world, and replacing it with a sound monetary system in strict accordance with article I, section 8, clause 5, of the Constitution of the United States and the act of Congress of November 1, 1893 (sec. 311, U. S. C. Annotated (ch. 8, 28 Stat. 4)), which will stabilize the currency; prevent economic collapse in the United States; give economic stability to the rest of the world; stop communism and other forms of absolutism; insure peace by eliminating the causes of war; save for the American taxpayers most of the billions of dollars proposed to be spent under the European recovery program; reduce taxes; protect our national sovereignty; preserve the American way of life; raise the American standard of living; quadruple the recoverable mineral wealth of America; make possible the profitable production here at home of 99 percent of our mineral requirements, including strategic minerals; and usher in an era of the greatest prosperity the United States has ever known; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. TALLE:

H. R. 2574. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce immediately the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2575. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2576. A bill to repeal the war-tax rate on toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2577. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. R. 2578. A bill to provide for salary increases for each officer and employee of the Federal Government, and each officer and employee of the District of Columbia municipal government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2579. A bill to provide for salary increases for employees of the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2580. A bill to incorporate the Gold Star Society of American War Widows and Orphans; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARCANTONIO:

H. R. 2581. A bill to repeal the Philippine Trade Act of 1946; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2582. A bill to exempt from income tax compensation received for service in the military or naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2583. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers and enlisted men of the military, naval, and air forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. R. 2584. A bill to promote the general welfare by providing funds to assist the several States and Territories in paying adequate salaries for the school year 1948–49 to elementary- and high-school teachers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2585. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for exemption from duty of certain metallic impurities in tin ores and concentrates when such impurities are not recovered; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2586. A bill to relieve postmasters and other paying employees of the postal service from accountability for wrong payment of money orders in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. J. Res. 155. Joint resolution making available certain funds for relief of farmers in storm-stricken areas; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARY:

H. J. Res. 156. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that Congress shall fill any vacancy occurring in the office of Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. J. Res. 157. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution providing for expansion and intensification of public-health research on the family aspects of chronic illnesses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution favoring the political federation of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution to suspend diplomatic and commercial relations with the Republic of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. Con. Res. 32. Concurrent resolution to express the disapproval of the Congress of the action of the Government of Hungary in sentencing Josef Cardinal Mindszenty to life imprisonment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution favoring the political federation of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. Con. Res. 34. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the issues raised by the action of the Government of Hungary in arresting and imprisoning Josef Cardinal Mindszenty should be referred to the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution protesting against the prosecution and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty by the Hungarian Gov-

ernment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. Con. Res. 36. Concurrent resolution requesting Congress to express its disapproval of the arrest, conviction, and imprisonment by the Government of Hungary of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and of other priests of the Roman Catholic Church; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H. Res. 90. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Emilie C. Read; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. Res. 91. Resolution condemning court proceedings in the case of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H. Res. 92. Resolution to protest the summary arrest and imprisonment of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. Res. 94. Resolution providing for employment of two additional laborers, office of the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2587. A bill for the relief of J. K. Barrington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2588. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for certain lands to V. LeBlanc and C. Riccard; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BELL:

H. R. 2589. A bill for the relief of Mary Wachter Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2590. A bill for the relief of Bradford N. Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2591. A bill for the relief of Giovanna Parisi, Michelina Valletta, Yolanda Altieri, Generosa Tamburi, Carolina Picciano, and Giovanna Turtur; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2592. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to John White Bear a patent in fee to certain lands; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2593. A bill for the relief of William H. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 2594. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Elser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Joe Gillespie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois:

H. R. 2596. A bill for the relief of George Eldred Morgan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 2597. A bill for the relief of Jerome Medrano, Danise J. Medrano, Daniel Medrano, and Patrick Medrano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 2598. A bill for the relief of Sampson Ross; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2599. A bill for the relief of Lula Hickey Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2600. A bill for the relief of Ralph Dunsmore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Michael Gladych; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2602. A bill for the relief of John B. Boyle; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Anthony (Tony) Di Ina; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2604. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret T. Hennessey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of John C. Nunes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Reuben J. Solomon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2607. A bill for the relief of Antonio Antunes Martins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2608. A bill for the relief of C. H. Dutton Co., of Kalamazoo, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN of South Carolina:

H. Res. 93. Resolution for the relief of John F. Schmelzer and Alliance Insurance Co.; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

56. Mr. HART presented a petition of Samuel Solomon, of Union City, N. J., urging that rent control be extended for 1 year, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## OATH OF OFFICE, MEMBERS AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in section 1757 of title XIX of the Revised Statutes of the United States and being as follows:

> "I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfuly discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by each of the following Members and Delegates of the Eighty-first Congress, pursuant to Public Law 412 of the Eightieth Congress entitled "An act to amend section 30 of the Revised Statutes of the United States" (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 25), approved February 18, 1948:

ALABAMA

1. Frank W. Boykin.
2. George M. Grant.
3. George Andrews.
4. Sam Hobbs.
5. Albert Rains.
6. Edward deGraffenried.
7. Carl Elliott.
8. Robert E. Jones, Jr.
9. Laurie Calvin Battle.

ARIZONA

*At large*

1. John R. Murdock.
2. Harold A. Patten.

ARKANSAS

1. E. C. Gathings.
2. Wilbur D. Mills.
3. J. W. Trimble.
4. Boyd Tackett.
5. Brooks Hays.
6. W. F. Norrell.
7. Oren Harris.

CALIFORNIA

1. Hubert B. Scudder.
2. Clair Engle.
3. Leroy Johnson.
4. Franck R. Havenner.
5. Richard J. Welch.
6. George P. Miller.
7. John J. Allen, Jr.
8. Jack Z. Anderson.
9. Cecil F. White.
10. Thomas H. Werdel.
11. Ernest K. Bramblett.
12. Richard Nixon.
13. Norris Poulson.
14. Helen Gahagan Douglas.
15. Gordon L. McDonough.
16. Donald L. Jackson.
17. Cecil R. King.
18. Clyde Doyle.
19. Chet Holifield.
20. Carl Hinshaw.
21. Harry R. Sheppard.
22. John Phillips.
23. Clinton D. McKinnon.

COLORADO

1. John A. Carroll.
2. William S. Hill.
3. John H. Marsalis.
4. Wayne N. Aspinall.

CONNECTICUT

1. Abraham A. Ribicoff.
2. Chase Going Woodhouse.
3. John A. McGuire.
4. John Davis Lodge.
5. James T. Patterson.

*At large*

Antoni N. Sadlak.

DELAWARE

*At large*

James Caleb Boggs.

FLORIDA

1. J. Hardin Peterson.
2. Charles E. Bennett.
3. Robert Sikes.
4. George A. Smathers.
5. A. S. Herlong, Jr.
6. Dwight L. Rogers.

GEORGIA

1. Prince H. Preston.
2. E. E. Cox.
3. Stephen Pace.
4. A. Sidney Camp.
5. James C. Davis.
6. Carl Vinson.
7. Henderson Lanham.
8. W. M. (Don) Wheeler.
9. John S. Wood.
10. Paul Brown.

IDAHO

1. Compton I. White.
2. John C. Sanborn.

ILLINOIS

1. William L. Dawson.
2. Barratt O'Hara.
3. Neil J. Linehan.
4. James V. Buckley.
5. Martin Gorski.
6. Thomas J. O'Brien.
7. Adolph J. Sabath.
8. Thomas S. Gordon.
9. Sidney R. Yates.
10. Richard W. Hoffman.
11. Chester A. Chesney.
12. Edgar A. Jonas.
13. Ralph E. Church.
14. Chauncey W. Reed.
15. Noah M. Mason.
16. Leo E. Allen.
17. Leslie C. Arends.
18. Harold H. Velde.
19. Robert B. Chiperfield.
20. Sid Simpson.
21. Peter F. Mack, Jr.
22. Rolla C. McMillen.
23. Edward H. Jenison.
24. Charles W. Vursell.
25. Melvin Price.
26. C. W. Bishop.

INDIANA

1. Ray J. Madden.
2. Charles A. Halleck.
3. Thurman C. Crook.
4. Edward H. Krause, Jr.
5. John R. Walsh.
6. Cecil M. Harden.
7. James E. Noland.
8. Winfield K. Denton.
9. Earl Wilson.
10. Ralph Harvey.
11. Andrew Jacobs.

IOWA

1. Thomas E. Martin.
2. Henry O. Talle.
3. H. R. Gross.
4. K. M. LeCompte.
5. Paul Cunningham.
6. James I. Dolliver.
7. Ben F. Jensen.
8. Charles B. Hoeven.

KANSAS

1. Albert M. Cole.
2. Errett P. Scrivner.
3. Herbert A. Meyer.
4. Edward H. Rees.
5. Clifford R. Hope.
6. Wint Smith.

KENTUCKY

1. Noble J. Gergory.
2. John Albert Whitaker.
3. Thruston B. Morton.
4. Frank L. Chelf.
5. Brent Spence.
6. Thomas Rust Underwood.
7. Carl D. Perkins.
8. Joe B. Bates.
9. James S. Golden.

LOUISIANA

1. F. Edward Hébert.
2. Hale Boggs.
3. E. E. Willis.
4. Overton Brooks.
5. Otto E. Passman.
6. James H. Morrison.
7. Henry D. Larcade, Jr.
8. A. Leonard Allen.

MAINE

1. Robert Hale.
2. Charles P. Nelson.
3. Frank Fellows.

MARYLAND

1. Edward T. Miller.
2. William P. Bolton.
3. Edward A. Garmatz.
4. George H. Fallon.
5. Lansdale G. Sasscer.
6. J. Glenn Beall.

MASSACHUSETTS

1. John W. Heselton.
2. Foster Furcolo.
3. Philip J. Philbin.
4. Harold D. Donohue.
5. Edith Nourse Rogers.
6. George J. Bates.
7. Thomas J. Lane.
8. Angier L. Goodwin.
9. Donald W. Nicholson.
10. Christian A. Herter.
11. John F. Kennedy.
12. John W. McCormack.
13. Richard B. Wigglesworth.
14. Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

MICHIGAN

1. George G. Sadowski.
2. Earl C. Michener.
3. Paul W. Shafer.
4. Clare E. Hoffman.
5. Gerald R. Ford, Jr.
6. William W. Blackney.
7. Jesse P. Wolcott.
8. Fred L. Crawford.
9. Albert J. Engel.
10. Roy O. Woodruff.
11. Charles E. Potter.
12. John B. Bennett.
13. George D. O'Brien.
14. Louis C. Rabaut.
15. John D. Dingell.
16. John Lesinski.
17. George A. Dondero.

MINNESOTA

1. August H. Andresen.
2. Joseph P. O'Hara.
3. Roy W. Wier.
4. Eugene J. McCarthy.
5. Walter H. Judd.
6. Fred Marshall.
7. H. Carl Andersen.
8. John A. Blatnik.
9. Harold C. Hagen.

MISSISSIPPI

1. John E. Rankin.
2. Jamie L. Whitten.
3. Will. M. Whittington.
4. Thos. G. Abernethy.
5. Arthur Winstead.
6. Wm. M. Colmer.
7. John Bell Williams.

MISSOURI

1. Clare Magee.
2. Morgan M. Moulder.
3. Phil J. Welch.
4. Leonard Irving.
5. Richard Bolling.
6. Geo. H. Christopher.
7. Dewey Short.
8. A. S. J. Carnahan.
9. Clarence Cannon.
10. Paul C. Jones.
11. John B. Sullivan.
12. Ray W. Karst.
13. Frank M. Karsten.

MONTANA

1. Mike Mansfield.
2. Wesley A. D'Ewart.

NEBRASKA

1. Carl T. Curtis.
2. Eugene D. O'Sullivan.
3. Karl Stefan.
4. A. L. Miller.

NEVADA

*At Large*

Walter S. Baring.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

1. Chester E. Merrow.
2. Norris Cotton.

NEW JERSEY

1. Charles A. Wolverton.
2. T. Millet Hand.
3. James C. Auchincloss.
4. Charles R. Howell.
5. Charles A. Eaton.
6. Clifford P. Case.
7. J. Parnell Thomas.
8. Gordon Canfield.
9. Harry L. Towe.
10. Peter W. Rodino, Jr.
11. Hugh J. Addonizio.
12. Robert Winthrop Kean.
13. Mary T. Norton.
14. Edward J. Hart.

NEW MEXICO

*At Large*

A. M. Fernandez.
John E. Miles.

NEW YORK

1. W. Kingsland Macy.
2. Leonard W. Hall.
3. Henry J. Latham.
4. L. Gary Clemente.
5. T. Vincent Quinn.
6. James J. Delaney.
7. [Vacant.[1]]
8. Joseph L. Pfeifer.
9. Eugene J. Keogh.
10. Andrew L. Somers.
11. James Heffernan.
12. John J. Rooney.
13. Donald L. O'Toole.
14. Abraham J. Multer.
15. Emanuel Celler.
16. James J. Murphy.
17. Frederic R. Coudert, Jr.
18. Vito Marcantonio.
19. Arthur G. Klein.
20. Sol Bloom.
21. Jacob K. Javits.
22. Adam Clayton Powell, Jr.
23. Walter A. Lynch.
24. Isidore Dollinger.
25. Charles A. Buckley.
26. Christopher C. McGrath.
27. Ralph W. Gwinn.
28. Ralph A. Gamble.
29. Katherine St. George.
30. Jay LeFevre
31. Bernard W. Kearney.
32. William T. Byrne.
33. Dean P. Taylor.
34. Clarence E. Kilburn.
35. John C. Davies.
36. R. Walter Riehlman.
37. Edwin Arthur Hall.
38. John Taber.
39. W. Sterling Cole.
40. Kenneth B. Keating.
41. James W. Wadsworth.
42. William L. Pfeiffer.
43. Anthony F. Tauriello.
44. Chester C. Gorski.
45. Daniel A. Reed.

NORTH CAROLINA

1. Herbert C. Bonner.
2. John H. Kerr.

[1] Representative-elect John J. Delaney died Nov. 18, 1948.

3. Graham A. Barden.
4. Harold D. Cooley.
5. Thurmond Chatham.
6. Carl T. Durham.
7. F. Ertel Carlyle.
8. Charles B. Deane.
9. Robert L. Doughton.
10. Hamilton C. Jones.
11. A. L. Bulwinkle.
12. Monroe M. Redden.

NORTH DAKOTA

*At large*

William Lemke.
Usher L. Burdick.

OHIO

1. Charles H. Elston.
2. Earl T. Wagner.
3. Edward Breen.
4. William M. McCulloch.
5. Cliff Clevenger.
6. James G. Polk.
7. Clarence J. Brown.
8. Frederick C. Smith.
9. Thomas H. Burke.
10. Thomas A. Jenkins.
11. Walter E. Brehm.
12. John M. Vorys.
13. Alvin F. Weichel.
14. Walter B. Huber.
15. Robert T. Secrest.
16. John McSweeney.
17. J. Harry McGregor.
18. Wayne L. Hays.
19. Michael J. Kirwan.
20. Michael A. Feighan.
21. Robert Crosser.
22. Frances P. Bolton.

*At large*

Stephen M. Young.

OKLAHOMA

1. Dixie Gilmer.
2. William G. Stigler.
3. Carl Albert.
4. Tom Steed.
5. Mike Monroney.
6. Toby Morris.
7. Victor Wickersham.
8. Geo. Howard Wilson.

OREGON

1. Walter Norblad.
2. Lowell Stockman.
3. Homer D. Angell.
4. Harris Ellsworth.

PENNSYLVANIA

1. William A. Barrett.
2. William T. Granahan.
3. Hardie Scott.
4. Earl Chudoff.
5. William J. Green, Jr.
6. Hugh D. Scott, Jr.
7. Benjamin F. James.
8. Franklin H. Lichtenwalter.
9. Paul B. Dague.
10. Harry P. O'Neil.
11. Daniel J. Flood.
12. Ivor D. Fenton.
13. George M. Rhodes.
14. Wilson D. Gillette.
15. Robert F. Rich.
16. Samuel K. McConnell, Jr.
17. Richard M. Simpson.
18. John C. Kunkel.
19. L. H. Gavin.
20. Francis E. Walter.
21. James F. Lind.
22. James E. Van Zandt.
23. Anthony Cavalcante.
24. Thomas E. Morgan.
25. Louis E. Graham.
26. Robert L. Coffee, Jr.
27. Augustine B. Kelley.
28. Carroll D. Kearns.
29. Harry J. Davenport.
30. Robert J. Corbett.
31. James G. Fulton.
32. Herman P. Eberharter.
33. Frank Buchanan.

RHODE ISLAND

1. Aime J. Forand.
2. John E. Fogarty.

SOUTH CAROLINA

1. L. Mendel Rivers.
2. Hugo S. Sims, Jr.
3. James Butler Hare.
4. Jos. R. Bryson.
5. James P. Richards.
6. John L. McMillan.

SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Harold O. Lovre.
2. Francis Case.

TENNESSEE

1. Dayton E. Phillips.
2. John Jennings, Jr.
3. James B. Frazier, Jr.
4. Albert Gore.
5. Joe L. Evins.
6. J. Percy Priest.
7. Pat Sutton.
8. Tom Murray.
9. Jere Cooper.
10. Clifford Davis.

TEXAS

1. Wright Patman.
2. J. M. Combs.
3. Lindley Beckworth.
4. Sam Rayburn.
5. J. Frank Wilson.
6. Olin E. Teague.
7. Tom Pickett.
8. Albert Thomas.
9. Clark W. Thompson.
10. Homer Thornberry.
11. W. R. Poage.
12. Wingate H. Lucas.
13. Ed Gossett.
14. John E. Lyle, Jr.
15. Lloyd M. Bentson, Jr.
16. Ken Regan.
17. Omar Burleson.
18. Eugene Worley.
19. George Mahon.
20. Paul J. Kilday.
21. O. C. Fisher.

UTAH

1. W. K. Granger.
2. Reva Beck Bosone.

VERMONT

*At large*

Charles A. Plumley.

VIRGINIA

1. Schuyler Otis Bland.
2. Porter Hardy, Jr.
3. J. Vaughn Gary.
4. W. M. Abbitt.
5. Thos. B. Stanley.
6. Clarence G. Burton.
7. Burr P. Harrison.
8. Howard W. Smith.
9. Tom B. Fugate.

WASHINGTON

1. Hugh B. Mitchell.
2. Henry M. Jackson.
3. Russell V. Mack.
4. Hal Holmes.
5. Walt. Horan.
6. Thor C. Tollefson.

WEST VIRGINIA

1. Robert L. Ramsay.
2. Harley O. Staggers.
3. Cleveland M. Bailey.
4. M. G. Burnside.
5. John Kee.
6. Erland H. Hedrick.

WISCONSIN

1. Lawrence H. Smith.
2. Glenn R. Davis.
3. Gardner R. Withrow.
4. Clement J. Zablocki.
5. Andrew J. Biemiller.
6. Frank B. Keefe.
7. Reid F. Murray.
8. John W. Byrnes.
9. Merlin Hull.
10. Alvin E. O'Konski.

WYOMING

*At large*

Frank A. Barrett.

ALASKA

*Delegate*

E. L. Bartlett.

HAWAII

*Delegate*

Joseph R. Farrington.

PUERTO RICO

*Resident Commissioner*

A. Fernós-Isern.

---

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, all the ways of our direst needs lead to Thee and to Thy everlasting mercy. For this quiet moment before the pressing concerns of a new day move in upon us, wilt Thou lift us from the confusion and baffiement of these desperate times into the unhurried, healing calm of Thy presence. Solemnize us with the responsibility of ability, as we face decisions affecting the lives and fortunes of untold millions who look eagerly to these halls of council for the wise word and the right action. Grant us so to know Thee that we may truly love Thee, and so to love Thee that we may freely serve Thee, to the honor and glory of Thy great Name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, February 8, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on February 9, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 547) to

continue through September 30, 1949, certain authority conferred on the President by section 2 of Public Law 395, Eightieth Congress, regarding voluntary agreements and plans.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. PACE, Mr. POAGE, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1211. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the Hatch Act.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRIAL AND SENTENCE OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I inquire, did not the Senate meet after an adjournment, and are we not in the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no objection, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. BRIDGES. Reserving the right to object, I shall not object to the Senator's request, but I should like to point out——

Mr. TYDINGS. I may say to the Senator that the matter about which I desire to make a short statement is one of great public interest at the present time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not intend to object, but I point out that objection was raised when I made a request a few days ago, and I am not going to see the rule generally violated and then have its enforcement applied to this side of the aisle, particularly to me personally. But I shall not object in the present instance.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to say that I agree with the Senator from New Hampshire. I did not object to his request.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know the Senator did not.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator looked at me as though I might have made the objection.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the trial and sentencing of Cardinal Mindszenty makes one of the darkest spots on the pages of history. It is a throwback to barbarism; to human slavery of both the mind and body.

Freedom of thought was put on trial, and one of the world's leading church figures was humiliated because of the exercise of this God-given right.

Freedom of religion was put on trial, and the great prelate was condemned because he would not renounce his God.

Freedom of conscience was put on trial, and this towering pillar of the church was humbled because he would not barter away his sense of right and wrong.

Cardinal Mindszenty made the decision to be a free man rather than a tool; to be a man of God rather than a cog in an evil machine; to be a proud patriot rather than a slinking traitor; to be a martyr rather than let the dark night, with its human bondage, fall upon his people unchallenged.

Before the jury of the civilized world, he stands forth as innocent. In the eyes of the world this courtroom in Hungary will be known, not as a temple of justice, but the temple of shame.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Humphrey | O'Conor |
| Baldwin | Hunt | O'Mahoney |
| Bricker | Ives | Pepper |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Reed |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Robertson |
| Byrd | Johnston, S. C. | Russell |
| Cain | Kefauver | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Connally | Langer | Sparkman |
| Cordon | Lodge | Stennis |
| Douglas | Long | Taft |
| Eastland | Lucas | Taylor |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Frear | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Fulbright | McGrath | Thye |
| George | McKellar | Tobey |
| Gillette | McMahon | Tydings |
| Gurney | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Hayden | Maybank | Wherry |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Wiley |
| Hickenlooper | Morse | Williams |
| Hill | Mundt | Withers |
| Hoey | Myers | Young |
| Holland | Neely | |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

READING OF GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a permanent order of the Senate it becomes the duty of the Presiding Officer to designate some Senator to read the Farewell Address of George Washington on the 22d day of this month. The appointment alternates between the two parties. This year the appointment falls to the Republican side of the Chamber, and the Chair takes pleasure in designating the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] to read the Farewell Address on the 22d.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF UNITED NATIONS PARTICIPATION ACT OF 1945

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the United Nations Participation Act of 1945 to provide for the appointment of representatives of the United States in the organs and agencies of the United Nations, and to make other provision with respect to the participation of the United States in such organizations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CERTAIN INCREASES IN ANNUITIES UNDER FOREIGN SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY SYSTEM

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System in view of the increased cost of living (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSOLIDATION OF PARKER DAM AND DAVIS DAM PROJECTS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate the Parker Dam power project and the Davis Dam project (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF OFFICE OF UNITED STATES HIGH COMMISSIONER TO THE PHILIPPINES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Office of the United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION CHARTER AND STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS STOCK PILING ACTS

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the thirteenth annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948, together with lists containing the names, salaries, and duties of all employees and officers in the employ or under the supervision of the Board (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the secretary, National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of that society, for the year ended April 1, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on personnel management in the executive branch of the Government (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

TASK FORCE REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Personnel Policy Committee of the Commission on Federal Personnel entitled "Programs for Strengthening Federal Personnel Management" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial by the Nineteenth Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact specific legislation that will provide adequate assistance to all needy Indians now residing on reservations

"Whereas there are various tribes of Indians within the State of New Mexico who live on reservations under Federal supervision and control; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has held that reservation Indians are wards of the Federal Government and, therefore, under the complete jurisdiction and control of Congress; and

"Whereas the relief and welfare needs of these Indians have been generally considered to be the responsibility of the Federal Government in the same manner as the health and education needs of reservation Indians; and

"Whereas many of the needs of some tribes have been so inadequately met by the Federal Government and these tribes have been reduced to such a low level of squalor and misery that rehabilitation and relief will be a very expensive undertaking; and

"Whereas the provisions of the Social Security Act impose upon the State of New Mexico a responsibility to Indians on reservations in spite of the fact that they are wards of the Federal Government; and

"Whereas the State of New Mexico, with a low per capita income, finds it very difficult to provide revenue to meet the current assistance requirements of its needy population; and

"Whereas if New Mexico must provide additional revenue for assistance to reservation Indians, assistance levels for all needy persons in the State could not and would not approach a standard compatible with decency and health: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to enact adequate legislation that will provide to needy Indians monetary assistance which cannot be provided through State funds and Federal funds available under the present matching formula of the Social Security Act.

"Approved by me this 31st day of January 1949.

"THOMAS J. MABRY,
*"Governor, State of New Mexico."*

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Whereas Josef Cardinal Mindszenty is suffering the cruelest persecution of mind and soul for his faith in God and the love of his fellowmen; and

"Whereas his torturers are the enemies of God and all freedom loving men; and

"Whereas his mock trial represents the cruel din of the dirge of infamy calling upon the hapless minions of communism to open warfare against God-fearing people throughout the world; and

"Whereas freedom of religion and its expression are the strongest citadel against the onslaughts of communism; and

"Whereas the eradication of the belief in God is the first order of communistic expansion; and

"Whereas communistic warfare is waged alike against all religion; and

"Whereas this inhuman episode, called a trial, brings out in the open, with all its panoply of barbaric raiment, the dastardly, demoralizing, and destructive figure of atheistic communism; and

"Whereas the mockery of this trial has laid bare the sword of Attila which would destroy all who stand in the way of communism; and

"Whereas because of its implications, the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty is of most serious concern to the people of the world, for it is a method to deprive these people of their inalienable right to freedom of worship; and

"Whereas we shrink in horror as we contemplate what further acts of cruelty and vandalism will be perpetrated against those in the world who dare place God above paganism, liberty above tyranny and life above mass slavery; and

"Whereas in our sorrow at the shame inflicted upon this good man, we condemn those in power in that unhappy land of Hungary, the devilish perpetrators of torture of sham trial; and call upon our Government to take appropriate action in response to the will of the greatest majority of our citizens: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That the Legislature of the State of New York call upon our Congress and our President to take immediate and appropriate action to request United Nations to inquire into the reported deliberate and wanton disregard of the freedom of religion, and the torture and drugging of the accused and the denial to the accused of the most elemental rights at his trial; and upon such findings being made, to take such action as shall be appropriate; and be it further

*"Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Congress from the State of New York."

A resolution adopted at a conference of 400 civic leaders and representatives in Greenwich Village, New York, N. Y., favoring an immediate price freeze; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by locals Nos. 1584, 1674, 1717, and 1737, International Longshoremen's Association, of Santiago, Humacao, P. R., favoring the inclusion of Puerto Rico in the provisions of the so-called minimum-wage law; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States and Puerto Rico, praying for the enactment of legislation providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted at a conference of 400 civic leaders and representatives in Greenwich Village, New York, N. Y., relating to national health insurance legislation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the National Renderers Association, Washington, D. C., favoring exemption of edible and inedible vegetable and animal fats and oils and oil-bearing materials from provisions of export control extension legislation; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself and Mr. O'MAHONEY):

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, favoring the enactment of legislation appropriating sufficient money to complete the building of the Eden Valley irrigation project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See joint memorial printed in full when presented by the Vice President on February 8, 1949 (p. 933), CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

## MAINTENANCE OF PARITY ON BASIC FARM CROPS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Legislature requesting 100-percent price support, and ask for its appropriate reference, and I request that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution A

Concurrent resolution petitioning Congress to enact permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops

Whereas it must be self-evident that if we are to avoid lower living standards and if this national debt is to be serviced and paid, it must be through the production of new wealth from the natural resources of the United States; and

We therefore recommend that the Eighty-first Congress enact legislation in 1949 which will first provide a new parity formula which is fair to farmers and to the consumers of the Nation. We recommend that support prices be established pursuant to this fair parity formula under which farmers shall

be assured not of fractional parity but of 100 percent of the parity prices. These prices should be consistent with the objective of abundant production. We believe that in the new legislation, account should be taken where they have an opportunity for decent living standards, including adequate health protection, good housing, and better educational opportunities for farm children: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the senate concurring therein)*, That we hereby petition Congress to pass permanent legislation to maintain a floor of not less than 100 percent of parity on all basic farm crops, to protect such floor prices with commodity loans of like amount and to prescribe such import duties, excise taxes, or quotas on competitive imports as may be needed to maintain these price levels and our national income and to equalize the differential between the dollar value of our production and that of foreign countries; be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution properly authenticated be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the presiding officer of each House of the National Congress and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from North Dakota, and the Department of Agriculture and Labor at Washington, D. C.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## RESOLUTIONS OF WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the meeting of the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, held in Washington from January 27 to January 29, a number of resolutions were adopted. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### Resolution 1

Faith in American constitutional government

Whereas the American people have developed under the Constitution of the United States into a most powerful nation; and

Whereas the abandonment of the wise counsel adopted by the Founding Fathers as set forth in Washington's Farewell Address has brought about many evils: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense call upon the membership of its constituent societies for a rededication of effort to restore the pure American doctrine of constitutional, representative, limited government—a government to be supported and controlled by the people in a free economy, independent of foreign ideologies and strict observance of all rights, privileges and immunities guaranteed to the separate States and to the people by the Constitution of the United States.

### Resolution 2

Oath of loyalty

Whereas taking the Oath of Loyalty to our Country by anyone holding public office is a privilege which would be welcomed by any loyal American: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge the President of the United States and the agencies working under executive order to require the oath of loyalty to be taken by all holding public office.

### Resolution 3

National Security Act

Whereas our country has grown stronger during the 15 months since the National Security Act of 1947 became law, and

Whereas substantial progress in the unification of the armed forces has been made in the past year: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense recommend to the Congress of the United States that no radical changes be made in the National Security Act of 1947.

### Resolution 4

Army Day

Whereas Army Day is to be officially celebrated on April 6, 1949; and

Whereas this day of the present year is of urgent importance to the security of the Nation and the peace of the world by its effectiveness in making the American people aware of the positive need for a strong armed defense; and

Whereas it is the duty of every American citizen and every American organization to give the fullest possible support to the armed forces, their preservation, their personnel needs, and the maintenance of their equipment: Therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense endorse the principles and purposes of Army Day and call upon each and every organization represented in the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense to give every possible support to the full success of Army Day, April 6, 1949.

### Resolution 5

Universal military training

Whereas the American Legion Auxiliary is and always has been for universal military training; and

Whereas adequate preparedness is the best protection against wars and the needless sacrifice of human lives; and

Whereas a citizenry trained for defense is the keystone of preparedness and can best be assured through the training of the Nation's youth for national security: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we request the participating groups of the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense to instruct their members to urgently request their Senators and Representatives to vote favorably on universal military training; that the participating groups be urged to institute forthwith a program of information and education for the benefit of the American people that they may understand the importance of immediate action on this measure, and the dangers to our homes and to our country which require its enactment without delay; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to all newspapers and civic agencies.

### Resolution 6

Voluntary enlistment program

Whereas the United States Army and United States Air Force are striving to maintain their personnel through voluntary-enlistment procedure; and

Whereas voluntary enlistment must gain complete and aggressive public support; and

Whereas the women of the Nation can and must be a vital factor in promoting public support of the United States Army and United States Air Force, their manpower needs and their place in American life: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense endorse the voluntary-enlistment program of the United States Army and United States Air Force and call upon all organizations represented in this conference to give full support to that program by disseminating information on Army and Air Force life and by influencing young men and women of the United States to accept the Army and Air Force as honorable institutions in which young men and women can find a worthwhile career.

### Resolution 7

Defense of Alaska

Whereas it is admitted by competent and high authority in our armed services that Alaska now is vulnerable to attack by air from bases under Communist control that are only 30 air-miles from the shores of Alaska; and

Whereas this proximity of attack constitutes a great immediate danger: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense petition Congress to give priority to the defense needs and requirements of Alaska in its consideration of any and all appropriations for the stated purpose of checking the advance of communism anywhere in the world.

### Resolution 8

Increase in pay for the armed services

Whereas it is essential, if we are to have a sound national defense, that the housing and pay of the armed services be such as to attract the highest possible caliber of men and women for careers as leaders therein; and

Whereas although the cost of living in the United States has increased 71 percent in the last 10 years and the wages and salaries of workers, professional men, and management generally have increased proportionately, the pay schedules of the career personnel of the armed services have lagged far behind with increases varying from 9 percent to 21 percent for commissioned personnel above the grade of second lieutenant and from 36 percent to 75 percent for second lieutenants and noncommissioned officers; and

Whereas the present housing, particularly for married commissioned and noncommissioned officers, is completely inadequate at all stations: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense sponsor and advocate an appropriate and adequate increase in the pay for commissioned and noncommissioned officers of the armed services as recommended by the Hook commission; and that further, they sponsor and advocate increased appropriations for the construction of adequate housing for the personnel of the armed services.

### Resolution 9

Unions servicing the merchant marine

Whereas evidence establishes the fact that Communists and their fellow travelers control key posts in the unions which service our merchant marine; and

Whereas in case of war this could easily result in the defeat of this country: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon Congress to enact appropriate legislation to give power to law-enforcement agencies to make such Communist control of unions servicing the merchant marine impossible.

Resolution 10

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act

Whereas a healthy economy is necessary to a strong national defense; and

Whereas high wages and full employment form the foundation of a healthy economy; and

Whereas the products of other countries made by workers paid much less than workers producing comparable goods in this country can only result in increasing unemployment, a weakening of our economy and our strength for national defense; and

Whereas the reciprocal trade agreements program has removed protection from our high-paid workers against the unfair competition of the low-paid workers of other countries, thereby threatening jobs of workers in industries important to our national defense; and

Whereas as a result the reduction of tariffs incident to the adoption of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, grave injury already has been inflicted upon various industries in this country important to our national defense program; and

Whereas imports into our country should be controlled by the imposition of proper tariffs by the exercise of our own sovereign right to serve as an equalizing balance between the low wages of other countries and the high wages of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon Congress the repeal of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act as constituting an ever-present menace to our national defense and our economy and an unwarranted encroachment by the executive branch of the Government upon the legislative powers conferred upon Congress by the Constitution of the United States.

---

Resolution 11

Subversive teaching of youth

Whereas the future of our country rests with those now constituting the youth of our land; and

Whereas many persons with ideals contrary to the Constitution and the principles on which it is based, have managed to obtain places as instructors in many of our educational systems; and

Whereas through the work of these persons and others interested in a government contrary to that of the United States of America, the basic principles of this Government are not clearly understood by many of our young citizens: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense disapprove un-American and subversive teachings and that all necessary steps be taken to prevent subversive teachings of our youth.

---

Resolution 12

Teaching American history and civics

Whereas the youth of the United States of America may be inducted into military service at 18 years of age under the present emergency draft bill; and

Whereas under the educational system of today youth does not thoroughly understand the functions of our Government and the rights of American heritage: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense recommend that a 4-year course in civics and American history be required in all secondary schools throughout the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the National Director of Education, the director of education in every State, the president of the Parent-Teachers Association and the national presidents of all teachers' associations.

Resolution 13

Text and reference books

Whereas the loose interpretation and even deliberate misrepresentation of true historical facts concerning the integrity of great Americans and of the principles of the Government of the United States is subtly and dangerously implanting un-American ideas in the minds of our children through the use of textbooks, biographies, reference books, and by word of mouth: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge the governors of the various States to appoint commissions to investigate textbooks and reference books in use in their respective States.

---

Resolution 14

Opposition to Federal aid to education

Whereas there has been a bill for Federal aid to education for more than a dozen years; and

Whereas it has always been rejected because it would result eventually in Federal control since the Supreme Court has ruled that whatever the Government subsidizes it may control; and

Whereas it is not needed because the States have large surpluses and few debts, while the Federal Government has debts above $252,000,000,000; and

Whereas these bills purport to equalize education, they give to the rich States equally with the poor States; and

Whereas giving to the rich States might secure the votes necessary to pass these measures, it would bring them all under the same political control: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense oppose all Federal aid to education bills that are now before Congress.

---

Resolution 15

Defense of constitutional rights

Whereas the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, historically and by convention mandate and policy, has stated its beliefs in the inherent constitutional and equal rights of all Americans; and

Whereas, the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense has decried mob violence, lynching, and religious hatreds, and has unequivocally favored tolerance, human rights, and an end to racial strife; and

Whereas the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense proudly states that great progress has been made, and is being made in these vital and important fields of human relationships: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense reaffirm its policy in regard to tolerance and human rights, and call upon its constituent organizations to support and seriously work toward the accomplishment of the ideals these enumerate.

---

Resolution 16

Treaty ratification

Whereas the founding fathers wisely provided that all agreements of a treaty nature with foreign nations must obtain the approval of a two-thirds vote of the Senate of the United States; and

Whereas this two-thirds provision was placed in the Constitution by the founding fathers as one of the many checks therein to protect the rights of minorities against the oppression of one-vote majorities; and

Whereas our form of government is the only one in the world today that provides protection and guaranties for minorities; and

Whereas one of the most insidious forms of attack upon our national security is the undermining of the rights of minorities in order that mob rule might prevail as it does elsewhere in the world: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense is opposed to any weakening of our national security by any change in the present two-thirds Senate treaty confirmation requirement of the Constitution.

---

Resolution 17

Geneva Conference proposals for control of communications

Whereas the United Nations Charter expressly states in article 2, paragraph 7: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter"; and

Whereas the proposals made at the Geneva Conference, April 1948, for international control of the press, news sources, and communication systems are un-American in principle and against the public interest, and not in accordance with article 2, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense recommend that the Senate decline to ratify any treaty for the international control of press, news, and communications.

---

Resolution 18

Opposing world government

Whereas the need for understanding and cooperation among nations as developed under the Charter of the United Nations is a matter of immediate concern to all patriotic Americans; and

Whereas this concern in the hearts of loyal Americans, offers an opportunity to those who would destroy our Nation and encourages their attempt to set up a world government which would abrogate national sovereignty; and

Whereas a world government would mean world citizenship and thus the abolition of all our country's immigration laws; and would mean world money and thus reduce our country's money to the level of that of all other countries in the world: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense declare itself as fully supporting the principle of world cooperation through sincere and candid cooperation among all nations; and that it declare itself also as uncompromisingly opposed to a world government with a supreme authority over all National Governments; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Conference impress upon its members the urgent need of informing themselves and others as to the vast and vital difference between World Cooperation and World Government.

---

Resolution 19

Revocation of United States citizenship

Whereas the several proposal plans for "world government" involve surrender of the independence and sovereignty of the United States of America and our ultimate submission to the tyranny of a world-governing bureaucracy under either Socialist or Communist control: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation under which naturalized citizens working under the cloak of "world government" to undermine our Constitution, shall be subject to revocation of citizenship.

Resolution 20

Un-American activities

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense request the Congress of the United States to print 1,000,000 copies of the following six booklets:

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism in the United States of America.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Religion.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Education.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Labor.

One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism and Government.

The Communist Party of the United States as an Agent of a Foreign Power.

---

Resolution 21

Assistance to Republic of China

Whereas the great nation of China has for many years mutually enjoyed a traditional friendship with our Nation; and

Whereas Chinese Communists are seizing control of much of China as well as Manchuria; and

Whereas the fall of China into Communist hands would constitute an irreparable loss and great defeat for the United States, necessitating large expenditures in defenses for Alaska, Japan, and the Philippines: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge immediate aid to China as necessary to insure the future peace of our Nation.

---

Resolution 22

To outlaw the Communist Party

Whereas the spread of communism is increasing throughout the world and is becoming more evident in the United States; and

Whereas communism is inimical to our form of government: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge Congress to enact legislation to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States.

---

Resolution 23

Recognizing and exposing communism

Whereas this Nation was founded upon the principles of freedom under law, private enterprise, and individual responsibility, by means of which it has endured with phenomenal development and security; and

Whereas our Nation now is threatened by the presence of an ideology in the form of communism and Fabian socialism completely contrary to our principles, which ideology seeks to destroy our form of government and our American way of living by subtle infiltration into many American groups; into schools and colleges in the name of youth movements; into women's groups in the name of peace; into labor groups in the name of higher wages and control; and even into church and patriotic organizations: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense call upon its entire membership to adopt a policy of informing themselves intelligently on the theory and manner of this threatening intrusion and to dedicate themselves, not casually, but earnestly to the business of recognizing and exposing communism wherever it is seeking to entrench itself or has already done so.

---

Resolution 24

Un-American Activities Committee

Whereas recent events have demonstrated that national security requires full cooperation from the Chief Executive and the Attorney General in releasing information (other than top military secrets) to congressional committees: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense petition the House to retain and strengthen the House Un-American Activities Committee and grant the committee ample funds to carry on its important work in exposing the obstructionists and enemies within our ranks; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Secretary of Defense.

---

Resolution 25

Commendation of Congress

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense commend the action taken by Congress in citing for contempt the script and scenario writers who refused to answer questions of the House Committee To Investigate Un-American Activities as to whether they were or had ever been members of the Communist Party.

---

Resolution 26

Communists employed by Government

Whereas it is a well-established fact that there are many persons now employed in our Government who are members of the Communist Party, or members of Communist-front organizations; and

Whereas it has been proved beyond any doubt that the beliefs and purposes of the Communist Party and these organizations are entirely opposed to the principles on which the laws and ideals of our country are based: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge the President of the United States of America, and those in charge of all branches of our Government, to free all Government offices of any and all persons who are affiliated with the Communist Party, or any of the several Communist-front organizations, and that a most careful screening be used in the future to prevent the hiring of such persons.

---

Resolution 27

State socialism

Whereas all countries which have sacrificed civic freedoms because of false propaganda promising peace and prosperity in exchange for their sovereignty; and

Whereas all countries embracing such socialistic controls have suffered military defeat in war, and misery and starvation in long years of peace, it would be dangerous to submit the United States to similar unsuccessful socialistic restrictions: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the preservation of our institutions, our free economy, and our homes is still our first line of defense; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense oppose all national or international plans, proposals, or legislation presented as emergency or defense measures, which would convert the United States Government into a form of state socialism.

---

Resolution 28

Socialized medicine

Whereas great pressure is being exerted on Congress to pass legislation which would place under Government control the health and medical care of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such action would impair or destroy the personal interest, initiative, and private research on the part of the medical profession, and put that profession under the control of a paternalistic bureaucracy with direct socialization as a result: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense express its emphatic opposition to the establishment of socialized medicine and thereby the expansion of bureaucracy in the United States; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the American Medical Association.

---

Resolution 29

Federal regulation and centralization

Whereas there has been a growing tendency in our Federal Government to centralize power and authority and to usurp the prerogatives and rights of the sovereign States, and to create bureaus and commissions and to endow them with authority to make regulations with the force and power of law: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense record its opposition to any Federal legislation which would tend toward further regimentation and centralization of government, and toward the lessening of the rights of the individual States.

---

Resolution 30

Unity and tolerance

Whereas it has been the policy of the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense to condemn and oppose all forms of subversive activities, whether they be manifested by an appeal to racial hatreds and prejudices or by attempts to divide this Nation into industrial strife by agitating and fomenting trouble between capital and labor, and economic group against economic group; and

Whereas subversive organizations and individuals are continuing their vicious campaigns of propaganda to disunite and divide the American people, setting class against class, race against race, and creed against creed: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense call upon the people of our Nation to oppose any threat to American unity and urge fellow citizens of all races, colors, and creeds to demonstrate that same spirit of cooperation that was evidenced by our armed forces on the battlefronts in the fight against aggression, bigotry, and intolerance, and to oppose every attempt of these un-American forces to destroy the fundamental principles of life, liberty, justice, and freedom guaranteed by our Constitution.

---

Resolution 31

Immigration quotas

Whereas our present immigration laws, now threatened with change, have restricted immigration to a quota system allocating a definite number to each nationality mentioned, such allocation not to be interchangeable among quotas; and

Whereas millions of our veterans of World War II who are entitled to our first consideration, still desire and need American education, housing, and employment: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That for the purpose of protecting the interest of all our citizens, and particularly our veterans, and for the purpose of excluding foreign elements imbued with political ideologies wholly at variance with our constitutional system of government, the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense urge upon the Congress that no immigration over and above the present quota system shall be permitted into the United States, either by special legislation, by unused quotas, or by Executive order.

Resolution 32

Pan-American good will

Whereas the forces of communism are seeking to infiltrate into all the nations of the Western Hemisphere, including the United States of America, thereby striving to injure the spirit of pan-American good will and to weaken the Pan American Union, and

Whereas the 21 independent, sovereign nations of the Pan American Union have, with very few exceptions, maintained friendly relations with one another for over 50 years; and

Whereas the spirit of good will and cooperation was of the greatest value during World War II and is of major importance to the United States of America and to the other nations of pan-America in time of peace: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense recommend to all its members the study of the several nations of pan-America, so that with knowledge of their history, culture, and problems, may come increased understanding and strengthening of hemispheric good will.

---

Resolution 33

To open United Nations meetings with prayer

Whereas the United States of America was founded on religious freedom; and

Whereas the early Congress, through Benjamin Franklin's wise appeal, was opened by prayer, after which the issues were clarified and the Constitution was ratified; and

Whereas our first line of national defense lies in dependence on God, the Great Commander: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense earnestly request that the United Nations meetings be opened with prayer, and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United Nations at Lake Success, N. Y.

---

Resolution 34

Thanking the press

Whereas the press is a great and effective weapon to prevent war and maintain peace: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, (1) That the twenty-third Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense call the attention of the editors of local newspapers to their responsibility in connection with the program for national defense;

(2) That the editors be urged to help educate our people as to the condition, size, welfare, strength, and needs of our armed services in relation to those of other nations, to the end that we shall maintain at all times an adequate, well-trained, and strong organization for national security;

(3) That we express our thanks to the press for the splendid support given our armed services in the past, and urge that it continue such support with increasing emphasis and vigor, as an indispensable contribution to the development of a sound, informed, and virile public opinion on the subject of national security, and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to International News Service, the Associated Press, and the United Press.

## ADEQUATE LAWS ON COMMUNISTIC INFLUENCES AND ACTIVITIES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Kiwanis Club of Rehoboth Beach, Del., on November 11, 1948, calling upon the State legislature to enact adequate laws on communistic influences and activities.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the ideology of communism is being vigorously pressed upon the people of the United States of America through misrepresentation, deceit, treachery, and intrigue, threatening our free institutions, and tending to the overthrow of our representative Government; and

Whereas the present critical condition of world affairs, particularly between the United States of America and Russia, has caused an organized cold war, which is being carried on by Russia, its satellite countries, and the Cominform in an endeavor to indoctrinate and foster among our people the ideology of communism; and

Whereas many citizens of the United States—indeed, many public officials—have, as a result of congressional investigations, proceedings of various grand juries, action by the United States Immigration Service and the Department of Justice, been shown to be of questionable loyalty to this country, or easy converts and zealous supporters of revolutionary doctrines, if not out-and-out active agents of Russia or the Cominform, or other alien nations and interests: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Legislature (General Assembly) of the State of Delaware is herewith and hereby called upon to enact adequate laws to protect the citizens of Delaware from these subversive communistic influences and activities; and be it further

*Resolved*, That as an approach to that end there be enacted public laws providing that no person who is a member of any political party or any other organization seeking the overthrow of the Government of the United States or the State of Delaware by force and violence, by deceit, treachery, and intrigue, and by any other false and treasonable practices or means, shall hold any office of trust or profit in the government of this State or in any county, kindred municipality, or any other administrative subdivision whatsoever.

CHARLES M. ROGERS,
*President.*
RALPH R. MESSICK,
*Secretary.*

## MVA—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition from Beaver Local, Farmer's Union, Stutsman County, N. Dak., dealing with the MVA, and the 100-percent parity plan, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEAVER LOCAL, STUTSMAN COUNTY,
*Alfred, N. Dak.*

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: We, the 56 members of Beaver local, wish to inform you that we are opposed to the Pick-Sloan plan and 100 percent in favor of MVA. Please consider this when you cast your vote.

Our local is also for 100-percent parity for family-type farms, and so are all the rest of the farmers and Farmers Union members in the State of North Dakota.

Yours truly,

L. C. OVERLANDER,
ALMON A. WILLIAMS,
*Resolutions Committee.*

## SALARIES OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION OFFICIALS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Washington, D. C., relating to the salaries of Rural Electrification Administration officials, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress now has under consideration a comprehensive readjustment of the salary structure of the principal executive offices of the Government to bring salaries of the administrative heads of the executive departments and agencies in line with present-day conditions; and

Whereas sound principles of government and effective management require that Government executives be compensated on a basis commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of their offices in order to attract and hold competent executives; and

Whereas the administration of the multibillion-dollar REA program requires the highest degree of executive skill and competence and imposes duties and responsibilities comparable with and, in many cases, greater than those of any Federal agency: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we endorse the making of a complete appraisal and readjustment of the salary structure of the principal executive offices of the Government in general, and urge upon the Congress that the salaries of the chief administrative officials of the Rural Electrification Administration be adjusted to give full recognition to their duties and responsibilities and to the principle of equal pay for equal responsibilities.

## HAND-PICKED JURIES—LETTER FROM MARGARET L. WHEELER

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Margaret L. Wheeler, of Albany, N. Y., relating to hand-picked juries.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALBANY, N. Y., *January 28, 1949.*

Senator WILLIAM LANGER,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I read with a great deal of admiration your remarks on the prevalence of hand-picked juries.

Our jury system as provided in the Constitution is at the heart of the democratic system, and I, as a layman, cannot see how the system about which Judge Knox boasts can be sustained in the courts.

We are trying to show various other countries what democracy is. A good way to do this would be to try it at home.

Very truly,

MARGARET L. WHEELER.

## RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY BLUE STAR MOTHERS OF DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the convention of Blue Star Mothers of America in Detroit, Mich.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED AT THE NATIONAL CONVENTION IN DETROIT, MICH.

I

Whereas the funds set aside by Congress for the return of our war dead has been found to be insufficient: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States of America be petitioned to increase to meet the added expense.

II

Whereas December 7, known as Pearl Harbor Day, is a day of special memory for Blue Star Mothers of America: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That we petition Congress to declare said day a legal holiday, set aside for prayer and appropriate memorial services.

III

Whereas adequate facilities in VA hospitals are not available to many veterans afflicted with tuberculosis; and

Whereas the Blue Star Mothers of America do feel the utmost interest in the welfare of the veteran; Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That the Blue Star Mothers of America, in convention assembled, do hereby petition the Congress of the United States to appropriate the necessary funds to provide accommodations for these afflicted veterans.

IV

Whereas we the Blue Star Mothers of America do feel strongly that in World War II many of our boys were forced to serve without proper military training; and

Whereas, because of the uncertain international situation of today, we feel the necessity of adequate preparation for the future: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That we strongly recommend to Congress the adoption of an adequate program of universal military training which will go into effect immediately upon the conclusion of the present emergency draft program.

V

Whereas the youth of the United States may be inducted into military service at 18 years of age under the present emergency draft bill; and

Whereas under the educational system of today he does not thoroughly understand the functions of our Government and the rights of his American heritage: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That Blue Star Mothers of America in national convention assembled, recommend that a 4-year course in civics and American history be required in all secondary schools throughout the United States.

VI

Whereas the spread of communistic ideas is increasing at an alarming rate in the United States; and

Whereas these ideas are found to be infiltrating our schools: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That all teachers be required to sign a loyalty or anticommunistic pledge before they shall be employed as teachers.

VII

Whereas Public Law 346 provides educational benefits for surviving veterans of World War II which has been of extreme benefit to those seeking to better themselves; and

Whereas the widows and children of service personnel who died in the service of their Nation face an uncertain future, with particular emphasis on the efforts of such orphaned children to secure an adequate education: Therefore be it

*Resolved,* That Blue Star Mothers of America in national convention assembled do hereby petition the Congress for the passage of legislation amending Public Law No. 346 to provide that such educational benefits as would have accrued to the deceased service person should be vested in the surviving widow or one child.

VIII

Whereas there is a woeful lack of housing for our veterans and their families: Be it

*Resolved,* That Congress be petitioned to take immediate action on providing adequate housing, financed by the Federal Government; and be it further

*Resolved,* That houses provided for veterans conform to certain specifications—not less than four rooms, bath, and utility room, and other facilities necessary to the American way of living; and be it further

*Resolved,* That these houses be made available to veterans at a price within the means of the average veteran; and be it further

*Resolved,* That where so desired the veteran may be permitted to rent these houses at a fair rental price for a period of at least 3 years with the option of buying, and at the expiration of said rental period all moneys paid as rental may be applied as a down payment for the purchase of said home; and be it further

*Resolved,* That in cases where the veteran may be the owner of a lot or lots, and wishes to build his own home, the necessary materials be made available to him at the prevailing price, and the cost of said material be covered by an insured Government mortgage at a rate of interest comparable to that of the GI loans, namely, 4 percent; and be it further

*Resolved,* That we go on record as objecting to the provisions of the 1948 housing bill which would permit an increase to 4½ percent of the interest chargeable on said GI loans; and

IX

Whereas current building costs have placed the acquisition of homes beyond the economic reach of the average veteran and his family; and

Whereas the building industry has found it impossible to build rental housing at a cost within the reach of such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That Blue Star Mothers of America urge upon Congress that a minimum of 125,000 rental units per year be constructed by the Federal Government during the next 5 years; and be it further

*Resolved,* That definite but reasonable income limitation be effected, in order that those most legitimately entitled to such homes may not be crowded out by high-income families.

## THE TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF MARYLAND HOUSE OF DELEGATES

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the Maryland House of Delegates, one of the two branches of the Legislature of Maryland, have adopted a resolution of protest which, through their officers, was ordered forwarded to the National Congress.

The resolution condemns the unjust procedures employed in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty, and deplores the practices being followed in the Soviet-dominated countries. It is further evidence of the deep feeling of outrage, which is the reaction of the people of Maryland to the Communist injustice perpetrated upon Hungary's beloved primate.

I present the resolution and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary constitutes an attack by atheistic communism upon the freedom of religion; and

Whereas prominent members of various religious groups in this country have characterized this unjust trial as a gross crime against freedom and as a rape of justice, these persons, including Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York; the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, president of the World Christian Endeavor Union; and the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate of the United States and pastor of Foundry Methodist Church in Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas Cardinal Mindszenty was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp during World War II for his efforts in saving 1,500 Hungarian Jews from the clutches of the German Gestapo, thereby proving himself a defender of and a martyr for civil rights and humanity; and

Whereas this trial is part of a worldwide conspiracy of atheistic communism to threaten not only the countries of eastern Europe but also the liberty, democracy, and very life of the United States; and

Whereas representatives of the freedom-loving nations were barred from the courtroom during the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR has asked the intervention of the State Department of the United States in this matter, seeking to ascertain whether Soviet and Hungarian Governments have violated the basic guaranties of the United Nations as to freedom of worship, fair and impartial trials and freedom of speech: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That this body, representing a great State, in which toleration and freedom of religion not only are guaranteed by the Constitution but also are part of the very fabric of its citizens, solemnly protests the outrageous crime against religion and humanity now being perpetrated in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

*Resolved,* That this resolution be spread upon the Journal of the House and that the Chief Clerk be, and he is hereby, instructed to send copies thereof to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

## IMPORTATION OF OIL—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I present Senate Concurrent Resolution 3, adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature. The resolution asks that the United States Senate call the importation of oil to the attention of the State Department of our Government. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to forward the resolution to the State Department.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, resolutions coming from a State legislature are received and printed in the RECORD. Without objection, the resolution will also be forwarded as requested.

The concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma was referred to the State Department and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 3

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to bring to the attention of the United States State Department the immediate need of drastically curtailing the importation of crude oil from foreign countries to the United States until such time as there is a need for the importation of crude oil to take care of the market demand for crude oil within the continental United States

Whereas it appears that the increase in stocks of crude oil and refined products have increased 105,000,000 barrels during the last year, resulting in a curtailment in production of oil in Oklahoma and in other States of the Union because of lack of storage facilities; and

Whereas above-ground storage of crude oil in abnormal amounts results in great waste of natural resources; and

Whereas the importation of crude oil in the United States during the past year have increased approximately 150 percent, and that approximately 600,000 barrels of crude oil is being imported daily into the United States; and

Whereas such importation of crude oil results in building up of the abnormal amount of the stocks of crude oil and refined products on hand, which has caused Oklahoma to decrease the allowable production of oil approximately 40,000 barrels daily; and

Whereas the importation of crude oil from foreign countries is a direct threat to the stability of the oil industry in Oklahoma and in the other oil-producing States, and to the tax structure in Oklahoma; and

Whereas unless the importation of crude oil from foreign countries is materially decreased, Oklahoma will be forced to curtail the allowable production of oil within the respective producing areas; and

Whereas the importation of foreign oil is a direct threat to the military security of the United States of America in that all initiative for the future development of the oil resources is stifled; and

Whereas the petroleum industry has continually developed new methods of discovering new resources when there is a proper demand for oil; and

Whereas the country is primarily dependent on American oil in time of war and these resources are only discovered when initiative is not stifled: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the senate of the twenty-second legislature (the house of representatives concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States bring to the attention of the United States State Department the important fact that the importation of crude oil from foreign countries to the United States should be drastically curtailed until such time as there is a need for the importation of crude oil to take care of the market demand for crude oil within the continental United States, and that the congressional delegation from Oklahoma do all within its power to carry out the purpose and intent of this resolution. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate to each Member of the congressional delegation from Oklahoma, and to the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 745. A bill to provide for the designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Chicago, Ill., as the Albert A. Sprague Veterans Memorial Hospital; without amendment (Rept. No. 51).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. 829. A bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 52).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 42. Joint resolution granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 53).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 55).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. R. 1252. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 54).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 461. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 602 (u) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 50).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Res. 45. Resolution to investigate certain matters pertaining to the United States merchant marine; with an amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 50. Resolution to investigate the financial condition of the air-line industry; with an amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 62. Resolution to investigate domestic land and water transportation conditions; with an amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 63. Resolution to investigate certain matters relating to radio, telegraph, and telephone communications; with an amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration;

S. Res. 64. Resolution to investigate the fishing resources of the United States; without amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

S. Res. 65. Resolution to investigate the Panama Canal and interoceanic canals generally; without amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## CATHERINE MARSHALL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably Senate Resolution 44, submitted by Mr. LUCAS on January 27, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Catherine Marshall, widow of Rev. Peter Marshall, late the Chaplain of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS RELATING TO INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably without amendment Senate Resolution 51, reported by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on February 3, 1949, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1949, and ending on February 15, 1950, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution (which shall not exceed $15,000 for studying intergovernmental relations with the States and municipalities or $18,000 for studying relations with international organizations) shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if he will give an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. The resolution involves two amounts of money for two subcommittees of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments; one of $15,000 for studying intergovernmental relations with the States and municipalities, and $18,000 for studying relations with international organizations. These are subcommittees which functioned during the past year and which are being continued. They did not spend all their money. The sum total here is practically the amount which was appropriated last year.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

## PRINTING OF HEARINGS OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO LIMITATION ON DEBATE (S. DOC. NO. 10)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I reported an original resolution providing for the printing of the hearings before the Committee on Rules and Administration on the limitation of debate in the Senate, as a Senate document, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be stated.

The resolution (S. Res. 68) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the hearings held before the Committee on Rules and Administration, relative to limitation of debate in the Senate, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS RELATING TO GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably Senate Resolution 52, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 52) reported by Mr. McCLELLAN from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on February 3, 1949, and subsequently referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 16, 1949, and ending on February 15, 1950, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, in addition to any unexpended balance under Senate Resolution 189, Eightieth Congress, agreed to January 28, 1948, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee as the case may be.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask that an explanation of the resolution be given.

Mr. HAYDEN. This resolution provides for a continuation of the Ferguson subcommittee of last year. It had an appropriation of $125,000. About $50,000 was left over. The committee is asking for another $50,000, so that the total expenditures under this authorization would be approximately $100,000 during the next year.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the life of the subcommittee expire as of February 15?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the reason for the resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. And it is necessary that an appropriation be made so that the subcommittee may continue its authority under the appropriation for another year.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the subcommittee does not expire. The appropriation expires.

Mr. WHERRY. The appropriation expires as of February 15, I believe.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. It is very necessary that the balance be reappropriated, plus an additional appropriation of $50,000, which makes an annual appropriation of $102,000, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection to the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, I report favorably, without amendment, House bill 1252. The bill is short, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. I ask that the bill be read.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the clerk will read the bill, I think it will be self-explanatory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill (H. R. 1252) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 with respect to the eligibility for appointment in the executive branch of the Government of former professional staff members of committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 202 (g) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended (prohibiting the employment in the executive branch of the Government of any former professional staff member of a committee of the Senate or the House of Representatives for a period of 1 year after he ceases to be such a member), is hereby repealed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona to explain what is incorporated in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Reorganization Act now provides that anyone employed as a clerk or assistant on the professional staff of any of the committees of the House or Senate may not accept employment in a department of the Government for 1 year after he ceases to be connected with a committee. The particular case which I think caused this bill to be acted upon unanimously by the House involved a man detailed to the Committee on Ways and Means from the Tariff Commission. The committee no longer needs his services, and the Tariff Commission wishes to reemploy him, but is prohibited from doing so for 1 year. The bill would permit him to resume his work with the Tariff Commission. I assume there are other similar cases.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, why should not this bill go to the calendar, in the normal course?

Mr. HAYDEN. There seemed to be some desire to expedite the employee's return to the Tariff Commission. Otherwise, I have no objection to the bill going to the calendar.

Mr. LODGE. I voted to report the bill from the committee; but it seems to involve an important question. It goes to one of the important points in the La Follette-Monroney Act. I should like to know what criterion we are to have for considering bills without having them first go to the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has asked unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill, to which request any Senator has the right to object.

Mr. HAYDEN. I withdraw the request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is withdrawn, and the bill will go to the calendar.

REPORTS OF SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit five reports from the Senate Small Business Committee. One has reference to steel supply and distribution, being the final report of the activities of the steel subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee (Rept. No. 43). One relates to changes in steel distribution, 1940 to 1947, being the result of a survey of steel-distribution practices by 14 major integrated steel companies, which the subcommittee on steel initiated in the fall of 1948 (Rept. No. 44). There is a report on small business finance and taxation (Rept. No. 46), a report on participation of small business in Government procurement (Rept. No. 45), and, finally a report on newsprint supply and distribution (Rept. No. 47), the final report of the Subcommittee on Newsprint and Paper Shortages, of which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] has been in charge.

I might say that the chairman of the subcommittee on steel has been the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. I am submitting these reports in their behalf.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be received and printed.

COMMUNICATIONS PROBLEMS — REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE (S. REPT. NO. 49)

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I submit an interim report relating to communications problems.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

ROUTINE PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably numerous appointments and promotions in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration. I see that the minority leader has risen, and in anticipation of what he is about to ask I will say that the purpose in making the request is to save the cost of printing. If these numerous routine promotions should go to the Executive Calen-

dar the names will have to be printed, and the calendar will be a very thick one. It will necessitate the spending of a considerable amount of money for printing the names. I will say that there is no objection to the promotion of any of the officers in question. Most of them are in the lower grades. I make the request only in the interest of public economy.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate the observation and the request made by the distinguished Senator from Maryland. I will say that during the past 2 years similar requests have been made by the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], and they have been complied with on both sides of the aisle. As I understand, we will then continue such a procedure; and the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee will ask for the confirmation of routine appointments and promotions, as he has done today, only in order to save printing the names. I understand the Senator will make the requests only with respect to nominations concerning which there are no disagreements, nominations which are unanimously reported.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Nebraska is correct. The Senator from Maryland, who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee, will also state that he will not take advantage of this situation when, to his knowledge, there is any controversy over any of the nominations.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for explaining the position he has taken and will continue to take, and I want to assure him that in order to save printing the names, so as to conserve on the printing bill respecting routine nominations in the armed services, I am agreeable to that procedure, and will not now object to his request.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the routine nominations in the armed services referred to by the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be notified.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 872. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 873. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1946, to authorize relief in cases where the Government has actual or constructive notice or knowledge of certain losses incurred under war contracts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 874. A bill for the relief of Elza Friedrych;

S. 875. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; and

S. 876. A bill for the relief of Jozef Omiliak and his wife Clara Omiliak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. BALDWIN introduced Senate bill 877, to repeal the special taxes on manufacturers of and dealers in oleomargarine, and to repeal other taxes on oleomargarine which is not colored certain shades of yellow, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 878. A bill to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 879. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 880. A bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 881. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 882. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906;

S. 883. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes;

S. 884. A bill to provide for the killing of starlings in the District of Columbia; and

S. 885. A bill to provide for the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. MAYBANK introduced Senate bill 886, authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey a portion of the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the City Council of Charleston, S. C., free from the conditions contained in the act of May 27, 1936, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 887. A bill to provide a temporary immigration quota for Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 888, to provide more adequate and effective rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 889. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Aristides Govatsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 890. A bill to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 891. A bill for the relief of Ronald Clive Jack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 892. A bill to reclassify assistant postmasters and other supervisory positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CORDON (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 893. A bill to provide for the design and construction of highway bridges near certain dams; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 894. A bill to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to extend financial assistance to homestead entrymen, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 895. A bill authorizing the construction of a multipurpose reservoir on the Pend Oreille River in Idaho for flood control, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER (for himself and Mr. TAYLOR):

S. 896. A bill for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon Irrigation District under the Payette Division of the Boise Reclamation Project in Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 897. A bill for the relief of William Henry Tickner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 898. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 899. A bill to amend section 2 of the Act of January 29, 1942 (56 Stat. 21) relating to the refund of taxes illegally paid by Indian citizens; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. THYE, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. HENDRICKSON):

S. 900. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 901. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Kwang Sup Yum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 902. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer a captured submarine to the Museum of Science and Industry in the city of Chicago; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 903. A bill for the relief of Seweryn Cajtung, Masza Cajtung, Ryszard Cajtung, Stefa Pizyc, and Frania Goldberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. DOUGLAS also introduced Senate bill 904, to provide for research relating to child life and development; to disseminate information as to the practical application of such research by parents, professional persons and others; and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 905. A bill for the relief of John Sewen; and

S. 906. A bill for the relief of John Sewen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 907. A bill to provide for retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, at age fifty-eight in the case of employees who have rendered 25 years of service and who served in the armed forces during World War I or World War II; and

S. 908. A bill to prevent nepotism in appointments to governmental offices and positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 909, to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 910. A bill to provide increased retired pay for certain persons who performed active military or naval service during World War I,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 911. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.," approved July 2, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S. 912. A bill to provide for the transfer of War Housing Project No. Fla–VN–8342 to the city of Sebring, Fla.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself and Mr. HUNT):

S. 913. A bill to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., and transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make certain emergency and disaster loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 914. A bill for the relief of Gladys Inez Greenwood;

S. 915. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Johanna Dagnall;

S. 916. A bill for the relief of Ascanio Collodel;

S. 917. A bill to enable children under 21 years of age adopted by United States citizens to enter the United States as nonquota immigrants and to become naturalized;

S. 918. A bill for the relief of Clara Sogor;

S. 919. A bill for the relief of Dr. Leon L. Konchegul; and

S. 920. A bill recording the lawful entry for permanent residence into the United States and authorizing the naturalization of Ellen Rodriguez Moreno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 921. A bill to provide for the retirement of any judge of the United States District Courts for the Districts of Hawaii, or Puerto Rico, the District Court for the Territory of Alaska, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, or the District Court of the Virgin Islands, any justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, and any judge of the Circuit Courts of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LODGE. I introduce a bill and ask for a reference of it to the Armed Services Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and will be referred to the appropriate committee.

Mr. LODGE. That is the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not necessary for Senators to ask that bills go to certain committees, if they go there anyway; if they do not go there it is not proper to make the request.

By Mr. LODGE (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S. 922. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

(Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request) introduced Senate bill 923, to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MYERS:

S. J. Res. 52. Joint resolution to authorize vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the period from March 15 to December 15, 1949, inclusive; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## COLORED OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, for some time a troublesome issue concerned with the taxation of colored oleomargarine has been before the Senate. Like other Senators I have received a great deal of mail on the subject. It seems clear that housewives, as a whole, are anxious to have the tax on precolored margarine removed. It is my understanding that generally the dairy industry has no objection to the removal of such tax, provided adequate guaranties make sure oleomargarine is not sold as butter and make sure misleading inferences do not confuse the buyer. It is my own humble opinion that——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is compelled to admonish the Senator from Connecticut that debate is not now in order.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am merely making a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but that is debate, and the Chair has no way of knowing how long it would run. Under the rules the introduction of bills and joint resolutions is now in order, without debate and without remarks.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, would it be in order for me to introduce a bill and ask that the statement be inserted in the RECORD?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would be; and, without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 877) to repeal the special taxes on manufacturers of and dealers in oleomargarine, and to repeal other taxes on oleomargarine which is not colored certain shades of yellow, introduced by Mr. BALDWIN, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The statement presented by Mr. BALDWIN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BALDWIN

Mr. President, for some time a troublesome issue concerned with the taxing of colored oleomargarine has been before us here. Like other Senators, I have received a great deal of mail on this subject. It seems clear that housewives, as a whole, are anxious to have this tax on precolored margarine removed. It is my understanding that generally the dairy industry has no objection to the removal of such a tax provided adequate guaranties make sure that oleomargarine is not sold as butter and make sure that misleading inferences do not confuse the buyer.

It is my own opinion that were the tax removed without any other protective legislation, the price of butter might be reduced somewhat, but the price of oleomargarine would be substantially increased so that the housewife would gain little or nothing in the end.

Oleomargarine is a nutritious food and there appears to be no legitimate reason why it should be taxed so long as unwarranted or misleading claims are not made.

Unfortunately, unless there is some tax provision, the Federal Government would have little or no opportunity to prevent such claims.

I therefore propose, Mr. President, that certain color stipulations be established so that the tax will not be charged on oleomargarine if it is not colored the same shade of yellow as butter. Under this bill, which I am introducing, oleomargarine would be held to be yellow in color and therefore taxable only if it has a tint or shade containing between 1.6 and 15 degrees of yellow or of yellow and red collectively, but with an excess of yellow over red measured in the terms of the Lovibond tintometer scale or its equivalent.

In less confusing language this simply means that butter, which is also sometimes colored, would be a light yellow whereas oleomargarine would have to be colored a sufficiently dark yellow to be clearly distinguishable.

This bill would remove all special taxes on manufacturers of, and dealers in, oleomargarine so long as it is not colored certain light shades of yellow—that color area being left to butter.

## CONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF CHARLESTON ARMY BASE TERMINAL TO CITY COUNCIL OF CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, and ask that it be referred to the Armed Services Committee.

I wish to state at this time that section 2 of the bill may conflict with some city ordinances or State laws or Public Law 616, so I ask the Armed Services Committee to hold a hearing on the bill at their earliest convenience.

The bill (S. 886) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey a portion of the Charleston Army Base Terminal to the City Council of Charleston, S. C., free from the conditions contained in the Act of May 27, 1936, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

## ADEQUATE AND EFFECTIVE RENT CONTROL

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for more adequate and effective rent control, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining the bill may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 888) to provide more adequate and effective rent control until June 30, 1951, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MYERS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. MYERS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN INTRODUCING NEW BILL SETTING FORTH ALL RENT-CONTROL LAWS IN ONE MEASURE, SUPERSEDING S. 434, WHICH AMENDED PREVIOUS ACTS

This bill is identical in nearly all provisions with S. 434, which I introduced on January 13. That bill, in turn, had been generally similar to the bill which I introduced in the Eightieth Congress, S. 1741, which was intended to repair the damages to effective rent control caused by the passage of the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

The Eightieth Congress, however, in passing the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, although making some slight improvements from the 1947 act, had refused to close up the loopholes to effective regulation in the manner S. 1741 would have done, and so, earlier this year, I redrafted S. 1741 to fit present circumstances and reintroduced it as S. 434.

Both of my bills—that in the Eightieth Congress and S. 434—were amendments to existing legislation, just as the Housing and Rent Act of 1948 was an amendment to the Housing and Rent Act of 1947.

This new bill which I am introducing today is a clean bill which, instead of amending two previous acts, as S. 434 and the other Senate bills on rent control would do, sets out for the first time in one measure all of the provisions of law on rent control. The lawyers and the courts will have a much easier time understanding rent control if all of the provisions can be found in one measure rather than in three different acts passed in three different years.

But, I repeat, the major provisions of this new one-package bill are substantially identical with those of S. 434. It had been my intention to have this bill ready for introduction at the start of the session, but that was not possible. Months were spent in preparation of S. 434, in seeking to make it as effective as possible in dealing with the problems of rent inflation, and then additional weeks were necessary to redraft S. 434 into this bill.

I have given a copy of this new bill to Representative DOUGLAS, of California, and she has already introduced it in the House as House bill 2291. I am glad to have her cosponsorship on this measure.

She has called to my attention the fact that in her State there is a very serious problem of rent inflation involving permanent residents of trailer courts and tourist cabins. Under present laws, such accommodations are exempt from rent control. My previous bill, S. 434, would have maintained that exemption. However, inasmuch as this is regarded as a serious problem in certain States and areas, I have agreed to go along with those who are concerned about it and to revise this bill to provide machinery for recontrol of such accommodations wherever such recontrol is necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

That does not mean, of course, that all trailer courts and tourist courts occupied by permanent residents will be recontrolled. The Rent Administrator (as he would be known under this bill) would have the same authority he had in previous years to decontrol or refuse to recontrol any class of accommodations in any defense-rental area if he feels it is not necessary to have them under control.

The rent-control authorities used just such authority to decontrol transient hotels when that was originally done.

There is one other change in this bill from S. 434 and it is very important in a mechanical sense. This bill makes no provision whatsoever—as S. 434 did—for the continuation of present powers of the Housing Expediter (who would become under this bill the Rent Administrator) to require that new housing construction be held available for veterans for certain preference periods.

I want to emphasize that I am not against that provision—in fact, I am very much for it. But I do not think that such powers should be lodged with the agency assigned the duty of administering rent control. It should be, instead, a function of agencies concerned with housing.

I would like to suggest to the members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, now holding hearings on new housing legislation, that the housing bill reported out of committee be written to include provision for veterans' preference on new housing construction, so that these powers now assigned to the Housing Expediter shall not lapse.

In conclusion, I want to repeat that the purpose of this new bill, superseding S. 434, is to have in one statute all of the provisions of rent-control laws, so that the public will not be forced in the future to refer to the Rent Act of 1949, the Housing and Rent Act of 1948, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 to find the laws on rent control.

## RESEARCH RELATING TO CHILD LIFE AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DOUGLAS. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for a research program relating to child life and development, and ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the body of the RECORD a short synopsis and explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the synopsis and explanation of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 904) to provide for research relating to child life and development; to disseminate information as to the practical application of such research by parents, professional persons, and others; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The synopsis and explanation of the bill presented by Mr. DOUGLAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In 1912 an act of Congress established the United States Children's Bureau and authorized the Bureau "to investigate and report upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of children and child life." Although fundamentally a research agency ever since, the Children's Bureau today obtains funds for research only as a part of its limited administrative budget, and has no funds available to make grants to research centers or individuals to stimulate research in child life and development.

Purpose: To remedy these deficiencies, the National Child Research Act would establish in the Children's Bureau of the Federal Security Agency a program of research in child life and development. This would enable the Children's Bureau more effectively to carry out its basic functions, and would advance human knowledge of child development and community aspects of child life; new knowledge would then be made available to parents, appropriate professional people, and others so that the health and well-being of children could be improved.

Functions: In consultation with a National Advisory Council on Research in Child Life, the Federal Security Administrator would carry out the purposes of the act through the Children's Bureau which would—

1. Conduct integrated research in such areas of child life and development as stillbirths; infant, childhood, and maternal mortality; the parent-child relationship; the social, cultural, physical, and emotional factors in the development of the normal child; illegitimacy; cause and prevention of juvenile delinquency; and such socially and physically handicapping conditions as cerebral palsy. Such studies, outside the field of medical laboratory research, would involve the biological, medical, psychological, physical, and social aspects of child life and development.

2. Operate a national clearinghouse on child-life research which is in progress or being planned; disseminate information on the practical use of new knowledge gained through research; make grants for child-life research to public and private agencies; establish and maintain fellowships for qualified individual research specialists in the Children's Bureau and elsewhere; provide and maintain traineeships in pediatrics and child development in the Children's Bureau and elsewhere; and secure facilities appropriate to and necessary for these research functions of the Bureau.

National Advisory Council on Research in Child Life and Development: Comprised of 15 members and the Chief of the Children's Bureau and the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, ex officio, the council would represent scientists and the public, with at least half of its members being outstanding scientific authorities in child-life research. The council would review and recommend research projects or programs to be fostered by the Chief of the Children's Bureau through research grants to universities, centers, and individuals; would review applications for such research grants and make recommendations; and advise the Chief of the Bureau on accepting gifts for the research program.

Appropriations: For the first year of operation $7,500,000 would be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the act, with ensuing appropriations being sufficient to carry it out. Funds appropriated for research grants would remain available for 4 years after being first appropriated, if research work was authorized within the year.

General provisions: The act provides for necessary coordination among Government agencies in planning and conducting research in child life, and provides for an annual report to the Congress of activities under the act.

## EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PERSONS FROM INDUCTION UNDER SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

Mr. LANGER. I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to exempt persons who have served in the merchant marine of the United States from December 1940 until June 1948, from induction in the service under the Service Act, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 909) to exempt persons who served in the merchant marine of the United States between September 16, 1940, and June 24, 1948, from induction or service under the Selective Service Act of 1948, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The explanation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1. Merchant marine war veterans are specifically not exempted from the present draft and are being drafted.

2. The merchant marine had a higher percentage of men killed in World War II than did the armed forces, Army or Navy.

3. Merchant marine war veterans who completed a required period of service in the merchant marine were issued after the last war discharges similar to the Army and Navy's exempting them from further service. Congress also authorized service ribbons, medals for heroes, and uniforms for merchant marine sailors and in other ways recognized their service to their country. Merchant marine war veterans may well ask precisely what has happened in the period after the shooting ended to now warrant a complete reversal of treatment.

4. Reversing its former position the last Congress specifically voted to draft these war veterans. This law is now in effect and operation. These veterans ask, Were men fools to have fought and died in the merchant marine for the privilege of being treated as less than stay-at-home factory workers? Essential industry, conscientious objection, political office, and even marriage are now considered as greater sacrifices to our country than fighting in the merchant marine in time of war.

5. We can only feel that this action was taken to punish merchant marine veterans for two opinions held in some quarters namely:

A. "Merchant sailors were draft dodgers."

B. "The merchant marine got rich on the war."

What are the facts? In answer to the first charge it can only be said that if one were dodging the draft in the merchant marine, he was a fool as that was the service in which he stood the greatest chance of being killed. The merchant marine first met the German invader, while our armed forces were shocked and helpless. They did not run as attested to by our oil-soaked beaches. The merchant marine fought from then till the last shell of the war was fired. It was neither an easy nor quick victory. Our record of dead speaks for itself.

Did the merchant marine get rich on the war? The facts: The merchant marine man's pay, dollar for dollar, for time in service was equal to or less than the Army or Navy man's. It might be noted here that during the war about half of this merchant sailor's salary was paid by private shipowners and about half by the Government in the form of war-area bonuses. A merchantman receives no family allowance. This in itself is a very considerable item. In addition, the merchant marine war veteran receives no Government loans, Government schooling, free dental care, and other veterans' benefits. The disabled merchant marine war veteran receives no pension. That he gave a healthy body for a maimed, crippled one in his country's hour of need is a just due.

Case by individual case it can be proven that there is no substantial difference between what the merchantman and Army-Navy man received for their war service. The price merchant lives were purchased for was right. This will perhaps please some persons.

6. The current treatment accorded the merchant marine has materially weakened the United States military-defense position at a critical time. It has had the effect of adding aeroplanes and divisions to any potential enemy because:

In the event of the next world war young men and merchant-marine veterans would not sail as a merchantman because it has been proven the most dangerous service. Despite this fact after the war the merchant-marine veteran can expect to spend two additional years training for the Army, over and above the 4 to 5 years or more he has spent fighting on the sea. As a merchant-marine war veteran myself, I can authoritatively state that due to Government policy I will not fight another war in the merchant marine. Since I, like many merchant-marine veterans, was rejected in 1943 by the Naval Reserve and unacceptable except to the merchant marine, it is likely my 4 years of merchant-marine experience will, in event of the third world war, be put to good effect in a victory garden. It is much safer and Government policy to victory gardeners did not change to aversion when the war ended. In the event of world war III, the Government would be forced to draft men and thus extend to them the status of servicemen to sail the merchant ships. This would necessitate fresh training of crews for the merchant-marine War Two veteran will not want to serve as a merchant sailor again or will have by then completed his Army training and have become a soldier. Of course, the soldier could be sent to a merchant ship, but then his Army training would have been wasted. Training men costs millions of dollars in taxpayers' money. Trained men are a war commodity and equally as valuable as the rare metals we are stock piling. More important, a trained man cannot be purchased in dollars alone but must be purchased in time. We are not now able to say how much of this latter commodity we possess. Under present Army manpower quotas the number of men to be drafted is limited and it seems our citizens would be getting more for their tax dollar in the way of protection if this training were given to novices and not to men who are now already fully trained and with actual war experience under their belt and who are able, if ordered, to leave for any point on the globe inside of 24 hours.

I ask you as a Congressman to vote in favor of a fair treatment of merchant sailors when this bill comes up. If this bill does not come up I hope you will introduce it. I ask you to do this for the best interest of the Nation as a whole and as a matter of decency to the men who fought and died in the merchant marine whose fine war record has now been made an object of public scorn and derision. This ridicule from a Nation that owes much to her merchant marine, I'm afraid, will live in the minds of these men as it is not something they can take lightly or easily forget. It is to be hoped this condition can and will be remedied.

Our country vitally needs a strong and intelligently run merchant marine in peace as much as in war. Such a fleet can only come through consistently wise and long-range planning. It is a problem requiring study and mature judgment by competent experts, civil and military. A good merchant marine no more "just happens" than a good fighting Navy "just happens." It is sincerely hoped we shall have both in the years to come.

## DEVELOPMENT AND CONSERVATION OF CERTAIN RESOURCES IN SUBMERGED COASTAL LANDS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which was sent to the President of the Senate on February 1, by Secretary Forrestal, Attorney General Clark, and Secretary Krug, for the administration of the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States.

The bill (S. 923) to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States, introduced by Mr. O'MAHONEY (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from the three Cabinet members submitting the bill may be printed at length in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
*Washington, D. C., February 1, 1949.*

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
*President of the Senate.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "to promote the development and conservation of certain resources in the submerged coastal lands adjacent to the shores of the United States."

This proposed legislation is similar to, but not identical with, the proposed legislation on this subject which we jointly submitted to the Congress on February 6, 1948. The previous proposal was introduced in the Senate as S. 2165, Eightieth Congress, and in the House of Representatives as H. R. 5528 and H. R. 5890, Eightieth Congress.

There is attached to the proposed bill an explanatory statement which summarizes and discusses its provisions in detail. We should like to supplement that explanatory statement in two respects.

The first additional comment relates to the matter of the distribution of the moneys received by the Federal Government from oil and gas operations in the submerged coastal lands. The proposed bill is silent on the subject, and hence, unless it is passed in a form expressly making other disposition of such income, all proceeds derived by the Government under the legislation will be paid into the Treasury of the United States and credited to miscellaneous receipts. In this connection, the Congress may wish to consider whether the States off whose shores operations under the legislation are conducted have equities which justify the payment of some portion of the income to them.

The second additional comment concerns the acreage-limitation provisions of the bill, sections 4 (a) and 6 (a). These sections are identical with the provisions of S. 2165 and H. R. 5528, but a brief explanatory comment seems in order. Section 4 (a) places a ceiling of 64,000 acres on the quantity of land that can be included in a lease at the time of its issuance, and this maximum figure is subject to certain requirements for subsequent reduction in the acreage, so that at the end of the fifth year of a lease the acreage shall not exceed 7,680 acres. Section 6 (a) prescribes an acreage limitation on the leases that can be held per person, the maximum being 128,000 acres under lease to a person (of which not more than 30,720 acres may be held under producing leases) in any one of the following costal regions: The Pacific Ocean or the Gulf of Mexico or the Atlantic Ocean. The reasons for suggesting in this proposed legislation-acreage limitation provisions that are more generous than those under the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U. S. C., 1946 ed., sec. 184) are set out on page 6 of the explanatory statement. We should like to make clear to the Congress, however, that these suggestions as to acreage limitations are matters of judgment and that they are not based on actual experience in the administration of a Federal program of oil and gas development in the submerged coastal lands.

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted as soon as possible, with such amendments and modifications relating to the two matters discussed herein as Congress may deem advisable.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed bill to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES FORRESTAL,
*Secretary of Defense.*
TOM CLARK,
*Attorney General.*
J. A. KRUG,
*Secretary of the Interior.*

## CONDEMNATION OF COURT PROCEEDINGS IN CASE OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—AMENDMENT

Mr. IVES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution (S. Res. 57) condemning court proceedings in the case of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, which was referred to the Committe on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

## FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on Monday the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and

the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], and myself introduced Senate bill 834, to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred and defense-incurred school enrollments, for the construction of additional school facilities. At this time I submit amendments to that bill for reference to the Committee on Public Works, the committee to which the bill was referred, and I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be printed in the RECORD. The amendments are intended to be proposed by the same sponsors of the bill and myself.

There being no objection, the amendments were referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amend title by inserting after the word "enrollments," the words "or by Federal activity in such districts." Amend section 1 by inserting, after the word "establishment", on line 1, page 2, the following: "(3) by reason of the school districts being overburdened, as the result of activities in such district, by any department or independent establishment (including a wholly owned Government corporation) of the Federal Government;".

## HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 1211. An act to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1243. An act to amend the Hatch Act; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERPED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 19) to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the arrest and imprisonment of Archbishop Stepinac of Yugoslavia and Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## RESEARCH ON FAMILY ASPECTS OF CHRONIC ILLNESSES

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Whereas the family is a dynamic unit in the maintenance of American educational, social, and economic standards; and

Whereas the family is the fountainhead of hereditary and environmental influences operative on the health of the individual; and

Whereas chronic illness is a significant cause of economic and social disruption of the American family; and

Whereas the greatest public-health problem today is the control of chronic diseases of long duration and insidious onset; and

Whereas the study and treatment of prolonged physical and mental disorders has hitherto concentrated on the individual, usually without consideration of family environment and hereditary proneness; and

Whereas failure to consider the familial aspects of disease may preclude successful health service to the individual and adequate protection for other members of the family unit; and

Whereas certain fundamental research conducted in Hagerstown and Washington County, Md., on the family prevalence, incidence, and mortality from heart disease, cancer, and other chronic diseases reveals an interrelationship between these diseases and family composition and environment; and

Whereas such studies thus far conducted have been on a limited scale, and have not involved integrated action of professional services: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That it is the sense of the Congress that research on the familial aspects of chronic illness and investigation of practical methods of furnishing family health services should be expanded and intensified, and that the United States Public Health Service should extend its activities toward this end.

## INVESTIGATION OF RETRIAL OF GREEK MARITIME UNION LEADERS BY GREEK COURTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I submit a resolution relating to an investigation of retrial of Greek maritime union leader by Greek courts, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanation of the resolution be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The resolution (S. Res. 69) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the retrial by the courts of Greece of Antonios Ambatielos, general secretary of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions; Vasilios Bekakos, president of the Panhellenic Marine Engineers Association; and other Greek maritime union leaders, on charges growing out of the same activities for which they have heretofore been tried by such courts. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations.

The explanation of the resolution presented by Mr. LANGER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On February 1, 1949, Antonios Ambatielos, general secretary of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions, and Vasilios Bekakos, president of the Panhellenic Marine Egineers Association, began a new trial for their lives with a group of 34 others, including many Greek seamen, some of whom have already been tried with the two top Greek maritime union leaders. Ambatielos and Bekakos and eight other maritime heads were sentenced to death by a Greek court last November on the same or similar charges on which they are now being retried. A third union leader, Timogiannakis, undergoes his second trial later this month. Even under present Greek laws it is illegal to try anyone twice for the same offenses.

The 10 maritime union leaders were temporarily saved from the firing squad last November as a result of a wave of protests from labor and democrats the world over, including direct United Nations intervention, wherein Herbert Evatt, Foreign Minister of Australia, and then President of the United Nations General Assembly, asked a suspension of execution on the grounds that such an act would lessen the hope of the Greek people for peace and the ending of the civil war. Other protests poured in from the British Trades Union Council and its president, Will Lawther, from Louis Saillant and Leon Jouhoux, leaders of the left and right wings of the French labor movement, from a large group of members of the British House of Lords and Commons, from Harold Laski, of the British Labor Party, and from leading American public figures. Protests came from the World Federation of Trade Unions, from trade unions in Australia, Sweden, Scotland, Canada, Italy, etc., from 14 American international and many local unions and from the CIO maritime committee. The foreign policy resolution of the 1948 national convention of the CIO condemned "the execution of trade-union leaders in Greece and other countries for carrying out their legitimate trade-union activities."

Obviously, the aim of the Greek Government in conducting the illegal retrials is to bypass United Nations and world protests by trying and executing the leaders one by one and two by two with groups of other Democrats, thus hoping to attract less attention.

### FACTS ABOUT THE FIRST TRIAL

The original indictment against the 10 maritime leaders and the thirty-odd seamen tried with them covered the activities of the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions since its formation in 1941. Significantly, it made no mention of the fact that, during the war, carrying out its pledge to keep the Allied ships sailing, the FGMU lost a greater percentage of its members than any other Allied maritime or military force, earning the highest praise from American and British statesmen.

The 57-page outline of the indictment was made available to 30 defense attorneys for 2 hours on two occasions during which period the attorneys had to read what they could from a single copy. The chief accused, Ambatielos and Bekakos, encountered particular difficulties in finding defense counsel because of the difficulties and personal dangers risked by lawyers themselves when defending prisoners unpopular with the Athens government.

Five of the accused were women. Three who had given evidence on October 25 repudiated their written depositions at the trial, stating that these were extracted from them by police beatings. One young woman, Mrs. Pandelidou, stated that she will suffer injuries for the rest of her life as a result of the Gestapo tortures. Another, Mrs. Cosmidou, collapsed in court as she muttered, "Stop beating me. I know nothing." After a governmental medical examination, she was found to be too ill to attend proceedings for the next 2 days. The trial went on without her.

Another of the accused, George Frangos, gave evidence which differed considerably from his written deposition. Frangos stated that he had given earlier testimony under duress but that now that he was under oath he was compelled to tell the truth. Denying that money had been sent to the guerrillas by the maritime unionists, he testified that all his dealings with them were strictly of a trade-union character.

During the trial the judge insisted on himself answering questions put to Ambatielos. Upon reading telegrams of protest from Louis Saillant, secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions and Leon Jouhoux, secretary of the anti-Communist French Force Ouvriere, the judge remarked to the court, "Communists in the guise of trade unionists." One can have little doubt of the fate which would befall the internationally known Saillant and Jouhoux at the hands of this jurist who took the position that Communists should automatically receive the death sentence.

In an effort to insure at least the semblance of a free trial for their leaders, the Greek seamen in the United States and Britain retained attorneys to defend their leaders. William Standard, the American attorney, was denied a Greek visa by the Greek consular authorities here. The British attorney, Simmons, was also denied entry to Greece. Lawyers organizations in the United

States (National Lawyers Guild) and Britain (Haldane Society) protested these exclusions but without result.

WHY THE GREEK GOVERNMENT ATTACKS THE FGMU

In 1943 the FGMU succeeded in winning the first contract ever won by the Greek maritime workers, the Cardiff agreement which was approved by the Greek Government. After the liberation from the Germans, the Greek Government established its own company union, the Panhellenic Nautical Federation which had been founded by the prewar dictator, John Metaxas. In 1947 the PNF signed an agreement with the shipowners annulling many of the hard-won gains of the Greek seamen. The FGMU refused to become a party to such a contract. It was then that the Greek Government arrested Ambatielos and Bekakos and raided and closed the FGMU headquarters in Piraeus, Greece. Soon afterward, the union was outlawed, its newspaper raided and closed. FGMU branches in Alexandria, Buenos Aires, and Antwerp were closed at the instigation of the Greek authorities there.

Government decrees made it illegal to ask for extra pay for extra work (such as the opening and closing of hatches in port which is the job of shore workers and for which American seamen receive a minimum of $1.50 hourly when they have to do it) and the traditional bonus after 6 months of continuous sailing aboard the same ship. Ship (or shop) committees, the kernel of American and other trade-union organizations, were outlawed. Greek seamen signing on Greek ships were asked to sign a yellow-dog contract repudiating the FGMU and abandoning all rights to extra work pay, the continuous service bonus, etc., under penalty of confiscation of their seamen's books and deportation to Greece for court martial if they refused. One thousand five hundred Greek seamen were blacklisted and forbidden to sail on Greek ships for various offenses including complaints of unhealthy food conditions aboard the vessels. A governmental decree ordered seizure of the seamen's papers of 600 seamen and their deportation to Greece for court martial on charges of mutiny for like offenses. A 30-man Greek gestapo, headed by a Greek gendarme, Microulis, who is an officer of the Greek security police, was established on American soil to terrorize Greek seamen sailing from American ports.

HOW AN AMERICAN COURT DECIDED A TYPICAL CASE OF MUTINY

Proof that the attack against the 10 maritime leaders is simply another attempt of the Greek Government to smash a bona fide trade-union and depress the wage and living standards of the Greek maritime workers is evidenced by the attempt to obtain deportation of Greek seamen on American soil that they may share the fate of their leaders in Greece. A case in point is that of four Greek members of the crew of the Greek ship S. S. *Syros* who were charged with mutiny, assault, and disobedience for claiming extra pay for extra work and the traditional bonus.

The four were hailed before the Federal District Court of Eastern Pennsylvania by Andreas Georgakopoulos, Greek harbor master for New York on the above charges. He asked that the men be turned over to him for deportation to Greece to face court martial. In denying the petition of Georgakopoulos, Judge J. Welsh, who heard the case, decided: (No. 421 of 1948, filed January 28, 1949):

"The evidence indicates quite clearly that the principal controversy between the ship owner and the crew in this case arises out of the claims for extra pay for opening and closing hatches on the steamship *Syros* under a custom existing at the time of the collective agreement of 1943 and still prevailing, and the refusal of the crew to perform that work without extra pay. It appears also that three of the respondents, prior to their service on the steamship *Syros*, had asserted claims for wage bonuses for continuous service under the Cardiff agreement while serving on the steamship *Kyvernitis*. Claims of both those classes were in effect outlawed by the Athens agreement of 1947, to which the respondents and their union were not parties, which agreement was adopted and sought to be enforced by the Ministry of Mercantile Marine. * * *

"Without a judicial determination of the rights of the respondent seamen to the compensation claimed, their conduct in refusing to do extra work without extra pay, and in claiming bonuses under an agreement they deemed to be still in force, has been characterized as unlawful disobedience for which they must be deprived of their seamen's credentials, repatriated, and punished. That members of the crew took issue against actions of the Greek Government in a matter in which a large part of the western world took issue (note: protests against the execution of the 10 Greek maritime union leaders), that they collected funds for their union, made some complaint as to the ship's food and concertedly solicited the master to reinstate Zannos, were not of sufficient importance to induce the master to impose disciplinary measures. Nor are they deemed sufficient to change the character of the dispute from one involving claims for compensation, to one involving mutiny or other disorder on the vessel for which this court might provide an aid to punishment."

Thus, while their leaders wait for death and illegal retrials in their Athens dungeons, the Greek seamen who had the luck to be tried in an American court are today free to pursue their calling, earning money to support their struggling families in Greece.

While the *Syros* case was being tried in Philadelphia, members of the Philadelphia Maritime Committee for Public Action headed by William E. Collier of the United Mine Workers and comprised of all A. F. of L., CIO, and independent maritime unions there, condemned the use of the American courts and other institutions by the Greek authorities in the United States to terrorize and intimidate Greek seamen sailing from American ports.

THE GREEK GOVERNMENT ATTACK AGAINST THE GREEK SEAMEN HURTS AMERICAN MARITIME INDUSTRY AS WELL

American maritime workers are already feeling the effects of unemployment and danger to their wage and living standards as a result of cheaper foreign competition. The tactics of the Greek shipowners and Government have made Greek-owned ships the greatest rival to the American industry. For, on the one hand, the Greek Government acts as an agent of the Greek shipowners, imprisoning, executing and blacklisting active union members who ask for their rights and wages (which happen to be considerably lower than those of American seamen). On the other hand, Greek industrialists, complaining that they "do not know how to keep books," have been avoiding the payment of most income and corporation taxes, unlike their American rivals. Moreover, in order to avoid even the few taxes asked by the Greek Government, Greek shipowners have been switching the flags of their vessels to flags of countries asking even lower taxes and whose maritime workers are not adequately protected by trade-unions.

In registering such a complaint, referring to the damage done to Canadian seamen by the Greek shipowners, Eric C. Adams, economic consultant to the Canadian Seamen's Union, wrote to Hoyt S. Haddock, executive secretary of the CIO Maritime Committee, on January 7, 1949: "While a few Canadian vessels have been sold to Panamanian registry the most disruptive influence in the industry is the switching of articles on Canadian registered vessels. Under Canadian law, a Canadian vessel whose articles run out in a foreign port may take on the articles of the foreign port. The Greeks are using this device since they operate as tramps and are thus able to arrange the expiration of 'time' articles for arrival in British, Panamanian, or other foreign ports. The owners then tell the Canadian crews they have the option of signing on foreign articles at lower wages and inferior working conditions, or being shipped home. To date, at least 13 vessels have adopted this device of getting out from under Canadian collective agreements and labor laws."

Thus we are confronted with a situation wherein the Greek Government and shipowners, using funds derived from American aid, are operating on American soil, employing every antilabor device condemned by American labor traditions, to beat down the working and living standards of Greek maritime workers and hurting American maritime workers as well. The operating costs of the Greek ships have decreased, profits have increased, and the Greek shipper thus enjoys a great advantage over the American shipowner, who cannot compete on equal terms. Ironically enough, many of the Greek ship purchases have been underwritten by the Greek Government with American-aid money.

According to figures published in the Naftika Chronika, London magazine of the Greek shipowners, of July 1, 1948, the Greek flag ship fleet consists of 300 ships, totaling 1,283,090 tons. Of these, 96 are Liberty ships purchased from the United States and underwritten by the Greek Government with American-aid money. Greek-owned ships flying foreign flags include 70 British freighters, 191 ships under Panamanian flags, and 19 ships under Honduran flags.

The Greek shipowners make it clear that they fully appreciate the advantages obtained through government intervention. The same issue of Naftika Chronika writes happily: "Our owners, large and small, benefit from the operation of the American ships. Their operating expenses are high, about 40 percent above those of Greek ships, even higher when compared with the Panamanian." The July 15, 1948, issue wrote: "The only encouraging fact for the consideration of the Greek cargoes and the Greek-owned Panamanian fleet is the increasing disappearance from the market of the American tramp steamers. The existing rates, even though higher for the Americans, do not cover the expense of the American Liberty ships. Statistics show that many are being returned to the United States Maritime Commission; 1,500 were chartered last year, today only 650 are in service. Perhaps the number will drop even lower. The fact that the number of American ships decreases facilitates the operation of the Greek cargo industry."

The Greek seamen and their organization, the Federation of Greek Maritime Unions, denounces the attempts of the Greek Government—climaxed by the death sentences against the 11 Greek maritime union leaders (Evangelos Claoudatos was condemned 2 months before the others) and their illegal retrial—to break their bona fide trade-union organizations. They call upon labor and democrats of the entire world to help them in their fight to save their leaders. They particularly look to their American brothers and friends to aid this fight by demanding that the death sentences of the 11 Greek maritime union leaders be commuted and the unprecedented retrials stopped immediately.

PRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT ENTITLED "COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON CENTRAL AND SOUTHERN FLORIDA FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND OTHER PURPOSES"

Mr. HOLLAND submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 70), which, with

the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That there be printed for the Senate document room 1,000 additional copies of House Document No. 643, Eightieth Congress, second session, entitled "Comprehensive Report on Central and Southern Florida for Flood Control and Other Purposes."

NOTICE OF HEARING BEFORE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to say that as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency we have set next Tuesday, at 10:30 a. m., to consider the so-called Murray resolution, the so-called Wherry resolution, and other matters in connection with small business, and we should like to have any Senators testify who desire to do so.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SESSIONS OF THE SENATE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which is continuing its present hearings, I ask unanimous consent that committee hearings may be held during the sessions of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF OSWALD RYAN AS A MEMBER OF THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement I have prepared with respect to the appointment of Oswald Ryan to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is with the greatest of pleasure that I have this opportunity to rise before the United States Senate and recommend the confirmation of the appointment of Oswald Ryan to another term as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

A true Hoosier, who was born in Anderson, Ind., Mr. Ryan has displayed that characteristic of public service which has symbolized the growth of America into the greatest Nation in the world.

His record as general counsel for the Federal Power Commission from 1932 to 1938 prompted the late President Roosevelt to select him for membership on the United States Civil Aeronautics Authority when that division of our Government was first formed in 1938.

He continued to give his exceptional services to the Civil Aeronautics Board following the change to that title and in 1943 he was rewarded by reappointment.

Mr. Ryan has again been honored by President Truman through his nomination for further service to the extremely important duty of assisting in the development of aviation in this country.

He attended Butler University in Indianapolis, Ind., before going to Harvard for his law degree.

Later he practiced law in Anderson and served as state's attorney there until he entered the service in World War I.

After the war he served as city attorney of Anderson and again as state's attorney until his selection as general counsel to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, it is indeed a privilege for me to recommend to this Senate the confirmation of Mr. Oswald Ryan.

REMOVAL OF EXPORT LIMITS ON FATS, OILS, AND OIL-BEARING SEEDS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to read a statement which has just come in on the news ticker. It is as follows:

Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer said he is willing to remove export limits on fats and oils and oil-bearing seeds.

However, he will withhold final action until a study of the proposal is made by the International Emergency Food Committee.

The committee previously said it favored continued control over the commodity.

This course, Sawyer said, has been approved by the State Department and the Agriculture Department.

Sawyer said he hoped the committee would take prompt action and that in the absence of early word from it, he would go ahead with his plans.

If he does, he will place fats and oils on an open-end export basis, which requires exporters to obtain licenses from the Commerce Department but which sets no quotas.

Mr. President, I wish to make only one observation, and that is that I am delighted that the Senate of the United States wrote into the export-control bill the provision that the Secretary of Agriculture could make the determination rather than have some bureaucratic committee investigate what the Secretary of Commerce himself says he would like to do. In the meantime the prices of cottonseed, soybean, and other edible vegetable oils and fats from the farms continue to decline.

WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC CONFERENCE ON NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Check and Balances—America's Greatest Need," delivered by him on January 29, 1949, in Washington, D. C., before the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense; which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES BY SENATOR SMITH OF MAINE AND DR. K. FRANCES SCOTT BEFORE THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC.

[Mr. KNOWLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator SMITH of Maine and the introductory address by Dr. K. Frances Scott before the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., on January 3, 1949, at Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., which appear in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY DINNER ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR DEWEY

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Lincoln Day dinner address delivered by Governor Dewey, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on February 8, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE AMBASSADOR FROM NORWAY AT THE CHRISTMAS CARNIVAL, BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

[Mr. SPARKMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the Ambassador from Norway, Wilhelm Morgenstierne, at a banquet given as a part of the Christmas carnival at Birmingham, Ala., on November 27, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIBUTE BY SENATOR WITHERS TO LT. GEN. SIMON BOLIVAR BUCKNER

[Mr. WITHERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a tribute prepared by him to the memory of Lt. Gen. Simon Bolivar Buckner, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE IN MAINTAINING BERLIN AIRLIFT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him entitled "Nation Should Honor Air Force for Success of Berlin Airlift," which appears in the Appendix.]

OIL PRODUCTION IN TEXAS—STATEMENT BY ERNEST O. THOMPSON

[Mr. JOHNSON of Texas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement concerning the production of oil in Texas, made by Ernest O. Thompson, commissioner, Railroad Commission of Texas, which appears in the Appendix.]

PETER MARSHALL, LATE CHAPLAIN OF THE SENATE

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him in tribute to Rev. Peter Marshall, late Chaplain of the Senate, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S DAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE SHEBOYGAN (WIS.) PRESS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "President Truman's Day," published in the January 24, 1949, issue of the Sheboygan Press of Sheboygan, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

TIME TO STOP, LOOK, LISTEN—EDITORIAL FROM THE KANSAS CITY STAR

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Time to Stop, Look, Listen," from the Kansas City Star of February 6, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICANS HAVE SUFFERED THE TORTURES INFLICTED ON CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a press release by the Department of State dated October 7, 1948, depicting the circumstances under which two American officials were forced to sign false confessions by the Hungarian Government, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION — ADDRESS BY DR. GEORGE W. TAYLOR

[Mr. DOUGLAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address, entitled "Is Compulsory Arbitration Possible?," recently delivered by Dr. George W. Taylor, former Chairman of the War Labor Board, and a brief foreword by himself, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICAN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY DR. EDWIN E. WITTE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Where Are We at in Industrial Relations?," delivered by Dr. Edwin E. Witte, professor at the University of Wisconsin, at the first annual meeting of the Industrial Research Relations Association, on December 30, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PATRONAGE JOBS—EDITORIAL FROM THE STARS AND STRIPES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Patronage Jobs," published in the January 6, 1949, issue of the Stars and Stripes, which appears in the Appendix.]

TVA AFTER 15 YEARS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "TVA After 15 Years," published in the New York Times, January 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATOMIC DEVELOPMENT—NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. MCMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD three articles regarding atomic-energy development, two from the Washington Post and one from the Washington Star, which appear in the Appendix.]

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S INTEREST IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF AFRICA—ARTICLE FROM THE COLORADO STATESMAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Colorado Statesman concerning the development of Africa, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL HEALTH PROBLEM—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MAGNUSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times regarding the national health problem, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMPUTATION OF COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 128) to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG conferees on the part of the Senate.

POSTPONEMENT OF DATE OF REPORTING LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably House Concurrent Resolution 22, and I submit a report (No. 48) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution was read, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am somewhat confused. Let me address an inquiry to the majority leader. It was my understanding that the business of the Senate today was to be confined to a debate on the District of Columbia daylight-saving-time bill. I did not know that this resolution would be ready for debate today. The chairman of the committee has reported the concurrent resolution, and is asking unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Personally I do not intend to object to the immediate consideration of this resolution, but I want Members of the Senate to know that this is a highly important question. It is a question of placing a ceiling limitation on the budget this year. According to the Reorganization Act, however, the legislative budget must be reported and acted upon by February 15.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am in favor of that. I think the resolution should be considered, but I think we should know what the Federal expenditures are to be. If we do not, the very spirit of the Reorganization Act is circumvented.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to yield the floor in a moment, so that the Senator from Massachusetts may address a question to the Senator from Tennessee.

Personally, I am not objecting to the consideration of this resolution at this time. I think it should be considered. However, I want Members on this side of the aisle to know that this is a very important matter. Some of our Members may not be able to be present, because I informed them that the immediate legislation for consideration would be the District of Columbia daylight-saving-time bill.

However, we are confronted with the dilemma that if we do not consider and act upon this resolution by February 15, we shall be guilty of postponing this question beyond that date. I believe that the resolution should be adopted. We should have the report before us. We ought to know what the appropriations are to be. When I say that, I think I reecho all the observations made by Members on this side of the aisle when this question was before the Senate on a previous occasion.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Is not this the same question which we had under consideration 2 years ago?

Mr. WHERRY. It was last year.

Mr. BALDWIN. At that time the Republicans asked for an extension.

Mr. WHERRY. They certainly did.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did they ask for an extension for the same reason for which the majority party is now asking for an extension?

Mr. WHERRY. I presume that the end results would probably be the same, except that at this particular time the Democratic Party is in control of the administration and in control of the various branches of government.

Mr. BALDWIN. All I have to suggest is that perhaps it should be stated for the RECORD that we would like to say the same things against extension that the Democrats said a year ago, so that we may be "even Stephen."

Mr. MCKELLAR obtained the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. LODGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to clear up one point. I believe the Senator from Nebraska may have left that point in question. Last year the Republicans did not ask for an extension.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. BRIDGES. We complied with the law. It so happened that the Senator from New Hampshire, in presenting the question, pointed out the hardships under which we were laboring in making our recommendation, but we asked for no extension. We complied with the law.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. This is a question of considerable importance. Why can it not be made the unfinished business, so that we may proceed with the morning hour in the normal way?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I shall be glad to answer that question. The reason is that last year a similar resolution failed because of lack of time. The 15th of February rolled around before the two Houses could agree. There was a conference, and there was objection, and therefore no resolution was passed. Yesterday the committee ordered this resolution reported to the Senate. I shall read from the report of the committee, because it was put in, and very properly so, at the request of our Republican friends, and because I think everyone voted for it:

> The committee realizing that there should be a complete resurvey of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which is the section pertaining to the legislative budget, respectfully suggests to the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget that it carefully study section 138 of the act with a view to making recommendations as to whether section 138 should be repealed, whether it should be amended, or whether in lieu of the method prescribed in section 138 for fixing a more effective control over appropriations and expenditures, Congress should provide for an omnibus appropriation bill as a means of placing before the Congress the over-all appropriation figure and permitting the Congress to have before it for action all the ensuing fiscal year appropriation bills at one time.

That was put in in order to have the joint committee look into the whole matter and make its report to the Congress. I see no objection at all to it, and I think it should satisfy everyone.

All of us realize that in the committee it is impossible in the next 4 or 5 days to arrive at a legislative budget or budget estimate, and the time should be extended so that we can submit a report on the budget estimate.

In view of what our experience has been and in view of what the experience of the Appropriations Committee was last year, I hope all Senators will agree

to the request, and I appeal to Senators to let the concurrent resolution be adopted as the best way out of the difficulty which confronts us, and the only way that is now open to us.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask the Senator why it is proposed that the Senate act on this matter during the morning hour. It seems to me it would be a very bad practice to start rushing things through during the morning hour, and would lead to all sorts of confusion. I wonder why we cannot take up this matter after we conclude the morning hour, and then make the concurrent resolution the unfinished business and deal with it today. It seems to me that the practice, which is beginning here, of legislating during the morning hour is most unsound.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Massachusetts or if the Senate thinks that would be the better method of arranging the matter, I am perfectly willing to ask unanimous consent a little later. But it seems to me that it is obvious that there cannot be a report from the committee within the time limit fixed by the law, and so it is our duty to extend the time to a date by which we can have a report from the committee, which is May 1. So I think that should be done.

Mr. McCLELLAN and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McKELLAR. I promised to yield to the Senator from Arkansas, and I now yield to him.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS DURING SENATE SESSION—POSTPONEMENT OF DATE OF REPORTING LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I do not wish to object to the request for unanimous consent made by the Senator from Tennessee; but I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to meet and to continue hearings this afternoon, while the Senate is in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas? The Chair hears none.

Mr. FERGUSON. I object.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Michigan to object?

Mr. FERGUSON. I did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then that ends the matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I address an observation to the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan objected to the consideration of this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe it was to the request for the consideration of the concurrent resolution that the Senator from Michigan objected.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I object to having the concurrent resolution taken up during the morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair ask the Senator from Michigan to what he was objecting.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to propound a parliamentary: What is the question before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, the unanimous-consent request propounded by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], to which the Senator from Massachusetts has now objected.

The other unanimous-consent request was made by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and was that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit and hold hearings during the session of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me make the record clear. I wish to object to having the Senator from Tennessee bring up the concurrent resolution at this time. I thought that was the question before the Senate. I have no objection to the sitting this afternoon of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan objected to the consideration of the concurrent resolution reported by the Senator from Tennessee; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is granted; and on objection the concurrent resolution goes to the calendar; or if the Senator from Tennessee desires to have the concurrent resolution remain on the table until a later hour, he has a right to have that done.

Mr. McKELLAR. Must I obtain unanimous consent to have that done? I should appreciate it very much if the Senate would allow the concurrent resolution to lie on the table, so that it may be brought up a little later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have no objection to having it brought up later. It was merely to having it brought up at this particular time that I objected.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry to the distinguished occupant of the chair, in reference to what has happened relative to the objection to the request made by the Senator from Tennessee: If unanimous consent had been granted, would not the concurrent resolution have been debatable at that time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It would.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly. I merely wished to make the RECORD clear, because it was my understanding that the rule would permit free discussion and debate at that time, either before the morning hour was concluded or afterward.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the Senate gives unanimous consent, out of order, to take up a bill out of order, during the morning hour, it is debatable.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is during the call of the calendar that the 5-minute rule applies.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

I should like to make one more observation, Mr. President. When the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] asked me whether the Republicans had requested an extension, my observation was that the end point result of the discussion last year was that an extension occurred, but I point out that the debate hinged around the evidence submitted in justification of the estimate, and not on an extension. We did not ask for an extension. The debate was based on the question of whether we could substantiate the amount of the estimate. However, I repeat, we did not ask for an extension. That is why I feel that, in keeping with the spirit of the Reorganization Act, we should not delay, but should see that the matter is taken care of between now and the time set by the Reorganization Act, which is February 15.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BALDWIN. Did the Republicans ask for an extension in 1947?

Mr. WHERRY. No; we did not ask for an extension at any time.

Mr. BALDWIN. In other words, both in 1947 and in 1948 we submitted a legislative budget within the time set by the law; is that correct?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. The debate which occurred centered around the report and the evidence submitted in justification of the estimate.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF SENATE RESOLUTION 57

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Monday I offered Senate Resolution 57, which calls upon the Senate to condemn the arrest and trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. The resolution was offered on behalf of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senators from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and myself. I now ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be added as cosponsors of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, apropos of the request made by the Senator from New Hampshire, I ask unanimous consent, out of order, to submit at this time an amendment to the resolution which the Senator from New Hampshire has

offered. The resolution says nothing about the conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty. But I think that should be in the resolution, to make it fully effective from that standpoint.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York asks unanimous consent, out of order, to offer for the information of the Senate an amendment to Senate Resolution 57, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES.] Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Are there any further concurrent or other resolutions? If not, the morning business is concluded.

### POSTPONEMENT OF DATE OF REPORTING LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee a few moments ago attempted by unanimous consent to get before the Senate a very important measure. There was some objection to it until the morning hour was concluded. I sincerely hope the Senate will permit the Senator from Tennessee to have this very important resolution considered, because of the time element involved.

That really is the essence of it. If we cannot obtain unanimous consent, the resolution would have to go to the calendar, and on Monday we would have to debate the resolution and try to adopt it, which I think we could do. It simply means that much delay. In view of the fact that a number of Members on the Republican side will be away, it seems to me this would be the proper time to debate the resolution, if there is to be a debate on it. I hope unanimous consent may be obtained.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 22, which went to the calendar a little while ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 22, which the Clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the date of reporting the legislative budget, as set forth in section 138 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as it may apply to the budget for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, is hereby postponed until May 1, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I do not object to its present consideration. I suggest, however, that the majority leader perhaps might request a quorum call before the debate begins, so that all Senators may be present .

Mr. LUCAS. I shall be glad to do that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) postponing to May 1, 1949, the date of reporting the legislative budget.

Mr. LUCAS. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum.

### MEETING OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming before suggesting the absence of a quorum.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has been holding sessions all this week in the morning. Today, however, the House of Representatives is not in session. The Senate, of course, will be in session. The Secretary of Agriculture was to appear before the committee this afternoon. In order that the work of the committee and of the House Members may not be interrupted, I ask unanimous consent that the committee may sit this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LUCAS. I want to say to my distinguished friend from Wyoming, I had the order in front of me and I apologize for not making the request. I was just getting around to it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is no need for apologizing, I may say to the distinguished leader.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Humphrey | O'Conor |
| Baldwin | Hunt | O'Mahoney |
| Bricker | Ives | Pepper |
| Bridges | Johnson, Colo. | Reed |
| Broughton | Johnson, Tex. | Robertson |
| Byrd | Johnston, S. C. | Russell |
| Cain | Kefauver | Saltonstall |
| Capehart | Kerr | Schoeppel |
| Chapman | Kilgore | Smith, Maine |
| Chavez | Knowland | Smith, N. J. |
| Connally | Langer | Sparkman |
| Cordon | Lodge | Stennis |
| Douglas | Long | Taft |
| Eastland | Lucas | Taylor |
| Ferguson | McClellan | Thomas, Okla. |
| Frear | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Fulbright | McGrath | Thye |
| George | McKellar | Tobey |
| Gillette | McMahon | Tydings |
| Gurney | Magnuson | Watkins |
| Hayden | Maybank | Wherry |
| Hendrickson | Miller | Wiley |
| Hickenlooper | Morse | Williams |
| Hill | Mundt | Withers |
| Hoey | Myers | Young |
| Holland | Neely | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

### POSTPONEMENT OF DATE OF REPORTING OF LEGISLATIVE BUDGET

The Senate resumed consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) postponing to May 1, 1949, the date of reporting the legislative budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I think that what is being considered is understood by every Senator, and I should like to have a vote on the question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator from Tennessee, from his long experience on the Appropriations Committee, agree that ultimately, in order to have before us a decent over-all picture of appropriations, we must have an over-all appropriation bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is a very broad question, and I do not know whether, prior to our investigation of it, we should attempt to decide at this time. I think the present situation obviously is not a good one and that we should have some other method of getting appropriations before the Senate. I hope and believe that the joint committee which has had the matter in charge and which has not had time in which to make a report of the kind the Senate should have before it, will report a resolution or a bill which will enable the Senate to have before it what is known as the legislative budget.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The provision in the La Follette-Monroney Act was inserted in an effort to give the Congress a better picture in the absence of an over-all appropriation bill, was it not?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. By postponing action to the time to which we are postponing it this year we are really nullifying the whole effect of the law; are we not?

Mr. McKELLAR. No. I think by May 1 the committee will make a report which will certainly be a very good estimate of what the appropriations may be and what the revenues may be. I hope it will be helpful, and I think it will be helpful.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator be willing to accept an amendment to postpone the time for making the report to March 15 or even April 1?

Mr. McKELLAR. We fought that out in the committee yesterday, and the committee, as the Senator will recall, by a majority of several votes, reported the resolution as it is. The reason for that is obvious. Unless we agree to the resolution in its present form there is no chance to have any resolution regarding the matter go through at this time. It will meet the same fate as that met by the resolution last year. I believe the Senate will get a better result by postponing the making of the report to May 1 than by postponing it to March 15. I do not think we would have time to make a good report before that date.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator assure me that as chairman of the joint committee he will make every endeavor to include a study and a report on an over-all budget?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall certainly do so. I think it is very necessary, and I shall be glad to make every effort possible to lay before the Senate the best view we can present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that by May 1 practically all appropriation bills will have been passed by the House and will be on their way through the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not think that has been the history in the last 2 years.

Sometimes we get appropriation bills from the House as late as July, and sometimes as late as August.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate that, but I base the question on the fact that I have conferred with some members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and they have advised that with the possible exception of the armed services appropriation bill, and one other, they expect the appropriation bills to be out of the way by May 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator will recall that the armed services appropriation bill is by far the largest appropriation bill we will have, and, until we find out something about that, we cannot make a very good estimate of what the appropriations will be.

Mr. FERGUSON. One further question, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the joint committee held any meetings?

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say that they have held any formal meetings.

Mr. FERGUSON. As a member of the committee I know of no notice I have received.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been no notice of formal meetings that I know of, but I have talked to Members of the House and Members of the Senate who are on the committee, to ascertain if we could do anything by February 15. I was advised by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is a member of the committee, and by several other members, that they could not possiblly reach a conclusion about the matter by February 15.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. I am sure the Senator from Tennessee will agree that it would be much more convenient for the Senate if the House would get the appropriation bills to the Senate by the first of May.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree entirely with the Senator. Instead of its being a disadvantage, I think it would be an advantage, so that we could discuss fully the action of the House. It would give us more time.

Mr. REED. It would give us more time, and we could do our work better, if we got the bills promptly.

Mr. McKELLAR. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. REED. I do not recall, during my experience, that we have gotten many of the bills in the Senate before the first of May, and most of them come after the first of May, some of them as late as June or July, as the Senator from Tennessee has just said, and some in August.

Mr. McKELLAR. Some even later than that. I agree entirely with the Senator. During the time I have been a Member of the Senate, we have received very few appropriation bills from the House by the first of May.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I concur in what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee has said, and I should like to add a word or two about the armed services appropriation bill. From an understanding I had this morning, I would say to the Senator from Tennessee that 34 cents out of every tax dollar is represented in the armed services bill, and 80 cents out of every dollar in appropriation bills which will come from the Committee on Appropriations this year will represent the cost of wars, including veterans' hospitals, interest on the debt growing out of the deficit during the war, and so forth. So 80 cents out of every dollar the taxpayer pays goes for the armed services, for preparations for war and for activities made necessary by wars, appropriated for, as the Senator well knows has been the case, from 1939 to the present.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not recall the exact figures, but an overwhelming part of our expenditures are for the armed services and related activities.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. What is the Senator's view as to what the Congress meant when it adopted section 138 of the Congressional Reorganization Act, containing this language:

> The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly at the beginning of each regular session of Congress—

And after due consideration and study to do certain things?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that language is perfectly clear.

Mr. CORDON. Has there been any such meetings?

Mr. McKELLAR. So far as I recall, there were no such meetings last year, and no such meeting the year before, and there have been no such meetings this year. I am informed by the clerk of the committee that the legislative budget committee met last year, but I must have been out of the city at the time. I recall no invitation to be present.

Mr. CORDON. The record will disclose that the same group met at the first of the session 2 years ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. CORDON. My question goes to this proposition: We have before us a concurrent resolution to extend the date of making the report to the first day of May of this year.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. If the committees had been called together, if they had been given an opportunity for an orderly consideration of this matter, might they not have reached the conclusion that if a later date were necessary it certainly would not have to be the first day of May? It might be the first of April or the first of March or the middle of March, so that the report could be what the law intended it to be, a budget estimate and not an accounting.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator will recall the language of the act, which I shall be glad to read, he will see that it is very confused. It gives to four committees, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House, and to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, certain directions. So far as I recall—and I shall read the act to see whether I am correct or not—it does not instruct which of those committees is to take the lead or which of the chairmen is to take the lead. It is very indefinite and confused—as the Senator will see. It reads:

> SEC. 138. (a) The Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate—

Now listen to this language—

> or duly authorized subcommittees thereof, are authorized and directed to meet jointly in the beginning of each regular session of Congress—

"To meet jointly in the beginning of each regular session of Congress"—

> and after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective House a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. Such report shall contain a recommendation for the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year which shall include such an amount to be reserved for deficiencies as may be deemed necessary by such committees. If the estimated receipts exceed the estimated expenditures, such report shall contain a recommendation for a reduction in the public debt. Such report shall be made by February 15.

I should like to ask the Senator, is it the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to call that meeting together? Is it the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Finance of the Senate to call the meeting? Is it the duty of the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House to call the meeting? Is it the duty of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House to call the meeting? The language is, the committees or subcommittees. I believe I will frankly say, that the purpose of the section I read was good, that it was directed along the right line, but the language respecting whose duty it is to take action at the beginning of the year is so uncertain that I think every Senator must concede that some change must be made in the language.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCGRATH in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield further to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator agree with me that reason would be on the side at least of the suggestion that all four chairmen, all being members of the majority party, might have gotten together and resolved the question of the date of meeting among themselves? Would that not have answered the purpose?

Mr. McKELLAR. That, Mr. President, is a very uncertain way of legislating. Knowing the Senator from Oregon as well as I do, I am sure he will agree with me that the act is quite uncertain in its

language. It raises doubt as to who is to take the lead. For instance, if the language of the act had provided that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate should call the meeting together, whether it be a meeting of a subcommittee or a full committee, or a part of a subcommittee or a part of a full committee, or whatever it may be, the Senator from Tennessee would have acted as soon as his committee was organized.

Mr. CORDON. Might not the majority have taken a leaf out of the record of the Republican control of the Eightieth Congress and followed a procedure which seemed at least to be sufficient to get the committees together in a meeting?

Mr. McKELLAR. As I recall, the majority in the Eightieth Congress asked for an extension of time, but it was not granted them.

Mr. CORDON. But they did have a meeting, did they not?

Mr. McKELLAR. They did have a meeting. That is to their credit. I will frankly yield them credit for holding a meeting. I do not know who called it. Who called the meeting?

Mr. CORDON. The ambiguity or uncertainty of the statute was not an insuperable obstacle to securing a meeting, was it?

Does the Senator from Tennessee apprehend that the confusion which exists in the statute will be cleared up any more by the first day of May than it was by the third day of January?

Mr. McKELLAR. I certainly do, or I would not have presented the resolution. I believe it will be of very great benefit to wait until the first day of May. We have a part of February, all of March, and all of April, and I believe that in that time we will be able to present a recommendation which will be something more than a guess. I certainly hope we will.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; I gladly yield.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator feel that he needs the time from now until the first day of May to determine which of the chairmen of the several committees shall call the meeting?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; I do not. We will have to do as the Republicans did last year, get all four chairmen together. I believe the year before Representative TABER was designated to take the lead. Last year we designated my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who was then chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to take the lead. Those who met made the best guess they could. But it is my hope that, if the resolution should be adopted, and we would then have a little more than 2½ months to consider the matter, we might agree on something better than a guess and something that will save the American people money. When the Senate and the House know more about how much money will be collected from the people we will then know how much we can properly spend for the same period. I do hope that the resolution will be adopted. I believe its adoption will be a step toward clearing up the ambiguity in the law as to who should have charge of calling the meeting.

Mr. CORDON. I am in agreement with the Senator from Tennessee, let me say—and I usually am——

Mr. McKELLAR. I am very happy to say that that is true.

Mr. CORDON. I am in agreement with the Senator that the presentation of a proper budget carrying the best information available as to anticipated receipts, and the best guess that might be made as to the anticipated or expected expenditures, would be a very great help to the Appropriations Committee and to the Congress in the great task ahead of appropriating money, and finding the money with which we may make the appropriations. But it occurs to me—and I want to ask the Senator from Tennessee a question about it—that that information, to be of value to the Appropriations Committee, of which the Senator is chairman, should be before the committee before it takes final action on any appropriation bill, and should be before the Committee on Appropriations of the House before that committee takes action, and certainly before either House takes action. Otherwise will we not be in the position of blindly making appropriations without the information contemplated in this section of the law; perhaps making larger appropriations than we might otherwise make; on the first day of May finding that we have appropriated too much money in the several bills which have been passed, and then have to pare down on some final bills, the importance of which may be so transcendent that we cannot make any reduction or change whatever? By such action would we not be doing those things which this section seeks to prevent our doing?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before answering the question I may ask the Senator whether he recalls any regular appropriation bill having been passed during the Eightieth Congress before May 1? I do not refer to a bill making appropriations for incidental purposes. No regular appropriation bill was passed before May 1 during the Eightieth Congress. That has been true for some years past. I have been a member of the Appropriations Committee for a long time, and I do not recall of any regular appropriation bill having come to us from the House, which must originate all appropriation bills of course, in time to be passed by the first of May. So I do not think that will be a matter with which we will be troubled.

Mr. CORDON. I do not have the record. I cannot dispute the Senator's statement. My memory, however, is that the Senate Appropriations Committee has worked on appropriation bills before the first of May, in fact during the full month of April. I may be wrong.

Mr. McKELLAR. Senate Appropriations Committees may have done so, but we do not get any of the regular appropriation bills over here before the first of May. I hope we may receive some earlier this year.

Mr. CORDON. Assuming that that hope is well founded, then the situation the Senator from Oregon has just outlined will be in front of us, will it not, and we will not have the value of the congressional budget to direct us in our considerations and final actions?

Mr. McKELLAR. I think we will have the benefit of it, because all the appropriation bills have to go to conference, and the information which will be obtained by the joint committee, which will be presented to us by the joint committee, will not only be of value to the Senate generally, but it will be of great value to the Senator from Oregon, who is a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield further.

Mr. CORDON. But will not such a report be a budget with reverse English? It will be a report of that which has been done, not of that which we expect to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. I cannot say what it will be, but I hope it will be more than a guess.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when the Seventy-ninth Congress was in session it passed one of the most important measures ever to come before this great body. I am referring, of course, to the Legislative Reorganization Act, which, despite certain criticisms which we all recognize, accomplished a vitalization and improvement of the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

One of the most important objectives of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was to strengthen the fiscal controls of the Congress. Advocates of the reorganization proposal stressed the fact that Congress would, for the first time, establish a budget or expenditure ceiling that would permit an over-all analysis of revenues and expenditures and a determination in the early days of a congressional session of the total amount to be appropriated to the executive departments and agencies for the fiscal year immediately ahead. It was thought that such a ceiling on expenditures could rather easily be determined by the Congress within the first 6 weeks of the session and that a recommendation could be made to the two Houses in the form of a resolution that, when enacted, would set the pattern of spending for the succeeding fiscal year.

The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was impressed by the number of witnesses who expressed themselves forcibly on this point and concluded that "primary responsibility rests with Congress to improve legislative control over governmental expenditures and that means must be provided to permit a closer scrutiny of them, not only by the committees charged with this duty but also by the individual Members and Congress itself."

The purport of the recommendation that revenues and expenditures be matched is that a ceiling would be placed on estimated expenditures when estimated revenues were insufficient to support a larger spending program and that only the specific action of Congress would permit the creation of additional public debt when revenues were insufficient and when it was decided that additional ex-

penditures were needed. Likewise, when surplus revenues existed Congress could make a determination of how much the public debt should be reduced.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that almost every State and municipality has a system by which it has some knowledge of balancing revenues and expenditures? In that respect, is not the fiscal system of the Federal Government considerably behind the times?

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe that is true. In spite of the fact that the Federal Government is the largest, most powerful, and richest agency in the world, it lags far behind municipalities and States generally in the provision for an adequate fiscal system.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So if the joint committee, of which the Senator from New Hampshire will undoubtedly be a member, has the opportunity to make some recommendations by which we can advance toward an over-all appropriation bill, thereby gaining a knowledge of how to balance our expenditures with our revenues, that will be a distinct step forward, will it not?

Mr. BRIDGES. It certainly will.

Two years of operation under the Reorganization Act is too short a period for positive declaration regarding the merits or demerits of most of its provisions. With respect to the legislative budget provision, however, I am prepared and feel qualified to speak out at this time.

From the standpoint of the appropriations procedure, the experience that we had last year with the legislative budget adopted by both Houses clearly indicated that there is no assurance that appropriation reductions will necessarily result in the desired expenditure cuts. To be more specific, the six billions of recommended expenditure reduction for the fiscal year 1948, although never finally acted upon by the Congress, was predicated on a $5,200,000,000 reduction in appropriations. The actual reduction in all appropriations effected by the Eightieth Congress, first session, was slightly in excess of $3,000,000,000. The President's August budget review, however, showed a revision in expenditures for the fiscal year 1948 of slightly more than one-half billion dollars, thus indicating that appropriation reductions affected expenditure reductions in a ratio of 6 to 1; that is, for every dollar of appropriation reduction, only about 16⅔ cents expenditure reduction resulted. The answer to this situation, of course, lies in the fact that the executive branch generally has at its disposal large sums from previous years' appropriations available for expenditure. It was a simple matter for the agencies to accelerate spending from these accumulations of previously unused funds.

It is with these observations in mind that I have repeatedly suggested the desirability of directing our energies toward strengthening the legislative budget provision of the Reorganization Act so that Congress will be better able to discharge its fiscal responsibilities. In consequence, in company with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 182 in the second session of the Eightieth Congress, which would have created a small workable joint committee to investigate Federal expenditures and prepare the legislative budget. This new committee would make a continuing study of all Federal expenditures looking to the elimination or reduction of those determined to be nonessential. The reporting date for the legislative budget would have remained unchanged from the present requirement of a February 15 deadline.

More recently in this Congress I joined several of my colleagues in the introduction of Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, which would require a consolidation of all general appropriations measures into a single or omnibus bill. This resolution would further require a consideration of available revenues and expenditures against such revenues during the fiscal year to which such appropriations apply.

Two years ago and last year I had the responsibility in the Senate of presenting for the Republican leadership the legislative budget as recommended by the joint committee created for that purpose and of which I was chairman. These were the initial efforts of an endeavor to make workable a most complex provision of law. But the Republican Party faced up to its obligation four-square. In good faith, the House and Senate Republican leadership met the deadline even though the first endeavor resulted in a deadlocked conference.

In discussing the report accompanying Senate Concurrent Resolution 42 on February 18 of last year, I admitted that there were doubts in my mind as to the feasibility of actually accomplishing the reduction in expenditures we were recommending for fiscal 1949, modest though the total was.

But the resolution was ready and was introduced on February 9, nearly a week prior to the deadline. Let no one say that there was not a great deal of committee and staff work on the report which went to the Congress.

On both occasions I was denounced by the Democrats despite the fact that every possible means was availed of by the Republican leadership to make a defective provision of law, inherited from the Democrats, a working reality. I have already indicated that the Democratic administration gave no evidence of a willingness on its part to regard the strictures of the Congress as, in any sense, binding on their profligate spending habits. The general attitude was one of ridiculing our sincere and honest efforts.

The Reorganization Act and the legislative budget provision are both a product of a Congress controlled by the Democrats when a member of that party was in the White House. Today the situation is exactly the same as it was in the Seventy-ninth Congress. This is the first real opportunity, therefore, to make the legislative budget ceiling an effective device for preserving the people's money and for guarding against overspending. All of the sources of information essential to the formulation of a legislative budget ceiling—and I am speaking from personal experience—are available to the party in power. Yet the very first thing the Democrats have done is to recommend postponement of the problem to a date when, for all practical purposes, it will be impossible to establish a true ceiling on expenditures because the Congress will have had presented and will have enacted a number of general appropriation bills by the time the reporting date of May 1 arrives.

The resolution which is now before the Senate is, in consequence, a stop-gap measure which avoids the inherent problem, and opens up the floodgates of Federal spending for the fiscal year 1950. The least that the party in power could have done was to endeavor sincerely and conscientiously to formulate a legislative budget, before throwing up its hands and admitting that it could not be accomplished.

I am sure that had the voters decreed otherwise, my Democratic colleagues would be insisting that the February 15 deadline be observed. If the attempt here is to do away with the legislative budget feature of the Reorganization Act, then simple honesty requires a repealing and not a postponing type of resolution. Please remember it was the Seventy-ninth Congress, not the Eightieth Congress, which enacted this provision, which the Eighty-first Congress now seeks to avoid. Mr. President, let us remember that it was the Democratic Seventy-ninth Congress which passed the Reorganization Act. The Republican Eightieth Congress endeavored to live up to it. The Democratic Eighty-first Congress now is attempting to repeal it.

I realize that February 15 is close at hand and that the Democrats have not yet done a thing about preparing and presenting the legislative budget by then; they have not even called together the chairmen of the committees to make preliminary plans to discuss this matter.

Inasmuch as the administration and the Democrats in this body and the Democrats in the House of Representatives have failed completely so far as carrying out this provision of the act is concerned, although we Republicans lived up to it faithfully 2 years ago and a year ago, and inasmuch as the Democrats and the administration now are "up against the gun," with nothing to report, I am going to offer an amendment to the concurrent resolution presented by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out "May 1, 1949" and insert in lieu thereof "March 15, 1949."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I hope favorable action may be taken on the proposed change of date, as set forth in the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator from New Hampshire request the yeas and nays on the amendment?

Mr. BRIDGES. I wish to have a quorum call, and then I shall request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire now suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall do so later.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the views which have been expressed by the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire in regard to House Concurrent Resolution 22.

It seems to me that there is presented to us today a fundamental question of fiscal policy and of legislative responsibility which, so far as the majority party is concerned, is being lightly dismissed by the resolution currently under discussion.

The spirit and the intent of the legislative budget are abundantly clear. The legislative budget is a charge upon the Congress to face its responsibilities and its intentions with regard to fiscal policy. It operates in the interest of governmental economy. It does not outlaw deficit financing, but it requires the Congress to state that if it intends to condone an unbalanced budget it will make that sentiment a matter of record, and will do so in advance and will not say later that it was compelled, because of appropriations, to go into deficit spending.

The legislative budget is, above all, a prescription for governmental fiscal policy and not a post mortem.

The concurrent resolution which is now pending, however, has the effect of abrogating the letter and the spirit of the Reorganization Act and its provision for the legislative budget. It would return us to a fiscal situation which the democratically controlled Seventy-ninth Congress found unsatisfactory, and sought to correct by requiring the establishment by Congress of a ceiling for Federal expenditures for each and every fiscal year. Senators on this side of the aisle supported that view and supported the passage of the Reorganization Act.

This concurrent resolution, as I see it, would put the legislative budget in a deep freeze. While the proponents of the resolution lack the candor to concede that it will kill the legislative budget, it can emerge as nothing more than a ghost.

At the very best, a May 1 reporting date will mean a mere summation of appropriation grants to that date and a projection of the remaining appropriations, which by that time the House Appropriations Committee will have passed on or at least will have readied for action.

Mr. President, I recognize that the preparation of the legislative budget is not an easy task. We who were in the majority for the first 2 years of the operation of section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act found it difficult to comply with. Obviously, further machinery is desirable to implement it, perhaps through closer liaison between Congress and the executive departments in the formulation of the budget, or perhaps through some device such as that which was submitted for study last year by the then chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee.

But we who served on the joint committee for the legislative budget in the last Congress also found the principle of the legislative budget sound, and accordingly we strove to submit and did submit an estimated ceiling on expenditures in accordance with the act and the law.

Mr. President, I admit that I am not a master of the sleight-of-hand mathematics which are employed by the administration in handling the people's money and in the formulation of the President's budget. Nevertheless, from my reading of the budget I cannot comprehend why it should be impossible, if one has a genuine desire to observe the purposes and principles or even the form of the Reorganization Act, merely to take the total estimates of receipts of the Government for the coming fiscal year and apply them against the expenditures as recommended by the President.

The Constitution of the United States places in the House of Representatives and the Senate the responsibility of determining what appropriations shall be made and how much the people of the United States shall be taxed to pay for the expenditures of the National Government. Therefore, a legislative budget is a requirement if the elected representatives of the people are to determine how much the Government can afford to spend and how much money it can take from the taxpayers to cover the expenditure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer to complete his statement before yielding?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. On the point the Senator from Michigan has been discussing, it is interesting to note some of the colloquy and debate between various members of the other party last year.

I quote now from former Senator Hatch, of New Mexico, now a Federal judge. He referred to the President of the United States, and said:

> I assume that the President of the United States submits his budget annually by virture of statutory mandate. The President is required to do that, and he does it.

Then the following colloquy occurred between Senator Hatch and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]:

> Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.
>
> Mr. HATCH. The President did that; did he not?
>
> Mr. O'MAHONEY. He did.
>
> Mr. HATCH. He submitted a budget, whether it was right or wrong; he complied with the law of the land, and he gave to the Congress and the country his best estimate of what that budget should be; is that correct?
>
> Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.
>
> Mr. HATCH. Is it not true that the statute which the Congress itself passed, requiring and commanding a legislative budget, is just as mandatory as the statute making that requirement of the President?

Mr. President, that is very clear. There was no misunderstanding on the other side of the aisle. There were two distinguished Democratic Senators, the then Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Hatch, and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], each one of them very clear in his own mind that this requirement is mandatory, just as mandatory as the provisions requiring the President of the United States to submit his budget. However, instead of that, we now see the majority turning their backs upon this mandatory statutory requirement.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am glad to have the record of the last session placed in the RECORD now, showing what actually happened; and of course the requirement for the submission of the legislative budget is just as mandatory upon the Congress as is the requirement for the President to submit a budget.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It would not become mandatory if the Congress were to change the date, would it?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. LUCAS. So far as February 15 is concerned, it is mandatory as the statute now stands.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. But in the event the resolution reported by the Senator from Tennessee is adopted, it becomes mandatory according to that date, does it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. On May 1. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. So if we adopt the resolution we are not doing anything different from what we have done in the past, other than merely to postpone the date?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall answer that a little later.

Mr. LUCAS. Very well. But I assure the Senator we will comply with the law if the date is postponed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Most of the extensive hearings on appropriation bills are conducted in the House. I understand under the present system in the House, hearings on various appropriation bills proceed at the same time. Those who are interested in making up the budget and spending the money are called in for questioning as to how much is needed, and then after all the hearings have been concluded and many of the bills have been passed by the House, they come to the Senate and we conduct our hearings. The question may be asked, Are we then to have a limitation? If the date is fixed as May 1, while we can hardly expect a limitation on the expenditures, at least we shall go through the formality by that date of placing a limitation after Congress has gone ahead and appropriated vast sums of money and perhaps reached the point where it cannot retrace its steps.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The distinguished majority leader, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], I think has an excellent memory. In case he has forgotten, I should like to refresh his memory, and remind him that in February 1947, when the date was being considered——

Mr. LUCAS. What date in February?

Mr. BRIDGES. February 21, 1947. The Senator from Illinois said:

> That committee had an obligation under the act, and they failed, * * * in the

performance of that duty and obligation, in not giving to the Senate sufficient information of some kind and character upon which it might intelligently act.

And all through the RECORD I see statements by the Senator from Illinois, who was very active, as he always is, in that debate, and he was very ardently in favor at that time of the Republicans taking action on the legislative budget.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield, in order that I may answer my good friend from New Hampshire?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield. I should like to have the Senator from Illinois answer the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. LUCAS. I was ardently anxious that the Republicans take action. The Republicans could have done the same thing, after the first year's experience, that we are now trying to do. The only thing we on this side of the aisle are attempting to do now is to profit by the experience the Republicans had with section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act during the past 2 years. The Senator well knows that during the first year, 1947, there never was any agreement by the Republican Congress upon the budget. There was agreement in the Senate on a saving of $4,500,000,000, but the House adopted the figure of $6,000,000,000, and told the American people they were going to save that amount. The conferees, during all that year, never agreed upon any amount. Therefore, so far as complying with the provision of section 138 is concerned, the Republican Senators, I must respectfully submit, never complied with it, although they threw the people of the country into quite a bit of confusion with respect to what they were trying to do. That is one of the reasons why the Senator from Illinois desires postponement of the date at the present time, so that perhaps by May 1 the Senate can have sufficient information, after House action on appropriation bills, possibly to make an intelligent guess or approach concerning an estimate. Let me say, while I am on my feet, if the Senator will yield further for another observation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I never voted for the $4,500,000,000 savings estimate, as the RECORD will show. I have never been in favor of this provision of the Reorganization Act. I have never thought it workable. I said, and as the Senator will discover if he will look at my remarks in the RECORD, that so long as national defense appropriations were in the condition they were, and nobody knew exactly how much would be needed in 1947 and 1948 for that purpose, I would not vote for any reduction in the budget, because, if I did so, it would be a dishonest vote in my opinion. I think that is what the RECORD will show. I may be wrong about that, but I felt that way about it at the time, and I feel that way at the present time. I hope the committee in making its study of section 138 of the Reorganization Act will reach one of two conclusions, either a conclusion in line with the resolution offered by the Senator from New Hampshire and others, with respect to an over-all budget, or a decision to eliminate this provision in its entirety, because I think it is wholly unworkable.

Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say, on May 8, 1947, just 8 days after the resolution which the Senator from Tennessee is presenting and which the Senator from Illinois is supporting, the Senator from Illinois said:

> Every member of the Senate knows, and the country knows, that the people were entitled many weeks ago to some kind of a budget report, good or bad, even though it was based on a speculative guess.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Evidently the Senator believed that very ardently.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who said that?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I made the same argument as the one now being made by the Senators on the Republican side, that there should be a compliance with the Reorganization Act, that they were not complying with it at that time, and that the country was entitled to know. I did not mean I was going to support the Republican position. You had not complied with the Reorganization Act up to that time, and I was merely reminding Members on the Republican side, and the country, of the failure to comply with the mandatory provision about which Senators are talking at this moment. That is all I was doing. That argument is hardly germane to the pending issue. Let us postpone the date and the majority will before that time live up to the law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield, in order that I may answer a question asked by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does not the Senator believe now that the committee and the Senate and the Congress should have more time in which to prepare the legislative budget?

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Tennessee that for a long time I felt that the reorganization bill as enacted was not wholly satisfactory, but the point I made was that so long as it was the law, we should go ahead on the first of January and attempt to work it out, and we did so. Now we are within 2 or 3 days of the dead line, and the joint committee of which the Senator from Tennessee is the distinguished chairman, have not even had a meeting to make temporary plans. That is my point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from New Hampshire has changed his opinion somewhat on all these matters within the past year. I read from the RECORD, if the Senator from Michigan will yield for that purpose——

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from page 1401 of the RECORD, of February 18, 3 days after the time had expired, and nothing had been done.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield in one moment. Let me read what the Senator said then. It is very interesting in view of his present position.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to reply, when the Senator is through.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield at the proper time. I do not have the floor, but I am sure the Senator from Michigan will yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, to enable him to reply.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read from the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire:

> For these reasons I restate my firm opinion that section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act, dealing with the legislative budget, should be amended as to the date of presentation. Only at a much later date—

The Senator did not fix April 1, but an even later date at that time. Maybe the 1st of July was in the Senator's mind.

> Only at a much later date, after hearings have been held, after we of the Congress have had ample opportunity to weigh carefully the requests of the President's budget, can we in justice to the country, to the taxpayers, to the departments and agencies involved, and to ourselves, judiciously arrive at a sound estimate of the proper relationship between appropriations, expenditures, revenues, and debt reduction.

I agreed with the Senator's statement at that time. He was in the same situation as I am now in asking for additional time. I think the Senator's views then were better than they are today. I think they were sounder, more reasonable, and better for the country. I think there will be a better report if we have more time in which to make it. Under the circumstances, I am wondering how the Senator can vote against the resolution, or how he can offer an amendment to it fixing the time at March 15, when he asked then not only for more time for the committee, but more time for hearings. The Senator knows that when hearings are begun they take a great deal of time. To be perfectly frank, I hope that the time may be extended to May 1. I do not believe extending the limit to March 15 will give sufficient time. I believe it will be more beneficial to every Senator and to the Nation if more time is given. I think it is really remarkable that there should be any opposition to the resolution. That may be due to the fact that I voted against this provision in the original reorganization bill. I doubted its wisdom then, and when I read section 138 I am more doubtful than ever. I do not think any such legislation as section 138 should ever have been passed; but I very sincerely hope that the joint committee, to which the matter is to be referred, may prepare a report which will make the law effective and not let it be ineffective as it has been during the past 2 years.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield so that I

may answer the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Tennessee correctly quoted my remarks from the RECORD, but let me point out to him that the speech he quoted was made on the floor of the Senate on February 18. Why is that date significant? Because on February 9, 6 days before the deadline, the Republican majority of the Congress submitted a resolution to the Senate and the House of Representatives establishing a legislative budget. In other words, we complied with the law. Whether we agreed with all the provisions of the law, we complied with it. I pointed out the defects, and I still stand by my statement. That is why I am today offering an amendment extending the time to March 15, which I am sure will give ample time, when we think of the time the President allowed for the work of the Special Session of the Congress last summer. It might be interesting to note at this time that the President, in calling a Special Session of the Congress last summer, said that within 15 days, Congress could bring about the following program:

1. Reestablishment of an excess-profits tax.
2. Restoration of consumer credit control.
3. Greater authority for Federal Reserve Board to regulate bank credit.
4. Authority to regulate commodity exchange speculation.
5. Authority for allocation and inventory control of scarce commodities.
6. Strengthening of rent controls, and extra appropriations for enforcement.
7. Stand-by rationing authority.
8. Price control authority.
9. Wage control authority.
10. Taft-Ellender-Wagner housing bill.
11. Federal aid to education.
12. Increase of minimum wage to 75 cents an hour.
13. Fifty-percent increase in old-age pensions, lowering of eligibility age for women from 65 to 60, extension of social security to all not covered now.
14. Amendment of Displaced Persons Act.
15. A United States Government loan for construction of United Nations headquarters.
16. Senate ratification of an international wheat agreement.
17. Extra appropriations for a TVA steam plant and other power projects and removal of certain limitations from the law.
18. Revision of Federal pay schedules.
19. Anti-poll-tax bill.
20. Antilynch bill.
21. FEPC bill.
22. Compulsory health insurance.
23. Repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and its replacement with another Truman-endorsed labor-management relations law.
24. Additional farm legislation.
25. Additional reciprocal trade agreements legislation.
26. Additional antitrust legislation.
27. Universal military training.
28. A national science foundation.
29. Approval of the St. Lawrence waterway treaty.

The President had great confidence, apparently, in the power of the Congress to pass that program in 15 days. I am sure that if the President had such great confidence that his program could be accomplished in 15 days, even though the Democratic majority has not done anything to date, and Congress has been in session somewhat longer than 15 days—two times 15 days—a very effective job could be done on the legislative budget by the date fixed in my amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. How long ago was it since that message was presented to the Congress?

Mr. BRIDGES. I read the President's recommendations to the Eightieth Congress.

Mr. McKELLAR. How long ago was that?

Mr. BRIDGES. The President said that entire program could be completed in approximately 15 days.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was that in August?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator be good enough to tell the Senate how many of those recommendations have been enacted into law, or whether any of them were enacted into law within the 15 days referred to?

Mr. BRIDGES. Two of them, in part.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of all those recommendations none was enacted into law in 15 days.

Mr. BRIDGES. The President said:

> Things are getting worse every day. We cannot afford to wait until the next Congress convenes.

So he called Congress into special session and outlined the program to which I have just referred. If it was so urgent in the special session, it is very interesting, to me, that the distinguished leadership of the Democratic Party has not done anything about putting into effect the program which was so necessary 7 months ago, for which the country could not afford to wait. It was very urgent in the summer of 1948, but now it goes into the back recesses of our minds—at least, the minds of the Democratic majority.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Hampshire has referred to the report of the joint committee last year. I should like to read a resolution to him and ask him a question. I should like to ask him if he thinks it was of any benefit to the Congress in passing upon appropriations:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the judgment of the Congress, based upon present available information, that revenues during the period of the fiscal year 1949 will approximate $47,300,000,000 and that expenditures during the said fiscal year should not exceed $37,200,000,000, of which latter amount not more than $26,600,000,000 would be in consequence of appropriations hereinafter made available for obligations in such fiscal year.

I am sure the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the former chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, will not assert that this report he rather proudly boasts of today was of very much value to our committee or to the Congress.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the Senator read was the resolution, not the report. He referred to it as a report.

Mr. McKELLAR. This is the resolution which the Senator made up from the report. There was really no information. The Senator argued then we did not have sufficient time under the La Follette-Monroney Act, and we have not the time today. All we are asking is that we be allowed more time, and I can assure the Senator and the Senate that if we can have this resolution adopted there will be information in the report which will be of value to the Senate in passing appropriation bills.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for yielding.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one other question. If the President had sufficient confidence that Congress could pass in 15 days all the measures I have enumerated, does not the Senator think that if we give the committee double the time, to March 15, they can really act on this one matter? I do not want to let the President down in his confidence in the Congress. If he thought all these things could be done in so short a time, I am sure this one little thing could be done by the date I have indicated in my amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Whatever the President may have thought about it before, I am quite sure he is convinced by this time, from the action of the Congress, that it takes more time to carry out this very foolish law, against which I voted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as a matter of fact the President has already made compliance with the act easy by submitting a budget some $873,000,000 in deficit. The legislative budget could be made up in a few minutes, simply by recommending a reduction in expenditures of $873,000,000 to bring the executive budget into balance. Personally, I think that even greater reductions are possible—the additional savings to be applied to the public debt. But the present leadership does not want to do even so obvious and simple a thing. I confess a suspicion that there is demonstrated here that they are preoccupied in something else—a concern for more and more governmental expenditure with scarcely token acknowledgment of any fiscal philosophy of governmental economy.

I do not propose to be an alarmist with respect to the behavior of certain economic barometers that have been showing storm warnings in the last few days. I submit, however, that the behavior of the commodity market and of the stock exchange and the trend of unemployment in the last few days suggest serious consequences for a loose fiscal policy which any failure to face up to responsibility on the legislative budget represents. I note that already some of the advocates of increased taxation have been brought up short in their thinking by a look at those storm warnings, and the thinking of more sober authorities on taxation has been confirmed and crystallized.

If we in Congress do not set a ceiling upon governmental expenditures according to the purposes of the legislative

budget, we are inviting either deficit spending or new taxes. Either consequence could be the influence to send the state of our economy, which is evidently in delicate equilibrium at this moment, over the brink.

Considering the economic state of the Nation at this moment, it appears to me that the proposal to disregard any limitation on expenditures by the majority party is an admission that the present Government spending will continue, or it is an admission that the majority has come face to face with some of the hard facts of economic life and is baffled, confused, and even badly frightened.

Let me restate my opinion that the President's budget is not airtight. It calls for a number of expenditures in new fields, and increases in others. Elimination of some of those newly projected enterprises, or their limitation, and a cut-back on other expenditures to a maximum over-all total, as contained in appropriations for the current fiscal year, would simplify matters as far as the legislative budget is concerned, and, I am certain, would exert a healthy influence upon our economy.

Let me observe, further, that if the majority leadership finds a problem in placing a limitation on expenditures at this time its problem will be immeasurably complicated next year. It may be expected that by that time new projects, contemplated in the present budget, will be in full flood, and demanding more and more sustenance. At the same time there will exist an aggravated threat of possible decline in national income and governmental receipts.

I am in full accord with the senior Senator from New Hampshire when he observes that while the present resolution is submitted as a stopgap measure it is in effect a repealer of the principle and purpose of the legislative budget. I think it is incumbent upon the majority leadership to admit as much. But I do not think that any such abrogation is wise or justifiable.

The legislative budget requires the Congress to call its shots with regard to fiscal policy. That is a sound proposition, as it was conceived to be by its proponents in the Seventy-ninth Congress. But this is no skeet match, and Senators cannot stand here on May 1 with appropriation measures in their final stages and expect to shoot in all directions. By that time any prospect for limiting expenditures will already be a dead pigeon.

I have been dwelling on these remarks on questions of fiscal policy and legislative responsibility for fiscal policy that are involved in this abrogation of the legislative budget. There is involved here also a grave question of legislative integrity and morality, which should command the attention of every one of us on this floor.

The Reorganization Act, with its provision for the legislative budget, was passed as an act of Congress in 1946. It was as binding upon the Congress as any law is binding upon an individual citizen, and certainly every citizen has a right to expect that Congress will observe its own legislation.

Now, however, we are asked to abrogate that law just 5 days before it is to expire, without any notice, and, moreover, without any attempt or gesture to comply with it. There has not even been a meeting of the joint committee on the legislative budget to explore the possibilities of conforming to the law.

Simply because Congress possesses the law-making power it is being asked to assert that power to absolve itself of an imposed responsibility which some apparently find burdensome.

It is perfectly in order, and I think an impelling question, to ask how we, the Congress, can expect individual citizens to obey our laws and not expect to have those citizens appealing to us for last-minute relief in any and every situation where they find the laws' restrictions burdensome upon them.

Here we are, on the 10th day of February, not having had a meeting of the joint committee, never having tried to follow the law at all, and we are asked to abrogate it when it requires action on the 15th. So I say we are asked to abrogate the law.

Now, with only 5 days left before the law requires something to be done, it is proposed that the law be changed so it will have no effect. Mr. President, I say there is involved the question of legislative integrity and legislative morality, which should concern every Member of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as the Senator who in committee made the motion to advance the date to March 15, the motion which the ranking member of the minority on the committee has made on the floor today, I want to say that I support his motion now made. I made the motion in the committee because I believe that the whole fiscal administrative policy of our Government is far behind the policies which are now common in our States and our municipalities. The States and municipalities, in practically every instance know, when an appropriation is made, where the revenue is coming to pay for it. That is not so in the Federal Government, as its business is now conducted.

The procedure provided for in the La Follette-Monroney Act is a little step forward in an effort to enable Congress to have a better over-all comprehension of the fiscal policy of the Federal Government when appropriation bills are considered. I think it is particularly important this year to have the date set forward, if it is possible to do so, in order that we may have a better idea of the general situation when we come to the huge appropriations we will be asked to make for the armed services and are called upon to determine whether they shall be $15,000,000,000 or more and whether veterans' benefits, shall be increased, and what action shall be taken respecting the new benefits asked for by the President in his state of the Union message.

Furthermore, we confront the problem of housing, and proposals regarding health, education, and other problems. Then, there is the question of universal military training. All these are new proposals. We do not know how much, if provided for, they will cost. We do not know how large the revenues will be with which to pay for them.

So, I think, this year particularly, without any regard to what has been done in the past, that the provision contained in the La Follette-Monroney Act is of great value, and I urge that the date be advanced, and that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] be adopted.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I want to associate myself as being in full support with the observations made by the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and also my colleague on the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. As one who comes from a State which does not have deficit spending, I believe that the Federal Government should take steps as quickly as possible to place limitations on what it may spend. If we are ever to get away from deficit spending, we should try to place such limitations on our expenditures.

Mr. President, it may be said that we can pick a figure out of the air and shoot at it; that it would be better for us to shoot at such a figure than not to shoot at all. I was on the joint committee which brought out such a report a year ago, a report which was severely criticized because it was said that supporting evidence for it was lacking. I took that criticism rather well, because even though there was not full supporting evidence, yet in the figure submitted to the Congress of the United States we at least had something to shoot at.

I was particularly interested in the argument advanced by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] relative to keeping faith with the La Follette-Monroney Act. Whether it can be complied with or cannot be complied with, what is now proposed to be done by extending the date to May 1 is to circumvent the intention of the Reorganization Act.

I think all of us will agree—I am sure the majority leader, because of his long service in the Senate, will agree with me—that if the time is extended until May the hearings will have been had in the House on most of the regular appropriation bills. The regular appropriation bills will then come over to the Senate at practically the time when a ceiling is established, and by that time the amounts of the appropriation bills in large measure will have been determined. So in reality what is proposed to be done now is a complete circumvention of what is intended by the spirit of the Reorganization Act.

I followed rather closely what was done last year respecting the ceiling, because I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and it has been a privilege for me to have served under the chairmanship of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] and also the chairmanship of the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who was chairman for the past 2 years. I followed the proceedings closely in an effort to try to solve this one great problem.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to place in the RECORD a statement respecting appropriation bills, to show what will actually happen if the date is extended until the first of May. On May 5, 1947, the following appropriation bills had been reported in the House. House bill 1968, the urgent deficiency bill. House bill 2436, Treasury-Post Office, 1948. House bill 2700, Labor-Federal Security, 1948. House Joint Resolution 154, hoof-and-mouth disease. House Joint Resolution 159, to supply deficiencies. House bill 2849, first deficiency. House bill 3123, Interior Department, 1948.

House bill 3245, second deficiency, 1947.

House bill 3311, State, Justice, Commerce, 1948.

In other words, there were nine appropriation bills on which the evidence had been taken. The bills came to the House ready for final passage. So the ceiling would not have applied in that instance. Perhaps it would not have been possible to do any better anyway.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When were those bills passed?

Mr. WHERRY. They were passed afterward, but they had been reported by May 5, 1947.

Mr. McKELLAR. They were passed long afterward, were they not?

Mr. WHERRY. They had to come to the Senate after they were passed by the House, and it was necessary to have conferences. They were all passed after May 1.

Mr. McKELLAR. What percentage of the money appropriations for that year did those bills constitute?

Mr. WHERRY. I did not compare the nine bills with all other appropriation bills.

Mr. President, I have before me a summary on the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. If there is no objection, I should like to have it placed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Table of appropriation bills, Eighteth Congress, second session*

| Bill No. | Title | Budget estimates | House | | | | Senate | | | | Public law | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Date reported | Amount as reported | Date passed | Amount as passed | Date reported | Amount as reported | Date passed | Amount as passed | Date approved | Amount as approved | Law No. |
| H. R. 5214 | Independent offices | $1,047,606,864 | Jan. 30 | $991,583,551 | Feb. 4 | $991,518,551 | Mar. 12 | $967,705,551 | Mar. 15 | $967,705,551 | Apr. 20 | $967,442,551 | 491 |
| H. R. 5524 | Army-civil functions | 737,804,300 | Feb. 24 | 606,558,766 | Feb. 26 | 606,558,766 | Apr. 23 | 708,586,666 | May 19 | 708,586,666 | June 25 | 641,575,666 | 782 |
| H. R. 5525 | Urgent deficiency, 1948. | 131,546,901 | Feb. 24 | 131,015,385 | Feb. 24 | 131,015,385 | Feb. 26 | 137,339,385 | Feb. 27 | 137,489,385 | Mar. 4 | 136,368,385 | 430 |
| H. R. 5607 | State-Justice-Commerce. | 589,417,230 | Feb. 27 | 503,420,263 | Mar. 5 | 503,590,263 | Apr. 23 | 516,029,937 | Apr. 26 | 516,029,937 | June 3 | 511,129,662 | 597 |
| | State | 215,823,330 | | 197,217,463 | | 197,217,463 | | 205,985,477 | | 205,985,477 | | 202,693,862 | |
| | Justice | 116,997,000 | | 116,300,700 | | 116,300,700 | | 116,655,700 | | 116,655,700 | | 116,655,700 | |
| | Commerce | 236,843,500 | | 171,087,000 | | 171,257,000 | | 174,036,660 | | 174,036,660 | | 172,428,000 | |
| | Judiciary | 19,753,400 | | 18,785,100 | | 18,785,100 | | 19,352,100 | | 19,352,100 | | 19,352,100 | |
| H. R. 5728 | Labor-Federal Security. | 931,539,169 | Mar. 5 | 905,405,250 | Mar. 8 | 905,405,250 | Apr. 23 | 890,751,440 | Apr. 26 | 890,751,440 | June 14 | 890,139,000 | 639 |
| | Labor | 16,600,300 | | 12,498,200 | | 12,498,200 | | 14,909,990 | | 14,909,990 | | 14,423,700 | |
| | Federal Security | 259,170,319 | | 239,788,500 | | 239,788,500 | | 220,072,900 | | 220,072,900 | | 219,946,750 | |
| | Related agencies | 655,768,550 | | 653,118,550 | | 653,118,550 | | 655,768,550 | | 655,768,550 | | 655,768,550 | |
| H. R. 5770 | Treasury-Post Office | 2,044,949,260 | Mar. 9 | 1,981,722,350 | Mar. 11 | 1,981,722,350 | May 24 | 2,010,601,200 | May 28 | 2,010,601,200 | June 14 | 1,996,313,425 | 640 |
| | Treasury | 334,304,700 | | 290,453,100 | | 290,453,100 | | 308,998,600 | | 308,998,600 | | 299,861,100 | |
| | Post Office | 1,710,644,500 | | 1,691,269,250 | | 1,691,269,250 | | 1,701,602,600 | | 1,701,602,600 | | 1,696,452,325 | |
| H. R. 5883 | Agriculture | 636,412,090 | Mar. 16 | 543,283,453 | Mar. 18 | 545,533,453 | May 12 | 580,270,278 | May 25 | 580,400,278 | June 19 | 577,546,953 | 712 |
| H. J. Res. 355. | Foreign aid—tax refunds. | 555,125,000 | Mar. 22 | 555,125,000 | Mar. 22 | 555,125,000 | Mar. 25 | 555,125,000 | Mar. 29 | 555,125,000 | Mar. 31 | 555,125,000 | 470 |
| H. R. 6055 | First deficiency, 1948 | 1,002,150,316 | Mar. 30 | 346,678,152 | Apr. 1 | 338,378,152 | Apr. 23 | 780,179,479 | Apr. 26 | 780,179,479 | May 10 | 777,986,045 | 519 |
| H. R. 6226 | Supplemental national defense, 1948: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Cash | 964,100,000 | Apr. 14 | 923,100,000 | Apr. 15 | 923,100,000 | Apr. 30 | 958,200,000 | May 6 | 958,200,000 | May 21 | 949,000,000 | 547 |
| | Contract authorization. | 1,453,000,000 | | 1,453,000,000 | | 2,275,000,000 | | 2,275,000,000 | | 2,275,000,000 | | 2,275,000,000 | |
| H. R. 6355 | Supplemental Federal Security Agency, 1949. | 993,708,460 | Apr. 27 | 969,050,000 | Apr. 29 | 969,050,000 | June 2 | 983,227,319 | June 2 | 983,227,319 | June 16 | 975,914,700 | 646 |
| H. R. 6430 | District of Columbia | 101,897,283 | May 4 | 101,164,983 | May 5 | 101,164,983 | June 2 | 99,567,983 | June 3 | 99,567,983 | June 19 | 99,729,483 | 724 |
| H. R. 6481 | Government corporations. | 49,644,100 | May 7 | 37,979,061 | May 11 | 37,979,061 | June 12 | 42,062,061 | June 15 | 43,422,061 | June 30 | 38,479,061 | 860 |
| H. R. 6500 | Legislative | 61,379,520 | May 11 | 55,859,690 | May 13 | 55,859,690 | June 2 | 56,362,726 | June 3 | 56,362,726 | June 14 | 56,140,401 | 641 |
| H. R. 6705 | Interior | 474,773,835 | May 26 | 375,677,591 | May 27 | 375,692,591 | June 12 | 422,179,098 | June 14 | 422,179,098 | June 29 | 407,836,974 | 841 |
| H. R. 6758 | Treasury-Post Office supplemental, 1949: | 355,205,375 | June 1 | 248,414,255 | June 1 | 248,414,255 | June 12 | 248,414,255 | June 12 | 248,414,255 | June 19 | 248,414,255 | 727 |
| | Treasury | 196,519,275 | | 190,538,755 | | 190,538,755 | | 190,538,755 | | 190,538,755 | | 190,538,755 | |
| | Post Office | 158,686,100 | | 57,875,500 | | 57,875,500 | | 57,875,500 | | 57,875,500 | | 57,875,500 | |
| H. R. 6771 | National Military, 1949. | 7,216,592,000 | June 2 | 6,447,689,000 | June 2 | 6,447,689,000 | June 17 | 6,777,426,052 | June 17 | 6,853,426,052 | June 24 | 6,705,418,163 | 766 |
| H. R. 6772 | Navy, 1949 | 3,936,738,700 | June 2 | 3,686,733,250 | June 3 | 3,686,733,250 | June 14 | 3,812,170,250 | June 15 | 3,812,170,250 | June 24 | 3,749,059,250 | 753 |
| H. R. 6801 | Foreign aid, 1949 | 6,533,710,228 | June 3 | 5,980,710,228 | June 4 | 5,980,710,228 | June 14 | 6,125,710,228 | June 15 | 6,125,710,228 | June 28 | 6,030,710,228 | 793 |
| H. R. 6829 | Independent offices, 1949. | 6,299,809,000 | June 8 | 5,795,048,931 | June 9 | 5,795,048,931 | June 17 | 5,854,783,851 | June 18 | 5,855,308,851 | June 30 | 5,819,659,851 | 862 |
| H. R. 6935 | Second deficiency, 1948. | 761,135,650 | June 15 | 485,196,951 | June 16 | 485,204,240 | June 18 | 605,209,130 | June 19 | 605,792,130 | June 25 | 549,774,876 | 785 |

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, let us consider what happened in the case of the appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1948. By May 4, 1948—and if this resolution is adopted, the time will be extended to May 1—the following appropriation bills had been reported to the House—and there were more in 1948 than there were in 1947, reported by May 4.

House bill 5214, independent offices. That is quite a sizable appropriation.

House bill 5524, Army civil functions. The distinguished Senator will agree with me that that is a pretty heavy appropriation bill.

House bill 5525, urgent deficiency, 1948.

House bill 5607, State-Justice-Commerce.

House bill 5728, Labor-Federal Security.

House bill 5770, Treasury-Post Office.

House bill 5883, Agriculture.

House Joint Resolution 355, foreign aid—tax refunds.

House bill 6055, first deficiency, 1948.

House bill 6226, supplemental national defense, 1948.

House bill 6355, supplemental Federal Security Agency, 1949.

House bill 6430, District of Columbia.

The point I wish to make is that before the ceiling could be complied with, if the date were extended to May 1, if we did our work well in the House and Senate, another list of appropriation bills would be either acted upon or ready for action. The evidence would have been heard, and the figures would have been arrived at. There would be no opportunity to cut them, even though the ceiling might require that they be cut. In that respect we would circumvent the spirit of the act by extending the date under this resolution until May 1, when the appropriation bills would come up before the ceiling is established.

I merely make the point to show that if the time is extended in accordance with the pending resolution, the force and effect of the law will be lost. It will be of no particular service, because the appropriations will have been made. We shall have to appropriate the total amount, regardless of the ceiling.

It is my judgment that if this resolution is adopted, and additional author-

izations are provided, we shall have to continue deficit spending. The only way to eliminate it is to establish a figure and say, "This is what we are going to receive, and this is all we can spend," and then keep within that figure. At least we can attempt to do so. By proceeding in the manner which has been suggested, when we pass the various appropriations and add them up, if we do not have the revenue we must resort to deficit spending to pay for the appropriations approved by both Houses, regardless of what the ceiling ought to be, based upon an inventory of income.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Is it not true that the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House, and each member of the House Appropriations Committee serve on the joint committee? Will they not have all the information by May 1, or whenever the time comes for the passage of an appropriation bill by the House? The House committee will have such information if the joint committee is able to reach a conclusion by that time.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to that observation by my distinguished colleague, for whom I have the highest respect, let me say that of course there will be more information than we now have. But the point I make is that if the time under this resolution is extended to May 1, there will be no ceiling. The appropriation bills will be passed. Hearings will have been held, and the amounts will have been arrived at, in most cases. Then if we pass additional authorizations, which we might do, additional appropriations will be required, and the very spirit of the Reorganization Act, with which we are pledged to keep faith, will have been violated.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Congress follow the recommendation of the ceiling on appropriations last year?

Mr. WHERRY. I believe that the Congress did its level best not only to follow the ceiling but to cut the cost of Government and save as much money as possibly could be saved. In addition, it endeavored to pay as much as possible on the debt. I believe that the Congress kept faith with the figure which was pulled out of the air, whether it could be justified or not. I agree that today we possibly cannot justify each and every figure that might be placed in the budget; but I hope we can adopt a ceiling, and thereby make an effort to place the Federal Government on a sound financial basis.

If I may be indulged for referring to my own State, I wish to pay a compliment to the State of Nebraska, which has a balanced budget. It does not know what it is to have deficit spending. It knows what its revenue will be, and what its expenditures should be, and it keeps within its budget. If we want to protect the financial stability of the Federal Government and keep faith with the spirit of the law, we must keep our expenses within our income. Unless we do so, we must continue deficit spending, which, as it continues to rise, threatens the destruction of the financial stability of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator's State on having a balanced budget and looking after its finances in the way it does.

The Senator seems to lay great stress on the question of the limit on spending which the committee established last year. Is it not true that the Congress of last year wholly disregarded the limit set, and appropriated far beyond that limit?

Mr. WHERRY. There were additional authorizations, such as that for ERP, and there were other legislative requirements. There will probably be additional requirements this year. We cannot possibly anticipate everything. I have a great deal of sympathy with the viewpoint which the distinguished Senator expresses in that regard. However, that should not prevent us from trying to establish a ceiling and pare appropriations to keep them within what we feel should be the limit of expenditure in the light of the income we expect to receive.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad the Senator desires to pare appropriations. I believe the Senator will joint the Senator from Tennessee in cutting appropriations to the greatest extent possible, and saving as much money as possible for the American people and the American Government.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the resolution as it is presented, and in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

I wish to be perfectly frank in discussing this situation, with particular reference to the value of section 138 of the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946.

Of course, the purpose of the section, Mr. President, is perfectly clear from its context. The Congress has directed that the four committees of Congress who deal with the fiscal affairs of the Government shall meet immediately after each Congress convenes; they are authorized and directed to meet jointly and—now I quote from the section—

> after study and consultation, giving due consideration to the budget recommendations of the President, report to their respective Houses a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including the estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year.

Mr. President, I call attention to two words there. The first one is "budget"; the second is the word "estimated." Mr. President, a budget is a financial statement of expected receipts and expected disbursements. It is not a summary; it is not an accounting of things already past. It is an attempt to plan for the future so that the fiscal affairs in question may be orderly, so that those in authority may approach their problems with at least some general plan with reference to their solution. That is what the budget is for.

I submit that with reference to the Congress, the type of budget contemplated in this section is not of too great value. I recognize that the estimates may be considerably off from the facts, as they later develop. But, Mr. President, so far as anticipated revenue is concerned, that is not true. Certainly, with all the information available to the Treasury Department and to the joint committees on Internal Revenue taxation, and all available to the four committees, acting jointly, which are directed to proceed under this section, those committees could have followed and can follow the direction of section 138. They could have reported and they still can report to the Congress a close estimate of the income of the Federal Government for the coming fiscal year. That could be estimated. It may be that the committees would have to go somewhat into the realm of guess with reference to anticipated or expected expenditures; but, Mr. President, even there in this Congress those committees should be in a far better position to make that estimate than the corresponding committees in the Eightieth Congress ever were. The majority in this Congress is of the same political faith as the Chief Executive. The majority has access to the leader of its party, who at this time is also Chief Executive of the United States. Certainly, with the close liaison which must exist between the executive department and the legislative department when both are of the same political complexion, we could expect the American people to be given some reasonably sound estimate as to where the party in power expects to take those people. Let me say, Mr. President, that the Eightieth Congress did not have that kind of a break.

Let me call attention, further, to the fact that the Eightieth Congress, even without any information from the Chief Executive except what was contained in his budget, was able to present to the President and to the people of the United States its best judgment as to both expenditures and income for both the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, and to do so substantially by the date called for in the statute, the 15th day of February. Mr. President, I say it can be done if there is a will to do it. It can be done if those in the majority believe that the law should be carried out, even when they differ with it and its wisdom. It can be done because it has been done.

Mr. President, I further call attention to the fact that last year, after the budget had been submitted to the Congress and to the people of the United States, and after the majority had done its best to comply with the section now under consideration, and after the two Houses of Congress had struggled to get together on the question, the Eightieth Congress was faced with supplemental and additional requests for appropriations, totaling $9,947,768,096.79 — appropriations coming to the Congress after the Congress had wrestled with and reached the best conclusion it could as to a budget it believed sound. Of that amount, Mr. President, $8,998,964,535.87 was appropriated by the second session of the Eightieth Congress. Only a part of that amount was in contemplation at the time when the Congress went into session and was handed the President's budget. At that time it was contemplated that there would be an additional appropriation during the year for

the Economic Cooperation Administration, in the amount of approximately $6,000,000,000; but the request for the other $3,000,000,000 came out of the blue sky, so far as the Eightieth Congress was advised when it opened its second session.

As a part of those supplemental or additional requests, there were 586 different items for consideration by the Appropriations Committees. That situation prevailed last year. It should not prevail this year. Certainly there can be a degree of cooperation between the Chief Executive and the administration and the majority in the two Houses of Congress which will at least permit the Congress to be advised by the majority as to what the majority expects from the Congress in a financial way at the present session.

Mr. President, if there be any real value in the type contemplated in section 138 of the Reorganization Act, if there be any value there, it lies in the action being taken by the joint committee early enough in the year to advise the Congress and particularly the Appropriations Committees of what the facts are. If those committees cannot have that information sufficiently early in the year so at least it may be, as the minority leader suggested, a target at which to shoot at least, they had just as well not have it at all. The thought of presenting a budget of anticipated expenditures on the 1st day of May and having any value to it is nonsense.

Mr. President, the majority, when they undertake that kind of delay, seek to present us with a budget with reverse English on it. They are using their future for a bustle; like a wahoo bird that flies backward and has no interest in where he is going but only from where he has come. They say they will present to us an estimate after the fact itself. All that can be presented then, Mr. President, is an accounting, so far as value to the Congress is concerned.

Let us take a look and see if that statement is not borne out by the record. In 1948, first in the month of January, one appropriation bill was reported by the committee on the House side, and in February, was passed by the House. In February three other appropriation bills were reported to the House, two of them passed in February, and the third one, in March. In the month of March, five bills were reported to the House, and of those five, four were passed in March, and one in April. All these bills I have just mentioned, if we may expect at least as much speed and diligence this year as the Republican-controlled Congress gave us last year, if we may expect at least like diligence, all those bills will have been considered by the committees, reported to the Houses, and passed at least by the House long before any consideration whatever is given to a budget which is expected to bring to us anticipated expenditures.

Let us get the rest of the record. In April two more bills were reported to the Houses, one passed by the House and one of those also passed by the Senate; nine bills had been passed by the House and passed by the Senate before the 1st day of May, according to the record. Now, Mr. President, again I say, if the budget can have any value—and certainly there should be some value to a committee working day after day, and night after night, and week after week, on these involved and complex appropriation bills, running into the billions of dollars—certainly there must be some value to it in at least having from the Congress of which it is member, and the Congress to which it must report, some word, some direction as to at least a target toward which it should aim in its consideration of those several thousand items in those estimates. But I say if it can have any value—and that value I contend it does have—then the word of the Congress, as expressed in the committee report required under section 138, and the resolution to accompany it, should be providently made, so the committees may begin their work with at least knowledge at the time they commence as to what the views of the two Houses are. That was the thought when the section was put in the law, and certainly there has been nothing shown to the Senate today to justify the emasculation of the statute in the way that is here suggested. It is utterly impotent, it is meaningless, unless action can be had. And, Mr. President, there is no answer in coming here today and confessing that there has been no diligence on the part of the majority in doing the job, by saying we have only 5 days. It is 45 days, Mr. President, that were available. If there be only five left, and nothing done, then let the responsibility rest where it should rest. Even so, we are faced with a situation, and I accept the confession from the other side of the aisle, and agree nothing has been done, not even a meeting called to discuss the matter—we are faced with that situation, then we must take such action as is necessary to correct the condition that never should have existed. The amendment offered here gives an additional 30 days in which to do the job that should be completed this week. That, added to the 45 that has gone, should have certainly enough time for the job to be done. Better, Mr. President, if we cannot have the legislative budget in time to use it, that we do nothing at all. Better to ignore the section entirely than to come in at the end of the extended time, flying backward, looking where you have been, with no thought as to where you are going.

Between now and the 15th day of March is adequate time in which to do this job. I am under no illusions, Mr. President, regarding the passage of the amendment, but I hope that the people of the United States will be under no illusion as to whether it should have passed. I think that is the point.

There is one other thing, Mr. President, and I am through. The action, or lack of action, to date, has, to me, an ominous implication. The pending resolution was not born, Mr. President, out of the old type of meeting of the majority and the minority which should always precede action in legislative bodies. There has been no attempt even to call the committees together. I am sure my good friend from Tennessee was not serious in attempting to excuse the failure by suggesting that the law did not indicate which chairman should call the meeting. A Republican-controlled Congress got by that objection for 2 years. Whether there be uncertainty or ambiguity in the law or not, there seems to have been found by the other side and the chairmen in question some way of cooperation in determining not to have a meeting and in urging concerted agreement as to a date definite on which to make a report under the same ambiguous and uncertain law.

Mr. President, it would appear clear that there has been no attempt to comply with the rule until the other House acted on the resolution. That was at least acting within the rule by attempting to avoid it by extension. That we have a perfect right to do. The section referred to is a rule of the Senate and a rule of the House, and we may abide by our rules or may amend them by unanimous consent. But until that resolution came in, nothing had been done. I say, Mr. President, that no minority member of the committee, to my knowledge, was consulted at any time with reference to the matter, or ever given an opportunity to present whatever views he may have had on the over-all subject.

I hope, Mr. President, that that action does not carry the implication it seems to carry. I realize that a majority can become so great and remain a majority so long that it can, in reprehensible arrogance, act in utter disregard of the minority. Let us at least carry out the forms of cooperation. Let us give to the minority at least a chance to be heard, no matter what our voting strength may be.

Mr. President, I wish I could hope that the amendment offered by my friend, the senior Senator from New Hampshire, will be adopted. I believe it would be for the best interests of majority, minority, Chief Executive, and the people as a whole, if it should be adopted. I believe that in that way only can we get even a scintilla of value out of a congressional legislative budget. But I have not that hope, more is the pity.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hunt | O'Mahoney |
| Bridges | Ives | Pepper |
| Broughton | Johnson, Colo. | Robertson |
| Cain | Johnson, Tex. | Russell |
| Capehart | Johnston, S. C. | Saltonstall |
| Chapman | Kefauver | Schoeppel |
| Chavez | Kerr | Smith, Maine |
| Cordon | Kilgore | Smith, N. J. |
| Douglas | Knowland | Sparkman |
| Eastland | Langer | Stennis |
| Ferguson | Lodge | Taft |
| Frear | Long | Taylor |
| Fulbright | Lucas | Thomas, Okla. |
| George | McFarland | Thomas, Utah |
| Gillette | McGrath | Thye |
| Gurney | McKellar | Tobey |
| Hayden | McMahon | Watkins |
| Hendrickson | Magnuson | Wherry |
| Hickenlooper | Maybank | Williams |
| Hill | Miller | Withers |
| Hoey | Morse | Young |
| Holland | Neely | |
| Humphrey | O'Conor | |

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The yeas and nays having been ordered on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired on this question with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired on this question with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official committee business and is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 43, as follows:

YEAS—24

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bridges | Ives | Smith, N. J. |
| Cain | Knowland | Taft |
| Capehart | Langer | Thye |
| Cordon | Lodge | Tobey |
| Ferguson | Morse | Watkins |
| Gurney | Saltonstall | Wherry |
| Hendrickson | Schoeppel | Williams |
| Hickenlooper | Smith, Maine | Young |

NAYS—43

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Anderson | Hunt | Miller |
| Broughton | Johnson, Colo. | Neely |
| Chapman | Johnson, Tex. | O'Conor |
| Chavez | Johnston, S. C. | O'Mahoney |
| Douglas | Kefauver | Pepper |
| Eastland | Kerr | Robertson |
| Frear | Kilgore | Russell |
| Fulbright | Long | Sparkman |
| George | Lucas | Stennis |
| Gillette | McFarland | Taylor |
| Hayden | McGrath | Thomas, Okla. |
| Hill | McKellar | Thomas, Utah |
| Hoey | McMahon | Withers |
| Holland | Magnuson | |
| Humphrey | Maybank | |

NOT VOTING—29

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ellender | Millikin |
| Baldwin | Flanders | Mundt |
| Brewster | Green | Murray |
| Bricker | Jenner | Myers |
| Butler | Kem | Reed |
| Byrd | McCarran | Tydings |
| Connally | McCarthy | Vandenberg |
| Donnell | McClellan | Wagner |
| Downey | Malone | Wiley |
| Ecton | Martin | |

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question recurs on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 22) was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I realize the problems which confront a majority leader in getting legislation before the Senate. I am satisfied that when the majority leader made the announcement, on page 980 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, on Tuesday last, that when the Senate concluded its business on that it was planned to adjourn until Thursday, and that he saw no reason why the Senate should be here for any considerable length of time on Thursday, he made it in the best of faith. Many Members on this side, feeling that important business would not be taken up, are not in the Senate Chamber today. I am not complaining at all about bringing up the legislation which has been considered, but I am sure that if Members on this side had known that it was to be considered they would have been present to cast their votes.

## DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in line with what the distinguished minority leader has said, yesterday I called him with respect to the next bill for which I shall ask consideration. He advised me that he thought there would be no objection to taking up the bill at this time. In fact, he advised me that he had conferred with the ranking minority member of the District Committee, who had no objection to the consideration of the bill.

With that understanding, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 135, which is a bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners in the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 135) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 135) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

## ACTIVITIES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION IN THE COMMODITY MARKETS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, yesterday in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry Secretary of Agriculture Brannan made the following statement:

> It has been said in connection with wheat that perhaps one explanation of the downward trend in the price of wheat was the withdrawal of the Government from the market. That is an unadulterated fallacy.

Mr. Brannan pointed out that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not pulled out from price support in any manner in the wheat market. At the same time, he announced to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that he was taking steps to investigate the commodity exchanges of the country for speculative accounts.

What Mr. Brannan failed to discuss before the committee was the activities of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the corn market. As everyone knows, the break in the corn market is what precipitated the recent break in commodity prices. I have checked the record of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the corn market, and I find that while it is true the Commodity Credit Corporation did not pull out of the wheat market, it withdrew almost entirely from the corn market. Here are the facts:

During the week of February 4, 1949, the week in which the commodity markets started to break, the Commodity Credit Corporation had cut purchases of corn 93 percent below the average purchases for the four preceding weeks, that is, the month of January. The record of their purchases by weeks through the last 4 weeks' period shows that during the week ending January 14, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 5,190,660 bushels, and during the week ending January 21 the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 16,024,950 bushels of corn.

In the week ending January 28, it purchased 6,644,263 bushels. However, last week, the week in which the commodity markets broke, it cut its purchases back to 512,810 bushels, or a cut back of 93 percent. So Secretary Brannan's statement that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not pulled from under the market is completely out of line.

Breaking this information down from the operations in the markets, I find that on the Chicago market the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased, in the week ending January 28, 3,982,000 bushels of corn. Last week the purchases were reduced to 386,500 bushels.

In Kansas City, week before last, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 2,562,263 bushels. Last week the purchases dropped to 126,310 bushels. These figures are a complete denial of Secretary Brannan's statement that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not withdrawn from the market.

The Secretary also failed to discuss operations in flour. In connection with flour, we find that during the week ending January 28, 1949, the Commodity Credit Corporation purchased 20,000,000 pounds, and in the week ending February 4, 1949, the week when the commodity markets broke, their purchases dropped to 4,430,000 pounds, or about 80 percent.

I make that observation merely because in the investigation of these exchanges I think the Secretary should also call for detailed operations on the corn market during the last 2 weeks, particularly to find out who, if anyone, in the Administration profited by this break.

The statement has also been made that perhaps some of this recent commodity break was due to a provision written by the Eightieth Congress — they always come back to that—in the European recovery program. That provision authorized or required the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain a 150,000,000-bushel wheat carry-over. I should like to read that provision for the information of the Senate:

> The funds authorized herein shall not be made available or used to acquire a quantity of wheat, wheat flour, and cereal grain in the United States which, after taking into consideration the amount estimated for export to other countries and the amount needed for domestic consumption in the United States, will leave a carry-over of less than 150,000,000 bushels of wheat on July 1, 1948, unless the estimates of the President after March 1, 1948, justify an increase in the amount available for export to the recipient countries, with full production for domestic needs.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The provision which the Senator is now discussing is obsolete.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, but Secretary Brannan yesterday used it as an excuse.

Mr. YOUNG. A former Secretary stated that a 150,000,000-bushel carry-over was too much. I agree with that. The present Secretary believes that we should have 300,000,000 bushels or more, which I believe is a depressing factor on the market.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. How does the Senator explain the fact that two distinguished Secretaries of Agriculture in President Truman's Cabinet disagree? Former Secretary Anderson, who is now a distinguished Member of this body, made the statement under oath before the committees that 150,000,000 bushels was a sufficient carry-over. Now a man who is equally prominent in the Cabinet, and who holds the same position, says that a carry-over of 300,000,000 bushels is necessary. What has occurred in the United States in the meantime to make those two distinguished Secretaries at variance to the extent of 100 percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I prefer to yield to the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], former Secretary of Agriculture. Perhaps he would care to reply to the question.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the situation clearly revolves around the needs of other countries. At a time when the people of the world were very much in need of grain, it seemed unwise to have in this country a carry-over of 150,000,000 bushels of wheat. We had found in 1946 and 1947 that from 83,000,000 to 85,000,000 bushels, or approximately those amounts, was sufficient.

The very able Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] protested the requirement of 150,000,000 bushels, and his position was stanchly defended by the then Secretary of Agriculture. Yesterday the Senator from North Dakota read into the records of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a letter from the then Secretary of Agriculture, a year ago, in which the statement was made that if a carry-over of 150,000,000 bushels were available, plus heavy crops coming in future years, we might see wheat prices break through support prices within a year. It is just about a year from the time that letter was written, and wheat prices did drop through the support prices.

Secretary Brannan in his testimony was saying that 300,000,000 bushels was not an unusually large amount for this country to carry over for national security purposes. The testimony of the former Secretary of Agriculture was that 150,000,000 bushels was not necessary; and the experience of the last year surely proves that to be true, and proves the correctness of the position taken by the very fine Senator from North Dakota in trying to defend the interests of his people. If we had been permitted to send 75,000,000 bushels to people who badly needed it a year ago, those 75,000,000 bushels would not now be plaguing the market.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator a question: Does he really believe that had this provision been left out of the European recovery program legislation, 75,000,000 bushels would have been sent?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that of the 75,000,000 bushels, 30,000,000 or 40,000,000 bushels would have been sent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then the Senator thinks that additional wheat would have been sent?

Mr. ANDERSON. I know it would have been.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator knows it?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to continue to quote from the law, showing that the President had full authority after March 1, 1948, to have reduced this carry-over:

> Unless the estimates of the President after March 1, 1948, would justify an increase in the amount available for export to recipient countries, with full adjustment for domestic needs.

In other words, under the law which the former Secretary of Agriculture supported, and which the present Secretary of Agriculture has criticized, the President had actual authority, after March 1, 1948, to reduce that 150,000,000 bushels.

I ask the Senator from New Mexico, the former Secretary of Agriculture, whether he wishes to deny that the President had this authority.

Mr. ANDERSON. The President of the United States could have tried to survey and certify as to the needs of the various countries; but the shipping schedules for shipments in May are not established in the month of May. One begins to order steamers on berth as early as February, for grain which is intended to be shipped in June, and the program is formed a long time in advance. Once the program is formed and once grain starts to move from the farms and the elevators, it is a long time before it reaches port.

If that provision had not been in effect, until we found out the size of the crop in June—and it is not until June

that we know the size of the winter-wheat crop—it would not have been possible to make the exports in June. The planning cannot be done at the last moment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I realize that the planning cannot be done at the last moment; but for 4 months the President of the United States had full authority to cut down the figure as much as he wished.

The Senator from New Mexico and former Secretary of Agriculture now states that they wanted to ship more wheat to Europe, and yet the report of the Secretary of Agriculture shows that on July 1 the carry-over of wheat was, not 150,000,000 bushels, but 196,000,000 bushels, or 46,000,000 bushels more than required by law on March 1. Yet the carry-over was not cut back to 150,000,000 bushels, and the additional 46,000,000 bushels was not shipped abroad.

Mr. ANDERSON. That very fact was pointed out to the committee, and it was stated that it is impossible so accurately to judge the shipments and purchases as to come out with an exact 150,000,000 bushels. So, in order to be safe, we ran beyond that amount, to the extent of the additional 46,000,000 bushels.

The then Secretary of Agriculture pointed out to the Congress more than a year ago that the existence of that limitation would make it extremely difficult to come out exactly at that figure; and that is how the additional carry-over of 46,000,000 bushels arose.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to say that had the former Secretary of Agriculture gone below the limitation, he would have gotten into trouble with many influential Members of Congress at the time.

I believe that the mistake was not too serious a one. It was only a 150,000,000-bushel limitation and probably 100,000,000 bushels would have been carried over anyway. But I think the mistake of the present Secretary of Agriculture is a serious one.

A few moments ago the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said that Secretary Brannan was holding the 300,000,000 bushels for security reasons. That is almost entirely aside from the argument made by Secretary Brannan before our committee, although he did mention it. His position was that the 300,000,000 bushels was not surplus, and would not have a depressing influence on the market—with which position I did not agree.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. As I understand from what the Senator from North Dakota has said—and, of course, two men of differing views cannot positively be right in every respect—he thinks the former Secretary of Agriculture, the present distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], was correct, and the present Secretary of Agriculture is wrong. Is that the impression he wished to leave?

Mr. YOUNG. Yes. Three hundred million bushels of wheat is a surplus in my opinion and will have a lasting depressing effect on grain prices. There certainly is a difference of opinion on this subject between the present and former Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I should like to point out the fact that the Department of Agriculture did not have to be so cautious about this 150,000,000-bushel figure after March 1. It was purely within the discretion of the President of the United States. Prior to March 1 they did have to be cautious; but for 4 months before July 1 they could have increased their shipments so as to include a substantial part of this 150,000,000 bushels. The Department of Agriculture was at that time reporting that we had a bumper wheat crop coming.

I wish to defend, first, the provision of the 150,000,000 bushels as security. I did go along with the former Secretary of Agriculture in the bill that we cut it to 120,000,000 bushels. The House never acted on this bill since it was found that the President already had ample authority, without any further direction from Congress, after March 1, to ship any amount of wheat he wanted to ship.

I do not wish to say that it is his fault that he did not, but I do not want him to be coming back to Congress and saying that it is our fault, as I have clearly demonstrated.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if any mistakes were made in congressional action as to the amount of carry-over last year, the authorities in charge added to that problem by going to Canada and, with the use of ECA funds, purchasing 151,000,000 bushels of wheat, which has added that much to the problem facing us at the present time, in view of the present high carry-over of wheat.

It seems unreasonable, in my opinion, that after the Congress appropriated funds in support of European recovery, the authorities should take some of those tax dollars and go to Canada and there purchase wheat in the amount of 151,000,000 bushels to supply the needs under the European recovery program, when at the same time we had in our country more than 300,000,000 bushels of wheat, which are depressing our market in the manner in which it has been depressed in the past week.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observation. I agree with him 100 percent.

I wish to point out that the authorities were buying more wheat from Canada than they were from American sources, under the European Recovery Act, for a limited period.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope the Senator is very sure of his facts. Five hundred million bushels was to come from the United States, and 150,000,000 bushels from Canada.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I said "for a limited period."

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no period for which that was true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over how long a period was the 150,000,000 bushels spread?

Mr. ANDERSON. It began somewhere in June 1948 and continues to the present time, with approximately 30,000,000 bushels yet to be delivered.

During the same period, more than 400,000,000 bushels have moved from the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, during the month of November there were purchased in this country 14,169,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is below the average monthly purchases for the 150,000,000 bushel total, if the total is divided by months. I do not say all of it was done at once; I said it was done in periods.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say to him that the pattern of purchases of grain depends on the geography of the area in which the grain is being purchased. Some 900,000,000 bushels or more of grain grown in the United States is produced in the winter wheat areas, and that winter wheat is purchased at the time it is ready. The distinguished Senator from Kansas knows that when his great Kansas winter wheat crop, which this year was in excess of 200,000,000 bushels and was a very large crop in view of the crop predictions, became available, it was necessary to move large quantities of it immediatey, and that wheat was purchased immediately.

Therefore, from the 900,000,000 bushels or so of the winter wheat crop, a great quantity is purchased in the winter wheat areas by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and stored for later shipment. We then move into the spring wheat area, and the dividing line in Nebraska marks off the spring wheat area. We then move into the area where spring wheat is purchased. The wheat from the State of the Senator from Minnesota and the two Senators from North Dakota is then bought, and when that crop is over, we come into the area where Canadian wheat moves into the market and the Commodity Credit Corporation bought the Canadian wheat when it was available, and not in a regular pattern, month by month.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say that is correct; but what I was pointing out is that there are periods in which you are buying more wheat from Canadian farmers than you were from the American farmers during the period of this operation. I do not think the Senator will dispute that. There were limited periods there. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I gather from what the able Senator says that the present Secretary of Agriculture is blaming the Eightieth Congress. Of course, there is nothing surprising about that. I should likewise suppose he is blaming former President Hoover. But my question is, What are we going to do about the decline in farm prices? Corn, I understand, is below $1 a bushel and wheat is

getting far below $2 a bushel. What are we going to do about it?

I should like to make this comment: It has not much to do perhaps with foreign wheat, but I notice that ECA recently purchased $240,000 worth of potato diggers in the United States and gave them to France. I remember as a youngster when I lived on a farm, I used to dig potatoes by hand, but I notice that our great Government here has just spent $240,000 of the taxpayers' money to buy potato diggers and give them to France. The whole thing is silly. It is ridiculous. The statement the Senator made a moment ago that the prices of farm products have been going up and down, as in direct response to the amount of purchases made by the Government. Do we have in this great Nation a false, synthetic economy where a bureaucrat can sit in Washington and buy or sell grains and push the price up and down and wreck tens and tens of thousands of farmers throughout the United States, and businessmen? Can he sit here in Washington and pull the strings, as the Senator indicated a minute ago, at least for the RECORD, that he had done, and buy, and, if he does not buy, the price goes down? Are 18,000,000 farmers at the mercy now of some bureaucrat who sits in Washington and pulls strings and pushes prices up one month and pulls them down the next month? Is that the sort of economy we have in this country? Is that what we actually have, or am I wrong?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Indiana can answer that about as well as I can, because frankly I do not know what kind of operations they are trying to conduct down there. When we stop to think that on the corn program, getting back to corn, which the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday, before the committee, was very careful not to mention—he talked about wheat; he did not talk about flour, he did not tell them about cutting back the purchases of flour that week 80 percent. He talked about wheat, and what he said about wheat was accurate. He did not tell them that the average purchases for the four preceding weeks on corn was 7,700,000 bushels. He did not tell them that he cut their corn purchases back 93 percent for the week of February 4, the week in which the corn market started this landslide.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am very happy the Senator brought up the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture had stopped his purchases, because I remember quite distinctly that immediately after the grain market toppled on February 6, a year ago, a Senator rose in his place in this assemblage and very sharply criticized the then Secretary of Agriculture for, he said, moving then by purchases to stop the downward price of grains.

Am I to understand the Senator to suggest that the Secretary of Agriculture should have used his purchasing powers in the corn market to stop the decline of corn prices? Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I will answer that question in exactly the same answer I gave a year ago, a copy of which I have with me. If we want to get back to discuss that, we will do that also. I will answer that in the same manner, and that is that the purchases of the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign relief should not be conducted in any manner to influence the markets.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is entirely correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But we are faced here today with a situation where the purchases for the foreign relief have been conducted in a manner to influence the markets, because, deliberately, somebody gave an order to pull the plugs from under the corn market the week of February 4, when they cut back their purchases 93 percent. That did not just happen; somebody gave that order. Now, who gave it, and why?

Mr. ANDERSON. I may suggest to the Senator that a year ago the same sort of speech was made here, and the time of the Senate and of the House was consumed with investigations of speculations in the commodity markets. The Senate committee that conducted that investigation—I have forgotten now who was chairman of the committee—filed, a short time ago, a report, and it certainly could not have been a report designed to defend the then Secretary of Agriculture, because it came from the Eightieth Congress, which was under the control of an opposite political party. But in a very fine report it was pointed out that after weeks and months of study they were unable to find one trace of evidence that there had been speculation from the inside in that transaction. That is a matter of official record.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is right—that is a matter of official record, and pretty much the same report will come from the investigation which was suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture yesterday, if it is carried out the way he suggested, and that is to check only the purchases of wheat. I said before, and I repeat, I see nothing wrong with the purchases of wheat. They form a pattern as near on a level as could be expected. I do see something wrong with the purchases of corn, when it is admitted that in 1 week their purchases declined 93 percent below that of the preceding week. There is some explanation coming on that. I wonder if the former Secretary of Agriculture would wish to comment on that? I should also like to point out this, that at the time the criticism was made a year ago—I think he is referring to a criticism which I myself made—at the time that was made, the wheat market was $3 a bushel, or in that neighborhood, and was considerably above the level which it now is, which completely changes the picture.

Mr. ANDERSON. The point that was then made was that there was a difference in the criticisms leveled at the then Secretary of Agriculture. The distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] raised the question as to whether or not there had been a press release designed to bolster the market. At the same time, a Member of the House from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] said that the Secretary was allowing prices to crash. The point the Department tried to make was that when there is a break in the grain market, it is not a function of the Department of Agriculture to use its foreign purchasing program to aid one group of speculators or the other, but the wise course is to stay out of the grain market until prices seem stabilized, and then move back in and resume purchases. Otherwise, it is joining sides with one group of speculators.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I want to refer the statement released to the press yesterday by Mr. Brannan in which he said that as near as his Department could figure without having an opportunity to study the reports of the Chicago board, the break was caused by untrue reports "that the Commodity Credit Corporation had withdrawn from the market."

Does the former Secretary of Agriculture still claim as true the statement made by Secretary Brannan yesterday in which he denied reports that the Commodity Credit Corporation had withdrawn from the market, in the face of the facts which I have given showing that he had cut his purchases of corn back 93 percent?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am pleased to say to the distinguished Senator that I am happy not to know whether the Secretary of Agriculture now is in the market or not. I am happy to be free from that responsibility, and I do not know whether he is buying or whether he is not buying, but I do know that the publication of a report that he had stopped buying would drop grain prices immediately, and that report was a false report.

The satisfying thing in this connection is that a great majority of the farmers have either placed their wheat under loan or have sold it prior to the period when the loan became effective. So far as corn is concerned, I am sure the Senator knows that every farmer who now holds corn which is not of extremely high moisture content can, at any time between now and the 30th day of June, get a corn loan to the full amount of his parity loan, and is not disturbed at all by the dropping price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in reply I happen to have in my hand a copy of the so-called false report which was issued, claiming that the Commodity Credit Corporation had withdrawn from the market. This report was published by the Commodity Credit Corporation itself. It says, in part:

> The Commodity Credit Corporation bought 2,466,349 bushels of wheat, 512,810 bushels of corn, 224,927 bushels of grain sorghums, and 50,000 bushels of rye during the period from noon of January 28 through February 4.

This report was issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, through the Production and Marketing Administration itself. I have a copy of the report in my hand.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it a fact or is it not a fact that some one gentleman can

sit in Washington and raise or lower the prices of grains in America?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a fact that it is being done.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator say that that is a fact?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is my opinion.

Mr. CAPEHART. One man can sit here in Washington, then, and govern and set the price which I am to receive on my farm for the grain which I raise. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Whether it is one man or a board I do not know, but it is a fact that the control is in Washington.

Mr. CAPEHART. Who is to blame for the falling grain prices at the moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know. I am merely stating the facts as to the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the past 3 or 4 weeks, which completely contradict the statement which the Secretary of Agriculture made yesterday that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not withdrawn from the market. The Secretary yesterday discussed wheat, and there was nothing wrong with his testimony in that respect. The fault lies in the fact that he did not tell what happened as to corn.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. With respect to the statement that there is one man in Washington who can control farm prices, I think it is substantially true, so far as concerns the price which the farmer receives. The Secretary of Agriculture has that authority under the price-support legislation which was subscribed to by both the Democratic and Republican parties. I do not like to hear the program criticized on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am not criticizing the program; I am criticizing the administration of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no hesitancy in criticizing the program, because, so far as I am concerned at the moment, prices are going down and the farmers are receiving less. Something is wrong when prices drop as rapidly as prices have dropped in the last few weeks. It is an unsound economy, and something should be done about it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know where prices are going. My opinion is that they will go lower and lower, unless this "almighty one" who is sitting in Washington decides to intervene by some magic. I frankly do not know what the magic is. I suppose it will be done with the taxpayers' money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not criticize the principles of the program. I think the administration of it has been handled inefficiently. Perhaps some of the inefficiency has been due to plain ignorance. I know of no other way to put it. Possibly it was deliberate on the part of whoever is handling the matter here. I think it would be most interesting to know who profited by the break. The farmers lost a great deal of money. We know that.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. I wonder if the Senator did not misspeak himself a few moments ago when he said the farmer could control the loan value of his grain.

Mr. ANDERSON. If I misspoke myself, I thank the Senator for correcting me. Present corn values are below the loan value of corn, and a farmer does not need to sell at the low price. He must have storage, but he does not need to sell his corn below the present loan value.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The able Senator from New Mexico just said the farmer needs to have storage capacity. So far as I know, every ear of corn has been picked and, as we say in Indiana, has been "shucked." It must be stored somewhere. Why cannot the farmer receive the loan value?

Mr. ANDERSON. Not all storage in the United States is approved.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why can it not be approved?

Mr. ANDERSON. Because certain standards of construction are required. Most farmers have sufficient storage for their corn. When there is a very large corn crop, such as that of last year, there may not be adequate storage for it.

Mr. CAPEHART. In each county there is a committee of local men who themselves establish the standards for loans on corn and other grains. They can either raise the standards so high that no farmer can meet them, or they can lower the standards to the point of storage in an improvised crib or other facilities.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think that is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is what I have been told by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not think it is quite that simple. I do not think it can be said that open storage is satisfactory in one place and that there must be airtight storage in another place. Most of the farmer committees are trying to safeguard the farm program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was told, and I believe it to be true, that they can loan money and can establish any standards they wish, but if a loan is made on a thousand bushels and 200 bushels are spoiled, the farmer himself would have to pay for the 200 bushels that were spoiled. Those are the facts, are they not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to admonish the Senator from Delaware that he can yield for questions, but he cannot yield to other Senators for the purpose of a running debate on his time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall conclude by saying that the action taken by the Eightieth Congress did not affect the carry-over, particularly in view of the fact that the actual carry-over was 46,000,000 bushels more than was required on July 1, and therefore there was plenty of opportunity to ship out the wheat. The responsibility goes back to the Commodity Credit Corporation and the statement released yesterday in the press, namely, "that the Commodity Credit Corporation had not withdrawn from the market" was wrong. The Commodity Credit Corporation, according to its own records, did withdraw from the market on corn during the week of February 4 to the extent of 93 percent, thus precipitating the sudden collapse of all commodity prices.

### THE FARMER'S PLIGHT—MANGANESE AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, relative to the debate which has just taken place concerning farmers, and the prices of farm commodities falling, I wish to say that I have received a great many letters and telephone calls within the past few days inquiring again about the prices of the products the farmer has to buy. After World War I farm machinery prices did not go down one single index point. Between World War I and World War II the prices of farm machinery went up and up, and never down, and although the price of wheat dropped from $2.50 a bushel to as low as 19 cents a bushel, in some sections of my State, the prices of farm machinery nevertheless remained away up.

Mr. President, sometimes it seems to me as though the only time that a farmer is consulted is for a few days before election, so that some party may get the farmers' vote, and then, as soon as the election is over, the farmer is again completely forgotten.

What is the situation today. A short time ago a Massey-Harris combine, 12-foot, self-propelled, cost about $3,300. Today one is lucky if he can find a second-hand combine that is in good shape which can be bought for $5,000 or $5,100. And what is true of combines is true of mowers, drills, binders, and all other kinds of farm machinery.

At the present time there are 23,000 telephone poles for REA, but it is not possible anywhere to get wire to put on those 23,000 telephone poles so that the farmer can get electricity into his home, and the farmer's wife can get some of the comforts which the people in the towns and cities enjoy. When a few days ago we had a hearing before the committee of which I am a member, we got the same old answer, that the kind of steel used in the manufacture of wire was not available. Who is to blame for that? Month after month and year after year I have stood upon this floor calling the attention of Senators to the plight of the farmer, how in one county in North Dakota, the county of Hettinger, the farmers lost over a million dollars from being unable to take off their wheat and their flax because their farm machinery was either obsolete, or because they were unable to get parts for the machinery they had.

Mr. President, Americans could not have a more frightening illustration of how suicidal the Truman foreign policy has been, than is contained in the news that Russia is now shutting off her exports of manganese to this country. We must have manganese if we are to have steel. It is shocking to discover that even after 2 years of the cold war our own statesmen have left our domestic economy and our national security almost completely at the mercy of the scheming politicians of the Politburo and of Russia's brutal slave-labor system.

Today, Mr. President, after 18 years of Democratic rule, after 18 years of Democratic Presidents, the United States is still dependent on Russia for 38 percent of our manganese and 42 percent of our chrome.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LANGER. I will not yield until I conclude. Then I shall be glad to answer any questions.

It now appears that our diplomats have been so intent on appeasing Russia on the one hand, and savagely determining to destroy the steel capacity of Germany on the other, that their efforts to give away our own resources in order to make up for this economy of planned scarcity have led them into a criminal neglect of our own vital interests.

As proof of this shocking state of affairs, we need only remind ourselves that the American steel industry needs 1,500,000 tons of manganese in the coming year if it is to maintain its present high record and produce 96,000,000 tons next year.

Mr. President, what does the record show? It shows that Russia's embargo on manganese has caught our diplomats flat-footed, with less than a year's supply in the Government's stock pile, and less than a 7 months' supply for the entire steel industry. In addition, experts tell us we will need at least 17,000,000 tons in order to defend ourselves if another war should break out.

In the face of these facts President Truman's demand for power to increase Government-operated steel-producing capacity becomes so much hypocritical drivel, for we cannot produce steel without manganese, and at the present moment we produce only 12 percent of our national requirements.

It is time the American people were given the whole story of how this sorry state of affairs has come to be, and who is responsible.

Mr. President, on September 21 in Denver, Colo., President Truman said:

> I know that all of you recognize the importance of creating new industries in this region, using the resources of the West so as to reduce your industrial dependence on the East.

Again on September 22, in the Mormon Tabernacle he said:

> I stand, and the Democratic Party stands, for rapid and uninterrupted development of the land and forest and water and mineral resources of the West.

If one were to take these statements at the face value he would be compelled to believe that our Government has been developing a policy toward the utilization of our natural resources that would enable us to maintain our high standards of living in peacetime and also a self-sufficiency in vital raw materials so necessary for national defense in times of emergency. But what is the true story?

Let us take just the question of manganese. Manganese is an absolutely essential element in the manufacture of steel. It takes 14 pounds of manganese to produce a ton of steel. Contrary to popular belief, created by propaganda, the United States has tremendous resources of manganese ore, running from 8 to 40 percent, located in at least 27 States. Yet, in spite of the fact that manganese is such a critical item in both our peace and war economies, the record shows that the above propaganda only continues to blind the American people to the fact that for the last 18 years the manganese situation has left us still completely at the mercy of foreign sources of supply in 1948.

Where did Jesse Jones put the $120,000,000 when he developed the great plant to produce manganese? He loaned that money to Canada, and, today, when farmers in Oklahoma want to get a little electricity they cannot get the means for having it brought to them. When they try to buy manganese from Canada they cannot obtain it from Canada. Oh, they can secure it on the black market in Mexico. Canada can ship it to Mexico, and it can be bought there by paying the black-market price.

On November 10, 1930, Mr. Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association, told its third annual convention:

> Today we are drawing our manganese supplies from Brazil, India, Africa, and Russia.

Mind you, Mr. President, Mr. Adkerson, president of the American Manganese Producers Association, made that public statement 18 years ago. He continued:

> Manganese imports from Russia have increased from 3,284 tons, or less than 1 percent of our imports in 1922, to 330,000 tons, or approximately 50 percent of our total imports in 1929. Our country cannot afford to remain dependent upon foreign sources for its supply of manganese.

Mr. Adkerson continued:

> As far back as 1927 I publicly called attention to the fact that the treacherous hand of the Russian Bolshevik would delight in lulling us to sleep with the ease with which manganese is flowing to our shores, filling Red coffers with American gold and then suddenly close in on the sources of supply, while the United States struggles to develop her own manganese resources after the day of opportunity had gone.

With these facts so well known over 18 years ago, it is utterly incredible that today we should find the same situation confronting us. Yet such is the case.

The Mineral Industry Surveys (of September 22, 1948), released by the United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines, reported:

> Manganese ore was being consumed at an annual rate of about 1,500,000 short tons (during the second quarter), a rate slightly in excess of that in 1947. Consumers of manganese ore were obliged to draw heavily on inventories during the second quarter, as receipts at consuming plants amounted to 24 percent of the quantity used. Imports of manganese ore during the second quarter dropped 21 percent from the first quarter. Of this, the U. S. S. R. furnished 38 percent, India and South Africa each 15 percent, Brazil 14 percent.

Mr. President, not only is Russia cutting off 38 percent of our supply, but we are also confronted with an even graver threat by the developments in the Far East, which stem directly from the betrayal of China by American representatives at Yalta. The Russian Communist conquest of China is daily becoming more of an ugly reality. If and when China falls, Korea and the whole southeastern Asiatic area will be next. Yet, we also find that we have been dependent on India for 15 percent of our manganese imports, which is now threatened to be cut off by these Communist advances.

What is even more ominous is the organization of 15 Moslem and southeastern Asian countries, which on January 24 met in New Delhi, India, to protest the policies of our allies toward Indonesia and the Asiatic peoples, policies which we are continuing to underwrite.

Speaking for this group of nations Prime Minister Nehru of India said on January 24:

> A resurgent New Asia, as shown by the conference on Indonesia should be notice to the United Nations that the Far East no longer intends to be satisfied with a minor or secondary role in world affairs.

In addition, Mr. President, this Government is becoming more deeply involved abroad in policies and commitments involving billions of dollars, designed to increase the productive capacity of nations on this side of the iron curtain. It is simple logic that as this industrial capacity is increased, there will be a proportionate struggle for increased allocations of available raw materials, which will cut down our own ability to obtain from foreign sources the materials we so desperately need.

No one has more clearly stated the extent to which our commitments go than Mr. William Philip Simms, who wrote on January 18, 1948, in the Washington News:

> Asia, home of half the earth's population, rapidly is overrun by Reds with little serious opposition.
>
> In western Europe, the battle seems to have reached a stalemate. But the outcome, British and other experts are now saying, depends upon at least another decade of American financial, economic, and military aid.
>
> Those 10 years will cost American taxpayers anywhere from 150 to 200 billion dollars. And 10 years is a long time and $200,000,000,000 is a lot of money.

Meanwhile, this administration continues the insane policy of destroying the steel capacity of central Europe, which could provide to the European nations everything we are being asked to furnish under the Marshall plan and under this prospective 10-year program. The fact that we are determined to destroy this industrial capacity is reflected in the fact

that since we are underwriting the British and French occupation of Germany, as well as our own, we are spending $1,000,000,000 a year to carry on the senseless dismantlement program and to continue to ship behind the iron curtain into the Russian sphere factories we are dismantling. That policy cannot be defended. It is simply the old Morgenthau policy of hate.

Furthermore, as the National Council for the Prevention of War pointed out in its release of January 5, 1949, this policy of destruction is reflected in the implementation of our Marshall plan aid to Germany based on an analysis of Paul Hoffman's report to the ECA of December 15, 1948. The report shows that—

Germany, with one-sixth of Europe's population and one-third of Europe's industrial potential, is being awarded only one-tenth of Marshall plan authorizations. Only 25 percent of this has been shipped. This compares with 40 percent shipments for Europe as a whole.

Less than 1 percent of the shipments to Germany are classified as industrial or recovery goods, while more than 36 percent of ERP shipments to all Europe fall in that category.

Mr. President, as the facts indicate, the policies to which we are being committed by this administration are a mass of insane contradictions. Here we stand today with the whole cause of human liberty resting on our shoulders, with the defense of the anti-Soviet world dependent upon us, with the continuing prosperity of the United States an absolute must—yet with our vital interests criminally neglected.

Today we are still dependent on the Soviet Union for 38 percent of our manganese, without which we cannot produce steel, while 15 percent of our imports of manganese come from India, which is now threatened by continuing Communist successes in China.

This is the result of deliberate administration policies, as the following record shows. I always like to quote the record. Whose fault is it that today this country is dependent to the extent of 30 percent upon manganese from Russia, and 15 percent from India, not to mention the other countries to which I referred a while ago?

The sad truth is that on March 3, 1933, the Buy American Act was passed as a criterion for public purchasing by the governmental department, title III of which reads:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, and unless the head of the department of independent establishment concerned shall determine it to be inconsistent with the public interest, or the cost to be unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States, and only such manufactured articles, materials and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, shall be acquired for public use.

Back in 1933 the Congress took action. It is not because during all these years the necessity for developing our own resources and providing against emergencies had not been discussed and dealt with by Congress, that we are in our present predicament. On June 7, 1939, the bill S. 572 was signed into law as Public Law 117. It has as its purpose:

To provide for the common defense by acquiring stocks of critical and strategic materials essential to the needs of industry for the manufacture of supplies for the armed forces and the civilian population in times of a national emergency, and to encourage, so far as possible, the further development of strategic and critical materials within the United States for common defense.

Again, on July 23, 1946, the Seventy-ninth Congress passed the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, amending Public Law 117, incorporating title III of the Buy American Act of 1933, and appropriated a total of $600,000,000 to implement it for the same purpose as stated above in Public Law 117.

How well I remember that on the very last night of the special session certain Senators from the eastern section of the country opposed a bill introduced and pleaded for by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and other Senators who were familiar with the situation, and familiar with the fact that our stock piles of many of these critical materials had dwindled to almost nothing. Yet, when President Truman signed Public Law 520, he stated in his approval message, on July 23, 1946:

It is only because of the overriding importance of this purpose that I am able to overcome my reluctance to sign a bill which reaffirms the application to stock-pile purposes of the provisions of Title III of the act of March 3, 1933, known as the Buy American Act.

These provisions will not only materially increase the cost of the proposed stock piles but will tend further to defeat the conservation and strategic objectives of the bill by further depleting our already inadequate underground reserves of strategic materials.

Mr. President, so far as manganese is concerned, this is a completely erroneous assumption. I am speaking about a material of which our country may be short. But we have manganese in 37 different States. We have more manganese than any other material. Yet we have the President stating he is against the bill because he says it would deplete our resources.

The President continued:

Furthermore, there can be serious conflict between these provisions and the foreign economic policy which this Government is actively pursuing.

There we have it. It conflicted with the foreign policy. A thousand times better, the President thought, to take care of foreigners than to take care of the American people and the American taxpayer.

Recognizing the increased necessity for constructive action to protect our own national security, in July, 1947, the Eightieth Congress passed the Premium Price Act of 1947, the purpose of which was "to stimulate the exploration, development, mining, and production of certain minerals and metals by private enterprise to supply the industrial, military, and naval needs of the United States, by providing for the development and conservation of those materials in order to decrease and prevent, wherever possible, a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of such materials."

This bill specifically dealt with increased production of copper, lead, zinc, and manganese. Yet, on August 2, 1947, President Truman vetoed the bill. As a consequence, many of our mines closed their doors, and instead of our getting a stock pile, we wiped out the stock piles on the ground where these mines were producing.

If today we are unable to get manganese, let the President assume the responsibility. If today a farmer cannot get a binder or a tractor, or if the housewife cannot get electricity because there is no steel with which to make wire, they need not blame the Eightieth Congress, because President Truman vetoed the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress.

Even today, in spite of the tremendous amount of money appropriated by Congress to start raising domestic production of these crucial materials, particularly manganese, our Stock-piling Act has remained practically inoperative.

Why, Mr. President, are America's vital interests ignored and neglected? All the facts point to but one conclusion: This administration, and those who are carrying out its policies, are deliberately violating the specific will and intention of Congress as clearly expressed by the statutes the Congress has passed.

On January 25, Chief Donald F. Carpenter, of the Munitions Board, issued a progress report on the stock piling of critical materials. Is it not significant that in this report there is no mention of manganese? Why not? Was he ashamed of what the administration had done with regard to manganese? Did he want to hide what the administration had done regarding manganese? But this vital, critical material, which must be had if we are to be able to manufacture steel, was never mentioned by Mr. Carpenter in the report. Is it not even more significant that in this progress report Mr. Carpenter specifically states that they have embarked on a new policy, totally different from that provided for under Public Law 520—the strategic stock-piling bill—which states that purchases of strategic and critical materials shall "be made, so far as is practicable, from supplies of materials in excess of the current industrial demand"?

Now we are informed that this new policy is one by which materials will be taken from our industrial supplies—whether such action will cut into civilian demands or not.

Mr. President, I wish to repeat that statement, because here is where the poor farmer gets it in the neck again: Now we are informed that this new policy is one by which the materials will be taken from our industrial supplies, whether such action will cut into civilian demands or not. This policy is the result of an Executive order, issued by the President 6 months ago, which countermands the basic intent of Public Law 520.

Of course, the President says, "If you have to sock somebody, sock the fellow who needs the steel." Mr. President, if we do not have manganese, we cannot manufacture farm machinery. So every day the telephone calls come in, asking where the senior Senator from North Dakota can locate a combine or a drill or some other piece of farm machinery the farmers need. The men and women who signed the REA agreements 6 or 7 years ago in my State and in South Dakota and in some portions of Minnesota and Montana are unable to obtain the benefit of electric utilities in their homes, because they are unable to obtain the wire to be put on the poles, to bring to their homes the electric energy to run the various pieces of electric equipment, because Russia has cut off the supply of manganese.

But what is even more disastrous is the fact that Public Law 520, the one the President set aside by his Executive order, specifically directs the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Bureau of Mines, and the Director of Geological Survey "to make scientific, technologic, and economic investigations concerning the extent and mode of occurrence, the development, mining, preparation, treatment, and utilization of ores and other mineral substances found in the United States or its Territories or insular possessions, which are essential to the common defense or the industrial needs of the United States in order to determine and develop domestic sources of supply."

Yet the shocking fact is, Mr. President, that up to this moment neither the Department of the Interior nor any other branch of the Government under this administration has taken a single step to implement the specific directive of Public Law 520 to provide for the stimulation of domestic production of critical raw materials. Absolutely nothing of any kind or character, either directly or indirectly, has been done by the administration to carry out the provisions of that act.

As the record now stands, it is simply fantastic to read in an article by the Associated Press, as of January 25, 1949, that instead of developing our own raw materials, the President is coming to Congress to ask for a billion dollars to implement his "bold new program to develop the world's backward areas, and that this money would be available for loans by this Government to foreign countries which join in a plan for coordinated development of their national resources."

In other words, Mr. President, we are being committed to the extension of an international policy which will underwrite the interests and security of everyone but ourselves. In the West there may be all kinds of manganese, but Public Law 520 has been completely ignored by this administration, and nothing has been done to develop the manganese there. I think the time has come, Mr. President, for an investigation of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Mines, the Geological Survey—and the administration itself—as to what constitutes their real attitude toward the development of America's own natural resources, upon which we become increasingly dependent with every day that passes.

So, Mr. President, I merely say, in conclusion, that here we have the President and the various departmental heads, who are supposed to carry out the will of Congress as to the stock piling of critical materials, ignoring the direction given to them, not once, not twice, but three different times. They are ignoring those directions entirely and completely, with the result that today we are at the mercy of Russia and at the mercy of India in the matter of manganese, which we need so very much in connection with the production of steel. Yet we find the President saying, "If we do not get steel, we will nationalize the steel industry." That is his reply after three different laws passed by the Congress have been neglected or willfully disobeyed.

## DAYLIGHT-SAVING TIME FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 135) to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance the standard time applicable to the District 1 hour for a period of each year commencing not earlier than the last Sunday of April and ending not later than the last Sunday of September. Any such time established by the Commissioners under the authority of this act shall, during the period of the year for which it is applicable, be the standard time for the District of Columbia.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, the pending measure is Senate bill 135, an act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight saving time in the District.

This bill is unanimously reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia. So far as I know, there is no opposition.

Therefore I shall move the engrossment, third reading, and passage of the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator know of any other Senator, on either side of the aisle, who wishes to debate or discuss this bill?

Mr. McGRATH. No Senator has expressed any interest in debating the bill, or has expressed any opposition to it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply ask that question for general information, and to protect any interested Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I strongly support the enactment of this measure. I do not wish to delay its passage by making a lengthy statement. However, I wish to call attention to two facts: First, that the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia has announced publicly on more than one occasion that he intends to give preferred attention to the creation of home rule, for the people of the District of Columbia, by having that matter brought as quickly as possible before the Senate and the House of Representatives. I fully approve and strongly support him in that position.

I note as well that he has requested the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] to head an able subcommittee to bring as quickly as possible before the full committee, and subsequently before the Senate itself, a home-rule measure for our consideration and, I hope, for passage.

It seems to me that in considering this particular measure it is apparent that the distinguished chairman of the committee is not in any sense violating the commitment he has made and the effort upon which he has entered to bring home rule to the District of Columbia, but, rather, is recognizing the importance of home rule; and it seems to me that insofar as it is possible under the present law, this measure is a home-rule measure, and will delegate to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia more authority than they have ever had under any prior bill on this subject; that is, authority not merely for 1 year but from year to year, to determine for themselves and for their District, and after hearings of any kind that they care to employ, at which their citizens may be heard, whether or not daylight-saving time shall be set up in the District from year to year. I would not support this bill if it were not for the fact that it does leave to the local officials, local citizens who represent the District as members of the Board of Commissioners, to determine the facts as to whether or not daylight-saving time shall be established.

Mr. President, I think this home rule measure and this home rule objective is so important that I am going to take a few minutes to place in the RECORD a brief statement which I made at a recent forum program put on by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith in the District of Columbia, and which was broadcast over Station WOL, on January 27, last. The distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER] likewise participated in the program, and I am only sorry I do not have his statement to incorporate in the RECORD. At this time, without taking the time of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the copy of the opening remarks which I made at that time in the effort to answer the question which was being considered at that public forum, "What should Congress do to secure the democratic rights of the citizens of the Nation's capital?" My own answer to the question was and is that there is no other task within the power of the Congress which at all compares in service to the citizens of the District of Columbia, and, I thought, in service to the Nation, in this local field, with the giving of real home rule to the District. Therefore I confined my remarks in that opening statement and generally

throughout the forum to supporting as strongly as I could this home-rule effort.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement by Mr. HOLLAND, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

I am glad to be here tonight to state my answer to the question, "What should Congress do to secure the democratic rights of the citizens of the Nation's capital?"

In my judgment, the first and most important task within the power of Congress, which would secure for the residents of the District of Columbia democratic rights which are regarded as basic democracy everywhere else in our Nation, is the speedy enactment of home rule for the District. Under home rule the people of the District, through representative citizens of their own choice, would have local self-government, comparable to that which is enjoyed by the citizens of every other large urban community in our Nation. This would operate in two fields which are generally kept separate: (1) A locally elected city or District council would handle those functions of government usually exercised by the municipal government of any large city; (2) a locally elected school board would handle those governmental functions under which the public school system operates.

The present thoroughly undemocratic government of the District, under which the citizens of the District have no direct control of any sort over their municipal government and their public school system, is a travesty on the fundamental American principle of representative government.

From the standpoint of the citizens of the district themselves, the present system, with its complete absence of responsibility on the individual citizens, breeds lack of interest, lack of pride, lack of information as to the details of their local government, and too often lack of confidence in and respect for the two local governments which are closest to them and have most to do with their daily lives and with the rendition of those services which mean most to them and to their families. Such services include, among others, police and fire protection, sanitation, public health, public safety, public welfare, and public education. Such a system, to my way of thinking, is very bad for the citizens themselves.

From the standpoint of the attitude of the public employees and the public services, such a system is bad. These employees and services cannot be, and they are not, as responsive to the will and the legitimate requests of the citizens of the district as they would be under a system of representative government which would allow the citizens to select the key officials who would have direct control and supervision over the District employees and services. I wonder if any citizen of the District who is listening to me tonight is so naive as to believe that his reasonable requests receive the same attention from many District employees as do the requests of a Member of Congress?

From the standpoint of giving to the local needs of the District the immediate and careful attention which they deserve and require, the present system is bad because every Senator and Representative has to give primary attention to the needs of the people of his State or district, who elect him, as well as to the needs of the Nation as a whole; and the District and its needs are bound to come last, and too often they come at long last.

There is nothing new in home rule. The founding fathers, as shown by Mr. Madison's clear statement on the subject, did not intend to abolish local selfgovernment in the District. By congressional action, local self-government actually existed here from 1802 until 1874. There is no constitutional question as to the legality of allowing the local election of members of the council and school board—no legal question about giving to the council and school board full administrative power, each in its field—no legal question about giving the council legislative power to enact ordinances covering the customary scope of municipal legislation. The only constitutional question is whether additional legislative power beyond the field of local municipal ordinances can be delegated by Congress to the council. This sole legal question can be solved by the courts through the years, but in the meantime it seems to me to be the imperative duty of Congress to enact home rule for the District and thus secure to the citizens of the Nation's Capital, basic democratic rights which are exercised by the citizens of every other city and town in the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in closing these brief remarks on this subject, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that not only is it an imposition upon the nearly 900,000 citizens of the District to continue a form of government which bans them from having any say whatever with reference to the selection of the officials who preside over them, either the members of their city ccmmission or the members of their school board; not only are they hopelessly deprived of any semblance of any local control over their own affairs in these two intimate governments which have to do so vitally with their happiness and the happiness of their families and homes, but that from the national standpoint it seems to me to be a terrible waste of time and effort and energy for the two Houses of the Congress to have to give their time, hour upon hour, to the consideration of many, many questions which are of such small importance that they do not at all justify any such consideration. I am not speaking of this particular measure, because while it is not a major one it does at least have substantial meaning to the District and to the Nation. But I am talking about such measures as those that we had up in the last Congress, for instance, determining whether or not mixed boxing bouts should be permitted in the District of Columbia, and whether or not the immediate removal of two ancient stone columns in the streets near the White House should be permitted, and whether or not the starlings should be required to roost at other places than upon the cornices of the public buildings in the District of Columbia, and whether or not those who sell bottled beverages and soft drinks within the District should be required to furnish straws to their customers, and whether or not the members of the barber board should have certain powers, and whether or not barbers within the District of Columbia should be permitted to work a certain number of hours, and whether or not the names of streets should be changed, or railroads should be permitted to build needed spur tracks upon alleys within the District. There were numerous other matters of such trivial importance, Mr. President, which consumed in the total, in my judgment, hundreds of Senator hours and hundreds of Representative hours at a time when the problems of the Nation and of the world as a whole are so great and so grave that they certainly offer to the Members of both Houses of Congress a challenge to give their very best efforts for as many hours of each day as they can continue to work.

And so, Mr. President, it is my hope that the occasion of the passage of this measure—and I hope it will be promptly passed—will also serve to point up the necessity for the creation of genuine home-rule government in the District of Columbia, in which again the citizens of the District may have the privilege, which they exercised for many years constitutionally, the privilege of selecting the members of their own governing bodies by their own vote. I strongly hope the distinguished chairman of the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate may persevere in his announced intention to bring to the floor of the Senate shortly a home-rule measure under which the only city in the United States which does not have for its citizens the power of local self-government, the capital of the United States of America, may have that particular blot removed from its escutcheon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill was passed.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing two nominations, which nominations were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. REED, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1955 (reappointment).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

## MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Aubrey B. Fennell to be an associate judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator, if he knows, what business will be coming up Monday, to which

day I understand it is intended to adjourn the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to my able friend from Massachusetts, I have an understanding with the minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that nothing will come up on Monday of importance in view of the fact that Republican Members of the Senate are now on their way, or soon will be, to various places throughout the country to make Lincoln Day addresses, and some of them will not return by Monday; some will not get back before Tuesday or Wednesday. So, with the sort of mutual understanding we have had in the past with respect to the celebration of Lincoln Day, Jackson Day, and Jefferson Day, I can assure the Senator that nothing of importance will come up on Monday, and Senators on the other side may praise the immortal Abraham Lincoln from now until then; and they would not be overdoing it if they should do that, because I think Abraham Lincoln was one of the great men of all time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator include the Presiding Officer who, I understand, will go to Illinois to make an address?

Mr. LUCAS. The Presiding Officer has condescended to go to Springfield, Ill., to make a speech upon Abraham Lincoln; and I prophesy that it will be the best speech that will be made by anyone on that particular day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to suggest that it is not a condescension to go to Springfield, Ill., on any occasion, and especially is that true of this occasion.

### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until next Monday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received February 10, 1949:

### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Philip C. Jessup, of New York, to be Ambassador at Large.

North Winship, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of South Africa.

Myron Melvin Cowen, of New York, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Australia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of the Philippines.

### SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

John C. Ross, of New York, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America, with the rank and status of Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, in the Security Council of the United Nations.

### UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the terms indicated, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate:

B. Harvie Branscomb, of Tennessee, for a term expiring January 27, 1951.

Harold W. Dodds, of New Jersey, for a term expiring January 27, 1950.

Martin P. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, for a term expiring January 27, 1949.

Mark Starr, of New York, for a term expiring January 27, 1949.

Edwin B. Fred, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for the remainder of the term expiring January 27, 1950, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified, vice Karl T. Compton, resigned.

The following-named persons to be members of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for terms of three years expiring January 27, 1952, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified (reappointments):

Martin P. McGuire, of the District of Columbia.

Mark Starr, of New York.

### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to the position of Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey, of Nebraska, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D. C., for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1950, vice William McChesney Martin, Jr., resigned.

### THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons to be judges of the Tax Court of the United States for terms of 12 years from June 2, 1948, to which offices they were appointed during the recess of the Senate (reappointments):

Byron B. Harlan, of Ohio.

Miss Marion J. Harron, of California.

### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Lester Luther, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Alfred E. Modarelli, of New Jersey, to be United States attorney for the district of New Jersey. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

### UNITED STATES MARSHALS

James J. Boyle, of California, to be United States marshal for the southern district of California. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina. He is now serving under a recess appointment.

### UNITED STATES COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employee of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

#### TO BE ENSIGN

Ateven L. Hollis, effective January 26, 1949.

### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard to be rear admirals, to rank from June 1, 1948:

Joseph F. Farley
Merlin O'Neill
Ellis Reed-Hill

(Admiral Joseph F. Farley, Rear Adm. Merlin O'Neill, and Rear Adm. Ellis Reed-Hill are presently serving in the Coast Guard, under 4 year statutory appointments, as commandant, assistant commandant, and engineer-in-chief, respectively. Their nominations to be permanent rear admirals in the Coast Guard are not intended to disturb their present incumbency in these statutory offices, nor the rank pay and other emoluments attaching thereto.)

#### TO BE REAR ADMIRAL, TO RANK FROM FEBRUARY 1, 1949

Louis B. Olson

#### TO BE REAR ADMIRAL, TO RANK FROM APRIL 1, 1949

Joseph Greenspun

#### TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM NOVEMBER 15, 1946

Raymond J. Evans — Allen E. Armstrong
Willis G. Partridge — James McMenamin

#### TO BE ENSIGN, TO RANK FROM JANUARY 15, 1947

Hardy M. Willis

The following officers of the United States Coast Guard Reserve to be commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard:

#### TO BE LIEUTENANT, TO RANK FROM OCTOBER 1, 1942

William R. Sayer

#### TO BE LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM AUGUST 1, 1944

Lloyd M. Logan

#### TO BE LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE), TO RANK FROM JANUARY 1, 1947

Charles R. Leisy

The following officers to be lieutenants (junior grade), dates of rank to be computed upon execution of oath in accordance with the regulations governing the determination of precedence as commissioned officers in the United States Coast Guard of Reserve officers, former Reserve officers, and former temporarily commissioned officers:

Dono W. Moore — Robert E. Foley
Bruce N. Jensen — John E. Riddell, Jr.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate Thursday, February 10, 1949:

### MUNICIPAL COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell to be a judge of the municipal court for the District of Columbia.

### IN THE ARMY

#### CHIEF OF ENGINEERS AND MAJOR GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Lewis Andrew Pick, O8096, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Chief of Engineers, U. S. Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Eugene M. Foster, O6228, United States Army, Chief of Finance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States.

#### UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Lt. Col. Walter J. Renfroe, Jr., professor of modern languages, United States Military Academy. (Given recess appointment on December 2, 1948.)

### IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Billy J. Baggett
Robert A. Westropp

John E. Parsons, Jr. (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Robert S. Blake — Thomas A. Kamm
William J. D. Bradford 3d — Adair Miller
William W. Davenport — Joseph J. Packo
Benjamin Dillahunty — Kenneth F. Pedersen
Edward J. Francois — Neil A. Swartz
Stanford J. Watson

Lek K. Von Kaesborg (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

James H. Greene (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy, to rank from date indicated after each name:

Erwin L. Aufdenkamp, June 3, 1949.
James H. Breunlin, June 4, 1948.

George L. Moreman (civilian college graduate) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated, to correct date of rank.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Ferris G. Hodge
Frederick S. Welham

LIEUTENANT

Eldon O. Schnoebelen

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

June V. Alvis
Eileen M. Bartels
Violet E. Bors
Wanda C. Bowman
Reba M. Bradford
Marjorie J. Brumit
Edith M. Cadman
Mary G. Cain
Jacqueline M. Camp
Mary Cerrato
Eleanor M. Chapman
Patricia E. Cresap
Nancy J. Crosby
Dorothy K. Cummings
Martha K. Daugherty
Mary I. Dekenys
Helen M. DeWitt
Vivian M. M. Dicke
Catherine R. Dupuis
Virginia C. Faeth
Mary J. Franco
Maurine G. Frederick
Dorothy L. French
Ina A. Gibson
Dorothy F. Giorgio
Rebecca Gomez
Anna G. Hart
Martha J. Hennessee
Laura M. Hoff
Eva M. Jacobsen
Louise F. Jakshe
Marie A. Johncola
Mary-Jeanne Lagano
Clara J. Leoni
Leslie E. McBratney
Mary P. McCarthy
Betty L. McDonald
Kathleen M. Malloy
Marcella A. Mickiewicz
Constance A. Miller
Doris M. Mortimer
Geraldine L. Newstrom
Regina M. Olko
Celia Olshefski
Angie L. Pettit
Joan E. Pollick
Evelyn F. Przybylek
Muriel E. Ramage
Madeleine J. Ruppert
Carolyn J. Shearer
Katherine Vagenas
Florence H. Volkering
Genevieve E. Wagasky

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Richard B. Phillips

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Alexander A. Bolton, Jr.
William McG. Crafft
Carl W. DeOnier
William W. Manson

LIEUTENANTS

Sidney D. Bond, Jr.
John A. McAfoos
Carl E. Pruett

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert H. Lemmon
John L. Reed
Anthony P. Rush
Eugene C. Stone, Jr.
Roger K. Wallace

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

COMMANDER

Willard J. Goldring

LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Allen L. McInturff
Syrus E. Tand›

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Frederick E. Batterson
Robert S. Leopold
Ralph A. Sennott
Carroll M. White

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William B. Hull
Willard J. Goldring

The following-named officers to the grades indicated in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANTS

Ethel J. MacNaughton
Mary J. Wolfe

Otto A. Fennig to be a lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Engineering, in lieu of lieutenant in the Navy, for limited duty only, classification Engineering, as previously nominated, to correct spelling of name.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

Franklin A. Hart

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of major general in the Marine Corps:

John T. Walker

The below-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Lawson H. M. Sanderson

The below-named officer for appointment to the temporary grade of brigadier general in the Marine Corps:

Walter W. Wensinger

The below-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of colonel in the Marine Corps:

Wayne H. Adams
Elliott E. Bard
Nelson K. Brown
Austin R. Brunelli
Edward B. Carney
John H. Cook, Jr.
Harlan C. Cooper
Edward J. Dillon
Robert E. Fojt
Edward H. Forney
Harry G. Fortune
Edmund B. Games
Bankson T. Holcomb, Jr.
Lewis C. Hudson
Albert J. Keller
Ralph M. King
August Larson
Harry S. Leon
Richard C. Mangrum
Francis J. McQuillen
Luther S. Moore
Ben Z. Redfield
Charles D. Roberts
Charles J. Schlapkohl
Walter T. Short
Clifford H. Shuey
William B. Steiner
Samuel G. Taxis
John A. While
Frederic L. Wieseman

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Thomas J. Ahern
Darrell L. Cool
George E. Dooley
Carl V. Larsen
David E. Marshall
Arba L. Norton
Edward L. Peoples
Arthur A. Poindexter
Bennet G. Powers
Charles O. Rogers
Eugene N. Thompson
Vernon O. Ullman
Harry A. Waldorf

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Olin L. Beall
Robert E. McCook
August F. Schonefeld
Rupert E. Stone

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps Reserve:

Donald R. Nugent

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Anthony A. Akstin
William E. Baird
William J. Barnatt
John H. Blumenstein
Richard L. Braun
Joseph A. Bruder
Robert I. Bryan
Lyle E. Buck
Roscoe E. Cole
Francis P. Dayton
Frederic F. Draper
Cecil D. Ferguson
Herbert Gomes
Robert H. Hammond
Charles H. Horn
Roy N. Johnston
Bolish J. Kozak
George E. Leppig
Truman K. Lyford
Charles L. McIndoe
Carl A. Nielsen
Glenn E. Norris
William R. Ourand, Jr.
Albert L. Pope
Konneth L. Reusser
Thomas H. Rogers, Jr.
John E. Shepherd, Jr.
Clyde T. Suttle
Edward C. Thoemmes
Harold Wallace
Warren E. Whipple
James S. Williams
Russell L. Young
John W. Zuber

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of major in the Marine Corps:

George K. Acker
Emory L. Anderson
Max Beruffy, Jr.
Richard Burgess
Charles W. Case
Zadik Collier
Philip J. Costello
George R. Eargle
John H. Faggart
Thomas G. Fields
Harry D. Hargrave
Johnny Jennings
Samuel A. Johnstone, Jr.
Arthur L. Kent
Harry E. Kipp
Wilfred S. LeFrancois
Stephen Lesko
James D. Ludvigson
John W. Mace
Gilbert McConville
Doyle A. New
Frederick O'Conor
Fulton L. Oglesby
Harry C. Parsons
George S. Plantier
Lee E. Roberts
Charles Seiler
Frederick M. Steinhauser
Reuben S. Stoner
Vernon A. Tuson
John W. Webber
Lloyd O. Williams
William L. Williams
William L. Woodruff

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Arthur H. Ackerman
Howard K. Alberts
Philip R. Anderson
Stanislaus A. Antos
Wade W. Atkins
James P. Aynes
Billy H. Barber
Irvin "J" Barney
George F. Bauman
Herbert L. Beckington
Louis W. Benjamin, Jr.
William C. Benton
James L. Berard
Albert J. Bibee
Richard L. Bland
James D. Boldman
Raymond N. Bowman
Lawrence H. Brandon
William B. Buckner, Jr.
Robert H. Buettner
Clarence J. Busick
Warren A. Butcher
Raymond J. Butters
Robert O. Carlock
Nicholas Chernock
Richard W. Cline
Frank R. Collen
Ralph D. Coplan
Charles E. Crew
Calvin K. Currens
Eldon E. Davidson
Stanley Davis
William E. Deeds
Charles F. DeKeyser
Gerald T. Dixon
John J. Doherty
Charles E. Dole
James W. Donnell
William R. Duncan
Richard A. Flanagan
James G. Fox
Burnette R. Gallagher
Baylor P. Gibson, Jr.
George "M" Golleher
David T. Gooden
James B. Graves
Joe R. Greene
Harold K. Hall
Curtis F. Hamlin, Jr.
Merlin L. Hasley
Paul B. Henley
Thomas R. Hickey, Jr.
Robert W. Hoffman
Marvin K. Hollenbeck
Howard G. Holt
Odia "E" Howe, Jr.
James O. Huston
Joseph N. Irick
William C. James, Jr.
George E. Jenkins
Charles D. Jones
States R. Jones, Jr.
Joseph R. Kapsch
Theodore A. Kelley
George C. Knapp
Alexander Kositch
George A. Krumm
Eugene F. Langan
Stewart R. Lauer
George E. Lawrence
Harry Lee
Claude H. Lewis, Jr.
William R. Lobell
Edwin B. Long
Edward "H" Mackel
John H. Maher
Norbert C. Manley, Jr.
Kenneth L. Mann
William S. McCarson
James D. McGough
Oscar "J" Morel
Robert J. Morrison
Victor E. Myers
James R. O'Moore
Will S. Patee, Jr.
Uel D. Peters
Franklin N. Pippin
Eugene J. Pope
John G. Prestridge
Joseph Pultorak
Richard H. Rainforth
Raymond J. Rightmyer, Jr.
David Riley
John J. Rollins
Carroll D. Rowe
Leonard L. Schultz
Robert R. Scott
William A. Shepherd
Robert C. Shipp
Frank "A" Shook, Jr.
Almond H. Sollom
Ira E. Spieker
Parks J. Stallings
Elmo J. Stingley
Harold H. Stirling, Jr.
Marvin R. Stout
John B. Sullivan
Walter E. Sullivan, Jr.
Wilson "C" Terry
Nicholas G. W. Thorne
Eddie C. Torbett
Johnnie V. Townsend
Thomas B. Trammell
Marion G. Truesdale
Herman L. Ubbins
Eugene "A" Wailes
Herbert R. Waltz
Stephen G. Warren
Warren C. Watson
Robert J. Weaver
Warren E. Weinberg
Robert M. Wetzel
James L. Whitaker
Patrick E. Wildman
Frank E. Wilson
James E. Wilson, Jr.
Ray Woods
Robert P. Wray
Frank R. Young

The following-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

George J. Batson, Jr.
Hersel D. C. Blasingame
Walter E. G. Godenius
Harry D. Hutchcroft
Francis L. Miller
James B. Seaton
Howard B. Smith
Ben W. White
Ellis R. Wright

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

James C. Alison
Eugene J. Ambrosia
Henry G. Ammer
William E. Androsko
Frederick L. J. Ashworth
Guy O. Badger
Lonnie P. Baites
John H. Barclay
Paul W. Barcus
Wallace C. Barrett
Raleigh E. Barton, Jr.
Richard Bell
George H. Benskin, Jr.
Joe R. Bibby
George G. Blair II
Donald M. Blomgren
Dorsie H. Booker, Jr.
James T. Breckinridge
John C. Breckinridge
Fitzhugh L. Buchanan, Jr.
Edwin B. Bucholz
Lyle W. Bullard
Edwin "A" Burns
Harrison M. Butler
John C. Butner III
Robert W. Calvert
Ira T. Carr
Michael P. Carroll
Frank A. Cassiano
Franklin R. Chambers
William E. Clark
David A. Clement
Stanford Cluggish
Thomas B. Collins
James G. Costigan
Robert E. Cox
Theodore T. Culpepper
Asa B. Culver, Jr.
William J. Cupelo
Clarence G. Dahl
Charles M. Darracott
John G. Demas
Edmund G. Derning, Jr.
Jack N. Dillard
Jack W. Dindinger
Thomas S. Dlugos
Donald W. Dorn
Robert E. Downen
Earl C. Dresbach, Jr.
LeRoy M. Duffy
William F. Dyroff
Edward W. Dzialo
Edward V. Easter
Paul M. Edwards
Harry D. Elms
Donald E. Estes
James D. Feltman
Henry Fischer, Jr.
Joseph R. Fisher
Thomas R. Freeman
Homer D. Frison
Robert W. Frye
Edward D. Gelzer, Jr.
Nolan R. Gibbons
Gerald W. Gibson
Hobson J. Gifford
Ronald L. Glendinning
Melvin K. Green
Richard P. Grey
Leo Gumienny
Arnold J. Hammons
Autrey B. Hammon
Frank W. Harris III
Howard H. Harris
Robert G. Harris
Lester Heinz, Jr.
Clayton V. Hendricks
Russell S. Hibbs
Norman W. Hicks
Joseph J. Holicky
Louis S. Hollier, Jr.
Thomas J. Holt
Frank H. Horn
Kenneth C. Ives
Curtis A. James, Jr.
Robert E. Jochums
Tracy N. Johnson
David G. Jones
Edward H. Jones
George P. Jones
Robert A. Jones
Robert W. Jorn
Timothy J. Keane, Jr.
Jack R. Kearney
John H. Keith, Jr.
Gene S. Keller
James P. Kelly
Edward B. Keyes, Jr.
Edwin W. Killian
Lee A. Kirstein
Harrol Kiser
Herbert J. Korstange
Orin D. Krone
Fred D. Kuhlmann
Robert J. Larsen
Harold V. Larson
Fred Lawton, Jr.
Thaddeus F. Lewandowski
Elmer "M" Lewis, Jr.
Harry M. Lindberg
James E. Machin
Fletcher B. Maddox
Reginald G. Martin
Jan Mason
Donald L. May
John R. McGuigan
Frederick C. McLaughlin
Clare R. McMahon
George C. McNaughton
Robert L. McNeely
Merrill J. Melton
John B. Melvin
George A. Merrill
Jack L. Miles
Frank N. Mitchell
Arthur B. Montagne
Clarence G. Moody, Jr.
Gail A. Newkirk
William J. Nietschmann
Richard F. Noble
Robert G. Parrish
Harold L. Parsons
William H. Peck
Jack B. Phillips
Brockman L. Plauche
Ray D. Pineo
Arthur J. Poillon
Linus F. Pottebaum
Robert G. Price
Elmore F. Ravensberg
James H. Reid, Jr.
Lester F. Reid
Knowlton P. Rice
Alvin R. Rieder
Glenn W. Rodney
Harold E. Roland, Jr.
John J. Roothoff
Maurice Rose
Ted J. Ryder
James R. Schoen
Gerald F. Schultz
Benjamin B. Selvitelle, Jr.
James F. Shea, Jr.
Donald A. Silva
John B. Sims
Frederick D. Singer
Perry T. Smith
Richard E. Smith
Harry A. Spaight, Jr.
Donald E. Spencer
Raymond B. Spicer
Clarence R. Stanley
Richard E. Stansberry
Thomas J. Stevens
Howard D. Stewart II
Hugh W. Stewart
Howard E. Stidham
Charles H. Sullivan
Theodore Summers
William Swanson
William E. Sweeney
Warren G. Tanzier
Alfred C. Taves
David S. Taylor
Jay "J" Thomas, Jr.
Robert J. Thomas
William L. Tipton, Jr.
Charles T. Turpin
Robert A. Underwood
Rollin F. VanCantfort
Robert N. Vance
Jo M. Van Meter
Floyd L. Vuillemot
John A. Wachter
Denzil E. Walden
Charles M. Wallace, Jr.
Henry M. Walter, Jr.
Ralph L. Walz
Alan J. Warshawer
Charles T. Westcott
Howard A. Westphall
Jack D. White
William A. Whitesell
Edward A. Wilcox
Loren K. Wildermuth
Wallace L. Williamson
Ralph C. Wood
Kermit M. Worley
John R. Wyatt, Jr.
Robert F. Young, Jr.
Vance L. Yount, Jr.

The followed-named officers for appointment to the temporary grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

George M. Best
Jack F. Boles
Johnny L. Carter
Robert E. Follendorf
Russell T. Gorter
William J. Hamilton
James M. Haney
Raymond E. Logan
John F. McCarthy, Jr.
Kenneth R. Porter
Cluese T. Powell
James A. Tootle
Frank C. Trumble
Wilmon Varnado
Andrew M. Young

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Oscar W. Cargile
Thomas J. Chandler
Claude N. Harris
Paul H. Mikkelsen
John F. Pezdark

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Walter E. Anderson
Wilbur R. Barnes
Kennard F. Bubier
Ira Brock
James E. Buckle
Hall V. Cartmell
Harry E. Detwiler
Thomas H. Dougan
Frederick Dykstra
Grammer G. Edwards
Frank W. Ferguson
Wallace Henry
Harold R. Jordan
Norman D. Kent
Clyde H. Long
Francis J. Lutz
Edward J. McCabe
Lee Moberly
Eero Nori
Joseph F. Stepka
Samuel M. Trippe
Herman A. Zehngebot

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Herman T. Barbee
Leonard I. Beatty
Paul F. Brandenburg
Richard P. Brezinski
Willie W. Brock
James E. Brown
Good Burleson
Theodore R. Cathey
Frank J. Cermak
Francis L. Churchville
Robert J. Corbett
Thomas H. Cutler
Robert L. Dickey
Walter H. Eastham
Edward E. Eder
James W. Eldridge
Irvin H. Elrod
James P. Evans
Joseph R. Foster
Howard C. Frazer
Elwood E. Gebhart
Cletus K. Gibson
Walter R. Giles
Raymond F. Gotko
John P. Grando
Robert C. Gunsalus
James K. Harris
Milligan G. Hereford
Ralph H. Hobbs
Michael J. Hogan
Arthur L. Jackson
Boyd J. Jackson
George Jones
Albert H. Keith
Beldon Lidyard
Raymond L. Luckel
Floyd M. McCorkle
Thomas W. McNeely
Charles E. McPartlin
Arthur J. Noonan
Ronald J. Nourse
Frederick V. Osborn
Thomas C. Palmer, Jr.
Paul R. Paquin
Howard H. Parker
Frank G. Paul
George T. Perschau
Fred R. Philpot
Paul J. Preston
Caryll A. Price
Joseph J. Reardon
John F. Ricard
William B. Richards
Joseph C. Schwalke
William A. Searight
Frank C. Sheppard
Michael J. Sisul
Samuel L. Slocum
Robert A. Smith
Allen F. Stockdale
Robert G. Straine
James D. Swinson
Max C. Taylor
Harold M. Tupper
Robert E. Wall
William F. Watson
George L. Williams
Adolph Ziegler

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Oscar A. Bosma
Woodrow W. Brown
Alfred T. Coon
Felix L. Ferranto
Henry G. Goare
Bill E. Grimes
Dudley J. Hagen
Adolph J. Kutilek
Walter P. Landis
Lornie Leslie
Virgil R. Martin
William D. Miears
Adam A. Metz
Warren L. Mobley
Howard E. Morris
William L. Nolte
Bill L. Parham
Gerald L. Pines
William M. Rossiter
Kenneth M. Stayer
St. Clair Tant
Russell Tarver
John H. Tomlinson
Charles M. Whitley

The following-named officers for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Raymond L. Amos
Everett L. Anderson
John T. Bates
Daniel M. Blue, Jr.
Louis J. Caminiti
Robert B. Dowdy
William A. Fiander
Allison G. Folsom, Jr.
Thomas F. Ford
Hollis W. Glass
Frank L. Howard
Stevan Iungerich
Lawrence W. Keenan
Homer King
Frederick J. Knack
Richard C. Laubach
Frank Lisi
Michael M. Marks
George M. Mathis
Glenn E. McComas
George E. McKain
John A. Mitchell
Louis A. Murphy, Jr.
Howard W. Pearson
Albert L. Protz
Estes N. Ratliffe
Leon C. Riley
Norman Rubin
Thomas J. Shaw
William H. Shuman
Edward Stallknecht
Clyde H. Stamps
Judson J. Swallow
James V. Valentour
Maurice S. Wahrer
Peter P. Yezierski
Albert J. Zlamal

The following-named woman officer for appointment to the permanent grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps:

Katherine A. Towle

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of major in the Marine Corps:

Julia E. Hamblet
Pauline E. Perate

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of captain in the Marine Corps:

Pauline B. Beckley
Barbara J. Bishop
Margaret M. Henderson
Emma H. Hendrickson
Elsie E. Hill
Helen J. McGraw

The following-named women officers for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Kathleen J. Arney
Eunyce L. Brink
Ben A. Day
Frances A. Denbo
Mary J. Fischer
Jeanne Fleming
Mary J. Hale
Margaret S. Ordemann
Pauline F. Riley
Margaret L. Stevenson
Jeanette I. Sustad

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Hugh S. Aitken
Ralph M. Anderson
John R. Bigler
Joseph A. Borowski
Travis D. Brown
George Caridakis
Oliver W. Christianson
Harold L. Coffman
Wallace E. Crowder
Rodger I. Eddy
Robert F. Edgar
Wendall C. Endsley
John C. Fite
Jerry D. Fly
Clarence W. Friesen
John "J" Gates
Tom L. Gibson
Harvey A. Goss
Edward C. Hall, Jr.
Edmund W. Hanlon
Ray Heck
John J. Hess
Frederick W. Hopkins
John W. Hutchinson
Edwin G. Javor
Austin C. Jenson
James E. Johnson
Nicholas Kavakich
David D. Kelley, Jr.
Damon J. Larson
"R" Michael McCarthy
Joseph Mordente
Francis W. Muetzel
Edward S. Murphy

| | |
|---|---|
| Earle W. Pye, Jr. | Vaughn R. Stuart |
| Robert O. Risinger | Warren H. Taylor |
| Alexander S. Ruggiero | Roy R. VanCleve |
| Stanley J. Seward | Wayne D. Walton |
| Carl F. Shifflette | John O. Williams, Jr. |
| Emmett B. Sigmon, Jr. | Leslie C. Williams |
| Joseph V. Slawta | Henry S. Zdankowski |
| Robert H. Starek | |

The following-named officers (former enlisted men) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

| | |
|---|---|
| Walter G. Ackerman | Thomas P. Lennon |
| Harry L. Alderman | Clarence W. Littleton |
| Merle W. Allen | Frank J. Mackin |
| Roscoe W. Anderson | William H. Marlowe |
| Nickolas D. Arkadis | James H. Marshall |
| George L. Armitage | Ronald A. Mason |
| Milton S. Ashcraft | William J. Masterpool |
| Dean C. Baker | Charles H. Mattox |
| John E. Baker | George E. McAlee |
| Harvey W. Baron | Eugene A. McGuire |
| Donald F. Bays | Floyd H. McKay |
| Elbert "T" Bell | Edmund C. McPoland |
| William J. Berlinguette | Joseph P. Mitchell, Jr. |
| | Arthur R. Mooney |
| Frank W. Boules | Edward C. Morris |
| Donald E. Bradley | Joseph E. Muir |
| Donald R. Brimmer | Richard L. Musselman |
| Dale L. Brown | Joseph Namesnik |
| Douglas L. Brown | Bud F. Nelson |
| Clayton O. Bush | Joseph A. Nevin |
| Arnold F. Bynum | Rollie D. Newsom |
| John J. H. Cahill | Minard P. Newton, Jr. |
| Richard E. Carey | Jack L. Nolan |
| Ray N. Carter | Arthur A. Oakley |
| Dana B. Cashion | James P. O'Connell |
| Charles A. Christiansen | Marion R. Ozburn, Jr. |
| | Eugene J. Paradis |
| John N. Christolos | John M. Patrick |
| William R. Clifton | Peter M. Payne |
| Edward E. Collins | Edward C. Post |
| Orville D. Conney | Robert J. Post |
| Manley H. Cosper, Jr. | Frederick K. Purdum |
| John D. Counselman | Wallace J. Reid |
| Bert "R" Covert, Jr. | Patrick C. Roe |
| David R. Cowling | Raymond E. Roeder, Jr. |
| Richard J. Coyne | |
| Lamar G. Crawford, Jr. | Paul J. G. Roosen |
| Ronald N. Davis | Victor A. Salvo, Jr. |
| Paul E. Denny | Robert P. Scheunemann |
| Edwin A. Deptula | |
| Richard M. Doezema | Harold G. Schmidt, Jr |
| William K. Duryea | Hugh C. Schryver, Jr. |
| Raymond S. Eason | Kenneth M. Scott |
| William S. Edler | Donald W. Sharon |
| David J. Ellington | Stewart A. Shaw |
| Billy J. Elliott | George E. Shepherd |
| Edward T. Emmelman | Michael J. Shinka |
| Tyler D. Evans | Van J. Simmons, Jr. |
| Richard G. Eykyn | Frederick L. Simons |
| Paul R. Fields | Donald D. Sisson |
| Bert Fisher | Patrick G. Sivert |
| Basil L. Flannagan | Louie J. Smith |
| Harry A. Florence, Jr. | Robert J. Smith |
| Howard O. Foor | Taylor B. Smith |
| William C. Foster | James W. Stemple |
| Marvin D. Gardner | Gerald H. Stewart |
| Joseph M. Glasgow | Charles R. Stiles |
| Raymond J. Glodowski | Ralph E. Sullivan |
| Frederic W. Golles, Jr. | Russell G. Swift, Jr. |
| Daniel J. Griffin, Jr. | Harold A. Thomas |
| James E. Hannan | Carl B. Thompson, Jr. |
| Dale M. Henz | Robert P. Thomson |
| Jack M. Hermes | Ralph J. Tuley |
| Roy E. Hess | Leon N. Utter |
| Wallace A. Heyer | Edgar W. Wagner, Jr. |
| Willis T. Howland | Wayne F. Wallace |
| John M. Jackson | Joseph A. Ward |
| Spencer H. Jarnagin | Lars R. Wargin |
| Richard M. Johnson | Andrew T. Watt |
| Donald R. Jones | Joseph R. Wayerski, Jr. |
| Joris F. Kenyon | Richard P. Wells |
| Ethmer W. King | Robert F. Werner |
| John W. Kostnik | William W. Westphall |
| Roy E. Krieger | Kenneth C. Williams |
| William A. Kronberg, Jr. | Goode D. Wilson, Jr. |
| | LeRoy K. Wirth |

The following-named officers (civilian college graduates) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Nate L. Adams II, a citizen of Virginia.
Stanley "G" Alexander, a citizen of California.
Wendell O. Beard, a citizen of California.
Howard G. Blank, a citizen of Maryland.
John S. Carson, a citizen of the District of Columbia.
James L. Crutchfield, a citizen of New York.
Brian J. Cummings, a citizen of New Jersey.
Bruce F. Cunliffe, a citizen of New York.
Jack H. Davis, a citizen of Illinois.
Thomas J. Deen, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Joseph K. Gastrock III, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
John N. Guild, a citizen of Colorado.
Gordon S. Hosmer, a citizen of New York.
George J. Kleess, a citizen of New York.
Donald J. Krabbe, a citizen of Missouri.
Donald E. Marchette, a citizen of South Carolina.
Donald V. McCloskey, a citizen of California.
Francis E. McDonald, a citizen of Missouri.
Philip T. O'Hara, a citizen of New York.
Joseph R. Owen, a citizen of New York.
Laurence M. Phelps, Jr., a citizen of Florida.
Charles B. Quinn, a citizen of New Jersey.
John A. Reames, a citizen of South Carolina.
Thomas C. Redfern, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.
Allan L. Reid, a citizen of California.
Edward W. Snelling, a citizen of South Carolina.
William A. Speer, a citizen of South Carolina.
Robert G. Staffney, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
John J. Swards, a citizen of New York.
Phillip F. Thomas, a citizen of Tennessee.
Francis W. Tief, a citizen of New York.
Robert G. Topp, a citizen of Mississippi.
John M. Walker, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Robert M. Winter, a citizen of California.
Cullen C. Zimmerman, a citizen of North Carolina.

The following-named officers (former contract NROTC students) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Mayhlon L. Degernes, Jr., a citizen of Minnesota.
Edwin W. Hakala, a citizen of Michigan.
Lawrence W. Hetrick, a citizen of Ohio.

The following-named officer (former midshipman) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Thomas H. Johnston

The following-named officers (former Regular officers) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

| | |
|---|---|
| Allan G. Copp | Wesley E. Strauley |
| Raymond C. Damm | William P. Yerger |
| Billy C. Marks | |

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS TO PERMANENT GRADES

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of captain for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

Cecil E. Anderson

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of first lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William Fellner

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant for limited duty in the Marine Corps:

William H. Howard

The following-named citizen (contract Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps student) for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Raymond R. Rall, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

The following-named midshipmen for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Samuel E. Englehart
William F. Saunders, Jr.

The following-named former Regular officer for appointment to the permanent grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps:

Warren J. Skvaril

The following-named officer for appointment to the permanent grade of commissioned warrant officer in the Marine Corps:

Harold K. Jackson

WITHDRAWALS

Executive nominations withdrawn from the Senate February 10, 1949:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF WASHINGTON

Hawthorne Arey to be a director of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

TRUCE COMMISSION FOR PALESTINE

John J. Macdonald to be the representative of the United States of America on the Truce Commission for Palestine.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Creator of mankind, we praise Thee for Thy immortal word—made in His image. Give us a courageous strength that we may never defile this blessed endowment.

As servants of the people of whatever section or creed, we pray for thorough cooperation and solidarity and mutual help for all groups. Give us courage to withstand anything that imperils our usefulness. Guarding our influence and example, help us to be worthy champions of those standards which exalt national character.

In all these experiences, work in us to do Thy will and Thy good pleasure. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BOLD NEW WORLD PROGRAM

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, President Truman's bold new world program is not a new thing; it is simply an extension and an expansion of President Roosevelt's Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation for the development and improvement of the

Latin-American Republics. President Roosevelt's ICSCC has been in operation for 10 years exporting American know-how, American machinery, and American wealth to our Latin-American neighbors. President Truman's bold new world program to raise the standard of living of the world's undeveloped areas therefore is simply an extension to the rest of the world of Roosevelt's Western Hemisphere good-neighbor policy.

President Truman extended aid to Greece and Turkey in 1947 through the Greek-Turkish aid program, and extended aid to the countries of western Europe under the Marshall plan. American aid and help and skill and resources are now to blanket the world through his bold new world program. The question arises, What is back of this ambitious world program, this world WPA? Why is it sprung upon our weary, overburdened American taxpayers at this particular moment?

Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern in Washington today among President Truman's advisers over falling prices, increasing unemployment, surpluses that are beginning to pile up, and an anticipated glutted market. Something must be done to avoid the deflation that lies ahead. American surpluses must be disposed of in order that full employment may be maintained and our national income kept above the $200,000,000,000 mark. President Truman proposes therefore to give away more goods to keep the production machine going, to raise more taxes, to pay for more goods to give away, ad infinitum.

This game of give-away is to be sold to the American taxpayers—who have to pay for it—as a defense measure because a business slump would be playing into the hands of Joe Stalin. It is what he has been waiting for. If a business slump comes Joe Stalin will have won his cold war. So we must tax and tax, spend and spend, give and give, produce and produce to avoid a depression.

Mr. Speaker, America's postwar appetite for consumer goods is finally becoming satisfied; the inflationary effects upon price levels of our huge shipments abroad—$14,000,000,000 worth of scarce goods to Europe last year instead of our normal exports of $4,000,000,000 worth—are now diminishing, so a glutted market with falling prices threatens our economy. Economists, both inside and outside the administration, have known for some time that our high-price, high-income economy must be maintained to keep America solvent, to meet the heavy service charges upon our $280,000,000,000 debt, and to support our extravagant $45,000,000,000 Federal budget.

President Truman's blueprint for world-wide peace and prosperity is bound to develop into a robbing-Peter-to-pay-Paul process, a spend-ourselves-into-prosperity program, where the American taxpayer will be required to pick up the check. How long can this give-away game be kept up?

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS]?

There was no objection.

ORGANIZED BASEBALL

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, organized baseball received a stunning blow yesterday when a court of appeals ruled in effect that the contract of a player is not binding. I certainly do not question the wisdom of the court's decision, but would like to make this observation.

Players, club, and league officials have traditionally had a complete understanding that the particular type of contract under which they operated was necessary to perpetuate our national game.

Now comes a player who jumps his contract to play in Mexico, and when the well runs dry down there, comes back here, and because he is disciplined for jumping his contract, brings this unprecedented action against baseball officials—an action that could well sound the death knell for the sport that has kindled the fires of ambition in the breasts of so many thousands of young Americans.

From the excellent program sponsored by the American Legion, up to the major leagues, baseball has been making splendid citizens out of boys who in many cases, were it not for baseball, would never have had a chance.

Some of these players have made an indelible mark in our sporting history. Their contribution to the youth of America can never be measured in money. I sincerely hope that any player who would destroy baseball for personal gain, will, for the sake of American youth, reconsider his action before it is too late.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] may have an indefinite leave of absence, due to serious illness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGEE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a talk made by him yesterday before the Brightwood Lions Club on education and Federal aid.

DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM ON OLEO

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the plank in the Democratic platform which proposes repeal of the Federal antimargarine taxes means just what it says.

I think I know what that plank means. I helped write it and heard the discussions which went on concerning it. I was a member of the subcommittee on resolutions at the Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia. My group prepared the first draft of the platform and then submitted it to the platform committee.

The plank on margarine which we drafted meant repeal of Federal antimargarine legislation. There was no thought of substituting a ban on the manufacture and sale of yellow margarine, or of putting any other restriction on margarine in lieu of the taxes.

Naturally, we discussed the matter at some length and decided that sentiment in the country as a whole is for repeal.

The persons who now argue that the administration would be breaking faith with Midwest farmers if it goes ahead with its plans for repeal of the margarine taxes evidently do not know what went on at Philadelphia when the Democratic platform was drafted.

At that time the proposal by the dairy group that the taxes be repealed but that yellow margarine be banned had not been made public. There was no mention of this proposal at Philadelphia.

To say now that the proposed ban on yellow margarine is in line with the platform and the administration's position is to ignore the plain facts.

To repeat, the plank meant outright repeal of the Federal antimargarine laws without reservations. I am hopeful that the House will take speedy action to carry out the platform pledge.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOLLING asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an address by Howard A. Cowden, president and general manager of Consumers' Cooperative Association, Kansas City, Mo.; and in the other case a quotation from the Hoover Commission task force on natural resources.

Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. LARCADE) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper editorial.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain letters pointing out the difference between the organizations meeting with reference to civil liberties.

Mr. PRICE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal.

Mr. MORRIS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BURNSIDE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MEETINGS ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there will be two conferences in this city during the next few days on the subject of civil rights. One, which is scheduled to meet on February 11 and 12, under the name of the Legislative Assembly and Rally to End Segregation and Discrimination, contains the usual list of Communists and Fellow Travelers, with the addition of one or two leading Republicans, plus several innocents some of whom are always unfortunately cajoled into these affairs by the Communists.

The other meeting the National Citizens Conference on Civil Liberties, is being held on February 15 and 16, called by the Civil Liberties Clearing House. This meeting has been given the blessing of the President of the United States who is the most courageous defender of civil rights our country has ever known. He wrote as follows to the chairman of this conference, Mr. E. Raymond Wilson:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
*Washington.*

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: Please accept my best wishes for a successful gathering of the National Citizens Conference on Civil Liberties which will be held in Washington February 15–17.

We must provide a solid foundation for the future growth of our country. Of great importance to the present and future generations of America is the development of a program of civil liberties guaranteeing to all people the heritage of freedom which we have received from the founders of this Nation. A free system can endure only when there is freedom of opinion, expression, and conscience.

Your conference has a great responsibility in formulating the kind of program which will give added strength to the principles of freedom which have come down to us from the fathers of the Constitution.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY TRUMAN.

I call these two meetings to the attention of my colleagues so that they may discriminate between the one which is heavily Communist-dominated, and the other which is of interest to those good American citizens who are trying to give statutory meaning to our constitutional guaranties, but who are opposed to cooperation with those who expound totalitarian doctrines.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] has expired.

SHARING OUR MATERIAL PROSPERITY WITH THE WORLD

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of a few minutes ago, on this floor, by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], call forth these extemporaneous remarks by me, as he apparently condemns the President of the United States, for the position he took toward sharing our democratic knowledge and advancements with other peoples of the world.

It seems to me that the President of the United States should be instead congratulated upon continuing to emphasize to the people of America, and the people of the world that the heart of America is still warm; that the heart of America is still intelligent and unselfish enough and Christian enough to be willing to share with the people of the world the material prosperity of America, and the spiritual attainments which the people of America have acquired through God's blessings, in part, in the form of our geographic location, climate, natural resources, and other features.

I wish to compliment the President of the United States upon renewing and emphasizing these things which our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, now deceased, emphasized in his lifetime. I am not surprised that President Truman has again reiterated those declarations of unselfish and sensible interests in the progress of the world, because I would expect the President of the great American people, with their thoughtfulness and unselfish attitude toward world progress, to reiterate them. In fact, I would not expect the President of the United States to do otherwise, than to be interested in the prosperity of the people of the world. He represents the thinking of the people and heart of America, and the intelligence and heart of America is to be generous and steadfastly helpful toward the progress of the people of the world. I would say that the great mass of American people recognize that only as the world goes forward in prosperity and in spiritualness can America go forward, and I am saying that the heart and mind of America recognizes that the peace of the world depends upon America's being interested in doing something about the advancement of all the people of the world, as well as the people of America. World prosperity is no longer divisible, nor is the peace of the world divisible. Uncertainty for any mass of people in the world spells uncertainty for many people of the world. Economical or social backwardness, or tardiness, for any mass of the people in the world holds back social and economical advancement for all the people of the world. President Harry Truman of the United States, in his inaugural address, in fact, spoke the heart and the mind of the great mass of people in America, when he urged that the people of America help in the material advancement of all of the people of the world.

I again compliment the President of the United States on doing this, again, and again, and again.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

ACQUISITION AND OPERATION OF THE FREEDOM TRAIN BY THE ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 95) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, for printing in the RECORD:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. J. Res. 84) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments which may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have until midnight tonight to file a report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an article from the Saturday Evening Post entitled "We Could Slip Into Socialism While Hating It."

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a memorial adopted by the Legislature of Montana.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a case study in international espionage in the Far East, notwithstanding the fact that the Government Printing Office estimates the cost will be $1,153.75.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next following the regular business of the day and any special orders heretofore granted for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

SPECULATION ON THE COMMODITY MARKETS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of congratulating the Secretary of Agriculture in ordering an investigation with respect to the operation of certain manipulators on the board of trade within the last few days that has resulted in an unusual break in the prices of grain.

While I believe the prices of grain are still high, I cannot subscribe to the manner in which a few manipulators and gamblers have acted in making short sales which resulted in such a drop in the prevailing prices.

I have frequently called attention on the floor to the operations of these few hundred speculators and gamblers in grains, as well as in stocks, who have been permitted to bring about breaks in the market which have caused a disturbance in the financial conditions of our country. However, what applies to the board of trade and grain speculators also applies to the stock exchange manipulators, short sellers, and gamblers.

Within the last few months some of these manipulators, taking advantage in the change in the result of the election, began to sell stocks short, which operation they have practiced from time to time whenever opportunity presented. Why should this Government permit a few hundred, or even a few thousand, of these professional speculators, by their operations, dislocate and affect conditions that invariably are destructive and affect the normal operation of business and the economy of our Nation?

None of the few hundred speculators on the Board of Trade grow a single bushel of wheat, corn, rye, oats, and other grain commodities, and still they sell not thousands but hundreds of thousands of bushels of grain a day that they do not own.

A former judge in New York and our former ambassador to Germany, James W. Gerard, made this observation: "He who sells goods that are not his'n, should be sent to prison," and I believe that some day in the near future a law will be passed that will make it a criminal offense for anyone to sell anything that he does not possess or own.

In 1929, and ever since that time, I have made many investigations of the manipulations of the grain and stock speculators and obtained valuable information satisfying me that 95 percent of the sales on the stock exchange, curb, grain, and commodity exchanges are professional deals on the part of a few of these manipulators, including the exchanges dealing in butter, lard, eggs, and other products. Of course, I realize that from time to time these gentlemen having friends on the floor have criticized me for calling attention to the outrageous activities of these brokers, but it has not and will not stop me from insisting and urging the passage of much stricter legislation than I advocated in 1929 which brought about the creation of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I recollect that 3 years ago I directed the attention of the House to the outrageous boosting of the price of rye on the part of a small group owning about 80 percent of the rye stock which they acquired at 65 and 70 cents a bushel. Through manipulation they forced the price up to $2 and $2.25 per bushel which price was 40 to 60 cents higher than the price obtaining for wheat. An investigation was undertaken by the Department of Agriculture and some of these speculators were suspended but, unfortunately, the infliction of that penalty apparently has not curbed or stopped the unethical and unfair practices as we have observed in the manipulations which have taken place in the last few days. In that connection I wish to say that notwithstanding that the prices of wheat, corn, rye, barley, and other grains have gone down, the flour millers and the bakers have ignored the drop in wholesale prices and the price of bread and all other food necessities have not been reduced or lowered to the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I also recall in the last Congress when I called attention to the activities of certain professional brokers and manipulators whose short selling brought about a break in the market, I was criticized by a gentleman from Pennsylvania, a former broker, whose defense of their operations indicated to me that he was connected with this coterie of gentlemen. Suffice to say that the gentleman is no longer here. I wonder whether today there may be some gentlemen who do not understand these manipulative stock practices who may come to the defense of these manipulators who are responsible for the recent break in the market.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will continue in his investigations and bring to light those who are responsible for these artificially created breaks or upturns in prices.

Investigations should also be made of the stock exchanges and it is my hope that the Securities and Exchange Commission will make public, as I have frequently requested, timely reports on all short sales, what stocks have been sold short and by whom sold, and such reports to be made immediately and not weeks later.

### THE WHITE HOUSE AND THE CAPITOL

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Nebraska a few minutes ago to the effect that he was instrumental in having signs taken down in front of the White House that it was being wrecked. That is what I was afraid they were doing. I hope from the reports I get that they do not wreck the exterior of the White House, because it has been a landmark for years and we appreciate it. Enough things have been wrecked; let us do a little repairing and building.

I also see in the newspapers that there is talk about spending $5,000,000 in changing the face of the Capitol. I hope that does not happen. We have not the money, and it is all O. K. as it is. But I do hope that the Architect of the Capitol will do something about the House Chamber. We should find some place where we could meet long enough to give them time to strengthen the ceiling and do away with the unsightly steel scaffolding in this room today. It is a disgrace that we should have permitted this condition to continue for so many years. I have served here for a good many years, and these beams have been here most of that time. I think the proper thing for us to do is to find a place where we could meet temporarily until the interior of this hall can be strengthened and these unsightly iron beams and braces removed. Its acoustics are bad. The steelwork is unsightly. In its present condition it is not a fitting place for the House of Representatives to meet. I hope prompt consideration will be given to this matter. We could move to some auditorium for 6 months so the work could be done, or better still, for the country, adjourn for 1949 the first session of the Eighty-first Congress now.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

### COMMODITY AND STOCK MARKET PRICES

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was not surprised at all to hear the 1-minute speech made a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] in which he blames the speculators entirely for the slump in commodity- and stock-market prices. Of course, we all know that speculators like other folks are not simon pure, but we also know that when anything happens of this nature the party in power makes a whipping boy, and tries to make a scapegoat of the fellow who has a little money whether he made it by the sweat of his brow, or by legal speculation, or what not.

The thing causing these prices to be depressed today is the attitude and the power of Mr. SABATH's New Deal socialistic administration and the campaign pledges and recent actions of most every member of his party, including the President of the United States, who have said in effect "We are going to take care of the fellows here in America who have some money to invest. Yes, we are going to see to it that they are ground down into the dust." And the people are taking them at face value. The people with a little or a lot of money to invest are not going to invest much as long as you keep up this kind of talk about those who have worked and saved money with which they can buy things or invest in most anything they see fit. That is the trouble, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and every thinking American, including the President, knows it. Facts are, this is the very thing the New Fair Deal party has been crying for during the past several months. What has come over them all of a sudden?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the program will be next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am in position to advise the House what the program will be until Wednesday next. It will be remembered that last week I said there would be nothing controversial called up on Monday.

For consideration on Monday I have assigned H. R. 2402, which is a bill extending the War Assets Administration to June 30, 1949. I will see that the gentleman from Massachusetts, also the minority whip, have copies of this bill. I do not think there is any controversy over that bill. It was unanimously reported by the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If anything should develop we can confer.

Mr. McCORMACK. We can agree to put the roll call over until the next day.

There is also House Joint Resolution 84, the Freedom Train bill, unanimously reported out of the committee and if anything develops there we can have the same understanding.

On Tuesday the first deficiency appropriation bill will be called up for consideration. There are certain controversial items in that bill. I make that statement in order that the Members might be advised of the fact. What the period of general debate will be I am unable to state at this time, however that is a matter of adjustment and determination by the appropriate members of the Appropriations Committee. Whether that will be completed on Tuesday or not, I do not know, but, if not, consideration will be continued on Wednesday.

The next order of business after consideration of the first deficiency bill, which I have tentatively assigned for Wednesday but which in any event will be the next order of business, is House Resolution 66, to authorize the Committee on Public Lands to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction.

After that we have House Resolution 75, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction.

Then there is H. R. 1661, a bill to provide for the continuance of authority for the regulation of exports. I understand that a rule has been applied for on that bill. Of course, this announcement is all dependent upon rules being reported out. A rule has also been applied for on the first deficiency bill.

Coming to Wednesday of next week, there is H. R. 782, a bill to constitute the Federal Security Agency as a Department of Welfare, assuming that bill is reported out of committee and a rule obtained.

I have nothing scheduled for Thursday or Friday, and I reserve the right to announce any program for those days early next week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I will state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am filing a report on H. R. 1437, and, if it is convenient with the House leadership, I would like to have it heard either Thursday or Friday, if a rule is granted.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had a talk with the gentleman yesterday or the day before about that. That is a bill relating to the strength of the Army and the United States Air Force. But at this particular time I can make no statement to the House in relation to that bill in reference to programing it. I shall certainly keep in mind the wishes of the gentleman from Georgia and also the talk I had with him, but I cannot make a definite commitment at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, in reference to the bill establishing the Department of Welfare, the chairman this morning agreed to continue hearings until next Tuesday. There are several witnesses that desire to be heard on that legislation and I am just questioning whether you should bring that in on Wednesday.

Mr. McCORMACK. That may be so. I am not pressing it. I am glad to receive the information from the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I have no knowledge about the agreement to continue it until next Tuesday, but if it is reported out and a rule can be obtained, then I shall bring it up in the order in which I stated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a statement made yesterday by Secretary of State Acheson.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 96, Rept. No. 63), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for Monday, February 14, be shifted to Wednesday, February 16.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD five short paragraphs by Mr. James Mountain, Jr., a young newspaperman and World War II veteran from my district which I think sets forth in an illuminating, concise, and simple style, the difference between trial procedures in a democracy and the farcical travesty on justice which has just occurred in Hungary. I call this article to the attention of the Members. I realize that we are all busy, and that a lot of things come to our desks every day, but I have read many stories and articles on the dastardly, inhuman, undemocratic, vicious persecution, not only of a man, but of Christianity itself in Hungary and I can recommend this article as being extremely pertinent. If you will take but a few minutes to read it, I am sure that it will give you food for thought for many days to come.

ALONG THE WAY

OHIO VALLEY MERRY-GO-ROUND

The cards were stacked against Cardinal Mindszenty in Budapest from the start. He was getting a crooked deal and everybody knew it. It wasn't the trial of a Catholic cardinal or a pressing of a technical charge of treason. Actually, it was a test of the strength of the Hungarian Communist Party—a test which wouldn't have been made unless the Kremlin was absolutely sure that its quislings are now solidly entrenched in Hungary. It would have been the same if the Protestant Church or the Jewish faith had been the last remaining obstacle in the path to complete subjugation of the Hungarian people.

The Hungarian Commies knew full well that in pressing the trial against Cardinal Mindszenty they were violating the terms of the Hungarian peace treaty agreed to by the Big Four and under which all were entitled to democratic justice. So now, in a major case which has attracted the attention of the world, the Hungarian Commies have thrown down the gauntlet and there are no takers among the democratic nations of the world. Mark up another victory for Russia. They have beaten down, in a farcical trial which was a travesty on justice, not Cardinal

Mindszenty, but the last remaining idea of the Hungarian people that they are entitled to the dignity of human beings.

The goddess of justice now must reinforce her blindfold, and put a clothespin on her nose when she is called to sit on trials behind the iron curtain. Yet these Communists are the people who rave and rant about world peace, who vilify the United States as imperialistic, who deride our trial-by-jury system and who point a scornful finger at our brand of democracy. Compare the trial of the Hungarian cardinal to the trial of the 12 Communist leaders now going on in New York. The cardinal probably will go to his death. The 12 in New York stand a much better chance of living out their allotted span of years.

Here is factual proof, in these two trials, of the basic differences between communism and democracy. The cardinal's trial was prefaced by torture to wring from him a confession, and the man who was named to defend him actually praised the Hungarian court for its conduct of the trial. Following his arrest, the cardinal was thrown into prison while the Hungarian guards softened him up for the trial. The 12 in New York, before and during their trial, are permitted the freedom of the Nation, to enjoy the rights and privileges which they are actually trying to destroy, and their defense attorneys are using the court as a sounding board for propaganda.

The lights are going out again around the world, and not all the words that may be spoken in the court of the United Nations, or that may be written in the free press of the democratic countries, will stay the clubs of the Soviet storm troopers from shattering these lamps of freedom which are winking out one by one in the face of the Communist flood edging out from Moscow in widening circles. What the solution is no one seems to know, but definitely, it is not to be gained by diplomatic notes of protest, ineffective words of condemnation. Hitler is having the last laugh, because Stalin is doing the same things better than the unlamented Nazi louse.

JIMMY MOUNTAIN.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

## GOVERNMENT FINANCES

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have before us for consideration the Budget Commission's recommendation that we enact legislation to spend approximately $41,900,000,000 in the next fiscal year. This budget recommendation is merely an estimate. It is likely that more requests for appropriations will be made, and this amount increased.

There are some cold and inescapable facts to be looked in the face as we consider, which duty requires us to do, the necessity or lack of it for spending this incomprehensible sum of money in one 12-month period. Unless the necessity actually exists, certainly we should not spend it.

This budget is $4,400,000,000 greater than the budget submitted for 1948, and it is $6,800,000,000 larger than the budget submitted for 1947.

How does it compare with actual spending in previous years?

Twenty years ago, in the peacetime year of 1929, actual Federal spending was $3,738,000,000. That was also about one-twelfth of the budget recommendation we are now considering for the next fiscal year. That was before the idea became current that the duty rested upon the American taxpayer to carry the rest of his world upon his back. That was at a time when the belief prevailed that every capable and able bodied man owed the duty to himself and his family to work and earn a living for them. It was at a time when thrift was considered a virtue and when economy was not considered a vice.

In 1930 Federal Government expenses were $3,789,000,000, a small increase over 1929. It was not until 1931 that Federal Government spending reached the $5,000,000,000 mark.

There followed year by year, almost without exception, a gradual increase in Federal spending. In 1940 it amounted to $9,802,000,000. That was our last normal peacetime year, so far as Federal spending was concerned. In preparation for war, the amount jumped in 1941 to $19,153,000,000.

At the 1929 rate of spending forty-one and nine-tenths billion would have operated our Federal Government nearly 12 years. At the 1940 rate it would have paid all Government expenses for more than 4½ years.

As Federal spending increased annually, so did the number of Federal civilian employees. In 1929 the number of these employees was 559,579. In 1930 they increased to 580,494 and in 1931 to 588,206. By 1940 in 11 years these employees almost doubled the 1929 figure, and had reached 1,014,117. In 1941 the number of Federal civilian employees had grown to 1,370,110.

In 1946 the year after the hostilities ceased there were 2,722,000 Federal civilian employees. In 1947 the number decreased to 1,995,469. It began to rise again in 1948. In 1948, according to the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, Federal employees in the executive department increased by 108,987, or a net increase which averaged 297 new employees added for every day in the year. That committee's latest report, issued February 3, 1949, shows the number of Federal employees in the executive agencies in December 1948 to be 2,104,456 and still increasing. Compare this with 559,000 in 1929 and with 1,014,000 in 1940.

More than 3 years have elapsed since hostilities ceased. If we ever intend to begin to practice economy, and to reduce expenses, 3 years is time enough to make a start. It is time to reduce expenses instead of increasing them, and time to cut taxes instead of adding new ones.

I do not believe the resources of the United States are sufficient to support an annual Federal budget of nearly $42,000,000,000, or even $40,000,000,000 on a permanent basis. Many of our natural resources are being rapidly depleted. Instead of continuing to scatter our resources all over the world with a lavish hand, it is imperative that we begin to practice rigid economy in many particulars. I have learned from research completed in 1947 that at our present rate of consumption, if new oil fields are not discovered in the meantime, our known and proved supply of petroleum would be completely exhausted in 12 years.

There will be, I assume, discoveries of some new oil fields in this country. But it is food for thought that the present known supply is sufficient to last us at present rate of consumption only 12 more years.

The National Minerals Conservation Council has published figures procured from the United States Bureau of Mines, calling attention to the critical mineral resources situation in the United States. Their report shows that there are many strategic minerals and metals of which we have an utterly inadequate supply. This council points out that America's mineral resources contrary to the general belief are exhaustible, and that known reserves of every day metals such as lead, zinc, and copper could be completely used up within the life span of the present generation. We have plenty of iron and we have plenty of coal, but these researchers point out that of the known reserve of copper, we have in our mines a supply sufficient to last only 34 years, enough zinc to last 19 years, enough lead to last only 12 years, enough manganese ore to last only 2 years, enough tungsten to last 4 years, and enough mercury to last 3 years, at the present rate of annual consumption.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Listening to the gentleman's discussion now, I just wish we had 300 Members of Congress who would think along the lines that you are talking on now. It would be the best thing that could happen to this country if we could get a little spirit of that kind into the thinking, if we are going to keep a solvent country.

I would like to ask the gentleman this: With a budget of $42,000,000,000, many things that we would like to see happen and many people would like to see happen cannot be undertaken. Does not the gentleman think we had better go a little slow in starting a lot of new things that will require a greater expenditure of funds until we are able to do those things satisfactorily and to the best interests of the country from a financial standpoint?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I concur in his thinking. I intend to deal with that question further along in my discussion.

At the present rate of soil erosion approximately 107,000,000 acres, or about 25 percent, of our cropland is deteriorating rapidly, and the United States Department of Agriculture warns that to prevent irreparable damage this land should have conservation treatment by 1960. They further state that approximately 500,000 acres of former cropland is being ruined each year as the result of erosion and rendered useless for any further practical cultivation.

Investigation into our natural resources shows that we are getting close to the bottom of the barrel with many of them. They are exhaustible, and unless steps are taken to conserve them many soon will be exhausted. We are not in a position to continue to scatter our resources with lavish hand to every corner and section of the earth. Not only is erosion depleting our soil but every crop grown on it takes from that soil just that much of its fertility, which

must be replaced, if the soil is to retain its capacity to produce.

How many generations in the future can be supported by this land of ours if we continue our present course? Are we taking into our consideration any generations except our own in the plans we are making? Do we owe posterity the duty to leave them anything but a huge debt? Have we set any goals, or are we merely drifting, and making no real effort to chart a course and follow it to a definite result? We now have a national debt of approximately $252,000,000,000. This budget of $41,900,000,000 makes no provision for a payment on this debt. It does include $5,450,000,000 to pay the interest on it. This annual interest amounts to more than the total cost of running the Government in 1933, just 15 years ago, and every year prior to that.

The cost of operating our Federal Government has grown at a steady rate and has reached a figure which I think can, without exaggeration, be called alarming. My own home State of Georgia will be called upon to pay, and will actually pay, upon this huge budget the sum of $590,000,000—considerably more than half a billion dollars; in fact, nearly two-thirds of a billion dollars, as Georgia's contribution toward the cost of the Federal Government for this one 12 months' period. This $590,000,000 which will be siphoned out of the State of Georgia to the Treasury at Washington for the fiscal year 1950 is more than four times the amount of the combined capital stock, surplus, and undivided profits of every bank within the State of Georgia, which total is $112,256,000. It is something to think about that the Federal Government is reaching its tax gatherer's hand into the State of Georgia and bringing from our people to Washington to apply on operating expenses for 1 year, more than four times the capital stock, surplus, and undivided profits of every bank in the State.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I made one mistake when I said "300 Members of Congress like the gentleman from Georgia"; I wish we had 435 Members like him. If we did we would save this country of ours.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The budget for the State government of Georgia for the same period is $108,000,000, with conditional increases estimated all the way from $35,000,000 to $80,000,000. If we use the highest estimate of the cost of Georgia's government, namely, one hundred and eighty-eight million, Georgia taxpayers will pay more than three times as much for Federal Government in the fiscal year of 1950, as they do for State government. If the cost of Georgia's State government should be held at the actual budget of $108,000,000, then Georgians would pay more than five times as much for Federal Government as the cost of State government.

In either case, whether three times as much, or five times as much, the respective cost of the two governments is all out of proportion. It is unreasonable. States' rights cannot survive in this atmosphere and under these conditions. Furthermore, the question presents itself, How long can the State of Georgia remain solvent, when the cost to the taxpayers of operating the State and Federal Government is a minimum of $698,000,000 and a possible $778,000,000?

This contribution of $590,000,000 by the State of Georgia to the Federal Government in the year of 1929 would have paid every penny of the cost of operating the Federal Government for approximately 2 months. So greatly has the cost of operating the Federal Government increased in that 20-year period, that this contribution of $590,000,000 at the present rate of Federal spending, will operate the Federal Government only 5 days.

In addition to these huge sums already mentioned, the taxpayers of Georgia must pay the cost of operating all city governments, county governments, and other miscellaneous governmental subdivisions.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that our natural resources and our productive capacity can permanently support these huge governmental expenses, or anything near these sums. I believe that continuous spending on these levels will surely lead to national bankruptcy, State bankruptcy, and individual bankruptcy. We have survived it this long because of an unprecedented period of production, manufacturing and selling, resulting from accumulated shortages of nearly all consumer goods because of the war. But many of these shortages of consumer goods have now been supplied. Shelves and warehouses have been restocked. Already we are feeling the effects of a buyers market. Unemployment is beginning to increase. Production has caught up with demand in many lines, and the market will no longer support the high capacity production which has provided the jobs and the employment so largely contributing to the prosperity of the past few years.

However much we would like for these good times to continue, we are going to have to face facts and realities. One of these realities is that governmental costs are going to have to be reduced. I believe that this is one of the major problems toward which this Congress should direct its efforts. It is a task so tremendous that intermittent and sporadic efforts in that direction will not suffice. The thread of economy must run through all congressional action.

We have made a beginning, and have taken a step toward reduction of Government cost, by passing through the House Monday a bill to authorize reorganization, consolidation, and elimination of Government agencies. This bill, if wisely used, can be the instrument through which overlapping agencies and positions can be eliminated, and efficiency restored where confusion and inefficiency have prevailed. This reorganization bill is not all that could be desired by any means. It does not contain all the provisions I would like to see in it. However, its purpose is good, and if reorganization plans are submitted under it which will be drawn with the good of the country in mind rather than political advantage, billions of dollars can be saved.

Our Constitution was not drawn and adopted with the idea that Congress should be the rubber stamp of the executive department. I have in years gone by felt that Congress has surrendered too many of its functions to the executive department. Our Government was set up to provide three separate, distinct independent departments, namely, the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. It will not remain a balanced government if either of those departments surrenders its prerogatives and functions. It will not remain a balanced government if either of those departments usurps functions and prerogatives which ought to be vested in one of the other departments.

I hope and trust that the majority party, of which I am a member, with the great power belonging to it in the Eighty-first Congress, will not undertake to rush through a program of legislation so fast and so hastily that Congress cannot give adequate consideration to the provisions of every bill we are called upon to enact, merely because it is part of an administration program. To do so would mean actually the surrendering by Congress of the duties and responsibilities which belong to its Members.

No emergency exists now which requires quick passage of speedily drawn and hastily considered legislation.

It is becoming more evident day by day that the American people will find it impossible from our own resources and productive capacity to maintain a high standard of living for the people of every other country on the globe, and at the same time continue to maintain our own high standard of living.

I believe that one of our first considerations should be reduction of our national debt of $252,549,855,401.63. In the past 3 years we have only reduced this debt approximately $6,000,000,000. The time to reduce it is when money is plentiful and times are prosperous. The time may come when we will find it a considerable burden even to pay the $5,500,000,000 interest on this tremendous debt.

I cannot help thinking that the people of the sovereign States of this Nation would do well to begin to think seriously of paying their taxes to their respective State governments and take care of their own functions, rather than send it to Washington and expect the all-wise, omniscient and infallible boards and bureaus here to provide a utopia for them.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The statement the gentleman has made evidences the fact he has made a very careful study and examination of the subjects which he has touched upon. He has given his brethren wise counsel and the statement he has made is extraordinary and worthy of the examination of the Members of this body. I congratulate the gentleman upon what he has produced because it is a statement of high quality and ought to have good effect.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman very much.

Considering the situation merely from the standpoint of my own home State of Georgia, I think it is extremely probable that we could take one-fourth the amount of money we will send to Washington in the next fiscal year, which one-fourth would be $147,500,000, add it to our present State budget, and provide for ourselves far, far better roads, larger pensions and assistance benefits to more people and more adequate public services of every kind, than we are getting now by sending it to Washington and then begging for a portion of it to come back to us, from people who do not have half the interest in our problems that we have ourselves, and whose primary interest necessarily is the maintenance and perpetuation of their own particular agencies, boards, and bureaus.

I know that the time is coming again, and it may not be in the far-distant future, when people are again going to recognize the virtues of thrift and economy, the necessity of paying debts, and of conserving our resources. I think that we in this Congress should devote much time to serious consideration of what agencies, boards, and bureaus can be dispensed with, not only in this country, but in our far-flung outposts and branch offices in other countries all over the world. If consideration is given and efforts made in these directions, I have no doubt but that savings can be made which will run into the billions of dollars. That will mean, of course, that some hundreds of thousands of Federal employees are going to have to leave Government service and get into some other line of work. This will, of course, bring objections and protests. However it is going to have to come sooner or later. I believe the sooner it comes, the better it will be for everyone, including the Federal employees.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I would like to tell the gentleman from Georgia how much I have enjoyed the remarks he has made. He talks exactly the way that the people I represent think. I wish that I could tell it to the Congress in the able manner that he has done it. The sooner we get down to the fundamental principles that the gentleman is talking about, the better off we are going to be.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

If we could operate our Federal Government in 1929 with 559,000 employees, and we did so operate it, it is not necessary to have 2,104,000, 20 years later in 1949, and to continue to increase that number at the rate of 297 per day. It should be going in the other direction at a much faster clip than 297 per day.

We face the necessity of choosing between cutting expenses on the one hand, or raising taxes on the other.

The average wage earner now sees approximately one-fifth his wages go for Federal taxes. In other words, he must work Monday for the Federal Government. He must also work the greater part of Tuesday for the city, State, and county governments. That leaves the other three working days for groceries, shelter, heat, clothing, medicine, education, transportation, and the other necessities of life.

We are taxed almost to the breaking point. An increase in taxes would be a step toward inflation and disaster. This is a time for economy—not for more taxes.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, the former chairman of my committee.

Mr. REES. I, too, want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for the very splendid, effective, and informative statement he has just made, and I trust that the Members of both Houses of this Congress will give heed to what he has had to say.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kansas.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

## RADIO BROADCAST

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week, while driving down to the office, it was my privilege and pleasure to tune in on one of the finest radio broadcasts that I have ever listened to. I thought that the choice of words, and the manner of presentation of this speaker, as well as the subject matter, should be brought to the attention of this body and given wide publicity.

On arriving at my office I called the broadcasting station and asked to speak to the gentleman who had spoken over the air. I asked him for a copy of his remarks, and he gladly sent it to me.

I would like to read it to you at this time:

### THE ATTRACTIVE MAN FROM GALILEE

(By Rev. Glendale Burton, minister, Wilson Boulevard Christian Church, of Arlington, Va.)

Jesus of Nazareth is the greatest personality ever to appear in the arena of human activity and play His part on the stage of life. No man equals Him in depth of character, breadth of soul, width of interest, or height of influence. He is the most outstanding individual who has ever trodden the dusty highways of life, or trudged up the steep, jagged hillsides of earth.

Jesus Christ of Nazareth is the Great Central Figure of all time. He divides history in two parts—B. C. (before Christ) and A. D. (in the year of our Lord).

It staggers the imagination to realize that a child could be born in an humble home; that home to be situated in an obscure hamlet, that hamlet to be located in a very insignificant small country less than the size of the State of Maryland; and yet from that humble home, obscure village, and small country should come One, the impact of whose personality should change the whole course of history, revolutionize philosophy, upset governments, revitalize religion, and transform men.

He was born in a conquered province of the Roman Empire held by the iron fist of military power, subject to the yoke of a slave—yet Jesus became the great Emancipator, setting free every man and woman of Adam's race.

He was born of a woman of lowly estate, living in the most despised city, Nazareth, from which "no good ever came." But He became the Fountainhead of all goodness.

He was born in a borrowed manger in the little town of Bethlehem. His father was an humble carpenter; but he instilled in his Son the creative genius of building, not a material house, but of constructing a new mansion of human beings called the Kingdom of Heaven. He lived but a brief 33 years. He was despised, lowly, and ignoble. Caesar ruled a great earthly kingdom, but he did not know that One would arise and found a kingdom greater in territory, wider in scope, infinitely richer in purpose which would endure when the stateliest of monuments and costliest palaces of the Roman Empire should crumble in the dust of oblivion.

He was not a general, yet He was to become the Conqueror of the world—not through the brutality of force but by the breadth of His mighty love.

He traveled little, confining His activity to Palestine, a country 45 miles wide and 100 miles long. He possessed no means of high-powered propaganda. There were no railroads, no steamships, no airplanes, no newspapers, magazines, printing presses, radio, or television.

He possessed no influential name, no wealth or position. He had neither training nor education, except that which He acquired at His mother's knee, in His father's carpenter shop, or in the humble village synagogue. He lived and moved among the common people. When He died they placed Him in a borrowed tomb. The estate He left was only a seamless robe which had been the gift of a friend.

He was not a doctor, yet He healed the sick, opened blind eyes, unstopped deaf ears, cleansed the lepers, and raised the dead. He was not a lawyer, yet He knew the law and interpreted it and applied it to the relationships which should prevail among men. He became the fountainhead of righteousness, and His principles are becoming more and more lodged in the hearts and consciences of men. He was not an author. He wrote no books, composed no poems, compiled no documents, edited no papers, contributed to no periodicals. The only sentence He ever wrote was a line in the sand which disappeared the same day.

No letter of it was preserved. He never used a fountain pen or a typewriter. We have no line, word, or syllable from His hand yet more books have been written about Him and His words than of any other man or group of men. He has affected the life of more people than all the authors of all the ages. The story of His life has been translated into more than 1,100 languages, read by countless millions, and is the best selling story every year.

He was not an orator, yet, "no man spake as this man." His discourses have become the theme of thousands of addresses. His thoughts are simple and clear. Very few adjectives are used—yet each sentence abounds with beauty, meaning, and grace. His sayings are hammered into polished marble, chiseled into imperishable granite, wrought into enduring bronze tablets, written in stained glass windows of numberless churches, fashioned in rich mosaics upon temple walls and set in arch domes of colossal cathedrals. They have been burned eternally into the hearts of the truly redeemed who down through the centuries have found com-

fort, relief, and healing. His words are literary gems. He stands without a peer in the literary field. Shakespeare, Milton, and Emerson must bow their heads in His presence, recognizing a superior. He used every form of speech without diluting the thought or overornamenting the truth. He was not a poet, yet He has inspired thousands of poets to utter their most sublime expressions.

He was not a musician; yet He inspired Mozart, Mendelssohn, Handel, and others. But for Him the great Christian hymns should have remained unwritten. He inspired Lowell Mason in "Nearer My God to Thee," Toplady in "Rock of Ages," Watts in "When I Survey the Wondrous Cross," Charles Wesley in "Jesus Lover of My Soul," and thousands of others.

He was not an artist or a sculptor or a painter. He was a stranger to the canvas; yet He was the inspiration for Raphael, Michelangelo, Hoffmann, and others.

He was not an architect, contractor, or builder. He was a Galilean carpenter—a maker of wooden plows and ox yokes; but He has inspired the noblest, most marvelous architecture known to man. He specialized in character engineering—making men human masterpieces. He took Peter "The big fisherman" and made a saint. He took Saul and made a Paul.

He was not a statesman. He never aspired to official position. He never delved into politics; but He did found a kingdom—the Sermon on the Mount was His constitution. His principles dethrone error, oppression, and tyranny.

At this hour we adore Him:
Beloved Personality,
Lover of the Poor,
Healer of the Sick,
Matchless Teacher,
Incomparable Philosopher,
Ideal of Ideals,
King of Kings;
But beyond all of this, Glorious Saviour.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. SANBORN, for 1 week, on account of official business.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 14, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

198. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the Commission's report on personnel management (H. Doc. No. 63); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

199. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the feasibility of the installation of additional generating capacity at Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington (H. Doc. No. 64); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

200. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish land-based air warning and control installations for the national security, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

201. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a report of the proposed transfer of a motor barge to the central Atlantic area council of the Young Men's Christian Associations for the boys' training camp at Andover, Sussex County, N. J.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

202. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report and findings on the Solano County project in the Central Valley Basin of California (H. Doc. No. 65); to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

203. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 537, 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

204. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 3, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Mississippi River at Alma, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 66); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

205. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Mississippi River between Missouri River and Minneapolis, with a view to harbor improvement in the vicinity of Hannibal, Mo., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 10, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 67); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

206. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 28, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on waterway from Pamlico Sound to Beaufort Harbor, N. C., via Core Sound, in the vicinity of Marshallberg, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 1, 1946 (H. Doc. No. 68); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

207. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 13, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a preliminary examination and survey of Scarboro River, Maine, between Prouts Neck and Pine Point, authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 69); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

208. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated September 27, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and two illustrations, on a review of reports on St. Petersburg Harbor, Fla., with a view to further improvement of Bayboro Harbor, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 27, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

209. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 26, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a preliminary examination and survey of Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, Wis., authorized by the River and Harbor Act, approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 71); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed, with one illustration.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 95. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 84, joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 62). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 96. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2402, a bill to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 63). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1437. A bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 64). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 199. A bill to provide the privilege of becoming a naturalized citizen of the United States to all immigrants having a legal right to permanent residence, to make immigration quotas available to Asian and Pacific peoples, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 65). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 97. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1661, a bill to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 66). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2609. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in honor of Clara Louise Maass; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN:

H. R. 2610. A bill to include in section 3 of the act of June 26, 1936 (49 Stat. 1967), the Midwakanton Sioux Indians of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 2611. A bill to provide assistance for local school agencies in providing educational opportunities for children on Federal reservations or in defense areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COX:

H. R. 2612. A bill to establish an American Mothers Memorial Commission to prepare plans and estimates of costs for the construction in the District of Columbia of a national memorial to the mothers of America; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2613. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 2614. A bill making unlawful the requirement for the payment of a poll tax as a

prerequisite to voting in a primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 2615. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to provide that payments be made to survivors for unused leave accumulated by members of the armed forces before their death in service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2616. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Alice McLellan Birney; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2617. A bill to authorize Federal aid to school districts overburdened with war-incurred or defense-incurred school enrollments for the construction of additional school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2618. A bill to amend subparagraphs (a) and (d) of paragraph 1 of part III of Veterans Regulation 1 (a), as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2619. A bill to extend the benefits of the annual- and sick-leave laws to part-time employees on regular tours of duty and to validate payments heretofore made for leave on account of services of such employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 2620. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $60 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2621. A bill to amend sections 555 and 556, part 4, Title IV, Administrative Provisions, Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGNER:

H. R. 2622. A bill to amend the act of July 31, 1947, with respect to the maintenance of actions to recover possession of publicly operated housing accommodations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WALSH:

H. R. 2623. A bill to promote the orderly and fair marketing of essential foods in commerce; to prevent confusion, fraud, and deception in commerce; and to prohibit practices which burden, obstruct, or affect commerce, the free flow of goods in commerce, or the production of goods for commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2624. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended, to grant the Secretary of Agriculture authority to regulate margin requirements with respect to speculative transactions in commodity futures on commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 2625. A bill to authorize the construction of an office building at Suitland, Md.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2626. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress, authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Public Lands of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of certain hearings with respect to Alaska; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 98. Resolution making H. R. 1437, a bill to authorize the composition of the Army of the United States and the Air Force of the United States, and for other purposes, special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their Senate Concurrent Resolution 1, recommending that the Congress of the United States amend the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 to permit gold producers of the United States and Alaska to sell their gold in the markets of the world; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Michael Sisto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2628. A bill for the relief of Auldon Albert Aiken; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2629. A bill for the relief of John P. Kremenezky; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2630. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of Gabel Construction Co.," approved July 2, 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER:

H. R. 2631. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation in the case of Frank Grimaldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

57. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of unlicensed crew members of the steamship *Azalea City*, New York, N. Y., containing 33 signatures, protesting Paul Hoffman's proposal to ship ECA bulk cargoes in foreign ships; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

58. By the SPEAKER: Petition of M. J. Dineen, Jr., city clerk, Omaha, Nebr., petitioning consideration of his resolution asking that the Congress pass the resolution now pending in Congress, which would establish the General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

59. Also, petition of Mrs. Loretta Joyce, secretary, Irish-American Unified Society, Yonkers, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution requesting the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States to continue the House Un-American Activities Committee; to the Committee on Rules.

60. By Mr. HOLMES: Petition of Rainier Auxiliary to Post No. 2289, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Seattle, Wash., containing 28 signatures, urging passage of H. R. 1693; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

# SENATE

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, midst all the traffic of our busy ways we are grateful for this noontide sanctuary of the spirit. Be to us a quickening presence, a sustaining power, a refuge from the confusion and tumult of our times. Direct us now to the sources of moral energy, so that Thy completeness may be linked to the limitations of our unaided strength.

We pray for the President and for the Congress, and for all in every land who bear the responsibility of public office.

As we enter upon the tasks of this week make us patient in argument, charitable in judgment, slow to wrath. As Thou givest us to see the right, make us strong to defend and maintain it, yet always seekers after a durable peace with justice and freedom for all mankind. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred, as indicated:

CONSTRUCTION OF EXPERIMENTAL NONPROPELLED SEADROME OCEAN STATION BY COAST GUARD

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Coast Guard to construct an experimental nonpropelled seadrome ocean station (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF LAW RELATING TO ADDITIONAL HOMESTEAD ENTRIES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527, 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT AND FINDINGS ON INSTALLATION OF ADDITIONAL GENERATING CAPACITY AT GRAND COULEE DAM

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and findings on the feasibility of the installation of additional generating capacity (units R-7, R-8, and R-9) at Grand Coulee Dam, Columbia Basin project, Washington (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON WITHDRAWALS OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, tabulations showing the withdrawals and restorations of public lands made during the period from January 1, 1948, through December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF NAVAL MOTORBOAT BARGE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the central Atlantic area council of the national council of the Young Men's Christian Association, of Andover, N. J., had requested the Navy Department to transfer a motorboat barge for use by that council in training boys

at Camp Wawayanda, Andover, N. J.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

TRANSFER OF POMONA STATION OF AGRICULTURE REMOUNT SERVICE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF NATIONAL PARK TRUST FUND BOARD

A letter from the secretary of the National Park Trust Fund Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the fiscal year 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

FINAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

A letter from the director, national legislative commission, the American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final financial statement of the Legion for the period ended December 31, 1948 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

Four letters from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of that Commission on Office of General Services—Supply Activities; the Federal Supply System (Appendix B); Records Management (Appendix C); and a detailed report on the Federal Supply System (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 1

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day, in the United States of America: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-sixth Indiana General Assembly (the senate concurring)*:

"SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

"SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith by the clerk of the house to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Indiana."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 1

"Whereas the prosperity of the State of South Dakota is dependent primarily upon farm prices, nevertheless, it is recognized that successful and profitable operation of our gold mines, and particularly the Homestake Mine at Lead, S. Dak., is a vital factor in a well-rounded State economy; and

"Whereas while in the 1930's, gold mining was at a high level of prosperity and South Dakota farmers were suffering from the ravages of drought, grasshoppers, and low prices, now the situation is exactly reversed with an unprecedented high level of prosperity on the farms of this State and a serious depression existing in the gold industry; and

"Whereas the gold-mining properties of the United States and Alaska, and more particularly the gold properties within our State of South Dakota are confronted by tremendously increased wage and material costs and are unable to sell their products in the markets of the world, but are instead compelled to sell only to the United States Government at the inexorable fixed price of $35 an ounce as set forth in the Gold Reserve Act of 1934; and

"Whereas, for example, since 1934, wage costs have more than doubled and material costs have increased 70 percent at the great Homestake Mine at Lead, S. Dak., during which period of time, there has been no increase in the price of gold; and

"Whereas the gold-mining industry of the Nation is at the present time in a precarious state of depression with practically all gold properties either abandoned, shut down, or with production vastly curtailed except for those mining companies which are fortunate enough to produce gold as a by-product to other metals such as silver, lead, copper, or zinc; and

"Whereas the gold mines of South Dakota do not produce other metals, but are dependent solely upon their production of gold; and

"Whereas the gold mines of this State sustained enormous losses during the compulsory period of the shut-down during World War II, and after reopening on July 1, 1945, have been confronted by declining profits and curtailed production;

"Whereas continuance of the gold-mining industry in the Black Hills, and particularly continuance of the operations conducted by the Homestake Mining Co. is of vital importance to the economic welfare of the State of South Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota Legislature (the house of representatives concurring)*, That we do recommend that the Congress of the United States amend the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 to permit gold producers of the United States and Alaska to sell their gold in the markets of the world by removing the present restrictions that prevent our citizens from buying, holding, or selling gold either domestically or in the foreign market.

"We recommend that Congress provide for the appointment of a commission or a committee to make a careful study of the relation of gold to the currency and its proper price in terms of dollars, and to formulate legislation to implement its findings."

Resolutions adopted by the Blue Star Mothers of America, at Detroit, Mich., relating to education, housing, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of New Hampshire, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by landlords of Indianapolis, Ind., protesting against the extension of rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by a conference of 400 civic leaders and representatives of many groups in Greenwich Village, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation extending the social-security law; to the Committee on Finance.

The memorial of Beatrice Masterson, of Elmhurst, L. I., remonstrating against the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mary McDowell, of Hawthorne, N. Y., relating to communism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the San Carlos Tribal Council, San Carlos, Ariz., protesting against the expansion of the powers of the Phoenix regional office of the Indian Bureau at the expense of the San Carlos Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Providence, R. I., the Common Council of the city of Kenosha, Wis.; and the commission of the city of Birmingham, Ala., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A telegram in the nature of a petition, signed by E. Reed, executive secretary, Dental Laboratories Institute of America, Chicago, Ill., requesting hearings be held on Senate bill (S. 248) raising the minimum wage to 75 cents; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A petition of sundry members of the Dorton (Ky.) Parent-Teachers' Association, relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of members of the Dorton (Ky.) Parent-Teachers' Association, and teachers of the Evarts (Ky.) High School, relating to Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. McGRATH (for himself and Mr. GREEN):

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to insist upon and work for the proper kind of Federal rent control legislation to prevent inflationary prices

"Whereas the extraordinarily high cost of living is making such inordinate demands

upon the family budget our citizens are finding great difficulty in 'making both ends meet' economically; and

"Whereas unless there is in force the proper kind of Federal rent control legislation inflationary prices will result inevitably: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby requested to use their efforts to be certain that there shall continue to be the proper kind of Federal rent control legislation in order that our people may be protected by statutory control from such inevitable rise in rent prices; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolution requesting the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to use their efforts to amend the Federal Social Security Act with the purpose of extending the coverage and the benefits now authorized by such legislation

*"Resolved,* That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they are, hereby requested to use their efforts to amend the Federal Social Security Act with the purpose of extending the coverage and the benefits now authorized by such legislation; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. MURRAY:

A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana, favoring the enactment of legislation appropriating sufficient money for the immediate construction of Yellow Tail Dam in Big Horn County, Mont.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Vice President on February 8, 1949 (p. 934, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial 2

"Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Congress of the United States, the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, Hon. James E. Murray, and the Honorable Zales N. Ecton, United States Senators from Montana, and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, and the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart, Representatives from Montana, for an act of Congress or such other authority as may be necessary to allow veterans of World War II just concluded, to acquire submarginal lands from the Department of Agriculture or the Department of the Interior which have been acquired under an act of Congress dated June 29, 1934, known as chapter 865 (48 Stat. 1265–1275) and an act of Congress dated July 22, 1937, known as Chapter 517, title III, section 32 (50 Stat. 525–526)

"Whereas under an act of Congress dated June 29, 1934, known as chapter 865 (48 Stat. 1265–1275) and an act of Congress dated July 22, 1937, known as chapter 517, title III, section 32 (50 Stat. 525–526), the Secretary of Agriculture acquired enormous acreages of land in Montana designated as submarginal lands to develop a program of land conservation and land utilization; and

"Whereas a considerable amount of this land was acquired on Indian reservations from the Secretary of the Interior, and a considerable amount from individual land owners in agricultural sections of the State of Montana. Taking this land from private ownership has resulted in a distinct hardship to the political subdivisions of the State of Montana;

"Whereas it is the considered judgment of your memorializers that a great portion of the lands so acquired by the Secretary of Agriculture are not necessarily submarginal lands but are good agricultural lands which may be utilized for agricultural purposes in Montana to good advantage; and

"Whereas veterans of World War II are unable to acquire agricultural lands in Montana, particularly those owned by the United States under the acts of Congress referred to above; and

"Whereas it would be of great advantage to the people of Montana as well as to the veterans of World War II that such agricultural veterans be afforded an opportunity of acquiring such lands: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring),* That the Montana Legislative Assembly urges the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as shall enable veterans of World War II to acquire agricultural lands owned by the United States Government, in economical units, or a part of an economical unit, under the submarginal program referred to above at valuations deemed reasonable by the United States Government; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Charles F. Brannan, Secretary of Agriculture, Hon. J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable James E. Murray, and the Honorable Zales N. Ecton, United States Senators from Montana, and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, and the Honorable Wesley A. D'Ewart, Representatives from Montana."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial to the President of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from the State of Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Congressmen from the State of Montana, for appropriate action to alleviate the shortage of tubular goods and steel necessary for the development of Montana's oil and gas resources, and for the end of discrimination against Montana by the shipment of steel and tubular goods to foreign countries for the development of oil and gas resources in such foreign countries, and the end of the gray market in steel

"Whereas there are vast undeveloped oil and gas resources as well as vast proven oil and gas fields in Montana; and

"Whereas during the past 3 years explorations for oil and gas in Montana have been seriously curtailed and hampered due to the difficulty, and sometimes impossibility, of obtaining the casing and pipe necessary and required for such development work in proven and wildcat oil areas; and

"Whereas this situation has resulted in what has been termed the gray market and exorbitant prices for steel tubular goods; and

"Whereas the ratio of oil discoveries and development of new production has been in almost exact proportion to the amount of pipe and casing obtainable and used; and

"Whereas the steel industry is unable to furnish tubular goods in sufficient quantity to meet the needs and demands of Montana producers in the ordinary channels of trade because of the desire of certain interests to exploit foreign oil resources at the expense of development within the borders of the United States, and has permitted and caused the exportation of thousands of tons of vital steel for the use and development of the oil fields of Saudi Arabia and in other parts of the world outside of the borders of the United States; and

"Whereas the situation is retarding the explorations and development of Montana oil and gas resources: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-first Legislative Assembly of the State of Montana (the senate concurring),* That we respectfully urge the President of the United States and Montana's Representatives in the Congress of the United States to take appropriate action to remove any discrimination which may exist against the oil operators of Montana, to the end that an adequate supply of tubular goods be made available in the regular channels of trade, and that conditions be corrected which retard the exploration for oil and gas within the borders of the United States and the State of Montana, so that the gray market in steel will not be necessary or possible; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the chief clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the United States, and to the Honorable JAMES F. MURRAY and the Honorable ZALES N. ECTON, Senators from Montana, and the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD and the Honorable WESLEY A. D'EWART, Representatives in Congress from Montana."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana, and Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River, about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon—35 miles southwest of Hardin, Montana; and

"Whereas Big Horn Canyon is the passageway of the Big Horn River between the northern end of the Big Horn Mountains and the Pryor Mountains. For more than 50 miles Yellowtail Reservoir will lie within the rugged, inaccessible canyon, the steep walls of which tower hundreds of feet above the narrow and winding river bed, forming a natural damsite of unique splendor that will in future years provide Montana and Wyoming with one of the greatest lake-recreation areas in the Western Hemisphere; and

"Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, as a part of the Missouri River Basin project to prepare preliminary surveys and construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has practically completed preconstruction work at the site of Yellowtail Dam. Design specifications for the dam and power plant have been started. Surveys have been made of the irrigable area, and transmission line location, and plans are ready or completed for construction of access roads, construction camp and other essential base work necessary before actual construction is undertaken; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam is being designed to provide for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, flood control, silt retention, conservation of fish and wildlife, recreational development, and other related beneficial uses of value to all mankind; and

"Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam will make possible the irrigation of 45,000 acres of new land along the Big Horn River from the Big Horn Canyon to approximately 10 miles north of the city of Hardin, and

supplemental irrigation water for large areas now inadequately served will be also provided. Because irrigation of lands along the Big Horn, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers is dependent upon pumping, a source of low-cost power is a prerequisite. Construction of Yellowtail power plant will make possible the irrigation of many proposed and desirable projects along these three valuable but presently little utilized rivers; and

"Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam offers a priceless solution for the equitable interstate use of the waters of the Big Horn by the creation of the Yellowtail Reservoir on the Montana-Wyoming State line; and

"Whereas power generating facilities to be constructed at the dam will have an installed capacity of at least 120,000 kilowatts, and will produce about 712,200,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. The said power produced at Yellowtail Dam will be used for irrigation pumping, and will serve as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's power system constructed to provide power for construction of other developments and to supply surplus power to principal load centers to permit its use by new and old industries and residences of the area; and

"Whereas the Big Horn River is the greatest silt offender in the entire Yellowstone River system, retention of silt behind Yellowtail Dam will be of material benefit; and

"Whereas fish and wildlife resources will gain by the dam, fishing and hunting, as well as the many allied recreational opportunities that will follow will be of immense value to Montana and Wyoming; and

"Whereas Yellowtail Dam as planned will be a concrete arch-type structure towering some 499 feet above the river bed, and will have a crest length of 1,480 feet, and will have a storage capacity of 1,366,000 acre-feet; and

"Whereas the construction of said Yellowtail Dam will attract new industries into southern Montana, and thereby be of great benefit to the entire State of Montana, as well as the entire Nation, by supplying cheap electricity for industrial and home use, and this postwar period is the time to develop such industries: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Montana,* That the Congress of the United States of America be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available immediately for the construction of Yellowtail Dam in Big Horn County in southern Montana; be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial be submitted by the secretary of state of the State of Montana to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the National Congress—ALBEN BARKLEY and SAM RAYBURN—to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D. C., to the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Commissioner of Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Secretary of the Interior, the Governor of the State of Wyoming, and the presiding officers of both Houses of the Wyoming State Legislature; and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States from the States of Montana and Wyoming."

## PROTEST OF TRIAL OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—RESOLUTION OF WASHINGTON HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Washington State House of Representatives protesting the arrest, trial, conviction, and sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty. I ask that the resolution be carried in full in the body of the RECORD. I myself am in full accord with it.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
*President of the United States:*

We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas the arrest, trial, conviction, and sentence of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty has shocked the conscience of all the peoples in all the Nations of the entire Christian world; and

Whereas such occurrence shows the underlying spirit of the communistic attack on religion in all forms; and

Whereas the trial of Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty must be regarded as a forerunner of comparative trials against other branches of the Christian Church and other religions generally: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That we, the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, do protest against such trial and do respectfully request your excellency to take every appropriate step to register a protest against the same by whatsoever means you may determine; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be sent to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

## RECLAMATION, IRRIGATION, AND POWER PROJECTS IN THE WEST

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter and resolutions from Herbert G. West, of Walla Walla, Wash., executive vice president of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, whose membership embraces the entire Pacific Northwest. Mr. West's letter covers in detail the attached resolutions which were adopted by the association in regard to our great reclamation, irrigation, and power projects in the West.

There being no objection, the letter and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INLAND EMPIRE WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION,
*Walla Walla, Wash., January 28, 1949.*

Hon. HARRY P. CAIN,
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR HARRY: The fifteenth annual meeting of the waterways association, held in Lewiston, Idaho, on December 14 and 15, 1948, adopted many resolutions pertaining to the over-all development program which I would like to discuss with you.

I am enclosing a copy of Resolution No. 1, pertaining to the recent press releases to the effect that the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government will recommend the creation of a new Department of Public Works that would assume jurisdiction over the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers. I do not believe it is necessary to elaborate on the resolution as I think it thoroughly covers the situation from our viewpoint.

Resolution No. 2 relates to the review report of the Corps of Engineers in House Document No. 308. The members of our association feel that this comprehensive multiple-purpose report is very extensive and represents a carefully coordinated plan to provide for present and immediate future needs of the Columbia River Basin. We urge the adoption of this report by the Congress with such modifications from time to time as good judgment and planning may dictate. Hearings are being held by the Board of Army Engineers in the Pacific Northwest on this request, beginning in Spokane on January 31, in Seattle on February 1, in Portland, on February 2, and in Boise on February 4. When this report is submitted to the Congress we sincerely and respectfully urge your earnest consideration to introduce appropriate legislation seeking the authorization of the report as a guide for the multiple-purpose plan of development of the Columbia River Basin within the United States.

Resolution No. 4 recognizes the serious shortage of hydroelectric power in the Northwest and urges a $3,000,000 supplemental appropriation to initiate construction of Ice Harbor Dam, the first dam in the series of four dams on the Snake River to channelize that river from the mouth to Lewiston, Idaho. This project will produce approximately 250,000 kilowatts of power besides being an aid to navigation, flood control, and irrigation in Franklin and Walla Walla Counties.

Resolution No. 5 merely reaffirms our position that the comprehensive development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers for navigation remain undisturbed in the department of the Corps of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, United States Army. We do respectfully request your watchfulness on this subject and your support in behalf of its objectives.

Resolution No. 7 is urging your support in the authorization of The Dalles Dam and the high John Day Dam which will provide slack water navigation from the head of the Bonneville Pool to the foot of McNary Dam. It is our understanding that these two projects have been favorably acted upon by the Corps of Engineers and the document should be before the Eighty-first Congress for consideration.

Resolution No. 8 has been before the Congress and we believe that it is worthy of support of the Northwest congressional delegation in seeking the acquisition of the Hood River and Cascade Locks bridges across the Columbia River. These are now private toll bridges, but have been renovated and raised, due to the increased height of the Bonneville Pool, by the appropriation of money by the Congress. It is our feeling that toll bridges across the Columbia River definitely restrict free intercourse of travel and thus injure the economic welfare of the entire region. We would sincerely appreciate your support of such legislation when introduced as we believe it to be of benefit to the entire Pacific Northwest.

Resolution No. 9 is one of the more important ones and can be classified as probably the most important looking to the future. This resolution requests Congress to appropriate a sum of $40,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1950 for McNary Dam construction. This ties in closely with Resolution No. 10, which respectfully requests the Congress to make available $10,000,000 for supplemental appropriation as early as practicable in order to hasten completion of the McNary Dam and to make power available not later than 1953. I do not believe it is necessary to enlarge upon these two resolutions. They speak for themselves. You are all very well familiar with the statements of private and public utility companies, as well as the Governors of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, the Grange, Farm Bureau, all farm cooperatives, and chambers of commerce, who are unanimous in the need of early completion of McNary Dam.

Resolution No. 11 relates to the regular appropriation in the amount of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year of 1950 for construction of Ice Harbor Dam, the first dam on the Snake River. As related before, planning and design of this dam is completed and contracts can be let immediately upon receipt of appropriation money. It is urged

that you support this legislation for the same reason that we should support legislation for McNary Dam and the beginning of Chief Joseph Dam.

Resolution No. 12 recognizes that the early completion of construction of the dams on the Snake River to provide slack water navigation from the mouth to Lewiston, Idaho, is essential to the economic welfare of the interior of the Pacific Northwest. I therefore believe that it is appropriate to seek an appropriation of $600,000 in the 1950 fiscal budget to complete the advance planning and designing of Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite Dams in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Your support of this legislation is respectfully urged.

Resolution No. 15 we only wish to call to your attention at this time. This resolution provides for the change of names of the four dams on the Snake River. The names now employed (Ice Harbor Dam, Lower Monumental Dam, Little Goose Dam, Lower Granite Dam) have no meaning whatsoever other than names employed for navigation purposes. We are asking the State legislatures of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho to memorialize Congress to change these names as follows:

The first dam honoring the memory and work of Dr. Marcus Whitman and to be known as the Whitman Dam.

The second dam honoring the memory and work of Capt. Merriwether Lewis and to be known as the Lewis Dam.

The third dam honoring the memory and work of Capt. William Clark and to be known as the Clark Dam.

The fourth dam honoring the memory and work of the Reverend Henry Harmon Spalding and to be known as the Spalding Dam.

We thought that it was best to have the State legislatures memorialize Congress for these changes of names in order that it would eliminate any possible point of controversy in the Pacific Northwest.

Kind personal regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

HERBERT G. WEST,
*Executive Vice President.*

---

Resolution 1

*Now, therefore, be it resolved,* The Inland Empire Waterways Association, in regular session this 15th day of December 1948, at Lewiston, Idaho, in light of recent press releases to the effect that the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government will recommend the creation of a new Department of Public Works that would assume jurisdiction over the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers; this association hereby makes known its unanimous and unequivocal opposition to any reorganization proposal to transfer the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers to any other Federal agency, new or old. We firmly believe that the prosecution of navigation, flood control, and other civil works under the Corps of Engineers as prescribed by existing law is efficient; is economical to the Government; is conducted in a thoroughly decentralized manner, giving full voice to State and local groups; is thoroughly coordinated with all other interested agencies, both Federal and State, and is in the best interests of the people of the Nation. Furthermore we believe it would be disastrous to the security of the Nation to take from the officers of the Corps of Engineers, upon whom we depend in time of war, the essential experience and development gained by those officers in large-scale engineering and construction tasks in time of peace. It is, accordingly, further resolved that if and when legislation is introduced to carry out any recommendations of the Commission that this association urge the Congress with all its vigor to include in such legislation phraseology that will clearly exempt the transfer of the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers to any other agency.

Resolution 2

Whereas the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in 1943, urged the adoption of a resolution by the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, to order a review of all reports and surveys by the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, with a view to formulating a definite development program embracing the Columbia River system as a future guide for the region; and

Whereas such a resolution was adopted by the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, immediately undertook the organization of such a review and survey by enlisting the cooperation and support of all Federal and State agencies in the Columbia River Basin; and

Whereas after 5 years of field and office surveys and reviews, the Corps of Engineers, North Pacific division, has developed a comprehensive and carefully coordinated plan to provide for the present and immediate future needs of the Columbia River Basin, also for later developments that will be needed as the region expands: Now, therefore, let it be

*Resolved,* That the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho, this 15th day of December, 1948, does hereby adopt such comprehensive plan as the guide for the Inland Empire Waterways Association, with such modifications from time to time as good judgment and planning may dictate; be it further

*Resolved,* That the Inland Empire Waterway Association respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to immediately authorize the adoption of such comprehensive multiple-purpose plan of development for the Columbia River Basin within the United States; be it further

*Resolved,* That the Inland Empire Waterways Association respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to specifically designate existing Federal agencies as responsible for construction and planning as their respective existing responsibilities appear in the over-all comprehensive multiple-purpose plan.

---

Resolution 4

Whereas the Pacific Northwest is experiencing a serious shortage of electric power to meet the needs of an ever-increasing population and expansion of its industrial base; and

Whereas the construction of large hydroelectric projects require several years to complete; and

Whereas the planning and design of Ice Harbor Dam, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, is for all practical purposes completed: Now therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That this association respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate a sum of $3,000,000 by supplemental appropriation in order to initiate construction of Ice Harbor Dam at once.

---

Resolution 5

*Now, therefore, be it resolved,* That the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in regular meeting held in Lewiston, Idaho, this 15th day of December 1948, does hereby reaffirm its position that the comprehensive development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers for navigation remain undisturbed in the Department of the Corps of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, United States Army.

---

Resolution 7

*Resolved,* In view of the surveys and report on the construction of the Dalles Dam and the High John Day Dam having been favorably submitted by the North Pacific Division, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, the Inland Empire Waterways Association respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to authorize these two projects thus completing the authorization of the slack water navigation program from the head of the Bonneville pool to Lewiston, Idaho, as contained in House Document 704, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session, Columbia and Snake Rivers, Oreg., Wash., and Idaho.

---

Resolution 8

*Be it resolved on this 15th day of December 1948 during the fifteenth annual meeting of the Inland Empire Waterways Association,* That the officers of this association continue their efforts in support of the legislation in Congress leading toward the acquisition of the Hood River and Cascade Locks (Wauna Toll Bridge Co.) bridges by the Federal Government for toll-free operations; the construction of all structures of a like kind hereafter with the cooperation of the Federal Government and the highway departments of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; and toward the maintaining of all such structures as free bridges.

---

Resolution 9

*Resolved,* In order to complete construction of McNary Dam and delivery of power by 1953, it is essential that appropriations be increased for the fiscal year 1950. Therefore, the Inland Empire Waterways Association respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to appropriate for the fiscal year 1950 the sum of $40,000,000 for McNary Dam construction.

---

Resolution 10

*Resolved,* That a definite power shortage exists in the Pacific Northwest, attested to by both public and private power interests. The urgent need of power from McNary Dam at the earliest possible date is essential to the national welfare and security. Therefore, the Inland Empire Waterways Association respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to make available $10,000,000 by supplemental appropriation as early as practicable in order to hasten the completion of McNary Dam, thus to make power available not later than 1953.

---

Resolution 11

*Resolved,* The advance planning and design of Ice Harbor Dam, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, the first in a series of four dams on the Snake River to provide slack water navigation from the mouth to Lewiston, Idaho, is for all practical purposes completed. Therefore, the Inland Empire Waterways Association does respectfully request the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of $12,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950 to begin construction of Ice Harbor Dam.

---

Resolution 12

*Resolved,* The early completion of construction of the dams on the Snake River to provide slack water navigation from the mouth to Lewiston, Idaho, is essential to the economic welfare of the interior of the Pacific Northwest. Therefore, the Inland Empire Waterways Association does respectfully request the Congress of the United States to appropriate the sum of $600,000 in the 1950 fiscal budget to complete the advance planning and design of Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite Dams, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho.

---

Resolution 15

Whereas the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, has favorably recommended the construction of a series of four locks and dams to provide slack water navigation from the mouth of the Snake River to Lewiston, Idaho; and

Whereas the site locations are, namely, Ice Harbor Dam, at mile 10.2 above the mouth of the Snake River; Lower Monumental Dam,

at mile 44.7; Little Goose Dam at mile 72.2; Lower Granite Dam, at mile 113.1; and

Whereas the above-mentioned dams are enduring structures constructed for the welfare and security of the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas certain names of early explorers and missionaries, are indelibly linked with the Snake River and honored and respected nationally: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in regular annual meeting this 15th day of December 1948, in Lewiston, Idaho, does hereby respectfully memorialize the legislatures of the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, to in turn memorialize the Congress of the United States of America to authorize and so legislate; so that the names of the dams hereinabove referred to be now named: dam at mile 10.2 above the mouth of the Snake River—Whitman Dam, honoring the memory and work of Dr. Marcus Whitman; dam at mile 44.7 above the mouth of the Snake River—Lewis Dam, honoring the memory and work of Capt. Merriwether Lewis; dam at mile 72.2 above the mouth of the Snake River—Clark Dam, honoring the memory and work of Capt. William Clark; dam at mile 113.1 above the mouth of the Snake River—Spalding Dam, honoring the memory and work of Rev. Henry Harmon Spalding; and be it further

*Resolved,* That each Member of the Congress of the United States from the States of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho be respectfully requested to support such legislation seeking early and favorable action.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF LOWELL, MASS.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Common Council of the city of Lowell, Mass., relating to General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Lowell and State of Massachusetts*—

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Massachusetts.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION OF CITY COUNCIL OF OMAHA, NEBR.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the City Council of Omaha, Nebr., and addressed to the Congress.

It urges the approval of pending legislation directing the President to officially proclaim October 11 each year as a memorial to Gen. Casimir Pulaski, the great Polish hero, who gave his life in the cause of American independence on October 11, 1779.

When we are bending such great effort to the winning of international understanding and good will I think it is particularly appropriate that we consider the subject and that this petition be noted and given full consideration in connection with the legislation to which it refers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's memorial day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's memorial day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Omaha, Nebr.,* That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve if passed, the General Pulaski's memorial day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Nebraska.

GENERAL PULASKI'S MEMORIAL DAY—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CITY COUNCIL OF PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] and myself, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of Providence, R. I., relating to General Pulaski's Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October, 1779, is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day"; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the City Council of the City of Providence, State of Rhode Island, and Providence plantations*—

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from the State of Rhode Island.

JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent that there be printed in

the body of the RECORD a telegram I have received from Albert Scavarda, grand knight, Knights of Columbus, embodying a resolution adopted by Kenosha (Wis.) Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, at its regular meeting in Kenosha, on February 8, 1949.

This resolution protested, as did hundreds of other resolutions, letters, and telegrams to me and to other Senators, against the outrageous prosecution of Cardinal Mindszenty and other spiritual leaders in Hungary and in other land-controlled Balkan States.

I have spoken on this matter on the floor of the Senate on January 10, right after the announcement of Cardinal Mindszenty's imprisonment, and again on February 8, and I shall continue to express my views along with my brother Senators in opposition to this fiendish persecution of man's spiritual conscience.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENOSHA, WIS., *February 12, 1949.*
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.:*

The following resolution on the arrest and trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty was adopted by the Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, at its regular meeting in Kenosha, Wis., on February 8, 1949:

"Whereas the conscience of the American people and liberty-loving people all over the world is shocked and outraged by the imprisonment and trial of His Eminence, Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, primate of Hungary, whose only offense is his courageous espousal of truth and justice and his fearless resistance to the dictates of Red Russia; and

"Whereas Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, has noted with approval that the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States, and the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, and the Members of the House of Representatives have voiced their condemnation of the trial and conviction of His Eminence: Be it

"*Resolved,* That Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, earnestly entreat the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the Members of Congress of the United States to demand the immediate release of this shepherd of millions of Hungarian people and to protest against the repetition of such iniquitous action unparalleled in our jurisprudence and revolting to our civilization; be it further

"*Resolved,* That it is the firm conviction of the members of our council, that failure by our Government zealously to explore all channels through which remedial action may be taken in behalf of the innocent victim of this travesty on justice will damage beyond measure the cause of human liberty everywhere as further evidenced by the persecution of the ministry in Bulgaria of more recent date, and will make a mockery of the affirmation of faith in fundamental human rights which is written into the preamble of the United Nations Charter; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of the resolution be spread upon the minutes of our council and copies thereof forwarded to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States; the Honorable Dean Acheson, Secretary of State; Hon. Lawrence Smith, Congressman of the First District of Wisconsin; and the Honorable Senators Joseph R. McCarthy and Alexander Wiley."

ALBERT SCAVARDA,
*Grand Knight, Knights of Columbus.*

## REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 198. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; with an amendment (Rept. No. 66);

S. 206. A bill relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese treaty merchants; with an amendment (Rept. No. 67);

S. 208. A bill for the relief of Ella L. Browning; without amendment (Rept. No. 56);

S. 271. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the northern and middle districts of Georgia; with an amendment (Rept. No. 68);

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Edwin B. Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 57);

S. 593. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 58);

S. 594. A bill for the relief of John I. Malarin, former Army mail clerk at APO 932, a branch of the San Francisco, Calif., post office, relative to a shortage in his fixed credit account; without amendment (Rept. No. 59);

S. 624. A bill for the relief of Herman A. Bennink; without amendment (Rept. No. 60);

S. 633. A bill for the relief of Rachel D. Gattegno; without amendment (Rept. No. 61);

S. 634. A bill to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property and personal injury arising from activities of the Army; without amendment (Rept. No. 62);

S. 664. A bill for the relief of Kihei Matsuo; without amendment (Rept. No. 63);

S. 748. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Bishop; without amendment (Rept. No. 64); and

S. Res. 40. Resolution relating to an investigation of the immigration laws and the administration thereof; without amendment (Rept. No. 65); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LODGE:

S. 924. A bill for the relief of Doris Marie Richard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 925. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, and Cooke Trust Co., Ltd., a corporation of the Territory of Hawaii, as receiver for said Trent Trust Co., Ltd.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 926. A bill to authorize an appropriation in aid of a system of drainage and sanitation for the city of Polson, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 927. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR) introduced Senate bill 928, to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 929. A bill to provide for disposition and use of funds held in trust for Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. PEPPER):

S. 930. A bill to provide for the liquidation of the trusts under the transfer agreements with State rural rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 931. A bill for postal employees' longevity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 932. A bill to amend section 334 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1156–1157; 8 U. S. C. 734);

S. 933. A bill to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath;

S. 934. A bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland;

S. 935. A bill for the relief of Friederike Strachwitz;

S. 936. A bill to provide for the care and custody of insane persons charged with or convicted of offenses against the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 937. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; and

S. 938. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 939. A bill to remove certain lands from the operation of Public Law 545, Seventy-seventh Congress; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 940. A bill to reaffirm the intent of the Congress with respect to flight training for veterans; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 941. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Barber Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 942. A bill to establish principles and policies to govern generally the management of the executive branch of the Government;

S. 943. A bill to eliminate the maintenance of perpetual accounts for unclaimed moneys; and

S. 944. A bill to discontinue the maintenance of inactive records and custody of unclaimed funds and contents of safety-deposit boxes in possession of the Comptroller of the Currency or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 945. A bill to provide for the Admiral David Glasgow Farragut Birthplace National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs;

S. 946. A bill to permit credit, for purposes of parole, for time served in a Federal penal institution under an illegal conviction or sentence in the case of a person who is subsequently legally convicted and sentenced for the same offense;

S. 947. A bill for the relief of the Baggett Transportation Co., Inc.; and

S. 948. A bill for the relief of Mickey Baine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 949. A bill to amend section 12B of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency; and

S. 950. A bill for the relief of the estate of Luke A. Treacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 951. A bill for the relief of Joe Greco; and

S. 952. A bill for the relief of Pietro Midulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. McCARRAN introduced Senate bill 953, to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 954, to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 955, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCARRAN also introduced Senate bill 956, to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALDWIN:

S. 957. A bill to permit members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, who have dependents, to occupy on a rental basis and without loss of rental allowances temporary housing facilities under the jurisdiction of any such service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 958. A bill to establish the United States of America Patriotic and Charter Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 959. A bill to authorize certain persons to accept decorations tendered to them by the United Kingdom for services rendered the Allied cause during World War II, and for other purposes;

S. 960. A bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. 961. A bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 962. A bill for the relief of Bradford N. Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 963, to provide for determination and payment of losses sustained by individuals as a result of recent storms in the Western and Middle Western States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## WILLIAM L. NELSON VETERANS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for designation of the United States veterans' hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital, and I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point the text of the bill and a statement concerning it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 928) to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR), was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., shall be known and designated on the public records as the William L. Nelson Veterans Memorial Hospital.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS (for himself and Mr. FREAR) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. WILLIAMS (FOR HIMSELF AND MR. FREAR)

There is under construction at this time a United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Wilmington, Del., which it is expected will be completed sometime next year, and it is the purpose of the proposed bill to give it the name of William L. Nelson, the only Delaware boy who was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously during the Second World War. He was a Sergeant of the Sixtieth Infantry, Ninth Infantry Division. He was born at Dover, Del., and entered the military service at Middletown.

He won the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously as a result of action at Djebel Dardys, northwest of Sedjenane, Tunisia, April 24, 1943. The Congressional Medal of Honor is the highest decoration which is awarded to American soldiers, and is awarded only for conspicuous gallantry above and beyond the call of duty in action involving actual conflict. It is awarded by the President of the United States in the name of the Congress. The following is the citation covering the exploit and description of the action in which Sergeant Nelson paid the supreme sacrifice: "G. O. No. 85, 17 December 1943. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at risk of life, above and beyond the call of duty in action involving actual conflict. On the morning of April 24, 1943, Sergeant Nelson led his section of heavy mortars to a forward position where he placed his guns and men. Under intense enemy artillery, mortar, and small-arms fire, he advanced alone to a chosen observation position from which he directed the laying of a concentrated mortar barrage which successfully halted an initial enemy counterattack. Although mortally wounded in the accomplishment of his mission, and with his duty clearly completed, Sergeant Nelson crawled to a still more advanced observation point and continued to direct the fire of his section. Dying of hand-grenade wounds and only 50 yards from the enemy, Sergeant Nelson encouraged his section to continue their fire and by doing so they took a heavy toll of enemy lives. The skill which Sergeant Nelson displayed in this engagement, his courage, and self-sacrificing devotion to duty and heroism resulting in the loss of his life, was a priceless inspiration to our armed forces and were in keeping with the highest tradition of the Army of the United States."

It is therefore deemed fitting and appropriate that the new United States Veterans' Administration Hospital, nearing completion at Wilmington, Del., should be given the name of William L. Nelson. Naming this hospital after a deceased World War II veteran, who won the Congressional Medal of Honor, makes it not only a memorial to his gallant exploits, but it is also a distinction and honor to all war veterans.

## AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS RELATING TO STOWAWAYS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Department of Justice.

I ask that an explanation, furnished me by way of a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the text of the bill and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 953) to amend the immigration laws relating to stowaways, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, 39 Stat. 875, as amended (8 U. S. C. 136), is amended as follows: "After the word 'stowaway' strike out the following language: ', except that such stowaway, if otherwise admissible, may be admitted in the discretion of the Attorney General'".

SEC. 2. Section 16 of the Immigration Act of 1924, 43 Stat. 163, as amended (8 U. S. C. 216), is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(d) The owner, charterer, agent, consignee, or master of any vessel arriving at the United States from any place outside thereof who fails to detain on board any alien stowaway until such stowaway has been inspected by an immigrant inspector, or who fails to detain such stowaway on board after inspection if ordered to do so by the immigrant inspector, or who fails to deport such stowaway on the vessel on which he arrived or on another vessel at the expense of the vessel on which he arrived when required to do so by an immigrant inspector, shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of $1,000 for each alien stowaway in respect of whom such failure occurs. Pending final determination of liability for such fine, no vessel shall be granted clearance, except that clearance may be granted upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fine, or of a bond with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof approved by the collector of customs. The provisions for detention of aliens for examination before

boards of special inquiry and the right of appeal provided for in sections 16 and 17 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, 39 Stat. 887 (8 U. S. C. 153), shall not apply to aliens who arrive as stowaways and no such alien shall be permitted to land in the United States, except temporarily for medical treatment, or pursuant to such regulations as the Attorney General may prescribe for the ultimate departure or removal or deportation of such alien from the United States.

"(e) The owner, charterer, agent, consignee, or master of any vessel arriving in the United States from any place outside thereof which has on board any alien stowaway shall pay to the collector of customs of the customs district in which the port of arrival is located the sum of $1,000 for each alien stowaway aboard such vessel. No vessel shall be granted clearance while such fine is unpaid, except that clearance may be granted upon the deposit of a sum sufficient to cover such fine, or of a bond with sufficient surety to secure the payment thereof approved by the collector of customs. No fine imposed under the provisions of this section shall be subject to refund, but the Attorney General may, upon application in writing therefor, mitigate such penalty to not less than $200 for any such violation for which such penalty is imposed, upon proof satisfactory to him that the presence of the alien stowaway aboard the vessel at the time of its embarkation from the last port outside the United States was not known to and could not have been ascertained by the exercise of reasonable diligence by the owner, charterer, agent, consignee, and master of the vessel aboard which such stowaway arrived in the United States."

The letter presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 17, 1949.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: The economic, political, and social conditions prevailing in many parts of the world, particularly in those countries which suffered most heavily as the result of war, have enormously increased the problems connected with the immigration of peoples to the United States. One of the most vexatious of such problems is that of the stowaway. This problem appears to be in the ascendancy. Information available to this Department indicates that the owners and masters of vessels are not exercising proper precaution to prevent the boarding of their vessels by stowaways at points of embarkation of vessels bound for the United States. The provisions of section 2199, title 18, United States Code, provide punishment for stowing away on vessels or aircraft. Additional sanctions seem required, however, to curb this practice, and there is need for some penal provision against the owners and masters of the vessels. This Department recommends the enactment of appropriate legislation.

Stowaways are now excludable under section 3 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 136), but the statute authorizes the Attorney General in his discretion to admit the stowaway if he is otherwise admissible. This language was written into the act of 1917 prior to the enactment of later immigration statutes which made necessary certain documents including immigration visas in order for aliens to enter the United States. At that time there was no numerical restriction on immigration. It was therefore not believed that the fact that an alien was a stowaway should be a mandatory cause of exclusion. Invariably an alien stowaway not only avoids the payment of his passage to this country, but also is lacking any appropriate immigration documents for admission to the United States. The language authorizing the Attorney General to admit stowaways, if otherwise admissible, is therefore usually meaningless and should be repealed.

This Department is convinced that the practice of stowing away on vessels proceeding to this country can best be minimized by legislation placing certain responsibilities, subject to penalties, upon transport lines engaged in transoceanic travel.

Examples of other sanctions of similar nature may be found in sections 9 and 10 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 145, 146), and in sections 16 and 20 of the Immigration Act of July 1, 1924 (8 U. S. C. 167, 216).

Enclosed herewith is a draft of a bill to effectuate the foregoing recommendations. It would repeal the discretion in the Attorney General to admit stowaways and would provide penalties in the sum of $1,000 to be paid by the owner or master of any vessel arriving in the United States with a stowaway aboard and a penalty in like sum for failure to comply with certain orders of immigrant inspectors in relation to such stowaways. The bill would further authorize the Attorney General to mitigate the penalty for bringing a stowaway to this country to not less than $200 each in proper cases.

A similar bill (S. 1450) was introduced in the Eightieth Congress at the request of this Department.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
*The Assistant to the Attorney General.*

## CLARIFICATION OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE IMMIGRATION ACT OF 1917

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Department of Justice.

I ask that an explanation, furnished me by way of a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 954) to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144), introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144), be and the same hereby is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That any person, including the owner, operator, pilot, master, agent, or consignee of any means of transportation, who shall bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or shall attempt, by himself or through another, to bring into or land in the United States, by any means of transportation or otherwise, or shall conceal or harbor, or attempt to conceal or harbor in any place, including any building, or any means of transportation, any alien not duly admitted by an immigrant inspector or not lawfully entitled to enter or to reside within the United States under the terms of this act or any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $2,000 and by imprisonment for a term not exceeding 5 years, for a violation of any of the foregoing provisions in respect to each and every alien in relation to whom such violation occurs."

The letter of explanation presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 18, 1949.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: The decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Paul Evans*, decided March 15, 1948, brought into focus the need for an amendment of the immigration laws. The defendant in that case was apprehended in the act of concealing a number of aliens who had not been legally admitted to the United States. The Government prosecuted him pursuant to the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (8 U. S. C. 144), which provides that any person who shall bring into the United States or shall conceal any alien not lawfully admitted shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, but the Supreme Court held that the section under which he was prosecuted was inadequate to provide a penalty for concealing or harboring such aliens. The result of the decision was to leave the penalty provided by the section applicable only to bringing into or landing in the United States aliens not entitled to enter but not applicable to the offense of concealing such aliens.

In holding that the statute did not provide an enforceable penalty for the act of concealing, the Supreme Court recognized the uncertainty in the law, referred to the matter of supplying the deficiency, and concluded its opinion by stating:

"This is a task outside the bounds of judicial interpretation. It is better for Congress, and more in accord with its function, to revise the statute than for us to guess at the revision it would make. That task it can do with precision. We could do no more than make speculation law."

In accordance with the above-quoted suggestion, it is recommended that the statute in question be revised. A draft of a bill to effectuate such recommendation is enclosed.

It will be observed that the bill proposes a number of changes in the existing language of the section. This section was enacted prior to the use of many modern means of transportation, and its language was directed principally to the transportation of aliens by water. The bill proposes changes in the language with a view to bringing the section more in keeping with modern means of transportation. The bill also proposes that an offense thereunder shall constitute a felony whereas it is now described as a misdemeanor, notwithstanding the fact that the penalty was fixed at a maximum of $2,000 fine and imprisonment for 5 years. Changing the classification of the offense from a misdemeanor to a felony seems more in keeping with the severity of the penalty. The words "any other law relating to the immigration or expulsion of aliens," at the end of the description of the offenses, were inserted so that the penalties for violation thereof would not be limited to violations of the Immigration Act of 1917, but would also apply to the Immigration Act of 1924, and any other laws which may be enacted of like character. The change of language which is designed to meet specifically the deficiency found by the Supreme Court in the existing section will be found in the last clause at the end of the bill.

Enactment of this measure will greatly facilitate control over the smuggling of aliens and the harboring of aliens who have illegally entered the country.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
*The Assistant to the Attorney General.*

AMENDMENT OF NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940, RELATING TO NATIONALITY OF NATURALIZED VETERANS, ETC.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, from the Department of Justice.

I ask that an explanation, furnished me by way of a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD, at this point as part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 955) to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans, their wives, minor children, and dependent parents, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That subsection (h) of section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940, approved December 24, 1942 (56 Stat. 1085; 8 U. S. C. 806), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(h) Who is a veteran of the Spanish-American War, of World War I, or of World War II, his wife, minor children, or dependent parents."

The letter of explanation presented by Mr. McCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: This Department invites your attention to the desirability of amending subsection (h) of section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (56 Stat. 1085; 8 U. S. C. 806).

Section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1170; 8 U. S. C. 804) provides for the loss of nationality by a person who has acquired his citizenship by naturalization if such person resides for at least 2 years in a territory of a foreign country of which he was formerly a national or in which he was born, if he acquires through such residence the nationality of such foreign country by operation of law; by residing for 3 years in the territory of a foreign country of which he was formerly a national or in which he was born; or residing continuously for 5 years in any foreign country.

Section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940 lists a number of classes of persons to whom section 404 does not apply. Subsection (h) of section 406 exempts veterans of the Spanish-American War and of World War I, their wives, minor children, or dependent parents.

No reason is discernible why this exemption should not be extended to veterans of World War II.

Accordingly the Department of Justice recommends that section 406 of the Nationality Act of 1940 be amended so as to include veterans of World War II. A draft of a proposed bill to effectuate the foregoing purpose is enclosed.

An identical bill (S. 489), which was introduced in the Eightieth Congress at the request of this Department, passed the Senate on January 12, 1948.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
*The Assistant to the Attorney General.*

ROYALTIES FOR USE OF INVENTIONS FOR BENEFIT OF OR BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill, which was sent to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary from the Department of Justice.

I ask that an explanation, furnished me by way of a letter from the Assistant to the Attorney General, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 956) to provide for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARRAN, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the act of October 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 1013-1015, 35 U. S. C. 89-96), be, and it hereby is, repealed, and that all agreements in adjustment of royalties or otherwise made thereunder be, and the same hereby are, terminated as to future force and effect: *Provided, however*, That, as to proceedings initiated by and now pending under notices previously issued and as to rights accrued or liabilities incurred prior to repeal thereof, the provisions of such act shall be treated as remaining in full force and effect for the purpose of concluding, settling, sustaining, qualifying, or defeating any pending matter, suit, or claim thereunder.

SEC. 2. Whenever an invention, either patented or unpatented, shall be manufactured, used, sold, or otherwise disposed of by or for the United States, subject to a royalty or like charge therefor believed to be unreasonable or excessive by the head of the department or agency of the Government which has ordered such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition, the head of the department or agency of the Government concerned, in behalf of such agency and the Government as a whole, shall give written notice of such fact to all known parties having a beneficial interest in such royalty or like charge, whether as payors or payees thereof. Within a reasonable time after the effective date of such notice, and in no event in less than 30 days, the head of the department or agency of the Government issuing such notice shall by order, directed to all parties to whom notice shall have been given, or who shall be found to have an interest in such proceeding, fix and specify such rates or amounts, if any, of such royalties or like charges as he shall determine are fair and just, taking into account all defenses available to a defendant in a patent infringement action and such other conditions as may be determined to be appropriate by reason of governmental procurement as contrasted with nongovernmental procurement, and shall authorize the payment thereof, if any be allowed, by any payor to any payee on account of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition: *Provided, however*, That any party to whom such notice is given, if he so requests within 30 days from and after the effective date of such notice, may, at such time as may be fixed by the head of such department or agency, present in writing or in person any facts or circumstances which may, in his opinion, have a bearing upon the rates or amounts of such royalties or like charges, if any, to be determined, fixed, and specified in view of the conditions aforesaid, and any order fixing and specifying the rates or amounts of such royalties or like charges, if any, shall be issued by the head of such department or agency within a reasonable time after such presentation. After the effective date of the notice, any payor affected by the notice may continue to collect royalties or like charges payable by or for the United States on account of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of the invention, but all such royalties or charges shall be segregated and safely kept by such payor and shall not, until issuance of the order herein provided, be paid over to any payee of such royalties or like charges. After issuance of such order, any payor thereunder, unless otherwise directed in the order, may continue to collect royalties or other charges as aforesaid, but shall not pay over to any payee affected by the order any such royalties or other charges in an amount or at a rate in excess of that fixed and specified by the order and shall refund any such excess to the United States in such manner as directed by the order. The payee of such royalty or like charge shall not have any remedy by way of suit, set-off, or other legal action against the payor for the payment of any additional royalties or like charges foreclosed by such order, or for damages for breach of contract or otherwise, but such party's sole and exclusive remedy, except as to the recovery of the amounts fixed and specified in said order, shall be as provided in section 3 hereof. The notice and order provided for herein shall be mailed to the last known address of all parties to whom the same shall be directed and such notice shall be effective upon receipt or 5 days after the mailing thereof, whichever date is the earlier.

SEC. 3. Any party entitled to receive such royalties or like charges, claiming to be aggrieved by any order issued pursuant to section 2 hereof, may institute suit against the United States in the Court of Claims or in the district courts of the United States insofar as such courts may have concurrent jurisdiction with the Court of Claims to recover such sum, if any, as when added to the royalties or other charges fixed and specified in such order shall constitute fair and just compensation to such party for the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition for the United States of the invention or inventions within the purview of the order, taking into consideration all of the circumstances set forth for the determination of such royalties in section 2 hereof. In any such suit the United States may avail itself of any and all defenses, general and special, that might be pleaded by a defendant in an action for patent infringement as set forth in title LX of the Revised Statutes, or any other defense, general or special, which might preclude the right of such party to claim, or which might limit the rate or amount of, a royalty or other like charge.

SEC. 4. The head of any department or agency of the Government which has ordered the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of an invention, whether patented or unpatented, and whether or not an order has been issued in connection therewith pursuant to section 2 hereof, is authorized and empowered to enter into an agreement, before suit against the United States has been instituted, with the owner of, or a party entitled to receive a royalty or like charge under such invention, in full settlement and compromise of any claim against the United States accruing to such owner or party under the provisions of this act or any other law by reason of such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition, and for compensation to

be paid to such owner or party based upon future manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of said invention. The head of any department or agency of the Government which has entered into an agreement under the provisions of this act or the act of October 31, 1942 (56 Stat. 1013–1015, 35 U. S. C. 89–96) is authorized and empowered to enter into supplemental agreements modifying, amending, or revoking such agreement as the equities of changed circumstances may warrant, any other law to the contrary notwithstanding.

SEC. 5. Whenever a reduction in the rates or amounts of royalties or like charges is effected by order, pursuant to section 2 hereof, or by compromise or settlement, pursuant to section 4 hereof, such reduction shall inure to the benefit of the Government either by way of a corresponding reduction in the contract price to be paid directly or indirectly for such manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of such invention, or by way of refund to the Treasury of the United States by the payor of such royalties or like charges insofar as the same may have been foreclosed from payment thereof to the payee.

SEC. 6. The head of the department or agency of the Government concerned is further authorized, in his discretion and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to delegate and provide for the delegation of any power and authority conferred by this act to such qualified and responsible officers, boards, agents, or persons as he may designate or appoint.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of this act, the manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition of an invention, whether patented or unpatented, by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government shall be construed as manufacture, use, sale, or other disposition for the United States; and for the purposes of the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (40 Stat. 705; 35 U. S. C. 68), the use or manufacture of an invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States by a contractor, a subcontractor, or any person, firm, or corporation for the Government and with the authorization or consent of the Government, shall be construed as use or manufacture for the United States.

SEC. 8. This act shall apply to all royalties or like charges directly or indirectly charged or chargeable to the United States for any supplies, equipment, or materials to be delivered to or for the Government from and after the effective date of the notice provided for in section 2 hereof and shall also apply to all royalties or like charges charged or chargeable directly or indirectly to the United States for supplies, equipment, or materials delivered to or for the Government prior to the date of such notice insofar as such royalties or like charges have not been paid to the payee thereof prior to the effective date of such notice.

SEC. 9. The head of each department or agency of the Government may issue such rules and regulations and require such information as may be necessary and proper to carry out the provisions of this act. The provisions of section 10 (1) of an act approved July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 787), as amended, and title XIII of Public Law 507, Seventy-seventh Congress, shall be applicable to the payor and payee of any royalty or like charge for an invention, whether patented or unpatented, manufactured, used, sold, or otherwise disposed of for the United States, and the term "defense contract" as used in said act shall mean and include an agreement for the payment of royalty or like charge regardless of the date of such agreement, under or by virtue of which any royalty or like charge is directly or indirectly paid by the Government or included within the contract price for property sold to or manufactured for the Government.

SEC. 10. Nothing herein contained shall be deemed to preclude the applicability of section 408 of Public Law 528, Seventy-seventh Congress, as the same may be heretofore or hereafter amended so far as the same may be applicable.

SEC. 11. If any provision of this act or the application of any provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, or if any provision of this act shall be inoperative by its terms, the validity or applicability of the remainder of the act shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 12. This act shall take effect 90 days after approval.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCARRAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 27, 1949.

Hon. PAT MCCARRAN,
*Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: There appears to be a need for the enactment of a permanent statute for the adjustment of royalties and like charges for the use of inventions for the benefit of or by the United States.

Under the act of June 25, 1910, as amended (36 Stat. 851, 35 U. S. C. 68), the Government and its contractors are authorized to use patented inventions upon the payment of reasonable and entire compensation for such use. Defenses of invalidity, etc., are available as in ordinary infringement suits. It has been held, however, that the act of June 25, 1910, does not apply when the Government or a Government contractor is already licensed under a patent. *Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co.* v. *Isherwood* (5 F. 2d 924). The result of this decision is that, despite a declared policy that the United States should be entitled to use patented inventions upon the payment of reasonable compensation, this policy is defeated whenever the Government or a person or corporation having a contract with the Government involving the use of certain inventions has entered into patent-license agreements with the owners of such inventions. As a consequence of that decision the Government has sometimes been forced to pay unreasonable royalties which may have been provided for by the license. Also, it must pay the royalties specified in the license agreement even where the patent may be invalid, or when the licensor for some other reason has no just claim to the royalties.

This situation was temporarily corrected during the war by the Royalty Adjustment Act (October 31, 1942, 56 Stat. 1013, 35 U. S. C., secs. 89–96) whereby the Government was authorized to reduce royalties payable under existing licenses where such royalties were excessive. This act is temporary wartime legislation and will at some early date become ineffective.

In view of the Isherwood decision, it would appear desirable to incorporate the principles of the Royalty Adjustment Act into the law as a permanent measure applicable both in wartime and peacetime. A draft of a proposed bill to effectuate this purpose is enclosed. The proposed legislation represents the consolidated views of the Departments of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Justice.

Enactment of the proposed bill before the termination of the Royalty Adjustment Act is necessary in order to avoid reestablishing the situation which existed at the time of the passage of that act.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
*The Assistant to the Attorney General.*

MYRA M. HARDY

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 71), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Myra M. Hardy, widow of Charles Oscar Hardy, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

DEVELOPMENT AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC HEALTH UNITS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on the 17th of January, I, along with certain distinguished Members of the Senate, introduced Senate bill 522, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, to authorize assistance to States, and political subdivisions in the development and maintenance of local public-health units, and for other purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be a reprint of the bill, and that on the reprint the names of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] to be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, FOUNDER OF THE REPUBLICAN FAITH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR VANDENBERG

[Mr. VANDENBERG asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Lincoln Day dinner in Detroit, Mich., February 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WHERRY

[Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Illinois Republican Lincoln Day dinner, at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Ill., on February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

A FORWARD LOOKING REPUBLICAN PARTY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject "A Forward Looking Republican Party," delivered by him on February 12, 1949, before the Lincoln Club, Louisville Ky., which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL, at the Middlesex Club Dinner, Hotel Statler, Boston, Mass., February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOP LIBERALS IN THE SENATE—ARTICLE BY SENATOR MORSE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "GOP Liberals—In the Senate They Have a Program for Action," by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, of Oregon, published in the magazine Parade on February 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIAL AND SENTENCE OF JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD editorial comments from Boston newspapers on the trial and sentence of Cardinal Mindszenty, which appear in the Appendix.]

NATIONAL HOUSING POLICY—TESTIMONY BEFORE THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ECONOMIC REPORT

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD summaries of the testimony of Mr. Raymond M. Foley, Mr. Tighe Woods, and Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug, before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on February 11, 1949, which appear in the Appendix.]

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION—ADDRESS BY JOHN R. STEELMAN

[Mr. KEFAUVER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John R. Steelman before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association on February 1, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

STALIN IS WILLING TO TALK—EDITORIAL FROM THE GREAT FALLS (MONT.) TRIBUNE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Stalin Is Willing To Talk," published in the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune of February 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD'S VOTE AGAINST THE UNITED NATIONS—ARTICLE FROM MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Henrik Shipstead Is Proudest of His Vote Against the UN," from the Minneapolis Tribune of February 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT ACTION IN STRIKES—ARTICLE BY WILLIAM H. DAVIS

[Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Government Action in Strikes," by William H. Davis, from the New York Times of February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BUILDING CODE REVISIONS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Building Code Revisions," published in the Fond du Lac (Wis.) Commonwealth Reporter of January 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN INSTANCE OF INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

[Mr. CAIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Nations Pull Together; So Everybody's Happy," published in the Seattle Times of January 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

INDUSTRIALIZING AND EXPORTING TO NONINDUSTRIALIZED AREAS—ARTICLES BY GEORGE H. HOUSTON

[Mr. FLANDERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Industrializing Nonindustrialized Areas of the World," by George H. Houston, which appears in the Appendix.]

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF WALTER L. POPE TO BE CIRCUIT JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, February 21, 1949, at 11:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Walter L. Pope, of Montana, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals, for the Ninth Circuit, vice Francis A. Garrecht, deceased. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is concluded.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

During the delivery of Mr. DONNELL'S speech,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to address an inquiry to the acting majority leader. Is it the intention to call the calendar?

Mr. MYERS. No. I intended to ask unanimous consent to dispense with the call of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to agree to such a request, so that we may clear the record and pass the call of the calendar, in order that the Senator from Missouri may proceed at his leisure.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSAL TO PLACE STATE LEGISLATORS ON A. F. OF L. PAY ROLL

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, an Associated Press dispatch issued under date of February 12 includes the following quoted language:

The A. F. of L. is considering putting State legislators on its pay roll so labor sympathizers can afford the lawmaking jobs.

This would be part of an extremely broad plunge into national political affairs about to be launched by Labor's League for Political Education, the American Federation of Labor's political arm.

Heartened by its success in helping elect President Truman last fall, the league is stepping up its national activities and planning extensive campaigns on State and local levels.

TO ENCOURAGE CANDIDATES

Details were worked out at the A. F. of L. executive council's recent midwinter session at Miami, Fla.

League leaders decided that union members or people sympathetic with labor's aims could have a great voice, or even control, in State legislatures if more such persons could be induced to run for office.

It was recognized, however, that the pay for State legislators is so low in most States that labor people often cannot afford to run for office or take time out from regular jobs for lawmaking.

Thus, it was proposed and virtually decided that the league will help elect and thereafter augment the salaries of legislators endorsed by labor where they have insufficient funds of their own to get by.

CITE A STATE FUND

The proposal was made by a high-ranking A. F. of L. official in a written statement presented to the labor league's administrative council.

Mr. President, I consider to be exceedingly unwise and highly reprehensible the proposal that the Federation of Labor put on its pay roll members of State legislatures. I should consider to be equally unwise and reprehensible a proposal, were one to be made, to put members of a State legislature on the pay roll of an organization which is or shall be created to promote the interests of management. Were proposals to be made to put Members of Congress on the pay roll of either an organization operated in the interest of labor or of an organization operated in the interest of management I should likewise consider such proposals to be exceedingly unwise and highly reprehensible.

My reason for the views I have stated are:

First. A person who is chosen to membership in a legislative body thereby becomes a part of that governmental unit the laws of which that legislative body enacts, and should under no circumstances allow himself to be placed in a position in which he is subject to the danger of allowing the performance of his official functions to be influenced by obligations to others.

Second. A person who is chosen to membership in a legislative body is thereby selected as an official of all the people within the jurisdiction of that body, and should not in his participation in its affairs accept any gift which is likely to cause or tend to cause him to be responsive solely to the interests of only a part of such people.

Third. For an official to be paid money, as is planned under the current proposal, would strongly tend to cause him to be responsive to the demands or wishes of the donor organization in the performance of his official duties.

Fourth. If the precedent of such proposal to place legislators on the pay roll of an organization formed for the promotion of the interest of one group of the population be established it may reasonably be expected that other organizations, perhaps of industry, such as railroads, or mine owners, or of the learned professional groups or of some other segment of our people, which may consider its members or the public interest to be in jeopardy because of public legislation, will follow the examples of such precedents and by paying either gratuities or salaries to legislators seek to make such legislators either exceedingly friendly to or perhaps virtually agents of the donor organization to carry out its will rather than to perform, free from bias or influence, the duties of the public official positions to which such legislators have been chosen.

Fifth. The proposal approaches closely and may easily lead to bribery of public officials.

Sixth. In addition to the evils which I have suggested which would result from

carrying into effect the American Federation of Labor proposal, it may reasonably be concluded that as a likely result thereof not only would there be an undermining of the character and stamina of the recipients of the gifts, but also a crop of legislation in furtherance of special interests rather than of the general good.

Seventh. No self-respecting legislator could accept money under such a proposal, with the probable resultant feeling of obligation to the donor, with the diminished or extinguished zeal which he would experience in advocacy of a measure designed for the general good but opposed to the desire of the donor organization, or perhaps of entire omission or abandonment by him of such advocacy because of the desire of the donor organization, and with the mortification or embarrassment which he would be likely to suffer—that is the legislator—should he after the receipt of the money from the organization decline or fail to carry out the desire of such organization.

Although larger salaries are frequently paid to judicial and executive officials than are paid to the members of the legislative bodies, and consequently there may not exist in the case of the executive or judicial officer the urgent financial need which in the case of members of legislatures is the reason for the current proposal of the American Federation of Labor, yet, Mr. President, on principle, if it be proper for organizations such as labor unions, or political arms thereof, or manufacturers' associations, to assist by financial contributions during the term of office the members of the legislative branch of any unit of American government, it would be equally justifiable for such organization also to render assistance by such contributions during the respective terms of office to the officers of each of the other two coordinate branches of government; in the executive branch of mayors, governors, and even the President, and in the judicial branch to judges of the courts, from the lowest of them to and including the Supreme Court of the United States.

It is difficult to imagine a plan more violative of the principle that public officials are not to become private agents of special interests, more hostile to the view that no man can serve two masters, more conducive to embarrassment, degradation, and corruption of public officials, and more likely to result in gross disregard of an egregious injury to public welfare than is the proposal set forth in the Associated Press dispatch previously mentioned.

The proposal which is being considered by the American Federation of Labor to put State legislators on its pay rolls, if once placed in effect, may easily be followed by like proposals to place on the pay rolls of labor organizations Members of Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope that this pending proposal will be abandoned in its incipiency.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks there be printed as a part thereof the editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun of this morning, entitled "A Curious A. F. of L. Scheme To Subsidize Legislators."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CURIOUS A. F. OF L. SCHEME TO SUBSIDIZE LEGISLATORS

That is a curious dispatch from Washington which reports an A. F. of L. plan to subsidize State legislators friendly to labor. The plan apparently would be to put lawmakers on a special union pay roll if they bound themselves to see the public welfare through union eyes. The idea is limited so far, apparently, to State legislators.

The reason for the State limitation may be guessed at. A. F. of L. interests suffered a shattering surprise in the Supreme Court the other day on the closed-shop cases. They had attacked State provisions against the closed shop on constitutional grounds. But a normally prounion court found it could not in this case strain the constitutional doctrines enough to come out the labor way.

That returned the unions to the necessity of securing what they want from State legislatures. The proposal to supplement the salary of legislators friendly to labor follows. It is a proposal which wise heads within the labor movement will wish to reconsider and probably in the end to withdraw.

First of all, why should there be any need for this adventure? All State legislators are now paid, some very well. The State legislative sessions run only 40 to 114 days and in a recent year the national average was only 93 days. It is hard to believe that prospective legislators able to judge labor's claims fairly are too poor to meet these requirements without a union subsidy.

There is another consideration which the wiser labor leaders will keep in mind. Grant for the sake of the argument that some State legislatures are relatively conservative, in much the way the National House of Representatives is relatively conservative. But this is not because the members from industrial areas are relatively conservative.

It is because the makeup of many State chambers and the National House gives the rural areas wider influence than they get, say, in the United States Senate. In the Senate, elected by State-wide vote, massed urban population can often outvote rural congressional districts.

It follows that many city legislators now are as friendly to labor as labor could wish. To subsidize labor men running for office in the cities would hardly improve on the situation as it now is in the National House and many of the State legislatures. And to subsidize such men in rural areas would very likely be to kindle the kind of rural sentiment which many times has frustrated labor's legislative plans.

For countrymen would be quick to see the most serious objection of all, the one raising the question of morality and even of loyalty. A proposal by the Association of Manufacturers to subsidize poor men who would vote the NAM way would arouse a roar of outrage, and rightly. It is merely a symptom of our present confusions that the A. F. of L. proposal is made in quarters which would most loudly denounce such an NAM scheme.

It just is not true in the United States that labor can get fair play in legislation only by subsidizing legislators. It is still true in the United States that all groups in the population will fare best when independent men are elected to consider the interests of all groups.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that I completely associate myself with his observations on the basic principles of good government which he has risen to defend.

Along the same line, I point out that, of course, one of our difficulties today is that many people feel that our representatives in various legislative bodies, on a State basis as well as on a Congressional basis, do in fact represent special interests, and do in fact sit in their legislative seats not as representatives of all the people, but as representatives of certain forces which exercise tremendous influence on their elections and on their income.

I point out to the Senator from Missouri that I have had pending for a long time in the Senate a resolution which, so far as this body is concerned, would require every Member of the United States Senate to place on record for public inspection all the sources of his income, no matter where the source. If we are going to retain the confidence of the American people in the legislative process, they are entitled to know to what extent, if any—and they are entitled to draw their own inferences—the sources of income of any legislator may affect the votes which he casts, either in the United States Senate or any other legislative body.

Up to date I have not been able even to obtain a hearing on my resolution; but I say that it is fundamental to good government and to the preservation of a sound legislative process. If men do not wish to make the sources of their income public, they do not have to run for office. But if they stand before the American people for election to the United States Senate, then I say that they should be willing to make the record public as to where they get their income, and in what amounts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as bearing upon the very matter upon which the Senator from Missouri has so eloquently spoken today, an article which appeared in a recent issue of This Week magazine, written by a State senator in the Oregon State Legislature. The article is entitled "I Am a $5-a-Day Senator."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I AM A $5-A-DAY SENATOR

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

My ears still burn from the scolding given me by a prominent constituent who visited the capital of our State on urgent business and could not find the senator from his district at any of the leading hotels. He wondered sarcastically where I had been keeping myself in Salem.

When I told him my wife and I had to live in a small auto court on the edge of town because my pay as a State senator averaged only $5 a day, he was flabbergasted.

Millions of other citizens of the United States, I have concluded, must be similarly uninformed. Otherwise, would they let the people who set policy for their schools, highways, courts, and welfare institutions work for lower pay than a baby-sitter or a caddie on a golf course?

I belong to the most neglected lawmaking body on earth—an American State legislature.

Nor is my State, Oregon, out of line with the national pattern. In New England, for example, Connecticut pays its legislators $600 for a 2-year term. The most recent session

went on for 145 days, giving the senators and representatives a daily wage of $4.13. Vermont pays the framers of its laws $750 for one term of office. At the last session this meant $6.88 a day. And New Hampshire doles out just $200 to its legislators every 2 years. The 1947 session lasted 182 days, making the salary of New Hampshire senators and representatives $1.09 daily, the lowest in the Nation.

It's pretty much the same everywhere. The most recent Missouri legislature worked 6 months—which made its daily pay $9.41. West Virginia legislators get $500 a year. Texas pays $10 for the first 120 days, $5 thereafter. Utah musters yearly pay of $300. Tennessee's scale is $4 a day, a wage which vanishes after the seventy-fifth day of a session.

LUCKY HANDFUL

In evaluating these wages, remember that the legislators have to leave their homes and live at the capital. A few States—notably Alabama, Arkansas, Washington, Kansas, and Arizona—add modest maintenance allowances to meet the hotel expenses of legislators. But the majority of States still require their lawmakers to eat and sleep in a distant city on wages that the most unskilled laborer would spurn.

As a friend of mine in the Montana Legislature says, "I appreciate the privilege, but I don't know how long I can afford it."

Only a handful of States pay salaries to their legislators which total more than $100 a month for an entire year. These generally are the States which pay an annual salary. New York leads the list with $5,000 a year. New Jersey and Illinois are next with $3,000. Following them are Massachusetts with $2,759, Michigan with $2,400, and Ohio with $2,600. Pennsylvania and Maryland are the only other States above $1,200.

Over all, the average annual pay of each legislator in the Nation is about $900.

The other night my wife and I totaled up how much it will nick our savings to have me serve as an Oregon State senator. In addition to losing my normal income as a writer and journalist for nearly 3 months, we are behind at least $5 a day. And we economize by pooling our groceries and cooking with the family of a young senator in an adjacent auto court. We have a car pool, too. (We get 10 cents a mile expense money, but only for one round trip from home to the capital.)

SECRETARIES DO BETTER

There is one economy I have not yet practiced. Almost half our members try to struggle along financially by listing their wives as their secretaries. The wife then goes on the pay roll at $7 a day (a new bill may raise it to $8). This, combined with the member's $5 or $6 (he gets paid less than the secretary), just about enables these senators and representatives to break even.

Wives of most legislators are not trained stenographers and the business of the State is not exactly expedited by their efforts. As I write this, a senator at a nearby desk is attempting to dictate a proposed statute to his wife. The wife cannot take shorthand. The senator must linger several seconds over each phrase; later the wife will diligently hunt for the right keys on the typewriter for an hour or two. A bill which may change educational policy for Oregon's quarter of a million school children might wind up with a typographical error that will put the State supreme court to work for weeks.

THE CITY GETS A LAUGH

The economies forced upon members of the legislature often give the capital city a chuckle. More than one dignified senator has been sternly reprimanded for preparing breakfast on a hot plate smuggled into his hotel room. And virtually every member picks up a few extra dollars at the end of the session by selling his set of the State's legal code to a bookstore or law library.

"I ought to keep those books," a young businessman in the senate confided, "so I'll know exactly what laws we passed or amended, but, by golly, I'm so far behind I've got to have that extra $50."

It may all sound slightly comic, but there is an aspect to it which rubs away the humor. There are 90 members in our legislature, and for every member and representative a half-dozen lobbyists crowd the capitol cloakrooms and hotel corridors. Armed with liberal expense accounts, they like nothing better than to pick up a legislator's dinner check, provide him with a bottle of liquor or a baked ham, or furnish him with a car and driver. It's gotten to the point where if you're a good lobbyist you can sometimes swing a vote for a steak dinner.

The lower the pay of a senator or a representative, the less well he is equipped to resist such blandishments. A man who would never think of accepting a bribe will let a lobbyist take care of some of his meal checks. It all seems perfectly innocent. But when the time comes for the lobbyist to ask a favor, the member is hard put to turn him down.

The lobbyist's request may be trifling and perfectly proper; he may use his friendship with lawmakers merely to hasten passage of a harmless bill. But then again, the request may relate to exploitation of the State's natural resources. A lumber company may hope to cut timber on school lands without competitive bids. A State may suffer a loss in millions because it is unwilling to authorize the few thousands in legislative pay which would make its senators and representatives self-supporting. It's the old story of penny-wise, pound-foolish.

I know a man who lobbies at State capitals all along the Pacific coast. He admits frankly that it is easier and cheaper to bring his influence to bear in Oregon than in California, where members are paid $1,200 a year plus expenses.

DIME-STORE LOBBYING

"The Oregon legislators are just as honest but less independent," confides this lobbyist. "Their measly pay makes them susceptible to what I call dime-store lobbying. You can get a key committee member indebted to you for the price of eggs and bacon."

In some States reports frequently hint of some senator or representative allowing his hotel bill to be paid by the local utility company. How much independence can be expected of a lawmaker under such circumstances?

In our own legislature I notice an increasing number of members who are openly on retainers from corporations or trade-unions. They do not have to live within their pittance from the State. They are company lawyers or labor officials. But how will the interest of the public fare when it conflicts with that of the private organizations on whose pay rolls these men serve at the same time that they enact the State's laws?

Stunted legislative salaries work adversely in another manner. Members are under intense personal pressure to adjourn speedily and go home. They see their bank accounts melting away.

Put yourself in the place of a young electrical contractor I know, for example, who not only has to pay his living costs in the capital and support his household at home, but also hire a skilled man to carry on his business while he's gone.

FAST WORK

Yet the State's business must be transacted. Taxes must be levied and policies decided. When I served in the Oregon House of Representatives before the war, we rushed through bills in the closing days that not more than two or three of us had read. And they affected such vital matters as Columbia River water power and the commitment of insane persons.

What is the solution? The Council of State Governments, a national organization, recommends that legislators in all 48 States be paid an annual salary in keeping with their responsibilities. This would enable them to spend time on State problems all the year around, rather than only while the legislature is in session. As it is now, many men and women go to our State capitals wholly uninformed on the great issues they must settle.

TIMES HAVE CHANGED

In 24 States the pay of legislators is fixed by the State constitutions. Some of these constitutions were written in pioneer times when a hotel room was 50 cents a night and a chicken-liver breakfast cost a quarter. The Council of State Governments believes legislative salaries should be set by statute so they may be varied with economic changes as they occur.

But, basically, the long-range answer is for the average citizen to take a more immediate interest in the government closest to him and his family, the government of his State. Not only the pay of legislators needs correcting. Seven dollars for a secretary fails to compete with the far higher wages she can receive from the Federal Government. I couldn't get a competent stenographer to go to the legislature until a family friend volunteered to do it "for the experience." Like her boss, she is losing money living at the capital.

Furthermore, virtually all State legislative districts in America require reapportionment. But the citizen, with his eyes on distant Washington, D. C., has failed to see that this is done. Our legislature has not been reapportioned since 1910. As a result, although the State constitution requires that all Senators represent equal numbers of people, I have 78,170 constituents while a member a few rows away has 7,268.

PREP SCHOOL FOR PRESIDENTS

We neglect our legislatures, yet we expect them to furnish our national leaders of the future. Washington and Jefferson were members of the colonial legislature of Virginia. Abraham Lincoln served in the Illinois State Legislature for 7 years. Theodore Roosevelt and Franklin D. Roosevelt graduated from the New York Legislature at Albany. Mention a prominent United States Senator and the chances are he began his career as a State legislator.

Lately Congress has been occupied with raising the pay of the President and other National Government officials, in line with the rise in salaries in private business. But there's been little talk about the far more overdue pay rises for State legislators. A notable exception is Michigan, where legislative salaries have been increased from $3 a day to $2,400 a year. Let's hope this is a straw in the wind.

We often speak glibly of States' rights when we want to express alarm over the encroachment of the Federal Government on local authority. Too often we forget that States' responsibilities are a partner of this slogan.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the contribution which my friend from Oregon has made. I had secured, at the moment he asked me to yield, consent of the Senate to the inclusion in the RECORD at that point as a part of my remarks of the editorial appearing in this morning's Baltimore Sun. I desire to emphasize particularly a few sentences which appear in the body of that editorial. It is entitled "A Curious A. F. of L. Scheme To Subsidize

Legislators." One of the sentences in the editorial reads:

> The plan apparently would be to put lawmakers on a special union pay roll if they bound themselves to see the public welfare through union eyes. The idea is limited so far, apparently, to State legislators.

A little further along in the editorial I find this sentence with respect to the curious proposal of the A. F. of L.:

> It is a proposal which wise heads within the labor movement will wish to reconsider, and probably in the end to withdraw.

Near the end of the editorial is this very clear and pungent statement:

> For countrymen would be quick to see the most serious objection of all, the one raising the question of morality and even of loyalty. A proposal by the Association of Manufacturers to subsidize poor men who would vote the NAM way would arouse a roar of outrage, and rightly. It is merely a symptom of our present confusions that the A. F. of L. proposal is made in quarters which would most loudly denounce such an NAM scheme.
>
> It just is not true in the United States that labor can get fair play in legislation only by subsidizing legislators. It is still true in the United States that all groups in the population will fare best when independent men are elected to consider the interests of all groups.

Mr. President, I desire to touch very briefly today upon what is probably even a far greater and more important point than that which I have thus far referred.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Before the Senator leaves the subject which he has been discussing, may I inquire whether he has a copy of the resolution adopted at Miami?

Mr. DONNELL. No, I have not. However, I have in my hand the Kansas City Star of yesterday, February 13, with an extended Associated Press dispatch. Indeed, it is the first article on the front page of the Kansas City Star. It is entitled "A Labor 'Subsidy'." The subheads are, "A. F. of L. would put State legislators on pay roll so that they could 'afford' to run. May pay poll tax, too. This would boost the number of eligible voters in the South. A national newspaper and radio program also proposed to carry political views."

Apparently there is an identical article in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of yesterday.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator think it is quite fair to the A. F. of L. to attack them the way he has done without first getting a full copy of the resolution which was introduced?

Mr. DONNELL. I think it is not only fair, but I think it is imperative. One of the great news services of the country, the Associated Press, without any qualification whatsoever, has carried the dispatch which I have read. It appears in two of the leading newspapers of my State. The St. Louis Globe-Democrat is one among three great newspapers in that metropolis. The Kansas City Star is a great newspaper known throughout the Central West. It is published in Kansas City. I think we are entitled to take the word of the Associated Press, without requiring certified copies or other copies of the resolution, for the purpose of calling attention to the importance of the American Federation of Labor abandoning any such idea as this.

Further in response to the Senator, the fact that a great newspaper such as the Baltimore Sun has printed this interesting and important editorial is in itself indicative of the fact that it is appropriate and timely that this subject be discussed today on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I realize that my distinguished friend has had a great deal of experience in public life. If he is interested, I can show him one quotation after another from the Associated Press which is absolutely false. When I was Governor of my State, newspapers having the Associated Press coverage would leave entire paragraphs out of releases which I had given to the Associated Press.

In other words, if I make myself clear, the excerpts which the distinguished Senator has read from the Kansas City Star and the St. Louis Globe-Democrat may be absolutely true, and yet a part of the release given out by the A. F. of L. may have been eliminated.

It seems to me that we are entitled to have a full copy of the resolution, because the A. F. of L. made a remarkable record during the war for loyalty, and distinguished itself by the vast amount of work which it accomplished during that time. I believe that upon reflection the able Senator will agree with me that the full resolution should be obtained before he goes further.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I may say that I thoroughly agree that we should have in the Senate, and I hope there will be placed before the Senate by any Senator who can secure it, an exact, verbatim copy of what was done.

In this connection I call to the attention of the Senator the concluding sentence which I read from the Kansas City Star article with reference to the proposal. The sentence reads as follows:

> The proposal was made by a high-ranking A. F. of L. official in a written statement presented to the Labor League's administrative council.

I call to his attention also the fact that the preceding sentence of the article reads:

> Thus, it was proposed and virtually decided that the league will help elect and thereafter augment the salaries of legislators endorsed by labor where they have insufficient funds of their own to get by.

Mr. President, what I am saying is no attack upon the American Federation of Labor. I have a very high admiration for the fine public service it has rendered. I realize, as does the Senator from North Dakota, that during the war the American Federation of Labor made a notable and outstanding contribution to the welfare of our Nation.

What I attack here today is the principle of any such proposal as this one, a principle which is wrong and is a mistake and is reprehensible. If my statement of facts is incorrect, obviously the correct statement of facts should be placed in the RECORD.

Perhaps a mistake occurs here or there, of course, but I submit that in the Senate day after day and week after week we rely, generally speaking with assurance, upon dispatches sent out by the great press services of the country, particularly when they are used by outstanding journals as leading articles of those publications in our various communities.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for an inquiry.

Mr. LANGER. In the first place, the article does not state who gave the interview. It simply says "a high ranking A. F. of L. official." Furthermore, the article does not say that such an agreement has been made. It simply says that the matter was "virtually decided."

Let me call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Missouri to the fact that I do not have the reliance he has upon the Associated Press. I remember only too well when in this very body, in 1915 or early 1916, I believe it was, the former Senator La Follette, Sr., was criticized by this body when it relied upon an Associated Press dispatch in connection with World War I. At that time the Senate nearly expelled Senator La Follette. But a few months later the Associated Press abjectly apologized for having given circulation to something that did not actually take place at the meeting at St. Paul, Minn., in connection with which the distinguished Senator La Follette was accused of saying something that he actually did not say at all.

So I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Missouri upon reflection will wish to obtain the entire resolution, because I know the fairness in his heart. I know his generosity, and I am sure he would not wish to say anything about the American Federation of Labor until he was entirely satisfied as to the real facts.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DONNELL. I do.

Mr. MORSE. Is the junior Senator from Oregon correct in his understanding that the Senator from Missouri has made these comments today in the belief that at the American Federation of Labor convention a proposal was made that when men endorsed by the American Federation of Labor for candidacy for State legislatures do not have sufficient financial resources with which to run for the office and serve during the term of the office, the American Federation of Labor should supplement their State salaries with labor money?

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator is precisely correct.

In addition, I have relied upon two further facts, or at least two further statements in the article by the Associated Press. One is as follows:

> Details were worked out at the A. F. of L. executive council's recent midwinter session at Miami, Fla.
>
> League leaders decided that union members or people sympathetic with labor's aims could have a great voice, or even control, in State legislatures if more such persons could be induced to run for office.

I also relied, if I may answer the Senator further, upon this additional sentence

of the article appearing in the Kansas City Star, to which I have referred, as carried in the dispatch for the Associated Press:

Thus, it was proposed and virtually decided that the league will help elect and thereafter augment the salaries of legislators endorsed by labor where they have insufficient funds of their own to get by.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it the Senator's position today that if such a proposal were in fact made, it cannot be reconciled with good principles of sound government?

Mr. DONNELL. Precisely.

Mr. MORSE. Is it also the position of the Senator from Missouri that if such a proposal in fact were not made, then it is incumbent upon the A. F. of L. to make that fact very clear to the American people and issue a statement as to what the real facts in the matter are?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, without undertaking to tell the A. F. of L. what its duties are, I would say that it is certainly the privilege of the A. F. of L. to make a statement in that connection; and I shall be glad, if that is desired, to carry to the floor of the Senate, when it is furnished to me, anything the American Federation of Labor may desire to say in regard to the premises.

However, the Senator from Oregon is precisely correct. It would make no difference whether it were the A. F. of L., the CIO, the National Association of Manufacturers, the American Medical Association, the Association of Railway Labor Executives, or any other organization, whatever it might be, of either labor or management. Even if it were by mistake, if that were possible, or even if it shall prove to be the fact, which I have no reason to think, the very fact that the proposal is heralded to the public, placed before the Nation, and read by millions of people demands and makes not only important but imperative that the views now being expressed in the Senate be placed before the people of the United States. I take that position, not because they are my personal views or because I am the one who is making this statement, but because sound judgment, political morality, and proper concepts of government and of the proper functioning of a legislative body all demand that clarification be made of the proposal which is said to have been virtually adopted.

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 74)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1180.)

REPORT ON LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 1180.)

THE PROPOSED NORTH ATLANTIC SECURITY PACT

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I now desire to address myself briefly to a further proposition which likewise appears in the newspapers, and I assume that the Senator from North Dakota will not be unduly critical of me if I accept the newspaper account, at least tentatively, for purposes of making a suggestion.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Let me say that I would never be critical of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, because 99 percent of the time he is correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I wish to say that the loyalty and good friendship of my esteemed colleague, the Senator from North Dakota, justify a use of the superlative, but the fact is that I am wrong many more times than he so generously indicates.

However, I desire to adopt as the thesis of the further remarks I shall make, a portion of an important article likewise appearing on the front page of the Kansas City Times. Those Members of the Senate who are familiar with the newspapers of Kansas City will recall that the morning Kansas City Star is known as the Kansas City Times. The Kansas City Times of February 12, last Saturday, the day before yesterday, carried an article entitled: "United States Pledges Aid—Norway Is Assured It Would Have Substantial Military Backing—Long Talk on Problems—Oslo Foreign Minister Leaves for London After Meeting With Acheson."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks this article be set forth in its entirety.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in this article we are told that the United States was reported to have assured Norway on February 11 that it can enter the proposed North Atlantic alliance as a full partner and with assurance of substantial military backing from this and other member countries.

The article then proceeds to recite:

That summary of the basic American attitude toward Norway's defense problems is understood to have been given to the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvard Lange, by Secretary Acheson in an 80-minute conference at the State Department this afternoon.

That is, on February 11.

It appears, according to this article, that earlier in the day Mr. Lange had conferred briefly with President Truman. After meeting with the Secretary of State, Mr. Acheson, he wound up his week-long visit to Washington with a call on the Republican foreign policy leader, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. The article then continues as follows:

Acheson and Lange issued a joint statement saying that they had held a "full and frank" discussion of the objectives and nature" of the North Atlantic security project.

The article then continues with respect to a further statement by Mr. Lange. Then, further in the article, is this:

Lange first saw Acheson Monday and raised a half dozen major questions regarding the Atlantic treaty proposal and the role Norway might play in it. He presented today a memorandum of the questions he raised in the first meeting and received answers from Acheson.

The article proceeds:

While the meeting was secret, it was understood that in general, Acheson covered these points.

There appear then a number of points, the third one of which is the one to which I address myself. In order that the third one may properly be before the Senate, however, I shall read points 1 and 2. I quote from the article. These are points, "it is understood," so the article states, covered in general by Secretary Acheson.

1. The United States and other North Atlantic countries—seven are now negotiating a treaty draft here—

That is to say, in Washington—

would be glad to see Norway join the group when it is enlarged before the treaty is put into final form and readied for signing. But no official invitation was issued to Norway to join and responsible informants insisted that no pressure was exercised to influence the Norwegian foreign minister one way or the other.

This is in bold type:

2. The United States, subject to Senate approval of the treaty, will make the strongest possible commitment to give prompt and effective aid if any one of the countries in the Alliance is attacked, but only Congress can declare war.

Then, the third of these points, being the one to which the attention of the Senate is specifically invited at this moment:

3. Military action, therefore, cannot be committed in advance. But—

Notice this sentence—

But in joining the Alliance the American Government would subscribe to the principle that an attack on one member nation was an attack on all, and this would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight.

Mr. President, it is to this language, "this would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight," that attention is respectfully directed. If the President of the United States of America shall make a moral commitment, the Nation must, and I believe it will be, scrupulously careful to keep that commitment, just as fully as if it were a legal commitment. Our national word, as well as the word of the individual members of this great legislative body, should be as good as our bond. So, Mr. President, if that be true, and again I may say to the Senator from North Dakota, I have not seen the draft—I do not know whether he has—of the proposed North Atlantic alliance pact, but if it be true, as stated in this article from the Kansas City Times,

which in turn derived the information from the Associated Press—if it be true that Mr. Acheson in general covered the point that "in joining the alliance, the American Government would subscribe to the principle that an attack on one member nation was an attack on all"—and I say, if it be true, Mr. President, to read the remainder of the sentence, that "this would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight," I want to protest, here and now, against our country being made subject to any moral commitment which, in good conscience, would in the ultimate effect require Congress to go ahead and declare war sometime, even though Congress has the constitutional power to determine whether or not war should be declared.

Mr. President, a legal commitment to fight would be, in effect, a promise to declare war. And, of course, any such legal commitment in the North Atlantic alliance pact is recognized to be improper. Yes, the earlier point I read before this third one itself says—and I quote it again, "only Congress can declare war." Of course, section 8 of article I of the Constitution says:

> The Congress shall have power * * * to declare war.

If it be true that the proposed Atlantic pact is to include something which is going to involve, or may be believed justly and reasonably by the other signatories to involve, a moral commitment to go to war, I protest against the inclusion in that pact of any such provision.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am scarcely in a position to speak for the Secretary of State on this subject. I am in position to speak for myself. I think the Senator will find when the pact is available for specific study that that North Atlantic community agreement, which is misnamed when it is called an alliance, because of the connotations which that word involves historically, is based essentially on the theory of the Rio pact, which starts out with the same general assertion of common interest the Senator has quoted in respect to the proposed North Atlantic community agreement. I remind the Senator, however, that under the Rio pact it is spelled out specifically that each signatory power retains unto itself the entire right of decision respecting the implementation of its obligations both as to its individual contribution and as to its collective contribution in respect to an ultimate armed attack.

I repeat, I am not even attempting to respond for the Secretary of State; I am responding only for myself. I am saying to the Senator that inasmuch as this is the outcome and the implementation of the resolution which the Senate adopted late last spring by a vote of 64 to 4, I know at least what was intended in connection with the prospectus, and I should say to the Senator I would expect that the complete right of decision respecting the type of contribution to be made either individually or collectively in the presence of an armed attack would remain exclusively with each signatory, and that this fact would be made plain.

For myself, I may add that in my opinion the mere formal recognition of this community of interest in the event of an armed attack upon the Atlantic community, without another word in the treaty, would be an infinite assurance against world war III. In my opinion, if the Kaiser in World War I and the Fuehrer in World War II had been on notice that an armed attack against any of the friendly nations with whom we associate ourselves would be considered a cause even for us to consider and study and determine whether or not we would enter into the common defense, it would have stopped both those wars before they occurred, and in my opinion that one single designation of a commonalty of interest in the North Atlantic pact, without any implementation at all, is the best assurance against world war III.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. May I respectfully ask him a question? Am I correct in understanding, or in assuming, that the Senator would not favor including in the North Atlantic pact anything which constitutes a moral commitment to fight on the part of the United States of America?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator means an automatic commitment, my answer is Yes. Obviously, something is meant by a general assertion that we find common interest in our mutual safety. The implementation, I repeat, of that recognition, so far as the Senator from Michigan is concerned—the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will speak for himself, but I know he agrees—so far as the implementation of any such community of interest is concerned, the decision will remain at home.

Mr. DONNELL. But the Senator would not favor, would he, a North Atlantic pact containing within it a moral commitment on the part of the United States to fight?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Not without its own independent decision to that end.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator, and I appreciate his contribution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. My name has been brought into the controversy.

Mr. DONNELL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas in a moment.

Mr. President, it was my privilege some few weeks ago to read a very large portion of the very interesting debate which took place at the time when the resolution which was adopted last spring by a vote of 64 to 4 was being considered. I have read over the debate in large part, and I remember that the Senator from Michigan then, in response, as I recall, to vigorous questioning by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], gave assurance, without any shadow of a doubt, that in his opinion, that is, in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, the adoption of that resolution would still leave it open to this country to determine whether or not it would enter into further commitments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That continues to be the opinion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I want to say that I did not hear all the discussion, but I assume it was with regard to the assumed obligations of the United States in the so-called North Atlantic Pact.

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator would like the precise language which was under discussion, I shall be glad to give it. I had quoted from an Associated Press dispatch appearing on the front page of the Kansas City Times of February 12, in the course of which reference was made to a meeting between Mr. Lange, the representative of Norway, and Secretary Acheson, representing this country. The dispatch says:

> While the meeting was secret, it was understood that in general Mr. Acheson covered these points.

And the third of the points was this, to which I particularly addressed myself:

> Moral action, therefore, would not be committed in advance, but in joining the alliance the American Government would subscribe to the principle that an attack on one member nation was an attack on all.

The portion from there on was what I was particularly addressing myself to.

> This would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight.

I was protesting, inasmuch as the word of our country, its moral obligation, ought to be, I believe, as good as its bond—against the inclusion of any such moral commitment which would, in effect, mean a legal commitment, if we value the rule of the observance of obligations.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not, of course, approve of any language which may be adopted which could be construed as automatically involving the United States in war.

Mr. DONNELL. Or as a moral commitment to fight?

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course. In the case of governments I do not know the difference between moral commitments and legal commitments. I certainly would not desire the adoption of any language which would morally commit us to fight. I think our morality is worth something in the world, and we would not want to play with a moral commitment, even though we might not be legally bound. But there are many people, and we have found them in government and elsewhere, who would favor automatically going to war, which would mean letting European nations declare war and letting us fight.

Mr. DONNELL. Which would, of course, be entirely contrary to the Constitution of the United States, would it not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Certainly. Congress alone has the power to declare war. Of course individual Senators declare war sometimes.

Mr. DONNELL. But those are only local wars.

Mr. CONNALLY. Seriously, I would not vote for any language of that kind. I have so told the Secretary of State, and I think he knows that I feel as does the Senator from Michigan, that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations would not approve or adopt any form of language in an international agreement which would commit us to go to war when some other country in Europe might be attacked. We are not responsible for the disagreements which may arise in the countries of Europe. Any European nation might attack another nation, not merely the one country about which we hear so much talk.

I would not attempt to assess all the different ramifications involved but when and if the situation shall arise, the Government of the United States can legally, morally, and constitutionally determine what our course shall be under the given circumstances; that is reserved to the United States. If we think the controversy or situation is of such a nature that we should go to war, we can do so. If we think it is not of such a nature, we shall not go to war.

That is my horseback attitude in regard to the question at the moment.

Members of the Foreign Relations Committee are in communication with the Secretary of State and have conferred with him a time or two, and we shall confer with him again regarding these matters. The Senator from Missouri need not be disturbed about the attitude of some of us, at least, regarding the whole proposition. We are making it very plain to the Secretary of State, and to anyone else who has a part to play in regard to the matter, that that is our attitude.

Some persons cite the Rio treaty. That treaty does not go that far. There is not an exact parallel between the Rio treaty and the proposed treaty. In the case of the Rio treaty, it simply put into legal form that to which we were already committed. We have been committed since 1823 to the principle that if any European power attacked a South American country we would intervene to resist the attack. We did so in the case of Maximilian, in Mexico, in 1867, when we told Napoleon III to remove his army from Mexico. He withdrew his army from Mexico. So we have had that moral, if not legal, obligation for many years. It was much easier to do that in the case of Latin-American attack.

The Rio treaty does not obligate us to go to war; it simply obligates us to consult with and call on the foreign ministers and take appropriate action in the interest of peace, not in the interest of making war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I shall yield in a moment.

I am greatly pleased at the contribution made by both these distinguished statesmen and members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. As I understand, neither of the Senators desires to put into the North Atlantic pact anything which constitutes a moral commitment on the part of the United States of America to go to war. If I have misinterpreted their statements, I pause now for a statement to the contrary from either or both of them.

I hear no such statement to the contrary.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri a question. While it is, of course, perfectly clear that this country cannot, of its own volition, become involved in an act of war except by the declaration of the Congress of the United States, does the Senator believe that in our own national interest this Government should be unconcerned at an overt act of aggression by any power upon any of the member states in the United Nations?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I would say that I certainly agree with the tenor of the inquiry, which I judge indicates that the Senator from California means that our country is to be concerned with peace or war anywhere in the world.

The point I am making is that if we sign the North Atlantic pact, I do not believe the Members of the Senate desire to have it understood that this country is entering into what is termed in the article I have read a moral committment to fight, any more than I would want us to enter into a legal commitment to fight.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I believe the Senator from California has not concluded, and I yield to him, then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say to the able Senator from Missouri that it seems to me in the day of airplanes and the atom bomb in which we now live, the American people and the American Congress must fully recognize the fact that peace in fact is in jeopardy, and that we can no longer be unconcerned at any overt act of aggression wherever it may occur in the world, because if the United Nations Charter means anything at all, it certainly must mean that the states which are signatories thereto hoped to establish a system of international law and order so that the peace of the world could be preserved for our generation, and for our children.

I do not believe that in this age, when transportation is as swift as it is, we could sit back twiddling our thumbs, so to speak, while nation after nation in Europe was being overrun by an aggressor power. I am sure the Senator from Missouri remembers, and would reply, that Holland was overrun in about 4 days, that Yugoslavia was completely overrun in about 18 days, if my memory serves me correctly, and that Poland was overrun in about 22 days. So, unless this Nation were prepared to take some affirmative action to uphold international law and order, we might find that the iron curtain had not only extended clear out to the English Channel, but perhaps beyond. I do not think the Senator wants to give the impression to the world that this Government would be unconcerned at any such act of aggression; and of course we hope that no such act of aggression will occur.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from California that of course I do not want the world to think that we would be unconcerned with acts of aggression. But neither do I want the countries or the people of the world, either signatory or not signatory to the North Atlantic Pact, to think that if we enter into it, if we do, we have made, not a legal commitment, because we cannot do that under the Constitution, but that we have made a moral commitment to fight. I do not want any such opinion to prevail anywhere. What I want may be stated in this way, that when the circumstances arise, even though they should require quick and immediate and prompt action, the Congress of the United States should have the power then, not as ceded away a few years, perhaps, before the circumstances should arise, and the legal right, and the moral right, unrestricted by any prior moral or other commitment, to determine whether or not we shall fight, whether or not we shall enter upon war.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Regarding the inquiry propounded by the Senator from California, of course we are interested in the peace of the world. But that does not mean that we shall blindfold ourselves and make a commitment now to enter every war that may occur in the next 10 years, and send our boys and resources to Europe to fight.

Mr. DONNELL. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the view some people seem to take of the whole situation. The nations in Europe are not fighting now. All the outrages which have been committed seem to be tolerated by the people of the countries involved. I do not approve of them, of course. But I do not believe in giving carte blanche assurance to these people, "Do everything you want to do, you need not worry, as soon as anything happens, we will come over and fight your quarrel for you. In the meantime you may have a good time, and bask in the sunshine of leadership which you do not deserve."

Mr. President, the mere fact that we associate ourselves with these other governments in a consultative capacity, we will say for the moment, agree to talk with them, advise with them, and talk to their foreign ministers, will of itself have a tremendous moral effect upon any possible enemies who might appear. I do not believe any great power is hunting a war with the United States, and I do not think they look on us with any idea that they could successfully conquer us. But it would have an influence if they knew that we were in favor of democratic governments in other nations, that we are advising with them and talking with them, and possibly would join them, but that such joinder must come after Congress, knowing the facts, viewing the issues, weighing our own responsibilities, determines that we should go to war.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator has spoken sound

words of wisdom, and I am very happy to hear him express himself so forcefully and vigorously on this subject.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I think the Senator from Missouri is to be congratulated for having opened up this discussion, which I think is a very valuable one, and the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan on the legal and moral phases of the subject are, I think, of the utmost importance.

Certainly, if we were to agree to an old-fashioned European type of alliance, in which when one member of the alliance gets into war the war automatically spreads to every other nation, in my judgment that would be a very unfortunate result. I cannot conceive that such a proposal would be submitted to us, or that the Senate would ratify it. To put the war-making power in the hands of other nations, or for us to underwrite nations over whose foreign policy we had no control, would I think be a great mistake. I think the genius of the undertaking under discussion insofar as it has genius, is that it does not attempt to do that.

Mr. DONNELL. I take it the Senator would not favor our going into such a pact which contained a moral commitment on the part of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. I do not see how it is possible to take away from Congress the right to declare war.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator would not be in favor of making a moral commitment, even it if were not a legal commitment.

Mr. LODGE. I am not sure that I know the difference between a legal and a moral commitment, but I think it would be a mistake to attempt to take away from the Congress the right to declare war on the part of our country.

I think a strong argument could be made for the contention of the Senator from Michigan, so dramatically and interestingly developed, that if the Kaiser had known that the United States would take a very special interest in his war-making activities, or if Hitler had known that the United States would take a very special interest in what he was doing, those two wars might not have occurred. But I feel we should always remember, in considering this matter, not only the moral phase and the legal phase, but the phase of practical military implementation. How is such an agreement to be administered, how is it to be implemented? The answer to that question is bound to have a strong effect on any would-be aggressor, because people like the Kaiser and Hitler are never as much embarrassed by words and phrases and good intentions as they are by their knowledge of the actual physical military means that are ready to be used in order to fight. We on our part should always remember in considering matters of this kind that if they are worth anything they are going to involve a military effort by this country in the way of weapons, in the way of manpower, in the way of diversion of human energy from the pursuits of peace, and it would be most unfortunate if in looking at this proposition we do not always bear in mind the question of implementing it from the standpoint of weapons and practical military effort.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield so that I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]? I was sitting in the rear of the Senate Chamber when I heard an observation made by the distinguished Senator from Texas. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri if he will yield so I may propound a question to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my understanding that the hemispheric security we have enjoyed has been the result of the Monroe Doctrine.

Mr. CONNALLY. I so stated.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I understood the distinguished Senator from Texas to say that the North Atlantic pact was only an extension of the Rio pact. Is that true?

Mr. CONNALLY. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I was in the rear of the room and did not hear distinctly.

Mr. CONNALLY. I said there were those who were citing the Rio pact as a precedent for the North Atlantic pact, and I cited the Rio pact to show that it did not present a parallel situation at all. I said that since 1823 we had made the Monroe Doctrine our national policy, and that we were ready to fight without any treaty if any country in the Western Hemisphere were attacked, but that principle did not apply to the proposed new pact; that under it we had no moral obligation to go to war, and had not pledged ourselves to defend Europe.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the Senator from Texas if the South American countries have been considered in the formation of the North Atlantic pact, that is, the countries that are associated in the western hempispheric agreement?

Mr. CONNALLY. So far as I know, they have not. They may have been consulted; I do not know; but they are not nations who are supposed to be signatories to the North Atlantic pact.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what I had in mind. I, of course, was asking simply for information. What I was trying to make clear was whether the North Atlantic pact is an extension of the Rio pact. I have now been informed by the Senator from Texas that it is not. The Senator, however, said that some contend it is an extension.

The question I now wish to ask is whether, in light of the security we in the Western Hemisphere have enjoyed because of the Monroe Doctrine, there has been any infringement upon the rights of any countries in this hemisphere, any of the South or Central American countries, in not inviting them to sit in during the consideration of the North Atlantic pact, and would such a situation affect in any way our relationship with them in the defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think there has been any infringement of their rights. There will be a protocol in the treaty, and the nations signing it will have to make the statement that the obligations they assume in no wise conflict with their own obligations to other countries not parties to the treaty.

Mr. WHERRY. So that they will have an opportunity to join as signatories to the pact.

Mr. CONNALLY. That part has not been completed.

Mr. WHERRY. Will they have to be consulted?

Mr. CONNALLY. I cannot give the Senator that assurance. I suppose they will.

Mr. WHERRY. Should they not be?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that they should.

Mr. WHERRY. That is all I am trying to find out.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that the North Atlantic pact or treaty has not been completed. On several occasions the members of the Foreign Relations Committee have been in conference with the Secretary of State concerning it. The Senator is aware of what happened to the Norwegian Foreign Minister. He came to the United States. He went back probably with different ideas than he had when he came. There is still uncertainty as to what the Scandinavian League may do. So that particular point, I will say to the Senator, has not yet been developed. I do not know what will be proposed. But let me say to the Senator that every line of the proposed treaty will be scanned by the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Michigan, and the Committe on Foreign Relations. We have had the pledge of the State Department that they will not sign any treaty until we have had a look at it. We propose to go through it pretty carefully in every respect. We have as much concern for the safety of the United States as has the State Department. We have as much concern about our relations in preserving the peace of the world as has the State Department. We want to preserve the peace of the world and we will do all we can to preserve it. We cannot, however, be Sir Galahads, and every time we hear a gun fired plunge into war and take sides without knowing what we are doing, and without knowing the issues involved. That is my attitude.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Texas for his observations. I also thank the Senator from Missouri for permitting me to propound the inquiries I did of the Senator from Texas. I wanted to have the point cleared up. It seems to me if we are to preserve the security of the Western Hemisphere it is vital that before the North Atlantic pact is concluded the Nation's signatory of the Rio pact be given an opportunity to set forth their views, so that we may not lose their good will, or the protection that has been accorded the Western Hemisphere by the adoption of the old Monroe doctrine. I do not believe we should conclude action without giving the South American nations opportunity to consider the pact.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say that some of the Nations signatory to the Rio

pact have not yet ratified it, at least they have not filed their ratifications as yet.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it a fact that only two of the countries have ratified the Rio pact?

Mr. CONNALLY. It was a fact some time ago, but I think additional ones have filed their ratifications since that time.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Let us not have a misunderstanding on that subject. The Rio pact came into effect only when 14 countries had ratified it. Since the 14 have ratified others have ratified. I think there are some four out of twenty that have not deposited their ratifications.

If the Senator from Missouri will further yield, I should like to make very sure that the Rio pact, as involved in the present discussion, is not misunderstood. I think I was responsible for injecting it into the debate. The reason I injected it was to point out that even under the Rio pact—which certainly has a more intimate traditional obligation on us than any other sort of pact—there is no automatic obligation on the Government of the United States to do anything, and even if a consultation under the Rio pact results in a vote of the signatory powers to go to war, only those who vote to go to war are bound in the consultations.

Mr. DONNELL. So that there is neither a legal nor a moral obligation at this time in the Rio pact, for the United States of America to go to war. Is that correct?

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is correct. And I was pointing out that if that is the attitude we took in respect to our good neighbors in the Western world, obviously we not only could not but should not go beyond that sort of an obligation in dealing with the North Atlantic community.

I should like, however, to add a word further if I may, Mr. President. I am very glad the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] made the interjection he did, because I would not want the debate today to indicate that our sole interest in the peace and security of the North Atlantic community is confined to our ability to avoid any responsibility in connection with it, and I am sure that is not the attitude of the Senator from Missouri. In my opinion there is no obligation contemplated in the North Atlantic community which is not already inherent in our pledge to the United Nations and our membership in it. There will be nothing, in my expectation, in the North Atlantic pact which is not written within the four corners of the United Nations Charter, and will specifically be so confined. Even if there were no United Nations Charter, and even if there never was a North Atlantic community, the sheer reality of the facts of life in this atomic age today present us with a situation in the North Atlantic community which inevitably would challenge our interest if world war III were to start in any such fashion as the other two world wars did. In my view what we are undertaking to do in the North Atlantic pact is nothing more than to acknowledge in writing the facts of life as they are. In my opinion the fact that we have underscored those facts of life will serve a notice upon potential agressors which they will not ignore or overlook, and we will never have to examine anything except the first sentence in the North Atlantic pact in order to have substantially underwritten peace.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very notable contribution to this discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FULBRIGHT in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that in the case of an outbreak of war or an act of aggression, we shall be following it along in our chancelleries. We shall know the issues involved, and the Congress will be better advised than anyone else as to whether we should take action immediately, or whether we should take action at all with regard to a declaration of war.

As I see it, this pact is more or less an official expression of our interest in peace and of our interest in the nations which are associating themselves together in the North Atlantic pact. We shall consult with them. We shall advise with them. But the pact does not carry any pledge—moral, legal, physical, or any other kind—that we must automatically go to war when some European nation demands that we fight its war.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator will bear with me a moment, I cannot very well keep all these observations in mind unless I comment on them at the moment.

With reference to the comments made by the Senator from Texas, of course, I share with him, and I think every other Senator shares with him and with the Senator from Michigan, an interest in peace. I think we all realize the close interdependence of the world at this time. We are living in the atomic age, an age of shortened distances, when a jet-propelled plane can cross the country from the west coast to Washington in a little more than 3 hours. I believe I feel as other Senators do. But the point I have in mind is that I do not want anything in the North Atlantic pact, if we adopt it, to justify the statement that its contents would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight. I want the power left in Congress to declare war or not to declare war. Even though the words "declared war" or "obligation to fight" be not in the North Atlantic pact, I do not desire, and I do not believe other Senators desire, that pact to contain something which inferentially contains some kind of a commitment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. DONNELL. If the Senator from California will bear with me for a moment, I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I speak with some degree of trepidation by reason of that fact. However, I have understood generally from the press that the North Atlantic alliance or pact—if that is the more correct term, as the Senator from Michigan indicates—is contemplated to be between the United States of America, Canada, Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and probably one or more of the other countries of western Europe.

A few weeks ago I observed a certain newspaper report which indicated that such a pact—and I quote from the newspaper report, which is not a quotation from the Secretary of State or from any official source, but which I trust is written in good faith—"will be written in general terms pledging mutual assistance in event of an attack upon any of the signatories, but avoiding any hard-and-fast clause committing them to go to war."

I am not satisfied with merely omitting a hard-and-fast clause committing us to go to war. I do not want in that pact anything that constitutes "the moral commitment to fight" referred to by the writer of this Associated Press résumé of what was understood in general to have been covered by Secretary Acheson.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address an inquiry to the Senator from Texas relative to his last statement.

I think all of us have recognized, from reading the press dispatches, that the so-called North Atlantic pact was never contemplated—at least I so understood it, as one Member of the Senate—to bind the United States to support any one of the signatories who might be bent on aggressive war against a neighbor. My concept of this pact is that it is a pact of nonaggression. Therefore I certainly want to reiterate that I believe that under our existing obligations, understandings, or commitments—whatever the proper term may be—under the United Nations Charter, if an act of aggression is committed by some power against one of the other signatory powers, we are vitally concerned about it, without any North Atlantic Pact. So certainly by no stretch of the imagination could this pact be considered as one which would bind us if one of the several signatories should itself engage in an act of aggression. It is merely defensive in character.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I apologize for taking so much of the time of the Senator from Missouri, but he yielded to the Senator from California to permit him to propound a question to me.

Mr. DONNELL. I will permit the Senator from Texas to answer it, if I have that prerogative.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from California has injected a great many controversial questions. What is aggression? We might consider a certain act to be an act of aggression, and some other nation might not think so. Someone would have to determine that question. It is true that the United

Nations Charter deals with acts of aggression. Under article 51 it permits defense, either jointly or separately, against aggression. Article 51 of the Charter provides for the nations, independently of action by the United Nations itself, to adopt defensive measures, either with other powers or alone, against any act of aggression. The Senator's view does not change that situation.

It is possible that there might be a controversy between some of the nations which join this pact. If Germany were admitted as a member, which might well occur under the clause which allows nations to join at a later date, there might be a controversy between France and Germany. The Senator is aware of their divergent views on economics and on past wars, and their bitter nationalistic feelings. Of course we hope that no such controversy will arise. I am simply trying to preserve our own peace and security.

Something was said by the Senator from California about the atomic age. Yes; this is an atomic age. I believe that if the United States is to be a leader in the world or a help to the rest of the world toward preserving peace and restoring their economic life, the United States must remain strong. When it comes to atomic bombs, we must have more of them and better bombs than any other nation on earth, until they are regulated in some fashion under international agreement. We must have the best fleet of airplanes in the world. The Senator from Missouri mentioned jet-propelled planes. We must have better, faster, and harder-hitting jet-propelled planes, not for the purpose of conquest, not for the purpose of aggression, but to protect our own security and the security of our people.

This is not a chauvinistic attitude on my part. God knows, I do not want any more war. We have not demanded any reparations from the last war. We have treated our enemies better than they have treated themselves. We have asked for no territory. We have asked for no reparations. On the other hand, even nations which took up arms against us are today receiving the bounty of this Government through ERP and other relief measures. We are feeding the very people who fought us and killed our sons in various countries of Europe. So we are not out for conquest. We are out for peace. But in preserving the peace we ourselves must be strong. That is why I favor not assuming obligations which we do not intend to fulfill. I favor the Congress and the Executive retaining the right to determine the question of war or peace under the Constitution.

Mr. DONNELL. And under the circumstances at the time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Of course, under the cricumstances at the time, and under our traditions. That is my attitude on this question.

Mr. DONNELL. I am grateful to the Senator from Texas for his continued statement on this subject.

Mr. President, reference was made earlier to the resolution adopted by the Senate by a vote of 64 to 4. I have been pleased to hear today the comment of the Senator from Michigan and to recall the splendid, strong, vigorous assurances he gave on the floor of the Senate at the time when the resolution was adopted. I am not undertaking to cast upon his shoulders the responsibility for an interpretation of that resolution, for each one of us has a duty in that regard which cannot be delegated to the Senator from Michigan, nor can we absolve ourselves from that obligation. Nevertheless, Mr. President, in the course of the debate in which the Senator from Nevada and the Senator from Oregon participated with such vigor and clarity some months ago, immediately prior to the adoption of the resolution, it was made abundantly clear, it seems to me, that the full intent of those who proposed the resolution was that we in the Senate are not in any sense, either directly, indirectly, inferentially, morally, or otherwise, bound to support the North Atlantic pact because that resolution was adopted by a vote, as I have indicated, of 64 to 4—or, for that matter, if it had been adopted by any other vote.

I want it to be perfectly clear—not that it is of any special importance, but because I am one Member of the Senate—that I deem an expression of opinion on my part with respect to entry into this alliance or this pact to be premature at this time, and accordingly I make no such expression today. To my mind it is a subject on which, from its very nature, the most profound and careful thought must be bestowed, before it shall be acted upon by the Senate; and I have confidence that the Senate will devote such profound and careful thought to this subject before deciding what it will do with respect to entry into or refraining from entry into the pact.

In a few days, Mr. President, we shall hear upon this floor the reading, once again, of Washington's Farewell Address. So I take it that it is not out of place for me to mention now that that address contains certain language bearing most pertinently upon the subject now under discussion. Of course, I know it to be true that that address was written, not in the atomic age, but at a time when conditions of travel were very different. Nevertheless, it was written or delivered by a man whose words we regard with veneration and respect. We may not believe that his ultimate conclusions are entirely applicable to the situation confronting us in the year 1949. However, let us observe what he said:

> It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than to private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But, in my opinion, it is unnecessary and would be unwise to extend them.
>
> Taking care always to keep ourselves, by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Mr. President, it may be of interest to note that John Marshall, who perhaps is not so frequently quoted on the subject of foreign alliances or pacts, when writing about 2 years after the date of the delivery of Washington's Farewell Address, used the following language:

> I do not think the interest and prosperity of America at all dependent on the alliance with any foreign nation; nor does the man exist who would regret more than myself the formation of such an alliance. In truth, America has, in my opinion, no motive for forming such connection and very powerful motives for avoiding them. Europe is eternally engaged in wars in which we have no interest, and with which the fondest policy forbids us to intermeddle.
>
> We ought to avoid any compacts which may endanger our being involved in them. * * *
>
> The whole of my politics respecting foreign nations are reducible to this single position. We ought to have commercial intercourse with all, but political ties with none.

Mr. President, of course there arises today the question whether present-day conditions—the atomic age, to which the Senator from California has referred, and perhaps the fact that the Atlantic Ocean, the crossing of which by John Marshall on his mission to France required 48 days, today can be crossed in a few hours—either demand or justify a new policy by the United States respecting foreign alliances. That question, as I have indicated, will require the most thorough consideration by the Senate, and will receive it I am confident.

So, Mr. President, in advance of seeing the pact and in advance of hearing the arguments by the distinguished Members of this body who will be far more familiar with the pact than will I, in my judgment it would be premature for me today to express an opinion as to whether I shall or shall not be in favor of the entry of the United States into the pact. But it is not premature, Mr. President, to my judgment, for me to express today, at this moment, strong dissent against any and all proposals to involve our Nation, by the North Atlantic pact, in any moral commitment to fight; and this I do.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Kansas City Times of February 12, 1949]

UNITED STATES PLEDGES AID—NORWAY IS ASSURED IT WOULD HAVE SUBSTANTIAL MILITARY BACKING—LONG TALK ON PROBLEM—OSLO FOREIGN MINISTER LEAVES FOR LONDON AFTER MEETING WITH ACHESON

WASHINGTON, February 11.—The United States was reported to have assured Norway today that it can enter the proposed North Atlantic alliance as a full partner and with assurance of substantial military backing from this and other member countries.

That summary of the basic American attitude toward Norway's defense problems is understood to have been given to the Norwegian Foreign Minister, Halvard Lange, by Secretary Acheson in an 80-minute conference at the State Department this afternoon.

Earlier in the day Lange had conferred briefly with President Truman, and after meeting with Acheson he wound up his week-long visit to Washington with a call on Senator VANDENBERG, the Republican foreign policy leader.

CALL IT A FRANK SESSION

Acheson and Lange issued a joint statement saying they had held a "full and frank discussion of the objectives and nature" of the North Atlantic security project.

Lange subsequently told the Associated Press, just before he left by plane for New

York, that he had had "a very good reception" and a "very good discussion" which had yielded "very frank information." At the State Department he informed reporters he planned to meet Ernest Bevin, British Foreign Minister, in London Monday. His itinerary called for him to stop over in New York tonight, then leave for England tomorrow morning.

As he boarded a plane, Lange said "there is no inkling of truth" in reports the State Department put pressure on him in his stay to link Norway to the North Atlantic alliance.

"The situation has cleared as result of my visit," he said. "And my recommendations will depend on my reflections on the way back."

Lange first saw Acheson Monday and raised a half dozen major questions regarding the Atlantic treaty proposal and the role Norway might play in it. He presented today a memorandum of the questions he raised in the first meeting and received answers from Acheson.

OUTLINE OF DISCUSSIONS

While the meeting was secret, it was understood that in general Acheson covered these points:

1. The United States and other North Atlantic countries—seven are now negotiating a treaty draft here—would be glad to see Norway join the group when it is enlarged before the treaty is put into final form and readied for signing. But no official invitation was issued to Norway to join and responsible informants insisted that no pressure was exercised to influence the Norwegian Foreign Minister one way or the other.

2. The United States, subject to Senate approval of the treaty, will make the strongest possible commitment to give prompt and effective aid if any one of the countries in the alliance is attacked, but only Congress can declare war.

3. Military action, therefore, cannot be committed in advance. But in joining the alliance, the American Government would subscribe to the principle that an attack on one member nation was an attack on all and this would be interpreted as a moral commitment to fight.

ON BASIS OF POWER

4. The objective of the security system, under the United Nations Charter, is peaceful, and not, as the Russians have charged, aggressive. It is based on the principle that aggression by any country would be discouraged by confronting that country in advance with a powerful array of allied nations.

5. Norway, like every other member of the group, would be expected to dovetail its defense plans with over-all western grand strategy for defense, but it would not be required to provide advance bases, a point which the Russians recently raised with the Norwegian Government.

6. The United States is not prepared to say at this time in detail exactly what military arms and equipment it can supply under a mutual-aid program paralleling the alliance. President Truman is expected soon to recommend authorization for such a program to Congress.

On his part, Lange is understood to have taken the line that he was on a fact-finding mission and Norway's formal attitude toward the security project will not be determined until he has reported to the Government in Oslo and the matter has been discussed in the Storting (Parliament).

STRONG OPINION BEHIND IT

However, it is understood that he reported strong sentiment in Oslo for basing Norway's long-range security on the Western alliance rather than on a Swedish-proposed alliance of armed neutrality.

On this point, the State Department publicly has taken the position that because the supply of American military aid is limited, no aid can be promised those western European countries which do not join the alliance.

This, in effect, had already put Norway, Sweden, and Denmark on notice that they could not expect American help if they held aloof from the North Atlantic grouping of powers.

Another question which Lange is understood to have raised with Acheson is that of Norway's security during the period in which the North Atlantic treaty is being negotiated and pending its final ratification by all the nations. Diplomatic officials said the basic United States position on this point—and presumably the position which Acheson stated to Lange—is that the United States is already committed by the United Nations Charter to oppose aggression at any point and intends to live up to that commitment.

## CROSS-WIND LANDING GEAR FOR AIRPLANES

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, toward the end of last year there were rumors that the Civil Aeronautics Administration was going to stop its work with cross-wind landing gear for airplanes.

I was much concerned, and on January 8 I wrote to the Civil Aeronautics Administration, asking for a detailed report on the cross-wind landing gear project.

I am happy to say that the report which has been furnished to me indicates that the Civil Aeronautics Administration not only has not stopped and is not planning to stop its cross-wind landing gear project, but, on the contrary, has had very good results to date, considers the project very much worthwhile, and is continuing the work.

For the information of the Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the report on cross-wind landing gear which I have received from the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, consisting of a four-page letter with an enclosure in the form of a summary report prepared by Mr. John H. Geisse, consultant for cross-wind landing gears, and Mr. Lloyd Child, assistant to the Administrator for personal flying development, may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
*Washington, February 7, 1949.*

The Honorable PAT MCCARRAN,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR SENATOR MCCARRAN: I have your letter of January 8, and I am pleased to be able to give you a detailed report on the cross-wind landing gear project.

Enclosed is a copy of the Summary Report on Cross-Wind Landing Gears of May 1948, which covers the results on the Fairchild PT-19 and the Piper J-3 Cub equipped with the cross-wind landing gear. On pages 6 and 7 of this report are comments quoted from various pilots who have flown the cross-wind landing gear.

As you know, the appropriation which you obtained for cross-wind landing gears made it possible for us to contract with six manufacturers to have cross-wind landing gears designed and installed under CAA supervision. A brief report on these is as follows:

FAIRCHILD PT-19

Covered by enclosed report.

PIPER J-3 CUB

Covered by enclosed report.

ERCOUPE

The Firestone Aircraft Co. installed a cross-wind landing gear on the Ercoupe and delivered it to the CAA on August 12 1947. Various degrees of restraint in the swiveling were tried. Continuous experimentation was carried out with all kinds of schemes to improve the characteristics. It was found that a tie rod between the main wheels was beneficial. The favorable results obtained on this airplane have convinced us that cross-wind landing gears are suitable for tricycle undercarriages. These findings have been borne out by the Beech Aircraft Co. on their Bonanza airplane. At the start, Beech asserted that their Bonanza could land satisfactorily in cross-winds and that a cross-wind landing gear was not necessary. However, the Goodyear Aircraft Co. furnished a cross-wind installation for the Bonanza and have reported that they and the Beech officials are completely satisfied with the results. Apparently the Beech people are convinced that cross-wind landing gear is beneficial on a tricycle undercarriage.

BELLANCA-CRUISAIR

The Bellanca airplane was delivered to the CAA on April 15, 1948; on it the landing gear swiveled in the shock-absorber strut. Dual wheels on the main landing gear were furnished so as to eliminate the necessity for shimmy dampers. The original contract called for our flight testing this airplane for 50 hours. During that time we indoctrinated numerous pilots, all of whom were agreeably impressed by its performance. The airplane was demonstrated to the United States Army, United States Navy, the press, and delegations from England. We displayed it and gave demonstrations at air shows throughout the East. After 50 hours of satisfactory flying, we renewed the contract so as to have 50 more hours available. At the present time we are continuing the demonstrations and pilots' indoctrinations.

TWIN BEECH

The cross-wind landing gear was installed on a CAA twin Beech airplane by All American Airways, Inc., and delivered on April 15, 1948. The castering of the wheels took place in the oleo struts. Shimmy dampers and centering cams were also incorporated inside the struts. The airplane was demonstrated formally to the press, and the United States Army and Navy. After 3 months of flight tests, it was decided that improved shimmy dampers would be desirable. All American Airways was directed to design and install external hydraulic shimmy dampers and centering cylinders. Now the cross-wind landing gear functions satisfactorily. Pilots who have flown it are favorably impressed. At present, the airplane is assigned to our fourth region where flight demonstrations and pilots' indoctrinations are being held in the South and Middle West. We are obtaining an NC license for this installation.

DOUGLAS

The Goodyear Aircraft Co., of Akron, Ohio, was awarded the contract to install a cross-wind landing gear on a CAA Douglas DC-3 airplane. This consisted of castering mechanisms inside the wheels of the airplane similar in principle to those which had been so successful on the Piper Cub. The airplane was delivered to the CAA on March 14, 1948. Exhaustive demonstrations and flight tests have been performed on this airplane, both in connection with obtaining an NC license and in displaying it to the United States

Army and Navy, the United States and Canadian air lines and to the British representatives. All pilots' comments on this have been favorable. The Canadian Airline is particularly interested as they have the problem of snow removal and are of the opinion that the cross-wind landing gear may be worth while because only one runway would have to be plowed. The United States Army officers charged with airport construction were especially interested in the prospects of only having to build one strip because the runways for their big airplanes are excessively expensive. The Army pilots and our own pilots, who are involved in all-weather operations, have stated that the cross-wind landing gear is of great value during blind landings. After we had demonstrated it to the Sperry officials and pilots, the Sperry company ordered a set of similar wheels for their blind-landing DC-3 airplane.

NORTHROP-PIONEER

An order was given to the Northrop company to design a cross-wind landing gear for their Pioneer airplane. Only enough money was available for engineering through the design and stress analysis stages, but the work done by Northrop is of value because it contributed to the engineering art. It is hoped that their cross-wind gear will be installed on future Pioneer-type aircraft.

Increasing interest has been shown in the adoption of this type landing gear by both private and commercial flyers. At present the Goodyear Aircraft Co. has delivered more than 140 sets of cross-wind landing wheels for personal aircraft. Cessna airplanes have received most of these cross-wind undercarriages, but a few have been sold for Stinsons, Cubs, and Goodyear amphibians, all of which have passed their tests and have been approved by the CAA. Goodyear castering wheels have been installed experimentally on Aeronca and Beech Bonanza airplanes. Orders on hand have resulted in production go-ahead by Goodyear on 1,000 sets of cross-wind landing gears for personal aircraft and 20 sets for DC-3 air-line-type airplanes. Enclosed is a copy of the Goodyear report covering these installations.

I quote from a letter received from Mr. C. O. Bell, manager, landing gear and flight operations departments, Aviation Products Division, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., dated January 6, as follows:

"We are going ahead obtaining approval on all the current light-plane production models of the various manufacturers and will be in a position this spring to supply cross-wind units to all manufacturers of light airplanes. We are in hopes that orders will start developing pretty rapidly because we now have quite a sizeable investment in this development."

In the Federal airport program our office of airports is favoring one-runway airports wherever possible, and not approving more than two runways except where traffic conditions so require.

As a result of the cross-wind landing-gear development, under CAA auspices, funds for which were provided by Congress largely through your efforts, I am happy to report that cross-wind landing gears are increasing the utility of airplanes.

Sincerely yours,

D. W. RENTZEL,
*Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.*

---

SUMMARY REPORT ON CROSS-WIND LANDING GEARS BY JOHN H. GEISSE, CONSULTANT FOR CROSS-WIND LANDING GEARS, AND LLOYD CHILD, ASSISTANT TO THE ADMINISTRATOR FOR PERSONAL FLYING DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUMMARY

The Civil Aeronautics Administration initiated an investigation of the possibilities of cross-wind landing gears for airplanes in 1945. The objective of the program was to determine whether the safety and utility of the airplanes could be increased and whether large savings could be made in airport construction costs by the use of such landing gears.

The program was carried out by the award of contracts to manufacturers in the aviation industry to design, construct, and test such undercarriages on airplanes ranging in size from the Piper Cub to the Douglas DC-3 and including an airplane with a tricycle undercarriage.

This report covers the inauguration of the program, description of the modifications to the first two airplanes: the Fairchild PT-19 and the Piper J-3 and the results obtained therewith.

It is concluded from these results that personal type airplanes can be economically modified to enable pilots to take them off and land them across the wind with no more skill than that required for into-the-wind operations and with no more hazard and that the principle appears to be applicable to transport type airplanes.

Other advantages are noted and the opinions of some prominent aviation personalities who have flown these airplanes are given in support of the results reported and conclusions drawn. It is reported that in the tests the airplanes have been flown by over 200 individual pilots.

Heretofore it has been considered necessary that airports be constructed with sufficient runways to enable the airplanes to be landed directly into the wind or not more than 22½ degrees from directly into the wind for all winds in excess of 4 or 10 miles per hour. The lower velocity was accepted practice up to 1944 and since then the higher velocity has been used.

These restrictions were made necessary by the high degree of pilot skill required to make successful landings with a cross-wind. This high skill requirement was in turn due to the noncastering type of landing gear used.

The need of providing multiple runways to cover changes in wind direction has required the use of large areas for airports, thus greatly reducing the number of suitable sites available and materially increasing their initial cost and the cost of maintenance.

In 1946, the Congress passed the Federal Airport Act authorizing the appropriation of $520,000,000 of Federal funds to match State and municipal funds for the construction of new and improvement of existing airports. With the passage of the bill, the Federal Government acquired a prime interest in the costs of airports.

OBJECT

The objective of the development program, of which this report is a part, was to determine whether or not alterations could be made in the airplane landing gears at a reasonable cost in dollars and pounds which would eliminate requirement of multiple runways to accommodate changes in the direction of the wind.

SCOPE OF THIS REPORT

This report covers the inauguration of the program and the results obtained with two personal type airplanes: the Fairchild PT-19 and the Piper J-3. Later reports will be issued to cover modifications of the Ercoupe, the Bellanca Cruisair, the Beech AT-7, the Douglas DC-3 and the effect of this development upon commercial air transportation. All of the latter planes had successfully completed flight tests prior to the preparation of this report, but had not been subjected to the extensive service testing given to the Fairchild and Piper J-3.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Personal type airplanes can be constructed at a reasonable increase in cost and weight to make it possible to land and take off across the wind with the same facility and safety as into the wind.

2. There has been no indication that the principle involved cannot be applied as readily to transport type airplanes.

3. The expressed opinions of well over 200 pilots who have flown either the Fairchild or the Piper have been universally favorable and in most cases enthusiastic.

4. The number of close-in sites for the smaller airports (classes I, II, and III) which would be opened because of the smaller landing areas and the more limited approach areas which would be required is a factor of major importance.

5. This same factor together with aircraft noise abatement would bring aviation within the reach of the potential private flyer in metropolitan areas where the largest unrealized market for personal aircraft exists.

6. The cross-wind landing gear could also bring short haul commercial transportation to these metropolitan areas and to large cities which have a potential air transport market which, to date, has scarcely been touched.

7. Adoption of cross-wind landing gears would reduce pilot skill required for take-off and landing and hence would shorten pilot training time.

8. Adoption of cross-wind landing gears would materially reduce the number of landing accidents.

HISTORY

An undercarriage with castered wheels aiding cross-wind landings was described in the Pinaud patent of 1873. Again in 1910, the first crossing of the English Channel was made by a Bleriot airplane with a similar undercarriage and a United States patent was issued to Bleriot covering this undercarriage in 1911. Also, the earliest airplanes were equipped with the tricycle type undercarriage which incorporated main fixed wheels back of the center of gravity and a castered nose wheel. This type, as compared to later types, might also be termed a cross-wind landing gear.

Prior to the First World War, the castered and tricycle type undercarriages had been almost universally discarded in favor of undercarriages having two fixed wheels ahead of the center of gravity and a castered or steerable tail-skid or V-wheel. With the introduction of this type of undercarriage, ground loops due to landing in a drift became the principal source of landing accidents.

The Bureau of Air Commerce, the predecessor of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, reintroduced the tricycle gear in its small-plane development program in 1934. This led to its adoption by the military and transport air services. The Bureau also had started development of castered main wheels ahead of the center of gravity but the program was discontinued before its completion.

Prior to and during World War II, Mr. O. W. Maclaren carried on developments in England using steerable main wheels which could be set by the pilot in flight to accommodate drift landings. Mr. Maclaren was granted a United States patent on this type of undercarriage in 1940. In 1944 Piper Aircraft Corp. constructed and tested two experimental cross-wind undercarriages on their J-3 airplane but then dropped the project.

In 1945, when it became apparent that the aircraft industry was not inclined to carry on further development work on undercarriages to facilitate cross-wind landings on its own initiative, the Civil Aeronautics Administration was given an appropriation of $150,000 to foster such a development. In 1946 Congress reappropriated the unexpended balance and this was all obligated in fiscal 1947.

METHOD

It was decided at the start of the program that all of the development including design, construction, and tests would be placed in the hands of the industry through develop-

ment contracts. It was also decided that these contracts should include a provision that, if any patents resulted from the work under the contracts, they would be assigned to the Government.

Contracts with individual inventors or others not in the aviation industry were not considered in the best interest of the program and none were granted. The reason for this was that the major objective of the program was not the development of novel cross-wind landing gears but that of determining the feasibility of the idea and interesting the industry in their adoption.

In line with this policy, the program was first called to the attention of the Aircraft Industries Association with the request that they interest their members in the taking of contracts. When this failed to produce results, individual manufacturers were requested to submit proposals and, as a result, contracts were awarded as follows:

| Contractor | Date | Airplane | Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp. | Feb. 8, 1946 | Fairchild PT-19 | $8,413.42 |
| Goodyear Aircraft Corp. | May 27, 1946 | Piper J-3 | 22,885.00 |
| Firestone Aircraft Co. | Dec. 19, 1946 | Ercoupe | 12,000.00 |
| All American Aviation, Inc. | May 21, 1947 | Beech AT-7C | 35,000.00 |
| Bellanca Aircraft Corp. | June 12, 1947 | Bellanca Cruisair | 5,650.00 |
| Northrop Aircraft, Inc. | June 19, 1947 | Northrop Pioneer | 10,000.00 |
| Goodyear Aircraft Corp. | June 27, 1947 | Douglas DC-3 | 51,800.00 |
| Total | | | 145,748.42 |

An early decision to include the steerable-type main wheels developed by Maclaren was later abandoned due to the excellent results obtained with the original castered gears and all of the above contracts cover castered gears.

Initial acceptance tests were conducted at the contractors' plants. Thereafter, the airplanes were brought to the Washington National Airport and made available for trial flights by both Government and civil pilots and for demonstrations to others interested. Thereafter, the airplanes were routed to the eight regions of the Civil Aeronautics Administration for further testing and demonstrations under the supervision of the personal flying assistants to the regional administrators. These demonstrations included demonstrations at various aviation meetings, and at the factories of aircraft manufacturers. Forms were prepared on which all pilots operating the airplanes could make a record of their flights and give their experience with an opinion of the modifications.

FAIRCHILD CONTRACT

The Fairchild Engine & Airplane Corp., Airplane Division, Hagerstown, Md., was awarded a contract to modify a Government-owned Fairchild PT-19 trainer in accordance with designs submitted by them.

The first modification consisted of providing an inclined kingpin ahead of the shock strut with hydraulic shimmy dampers and coil springs for centering. The springs were found insufficient to provide static stability and the propeller thrust was found insufficient to straighten the wheels from their maximum castered position. The design was then changed to include cams to provide the required static stability and centering force. A detailed description of the gear is provided in appendix I, page 9.

GOODYEAR CONTRACT

The Goodyear Aircraft Corp. was awarded a contract to determine the practicability of using kingpins mounted within the wheel hubs for airplanes in which external kingpins could not readily be used. The contract called for preliminary investigation on a rig which could be towed and subsequent construction and tests of an undercarriage on a Piper J-3 airplane. The Piper Aircraft Corp. loaned a plane for the initial tests and the Government supplied a Piper L-4 for the final installation.

The towing rig first designed by Goodyear used inclined kingpins to secure the desired caster length. Two tests revealed that the static instability was such that the propeller thrust would be insufficient to straighten the wheels from their maximum castered position. Then the rig was modified to include cams to secure static stability and centering force and the results of the tests were so encouraging that further tests of temporary gears were suspended and wheels incorporating kingpins and cams all within the wheel hubs were constructed and tested on a Piper J-3.

RESULTS

1. The Fairchild PT-19 was landed and taken off by three different pilots in a gusty cross wind with gusts up to 50 miles per hour. The Piper has been taken off and landed by a number of pilots at different times with cross winds of 35 miles per hour. In all cases, the pilots reported that no difficulty was encountered and that no special technique was required.

2. The Goodyear gear is now being offered as alternate equipment on new airplanes and as replacement equipment by the Stinson Division of Consolidated Vultee Corp. and the Cessna Aircraft Corp. Other personal airplane manufacturers are currently considering similar action.

3. Of the approximately 200 pilots who have flown either the Fairchild or the Piper, none has given an adverse report on either landing or take-off characteristics.

4. Some, but far less than the majority, of the pilots who have flown the Piper have been moderately critical of its taxiing characteristics.

5. Only minor mechanical failures have been encountered on the Fairchild and none on the Piper.

6. Total increase in weight was 28 pounds on the Fairchild and 12 pounds on the Piper.

7. The Goodyear Aircraft Corp. has reported that during their extended testing, they observed that the tire wear was noticeably less with the castered wheels than with conventional noncastered wheels.

8. The Piper wheels caster very freely due to low friction and a low degree of static stability. As a result, the airplane taxied in a yawed attitude under the slightest provocation and was yawed to its maximum 25 degrees limit by medium cross winds and medium accelerations in turns. When yawed to the full extent, the minimum radius of turn against the yaw was quite large when using only the steerable tailwheel due to its limited stroke. However, sharp turns around either wheel could be readily accomplished by use of differential braking. This low degree of stability also permitted the wheels to toe in and hamper movement when the airplane was pulled backward; although, this tendency could be eliminated by raising the tail high enough to provide a negative caster length. The Goodyear company later provided a notched cam to restrain the wheels from toeing in when the airplane is pulled backward which has eliminated this difficulty.

9. The Fairchild gear had a pronounced tendency to hold whatever position it initially had due to friction in the kingpins. It therefore had a tendency to taxi just like any conventional airplane once the wheels were straightened. However, the wheels could be thrown over to full caster by a rapid turn; and, thereafter, the airplane could be taxied in the resulting yawed attitude without the wheels straightening. Out on the field, this performance was not objectionable and had some advantages. However, when close to spectators or other airplanes, the high degree of propeller thrust required to return the wheels to neutral from fully castered position was objectionable. Changes in the cams and reduction of friction would eliminate the objection. The combination of high friction and high static stability prevented the wheels from toeing in when the airplane was pulled backward.

10. Most pilots were favorably impressed by the improved vision from the cockpit when the airplanes taxied in a yawed attitude. This improved vision made zig-zagging unnecessary during taxiing.

11. There appeared to be a complete absence of any tendency for the upwind wing to rise in either airplane under any conditions of operation.

12. Both airplanes were tried with and without steerable tailwheels. The majority of the pilots making the tests preferred the operation with the combination of brakes and steerable tailwheel.

13. Shimmy was encountered with both airplanes when they were operated without shimmy dampers.

PUBLIC ACCEPTANCE

Comments on the performance of these airplanes from a few of those who have flown them or witnessed demonstrations have been as follows:

G. R. Price, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.: "Our own experience with the first wheel on the Piper J-3 has convinced us of the tremendous effect this type of landing wheel installation will have on the future of commercial as well as private aviation."

B. Allison Gillies, prominent private pilot and test pilot: "With the gear there is no special skill required for cross-wind landings and it will, therefore, add real utility to an airplane for the inexperienced pilot and it will save many repair bills."

Oliver L. Parks, president, Aircraft Sales and Service: "I was tremendously impressed with the demonstration—so much so that I have written both Northrop and Boeing suggesting that they take immediate steps to adopt it."

Roger Wolfe Kahn, prominent private pilot and test pilot: "It is undoubtedly one of the most important developments in the advancement of aviation."

Robert M. Love, president, All American Aviation, Inc.: "Landings were intentionally crabbed up to 20 degrees. Remarkable."

John W. Myers, vice president, Northrop Aircraft, Inc.: "Light wind, but attempted to simulate cross wind by skidding, etc. Results excellent. Castered gear on Cub actually helps taxiing."

J. B. Hartranft, general manager, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association: "I thoroughly enjoyed the demonstration which resulted in making me a convert, and we shall do everything possible to assist the CAA in the further development of this project."

Crocker Snow, director of aeronautics for Massachusetts: "It has long been my opinion that this development is of primary importance to the future of personal flying, at least in this part of the world, and Friday afternoon's experience merely served to confirm this opinion."

T. H. Jordan, Wisconsin Aeronautics Commission: "Excellent. Wings level, no rudder required, excellent control, no swinging; castered gear should be placed on the market as soon as possible."

M. K. Hefty, Hefty Flying Service: "Perfect. Ideal for student training and small two-way fields."

Rex D. Penlong, chairman, San Francisco, A. O. P. A.: "It is my belief that you have shown us the most outstanding single safety development in the history of the airplane."

Rex Hardy, Jr., assistant to the vice president, Northrop Aircraft, Inc.: "The airplane was flown for approximately 4 hours by 10 separate pilots who carried with them approximately 20 rear-seat passengers. All agreed that the principle of the castering landing gear could and should be applied to every airplane in the private flying class, and that it would be very valuable to many types not included in this class. The pilots, in particular, who approached the airplane with traditional reservations were united in their approval."

P. G. Robinson, proprietor, Robbies Wheel Service: "I am thoroughly impressed with the advantages this type gear offers, and believe that it is the greatest development in aviation since the end of the war."

DISCUSSION

The results obtained with the Fairchild and the Piper will be discussed only as they apply to personal type airplanes, leaving to later reports on the larger airplanes the discussion of the application to commercial flying.

First, it should be noted that the objective of this development program was to determine whether it would be practicable to construct airplanes for which it would be unnecessary to provide all-way fields. It was not intended that the Government should develop cross-wind landing gear designs for the industry.

The results obtained are considered ample proof that airplanes in this category can be so modified that cross-wind landings and take-offs can be made as easily, as safely, and with no more skill than into the wind landings and take-offs.

The limited funds available for this project did not permit carrying on the development work which would be required to refine the design to secure maximum performance and to reduce cost. It should be possible to design cross-wind modifications for most of the airplanes now in service which could be sold at a price attractive to the airplane owners.

The general principle, i. e. castered main wheels with castering restraint, can be applied in many ways and the best way for one airplane could very well be entirely unsuited to another. The basic idea is very old, is not patentable, and the field is wide open for the development of other designs. This development should be carried on by the industry.

The major importance of the cross-wind landing gear is in its effect upon airport design and construction. A study of airport costs has indicated that substantial savings could be accomplished; the amount varying with the class of airport and terrain conditions.

The number of suitable sites for airports would be tremendously increased if only one runway were required and this in addition to the cost reduction would have a considerable effect on securing more accessible airports. More airports and more accessible airports have long been known to be essential in making personal flying more pleasant and more useful.

Another important advantage of the cross-wind landing gear is in the reduction in pilot-training time which has been freely predicted by those familiar with both pilot training and with the performance of the cross-wind undercarriage. This reduction can be realized only if the student intends to limit his flying to airplanes not sensitive to drift landings and drift landings may occur without cross winds due to improper use of the airplane controls. However, some reduction might be realized by initial training with a cross-wind undercarriage. This is indicated by the results of a rather extended pilot-training research program which showed that total training time for flying a three-control airplane with conventional undercarriage could be shortened by starting the training in a two-control airplane with a tricycle undercarriage.

The third advantage would be in a reduction in accidents. Close to 50 percent of all accidents in nonscheduled flying are landing accidents and it is estimated that well over 10 percent of these accidents would be eliminated with the adoption of the cross-wind landing gear. Forced landing accidents, which account for another 15 percent of the total, might be still more reduced by the greater latitude made possible in the choice of landing fields by eliminating consideration of cross winds. The improvement in safety with the cross-wind landing gear could be further increased by moving the main wheels further forward, which would be permissible with the great reduction in ground-looping tendency accomplished with castered wheels.

Some simplification of traffic control might result from the use of a single runway and, in locating airports close to communities, the traffic pattern would be made such that flying over the community would be entirely unnecessary either for landing or for take-off.

## POINT 4 OF THE PRESIDENT'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in his inaugural address, President Truman gave voice to what has been referred to as a new administration policy whereby aid in the form of American technical knowledge and the opportunity to utilize primarily private scientific skills would be extended to the underdeveloped areas of the earth on a basis of mutual assistance wherever fair conditions for their employment could be enjoyed. This has been referred to as point 4 in the President's message and has attracted much attention. In reality such a policy is novel only in that it gives broader scope to that spirit of cooperative help which took form with the implementation of the Marshall plan.

On January 26 the Secretary of State placed point 4 of the President's address in its setting as a part of American foreign policy. In doing so, he pointed out that there was a great impediment to development in many countries where many people fail to understand the importance of being fair to private investors and he made it clear that proper conditions which would invite the flow of private capital should be created in the less developed areas of the world. Certainly if private investment is to be discouraged, the principal sufferers are the people of relatively undeveloped countries.

In this respect, I am advised, the just and fair treatment of foreign investments in certain quarters in Latin America has for many years been a subject of grave concern. The United States has made many efforts to aid the Latin-American countries and for many years has been careful to refrain from interfering in the protection of its interests, although they were widely recognized as being legitimate.

In this connection, I am told, it is striking to note that last April the Bogotá Conference in approving chapter IV, which deals with the protection of private investments and the creation of conditions which would be favorable to the investment of foreign capital in Latin America, did so by the slim margin of one vote. And this vote came only after many of the Latin-American states had so weakened the measure as to render it well-nigh ineffectual from the point of view of inducing the flow of private capital, safeguarding the investor, and then raising living standards in these countries.

While, for the most part, the Latin-American countries have not directly participated in the European recovery program, they have, according to reports made to me, frequently made overtures to the United States for loans on a government-to-government basis, and in many instances such financial assistance has not been forthcoming because, according to the normal standards of sound banking, the risk could not be underwritten.

The general character of the language in which the administration's plan was proposed has, according to advices I have received, been a cause of great expectations on the part of Latin America that there would soon be new programs of increased financial aid. Even though the Secretary of State, in his clarifying statement, has stressed the importance of creating conditions for safeguarding the foreign investor, Latin Americans have, so it appears, continued to give a very liberal interpretation to point 4.

But it is to be noted that at the very same time that these expectations flourish, the recent actions of certain of the Latin-American countries with respect to just and equal treatment, nondiscrimination, and the fostering of private capital, might well, it seems to me, disqualify them from any consideration at all under a plan such as the President proposed in his first message.

For example, it is reported that the Argentine Government's current unjustified attacks upon foreign interests in the Argentine runs counter to all normal concepts of international comity.

Certainly the foreign investor, according to all reports, is denied the comfort that his capital will be protected in Colombia where the compulsory arbitration of issues relative to American oil interests, the division of profits, and the expropriation of American-owned utilities are matters of common knowledge.

Another outstanding instance lies in the case of Guatemala, word of which has recently reached me. Here, a new code, supposedly written for the benefit of everyday citizens, has been devised and is interpreted so as actually to discriminate solely against the most extensively invested American enterprise in that country. This large American enterprise in Guatemala has also been denied lawful access to the courts, so I am informed, and is confronted with serious economic break-downs through actions which, I am informed, can be directly traced to Communist influences.

The many fine and responsible people in Latin America should, it seems to me, realize that insofar as point 4 is concerned, actions speak louder than words. Unfortunately, Latin America is often considered as a whole by people in the United States and the overt acts of a few can disqualify those who actually do deserve assistance.

These conditions are well known and the State Department is sparing no effort to point out to the responsible officials in Latin America the jeopardy

in which they place themselves by certain of their policies. But since point 4 is now open for all the world to examine and the aid which it proposes is actually being anticipated, it is appropriate that we speak out beyond diplomatic channels in order that our neighbors in Latin America may be cognizant of that spirit of mutual partnership, cooperation, and responsibility which the good-neighbor policy implies.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD following my remarks the full text of the statement of the Secretary of State concerning point 4, which was made on January 26, 1949.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERR in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPTION OF EXTEMPORANEOUS REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN ACHESON, CONCERNING POINT 4 OF THE PRESIDENT'S INAUGURAL ADDRESS, AT HIS PRESS CONFERENCE, JANUARY 26, 1949

First of all, I hope that you all understand the setting of point 4 in the President's inaugural address. It was one of four major courses of action which the President said would be carried out by his administration over the next 4 years, for the purpose of achieving the great objective which he talked about mainly in that address. That objective was to make clear in our own country and to all the world the purpose of American life and the purpose of the American system. That purpose is to enable the individual to attain the freedom and dignity, the fullness of life which should be the purpose of all government and of all life on this earth except insofar as it may be a preparation for some other life.

The President went on to point out that the other theory—of the place of the individual in society—was not a modern theory, was not a radical or a new view, but was reactionary in the extreme. It is a view which goes back to the period before the Renaissance. It is a view which is founded on the basic idea that status is the governing factor in life; that every person is born into the world in a position and that that person becomes a mere cog in a machine. That is a basically reactionary attitude and philosophy. It is not, as I say, modern. It is an attempt to crawl back into the cocoon of history. The American view of life is one which flows directly from the Renaissance and is one which says that the worth and dignity and freedom of the individual are the objectives of government.

Then the President went on to point out courses of action which we were going to take over the next 4 years to try to bring about that purpose of life, not only in this country, but in any other country which wished our help and association in that effort. To me the essential thing about it is that it is the use of material means to a nonmaterial end. It is not that we believe that other people need or wish things for their own purpose merely to have these material objects. It is not that material objects in and of themselves make a better or fuller life, but they are the means by which people can obtain freedom, not only freedom from the pressure of those other human beings who would restrict their freedom, but help in the ancient struggle of man to earn his living and get his bread from the soil. That is the purpose; that is the objective of this program.

Now, the President was not announcing a project to be completed within a few weeks or months. He was announcing in this, as in the other three respects, a long program for his administration. It was a program on which much has been done in the past and on which more can be done in the future. The President pointed out that the United States has no monopoly of skills or techniques. Other countries have vast reservoirs of skill. In almost every country there is some nucleus of skill, some group of people whose technical abilities can be expanded with help from the outside. With all of those people, the Pesident stated, we wish to work. He particularly stated that we wished to work through the United Nations and all those affiliated organizations which are associated with it. He pointed out that in so far as his program is successful and in so far as peoples in less developed areas acquire skills, they may also create the conditions under which capital may flow into those countries. He did not say this was to be governmental capital and indeed, if the proper conditions are created, the reservoirs of private capital are very great indeed. He pointed out that these must be two-way operations. There is abroad in the world an idea that there is a magic in investment. There is an idea that if every country can only have a steel mill, then all is well. There is a failure to understand that it is a long and difficult process to develop the skills which are necessary to operate many of these plants. There is sometimes failure to understand that plants should be located where the natural resources exist and not on purely nationalistic bases. There is also in many places a failure to understand that unless the conditions are created by which investors may fairly put their money into that country, then there is a great impediment to development. It is no solution to say, "Well, the private investors won't do it. Therefore, governments must." So he pointed out that it must be a two-way street.

Now, as I say, much has been done in the past to try to make technological skill and advice available from the United States and from other countries, through the United Nations and through many of its organizations. All of those efforts can be brought together and intensified. The President pointed out that we are willing and anxious to work with every country that wishes to really enter into a cooperative system with the rest of the world to this end and with every country that wishes to help other countries to develop.

Now, that is the broad background of the inaugural address. I have talked at some length about this because it seems to me important that it be put in its setting of American foreign policy.

## INVITATION TO ATTEND DEMONSTRATION OF TACTICAL AIRCRAFT AT ANDREWS AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Stuart Symington, desires to extend to the Members of the Senate an invitation to attend a display and demonstration of tactical aircraft which has been scheduled to be held on February 15, 1949, at the Andrews Air Force Base.

The presentation will show the progress made by the Air Force in the field of combat aviation since the beginning of World War II.

Transportation for those Members of the Senate who may wish to attend will be on hand at the Senate Office Building at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. The presentation will be concluded at 4:45, at which time return transportation will be available.

It will be appreciated if those Members of the Senate who wish to attend will be kind enough to advise the Senate Armed Services Committee to that effect and if they will please arrange to meet with the members of that committee in the committee room, 212 Senate Office Building, at 2 p. m., February 15.

## RELIEF OF CERTAIN STORM-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the Eightieth Congress, bills were introduced to provide aid for Greece and Turkey in the total sum of $625,000,000. As I remember, the bills were passed almost unanimously. I was one of the few Senators who voted against them. At that time I stated my reasons. I said, among other things, that nearly one-third of our population was underclothed and undernourished; our teachers were not getting enough money; there was a need of Federal aid to education, for public health, and so on.

Today, I have been informed by Mr. Seward, of the Federal Works Agency, that all through the Middle West not only have people died as a result of the cold and the blizzards, but literally millions upon millions of dollars' worth of sheep and cattle are dead. In the State of Nevada, according to the senior Senator from Nevada, roughly, one-third of all livestock have perished.

I am introducing a bill providing for an appropriation of $150,000,000. It is not an ordinary disaster loan. In fact, it is not a loan at all. Last night, over the radio, Eric Johnston said we ought to guarantee loans made by Americans in foreign countries. It seems to me if we are going into the business, as we have done during the past few years, of practically guaranteeing some of the loans, we should be willing to make good the losses of some of our own people here in America. Certainly it is not the fault of the stockman, farmer, or rancher when the blizzards suddenly come upon him and he is wiped out. I may say that telephonic inquiry develops the fact that the blizzards are today worse than ever.

The bill I am introducing provides that these losses shall be paid in full by the Government, so that a man, for example, who through the years saved his money and finally gathered together a herd of cattle or sheep, will not suddenly become bankrupt because of an act of God such as that which has occurred within the past few days.

I have discussed the bill with other Senators. I ask unanimous consent out of order to introduce the bill. If other Senators want to join me in sponsoring it, I shall be glad to have them do so; or if some other Senator wants to sponsor it, I shall be very glad to join with him.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 963) to provide for determination and payment of losses sustained by individuals as a result of recent storms in the Western and Middle Western States, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ISRAEL AN ACTUALITY

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, although the headlines and the news stories from day to day have been alternately hopeful and pessimistic on the outcome of negotiations in the Near East over Israel,

the fact remains that Israel is now an actuality. It exists; it functions; it will endure.

I am indebted to Mr. Seymour Staiman, secretary of the Williamsport-Sunbury district of the Zionist Organization of America, for a very kind letter in which, on behalf of his organization, he expresses the thanks of his group for what he terms "a quite satisfactory ending" in the Israel saga, and adds:

The United States policy on Israel has, of course, been perhaps the major factor in effecting this satisfactory ending.

I think men of good will everywhere will readily concede that the forthright position of President Truman on this issue has been one of great courage and great humanity, and I am glad to have this expression from a Pennsylvania leader in the Zionist cause in grateful acknowledgment of the United States position in behalf of decency in the Near East and justice for a great cause.

As Mr. Staiman expressed it further, "This is a great moment in history for those of the Jewish faith." In my reply to his gracious letter, however, I emphasized that it is not only those of Jewish faith who consider the successful emergence of this new nation "as a great moment in history."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Staiman's letter be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILLIAMSPORT-SUNBURY DISTRICT,
ZIONIST ORGANIZATION OF AMERICA,
*Williamsport, Pa., January 22, 1949.*

Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS,
*Senate Office Building,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR MYERS: As the situation in Israel seems to be heading for a quite satisfactory ending, we find time to thank those who helped make this possible.

The United States policy on Israel, has, of course, been perhaps the major factor in effecting this satisfactory ending. And we wish to express our appreciation to you for your excellent efforts on our behalf. We know full well that when the support of others was no more than double-talk, your support was in action.

This is a great moment in history for those of the Jewish faith. We wish to thank you from the bottom of our hearts for helping to make it possible.

Very sincerely yours,
SEYMOUR STAIMAN,
*Secretary, Williamsport-Sunbury District Zionist Organization of America.*

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, may I inquire of the acting majority leader to what time the Senator proposes to have the Senate adjourn or recess?

Mr. MYERS. To Thursday.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the acting majority leader state what legislation he expects to have brought up at that time?

Mr. MYERS. Exactly what the situation will be I do not know. I do not believe there will be anything on the calendar. The cotton acreage report may be brought up.

Mr. WHERRY. Is that all the acting majority leader feels might come up for consideration on Thursday?

Mr. MYERS. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the acting majority leader for the information.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MYERS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Frank C. Bingham, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 2, District of Alaska;

Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, District of Alaska;

George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York;

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina; and

Kehoe C. Shannon, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John Monroe Johnson, of South Carolina, to be reappointed as an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1955.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether the report on this nomination was unanimous?

Mr. MYERS. I understand it was a unanimous report.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, as in legislative session, that the Senate adjourn until next Thursday at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 17, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 14, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ernest A. Gross, of New York, now Legal Adviser of the Department of State, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John Theodore Koehler, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Dan A. Kimball, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

UNITED NATIONS

Stuart A. Rice, of Virginia, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years (reappointment).

Philip M. Hauser, of Illinois, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years (reappointment).

Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Wisconsin, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years (reappointment).

CIRCUIT JUDGE

Walter L. Pope, of Montana, to be circuit judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, vice Hon. Francis A. Garrecht, deceased.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Francis M. Bardwell | Raymond W. Johnson |
| Charles E. Briner | Warren W. Johnson |
| Richard R. Briner | Franklin D. Karns, Jr. |
| Leonidas D. Coates, Jr. | Charles B. Martell |
| Arthur B. Dickie | Frank P. Mitchell, Jr. |
| Thompson F. Fowler | Robert L. Moore, Jr. |
| William E. Gentner, Jr. | William T. Nelson |
| Donald W. Gladney, Jr. | Richard M. Nixon |
| George H. Hamilton | Robert J. Ramsbotham |
| John T. Hayward | Charles M. Ryan |
| Joseph A. E. Hindman | Richard T. Spofford |
| Albert E. Hindmarsh | Marion C. Thompson |
| James H. Howard | Harold F. Traua |
| William S. Howard, Jr. | John K. Wells |
| Carl A. Johnson | Ralph E. Westbrook |
| Frank L. Johnson | |

---

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 14, 1949:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

John Monroe Johnson to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1955.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord and Shepherd of our souls, give us brave and stout hearts, conscious of Thy wise direction. We are aware that trials and difficulties may await us ere the day is over, yet we would not bemoan our duty.

Grant that we may meet the challenge of any just appeal without prejudice or the spirit of retaliation. O keep us open-minded, and let us feel the tides of emotion and broad understanding, that will defeat the hazards of disunity and failure. We pray in the name of Him who spake as the Son of Man. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 10, 1949, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on February 7, 1949, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 136. Joint resolution making a further appropriation for disaster relief, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 22. Concurrent resolution suspending legislative budget until May 1, 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 135. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 128) entitled "An act to provide that acreage planted to cotton in 1949 shall not be used in computing cotton acreage allotments for any subsequent year," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. YOUNG to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHESNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances, in one to include an article on the Calumet plan for Chicago and in the other a speech he delivered on February 12 at the Thaddeus Kosciusko Monument in Washington, D. C.

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances, in the first to include an article from the Sheboygan Press, in the second a statement from the American Federation of Labor, and in the third a speech by Bernard Baruch.

GEN. THADDEUS KOSCIUSKO

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I join with my distinguished colleague from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM] and concur in his eloquent remarks with reference to one of America's greatest Presidents, Abraham Lincoln. I direct the attention of the House also to the fact that Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko was born on the same day. It is particularly important that with the desperate and tragic events occurring in Hungary with reference to the persecution of the great Cardinal Mindszenty that America recognize behind this iron curtain the brave people of Poland and that they should receive our tribute again as they have paid tribute to us. Certainly in those years when America needed help brave Poland came forward with a brave man, Thaddeus Kosciusko.

The service of these two great men to their God and to their country is far beyond my poor power to add or to detract. We honor two outstanding champions of freedom from two different countries and from two different generations. As Americans we join with each other in honoring the memory of the Great Liberator, Abraham Lincoln, and as Americans we join again in honoring the memory of a great patriot, Thaddeus Kosciusko.

Today, however, there is deep and special significance when we honor the name of Kosciusko, for as the symbol of freedom and liberty, he appeals to the hearts of men all over the world where there remains a love of justice, freedom, and liberty.

And particularly is this so because in his homeland, once again under the heels of the invader, the oppressor, and the tyrant, the cause of liberty, deep-grained and everlasting, remains.

To the cause of American independence Kosciusko contributed three things, scientific knowledge, most desirable traits of human character, and an unalloyed and unwavering enthusiasm for the cause of liberty. Kosciusko was the first foreign soldier of distinction to heed the call of freedom and cross the stormy sea. He came not because he sought fortune, but simply because he loved freedom.

Kosciusko was an American in spirit through and through. He did not mind beginning at the bottom. Tradition says that when he presented himself to Gen. George Washington, the future President of the United States inquired, "And what can you do?" "Try me; I am willing to do anything," was Kosciusko's reply This is merely a tradition, but well does it speak the truth of the zeal, the enthusiasm, and the courage of a leader of liberty among leaders of that cause since the dawn of history. Today, in this year of our Lord, I stand in the Halls of Congress and pay my tribute. It is interesting to observe that on January 20, 1818, in this same Hall of Congress, William Henry Harrison, then a Representative in Congress from Ohio, later to be President of the United States, when he heard of the death of Kosciusko, introduced a resolution just as I do today, asking for a public expression of respect "for the memory of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, formerly an officer in the service of the United States and the uniform and distinguished friend of liberty and the rights of man." At that time, Congressman Harrison had this to say in support of his resolution:

He was remarked throughout his service for all the qualities which adorn the human character. He was idolized by the soldiers for his bravery, and beloved and respected by the officers for the goodness of his heart and the great qualities of his mind.

Such was the man, sir, for whose memory I ask from an American Congress a slight tribute of respect. Not, sir, to perpetuate his name—but our gratitude. His fame will last as long as liberty remains upon the earth; as long as a votary offers incense upon her altar, the name of Kosciusko will be invoked. And if, by the common consent of the world, a temple shall be erected to those who have rendered the most service to mankind, if the statue of our great countryman shall occupy the place of the most worthy, that of Kosciusko will be found by his side and the wreath of laurel will be entwined with a palm of virtue to adorn his brow.

It is, indeed, then fitting and proper that today in walking down the great Pennsylvania Avenue in the Capital City of Washington, opposite the White House, the official residence of the President of the United States, in the beautiful Lafayette Park, there stands the magnificent monument of Kosciusko, a soldier, a scholar, and a gentleman, faithful to one aim—liberty and human happiness. In his aid to the struggling new Nation in America, Kosciusko did not announce himself by any assumed title or name, although that was fashionable. He did not ask for any rank, did not demand any pay. He went from task to task doing this work quietly and efficiently. Being a military engineer, he had no chance for a brilliant personal distinction; his business was to make it possible for the commanding general to win victory and prevent defeat. Washington called him a gentleman of science and merit.

Kosciusko served with the armies, both in the North and the South through the entire war, and served with distinction. It was said that his deeds naturalized him as an American, and they also associated him with that band of chivalrous foreigners De Kalb, Steuben, Lafayette, and the others who left the Old World to uphold the cause of liberty in the New. It is to be regretted, indeed, that today Poland cannot be represented in international affairs by men who have a right to speak for the Polish people. No, today it is another tragedy for—oh, so tragic Poland—that her mouthpieces before the nations are mere passive agents of the atheistic, communistic Kremlin.

And during the days of Kosciusko the Poles saved others. They could not save their national independence and the country after the desperate resistance of Kosciusko and the other patriots, and the nation was partitioned between Russia, Austria, and Prussia in the latter part of the nineteenth century. But the Poles never stopped fighting for their liberty. And their fight was always animated by those ideals of human liberty once again exhibited in the peoples of the western Christian democracies in their declared modern crusade against the dictatorship behind the iron curtain.

It is not easy for us today to look behind the infamous iron curtain and find the true thoughts and feelings of the brave Polish people. But we know Polish history and it speaks eloquently, loudly, and long. And we hear the eternal

truth in the words of the famous Polish patriot, Mochnazki:

When the foreigner's government is gentle the Poles rise up because they can; when it is severe they rise up because they must. Nothing will accommodate them to the ruin of their Fatherland, and moderation no more than cruelty.

The questions are not: Shall Poland's eastern border be shifted westward? Shall she lose her eastern territories or losing them acquire western territories? The question is, Shall Poland exist?

And this answer is "Yes, 10,000 times; 10,000 times yes," for the hopes and dreams of a free and independent Poland no tyrant can ever crush.

And shining as a beautiful star leading the way to their certainty of liberty is the deep and lasting and abiding faith of their fathers beloved by the Poles. Christianity is the companion of liberty in all its conflicts, the cradle of its infancy, the divine source of its fame.

Liberty cannot be established without a proper sense of morality. And morality cannot exist without a great faith. And this the Poles have had since their conversion and in abundance, and to a degree that is a powerful example to the peoples and nations of the world of their own faith and of all others. And this, the evil men of communism will never understand. They forget the teachings of history. They forget the deep love in the Poles of religious liberty as well as political freedom. They forget that religious liberty is made up of the best sense of what is right and the highest conviction of loyalty and duty. Armed with these, the Poles have looked the sternest despotism in the face.

Mr. Speaker, nestled among the beautiful hills and the rolling country in Pennsylvania is the County of Luzerne, the district which it is my high honor to represent in this Congress. And there resides over 100,000 Americans, staunch, faithful, and true, and in their veins flows the proud blood of ancient Poland. But they have won their spurs, they have won their right to the proud name of American, and the best proof in the world of this is to look at the casualty lists of the two past great world wars and there inscribed in letters of blood are the names of Poland. There is a close tie both in blood and faith between the Polish and American people—each has given the other so much national character.

Historically, the two countries have trod much the same path in their search for statehood and national existence. And historically, too, they have sprung to one another's aid when disaster threatened.

The course of democracy in Poland has staggered under almost insuperable odds. Yet the flame of freedom has never died. It will never die. Through the dark, endless years of oppression, when the prospect of a free Poland seemed but the fragile dream of zealots, the one inextinguishable idea has persisted. It persists today.

And today the whole world is plunged in a bitter struggle to maintain those same principles of human decency for which Poland has traditionally searched. The whole world of the millions of people who despise tyranny and who fought nazism now find themselves faced with communism and the kindred doctrine that shall as well be crushed. Old enmities, suspicion and prejudice must now be thrust aside to form one overwhelming, united front.

But, Mr. Speaker, just as Kosciusko and other Polish patriots had concern for America, we should have some concern for Poland's welfare today. A great Christian people like the Poles will never accept the pagan political and social philosophy of the Soviet. There can be no place in Europe or in the world for one people who try to force upon another ideologies in which they have no faith.

As a nation dedicated to freedom, recognizing the blessing of liberty, as we do, the United States of America must continue to exhibit the gravest concern in the welfare and the future of Poland. The great weight of the United States of America must be thrown behind the fight of all true Poles for a truly free Poland.

Two hundred years has failed to dim the luster of Kosciusko's glory achieved in the cause of our freedom. Kosciusko's name will live forever, symbolic of the struggle of man against the forces of oppression.

The United States of America is the leading nation in the world today. There is only one thing for a leader to do and that is to lead. The spirit of Kosciusko will never rest in peace until there is restored to her proper place at the council table of the nations of the world a free and independent and sovereign state, the Republic of Poland. In paying tribute to this hero, Thaddeus Kosciusko, I pay tribute to the brave and gallant Poles who have always shed their blood on the battlefields of liberty all over the world, who have fought for the freedom of almost every foreign nation. The spirit of Poland is the spirit of Kosciusko. It is an unconquerable spirit that will never die.

Mr. Speaker, I sing to the memory of Thaddeus Kosciusko, the immortal Polish song, Jeszcze Polska Nie Zginela.

### ST. VALENTINE'S DAY AND BROTHERHOOD WEEK

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, St. Valentine's Day and Brotherhood Week should be an appropriate time for the things that I want to say. I have heard many speeches about deceased Members of Congress; however, I notice that no one gets up and mentions the fact when one of our Members is seriously ill and is confined to a hospital. I sincerely believe that any Member who knows that one of our colleagues is ill should either notify us here on the floor or perhaps we could hand the names in so that it could be listed on the last page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have belonged to organizations that have tried this scheme of sending get-well cards to members and I assure you it does the patient a great deal of good to know that his colleagues are thinking of him and hope that he will soon be well.

At the present time, our ailing colleagues must feel that their colleagues are hovering over them like vultures hoping that the illness is nothing trivial so that some one of us can edge up a place on some particular committee.

I know that we do not want to give this impression.

While I am on my feet, I would like to remind you that today is PERCY PRIEST'S wedding anniversary. He is a gentleman that the Sixth District of Tennessee can well be proud of and I want to compliment Mrs. Priest on her excellent taste in choosing a husband.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain editorials.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask uanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Mickey Marcus Memorial Address."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. LYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a magazine article.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the abuse of regulation W and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two other instances and include certain statements and excerpts.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

### WILLIAM REMINGTON

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the reversal of the decision of the Loyalty Board, holding that William Remington, a top-flight employee in the Department of Commerce, was not a safe security risk, and the Department's hurried reinstatement of him in a $10,300 job, with above

$5,000 back pay, should be a matter of grave concern to the public, and, therefore, of concern to every Member of this body.

On Friday last I said that if Congress passed up this matter without doing something about it, it would evidence Members' unfitness to be trusted as guardians of the public safety, and that statement I now reiterate.

The hearings conducted by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in July 1948, established, beyond the slightest possibility of reasonable doubt, the fact that William Remington, who at the time was chairman of a board in the Department of Commerce screening vital exports to Europe, and particularly to Russia, was a Communist and had formerly, when on the War Production Board, performed as an agent and spy for Russia. The evidence taken on this particular subject is contained in parts 1 and 2 of the hearings of the Senate committee and is available to Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I shall address the House at length on this subject later on.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PRIEST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Paul A. Strachan, and a copy of a bill he introduced.

Mr. ERYSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper excerpt.

Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Pope Pius and others with respect to the Cardinal Mindszenty trial.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, even though a Democrat, I have, on more than one occasion, had the honor of being elected president of the Abraham Lincoln Club in my home city of Long Beach, Los Angeles County, Calif.; and the last occasion on which I received this high honor was very shortly after I was defeated for return from the Eighteenth Congressional District to the Eightieth Congress. Perhaps my many friends in my home city, regardless of political affiliation, realizing that, ever since I was a lad, the life of Abraham Lincoln has been the most inspiring life to me in the course of our American history.

Last Saturday, February 12, having been appropriately observed as the one hundred and fortieth birthday of this great citizen of the ages, and the President of the United States reportedly standing for about 10 minutes with bared head while his wreath was being placed at the Lincoln Memorial, I just wish to now call the attention of the Members of this Eighty-first Congress in the history of the United States to the fact that Abraham Lincoln was elected as a Whig to the Thirtieth Congress, March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849. He first came to Washington to serve, arriving December 2, 1847, for the session of that Congress opening on December 6.

While in Congress, he lived in a boarding house, commonly known as Mrs. Sprigg's boarding house, right here on Capitol Hill where the Library of Congress is now located; and other Congressmen living at the same place were John Blanchard; John Dickey, of Pennsylvania; P. W. Tompkins, of Mississippi; Giddings, of Ohio; and Embree, of Indiana. One of his colleagues in the House was John Quincy Adams of Massachusetts; another was Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee. The United States Senators from Illinois at this time were Sidney Breeze, of Carlyle, and Stephen A. Douglas, of Quincy.

The principal issues of the day were, of course, the war with Mexico; the extension of slavery and the Wilmot proviso; westward migration—which, of course, was increased greatly by the discovery of gold in California; internal improvements by the Federal Government; and our relations with the American Indian.

Lincoln was regularly appointed to the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads and also to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department. Because I think the general impression is that Lincoln was more or less inactive on the floor of the House while here, I asked our very able and cooperative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to furnish me with a memorandum showing the incidents wherein Abraham Lincoln took part in any manner on the floor of the Congress while a Member. I knew this information would be new information to many people and possibly to some Members who have not had time to read in detail of his congressional activities. This information is as follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, Thirtieth Congress, first session (December 6, 1847–August 14, 1848):

Page 56: Presented petition for State of Illinois praying for an amicable termination of the war with Mexico.

Page 57: Notice of the introduction of a bill to amend an act to raise for a limited time an additional military force.

Page 64: Resolution introduced requesting the President to inform the House more fully regarding his messages of May 11 and December 8, 1846, and December 7, 1848, with regard to the Mexican War, its inception, policy, and the shedding of American blood on American soil, etc.

Page 103: Petition presented in behalf of James Semple and others praying a relinquishment of certain lands.

Pages 107–109: Remarks on the joint resolution concerning the contract for transporting the great southern mails.

Page 119: Remark.

Page 146: Obtained the floor.

Pages 154–156: Remarks upon the President's annual message concerning the Mexican War.

Page 181: Introduction of a bill to amend an act to raise, for a limited time, an additional military force.

Page 197: Reported a bill for the relief of William Fuller and Orlando Saltmarsh from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Page 449: Reported a bill authorizing postmasters at county seats of justice to receive subscriptions for newspapers and periodicals, to be paid through the agency of the Post Office Department; from the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Page 550: Remarks upon the soldiers' bounty lands bill.

Page 571: Moved to suspend the rules of the House to take up the joint resolution relative to contracts for the purchase of hemp for the use of the Navy.

Page 727: Remarks on bill to pay Texas volunteers.

Page 755: Remarks on bill for the admission of the State of Wisconsin into the Union.

Page 762: Debate of bill for settling the claim of the legal representatives of Richard W. Meade.

Page 857: Delivered speech on the subject of internal improvements. (See Appendix, p. 709.)

Page 878: Remarks upon bill to change the times for holding the district court of the United States in the western district of Virginia.

Page 950: Reported a bill from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to establish certain post routes.

Page 990: Obtained and yielded the floor.

Page 1006: Delivered speech on politics in general and on the merits of the candidates for the Presidential Office. (See Appendix, p. 1041.)

Page 1027: Remarks by Mr. Lincoln and others in explanation of the bill granting to the State of Illinois certain rights-of-way for railroad connections.

Page 1049: Reported joint resolution for relief of persons incurring disability under section 28 of the act approved July 2, 1836, changing the organization of the Post Office Department.

CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, Appendix, Thirtieth Congress, first session:

Page 93: Remarks concerning the Mexican War, its inception, policy, etc.

Page 709: Remarks concerning internal improvements by the Federal Government.

Page 1041: Remarks concerning the Presidential question, and the territories ceded to the United States by Mexico.

CONGRESSIONAL GLOBE, Thirtieth Congress, second session (December 4–March 3, 1848):

Page 188: Notice of the introduction of a bill in relation to school lands which have been or may be relinquished.

Page 212: Introduces an amendment to the resolution abolishing slavery from the District of Columbia.

Page 244: Notice of introduction of a bill to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.

Page 533: Remarks on the bill granting lands to the States to make railroads and canals.

Page 559: Presents certain joint resolutions of the Legislature of Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I know that we, as Members of the present Eighty-first Congress, cannot sit between these walls on any occasion without realizing that Abraham Lincoln also worked here. This fact must, of necessity, renew our determination to make it literally true that we assume the great task remaining before us and that the honored dead of our wars for democracy shall know that we dedicate an increased devotion to the cause for which they gave their lives and that, in like manner, we at this birthday season, do again highly resolve that they shall not have died in vain and

that we, as Members of the same Congress of the same great Nation which Abraham Lincoln served as a Member of Congress, shall daily dedicate our lives to the proposition that, because of our unselfish service to our Nation, that Nation shall have a new birth of freedom and that we shall make it truer than ever that Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that one of the outstanding agencies of the Government, and the one Department that has been noted for the administration of its affairs and for its efficiency throughout its organization is about to bog down—I refer to the United States Post Office Department. Mr. Speaker, the population of our country and of most of our cities and towns has increased tremendously, and with the building of good roads and rural electrification, our rural areas have also progressed and have required and now demand extended mail delivery, and besides the services of the Post Office Department have been so multiplied and expanded that, with the recent appropriations sufficient funds have not been made available to the Post Office Department to furnish the personnel and service to meet the needs of the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, of great importance also is the fact that for many years no appropriations have been made for construction of post-office buildings and Federal court buildings, many of the post offices being housed in shacks which are a disgrace to our Nation, and limited repairs, if any, have been made to provide the necessary space for the handling of the greatly increased volume of all classes of mail, particularly air mail and parcel post, parcel-post mail alone being more than enough to overtax all available room, making it necessary to use basements and any and all rooms in the buildings which should be used for other necessary purposes.

Mr. Speaker, in my district—and I understand the same condition exists in practically nearly all other parts of the United States—many of the present post-office buildings are outmoded, antiquated, and inadequate to handle the mails, and in many instances, as a result, the patrons of the offices are forced to stand in line and wait an interminable amount of time for mail and stamps and other services of the Post Office Department, and while during the war, of course, the citizens of the country were not complaining about these inconveniences and conditions, since the end of the war demands have been made and are now being made upon nearly every member of the Congress for relief.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, with the funds which have been recently appropriated to the Post Office Department, the Department has been unable to provide the necessary personnel and help, not only in the post offices but also on city and rural routes, and I am told that this has been responsible for unnecessary and unreasonable delay in the dispatch of the mails, and which never existed before in the history of the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, I am taking the liberty to call this matter to the attention of the President and administration and the Congress, and especially to the attention of the committees of the House and Senate who are concerned with and have jurisdiction over the authorizations and appropriations in the hope that they will take steps to correct this most unsatisfactory and unpardonable situation, and I trust that they will take such action as they determine best to provide relief to the Post Office Department in order that this fine Department may continue to maintain its service and reputation as it has so well done in the past.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include editorials in each.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a short letter.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances.

Mr. LOVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENNINGS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WHY ARE MILK PRICES NOT SUPPORTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LAW?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the administration is not following the law in regard to the agricultural support program. This is particularly evident so far as milk for manufactured dairy products is concerned. While the New Deal and Fair Deal branch of political agricultural support may be sending out letters attempting to blame the lack of support on the Eightieth Congress, and also saying that there are no funds available for supporting dairy prices, the fact is that the law today provides for 90-percent parity support price for milk and its products.

It appears easier and perhaps more desirable for certain groups to try and blame the Eightieth Congress, than to admit they misled the dairymen of our country into believing President Truman's campaign promises.

It is also a fact that the administration has the power, authority, and the funds to support the price of milk in accordance with the provisions of the law. The cunning, cute, and evasive approach of this administration will not stand the light of day. The President killed the 90-percent parity support price himself—all of the false propaganda notwithstanding.

The cheap politics behind this lack of announced support for milk is beyond doubt a move to let the price of milk become so low that the dairymen will come to Washington on bended knees to ask for relief from the administration. And when it is granted, the administration will then tell the dairymen just how they saved them. This one is too crude and apparent for the administration to get away with. All the dairymen ask, is a support price equal to that provided by law.

This should be a country governed by laws, and not by men, especially evasive politicians. The dairymen of the United States have already been deprived of millions of dollars because of the failure of the Fair Deal to carry out the provisions of the price-support law.

THE AIKEN BILL

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am including in my remarks a copy of a resolution passed by the Winnebago County, Ill., Farm Bureau, whereby they have gone on record in support of the Agricultural Act of 1948, known as the Aiken bill, which provides flexible price supports of 60 to 90 percent of parity.

The Winnebago County Farm Bureau is one of the three largest in the State of Illinois. It pleased me immensely to see the agricultural leaders of the Nation supporting the Republican farm bill, passed by the Eightieth Republican Congress.

RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WINNEBAGO COUNTY FARM BUREAU

I

Whereas farmers want to help develop economic programs which facilitate the best use of land and human resources; and

Whereas farmers want these programs to be in the best interest of public welfare; and

Whereas farmers recognize that too high price supports in any farm program would produce unwieldy crop surpluses with disastrous results such as fixed prices and rigid control and farmer regimentation: Be it hereby

*Resolved*, That our country farm bureau go on record in support of the Agricultural Act of 1948 known as the Aiken bill which provides flexible price supports of 60 to 90 percent of parity.

XII

Because the welfare of the Nation depends upon the prosperity of all segments of our economy, no segment of our economy has the right to make demands for itself at the ex-

pense of the general public. Neither agriculture, labor, nor industry can solve their own problems without giving due considerations to the problems of others, so we urge that agriculture, industry, and labor make a sincere effort to promote harmonious relationships and cooperate for the benefit of all, and in helping to bring about better relationships between the three groups and especially between labor and industry, our Representative in the National Congress, as well as management and labor leaders give careful study and considerations to pending labor-management legislation in order to avoid hasty judgment and actions in the passage of labor-management legislation which might prove harmful to the best interests of our country.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TABER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RICH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., Republican leader of the House of Representatives, at a Lincoln Day dinner at Lochhaven, Pa., on Saturday evening, February 12, 1949.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a New York Times editorial on housing.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

THE JOHNSONVILLE STEAM PLANT

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation of funds for the construction of the Johnsonville steam plant should not be made. This proposition has been before Congress on several occasions, and I have always voted against it. I shall expect to vote against it when it comes before the House again. Because of the uncertainty as to the progress of legislation at this time it is uncertain just when the matter will come up for final vote, but I want to be on record as opposed to the project when it does come. But to be doubly sure, I am making this statement and having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I am opposed to this project for two very substantial reasons. First, the Government has no right under the Constitution to engage in the power business. It has no right to construct dams for power purposes. Its power in this respect is limited to flood control and navigation purposes. The whole Tennessee Valley project was constructed in violation of the spirit of the Constitution. It was well known that this great project was primarily and principally a power project and not a flood-control or navigation project. Now they come along with the proposition to build a steam plant to produce power, and this plant will be operated by coal and not by water power. It will be directly in opposition to private industry, which is at this time doing a good job in supplying power to the people.

I hope that we will be able to defeat this proposition when it comes up for consideration as we have done on several previous occasions.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore granted, I may be permitted to address the House of 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOEVEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include certain newspaper articles.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD regarding the persecution of the Bulgarian clergymen and also to include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LYNCH (at the request of Mr. DEANE) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. ZABLOCKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a copy of a speech and an editorial and a resolution.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington (at the request of Mr. HOLIFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article, and that my remarks appear in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOLIFIELD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

COMMUNISTS IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have heard all of these talks by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] criticising the Committee on Un-American Activities. I propose to answer at least a portion of them today.

In the first place, I join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] with reference to William W. Remington. He ought not to be on the Federal pay roll. If Congress is going to sit idly by and see those men of questionable loyalty returned to the Federal pay roll, then it is time the American people took things into their own hands and changed the Congress.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] gets up here and repeats what some alleged scientists have said about Dr. Edward U. Condon. Many people think that Dr. Condon is one of the most dangerous men on the Federal pay roll today, and that he is in a dangerous position, so far as our atomic security is concerned.

I here and now call upon the new Committee on Un-American Activities to have Dr. Condon come before it, let him make his statement, cross-examine him, and bring out into the open the facts as to the danger that Dr. Condon represents to our atomic security.

When they do that, and publish the letter the FBI wrote about him, then the American people will understand the situation. Remember the safety of our country comes first.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor may be allowed to sit this week during the time when the House may not be in session and during the time when general debate is under way in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement that it is impossible to bring out the minimum wage bill within the next week or 10 days. The Committee on Education and Labor has reported out H. R. 858, which deals with the supposed strike of the stevedores, coming on March 1. The bill reported out is the same as H. R. 858, with the exception that we added the words "as applied in the longshoreman, stevedoring, and building and construction industries."

The reason the construction industry is in the bill is because the trades are now bargaining for wages for next spring. So that we may avoid any strikes, this bill has been reported practically unanimously from the committee on last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar may be dispensed with this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION (H. DOC. NO. 74)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk and, together with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed, with illustrations:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the second report of the Economic Cooperation Administration created by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, Public Law 472 of the Eightieth Congress, approved April 3, 1948.

The report covers activities under the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948 (title I of Public Law 472) and the China Aid Act of 1948 (title IV of Public Law 472). There is also included a summary of the status of the United States foreign relief program (Public Law 84) and the United States foreign aid program (Public Law 389).

This report is for the quarter ended September 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 11, 1949.*

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TRANSMITTING TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT OF LEND-LEASE OPERATIONS (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and together with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

*To the Congress of the United States of America:*

I am transmitting herewith the twenty-seventh report to Congress on lend-lease operations.

This report contains a report on lend-lease fiscal operations prepared by the Treasury Department and submitted to the Secretary of State in accordance with Executive Order 9726. The period covered is from March 11, 1941, through March 31, 1948.

All deliveries under the various pipeline agreements to lend-lease recipient governments have been concluded. The consummation of these agreements constituted one of the first measures of the United States which contributed to post-war economic recovery in countries suffering from wartime disruption and devastation.

An agreement, commonly referred to as a "settlement of settlements," was signed with the United Kingdom on July 12, 1948, and appears in this report as appendix II. This agreement disposes of wartime financial claims and related matters not completely disposed of by the previous agreements with the United Kingdom published in the twenty-second report.

A final lend-lease settlement agreement signed with Yugoslavia on July 19, 1948, appears as appendix III.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 14, 1949.*

COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES AND THE CONDON CASE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. If these objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to the comments of the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Mississippi on the so-called Condon case. As a new member of the Committee on Un-American Activities perhaps I should not say too much; but I do want to make my position clear. In accepting an assignment to the committee, as far as I personally am concerned, I shall feel that members of the executive branch of the service should not have their names used in a manner which casts reflection upon them without giving them an opportunity to be heard. My understanding is that the chairman of the committee has been quoted in the press as saying that he intends to see that Dr. Condon is given an opportunity to appear before the committee. Certainly such a move as that in the committee will have my support.

I know nothing about Dr. Condon, personally; I have no prejudged convictions about him one way or the other; but I do think any man is entitled to be heard in his own defense if he is accused or his loyalty publicly questioned. At the same time, I wish to say that I think such situations as this would be largely avoided and, when they arise, would be more speedily cleared up if the executive agencies were free to give the committee full information from their files. The President's directive of August 5, 1948, effectively puts an iron curtain between the committee and information which is generally important and frequently essential if justice is to be done.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 111), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 96, providing

for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules letting me present this bill which has for its purpose the continuation of the War Assets Administration for about 4 months. The life of the present administration expires on the 28th of February 1949. We are seeking to have it extended until June 30, 1949. I think those of us who were in the war and saw the tremendous amount of matériel and other things that are still in existence, and should, if possible, be made available for peacetime construction and peacetime promotion of some kind will realize that this additional time is necessary for the Board to act. I believe we may say this is the legislative opportunity for us to in a way carry out the Biblical admonishment of beating our swords into plowshares and our spears into pruning hooks, and to try to get this matériel, as far as possible, into peacetime production.

I am sure the House will realize this is a worthwhile project. The time on this rule has been divided between the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN] and myself.

I now yield to my distinguished colleague, the Congressman at Large from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] such time as he may desire. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I add my sentiments to those of my colleagues here and millions of people the world over regarding the unscrupulous, malicious and dastardly crime that was perpetrated on a prince of the Catholic Church and six of his associates by the Hungarian People's Court. The Russians criticized us for meddling in this matter. Well, if that is meddling, then we should add to its meaning for all time to come a practice of resentment and defense against indignities and assaults committed on people everywhere in the world, upon all religions and upon freedom itself.

That unfair trial was not directed entirely to a religious group. It was a direct attempt by a pagan dictatorship to break the very souls of free thinking men and women.

Let us be proud that we are Americans knowing that we not alone have the strength and courage to discern an injustice, but that we have the fortitude to express ourselves freely. We are the greatest democracy in the world today and we can be sure that we shall always maintain that status. It is in the annals of history that every emperor, king, or dictator who attempted to crush his subjects, or conquer the world, was himself crushed. If Cardinal Mindszenty does not win in his appeal, or if his brave spirit is extinguished by torture in the vile prison where his Communist captors have him confined, let it be a warning to the Red dictators that they are only preparing the way for their own downfall.

Josef Cardinal Mindszenty's conviction by a Hungarian court and sentence to imprisonment for life is an affront to liberty-loving people everywhere and an assault upon Christianity, and in truth upon all religion. This was persecution not prosecution. This was the most savage attack of civil power against the dignity of a man of God since the dictator Napolcon arrested and kidnaped Pope Pius VII 140 years ago. The conscience of mankind is aroused; and in the end whether Cardinal Mindszenty dies in the medieval prison where he is imprisoned, whether he is executed or released in response to the demands of outraged citizens and officials of democratic nations, he will be remembered with reverence and his persecutors condemned and forgotten. People who are religious and who love freedom will not forget.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I desire.

Mr. Speaker, first I want to compliment the new member of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, for the clear way in which he explained the rule now before us. Inasmuch as this comes with a unanimous report of the Committee on Expenditures there is no disposition on the part of any one on this side to oppose the rule, although I understand that members of the Committee on Expenditures will fully explain the bill when we go into committee in order that all will fully understand.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2402, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, H. R. 2402 comes before the Congress on a time urgency basis. The supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation bill of 1949 which was passed June 9, 1948, by the Eightieth Congress, contained language which terminated the War Assets Administration and the Office of War Assets Administrator as of February 28, 1949.

Time has proven that this action was premature and ill-advised. The legislative language was placed in the appropriation bill against the advice of every member of the Rizley Subcommittee on Surplus Property Disposal, of which I was the ranking Democratic member. The members of the subcommittee (both Republicans and Democrats) had studied the problem of surplus disposal for 18 months. We were unanimously agreed that a year's extension was needed to liquidate the $4,555,000,000 of surplus property which then remained.

The appropriation committee ignored our recommendation and arbitrarily set an 8-month time limit for termination.

Today's urgency therefore demonstrates again the fallacy of ignoring a legislative committee's recommendation based on long study and justified conclusions, and substituting therefor arbitrary legislative provisions in an appropriation bill.

Now what is the present problem?

The War Assets Administration's authority to function expires February 28 in 10 more legislative days, according to Public Law 862.

The War Assets Administration still has to dispose of approximately $2,300,000,000 worth of real and personal property.

Approximately $2,000,000,000 is the value of real property involved; $300,000,000 is the value of personal property.

The War Assets Administration has, at this time, a smoothly functioning organization with which to continue liquidating this property in the most economical and efficient manner. Under the present Administrator, Mr. Jess Larson, the efficiency of the War Assets Administration has constantly improved. The personnel has been drastically reduced as the property load has diminished. I will refer in a few minutes to some charts which Mr. Larson used before the Appropriations Committee a few days ago, to further illustrate the true record and status of the War Assets Administration.

For the moment let us consider the alternative of allowing the War Assets Administration to expire on February 28.

First. The Government would still have the custody of $2,300,000,000 worth of property, yet to be disposed of.

Second. At the present time there is no central property disposal agency with the experience, personnel, and budget allowance to assume these duties.

Third. Under Public Law 862 heretofore alluded to—the supplemental independent offices appropriation bill of the Eightieth Congress—additional legislative language directed that property remaining in the hands of War Assets Administration on February 28, 1949, should be divided among four separate Government agencies:

(a) Real property to RFC.

(b) Ordinary personal propert, to the Bureau of Federal Supply.

(c) Aircraft component parts—acquisition value, $504,000,000—to the Department of the Air Force.

(d) Administrative property, records, and accounts to the Treasury Department.

During the hearings on H. R. 2402 representatives from these Departments appeared before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments or filed statements and letters protesting any transfer of these properties and duties at this time on the grounds that—

(a) No appropriation is carried in their 1949 fiscal budget to assume these duties.

(b) They do not have the personnel or background of experience to do the job.

(c) The interruption of the present disposal procedure would cost the taxpayers many extra millions of dollars.

Realizing the necessity for continued operation of the War Assets Administration, and by request of the President, an appropriation of $15,000,000 has been included in the present deficiency appropriation bill, which is under consideration by the Appropriations Committee. I understand Judge KERR's subcommittee has approved a slightly reduced appropriation for this purpose, but we are faced with a practical situation. The present appropriations bill also includes several controversial items over which debate will cause delay in final passage until after February 28.

We therefore face the necessity of immediate legislative authorization for this agency.

H. R. 2402 extends the life of the War Assets Administration from February 28 to June 30. The pending supplemental appropriation bill will provide the necessary funds for operational expenses until June 30, or until the functions of the War Assets Administration are absorbed by a permanent property disposal agency, which I understand has been recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman advise as to any information he may have as to the amount of money it will be necessary to appropriate for this agency?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman had been listening carefully to my remarks he would have found that I gave the House the following language——

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was listening, may I say to the gentleman, to every single word he said. Perhaps I did not get it.

Mr. HOLIFIELD—

An appropriation of $15,000,000 has been included in the present deficiency appropriation bill.

I later stated that I understand the requested $15,000,000 has been reduced slightly by Judge KERR's subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What does that slightly mean?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have no official figures, but I understand that it has been reduced $2,500,000, and is now $12,500,000. The gentleman will have to consult the Committee on Appropriations to get verification of that. I only received the information over the phone.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman can readily understand, then, why we do not have the figures, if he does not know himself.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do know myself.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How much is it?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think my previous statement is adequate.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. In the gentleman's further statement this morning will he have the total amount of war surplus property that we had on hand at the end of the war, when it was turned over to the War Assets Administration? Does the gentleman know how much that was?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe the charts which I intend to explain will give that information.

Mr. STEFAN. They will show how much they had and what the receipts have been up to now?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. It is my intention now to explain that.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman will also tell the Committee, will he not, that the War Assets Administration has nothing to do with the surplus in foreign countries over which the foreign liquidation has been operating? That is not included in the gentleman's figures?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No, not unless it has been declared surplus and brought home. Some surplus property has been brought home over the past 3 years.

Mr. STEFAN. Approximately $8,000,000,000 of surplus was in the countries of Europe, from which we collected approximately $1,000,000,000. There is now left over there, I understand, around $100,000,000 worth. None of that has anything to do with the War Assets Administration, for which we are legislating at this time? Is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. That is in the hands of the Foreign Liquidation Commission and has nothing to do with the War Assets Administration.

Mr. STEFAN. But you have in your figures the total amount that we originally had, the cost and the approximate receipts to date?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I intend to give that information to the House at the present time.

The chart which is presented to the House at this time shows that in May 1945 on VE-day there was a total of $25,000,000,000 of surplus property which would have to be disposed of. This figure of $25,000,000,000 includes the amount that was then on hand and such amounts as have been declared up until December 31, 1948. During that period of time the War Assets Administration has disposed of $14,600,000,000 by sales. It has by scrapping, donations, and transfers to other governmental agencies disposed of $9,700,000,000. It has disposed in the form of leases of $800,000,000. It has realized from this the total figure of $4,140,000,000. Its operating costs have been $95,000,000. It has therefore given to the Government a net return of $3,190,000,000. This sales realization compared to the $14,600,000,000 figure, 28.4 percent of the acquisition cost, if compared to the total amount—and I call attention to the fact here that $9,700,000,000 has been disposed of without income to the Government, but with great benefit to other divisions of government such as States, cities, hospitals, schools, and so forth—would amount to about 17.2-percent recovery. That is, if it is compared to the total amount.

The operating cost shows for the total amount of service which the War Assets Administration has rendered, that it amounts to 6.5 percent of the realized return.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. You say that in 1945 we had $25,000,000,000 worth of surplus property, of which we disposed of $14,000,000,000 worth? That is, you gave away $9,000,000,000?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is approximately correct.

Mr. STEFAN. Does that $14,000,000,000 include the $9,000,000,000?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Then what did you really collect?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. You add the two together to get the $25,000,000,000, which represents the acquisition cost to the Government of all declared surplus.

Mr. STEFAN. What did you really collect in cash from the $25,000,000,000?

How much did you collect in cash and turn over to the Treasury from the original $25,000,000,000?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Four billion one hundred and forty million dollars.

Mr. STEFAN. That was in cash out of the $25,000,000,000?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. And those figures show that approximately one-quarter of the net return has been used in administrative expenses, is that right?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The relation would be 6.5 percent operating cost to 28.4 percent realization.

Mr. KEATING. That means that out of every dollar collected, approximately 25 cents has been used up for administrative expenses, is that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is true.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman have any chart showing the people who have received this property; how it has been distributed among individuals, municipalities, and so on? The reason I ask that is that I tried for many, many constituents to get some of this property and they simply got the run-around. They would be sent from one place to the other to get it, and when they got

there it would be gone. I have not been able to get any of it for any of my constituents. I would be interested to know who has gotten this property and where it has gone.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The property has been widely distributed among individuals, among States, schools, hospitals, and so forth. I believe you will find a partial breakdown in the last report of the War Assets Administration to the Congress.

Mr. KEATING. Does the gentleman have a chart showing the break-down?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I do not have a chart showing the break-down between the different agencies which have received this property.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has again expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

I might point out that the $9,700,000,000 also includes withdrawals by the armed services of many hundreds of millions of dollars worth of property which was originally declared surplus, but which has since been reclaimed by them, in view of pressing needs which they had in the postwar era. At the present time a great deal of the aircraft component parts are being requested to be used in the so-called Berlin air lift in Germany.

Mr. KEATING. Do veterans now have, under existing law, any preference in procuring this surplus material?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes. There are certain veterans' preferences in real property, but I might point out that the amount of personal property that is left is quite small. It will amount to approximately $37,500,000 as of March 1. The aircraft component parts will total about $504,000,000. I will check that figure and supply the correct one if it is not right.

The veterans have certain rights for such real property as remains. There is not a great deal of it remaining.

Mr. KEATING. Do I understand that if we grant this extension of time we may have assurance that the War Assets Administration will be wound up and that they will not be coming in here asking for a further extension of time?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Here we have a break-down of the work which can be done by this agency in the next 4 months, which is the period of time provided in H. R. 2402. There is still $2,299,000,000 worth of property to be disposed of. According to their present schedule, on the real property they expect to dispose of $468,000,000 worth. There will be left on June 30, $1,269,000,000 worth of real property. Included in that is $800,000,000 long-term leases on aluminum plants and other large facilities. Such leases run from 5 to 25 years.

With reference to aircraft component parts, out of a total of $504,000,000, $210,000,000 is expected to be sold by June 30, and that will leave a balance of $294,000,000.

In all other agencies combined there will be $689,000,000 sold and $1,609,000,000 worth of property left. So they will not be completely finished by June 30.

In the meantime, it is my understanding that the Hoover Commission report, has requested that the Congress set up a central surplus property disposal agency. At that time this residue of real and personal property would be turned over to the central property disposal agency, if the Congress sets up such an agency.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish to ask the gentleman about the disposal activity shown on his chart. In my district there is a big airport that was turned back to the city of Stockton which was utilized by the Army Air Force. I understand that at the time they turned it over they reserved the right to take it back in the event of a national emergency. The city has it on a nominal lease. Is that included in "Leases," or "Donations"?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is included in "Transfers without reimbursement."

Mr. JOHNSON. That also includes all those barracks and things for colleges?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. Has it been a policy in turning over airports that the right is reserved to demand the return of the airport in the event of an emergency?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is a saving clause in all of the leases or transfers, I understand, which is placed in the contracts at the request of the military, where such request is deemed necessary in order to repossess this property in case of war.

Mr. JOHNSON. And the sales are outright sales for cash, are they not?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right. Maybe I should qualify that; in some cases time payments have been arranged.

Mr. JOHNSON. I mean that ultimately the purchaser pays the Government cash.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; that is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. I notice on the chart $9,700,000,000 given away. That was entirely in keeping with legislation passed by this Congress; is not that correct?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes; it was.

Mr. HARDY. That includes transfers to other Federal agencies as well as in some cases special acts passed by Congress authorizing the transfer to municipalities or States.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right; it refers to all forms of transfer or donation without reimbursement; and it also refers to the scrapping of many things that had no commercial value.

Mr. HARDY. But that was done in accordance with legislation passed by Congress; and, therefore, any comparison of cash returns must be made between the 4.14 recovered and the 14 that was actually sold.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. From a standpoint of direct return on the amount of cash realized, not from the operational costs; because I have been told that War Assets' cost on handling the $9,700,000,000 worth of property scrapped or transferred without reimbursement was just as great proportionately as on the $14,600,000,000 which they sold.

Mr. HARDY. That is just the point I wanted to bring out. Now may I take the matter of administrative costs which was applied against the cash receipts, actually.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I applied it both ways, I may say to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I know the gentleman does; but the proper way to apply it would be really to take only that portion and relate it to the cash value of the merchandise disposed of.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield, but my time is running out fast; I have used 25 of the 30 minutes allotted to my side.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Just a question to clear this up. You sold four billion one hundred and forty millions of gross sales, income; and there is nine hundred and fifty millions expense on that gross sales income; is that right?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Fourteen billion six hundred million dollars is the gross total of cash sales.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Four billion one hundred and forty millions received out of fourteen billion six hundred millions of sales.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. War Assets paid out $950,000,000 to sell $4,140,000,000.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Fourteen billion six hundred millions was the total sales figure at Government acquisition cost; $4,140,000,000 was the net receipt figure.

Mr. HARDY. If the gentleman will yield, that is just the point I was trying to make a while ago.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman did not get it very clear. In other words, as far as expense is concerned, the $950,000,000 covered the administration of $9,700,000,000; is that right?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Oh, no; that is wrong, the $950,000,000 is the complete operating cost for the whole $25,100,000,000, which was either sold, scrapped, or transferred without reimbursement.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I wanted to clear up.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in the minute remaining I wish to point out that on June 30, 1947, the War Assets Administration had 41,900 employees. They have been reduced until last June 1948, when we considered the supplemental independent offices' appropriation bill, they had 17,100. At the present time—February 14, 1949—there are 5,000 employees, and this number will be reduced to 2,100 employees by June 30, 1949.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I was pleased to hear the gentleman from California mention that it is contemplated that some new method for disposing of surplus property which we have on hand will probably be recommended by the Hoover Commission. I

certainly hope that we can at long last find some means to put the disposal of this property into the hands of an organization that will administer it without getting into the confusion, the red-tape, the impossible situations that the War Assets Administration have gotten into and I take this time to show you how wound up the War Assets Administration can get with itself.

You have had your attention called to the disposal of some of this property to municipalities, States, schools and so forth. I happen to have a vocational school up in my district in Appleton, Wis., which tried to get a multilith machine, a duplicating machine in other words. They went to the Bureau of Community Facilities who attempted to be very helpful to them in trying to find one of these multilith machines.

Back in the early part of 1948 they had assigned to them by the War Assets Administration what they thought was a machine that would serve the purpose. This was sent out to the school, but in unpacking it they found it had so deteriorated by reason of improper storage it was impossible to use the machine. The company that originally produced the machine said that they could in no way repair the machine. The company stated that it was so bad it had to be junked. So, after a lot more red-tape there came through an order to junk it.

They thought maybe they could find another one some place. The War Assets Administration apparently did find one and so certified it to the Bureau of Community Facilities; but when the time came for delivery it could not be found.

Then finally they said, "Well, now, we have found something for you," and they shipped a box. Supposedly it was a multilith machine and that is what the order called for, but when the school opened it up they found it was a ditto machine, which is anything but a multilith machine. The school has no use for a ditto machine. Now, somebody can use a ditto machine, but this school cannot. The excuse of the War Assets Administration for that situation was that when it was originally declared surplus it was marked as a multilith machine and when they shipped the box up to the school they did not find out what it contained.

In my office we call this case the comedy of errors. We have spent a good deal of time within the last 6 months trying to straighten it out. The Bureau of Community Facilities has been trying to solve this problem, and no doubt other agencies of War Assets have spent a great deal of time to try to straighten out this little multilith-machine transfer which should not have been too complicated in the first instance.

Here is a letter which I received on February 8 from Mr. Carl Bertram, director of the Appleton Vocational School, and I will read a part of it:

> February 2, I received a telephone call from Mr. Crain, of the Bureau of Community Facilities in Chicago, who stated that he had received a call from their office in Washington, D. C., and that there were two offset duplicating machines, either of which this school might have. These two machines were items 52 and 53 on the declaration made to the Bureau of Community Facilities. One was a Davidson, model 221, offset printing press and the other a model 2066 multilith. Both machines are in good operating condition.
>
> Mr. Crain said that I should go to Minneapolis at once to determine which machine would best serve our needs. Accordingly, I had a representative of this institution make a special trip to Fort Snelling for the purpose of examining the two items. He visited the Veterans' Administration center where the machines were located on Monday, February 7. I received a call from him, and he stated that neither machine was at the center. The story that was given him was that the duplicator had been disposed of to the Michigan School of Mines at Houghton prior to November 1, 1948, and the multilith, model 2066, which would normally sell for at least $6,000, was not disposed of by December 1, 1948. Since no one made any effort to claim the multilith for anyone wanting it, the instructions were to junk it by December 1. In spite of the fact that this machine had a minimum fair value of $2,500 as stated in their own declaration, they informed our representative that it had been sold for junk.

Well, now, that is what happened in just one small case in this program for surplus disposal. Think of the time and effort that has been consumed not only by men on the pay roll of the War Assets Administration, but in all the other agencies, such as the Bureau of Community Facilities, and by the little communities and schools who are trying to get this material. I certainly hope that the Hoover Commission does come in with a recommendation to provide a reasonable method for the disposal of the property that is remaining today.

I am going to vote for this extension, sure, because we do not have any alternative. But, if there was an alternative, I certainly believe that I would take the alternative. rather than the continuation of the present set-up.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, as a member of this committee I intend to vote for this legislation. I do not intend to take much time of the Members of this House. I was interested in noting that the number of employees by June 30 will have been decreased to 2,100. I am hopeful, with 2,100 employees rather than the thousands that they formerly had that, we might be able to make more headway in disposing of the rest of the surplus materials that we have and get the job finished. If it is necessary, perhaps, to give more attention to veterans' preference; if it is necessary to make it easier for veterans to buy this material, I would be for it, because I think that the quicker we get it disposed of the less money it is going to cost us. I note that it is going to cost us $12,500,000 for the next 4 months to dispose of this surplus material. I am quite sure that we are not going to be finished with the job at that time; I am sure that we will not.

But, I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that those who have the responsibility of disposing of this material will not, as is so often done, delay the disposal in order to perpetuate themselves in jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Expenditures has had this matter before it several times. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union undoubtedly knows as much and probably more about war assets and legislation connected with the congressional effort to dispose of the war assets than any Member of the House. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who is the chairman of the committee, advises me that we had surplus property back in 1933, property which had been accumulated by the various agencies of the Government, and we had legislation looking toward its disposal at that time. That was before I had the privilege of being here. He also advises me that the committee reported out legislation to dispose of war assets in 1944.

Practically every Member of the House who has ever had any dealing with the War Assets Administration can tell a story similar to that so accurately told by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES]. I notice a gentleman in front here nodding his head. I recall very, very distinctly that I was never able to get from War Assets anything for any veteran; no, never. I tried to get tools for dentists, dental chairs, trucks for veteran farmers; oh, I do not know what all—yes, one time a cabin cruiser for a doctor who was a veteran. I do not know what he wanted of it, but he wanted it. I had it up with the War Administrator for months and was finally advised by someone in the department to just forget it, because "everyone in the Navy has a cabin cruiser, and they use them until they are not worth repairing, so you tell your friend and constituent to forget it." So I did. That was one of my experiences.

My first experience with this kind of legislation arose on a bill that was introduced by the committee. There were members of the committee at that time who wanted to place the property in the hands of some selling agency and get rid of it. Then there was another group of witnesses who came before the committee, and they wanted to junk it, sink it in the sea, because, they said, the experience with the First World War assets had shown it would cost more to administer the selling of the property than we ever got out of it.

We will have to take this extension, because there is nothing else we can do. But what bothers me is this. In the legislation which became law on June 30, 1948, the very first provision that has to do with surplus-property disposal reads this way:

> Effective February 28, 1949, the office of War Assets Administrator is abolished and the War Assets Administration shall cease to exist as an agency of the Government.

We put a definite time, a limitation on it. The War Assets agency knew very well that it was the desire of Congress that it should wind up its affairs in February 1949. Did they do it? No; they did not. Now they say June 30, 1949. I recall the other day, when this bill was before the committee, I asked one of the members of the committee, I think it was the majority leader of the House, about this terminal date. One of the members of the committee had asked, "Is June 30, 1949, the date of termination, going to finish it then?"

Well, the majority leader, as I recall it, said he thought it might be, but it was my suggestion that perhaps June 30, 1949, was just a way station on a long, long road, a sort of a whistle stop that they were going to put in there on a road without an end.

I do not know how the Congress can end some of these unnecessary expenses. The Eightieth Congress certainly caught heck all up and down the country during the last campaign because it did not do this, that, or the other thing. But in June of last year, we told the War Assets Administration to wind up its business and end this expense. They did not do it. Now we give them another lease of life, because we are forced into it. I have an amendment which proposes to strike out June 30, 1948, and insert January 1, 1950, and add a provision that they should on that date go out of existence.

Then I looked at the old law, and I said, "Well, we told them that last year, so what is the use of telling them again?"

I shall vote for the extension. There is nothing else that we can do. But I wonder if the majority, come June 30, is going to say to this Department down there, in view of this great economic program that the President submitted to us "You fellows are through." I ask you now. I see the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] wants to give us an answer.

I yield to the gentleman from California, a member of the committee.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have already stated that the total job of disposal will not be done by June 30. I said that on the floor on June 9, 1948, during the debate on the floor, to set the time limit at February 28, that it was a totally unrealistic approach to the solution of the problem, and did not give to the War Assets Administration enough time to do the tremendous job that they have to do and which the gentleman, if he had been present when Mr. Larson testified, would remember to follow.

Mr. Larson testified that the $25,000,000,000 disposal program was a greater program than the four or five greatest corporations in America rolled into one. They had to do it with inexperienced help and had to do it under restrictive legislation which Congress put upon their disposal problem, the restrictions of priority and procedure, which an ordinary merchandiser in the sale of merchandise would not have to put up with. Therefore, it has delayed the program.

We will always have in Government a surplus property disposal problem.



Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then I gather from what you say the Congress is to blame because we wrote all these restrictions in?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will say that I helped to write those restrictions in. I do not place the blame on the Congress because I believe that we were putting those restrictions in from the standpoint of protecting the priority rights of veterans, municipalities, States and other political subdivisions.

But owing to the fact that we did put them in, it made it a more onerous duty of the War Assets Administration to perform their functions in the disposal of this property, because they had certain advertising, periods of time, certain exercises of the priorities, and so forth, which prohibited them from making an outright sale such as a commercial establishment would be able to do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then to boil it all down, when do you think, or when have you been assured, that the War Assets Administration will be through forever?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe that during this session of Congress there will be a central agency, probably the Treasury Department, or some other agency, which will take over the duty of surplus property disposal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You mean that somebody else is going to take on this job?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I mean to say that I believe one of the reorganization plans of the President will consolidate the problem of surplus property disposal, which is a part of every bureau of Government, into one central agency, and there we will be able to scrutinize it more closely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When do you think we will get rid of the personal property that is properly war assets? Let us forget the real estate for a moment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think most of the personal property will be disposed of within the following year. I am speaking now of war surplus property.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Why not change this date, then, to January 1 and make it a year? Have you any idea we are ever going to wind up the functions of the War Assets Administration, whether it is administered under the War Assets or some other agency?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman has seen the chart showing the reduction from around $25,000,000,000 down to $2,000,000,000 in the 3 years in which the War Assets Administration has been functioning?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, at the same rate they ought to be through, then, within a year?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is my prediction.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has made reference to two kinds of property; first, to personal property, and then to real property. On the whole, I agree with what the gentleman from Michigan has said. However, I do want to make this observation: The condition of the country today, as far as world affairs is concerned, is such that it seems to me we would be doing the country disservice if we required the War Assets Administration to immediately dispose of all of this property that is in its custody. For instance, I have in mind an extrusion plant. Some probably do not know what that is, but it is a big aluminum plant. It cost the Government $13,000,000. It has been declared surplus. They are going to use these new types of airplane that are just now coming to the market. If we dispose of this plant it will be necessary for someone to buy it, to use it, or to convert it into something else. It will be converted. Now if worst comes to the worst, and we should have another war, we would have eighteen or twenty million dollars more and a year or two of extra time required to furnish the very thing we now have. I advocate and urge careful consideration and slow final disposition of real estate and plants and equipment that will be essential and that will be required if we should get into war within the next 6 months or year.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman. That is all very well. My purpose was to call attention to the fact that it is extremely difficult for Congress to do anything about expense, which some of us and some of our constituents seem to think is unnecessary. My folks say, "Why don't you cut out some of these things?" We just heard within the last week about this duplication and unnecessary expense in the departments. Here we are with another one. I am doubtful whether the gentleman's estimate of a year is going to see the end of this.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Michigan and also the gentleman from California this question: If an agency of Government declares any of its property surplus, does that property automatically go to the War Assets Administration?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. May I answer that question?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. At the present time there has been no declaration since 1948 to the War Assets Administration. They were not allowed to receive surplus disposals from any other agency. As a result, in my opinion, we have lost millions of dollars because some of the agencies were not given an opportunity to function on as broad a basis as the War Assets Administration, and they were scrapping material which could have been sold.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Agencies of Government are continually declaring items surplus, are they not?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To what agency do those goods go for disposal?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Some of the agencies dispose of them themselves. If I am in error, the gentleman from California will correct me.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The Treasury Department can dispose, under certain circumstances, of the material, but military agencies in many instances are restricted. They scrap material which could be sold, but they have to scrap it because of certain provisions in the law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And in some instances they scrap it because the administrative cost of trying to dispose of it is greater than the stuff is worth. The Congress attempts to end some of the agencies but they refuse to quit—that is the fault of the Administration—the executive branch—not the fault of the Congress—but we get the blame.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to the hearings on this question. It is astonishing that so much of our war material is being sold as junk; it is a very serious thing. It happened that my colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and I served together in Italy during the last war. Orders came over there for a tremendous amount of aluminum to be sold as scrap. It turned out, however, to be a source of great income for certain persons in Italy. This material was sold in bulk and not by weight. They made a great deal of money out of what we should have had an opportunity to sell ourselves.

Another thing that interests me is the fact that no matter what you try to do, war, from beginning to end, is waste, a waste of human life, a waste of the matériel of a country, and a waste of the natural resources of a country. To me, this bill is merely an effort on the part of our Government to try to salvage as much as possible and to get it back from war purposes into peace purposes.

Another thing in regard to this bill that I also find of great interest is the fact that if we do have a reorganization plan, and I hope we shall have, the Treasury or some other branch of Government will take over the disposition of this material, then we shall have at the disposal of whatever department takes over this work a trained personnel, part of which could be absorbed by the said department and thereby I believe expedite a work that is very necessary after any great conflict.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio yields back 3 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the paragraph under the heading "Surplus Property Disposal" in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, is amended by striking out "February 28, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

SEC. 2. The item "Salaries and expenses" under the heading "Salaries and Expenses, War Assets Administration, Special Fund" in the Supplemental Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1949, is amended by striking out "February 28, 1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no amendments, the Committee automatically rises under the rule.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949, pursuant to House Resolution 96, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### MEMBERS OF THE THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Resolution 49, Seventy-third Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. SMITH, Virginia; Mr. WHITTINGTON, Mississippi; Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, New Jersey.

### MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 816, Eightieth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MAHON, Texas; Mr. BROOKS, Louisiana; Mr. ENGEL, Michigan; Mr. MEYER, Kansas.

### MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL FOREST RESERVATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 16, section 513, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the National Forest Reservation Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. COLMER, Mississippi; Mr. WOODRUFF, Michigan.

### MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, sections 42 and 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. CANNON, Missouri; Mr. COX, Georgia; Mr. VORYS, Ohio.

### THE FREEDOM TRAIN

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 95 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 84) to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments which may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of the time on the rule to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the bill which will be before the committee on adoption of this rule is one that I introduced. Its purpose is to assure continuance of the Freedom Train, as provided in the bill, up to July 4, 1951, which will be the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence.

We know the great results that have flown from the operation of the Freedom Train and its journey throughout the country. Roughly speaking, it visited between 550 and 600 cities and communities. The throngs of people who have gone to see the historical contents of that train have been tremendous.

Already there are close to 600 requests from communities in the United States where the train did not pass through for the visitation of the train if this bill should pass and become law. It is estimated that for the next 2 years it will cost about $2,500,000; $1,500,000 for the first year, and $1,000,000 for the second year. It seems to me that in these days when liberty is being challenged it would be an excellent investment for our Government to assure the continuance of this program through governmental appropriation, and bringing to the people and to the children, to the young men and the young ladies of the different parts of the country, these historic documents to intensify in their minds the meaning of liberty.

Down through the ages comes the cry of great statesmen and of countless millions of people that "Where law ceases, tyranny starts." The meaning of that is that where a government of law ceases to exist, tyranny begins, and where there does not exist a government of law, there must exist a government of men. Liberty, in the case of a benevolent dic-

tator, exists in part only through tolerance and sufferance, or in the case of a vicious dictator, by the modern totalitarian or police state, where liberty is completely suppressed and destroyed. We do not want to live under such conditions.

I want to express my appreciation to our friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for introducing the resolution with reference to Cardinal Mindszenty and Archbishop Stepinac, and to congratulate every Member of the House of Representatives for the unanimous passage of this resolution last week. If the Evangelical ministers who have since been arrested had been arrested then, they would have been included, and should be, in the resolution. I think I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues when I say that while they are not specifically included, we intend that they should be. I would welcome a resolution being introduced covering them, and I would do everything I could to bring it out so that this branch of the Congress would place itself on record emphatically in relation to the arrest and future imprisonment, as the newspapers say, of the 15 ministers of the Evangelical faith in Bulgaria, and do it as strongly as we did in the case of the two churchmen of the creed of which I am a communicant that the House acted upon so decisively last week.

The world, in my opinion, is faced with its most serious challenge in the known history of man. Our way of life is being challenged. We Americans, as Members of the Congress, might disagree on this or that bill; we might have our views with reference to a particular piece of legislation or a portion of a particular piece of legislation, but we all agree in the fundamentals that our Government stands for. We all agree in those fundamentals that make up our way of life, and we all recognize that the fundamentals we believe in come from God Himself, and that when any force undertakes to challenge any organized religion, the members of which believe in God, whether Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, it should be resisted by all means at our command.

I was very proud the other day of the strong statement made by Secretary of State Acheson in condemnation of the tactics of the Hungarian Communist Government in the trial and prosecution of Cardinal Mindszenty. That applied to everyone. While directly applicable to the cardinal, the statement made by Secretary Acheson applied to all others past, present, and in the future, who may be the subject of persecution simply because they believe in God.

I was also very proud of the strong statement made by President Truman condemning the Hungarian Communist Government.

The only offense any of these spiritual men, Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, who have suffered, might be charged with is that they believe in the word of God and are opposed to communism or opposed in any way to the modern totalitarian state. The modern totalitarian state is one that would destroy the dignity of the individual. It is where the individual becomes a cog in the wheel of the institution known as the state, and where the state is supreme and ruthless in compelling obedience on the part of the individual.

We have it behind the iron curtain. One day it is a Catholic priest or a bishop or a cardinal who is persecuted, the next day it is ministers of the Lutheran faith. As a matter of fact, one of the great bishops of the Lutheran faith has also been subjected to persecution in Bulgaria. Now it is the Evangelical faith.

The whole purpose is to try to break down the very backbone of our civilization, without which our civilization could not exist, people who believe in one God and who believe in living up to His law.

We have heard a lot of talk recently about Marshal Tito in Yugoslavia having a break with the Soviet Union. Of course we must view that with considerable suspicion. The sincerity of that must be very carefully inquired into in view of the suspicion, which is justifiable. If Marshal Tito is sincere and there is a break between him and his government and Stalin and the government of the Soviet Union, Marshal Tito could give some very strong evidence to the people of the world of that sincerity by releasing Archbishop Stepinac from jail and letting him go back to his people. He could also evidence it by refusing to allow the Communist guerrillas of Greece to receive aid and assistance from any sources within Yugoslavia.

Those are two actions on the part of Tito that would be very strongly indicative of sincerity on his part when he undertakes to say to the world that there is a break between him and his government and Stalin and the government of the Soviet Union.

A year and a half ago I spoke on the floor of this body—and I do not think I am an alarmist; I try to view things rationally—and I said then and repeat now that the Soviet Union is challenging our way of life; that the ideology known as communism is simply used by the Soviet Union as a nation to deceive people and through it to take over country after country and bring them within the orbit of the Soviet Union; and that the Soviet Union is the most reactionary form of government that could exist. Anything is reactionary that suppresses or destroys the proper exercise of the dignity of the individual.

The Soviet Union is imperialistically inclined. I said that a year and a half ago. Its imperialism takes the form of an ideology to dominate the world. Ultimately every one of their actions is aimed at the United States of America. I said then, and I say now, that world conditions could easily be improved if the representatives of the Soviet Union entered into the council of the nations of the world with a mind of understanding. But as long as they refuse to approach the solution of international questions with an understanding mind, then this constant pressure on their part is going to continue. Where it will lead, one does not have to look very far into the future to determine. There is a point beyond which we cannot permit the pressure to go.

May I say to the Soviet Union that they had better not misunderstand or underestimate the people who are free in the world today. They had better not underestimate the people of America, because where liberty and law cease tyranny begins. That was translated in terms of our American history by Patrick Henry when he said, "Give me liberty or give me death."

The American people can only stand so much, and if the Soviet Union thinks that they can proceed upon the theory that we are afraid of them, they are likely to wake up some morning realizing that they have misunderstood the mind and temper of the people of America, and the mind and temper of the people of free nations of the world which still exist.

We find in the arrest of the cardinal and the arrest of the archbishop and the arrest of the 15 ministers that they are charged with a conspiracy to overthrow their own government, and that they are accused of being agents of the United States.

Every one of these cases starts out with the charge that they are acting for the United States or for the United States and Great Britain. Then, through cruelty and through actions that human beings physically cannot resist, they obtain confessions. Then they go through their trial, which is a sham affair, for propaganda purposes, not only behind the iron curtain but throughout the rest of the world.

While I am talking about propaganda, I am wondering when the distinguished judge in New York, Judge Medina, is going to stop the Communists and their attorneys in New York from using his court for propaganda purposes throughout the world, and behind the iron curtain as well, and instead of putting our whole constitutional system of government on trial, make those attorneys get down to the legal question of whether or not the grand jury was properly selected in accordance with the law of the United States—and not in accordance with the law of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, I speak thusly because all religions are attacked. Our way of life is attacked. The people of America have been tolerant, but we cannot afford to see country after country, with their enemies from within backed and supported by the Soviet Union, against their will being taken out of the orbit of western civilization, which means so much to us, so much to them, and so much to the entire world. There is a time when we must act, and act affirmatively. Russia must, in order to bring about peace, make its contribution and must approach the solution of these problems with understanding not only in Europe but in China as well. We cannot let China become subject to Communist government.

By the way, in my opinion a coalition government of China is nothing but a Communist government, and I hope that the Nationalist Government will not capitulate in China. I hope China will not become subject to domination and become another satellite nation of the Soviet Union.

This is a great question, the world question, the question of the ages. Its solution in the main rests with the United States of America. We of this generation appreciate that for which our forefathers fought. The liberty for which they fought is being threatened today.

Mr. Speaker, the remarks that I have made now will be most appropriate in relation to the joint resolution which will presently be before the House, providing for the extension of the operation of the Freedom Train for the next 2 years.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], has made a very important statement. He has emphasized the very great importance of driving out of our lives those prejudices that make difficult people of the Christian faith and of high purposes joining together and making common cause in resisting the threat of communism that hangs over the world.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few of the Catholic faith who live in my district and therefore no political complexion can attach to the statement that I am about to make. The Christian world and all people who love liberty owe a deep debt of gratitude to the Catholic Church. It is the church that has been taking the brunt of the attack that has come from the east. The head of that church, the Pope of Rome, has for a long while and is now making a tremendous contribution to the endeavor to keep this sick and troubled world in balance, and as one who loves the Government under which we live and who loves liberty, I salute him.

Mr. Speaker, there has developed in certain circles, and I might be specific to the extent of saying Government circles, the habit of defending, and in many instances glorifying, people in the Government service who have been charged with disloyalty. I give you the examples of William Remington and Alger Hiss. The records made by committees of Congress investigating those cases establish beyond the possibility of doubt the fact that both were Communists and both, while holding high positions in departments of the Government, performed as agents of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill which this rule makes in order is to cultivate the love of country and the freedoms that we enjoy. It runs completely counter, however, to what has been the fashion in certain circles as regards the treatment of the Reds who are in and out of Government, all carrying on in the common purpose of undermining and ultimately destroying our whole system of free enterprise, and delivering our country and our people into the keeping of Soviet Russia.

I hope there will not be a single vote against the resolution; and I trust that as a result of the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, there may be forthcoming many Members hitherto completely silent on the question as to whether or not liberty is in danger who will defend the ideals which the gentleman has discussed and join in the determination that liberty shall not perish from the face of this earth.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as me may desire to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD a speech made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to use the time that has been allotted to me to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] one or two questions.

Am I right in understanding the gentleman to state that approximately 500 cities were visited by the Freedom Train during the time it was in operation?

Mr. McCORMACK. I believe I said 500, but the correct number is 325 cities. I understand that about 3,500,000 people visited the train.

Mr. FORD. And about 650 communities have requested that the train visit them?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am informed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the committee, that the number is 581.

Mr. FORD. Is the gentleman at all familiar with, and if so, will he tell us, how the Freedom Train was financed in the past?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The Freedom Train was financed by the American Heritage Foundation, a nonprofit foundation composed of businessmen, industrialists, labor unions, and so forth; the Government had nothing to do with financing the train or with its operation. It has operated for 16 months under the sponsorship of this foundation.

Mr. FORD. That was my understanding. My point is this, and it is rather simple: For the last 16 months the Freedom Train has been traveling all over the country. It so happened that I was connected with the committee in my community that went out and raised $7,500 to bring the train to our city. The money was raised for a most worthwhile purpose. I wholeheartedly subscribe to the program. But the Government did not come to our assistance or the assistance of the other 325 communities which over the past 16 months have shouldered the burden of financing the Freedom Train. Today some 650 additional communities want visits by the Freedom Train. My point is that if these communities want the train they should be willing to raise the necessary money among themselves to bring the train to their citizens.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure the gentleman realizes the difficulty involved as well as he does the importance of having the train visit those parts of the country and those communities it did not visit during the past 16 or 17 months. I think the answer is that the evidence showed it would be very difficult to bring that about because most of the communities that would be visited are the smaller communities of the country, whereas the Freedom Train during the last 16 months or so was visiting the larger communities, among them the great metropolitan centers. I assure the gentleman I respect his viewpoint.

I think the train should visit those parts of the United States that have not been visited before and that it should only revisit those as to which there is some particularly compelling reason why that should be done. I believe further that this train should go into every section of the country that was not visited before. In practical operation, the evidence impressed me it would be very difficult to raise the funds necessary to pay the expense of the train, particularly from communities it will visit, because they are not the large metropolitan centers or substantial-sized cities that the train has visited during the past 16 or 17 months.

Mr. FORD. I am not minimizing the difficulty of raising the money because I am quite familiar with voluntary fund campaigns of this sort. It was a hard job for those who raised the money in the 325 communities and it would be a difficult job for the 650 communities. However, under no circumstances do I wish to have the gentleman or myself interpreted as stating that the communities that now want the train are not patriotic enough to go out and raise the money themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think that is involved. My friend from Tennessee has another observation which I think is very pertinent.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The American Heritage Foundation is not willing to sponsor the train any longer. The train has been put in what we might call cold storage in the railroad yards at Wilmington. We are unable to find another private sponsor and if the Government does not sponsor the train its journey will not be resumed.

Mr. FORD. Have you thought that perhaps the Government might underwrite the portion that the American Heritage Foundation underwrote before and still get community participation by the 650 communities that now want the train to come to them so that the cost can be equalized?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. If the Government sponsors this train it should not charge any city anything for the exhibition of that train in the city. It should be free to the people of every community.

Mr. FORD. That is not the way it was in the last 16 months. The people in the 325 communities paid a share of the cost so that the train could visit them.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I see the logic of the gentleman's argument. On the other hand, I think there is logic in passing this bill. The mere fact that during the last 16 months 325 or more cities and communities contributed toward the expense of this train is valid indication of the interest of the people in the train and I do not think they would object where there is no sponsor to be obtained and where the sponsor of the last 16 months does not desire to continue for the Government continuing it where there is such a demand and where so many fine results would flow to the communities which the train will visit, being the beneficiaries of the visitation of the train at Government expense.

I appreciate the thought expressed by the gentleman. It is a very fine one and under no condition would I take any position except that the gentleman is very discerning in addressing that thought to the attention of the Members; but the fact is we could not get the Government to do this 16 or 17 months ago. The history of this matter is that some individuals, prominent Americans, conceived the idea and approached the Attorney General. The American Heritage Foundation sponsored it. As a result of the experience of the past 16 months we know the great benefits that flowed therefrom. The question is whether or not it is a desirable project to extend for the next 2 years so that it may go into other communities in the United States not previously visited. I think it is and under those circumstances none of the cities and communities visited in the past 16 months would feel very much concerned because they made certain contributions whereas during the next 2 years certain other cities and communities will not make any contribution. I make that statement in light of all the facts.

Mr. FORD. Just one word. I think it is highly desirable that the train go on in the future, but I think it is unfortunate that the proposed procedure is to be followed, because I know that in the communities where the train has been within the last 16 months, the mere fact that the citizens of those communities had to go out and individually raise funds to bring that train to their cities made them appreciate what a wonderful opportunity they had. Their contributions made them realize there was a real importance to those documents that were being brought to their communities for the education of their children, their fellow citizens and themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot challenge what the gentleman says except to draw the line of differentiation. If this bill does not pass, the Freedom Train will not continue. This is the only way by which it will. I agree that if private sponsors could have continued it, and were willing and felt that they could, that it might be more desirable, and this question would not arise. But, in the exercise of their judgments—and I cannot question their judgment—they feel that they cannot continue it. Now we are faced with the proposition whether to discontinue it, and that is what will happen unless it is provided for in this bill.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, of course, will pass, and we shall authorize the continuance of the Freedom Train with the hope that it will be beneficial to the Nation. It is quite evident that it will continue, even though it was started for 2 years, because it is appreciated by the people, and it coincides with the thought of the American people, and particularly the Congress, that once something is started, we always continue it.

I was interested in the very fine moral philosophy threading through the speech of the Majority Leader. I think his words were forceful and well directed toward the danger of the destruction of freedom, not only in this country but in the entire world. We, in America, who have been taught to love freedom and know what flows from it, want to always extend a bulwark if we can, against the danger of communism encompassing our Nation, and the destruction of the freedom and happiness of our people. If we can spend two or three million dollars to encourage freedom in this country, the Congress cannot do a better job than to extend the Freedom Train.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that notwithstanding we have gone through a great war, notwithstanding the good intent of the principles of the "four freedoms", notwithstanding that the war cost $400,000,000,000 and the loss of a great many lives, the world has probably less freedom today than before we fought the recent war for more freedom.

Just within the past few months it appears that 400,000,000 people will come behind the iron curtain in a country with which we have always had the finest relations, China. When that goes, countless millions more will go. So it behooves the Members of this Congress, the President of the United States, and liberty-loving people of this country to be very serious in our effort to help to hold and secure the foundations of freedom in this country.

I think a spiritual resurgence throughout the length and breadth of this country, starting in the home, which is the most important element of government in our country, and going on up through the churches, is one of the finest things that could happen.

I was interested in the reference to the persecution of the religious leaders in Europe. We all condemn such atrocities.

The point I want to emphasize, and I think it is important, is that if we are finally to fight off Russian communism and the communization of the world it will be because we as Members of Congress, in cooperation with the President, conduct the fiscal affairs of this country in such a manner that we shall remain strong financially.

About 160 years ago there was written into the Constitution the power of the Congress of the United States to finance this country through the levying of taxes. With a debt of $252,000,000,000 hanging over the people today there should weigh more heavily on the minds of every Member of Congress that great responsibility, that mandate, if you please, that was written into the Constitution at Philadelphia; that is, to keep this country in a sound financial condition. To do this we shall have to stop waste, extravagance, cut the cost of Government, and constantly reduce the Federal debt.

I do not know what good the Freedom Train will do, but I do know that the Congress of the United States in passing upon legislation day after day has the opportunity to make the greatest contribution we can make to defeat communism's finally encompassing this country. It lies in the Halls of Congress and with the Chief Executive to render the greatest service to promulgate and perpetuate freedom in this country. If we do that we must fight against the constant approach of socialism, which is only the vestibule, which is only the first long step toward totalitarianism and communism in this country. That is something the Members of this Congress might well turn their attention to. It is more important than the Freedom Train.

Freedom in this country is invaluable to us and invaluable to our prosperity. I am for anything that can sell freedom to the people. I am in hopes that this Congress will so conduct itself in this session and in the next session that we may preserve with all of the strength and virility of the past, the financial solvency of this Government, because in the last analysis that is what we will have to rely upon in order to maintain and perpetuate our freedom, and fight off communism.

May I close by saying, let us give a little more genuine attention to the uprooting of the Communists and the containment of the influence of the Communists in this our own country.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust that the resolution which we are now considering will be passed unanimously. In speaking in behalf of the resolution I want to follow a little further along the path which my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], followed in his inquiries to the distinguished Majority Leader. It so happened that during the travels of the Freedom Train, one of the so-called smaller communities of the Nation, which was in my district, desired to have the train go through that section. I had a particularly strong feeling along that line, not only because the particular city was within my district, but because from that city came the second Congressional Medal of Honor man in this war. I speak of Lieutenant Bianchi. We, out in Minnesota, are as deeply patriotic as people in Massachusetts, Tennessee, Texas, or any other part of the country. Although I think the name "Freedom Train" was an attractive slogan, I feel

that it might just as well have been called "The American Train," because that train had as its purpose to call the attention of the people of our great country to the important documents and important events which mean so much to the freedom of the people of America. But whatever the title or name may be, let that train be assigned fairly in going from State to State in calling the attention of all the people of our country to that which the other speakers have so eloquently spoken of, namely the American principles that mean so much to us today and which may be so easily lost tomorrow, if we are not reminded that: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

So, in the operation and administration of the so-called Freedom Train, I hope, as I am sure the attempt has been in the past, and that efforts will be made to see that not only does the Freedom Train go to the large metropolitan centers, but that it will go out to some of the smaller communities where people will drive 50, 100 and 150 miles to see the train because they, too, deeply love the principles of freedom.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the only thing before the House at the moment is the rule which would make it possible to call up and consider House Joint Resolution 84, a bill to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States. If this rule prevails, and I am sure it will prevail, then the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will present the merits of the resolution. There will be adequate debate and I am sure that the legislative committee is prepared to answer all questions.

I favor not only the passage of the rule, but also the resolution. All those who have thus far spoken seem to be of like mind, and most of the debate has been on matter extraneous to House Joint Resolution 84. There have been no discordant tones in the debate, and I concur in the sentiments expressed by each speaker beginning with the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]. Surely the tour of the Freedom Train throughout the last few months has quickened patriotism, impressed our people as to just what the American way of life stands for, and on the whole has been a source of inspiration to all of our people.

The district which I have the honor to represent in Congress is composed of four counties in the southeast corner of Michigan, and the Freedom Train visited the three largest cities in the district. It was my privilege to attend meetings in two of those cities incident to the visit of the train. There was no political partisanship. We were all Americans believing in, and ready to fight for, a common cause. The preservation of our Constitution and the guaranty of freedom under our system of government were spectacularized to the end that the Freedom Train left in its wake a reconsecration on the part of the people to those principles for which our forbears had sacrificed, fought, and even died.

Mr. Speaker, I was permitted to participate in two of these celebrations in my district, and I would repeat here Freedom's Pledge, which was presumably used at every city where the Freedom Train stopped, were it not for the fact that the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] has a copy of the pledge and will include it in the part of his remarks which are to follow.

The committee report accompanying this resolution is most informative and is a concise statement of what the resolution does. It reads as follows:

Under the terms of this resolution the Freedom Train will be continued for a period of approximately 2 years under the sponsorship of the Federal Government. For the past 16 months ending January 22, 1949, the Freedom Train has traveled throughout the United States under the sponsorship of the American Heritage Foundation. The American Heritage Foundation raised privately, through contributions from individuals and business associations, as well as quotas assessed against cities where the Freedom Train was exhibited, funds to cover the operation of the train.

During the 16 months the train operated more than 3,500,000 people visited the train and approximately 45,000,000 persons participated in a week of rededication which preceded the visit of the train to the various cities.

The program of the Freedom Train consisted of three parts. First, there was a continuous campaign of public education utilizing all means of mass communication to persuade the people of the country that "freedom is everybody's job." Second, there was the week of rededication immediately preceding the arrival of the train in each city. And finally, there was the visit of the Freedom Train itself. During the 16 months the train operated it visited 350 cities. It is understood that more than 500 additional communities have requested that they be visited by the Freedom Train.

There is no longer the prospect of a private sponsor or the private financing of the Freedom Train. Under the terms of the resolution the Archivist of the United States would be authorized to operate the Freedom Train. A commission would be established consisting of the following: The President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Attorney General of the United States, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service, and five members to be appointed by the President.

The Archivist, in carrying out the provisions of the resolution, would be required to formulate specific plans covering the program authorized by the resolution, which would include, among other things, plans for the acquisition, operation, exhibition, and disposition of the train.

In the view of the committee, consideration should be given, in the scheduling of the Freedom Train during the period in which it is to be operated under the sponsorship of the Federal Government, to arranging its itinerary so that it will visit, insofar as possible, cities where people have not had an opportunity to see the Freedom Train. The schedule should also reflect a wide distribution throughout the country, visiting the respective congressional districts.

(Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include some excerpts from the committee report.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, the reference just now made by the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] to the pledge of the Freedom Train probably makes it appropriate that I call to the attention of you, my distinguished colleagues in the House, that on the reverse side of my card as Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District is printed the pledge of the Freedom Train, as follows:

I am an American, a free American,
Free to speak—without fear—
Free to worship God in my own way,
Free to stand for what I think right,
Free to oppose what I believe wrong,
Free to choose those who govern my country;
This heritage of freedom I pledge to uphold
For myself and all Americans.

And in many letters which leave my congressional office to go back to my congressional district this printed pledge has been and is daily sent, for it fairly accurately and truly portrays the freedoms which I feel we, as Congressmen must increasingly and more emphatically be willing to fight, and, if need be, die for.

Not yet in this worthy debate has anyone mentioned one of the main reasons, in my judgment, why we should this date vote aye on this bill. It is simply this: That the fact is that the last 16 months' trip of the Freedom Train over the railroad tracks of our Nation has given concrete evidence that the children and youth of our Nation are literally hungry and eager for more knowledge of their heritage and for the background of the beginning and the course of our Nation. I am informed that the great majority of those who visited the Freedom Train in the different cities are children or those of teen-age or of the ages of youth. In other words, gentlemen, the most important segment of our Nation, when it comes to talking in terms of the future strength of our Nation as relates to the freedom of our Nation, is the segment which has most largely attended upon the historical exhibits in the train. One reason for this, of course, is that the schools of the Nation have encouraged the school children to visit the Freedom Train. Likewise, it is because the parenthood of the Nation have seen to it that their children have visited these inspiring and informative exhibits. This is as it should be.

Yet in many places, thousands upon thousands of children and young people and adults could not get access to see these original documents and parchments. This is as it should not be. Every person in America who wishes to see these original documents of our forthright and inspiring history should have an opportunity so to do.

But these people cannot come to Washington—it is too costly and they live too many miles away. These documents have not been injured on the 16-months' journey and the fact that they are looking at the originals instead of copies or replicas is a great inspiration. Let us repeat and extend the opportunity to more millions of the children and youth of America as well as the adults to personally see these original documents.

May I remark that during the war, when I was here as a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress from the great Eighteenth Congressional District of

California, I frequently went across the street to the Congressional Library and there stood in the presence of some of these original documents. It was a great inspiration to stand there quietly for a few minutes and to recollect my reading of the lives and purposes of these great men who participated in the creation of these parchments and in the history leading up to them and following their signatures.

As knowledge is said to always give power, so it must be true that personal observation of these original documents will give to the children and youth of the Nation, as well as the adults, a sense of personally belonging to the Nation. It will give them a sort of feel of what their ancestors did and were trying to do. It will logically result in a thrill of patriotism and resulting devotion to the high purposes for which our Nation was created under God. Our predecessors and forefathers are to be congratulated upon having preserved these documents. But one of the reasons they deserve our congratulations is that they preserved them for posterity; and that part of that posterity is here now in the present generation of the children and youth and adulthood of America.

As only an infinitesimal portion of that population can come to Washington to see these historical documents, we must therefore again send these originals out to the people. This is as it should be. Let us do it cordially and promptly and fully. I congratulate our distinguished majority leader on authoring this bill for this appropriation for the Freedom Train. It is just like JOHN MCCORMACK, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, to be thinking of anything and everything which will strengthen the American way of life and which will perpetuate our freedoms and which will help destroy either communism or any other form of totalitarianism which would destroy the freedoms for which our forefathers, who helped write these documents, fought and died.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCSWEENEY].

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I believe that when every Member of Congress takes upon himself or herself the responsibility of representing the respective districts or States of our country, among those responsibilities is the expenditure of the tax money which is raised by the citizens of our country. One man may feel that his idea of expenditure is better than mine. My idea may differ from that of many Members in the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] will feel one way about an appropriation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] will feel another way about an appropriation. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], who is not only very well informed on, but very much interested in, rural electrification, will feel another way about an appropriation. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. CARL VINSON, the distinguished leader who is doing so much to provide protection for our country, may feel another way about an appropriation. But I may say I have never voted any of my taxpayers' money with a clearer conscience than I will vote for the extension of the use of the Freedom Train to carry these great documents which represent the fundamental things of our country out to the different sections of America.

I feel this train is, in reality, almost a mechanized Paul Revere, carrying into every Middlesex village and farm the things we want the people of our community to see.

I have been a history teacher much of my life, and I always hoped that every graduating class from the high schools of America could come to Washington and there see the great fountainhead of our democracy and the fountainheads of our freedom.

This bill which has been patriotically introduced by our distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] makes it possible for us to carry into all sections of our country these actual fountainheads of the things that we in America so love. Were we sending out replicas or copies, I would be opposed to it. I was much impressed by the fact that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] a few days ago said he wanted to retain, even if only the shell, the old White House, because of our traditional association with it. I feel when I go to Mount Vernon and lean against one of the lintels on the doors that probably George Washington himself might have leaned there. When I walk upon those floors I realize they are the actual floors upon which the father of our country may have strode in past generations.

So today we are not sending out copies but we are sending out the originals of these great documents, that fire the imagination not only of our own people but of the people of the world.

When the New England poet Emerson said:

By the rude arch that spanned the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
There once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world.

I am frank to say that that shot could not have reverberated very long unless we had given meaning to that shot. So the great American, Thomas Jefferson, did not fire a shot, but he fired the imagination of the people by giving them the cause for firing that shot, in the Declaration of Independence which gave the cause for our revolution, and gave those patriotic men the reason for going out and dying for that cause of freedom.

We are not carrying a replica or copy of that great instrument around through the country. We are carrying the very instrument itself, so every child who goes up to that document and looks at it can realize that he is actually feasting his eyes on the very parchment itself, where the hand of Benjamin Franklin and the hand of the other distinguished signers of the Declaration of Independence may have rested—not a parchment like it, but the actual parchment itself. The men who signed their names there knew not what might grow out of their signing these new expressions of human rights, yet they were not deterred and did not falter. I like to know that the original Declaration of Independence is being carried into every Middlesex and village of our great domain, to every municipality, proclaiming to the world that we Americans still stand by it. I like to think that that great document will be carried now to every Middlesex and village by this Freedom Train which this proposed legislation of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] will accomplish; and I hope that every Member of this House will vote this money for the continuation of this great patriotic Freedom Train as gladly as I do.

May I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that one thing that worried me was the fact that these great documents going out as they do to the various parts of our country and passing rather quickly from one atmospheric condition to another, might in some way be jeopardized; but the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] in his very splendid presentation before the committee, assured us that examination and investigation showed that these priceless documents after this first trip of the Freedom Train are as in good condition as they were before they started; so we have nothing to fear by their being subjected to different atmospheric conditions.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree with the gentleman in his statement that it is a most excellent thing for us to send out to the children and the people of this country some of these priceless old documents that have meant so much to this country of ours, a great deal more than a lot of things we are sending out to the people of the country today, because the people who lived in the days when the Declaration of Independence was written and signed, and the other great documents we are supposed to be living under, were men who asked Divine guidance and tried to do the things that would be for the best interest of their country; and they did a wonderful job. While I do not like to spend any $2,500,000 that is not necessary, yet when it is realized what patriotism and beliefs these documents can instill in the children of future generations it is probably the wisest way in which the money could be spent.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. I remember that back in the days of my earliest service in this House a question we frequently heard raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was: "Where is the money coming from?" which is probably not a bad question.

May I answer my colleague from Pennsylvania who spoke about having each community participate in the cost, by saying that in my State, in the thriving, patriotic city of Canton, the largest city in my district, I saw a reverential group standing there waiting for hours for their turn to enter this Freedom Train. There were the rich and the poor man, people from all walks of life, the man of foreign extraction and his family, waiting patiently to see the instruments which made their freedom possible. I

feel that those people of Canton who had to contribute something to bring the train to their city would be very happy to have their Government do something to make it possible for smaller communities less fortunately situated to enjoy the benefits of the train and its inspiration through governmental participation. I am inclined to think that is what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] had in mind when he spoke of the difficulty of some of the smaller communities in raising the money necessary to bring the train to their district.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What testimony was there before the committee as to the continuation of this train after 1951?

Mr. McSWEENEY. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] spoke about that. I believe there is no desire to extend the time of operation beyond that necessary to meet certain requirements. I believe some 580 cities have made a request for the train.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Children will continue to be born, to grow up and become older and older; and I think this demand will run on indefinitely down through the years. I want to raise this question: Is it to be the policy of this Government to run this train ad infinitum; or is this to be cut off in 1951? And was this $3,000,000 item included in the President's budget? If not, why is this proposition here? Somebody has got to pay for it; in this case the taxpayers pay for it. What information can the gentleman give us on that?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I am not a member of the committee that had the bill under consideration. I would like for some member of the committee to answer the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. The Archivist of the United States came before us asking that this train be continued, but he pointed out that it would be impractical to continue it beyond the approximate period set up in this bill because of the value of the documents and the danger that would come to them by the continuous operation of this train.

Under the circumstances, I do not think there will be any further effort made for that reason. There is the matter of the security of the documents and also the fact that about 25 percent of these documents are not the property of the United States Government. They are privately owned but lent for this occasion. I think that in itself would preclude extension of this matter.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman states that all of the documents abroad are original documents?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I understand they are all original documents, especially those for which we have reverence, like the Emancipation Proclamation, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Ordinance of 1787, and so forth.

Mr. GROSS. I think the gentleman will find they are not all original documents.

Mr. McSWEENEY. The ones I have mentioned are original documents.

Mr. GROSS. I understood the gentleman to say they were all original documents.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I think practically all of them are original documents.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McSWEENEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will somebody on that side tell us whether that statement is true?

Mr. McSWEENEY. Is that correct; are they all original?

Mr. MILLER of California. I think practically all of them are original documents.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then, as I understand it, on this train which will travel all over the country, you are taking the original Declaration of Independence, the original draft of the Constitution, and other documents of that nature?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. McSWEENEY. I feel that the effectiveness of this train would be gone if copies only were sent out. That is the thing which is very impressive. A question was asked before as to whether it should be continued indefinitely. I do not think so. We have certain contracts with the Pullman Company for use of the train. I think a time like this, right after the war, when we are trying to reinspire our people with patriotic fervor, is the most important time to have the train go out, but I do not think it need to be continued further.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, it is a source of constant pride to us who are natives of Pennsylvania that those of America who were fortunate enough to visit this train saw the great historical and imperishable documents that existed originally in the city of Philadelphia, then the Capital of the United States of America. It is also a source of gratification to us that our great statesman, Benjamin Franklin, was a signer of both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. It is true that Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, was the only signer of the four great documents of America. I refer to the Articles of Confederation, the Declaration of 1774, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of the United States. But it is to our great fortune and distinct honor that the First Continental Congress met in the city of Philadelphia, and the Second Congress met there also, and from these came first the Declaration of 1774 and the Declaration of Independence, in which every American today is joint heir of their great privileges. Eleven years later, in that same city and in that same hall, there was given to the world the greatest document that ever fell from the hands of man, so characterized by Gladstone, the Constitution of the United States of America, which has guaranteed to us and to every person who has come to these shores the right of imperishable liberty. Then it is also to our great honor that on the field of Gettysburg Abraham Lincoln gave to the world that immortal statement of the rights and freedoms of human mind and human liberty, and therefore we are rich indeed in our heritage. Consequently we are only too glad that those documents have been moved here to our Capital, where all who visit here may view them. It is a matter of record that many people did not get to see them while the Freedom Train was here, but, by the same token, the great railway systems of America, by doing a magnificent job in safely transporting these documents throughout the length and breadth of our great domain, made it possible for millions of people to have an opportunity to see them, which otherwise they would not have had. I think we can allay the fears of those who fear that this will run on interminably, and that the price will be too high if we continue it for some time. Every boy and girl in America who sees these vital documents will be inspired to have greater faith in this country, to believe in its traditions, to be proud of its heritage, to hold up to the world and defend our freedoms that we so richly enjoy. Let us have no fear on the pecuniary side. We are giving to the world at this critical time, a world broken, shattered, distracted, the greatest exemplification of our national unity, of our history, of our determination that this world will survive, that America shall be the land of the free, and here God will bless us all if we carry on in the true spirit and the highest traditions of our forefathers. God bless America.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 84) providing for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 84, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], providing for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the

United States, was reported unanimously for passage by your Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service. It is the purpose of this resolution to provide for the continuance of the Freedom Train under Government sponsorship for a period of approximately 2 years.

The Freedom Train consists of an engine and seven cars. I might say that the engine was donated by the American Locomotive Co. The use of three of these cars for display purposes, and one baggage car, were given free to the American Heritage Foundation, the sponsors of the Freedom Train, by the Pennsylvania and the Santa Fe railroads. The three Pullman cars which house the personnel accompanying the train were leased to the American Foundation at a rental of $25 for each car per day by the Pullman Co. Three of these cars are specially constructed for the security of the priceless documents transported in them.

In all, there are 127 documents, about 25 percent of which are owned by private individuals and about 75 percent of which belong to the Government. These documents concern our American heritage of freedom, and include such priceless documents as the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, and President Lincoln's Gettysburg Address.

During the past 16 months the train traveled nearly 40,000 miles and visited 325 cities under the sponsorship of the American Heritage Foundation; 3,500,000 people visited the train and saw these immortal, priceless documents which it contains. More than 45,000,000 people participated in the week of rededication to our American principles, which was a program carried on just prior to the arrival of the Freedom Train in the respective communities.

The Freedom Train and its program came to an end on January 22, 1949, and it will be discontinued permanently unless it is continued under the sponsorship of the Federal Government.

The American Heritage Foundation, which arranged for the financing of the Freedom Train by private contributions, the sale of publications and pamphlets, and quotas raised by the cities which the train visited, has determined that it can no longer continue to operate the train as it has in the past.

You may be interested in a brief statement with respect to the operation of the train under the American Heritage Foundation. The foundation was composed of leaders in business, education, and labor. The foundation made all the necessary arrangements with respect to the financing, scheduling, and setting up of the train. It acquired documents on loan from the Government, principally from the Archives and the Congressional Library, and from private collections. It arranged for the special construction of the train, which placed primary emphasis on the security of these priceless documents.

The program for the Freedom Train consisted of three parts. First, there was a continuous campaign of public education utilizing all means of mass communication to persuade people that freedom is everybody's job. Secondly, immediately preceding the visit of the train to a community there was a week of rededication, wherein special public programs were carried out. And third, there was the actual visit of the Freedom Train itself. The Archivist of the United States stated in his testimony before our committee that he proposed to operate the train in much the same manner as the American Heritage Foundation and within the policy laid down by the Freedom Train Commission as provided for in the resolution.

You will note that our committee has made seven amendments to the resolution. While I will be glad to discuss in detail any one of them, in general these amendments provide for a clearer delineation of the respective authority and responsibility of the Freedom Train Commission and the Archivist. Under the resolution, as amended, the train will be operated by the Archivist of the United States. The Archivist will be required to formulate plans for its acquisition, operation, and exhibition. These plans must be presented to the Freedom Train Commission and must be approved by the Commission before the Archivist can put them in operation.

The Freedom Train Commission is composed of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives; the chairmen of the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees, the Attorney General of the United States, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and five members to be appointed by the President.

It is estimated that the cost of operating the train for the next 2 years will be about $2,500,000. However, this amount will naturally depend upon a justification of the expenditures through regular legislative channels. The bill was amended so as to provide that not more than $3,000,000 could be expended in the acquisition and operation of the train.

I might state here now concerning the acquisition of the train that the Government will not buy the train. It expects to get an engine donated by the Army. It has the assurance that the Pennsylvania and Santa Fe railroads will continue to let the Government use the four cars containing these exhibits and the baggage and fire-fighting equipment free of charge. The only expense in connection with the use of the train will be the rental from the Pullman Co. of the 3 Pullman cars for which the American Heritage Foundation had to pay $25 a day each. The many requests that have been received for the exhibition of the train in cities where people have not yet had an opportunity to see it, and the spontaneous and enthusiastic response given the train during the 16 months' tour, when it was exhibited, amply justifies the passage of this resolution.

I might say that the train started its journey at Philadelphia and ended its journey in the same city. When the train visited Philadelphia at the close of its journey, there were more people to see the train then than there were when the train began its journey. The train was here in Washington during the inaugural ceremonies. Five hundred and eighty-one cities have already requested a visit of the Freedom Train.

The Freedom Train under the American Heritage Foundation visited principally large metropolitan cities. It visited few cities of less than 40,000 population. It is the purpose of the Archivist to have the Freedom Train in the next 2 years visit the smaller communities, and the smaller towns and cities of the United States. It is also the plan of the Archivist to have the Freedom Train during the next 2 years visit every one of the 435 congressional districts. The train stands as a symbol of our American way of life, our American traditions, our heritage, our liberty, and our individual freedom. It teaches a valuable lesson in citizenship training and citizenship responsibilities and is a great patriotic contribution. I am so eager for the school children and all other young Americans in the cities where the train has not yet visited to have the opportunity and privilege to visit the train and to see the precious and immortal documents contained in the exhibition on the train.

I trust there will be no opposition to this resolution, as I feel it is most worthy and deserving.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of our committee, Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee, who, I believe, has presented this matter in a most able manner. There is little that I can add which would be of assistance in explanation of this legislation. There are a few things, however, I would like to point out.

Together with other Members of the Committee and House, we hope that a great deal of good may be accomplished by the Freedom Train. Something has been said about the need of this train going to the hinterlands. I am in accord with that view. I want this train to go out where people do not have as much opportunity perhaps of viewing these very valuable documents. But I am inclined to believe that the lessons we get from these documents and the things we expect our people to learn by reason of them could well be emphasized in some of the large places.

I think it is fair to call attention to the fact that this legislation is going to cost an additional $3,000,000. I trust that the hope of the sponsors of this legislation may be realized and that the use of the train may be worth even more than the expenditure involved. I agree, too, it is impossible to measure in monetary terms what may be accomplished by reason of this legislation if complete use is made of it.

I believe, as the sponsors do, that the train should be exhibited in smaller places where people do not have access to opportunities of this kind, and I hope the tour of the train may be distributed so it will go to all parts of the country. I do, however, want to remind you on

this occasion that the need of the teachings to come out of the use of this train is just as important, or more important, in the larger centers than in what have been described as the hinterlands today. I would remind you that you will find the spirit of freedom, liberty, and genuine patriotism running pretty high in the so-called hinterlands as compared with that in some of our congested areas. This statement is not made by way of criticism but to suggest that it is entitled to your sober consideration. That is pretty important right now.

Sponsors of the legislation have directed attention to the need or the value of the Freedom Train being visited by the younger people of our country. I think that is extremely important. I do not believe we realize quite so much as we should the responsibility we are passing on to the coming generation. Those of us in the present generation cannot point with too much pride with regard to what has beeen done in recent years in the protection of what is known as the American way of life. It seems to me we do not quite appreciate as much as we should the fact that when our country is in trouble we depend upon the younger people to get us out. They are the ones who fight the battles and make the sacrifice. They are the ones who come forward in the time of emergency. I trust that the use of the Freedom Train may accomplish the purpose that the sponsors of this legislation believe it will do. There never has been a time when the people of our country needed the rebaptism in the meaning of liberty and freedom than right now.

Again I call attention to the sponsors of the legislation to see that the documents so valuable and so precious may be carefully guarded and protected and safely returned to their proper places when the journey of the Freedom Train has been completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, there seems to be no diversity of opinion about the proposition that everything that the Congress can do to familiarize our people with the principles laid down in the Constitution should be done.

We have been told during the last 2 or 3 years, or perhaps longer, about the Communists who were infiltrating into labor unions, into the schools, into the churches, and into the Federal Government itself right here in Washington. Something should be done to counteract the things that the Communists are teaching, to not only our young folks but our older people.

Every time I return to my district I learn that the people at home—and I say this with apologies to my colleagues—seem to have clearer, sounder ideas about patriotism, about the way the Congress should direct the affairs of the Nation than do we here in Congress.

It has always seemed to me that there was a sort of muddled or muddied thinking here in Washington. Before I came here I had heard a great deal about the beautiful Potomac. Well, in Michigan we have clear water running over gravelly bottoms in the streams, and all sorts of bass, trout, and game fish. I notice the gentleman from the northern peninsula has risen to his feet.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. POTTER. Just where did the gentleman catch his bass?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, that is a long story. If the gentleman from Kansas will give me a little more time I will tell it. First, from the age of, say, 4 on until 16 or 18 in the St. Joe River of Michigan, not in the northern peninsula.

Mr. POTTER. But where did the gentleman catch his good bass?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then later in the Kalamazoo before the industrial plants polluted the waters so you can almost walk on them and never can see down through any more. Then later on up in the gentleman's territory—rather, in the northern part of southern Michigan—trout, you know—my grandson John says, "So long," spreading his hands and keeps watching until I tell him where to stop—wonderful country; and still later up in the northern peninsula, in the district so ably represented by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BENNETT] and of course in the Fox, the Sucker, the Hurricane, and other streams in the district of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. POTTER].

But we are not talking about fishing, not clear water, in lakes or streams; but about this Potomac. When I got a look at it I would not think of washing my feet in it, to say nothing of taking a bath. And over the years the thinking, the thinking that you pick up, the idea and the plans that you pick up here in Washington, they are a mess; they are a mess. Muddled thinking—muddied thinking.

I am all for the Freedom Train, anything that will teach patriotism—most of the people know enough in theory about our Government—is all right. But how would it be if instead of spending our efforts and this $3,000,000 to teach our constituents, the poor folks back home who, apparently some of us think do not know anything about this business of freedom and constitutional government, how would it be if we were to run a train—well, you could not run it through the well of the House, bring it in on the Republican side and run it out over there on the Democratic side minus—something maybe of constitutional government—you could not do that exactly; even though we need these lessons on patriotism, this inspiration to follow the old Constitution far more than do our people at home but how would it be if we would put on an amendment to this bill requiring every Member of the House and the other body to go over and read the Declaration of Independence, the Bill of Rights, the Constitution, and then sit down on the porch if he wished in a rocking chair with a pipe and think about what he has read; do a little sober, conscientious thinking about the old Constitution and whether we are not drifting into socialism, and just how far we are today on that road. I wonder if that would help?

How about right here in the Congress, right here from the well of the House, a little adherence to the rules laid down in the Constitution?

All right; when I think about the Constitution and the principles of the Constitution I cannot help thinking sometimes about what we are doing here in Congress; how from day to day, week after week, we, first in one way and then in another, surrender our duties, our congressional duties, to the Executive, to the bureaucrats, to rules and regulations promulgated by them.

If I remember correctly the Constitution states that the legislative power is vested in the Congress, the House and the Senate; yet the other day—there were only nine votes against the proposition; I was away doing some other work; if I had been here I would have voted against it, too, and that would have made ten—yet the other day, notwithstanding that provision of the Constitution that Congress shall legislate for the people, what did we do? We transferred that constitutional legislative power and duty to the President and said that anything he might send down in the way of a plan affecting the executive departments would be all right unless we vetoed it.

These home folks you are thinking so much about and are so afraid they will not know about patriotism and constitutional processes, all of those folks out in the sticks, if I may so refer to the localities in which they live, know that under the Constitution a proposition can only become the law of the land if it receives a majority vote of each House of the Congress. Yet we changed all that and provided anything the President wants done, if it has to do with the executive departments, will become the law of the land unless each House of the Congress vetoes it. So the kids out in the country read the Constitution, but they will say, "Yes, that is all right, but that is not the way they do it nowadays down in Washington. Our Congress has provided that we do it this way. The President suggests and it is the law unless the Congress vetoes."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A moment ago a question was raised as to whether the original documents were aboard the Freedom Train. I am informed that the original Bill of Rights was aboard the train but neither the Constitution of the United States nor the Declaration of Independence were aboard the train.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The original drafts of the Constitution and Declaration of Independence are on the train.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. With the interlineations made in the script.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no; not the original documents.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. The original drafts of the documents.

Mr. GROSS. No. I just talked to the Archivist about that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think this is the answer as to the differentiation between the drafts and the original documents. The original drafts are on the train but the original documents are not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, just how much of the people's power entrusted to us have we given away? You will recall that the Congress under the Supreme Court decision and the Constitution has the authority to inquire through committees and obtain information which is necessary to enable it to legislate. There is no question about that provision. Yet in the last session of Congress, when a legislative committee sought information from an adviser to the President of the United States, the committee was twice denied this testimony. A letter came up from the adviser saying that on order of the President he would have to refuse to appear or testify.

The power denied by the President to the Congress he delegates to 14 departments of the Government.

Has that any significance in your mind? I thought of it when I read Executive Order 133 put out on February 8; I began to wonder just how far our power was being taken away from us and just how much of our power the Executive was assuming and delegating to the executive departments and agencies.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10033—ANOTHER STEP ON THE ROAD TO DICTATORSHIP

As though we were not moving fast enough toward socialism through the centralization of power and its application by the Federal Government to States and local authorities, a step which will hasten that trend is Executive Order 10033 issued by the President on February 8, 1949.

Notwithstanding statutory provisions giving to congressional committees the power to subpena witnesses to obtain information which would enable them to perform their constitutional duty to legislate wisely for the benefit of the people and the Nation, the President twice within the past year directed one of his advisers, John R. Steelman, to refuse to appear before a congressional committee. That committee was seeking to ascertain whether Mr. Truman was throwing his weight behind a labor union which had called a strike in 40 cafeterias serving Government employees. The union's officers had refused to sign the anti-Communist affidavits required by the Taft-Hartley Act.

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, frequently at the President's elbow on legislative matters, also refused to appear before a committee which sought to ask him whether he, as president of the CIO, approved of goon squad raids in connection with strikes and picket lines maintained by CIO locals advised by international CIO officials.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10033

Apparently, it is a horse of a different color when the President or some of his political advisers seek to pry into the business secrets and production methods of American farmers, businessmen, and industrialists.

The latest drive toward dictatorial power grows out of Executive Order 10033 issued February 8, 1949, by Mr. Truman. Briefly, that order recites that whereas the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member have need for statistical information which can be supplied by the Government of the United States, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is given authority to determine, in concurrence with the Secretary of State, what information shall be given to official requests received by the United States Government from these other organizations. When that has been determined by the Director, then, to collect that information, authority is given to 14 departments of the Government to—and note this—by subpena or otherwise, require any person to appear and furnish such information.

Now, get that: The power given by the Constitution and by Federal law to congressional committees has been challenged by the President. But the President claims the right by Executive order to require any citizen anywhere to appear before any or all of 14 Government departments or agencies, turn himself and his business secrets wrongside out, and disclose any and all information which those agencies or any one of them may request.

That order, if followed through, turns inside out every production and business agency in the United States and makes available to the United Nations and any intergovernmental organization of which this country is a member the secrets and methods of every individual engaged in any occupation, profession, or business. That information, once in the hands of the United Nations or other intergovernmental organization, will inevitably get into the hands of competitors of our economic system.

Individuals and organizations in other lands in competition with our citizens, partnerships, and corporations, without any return will reap rewards of our initiative, reasearch, and experiments.

Our citizens will be required to give the people of other lands the benefit of everything we have; in return they give us nothing except competition. Through propaganda and rubber-stamp legislation over the past 10 years, the administration has been giving away dollars and materials until there has been created here at home the groundwork for a depression. Now, by Executive order, the President proposes to turn loose upon the citizen a horde of investigators and questioners who will strip us of whatever advantage we may now hold in production because of our efficiency and progressiveness.

We sow, they harvest.

The order is as follows:

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10033

*Regulations governing the providing of statistical information to intergovernmental organizations*

Whereas the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations of which the United States is a member have need for statistical information which can be supplied by the Government of the United States; and

Whereas the burden imposed on this Government in connection with providing such information to such organizations should be the minimum compatible with adequacy of information; and

Whereas a systematic procedure for furnishing such information will conserve effort and improve the quality and comparability of the data furnished:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the statutes, including section 8 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act (59 Stat. 515; 22 U. S. C. 286f), and as President of the United States, it is hereby ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. Except as provided in section 2 hereof, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, hereinafter referred to as the Director, (a) shall determine, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, what statistical information shall be provided in response to official requests received by the United States Government from any intergovernmental organization of which this country is a member, and (b) shall determine which Federal executive agency or agencies shall prepare the statistical information thus to be provided. The statistical information so prepared shall be transmitted to the requesting intergovernmental organization through established channels by the Secretary of State or by any Federal executive agency now or hereafter authorized by the Secretary of State to transmit such information.

SEC. 2. (a) The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, hereinafter referred to as the National Advisory Council, shall determine, after consultation with the Director, what information is essential in order that the United States Government may comply with official requests for information received from the International Monetary Fund or the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

(b) The Director shall determine which Federal executive agency or agencies shall collect or make available information found essential under section 2 (a) hereof.

(c) In the collection of information pursuant to a determination made by the Director under section 2 (b) hereof in response to a request under article VIII, section 5, of the Articles of Agreement of the International Monetary Fund, the authority conferred on the President by section 8 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to require any person to furnish such information, by subpena or otherwise, may be exercised by each of the following-named agencies:

Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of the Interior.
Department of Labor.
Department of the Treasury.
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.
Federal Communications Commission.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
Federal Power Commission.
Federal Trade Commission.
Interstate Commerce Commission.
Securities and Exchange Commission.
United States Maritime Commission.
United States Tariff Commission.

(d) The information collected or made available under section 2 of this order shall be submitted to the National Advisory Council for review and for presentation to the said Fund or Bank.

(e) As used in this order, the word "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, or association.

SEC. 3. The Director's determination of any matter under section 1 or section 2 (b) of this order shall be made after consulting appropriate Federal executive agencies and giving due consideration to any responsibility now exercised by any of them in relation to an intergovernmental organization.

SEC. 4. This order shall not be construed to authorize the Director or the National Advisory Council to provide, or to require any Federal executive agency to provide, to an intergovernmental organization (a) information during any period of time when the agency having primary responsibility for security of the specified information declares that it must be withheld from the intergovernmental organization in the interest of military security, or (b) information which any Federal executive agency is required by law to maintain on a confidential basis.

SEC. 5. The Director and the National Advisory Council are authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out their respective responsibilities under this order.

SEC. 6. To the extent that this order conflicts with any previous Executive order, the provisions of this order shall control.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 8, 1949.*

[F. R. Doc. 49-1027; Filed, Feb. 8, 1949; 10:49 a. m.]

Mr. Chairman, our people at home, in my humble judgment, are more familiar with the principles laid down in the Constitution and adhere more closely to constitutional methods and procedure than does the Congress—the Congress all too often amazes the people who would be reached by the Freedom Train by its disregard of simple, clear constitutional provisions.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY].

A DEMONSTRATION OF FAITH

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a great demonstration of the faith we have in the tradition and history of our country that we are anxious to send through this land a Freedom Train bearing the precious documents which have done so much to make our heritage a glorious one.

It is our hope that this cavalcade of our history will cause men and women and boys and girls everywhere to pause and give thanks for the foresight of our ancestors and that it will inspire them to match this foresight, today, with action and deeds.

BEWARE OF INDIFFERENCE

We so often say that our country is at the crossroads of history. We lay the blame for this period of unrest to the attack of outside interests. We spend a great deal of time voicing our fears that other governments are planning to destroy our country. And yet, I think it can be safely said, that the greatest danger our country would ever have to endure would not be from outside forces of any kind, but from the indifference of our own people.

FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

Present plans for extending the tour of the Freedom Train for two more years call for stops where the train has not yet visited—in the smaller towns and villages of our country. I am glad that the history-laden train would go to these smaller communities, because I think the people of these communities have time and again demonstrated their willingness to be first when there is fighting to be done—to be first when there are taxes to be paid—to be first when there is work to be done for the general welfare of their country. So often it is upon these people that we depend for inspiration and resourcefulness as we grope for the answers to the perplexing problems facing us. It is only right, then, that the Freedom Train should go to the people in these communities.

MEANINGFUL DEMOCRACY

We can perform no greater service for the youth of our land than to make the most of every opportunity available for them to see democracy in action—to see it so that they will grow up understanding and practicing it. As the boys and girls of our land grow into adult citizens they can carry with them the inspiration of having seen an original draft of our Constitution—as well as having studied about it—of having read the original Declaration of Independence manuscript in Thomas Jefferson's handwriting—as well as having memorized it.

THOUGHTS OF OUR TIMES

Many of the documents of the Freedom Train seem to have been written for our own day. When we think of the oppressed people of other lands we like to repeat the words of the first 10 amendments to our Constitution. We feel secure in our own Bill of Rights.

It gives us a reassuring feeling to read the famous letter written by Robert E. Lee when at a time of confusion and turmoil he wrote his answer to the board of trustees who had offered him the presidency of Williams College. He said he felt "the duty of every citizen in the present condition of the country is to do all in his power to aid in the restoration of peace and harmony."

These are but several of the documents that will be on view to the boys and girls of our country when they visit the Freedom Train.

FOR TOMORROW'S CITIZENS TODAY

Perhaps through the inspiration of a visit to the Freedom Train somewhere, somehow, a boy will be imbued with the will to work toward advancing the cause of peace or the rights of mankind. Or, perhaps, a girl will be led into the schoolhouse of tomorrow to impart to the youngsters of her day an enthusiasm and zeal for patriotism greater than has ever before been known.

The Freedom Train leaves a great trail of food for thought behind as it winds its way across the country. It reminds us that we each have the responsibility of being alert, active citizens—not only for ourselves as we face the problems of living today but for our children who will some day be shouldering these same responsibilities.

In less than a score words, Ralph Waldo Emerson gave my thoughts on this subject when he said:

> For what avail the plough or sail,
> Or land or life, if freedom fail?

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT].

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, within a period of 3 minutes I do not have ample time to make a reasonable statement in opposition to the passage of this bill. Of course, it is not popular to stand here and make a speech against a bill that affords so many Members of Congress the opportunity to make patriotic speeches.

Soon after World War I, the only Communist college ever to exist in the United States was established near Mena, in Polk County, Ark., which school was known as the Commonwealth College. It became my pleasant duty during the year of either 1941 or 1942, while serving as prosecuting attorney of the Ninth Judicial District of Arkansas, of which Polk County was a part, to close the college and remove the Communists from that section of our country. We in western Arkansas knew in those early days the Communists whose names have now become so well known throughout the Nation. Even though a few of the national magazines did lend a helping hand, we were unable to, at that time, convince the people just what the Communists were doing and hoped to do in this country. Our story meant but little and few cared to listen until here of late. Being informed as I was, even during the period of time that we were fighting on the side of communism during World War II, I well knew that we could be in no better position than maybe on the side of the lesser of two evils—and, even though I dared not say so, I doubted that we were placing our assistance on the side of the lesser of the two evils.

The Commonwealth College existed in Arkansas for a good many years, and yet the teachings and preachings of that institution, supported by the Communists, did not change the beliefs of the neighbors of that college. The only Communists ever at or near the site of Commonwealth College were the teachers and students of that institution. Since the termination of that Communist school, we have no followers of the communistic belief within that area. I contribute this fact to the proven theory that to actually know communism makes stronger followers of democracy.

This bill is requesting an expenditure of $3,000,000 to further the teachings of democracy in a land of democracy—as though it were necessary to teach democracy in order to encourage the people of the United States to believe in democracy. Were such a bill advocated for the teaching of communism in Russia, we would argue that it had become necessary for the Communists to sell their wares and attempt to propagandize their own people to follow their teachings. It has never been necessary in America to teach democracy because actions speak louder than words and we are sold upon our system of freedom.

Were this requested expenditure to enlighten our people of communism in order that all of us might better appreciate democracy, then I would favor the immediate passage of this legislation. However, this bill purports to do nothing other than to teach the people that which they already know—there not being a school child in this democracy who has not been versed in every document that the Freedom Train carries. The sponsors of this proposed expenditure are advocating same upon the anti-Communist theory, which for the aforementioned reasons, in my opinion, is not sound.

I would hesitate to protest the spending of this enormous amount of money for the continuation of the Freedom Train travels if the project were being advanced for educational purposes which are not mentioned. In answer to such proposal, I might state that as per past experience of the Freedom Train travels, only the boys and girls in the larger cities of the United States of America would receive any benefit from the extended travels. The boys and girls from the forks of the creek and within the hill countries of my State and your State, who are entitled to equal opportunities with the boys and girls from the larger cities of the East and elsewhere for preparation to compete in the battle of life in this great world of competition, will not benefit from a continuation of the Freedom Train travels.

Heretofore, the travels of the Freedom Train have been financed by the interested individual citizens. My people are already sold upon democracy and do not need any Freedom Train to convince them that communism is not sound. It seems to me that New York and other places within that section along the seaboard, where Communists are running at large, most need the services of the Freedom Train, and should be willing to bear the expenses for the continuation of its travels in order to sell their people upon democracy.

This Congress considers $3,000,000 a mere drop in the bucket in face of the billions of dollars that we are now indebted. Perhaps we can stand this expenditure, which is a drop in the bucket compared with the over-all indebtedness. I am certainly at a loss to know how we are to ever reduce our indebtedness by continuously authorizing every proposed mode of spending additional moneys. Even though I am a new Member of Congress and unknown to most of you, I have no doubt that before this session of Congress has ended that you will know that I am not a reactionary in any sense of the word—but, honestly, gentlemen, the manner in which we nonchalantly authorize expenditures would stagger the most devout liberal.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. I am sorry that we cannot make the operation of the freedom train continuous, but for reasons that were stated a few minutes ago that is going to be impossible. I wish it were possible to send this train throughout the length and breadth of this country on a continuous mission, that all children in all generations could see the precious documents that it contains.

In my own experience I hark back to the period shortly after I finished my education, when in 1915 the city of Philadelphia generously lent to the Panama Pacific International Exposition the Liberty Bell. I remember the people who traveled from all over the West to San Francisco to see that historic symbol. It is the one thing that stands out in that great exposition, as far as I am concerned. I have had the opportunity of seeing that Liberty Bell many times since yet I still stand in awe and reverence in its presence.

Perhaps we who live here in Washington become calloused to the value of the documents that go forth throughout the country on the freedom train. To cite an old adage, "Familiarity breeds contempt." We do not appreciate what seeing these original drafts or original documents mean to the people of the United States. I join with my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] in trying to impress this upon you.

Mr. Chairman, one of the primary purposes of this joint resolution is to augment the citizenship training of our school children. The public, private, and parochial schools through the country already are giving increasing attention to this important program. But as the New York Times reported some time ago after a Nation-wide survey, many persons of school and college age are woefully ignorant regarding many basic facts about American history as well as the rights and obligations of citizenship.

The tour of the Freedom Train to the 48 States and the District of Columbia has done much to stimulate an appreciation of our American heritage. Here are some first-hand reports from various sections of the country that show that the Freedom Train and its patriotic and educational program has more than temporary benefits. I would like to quote part of a letter dated January 19 from Mr. Roscoe Clark, of the Eli Lilly & Co., who served as chairman for the Freedom Train committee during the train's exhibition in Indianapolis last summer. I quote:

> You will be interested to know that there are still echoes of the Freedom Train in Indianapolis. The school system has issued a 28-page booklet on the subject as a manual for the teaching profession of this county, numbering some 2,300 teachers.

In Denver, Colo., the city department of education inaugurated a special study program devoted to our American heritage. This program in Denver started as early as the opening of the school year in September 1947, even though the Freedom Train was not scheduled to reach that city until almost 6 months later.

In San Francisco, as a result of the Freedom Train visit and school program, a group of patriotic local citizens created a permanent Freedom Train scholarship fund. This fund will award college scholarships to winners of essay contests among San Francisco school children dealing with the subject of good citizenship.

In New York City the impact of the Freedom Train program was particularly effective. Unfortunately, because of the limited time in which the train could be exhibited in New York City, only a small fraction of the city's school children could view the priceless documents aboard the train. I might add that this has been true of all the larger cities so far visited by the train. Nevertheless, officials of the New York school system made every effort to bring home through mass meetings, class-room discussions, and special assemblies a better appreciation of our political system and the priceless liberties we enjoy as Americans in a world beset with totalitarian philosophies.

Another demonstration of the dramatic acceptance of the Freedom Train took place in Virginia. When the train came to Danville, school authorities from communities 100 miles distant chartered a special train to bring 2,000 youngsters to the Freedom Train. For the great majority of these boys and girls it was the first time they had ever ridden on a railroad train.

I would like to quote from another letter. This was written last October by the superintendent of schools of Bristol, Tenn., Mr. Clement M. Eyler. Mr. Eyler says, and I quote:

> Bristol, Tenn., had a genuine rededication week for the Freedom Train. It is my confirmed opinion that this experience in the lives of the children of our public schools was for the best interest of our form of government and that it will carry over with our children as long as they live.

These are just a few of the many typical letters that have come from educators from all over the United States during the past year. In nearly every city where the Freedom Train has stopped on a school day the story has been the same. There have been school pilgrimages with special trains and busses. Many of these children traveled as much as 200 miles to see this historic exhibit.

Throughout every Rededication Week that was staged in the cities along the tour, special stress has been placed on the school children. The freedom pledge has been taken in virtually every schoolroom. In Philadelphia, New York, and Boston the pledge was directed by loud-speaker to every class. School contests on the heritage theme have been held in scores of communities. Prizes have been awarded by newspapers, radio stations, veterans' groups, and other civic organizations.

Most parent-teacher associations have sponsored local school programs on the heritage theme. The Freedom Train study guide prepared with the help of the National Education Association is now being used by hundreds of school systems in classes in English, social studies, and American history.

Truly, Mr. Chairman, the tour of the Freedom Train and its important message has been an overwhelming influence in stirring the patriotism of millions of

American people. But the job is only beginning. The limitations of time and resources that have been at the disposal of the American Heritage Foundation have prevented the spread of this program into hundreds of cities and towns. When the tour started at Philadelphia late in September 1947 it was planned to visit only 300 cities. This finally was increased to 324. In most places the Freedom Train stopped only for 1 day. This meant that only a small part of the school children and the adult population of these communities had the opportunity to go aboard. Hundreds of cities were necessarily bypassed, particularly the towns of 25,000 population or less. I believe that this tour and the patriotic and better citizenship program should be extended so that all these cities and towns that were not included in the train itinerary will have the same opportunity to rededicate themselves to our American heritage.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, this bill interests me. I grew up in the backwoods. I attended a one-room schoolhouse, and had one teacher. I recall what happened to me when I first saw some of these documents that have been referred to. It is something that gives a backwoods boy or girl a great thrill. But we here in the United States have a tax problem, a budget problem, a debt problem. I have great respect for taxpayers and bond buyers. As you have heard many times we have a budget before us amounting to $42,000,000,000. The President is asking for $4,000,000,000 in additional taxes, and $2,500,000,000 in social-security taxes. That brings the deal up to about $48,500,000,000. That is something to think about. I raised the question a while ago as to whether or not this $3,000,000 was in the budget which was submitted. I do not assume that it was. Here is another expense to put on the taxpayers and the bond buyers of this country. It reminds me of something that a great American said within the last few hours. He is a great educator and a great soldier who has been called back to Washington this very week to help the administration get out of some of its difficulties. I refer to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower. In speaking at a symposium on freedom at the First Annual Columbia College Forum on Democracy just the other night, he had this to say. I am quoting from the press report:

> Eisenhower on leave from his post as president of the university did not refer to his newly assigned duties as presiding officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Instead he said, "It is the dictatorship born of a surrender of our own responsibilities and therefore a surrender of our own thought, and of our own ideas and our own right to exercise our vote indicating the policies of this country."

He quoted Lincoln, in which Lincoln said:

> I have been given a job to do for the United States; that job I will do.

Then the general spoke, and he said:

> In sum, these results will come from a constant drift toward centralized Government; There will be a swarming of bureaucrats over the land. Ownership of property will gradually drift into that Central Government, and finally you have to have a dictatorship as the only means of operating such a huge and great organization.
>
> I believe that it is things such as that that we must watch today if we are going to be true to the standards that Lincoln gave to all of us.

Those words are from General Eisenhower, who was called down here at this very moment. He fears that type of dictatorship. He fears the acquisition of ownership and management by the Government. He fears that we will remove the freedoms of our people.

I would like to see this Congress furnish the necessary leadership to our people to have education put into the hearts and minds of our children by State and local finances, and State and local control, to teach those children how American enterprise operates, so that they will know from what source taxes come, with which to finance a Government such as we have in the United States.

To me, that is more essential at this particular moment, than it is to send this train throughout the country.

I think General Eisenhower had something like that in mind when he made his reference the other day to this proposition. If the general did not mean something like that, just why did he make this particular observation at this moment, only a few hours before he comes back to Washington? Why does he fear that private enterprise may pass away in the United States? Why did he issue a warning of that kind? I say, why did General Eisenhower issue that warning at this time? I think the general has got something there.

The President stood here in this House a short time ago and pointed out that of the $46,000,000,000 used in 1948 by our industries in expanding their plants 65 percent of it came from internal funds of the corporations; and you will find that during the last 9 years private individuals in this country have reduced their holdings in private enterprise by $3,000,000,000. That is private individuals, private enterprise stepping out of the picture. If the freedom of our people is preserved it will come from our people having confidence in our own institutions that are operated and taxed to support this Government. That is what will protect the freedom of our people.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Are we not justified in assuming that the reason Eisenhower issued that statement was because he saw the danger of socialism?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is exactly why he issued that statement.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. You can go out and teach the children about how this country attained its present position, but when the kids go home and find dad, who is in business, hampered at every turn by executive regulations, where do you get?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Well, the child will say, "You are not following the original principles set up in these documents which they showed me at the train."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, what can dad do to change it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] has again expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. This is a time of very serious thinking. The children of our land are in need of this type of education.

Last night I read in a paper here in Washington that four or five boys had gone to a show and had seen some kind of a western picture, and they went out from that show and robbed a store. It was a great embarrassment to their parents; and today, of course, they are trying to fix it up.

This train is a form of high-class education. The train will visit every place in the country that requests it, so far as that is physically possible. The children passing through the train and seeing those documents for the first time will get a thrill that will probably never be equaled during the rest of their lives.

I have noticed during the proceedings today that a great deal of time has been spent talking about a bill which has already been passed. When a bill has been passed and all of the arguments have been advanced for it and against it, that is the end of the arguments and of that particular bill. What is passed is passed and is a closed issue; it is not a question of what it is, what it is not, or what it may be. Today we are discussing the Freedom Train. We know it is a worthwhile thing. We have seen from past experience the eagerness and enthusiasm with which it has been accepted all over the land; the people are calling for it to come back into their communities again; and certainly it is a thing we should praise all the days of our life. I, for one, hope the vote for this bill will be unanimous.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

The Clerk read, as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That, as a means of focusing the attention of the American people on a reexamination of their heritage of freedom, fostering the preservation of their liberties, awakening their loyalty to the American tradition, and contributing to citizenship training, particularly of Americans of school age, the Archivist of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to acquire the Freedom Train, and to operate the said train for a period of 2 years.
>
> SEC. 2. In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the Archivist is hereby authorized—
>
> (a) to enter into and carry out such agreements with such person or persons, natural or artificial, as may be necessary for the acquisition of the Freedom Train and its equipment and for its relinquishment after a period of 2 years, and to make such expenditures, without regard to other provisions of law, as may be required to carry out such agreement;

(b) to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he deems advisable without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to procure services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $40 per diem for individuals; to accept services and facilities without compensation; and, with the consent of the head of any Government department or agency, to utilize or employ the services of personnel or facilities of any such department or agency, with or without reimbursement therefor;

(c) to obtain printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919, as amended (40 Stat. 1270);

(d) to purchase or contract for supplies or services (including printing and binding) without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended;

(e) to obtain and pay for comprehensive insurance coverage, as he may deem necessary, of other than Government property used in connection with the Freedom Train;

(f) to acquire by gift, bequest, loan, or otherwise, personal property for the benefit of, or in connection with, the operation of the Freedom Train;

(g) to cooperate with the governments of the several States and their political subdivisions in promoting the exhibition of the Freedom Train;

(h) to pay per diem to personnel required to travel in connection with the operation or inspection of the train as follows: To civilian personnel at the maximum rate applicable under existing laws or regulations; to officer personnel of the armed services in accordance with section 12 of the Pay Readjustment Act of June 16, 1942, and regulations pertinent thereto; and to enlisted personnel of the armed services a military allowance in lieu of rations and quarters as provided in Executive Order Numbered 9871 and regulations pertient thereto;

(i) to pay in cash for any services, supplies, or equipment not exceeding $50 in cost;

(j) to purchase, print, mimeograph, multilith, photostat, or produce or reproduce in any known manner, pamphlets, brochures, facsimiles, or other material pertaining to the Freedom Train for free distribution or for sale, the proceeds of such sales to be deposited in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury;

(k) to prescribe such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the operation of the Freedom Train.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to provide a security detachment for the protection of the Freedom Train.

SEC. 4. A commission is hereby created and established, to be known as the "Freedom Train Commission," to consist of the President pro tempore of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the minority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the House of Representatives, the Attorney General of the United States, the Librarian of Congress, the Archivist of the United States, and five members to be appointed by the President. The members of the said Commission shall serve during the period the Freedom Train is in operation, and for 6 months thereafter. Such members shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. The Commission shall elect one of its members to serve as Chairman.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall advise on the plans formulated by the Archivist and submitted to it for exhibiting the Freedom Train.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered as read and open to amendment at any section.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the committee amendments, as follows:

Page 2, strike out line 1 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "said train during the period ending July 5, 1951."

Page 2, strike out lines 5 to 11, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(a) to enter into and carry out such agreements with such person or persons, natural or artificial, as may be necessary for the acquisition of the Freedom Train and its equipment, for its operation during the period ending July 5, 1951, and for the disposition of such train and equipment within 60 days after such date; and to make such expenditures, without regard to other provisions of law, as may be required to carry out such agreements."

Page 4, line 7, after the number "9871", insert a comma and the following: "as amended."

Page 4, strike out beginning with the word "deposited" in line 15 down to the semicolon in line 16 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "paid into administered, and expended as a part of the National Archives trust fund."

Page 5, line 4, after "Representatives," insert the following: "the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Post Office and Civil Service."

Page 5, strike out lines 16 to 18, both inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. The Archivist shall formulate plans to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution, and all such plans shall be subject to the approval of the Commission."

Page 5, line 25, strike out "such sums as may be necessary" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed the sum of $3,000,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 84, to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 95, had directed him to report the same back to the House, with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a bill he introduced.

## URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 99) for printing in the RECORD:

*Resolved*, That notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order on Tuesday, February 15, 1949, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

## CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have been commemorating the birthday of one of America's true noblemen, Abraham Lincoln. I am glad that we of the South can join with those of you from the North in paying tribute to this great American. We now see that had he lived many of the unspeakable indignities we had to suffer would not have been our lot.

At one time when some of the more violent men of ill will were urging harsher treatment for the South, Mr. Lincoln replied that he had not suffered at the hands of the South but with the South. Were he alive today I am sure that again he would suffer with the South at the threat of the enactment of force laws that would inevitably bring another tragic era for our beloved Southland.

A few days ago the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, spoke from the well of this House words of such reasonableness and sanity that I wish every one of you would study and heed them. I am not prepared to say that I would agree in every detail with the proposed plan for the settlement of the so-called civil-rights question. But I do commend to you the spirit of good will and understanding that pervades Mr. HAYS' proposals. It is from this approach that a fair and equitable settlement of the issues involved can be evolved.

A few days ago I heard a friend gently chide the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] with the charge that he was "always floating around on a cloud." He admitted that occasionally the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] parked his cloud and came down to earth. In this age of materialism and cynicism I am sure we need more cloud floaters. For "without a vision my people perish." Fortunate are we to have a man in Congress like the gentleman from Arkansas, BROOKS HAYS. His head may be in the clouds where the winds of God's truth can reach him, but his feet are firmly planted upon the ground. His is that rare combination of vision and practicality.

It is in this spirit of good will, of idealism, and at the same time of practical compromise that the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has attacked the problem of race relations that cries out for settlement.

Over the week end I have read several chapters from Lanterns on the Levee, by William Alexander Percy, great southerner and great American. I wish every man in Congress would read chapter XXIII of that book. It was written while Percy stood in the shadow of death, which overtook him a few weeks or months later. Percy was a poet at heart, and maybe a "cloud floater," but he spoke from a deep knowledge of the Negro, in prose that literally sings its way along. I quote a few paragraphs, and suggest that you read the entire chapter at the first opportunity:

The whole atmosphere of America is such as to mislead and endanger the Negro. The sickening adulation paid to Negro athletes and artists, not because of their great abilities, but because they are Negroes; rumors of what the Negro does in Paris, in Moscow, in the northern cities; the promises and bribes of demagogic politicians interested not in his welfare but his vote; the Negro press' hatred of the white man, its demand for social equality, its bitterness, its untrustworthiness—all combine to create about the young southern Negro an atmosphere as dangerous as it is febrile and unwholesome. The work of white sentimentalists is equally perilous. When personal relations with the Negro are too familiar, they are misinterpreted by him. He reasons, plausibly, that if you are willing to dine with him, you are willing and probably anxious to sleep with him. With the genius of the poor for misinterpreting the motives of the rich, added to the Negro's own special genius for suspicion and distrust, it should require little except common sense to deduce what the effects of white sentimentalists may lead to. The noblest of them, such as Mrs. Roosevelt, accomplish their insidious evil quite unsuspectingly and with the highest motives. * * *

I claim only to be one of the vast number of men of good will, who try with indifferent success, to see wisely and act justly. As such, I would say to the Negro: Before demanding to be a white man socially and politically, learn to be a white man morally and intellectually—and to the white man: The black man is our brother, a younger brother, not adult, not disciplined, but tragic, pitiful, and lovable; act as his brother and be patient.

Mr. Percy makes it clear that the southern white man understands the Negro better than the people of other sections who have not had the same long experience with him. And yet it is made equally clear that there is a glass wall so to speak between even the southern white man and the Negro. Patience, good will, and intelligent cooperation with equal educational opportunities for the Negro will break down this wall of racial misunderstanding and prejudice. Force laws, resulting in another tragic era of carpetbagging in the South can only intensify the problem. For example, witness the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan and violence since the ill-advised political effort to pass the so-called civil-rights program.

The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has proposed a sane and calm approach to the vexing problem. I call upon the Members on each side of the aisle to study his proposals, and to approach the problem with the same degree of sanity and reasonableness that characterizes Mr. HAYS' thinking on the subject.

With the Speaker's leave, I include with my remarks an editorial from the Atlanta Constitution commenting on the HAYS' plan, and an article by Gladstone Williams that appeared in the same newspaper:

[From the Atlanta Constitution]

Southerners are planning to introduce in Congress this week their own version of a civil-rights program.

It is being introduced by men of good will and good intent. The plan is to get it before the Congress ahead of any administration bills.

We urge thoughtful southerners to have a look at it. In brief it would do these three things:

1. It would provide for a constitutional amendment to abolish the poll tax. Since 41 States, including Georgia, have already abolished it and others are preparing to do so, there is no doubt but that the poll tax will go and that it would do so without any Federal coercion. Since even the most ardent supporters of poll-tax banning agree there is grave doubt as to constitutional authority to do so, an amendment would seem the most sensible plan.

2. Lynching would come under Federal statute. This newspaper has always opposed Federal coercion, and still does. But there can no longer be any doubt but that failure of local peace officers to enforce laws against such violence properly has created so much national anger and opinion that it is not longer possible to avoid some such measure. We are then, from the practical viewpoint, up against the problem of what sort of legislation we will get, not whether we will have it.

The honest southerner must admit that local law-enforcement agencies, because of the peculiarities of our political methods, frequently are powerless to proceed against a prominent family or one politically powerful when such is involved in a lynching case. This is wrong, but it is a fact. The southerners propose to remove a lynching case from the county where it occurs and try it in a county where the local passions and political blocs would not apply.

3. The southerners plan to introduce legislation which would establish in the Department of Labor a board which would have the power to investigate, conciliate, arbitrate, and recommend in cases involving discrimination in employment. This avoids the Federal police feature, and it bypasses the unconstitutional proposal that a man may be told he must hire someone whether that person is acceptable or not. It was exactly this system which worked so well during the recent World War in cases involving thousands of workers from minority groups. There is no reason to think it will not work even better now when the national conscience is so much more aware of the evils and wrongs of discrimination. A standing army could not enforce the provisions of the FEPC as proposed by the more radical makers of civil-rights legislation.

We recommend this plan to thoughtful southerners as reasonable and as being possible of excellent results. At least it is a starter, and it is a positive action. We will be offering something that we are for, and not appearing as merely against something, a role which has brought the South much of its present trouble.

---

[From the Atlanta Constitution of February 7, 1949]

HAYS' RIGHTS PLAN A TEST OF GOOD FAITH

(By Gladstone Williams)

WASHINGTON.—In an effort to remove civil-rights legislation from the field of bitter controversy, Representative BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas, has come forward with a well-reasoned compromise program that should appeal to moderates on both sides of the question. Without a compromise there is danger of Congress being split wide open on the issue. The Senate Rules Committee is now wrestling with the problem of strengthening cloture rules in order to give President Truman's civil-rights program a fair chance of passage. Southern Senators are determined to wage a last-ditch fight against any change in the rules which would deny them the right to unlimited debate in discussing controversial legislation of the kind.

What may result is a prolonged filibuster against proposed changes in the rules aimed at ending filibusters. That could tie up Senate proceedings indefinitely, blocking other important legislation that may be pending.

Mr. HAYS, a southerner himself, calls for concessions from extremists on both sides of the racial question. If the moderates on both sides will approach the problem in the spirit of compromise, he believes it will be possible to work out a civil-rights program that will be acceptable to all concerned and generally meet the objectives sought by the President.

Four major items are involved in the President's civil-rights program. They are (1) segregation, (2) anti-poll tax, (3) antilynching, and (4) fair-employment-practices legislation. The compromise Representative HAYS proposes calls for this:

First, he would limit Federal segregation policies to movements in interstate transportation—travel.

Second, he would repeal poll-tax requirements for voting by constitutional amendment, rather than by statute.

Third, he would have enacted a modified antilynching law which would leave primary responsibility for dealing with mob violence to the individual States and local communities, with the Federal Government empowered to step in only when the State and local authorities failed to act.

Fourth, he would abandon all proposals for a Federal law for coercion in employment, and instead would set up a counseling service in the Department of Labor to work for nondiscrimination in industry.

As the Arkansas man points out, there seems no need for further legislation to achieve the President's objective of nonsegregation in interstate travel because of the Supreme Court decision invalidating a Virginia statute requiring the segregation of white and Negro passengers in interstate travel. That decision had the effect of sustaining a nonsegregation policy in all interstate travel.

So far as the poll tax goes, Mr. HAYS is entirely willing to have Congress submit the question to the various States in the form of a constitutional amendment. Other

southern members have taken a similar stand all along. Only seven States still retain the poll tax now, anyway.

On antilynching measures, he reminds that that is an evil that has practically been extinguished, so that it is no longer the issue it once was. He sees no reason why a compromise should not be reached whereby the Federal Government would step in only after local authorities had failed to do something, and with the penalties and fines now proposed being eliminated.

The HAYS program is certainly worthy of careful consideration by all those who honestly would like to see some effective civil-rights legislation enacted. It opens the way for a meeting of minds among the moderates, though the extremists may be expected to raise their voices in opposition on both sides.

It will probably offer the test of whether the extremists are really interested in seeing a constructive program adopted, or whether they merely prefer to keep the issue alive for its political effect.

## THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I hope everybody appreciates the splendid service of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

On January 1, 1949, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation began its sixteenth year of protecting the depositors in banks of this Nation. During this period a great change has taken place in the thinking of those who own the 90,000,000 bank accounts in the United States. Before deposit insurance was established the slightest rumor of trouble in a bank caused panic among its depositors and resulted in runs that inevitably hastened the closing of the bank. Assets had to be sacrificed to meet the unreasoning demands of depositors, and the consequence was that everyone suffered.

How greatly deposit insurance has changed the picture was demonstrated dramatically by two brief news stories during the past week.

On February 1 it was announced that the cashier of the First National Bank, Dyer, Ind., had admitted sizable defalcations. Before Federal deposit insurance this would have been the immediate signal for panic and a run on the bank. What happened under Federal deposit insurance is well described by Robert A. Vanderpoel, financial editor of the Chicago Herald-American:

FDIC ONCE MORE PROVES WORTH TO UNITED STATES ECONOMY—ONE BANK'S TROUBLES TODAY ARE NOT DISTURBING

Despite a defalcation estimated at $200,000 by its cashier, the First National Bank of Dyer, Ind., is operating as usual.

In the old days an episode of this sort would have caused an immediate run on the bank and the chances are that very quickly it would have closed its doors. There would have followed other more moderate runs on nearby banks and the Dyer bank would have gone through the long and costly process of receivership and liquidation.

At best depositors' money would have been tied up for a long period and business in the whole community would have suffered. At worst depositors would have received only a gradual and partial return of their funds over a period of years. Stockholders would have been assessed their 100-percent double liability and a substantial amount of the assets would have been eaten up with the fees of receivers, attorneys, and what not.

At it was, with deposits insured up to $5,000 by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, there was no fear on the part of small customers of suffering any loss. Consequently there was no run, no frantic efforts to liquidate under unfavorable circumstances.

LOANS WILL BE GUARANTEED

Instead, plans were made for all deposits of the bank to be taken over by the Gary National Bank with the Federal Deposit Insurance Cororation guaranteeing loans up to $1,000,000 and agreeing to assume slow-paying loans at the end of a 6-month period.

This episode recalls the manner in which almost every banker in the country opposed Government guaranty of bank deposits prior to the bank crisis of 1933. Today the bankers recognize this insurance as the greatest blessing that has come to their business. They no longer lie awake nights fearful of runs that sometimes started from rumors that had no basis in fact.

Yes; it was business as usual in Dyer, with the Gary National Bank taking over all deposits and sound assets of the First National Bank of Dyer and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation putting in cash to make up the difference between deposits and sound assets. There was no panic, no run, no interruption to banking services, and all depositors of the Dyer bank were protected in full.

A story later in the week gave the other side of the picture. Remember that in the old days assets had to be dumped on falling markets to meet depositor demands. How different it is today. On February 4 Chairman Maple T. Harl, of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, announced that liquidation of the affairs of the Peoples Bank of Donalds, Donalds, S. C., had been completed. So what? you say. This is what: Under the orderly procedures of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which took over when the Donalds bank ran into difficulty in December 1947, assets of the bank were liquidated so efficiently that their proceeds, first, protected all the Donalds depositors completely; second, reimbursed Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation the full amount of its $148,000 advance and all expenses of liquidation; and third, returned to stockholders of the bank cash and miscellaneous assets exceeding the par value of their common stock.

That is the way it works today. If a bank does run into trouble, its depositors go on about their business, secure in the knowledge that their funds are protected by Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. After the Corporation has taken over unsatisfactory assets of the bank in trouble, it liquidates them in an orderly manner, with due regard for credit conditions in the community, and so achieves maximum recovery without strain on business in the neighborhood.

The independence and freedom of action granted to the Corporation by its organic law are the most important factors in the success of deposit insurance. Where aid has been needed by an insured bank, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has not been hampered by budgetary and other fiscal restrictions. As a mutual fund, supported by the banks and sponsored by the Federal Government, it has been able to act promptly in emergencies requiring aid to insured banks and has thus prevented the distress which accompanied earlier bank failures. The flexibility and the efficiency possible under its present organization should certainly be continued if Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is to continue its work as bulwark of our financial stucture.

More than 1,500,000 depositors in the 408 insured banks that Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has helped financially so far know personally how valuable is the work of the organization.

Owners of 90,000,000 bank accounts now sleep soundly at night without fear for the safety of their deposits. No one anywhere should overlook the magnificent contribution the Corporation has made to financial and economic stability by making our banking system secure for depositors.

I feel sure that the people of our country, and especially the Members of Congress, do not want to see this agency consolidated with any other agency of the Government but left entirely independent.

## THE UNITED MINE WORKERS WELFARE AND RETIREMENT FUND

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon I called at the George Washington University Hospital to see a former client along with several other coal miners from my district who were all suffering from some form of paralysis to the spinal column, arising out of and in the course of their employment.

These men are all wards of the United Mine Workers welfare and retirement fund and are eligible to participate notwithstanding that some of them were injured before the creation of the fund in 1946. They all require treatment by specialists and their bills are being paid from the United Mine Workers welfare fund, which receives 20 cents for each mined ton of coal. The necessary hospitalization and treatment for these miners would have been utterly impossible for them to obtain but for this welfare fund.

LEWIS RECOGNIZED THE NEED

The United Mine Workers were fortunate to have leadership who were looking ahead for their general welfare, as well as the industry, in the establishment of the health, welfare, and retirement fund. The leadership recognized that both social-security payments to retired miners and workmen's compensation rates for accident and injury are inadequate, particularly in view of the increase in the cost of living.

It was realized that the high accident rates—each year between 900 and 1,250

men lose their lives through accidents and some 50,000 more suffer injuries, some of which incapacitate them for long periods of time—result in a high insurance premium for individual miners, which is difficult for the average miner to pay.

That leadership came along with the idea that the high accident and disease rate are economic costs of the mining industry and therefore should be borne by the industry in exactly the same way that machine repairs and replacement are considered part of the cost of operation, and that such cost should not be borne by the miners and their dependents; and on that base the UMWA bituminous welfare and retirement fund was established.

The president of the United Mine Workers, John L. Lewis, saw these facts and faced them. He was brave and steadfast at a time when it was unpopular to face the facts. His action brought about one of the greatest humanitarian events in history with the creation of the welfare and retirement fund for the coal miners.

OTHER BASIC REASONS FOR HEALTH PLAN

The benefits of such a fund are now apparent to the general public. In many instances isolated conditions of the mining communities have resulted in miners and their families being deprived of many of the advantages of modern community life. At the same time the hazardous nature of the industry and the economic insecurity of the one-industry localities have increased the need of miners for health and welfare and retirement benefits.

Then, too, it is recognized that the advancing average age of miners can only be halted by the entrance of a large number of younger workers into the mines. In addition to wages paid, one of the chief incentives for younger workers to enter an industry is adequate health and accident insurance and a retirement plan. Such benefits weigh heavily in an industry such as mining, in which unfavorable factors are well known. Improvement in the mechanization of the mines will increase productive capacity of the industry but cannot eliminate the need for a continuous supply of younger workers into the industry.

SERVICE TO MINERS

In the first 20 months of administration, or up until January 1, 1949, the UMWA welfare and retirement fund reported a total of 260,123 beneficiaries receiving approximately $63,000,000, which sum was disbursed in the form of disability grants, pensions, death benefits, hospital and medical care.

The establishment of this fund has brought about new interest in the study of diseases in the mining industry and will focus public attention upon the need for expanding research. Centralized administration of the fund makes possible the application of improved medical techniques more rapidly to the various mining areas.

The benefits derived from this fund are immeasurable. The future only will reflect them.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, for many years I have been keenly interested in some form of crop-insurance protection for farmers. I have seen at first hand the desperate financial plight in which farmers find themselves in years of crop failures. That is why I have followed with considerable personal interest the progress of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, which was created under title 5 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Insurance is protection. It is man's effort to protect himself against the unknown. I am a strong advocate of all types of insurance. Nearly every risk known to man is insurable. For years our farmers have faced fear of the future in the growing of their crops, not knowing at the time of planting whether or not they would produce even enough to cover their investment of hard-earned savings or borrowed money in the crop. Man has no control over the elements. A flood, a drought, a sudden hail, a windstorm, or the many other unavoidable causes known to you may in a few hours or even in a few short minutes destroy the farmer's labor and investment in his crop.

Recently I had occasion to read the report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for 1948. This report is very interesting to me, as it shows the Corporation is now making real progress in offering to our farmers a program which insures them against the loss of their investment in the crop and assures them of a means whereby they will be in a position to plant a crop from year to year.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight was the ninth year of active operation of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. It was the second year since the inception of the crop insurance program that a net profit has resulted from the over-all operations. Of even more significance is the fact that 1948 was the first year in the history of crop insurance that a profit was shown on each commodity insured. The development of the crop insurance program has gone through several very definite stages. For the first 5 years—1939 to 1943—the program was launched on a national basis to insure unavoidable crop losses on wheat for the years 1939, 1940, and 1941, and for both wheat and cotton for the years 1942 and 1943. The program got off to a very bad start and net losses were suffered each year. These losses can be attributed in large part, I believe, to the fact that there was no background experience—no guide whatever—upon which to formulate an insurance program providing protection against all production risks. Up until the time of the enactment of the legislation creating the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, all-risk crop insurance was a virtually uncharted field. True, there had been various attempts—about a dozen I believe—by private insurance companies to write all-risk crop insurance. But each of these attempts was short-lived and ended in bankruptcy. I think we should not underestimate the real problems that confronted the Corporation in establishing actuarial bases and the contractual provisions with the farmer. Considering these problems there is little wonder that losses were incurred until sufficient experience was gained to demonstrate the weaknesses and needed changes in the program.

The second stage of the crop-insurance program began with its reinstatement by the Congress and extended from 1945 to 1947. This legislation provided that wheat, cotton, and flax insurance was to be offered on a Nation-wide basis and also authorized experimental programs for corn and tobacco in a few counties each. A study of the plans adopted would indicate that the first stage of its development enabled the Corporation to establish a better basis for insurance in the second stage.

The third stage in the development of the crop-insurance program began in 1948 with the transition to the limited program which allowed insurance to be offered in only 200 counties for wheat, 56 counties for cotton, 50 counties for corn and flax each, 35 counties for tobacco, and in not to exceed 20 counties for any trial experimental programs which might be instituted.

Additional crops should be covered, I think, especially to include peaches. The county of Spartanburg, in my district, is now the leading fresh-fruit producing county in the world. Records show that the wheat insurance program, which was the oldest of the insurance programs offered and for which there was, therefore, longer experience, began to show considerable improvement. In each of the years 1945, 1946, and 1947 wheat premiums exceeded indemnities. The flax and tobacco programs were also operated successfully. For this 3-year period flax premiums exceeded indemnities by about 3 to 2. The tobacco program showed a profit each year. The corn program showed a slight loss for the 3-year period due principally, I understand, to the unusually poor crop in 1947. Heavy losses on cotton continued, however, for the first 2 years of this 3-year period, and the indemnities on cotton were so large that they offset the favorable experience on the other commodities insured and resulted in a net operating loss on the over-all program. The losses on cotton resulted in amendatory legislation by the Eightieth Congress, which, beginning with the 1948 crop year, limited the scope of crop-insurance operations for all commodities. However, it is interesting to note that in 1947—the last year before reduction in the number of counties in which insurance could be offered—the cotton program operated much more successfully and premiums almost equaled indemnities.

In South Carolina crop insurance for tobacco is authorized in two counties, Horry and Marion; and in three counties for cotton, Greenville, Orangeburg, and Anderson. Since we have 46 counties, it will be observed only one-ninth of the

counties may participate in the crop-insurance program under present authority. Only one county in my district, my own county of Greenville, is authorized to participate in the insurance program.

In view of the splendid showing made by the Corporation during the past 2 years, I am very hopeful that this needed insurance protection may be made available soon to every farmer throughout the country.

Time will not permit me to enlarge on the changes which have been adopted by the Corporation within the last 3 years to strengthen the program and to comply with what I believe was the intent of the Congress. However, it is my opinion that the present management of the Corporation is to be highly commended for the progress that has been made. The favorable experience of the crop-insurance program in 1947 and again in 1948 is due principally to the major changes that have been made both in the program and in its administration. In 1948 the Corporation placed greater emphasis on local responsibility for administraton of the program, took steps to eliminate poor insurance risks, improved its loss adjustment work generally, and took other aggressive action in the development of a sound system of all-risk crop-insurance protection.

The experience of the Corporation in recent years indicated that the program is now operating on the basis that a sound crop-insurance program should. It would be expected that premiums would exceed losses in good-crop years and that in poor-crop years, indemnities would exceed premiums. I think that the availability of crop-insurance protection is a very fundamental part of the well-being of American farmers and I feel that the progress which has been made by the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation justifies an expansion in the program so that additional farmers will have the opportunity of obtaining this protection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. McCARTHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an open letter addressed to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the magazine Marine Progress for January 1949 entitled "Waterway Improvements."

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject The Atomic Bomb and the Panama Canal. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed, notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

SERVICE CREDIT FOR VETERANS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act.

The present social-security law is in need of revision if our Government is to be fair to the veterans of World War II. The present social-security law provides coverage only for those who were covered by the social-security law at the time they entered military service. Those who were not so covered on the date they entered military service were prevented from coverage for social-security benefits throughout their entire service because they had no opportunity to obtain employment that would entitle them to social-security coverage.

My bill will extend social-security coverage to all persons in the military service through the national emergency, commencing September 16, 1940, and extending 180 days from the date proclaimed by the President as the date of termination of World War II. I hope my bill can be made a part of the revision of our social-security law that the Committee on Ways and Means now has under study.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Human Events, entitled "Flight of Capital."

WICHITA, KANS., IS THE LOGICAL PLACE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AIR ACADEMY

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to establish a United States Air Academy at Wichita, Kans.

I think it is pretty well known that Wichita, Kans., is the air capital of the West and Middle West of the United States. Since the establishment of an Air Academy has been recommended, Wichita, in my judgment, is the ideal location.

Wichita is the home of three large aircraft factories. It is where large and small war planes were built during the war period. It is the manufacturing center of the famous B-29. Right now airplane factories have large contracts with the Government for the production of airplanes and air equipment.

Not only is Wichita well located, being in the center of the United States, it also is in an area where the terrain is adaptable for training. The climate is right because it has the various temperatures for flight training. It is cold in the winter and warm during the summer, and yet there are few days during the year when planes do not fly in that area.

Wichita is well located with respect to transportation facilities, and is easily accessible from various points of the country.

I believe that when all factors are taken into consideration, Wichita is the proper place for the establishment of the United States Air Academy.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OLD-AGE PENSION

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, President Truman is proposing that the benefits paid old-age and survivors' insurance pensioners be increased by 50 percent and that, at the same time, the withholding taxes paid by workers and employers also be increased by 50 percent.

The present pension benefits of old-age and survivors' insurance are inadequate. I favor increasing them by 50 percent. I introduced a bill in January 1948 to accomplish that purpose and I reintroduced that bill on the opening day of this session of Congress. My bill is now known as H. R. 258.

While I favor increasing the pension benefits by 50 percent, I do not favor increasing the withholding taxes at this time by 50 percent. I do not believe there is any need for an immediate increase in these withholding-tax rates.

In the 12 years that old-age and survivors' insurance has been in operation it has collected more than $13,000,000,000 in withholding taxes and in interest on its reserve fund. In those same years old-age and survivors' insurance has paid out less than $2,500,000,000 in pension benefits. In short, of every $6 collected during the past 12 years from the workers in withholding taxes only $1 has been returned to them in benefits. Five dollars out of every six has gone into the reserve fund.

At the present time, this old-age and survivors' insurance reserve fund contains $10,722,000,000. To increase, at this time, the withholding tax rate levied on workers merely would mean that this already huge reserve fund of more than $10,000,000,000 soon would be increased to twenty or forty billion dollars. To increase this reserve to such astronomical proportions will only make easy borrowing easier for the tax spenders and stimulate increased wasteful spending by an already extravagant Government.

The President proposes a 50 percent increase in the old-age and survivors' benefits and a 50-percent increase in withholding taxes. Let us see how this would have worked if applied to the experiences of last year.

If the President's plan for increasing pension benefits by 50 percent had been placed in effect a year ago the total cost

of pension benefits last year instead of being $556,000,000, which it was, would have been $834,000,000.

If the President's plan for increasing withholding taxes on workers by 50 percent had been in effect last year the withholding tax collections instead of being $1,683,000,000 last year, which it was, would have been $2,532,000,000. Thus, under the President's proposal, workers last year to obtain a $278,000,000 increase in their pensions would have been required to pay $844,000,000 in additional withholding taxes, or it would have cost them $3 in increased taxes for every dollar they received in increased benefits.

Higher withholding tax rates, of course, in time will be required to support a higher level of pensions but, it is my opinion, that these increased withholding taxes should not be levied until such time as the pay-out for pensions begins to approach the income from the receipts from withholding taxes.

There is neither need nor wisdom in building up a $20,000,000,000 to $40,000,000,000 old-age and survivors' insurance reserve fund.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a short table giving the year by year collections during the last 12 years of old-age and survivors' insurance from withholding taxes and from interest on the reserve fund and also the year by year disbursements of old-age and survivors' insurance for benefit payments and administration expenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the table is as follows:

*Fiscal data on Federal old-age and survivors insurance system*

[In millions of dollars]

| Calendar year | Appropriations to fund [1] | Interest | Total income | Benefits paid | Administrative expenses from fund | Added to fund |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1937 | $514 | $2 | $516 | $1 | (2) | $515 |
| 1938 | 343 | 15 | 358 | 10 | (2) | 348 |
| 1939 | 566 | 27 | 593 | 14 | (2) | 577 |
| 1940 | 607 | 43 | 650 | 35 | $26 | 589 |
| 1941 | 789 | 56 | 845 | 88 | 26 | 731 |
| 1942 | 1,012 | 72 | 1,085 | 131 | 28 | 926 |
| 1943 | 1,239 | 88 | 1,328 | 166 | 29 | 1,132 |
| 1944 | 1,316 | 107 | 1,422 | 209 | 29 | 1,184 |
| 1945 | 1,285 | 134 | 1,420 | 274 | 30 | 1,116 |
| 1946 | 1,295 | 152 | 1,447 | 378 | 40 | 1,029 |
| 1947 | 1,558 | 164 | 1,722 | 466 | 46 | 1,210 |
| 1948 | 1,688 | 281 | 1,969 | 556 | 51 | 1,362 |
| 1937–48 | 12,214 | 1,142 | 13,356 | 2,329 | 305 | 10,722 |

[1] Beginning July 1, 1940, appropriations equal taxes collected, except that after 1946 appropriations include relatively small amounts appropriated to meet benefit costs and administrative costs of the special veterans' survivor benefits of sec. 210 (namely, $375,000 in 1947; $700,000 in 1948; and $3,251,000 in 1949). Prior to July 1, 1940, Congress, in accordance with the provisions of the Social Security Act of 1935, annually appropriated funds to the old-age reserve account based on estimates of amounts required to finance the system on an actuarial basis.

[2] Administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the Treasury Department under title II of the Social Security Act and under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act were reimbursed out of the fund beginning Jan. 1, 1940.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I wish to commend the gentleman on his fine statement. I know he has been a champion of this type of legislation ever since he has been in Congress. I wonder if the gentleman could enlighten the House as to the average benefit received under old-age and survivors insurance.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Under old-age and survivors insurance the average benefit as of the present time is about $28 a month.

Mr. POTTER. Is it not true that in many States the old-age assistance program carries a grant or a benefit much higher than the average benefit under old-age and survivors insurance?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The average pension under State old-age assistance, for which the pensioners have paid no withholding tax for their pension, at the present time is $42.25, or $14 more than is paid to those who pay in month after month and year after year in withholding taxes for their Federal old-age and survivors insurance benefits.

Mr. POTTER. In many, many cases, if the benefits should be increased for old-age and survivors insurance, it will be just a matter of transferring a recipient from the old-age assistance rolls, where they possibly are now, to the rolls where they receive benefits under the old-age and survivors insurance?

Mr. MACK of Washington. That, of course, could be the case if all people were covered by old-age and survivors insurance, which I believe they should be. In that case, eventually we would cut out the tremendous cost of State old-age assistance.

Mr. POTTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. He is a former administrator of social security in the State of Michigan and is an especially well informed man on social security and pension problems.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that since the inception of this program there has been paid into the old-age and survivors insurance fund something like $13,000,000,000, and that approximately $2,500,000,000 has been paid out in benefits, leaving almost $11,000,000,000 in the reserve fund?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is correct. There is now approximately $11,000,000,000 in the reserve fund of the old-age and survivors insurance. Not only that, but this reserve fund has been increasing for the past several years at the rate of more than $100,000,000 a month.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Is it not conceivable, then, that if this program should be expanded to include additional people, say $20,000,000, this reserve fund could be and would be increased to almost astronomical figures without an increase in the withholding tax rate?

Mr. MACK of Washington. The gentleman is certainly correct on that.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I have been receiving letters from some small-business men who have asked about their prospects of coming under the protection of the old-age and survivors insurance. Does the gentleman's bill make any reference to such people?

Mr. MACK of Washington. My bill provides for the inclusion of all self-employed persons and for the inclusion of many other groups. It is my feeling that we ought to bring as many of the people of the country as possible under old-age and survivors insurance, to the end that everyone will pay during the earning years of their youth into a fund which will finance the benefits which they receive in old age.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. The gentleman made some reference to State old-age pensions. Can the gentleman enlighten us with respect to the cost of State old-age pensions?

Mr. MACK of Washington. State old-age pensions, which are paid for by the taxpayers of the Federal and State Governments, without recipients paying anything in withholding taxes last year cost $1,093,000,000. For the current year, which ends next June 30, these State old-age pensions, for which those receiving them had to pay nothing in withholding taxes, will cost the taxpayers $1,324,000,000. These State pensions, for which the pensioners pay nothing in withholding taxes, will, during the coming year, which begins next July 1, cost $1,980,000,000. The costs of State old-age assistance to taxpayers are increasing not slowly but by leaps and bounds.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MACK of Washington. And I thank the gentleman for his fine contribution. I know he is a thorough student of the growing pension problem and wants it solved correctly.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The gentleman made the statement that there is $11,500,000,000 in the reserve fund.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I said $10,700,000,000 in the present reserve.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it in there or is it not in there? Where is the money? Is that actual cash on hand, or is it I O U's?

Mr. MACK of Washington. All the money the Government has borrowed, whether it has borrowed it from the old-age and survivors insurance fund or from the banks, the insurance companies or the savings and loan companies, is in I O U's, which we call bonds. I see nothing wrong with the Government's borrowing from the old-age and survivors insurance fund and replacing it with interest-bearing bonds.

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACK of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SCUDDER. May I ask the gentleman a question as to the effect of improvements in medical science which have brought about a greater life span for

more people. What is going to be the outcome of this program with the life span becoming greater and greater? Has the gentleman any figures showing the difference between the life span of today and the life span of 5 or 10 years ago? I believe that should be taken into consideration in a program of this sort.

Mr. MACK of Washington. I would say to the gentleman from California that the life span of the average American, thanks to our unmatched and unequaled medical science, is increasing very rapidly. In 1910 in this country there were in the United States approximately 3,900,000 people of 65 years of age or over. They represented 4.3 per cent of the then population of the United States. In 1947, according to the Census Bureau estimate, there were 10,600,000 people in this country 65 years of age or over, representing 7.3 percent of the nation's population. The Census Bureau now estimates that by the year 2000 there will be in this country 21,000,000 persons or about 13 percent of the nation's population who will be 65 years of age or over. The great increase in the numbers of our people who are 65 years of age or older increases the need for a more adequate pension system—and a sounder one.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table of population growth in the United States of the group which is 65 years of age or older.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks including a table showing the growth, thanks to medical science, on that part of our population which is 65 years of age or older I include the following statement supplied me by the Research Library of Congress.

There are 10,591,000 persons 65 years of age and over in the United States according to the latest United States census estimates—April 1947. This figure represents 7.45 percent of the total estimated population of 142,061,000. The rate at which this percentage is changing is shown in the table set forth below:

*United States population and number and percentage, age 65 and over*

| Year | Total population | Age 65 and over | Percentage 65 and over |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1910 | 91,972,266 | 3,954,807 | 4.3 |
| 1920 | 105,710,620 | 4,968,399 | 4.7 |
| 1930 | 122,775,046 | 6,629,852 | 5.4 |
| 1940 | 131,669,275 | 8,953,510 | 6.8 |
| 1947 | [1] 142,061,000 | [1] 10,591,000 | [3] 7.45 |
| 1950 | [2] 145,460,000 | [2] 11,200,420 | [3] 7.7 |
| 1960 | [2] 153,375,000 | [2] 13,957,125 | [3] 9.1 |
| 1970 | [2] 159,847,000 | [2] 16,304,394 | [3] 10.2 |
| 1980 | [2] 163,877,000 | [2] 19,009,732 | [3] 11.6 |
| 1990 | [2] 164,585,000 | [2] 21,560,635 | [3] 13.1 |
| 2000 | [2] 163,312,000 | [2] 21,557,184 | [3] 13.2 |

[1] Official estimate, Bureau of the Census, April 1947. Figures prior to 1947 are taken from the U. S. Department of Commerce, Statistical Abstracts, 1946, table 18, p. 18.
[2] Projected scale 1950–2000 published by the Bureau of the Census in cooperation with Scripps Foundation for research in population problems. Source: New York Times Magazine, Sept. 15, 1946.
[3] Computed from estimates in columns 2 and 4.

This table, I believe, clearly indicates the magnitude of the old-age pension problem which confronts the Nation. We must find a sound and enduring solution of that problem. I believe that old-age and survivors insurance, if benefits are increased adequately and everyone is brought under that system, offers a sound and enduring solution of that problem.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

## THE 1950 BUDGET AND THE NORTHWEST POWER SHORTAGE

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague [Mr. MACK] from the State of Washington. I have studied his bill, and I believe that if we are going to extend the benefits of social security, we might very wisely take a good look at his bill. It is a very good measure and should be fully considered by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will have before us the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949. Under the heading National Military Establishment, Corps of Engineers, and under the subheading of Rivers and Harbors, we have the following comment in the report now before the Congress:

Rivers and harbors: The amount of $10,500,000, a reduction of $1,000,000 in the budget estimates, is recommended for the maintenance and improvement of existing river and harbor works. The budget estimate contemplates an appropriation of $8,000,000 for McNary lock and dam; $1,500,000 for Ice Harbor lock and dam; and $2,000,000 for Chief Joseph Dam. With respect to the McNary Dam, which is now under construction, the amount is required to initiate work on the south-shore cofferdam and for earning requirements under existing contracts on the north shore. Both the Ice Harbor lock and dam and the Chief Joseph Dam are new projects which are interrelated to the power development of this area. It was testified that the entire power capacity in the country approximates 53,000,000 kilowatts with the demand approaching 52,000,000 kilowatts. While it is recognized that everything possible must be done to promote as rapid completion of these projects as possible in order to alleviate the power shortage in certain areas and, in order for the Government to sooner realize a return on its investment, it is believed that the amount appropriated will not be entirely needed during the balance of the fiscal year, especially in connection with the two projects being initiated. However, the committee does not wish to earmark funds for either of these three projects and leaves it to the Corps of Engineers to effect the best possible utilization of funds recommended in the accompanying bill.

Mr. Speaker, this report is very inconclusive. It leaves many questions unanswered. It makes it essential that we carefully study the hearings in order to determine how these funds should best be allocated.

In order that the Congress and the House of Representatives may have the benefit of studies that I have made in this particular field, I ask unanimous consent to include some statistics that I have prepared, a letter from Mr. Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation, and a letter from Major General Crawford, Acting Chief of Engineers. I believe these reports from these men to be factual and that they should aid us in a better understanding of this matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, new electric-power installations in the Pacific Northwest will run at least 186,000 kilowatts behind schedule until 1956, if appropriations contemplated by the administration's 1950 budget are not raised by Congress. At least seven projects intended to help offset the Northwest power shortage by that date will be delayed from 6 months to a year or more, six others will proceed as planned, and three will be pushed ahead of previously announced programs. At the allowed rate of construction, load growth will continue to exceed new installations for six more years and the shortage cannot be met for at least 10 years.

These facts were brought out in answers I received this week from the Chief of Army Engineers and Commissioner of Reclamation to letters I wrote them January 26, regarding the ability of the construction agencies to meet the advance program of the Northwest power pool under the 1950 Federal budget. The answers were based on a comparison of actual Budget Bureau requests for the projects for fiscal 1950 with the generator-installation program outlined in schedule R of the Bonneville Power Administration, issued November 10, 1948. This schedule sets forth the dates on which new power supply could be added to the pool if all projects were constructed at the optimum rate consistent with sound engineering and economical construction practice.

The major deficiency rests in the item for Chief Joseph Dam, on the Columbia River 51 miles below Grand Coulee Dam, which should have three generators supplying 193,000 kilowatts by 1956. The President's budget will delay construction of Chief Joseph Dam one full year. Competent officials have estimated $21,000,000 are needed in 1950 to keep this project on schedule; the budget allows $5,000,000 for next year and $2,000,000 supplemental funds in 1949.

Other new power units in the "delayed" category are Albeni Falls, Roza, Chandler, Hill Creek, Meridian—Lookout Point—and Dexter. Ice Harbor and Big Cliff will be 1 year ahead of schedule and Detroit Dam power units 6 months early. The total first-year generation of these three projects, however, is 40,000 kilowatts less than the initial output at Chief Joseph.

I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today a table showing the status of each Federal power project in the Pacific Northwest, the schedule according to which Bonneville Administration and the Northwest Power Pool (composed of public and private power distributors) had planned new generator installations, and the effect of the actual budget requests on that schedule.

While it is known that even if we built each of these projects as rapidly as

engineering abilities and the supply situations permitted we could not catch up with the Northwest power demand for at least 10 years, these figures will show that the administration requests for construction money fall far below what could and should be done. I intend to ask the Congress to make up the deficiencies in the budget and to authorize the new projects necessary to meet the demand. There are several reasons why these projects should not be delayed:

First. Hydroelectric generation is the cheapest source of new wealth in the Pacific Northwest, putting efficient water to work and saving nearly 100,000,000 barrels of oil yearly and/or 6,000 train loads of commercially important coal yearly for use in areas having no hydro potential. All projects listed are reimbursable, with interest, to the Federal Government.

Second. Domestic demand and security provisions require immediate development of the maximum power potential for mineral, agricultural, industrial, research, and atomic energy purposes.

Third. Construction on a "slow-down" basis increases the net cost of each project.

Fourth. Consistent construction schedules are necessary to intelligent planning by power users. The future of hundreds of small business ventures hangs in jeopardy today because of the "stop-go" planning of these projects from VJ-day, through the President's "freeze order" of August 1946 the budget-appropriations squabbles of the Eightieth Congress, issuance of schedule R in November 1948, and the arbitrary juggling of projects in that schedule by the Budget Bureau in making up the 1950 appropriation requests.

I am also placing in the RECORD the complete text of letters received by me from the Acting Chief of Engineers and the Commissioner of Reclamation, a clear presentation of what must be done if Northwest power development is to go forward on an orderly basis:

COMPARISON OF 1950 BUDGET WITH BPA ADVANCE POWER SCHEDULE

(Compiled by WALT HORAN, Member of Congress, Fifth District, Washington)

RECLAMATION BUREAU PROJECTS

Grand Coulee: Dam complete, 11 generators in, total 18 scheduled for installation by 1952, proceeding on schedule with present funds.

Roza: 10,000 kilowatts power scheduled by 1952, no budget request for power facilities, will fall 1 year behind.

Chandler: 12,000 kilowatts scheduled by 1953, no budget request, 1 year behind.

Hungry Horse: First 104,000 kilowatts scheduled by 1953, on schedule if present request granted in full.

Anderson Ranch: 27,000 kilowatts due in 1951, on schedule.

Palisades: First 17,000 kilowatts due in 1954, can stay on schedule if construction funds granted in 1950.

Upper Scriver Creek: Must be authorized this year to bring in planned 30,000 kilowatts by 1953.

Lower Scriver Creek: 30,000 kilowatts planned by 1953, status same as Upper Scriver.

Garden Valley: 54,000 kilowatts planned by 1954, status same as Upper Scriver.

ARMY ENGINEERS PROJECTS

McNary: First 140,000 kilowatts due 1954, on schedule if all money requests now before Congress are granted.

Lower Monumental: First 60,000 kilowatts due 1956, on schedule.

Chief Joseph: First 192,000 scheduled for 1956, needs $21,000,000 this year to stay on schedule, budget request only $5,000,000, falls 1 year behind.

Ice Harbor: 130,000 kilowatts scheduled for 1955, being pushed 1 year ahead.

Big Cliff: 16,000 kilowatts planned 1956, being pushed 1 year ahead.

Detroit: Fifty thousand kilowatts scheduled 1954, pushed 6 months ahead.

Lookout Point (Meridian): Power features not yet authorized, 115,000 kilowatts planned for 1955, 6 months behind, more if authorization delayed.

Hill Creek: 20,000 kilowatts planned for 1955, project must be authorized immediately if delay of more than 1 year to be averted.

Dexter: 15,000 kilowatts planned for 1955, status same as Hill Creek.

Albeni Falls: 43,000 kilowatts planned for 1955, could be kept on schedule if authorization and initial construction funds granted this year; otherwise 1 year behind.

Hells Canyon: First 170,000 kilowatts planned for 1957, can be kept on schedule if authorized this year and construction begun by 1951.

(Sources: Bonneville Power Administration 1949 advanced program; Federal Budget for 1950; letter of February 4, 1949, from Commissioner, U. S. Bureau of Reclamation; letter of February 8, 1949, from Acting Chief of Army Engineers.)

---

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION,
*Washington, D. C., February 4, 1949.*

Hon. WALT HORAN,
*House of Representatives.*

MY DEAR MR. HORAN: I have your letter of January 26 requesting information as to whether the Bureau of Reclamation, with funds made available as requested in the 1949 and 1950 budget, will be able to proceed with new projects in accordance with schedule R of the Bonneville Power Administration, revised November 10, 1948.

The power developments in the Northwest in which the Bureau is directly concerned are Columbia Basin project (Grand Coulee power plant), Yakima project (Roza and Chandler power plants), Hungry Horse project, Hells Canyon project, and the projects in the Upper Snake Basin, power plants of which are listed in schedule R. The status of the power developments on these projects is as follows:

Grand Coulee: Schedule will be maintained if supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1949 and regular estimate for fiscal year 1950 are approved by the Congress.

Roza and Chandler power plants are not included in the present budget and Roza will be postponed to fiscal year 1953 and Chandler power plant to fiscal year 1954.

Hungry Horse project will be maintained on schedule if appropriations now requested are provided.

Hells Canyon project is not as yet authorized so there are no appropriations yet requested.

Anderson ranch project will be on schedule except possibly the transmission line for which appropriations were denied last year. Appropriations are again being requested in the presentation for 1950 in the hope of expediting this construction. If materials can be made available in time, the schedule can be approximately maintained.

The Upper and Lower Scriver Creek and Garden Valley plants are part of the Mountain Home project which is, as yet, not authorized, and, accordingly, there are no requests for appropriations in the present budget presentation.

Palisades project: The budget presentations for 1950 include funds in the amount of $205,000 for preconstruction work on Palisades project so that construction of the dam and reservoir may proceed as soon as agreement is reached with the water users. The present schedule of installation of generating units in the Palisades power plant calls for one unit in fiscal year 1954 and another unit in fiscal year 1955.

I appreciate your interest in this matter. Your conclusion that, even if we build these dams as fast as possible, we cannot catch up with the demand for at least 10 years, coincides with my own opinion. This is true not only for the Northwest area but in all areas of the West in which the Bureau is directly concerned. I might even go further and say that it applies to the whole United States. I regret that this fact is not more generally realized, as the most rapid progress practical in developing our potential hydroelectric resources is the only rational one. Not only has our power market overtaken us, but so far as we can foresee now, the market far into the future will be limited only by the available supply of low-cost power and not by natural unrestricted demand. Also, the concentrated development of fuel-electric plants in the past several years and the restricted development of our hydro resources simply mean accelerating the consumption of our irreplaceable resources of oil, gas, and coal, while at the same time a large part of our perpetual water-power resources continues to waste. Such a procedure simply does not make good sense.

If I can assist you further in this matter, please call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL W. STRAUS,
*Commissioner.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
*Washington, February 8, 1949.*

HON. WALT HORAN,
*House of Representatives,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. HORAN: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 26, 1949, with which you forwarded a copy of the Bonneville Power Administration's schedule R, showing its current recommendations for future generator installations in the Northwest. You inquire whether the Corps of Engineers' projects in the Northwest can be constructed to meet schedule R with the funds included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1950 and in the approved 1949 supplemental estimate. You also request information for comparison with schedule R on when generators can be installed at the various projects with the funds included in the above budgets.

With funds presently included in the approved 1950 budget and 1949 supplemental estimate, and assuming adequate appropriations in subsequent years, generator installations at McNary and Lower Monumental are expected to meet schedule R. At Ice Harbor and Big Cliff, generator installations will be 1 year earlier and at Detroit 6 months earlier, but at Chief Joseph installations will be 1 year later than schedule R.

The construction of Lookout Point Reservoir (called Meridian in BPA schedule) will continue rapidly with funds included in the 1950 budget. Although the power features at this project are not yet authorized, provisions have been made to readily include such features when authorized. The entire projects at Hill Creek and Dexter sites have not yet been authorized. Hill Creek is upstream and will provide supplemental storage to

Lookout Point. Dexter is downstream and will regulate the flows from Lookout Point. If the power features at Lookout Point, and the Dexter and Hill Creek projects are authorized for construction by the Eighty-first Congress and funds are appropriated for fiscal year 1951, power installations at these three projects can be expected about 6 months later than called for in schedule R.

Albeni Falls has not yet been authorized for construction. Senate bill 142, introduced by Senator CORDON on January 5, 1949, would authorize construction of this project. The Secretary of the Army forwarded on January 27, 1949, to the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, United States Senate, a report recommending early construction of the Albeni Falls project. If authorized by the Eighty-first Congress and funds are appropriated for fiscal year 1951, generator installations may be expected 1 year later than schedule R. If funds are appropriated for fiscal year 1950, schedule R can be met.

The Hells Canyon project has not yet been authorized for construction. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors will complete in the near future its review of the report on the Columbia River basin in which the division engineer, North Pacific division, has recommended early construction of the Hells Canyon project. If authorized for construction in this Congress and sufficient funds are appropriated for 1951 and subsequent years, it is expected that generators can be installed at this project to meet schedule R.

To meet schedule R, additional funds will be required in fiscal year 1950 for the Chief Joseph project, and early authorizations and appropriations are required for the Hells Canyon, Albeni Falls, Hill Creek, and Dexter projects and for the power features at Lookout Point.

Sincerely yours,

R. C. CRAWFORD,
*Major General,*
*Acting Chief of Engineers.*

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the close of the legislative program and after any other special orders previously agreed to, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. JONES of Missouri, until Wednesday next, on account of illness in his family.

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for an indefinite time, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. IRVING (at the request of Mr. WELCH of Missouri), for an indefinite time, on account of official business.

### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 135. An act to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to establish daylight-saving time in the District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 15, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

210. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a detailed report on the Federal supply system; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

211. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government transmitting a summary report on the Federal supply system; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

212. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the task-force report on records management; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

213. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a report on the Office of General Services (H. Doc. No. 73); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

214. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 21, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of Presumpscot River, Maine, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on August 26, 1937; to the Committee on Public Works.

215. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 5, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on Waiska River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 20, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

216. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to transfer the Pomona station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

217. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

218. A letter from the Director, Central Intelligence Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

219. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a copy of a resolution adopted on January 13, 1949 by the Fono of American Samoa, stating the desire that the administration of the government of Samoa and these islands continue under the United States Navy; to the Committee on Public Lands.

220. A letter from the Secretary, United States Department of the Interior, transmitting a report of the financial status of the National Park trust fund as of June 30, 1948; to the Committee on Public Lands.

---

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KERR, Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 2632. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. VINSON: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 1945. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 by providing that the Vice President shall be a member of the National Security Council; without amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 967. A bill for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1509. A bill for the relief of the city and county of San Francisco; without amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1959. A bill for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2049. A bill for the relief of certain postal employees; without amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 2313. A bill to suspend certain import taxes on copper; with an amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 99. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2632, a bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 102. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 92, joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the House Calendar.

---

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 572. A bill for the

relief of Sylvia M. Misetich; with an amendment (Rept. No. 67). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 618. A bill for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman; without amendment (Rept. No. 68). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 637. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers; without amendment (Rept. No. 69). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 659. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 70). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 683. A bill for the relief of Louise Peters Lewis; without amendment (Rept. No. 71). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 684. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Gordon; without amendment (Rept. No. 72). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 739. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Harris without amendment (Rept. No. 73). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 745. A bill for the relief of B. John Hanson; without amendment (Rept. No. 74). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 767. A bill for the relief of Eugene Spitzer; with an amendment (Rept. No. 75). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1036. A bill for the relief of R. C. Owen; with amendments (Rept. No. 76). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1043. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth Cameron; with amendments (Rept. No. 77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1057. A bill for the relief of John Keith; with an amendment (Rept. No. 78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1061. A bill for the relief of Bernice Green; without amendment (Rept. No. 79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1066. A bill for the relief of James Leon Keaton; with an amendment (Rept. No. 80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1076. A bill for the relief of Jennie Olsen Anderson; without amendment (Rept. No. 81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1093. A bill for the relief of D. Lane Powers, Elaine Powers Taylor, and Monroe W. Taylor; with amendments (Rept. No. 82). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1094. A bill for the relief of Nellie M. Clark; without amendment (Rept. No. 83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1095. A bill for the relief of Pittsburgh DuBois Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1098. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt, Jr., a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 85). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Miriam Barkle; without amendment (Rept. No. 86). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1137. A bill for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 87). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1164. A bill for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey; without amendment (Rept. No. 88). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1169. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marion T. Schwartz; without amendment (Rept. No. 89). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1176. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann; with amendments (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1271. A bill for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of George Hampton; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1280. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1286. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland; without amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1299. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford; without amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1300. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley; with an amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1452. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1459. A bill for the relief of E. Neill Raymond; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1461. A bill for the relief of L. J. Houze Convex Glass Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1471. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1489. A bill for the relief of James I. Matthews; with an amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1490. A bill for the relief of the estates of Arthur F. Saladino, Joseph Spivack, and Irving Weinberg; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1501. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, a minor; with amendments (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1597. A bill for the relief of Hal W. Cline; with an amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1602. A bill for the relief of Ben Grunstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1794. A bill for the relief of Cohen, Goldman & Co., Inc.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1983. A bill for the relief of Edward L. Barreras; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2089. A bill for the relief of William Price; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2261. A bill for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2352. A bill for the relief of Roy Durbin; without amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

---

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 2632. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARDEN:

H. R. 2633. A bill to provide for the free importation of evergreen Christmas trees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2634. A bill to provide transportation of passengers and merchandise on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BOGGS of Delaware:

H. R. 2635. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2636. A bill to provide for designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital now being constructed at Wilmington, Del., as the William L. Nelson Veterans' Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 2637. A bill to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the

Indians of California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CAVALCANTE:

H. R. 2638. A bill to authorize the employment of executive assistants for Members of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

H. R. 2639. A bill to provide an allowance for Members of Congress for duplicate-copy service; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COTTON:

H. R. 2640. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2641. A bill to create an Office of General Services as a central agency to have jurisdiction and control over certain administrative services in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. R. 2642. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the free importation for 1 year of twine used for baling hay, straw, and other fodder and bedding material; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2643. A bill to amend the act of June 30, 1945 (Public Law 106, 79th Cong.), as amended, to provide true time and one-half for overtime and true double time for Sunday and holiday duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2644. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 2645. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to enable States to establish more adequate public-welfare programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 2646. A bill to amend paragraph 1007 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANAHAN:

H. R. 2647. A bill to amend section 4 of the United States Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2648. A bill to establish the Fish and Wildlife Advisory Board; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. R. 2649. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of an experiment station in the Sixth Congressional District of West Virginia, or some other suitable location in the State of West Virginia, for research on the production, refining, transportation, and use of petroleum and natural gas from coal; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 2650. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. JONAS:

H. R. 2651. A bill to terminate the war tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (by request):

H. R. 2652. A bill to require the use of the Vaughn record of watch comparison by persons subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 2653. A bill to amend chapter 29 of the Internal Revenue Code to allow exporters a refund of taxes paid on tires shipped to foreign countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2654. A bill to provide for the construction of a customhouse building in the Los Angeles Harbor area at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2655. A bill to provide for the purchase of a site for a customhouse building in the Los Angeles Harbor area at Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LIND:

H. R. 2656. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2657. A bill to terminate the war-tax rates on certain miscellaneous excise taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2658. A bill to continue until the close of June 30, 1950, the free importation of lead; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2659. A bill to increase the amount of wages that may be earned by individuals entitled to old-age and survivors insurance benefits payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 2660. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PHILLIPS of California:

H. R. 2661. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2662. A bill to grant time to employees in the executive branch of the Government to participate, without loss of pay or deduction from annual leave, in funerals for deceased members of the armed forces returned to the United States for burial; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCRIVNER:

H. R. 2664. A bill to expand coverage for old-age and survivors insurance under title II, Social Security Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 2665. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2666. A bill to authorize the improvement of La Grange Bayou, Fla., and to provide a turning basin at Freeport, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 2667. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, part III; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2668. A bill to further extend the period of validity of the act to facilitate the admission into the United States of the alien fiancées or fiancés of members of the armed forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2669. A bill to promote maximum employment, business opportiunities, and careers in a free competitive economy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WADSWORTH:

H. R. 2670. A bill to establish a commission on the legal status of women in the United States, to declare a policy as to distinctions based on sex, in law and administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2671. A bill to establish uniform procedure relative to the proof of age, place of birth, or of death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2672. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the War Department or of the Army for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2673. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 2412, relating to taxation of fees and costs against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2674. A bill providing for the incorporation of the National Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, organized December 10, 1847; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 2675. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 2676. A bill to promote the general welfare and to strengthen national security and the common defense of the Nation by authorizing the construction and operation of demonstration plants to produce potable water from sea water or other liquids, elements, or substances in order to promote and to conserve, develop, and increase the national water resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 2677. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2678. A bill to amend section 5 of the act approved July 10, 1890, as amended, relating to the admission into the Union of the State of Wyoming, so as to permit the leasing of school lands within such State for mineral purposes for terms in excess of 10 years; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2679. A bill to exempt from income tax so much of any Christmas bonus paid to an employee as does not exceed $100; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 2680. A bill to provide Federal funds to assist the States in the acquisition and construction of plant facilities for public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request)

H. R. 2681. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2682. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EVINS (by request):

H. R. 2683. A bill relating to certain disability compensation ratings and to certain ratings for insurance purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2684. A bill to extend insurance benefits granted by the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to parents of certain deceased veterans of World War II without any requirement as to the dependency of such parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2685. A bill to provide automobiles for disabled veterans of World War I under the same terms and conditions as are now applicable to veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2686. A bill to restore the status quo in respect of certain employment taxes and social-security benefits pending action by Congress on extended social-security coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H. R. 2687. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Cowan, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2688. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Watertown, Tenn.; to the Committe on Public Works.

H. R. 2689. A bill to provide for the construction of a post office at Sewanee, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2690. A bill to provide for the review of certain decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals; to the Committee of Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2691. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bunkruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2692. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE:

H. R. 2693. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 2694. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, approved January 24, 1934, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 2695. A bill to grant pensions to veterans who served in the Regular Army before 1898; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 2696. A bill to establish a Bureau of Reserve Affairs in the Department of the Army and a Bureau of Reserve Affairs in the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2697. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purpose of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 2698. A bill authorizing the town of Freeport, Tex., to construct a cut-off channel in Oyster Creek, Brazoria County, Tex., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 2699. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the western district of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2700. A bill to provide for centralizing certain wage rates to the supervision of the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2701. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for a term of the United States district court at San Jose, Calif.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. J. Res. 158. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the hundredth anniversary of the founding of Fort Laramie in the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SABATH:

H. J. Res. 159. Joint resolution providing for the observance of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. J. Res. 160. Joint resolution to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancées Act (60 Stat. 329), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. Res. 100. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. Res. 101. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1945) to amend the National Security Act of 1947 by providing that the Vice President shall be a member of the National Security Council; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their resolution adopted on February 7, 1949, relating to Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and asking that immediate and appropriate action be taken requesting United Nations to inquire into the reported deliberate and wanton disregard of the freedom of religion, and the torture of the accused; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of House Joint Memorial 3, asking that Congress authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assist local lending agencies in financing disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders in the blizzard areas of the Western States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their House Concurrent Resolution 1, asking for the establishment of October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, memoralizing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their House Concurrent Resolution C, asking to increase the share of Federal participation and increase the annual appropriation under Public Law 725; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for the consideration of their Enrolled Joint Memorial 3, asking that Congress consider and pass legislation appropriating funds to complete construction of the Glendo Dam project in Platte County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:

H. R. 2702. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 2703. A bill for the relief of Ida L. Funston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2704. A bill for the relief of Freda Wahler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2705. A bill for the relief of Martin Kenneth Ikeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 2706. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Susie Larvie Dillion; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of the Lacchi Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMER:

H. R. 2708. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRANGER:

H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of Sadae Aoki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2710. A bill for the relief of Emma Armstrong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Helen Doherty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 2712. A bill for the relief of Gardi Sourell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 2713. A bill for the relief of Seli Spigler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2714. A bill for the relief of Katalin Stamberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2715. A bill for the relief of Sandor Stamberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. R. 2716. A bill for the relief of Jose Simao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2717. A bill for the relief of Jose Medalha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 2718. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Vitelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 2719. A bill for the relief of I. D. Cosson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

61. By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming: Memorial of the thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memoralizing the Congress of the United States of America to alleviate the present electric-power shortage and anticipate future electric-power needs to avoid crippling the economic development of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Public Lands.

62. Also, memorial of the thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating funds to complete construction of the Glendo Dam project in Platte County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

63. Also, petition of Laramie Rental-property Owners' Association, Laramie, Wyo., objecting to existing legislation on rent control or proposed extension of controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

64. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution adopted by Kenosha Council, No. 973, Knights of Columbus, at its regular meeting in Kenosha, Wis., on February 8, 1949, stating that the conscience of the American people and liberty-loving people all over the world is shocked at the trial of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, and voicing their condemnation of such proceedings; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

65. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Miss Jean Kennedy and 24 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also, petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

66. Also, petition of Miss Marie S. Crooks and 24 other citizens of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also, petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

67. Also, petition of Miss Cynthia Szymanski and 39 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

68. Also, petition of 767 residents of Jersey City, N. J., and vicinity, petitioning the Government of the United States to send a formal protest to the Hungarian Government for the miscarriage of justice which is evident in the mock trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; also petitioning the Government to condemn publicly the fallacy of such a trial and conviction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

69. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of the Fall River Clover Club, Inc., and the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, protesting against the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

70. By Mr. RICH: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Muncy, Pa., in opposition to the construction of steam power plants in the Tennessee Valley Authority or in any other section of the United States with funds provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Appropriations.

71. By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma: Memorial of the Twenty-second Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 3), concerning the immediate need of drastically curtailing the importation of crude oil from foreign countries to the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

72. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of the City Council of Providence, R. I., requesting that the Congress of the United States pass and the President of the United States approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

73. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Kenosha, Wis., memorializing the Congress to pass and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress, providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

74. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. Charlotte C. Cobb, chairman, resolutions, Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to education, housing, and national loyalty adopted at this meeting; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

75. Also, petition of Fred S. Mansfield, secretary, Dallas Clearing House Association, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution urging amendment to Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation law authorizing and directing discontinuance of assessments so long as FDIC capital funds are not less than $1,000,000,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

76. Also, petition of Stanley J. Witkowski, city clerk, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution asking for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

77. Also, petition of A. D. Edmonston, acting secretary, Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to favorable consideration of H. R. 163 and H. R. 126, which would authorize Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California; to the Committee on Public Lands.

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mercies, we give Thee most humble and hearty thanks for all Thy goodness and loving kindnesses to us. Grant us in all our doubts and uncertainties the grace to ask what Thou wouldst have us do, that the spirit of wisdom may save us from all false choices, and that in Thy light we may see light and in Thy straight path we may not stumble. Grant that this day we may fall into no errors and all our doings be righteous in Thy sight.

Blessed is the man that maketh the Lord his trust. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article.

### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

### COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries may have permission to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KELLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, delivered over the American Broadcasting Co. on Saturday, February 5, 1949.

### CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the recent farcical trial and subsequent conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty is further evidence of the operation of the Communist system. The Communist philosophy advocates a deliberate debasement of the dignity of the human being to the level of a common beast. How else would such a philosophy survive if each and every individual was not subjected to the domineering will of the state?

That trial was a political trial and had an imperialistic end. Obviously, in order to attain the imperialistic end, the proceedings at the trial had to be served to the outside world in such manner so as to indicate the apparent innocence of the state. Thus the cardinal was presumed to have pleaded guilty. This in itself serves as valuable propaganda for the Communist ends at home, even though it may not necessarily be accepted in a democratic country. But was it actually the cardinal who pleaded guilty? How are we to know whether Cardinal Mindszenty ever appeared at the trial? The trial was certainly not open to everyone and was not a free trial. Some say the cardinal was a victim of chemical treatment; others say he was drugged. The fact is, he is said to have confessed his guilt to some of the charges. But why could not the trial have taken on a Hollywood atmosphere and substituted a double in the cardinal's stead? That would not have been difficult to do, for we have no proof that he was there at all except that the controlled Communist press tells us that he was there. It is very likely that Cardinal Mindszenty never appeared at his trial, that he was either in a prison somewhere or was dead at the time.

It is absolutely necessary that a Communist-controlled government employ

any expedient measure to erase the life of any human being who stands opposed to that government because of its false philosophy, particularly where that government condones the outrageous extinction of Christian doctrine.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, on which I have the honor to serve, has just reported a pension bill for World War I and World War II veterans. In my opinion the bill that has been reported has been reported without proper and due consideration by the committee. In fact, seven members of that committee walked out of the hearings this morning because of the high-handed and arbitrary tactics of the gentleman from Mississippi, chairman of the committee.

This bill provides that an individual, not having an honorable discharge, and ineligible for membership in major veterans' organizations, is still eligible to receive pension under the provisions of this bill.

Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, that the Veterans' Committee members never saw this bill until it was presented by the gentleman from Mississippi, Chairman RANKIN, this morning. Surely this House does not want to take up a bill that was only considered by the committee for seven brief minutes.

During my service on this committee I have always been sympathetic to legislation designed for the welfare of our veterans and their dependents; however, I cannot support a bill that would ultimately cost over $6,000,000,000 per year, nor would I ask this House to do so unless the Members were sure that ample hearings had been held. If this bill is brought up after the necessary number of days, under the new rules, I sincerely urge that the membership of this House will, regardless of possible political consequences, recommit the bill to the committee for further consideration. If this is done, I can assure the Members that a pension bill will be favorably reported by the committee that will be fair and equitable to both veterans and citizens.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is true that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] walked out on the veterans this morning and that a few uninformed, or I probably should say misinformed, members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs went along with him; but a large majority of the members of the committee remained, went through the entire bill, and voted to report it out.

As to my being arbitrary, as a matter of fact, I put that question to a vote, and the committee sustained me, which put the gentleman on the spot, and that is when he walked out.

I want to say that a majority of the members of the committee voted to raise the age limit to 65 years and voted to follow the Spanish-American War veterans pension law by providing them a pension of $90 a month—just what the Spanish War veterans are being paid now.

Mr. HUBER. Is the gentleman discussing what occurred in executive session?

Mr. RANKIN. I am talking about what the gentleman spoke of here a moment ago.

The gentleman gets up here and misinforms the House, and I am trying to correct him. If the gentleman had stayed there and voted he would not have any "gripe."

We do not intend for our old veterans, when they pass the age of their earning capacity, to have to go to the poorhouse to get a meal ticket.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by Mr. Eric Johnston.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a Lincoln Day address delivered by his colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in Paterson, N. J.

Mr. HALE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an editorial appearing in the Bangor (Maine) Daily News, and in the other an article by Roscoe Pound on the present situation in China.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by a former Member of the House.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. RIVERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address delivered by his colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., at Charleston, S. C.

Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one an article appearing in the Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) Times, February 12, and in the other an editorial appearing in the same newspaper with reference to the celebration of the birthday of John L. Lewis.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it becomes necessary for me to rise in support and corroboration of the statements that have been made by the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Arizona regarding what did happen in our Committee on Veterans' Affairs this morning. I want the House to know that I attended every daily session of the hearings that were held on that bill, and to say that those of us who walked out, as a class, are uninformed is a reflection not upon those Members but upon the way in which those committee hearings have been held. I think that every one of us was justified in leaving a meeting of the committee. It did not operate in accordance with the rules of this House.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any desire to become entangled in any personal fight or disagreement between Members of this House, but I have been present at all committee hearings on a uniform-pension bill. I have heard the discussions on both sides. It has been fair. It has been an effort to keep faith with the men that have worn the uniform with honor in the defense of this Republic. The American Legion, the VFW, the Disabled American Veterans, and all great veterans' organizations have been given fair and courteous treatment before our committee. I introduced a bill myself, No. 5810. My chief concern is in promoting the welfare of the veterans and the American people. I trust that no veteran who has defended his country will ever be forced upon the charity of others when he becomes ill and disabled.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know whether the committees of this House operate under the same rules as the House.

The SPEAKER. The rules of the House so provide.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know further whether this House has a right to appeal from a ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Any Member has the right to appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. CHUDOFF. I should like to know whether, under that ruling, members of the committee can appeal from the ruling of the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. They can.

Mr. CHUDOFF. So that the chairman of a committee who had his ruling appealed from would have no right other than to allow that appeal to go before the entire committee; is that right, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The rules of the House provide that the rules of the House are made the rules of its standing committees so far as applicable. The Members of the House have a right to appeal from a decision of the Chair. That would also apply in a committee.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Suppose a question is raised here and a roll call is asked for, and one-fifth of the Members rise and ask for a roll call, and the Chair holds that a roll call is called for, no appeal from that ruling would be in order, would it?

The SPEAKER. That would be in accordance with the rules of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. That is just what happened in the committee this morning. I demanded a roll call and asked for a showing of hands, and more than one-fifth voted for a roll call. One member tried to appeal from the decision, which, of course, was ridiculous. Then a few of them walked out, evidently to keep from going on record.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was only answering the parliamentary inquiry. He does not know what happened in the committee.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include certain statements and excerpts.

Mr. FORAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the general assembly of his State.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report from a soil conservation district.

Mr. HARE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Emory Alumnus.

Mr. McSWEENEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some statistics he has gathered relative to the Taft-Hartley law.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter. In one instance, the Government Printing Office advises me the cost will be $159.75 and that it will take 2¼ pages of the RECORD, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

### COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I am a new Member of Congress. I am also an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, having served 5½ years—3½ years of this time overseas. I have a deep and sincere interest in the veteran.

I believe that our Nation owes a great debt of gratitude to the men who served it, and who helped to save our way of life—the great American way.

I deem it a singular honor and privilege to be able to serve on the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Today the Committee on Veterans' Affairs had under consideration a general pension bill for veterans. In my opinion, the people of our country are grateful that these men were able to preserve our democratic processes and they would like to make this feeling manifest through a measure of this kind. However, even while such a measure is under consideration, we must not yield any of our democratic processes. The veteran fought to preserve our democratic way—and as a Member of Congress—it is my solemn duty to continue to fight to preserve that way. And I intend to do so unceasingly.

This opportunity I do not believe was afforded to us because of the objectionable way in which the chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee conducted today's meeting.

The chairman of that committee has charged that seven members ran out on the veterans when considering the general pension bill. I take issue with that remark. My interest in the welfare of the veteran is as great as his—but I am strenuously opposed to what I regard as the undemocratic method he has used in the conduct of today's meeting. I feel that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER] who walked out with us, reflected a commendable attitude.

I did not walk out on the veteran. I shall never walk out on the veteran. I shall always fight for the welfare of the veteran. But I shall also continue to fight for the things the veteran fought for—the preservation of our democratic principles.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHUDOFF. Mr. Speaker, I too am a new Member of Congress. The gentleman from Mississippi would like you to believe that the reason the members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs walked out this morning did so because they are walking out on the veterans. I think that is an unfair statement. I believe the first obligation of the Congress is to the veteran. I think every member that walked out this morning walked out only because the chairman was not adhering to the rules of the House, and was acting in a dictatorial fashion.

### AUTHORIZING READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, February 22, 1949, Washington's Farewell Address may be read by a Member to be designated by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

### COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to sit today during general debate.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand there is important legislation here. Will we be notified when the general debate is over and when the bill is being read for amendment?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will see that that is done. The rule calls for 3 hours of general debate.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman states that the committee will be notified?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will see to it that that is done.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, with that explanation I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 9]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Bloom | Burnside |
| Allen, Ill. | Bonner | Byrne, N. Y. |
| Barden | Boykin | Carlyle |
| Bennett, Fla. | Bulwinkle | Colmer |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Coudert | Kennedy | Scott, |
| Curtis | Linehan | Hugh D., Jr. |
| Dawson | McMillan, S. C. | Scudder |
| deGraffenried | Magee | Shafer |
| Dingell | Mason | Short |
| Dolliver | Miles | Smith, Ohio |
| Douglas | Miller, Calif. | Somers |
| Ellsworth | Mitchell | Staggers |
| Gavin | Monroney | Stockman |
| Gorski, Ill. | Morrison, La. | Tackett |
| Halleck | Morton | Taylor |
| Heffernan | Nixon | Teague |
| Herter | O'Toole | Thomas, N. J. |
| Hinshaw | Pace | Towe |
| Hoffman, Ill. | Pfeifer, | Velde |
| Irving | Joseph L. | Weichel |
| Jackson, Calif. | Poulson | White, Idaho |
| Jenison | Powell | Whitten |
| Jenkins | Reed, Ill. | Willis |
| Jones, Mo. | Richards | Wilson, Ind. |
| Judd | Riehlman | Woodhouse |
| Kee | Sanborn | |

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 355 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments be permitted to have until midnight to file a report on the bill H. R. 782.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 99 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That, notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order on Tuesday, February 15, 1949, to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies for the fiscal year 1949, and for other purposes, and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, later I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 2632, the first deficiency appropriation bill. The rule waives all points of order and provides for 3 hours of general debate, after which the bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, the older Members know my position with respect to legislation carried in appropriation bills. However, I think I owe it to the new Members to explain that it is the duty and the function of the legislative committees to bring in legislative proposals.

The regular rules of the House preclude the Committee on Appropriations from bringing in new legislation, its jurisdiction being confined to making appropriations. Notwithstanding the fact that I have been opposed and am still opposed to the Committee on Appropriations reporting legislation in their general appropriation bills, I feel in this instance that this being a deficiency appropriation bill a waiver of points of order should be had and I favor the passage of the bill for the following reasons. Unfortunately the Republican Eightieth Congress went out of its way through waiver of points of order in restricting certain appropriations which have affected and which might affect the efficiency of some departments of government and which even make it impossible for some of the departments to perform their duties and functions as authorized by the Congress. Consequently I feel we are justified in agreeing to this rule which waives points of order on certain items in the bill.

Before I go any further in discussing provisions of the bill which will later on be explained by the chairman and members of the Committee on Appropriations, I am sure to the satisfaction of the House, I want to say that the Committee on Appropriations has filed and there is available to all Members a report showing the various appropriations provided for, including those that would be subject to points of order. I would advise the new Members to familiarize themselves with this report because, while 3 hours of general debate are provided for, a reading of the report will give them an opportunity to know the contents of the bill. I am satisfied that after careful consideration by the membership they will vote for the rule and later vote for the bill. I think the bill has been carefully prepared. There are reductions from the original amounts asked for by the budget to the extent, I believe, of $14,000,000. That shows that the Committee on Appropriations has been careful in passing on this legislation before reporting the same to the House. I urge the members to adopt the rule and vote for the passage of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time and now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] has explained, House Resolution 99 makes in order the consideration of H. R. 2632, a bill to make appropriations to supply deficiencies for the fiscal year which ends June 30. The rule also provides for 3 hours of general debate and, in addition, which is very important, waives all points of order on the different sections of the bill.

I wish to say with all the seriousness and conviction at my command that every Member of the House had better look over this bill carefully. I have served for a great many years on the Rules Committee, and H. R. 2632 is one of the most cleverly drawn measures that I have seen in a very long time. When it was brought before the Rules Committee it was not even in printed form. It had not been reported from the committee, and it had not even been introduced in the House. It was practically impossible to get any information as to what the measure contained. Then some of us on the committee began to ask some questions, and we found that there are many provisions and sections in this bill which are actually of a type that the House should consider, as separate pieces of legislation or each item by itself, and decide for itself, after due consideration, just what policy it desires to follow on such widely different important issues.

For instance, no one can find any fault with some of the sections in this bill, such as those taking care of the needs of the Vice President, or the usual payments to widows of deceased Members. I am sure something has to be done for the Capitol Building and the House and Senate chambers. So that is proper legislation in a measure like this.

The section providing additional fees for jurors in the Federal courts can easily be explained. Also the provision to carry out the intent and purpose of the new law relative to the President's salary, and also for the other matters which have been authorized by the Congress.

Then the bill carries some other provisions. For instance, grants to States for public assistance in connection with administration of unemployment compensation. Incidentally I think it might be well for all Members of the House to check rather carefully to find out just what compensation will be given to each State to carry out the provisions of this law. I can say to you frankly that, regardless of political affiliation, the public officials of the State of Ohio are not at all satisfied with the treatment which that great State has received in this connection.

Then I want to refer, please, to page 7, line 19, the item for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I wonder how many of you can read that section just by a cursory reading, and determine that it is a provision to build, to construct, and to put into operation, the Johnsonville steam plant, which this Congress turned down by direct legislative action, when it refused to put the Tennessee Valley Authority and the United States Government fairly and squarely into the business of producing electric power. That, and nothing more nor less, is all this steam plant section of the bill amounts to.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman will give me additional time, I will be glad to yield to him. Yes, if the gentleman will give me 5 minutes extra, I will be more than glad to yield to the gentleman.

When you vote for this rule waiving these points of order, you will make it so they can put into operation this steam plant down in the Tennessee Valley.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This steam plant is to be constructed at an expense of $2,950,000 of the taxpayers' money, to do something that we have been told all these years the Tennessee Valley Authority never intended to do; that is, to go into direct competition with our privately owned public utilities.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sorry; I cannot yield.

I want to go on, if I may. Here in the bill is a provision to continue the life of the War Assets Administration. The House has already passed a bill, just this last week, to extend its life, but we do not know what the Senate or the President may do about it. It might surprise some of you to find that the President may want to do something about liquidating these matters.

I want to go a little further in the discussion of the bill quickly because of time limitation; I want to refer to line 17 on page 16. The entire intent and purpose, force and effect of this particular section is to put Mike Straus and Richard Boke back on the pay roll out in California on the Central Valley project. You and I know that a law was passed by the last session of Congress to require that licensed and properly accredited engineers be named for supervisory work of this type because a situation developed out there which was so scandalous, and the waste of the money of the taxpayers of this country has been so great, that, in the opinion of congressional committees which have been investigating, something had to be done.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I will yield if the gentleman from Illinois will grant me more time.

If you want to put Mr. Straus and Mr. Boke back on the pay roll and permit this same sort of wasteful activity to go on, then vote for this rule; but if you want to stand by the legislation previously enacted by the Congress, then vote against the rule. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this rule should be voted down. It is time that we bring an end to the waiving of points of order on appropriation bills. Yes, it is time we stop certain committees of this House from legislating by circumvention without permitting the Members of the House to really know what they are voting on. I hope this rule will be voted down. So I ask for a vote of "No" on the adoption of this rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LYLE].

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, I concur with my distinguished colleague from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, that this membership should have full information on this measure—indeed, on every measure that is presented to the House. I would not willingly be a party to any procedure depriving the House of information. Appropriation bills are by their nature difficult to draft and difficult to present. Those of us not serving on that great committee must depend upon the report and hearings accompanying each bill and upon the debate. At this moment the provisions of the first deficiency appropriation bill, 1949, are not in issue, nor is the continuing controversy of "legislation in appropriation bills" in issue.

The question is, Shall the House follow the recommendation of its Committee on Rules and consider the proposed deficiency appropriation bill without the privilege of attack upon its many items by the use of points of order?

This procedure for the consideration of such a measure is by no means new or unusual. It is not inconsistent with the customs and practice of this body. The position of the gentleman from Ohio in requesting the House to vote against the adoption of the rule is, however, seemingly inconsistent. During the last Congress and for many, many years before, appropriation bills were consistently considered under similar rules.

It is a good rule. It is a necessary rule, for it permits the expeditious consideration of the many and varied problems and issues arising almost daily before the Congress. For example: The bill we seek to consider provides funds for the widows of two of our deceased colleagues. Should it be necessary to refer such an accepted practice to a legislative committee for authorizing legislation? We think not. But without the adoption of this rule a point of order properly raised would likely be sustained. That, to be sure, would not be done. It is an example, however, of the necessity and correctness of this character of procedure.

This rule is democratic. It permits any Member to challenge any part of the bill with which he disagrees by offering an amendment, and it permits the House, by a majority vote, to effect any change its will dictates.

This rule is fair for it makes in order 3 hours of general debate. During that time any Member who desires can surely inquire fully into any or all provisions.

I, too, regret that the Committee on Appropriations has found it necessary at times to write into its bills legislation. I regretted that in the Eightieth Congress. For instance, the matter discussed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] concerning the Bureau of Reclamation, the hiring of certain personnel, was a provision of an appropriation bill passed by the Eightieth Congress. That appropriation bill came to this floor under a similar rule—one waiving points of order. I have that resolution in my hand. It was House Resolution 615, Eightieth Congress. It was recommended by the Committee on Rules of that Congress. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] was then a member of that committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The fact of the matter is that provision was not in the bill as it was reported to the House by the Appropriations Committee. It was put in by amendment. If it was out of order when it was offered, a point of order could have been made against it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Inasmuch as the gentleman has referred to me, I call his attention to the fact mentioned by the gentleman from New York that the item to which he refers was not in the bill at the time a rule was granted. It was placed in on the floor of the House by an amendment offered by a Democrat from California, by the way, a member of the minority at that time. It was the result of legislation which had been introduced and passed in the Senate. It was introduced in the Senate by Senator DOWNEY, of California. That was not partisan. It was just a very, very good American move.

Mr. LYLE. That is the point I would impress upon you. This procedure is not partisan, nor is it restrictive. Under this rule, any germane amendment may be offered and may be adopted.

It may well be that the House in its wisdom will retain the restrictive clause adopted during the previous Congress. Assuredly, it can do so.

Consideration of the bill under this rule by no means insures its passage in toto. A "yea" vote on the rule does not and is not intended to bind any Member in support of the measure in whole or in part. It permits orderly consideration. It permits the issues to be considered by a majority. It prohibits an individual from successfully urging points of order against individual items and provisions of the bill.

The adoption of this rule is consistent with good legislative procedure and is in accord with the custom and practice of the House. The issues—many of them justly controversial—that will be raised during the consideration of the bill on its merits can be resolved in an orderly and democratic way. I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Speaker, for some years I have been disturbed about the tendency of the Appropriations Committee to absorb the function of legislating, and I am not criticizing individual members of that committee.

In the bill covered by the pending rule there are something like 10 of those instances. I do not intend upon this occasion to discuss any but 1 of them, which will be found at the bottom of page 16 of the bill and has to do with legislation passed by the last Congress prescribing certain qualifications for the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Assistant Commissioner, and regional directors in the reclamation-project areas.

I think it fair to the House to give the Members, and it must be brief because my time is not long, the background of that legislation. I happen to be familiar with

it because I was a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments directed by the full committee to investigate publicity and propaganda activities of the executive departments, a field in which we knew at the time the bureaucracy had been engaged over many, many years at ever-increasing expense until the information reached us that a total of $75,000,000 was being spent by publicity agencies of the various departments.

In investigating the publicity propaganda efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation we stumbled upon some exceedingly interesting and, I might say, distressing facts. Those facts were submitted in a report by our committee to the Congress, but I doubt if that report, which was made late in the session, was read by a great many Members in the confusion of the closing days.

Going back as briefly as I can to tell the story—and it is not a very nice story—the budget recommended to the Congress in the early winter of 1947 an appropriation of $30,000,000 to carry on the work in the Central Valley of California project, whose headquarters are at Sacramento. According to the budget estimates there would be an unexpended balance at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1947, of something like $10,000,000. The budget recommended the reappropriation of that $10,000,000 and an additional $20,000,000 of new money, making a total of $30,000,000. The Committee on Appropriations of the House, and later the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, found that the accounts and the reports of the reclamation district out there in the Central Valley project were most unreliable. When inquiries were made as to how much money they would actually have left to spend at the end of the fiscal year it was found, in the first instance, that they reported they would have $19,000,000 instead of $10,000,000, and then we found in the papers of the Department a report from Sacramento itself to Mr. Straus, the Commissioner of Reclamation, that actually they would have $25,000,000 left unexpended. Mr. Straus withheld this information from the Congress. And finally, in desperation, either the Senate committee or the House committee appealed to the Bureau of the Budget to actually find out how much money they would have left unexpended at the end of the fiscal year, and the budget reported in round figures $21,000,000. So, the Congress, acting in accordance with the recommendation of the budget, appropriated the $21,000,000 unexpended balance, and added $9,000,000 plus in order to make the total expendable in the next fiscal year $30,000,000, almost exactly the figure recommended by the President.

Now, what happened? The Bureau of Reclamation was outraged by this. It began agitating in California against the stinginess of the Congress. We found any number of examples of that. But, let me tell you what that regional office out there did. The man at the head of the regional office was a man named Richard L. Boke. He had never had the slightest experience as an engineer, nor had he ever administered any large undertaking. Under him was a man named Calland, his first assistant. On June 17, 1947, this man Calland sent out a letter to all of the Reclamation officials in the Sacramento Valley region. On June 17 the Congress was just finishing up the appropriation bills, and it was then perfectly apparent that the Central Valley project was going to get $30,000,000. I will read you a portion of that letter, which was dated June 17, 1947:

> Subject: Means of effectuating the regional director's responsibilities for construction on programing and execution, region 2
>
> 1. For reasons valid or otherwise, the construction program in the region has fallen far behind schedule. Because of failure to meet estimated progress, large amounts of appropriated funds have remained unspent at fiscal year ends. This fact has brought severe criticism upon us from the Secretary of the Interior, the Commissioner, from members of congressional appropriations committees, and from others.
>
> 2. The heavy carry-over from the current fiscal year (1947) plus an appropriation in the order of amounts recently passed by the Senate and House of Representatives will give us a total of funds available for fiscal year 1948 which is far above that required to meet our current rate of spending. The Secretary and the Commissioner are insistent that 1948 funds be spent early in the year—by January 1, if possible.

There is an order sent out with the approval of the high command, that, despite the fact that the Congress said they should have $30,000,000 to cover an entire fiscal year, they must spend it in half a year; and that was done, under the most peculiar circumstances.

As late as September 1947, after the new fiscal year had started, there was a meeting of the reclamation officials at Salt Lake City, about September 1, at which it was generally understood that there was sufficient money left in the appropriations to go at least until February 1, 1948, at which time the Congress would be in session and a deficiency could be asked for, if necessary. Nothing was said about their going broke, until suddenly, on November 26, 1947, a conference met at Sacramento at the regional office, from which it was announced to California and the entire western coast that there was no money left, that all major contracts had to be suspended. Incidentally, Boke, the regional director, did not attend the conference. He had gone off on a vacation 3 or 4 days before.

Mr. Boke upon the stand said, "Yes," he knew about Calland's letter. He had not heard of it, he said, although Calland was his first assistant, until it had been out for 5 or 6 or 7 days. We asked him if he took any measures to counteract that letter which carried the order to this vast organization. He said, "No," he had not. We asked him why he had not done so. For administrative reasons, he said. That is all the explanation we could get.

I asked him if he thought the Calland letter was in conformity with the intent of the Congress, and he admitted it was not.

What happened? The contracts were closed down. One thousand six hundred employees of the contractors were thrown out of work. The contractors filed claims for damages amounting to $1,900,000. Were any Federal employees suspended from employment? Not one. They kept them all on, although most of the work in the field had stopped.

Senator WHERRY heard of this thing a day or two before it happened. He was completely surprised. The members of our Committee on Appropriations did not hear of it until afterward. They were completely surprised.

The instant that close-down took effect they flooded the California newspapers with violent attacks against the Congress for not having appropriated enough money. Now, that is the fact. There is your propaganda, deliberate, although they had violated all decent rules of financial management in spending in 6 months the amount of money which the Congress said should last them for 12 months. That is the fact.

The committee employed one of the best-known chartered public accountants in San Francisco to look into the books of that office at Sacramento, the regional office.

After a lengthy investigation and auditing he found that instead of their being broke on November 26 there were $7,000,000 still left unspent. That is the kind of administration we had. It did not stop there. I have referred to the meeting at Salt Lake City attended by reclamation officers from the Western States. It was attended by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Straus, as well as all the regional directors and engineers. In the appropriation bill which was passed applicable to the year commencing July 1, 1948, the Congress had seen fit to reduce the appropriations for their information and publicity services from $150,000 to $50,000. Of course, that was with the intent and in the expectation that the personnel employed in this publicity propaganda business—and we saw a great deal of the publications and many of them were not at all sensible—would be dropped from the pay roll. Did that happen? Not one of them was dropped from the pay roll. In the meeting at Salt Lake City Mr. Straus, the Commissioner of Reclamation, described how they had avoided dropping anybody from the pay roll. He said he changed the name plates of the persons: he transferred them to jobs with different names and left them on the pay roll.

You may be interested to know what the chief engineer of the Reclamation Service said about that. The chief engineer, Mr. Young, made a speech before that gathering, and we obtained transcripts of all the speeches, in which he said—I quote:

> There was a legal procedure involved there and we even went so far as to perjure ourselves to get ourselves out of the woods. It didn't amount to anything in money, but the principle is there.

There you have it—he admitted perjury.

Now that is the atmosphere in which this thing has been run by Straus and Boke. I am telling you the truth about it. Another little incident occurred out there which may be of interest. It may not be important, but the Secretary of the Interior was present at that Salt

Lake City meeting and made an address. He was denouncing the Congress, as they all did. This merely indicates the contempt in which certain elements of the bureaucracy hold the Congress. He was denouncing the Congress and he said apropos of his connections and contacts with the Congress:

When you try to explain these matters to some "jass-ack" from across the river who has never had anything to do with such a construction program in his life, why you really got to have an excuse, and then I doubt it will do any good.

"Jass-acks," I greet you!

Well, I asked him in the hearings:

What river did you have in mind, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary KRUG. I do not recall, but I meant the general problem of explaining carry-overs to anyone. * * *

Mr. WADSWORTH. To what river did you refer?

Secretary KRUG. Perhaps the Mississippi—I do not know.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am disappointed. I thought perhaps you were going to say the Hudson.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the facts which were brought out, and many others which I have not related to you—many others—the Congress last year provided, in an amendment to an appropriation bill, to be sure, as a restriction on the expenditure of funds, that hereafter public funds shall not be expended for the salaries of the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Assistant Commissioner of Reclamation or a regional director, unless that officer has had 5 years' experience as an engineer and administrator. That provision took effect on January 1 of this year. I suppose Mr. Straus and Mr. Boke are out of office. Here we have in an appropriation bill a provision to put them back. The Committee on Public Lands has had no chance whatsoever to look into this thing, and as I understand it, it falls rightly within the jurisdiction of that committee. I do not think it is the part of the Committee on Appropriations to bring in an item like this asking a waiver of all points of order, in order that those two men, whose incompetence was demonstrated over and over again, may be reappointed. I am not violating any confidence. It is a matter of public knowledge that a sterling Democrat on our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] wrote his own report about those people and was just as severe as the report written by the other members on the Republican side. There was no party division on that subcommittee. I am hoping that in view of this situation the Public Lands Committee will be given a chance to look into these things, which they will not have if this rule is adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As a member of the Public Lands Committee, I want to extend my appreciation to the gentleman for making this information available to me and other members of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It is all in our committee report.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This information has not been before our committee heretofore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York, [Mr. WADSWORTH] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, all of the Members who were here in the Eightieth Congress, when the Republicans were in power, remember that that restriction was placed in the appropriation bill then under consideration, stopping the payment to those two men, and also a restriction on expenditures in reclamation. It was passed when only a few Members were on the floor of the House.

This matter had been considered by three committees of the Congress and by the Senate Appropriations and the House Appropriations Committee, and both committees found no reason to take any action against either Commissioner Straus or Mr. Boke. Both committees, by nearly unanimous action, recommended that appropriations be provided for both these gentlemen because the committees undoubtedly realized that while the Reclamation Division employed hundreds of engineers, it was also quite necessary that the Division be staffed with men possessing administrative and executive ability, which both these gentlemen have demonstrated in long years of Government service. These men sought to protect the public interest, and the fight against them were by those who were more interested in the private power interests.

Mr WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I am sorry I cannot yield now.

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] has quoted some speeches. We all sometimes make speeches here and there, and sometimes use words that may not be proper or that would not appeal to everyone. Now, the gentleman has paid a great deal of attention to it, and I hope that he is not being misled, as other people have been misled in California, due to the publicity that was given to this matter by the private power corporations that were opposed to the rulings of Straus and the Department of Reclamation, because they were trying to safeguard and protect the efforts on the part of the Government to construct, build, and complete projects in the interest of the public and not in the interest of a few private power interested corporations.

I am informed that a great deal of advertising space in California newspapers was used and paid for by the private corporations opposed to the ruling of the Secretary of the Interior and the Bureau of Reclamation refusing to yield on the 160-acre limit that Congress established, and because they failed to grant the things the private interests were seeking which would have been against the best interests of the Government and the people in that section of the country.

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. HAVENNER. Can the gentleman say whether the Rules Committee was given any information about the very large sums of money expended by the private power companies through the newspapers and advertising agencies in the Central Valley area to persuade the people of California that the Government's program for public control of the power development on the Central Valley project was an evil thing? Does he know that millions of dollars were expended by the private power companies of California through newspapers and other agencies of propaganda to conduct this enormous advertising campaign? And that the power companies charged up to operating expenses the cost of these newspaper advertisements and the other propaganda, and that those operating expenses in turn were charged up to the ratepayers of these private corporations, who are taxpayers of California? Has that information been brought before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. SABATH. No; it was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Rules; but I have received such information from certain sources that have been opposed to the activities of these large private power corporations which are trying in every conceivable way to obtain benefits to the disadvantage of the Government and the taxpayers.

Now, may I say to my Republican friends that an outstanding Republican Member in the last Congress, Mr. Robert Jones, of Ohio, chairman of the subcommittee, insisted on the floor that the money should be expended, that these improvements should be proceeded with in haste, and that if he had the power he would demand, and urge, bringing about still greater speed in the execution of these projects that were criticized by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. I regret I cannot yield. I have the floor and shall delete anything the gentleman may have said which the reporter may have taken down in his interruption during the course of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, personally, I am satisfied that the Committee on Appropriations that has heard the evidence used good judgment in embodying in the bill before us the various provisions contained therein striking out restrictions put in by the Republican Congress so as to hamstring the various departments in every conceivable way in the performance of their duty in the interest of the country. It was generally recognized then, and it is known now, the American people have spoken and disagreed with the policy of the celebrated Eightieth Congress.

In view of the existing situation I feel that the rule should be adopted and the bill passed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, upon that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 242, nays 121, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 10]

YEAS—242

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Gore | Noland |
| Addonizio | Gorski, N. Y. | Norblad |
| Albert | Gossett | Norrell |
| Allen, La. | Granahan | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Andrews | Granger | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Angell | Grant | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Aspinall | Green | O'Konski |
| Bailey | Gregory | O'Neill |
| Baring | Gross | O'Sullivan |
| Barrett, Pa. | Hagen | Pace |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Hardy | Passman |
| Bates, Ky. | Hare | Patman |
| Battle | Harris | Patten |
| Beckworth | Harrison | Perkins |
| Bentsen | Hart | Peterson |
| Biemiller | Havenner | Philbin |
| Blatnik | Hays, Ark. | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Bloom | Hays, Ohio | Poage |
| Boggs, La. | Hébert | Polk |
| Bolling | Hedrick | Powell |
| Bolton, Md. | Herlong | Preston |
| Brooks | Hobbs | Price |
| Brown, Ga. | Holifield | Priest |
| Bryson | Holmes | Quinn |
| Buchanan | Horan | Rabaut |
| Buckley, Ill. | Howell | Rains |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Huber | Ramsay |
| Burdick | Hull | Rankin |
| Burke | Jackson, Wash. | Redden |
| Burleson | Jacobs | Rhodes |
| Burton | Jennings | Ribicoff |
| Camp | Johnson | Rivers |
| Cannon | Jones, Ala. | Rodino |
| Carnahan | Jones, N. C. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Carroll | Karst | Rooney |
| Cavalcante | Karsten | Sabath |
| Celler | Kee | Sadowski |
| Chatham | Kelley | Sasscer |
| Chelf | Keogh | Sheppard |
| Chesney | Kerr | Sikes |
| Christopher | Kilday | Sims |
| Chudoff | King | Smathers |
| Clemente | Kirwan | Smith, Va. |
| Combs | Klein | Spence |
| Cooley | Kruse | Staggers |
| Cooper | Lane | Stanley |
| Cox | Lanham | Steed |
| Crook | Larcade | Stigler |
| Crosser | Lemke | Stockman |
| Davenport | Lesinski | Sullivan |
| Davies, N. Y. | Lind | Sutton |
| Davis, Ga. | Lucas | Tauriello |
| Davis, Tenn. | Lyle | Teague |
| Deane | Lynch | Thomas, Tex. |
| Delaney | McCarthy | Thompson |
| Denton | McCormack | Thornberry |
| Dollinger | McDonough | Tollefson |
| Donohue | McGrath | Trimble |
| Doughton | McGuire | Underwood |
| Douglas | McKinnon | Wagner |
| Doyle | McSweeney | Walsh |
| Durham | Mack, Ill. | Welch, Mo. |
| Eberharter | Mack, Wash. | Wheeler |
| Elliott | Madden | Whitaker |
| Engle, Calif. | Magee | White, Calif. |
| Evins | Mahon | White, Idaho |
| Fallon | Mansfield | Whitten |
| Feighan | Marcantonio | Whittington |
| Fernandez | Marsalis | Wickersham |
| Fisher | Marshall | Wier |
| Flood | Merrow | Williams |
| Fogarty | Miller, Calif. | Willis |
| Forand | Miller, Nebr. | Wilson, Okla. |
| Frazier | Mills | Winstead |
| Fugate | Morgan | Withrow |
| Furcolo | Morris | Wood |
| Garmatz | Moulder | Worley |
| Gary | Multer | Yates |
| Gathings | Murdock | Young |
| Gilmer | Murphy | Zablocki |
| Gordon | Murray, Tenn. | |

NAYS—121

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Bramblett | Cunningham |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Brehm | Dague |
| | Brown, Ohio | Davis, Wis. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Byrnes, Wis. | D'Ewart |
| Andresen, August H. | Canfield | Dondero |
| | Case, N. J. | Eaton |
| Arends | Case, S. Dak. | Elston |
| Auchincloss | Chiperfield | Engel, Mich. |
| Bates, Mass. | Church | Fenton |
| Beall | Clevenger | Ford |
| Bennett, Mich. | Cole, Kans. | Fulton |
| Bishop | Cole, N. Y. | Gamble |
| Blackney | Corbett | Gillette |
| Boggs, Del. | Cotton | Golden |
| Bolton, Ohio | Crawford | Goodwin |
| Graham | Lichtenwalter | Sadlak |
| Hale | Lodge | St. George |
| Hall, Edwin Arthur | Lovre | Scott, Hardie |
| | McCulloch | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Hand | McGregor | |
| Harden | McMillen, Ill. | Scrivner |
| Harvey | Macy | Scudder |
| Herter | Martin, Iowa | Secrest |
| Heselton | Martin, Mass. | Short |
| Hill | Meyer | Simpson, Ill. |
| Hinshaw | Michener | Simpson, Pa. |
| Hoeven | Miller, Md. | Smith, Kans. |
| Hoffman, Mich. | Murray, Wis. | Smith, Wis. |
| Hope | Nelson | Stefan |
| James | Nicholson | Taber |
| Jensen | O'Hara, Minn. | Talle |
| Jonas | Patterson | Van Zandt |
| Kean | Pfeiffer, William L. | Vorys |
| Kearney | | Vursell |
| Kearns | Phillips, Calif. | Wadsworth |
| Keating | Pickett | Walter |
| Keefe | Plumley | Werdel |
| Kilburn | Potter | Wigglesworth |
| Kunkel | Reed, N. Y. | Wilson, Tex. |
| Latham | Rees | Wolcott |
| LeCompte | Rich | Wolverton |
| LeFevre | Rogers, Mass. | Woodruff |

NOT VOTING—70

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Gorski, Ill. | Nixon |
| Allen, Ill. | Gwinn | Norton |
| Barden | Hall, Leonard W. | O'Toole |
| Bennett, Fla. | | Pfeifer, Joseph L. |
| Bland | Halleck | |
| Bonner | Heffernan | Poulson |
| Bosone | Hoffman, Ill. | Reed, Ill. |
| Boykin | Irving | Regan |
| Breen | Jackson, Calif. | Richards |
| Bulwinkle | Javits | Riehlman |
| Burnside | Jenison | Sanborn |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Jenkins | Shafer |
| Carlyle | Jones, Mo. | Smith, Ohio |
| Coffey | Judd | Somers |
| Colmer | Kennedy | Tackett |
| Coudert | Linehan | Taylor |
| Curtis | McConnell | Thomas, N. J. |
| Dawson | McMillan, S. C. | Towe |
| DeGraffenried | Mason | Velde |
| Dingell | Miles | Vinson |
| Dolliver | Mitchell | Weichel |
| Ellsworth | Monroney | Welch, Calif. |
| Fellows | Morrison | Wilson, Ind. |
| Gavin | Morton | Woodhouse |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. Norton for, with Mr. Halleck against.

Mr. Kennedy for, with Mr. Towe against.

Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Riehlman against.

Mr. Monroney for, with Mr. Coudert against.

Mr. Dawson for, with Mr. Smith of Ohio against.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Jenkins against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Reed of Illinois against.

Mr. Gorski of Illinois for, with Mr. Gavin against.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Taylor against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Weichel against.

Mr. O'Toole for, with Mr. McConnell against.

Mr. Byrne of New York for, with Mr. Shafer against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. Somers with Mr. Sanborn.

Mr. Burnside with Mr. Dolliver.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mrs. Bosone with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Nixon.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Jones of Missouri with Mr. Gwinn.

Mr. Regan with Mr. Jenison.

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Morton.

Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Poulson.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Velde.

Mr. HALE changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. ANGELL and Mr. HARRIS changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the report accompanying the bill, H. R. 2632, does not comply with the so-called Ramseyer rule.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that although the resolution which has been adopted waives points of order against the bill by the provisions contained therein it does not specifically waive or exempt the so-called Ramseyer rule which requires that a report accompanying a bill, including appropriation bills, shall set forth in appropriate type the text of the statute it is proposed to repeal.

In this connection I invite the Chair's attention to the fact that on page 8 of the proposed bill, line 6, it is proposed to repeal a title in a previous act of Congress, and again on page 16, lines 15 and 16, the bill carries this language: "and the first, fourth, and fifth provisos under said head are hereby repealed."

I have diligently searched the entire report on the bill and can find no citation of the statute to be repealed in order to comply with the Ramseyer rule.

I make the point of order which, if sustained, as I understand it, would automatically recommit the bill to the committee.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read the rule:

Notwithstanding any rule of the House to the contrary, it shall be in order—

And so forth—

and all points of order against the bill or any of the provisions contained therein are hereby waived.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair indulge me for a moment?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will indulge the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Under the rule in the House Manual, a citation is made to a precedent in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the Seventy-first Congress, second session, page 10595. This citation reads:

Special orders providing for consideration of bills, unless making specific exemption, do not preclude the point of order that reports on such bills fail to indicate proposed changes in existing law. (Cannon's, sec. 9220a; 71st Cong., 2d sess., CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 10595.)

I fail to see any provision in the rule adopted which specifically exempts clause 2a of rule XIII, the Ramseyer rule.

The SPEAKER. The Ramseyer rule is a rule of the House, and this resolution states "all rules to the contrary notwithstanding," it shall be in order to consider the bill.

The Chair overrules the point of order.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2632, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, my remarks at this time will be limited to a brief summary of the bill and the action of the Committee on Appropriations now presented for consideration by this body.

The report before you contains a rather detailed explanation of each item contained in the bill which is, as you are aware, the first appropriation bill reported to the Eighty-first Congress. First of all I wish to express my appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee, all of whom have been very cooperative and pleasant to work with. We are, of course, honored by having the chairman of the full committee the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], as a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Army Civil Appropriations.

The bill before you contains a total in recommended appropriations of $466,800,000, which represents a reduction of $14,000,000 in the budget estimates. I want to point out, however, that of the total request of $480,800,000 approximately $353,000,000 was requested for items over which neither the administration nor the committee had much control. For example, $151,000,000 is for additional grants-in-aid for public assistance made necessary by the enactment of legislation since the original fiscal year 1949 budget was presented. Almost $103,000,000 is for the postal service, part of which is due to the increased volume of mail and part of which is due to increased transportation rates imposed on the Post Office by the Interstate Commerce Commission and by the Civil Aeronautics Board. An amount of nearly $100,000,000 is included for the veterans' benefits. The net result is that there remained only an amount of something over $127,000,000 in which the committee could effect some reductions, and out of this total the amount of $14,000,000 has been saved.

I wish to call your attention to one item, a recommended appropriation of $2,274,500 for reconstruction of the roof in the House Chamber and for other needed improvements. The Senate made a similar appropriation last year, and it was the thought of the Architect of the Capitol and the committee that considerable savings in the ultimate cost could be effected if the work on both roofs was done simultaneously.

As you read through the report you will notice that many of the deficiency items included in the bill are the result of legislation enacted subsequent to the presentation of the regular fiscal year 1949 estimates. This is the case in connection with the Office of Defense Transportation whose existence was continued until June 30, 1949, by the enactment of Public Law 606, Eightieth Congress.

The Displaced Persons Commission received an initial appropriation of $2,000,000 with a proviso that it could be obligated and expended during the first three-quarters of the fiscal year; hence, the need for this deficiency.

I previously mentioned the grants to States for public assistance. This calls for an amount of $151,000,000 made necessary by the enactment by the Eightieth Congress of Public Law 642, increasing the Federal share of the contributions for old-age assistance, aid to the blind, and aid to dependent children.

With respect to grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service, the committee is recommending the full amount of the estimate, or $4,987,000. However, the committee, because of the great divergence of opinion on this item, has instituted a study of the situation by its own investigative staff and will later entertain recommendations for such adjustments as the facts may justify.

For the Federal Housing Administration the committee increased the limitation under administrative expenses from $19,000,000 to $23,000,000 because of the tremendous increase in applications for loans. These administrative expenses, as you are aware, come out of the corporate earnings of the Administration and not out of the general fund of the Treasury.

The Housing Expediter requested $7,450,000. The subcommittee recommends $4,800,000, which will carry the activity through the month of May, prior to which time, undoubtedly, some new legislation affecting this agency will be passed by the Congress.

The bill includes $2,950,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, of which $2,500,000 is for beginning construction on the New Johnsonville steam plant. Although this item was left out of the regular 1949 appropriation act after considerable discussion of the matter in committee and on the floor, it is the thought of the committee that, so long as this is a Federal project, it should be made as efficient an operation as possible.

The bill includes nearly $100,000,000 for the Veterans' Administration. This amount is largely attributable to amendments to the authorizing act passed by the Eightieth Congress subsequent to the consideration of the regular fiscal year 1949 estimates.

For the War Assets Administration the bill includes the amount of $12,500,000. Under present law this agency is to go out of existence on February 28. However, in view of the President's recommendation for legislation to establish one over-all disposal agency, it is thought that the War Assets Administration should be continued in existence until the end of this year in order that a more orderly transition may be effected when the new agency is established. The bill (H. R. 2402), extending the life of the War Assets Administration to June 30, was, as you are aware, passed by the House yesterday.

Two items are included for the Department of Agriculture. They are not large from the standpoint of money but are nonetheless important. The first is an amount of something over $9,700,000 for establishing acreage allotments for cotton and wheat as provided for in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The other item is an increase of something over $3,000,000 in the administrative-expense limitation for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The record crops and the recent drop in prices have trebled the number of loans from that contemplated originally.

There are five items in the Department of Commerce, the most important of which is an amount of $11,000,000, for the census of business authorized by the Eightieth Congress. The census will cover all the retail establishments in the Nation as of December 31, 1948, estimated to number 3,000,000.

Under the Department of the Interior there is an item of $6,000,000 for the Bonneville Power Administration, the amount to be used for extending electrical transmission facilities. Two small items are included for the Bureau of Indian Affairs; one in the amount of $360,000 for the Navajo and Hopi service, mostly for salary increases under Public Law 900, Eightieth Congress, and $385,000 for the welfare of Indians, generally. A number of construction items are included under the Bureau of Reclamation, both from the Reclamation fund and from the general fund. Under the Reclamation fund the bill includes $975,000 for continuing construction on three projects—two in Idaho and one in Utah. Three items are included for construction under the general fund. These also are continuing projects, and the added amounts are made necessary in the main because of contract earnings beyond the availability of appropriations. The total of these three projects is $10,800,000. Also included is an amount of $4,500,000 for the Missouri River Basin project. As most of you gentlemen are aware, this is a development covering 10 States of the Missouri River Basin and includes irrigation, power, navigation, flood control, and water for municipal and other purposes.

A number of items are included for the Corps of Engineers, National Military Establishment. For rivers and harbors a recommended amount of $10,500,000 is to provide for continuing construction on the McNary lock and dam and for beginning construction on the Ice Harbor lock and dam and the Chief Joseph lock and dam, the last two of which are interrelated to the power development in the Northwest area. Under flood control, general, the bill includes $14,000,000 for continuing construction on six projects. The bill also includes $2,500,000 for the emergency fund needed to complete the repair, restoration, and strengthening of levees in the Columbia Basin damaged by floods in May and June 1948.

Almost $103,000,000 is included for the postal service, of which $70,000,000 is for railroad transportation; $17,000,000 for foreign air-mail service, and $13,000,000 for the postal vehicle service. The additional appropriation is made necessary by a temporary increase of 25 percent in rail rates authorized by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and because of a tremendous increase in mail volume. Increased rates were also approved by the Civil Aeronautics Board for foreign air mail.

Three items are included for the Treasury Department. In the case of two of these, no action could be taken by the committee. One is the amount of $2,300,000 for the payment of claims and another is $800,000 for refund of moneys erroneously received and covered into the Treasury. The committee allowed $1,500,000 for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing for the printing of an additional 16,000,000 sheets of currency for replacement, principally in the one-dollar-bill category.

As I indicated previously, while the total of appropriations in the bill is substantial, many of the items could not be reduced. I feel that the committee has done a good job and has reduced wherever reductions could be made without jeopardizing the authorized programs of the various departments. I hope that the House will sustain the recommendations of the committee in full.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirteen Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I expect to make no motions with reference to most of the amounts contained in this bill. One exception is the amount for the steam plant at the TVA at Johnsonville, Tenn. I intend to discuss that in a moment.

I will first call attention to two or three of the major items of legislation involved in the bill, to which I am opposed.

At the bottom of page 13 there is an item under "Bonneville Power Administration," and following that on page 14 is an item which repeals the limitation under the head of "Bonneville Power Administration" on the use of funds for force account activities. There is also a limitation on the amount of money that may be spent for propaganda. I am opposed to the repeal of both of those items. They were put in for the protection of the Government.

The force account limitation was put in so that they would have to comply with the rules, and let the jobs to contract and get them done in a reasonable way for a reasonable sum, rather than to fill up the pay roll of the department with a lot of people who were unnecessary, and allow the work to drag and allow the people to work about half time, as they had been doing for a long time.

The idea of repealing the limitation on propaganda activities, allowing them to spend all the funds that are appropriated and made available to the agency for propaganda, has no appeal to me.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I notice that the committee has given the amount for the Veterans' Administration asked for by the budget. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the Veterans' Administration ask for any more than the budget allowed?

Mr. TABER. They did not. The item with reference to the Veterans' Administration appears on page 8. There is an item for national service life insurance, $55,000,000. They stated that they thought that would carry them through to the end of the year without any trouble.

The next item is $190,000 for soldiers' and sailors' civil relief, which is a very small item and a very small activity.

The next item is $44,189,000. That is for veterans' miscellaneous benefits. They told us that they thought that would carry them through all right.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Did the Veterans' Administration give any information as to when the accumulated dividends would be paid to the veterans?

Mr. TABER. They did not in these hearings; no. I did not expect, the way they were operating on that, that such a result would come about for 2 or 3 months, in all probability.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thought if perhaps more persons were put on the work the men might receive the dividends sooner.

Mr. TABER. It would be better if they could.

Mr. RABAUT. I should think that would be a matter to be referred to the regular subcommittee having veterans' affairs in charge.

Mr. TABER. That would be an item that would be considered when the regular annual bill came up. We took up nothing in this bill but deficiency estimates; and some of those deficiency estimates were considered in regular committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. There would be an appropriation, because they have the authority for it already.

Mr. TABER. If it were necessary to make an appropriation in order to meet what expenditures were required there would be no delay that I know of in anything of that kind by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Could the gentleman give us some idea of what this $44,000,000 item for miscellaneous expenses consists of in general?

Mr. TABER. It is such things as burial allowances and matters of a special character rather than the regular large items of pensions or education aid and that sort of thing; those are not included in it.

Mr. KEATING. It is to cover specialized items?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If the gentleman from New York will yield, there is a full description of that item on page 7 of the committee report.

Mr. TABER. The next item I expect to take up is on page 15 where there is another force account item under the Bureau of Reclamation. What I said about the force account in the Bonneville item applies equally to this item.

We pass now to page 16 where there is a section repealing the first four or five provisos under the appropriation act for the Interior Department 1949 and repeals the limitation which would throw them out. One of those limitations provides that not to exceed about $7,500,000 shall be transferred out of construction funds to the different administrative funds in the Bureau of Reclamation; in other words, they can spend the whole of the construction funds on salaries and expenses in their offices and agencies rather than have any limitation or any control such as the Congress set up for them.

Another of the provisions repeals the prohibition against spending more than $50,000 for propaganda purposes. It has no merit whatever.

The next item is at line 17 on page 16 where the Mike Straus amendment appears, to put Mike Straus back. He was so incompetent that they want to keep him; and I shall have to admit that that is the chief qualification for a New Deal appointment. But that does not appeal to me, nor does it promote efficiency in government.

These are the major items in the bill with reference to which there will be controversy. I would not say that they were all of them but they are the major ones.

I wish now to discuss for a little while the item relating to the steam plant in the TVA.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. On page 4, under "Appropriations for the judiciary," I have been consulted in my district by the secretary to the district judge regarding the purchase of typewriters. Can the gentleman inform me what the present provision in the Treasury Department Appropriation Act is regarding the typewriter question, or can someone on the gentleman's committee give us that information?

Mr. TABER. There is a limitation, as I understand it, that typewriters may not be purchased at a price above 90 percent of the lowest price quoted a commercial purchaser. I think that is correct?

Mr. KEATING. But under this provision it is intended, as I read it, to permit the purchase now by those who need them in the judicial branch of the United States new typewriters, and not simply have to recondition the old typewriters?

Mr. TABER. They would be confined to the price set forth in the Treasury-Post Office bill. There would be no limitation on their funds for the purchase of typewriters if they could be bought within the limitation which has been prescribed, provided they have the funds appropriated to them for that purpose, and I understand they have.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the TVA item on page 7, line 20, I propose to offer an amendment which will reduce the item of $2,950,000 to $450,000. They have asked for $450,000 for a couple of generators, for the initial payments on them anyway, in one of the hydroelectric set-ups, and that I am not going to oppose; but the two and a half million dollars is to start the steam plant, and that I am going to oppose. I will have to offer a similar amendment cutting two and a half million dollars out of the $24,000,000 item in line 24, and I will move also to strike out the part of the limitation which they propose to repeal beginning with the word "and" in line 4, page 8, and going through the rest of the paragraph.

I will also offer an amendment which would prohibit the use of funds for the construction of a steam power plant. What are the facts with reference to that steam power plant?

In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1948, the Tennessee Valley Authority marketed 12,244,000,000 kilowatts of power. That appears on page 11 of the financial statement of the Tennessee Valley Authority which I have before me. The TVA has had appropriated to it funds which will increase its available power plants, including the steam plants and the ones they already have. They have steam plants at the present time capable of producing 448,000 kilowatts an hour. They have hydro plants capable of producing 2,200,000 kilowatts an hour, or a total of 2,650,000 kilowatts. That means that they have available approximately 18,000,000,000 kilowatts to sell in the course of a year. Of course, they cannot sell all of it because of peaks; that is, they have peak loads during the day. They probably have power available at the present time amounting to about 4,000,000,000 kilowatts to sell if they could sell at all. They tell us that they will have available power projects that are coming in with the funds that are already appropriated, and with the generators that are here provided, amounting to 3,504,000 kilowatts of power-generating capacity. That will produce for sale approximately 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year. Now, that is 50 percent above what they sold in the fiscal year 1948.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. It is my understanding that private power companies use about two-thirds of their capacity, while the TVA has only used about one-half of its capacity; that is, if they use their two-thirds capacity like private power companies do, there would be no necessity for this steam plant.

Mr. TABER. There is no necessity for it anyway, because they have got the power capacity to take care of their loads with a margin now. Their steam capacity is plenty to firm up the hydro power that they have or ever will have, because they can run their hydro power or they can run their steam power in the low periods and hold back their water if they have a dry season, and ultimately use their steam or their hydro power effectively.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Was there any testimony produced before the gentleman's committee to show that some of the cities in Tennessee, I will not say had been compelled, but did make contracts with the TVA that they would not build any electric power plants within their cities?

Mr. TABER. There was not before our committee this time, but there has been such testimony before the Committee on Appropriations heretofore. Those contracts are in existence. Those municipalities and cooperatives all would have the right, if the TVA would let them, and the TVA could let them without any trouble, to build all the power plants that they wanted. They should do that if we are going to have the expensive method of providing peak power gone into in the TVA.

Let me give you the general picture of the TVA, because I think people generally ought to understand it. The low rates down in the TVA and for Federal power generally are caused by this fact: The TVA sets up only $2,000,000 for taxes. It has estimated power earnings, according to page 11 of its financial statement, of $48,000,000 a year. This means 4 percent. The private power concerns run 20 to 22 or 23 percent in their over-all tax, and that extra tax is part of the place where they save the money to the power users in their localities.

I checked the record in the manuals in the library, and I know one private power concern right next to this set-up where they have a gross revenue of $125,000,000 and paid taxes of $23,000,000.

Mr. DONDERO. What is the total capitalization of the TVA?

Mr. TABER. The total capitalization of the TVA that is allocated to power is $48,000,000, and they never have paid a cent of interest on that power set-up to the Treasury of the United States. They never paid any money back until this last year, when they paid just a hair under $31,000,000.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman point out to the Members of the House that there is authorization in the TVA Act for turning into the Treasury each year some $20,000,000?

Mr. TABER. That is so, toward principal, but there is no authorization for the payment of any interest. The taxpayers in the rest of the country are subsidizing the rates in the TVA by the TVA's avoiding the payment of taxes and by the failure to charge enough rates to cover a proper depreciation charge, which should be at least $11,500,000, and interest at the rate of 3 percent, which is what would be fair for the TVA to pay back.

Mr. EVINS. Will the gentleman point out if there is a public power plank in the Republican platform?

Mr. TABER. Maybe there is, but that did not mean a dishonest public power outfit that did not pay its way. It meant having things in such shape that the people of the United States who were not in the power district would not have to pay the electric-light bills and power bills of the folks in that district.

Mr. EVINS. I disagree with the statement the gentleman makes that you are paying the light bills of the people of Tennessee.

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. EVINS. That is not true.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about it. The statistics all bear it out.

Mr. EVINS. Is the gentleman in favor of the St. Lawrence seaway project?

Mr. TABER. No.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is not in favor of that project?

Mr. TABER. Not the seaway; no.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. The gentleman ought to be heard on this important point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 11]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Fisher | O'Toole |
| Allen, Ill. | Gavin | Pfeifer, |
| Anderson, Calif. | Gordon | Joseph L. |
| Arends | Gorski, Ill. | Philbin |
| Baring | Green | Poulson |
| Bates, Mass. | Halleck | Powell |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hardy | Price |
| Bennett, Mich. | Harvey | Ramsay |
| Blackney | Havenner | Reed, Ill. |
| Bland | Hébert | Richards |
| Bonner | Heffernan | Riehlman |
| Boykin | Herter | Rivers |
| Brooks | Heselton | Sanborn |
| Bryson | Hinshaw | Sasscer |
| Buckley, Ill. | Irving | Scrivner |
| Bulwinkle | Jackson, Calif. | Shafer |
| Burnside | Jenison | Short |
| Carlyle | Jenkins | Simpson, Pa. |
| Celler | Jennings | Smith, Ohio |
| Chiperfield | Jones, Mo. | Smith, Wis. |
| Clemente | Judd | Somers |
| Coffey | Kennedy | Stockman |
| Cole, N. Y. | Kilburn | Tackett |
| Coudert | Kilday | Taylor |
| Cox | Lind | Thomas, N. J. |
| Crosser | Linehan | Towe |
| Curtis | McCulloch | Van Zandt |
| DeGraffenried | McSweeney | Velde |
| Dingell | Mason | Vinson |
| Doyle | Miles | Weichel |
| Durham | Monroney | Welch, Calif. |
| Ellsworth | Morrison | Wilson, Ind. |
| Elston | Morton | Withrow |
| Feighan | Moulder | Woodhouse |
| Fellows | Nixon | Woodruff |
| Fernandez | Norton | |

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 329 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I stated a little while ago that I believe that according to the evidence the TVA submitted themselves in their own reports, and on pages 40, 41, and 42 of the hearings, they have demonstrated that this item is not necessary for the benefit of

the people in that locality, because they have already in sight a 50-percent margin of power over what they are presently using.

Perhaps it might be interesting to the House if the House were told that some of the smartest corporations of the country have moved into that locality to take advantage of these low, subsidized power rates.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. PATTERSON. Would the gentleman tell the committee the names of the corporations that have gone down South in order to take advantage of this cheap rate that has been subsidized at the expense of the taxpayers, say all those of New England, and in Connecticut especially? Also, will this not in effect invite new industries that might be starting in New England and some older industries to go down South to Tennessee, at the expense of the taxpayers in the North, to start operations?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct. Some of the corporations that have been smart enough to go in there are the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., the Vickers Chemical Co., and the Pennsylvania Salt Co. There are a great many more of those smart corporations. I do not blame them for going in there and taking advantage of this opportunity, but the taxpayers of the gentleman's territory and those in my territory are carrying that load.

I think it is about time that there be a complete review of this public-power business and that the whole thing be on the basis of fairness, with the power project carrying its share of the load and its share of the taxes. I do not think we should get into this situation and not have these power projects carry their part of the load. I cannot support it, and I feel that I shall have to do everything I can to bring it to the attention of the House and to see that the House has a full opportunity to vote on it.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I respect the position the gentleman has held on the Committee on Appropriations as a former chairman, but I wish that he would be fair and tell all the facts.

Mr. TABER. I have told all the facts, except this: They charge $9,000,000 depreciation as against $11,500,000, according to the rules of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. They pay no interest. Those are the things I have not told.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman just stated on the floor that these industries had moved into that area. That is not the truth. These industries have been in this area for some time. The testimony did not show that a single industry had ever moved from the North or the East or the South.

Mr. TABER. It did so.

Mr. EVINS. It did say some branch plants had grown up, and there had been some natural growth, but not a single one had moved from the North.

Mr. TABER. Many have moved into that area.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman knows that is not true.

Mr. TABER. I know it is true, and the gentleman knows it is true. Let us be honest about it. Let us have the TVA pay to the Treasury of the United States $15,000,000 interest on the $480,000,000 investment. That is our peak interest and that is what it will cost the people of the United States and the taxpayers.

Let us have them charge their depreciation and pay it back every year. Let us have this public-power business put on an honest basis, dollar for dollar, and let the people of the United States understand that it is going to be honest and that it is going to be kept honest.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this being general debate, I want to make certain remarks before referring specifically to the terms of the bill. I want to say a brief word in regard to the Committee on Appropriations of the House.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—STAFF AND ORGANIZATION

I have been a member of the committee for many years. I have long considered it the most important committee in the House of Representatives. Because of present conditions in the world both at home and abroad I consider it has a tremendous responsibility.

Over the years, Mr. Chairman, it has been the opinion of Members on both sides of the aisle belonging to this great committee that that committee could only do its work properly, in a manner worthy of the confidence of the House and of the country, if by some means or other it could obtain a competent, expert, permanent staff, a staff equipped to make investigations and analyses when the occasion demands.

As I stand here and look back over the years, I can hear Member after Member standing in the well of this House, Members from both sides of the aisle, making an appeal for that kind of staff.

We finally got the necessary authority for that staff, Mr. Chairman. It came in the so-called reorganization bill approved August 2, 1946.

That bill provides that—

> Each standing committee of the House and Senate, other than the Committee on Appropriations, is authorized to appoint by majority vote not more than four professional staff members * * * on a permanent basis, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the office.

That bill goes further, Mr. Chairman. It provides that—

> The Committee on Appropriations in the House and in the Senate is authorized to appoint such staff as each committee by majority vote shall determine to be necessary * * * and to conduct such studies and examinations of the organization and operation of any executive agency as it may deem meet.

In other words, each Appropriations Committee was authorized to have an unlimited staff, subject only to the judgment of the committee, and essential appropriations.

In my judgment this was one of the most important and most helpful features of the entire Reorganization Act.

What happened, Mr. Chairman? Not long after the Reorganization Act a beginning was made on a real staff for this great committee. Some 8 or 10 permanent employees were appointed, with contemplated expansion. The regular staff was augmented by a group of consultants from private enterprise, who gave generously of their time in the interest of economy. A small allowance for expenses was permitted, and the time and transportation of these individuals was a donation to the cause of good government.

In this manner, skills far beyond the ability of the Government to provide were made available to the committee.

Numbered among these men were 10 of the country's outstanding accountants, picked as a special committee by the American Institute of Accountants. All of these men were, of course, certified public accountants of national standing, and one is currently president of the New York State Certified Public Accountants Society.

The remaining men were business executives and research assistants of considerable standing, many of whom were, and are continuing to be, used as consultants by various Government agencies which have learned to value their counsel and assistance.

There was no partisanship in the activity, as the group was very representative of both political parties, although all were united on behalf of Government economy.

In addition to the day-to-day work of the staff, the major studies completed were as follows:

First. An exhaustive study of the then Federal Public Housing Administration, extending into nine States. The study exposed many vicious illegal practices, and was the basis of corrective legislation. As a result, the agency undertook a real reorganization, eliminating frills, waste, and extravagance.

Second. A review of the Department of Agriculture budget for 1948, including all the bureaus and agencies of that Department, resulting in many recommendations of benefit to the Department. This review also encompassed a particular inquiry into the Rural Electrification Administration.

Third. A study of the Maritime Commission for both 1948 and 1949, which resulted in corrective legislation recovering for the Government hundreds of millions of dollars.

Fourth. Studies of the Veterans' Administration's requirements for both 1948 and 1949, which information has been the basis of a great deal of organizational correction. This study likewise went into the Federal hospital picture in great detail and has formed the basis of continued study by the Hoover Commission as well as the Veterans' Administration themselves.

Fifth. A study of the War Assets Administration for 1948.

Sixth. Continuing studies of the Department of the Interior for 1948 and 1949, including such technical subjects as an analysis of existing Federal power policy and including spot checks of the accounting systems in the various field installations, which were made available to the Department of the Interior and are currently the basis of accounting reorganizations.

Seventh. Detailed analyses of the operations of the United States Employment Service and the Bureau of Employment Compensation, which materially assisted in the reorganization of those agencies and will no doubt be very helpful in the 1950 hearings. This particular investigation required a great deal of field study and resulted in the exposé of especially flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in the State of Tennessee. This information has been forwarded to the Department of Justice and to the United States Civil Service Commission, who are currently investigating the matter, with a view to dealing with the offenders.

Eighth. A detailed analysis of the operations of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which resulted in the location of widespread abuses and inefficiency. The report has been made available to the Secretary of the Treasury, and studies are now being made and many improvements instituted that were recommended in this report. As a corollary to this investigation, particularly flagrant violations of the Hatch Act in Massachusetts were uncovered. This information was likewise turned over to the Civil Service Commission and to the Department of Justice for their investigation.

The Civil Service Commission has cited for removal some twenty-odd employees in one Massachusetts office of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. I understand the Department of Justice still has the matter under consideration.

Ninth. An exhaustive investigation of the Department of State, which likewise located many flagrant abuses of good administration, and also located a list of undesirable individuals with subversive connections who were then employed by the State Department. Subsequent to the exposé, some 30 to 40 of these individuals were separated from the service. It is also interesting to note that many of the individuals mentioned in the original list were later questioned by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Tenth. A study of the Treasury Department budget for 1948 and 1949.

Eleventh. A study of the Army and Air Force budgets for 1948 and 1949, which formed a basis of rescissions approximating $5,000,000,000 returned to the taxpayers by this committee.

Twelfth. A study of the budget of the Navy for the fiscal years 1948 and 1949, which likewise formed a basis for substantial monetary rescissions and appropriations reductions.

Thirteenth. An executive study on operations of the Government in the Territory of Alaska. It touches upon the activities of almost every Federal agency operating in Alaska and should be of great value to the committee in the 1950 deliberations.

Fourteenth. A report on the study of the subsistence procurement of the Army for use in the 1950 hearings. The report indicates that corrected procedures can save tremendous sums of money.

These are only a few of the more important studies undertaken by the group. In addition, scores of comparatively minor studies were made of specific units of the Government.

The over-all result was that the committee was able to effect savings or rescissions detailed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of some $9,800,000,000 in 2 years, making possible a balanced budget for the first time in 16 years, making possible a reduction in our national debt of some $7,000,000,000, making possible a reduction in our tax burden of $4,800,000,000, 71 percent of which went to those with incomes of less than $5,000, some 7,000,000 persons being removed from tax rolls entirely.

It was a fine start, and I agree with the sentiment of a close friend of mine now on the majority side of this great committee, who said to me shortly after our return to Washington in January, that in his opinion the Republicans of the last Congress had made a fine start with this staff, and that his only criticism was that the staff had not been large enough.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you may be surprised, in view of this record, to know that this staff has been completely abolished. It has been abolished, despite the experience of years, despite the intent of the Reorganization Act, despite the splended record that it made.

The staff has not only been abolished, it is not only a question of relieving those who served on the staff, the whole theory of a staff responsible only to the Appropriations Committee has been, for the time being, abandoned, and we have gone back to the old idea of asking one executive agency to please investigate the actions of another executive agency, whenever an investigation seems necessary.

Mr. Chairman, that plan has been tried. It is better than nothing. But as long as human nature remains what it is, it will never, in my opinion, get fundamental results. In fact it may tend at times to conceal rather than to disclose.

Real results depend on a permanent, nonpolitical skilled staff, responsible to the Appropriations Committee and to that committee alone.

I want to pay my tribute, Mr. Chairman, to the work done by the staff of the Committee on Appropriations during the last 2 years. They made a splendid contribution to the Nation in terms of lower prices, in terms of lower taxes, in terms of a stable economy.

I want also to record for the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, my opinion that the action taken in abolishing the staff and certain other action taken in connection with the organization of the committee for this Congress is most unfortunate.

That action was taken contrary to the views of the minority members of the committee. In fact, it was taken without allowing any minority member of the committee the opportunity to question, to debate, or to offer to amend any one of a half dozen resolutions that were adopted in the full committee.

I regret the manner in which the action was taken. In my judgment, it was unworthy of the traditions of the great Committee on Appropriations.

I regret the action taken, because, in my judgment, it is likely to cost the people of this Nation literally billions of dollars.

THE BILL IN GENERAL

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to speak briefly on the bill under consideration.

As you know, it calls for something less than $500,000,000 of appropriations. The budget sent it up here in the sum of about $480,000,000. The committee has taken off $14,000,000.

If I had my way, there would be further reductions. If I had my way, the restrictions and limitations, which it is proposed to cancel, and which have been referred to first by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], and then by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], would remain the law of the land.

I want to mention in passing that the committee has allowed in full the amount of approximately $5,000,000 for grants to States for unemployment compensation and the Employment Service to give the Service an average of 38,000 employees as compared with an average of 35,000.

This situation has not been satisfactory. It has been charged, among other things, that the allocation to the several States of the over-all sum made available by the Congress has been very inequitable, that State set-ups which have striven to operate with efficiency and economy have been penalized, while others operating on an inefficient and extravagant basis have had more staff than they should fairly have been allotted.

This amount provided, in my judgment, is entirely inadequate. The Bureau of the Budget has ordered a complete investigation. The Appropriations Committee has also ordered a complete investigation.

I have no doubt that further funds will be available for this activity either in this bill or subsequently in the light of the two investigations.

TVA STEAM PLANT

The principal item of controversy in this bill is the one already referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

It is the proposal by TVA that this Congress make available some $3,000,000 as a first installment on a gigantic steam plant to cost ultimately some $84,000,000 and to produce some 375,000 kilowatts, having a capacity sufficient, it has been said, for all of the needs, both commercial and domestic of perhaps a million people; a steam plant requested for the purpose of meeting the prospective power needs of the TVA industrial users.

The identical proposal, Mr. Chairman, was before this House last summer. Exhaustive hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Government Corporations. Thorough debate took place on this floor on two

separate occasions. On each occasion the proposal was voted down by a record vote.

I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, for the Congress to reverse at this time the decisions it made at that time.

I do not want to repeat in detail the arguments presented to this House last summer. I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, however, that the decision of the House was based on fundamental grounds which transcend in importance any single steam plant at any single project. I do want to say, also Mr. Chairman, that we are not discussing a theory; that this is an intensely practical question in which there is very great interest.

There is widespread opposition to embarking on the policy implied in the construction of this plant. If proof of this were needed, I may say that I understand that over 90 different organizations of businessmen, taxpayers, and others appeared in opposition to the proposal last summer. I may add that in the course of the very brief hearings conducted in respect to this bill we were confronted by the chambers of commerce of perhaps three-quarters of the States of the Union, by the National Chamber of Commerce, and by representatives of other business organizations who registered their emphatic opposition to the policy implied in the request now before us.

What are the broad grounds of objection, Mr. Chairman?

There are several of them.

In the first place, while it is clear that the TVA Act authorized the generation and marketing of electric energy incidental to navigation or flood control, it is exceedingly doubtful that there is any authority whatsoever for TVA to enter into the generation and marketing of commercial power which has nothing to do with navigation or with flood control.

But for the rule adopted by this House it would be my view that a point of order would clearly have lain against the present requested appropriation for that reason. I regret that the rule was obtained, because, in my judgment, the matter of policy here involved is far too important to be determined in the course of the consideration of an appropriation bill.

In the second place, Mr. Chairman, if the act be construed to give the necessary authority, then there is the further question of whether the act is constitutional. Time does not permit going into that legal question this afternoon. But I would like to quote again Mr. Justice Reed when he was Solicitor General some years ago, in appearing before the United States Supreme Court in a case concerning the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

Mr. Justice Reed, then Solicitor General, said:

> From the bench and at the bar the controversy has come down to a question of this kind: If we assume that this act was primarily for navigation, then it would be valid. If we determine that this act, while stating that it is for navigation, national defense, and flood control, is actually for the purpose of developing power and selling it commercially, the act would be invalid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, aside from these legal questions there remains the broad question of national policy by which we are confronted.

The TVA could conceivably earn a profit even if it was organized and run like a legitimate business. It could at least eliminate all unfair competition by paying the legitimate costs of operation.

But that is not the case, Mr. Chairman. Here we have the TVA representing an over-all investment of $780,000,000, of which some $480,000,000 represents investment in power alone. Until recently TVA made no proper arrangements for amortization or depreciation. As has been pointed out, its interest burden has been practically negligible and the tax burden which it bears is estimated at between 10 and 20 percent of that borne by a private company in a similar situation.

Its net income of about $17,000,000 is not even sufficient to pay the interest charges and the amortization charges which would be normally borne by a private company operating in this field of industry.

However you figure them, the alleged costs of operation by TVA are far less than the actual costs paid by a private industry in the same field and the difference is paid by all of us in terms of subsidy.

Now until this time TVA has limited itself to dealing with power incidental to its proper functions of navigation and flood control, and it has acted under a statutory provision requiring that insofar as power is available, it should be made available to preferred customers, such as municipalities and cooperatives.

Now we see the TVA coming before the Congress and saying, in substance: "Gentlemen, there is going to be an increase in demand in the TVA area. We are not going to be able to meet that demand. Whether you intended it originally or not, we believe that there is a clear obligation on the shoulders of TVA to meet the total demand from the TVA area, whatever that demand may amount to, and whether or not we have enough power incidental to navigation and flood control to meet that demand. And, if you agree, you must give us the essential steam generating capacity to meet that demand which is in excess of the incidental power that we shall have at our disposal.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a radical departure from the policy heretofore followed. It is a very far-reaching departure, in my opinion, and for one I am opposed to it.

I am opposed to it because from the record it is clear that there is ample capacity available today and for the next 3 or 4 years to take care of the demands of all preferred customers.

If you look at the tables in the record, you will find that those preferred customers only used about 3,300,000,000 kilowatt-hours out of a total of 14,000,000,000 available in the fiscal year 1945; that they only used about 6,050,000,000 kilowatt-hours out of a total of 16,500,000,000 available in 1948, and that it is estimated that they will only use about 9,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours out of a total of about 19,600,000,000 available in the fiscal year 1952. The balance goes to industrial users and to public utilities in adjoining areas which are subject to control.

Were it not for the industrial users there would be more than sufficient to take care of the preferred customers. And, Mr. Chairman, there are vacant stalls today in various dams that are available for additional hydroelectric units.

What TVA is really asking is additional subsidized power to meet the prospective needs of its big industrial users, like the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., and the Tennessee Copper Co., and others.

That Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, is unfair to the men and women of the rest of the country who, on the basis of present operations, must subsidize the power that is used.

I am opposed to this proposal, Mr. Chairman, because the needs of these industrial users do not have to be met by TVA—they can be met in various ways. If the construction of a steam plant is necessary, the simplest way is to let the industrial users construct and pay for the plant just as they would in any area outside of the TVA area.

Let TVA limit itself to its prescribed role, and the industrial users and the cities concerned will supply the necessary steam-plant construction for other power, in my opinion, in very short order.

Failure to do this is unfair to other sections of the country with and for whose industries TVA-subsidized power under present conditions competes.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to this proposal because I believe that Congress never intended that TVA should go into the power business over and above its incidental power, and because I believe if the precedent is established, there is no end or limitation in sight to unfair Government-subsidized competition with private industry.

Why, Mr. Chairman, should the people of the West, the North, and the East, rich and poor alike, be compelled to pay through higher prices and higher taxes for power used by the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., and other multi-million-dollar plants in or near the TVA territory?

Why, Mr. Chairman, should other parts of the country be compelled to subsidize TVA industry which competes with and for their own industries at home?

Why, Mr. Chairman, should we adopt a precedent which assures a widespread unfair competition with private industry in this field of industry, which may lead to complete nationalization in this field of industry, and which, if proper in this field, may be proper in any other industrial field in America?

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that there is any present authority in TVA to generate or market electrical energy not incidental to navigation and flood control, in competition with private business.

If, however, the assertion of that authority, in spite of statutory and constitutional difficulties, is to be approved by this Congress, then let us eliminate the present elements of unfair competition immediately.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the Congress will stand by its position in this matter. I hope that the amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has referred to, when offered to this House, will be adopted.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, without a doubt, the things the Republicans in Congress are trying to do to bring order out of chaos in many departments of government will fall on deaf ears like a voice crying in the wilderness, but we must never give up the fight. We know only too well by now what is in the back of the minds of the party in power, because we had an excellent demonstration of that in the full committee about 3 weeks ago when the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the full Committee of Appropriations, refused to recognize a single minority member when we attempted and tried our best to get Mr. CANNON'S attention. We had some amendments to offer, but, believe it or not, he did not even look our way. They put through their resolutions one right after the other and then immediately ordered the previous question, which shut off debate and when they got all their resolutions adopted they had someone of their own party move to adjourn, and they adjourned without paying the slightest notice to the 18 minority-party members present.

In this America of ours, the minority has always had a voice or a say, or at least had an opportunity to express its opinions in Congress and out of Congress until now. Now they are patterning after Uncle Joe Stalin and his one-party rulers. That is what the gentleman from Missouri is doing, and the gentleman is sitting right here in front of me on the floor of this House. If he does not like it, let him stand and defend himself before his colleagues and the American people.

I am waiting for the answer of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], Then I saw another performance, and it is almost too disgraceful to mention; just last week in a subcommittee meeting, the same gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] muffled one of the finest, most able Representative of the people in Congress and did his voting for him. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had not heard a word of the testimony that had been given by the departments, but he came in and did the voting for this member of his party. Now, that is something to think about, folks. I want every American to know about this, so they will know the course we are taking. We are taking the direct course to a one-party rule in America like many other nations have, including Russia. Then, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] had the boldness to say that he was going to sit in with every Subcommittee of Appropriations during the marking-up of each bill. He is going to see to it that the program they have concocted to destroy our American liberties is going through regardless of any and all opposition.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I cannot yield to the gentleman at this moment, but I would yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. If he has any defense.

Mr. WHITE of California. I have a defense of the party, if the gentleman will yield to me for just one moment.

Mr. JENSEN. All right then, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. I ask the gentleman if he recalls the time during 1946 when the Gearhart committee of the Ways and Means Committee had star-chamber proceedings and brought out legislation under gag rule and not a word could be heard in committee or on the floor.

Mr. JENSEN. Oh, my dear colleague—gag rule—you accuse the Republican Party of gag rule? Say, the gentlemen on that side of the aisle have for years, without end, gagged the Republican Party or tried to gag us until it became a national scandal. Now, I do not care to hear any more of that kind of stuff from the gentleman who just recently arrived, or from anyone on that side of the aisle, because we know the sad story about them.

Last year the Eightieth Congress saw fit to put a limitation on the amount of money that could be spent for force account. Force account means that the Bureau of Reclamation can hire anyone they see fit, to do any job they see fit, regardless of how large the job is, whether $100 or $50,000,000, without letting a contract or asking for bids.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] is recognized.

Mr. JENSEN. Now, in this bill appears a provision which would strike out all of those limiting provisions which were placed in the bill last year and again let them run wild and do anything they like with the taxpayer's money.

More actual construction work for hydroelectric power, transmission lines, and irrigation has been performed in the last year and a half than has ever been performed in three times that length of time before in the history of this Nation. Why? Because we put their house in order. We said, "Go to work and stop wasting money and time." Now if there is anybody who wants to deny that, let them stand. They cannot do it, because what I have said is the truth. Yet they travel all over the country.. Yes, from the President on down—saying that the Republican Party had almost completely destroyed the reclamation program—when the facts are that the Eightieth Congress appropriated twice as much money than had ever been appropriated before for the development of the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my brief remarks I wish to express my appreciation for the action of the Appropriations Committee for having approved the amount of $2,500,000 for the beginning of construction of the new Johnsonville steam plant and $450,000 for two additional hydroelectric generating units at existing TVA dams. It is good economy for the Government to make full use of the natural resources of its investment. The existing power facilities in the Tennessee Valley serve a large area, which is rapidly developing, and with this natural progress and development there has been a great increase in the consumption of electric power.

More than 5,000,000 people are supplied by TVA power and are dependent upon this great Federal project for their source of electric power. It has been estimated by the Tennessee Valley Authority and by other reliable testimony that we are facing a power shortage in the entire valley served by TVA. The people of this section of America are confronted with a different situation than that which is generally the case. Here the only source of power is the Government agency. Private utilities voluntarily sold their properties and moved out. There is no other source of power. Industry needs additional power. The great REA program is in need of additional power to supply the applications that are now currently on file. Electric cooperatives have entered into agreements and contracts to furnish rural power to thousands of farmers, but due to the power shortage the Government has not been able to carry out these commitments. I have said on the floor of this Congress on previous occasions that the greatest guarantee that we shall continue as a free and independent people is for the Congress by appropriate action to place on the statute books of this country laws which will build up the rural and farm life of America. The farmers have never failed us in war or in peace, and we must not fail them now.

The development of this great area in America will create good business; the farmers and public generally will increase their use of electrical appliances and equipment in their homes, and will thereby create an outlet and market for electrical appliances and devices and gadgets of every kind, which are produced all over America. This natural market will, therefore, employ idle labor, and will stimulate production, and will in no sense of the word injure our American industry.

In my mind there is a big object, which we may overlook in this bill under consideration. This Congress has been

called upon to appropriate billions of dollars in an effort to stop the onrushing tide of communism, which was calculated by some people to be on the march throughout the Continent of Europe, and on into the far eastern world. With that dark shadow casting its shadows on the lives, happiness and hopes of millions of peace-loving people throughout the world, we as a Congress have a responsibility to preserve the national defense of this country. When we spend billions to help little nations fortify themselves against our common enemy, then does it not follow as a matter of clear logic, that we should spend the necessary amount of money to build the power facilities to supply electric power to insure that the great atomic energy development, which is located at Oak Ridge, Tenn., has the required amount of electric current at all times to run and operate this great project on a full production basis.

The history of World War II shows that we had, and now have great and vast Federal agencies in the Tennessee Valley, which played an important role in the production of war material in the recent war. The Oak Ridge plant, the Alcoa Aluminum Mills, the Tennessee Eastman, the Holston Ordnance, and North American and Bemberg Rayon corporations are some of the big manufacturing concerns that contributed in a large way to our national defense.

In view of the world situation, I believe that this country should have the finest air force on earth. We should have an air force that can circle and police the world if necessary. The record shows that TVA at one time furnished the power that was used to make 51 percent of the aluminum which went into our war planes. The Eightieth Congress voted for a 70-group air force program. We cannot afford to face a situation which would deprive these great facilities of the necessary power during slack seasons to continue the full operation of these vital defense factories, which are a part of our announced preparedness program.

We are not considering a new principle here today. The Government has appropriated the money to build steam plants on a number of occasions. The Watts Bar steam plant built by TVA is an example of a steam plant. In fact when the private companies owned their own plants in Tennessee, they not only sold their water plants, but these companies sold steam plants to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is a corporation created by act of Congress on May 18, 1933. It was established to improve navigation and to provide for flood control of the Tennessee River; to provide for reforestation and the proper use of marginal lands in the Tennessee Valley; to provide for the agricultural and industrial development of the valley; to provide for the national defense, and for other purposes. The Tennessee Valley has accomplished these purposes by developing dams and reservoirs in the Tennessee River Basin and its tributaries It has engaged in the generation of hydroelectric power.

We should not in days of emergency deny to this great publicly owned utility the same right and privilege that is enjoyed by every private business and utility in America. I mean by this that it is a common practice for our large industries, which make use of hydroelectric power to also have as a secondary source of power, a steam plant. In that way an industry is not wholly dependent upon one source of power. A steam plant will, therefore, guarantee a continuous flow of power during a time when hydroelectric power may be curtailed in production because of dry weather, and because of a drying up of the water power in the dams.

In some quarters the legal power of the Tennessee Valley Authority to engage in the erection of a steam plant has been questioned. Under the Constitution the Congress has the power to promote the general welfare and to promote the common good of the people of this country. We are implementing a great program and are giving it the necessary strength and the necessary appropriation to implement the power program so as to meet the needs of the people in this valley. This is no new departure. The Congress from time to time has appropriated money for the great highways of this country. We have developed the forests and waterways of America. We have developed the rivers and harbors, and have developed the canal service to accommodate the commerce flowing all over this land.

We as a nation have encouraged the development of the great reclamation service of the West, which has produced fertile soil, where fruits and vegetables now grow. A great section of the West is rapidly becoming an agricultural and one of the chief bread baskets of America. This same area was at one time a place of dust and wastelands. This transition and new development has added to the wealth and productivity, as well as to the progress and happiness, of the people. Therefore, I want to say, in conclusion, that I have seen the benefit the people have derived from TVA, and I am happy that the Congress is approaching this subject from a nonpartisan and national point of view. I am happy that we are recognizing the great public interest involved and that we do not propose to place a lid upon the progress and upon the advancement of an area consisting of approximately seven States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, at the very outset I want to be recorded, as I have been in the past, that I am not opposed to the development of power in the river basins of our country by the Federal Government. With the demand that exists all over the Nation for power I think that is essential and necessary. What I am opposed to and where we divide with minds in this body is the projection of the Federal Government into the sale of power as a private distributor and in competition with investment already made by the citizens of this country and already serving the area where these new projects may come into being.

In a hearing before the Committee on Public Works last year and the year before it was developed that if the Federal Government were compelled to pay the taxes, overhead expenses, interest involved in borrowing money, payment of dividends, the Federal Government could not produce 1 kilowatt of power cheaper than private industry and private investment is now producing it in this country. It is because of that unfair advantage by the Federal Government in projecting itself into the power field in competition with private enterprise that sooner or later if the step we are taking today is extended and expanded private enterprise in the power field will vanish from the American scene. That is socialization of industry. If it is so desirable to socialize electric power, will someone get up on this floor and tell the Nation why it should not be projected into all the other activities of American life—communications, transportation, mines, food, clothing, and others. But after we have done all of that, we will have brought to America an ideology that is foreign to the standards and the basic principles upon which this Nation stands, and the Republic of the United States will disappear.

Congress is now confronted with a proposal that the Tennessee Valley Authority construct and operate a steam electric generating plant. This is unusual, and in fact an unprecedented request. The Federal Government in the past has constructed and operated steam plants, but in every such case the legal background for such authorization has been on the basis of national defense. The classic example, of course, is the still existing steam plant at Muscle Shoals, created under the War Powers Act of 1916 and constructed for the purpose of the manufacture of nitrates for ammunition. Similarly, in 1940, a large steam plant was constructed at Watts Bar, Tenn., as a part of the equipment of the TVA for the purpose of augmenting its generating capacity to meet national defense demands. In addition, the Atomic Energy Commission, at Oak Ridge, has one of the largest steam electric plants in the world, wholly devoted to generating power for the manufacture of atomic bombs.

With none of these projects has any objection ever been raised as they obviously follow the familiar pattern necessary to national preservation.

In the case of the pending proposal for the construction of a plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., the matter of national defense is not used as a justification.

The lack of such justification indicates that the administration is prepared to establish a new precedent: That the Federal Government shall accept as a normal function the business of producing and selling power commercially, not as an incident to the control of rivers, but as an out-and-out business, not incidental to any other necessary and constitutional functions of government. The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-two Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 12]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Fisher | O'Toole |
| Allen, Ill. | Gilmer | Pfeifer, |
| Anderson, | Gordon | Joseph L. |
| Calif. | Gorski, Ill. | Philbin |
| Andresen, | Granger | Plumley |
| August H. | Green | Poulson |
| Arends | Hall, | Powell |
| Baring | Leonard W. | Price |
| Bates, Mass. | Halleck | Ramsay |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hardy | Reed, Ill. |
| Bennett, Mich. | Harvey | Richards |
| Blackney | Havenner | Riehlman |
| Bland | Hébert | Rivers |
| Bonner | Heffernan | Sabath |
| Boykin | Heselton | Sanborn |
| Breen | Hinshaw | Sasscer |
| Brooks | Hoffman, Ill. | Scrivner |
| Bryson | Irving | Shafer |
| Buckley, Ill. | Jackson, Calif. | Sheppard |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Jacobs | Short |
| Bulwinkle | Jenison | Smith, Ohio |
| Burleson | Jenkins | Smith, Wis. |
| Burnside | Jones, Mo. | Somers |
| Carlyle | Judd | Stockman |
| Celler | Kennedy | Taylor |
| Chiperfield | Kilburn | Teague |
| Clemente | Kilday | Thomas, N. J. |
| Coffey | Lesinski | Towe |
| Cole, N. Y. | Lind | Van Zandt |
| Coudert | Linehan | Velde |
| Cox | McCulloch | Vinson |
| Crosser | Magee | Weichel |
| Curtis | Mason | Welch, Calif. |
| Davis, Ga. | Miles | Williams |
| DeGraffenried | Miller, Calif. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Dingell | Monroney | Wilson, Okla. |
| Doyle | Morrison | Wilson, Tex. |
| Durham | Morton | Withrow |
| Ellsworth | Moulder | Woodhouse |
| Elston | Nixon | Woodruff |
| Feighan | Norblad | Zablocki |
| Fellows | Norton | |

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 309 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The committee will resume its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I was saying when I was interrupted a few minutes ago that the proposal pending before the Congress is unique in some other respects.

The proposal pending before Congress is unique in other respects. For example, it is presented as a deficiency appropriation. Until now, deficiencies have always been appropriated only for the continuance of enterprises and projects already previously authorized and for which funds have already been appropriated. In this case the Congress not only has not authorized and appropriated money for the steam plant, but in fact only a few months ago Congress by roll-call votes—two in the House of Representatives—flatly rejected the proposal to construct this very same project. No one has yet explained satisfactorily how a deficiency appropriation could be made for a project never originated and for which no money was ever appropriated.

There is a strong doubt that such an appropriation would be legal inasmuch as there is nothing in the organic TVA Act as amended which permits the construction of new steam plants. Even if the act did so provide, it would be patently unconstitutional. The TVA was created for the purpose of harnessing the Tennessee River so that its facilities for navigation would be improved and so that its floods would be controlled. As Senator Norris once said, "These are the constitutional pegs upon which the Tennessee Valley Authority Act must rest under the commerce clause of the Constitution."

There must be some lurking doubts as to the acceptance of this long step in the direction of socialism in the minds of its proponents. Otherwise the problem would have been approached in the normal parliamentary manner and under normal parliamentary procedure. The atmosphere of candor is lacking in the procedure by which this bill arrives before the House.

On February 3, 1949, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, acting either in that capacity or as chairman of the Deficiency Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, appeared before the Rules Committee and asked for a rule to obtain debate on the bill on February 4. He appeared before the Rules Committee without a bill. The Appropriations Committee itself had not met to discuss the matter. As I understand it there had not been a formal marking up of the bill by the Deficiency Subcommittee—although this may have happened among the majority members. Thanks to the wise decision of the senior Member of this House, both in age and in consecutive legislative experience—the chairman of the Rules Committee—the proposal was given short shrift.

In my long service in this House I recall no incident where the chairman of a committee requested a rule of the Rules Committee before his own committee had even held a meeting to consider the measure.

This is a house of the representatives of the people of the United States. Whether they bear the label Democrat or Republican, every member of this House is sworn to sustain the Constitution and to put flag and country before partisanship. On that basis every member in this House has a right to resent parliamentary tactics that would have been scorned by the so-called, rubber-stamp congresses of the early New Deal.

A century ago Karl Marx published the Communist Manifesto. The past century has been the bloodiest, the cruelest, and in many ways the most catastrophic century in the history of mankind. The forces let loose by this evil dream of Karl Marx are reaping their harvests down to the present day. Only now a cardinal of the Holy Roman Catholic Church awaits his fate at the hands of a Marxian court because he placed God before the Soviet Caesars. For his courage he may hang, or spend his life in a convict's cell, or in the mercy of this Marxian court, his term may be shortened. Marxism in Hungary is no different than Marxism in America, except in degree.

Socialism is a complete word. It needs no qualification. An activity of government is either socialistic or it is not socialistic.

This continent was peopled by men and women whose whole philosophy is a rejection of socialism and the planned state idea as conceived by Karl Marx. It was pioneered by men and women who believe in God, and in America.

This small item in the deficiency appropriation calling for the beginning of construction of a steam plant for the TVA is little in itself, but the potentialities as a precedent can involve enormous sums as the curse of socialized power spreads like a creeping paralysis over the economy of our Nation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to stress an amendment which I will present when the bill is read for amendment. It is to page 6, line 24. I shall urge there striking out "$4,987,000" and the insertion in lieu thereof of "$14,000,000."

On page 4 of the committee report, under "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service," it states that the Budget estimate, $4,987,000, is being recommended for this item. There follows:

It is believed that the amount herein recommended, together with an increased application of flexibility as between the unemployment compensation and employment services should enable the States to make some headway in reducing the present backlog of work.

The concluding paragraph reads:

The committee is advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the present estimate is based on work loads as of November 30, 1948—

I stress that date—

and that it is at the present time reviewing developments since that date.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] earlier today told us that an investigation is pending by the Committee on Appropriations, as it is by the Bureau of the Budget, to ascertain the amount of additional funds that would be necessary in this particular category and to make other pertinent recommendations.

I commend the investigations by the Committee on Appropriations and the Bureau of the Budget; however, it is my desire to bring to the notice of the Committee of the Whole House some facts subsequent to November 30, 1948, which indicate a need for immediate action, and a larger appropriation now. I quote at this time from the Hartford, Conn., Courant of Friday, January 28, 1949. The headline is "State jobless at high point for 10 years—Compensation claims of 44,264 last week up by 4 percent":

State Labor Commissioner John J. Egan said Thursday that claims for unemployment compensation payments are at the highest point in 10 years with the exception

of the reconversion period at the close of the war.

Claims last week totaled 44,364, about 4 percent above the preceding week and 85.3 percent above a year ago.

New claims total 7,821, a rise of 800 above the preceding week and 107 higher than new claims a year ago.

Bridgeport continues to lead the State in the number of unemployed, with 7,508 claims for unemployment payments last week. Claims in other cities were New Haven, 7,172; Hartford, 4,605; Waterbury, 4,374, and Stamford, 2,953.

About 650 workers were laid off by textile mills in the Norwich area due to lack of orders. Lay-offs were also reported in the casters, electrical parts, turbine, screw machine, metal products, tire, lumber, and carpeting industries.

To bring that a little more up to date, I desire to quote from the New Haven (Conn.) Register of February 9, 1949, which carried this very imposing headline: "City's jobless double in month; now at 7,000—Survey indicates trend to shorter workweek—Smaller shops hardest hit—Uncertainty over future, seasonal lay-offs blamed for mounting idle total." This article is very interesting as much as it is startling and alarming. I sincerely hope it is not the recording of a definite trend of affairs in the days just ahead of us. I ask you to give it your attention:

Unemployment in New Haven has doubled in the last month. There are 7,000 workers unemployed as of today. About 3,500 who were working a month ago are not working now.

My colleagues, I am not reading any dispatches from 1932 or 1933 or any of the so-called depression years. This is February 9, 1949. The article continues:

The round-number figures were made public today by Mrs. Alice Marshall, manager of the New Haven branch office of the Connecticut State Employment Service.

Seasonal lay-offs can account for some of it. Finishing of building jobs without acquiring new construction contracts has left many workers stranded in the city, and that accounts for more.

But a good share of the unemployment, according to Mrs. Marshall, "comes about in lay-offs of from one to a dozen men, not only in the larger plants, but in New Haven's numerous small shops."

WORKWEEK CUT

In addition to swollen unemployment figures working hours showed a trend to cut back from overtime to the 40-hour week. In some places the workweek is under 40 hours.

There are a number of examples given here in this news item and I cite some as I continue reading the New Haven Register:

For example, the New Haven Clock Co., hard hit by importation of cheap Swiss clock movements, February 1 went on a 4-day week. That reduced by 20 percent the income of 1,000 people.

The American Steel & Wire Co., employing 1,000 went on a 4-day week in some departments, affecting 200 men. S. B. Metcalf said, "Business has fallen off, and we are going to cut back on hours rather than lay off men. We will do that until it hits a 3-day week, if necessary."

SMALL SHOPS HIT

Mrs. Marshall said it was in New Haven's numerous small shops that the cut-back was most apparent. "When a firm that employs 15 or 20 men lays off 2 or 3, that adds up. And when a company which employs 500 men lays off 15 instead of a usual seasonal 10, that is 5 men out of a job, and it adds up."

Most men laid off, she said, "hope they will be taken on again soon and the manufacturers do too." But they are not on a definite call-back basis.

Mrs. Marshall cited factors which manufacturers think operate adversely. They included uncertainty in regard to taxes, price changes in consumers' goods, foreign competition in some lines such as the clock business.

To bring the attendant facts still more up to date, I wish at this time to call the attention of the Committee to a release from the Connecticut State Labor Department, which was released on February 9, 1949, for the morning papers of February 10. I read from that release:

Reaching its highest point since the reconversion lay-offs in 1945, the number of jobless claimants for unemployment insurance benefits in Connecticut rose to 49,822 during the week ended February 5, Labor Commissioner John J. Egan stated today. This was 9 percent more than a week ago and 101 percent over the 24,793 who filed a year ago.

Mr. Chairman, I submit to the Committee that this is ample evidence for increasing this particular deficiency appropriation at this time without waiting for the investigations of the Committees on Appropriations and the Budget Bureau, which I am sure will substantiate what I have said not only for my district, which is the entire State of Connecticut, but also throughout the United States. May I ask for your favorable consideration of my amendment when it is offered under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supply supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, namely:

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask if there is any appropriation in this bill for the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, so far as I know there is not. The appropriation for the Committee on Un-American Activities comes out of the contingent fund of the House and there is no money carried for that purpose here. I believe that that is correct.

Mr. CANNON. There is no money involved in this bill for that committee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very vital that that money should be expended by the Congress for these investigations of subversive activities.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentlewoman will yield, the money has already been appropriated.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But I wanted to draw attention to the importance of it.

I want to read to the Congress a letter that came to me this morning. This is one letter. I have received a great many threats recently. This letter begins "Valentine Day." It reads:

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: Here is a valentine for you. Lay off your activities against us now, or we will get you. Who are we? We are the Nazis. We are the loyal supporters of Hitler. Long may he live. Down with the Israelites. Down with the Jews.

Then it reads: Signed "The Nazis."

I bring this letter to the attention of the Members of the House because I have received a great many threats recently. I warn the House and the country that not only communism stalks in the United States today but also nazism and Hitlerism. There are disloyal, subversive persons in the United States. They should be sent from the shores of America. No effort should be spared to remove them. They appear in strange and unexpected places. I believe they will be caught.

This letter will be turned over to the FBI, as well as other information that I have in my possession.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE HOUSE

*Miscellaneous items*

Notwithstanding the provisions of the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1949, the appropriation for "Miscellaneous items" for the House of Representatives in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1949, shall be available for purchase of new or used typewriters at prices which do not exceed prices established under the provisions of the Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1949.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I desire at this time to call the attention of the committee to page 3 of the bill under the title "Architect of the Capitol, Capitol Building, Senate and House Roofs and Chambers."

I am calling this to the attention of the committee in order that I may give you a brief summary of what has taken place relative to the improvement of these Chambers.

Several years ago a special committee was appointed by the Speaker, with the thought of improving the interior of the House of Representatives. It was my privilege to serve as the ranking member on that particular committee, then as chairman of that particular committee, and today as the ranking minority member of the committee, under the chairmanship of the capable gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

We have taken the position for some years that we would hold in abeyance any construction on these Chambers so that we might give to those individuals out in our respective districts the opportunity to obtain building material which is necessary for them to construct homes

which are so badly needed. We also took into consideration the high construction costs and the high material costs, if you please, feeling that possibly at a later date these material costs would be less, and possibly at sometime we might get into a depression and have an unemployment program whereby we would have our plans ready to immediately step into the construction and the remodeling and improvement of these Chambers. That was the policy of your committee prior to the present time. We also objected during that past period of allowing this construction to be done on what is known as a cost-plus basis. Some of us are of the firm conviction that all should be given an opportunity to bid on the project, should be given an opportunity to have their day in court, so to speak, rather than to continue further on that philosophy and method of the Federal Government whereby we are developing a policy of letting contracts on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. When you go back to your private business I am certain that if you had a house to build or some other structure that you would ask for bids on it; then you would get value received for the dollar you spent. On a cost-plus basis, as set forth in this bill, you seldom know what your costs will be until the project is completed.

The question arises in our minds, just how much the repairs on this building, on this Chamber, will cost if we get into the category set forth in this bill of cost-plus-a-fixed fee. We have heard for quite some time that we who are members of the Legislative Committee should be careful and always protect our rights. Here is an appropriation measure that contains a definite legislative provision. I will quote from the bill:

The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts—

Please note—

including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as approved by the Special Committee on Reconstruction of House Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of the House Chamber, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee appointed under section 1 of the act of July 17, 1945, notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 of that act.

I may call to your attention the fact that previously we had authorized and appropriated $585,000 for the remodeling of this Chamber. Approximately one-half of that amount has been spent to date for plans, designs, and specifications; or approximately $292,500. This legislation gives further authorization and an appropriation of $2,274,500; and a contract is to be awarded, if you please, on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

We did not have any meetings of the special committee until this morning we were called into session by the chairman of our committee. He presented to us a letter to sign; and I should like to read it to you. This is a letter dated February 15, 1949, today, and on the bottom of it appears this statement: "Members of House committee appointed under Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress," and then there is supposed to be the signature of the House committee. It is addressed to Mr. David Lynn, Architect of the Capitol, and reads as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LYNN—

Mr. Lynn, by the way, is the national architect. He handed us this letter for us to sign, a letter which I believe he had written and addressed to himself. The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR MR. LYNN: Subject to the enactment of the necessary legislation and appropriation in the First Deficiency Act, 1949, you are hereby authorized and directed to enter into contracts and to incur such other obligations as may be necessary for the reconstruction of the roof over the House wing of the Capitol and improvement of the House Chamber, cloakrooms, and other adjacent areas included in the House project as approved by the House committee appointed under Public Law 155, Seventy-ninth Congress, in a total amount of not to exceed $2,567,000.

The contracts may be let on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to such extent and in such manner as in your judgment is to the best interest of the Government.

You are further authorized to award the general contract for the House project on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to the Consolidated Engineering Co., of Baltimore, Md., presently employed under contract of October 28, 1948, as the general contractor for the reconstruction of the roof over the Senate wing of the Capitol and improvement of the Senate Chamber, cloakrooms, and other adjacent areas.

Allow me to divert a moment and call your attention to the fact that this is on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. In this letter we are giving Mr. Lynn the authority to enter into a contract with one individual, if you please, the Consolidated Engineering Co., of Baltimore.

Now, if I may go on with the letter of instructions that the committee received:

The committee authorizes the award of the general contract to the Consolidated Engineering Co., without further competitive bidding, for the following reasons, predicated on the urgency of the time element:

(a) The materials and equipment required for the House project cannot be fabricated and delivered to the site in time to permit the start of construction work on July 1, 1949, unless orders for the same are placed immediately upon the approval of the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949.

(b) Inviting of competitive bids and subbids for the House project, including bid analyses, conferences, and other details necessary prior to contract award, would cause too great a loss of time to permit scheduling, fabrication, and delivery of the required materials and equipment to the site by July 1, 1949.

(c) Utilization, insofar as practicable, of Senate subcontract bids for the House project at the same price levels used for the Senate project, which prices are the result of comparatively recent competitive bidding, will enable the House materials and equipment, which are similar in character to the Senate materials and equipment, to be included in the Senate production schedules, thereby expediting fabrication and enabling the maintenance of construction progress schedule for the House work on the same basis as the Senate work.

(d) Award of the general contract to the Consolidated Engineering Co. will eliminate the time losses that would otherwise be entailed not only by the securing of competitive bids and the possible necessity of having to work out the details of contract negotiations with another general contractor, but entailed also by the details necessarily incident to negotiations with different subcontractors than those employed for the Senate project, and the working out of new production schedules and other procedures.

Then there is a space for the members of the committee to sign.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I am reading this whole detailed report because I firmly believe this committee should know about the whole procedure. I read the letter that was given to us in all fairness by Mr. Lynn, the Architect. It is entirely up to this committee. If you want to let the contract for the remodeling and repairing of this Chamber on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis, it is in this bill. If you pass it as it is then you are giving complete authority and really a directive, to this special committee to enter into an agreement and award the contract to this one company on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Can the gentleman state how many members of the committee have signed that letter?

Mr. McGREGOR. None of the members of the committee have signed it yet because the Member speaking raised the question this morning whether or not we had any authority to bind this Congress to the expenditure of over $2,000,000, without further enabling legislation. It was suggested that we get a letter from the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, citing his opinion before deciding whether or not we should sign this letter to Mr. Lynn.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has again expired.

Mr. McGREGOR. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, these are the facts and it is up to the committee to decide what they want done.

The Clerk read as follows:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

CAPITOL BUILDING, SENATE AND HOUSE ROOFS AND CHAMBERS

Capitol Building: For an additional amount to enable the Architect of the Capitol to carry forward the improvements affecting the House Wing of the Capitol authorized by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act of June 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 629), as amended by the acts of June 8, 1942 (56 Stat. 342), and July 17, 1945 (59 Stat. 72), $2,274,500. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts, including cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts as approved by the Special Committee on Reconstruction of House Roof and Skylights and Remodeling of House Chamber, and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House Wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee appointed under section 1 of the act of July 17, 1945, notwithstanding the provisions of

section 2 of that act: *Provided*, That the amounts so approved by such committee may be obligated in full prior to the actual appropriation thereof.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGREGOR: Page 3, line 6, strike out all of the paragraph.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this amendment is offered so that each and every one of you will be given an opportunity to decide whether or not you want the remodeling done which will cost, in addition to what has been allocated, $2,274,500. This amendment would simply strike out that particular section of the deficiency bill which gives an authorization for the remodeling of this chamber and the adjoining cloak rooms. An authorization to be established under the legislation on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis. I am certain that the other members of the committee, on which it is my privilege to serve, will not object to allowing you to decide whether or not you want to continue that procedure in Federal construction.

Again I reiterate my previous statement, if this amendment is turned down, the repairs of this section of the Capitol will, at least, be temporarily delayed. The procedure that we have carried for a number of years is that we should not repair at this time and allow the material, and that which is necessary for the repairs, to go to the individual who is having a difficult time to find material and labor to build a house. I am leaving it for your consideration whether or not you want to authorize a contract being entered into on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis to the extent of $2,274,500 for the repair of these chambers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Do I understand that neither the gentleman nor the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] agreed with this program?

Mr. McGREGOR. We have not agreed with the program, nor have we disagreed with it, I will say to the gentleman from New York. We gave consideration to it this morning. The question was raised whether or not we should sign the letter to Mr. Lynn, which has been previously referred to. The question was also raised whether or not we should enter into a contract of a cost-plus nature to the extent of $2,274,500. I want to be perfectly fair; a similar arrangement has been made in the Senate. They are following through on a cost-plus basis, but we have always taken the position that we are not going to do it on this side.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I will not say that it is in the testimony, but I understood when this matter was before the committee that the gentleman's committee had approved it. Now, if that is not so, that is a different picture.

Mr. McGREGOR. I will say to the gentleman that we have not approved it. We had no meeting until this morning, and the statement referred to was handed to us, and we—I think in all fairness to those who have honored us with that responsibility—refused to sign the statement, and that is the reason I am taking the floor here today so that the committee may know what is incorporated in this legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman in a position to state whether there is an emergent condition here which should be cured immediately or as soon as possible?

Mr. McGREGOR. I will answer that by repeating the statement that our good friend, the minority leader, made, "It is unsightly but safe."

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RAYBURN. Just exactly what will be our situation? I am tired of this bandywork being over my head and destroying the symmetry and beauty of this Chamber. I have talked to the Architect of the Capitol and he says this work can be done in 5 months. If you strike out this paragraph, what will be our situation? Are we going to get this work done?

Mr. McGREGOR. May I say to the Speaker that it will require approximately a year to complete the whole project, and it would have to be done in two 5- or 6-months periods, for reasons that I am certain all of us are familiar with. Should we not pass this legislation, it probably would go over until another year, and if you did not decide then to do it then it would go over to another year. It is entirely within our power to authorize its construction at any time.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is just exactly what I think about this. If you strike this out, then no one can tell when this work will be done. Frankly, I do not feel any too safe under this thing. If we are not going to do anything if this is stricken out, then I would certainly be opposed to striking out this paragraph. I think this work ought to be done. I think this Chamber ought to be modernized. I think we ought to have better seats in here.

Mr. McGREGOR. New seating arrangement is covered in the plans.

Mr. RAYBURN. We ought to have a great many other things. I should like to see this gray painted out and put back to gold, that was around here for so many years and that was so beautiful and so attractive to the eye. I do not like coldness when I can have warmth. I just fear that if you strike out this paragraph we are not going to get this job done in 2 or 5 or 10 years.

Mr. McGREGOR. Carrying further the statement of our distinguished Speaker it is incorporated in this legislation or at least the plans that if it goes through there will be a different seating arrangement; the plans have been in the Architect's office for many, many months where all can see them. There is a different seating arrangement being arranged for. The acoustical part is being taken care of. The beam work is taken out. The roof is changed. It will be the privilege of the various Members of Congress to decide what they want to do with the seals of their respective States, because the ceiling will be entirely different.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGREGOR. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. If I understand it, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR] is not opposed to the face-lifting operation but only to the manner in which the operation is to be performed. I agree with the gentleman. Surely there should be no objection to consulting various doctors of architecture. It would be better to consult and successfully operate rather than to operate without consultation and find that instead of effecting a cure, we had only succeeded in deforming.

Mr. McGREGOR. I certainly want this committee to know just what this section of the bill really does. We are most assuredly closing the door to any competitive bidding and closing the door to any other contractor, and allowing that one to construct on a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee basis.

I am certain that the other members of the special committee will join me when I say, "We want you to decide."

My personal opinion is that it should not be repaired now in the face of high prices, critical-material shortages, and I certainly do not like, or do I think it is fair to the taxpayers, a cost-plus construction procedure.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have just this to say. The Architect of the Capitol—and I think everyone else understands this situation—thinks that it would be so much easier to do both these works at the same time. I fear, and let me express the fear again, that if we do not do this as provided in this bill we will not do anything for some years to come. I have talked with the Architect of the Capitol about this. I think it is his idea that these contracts ought to be carried on at the same time. I do not see why we should not look after our business and our comfort here just as the other body or anybody else does. I hope this provision is not stricken out of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering if something could not be done that would result in an amendment that would perhaps do away with this idea of letting the contract on a cost-plus basis to this one contractor, and leave it to the approval of this committee, composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR], before a contract is entered into.

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not like cost-plus contracts. I believe this is the one way we are going to get this job done within a year or two, to be frank about it.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in not to exceed 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Many of you know of my great concern regarding the danger of possibly destroying valuable American architecture. I have gone all over this problem from its inception. There is absolutely nothing wrong with this ceiling. The original plan was to repair the roof because the Architect and the engineers whom we brought here to Washington at the expense of the Government, to examine the ceiling, found some defects in the iron. Then we feared that a heavy snowfall would cause the roof to cave in because we had an instance where a heavy snow falling on the roof of a theater caused the death of some people some years ago.

We removed the roof over this Chamber and put up the superstructure and these iron supports for additional safety. However, the ceiling is in excellent condition. There is nothing the matter with it. I have seen some of the proposed plans, and I fear that when they are completed, some valuable American architecture, which should be preserved for posterity, would be removed. Your State seals will be removed. When they get through with this program of face lifting the Capitol of the United States, because there is an apparent defect in the dome where the lip hangs over the cornice, you will find that they are going to remove column after column of historical American architecture. The cornstalk pillars designed by Thomas Jefferson will be removed. Many of the statues, I am told, will be farmed out to the States. I, too, do not like to disagree with my distinguished Speaker, but I believe that we should have this matter reviewed in order that every Member of the House will realize his responsibility in voting for something that at some time they may be sorry for—something that will destroy American architecture which should be preserved for posterity.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. If this paragraph is stricken out of the bill, is there any reason in the world why we cannot bring in, if necessary, a special resolution after the other body has considered the matter?

Mr. STEFAN. There is no hurry about it at all. We have many, many new Members here who also believe in preserving American architecture. Let them study this program which is designed to streamline the Capitol; to take away the State seals and put in neon lights and make this historic Chamber look like a modern night club.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield.

Mr. RAYBURN. What does the gentleman suggest that we do about this matter? This roof has been condemned. What should we do about it?

Mr. STEFAN. The ceiling is intact and in perfect condition, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska really think that that is a correct statement?

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I am told, sir. I have crawled over every part of the roof that has been removed.

Mr. RAYBURN. I have been told otherwise. I do not know why, if the ceiling is in good condition, why we should have all this steel framework over our heads.

Mr. STEFAN. I would not debate that point with my distinguished Speaker, but I have gone into this matter carefully and I have been told by the Architect that the ceiling is in perfect condition. I have been told that your State seals, from Kentucky and Maine and Ohio, and every State in the Union, would be removed. They have shown me other designs for changing the appearance of this Chamber.

Mr. RAYBURN. Then why is this steel structure erected over us if the ceiling is safe? Why do we have these steel girders supporting the ceiling?

Mr. STEFAN. For the reason of additional protection, since they removed most of the roof, because we are liable to have a snow that would come down on top of the ceiling. You could make this Chamber safe by putting on the roof that they originally wanted to replace. There has been no change in this historic Chamber from the very time it was constructed, except the seating capacity or arrangement. No other change has been made. And yet overnight, Members of the House, you are participating in a program that some day you will regret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the original committee, together with Senator CONNALLY, to investigate the roofs of the Chambers. We went up there, and we were astonished. This roof is somewhat similar to a bridge construction. It is up beyond this glass ceiling, and, incidentally, what appears to be plaster overhead is cast iron. That is a cast-iron ceiling that weighs either 80 or 120 tons. I am calling this figure from memory. This bridge roof support is of old-fashioned iron construction, with pins holding the two elements together in the brace of the roof. Those pins were bent, each pin going in two directions, proving to anyone who would look at them that the pins were broken somewhere in between. This roof is dangerous. When it was brought to the attention of the able Speaker of this House as a precautionary measure, we proceeded to put in this beamwork, inside of this Chamber, which I want to explain to the new Members of the House does not belong in this room and would not be in this room for this period of time, had it not been for the war which came along, and, of course, set all things of this nature aside by reason of its immensity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, how long is this bridgework to be in this room? How long are we to sit idly by, when people come to the Capitol, and ask them to hide behind posts to take a look at the House of Representatives, that cannot even put their own Chamber in order without debate such as we have had here this afternoon?

Over and above that, the Chamber at the other end of the Capitol, the Senate Chamber, is smaller than this Chamber, and that roof is in a similar condition, because all of the air-conditioning has been hung in these roofs, among other things up there that were not there originally, adding weight to a condition which made it all the more dangerous, both here and over in the Senate.

The Senate has entered into an agreement with the contractors, and they did it in the Eightieth, Republican Congress, for the repair of their Chamber. They are to vacate the Chamber by the 30th of June of this year. Now, do we want trucks and whistles and hoists out in front for 4 or 5 years, to the inconvenience of the American people when they come to the Capital of the United States, or do we want to step on the gas and get this thing over with? I see no reason why we should not proceed to take the bridgework out of this Chamber. It is very nice for my friend the gentleman from Nebraska to talk about moving a statue or moving something else. They have been moving statues and men around this building for a long time; they have moved them out since I have been here; and I was moved with them once.

Many statues were taken out of the rotunda a few years ago, as you older Members will recall, and it is no longer permitted to place them away from the sides of the room, for they have all been moved closer to the supporting walls, because it was discovered there was a danger from the concentrated weight.

This roof is 90 years old; it was built according to the standards of those days. It should be taken off now just like a chap would shed his ancient cap.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if I understood correctly the description of the structure above us as given both by the gentleman from Nebraska and the gentleman from Michigan, there is a difference between the ceiling and the ironwork that we see, and the roof itself which is or was above the ceiling. Apparently the condition of the roof itself was responsible for the ironwork. I remember that shortly after I came here this ironwork was put in because we were told that if a heavy snow should come, the ceiling might fall on us; but apparently a distinction should be made between the ceiling, including these sections which carry the State seals, and the structure of the roof above.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. We held a brief hearing yesterday. As to the safeness, or the unsafeness, if you choose to call it such, of this ceiling, we have been assured that the roof has been removed. These beams were put in; and as I have said before, and the evidence before our committee will show, it is unsightly but safe.

The gentleman from Michigan said the roof has been here for 80 or 90 years. I might say to my distinguished friend that that section has been moved and was moved when we put in these new beams.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is not correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Just a minute. If I have time I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Now, personally, I would like to see the seals preserved up here. This morning I read in one of the columns, I think it was in the Washington Post, that under the plan that had been agreed to, if this language should prevail, these seals would be removed.

I should like to know whether the plan as presently contemplated does include the removal of the seals from the ceiling? Could some gentleman of the committee advise me definitely on that point?

Mr. McGREGOR. As a member of the committee I may say that it has been agreed that the seals will be removed and will be taken care of according to the will of the various State organizations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is if we approve this language.

Mr. McGREGOR. That is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then our only chance to preserve the seals for the House of Representatives is to take the language out.

Mr. McGREGOR. Either that or endeavor to get your committee to change the plans of remodeling so that the seals will be retained; but under present plans and specifications the seals will be removed. That is called for.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I share the desire of the Speaker to see this work done. We should agree upon a plan for the work and go ahead with it; but if the present plans, as they appear to, mean the removal of the State seals from the Chamber of the House of Representatives I shall be compelled to support the amendment to strike this language from the bill. In voting that way, however, I do not want it understood as meaning that I am opposed to getting rid of this ironwork and the unsafe condition of the Chamber, but rather that I want the seals preserved for the House of Representatives.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder how many Members of this body have taken the trouble to go down to the Architect's rooms and see the plans? I wonder if they know that these two doorways will be changed, that the position of the portraits will be changed, that Brumidi's painting of General Washington and Lord Cornwallis will be removed—Why? Because there must be balance in the Chamber and there is no painting in the corresponding corner on the other side of the Chamber. Not only will this ceiling of the State seals be destroyed but also all the decorations will be changed. There will be columns on either side of the Speaker's chair that might bury the Speaker behind them. Columns are formal and cold and out of keeping with this present old room so filled with understanding between the Speaker and those of us on the floor. And these are but the simpler changes.

It seems to me a great pity that we in this young country do not see the value to posterity of this great Capitol. A thousand years hence—and we hope this Capitol will still be here—the young people will not bless us if we remove all evidence of ourselves and our methods and our ways of life.

You know well that in the other countries of the world, in the old countries of the world, it is very wonderful to go into their houses of parliament, or whatever they may be called. Redolent of the past they give dignity to all that there transpires—they are living history.

Let me call attention again to the condition between the ceiling and the roof. If the contractors so lack ingenuity that they cannot find ways of making the roof safe over and above this old-fashioned, traditional ceiling, we had better find another contractor!

I too agree with the Speaker in the matter of the removal of our factory construction—but here under these iron beams we fought a war like no other war.

For myself—and I am certain that I speak for the people of this great Republic—I would rather keep the factory supports a little longer than destroy this atmosphere. By all means let us have new chairs, but not new walls. You have not seen the picture of the dull, arched ceiling, the uninteresting design. If you had, you would not lend yourselves to this destruction.

They say we will be able to hear. If we are quiet, we can always hear. Are you so sure the change will do all you say it will?

To use as an argument the removal of these steel struts to strengthen a roof that can be strengthened up above and so destroy an atmosphere that has seen some of the great of our country, within whose walls vibrates something we cannot afford to lose, Mr. Chairman, will deprive those who come after us of a rich heritage they can ill afford to lose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I shall not take 5 minutes. I would like to direct your attention, however, to the fact that before long an analogous situation will no doubt be presented to the Congress. I refer to the situation that involves the historic White House. It is said on good authority that the present structure could be reduced and a new structure be built to meticulous specifications as to present form at a cost of $2,000,000. It is further said that to preserve that historic structure as is, with suitable improvements, will cost from six to eight million dollars, and you are going to have to ultimately decide that when the appropriation for that estimate comes before the Congress.

Now, the wails have gone up all over this country at the very thought of destroying that historic structure, and voices have been raised all over this country to preserve it, cost what it may. Now you will have to meet that issue again a little later on.

I am inclined to agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] and my good friend the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN]. I was here when these atrocious supports were put in this room. As a Member of the House of Representatives I have not suffered any by it. I have seen the plans that are proposed. Far be it from me to attempt to assess whether those plans are the best that could be prepared or not. But, let me tell you that if you vote for this proposal you are going to vote to destroy this Chamber of the House of Representatives as we have known it and as the people have known it for the last 90 years.

Maybe we have reached a point where sentiment means nothing, but in my vote it still does mean something. I would hate to have this Chamber transformed in the manner in which it has been suggested and thus for all time destroy the identity of this Chamber with the historic past. It is more than just a mere changing of the roof, Mr. Chairman. There is more to this situation than just the mere expenditure of this money in order to improve the comfort of people who are involved.

Mr. RAYBURN. Right there, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I gladly yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. RAYBURN. Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor anyone else during the next 2 years can make any plans for changing this structure unless they consult with the committee of the House named by the Speaker the other day. That committee is composed of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GOODWIN]. Neither the Architect of the Capitol nor anybody else could do anything without the approval of that committee.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, Mr. Chairman, as I read the language of the bill, it says:

> The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to enter into contracts * * * in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee—

And so on. I understand from the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR] that the Architect of the Capitol has already, before the passage of this act, presented a letter of approval of this program to go into ef-

fect, and the whole necessity and urgency is based upon the fact that unless he is immediately authorized to enter into this contract in collaboration with the contract that has been entered into to improve the Senate, that we will not get what we want.

Mr. RAYBURN. The bill goes on to say:

and to make such other expenditures as may be necessary for the improvements affecting the House wing of the Capitol authorized by such acts, in such amounts as may be approved by the House committee—

And so forth.

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I understand that, but for all practical purposes does not the Speaker realize, and I am sure he does, that if we pass this appropriation this afternoon, the balance of it is merely perfunctory because the plan has already been submitted to the committee? The committee is prepared to go ahead, and the very basis of it all is speed. We must work in cooperation with this firm of contractors that is doing over the Senate. I wish it could be done that way and preserve this historic Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the statements made on this floor by the gentlewoman from Ohio and the gentleman from Wisconsin. The bill brought before us is a deficiency bill. This is considered so important a matter that we cannot wait for 6 weeks, or whatever the time may be, before an appropriation bill comes before this House in its regular order appropriating $2,274,500.

If the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of the House, is correct, and it is necessary for the committee still to approve plans, for plans still to be completed, then it seems to me it is primary evidence that it is not necessary for this item to be in a deficiency appropriation bill. It might very well take its proper order. The committee might consider the plans, vote upon them, pass them, and determine the amount of money, for if the plans have not been approved, how does the committee know the amount of money that is necessary?

However, I call attention primarily to two things. One has already been spoken of by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], and that is that right downtown, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, we have a house which does not have the historic associations of the Chamber in which we sit today. Here the laws of the United States have been made. In the other house they have only been carried out. This is the body, this is the building, this is the Chamber, in which United States history has been made. Yet when it comes to repairing the White House, at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, we have evidence before our committee that $6,400,000 is to be spent on the White House to preserve the White House as it stands, when a like building, similar in every way, better and more modern, could in the words of the head of the Public Buildings Administration be built for half that amount. It seems to me that here, in this Chamber, is where the historic evidences of the history of this country ought to be preserved.

So let me tell you what England did under exactly the same situation. England during the last war was bombed, bombed thoroughly, bombed as I hope this country may never know what bombing is. The House of Parliament was struck by bombs. The House of Commons was completely destroyed, gutted, nothing left standing except the walls, with everything else open to the air. The chamber of the House of Commons, which goes down in its history and in the hearts of the people of England as this building should go down in the hearts of the people of America, never was big enough, or has not been big enough for generations, to seat all of the members of the House of Commons at one time.

What would have happened in this country? If this is any evidence, architects and committees and Architects of the Capitol and building contractors would immediately have rushed in and said, "Here is our chance. Now let us build a great big room, a great big new room. There isn't anything left. Let us build one that will take all the members of the House of Commons at one time." Did they do that? No. The new House of Commons which is now being built in England is exactly the same size, an exact replica of the room which was bombed during the war.

It seems to me that while this may not be the most important matter to come before this House this session, it is a very important matter. If this Nation is to be preserved, we must look back to some of the principles that were established in this room, and we should be reminded by the room of what those principles were and of their association with the history of the United States.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. Am I not correct in believing that this Chamber, this building of our young Republic is the oldest House of Representatives in the world? The British Chamber is younger than this. I think the French Chamber is, and I know of no chamber where the elected representatives of the people meet any place in the world that is as old as this 90-year-old Chamber in which we meet.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I thank the gentleman. I am sure we should preserve it.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to supplement what the gentleman said about the House of Commons in England. When I was there the Assistant Speaker told us that the reason they did not enlarge the Chamber, or at least one of the pertinent reasons, was that they always have so many people absent, about 100 or 150, that if they enlarge the Chamber, the absence would be so much more noticeable and that they therefore retained the old size.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Is the gentleman suggesting that, in making this change, we reduce the size of this Chamber?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCGREGOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEFAN) there were—ayes 74, noes 116.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. MCGREGOR.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 78, noes 122.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WORLEY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WORLEY. In view of the difference of opinion in the House, I wonder if it would be satisfactory if we just repaired the roof on the Democratic side and let the Republican side stay as it is.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman does not state a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2632, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

## COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress, I am not in sympathy with the manner in which the Veterans' Affairs Committee was conducted this morning. A bill of such magnitude was reported out that it might involve as much as $200,000,000,000 in the future, and affects thousands of veterans.

This bill was reported with a total hearing time of 7 minutes, having never been seen by many members of the committee prior to the meeting this morning. I shall always object to conducting a committee hearing in this fashion.

I have a very keen interest in the problems of veterans and I am anxious to see this particular bill be given full and adequate consideration by the Members of both Houses. Certainly a bill affecting the very life and welfare of our veterans should be given every consideration and study. The committee, I feel, was being put in a position to place its stamp of approval upon proposed legislation regardless of its feeling in the matter, and without giving the Members a chance to pursue the details in the bill.

Neither was their help asked or their advice requested on what may or may not be best in this legislation. We believe that, because we are on this committee, we are responsible to the veteran and are his voice on matters pertaining to legislation that concern him as well as the public in general. Therefore, it behooves the chairman, as well as the committee members, to familiarize themselves with any measures that are brought before the committee for its action. My 5 years in the service, with 31 months overseas, justify my belief that I have as great an interest in this legislation and in the veterans and their problems as any Member of this Congress. My continued interest in veterans' organizations since my discharge in 1945 further substantiates this.

It was necessary for the members of the committee to decide in 7 minutes what the minimum age would be for a pension, and to vote to exclude the 62–64-age group without an adequate presentation of background data to substantiate this exclusion. Further, the bill provided for the pensioning of those other than honorably discharged from the armed services and gave consideration to non-service-connected disability veterans below the age of 65. The chairman of this committee did not permit me or any other member of the committee the opportunity to ask questions or discuss these facts, but in an arbitrary manner himself called for a roll-call vote. I consider that he has exceeded his authority as chairman and is not providing adequate opportunity for the problems of veterans to be considered, for members of the committee to be heard, or for information to be distributed and assimilated.

### MR. CORBETT DESIGNATED TO READ WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the special order agreed to today, the Chair designates the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CORBETT] to read Washington's Farewell Address immediately after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday, February 22, 1949.

### PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, last week I announced that if the bill (H. R. 782) to constitute the Federal Security Agency a Department of Welfare were reported out of committee, that it would be on the program for this week. The bill is still in the committee; and even if it were reported now, the bill could not come up this week.

With that exception the program is the same as heretofore announced.

With the completion of the bill now under consideration there will follow H. R. 1661, the Export Control Act; House Resolution 66, the investigation of public lands; and House Resolution 75, investigation by the Committee on Education and Labor.

There will be a bill out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House Joint Resolution 92, continuing the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate ships until June 30, 1949.

If these bills are disposed of by Thursday, it is my intention to ask to adjourn over until the following Monday.

### REPUBLICAN OBJECTORS ON CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House I wish to state that the Republican objectors on the Consent Calendar will be the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER].

The objectors on the Private Calendar will be the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. LICHTENWALTER].

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter to the editor of the New York Times.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Passaic (N. J.) Herald-News on housing.

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Times-Leader-Evening News of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short statement.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE].

### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes tomorrow following the legislative program of the day and any special orders heretofore granted for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

### SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order I had for tomorrow be changed to Thursday of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

### THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Joint Resolution 161, and my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, ANDREW BIEMILLER, has introduced an identical resolution, calling for the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project—a project which has been the hope and dream of the people of the Great Lakes area for over two decades, and one which is necessary to the future prosperity and welfare of the entire Midwest section of the United States. There is no need to present a detailed analysis of the provisions of this resolution on this occasion. The effect of this bill is to authorize the President to approve the 1941 agreement with Canada to permit the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project in cooperation with Canada.

The advantages of constructing the St. Lawrence project are so obvious, so convincing, and so well known that I need mention them only in passing. By building the necessary dams, locks, and canals to remove the obstructions to shipping in the 119-mile bottleneck between Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Montreal, Canada, a great inland seaway of 2,351 miles in length would be made available to ocean shipping. This would mean that the deep-sea vessels from all over the world would be able to steam up the St. Lawrence River from the Atlantic Ocean, and unload their cargoes at the Great Lakes ports of Duluth, Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, and Buffalo.

Such an inland shipping system would mean great savings in transportation costs to consumers and producers alike. It is estimated that the average reduction in transportation costs would be about $3.90 per ton. Automobiles could be shipped from Detroit at a saving of $12.24 a ton. Wheat and flour could be shipped from Duluth at a saving of $1.61 per ton, and could be laid down in Liverpool at 5 to 8 cents less per bushel. Crude rubber could be brought to Detroit at a saving of $8 per long ton. The dairy products of the Great Lakes region could be transported to the Atlantic coast at a saving of $4 per ton. In other words, savings in transportation costs would amount to between $35,000,000 and $40,000,000 per year, which means that the seaway would pay for itself in transportation savings alone in a few years' time.

The seaway would have the effect of stimulating trade between the east coast and the Midwest. Grain, flour, meat, and ores would flow from the Midwest to the East to be exchanged for the man-

ufactured goods of the East. Trade between the two great regions would grow, employment would rise, and living standards in both areas would improve.

The power facilities of the St. Lawrence project would provide enormous amounts of cheap electric power to relieve the power famine now affecting New York and the New England States. It has been estimated that the United States share of electric power generated by the project would amount to 13,000,000 kilowatts per year at the very low rate of 1 mill per kilowatt. According to the New York Power Commission, St. Lawrence-generated power would save the people of New York some $26,000,000 per year in reduced power costs, and and would allow for the expansion of her retarded industries to employ 50,000 additional workers. The New England States would also benefit in a similar degree.

Just as the savings in transportation costs would pay for the cost of the seaway in a relatively short time, so will the electric power obtained from the project also offset in a few years' time the $571,000,000 outlay on the part of the United States for its construction.

The case for construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project is so overwhelming that it is a mystery why anyone would be opposed to it—the mystery is, Why was it not constructed years ago? The project has been an issue in the Congress year after year, and each time its supporters have been disappointed. However, the picture has been changing and support has been growing for the project by leaps and bounds.

An unprecedented series of developments have occurred recently to give the project a new and powerful stature and bring close the day when the Congress must recognize its intrinsic merit. President Harry S. Truman recommended the passage of the seaway measure three times during the month of January of this year, and has listed the seaway as an expenditure item in his 1950 budget. The appointment of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State is important, inasmuch as Mr. Acheson headed State Department activity in support of the project in the past, and he was also the former chairman of the Joint Canadian-American Defense Board.

Of equal significance has been the shift in position of the Great Lakes shipping interests. Mr. George Humphrey, of M. A. Hanna Co., has now come out in support of the seaway, and the influential Lake Carriers Association has decided to change its position from bitter hostility to one of neutrality. Shippers and leaders of industry have come to realize that the seaway is essential to the stabilization of the iron and steel industry—the backbone of the American industrial system.

Just as the movement supporting the seaway gathers momentum, we also find the opposition forces now resorting to new stratagems to prevent its realization.

I note from the press reports from Albany, N. Y., that Gov. Thomas E. Dewey is busily engaged in encouraging the passage of resolutions in the New York State Legislature to petition the President and the Congress to build the St. Lawrence power project and defer the seaway. I recall that during the Presidential campaign, when he came to Minnesota, he gave strong assurances that he is for the St. Lawrence seaway project, and if elected President he would vigorously press for congressional approval of the project. But, of course, Albany is not Minnesota, and we hear a different tone now since the Presidential campaign is over.

My friends in both great parties realize, however, that for the first time in the history of the country we have a President elected with the support of the Western States who has unequivocally stood for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project to benefit the whole Nation, regardless of sectionalism. In fact, for the past 25 years no President has been elected to office who has not strongly and unequivocally supported the construction of this project for both power and navigation.

Needless to say, this Congress should not entertain any idea of following Governor Dewey's suggestion to develop power alone, for the following reasons:

First. As proposed by Governor Dewey, if St. Lawrence power alone is developed, the project will cost $49,000,000 more to the people of the State of New York and other Northeastern States, thereby increasing the cost of power developed to industries and consumers. It is not to the interest of the northeastern part of the United States to support this proposition. The Governor has kept this fact from the people of the State of New York.

Second. It is unfair to mislead the public of New York and other Northeastern States with the false hope that they will secure the power project without navigation, as both the Canadian Government and our own Federal Government have commitments and agreements for the joint development of the project. And those arrangements cannot be changed without years of delay and without welshing upon promises made to the people of this country and of Canada. I am sure that the Federal Government will not go back on its word and any false expectations aroused to the contrary merely mislead the public and play into the hands of the minority groups who oppose this great development.

Third. On account of the critical situation arising in the exhaustion of our raw materials upon which the industry of the Middle West and the whole country depend, the St. Lawrence seaway is just as vital to national interest as the power, hence no leader who only recently presumed to represent the country as a whole can, in good conscience and with frankness, propose the indefinite postponement of the seaway in order to satisfy minority pressure groups in New York and other Eastern States.

At a time when the press of the country is applauding the initiative taken by this country in support of democratic principles all over the world through economic and technical assistance, it is inconsistent to close our eyes to the greatest development within our grasp, which will make the North American Continent a strong and a better place in which to live.

Recently, Defense Minister Claxton, of Canada, gave a speech at Sault Ste. Marie, on January 11, emphasizing the importance of the joint seaway power development in the defense of the North American Continent, from which I quote in some length:

THE PLACE OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY IN OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Here we are, 1,500 miles from the sea at one of the four main junctures of Canada and the United States across the mighty St. Lawrence system. The foresight and cooperation of Canadians and Americans built the locks which opened the waterways system from Fort William to Sarnia and joined Lakes Superior, Michigan, and Huron into the greatest inland area of deep-water transportation on the face of the earth. What this single engineering job at the Sault has meant in profit to the people of Canada and the United States is impossible to calculate. More tonnage passes through the Sault Ste. Marie canals than through the Panama and Suez Canals combined, and this despite the short season.

The way opened here was extended by other canals on through Lakes Erie and Ontario, down the St. Lawrence as far as Prescott, adding 500 miles to deep-water inland navigation.

Now there is only the part from Prescott to Montreal blocking the flow of deep-water trade and travel from Lake Superior out into the oceans of the world.

You will recall that it was during the darkest days of the war that President Roosevelt and Mr. Mackenzie King worked out again an agreement for the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. The project was advocated as a great contribution to the peaceful life and trade of this continent, and it was planned as a definite line of communication for the defense of our continent.

If it was desirable in 1941 that we should construct the waterways for purposes of transportation and for power, recent events have shown that it is even more desirable today; if it was desirable to proceed with the construction of the St. Lawrence waterway for purposes of defense in 1941, nothing that has happened since has in any way diminished that need.

In the interest of national defense and international security the St. Lawrence waterway project should be started as soon as possible and pressed to completion. General economic benefits, transportation and communication, power, and iron ore are reasons which give the completion of the St. Lawrence urgent priority in joint defense. Let us examine each of these:

1. The completion of the waterways system, like every other major development of transportation and power, would lead to the expansion of the civilian economy, and any expansion in the industrial and economic potential which in peacetime leads to prosperity and a higher standard of living also leads to an increased ability to arm ourselves for our own defense. Here, in this home of steel, there is no need to remind you of what Hanson Baldwin said, that it was "the factories of America, the industrial know-how of America, and the mechanical competence of America * * * that won the war."

2. In the modern war the lines of communication stretch all the way from the battle front to the factories and the full use of the St. Lawrence would bring resources of the interior of our continent closer to any possible fighting front; it would permit the more effective mobilization of the industrial potential of the continent; it would make possible the construction of all but the

largest vessels in the industrial centers of the Great Lakes; it would provide a means of transportation alternative to the railways.

3. We saw in the last war how important an element was water power. You may remember how it led us in 1942 to build at Arvida a plant bigger than Boulder Dam in a little more than a year. The United States and Canada need the full power potential of the St. Lawrence now.

4. The completion of the waterways would make it possible for the great resources of iron ore in northern Quebec and Labrador to be made safely available to the smelters of Canada and the United States.

This matter has already received the attention of the Permanent Joint Board of Defense. Ordinarily its recommendations are not made public, but this was of such interest that the recommendation of the Board in May 1947 was put in evidence by General Marshall at a congressional hearing. The Honorable James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense of the United States, gave evidence of the need for the project.

In these circumstances, it is not surprising that the Governments of the United States and of Canada, accepting the advice of their principal military and civilian advisers, are pressing for authority to proceed with the completion of the St. Lawrence waterway as a combined power and navigation project in the interests of prosperity in peace and security in war.

This speech by Defense Minister Claxton indicates the thinking of most Canadians—it shows that our neighbors to the north share the views of most Americans who today recognize the material benefits to be derived from the navigation and power facilities of the St. Lawrence project.

In addition, they agree with most high military officials in America that the seaway is an important link in our joint national defense system. For the seaway would provide both countries with a great inland water route protected against enemy submarine and air attacks in case of war—it would make available new and protected shipbuilding facilities where ocean vessels could be assembled and floated directly to the ocean.

Mr. Speaker, every postponement of the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project robs America of a valuable natural asset. The seaway will open the world's market to Midwest farmers, and stimulate commerce and trade between the east coast and the Great Lakes areas. It will provide vast quantities of cheap electric power to power-starved New England. It will directly benefit half of America, and indirectly the whole Nation. It will contribute to our national defense.

The people of the Midwest have dreamed of the day when the seaway would become a reality. Forty years is long enough to wait for this development which represents their hopes and aspirations for the good life. It is far too long to have permitted the railroad and the power lobby to block a program of utmost importance to the general welfare. It is my hope that the Eighty-first Congress will set aside any narrow sectionalism that may exist, and forget all false fears that seaway will damage any region or any American industry, and take action to enact this resolution into law.

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLATNIK. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER].

Mr. BIEMILLER. May I congratulate my colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] on his able and skillful presentation of the case for the St. Lawrence seaway. I find myself in complete agreement with what he has said. I sincerely hope that the resolution which the gentleman has introduced, and which I have the honor to introduce a twin to, will soon be before the House, and that we will have the privilege of bringing to a realization this great dream that so many people have had of a very important means of strengthening our entire St. Lawrence and Great Lakes regions, and at the same time strengthening the national defense of the United States.

Mr. BLATNIK. I thank my friend and colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER]. I am more than happy to welcome his support in the sponsorship of this very important resolution.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include testimony of Dr. John D. Clark before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. BOGGS of Delaware, for February 16, 1949, on account of attendance at funeral services.

To Mr. CARLYLE (at the request of Mr. KERR), for the 15th and 16th, on account of official business.

To Mr. WEICHEL (at the request of Mr. MCGREGOR), on account of illness.

To Mr. TAYLOR, for indefinite period, on account of illness.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 16, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

221. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed Economic Stabilization Act of 1949, together with a summary of the proposed bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

222. A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for further contributions to the international children's emergency fund"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

223. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

224. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code, relating to destruction of letter boxes or mail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

225. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated August 6, 1948, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the coasts of the Great Lakes, harbors of refuge for light-draft vessels, particularly with respect to harbor of refuge at Lester River, Minn., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on October 30, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

---

### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTINGTON: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 2626. A bill to amend Public Law 533 of the Eightieth Congress authorizing the construction of a building for the General Accounting Office on square 518 in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Education and Labor. H. R. 858. A bill to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building construction industries, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 782. A bill to constitute the Federal Security Agency a Department of Welfare; with an amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

---

### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming:

H. R. 2720. A bill authorizing the erection of a monument to Sacajawea; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 2721. A bill to extend certain provisions of Public Law 690, Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2722. A bill to amend section 144, title 28, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for transfer of proceedings before United States district court judges by reason of bias or prejudice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 2723. A bill to authorize a temporary program of Federal aid to public-school agencies for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 2724. A bill to provide a decree of competency for United States Indians in certain cases; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2725. A bill to provide for disposition of inherited interests in the estates of deceased Indian allottees; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2726. A bill authorizing the completion of certain works of improvement in the Red River of the North drainage basin, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota, in

the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 2727. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a mining research station in the vicinity of Missoula, Mont., for investigation of methods of mining the ores and other mineral raw materials of the Northwest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2728. A bill to eliminate any liability of a collector of internal revenue for uncollected taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2729. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2730. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maryland of certain land situated in Greenbelt, Md.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 2731. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to announce the parity price of milk, and to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately announce the support price of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2732. A bill providing a direct Federal old-age pension at the rate of $60 per month to certain citizens 60 years of age or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WORLEY:

H. R. 2733. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Canadian River reclamation project, Texas; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2734. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. R. 2735. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress, known as Indian liquor laws, in certain parts of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2736. A bill to subject Indians and Indian reservations in the State of Wisconsin to the laws of the State, with certain exceptions; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2737. A bill to establish the decoration Medal for Humane Action for award to persons serving in or with the armed forces of the United States participating in the current military effort to supply necessities of life to the people of Berlin, Germany; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H. R. 2738. A bill to amend the Housing Act of 1948; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2739. A bill to promote and maintain amicable relations between the office of the Second Assistant Postmaster General and the employees in the field service of the surface and air postal transport by the establishment of a board of arbitration; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRESTON:

H. R. 2740. A bill to establish rearing ponds and a fish hatchery at or near Millen, Ga.; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRESTON (by request):

H. R. 2741. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide a 20-percent increase in survivor benefits to widows, children, and parents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 2742. A bill to amend and reenact sections 4F, 4G of title 30, United States Code, act of May 7, 1941, chapter 87, sections 1 and 2, 55 Statutes 178, relative to the appointment of coal-mine inspectors; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2743. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privilege he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H. R. 2744. A bill to provide designation of the United States Veterans' Administration hospital at Madison, Wis., as the Richard Bong Veterans Memorial Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 2745. A bill to extend disability and death benefits to personnel of the Reserve components of the armed services while on active duty or in training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 2746. A bill to provide for a service credit for veterans for the purposes of title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 2747. A bill to increase the rates of service-connected death compensation payable to, or on account of, the children of persons who served in the active military and naval service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Idaho:

H. R. 2748. A bill for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon irrigation district under the Payette division of the Boise reclamation project in Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2749. A bill making appropriations for emergency flood relief; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 2750. A bill to provide free transportation for parents or wives on Government-owned ships and aircraft to the graves of veterans buried abroad; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 2751. A bill to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By. Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2752. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Weber Basin reclamation project, Utah; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2753. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527, 43 U. S. C. sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 2754. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 2755. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 2756. A bill to implement the established national policy of promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. J. Res. 161. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project for national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution approving the agreement between the United States and Canada relating to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin with the exception of certain provisions thereof; expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the negotiation of certain treaties; authorizing the construction of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project for national defense; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HART:

H. J. Res. 163. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WELCH of California:

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. J. Res. 165. Joint resolution amending Public Law 49, chapter 87, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session, so as to provide that whenever a Federal coal-mine inspector finds that imminent danger to the employees in the mines exists, he shall immediately order the operating manager or his representatives in the mine to cause all employees to be withdrawn from the unsafe area until such imminent danger is removed; and providing a penalty for refusal of such operating manager or his representative to obey such order; and providing that nothing in such amendment shall be construed or operate to nullify any existing contract between mine employees and mine management, or to nullify any existing State statute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. Con. Res. 38. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the disposition of certain Italian colonies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution to protest the arrest of Protestant clergymen by the Government of Bulgaria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 103. Resolution providing for the employment of an additional expert transcriber in the office of the Official Reporters of Debates; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. Res. 104. Resolution providing for additional compensation for certain employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. Res. 105. Resolution expressing the sympathy of the House of Representatives with the victims of the Carbondale Township, Pa., mine cave-in; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States for consideration of their resolution regarding means of attaining a stronger and more effective world government through the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Salomon Nadler, Vera Nadler, Daniel Nadler, and Robert Nadler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOSONE:

H. R. 2758. A bill for the relief of the Fisher Brewing Co., Salt Lake City, Utah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 2759. A bill for the relief of certain officers and employees of the office of United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands who suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage, or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 2761. A bill for the relief of Angelo Ferrari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

H. R. 2762. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lazanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 2763. A bill for the relief of Morris Zucker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2764. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Caroline M. Neumark and Melville Moritz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2765. A bill for the relief of Reno E. Stitely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCUDDER:

H. R. 2766. A bill for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

78. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the Congress of the United States of America, pursuant to Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, not to enact legislation federalizing the National Guard of the several States of the Union; to the Committee on Armed Services.

79. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Commissioners and the mayor and council of the city of Hoboken, N. J., urging President Truman to protect against the communistic travesty of justice and morality such as imposed on His Eminence Cardinal Mindszenty, of Hungary; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

80. By Mr. BURDICK: Memorial of the North Dakota Legislature, requesting increased Federal participation in the construction of approved hospital projects; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

81. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Paul C. Empie, executive director, National Lutheran Council, New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to proposed legislation before the Congress affecting the entry of displaced persons into this country; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of compassion and deliverance, we thank Thee for Thy promise: If any man lack wisdom, let him ask Thee.

In this moment of prayerful quietness we would again take the pledge of service we owe our country. We pray Thee to confirm that which is good in us, and rebuke that which is foolish.

While we value the counsel and fellowship of our comrades in service, yet we know that, as individuals in the hands of a good God, we cannot be all things to all men, but true to Thee and our consciences. Free us from the fetters of our old selves, and help us to stand erect for the truth and right. Lead the way, O Lord, and Thine shall be the praise. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUSPENDING CERTAIN IMPORT TAXES ON COPPER

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 2313) to suspend certain import taxes on copper.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say as a member of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means that this was considered by the full committee and there was no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the import tax imposed under section 3425 of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply with respect to articles (other than copper sulfate) entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption during the period beginning April 1, 1949, and ending with the close of March 31, 1950.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "March 31, 1950" and insert "March 31, 1951."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill H. R. 2313 is to continue for another 2 years the suspension of the import tax on copper. In 1947 the Committee on Ways and Means held hearings at which the critical shortages in the supply of copper for American industry were described. The Honorable Oscar B. Ryder, Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission, has advised the Committee on Ways and Means that there have been no major developments which would indicate any substantial change in the production of, or the civilian demand for, copper and copper products for some time to come.

We are confronted, therefore, with the identical problem that we faced 2 years ago. Present production of copper in the United States is insufficient to meet the demand. In fact the demand for 1948 was roughly 400,000 short tons in excess of domestic supply. As a result of this critical supply situation not only industry consumers of copper but also the producers have joined in the support of the pending legislation. Continuation of the suspension of the import taxes on copper has been urged by manufacturers of products used in such varied industries as the automotive, electrical equipment and appliances, housing and construction of all kinds, shipbuilding, telephone and public utilities, and other basic industries. A brief submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means on behalf of more than a dozen of the principal domestic copper producers stresses that the present abnormal demand is temporary, resulting from the unsatisfied civilian requirements of the war years and of the requirements of the Economic Cooperation Administration and Government stock-piling for defense. The domestic producers agree it is necessary to suspend the import taxes, but they want a time limit of 2 years placed upon the suspension.

In addition to the endorsement of producers and consumers of copper, the interested governmental agencies have expressed their support not only in the interest of meeting the quantitative requirements of industry and the national defense program but also in maintaining the current price of copper and thereby providing an anti-inflationary effect. The Secretary of Commerce advised the committee that should the import taxes in question be restored at this time, it is certain that the price of copper would rise still further, having an inflationary effect on the American economy.

DIVISION OF WATERS OF COLORADO RIVER

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to call the attention of this House to the unprecedented unity of the Congressmen from my State of California.

For many years California has faced a serious controversy over division of the waters of the Colorado River. We have now proposed that the issues of this conflict be placed before the Supreme Court.

Our economy in California is based on an assured and dependable water supply. Therefore, whatever is the result of this vital controversy is the key to our future.

We have 23 Members from California in this House, and each one of them has introduced a resolution asking the permission of Congress to take the Colorado River controversy before the Supreme Court.

Party lines are invisible in this issue. We, of California, stand together, united without exception. Our strength is the strength of 22 men and 1 woman who, regardless of political beliefs, are working for the common good of our State, its people, and their destiny.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GORSKI of New York asked and was given premission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include some articles on the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. CROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a house concurrent resolution of the Indiana State Legislature memorializing the Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto.

### ADOPT THE 70-GROUP AIR-FORCE PROGRAM

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BRYSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on invitation extended to me by the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, it was my privilege, yesterday afternoon, Tuesday, February 15, to attend at Andrews Field, the most spectacular air show or demonstration that I had ever winessed.

The President, his Cabinet, Members of Congress, and other Government officials were present. On exhibition in the huge hangars were the crude planes used by the Wright brothers at the birth of aviation. Alongside these simple machines, the successors of which have changed the very face of the earth, were the modern engines used in the finest types of aircraft. Certainly great strides have been made in aviation during the past 2 decades. It was our privilege to examine the latest jet bombers and fighters. Surely they are the pride of the world.

The tragic truth is we now have the know-how but do not have the planes to protect ourselves. It is hard to realize how much time is required after authorization before planes of any appreciable number are in production. In spite of the accelerated plane production program precipitated by World War II not a single plane participated in combat during the war which was designed after Pearl Harbor Day.

In my judgment, we should adopt the 70-group air-force program without delay because for a truth air power is peace power.

### ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, 31 years ago today, the fine people of Lithuania adopted their Declaration of Independence at Vilnius.

Americans of Lithuanian descent are today observing this anniversary. They are expressing their gratitude to the land of their adoption for not recognizing the annexation of Lithuania and her two small Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia, by the Soviet Union.

In our turn, Americans of all racial origins, all Americans who love freedom and who respect the dignity and the independence of free people, may well rejoice that the heroic men and women of these small Baltic states are resisting the oppressor with every means at their command.

The brave people of Lithuania are determined that they shall not be subjugated. They are determined to be free again. So long as they are impelled by the spirit of freedom, they will never be conquered.

The great darkness which falls behind the frightful iron curtain in Europe will not prevail forever. The tragic fate of nations ground into submission under the heel of dictatorship is gradually awakening all the world.

Communism can rule only with the bloody tools of tyranny. It is at war with every aspiration of free men and women. It is a one-way street to human slavery.

Those who, like the people of Lithuania and the Baltic States, resist the godless advances of world communism, are fighting the good fight of human freedom everywhere. That freedom will be realized only when Lithuania and all other fair lands now under the domination of the Kremlin are restored to their full rights and privileges in the family of free nations.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the thirty-first anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, which occurred historically on February 16, 1918, at Vilnius. Lithuanian Americans throughout the United States are observing this day with fitting ceremonies of thanks to this great country for not recognizing Russia's annexation of Lithuania and her two good Baltic neighbors—Latvia and Estonia. Today, Lithuania is isolated by the iron curtain and her people are dying for their belief in God and freedom. An armed heroic resistance is carrying out the will of the people against the oppressor and their attitude of enslavement.

Looking back in retrospect, I recall that on March 17, 1922, I introduced in the House of Representatives the following resolution:

House Joint Resolution 289

Resolution urging the recognition of the Republic of Lithuania by the Government of the United States

Whereas the Council of Lithuania representing all of the peoples of that nation on February 16, 1918, unanimously decided to communicate to the Russian, German, and other governments the following declaration: "The Council of Lithuania, the only representation of the Lithuanian nation, relying on the recognized rights of self-determination for nationalities, and the decisions of the Lithuanian Conference at Vilnius September 18–23, 1917, announces the rebirth of the independent democratic Lithuanian State with the capital at Vilnius, and the severance of all governmental ties of this state with other nations;" and

Whereas for over 4 years a stable government has been maintained by the Republic of Lithuania; and

Whereas the geographical situation of Lithuania is not only a warranty for its survival but for its growth to wealth and power among the nations of the world; and

Whereas in this Nation there are nearly 1,000,000 people of Lithuanian blood who, during the late war with unsurpassed devotion to the cause of liberty and independence, rallied to the assistance of the Government of the United States; and

Whereas England, France, Italy, and Poland have recognized the Republic Lithuania de facto; and

Whereas Czechoslovakia, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Estonia, Germany, Russia, Argentina, and Mexico have recognized the Republic of Lithuania de jure: Therefore, be it

*Resolved, etc.*, That the Government of the United States recognize the Republic of Lithuania.

I am indeed gratified that shortly thereafter the United States recognized the independence of the Republic of Lithuania, whose people have demonstrated to the world that they were capable and deserving of self-government.

Needless to say, I greatly regret that at the present time the people of Lithuania should be denied the freedom and liberty that I personally urged and advocated.

It is my fervent hope and prayer that in the not too distant future, Lithuania

will again be liberated, together with the other unfortunate countries of Europe.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

CARDINAL MINDSZENTY AND BISHOP ORDASS

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN].

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will give due consideration to the resolution submitted to us by the general court of Massachusetts memorializing Congress to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass.

These flagrant and inhuman outrages against organized Christianity have aroused the righteous indignation of the American people and millions of right-thinking, liberty-loving peoples throughout the world.

I believe it is the duty of this Government to take immediate and unequivocal action to secure the release of these persecuted churchmen and move to prevent the reoccurrence of similar outrages against persons because of their religious convictions and courageous opposition to the godless doctrines and practices of communism.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall take advantage of the time allotted me to express my thoughts on this thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania. I am proud of the fact that this nation has refused to recognize Russia's annexation of Lithuania and her two Baltic neighbors, Latvia and Estonia. I sincerely pray that we may continue our stand in this regard until the day when Lithuania and the Baltic states become free and independent governments once again.

No finer citizens ever emigrated to these shores than those who came from Lithuania. Today, when these Americans of Lithuanian birth and descent celebrate throughout this Nation the declaration of independence made at Vilnius, Lithuania, on February 16, 1918, they have in their hearts genuine appreciation of our Government's refusal to recognize the Moscow-trained gangsters and cutthroats who have taken over the land they love.

Lithuania is, I hope, only temporarily isolated by the iron curtain. Because of the barbaric treatment accorded them by the Communists thousands of her people have perished while stoutly maintaining their religious convictions, belief in God and right to freedom.

Despite constant persecution and indescribable humiliations suffered by these people in their struggle, they have had the fortitude and courage to carry on a resistance against the oppressors who serve the Soviet Union.

Our forefathers founded our free and liberty-loving country upon the recognition of the existence of a supreme being. I am sure that the people of our Nation, of all religious faiths and creeds, are saddened at heart today by the plight of Lithuania. I am sure they join me in thoroughly denouncing these communistic tyrants of Soviet Russia who, through intimidation and force, have brought about the enslavement of Lithuania and the Baltic states.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include resolutions.

Mr. LANE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement from the Irish Legation.

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Atlanta Journal.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from the Michigan soil-conservation report.

ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIAN DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to join with the other Members of Congress in paying my tribute and extending my congratulations to the fine, brave people of Lithuania, who celebrate today the thirty-first anniversary of their declaration of independence. Late this afternoon I shall go to the Lithuanian Embassy to convey in person my good wishes and to tell the Lithuanian Ambassador how much we admire the Lithuanians who are in our country and how much they have contributed to America.

As I was listening to the other Members, I could not help but feel the gravity of the situation of these courageous people of Lithuania, isolated behind the iron curtain—people who are dying and suffering because of their faith and their love of freedom. I believe everyone in the world today who wants a free and democratic form of government will join with us here in America in wishing them a future of happiness, and freedom to enjoy it. Those of us assembled here know how hard the United States is working to remove the iron curtain and to secure freedom, independence, and happiness for the world.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Veterans' Affairs reported out a bill providing $90 a month pensions for the veterans of World War I and World War II after they reach the age of 65.

The press describes this bill as a "hot potato" in the lap of the administration. It is no "hot potato" as far as this particular Member of Congress is concerned.

I am unalterably opposed to this bill. Let me serve notice that if an attempt is made to bring this bill up under suspension of rules, I will certainly object to such procedure.

This legislation is dishonest. It attempts to deceive the veterans into believing they are getting something for nothing when, as a matter of fact, in 10 years our veterans will be shouldering half of the Nation's tax burden, including the tremendous increase this bill contemplates.

Such legislation is unsound. At a time when we are staggering under the impact of our huge war-incurred debt, at a time when all of our resources and ingenuity are pledged to the prevention of another such conflict, it would take us dangerously near the brink of national insolvency.

I want the veteran to be able to look forward to a future in which peace is possible, in which his Government is sound, in which his tax burden is reasonable, in which he can be assured of governmental care based on his need—a future, in other words, which has meaning for him and his children. This bill will seriously jeopardize that future.

In all sincerity I say to you, Mr. Speaker, if we Members of this great legislative body cannot point out to the veterans in our individual districts the dangerous fallacies in this legislation, then we do not deserve to represent our districts in future Congresses.

AN ANSWER TO SHORTAGES AND CONTROLS

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, in view of this morning's newspaper comment to the effect that the majority expect to reinstate controls, it might be interesting to note that 105,000 tons of scrap steel came over from the German Ruhr in De-

cember and 150,000 tons in January. These are larger amounts than have come over in previous months and the boats taking over relief have not come back empty to that extent.

While it was urged last year that this operation was desirable, it is also interesting to note that during the fine summer swimming weather, a tight embargo was placed on scrap steel so that the relief boats were coming back empty, for the most part. This was due to interdepartmental and international involvements.

Steel has been recently, and now is being, manufactured in the United States at unprecedented peacetime rates and doubtless had steel scrap come back last summer more finished steel would have started flowing through our domestic markets at an earlier date. This only shows that increasing supplies is a much better answer to shortages than controls, which simply divert scarce supplies into black markets at prodigious advances.

Another result is that steel scrap in the United States has dropped from $50 to $37.50 a ton, which may have an effect not only on the supplies of finished steel but upon the price as well. It would not surprise me if price support efforts would now be made, which would again induce shortages, which would set in motion renewed measures for control.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] may be excused indefinitely on account of official business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the State board of the Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, December 8, 1948.

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by Senator IVES.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of the birth of the Republic of Lithuania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by David Lawrence on the Atlantic Defense Pact.

Mr. D'EWART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Montana.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Know Your Congress." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $159.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Bill Cunningham, of the Boston Herald.

VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I was very much surprised at the speech of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] who spoke a moment ago, attacking the bill for the pensioning of World War veterans who have reached the age of 65 years. His speech showed that he did not know what he was talking about. That bill merely follows the exact line of the Spanish-American War pension bill, except that the committee voted out of it the provision for pensioning veterans at age 62 and raised the minimum age to 65 years.

You were told on yesterday, that the bill would pension dishonorably discharged veterans. There is not a word of truth in that statement.

You were also told on yesterday that we only had 7 minutes of hearings on the measure. We have been holding hearings on these measures for weeks. There are 186 pages of hearings. We brought in every witness anybody asked for. Yesterday there appeared before our committee the representatives of the Veterans' Administration for the members of the committee to ask any questions they desired.

You have been told that this bill was reported by a minority. There were 19 of the 27 members of the committee present. One distinguished gentleman was unavoidably absent, and I refer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MEYER]. If he had been present we would have had 20. We had 19 members present and all of them, with the possible exception of 2 or 3, voted to report the bill.

I am filing my report as chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee today, and we hope to bring it to the floor of the House for final passage at an early date.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 13]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Curtis | O'Toole |
| Allen, Ill. | Davis, Tenn. | Pace |
| Allen, La. | DeGraffenried | Perkins |
| Beall | Dingell | Pickett |
| Bennett, Fla. | Donohue | Potter |
| Bentsen | Ellsworth | Poulson |
| Blatnik | Gilmer | Quinn |
| Boggs, Del. | Gossett | Reed, Ill. |
| Boykin | Halleck | Ribicoff |
| Breen | Heffernan | Sanborn |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Hoffman, Ill. | Shafer |
| Bulwinkle | Irving | Smathers |
| Burnside | Jackson, Calif. | Smith, Ohio |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Jenkins | Somers |
| Carlyle | Judd | Taylor |
| Chesney | Linehan | Thomas, N. J. |
| Cole, Kans. | McMillan, S. C. | Towe |
| Colmer | Mason | Trimble |
| Coudert | Miles | Weichel |
| Cunningham | Morrison | Whitaker |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and seventy-one Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1949

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HUBER: On page 3, line 12, before the period insert "*Provided*, That in making such improvements the basic architecture of the House Chamber shall not be altered and the existing skylights of the House Chamber shall be retained."

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the debate yesterday regarding the reconstruction of the House Chamber with a great deal of interest. I share the opinion of our esteemed Speaker and others that this structural steel should be removed from the roof of this Chamber.

I am not an architect or an engineer. However, I heard the reference to the amount of cast iron in this roof and it seems to me it would be a very simple matter to take out the cast iron and put in a strong aluminum or other lightweight metal that would carry the load. We do not build airplanes out of cast

iron. I believe the type of construction to which I referred could safely reinforce the roof and make it safe and yet retain the basic architecture of the Chamber as it is.

Mr. Chairman, we are only the temporary custodians of this Chamber. It belongs to posterity and should be preserved. We have over here on the other side the old Senate Chamber. It is regarded as such a holy of holies that they have a fence around it and we are not even permitted to go in and walk around. Yet we would change the architecture of this Chamber overnight.

My amendment will not interfere with the letting of this contract. They can go ahead and make the necessary repairs and do the remodeling of the House Chamber, but it will not be necessary to take out the skylights and change the basic architecture. It is very little consolation to think that the State seals overhead will be taken out and deposited in a certain place in your home State. We are spending a lot of money on other projects and I do not see any reason in the world why we cannot safeguard this historic Chamber and keep it so that generations to come may visit and see it in its historic state. There is no reason, in my opinion, why it should not be preserved.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my amendment will be agreed to. As I stated, it will not interfere with the letting of the contracts that are proposed. Surely the Architect and the engineers can do this job, yet preserve the building as it is.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, whenever I enter this Chamber I do not necessarily see the faces that are here now. All of us look back into history and we see and think of the great men and women who labored in this room for the preservation of free government on this earth. In these seats have sat and in these aisles have walked the great of America.

These walls and this roof have heard the debates of some of the greatest men this country ever produced. Their labors always have been for the preservation of America and her institutions. To change these walls and to change this roof would be destroying one of the greatest shrines of freedom on this earth. These walls are rich in the traditions of our country and to change them, to make them over or alter them, would destroy that richness of tradition and history it has represented throughout the years.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio ought to be adopted. The Architect, in my opinion, could well change the plans to conform with the object he has in mind, namely, preserving this Chamber, this rich, historic room, in its present form. Reference has been made to the fact we cannot hear each other, but that is perhaps due more to our own fault than to that of the acoustics of the room itself. Now that we have this public-address system anyone can hear who will listen, and there is no need nor necessity for changing or destroying one of the finest shrines and monuments to freedom in the world—the Chamber of the House of Representatives.

I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CROOK. In this proposed amendment is it planned to leave this structural work intact?

Mr. DONDERO. No. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio takes into consideration the removal of this steel. If they could build a cast-iron roof 90 years ago, and that is what is in this roof, they can build it with structural steel or aluminum to support it now.

Mr. CROOK. We, over in the great Hoosier Commonwealth of Indiana, do not like this steel construction, where we have to look through a tremendous amount of steel work to find the seal of the State of Indiana. I want to see those seals preserved, but I want to see them put down some place where the public can see them.

Mr. DONDERO. It can be done under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. Unless this amendment prevails, you will not see the seal of the great State of Indiana in the ceiling of this building, or the seal of any other State. They will be gone forever.

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, may I ask one more question? How many of these seals were here when this building was originally built?

Mr. DONDERO. We are admonished by scriptural authority to "remove not the ancient landmark which thy fathers have set"—Proverbs 22: 28.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, in reply to the gentleman from Ohio, we would like to stay with the old quill pens, but present conditions require the use of many typewriters, and as far as my colleague is concerned, in his devotion to antiquity, why do we not take the Capitol back to Philadelphia?

I discovered yesterday and today a great many architects in the Congress of the United States. They are more informed on the needed improvements to this room than is the Fine Arts Commission and some of the most outstanding engineers of this country.

I have here the report of the Commission of Fine Arts, and I am going to ask, when we go back into the House, to insert it at this point in the RECORD.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS,
*Washington, D. C., June 20, 1947.*

Hon. DAVID LYNN,
*Architect of the Capitol,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. LYNN: The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on June 19, 1947, were pleased to consider with you and with your associates the plans and the samples of materials of construction and embellishment necessary for improving the Chambers of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives.

The Commission unanimously approve the plans for these two Chambers, as well as the samples of the materials of construction and embellishment which were presented with the plans.

The Commission gave careful consideration to the suggestion that only those portions of the Chambers above the gallery floor be improved in the first construction contract, and that the lower parts of both Chambers be delayed at least until the construction of the upper portions are completed. While it is practicable to arrange to carry out such a program the Commission respectfully suggest that further consideration be given the reconstructing the two Chambers in a single operation. The inconvenience to the Members of the Congress would be minimized, the total cost would undoubtedly be less, and the completely reconstructed Chambers would present a unity of design which will not obtain in the case where the upper parts of the two Chambers are of one character and the lower parts of another. Of course, the approval of the plans by the Commission is predicated upon the ultimate carrying out of the entire approved plan for each Chamber.

The Commission are exceedingly well pleased with the results obtained by you and by your architects and we believe that the results of the remodeling of the two Chambers will provide meeting rooms for the Senate and for the House of Representatives in keeping with the importance of the deliberations of the legislative branches of the Government.

Please accept our congratulations upon the excellent results you have obtained. We appreciate your splendid cooperation.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:
Sincerely yours,
GILMORE D. CLARK, *Chairman.*

Furthermore, we have the report of the Committee on the Construction of the Roofs, and so forth. The report was issued by that sterling gentleman and former colleague of ours, beloved by every Member of this House, the Honorable Fritz Lanham. What does it say in this report? Here is what it says:

The plans, as submitted, represent designs developed by Francis P. Sullivan, associate architect, and Harbeson, Hough, Livingston, and Larson, consultants, in collaboration. The designs have the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts and the Architect of the Capitol, and they are acceptable to the several consultants on air conditioning, lighting, and acoustics, and to the structural engineers. In their present form, they are the result of the combined efforts and ideas of all concerned with their preparation.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I might say, as a Member of the committee which has been appointed to go over the plans and

specifications for the remodeling of this Chamber, that if this amendment is accepted, it will mean a complete change of all the plans which will completely take us out of the coordinated efforts of the House and the Senate, so that we then cannot expedite the remodeling which this committee voted for last year.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is absolutely right, and it is time that we entrust the affairs of this roof to men who have been educated in our institutions in architecture, in engineering, and in design, rather than to constitute ourselves as a group of professionals in the field of architecture.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. Has the gentleman ever known a contractor or an architect willing to cut down on the size of a job?

Mr. RABAUT. I am not suspicious of every man in his own business, but I should like to ask the gentleman, as well as the Members of Congress, is this a matter of your own personal opinion or does it go back to the people of this Nation? If so, why is it that we have built so many new State capitols and abandoned the old for the new? We are seeking here only to make a renovation of this hallowed room. So let us have no more talk about it. I ask for a vote, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUBER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUBER) there were—ayes 72, noes 86.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. RABAUT and Mr. HUBER.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 83, noes 109.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For an additional amount for "Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration," $4,987,000.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RABAUT: On page 6, line 24, strike out "$4,987,000" and insert "$10,000,000."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee consents, reluctantly, to the introduction of this amendment. The Bureau of the Budget has received an estimate on the item but has not yet had time to process it. The committee itself has had its investigators working on the proposition for the last 2 or 3 days, but they have not yet had sufficient time to complete their investigation.

Enough is known, however, to indicate that there must be some increase in the amount of this appropriation. The amount provided in the last session is not sufficient to meet the needs of the agency.

Enough money is available to take care of the requirements for this quarter, and apparently we have funds available to take care of the situation until another deficiency bill can be brought to the floor.

However, in view of the vital nature of the proposition and in order to be absolutely certain about the matter, we propose at this time in this amendment an increase of $5,000,000, so as to leave no doubt about the matter.

Accordingly, the committee has authorized the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] to offer the amendment, and the amendment has the sanction of the committee.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Is it possible that this money may have been allocated to the States by quarters, in advance, and has already been spent, necessitating the closing of a lot of these offices and branch offices?

Mr. RABAUT. If the gentleman wants an explanation of it, here it is. In the Eightieth Congress their funds were cut $15,000,000. They had an increased load. Now they are feeling the pinch of the condition.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I was not asking necessarily for an explanation of it, but it is a fact that in Indiana there were 72 field offices of the United States Employment Service and they were all closed. We were able to get one of those offices reopened and kept open because the people had to travel about 80 miles. Perhaps a hundred people a week traveled 80 miles in order to sign up, and that created a hardship. So now we have 71 of the 72 offices in Indiana closed, and they say it is because they have already spent the money in the first half, which was necessary to carry through the whole year.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that I was not here in the Eightieth Congress. The Eightieth Congress curtailed these funds to the point where it pinched the agency; so there is nothing to do except to recognize the condition in which they find themselves. They have money to continue; but they have not money to meet the program as it now faces them.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Then it is possible that the money for this quarter may have been allocated to the State and already spent; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. The agency administers these funds under the laws that have been enacted.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Then the gentleman cannot answer my question.

Mr. RABAUT. Not that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. SADLAK: On page 6, line 24, after the word "administration", strike out "$4,987,000" and insert "$14,000,000."

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I talked of the necessity for increasing this appropriation. I gave the total of unemployment claims in the State of Connecticut as being 49,822. I want to submit to the House at this time that the total unemployed in the State of Connecticut has again risen during the past week, and as of this last Saturday, after a telephone call to the Department of Labor this morning, it is now 52,451, an increase of some 2,629 in 1 week.

I want to stress this one point. To process the claims it requires the same procedure for partial or full claims for benefits. It requires the handling personnel which is lacking, especially in local field offices. The individual States operate the unemployment compensation and employment services, they collected for the United States Government during fiscal 1948 some $200,000,000. The States received in return for the administration of these services $130,000,000; in other words, the United States Government made a profit of $70,000,000, and there is no earmarking of these funds. As a matter of fact, remarks were made here on the floor yesterday about contemplated changes and improvements of this Chamber even to the extent of installing neon lights. I submit that the money which has been collected from the employers could even be used for such purposes to the detriment of the growing numbers of unemployed who need expeditious servicing of their claims for checks to which they are entitled and need now.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to associate myself with the position taken by my friend and colleague, and commend him him for his amendment. It reflects the new necessities brought about by increasing unemployment not only in Connecticut but in the Nation at large.

Mr. SADLAK. I am most grateful to the gentleman for his support. In the district he represents, one of the largest affected cities in the State of Connecticut is the city of Bridgeport, and they have some 10,000 unemployed at this moment.

This matter is nonpartisan, and we want to give the States the tools to work with to do this job properly.

I refer you to the hearings on this particular point and to the statement made by Mr. Harry Kendall, chairman of the Employment Security Commission for North Carolina. He there stressed the fact that we have an obligation to return these funds to the States so that they can do the job for the people who are entitled to this service.

I am told that it is necessary to wait from 5 to 9 weeks for the initial check because of the backlog of these claims in these offices.

I urge you to vote for this amendment.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. What did the gentleman say the number of unemployed in Connecticut is?

Mr. SADLAK. 52,451.

Mr. RANKIN. What is it normally?

Mr. SADLAK. Well, in mid-October 1948, I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi, it was 21,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADLAK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. There are a lot of folks unemployed. Many of those folks are experienced in clerical and office work of every kind. Was any effort made to bring those folks into the offices to expedite the unemployment payments, or are they just standing in line and doing nothing?

Mr. SADLAK. I will say to the gentleman from Iowa that with the unforeseen change in employment or rather the loss of jobs and the consequent applications for unemployment claims, the States did not have sufficient funds to put on additional clerical help, and I say that we should have that additional help as soon as possible in order to properly audit these claims and process them in an endeavor to help the jobless who need the money.

Mr. JENSEN. There are all kinds of folks standing in line waiting for their checks, or to sign them, that would be only too happy, I am sure, to go in and work for the good of the cause without any compensation.

Mr. SADLAK. I assure the gentleman that such patriotism is worthy of praise, but it is conceded by both sides of the aisle that the Government now has some $70,000,000 in excess of the three-tenths of 1 percent that had been collected to be used for that purpose, and we ought to send back a larger amount of this money now for the proper administration of this service. With the large number of unemployed and more workers laid off each day as I have shown to you in my remarks yesterday and today and new claims to be made, the $14,000,000 of my amendment should be approved.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, far be it from me as a member of the subcommittee dealing with appropriations for this agency to try to take anything away from them, but I think the fairest consideration this agency has ever been given has been given it by the deficiency committee here this afternoon in allowing $10,000,000 instead of the $4,987,000 allowed by the Bureau of the Budget.

I think it would be well if we went back a year ago. The employment services and the unemployment compensation boards of this country requested the Bureau of the Budget for $160,000,000 to run this program in this fiscal year of 1949. The Bureau of the Budget cut the $160,000,000 to $145,000,000. That was the figure we had before us a year ago this time when we were considering the Budget for the fiscal year 1949.

The Subcommittee on Appropriations for Labor and Federal Security cut the Budget request of $145,000,000 to $123,000,000 a year ago. The bill went over to the Senate and they increased the $123,000,000 to $136,000,000. In conference we finally agreed on the sum of $130,000,000 to run this agency for the fiscal year 1949, which was $15,000,000 below the request of the Bureau of the Budget and $30,000,000 below the request of these agencies to the Bureau of the Budget for the fiscal year 1949.

As I recall now, the figures that were presented to the deficiency committee at this time, before they were approved by the Bureau of the Budget, were figures that were arrived at last October or November. They did not take into account the increase in the work load that has developed since the first of the year 1949. As a consequence the Bureau of the Budget cut that $14,000,000 down to $4,987,000.

A year ago we gave a great deal of consideration to the establishment of a contingency fund. I thought a year ago we were going to establish a contingency fund. I think the committee was at that time in full agreement that a contingency fund should be established. It had been represented to our committee that that fund would be established by allowing 10 percent of the grant made; in other words, if we had established a contingency fund a year ago of 10 percent of the the $130,000,000, it would have been $13,000,000, and we would not have any need for this deficiency at the present time.

I hope this year when we finally write up the appropriation bill and report it to the House in the early part of March the subcommittee can agree on the establishment of a contingency fund that would take into consideration some of the things that we, as a committee, cannot foresee a year ahead. I know it is very difficult to look ahead for 1 year or a year and a half and determine what the work load is going to be.

State legislatures at times raise the pay of their employees. That is something we cannot foretell or foresee. It is one of the things we are up against when we make appropriations of this kind. But I do believe that the fair solution is to stick to the $10,000,000 being allowed by the Deficiency Committee at this time and that will serve to accomplish the purposes that we are looking toward at the present time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the State of Rhode Island have the same percentage of unemployment as the gentleman from Connecticut says there is in his State?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not hear the percentages, but I know that in the State of Rhode Island it is worse now than it has been in the last 10 years, that is, since 1939.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am glad to note that the gentleman from Rhode Island has brought up this question of the contingency fund. I think it should be made crystal clear that the subcommittee last year was in unanimous agreement, including the gentleman who is now addressing you and who was then chairman of the subcommittee. But you will recall that we were not able to sell that to the other body. That is where the stumbling block was. Right now the subcommittee is considering the establishment of a contingency fund that can be utilized under authorizations from the Bureau of the Budget which will meet these variables found in the administration of these various grants in the States.

But may I ask the gentleman: He is satisfied, is he not, from the testimony that has been given by the administration itself, by Mr. Goodwin of the Employment Service and the people from the Bureau of Employment Security, plus the representatives of the interstate conference, which is composed of the State administrators, that this $10,000,000 will not do the job and that you will have to provide some money in another deficiency appropriation which will be coming along very shortly? The gentleman is satisfied as to that, is he not?

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not definitely decided on that.

Mr. KEEFE. Their story was this morning that they would need at least $20,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. But at the same time I am firmly convinced that the additional $5,000,000 which is being allowed by the Deficiency Appropriations Committee would be better than $10,000,000 in another deficiency bill which is to come later, because they need the money and need it now to take care of some of the deficits that arise at the present time in practically every State of the Union.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. According to the gentleman's own statement then, he is unqualifiedly in favor of my amendment to allow $14,000,000?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I am speaking in favor of the recommendation of the subcommittee, which is found in the bill, for the $10,000,000, because they have gone into that in the hearings. They have heard the Employment Service. They have heard the interstate conference people on this particular item in the bill and I think that they have more knowledge of what is needed at the present time than any of the other Members of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

It has been apparent to me all along from the hearings on this bill that the amount carried in the bill is totally in-

adequate and I reserved specifically in committee the right to support an amendment of this character, should it be offered on the floor of the House.

I think the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has given the fundamental reason for the difficulties by which we are confronted. I suspect there is another reason. I suspect that the formula for allocation by FSA to the several States of the lump-sum appropriation made available to FSA by the Congress has been so inequitable as to penalize certain States while providing other States with an excess of staff. The formula has certainly been under fire for a year or more, and the record shows that nothing has been done to date by way of changing the formula.

Whatever the reason Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly apparent from the record that important States cannot function with the money now available, and that the amount carried in this bill is entirely insufficient.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, we are confronted by a serious problem arising from the flagrant abuse under this law, an abuse which can only be regulated properly if sufficient personnel is provided.

Some months ago, in October or November, the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies met and determined that an additional $14,000,000 was essential to the proper functioning of these agencies—an increase of $14,000,000 was in fact recommended by FSA to the Bureau of Budget. So that all this substitute amendment asks for is the amount which the Social Security Administration itself actually submitted for approval to the Bureau of the Budget.

Since that time, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has pointed out, there has been a steady increase in unemployment and a corresponding increase in the work load of this agency.

I have a letter from the director of the Division of Employment Security in Massachusetts, a highly competent and conservative official, in which he states that the current work load in Massachusetts, is 43 percent higher as of January 26, than it was a year ago this time, and that he understands the increase in work load in some States runs as high as 200 percent.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HAND. Prior to the work load being increased, in my State certain offices were being closed because of lack of funds. Is the gentleman satisfied that under the Sadlak amendment there will be sufficient funds, at least for the purpose of this appropriation, to take care of that situation?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am prepared to go along with the Sadlak amendment, in the light of the testimony of the organization to which I have referred; in the light of testimony embodied in letters which we have received from various governors of States, and in the light of the fact that whereas we are collecting about $200,000,000 from the States, we are only returning to the States about $130,000,000.

Mr. HAND. And this is the amount the States are asking?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This is the amount which the over-all organization representing the State employment security agencies suggested several months ago as adequate, before the recent increase in work load.

In the interest of the unemployed, I urge the adoption of the Sadlak amendment. If that proves to be insufficient, further funds can be made available in the light of the two investigations to which I referred yesterday, one ordered by the Bureau of the Budget and the other ordered by the Appropriations Committee of the House.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I think in this connection it should be made crystal clear that the 1950 budget estimate, which is now pending before the subcommittee for this very purpose, gave to this service the identical amount that the Eightieth Congress gave, plus the amount of the deficiency recommended in this bill. So that the amount that the Bureau of the Budget recommended for these two services for the fiscal year 1950 was in round figures $135,000,000. That is some indication of the lack of consideration that they have received from the Bureau of the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has expired.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Truman depression is on. That is obvious, and this is one of the first recognitions of that fact.

I did not intend to inject politics into this debate. I simply asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] a simple question about the allocation of funds to the States by quarters, because I found that Indiana was extremely short on funds at this time, and 71 or 72 field offices have been closed. Now I want to remind the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] and the Members of this House that when the estimate of funds was made in that Eightieth Congress we had the highest peacetime employment of any year in the history of this country. Also, under that Eightieth Congress labor had the greatest income of any peacetime year in the history of this country. Farmers had the greatest peacetime income under the Eightieth Congress of any Congress in the history of this country. Those may be the reasons why we did not anticipate the need for allocating a lot of funds to take care of the 3,000,000 unemployed people we have today. Had the Eighty-first Congress continued as a Republican Congress, had we elected a Republican President and thereby restored and renewed the confidence of the people in their form of government, private enterprise, the free enterprise system, we may not have had this unemployment today, and we would not have needed any additional funds.

We must take care of these unemployed. We must reopen these field offices so unemployed people do not have to travel 80 and 90 miles weekly to sign up for unemployment compensation and look for jobs. I am willing to vote for whatever funds are necessary; but I do charge the committee with the responsibility of seeing that whatever funds are made available are used for the purpose of helping the unemployed. I recall when we cut the amount of funds for the expenditure of the customs department by 20 percent, and the administration went out in the field and cut off 80 percent of the gagers in the field, the men who collect the revenue. Right in my own congressional district in the little town of Lawrenceburg, a town of 5,000 people, where the Federal Government collects more revenue than it collects in the entire city of Chicago, the Customs Bureau took off 80 percent of gagers in the distilleries there. We cut the appropriations for that purpose 20 percent; but they cut the men who collected the revenue in the field 80 percent and kept the office padded with surplus personnel as they have done ever since the Bureau has been in existence.

The purpose of course was to close the distilleries and thereby bring the wrath of thousands of workers down upon the heads of the Congressman. The workers were led to believe that Congress was closing the distilleries.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I am glad the gentleman has referred to the 1948 Treasury-Post Office appropriation and the funds therein for the Customs Service. The aftermath of that is this. When Customs came back for funds in 1949 they asked for $500,000 less than we gave them the prior year, proving our action was proper, and in the taxpayer's interest.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, when I asked a few mintes ago that debate be closed in 15 minutes I had in mind that the Chairman would divide the time for debate evenly amongst those desiring to be heard, or that 5 minutes would be reserved for the committee. I have since been informed that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], desires to speak to this amendment.

Mr. COTTON. I will take only one-half a minute.

Mr. RABAUT. I now ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], be allowed to speak for 5 minutes, and that I be allowed to speak following him for 5 minutes to close the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. Chairman, it is not our concern here today to determine who is to blame for the unemployment existing in the country. It is very much our concern to see that adequate measures are taken to provide promptly the compensation for those who are out of work.

I rise in support of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman

from Connecticut that $14,000,000 be included in this deficiency bill for additional grants to States for unemployment compensation administration expenses. This is approximately the amount asked for by the Bureau of Employment Security and was based on detailed reports from the States. The bill has reduced that amount to $5,000,000. The committee on the floor has now, in its own words, "reluctantly agreed to raise this amount to $10,000,000."

Mr. Chairman, I am amazed and appalled at the refusal of the committee to include at least $14,000,000 for this purpose. Last year we collected in this country over $1,000,000,000 from the employers of labor to provide unemployment compensation. The numbers of unemployed are greater than they have been in 10 years and still increasing. In my State the unemployment load for the last week of January was double what it was the last week of January 1948, and indications are that the load will increase. Men and women out of work are not getting their checks because the unemployment service has had to reduce personnel and cannot get them out promptly. The money has been collected from the employers of the country and indirectly from the wages of the workers. They are entitled to receive this help when it is needed.

The explanation given by the committee is that they thought $5,000,000 would take care of the matter until the next deficiency appropriation and that they feel that the proposed $10,000,000 is certain to do so. Some of us have been waiting anxiously for this deficiency bill to appear upon the floor. We have talked with members of the committee; we have telephoned the clerks of the committee. Our people back home have been crying for action. Six weeks have elapsed since Congress convened and at last the bill is on the floor. I am not criticizing the committee for this because we all realize the many details that have to be considered in a deficiency bill, but we all realize also that this is true of every deficiency bill and the next one is likely to be just as slow in reaching the floor.

Mr. Chairman, the most urgent need covered in this bill is this one for unemployment compensation administration. We cannot afford to run the risk of having the service run short of funds before the next bill. We are under an obligation to the States; we are under an obligation to the employers who have paid in the funds; and we are under a special obligation to the men and women who are out of work and who have been assured of this income.

Mr. Chairman, we are furnishing money to half the nations of the earth. We appropriated over $6,000,000,000 for that purpose in the last Congress and are preparing to appropriate 5 or 6 billion more in this one. We are appropriating money right in this bill for all kinds of projects, including an amount for a steam plant to generate power in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority; power which will be paid for in part by the tax payers of my State to furnish cheap power in the Tennessee Valley to lure industries from my State and the rest of New England, and cause even more unemployment, and yet we are refusing reasonable aid to our own unemployed.

I must say that I resent rather bitterly the situation in which I find myself. I have waited anxiously for this bill. I have begged and urged that it be brought upon this floor that the unemployed whom I represent could be provided with facilities to get their checks. When it finally is brought forth I find only a niggardly and inadequate amount for this purpose and then I find that in order to obtain even that amount I must vote for a project which I think is incompatible with our system of free enterprise and which I know will take the bread from the mouths of some of the workers in my State.

I hope that the substitute amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT] is recognized for 5 minutes to close the debate.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, the committee has in mind to do no wrong. The committee seeks to provide this money, $10,000,000 at this time for the unemployment service administration. The committee is not closing the door to calls by this worthy agency for any future sums necessary. The committee is having its own investigators investigate the conditions in this agency at this time. Over and above that, the committee has called before it the budget Director asking why such a small amount was allowed at this time when the necessity appeared to be so great and when the cut in the last Congress was so drastic.

This increase in excess of $5,000,000 above the budget estimate is necessary at this time and as I said in the beginning the door is not closed to the agency for additional funds, the need of which I feel will be further augmented as a result of the investigations now being made.

At this point by special permission I place in the RECORD the telegram from Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of the State of Michigan:

LANSING, MICH., *January 25, 1949.*

LOUIS RABAUT,

*House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

Deficiency appropriations for State unemployment compensation administration will come before your committee Wednesday. Michigan, and I believe every other State, has been forced to operate hundreds of thousands of dollars in the red due to inadequate original appropriations. Suggested deficiency of less than $5,000,000 is completely inadequate to meet money already spent by States. Full information may be obtained from the Bureau of Employment Security as to the inadequacy of the Budget Bureau's recommendation. You can do the State of Michigan a good service by getting all the facts before the committee.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS,
*Governor.*

The committee has been informed that the budget is having an investigation made.

It becomes apparent that we are trying to do the right thing by this agency. We are not looking into a crystal ball, as one gentleman said, misjudging the future by $15,000,000, and now grabbing the ball and saying that $14,000,000 is the necessary sum. No. That crystal ball was brighter in some folks' minds a year ago than it is today and it was looked into so many times, and so many times the erroneous answer came therefrom, according to the things we are learning now in the Eighty-first Congress, that I hope the committee will be followed in its decision for this sum.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SADLAK].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SADLAK) there were—ayes 76, noes 97.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SADLAK and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 132.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

For an additional amount for "Tennessee Valley Authority," $2,950,000, to remain available until expended; and the limitation under this head in title I of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for capital expenditures, is increased from "$21,689,000" to $24,639,000": *Provided*, That the limitation under this head in title II of the Government Corporations Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available for administrative and general expenses of the Corporation, is increased from "$3,677,000" to "$3,988,000", and the limitation therein on the use for such purposes of funds appropriated by title I of said act is hereby repealed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER:

On page 7, line 20, strike out "$2,950,000" and insert "$450,000."

On page 7, line 24, strike out "$24,639,000" and insert "$22,139,000."

Strike out "and" at the end of line 4 on page 8, and the balance of the paragraph, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated in this act shall be used for the construction of a steam power plant."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the TVA at the present time has a capacity of 2,650,000 kilowatts per hour. It is selling 12,244,000,000 kilowatts a year. With what they already have coming in without this big plant, they will be able to sell 18,000,000,000 kilowatts a year, an increase of nearly 50 percent, and it is absolutely impossible that they can increase their consumption to that point in 3 years.

At the present time they have steam plants which they can use for firming power with a capacity of 448,000 kilowatts, and that is sufficient to take care of their peak. So much for the needs of the situation. There is no need.

They are not charging in the TVA enough to cover interest on the investment, payment of a reasonable amount

back to the Government, and the equivalent of the taxes they should pay on the basis that private concerns pay.

A similar concern with an investment of $492,000,000 as compared with their $480,000,000 for electric power pays taxes totaling $23,000,000 and as set up here the tax payment is only $2,000,000. The depreciation that they should charge according to the provisions of our internal revenue laws would be about $11,500,000 and they charge off only $9,000,000. They pay no interest on the money that they get from the Federal Government. The total cost of TVA power investment according to their own story is $480,000,000 for the electric power set-up and they have passed a bill here providing that they should only pay back $392,000,000 which is nearly $100,000,000 less than the cost—and with no interest.

This whole thing means that you and I, your taxpayers and my taxpayers are paying for the subsidy that is being given to the people who use the TVA power. Many large corporations are there getting low rates. The figures show that they get 3,472,000 kilowatts or one-third of the total consumption. That is the commercial and industrial figure. Those rates are very low—3.16 mills. I am taking these figures directly from the report of the TVA Authority, which I have before me. It seems to me that it is absolutely unfair on any basis for us to appropriate this money to throw even more money into a socialistic attempt to destroy private business.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by praising the gentleman from Tennessee who stood up here yesterday and defended the building of this New Johnsonville steam plant for the TVA. I think he was representing the folks of his State and coming from the side of the aisle that he does leads me more and more to commend the stand that he took.

I hope this bill can pass without a crippling amendment. I think it is justified. I think it is necessary and meritorious.

I am amazed at some of the arguments that my colleagues on the left side of this aisle bring up every time a piece of forward-looking legislation is proposed on the floor of this Chamber. Of course, they are in opposition to anything that will make TVA better and that will make it work. I want to see TVA extended and coupled in with the White River project in Arkansas and Missouri; connected with the Grand River Dam in Oklahoma, and the Denison project in Texas, and carried on up through my State of Missouri by Southwestern Power Administration, so that Missouri, Kansas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas can have a chance to become the great inland industrial empire that they have every right to become.

What makes the argument against TVA and anything that will make it efficient so amusing is because it runs along the same old pattern. Those opposing TVA say it is communistic, socialistic, unconstitutional, and interferes with free enterprise and puts the Government in business in competition with private industry. That cry has been going up from the left-hand side of this aisle ever since Woodrow Wilson was President of these United States. It was said that production credit was all the things I have just mentioned and that it would result in the ruin and destruction of every bank in the rural areas. The exact opposite has been the result. Those banks today have more money on deposit than ever before in their history. They have a larger volume of loans than ever before. They have more customers, whose notes, are good at the teller's window than they ever have had before. A little healthy competition improved the services of the banks to the good of everybody, including the bankers themselves.

Before the day of the Federal land banks, mortgage loans were made on a 5-year basis. Out in my country a farmer paid 7-percent interest and 5-percent commission to secure a loan, and in 5 years the loan was due, and for an additional 2½ percent he might get a renewal for another 5 years. So if he borrowed a thousand dollars and kept it for 10 years, he paid out $775 in interest and commission, and still owed the full $1,000 principal.

The Federal land bank was declared unconstitutional, communistic, socialistic, and all these other "istics" that come from the left-hand side of the aisle whenever legislation of that kind is proposed in this House. That argument is so old that its whiskers drag on the floor of this Chamber every time they bring it out. I am tired of listening to it. So you see their prophesies of dire calamity have failed to materialize in the past, and their predictions have proved wrong so many times that I am sure they will prove untrue in the future.

Let us give TVA, REA, and Southwestern Power Administration a chance to develop. REA brought the blessings of electric lights and power to the American farm, and permitted the hardworking farm woman to throw away her old coal-oil lamp and the farmer to discard his old smoky lantern that only served to make the night a little darker, and allowed them to have the blessing not only of electric light but refrigeration, hot and cold running water, and motors for the milking machine and the washing machine. The job is only partly done. Let us give REA, TVA and Southwestern Power the tools with which to finish the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CHRISTOPHER] has expired.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we can reach some agreement as to how much time will be required on this paragraph.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that all debate on this paragraph, and all amendments thereto, close in not to exceed an hour and a half, the last 10 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, and Members of the House, there are some facts in connection with this matter which I think are highly important, which I wish to call to your attention. I hope you will keep them in mind as we consider this matter for they correct certain arguments which have been presented by supporters of this amendment. This is not a question of public power versus private power in that the TVA is already in existence. We are in the public-power business through the national ownership of the TVA. This utility—and that is what it is—is the property of the United States of America; every dollar of its earnings belongs to the United States of America. Some opponents of the proper operation of this Government-owned plant will raise questions here, and I have heard them raised before, that the TVA does not pay interest on the investment the Federal Government has in it. I tell you the TVA must do more than that. It is doing more than that. Under the law which this Congress passed, with my support, the TVA, in a 40-year period, must return to the Federal Government in cash, if you please, the entire cost of the power-producing facilities; and, listen to this: When it does that, in 40 years, when all the cost has been returned, the Tennessee Valley Authority and all its assets still belong to the Federal Government. We are in the power-producing business in the Tennessee Valley; in fact, through law, this is the only public utility in the area. Let me repeat: This utility, the TVA, and all its earnings belong to the Federal Government. At the end of the 40-year period at the rate funds are being withdrawn all that money invested in the power-producing features of the program will be repaid and we still will have the TVA. So do not fall for the fallacious argument that interest is not paid.

The Tennessee Valley Authority primarily produces its electric power from water. Electricity is produced from a series of dams which provide flood control, navigation, and electricity. A few of these dams were purchased, most of them were built with funds provided by Congress. When the private facilities in that area were purchased as provided by law the privately owned utility then operating in the Tennessee Valley was operating steam plants along with its water generating plants because it has always been recognized as the proper way to have available the maximum amount of firm, year-round electricity. These steam plants were purchased by the Federal Government along with the water generating facilities. The TVA Act itself provides for erecting steam plants. Since the Government started operating the TVA, an additional steam plant has been built and its productive capacity integrated in the system to help firm up the water-power production.

You may ask, if they have steam plants, why build another? The answer is that since that steam plant was built, we have built a number of new dams,

which have increased tremendously the waterpower production, the hydropower, and now there is simply inadequate steam production to carry through the lean months, or months of low water supply.

You may ask, if this is a hydro or water-power development, why have steam? There is a real answer, a real reason for the steam capacity. In the fall and winter there is much water in the reservoirs. This will generate great quantities of electrical energy as it goes through those dams. In the summer and dry seasons, however, the water becomes limited, the amount of electricity which can be produced through these dams falls off.

Rural electrification associations, municipalities, and most other users must have dependable supplies of power—it must be available on a year-round basis. If it were not for steam power, the TVA would be limited in supplying such distributors to the electricity they could produce during the summer months. Much of the huge production during the water season would have to be sold to other users, whoever would be willing to take such electricity knowing it would be available for 5 or 6 months, knowing it would play out during the dry season. This would mean the sale of this Government-produced electricity at dump or low rates.

If we want to increase the availability of power for the public users such as the REA, the municipalities, we must firm up this power, produce steam-generated electricity during the dry season in order to bring the low point up, for the low point of production fixes the limit of firm power that can be sold on a year-round basis.

My friend from New York complains that much of the power generated by the TVA is sold to large industrial companies. Too much of it is. Who else is going to buy electricity available only for a part of the year, unless it be the privately owned utilities?

The Tennessee Valley Authority and all its assets belong to the American people.

We all have an interest in its proper operation, with maximum benefit to the people, with the maximum return to the Government which owns it.

In the absence of steam to hold up the total production in the dry months, the high production during the water season is what might be termed an undependable source of power and they have to sell at low rates. But if you permit the TVA to firm up this power and make it available on a year-round basis, the TVA can sell at much higher rates, firm rates, because it is worth more. This is the organization, proponents of this amendment say, they want to return to the Treasury what has been put into it. I agree with them on that. If you want to further increase its value and success as a worth-while financial undertaking beyond the point of its worth today, permit the TVA to firm up its power during the dry seasons and thereby let them sell their power at firm rates. Do not cripple its operation by denying funds for steam generation in the lean months. To deny steam generation is to go counter to the policy of the privately owned utility which served the area before the advent of the TVA. To deprive the TVA of a proper proportion of steam is to force TVA to sell its surplus power at low rates to the big industrial companies, of which gentlemen on the other side of the aisle complain. There is one other outlet for the surplus winter power and that is sale to privately owned utility companies. If they can buy the extra power produced in the water season at dump or cheap rates, they could firm up such power, sell the combined power at firm rates and make a neat profit, some say, of millions of dollars.

If there is profit in taking the high-water season production and firming it up, and thereby selling the combined production at firm rates, do you not think that profit should go to us, the Federal Government, which has put nearly a half billion dollars in this project, not to mention the benefits of having additional firm electricity for the further expansion of REA lines in this time of national shortage of firm electrical power?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is making a very important statement and I desire to yield my time to him.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Tennessee, who I know is vitally interested in this matter. That is the situation in a nutshell. As I said, when we bought TVA it was understood that they had to have steam plants for the purpose of firming up water power. The private utility formerly operating in the area had such steam plant for its small hydro or water-power system. Such necessity has been recognized in every water-power development for the generation of electricity throughout the history of this country. The TVA now operates steam plants. However, since we have had the TVA, we have built new dams.

In the last 4 or 5 years through the action of this Congress we have added five or six new dams which produce hydroelectric power. We have produced more and more electricity by that means and now the steam power capacity for the dry or lean period is lagging behind. The actual production of electricity in 5 or 6 months of the year is away beyond what it is during the remainder of the year.

If we want the TVA to properly operate and to be the best possible investment on the part of the Government, we need to provide funds for the construction of this steam plant to firm up this current so it can be sold on a year-round basis to municipalities, to REA cooperatives, and to the other power users which is required in the basic law and which I wish them to do.

If, on the other hand, you want to take the development that we have developed in the Tennessee Valley at a public expenditure of more than $400,000,000, if you want to take the benefits of that expenditure of Government funds and turn them over to the big industrial companies or private utilities, for that matter, who will buy at dump rates, firm up such power with their steam plants, and sell the whole at firm rates and make the profit, you prohibit the TVA from firming up its hydro power by steam and you will do just that.

I believe the Membership of this House will take no such ill-advised action. You will want maximum service to the people, maximum return on the Government's investment, and I firmly believe that can be attained only by maintaining the proper proportion of steam power to go with the hydro or water power we have provided in the construction of these new dams.

You may say the privately owned power companies could firm up this power for the TVA. I asked that question of them and no offers have been received. They are all having trouble meeting their own needs. No. The power companies say, "We would buy the surplus from the TVA." Of course, they would buy it at bulk rates, cheap rates, forced rates, because in the absence of firming up, the TVA would be forced to sell extra hydro power to such takers as they can find. Some have said this possibility explains the many telegrams which Members of the House have received the last few days opposing this plant. As to that, I cannot say. I am sure that many of the senders have not understood just what issue is involved here and if they did, I believe they, too, would be for the proper operation of this public utility with maximum service to the people of seven States and with maximum returns to the Government.

The senders of many of these telegrams apparently do not understand and many Members here do not seem to realize that to prevent the construction of the steam plant would mean we would not fully utilize the millions and millions of dollars that this Congress put into the development of a great facility which provides all of the electricity for a great part of the people of seven States.

I do not happen to live in the Tennessee Valley. However, I have been for the last 4 years a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations that handles the TVA, and the need for providing this steam plant is so clear in my own mind that I wish I could convince you and point out to you that what this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would mean is that, after we have already put this money into the TVA, we are not willing to let them run it in a proper way to render the maximum service and to make the greatest return to the Government on its investment, and, again, may I remind you, the minute TVA pays out, returns to the Government every dollar we have put in it, as it will, under the law, the TVA will still belong to the United States of America. So, at the end of 40 years the Government will have an amount of dividends equal to the original cost; in addition to that we will have a going concern, a property worth millions, which will bring in substantial returns in a financial way as well as render a fine service to the people of future generations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi the time reserved to me in order that he may continue.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I have always understood that it was not the practice of this House to permit one gentleman to yield his time to another in a situation of this kind.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, it certainly can be done.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not like to object, but obviously if 15 men stand up on one side of the aisle and all yield to one man——

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that the gentleman from Alabama is named on the list. He is entitled to his time.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. He is asking unanimous consent that his time be yielded to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I deeply appreciate the action of the gentleman from Alabama, who has worked untiringly with members of my committee and whose interest in and knowledge of this subject and problem is great. During this time which has been granted me, I would like to discuss certain provisions of the TVA Act which make steam generation more necessary than would normally be the case.

The Tennessee Valley Authority must generate its hydroelectricity between two water levels. The TVA must first provide flood control, and, secondly, under the basic act the TVA must operate its dams so as to provide navigation, and between those two requirements it must produce electricity. In the absence of these requirements of the law you might say, why not fill all the reservoirs in the wintertime with their 18 or 20 dams, hold all of such water, and let it out gradually so that it will last the year round or until the next rainy season. If it were not for the law itself, from a power-producing angle, that might possibly be done. However, in order to take care of flood control, the primary requirement under the law, when those reservoirs get sufficiently full, the TVA must let the water out so that they will be sufficiently empty to take care of the floods that may occur. On the other hand, you might say, in the summertime why not let all the water out, down to the absolute bottom of the stream, perhaps, and thereby meet their needs of this firming up of power? As heretofore pointed out, under the basic act the TVA cannot do that. Under such law, when the water reaches a certain low level the dams must be closed, for sufficient water must be retained to provide for navigation.

So the TVA is caught, and rightly so, in this multiple-purpose system, of having to produce power while keeping the water low enough to take care of flood-control needs and keeping the water high enough to protect navigation. Hydropower production is "Mr. In Between."

It means that in the wintertime when reservoirs would fill with water, they have to let it out to keep storage space available for flood control, and as they let this water out they must generate electricity, or the chance to develop electricity from that water is gone forever. Electricity so produced is for sale, but who is going to buy electricity which will be available only during the time the water is high and they are letting it out?

As I have said, there are two groups that might buy it. One is the big industrial company down there in the area who may buy it at that time, and figure on firming it up themselves by providing steam during the summertime, and the other is the big utility companies who might buy at these cheap dump rates, and firm it up and pass it on to the ultimate consumer on a firm rate, a high rate as compared to the dump rate at which they would purchase.

But there is another way for the matter to be handled and that is what we are trying to do in this bill. That other way is to let the Tennessee Valley Authority generate more steam power, and I say more, because they already are generating steam power; let them generate more steam power in the dry months so that this hydro power of the high-water months is available to the people of the area on a year-round basis, so that the TVA can extend this service to more and more REA cooperatives and to more and more municipalities, firm power, dependable and valuable. If we defeat this amendment, and provide this steam plant, it means a net income to the Federal Government, the Federal Government that, my friends on the left say, they want to protect. To firm it up, as provided under the original act here through an additional steam plant to go along with the five or six new hydro dams we have built, will mean an income of millions of dollars to the Federal Government, sole owner of the TVA and all its assets, including its profits. Vote down the amendment of the gentleman from New York. Thereby we will help to insure the maximum financial returns to the Federal Government by providing for the proper operation of the Government-owned TVA. We have financed the construction of many dams which provide a huge amount of power for much of the year; let us provide additional steam facilities to carry through the dry months, that the maximum firm, dependable power will be available to the REA, to the municipalities of the area, on a year-round basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment to eliminate the item for construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.

As I read the hearings I could discern the same persistence of the public-power-minded people to insist in their will to drive private industry into the position of capitulation.

If they cannot achieve their objective in a direct manner, they do it indirectly.

Talk about monopolies. These people have gone so far that they will not permit any community who now uses their power to build a steam plant, should they wish to do so. And, not being content with staying within their own boundary, they are extending their tentacles into other areas.

Their attempt to justify this steam plant—as indicated in the hearings—is indeed the same pattern which is so clear to many of us who listen to the public-power-minded people. They just pound and hammer away at private industry until they so weaken it that there is very little resistance left, if any, in some parts of the country.

I stated last year that the electric power people in my district were building their own power plants. They do not ask our Government for a hand-out. In fact, they are now expanding their property to the amount of $115,000,000. Of course, that is because we are not handcuffed by any TVA, or similar set-ups. We still retain the rights of free people and we want to continue to be free.

But, under the guise of flood control and navigation, the taxpayers of the United States are now asked to pay the power bills of certain sections of the country. It reminds me of a case of paralysis agitans—creeping paralysis. If this thing is not curbed it will slowly and surely paralyze private incentive.

This appropriation to begin construction of a TVA steam plant at New Johnsonville is another step to state socialism.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was originally authorized for the purpose of harnessing the Tennessee River and its main tributaries to promote navigation and control floods. But instead, we see these tax-exempt or Government-owned enterprises in one area resulting in a greater tax burden on the taxpayers in the rest of the country and which will eventually strangulate free enterprise.

Such a steam plant as proposed for New Johnsonville would place the Government outright into a commercial business, opening the way for nationalizing of that business and thus creating a precedent for nationalization of other business.

The Government would be assuming a responsibility that does not properly belong to it by undertaking to supply all the electricity the TVA region may require, without limit, for all future time, thus saddling the taxpayers of the Nation with increased and continued expense for the benefit of a favored area.

Additional Government - subsidized cheap power in the Tennessee Valley can only hinder the efforts of other States to attract new industries and encourage the expansion of industries already there.

Steam-generating plants operated by the Government are alien to the original concept of TVA as a flood control and

navigation project, and will create additional Government competition for our privately operated electric utility companies.

Such projects as the proposed New Johnsonville steam plant is a definite step toward nationalization of industry, and is setting the stage for a gradual or piecemeal transition from our competitive economy to a Socialist state.

There can be no warrant for additional appropriations for a Government project which will mean further competition with private business. A measure of justification might be found in some areas where electric generation is the by-product of flood control or navigation. But when these bounds are exceeded and public funds used to create a steam plant for electric generation, then the sinister figure of Government competition with public business appears.

One is astounded by the figures which show how this competitor with private business is growing and expanding. The Government is contending for business with privately owned concerns. The time has come again for American citizens to ask themselves if they want this trend to continue.

Are industry and all the other institutions which in private hands made this a great country to become nationalized? Do we follow the steps of England, trembling and limited as they are, or shall the United States go the whole way and wrap the blanket of socialism around it and enslave itself to a philosophy which is so alien to our American way of life?

Now is the time to answer the question of Government competition with free American enterprise by stopping in its tracks this movement or any other movement to expand already overexpanded Government competition with private business and industry.

I ask that the appropriation requested for this steam plant be rejected in such a decisive manner that no further attempts will be made by those who try by every means at their command to force upon us another step to state socialism by putting our Government in competition with the American system of free enterprise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to speak on this amendment because I believe we ought to go through with it and it ought to be passed. I want to serve notice that I am going to vote against other projects elsewhere until I can get satisfaction for my territory. One of the Members said that the TVA would help in flood control. They cannot do a thing for us up on the Susquehanna River. At least they have not tried to and nobody else has tried to. They talk about logrolling. I have seen a great deal of it in the last 10 years that I have been in the House. The shoe is always on the other foot, whenever our area wants anything. The only thing they ever do to us in upstate New York is to roll us, but they never give us any logs. I think it is time that we had some flood control on the Susquehanna River.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], because he has a lot of levees of his own down there.

Mr. RANKIN. I will say to the gentleman from New York that I have been a constant supporter of the St. Lawrence project to develop 12,000,000,000 kilowatt hours of electricity which is going to waste, and thus relieve his people of high power rates.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman is getting far afield when he gets into the St. Lawrence project. I remember he did that a couple of years ago when I took the floor. That does not have a thing to do with what I am talking about, which is flood control on the Susquehanna River.

Last year we were just about wiped out. Many of the 20,000 Endicott-Johnson shoe workers were left homeless. It took out the power plant in the city of Endicott. It was one of the most devastating floods in history. It took out many of the homes of the workers of the International Business Machines Co. in Vestal and in Endicott. It went on to prove that flood walls are necessary for the protection of that section of the Susquehanna River. I think it is time the House gave us some money for flood control up there, where we so sorely need it.

We are getting ready for our annual flood. I predict we will have an annual flood, because we have always had it, and the same answer has always been given us by Washington, "We are not giving you a penny for flood control up there." I say it is about time that we had it.

I propose to erect flood walls in the Endicott, Vestal, and Johnson City areas to protect some of the largest manufacturing plants in the entire country; plants that are engaged in turning out shoes for the military; shoes for the civilian population; some of the finest shoes that are made. They cannot function if the Susquehanna River is going to wipe out the homes and the cities of Endicott, Vestal, and Johnson City every year. It is time we were given some protection.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman is expressing the same ambition that we in the valley are expressing and I cannot see how the gentleman can oppose the amendment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. But you are getting the fruits of it and we up there are out in the cold, as we always have been. You cannot help us a bit except to vote for an appropriation for these flood walls that I am interested in. I would like to see the House appropriate the money so that we can have the flood walls to keep the Susquehanna River from overflowing its banks every year.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. The gentleman got the fruits of TVA during the war when half the aluminum in the country was manufactured in that district.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Not in my district. The trouble is the geography is limited to your part of the country, and we get nothing up where we are.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman have a bill in for an appropriation for flood control on the Susquehanna?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I certainly have.

Mr. RANKIN. This is the first time I ever heard of it.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. That is not my fault. The gentleman is too busy with other subjects. If the gentleman will read the RECORD he would have seen it.

Mr. RANKIN. Well, I cannot read the RECORD all the time, but I am willing to help the gentleman.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. The gentleman does a pretty good job of keeping track of things from what I have seen.

Mr. RANKIN. But this is not the way for him to get results.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman can think of a better way, I would like to hear it. Nevertheless, flood control is definitely a part of this program, and I would like to see it brought in for my section.

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield.

Mr. PICKETT. Has there been an authorization for a flood-control project on the Susquehanna?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. We are waiting for a report. We have waited a year, which is far too long to have to wait, and we are about to undergo another disastrous flood before anything comes of it. We had better get busy before we have another deluge in my territory.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] has expired.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, in the exercise of our common sense, let us consider the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], to strike out of this bill the $2,950,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority. Of this amount $2,500,000 is for beginning construction of the New Johnsonville steam plant, and $450,000 for the purchase and installation of two hydroelectric generating units at existing TVA dams.

First, let us get the undisputed facts. The 375,000 kilowatts of power which this steam plant, when completed, will produce, and the 53,000 kilowatts of power which these two hydroelectric installations will produce, are desperately needed by the TVA and by the people of the region which it serves, if this agency is to supply the demand that will be made upon it for power in 1951 and 1952. The undisputed testimony before the Appropriations Committee considering and reporting this bill establishes these facts. These facts are admitted by the private power companies' chief lobbyist, Purcell L. Smith, whose salary is $65,000 per year plus an unlimited expense account, and his witnesses and those who spoke

for him before the Appropriations Committee.

The report of the committee accompanying a similar bill to the one we are now considering, made to the Eightieth Congress which in summing up the testimony and insistences of Purcell L. Smith and his aids in discussing this proposed steam plant disclosed these facts: That unless this steam plant is constructed, and I now quote from said report:

Although substantial additional power can be generated by installation of new hydro generators, it—

The TVA—

is approaching the limit of the amount of electricity which can be generated by water power harnessed primarily for purposes of flood control and navigation. The proposal to construct this steam plant is based upon the recognition of these two factors, and is intended to provide additional generating capacity to meet the currently estimated requirements of the foreseeable future for electric power in the Tennessee Valley area (committee report, p. 12).

All the dams, all the hydroelectric generators, all the steam plants, all the transmission lines, all the transformers, all the property of every kind operated by the TVA is the property of the United States Government. The Tennessee Valley Authority is the medium through which the Federal Government, for the benefit of all its people, operates these vast properties.

The Federal Government does not pay taxes to itself on property which it owns, nor does it pay taxes on its property to any State, county, or municipality. The complaint of those opposing the above appropriation that the TVA pays no taxes on the Government-owned property which it operates, therefore, does not rise to the dignity of respectable nonsense.

When the United States Government acquires title to property either by purchase or through its construction by the use of Federal funds, it does not pay interest to itself on the property which represents the money which it has invested in such property. The insistence that the TVA should pay to the Government interest on the Government's investment in these properties is ridiculous.

The TVA was created and has been developed by the Congress for three purposes—first, for flood control. In 1927 there was a devastating flood on the Mississippi and its tributaries which destroyed property of the value of one-half the cost of the entire TVA project.

Second, it is to improve navigation. The Federal Government has the exclusive power under the commerce clause, the general-welfare clause, the national-defense clause, and the property clause of the Federal Constitution to control and improve the rivers, lakes, and harbors of this country in the interest of the general public.

This right of the Government cannot be challenged by a private citizen nor by any private corporation. Until the TVA was created in 1933 and until the dams which it has constructed on the Tennessee River and its tributaries were completed, the Tennessee River, due to the existence of Muscle Shoals and a sharp fall of the river through that area, was not a navigable stream above said shoals. Today this river is navigable the year round from Knoxville, Tenn., to the Gulf of Mexico and to the upper reaches of the Mississippi. And the commerce on this stream runs into millions of tons yearly.

The statement has been made by those opposed to the TVA, and I quote:

TVA and the Federal Government have neither constitutional nor statutory authority to build this steam plant and that, therefore, the TVA is under no obligation to supply electric energy required by occupants of the Tennessee Valley.

And it is said that the authorization of this steam plant will set a far-reaching precedent. There is no foundation in fact and no authority under the law for these statements on the part of those who seek to defeat the construction of this necessary plant. The TVA Act, passed May 18, 1933, and amended from time to time, clothes the TVA with the right and power not only to construct dams upon the Tennessee River and its tributaries, but also—

to acquire or construct power houses, power structures, transmission lines * * * and to unite the various power installations into one or more systems or transmission lines.

The TVA is further authorized—

to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy in order to avoid the waste of water power * * * to assist in liquidating the cost or aid in the maintenance of the projects of the Authority.

The act further provides that in the construction of any future dam, steam plant, or other facility to be used in whole or in part for the generation or transmission of electric power the Board is authorized and empowered to issue and to sell bonds not to exceed $50,000,000. The lawful right and the power of the TVA to construct a steam plant is further recognized by the act of Congress July 31, 1940, authorizing the TVA to begin construction of steam-electric generating facilities with a rated capacity of approximately 120,000 kilowatts.

Under the authority conferred by this act, the TVA constructed the Watts Bar steam plant at a cost of $60,000,000. The Government purchased the properties of the private power companies in this area, consisting of hydroelectric dams and steam plants which it now operates at Hale's Bar, Parksville, and Nashville and also other steam plants.

The TVA has owned them and has been operating them all the time. What is the difference, pray tell me, between the purchase of a steam plant already in existence and the construction of a steam plant? The Government has the power to operate a steam plant regardless of whether such plant is purchased or built by it.

Some of my friends opposed to the construction of this steam plant have made some rash statements and arguments against it. The weaker a man's case is the more rash are the statements he makes. It has been said today that the TVA has more electric power than it knows what to do with. I know that there is a shortage of power now in the TVA area. This is due to the long period of drought which we had in this region during the summer and fall of 1948. As a result of this shortage of power the Aluminum Co. of America at Alcoa, in Blount County, in Tennessee, which operates one of the greatest aluminum plants in the world, was forced to lay off 1,200 of its employees. That a shortage of TVA power is inevitable is admitted by the paid opposition to this steam plant in the person of Purcell L. Smith, his lawyers, and assistants.

Our good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] and he is a lovable man, and is conscientious about this matter, if he succeeds in killing this steam plant he will have succeeded in destroying the ability of the TVA to supply the needs of the present and future enterprises in my district and in my State. And he will, if he succeeds in preventing the construction of this plant, arrest and destroy the prosperity and future development of the people of Tennessee and adjoining States.

Mr. TABER. Oh, not now.

Mr. JENNINGS. Just be quiet. The gentleman has had his say. You are going to take this now, for the doctor says you need it; so just sit down and take it, it is coming to you. I hope that some of these days you will travel some Damascus road and that like Saul of Tarsus you will experience a change of heart, and that the scales will fall from your eyes; that you will no longer walk through the darkness with your headlight out behind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS] is recognized for the additional time.

Mr. JENNINGS. Some of the opponents of this plant ask: What about the industries of the other parts of the country? Bless your soul. We have not taken a single industry from any other part of the country. We were industrialized when the TVA came. We had the great Aluminum Co. of America, and during the war that company expanded its developments so that it produced enough airplane aluminum to enable this country to build and launch a fleet of planes that darkened the skies and dominated the battlefields all over the world. Not only that, as a result of TVA power in our region the atomic city was built in our midst. You cannot make aluminum without electricity; you cannot make the atomic bomb without an unlimited quantity of electricity. We are furnishing today to that great atomic plant there in my district 200,000 kilowatts of power. Not only that, the makers of atomic bombs are calling for more power. We

stand in the shadow of the third world war. Who is there who would paralyze the ability of this country to produce the aluminum that in the words of our leader and former Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, "will enable us to raise an umbrella of air power over our own country and to carry the war to any enemy that may attack us." The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] said that during the last Congress, speaking of our effort to prepare for a threatened war.

It is said by the opponents of this appropriation that the Government has not the power to build this steam plant, that to do so is unconstitutional. No lawyer who has ability enough to get into any court of record that has the power to pass on a constitutional question would stand up here and tell this Congress that the Federal Government is without such power. Those who oppose the building of this steam plant cannot even get into court on this question; and they admit it. They brought a lawyer named Jackson down here, and I knew as soon as I saw the brief that was embodied in the report of the committee at the last session of Congress that it came from the office of Newton D. Baker in Cleveland, Ohio. I was on the power companies' side in the litigation when the TVA was attacked, and I, along with other lawyers, did all I could to question the constitutionality of the TVA act. We used the same arguments and relied on the same authorities as are cited in the antique and out of date brief filed in the hearings on this proposal. We were overruled by the courts. The power of the Federal Government to produce, transmit, and sell electric current generated by water power or by steam plants was upheld.

Here is what these fellows who are trying to kill this proposal admit, "Consequently, if your committee rules the appropriation for this steam plant and the Congress ultimately does so appropriate, no one can invoke a judicial determination of whether that action was in excess of constitutional authority." This is the language of Mr. Jackson, attorney for lobbyist Purcell L. Smith, used on the hearings before this committee in 1948.

My learned friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR] pinned this lawyer's ears back when he appeared before the committee at this session of the Congress and, as we say down in Tennessee, "led him up to the rack and made him stem his fodder," made him admit that he could have no possible standing in a court, that no citizen, no power company or anybody else in this country could challenge the constitutionality of the TVA Act and the power of the TVA to build and operate a steam plant.

Why do we want it? We want it for national defense. We want it because in this country today there are 945 cooperatives that are carrying power to the farmers of this country in 45 States. We want it because in my district and in yours there are thousands of veterans, many of them with arms and legs off who are using and who desire to use TVA power. Many of them with TVA power are able to operate machinery they could not otherwise operate, thereby making a living for themselves, their wives, and their children. The other day I walked across the street from my office to a shoe shop run by two brothers who are veterans. They had all sorts of shoe-repair machinery operated by TVA electric power.

Down in my district and in other districts of the 80,000 square-mile area served by TVA power, within the last 3 years, electric energy has been carried to the homes of 250,000 farmers. More than 200,000 farmers are clamoring for TVA power today. No one in the world works harder than a farmer's wife and God pity Congress or anybody else who would deprive her of electric power in her home. The farmer works from sun to sun but his wife's work is never done. Do not paralyze and kill the future growth and prosperity of this great area in seven States. We are a part of our common country—our prosperity we share with you. Let us vote down Mr. TABER's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, for a fellow like myself, who has never been complimented for his oratorical ability, to follow my good friend, and a great American, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], schooled in art of oratory, is quite a handicap I will admit. Even though the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS], does not agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and some of the rest of us on this particular issue, without a doubt the next time he speaks on the floor he will tear the hide off of the spending, wasting outfit in power, from the President right down the line. So I take this with a grain of salt. I know he is fighting for his people. But knowing what is deep down in his heart, and knowing what a great American he is, I know he would not knowingly do anything that would eventually destroy America.

Let us look at this picture for a moment. In TVA we have an area of our Nation which has been set aside as a separate and distinct empire within the great United States of America. It is run and controlled and dictated over by three men, and anyone who gets in their way can get in serious trouble.

Now, I shall not present a bill in Congress to abolish TVA, but I would like to go along with this Congress to build a wall around that empire within our empire so high and so strong that that kind of dictatorship as you have in the Tennessee Valley will not spread to any other section of America, because it is so un-American that any schoolboy knows if it is allowed to spread to the other 10 river valleys of this Nation, then 33 men can control the Nation, because he who controls the electric energy of America in this electrical age controls America. I do not want to see anybody, either private utilities or any 33 men control America.

The main pressure back of this steam plant is the cities in the Tennessee Valley that want to get cheap power: Memphis, Knoxville, and Chattanooga. I could go on and name a lot more of them. Yes; we built a steam plant down in the TVA area in 1940 for military purposes. You can read the RECORD and see that is what it was for. If TVA is entitled to this steam plant for the benefit of the towns in that area then most every community in America is entitled to a steam plant built with taxpayers' dollars.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the House will vote down the amendment to strike out the funds to begin construction of this TVA steam plant at Johnsonville, Tenn.

The object of this plant is to firm up the power now produced on the Tennessee River to the peak of the average year. Unless this is done, you will have a large amount of power produced, we will say for 6 or 8 months in the year, and then a drop for the rest of the year, instead of having a firm supply of the peak amount the year round.

This plant will not be a burden on the taxpayers of the Nation, but will pay for itself through the sale of the power produced, just as the dams on the Tennessee River are now paying for themselves. As every member knows, I was co-author with Senator Norris, of Nebraska, of the bill creating the Tennessee Valley Authority in 1933. We had a terrible battle, but we finally got exactly what we were asking for.

Before I would agree to introduce the bill in the House, I went over it with Senator Norris carefully, and it was agreed that three things, that I insisted on, should be provided.

First. That in addition to building all the dams necessary, the Authority should have the right to build power lines, including rural power lines, to transmit this power to the ultimate consumers.

Second. That preference in distributing this power should be given to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative power associations, not operating for profit, within the distribution radius.

Third. That the Authority should have the right to fix the maximum retail rates at which this power should be sold to the ultimate consumers.

At that time it was understood that the distribution radius was 350 miles. That is what the Army engineers said it was in their report on the Tennessee River in 1930.

It is admitted by everyone that this power can be generated and transmitted economically at least 300 miles in any direction from any dam or any plant where it is generated in large quantities.

It costs on an average of four-tenths of a mill a kilowatt-hour 100 miles to transmit electricity over high power lines, or 1.2 mills to transmit it 300 miles. This was the testimony of the best electrical engineers in America, representing both sides of the power issue.

This power should be supplied to every cooperative power association within 300 miles of any of these dams in order to supply the farmers of the entire area with TVA power at TVA rates.

In 1921, the year I came to Congress, the electric utility production for the entire country, including both public and

private utilities, was only 37,180,123,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1948 it was 282,594,459,000 kilowatt-hours, or more than seven times as much as it was in 1921.

In 1948 private establishments that produce their own power, such as the Ford Motor Co., generated 53,741,019,000 kilowatt-hours, which added to the 282,594,459,000, made a total for the entire country of 336,335,478,000 kilowatt-hours.

In 1921, when we were trying to get the Muscle Shoals dam finished and the power distributed, we were told by the power interests that we did not need any more electricity—that we had a surplus.

Yet in 1948 we used seven or eight times as much as we did in 1921, and there is a greater demand for additional power today than there has ever been at any time in all the history of this country.

In 1921 there was not one farmer out of 100 who had electricity in his home. Today we have about 75 percent of our farms electrified, and we expect to continue the drive until we reach every farmhouse with a power line that we can reach with the draft in times of war, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace.

In 1933, when Senator Norris and I were carrying on the drive for the passage of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, the electric utility production in this country, both public and private, was only 81,749,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or less than one-third of what it was in 1948.

At that time only 10 percent of our farms were electrified, while Japan had 90 percent of her farms electrified, Germany had 90 percent, and both Italy and France had 94 percent of their farms electrified.

Today, after 15 years of hard struggle, we have 75 percent of our farms electrified, and the demand for this service is greater than it has ever been at any time since rural electrification began.

As I have said before, the TVA has wrought the greatest development of ancient or modern times, and, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN], the greatest thing that could happen to the people of Iowa, who are overcharged approximately 100 percent for their electricity now, would be the creation of an authority on the Missouri River to harness that great stream and its tributaries, control its floods, provide navigation, and generate and distribute that vast wealth of electricity that is now going to waste.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Not just now.

Mr. JENSEN. I will fight it to my death.

Mr. RANKIN. Oh, yes, the gentleman has fought this power program all along. He and I do not agree on this subject at all.

When I started in this fight, there was not one farmer in Iowa out of a hundred that had electricity in his home. Today they have over 80 percent of the farms in that State electrified.

If the TVA had been in existence in 1927, you would not have had that disastrous flood on the lower Mississippi. A reduction of 8 inches in the flood crest at Cairo, Ill., would have saved the people along the Mississippi untold millions of dollars. The TVA would have reduced that flood crest by at least a foot and a half by holding the flood waters of the Tennessee back and preventing them from synchronizing with the floods on the Ohio, the Missouri, and the upper Mississippi.

Electricity is the lifeblood of our advancing civilization. The cheaper the rates, the more freely it flows; and the more freely it flows the greater are its benefits to mankind.

It is the greatest servant mankind has ever known, and the only one the man or woman of ordinary means can afford.

It is doing more to brighten the homes, lighten the burdens, and raise the standards of living of the American farmer than everything else this Government has ever done.

This steam plant, as I said, is to firm up this power to the peak of the average year. We expect to do the same thing in the Central Valley in California, along the Columbia River, and everywhere else these great streams are harnessed and these plants are found to be necessary.

Oh, somebody says that the TVA is selling that power below cost. Your party was in power in 1930, and you had a great engineer for President. You were selling power wholesale to the private power companies at Muscle Shoals at 1.59 mills a kilowatt-hour and showing the American people that it would pay 4 percent on the investment. Today the TVA is selling that same power for more than twice that price, and you say they are selling it at a loss.

This is not to build up industries in the Tennessee Valley. I am fighting for the farmers and others who want this cheap electricity in their homes and small business establishments for 300 miles around, which is the admitted distribution radius of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

That would reach practically every farm house in Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas, Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Kentucky, and a large portion of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia.

Let me call your attention to the fact that we have 394,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of hydroelectric power now going to waste in our navigable streams and their tributaries every year. If developed, it could be firmed up to the peak of the average year with 116,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of steam power, making a total of 510,000,000,000, which, added to what we are now using, would give us more than 800,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year.

That would be enough to run every industry and every commercial establishment, light every house and every barn, milk every cow, wash every garment, and heat every home in this country for centuries to come.

Then our country could go on down to the future, holding high the torch and lighting up the way for all other nations of the earth to follow, into the greatest era of progress and prosperity the world has ever known.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I am very sorry that this debate started on a partisan angle. This is not a partisan problem. The differences of opinion go down the middle of both parties. We have men on both sides of the aisle who are very enthusiastic over public power development, and others who are violently opposed to it. This is not a Republican nor a Democrat problem; it is a national problem. Both parties in their platforms have endorsed public power. I point out that one of the authors of the bill creating the TVA was Senator Norris, a Republican. The other was our colleague JOHN RANKIN, a Democrat. Senator Hiram Johnson and Phil Swing, a former distinguished Member of the House, fought for 10 years for the Hoover Dam, which is one of the largest public power projects in the country. They were Republicans.

Let me point out one of the things that I think is important to remember in connection with the development of public power. In the first place, many of these great projects like the TVA, the Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee, and the Central Valley water project of California, would never have been developed by private enterprise. We had to have the public, who can afford to gamble on the outcome of the projects, finance and build these types of projects. It is not that they are not sound in the long run. They will all pay out, and pay big dividends in money and greater dividends in benefits to the people that benefit by them, but over the span of a few years perhaps the income would be insufficient to pay the bonds and the dividends on the bonds that private capital would be required to float to finance such projects. For that reason, we had to get these projects through governmental channels and with Government funds if the projects were to be developed to meet the needs of an expanding economy.

May I point out also that these developments, in my humble judgment, are not socialistic. For instance, the Central Valley project of California was really started on its way by a great banker, Rudolph Spreckels, a very successful banker. In 1916 he got behind what was known as the water power bill in California, which provided in general for the conservation of the waters of that great valley. I heard him after he had lost the battle, make the statement, "I believe in capitalism; but I do think that sometimes the people that are in control of capitalistic wealth overreach themselves."

I also believe that these great natural resources, such as we have in California, are our greatest assets in which the people have perpetual values, and they, therefore, must be developed in the public interest by public agencies. I also want to make the point that the problem being considered here is not confined to the waters of the Tennessee. We have the identical problem in California. You have it in other parts of the Union. To firm the power by a steam plant is common practice in the electrical business. Every private utility that is successful

does that very thing. It only makes the investment of the National Government more efficient by enabling these projects to sell a larger proportion of their power. The investment in this steam plant, which will ultimately be much larger, will bring back every dollar plus interest that is invested in it. That is why I think this amendment should be defeated.

We have heard this charge of socialism time and again in this discussion. Remember, that is a relative term. The world, and especially our country, is not static. We are changing from day to day, and some of the things that were thought to be socialistic 10 years ago are accepted today. Just think—over 95 percent of the cities of America, and every large city of America, owns its own water system. Hundreds of them own electrical distributing systems. In my own State we have 116 irrigation systems. Every one of them was established by a group of ranchers joined together in a semipublic body called an irrigation district to get water for their farms and ranches. Many of them have a by-product of electricity. You might say that that is socialism, but that is not interfering with the private-enterprise system of America, and neither will this project. These great projects, such as TVA, are developing and building mighty economic empires that private enterprise could not build up in centuries. In my State of California we are going to have a population of 30,000,000 people in the next 25 years. Why? Because Federal and State funds are going into the development of our water resources in California which will justify a population of twenty-five or thirty million people. All these empires being developed in the various river basins can only be successful if they are developed and started through the immediate provision of public funds. That is why I am in favor of this appropriation and am against the amendment to eliminate the item for a stand-by steam plant.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend those of my colleagues who have spoken heretofore in behalf of the pending deficiency appropriation bill to provide funds for beginning construction of a steam plant to be built by the Tennessee Valley Authority in Tennessee. I want to join with those supporters of TVA in urging the adoption of the pending appropriation to assure that this much-needed facility for the people of the Tennessee Valley be provided, and to urge that the House vote down the Taber amendment to kill this appropriation.

As the Members who were in the Congress during the previous session will recall, funds necessary for the construction of this steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., failed to get the approval of the Eightieth Congress. Construction of this plant at that time was called vital to the extension of power from the Tennessee Valley Authority for industrial and farm uses and for purposes of national defense.

The modest sum that was asked for this construction was denied by less than 20 votes in this body. When the matter was brought before the Senate it was approved by a decisive vote, not once, but on two different occasions.

The question is before the House again today. I doubt if any legislation ever brought before this body has been the subject of more false propaganda, more misleading information, and more half-truths made in opposition to it than this legislation which we are now considering.

Only yesterday a distinguished former chairman of the House Appropriations Committee made the statement that three or four industries, including the Aluminum Corp. of America and the Monsanto Chemical Corp., had moved from the North and East into Tennessee and the TVA region.

These plants, Mr. Chairman, did not move from the North or East or anywhere. They have been there in the Tennessee area for many, many years. Testimony before the Appropriations Committee on this subject failed to disclose that a single industry has transplanted its plant and facilities from the North or East into the TVA area. The testimony did show that some few branch plants have located there and that there has been a normal and progressive industrial growth in the area. I want to get the truth and the facts in this matter straight.

The gentleman went on to state that the people of New York were paying the light bill for the people of the Tennessee Valley. This, of course, does not represent a true statement of fact. I should like to dispel this impression. Every kilowatt of power is paid for by the consumers. This is no charity operation. There is a provision in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act providing for the amortization of revenue to cover the cost of this great project and each year a percentage sum required by statute is set aside by the TVA and paid into the United States Treasury.

Another speaker in opposition to this appropriation stated that TVA had no constitutional or legal authority for its operations. In support of his statement he went back into ancient history and tried to dig up some old arguments which were used to oppose this agency of the Government in the very beginning.

Mr. Chairman, the constitutionality and legality of the Tennessee Valley Authority and its operations has long been established by the decisions of our courts.

This same gentleman went further to state that it was never intended that the Government should engage in the power business. I should like to ask this gentleman and others who hold this view what they thought was intended when the Federal Government bought out all the private power companies in the area of the TVA. The sale of private power companies to the Government was negotiated by the late Wendell Willkie.

When the Government bought out the property of the Tennessee Power Co. and the Commonwealth & Southern Utilities, it thereby went into the power generating and distribution business and thereby formed a Government power monopoly in that area. By what argument can it thus be advanced that the Government never intended to go into the power business when the Government, by its private power purchases, became the sole source of electric power for the people in the Tennessee Valley?

In these transactions, the private-power interests received the sum of $125,000,000 for their entire operations within the area. Of this amount the Government, through TVA, paid $59,263,122 and the various municipalities and distributors paid the remaining sum. The one single largest transaction was the outright purchase of the holdings of the Tennessee Power Co. and Commonwealth & Southern for the sum total of $44,949,400.

As indicated, the total amount received by the former private-power owners was $125,000,000 from both TVA and distributors. Could it thus be said that it was never intended for the Government to go into the power business after these transactions?

It was further stated on the floor yesterday that the Government is subsidizing the power consumers in the Tennessee Valley. The truth of the matter is that the TVA pays into the Federal Treasury each year large sums of money from its operations. Payments are made in the form of interest on bonds and the retirement of bonds and other receipts in addition to the sale of power.

Section 26 of the TVA Act provides for annual payments to be made to the Treasury from the sale of power. Section 26 payments alone brought into the United States Treasury in 1945 the sum of $7,087,741. In 1946, payments amounted to $7,971,278 and in 1947 $8,000,000 was paid into the Treasury, making a total of $23,059,019 in the past 3 years, which TVA has returned into the Treasury of the United States.

In addition, while the people of our region are being served with cheap electricity, the power-generating facilities of the TVA constitute only one phase of this great development program. TVA is concerned with navigation, flood-control, and conservation programs. These are all worthy and needed functions and alone fully justify the existence of TVA.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the Democratic Party and, for that matter, both political parties have public-power planks in their national platforms and each party has gone on record as advocating the development and expansion of our natural resources in the interest of all the people. The Democratic Party in national convention last year adopted specific recommendations for the continued development of the Tennessee Valley Authority and the President in his recent budget request to this Congress asked for an appropriation of funds sufficient to start construction of this steam plant by the TVA.

This plant is badly needed, Mr. Chairman, to help relieve the power shortage and to meet the rising demand for electricity in our area and in line with the general economic growth of Tennessee and the South. The sum asked for this expansion work is not large, but the benefits which will be derived there-

from are great—great for our people and also for the prosperity of the people of the entire Nation.

Let me give you some other facts and figures with respect to this great facility in the Tennessee Valley. The Federal Government has an investment of more than $350,000,000 in generating and transmission facilities alone in the Tennessee Valley. These TVA properties and operations are owned by all the people of the United States. The people of the Tennessee Valley—7,000,000 of them, of whom 750,000 are users and consumers of electric power within this area—reside in seven States—Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, and Alabama—an area of more than 80,000 square miles.

There is a definite concern, Mr. Chairman, on the part of the people of the area that the senior partner in this vast operation—that is, the Federal Government acting through the Congress—may not make sufficient appropriations to insure consumers an adequate supply of power. This is a partnership, Mr. Chairman, between the people and their Government. At the beginning of this great project—a project which would never have been made possible had the Members of Congress in general adopted a dog-in-the-manger attitude—the Federal Government through the Authority bought out the private power interests serving the region. In so doing the Government thereby became the sole supplier of power in this large region. It thereby also morally obligated itself to supply power for the people of the Tennessee Valley in quantities to meet their needs, both present and future. The Government should not go back on its contract with the people in this instance.

In the TVA the Federal Government—all of the people of America—have a sound investment. Figures prove this to be true. Therefore, from an economic and strictly business point of view this mutually satisfactory arrangement should be continued. From the standpoint of service to the people and the prosperity of the Nation the Congress should take no action which would, in effect, say, "This much progress you shall make and no more; thus far you can go and no farther." The Federal Government should not put a ceiling on power production nor freeze the amount of power which may be produced when electric power is so critically needed for our domestic progress and national defense.

The Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Krug, testified recently before committees of the Congress concerning these needs for additional power for domestic purposes, and also to help carry out the national defense requirements of our country.

Mr. Chairman, it is a matter of common knowledge that a power shortage exists in America today. Although some people want to debate this fact, everyone—even the most ardent advocates of private power—agrees that there is no great surplus or excess of power and they also agree that there is an increased consumer demand and a growing need for additional power for industrial and national defense purposes. All over the Nation power demand is pressing hard upon supply. This growing demand is a testimonial to progress. It is evidence of a growing regional and national strength. It should be hailed as a triumph of democratic achievement.

Mr. Chairman, I desire not only to urge approval of this much-needed appropriation, but also to protest the misleading information and false propaganda concerning the TVA which has pervaded this body like a London fog. Whenever any matter pertaining to the TVA has arisen in the past, this propaganda fog has gathered instantly out of a clear sky to obscure the facts and the truth. Today the smoke screen is denser than ever, and it has the undeniable odor of the private power interests.

From statements which have been made on this floor, Mr. Chairman, it seems one is being asked to believe that the fine and estimable people of the North and East are benevolently paying the light and power bills to save the people of the South from darkness. Need I say that such is not the case.

We have also been asked to believe that because of the alleged abundance of cheap power industries in the North and East are making a mass exodus into the area of the TVA. Mr. Chairman, I not only deny emphatically that this is the truth, but I shall prove my statement—a thing which opponents of this small appropriation measure have failed to do. Extensive hearings, Mr. Speaker, before the House Committee on Appropriations failed to disclose that one single solitary industry had moved from the North or East to the TVA region.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that new industries have grown up in the TVA area, as I have pointed out before. But this industrial development has not been accomplished at the sacrifice of the industrial prosperity of any other region in this country. The development which has occurred has been a healthy advancement to which every area of this land is rightfully entitled. TVA only made it possible for our region, neglected by private power interests, to grow as the Good Lord meant for it to grow when he bestowed so many rich, natural resources there.

I should also like to dispel the impression that the Government is giving the people of the Tennessee Valley anything. Every kilowatt of power is paid for, Mr. Chairman, by the consumers. This is no charity operation. There is a provision in the Tennessee Valley Authority Act, Mr. Chairman, providing for the amortization of revenue to cover the cost of this great project and each year a percentage sum required by statute is set aside by the TVA and paid into the United States Treasury. In addition, while the people of our region are being served with cheap electricity, the power-generating facilities of the TVA constitutes only one phase of this great development program. There is the navigation program, flood-control, and other conservation programs—all worthy and needed developments within their own right—which of themselves more than justify the existence of TVA.

Members of this body who do not acknowledge the fact of power shortage, the truth of the situation in the Tennessee Valley, are hampering their own progress. What is good for one region is good for all. Opportunities for expansion cannot be bottled up in one region or another. When one region prospers, the entire country is better off for it. I could not bring myself to deny to the eastern regions the development of their natural resources, nor could I bring myself to snipe at efforts of the Northwest to harness the vast resources of its area. Development in those areas promotes general prosperity in all sections of our common country.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that we have too long overlooked the sources of the false propaganda that follows TVA like a haunting ghost. It is very definitely man-made, Mr. Chairman. It can be traced to the private power lobbyists—those masters of the man-made fog. They have been exceedingly industrious in this matter.

In the desperate efforts of the private power propaganda fogmakers, whole page ads have been bought in the daily newspapers. Shout the propaganda from the rooftops, is their theory. Spare no expense. Such magazines as Newsweek, World Report, and others—who certainly do not give away their space—have been utilized to spread the message of the private power interests in full-page advertisements. They have even created a special organization to spread their false gospel. I refer to the National Association of Electric Companies. This organization, Mr. Chairman, has bombarded the Members of Congress with cleverly drawn letters designed to give out a false impression and improper information on this subject. This campaign has been astutely planned to minimize and discount the benefits the public receives from public power through the Tennessee Valley Authority. They have subtly planted the seeds of doubt by insinuations against the TVA.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I believe it will be of interest to point out the National Association of Electric Companies is registered with the Congress as a lobby organization and that its official report to Congress on its activities shows that last year it was the third highest spender for lobbying purposes of any registered agency. They spent for purposes of discounting the benefits of public power, particularly the TVA, the sum of more than $304,000. And, Mr. Chairman, the sum of $65,000 of that avowed expenditure was salary for its No. 1 lobbyist in Washington. Such a salary thereby makes him the highest paid lobbyist in Washington today.

This highly paid private power lobbyist has produced many works of propaganda art. He has authored many fancy and costly brochures and pamphlets with which to educate the public. Let me quote briefly from some of this antipublic power literature:

The New Johnsonville steam plant, it was pointed out would lead to nationalization of other industries. Here is another:

It is the taxpayers in the rest of the United States who will help pay for the steam plant to benefit one privileged area. They subsidize TVA.

TVA is also called an unfair competitor and the charge is made that enlargement of TVA would be injurious to the economic welfare of other sections of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I should also like to point out that in the RECORD of Monday in the Extension of Remarks made by the distinguished former chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, Mr. TABER, of New York, an effort was made to deprecate the fact that he has received many letters and communications from the people of the Tennessee Valley expressing their pride in the TVA and what it has done to bring prosperity and well-being to the people of this area and the South.

I should like to state to the gentleman from New York and to this entire body that those letters which he has received represent a true expression of the feelings and beliefs of the people of the Tennessee Valley toward this great agency.

Mr. Chairman, among the purposes declared by the Congress in passing the TVA Act was to develop the resources of the Tennessee Valley for the benefit of all the people; to promote the prosperity and raise the level of income of the people of the valley; and also to strengthen the entire Nation by making the valley more productive. Progress has been made—progress in the development of our rivers for purposes of navigation and flood control, in the improvement of the fertility of our soil and the prevention of soil erosion through approved methods of conservation. A major portion of this progress is rooted in the blessings TVA has bestowed on the people of this region. Progress has also been made through the extension of rural electrification. Community and farm electrification has been developed and expanded. Our farmers and other individual consumers are making greater use of low-cost electricity. In 1933, when the TVA Act was passed, only 1 farm in 28 had electric service. Today 50 farms out of every 100 are served by electricity through our efficient rural electric cooperatives cooperating with the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Within the Fifth Congressional District of Tennessee, the district which I have the honor to represent, the farms in 1930 were only 5 percent electrified. Today a little more than 51 percent of the farms of the Fifth District are served by electricity. These figures, Mr. Speaker, show the trend of the current program which aims toward further expanded rural electrification within Tennessee and rural America.

In the postwar period alone some 1,400 miles of new power transmission lines have been built within the Fifth District of Tennessee. It is my hope that rural electrification can be extended to farm areas in all sections of our common country, as each strong region makes for a stronger Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I have voted for measures that have been for the benefit of the people of the North, the East, and the West. I have cast my vote for measures which were for the welfare of the people of other sections and regions. I have favored needed and necessary measures for other sections of our common country.

I fail utterly to understand the tragic shortsightedness which keeps men from realizing that prosperity has a chain reaction; that when one section prospers, other sections will reap a harvest of benefits. This Government of people from the North, the East, the West, as well as the South, should not—it cannot—be guilty of putting a ceiling on progress in the South.

Let us not take any action here today which would reverse the trend of prosperity. Let common sense prevail.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that Members of this Congress will vote the modest sum requested by the pending amendment to the appropriation bill for the Tennessee Valley Authority. I urge adoption of the amendment not only in behalf of the people of Tennessee, but of all the people of America.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, the bone of contention concerning the appropriations to construct steam auxiliary power plants appears to be the profits to be made from the sale of seasonal surplus electric power now being generated by the Government-owned hydroelectric plants during the high-water season.

The question here is shall this surplus seasonal Government-produced power be sold at bargain rates to privately owned electric companies to be firmed up for year-round production by supplementing steam-generated power by private interest and sold at a large profit? Or shall the Government firm up this seasonal surplus power by the construction of its own steam auxiliary plants and thereby secure a larger return on its investment by selling this seasonal and steam-generated power on a year-round basis at the current price rate?

I am wondering how the gentleman from New York and his colleagues expect to win the confidence of the American people by opposing good, sound business principles in building these auxiliary plants, and firming up this power and increasing the return on the Government investment.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. If the gentleman had been washed out as many times as we have on the Susquehanna, he would worry about it.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. What does steam plants have to do with being washed out by the Susquehanna?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. It has something to do with flood control.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. This is a plain business proposition. I believe no man on the Republican side would hesitate a minute to put in a steam-generating plant to firm up the power and increase the revenue of these Government plants if it were proposed by a Republican administration.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I am from Massachusetts; and, of course, that State is not directly affected by this TVA proposition. It does seem to me that the arguments on the Republican side more or less fall by their own weight: On the one hand, we are told this proposition is socialism; on the other hand, we are told that this proposition is in favor of the vested interests, the big corporations down there. It cannot very well be in favor of both. In addition to that, we have, of course, the argument of sectionalism. That, I suppose, comes up more frequently on the floor of this House than any other place in the country. For the life of me, I cannot see how we can look at the TVA or any other public-power project from the point of view of what it is going to bring to our home States. Directly, it is not going to bring anything to Massachusetts; but, looking at the project in the light that I regard it, it is going to bring benefit after benefit to the whole country. We represent all the people of the country, not just the people of one State or district; we represent all the people of this country. I say to you that the TVA is a proven proposition; it is not a matter of prophecy, it is not a matter of experimentation. TVA has proven its merit time after time in industry, in production, in defense, in all the articles that go into the home to make our American standard of living the standard of living that we want for this country and for our children.

It is not a question of what is good for my State or what is good for any other State; it is a question of what is good for the people of this country; and it is the people of this country who own TVA. It is good for all the people, and that includes those in my own State of Massachusetts, which is far removed from Tennessee.

I hope that in the future there will be many other projects similar to the TVA, projects that will reach throughout this entire Nation, projects to which we can point with pride and say we had a hand in their creation. How are you going to do it if you vote against TVA here and now? How are you going to go back to the people of this country when it is something for your State and say: "Oh, yes, I am in favor of that"? We are either for or against projects like TVA, wherever they may be. It is a matter of principle, not sectionalism.

We must go all the way, the whole distance on this proposition. I say to you that power is probably more needed than anything else to improve the American standard of living. We are for or against it; there is no middle ground.

As concerns the statement of the Member who said that if we had 10 such valley authorities 33 men could control the country, let me say this: If 33 men could control the country through the control of power, what greater argument is needed for public power? And what greater argument is needed for the TVA

and every other single proposition that tends along the same line? You are either for TVA or you are against it. I urge you to vote in favor of it by voting down this amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am from the city of Chicago. I wish to subscribe 100 percent to the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts. As far as I am concerned I believe there is too much sectionalism expressed upon the floor of this House.

The benefits that flow from TVA will affect the entire country. Just as a few days ago we voted funds for the relief of a disaster which affected primarily the people of the West, yet that disaster secondarily affects the entire Nation as well. I believe, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts, that the TVA will do much to benefit and increase the prosperity of the entire Nation.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SUTTON] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Chairman, I am amused, amazed, and disgusted by some of the statements that have been made yesterday afternoon and today relative to the New Johnsonville steam plant. It seems that some of our friends from New York, Pennsylvania, and Iowa have had the same fight going on since 1933. The same reasoning advanced yesterday by the gentleman from New York in opposition to this plant was the identical argument he used in 1932 when TVA was created. He is running true to form in his consistent support of special interests. In my opinion, the philosophy of progressive government advanced by the opponents of this plant, was well defined by the late, lamented, and beloved Will Rogers when he said, "Our policy is simple, nothing is no good."

There has been much talk about the constitutionality of the TVA. The Supreme Court of our Nation has declared the act constitutional. Today the gentleman from New York decries there is no need for this steam plant.

Mr. Chairman, as information for the opponents of this plant, there are in this 80,000-square-mile area some 6,000,000 people who are dependent upon TVA for electric energy. These 6,000,000 people, mostly rural, are in dire need of more power. We have 800,000 consumers of electricity today, within the area of the TVA, and hundreds of thousands more without electric power. These are not the big industries. They are the boys out on the farms who raise the crops that feed us. They have no electricity today. They need it to light up their homes, for washing machines, cream separators, water systems, various and sundry farm operations, and not to produce anything to be manufactured, but to feed the Nation in which we exist and reside.

There is a definite need for this plant unless you wish to segregate these 6,000,000 fine people. It is the obligation of this Government to take care of the people of our Nation and to protect them. By cutting out the appropriation for this steam plant you will say to those 6,000,000 people: "We do not want to have a thing to do with you; we want you to be backward, we do not want you to have any light or any power at all; we do not want any part of your future generation to be educated."

Mr. Chairman, that is not right. There is too much sectionalism brought up here today. I agree with the gentlemen who preceded me and spoke on that point. The gentleman from New York should bow his head in shame when he brings in sectionalism as he did yesterday afternoon.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I never mentioned sectionalism in my life.

Mr. SUTTON. I decline to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, during World War II when we went into the service of our country and when his constituents went into the service of his country, when we went down through the valley of hell fighting for America, we were not fighting for New York, we were not fighting for Tennessee, we were not fighting for Texas or Washington; we were fighting for America.

That is the attitude I take here today. This is not a sectional problem. This is not just for the South. It is for the United States of America. It belongs to the people of America, not to the State of Tennessee. It belongs to everybody in the Nation. I will give the gentleman from New York the best hat there is in Washington, D. C., if he will point out one industry that has moved from the North or Northeast to the TVA area since 1933. TVA is not in competition with the North nor the Northeast. It is strictly an American institution for all the people of our Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

I support it for the reasons which I gave yesterday during general debate. I support it for the reasons as a result of which after thoroughgoing debate on the floor of this House last summer the proposal submitted by TVA was on two separate occasions voted down by record vote.

This is not a question, Mr. Chairman, of being for the TVA or against the TVA. We are all for the TVA in its proper sphere of action.

It is a question of fair play to private industry and to the American people.

The facts are, as has been pointed out, that TVA under present conditions, with the subsidy which it receives, operates in such a manner that no private industry can possibly compete with it on a fair basis.

Until recently it made no reasonable provision for amortization or depreciation. Its interest burden has been practically negligible. Its tax burden has been estimated at somewhere between 10 and 20 percent of what anybody in private business would have to pay. I understand that a person in private industry pays more for taxes alone than TVA collects for the power which it sells. The net income which it earns, of around $17,000,000, is not even sufficient to cover what anyone in private industry would normally have to set aside for interest payments and for depreciation.

However you figure them, alleged costs of TVA are far less than the actual costs of private industry, and the people pay the difference in subsidy.

Until now TVA has limited its power activities to the generation and marketing of power incidental to navigation and flood control, in accordance with the clear intent of the TVA Act.

It now tells the Congress that there is an increasing demand in the TVA area which it cannot meet with its incidental power. It asserts a brand new obligation to meet that demand, and it requests the Congress to put it in a position, by steam-plant construction, to meet that demand, whatever it may prove to be, whatever its source, even though it can only be met by power over and above its incidental power and even though its customers are prohibited from steam-plant construction by so-called binding contracts with TVA.

This is a radical departure from the policy heretofore pursued.

I am against the proposal of TVA for the reasons which I stated yesterday. Limited time prevents any detailed statement.

I am against it because I do not believe that TVA has authority under present legislation to engage in the production and marketing of nonincidental power in competition with private industry, and because I believe that such a question of policy should not be determined in the course of considering an appropriation bill.

I am against it because the record indicates clearly that there is ample power available now and for years to come except for the prospective needs of big business users, such as the Aluminum Co. of America, the Monsanto Chemical Co., and other multi-million-dollar industries in and near the TVA.

I am against it because the prospective needs of big business do not need to be met by TVA. If steam-plant construction is necessary, the simplest solution is to let the industrial users construct and pay for the steam plant as they would in any other part of America. They will do it fast enough if they have to.

I am against it because I am against establishing the broad national policy which the proposal implies.

I can see no reason why the people of America, rich and poor alike, should be compelled to pay through higher prices and higher taxes for the power requirements of big business in Tennessee.

I can see no reason why government should compete with private industry on a basis which is utterly unfair.

I can see no reason for establishing a precedent which means increasing unfair competition and possible nationalization in this field and perhaps in any other industrial field in America.

Let us either limit TVA to its prescribed role or eliminate the present

elements of unfair competition immediately.

I hope the pending amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the matter before the Committee of the Whole now is simply a business one, whether we are going to make the Tennessee Valley Authority throughout all its activities in the distribution of power a real, efficient agency, or whether we are going to permit it to continue in its present ineffective form.

The Tennessee Valley Authority was established 16 years ago. Those of us who were here then remember that dramatic fight, the forces of progress against the forces who look backward. I stood in the well fighting for it then. On various occasions since when various questions have arisen in connection with the Tennessee Valley Authority I have stood in the well supporting legislation that would make it operate effectively and efficiently. I remember that then the charge of communism was hurled at that project, the inference being that those who supported such a project were inclined in that direction. I do not think any of us who supported it need take a back seat to any of those who opposed it, in our patriotism. It is the basic issue that will exist a thousand years from now, the issue of the forces of progress against the forces of backwardness or the forces of reactionism. That is the issue which is involved in the question before the Committee of the Whole today.

The only purpose of this $2,000,000 plus is to determine whether or not the TVA will be allowed to operate as any other private power company would, with a steam plant to provide a steady flow of power throughout the year. All private companies possess such steam plants now. It is what is called a firm-up plant.

The opponents of the utilization of our natural resources—and that was the basic question involved 16 years ago—are opposed to this just as vigorously as they opposed the Tennessee Valley Authority 16 years ago. They opposed Boulder Dam, they opposed the Grand Coulee Dam, they opposed the Central Valley project, they will oppose a Connecticut Valley Authority, or a Merrimac Valley Authority in New England, which should be given serious consideration, and they will oppose the Missouri Valley Authority. Honest? Yes, I know they are honest in their view, but I sharply disagree with their judgment.

This project has brought benefits to millions of people. Private capital was unable to meet the situation. Tremendous floods, bringing in their wake destruction of property and danger to persons, had visited that great area of the country for countless generations. Were we going to permit that condition to continue? It was primarily a flood-control and navigation project. Then should we waste the tremendous power that could be developed as a result of our flood control and reclamation and irrigation? Common sense tells us that it would be a waste of public funds and a lack of common sense to permit the great power that could be developed as incidental to our flood control to be wasted.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is another illustration of the time-old battle that was going on 200 years ago and 100 years ago and is going on now and will continue in the future—the battle of the forces of progress against the forces of reactionism.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to yield my time to the dean of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts has called attention to what transpired 16 years ago. I can go a little further back than that. I remember when the same forces that are now fighting this project tried to turn over Muscle Shoals to private industry. I remember when they were trying to turn it over to Mr. Henry Ford for little or nothing. I remember also that 14 years ago, under the leadership of a gentleman by the name of Hopson, forces were fighting the so-called holding-company bill, maintaining that it was a death sentence to the power companies. They spent over $3,000,000 in lobbying in an attempt to defeat that legislation, claiming that its passage would destroy the power companies. Sometime later Mr. Hopson was convicted for giving false information concerning his lobbying activities.

We did pass legislation that sought to relieve the situation to bring about cheaper power rates, but notwithstanding our action, I find today that the power companies which spent over $3,000,000 for propaganda at that time against the measure are also opposed to the construction of the steam plant on the pretense that it would affect the private power industry. The legislation which Congress has enacted in the past has not injured the companies and has proven of benefit to certain sections of the country in the obtaining of expanded and better power service and fair rates.

Mr. Chairman, the power companies are as wrong today as they were then in contending that public power service would seriously affect or destroy them. I have here a statement giving the profits of the private power companies. Not wishing to unduly encumber the RECORD I will list six or seven of the companies showing the profits they derived in 1948 and ask unanimous consent to insert them as part of my remarks:

| | |
|---|---|
| Pacific Gas & Electric Co | $27,351,000 |
| Electric Power & Light Corp | 26,420,926 |
| American Power & Light | 23,392,937 |
| Public Service Electric & Gas Co | 20,400,912 |
| American Gas & Electric | 19,740,816 |
| Ohio Power Co | 8,906,893 |

Those profit figures do not indicate that the private power companies are suffering and in danger of being destroyed. The fact is that their profits increased from 5 to 20 percent in 1948 and the profits of most of the companies are the highest since they were organized.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, with all this evidence before us as to the operation of the private power companies and being aware that these same interests have been able to influence the Republican side in the past, I regret that the Republicans in the light of full facts should continue now to endeavor to serve private interests as against the interest of the people generally and contrary to the good of our Government. The TVA has not only been of great benefit to that part of the country but also to adjoining States. It has been beneficial to the entire country and has proven that it can produce and furnish power at a much lower cost to the users than the private power companies and to a great extent its operation has served as a yardstick as to the rate to be charged for power service.

For these reasons I am for the appropriation for the plant as reported by the committee which will make it possible for the TVA to reduce the cost of producing the power with a corresponding reduction in cost to the users. I regret that there has been opposition to the provision and in view of the benefits that will follow the erection of the steam plant, I am constrained to say that those who are opposing the provision unfortunately have been led astray by the avaricious power interests.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I will yield to the gentleman today.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman also add to his statement the fact that the private utilities are paying and have been paying for several years past in local, State and Federal taxes on an average the little sum of $650,000,000? Then, I would like to have you say, as a note to the list that you are going to submit, that we need the money in the Treasury of the United States to help build these projects that you are talking about.

Mr. SABATH. Where did they get the money? They got it from the people, from the consumers, because of the overcharges that they made. Otherwise they never could have made such profits that enabled them to pay the taxes which the gentleman mentions, and I presume the greater portion was for income taxes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to eliminate from this bill the item providing for the construction of a steam plant by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The bill provides for $2,950,000 for the Tennessee Valley Authority, of which $2,500,000 is to start construction of the new steam plant. According to the testimony before our Committee last year, the total ultimate cost of the plant, including auxiliary appurtenances for its operation, will be approximately $84,000,000.

My opposition to this proposed project is not based solely on the cost in dollars. By that I do not for a moment mean to imply that I do not consider the dollars to be expended important. In these days of many uncertainties, nationally and internationally, it is most important—indeed, it is imperative—that we concern ourselves about every single item of expenditure, however small. But, judging from what has taken place in committee and the nature of the bill before us, whatever I might say about the absolute need for economy will probably fall on deaf ears.

If this item only cost $10,000, or $1,000, or even $1, I would be opposed to it. There is involved here a fundamental principle. It presents by indirection an issue which we must definitely face. In this proposed new steam plant for generating electricity we are brought face to face with the fundamental question as to whether we intend to have the Federal Government continue to enlarge its operations in competition with private enterprise.

The proposal before us is a notable example of how, once the Federal Government enters some particular field of endeavor, the scope of the program invariably grows and grows. In the process the primary purpose of the program is completely changed, and new and different reasons are presented in support of the program or its enlargement. In the end we arrive at something altogether different from what was originally intended.

Take, for example, the school-lunch program. To be sure, that is not in issue here, but it presents an example of how these various Government programs are completely changed in character. You will recall that we originally entered upon the school-lunch program as a way to use surplus agricultural products. The primary purpose of the program was to help absorb the surplus in agriculture. It was part of the general program of several years ago to raise farm prices. And the subsidizing of school lunches for the children was incidental to that overall objective.

We still have the school-lunch program, and on a much larger scale than when initiated. The primary purpose now is to subsidize school lunches and the matter of absorption of farm surpluses is merely incidental, if it is even a consideration.

I am not debating the merits of the school-lunch program, Mr. Chairman, I am merely trying to emphasize how the character and purposes of programs of the Federal Government can be and are changed, slowly but surely, without the people actually realizing what has taken place. It is this very process that seems to be characteristic of bureaucracy which gives me concern when we have recommended to us such programs as Federal aid to education. I can readily see how that program can in the course of time be converted into something more than mere Federal subsidies to States for education, and instead can ultimately mean a Federal school system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the item in this bill for the steam generating plant for TVA raises this question: Is the purpose of the Tennessee Valley Authority to generate electricity, or is the purpose to promote navigation and control floods? If you turn to section 9a of the TVA Act, there can be no doubt as to the answer. Let me read that section:

SEC. 9a. The Board is hereby directed in the operation of any dam or reservoir in its possession and control to regulate the stream flow primarily for the purposes of promoting navigation and controlling floods.

Note those words, Mr. Chairman, that the dams and reservoirs are to be operated "primarily for the purposes of promoting navigation and controlling floods." Navigation and floods constitute the primary purpose. That is why the TVA was originally established. That was the argument made for its establishment.

I read further from section 9a of the enabling act for TVA:

So far as may be consistent with such purposes, the Board is authorized to provide and operate facilities for the generation of electric energy at any such dam * * * in order to avoid the waste of water power.

There should not be the slightest doubt, from the language of the act itself, as well as from the testimony and debates at the time it was enacted, that the real purpose of TVA was to control floods and promote navigation. And, incidental to that purpose, the TVA was authorized to use such power as may be generated by the dams to control floods and promote navigation. It was logically contended that it would be pure waste to have all this water power without taking advantage of the electric power it produced.

Today we have before us a proposed appropriation for the construction of a steam plant. This is not a proposal for a new dam or a new reservoir. What is proposed here has nothing whatever to do with floods or navigation. It is simply proposed that we appropriate money for the TVA to build a steam plant to generate electricity. In other words, it is proposed that we change the whole purpose of the TVA, that we make it one vast public power project. This is a precedent, if there ever was one, for Government subsidized competition with private enterprise. If we adopt this proposal, we will be saying that a normal function of the Federal Government is to produce and sell commercially electric power.

The American people should bear in mind that they pay the costs for this operation. As has been pointed out, the net income which TVA earns amounts to around $17,000,000, and that is not even sufficient to pay for interest and depreciation. The costs of TVA are misrepresented. It is the people who pay the difference in taxes.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] who has just preceded me spoke about the profits of the private utilities. His figures may be correct. I shall not contest them. But I should like to remind the gentleman that it is out of profits that taxes are paid; and, as the gentleman seems to forget, the rates charged by utilities are subject to Government regulation.

I hold no brief for private utilities. I hold no brief for any particular business. But I believe in private enterprise, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to use all the energy at my command in defense of our system of private enterprise. It is in defense of private enterprise that I have taken the floor this afternoon to urge that the pending amendment be adopted, and that by our vote we declare that we intend to strengthen, not destroy, what has proved to be the greatest productive system in the world.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the committee yields the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, it shall be my purpose to address my remarks primarily to the approximately 100 Members who are serving their first term in this legislative body, and to whom the TVA is new legislation.

I would like to digress for a moment to say that I have watched this freshman class. I have been made very proud of them today. I am ready to say now that this freshman class is the brightest prospect this Congress has had in the 11 years I have been here.

I regret that you new Members must undergo this baptism of fire and propaganda and pressure politics of vested interests to which you are and have been subjected on this question. It is not new to Members of the Eightieth Congress, nor is it new to Members who have served here in any year since the TVA was created in 1933. This is but a continuation of the same old fight.

Why is it that you are having long-distance telephone calls from people in your districts who are wholly unfamiliar with the TVA and its contribution to national defense and the national economy? Why is it you are receiving telegrams? It is because there are powerful forces arrayed against this proposition, the power trust, with the highest paid lobbyists in the world; Purcell L. Smith, as clever a gentleman as ever tried to destroy a Government project or to slit the throat of progress of 6,000,000 people. Sixty-five thousand dollars a year and an unlimited expense account he receives to propagandize you; and I am informed that in this fight he has contacted between four and five hundred thousand people, all for one purpose, to have them bring pressure to bear upon Congress, seemingly with particular attention directed to the new Members of this Congress. Do not fall prey to such pressure politics.

What is the TVA? It is a great, integrated undertaking to develop an entire river valley. If it is new to you, make no mistake about its being important. Why do I say it is important? Let me reflect just a moment to tell you that had it not been for the two great public power projects in the United States, TVA and Bonneville, neither of the atomic bombs that ended the war with Japan would have been manufactured. Today, the Oak Ridge atomic energy plant is the largest consumer of electrical energy

generated by TVA. It uses more electricity, for instance, than the great city of Memphis with its 300,000 to 400,000 people with all of its houses, shops, stores, and industries.

During the heat of the conflict, when the contest was as to who would dominate the air over Europe, over the Atlantic, and the Pacific, it was TVA power that manufactured 51 percent of the aluminum that went into America's airplanes. Make no mistake about this being an important issue.

Let me go back a little further, especially for the new Members. Before TVA, the Tennessee River was a wild, turbulent stream, racing through its rapids of 650 miles, uncontrolled; floods occurring, not yearly, but sometimes several times during a year, wreaking destruction and ruin. There was a 650-mile stream, surging with unharnessed power, meandering through a region of great natural resources of America, unnavigable because of the hazardous rapids.

So, there was the problem of navigation. There was the problem of flood control. There was the problem of power.

And, most important of all, there was a human problem. In that region, which was a part of America and still is, the people's per capita income was only 40 percent of the national average. Oh. We thrill at the rehabilitation of Europe, and when our great leader mentions in an inaugural address a program to develop the backward areas of the world we all cheer and applaud; but when something is done for an underprivileged, undeveloped area of America with a per capita income only 40 percent of the national average that is socialism. That is an invasion of the prerogatives of private industry.

With what private industry would this proposed steam plant compete? There is no private electric industry in the Tennessee Valley. By act of Congress the TVA was authorized and directed to buy out the private utility interests of that region. Thereby, Congress eliminated the question of competition, and set aside this area of the Tennessee Valley and designated a Federal agency, the TVA, to serve its utility needs, to construct those dams to serve three purposes, flood control, navigation, and the generation of electricity. This will compete with no private industry whatsoever.

Now, in doing this, what did Congress do to the people of that valley? You gave them an opportunity; yes, a wonderful opportunity—and we appreciate it—just as you have given an opportunity to Norfolk, for instance, by improving their harbor; just as you have given an opportunity to the people of the Northwest, of the East, the North, the South, and the West; and I hope much more will be done in that regard. But you also created a monopoly supplier, the TVA, where 6,000,000 people must look to the TVA for their power needs. They have no other agency to look to; no private industry to look to.

All over America there is one phrase that has a familiar sound: "shortage of power." What is being done about it? Purcell Smith testified before the subcommittee—it is in the hearings—that within the next 6 years the private utility concerns—and I applaud them for their efforts—have plans under way to augment their generating capacity by $6,000,000,000 worth of plant capacity. That is well and good, but what about the area of the Tennessee Valley, where you, the Congress of the United States, have said that we must look to this agency for our power? Demands have been growing there, too. When the TVA started, less than 1 farmer in 30 had electricity. We have made progress, yes—1 out of every 2 now has electricity. Five thousand new farmers are receiving electricity every month. Every time a 3-month period rolls around this year we are extending electricity to more farmers than had electricity in the entire Tennessee Valley before the TVA was created. Our power demand has increased by more than 1,000 percent. Now, are you going to place a lid on development? Are you going to stop the rural-electrification program in this area? Are you going to stop the lighting of veterans' homes? Are you going to say to the people, these 6,000,000 Americans, that although they must look to the TVA as the sole supplier of their electricity, we are not going to let the TVA increase their generating capacity—people of the TVA region, we are going to place a lid on your further development? Surely this Congress will not do that. I say "this Congress" because the American people rejected the bus-bar philosophy of the Eightieth Congress.

Before the TVA was created, the people in the Tennessee Valley paid 3 percent of the national income tax. Do you know what we paid last year? We paid 6 percent of the national income tax.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Chairman, as in the previous Congress, I am opposed to the granting of this appropriation to establish a huge steam-power plant in the TVA. The TVA was established to develop and protect the natural resources of the region but, as has been pointed out by friends of the TVA, its authority has been used to create a monopoly of power development. Today they use that argument to justify the necessity for the Government to go completely into the power business and to develop and furnish power for the territory regardless of the process of such development.

Advocates of the valley-authority idea are urging the establishment of other authorities, the first such proposals being the Columbia Valley Authority, which would include my district—the Second District of Idaho. Step by step they plan to blanket the whole United States with such authorities. Ostensibly these governments are for the purpose of integrating the development of the country on a more rapid and more efficient basis. But this growth of power monopoly in the TVA is a pattern and a warning for the rest of the country as to what a Federal monopoly it will expand.

Many of my colleagues have remarked that this item does not affect their territory, but I insist that it is only another step until their territory will be threatened with similar treatment. It is a fallacy to say that private industry would not furnish its own power if needed, provided it was assured that the Government would stop with the development of the natural resources. We need the Government to help develop our natural resources.

Of course, President Truman has asked the power to build and operate Federal factories where private industry fails to meet an enlarged demand. If it is to be the policy of our Government to crowd in on private industry and socialize it, then this new policy of building steam power plants points the way and accelerates the job. I am so thoroughly opposed to this item in the bill before us that I cannot bring myself to vote the benefits in the bill as long as this item remains. I cannot be a party to such a policy.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 86, noes 171.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TABER and Mr. RABAUT.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 105, noes 192.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION

CONSERVATION AND USE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND RESOURCES

For an additional amount for "Conservation and use of agricultural land resources," for formulating and carrying out programs under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, including cotton and wheat marketing quota programs, $9,734,500; and the limitation under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1949, on the amount available during the fiscal year 1949 for salaries and other administrative expenses, is increased from "$24,500,000" to "$34,234,500"; and the limitation under said head on the amount available for transfer to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938," is increased from "$7,000,000" to "$8,284,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, there are only about 4 more amendments to be considered. We think we can dispose of them with 10 minutes of debate each. I trust everyone will remain on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I now ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and that amendments to any portion of the bill not yet read be now in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to make a statement for the benefit of the House. As I stated yesterday, if the program that I have announced for the remainder of the week is completed by tomorrow night, I shall ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjorn until Monday. The next order of business will be the continuation of the export controls. There are also two resolutions with relation to investigations which I do not think will take very long.

Then there is a bill reported out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries relating to some of the activities of the Maritime Commission. My information is that there is no opposition to it. I make this statement to the membership so that my colleages will know what my intentions are if we dispose of this bill and the remainder of the legislative program.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 14, line 2 to 5, strike out the following: "and the limitations under said head on force account activities and on salaries and expenses in connection with informational work are hereby repealed."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my amendment is to retain in the present law the limitations on the amount of the appropriated funds that the Bonneville Power Administration can spend for force-account construction. Also the present law provides that only $50,000 can be spent for informational service.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. If your amendment is not adopted, then they can spend all of it for propaganda purposes; could they not?

Mr. JENSEN. That is right. They can also spend all the money that the Congress appropriates to construct projects by using day labor instead of following the regular governmental procedure of letting all its contracts to the lowest responsible bidder. The law at the present time limits the amount that can be spent by the Bonneville Power Administration for force account to 8 percent of the funds appropriated for each project. We placed that limitation in the law during the last session of the Eightieth Congress to safeguard the taxpayers of America against a program of hiring people by day labor to do these big construction jobs amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars each year. We had indications last year that that much of this work was to be done, more than ever before, by force account.

We felt it right and proper that a limitation of 8 percent should be placed on force account expenditures. In former years an average of only 5 percent had been spent for such construction purposes. The construction program of the Bonneville Power Administration has been going forward at a more rapid rate than ever before, during the last year and a half. Of course, it is a fact that the Eightieth Congress appropriated more money for transmission lines than had ever been appropriated before in the history of the Nation, not only for Bonneville, but also for the Bureau of Reclamation to expend. So it cannot be said that the Republican Party, which was in charge of the Eightieth Congress, was stingy with funds for needed transmission lines to take the power from federally owned and operated plants to load centers where the people, the REA, municipalities, and industries could come and get that power with their own lines, built with their own money as they should do.

The publicity limitation was placed in the bill last year to head off this great propaganda machine that has been built up in the Department of the Interior to such a degree that scores of their employees spent little time at the job they were supposed to do, but spent almost all of their time propagandizing for public power ownership, for a Columbia Basin Authority, for a Missouri Valley Authority, and for things which they were not paid to do, but which the Department permitted them to do. So we felt it right and proper and absolutely necessary to limit that kind of a program to $50,000.

I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has expired.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] has offered an amendment that relates to two distinct provisions in the bill. One refers to a limitation on the informational work of the Bonneville Administration, and the other refers to the force-account provision. These limitations interfere with the proper management of the agency.

The Bonneville Power Administration has done a real job in marketing the great power resources of the Pacific Northwest. There has been virtually no criticism of the work done by this great agency. We have one of the greatest power-resource areas in the entire United States located in the Northwest. In fact, about one-third of all the potential hydroelectric power in America is in the Pacific Northwest. Obviously they cannot do the job if they are to be hamstrung by limitations.

During the last Congress a limitation of $12,500 was placed on all informational work of the Bonneville Power Administration, which includes all personnel of every kind. The Director of the Bonneville Administration would like additional funds to properly carry on the work commensurate with this vast undertaking. He has the problem of dealing with both private and public utilities. He is trying to do a good job under difficult circumstances. The private utilities today can spend thousands and thousands of dollars, not only here in Washington but throughout the country in propaganda work of all kinds. They have a paid lobbyist here in Washington, D. C., by the name of Purcell Smith, who draws a salary of $65,000 a year. Certainly it is high time that the public interest be adequately and fairly protected.

Let me turn to the other item, the force-account provision. Our committee is agreed that the work being done in the Pacific Northwest by Bonneville Power Administration and the Bureau of Reclamation should be done by private contractors. The truth is that prior to the placing of this limitation in the Bonneville appropriation approximately 5 percent of all the work was done on force account. In the last Congress an 8-percent limitation was written into the bill.

As long as the force-account limitation remains in the bill the private contractors have an unfair bargaining advantage over the Government. With the limitation removed the contractors will be forced to submit reasonable bids, lest the Government undertake to do the work by force account. Our committee feels very strongly that the limitation should be removed. We are not in disagreement regarding the right of private contractors to do the work; the question is, Is this the right approach by placing a limitation on the Administrator? The committee feels it is the wrong approach and not in the public interest.

It is unworkable if we expect a businesslike operation of the Bonneville Power Administration. I hope the committee will vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 63, noes 116.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask permission to extend my remarks. I take this time not to offer an amendment, but to read a telegram which has just been handed me. This is the telegram:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *February 16, 1949.*

Hon. JOHN R. MURDOCK,

*House of Representatives:*

Navajo schools will close March 15 unless $550,000 for operation approved by Budget Bureau is reinstated in H. R. 2632, deficiency bill now before the House. Urge you take immediate action to avert this calamity, considering only tragic emergency in lives of thousands of Navajo children.

ASSOCIATION ON AMERICAN INDIAN AFFAIRS,
OLIVER LAFARGE, *President.*

Mr. Chairman, this telegram comes too late, under the parliamentary situation, to remedy the defect, if such it be, in the finishing of the present bill. But I do want to comment on the educational situation of these Indians in general for the benefit of the Committee.

The whole public has been aroused with regard to the tragic conditions of the Navajo Indians. Congress appropriated generously a year ago for the relief of the Navajo and Hopi Indians, for which I am grateful in their behalf. But in the last Congress when we were considering authorization and appropriations for the Navajo and Hopi Indians I pointed out that what was even more important was a long-range development program for these sixty-five or seventy thousand Indians. Repeatedly I have called attention to the situation on the Navajo Reservation. Probably 20 times during the 12 years that I have been here, on the floor of this House or in committee meetings, I have called attention to a bad situation which needs remedying.

The Navajo Reservation is as large as the entire State of West Virginia, mostly situated on a high plateau. It has very few roads that are passable 6 months of the year. With 22,000 children of school age, not more than 6,000 of whom have ever been to school, their educational needs are among their greatest needs. Their leaders have repeatedly called for schools and hospitals over and above other petitions on vital matters.

I fear too many serious-minded citizens do not understand the immensity of this educational problem. I hear gentlemen speaking of "turning the Indians loose" and assuming that their children can go to school in the States where they live and that their education will be amply provided. Now, these are full-blood Indians, mostly classified as wild Indians. They have long been neglected by the Government and the appropriations made have been woefully inadequate. Without assessing blame on whoever is to be blamed, I cite a fact. This Navajo case is the most serious problem in connection with the whole American Indian question. The present item, important as it is, is a minor point, but I felt I would be derelict in my duty if I did not call it to your atention.

Mr. Chairman, it is too late in the reading of the bill to make further comment. I do not know the justification the service offered for the full budget amount, but I do know that there is a dire and lasting emergency among those Indian people and I have taken this moment to call it to the attention of the Committee.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Chairman, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has asked for an additional amount of $385,000 for welfare of Indians for the remaining months of the current fiscal year. I am pleased to note that the committee has provided the full amount in this deficiency bill.

I wish to point out that this deficiency request was made several weeks ago before the Bureau of Indian Affairs or anyone else was aware of the emergency situation which has been created by the unusually severe January weather in the West. The suffering of Indians on many reservations has been acute as the result of the recent blizzards, and the need for additional welfare funds is much greater now than it was at the time this supplemental request was made.

I am unofficially informed that the welfare account of the Indian Bureau contained $106 as of last Friday. The small reserve which the Bureau had as of January 1 has been exhausted by the allocations required for blizzard areas. Reservations in North and South Dakota have been particularly hard hit. The Bureau has made available a total of $29,800 for the Crow Creek, Rosebud, Pine Ridge, Sisseton, Turtle Mountain, Standing Rock reservations in these States. In addition, the State of North Dakota has made available $12,000 for the relief of the Indians at Turtle Mountain and local citizens and civic groups in the Dakotas and Montana have contributed to the assistance of these Indians.

In addition to these amounts, I am advised that the sum of $50,000 from the President's emergency funds was allocated to Indian relief and has been expended.

Before the January storms began, the Indian Bureau had found that heavy snows in some areas and drought conditions in others had reduced employment opportunities for Indians. In addition, assistance payments have risen due to increased living costs. As a result, the rate of expenditures for welfare of Indians has been considerably higher this year than formerly. The months from January to June usually impose the heaviest burden on Indian relief and assistance funds. It is estimated that 16,000 persons will require assistance during the remainder of this fiscal year. With these facts in mind, it is obvious that the full amount of the appropriation requested by the Indian Bureau is required to fulfill our obligations to the Indians.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Welfare of Indians: "For an additional amount for welfare of Indians, $385,000: *Provided*, That after the approval of this act no payment shall be made from this appropriation to Indians who are eligible for benefit payments under the Social Security Act."

The purpose of this estimate is to provide additional funds for assistance to needy Indans except those who are members of the Navajo and Hopi tribes and those who are eligible for benefit payments under the Social Security Act. Heavy snows and low temperatures in many areas and drought in other areas have resulted in a reduction in employment opportunities for many able-bodied Indians and in hardship to unemployables. In addition, there has been an upward adjustment of assistance payments to meet increased living costs.

For the current fiscal year, Congress appropriated $472,710 for "Welfare of Indians" of which amount $229,756 was earmarked for direct assistance. Our estimate was in the amount of $750,000 with an allowance of $492,367 for direct assistance. The reduction in the appropriation resulted in a cut of $262,611 for direct assistance.

Through November 30, 1948, 10,954 persons have been given assistance at an average monthly rate of $13.81 per person. This is an increase of 4,305 persons in the same period of the last fiscal year, and an increase in the average grant per person of $2.95. It must be recognized that the months of January to June constitute the period of greatest need until work becomes available. During those months in 1948, assistance was given to 33,338 persons. Our superintendents estimate that during the six remaining months of this fiscal year 16,000 persons will require assistance. It should be noted that these estimates were prepared prior to the recent blizzards in the West, and no doubt the number of Indians asking for assistance has increased very materially.

The sum of $297,017 of the appropriation of $472,710 has been expended up to December 31, 1948, thus leaving $175,693 available for all purposes for the remainder of the year. Of the $175,693 remaining, approximately $100,000 will be required to meet certain fixed charges, including payment of boarding home care, care of juvenile delinquents, burials, contracts, and salary and expenses of personnel. This leaves about $75,000 for giving relief or direct assistance which is entirely inadequate to meet the needs of an estimated 16,000 persons for the remaining 6 months of the year. Of the amount expended to December 31, 1948, namely, $297,017, $208,763 was used for giving relief to Indians, and $88,254 for all other purposes.

With few exceptions, the needy Indian is solely dependent on the Federal Government for direct assistance. Funds appropriated by Congress or tribal funds either authorized by Congress or under the immediate control of the tribe are used to give assistance to those physically handicapped, dependent or deserted families, those not yet eligible for old-age assistance, those unemployed for various reasons, and others who must be helped in time of need.

On many jurisdictions the resources are inadequate to support the population. Despite our efforts to induce employable Indians to leave the reservation for outside work, it is and has not been possible to decrease the relief load. Even though work is available, there are times and circumstances when the Indian cannot leave the reservation to accept it because of lack of housing, lack of skills to perform the type of work required, or because the earnings are not sufficient to support the individual or members of his family. Again, most of the work available to the Indians is seasonal, such as harvesting of crops, picking of fruit, road work, etc. Such opportunities usually provide employment for 2 or 4 months, and the earnings and savings are not sufficient to meet the needs of the family for the remainder of the year, especially when the Indian lives in that portion of the country, as many do, where the winters are long and cold, and where work is not available again until late spring. When the average period of employment is less than 18 weeks during the year and the average weekly earnings are about $37, or a total of $666 for the year, many families cannot support themselves on a 12-month basis, and assistance from the Government during the long, cold winter is necessary.

State welfare departments recognize the fact that the cost of living has gone up, and State budgets, which we attempt to follow within the funds available, have been increased upward. Increase in grants in line with State procedures and standards reduces the available funds for giving relief, especially when the amount requested was reduced and the amount initially appropriated is inadequate. A month-by-month comparison of the case load of the larger agencies sharing in this appropriation shows a substantial increase in the number of relief clients, which fact is also responsible for a heavier demand on available funds.

Reports from the field, including newspaper reports, indicate that the Indians in

many areas are confronted with severe winter weather, heavy snows, and low temperatures, that work has terminated, and that many Indians had only short periods of employment, and in some areas, due to mechanization of the farm, hand labor has been sharply curtailed. Drought in other areas has seriously affected employment. Consequently demands for assistance have increased and are increasing. Information presented by our superintendents, dependent upon this appropriation, show that during the months from February to June 1949, inclusive, in excess of 13,500 Indians will need to be assisted.

Not only does the Indian Service give direct assistance to the needy but it is called upon to meet the cost of placing Indian children in boarding homes and in institutions, burial of indigents, and to give other types of service and assistance.

Of the amount requested, $10,000 is to cover salary increases due to Public Law 900.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 15, lines 3 to 11, strike out the entire paragraph.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, this is an almost identical amendment to the one we just voted on and I shall not make any further comment upon it after the defeat of the last amendment for I know this amendment will meet the same fate.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: On page 16, line 8, beginning with the word "*Provided*", strike out the provision in lines 8 to 16, inclusive.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I have just offered is to keep in the law which was passed last year certain limitations, the first being a limitation of $7,800,000 which we permitted the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation to spend for engineering services. That amount provided for over 1,800 engineers. Because of this limitation it was necessary for them to take a few engineers off the pay roll in the Denver office. Of course, as usual they were shifted to some other department of the Department of the Interior. A few of them got good jobs with private industry I am pleased to report.

The next part of the amendment is to strike out a limitation of $48,000,000 which we placed in the law last year, which was the amount that could be spent for administrative personnel hire for the whole Department of the Interior. The year before they had spent $45,000,000-plus for personal service and administrative expenditures. But, we expanded the construction program last year. We thought we were liberal and we limited the Department to $48,000,000. Now they say they must have a lot more, and want no limitation placed on them whatever. If we want to let them run wild and get nothing done, why this is a good way to do it; just turn them loose to spend and waste the taxpayers' dollars.

The next part of the amendment is a limitation which was placed in the law last year of 3,500 employees that could draw salaries above CAF–9 and P–3, salaries amounting to $4,100 or more. We limited them to 3,500 employees who could draw more than that. They had had something like 3,300. So, we thought we were liberal there. Now they say these limitations have almost brought destruction to the Bureau of Reclamation.

I hope the Members who want to get jobs done in the West, like all the rest of us do, who want the departments of Government to carry on in a sound businesslike manner and earn their money and not squander the taxpayers' money, will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JENSEN) there were—ayes 62, noes 117.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WADSWORTH: On page 16, line 17, strike out the entire paragraph to and including page 17, line 4.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and half by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, of course, I will be entirely frank with my friends on the Democratic side and say to them that I expect this amendment will be greeted with a roar of "noes." Yet I desire to call to their attention some facts. I desire to call to their serious attention these facts, and I do it in no partisan spirit whatsoever. I think it will be conceded by a fairly good number of my Democratic friends that I have not been overpartisan in my behavior in this House of Representatives during the last 18 years. The language which I seek to strike out is that found on page 16, and continuing on page 17, which, in effect, states that the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Assistant Commissioner and the regional director shall, each of them, have had 5 years' engineering and administrative experience. That provision was put in the law last year on motion made by Congressman ELLIOTT, a Democrat, from California. Upon yesterday in a talk extending about 22 minutes I attempted to give the background of that legislation. In doing so I made a series of statements with respect to the behavior of the Commissioner of Reclamation, Mr. Straus, and a certain regional director, Mr. Boke. Every one of those statements was founded upon incontrovertible evidence—every one of them. Some of the evidence came from the official correspondence of the Reclamation office; some of it came from the utterances made publicly by officials of the Reclamation Service, and some of it came from the sworn testimony delivered on the witness stand before our investigating committee by those officials themselves. What did the evidence show? Briefly, first, that the Reclamation Service in handling the Central Valley project undertaking deliberately ignored the intent of the Congress. The regional director of that project admitted that the course they pursued did not follow the intent of the Congress.

Secondly, they deliberately deceived the Congress with respect to the financial condition of the Central Valley project, giving the Congress no warning whatsoever, keeping it a secret that they intended to spend the entire year's fund in 6 months, which they did. And, finally, at a meeting of the members of this Reclamation Service at Salt Lake City, the Chief Engineer of the whole Service admitted that in evading the intent of Congress with respect to the discharge of certain employees, they had perjured themselves.

This is, in short, a list of their offenses. I confess that as a member of that committee I was shocked that men in the employ of the Government in positions of high responsibility should behave in such fashion. That is the way they behaved.

As I said a moment ago, the evidence is documentary and incontrovertible.

Now, I am not appealing to this committee on partisan lines. I am appealing to the members of this committee to see to it that a rebuke is administered for that kind of conduct. This provision was put into the law last year at the instance of a Democratic Member and it will have no deleterious effect upon the administration of the Reclamation Service.

I might remind you that in the long, long career of the Reclamation Service, which has been highly creditable until 2 years ago when these people came in, all but one of the Commissioners of Reclamation has been an engineer, and every single regional director, up to this particular point, has been an engineer.

I suggest to my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle that they vote to keep this Government clean.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this language was put into the bill last year at the behest of the chairman of the subcommittee investigating expenditures and propaganda in the Government. The chairman of that subcommittee, Mr. Harness, is not working with us any more. He was defeated last year. The other, a Democratic member at that time, chose not to run.

They tell you in this language that the Commissioner of Reclamation must be an engineer. Let us look into this.

In the year 1923, when the private utilities, if you will, tried to make the greatest steal that was ever attempted in this country, the project then known as Muscle Shoals, Wilson Dam—the Nation was shocked. Why? Because the engineer who at that time was Commissioner of Reclamation, backed up the committee and the people and told the people the truth. The head of the Reclamation Service at that particular time was an engineer, and was recognized as one of the three greatest engineers in America.

That is what you had in 1923. What did they do in this House at that time? They passed a law then discharging that man because he was not an administrator. He was an engineer. Now, what did you do last year? Because the Commissioner of Reclamation defended the public and the American people, the Eightieth Congress passed a law discharging him because he was not an engineer.

Now, what is the truth? You cut the bill 47 percent in the first session of the Eightieth Congress. Of course the funds lasted only 6 months. Anyone knows that and can understand why. The contractors were going to finish it in 6 months. It would not run over a year. I told you that in the committee. I spoke in this House and I said it will come back to haunt you if you cut it 47 percent. They cut it, and they slowed up the work and what I said came true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the gentleman recollect that the appropriation made for the Central Valley Authority was exactly the same figure as that requested by the President of the United States?

Mr. KIRWAN. Perhaps it was, but I am telling you what went on on this floor. When you cut that bill 47 percent, certainly they ran out of work. Construction had to stop. Now you have got an attorney pressing a claim here against the Government of the United States for $850,000 for stopping that contractor and running out of work, and not living up to the contract. That is what went on in America year before last.

Now, let us look at the Congress. Long before they ever had a President or saw a bureaucrat, the Congress was here; the Continental Congress.

Let us see if they practice what they preach. In the year 1947 there came to this House a man wearing the Congressional Medal of Honor—and others have down through the 165 years or so of this Congress—a graduate of Annapolis, one of the greatest heroes we ever had. Everyone thought he would be placed on the Committee on Naval Affairs; but, no, he went on the Committee on Agriculture. So it has been many times that people were put on committees without reference to their qualification to serve on committees.

But remember, back in 1923 the effort was made to discharge the commissioner who was an engineer because he was not an administrator.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. And also involved last year was the attempt of certain big interests to get rid of these two men because they were fighting for the principles established by Congress.

Mr. KIRWAN. The gentleman is correct.

Yesterday the gentleman from New York complained saying they petitioned the Congress and the press petitioned the Congress for those men. Who would they petition but the Congress? That is provided for in the Constitution. I certainly would have objected had they petitioned the British Parliament.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KIRWAN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to tell the House that the present Commissioner of Reclamation, Mike Straus, was inducted into the Blackfeet Tribe in Montana last July 10 and was given the title "Engineer of the Wilderness." I submit that the awarding of this degree qualifies him for the position he now holds.

Mr. KIRWAN. Yes; and he has made a good engineer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WADSWORTH) there were—ayes 87, noes 136.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Page 17, line 9, after the word "Idaho", strike out "$300,000" and insert "$350,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of offering this amendment increasing the amount from $300,000 to $350,000 is, in the first place, to insert the amount that was recommended in the budget, and it also carries out a program that has been worked up by the water users of the Lewiston Orchards irrigation district and the Department of the Interior. If we do not add this amount now, it will simply increase the cost and delay the construction of this project.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to read to the Members a statement from the manager of the Lewiston Orchards irrigation district, as follows:

It is going to be a difficult operation to install our new pipe because of the interruption of service to 1,100 houses and small farms. Then we have the problem of trying to maintain the old rotting wooden pipe with heavy equipment working on or near it. Now that we have once started to tear things up, it would be a tragedy to have an interruption in the construction program. But the people here have experienced consistent aid from you, and they are confident that the appropriation will be forthcoming.

It was understood and agreed that the budget amount would be appropriated.

Mr. Chairman, it would be poor economy to cut off $50,000 just as a matter of economy, because now that the work has started, it should be carried to completion.

I wish to read at this time a telegram received from the secretary of the Lewiston Orchards Active Business Men's Association, as follows:

We wish to ask your assistance for reinstating the $50,000 cut from the Lewiston Orchards supplementary appropriations. We feel this cut would delay construction program.

Mr. Chairman, I have another telegram from the manager of the Lewiston Orchards irrigation district, as follows:

Was notified supplemental appropriations for Lewiston Orchards was cut $50,000. This will again delay our project. Please help us get this restored.

Mr. Chairman, to give you a reason for the urgency of asking for this appropriation or that the additional amount be included, I read from a statement of the Lewiston Orchards project, as follows:

When the fiscal year 1949 appropriation requests were made, final designs had not been completed, and therefore an accurate estimate was impossible. All materials, such as steel and asbestos cement, pipe, valves, and other miscellaneous pipe fittings, have considerably increased in cost from a year ago. Construction bids received have been considerably higher than estimated.

All piping and valves have been ordered, and contracts for both the main pipe line and the distribution system have been awarded. In order to continue these contracts to completion without interruption, supplemental funds in fiscal year 1949 are required. Without additional funds, construction of the badly needed water-treatment plant must be postponed until fiscal year 1950.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the Members of the House to accept my amendment and vote back this small amount in order to complete the program. It is poor economy to cut the amount when it was in the program originally. This money is reimbursable and is to be repaid by these people pursuant to contract entered into with the Bureau of Reclamation. I again ask the Members of the House to support my amendment to add this additional amount, bringing it back to the original sum in the budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have up for consideration today the first deficiency appropriation bill for 1949. This bill contains items for construction, operation, and maintenance for the Bonneville power transmission system in the sum of $7,500,000. Included in these items are sums for the main grid system to carry Grand Coulee power into the coastal load centers of Washington and Oregon, particularly the Puget Sound area and the Portland area, and items for the maintenance of work schedules on facilities for service within the Puget Sound area. These projects have heretofore been authorized and in 1948 appropriations were made for them. However, the actual cost of the construction of the transmission lines and facilities is approximately 20 percent greater than was estimated at the time the appropriations were made. It is apparent, therefore, that it will be absolutely impossible to complete these lines which are under construction, on schedule, with the money which was appropriated last year. If they are to be completed on time additional funds must be appropriated by this bill.

May I say to my colleagues that the completion of these and other key supply lines for the Puget Sound area is a matter of vital concern to the people of my area. During recent months there has been a definite shortage of power in the Pacific Northwest. There has been a considerable voluntary curtailment of use of power by the people. Notwithstanding this fact the demands for power are such that if they are not soon met the entire economy of the area will be seriously affected. Not only is the present situation serious but there is also urgent need for increased power in the months and years ahead. The Bonneville Power Administration is hard-put to keep up with its proposed schedules. If this deficiency appropriation is not granted the whole program will be handicapped and bogged down. May I say parenthetically that if the economy of the Pacific Northwest is affected so will that of the entire country. I trust that the Members will not view this matter as a particularly local issue. This is a Federal project which we in Congress have authorized and is one which we should push to completion according to schedule and as rapidly as possible. I trust that you will vote favorably upon this appropriation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, now that the Indians have made Mike Straus Engineer of the Wilderness, I want to revert back to the subject of Indians. I am going to make it brief.

Mr. Chairman, in the enactment of this deficiency bill, this Congress is being asked, without being fully advised as to the consequences, to make a most important policy decision affecting three States, the States of New Mexico and Arizona on the one hand, and the "Navajo-Hopi Reservation state," which comprises some 25,000 square miles equal in area to the States of Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island, all put together, on the other.

Since the enactment of this bill as now written will have serious repercussions in our dealings with the Indians, I hope the House will bear with me if I discuss the situation briefly.

At the outset, I must say that at every turn it has been the Indian Office in charge of these affairs which is responsible for these errors, and that the Congress cannot be blamed except perhaps for our failure to demand and obtain full and complete information. Even in that respect the Congress has done all it can in attempting to so demand information from the Indian Office, as I will point out in the course of my discussion. In the report of the committee on this very bill, the committee has reprimanded the Indian Office in the following strong terms which I quote:

> The committee will not here recount its comments on the maladministration in the Bureau of Indian Affairs brought to light in its report on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1949. However, it does wish to serve notice that such testimony and lack of knowledge on the part of officials representing this service will not be tolerated in the future. Present funds available for the education program are adequate to meet requirements until at least the 1st of April and the committee will consider the matter further only when it is able to secure firm data on which to base a judgment.
>
> The committee is fully aware of the responsibilities of the Government to the Indians resident on reservations and is more than anxious to provide every dollar needed to discharge fully not only the recognized legal obligations, but also those obligations which humanitarian instincts dictate. It does not appear, however, that more than a passive appreciation of these problems is manifest by those whose responsibility it is to administer the laws passed by the Congress.

As early as June 1946 I appeared before the Committee on Appropriations to point out the intolerable and shameful situation existing in the Navajo-Hopi Reservation. I explained to the committee that though we understood the need for immediate action, my office had not the facilities to present facts and figures in detail, but that I was sure the Indian Office had done so. I quote a part of the record to show that the Indian Office seemed to be wholly unaware of the necessity for presenting the facts to the committee:

> Mr. FERNANDEZ * * * I appear before this committee today not asking anything for the voters of my State. I appear for the voteless and voiceless Indians of the Navajo country and their children. The situation with respect to the education of the children of the Navajo Indians is deplorable. The people of the State, all over the State, not only around the Navajo country but all over the State, are alarmed. I think it has reached, in my opinion, the proportions of a public scandal.
>
> I appear here more with a plea than as a witness. I assume that the facts have been carefully set out before the committee by the Office of Indian Affairs.
>
> Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to you right here that the committee has not been fully advised.

Shortly after the clamor for investigations grew so loud that magazines and newspapers sent correspondents to that area, and as a result of the findings made by those writers and by some subcommittees of the House and Senate half a million dollars was appropriated in a supplemental bill in the spring of 1948 to handle the situation until the 1st of July of that year. Added to that appropriation, the Red Cross made available an additional $100,000. Civic and charitable organizations and individual citizens undertook to send charity bundles to the reservation. All of these moneys and all of this help was used within that fiscal year, and it was not enough. Yet, in the face of that experience, when the Indian Office appeared before the committee asking for appropriations for the fiscal year 1949 they requested only $120,000.

When the bill came to this body I called the attention of the Congress to the situation, and I said:

> I am duty bound to call attention of the House to the fact that although the committee approved every cent that was asked for the Navajo Indians for welfare work, $120,000, that, in my opinion, is not enough. The Department asked for only $120,000 and I am not blaming the committee for not allowing more; but the fact is that in this Congress year after year the Indian Office has not asked for near enough for that purpose. Consequently, last year, as you will recall, we had to appropriate supplemental funds to the tune of $500,000. That is going to happen again. I hope that by the time the bill gets to conference the committee will have the true facts presented independently of the Indian Office if necessary and that proper provision is timely made. The Indian Office in Washington may not know that they are insufficient—apparently they do not; but the superintendent of the reservation and all those who work in the reservation or have studied conditions out there know that $120,000 is not going to take care of the situation on the Navajo Indian Reservation. It seems that year after year a ceiling is placed on the total they can request, and the Washington Indian Office takes it out on the item of welfare and relief for Indians. It is time that somebody in that Office had the courage to tell Congress what the superintendent out there tells us but is not allowed to tell Congress. I am tired of this, and have come to the conclusion that the reservation should be placed out of the hands of the Indian Office.

That bill went to the Senate and the Senate in its wisdom increased the appropriation for welfare by $750,000, making a total of $870,000, as I understand the record. In conference, the sum of $500,000 was agreed upon for welfare of the Navajo-Hopi Indians and the conference committee said in its report to the Indian Office:

> Conferees request that the Indian Bureau submit a report to the Congress early in the next regular session on conditions as to the general welfare of the Navajo and Hopi Indians.

It appears now that this demand on the part of the House through its conferees has been wantonly ignored. So far as I can find, no such report has been made. On the contrary, they came to the subcommittee handling this deficiency bill and they came wholly unprepared to answer the simplest questions. They requested funds for only three main

items: First, $300,000 for increases in salaries under Public Law 900, which is self-explanatory; second, $550,000 to prevent closing of the schools on the Navajo-Hopi Reservation; and, third, $385,000 for the welfare of Indians.

With respect to the item for schools they were so utterly confused and unprepared to answer that the committee very properly, in my opinion, refused to make a guess as to what they should be allowed for that in this deficiency bill. As to the item for welfare of Indians, they were as utterly confused and even more so. A reading of the hearings will convince anyone that the committee was completely disgusted with their presentation. They were requested to come back the next day and did no better. The subcommittee, nevertheless, in its anxiety to prevent human suffering, chose to err on the side of humanity and granted the full $385,000.

At the hearing of the main committee I undertook to congratulate the committee on its wisdom and generosity, notwithstanding the poor showing, in allowing this amount for welfare relief of Indians, and then for the first time, to my dismay and consternation, I found that not one dime of that money goes to either the Hopi or the Navajo Indians; that not one dime had been asked for that purpose and that only $60,000 included in the item designated as "Agency services" had been requested. Turning to the testimony, I find, on page 178, the statement with respect to that request, which is as follows:

Mr. PROVINSE. This is an emergency item which was brought about by the fact that many of the families that we had succeeded in obtaining employment for off of the reservation were cut off of their jobs because of the snow in southern California and southern Arizona. * * *

* * * So this item was put in to cover the needs of those families who are trickling back to the reservation who are employable but who have no resources.

Both the States of New Mexico and Arizona directly and through the press in the months of December and January have been told that all welfare funds appropriated for the Navajo-Hopi Reservation have been exhausted and that they must take care of the Indians under social security. The States of New Mexico and Arizona in an attempt to begin processing cases as best they can, though without funds with which to pay them, agreed early last year to process such applications as were referred to them and to certify them for payments by the Indian Office out of the half-million dollars made available by Congress, and this has been done to date. New Mexico and Arizona, since that agreement was reached, nearly a year ago, have certified 44 cases involving a little over a hundred individuals, on which about $3,800 has been paid. Two or three times that many have been referred back to the Indian Office for further investigation, and, mind you, these were to be paid not by the State but from the half-million dollars made available for that purpose by this Congress. Who has taken care of the rest of the thousands of other indigents, and where has the balance of the half-million dollars gone? If those funds are now exhausted, who is going to process and pay them?

Under date of February 4, 1949, the Secretary of the Interior addressed a letter to me, in which he says:

This is to inform you that due to the exhaustion of available funds, I have been forced to notify our superintendents in New Mexico that no further allotments will be made them to make cash grants to those Indians whose applications for categorical assistance have been approved by the county welfare boards.

If those funds are exhausted, it was the duty of the Indian Office to so tell this Congress. Not one word was said about it to the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee.

I have now come to the point which makes this bill so important and so significant insofar as it affects the obligation of the Federal Government toward these unfortunate people.

To the two items of appropriations for the Indian Office on page 14 of the bill there are attached two innocent-looking provisos which appear for the first time in any appropriation bill. They were placed there in conformity with the language requested of the Bureau and followed by that Bureau.

The first item of $360,000 for agency services for the Navajo-Hopi Indians consists of $300,000 for increase of salaries under Public Law 900 and $60,000 for the relief of Navajo Indians. The testimony at the hearings makes it crystal clear that this amount of $60,000 is for able-bodied unemployed Indians who have been discharged from employment in California and elsewhere and are being repatriated, so to speak, to the reservation. The second item of $385,000 is for the welfare of Indians aside from the Navajo and Hopis, but including 20 other reservations in New Mexico comprising 15,000 Indians, and 6 in Arizona, comprising 20,000 Indians. Under the proviso, none of these monies can be made available to the blind, the aged, and dependent children.

I am not going to move to strike out these provisos because as I have repeatedly stated, so far as my State is concerned, it can in one way or another, take care of the 20 reservations other than the Navajos in the State of New Mexico, insofar as social-security payments for the aged, the blind, and the dependent children are concerned.

But I do want to call the attention of this Congress to the fact that these provisos were placed in the bill in a determined and direct attempt to force New Mexico and Arizona to take over the impossible burden of processing and footing all the needs of all the blind, the aged, and the dependent children in the Navajo reservation. Following that extreme and drastic policy, they have not requested any appropriations for the balance of this year to take care of those unfortunate people.

With all the power of the Federal Security Administrator to investigate and to enforce compliance by the States of New Mexico and Arizona, the officials in the executive department concerned have chosen rather this cruel and drastic course. Everyone who has looked into the situation has had to admit that it is a physical impossibility for either of the two States to carry on the processing and paying of social security to these unfortunate people until, by a gradual process which will take months and months and perhaps years, the two States can work out a system for the processing of those cases under the standards set for the balance of the State.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Does the gentleman mean that there is no money in this bill whatever for the aid of Navajo and Hopi Indians?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Absolutely not one dime for the aid of the blind, the aged, and the dependent children. The $60,000 is only for those who were employed in California and were discharged, as the record fully shows, and this proviso makes it impossible to use any of that money for the Navajo blind, the aged, and dependent children; the proviso was placed there specifically for that purpose.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman also knows that this request for funds for the Indians did not come before the regular subcommittee which deals with Indian problems, the Interior Department.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It did not.

Mr. JENSEN. Consequently, the gentlemen who did handle it did not have all the facts which they should have had in order to appropriate and act properly on this matter.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is absolutely correct. This item came before the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee. I am not blaming the Deficiency Appropriations Subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations. I am blaming the people who ought to be blamed, and that is the Indian Office that has again, as in the past it has again and again and again, failed to tell this Congress the true story about the Navajo Reservation.

Mr. JENSEN. Is not the gentleman going to offer an amendment to include the Hopis and the Navajos in this overall appropriation that we are making here today for Indians?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I would not offer an amendment to that effect, because that would be unfair to the other Indians outside of the Navajo Reservation. This money has been appropriated for the other Indians outside the Navajo Reservation, and the Navajo Reservation has been cut off at the pockets in order to punish Arizona and New Mexico. The Indian Office and the Bureau of the Budget, and all those responsible for this shortsighted and cruel policy, are putting this Congress in a most untenable position, one which will go down in history as unworthy of this great House.

The legislature in the State of New Mexico is now in session, but even if it found the money to increase those funds for that purpose, those funds would not be available before the end of this fiscal year. As shown by the number of cases so far certified in the attempt of the two States to take over this burden, the peremptory saddling of this burden on these two States, so far as the Navajo-Hopi Reservation is concerned, will be a

tragedy of the first magnitude for the unfortunate Navajo and Hopi Indians.

New Mexico is and has been at all times able, willing, and ready to undertake that burden as to the 20 other pueblos and reservations within its borders, comprising some 15,000 Indians. I am certain that Arizona is able to undertake that burden insofar as it affects the six reservations, other than the Hopi-Navajo people, constituting approximately 20,000 Indians. It will be an exceedingly heavy burden on these two sparsely settled States with small resources, but it would not be a tragedy to the Indians as in the case of the Navajos.

Insofar as the Navajo-Hopi Reservation is concerned, however, the task is, I repeat, physically impossible. The result will be that only a few of these will be paid, and those cases will probably be situated on the outer edges of the reservation, whereas the Indians who need it most within the interior of the reservation will go uncared for and unnoticed. There are no towns or villages in the 25,000 square miles of reservation, which, as I have said before, is equivalent to the area of Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, Delaware, and Rhode Island put together. The State has no place for a staff to live in and contact the needy cases within the interior of the reservation, such as the Indian Office necessarily has; the reservation consists of 25,000 square miles of wilderness populated by Indians living in hogans and moving about with their hogans constantly. The Navajo Reservation in point of Indian population, with its 60,000 Indians, is 6 times larger than the largest reservation anywhere in the country. The next largest is the Consolidated Chippewa in Minnesota with 10,570, according to the report of the Department for 1945, page 80. The next in order are in South Dakota, Pine Ridge with 9,029, and Rosebud with 8,532; and the next in population is the Kiowa in Oklahoma with 7,780.

The States of New Mexico and Arizona have absolutely no jurisdiction over the Indian population within the reservation. Marriages and divorces are not subject to the State law. The Indian Office records are inadequate even to check up on the legitimate children, much less on the rampant illegitimacy throughout the reservation. This Government has completely failed these Indians in the most rudimentary of their social needs, and now they propose we slough off the whole mess to the States of New Mexico and Arizona.

This blow is aimed at those States, but it will fall on the Indians. This tragedy may teach New Mexico and Arizona a lesson—and I think that is the purpose—but it will cost the Federal Government far more money than the present arrangement, unsatisfactory as it is, and it will not do the job. The Indian Service of necessity has to have personnel over the reservation in processing the able-bodied and other noneligible indigents, and in its Indian placement services, its health service, its soil-conservation service, and so forth, and, of necessity, has contact, unsatisfactory as that is, with the Indians in the interior of the reservation. It would be far better if the relief to the blind, the aged, and dependent children were administered by them as at present.

This bill is the first nail in the coffin of many hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of destitute, blind, aged, and needy children. It is another big nail in the skeleton closet of the shameful history of neglect and mistreatment of the Navajo Indians which they have consistently endured, notwithstanding the promises made to them when they were released from their imprisonment camp at Fort Sumner.

After the Government has completely failed in rehabilitating the Indians, completely failed in the passage of the long-term program recommended by both the Senate and House committees last year, we are now asked to take the first step in salving our conscience by turning these unfortunate humans over to inadequately equipped States for care.

I want to say at this point that I again lay the blame for the failure of the bill last year to the officials in the Indian Office. This bill, after it had been reported by both the House and Senate and actually passed by the Senate, was killed because of an adverse report from the Indian Office. When that adverse report came before the committee I took the floor and described the situation in language as strong and as clear as my humble efforts could produce. That statement, made on June 8, 1948, beginning at page 7477 of the RECORD for the second session of the Eightieth Congress, is as follows:

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I heartily commend the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH], chairman of the Public Lands Committee, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART], chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee as well as the Republican steering committee, for their decision Friday to push enactment of the Navajo Indian legislation before Congress adjourns. Following their action Friday, it was my understanding that the Navajo bill would be called up today under unanimous consent or by a suspension of the rules. Though the primary election is in progress in New Mexico today, I flew back to Washington yesterday, only to find this morning that the Indian Office has filed an adverse report to the D'Ewart bill.

I have heretofore restrained myself because of my affection for Secretary Krug and Under Secretary Warne, who are sincere men, but this action on the part of the Indian Office shocks me beyond further restraint. I must speak out. Is it possible that the Indian Office is more interested in putting this Congress on the spot so that it can be blamed for failure to act? I do not believe in playing politics at the expense of hungry and destitute people.

The bill reported out by the committee is right in line with Secretary Krug's recommendations. It authorizes the full $25,000,000 requested for the construction of schools, school dormitories and other educational facilities. It authorizes $100,000 per year to promote employment of Navajo Indians off the reservation; it authorizes $250,000 per year for the relief of disabled and dependent Navajo Indians; it authorizes $228,000 for health improvement, and $1,000,000 per year for the construction of roads. All of this is right in line with the recommendations of Secretary Krug.

True, this does not at one stroke authorize the entire 10-year $90,000,000 program, and because it does not do so the Indian Office objects to the enactment of this bill. This arbitrary and dilatory attitude is unreasonable and likely to result in no action at all.

Heretofore in the summer of 1946, nearly $1,000,000 was appropriated for the building of two Navajo schools. To this date, not a handful of dirt has been turned and not a nail has been driven in the construction of those two schools. Chicago architects were hired, as if there were none competent in New Mexico and Arizona, and the whole matter is still tangled up by the red tape and dilatory attitude of the Washington Indian Office. Under the circumstances, objection to the House bill on the grounds that it does not authorize the entire program, including airports and modern coal bins and all, comes with poor grace.

The D'Ewart bill should be taken up as promptly as possible. I hope this is done before this week ends, and that it is passed and enacted into law before the adjournment of Congress. I go further and say that either Acting Commissioner Zimmerman and Educational Director Beatty should be discharged for their delay in carrying out the mandate of Congress as expressed in the appropriation bill in 1946, or else the Navajo Reservation should be taken from under their jurisdiction and their inaction. The Congress is not in position to discharge the men responsible for the neglect of this tribe, but it can and should emancipate the Navajo from the lethargy of this Bureau. Congress can pass legislation whereby a man of vigor and action can be selected to administer the long-delayed rehabilitation and education of these people. A bill to do that very thing is now pending in the Senate and I sincerely hope that Mr. D'EWART's bill and the Senate bill are combined and are enacted into law before we adjourn.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this observation. The gentleman from New Mexico had some very complimentary things to say about the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands and also about the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. And I say they deserve it, too.

Mr. MURDOCK. They do deserve it, and for that reason I wanted to second what the gentleman said in that respect. I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from New Mexico himself has been untiring in his efforts to get the kind of legislation for which he now pleads. That was shown quite eloquently last November when we had temporary legislation before us, and at that time the gentleman from New Mexico time after time stressed the need of a permanent piece of legislation that would rehabilitate this great Navajo Indian Tribe. I am in accord with the gentleman in wanting a proper long-range plan.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman. I have also been very patient. I have not spoken out, although I did tell the committee what I knew about the details regarding the building of those two schoolhouses. Now they come in here with this report. If they had criticized our committee for not giving them the full amount requested, I would not have anything to say, but when they come in and say, "Do not enact this bill," when they know full well or ought to know full well that if we are not going to enact this bill we will not at this late date get anything, that is the last stroke.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRETT. I want to commend the gentleman for his courageous statement on

this matter. We are all very deeply interested in the welfare of the Indians of the country, and the gentleman from New Mexico has always fought valiantly for the Indians of his State.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRETT. In my opinion, our Committee on Public Lands has not had the proper cooperation from the Indian Bureau. I hope that some way may be arrived at whereby we can secure more adequate information and better reports and more active cooperation from the Indian Bureau.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. As far as getting information about the Navajo Reservation is concerned, I do not think we will ever get it until we have a man responsible at the head of that reservation, instead of trying to channel everything through the Indian Office in Washington.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. D'EWART. I in turn want to compliment the gentleman from New Mexico on bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress. Certainly the situation on the Navajo-Hopi Reservation is something that is a disgrace to the Nation. We have made treaties with these people under which we are supposed to do certain things. We have fallen down in the carrying out of those treaties. During this session we have held extensive hearings on the situation in the Navajo Reservation. As a result of those hearings, various bills were introduced. The one to which the gentleman from New Mexico refers is the one that is being pressed for enactment at this time and has been voted out unanimously by our House Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The gentleman will agree with me, I am sure, that it is the beginning of the very program Secretary Krug has recommended.

Mr. D'EWART. That is right. It is not the intention of the committee that this shall be the final word on this problem, but it is a step in the right direction. I think this goes along and is in accord with the recommendations of the Bureau. I regret very much that they have seen fit to send up an adverse report on this necessary legislation. I hope we may not pay too much attention to that report, but can get favorable action in this session on this bill, which will be a step in taking care of this very, very bad situation.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am sure Congress will do what is right, regardless of the report.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. POULSON. As I recall, when this bill was brought before the full Committee on Public Lands this very statement was made, that this was the first step in the general over-all program and approach to settling this very delicate and serious problem as far as the Indians are concerned.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes. I think the committee is very properly putting first things first in this bill. If we authorize the whole $90,000,000, what assurance have we that they will handle that any better than the $1,000,000 we gave them 2 years ago, with which they have done nothing up to date?

Mr. POULSON. I do not believe there is a single committee in the House that works any harder than the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, of which the gentleman is one of the very able members.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I am sorry to say that in this particular matter we have not accomplished very much so far because of the lack of a cooperative attitude on the part of the Indian Office in Washington. What has been done is due to the untiring efforts of men like the gentleman from California, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWART].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now before us, H. R. 2632, contains therein an appropriation of $2,500,000 for emergency flood-control work on the Columbia. Of this amount, $150,000 has been allocated for flood-control work on the Clarks Fork of the Columbia in the vicinity of Orchard Homes, Missoula, Mont.

The Corps of Engineers is cognizant of the extreme danger which faces the Orchard Homes area this winter and spring and has urged that this amount of money be approved. Maj. Gen. R. C. Crawford, Acting Chief of Engineers, has assured me in a letter, under date of February 10, 1949, that if this fund is approved they will proceed promptly with such remedial measures in the vicinity of Orchard Homes as are consistent with existing authority and the funds provided by Congress.

In behalf of the people in the Orchard Homes area, I urge the House to pass this appropriation immediately. I fear, even now, what may happen in the meantime, and I pray that we will not be too late in giving this assistance to the people of my district who need it so much.

The people of Orchard Homes are looking to us for assistance, and as their Representative in the Congress of the United States I urge you to heed their request and pass this appropriation promptly.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2632) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 99, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SADLAK. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SADLAK moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Page 6, line 24, strike out "$4,987,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,000,000."

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. SADLAK. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 148, nays 237, not voting 48, as follows:

[Roll No. 14]

YEAS—148

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Hall, | Nelson |
| Anderson, Calif. | Edwin Arthur | Nicholson |
| Andresen, | Hall, | Nixon |
| August H. | Leonard W. | Norblad |
| Angell | Hand | O'Hara, Minn. |
| Arends | Harden | Patterson |
| Auchincloss | Harvey | Pfeiffer, |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Herter | William L. |
| Bates, Mass. | Heselton | Philbin |
| Beall | Hill | Phillips, Calif. |
| Bennett, Mich. | Hinshaw | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Bishop | Hoeven | Plumley |
| Blackney | Holmes | Potter |
| Bolton, Ohio | Hope | Rankin |
| Bramblett | Horan | Reed, Ill. |
| Brehm | Hull | Reed, N. Y. |
| Brown, Ohio | James | Rees |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Javits | Rich |
| Canfield | Jenison | Riehlman |
| Case, N. J. | Jennings | Rogers, Mass. |
| Case, S. Dak. | Jensen | Sadlak |
| Chiperfield | Johnson | St. George |
| Church | Jonas | Sanborn |
| Clevenger | Kean | Scott, Hardie |
| Cole, Kans. | Kearney | Scott, |
| Cole, N. Y. | Kearns | Hugh D., Jr. |
| Corbett | Keating | Scrivner |
| Cotton | Keefe | Scudder |
| Crawford | Kunkel | Secrest |
| Dague | Lane | Short |
| Davis, Wis. | Latham | Simpson, Ill. |
| D'Ewart | LeCompte | Simpson, Pa. |
| Dolliver | LeFevre | Smith, Kans. |
| Dondero | Lichtenwalter | Smith, Wis. |
| Donohue | Lodge | Stockman |
| Ellsworth | McConnell | Taber |
| Elston | McCulloch | Talle |
| Engel, Mich. | McDonough | Tollefson |
| Fellows | McGregor | Van Zandt |
| Fenton | McMillen, Ill. | Velde |
| Ford | Mack, Wash. | Vorys |
| Fulton | Macy | Vursell |
| Furcolo | Marcantonio | Wadsworth |
| Gamble | Martin, Iowa | Welch, Calif. |
| Gavin | Martin, Mass. | Werdel |
| Gillette | Merrow | Wigglesworth |
| Golden | Meyer | Wilson, Ind. |
| Goodwin | Michener | Wolcott |
| Graham | Miller, Md. | Wolverton |
| Gwinn | Morton | Wood |
| Hale | Murray, Wis. | Woodruff |

NAYS—237

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Burke | Dollinger |
| Addonizio | Burleson | Doughton |
| Albert | Burton | Douglas |
| Andersen, | Byrne, N. Y. | Doyle |
| H. Carl | Camp | Durham |
| Andrews | Cannon | Eberharter |
| Aspinall | Carnahan | Elliott |
| Bailey | Carroll | Engle, Calif. |
| Barden | Cavalcante | Evins |
| Baring | Celler | Fallon |
| Barrett, Pa. | Chatham | Feighan |
| Bates, Ky. | Chelf | Fernandez |
| Battle | Chesney | Fisher |
| Beckworth | Christopher | Flood |
| Biemiller | Chudoff | Fogarty |
| Blatnik | Clemente | Forand |
| Bloom | Coffey | Frazier |
| Boggs, La. | Combs | Fugate |
| Bolling | Cooley | Garmatz |
| Bolton, Md. | Cooper | Gary |
| Bonner | Cox | Gathings |
| Bosone | Crook | Gilmer |
| Boykin | Crosser | Gordon |
| Breen | Davenport | Gore |
| Brooks | Davies, N. Y. | Gorski, Ill. |
| Brown, Ga. | Davis, Ga. | Gorski, N. Y. |
| Bryson | Davis, Tenn. | Gossett |
| Buchanan | Dawson | Granahan |
| Buckley, Ill. | Deane | Granger |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Delaney | Grant |
| Burdick | Denton | Green |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Gregory | McSweeney | Rhodes |
| Gross | Mack, Ill. | Rivers |
| Hagen | Madden | Rodino |
| Hardy | Magee | Rogers, Fla. |
| Hare | Mahon | Rooney |
| Harris | Mansfield | Sabath |
| Harrison | Marsalis | Sadowski |
| Hart | Marshall | Sasscer |
| Havenner | Miller, Calif. | Sims |
| Hays, Ark. | Miller, Nebr. | Smathers |
| Hays, Ohio | Mills | Smith, Va. |
| Hébert | Mitchell | Spence |
| Hedrick | Monroney | Staggers |
| Herlong | Morgan | Stanley |
| Hobbs | Morris | Steed |
| Holifield | Moulder | Stefan |
| Howell | Multer | Stigler |
| Huber | Murdock | Sullivan |
| Jackson, Wash. | Murphy, | Sutton |
| Jacobs | Murray, Tenn. | Tackett |
| Jones, Ala. | Noland | Tauriello |
| Jones, Mo. | Norrell | Teague |
| Jones, N. C. | Norton | Thomas, Tex. |
| Karst | O'Brien, Ill. | Thompson |
| Karsten | O'Brien, Mich. | Thornberry |
| Kee | O'Hara, Ill. | Trimble |
| Kelley | O'Konski | Underwood |
| Kennedy | O'Neill | Vinson |
| Keogh | O'Sullivan | Wagner |
| Kerr | Pace | Walsh |
| Kilburn | Passman | Walter |
| Kilday | Patman | Welch, Mo. |
| King | Patten | Wheeler |
| Kirwan | Perkins | White, Calif. |
| Klein | Peterson | White, Idaho |
| Kruse | Pfeifer, | Whitten |
| Lanham | Joseph L. | Whittington |
| Larcade | Pickett | Wier |
| Lemke | Poage | Williams |
| Lesinski | Polk | Willis |
| Lind | Powell | Wilson, Okla. |
| Lovre | Preston | Wilson, Tex. |
| Lyle | Price | Winstead |
| Lynch | Priest | Withrow |
| McCarthy | Quinn | Woodhouse |
| McCormack | Rabaut | Yates |
| McGrath | Rains | Young |
| McGuire | Redden | Zablocki |
| McKinnon | Regan | |

NOT VOTING—48

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Eaton | Poulson |
| Allen, Ill. | Halleck | Ramsay |
| Allen, La. | Heffernan | Ribicoff |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hoffman, Ill. | Richards |
| Bentsen | Hoffman, Mich. | Shafer |
| Bland | Irving | Sheppard |
| Boggs, Del. | Jackson, Calif. | Sikes |
| Bulwinkle | Jenkins | Smith, Ohio |
| Burnside | Judd | Somers |
| Carlyle | Linehan | Taylor |
| Colmer | Lucas | Thomas N. J. |
| Coudert | McMillan, S. C. | Towe |
| Cunningham | Mason | Weichel |
| Curtis | Miles | Whitaker |
| DeGraffenried | Morrison | Wickersham |
| Dingell | O'Toole | Worley |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Burnside for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. deGraffenried against.

Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Irving against.

Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Bentsen against.

Mr. Halleck for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Bennett of Florida against.

Mr. Smith of Ohio for, with Mr. Abbitt against.

Mr. Weichel for, with Mr. Carlyle against.

Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Colmer against.

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Worley with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Linehan with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Lucas with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. LANE, Mr. PHILBIN, and Mr. MARCANTONIO changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 367, nays 19, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 15]

YEAS—367

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Crosser | Hays, Ark. |
| Addonizio | Dague | Hays, Ohio |
| Albert | Davenport | Hébert |
| Allen, Calif. | Davies, N. Y. | Hedrick |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Davis, Ga. | Herlong |
| Anderson, Calif. | Davis, Tenn. | Herter |
| Andresen, August H. | Davis, Wis. | Heselton |
| Andrews | Dawson | Hill |
| Angell | Deane | Hinshaw |
| Arends | Delaney | Hobbs |
| Aspinall | Denton | Hoeven |
| Auchincloss | D'Ewart | Holifield |
| Bailey | Dollinger | Holmes |
| Barden | Dolliver | Hope |
| Baring | Dondero | Horan |
| Barrett, Pa. | Donohue | Howell |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Doughton | Huber |
| Bates, Ky. | Douglas | Hull |
| Battle | Doyle | Jackson, Wash. |
| Beall | Durham | Jacobs |
| Beckworth | Eberharter | James |
| Bennett, Mich. | Elliott | Javits |
| Biemiller | Ellsworth | Jennings |
| Bishop | Elston | Johnson |
| Blackney | Engel, Mich. | Jonas |
| Blatnik | Engle, Calif. | Jones, Ala. |
| Bloom | Evins | Jones, Mo. |
| Boggs, La. | Fallon | Jones, N. C. |
| Bolling | Feighan | Karst |
| Bolton, Md. | Fellows | Karsten |
| Bolton, Ohio | Fenton | Kearney |
| Bonner | Fernandez | Kearns |
| Bosone | Fisher | Keating |
| Bramblett | Flood | Kee |
| Breen | Fogarty | Keefe |
| Brehm | Forand | Kelley |
| Brooks | Ford | Kennedy |
| Brown, Ga. | Frazier | Keogh |
| Brown, Ohio | Fugate | Kerr |
| Bryson | Fulton | Kilday |
| Buchanan | Furcolo | King |
| Buckley, Ill. | Gamble | Kirwan |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Garmatz | Klein |
| Burdick | Gary | Kruse |
| Burke | Gathings | Kunkel |
| Burleson | Gavin | Lane |
| Burton | Gillette | Lanham |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Gilmer | Larcade |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Golden | Latham |
| Camp | Goodwin | LeCompte |
| Canfield | Gordon | LeFevre |
| Cannon | Gore | Lemke |
| Carnahan | Gorski, Ill. | Lesinski |
| Carroll | Gorski, N. Y. | Lichtenwalter |
| Case, N. J. | Gossett | Lind |
| Case, S. Dak. | Graham | Lodge |
| Cavalcante | Granahan | Lovre |
| Celler | Granger | Lucas |
| Chatham | Grant | Lyle |
| Chelf | Green | Lynch |
| Chesney | Gregory | McCarthy |
| Chiperfield | Gross | McConnell |
| Christopher | Gwinn | McCormack |
| Chudoff | Hagen | McCulloch |
| Church | Hall, Edwin Arthur | McDonough |
| Clemente | Hall, Leonard W. | McGrath |
| Coffey | Hand | McGregor |
| Cole, Kans. | Harden | McGuire |
| Combs | Hardy | McKinnon |
| Cooley | Hare | McMillen, Ill. |
| Cooper | Harris | McSweeney |
| Corbett | Harrison | Mack, Ill. |
| Cotton | Hart | Mack, Wash. |
| Cox | Harvey | Madden |
| Crook | Havenner | Magee |
| Marcantonio | Phillips, Calif. | Mahon |
| Marsalis | Phillips, Tenn. | Mansfield |
| Marshall | Pickett | Stigler |
| Martin, Iowa | Poage | Stockman |
| Martin, Mass. | Polk | Sullivan |
| Merrow | Potter | Sutton |
| Meyer | Powell | Tackett |
| Michener | Preston | Talle |
| Miller, Calif. | Price | Tauriello |
| Miller, Md. | Priest | Teague |
| Miller, Nebr. | Quinn | Thomas, Tex. |
| Mills | Rabaut | Thompson |
| Mitchell | Rains | Tollefson |
| Monroney | Rankin | Trimble |
| Morgan | Redden | Underwood |
| Morris | Reed, Ill. | Van Zandt |
| Morton | Reed, N. Y. | Velde |
| Moulder | Rees | Vinson |
| Multer | Regan | Vorys |
| Murdock | Rhodes | Vursell |
| Murphy | Richards | Wagner |
| Murray, Tenn. | Riehlman | Walsh |
| Murray, Wis. | Rivers | Walter |
| Nelson | Rodino | Welch, Calif. |
| Nixon | Rogers, Fla. | Welch, Mo. |
| Noland | Rogers, Mass. | Werdel |
| Norblad | Rooney | Wheeler |
| Norrell | Sabath | White, Calif. |
| Norton | Sadowski | White, Idaho |
| O'Brien, Ill. | St. George | Whitten |
| O'Brien, Mich. | Sasscer | Whittington |
| O'Hara, Ill. | Scott, Hardie | Wickersham |
| O'Hara, Minn. | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. | Wier |
| O'Konski | Scudder | Wigglesworth |
| O'Neill | Secrest | Williams |
| O'Sullivan | Sheppard | Willis |
| Pace | Short | Wilson, Ind. |
| Passman | Simpson, Ill. | Wilson, Okla. |
| Patman | Sims | Wilson, Tex. |
| Patten | Smathers | Winstead |
| Patterson | Smith, Kans. | Withrow |
| Perkins | Smith, Va. | Wolcott |
| Peterson | Spence | Wolverton |
| Pfeifer, Joseph L. | Staggers | Wood |
| Pfeiffer, William L. | Stanley | Woodhouse |
| Philbin | Steed | Worley |
| | Stefan | Yates |
| | | Young |
| | | Zablocki |

NAYS—19

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Bates, Mass. | Kilburn | Simpson, Pa. |
| Clevenger | Macy | Smith, Wis. |
| Crawford | Nicholson | Taber |
| Hale | Plumley | Wadsworth |
| Jenison | Rich | Woodruff |
| Jensen | Sanborn | |
| Kean | Scrivner | |

NOT VOTING—47

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | DeGraffenried | O'Toole |
| Allen, Ill. | Dingell | Poulson |
| Allen, La. | Eaton | Ramsay |
| Bennett, Fla. | Halleck | Ribicoff |
| Bentsen | Heffernan | Sadlak |
| Bland | Hoffman, Ill. | Shafer |
| Boggs, Del. | Hoffman, Mich. | Sikes |
| Boykin | Irving | Smith, Ohio |
| Bulwinkle | Jackson, Calif. | Somers |
| Burnside | Jenkins | Taylor |
| Carlyle | Judd | Thomas, N. J. |
| Cole, N. Y. | Linehan | Thornberry |
| Colmer | McMillan, S. C. | Towe |
| Coudert | Mason | Weichel |
| Cunningham | Miles | Whitaker |
| Curtis | Morrison | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Coudert.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Burnside with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.

Mr. Colmer with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Sadlak.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Boggs of Delaware.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. McMillan of South Carolina with Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Carlyle with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.

Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Jackson of California.

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Jenkins.

Mr. Ribicoff with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Linehan with Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Shafer.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Mason.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LITHUANIA

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, one of the most shameful and least publicized events of the twentieth century was the dastardly conspiracy of the Kremlin against Russia's good little neighbor, Lithuania. The political police of the vast Soviet Union, holding in subjection 180,000,000 people, launched in peacetime a scheme directed at the physical extermination of millions of Lithuanian Christians.

However, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the history and glory of the brave people of that brave nation of Lithuania, nestled on the shores of the Baltic Sea. Never has there been greater proof that the United States of America remains loyal to her friends than the fact that this great leader of democracy still recognizes as a sovereign power the Republic of Lithuania, and denies and refuses to recognize the illegal and outrageous attempt on the part of Soviet Russia to annex Lithuania as a province of the Soviet.

I think it proper at this time that I say a word about the recognition of Lithuania by the United States.

When Lithuania was incorporated into the Soviet Union on July 21 of 1940, we and a large number of western countries felt that this was not done voluntarily, and refused to recognize this incorporation as legal. Thereby Lithuania was allowed to retain her diplomatic representatives in these countries. Two days after Lithuania's annexation to the Soviet Union the then Acting Secretary of State—Sumner Welles—clarified the position of this country in a press release which read:

> During these past few days the devious processes whereunder the political independence and territorial integrity of the three small Baltic Republics—Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—were to be deliberately annihilated by one of their more powerful neighbors, have been rapidly drawing to their conclusion.
>
> From the day when the peoples of these republics first gained their independent and democratic form of government the people of the United States have watched their admirable progress in self-government with deep and sympathetic interest.
>
> The policy of this Government is universally known. The people of the United States are opposed to predatory activities no matter whether they are carried on by the use of force or by the threat of force. They are likewise opposed to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.
>
> These principles constitute the very foundations upon which the existing relationship between the 21 sovereign republics of the New World rests.
>
> The United States will continue to stand by these principles, because of the conviction of the American people that unless the doctrine in which these principles are inherent once again governs the relations between nations, the rule of reason, of justice, and of law—in other words, the basis of modern civilization itself—cannot be preserved.[1]

On March 3 of 1945 the Secretary of State issued a statement indicating that the position of this country had not changed since the enunciation of our policy as stated by Mr. Welles in 1940. This statement, as given in the New York Times, March 4, 1945, page 24, read:

> The Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania still are officially regarded by the United States as independent states, even though they were adsorbed into the Soviet Union early in the war.

Early last year when it was reported that the consular officials of the Soviet Union in this country were claiming to represent the Baltic countries here, the State Department sent letters to the governors of all 48 States, stating that this country has never recognized Soviet annexation of the Baltic States.

So far as this country is concerned—

Read the letter as quoted in the New York Times, March 30, 1948, page 12—

> the Baltic countries still are independent nations, with their own diplomatic representatives and consuls.

The foregoing statements indicate just how we still recognize Lithuania as an independent country. Our position has not changed since 1940 and the same may be said of other countries which still recognize Lithuania.

The Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have been recognized either as de jure or de facto governments by the principal governments of Europe and have entered into treaty relations with their neighbors.

In extending to them recognition on its part, the Government of the United States takes cognizance of the actual existence of these Governments during a considerable period of time and of the successful maintenance within their borders of political and economic stability.

The United States has consistently maintained that the disturbed condition of Russian affairs may not be made the occasion for the alienation of Russian territory, and this principle is not deemed to be infringed by the recognition at this time of the Governments of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, which have been set up and maintained by an indigenous population.

Not only has the United States of America persisted in its recognition of the Republic of Lithuania as a de jure government but likewise it has consistently refused to recognize Russian claims.

Never have I been prouder of the integrity before the nations of the world of my own country than I am in the championing of the cause of the ancient lovers of democracy, the people of Lithuania.

And so today, Mr. Speaker, on this, the birthday of the Republic of Lithuania, I stand in this great forum of freedom, the House of Representatives of the United States of America, and pay my tribute to the Republic of Lithuania on this, the natal day.

The good and brave people of Lithuania, riding under the heel of the oppressor, do not passively sit by and accept without resistance the yoke of slavery.

Fighting for liberty and freedom and for the belief in the church of their ancestors is the tradition of the Lithuanian people. And in this year of our Lord 1949 the Lithuanians hold high the torch of their tradition and do not break faith with their noble ancestors.

Anti-Soviet resistance continues and will continue and continue until once again Lithuania is a free and independent nation.

I want to bring to the attention of the whole world the incessant struggle by patriotic Lithuania against the oppressor day in and day out since the infamous day when her liberty was destroyed by the Communist government from Moscow.

Resistance inside the country and in neighboring Latvia, White Ruthenia, Poland, and Ukraine continues. As a matter of fact, several Lithuanian guerrilla detachments were recently reported active in Silesia.

For this reason, Soviet units with some drafted Lithuanians are stationed far from the homeland—on the Arctic Ocean and in the Far East. A negligible number of units made up of natives are retained for effect in the country—the unarmed uniformed youths, singing in Lithuanian, are paraded on the streets of Vilnius, Kaunas, and several other larger cities. Not a single Lithuanian is entrusted with a plane. Most of the Soviet Army—former Red Army—troops garrisoned in Lithuania are natives of Siberia and Uzbekistan.

Lithuanian guerrillas presently operate in small mobile units. They are armed with captured Russian equipment and dressed, for the most part, in Russian uniforms with prewar Lithuanian insignia of rank. The guerrillas still have motorcycles, motorized light artillery pieces, and small tanks.

The guerrillas retained mastery of the countryside throughout the summer and fall of 1947 and carried their operations into Poland and East Prussia. An active liaison was established with the Polish underground and some operations, as, for example, the occupation of the frontier town of Cypliskes in Sudavia, were carried out jointly.

A legendary leader, a former resident of Kybartai, nicknamed "Zaliasis Velnias"—the Green Devil—is especially notorious.

Mimeographed newspapers, printed appeals, and news sheets are widely distributed. Even the impressed Polish and German laborers are supplied with underground literature. Some 20 newspapers are published regularly. Their titles disclose the spirit of the fighting, freedom-loving people: Laisvoji Lietuva—Free Lithuania, Laisves Varpas—the Liberty Bell, Tevynes Kovotojas—the Patriotic Fighter, Ginkime Lietuva—Defend Lithuania, Kova—the Struggle, Uz Laisve—For Freedom, and so forth.

[1] Department of State Bulletin, July 27, 1940, p. 48.

One of the outstanding achievements of 1947 was the creation of a unified command in the field and propaganda. The Lithuanian Liberation Army, the Freedom Fighters, the Partisan Column, and other formerly uncoordinated units finally created a joint staff and liaison service. This fact was jubilantly announced in a fighting editorial, Lithuania Militans. All political differences were buried in the interest of a united resistance struggle, as existed during the days of the Nazi occupation.

This development brought an immediate reaction from the enemy. The six regular Soviet Army divisions, strong air formations, motorized units, special transport and guard units protecting the railroads, highway bridges, and transport convoys, and 75,000 men of the MVD-MGB troops, the "people's militia," and the organized marauders called exterminators—Istrebiteli—needed reinforcements. Five special MGB air squadrons were brought in to the country in the fall of 1947. Additional armored and infantry divisions were moved to Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in January 1948.

Large units are presently stationed in county seats. For instance, 3,000 MVD troops equipped with tanks and armored motorcycles are stationed in a small railroad junction town of Mazeikiai. Larger forces are garrisoned in Lithuania than at any time since the occupation of the country in 1940.

There is no appreciable decrease in the armed anti-Soviet resistance, but guerrillas' tactics have changed.

The Russians are making every effort to convert the independence struggle into a civil war. For example, drafted natives are interdispersed in the units dispatched against the guerrillas. On the other hand, the internecine aspect is intensified by the guerrillas, who take a heavy toll of the natives who dare to accept administrative offices under the Russians or who enroll in the Communist organizations.

There were no large-scale battles since the fall of 1946, but individual MVD-NKVD troopers, MGB-NKGB investigators, Communist Party officials, and militiamen are killed daily. Several dozen guerrillas were encircled in the woods near Vilnius and were killed to the last man. Russian operations against another large unit in Utena County failed. When MVD concentrations arrived the guerrillas had vanished. An 18-year-old girl, who had organized medical aid for guerrillas, was detained—and later liberated by a patriot band. She is now in Poland—completely gray, nerves shattered, crippled for life by "interrogation." A guerrilla leader was recently captured, tried, and executed in Poland. His unit continues to operate in both Lithuania and Poland.

Guerrillas are masters of the situation in summer, but they go into hiding in winter. The promises of an "amnesty" were largely ignored. Nevertheless, some men who had merely evaded mobilization surrendered, some sought legitimization by moving to East Prussia, the Memel District, or the largely depopulated areas of the Vilnius district, where they are not known personally.

Railroad stations and towns are still heavily garrisoned. Units of people's militia and exterminators—istrebiteli—are very active in the country. When not engaged in manhunt, these exterminators act as inspectors of produce deliveries. They indiscriminately open fire on persons walking too fast—in their judgment. Their chiefs are Russians, the rank and file contain some native traitors and draft evaders. Lately, the exterminators attempted to popularize their new designation as freedom defenders and activists. However, the people stick to their original derisive nicknames—strebokai, skrebai, stribikauliai—persons with deformed hip bones, and so forth.

After continuous and meticulously effected combing operations, the Russians uncovered a great many bunkers and other hiding places. The forest brethren had to shoot it out with the invaders or look for other hiding places. Life of the guerrilla fighters is extremely dangerous. So is the life of the exterminators—some retire to lunch in privacy and never again appear. This kind of life causes much drinking among the exterminators.

Farmers of the areas where guerrillas show increased activities are indiscriminately deported. No explanations help, even when the people offer explanation: all sorts of armed men, invariably dressed in Russian uniforms, come to look for food and to rob—"to inspect." When a wounded guerrilla, whose tenure of life was spared for questioning purposes, was spirited out of a hospital, several employees of the hospital suffered exile. When a boy who had purchased bandages for the guerrillas in several drug stores was unmasked, all of the druggists suffered.

Every former officer, official, national guard member and independence war veteran had to enlist in the forest fraternity. They had no choice. Their ranks were swelled by draft evaders and by liberated political prisoners.

The guerrillas follow certain established patterns. Women informers, first offenders, are punished by a shave and a token flogging. Men, first offenders, have their seats grated and salted. The second offense merits a bullet.

The desecration of the corpses of the guerrillas continues as a pattern. When a guerrilla is killed, the Russians remove his boots and clothing, bring the body to the nearest town, and dump it on the sidewalk in a prominent place. The Communists passing by spit and kick the corpses. People are forced to watch the sadism of the Russians. The bodies are badly mutilated—legs are twisted and broken, bowels laid open, eyes are gouged out, the crania smashed.

In the past, the Russians permitted the natives to bury the bodies. Since the fall of 1946, decomposed bodies are picked up at night by war-prisoner details, taken out of town and buried in unmarked graves. In some places, bodies are thrown into the quagmire.

Some women dared to approach the martyrs' corpses, to kneel and pray. One mother gained fame when she gently touched her son's hair and firmly stated that this was not her son—to save her other boys. None of the multitude of acquaintances betrayed her.

The Communists killed by the patriots are ceremoniously buried in red-painted coffins—in the desecrated Christian cemeteries. Sometimes the authorities demand that priests accompany the heroes' coffins. One priest refused—and joined the forest fraternity after his liberation from prison.

The alien regime depends on armed force exclusively. One-half of the nominal ministers are Russians, and business is transacted at the cabinet meetings in Russian. The Lithuanian language is a stranger in the MVD—former NKVD—and MGB—former NKGB. Nevertheless, translators are retained in the administrative offices and applications in Lithuanian are accepted. All of the records and tax receipts are printed in Russian and Lithuanian.

The people's commissars are now called ministers. Some of them wear resplendent uniforms. The cabinet is established in Vilnius, in a building on Ciurlionis Street which had formerly housed the headquarters of the Gestapo—a familiar landmark to the natives. The residence of Paleckis is heavily guarded.

Only two Lithuanian conductors were retained in the railroad service. Railroads are serviced by Russian personnel exclusively. All outgoing mails pass through Moscow.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I take this time in the midst of our busy deliberations to focus the eyes of the western Christian world upon this island of freedom and democracy where the tyrant will never succeed in the end.

In the voice of the lovers of freedom and justice throughout the world I say, long live Lithuania.

### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I understand the export-control bill will be the first one on the program?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct, followed by two resolutions relating to the giving of two committees the power to investigate; then there will be a bill out of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

It is hoped that we may clean them all up tomorrow and adjourn over until Monday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to include in his extension of remarks certain letters and excerpts.

Mr. FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to include with the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole an excerpt from the RECORD of June 8, 1948.

Mr. GARMATZ (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a statement by Mayor D'Alesandro, of Baltimore.

Mr. LUCAS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial on the subject of rent control.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement entitled "The College Fraternity Crisis." I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost $301.75, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a speech made at Bridgeport, Conn., by Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.

Mr. KEARNEY and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and were given permission to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; to include in one, editorials appearing in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, the Pittsburgh Press, and the New York World-Telegram; and in the other, a letter from the director of the United Service for New Americans and an article appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. HINSHAW asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

FILIPINO REHABILITATION COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 381, Seventy-eighth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission the following Members of the House: Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas; Mr. MURDOCK, of Arizona; and Mr. WELCH, of California.

THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF LITHUANIA

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today free Lithuanians throughout the world are commemorating the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Lithuania. The enslaved people in Lithuania are denied this right by the despotic occupant of the country. I know that these unfortunate people are not alone in celebrating this day, for there are countless millions who join with them and extend to these freedom-loving people their sympathies on their temporary subjugation and enslavement in which they find themselves, and at the same time wish them a very speedy restoration of their Republic with complete freedom and independence.

The 600-year-old Lithuanian state was first occupied by Czarist Russia in 1795. That enslavement was terminated on February 16, 1918, by the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Soviet Russia gave full recognition to this declaration, renounced for all time all rights to the territory of Lithuania, and recognized Lithuania as a sovereign independent state. The United States and other nations also recognized Lithuania's rightfull independence.

The independent Republic of Lithuania in their short space of independence made remarkable progress in every phase of life. Impartial observers acknowledged Lithuania to be one of the most cultured, progressive, and industrious countries of Europe, and her people were happy, prosperous, and self-sustaining.

The outstanding achievements and accomplishments of Lithuania were destroyed when it was occupied for the second time in 1940. Soviet Russia then enslaved and annexed Lithuania by aggression and still rules it by force.

Lithuania is a tragic victim of Soviet aggression. The people of Lithuania have been deprived of their cherished land, of all private enterprises, of human rights, and of fundamental freedoms. They have been converted into chattels of the Soviet state. Over one-half million people of Lithuania have been slain or banished from Lithuania. Genocide by the Soviets threatens to annihilate the Lithuanian nation.

These crimes of aggression and genocide against Lithuania have been condemned by the Lithuanian nation, by the United States and by other democratic countries, which continue to recognize independent Lithuania and its lawful representatives.

In the fight for their rights and freedom, Lithuanians hope and pray that the United States and the western democracies will continue to stand by the principles of right and justice, and that they will actively champion the cause of sovereign rights and self-government for Lithuania and all other victims of aggression and injustice.

It seems to me that the time has come for making a demand upon the Soviet Union: First, to halt genocide in Lithuania and other occupied countries by murder and deportation of innocent people; second, to return deportees from the slave-labor camps in Siberia and other parts of Russia; third, to remove Soviet armies, police, and secret agents from Lithuania and other Baltic countries; and, fourth, to restore freedom, sovereign rights and self-government to the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, who have been forcibly deprived of them by the Soviet Union.

The Lithuanian people want their freedom and they are entitled to it. I hope their ambition to be a free nation is not too far away. There will be no peace in this troubled world, as long as Russia tries to dominate and subjugate small nations. Russia will not only bring an endless trail of troubles upon herself, but will be the cause of world unrest which eventually will bring her own downfall.

The days of tyrants are over. People all over the world are demanding a representative form of government, and this demand will spread from one subjugated nation to another until all mankind has achieved freedom and independence.

I want to extend my best wishes to these great patriotic freedom-loving people, who today are putting up a gallant fight to restore their independence, and throw off the shackles of a ruthless tyrant. The Republic of Lithuania is still recognized by our Government, and I trust we will insist that the principles of the Atlantic Charter be applied to the case of Lithuania, together with Latvia and Estonia.

If Russia desires peace in the world, she, more than any other nation, can bring that about by liberating the people whom she now dominates and unless Russia does that, the everlasting desire of the people to be free and independent, will go on, as it has in centuries past, until tyrants are destroyed everywhere.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his splendid remarks and I want to join with him in everything that he has said. The people of America are wholeheartedly with the people of Lithuania, and we are all looking forward to the day when the iron curtain will be rolled back and the people of Lithuania will regain their independence which they so richly deserve, and that our great country will be able to make its most effective contribution toward the regaining of their lost liberties.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

REGULATION W CAUSING TROUBLE—FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD WARNED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have urged the Federal Reserve Board to rescind or substantially change regulation W. Today I sent to the Chairman of the Board, a copy to each member, the following letter:

FEBRUARY 16, 1949.

Hon. THOMAS B. McCABE,
*Chairman of the Board of Governors,*
*The Federal Reserve System,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Nearly 2 months now have elapsed since I began calling attention of the Federal Reserve Board to the widespread damages being caused to our na-

tional economy by certain overstringent consumer credit controls.

At that time I pointed out that an utterly needless depression could be created and was being threatened by the Federal Reserve Board's credit squeeze. More proof has kept pouring in since then that the Federal Reserve Board is depriving millions of American families of the opportunity to purchase needed automobiles because your regulation W requires excessively high monthly payments spread over only 15 to 18 months. I urged you in December—and now I again plead—that you exercise the power already vested in your board to extend the payment period to at least 24 months.

While the Federal Reserve Board has taken no action to date to alleviate hardships it is causing the people and to durable goods industries, unemployment is mounting at an alarming rate, production is being cut back, and other soft spots have appeared in our economy.

Consequently I took some heart as I heard you testify on regulation W February 14 before the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report when you promised:

"I can assure you that we will modify these restraints as the economic conditions warrant it and will not hesitate to relax them when they have served their purpose."

Then why don't you act immediately?

Already it is dangerously late.

Already you have thrown countless thousands of workers unnecessarily out of jobs.

Already you have carried too far your deliberate policy of discriminating against our families of moderate means whom you dictate cannot have reasonable installment credit to purchase the durable goods they need.

You are jeopardizing the very business lives of an untold number of small, independent businessmen throughout the country.

By singling out only certain industries, small businessmen, and the mass market of ordinary folks for your unfair and discriminatory consumer-credit measures, you already have carried the country too far toward deflation and depression.

If we have a depression, it should not be called a Truman depression, as the Republicans no doubt will attempt to do; instead it should rightfully be called a Federal Reserve Board depression.

It is not unusual for the Federal Reserve Board to cause depressions. It caused a devastating one in 1920. It contributed to the 1929–30 depression. It started a real depression in 1937, but fortunately our Chief Executive at that time caused changes to be made which put the Government back on a sound economic basis.

Of late there has been an alarming increase in areas of depression in sections of our country and our economy. Certainly we must give credence to such reports as the following, which have appeared in the press in the last few days:

As a sharp index to what's happening to business, Dun & Bradstreet says bank clearings in 25 leading cities during the week ending February 9 were the lowest of any week since September 1.

Unemployment among railroad workers of the Nation passed the 100,000 mark last week. This is around 10 percent of the working force in the industry.

United Air Lines' President W. A. Patterson reports a recession is already here—that he has found evidences of a business slump all over the country and that United has had to lay off 1,300 employees since October.

The Federal Reserve Board reports that department store sales for the Nation were down 4 percent as compared to the same week last year, with New York and Atlanta down 7 percent and Dallas and San Francisco down 10 percent.

Montgomery Ward's January sales were down 10 percent over the same month last year, and Sears, Roebuck sales were down 11 percent.

General Electric cut production 10 percent at its Tiffin, Ohio, plant which makes small motors.

International Harvester will curtail heavy truck production at Fort Wayne, Ind., by 30 percent and light truck ouput at Springfield, Ohio, by 10 percent about March 1.

California factory employment dropped 5 percent in January over December of last year for the sharpest decline since 1939.

Commercial and industrial failures rose 32.4 percent to 192 in the week ended February 10, reaching the highest level since June of 1942, according to Dun & Bradstreet.

This represents just a very small sample of the worker lay-offs and production curtailments which are taking place throughout our Nation today.

All but the upper crust of purchasers are being forced out of the markets for new automobiles, refrigerators, furniture, applicances, and other consumer goods that fall under your regulation W consumer credit curb.

Not 2 out of 10 persons can afford to pay $100 a month or more for new cars, since in general only persons earning $5,000 a year or more—roughly the upper 14 percent—are classed as good credit risks for such installments. Yet simply by extending the credit period to 24 months, such monthly payments could be reduced to approximately $75 a month.

Cars are an absolute necessity for most Americans today, the majority being used in their work or business, and so I am deeply concerned when the little fellow is hit as regulation W is hitting him.

Auto installment credit today is virtually the same amount as it was in 1941, and you surely cannot consider that out of line in view of the fact that the sales value of autos now is much greater. Yet in the prewar era, when cars cost less, purchasers were allowed to spread payments over longer periods.

Thousands of additional workers in durable-goods industries are being laid off each week that you delay modifying Regulation W. This is endangering the Nation's domestic, foreign, and defense programs, which hinge on a continued high level of production and employment in the durable-goods industries.

Some time back I noted Detroit reports that up to then Regulation W was being blamed in connection with the auto industry having to lay off 10,000 workers and with almost all the auto-parts manufacturers being forced to cut back production and employment. Over the week end Walter Reuther, of the United Auto Workers Union, announced that the auto industry in recent weeks laid off 5,000 tool and die makers, "who have little hope for reemployment in the immediate future."

These lay-offs are setting off a chain reaction.

Small business, whose interests our House committee has been charged with looking after, is suffering severely from Regulation W.

Three out of every four auto dealers in the Nation report they are being hurt by Regulation W, according to a poll being taken by the National Automobile Dealers Association among its 35,000 members. The association's membership, representing an important segment of American small business, went on record at their recent national convention in San Francisco as urging immediate extension of the installment period to 24 months.

You no doubt also have received a poll taken by the National Appliance and Radio Dealers Association showing the feeling of these small-business men that you should revise the regulation to permit longer credit terms.

The promises you made before the joint congressional committee to cause the least possible interference with usual business operations and to use your powers to meet deflationary developments lead me to observe this:

Recently the Departemnt of Agriculture stepped in promptly, in the public interest, to stop the sudden, chaotic drop in farm commodity prices. This Government agency felt the need for action and did something about it immediately. Likewise the Federal Reserve Board is empowered and entrusted with the responsibility to act positively and swiftly against needless reduction of production and employment.

As a member of the Congressional Joint Economic Committee and House Banking and Currency Committee, and chairman of the House Small Business Committee I regard it as my solemn duty to call to your attention what is happening to our country, something which I am afraid will not be recognized by your Board until it is too late. I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to your fellow members of the Board of Governors and I hope that each of you will see the human suffering that continued delay can cause. If you but listen to the reports from the grass roots of the country, I believe you would act at once to safeguard the people's interest.

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

(Copies to six other Federal Reserve Board members.)

NADA HAS REPEATEDLY WARNED FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. Speaker, the adverse effects of the imposition of regulation W on the retail automobile trade are not new. They first came to the attention of the headquarters of the National Automobile Dealers Association here in Washington on November 30, 1948, in a wire from a member. Some 40 other wire complaints followed shortly.

NADA acted promptly on the dealers' behalf, as we who are familiar with its service know it is accustomed to do. The complaints were referred to the industry relations committee of NADA on December 1, and with its approval went to the executive committee on December 3. Reference of the situation to the Federal Reserve Board was authorized and the Board set December 7 to receive the first complaints from NADA representatives. This action was in accord with the association's regular practice of seeking to settle all matters with Government departments administratively, if possible, before asking for remedial legislation. It is a good practice and one which, I am sure, every Member of Congress will endorse.

The association representatives asked that the period for making monthly payments on cars be extended from 18 to 24 months. No change in the down payment of one-third was asked. Dealers had said that their customers, in general, were able to make the initial payment but found difficulty in meeting subsequent monthly payments. In most cases each of these monthly payments, on even the smallest cars, amount to at least $100. That is a large amount of money for a worker who must use his car to reach his place of employment, or a small-business man who uses his car in trade.

The Board received the presentations with thanks on December 7 and asked that any future information on the matter be submitted to it. Since that time, at regular intervals, on December 17 and

December 19, 1948, and January 14 and February 7, 14, and 15, 1949, NADA representatives have submitted to the Board additional information from dealers substantiating the original complaint that application of regulation W in its present form was slowing up credit sales.

In this connection, a statement on the situation, issued by the executive committee of NADA at its national convention held in San Francisco on January 25–28, 1949, is of interest. It follows:

NADA RELEASE ON REGULATION W

SAN FRANCISCO, January 23.—Reports from throughout the Nation that regulation W is imposing grave hardships on persons of small incomes who must use motorcars in their work or business greatly disturbed members of the National Automobile Dealers Association meeting here today.

So serious did the association's executive committee regard the situation that it issued a special statement strongly urging the Federal Reserve Board anew to take remedial action immediately. The Board is authorized to ease the present time payment terms of one-third down and the remaining two-thirds in 18 months whenever it sees fit. The Board now has before it a request from the association that the time payment period be extended to 24 months.

The statement said:

"The executive committee of NADA has heard with renewed concern from thousands of its 35,000 members attending its national convention here that the application of regulation W is hurting persons of small income who must have cars to help them earn a livelihood. Workers who must travel long distances to their employment and small-business men who use cars for making deliveries and other gainful purposes are being hit especially hard. Most of them are able to make the initial payment but find it impossible in many cases to meet the subsequent 18 months' requirements.

"These payments, even on the smallest cars, now approximate $100 per month. Of course, persons in the low-income brackets simply cannot meet such terms.

"This is not a question of dealers being unable to move all the cars they can get. They can do that because there are enough customers with higher incomes ready and able to buy all available new cars. But the higher income classes generally do not need cars to help them make a living. Therefore, the regulation puts pressure on the segment of car buyers least able to stand it.

"NADA has previously called the attention of the Federal Reserve Board to the situation as reflected by scattered reports and the Board has been investigating this limited number of cases and others brought to its attention. Since arriving here, however, your executive committee has learned from dealers representing all States that complaints against the harsh terms of the regulation are general.

"We, therefore, are again urging the Board to give the small buyers relief immediately."

Informal discussions looking to amendment of the regulation by congressional action in case the Board continues to decline to modify the terms of the regulation have been held. Thus far, however, NADA has made no direct appeal to Congress for legislative assistance.

Shortly before the convention, NADA headquarters here sent a postcard questionnaire to its 35,011 members in all States asking them to report on the current effects of regulation W. To date a total of 19,862 members, or about four-sevenths of the total membership, has replied. A very large majority of them declare that the regulation is slowing down time-payment sales. Not all of the replies have been tabulated, but the ratio of those counted shows that those dealers who think the regulation is hurting sales is approximately 3 to 1 over those who say the regulation has not proved harmful.

As the replies are being received, reports on them are being given to both the Board and interested congressional Members. It is expected that the last of the replies will be received within a week or 10 days and final reports will then be made by NADA to the two groups.

The Federal Reserve Board also is conducting surveys of retail automobile credit sales in different parts of the country. Although the Board has not acceded thus far to the request of NADA and others for a modification of the regulation, neither has it refused finally to do so.

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include statements and excerpts.)

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE ATOMIC BOMB

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, to paraphrase a great statesman of our time—never before have so many known so little about so potent a weapon as the atom bomb. Out of the devastating explosions of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, and Bikini has arisen a vast mushroom of contradictions and confusion.

Millions of dollars have been siphoned from the pockets of the American people for the development of atomic destruction. But how much have these investors in the atom bomb—these stockholders of the Nation's welfare—been permitted to know regarding the potential uses and effects of the atom bomb in a future war?

If the stockholders of a large corporation were handled with similar scorn and disrespect, it would be considered bad business and bad public relations. When the men who are elected or appointed to guide our destinies withhold from the people they represent the facts which are rightfully theirs to know—then I say those leaders are acting dangerously and intolerably.

What are some of the contradictions and muddy statements concerning the atom bomb which have come to our ears in recent months?

I recall, for example, the statement of Rear Adm. William Parsons, the Navy's atomic-defense director, who claimed there had been tremendous overemphasis of the atom bomb. Admiral Parsons said that one or a dozen atom bombs dropped on American cities would be just another Pearl Harbor. He added confidently:

It would cook the goose of any nation doing it unless that nation had hundreds of atom bombs to follow up with.

Fears of radioactivity, Admiral Parsons said, are largely unfounded. Only the Bikini underwater blast, he pointed out, left appreciable amounts of radioactive deposits.

Well, two holes can be shot in that statement right off by the mere layman. First of all, I know of no guaranty that the enemy of the future would not have in his possession hundreds of atom bombs to hurl at our cities. And, second, what does Admiral Parsons mean by only the Bikini underwater blast left appreciable amounts of radioactive deposits? Does he mean to imply that underwater atom blasts will be declared outside the rules of future warfare, and that our potential enemies will only explode their bombs in the air, to spare us the inconvenience of radioactivity?

That is a pet point of the atom-bomb depreciators who would calm our nerves—the tell-'em-nothing and save-'em-from-fear boys. Oh, the radioactive particles of the air-burst atom bomb, they tell us, do their darnedest immediately following the explosion, and then they disappear into the stratosphere where nobody cares what happens to them. The worst sting of the atom bomb, they console us, lies in its explosive power, its terrific heat and fire. After it is all over, and thousands lie dead and mangled, there is nothing further to worry about—unless you happen to be dead and mangled, and then you are beyond worry anyway.

Again, there is this unwillingness to face up to the awful consequences of an underwater bomb.

Unfortunately, Col. James P. Cooney, one of the Army observers at Bikini, belongs to the do-not-let-the-atom-bomb-disturb-your-dreams school of thought. Colonel Cooney, who is chief of the Army Surgeon General's Special Projects Division, called the atom bomb primarily a blast weapon, referring to it casually as a piece of ordnance. An air-burst bomb, Colonel Cooney said, leaves so little radiation that rescue workers can safely enter a bombed area immediately after the blast. And then he warned that unreasoning psychological fears of the effects of radioactivity could well interfere with an important military mission in time of war.

Then why not give the American people the facts about radioactivity so that they can act intelligently in the light of this knowledge? The way to protect people from unreasoning psychological fears is not to keep them ignorant.

The way to avoid hysteria is not to stifle free discussion as was done several weeks ago in San Francisco. A round-table discussion on the deadliness of radiation, which was scheduled by the Radiological Society of North America, was canceled at the request of military authorities in Washington. It was claimed that the discussion would have involved many military angles, although this explanation must be taken with tongue in cheek. This is precisely the type of censorship which can multiply to threatening proportions.

Through this haze of censorship and official hedging has come a dramatic warning, which I believe brings us closer than we have ever been before to the true implications of the atom bomb. It is the account of Dr. David Bradley of his experiences as a radiological monitor at Bikini in the summer of 1946. The title

of Dr. Bradley's book is in itself a warning—"No Place To Hide."

This Geiger monitor whose job it was to guard the Bikini personnel from the unseen dangers of radiation does not look upon the atom bomb as merely another piece of ordnance. Dr. Bradley gives us a far different picture. He views the bomb as—and we quote:

> The colossus which looms behind tomorrow.

It was the underwater explosion, Dr. Bradley points out, which left behind it the real atomic menace—the lingering poison of radioactivity. In this test the lethal elements, the most dangerous fission products—including the deadly plutonium, which cannot be detected by the Geiger counter—were held captive in the huge cloud of water which fell back on the atoll.

While others whistle as they pass the atomic cemetery, Dr. Bradley tells us that the Bikini Atoll—an area of some 200 square miles—could not be decontaminated and made habitable for years or perhaps for centuries. Habitable that is, for people, not for fishes or birds. Furthermore, he says the Navy failed completely to cleanse the more strongly radioactive ships which were blasted in the experiment.

Let us not overlook the implications of that statement, as we contemplate the defense budget, and note the construction of a 65,000-ton carrier costing the stockholders—or rather, the taxpayers—$124,000,000. This carrier, and the Navy's request for an increase in its budget, contribute not only to the general confusion but to the national deficit.

Let us pierce the confusion and find out why we cannot devise a more economical and perhaps even more efficient defense. To quote from an editorial in the New York Herald Tribune:

> Surely the present level of military effectiveness could be provided for less than $15,000,000,000 a year.

And the New York Times on the same subject:

> It is one thing to know what we want to spend our money for; it is another thing to pay too much for what we get. We want an adequate defense, not a race between the services.

The services also appear to be outdoing each other in contradictory and confusing statements relative to our defense needs. Each official pleads the special case of his branch of the service, but no one attempts to define our defense needs in terms of atomic realities. So far I have heard none of our high officials convincingly refute these four conclusions presented by Dr. Bradley:

First. There is no real defense against atomic weapons.

Second. There are no satisfactory countermeasures and methods of decontamination.

Third. There are no satisfactory medical or sanitary safeguards for the people of atomized areas.

Fourth. The devastating influence of the bomb and its unborn relatives may affect the land and its wealth—and therefore its people—for centuries through the persistence of radioactivity.

This, as I have said, is the closest we have yet come to a straightforward statement of atomic consequences. However, it is not a top official report. It comes from a keen observer who has gone as far as he could in awakening us to the possible dangers of the poisoning of land, sea, and air with radioactivity from the atom bomb.

Much of the information the author acquired—Dr. Bradley notes—must remain veiled in official secrecy.

He does not mean that it should remain veiled, but that it must remain veiled under the official mandate.

There is a top official account of Bikini, which from all we can gather, is blotted out with the black ink of censorship. The Joint Chiefs of Staff Evaluation Board on the Bikini tests were charged with the task of writing a separate report on the value of the atom bomb and its place in the war of the future.

According to Mr. Bradley Dewey, a member of the Evaluation Board, and a respected New England industrialist, it was understood that the Board's report was partly for the guidance of public thinking and that all of it except those portions which might jeopardize military security would be made public. The Board chairman, Dr. Karl T. Compton, together with security experts of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, made certain deletions which Mr. Dewey calls entirely proper and expected, and then approved the remainder of the report for publication. It was also approved for publication by the Atomic Energy Commission. Then, according to Mr. Dewey, it was sent to the White House in the custody of Admiral Leahy, the President's Chief of Staff.

Where is this report now—this report which belongs to the public?

An Associated Press dispatch of November 26 quoted the National Military Establishment as saying Secretary Forrestal had recommended that the final official report on the Bikini atom-bomb tests be withheld for reasons of national security.

Mr. Bradley Dewey says:

> In the many months this report has been withheld from the public, millions of words have been printed expressing mere opinion and gross speculation, thus fanning the winds of rumor so that they swirl and eddy about the earth. Now serving one propaganda, now another, rumor exaggerates or depreciates the value of atomic weapons, falsifying and distorting public opinion everywhere.

I can foresee grave consequences if this type of dangerous mentality is permitted to keep legitimate information about the atom bomb from the American public. Even during wartime there exists an exaggerated sense of distrust of the public among this section of the military, which would, if permitted, clamp down an all-inclusive censorship on information reaching the public. Their unreasonable actions would be rationalized by befuddled references to military security and maintaining the public morale. This military mentality extended into peacetime censorship is even more dangerous, for it cannot wear the mask of immediate military necessity. It stems basically from distrust of the people and democratic processes of shaping national policy.

Both history and common sense demonstrate that contempt of the public and unjustified censorship are among the first blows against democracy. Unwillingness to take the public into counsels that affect the public welfare is based in good part upon the desire to build and preserve an undue sense of power and omnipotence.

I want to warn you that the seeds of military dictatorship lie in that course. I see great cause for alarm if atomic policy and other national policy is to be made and carried out over the heads of the American people. Powerful military leaders, monopolizing atomic information, can do more harm to our Nation than any truth about the dangers of atomic destruction and radioactivity. Yes; I think we have really to fear the military grab for power—the military who would control our destiny, perhaps laying the pattern of our destruction, rather than serving the interests of the Nation's defense.

I hold that no potential enemy will be served if the American people are told plainly and truthfully the facts about atomic destruction and radiation disease—what the bomb can do and has done to people and to ships and other devices of war.

I believe, in fact, that the more we know about the destructive powers of the atom bomb, the more convinced we will become that atomic warfare may very well mean the destruction of our civilization. Knowing this, I believe it will become more apparent to us that war is not inevitable, any more than voluntary death is inevitable to a person contemplating suicide. There is still a chance that he may be reasoned out of his impulse for self-destruction. That is what I fear the next war may amount to—mass self-destruction.

If the Russian people, as well as the American people, are given the full facts about the destructive potential of the atom bomb, I believe a long step will be taken toward making sure there will be no future war. In the atomic age, this is indeed one world. The atom bomb with its chain reaction, its radioactivity, and its dread byproducts respects no national or ideological boundaries. We cannot build Maginot lines against radioactivity. We cannot suppress or censor radioactivity or cheerfully contend that it does not exist, or even if it does exist, that it is not as bad as it might be.

We must take the guesswork out of national defense and international diplomacy. The diplomats and defense officials in our democracy must serve the interests of the people. But the people cannot decide where those best interests lie unless and until they know the truth. Knowledge banishes fear and provides an intelligent basis for democratic action. Therefore, I recommend—for the sake of the national security and the public welfare—that this body demand a full accounting of the final report of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Evaluation Board on the Bikini tests. Let us give this report to the people, to whom it belongs. I believe

we should also investigate all other possible suppressions of legitimate information about the atom bomb, such as the official silence concerning the later atomic-weapon tests at Eniwetok. Furthermore, let the committees charged with weighing our national defense needs study carefully the justification of all expenditures in the light of the actual necessities of the atomic age.

Practically every American has seen the impressive photograph of an atom-bomb explosion, with its mushroom of smoke or steam. The caption of this familiar photograph has been distorted and blurred. It is up to us to rewrite it clearly and truthfully, so that the atomic explosion may never be blasted out of that photograph to engulf our world in a radioactive doom.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. BLATNIK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

## TOWNSEND PLAN FOR NATIONAL INSURANCE

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1949, I introduced H. R. 2135, and the gentleman from Oregon, Representative ANGELL, introduced a companion bill, H. R. 2136, which is the Townsend plan for national insurance, and the following is a condensed version of the bill:

A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys

*Be it enacted, etc.—*

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

TITLE II—GROSS INCOME TAX

SEC. 201. In addition to all other excises, duties, or taxes, there shall be levied, collected, and paid a tax of 3 per centum of the gross income of all persons or companies derived from any and all sources, except in personal incomes there shall be an exemption up to $250 per month.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 202. The taxes shall be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Treasury may distrain upon any goods, chattels, etc., for delinquent taxes.

SEC. 204. The Secretary of the Treasury shall designate the manner and place for filing returns and payment of tax.

SEC. 205. The tax shall be computed on the total gross income of all persons and companies at the end of each calendar month.

SEC. 206. All remittances of taxes imposed by this act shall be made to the place designated by the Secretary of the Treasury on or before the 20th day of the second month after they accrue.

COLLECTIONS, ASSESSMENTS, AND APPEALS

SEC. 207. If the taxpayer shall make any error in computing the tax assessable against him, the Secretary of the Treasury shall correct such error.

SEC. 208. If the amount already paid exceeds that which should have been paid on the basis of the tax so recomputed, the excess so paid shall be immediately refunded to the taxpayer.

SEC. 209. If any person having made the return feels aggrieved by any assessment so made upon him, he may appeal from said assessment by filing a petition in the manner provided.

SEC. 210. The Secretary of the Treasury shall enforce the payment of the excises, taxes, or duties required by this act.

SEC. 211. For the purpose of the income tax imposed by title I of the Revenue Act of 1934, the tax imposed by section 201 shall be allowed as a deduction to the taxpayer in computing his net income.

SEC. 212. All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to any tax imposed by various revenue acts, shall be applicable to this act.

SEC. 213. All Federal officers or agents making contracts on behalf of the United States or its instrumentalities or any political subdivision thereof shall withhold payment in the final settlement of any contracts until the receipt of a certificate from the Secretary of the Treasury or his duly appointed agent to the effect that all taxes levied or accrued under this title against such contractor have been paid.

EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 214. The provisions of this title shall not apply to the following: (1) All moneys received by individuals or institutions and held in custody or as a deposit for others; (2) fraternal benefit societies, orders, or associations, operating under the lodge system, or for the exclusive benefit of the members of the fraternity itself, operating under the lodge system, and providing for the payment of death, sick, accident, or other benefits to the members of such societies, orders, or associations, and to their dependents or beneficiaries; (3) corporations, associations, or societies organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, or educational purposes; (4) business leagues, chambers of commerce, labor organizations, boards of trade, civic leagues, and other similar organizations operated exclusively for the benefit of the community and for the promotion of social welfare, and not for commercial trading in any form, and from which no profit inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual; (5) hospitals, infirmaries, and sanatoria, from which no profit inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual; (6) amounts received by any person as a benefit payment so-called or like payments by virtue of acts passed by the Congress of the United States relating thereto and disbursed to others as such benefit payment; but the Secretary of the Treasury may by regulation require any such deductions to be set forth specifically by the taxpayer in his return: *Provided, however,* That exemptions (2) to (6), inclusive, shall apply only to the gross income received from nonprofit activities.

PENALTIES

SEC. 215. It shall be unlawful for any person to refuse to make any returns provided for in this title; or to make any false or fraudulent return or false statement in any return with intent to defraud the United States, or to evade the payment of the tax, or any part thereof. Any person violating any of the provisions of this title shall be guilty of a felony, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 5 years, or by both. Any corporation for which a false return, or a return containing a false statement, as aforesaid, shall be made, shall be guilty of a felony and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000.

SEC. 216. The Federal Insurance Contributions Act is hereby repealed.

TITLE III—ANNUITIES

SEC. 301. There is hereby created an account in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the business, employment, and security insurance account (hereinafter referred to as the "account"). There are hereby authorized to be appropriated annually amounts to be equal to the estimated revenue derived under title II of this act. On the twentieth day of the month succeeding the month in which this act is enacted, and on the twentieth day of each calendar month thereafter, there shall be credited to the account an amount equal to the amount of revenue to be collected under the provisions of such title as indicated by the returns filed during the preceding calendar month. Such amounts shall be available for making the payments as hereinafter provided. The Secretary of the Treasury shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget an estimate of the appropriations to be credited to the account.

SEC. 302. Amounts estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury to be necessary for monthly expenditures in the administration of this title shall be deducted from amounts credited to the account for each month and all funds not so deducted shall be prorated and paid monthly to the number of annuitants per capita.

QUALIFICATIONS

SEC. 303. Every citizen who is 60 years of age or over shall upon filing an application under oath, be entitled to receive an annuity payable in monthly installments during the remainder of the life of such person.

SEC. 304. Every citizen between the ages of 18 and 60 who is disabled for a period longer than 6 months, every widow who is a citizen and who has the care of one or more children under 18 years of age, shall be entitled to receive an annuity payable in monthly installments so long as their incapacity for employment exists, or so long as they have the care of one or more children under 18 years of age.

SEC. 305. (a) The annuity shall be spent within the confines of the United States, its Territories, and possessions.

(b) Each installment of the annuity shall be spent by the annuitant within 30 days after the time of its receipt.

(c) An annuitant shall not engage in any occupation, business, or other activity from which a profit, wage, or other compensation is realized or attempted, except that nothing in this title shall be construed to prohibit an annuitant from collecting interest, rents, or other revenues from his own investments. No annuitants shall support an able-bodied person in idleness except a spouse.

(d) Any annuitant may waive all or any part of his right to an annuity under this title by filing a notice thereof with the Secretary of the Treasury in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe. Any such waiver shall not affect the right of any person to apply for an annuity at any time thereafter.

(e) Any sum received by an annuitant which represents the proceeds of a sale of any real property acquired through the use of money received as an annuity under this title shall be expended by the annuitant within 6 months after the receipt of such proceeds of such a sale.

(f) Each annuitant by accepting his annuity agrees to comply with all the provisions of this title and all rules and regulations.

REGULATIONS

SEC. 306. (a) Payments of the amounts due each annuitant under this title shall be made as near the first day of each month as possible.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall furnish application blanks and other necessary forms, etc.

SEC. 307. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury prescribes such rules as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby empowered to call upon now existing

departments or agencies of the United States to aid in the administration of this title.

(c) The Secretary of the Treasury is also empowered to make adjustments with respect to the time in which installments shall be expended in case payments to any person may have been delayed and there is an accumulation of two or more installments.

SEC. 308. The right to receive any payment under this title shall not be transferable or assignable.

PENALTIES

SEC. 309. Whoever in any application or any payment under this title knowingly or willfully makes any false statement of a material fact, or fails or refuses to obey any rule, or regulation, issued by the Secretary of the Treasury under this title, or violates any provisions of this title shall be prosecuted by the United States attorney in the United States district court in the district in which the offense occurred, and, upon conviction, the annuitant shall forfeit each month for the remainder of his life up to one-fourth of the annuity to which he would otherwise be entitled.

TITLE IV—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 401. Titles I and II of the Social Security Act, as amended, are hereby repealed.

SEC. 402. All acts or parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed to the extent of such conflict.

SEC. 403. If any part of this act is for any reason held to be unconstitutional, it shall not affect any other part of this act.

SEC. 404. This act may be cited as the "Business, Employment, and Security Insurance Act."

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WICKERSHAM, for an indefinite period, on account of illness in family.

To Mr. BENTSEN, for 1 week, on account of official business.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 17, 1949, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

226. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of leases in two sections—cumulative report as of June 1, 1948, and additional leases as of December 1, 1948—property outleased under authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

227. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting copies of amendments, requests, and letters of compliance with the amendments and requests to certain voluntary plans under Public Law 395; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

228. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a letter relative to section 3 (k) of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act, approved August 2, 1946 (Public Law 592, 79th Cong.); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 630. An act to amend section 19 of the act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1057), so as to remove the upper age limit for appointment to commissioned grade in the Supply Corps of the Navy; without amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 673. An act relating to the pay and allowances of officers of the Naval Reserve performing active duty in the grade of rear admiral, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALSH: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2485. A bill to authorize the attendance of the United States Marine Band at the Eighty-third and Final National Encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held in Indianapolis, Ind., August 28 to September 1, 1949; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H. R. 2681. A bill to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2513. A bill to amend subdivisions d and e of section 58 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 652. A bill for the relief of Laura Spinnichia; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2463. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Florence Byvank; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2474. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard; with an amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2605. A bill for the relief of John C. Nunes; without amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 279. An act to authorize the advance on the retired list of Lt. John T. McDermott, United States Navy (retired), to the grade of lieutenant commander; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. S. 632. An act to authorize certain personnel and former personnel of the Naval Establishment to accept certain gifts and a foreign decoration tendered by foreign governments; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2767. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates, essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the armed forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:

H. R. 2768. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide certain retirement benefits for civilian marine inspectors, officers in charge, and marine inspection officers of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2769. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the two hundred fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the first colony in the Louisiana Territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

H. R. 2770. A bill to amend section 77 of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CROOK:

H. R. 2771. A bill to provide credit for salary purposes to carriers advanced from the status of village delivery; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2772. A bill to abolish the village delivery service of the Post Office Department; to transfer village carriers to the city delivery service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FELLOWS:

H. R. 2773. A bill to provide a method of paying referees in those bankruptcy courts where the existing funds are insufficient to pay sums due such referees for services rendered and expenses incurred; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 2774. A bill to amend section 17 of Public Law 134 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 2775. A bill to reclassify postmasters, assistant postmasters, and other positions in the postal field service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLMES:

H. R. 2776. A bill authorizing flood-control works on the Yakima River and tributaries; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 2777. A bill to provide for the national defense through the acquisition of domestically produced manganese ores and concentrates essential to the manufacture of supplies and material for the armed forces in time of emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANBORN:

H. R. 2778. A bill for the relief of Carey Act settlers in the Black Canyon irrigation district under the Payette division of the Boise reclamation project in Idaho; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 2779. A bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of bulls with intent to use such bulls for bull fighting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 2780. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. R. 2781. A bill to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MILLS:

H. R. 2782. A bill to permit any veteran of both World Wars to elect to have his service in World War I counted as service in World War II for the purpose of determining eligibility for certain benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POTTER:

H. R. 2783. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REES:

H. R. 2784. A bill to repeal a proviso which limits, in certain cases, the amount which may be paid to rural carriers on heavily patronized routes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 2785. A bill to provide for further contributions to the international children's emergency fund; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H. R. 2786. A bill to make certain increases in the annuities of annuitants under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system in view of the increased cost of living; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN:

H. R. 2787. A bill to authorize a further preliminary examination and a new survey of the following streams, which are tributaries to the Red River of the North: Snake River, Middle River (tributary to Snake River), Tamarac River, and Two Rivers (including North, South, and Middle Branches), Big Joe and Little Joe Rivers, in the State of Minnesota, for flood control, for run-off and water-flow retardation, and soil-erosion prevention; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 2788. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEYER:

H. R. 2789. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 2790. A bill to provide for the improvement of Pennypack Creek, a tributary of the Delaware River, in Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. R. 2791. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional circuit judge for the tenth circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2792. A bill to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability, from whatever cause, for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Oklahoma:

H. R. 2793. A bill to establish a United States Air Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HART:

H. R. 2794. A bill to incorporate the Legion of Guardsmen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 2795. A bill for the purpose of erecting in Mount Lebanon Township, Allegheny County, Pa., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2796. A bill for the purpose of erecting in the Borough of Castle Shannon, Allegheny County, Pa., a post-office building; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 2797. A bill to provide that children be committed to the Board of Public Welfare in lieu of being committed to the National Training School for Girls; that the property and personnel of the National Training School for Girls be available for the care of children committed to or accepted by the Board of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2798. A bill to require the taking and destruction of dangerous weapons in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 2799. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act regulating the retent on contracts with the District of Columbia," approved March 31, 1906; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 2800. A bill relating to certain subsistence allowance overpayments made during 1946 to veterans pursuing courses of education or training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. J. Res. 166. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to joinder of the United States in suit in the United States Supreme Court for adjudication of claims to waters of the Colorado River system; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. J. Res. 167. Joint resolution to provide for the reforestation and revegetation of the forest and range lands of the national forests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. J. Res. 168. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the term of office and qualifications of Members of the House of Representatives and the qualifications of Members of the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 40. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to have printed for Members of Congress copies of the reports submitted by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, after said reports have become a House document; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. Res. 106. Resolution to express the gratitude of the House to amateur radio operators; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. Res. 107. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 108. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2681 to provide pensions for veterans of World War I and World War II based on non-service-connected disability and attained age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2801. A bill for the relief of J. P. Olsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 2802. A bill for the relief of Jerta and Peter Stephan Blumenstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 2803. A bill for the relief of Albert J. Peterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GORDON (by request):

H. R. 2804. A bill for the relief of Manuel DaCosta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 2805. A bill for the relief of John F. Oettl; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2806. A bill for the relief of Paul C. Juneau; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2807. A bill for the relief of Loretta B. Powell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 2808. A bill for the relief of Grace G. Walker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 2809. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Mascarin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SOMERS:

H. R. 2810. A bill to authorize the admission of Eliezar Tatz, a native of Israel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

82. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of members of the Holy Name Society of St. Peter's Parish, Lovilia, Iowa, urging inclusion in the Federal aid to education bill of the well-being of all children, regardless of race, color, or creed, without discrimination; and health and welfare for non-public-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

83. Also, petition of members of the Altar and Rosary Society of St. Peter's Parish, Lovilia, Iowa, urging inclusion in the Federal aid to education bill of the well-being of all children, regardless of race, color, or creed; and health and welfare services for non-public-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

84. Also, petition of members of the Holy Name Society and the Altar and Rosary Society of St. John's Parish at Hiteman, Iowa, urging inclusion in the Federal aid to education bill of the well-being of all children, regardless of race, color, or creed, without discrimination; and health and welfare services for non-public-school children; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

85. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions passed by the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, New Bedford, Mass., on February 10, 1949, protesting the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

86. By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, Regu-

lation of Lobbying Act, section 308 (b), which provides as follows:

(b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received for the fourth calendar quarter of 1948.

To carry out the provisions of the Lobbying Act, three forms were printed and used in making detailed statements (Form A), registrations (Form B), and filing quarterly reports (Form C).

Section 308 (b) requires the printing of information received and filed. Forms B and C, upon which this information was submitted, are reproduced as follows:

FORM B

REGISTRATION (IN DUPLICATE) WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE UNDER THE LOBBYING ACT

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------
Business address----------

INFORMATION REQUESTED FROM PERSONS REGISTERING

(1) The name and address of the person by whom employed:
(1) ----------
(2) In whose interest he appears or works:
(2) ----------
(3) The duration of such employment:
(3) ----------
(4) How much he is paid and is to receive:
(4) ----------
(5) By whom he is paid or is to be paid:
(5) ----------
(6) How much he is to be paid for expenses:
(6) ----------
(7) What expenses are to be included:
(7) ----------

See Form C for quarterly report to be filed.

OATH OF REGISTRANT

[Omitted in printing]

---

FORM C

QUARTERLY REPORT OF PERSONS REGISTERING UNDER LOBBYING ACT TO BE FILED, IN DUPLICATE, WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SECRETARY OF THE SENATE

(Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

Name ----------
Business address----------
Employed by----------
Address ----------

INFORMATION REQUIRED IN QUARTERLY REPORT

Each such person so registering shall, between the 1st and 10th day of each calendar quarter, so long as his activity continues, file with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and Secretary of the Senate—

(1) A detailed report under oath of all money received and expended by him during the preceding calendar quarter:
(1) ----------
(2) To whom paid:
(2) ----------
(3) For what purposes:
(3) ----------
(4) The names of any papers, periodicals, magazines, or other publications in which he has caused to be published any articles or editorials:
(4) ----------
(5) The proposed legislation he is employed to support or oppose:
(5) ----------

OATH OF REGISTRANT FILING QUARTERLY REPORT

[Omitted in printing]

REGISTRATIONS

The following registrations were received for the fourth calendar quarter 1948, and filed, using Form B, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space, the questions in Form B (see above) are not repeated. Only the answers to questions are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

American Citizens Committee To Establish New Immigration Quota for Greece Without Discrimination (short title: Act Now Committee), 4314 Argyle Terrace NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Self-employed. (2) All voluntary members interested in purposes of registrant. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite; supported by voluntary contributions. (5) Voluntary subscribers or donors. (6) Indefinite; for expenses actually incurred. (7) Those actually incurred.

Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The Western Union Telegraph Co. (3) One year. (4) The employment is an ordinary attorney-client relationship on a retainer basis. The retainer is $25,000. (5) The Western Union Telegraph Co. (6) Actual disbursements are to be reimbursed. (7) Travel, cabs, telephones, miscellaneous.

Barnett, Arthur R., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Electric Companies. (See attached statement [1]). (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary of $13,500 per annum as secretary, treasurer, and director of research. I estimate that less than 10 percent of my time is spent on legislative matters within the purview of the act. (5) National Association of Electric Companies. (6) Amount incurred. (7) Traveling and expenses incidental thereto and those expenses incurred in the performance of routine work and duties.

Berthelot, Helen, 17231 Lahse Road, Detroit, Mich. (1) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44, 510 Lafayette Building, Detroit, Mich. (2) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44. (3) December 1949. (4) $4,200 per year. (5) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44. (6) $6 per diem plus transportation and hotel. (7) Transportation, meals, hotel.

Blankenship, C. B., Post Office Box 1150, Birmingham, Ala. (1) Communications Workers of America and its divisions, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the organizations whose name appears in (1) above. (3) For the term of office which requires 2 years (November 1948 to November 1950). (4) $4,800 per annum. (5) The organization whose name appears in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

Boggs, Maywood, 825 Bowen Building, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, Brotherhood Building, Kansas City, Kans. (2) International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America. (3) Indefinite; probably while Congress is in session. (4) $700 per month. No segregation is made or is possible as to the portion of this amount which is compensation for legislative activities. (5) International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America. (6) $15 per diem and actual traveling expenses outside of the city. (7) Per diem to be used for hotels, meals, taxies, entertainment, and other incidental expenses incurred in performing work.

Booras, James A., 4314 Argyle Terrace NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Citizens Committee To Establish New Immigration Quota for Greece Without Discrimination (short title: Act Now Committee). (2) The committee under (1) and voluntary associate members thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite. (5) The committee as under (2). (6) Indefinite. (7) Those actually incurred.

Bradford, Ira P., 1515 Stafford Street North, Arlington, Va. (1) Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) Standard Oil Co. (Indiana). (3) Indefinite. (4) I estimate that not in excess of $1,000 of the compensation received by me will be related to activities coming within the scope of the Lobbying Act. This is for the reason that my duties are to be concerned with the maintenance of an information service for the benefit of my company. It is not intended that lobbying activities will constitute any appreciable part of my work. (5) Standard Oil Co. (Indiana). (6) No specified amount. (7) Not specified.

Brooks, William F., 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Grain Trade Council and its members. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000, a small and unallocable part of which might be regarded as compensation for services for activities covered by the Lobbying Act. (5) National Grain Trade Council. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses. (7) Transportation costs, telephone calls, newspapers and periodicals, limited amount of entertainment, luncheons, etc.

Bundy, William P., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (2) Northwest Horticultural Council as above; this organization is an association of apple and pear growers of the Pacific Northwest and is interested in legislation affecting the import of apples and pears and the stimulation of exports thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) This employment is jointly undertaken with Howard C. Westwood. Mr. Westwood's registration gives the amount of the joint retainer, $500 per month. (5) Northwest Horticultural Council. (6) Mr. Westwood's registration states that the joint payment for expenses will cover actual disbursements only. (7) Actual disbursements as indicated in (6). Travel, telephone, telegraph, and similar miscellaneous expense.

Carter, Horace,[2] 209 West One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) I am not employed by any business or organization. This is my initial application. (2) For the purpose of amending and broadening of social-security benefits, adequate housing program, revising the Railway Labor Act and for legislation pending or contemplated on civil rights. (See amended form.[1]) (3) Indefinite. (4) To be filed accordingly, all money received will be solicited

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

and detailed accounts will be outlined, whenever loans, gifts, subscriptions, promises, contributions, and agreements are made. (5) To be outlined accordingly. (6) To be outlined accordingly. (7) To be outlined accordingly.

Chisholm, William James, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Regular Veterans Association, a membership corporation duly organized under the membership corporation laws of the District of Columbia, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW, Washington, D. C. (2) Regular Veterans Association, the veterans of the World Wars and the service men and women serving in the Regular Military Establishments of the armed forces. (3) Elected national judge advocate and appointed national adjutant of the Regular Veterans Association September 20, 1948, for a period of 1 year, or longer if necessary, until a successor is duly elected and appointed at a national convention. (4) $1,300 per annum as a salary for services as national judge advocate; $3,900 per annum as a salary for services as national adjutant. (5) Paid by the Regular Veterans Association. (6) All expenses to be defrayed from above salary. (7) This will include all expenses in connection with offices of national judge advocate and national adjutant.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Veterans Committee, Inc., 1200 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) American Veterans Committee, Inc., its members, and all veterans of World War II. (3) As national vice chairman, until next national convention; as national secretary, at the pleasure of the national planning committee. (4) $7,500 salary as national vice chairman, of which not more than 10 percent is attributable to activities under the Lobbying Act, and none as national secretary. (5) American Veterans Committee, Inc. (6) Not more than $5 per month for legislative activities. (7) Taxi fares.

Clovis, Edwards & Reed, Inc.[3] (H. E. Clovis, A. W. Edwards, and Louis Reed, employees thereof), 630 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Foremen's League for Education and Association, room 603, 11 West Monument, Dayton, Ohio. (2) Same as above. (3) Six months, commencing January 1, 1949. (4) $1,500 per month. (5) Same as (1). (6) Reimbursement of out-of-town travel expenses. (7) Only those in (6).

Russell Coleman, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Employer as indicated in (1). (3) Employed on a year-to-year basis. (4) Russell Coleman is paid a salary as president of the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., and he is informed and believes that when he shall do anything as such president to influence legislation by Congress an allocable part of his salary may be said to be paid as consideration for such activity, and in such event he intends to report the same in his quarterly report. (5) [Blank.] (6) See answer to (4). In addition, Russell Coleman is not to be paid any sum specifically for expenses in attempting to influence legislation. Any expense actually to be incurred in attempting to influence legislation will be paid by him subject to reimbursement by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc. (7) Any such expenses as travel, hotels, meals, taxies, tips, and entertainment are to be included and will be reported when actually incurred by the registrant.

Cooper, J. Milton, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Coal Association, Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Coal Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) This employment is an ordinary attorney-and-client relationship, and is based on a regular retainer. Some of the employment may fall within the provisions of the act. It is impossible, however, to allocate in advance the amount of the remuneration to be reported. (5) National Coal Association. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Cooper, J. Milton, 544 Washington Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Lime Association, 927 Fifteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Lime Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) This employment is an ordinary attorney-and-client relationship, and is based on a regular retainer. Some of the employment may fall within the provisions of the act. It is impossible however to allocate in advance the amount of the remuneration to be reported. (5) National Lime Association. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Cullum, Robert M. (1) Committee for Equality in Naturalization, 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (2) Committee for Equality in Naturalization. (3) July 1949. (4) Part time. Basic rate, $500 per month. (5) Committee for Equality in Naturalization. (6) Reimbursement for actual expense incurred. (7) Postage, supplies, travel, etc.

Curry, James E., 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant is employed by certain public corporations, instrumentalities of the government of Puerto Rico, for general legal work. On very rare occasions he is or may be called upon to perform work which influences directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of congressional legislation. He has examined the list of registrants and finds no registration for similar corporations, controlled by Federal, State, or Territorial government. It is registrant's very emphatic opinion that the Lobbying Act does not apply to State, Territorial, or Federal agencies or instrumentalities or representatives. This registration is filed merely as a matter of public record. If the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate desire compliance with said act by the undersigned in spite of the circumstances above recited, a notification to that effect is hereby requested. (2) Puerto Rico Communications Authority and others. (3) Indefinite. (4) $10 per hour of work actually done. (5) See (2). (6) Actual expenses. (7) Actual expenses.

Danaher, John A., 1625 K Street, Washington, D. C., and 50 State Street, Hartford, Conn. (1) Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., 230 Park Avenue, New York City. (2) See (1): as an attorney engaged in the general practice of law I represent the above-named client in appearances before Government departments and agencies and, incidentally, may be required to appear before committees of Congress. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite; charges will be made in accordance with appearances required, time expended, professional judgment, and experience relied upon and services rendered. (5) See (1). (6) Indefinite; but as incurred. (7) Necessary stenographic and office expenses, essential travel, telephone charges.

Donnelly, James L., 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (I am advised that my activities do not subject me to the provisions of the act, but I have registered and will file reports pending clarification of the law.) (1) Illinois Manufacturers' Association (for which registrant is executive vice president) 120 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) Illinois Manufacturers' Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) An annual salary for all services rendered as executive vice president of which not over $5,000 per year could reasonably be allocated to activities covered by the Lobbying Act. (5) Illinois Manufacturers' Association. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Cost of transportation, hotel accommodations, meals, taxicabs, etc.

Drake, John (amended form), 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $5,500 per annum to cover all services for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Edelsberg, Herman, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (2) Anti-Defamation League. (3) Registrant is a regular employee of the Anti-Defamation League. (4) Registrant is employed as Washington representative of the civil-rights division of the Anti-Defamation League. Only 5 percent of his activity and time, at most, is devoted to activity within the terms of the act. Approximately $500 per annum is allocatable to his activity under the act. (5) Anti-Defamation League. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses for activities under the act will approximate $60 per year or less. (7) Actual out-of-pocket expenses for fares, telephones, postage, meals.

Edwards, Burton E., executive secretary, National Apartment Owners Association, Suite 204–5–6, Portland Building, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., suite 226, Douglas Building, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) National Apartment Owners Association. (2) National Apartment Owners Association. (3) Temporary retainer; at will of National Apartment Owners Association's president. (4) $500 retainer, per month. (5) National Apartment Owners Association. (6) Estimated, $4,000 per year. (7) All travel and incidental expenses thereto.

Evans, Walter M., 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va. (1) Virginia Associated Businessmen (a Virginia corporation), 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va. (2) In the interest of the members of and subscribers to Virginia Associated Businessmen, a Virginia nonprofit corporation, and the said corporation, on a part-time basis. (3) Of indefinite duration, but now specified to terminate on April 21, 1949, unless extended beyond that date by mutual agreement. (4) $150 per month for general office expenses. No other compensation is paid by the association, but the sum of $200 per month is paid on behalf of the association by Messrs. Scott and Schuler of 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (5) The answer to this question is set forth in (4). (6) In addition to the $150 for general office expenses, all expenses incurred in traveling, long-distance-telephone calls, and telegrams, postage, printing, and additional stenographic and clerical hire are paid by Virginia Associated Businessmen to the registrant. (7) In addition to those listed under (6) the $150 stated in (4) includes association's use of basic telephone service, routine stenographic service, and office space in registrant's office.

Farhat, Selma, 1217 West St. Joseph Street, Lansing, Mich. (1) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44, 510 Lafayette Building, Detroit, Mich. (2) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44. (3) December 1949. (4) $13 per day for each day worked. (5) Communications Workers of America, Michigan Division, No. 44. (6) $6 per diem plus transportation and hotel. (7) Transportation, meals, hotel.

Farquhar (Mrs. Norman), Randolph, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (2) American Parents Committee. (3) Started December 13, 1948. (4) $75 per week and ex-

[3] Registration with the Secretary only.

penses. (5) American Parents Committee. (6) [Blank.] (7) Travel, entertainment, etc.

Foster, Charles E., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of service-connected disabled American war veterans and their dependents. (3) Indefinite. (4) $6,480, less withholding and social security. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Any expense incurred, see (7). (7) Taxis, lunches, and other expenses incidental to work at the Capitol. Actual traveling expenses.

Foutz, Dave, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans Organization Council of Altadena, 2302 North Lake, Altadena, Calif. (2) VOCA. (3) Undetermined. (4) $600 per month. (5) VOCA. (6) Actual costs on monthly audited statement. (7) Living in Washington, office maintenance, and guests.

Frackman, H. David, 276 Fifth Avenue, New York City, N. Y. (1) Regular Veterans Association, a membership corporation duly organized under the membership corporation laws of the District of Columbia, 1115 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Regular Veterans Association, the veterans of the World Wars and the service men and women serving in the Regular Military Establishments of the armed forces. (3) Elected national commander of the Regular Veterans Association September 20, 1948, for a period of 1 year, or longer if necessary, until a successor is duly elected at a national convention. (4) $5,000 per annum as a salary for services as national commander. (5) Paid by the Regular Veterans Association. (6) To be paid an additional $5,000 for expenses, as the funds of the organization permit, in connection with personal expenses, transportation, hotel bills, and miscellaneous expenses disbursed in the performance of the duties of the office of national commander. (7) This will include all expenses in connection with office of national commander.

Freeman, Milton V., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Consumer Mail Order Association of America, Post Office Box 1025, Joplin, Mo. (2) Consumer Mail Order Association of America. (3) One year. (4) The employment is an ordinary attorney-client relationship with compensation to be paid by a retainer of $5,000 and such additional fees as may be earned. (5) Consumer Mail Order Association of America. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel, telephones, taxicabs, printing, etc.

Garstang, Marion R., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $7,700 per annum to cover all services as attorney for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

George, J. M., H. K. Brehmer, and C. S. McMahon, constituting the partnership of George, Brehmer & McMahon, 165 Center Street, Winona, Minn. (1) National Association of Direct Selling Companies, Winona, Minn. (2) Same as (1). (3) Indefinite but continuous and as general counsel on all legal matters, Federal legislation being merely incidental. (4) General law service retainer of $1,000 per month, payable without regard to any incidental service re Federal legislation, and this registration is made without belief that it is required by the law and facts. (5) Same as (1). (6) Those necessary and incidental to the work. Amount not known but to be reimbursed as incurred. (7) Necessary travel and communications.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Cargill, Inc., a corporation with its principal office at 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (2) In the interest of dealers in and warehousemen and shippers of grains, seeds, and beans, and manufacturers of feed for livestock and poultry, the ingredients thereof, and vegetable oils. (3) See letter attached. (4) $2,083.67 per month, plus bonuses not exactly determinable in advance, plus expenses. (5) Cargill, Inc. (6) Reimbursed in full for all expenses; no fixed limit as to amount. (7) All usual business expenses, including office rent, telephone, etc.

Heiman, Marcus, 234 West Fourty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) E Street Theatre Corp., 234 West Forty-fourth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) E Street Theatre Corp. (National Theatre). (3) Indefinite. (4) Aside from my regular salary as president of the corporation I receive no further compensation and anything I may do before Congress is purely incidental to, and cannot be segregated from my duties as president. (5) E Street Theatre Corp.; regular salary as President only. (6) Nothing. (7) None.

Henning, William C., executive secretary, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio. (1) American Cemetery Association, 50 West Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio. (2) American Cemetery Association. (3) Permanently engaged. (4) Salary, $6,000 per year. (5) American Cemetery Association. (6) Exact amount of expenses. (7) All necessary travel and expense in behalf of this organization.

Hermann, Louis F. (amended form), 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $7,700 per annum to cover all services for the federation including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) The National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Hewes & Awalt (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, Maxwell M. Merritt, and W. V. T. Justis), 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C., and 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn. (The filing of this registration is not to be taken as an admission that the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act is applicable.) (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Approximately 94 member companies and approximately 7 subscribing companies of the National Association of Electric Companies, located in 39 States and the District of Columbia. (3) Indefinite. (4) No payment has been received but the firm of Hewes & Awalt will be paid an annual retainer of $25,000 as general counsel of the association, with compensation for additional or extra services (not within the regular routine duties of general counsel) to be made the subject of special agreement when the occasion arises. (5) National Association of Electric Companies. (6) Usual out-of-pocket expenses will be reimbursed. (7) Expenses customary in legal work, such as carfare, taxi fares, telephone and telegraph charges, transportation, and traveling expenses.

Hilts, Harry B., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Atlantic Coast Oil Conference, Inc., Empire State Petroleum Association, Inc., 122 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Membership of Atlantic Coast Oil Conference, Inc., and Empire State Petroleum Association, Inc. (3) Elected to serve 1-year term. (4) The registrant does not believe his activities come under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The registrant is not employed primarily to support or oppose any specific legislation, nor is any particular part of his salary allocated for this purpose. The registrant's duties are such that, in the course of normal and regular association activities, he is required to report to the association's board of directors the nature of pending legislation which might affect the interests of the association's membership and the petroleum industry in general. Any action taken in connection with pending legislation is done under the direction of the association's board of directors. The registrant's authorized salary is $17,500 annually and covers all duties of regular and normal association activities. (5) Atlantic Coast Oil Conference, Inc., and Empire State Petroleum Association, Inc. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expense for legitimate association work. No specific budget items set up to cover activities under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (7) Traveling, telephone, telegraph, and such legitimate out-of-pocket expense incurred through regular and normal association activities.

Hobbie, Edgar V. H., 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite. (4) $700 per month. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenses. (7) All actual expenses.

Hood, J. M., president, American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (2) The 317 members of American Short Line Railroad Association listed in detail in the registration of the association. (3) Subject to the pleasure of the board of directors of the association. (4) Annual salary, $20,000, of which an indefinite amount, estimated at $2,000 per annum, is to cover services in connection with legislation. (5) The association. (6) Reimbursement for expenses incurred for account of the association. Amount indefinite, but based on past experience amount for account of legislation estimated at $2,500 per annum. (7) Travel, hotel, restaurant, and entertainment.

Householder, Glen M., 1 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vt. (1) Holstein-Friesian Association of America, 1 Main Street, Brattleboro, Vt. (2) Holstein cattle breeders of America. (3) Indefinite; by the year. (4) $8,000 per annum. (5) Holstein-Friesian Association of America. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenses. (7) All actual expenses.

Houston, William J., 716 Washington Loan and Trust Building, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Federation of Government Employees, 716 Washington Loan and Trust Building, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Employees of the Federal Government. (3) Permanent. (4) $7,500 per annum. (5) American Federation of Government Employees. (6) Actual expenses. (7) Carfare, taxicabs, meals, and incidentals.

Jackson, Robert C., 301 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cotton Council of America, 165 Madison Avenue, Memphis, Tenn. (2) National Cotton Council of America, an organization of cotton producers, ginners, merchants, warehousemen, cottonseed crushers and cotton textile mills. Sole purpose of organization is to increase consumption of cotton, cottonseed, and the products thereof. (3) Permanent. (4) $12,000. (5) National Cotton Council of America only.

(6) Reimbursement for legitimate out-of-pocket expenditures. (7) Legitimate out-of-pocket expenses such as out-of-town travel, telephone and telegram, cab fares, meals for guests, etc.

Jennes, Ernest W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatches, Wash. (2) Northwest Horticultural Council as above; this organization is an association of apple and pear growers of the Pacific Northwest, and is interested in legislation affecting the import of apples and pears and the stimulation of exports thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) This employment is jointly undertaken with Howard C. Westwood. Mr. Westwood's registration gives the amount of the joint retainer, $500 per month. (5) Northwest Horticultural Council. (6) Mr. Westwood's registration states that the joint payment for expenses will cover actual disbursements only. (7) Actual disbursements as indicated in (6); travel, telephone, telegraph, and similar miscellaneous expenses.

Johnson, Curtis E., 4619A South Thirty-sixth Street, Arlington, Va. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) Terminable at will. (4) $625 per month plus reimbursement of actual out-of-pocket expenses. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) To include such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Jones, Rowland, Jr., 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Retail Federation. (2) American Retail Federation. (3) Permanent. (4) Annual salary, $17,400, of which 10 percent is estimated as being attributable to legislative purposes. (5) American Retail Federation. (6) Indeterminate amounts depending upon legislative activity but limited to taxis, telephones, and telegraph expenditures and meals. (7) See (6).

Kass, Rear Adm. I., Post Office Box 4037, Washington, D. C. (1) On my own initiative. (2) In interests of Southern States government and free liberal government. (3) Not certain. (4) Expect to receive $60,000, but none was arranged nor promised. (5) Southern States governments. (6) Not certain. (7) My professional services and railroad fare, printing and mailing, and similar expenses, and telephone.

Keefe, Thomas J., 1319 F Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Road Builders' Association, a nonprofit, noncommercial organization which directs its efforts to technical, scientific, and educational work. (2) American Road Builders' Association. (3) On an annual basis. (4) $3,600 per year. (5) American Road Builders' Association. (6) Actual out-of-pocket expenses, but not to exceed $2,600 per year. (7) Taxicabs, luncheons, postage, telephone, transportation, etc.

Ketchum, Inc., 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) National Competition Committee, room 56, 524 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh Pa. (2) National Competition Committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) Approximately $11,000 per month. (5) National committee. (6) Expenses will be paid directly by the committee. (7) Office rent, travel and living expenses for Ketchum staff members assigned to this client, stenographic salaries, printing, multigraphing, postage and other mailing expenses.

Klepinger,[2] Robert F., 1720 M Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant will be employed by officers discriminated against under interpretation by the Comptroller General of section 201, Legislative Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1933, upon enactment of correctional legislation enabling such officers to establish and prove the right to payment of pay loss due to such interpretation; and he will be employed by persons the property of whom was seized under the act of 1917 as amended (50 U. S. C. A. App. sec. 1, et seq.) under which employment legislation will be required to enable such persons to establish the right to have such property restored. In this connection, see registrant's statement filed with the Clerk January 20, 1948. (2) See (1) supra. (3) Uncertain; see (1) supra. (4) None for advocating enactment of proposed legislation referred to in (1) supra. If such legislation is enacted, fees will be determined commensurate for services rendered in compliance and conformity with such legislation but not for assistance in securing its enactment. (5) No one; see (1) and (4) supra. (6) None; see (1) and (4) supra. (7) None; see (1) and (4) supra.

Kyle, J. M. DeW., II, 1811 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The National Defense League of America, 1811 Nineteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of national defense as outlined in the attached program of the National Defense League of America. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary undetermined but will be fixed and reported in quarterly reports. (5) The National Defense League of America. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses. (7) Local transportation, tips, lunches, and postage.

Lancraft, Robert J., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Realtor's Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The Realtors' Washington Committee, and through it the members of the National Association of Real Estate Boards throughout the United States, (3) Two weeks. (4) $6,000 per year. (5) Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards. (6) No specified amount; to be reimbursed upon claim for legitimate out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Transportation, telephone, meals, and similar expenses in connection with my duties.

La Roe, Wilbur, Jr., 743 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Eastern Meat Packers Association, 740 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) The above association. (3) Annual. (4) $6,000 annually mainly for legal advice, being salary as general counsel. No amount paid specially for legislative work which constitutes such a small portion of the total that it cannot be measured. (5) By the association itself. (6) Nothing except actual incidentals such as transportation and meals while traveling. No expenses for legislative work unless there is printing expense. (7) Only incidental expenses as above.

Lee, Thomas A., Post Office Box 2169, South Portland, Maine. (1) Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association. (2) Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association to secure sorely needed legislation for the welfare of the retired employees. My position is secretary of the association. (3) Calendar year 1949. (4) Not paid and will receive nothing for pay. (5) Not paid. (6) Travel on actual basis plus $12 per day for subsistence and lodging. (7) Lodging and subsistence.

Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is an association composed of 90 legal reserve life-insurance companies. (See exhibit attached[1]). (2) (See exhibit attached[1]). (3) Unlimited. (4) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in act. At the end of each quarter, an estimate and report will be made to determine the amount received from members during the quarter which might come within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the Department of Justice. (5) See exhibit attached[1]). (6) Staff members will be paid actual out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, etc.

Litschert, Robert G., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Electric Companies. (3) Indefinite. (4) Salary of $9,000 per year. I estimate that less than 10 percent of my time is spent on legislative matters within the purview of this act. (5) National Association of Electric Companies. (6) Amount incurred. (7) Traveling and expenses incidental thereto and those expenses incurred in the performance of routine work and duties.

Locke, Gordon C., 632 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 632 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Committee for Pipe Line Companies. (3) Indeterminate period. (4) $13,500 per annum, of which amount, it is estimated that 5 percent or $675 may be a fair apportionment to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (5) Committee for Pipe Line Companies. (6) Only actual expenses which may be incurred but cannot at this time be determined with any degree of accuracy. (7) Personal expenses, such as incidental to travel and other miscellaneous personal expenses.

Love, Richard H., 709 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Judge Advocates Association, 331 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (2) Judge Advocates Association. (3) Indefinite. (4) $50 per week. (5) Judge Advocates Association. (6) Reimbursement of actual expenses incurred approved by president and/or secretary of association. (7) Telephone, telegram, postage, secretarial, office expenses, stationery, supplies, printing, transportation, etc., actually incurred.

Lunn, Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Townsend Plan, Inc., Townsend National Insurance Plan, 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) [Blank.] (3) Temporary, voluntary. (4) No salary; no specified amount; a small commission on dues from members locally for postage, announcements of meetings, never enough to cover; because a humanitarian movement I donate time. (5) Townsend Plan, Inc.; I pay most expenses myself. (6) No set amount; a small commission; never enough to cover local expenses of local mailing of announcements of meetings, etc. (7) Mimeograph occasional news bulletins, postcard notices of local Townsend Club meetings, etc.

Lynn, John C., 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Farm Bureau Federation. (3) Continuing. (4) $8,000. (5) American Farm Bureau Federation. (6) None, except reimbursement of actual necessary expenditures approved by officers of the American Farm Bureau Federation. (7) None, except as noted under (6).

McAdams, William D., Room 521, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (2) Retail Stores which are members of the association. (3) One year. (4) $3,750 per quarter to be received. $2,500 received to date. (5) National Retail Dry Goods Association. (6) Traveling expenses only which are not determined at this time. (7) Traveling only.

McGrath, Thomas Edward, general delivery, Washington 1, D. C. (1) Taxpayers of United States of America, United States Treasury. (2) In interests of taxpayers. (3) Indefinite. (4) Expenses, $165. (5) United States

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

taxpayers. (6) No specific amount. (7) [Blank.]

Malone, Robert W., 4314 Argyle Terrace NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Citizens Committee To Establish New Immigration Quota for Greece Without Discrimination (short title: Act Now Committee.) (2) The committee under (1) and voluntary associate members thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) Indefinite. (5) The committee as under (2). (6) Indefinite. (7) Those actually incurred.

Margolin,[2] 235 East Twenty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-six Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The above committee. (3) At will. (4) Fee according to services rendered. (5) Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons. (6) Actual amount of out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Such items as railroad fare, travel subsistence, and telephone and telegraph tolls.

Marsh, Homer E., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Associated Businessmen, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) Not over $1,000 per annum for legislative work (should any be done). (5) National Associated Businessmen, Inc. (6) I am reimbursed for amounts actually incurred and paid by me for travel and other incidental expenses. (7) Transportation, hotel bills, and other incidental expenses.

Masaoka, Etsu M. (Mrs. Mike), 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington D. C. (1) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc. (3) Eighty-first Congress, or until employment is terminated. (4) $100 per month while Congress is in session minus social security and withholding taxes. (5) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incident to work. (7) Transportation (taxicabs), telephone, telegraph, etc.

Masaoka, Mike M., 300 Fifth Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc., Beason Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (2) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc. (3) Eighty-first Congress, or until employment is terminated. (4) $200 per month while Congress is in session minus social security and withholding taxes. (5) Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, Inc. (6) Actual expenses incident to work. (7) Transportation (taxicabs), telephone, telegraph, etc.

Molnar,[2] Joseph, 225 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) The unemployed. (3) Indefinite. (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Morrison, Donald S., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is vice president of American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., by whom he has been employed since 1932 and of which company he has been vice president since 1937. (2) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. and its subsidiaries. Represents interests of company and subsidiaries with regard to legislation affecting the shipping industry; such representation is only incidental to registrant's general employment. (3) Until otherwise determined by employer or registrant. (4) Current salary of $1,833.33 per month, plus reimbursement for actual expenses. Foregoing compensation is for all registrant's services. (See (2).) (5) American-Hawaiian Steamship Co. (6) Reimbursement for actual expenses incurred as indicated under (7). (7) Actual expenses incurred on behalf of employer, including cost of transportation, communications, stenography, hotel accommodations, meals, etc.

Neuberger, David M., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) National Coast Antipollution and Conservation League. Registrant is president of the league and acts by authority of its executive committee, whose address is 154 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The league stated in answer to (1). (3) As long as he is president of the league. (4) Registrant is paid nothing and is not to receive any pay. (5) Nobody. (6) Nothing; registrant as well as other officers pay their own. (7) Answered in (6).

Parker,[2] James P., 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. Former address: 1317 F. Street NW. (1) National Association of Private Schools, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Private trade and vocational schools who are members of the association. (3) Indefinite. (4) The amount is undetermined at the present time, but is expected to be compensated on the basis of straight fees for legal services rendered. (5) National Association of Private Schools. (6) The amount is undetermined at the present time, but he is reimbursed for actual expenses incurred. (7) All expenses incurred as Washington counsel for the association such as transportation, communications, entertainment, office and administrative supplies.

Paterson, Chat, 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York City, N. Y. (2) On behalf of the committee. (3) Indefinite. (4) $15,000 per annum. (5) Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc. (6) Necessary expenses. (7) Travel, taxis, incidentals.

Peoples Voice, 931 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Peoples Voice is incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia as a nonprofit, nonpartisan educational organization. Its three trustees are Frank T. Fuller, Peter C. Cameron, and Richard P. Schulze who serve without pay. The purpose of Peoples Voice is ultimately to petition the Congress of the United States urging the enactment of legislation for a national lottery to be conducted by the United States Government. To this end names of persons in favor of a national lottery and who wish to add their endorsement of the petition are being assembled. The present plan of Peoples Voice for such assembly of names is to distribute postal cards, as identified in exhibit A attached hereto,[1] to individuals throughout the United States and then to prepare such petition from such postal cards which have been signed and returned to Peoples Voice. Voluntary contributions from such individuals comprise the sole source of operating funds. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.] (6) [Blank.] (7) [Blank.]

Pike, Albert, Jr., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is an employee of the Life Insurance Association of America, an association composed of 90 legal reserve life-insurance companies. (See exhibit attached to registration form of the Life Insurance Association of America.) (2) Life Insurance Association of America. (See exhibit attached to association's registration form.) (3) Unlimited. (4) Registrant does not receive payments earmarked for purposes set forth in the act. At the end of each quarter, an estimate and report will be made to determine the portion of his annual salary, if any, which might come within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the Department of Justice. He is paid an annual salary of $17,000 for many services growing out of the varied functions of the association as described in the exhibit attached to the association's registration form filed this same date. (5) Life Insurance Association of America. (6) Will be paid out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, etc.

Poston, Robert R., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanization, included in which is opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws: child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations, the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion. (3) Indefinite. (4) $7,000 per annum. (5) The American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (6) Average of $25 per month. (7) Travel and such items as taxi fare, meals, phone calls.

Producers' Council, Inc., The., 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The council is not employed by anyone unless working in the interest of its contributors constitutes being employed. Names and addresses of contributors filed with Form A. (2) In the interest of its contributors. The Producers' Council, Inc., is an organization established in 1928. The purposes as stated by the charter of incorporation are attached hereto as exhibit K.[1] In view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes principal purpose and the phrase "to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation, etc.," we are filing this form, giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (3) Indefinite. (4) Varying amounts. (5) By the contributors. (6) The amount received from contributions. (7) Offices, staff, fees to consultants, printing, news service, accounting, etc.

Riepma, Siert F., 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (2) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (3) January 1, 1947. (4) $7,000 a year. (5) National Association of Margarine Manufacturers. (6) Unspecified expense account, of which none, so far, has been expended regarding Federal legislation. (7) All expenses incident to Federal margarine legislation.

Risser, Donald A., 2404 North Seventy-first Street, Milwaukee, Wis. (1) Communications Workers of America and its divisions, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the organization whose name appears in (1) above. (3) For the term of office which expires November 15, 1949. (4) None per annum. (5) The organization whose name appears in (1) above. (6) No specific amount authorized. Reimbursed for actual expenses. (7) See answer in (6) above.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

[2] Registration with the Clerk only.

Russell, Francis M., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Broadcasting Co., Inc., Radio Corp. of America, and its other subsidiary companies. (3) Indefinite period of employment as vice president of National Broadcasting Co., Inc. (4) Registrant's compensation is paid entirely by National Broadcasting Co., Inc., and covers all his activities as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including supervision of the company's Washington broadcasting operations. No specific part of such compensation is allocable to legislative matters. (5) National Broadcasting Co., Inc. (6) Actual expenses incurred in carrying out duties as officer of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including activities on behalf of Radio Corp. of America and its other subsidiary companies. (7) Membership dues, travel, entertainment, etc.

Sayler, Frances, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO, 11 East Fifty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (2) The members of the UER & MWA, CIO, their families and neighbors. (3) Indefinite. (4) $4,000 yearly for all work in Washington office, including legislative work and nonlegislative work with Government agencies. (5) United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, CIO. (6) $5 per week for expenses in connection with all work, much of which is nonlegislative work described above. On trips into the field, actual expenses of travel, food, and hotel are covered. (7) Transportation and other incidental expenses in Washington.

Shepherd, Bruce E., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is an employee of the Life Insurance Association of America, an association composed of 90 legal reserve life insurance companies. (See exhibit attached to registration form of the Life Insurance Association of America.) (2) Life Insurance Association of America. (See exhibit attached to association's registration form.) (3) Unlimited. (4) Registrant does not receive payments earmarked for purposes set forth in the act. At the end of each quarter, an estimate and report will be made to determine the portion of his annual salary, if any, which might come within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the Department of Justice. He is paid an annual salary of $35,000 for many services growing out of the varied functions of the association as described in the exhibit attached to the association's registration form filed this same date. (5) Life Insurance Association of America. (6) Will be paid out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, etc.

Spencer & Louisell, 1712 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Peder Kristian Kristensen, also known as Peter Kristen Kristiansen, also known as Peter Christensen, 13901 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (2) Peder Kristian Kristensen, etc., 13901 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit 15, Mich. (3) The employment is of indefinite duration. See answer to question 4. (4) The employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer. This law firm represents this client in litigation in connection with his application for suspension of deportation and will seek on his behalf, if necessary, relief by congressional legislation. Payments on account of fee and disbursements in respect to the litigation have been received by this firm. What fee, if any, will be charged in connection with the legislation cannot be estimated at this time. In any event, any fee in connection with the legislation will be calculated at a rate not in excess of $150 per diem. It is believed that Public Law 601 is not applicable to this situation, but this registration is filed in view of lack of authoritative interpretation of such law. (5) Peder Kristian Kristensen, etc. (6) Actual telephone and telegraph expenses incurred. (7) Actual telephone and telegraph expenses incurred.

Stong, Benton J., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Regional committee for an MVA (Missouri Valley Administration), 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver 16, Colo. (2) Regional committee for an MVA, National Farmers Union. (3) January 1, 1949 to June 30, 1949. (4) $625 per month. (5) National Farmers Union, as a contribution to regional committee for an MVA. (6) Actual. (7) Washington living expenses and actual out-of-pocket expense for committee above.

Sullivan, Francis M., 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of service-connected disabled American war veterans and their dependents. (3) Indefinite. (4) $9,720, less withholding and social security. (5) Disabled American Veterans. (6) Any expense incurred (see No. 7). (7) Taxies, lunches, and other expenses incidental to work at the Capitol. Actual traveling expense.

Switzer, John B., 70 North Thirteenth Avenue, Beach Grove, Ind. (1) Indiana Divisions No. 1 and No. 56, Communications Workers of America, 27 West Ohio Street, Room 5, Indianapolis, Ind. (2) Communications Workers of America, Legislative League. (3) Unable to determine duration of employment. (4) No compensation. (5) [Blank.] (6) Unable to determine. (7) Transportation, meals, and lodging.

Taggart, Eugene F., 817 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, 817 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Legislation pertaining to veterans. (3) Permanent. (4) $50 per week. (5) Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America. (6) $140 per month. (7) Postage, meals, transportation.

Taylor, Margaret K. (amended form), 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (3) Indefinite; no fixed term. (4) $7,700 per annum to cover all services for the federation, including such services, if any, as are rendered in connection with lobbying. (5) National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation. (6) To be reimbursed for all actual expenditures. (7) All expenses incident to the work of the federation.

Taylor, Russell J., 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) United Shoe Workers of America of the CIO, 917 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) United Shoe Workers of America of the CIO. (3) Eighty-first Congress. (4) Salary, $80 per week. (5) United Shoe Workers of America of the CIO. (6) $33 per week. (7) Hotel and incidental expenses.

Thoré, Eugene M., 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant is an employee of the Life Insurance Association of America, an association composed of 90 legal reserve life insurance companies. (See exhibit attached to registration form of the Life Insurance Association of America.) (2) Life Insurance Association of America. (See exhibit attached to association's registration form.) (3) Unlimited. (4) Registrant does not receive payments earmarked for purposes set forth in the act. At the end of each quarter, an estimate and report will be made to determine the portion of his annual salary, if any, which might come within the meaning of the act as interpreted by the Department of Justice. He is paid an annual salary of $35,000 for many services growing out of the varied functions of the association as described in the exhibit attached to the association's registration form filed this same date. (5) Life Insurance Association of America. (6) Will be paid out-of-pocket expenses. (7) Travel, meals, lodging, etc.

Updike, Ralph E., 6044 Twenty-second Street North, Arlington, Va. (1) National Customs Service Association, Washington, D. C. (2) In the interest of the officers and employees of the United States Customs Service and of the Federal civil service. (3) Appointed period, indefinite. (4) $1,500 per annum, part-time job. (5) National Customs Service Association. (6) No expense account; see (7). (7) Reimbursement for travel, office supplies, and postage.

Vaughan, Wales, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Veterans Organization Council of Altadena, 2302 North Lake, Altadena, Calif. (2) VOCA. (3) Undetermined. (4) $350 per month. (5) VOCA. (6) Actual costs on monthly audited statement. (7) Living in Washington, D. C., and guests.

Watson, Deneen A., 143 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) American Finance Conference, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (2) American Finance Conference. (3) Indefinite. (4) Receives $625 per month as general counsel, lobbying in Washington being only incidental to principal duties. (5) American Finance Conference. (6) Actual disbursements. (7) Cost of transportation, hotel, meals, and all other out-of-pocket expenses.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Big Sandy Valley Association, Inc., Ashland, Ky. (2) Big Sandy Valley Association, Inc. (3) Indefinite. (4) $50 per month beginning January 1, 1949. (5) Big Sandy Valley Association, Inc. (6) Not specified. (7) Not specified.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Robert F. Klepinger, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Robert F. Klepinger. (3) Indefinite. (4) 20 percent of Klepinger's net fee. (5) Robert F. Klepinger. (6) Not specified. (7) Not specified.

Westwood, Howard C., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (2) Northwest Horticultural Council as above; this organization is an association of apple and pear growers of the Pacific Northwest, and is interested in legislation affecting the import of apples and pears and the stimulation of exports thereof. (3) Indefinite. (4) $500 per month. (5) Northwest Horticultural Council. (6) Actual expenses incurred. (7) Travel, telephone, telegraph, and similar miscellaneous expenses.

Woodward, Guy H., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (2) Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association. (3) Annual retainer. (4) Registrant is retained as counsel to advise and consult with the officers, staff committees, and members of the association on all of its activities. Such part of registrant's retainer which may be paid and received in connection with "the passage or defeat of legislation by the Congress" cannot be determined at this time but will be computed and shown in subsequent quarterly reports as required by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (5) Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association. (6) No fixed amount is to be received for expenses, but registrant will be reimbursed for all actual necessary expenses incurred in connection with carrying out his duties as attorney for Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association as above enumerated. (7) Travel, hotel, and such incidental expenses as may be necessary in carrying out duties for which registrant is retained.

Yaden, James G., 716 Washington Loan and Trust Building, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) American Federation of Government Employees, 716 Washington Loan

and Trust Building, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (2) Employees of the Federal Government. (3) Permanent. (4) $10,000 per annum. (5) American Federation of Government Employees. (6) Actual. (7) Carfare, taxicabs, meals, and incidentals.

Youngman, William S., Jr., 1016 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Lawyer practicing independently representing persons named in (2). (2) Massachusetts Investors Trust, 19 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.; Massachusetts Investors Second Fund, Inc., 19 Congress Street, Boston, Mass.; Investors Mutual of Minnesota, Roanoke Building, Minneapolis, Minn.; American Business Shares, Inc., 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Affiliated Fund, Inc., 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Union Trustees Fund, Inc., 63 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; and Chemical Fund, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (3) Until conclusion of effort to clarify Federal Internal Revenue Code provisions relating to distribution by regulated investment companies of stock dividends. (4) Paid to date nothing; promised $2,250 as retainer, and possibly further compensation if work greater than expected. (5) By persons listed in (2). (6) Nothing. (7) Inapplicable.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were received for the fourth calendar quarter, 1948, and filed, using Form C, with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate:

(NOTE.—In order to reduce space the questions in Form C (see p. 1279) are not repeated. Only the answers are printed and are indicated by numbers in parentheses.)

Adkerson, J. Carson, 976 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; self. (1) Receipts: $1,000 from Luna Manganese Co., Deming, N. Mex., on expenses. Expended, $186.64. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Interested in any legislation having to do with manganese or strategic minerals.

Alifas, Nels Peter, District No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,000.06. No expenditures; Congress not in session. (2) No expenditures; Congress not in session. (3) Lobbying when Congress is in session; that is, supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and incidentally organized labor in general. (4) The Federal Machinist, a monthly periodical, of which he is editor. (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees, and occasionally organized labor in general.

Allman, Roy G., 927 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received, however expended approximately $100 per month. (2) Transportation, taxis, telephone, cables, postage, entertainment. (3) To promote bills to pay Americans for damages received as a result of war in the Far East. (4) None. (5) To pay Americans for war damages.

American Association of University Women,[4] 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None except salary of registered associate, $1,025. (2) Legislative program associate who is registered under the act. (3) As part of yearly salary. (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women (quarterly); general director's letter (program guide for branch officers, three or four times yearly). (5) Not yet determined for this quarter.

American Citizens Committee to Establish New Immigration Quota for Greece Without Discrimination (short title, Act Now Committee) (and James A. Booras and Robert W. Malone, chairman and secretary, respectively), 4314 Argyle Terrace, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000, a contribution from James A. Booras; $30, from miscellaneous contributors. (2) Details: Legal charges, $50; printing, stationery, $116; broadcasting recording, $26; Greek language broadcasting, $230; Greek language press, $240; secretarial, $250; telephone, telegraph, postage, and letters, $42. (3) All relating to publicity and public relations. (4) Greek language papers Atlantis and New Herald. (5) To augment and implement existing quotas of Greek immigration.

American Council on Human Rights,[4] Elmer W. Henderson, director, 1130 Sixth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Statement of cash receipts and disbursements for the period April 3 to November 30, 1948: Receipts—Contributions, regular, $10,625; contributions, special (AKA), $500; inaugural dinner, receipts, $880; total receipts, $12,005. Disbursements—$5,524.48. (2) Various. (3) Office equipment, office rent, salaries, printing and stationery, traveling expenses, telephone and telegraph, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Civil-rights legislation.

American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) No expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) No expenditures. (4) None during period covered by this report. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social-security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Contributed by 317 member lines during fourth quarter 1948, $22,781.62; only a small portion of which is for the purpose of influencing legislation. (2) J. M. Hood, $72.06; A. C. Mellichampe, $2.63; L. W. Hoskins Co., $22.35; Morrison Hotel, $229.40; Superintendent of Documents, Washington, $175; Wilson Epes Printing Co., $239.10; proportion of president's time and supporting secretary and clerks, telegraph, telephone, postage, rent, office supplies, taxes, etc., estimated at $402.15. (3) For salaries, office expenses, printing, and reimbursement of personal expenses in furtherance of the legislative program of the 317 member lines of the association. (4) Proceedings of the 1948 annual meeting (copy attached). (5) Legislation affecting short-line railroads (see report for first quarter for complete text of legislative program).

Aring, Hector M., 826 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Johns-Manville Corp., 22 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See original registration form for complete explanation. No other contributions received. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Opposed to appropriation for cotton subsidy under section 32 of the Agriculture Appropriations Act, 1947 tax legislation.

Arnold, W. C., Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., 200 Colman Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) None. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Associated Third Class Mail Users,[5] 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $217.50 income; $2,879.90 expenses. (2) Lobbying activities, none. Noniobbying activities: Edward M. Kriz, John H. Smith, Jr., Patricia Mortell, Virginia Brenchley, plus miscellaneous operating expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Associated Third Class Mail Users,[6] 1010 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,131 income; $4,269.68 expenses. (2) Lobbying activities, none. Noniobbying activities: Edward M. Kriz, John H. Smith, Jr., Patricia Mortell, Mary Malone, Joseph F. Hintersehr, Robert McQueeney, Lilian Neuner, Mabel O. Hill, plus miscellaneous operating expenses. (3) The general purpose of the association is to foster more efficient use of third-class mail by those enterprises employing the use of it. (4) None. (5) All legislation relating to postal laws and regulations.

Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. The registrant, during the quarter for which this report is filed, was composed of 14 owners of vessels documented under the laws of the United States. (1) No money has been received by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. The registrant did, however, in the regular course of business receive payment of dues from one of its members. No expenditure has been made by or on behalf of the registrant to any person for any amount or value in furtherance of any such object, except that registrant has paid the cost of printing and mailing the articles or editorials referred to in the report of George W. Morgan, its president, and also that registrant has paid salaries to and expenses of said George W. Morgan and Lynn E. Mote, manager of its Washington office. For the extent, if any, to which such expenditures for salaries and expenses have been applied to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration, reference is hereby made to the reports being concurrently filed by such officer and employee of the registrant and such reports are hereby made a part hereof. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) See (1). (5) The registrant is not employed to support or oppose any proposed legislation. Reference is hereby made to paragraph 2 of the registrant's registration statement on Form B, which paragraph is hereby made a part hereof.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See exhibit A attached to Form A. (2) See exhibit A attached to Form A. (3) See exhibit A attached to Form A. (4) The association publishes the Casualty and Surety Journal. Also issues releases to insurance trade press and to papers and periodicals of general circulation, such releases being mainly concerned with accident-prevention problems. (5) Legislation affecting casualty and surety companies.

Austern, H. Thomas, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; British Columbia Packers, Ltd., Vancouver, B. C., Canada. (1) No money received or expended during fourth quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Canadian fisheries.

Ayer & Son, N. W., Inc.,[5] a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y.; National Association of Electric Companies. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer) received from National Association of Electric Companies $15,393.20 for compensation and out-of-pocket expenses. (See (2) below.) The only money received or spent by registrants J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker was for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Traveling and miscellaneous expenses of employees of Ayer, $1,940.08; materials, postage, messages, clippings, telephone, and telegrams, mimeographing,

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

prints, etc., $1,053.12. (3) The amounts described in (1) and (2) were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948. Neither the services, nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except that Ayer services included publicity on general problems affecting the electric utility industry. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948.

Ayer & Son., N. W., Inc.,[6] a New York corporation, and J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, employees thereof (collectively herein called registrant), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N. Y. (1) N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc. (Ayer), received from National Association of Electric Companies $14,638.79 for compensation and out-of-pocket expenses. (See (2) below.) The only money received or spent by registrants, J. Vance Babb and Raymond C. Baker, was for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Traveling expenses, telephones, telegrams, mimeographing, postage, materials, prints, clippings, messengers, and miscellaneous expenses totaling $2,302.26. (3) The amounts described in (1) and (2) were received or expended by Ayer in the performance of its services in advising on public relations and in connection with publicity affecting the electric industry as described in registration dated April 15, 1948. Neither the services, nor the expenditures involved lobbying within the meaning of the Lobbying Act. (4) None. (5) None, except that Ayer services included publicity on general problems affecting the electric utility industry. This quarterly report is filed subject to the reservations contained in the amended registration dated April 15, 1948.

Babcock, Charles E., Route 4, Box 73, Vienna, Va., National Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics of the United States of North America, 3027 North Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Have an expense account of $600 per year for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Various, see below. (3) Services at gasoline stations, postage, telegrams, meals, and hotel rooms, transportation to and from Washington. (4) The Junior American, the official organ of the junior order. (5) Immigration, deportation, and naturalization; free public schools; other legislation the national council believes for the general good of the country.

Bailey, C. Lloyd, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary: October, November, December, $1,000; travel expense, $275.62. (2) Various. (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, or conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees; protection for racial minorities; support for the rights of conscience; opposition to conscription and the militarization of America.

Bailey, Frazer A., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $450 represents the amount of his salary received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., during the fourth quarter of 1948, which is allocable to legislative activities; $93.91 paid to Waldorf-Astoria, Park Avenue, New York, N. Y., for expenses of luncheon meeting with industry and labor representatives in connection with overtime-on-overtime legislation. (2) No expenditures other than as indicated in (1) except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) During past quarter supported overtime-on-overtime legislation and certain amendments to Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

Baker, Gibbs L., 1011 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D.C.; Charles Niedner's Sons Co., Inc., Malden, Mass.; United States Rubber Co., New York City; Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inc., New York City; Approved Equipment Manufacturing Co., Inc., New Milford, N. J.; and Federal Firehose Manufacturing Co., Inglewood, Calif. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5608. Since my lobbying activities terminated in the last quarter of 1948, the enclosed report is final.

Baldinger, Mary Alice, 4607 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Civil Liberties Union, 170 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Expenses, October 1 through December 31, 1948, $25.82; salary, same dates, $77.70. (2) Expenditures made for transportation, office work, and supplies, etc. (3) Same as (2). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting civil liberties.

Baldrige, H. M., United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 408 American Building, Washington, D. C., and 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,000 per month or $6,000 for the quarter; no money expended on any legislative activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) During the year I opposed H. R. 5051, H. R. 6502, and H. R. 425.

Barber, Hartman, room 301, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees, 1015 Vine Street, seventh floor, Brotherhood Building, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. Total salary for quarter, $1,320; total expenses for quarter, $157.33. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) All legislation directly or indirectly affecting labor in any manner whatsoever, especially railroad labor.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; The Haloid Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barker, Richard B., 306 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y. (1) No funds received. (2) Not applicable. (3) Not applicable. (4) Not applicable. (5) Excise tax on photographic materials.

Barlow, Joel, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Northwest Horticultural Council, Wenatchee, Wash. (1) Received, $1,500; expended, $48.04. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $32.38; Western Union, $7.91; miscellaneous expenses, $7.75. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, teletype messages, transportation within the District of Columbia, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer for the purpose of rendering general legal advice and assistance. Considerable time is being currently spent and may continue to be spent in the preparation of materials for presentation to Congress in support of proposed legislation to improve marketing conditions in the fruit industry during the postwar interruption in normal export marketing.

Barnard, Robert C., Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Disbursements by registrant and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox during last calendar quarter, $1.50; receipts by registrant and Cleary, Gottlieb, Friendly & Cox from Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co., none. (2) Disbursements, $1.50 notary fees. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6253 and S. 2539, both bills entitled "For the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co."

Barnett, Arthur R., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $2,152.50 as an officer and employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $308.86 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law No. 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, air lines, telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, bookstores and stationers. (3) Railroad and transportation, $76.37; hotel and restaurants, $163.10; bookstores and stationers, $7.29; telephone and telegraph, $1.10; gratuities and miscellaneous, $61. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an officer and employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Beirne, J. A., Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $656.96; salary, $3,300; total, $3,956.96. (2) Normal living expenses, plus railroad, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America. None of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Benson, Ernest H., national legislative representative, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 61 Putnam Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary at rate of $8,600 per annum; no expense account. (2) Ernest H. Benson. (3) Activities in connection with legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly or indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.

Berckes, Herbert C., secretary, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 Canal Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Received for services as secretary, $750; expended for travel expense, $1,089.59 (includes transportation and per diem). (2) Various. (3) Legislation. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the southern pine-lumber industry.

Bergin, Preston B., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $400 salary. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security-law revision.

Bernard, William S., Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None; expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Displaced Persons Legislation, Polish Review, December 1948. (5) H. R. 6369 (Emergency Displaced Persons Act).

Berns, Karl H., Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,895.04, which covers both

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $397.01. (2) Self (salary); expenses, hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Biorn, Norman E., Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., 520 Endicott Building, St. Paul, Minn. (1) Salary from Minnesota Associated Businessmen, none; received for actual expenses, $160.89; spent for legislative activities, none. (2) Mary Lou Kustelski, $150; United States Government, $4; miscellaneous, $6.89. (3) Stenographic services, postage, miscellaneous phone, travel, railway-express charges. (4) None. (5) Elimination of inequalities in tax legislation.

Bison, Henry, Jr.; Tyre Taylor, Suite 1112 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,581.27; expenditures for living purposes only. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) Legislation favorable to the maintenance of the free-enterprise system.

Blankenship, C. B., Post Office Box 1150, Birmingham, Ala.; Communications Workers of America, and its divisions, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $1,200; salary, $1,200; total, $2,400. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform the normal function of my positions with the Communications Workers of America and/or one of its divisions, none of which is related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Bledsoe, Samuel B., 1730 I Street NW.; Selvage & Lee, 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $4.60. (2) Luncheon, $3.50, taxies, $1.10. (3) Luncheon, transportation. (4) I worked to assure the dissemination and publication of news favorable to margarine legislation desired by our client but I cannot say categorically that I caused any such articles to be published. (5) Margarine legislation.

Bodary, D. A., national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) Annual compensation of $6,000, and $12 per diem for expenses; hotels, meals, etc. (2) D. A. Bodary. (3) As national legislative and general representative, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, my duties include handling of legislative matters and handling and progressing of grievances and other activities of my organization. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America.

Bodfish, Morton, United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended $341.42. (2) Various. (3) For travel, hotel, and maintenance in Washington, D. C. (4) Only the customary materials found in our trade papers, in our trade association periodicals, and in our trade association bulletins: The Need for Merchandising, by Morton Bodfish, December 1948, Savings and Loans News; Toward the Kind of Country We Want, by Morton Bodfish, December 1948, Directors Digest, excerpt from fifty-sixth annual convention address. (5) Support all legislation favorable to thrift and home ownership and particularly helpful to savings and loan associations and cooperative banks in carrying out their thrift and home-financing objectives and oppose legislation detrimental to home ownership and these institutions.

Bonamarte, Robert Francis, Sr., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Fifteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Pay legislation affecting the armed forces; legislation affecting the armed forces and veterans.

Booras, James A.,[4] and Robert W. Malone (jointly and severally and/or separately), 4314 Argyle Terrace, Washington, D. C. (1) Sundry small sums incident to office management and publicity activities, both aggregating, income and expenditure, slightly less than $1,000. (2) Precisely as stated in Form C, this date, for Act Now Committee. (3) As above. (4) As above. (5) As above.

Borkin, Joseph, 1017 Ring Building, Washington, D. C.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $526.31. (2) Mimeographing service, Western Union, telephone company, office supplies. (3) Office supplies and services. (4) [Blank.] (5) The above amount represents expenses in connection with the Washington office of the Federation for Railway Progress and was not paid to me for the support of or opposition to any legislation.

Bourg, Clarence J., 510 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Sugar Cane League, Main Office, New Orleans, La.; Farmers & Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, main office, Saginaw, Mich. (1) The following sums have been received and expended in connection with legislation and other contacts with the Government, of which not more than one-fourth has been expended in connection with legislation, such as taxicab fares about Washington and an occasional lunch when Congress is in session: October 1–15, 1948, $21.20; October 15–31, 1948, $21.10; November 1–15, 1948, $24.10; November 15–30, 1948, $15.20; December 1–15, 1948, $36.60; December 15–31, 1948, $56.40. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Sugar Bulletin of New Orleans, La.; Sugar Beet Journal of Saginaw, Mich. (5) Any legislation affecting the domestic sugar producer.

Bowden, Ray B., National Grain Trade Council (until January 31, 1949), 608 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received as salary $1,968, all used for personal living expenses, none for lobbying; received as expense refunds, $331.36. Railroad travel to meetings; expense of meals, etc., for members of board at quarterly meeting; routine travel expense. (2) Railroads, hotels (Union League Club in Chicago for board meeting), etc. (3) Routine expenses; none spent with direct purpose of influencing legislation, although legislative matters were discussed at board meeting; various legislative subjects were frequently discussed in speeches before trade conventions and meetings, but without direct bearing on lobbying. (4) None so far as known, excepting routine newsletters sent regularly by our office to members informing them on news developments. (5) Not principally employed to support or oppose legislation, but would be interested in any legislation which involves the grain and/or feed trade of the United States.

Boyd, H. B., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar, but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Boyd, William R., Jr., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule[1] for answers to (1) to (5). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

Bradley, Otis T., 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y.; Guaranty Trust Co. of New York as trustee of the several trusts described as the Frances G. Phipps trust, Herbert Sanford Ward trust, Sarita E. Barclay trust, and Colville Herbert Sanford Barclay trust, under indenture dated December 24, 1913, and various indentures supplemental thereto made by Charles H. Sanford, 140 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) The employment is for the purpose of attempting to secure an amendment to the Federal Gift Tax Acts involving gifts in trust and the effect for gift-tax purposes of the surrender by the grantor of a retained power to alter the disposition of the property but not in any way beneficial to himself, and the employment is expected to continue until such amendment is either secured or rejected.

Brady, Joseph E., Brewery Workers International Union, 2347 Vine Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Oppose dry legislation.

Breed,[5] Arthur H., 310 Fifteenth Street, Oakland 12, Calif.; Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) July 1, 1948, through September 30, 1948: Salary, $3,614.24; miscellaneous office expense, postage, telephone, and telegraph, etc., and entertainment, $228.71. (2) James D. Hahn, associate, $50 per week plus expenses. (3) Supporting overtime-on-overtime legislation. (4) None. (5) Overtime on overtime.

Breed,[6] Arthur H., Jr., 310 Fifteenth Street, Oakland, Calif.; Waterfront Employers Association, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) October 1, 1948, through December 31, 1948: Salary, $3,574.92; miscellaneous office expense, postage, telephone, and telegraph, and travel expense, $191.65. (2) James D. Hahn, associate, $50 per week plus expenses. (3) Supporting overtime-on-overtime legislation. (4) None. (5) Overtime on overtime.

Brewbaker, James M., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125, expenses reimbursed by employers, $658.52. Expenditures, $658.52. (2) Expenses paid to various restaurants, hotels, taxicabs, railroads, and air lines. (3) Traveling, attending meetings to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) National labor policy, wage-and-hour legislation, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Government controls over production and distribution of manufactured products, or the raw materials going into such products, Federal subsidization of research, patent, and trade-mark legislation.

Bright, O. O., Southern Pine Industry Committee, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,050; expenses, $56.60. (2) To various hotels, cab drivers, etc. (3) See No. 2 above. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the lumber-manufacturing industry.

Brightman, Melvin H., Dairy Industry Committee, 1112 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 salary as executive secretary of Dairy Industry Committee. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To observe legislation possibly affecting dairy industry.

Brooks, A. E., 2202 Fort Worth National Bank Building, Fort Worth, Tex.; American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Cook Building, Mexico, D. F. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To exempt from income taxes income derived from sources abroad by nonresident United States citizens actively engaged in a trade or business abroad.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Brooks, William F., National Grain Trade Council, 604 Hibbs Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary and expense received during period amounted to $3,598.58, none of which was spent for any purpose covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None other than weekly newsletter published by employer. (5) Legislation affecting agriculture in general and the grain trade in particular.

Brown, Russell B., Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered within the scope of the act: $20. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) My normal duties include periodic reporting to members of the association on pending legislation. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Bryson, Jack, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received: $6,280.79. Expended: $6,280.79. (2) To self. (3) For personal and family needs. No sums received or expended in connection with activities covered by act. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the motion-picture industry.

Buck, Mrs. J. L. Blair. Not employed for pay. Elected to office of president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, 1734 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For October, November, and December, $2,066.79 travel and expense of entertaining in connection with work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs. (2) See question No. 1. (3) See question No. 1. (4) General Federation Clubwoman and State federation magazines. (5) Not employed for pay. The president of the General Federation supports or opposes legislation, and asks the organization membership to do likewise, when authority for such action has been provided through the adoption of a resolution in national convention.

Buckman, Henry Holland, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md.; Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla. (1) Received from Florida Inland Navigation District, Daytona Beach, Fla., for professional services, $750 pro rata expenditures account long distance telephone calls paid during fourth quarter, $3.93. (2) The Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone calls. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation as yet. Interested in any legislation providing for or related to improvement of the Intracoastal Waterway between Jacksonville, Fla., and Miami, Fla., and any legislation relating to inland navigation, flood control, erosion, the use and conservation of water, and agencies of the Federal Government having to do with these.

Buckman, Henry Holland, 405 Dorset Avenue, Chevy Chase, Md., the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J. (1) Received from the Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J., for professional services, $300 pro rata; for reimbursement for long distance telephone calls, pro rata, $13.41; pro rata expenditures account long distance telephone calls paid during fourth quarter, $20.22. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C. (3) Long-distance telephone calls. (4) None. (5) No specific bill since close of second quarter. Interested in legislation of any kind related to tin or tinning.

Bugbee, George, American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $5,374.98; reimbursement for travel $900.94. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals, and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association; Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Building Products Institute, Room 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $6,884.44. The Building Products Institute is an organization devoted to economic research and analysis of trends in construction, disseminating its findings to those interested in the construction industry and to the public. However, in view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes a "principal purpose" and the phrase "To influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation," etc., we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) As indicated by items on attached sheet.[1] (4) Construction trends, press releases and certain economic studies. (5) Proposals which may affect the producers of building materials.

Bulow, William J. Jr., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $12.75. (2) Various transportation, telephone and telegraph companies, and United States Post Office. (3) Customary business expense for transportation, telephone calls, telegrams, and postage. (4) None. (5) Postage rate legislation.

Burger, George J.,[5] 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $5,866.19 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent, and acting as director in charge of Washington office of National Federation of Small Business. Expended $4,729.66 for general operating expenses. (2) General office expenses. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel expenses. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust laws, rubber tires bill; all legislation affecting small business.

Burger, George J.,[6] room 810, 250 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y., self. (1) Received $5,776.02 from operating Burger Tire Consultant Service, publishing National Independent, and acting as director in charge of Washington office, National Federation of Small Business. Disbursements, $4,951.55. (2) For general operating expenses; general office expense. (3) Publications, weekly bulletin, travel, etc. (4) National Independent, Burger Tire Consultant Service weekly bulletin. (5) Antitrust legislation, tire bill, all legislation affecting small business.

Burke, Harold, United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, 115 Pearl Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for 3 months at $708.33 per month equals $2,125. No expenses received or expended on any legislative activity. (2) No one. (3) No one. (4) None. (5) None.

Burnett, Leo, Co., Inc., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) For National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, $89,927.51. (2) See addendum A [1]—A portion of this sum not definitely ascertainable was for purposes referred to in section 307, Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. The reason for our not being able to specify the exact amount used for so-called lobbying purposes is that we handled advertising generally for the margarine association. Not only is some of our advertising not directed at the affective legislation at all, but individual advertisements may be partially what may be termed "general advertising" and partially an appeal to support the margarine association's position in the legislative matters referred to. (3) See addendum A. (4) None. (5) Generally, legislation favorable to margarine manufacturers; specifically, the Rivers bill (H. R. 2245).

Burrows, Orrin A., International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., 1200 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,901.64; expenses, $112.10, minus withholding and railroad retirement deductions. The expenses are reimbursable items, such as transportation, hotels, meals, and incidental items. Nothing for lobbying purposes. (2) Railroads, bus companies and taxis for transportation, hotels, motels and restaurants for meals and lodging, telephone and telegraph companies for messages. (3) Transportation, meals, lodging, telephone calls, telegraph messages, and incidental items such as tips. (4) The Electrical Workers Journal. (5) All legislation affecting the electrical worker in particular and labor in general.

Butler, Eugene J., Esq., National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,186.32; salary for 3 months. (2) Eugene J. Butler. (3) Salary for 3 months. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting religious, charitable and educational institutions and organizations.

Caffrey, Charles G., 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Cotton Manufacturers Association, 203A Liberty Life Building, Charlotte, N. C. (1) None. (2) No payments were made to anyone by Charles G. Caffrey during the quarter in question (normal expenses excepted). (3) None. (4) None. However, I might state for the record that I spent about $25 for cab fare, lunches, telephone calls and streetcar fare to and from the Capitol, to study bills passed at last session. (5) [Blank.]

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Rehabilitation Association, 1025 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C. (1) $575.65 received from National Rehabilitation Association for all services as Washington counsel for the association and as reimbursement for necessary travel expenses; $125.65 of this amount expended for travel expenses to Madison, Wis., to attend meeting of the association. (2) Travel, Inc. (air ticket), $99.65; meals, taxis, hotel, $26. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) No particular legislation. The association is interested in any legislation affecting the vocational rehabilitation program.

Calhoun, Leonard J., Morgan & Calhoun, 412 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; National Tax Equality Association, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $2,125.75 received by Morgan & Calhoun for all services as Washington counsel for National Tax Equality Association and as reimbursement for necessary expenses. Allocation between legislative and nonlegislative activities is not feasible; $25.75 of this amount represented reimbursement for hotel, meals, etc., in Chicago. (2) The Stevens Hotel, Chicago, $18; meals and taxis, $7.75. (3) See (1) and (2). (4) None. (5) Firm retained as Washington counsel for all legal matters affecting National Tax Equality Association, including legal aspects of various legislative proposals relating to taxation of cooperatives and other corporations enjoying tax exemptions or special privileges.

Carter, Albert E., 1026 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received $3,000 as compensation; reimbursed $641.55 for expenses advanced—expended $977.93 which will be reimbursed.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

(2) Southern Pacific Railroad; Munsey Real Estate Co.; telephone companies; incidentals. (3) Telephone services, rent, transportation, incidentals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Retained to represent the company before administrative agencies and commissions and on legislative matters affecting company's interest.

Carter, Asa L., 325 Ashland Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; petitioners and their due successors and joining associates at and after War Department file No. 7040-7 April 1933 (287 U. S. 629); (supra) extended to all abutters on B-lines duly and precisely mapped herein. (1) I received and expended only $142.42 costs and disbursements herein, divided: Petty cash, clerical work, searching records, and addressing mail $85.62 and for postage, printing, telephoning, carfare, bus fare, etc., $56.80. (2) It was paid to postmasters, printers, public service companies, and stand rd clerical help at Pittsburgh, Pa. (3) For the purpose of furthering sentiment for a "Rainhill Prize" for the best B-line electric pipe train locomotive for major heavy freight, maximum ton-miles minimum cost, and on wheels 99.8 percent perpetual motion, one-half pound $\varphi$ absolute (as at 56 minutes elevation) $\gamma_2$ speed 3,600 miles per hour, 18-inch diameter pneumatic loaded trains, 2,000-ton burden, 10 miles long 3 minimum head, transocean or nation on hour. Keep out of the air and to wheels at $\frac{1}{20}$ mill per ton-mile and make reasonable effort to pay off the $252,000,000,000 debt accumulated on spectacular air logistics, which is just as destructive as pack-animal logistics—impossible to stave off for 1,500 years dark ages—60 cents ton-mile. (4) I publish nowhere except by first-class mail to abutters and contributors, and their due and immediate representatives. (5) Everything for or against B-line, I include that set forth in last quarter report and that which appears in hereto attached.[1]

Carter, Clarence B.,[5] Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $60 for traveling expenses. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) Support of S. 2055 and H. R. 4695.

Carter, Clarence B.,[6] Railroad Pension Conference, Post Office Box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) Received $15 for traveling expenses. (2) Clarence B. Carter. (3) Traveling expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of railroad retirement legislation beneficial to railroad workers.

Carter, Horace,[7] 209 West One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Street, New York City. (1) This is the initial application, thus no expenditures have accumulated. Further, all money received will be solicited, and detailed accounts will be filed accordingly under section 303. (2) To be filed accordingly under sections 302 and 303, Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. (3) For the purpose of amending and broadening of social-security benefits, adequate housing program, revising the Railway Labor Act and for legislation pending or contemplated on civil rights. (See amended form.[7]) (4) To be filed accordingly. (5) Refer to answer in question and answer No. 3 as outlined.

Carter, Jack, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $375 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $11.99 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

(5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, and combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Carver, Leslie O., associate general counsel, National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc., 1500 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at the rate reported in last quarterly report for performance of regular and usual duties incident to my employment. Expenses for travel, hotel, subsistence, and incidentals totaled $404.57. I engaged in no activity contemplated by the act and none of the money received and expended was for the purpose of work under the act. (2) Paid nothing. (3) Performed no activity under the act. (4) None. (5) None.

Case, Ralph H., National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Three Affiliated Tribes, Fort Berthold Reservation, Elbowoods, N. Dak. (1) Compensation for services rendered under contract, $1,000. (2) $375 for reimbursement of travel, Pullman, and other expenses which is to be allocated to Fort Berthold, Standing Rock, and Cheyenne River Reservations by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. (3) Official business transactions and correspondence with tribal council, Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak.; and travel expense. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 426, Eightieth Congress; House Joint Resolution 33, Eighty-first Congress.

Casey,[5] Joseph E., Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 701, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912, which provides for a fair and equitable tax on cigarettes depending upon the price at which these cigarettes are sold.

Casey,[6] Joseph E., Committee for Equalization of Tobacco Taxes, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., No. 701, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912, which provides for a fair and equitable tax on cigarettes depending upon the price at which these cigarettes are sold.

Castiglioni, Paul M., National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $1,500 less withholding and social-security taxes. Expenses for quarter amounted to $900 and includes all expenses incidental to maintaining offices and attendance at national conventions, meetings, etc. (2) Paul M. Castiglioni. (3) To promote the welfare of the motor-vehicle employees of the Post Office Department; covering both legislative and nonlegislative work. (4) Rotor and bulletins called Motor Vehicle News. (5) Supporting all legislation of benefit to motor-vehicle employees.

Cates, Larry, 1185 National Press Building; Air Line Pilots Association, 3145 West Sixty-third Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received, $2,118.36; expended, $243.36. (2) Various companies and business firms for transportation, communications, gasoline, oil, airplane operation, miscellaneous entertainment, meals, hotels, tips, and incidental expenses. (3) Travel and all expenses in connection therewith, taxi, telegraph, telephone, etc. (4) Air Line Pilot. (5) All legislation concerning aviation safety and hours, wages, and working conditions of pilots on our commercial air lines.

Chace, W. E., The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $20 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, H. R. 4417, and S. 1251.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Chamblin, Walter, Jr., 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Manufacturers, 14 West Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $6,250; expenses in Washington reimbursed by employer, $1,008.04; expenditures in Washington, $1,008.04. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, trade associations, and clubs. (3) Attending meetings and making speeches to discuss general conditions in Washington of interest to business and industry in particular. (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills affecting: National labor policy, tax laws, reduction of Federal expenditures, Federal subsidization of research, patents and trade marks, control powers, revision of SEC, foreign aid, Federal housing, Government competition with business, and such other matter as may affect industry.

Chandler, E. Lawrence, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (American Society of Civil Engineers). (1) $10. (2) Taxicab drivers,. United States post office. (3) Taxicab fares, postage. (4) None. (5) Legislative bills regarding which it is considered that the engineering viewpoint can be constructive.

Church, R. R., 6000 Champlain Avenue, Chicago, Ill.; National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Commission, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I receive no salary. Ten ($10) dollars per day allowance, when away from home for hotel and meals only as incurred, plus railroad transportation when necessary. I advance out of my funds paying these expenses, after which I am reimbursed by the National Council for a Permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission. At the present time said council is indebted to me for advancement for hotel, meals, and railroad fare. As of today, January 3, the national council owes me over $400 reimbursement for actual money that I have spent for my maintenance last year. (2) Dunbar Hotel, Washington, D. C.; McAlpin Hotel, New York; B. & O. Railroad and Pennsylvania Railroad. (3) For subsistence of myself when actively engaged for aforesaid council. (4) None. (5) Ives-Fulton bill (S. 984) against discrimination in employment.

Clarke, David R., 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; National Metal Trades Association, 122 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Clorety, Joseph A., Jr., American Veterans Committee; American Veterans Committee, Inc. (AVC), 1200 Eye Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary of $7,500 per year for position of national vice chairman of the American Veterans Committee plus not more than $5 per month for expenses in connection with legislative work. (2) Joseph A. Clorety, Jr. (3) To execute duties as national vice chairman of the organization of which not more than 10 percent involve activities under the Lobbying Act. (4) AVC Bulletin. (5) Legislation relating to international, domestic, and veterans' affairs in accordance with national platform of the American Veterans Committee.

Clovis, Edwards & Reed, Inc.[7] (H. E. Clovis, A. W. Edwards, and Louis Reed, employees

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

thereof), 630 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Foremen's League for Education and Association, room 603, 11 West Monument, Dayton, Ohio. (2) Same as above. (3) Six months commencing January 1, 1949. (4) $1,500 per month. (5) Same as section 1. (6) Reimbursement of out-of-town travel expenses. (7) Only those in section 6.

Cohn, Marcus, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Marcus Cohn. (2) Marcus Cohn. (3) During a typical month, the registrant devotes a maximum of 5 percent of his time to matters which may possibly be regarded as embraced in section 308 (a) of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. The figures set forth here for the months of October, November, and December 1948, are based upon that percentage: Salary, $93.75; travel, $2.21; telephone, $9.59; office and miscellaneous expenses, $48.65. (4) I have supplied information to the general press on immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested. (5) Legislation dealing with immigration and other matters in which the American Jewish Committee is interested.

Colborn, Miss Fern M., Presbyterian Board of Christian Education, United States of America, Division of Social Education and Action, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) Salary, quarterly, $300; personal expenses refunded (i. e.), travel, $69.56; lodging, $18; food, $29; total $116.56. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress magazine, special bulletins. (5) Same as No. 3.

Coleman, Russell, The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $100 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes and Pasture Progress, all published by The National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington 5, D. C. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Coles,[5] Marvin J. 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Freight Corp., Pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (1) During the past calendar quarter, registrant has received $3,701.72, of which $3,500 was for legal services and $201.72 represents reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) Payments have been made to the telephone and telegraph companies, several restaurants, taxies, and Army and Navy Club. (3) Telephone, telegraph, luncheons, dinners, taxies, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation dealing with Government assistance to Alaska shipping.

Coles,[6] Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; Alaska Freight Express Corp., Pier 50, Seattle, Wash. (1) During the past calendar quarter, registrant has received no money from the Alaska Freight Express Corp.; out-of-pocket expenditures have been under $100. (2) Payments have been made to the telephone and telegraph companies, several restaurants, taxies, and Army and Navy Club. (3) Telephone, telegraph, luncheons, dinners, taxies, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation dealing with Government assistance to Alaska shipping.

Coles,[5] Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, 27 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the past calendar quarter, registrant has received no money from the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association. (2) Expenditures have been purely for incidental matters, such as telephones, lunches, transportation, and mimeographing, and have been paid to the telephone company, taxicab company, mimeographers, restaurants, etc. (3) Telephones, luncheons, transportation, mimeographing. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and to the governmental agencies concerned information concerning foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Coles,[6] Marvin J., 813 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, 227 Water Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the past calendar quarter registrant has received legal fees from the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association in the amount of $1,000 and reimbursement for expenses in the amount of $42.01. (2) Expenditures have been purely for incidental matters, such as telephones, lunches, transportation, and mimeographing, and have been paid to the telephone company, taxicab company, mimeographers, restaurants, etc. (3) Telephone, luncheons, transportation, mimeographing. (4) [Blank.] (5) Registrant has been employed as attorney to present to the Congress and to the governmental agencies concerned information concerning foreign freight forwarders and use of their services under the foreign relief programs.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1); proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Colgan, Howard O., Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1); proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Colorado River Association,[4 8] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Contributions, $40,050; expenditures, $17,565.41; see detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California; no control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Colorado River Association,[4 10] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Contributions, $49,855; expenditures, $14,802.83; see detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California; no control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Colorado River Association,[4 11] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Contributions, $445; expenditures, $22,487.50; see detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California; no control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Colorado River Association,[4 5] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Contributions, $51,840; expenditures, $16,516.42; see detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California; no control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Colorado River Association,[4 6] 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Received from Royal Typewriter Co., $129.39, refund of duplicate payment. Expended $25,072.81. See detailed statement attached.[9] (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Factual material is released to newspapers and magazines generally, inside and outside California. No control of its use by the press is or can be exercised. (5) To support legislation protecting California's established water rights on the Colorado River, and to oppose legislation inimical to California's established water rights.

Compton, R. T., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary $3,750, expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,156.07. Expenditures, $1,156.07. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone company, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations, and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Comstock, Boyd, legislative assistant, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,320 which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $264, expenses. (2) Self (salary). Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Cone, D. C., Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, room 307, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) Annual compensation for 1948, $5,700. (2) D. C. Cone. (3) As vice president and part-time national legislative representative of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America covering all service rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act and particularly the interests of the employees represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America.

Cone, John C., Pan American Airways, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter ended December 31, 1948, I have not participated in any way or received or spent any funds in connection with legislation. (2) None received or spent in connection with legislation. (3) Same as

[5] Filed for third quarter 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter 1948.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[8] Filed for fourth quarter 1947.
[9] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.
[10] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[9] Not printed. Filed in the Secretary's office.

above. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose legislation but may be concerned with any legislation relating to aviation which may be pending.

Conn, Donald D.,[5] Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Personal expenses in connection with trip to Washington for conferences with Chairman Wolverton and his staff, $399.74. During the calendar quarter July 1 to September 30, 1948, my salary from the association was $6,250. The time spent in Washington in this period were the days of August 16 and September 24–27. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Conn,[6] Donald D., Transportation Association of America, 130 North Wells Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Personal expenses in connection with trips to Washington for conferences with Chairman WOLVERTON and his staff, $530.08. During the calendar quarter October 1 to December 31, 1948, my salary from the association was $6,250. The time spent in Washington in this period were the days of October 29, November 18–21, and December 16–19. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) None.

Conroy, Eugene J., The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None; no activities during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Cooperstock, John, 30 Bellingham Avenue, Revere, Mass.; Veterans Association of Federal Employees, New York Naval Shipyard, Lenruth Hall, Myrtle and Waverly Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y. (1) None this quarter. (2) Self. (3) Travel, hotel, meals, etc. (4) None. (5) Support or oppose legislation affecting veterans' preference in Federal employment.

Corbett, John T., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 1118 Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) $2,749.98 as wages, $626.77 as expense account, $200.01 for official rental, telephone $28.78, postage $3.47. (2) "Labor" for office rental, $200.01; Morrison Hotel and restaurants at Chicago, Hollenden Hotel and restaurants at Cleveland, Pullman reservations, $626.77; telephone, $28.78; postage, $3.47. (3) As assistant grand chief engineer and national legislative representative, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislation and legislative matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interest of labor.

Cortright, Frank W., National Association of Home Builders, suite 1116, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, and December 1948, $4,374.94; per diem, October, November, and December 1948, $644; expenses, travel (general), taxis, entertainment, and meetings, $1,770.88; expenses, travel (meetings and conferences), $737.62. Total, $7,527.44. As indicated upon my registration, I have been advised by counsel that I am not subject to the Lobbying Act. Such registration and this report are therefore filed under protest and merely as a matter of personal precaution in view of the indefiniteness of said act and the lack of judicial interpretation thereof. Neither said registration nor this report in any way are intended to constitute an admission by me that I am subject to the act. The payments reported above as my salary and per diem are for general services as executive vice president of the National Association of Home Builders, and are not dependent upon rendition of services which might be considered lobbying within the meaning of the act. Similarly, expenses reported include substantial amounts for routine association business which could not be regarded as lobbying within the meaning of the act. Expenses reported do not include items of association expense such as travel, secretary's salary, telephone, and rent, which are part of the general administrative budget of the association and do not represent moneys received by me from the association. (2) Paid out in cash to taxis, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, International News Service, United Press, and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to effect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. I also write an article each month for the American Builder, a monthly publication devoted to the interests of the housing industry. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter, and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but I am the executive vice president of the trade association of the home-building industry. In that capacity it is incumbent upon me to supervise, among other things, the work of the association's legislative department. The function of that department of the association is to follow all legislation affecting the home-building industry; to advise the membership of the association of all such legislation; and to make known to the public and to the Congress the opinion of the membership on all such legislation.

Costello, John M., 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; The American League for an Undivided Ireland, 165–167 William Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received as fees for services, $750; no expenditures. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. (5) Any legislation which may tend to effectuate the unification of all Ireland into a united nation.

Courtney, Paul L.,[4] 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by me for lobbying purposes during the preceding calendar quarter. I registered as an employee of National Associated Businessmen, Inc., but said employment has terminated so this is the final report that I shall file under Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Am no longer employed to support or oppose legislation. (See answer to (1).)

Covington, J. Harry, 3d, American Smelting & Refining Co. et al., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $15,000 for legal services rendered in connection with all legal matters for client; expended in connection with all matters for client $145.07. (2) Telephone expense, $67.31; travel expense, $45.12; telegram expense, $7.33; and miscellaneous expense, $25.31. (3) Long-distance-telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Crampton, Charles J., 700 Insurance Building, San Antonio, Tex.; Texas Tax Association (formerly State Rights Association), Post Office Box 2559, Houston, Tex. (1) Statement attached.[1] (2) Statement attached.[1] (3) Statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) Statement attached.[1]

Crawford, William A., Railroad Association of Georgia, 536 Hurt Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) No money received or expended for any lobbying activities. (2) No one. (See reply to (1) above.) (3) None. (See reply to (1) above.) (4) None. (5) None.

Crowley, Leo J., 922 Equitable Building, Denver, Colo.; Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, 615 C. A. Johnson Building, 509 Seventeenth Street, Denver, Colo. (1) Received compensation of $30 and expenses in the amount of $50 during the month of December 1948, these amounts being the only money received during the period whose expenditure had to do with Federal legislation. (2) Utah Hotel, Salt Lake City, restaurants, Pullman Co., dining cars, taxicabs, tips, etc. (3) $50 expenses was expended in connection with attendance at a meeting in Salt Lake City, at which proposed Federal legislation affecting railroads was discussed. This sum was spent for hotel bill, meals, taxicabs, Pullman fares, tips, etc. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroads operating in and having trackage in the State of Colorado.

Cuneo, John C., Post Office Box 1054, Modesto, Calif.; Townsend National Recovery Plan (the Townsend Plan), 6675 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received from the Townsend Plan, gross for operations in California, $2,012.83 (less deductions at source) $575.55; from California State Council legislative committee for reimbursement for expenses for California legislative campaign (one-half), for use in operations, $1,254.81; amount paid to John C. Cuneo for personal use, $780. Balance to be used for operations in California, $1,912.09. (2) Total disbursements for California operations, $1,214.60. (3) See detailed attached statement.[1] (4) None. (5) The Townsend Plan.

Curran, Roland, Central Valley Project Association, Box 15, Bakersfield, Calif. (1) No change from last report. (2) No change from last report. (3) No change from last report. (4) No change from last report. (5) No change from last report.

Curry, James E., National Congress of American Indians et al., 1016 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the American Indian.

Curtiss, Ralph E., 111 Kellogg Building, 1422 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; retained by Associated Tavern Owners of America, Inc., 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis. (1) Received, $685.07; expended, $85.07. (2) Hotel, railroad company, and telephone company. (3) Travel expense and telephone. (4) ATOA News, monthly publication of the association. (5) Any legislation affecting the tavern industry.

Daley, William L.; 817 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; National Editorial Association, 222 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts from National Editorial Association, $1,065.01; expenses, $240.01. (2) Railroads, telegraph and telephone companies, taxicabs, office-supply companies. (3) Reimbursement for expenses, transportation, and communications. (4) Interpretative articles in official bulletins of national and State publishers' associations; also in trade publications of publishing industry. (5) Measures affecting the press.

Dameron, William V., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Damon, Eugene J., St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Co., chairman, Missouri railroad committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Daugherty, Paul J., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus,

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Ohio, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

Davies,[5] Aled P., American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary of $2,076.96. Travel expenses when out of Chicago, including lodging, meals, taxicabs, entertainment, transportation, telephone, and telegraph, $470.67. (2) Various railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and telephone and telegraph companies. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Davies,[6] Aled P., American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary from American Meat Institute of $1,793.12. No travel expenses during fourth quarter of 1948. (2) No one. See (1). (3) None. See (1). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry.

Davis, John H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $3,000. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Washington Situation—a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the National Council of Farmer Cooperatives. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Dawes, Bourbon, Hotel Association of Washington, D. C., Inc., 1331 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,708.32; expenses, $50. (2) (a) Taxies and transportation, $22; (b) miscellaneous lunches and dinners, $16; (c) miscellaneous expenses, $12. (3) Normal operating expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting hotels in the District of Columbia.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) See (1) Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the City of New York.

Dawson, Clarence E., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1); proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Day, Mary R., 741 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (lawyer); Massman Construction Co., 20 West Ninth Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) $1,862.31 received by Mary R. Day as fee for legal services. (2) Mary R. Day, 741 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C. (3) Fee for legal services. (4) None. (5) Bill for the relief of the Massman Construction Co., H. R. 2192.

Deegan, Thomas J., Jr., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,249.98; expenses (travel), $78.90. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

DeGroot, E. H., Jr., 924 Colorado Building, Washington, D. C.; Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State (as treasurer), 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. ((1) The attached typewritten statement[1] is hereby made part of this Form C, an integral part, to the statements of which the oath of the registrant filing same apply without reservation or exception. (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) See statement attached.[1]

Denning, William I., 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Magazine Publishers, 232 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,875 was received as retainer for services plus $27.07 reimbursements for personal expenses in connection with work for the association. (2) William I. Denning, 1518 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For general legal representation in Washington, D. C. (4) None. (5) Not called upon during quarter in connection with any legislation.

De Quevedo, Rafael G., 1032 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,050; expense, $18.35. (2) Taxi, $2.80; restaurant, $15.30; notary, 25 cents. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) None. (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Dickerman, John M., National Association of Home Builders, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, from October 1 through December 31, 1948, $2,500; expenses, October 1 to Jan. 1, 1949, $58.05; reimbursement for out-of-pocket expenses incurred on administrative tour of local associations in company with association president, $267.55; total, $2,825.60; the salary and expenses (except for the $267.55 item which is charged as part of the administrative expenses of the association) listed under (1) are charged against that portion of the association's budget allocated to the legislative department, of which I am in charge, which allocation is $26,900 for 1948. Only some of the functions of this department might be deemed as coming within the purview of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. (2) Paid out in cash to taxies, restaurants, hotels, telephone and telegraph companies, etc. (3) Transportation, telephones, telegrams, tips, hotel rooms, etc. (4) News releases are sent to the Associated Press, I. N. S., U. P., and other national newspaper wire services by the association for publication in subscriber papers and magazines, some of which releases may contain material deemed to affect legislation directly or indirectly. Neither the association nor I have any means of ascertaining a complete list of the publications utilizing such releases. The association publishes a weekly news letter called the Washington Letter and a monthly magazine, the Correlator, containing material of interest to the membership, including information on legislative matters. (5) All legislation affecting the home-building industry.

Disbrow, Walter L., Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, and December, 1948, $1,115. (2) Walter L. Disbrow. (3) To represent members of the Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any and all legislation affecting civil-service retirement laws.

Disney, Wesley E., 434 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (See (1).) (1) Income: Western Oil & Gas Association, 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., $1,500; Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C., $1,250; Henry B. Cleereman, Green Bay, Wis., $1,500; expenses: Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (reimbursed), $189.12. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals such as taxi fares, telephone calls, etc. (4) None. (5) Natural Gas Act amendments; attention to legislative matters affecting oil-and-gas industry, family-partnership-tax legislation.

Dodge, Homer, 1244 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $600 salary and $225 expenses. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., the postmaster, the Superintendent of Documents, and others. (3) Telephone service, postage, Government documents, rent and minor office expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Dorsett, J. Dewey, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Article entitled "In the Common Cause," appeared in December 1948 issue of the National Insurance Producer. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital-stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

Dougherty, John E., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending December 31, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Dougherty,[10] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; expenses, $196.55. Only part of the sums expended in the course of duties having to do with legislation. (2) Hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, phone calls, tips. (3) Meals, tips, $118.25; cab fares, phone calls, $78.30. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the lumber-manufacturing industry.

Dougherty,[11] Robert E. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $500; expenses, none. Hospitalized for entire period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty,[5] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $500; expenses, none. Hospitalized for entire period. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Dougherty,[6] Robert E., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $666.66; expenses, $33.55. Only part of the sums expended in the course of duties having to do with legislation. (2) Local hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, phone calls, tips. (3) Meals, tips, $15; cab fares, phone calls, $18.55. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the lumber-manufacturing industry.

Dow, Fayette B., Munsey Building, Washington, D. C., Committee for Pipe Line Companies, care of L. F. Kahle, Box 1349, Tulsa, Okla. (1) The Committee for Pipe Line Companies was organized to represent, as occasion may arise, in Washington, before departments of the Government, including Congress, the petroleum pipe lines that are regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission under the Interstate Commerce Act.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[10] Filed for first quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

The committee is not proposing or advocating any changes in existing laws. Deponent believes that in the period covered by this quarterly report he has taken no action that comes within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Deponent believes that of his total compensation for all services rendered to the Committee for Pipe Line Companies, $500 would be a fair apportionment for any services which might be considered to be within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. In the quarter ending December 31, 1948, deponent received from the committee $2,016.20, representing disbursements made in August and September 1948, as follows: For statistical services to S. J. Elder, $325; office furniture and equipment, $1,613.35 to various local dealers; telephone installations, $16.38; map $13.10; postage, telephone, telegraph, etc., $48.37. Deponent has also expended in that quarter $231.60, covering postage, telephone, and miscellaneous items for which he has not been reimbursed. None of the foregoing items, deponent believes, relate to activities within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No legislation is proposed by Committee for Pipe Line Companies, deponent's employer, and there is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon to support or oppose.

Dowd, M. J., Care Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (1) For fourth quarter of year 1948: Salary $960 per month; incidental traveling expenses, $226.30. (2) The salary is regular compensation for my full-time employment as consulting engineer for Imperial irrigation district on irrigation, power, drainage, and related matters. Expenses represent reimbursement to me for personal travel, hotel, and subsistence expenses. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to the Colorado River and affecting Imperial irrigation district.

Downs, Thomas J., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Associated Fur Coat & Trimming Manufacturers (now known as Associated Fur Manufacturers, Inc.). (1) None. Compensation and expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation affecting the fur industry.

Drake, John, National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $4 for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Dresie, Grey, 202 Bitting Building, Wichita, Kans; Kansas Independent Business Men's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Friendly Dollar. (5) Tax equality.

Drysdale, Robert M., Jr., Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, $2,124.99 as executive vice president of the federation; travel expenses, $772.54. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) Travel expense. (4) None. (5) None.

DuBois, Ben, secretary, Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn. (1) During the last quarter I was in Washington once. Congress was not in session. I discussed banking matters with the banking agencies. During the quarter we have put out a number of circular letters, both to nonmembers and to members. We have been urging upon the independent bankers the need for legislation that will regulate the bank holding company. I do not think that letters of this kind constitute lobbying. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

DuBrul, Stephen M., General Motors Corp., 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Dudley, Harold, American Council of Commercial Laboratories, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $500 a month for October, November, and December. Total of $235.34 for traveling expenses. (2) Harold Dudley, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) For representing the interests of the American Council of Commercial Laboratories before Government agencies and serving as the council's executive secretary. (4) [Blank.] (5) Revision of Internal Revenue Form 990.

Dunn, William M., Communications Workers of America, 917 G Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expenses, $621.05; salary, $1,999.98; total, $2,621.03. (2) Normal living expenses plus railroads, air lines, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, and other incidental and related expenses. (3) To perform to the normal functions of my positions with the Communications Workers of America, none of which were related to legislative activities. (4) None. (5) Any proposed legislation which would affect the Communications Workers of America or its divisions.

Dwyer, Joseph L., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $12,000 annually; expenses reimbursed by employer, $1,150.11. (2) Various railroads, hotels, restaurants, retail stores, taxicabs, telephone companies, Government Printing Office, Hickey Bros. (3) Administrative, traveling, and incidental expenses; newspapers, periodicals, cigars, cigarettes, etc. Meals and entertainment. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting petroleum and its products, or natural gas.

Echols, Oliver P., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Nothing received except salary, no part of which was paid for activities covered by Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. No expenditures. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Edelman, John W., 1031 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Textile Workers Union of America, 99 University Place, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,499.94; $581.69 to reimburse actual expenses incurred, $74.45 of this amount for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Railroads, hotels, restaurants, cab drivers, bus companies, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) Textile Labor, CIO News, Labor Press Associates. (5) Support legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Edelsberg, Herman, 1003 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 212 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) For activities covered by the act—approximately 5 percent of salary—$125. Actual expenses for fares, telephone, etc., approximately $15. (2) To various persons who provided actual taxi, telephone, postage, meals, etc., services. (3) Transportation, telephone, postage, meals, etc. (4) ADL Bulletin. (5) The ADL is an educational organization whose primary purpose is to promote better human relations among Americans. Incidental to this purpose, registrant supports legislation which promotes the civil rights of all Americans and opposes undemocratic discrimination against any Americans.

Edwards, Burton E., executive secretary, National Apartment Owners Association, suite 204, 205, 206 Portland Building, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; suite 226, Douglas Building, 257 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) See attached annual statement,[1] general fund, National Apartment Owners Association, and annual statement, president's fund, National Apartment Owners Association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) All measures affecting the multiple-housing industry.

Eliason, Courtleigh W., General Motors Corp, 11-243 General Motors Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file this report. (4) None. (5) None.

Elliott, John Doyle, 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of $60 per week plus average allowance for traveling costs of $30 per week in pursuance of work. (2) Paid for fares, mileage, hotel, and meals while traveling for purposes of work. (3) Contacting Townsend Clubs, other organizations, and citizens relative to promotion of the Townsend Plan. (4) None. (5) Amendment of the Social Security Act to embrace provisions generally known as the Townsend Plan, designated to date as H. R. 16, Eightieth Congress, first session.

Ellis,[1] Clyde T., National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 1303 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (3 months ending December 31, 1948), $3,300; expense account, $663.26; total, $3,963.26. (2) To self for salary and reimbursement for meals, hotel, tips, and transportation, $3,963.26. (3) Travel incident to members' meetings, board of director's meetings, etc. (4) Rural Electrification. (5) Legislation affecting the growth and welfare of rural electric cooperative corporations, public-power and public-utility districts, and legislation affecting public-power developments where they would, in turn, affect the rural electric cooperative corporations, public-power and public-utility districts.

Ellison, Newell W., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Arabian-American Oil Co., 200 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) The firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb, of which I am a partner, received during the preceding calendar quarter $7,584.33; $7,500 for fee and $84.33 for miscellaneous expenses, including long-distance telephone calls and telegrams and my expenses on a trip to New York. (2) $84.33 to the telephone company for telephone calls and telegrams, and to reimburse the firm of Covington, Burling, Rublee, Acheson & Shorb for my expenses on a trip to New York. (3) Long-distance telephone calls, telegrams, and other miscellaneous costs. (4) None. (5) Proposal to amend provisions of the Internal Revenue Code relating to United States corporations doing business abroad.

Ellsworth, Charles K., Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $2,400; expenses, $40. (2) Expense money paid out only to hotel, restaurants, and cab drivers. (3) Covered above. (4) Have no records of any such publications. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Have been assigned by Hill & Knowlton, Inc., to prepare educational information and material showing consequences of measures proposing to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Public Power Association (as general counsel), 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Services this quarter have not involved the supporting or opposing of legislation. At the request of the association, legal analyses

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

and opinions are rendered from time to time on legislation affecting public power.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Colorado River Board of California and Six Agency Committee (as special counsel), 315 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $6,846.30, comprising fees for legal services of this office and in California in connection with matters affecting California's interests in the Colorado River. Of this amount $926.30 was reimbursement of expenses; $2,000 of the total figure was paid by the Colorado River Board and $4.846.30 by the Six Agency Committee. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items; but, since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work mainly related to conferences with Federal Government departments and agencies of the State government. Conferences with members of California congressional delegation re matters affecting California's right in Colorado River expected to be before new Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles, special counsel; Los Angeles, Calif. (1) $1,500, representing legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, and litigation, and consultation as to legislation expected to come before the Eighty-first Congress. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items; but, since this is part of a general law practice, it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent, and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work done related mainly to litigation and departmental conferences. Conferences were held with California congressional delegation re matters of interest to department of water and power expected to come before new Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif. (Quarter ending December 31, 1948.) (1) $2,100 as legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with power and water contracts, conferences with Government departments, etc., and consultation with respect to legislation expected to be considered by the Eighty-first Congress. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work done related mainly to litigation and departmental conferences. Conferences with California congressional delegation re matters affecting Imperial Irrigation District expected to be considered by new Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; attorney for Water Project Authority of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (Quarter ending December 31, 1948.) (1) $1,500, the entire amount of which represents legal fees for services of this office and in California in connection with Central Valley power and water questions. (2) Office staff, building owner for rent, telegraph and telephone companies, suppliers of office materials, etc. Approximately one-third of total income is expended for these items, but since this is part of a general law practice it is impossible to allocate specific items of salary, rent, etc., to particular clients. (3) Salaries, office overhead, telegraph, telephone, office rent and general maintenance of law offices. (4) None. (5) Work mainly related to conferences with Government departments. Conferences with California congressional delegation re Central Valley matters expected to arise before new Congress.

Ely, Northcutt, 1209 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; special counsel for Water Resources Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif. (Quarter ending December 31, 1948.) (1) None. Services as special counsel are loaned by the Water Project Authority of the State of California, which pays a fee of $500 per month. See registration under that employment. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) None during the quarter covered by this report.

Evans, Walter M., Virginia Associated Businessmen (a Virginia corporation), 512 Travelers Building, Richmond, Va. (1) See sheet hereto attached marked "Schedule A".[1] (2) The answer to this question will be found on Schedule A[1] hereto attached. (3) The answer to this question will be found on Schedule A[1] hereto attached. (4) None. (5) Any legislation relating to the tax exemptions or any governmental subsidies granted the cooperative associations and corporations and other groups or businesses other than religious, charitable, and fraternal groups and organizations.

Fahy, Kathleen M. (Mrs. Jack B.), American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $256.27; expended $256.27. (2) Various. (3) Entertainment and miscellaneous expense. (4) Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; Appropriation for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education bill.

Fakler, Herman, 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) I received $5,500 salary as an officer of the Millers' National Federation. I am not employed specifically to engage in activities described in section 307 of title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. During the preceding quarter I devoted no time to and I made no expenditures for such activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Farquhar, Randolph, American Parents Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) Parents' Magazine and School Management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; Appropriations for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education bill.

Farrington, Charles J., The National Coal Association, 803 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,147.75. Salary and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxicabs, telephone, lunches, postage, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting the bituminous coal business.

Farshing, Donald D., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue N.W., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,300 gross salary received; $174.01. (2) Transportation, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Ferguson, Abner H., 1139 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; United States Saving and Loan League, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) October 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948, telephone calls, telegrams, and taxicabs, $48.63; expenses attending annual convention, $154.37; general retainer, as Washington counsel. Less than one-half of work is in connection with legislation, $2,250. (2) American Telephone Co., Western Union Telegraph Co., and taxicab drivers. (3) Charges for services rendered. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting savings and loan associations and general mortgage lending.

Ferguson, John A., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, Room 305, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. During this period no legislative matters of any character in which this association or its staff were interested. (2) No legislation pending; no expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter, not pertaining to legislation. (5) No legislation pending.

Fernbach, Frank L., United Steelworkers of America, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $1,264.98. Expenses covering transportation costs and $10 per diem when out of Washington, D. C. (2) Frank L. Fernbach. (3) Approximately 50 percent of my time is devoted in behalf of enactment of a Labor Extension Service bill and the remainder in behalf of the research and educational activities of the United Steelworkers of America and the Congress of Industrial Organizations. (4) The labor press, generally. (5) The Labor Extension Service bill, S. 110 and H. R. 875 and 61, to establish a Labor Extension Service Division in the United States Department of Labor.

Ferris, Muriel, League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $185.42 salary every 2 weeks; received and expended: Carfare to and from the Capitol and travel, $7.20. (2) None expended in carrying on work except for carfare and travel. (3) Carfare and travel only. (4) Trends in Government, member magazine, publications of the League of Women Voters, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (5) I am employed principally to inform league members on legislative matters; secondarily to influence legislation. For legislation, see league platform adopted by national convention, 1948, attached.[1]

Fifer, Russell, American Butter Institute, 110 North Franklin St., Chicago, Ill. (1) For December 1948 only: Travel, $37.52; taxi and limousine, $9; meals, $18; telephone and telegraph, $4.36; total, $68.88. No expense in October and November. (2) To hotels, railroads, etc., for services rendered. (3) Normal business and traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) General farm legislation affecting the butter and dairy industry.

Filer, Harry L., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary $5,300 and no expenses, no part of salary chargeable to lobbying work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Finucane, James, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary at annual rate of $3,600; expenses, $49. (2) Expenses paid to usual suppliers of small commercial items and services. (3) Transportation, periodicals, etc. (4) Newspapers of general circulation carrying news releases of council; also Peace Action. (5) To support any legislation which is internationally unifying in a wholesome sense. To oppose legislation tending to cause excess militarism.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Fisher, Lewis H., 1416 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.; National Association Retired Civil Employees, District of Columbia, 1246 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z.; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily, San Marino, Calif. (1) National Association Retired Civil Employees, District of Columbia, $800; Canal Construction Service Committee, Balboa Heights, C. Z., nothing; Dr. Alexander Renner, temporarily at San Marino, Calif., nothing. (2) Various individuals and corporations. (3) Telephone, $25; taxicab and streetcars, $3.40; stationery, $5; postage, $3.50; five meals, $10; office help, $130. (4) Annuitant. (5) Civil annuities and pensions for annuitants and potential annuitants. Assisting displaced persons under provisions of Public Law 774.

Fitzpatrick, F. Stuart, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received, salary, $3,625; expenses, $30. (2) Statler Hotel, lunches, $30. (3) Necessary normal expenses. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the general fields of public works, city planning, urban redevelopment, and housing.

Fleming, Roger W., 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $25.05 expended. (See (6) of Form B, filed May 1948.) (2) Taxis and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) None. (5) Congress not in session.

Flinn, W. C., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Ford, Mrs. J. A., 305 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Average approximately $42 per week this last quarter due to special itineraries. (2) Hotels, meals when away from my own home, and traveling expenses. (3) As above. (4) Townsend National Weekly. (5) A bill known as H. R. 16 in the Eightieth Congress to provide every adult citizen in the United States with equal basic Federal insurance, permitting retirement with benefits at age 60, and also covering total disability from whatever cause for certain citizens under 60; to give protection to widows with children; to provide an ever-expanding market for goods and services through the payment and distribution of such benefits in ratio to the Nation's steadily increasing ability to produce, with the cost of such benefits to be carried by every citizen in proportion to the income privileges he enjoys.

Ford, John B., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) A fair portion of my salary chargeable to lobbying purposes is $25 per month, $75 for the quarter. I have not expended or received any other money for lobbying purposes. (2) To me. (3) Compensation for personal services. (4) I caused no articles or editorials to be published relating to legislation. (5) Legislation affecting the American merchant marine, specifically legislation amending the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, House Joint Resolutions 377, 398, 412, and 413, and companion bills, overtime-on-overtime legislation, and other legislation affecting shipping.

Ford, Tirey L., Sea-Air Legislative Committee, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Fort, J. Carter, Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For all services rendered to the Association of American Railroads, of the nature described in Registration Form B, filed December 1946, registrant received salary during the fourth quarter of 1948 at the rate shown in such registration, as amended by the supplement thereto, filed January 10, 1948, and received in addition $758.12 as reimbursement for all traveling expenses in connection with such services while away from Washington and all reimbursable business expenses in Washington, such as cab fares, business meals, etc. Of the salary received, $6,012.48 is estimated to be attributable to legislative activities. Of the expenses for which registrant was reimbursed, $585.34 is estimated to be attributable to legislative activities. The legislative activities referred to include activities with respect to possible legislation which registrant was called upon to consider, analyze, etc., which was neither supported nor opposed by him. (2) The expenses above shown were paid to the Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis; Hotel Claypool, Indianapolis, Ind.; Palmer House, Chicago; Hotel St. Paul, St. Paul, Minn.; Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Wash.; Hotel Mark Hopkins, San Francisco, Calif.; Mapes Hotel, Reno, Nev.; Brown Palace Hotel, Denver, Col.; the Baker Hotel, Dallas, Tex.; Hotel Mayfair, St. Louis, Mo.; Hotel Muehlebach, Kansas City, Mo.; Hotel Fontenelle, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago Club, Chicago; Atlanta-Biltmore, Atlanta, Ga.; Biltmore and Waldorf-Astoria Hotels, New York; and the Algonquin Club of Boston; and to various restaurants and taxicabs in the cities above indicated and in Washington, D. C., and to dining cars while traveling between such cities. (3) Traveling expenses while away from Washington and such expenses in Washington as business meals, taxis, etc. Passes are used for rail transportation and, accordingly, no expense is incurred in that connection. (4) None. (5) Generally, to support all legislation in the interest of the railroads and of a sound national transportation policy and to oppose all legislation contrary to the interests of the railroads and to a sound national transportation policy. No such legislation was under consideration by Congress during the fourth quarter of 1948. However, during that quarter registrant gave consideration to possible legislation dealing with revision of the Internal Revenue Code, excise taxes, St. Lawrence project, amendments to the Federal Employers Liability Act, the Railway Labor Act, the Interstate Commerce Act, etc.

Foster, Charles E., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: October, November, December 1948 (after taxes and social security), $1,654.80 (including semiannual bonus); expenses to New York, N. Y., $52.03; incidental expenses for October, November, December, 1948, $6.40; total, $1,713.23. (2) Charles E. Foster, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (3) See No. (1) above. (4) DAV Semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased servicemen and women.

Francis, Joseph H., National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Morgan, Utah. (1) No activities carried on during the third quarter. No money received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Franklin, L. S., director, National Tax Relief Coalition, 2309 Pine Croft Road, Greensboro, N. C. (1) Received $350 for October, November, December, 1948. Paid out $375. (2) L. S. Franklin, director. (3) Salary for October, November, December, 1948. (4) None. (5) Tax reform.

Fredrickson, Fred J., Valley City, N. Dak.; North Dakota Resources Board, 311 North Broadway, Fargo, N. Dak., and State Water Conservation Commission, Bismarck, N. Dak. (1) Quarterly salary for October, November, and December 1948, before deductions for withholding and social security taxes, $1,800; and reimbursed expenses for same period, $691.49, none of which was for lobbying purposes. (2) Hotels, eating establishments, railroad and bus companies, garages and service stations; telephone and telegraph companies, and stationers. (3) Lodging, meals, transportation, communications, and office supplies. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting irrigation, reclamation, water conservation, flood control, land and mineral development and utilization in North Dakota.

Fuller, George M., National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1319, Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October, $158.28; November, $147.48; December, $434.37. (2) Miscellaneous. (3) Entertainment and transportation. (4) None. (5) Oppose any legislation inimical to the interests of the lumber industry and support any legislation which would be helpful to it.

Fyffe & Clarke (David R. Clarke) John Harrington, Albert J. Smith, Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 120 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $250. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting manufacturers generally.

Gall, John C. (law firm of Gall & Lane), 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, 1200, Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received during the preceding calender quarter in payment for all legal services rendered the National Association of Electric Companies, Washington, D. C., $5,000. There were no direct expenses. During the quarter, there were no activities of legislative character and no expenses incurred. The total amount received by way of general legal retainer is reported due to impossibility of determining to what extent, if at all, services rendered might be related to actual or prospective legislation within the meaning and scope of Public Law 601. (2) Retainer paid to firm of Gall & Lane. (3) Retainer for general legal services. See registration form filed October 4, 1948. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation; retainer is for general legal services, advice, and consultation, and may from time to time relate to matters of legislation affecting client's member companies.

Gall, John C. (Gall & Lane), 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio. (1) Received during the preceding calendar quarter, in payment for all legal services rendered the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., Youngstown, Ohio, $8,024.19. Total expenses, as listed under item (2), $24.19. The full amount received for all legal services is reported for the reason that it is impossible to determine what part, if any, of this compensation is allocable to services within the scope of Public Law 601. (2) Retainer paid to firm of Gall & Lane; total expenses to Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. and Western Union: $24.19. (3) Retainer for general legal services (see registration form filed January 15, 1947; expenses for telephone and telegraph). (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to labor, taxes, and business practices. Primary function in connection with most legislation is to advise client as to status and progress thereof.

Galvin, M. J., 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.; Minnesota railroads, St. Paul, Minn. (1) None (all of the undersigned's clients as listed on his registration have paid the expenses reported herein, and the undersigned's salary, on the ratio of the mileage which they have within the State of Minnesota. Amount paid is the same as that expended). (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Gammons, Earl H., 801 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Columbia Broadcasting

System, Inc., Warner Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $325. (2) Restaurants, hotels, and incidental expenses. (3) Entertainment and out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) None.

Gardner,[4] Fraser S., national legislative chairman, Army and Navy Union, (home) 5410 Third Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Spent $144 personal out-of-pocket moneys for regular duties of office held; attending veterans' meetings; legislative research; cost of sending mail to other national officers and headquarters; lunch; cabs; parking; etc. Received $50 on account, December 19, 1948. (2) Stamps; cabs; restaurants; parking lots; telephone calls, local and long distance; to Del Ankers, photographer, Washington, D. C., for picture of lunch, $16.25. (3) Picture and lunch costs incurred in presenting Army and Navy Union plaque to Watson Miller, United States Immigration and Naturalization Commissioner. Other out-of-pocket items incurred in regular duties of office of national officer of veterans' organization as covered in (1) and (2) of this report. (4) Army and Navy Union News; copy attached (marked). (5) We are expressly anxious to have the present Congress approve a national charter for this organization. On January 3, 1949, Congressman J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, was asked by this writer to drop such a bill in the legislative hopper.

Garstang, Marion R., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Expended $1.20 for taxi fares. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Gavitt, Frank,[4] Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., 10 East Fortieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Carl Byoir & Associates, Inc., registered in accordance with Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, and retained as public relations counsel for Schenley Distillers Corp., did not, during the fourth calendar quarter of 1948 (the period covered by this report), conduct any lobbying activities. Please note that the name of the firm was changed from Schenley Distillers Corp., to Schenley Industries, Inc., effective January 4, 1949. Future quarterly reports will be filed in this new name. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Geary, Paul M., National Electrical Contractors Association, 610 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenses incurred and no money received other than salary originally reported on Form B, filed May 22, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) No special legislation under consideration.

Geaslin, Bon, 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala. (1) No expenditures made during this quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation, but as an incident to my position as general counsel of Waterman Steamship Corp., we are interested in all legislation affecting the merchant marine and civil aeronautics.

Gebhard, Mrs. Paul, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Presbyterian Church, U. S. A., Division of Social Education and Action, Board of Christian Education, 830 Witherspoon Building, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) No expenses incurred during this period. (2) [Blank.] (3) Lobbying in the interest of social legislation on which the Presbyterian General Assembly has taken action. (4) Social Progress Magazine; special bulletins. (5) Same as (3).

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

Geiselman, R. H.,[11] John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary, incidental to regular employment as legal counsel, and assistant secretary of the company, and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

Geiselman,[5] R. H., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary, incidental to regular employment as legal counsel, and assistant secretary of the company, and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

Geiselman,[6] R. H., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary, incidental to regular employment as legal counsel, and secretary of the company and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Support proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

George, Leo E., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, October, November, December, 1948, $2,500.03; travel and general organization expense, $1,443.39. (2) Travel and general organization expenses, including hotels, meals, and minor incidental expense due to attendance at local, State, and National meetings and conventions, plus transportation, as follows: Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $153.08; American Air Lines, $90.31; total, $1,443.39. (3) Expenditures for hotels, meals, and incidental expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended in connection with attendance at meetings and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk, the Federation News Service Bulletin, the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures, designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the civil-service retirement system; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks, and to improve the postal service.

Gerrity, Harry J., Oregon-Washington Bridge Co., 1001 Hill Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 569 and S. 570.

Giddings, Ernest, assistant director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,445.04, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $289, expenses. (2) Self, salary. Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash, NEA Journal (articles therein), informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Gilbert, C. C., Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) $1,950, as secretary, Southern States Industrial Council. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation as may be of interest or affecting industry generally.

Gilliam, A. W., 727 National Press Building; American Meat Institute, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary from American Meat Institute of $2,500. No travel expenses during fourth quarter of 1948. (2) No one. (See (1) above.) (3) None. (See (1) above). (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting specifically the meat-packing industry

Glazier, William,[5] room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's and Warehouse's Union, CIO, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,392.82; expenses, $347.98. (2) Expenses include those in Washington as well as air transportation and living expenses while out of town. (3) See (2). The Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William,[6] room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Salary, $1,235.04; expenses, $363.81. (2) Expenses include those in Washington as well as air transportation and living expenses while out of town. (3) See (2). (4) The Dispatcher, publication of the International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and longshoremen and warehousemen specifically; oppose undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William,[5] room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No salary or personal expenses; $300, or $100 per month, received toward cost of office operations. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and maritime workers specifically; oppose all undemocratic legislation.

Glazier, William,[6] room 521, 930 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO, 86 Commercial Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No salary or personal expenses; $300, or $100 per month, received toward cost of office operations. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) The Voice, publication of the National Union of Marine Cooks and Stewards, CIO. (5) To support all legislation of interest to American workers and maritime workers specifically; oppose all undemocratic legislation.

Goddard, Livingston, 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Travel expenses, $160.21; salary, $833.21. (2) Various hotels and transportation agencies for traveling expenses. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Goodman, Leo, 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,250; expenses, $359.34. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) CIO News; Autoworker. (5) Rent control, housing, and community development and planning.

Goodwin, William J., the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y., and Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; National Resources Commission of China, 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received, none; money expended, $4,438.25. (See schedule attached.[1]) (2) See schedule attached.[1] The attached schedule of expenses during the last 3 months includes some expenses perhaps not pertinent to the purposes of this retainer. Other expenses, not included, definitely do not pertain to this account, as I have other income and other accounts which do not come under this act. (3) See schedule attached.[1] (4) As stated

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

before, I have introduced representatives of the Chinese Government to newspaper editors, legislators, businessmen, and others, in order that they would learn the truth about China. Also, for the period ending December 31, I have written letters and made speeches as filed with the Department of Justice. (5) Reference is made to my letter of July 1, 1948, which accompanied my registration statement. Also, I intend to urge Congress to pass legislation providing for substantial military help to China to fight communism in order to establish stability in that country. Naturally, as a prerequisite for the work of interesting American capital in Chinese enterprises, but, far more important, as an American citizen, I will do so for the sake of the common world fight against Red fascism.

Gordon, Spencer, Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; American Institute of Accountants, 13 East Forty-first Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received or expended. (2) None received or expended. (3) None paid. (4) The Journal of Accountancy and the Certified Public Accountant. (5) Advancing the interests of the accounting profession in reference to bills relating to practice before Government agencies and practice before the tax court.

Goss, Albert S., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,875 in salary for the quarter which is my total compensation for all my services as master of the National Grange of which legislative activities form only a part. I paid out none of it. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. As master of the National Grange, however, it is my duty to support or oppose legislation in conformity with the policies of the National Grange.

Goss, Bert C., 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received no money other than salary as vice president of Hill & Knowlton plus essential travel and entertainment expenses. I estimate that of my travel and entertainment expenses for the 3 months ended December 31, 1948, less than $50 was expended for purposes that might be interpreted as subject to being reported under this law. (2) Paid to taxicabs and restaurants. (3) For travel to and from the Capitol, for luncheons and dinners for committee personnel and Congressmen, etc. (4) Supervised issuance of numerous press releases. (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose legislation. Interested in legislation affecting aviation, in proposals to repeal the Federal tax on oleomargarine, and in other legislation affecting interest of clients of Hill & Knowlton.

Gourley, Lawrence L., 902 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $3,000 retainer. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Bills affecting the public health.

Gray,[5] David G., Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. My duty was to watch the program of legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Gray,[6] David G., Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston Tex. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation. My duty was to watch the program of legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Green,[5] Angus, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts: Salary, $1,668.99, plus $400.60, reimbursement of the expenditures referred to in (2) and (3) below. (2) Transportation and communications services, post office, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) Travel, living and business expenses connected with employment. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Green,[6] Angus, American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No activities in this quarter, and no expenses incurred. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting shipping industry which concerns employer.

Greene, Ernest W., 731 Investment Building; Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association, post-office box 2450, Honolulu, T. H. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any legislation.

Griffith, H. McAllister, National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $1,900. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) Economic Council letter; Economic Council action report. (5) To support all legislation promoting the prosperity and independence of the United States, the preservation of our free social and economic system and the kind of government set forth in the Constitution of the United States. To oppose all legislation contrary to the foregoing, including proposals not on their face Communist or Socialist but which are being promoted in the interest of eventual transformation of the United States into a Socialist, Communist, or welfare state.

Grimes, Weston B., 436 Bowen Building, 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Cargill, Inc., 200 Grain Exchange, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Received: (Includes office, travel, and general expenses totaling $1,619.52), $7,869.54. Expended: (For purposes designated in the Lobbying Act), $9. (2) Restaurants, $5, taxicabs, $4. (3) Meals, entertainment, for purposes designated in the Lobbying Act. Taxicabs to and from the Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation concerning commodity exchanges, international commodity agreements, regulation of exports and imports, and taxes.

Grinberg, P. Irving,[7] Jewelers Vigilance Committee, Inc., 17 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) National Jeweler, Jewelers' Circular-Keystone, Jewelry, Jewelers' Outlook, Jewelers' Newsletter, Executive Jeweler, ANRJA Bulletin, NACJ Bulletin, Mid-Continent Jeweler, Northwestern Jeweler, Southern Jeweler, Pacific Goldsmith, Trader & Canadian Jeweler, Manufacturing Jeweler. (5) Interested in securing relief from excise taxes as applied to jewelry.

Haas, Frank E., Western Association of Railway Executives—The Association of Western Railways, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Illinois. (1) None received or expended for Federal legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interest of western rail lines.

Haddock, Hoyt S., CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,560 in salary and $130 for expenses. No portion can be charged to legislative expenses as none were participated in. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) NMU Pilot, Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in interest of seamen; oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Hadley, Harlan V., 830 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C.; Automobile Manufacturers Association, 320 New Center Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) None, other than one-quarter of the annual compensation of $2,500 as set forth in supplemental registration (Form B) filed April 9, 1948, and miscellaneous expenses not to exceed $15. (2) See above. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Federal tax (excise) legislation, materials control legislation, and such other legislation as the association may hereafter from time to time indicate.

Haines, Samuel P., 4407 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; 20 percent Cabaret Tax Committee, 171 West Randolph Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) See exhibit A[1] attached. (2) See exhibit B[1] attached. (3) See exhibit B[1] attached. (4) None. (5) Reduction or repeal of the 20 percent excise tax applying to dine-and-dance rooms of hotels.

Hale, William C., Tennessee Eastman Corp., Kingsport, Tenn. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Revisions in the tariff act—draw-back regulations.

Hallbeck, E. C., National Federation of Post Office Clerks, 1510 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,666.65; legislative expenses, $887; transportation expense, $264.19; general organization expense, $356.22. (2) Legislative expense includes meals, streetcar, taxi, hotel, and other traveling expenses incident to attendance at legislative meetings and conferences, except transportation, $887; transportation expenses includes Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, $224.05; Capital Airlines, $26.45; Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railroad, $13.69, $264.19; general organization expense includes expenses incident to attendance at convention of A. F. of L., Cincinnati, Ohio, and other expenses not connected with the enactment of legislation, $356.22. (3) All expenses except transportation expenses are an actual reimbursement for cash expended on account of travel and attendance at meetings, conferences, and conventions. (4) The Union Postal Clerk; the Federation News Service bulletin; the Federation Press Service. (5) Support of measures designed to improve and strengthen the civil service; improve the civil service retirement system; improve the wages, hours, and conditions of post-office clerks and to improve the postal service.

Hamlet, Harry G., Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $600. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended, nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. Delivered Newcomen Society of England lecture to cadets, Coast Guard Academy, October 5, 1948; was published by their alumni association not at my request. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Harmanson, L. James, Jr., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,625. Less than 10 percent of this amount would be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Harper, Elsie Dorothy, National Board of the Young Women's Christian Associations, 60 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $425; expenses, $280. (2) Elsie Dorothy Harper. (3) Presenting to the President, the Cabinet, and both Houses of Congress (a) the opinion on subjects related to (5) below, of the convention of Young Women's Christian Associations held triennially and (b) the opinion of the National board of the Young Women's Christian Associations in line with actions taken by the convention. (4) None. (5) Legislation related to international security, social and

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

economic justice, education, health, and civil liberties.

Harris, Ronald B., 62 T. W. Patterson Building, Fresno, Calif.; Irrigation Districts Association of California, 932 Pacific Building, Fourth and Market Streets, San Francisco, Calif. (1) I received for services rendered during 1948, for all services, the sum of $2.00. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3194.

Harris, Winder R., Room 203, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Shipbuilders Council of America, 21 West Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received: office expense, $193; personal expense, $213.23; total $407.08. Expended: office expense, $193.85; personal expense, $213.23; total, $407.08. (2) Various. (3) Office supplies, drinking water, rental of electric water cooler, laundrying of office towels, Christmas gifts to building employees, purchase of Government documents, steel shelving, janitors' services, rail transportation, hotel accommodations, taxicab and streetcar transportation, lunches (not for anyone connected with legislation), dues to Washington Port, Propeller Club of the United States. (4) None. (5) None in quarter for which report is made.

Hart, Merwin K., National Economic Council, Inc., 7501 Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $350; December advance for expenses, $220; total, $570. (2) It is difficult to allocate any money expended by me during the quarter in question to any lobbying activities. However, I spent October 20–22 in Washington at a total cost of $40.95, which included rail and pullman fares, taxis, hotel bill, meals, and miscellaneous. On November 20 I went to Boston to make an address and spent a total of $42.62, which included rail and pullman, plane, hotel bill, meals, and miscellaneous. December 10, I went to Washington for a brief trip and spent $48.62, including rail and pullman, hotel bill, taxis, and miscellaneous. Though I do not believe any of these expenditures are really allocable to any lobbying activity, they are mentioned for what interest they may have. (3) See (2). (4) Economic Council letters. (5) Measures discussed in council letters Nos. 200–205, both inclusive, published during this quarter, and which publications might be considered lobbying, are certain conventions of the ILO which will come before the Senate for ratification this winter, possible appropriations in 1949 for ERP, a general review of certain measures likely to be considered at the coming session of Congress, and the pending controversy over evidence recently produced by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Hart, Stephen H., 350 Equitable Building; National Livestock Tax Committee, Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) During the quarter the National Livestock Tax Committee paid to me a per diem of $50 for office work and $100 out of town for actual time spent in study, advice, conferences, and correspondence concerning general livestock tax questions including the analysis of the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and current rulings and decisions concerning Federal taxation of livestock operators. Such activities also included work in connection with proposal of the National Livestock Tax Committee to amend the Internal Revenue Code, recognizing capital gains in sale of breeding livestock and permitting deduction of ordinary recurring ranching expenditures. It is impossible to determine what part of my services related to this problem, but it is my opinion that none of my activity during the preceding quarter could be interpreted as lobbying. During the quarter a total of $510 for legal services was paid to me for all my activities and services. I was also reimbursed $16.39 for out-of-pocket expenses. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Harter, Dow W., 412-14 Washington Building, Washington, D. C.; the B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron, Ohio. (1) Receive annual retainer from the B. F. Goodrich Co. for all services as its Washington counsel. Allocation of amount paid for my services between legal and legislative activities is not feasible. Amount received during fourth quarter of 1948, $1,675. In addition, receive reimbursement for long-distance telephone, travel, taxicab fares, and out-of-pocket expenses. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) The B. F. Goodrich Co. is interested in legislation relating to the maintenance of facilities for the production of an ample supply of synthetic rubber in the United States for commercial and national defense purposes. It is interested in various proposals now under study by Congress for a long-range rubber program for this country. It is also interested in the repeal of the present exercise taxes on tires and tubes, and in other legislative proposals which come before Congress from time to time.

Hawes, Robert N., 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C.; Grays Harbor Industries, Aberdeen, Wash.; Forks Chamber of Commerce, Forks, Wash.; Port Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Port Townsend, Wash.; Sequim Chamber of Commerce, Sequim, Wash.; and Port Angeles Chamber of Commerce, Port Angeles, Wash. (1) From Grays Harbor Industries: $2,499.99, compensation; $98.67, expenses. (2) Out-of-pocket expenses. (3) Telephone, telegraph, travel, entertainment, postage, etc. (4) None. (5) Reference to Olympic National Park.

Hawkins, Paul M., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York 19, N. Y. (1) Received $2,050, only a small fraction of which was for lobbying activities; $260.27 expenses, only a small fraction of which was expended for lobbying activities. (2) Taxicabs, railroads, restaurants, hotels, air lines. (3) Transportation, meals, rooms. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the hotel industry.

Hayden, Harry Vere, Jr., 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $250 salary, semimonthly, less withholding and social security taxes; $4.60 incidental expenses for months of October, November, and December 1948. (2) Harry Vere Hayden, Jr. (3) Taxi, carfare, phone calls, meals. (4) The American Legion Magazine, New York City; The National Legionnaire, Indianapolis, Ind.; National Legislative Bulletin, Washington, D. C. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which are opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil-aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Haynes, Kit H., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $1,500. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Assist in the preparation of Washington Situation, a weekly mimeographed newsletter of the national council; also prepare farm news releases at irregular intervals and special reports at irregular intervals. Such reports are distributed to members of the national council, news services, radio networks and stations, and miscellaneous persons who have requested inclusion on mailing lists. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Hays, Joseph H., Western Association of Railway Executives, the Association of Western Railways, 204 South Canal Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None received or expended for Federal legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interest of Western rail lines.

Hazen, John C., 1008 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; National Retail Dry Goods Association, 100 West Thirty-first Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Meals, $300.25; hotel, $68.69; taxis, $49.20; transportation (rail, plane), $210.18; miscellaneous, $15; convention registration fees, $23.50. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Special Bulletin of the National Retail Dry Goods Association, published weekly. (5) [Blank.]

Hebert, Felix, Associated Factory Mutual Fire Insurance Co. et al., 702 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I. (1) Telephone call to Washington: toll, $1.70; tax, $0.43. (2) New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. (3) Telephone call. (4) None. (5) Amendment to Internal Revenue Code.

Heberton, K. W., 1405 G St. NW., Washington, D. C.; Western Union Telegraph Co., 60 Hudson Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary of $800 per month, which is paid for all services, only a part of which concerns legislation. Out-of-pocket travel and incidental expenses, $85.55. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and luncheons. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Western Union Telegraph Co.

Hecht, George J., 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N. Y.; American Parents Committee (without salary), 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $173.19 for traveling expense, entertainment, etc.; expended $173.19. (2) Various. (3) Railroad fare, miscellaneous expense. (4) The Parents magazine and school management. (5) National School Health Services Act; National Science Foundation bill; Appropriations for United States Children's Bureau; Federal aid for education.

Heiney, Robert B., National Canners Association, 1739 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,625 as one-quarter year's salary as assistant to secretary of association for all work performed. $18.95 has been received as reimbursement for expenses incurred. (2) Taxi fares and miscellaneous expenses, $18.95. (3) See above. (4) National Canners information letter. (5) Opposing marketing orders on commodities for canning.

Henderson,[5] Joseph D., American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $1,500, based on $6,000 per year, received this quarter from the American Association of Small Business; no money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Small Business Review, monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

(5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Henderson,[6] Joseph D., American Association of Small Business, 602 Carondelet Building, New Orleans, La. (1) Salary of $1,500 (based on $6,000 per year) received this quarter from the American Association of Small Business. No money expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) The Small Business Review, monthly publication of the American Association of Small Business; routine news releases to newspapers and radio stations; weekly column to Louisiana newspapers, Minding Your Own Business. (5) To support legislation favorable to small business; to oppose legislation unfavorable to small business, standing always for that which is right for the country and the will of the majority.

Hensel, Robert E., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of $5.27 in connection with the proposed legislation described in (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) Various. (3) Postage, miscellaneous carfares, phone calls, and petty cash disbursements. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend-received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Herndon, Maurice G., 1001–2 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank]. (3) [Blank]. (4) [Blank]. (5) [Blank].

Herrmann, Louis F., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank]. (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Hess, Amiel Edgerton,[7] Oil-Heat Institute of America, Inc., 6 East Thirty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) Nothing at present.

Hester, Ewart A., law offices of Clinton M. Hester, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary: October, November, and December, $2,500. No expenses for this quarter. (2) No expenses incurred. (3) None. (4) None. (5) See supplementary statement (2) attached to Form B filed by me January 9, 1948. H. R. 7036.

Hewes & Awalt (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, and Maxwell M. Merritt), 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn., 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Life Insurance Association of America, 165 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) This registrant received no money or other compensation from the Life Insurance Association of America during the calendar quarter ended December 31, 1948. This registrant made certain out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended December 31, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement, these being listed in detail: To the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., for long-distance calls, $5.64; to taxicab drivers, $1.40; total, $7.04. (2) See (1). (3) Expenses for transportation and communication. (4) None. (5) Any revision of Internal Revenue Code affecting life insurance and annuities.

Hewes & Awalt (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Thomas Hewes, F. G. Awalt, Samuel O. Clark, Jr., Harold E. Mitchell, Raymond Sparks, Henry L. Shepherd, John S. Murtha, Maxwell M. Merritt, and W. V. T. Justis), 93 Elm Street, Hartford, Conn., 822 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The filing of this report is not to be taken as an admission that the Federal regulation of Lobbying Act is applicable. This registrant received no money or other compensation from the National Association of Electric Companies during the calendar quarter ended December 31, 1948. This registrant made certain out-of-pocket expenditures during the calendar quarter ended December 31, 1948, in connection with its employment by the above-named association for which registrant has not received reimbursement, these being listed in detail: To Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co. for long-distance calls, $9.84; to taxicab drivers, $3.15; total, $12.99. (2) See (1). (3) Expenses for transportation and communication. (4) None. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which this firm is counsel, is to provide the members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association, therefore, is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Hill & Knowlton, Inc., 300 Hibbs Building, 725 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached.[1] (2) See attached.[1] (3) See attached.[1] (4) Have no records of such publication. (5) Not employed to oppose or support legislation. Are retained to prepare educational information and material.

Hinders, Justin, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,000 (only 50 percent of time, however, is devoted to legislative activities). Expenses incurred, $233.30. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fare, transportation, etc. (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Hines, Lewis G., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December, $2,380; expenses for October, November, and December, $184. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company, and messengers. (3) As stated in No. 2. (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hinman, Ray C., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary, $1,250 (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act); reimbursement for traveling expenses, $132.80; total, $1,382.80. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $132.80. (2) Railroads, air lines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Hollister, R. F., Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, 802 Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) Money received, salary, $1,800; money expended, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Federal legislation controlling bank holding companies.

Holloway, William J., Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and others, 2816 First National Building, Oklahoma City, Okla. (1) Have neither earned nor received any attorney's fees under United States Lobbying Act during October, November, and December 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Holman, Charles W., the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Miscellaneous expenses, $102.70. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, luncheons, etc. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Holmes, George T., Tax Equity Committee of Kentucky, 211 Columbia Building, Louisville, Ky. (1) No money was received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Hood, J. M., president, American Short Line Railroad Association, 1120 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary received from the American Short Line Railroad Association, $4,125. Expenses incurred for account of the American Short Line Railroad Association for which reimbursement has been or will be made, $948.08. Impossible to accurately allocate either salary or expenses, but carefully calculated estimate is that 5 percent of salary, $206.25, and 10 percent of expenses, $94.81, total, $301.06, expended for purpose of influencing legislation. (2) Expenses paid to hotels, clubs, transportation, and communication companies. (3) For travel and entertainment in connection with the furtherance of the legislative program of the 317 common carriers by rail members of the American Short Line Railroad Association. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting member lines of the American Short Line Railroad Association.

Hooks, Homer E., Canners League of Florida, Post Office Box 1252, Lakeland, Fla. (1) No activity during quarter. Temporary work on specific legislation terminated with adjournment of last session, Eightieth Congress. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Horsky, Charles A., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; P. E. Harris & Co., Dexter Horton Building, Seattle, Wash.; Libby, McNeill & Libby, Chicago, Ill.; New England Fish Co., Smith Tower, Seattle, Wash.; Kadiak Fisheries Co., Lowman Building, Seattle, Wash.; Pacific American Fisheries, Inc., South Bellingham, Wash. (1) Received, none; expended, none. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) This employment is an ordinary attorney-client retainer on a per diem basis for the purpose of assisting in the formulation and presentation of a proposed legislative program, being developed jointly for presentation to Congress by various interested salmon-canning companies and the Department of the Interior, relating to stabilizing certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry. The per diem is computed at $250 a day for each day of legal services rendered.

Hosking, Floyd J., 1329 E Street NW., Washington D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 East Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.06 as miscellaneous expenses. (See below.) (2) Notary public, $2; postage, 6 cents. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Howard, Paul, 1709 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salaries, $3,497.06; rent, $375; postage, $72.88; telephone and telegraph, $95.56; insurance on office equipment, etc., $25.65; travel, $387.01; supplies, $378.65; total expenditures for period, $4,553.16. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). Operation of office. Not more than one-third of expenditures applicable to legislative activity. (4) ALA bulletin; Library Journal; San Antonio Express; New York Times; and any other newspapers or magazines who use material from this office. Since we do not subscribe to a clipping service, we do not know who they are. (5) Any legislation affecting American Library Association members and/or the library profession.

Howard, S. H., 1328 Evergreen Avenue, Millvale, Pa.; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, 503 Wellington Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, none; expenses, none. No legislative activities. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Howe, Harold K., 2480 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill. (1) Received $1,500 as salary, and $464.16 as reimbursement for general expenses. (2) Various. (See answer to (3).) (3) Miscellaneous and incidental, including local transportation, lunches, gratuities, committee meeting expenses, and other incidental expenses of Washington office, American Institute of Laundering. (4) Not applicable under section 308 (a). (5) I am interested in all legislation affecting the laundry industry and the members thereof. My primary function as to legislation is to report status, prospects, etc., to my employer, the American Institute of Laundering. (See also letter attached to registration Form B, which is made a part hereof.)

Howe, Robert E., Jr.,[5] United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since July 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,125 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,677. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Howe, Robert E., Jr.,[6] United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW., and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,374.96 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,926.96. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Huff, W. T., 806 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc., 101 West Eleventh Street, Kansas City, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support the program of the Presidential Air Policy Commission and the Congressional Air Policy Board for the advancement of aviation.

Huntress, Carroll B., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y.; National St. Lawrence Project Conference, 843 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Carroll B. Huntress, vice president, Republic Coal & Coke Co., 17 Battery Place, New York, N. Y., acting as chairman for the National St. Lawrence Project Conference, without compensation and for reimbursement of expenses of travel and hotel. (2) Railroads, hotels, $53.92. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Senate Joint Resolution 111; House Joint Resolution 192.

Hushing, W. C., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December, $2,380. Expenses for October, November, and December, $231.60. (2) Taxi drivers, phone company (when away from office), and messengers. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

Hutson, John B., suite 719, 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Tobacco Associates, Inc., Raleigh, N. C. (1) Salary at the rate previously reported on Form B, which registrant filed as a matter of information to the Congress, although of the opinion that he does not come within the purview of the act (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.). (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Ingles, William, 1624 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., $1,080; J. I. Case Co., $900; The Falk Corp., $900; Inland Steel Co., $900. Expenditures: Office salaries, $750; lunches, taxi fares, and incidentals (no individual expense exceeding $10), $360; office rent, $330; telephone, $125.51; office services, supplies, and general expense, $67.65; traveling expenses, $762.44. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). Normal operating expense. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting industry.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America, Room 305, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Dues payments, fourth quarter, 1948: Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Commerce Building, Houston, Tex., $3,800; Rio Grande Valley Gas Co., Brownsville, Tex., $200; all other dues to December 31, 1948, $1,940.63; total dues collected for quarter, $5,940.63. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Regular association publications. (5) No legislation pending.

Jackson, Charles E., general manager, National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 228 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) NFI Flashes, published weekly (50 issues), mailed to institute membership. (5) None.

Jackson, Robert C.,[5] National Cotton Council of America, 1406 G Street NW. (1) Salary as reported on Form B. No expenses incurred that related to legislative activity. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Jackson, Robert C.,[6] 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, Tenn. (1) In addition to regular salary from National Cotton Council, as reported on Form B, received expense reimbursements amounting to $97.84 that might be construed as relating to legislative activity. (2) Taxi fares $3.60; travel expense $94.24. (3) Transportation, meals, and lodging. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. Expenditures reported above relate to plans for efforts to repeal taxes and license fees on margarine.

Jhung, Walter, Post Office Box 1706, Washington, D. C.; Korean-American Trading Co., 105 East Houston Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 152 and H. R. 860 (superseded by H. R. 2932), immigration quota for Korea and to extend naturalization privileges for Korean nationals in United States.

Jobe, William T., National Association of Ice Industries, 1706 L Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Employed on a full time annual basis as general counsel for the National Association of Ice Industries at a salary of $10,800 per annum. I have received my regular monthly salary for the past calendar quarter of 1948 and nothing more. Pursuant to the requirements of Public Law 601, I have expended no money. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Johnson, Curtis E., 4619A South Thirty-sixth Street, Arlington, Va.; Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, 39 East Thirty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Expenses received as stated on registration statement. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 6569, Emergency Displaced Persons Act.

Johnson, Elmer, National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1246 Twentieth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The sum of $743.28 was received during the fourth quarter of 1948. (2) None. (3) Fee, $225 per month; $68.28 to cover transportation, meals, etc. (4) The annuitant. (5) In support of any measure designed to improve the Federal retirement system.

Johnson, Gilbert R., 874 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio; Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Pro rata of annual retainer as legal counsel (including 8-percent increase effective September 1, 1948) as set forth in my letter of April 9, 1948, amending initial registration dated January 10, 1947. No expenses were incurred during this period. (2) Retainer to self. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) During this quarter I have given attention to legislation relating to Great Lakes shipping as part of my work as legal counsel for Lake Carriers' Association. I do not consider that I am engaged for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation and this report is made without prejudice to that position.

Johnson, Vernon A., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (1) Received a total of $4,405.42, all from the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. $2,750 of this was for salary. The balance of $1,655.42 was for expenses, itemized as follows: $20 for automobile travel, $44.10 for taxicab fares, $982.70 for entertainment, $381.54 for travel tickets, $150 for hotel-room rent, and $77 for meals. (2) Various taxicab companies, hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, etc. (3) For normal business activities and relationships. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Johnson, W. D., room 312, Labor Building, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) January 1949, annual compensation of $8,500. (2) W. D. Johnson. (3) As vice president and national legislative representative of the Order of Railway Conductors of America, covering all services rendered, including services entirely unrelated to legislative matters. (4) None. (5) Legislation directly and indirectly affecting the interests of labor, generally, employees of carriers under the Railway Labor Act, and particularly the interests of various classes and crafts of railway employees represented by the Order of Railway Conductors of America.

Johnson, Walter R., National Association of Attorneys General, 917 District National Building, 1406 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary due to July 31, 1948, $3,500; expenses, $266.56. (2) Registrant. (3) Expenses incurred attending meeting American Association of Port Authorities, $101.60; expenses for hotel, meals, taxis, etc., in Washington during December 1948, $164.96. (4) None. (5) To confirm and establish titles in States to land beneath navigable waters within State boundaries.

Jones, J. M., National Wool Growers Association, 414 Pacific National Life Building,

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Salary $2,100. (2) [Blank.] (3) No lobbying expense for fourth quarter, 1948. (4) The National Wool Grower, coeditor, J. M. Jones. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, L. Dan, Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary previously reported plus the following expenses which might be considered to be within the scope of the act, $17.10. (2) See (3) below. (3) Taxi fares. (4) None. (5) I am not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. My duties include that of maintaining surveillance of legislation which might affect the petroleum industry and taking such action with respect to such legislation as directed by the association.

Jones, Lyle W., 1737 De Sales Street, NW.; National Small Business Men's Association, Akron, Ohio. (1) $600 monthly salary less withholding tax and social-security tax; $160 personal expenses, October, November, and December. (2) Lyle W. Jones. (3) Luncheons, taxicabs, and miscellaneous expenses. (4) Pulling Together—monthly bulletin, National Small Business Men's Association. (5) [Blank.]

Jones, Walter J.,[5] care of W. C. Hushing, room 607, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone Central Labor Union and Metal Trades Council, Balboa, C. Z. (1) $500 per month for July 1948; none for August or September 1948. (2) Landlord for rent, various groceries for food, service stations for gasoline and oil, cab fare, tips, railroads for fare, and miscellaneous items incidental to living in Washington; boat transportation to Canal Zone. (3) Fares, rent, food, operation of automobile, etc. (4) None. (5) Retirement for Canal Zone employees, pay legislation, increased injury compensation, any others affecting Federal employees.

Jones, Walter J.,[6] care of W. C. Hushing, room 607, American Federation of Labor Building, Washington, D. C. Not employed as representative during this period; employed in regular position with the Panama Canal, Balboa, Canal Zone. (1) None period October, November, December 1948. Returned to regular position with the Panama Canal. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

Kane, John E., 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported in Form B heretofore filed pursuant to act; expenses reimbursed by employer, $384.22. (2) Various taxicab companies, restaurants, hotels, other service establishments. (3) Administrative expenses, transportation, gratuities. (4) None. (5) Matters affecting the petroleum industry and its customers.

Kane, John E., District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $343.90 as treasurer of District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. The sum of $343.90 expended on behalf of committee during quarter. (2) Various. (3) Incidentals. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the sale and distribution of petroleum products in the District of Columbia.

Kass, Rear Adm. I., Post Office Box 4037, Washington, D. C., and Hotel Princess Anne, Fredericksburg, Va. (1) Expended about $200 since last report; received none. (2) Railroad company, post office, telephones, and similar items. (3) Rail travel, mailing, and telephoning. (4) Pamphlet the States Rights (Dixie Party) and Liberty. (5) Oppose all fair-employment practice laws; promote free liberal government.

Keesling, Francis V., Jr., 315 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.; city and county of San Francisco, City Hall, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $3,000, retainer; $1,646.73, reimbursement for travel, subsistence, secretarial, stenographic, telephone, telegraph, and postage expense. (This also covers services concerning matters before the various executive departments, in addition to legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco, and includes expenses at Washington, D. C., San Francisco, and elsewhere.) (2) No payments made except as set forth in (1) above. (3) In connection with various legislative matters of interest to the city and county of San Francisco. (4) None. (5) Various bills of interest to the city and county of San Francisco including Army civil functions, housing, surplus property, in-lieu taxes.

Kennedy, Gilbert F., Esq., partner of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y., Washington, D. C., and 1 Garden Court, Middle Temple, London, England; Louis Dreyfus, of Chappell & Co., Inc., RKO Building, New York, N. Y., and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) Nothing received during the quarter; $2 expended during the quarter. (2) H. W. H. Smith Howard, commissioner for oaths, $2. (3) Commissioner's fees. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704, Eightieth Congress, second session, being a bill to enable wife (Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus) to regain her United States citizenship.

Kennedy, Harold L., 605 Commonwealth Building, Washington, D. C.; Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association, 308 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla. (1) Received 3 months' retainer in the amount of $3,000; expended nothing. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) All proposed legislation that might affect the oil and gas industry.

Kent, Arthur H., 1720 Mills Tower, San Francisco, Calif.; American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Payment of $33.47 received from American Contractors Engaged in Foreign Work, 420 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., December 2, 1948. (2) United Airlines (extra fare), Washington to San Francisco, $15.81; Lulu P. Loveland, notarial fees, $4; Standard Photoprint Co., photostats, $8.29; long-distance-telephone tolls, $5.37. (3) Transportation and other out-of-pocket expenses incurred to November 20, 1948, and reimbursed by above payment. (4) None. (5) Support of amendment to section 116 (a), Internal Revenue Code, relating to taxation of earned income of United States citizens from foreign sources.

Kern, George A., Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Ketchum, Inc.,[5] 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.; National Education Association of the United States, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Education Association, $1,162.93. (2) Ketchum, Inc., $1,-162.93. (3) Services, $800; expenses (living, travel, and incidental expenses), $362.93; total, $1,162.93. (4) News releases sent to the Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, general distribution to Washington news and radio correspondents. (Information also distributed to Members of Congress.) (5) Current educational problems in furtherance of the passage of H. R. 2953 and S. 472.

Ketchum, Inc., National Competition Committee, 1400 Chamber of Commerce Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $18,850 received. (See attached paper A.[1]) (2) To Ketchum, Inc., to members of management and field staff (McClean Work, Walter M. Megronigle, Harold D. Huycke, Rollin C. Bacher, George Hoeveler, and Marshall Lewis) as salaries, and for traveling expenses for these men, and office expenses. (See attached paper B.[1]) (3) For organizing and implementing committees in various parts of the country (see attached paper C,[1] and directing attendant publicity. (4) One release to Pittsburgh papers, Wall Street Journal, trade press, and press associations, on December 8, 1948 (copy attached).[1] (5) These committees were organized to support legislation to assure the continuance of the delivered-price system of selling. Since Ketchum, Inc., has completed its work of organizing these committees its work has been discontinued as of December 31, 1948.

Ketchum, MacLeod & Grove, Inc.,[5] 411 Seventh Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Main & Co., First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Received from Main & Co., $1,522.87. (2) Various. (3) For type composition for folders descriptive of tax plan; printing of folders; letter shop service; clipping services; postage, telephone, art lay-out, and services. (4) News releases sent to Pittsburgh Press, Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, Pittsburgh Sun-Telegraph, Wall Street Journal, Associated Press, United Press, International News Service, and general distribution to Washington News and radio correspondents. (Information also distributed to Members of Congress.) (5) The incentive income-tax plan, a program of income-tax revision prepared by Frank Wilbur Main and other partners in Main & Co., certified public accountants, with headquarters office in Pittsburgh.

Ketchum, Omar B., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,000 per month as salary minus social security and withholding taxes; $62.50 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities; and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

King, Carol, 220 Broadway, New York, N. Y.; acting for American Committee for Protection of Foreign-Born, 23 West Twenty-sixth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Repeal of act of October 16, 1918, as amended.

King, Joseph T., National Retail Lumber Dealers Association, suite 302, Ring Building, Eighteenth and M Streets NW, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,800 salary and $585.35 expenses. (2) Restaurants, cab drivers, hotels, railroads, Pullman companies, porters. (3) Meals, taxi fares, and tips while traveling on official business; business luncheons, entertainment. (4) National affairs reports and bulletins. (5) Legislation directly affecting the retail building supply dealers, such as Fair Labor Standards Act, wage-and-hour legislation, housing legislation, tax legislation, freight rates, price and allocation controls.

King, Thomas H., 1025 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

King, Willford I., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the past quarter I received an over-all of $2,606.02, including salary and expenses. (2) I am not a disbursing officer and have made no payments for the Committee for Constitutional Government, by whom I am employed. (3) [Blank.] (4) Dun's Review. (5) Not employed for this purpose, but, incidentally, I occasionally oppose legislation which I believe to be antisocial and favor that which I believe to be socially beneficial.

Kitchen, C. W., United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 2017 S Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Various articles have been prepared and published in trade periodicals and association yearbooks on marketing subjects, none dealing specifically with legislative matters. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Kline, Allan B., American Farm Bureau Federation, 58 East Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $254.03 expended. (See (6) of Form B filed January 1948.) (2) Taxi fares, train fares, hotel, and restaurants. (3) Transportation, lodging, and luncheon conferences. (4) None. (5) Congress not in session.

Kline, Robert E., Jr., 322 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; Washington counsel for Kirlin, Campbell, Hickox & Keating, 120 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to permit steamship companies to engage in foreign and overseas air transportation.

Kneipp, Leon F., 3700 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Organization of Professional Employees of United States Department of Agriculture, South Building, Department of Agriculture, Washington D. C. (1) Only money received was compensation for services during months of October, November, and December 1948 at rate of $100 per month; total $300. (2) No money paid to any person, company, corporation, or otherwise. (3) None. (4) None, other than small publication, Opeda, published by organization for issuance to its members; a part of which consists of a letter from the executive officer apprising members of current developments in subjects of interest. (5) Measures relating to interests of Federal professional employees; pay, per diem, classification, retirement, auto mileage, annual and sick leave, disability compensation, civil service, and other like subjects.

Koch, Robert M., National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., 1424 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) It is estimated that, as secretary of the National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc., $500 of my salary represents that part of my time covered by Public Law 601 during the fourth quarter of 1948. This was all disbursed for personal living expenses. In addition, I received $20 for reimbursement for taxis and carfare in connection with legislation of interest to members of the association. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation directly or indirectly affecting the agricultural limestone industry.

Krebs, Alfred U., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant believes that $50 per month represents a fair allocation of his salary for the fourth quarter of 1948, to the activities referred to in Form B. (2) No expenditures except for taxicabs and similar items. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Registrant did not support or oppose any legislation during the fourth quarter of 1948.

Kreutz, Oscar R., National Savings and Loan League, 1835 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $4,500 total salary for quarter and $1,743.77 reimbursement of expenses. No portion of either my salary or expenses is allocable to lobbying for this quarter. (2) None of the expenses incurred nor reimbursements received by me in the fourth quarter was chargeable to legislative expense. (3) [Blank.] (4) National Savings and Loan Journal; National Letter. (5) Bills to improve the facilities of savings and loan associations for encouragement of thrift and home ownership are supported, while legislation inimical to the interests of the savings and loan business is opposed.

Krueger, A. H., 847 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Millers' National Federation, 309 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) During the quarter October–December 1948 I was paid $2,149.98 by the Millers' National Federation for various services most of which are not related to the activities described in section 307, title 3, Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. Section 307 activities, if any, would be incidental in relationship to my regular employment and no amount of my salary is specifically allocated for such activities. (Effective September 1 my salary as originally reported was increased $600 annually.) No expenditures were made for the quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Activity dependent on my employer's interest with respect to legislation, directly affecting milling industry. No pending legislation.

Kruse, Herman C., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) No activity during quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Lacques,[5] Paul H., Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (July, August, September) at various times a total of $408.19, from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. None of such receipts exceeded $100. (2) Railroad companies, hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, meals, telephone, and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) H. R. 4044.

Lacques,[6] Paul H., Bingham, Englar, Jones & Houston, 99 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received various sums during the quarterly period (October, November, and December 1948) at various times a total of $81.20, from Bigham, Englar, Jones & Houston. (2) Railroad companies, hotels, and club. (3) Transportation, accommodations, meals, telephone and telegraph charges. (4) None. (5) [Blank.]

LaFrance, Francis X., Esq., Swan, Keeney & Smith, 911 Turks Head Building, Providence, R. I.; Narragansett Brewing Co., New Depot Avenue, Cranston, R. I. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2759 and any corelative bill.

Lanham, Fritz G., Woodley Park Towers, 2737 Devonshire Place NW., Washington, D. C.; National Patent Council, Inc., 1434 West Eleventh Avenue, Gary, Ind.; American Fair Trade Council, Inc., 11 East Forty-fourth Street, New York City, N. Y.; Trinity Improvement Association, Inc., 1308 Commercial Standard Building, Fort Worth, Tex. (1) From National Patent Council as retainer $1,500; from American Fair Trade Council as retainer $1,000 and for expenses of trip to New York $35.65; aside from small sums for postage, etc., no expenditures for either council except as recited; Trinity Improvement Association for rental and other expenses $750 and $250 additional for expenses of trip to Texas on business for the association in meetings at Beaumont, Dallas, and Fort Worth, Tex. (2) Except as recited above, $408 to Woodley Park Towers, Washington, D. C. (3) Rental and garage. (4) None. (5) My employers are all nonprofit organizations, and I was employed in an advisory capacity. Their purposes are principally educational with reference to the objectives of their organizations.

Laugherty, R. R., 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Employees' Department, American Federation of Labor, room 1309, 608 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $1,500; expenses, $750. No money expended only for personal maintenance. (2) Annapolis Hotel, taxi fare, postage, telephone and telegraph, cleaning and food. (3) Necessary living, transportation, and communication expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting and detrimental to railroad employees.

Lawrence, John V., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $26.05. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Lawrence, Joseph S., M. D., suite 301, 1302 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Receipts: Salary, October 1 to December 31, 1948, $3,750; retirement savings bonus, $5,000; reimbursement for American Medical Association expenses reported, $827.03; total, $9,577.03. Expenses: Travel, $622.37; hotels, $126.15; meals, $98.50; taxi, $52.35; conferences, $102.75; miscellaneous, $18; total, $1,020.12. (2) Various. (3) Travel, local transportation, hotels, conferences, incidental expenses, and meals. (4) None. (5) Bills relating to public health endorsed or opposed by the section of the house of delegates of the American Medical Association or the principles espoused by that body.

Laylin,[5] John G., American Smelting & Refining Co. et al., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received, none; expended in connection with all matters for client, $115.92. (2) Telephone and telegraph expense, $79.15; travel expense including hotel accommodations, $36.77. (3) Long-distance-telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

Laylin,[6] John G., American Smelting & Refining Co. et al., 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Received $15,000 for legal services rendered in connection with all legal matters for client; expended in connection with all matters for client, $145.07. (2) Telephone expense, $67.31; telegram expense, $7.33; travel expense, $45.12; miscellaneous expense, $25.31. (3) Long-distance-telephone calls, telegrams, transportation, and hotel accommodations. (4) None. (5) Appropriation for continuation of drainage tunnel by Bureau of Mines at Leadville, Colo.

League of Women Voters of the United States, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant has received no contributions for the purposes designated in subparagraph (a) or (b) of section 307, Public Law 601. Expenditures, $1,119.72. (2) Muriel Ferris, salary and carfare. (3) As indicated in (1). (4) Trends in Government, and Member magazine, both published by registrant. (5) See attached program of the League of Women Voters of the United States.

Lee, Ivy, and T. J. Ross, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N. Y., United States Cuban Sugar Council. (Registrant disclaims that Public Law 601 has any application to it but

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

is filing this form in the event that the act may be deemed to be applicable to it.) (1) See appended statement I.[1] (2) See appended statement I.[1] (3) See appended statement. I.[1] (4) See appended statement II.[1] (5) Registrant advises the United States Cuban Sugar Council on public-relations matters pertaining to sugar legislation relating to the Sugar Act of 1948.

Leith, W. Gordon, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $1,500. Less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Agricultural legislation.

Letts, David S., 901 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; American Transit Association, 292 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2,250 salary as attorney for the American Transit Association; received $182.97 for actual business expenses. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, etc., hotels and restaurants, merchants, and others. (3) Traveling and living expanses away from Washington. Expenses in Washington for transportation, fees, dues, entertainment, and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) In connection with proposed legislation affecting the transit industry, registrant may present the views of members of the American Transit Association.

Levine, Seth, CIO Maritime Committee, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) $1,365 salary, $130 expenses. No legislative activities participated in during quarter. (2) Taxi companies, telephone companies, dispensers of periodicals. (3) Taxis, telephone calls, periodicals. (4) CIO News, NMU Pilot, IFAWA Fisherman, The American Marine Engineer. (5) Support legislation in the interest of seamen, longshoremen, fishermen, and allied maritime workers and oppose legislation detrimental to them.

Lewis, George J., Union Station, Lexington, Ky.; Kentucky Railroad Association, Louisville, Ky. (For fuller details see Form B, filed by me June 3, 1947.) (1) No moneys received; none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Employed to support legislation favorable to the railroad industry and to oppose legislation detrimental to that industry.

Libby, Frederick J., executive secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,149.99; expenses, $149.68; total, $1,299.67. (2) Expenses for railroad tickets, hotels, taxis, porters, telephone and telegraph services, postage, and miscellaneous expenses when away from Washington. (3) Speaking trips, attending conferences, meetings, etc. (4) Peace Action, monthly News Bulletin of the National Council for Prevention of War. (5) Supports, in pursuance of the purposes of the organization, legislation which promotes peace and opposes legislation which, in our judgment, leads to war.

Liljenquist, L. B., 1415 K Street, Washington, D. C.; Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Money received during October–December quarter 1948 was $2,000 in salary plus $751.86 as reimbursement for expenses in operating the Washington office, none of which should be charged as lobbying expense. (2) Various. (3) Taxi fares, postage, entertainment, communications, etc. (4) Trade association bulletins to the members of the Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc. (5) While supporting or opposing legislation is not my principal responsibility I am nevertheless interested in legislation which affects the livestock and meat-packing industries.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Littell, Norman M., 1422 F Street NW., Washington 4, D. C.; Navajo Tribe of Indians, residing in Arizona, New Mexico, Utah, and Colorado; address of superintendent, Window Rock, Ariz. (1) For quarter ending December 30, 1948, received $1,875 as legal retainer for services from May 8 to August 7, 1948, and $1,875 as retainer for legal services as general counsel from August 8 to November 7, 1948; and $619.86 for expenses as general counsel (travel and otherwise), and $332.09 to reimburse for fees and expenses paid to expert witnesses. The $619.86 for expenses covers the period May 8 to November 7, inclusive, 1948. (2) To employees of registrant's law office, including stenographers, and to expert witnesses. (3) For legal services in conection with Navajo business. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation, but registrant is to represent the Navajo Indians as requested at any hearings when legislation affecting the Navajos is being considered.

Little, Charles R., 7280 Kenwood Road, Cincinnati, Ohio; Ohio Valley Conservation and Flood Control Congress, Dr. Charles E. Holzer, Sr., president, Holzer Hospital, Gallipolis, Ohio. (1) Total received for salary $900; total received for expenses, $600. Total expenses, $576.94. Actual amounts directly chargeable to lobbying are less than totals shown above. (2) Various restaurants, hotels, vendors, stores, etc. (3) Transportation, $20.98; lodging, $5; meals, $11.02; tips, $1.35; office (communication, equipment, periodicals, supplies, etc.), $538.64. (4) None. (5) Not solely employed for this purpose, but concerned with any legislation (Federal or State) dealing with flood control and allied conservation in the Ohio Valley.

Little, Walter J., 510 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.; Southern Pacific Co., and Northwestern Pacific Railroad, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.; Union Pacific Railroad, 422 West Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.: Western Pacific Railroad, 526 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Received from Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, Southern Pacific Co., Union Pacific Railroad, Northwestern Pacific Railroad, and Western Pacific Railroad, for expenses, $113.34. (2) Pullman Co., $59.94; Hotel Utah, Salt Lake City, $53.40; total, $113.34. (3) Pullman, meals, and lodging. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the railroads.

Locke, Gordon C., Committee for Pipe Line Companies, 632 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) To his best knowledge and belief dependent states that he has not, in the preceding calendar quarter, rendered any services for the Committee for Pipe Line Companies that come within the provisions of the Lobbying Act. Deponent has received total compensation, by way of salary, in the amount of $3,000 for his services during the said quarterly period, none of which should be apportioned for services which might come within the Lobbying Act. Deponent received $672.67 to cover items of expense, such as travel, telephone, and other miscellaneous expenses, none of which related to activities within the scope of the act. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) There is no pending legislation which deponent has been called upon by his employers to support or oppose.

Lodge, F. S., National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter $75 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Fertilizer News, Fertilizer Review, Agronomic Notes and Pasture Progress, all published by the National Fertilizer Association, Inc., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, H. R. 2494, H. R. 3421, H. R. 4417, H. R. 4562, H. R. 4752, and S. 1251.

Lofgren, Charles E., Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,500. Expenditures none, except personal living expenses. (2) $1,500 salary paid by Fleet Reserve Association to C. E. Lofgren, national secretary, as salary. (3) Salary. (4) Naval Affairs magazine, the official organ of the Fleet Reserve Association. (5) Veteran and naval personnel legislation.

Lord, Day & Lord, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y., and 1216 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; agency of Canadian Car & Foundry Co., Ltd., 30 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $39,671.39. (2) No disbursements made during fourth quarter of 1948. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation having relation to World War I claims.

Love,[5] Richard H., 709 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Judge Advocates Association, 331 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $600; reimbursement of expenses, $264.66. (2) Various stationers, carriers, post office, etc., not related to lobbying activities. (3) Supplies, postage, communications, and travel. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting military justice, the functions, administration and operation of legal departments of the armed forces, and national security.

Love,[6] Richard H., 709 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; Judge Advocates Association, 331 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,150; reimbursement of expenses, $280.66. (2) Various stationers, carriers, post office, etc., not related to lobbying activities. (3) Supplies, postage, communications, and travel. (4) Judge Advocate Journal, Bulletin No. 1, December 1948. (5) Legislation affecting military justice, the functions, administration, and operation of legal departments of the armed forces, and national security.

Lovelady, Rufus M., care of American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Canal Zone District, American Federation of Government Employees, box 1703, Balboa, C. Z. (1) None (not active from October 1 to December 31, 1948). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None during period covered by this report.

Lucas, James C., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision.

Lunn,[4] Dr. Carl E., 1501 West Washington, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (2) Townsend national insurance plan. (3) Temporary. (4) No set salary. No set amount. A small commission on dues from local members, for postage, announcements of meetings, etc.; because a humanitarian movement, I donate. (5) Partially paid out of commission on dues from local members, but am donating more than that myself. (6) No set amount, except small commission, I repeat, as above, for postage and post-card announcements of local meetings. (7) Mimeograph occasional news bulletins, post-card notices of local Townsend Club meetings, etc.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Lyon, A. E. (executive secretary, Railway Labor Executives' Association), 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received except regular salary and expenses. No money expended for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation. Total salary for quarter, $2,250. Total expenses for quarter, $596.70. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Incidental to other and varied duties which comprise the major part of work, all legislative proposals of concern to labor and railway labor in particular.

Lyons,[11] J. J., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary incidental to regular employment as director of personnel of the company and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

Lyons,[5] J. J., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary incidental to regular employment as director of personnel of the company and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

Lyons,[6] J. J., John F. Jelke Co., 759 South Washtenaw Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money is received other than salary incidental to regular employment as director of personnel of the company and reimbursement for transportation, lodging, and meals. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support of proposals for repeal of taxes on oleomargarine.

McAvoy,[7] Harold, room 916, 900 F Street NW, Washington, D. C.; president, National Association Post Office and Railway Mail Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen, and Messengers, 1113 Arch Street, North Side, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) $1,520, which must take care of all expenses for the quarter. (2) Harold McAvoy, our legislative representative. (3) Legislation for the benefit of all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department. (4) The Mail Handlers Journal. (5) He must support all legislation that will benefit all mail handlers, watchmen, and messengers employed by the Post Office Department.

McBreen, Thomas J., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards and its Realtors Washington Committee, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (60 percent of time devoted to legislative activities), $1,300; reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses, and per diem, $752.23; total, $2,052.23. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached[1] list shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

McBride, Jonas A., 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, 318 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary of Jonas A. McBride, vice president, national legislative representative, $2,500; salaries of employees, $1,101.35; printing and supplies, $61.25; rent, $360; personal expenses, $1,066.65; telephone and telegrams, $67.43; postage, $30. (2) Salary to Jonas A. McBride and Glenn C. Russell, stenographer; printing and supplies to various printers and stationery firms; rent to labor newspaper, 10 Independence Avenue, Washington, D. C. (3) For maintenance of office of national legislative representative of Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting the interests of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen.

McCarthy, Frank J., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending December 31, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

McCaskill, J. L., associate secretary, Department of Higher Education, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,631.68, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative services. Estimated for legislative services, none; expense, none. (2) None. (3) No expense incurred. (4) College and University Bulletin. (5) Any and all legislation designed to strengthen education in all areas.

McCloskey,[4] Bryson deHaas, Post Office Box 1657, Washington, D. C. (1) No money has been received or expended during the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None have been published or written as yet. In preparation are briefs relating to the following proposed legislation which are planned for presentation to the Members of both Houses of Congress early in 1949. (5) Legislation requiring all philanthropies and nonprofit organizations to make yearly detailed public reports of all funds received by them and all expenditures made by them; legislation instigating an investigation of the methods employed by big business and their agents to prevent the manufacture of a low-cost auto for the people aided by Republican administration departments; investigation of philanthropies as Republican-controlled monopolies.

McClure, Warren C., Box 207, Camden, Ark.; Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

McDonald, Angus H., 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, old address: 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo.; new address: 1555 Sherman, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

McDonald, E. L., 524 Governor Building, Portland, Oreg.; The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total amount received, $937.14. (2) Transportation and living. (3) Travel and living costs. (4) None. (5) H. R. 16, The Townsend Plan Inc.

McFarland, Rev. A. J., 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; The Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary, $750; expenses, $150; total, $900. (2) Salary to self; expenses for travel. (3) Answered above. (4) The Christian Patriot. (5) A Christian amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

McGough, Richard, 515 Hoge Building, Seattle, Wash.; Northern Pacific Railway Co., Union Pacific Railroad Co., Great Northern Railway Co., the Milwaukee Road, Seattle, Wash. (1) Salary as stated in original registration; expenditures in connection with Federal legislation, none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting transcontinental railroads operating in the State of Washington.

McKercher, M. C., The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the welfare of railroad employees.

McLaughlin, Robert E., AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II), 410 Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expense money drawn or expended except petty cash for taxi fares and actual expenses in connection with attendance at the AMVETS national convention. As national legislative director, I draw a modest per diem for time actually consumed. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) National AMVET and AMVET Letter. (5) To support legislation providing care and assistance for veterans of World War II and their dependents.

McLaughlin, Robert E., Washington counsel for National Association of United States Storekeepers-Gaugers, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received quarterly retainer of $350. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) To support legislation beneficial to this client and civil-service employees in general.

Mahon, John A. M., president, National Association Postal Supervisors, 171 Milton Street, Dorchester Center, Boston, Mass.; National Association of Postal Supervisors, box 1225, Nashville, Tenn. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) The Postal Supervisor, official magazine of the National Association of Postal Supervisors. (5) Legislation involving salary adjustments, working conditions, retirement, all in the interests of the supervisory officials in the field postal service.

McMains, W. H., Distilled Spirits Institute, 1135 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary same as previous report. No expenses have been authorized or incurred for purposes listed under this act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the industry represented is reported to members.

McMillan, Robert W., Management Planning of Washington, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $2,100, with less than one-twentieth of the time and services for which such compensation was paid being for activities which might conceivably be construed as coming within the purview of any of the provisions of title III of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946; $148.30, reimbursement of expenses allocable to foregoing activities. (2) Taxi drivers and operators of eating and refreshment places. (3) Transportation and other normal out-of-pocket expenses. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

MacCracken, William P., Jr., 1152 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; American Optometric Association, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, O. D., 111 East North Street, Fostoria, Ohio. (1) None. (2) During this quarter I expended $4.81 for telephone and telegraph, $1 for notary fees, and $1.20 for taxi expense; total expenditures of $7.01. (3) See (1) and (2) above. (4) None. (5) On behalf of the American Optometric Association, I have contacted various Members of Congress to secure support for a proposed bill to amend the District of Columbia optometry law for the purpose of raising the standards of the profession and providing better visual care for residents of the District of Columbia. I have also discussed with certain governmental officials and Members of Congress the inclusion of the profession of optometry in any legislation introduced by the administration, looking to the establishment of a Health Department in the executive branch of the Government and legislation for the

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

establishment of a national health insurance program.

Macleay, Lachlan, Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) Total reimbursable expenses in connection with general work done for the Mississippi Valley Association, all reimbursed by association, $1,211.49. (2) Railroads, etc., $644.63; hotels and miscellaneous, $566.86. (3) Travel, subsistence, and incidentals. (4) None. (5) A portion of Mr. Macleay's time was used in regard to legislation relating to river and harbor maintenance and improvement, the American merchant marine, soil conservation, flood control, regulation of domestic transportation.

Macnamee, W. Bruce, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $150 per month ($450 for quarter) received from the National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., allocable to legislative activities. (2) W. Bruce Macnamee. (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Magee, Miss Elizabeth S., National Consumers League, 348 Engineers' Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Salary, part-time, $583.38. (2) [Blank.] (3) Part-time salary. (4) National Consumers League Bulletin. (5) Supporting minimum-wage legislation, extension of social security.

Marchbanks, Miss Modane, 901 Lincoln Tower, Chicago, Ill.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $45.44. (2) Various persons. (3) Cab fares, $7.05; travel expenses, $38.39. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Margolin, Mrs. Olya, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., 1819 Broadway, New York City, N. Y. (1) $1,125 (gross, before income-tax deduction) in salary received from the National Council of Jewish Women, 1819 Broadway, New York City, N. Y., none of which was spent in connection with work; $22.20 received from above spent for carfare, postage, etc. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed specifically to support or oppose any legislation, but for the purpose of securing information to be transmitted to headquarters for the preparation of educational and other material.

Mark,[11] James, Jr., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since April 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,041.67, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $546, a total of $2,587.67. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday, living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Mark,[5] James J., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since July 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,124.99, and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $552, a total of $2,676.99. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday, living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

Mark,[6] James, Jr., United Mine Workers of America, 900 Fifteenth Street NW. and 907 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Since October 1, 1948, there has been received by affiant as salary the sum of $2,499.96 and as per diem for personal living expenses the sum of $366, a total of $2,865.96. (2) No sums in any amount have been paid by affiant to any person other than affiant's expenditures for normal, everyday, living expenses such as transportation, meals, etc., in the regular discharge of his duties. (3) Answered in (2) above. (4) None. (5) Any and all legislation construed to be directly or indirectly beneficial or detrimental to the United Mine Workers of America and its members.

Markham, Baird H., American Petroleum Institute, 50 West Fiftieth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) See attached schedule [1] for answers to (1) to (5). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marks, Herbert S., 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; The Detroit Edison Co., 2000 Second Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) None of registrant's activities or expenditures for client during this quarter were in support of or opposition to any legislation, nor were any receipts from client in payment for any such work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) General legal services to this client include services in connection with proposed amendment to exempt certain limited electric connections from the Federal Power Act.

Marks, Raymond E., Southern Pacific Co., 43 Sierra Street, Reno, Nev (1) Nothing to report for the fourth quarter of 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, expended the sum of $5.27 in connection with the proposed legislation described in (5) hereof, for which it was or will be reimbursed by the American Tobacco Co. (2) United States Post Office, $0.27; miscellaneous, $5; total, $5.27. (3) Postage, $0.27; miscellaneous carfares, phone calls, and petty cash disbursements, $5. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation extending the 85-percent dividend-received credit to dividends received from resident foreign corporations to the extent that such resident foreign corporations derive income from United States sources.

Marran, Donald J., Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, 25 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) The firm of Chadbourne, Wallace, Parke & Whiteside, of the above address, of which registrant is an associate, did not receive or expend any sums during the quarter ended December 31, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Tax legislation proposing to amend sections 116 (a) and 1621 of the Internal Revenue Code, pertaining to United States citizens earning income from sources outside the United States and withholding required on such income.

Marsh, Benjamin C., Peoples Lobby, Inc., 810 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts, $3,055.48: Salaries and wages, $916; bulletin and printing, $791.50; postage, $387.12; rent, $165; supplies, $55.75; expenses, board meeting, $27.15; representation, Delaware registration, $52; expenses, speakers and conference, $49.40; war tax and social security, $154.31; Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., $24.91; incidentals, $50.57. (2) Benjamin C. Marsh, Arlene Ryan, Graphic Arts Press (postage), J. B. Stein, Andrew Walker, Addressograph Corp., Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Delaware registration, Colston Warne. (3) Salaries and wages for publicity and clerical work; other for maintaining office and getting out material. (4) We have not caused any article to be published, but have sent material and releases to hundreds of papers. (5) Support attached program [1] and oppose that against it.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; William J. Goodwin, the Loch, Roslyn, N. Y. (1) $1,250 received from William J. Goodwin; $16.31 expended. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., and taxi drivers. (3) $6.31 for long-distance phone calls; $10 for taxies. (4) None. (5) See letter attached to registration statement of William J. Goodwin, dated July 1, 1948.

Marshall, J. Paull, 528 Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Magothy River Association, 908 St. Paul Street, Baltimore, Md. (1) None received; none expended. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) H. R. 3314, 6341; S. 230, 1675.

Marston, R. B., director, Legislative-Federal Relations Division, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary $2,157.54, which covers both legislative and nonlegislative activities; estimated for legislative service, $431.50; expenses. (2) Self, salary. Expenses: Hotels, railroads, cabs, restaurants, etc. (3) Lunches, transportation, food, and customary personal expenses. (4) Legislative News Flash; NEA Journal (articles therein); informative articles in State educational magazines. (5) To support any and all legislation designed to strengthen public education in all of its areas.

Martin,[7] Robert F., Vitrified China Association, Inc., 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Masaoka, Mike M., national legislative director, Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, post-office box 1628, Washington, D. C.; Japanese American Citizens League Antidiscrimination Committee, 406 Beacon Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) All moneys received include only monthly salary and expenses as explained in Form B, filed January 22, 1947, except those listed on attached sheet.[1] (2) Telephone and telegraph companies, taxicabs, export company, and air lines. (3) Information, contacts, transportation, personal season's greetings. (4) News stories in Japanese language and Japanese-American newspapers relating to work here are the only articles known to have been published because of our contacts with them. (See accompanying list.[1]) (5) Legislation affecting persons of Japanese ancestry in the United States.

Maslow, Will, American Jewish Congress, 1834 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $112.50 for services under Public Law 601; in addition, I received for services not under Public Law 601, $2,500. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Law and Social Action, September-October 1948; article in Congress Weekly on Israel draft constitution; pamphlet on Israel draft constitution. (5) Legislation designed to implement the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights; to keep separate church and state; to liberalize immigration laws; to liberalize Senate rules.

Mason, Walter J., American Federation of Labor, 901 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December, $2,380; expenses for October, November, and December, $204. (2) Cab drivers, phone company, and messenger services. (3) As stated in (2). (4) None. (5) Affecting labor.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Mathews, John Clifford, 914 Clay Street, Topeka, Kans.; Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America for the Christian Amendment Movement, 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) Salary received from J. S. Tibby for October, November, December, $750; preaching fees to be applied on expense account, $167.50. (2) Salary used for personal and family expenses only; preaching fees applied on expense account—railway fare, hotel bills, meals, etc., in necessary travel for Christian Amendment Movement. (3) See above. (4) The Christian Patriot and the Covenanter Witness, 1121 Buchanan Street, Topeka, Kans. (5) In support of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would acknowledge Jesus Christ as Saviour and King of nations.

Mathews, P. H., Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C. (1) For services rendered to the Association of American Railroads as described in registration filed October 1948, registrant received salary at rate as reported therein, of which $3,506.38 is allocated for legislative work. Registrant further received $875.46 for expenses, of which $802.32 is assigned to legislative activities, such expenses being described in (2). (2) Expenses above shown were paid to hotels, Pullman Co., dining cars, restaurants, etc., such as necessary when traveling and away from home. (3) As noted in (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to railroad industry. No legislation was under consideration by Congress during the fourth quarter, 1948. Consideration was given proposed legislation on taxes and other matters pertaining to the railroad industry.

Maudlin, C. V., 716 Mills Building, Washington, D. C.; Georgia Power Co. and its associate company, Savannah River Electric Co., Electric Building, Atlanta, Ga. (1) All money received and expended during quarter ended December 31, 1948, was for nonlegislative activities. (2) None for legislative activities during quarter ended December 31, 1948. (3) None for legislative activities during quarter ended December 31, 1948. (4) None during quarter ended December 31, 1948. (5) None during quarter ended December 31, 1948.

Mechem,[1] Frank L., P. E. Harris & Co. et al., 603 Central Building, Seattle, Wash. (1) As stated in answer to (4) on Form B, the only money received by registrant is (a) legal fee on per diem basis for services performed and (b) reimbursement for traveling expenses. No money was received during the preceding calendar quarter by way of legal fees and no money was received as reimbursement for traveling expenses. (2) See (3). (3) The only expenditures during the preceding calendar quarter consisted of traveling expenses covering air and railroad transportation, hotel, meals, telephone and telegraph tolls. (4) None. (5) The formulation and presentation of proposed legislative program designed to stabilize certain phases of the Alaska salmon industry.

Meeks, E. A., National League of District Postmasters, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary only, $1,500 for quarter ending December 31, 1948. (2) E. A. Meeks. (3) Salary. (4) The Postmasters' Advocate, 1110 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (5) Any legislation affecting postmasters.

Messer, James, Jr., Florida Railroad Association, 404 Midyette-Moor Building, Tallahassee, Fla. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Any legislation in which I might be directed to support or oppose by Florida Railroad Association; generally legislation affecting railroads.

Miles, Clarence R., Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received: Salary, $4,375; expenses, $57.77. Expenses: Transportation, $14.20; telephone, $28.07; meals, $15.50. (2) Meals, taxi companies, railroad, and telephone company. (3) Transportation to and communication with the Capitol; other normal and necessary expenses. (4) None. (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Miles, Harold M., Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) None for Federal legislation. (2) None paid. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None.

Miller, Charles C., 715 Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) I have received from my employers, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., for the quarter ended December 31, 1948, prorated on the basis of total expenditures for salaries of self and secretary, office expenses, etc., at the rate of 10 percent to cover time spent on legislative work during this period a total of $474.37. (2) The expenditures on this basis of allocation were for salaries $314.80; guest meals, $23.08; taxis, $6.25; tips and miscellaneous expenses, $5.37; printing, $11.08; telephone and telegraph, $31.05; postage, $3.66; rent, $63; dues, subscriptions, and services, $13.13; office supplies, $2.85. (3) [Blank.] (4) Press coverage in daily and financial papers consisted of general news reports on tire and tube production, rubber consumption, and the industry's production achievements in 1948 and its outlook for 1949. (5) Revision of excise tax on tires and tubes; measures pertaining to regulation of transportation of coated fabrics; investigation into effects of recent basing-point decisions on industry.

Miller, Dale, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C.; Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex.; Intracoastal Canal Association of Louisiana and Texas, Houston, Tex.; Texas Gulf Sulphur Co., Newgulf, Tex., and New York, N. Y. (1) Received: $2,100, plus $750 expenses, from Dallas Chamber of Commerce; $1,500, plus $119.74 expenses, from Intracoastal Canal Association; $1,500, plus $857.22 expenses, from Texas Gulf Sulphur Co. Expended: $1,726.96; this sum includes all business expenses in Washington, only a small portion of which would apply to activities within the purview of the act. (2) Carlyn Apartments, Mayflower Hotel, United States post office, telephone and telegraph companies, local transportation facilities, printers and stationers, food and beverage establishments. (3) No specific expenditures during last quarter of 1948 for purposes within scope of the act. (4) Monthly article in Dallas magazine, official publication of Dallas Chamber of Commerce. (5) Legislation affecting flood control, water transportation, river and harbor improvement, appropriations, and taxes.

Milton, Charles J., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J.; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3237 and S. 249.

Mollin, F. E., executive secretary, American National Live Stock Association, 515 Cooper Building, Denver, Colo. (1) Have had no special contributions for lobbying purposes. The association finances handled in normal fashion. My compensation as executive secretary of the American National Live Stock Association is $1,000 a month. In addition I received in January of this year a bonus of $1,000 for last year. (2) No payments to anyone in connection with lobbying activities, and I made no trips to Washington during quarter. (3) [Blank.] (4) Our own official magazine, the American Cattle Producer. (5) [Blank.]

Montgomery, Donald E., 1129 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; International Union, United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, CIO (UAW-CIO), 411 West Milwaukee Avenue, Detroit, Mich. (1) Salary, 13 weeks at $100, $1,300 (this amount covers nonlegislative work, as described under (4) in Form B, as well as legislative work; legislative work accounts for less than half of total duties); subsistence, 13 weeks, $819; expenses, 13 weeks, $854.59; total, $2,973.59. (2) Subsistence, transportation, hotel, etc. (3) Subsistence and travel. (4) Auto Worker, Ammunition, and Washington Report (UAW-CIO publications); Economic Outlook (CIO publication); Antioch Review; Labor and Nation. (5) Support all bills favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Mooney, William W., 406 Bernice Building, Tacoma, Wash., The Townsend Plan, Inc., 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Total received during period, $1,167.06, with all withholding tax taken out by national office; out of this $370.57 was spent for travel, hotels, and incidentals in traveling over the States of Washington and Idaho; $796.49 left for personal use. (2) Paid by William W. Mooney for travel on train, bus, and auto, hotels, taxi, and other incidentals needed in travel over the States of Washington and Idaho to carry out duties. (3) To visit the different clubs or units to create interest in the national bill in United States Congress. Subject to call from clubs and by orders from national office and on own arrangement, to build clubs and organize new ones. (4) At times short articles are sent to Townsend National Weekly, printed at 6875 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. Also sent to clubs, bulletins to create interest and give information to help build morale and special meeting arrangements. (5) To support the Townsend Plan, Inc., bills in the United States Congress.

Moore, Chester B., Western Growers Association, 606 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Regular salary as managing director of Western Growers Association, plus traveling expenses. (2) To all regular accounts of my personal and business life. (3) [Blank.] (4) Western Grower and Shipper. (5) Am paid regular salary. Not directly employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. I do oppose or support any legislation of interest to our members.

Moore, Clayton, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Fourth and Main Streets, Winston-Salem, N. C. (1) None. Salary for full-time services as associate counsel same as amount in last quarterly report and for the purposes more fully set out in registration form. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax legislation affecting R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.

Morgan, George W., Association of American Ship Owners, 90 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made no money has been received or expended by the registrant for activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration under Public Law 601. (2) Inapplicable. (3) Inapplicable. (4) Copies of the only material in which the registrant caused any article or editorial to be published during the quarter for which this report is filed are annexed hereto[1] and made a part thereof. (5) The registrant is employed as president of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation. Except to the extent, if any, that publication of the material annexed hereto amounts to support of or opposition to any proposed legislation. During the quarter for which

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

this report is filed the registrant did not support or oppose any proposed legislation.

The Morris Plan Corp. of America, 103 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; none expended. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) The corporation in its interests and in the interests of its stockholders opposes the adoption of bank holding company legislation in the forms represented by S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Morrow, Giles, Freight Forwarders Institute, 1220 Dupont Circle Building (new address), Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary at rate reported on Form B, previously filed, and in addition received $561.17 as reimbursement for expenses incurred in conducting institute business in Washington, New York, Kansas City, Mo., and Los Angeles, Calif. (2) Taxicabs and restaurants in Washington, New York City, Kansas City, Mo., and Los Angeles, Calif.; the Pennsylvania, Baltimore & Ohio and Missouri Pacific Railroads and the Pullman Co.; Eastern and United Air Lines; the Muehlebach Hotel, Kansas City, Mo., and the Alexander Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif. (3) Local and interstate transportation, meals and other traveling expenses, all incurred in connection with meetings and other business of the Freight Forwarders Institute. (4) ICC Practitioners Journal (editor and contributor of legal and technical articles). (5) Any legislation directly affecting the freight-forwarding industry.

Morse,[7] Henry Hoyt, 99 Pearl Street, Gardner, Mass.; Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliances Manufacturers, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received. (2) No money paid. (3) No work undertaken. (4) Stove Builder. (5) None.

Mosier, Harold G., Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C.; The Glenn L. Martin Co., Middle River, Baltimore, Md. (1) See attached sheet.[1] (2) See attached sheet.[1] (3) See attached sheet.[1] (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting aviation.

Mote, Lynn E., Association of American Ship Owners, 1713 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) During the quarter for which this report is made registrant received only his salary and expenses. The total salary received by the registrant during the quarter was $2,000 and the total expenses received by the registrant amounted to $227.97. Only a small portion, if any, of such salary and expenses is applicable to activities in furtherance of any object necessitating registration. (2) No expenditures except taxicabs, meals, railroads, and similar out-of-pocket expenses. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) The registrant is employed as manager of the Washington office of the Association of American Ship Owners and is not employed to support or oppose any specific legislation.

Mougey, William J., 200 Hill Building, Washington, D. C.; General Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) Registrant is filing this quarterly report merely to avoid any technical claim of violation of the act for failure to file report. (4) None. (5) None.

Munro,[5] Walter J., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Munro,[6] Walter J., Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Murph, Daniel S., The National Fertilizer Association, 616 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Of salary received by me during the preceding calendar quarter, $25 may be allocable to attempts to influence the passage or defeat of legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that might affect the manufacture or distribution of fertilizer or the general agricultural economy, including such bills in the Eightieth Congress as H. R. 869, 2494, 3421, 4417, 4562, 4752, and S. 1251.

Murphy, Dr. Emmett J., 5737 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; National Chiropractic Association, Inc., Webster City, Iowa. (1) None received. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) None specified.

Murphy, Ray, Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $75 received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. Registrant does not believe he has engaged in any activities in this quarter within the purview of this act. Registrant has expended no money in this quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock casualty insurance and surety companies.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Realtors Washington Committee, and its public relations department, Chicago and Washington headquarters. (1) See schedule attached.[1] (2) See schedule attached.[1] (3) See schedule attached.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) All legislation affecting real estate.

National Association of Stevedores, 140 Cedar Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None received; $21.56 expended. (2) Orco Cameras, Inc., 112 Liberty Street, New York, N. Y. (3) Cost of multilith plates, copy of articles in New York Sun and Journal of Commerce. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6534; S. 2728.

National Postal Committee for Books, room 305, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (See registration for statement of membership of committee.) (1) No receipts during said period. Expenditures, $11.74. (2) American Book Publishers Council, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (3) For preparation and postage on releases and charges covering mailings. (4) New York Herald Tribune Book Review. (5) The committee opposes unfair increase in postage rates and discrimination in postage rates, such as contained in H. R. 2408 and H. R. 3519.

National Reclamation Association,[4] Don McBride, secretary-manager, 1119 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Total receipts for period, $5,449.33 (see schedule I[9]); total expenditures for period, $10,347.37 (see schedule II[9]). (2) See attached schedules I and II.[9] (3) See attached schedules I and II.[9] (4) National Reclamation Association Bulletin (see enclosed[9]). (5) Amendment to the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 and any other legislation affecting resources of the 17 Western States (see sec. 3, purposes, first page, our constitution, which was enclosed in first quarterly report).

National Renderers Association,[7] 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, $4,540; expenditures, $10,637.38. (See attached tabulation.[1]) (2) See attached tabulation.[1] (3) See attached tabulation.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Nau, Carlton L., American Public Power Association, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) None.

Neal, William S., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No expenditures for purposes under act. General salary, $3,375; expenses, $451.55. (2) Expenditures for attending conventions and meetings, lunches, taxicabs, phones, miscellaneous. (3) As above. (4) Regular contributions to NAM News. (5) NAM program as publicly announced: For reduction of Federal expenditures, reduction and revision of taxation; for voluntary controls and against compulsory controls except in time of war or intense war preparation; for National Science Foundation; in opposition, in part, to Office of Technical Services; for maintenance of regulation of labor unions and general promotion of individual enterprise system; for continuation of ECA.

Neel, Samuel E., 1001 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) I am retained by the Mortgage Bankers Association of America as Washington counsel to the association on the usual lawyer-client relationship. I am reimbursed by the association on an annual retainer basis. Also paid by the association are actual traveling expenses incurred by me while traveling outside of Washington representing the association. Money received, October 1 to December 31, 1948: retainer, $2,750.01; traveling expenses, $457.43; office expenses, $876.39. Money expended: Traveling expenses, $457.43; office expenses, $876.39. (2) The only money expended was that for travel expenses and office expenses. The travel expenses were paid to various railroads, hotels, etc., and the office expenses were paid for postage, office supplies, etc. (3) See (2) above. (4) Washington News Letter, published biweekly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; Letter to Members, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America; The Mortgage Banker, published irregularly by Mortgage Bankers Association of America. (5) Matters affecting the mortgage banking industry.

Nelson, Herbert U., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Reimbursement by employer for travel expenses and per diem, $1,603.90; salary, 20 percent of time devoted to legislative activities, $1,250; total, $2,853.90. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Nelson, George R., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Noble, William R., National Retail Farm Equipment Association and National Retail Hardware Association, 1028 Barr Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Out-of-pocket expenses, $54.40. (2) Public transportation, telephone company, restaurants, and hotels. (3) Taxi fares, phone calls, luncheons, and hotel. (4) Farm Equipment Retailing: Hardware Retailer. (5) Have taken position on

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[9] Not printed, filed in the Secretary's office.

[1] Not printed, filed in the Clerk's office.

wage-and-hour legislation, taxation matters, and several minor bills.

Noffsinger, J. S., executive secretary, National Council of Business Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., director, National Council of Technical Schools, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., director, National Federation of Private School Associations, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Noffsinger, J. S., director, National Home Study Council, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) [Blank.] (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation in the Congress is a very small part of my duties. If legislation should arise so as to affect the above association, I would act in the proper interest as I may be advised.

Northam,[4] Harry E., 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary, $2,500; traveling, hotel, and subsistence expenses, $400. Only approximately 10 percent is devoted to legislative activities in behalf of my association. (2) Railroads, taxicabs, hotels, etc. (3) Traveling, subsistence, and lodging. (4) Monthly news letter of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons issued to the membership of the association. (5) About 10 percent of my time is devoted to supporting or opposing legislation which deals with medical care.

Nortman, Walter, Wisconsin Railroad Association, 122 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) None. (2) None paid. (4) See above. None paid. (4) None. (5) All matters affecting the interests of railroads.

Nyce, Peter Q., 1266 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money received and none expended. (2) None paid. (3) None paid. (4) None. (5) Legislation pertaining to lands of the United States.

O'Connor,[7] Edward H., Insurance Economics Society of America, 176 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary received during quarter, $2,500,12; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $1,109.53. (2) Paid out $1,109.53 in traveling expenses to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, and miscellaneous items of personal expense. (3) For personal traveling expenses of the undersigned incurred in carrying out my work for the Insurance Economics Society of America. No moneys expended during this quarter for lobbying activities. (4) None. (5) The Howell bill, H. R. 3150, and its companion bill, S. 670, by Hawkes; S. 1320 and its companion, H. R. 3548; H. R. 6355; Senate Resolution 249.

O'Dunne, Eugene, Jr., Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) $2,500 compensation; $263.54 on account of expenditures previously reported for which reimbursement had not been made. (2) [Blank.] (3) Taxicab fares, telephone tolls, and telegrams, $100.27; the Public Printer (for copies of S. 2582), $163.27. (4) [Blank.] (5) H. R. 2860, amendment to section 1 (b), Eightieth Congress, second session; House Joint Resolution 131, Eightieth Congress, second session; H. R. 6556, 6379, and S. 2582.

O'Gara, Herrick J., Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 per month as salary, minus social security and withholding taxes; $2.54 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in connection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation, and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the National Council of Administration.

O'Hara, Bart W., Secretary-Treasurer, Colorado Association Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation that may be designed to bring about tax equality concerning corporations.

Oliver, Fred N., 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C.; Senior partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Estimated $262.50 from the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks and an indeterminate part of $1,200 from Railroad Security Owners' Association, Inc. (See appendix[1].) (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation but is to appear before congressional committees on legislation in which the mutual savings banks and railroad security owners have a legitimate interest.

Oliver, John P., Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 2517 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October 1948, $583,33 plus $7.50; November 1948, $583.33 plus $20.30; December 1948, $583.33 plus $15.60. (2) Various. (3) Living expenses for self and family, transportation, taxes of various kinds. (4) The Reserve Officer. (5) Legislation for the development of a military policy for the United States which will provide adequate national security.

Oliver,[7] Stanley W., International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftmen's Unions, 900 F Street NW., room 908, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: personal salary at the rate of $7,200 per annum, payable semimonthly, less social-security tax and withholding tax, plus allowance up to $75 per month for miscellaneous expenses, etc., incidental to performance of duties. Stanley W. Oliver. (3) Payment of salary and expenses as national president and administrative head of the International Federation of Technical Engineers, Architects, and Draftsmen's Unions. (4) IFTEADU Monthly Outlook and special news letters for dissemination of union information to members and local unions. (5) Legislation affecting technical engineers, architects, draftsmen, and allied workers.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; National Council on Business Mail, Inc.; 105 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received fees of $2,500 and approximately $400 for expenses on two trips to New York and one trip to Chicago. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to postal rates and regulations.

O'Neal, Sam, 211 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. Power Distributors Information Committee of Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, Chattanooga, Tenn. (1) Received fees of $1,875 from above organization. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation pertaining to private and public power.

Owens, T. R., 717 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; United Rubber Workers of America, URWA Building, High and Mill Streets, Akron, Ohio. (1) Salary, $1,000; expenses, $745. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, taxies. (3) Personal expenses and travel. (4) United Rubber Worker. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare; oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

Oxholm, Mrs. Theodor, volunteer worker for Spokesmen for Children, Inc., 654 Madison, Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Membership contributions, $10; office maintenance and stationery, $58; travel expenses, $22. (2) As indicated. Travel expenses to Mary H. Oxholm. (3) Trip to Washington, D. C.; October 26, 1948, for research on school lunches. (4) [Blank.] (5) Federal legislation specifically affecting children.

Parel, James Donald, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $8 expended. See (6) of Form B, filed December 1946. (2) Taxies. (3) Transporation. (4) None. (5) Congress not in session.

Parker,[7] James P., National Association of Private Schools, 1010 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See expenditure schedule[1] attached. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Veterans' education and training program outlined in Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Paterson, Chat, Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE. (1) Received $500 of which $36.86 spent. (2) Paid to me for train fare (round trip) and expenses to New York December 26 to 31, 1948. (3) Travel. (4) [Blank.] (5) National health insurance bill.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb,[5] 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: $5,000 for professional services; $90.09 for disbursements. (2) [Blank.] (3) $5,000 for professional services in framing and promoting an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, so as to authorize property formerly owned by deceased and heirless persecutees to be turned over to relief organizations; services in connection with introduction of S. 2764 and H. R. 6718; $90.09 for telephone charges and transportation expenses. (4) None. (5) As counsel for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to the organizations for the relief of survivors.

Patterson, Belknap & Webb,[6] 1 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; The American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No activity during the preceding quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.]

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

(5) As counsel for the purpose of obtaining an amendment to the Trading With the Enemy Act, whereby alien property in this country formerly owned by persons under persecution by an enemy government, in cases where the owner is dead and left no heirs, may be turned over to the organizations for the relief of survivors.

Patton,[7] James G., Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, old, 3501 East Forty-sixth Avenue, Denver, Colo.; new, 1555 Sherman, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Paul,[5 7] Randolph E. (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison); 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts: $1,000 to professional services rendered; expenditures, 50 cents. (2) Notary public. (3) Notarial fee in connection with Form C for preceding quarter. (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Paul, [6 7] Randolph E. (a partner in the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison); 1614 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Receipts, none; expenditures, 50 cents. (2) Notary public. (3) Notarial fee in connection with Form C for preceding quarter. (4) None relating to the subject below. (5) An amendment to eliminate section 131 (b) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code.

Payne, Albert Alford, 1737 K Street NW., Washington D. C.; National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received and expended $240.10. (2) Various. (3) For travel, lunches, taxi fares, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Perry,[7] Leslie S., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) NAACP bulletin. (5) FEPC, antipoll tax, antilynch, minimum wage, Wagner-Ellender-Taft housing, Murray-Dingell health, Wagner-Murray-Dingell social security, and similar social-welfare legislation.

Petersen, William J., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 704 Insurance Building, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my regular salary as general manager for the Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, for which I performed my regular duties as chief administrative officer of the chamber, which said duties were related only incidentally to Federal legislation. Aside from my regular salary nothing was received nor spent for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally, as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Peterson, Esther, 1034 Warner Building, Washington, D. C.; Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary of $376. Received $206.62 to reimburse actual expenses incurred; $41.50 of this amount was for expenses incurred in Washington; remainder of amount for expenses outside of Washington. (2) Hotels, railroads, restaurants, cab drivers, air lines. (3) Personal expense and travel. (4) CIO News and the Advance. (5) Support all legislation favorable to the national peace, security, democracy, prosperity, and general welfare. Oppose legislation detrimental to these objectives.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for the fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Petty, Don, National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $3,750 received for services as attorney for the National Association of Broadcasters for quarter ending December 31, 1948; $2,651.25 received from the association as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various railroads, air lines, taxi companies, communications companies, hotels, restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth in (1) above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as general counsel handling all of the legal affairs of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involved Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Pierson, A. T., the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., 54 Meadow Street, New Haven, Conn. (1) Salary, $1,815, and no expenses. And no part of salary chargeable to lobbying work. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting employer.

Place, Henry C., care of Townsend, Elliott & Munson, 1100 Provident Trust Building, Seventeenth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia. Pa. (1) The firm received from the National Association of Electric Companies $6,225 for legal services for the quarter and reimbursement of $1,147.85 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all legal services to the association, only a part of which fee and expenses was for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, railroads, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $393.17; subsistence expenses away from Philadelphia, $576.42; telephone and telegraph $67.09; miscellaneous, $111.17. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which our firm is counsel, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on all problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in any and all legislation that might affect its members directly or indirectly as going business concerns.

Plumley, Fletcher, 421 Tower Building, Fourteenth and K Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Federation of American Shipping, 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary received, $925; expenses, $141.30. (2) Taxis, luncheons, etc. (3) Out-of-pocket expense. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

Pogue, L. Welch, 805 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 fee received during quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Pollitzer,[7] Anita, national chairman, National Woman's Party, 144 B Street NE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from National Woman's Party, $79.71, for traveling and organizing expenses. (2) Reimbursement for expenses to above. (3) Traveling and organizing expenses. (4) Equal Rights. (5) the equal-rights amendment.

Pope, Ballard & Loos, 707 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.; California Fruit Growers Exchange and California Walnut Growers Association, both of Los Angeles, Calif.; Northwest Nut Growers of Dundee, Oreg.; and California Almond Growers Exchange, of Sacramento, Calif. (1) Receipts, $96.23 (reimbursement of cash disbursements reported as item 1 (a) of report of October 8, 1948). Disbursements, none. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 6556, Eightieth Congress.

Posner, Stanley I., Ring Building, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Linen Supply Association of America, fees, $1,500; expenses, $227.11. Institute of Industrial Launderers, fees, $1,500; expenses, $138.52. National Council of Technical Schools, expenses, $18.45. National Council of Business Schools, expenses, $27.68. (2) Miscellaneous commercial accounts. (3) Taxis, railroad, mimeographing, telephone, telegrams, and similar purposes. (4) Mimeographed bulletins of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers; also Linen Supply News. (5) Labor legislation on behalf of Linen Supply Association and Institute of Industrial Launderers; veterans' training programs on behalf of National Council of Technical Schools and National Council of Business Schools.

Poulton,[5] James E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Poulton,[6] James E., grand lodge representative, International Association of Machinists, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money expended or received for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Powell, E. Henry, partner, Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y., and 1106 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $4,100 is the entire amount received by registrant from Oliver & Donnally for all his legal services rendered during the quarter. A small proportion of this amount (not more than 5 percent) was for purposes mentioned in the Lobbying Act. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Any legislation which the mutual savings banks have a legitimate interest in supporting or opposing.

Powell, W. Royce, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md.; Committee of Americans, 122 East Forty-second Street, New York City, N. Y. (1) Magothy River Association, Annapolis, Md., $1,000; Committee of Americans, New York, N. Y., $400. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Baltimore Sun, Washington Post, Washington News, Washington Star. (5) S. 230, S. 1675, H. R. 6341, and H. R. 3314.

Pray, Kenneth L., 1026 Seventeenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C.; Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies, Empire State Building, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary, $5,000; expenses, allowance, $1,260. (2) University Club, National Press Club, Statler Hotel, taxicabs, Pennsylvania Railroad, etc. (3) Dues, meals, transportation, etc. (4) None. (5) My services insofar as legislative matters are concerned consist primarily of factually reporting the status and content of proposals affecting Schenley Distilleries, Inc., and affiliated companies.

Prentice, Howard A., 1329 E Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Corn Industries Research Foundation, 3 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received $2.06 as miscellaneous expenses. (See below.) (2) Notary public, $2; postage, $0.06. (3) Notarizing quarterly report, postage. (4) None. (5) No specific legislation.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

Pritchard, E., Anthony, National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C., and 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and traveling expenses in connection with his usual duties as assistant to the manager of the Washington office of the National Lead Co. and no part of it whatsoever was expended during this quarter in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co. including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Proctor, Harry E., 1110 Investment Building, Washington 5, D. C.; Oliver & Donnally, 110 East Forty-second Street, New York, N. Y. (1) $3,000 paid the registrant as salary by Oliver & Donnally. No expenditures. (2) No expenditures. (3) None. (4) The registrant contributed articles for the October, November, and December issues of Mutual Savings Banking, a trade publication of the National Association of Mutual Savings Banks. (5) The registrant studied and analyzed a number of bills pertaining to banks, savings and loan associations, taxes, railroads, veterans, and housing.

Producers Council, Inc., The, 815 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached exhibits A through H.[1] The Producers' Council, Inc., is an organization established in 1928. The purposes as stated by the charter of incorporation are attached hereto as exhibit K.[1] In view of the uncertain interpretation of certain provisions of the regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 concerning what constitutes "principal purpose" and the phrase "to influence directly or indirectly the passage or defeat of any legislation," etc., we are filing this form giving a full disclosure of the information required under the act. (2) See attached exhibits A through H.[1] (3) As indicated by items on attached exhibits.[1] (4) Technical bulletin, Producers' Council News, press releases and certain informative, economic, and technical studies. (5) None.

Purves, Edmund R., director of public and professional relations, The American Institute of Architects, 1741 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None, except salary for this period, which amounted to $3,125. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation in relation to the architectural profession.

Putt, C. J., The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans. (1) None preceding calendar quarter. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None preceding calendar quarter.

Pyle, Schuyler Shelby, Fleet Reserve Association, 429 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Quigley,[2] Frank, 725 Thirteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) $1,382.56. (2) Detroit & Cleveland Navigation Co., $1,662, Detroit to Buffalo; Hotel Statler, Detroit, Mich., $18.50; Hotel Madison, New York City, $14.60; Beaux Art Hotel, New York, $20.49; Whiteface Inn, Lake Placid, N. Y., $20; Parker House Hotel, Boston, Mass., $24.23; Hotel Roosevelt, New Orleans, La., $21.10; Hotel Atlanta Biltmore, Atlanta, Ga., $37.05; all other items individually amounting to less than $10 cover meals, lodging, garages, and incidental traveling expenses. (3) Conferring with field representatives of American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Companys, the Bell Telephone Co. of Pennsylvania, the New York Telephone Co., the Michigan Bell Telephone Co., the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Southern New England Telephone Co., the Intermountain Telephone Co., the Peninsular Telephone Co., the Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co., in connection with general matters of information and public relations. (4) None. (5) None.

Radner & Zito (the firm members and associates are William Radner, Frank J. Zito, J. Franklin Fort, Odell Kominers, Mary L. Schleifer, and William F. Ragan), 523 Tower Building, Washington, D. C.; Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast, 16 California Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) $2,500, representing compensation at the rate of $250 per month from March 1, 1948, to December 31, 1948. (2) Radner & Zito. (3) Compenration for work done by firm members or associates. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting maritime industry, particularly in relation to wage-and-hour law.

Raesly, Leon, Thornton & Taylor, 1218 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $13,121.09 and assigned under agreement to Leon Raesly Organization, Inc. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Ragland, Edward F., Associated Tobacco Manufacturers, 109–110 Willard Hotel, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None, but am interested in any legislation affecting tobacco industry.

Railroad Pension Conference,[4] postoffice box 798, New Haven, Conn. (1) $526. This is for $1 membership fees into the Railroad Pension Conference. Expended $144.84. (2) Railroad Pension Conference. (3) Membership fees. (4) Railroad Pension Conference Bulletin. (5) In support of railroad retirement legislation beneficial to railroad workers.

Ramsey, Donald J., Silver Users Association, 1612 (formerly 1730) I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, before withholding taxes, $3,000; reimbursement for expenses, $2,233.73; expended, $2,492.77. (2) Various. (3) Railroad and airplane tickets, $366.84; hotels, $157.91; meals, $187.85; taxies and tips, $82.45; telephone, $341.65; office expenses including supplies, furniture, expenses of employees, and taxes, $1,318; meetings, $38.07; total, $2,492.77. (4) Silver News Letter. (5) Legislation affecting the silver-using industry.

Ramspeck, Robert, Air Transport Association of America, 1107 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received regular salary as previously reported. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the proper advancement of the air-line industry in the pubic interest. Supported the proposed repeal of the transportation tax.

Rankin, J. Lee, Beghtol & Rankin, partnership (Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc.), 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation designed to bring about equality of taxation between private business and cooperatives.

Ratcliffe, William O., Baltimore Lumber Co., 1600 New York Avenue NE., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Ray, L. S., 2015 Lanier Drive, Silver Spring, Md., Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars, 1604 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $300 salary as legislative adviser. (2) Myself. (3) Salary. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting disabled emergency officers.

Reck, Jacob, 1023 National P ess Building, Washington, D. C.; National Beauty and Barber Manufacturers Association, 270 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) None. Registrant receives annual retainer as counsel of above association, no determinable amount is allocable to lobbying activities. Normally, lobbying activities take infinitesimal part of registrant's activities on behalf of association. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Repeal of Federal retailers' excise tax on toilet preparation.

Reckord,[4] Milton A., 1600 Rhole Island Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received, and none expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Nothing published. (5) Our effort was to add funds to the Army appropriation bill for aid to civilian rifle clubs, and to conduct the national rifle and pistol matches.

Reinhold, James P., 525 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.; 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received salary for calendar quarter, namely, $1,133.33 per month during October, November, and December for services as representative of president of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. No money was received or expended by me during this calendar quarter for purposes covered in the act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the interest of the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co.

Rhodes, Hubert M., 3308 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1342 East Washington Avenue, Madison, Wis. (1) Registrant is a regular employee of the Credit Union National Association, Inc., and receives no additional compensation for service on legislative work. The amount received and expended by him was $0.50. (2) Notary public, $0.50. (3) Notarizing reports required to be filed under the Lobbying Act for the quarter ended September 30, 1948. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting credit unions.

Richards,[2] D. D., 1233 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.; Mail Order Association of America, 1061 West Thirty-fifth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None specifically.

Riepma, Siert F., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1028 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1. (2) Notary public. (3) Notarizing registration Form B under Lobby Act. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Riggle, John J., National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $2,000 (less than 10 percent of this amount could be chargeable to activities designed directly to influencing legislation). (2) No one. (3) None. (4) Foreign Trade Memo, a mimeographed résumé of foreign-trade regulations and activities of the Federal Government. Distributed to members of National Council of Farmer Cooperatives only. (5) Agricultural legislation.

Rising, E. W., Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont.; National Water Conservation Conference, 1215 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) (a) Western Beet Growers Association, Great Falls, Mont., $558.96. (b) National Water Conservation Conference, $396.08. (2) (a) E. W. Rising, expended for railroad fare, $168.06; postage, $25.37; bulletin, $30.; stenographer, $26.80; office rent, $15; miscellaneous office expense, $23.73; personal service, $270 being for information service to members and attendance at beet growers meetings. (b) E. W. Rising, expended for stenographer, $313.84; postage, $32.06; miscellaneous office expense, $50.18 in connection with information service furnished members. (4) None during fourth quarter 1948. (5) (a) Legislation of interest to sugar-beet growers. (b) Legislation in connection with development and conservation of land and water resources and in preservation of States'

[1] Not printed. Filed in Clerk's office.
[2] Filed with the Clerk only.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

rights and control of natural resources, tidelands legislation, regional and valley authority legislation.

Robb, George Mackay, 121 Warner Avenue, Syracuse, N. Y.; Reformed Presbyterian Church, 2517 South Salina Street, Syracuse, N. Y.; denominational headquarters are at 209 Ninth Street, Pittsburgh, Pa. (1) No money received during preceding calendar quarter, as I was not engaged in any type of lobbying during this period. (2) No money paid during preceding calendar quarter, as I was not engaged in any type of lobbying during this period. (3) No money paid during preceding calendar quarter, as I was not engaged in any type of lobbying during this period. (4) None. (5) House Joint Resolution 239 and Senate Joint Resolution 150, bills introduced into the Eightieth Congress providing for a recognition of the authority and law of Jesus Christ in the Constitution of the United States.

Robbins, Paul H., National Society of Professional Engineers, 1359 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary, $500, and expenses, $50, for October, November, December 1948, for attention to legislative matters. (2) Regular office and travel expenses. (3) As executive director, National Society of Professional Engineers. (4) American Engineer, Legislative Bulletin, National Society of Professional Engineers. (5) All legislation affecting the welfare of professional engineers.

Rogers, Watson, National Food Brokers Association, 527 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Rowe, Roland H., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No money was received or expended by the undersigned for the purpose of influencing Federal legislation except $63 (21 hours estimated at $3 per hour) as part of annual salary of $5,780 received by the undersigned as vice president and secretary of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., allocable to the preparation of the following documents in which Federal legislation was advocated, opposed, or mentioned: News letters; news releases; preparation of the presentation of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association to the Capehart committee on delivered prices including questionnaire and tabulation of results; preparation of the presentation of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association on monopolistic and other unfair methods of competition to the House Small Business Committee; preparation of statement to wholesale grocers on legislation in the Eighty-first Congress. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) Washington news letter of United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc. (5) Any and all legislation that affects the welfare of wholesale grocers.

Rudy, John Forney, National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $35 received as salary from National Federation of American Shipping during fourth quarter 1948, allocable to legislative activities. (2) To undersigned. (3) As salary. (4) None. (5) As director of public relations of the National Federation of American Shipping am not employed to support or oppose any particular legislation.

Rule, Gordon W., Committee for World Travel, Inc., Union Trust Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $937.50 fee received during quarter, plus disbursements as follows: $39.10 for mimeographing statement on S. 2886, for a total of $976.60. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) See memorandum attached to Form B on file in your office.

Rule, Gordon W., Union Trust Building, Room 427, Washington, D. C.; Gillette Safety Razor Co., Boston, Mass. (1) Received $3,210 fee and $192.48 out-of-pocket disbursements for all work done for the company. Of these amounts approximately $1,400 fee and $87.50 disbursements for train fare, taxicabs, long-distance telephones, etc., are applicable to this registration. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank]. (4) None. (5) Retained in connection with a proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code relating to the foreign tax credit.

Rumely, Edward A., Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York City. (1) I receive my salary, commission, and expenses, as reported on earlier Form B. The corporation has reported its disbursements separately on Form A. (2) Disbursements were corporation disbursements and are reported separately on Form A. (3) [Blank.] (4) We never pay to have news articles printed, but issue news releases, some of which are reprinted, and of these I have no record. (5) I am not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing legislation. Sometimes, the committee trustees take a stand for or against an issue (on legislation) where they think a constitutional principle is involved. Then I distribute educational material on the question.

Rush, Charles J., Washington Real Estate Board, 1417 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $666.66 per month as executive secretary. (2) None paid out. (3) None. (4) [Blank.] (5) Measures affecting the ownership and operation of real estate.

Russell, Francis M., National Broadcasting Co., Inc., 724 Fourteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $175 (expended for matters relating to legislation). (2) See (3) below. (3) Telephone and telegraph, taxi fares, entertainment. (4) None. (5) As a part of registrant's duties as vice president in charge of Washington office of National Broadcasting Co., Inc., including operation of the company's radio stations in Washington, registrant may engage in activities relating to legislation affecting radio communication companies.

Russell, Horace, 7 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.; United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received retainer at rate of $11,000 per annum for one-half time, a nominal fraction of which is for legislative work; also received and expended $107.89. (2) Hotels, taxi fares, etc. (2) See (2). (4) Contents of the legal bulletin of the United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago, Ill. (5) Legislation affecting the savings and loan business.

Ryan, M. O., 1405 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; American Hotel Association, 221 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Salary for quarter, $3,550.02. October 1 to December 31, 1948, inclusive, total personal expenses for taxies, lunches, and dinners, phones, etc., in Washington, D. C., were $456.89, of which an insignificant amount was for activities related in any way to lobbying. (2) Taxies, Washington restaurants, and hotels. (3) Transportation, lunches, and dinners. (4) Organizational bulletins for American Hotel Association. (5) Any legislation affecting hotel industry.

St. Clair, Labert, 2633 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Stran Steel Division, Great Lakes Steel Corp., Detroit, Mich.; National Automobile Dealers, Washington, D. C. (1) Received from Stran Steel Division, $1,500; from National Automobile Dealers, $1,250. (2) None. (3) See above. (4) None. (5) Anything of general interest to clients.

Sands, Charles E., 4211 Second Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, A. F. of L., 528 Walnut Street, Cincinnati, Ohio. (1) Quarterly pay at the rate of $7,200 per year. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Support labor and social legislation, oppose antilabor and antisocial legislation.

Sanders,[1] J. T., the National Grange, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) I received $1,500 as salary for the quarter as legislative counsel of the National Grange. In addition, I received $32.09 for expenses, as follows: Transportation, $16.30; meals and incidentals, $15.79. (2) Transportation agencies and restaurants. (3) Transportation, food, etc. (4) The National Grange Monthly. (5) Hawaiian statehood; Commodity Credit Corporation, H. R. 6214; selective service; Federal standard time, S. 2041 and S. 2246; meat-inspection bills, H. R. 5675, H. R. 6259, and S. 2256; cattle-grub eradication; agricultural appropriations bill; soil conservation, H. R. 6054; international wheat agreement; mortgage insurance, H. R. 6114; Interior appropriations; Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; ECA appropriations; Federal aid to schools.

Saylor, Richard D., National Lead Co., 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D. C., and 111 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) All money received by this registrant was for salary and expenses in connection with his usual duties as manager of the Washington office of the National Lead Co., and no part of it whatsoever was expended in an attempt to influence legislation. (2) Office lessor, telephone company, stationers, etc. (3) Rent, telephone service, supplies needed in carrying out duties as manager of the Washington office. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the operation of the National Lead Co., including the manufacture and sale of its products.

Schaeffer, Alexander L., Ancram, N. Y. (1) Total of $15.36 was spent and all contributed by self. (2) To general merchants and sales vendors, and post office. (3) For postage, newspapers, periodicals, and stationery. (4) None. (5) The right to strike and the right to work; abolition of the closed shop; making it unlawful for any individual, organization, or group to levy a royalty tax on any commodity or service.

Schell, S. D., National Federation of American Shipping, Inc., 1809 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Approximately $300 of regular salary for the quarter is allocable to services performed on matters relating to legislation. Activities consisted mainly of answering questions of various officials in the Government and others interested in general legislation pending in Congress, with no particular activity on any pending legislation. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) No appearances before Congress or committees; no conferences with Members or employees of Congress during the period on any legislation.

Schoen,[1] Paul W., Forest Farmers Association Cooperative, Post Office Box 692, Valdosta, Ga. (1) None. (2) None. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Schoene, Freehill & Kramer, a law partnership composed of Lester P. Schoene, Joseph H. Freehill, and Milton Kramer; 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Railway Labor Executives' Association, 10 Independence Avenue SW., Washington, D. C. (1) None received or expended. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) All written materials are delivered to the client and dissemination is entirely in the client's control. (5) Railroad retirement, unemployment insurance, and employers' liability matters.

Schoenhals, E. L., Tax Equality League of Utah, 915 Kearns Building, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) Received from Tax Equality League of Utah for use of my law office, stenographic services, traveling, telegrams, air express, secretarial services, phone, etc., $456.40. (2) To my secretary, Jean Powers, for office rent, United Airlines, Western Union, Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph, etc. (3) To maintain my office, received phone calls from members and carry

[1] Filed with the Clerk only.

on correspondence with members of the organization, to travel. (4) Deseret News, Salt Lake Tribune, and Salt Lake Telegram have carried news items only but no paid advertising. (5) To obtain tax equality.

Scott, Jack Garrett, National Association of Motor Operators, 839 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No receipts except annual retainer for general legal services as shown in registration statement. No expenditures for legislative purposes. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Generally all legislation affecting the intercity motor bus industry.

Scott, John W., 1025 Vermon Avenue NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None other than salary received at the total monthly rate of $400 from Harvey B. Jacobson, John N. Randolph, and Patrick D. Beavers. No expenditures made. (2) Does not apply. (3) Does not apply. (4) None. (5) As previously stated in my registration statement. (NOTE.—The firms of McMorrow, Berman & Davidson, and Victor J. Evans & Co. are attempting to cancel contracts of employment with me, and they are not currently paying me any sum of money.)

Scott, Vernon, and Loring A. Schuler, constituting the partnership of Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, organizers and counselors, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. National Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1025 Vermont Avenue, Washington, D. C.; Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., 335 Symes Building, Denver, Colo.; Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 549 Warren Street, Huntington, Ind.; Kansas Independent Businessmen's Association, 205 Orpheum Building, Wichita, Kans.; Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, Columbia Building, 401 West Main Street, Louisville, Ky.; Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich.; Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., 714 Stuart Building, Lincoln, Nebr.; New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y.; North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, Post Office Box 1954, Fargo, N. Dak.; Ohio Associated Businessmen, Inc., 198 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Oklahoma Associated Businessmen, Inc., 135 Northwest Second Street, Oklahoma City, Okla.; Federal Tax Equality League of Texas, 4032 Hanover Street, Dallas, Tex.; Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., 231 West Wisconsin Avenue, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 305–306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss.; Pennsylvania Associated Businessmen, Inc., 112 Market Street, Harrisburg, Pa. (1) The firm of Scott and Schuler received $9,999.97 from NAB as retainer fee in 1948. No money was received or expended for purposes within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. See above. (2) No one. See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have various types of business corporations taxed on the same basis.

Scott, William C. (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books); 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received during said period. Expenditures, taxi fares, $1.75. (2) Various taxicab companies. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Sears, W. James, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) During this quarter I engaged in no legislative activity nor did I make any expenditures for this purpose. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

See, Harry,[5] Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street, SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank]. (3) None. (4) None. None.

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.

See, Harry,[6] Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, 130 Third Street, SE., Washington, D. C. (1) No money received or expended in connection with legislation. (2) [Blank]. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Selvage & Lee (in Washington, Selvage, Lee & Bledsoe); 1 East Forty-third Street, New York, N. Y., 1730 I Street, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Fee $4,500 plus expenses as shown below. (2) Printing, mimeographing, postage, telephone, press clippings, traveling expense, supplementary staff, etc., $3,835.77. (3) Publicity and lobbying activity in connection with repeal of the discriminatory legislation affecting margarine. (4) We did all within our power to disseminate information favorable to margarine and to legislation which would remove unfair restrictions on margarine, but cannot say categorically that we caused any articles to be published or any radio comment. (5) As above.

Shaw, Mark R., 114 Trenton Street, Melrose, Mass.; New England secretary, National Council for Prevention of War, 1013 Eighteenth Street, NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, including $600 for previous quarter, $1,200; traveling expenses, $90.17; total, $1,290.17. (2) Gas stations, restaurants, railroads, hotels. (3) Travel to speaking dates, conferences, meetings. (4) Bulletins of the NCPW; Boston Herald; Christian Science Monitor; Zion's Herald. (5) Oppose universal military training; favor repeal of peacetime selective service; favor admission of more displaced persons; other measures related to issue of peace and war.

Shields, Robert H., United States Beet Sugar Association, 1001 Tower Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Interested in legislation affecting sugar but not employed for the purpose of supporting or opposing any legislation.

Shufelt,[4] Bernard E., 66 Gross Avenue, Richmond, Va. (1) This report is my final report under the Lobbying Act. The period covered is July 1 to 10, 1948, inclusive. During this period I engaged in no lobbying activity; received no money; spent no money. My lobbying activity was terminated July 10, 1948. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Smart, Miss Elizabeth A., 100 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.; National WCTU, 1730 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Ill. (1) Received $221.69 salary; received and paid out $54.25. (2) Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co.; post office; Woolworth's; Washington Times-Herald; E. Morrison Paper Co.; National Congress Bulletin; Connecticut Liquor; Control Commission; Congressional Record; refill on memo pad 65 cents. (3) Telephone, postage, office supplies, subscription, copy Connecticut Liquor Control Act, copy Congressional Record, refill. (4) The Union Signal. (5) Legislation dealing with alcoholic beverages, motion pictures, radio, children, women in industry, peace and international relations, narcotics, gambling, social hygiene, interracial relations.

Smith, Allen L., Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc., Post Office Box 1526, Baton Rouge, La. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) To support any legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to improve basic taxation principles providing for removal of tax disparities between business competitors.

Smith, Anthony W., Congress of Industrial Organizations, 718 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Portion of salary allocable to legislative employment, $75. This is computed as stated in registration statement at $300 a year. No expenditures. (2) None.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.

[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

(3) Compensation as above received for legislative work. (4) CIO News. (5) Forestry legislation; river valley developments; resource conservation.

Smith, Donald W. (report as attorney for American Nurses' Association), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American Nurses' Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Receipts, $1,812.02 for legal fees and disbursements, paid to Satterlee, Warfield & Stephens for services by firm as counsel in all capacities. Expenditures: No expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None during the period covered by this report. (5) Legislation relating to nurses, nursing, or health, on which the American Nurses' Association has taken a stand, including the extension of social-security coverage and Federal aid to nursing education.

Smith, Dudley, Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $1,250 monthly from the Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for the principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for the purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Smith, Harold O., Jr., United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., 837 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) During the past quarter I did not have occasion to engage in any activities which I believe would be construed as lobbying. Serving full time as executive vice president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, Inc., my activities are those of a trade-association executive and any contacts with Members of Congress are purely incidental to my many other activities in connection with trade-association work. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) In our association's bulletins and weekly news letters to members, we occasionally report on legislative matters affecting the trade. (5) No legislation in particular; any legislation in general affecting the interests of wholesale grocers. On behalf of our members, I appeared as a witness at a public hearing before the House Small Business Committee and the Capehart committee to express the views of the trade on the need for clarification occasioned by court rulings on delivered prices.

Smith, Howard J., Central Arizona Project Association, 510 Goodrich Building, Phoenix, Ariz. (1) October salary, including September, $1,500, plus travel expenses, $867.10; November salary, $750; December salary, $750. (2) Howard J. Smith, executive secretary. (3) Salary, travel expenses, room and board, when engaged in travel in interest of work of the association. (4) The Case for Water in Central Arizona; Work for Water; California's Stake in Arizona's Share of Colorado River; What the Central Arizona Project Means to You. (5) Employed to support Senate bill 1175.

Smith, Hilda W., National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, 1508 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Occasional articles sent out through Labor Press Associates. (5) Bill for a Labor Extension Service in the Department of Labor.

Smith, Lloyd W., Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received regular salary for the period October 1 to December 31, 1948, for services as special representative of the Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co. in the same amount as for the quarter ending September 30 and reported previously. No money was received or expended by me during this last quarter in connection with any lobbying activities. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting interests of Chicago, Burlington & Quincy R. R. Co. Other duties for said

company comprise the major part of this work.

Smith, Purcell L., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $16,250 as president of the National Association of Electric Companies and reimbursements of $1,195.76 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all official duties, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in the act. (2) Various hotels, restaurants, clubs, railroads, air lines, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies. (3) Railroad and transportation, $103.83; telephone and telegraph, $14.34; restaurants and other meals, $464.71; hotels, $190.79; subscriptions, $360; gratuities and miscellaneous, $62.09. (4) I am advised that a correct answer to this question is "none." However, in the interest of a full and complete disclosure, I am calling attention to the attached pamphlet which was recently published by the association for general distribution. (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am president, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Smith, Robert E., Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y. (1) December 22, 1948: Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., on account travel expense, $1,007.50. October 28, 1948: Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, 116 Nassau Street, New York, N. Y., loan, $1,000. Expended for travel expense, $1,167.95. (2) Various. (3) Meals and miscellaneous. (4) None. (5) To support legislation which directly or indirectly is believed to be beneficial to holders of life insurance and their beneficiaries; and to oppose such legislation as is believed to be unfavorable to same.

Smith, Russell, 300 B Street SE., Washington, D. C.; Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1555 Sherman, Denver, Colo. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All major pending legislation.

Smith, Sylvester C., Jr., the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, 763 Broad Street, Newark, N. J. (1) None. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Snyder, Calvin K., Realtors' Washington Committee of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received and expended $1,509.74. (2) Various. (3) Traveling expenses, etc. (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Snyder, James D., Hotel La Salle, Chicago, Ill.; Illinois Legislative Committee, La Salle Street Station, Chicago, Ill. (1) none. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4)None. (5) Any legislation affecting the interests of the Illinois railroads.

Spence, Hotchkiss, Parker & Duryee, 40 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Spencer, Lyndon, Lake Carriers' Association, 905 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Stack, Thomas George, National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 1104 West One hundred and fourth Place, Chicago, Ill. (1) Was not in Washington, and did no lobbying during the quarter. (2) Thomas George Stack. (3) To get before Congress legislation to improve pensions for railroad employees. (4) Rail Pension News, publication by the National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., for rail workers. One edition September, October, and November 1948. Cost including mailing $950 and another edition December and January cost $1,200. (5) To support any bills in Congress to improve pensions for rail workers.

Starling, Howard M., 837 Washington Building, Washington, D. C., Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 60 John Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Registrant does not receive funds earmarked for purposes set forth in this act. Registrant has estimated, however, that $150 received by registrant during the fourth quarter of 1948 might come within scope of act as registrant understands act has been interpreted by the Department of Justice. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Registrant doubts that he is employed to support or oppose legislation. However, on very infrequent occasions, he has supported or opposed legislation as it specifically affects capital stock, casualty and surety insurance companies.

Stebbins,[4] Frank L., room 1025, 231 South La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me for lobbying purposes. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Any legislation designed to tax like business organizations on a like basis.

Steele, Raymond E., National Fisheries Institute, Inc., Suite 228, Victor Building, 724 Ninth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) N. F. I. Flashes, published weekly (50 issues), mailed to Institute membership. (5) None.

Stein, Margaret I., 602 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D. C.; Committee for the Nation's Health, Inc., 1790 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Received salary, $923.10; travel expense received, $37.82; total, $960.92. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) National health insurance.

Stengle,[7] Charles I., American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $9.60. (2) Taxi drivers. (3) Rides to and from Capitol. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting Government employees.

Stewart, Charles T., 1737 K Street NW, Washington, D. C., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Salary (50 percent of time devoted to legislative activities), $3,000; reimbursement by employer for travel expenses, incidental expenses, and per diem, $696.35; total, $3,696.35. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publications is not available. (5) Any legislation affecting the real estate industry.

Stoll, Edwin L., 1737 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., National Association of Real Estate Boards, 22 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Expenses incurred, $224.86, for which reimbursement was received. (2) See attached itemized statement.[1] (3) See attached itemized statement.[1] (4) Attached list[1] shows names of papers, periodicals, magazines, and other publications to which news releases and articles have been mailed. Complete information as to the extent to which material has been published by these publication is not available. (5) Legislation affecting the real-estate industry.

Stoudenmire, Sterling F., Jr., 1740 G Street NW., Washington, D. C., Waterman Steamship Corp., Waterman Building, 61 St. Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala. (1) No money received during the preceding calendar quarter as compensation or otherwise for the purpose of attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation or carrying on any work in connection therewith. No expenses incurred in preceding calendar quarter in connection with any activity in connection with attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation. (2) Nothing paid to any person during preceding calendar quarter as expenses or otherwise in connection with attempting to influence passage or defeat of any legislation or carrying on any work in connection therewith. (3) Nothing. (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any legislation of any nature during the preceding calendar quarter.

Strachan, Paul A., American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, Inc., 1376 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Neither I nor any officer of this federation has paid any sum to anyone, as affecting legislation. The only change in my personal status as president of this federation is that the A. F. P. H. council authorized an increase in salary, or a total salary of $10,000 per year to continue and increase supervisory activities over A. F. P. H., only a part of which is legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Sponsoring legislation upon behalf of our 28,000,000 physically handicapped citizens. Supporting bills for a Federal Commission on Services for the Physically handicapped; National Cerebral Palsy Institute; National Leprosy Act; National Epilepsy Act, and census (survey) of handicapped.

Strackbein, O. R., America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, 601 Carpenters' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts, October–December 1948, $4,030; expenses, October–December 1948, $4,817.02 (consisting of $4,200 salary and $617.02 in expenses). (2) No payments were made to individuals. Funds were expended for the purposes listed below. (3) Traveling, rent, telephone, taxicab fares, clerical work, duplicating services, a few lunches, and office supplies. (4) Editorials in the Photo-Engraver, a monthly publication of the International Photo-Engravers Union. Also a treatise (mimeographed) entitled "War Debts and the Tariff—a Foreign Trade Fallacy." (5) Tariff legislation and related matters such as ratification of the charter of the International Trade Organization; also other legislation affecting the welfare of the member unions of the conference.

Strong,[5] Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, July 1 to September 30, 1948, $825; reimbursement for expenses, $294.84; total, $1,119.84. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions; (4) None. (5) Registrant is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Strong,[6] Arthur D., Upper Mississippi Waterway Association, 1034 Midland Bank Building, Minneapolis, Minn. (1) Salary, October 1 to December 31, 1948, $825; reimbursement for expenses, $533.56; total, $1,358.56. (2) Arthur D. Strong. (3) Salary and reimbursement for traveling, hotels, entertaining, attending meetings, hearings, and conventions. (4) None. (5) Registrant

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.

is employed to support legislation relating to the improvement and development of navigable waterways in the upper Mississippi River, together with legislation relating to flood control, conservation, pollution, recreation, fish and wildlife, including all legislation that has to do with the development of water resources of the upper Mississippi River and its tributaries as this legislation relates to all types of public benefits. He is employed to oppose legislation detrimental to the above.

Sturgis, Arthur, Jr., American Retail Federation, 1627 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $200; expenses, $17.70. (2) Taxi drivers and restaurants. (3) Transportation and meals. (4) American Retail Federation informational bulletins to the retailing industry. (5) Legislation affecting retail industry, including tax revision, labor-law revision, social-security law revision.

Sturrock, J. E., Texas Water Conservation Association, 207 West Fifteenth Street, Austin, Tex. (1) Salary for October, November, and December 1948, $1,800, less income tax. Traveling expenses for October, November, and December 1948, $384.97. (2) $384.97 traveling expenses paid to various railroad, air line and taxi companies, hotels, and restaurants. (3) Covering transportation, meals, lodging, and entertainment. (4) Texas Water Conservation Association bulletins and pamphlets and various analyses of bills pending in Congress. (5) Employed to support all legislation, both State and National, concerning the development, conservation, protection, and utilization of Texas' land and water resources through existing State and Federal agencies; oppose all legislation creating Federal valley authorities and all legislation seeking to superimpose Federal control over State control in the distribution of the State's water resources.

Sullivan,[5] Francis M., in care of National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers, Suite 408, Central Building, 805 G Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Legal fee, $250. (2) Francis M. Sullivan. (3) Represent the interests of the association before various Federal governmental departments. (4) None. (5) All legislative duties performed by an associate.

Sullivan,[6] Francis M., Disabled American Veterans, 1701 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (including semi-annual bonus): October, November, December, 1948 (after taxes and social security), $3,480; expenses to Miami, Fla., and return, $256.17; incidental expenses for August, September, October, 1948, $32.50; total, $3,768.67. (2) Francis M. Sullivan. (3) See (1) above. (4) DAV semimonthly. (5) Legislation affecting service-connected disabled veterans, their families, and the survivors of deceased servicemen and women.

Sutlive, Carey R., National Association of Manufacturers, 623 Investment Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts: Salary, $2,125; expenses reimbursed by employer, $556.55. Expenditures: $556.55. (2) Expenses paid to various railroads, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, etc. (3) For expenses incurred in course of business, such as travel, meals, and hotel accommodations and expenses of conducting conferences for discussion of business matters. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting industry, such as legislation relating to national labor policy, taxation, public expenditures, industrial controls, social security, research, patents, and investments.

Swanson, Walter S. J., National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 938 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary, no part of which is paid him for, nor can be allocated to, the presentation of the views of the constituent members of the National Highway Users Conference or of the conference itself. During the quarterly period just ended, he has expended no money and has made no payments to anyone in connection with any activities coming under the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Prepared articles for Highway Highlights and certain bulletins released by the National Highway Users Conference. (5) Within the general responsibility of my office I have carried out the work outlined above. During the past quarter this has been solely confined to reportorial coverage of congressional activities dealing with Federal highway aid and highway taxation, the only legislation in which I am interested. I have conducted no activity during the quarterly period coming within the purview of the Lobbying Act.

Swomley,[4] John M., Jr., 1013 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Travel expenses between Washington and New York plus out-of-pocket expenses in Washington, $55.93. (2) John M. Swomley, Jr., for personal expenses indicated above. (3) Indicated above. (4) Conscription News, bi-weekly. (5) I serve as director of the National Council Against Conscription on a volunteer basis to promote the achieving of the international abolition of conscription, world-wide disarmament, and the defeat of conscription.

Taylor,[7] Hugh W., 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Inc., 620 South Broadway, Lexington, Ky. (1) Amount received from Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, for salary, less social security and tax, $2,250; for expenses incurred, $151.16. (2) Various. (3) Miscellaneous expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation which affects tobacco production and foreign trade in leaf tobacco.

Taylor, John Thomas, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.; the American Legion (national organization), 777 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) $500 salary semimonthly, less withholding and social-security taxes; $543.59 reimbursement for traveling expenses, October, November, December, 1948; $10.05 incidental expenses, October, November, December, 1948. (2) John Thomas Taylor. (3) $543.59 reimbursement for traveling expenses: Round trips to Louisville, Ky.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Columbia, S. C.; Miami, Fla.; $10.05 incidental expenses: taxies and luncheons. (4) The American Legion Magazine; the National Legionnaire; National Legislative Bulletin. (5) The American Legion and all veterans of World War I and World War II and their dependents on all matters affecting their care, their rehabilitation, hospitalization, reeducation, and housing; all matters affecting the general welfare of our country with regard to national defense; Americanism, included in which are opposition to all subversive activities and particular attention to our immigration and naturalization laws; child welfare, not only for children of veterans but for all children; aid and assistance to veterans in agricultural development; matters dealing with our foreign policy and foreign relations; the development of sound civil aviation programs and policies; the development of sound and progressive programs for the employment and reemployment of veterans in civilian pursuits and in civil service; legislation which would eliminate all improper discriminations and be of benefit to the men and women who are still in our armed services; and all other matters included in the mandates and program of the American Legion as adopted and approved by the national convention of the American Legion and/or by its national executive committee, which are the ruling and policy-making bodies of the American Legion.

Taylor, Margaret K., National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation, 1731 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) October 1–24, 1948, taxi, $3. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation that may affect milk producers or the cooperatives through which they act together to process and market their milk.

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; National Association of Retail Grocers, 360 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Received $2,500 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by National Association of Retail Grocers. Expenditures as follows: Adjusted regular office expense, $784.16; traveling expenses, $73.15. (2) Landlord, secretary, postage, telephone, etc.; Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1). (4) National Grocers Bulletin. (5) Repeal of margarine license taxes and other legislation of interest to independent retail food distributors.

Taylor, Tyre, suite 1112, Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D. C.; Southern States Industrial Council, Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn. (1) Received $4,237.50 as one-fourth of adjusted annual retainer by Southern States Industrial Council. Expenditures as follows: Adjusted regular office expense, $484.16; research and technical assistance, $1,581.27; travel expense, $73.15. (2) Landlord, postage, telephone, etc.; Henry Bison, Jr.; Washington taxicab operators. (3) See (1). (4) Semimonthly News Bulletin of Southern States Industrial Council. (5) The general legislative program of the council with particular emphasis on legislation favorable to the maintenance of a free-enterprise system.

Teel, Donald, Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., 1516 Olds Tower Building, Lansing, Mich. (1) No money received or expended for lobbying. (2) No one. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) Legislation designed to have all business corporations taxed in the same manner and on the same basis.

Temple, Marjorie L., American Association of University Women, 1634 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received only salary, approximately one-half of which is for legislative work; no money paid out. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) Journal of the American Association of University Women; General director's letter, three or four times yearly as program guide to branch officers. (5) Not yet determined for this quarter.

Terrell, John U., Colorado River Association, 306 West Third Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) Salary, business expenses, including travel, hotels, phones, fares, meals, mail, and other ordinary expenses, total $2,625. (2) Salary for self, travel, hotels, phones, meals, mail, and other ordinary business expenses. (3) Newspaper publicity, etc. (same as (2)). (4) Wire services and California and other western newspapers. (5) House Joint Resolution 3; Senate Joint Resolution 4.

Thompson, Chester C., The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1319 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary from The American Waterways Operators, Inc., $5,000, covering October, November, December, 1948. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting domestic water carrier and operator industry of the United States.

Tinney, William H., Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 211 Southern Building, Fifteenth and H Streets NW., Washington, D. C. (1) No activity under the act during the quarter ending December 31, 1948, consequently no part of the salary received during that quarter can be attributed to purposes covered by the act, and, likewise, no expenses were incurred for the purposes covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5)

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Legislation affecting the interests of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.

Tobin, Fred A., 821 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers Union of America, 222 East Michigan Street, Indianapolis, Ind. (1) My salary is $1,250 per month or $3,750 for a quarter year. I do not incur any expenses in performance of legislative work. (2) Fred A. Tobin. (3) I am an attorney representing the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers Union and its affiliated locals before the Interstate Commerce Commission and the National Labor Relations Board, and the liaison representative between various Government agencies and international union and the affiliated locals. The above includes general services of a nonlegislative nature pertaining to business and operation of International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals; also for part-time services in connection with legislation, both Federal and State, for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals. (4) [Blank.] (5) Legislation, Federal and State, which may affect the interests of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters and its affiliated locals, particularly in the field of labor law.

Tobler, H. Willis, 261 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, D. C.; American Farm Bureau Federation, 109 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill. (1) Approximately $4.50 expended. (See (6) of Form B, filed December 1946.) (2) Taxies. (3) Transportation. (4) None. (5) Congress not in session.

Todd,[7] John H., 1037 Woodward Building, Washington, D. C.; National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, 586 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) None for purposes covered by the act. (2) None for purposes covered by the act. (3) None for purposes covered by the act. (4) None relating to the purposes covered by the act. (5) No specific legislation.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., 1802 Massachusetts Avenue, Lexington, Mass. (1) See attached schedule.[1] (2) See attached schedule.[1] (3) See attached schedule.[1] (4) Program for progress (vol. 2, nos. 3 and 4); news release. (5) No specific legislation.

Truitt, Paul T., National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, 1023 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $66.46. (2) Various persons. (3) Miscellaneous expenses such as taxi fares, carfare, luncheons, etc. (4) None. (5) Any margarine legislation.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., partner of law firm of Breed, Abbott & Morgan, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Louis Dreyfus, president of Chappell & Co., Inc., R-K-O Building, New York City, and of Chappell & Co., Ltd., 50 New Bond Street, London, England. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) H. R. 5704 (80th Cong., 2d sess.), a bill to facilitate naturalization of Jeanne Bouchet Dreyfus.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C.; John Frederick Firth-Hand, 1744 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) S. 1742 (80th Cong., 1st sess.), a bill for the relief of John Frederick Firth-Hand.

Tumulty, Joseph P., Jr., 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Insurance Co. of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia; the Insurance Co. of the State of Pennsylvania, 308 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation for the just payment of French spoliation claims.

Turner, Harold J., Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co. et al., 325 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) None on Federal legislation. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Not employed to support or oppose any particular proposed Federal legislation. (See statement A to my registration, Form B.)

Van Arnum, John R., National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, 512 F. Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Vance, C. W., 10 Independence Ave., S. W., Washington, D. C.; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa. (1) None; no services performed in fourth quarter. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Van Nostrand,[5] George C., American Airlines, Inc., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As assistant vice president of American Airlines, on a permanent basis, I received a monthly salary of $1,000, or $3,000 for the quarter for all of my activities. None of my time was spent on activities involving legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting air transportation.

Van Nostrand,[6] George C., American Airlines, Inc., 1437 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As assistant vice president of American Airlines, on a permanent basis, I received a monthly salary of $1,000, or $3,000 for the quarter for all of my activities. None of my time was spent on activities involving legislation. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting air transportation.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York.

Vernon, Weston, Jr., Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, 15 Broad Street, New York, N. Y. (1) None. (2) See answer to (1). (3) See answer to (1). (4) None. (5) See answer to (1). Proposed Federal tax legislation affecting the interests of the New York Stock Exchange and its members.

Versen, Albert F., Missouri Valley Chapter Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None.

Versen, Albert F., St. Louis, Local Meat Packers Association, 508 Security Building, St. Louis, Mo. (1) See statement attached.[1] (2) See statement attached.[1] (3) See statement attached.[1] (4) None. (5) None at present.

Viles,[7] A. L., the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) No time devoted to legislative work. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Bills pertaining to long-term legislation on national rubber policy, on the transportation of flammable materials, and on proposed revisions of the excise taxes.

Vitrified China Association, Inc.,[7] 312 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) No activities covered by the act. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Walker, Jimmie, Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., 305-306 Millsaps Building, Jackson, Miss. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Tax equality among all business.

Waller,[5] Theodore, United World Federalists of Washington, D. C., 1710 I Street NW., Washington, D. C.; United World Federalists, Inc., 7 East Twelfth Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for salary, $250; received from United World Federalists, Inc., for travel expenses, $415.57; received from William Cochran as a gift for the purpose of carrying out the work and program of United World Federalists, $500; grand total, $1,165.57. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Waller,[6] Theodore, United World Federalists, Inc., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D. C. (1) Received from United World Federalists, Inc., for salary, $1,187.50; received from United World Federalists, Inc., for travel expenses, $927.83; received from United World Federalists, Inc., as an advance, $500; received from William Cochran as a gift for the purpose of carrying out the work and program of United World Federalists, $500; total of all money received, $3,115.33. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) World Government News. (5) Any legislation designed to strengthen the United Nations.

Walter, Stephen M., National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 Eighteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received salary of $6,625.02 as an employee of the National Association of Electric Companies, and reimbursements of $1,636.22 of routine expenses incurred in the performance of all duties and assignments, only a part of which salary and expenses were for those purposes described in section 308 (a) or otherwise within the scope of Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress. (2) Various railroad and airplane companies, hotels, restaurants, taxicabs, telephone and telegraph companies, book stores, and stationers. (3) Transportation, $427.40; hotels, $515.57; meals and incidental expenses on account of association members in Washington and elsewhere, $514.15; telephone and telegraph, $44.15; publications, $32.80; miscellaneous, $102.15. (4) [Blank.] (5) One of the purposes and activities of the National Association of Electric Companies, of which I am an employee, is to provide its members with a medium through which they can exchange ideas and take appropriate action on problems of mutual concern and interest, including legislative matters. The association therefore is interested in legislation that might affect its members as going business concerns.

Walters,[5] Thomas G., Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., room 1008, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As operations director, receives a monthly salary ($580) minus withholding tax and social-security tax—expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers; international union publications; weekly council bulletin for the dissemination of organizational news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

Walters,[6] Thomas G., Government Employees Council, A. F. of L., room 1008, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) As operations director; receives a monthly salary ($580) minus withholding tax and social security tax—expended for personal living expenses. (2) Thomas G. Walters. (3) Salary received and expended for personal services as operations director of council; lobbying is minor and incidental. (4) Washington newspapers; international union publications; weekly council bulletin for the dissemination of organizational news, including legislation. (5) Favorable to Federal Government employees and opposition to adverse legislation.

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

Warfel, George L., National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, 112 C Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary (gross—withholding and social security taxes deducted), $1,500; expense vouchers: cab fares, phone calls, luncheon guests, notary fees, hotels, meals and transportation on organization trips for the National Association of Special Delivery Messengers, $382.94; total, $1,882.94. (2) George L. Warfel. (3) To improve the special delivery service and promote the welfare of the special delivery messengers in the United States postal service, including liaison contacts with administrative officials as well as legislative contacts. (4) The Special Messenger; Special News (mimeographed bulletins to membership). (5) Supporting all legislation beneficial to the special delivery service and special delivery messengers.

Warfield, Ethelbert, (report as attorney for American General Corp.), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; American General Corp., 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N. J. (1) No receipts or expenditures during said period. (2) No expenditures. (3) No expenditures. (4) None. (5) To oppose S. 829 and H. R. 3351.

Warfield, Ethelbert (report as attorney for National Postal Committee for Books), 49 Wall Street, New York, N. Y.; National Postal Committee for Books, 62 West Forty-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) No receipts during said quarter. Expenditures: American Airlines, $5.14 (share); Pennsylvania Railroad, $6.17 (share); other travel expenses, $51.99; telephone calls, $12.95; postage, $1.05; taxi fares, $2.25; carfare, $0.20. (2) Travel expenses ($51.99) paid to American Airlines, Pennsylvania Railroad, Hotel Carlton, and various restaurants; telephone charges paid to various telephone companies; postage to United States post office; various taxicab and transportation companies. (See also (1).) (3) For the purposes above indicated. (4) None. (5) Legislation relating to postage rates on books.

Warner, Milo J., 1631 Nicholas Building, Toledo, Ohio; Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J. (1) Received from the Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J., for professional services; conferences with various Members of Congress in regard to legislation for the period July 1 to September 30, 1948, inclusive, $2,250. Expenses for transportation and traveling to and from Washington, hotel, meals, telephone, telegraph, entertainment, and expenses in Washington, $182.52. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) Services were rendered in connection with housing, credit, labor, railroad reorganization, and general-welfare legislation, and protective of the interests of the policyholders of the Prudential Insurance Co. of America.

Washington Taxpayers Association, 1830 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Moneys received, contributions from members of the association (none over $500), $2,255. Moneys expended: Management fee of Rufus S. Lusk, $1,300. Reimbursement, Rufus S. Lusk, for clerical services, $1,112.50; rent, $87.50; telephone, $75; postage, $114.43; stationery and printing, $310.19; office expenses and supplies, $271.63; miscellaneous expenses, $160.04; total, $3,431.29. Registrant devotes only part of his time and efforts to association affairs. Of his time and efforts so devoted not more than 10 percent are applied to legislative activities, therefore the sum of $130 is allocated to those purposes. (2) Rufus S. Lusk in the form of management fee, or in reimbursement of amounts expended by him for the association. (See (1).) (3) See (1). (4) The following are names of papers, magazines, periodicals, etc., to which news releases have been sent (registrant has no information as to the utilization of this material); Washington Evening Star, Washington Times-Herald, Washington Post, Washington Daily News. (5) Any legislation concerning District of Columbia taxation, appropriations, and the efficient and economical operation of the District government.

Watson, J. R., Mississippi Railroad Association, Room 1, Illinois Central Railroad Passenger Station, Jackson, Miss. (1) No reportable receipts and expenditures. No segregation of salary as between principal employment and possible incidental concern with matters of Federal legislation. The registrant is of the opinion that his activities for the period covered by this report do not fall within the scope of the Lobbying Act. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Annual employment, primarily for services not related to Federal legislation. Matters of Federal legislation are other and different from and only incidental to principal employment and purpose, but as an incident thereto, legislation pertaining to railroads in Mississippi. None within the period covered by this report.

Weathersby, Newton Patrick, district No. 44, International Association of Machinists, room 303, Machinists' Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,000; no expenditures, Congress not in session. (2) No expenditures, Congress not in session. (3) Lobbying when Congress is in session, that is, supporting or opposing, as the case may be, legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, incidentally, organized labor in general. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation affecting working conditions of Government employees and, occasionally, organized labor in general.

Webb, William H., 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Big Sandy Valley Association, Inc., 1010 Second National Bank Building, Ashland, Ky. (1) Received $100 on December 23, 1948, being retainer for 2 months from January 1, 1949, at the rate of $50 per month. Nothing expended. (2) William H. Webb. Nothing paid to anyone by him. (3) Retainer fee for 2 months from January 1, 1949. (4) None in connection with this employment. (5) Legislation authorizing the Big Sandy River improvement, Tug and Levisa Forks, Ky. and W. Va., as recommended by the Army engineers.

Webb. William H., National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1720 M Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) See attached schedule.[1] (2) Various individuals, corporations, and organizations, as indicated on attached schedule.[1] (3) As indicated in attached schedule, and for miscellaneous office, personal, and traveling expenses. (4) Waterways, Waterways Journal, and the Workboat. (5) All laws and regulations needed to promote the maintenance and improvement of waterways, the development and protection of water transportation, etc.

Weingarten, J. W., 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.; Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. (1) No money received or expended by me during the quarter ending December 31, 1948, on account of lobbying activities. I received my regular monthly compensation described in last report for the duties of my office, but neither received nor expended any money in connection with any lobbying activity. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting railroad business.

Weitzer, Bernard; 3147 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America, 50 West Seventy-seventh Street, New York, N. Y. (1) Money expended: Railroad fares, $23.16; plane, $29.33; hotel bills (including room and meals), $37.94; taxi fares, $47.35; miscellaneous office expenses, $1.85; postage, $6.22; telephone calls from booths, $5.95; salaries, $1,666.65, received by Bernard Weitzer. (2) Railroads, Pennsylvania plane, American Air Lines, hotels, New Yorker, Park Central in New York, various restaurants, various taxi drivers, various telephone booths, office expenses. (3) As indicated by the nature of expenses in (1). (4) The Jewish Veteran. (5) He is to support such legislation as will carry out the purposes of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America as expressed in the preamble to its constitution which follows and to oppose any legislation which would tend to frustrate the purposes therein expressed: "To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate true Americanism, to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institutions, to uphold the fair name of the Jew and fight his battles wherever unjustly assailed, to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men, to combat the powers of bigotry and darkness wherever originating and whatever their target; to preserve the spirit of comradeship by mutual helpfulness to comrades and their families; to cooperate with and support existing educational institutions and establish educational institutions and foster the education of ex-servicemen and our members in the ideals and principles of Americanism; to instill love of country and flag and to promote sound minds and bodies in our members and our youth; to preserve the memories and records of patriotic service performed by the men of our faith; to honor their memory and shield from neglect the graves of our heroic dead."

Welliver, Edward M., American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1424 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Registrant received only his regular salary as shown in his registration. He expended a total of $51.80. (2) The money was paid to various taxi drivers employed in taking registrant between his office and the Capitol or House or Senate Office Buildings, and to clerks and cashiers for lunches at restaurants. (3) The money paid taxi drivers was for transportation to and from my office as indicated in (2). (4) None. (5) Any legislation affecting the trucking industry.

Wenchel, Tannenbaum & Nunan, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No funds expended. (3) See (2). (4) None. (5) To support changes in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to family partnerships.

West, Oscar H., 1001-2 Washington Loan and Trust Building, Ninth and F Streets NW., Washington, D. C.; National Association of Insurance Agents, 80 Maiden Lane, New York, N. Y. (1) No money received or expended during preceding calendar quarter. Status of registrant the same as stated in original Form B and accompanying letter of explanation, filed March 6, 1947. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) [Blank.]

Wescott, James B., 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) During the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1948, the law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., of which firm registrant is a partner, received $7,500 from Salt Producers Association, Detroit, Mich. (2) See (1) above. Registrant made no expenditures. (3) Legal services rendered in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (Note.—Registrant performed no services, made no expenditures, and received no money during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1948.)

White, John C., care of Fulbright, Croker, Freeman & White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C., American Cotton Shippers Association, Cotton Exchange Building, Memphis, Tenn. (1) No expenses. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) Support S. 2202, European Recovery Act; S. 2376, Revolving Fund for Occupied Areas,

[1] Not printed. Filed in the Clerk's office.

Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension. Oppose minimum margin legislation on futures exchanges; tax exemption of cooperatives.

White, Richard P., American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 635–636 Southern Building, Washington, D. C. (1) Receipts of salary, $2,500; expenses reimbursed by employers, $199.60. (2) Expenses paid to various air lines, railroads, hotels, clubs, restaurants, taxis, associations, etc. (3) Attending meetings of association committees, local associations, and payment for miscellaneous publications. (4) [Blank.] (5) Any legislation affecting the nursery industry.

Whitehall, Albert V., 1634 K Street NW., Washington, D. C., American Hospital Association, 18 East Division Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) Quarterly salary, $2,187.48; reimbursement of travel expenses, $151.65. (2) Various air lines, railroads, hotels, and recipients of miscellaneous amounts for taxicabs, meals and similar necessary expenses. (3) Necessary traveling expenses as indicated. (4) Hospitals, the official journal of the American Hospital Association Trustee, the journal for members of hospital governing boards. (5) Legislation which might affect the quality of hospital service to the people of this country.

Whitlock, Douglas, partner, Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, Room 1032, Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C., Building Products Institute, Washington, D. C. (1) Total fee, $4,500; allocated $1,500 to legislative, and $3,000 to legal and administrative. Total expenses, $119.81; allocated $5.30 to legislative; and $114.51 to legal and administrative. (2) Notary, $3.50; telephone and telegraph, $7.76; travel, $100; postage, $1.80; restaurant, $6.75. (3) As indicated by items above. (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation which may affect the producers of building materials.

Whyte, Louis E., Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 1700 I Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) None. During this period there were no legislative matters of any character in which this association or its staff were interested. (2) No legislation pending; no expenditures. (3) [Blank.] (4) Natural Gas News Letter; not pertaining to legislation. (5) [Blank.]

Wickenden, Elizabeth, 522 Transportation Building, Washington, D. C., American Public Welfare Association, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago, Ill. (1) $800 (half-time salary). (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) A. P. W. A. Letter to members. (5) Social security amendments and other legislation affecting public welfare administration.

Wiley,[5] Mrs. Harvey W., District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) July, August, and September 1948. Voluntary worker; no money received during preceding calendar quarter. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) See anawer No. 1. (4) District of Columbia Federation magazine September and November 1948. (5) A volunteer worker for the District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs.

Wiley,[6] Mrs. Harvey W., District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, 2345 Ashmead Place, Washington, D. C. (1) October, November, and December 1948; voluntary worker. (2) See answer No. 1. (3) See answer No. 1. (4) [Blank.] (5) Chairman of legislation, District of Columbia Federation of Women's Clubs, not employed for pay.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Klamath Tribe of Indians of Oregon, Klamath Agency, Oreg. (1) Received $2,250, a portion of which is allocable to planning and drafting a legislative program. Expended $682.29 as follows: Travel, $486.60; telephone, $150.13; telegraph, $33.36; miscellaneous, $12.20. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No activity on pending legislation; some work was done on prospective legislation to be presented to the members of the Oregon congressional delegation for their consideration.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., Francis M. Goodwin, and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin, Keshena, Wis. (1) Received $650 for legal services, of which only a small portion is properly allocable to legislative work. Expended $130.69 for travel, $24.95 for telephone, $1.63 for telegraph, and $1 for notary fees. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No activity during quarter, except for preliminary preparation of possible legislative program.

Wilkinson, Ernest L., and Glen A. Wilkinson, 744 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C.; Radio Service Corp. of Utah, 10 South Main Street, Salt Lake City, Utah. (1) No money received. Expenses consisted of 50-cent notary fee on lobbying reports filed in October 1948. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) No activity during the quarter covered by this report.

Willard, A. D., Jr., National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $6,250 received for services as executive vice president of the National Association of Broadcasters for the quarter ending December 31, 1948; $2,343.34 received as reimbursement for business expenses for same period. (2) Various air lines, railroads, taxi companies, communication companies, hotels, and restaurants, etc. (3) The amounts set forth above were received and/or expended in carrying out my normal duties as executive vice president, acting as administrative officer at the headquarters of the National Association of Broadcasters, only a small part of which duties directly or indirectly involve Federal legislation. None of this money was received or expended for the specific purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any Federal legislation. (4) None. Miscellaneous information is furnished to members through weekly bulletin. (5) None. I am interested in any legislation, Federal or State, which may affect the radio-broadcasting industry.

Willenbucher, Franz Otto, Retired Officers Association, 1600 Twentieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Received $1,500. No part of this sum was received specifically for the purpose of attempting to influence legislative action. (2) Expended: nothing. (3) See (1) above. (4) Retired Officers Association Bulletin. (5) Legislation affecting retired officers, warrant officers, and nurses of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Williams, Myers & Quiggle (a law partnership, consisting of the following partners: Paul F. Myers, James Craig Peaccck, Martin W. Meyer, John E. Skilling, and Robert H. Myers), National Food Brokers Association, et al., 817 Munsey Building, Washington, D. C. (1) On October 4, 1948, we received from the Washington Food Brokers Association $21.55 as reimbursement to us for taxi fares and $900 as payment of balance of fee due us for legal services rendered in this matter. No expenditures. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) None. (5) S. 2409, which became Public Law 509 on May 3, 1948.

Williamson, C. J. S., 901 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.; California State Chamber of Commerce, 350 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif. (1) Annual salary received, $7,260; expense allowance, $1,800. Please note salary base for 1949 will be $8,000. (2) Owing to the fact that Congress was in adjournment during the last quarter of 1948, no portion of my salary or expense allowance was expended under the provisions of Public Law 601, second session, Seventy-ninth Congress, and for that reason no statement is filed. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.]

Williamson, John C., Veterans of Foreign Wars, 1026 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) $540 per month as salary minus social-security and withholding taxes; $7.60 as expenses for transportation and luncheons in conection with legislative activities. (2) No record kept of recipients of taxicab fares and luncheons. (3) Transportation, social obligations, and normal luncheon requirements. (4) VFW Foreign Service, VFW Legislative Newsletter. (5) Legislation affecting all veterans and their dependents in relation to employment, hospitalization, rehabilitation, pensions, disability compensation and housing; welfare of servicemen of the armed forces and their dependents; matters relating to the national security, immigration, and naturalization, the combating of subversive activities, and the furtherance of a sound foreign policy; other matters included in the resolutions adopted by the national encampment and the national council of administration.

Willingham,[5] Carl H., Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y.; National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, $4,250; expended, $486. (2) Railroads, planes, taxies, meals. (3) Travel. (4) None. (5) Excise taxes.

Willingham,[6 7] Carl H., Washington Loan & Trust Building, Washington, D. C.; Oneida, Ltd., Oneida, N. Y.; National Association of Chain Drug Stores, 4 Park Avenue, New York, N. Y. (1) Received, $5,000; expended, $346. (2) Railroad, planes, taxis, meals. (3) Travel. (4) None. (5) Excise taxes.

Wilson, E. Raymond, Friends Committee on National Legislation, 1000 Eleventh Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Gross salary (October, November, December), $1,500; travel expense, $201.33. (2) Carfare, room, meals, telephone and telegraph, and miscellaneous. See (1). (3) Travel is for the purpose of attending yearly meetings, quarterly meetings, conferences of Friends and other groups to interpret developments in national and international policy, with special reference to legislation, and for other committee business. (4) We send a newsletter to a limited number of subscribers and Friends about once a month. (5) In general, to support measures leading to peace and humanitarian ends, such as world organization and world economic stability, world disarmament, foreign relief, aid to refugees, protection for racial minorities, support for the rights of conscience, opposition to conscription, and the militarization of America.

Wilson, Eugene E., Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc., 610 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) None. (2) No one. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation to establish a national air policy.

Wilson, Everett B., Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, 732 Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $750 monthly from Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, but not for principal purpose of influencing legislation, which is a minor part of my activities. (2) None for purpose of influencing legislation. (3) None. (4) Newspapers in Puerto Rico only. (5) None.

Wilson, J. B., Wyoming Wool Growers Association, McKinley, Wyo. (1) No money received for legislative work. The Wyoming Wool Growers Association pays my salary, amounting to $1,500, for the fourth quarter of 1948 and paid me $877.12 for traveling expense. The National Wool Growers Association, during the fourth quarter paid me $113.90 for traveling expense. In addition to

[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[7] Filed with the Clerk only.

the amount paid me by the National Wool Growers Association for traveling expense, they furnished me an air-travel card, and during the fourth quarter I charged air transportation to the National Wool Growers Association amounting to approximately $159.10. None of the money received for traveling expense was expended on legislative work. I was in Washington on October 18, 19, and 20 as a member of the Wool Advisory Committee to the Research and Marketing Administration. I traveled to and from Washington on a Government transportation request and the Government paid me per diem and auto expense from McKinley, Wyo., to Cheyenne, Wyo., and return, which was not sufficient to cover my hotel bill in Washington. No legislative work was done while I was in Washington attending the advisory committee meeting. (2) None. (3) None. (4) J. B. Wilson is editor of the Wyoming Wool Grower, a semimonthly publication published by the Wyoming Wool Growers Association for its members. (5) J. B. Wilson is not employed to support or oppose any legislation, but as secretary of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association he supports all legislation concerning wool, lamb, mutton, public lands, taxes, etc.

Wingert, E. L., Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, 1 West Main Street, Madison, Wis. (1) Received my share of retainer fee paid my firm for general services as legal counsel for Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, involving mainly services unrelated to Federal legislation. Aside from that, received nothing for use in influencing Federal legislation and expended nothing for that purpose. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) Such legislation affecting business and industry generally as I may be instructed to give attention to from time to time.

Winston, James H., 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.; Salt Producers Association, Book Building, Detroit, Mich. (1) During the calendar quarter ending December 31, 1948, the law firm of Miller, Gorham, Wescott & Adams, of which firm registrant is a partner, received $7,500 from Salt Producers Association. (2) See (1). Registrant made no expenditures. (3) Legal services rendered in connection with H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. (4) None. (5) H. R. 2717 and H. R. 4211. Registrant performed no services, made no expenditures, and received no money during the calendar quarter ending September 30, 1948.

Winter, Everett T., 705 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr., Mississippi Valley Association, 511 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo. (1) None for legislative purposes. (2) None for legislative purposes. (3) [Blank.] (4) None. (5) None at the present time.

Woodrum, Clifton A., president, American Plant Food Council, Inc., 910 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) The registrant, Clifton A. Woodrum, nor his employer, the American Plant Food Council, Inc., neither received nor expended during last quarter any funds for the purpose of influencing directly or indirectly any legislation. (2) Please see letter filed with original registration. (3) None. (4) None. (5) None.

Woodson, George W., 424 North Washington Avenue, Lansing, Mich.; Townsend Plan, Inc., 675 Broadway, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) Received in the past quarter, $1,290.20, which was spent for postage, supplies, printing, lodging, meals, travel, office fixtures, telephone, telegraph, and clerical hire. (2) Mr. Fay A. Bradley. (3) Clerical work. (4) None. (5) The Townsend plan.

Woodul, Walter F., 818 Chronicle Building, Houston, Tex.; Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex.; Burlington-Rock Island Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Fort Worth & Denver City Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; Gulf, Colorado & Santa Fe Railway Co., Galveston, Tex.; Kansas City Southern Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Louisiana & Arkansas Railway Co., Kansas City, Mo.; International Great Northern Railroad, Houston, Tex.; Missouri-Kansas-Texas of Texas, Dallas, Tex.; New Orleans, Texas & Mexico Railway Co., Houston, Tex.; Panhandle & Santa Fe Railway Co., Amarillo, Tex.; Paris & Mount Pleasant Railroad Co., Paris, Tex.; Quanah, Acme and Pacific Railway Co., Quanah, Tex.; St. Louis, San Francisco & Texas Railway Co., Fort Worth, Tex.; St. Louis, Southwestern Railway Co. of Texas, St. Louis, Mo.; Southern Pacific Co., San Francisco, Calif.; Texas Electric Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas & New Orleans Railroad Co., Houston, Tex.; Texas Southeastern Railroad Co., Diboll, Tex.; Texas & Pacific Railway Co., Dallas, Tex.; Texas Mexican Railway Co., Laredo, Tex.; Union Terminal Co., Dallas, Tex.; Wichita Falls & Southern Railroad Co., Wichita Falls, Tex.; Wichita Valley Railway Co., Fort Worth Tex. (1) Compensation as previously reported, and reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses for months of September, October, and November 1948, $467.85. (2) Pullman Co., $28.39; Southern Printing Co., Houston, Tex., $40.40; Yorks, Houston, Tex., $176.40; various hotels, eating places, and others, amounts less than $10. (3) Transportation, $28.39; hotel, $3.50; printing, $40.40; meals, $19.85; entertaining, $190.80; tips, telephones, taxies, and incidentals, $15.83. (4) None. (5) All legislation affecting Texas railroads.

Woodward,[5] Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) The undersigned engaged in no activities for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress during the period July 1 to October 10, 1948, inclusive. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, undersigned observes, analyes, and reports on items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Woodward,[6] Albert Young, Signal Oil & Gas Co., 811 West Seventh Street, Los Angeles, Calif. (1) The undersigned engaged in no activities for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress during the period October 1, 1948, to January 1, 1949, inclusive. (2) [Blank.] (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) In addition to general activities unrelated to legislation, undersigned observes, analyzes, and reports on items of legislation introduced in Congress affecting oil and oil operations.

Wootton, Edward W., Wine Institute, 900 National Press Building, Washington, D. C. (1) $3,000 quarterly, salary as manager of the Washington office of the Wine Institute, principal offices at 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif. (2) Received by the undersigned for all personal services rendered as manager of this office, some of which services involve legislative activity. (3) See (1) and (2) above. No expenditures were made by undersigned to any other person for legislative purposes. (4) None. (5) No legislative activity this quarter.

Wozencraft, Frank W., 605 Southern Building, Washington, D. C.; Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Failing Building, Portland, Oreg. (1) $3,000, fees for services; $998.70, reimbursement for traveling, telephone, and telegraph (including that paid to firm of Case & Wozencraft). (2) Air lines, hotels, etc., in connection with travel involved, Western Union, and telephone company. (3) See (2) above. (4) None. (5) Bank holding company legislation.

Wright, Mrs. Leslie B., chairman of legislation, General Federation of Women's Clubs, 4620 Thirtieth Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) For October, November, and December 1948; for postage, material, and miscellaneous expense $15.40; for expense attending General Federation board meeting, October 1948, $23; total $38.40. (2) See (1). (3) See (1). (4) [Blank.] (5) Not employed for pay. A volunteer worker for the General Federation of Women's Clubs. The General Federation supports legislation which pertains to the welfare of the home and to the general welfare, after given authority through the adoption of resolution by the delegate body.

Yeaman,[5] Addison, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant has received no moneys and has expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912.

Yeaman,[4 11] Addison, 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant during the quarter ending June 30, 1948, received no moneys and expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912.

Yeaman,[6] Addison, Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 1600 West Hill Street, Louisville, Ky. (1) Registrant has received no moneys and has expended no moneys except his regular salary and traveling expenses, which were paid without regard to registrant's activities under the so-called Lobbying Act. (2) See (1) above. (3) See (1) above. (4) None. (5) H. R. 3912.

Yonkers, Andrew J., Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., Inc., 26 Broadway, New York, N. Y. (1) Money received: Salary (this represents one-quarter of the amount of registrant's annual remuneration which is attributable to the performance of duties which are subject to the Lobbying Act), $875; reimbursement for traveling expenses, $495.98; total, $1,370.98. Money expended (in connection with duties related to the Lobbying Act), $495.98. (2) Railroads, airlines, taxis, hotels, restaurants, telephones, and tips. (3) Normal traveling expenses. (4) None. (5) Legislation affecting the petroleum industry.

Young, Donald A., Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D. C. (1) Salary, $1,375; expended, $5.10; meals, $3.55; transportation, $1.55. (2) Restaurant and taxi companies. (3) [Blank.] (4) [Blank.] (5) All legislation of interest to business.

Young, Robert R., 4500 Chrysler Building, New York, N. Y.; Federation for Railway Progress, 1326 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) Railway Progress (vol. II, No. 5, July 1948; vol. II, No. 6, 1948; vol. II, No. 7, 1948; vol. II, No. 8, 1948; vol. II, No. 9, 1948; vol. II, No. 10, 1948). (5) None.

Zook, John D., 820 Huntington Bank Building, 17 South High Street, Columbus, Ohio; Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio. (1) None. (2) None. (3) None. (4) None. (5) Legislation dealing with social security, business, taxation, and other matters of interest to our organization.

[4] Filed with the Secretary only.
[5] Filed for third quarter, 1948.
[6] Filed for fourth quarter, 1948.
[11] Filed for second quarter, 1948.

# SENATE

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1949

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, facing decisions which make our wisdom or our folly affect the lives of untold millions, our need of the Divine leading is very deep. As we come to this quiet, noontide cloister of the eternal may we be strengthened for waiting tasks by the far look. Enable us to bear with fortitude the fret of care, the sting of criticism, the drudgery of unapplauded toil; to think clearly, to act kindly, to play manfully our part in the life of our times, to strike our blow for freedom and, keeping to the end of our brief day the unbroken vigil of the inner light, to leave the world better for our sojourn in it. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 14, 1949, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 2313. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper;

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the Office of War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949;

H. R. 2632. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Aiken | Ellender | Jenner |
| Anderson | Ferguson | Johnson, Colo. |
| Baldwin | Frear | Johnson, Tex. |
| Brewster | Fulbright | Kefauver |
| Bricker | George | Kerr |
| Broughton | Gillette | Kilgore |
| Butler | Green | Knowland |
| Byrd | Gurney | Langer |
| Cain | Hayden | Lodge |
| Capehart | Hendrickson | Long |
| Chapman | Hickenlooper | Lucas |
| Connally | Hill | McCarran |
| Cordon | Hoey | McClellan |
| Donnell | Holland | McFarland |
| Douglas | Humphrey | McGrath |
| Downey | Hunt | McKellar |
| Eastland | Ives | McMahon |
| Magnuson | O'Mahoney | Thomas, Okla. |
| Malone | Pepper | Thomas, Utah |
| Martin | Reed | Thye |
| Maybank | Robertson | Tobey |
| Miller | Saltonstall | Tydings |
| Millikin | Schoeppel | Vandenberg |
| Morse | Smith, Maine | Watkins |
| Mundt | Smith, N. J. | Wiley |
| Murray | Sparkman | Williams |
| Myers | Stennis | Withers |
| Neely | Taft | Young |
| O'Conor | Taylor | |

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I ask that the Committee on Finance be permitted to continue its hearings on the reciprocal trade-agreement program this afternoon while the Senate is in session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine asked and obtained leave for the Subcommittee on Home Rule of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is pending before the Armed Services Committee the nomination of Mr. Mon C. Wallgren for Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, and a hearing was held on that nomination this morning. The committee unanimously directed me to ask unanimous consent, in the event the Senate were in session at 3 o'clock this afternoon, that the committee may sit and continue the hearing at that time; and I so request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### NOTICE OF HEARINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary Senate Joint Resolution No. 2 proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the election of President and Vice President. As chairman of a subcommittee of that committee, I desire to announce that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, February 23, 1949, at 10 o'clock a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on the resolution referred to. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee by Monday, February 21, so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear.

### REPORT OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1949.*

(The report accompanied a similar message to the House of Representatives.)

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 14)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $11,500,000, and proposed contract authorization in the amount of $2,550,000, fiscal year 1949 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 13)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, amounting to $700,000, fiscal year 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY (S. DOC. NO. 12)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Works Agency, amounting to $5,400,000, fiscal year 1949 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL CHILDREN'S EMERGENCY FUND

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for further contributions to the International Children's Emergency Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

GOVERNMENT FOR AMERICAN SAMOA

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a resolution adopted by The Fono of American Samoa, relating to a change in the form of its government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO DESTRUCTION OF LETTER BOXES OR MAIL

A letter from the Postmaster General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED ECONOMIC STABILIZATION ACT OF 1949

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a copy of the proposed Economic Stabilization Act of 1949, together with a summary thereof (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VOLUNTARY PLANS FOR ALLOCATION OF STEEL PRODUCTS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of amendments, requests, and letters of compliance with the amendments and requests to voluntary plans for allocation of steel products (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON LEASES BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of leases, in two sections, (1) cumulative report as of June 1, 1948, and (2) additional leases as of December 1, 1948, under authority of Public Law 364, Eightieth Congress (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT OF ACT OF JUNE 18, 1929, RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONGRESS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of June 18, 1929, relating to apportionment of Representatives in Congress (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF GOVERNMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the official operations of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON HEARINGS ON PUBLIC LOW-RENT HOUSING, ETC.

A letter from the Acting President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, reporting, pursuant to law, on the hearings for public low-rent housing to determine whether administrative or interpretive difficulties or unsatisfactory progress in the provision of low-rent housing requires a modification thereof, and a survey on income of white and nonwhite families in the District of Columbia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, a study, prepared by the Commission's consideration on management, organization, and administration of the Post Office Department (appendix I) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report on the Post Office Department and, separately, the report of the investigation and recommendation of Robert Heller and Associates, Inc. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

*"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the ninty-fourth legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petion your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas Josef Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary was sentenced to life imprisonment by the Government of Hungary; and

"Whereas we memorialists feel that such sentence threatens freedom of religion and speech: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved,* That we, your memorialists, do hereby respectfully petition and urge the Members of Congress to take whatever action that can be taken to have the sentence imposed upon Josef Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary removed; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That a copy of this memorial duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state, by air mail, to the proper officers and committees of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, the President of the United States, and to each of the Representatives and Senators representing the State of Maine in the United States Congress."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"House Joint Memorial 3

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assist local lending agencies in financing disaster stricken livestock producers and feeders in the blizzard areas of the Western States

"Whereas unprecedented and widespread blizzards have recently wreaked disastrous losses on the livestock producers and feeders in the intermountain west to an extent and in an amount never before experienced; and

"Whereas the physical and financial losses suffered by such livestock operators in these storms of catastrophic proportions will seriously hamper, if not entirely preclude, the future operations on a practical basis of many livestock producers and feeders in this region, and will thus seriously affect the meat supply of this Nation for an indefinite period unless financial assistance is made available to them immediately; and

"Whereas the presently established banks and other livestock loaning agencies are fully staffed and prepared to service and pass upon the financial needs of these disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the senate concurring herein),* That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby urged to enact such legislation as it deems necessary to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make its facilities available to the local banks and other lending agencies by way of guaranteeing loans to livestock producers and feeders to the extent of 90 percent of any such loans and budget advances made to them, the local lending agencies in turn to carry 10 percent of such commitments, and otherwise to assist and facilitate the services of such agencies in meeting the local requirements occasioned by the widespread and disastrous losses in the blizzard areas of the Western States; be it further

*"Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Senate Joint Memorial No. 4

*"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Forty-fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in regular session assembled, respectfully represent as follows:

"Whereas Depoe Bay is located 100 miles south of the Columbia River on the Oregon coast; and

"Whereas there has been recommended the development of said Depoe Bay by the River and Harbor Act of 1945, in accordance with the United States Corps of Engineers' report contained in House Document No. 350, Seventy-seventh Congress; and

"Whereas the United States Corps of Engineers is prepared to start construction of this project immediately upon the appropriation of funds therefor; and

"Whereas the present conditions of said Depoe Bay result in lost time of commercial fishing boats, lost recreation facilities to vacationists and tourists, damage to boats in said bay at low tide and restricted use of said bay for rescue use by the United States Coast Guard motorboat stationed at Depoe Bay; and

"Whereas completion of this project will provide greater income to all commercial fishing boats, increased recreational facilities for tourist trade in the State of Oregon, elimination of damage to boats now using said Depoe Bay at low tide and the unrestricted use of this bay for rescue by the United States Coast Guard motorboat stationed at said bay; and

"Whereas the sum of $462,000 is necessary for the construction required on this project: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the house of representatives jointly concurring therein),* That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States be and the same hereby is memorialized to further consider and make an appropriation in the amount of $462,000 available to the United States Corps of Engineers for the completion of the authorized Depoe Bay improvement project: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial be forwarded to each House of the Congress and to each Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Oregon and to each of the United States Senators from this State, and urge that they individually and collecively give wholehearted support to bring about this appropriation.

"Adopted by senate February 3, 1949.

"Concurred in by house February 8, 1949."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"Enrolled Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to consider and pass legislation appropriating funds to complete construction of the Glendo Dam Project in Platte County, Wyo.

"Whereas the construction of the Glendo Dam project has been surveyed and all other preliminary work completed and suitable materials for the construction thereof are available adjacent to the project area; and

"Whereas the dam is to be constructed for the purposes of generating electricity, of which there is a shortage in the area, and also for the purpose of flood control; and

"Whereas the project when completed will have a capacity of 150,000 acre-feet of storage water for power-generating purposes; and will have a maximum capacity of 750,000 acre-feet for flood-control purposes; and

"Whereas construction of the project has been suspended for the reason that funds are unavailable: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of the Thirtieth Legislature of the State of Wyoming (the senate concurring)*, That the Congress of the United States of America be, and is hereby, memorialized to appropriate sufficient funds for the completion of the Glendo Dam project, and that copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives; to United States Senators Joseph C. O'Mahoney and Lester C. Hunt; Congressman Frank A. Barrett; J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior; and Michael W. Straus, Commissioner of Reclamation.

"Approved February 5, 1949.

"A. G. CRANE,
*"Governor."*

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution memorializing the Eighty-first Congress of the United States of America regarding means of attaining a stronger and more effective world government through the United Nations

"Whereas the youths of the State of Connecticut now under the legal voting age have not had an opportunity by means of a referendum to express their views regarding a stronger and more effective world government through the United Nations; and

"Whereas these youths wish to express their support of a strong United Nations to prevent future world conflicts of major scale by the following means, to wit:

"SECTION 1. That the Security Council of the United Nations be given executive powers to quell disturbances of international peace;

"SEC. 2. That an international police force be established with powers to enforce decisions of the Security Council of the United Nations;

"SEC. 3. That the Security Council of the United Nations be given the right to inspect armament and munitions plants and the right to control the production of weapons of war and destruction within any and all national boundaries; and

"SEC. 4. That no member nation of the United Nations be allowed to resign from or secede from the United Nations: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Senate of the State of Connecticut*, That the Eighty-first Congress of the United States of America be memorialized regarding these means of obtaining a stronger world government through the United Nations.

"*Resolved*, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of Connecticut to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, The President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Concurrent Resolution 5

"Concurrent resolution memorializing and requesting the Congress of the United States to enact a bill to aid the State in the enforcement of the cigarette tax now evaded by use of the United States mails

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma has seen fit to impose a tax on the sale and use of cigarettes within its boundaries, and the revenues so obtained constitute an important portion of the funds available for its functions of government; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Senate of the State of Oklahoma that a large and growing system of evasion of such tax law has developed; that the United States mails are flooded with advertisements and inducements to the citizens of this State to violate the law of this State; that in numerous instances such advertisers entice prospective customers with statements to the effect that the use of the United States mails is sufficient proof of the legitimacy of such business and such a system; that the mails of the United States are constantly flooded with cigarettes in the process of delivery within this State, and on which cigarettes the tax required by the laws of this State have not and will not be paid; that this State is seriously disadvantaged by such use of the Postal Offices and mails of the United States for the purpose of evading the laws of Oklahoma; and that Oklahoma faces and is now suffering serious losses of revenue as a result of such system of evasion; and

"Whereas it has been brought to the attention of the House of Representatives and the Senate of Oklahoma that there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a proposed bill which would aid the States by requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each shipment and the name and address of each person to whom shipped: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and the same is hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to enact a bill requiring shippers of cigarettes in interstate commerce to furnish to the taxing authority of the State to which shipped a copy of the invoice on each such shipment; or to enact such other bill to the aid of the several States affected as may be proper; be it further

"*Resolved*, That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded immediately to the Presiding Officers of the respective Houses of Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 10th day of January 1949.

"Adopted by the senate the 11th day of January 1949."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto

"Whereas each year the overflow of the many rivers, streams, creeks, and tributaries which empty into the Wabash River creates a flood condition imperiling life and causing property damage throughout the entire Wabash Valley, contributing at the same time to similar conditions which exist in the Southern States through which the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers flow; and

"Whereas the specific consequences of such flood conditions are: silting and sedimentation of stream channels, reservoirs, dams, ditches, and harbors; loss of soil and water; and increase in the speed and volume of rainfall run-off, causing severe and increasing floods, which bring suffering, disease, and death, impoverishment of families, damage to roads, highways, railways, buildings, and other property from floods; and losses in navigation, hydroelectric power, municipal water supply, and underground water reserve: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):*

"SECTION 1. The Eighty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Indiana does hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation for the control of floods and the prevention of soil erosion, to preserve natural resources, prevent impairment of dams and reservoirs, assist in maintaining the navigability of rivers, protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people, and to appropriate sufficient funds for the execution of such legislation.

"SEC. 2. The principal clerk of this house is directed to forward copies of this resolution to the Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Clerk of the National House of Representatives, and to each United States Senator and Congressman from Indiana."

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by Charles W. Holman, of Washington, D. C., relating to the removal of restrictions on yellow oleomargarine (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter in the nature of a petition from C. B. Wilson, president and general manager, Taylor-Wilson Chevrolet Co., Paducah, Ky., relating to the construction of a steam-operated power plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from A. L. Marcum, of Louisville, Ky., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a decrease in Federal expenditures; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide universal military training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to extend rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide rent control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from John M. Davis, of Arlington, Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to include as war service all military personnel who have served in foreign service campaigns; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to broaden the provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, relating to social security; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Jessamine County Bar Association, Nicholasville, Ky., favoring the enactment of House bill 1639, Eightieth Congress, relating to venue of trials under Employers' Liability Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petition of C. H. R. Hovde, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for a redress of grievances against J. Edgar Hoover, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Gerard Piel, chairman, board of editors, Scientific American, New York, N. Y., on behalf of himself and sundry other citizens of the United States, relating to the general charges against Dr. Edward U. Condon, Director of the United States Bureau of Standards (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., favoring the repeal of the Displaced Persons' Act of 1948; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Resolutions adopted by the City Council of the City of Phoenix, Ariz.; the City Council of the City of Niagara Falls, N. Y.; the City Council of the City of Omaha, Nebr.; the Common Council of the City of Hamtramck, Mich.; and the Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States relating to the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia (Pa.) County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Massachusetts Mayors' Association, New Bedford, Mass., and the city council of the city of Elizabeth, N. J., relating to the trial of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Edna Proctor Post, No. 192, Department of Kentucky, Louisville, Ky., signed by Elizabeth Ruf, commander, favoring an interchange of Ambassadors with Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Two telegrams, in the nature of petitions, signed by Cesar A. Toro, governor, Lions International, and Sergio Gelpi, president, Lions Club, both of San Juan, Puerto Rico, requesting that Puerto Rico be included in the bill providing Federal aid to education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Frank H. Boos, president, State Bar of Michigan, Lansing, Mich., relating to the Taft-Hartley labor law (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Memorials of sundry citizens of the United States remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing socialized medicine; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter, in the nature of a petition, from Juan Miranda and Antonio Sanchez, of Isabela, Puerto Rico, relating to the minimum-wage and social-security laws; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the United States favoring the enactment of legislation providing an increased hourly rate of compensation under the minimum-wage law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The petition of Lowell K. Bentley, of Fort Dodge, Iowa, relating to the retention by nonveteran postal employees of their seniority and employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MYERS:

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Erie, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation proclaiming October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"House Concurrent Resolution C

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the share of Federal participation and increase the annual appropriation under Public Law 725

"Whereas hospital construction costs have continued to rise to a point where it has become increasingly difficult for communities in North Dakota to finance hospital construction; and

"Whereas many of the communities in the areas of greatest need for hospital facilities find it impossible to meet the financial burden even with the present 33⅓ percent of Federal participation for approved projects under Public Law 725; and

"Whereas this condition tends to defeat one of the primary purposes of Public Law 725, which is to give special consideration to hospitals serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources; and

"Whereas the Federal Government in several grant-in-aid programs pays 50 percent and in some cases 100 percent of the cost; and

"Whereas the increased share of Federal participation is necessary if hospital construction is to go forward in the areas of greatest relative need in North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is memorialized and petitioned to amend Public Law 725 by increasing the Federal share of participation in the construction of approved hospital projects from 33⅓ percent to 50 percent and to increase the annual appropriation under said law to meet the added cost of the revised share of Federal participation, and that the provisions be made retroactive so that hospital projects approved on the Federal construction schedules prior to the enactment of these amendments may benefit from the increased share of Federal participation; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Federal Security Administrator, to the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, and to North Dakota's delegation in Congress."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith.

"Whereas the whole civilized world and all individuals who believe in God regardless of race, creed, or denomination, and that freedom of religion is necessary in this troubled world have been profoundly shocked by the arrest, imprisonment, and sentence of His Eminence Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and the arrest and imprisonment of Bishop Lajos Ordass, of the Lutheran faith, by the Communist government of Hungary; and

"Whereas it appears that there is no justification for such arrest, imprisonment, and sentence but that it is actuated solely by the desire to destroy religious freedom and freedom of worship; and

"Whereas Hungary, recently styled 'a people's republic,' a satellite of Soviet Russia, has shown its utter disregard for freedom of religion in making the arrest and causing the imprisonment of these two men of God: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts desires to register an emphatic protest to the Government of Hungary in causing the arrest and imprisonment of these two churchmen; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts urges the President of the United States and the Secretary of State and the Members of Congress from this Commonwealth to take appropriate action to convey to the Hungarian Government the demand of the people of this country that Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Ordass be immediately released; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"In senate, adopted, February 9, 1949.

"In house of representatives, adopted, in concurrence, February 9, 1949."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions of the General Court of the State of Massachusetts, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of Maryland; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Resolution protesting the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty

"Whereas the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty of Hungary constitutes an attack by atheistic communism upon the freedom of religion; and

"Whereas prominent members of various religious groups in this country have characterized this unjust trial as a gross crime against freedom and as a rape of justice, these persons, including Archbishop Keough of Baltimore, Cardinal Spellman, archbishop of New York, the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, president of the World Christian Endeavor Union, and the Reverend Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the Senate of the United States and pastor of Foundry Methodist Church in Washington, D. C.; and

"Whereas Cardinal Mindszenty was imprisoned in a Nazi concentration camp during World War II for his efforts in saving fifteen hundred Hungarian Jews from the clutches of the German Gestapo, thereby proving himself a defender of and a martyr for civil rights and humanity; and

"Whereas this trial is part of a world-wide conspiracy of atheistic communism to threaten not only the countries of eastern Europe but also the liberty, democracy, and very life of the United States; and

"Whereas representatives of the freedom-loving nations were barred from the courtroom during the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and

"Whereas Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR has asked the intervention of the State Department of the United States in this matter, seeking to ascertain whether the Soviet and Hungarian Governments have violated the

basic guaranties of the United Nations as to freedom of worship, fair and impartial trials, and freedom of speech: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That this body, representing a great State, in which toleration and freedom of religion not only are guaranteed by the Constitution but also are part of the very fabric of its citizens, solemnly protests the outrageous crime against religion and humanity now being perpetrated in the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That this resolution be spread upon the journal of the house and that the chief clerk be, and he is hereby, instructed to send copies thereof to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State of the United States, and to each member of the Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States.

"Read and adopted by the house of delegates, February 7, 1949."

A resolution of the House of Delegates of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress

"Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the present session of the United States Congress; and

"Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

"Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Kansas, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment, designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day; and

"Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated October 11, 1929, October 11, 1931, October 11, 1932, and October 11, 1946, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland,* That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day Resolution now pending in the United States Congress; and be it further

*"Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the house be and he is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the United States Senators and Representatives from Maryland.

"Read and adopted by the house of delegates February 1, 1949."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Delegates of Maryland, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

## PROTEST AGAINST FEDERALIZING NATIONAL GUARD—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I present a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of South Dakota urging Congress not to pass legislation which would federalize our State National Guard. I heartily concur in the resolution, and ask that it be appropriately referred and printed in the body of the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America not to enact legislation federalizing the National Guard of the several States of the Union

Whereas certain proposals and recommendations have been made that the National Guard of the several States be federalized; and

Whereas it is the considered judgment of the thirty-first session of the legislature of the State of South Dakota that to federalize the National Guard of the several States will not benefit the national defense program; that it will be detrimental to the effectiveness of such program in that it will destroy local initiative and relieve the States of their responsibility and duty to the Nation to maintain a military establishment available for national service in time of emergency: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved,* That the Senate of the thirty-first session of the South Dakota Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring therein, do urge and recommend that the Congress of the United States refrain from adopting legislation federalizing the National Guard of the several States; be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency, the President of the United States, to the honorable the Secretary of War of the United States, to the chairmen of the Committees on Military Affairs of both Houses of Congress, to the Honorable CHAN GURNEY and Hon. KARL MUNDT, United States Senators from South Dakota, and to the Honorable FRANCIS CASE and the Honorable HAROLD O. LOVRE, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota, and to the Presiding Officers of both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

## HOSPITAL BEDS FOR VETERANS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Council of Administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of the State of South Carolina, relating to hospital beds for veterans.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas plans for 16,000 proposed Veterans' Administration hospital beds have been ordered by the President of the United States to be canceled; and

Whereas the greatest need of veterans of this great country is for prompt, proper, and adequate hospitalization of those suffering from physical and mental disabilities; and

Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge that all presently available hospital facilities of the Veterans' Administration are being utilized to capacity and there is a clearly demonstrated need for expansion of existing facilities; and

Whereas the President's order has necessitated plans in the Veterans' Administration to cancel plans for 24 proposed hospitals and reduce the size of 14 other hospitals; and

Whereas such curtailment of bed facilities is calculated to increase the suffering of veterans throughout this Nation by causing the Veterans' Administration to be unable to hospitalize many who may be in real and immediate need of hospital facilities; and

Whereas failure to hospitalize veterans promptly will ultimately result in aggravation of injuries and suffering which in turn will result in increased claims against the Government; and

Whereas the policy of present curtailment appears to be a penny-wise-pound-foolish action aimed at present savings which may mean several times the amount saved in future costs; and

Whereas the protection of sick and disabled veterans and their dependents is a primary responsibility of all able-bodied veterans, their organizations, and the people of the United States, and is the main reason for the existence of veterans' organizations: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Council of Administration of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of the State of South Carolina:*

1. That this body do go on record as opposing, in principle, the said order of the President of the United States.

2. That the Members of Congress from South Carolina be forwarded copies of this resolution along with a list of all facilities affected by the Presidential order noted above with the request that they support legislation which may effectuate the completion of the Veterans' Administration hospitalization program as initially scheduled.

## PROTEST AGAINST ARREST AND IMPRISONMENT OF RELIGIOUS LEADERS OF HUNGARY AND BULGARIA

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by members of the P. N. Lynch Assembly, No. 704, Knights of Columbus, of South Carolina, in regular meeting assembled, protesting against the arrest and imprisonment of outstanding religious leaders in portions of Hungary and Bulgaria, and so forth.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we have learned from press and radio releases that certain countries allegedly democratically governed, but actually controlled and dominated by atheistic, communistic governments, have without cause, reason, or any sense of justice, arrested and imprisoned the outstanding religious leaders in portions of Hungary and Bulgaria and other Communist-dominated countries; and

Whereas the authorities conducting such arrests and trials have not permitted members of the free press of the United States and Great Britain to be present at any of the hearings or trial; and

Whereas the afore-mentioned religious leaders so falsely arrested, tried, and convicted because of their faith and belief in God and in true democratic government

must of necessity oppose the atheistic, communistic element now in control of the governments of Hungary and Bulgaria: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That we, the members of P. N. Lynch Assembly, No. 704, Knights of Columbus, in regular meeting assembled, do deplore the mock trial, treatment, and hardships inflicted on our brother Christians and Jews in the afore-mentioned countries; and further

*Resolved*, That we commend our President, our Secretary of State, and all civil and religious leaders who have unhesitatingly condemned the mockery of justice now prevailing in this section of eastern Europe; and finally

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be inscribed on the minute books of this assembly and that copies of the resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Honorable Burnet R. Maybank, to the Honorable L. Mendel Rivers, to the Honorable J. Strom Thurmond, and to the editors of the Charleston Evening Post and the News and Courier.

## TRIAL OF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY—TELEGRAM FROM REV. LOUIS R. WILLIAMSON AND REV. ALLAN R. JEFFORDS

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Rev. Louis R. Williamson and Rev. Allan R. Jeffords, of St. Mary's Church, Hartsville, S. C., condemning the inhuman trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. I may add that I have already publicly condemned the treatment accorded Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARTSVILLE, S. C., *February 16, 1949.*

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
*United States Senator from South Carolina, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:*

Respectfully request you make strong public statement for record condemning inhuman trial of Cardinal Mindszenty and urge State Department to take effective diplomatic, economic, and United Nations steps toward bringing Hungarian atheist Reds to senses.

Rev. LOUIS R. WILLIAMSON,
Rev. ALLAN R. JEFFORDS,
*St. Mary's Church.*

## MISSOURI VALLEY AUTHORITY—RESOLUTION OF GERING AND FORT LARAMIE IRRIGATION DISTRICT OF GERING, NEBR.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district of Gering, Nebr., protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 555, to provide for a Missouri Valley Authority.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Whereas in the Seventy-ninth Congress there was introduced a bill to provide for a Missouri Valley Authority, known as S. 555; and

Whereas in opposition to this bill we adopted a resolution on July 3, 1945, quoted as follows: "*Resolved*, That we are definitely opposed to a Missouri Valley Authority that would include in its scope the North Platte River and thereby radically alter our irrigation operations in any way, or that would subject our irrigation interests to wide governmental interference and restrictions under the guise of all-out social plans or programs"; and

Whereas our district authorized its president, Kent Lane, of Lyman, Nebr., to appear before the congressional committee of the Seventy-ninth Congress in opposition to the bill on behalf of our district and others representative of stability and welfare of the people of the North Platte Valley as a result of sentiment expressed at a mass meeting held in Scottsbluff, Nebr., on September 6, 1945; and

Whereas it is now reported that a new Missouri Valley Authority bill is being prepared for introduction into the Eighty-first Congress: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the board of directors of the Gering and Fort Laramie irrigation district of Gering, Nebr.*, That we have not changed our position in this connection and that we reiterate our opposition to any bill of this nature which would place administration in the hands of strangers, deprive local interests of representation, and invade State's rights; and be it further

*Resolved*, That we favor the continued development of the Missouri Valley Basin under the Pick-Sloan plan, which is now going forward constructively in charge of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, two well-established governmental agencies of long standing and high reputation.

## BAN ON USE OF YELLOW COLORING IN OLEOMARGARINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two of the many resolutions which I have received from dairy organizations in my State, urging the banning of yellow color of oleomargarine in order to prevent fraud in competition with butter.

One of these resolutions is from the Farmers Union in Barron County, in my State, a county in which I myself have owned and operated a farm since 1916.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas we, the members of the Barron County Farmers Educational Union, are concerned about the welfare of our members: Be it therefore

*Resolved*, That we, the Barron County Farmers Educational Union, gathered at our annual convention, this 11th day of December 1948, do hereby respectfully submit the following resolution that we back the program of the National Milk Producers Federation, in demanding a law to ban the use of yellow coloring in oleo or any other substitution by anyone; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That we send a copy to the Wisconsin Farmers Union State office and to all of our Representatives and United States Senators.

NORMAN FANKHAUSER,
*County President.*
ALICE LE JEUNE,
*County Secretary.*

---

FEBRUARY 5, 1949.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY:

The following resolution pertaining to the oleomargarine legislation was passed and signed by members of the Inter-Breed Association of Wisconsin, which represents all of our State's purebred dairy cattle breeders.

"We will support removal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine and the license fees and reporting requirements controlling manufacturers and distributors of the product, provided adequate legislation is enacted to ban the manufacture and sale in commerce of oleomargarine colored yellow in imitation or semblance of butter."

Mrs. Jack Reynolds, Secretary-Treasurer, Holstein-Friesian Association of Wisconsin, West Allis; Willard R. Evans, President, Brown Swiss Association of Wisconsin, Waukesha; Charles C. Bruce, National Fieldman, Holstein-Friesian Association, Lone Rock; R. J. McCarthy, President, Milking Shorthorn Association of Wisconsin, Cottage Grove; George D. Britts, Secretary, Guernsey Association of Wisconsin, Waukesha; Richard A. Breckett, President, Wisconsin Jersey Breeders Association, Elk Mound; V. L. Peterson, National Fieldman, Jersey Association, Columbus, Ohio; G. B. Price, Secretary, Jersey Association of Wisconsin, Kenosha; M. L. Witz, Director, Guernsey Association of Wisconsin, Mauston; Leonard Seybold, President, Holstein-Friesian Association of Wisconsin, Forest Junction; Thy Johnson, Secretary, American Jersey Cattle Club, Columbus, Ohio.

## JOSEF CARDINAL MINDSZENTY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Lynn, Mass., together with an editorial from the Daily Evening Item, of Lynn, Mass., relating to the trial and conviction of Cardinal Mindszenty.

There being no objection the resolution and editorial were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY OF LYNN, IN CITY COUNCIL,
*February 8, 1949.*

*Ordered*, That the city clerk, as clerk of the city council, be and hereby is requested to forward communications to our Senators and Representatives in Congress protesting and bitterly denouncing the travesty of justice enacted in the Communist-dominated courts of Hungary in the trial and conviction of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty; and be it further

*Ordered*, That the City Council of the City of Lynn, in the foregoing respect, endorses the editorial in the Daily Evening Item of this date entitled "Budapest's Real Defendant," and orders that a copy thereof be spread upon the records of the city council, and that the city clerk also forward to our Senators and Congressmen LANE and BATES, copies of this editorial.

---

[From the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Evening Item]

BUDAPEST'S REAL DEFENDANT

As the Cardinal Mindszenty case swiftly approaches its tragic and inexorable climax in Budapest, it is well to remember that the real defendant in the dock in this mock court is not a Prince of the Catholic Church, but organized religion, which the Communists hate with a vehemence surpassing all their other multitudinous hatreds.

Every Catholic, every Protestant, every Jew—all who profess a belief in God and His omnipotence—are Cardinal Mindszenty's codefendants. The Hungarian primate represents a philosophy which is anathema to every Communistic principle. The Kremlin's Hungarian puppets seek to stifle it by dragging its most distinguished exemplar in their country to the prisoner's bench like a common criminal.

This mock trial is strangely reminiscent of another held more than 2,000 years ago when Christ was haled before Pontius Pilate on

similarly trumped-up charges. Then, as now, the official charge was treason, but the real indictment was that the Defendant dared to place God above the state. And the modern Pilate—Judge Vilmos Olthys—must at this moment be experiencing some of the uneasy qualms which Scripture tells us beset his notorious predecessor. Like Pilate's, his name will live in infamy, while that of the man he condemns will join the glorious company of religious martyrs.

During World War II, it was a common saying that the Nazis could be counted upon to commit some tremendous stupidity whenever the opportunity afforded. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the Communists are ruled by men of similar mentality because in centering their attack on this blameless Catholic prelate they have provided the spark needed to arouse world-wide organized opposition to their godless rule.

If Cardinal Mindszenty goes to the gallows, no worshiper of God anywhere in the world will be safe. The love of God and the right to worship Him freely are so deeply implanted in the human breast that men will fight to the death to preserve them. The sorry spectacle unfolded in Budapest will become an historic rallying cry that will eventually spell the doom of communism everywhere.

Let those here in America who have ridiculed repeated warnings of the dangers of communism come to their senses now that the Reds have reached the apex of their boldness. Let's have an end to queasy, half-hearted toleration of this serpent whose aim is to exclude Christ from men's lives. Let's have an end to the spineless appeasing and "negotiating" that have marked our official attitude since VJ-day. Communism is our hated and determined enemy and let's resolve from this moment forward to treat it as such. Let's repulse Stalin's "peace" feelers for the treacherous impostures they are. If there was one ounce of sincerity behind them, Stalin would immediately order a halt to the disgraceful proceedings at Budapest.

We are confronted at this moment in history with the greatest threat to human liberty the world has ever known. Let's recognize it for what it is and face up to it. The time for temporizing and half-measures has passed. This is Armageddon.

## PREVENTION OF WAR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the people of Williamsburg, Mass., in town meeting assembled, on February 7, 1949, relating to the prevention of war.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas modern science has now produced means by which mankind can destroy itself; and

Whereas the United Nations was created as an instrument to preserve peace and its Charter is capable of amendment so as to make it effective for the maintenance of world order; and

Whereas disarmament and world peace can only be achieved by world order, world law, and some measure of world government; and

Whereas the people of Williamsburg have since April 24, 1771, been happy to delegate certain functions of government to their town government, other functions to their State government and still other functions to their National Government and are now willing to delegate further limited functions of government to a world government for the purpose of maintaining peace: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the people of Williamsburg, Mass., in town meeting assembled,* That they call upon their Representatives in the Congress, in the executive department of the United States, and in the United Nations, to take note of these truths and forthwith to take such steps as may be necessary to have our delegates to the United Nations present or support amendment of the Charter for the purpose of making the United Nations into a world government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing world law to prevent war; and be it further

*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to both Senators from Massachusetts, the Congressman from the First Congressional District, the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and the United States representatives in the United Nations.

## HOOF-AND-MOUTH-DISEASE PROGRAM IN MEXICO—INTERNATIONAL QUARANTINE STATION ON SWAN ISLAND

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three resolutions adopted by the California State Board of Agriculture and senate joint resolutions 9 and 10 of the California Legislature relating to the hoof-and-mouth-disease program in Mexico, and the need for laboratories to study the disease, and also senate joint resolution 8 of the California Legislature relative to the proposed international animal quarantine station on Swan Island.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

To the Committee on Appropriations:

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
*Sacramento.*

On January 17, 1949, the California State Board of Agriculture met in regular session at Sacramento, Calif., and had as its guests and participants in its deliberations, representatives of the California Farm Bureau Federation, California Cattlemen's Association, California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce. The following motion was unanimously adopted by the board with the concurrence of all those in attendance at the meeting:

"Whereas foot-and-mouth disease, a major and devastating disease of livestock, is present in the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America have joined forces to control and eradicate the disease in Mexico; and

"Whereas the chief instrument for the control of the disease is the Joint Commission established for that purpose and supported by the two nations with financial, scientific, and general ways and means; and

"Whereas great strides are being made in the Republic of Mexico by the efforts of the Joint Commission toward the control and eradication of this disease, which is not known to exist elsewhere in North America; and

"Whereas it is in the general welfare of the two contracting nations to continue the work of the Joint Commission without any slackening of effort or loss of research, program, or planning: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That we request the Congress of the United States to approve an appropriation of funds, and to approve such other enactments as are necessary, to continue without interruption the work of the Joint Commission for the eradication of foot-and-mouth disease in the Republic of Mexico, and that we commend the Commission for its excellent work at this time."

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
*County of Sacramento, ss:*

I, Romain Young, assistant secretary of the California State Board of Agriculture, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution passed on the 17th day of January 1949.

In witness whereof I hereto set my hand this 3d day of February 1949.

ROMAIN YOUNG.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d of February 1949.

WILMA WILSON,
*Notary Public in and for the County of Sacramento, State of California.*

My commission expires October 12, 1952.

---

Senate Joint Resolution 9

Joint resolution relative to funds for the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico

Whereas foot-and-mouth disease, a major and devastating disease of livestock, is present in the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas the Republic of Mexico and the United States of America have joined forces to control and eradicate the disease in Mexico; and

Whereas the chief instrument for the control of the disease is the Joint Commission established for that purpose and supported by the the two nations with financial, scientific, and general ways and means; and

Whereas great strides are being made in the Republic of Mexico by the efforts of the Joint Commission toward the control and eradication of this disease, which is not known to exist elsewhere in North America; and

Whereas it is in the general welfare of the two contracting nations to continue the work of the Joint Commission without any slackening of effort or loss of research, program, or planning: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly),* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to approve an appropriation of funds, and such other enactments as are necessary, to continue without interruption the work of the Joint Commission for the Eradication of Foot-and-Mouth Disease in the Republic of Mexico, and commends the Commission for its excellent work; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

---

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
*Sacramento.*

On January 17, 1949, the California State Board of Agriculture met in regular session at Sacramento, Calif., and had as its guests and participants in its deliberations, representatives of the California Farm Bureau Federation, California Cattlemen's Association, California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce. The following motion was unanimously adopted by the board with the concurrence of all those in attendance at the meeting:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for a livestock disease research laboratory with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease; and

"Whereas funds have not as yet been appropriated for such laboratory; and

"Whereas a site for such laboratory has not as yet been selected: Be it

*"Resolved,* That we are in favor and respectfully urge that the Congress of the United States appropriate money for the immediate construction of such laboratory and that the site of the laboratory be determined considering not only the legal requirements as provided by congressional enactment, but also the economic situation as existing Nation-wide.

"It is the belief of this group assembled that because of the great movement of livestock east from the Pacific Coast a laboratory on the Pacific would be the least desirable because of the greater possibility of wide dissemination of the disease in the event of its escape from the laboratory; be it further

*"Resolved,* That it is our opinion that it will take several years to construct and equip a laboratory, during which time research could be greatly furthered by sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories during the interim between the present and the completion of the laboratory in question."

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
*County of Sacramento, ss:*

I, Romain Young, assistant secretary of the California State Board of Agriculture, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution passed on the 17th day of January 1949.

In witness whereof I hereto set my hand this 3d day of February 1949.

ROMAIN YOUNG.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d day of February 1949.

WILMA WILSON,
*Notary Public in and for the County of Sacramento, State of California.*
My commission expires October 12, 1952.

---

Senate Joint Resolution 10

Joint resolution relative to the Federal Livestock Disease Research Laboratory

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation providing for the Livestock Disease Research Laboratory with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease; and

Whereas neither a site for such laboratory has as yet been selected nor have funds been appropriated for it; and

Whereas the need for such a laboratory is very great in view of the outbreak of the foot-and-mouth pestilence in the Republic of Mexico; and

Whereas because of the large movement of livestock east from the Pacific coast, the establishment of the laboratory on the Pacific slope would be least desirable because of the greater possibility of wide dissemination of the foot-and-mouth disease in the event of its escape from the laboratory; and

Whereas several years will be consumed before it will be possible to construct and equip a laboratory during such time research could be greatly furthered by sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly),* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States immediately to make provision for the construction of a livestock disease research laboratory with particular reference to foot-and-mouth disease other than on the Pacific slope, and during the interim prior to the completion of such laboratory to make provision for sending young men abroad to work with foreign research laboratories in the accomplishment of scientific research with respect to the control of foot-and-mouth disease; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
*Sacramento.*

On January 17, 1949, the California State Board of Agriculture met in regular session at Sacramento, Calif., and had as its guests and participants in its deliberations, representatives of the California Farm Bureau Federation, California Cattlemen's Association, California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce. The following motion was unanimously adopted by the board with the concurrence of all those in attendance at the meeting:

"Whereas the Congress in its wisdom enacted certain legislation in 1930 designated as the Tariff Act of 1930 (46 Stat. 689) prohibiting the importation of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease or products thereof from countries in which foot-and-mouth disease exists; and

"Whereas attempts have been made from time to time to break down the provisions of this congressional enactment; and

"Whereas the Seventy-ninth Congress enacted Public Law No. 522, approved July 24, 1946, authorizing the construction of a livestock quarantine station on Swan Island; and

"Whereas regulations for the operation of the Swan Island quarantine station have been proposed by the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture; and

"Whereas the proposed regulations provide for importation onto Swan Island of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from areas in countries in which statement is made by the veterinarians of the country in question that foot-and-mouth disease has not existed in that area 60 days immediately preceding: Therefore be it

*"Resolved,* That we strongly oppose such regulation and point out that it is in violation of the intent of the Tariff Act of 1930 and constitutes a decided weakening of our sanitary embargo; be it further

*"Resolved,* That we urge and recommend, with the greatest emphasis possible, that the terminology of the Tariff Act and the intent of the Tariff Act be incorporated into law and regulations to the effect that animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease may not be imported onto Swan Island from any country in which it is determined that foot-and-mouth disease exists."

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
*County of Sacramento, ss:*

I, Romain Young, assistant secretary of the California State Board of Agriculture, do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of resolution passed on the 17th day of January 1949.

In witness whereof I hereto set my hand this 3d day of February 1949.

ROMAIN YOUNG.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 8d day of February 1949.

WILMA WILSON,
*Notary Public in and for the County of Sacramento, State of California.*
My commission expires October 12, 1952.

"Senate Joint Resolution 8

"Joint resolution relative to the proposed International Animal Quarantine Station on Swan Island

"Whereas the people of this State remember with the direst apprehension the outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in 1924 and 1929 and the paralyzing effect each of these outbreaks had upon the economy and welfare of California; and

"Whereas the bulwark of protection against the introduction of foot-and-mouth disease into the United States or this State has been subdivision (a) of section 306 of chapter 497 of the United States Statutes of 1930, providing that if the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists in any foreign country, he shall officially notify the Secretary of the Treasury and give public notice thereof, and thereafter, and until the Secretary of Agriculture gives notice in a similar manner that such disease no longer exists in such foreign country, the importation into the United States of cattle, sheep, or other domestic ruminants, or swine, or of fresh, chilled, or frozen beef, veal, mutton, lamb, or pork, from such foreign country is prohibited; and

"Whereas restrictions on importations have from time to time been issued pursuant to the authority of Congress and by that means foot-and-mouth disease has been kept from the United States or any part thereof; and

"Whereas chapter 592 of the United States Statutes of 1946 authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, to establish and maintain on Swan Island, situate in the Caribbean Sea, an international animal quarantine station and permits the Secretary of Agriculture, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, but subject to regulations prescribed by him to prevent the introduction into the United States of communicable diseases of animals, to permit animals to be brought into the Swan Island Quarantine Station from any country, including those in which the Secretary of Agriculture determines that foot-and-mouth disease exists and to permit the same to be subsequently imported into other parts of the United States under the regulations of the Secretary of Agriculture; and

"Whereas on December 7, 1948, the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States gave notice of his intention to issue regulations relating to the Swan Island Quarantine Station, which regulations permit ruminants and swine to be shipped into the quarantine station if they originate in an area in a foreign country which has been free from foot-and-mouth disease for at least 60 days immediately preceding the date of movement of the ruminants and swine therefrom and after quarantine at Swan Island for not less than 90 days may be brought into the United States; and

"Whereas the report on foot-and-mouth disease made to the Senate of California on March 18, 1948, by the senate interim committee on livestock diseases, created by senate resolution 145 of the 1947 session of the California Legislature, shows that 316 Cebu bulls were landed on Sacrificios Island in April of 1946 and were removed from said island to the vicinity of Vera Cruz, Mexico, on the 28th of September 1946, and were thereafter inspected by two veterinarians of the Bureau of Animal Industry of the United States Department of Agriculture and found to be free from foot-and-mouth disease and 3 weeks thereafter foot-and-mouth disease broke out in the vicinity into which the Cebu bulls has been imported; and

"Whereas the regulations for the operation of the Swan Island Quarantine Station proposed by the Secretary of Agriculture can therefore not give any assurance that Swan Island will not become the avenue through which foot-and-mouth disease will be introduced into the United States; and

"Whereas the California State Board of Agriculture at its meeting on January 17, 1949, attended by representatives from the California Farm Bureau, the California Cattlemen's Association, the California Wool Growers Association, California Farmers, Inc., the Agricultural Council of California, and the Agricultural Department of the California State Chamber of Commerce, adopted a resolution with the unanimous concurrence of those in attendance, that the regulations for the Swan Island Quarantine Station should prohibit the importation into the United States of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in which it is determined that foot-and-mouth disease exists: Now, therefore, be it

*"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States and the Secretary of Agriculture thereof that no action be taken for the use of Swan Island as a quarantine station with respect to the importation into this country of animals susceptible to foot-and-mouth disease from any country in any part of which exists foot-and-mouth disease, and respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to this effect; and be it further

*"Resolved*, That the secretary of the senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to every Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. J. Res. 31. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. Con. Res. 10. Concurrent resolution to provide additional funds for the Joint Committee on Labor-Management Relations; with amendments (Rept. No. 70); and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE (S. REPT. NO. 69)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably Senate Resolution 15, relating to limitation of debate in the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received.

The Senator from Arizona asks unanimous consent to make a brief statement in regard to the report.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who joined with me in submitting the resolution, and we have agreed to recommend to other Senators that no definite action be taken on it by the Senate until Monday, February 28.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the Senate gives unanimous consent, the Chair holds that discussion is not in order.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I fear that if we were to enter into a discussion of this question, the Senator might be taken from his feet, and other Senators might not have an opportunity to ask him questions. I respectfully suggest that this discussion be delayed until the conclusion of morning business, and then if there are any questions, they can be asked without any parliamentary situation interfering.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in connection with the report from the Committee on Rules and Administration which has just been submitted by the chairman, I submit minority views of those who are opposed to the resolution. The minority views are concurred in by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and myself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The minority views will be filed.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask that they be printed along with the majority report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADDITIONAL ASSISTANTS TO COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration I report favorably a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the resolution.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 66), as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized, until otherwise provided by law, to employ two additional professional staff members and three additional clerical assistants to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at rates of compensation to be fixed by the chairman in accordance with section 202 (e) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the provisions of Public Law 4, Eightieth Congress, approved February 19, 1947.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand from the Senator from Arizona that the resolution was considered by the Committee on Rules and Administration, and that the report submitted is the unanimous report of that Committee, allowing two additional professional staff members and three additional clerks in the Judiciary Committee, until otherwise ordered?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct. The situation as presented to the Committee on Rules and Administration by members of the Committee on the Judiciary is serious and urgent. The Judiciary Committee has pending before it some 500 bills. More than a third of all bills introduced in the Senate are referred to the Judiciary Committee. The additional assistants are needed immediately. For that reason, members of the Committee on Rules and Administration approve the request. I hope the resolution will be adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Reserving the right to object, may I ask one more question? In substance, does not the resolution amend the Legislative Reorganization Act with respect to the number of assistants authorized for the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. HAYDEN. It really places the Committee on the Judiciary in the same exceptional position as that enjoyed by the Committee on Appropriations, in recognition of the fact that it has more work to do, since it handles a greater number of bills than do the other committees of the Senate. It therefore requires the additional help.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But the Committee on Rules and Administration is doing it in this manner, rather than changing the law.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would require a joint resolution to amend the law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not wish to question the Senator, but I do not think we should let stand the statement that an amendment of a rule of the Senate requires a joint resolution. The act, on its face, clearly states that rules relating to the Senate may be changed as other rules are changed in the Senate, by action of the Senate alone. I do not think there should stand on the record a statement that we cannot change the Reorganization Act except by action of the two Houses.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I was led into that statement by the fact that the proposal was originally presented in the form of a joint resolution which required action by the House. The suggestion was made to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee that it be changed to a simple Senate resolution and be taken care of in that way.

Mr. TAFT. Is this a permanent change, or is it merely for the present Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is a permanent change. Of course, the money will have to be appropriated hereafter by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. TAFT. There is, then, a change in the rule involved?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The resolution says "until otherwise provided by law." It does not seem to me to be a change in the rules.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to read the provision of the Reorganization Act with reference to this point:

The following sections of this title are enacted by the Congress:

(a) As an exercise of the rule-making power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply; and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(b) With full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to the procedure in

such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

So that those rules can be changed so far as they relate to Senate committees by a simple Senate resolution, and do not require a joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is a correct statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

THE ALUMINUM SHORTAGE — CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN SENATOR BUTLER AND THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD copies of several letters I have exchanged with the Secretary of Commerce regarding the severe shortage of aluminum and aluminum conductors.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 28, 1948.

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
*Secretary of Commerce,*
*Department of Commerce,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During recent months I have become increasingly concerned with the severe shortage of aluminum for the manufacture of wire and other electrical equipment because of the way it is holding up our rural electrification program in Nebraska. I believe that this aluminum situation is the worst shortage we have today in this country, bar none.

In my State alone, loans have been approved by Rural Electrification Administration for extension of electric service to beween seventy and eighty thousand consumers but only about 40,000 have been connected up. During the last fiscal year, loans were approved to serve over 12,000 additional consumers but only 7,000 new rural establishments actually received power during the same period. In many cases, farmers are forced to wait years for current after signing up. Orders placed today for aluminum rod simply go into a backlog which will take from 2 to 5 years to work off. If the supply situation in any industry can be called critical, certainly aluminum is that industry.

Under these circumstances, it seems to me of the utmost urgency that some system be worked out to take care of the most essential needs for virgin aluminum. Under the provisions of Public Law 395, passed last year, you have the power to work out, in cooperation with the industry, a program of voluntary allocations to meet such needs. This method has been used with some measure of success for some industries, such as steel, and I am a little surprised that no action has yet been taken to meet the aluminum situation in the same manner. As I understand, some segments of the industry have expressed a willingness to cooperate with the Government in working out such an agreement. Certainly this method is worth a try.

It is my opinion that rural electrification should receive a priority for aluminum second only to our defense program. Under the present situation, the program is certainly not faring very well. REA co-ops and districts are constructing nearly three-fourths of the rural mileage, but I do not believe they are receiving that proportion of the production of rural conductor sizes. Meanwhile, there seems to be plenty of aluminum for all sorts of new nonessential uses. I am advised that 85 percent of all the needs for aluminum could be met just as well with scrap as with virgin metal.

It seems to me it is time to put first things first. This REA program is of the utmost importance to farmers and to our food production effort. Farmers all over the country have been promised electric service for years now, and those promises ought to be kept.

I do believe it is high time that some action be taken on this problem. If you were not aware of the seriousness of this situation before, I hope you will undertake an immediate inquiry and let me have the benefit of your comments on this proposal.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER,
*United States Senator, Nebraska.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, January 10, 1949.*

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: Reference is made to your letter of December 28, 1948, expressing your concern over the severe shortage of aluminum for the manufacture of wire and electrical equipment and the adverse effect of this shortage on the construction of rural-electrification facilities.

This Department is fully aware of the difficulties faced by the aluminum industry in its efforts to supply current demand, which exceeds the supply by a very substantial margin. There is attached a statement showing our estimate of supply and demand for the 12 months' period ending June 30, 1949. Our estimate indicates a shortage of 500,000,000 pounds during this period; other estimates run as high as 1,000,000,000 pounds shortage.

You suggest that the requirements for aluminum for rural electrification should receive a priority second only to national defense, and you raise a question as to why the voluntary agreements under Public Law 395 have not or cannot be used for this purpose. Some months ago the Department discussed the possibilities of voluntary allocations with the three producers of primary aluminum. Up to this time, only one of these producers fabricates redraw rod for manufacturing cable and wire. Assuming that this producer had the facilities to increase production substantially of wire rod, the full burden of supplying an increased amount of material for wire making would fall on this one company. Since such agreements are purely voluntary, there is no way in which the objective you mention could be achieved unless the company volunteered to divert its facilities and materials to this particular end use.

Under these circumstances, a voluntary agreement affecting only one producer seems impracticable. If one or both of the other producers would undertake the fabrication of redraw rod, a more equitable basis would be established for a voluntary agreement to increase the output of the raw material for cable and wire manufacture.

I am asking my staff to again discuss the distribution of aluminum with the three producers of primary metal. Any discussion of the possibility of a voluntary agreement will necessarily be exploratory, since Public Law 395 expires February 28 next. If additional facilities are installed by the industry for the fabrication of wire and cable rod and if the voluntary provision of Public Law 395 is extended beyond the present termination date, there is a possibility that the Department will give consideration to proposing a voluntary agreement to increase the supply of aluminum wire and cable.

As you know, the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee held hearings on December 28 to explore the requirements for aluminum for rural electrification and to obtain data from the aluminum industry with respect to production and distribution. When available, the information developed at this hearing, especially with respect to the aluminum industry's attitude toward increasing the production of materials for the manufacture of cable and wire, may be helpful to us in dealing with this problem.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS C. BLAISDELL, JR.,
*For the Secretary of Commerce.*

---

*Percentage distribution pattern of aluminum for fiscal year 1949*

| | Percent |
|---|---|
| Building products | 30 |
| Transportation | 25 |
| Cooking utensils | 10 |
| Machinery | 6 |
| Household appliances | 7 |
| Power transmission | 6 |
| Miscellaneous | 16 |
| Total | 100 |

---

FEBRUARY 4, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
*Secretary of Commerce,*
*Commerce Department,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Reference is made to your reply of January 10, 1949, to my letter of December 28, 1948, regarding the shortage of aluminum.

Your reply contains many useful facts, but for some reason which I cannot understand, you have marked the whole reply confidential. Frankly, I cannot understand at all why this material should be confidential, with the possible exception of the small part relating to military needs. For that reason, I feel I must make a formal request that you indicate to me which parts of this letter may be made available to the public.

Your reply to this request will be appreciated.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER,
*United States Senator, Nebraska.*

---

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, February 16, 1949.*

The Honorable HUGH BUTLER,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: In reply to your letter of February 4 concerning the confidential letter of January 10 from this office on aluminum, I wish to advise you that the reason the letter was marked "Confidential" was to conceal the demands for national-security programs.

There is no objection to your making public the statements in the body of the letter. However, since the time that letter was written additional information has been obtained, and a new tabulation is attached giving the estimated supply-requirements position of aluminum for the calendar year 1949. You will note that this statement lumps all of the requirements, and in this form the information can be made public.

The new figures on supply and requirements make necessary a change in the second paragraph of the letter of January 10, as follows:

"This Department is fully aware of the difficulties faced by the aluminum industry in its efforts to supply current demand, which exceeds the supply by a very substantial margin. There is attached a statement showing our estimate of supply and demand for the calendar year 1949. Our estimate indicates a shortage of 640,000 short tons during

this period. The estimate, both for supply and requirements, is based upon the continuation of a high level of business activity, with no interruption to supply and the continuation of a high level of demand."

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES SAWYER,
*Secretary of Commerce.*

---

*Aluminum*

ESTIMATED SUPPLY-REQUIREMENTS POSITION (SHORT TONS)

(Calendar year 1949)

| | |
|---|---|
| Supply: | |
| Domestic primary production | 625,000 |
| Domestic secondary production | 250,000 |
| Imports | 85,000 |
| Total | 960,000 |
| Requirements: Total demand, including national-security programs | 1,600,000 |
| Deficit | 640,000 |

---

FEBRUARY 16, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES SAWYER,
*Secretary of Commerce,*
*Commerce Department,*
*Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: With reference to my previous inquiries regarding proposed action to be taken to handle the aluminum shortage, your attention is invited to the fact that by the terms of Public Law 6 of this Congress your authority to control the distribution of scarce materials, such as aluminum, has been extended until September 30 of this year.

It appears to me that this aluminum bottleneck could be broken overnight and ample aluminum made available for rural electrification if the Department of Commerce would move promptly under this law to work out a system to take care of this vital need with the aluminum industry. It is my understanding that a very small portion of the aluminum output, considerably less than 10 percent, is now made available for the manufacture of aluminum conductor. The entire aluminum shortage could be solved for the rural systems through a moderate increase in this percentage.

Inasmuch as I have previously written you on two occasions and have yet to receive a reply other than some confidential information which I am not permitted to make public, I would appreciate being informed of your intentions in this matter. The authority granted by this legislation has been used very effectively in dealing with the steel industry, and I can see no reason why it could not be equally effective in handling the aluminum situation.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER,
*United States Senator, Nebraska.*

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, for some time I have been urging that the Department of Commerce proceed promptly to set up a voluntary allocation plan with the aluminum industry, so as to make sure that enough aluminum is found to permit the rural electrification program to proceed rapidly. This aluminum situation is probably the worst shortage we face today. The Department of Commerce has told me that there will be a shortage of 640,000 short tons during the calendar year 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must admonish the Senator from Nebraska that speeches are not now in order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I am making a statement in connection with the insertion in the RECORD of the correspondence I have had with the Secretary of Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; we can make no distinction between such a statement and a speech. The Senator may have the statement printed as a part of his remarks if he desires.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, for some time I have been urging that the Department of Commerce proceed promptly to set up a voluntary allocation plan with the aluminum industry, so as to make sure that enough aluminum is found to permit the rural electrification program to proceed rapidly. This aluminum situation is probably the worst shortage we face today. The Department of Commerce has told me that there will be a shortage of 640,000 short tons during the calendar year 1949.

Recently we were told at a congressional hearing that an order placed today for aluminum conductor with the Aluminum Co. of America would not be filled until 1953. Thousands of poles have been set in place by rural co-ops, but construction cannot be completed until the aluminum wire is delivered. It is absolutely essential for the Government to take immediate action to break this bottleneck.

Under the provisions of Public Law 395, of the Eightieth Congress, voluntary agreements have been worked out very successfully with the steel industry to provide sufficient steel for essential uses. I believe that rural electrification should have a priority second only to national defense in securing aluminum. It will be noted from one of the tables I introduced that only 6 percent of the aluminum is going into power transmission, and it certainly seems that additional supplies of aluminum could be made available for electrification without injuring any of the other industrial users.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MAYBANK:

S. 964. A bill for the relief of Cole M. Shaw and M. M. Hendrix; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEY (for himself and Mr. BROUGHTON):

S. 965. A bill to extend the time within which suit may be commenced under the Federal Tort Claims Act on the claim of Ulma B. Riggs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 966. A bill to extend Veterans' Administration benefits to disabled retired enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, without impairment of their right to receive retired pay which they had earned for stipulated service prior to their reentry into the service in World War II; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. FERGUSON introduced Senate bill 967, to provide for preference under the immigration quotas, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 968. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Wladyslaw Zachariasiewicz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 969. A bill to transfer the Pomona Station of the Agriculture Remount Service, Department of Agriculture, at Pomona, Calif.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 970. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the 191st birth anniversary of Maj. Jean Pierre Chouteau; and

S. 971. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of commemorative stamps honoring 160 years of cotton-textile manufacturing in America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 972. A bill to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress, with respect to surplus airport property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 973. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 974. A bill to amend the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to certain mothers of veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 975. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the life and services of P. T. Barnum; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 976. A bill for the relief of Vartan Chamsarian; and

S. 977. A bill for the relief of Jacques Yedid, Henriette Yedid, Richard Emanuel Yedid, and Ethel Danielle Yedid; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 978. A bill to amend the Federal Alcohol Administration Act as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 979. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928, as amended, authorizing and directing a national survey of forest resources; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 980. A bill for the relief of Toshie Okutomi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 981. A bill for the relief of John Clark Sharman;

S. 982. A bill for the relief of D. A. Sullivan & Sons, Inc., and Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as Harney Engineering Co.; and

S. 983. A bill for the relief of Samuel D. Shanker and the legal guardian of Miriam Shanker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 984 (by request). A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of Joseph Lee, Sr., founder of recreational and civic groups and organizer of recreational activities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH (by request):

S. 985. A bill for the relief of Eva Friedmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 986. A bill for the relief of Carlos Riggenbach; and

S. 987. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Maloney Preece; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 988. A bill to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntary separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after

having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McCLELLAN:

S. 989. A bill amending the act approved May 15, 1928, for flood control and improvement of the lower Mississippi River in its alluvial valley, by including the construction of certain works of improvement in the Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto area, Arkansas; to the Committee on Public Works.

(Mr. McCLELLAN also introduced Senate bill 990, to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. McCLELLAN also introduced Senate bill 991, to create an Office of General Services as a central agency to have jurisdiction and control over certain administrative services in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 992. A bill to amend existing law relating to military leave so as to extend the benefits of such law to substitute employees in the postal service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 993. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit coverage thereunder of employees of States and their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 994. A bill for the relief of Herbert Karl Jabs;

S. 995. A bill for the relief of Irene George Livanos;

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Aron Tejbus Birenbaum; and

S. 997. A bill for the relief of Leon Engel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 998. A bill to provide for acquisition from sources within the State of North Dakota of sand and gravel for use in the construction of Garrison Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 999. A bill to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. THYE, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. ANDERSON):

S. 1000. A bill to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 1001. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Navy, and the United States Maritime Commission to dispose of certain materials to the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 1002. A bill for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judicary.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 1003. A bill for the relief of Emory T. Wales; and

S. 1004. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the court of claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the heirs of William H. Peters and Washington Reed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 1005. A bill to further extend the authority conferred by certain acts pertaining to the admission into the United States of alien fiancées, fiancés, and spouses of persons who served in the armed forces during World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1006. A bill for the relief of Arthur Woloski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. MARTIN introduced Senate bill 1007, to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. MYERS introduced Senate bill 1008, to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered price systems and freight-absorption practices, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1009. A bill to authorize the Coast Guard to construct an experimental nonpropelled seadrome ocean station; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1010. A bill to establish the United States Air Academy at Randolph Field, Tex.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1011. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent borrow area, without exchange of funds or reimbursement; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the period from May 21 to 30, inclusive, 1949, as Park and Recreation Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY:

S. J. Res. 55. Joint resolution to print the monthly publication entitled "Economic Indicators"; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## IMMIGRATION QUOTAS

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for preference under the immigration quotas, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 967) to provide for preference under the immigration quotas, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. FERGUSON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

This measure is a companion bill to H. R. 946, introduced in the House by Mr. HERTER, of Massachusetts. It is identical in language and purpose with the Herter bill.

This bill would amend section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 in order to revise the classes of immigrants who are to be granted preferential status in the issuance of quota immigration visas by American consular offices abroad, having particular regard for the national interest in fixing preferences.

It does not alter the presently authorized volume of immigration into the United States. Although operating in the direction of selective immigration it does so within the framework of basic policy as established by Congress in existing law, wherein preferential treatment for quota immigration is prescribed. It acts to relieve an administrative burden imposed by Congress through its failure to make statutory provision for the treatment of quota immigrants who are not accorded preferential status.

In order that the purpose and scope of the bill may be clearly understood it is necessary to review provisions of the present law and administrative procedures thereunder.

Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 provides that each national origins quota (except the quota for India and the quota for China) shall be divided into two halves, which shall be available to certain classes of immigrants commonly referred to as first-preference and second-preference classes.

The first half of the national origins immigration quotas (excepting India and China) is available to first-preference classes which consist of alien parents of citizens of the United States who are at least 21 years of age, the alien husbands of citizens of the United States regardless of age, but who were married on or after January 1, 1948, and, in quotas of 300 or more annually, to aliens who are skilled in agriculture.

The second half of the national origins immigration quota, plus any portion of the first half not required for the issuance of immigration visas to qualified immigrants of the first-preference classes, is available to second-preference classes which consist of the alien wives and the unmarried alien children of aliens who are lawful permanent residents of the United States.

By section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924 alien wives, the unmarried minor alien children, and the alien husbands of American citizens are entitled to nonquota immigrant status, provided in the cases of such husbands that the marriage occurred before January 1, 1948.

Immigrants who are brothers, sisters, uncles, aunts, nieces, nephews, or nonrelative of American citizens or of lawfully resident aliens are not entitled either to preferential consideration under the quotas or to nonquota status. They are considered to be nonpreference quota immigrants. They may immigrate under the quotas only in the event the demand on the part of qualified immigrants of the preference classes does not exhaust the quotas.

It may be observed that just one occupation class is granted preferential consideration under the quotas. Skilled agriculturists are entitled to first-preference classification provided the quota to which they may be chargeable under the law is at least 300 annually. Otherwise, however, no alien may come or be brought to this country for permanent residence, no matter how highly skilled he may be as a worker, technician, or scientist, unless he happens to be classifiable as a nonquota immigrant, in a preference class, or if as a nonpreference quota immigrant he finds a place high enough on the list of nonpreference applicants to take advantage of any otherwise unused quota.

In administering the quota provisions of the law with respect to nonpreference immigrants the administrative authorities devised a waiting-list procedure. Such improvisation was necessary because Congress did not specifically deal with this category of immigrants in the law, having limited itself in its legislative action to the preference classes.

The waiting-list procedure was soundly conceived by the administrative authorities, in the absence of statutory direction, in accordance with the accepted democratic custom of first come, first served. Faithfully observed by consular authorities, it has imposed a great administrative burden in the face of pressure to grant exceptions. At the same time, it has necessarily operated to exclude numerous aliens whose admission to the United States in permanent status would undeniably have been in the national interest.

It is believed that the time has come for Congress to review the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 and its administration so that important considerations of national interest may be brought to bear in fixing preferences and so that orderly and desirable procedures may be effected under which administrative authorities may operate in enforcing the law.

The proposed bill would provide that the first 10 percent of any quota may be used for the issuance of immigration visas to aliens whose immigration into the United States would be desirable from the viewpoint of our national interests. This would be without regard to any relationship, or nonrelationship, such citizens may have to any citizen or resident of the United States.

Appropriate agencies of the government would have to give their approval to the immigration of aliens in this first 10 percent of the quota. This is to establish necessary safeguards against a possible abuse of the privileges to be granted.

The administrative authorities in the Executive branch of the government are being approached regularly by business concerns and others who are interested in bringing to this country aliens skilled as workers, technicians, or scientists who are needed in American business, research, or enterprise. The administrative authorities are helpless to assist, however, when they find the alien concerned is entitled to no preference under the law and is chargeable to a quota which is heavily oversubscribed and in fact would be barred under the contract labor feature of existing law.

In addition to facilitating the immigration of an alien whose services would be a distinct contribution to our economy, the proposed bill would provide for those whom an agency of the government may be anxious to procure for technical or scientific purposes in connection with improvement of the National Defense Establishment. Also, aliens who have been working for the United States in foreign countries, often at the risk of their lives or personal safety and whose immediate immigration into the United States is desirable in the interest of national security, could be permitted to migrate to this country without having to wait for years until their turns as nonpreference quota immigrants are reached on the waiting lists.

One effect of this bill would be to obviate the necessity of having numerous private bills introduced in Congress each year, to facilitate the immigration of aliens whose migration would be highly desirable in the national interest.

Under this bill it is further proposed that the next 50 percent of a national quota would be made available to those immigrants who now fall in the so-called first-preference classes, which would become the second-preference category. The proportion of the total quota allotted to such immigrants is not reduced or changed.

The bill proposes that the next 20 percent of a quota may be available to immigrants who now fall in the second-preference classes, which would become the third-preference category. The proportion of the quota allotted to such immigrants is accordingly reduced from 50 percent under present law to 20 percent. However, experience has shown that uniformly such immigrants rarely use as much as 20 percent of a quota.

The bill also creates a new category, to be known as fourth-preference quota immigrants, to whom will be available the next 10 percent of any quota. This class would include immigrants who have certain close relations in the United States but who are not entitled to any preferential consideration as quota immigrants under the existing law.

A final 10 percent of a quota would be available, under the proposed bill, to what may be termed "new-seed" immigration, or those immigrants who have no close relatives in the United States and who do not fall within any of the various classes of immigrants entitled to preference under the first 90 percent of a quota.

The first preference quota status provided in the existing law for aliens skilled in agriculture would be repealed. It is felt for one thing that since provisions of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 permit thousands of aliens skilled in agriculture to immigrate into the United States there is no apparent necessity for continuing the preferential status for agriculturalists under regular quotas.

One of the most important provisions of the proposed bill from the administrative point of view is that it would provide a statutory basis for the maintenance of consular waiting lists of quota immigrants. Under the proposed bill, visas to preferential quota immigrants in each class will be issued in the order that such preferential status is established. Nonpreference immigrants would be placed on waiting lists in the chronological order in which they qualify and are registered. Thus the integrity of the waiting-list procedure would be established by statute, which would assure protection to quota immigrants awaiting the issuance of visas, would preclude the exercise of administrative favoritism, and provide administrative authorities with a statutory buffer to pressure in the issuance of quota immigrant visas.

This bill is similar to one introduced in the Eightieth Congress, regarding which favorable reports were submitted to the House Judiciary Committee by the Departments of State and Justice, which are the agencies concerned with and responsible for the administration and enforcement of the immigration laws.

## FEDERAL PROPERTY ACT OF 1949—OFFICE OF GENERAL SERVICES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference two bills. One is cited as the Federal Property Act of 1949, and the other provides for the creation of an Office of General Services. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bills prepared by me may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the explanatory statement presented by the Senator from Arkansas will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN were each read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

S. 990. A bill to reorganize and simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, and for other purposes; and

S. 991. A bill to create an Office of General Services as a central agency to have jurisdiction and control over certain administrative services in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes.

The explanatory statement presented by Mr. McCLELLAN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR M'CLELLAN REGARDING THE FEDERAL PROPERTY ACT OF 1949 AND A BILL CREATING AN OFFICE OF GENERAL SERVICES

I am introducing today two bills, one of which is cited as the Federal Property Act of 1949, and is similar to a bill reported favorably by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in the Eightieth Congress (S. 2754). This bill, drafted by the administration and introduced by request, proposes to create an efficient, businesslike system of property management within the Federal Government. The bill would coordinate present property management functions of the Federal Works Agency and the Bureau of Federal Supply, and absorb the activities of the War Assets Administration.

I am also introducing, at the request of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, a bill to create an Office of General Services. This bill is designed to carry out the recommendations made by the Commission in its report on "Office of General Services—Supply Activities." The primary purpose of this bill would be to coordinate top-level services of the Government in the fields of procurement, disposition of surplus property, supply, and property and records management.

These two bills contain certain features which are in conflict. The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will examine each of them in detail, consult with officials of the Government agencies concerned with these activities and with experts associated with the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government who have been engaged in task force activities dealing with this subject, with a view to perfecting legislation that will be adequate to meet the needs of the reorganized services; and eliminate existing conflicts.

On January 24, I introduced another bill, S. 597, providing for the more economical operation of the General Supply Fund of the Bureau of Federal Supply, Department of the Treasury, at the request of the Department of the Treasury. This bill deals largely with the simplification and expansion of activities and would expand the General Supply Fund. It is designed to make the operations of the fund more flexible to the needs of any reorganization that might be effected under the above two proposals or under a bill that might be reported by the Committee on Expenditures involving the acceptable features of both measures.

These three bills comprise a general overall program designed to reorganize the purchasing and warehousing functions and effect a unified and efficient program for the distribution of supplies and materials throughout the Government, including provisions for executing utility contracts under a long-range program and make for greater economy and efficiency of operation.

The Committee will direct its efforts toward incorporating the main features of all three of these measures in one over-all reorganization proposal patterned on the recommendations made by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch under its report relating to the creation of an Office of General Services, and on the needs of the various agencies concerned as proposed by the Administration.

## DEDUCTION FOR INCOME-TAX PURPOSES OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANIES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to allow a deduction for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill, together with the explanatory statement, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1007) to allow a deduction, for income-tax purposes, of contributions or gifts to volunteer fire companies, introduced by Mr. MARTIN, was read

twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 23 (o) of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to the so-called "charitable contribution" deduction for individuals) is hereby amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of paragraph (5) thereof, and by inserting at the end of paragraph (6) the word "or", and by adding after paragraph (6) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(7) a volunteer fire company or association, not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any shareholder or individual, and operated exclusively for the benefit of the public;".

SEC. 2. Section 23 (q) of such code (relating to the so-called "charitable contribution" deduction for corporations) is hereby amended by inserting at the end of paragraph (4) the word "or", and by adding after paragraph (4) a new paragraph to read as follows:

"(5) a volunteer fire company or association, not organized for profit and no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any shareholder or individual, and operated exclusively for the benefit of the public;".

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1948.

The statement presented by Mr. MARTIN was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MARTIN

The purpose of this bill is to make possible a substantial increase in the effectiveness of the unselfish and praiseworthy service performed by volunteer fire companies and their members throughout the Nation.

It is designed to encourage more generous financial support of the volunteer fire companies by making contributions to such associations deductible for income-tax purposes in the same manner that donations to charitable and nonprofit educational organizations are now deductible.

Volunteer fire companies depend, for the most part, upon contributions from individuals and business concerns in the communities they serve.

The extent to which our communities rely upon volunteer fire companies for protection from fire is shown by the fact that there are upward of 14,000 volunteer associations in the United States with a total membership in excess of 650,000. These figures are most impressive when we consider that there are only 900 full-time paid fire departments, supported by local taxation, in all the 48 States.

In my own State of Pennsylvania nearly 200,000 public-spirited citizens are enrolled as members of about 4,000 volunteer associations. I cannot praise too highly the tremendous value of the civic responsibility they have accepted.

In the case of paid fire companies, supported by public funds, income-tax deduction is permitted for taxes paid by individuals and business firms for fire protection. To my mind voluntary contributions paid by citizens of rural communities should be tax exempt in the same manner.

The bill I have introduced is identical with H. R. 1822, sponsored by the distinguished Congressman at Large from Delaware, the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS.

Representative BOGGS has given a great deal of thought to the problems of the volunteer fire companies. In discussing this proposal he has pointed out that the volunteer fire associations, to a great extent, are educational organizations. For many years they have conducted campaigns to teach the public modern methods of fire prevention. They have conducted classes among their members to train them in the latest methods of fire fighting and fire prevention that are constantly being developed.

It is most unfortunate that these improved methods cannot be applied in many communities because lack of funds prevents the acquisition of the necessary equipment and apparatus.

My object in offering this bill at this time is to give ample opportunity for its consideration in committee and I ask that it be acted upon favorably. I join with Representative BOGGS in urging that the situation which hampers the work of the volunteer fire companies be corrected by enacting this bill into law.

## CONSOLIDATION OF GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 18), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That, effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-first Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the 'Consolidated General Appropriation Act of ——' (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the amounts to be transferred between such appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from each appropriation referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from the balances of prior appropriations;

"(E) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C) and (D); and

"(F) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of such fiscal year from the appropriations referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during such fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, for each wholly owned Government corporation or other agency of the Government which is authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury of the United States and which uses a checking account maintained with the Treasurer of the United States for that purpose (A) the estimated expenditures (other than retirement of borrowing) to be made out of such checking account for the fiscal year, (B) the estimated receipts (other than borrowing) to be deposited in such checking account for such fiscal year, and (C) the difference between (A) and (B).

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conforms with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon."

## INVESTIGATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH-DISEASE PROBLEMS

Mr. THYE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 72), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

*Resolved*, That the authority of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 223, Eightieth Congress, agreed to June 12, 1948 (providing for an investigation of all problems related to foot-and-mouth disease and its incidence in neighboring countries), is hereby continued during the Eighty-first Congress; and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased to $8,000.

## AMENDMENT OF ECONOMIC COOPERATION ACT OF 1948—AMENDMENT

Mr. BREWSTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 833) to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed.

TRANSPORTATION COSTS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 236) to clarify and formulate a consistent and coordinated national policy with respect to transportation costs in interstate commerce; to strengthen the antitrust laws of the United States and to provide for their more effective enforcement; and to promote competition by permitting sellers to have access to distant markets, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REORGANIZATION OF GOVERNMENT AGENCIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 526) to provide for the reorganization of Government agencies, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and ordered to be printed.

EQUIPMENT FOR USE BY EXAMINATION APPLICANTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. LANGER submitted an amendment in the nature of the substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 86) to provide equipment for use by examination applicants, which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR ORDERED TO BE PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, and ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 2313. An act to suspend certain import taxes on copper; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the Office of War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 2632. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution to provide for the acquisition and operation of the Freedom Train by the Archivist of the United States, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

ELECTRIFICATION OF RURAL AMERICA—ADDRESS BY SENATOR AIKEN

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the electrification of rural America, delivered by Senator AIKEN before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association in New York on February 2, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

CURBING THE OCTOPUS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOBEY

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Curbing the Octopus," delivered by him on February 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE MR. WINANT I KNEW—ARTICLE BY ETHEL M. JOHNSON

[Mr. TOBEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Mr. Winant I Knew," written by Ethel M. Johnson, and reprinted from the South Atlantic Quarterly of January 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR MILLIKIN

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by Senator MILLIKIN at Denver, Colo., on February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

SENATOR AT LARGE—EDITORIAL FROM BOSTON POST

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senator at Large," published in the Boston Post of February 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECLAMATION PROGRAM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "What We May Expect Out of Washington," delivered by him before the Nebraska Reclamation Association, Lincoln, Nebr., on February 10, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOUNDER'S DAY ADDRESS AT TEMPLE UNIVERSITY BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

[Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator HENDRICKSON at the founder's day ceremonies, Temple University, Philadelphia, on February 12, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECONOMIC FACTS IN RELATION TO TAFT-HARTLEY ACT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement entitled "Economic Facts Condemn Taft-Hartley Act," made by Senator HUMPHREY before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which appears in the Appendix.]

DISAGREEMENTS AMONG SUPREME COURT JUSTICES—ADDRESS BY MR. JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of disagreements in opinions among Justices of the Supreme Court, delivered by him before the section of judicial administration of the American Bar Association, Seattle, Wash., September 8, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM M. BOYLE, JR., BEFORE TRUMAN VICTORY DINNER AT KANSAS CITY, MO.

[Mr. MYERS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by William M. Boyle, Jr., assistant to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, before the Truman victory dinner at Kansas City, Mo., on December 7, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHALLENGE TO WESTERN CIVILIZATION—ADDRESS BY DR. BURTON L. FRENCH

[Mr. BRICKER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix a radio address entitled "The Challenge to Western Civilization," delivered by Dr. Burton L. French, professor emeritus, Department of Government, Miami University, Oxford, Ohio, on January 9, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY J. FINLEY WILSON AT RALLY TO END SEGREGATION AND DISCRIMINATION

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by J. Finley Wilson, grand exalted ruler, Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World, at a rally to end segregation and discrimination, in Washington, D. C., on February 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE LAW PROFESSION AND GENERAL EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY J. VELMA KEEN

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Law Profession and General Education," by J. Velma Keen, of the Tallahassee, Fla., bar, which appears in the Appendix.]

MONTE CASSINO—ARTICLE BY ISAAC DON LEVINE

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Monte Cassino," written by Isaac Don Levine, editor of Plain Talk, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOOD FOR EUROPE—ARTICLE BY MASON KOENIG

[Mr. ANDERSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Food for Europe, But With an If," written by Mason Koenig and published in the January 1949 issue of Survey, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPUBLICAN PARTY POLICY—EDITORIAL FROM LINCOLN (NEBR.) JOURNAL

[Mr. BUTLER (for himself and Mr. WHERRY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial discussing Republican Party policy and entitled "Who Was a Coward?", published in the Lincoln, Nebr., Journal of February 13, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

BREAK-EVEN POINTS IN FARMING—ARTICLE BY SHERMAN E. JOHNSON

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Break-Even Points in Farming," by Sherman E. Johnson, appearing in the January 1949 issue of the Agricultural Situation, published by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, which appears in the Appendix.]

A DEFENSE OF SENATOR TAFT—ARTICLE BY EDWIN A. LAHEY

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article headed "Defends TAFT as No Ogre," written by Edwin Lahey, and published in the January 31, 1949, issue of the Chicago Daily News, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRESLEY D. BOWEN—ARTICLE FROM BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relating to Presley D. Bowen, Chairman of the Federal Assay Commission, published in a recent issue of the Baltimore Evening Sun, which appears in the Appendix.]

APPOINTMENT OF NEGRO TO RALEIGH (N. C.) SCHOOL BOARD

[Mr. BROUGHTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Negro Attorney Named to Board," published in the Raleigh News and Observer of Raleigh, N. C., of February 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF CLOTURE RULE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as I was about to say a few moments ago when I reported Senate Resolution 15, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] and I are recommending to Senators that no action be taken on the cloture resolution, which we jointly submitted, until Monday, February 28, for what we believe to be good reasons.

The resolution will not appear on the calendar until next Monday, February 21. Under a standing order of the Senate the junior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has been designated to read George Washington's Farewell Address on February 22. For a number of years it has been customary to hold Jackson Day meetings on the 24th of this month, and a number of Senators intend to travel considerable distances to address various gatherings. They must leave ahead of that date, and it will not be convenient for them to return to their seats in the Senate until over the week end. Under those circumstances I think courtesy requires that there shall be a distinct understanding that no definite action will be taken on this controversial question until they return.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Arizona mean that the resolution will be made the unfinished business on Monday, February 28; or do I correctly understand that it will be made the unfinished business on the 24th of February, but no action will be taken on it until the 28th?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I do not think it is important whether such action is taken on one or the other of those dates; but I will say that on Monday, February 28, a motion will no doubt be made to make the cloture resolution the unfinished business of the Senate; and, as one of the Senators who sponsored Senate Resolution 15, I wish now to state that on February 28 I shall seek an opportunity to present an argument in favor of its adoption by the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to say that the Senator's statement is perfectly agreeable, so far as the junior Senator from California is concerned. I know the Senator from Arizona would also wish to point out to the other Members of the Senate that printed copies of the hearings are now available, so that anyone who wishes to study the hearings may have a chance to do so between now and the 28th of this month.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; copies of the hearings on Senate Resolution 15 have been sent to the offices of all Senators.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I think the distinguished Senator from Arizona, who is chairman of the committee, has stated the facts correctly. However, I wish the record to show, further, that the minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], along with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], met with the Senator from Illinois and agreed upon this program. At that time we agreed not to give any information to the press until the Senator from Arizona had an opportunity to explain the situation on the floor of the Senate, with the further thought that if there were any questions about it, they could be cleared up before the Members of the Senate in the session today.

It is the intention, let me say to the Senator from Arizona, who agrees with me in this position, to take up this matter definitely on February the 28th. There will not be any question about it. So far as I am concerned, that is the schedule which has been agreed upon, and the resolution will be taken up.

I wish to thank my friend, the Senator from California, who has been very much interested in this resolution, for agreeing to that proposition. It is my understanding that all the Republican members of the Rules Committee and a majority of the Democrats of the Rules Committee have agreed to the statement of facts which has been submitted here by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

EXCERPT FROM HEARING HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an excerpt from the hearing held before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on February 15, 1949, which includes testimony given by Mr. William Green, the head of the American Federation of Labor, given before the committee.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM HEARING HELD BEFORE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE ON SENATE BILL 249, FEBRUARY 15, 1949

Senator MORSE. I completely agree and if I should be completely wrong in my interpretation of the law—and all lawyers are frequently wrong as to their interpretation of the law, as I have been in the past and expect to be again in the future—but if the future should prove that I am mistaken on this very important point of constitutional law, you will find me out barnstorming this country if the Supreme Court ever rules that this power exists for a constitutional amendment taking it away because I don't want any one man, just as I don't like to give the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board the power you and I are objecting to, neither do I want to give to the President the power to exercise what might be caprice in time of great national stress by seizing the property of this country and moving the Army in, for example, to support him in such a seizure.

Mr. GREEN. I think we join with you in that, Senator.

Senator TAFT. Mr. Green and I perhaps will join you in that barnstorming tour. I look forward to it with a good deal of pleasure.

Senator MORSE. You spoke this morning in your testimony with regard to the limitations of the Taft-Hartley law on the political activities of unions. I make this statement as a foundation for the question I want to ask. I completely agree with you and have said so many times that I think the political-activity section of the Taft-Hartley law should be removed, and hope it will be. However, yesterday on the floor of the Senate there was a discussion by the Senator from Missouri and myself in regard to an Associated Press dispatch concerning a purported resolution that the A. F. of L. had passed to the effect that the A. F. of L. proposed to participate in political activity to the extent of running men for State legislatures and putting them on the A. F. of L. pay roll because they couldn't serve in the legislature and meet the financial expenditures of serving.

The Senator from Missouri and I expressed our complete disapproval of the basic principle of any such resolution. The distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] raised the question as to whether or not we weren't commenting on something without having the official statement. We said that was, of course, true, but it was in the press, it seemed to be a reliable report, and if it wasn't a reliable report, the A. F. of L. most certainly should make its position clear.

I now ask you, Mr. Green, if you can advise this committee because I think it has a direct bearing upon this political-activity section of the Taft-Hartley law, whether it is the position of the A. F. of L. that through its political activities it proposes to run men for the State legislatures and then put them on the A. F. of L. pay roll while they are serving?

Senator DONNELL. Might I interject just a moment for the purpose of absolute accuracy of the record?

Senator MORSE. I want it accurate.

Senator DONNELL. In the discussion on the floor of the Senate yesterday it was not stated that a resolution had been adopted by the A. F. of L. The press dispatch to which the Senator from Oregon refers was made by a high-ranking A. F. of L. official in a written statement presented to the labor league administrative council. By the labor league is meant Labor's League for Political Education, which is described in the article as the American Federation of Labor's political arm.

The article in the Kansas City Times in which this dispatch appeared also stated:

"Thus it was proposed and virtually decided that the league will help elect and thereafter augment the salaries of legislators endorsed by labor where they have insufficient funds of their own to get by."

Senator MORSE. I accept that. My question, Mr. Green, is: Has the A. F. of L. adopted a policy of supporting candidates for the State legislature in the future with the contemplation of putting the successful candidates on the A. F. of L. pay roll while they serve in the legislature?

Mr. GREEN. I am very glad to answer your question and do so in a very frank way. The American Federation of Labor never took such action. The executive council which met at Miami beginning January 31 and was in session for about 10 days never considered or acted upon any such proposal, and between conventions there is no agency clothed with authority to act upon such a question except the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

It is clothed with authority to deal with questions of that kind between conventions and only between conventions. No other agency, no other authority, not even the executive officers of the federation of labor is clothed with authority to take action on a question of that kind.

So I can say to you truthfully, and the records of the meeting will show, that no consideration to this question or any action was taken at any sessions of the executive council's meeting.

Now I will tell you where I think the story originated. Shall I tell you?

Senator MORSE. Yes. I want to say I am very glad you are making this statement be-

cause I think it was very desirable that the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Oregon raised it yesterday because I can tell you from the reports I have already received that great injury has been done your organization by the story because I think widespread public disapproval would flow from the adoption of any such policy, and rightly so.

Mr. GREEN. Now, I think I am right on this, that the story grew out of a statement prepared by the representatives of Labor's League for Political Education. That league is functioning for educational purposes to acquaint our membership with developments in Congress and in State legislatures and with what is being considered and what is being acted upon, and so on.

Now the question came up as to what we could do or what we might be able to do in bringing about a repeal of these antilabor laws in about 12 or 13 States which were passed by State legislatures. In Maine we repealed one by a referendum vote. In Massachusetts we repealed one by a referendum vote at the last election. In New Mexico, I think it was, we repealed one at the last election.

The Supreme Court in its decision, made recently, upholding the constitutionality of these laws, made it very clear that the only way the workers in these different States could bring about a repeal of these acts was by calling upon the legislature and having enough in the legislature who are members of the legislature, State legislature, to vote to repeal them.

Senator DONNELL. May I ask Mr. Green whether he is referring to the recent decision in the case of *Lincoln Federal Labor Union, A. F. of L. et al.* v. *Northwestern Iron & Metal Co. et al.*, and *George Whitaker* v. *the State of North Carolina?*

Mr. GREEN. Yes; that is right. Many of these States in the different laws make the closed-shop contracts illegal and prevent the workers, just like the Taft-Hartley law, from entering into closed-shop agreements. In the discussion that was brought up about it it was pointed out that there were many workingmen in these different States who could be elected to the State legislatures, but the trouble was that for economic reasons they were prevented from doing so because of the small amount of pay that was paid to the State legislator, which was too small for him to accept and care for his family.

Senator DONNELL. Where did this discussion come up?

Mr. GREEN. I understand it was reported to me that it came up in the discussion of, shall I say, publicity representatives of Labor's League for Political Education.

Senator DONNELL. What is that organization as referred to the A. F. of L.?

Mr. GREEN. That is an organization formed by the American Federation of Labor for educational and political reasons.

Senator DONNELL. Is it correct to call it, as the Associated Press dispatch does, the American Federation of Labor's political arm?

Mr. GREEN. They designate it that. I have never designated it as our political arm. It is Labor's League for Political and Educational purposes. Some one of the representatives there referred to that in a publicity statement only, and no action was taken on it so far as I understand, even by the executive authority of Labor's League for Political Education. I know no action was taken on it by our executive council because it was never brought to the attention of the council, and as a result of it, it was given a wide press play with statements that we were going to do that, and so on.

I can tell you truthfully there is no thought of the American Federation of Labor engaging in any such actions or such a policy. Now there is the story as best I can tell you.

Senator MORSE. I think it is a very important story and I think it is very appropriate that that story go out to the American people today.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Senator DONNELL. May I say to the Senator from Oregon that I think it is likewise important, but I should like in due time to examine Mr. Green further with reference to the matter. I don't want to infringe on the Senator's time.

Mr. GREEN. That will be very satisfactory.

Senator MORSE. I wanted to make clear your position because, as I said on the floor of the Senate yesterday, any such reported action by any labor organization in this country in my opinion would be a blow at sound representative government.

Now with that out of the way, I come back to this political restriction section of the Taft-Hartley law. Have you found that the Taft-Hartley law, Mr. Green, has interfered with political activities on the part of A. F. of L. unions because of its terminology?

Mr. GREEN. Oh, yes. It has prevented A. F. of L. unions from using funds—that is, the local organizations—for political purposes.

Senator MORSE. Do you believe that a voluntary organization of workers, namely, a trade-union, should have the right in this country if they wish to exercise it through democratic action within their union to engage in political activity if they so desire?

Mr. GREEN. I do. I believe they should because we always have ever since the organization of the American Federation of Labor, ever since it was formed. No one ever challenged that right heretofore.

Senator MORSE. Has it been the experience of labor, both on a State legislature level and on the Federal congressional level, that the attitudes of men elected to legislative bodies, their attitudes on labor have a direct bearing upon the strength of organized labor in this country?

Mr. GREEN. Certainly. They possess the power, they are clothed with the power and authority to take action which affects very seriously the life of the trade-unions, their very existence. We have found through experience as our organizations grow and expand numerically and otherwise, that we are in a far better position to deal on a more equitable basis with powerful corporations than we are when we are weakened or controlled by Government intervention and Government administration.

That point makes it clear that we are tremendously interested in the action of Congress and of State legislatures because they can take action that will limit, hinder, and weaken the activities of our trade-union movement.

Senator MORSE. In your opinion, has labor come to learn from experience that if it wants to protect its legitimate rights from being damaged by the passage of unwise legislation, it must keep itself in a position where it can support its friends and oppose its enemies in political campaigns?

Mr. GREEN. Yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. And in your opinion the operation of the Taft-Hartley law has greatly restricted labor's exercise of what it considers to be its democratic right as an organization to support its friends and oppose its enemies in political campaigns?

Mr. GREEN. Absolutely, yes, sir.

Senator MORSE. Now I turn, Mr. Green, to the question of the closed shop. Prior to the passage of the Taft-Hartley law the various labor organizations federated with the American Federation of Labor had entered into a great many closed shop collective bargaining agreements with American employers; is that not true?

* * * * *

Senator HUMPHREY. All right, now, the one question that was asked you, and I think it was a very good thing that you gave us the answer this morning, because I was disturbed to hear Senator DONNELL and Senator MORSE speak as they did speak on the floor of the Senate in reference to a statement which supposedly emanated from the American Federation of Labor about placing legislators on the A. F. of L. pay roll. I hope that we will have one of the Senators who will insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or reply to that statement so that we will have a complete record.

Mr. GREEN. I hope so, myself.

Senator HUMPHREY. I shall personally see that it is done.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you.

Senator DONNELL. I wish you would include the further examination of Mr. Green on that same subject.

Senator HUMPHREY. I will be very glad to do that. We will take all that Mr. Green has to say on that subject.

I wonder whether or not, Mr. Green—I personally would be opposed to it, and I want you to know that.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. I feel that it would be a very bad precedent.

I did hear Senator MORSE, however, say that he has asked on the floor of the Senate that every legislator divulge the sources of his income, not just have this business, you know, not just to get this pious look when it gets to be that way, just onesided look, like it is going to be provided with a little sum of money to keep the wolf from the door and keep the bacon and eggs coming home.

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Senator HUMPHREY. Have you ever heard of any legislators representing any corporations that were ever elected to office?

Mr. GREEN. Well, I cannot name any at the moment.

Senator HUMPHREY. I can. [Laughter.] I mean who have as their clients——

Mr. GREEN. It has been my impression that there have been a good many representatives of corporations in Congress, in the Congress of the United States.

Senator HUMPHREY. Well, all of us have to have a means of income. I think that is perfectly true.

Mr. GREEN. Yes; that is true.

Senator HUMPHREY. Do you think there would be any difference, for example, if the American Federation of Labor put a man on their pay roll, let us say, as an organizer, after he was elected to the legislature, as compared to a man—I am talking about the legislature now; we are not talking about the honorable body of the United States Congress—you think there would be any difference between that and having a man who was elected to the legislature who, let us say, was an attorney for a public utility?

## AWARD BY VIRGINIA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE MEDAL TO RICHARD F. PENCE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD a statement of the award by the junior chamber of commerce of the distinguished service medal to Attorney Richard F. Pence, of Roanoke, Va., as the outstanding young man of 1948.

He was nominated for the award by the attorney general of Virginia, the Honorable J. Lindsay Almond, and Mr. Pence is very deserving of the high tribute paid him.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARLOTTESVILLE, February 19.—The Virginia Junior Chamber of Commerce tonight named Attorney Richard F. Pence, of Roanoke, to receive its distinguished-service

award as the outstanding young man of 1948 at a banquet in the Monticello Hotel here. The presentation was made by Frank Rogers, Roanoke attorney and vice president of the University of Virginia Law School Alumni Association.

The award was given to Mr. Pence, in part, for his service as civil and police justice for Roanoke from which position he resigned in November to resume his law practice. He passed judgment in over 20,000 criminal cases and 3,000 civil cases.

Mr. Pence was nominated for the award by Attorney General J. Lindsay Almond, Jr. In his nomination brief, Attorney General Almond said of Mr. Spence: "He brought his court to a high level of efficiency not heretofore attained and has won an unparalleled reputation for decisions characterized by foresight, practicality, and justice—impartial and equal for every race, creed, and nationality."

Mr. Pence is president of the Roanoke City-County Public Forum, Business Men's Club, and Patchwork Players; chairman of the Roanoke Battalion, United States Navy Organized Reserves; vice president of the Roanoke chapter, Mental Hygiene Association of Virginia, and Mental Hygiene Service; vice chairman of the board of stewards, Green Memorial Methodist Church; a member of the Welfare Conference; YMCA; Roanoke Council, Boy Scouts of America executive board; Community Fund; Kiwanis; Junior Chamber of Commerce; and Roanoke, Virginia, and American Bar Associations.

He is also a member of the board of directors of the American Red Cross, Community Concert Association, Family Service Organization, Travelers Aid Society, Touchdown Club, and the Western Virginia Division of the Automobile Association of America.

He was chairman of the Roanoke Navy Day program last year and is a recipient of the Roanoke Junior Chamber of Commerce Distinguished Service Award.

Mr. Spence received his BA degree from the University of Virginia in 1935 and his LLB degree from Harvard Law School in 1939. He was admitted to the Virginia bar in 1939.

He has been secretary and clerk to Justice H. B. Gregory, of the Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals, and assistant Commonwealth's Attorney for Roanoke. He is now a member of the law firm of Dodson and Pence.

He was in the Navy for 4 years and served as director of the legal department of the United States Navy Military Government on Okinawa. He was discharged in 1946 as a lieutenant commander.

Judges for the award were Dr. Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the Richmond News Leader; William E. Blewett, vice president of the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Co., and Mr. Rogers. James V. Creasy, of Charlottesville, was the Jaycee State chairman of the award project. Also on the committee were Charles F. Clark, of Roanoke, and Arthur S. Beauchamp, of Newport News.

Principal speaker at the banquet following the award presentation was Colgate W. Darden, president of the University of Virginia.

## PROGRESS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in common with every other member of the Senate, I have been following with keen interest the remarkable work which has been done by the Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, commonly referred to as the Hoover Commission. My interest is perhaps enhanced by the fact that I was the Senate author of the bill which set up this nonpartisan commission. I have followed its work as closely as is possible without actually being a member. I know the intelligent way in which the work has been subdivided and organized, and I know that the men who made up the various so-called task forces were leaders in their respective fields, and that their names constitute a sort of roster of American ability.

Now the Commission has begun its reports, and of course some of these reports touch on controversial matters. It could not be otherwise. The work of the Commission would be without value if it did not stir some strong emotions.

Congress has a very heavy responsibility insofar as the report of this Commission is concerned because we must give legislative effect to the recommendations of the Commission. There is no doubt that this report will increase the efficiency of the Federal Government very much insofar as service to the American citizen is concerned, and the estimate is made that if all its terms are put into effect there will be a saving of $3,000,000,000 without any curtailment of service. Three billion dollars, Mr. President, is a very large sum, even today.

For all these reasons there is a great responsibility on Congress to give effect to the terms of the Hoover Report. The good results to be achieved and the high caliber of the personnel involved create such a strong presumption in favor of this report that it must be presumed to be right unless definitely proven to be wrong.

The first action which Congress must take is to pass legislation which will enable the President to put this reorganization into effect. This is the only way in which Government can be reorganized, for the very simple reason that by its very nature Congress cannot supervise a multiplicity of detailed reorganization measures. Let it be said that in enacting legislation giving the President the power to reorganize the Congress does not give up its ultimate control over the situation. If the President reorganizes in a way which to Congress seems mistaken, the Congress has a complete opportunity to prevent any harm from being done.

It is, however, of the utmost importance that this limited authority be given to the President without any exceptions being made. If any one agency is exempted from the operations of the Reorganization Act the American people are deprived of the benefit of whatever economies might flow from the reorganizing of the exempted agency, and an invitation is in effect extended to every other agency of the Government to get itself exempted, too. Obviously, if one agency is to be left out, all the other agencies of the Government will feel that they ought to be left out.

For all these reasons, it is very disturbing to note that in the House of Representatives the reorganization bill was amended so as to exempt the armed services from the normal scope of the Reorganization Act. About one-third of our budget today is attributable to the armed services; and it is certain that at least one-third—and perhaps more—of potential economies are to be effected in that field. I understand that a great deal of political pressure was generated in order to amend the bill in the House in this way, and that this pressure came from those who are interested in maintaining the Army engineers in their present status insofar as Federal contracts are concerned. Mr. President, I share the general admiration for the technical proficiency of the Army engineers. Nothing which I intend to say will reflect in any way on their technical proficiency. But it is perfectly conceivable that the statutory directive under which the Army engineers operate could put them in a wasteful relationship with other contract-making agencies, such as the Bureau of Reclamation, and that this might cause a great waste of money.

In any event, there can be no excuse for seeking to exempt the Army engineers from the operations of the Reorganization Act. Yet this is precisely what is being done.

In order to substantiate my assertion, I should like to read a copy of a telegram which was sent to a man whose name I am not at liberty to reveal. It came from Fargo, N. Dak., and reads as follows:

FARGO, N. DAK.

House bill H. R. 1569, Senate bill 526, would eliminate contracts by United States engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, etc., and create Public Works Department who would purchase machinery and do all Government work. This would eliminate distributors and place Government in competition with contractors. House takes this up Monday, Senate Wednesday. Imperative we have immediate action. Suggest you wire opposition to committee members at once. Those from our area on Senate committee: JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas; KARL MUNDT, South Dakota; HUBERT HUMPHREY, Minnesota; ARTHUR VANDENBERG, Michigan, ANDREW SCHOEPPEL, House members: WILLIAM DAWSON, Illinois; HAROLD G. LOVRE, South Dakota; KARSTEN, Missouri; JOHN BLATNIK, Minnesota; RICHARD BOLLING, Missouri; RALPH HARVEY, Indiana. These are committee members on Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments.

Mr. President, I think it is deplorable and selfish for this type of pressure to be exerted. How can it be denied that this is a crass attempt to put personal selfish interest above public welfare. Frankly, I was shocked when the contents of this telegram were made available to me.

But I have found out that even more reprehensible actions have been taken. I have seen a letter, coming from one of our greatest industrial cities in America, signed by a prominent businessman—I am not at liberty to give his name—which reads as follows:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

I know you will be interested that our chamber of commerce was approached by the district engineer of the Army, asking that they oppose the Hoover Commission's proposal to transfer the civil functions of the engineers to the proposed Department of Public Works.

At a meeting of the board of directors today, a motion was made and seconded that we support the Army engineers, at which time I made a statement that while I had the highest respect for the engineers, I did not feel the chamber of commerce should oppose the work of the Hoover Commission, as certainly the Commission was composed of very high-grade men and that Mr. Hoover deserved our every support for the great job which he was doing for our country. I was ably supported by—

Another name which I am not at liberty to mention—

who made a motion that the chamber not oppose any of the provisions of the Hoover report, and this was carried almost unanimously.

Yours very truly.

Mr. President, we are accustomed to witnessing pressure being exerted by private citizens of America, and they have a right to exert this pressure even though one may disagree with what they are trying to accomplish. But when officers of the Army engineers undertake to stir up an agitation against the report of this eminent, distinguished and patriotic Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch, the time has come to call a halt. When an officer in the Army engineers undertakes to exert political pressure on Congress to tell Congress what it ought to do on a broad matter of national policy, that officer is stepping out of bounds and he is guilty of just as much of an impropriety as a Member of this Senate would be if he undertook to go onto a job which an Army engineer was supervising and tell him how he ought to mix the concrete.

The Army engineers have a fine standing in America. I know I have always honored them and regarded them as a shining example of all that is disinterested and patriotic. But they will lose their fine standing very rapidly if they, or any other group in the Government similarly situated, attempt to obstruct these praiseworthy efforts to promote the efficiency of the Government.

I have heard a good deal of talk in the past few years about the dangers of militarism in our Government and I have never paid any attention to it because I have had a life-long contact with military people, and among the ones I know I have never seen the slightest desire to take control of civilian affairs. The instance I have just cited is the first example I have ever seen of the military attempting to dominate the civil functions of the Government. Mr. President, I deplore it deeply and hope that it will not happen again.

### ARMY AND NAVY NOMINATIONS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session, I report numerous routine promotions in the National Military Establishment, and ask for their immediate consideration, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland asks unanimous consent for the consideration of certain nominations as in executive session. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, my attention was diverted to another matter momentarily. Reserving the right to object, may I inquire whether there was any objection to the nominations?

Mr. TYDINGS. There was no objection. They were unanimously reported, and they are purely routine.

### NOMINATION OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Secretary of the Navy, Mr. John L. Sullivan, will be absent from Washington for about 2 weeks in connection with the Navy maneuvers in the Caribbean. Several of the important positions under him have not been filled. Among them is the position of Assistant Secretary of the Navy, to which the President has nominated John Theodore Koehler. Mr. Koehler appeared before our committee this morning and made a very creditable showing. I was directed by the committee to ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, to report his nomination, and request that it be confirmed and the President notified, so that he may be on the job while Mr. Sullivan is absent on the Atlantic.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire, does Mr. Koehler come from Wisconsin?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. Koehler came from Pennsylvania originally, and is living in Maryland at the present time. The committee is so advised.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection as in executive session, the nomination will be confirmed, and the President notified forthwith.

### EXTENSION OF WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the calendar, order No. 37, is a bill (S. 829) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House bill 2402.

The VICE PRESIDENT. House bill 2402, which is identical with the Senate bill, has come over from the House. Is the Senator asking that the House bill be considered?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2402) to extend the office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 2402 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 829 is indefinitely postponed.

### THIRTY-FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, 1 year ago today I spoke here on the floor of the Senate on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of Lithuania's independence.

On that occasion I noted with profound sadness the unhappy events which have led up to that nation's total disappearance behind the implacable shrouds of the iron curtain. I expressed my fervent hope that the day was not too distant when the sunlight of freedom and the blessings of liberty would again be enjoyed by the people of Lithuania. I voiced my concern that the United States seemed to be shutting its eyes to the conditions which persist in that unhappy small nation.

A year has passed and yesterday marked the thirty-first anniversary of the declaration of independence by the people of Lithuania at Vilna on February 16, 1918. Again there is little cause for rejoicing or celebration. Our loyal Americans of Lithuanian descent, so many of whom fought in World War II to preserve individual dignity and freedom, have every reason to look to the Government of the United States for support and encouragement. They know that in Lithuania men and women are deprived of every possibility to enjoy civil rights, freedom of press, speech, and assembly, the right to express their will in free elections, and their right to worship in accordance with their religious convictions. They can tell you better than I of the mass deportations, the arrests, the quick trials, the reign of terror.

We in this country have rightly joined with other moral peoples in condemning the recent tragic case of Cardinal Mindszenty. But do we realize that in Lithuania there has been a systematic persecution of leading prelates of the church together with their assistants and associates? As part of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point the statement of the Supreme Lithuania Committee of Liberation dated October 15, 1947, contained in its appeal to the United Nations, describing the treatment to which members of the clergy have been subjected under Soviet enslavement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The wave of arrests has especially affected members of the clergy. On February 19, 1946, V. Borisevicius, Bishop of Telsiai, was arrested and sentenced to death. In the middle of December 1946, his auxiliary, Bishop P. Ramanauskas, was arrested and deported. T. Matulionis, Bishop of Kaisiadorys, was deported at the same time; he had previously endured Soviet imprisonment for 12 years (1920–32) and had been threatened by the Gestapo with confinement in a concentration camp. Recent persistent reports indicate the arrest and deportation of M. Reinys, Archbishop of Vilnius. Thus, at the present time there remains only one bishop in the entire country. Also arrested were the closest assistants of the bishops: Prelates Labukas, Pukys, Olsauskas, and others. That one may appreciate the wide range of arrests in the church, it is enough to mention those in Kaunas alone. Here there are 12 churches. Up to the beginning of 1947, the following Catholic priests of Kaunas had been deported: Canon V. Kieleska, pastor of the Carmelite parish; Rev. J. Dagilis, pastor of Vilijampole parish; Reverend Fabijanskas; Reverend Bubnys, pastor of the Resurrection Church; the Salesian Fathers, S. Gustas and B. Paukstys, of the Igulos Church; the prorectors of the Priests' Seminary, Canon Rauda, and Reverend Kuzmickas; the Jesuit Father Biliunas, of the Jesuit Church; Rev. J. Zelvys, of St. Anthony's Church, managed to go into hiding. In the provincial churches, the following were arrested: Reverends Janulaitis, Adomaitis, Ylius, Jonas Grigaitis, Sauklys, Mieldazys, Sliumpa, Vaisnora, Nagulevicius, Guteravicius, Gaizutis, Cimielis; Franciscan Fathers; Cepulis, Puedzlunas, Andraitis, and others—some 70 priests in all. Fearing persecution, about 150 priests have gone into hiding.

Mr. LODGE. These and other reported acts of incredible brutality are so shocking that it seems wholly inadequate merely to stand aside and refuse recognition to the unjustified annexation of Lithuania and the other Baltic countries.

It seems to me that we must do more. We should exhaust every possible means at our disposal to help this brave little nation resume her rightful place among the free and peace-loving countries of the world.

This will take courage, patience, and intelligence. To all Americans who have ties of friendship and family with the people of Lithuania, let me again express my profound hope that a way will be found to restore to that nation the liberty and freedom and prosperity which she deserves. May Lithuania's Independence Day be a day of true rejoicing.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate that yesterday, February 16, marked the thirty-first anniversary of a declaration of independence by one of the liberty-loving peoples of the world—the Lithuanians.

Our country and Lithuania are linked by a common devotion to the ideals of freedom. Many thousands of our finest citizens are descended from Lithuanians who came to the United States from their ancient home on the Baltic Sea.

In cities and towns in many parts of our Nation, Americans of Lithuanian ancestry gathered at dinners and mass meetings to celebrate the Lithuanian day of independence. Because Lithuania has been occupied by a Soviet army since June 1940, the people there are not able to participate in open demonstrations. Their relatives and allies in more fortunate countries must celebrate for them.

Our Government has refused to recognize the conquest of Lithuania carried out by the Russian armed forces. We will never recognize the legality of such a conquest. Our diplomatic representatives have repeatedly protested against it to the Soviet Government.

The American people are convinced that the whole civilization of the world rests upon the rule of reason, of justice, and of law. Brutal oppression of a small nation by a large nation strikes at the very foundations of our international relationships.

Through the years of Soviet occupation, the people of Lithuania have never abandoned the struggle to restore their lost liberties. Hundreds of leaders in their flight for freedom have been deported to Siberia. Others have been arrested and executed. Many have been sent to Russian prisons because they would not bow to their Red rulers.

Our sympathies and our friendship go out to the Lithuanian people. We are sure that their gallant fight will have its reward. We know that the forces of liberty will always triumph over the forces of tyranny and terror in the long march of mankind.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the occasion of the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HERBERT R. O'CONOR

On this, the thirty-first anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Lithuania, all patriots of Lithuanian birth or ancestry throughout the world deserve a heartfelt salute from the people of the United States. The establishment of our own great country stemmed from the determination of our colonial forebears to rid themselves of oppression, and to set up a homeland where freedom would prevail. And our forebears were willing to fight, and die if need be, to realize their heart's desire.

What our forebears dared and suffered has been dared and suffered not for a few years, but for centuries, by the gallant people of Lithuania. They have plumbed the bitter depths of despair and suffering, the like of which the people of America have never known, and, God willing, may never know.

In their darkest moments today, however, every Lithuanian and person of Lithuanian ancestry may recall with pride the glories of Lithuania during the middle ages when, under Vytatus in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, they were the foremost state of all Europe. They can take consolation, too, in the magnificent achievements of the generation that followed the close of World War I and the proclamation of Lithuania as a free and independent state, on February 16, 1918.

No people in all the world have ever given more convincing evidence of their capacity for successful self-government than did the people of Lithuania following their reemergence as a free nation 31 years ago. They succeeded despite all the ravages of that first world war, and notwithstanding the looting of their natural resources during the generations under the Czars. With little opportunity during the several centuries immediately preceding to learn or practice the art of government, they, nevertheless, in the short period between World War I and II, were able to establish their new republic as a stable and enlightened member of the family of nations.

There is no possible ground for self-condemnation on the part of any resident or friend of Lithuania because of the loss of their freedom following the outbreak of World War II. First overrun and overwhelmed by the Russian hosts, then invaded by the Nazis under Hitler, and ruled rigorously for 3 years as a part of a new administrative province, Ostland, the unhappy and unfortunate people of Lithuania and the other Baltic states found even worse horrors in store for them in 1944 when the Russians once again poured over their beloved homeland like a tidal wave and with consequences just as devastating.

No need to detail here the untold horrors visited upon Lithuania under both Communists and Nazis. Suffice it to say that the firing squads never lacked victims, the labor camps were absolutely insatiable in their demand upon the population, the vast reaches of Siberia afforded a dread prison to which literally hundreds of thousands were sent to death or to privations far worse than death.

The joy with which the Treaty of Moscow was received in 1920 by the Lithuanian people turned into the sadness of despair when that treaty was violated so flagrantly and so completely by Russia. In that memorable treaty of 1920 Moscow had agreed to recognize without any prejudices the independence of the state of Lithuania and to renounce for all time all sovereignty rights which she had ever held in regard to Lithuania.

Today, despite her position of slave state of Russia, as the fourteenth Republic of the U. S. S. R., Lithuania has at least this consolation, that our own great nation has consistently refused to recognize the unlawful act of Russia in destroying Lithuania's independence. Our government has never recognized the absorption of Lithuania, or the other Baltic states into the Soviet Union, and continues, instead, to recognize the diplomatic representatives of those countries in the United States. America's attitude was expressed forcibly at the time by the then Acting Secretary of State, the Honorable Sumner Welles, when he said that the people of the United States are opposed to predatory actions no matter by whom they are carried on, and they are opposed likewise to any form of intervention on the part of one state, however powerful, in the domestic concerns of any other sovereign state, however weak.

What this country's official representative said in 1940, is just as true today. One may be sure that it will continue to be our country's principle, until when, in God's good time, Lithuania again regains its cherished independence. As the people of the United States sympathized with Lithuania in its time of anguish and travail, and watched with heartfelt interest the splendid progress in self-government made by this gallant people following 1918, so today all people of good will throughout America sympathize deeply with the sufferings that prevail today in Lithuania and among the many thousands of exiled Lithuanians throughout Asiatic Russia.

With this unhappy people, our prayers go up to Almighty God that the heavy hand of sorrow and slavery which has been laid upon their shoulders will be lifted in the not-too-distant future so that once again we may welcome Lithuania as a free nation of the world, and help its earnest, God-fearing people to a rebirth of national estate.

My own State of Maryland is vastly indebted to the industry and skills of its residents of Lithuanian birth and ancestry. We join ardently with them in cherishing the indomitable spirit of Lithuanian freedom now temporarily banished from their homeland. With them we look confidently forward, to the day when Lithuanian independence again will be a reality, and when February 16, Republic of Lithuania Day, will be a beacon shining brightly aloft, a joyful symbol to all the world that where a people is determined, come what may, not to accept anything less than complete freedom and independence, that noble aspiration will not be denied them by a just and gracious Deity.

## AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this morning the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and certain other Senators submitted a resolution dealing with a very important policy with regard to foreign relations, and I desire at this time to state my views with regard to the question.

On January 5, 1949, President Truman delivered his State of the Union message to a joint session of Congress. During that address, the President assured the American people as to the essential soundness of both our domestic and our international affairs, when he said:

> I am happy to report to this Eighty-first Congress that the State of the Union is good. Our Nation is better able than ever before to meet the needs of the American people and to give them their fair chance in the pursuit of happiness.
>
> Our domestic programs are the foundation of our foreign affairs. We are doing what we can to encourage free states and free peoples throughout the world, to aid the suffering and the afflicted in foreign lands, and to strengthen democratic nations against aggression. We are supporting a world organization to keep peace and a world-economic policy to create prosperity for mankind. Our guiding star is international cooperation. To this concept we have made a commitment as profound as anything in history.

Yet, nowhere, Mr. President, is there a single mention in this State of the Union message of the real state of our international relations, into which this guid-

ing star of international cooperation has led us.

Mr. President, my grave concern for the future continues to grow as I watch the ominous administration strategy unfold following that State of the Union message.

Frankly, I am alarmed by the implications of the President's bold, new, five-point international program which he launched, out of the blue, during his inaugural address on January 20.

Mr. President, is it not a cause of alarm that, in order to put over this bold, new program, President Truman also now finds it necessary to revive the very government-by-crisis techniques by which all the other international programs, for which he now refuses to give an honest accounting, were sold to the American people?

Mr. President, no one is more conscious of the growing gravity of our international relations than I, and I yield to no one in my sincere determination to do my full part in protecting America's interests and strengthening our security at home and abroad.

Yet, as I have reflected on these startling new developments, I have been continually reminded of Tennyson's observation that "a half truth is the worst kind of a lie." It is perfectly obvious to me now that, by announcing this new adventure in international affairs without taking us into his confidence as to just what has happened to all the other international programs on which he so optimistically generalized only 2 weeks previous, President Truman is indulging in the most misleading and dangerous kind of a half truth.

Mr. President, such action not only embarrasses the elected representatives of the American people, it carries far more serious implications. Such action constitutes an expression of contempt for the constitutional prerogatives and duties of the legislative branch of our Government.

No one knows better than President Truman himself that Congress cannot possibly play its rightful role in intelligently evaluating, constructively criticizing, and helping creatively to formulate a sound basis upon which to implement his new international objectives until we know just what has happened to all the other slogans, programs, and principles to which we have committed this country during the war and postwar years.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] gave expression to this obvious truth when, in response to the question, "What are your reactions to the President's speech?" he replied:

> I cannot pass judgment on the balance of his new aid programs until I know more concretely what he has in mind.
>
> I suggest, however, that we perfect existing plans before starting any new ones. The President himself says there are limits to our resources. I underscore that warning.

Mr. President, before Congress or the American people can intelligently act on the President's new international program they must find the answers to three of the most crucial questions ever to perplex this Nation.

The first question is, Just what has been accomplished to date by the commitments we have been discharging in support of the whole vast network of international policies and principles to which we have been a party in recent years?

What has been accomplished by discharging our commitments under the Atlantic Charter, the four freedoms, the Moscow Declaration, the Connally resolution, lend-lease, Casablanca, Cairo, Tehran, Yalta, unconditional surrender, UNRRA, the Potsdam Declaration, the Bretton Woods Agreement, the International Bank, the World Monetary Fund, the World Food Organization, the International Trade Organization, the United Nations, the British loan, the Morgenthau plan, the Italian, Rumanian, Hungarian, and Bulgarian treaties, the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Act of Chapultepec, the Rio Compact, and all the other slogans and schemes which the American people have loyally supported with their treasure and their blood?

Why is it, Mr. President, that President Truman refuses to take us into his confidence and tell us just where these commitments have taken us? The only answer that is convincing to me, is that President Truman, by his own arbitrary actions, is now seeking to escape responsibility for what has really been happening behind the smoke screen of administration propaganda during these tragic years.

Of course, such a deliberate effort to postpone a day of reckoning makes it all the more imperative that we intensify our efforts to ferret out the real facts ourselves. The American people want to know the facts. We now know from bitter experience that when secret agreements are entered into in our name and kept from us for long periods of time, we learn of them too late to do anything but take the tragic consequences. What is even more tragic is that, in this process, the burden of responsibility for what has happened becomes lost in the mad, face-saving scramble to pick up and put the pieces back together.

No one has more clearly seen this very development coming to a head in our own times than Walter Lippmann, who wrote on January 11, 1949:

> It is not healthy in the long run to treat foreign policy as something separate from the normal process of democratic government and of party responsibility. There are no statesmen wise enough, and no experts who are expert enough, to make decisions of life and death, when they are artificially insulated from the give and take of general debate.
>
> An unavoidable result is to thrust excessive power upon men who are not accountable to Congress or to the people, who are often unknown to the public, who decide questions of great moment without having to explain or to justify their actions.

It was Woodrow Wilson, himself, who prescribed the following preventative against such a development in the executive branch of Government, when he said in his book Congressional Government:

> The informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislative function. The only really self-governing people is that people which discusses and interrogates its administration.

Mr. President, these serious implications of the Chief Executive's refusal to take the American people into his confidence, and President Truman's persistent silence, force us back completely onto our own resourcefulness, to find the answers to these questions.

The second question which we must answer, before we can act intelligently on the President's new program is, "What has become of the bipartisan foreign policy, by which we have sought to implement our international policies and commitments of the past?"

We have been led to believe that it is the bipartisan policy that has kept our international relations free from partisan politics—that has made possible access to information so necessary for enlightenment of public opinion—and that has made possible a genuinely cooperative participation in the formulation and implementation of our foreign policies by majority and minority parties alike.

I now read Mr. Walter Lippmann's observation on what is happening to this bipartisan policy. This appeared in the Washington Post on January 11, 1949:

> The bipartisan system of the past 4 years was necessary in the circumstances, but we need not regret that the circumstances have changed. Useful, indeed, indispensable as it was, it had its grave disadvantages. It is one thing to be consulted just before or just after some critical decision is taken; it is quite another thing to share the responsibility from the outset in all the steps which lead up to and may compel the decision.
>
> Yet the effect of the bipartisan system has been to prevent discussion and debate.

Certainly the American people have been solemnly assured, by bipartisan foreign-policy architects of both parties, that this was not the case. Furthermore, we have been continually assured that this bipartisan policy was firmly rooted in, and specifically and adequately designed to protect, the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the traditional American principles upon which, and for which, this Nation has always stood.

On May 21, 1946, the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan, upon returning from his duties as United States representative at the London Foreign Ministers' Council, solemnly assured this body that—

> The Council was a complete success in developing at last, and in disclosing a positive, constructive, peace-seeking, bipartisan foreign policy for the United States. It is based at last upon the moralities of the Atlantic Charter and the San Francisco Charter.

There was not the slightest doubt expressed by the Senator that America's vital interests, security, and principles were not completely secure in the hands of the architects of this bipartisan policy. For the Senator insisted that it was—

> A policy which now substitutes justice for vengeance in these formulas of peace, which now insists upon ethnic recognitions that no longer traffic in the lives and destinies of helpless peoples, and which spurns expansionism as a plague upon tomorrow's peace and security.

Even as recently as January 5, 1949, in his state of the Union message, President Truman assured us that—

> We are following a foreign policy which is the outward expression of the democratic faith we profess.

Yet, nowhere, Mr. President, in his state of the Union message, nor in his inaugural address, nor in any other major speech or statement, has the President honestly told the American people what has happened to the bipartisan foreign policy, which we have been led to believe was an absolutely indispensable medium for the continuing success of our international ventures.

Is it not then, Mr. President, a matter of the gravest concern to find President Truman taking the initiative in deliberately destroying this bipartisan approach to our international problems, by presenting this new version of American foreign policy, without making the slightest attempt to conceal the fact that he had refused to take the Republican Party into his confidence on a single important issue to which he referred?

Is not this fact particularly true when we realize that this bold new adventure carries us even more deeply into the internal affairs of the other nations all over the world?

Yet, in the face of these grave implications, the only sop that has been thrown to the Republican supporters of the bipartisan foreign policy is a deliberate change in the ratio of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Vice President's ingenious observation that he did not see why five Republicans could not cooperate with this kind of a foreign policy, as well as six.

Mr. President, why would President Truman assume responsibility for thus destroying the bipartisan foreign policy unless he is seeking to cover up the fact that in reality, throughout its operation, it has been making a mockery of constitutional government? Why would President Truman now take this action? It now appears that the bipartisan policy has made both its Republican and Democratic supporters in Congress the legislative goats of an official administration propaganda line—goats who have been effectively barred from access to the real facts of our international life.

Personally, I can reach no other explanation of what has been happening in administration circles. I assure my colleagues that it is no satisfaction for me to find that much as I have wanted to do my full part in protecting America's vital interests, I have never once been taken into the confidence of the architects of the "master plan" by which our over-all international relations have been guided.

Mr. President, I am referring to the master plan which is described in the United States News of February 7, 1947, from which I quote:

> During Mr. Byrne's tenure Mr. Acheson's principal contribution was a codification of American foreign policy, the first in many years. This was largely written by the Under Secretary, outlining in detail the United States policy toward every nation and area. In preparing the document Mr. Acheson acquired what some had complained that he lacked; a knowledge of the minutiae of international dealings.
>
> The brochure is, of course, top secret. Only two copies of it exist. One is kept in a State Department vault, the other by the Army's Chief of Staff, so that military and diplomatic policy may be integrated. As former Chief of Staff, General Marshall, of course, was kept up to the minute on foreign policy everywhere. He is now familiarizing himself with developments during his year in China mostly by a study of Mr. Acheson's book. While the Secretary digs into his job and prepares to attend the foreign ministers' meeting in Moscow in March, Mr. Acheson is largely running the Department on the basis of his own guide book.

Mr. President, I would like to ask the members of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, if any one of them, whether a Democrat or Republican, has ever seen this "top-secret, master plan" of American foreign policy, or whether he has ever been informed of its basic contents?

I raise this point, Mr. President, because, if, during the operation of the bipartisan foreign policy, we have been made the "goats" of administration maneuvering, it is perfectly obvicus what is going to happen in the future after the President himself has abandoned even the pretense of genuine cooperation with both Congress and the American people.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the President's bold, new course of action also means that the alleged "unwillingness to rock the boat of our delicate international negotiations," which has been used during the past years as a convenient excuse for covering up secret diplomacy, and the suppression of honest and open debate, and criticism, has now become a deliberate Presidential strategy.

Let me assure my colleagues that I have no desire to impugn the motives of any man or political party. Yet, in the light of these developments, I do consider it my solemn duty now to see this whole matter through to its ultimate conclusion. I am moved to take this course of action because I believe that no President would so abruptly throw overboard an international program which has been laboriously developed over the years, both on the domestic and international level, nor so flaunt his power in the face of his own bipartisan supporters of both parties in Congress, unless he had become convinced that the real developments, for which he now refuses to account or to be held responsible, have become suicidal political liabilities.

Mr. President, I also know of no other course of action on my part that will answer the third and most crucial question of all, namely: "What has become of the moral principles for which we have been fighting?" These principles are, after all, the greatest stakes that have been involved in this game of international power politics we have been playing. Well, what has become of our American principles?

If I read the signs of the times aright, the optimistic pleasantries with which the administration seeks to put off every serious critic can no longer suffice to explain away the rising chorus of shocking charges that American principles and interests are being betrayed all over the earth, or to hide the frightening developments now taking place on the international scene.

Again may I say that I am not happy to admit that I now am forced to believe what, for a long time, I have more than suspected, that we have been following policies and commitments which have underwritten everyone else's interests but our own.

Mr. President, I have not come to this conclusion easily.

The first real shock to my high hopes for a just and lasting peace came to me when, following the Tehran Conference in 1943, a trusted friend in high-policy-making circles came into my office and said:

> For God's sake, don't keep fighting the war on the basis of this agreement or we'll lose our shirts and turn communism loose around the world.

The next shock came when another friend told me that early in the fall of 1945 General Marshall had said to him:

> We have got to get Eisenhower out of Europe, because anyone who has had anything to do with Europe is a dead duck.

Then I learned of Gen. George Patton's bitter commentary on what was happening when he said, just before his untimely and tragic death:

> We fought the War of 1776 for independence. We fought the war of 1864 to free the slaves. We fought the war of 1917 to make the world safe for democracy. We fought this war to lose for humanity all that we had gained from the other three.

Then came the charges by Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, which I am certain no Senator would now undertake to refute, that—

> We began the war with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and democracy as our goal. * * * We finished the war in the Far East, furnishing lend-lease supplies and using all our reputation to undermine democracy and bolster imperialism and communism. The weakness of American foreign policy has backed us into two world wars. We had no part in shaping the conditions that brought about these two wars.
>
> There is a third world war in the making. In diplomacy today we are permitting ourselves to be sucked into a power block on the side of colonial imperialisms against Communist imperialism.

Then came Gen. Clare Chennault's warning, echoing these same charges:

> The United States is losing the Pacific war. * * * United States policy toward China is plunging us into a disastrous repetition of the errors that dragged us into World War II. I can hear the time fuze of the third world war sputtering in China, as it burns toward the final powder keg, and I cannot stand idly by without making every effort in my power to snuff it out.

On February 17, 1948, no less a figure than Mr. James Farley admitted to an audience at Colgate University the following reasons for these tragic developments when he said:

> I sincerely believe that many of the ills of the world today can be traced to the third and fourth terms, which brought a great mind, but one worn with the weight of years and the cares of state to the all-important conferences of Tehran and Yalta.
>
> There we had a worn leader dividing the world in a series of secret agreements which, having arisen from the Pandora's box of secret diplomacy are now plaguing the world's children with blood, death, and tears.

Then, Mr. President, the Hoover Commission task force, seeking the reorgani-

zation of our armed services issued a report which confirmed this whole tragic betrayal of American interests and principles, when it said, in part:

> Within slightly more than a score of years, at great cost in life and property, we have won two wars, only to lose the peace both times through lack of a clear and consistent national objective. * * * The bitter lesson does not yet seem to be fully learned—for the committee found that strategic plans, made without clear guidance of long-term peace aims, were based on assumptions that may or may not be true, that the military were planning now to fight the next war, if this tragedy should occur, without knowing what exactly we would be fighting for.

Mr. President, it is obvious that something has gone terribly wrong with our international programs and policies. It is no longer even an open secret that the situation we confront around the world has become too serious for anyone to dare to make political capital out of our predicament.

Our whole American foreign policy is crumbling around our heads, our most vital interests are being forsaken, our prestige is being irreparably undermined, our security is increasingly threatened, and our principles have been trampled under foot.

Since President Truman will not take either Congress or the American people into his confidence and tell us the tragic truth, it has now become our solemn duty to dig out the facts, weigh the evidence, and piece together the picture of what has happened. For myself, I believe it would be a criminal disservice to ignore the challenge of these times for one moment longer.

Therefore, Mr. President, insofar as I have been able to trace it, I want to lay before my colleagues and the American people the true picture of what has been going on during these past tragic, trying years, in the earnest hope that, having once got to the real roots of the wrongs that continue to be committed, we shall then be able to right them.

Mr. President, the American people were promised five basic principles upon which we could build a just and lasting peace, as a reward for their sacrifice and suffering during the war.

First, we were promised that Russia was a great democratic, peace-loving ally, upon whom we could absolutely count for continued genuine cooperation in the just solution of all the economic, social, political, and military problems of the postwar world.

Second, we were promised the realization of the peace aims contained in the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which we were solemnly assured Russia had signed and by which she would abide.

Third, we were promised that the system of sovereign and independent states and the whole system of international law upon which that system had been based would be preserved, and that these nations would also be permitted to join in solving the world's problems as sovereign and independent states.

Fourth, we were promised that the vanquished peoples—Germany, Japan, and Italy—would be rehabilitated and reincorporated into the family of peace-loving nations on the basis of equal access to the trade and raw materials of the world.

Fifth, we were promised that there would be preserved in all the nations stable elements of society with whom we could enter into long-term, social, economic, and diplomatic relations.

Mr. President, what has become of all these promises to the American people, the promises to the soldiers who fought in the fox holes, the promises to the ones who lost their limbs or who now are blind as a result of war wounds? What has become of all these promises, upon the realization of which the success of every single one of our international programs for economic recovery and for maintaining peace have been absolutely dependent?

What has become of the vicious propaganda that Russia was a democratic, peace-loving ally, whom we must not offend by even an honest and open discussion of our own vital interests, and without whose consent we must not dare to take a step even to safeguard those interests?

Here is how Elmer Davis explains what happened to this particular proposition, which he spent hundreds of millions of dollars peddling to the American people. On April 15, 1946, he said:

> A year or so ago, most of us supposed that Russian objectives were the same as ours; and extensive concessions were made to them on that hypothesis. We now seem to have been mistaken.

Of course, Mr. Davis' bland admission that our statesmen were the victims of a mistake in this matter is merely another example of the misleading and dangerous half-truth to which I have been referring. After thousands and thousands of our American soldiers and sailors have died while fighting for what they were told were our objectives, this man blandly states we were mistaken.

In the first place, the concessions that were made to Russia, could not possibly have been made on the hypothesis that Russia's aims were identical with our own. Not only were our representatives armed with the whole arsenal of historical facts concerning the viciousness and treacherous designs of Czarist and Communist foreign policy, with which to protect our interests against Russian guile, but they were also armed with the full knowledge that, contrary to the official propaganda, Russia never really signed the Atlantic Charter at all. Behind that half-truth lies the real fact that before Ivan Maisky would sign the Atlantic Charter document in London, on September 24, 1941, he read a long list of Russian exceptions and reservations to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which constituted Russia's own unique Atlantic and Pacific Charter, all with the full knowledge and consent of our American representatives at that ceremony. But how many Americans knew it?

The question of what happened to the peace aims of the Atlantic Charter is of the utmost significance then, Mr. President, when these extensive concessions were made to Russia on the assumption that she had embraced its principles.

That only a tragedy could follow from policies based on this assumption, is evident from President Roosevelt's own attempt to explain away the embarrassing developments that followed. This is the reason why, on December 19, 1944, he jocularly stated that, so far as he ever knew, there never was a formal copy or document known as the Atlantic Charter in existence, and that, anyway, it was never more than a scrap of scribbled paper. Mr. President, I wonder how the boys who today are almost 95 percent disabled as the result of injuries or wounds they received during the war, feel now about President Roosevelt's statement on that date?

The truth is, Mr. President, that the mistake, to which both Mr. Davis and President Roosevelt referred, is a mistake which now endangers the future of the whole cause of human liberty. This mistake has destroyed the foundations upon which, alone, the success of all the international schemes to which we have been a party could possibly have been, or ever can be, realized.

In a word, the extensive concessions which were made to Russia on the basis of this mistaken assumption transformed the war both in Europe and in Asia from one of limited objectives into a world revolution, and threw onto the ash heap of lost civilizations the principles of the Atlantic Charter. After all, Mr. President, these principles were but the expression of the commonly accepted practices and objectives of civilized nations before the war broke out.

This means, Mr. President, that all the fine phrases about the guiding star of international cooperation by which we have set our course during and since the end of the war, are but more miserable half-truths which serve to cover up the fact that, instead of following that star, we have been plunged into the gathering darkness of a vicious struggle of power politics, which is slowly degenerating into a brutal struggle for sheer self-survival.

It is little wonder then to find that the third basic principle, without which we could not build a just and lasting peace, has also been torn out by the roots. I am speaking of the whole prewar system of sovereign and independent states and the body of international law upon which it was based. Today we find, instead, that those extensive concessions, which have been substituted as a new basis for international relations, are the outrageous and criminal betrayal of American principles which are contained in the secret conferences at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. The tragic ignorance of what really happened or the utter hypocrisy of the continued peace-loving protestations on the part of those who have been responsible, is nowhere better revealed than in the terrifying contradiction contained in a speech by President Truman himself. On September 1, 1944, Mr. Truman made a campaign speech, as running mate of the late President Roosevelt, in which he told the American people that they had no cause to worry about the peace aims of the United States because, as he said, on the one hand:

> This peace was in process many months ago when two men met in mid-Atlantic and drew

up a charter, a set of principles for peace, that have been cited and used as guides by both Democrats and Republicans alike ever since they were first set forth.

Then Mr. Truman went on to assure us that, on the other hand:

> This peace was being made at Casablanca, at Moscow, at Quebec, at Cairo, at Tehran. * * * It is a continuing process already years under way, still years in prospect.

The record proves that no man ever uttered a more well-intentioned yet absurd contradiction, for the whole sordid series of secret agreements to which President Truman referred has torn the world in two, turned Russia loose across eastern Europe and western Asia, paralyzed European and Asiatic economies, and placed us in the suicidal position, since 1933, of having built up both jaws of the military monster which is continuing to crush both Europe and Asia between them.

This mistake has resulted in our actually legalizing Russia's aggression by continuing to honor these outrageous secret agreements of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. What is more, we now find that we have actually financed Russian aggression over these years. First, we know that billions of dollars worth of lend-lease goods we gave to Russia, with no strings attached, were not used to fight either Germany or Japan, but were used, and continue to be used, to crush all opposition within the so-called liberated countries which we turned over to Russia's tender ministrations in the series of secret conferences.

Then we continued to finance and support Russian aggression both in Europe and Asia by entering into the insane reparations agreements, which gave Russia the right to loot and rape Manchuria, and which have resulted in the withdrawal from Central Europe of at least $14,000,000,000 in loot, all at the subsequent expense of the American taxpayer.

Moreover, we entered into international programs such as UNRRA, knowing all the time that these resources could not help but further feed Russia's gluttonous, expansionist appetite. Then we seem to have confounded the confusion even more by actually ratifying, on the United States Senate floor, treaties with Axis countries, which in effect have forced us to continue to pay indemnities and reparations indirectly to Russia. What is more, the very act of ratification has become a further embarrassment, for, by condemning such a nation as Italy to permanent miserable substandards of living, we have placed an additional and continuing burden on the American taxpayer, which cannot be lifted except we change the treaty obligations, an act which leaves us wide open to charges by the Russian signatories of violating international law.

In the process, Mr. President, every Member of this Senate body can recall how we were consistently urged to recognize Russia's right to surround herself with friendly nations, all during the time when this whole system of sovereign and independent states, and the whole body of international law upon which it was based, were being ruthlessly repudiated in a series of as savage and cruel acts of aggression as the pages of history have ever recorded.

Meanwhile, we have learned to our sorrow that as a result of this shameful division of the world, we have left Russia in possession of the maximum of the raw materials and a minimum of the population of Europe and Asia, while we have been burdened with the task of supporting the permanently bankrupt economies of western Europe and eastern Asia with a minimum of the raw materials and a maximum of the population that has been caught between Russia and ourselves. In undertaking to fulfill this impossible task, we have finally been forced to accept the fact that Russia has been bent on world domination all the time, and that contrary to the official propaganda line, she is determined to undermine our interests, defeat our objectives all over the earth, and destroy the United States in the process.

Yet, Mr. President, when we look at what we have been accomplishing by our foreign policies on this side of the iron curtain, the picture is just as tragic. For instance, by making these mistaken extensive concessions and by following the anti-American political propaganda line which sought to justify them, our American statesmen have carried out a foreign policy on this side of the iron curtain which has also played directly into the hands of Russia's interests and further undermined the basic principles for which this Nation stands.

In the first place, Mr. President, we have repudiated the promise that the vanquished nations would be re-incorporated into the family of nations on the basis of a just and lasting peace. Instead, we have been carrying out the insane commitments entered into at Potsdam, which call for the destruction of the German speaking peoples, and for the destruction of the industrial potential upon which the people, not only of Germany, but of the whole of Europe are absolutely dependent even for a minimum standard of living. We are spending a billion dollars a year, to carry out this senseless process of destruction, even while the President is calling for an additional $1,000,000,000 to help raise the standards of living of industrially underdeveloped peoples in other nations which are dependent on the industrial potential which we are destroying.

This whole program is playing directly into the hands of the Communists, destroying the economic, social, political, and military stability of the European nations, uprooting the whole principle of private property which is protected under the Hague Convention, and paving the way for the collapse of our vital interests in Europe, just as they are collapsing as a result of identical policies in the Far East.

What is more, by following out this pro-Communist policy we are subsidizing other European nations which are determined to use our resources to secure their own individual and selfish interests, no matter what effect such action may ultimately have either on their neighbors or on the United States itself. This explains what has happened to the promise to reincorporate the vanquished peoples into the family of nations.

In the second place, we now discover that we have also continued to play into Communist hands on this side of the iron curtain by following the political division of the world, resulting from the repudiation of the Atlantic Charter and the substitution of the secret agreements which for so long have forced us to permit Russia to carry on her own game of power politics with impunity. I am referring to the fact that following the Tehran Conference the ideological basis of the war, between the Fascist and democratic powers, was transformed into a world revolution between the "democrats" who faithfully followed the Russian line, and the "Fascists," who opposed her.

By following this line—and, oh, how important this is—by following this line the United States continued to attack nations on this side of the iron curtain, such as Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Portugal, the Argentine, and others, as non-peace-loving nations, and we continued to subject them to economic and diplomatic insults all patterned after the Moscow line. This explains what has happened to the stable elements of society which were to be assured continuing control of their own destinies.

Third, we also fell into the trap, for Communist propagandists to exploit, when we allied ourselves with the Western Powers who were determined to reimpose their system of colonial exploitation over the weaker peoples of the African and Asiatic worlds. Now we know that we have been financing Dutch imperialism, French imperialism, British imperialism, and all the other imperial systems, which have been the curse of so many millions of helpless and weaker peoples around the world. This holds true even of the policies we have followed toward South America.

And so to date, Mr. President, our foreign policy, which has been subsidized by the American people and paid for by the blood of America's youth, has been selling peoples into the slavery of economic and political systems all over the world.

Mr. President, it now begins to appear that we are the first nation in history that has ever become so pathological as to launch on such a cosmic crusade as we now find ourselves in, pouring out our treasure and our blood in two tragic world wars in one generation, only to end up by underwriting a permanently bankrupt imperialist venture, which was doomed at the start.

What other nation in history has made such tremendous sacrifices as have followed these two world wars, only to end up by deliberately subsidizing the very forces of greed, exploitation and tyranny which produced them?

Can it be that we have finally embarked on the fatal course, against which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] so strenuously warned us over 20 years ago, when he wrote:

> A stream can rise no higher than its source. The source of internationalism is and must be nationalism, because the latter

is the inevitable entity upon which the former must build.

Destroy the latter and the former immediately and automatically becomes anomalous.

Just as the home is the basis, sine qua non, of the nation, so in turn, is the nation the basis of world cooperation. The nationalist puts first things first. The internationalists puts first things last.

Thus, while nationalism readily cooperates on its own volition, this latter being the crux of independence, with humanitarian enterprises * * * invoked by the League of Nations or under any other trans-oceanic auspices, it refuses to forget that America has separate and different standards of life and government, and it refuses either to merge these advantages in a general averaging of the standards of other lands, or to expose them by any untoward degree, to the mandate of massed foreign pressure or duress.

That is what they always say, Mr. President, when they find they have gone wrong. Their excuse is that we did not give them enough, or that we gave it to them too late. The excuse they now have is that the American people did not do enough.

The Senator from Michigan went on to utter these prophetic words concerning this great American tradition, which we now seem to have forsaken:

It is a rugged trail of hard-bought freedom. No toll road this—with unwelcome and unbidden mercenaries making alien levies on our liberties and rights.

Reckless adventurers with naught to cherish and naught to lose—soldiers of doubtful political fortune for whom speculation is a trade—may leave this high road for the bypaths and the detours, and the proscribed entanglements of international experiment. High-purposed theorists, scorning the admonitions of yesterday, may clothe their call to other roads in all the habiliments of an evangelical crusade.

But this independent Nation of justly proud Americans will meddle with such vagary, only at its peril.

Mr. President, when a nation forsakes its own traditions and turns over the reins of its destiny to those whose internationalism becomes so pathological as to ignore, or desert, or to betray our own primary national interests and principles, it is time that once more we recalled those words of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, who said:

The peril of this Nation is not in any foreign foe. We, the people, are its power, its peril, and its hope.

Mr. President, it is time the American people were fully aroused to the stark tragedy that is now stalking them. While we have been able thus far to weather the tremendous sacrifices that have been imposed upon us during and since the end of the war, these sacrifices have only advanced the cause of imperialist exploitation on both sides of the iron curtain. We have been following a pattern of international cooperation that has not advanced a single cause or principle which is so vital to our own future strength and security.

Instead, the tragic consequences of these sacrifices are rapidly becoming suicidal liabilities.

Would it not be tragic, Mr. President, if now, knowing these things to be true, we should be panicked, or driven, or blindly led to underwrite a permanent extension of this same brand of suicidal internationalism?

Certainly there cannot any longer be doubt of where we are heading. To date, we have been pouring out billions of dollars to carry out these basic programs abroad. Where has all this led us?

Mr. President, it has led us even deeper into the internal affairs of the other nations of the earth, and into ever-heavier financial and economic commitments and controls at home.

Now, we are told that the reason for our present dilemma is that these sacrifices have not been extensive enough, that we did not aid enough countries, and were too stingy in what aid we have given. So that now, Mr. President, we are advised that even at the end of the 4-year program, the Marshall plan cannot possibly get these nations back on their feet, but that we had better plan now for a 10-year program, which, including the additional costs of other incidentals, will cost the American taxpayer from $150,000,000,000 to $200,000,000,000 before it is over.

For instance, we are told that the additional costs will be necessary to put the North Atlantic Alliance into effect, which will involve a revival of military lend-lease, all of which will also be dependent upon implementation of the President's bold, new program for raising the standards of living of the whole world.

Furthermore, we are told that because of the strains on our own domestic economy we must now put the Government into the steel business, extend its functions ever deeper into our economic and social life, continue Government powers of allocation and controls over scarce materials, and submit to a tremendous tax increase to support the whole domestic and foreign program.

In addition, we are headed into increased involvement in the economic affairs of other nations to such an extent that this kind of a program cannot possibly be successful without the destruction, not only of our own economic freedom, but of our whole standard of living.

Nowhere has this picture been more clearly drawn than in the report, Independent Business—Its Struggle for Survival, Senate Document No. 7, in which the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] states:

This policy has already led to the imposition of both mandatory and voluntary controls over many segments of our economy, because of the grave shortages that have already developed as a result of the unprecedented foreign commitments already entered into by this Government.

The dangers of an extension of this policy to free enterprise are increasingly apparent. In proportion as we become involved in international commitments for political purposes, and as we seek to meet those commitments by further involvement, and through increased dependence upon adherence to a wider range of international commodity agreements, the greater will become the necessity for fitting our own economy into this new international pattern of Government-controlled cartel allocation of raw materials and markets.

As we continue to depend on export controls and domestic allocation of scarce materials to meet these commitments we will be compelled by self-interest to force more investments into development of foreign sources of production and supply of these same materials upon which our own economic health depends.

Mr. President, the economic lunacy that underlies the administration programs and propaganda is very simply to be described.

On the one hand, we emerged from the war with a $250,000,000,000 debt which we must finance in order to maintain our own solvency.

In order to carry this burden and increase the production which is so necessary to keep our economy functioning, we, of necessity, moved into a higher price level following the end of the OPA, a price structure which reflects the tremendous inflationary impact of the war and the huge national debt it had incurred.

In order to keep this level of production at this level of 69 percent above 1929, this Government has embarked upon a subsidy program that reaches out into every area of our social and economic life. Shipping, aviation, post offices and post roads, Federal power projects, irrigation and flood control, rural electrification, the price-support program for agriculture, and many other fields.

This means that the American people are spending billions of dollars to keep our economy operating on a price-level unit-production basis, which will enable us to expand our own facilities, develop new sources of raw materials, provide an adequate income for consumption of the goods produced, leave sufficient profit margins to carry business along, and pay for our huge international programs which are all absolutely dependent upon the present high production price and income level of this country, which this Government is trying to protect.

On the other hand, this Government is spending billions of dollars in foreign programs, raising raw-material production and increasing productive capacities among those nations which are increasingly dependent upon American markets for their finished goods or raw-material surplus outlets. Yet the administration insists that a reciprocal-trade program, which cuts tariffs below the American production-cost level, is an absolute essential for the success of their foreign programs.

Of course this means, Mr. President, that the American people, who are absolutely dependent upon our ability to protect the American economy and price structure for their own economic security, are forced to pour our billions of dollars abroad to develop the very competitive forces which this administration insists must be able to find an outlet for their goods in the American market, under trade agreements which undermine the whole American cost-of-production and price structure.

In other words, we are subsidizing our own American economy to keep our price structure sound, and at the same time subsidizing foreign competition, which the Administration insists must have the right to come in and undermine the American standard of living. It simply does not make sense.

Mr. President, aside from the inevitability of its bringing about our own economic and financial collapse, this program is also guaranteed to make the necessity for American subsidy abroad a permanent burden, because it is based on the reimposition of colonial exploitation in those areas of the world which the President insists we must spend billions of dollars out of the American taxpayers pockets to industrialize and develop. How, Mr. President, can these nations ever expect to be able to get back on their own feet, or even improve their own industrial equipment, when we subsidize an economic policy which so exploits them that they can never earn their own way out of the predicament they are in?

Mr. President, such economic insanity cannot possibly lead anywhere except where it has already led us, even deeper into the internal affairs of other nations, at the expense of the American people.

What is more, Mr. President, this whole policy will continue to lead us ever deeper into a permanent war-economy status that will destroy constitutional representative government in this country, and substitute, instead, a Government by executive order implemented by legislative appropriations.

In a recent exhaustive study of the foreign affairs powers that are necessary to carry out this kind of an international program, Professors McDougal and Lans, writing in the Yale Law Review, in 1945 observed:

> It is becoming increasingly difficult to divide effective control over foreign and domestic affairs if we are to have more prosperity and less depression, or to divide effective control over war and peace if we are to have less war and more peace.

Never were truer words spoken.

The tragedy is, however, Mr. President, that, contrary to the propaganda that such a policy is leading to more prosperity and more peace, it is leading us instead into a planned-scarcity depression and a war, the consequences of which no man dares to predict, other than that it will doom our form of Government and our way of life for generations to come.

This means also, Mr. President, that we are rapidly losing not only our own economic and social freedom, but that we are undermining the safeguards of the constitutional guarantees of our personal liberty under law.

It is frightening to learn that this whole legal question regarding the basis of our international relations has confused our own Supreme Court to such an extent that when Mr. William Logan, of New York, argued against the legality of the international tribunal that tried the Japanese War Crimes cases, no less a person than Mr. Justice Frankfurter admitted that as a result of the legal confusion which underlies out international programs and policies, even the Supreme Court was unable to straighten the matter out.

Mr. Frankfurter said to Mr. Logan, who had apologized for his own inability to state his arguments more clearly:

> The trouble is not with your clarity but with your problem. * * * Something may be illegal, and still be international and so be something over which this Court has no jurisdiction.

It is even more disconcerting to find that in its own brief prepared on this case the United States Government states:

> Once it is suggested that American courts may review the judgments of an International Court or pass upon the actions of an international authority's agents, most unhappy consequences can be anticipated in the development of international affairs.

Mr. President, before we permit this whole international program to get completely out of hand, by underwriting a permanent extension of its present legal and economic absurdities, it is time we stopped and reconsidered the lessons of our whole history as a free and sovereign people.

If we are not permanently to embrace an international program which will lead us down the road to destruction by taking us ever deeper into economic, military, and political intervention all over the world, we must retrace our steps out of the international morass into which we have plunged, by following once more the guiding star of our traditional American principles.

Mr. President, America was carved out of the remnants of five ancient empires, the British, the French, the Spanish, the Dutch, and the Russian. From its inception, America was dedicated as a sanctuary for the politically and spiritually oppressed who might reach our shores in their search for liberty and freedom from exploitation and oppression. Our Nation was founded on the belief that the external relations of a people ought always to reflect the internal economic, social, and political needs and the sovereign will of the people themselves.

This is the reason why Washington and Jefferson sought to guard us against embroilment in the internal quarrels of the nations of the Old World, and to preserve our constitutional government "as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad."

Throughout our history as a free and sovereign people, we have stood by this conviction that under no circumstances has any nation any right to exploit weaker and helpless peoples either within or outside of its borders.

If we read the Declaration of Independence again, we shall see that the gravest concern of our founding fathers was not that we should ever approve indirect support of exploitation of weaker peoples by stronger nations, but, instead, their primary concern was to create on these shores a form of government which would forever preserve the American people from the brutal exploitation of their own resources, freedoms, and persons by their own Government.

How, then, does the President's bold new program appear in the light of the foregoing facts?

Again we find the American people being made the victims of a misleading and dangerous half-truth, which, if accepted, will only take us farther down the road of exploitation, bankruptcy, and ruin.

Mr. President, in the midst of all the confusion that prevails we are indeed fortunate to be able to contrast clearly the difference between a genuine American program for international cooperation and the pathological internationalism we are now being asked to perpetuate. Indeed, I have in my hand a copy of a communication which reveals the nature of this contradiction down to its very roots. I refer to a communication sent to the late President Roosevelt by Gen. Patrick J. Hurley, from Chungking, China, on September 17, 1944. This communication contains the American plan for international cooperation which was outlined to President Roosevelt by General Hurley in a report of December 21, 1943, which I now wish to read into the RECORD.

Has any Senator on this floor ever seen this correspondence between General Hurley and the late President Roosevelt? Has it been published in any newspapers? General Hurley was sent to China by President Franklin D. Roosevelt. He was sent there at the expense of the American taxpayers. I say that even the members of the Foreign Relations Committee have not seen the correspondence between Gen. Patrick Hurley on the one hand and the late President Roosevelt on the other.

This is what General Hurley wrote to the President on the 21st of December 1943, after he had been in China at the request of the President:

> It is the purpose of the United States to sustain Iran as a free, independent nation and to afford the Iranian people an opportunity to enjoy the rights of man as set forth in the Constitution of the United States and to participate in the fulfillment of the principles of the Atlantic Charter.
>
> The policy of the United States toward Iran, therefore, is to assist in the creation in Iran of a government based upon the consent of the governed and of a system of free enterprise which will enable that nation to develop its resources prin.arily for the benefit of its own people. Iranian resources are adequate to sustain a program to help Iran to help herself. By this program of self-government and well-directed self-help Iran can achieve for herself the fulfillment of the principles of justice, freedom of conscience, freedom of the press, freedom of speech, freedom from want, equality of opportunity, and to a degree freedom from fear.

In all the history of America, Mr. President, no one has ever expressed anything more clearly than did that great patriot, Patrick J. Hurley, in his letter to the late President. General Hurley continued:

> To accomplish the above the United States will furnish upon invitation of the Iranian Government, experts and advisers in any or all of the fields of government. All experts and advisers furnished to Iran by the United States will be paid—

By whom? By the American taxpayers? No, Mr. President, General

Hurley said, "Let the Iranians pay for the experts sent to their country to help Iran." General Hurley said they—

will be paid by the Iranian Government and implemented in their operations by authority of Iranian law, and will not be a financial responsibility of the American taxpayer. The United States will not ask or receive any special privileges in return for these services.

American advisers will be fully indoctrinated in the policy of our own Government toward Iran and shall make regular progress reports to our State Department. This indoctrination and requirement of reporting will provide a vital element of coordination which is essential to direction of our policy and protection of our interests.

Modern history of this country shows it to have been dominated by a powerful and greedy minority. The people have also been subjected to foreign exploitation and monopoly. In extending American assistance to the building of an improved society in Iran there must be imposed a sufficient degree of supervision and control over free enterprise and personal aggression to protect the unorganized and inarticulate majority from foreign and domestic monopoly and oppression.

Mr. President, here we come to the difference in theory between those who are following President Truman in what he said in his inaugural address and some of us who believe that when we go into a foreign country we should not go there to exploit it, but should go there to help the common people of that country. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley set a pattern for us in America to follow, and in a few minutes Senators will find out what became of that pattern set for the American people by that great general. General Hurley said:

Inauguration in Iran of the American pattern of self-government and free enterprise will be an assurance that proceeds from development of Iranian resources will be directed substantially to the building of schools, hospitals, sanitary systems, transportation and communication systems, irrigation systems, and improvement of all facilities contributing to the health, happiness and general welfare of the Iranian people.

This plan of nation building may be improved through our experience in Iran and may become the criterion for the relations of the United States toward all the nations which are now suffering from the evils of greedy minorities, monopolies, aggression, and imperialism.

Where can there be found a finer expression than that contained in the letter by Gen. Patrick Hurley to the late President Franklin Delano Roosevelt? General Hurley continued:

The American people, single-mindedly devoted to independence and liberty, are fighting today not to have the imperialisms of other nations nor to create an imperialism of our own but rather to bestow upon the world the benevolent principles of the Atlantic Charter and the four freedoms.

How could General Hurley have expressed himself more clearly? He said that the American taxpayer is contributing and the American soldier is fighting, not to keep some discredited king on a tottering throne, but for the common people.



In his Chungking communication General Hurley continued:

The whole plan is being predicated on your desire—

That is on President Roosevelt's desire—

to raise the standard of living in other nations as a means of sustaining our own standard of living. The standard of living in other nations cannot be substantially or permanently raised by lend-lease or doles. The American taxpayers would not be able to pay for a continuance of relief for the world on a lend-lease basis. Therefore, as I understood you, our purpose was, as stated above, to establish free governments and free enterprise and to lend expert advice and leadership in developing the resources and the commerce and building up generally the industry of each of the less-favored nations so that the citizens, through their own efforts, could raise their own standard of living.

President Truman said in his inaugural address that we are going to extend our activities all over the world, and what he proposes to do will be at the expense of the American taxpayers, and he asked for a great sum of money for a single year, to begin the work. Yet we are tearing down German industry, even tearing down the German fertilizer plants, thus depriving German farmers of the opportunity to obtain enough fertilizer, and their crops are becoming poorer all the time. The American taxpayers are paying more and more for it all.

General Hurley continued:

The American agents or experts were to be paid by the nations in which they served and would not be a burden on the American taxpayer. All of this is in conflict with the opinions of those who believe that the American taxpayers can become the Santa Claus to the whole world, and is also in conflict with the opinions of all who favor imperialism, monopoly, and exploitation.

Then General Hurley revealed that he had received President Roosevelt's endorsement of this plan when he recalled that—

On March 25, 1944, I received a letter from you which is, in full, as follows:

MARCH 25, 1944.

Maj. Gen. PATRICK J. HURLEY,
*Shoreham Building, Washington, D. C.*

DEAR PAT: Your letter of December 21, 1943, concerning Iran contains suggestions of very great interest. I am thrilled with the idea of using our efforts in Iran as an example of what can be done by an unselfish American policy. If we can get the right kind of American experts who will remain loyal to their ideals I feel certain that our policy of aiding Iran will succeed.

You are right that the distribution of lend-lease supplies throughout the Middle East should be taken over by our own people, and I have let the Secretary of State know my views in this matter.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

General Hurley went on to say:

This letter is excellent. It indicates that you approved and desired to make effective the plan for Iran.

I was permitted also to read in the State Department your memoranda of January 12, 1944, addressed to the Secretary of State, with which you transmitted my report. You expressed to the Secretary your desire to use Iran as an example of what we could do with an enlightened, unselfish American policy. You told the Secretary, as I recall it, that you would like to have a try at making this policy effective in Iran as Iran appeared to present the most difficult situation in the Middle East at that time. You wished to make Iran the testing ground for an American policy based on the principles stated in the Atlantic Charter. You very pointedly stated that the essence of your plan was in the fact that it offered assistance to the so-called less-favored nations in their economic difficulties without creating a burden on the American taxpayer.

On March 2, 1944, I received a very favorable and understanding letter from the Acting Secretary of State, Edward R. Stettinius, copy attached, in which he enumerates the recommendations made by me, in reference to Iran, which had been made effective.

I am justified in assuming that the program for Iran had your approval and the approval of the Secretary of State.

Mr. President, I want at this time to refer to a letter written on April 9, 1945, to the Secretary of War by Secretary of State Stettinius, to prove the assertion of General Hurley that he had also been assured by the State Department that it was putting this policy into effect:

APRIL 9, 1945.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During 1943 and 1944 the War Department was good enough to make available to the Department of State the services of Maj. Gen. Patrick J. Hurley for important and urgent diplomatic negotiations in the Middle East. His duties in the Middle East having been concluded, I wish to express the warm appreciation of this Department for his outstanding services and to report to you, for the record, a statement of his accomplishments.

This is what Stettinius thought of General Hurley at that time:

Under date of May 13, 1943, General Hurley made a report on Iran to the President, at the conclusion of which he made four specific recommendations: (1) that Iran be assured of American insistence that the principles of the Atlantic Charter do in fact apply to Iran; (2) that Iran be permitted to join the United Nations in the declaration of war against the Axis; (3) that the American and British Legations be raised immediately to the status of embassies; and (4) that American and British Ambassadors who are compatible to each other and are able to understand and promote British-American cooperation in Iran be appointed. All four of these recommendations were accomplished. Subsequently General Hurley was instrumental in having brought before the Tehran conference what is now known as the declaration regarding Iran. The various forms of this declaration which had been considered previously were revised under General Hurley's insistence and a reaffirmation of the principles of the Atlantic Charter inserted for the first time. General Hurley played the leading part in obtaining the adoption and signature of this declaration by President Roosevelt, Marshal Stalin, and Prime Minister Churchill. The declaration has been of material service to the American Government and an inspiration to all of the peoples of the Middle East.

In addition to the foregoing, General Hurley outlined a general plan for our relations not only with Iran but with other Middle East nations, including a recommendation in regard to the administration and distribution of lend-lease supplies throughout the Middle East. Later, on December 21, 1943, he rendered another report on Iran which the President acknowledged in a letter dated March 25, 1944, a copy of which is attached hereto. The

plan outlined by General Hurley in his report of December 21, 1943, is being implemented by this Department.

General Hurley also made an investigation of the oil situation in Saudi Arabia and made an intensive and incisive report on that situation.

General Hurley rendered services of a highly meritorious character, with far-reaching effect on the policies of this Government. I am happy to place on record this evidence of the Department's regard for his achievements while serving in the Middle East in the capacity of special representative of the President with the rank of ambassador.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

E. R. STETTINIUS, Jr.

I want every Senator to remember that letter, written by the then Secretary of State.

Mr. President, now follows a grim picture of just how this genuine American plan for international cooperation and every hope of salvaging the principles of the Atlantic Charter were undermined. I want now to read this story into the record in order to help the American people understand just where, when, and how the roots of our present predicament were planted.

I am continuing to quote from General Hurley's Chungking communication to the President:

At this point I might state that I have been told that the deterioration of America's position in Iran is due, in large measure, to the fact that you did not call on the Shah after he visited you while you were in Iran. This, in my opinion, is not true. The deterioration in America's position in Iran is due to more deep-seated causes.

Let me examine for you what I believe to be the more deep-seated reasons for the deterioration of America's prestige in all of the Middle East.

Why have the Communists won in that area? Why have the Communists won in China?

They have won because Pat Hurley's advice was not followed. They won, for one reason, because after Roosevelt advised that Mr. Hurley's advice be followed, it was not follow d. There is another reason which I shall point out in a moment.

Mr. President, let us examine briefly what Mr. Hurley considers to be the deep-seated reasons for the deterioration of America's prestige in all of the Middle East. I read further from his letter:

I was shown a memorandum in the State Department which was written by Mr. Rostov and was initialed by Assistant Secretary Dean Acheson and others. This memoranda condemned the Iranian plan and referred to it as "messianic global-baloney."

There we find this man Dean Acheson again, Mr. President. I am very proud of the fact that I voted against confirmation of his nomination when it was before the Senate. Let those on this side of the aisle who voted for the confirmation of his nomination take the consequences.

I continue to read from Mr. Hurley's letter:

My report which you sent to the State Department was circulated in other departments of the Government. It carried with it the "messianic global-baloney" memoranda and was also verbally attacked by men in the State Department to such an extent that the report was discredited. It finally reached the press through a keyhole columnist in a discreditable form. So the basic work of destroying your Iranian plan was accomplished in Washington.

Those who opposed the Iranian plan in Washington have also expressed the same opinion about the Atlantic Charter that they have expressed about the Iranian plan. They are especially opposed to articles 3 and 4 of the Atlantic Charter which are, in full, as follows:

"3. They respect the rights of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live—and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

"4. They will endeavor with due respect for their existing obligation to further the enjoyment of all states, great and small, victor and vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity."

These are men in the State Department who are upholding imperialism, monopoly, and exploitation as opposed to the principles stated in the Atlantic Charter. That is one of the deep-seated reasons for the failure of the Iranian plan.

We come now to consider the experts. You very wisely pointed out, in your letter to me of March 25, 1944, that:

"If we can get the right kind of American experts who will remain loyal to their ideals I feel certain our policy of aiding Iran will succeed."

Here you put your fingers on the second deep-seated cause for the failure of the Iranian plan.

Mr. President, I hope all Senators clearly understand this matter. The Members of the Senate now on the floor should put themselves in the place of the Iranian people at that time. After the Tehran Conference, hundreds of thousands of them were awaiting action by the American experts.

I read further from Mr. Hurley's letter:

After the Tehran Conference, the Iranians awaited action by the American experts. Some of the so-called experts had already been appointed. The American experts in Iran were, at best, faced by a very difficult situation. Britain and Russia had occupied the country and had hired or commandeered nearly all the transportation facilities. They had already consumed a considerable portion of Iranian food. Our General Connolly was operating the Iranian railroad for the purpose of transporting supplies to Russia. American so-called experts were put in charge of food rationing and finance; military reorganization; national and municipal police reorganization and other internal affairs for the reorganization and development of Iran.

Significantly, Mr. President, all those foreigners were brought into Iran to conduct the affairs of the people of Iran for them, instead of letting the people of Iran control their own affairs, and those experts and other foreigners were brought there at the expense of the American taxpayers. I challenge the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to show any activity on its part at that time to point out the evils and errors in that situation. Not one speech on that subject was made on the floor of the Senate by the Republicans. So it is no wonder that the American people had no confidence in the Republican Party as constituted at the time of the last election. Of course, the people had no confidence in the Republican Party, and they should not have had any confidence in it, Mr. President. It has been said that we had a bipartisan foreign policy. A bipartisan policy to do what? It was a policy to ruin every poor man in every one of the poor countries which was relying upon the United States, as its friend, for help. But the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sat idly by and watched the exploitation go on.

I read further from Mr. Hurley's letter:

The conduct of the occupying nations had deprived Iran of transportation and food to a great extent. The occupying nations had required Iran to issue large amounts of currency which, together with the shortage of transportation and supplies, brought about inflation. The occupying nations publicly condemned the Iranian Government, which they had made impotent, for not taking stronger action. The occupying nations finally condemned the American experts or agents for not bringing order out of the chaos which the occupying nations had created. They have now succeeded in getting the Iranian Government to join them in condemnation of the American agents. In short, Mr. President, America has been made the goat. I am advised that the Shah said recently, during the course of a conference with the British Chargé d'Affaires, that he would be happy if all the so-called American experts would go home. We should frankly face the fact that to a great extent this position, if taken by the Shah, is justified.

Minister Dreyfus was withdrawn by you so that you could appoint a man capable of coordinating and leading the American agencies in Iran. There was great delay in appointing an Ambassador and a commercial attaché. The man who has recently been appointed Ambassador is unquestionably a splendid gentleman. He was in Iceland before being made Ambassador to Iran. He is not familiar with the situation in Iran. His previous experience would not justify anyone in believing that he is capable of handling the most difficult situation in the Middle East. He does not seem to understand your policy, nor does he show any evidence of being able to make it effective.

Dr. Millspaugh, the finance expert, is able and honest but has not been getting along very well. He has not had the support of the other American agencies in Iran.

Mr. President, in the United States the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force cannot get along together very well. Likewise in Iran the Americans who were sent there by the United States have even been quarreling among themselves, so, of course, they do not get very far in the right direction under those circumstances.

Mr. Hurley continues as follows:

The Iranians, the British, and the Russians and our own State Department believe that Dr. Millspaugh has failed. I am not willing to go that far in his case. I think his trouble is that he has not had the proper direction or support.

General Connolly, the American military commander, has certainly been efficient. He has achieved outstanding results in getting supplies to Russia. That was his mission.

Most of the other so-called American experts in Iran are washouts. Some of them have taken no action whatever. There is neither unification nor harmony among them. There has been no enlightened effort to coordinate American experts in Iran. The

experts, sent to Iran, have not been indoctrinated in the fundamental principles of the policy which you have adopted.

Instead of creating a set-up in Iran which would serve as criterion for America's policy not only in Iran but in all the so-called less-favored nations, the American effort in Iran has become a symbol of American inaction, incompetence, and failure.

Mr. President, it is no wonder that the Communists won in China.

I read further from the letter:

This is certainly not your fault nor is it the fault of the Secretary of State. Both of you have, in my opinion, been faithful to the principles of the Atlantic Charter and have reiterated many times the rights of small nations to free government, free enterprise, and the development of their own resources for the purpose of raising their own standard of living.

The deterioration of America's position in Iran and in the entire Middle East and the debacle of the principles of the Atlantic Charter was initiated in Washington. The element in the State Department that made plans for the defeat of your Iranian policy justifies the sale of lend-lease goods by the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. This corporation is a government-owned institution created for the purpose of establishing a trade monopoly in Iran. This corporation is the deep-seated basic reason for the failure of your plan for Iran. Those in the State Department who are opposed to the principles of the Atlantic Charter are cooperating in furnishing lend-lease goods to the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. and its subsidiaries for the purpose of sustaining imperialism, monopoly, and exploitation. These same people wish to prevent the building of free governments and free enterprise and the development of the resources of Iran and other Middle East nations for the purpose of raising the standard of living of the people within the Middle East nations. They are succeeding in subjecting all the peoples of the Middle East and Africa to the principles of imperialism, monopoly, and exploitation. The result of all this is that the United States, having occupied the highest position in the estimation of the Iranian officials and people, now occupy the lowest position of any of the powers represented there.

While I have written to you and spoken to you personally about the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. I am not certain that I have been able to impress upon your mind a true picture of what that corporation is doing. Let me give you here a brief outline of one of the chief reasons for the failure of your Iranian plan.

The United Kingdom Commercial Corp., with the use of American lend-lease goods, is establishing a trade monopoly in Iran. While in Iran I expressed my opposition to the use of American lend-lease goods for this purpose and wrote you suggesting that lend-lease supplies in the categories that were being sold should be stopped or at least the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. should be required to reimburse America for the lend-lease goods which it is selling for purposes that have no connection with the war but have the sole purpose of establishing a monopoly.

Your Minister, Dean James Landis, has told me that, in recognition of my demands, the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. has deposited $15,000,000 in some sort of a suspense account in London which is to be applied on the payment of lend-lease goods which it has sold. In recognition of the principle which I advocated the lend-lease goods are to be paid for as soon as an accounting has been made. While this does acknowledge the principle, the action would not be satisfactory to me if I were representing the United States. In the first place, the amount is not a drop in the bucket compared with the value of lend-lease goods which have been sold by the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. and its subsidiaries. In the second place, even the $15,000,000 will not, in my opinion, be applied. There seems to be a determined effort not to pay the United States for any lend-lease goods whether they are used for war purposes or sold by a corporation for the purpose of establishing a monopoly.

Article 1 of the Atlantic Charter is as follows:

"1. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other."

Because of the demands made on your time, I do not believe that you have ever fully realized that the money of the American taxpayer is being used in the name of democracy and in the name of the Atlantic Charter to establish an international trade monopoly that has for its purpose the exploitation of the people of the weaker nations throughout the Middle East, Africa, and elsewhere.

I might say, Mr. President, I do not believe a single Senator knew this corporation was selling lend-lease goods which they got for nothing from the United States. I do not believe there is a Senator upon the floor, including any member of the Foreign Relations Committee, who knows the extent of the corporation's operations.

The letter continues:

So that you may have a sketch of the gigantic operations of this monopoly, which we are supporting through lend-lease, I submit here a rough outline of the set-up of the United Kingdom Commercial Corp. and its subsidiaries.

A. The United Kingdom Commercial Corp. is a Government corporation having its headquarters in London. Its subsidiary corporations operate in each of the following nations under the name indicated:

1. UKCC (Egypt) Ltd.
2. UKCC (Libia).
3. UKCC (Sudan) Ltd.
4. East Africa.
5. UKCC (Ethiopia) Ltd.
6. UKCC (Eritrea) Ltd.
7. UKCC (Palestine) Ltd.
8. UKCC (Syria & Lebanon) Ltd.
9. UKCC (Iraq) Ltd.
10. UKCC (Persia) Ltd.
11. UKCC (East Africa) Ltd.
12. UKCC (Algiers) Ltd.
13. UKCC (Turkey) Ltd.

(In addition there are branch offices at Cyprus, Aden, and Jibuti.)

B. Global subsidiary:

14. United States.
15. India.
16. Argentine.
17. Portugal.

Mr. Hurley then expresses the viewpoint, I believe, of those typical, patriotic Americans who willingly sent their sons to fight for our country. It cannot possibly be better expressed than the way it is expressed by General Patrick Hurley—this man whom the President appointed, the man whom he would naturally suppose he could trust, and who up to the present time has always proved trustworthy; a man of ability, patriotic, honest, hard-working, self-sacrificing. In his letter to President Roosevelt, Mr. Hurley continues:

American money and lend-lease supplies are used by this corporation and by its subsidiaries for the purpose of controlling natural resources and trade and exploiting the people in all of the nations indicated. Incidentally, it is being used also for the purpose of defeating America's economic interests in all of these nations.

They are fighting the United States. They are using our lend-lease, selling it and taking the money, and fighting with lend-lease. That is what General Hurley found over there. The letter continues:

I do not say that it is intended to defeat America's interests alone. It is designed to prevent free enterprise, free commerce, free access to raw materials by all nations except Britain. The United Kingdom Commercial Corp. is the antithesis of the Atlantic Charter.

A frank statement of this situation in my letter to you of December 21, 1943, which became public through the State Department, led to the accusation that I am anti-British. I am not anti-British.

Oh, how the British rejoiced when Dean Acheson was appointed Secretary of State. The newspapers here in Washington were filled with their statements the next morning. They said, "We are satisfied with Dean Acheson; he suits us." Is not the fact that they can take our lend-lease, sell it, and then in every one of the countries I have named establish corporations for the purpose of exploiting the common people one reason why his appointment suits them?

Mr. Hurley says—and he uses beautiful language, Mr. President:

I am opposed to imperialism. I am opposed to monopoly. I am opposed to exploitation of weaker people. It is not necessary for me to say this to you as you are fully aware of these facts, but I am stating them here so that if this letter gets into the same channels that my letter of December 21, 1943, got into it will not be as easy for those in our Government who oppose the principles of the Atlantic Charter to put their own estimate on my character and the principles I support. For that reason I am writing down here that I do believe in democracy. I do believe that the people of the world should have equal rights of access to the raw materials of the world. I do believe that the people of small nations should be assisted in the development of their own resources for the benefit of themselves. I do believe that the resources and trade of nations should be developed primarily for the purpose of raising the standard of living within each nation. I am in favor of the principles for which you and Mr. Churchill have stated we are fighting. I am opposed to the British policy of imperialism and monopoly and exploitation in the Middle East and in Africa. I am convinced that this British policy is in conflict with the principles for which you and Mr. Churchill have stated we are fighting. I do believe that the destiny of the English speaking people is a single destiny. I do believe that the United States and Britain should get together on principles. From the facts stated here it is evident that the British do not uphold the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The failure of your program in Iran is due (1) to incompetence and lack of leadership of some of our own agents in Iran; (2) opposition to the plan in our own State Department; (3) to the determined opposition of British imperialists, and (4) to the strong, intelligent and determined opposition of the United Kingdom Commercial Corp.

My purpose in addressing this letter to you is to call your attention to the deterioration of America's position in Iran and to emphasize the effect of that deterioration on the prestige of America. I have no recommendations to offer other than those stated in my former letter. I do suggest the advisability of taking appropriate action to

correct the situation in Iran; to restate or reaffirm your policy and to retrieve America's prestige.

Respectfully submitted,

PATRICK J. HURLEY,
*Major General, A. U. S.*

Here then, Mr. President, is the way in which our own State Department representatives helped to plant the roots of imperial exploitation which are now bearing such bitter fruit. The tragic concesions that were made to Russia, already dealt with above, continue to be strengthened by the policies we are pursuing.

Not only have we subsidized the spread of British trading monopolies with lend-lease goods, during and since the end of the war, not only have we been financing British exploitation of weaker peoples in Africa and Asia, not only have we squeezed American business interests out of these areas with our own money, on this side of the iron curtain, but we have been doing exactly the same thing on the other side.

The fact is that for years we have been financing an expansion of British trade and financial interests on the other side of the iron curtain, to such an extent that we are now making a mockery of the cold war, both sides of which we are financing at the expense of the American taxpayer.

At this very moment Britain is moving in and taking over the trading concessions behind the iron curtain, which we are forbidding the American people to touch.

We say to our American business men, "You cannot go behind the iron curtain in order to get business." At the same time, we are putting up money so that the British can go there, and they are going there.

As proof of this fact let me cite a few examples.

First, let us remember that the Russian blockade of Berlin was answered by the United States with a counter-blockade of the eastern zone. Yet, this action has been largely negated by the British, since supplies of almost all the materials the eastern zone used to get from the west are now being shipped in increasing quantities through the British zone. Even in the British sector of Berlin, a profitable trade with the Russians continues in a trading system that involves both outright barter and cash payments in hard currency or gold.

We can keep on flying in materials. We can keep on saying to American business men, "You cannot do business behind the iron curtain"; but Great Britain is doing it every day, every hour, every minute.

It also now develops that Britain is extending her activity further into the Russian sphere in bilateral trade arrangements both with the satellite countries and with Russia herself.

For example, let us look at what is happening under the British 5-year trade and financial agreement with Poland.

This involves such an increased volume of trade that it will definitely cut British imports from Canada and replace them with imports from behind the iron curtain.

We have voted many billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. But the people told the Republicans what they thought of that policy, and they told them in no uncertain terms. The Democrats said, "We will give them $1,000,000,000." The Republicans said, "Let us make it $2,000,000,000." The vote in the Foreign Relations Committee was unanimous. I, as a member of the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party, am here alone, and I assure my Republican colleagues that the people of America shall know the record. It is time they found out about it.

As to taxes, the President calls for $4,000,000,000 additional taxes. I am not surprised that there are not more Senators upon the floor; I am not surprised at all. I am the lone member of the farmer-labor branch of the Republican Party in the Senate. I felt flattered a day or two ago when one of the distinguished Republican Senators, who is up for reelection 2 years from now, asked me to come into his State and campaign for him. There is a group of 6, 8, or 10 Senators on the Republican side who feel as I do, as is evidenced by the resolution introduced today by the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. I want to assure the Senate that we do not want to give away America. There may be only a small group of us upon the floor, but it is a group that will fight, bring out the facts for the benefit of the American people, and call a spade a spade, without regard to the distinction between Republicans and Democrats.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that England was getting this trade away from the United States, going behind the iron curtain and getting it. I mentioned the 5-year trade and finance agreement regarding Poland which England has made. Let us look at what is happening. Already this agreement calls for a tremendous increase in imports over present levels of such commodities as eggs, bacon, and lumber products. Polish shipments of eggs will rise from 435,000 to 1,100,000 boxes annually—frozen eggs from 3,500 to 8,000 tons in 1953. I have here a letter from a North Dakota farmer, which indicates that farmers there are getting 33 cents a dozen for their eggs. The shipment of frozen eggs, as I have said, will rise from 3,500 to 8,000 tons in 1953. 1949's shipments of lumber to Britain will be augmented by over a billion dollars' worth of lumber products.

Britain is already increasing her trade with Russia directly under agreements which are still in force, and she is carrying on negotiations to increase this trade on a permanent basis.

A picture of how this is developing, particularly in the Far East, is contained in the International Statistical Bureau's Foreign Letter of February 4, 1949, from which I quote:

> Hong Kong, for example, has its own currency, but it is also one of the largest trading centers in free- and transferable-account sterling. British and Dutch firms may sell Chinese goods in the United States, acquire dollars, buy transferable-account sterling at a discount of 15 to 20 percent, and with it buy British goods for reexport into China, Macao, or other areas where hard currency can be obtained.
>
> Great Britain's imports from the United States declined about 40 percent last year but Hong Kong's imports from the United States increased by about 27 percent. Hong Kong's exports to Malaya and to the British Commonwealth countries were more or less stagnant but there was a major increase in shipments to China and Macao.
>
> Closer analysis shows that exports from Hong Kong to southern and central China decreased, while shipments to the Communist-controlled north and to such black market centers as Macao rose sharply.

The Communists got more than ever.

> Macao is a Portuguese colony off the China coast, opposite the mouth of the Canton River, having a population of 375,000 and an area of 14 square miles. Exports from Hong Kong to Macao have been almost twice as great as exports to the United Kingdom and not much less than exports to the United States.
>
> Another even more striking example is trade with Russian-controlled Northern Korea via Hong Kong. Northern Korea is practically a forbidden zone for American traders, but Hong Kong's shipments to this area are booming and profits of 100 to 200 percent are not unusual.

Mind you, Mr. President, I am quoting that from the International Statistical Bureau's Foreign Letter of February 4. It proceeds.

> Payments are made in local produce or in goods produced in the U. S. S. R. and shipped especially to Northern Korea for reexport to the Western Hemisphere via Kong Kong.

An even more glaring example of how we are continuing to underwrite everybody else's interests but our own, and to play into the hands of the Communists on both sides of the Iron Curtain, can be found in recent developments in Indonesia.

What about Indonesia? The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] was especially concerned, when he offered his resolution on behalf of himself and a group of other Senators, about Indonesia.

It is strange that the real story of what is taking place there has been so completely suppressed. The fact of the matter is that, in direct violation of our own promises to the Indonesians that we would support their drive for independence when the war ended, we have been supporting Dutch tyranny and aggression with American taxpayers' money ever since.

When the Dutch moved in, just before Christmas, and captured the Republican Nationalist Government leaders, they took that action supported by Marshall plan dollars. It is terribly significant that the expenses of this war do not appear in the Dutch budget as an expense item, but rather as a credit, which they are going to force the new United States of Indonesia Government to assume, when the final arrangements are made to set that Government up.

This means that by the time this takes place, the Indonesians will have become so burdened with the war debt incurred by the Dutch that the representatives of that Government will actually do no more than serve as exorbitant tax collectors for the Dutch, exploiting their own people and their tremendous raw material resources, for the benefit of the

Dutch, who in turn, will exploit America's need for these materials, without making any part of the resulting profits available to the Indonesians who produced them.

What is more Mr. President, these policies are also resulting in the exclusion of American firms from the Indonesian market.

On December 24, 1948, Mr. Thomas Conroy, business editor of the New York Times, wrote:

> The quota regulations set up by the Netherlands Indies Government, it was asserted by exporters here, have almost completely barred the American exporter from enjoying any portion of this business (that is, United States exports of almost $250,000,000 to Indonesia in 1946, 1947, and 1948.)
>
> It is understood that representations on this situation have been made to the State Department, from time to time. Although the State Department has appeared sympathetic to these protests, it has not seen fit to take any effective action to remedy these conditions.

Mr. Conroy went on to charge:

> It was explained for background that a number of Dutch East Indies official, semi-official, and private purchasing missions have been established in the United States through which that business has been channeled.
>
> Moreover, according to the exporting fraternity here, they know of no other country, and many of them have as compelling foreign-exchange problems as does the Netherlands Indies, which monopolizes the trade to such an extent.

Mr. President, the same picture holds true of France in Indochina. All of this is confirmed in a recent pact agreed upon by England, France, and the Netherlands, to the effect that they would stand by each other in their plans to reimpose their systems of imperial exploitation in every possible area around the world.

This then is what has become of the Atlantic Charter principles, and of the genuine plan for American international cooperation drawn up by General Hurley and endorsed by the late President.

It is against this background that we must now project the President's inaugural address, because there are two different worlds here represented.

During his inaugural address, President Truman once more reaffirmed the basic American principles for which this Nation stands, and upon our faithful adherence to which our future is utterly dependent, when he said:

> Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.
>
> Such new economic developments must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. The old imperialism—exploitation for private profit—has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing.

Yet, Mr. President, not only is this bold, new program compromised by existing programs which are based on the principles of cruel exploitation, it is also based on a return to the fallacy that American taxpayers must spend the rest of their lives bailing out the peoples whom we are helping to keep in permanent bankruptcy and bondage.

Mr. President, the time has come to hold a complete and honest review of our whole over-all foreign policy, if we are to be able to undo the tragic blunders of the past, and take advantage of our last chance to restore the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of our own magnificent tradition as the basis of our domestic and foreign relations.

If the President fails to meet this challenge of these critical times, and seeks to perpetuate on a permanent basis more of this pathological internationalism that is destroying us as a free and sovereign people, then the United States Senate should rise to the challenge, drag this whole sorry matter out in the open, for all to see, repudiate the blunders and betrayals that have taken place, and rewrite the foundation of a genuine American foreign policy right here on the Senate floor.

If this becomes our only recourse, we shall be doing only what the late President Roosevelt himself recognized to be the sovereign duty of the representatives of the American people to protect their own interests, when he wrote to Stalin on March 24, 1945, to protest Soviet violations of their agreement:

> I am sure you are aware that genuine popular support in the United States is required to carry out any governmental policy, foreign or domestic. The American people make up their own mind and no governmental action can change it.

Mr. President, the time has come to give the American people this last chance to make their own decisions, and to take control of their own destiny back into their own hands once more.

## EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF MARITIME COMMISSION TO SELL AND OPERATE VESSELS, ETC.

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER's speech,

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment, with the understanding that my remarks and any further proceedings in connection therewith will be placed at the conclusion of his address, so that it will not be interrupted in the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to have called up at this time a joint resolution dealing with the Maritime Commission. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 51, which is the same as House Joint Resolution 92.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I did not realize that this question would be raised to interrupt the Senator from North Dakota, and I would not wish to do so. I understood that the joint resolution was agreeable to both sides. I spoke to the minority leader about it, and I understood that it had been cleared.

Mr. KNOWLAND. But I understand that the Senator from Washington has an amendment to offer.

Mr. BREWSTER. The amendment will be offered by me.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Maine has an amendment. The joint resolution is unanimously reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and the House joint resolution has the approval of the House committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have been left here as acting minority leader. Because of the small attendance of Senators in the Chamber at this time, I feel that under the circumstances we should have a quorum call.

Mr. LANGER. Then I decline to yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will withdraw the point of no quorum, I will yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield at this time.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I withdrew my point of no quorum, on the theory that the Senator from North Dakota would proceed with his remarks.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

After the conclusion of Mr. LANGER's speech,

## SUGGESTION FOR RECALL OF GENERAL MACARTHUR TO PRESENT HIS VIEWS REGARDING THE FAR EAST

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on yesterday I addressed a letter to the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, as follows:

FEBRUARY 16, 1949.

Hon. MILLARD TYDINGS,
*Armed Services Committee,*
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: In view of recent press dispatches that have cast some doubt upon our Pacific military policy, and the demands that will soon be made upon the Congress for military assistance to western Europe, I believe that it is vital that members of the Armed Services Committee be fully informed on all phases of the entire global situation. For this reason, I strongly urge that the Senate Armed Services Committee extend an invitation to Gen. Douglas MacArthur to return to the United States to present his views of the situation existing in the Far

East and its effect upon the national defense of the United States and its territories.

With best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
*United States Senator.*

Mr. President, it will be recalled that about a year ago the suggestion was made that General MacArthur return to the United States and appear at that time before the Senate Appropriations Committee. The general quite properly declined to do so, first, because of his duties in the Pacific area at that time, and, second, because the United States was then engaged in the preliminaries to a great political campaign. The general apparently felt that his return at that time might be misunderstood. I think his reasons were perfectly valid.

At the present time, however, Mr. President, the situation is entirely different. The Senate of the United States in a short time is going to be called upon not only to make substantial appropriations for the continued support of the ECA program, but is also going to be called upon to make substantial appropriations for military support to western Europe.

I have been concerned of late, as I think a number of other Members of the Senate have been, over recent reports emanating from Tokio to the effect that there perhaps has been a basic change in American policy toward Japan. I hope there has been no basic change in American policy in regard to keeping Japan from falling prey to communism. I can think of nothing, Mr. President, that would do more to undermine the hope of establishing a free democratic government in Japan and retard the economic recovery of that country than for anyone in a responsible position to indicate that the United States might, under present world conditions withdraw from the islands of Japan, or in the event of Soviet aggression might abandon them into the hands of Soviet Russia.

With respect to what has happened in China our policy in that regard should be reexamined. The Yalta agreement made certain commitments to Soviet Russia at the expense of our historic friends, the Chinese National Government. Those agreements which were made at that time certainly have contributed mightily to the problems faced by China today.

At a time when I think all of us agree on the importance of preventing western Europe from going behind the iron curtain to me it simply does not make sense for our nation to sit complacently by while some 450,000,000 of our traditional friends, the Chinese, are taken behind the iron curtain. It does not seem wise to me that there should be even contemplated, Mr. President, the possibility of further retreat in the Far East and out of the islands of Japan.

For that reason it seems to me that it would be entirely fitting and proper for General MacArthur to return to this country and give the Members of the Senate and of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and such other committees as might want to hear his testimony, the benefit of his advice.

This is a matter that relates to the national defense of the United States of America. Perhaps those of us who represent Pacific Coast States, Mr. President, may be pardoned for having a particular interest in this regard, but the waters of the Pacific Ocean wash upon our States. It was not so very many years ago that we had in the State of California, so far as I know, the only enemy shelling of an American State by an enemy submarine. We saw the encroachments at that time of one of the Axis partners coming down through Alaska and establishing enemy bases in that territory. We want no repetition of that kind should the world be so unfortunate as to become engaged in another war at some time in the future.

Mr. President, the members of the Senate Armed Services Committee have a responsibility to themselves, to the Congress, and to the country, to secure as much and as complete information as possible on the entire global situation before we make our final decisions.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from California an address delivered by me in Sacramento, Calif., on last Friday night, dealing with the subject of American policy in the Orient, which was the subject which the Senator from California discussed.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY IN THE ORIENT

(Address by Senator OWEN BREWSTER, of Maine, before Lincoln Club at Sacramento, Calif., on Friday evening, February 11, 1949)

California is justly proud of its myriad products but its greatest product is the United Nations.

Here on the shores of the Pacific at the Golden Gate this age-old vision of a united world at last had its dramatic birth.

The child is having a tough time. The iron curtain of communism threatens to clang down on the Open Door in the Orient.

The American doctrine of this century of a free and peaceful Orient is threatened with destruction by the advancing hordes of a modern Genghis Kahn.

Certainly no one on the west coast will have any illusions as to American trade with a Communist-dominated China on any other terms than seem at the time advantageous to the masters of the Kremlin.

As our own Ambassador Philip C. Jessup well said in the Security Council on January 11, 1949; "No one doubts that the Communists in Indonesia like the Communists throughout the world are responsive to and act in accordance with instructions from Moscow. * * * Anywhere in the world when a Communist government climbs in through the window, independence is kicked out the door."

The velvet paws of the present will all too soon disclose their cruel claws when the time seems ripe to strike.

Every consideration of decency and self-interest argues for America to stand firm against Communist domination of the Orient.

I do not say our State Department is under Communist control. I say that if Stalin had been in charge of our State Department for the past 3 years he could not have done a better job to serve the cause of Communist penetration in China.

With the world war ended there was every reason to expect China would be restored to its ancient dominion in accordance with the pledge to Chiang at Cairo by Roosevelt and Churchill.

What happened? Stalin under the secret agreement at Yalta (of which not even General Marshall had been informed) was given control of Manchuria. The vast stores of Japanese war matériel and the even more important munition production of Manchuria were placed at the service of the Communists. Time was necessary to reorganize and mobilize this enormous military potential. Now note the coincidence.

For 10 months all American military aid was cut off to Chiang while the State Department sought to force Chiang to take the Communists into his government. For the following 10 months with the American embargo lifted it proved impracticable for any material shipments to be made.

Vast and insidious agencies of propaganda were operating full blast to discredit the Chiang regime with apparently the full sympathy of the responsible authorities in our State Department.

Chennault, Wedemeyer, Hurley, and Bullitt might warn in vain. Chiang seemed doomed to destruction by the official voice of the State Department even though he was obviously the only challenge to Communist domination.

Why has the Wedemeyer report never yet been released to the American public? Is it because it pointed out the deadly peril of Soviet domination of Manchuria? Is it because it suggested a United Nations' mandate for Manchuria?

Is it not now clearly evident that Berlin was simply a side show to distract our attention while communism engulfed the Orient?

Similarly a republic regime in Indonesia is in process of destruction while the United Nations wrings its hands in vain protest and the United States supplies hundreds of millions of American dollars to the government that defies the United Nations.

Listen to a leader of American communism: "With Chiang liquidated the Soviet member of the United Nations Security Council will announce that he represents more than one-half the population of the globe and Americans will hang their heads in shame."

Two of the five permanent members of the Security Council will be Communists and France totters on the brink.

The Pacific coast owes it to their fellow Americans to make its voice heard.

A Communist-dominated Asia means a menace to everything for which America now stands.

The Republican Party has never left its position in doubt as to the vital importance of a peaceful Pacific to our national security.

What shall it profit us to stabilize Europe and lose all influence in the Orient?

Fifty years of patient cultivation of friendly relations with China seem in danger of destruction in the very hour of our triumph.

With the Japanese menace eliminated, peace in the Pacific, and all that implies, was easily within our grasp. Now we see it turn to ashes in our hands.

Our sons and grandsons may well pay a bitter price for our tragic failure in the very hour of victory.

Once again we have won a war and now proceed to lose the peace.

Mr. IVES subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to speak for just a moment on the question just discussed by the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I beg the attention of the Senate while I support as strongly as I

can the recommendation which he has just made to have Gen. Douglas MacArthur come to this country and appear before either the Armed Services Committee of the Senate or such other committees as it may be desirable to have him appear before, for the purpose of obtaining as much knowledge as possible at this particularly important time with regard to the questions now confronting us in the Pacific.

I do not believe that the Pacific coast is the only part of the United States which is interested in having General MacArthur come to this country. Speaking for the State of New York, I know that there is intense interest among many of our citizens in having Douglas MacArthur come to this country to place himself in a position where the vast knowledge which he must have can be made available to our Government and our people. Perhaps other Senators have spoken on this subject prior to the remarks of the Senator from California and myself.

Of course, I assume that certain portions of the Government, such as the executive branch and the armed services, may be obtaining this information, and presumably are obtaining it. But the Congress is not getting it. The rank and file of the people in this country are not getting it. I know definitely that all Americans everywhere undoubtedly would feel a great deal more comfortable if they knew that all the knowledge which that great American possesses—and undoubtedly he knows more about the Pacific and the Pacific problems than any other living American—would be placed at our disposal for our use and our advantage, and for the advantage of the country. So I strongly support the suggestion which I just heard submitted to the Senate by the dintinguished Senator from California.

## EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO MARITIME COMMISSION TO SELL AND OPERATE VESSELS, ETC.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 51, Calendar No. 39.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 51 is identical with House Joint Resolution 92, which has been favorably reported unanimously by the House committee. The House has granted a rule on the joint resolution, and the resolution is going to be considered in the House today. The two resolutions provide for the extension of the Maritime Commission authority to buy, to charter, to sell, and to operate ships until June 30, 1949. The joint resolution has been unanimously reported from the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The reason we have set the date at June 30, 1949, to correspond with the House committee action is that both committees, the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, hope to have a real review of our maritime plight by that time, with a view of enacting permanent legislation regarding the sale, charter, and operation of ships.

The American flag is rapidly going off the seas. The American merchant marine has disintegrated in front of our eyes, from 1,200 ships operating under the American flag 16 months ago to only about 360 ships operating under the American flag today. The Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce expects to go into the subject. We hope to be able to do something not only with regard to the policies of the Maritime Commission and the establishment of a national maritime policy, which we do not have today, but we also hope to consider the question of ERC, and shipments in American bottoms, as well as the question of the Army and the Navy being in the shipping business.

Paradoxically, Mr. President, the Army's navy today, in competition with the American merchant marine, has more ships operating on the seas than has the merchant marine itself. The Navy is in the shipping business. Several American operators have sought to circumvent American taxation and American rules and regulations by operating under the Panamanian and Liberian flags.

All these things have led to a disintegration in the American merchant marine, and we are finding ourselves in the same position in regard to our merchant marine that we were in after World War I. I think the Congress should take some action about it. Something should be done in all branches of government, and with private operators, labor, and all other groups involved, in an effort to provide a strong merchant marine.

In view of the fact that we intend to give the question an honest review, we have extended the date to June 30, 1948, in the hope that we can report to Congress some permanent legislation, or at least undertake to establish a permanent merchant marine policy. I hope the Senate bill will pass the joint resolution. This authority expires on February 28, and it is quite necessary that we act this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 51?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment, on page 1, line 9, after the word "date" to strike out "March 1, 1950" and insert "June 30, 1949," so as to make the joint resolution read:

*Resolved, etc.*, That (a) the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 27, 1948 (Public Law 423, 80th Cong.), is amended by striking out the date "March 1, 1949" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the date June 30, 1949. That joint resolution is further amended by inserting at the end of subparagraph (b) thereof the words "*Provided, however,* That vessels may be chartered to the Republic of the Philippines, or citizens thereof, for use in the interisland commerce of the Philippines in accordance with section 306 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 137; U. S. C., 1946 edition, table 50, sec. 1786)."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will say to the Senator that there is a committee amendment first to be considered.

Mr. BREWSTER. I will await disposition of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Maine will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the joint resolution it is proposed to insert the following proviso: "*Provided, further,* That the Maritime Commission is hereby authorized to approve without condition the transfer of flag or sale foreign under section 9 of the Shipping Act of 1916, of any vessel owned by a citizen or citizens of the United States, which was acquired by the United States pursuant to a determination by the Inter-allied Reparation Agency Shipping Committee and thereafter sold to such citizen by the Maritime Commission, if in the opinion of the Maritime Commission such vessel is not necessary or economically desirable for permanent use in the American merchant marine."

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, this amendment relates only to ships which were acquired from foreign countries by the United States under the reparations agreements. The only ships which I know of that are immediately involved are four ships acquired from German registry, which it has been found entirely impracticable to operate under the American flag. There was some question in the Maritime Commission as to whether or not it had the authority to authorize their transfer. The first opinion was that it did not. Subsequently the Commission has indicated that perhaps it does have the authority, and it has now asked for a hearing on the question, which will be held shortly. However, in order to clear up any doubt as to the authority of the Commission, I am offering this amendment, which I trust will be accepted.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Maine, and the amendment is perfectly acceptable. However, it should be understood, as the Senator from Maine has said, that this applies only to foreign ships. I think the Congress should know that while this authority is to be continued until June 30, 1949, the Maritime

Commission still adheres to the policy of refusal to sell American-built ships to foreign governments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENLARGEMENT AND EXTENSION OF THE MARSHALL PLAN

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is now engaged in hearings upon the continuation of ECA. As a member of the committee I have listened to a great part of the hearings with the greatest of interest. As I announced in the discussions yesterday afternoon in the hearings, I shall support fully the sums requested by ECA authorities and by the State Department and by the President. I believe the Marshall plan, so-called, has achieved great progress, that it has made possible immense strides in the rehabilitation of the war-devastated areas of Europe, and in strengthening democracy in the world. As I said yesterday, I could not but feel some regret, when I heard recitals of how effectively the nations which are the recipients of this aid have worked together, that that pattern could not be the form of cooperation of the whole world.

In the course of yesterday afternoon's hearing Mr. Paul Hoffman stated that not only had the recipient nations, 19 in number, had to work together to better their conditions, but they would have to cooperate in the future to preserve the gains which they have won or shall have won under the ECA program.

I hope, however, Mr. President, that we shall find it possible to continue and enlarge the reach of such a program to other parts of the earth. If it is good for the countries of western Europe to be rehabilitated, to regain their democratic strength, to become more valuable contributors to world commerce and trade, then I think at least with respect to other areas of the world which embrace democracy the same advantages would lie. I have regretted somewhat the specialized motivation for the ECA program, which I think I have discovered in some sources. I regard the ECA program not as merely a program to stop communism or to arrest aggressive nationalism, but as an affirmative program which will contribute to a more prosperous world and therefore to a more prosperous and secure United States of America. And of course my own interest is primarily in the effect which the program will have upon the security and the economic strength and power of our own country.

Mr. President, when we have achieved that level of progress with ECA which will make it possible for us to shift the emphasis to other non-Communist areas of the earth, if the Communist areas show the proper spirit of cooperation and accord, the proper observance of the principles of the international charter, and contribute to making ours a peaceful and prosperous world, then of course they themselves, as General Marshall has said, might also be included in such a program. But I hope we shall recognize, when the program reaches its peak, and when it comes to a conclusion, that it has achieved a measure of success and conferred benefits not only upon other countries but upon ours, which will justify us in attempting to enlarge its beneficence and its munificence to other areas of the world where the need is so crying as it is today. I believe the world must work together, not only to have peace, but to enjoy prosperity, and that those nations that have interrupted world economic cooperation are themselves the greater losers for their obstructive tactics. I hope some day that self-interest, without referring to human obligations, will induce all peoples to bring themselves, through the United Nations, into a truly cooperative world.

Therefore, Mr. President, feeling that way about it I was very much gratified at point 4, which was contained in the inaugural address of the President. There are certain brief passages in that portion of the President's address to which I should like to advert. Said the President:

> I believe that we should make available to peace-loving peoples the benefits of our store of technical knowledge in order to help them realize their aspirations for a better life. And, in cooperation with other nations, we should foster capital investment in areas needing development.
>
> Our aim should be to help the free peoples of the world, through their own efforts to produce more food, more clothing, more materials for housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens.
>
> We invite other countries to pool their technological resources in this undertaking. Their contributions will be warmly welcomed. This should be a cooperative enterprise in which all nations work together through the United Nations and its specialized agencies whenever practicable. It must be a world-wide effort for the achievement of peace, plenty, and freedom.
>
> With the cooperation of business, private capital, agriculture, and labor in this country, this program can greatly increase the industrial activity in other nations and can raise substantially their standards of living.
>
> Such new economic developments must be devised and controlled to benefit the peoples of the areas in which they are established. Guaranties to the investor must be balanced by guaranties in the interest of the people whose resources and whose labor go into these developments.
>
> The old imperialism—exploitation for foreign profit—has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concepts of democratic fair dealing.

The concluding paragraph in that very conspicuous portion of this very able address was this:

> Democracy alone can supply the vitalizing force to stir the peoples of the world into triumphant action, not only against their human oppressors, but also against their ancient enemies—hunger, misery, and despair.

I am an optimist about the future.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to advocate that ECA assistance be now extended behind the iron curtain?

Mr. PEPPER. I have certainly said just the contrary. I am glad the Senator gave me a point to leave no possible ambiguity in the minds of any hearer.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wondered whether there was any doubt about it.

Mr. PEPPER. Not in the slightest. I laid down the standards, when they would become the recipients. They were the same standards as those promulgated by General Marshall when the Marshall plan was first proposed, namely, their willingness to subscribe to the principles of the United Nations Charter and to become cooperative parts of a peaceful and cooperative world.

Mr. President, I believe the future holds the brightest era of all history for us. With the technology we possess at the present time, with the business genius the world possesses, with the natural resources yet to be exploited and developed, the golden age of all history is with the dawn and not with the sunset, or even the noon.

But it is essential to American prosperity that we help other parts of the earth to be prosperous as well as peaceful. We have a capacity which we cannot consume in this country of ours. We must find markets. Those markets must come either from the alteration of our own economic system, so that we shall provide out of our bounty for those who cannot even buy, or we must stimulate other areas of the world to a fair participation in trade which will make them buyers from us and sellers to us, and we, buyers from and sellers to them. The backward parts of the earth particularly cry out for our technological skill, for the genius of our businessmen, for the assistance of our capital, and for the beneficent influence that our great Government may extend to them in their own effort. That particularly applies to our own hemisphere, where boundless resources are yet to be tapped, and where almost unimaginable progress is a possibility for the future.

That brings me to an observation I particularly rose to make, which is, that it must be understood by those who want American assistance that they must receive it and deal with us in the same way we receive their assistance and deal with them. A foreign corporation operating in the United States, for example, observes only the law of the land. Foreign corporations are not discriminated against in the United States. They receive no special favors. Once they are admitted into the heart of our Nation and life and people, they meet competition just as other entrepeneurs do. They receive the benefits of our blessings, and they must bear their share of our duties and burdens. I am afraid that is not always true according to present practices in some of our sister republics in the Western Hemisphere. I am thinking now of some of the general tendencies we hear about almost daily—instances of coup d'états by military cliques—instances of democratic governments being deposed by military coercion. The American people do not subscribe to

the principles related to such practices. We hear of other cases where legitimately chosen governments are ousted from their authority by anarchy and force of one kind or another. That, too, is strange to the American concept of democracy.

In still other cases, Mr. President, our business enterprises are discriminated against. They are the victims of discriminatory policies which other business enterprises in competition with them do not have to bear. That also is not in accord with our concepts of fair dealing and with the premises upon which we generally extend aid to other peoples of the earth. I have in mind a recent case occurring in Guatemala, where a great American enterprise, the United Fruit Co., in the words of the president of that very country, had been discriminated against by the action of the Guatemalan Government. For instance, President Arevalo himself advised the United States Ambassador, so I am informed, that a certain law was obviously intentionally discriminatory against this American company, and that he, the President, thought it was a machine gun aimed at the head of this American company, and that he, the President, agreed that the discrimination should be removed, and that he would do everything possible to effect its removal. These assurances, so I understand, have repeatedly been given to our State Department in the past few months; and I am informed that it is the policy of the President of that country to try to rid his government of the criticism that she had adopted discriminatory practices and policies toward this very enterprising and highly valued American company.

Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood. I do not desire to see America return to the days of the past, the lamentable past, when American marines stood at the command of the Government of the United States to collect corporate debts and sometimes to enforce corporate preferences in our part of the world. Certainly, I shall to the limit of my ability resist any effort to return to such odious practices on the part of American business or American Government. But, Mr. President, at the same time that I would be the first, if I could, to condemn American abuse of the hospitality of a foreign country by American entrepreneurs by means of attempting to take that which is not fairly theirs, or to enjoy privileges which they have no right to request, I would be equally alert in extending warnings to those who would discriminate against our enterprising investors, against our business concerns, and I would point out that that cannot be the way by which they or their country may obtain or enjoy the greatest cooperation from the American Government or the American people.

Mr. President, I hope that the countries of South America and Central America, our sister republics who hold such close places in our affections, who lie so close to our country and to our hearts, will recognize that they have a collective responsibility to see to it that when American capital and American enterprise venture forth to enjoy their hospitality, they, like all others who enjoy hospitality, shall accept it upon fair conditions; but at the same time, Mr. President, I hope they will recognize intelligently that their own self-interest, as well as hemispheric and world prosperity, are related to their extending the same nondiscriminatory, fair conditions of investment and operation to American investors and entrepreneurs, when they happen to go into those countries, as may be enjoyed either by other foreign interests or by domestic enterprises of the same character which occupy the same relative positions.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my able friend from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have listened with much interest to all that the Senator from Florida has had to say. I was also very much interested in the address delivered on this floor on Monday by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. PEPPER. So was I.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Massachusetts spoke along the same lines on which the Senator from Florida has spoken today, giving emphasis to the proposition that there must be mutuality in the matter of aid—that it is a two-way street.

The Senator from Florida has well stated—and in stating his position, he certainly states my position—that we are unalterably opposed to any imperialism or any imperialistic designs; we are unalterably opposed to any return to the lamentable past, as the Senator has so aptly described it, when marines were used, or when anything of that kind occurred in connection with any of our sister republics in Central America or South America.

In fact, I take it that the Senator from Florida and I stand here today, as we speak, in keeping with the spirit of the good-neighbor policy of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, wishing to extend a helping hand to the people of South America and Central America, particularly those who must live and must work out their existence in the more backward areas. But if we are to extend a helping hand, it must be received in a spirit of justice and of equality and of fair play. There must not be discrimination against the interests of the United States or the interests of United States companies or United States nationals.

The Senator from Florida spoke of the United Fruit Co. That is a great company. As the Senator from Florida well knows, as a native Alabamian, we have in Alabama the great port of Mobile. We are proud of that port as one of the great ports, not only of the Gulf area, but of the whole United States. The United Fruit Co. does much business in that port; it makes many contributions to the business and the success of that port. We like the United Fruit Co., and we do not appreciate the discriminations which now are being practiced against it in Guatemala and perhaps in some other places.

I recall that during the war the United Fruit Co. rendered a very great service to our country. As the Senator from Florida well recalls, before the war our Navy was almost entirely dependent on the Far East for the hemp it had to have to carry on its operations successfully. The United Fruit Co. went into Latin America, and provided the engineering techniques and the agricultural skills for the production of hemp; and thus the United States Navy, in the time of the great stress and danger of war, was enabled to have an adequate supply of hemp it so badly needed.

I understand that that company has been carrying out plans for the production, perhaps, of rubber and other agricultural products which will give us, shall we say, a living, growing stock pile, so as to free us from our dependence upon the Far East for these vital strategic products. We know from our experience in the last war that we can no longer rest easy when we are dependent upon products coming great distances from places located in the Far East. This company has rendered and is rendering today a great service. I would be the last person to ask for any special favor or for any special privilege for it, or for any other company, but surely we have a right to ask that it be treated fairly, that it be not discriminated against, that it have a right to go into those countries to render help and to give aid to them and to their people. That is exactly the idea the Senator from Florida has so well expressed here today. I want to join with him.

Mr. President, I should like to say another thing while I am on my feet. From what we know of the situation in Guatemala, and perhaps in other countries, the labor unions in those countries are completely dominated and controlled by whichever faction happens to be in control of the Government. Those labor unions are used as mere pawns, under the command of the governing clique. They are used against the best interests of the United States.

I simply rose, Mr. President, because I was interested in the remarks of the Senator from Florida, and to associate myself with him. We wish to render aid to Latin America, but we insist that when we do extend a helping hand the people of the United States should be treated with fairness, equity, and justice.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am very deeply indebted to the able senior Senator from Alabama. Whenever he addresses himself to a subject he makes a very great contribution to it. If I, in my feeble remarks, have precipitated the very able utterances which the senior Senator from Alabama has made, I have been successful far beyond my anticipation.

Mr. President, I remember being in a certain part of the world and being told by representatives of a particular government there that another nation, which was the recipient of American assistance, had requested it not to give certain concessions to the United States

which were of a public nature. I do not consider that to be fair dealing. We want to deal as a good neighbor and friend, and as an intelligently self-interested people, with all nations and peoples in the world. The same principle applies where it is not a matter of one nation which is the recipient of our aid asking others to discriminate against us as in instances where the nation itself which seeks and needs American help, as we need its assistance and good will, proposes to discriminate against American entrepreneurs.

I say this with particular interest in and affection for Central and South America. As the able present occupant of the chair knows, we in Florida pride ourselves upon our feeling of kinship as well as upon our geographic propinquity to the people of Central and South America. We often speak of ourselves as representing in friendship the outstretched hand of the United States of America to Central and South America.

Mr. President, I have said what I have said today because I am one of those who will hardly be exceeded by any other Senator in the Chamber in favoring American assistance to those people. I think there are involved immeasurable opportunities for them, for us, and for the world. What I have said has not been intended as being said in any spirit of criticism, of rebuke, or of reproach, but, as best I could, as an interpretation of what I believe to be the general sentiments of our Government and of our people in respect to the matters which I have mentioned.

So let us seek to work more closely together. Let us preserve integrity of property, integrity of person, and integrity of human liberty everywhere in the world, or, at least, let us form a great community of nations and peoples who believe in those principles and who will promote them to the best of their ability. We can bring prosperity and peace to a great part of the world. Some of us are persuaded that by our good example and by what we may be able to accomplish together we may establish a pattern for all the nations of the world.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, no Senator, of course, would quarrel with wanting to help other nations and other peoples or with wanting to help our own people. I do not know of anyone who does not want to help. But we cannot help individuals, nations, or people unless they want to be helped. There is nothing new about our technology, our scientific achievements, and our manufacturing skill. They have always been open to the world. Our great manufacturing facilities have been open to every country in the world. Our businessmen have always been anxious to sell their goods in any part of the world. Our form and type of government has been available to all the nations of the world for 165 years, and for all those years we have been anxious to have them follow our pattern and our type and form of government. We have been anxious to sell them merchandise. We have been anxious to see them do all the things which we have been doing. Our so-called know-how in America is free to all the peoples of the world. Our form of government is free to all the peoples of the world to adopt. There is no mystery connected with it.

Mr. President, if we may go back for a moment to 1933, we heard the same sort of argument and debate on the floor of the Senate when this body was considering the recognition of Russia. At that time it was stated that we should recognize Russia because the Russians were a great people, that Russia was a great nation, and that we should help Russia. We did recognize Russia. We gave Russia all of our technical knowledge and our skills, and our businessmen and engineers went over there by the dozens and the hundreds and helped to build up that great nation. My personal opinion is that one of the unpardonable sins we have committed as a nation was the recognition of Russia in 1933. We should have known at that time that our recognition of Russia was going to enable Russia to become a great nation, or a big nation, or a powerful nation. We should have known at that time that if communism became successful in Russia it would become a threat not only to our own people and our form of government but to peoples throughout the world. Yet, I believe, I am safe in saying that one of the moving factors in the recognition of Russia in 1933 was that there were some 160,000,000 people in Russia with whom we could trade, that by recognizing Russia we would open up a great market for our merchandise, our goods, and our skills, and the recognition of Russia did open up a great market. Our technicians did go over there by the hundreds, as I said a moment ago; we taught the Russians how to build factories; we taught them mass production; we initiated them into our know-how and our skills. What has been the result? The result has been that they have taken our know-how and our skills and built themselves into a powerful nation, with a form of government that is the same as it was in 1933, and now we are faced with the threat of communism, and are spending billions upon billions of dollars trying to stop it.

I am not opposed to helping any nation or any people throughout the world—I think we should do it; but what is always uppermost in my mind is that our skills and our know-how are free to all other peoples, and have been for years and years. The example of our form of government, our society, our high standard of living is free to other peoples. We have been here for 165 years as an example of how a nation and people might live, how they might enjoy a high standard of living. Yet my observation has been that none of the foreign peoples have taken advantage of it. The things in this Nation which are free to all the peoples of the world, they seem to ignore.

If I understand what the able Senator from Florida was discussing, it was that we will again dig into the pockets of the taxpayers of the United States and pour forth more billions and billions and billions of dollars. I have no particular objection to that if it is done on a basis of common horse sense; but I am wondering if we are not trying to force many things down the throats of many peoples of the world who do not want them.

Why should we finance the world? In the first place, we do not have enough money with which to finance the world. Secondly, we had one experience with recognizing a country and giving them our know-how, and I now rather suspect that we wish we had our know-how back; I rather suspect that, if we had to do it over, we would not be so free with our skills and our knowledge, and possibly if it were to be done over, we would not recognize communistic Russia.

We simply cannot go on spending billions upon billions of dollars. If, without bankrupting America, we can help other peoples by giving that which is already free to them, I am in favor of it. I am in favor of lending them some money if it can be done on what we may call the private industry basis, but I certainly shall have to oppose giving any further money to any nation anywhere in the world which is going to use the money to socialize its own industry, as is being done now in England. I do not know how many billions of the dollars we have given England since the end of the war or what percentage they have used, but we do know they have socialized the mines, they have socialized banking, they have socialized the railroads, they have practically socialized the farms; at least, they have a law which permits them to do so. They are now talking about socializing the steel industry. What are we thinking about? We are either opposed to socialism and communism or we are for them. Why should we ever spend one dime of our taxpayers' money, or give it away, to socialize some other nation when we know that if those nations become socialistic or go communistic we will go communistic?

Mr. President, it is not quite fair. It seems to me we should be a little more cautious in what we do, because I believe I could successfully prove that every foreign scheme into which we have entered in the past 25 years—and that goes back even to Republican administrations—has failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was intended. The exception to that might well be the United Nations, which has not yet had a chance. The Marshall plan, it is said, is working well. It remains to be seen whether it will be ultimately successful. But we have had nothing but failure after failure, we have had nothing but one emergency after another. Before we get through spending billions of dollars on the Marshall plan we are now talking about spending further billions of the taxpayers' money in other nations.

The things we are offering are free to all the nations throughout the world, as I said a moment ago. Our know-how and our technical knowledge, and that greatest of all things which is free to them, our type and form of government, and our way of life, they do not seem to be interested in. It seems to me as though the only things in which they are interested are our dollars.

So, Mr. President, I suggest that we go slowly. I suggest that the next move we make in international affairs, the next

scheme into which we enter, we make certain it is going to work, because my observation has been that all the schemes into which we have entered have failed, as I have stated, and each and every one of them has cost the American people billions upon billions of dollars.

If we must go into these schemes and spend the taxpayers' money in order to maintain our own prosperity, then let us be honest enough to call what we pass the American Recovery Act, and not the European Recovery Act. If in this Nation we have arrived at the point where we can maintain our own economy only by taxing our people billions upon billions of dollars in order to give them away to some foreign country, in order to maintain prosperity in this Nation, then we had better stop, look, and listen, because there is something radically wrong with our own economy.

## TWO-YEAR MORATORIUM FOR APPLICATION OF CERTAIN ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to end, at least temporarily, the present widespread uncertainty and confusion over the application of the Supreme Court decision last year in the so-called basing-point case, involving the cement industry.

This bill would suspend for 2 years any application of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act, as amended, in depriving individual companies—and this is very important—in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, of the right to independently use delivered-price systems or to absorb freight to meet competition in any and all markets.

This bill is not designed to countenance contracts, combinations, conspiracies, or monopolistic practices in restraint of trade; the bill, in fact, states that such things are inimical to the public interest. Since the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case concerned itself largely with charges of collusion and conspiracy in connection with basing-point pricing, the bill would not be intended to legalize that sort of a basing-point system.

As we all know, however, all industry, all firms which have over a period of years been following a policy of freight absorption in order to enable them to compete in distant markets with firms located in those market areas, have been exceedingly disturbed by the implications of the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case, and in the case of steel particularly, the companies announced that the basing-point or freight-absorption system was being abandoned in favor of a straight f. o. b. system of pricing out of fear that any other system might violate the antitrust laws.

A special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held extensive hearings on this matter late last year and the hearings were resumed briefly this year. Voluminous testimony was taken on the applicability of the antitrust laws to freight absorption and the net result, as I evaluate that testimony, is one of great confusion and continued uncertainty.

A great many of the witnesses who appeared, like most of the businessmen from Pennsylvania who have written to me on the matter, regarded the decision in the Cement case as probably outlawing any type of freight absorption. Unfortunately, we have not been able to get a clear-cut opinion from any authority as to whether it does or does not.

A large number of outstanding lawyers have sought to interpret the decision, but I do not think anyone is really sure of its applicability in cases other than the alleged collusive situation represented in the cement industry.

Spokesmen for the Department of Justice told us at a recent hearing that there is a case now pending before the Supreme Court which would place the issue squarely in focus, the Rigid Steel Conduit case. When that decision may be handed down no one really knows.

Meanwhile, however, there is pending before the Subcommittee on Trade Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce S. 236, introduced by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], chairman of the subcommittee and also chairman of the parent committee, which seeks to meet the situation by legalizing certain types of freight absorption which many businessmen think, perhaps, may have been outlawed by the decision in the Cement case. There have been some hearings on S. 236, and the chairman has notified us that a further hearing will be held tomorrow, and that that will be the last hearing.

The Johnson bill, S. 236, deals, admittedly, with a very complex issue. The bill itself is complex. The intent behind the bill is to clarify the situation and remove the uncertainties besieging so many businessmen whose firms follow a freight-absorption policy, and to permit them to continue to follow these policies without fear of being held in violation of the antitrust laws.

There is a strong desire on the part of proponents of this legislation for speed in its enactment. I am very much afraid, however, that unless we know exactly what we are dealing with in a matter like this, the speedy enactment of so-called corrective legislation might lead to much worse difficulties than the present uncertainty admittedly experienced by many business firms.

This is why I am introducing this bill. It takes the heat off business, those businesses following what most of us would regard as legitimate freight-absorption practices, it takes the heat off Congress and removes the necessity for hasty legislation which might boomerang on business or on a proper administration of the laws against monopoly and conspiracy.

The 2-year interval provided in this bill would give the Congress an opportunity to have all the facts at hand before drafting permanent legislation, if such permanent legislation is determined finally to be necessary. It will give the Supreme Court an opportunity to rule on the basing-point issue per se.

The bill provides in section 3 that nothing it contains shall affect any proceeding in any Federal court as of February 1, 1949, so that it would not act to prevent the courts from making a final determination on this basic and very fundamental issue.

When the decision comes down, we will then have for the first time—and I repeat that, it will be for the first time—an authoritative, reliable, clear-cut explanation of the applicability of the antitrust statutes to the whole freight-absorption practice.

During the 2-year moratorium provided in this bill on the application of antitrust laws to good-faith delivered-price systems, it may well be that the Congress may want to take a good look at our conglomeration of antimonopoly statutes, with a view toward tightening them up, eliminating the overlapping of agency functions, and otherwise streamlining our whole concept and application of the antitrust philosophy. But that is a long-range problem, and the one the Congress faces right now is an immediate one, the problem of eliminating uncertainty and confusion among businessmen who claim they have already sufficient other problems to keep them occupied without having to contend with possible prosecution under the antitrust statutes for what are generally regarded as legitimate business policies.

The Subcommittee on Trade Practices of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will, no doubt, come to a decision shortly in regard to the Johnson bill, S. 236. At our hearing tomorrow I intend to call attention to this bill I am introducing today as a suggested means of proceeding. I would much rather see any contrary provision of the antitrust laws waived for a period of 2 years—since we have gone along these many years safely enough under delivered-price systems—than to participate in the enactment of long-range legislation which may turn out to be either unnecessary or inadequate to cope with a situation which will arise some months from now when the Supreme Court acts.

This bill would say to the individual steel companies that they are not required to engage in an exclusively f. o. b. system. If the steel corporations were sincere, as they very well might have been, in adopting f. o. b. pricing out of self-defense, out of fear that any other system might subject them to violation of the antitrust laws, then this bill says to them that if the basing-point system is not collusive, if it is a good-faith delivered-price system designed to meet competition in distant markets, carried on independently and not through any combination or conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act, then they can go back to their own independent delivered-price systems and know that they will not be slapped with an indictment or sued under the antitrust statutes.

If, on the other hand, the individual steel companies decided that this was a good pretext in a seller's market for raising their profits by eliminating freight-absorption costs, we shall know that, too.

If it is true, we certainly would know it. I think some of the steel companies were pretty coy about testifying on the issue even though it is one which affects them directly and intimately.

My mail reflects widespread concern from small- and medium-sized businesses in Pennsylvania over what they consider to be the denial of their right to compete in distant markets because of interpretations of the Cement case decision. My bill gives them the assurance they need that they do not have to revolutionize their method of doing business overnight; it assures them that if their present methods are subsequently found to be violations of the antitrust laws, they have 2 years from the date of the enactment of this bill to revise their procedures in order to comply with the law; it assures them that if the law is changed, it will be done only after careful study and complete understanding of the problem by Congress.

I ask that the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1008) to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual, good-faith delivered-price systems and freight-absorption practices, introduced by Mr. MYERS, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That because of widespread uncertainty resulting from recent administrative and judicial constructions of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, the Congress hereby declares that it is the sound and traditional policy of the United States that contracts, combinations, conspiracies, or monopolistic practices in restraint of trade are inimical to the public interest in maintaining a free, private, competitive enterprise system; but that it has not been the intent of the Congress to deprive individual companies of the right to use delivered-price systems or to absorb freight to meet competition in any or all markets, provided such activities are carried on independently and in good faith, and not through any combination or conspiracy in violation of the Sherman Act, as amended.

SEC. 2. Until the expiration of 2 years after the enactment of this act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, and the Clayton Act, as amended, shall not be construed as depriving individual companies, in the absence of conspiracy or combination or other agreement in restraint of trade, of the right to independently use delivered-price systems or to absorb freight to meet competition in any and all markets.

SEC. 3. Nothing herein contained shall affect any proceeding pending in any Federal court of the United States on February 1, 1949.

## BASING-POINT PRICING

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, last November I addressed a letter to the Governor of Pennsylvania, the Honorable James H. Duff, asking for a report on the views of the State government or any of its agencies on the matter of basing-point pricing. My inquiry was inspired by a newspaper article quoting some informal comments of the Governor on the effects of the elimination of basing-point pricing on our industrial State.

The Governor subsequently sent me a very interesting letter outlining some of the aspects of this important matter as expressed to him by an industrial leader whose knowledge of the matter the Governor considered to be outstanding.

Since then I have been placed on the subcommittee investigating this matter. Because of the widespread interest in the whole matter of freight-absorption and delivered-price systems, I ask unanimous consent that for informational purposes my letter to the Governor and his reply to me may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the correspondence referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NOVEMBER 17, 1948.

Hon. JAMES H. DUFF,
*Governor, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.*

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: One of the news services (the United Press) recently quoted you as expressing the belief that the Supreme Court decision in the so-called Cement case involving the use of basing-point pricing will be of great long-range benefit to Pennsylvania by inducing fabricators to move closer to their sources of steel. The article I read declared that in answer to a question as to whether Congress should legalize basing-point pricing, you said that you favored anything "that's good for Pennsylvania" but indicated you believed such action would be contrary to the State's best interests.

As you no doubt know, the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee has undertaken an investigation by a subcommittee headed by Senator CAPEHART into this very issue. I am not a member of the subcommittee, but as a member of the parent committee, I have been sitting in from time to time at the hearings and have been seeking to determine the facts in this issue as they affect Pennsylvania. I was, therefore, quite interested in your reported views on this subject and would appreciate any material which you can have State agencies which may be studying the problem forward to me which will bear out the views attributed to you in this newspaper story.

The issue is very complex and is presently being subjected to a great deal of misinterpretation making for great confusion. I am primarily interested in the effect upon Pennsylvania industry of the Supreme Court decision, and although we are having a number of Pennsylvania businessmen appear before the subcommittee to give their views, I think it would be helpful if the State, as such, would submit a report for my review. If officials of any of the State agencies have any documented evidence bearing on the subject from the standpoint of the welfare of the State and of its industries, perhaps it might be advisable to arrange for such officials to appear as witnesses before the subcommittee.

Please feel free to call to my attention any relevant information on this matter which you or your administration may have. The important thing is that the interests of the people of our State be fully protected.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS J. MYERS,
*United States Senate.*

---

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,
*Harrisburg, December 31, 1948.*

Hon. FRANCIS J. MYERS,
*United States Senate,*
*Washington, D. C.*

DEAR SENATOR: Some time ago you wrote asking in a general way my attitude with reference to the basing-point problem. This subject, following the Cement decision, has excited such controversy, that I was anxious to sound out a number of industrialists in whose judgment I had confidence before replying specifically to the question to my appraisal of this situation.

I should say that the following fairly represents what I take to be a sound industrial thinking in this Commonwealth, that is that the effect of the recent decisions in the long run will be harmful to the American economy and national security.

I am quoting one opinion expressed to me which I believe may be said to be a representative opinion as follows:

"These decisions leave most of American industry in a position of uncertainty where, to avoid possible severe penalties, they must adopt conservative pricing policies, i. e., they must sell their products at uniform f. o. b. mill prices. This is a severe handicap in the competitive marketing of their goods and products. We believe that remedial legislation which would establish the rules of the game for competitive-pricing policies is essential for maximum industrial health in this country.

"We firmly believe that what is good for all of the American economy is, in the long run, good for any particular segment of it. One locality or one industry might easily achieve a short-range advantage at the expense of others. We believe that, in the long run, this is bad, not only for the whole economy but also for the particular segment that gets the short-range advantage.

"From the long-range point of view, industry of all kinds needs a maximum of freedom to meet competition. Such a maximum of freedom will keep industry on its toes, alert and vigorous.

"As a short-range proposition, we could press for the relocation of fabricating industries in the Pittsburgh area in order to obtain a surety of outlets for our steel products. However, for maximum security, a business such as ours (and I believe this is true for other manufacturers) should have wide dispersion of its consumers and a reasonable diversity of products. This is true because, in times of slack business, all parts of the country are not slack simultaneously or, at least, they are not slack to the same degree and, also, all consumers of steel products are not slack to the same degree. Therefore, the more dispersion and diversity (within practical limits) the more security.

"In addition to the foregoing, the ability to meet competitive prices in various parts of the country permits us to shift the direction of our selling efforts with changes in concentrations of industry, shifts in populations, and new industrial developments.

"In other words, we want the right to compete by going into any part of the country with any of our products whenever we find it profitable to do so. We can do this only if we have the freedom to make competitive prices.

"The concentration of fabricating industries around centers of production of raw materials (such as steel) is not good from the national security standpoint, nor is it good from the sociological standpoint. The development of modern offensive weapons dictates the dispersions of industries and, more important, the dispersions of people for maximum national security.

"In summary, I believe that within the boundaries fixed by our antitrust laws which prohibit collusion, conspiracy, and stifling of competition by unfair trade practices, industry should have the maximum of freedom to establish prices which it deems right and proper to meet competition.

"In reply to your question as to the desirable time element in obtaining a clarification of the law with respect to the rights of industry to compete pricewise, it is my firm

belief that much harm will be done, particularly to small business and especially to those small businesses which have only one plant, if the present situation is allowed to drift into a period of slack business. Therefore, I believe that the sooner we have remedial legislation the better.

"While the change in the basis of distribution might force a greater concentration of fabricators in Pennsylvania, it would be many years before such a concentration would absorb a productive class in our territory.

"In such a critical period as this both from an economic and military standpoint, it appears to me that a strict interpretation of this might prove extremely ill advised."

This is for your information in relation to your inquiry.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. DUFF.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. LUCAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no reports of the committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

## UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank C. Bingham, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harry O. Arend, of Alaska, to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George L. Grobe, of New York, to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

## UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Kehoe C. Shannon, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified in all cases.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ADJOURNMENT TILL MONDAY

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senate will immediately adjourn over till Monday, and, I may say, there will be no measures of any controversial importance to be taken up by the Senate when it convenes on Monday. However, we will call the calendar. I make the announcement now in order that Senators may have an opportunity to read the RECORD and to be apprised of that fact.

If there is no further business to be considered, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

---

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 17, 1949:

H. Merle Cochran, of Arizona, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Pakistan.

### COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Earl James McGrath, of New York, to be Commissioner of Education.

### UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

John F. X. McGohey, of New York, to be United States attorney for the southern district of New York. (Mr. McGohey is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires February 16, 1949.)

### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named person, who was appointed in the United States Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eightieth Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 107, title I, Public Law 810, Eightieth Congress:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

Charles A. Pursley

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the United States Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eightieth Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grades indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 308, Public Law 625, Eightieth Congress (Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948):

*To be majors*

| | |
|---|---|
| Alpha A. Adams | Virginia A. Hardy |
| Marian F. Allen | Alvina K. Hobbs |
| Irene S. Bragaw | Umbria M. Johnson |
| Mary H. Bratt | Mary L. Kersey |
| Betty Clague | Eleanor King |
| Mary C. Costello | Virginia J. Phelps |
| Margaret G. Crosson | Marie L. Ray |
| Marion B. Dockray | Evelyn F. Rees |
| Corinne E. Edwards | Florence M. Rowand |
| Gertrude E. Foerster | Dorothea M. Ryan |
| Margret I. Fullerton | Mary D. Schureman |
| Emy-Lee N. Gardner | Esther C. Settle |
| Eloise M. Granberry | Madge R. Shea |
| Phyllis D. S. Gray | Evelyn M. Way |

*To be captains*

| | |
|---|---|
| Pauline E. Abell | Ruth L. Blind |
| Evaline M. Absalom | Katherine F. Bradspies |
| Della J. Angst | Dorothy P. Brandow |
| Martha L. Armbruster | Anna L. Briggs |
| Margaret A. Bacchus | Margaret G. Brown |
| Laurie M. Ball | Lucille Caldwell |
| Virginia C. Dietz | Jacquelin M. Mooney-ham |
| Ann Duffy | Ruth A. Nichols |
| Kathryn G. Ecke | Helen E. O'Day |
| Frances M. Ellison | Florence K. Olson |
| Mary E. Elrod | Marjorie D. Parker |
| Anna M. Frost | Bernice C. Philipps |
| Wilma R. Hague | Margaret L. Philpot |
| Helena C. Hendrickson | Bertha Pinckes |
| Kathleen E. Hoffman | Mildred L. Recknagel |
| Elaine O. Homan | Emma J. Riley |
| Marjorie O. Hunt | Charlotte G. Sticksel |
| Margaret G. Jennings | Marion E. Swan |
| Marguerite A. Johnson | Edith M. Theye |
| Rachael A. Johnstone | Mildred E. Thomas |
| Eleanor J. Laing | Janna Tucker |
| Kathryn M. Ludlow | Frances W. Van Pelt |
| Margaret E. McEnerney | Margaret M. Werlein |
| Gladys E. McManimie | Frances L. White |
| Willa M. Mizell | |

*To be first lieutenants*

| | |
|---|---|
| Jean D. Armstrong | Winifred E. McAllister |
| Joan E. Bennett | Ruth McCraw |
| Virginia M. Blanchard | Muriel M. Moran |
| Carolyn E. Boatwright | Mary A. Morgan |
| Virginia S. Bruno | Brooksie E. Netherland |
| Florence B. Casey | Shirley T. O'Dell |
| Madelen Cassidy | Rita E. O'Donnell |
| Evelyn Cherry | Frances Oppenheimer |
| Alberta M. Courchene | Laura A. Ostrowski |
| Elizabeth N. Cox | Viola M. Peschel |
| Doris D. Diamant | Ruth Ramee |
| Elsie O. Ellingson | Cora E. Sharon |
| Harriet M. Fivenson | Albina H. Shimkus |
| Mary E. Flannagan | Mary E. Shull |
| Elizabeth Guild | Flora M. Smothers |
| Alice H. Hartley | Mary H. Strong |
| Verdia M. Hickambottom | Anne W. Tinges |
| | Lillian R. Tombacher |
| Marion N. Hunt | Ruth E. Vorkoeper |
| Bonnie T. Martin | Ruth L. Williams |
| Virginia E. Martin | Jean S. Wilson |

*To be second lieutenants*

Victoria E. Fox
Katherine A. Humm

The following-named persons, who were appointed in the United States Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eightieth Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

*To be second lieutenants*

| | |
|---|---|
| Lyle L. Ahner | Adrian L. Christenson |
| George L. Ahrens | Ben H. Clements, Jr. |
| Ralph G. Allen, Jr. | Daryl D. Cole |
| Thomas I. Allison | Charles Cusworth |
| Earl M. Amador | John I. Daniel 3d |
| Hunter W. Anderson | Herman L. DeLaune |
| Robert E. Anderson | James L. Dick |
| Franklin E. Ausburn | James F. Donahue, Jr. |
| Wilson K. Baker, Jr. | Charles A. Downing |
| John R. Barnard | Walter B. Duff |
| Martin J. Barnard | Robert C. Eckerlin |
| James G. Barney | Frederick C. Eckmann |
| Ernest R. Bartley | Walter H. Escue |
| Bertram D. Becker | William E. Fedro |
| William C. Bedoit, Jr. | William H. Femmer |
| Robert E. Bell | Edwin A. Fitz, Jr. |
| Robert W. Bieber | Bruce R. Foster |
| Tedd L. Bishop | Willard S. Garwood |
| Buford C. Blount | James E. Geary |
| Randolph Blumberg | Clinton G. Gillespie |
| Warren W. Boone | Richard L. Haggard |
| Marion L. Boswell | Lloyd L. Hall |
| William F. Boyle | John J. Harnitchek |
| Joseph X. Brennan | Almet B. E. Harran |
| Dick P. Bresee | Philip O. Hertsgaard |
| George G. Brown, Jr. | John K. Hickey |
| Robert E. Brumm | Harry D. Hink |
| Ernest L. Buckley | Robert P. Horn |
| Robert B. Burns | Charles B. Humphreys |
| Joseph R. Calistro | Richard W. Kane |
| Donald D. Carlson | Joseph F. Kent, Jr. |
| John M. Chapman | Orville J. Kvamme |

Donald R. Latham
Alfred W. Lundhigh
Herbert A. Lyon
Roy L. Maddox
Kenneth E. Marstad
James C. Martin, Jr.
James I. Mathis
Hugh W. McBride
George C. McCleary
Ernest L. McCollum
Thomas U. McElmurry
Daniel E. McPherson, Jr.
Charles S. Melton
Harold O. N. Mendenall
Jim T. Meredith
William F. Miller
James F. Moir
Bill A. Montgomery
Winston E. Moore
Richard J. Moran
Alfred W. Mullan, Jr.
Harry W. Neville
Robert O'Clock
Arthur E. Oligher
Herman L. Peace
Bert E. Pettitt, Jr.
Leonard W. Pierson
Robert S. Pingree
Edward M. Potter, Jr.
Roland T. Pullen
Thomas S. Rea
William F. Reinecke
Eldon S. Riley
Dean R. Rindy
Robert Rotstan
Joe S. Schiele
Charles D. Schwalier
Charles F. Schwaner
Orville O. Scroggin III
James M. Sharp
John B. Shipp, Jr.
Silvio G. Simplicio
Hassell E. Sims
Robert E. Sizemore
Clark B. Smith
Mart G. Smith, Jr.
Herman F. Son
Paul R. Springer
Roscoe E. Sprinkel
Donald F. Steele
Harold E. Sterling
James R. Stimson
Robert E. Stockhouse
Roger W. Stubblefield
Clarence A. Syvertson
Irvin E. Taylor
Mervin M. Taylor
Alan B. Thomas
George W. Thompson
Thomas E. Thorpe, Jr.
Frank A. Titus
Bobby J. Tooley
Andrew J. Trammell
Jack L. Tunstall
George A. Voris
Marvin M. Watkins
LeRoy L. West
Donald C. Winner
Leonard S. Wissow
Edwin N. York

The following-named person, now serving in the United States Air Force, who was appointed in the United States Army under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the Eightieth Congress, for appointment in the United States Air Force in the grade indicated, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force under the provisions of section 506, Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress (Officer Personnel Act of 1947):

*To be second lieutenant*

Jere J. Lewis

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (aviation) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Harry E Aine
Marshall J. Barry, Jr.
Leon T. Bonner, Jr.
Edward N. Bouffard
John W. Brannon, Jr.
Jesse LeR. Brown
William D. Campbell
Charles C. Carter
Harold D. Case
William E. Clark
Jean S. Clauzel
Theodore E. Daum
Walter R. David
Dale E. Davis
Harold E. Dodd, Jr.
John C. Duck
James R. Edixon
Charles E. Engel
James T. Foreman
Marshall L. Foreman, Jr.
Herbert W. Gewehr
David O. Gudal
Donald M. Hegrat
Kenneth G. Heimbaugh
Dennis W. Henderson
Richard S. Hubler
John C. Humphrey
Francis N. Jones
Simeon D. Lowe, Jr.
Thomas H. McCoy
John E. McDonald
Roy W. McLain, Jr.
Dean W. Miller
Jurgen H. Miller
Charles R. Mitchell
William Mohlenhoff
Ronald A. Moore
James B. Morin
Clifton D. Myers
Gordon M. Nonnemacher
Neal C. Phillips
Merle A. Rice
Bertram M. Roeder
George P. Russell, Jr.
Herbert A. Sargent
Charles F. Schied
David L. Schloredt
Mack C. Sellers
David K. Smith
Donald E. Sparks
James R. Stevens
Dennis A. Tuck
Rex J. Vannoy
Jerome K. Walterskirchen
Rodney G. Williams
William R. Wood, Jr.

Edward Stanton (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949, in lieu of ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy from the 3d day of June 1949:

Gerald B. Anderson
Charles E. Callahan
Eugene A. Davis
James D. DeLaughter
Arthur C. Derrick
Mark H. Forsthoefel
Loyd F. Galyean
Milburn K. Hemmick
Neal J. Johnson
Donald O. June
Arthur J. Linden
Donald A. McCartin
Robert L. May
Kenneth N. Murphy
Henry J. Nawoj
Frederick W. Nehring, Jr.
David W. Olmstead
Harry J. Post
William J. Reed
Arnold Stein
Lester L. Stoakes
Cordice I. Teague
Marvin H. Warner
Benjamin E. Weeks
Stuckey D. Willson
Robert E. Wilson
John W. Wood

Glenn E. Nippert (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy (special duty officer).

The following-named persons to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Margaret A. Damush
Dorothy K. Erickson
Lorraine V. Feifer

The following-named officer to the grade indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT (JUNIOR GRADE)

William R. True

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Arthur R. Scroggins, East Tallassee, Ala., in place of J. D. Hilyer, deceased.

J. Ponder Livingston, Eutaw, Ala., in place of J. J. Harkness, deceased.

James C. Mattox, Guin, Ala., in place of J. N. A. Hulsey, deceased.

James D. Jackson, Horton, Ala., in place of J. T. Mabrey, transferred.

Felton Jones, Kennedy, Ala., in place of Tom Dorroh, transferred.

Marvin T. Davis, Letohatchee, Ala., in place of W. L. Adams, deceased.

Pauline B. Sandlin, Magnolia Springs, Ala., in place of J. W. Sandlin, deceased.

John W. Roney, Newville, Ala., in place of L. J. Brannon, retired.

Oscar Day, Jr., Oakman, Ala., in place of L. W. Richardson, transferred.

Charles H. Eddins, Jr., Peterman, Ala., in place of Marguerite Helton, resigned.

ALASKA

Clarence S. Hollingsworth, College, Alaska, in place of C. E. Bunnell, retired.

Marietta M. Benson, Metlakatla, Alaska, in place of T. E. Benson, resigned.

ARKANSAS

Clinton C. Cook, Buckner, Ark., in place of C. C. Stokes, deceased.

Orval E. Faubus, Huntsville, Ark., in place of Hugh Murphy, transferred.

Charles L. Duncan, Murfreesboro, Ark., in place of H. M. Austin, transferred.

Leo J. Schreick, Osceola, Ark., in place of G. M. Doyle, deceased.

CALIFORNIA

Floyd M. Harvey, Adin, Calif., in place of F. M. Harvey, resigned.

C. B. Childers, Arvin, Calif., in place of O. G. Nance, resigned.

Harry Bergseid, Bell, Calif., in place of C. L. Boren, retired.

Edna Stratton Hamilton, Bolinas, Calif., in place of H. I. Hoirup, deceased.

Anita V. Reid, Burrel, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Florence E. Kahmar, Camino, Calif., in place of E. M. Carsten, deceased.

Cecilia A. George, Castroville, Calif., in place of F. E. Faustino, removed.

Clive B. Hubbell, Challenge, Calif., in place of H. P. Mulock, resigned.

Frank J. Norton, Chula Vista, Calif., in place of R. A. Higgs, resigned.

Frederick G. Zittleman, Cloverdale, Calif., in place of B. A. Williams, resigned.

Catherine C. Schultz, Colfax, Calif., in place of A. D. Scanlon, retired.

Keith L. Tobin, Cutler, Calif., in place of D. M. Tobin, resigned.

Ruth Pugh, Cypress, Calif., in place of M. F. Inskeep, transferred.

June R. Dolcini, Davis, Calif., in place of V. F. Dolcini, deceased.

Lloyette Osborne, Earlimart, Calif., in place of H. O. Adams, resigned.

Edythe Burgett, El Segundo, Calif., in place of Clyde Burgett, deceased.

Evelyn K. Hodge, Florin, Calif., in place of B. V. Eaton, retired.

Viola S. Pambianco, French Camp, Calif., in place of V. F. Gorrell, retired.

Cleo A. Mollring, Galt, Calif., in place of M. B. Bradford, resigned.

Paul R. Todd, Garberville, Calif., in place of D. E. Knapp, deceased.

Beatrice K. Geiger, Herlong, Calif., in place of G. E. McIntire, resigned.

William Howard O'Brien, Hollister, Calif., in place of E. F. O'Donnell, deceased.

Grace R. Aldridge, Joshua Tree, Calif. Office became Presidential October 1, 1946.

John L. McKindley, Lockeford, Calif., in place of J. A. Coil, deceased.

Oscar Ditmanson, Lodi, Calif., in place of C. M. Jones, deceased.

Blanche I. Dunn, Los Alamitos, Calif., in place of L. R. Cloud, transferred.

Walter J. Degregori, Los Banos, Calif., in place of B. A. Wilson, retired.

Lois M. Hartwell, Loyalton, Calif., in place of H. W. Rapp, resigned.

Horace C. Coe, Lynwood, Calif., in place of E. C. Halverson, resigned.

Margaret S. Cooper, McKittrick, Calif., in place of M. O. Quandt, resigned.

Joseph J. Joaquin, Madrone, Calif., in place of N. K. Kirby, retired.

Pearl C. Kehlet, Meeks Bay, Calif., in place of F. L. Kehlet, resigned.

Raymond R. Dingle, Middletown, Calif., in place of F. R. Carpenter, resigned.

John E. Mixer, Midway City, Calif., in place of W. L. Watts, resigned.

Fenton E. Watson, Mira Loma, Calif., in place of C. E. Faulhaber, resigned.

Jared W. Moore, Modesto, Calif., in place of A. A. Fields, resigned.

William J. Wasley, Nevada City, Calif., in place of B. M. West, resigned.

Louise H. Blanchard, Occidental, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Ella A. Dominguez, Olive, Calif., in place of T. H. Mieger, resigned.

Puella E. Forbes, Orcutt, Calif., in place of R. A. Osborn, resigned.

Mary E. Bailey, Piru, Calif., in place of F. E. Cornelius, retired.

Lillie E. Connor, Richvale, Calif., in place of La Verne Friberg, resigned.

Harry H. Lauritzen, Rio Vista, Calif., in place of J. I. Fiscus, resigned.

Kenneth W. Dyal, San Bernardino, Calif., in place of H. P. Thoreson, resigned.

James W. Kern, Santa Susana, Calif., in place of L. R. Riave, retired.

Velma E. Mackey, Santa Ynez, Calif., in place of S. M. Fair, resigned.

Raymond E. Ledford, Talmage, Calif., in place of R. O. Foster, resigned.

Henry S. Fager, Waterford, Calif., in place of Jennie Root, resigned.

LaVerna N. Strawbridge, Westminster, Calif., in place of M. M. Sitzer, resigned.

Ernest D. Robinson, Willow Creek, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Adelaide C. Byrn, Windsor, Calif., in place of G. P. Johnson, retired.

COLORADO

Dorothy F. Mullen, Bayfield, Colo., in place of L. E. Landreth, resigned.

Eldora F. Giberson, Dillon, Colo., in place of Grace Warren, resigned.
R. Terrell Ellington, Grand Junction, Colo., in place of C. D. Moslander, resigned.
Betty R. Ingram, Nederland, Colo., in place of M. C. Shellhaas, resigned.
Raymond H. Talbot, Pueblo, Colo., in place of C. F. Horn, deceased.
Dean S. Hainey, Ridgway, Colo., in place of G. C. Huffnagle, resigned.
Elmer Glen VanScoy, Westminster, Colo., in place of J. M. Hanks, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Howard Macciocca, Derby, Conn., in place of J. J. Mahony, deceased.
James F. Abbott, Gales Ferry, Conn., in place of J. M. Abbott, deceased.
Margaret H. Burke, Litchfield, Conn., in place of M. J. Donahue, removed.
Frank J. Barboni, North Haven, Conn., in place of C. W. Thompson, resigned.
Mary T. Doyle, Thomaston, Conn., in place of F. C. Flynn, deceased.

DELAWARE

Warren Francis Comstock, Farnhurst, Del., in place of R. R. Veasey, deceased.
Bertha M. Carrow, Saint Georges, Del., in place of G. E. Bright, resigned.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Roy M. North, Washington, D. C., in place of V. C. Burke, transferred.

FLORIDA

John F. Pelot, Belleview, Fla., in place of C. G. Hanson, resigned.
Myrtle Clare Booth, Cantonment, Fla., in place of M. C. Booth, transferred.
Theodore L. Latimer, Deleon Springs, Fla., in place of Flode Jones, retired.
Joseph W. Westmoreland, Jay, Fla., in place of M. V. North, transferred.
Earl L. Williams, Lady Lake, Fla., in place of L. R. Estell, retired.
Billie S. Campbell, Lake Harbor, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Evan D. Mixon, Ruskin, Fla., in place of J. F. Linder, resigned.

GEORGIA

Norwood W. Miley, Hahira, Ga., in place of W. H. Massey, deceased.
Evander L. Raulston, Trenton, Ga., in place of W. H. Brock, retired.

IDAHO

Charles E. Ruger, Bancroft, Idaho, in place of Z. G. Steele, resigned.
Thomas W. Rogers, Glenns Ferry, Idaho, in place of H. H. Tate, removed.
Arthur B. Peck, Lava Hot Springs, Idaho, in place of I. J. Peck, resigned.

ILLINOIS

Kenneth V. Mason, Albion, Ill., in place of J. R. Wick, transferred.
Mabel H. Green, Alvin, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Fred D. Knaus, Arcola, Ill., in place of J. F. Speelman, resigned.
William A. Goetz, Bethany, Ill., in place of H. L. Bone, transferred.
Lloyd O. Huff, Blandinville, Ill., in place of L. C. Mosley, resigned.
Daniel J. Boyd, Blue Island, Ill., in place of A. J. Lagod, resigned.
Clifford A. Walsh, Bourbonnais, Ill., in place of M. F. Senesac, resigned.
Gilbert R. Gish, Buda, Ill., in place of R. V. Westervelt, resigned.
Margaret Carlson, Bureau, Ill., in place of J. F. Frederickson, transferred.
Pearl H. Collins, Catlin, Ill., in place of R. O. Huffman, transferred.
William K. Armstrong, Chandlerville, Ill., in place of G. J. Armstrong, resigned.
Ray B. Brockhouse, Chapin, Ill., in place of W. R. Fisher, transferred.
Eula McCawley, Chesterfield, Ill., in place of Verda Malone, resigned.
Albert J. Buehler, Chestnut, Ill., in place of L. C. Rentschler, resigned.
Donald L. Doan, Claremont, Ill., in place of J. H. Leathers, deceased.
Monroe A. Lawson, Clay City, Ill., in place of C. W. Black, resigned.
Andrew J. Rogers, Jr., Cordova, Ill., in place of L. A. Cooper, transferred.
Louis Sloter, Crescent City, Ill., in place of Gerd Willms, transferred.
G. Stewart Allen, Crete, Ill., in place of D. W. Helme, deceased.
Harry A. Osman, Cypress, Ill., in place of M. E. Osman, resigned.
Marie Little, Dallas City, Ill., in place of Claude Shaffner, retired.
Leland Adams, Dieterich, Ill., in place of R. L. Graham, resigned.
Fred H. Popp, Jr., Dundee, Ill., in place of H. F. Kuettner, resigned.
Joseph J. Holloway, Elmhurst, Ill., in place of J. F. Grogan, deceased.
Ruth Sartain, Fithian, Ill., in place of O. E. Bantz., Retired.
John C. McKinstra, Freeport, Ill., in place of F. H. Gibler, resigned.
Glen W. Seaton, Glen Carbon, Ill., in place of Myrtle Wilkison, resigned.
John J. McCaughey, Gurnee, Ill., in place of W. K. Kimball, retired.
George A. Frazer, Hamilton, Ill., in place of R. A. Wescott, removed.
Lester A. Binder, Hinckley, Ill., in place of H. J. Price, transferred.
Russell M. Shoaf, Homer, Ill., in place of O. P. Dickson, deceased.
Russell E. Snyder, Hull, Ill., in place of F. S. Sprague, resigned.
Mary E. McCarl, Kinderhook, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Richard R. Atkins, Kinmundy, Ill., in place of F. O. Grissom, retired.
Ralph D. Waddell, Latham, Ill., in place of W. C. Howe, retired.
James O. Brown, Long Point, Ill., in place of G. F. Turner, retired.
Albert O. Ledbetter, Marion, Ill., in place of D. C. Moss, resigned.
George M. Farrell, Marseilles, Ill., in place of J. A. Maier, resigned.
C. Lincoln Guernsey, Mechanicsburg, Ill., in place of O. M. Elliott, transferred.
Helen F. Gleich, Menard, Ill., in place of F. V. McNabney, deceased.
Arthur E. Maloney, Mooseheart, Ill., in place of M. D. Davis, resigned.
Evans R. Pratt, Morrison, Ill., in place of J. W. Wilson, resigned.
James T. Malley, Mounds, Ill., in place of H. E. Young, transferred.
Adam A. Munsterman, Nameoki, Ill., in place of J. A. Miller, resigned.
John W. Bosaw, New Haven, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Ellwyn Barnett, Oakland, Ill., in place of W. A. Reeds, retired.
Charles J. Murphy, Oak Park, Ill., in place of J. L. Lynch, resigned.
S. Jay Thomas, Oregon, Ill., in place of Henry Cottlow, transferred.
William H. Watson, Prospect Heights, Ill., in place of H. L. Galbraith, resigned.
Emmett P. Hayes, Rochelle, Ill., in place of F. J. Tilton, deceased.
Charles H. McGough, Secor, Ill., in place of Henrietta Hinds, resigned.
Frank C. Spengler, Shannon, Ill., in place of A. J. Geiseman, transferred.
Hazel M. Wolf, Sidney, Ill., in place of F. R. Drews, removed.
Francis L. Weghorst, South Pekin, Ill., in place of R. C. Morris, removed.
Michael A. Bernasek, Sparta, Ill., in place of J. V. Lessley, retired.
Besse M. Hewitt, Steward, Ill., in place of T. F. Kirby, deceased.
Frank C. Niemeyer, Stockton, Ill., in place of J. D. Cotter, resigned.
Herbert M. Bowman, Thompsonville, Ill., in place of A. M. Akin, resigned.
Wilbur K. Reader, Thomson, Ill., in place of M. J. Sheridan, resigned.
Orville L. Glasford, Trivoli, Ill., in place of R. A. Swan, resigned.
Beatrice E. Reck, Winslow, Ill., in place of H. M. Dean, resigned.

INDIANA

Bernice Sigman, Castleton, Ind., in place of N. M. Sigman, resigned.
Lloyd B. Helms, Centerville, Ind., in place of P. L. Helms, transferred.
Dale M. Sands, Claypool, Ind., in place of Walter Bouse, transferred.
Adrian M. Morrison, Cloverdale, Ind., in place of R. S. Stwalley, transferred.
George W. Horan, Collegeville, Ind., in place of F. A. Hehn, resigned.
Walter H. Fried, Corydon, Ind., in place of G. C. Rainbolt. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Harry G. Thomson, Danville, Ind., in place of Bertha Higgins, resigned.
Marion E. Maxwell, Darlington, Ind., in place of D. C. Thompson, transferred.
Elizabeth May Reiff, Deputy, Ind., in place of F. A. Anderson, deceased.
Margaret A. Horseman, Dublin, Ind., in place of G. A. Adrion, retired.
Henry O. Kipfer, Grabill, Ind., in place of G. R. Woods, resigned.
Omer D. Hendricks, Hartford City, Ind., in place of Jack Dolan, resigned.
Everett J. Laun, Kingsford Heights, Ind., in place of W. J. Rash, resigned.
Arthur C. Welch, Lapaz, Ind., in place of I. B. Carbiener, resigned.
Geneva K. Gant, Laurel, Ind., in place of B. F. Russell, transferred.
Lowell Odom, Medaryville, Ind., in place of H. A. Rowe, transferred.
Robert D. Long, Millersburg, Ind., in place of W. D. Stoner, transferred.
Henry Claude Steininger, Monticello, Ind., in place of T. V. Koontz, resigned.
Marion L. Garstka, New Haven, Ind., in place of D. A. Blaising, transferred.
Pearl L. Smith, New Market, Ind., in place of Ethel Martin, resigned.
Roy L. Strange, Plainville, Ind., in place of E. J. McWilliams, resigned.
Dow Haimbaugh, Rochester, Ind., in place of H. G. McMahan, retired.
John V. Pinegar, Rockville, Ind., in place of J. C. Hoopingarner, deceased.
Sherman L. Wright, Rushville, Ind., in place of W. L. Newbold, removed.
Joseph C. Renie, Sharpsville, Ind., in place of C. W. Cottingham, resigned.
Frank C. Kettring, South Bend, Ind., in place of B. J. McCaffery, resigned.
Arnold B. Rhodes, Tippecanoe, Ind., Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Sylvia Swanson, Twelve Mile, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

IOWA

Estelle M. Burroughs, Albion, Iowa, in place of B. E. Fraley, retired.
Russell E. Bamsey, Audubon, Iowa, in place of G. W. Oelke, resigned.
Vernon L. Dinges, Avoca, Iowa, in place of Harry Eckhardt, deceased.
John M. McNiel, Batavia, Iowa, in place of W. S. Olexa, resigned.
Charles W. Crees, Bayard, Iowa, in place of O. V. Stevens, resigned.
Vernon M. Zylstra, Bussey, Iowa, in place of Z. P. Way, resigned.
James T. Kisgen, Carroll, Iowa, in place of J. F. Rettenmaier, deceased.
Francis L. Porter, Clarion, Iowa, in place of Richard Tomke, deceased.
Marion W. Palmer, Clearfield, Iowa, in place of J. S. Walton, removed.
William G. Strunce, Creston, Iowa, in place of T. M. Conway, deceased.

Joseph L. Torpey, DeWitt, Iowa, in place of H. L. Smith, transferred.
George W. Kunzman, Douds, Iowa, in place of M. R. Doud, resigned.
Paul Davie, Dunlap, Iowa, in place of J. P. Burke, deceased.
Edward P. Domayer, Dyersville, Iowa, in place of L. C. Smith, retired.
James W. Klaus, Earlville, Iowa, in place of G. E. Faust, transferred.
John R. Bahne, Eldora, Iowa, in place of J. J. Fowler, deceased.
George R. Lewis, Elliott, Iowa, in place of Mabel Kinney, deceased.
Dorris E. Trullinger, Farragut, Iowa, in place of P. K. Kraschel, resigned.
Raymond J. Gilday, Fort Dodge, Iowa, in place of P. T. Vaughan, retired.
Mattison L. Swaney, Garner, Iowa, in place of C. O. Rce, resigned.
Jerome A. Bunkers, Granville, Iowa, in place of R. M. Fischbach, transferred.
Ralph W. Gardner, Humeston, Iowa, in place of W. C. Eaton, transferred.
Robert B. Christopher, Huxley, Iowa, in place of Albert Johnson, retired.
Amy E. Allen, Jewell, Iowa, in place of Y. A. Johnson, transferred.
Elton O. Brill, Kamrar, Iowa, in place of M. J. Torrence, transferred.
Frank E. Orwan, Lorimor, Iowa, in place of N. T. Nixon, deceased.
Mary C. Burns, Neola, Iowa, in place of Grace Ryan, resigned.
Alice L. Pool, New Providence, Iowa, in place of Gladys Hadley, deceased.
Raymond M. Harrold, Palmer, Iowa, in place of W. H. Theisen, removed.
Ernest J. Heatherington, Prescott, Iowa, in place of C. B. Chapman, resigned.
Fred J. Ehrhardt, Sac City, Iowa, in place of C. L. Anderson, resigned.
Stanley H. Nelson, Terril, Iowa, in place of C. C. Lockner, resigned.
Marion C. Retter, Van Horne, Iowa, in place of A. O. Reinhardt, retired.
Oral J. Brown, Washington, Iowa, in place of M. C. DeLong, deceased.
Rex C. Severt, Wellman, Iowa, in place of H. D. MacGugin, deceased.
Wesley B. Neal, Westfield, Iowa, in place of O. M. Sanford, retired.
William J. Newcomb, Williamsburg, Iowa, in place of W. J. Cash, removed.
Pearl L. Smith, Woden, Iowa, in place of V. L. Eaton, resigned.

KANSAS

Albert H. Sauvain, Agenda, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Earle F. Hill, Altamont, Kans., in place of C. H. Kessler, transferred.
Ralph W. Smullins, Burr Oak, Kans., in place of E. J. Callahan, resigned.
Charles G. Persinger, Canton, Kans., in place of Ralph Ganson, resigned.
Francis K. Darr, Centralia, Kans., in place of C. E. Drumm, deceased.
Howard C. Cain, Delphos, Kans., in place of M. A. Cain, resigned.
Frank L. Robinson, Eskridge, Kans., in place of J. O. Warren, transferred.
Harry C. Brooks, Fort Scott, Kans., in place of J. M. Miller, retired.
Harold D. Vernon, Goff, Kans., in place of E. H. Huerter, transferred.
E. Lucille Logsdon, Grenola, Kans., in place of E. C. Logsdon, deceased.
Charles W. Parker, Highland, Kans., in place of W. D. Gilmore, resigned.
Harry Lang, Jetmore, Kans., in place of F. R. Wilson, resigned.
Beatrice H. Howell, Langdon, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Gordon N. Carlisle, Leoti, Kans., in place of G. V. Downs, transferred.
Alvin A. Pfeiffer, Linn., Kans., in place of D. L. McGregor, transferred.
Marlin L. Ames, Long Island, Kans., in place of Loraine Champlin, transferred.
Leslie A. Leochner, Ludell, Kans., in place of A. W. Howland, transferred.
Faye G. Mullikin, Montezuma, Kans., in place of B. W. Wherritt, transferred.
Ola J. Canny, Mound Valley, Kans., in place of C. L. Hinds, transferred.
John F. Buche, Mulberry, Kans., in place of Albert Cameron, deceased.
Una V. Shoemaker, Perry, Kans., in place of Guietta Stark, deceased.
Patrick J. Jolly, Scammon, Kans., in place of D. P. McCormick, resigned.
Richard D. Wiley, Sedgwick, Kans., in place of J. A. Wiley, resigned.
Ruth H. Berrigan, Solomon, Kans., in place of H. D. MacCloughan, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Ernest C. Runyon, Belfry, Ky., in place of K. S. Keesee, removed.
John B. Adams, Berea, Ky., in place of J. E. Moore, deceased.
Edna T. Holman, Cerulean, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Arthur Kelly Hearon, Clay, Ky., in place of P. L. McGraw, deceased.
John M. Magee, Cynthiana, Ky., in place of S. F. Sprake, deceased.
Leland G. Rubarts, Dunnville, Ky., in place of O. L. Ellis, retired.
Lillian Bodenheimer, Freeburn, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Lora C. Birmingham, Hardburly, Ky., in place of Elizabeth Godsey, resigned.
Harold A. Bolin, Irvington, Ky., in place of R. L. Frymire, transferred.
John C. Ryan, Pine Knot, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
John R. Craig, Rockholds, Ky., in place of Stella Creekmore, retired.
Robert F. Gillispie, Sadieville, Ky., in place of W. A. Marshall, transferred.
Hodge J. Slayden, Salem, Ky., in place of Jessie Mitchell, resigned.
Effie M. Voiers, South Shore, Ky., in place of Josephine Shepherd, removed.
Mary M. Deaton, Toner, Ky. Office became Presidential April 1, 1947.
Rachel A. Galvin, Waverly Hills, Ky., in place of M. F. Beck, transferred.
George G. Wilson, Whitley City, Ky., in place of B. K. Morris, removed.

LOUISIANA

Miles K. Hartsell, Rodessa, La., in place of M. K. Hartsell, transferred.
K. C. Peterson, Zwolle, La., in place of E. C. Leone, deceased.

MAINE

Howard Mills Martin, Kennebunk Port, Maine, in place of W. F. Goodwin, retired.
Delmar C. Ellinwood, North Windham, Maine, in place of L. H. Hern, resigned.

MARYLAND

Thomas F. Conlon, Cumberland, Md., in place of J. C. Shriver, resigned.
H. Lester Long, Jr., Ellicott City, Md., in place of M. J. Sullivan, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Francis A. Crowley, Boston, Mass., in place of P. J. Connelly, retired.
Maurice R. Savage, Buzzards Bay, Mass., in place of F. C. Small, retired.
Thomas P. Hallinan, Chicopee Falls, Mass., in place of A. E. Roberts, retired.
Donald P. Steele, Gloucester, Mass., in place of G. W. O'Neil, deceased.
Malcolm W. Chase, Princeton, Mass., in place of R. J. Gregory, deceased.
Hazel F. Tenney, West Townsend, Mass., in place of G. H. Tenney, retired.
Thomas J. Gilgun, Winchester, Mass., in place of V. C. Ambrose, resigned.
John A. Marshall, Worcester, Mass., in place of J. T. Sheehan, retired.

MICHIGAN

Perry F. Frownfelder, Adrian, Mich., in place of H. I. Bourns, resigned.
Elias W. Lyons, Armada, Mich., in place of M. E. Shaw, resigned.
Samuel Somora, Sr., Baroda, Mich., in place of M. D. Hartman, resigned.
Gerald D. Swanson, Bear Lake, Mich., in place of H. P. Snyder, transferred.
Frank A. Prais, Belleville, Mich., in place of E. T. McGlothlin, resigned.
James L. Milliron, Benzonia, Mich., in place of M. B. Mills, deceased.
John J. Redmond, Bloomfield Hills, Mich., in place of K. L. Martin, resigned.
Roland F. Duff, Buckley, Mich., in place of W. W. Plank, retired.
Alexander S. Lynch, Carney, Mich., in place of V. R. Moran, transferred.
Archie W. Visnaw, Cedarville, Mich., in place of Edwin Dutcher, resigned.
Franklin L. Erickson, Central Lake, Mich., in place of Evert Van Den Berg, resigned.
Harry T. Dransfield, Channing, Mich., in place of R. J. Tobin, resigned.
Arthur F. Newman, De Witt, Mich., in place of V. W. Halterman, resigned.
Horace J. Lickly, Dexter, Mich., in place of L. W. Rector, transferred.
Leo B. Francisco, East Lansing, Mich., in place of E. E. Young, removed.
Richard L. Price, East Tawas, Mich., in place of C. A. Bigelow, deceased.
Woodrow L. LaLonde, Felch, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Keith Adams, Fountain, Mich., in place of J. H. Boehm, resigned.
Clarence F. Allen, Fowlerville, Mich., in place of D. L. Lockwood, resigned.
Mary M. Blower, Grand Blanc, Mich., in place of E. M. Page, resigned.
Clarence F. Goerner, Howard City, Mich., in place of Sidney Reynolds, resigned.
Robert J. Buller, Interlochen, Mich. Office became Presidential, July 1, 1945.
Joseph Thomas Kaderabek, Irons, Mich., in place of E. M. Voorhees, retired.
John B. Seidl, Jones, Mich., in place of R. L. Schell, retired.
Reuben S. Eddy, Lake Linden, Mich., in place of H. E. Penninger, retired.
John E. Dooley, Linden, Mich., in place of J. E. Hogan, resigned.
Emerson E. Dufina, Mackinac Island, Mich., in place of Paul Doud, resigned.
Lovatus A. Butler, Milan, Mich., in place of W. R. Mason, resigned.
Court R. Houghmaster, Millersburg, Mich., in place of F. B. Mills, deceased.
Bruce A. Lee, Millington, Mich., in place of R. P. Lee, resigned.
Otto F. Wormsbacher, Mount Clements, Mich., in place of J. C. Bannow, deceased.
Charles L. Kaltenbach, New Haven, Mich., in place of C. J. Tessman, resigned.
Collins H. Luth, Niles, Mich., in place of F. C. Franz, resigned.
Charles J. Bal, Norway, Mich., in place of Elizabeth Treiber, retired.
Russell C. Scott, Pittsford, Mich., in place of F. B. Wadsworth, retired.
Charles K. Guy, Rapid City, Mich., in place of J. O. Way, resigned.
Clarence F. Bushman, Rochester, Mich., in place of J. M. Stackhouse, deceased.
Darwin H. Van Houten, Sixlakes, Mich., in place of Ward Gibbs, resigned.
Vester E. Mock, Springport, Mich., in place of L. L. Peterson, transferred.
William H. Mullins, Trout Lake, Mich. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

MINNESOTA

Alfred C. Howe, Aitkin, Minn., in place of C. C. Young, deceased.
Peter B. Kiselewski, Browerville, Minn., in place of L. F. Masonick, resigned.
Charlotte C. Keniston, Champlin, Minn., in place of H. A. Smith, transferred.
Walter L. Franti, Coleraine, Minn., in place of J. K. Sloan, deceased.
Bertha H. Avenson, Dorset, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Anna C. Hite, Emily, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Edna K. Gerding, Greenwald, Minn., in place of H. A. Behrien, resigned.
Joseph F. Ruzek, Hayfield, Minn., in place of Earl Stanton, transferred.

Alfred F. Ess, Hopkins, Minn., in place of F. D. Markham, resigned.

Raymond B. Sullivan, International Falls, Minn., in place of W. V. Kane, resigned.

Max H. Casey, Jordan, Minn., in place of Herman Herder, retired.

Fred J. Peterson, Laporte, Minn., in place of A. E. Child, removed.

Reuel J. Jacobson, Lutsen, Minn., in place of J. C. Bally, resigned.

John J. Jaschke, Minneota, Minn., in place of W. B. Gislason, resigned.

George A. Schultz, Ottertail, Minn., in place of E. H. Albers, transferred.

Alfred A. Nelson, Perham, Minn., in place of J. C. Grimm, deceased.

Grant D. Bergstrom, Pine River, Minn., in place of M. M. Steward, resigned.

Jerome L. Chmielewski, Princeton, Minn., in place of C. E. Paulson, resigned.

Carl S. Fischer, Sauk Centre, Minn., in place of B. F. DuBois, Jr., resigned.

Fred P. Schroeder, Sauk Rapids, Minn., in place of T. G. Schaefer, removed.

Lyle R. Martinson, Shafer, Minn., in place of R. E. Grandstrand, transferred.

Alban D. Bertrand, Sleepy Eye, Minn., in place of George Glotzbach, resigned.

Evelyn McGivern, Staples, Minn., in place of T. L. Wolf, resigned.

James Monroe Cunningham, Sturgeon Lake, Minn., in place of G. W. Phares, deceased.

Vida B. Adams, Truman, Minn., in place of N. T. True, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Charles C. Provine, Big Creek, Miss., in place of J. H. Seale, deceased.

Owen O. Odom, Steens, Miss., in place of S. L. Brewer, deceased.

MISSOURI

Clyde A. Revelle, Advance, Mo., in place of Carl Richmond, resigned.

Maude E. Coburn, Arbyrd, Mo., in place of H. K. Bridges, resigned.

Ida M. Brunnert, Argyle, Mo., in place of F. P. Wulff, deceased.

Cleatus F. Henson, Bell City, Mo., in place of A. J. Henson, retired.

Edna M. Keesling, Belleview, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Mary W. Chaffin, Breckenridge, Mo., in place of R. E. Chaffin, deceased.

Waldo E. Malone, Clifton Hill, Mo., in place of E. E. Essig, deceased.

Dudley W. Peters, Crane, Mo., in place of W. L. Wiley, resigned.

Eugene H. Davison, Elkland, Mo., in place of I. F. Davison, retired.

Fred V. Hogan, Flemington, Mo., in place of R. L. Whited, transferred.

Alfred D. Boon, Franklin, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Arthur G. Emmons, Grandin, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Willie L. Anderson, Green City, Mo., in place of V. B. Watt, transferred.

Floyd R. Robertson, Harviell, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leanora R. Condit, Hayti, Mo., in place of C. O. Raine, Jr., resigned.

Walter H. Bruens, Hermann, Mo., in place of George Petrus, resigned.

Lola E. Frohse, High Ridge, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Charles H. Boemler, House Springs, Mo., in place of K. M. Boemler, deceased.

Tom J. Molloy, Joplin, Mo., in place of L. L. Travis, retired.

Carl E. Schreiner, Lamar, Mo., in place of W. G. Warner, resigned.

Elmer H. Temme, Leslie, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Aubrey M. Gooch, Meadville, Mo., in place of W. E. Evans, resigned.

Doris N. Cornine, Nelson, Mo., in place of A. R. White, deceased.

Sylvester Welch, Parnell, Mo., in place of E. J. Echterling, resigned.

Desmond Earl Todd, Pevely, Mo., in place of V. G. Guidicy, resigned.

T. Ray Gourley, Phillipsburg, Mo., in place of F. E. Dennis, retired.

Paul R. Viles, Pineville, Mo., in place of L. D. Smith, resigned.

Jacob E. Fry, Stover, Mo., in place of E. J. Fry, retired.

Mildred F. Parsons, Syracuse, Mo., in place of M. T. Keevil, removed.

Billie B. Cooper, Windsor, Mo., in place of F. L. Stafford, resigned.

Donald H. Lockman, Winona, Mo., in place of J. T. Loyd, resigned.

MONTANA

Dorothy W. Carrigan, Birney, Mont., in place of Dessie Burnsides, resigned.

James Charles McCue, Winnett, Mont., in place of E. V. Leslie, resigned.

NEBRASKA

Irvan S. Renie, Arapahoe, Nebr., in place of A. A. Anderson, transferred.

Arthur Glen Miller, Atkinson, Nebr., in place of A. G. Miller, incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Lorin V. Jones, Auburn, Nebr., in place of R. E. Harmon, retired.

Viola Calhoon, Benedict, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Audrey Ida Babb, Broadwater, Nebr., in place of Bert Winters, retired.

Donald K. Burklund, Brule, Nebr., in place of E. E. Kampfe, resigned.

Edward J. Pepperl, Burchard, Nebr., in place of A. M. Hart, resigned.

Winton E. Newcomb, Cambridge, Nebr., in place of K. R. Newcomb, transferred.

Cyrus F. McDowell, Chadron, Nebr., in place of R. L. Isham, resigned.

Wayne L. Patras, Clearwater, Nebr., in place of R. E. Flowers, transferred.

John P. Davis, Crawford, Nebr., in place of G. J. Scott, resigned.

Troy Kenneth McCown, Elsie, Nebr., in place of W. O. Troxel, transferred.

Charles Edmond Rock, Geneva, Nebr., in place of G. L. Koshler, resigned.

Gayle K. Conner, Glenvil, Nebr., in place of Walter Kowka, transferred.

Harry L. Dresslar, Grant, Nebr., in place of U. V. Dobbs, resigned.

Henry A. Davis, Louisville, Nebr., in place of E. L. Ossenkop, deceased.

Mary L. Wunderlich, Martell, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

James J. Marshall, Merriman, Nebr., in place of F. C. Johnson, removed.

Adeline L. Breslin, Newcastle, Nebr., in place of J. A. Hoy, resigned.

Raymond R. Stevens, Orchard, Nebr., in place of F. D. Strope, deceased.

M. Belle Bouck, Palmyra, Nebr., in place of M. A. Foreman, deceased.

Robert K. Corn, Papillion, Nebr., in place of G. P. Miller, retired.

Fahy E. Wadkins, Phillips, Nebr., in place of J. W. Spencer, retired.

Rolland L. Winkle, Pickrell, Nebr. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Calvin Joseph Olk, Pilger, Nebr., in place of O. A. Pilger, transferred.

Leslie W. Niel, Plattsmouth, Nebr., in place of M. W. Price, resigned.

Mae M. Lovell, Potter, Nebr., in place of W. M. Goding, resigned.

Walter A. Aregood, Rising City, Nebr., in place of P. W. Barker, transferred.

Jerry E. Severyn, Schuyler, Nebr. in place of M. B. Farrell, resigned.

Hattie A. Pateidl, Snyder, Nebr., in place of Joseph Kounovsky, retired.

Charles V. Brokaw, Uehling, Nebr., in place of Catherine Honey, retired.

Margaret Linhart, Verdel, Nebr., in place of W. N. McClintock, transferred.

Aura Mae Keckler, Weeping Water, Nebr., in place of R. W. Keckler, transferred.

NEVADA

Renee C. Gibson, Beatty, Nev., in place of C. E. Merkel, resigned.

Teresa A. Mahoney, Beowawe, Nev., in place of F. J. Smyth, retired.

Thelma R. Studer, Gabbs, Nev., in place of G. P. McMichael, resigned.

Edward L. Gregory, Goldfield, Nev., in place of N. W. Wills, removed.

Josephine Roberts, McGill, Nev., in place of E. S. Christensen, resigned.

Beatrice E. Hinds, Smith, Nev., in place of Geraldine Keeley, resigned.

Carolyn W. Parshall, Stewart, Nev., in place of D. E. Larson, transferred.

Alice I. Strieby, Wellington, Nev. Office became presidential—July 1, 1947.

Ray E. Hepworth, Wells, Nev., in place of E. C. Smith, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Rodney B. Wright, Brookline, N. H., in place of C. A. Morse, deceased.

Walter E. Hill, Fitzwilliam Depot, N. H., in place of S. E. White, retired.

James H. O'Connell, Fremont, N. H., in place of M. A. Willey, retired.

Joseph E. Hurley, Wilton, N. H., in place of J. R. K. Kelley, retired.

NEW JERSEY

Sesto A. Ferretti, Alpha, N. J., in place of R. B. Sokolowski, deceased.

William F. Kuhn, Brigantine, N. J., in place of S. H. Smith, resigned.

Kathryn W. Haines, Browns Mills, N. J., in place of Delbert Bush, resigned.

Stanley John Ryba, Burlington, N. J., in place of R. P. Hughes, retired.

Edmund O. Howell, Cape May Court House, N. J., in place of Jacob Garrison, deceased.

Charles M. Kammerer, Carlton Hill, N. J., in place of F. J. Baker, resigned.

George T. Albrecht, Dover, N. J., in place of Irving Washburn, retired.

Edward J. Breen, Edgewater, N. J., in place of Emery Benoit, retired.

William J. Pricolo, Emerson, N. J., in place of F. E. Schmidt, deceased.

Damon Caccese, Franklinville, N. J., in place of G. W. Karge, retired.

Elizabeth A. Philhower, Gladstone, N. J., in place of Remsen Howard, removed.

Jerome L. Becker, Jr., Hightstown, N. J., in place of J. B. Braun, Jr., deceased.

Henry T. Hopkins, Keyport, N. J., in place of W. H. Hitchcock. Incumbent's commission expired August 23, 1941.

Melvin A. Jolly, Old Bridge, N. J., in place of Luella Brown, retired.

Walter C. Farley, Oldwick, N. J., in place of M. D. Farley, deceased.

John F. O'Donnell, Phillipsburg, N. J., in place of W. H. Fisher, deceased.

Joseph E. Stout, Pittstown, N. J., in place of W. T. Snyder, transferred.

Robert G. Young, Port Monmouth, N. J., in place of M. B. Naughton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Nicholas M. DaPrile, Port Reading, N. J., in place of C. V. Richardson, declined.

William A. Kearns, Ridgewood, N. J., in place of A. W. McNeill, deceased.

Julius B. Scott, Somerdale, N. J., in place of P. F. Whelan, Jr., transferred.

James Abercromby, South Branch, N. J. Office became Presidential October 1, 1947.

Ralph T. Hodge, South Vineland, N. J., in place of Ethel Light, resigned.

Carl L. Roof, Stillwater, N. J., in place of C. M. Garris, retired.

Joseph E. Lyons, Vineland, N. J., in place of T. H. Hall, resigned.

Joseph Carroll Bransfield, Wildwood, N. J., in place of P. J. Shortt, retired.

William M. Danridge, Wortendyke, N. J., in place of Nora Loughman, resigned.

NEW MEXICO

Carl J. Dagostino, Socorro, N. Mex., in place of L. M. Fay, resigned.

NEW YORK

Mary A. Burns, Andover, N. Y., in place of J. D. Chessman, deceased.

David E. Dodge, Apalachin, N. Y., in place of Asa Camp, retired.

Alonzo L. Grasberger, Ashland, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

William A. Clukies, Bellmore, N. Y., in place of A. J. Lee, deceased.

Charles C. Vorhis, Brocktondale, N. Y., in place of A. C. VanDemark, resigned.

Chester E. Canniff, Cairo, N. Y., in place of L. A. Timmerman, resigned.

William J. Trombley, Cohoes, N. Y., in place of Michael O'Donnell. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1940.

Dorothy N. Lyke, East Bethany, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Maurice H. Adair, East Meredith, N. Y., in place of F. I. Adair, retired.

Phoebe J. Varney, East Nassau, N. Y., in place of L. B. Pulver, deceased.

Richard A. Stahley, East Randolph, N. Y., in place of S. V. Woods, deceased.

Paul E. Carrigan, East Rockaway, N. Y., in place of A. A. Crary, deceased.

Mary H. Bunt, Elka Park, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Robert G. Sullivan, Gainesville, N. Y., in place of J. J. Hickey, transferred.

Elvira Reppucci, Glenwood Landing, N. Y., in place of F. J. Burns, Jr., resigned.

Elizabeth C. FitzPatrick, Hamilton, N. Y., in place of M. F. Dixon, deceased.

Manuel Fisher, Harris, N. Y., in place of H. A. Monroe, resigned.

Arnold D. Case, Hinsdale, N. Y., in place of D. B. Allen, retired.

Julia M. Conway, Kiamesha Lake, N. Y., in place of Henry Karchmer, deceased.

John L. Barrett, Minetto, N. Y. In place of Z. I. Seymour. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles W. Schmitt, Montgomery, N. Y., in place of W. J. Devitt, transferred.

Julia C. McManus, Montrose, N. Y., in place of E. C. McManus, resigned.

Frank A. McEvoy, Mount McGregor, N. Y. Office became Presidential October 1, 1946.

Andrew A. Wulforst, New Hyde Park, N. Y., in place of John Flinn, deceased.

Walter J. McCue, North Vellmore, N. Y., in place of Benjamin Lomench, resigned.

Mildred C. Sigrist, North Evans, N. Y., in place of S. M. Waltz, retired.

James F. Byrne, Norwich, N. Y., in place of H. M. Bulger, deceased.

T. Leo Ford, Oak Hill, N. Y., in place of E. E. Ford, retired.

Edward Warner, Point Pleasant, N. Y., in place of E. R. Chaffer, deceased.

Walter R. Cumiskey, Port Washington, N. Y., in place of T. E. Roeber, resigned.

Margaret M. Fox, Purdy Station, N. Y., in place of Rose Bittner, resigned.

Robert L. Simmons, Ripley, N. Y., in place of I. R. Bennett, deceased.

Cornelius S. Ball, Rye, N. Y., in place of T. V. Ball, deceased.

Louise H. Allen, Sandy Creek, N. Y., in place of A. H. Wart, resigned.

Winston R. Reel, Schuylerville, N. Y., in place of D. J. Falvey, deceased.

Mary W. Hally, Sonyea, N. Y., in place of E. J. Hally, deceased.

Mae Carroll, Sound Beach, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Francis A. Brophy, Stony Point, N. Y., in place of Mary Lynch, removed.

Hyman Sasnowitz, Swan Lake, N. Y., in place of Frank Kilcoin, resigned.

Althera Wahl, Sylvan Beach, N. Y., in place of M. M. Rice, deceased.

Arthur J. Kane, Waverly, N. Y., in place of M. G. Baldwin, resigned.

William J. Yaeger, Webster, N. Y., in place of P. J. Smith, retired.

Frederic Francais, Westhampton Beach, N. Y., in place of M. B. Williams, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

Evelyn J. Sutton, Dillsboro, N. C., in place of E. B. Monteith, retired.

Belle Q. Cable, Fontana Dam, N. C., in place of M. T. Calahan, resigned.

Claude A. Dry, Misenheimer, N. C., in place of M. C. Peeler, resigned.

A. Garland Pierce, Southern Pines, N. C., in place of P. F. Buchan, deceased.

Gilbert A. Holt, Troy, N. C., in place of G. W. Stuart, resigned.

George H. Ross, Wadesboro, N. C., in place of F. M. Mills, resigned.

NORTH DAKOTA

Mathilda A. Johnson, Adams, N. Dak., in place of N. H. Koppang, resigned.

Ben Ramsland, Almont, N. Dak., in place of Otis Malone, retired.

Donovan J. Dolan, Bowbells, N. Dak., in place of I. E. Schultz, resigned.

John J. Murray, Mandan, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Hudson, retired.

Roy R. Just, New Salem, N. Dak., in place of Carl Jahnke, retired.

Herbert J. Clark, Powers Lake, N. Dak., in place of E. J. Powell, resigned.

Daniel F. McMenamy, Reynolds, N. Dak., in place of H. J. Mealy, transferred.

Byron P. Pulles, Stanton, N. Dak., in place of I. D. Thue, deceased.

Henry Lemke, Wishek, N. Dak., in place of J. H. Case, removed.

OHIO

Ralph C. Bennett, Amesville, Ohio, in place of W. L. Carpenter, resigned.

Willis D. Kay, Anna, Ohio, in place of M. L. Sollmann, transferred.

Ida U. Smeltz, Attica, Ohio, in place of R. W. Senn, resigned.

Anna Gilmer Love, Basil, Ohio, in place of J. F. Shell, deceased.

Norman W. Elsass, Botkins, Ohio, in place of F. J. Lenhart, transferred.

Harry B. Bavis, Bowling Green, Ohio, in place of F. W. Thomas, resigned.

Harley G. Butler, Bryan, Ohio, in place of G. H. Smith, deceased.

Woodrow E. Cecil, Caldwell, Ohio, in place of A. C. Barnhouse, deceased.

Robert S. Keadey, Centerburg, Ohio, in place of R. W. Litzenberg, resigned.

Mary C. Dick, Cleves, Ohio, in place of R. J. Schwing, declined.

Harry F. Schiewetz, Dayton, Ohio, in place of C. N. Greer, deceased.

Willis W. Hill, Dublin, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William Henry Jenne, Elyria, Ohio, in place of C. J. Sartor, resigned.

Walter L. Bervinkle, Jr., Fort Jennings, Ohio, in place of C. B. Brockman, transferred.

Robert W. Garrison, Frankfort, Ohio, in place of D. F. Briggs, Jr., transferred.

Elmer E. Caldwell, Gallipolis, Ohio, in place of A. K. Merriman, resigned.

Clarence N. Emrick, Germantown, Ohio, in place of R. V. Condrey, transferred.

L. Abram Flory, Granville, Ohio, in place of N. H. Overturf, resigned.

Harold L. LaFountaine, Helena, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

William R. Hapner, Hillsboro, Ohio, in place of E. V. Miller, resigned.

Russell E. Elliott, Jackson Center, Ohio, in place of P. L. Heintz, removed.

Herbert N. Dunfee, Jacobsburg, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

Ralph W. Stitsworth, Jamestown, Ohio, in place of H. C. Lieurance, retired.

J. Gilbert Coil, Jeffersonville, Ohio, in place of G. W. Blessing, resigned.

Ivor W. Cowell, Lake Milton, Ohio, in place of O. A. Holzbach, resigned.

Mildred C. Sellars, Little Hocking, Ohio, in place of P. A. Bond, retired.

John B. Fanto, Lowellville, Ohio, in place of L. B. Milligan, deceased.

William C. Simon, Metamora, Ohio, in place of E. L. Churchill, transferred.

Homer E. Omen, Millfield, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Forest L. Ayers, Murray City, Ohio, in place of F. E. Surgen, resigned.

Albert D. Borer, New Riegel, Ohio, in place of A. C. Klein, retired.

Russell M. Powell, New Vienna, Ohio, in place of T. H. Rice, transferred.

William J. Gallehue, North Hampton, Ohio, in place of M. K. Lehman, resigned.

Howard B. Acker, Perry, Ohio, in place of M. C. Hickman, resigned.

George J. Stoll, Piketon, Ohio, in place of G. E. Leist, resigned.

Richard P. Hampson, Pleasantville, Ohio, in place of G. R. Daubenmire, removed.

Gail I. Lauer, Prospect, Ohio, in place of C. B. Dix, resigned.

Ella L. Clare, Richmond, Ohio, in place of J. R. Simpson, retired.

Robert E. Erwin, Richwood, Ohio, in place of M. L. Dickason, transferred.

Glenn G. Rex, Rome, Ohio, in place of J. P. Statler, deceased.

Francis M. Myers, Russellville, Ohio, in place of L. E. Harman, transferred.

Charles L. Sparks, Sabina, Ohio, in place of E. H. Barns, resigned.

Eugene Victor Grevencamp, Saint Henry, Ohio, in place of A. J. Beckman, resigned.

Lena G. Konneker, Sawyerwood, Ohio, in place of A. L. Milhoan, resigned.

Philip F. Dickerson, Scio, Ohio, in place of L. H. Duswald, resigned.

Mabel I. Linson, South Solon, Ohio, in place of Emma Duff, retired.

John M. Daly, State Soldiers Home, Ohio, in place of A. M. Speir, removed.

Laura V. Tipton, The Plains, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

Roger M. Crites, Tuscarawas, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Roger W. Goertemiller, Verona, Ohio, in place of J. A. Ressler, retired.

Ermel Ward, Vinton, Ohio, in place of H. D. Devore, retired.

Lester Gerber, Walnut Creek, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Elijah H. Jackson, Waverly, Ohio, in place of A. S. Keechle, resigned.

Harry A. Hahn, Waynesburg, Ohio, in place of H. C. Brubaker, resigned.

Erwin J. Brause, Westlake, Ohio, in place of E. J. Orvis, deceased.

Edsel F. Rowland, Williamsfield, Ohio, in place of L. W. Spellman, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

Phil Lee Brown, Cherokee, Okla., in place of H. C. Forde, resigned.

Clarence W. Phillips, Coyle, Okla., in place of G. E. Wandell, retired.

Alfred V. Koehler, Manchester, Okla., in place of B. E. Stone, resigned.

Glen H. Newell, Nash, Okla., in place of Roy Rine, resigned.

Robert Anderson, Sperry, Okla., in place of R. T. Holbert, deceased.

OREGON

Ardis E. Bradley, Aumsville, Oreg., in place of V. R. Bradley, resigned.

Farley J. Elliott, Bend, Oreg., in place of R. H. Fox, retired.

Victor Carl Black, Dallas, Oreg., in place of Tracy Savery, transferred.

Joseph Omlin, Jr., Gold Beach, Oreg. in place of Vincent Byram, deceased.

Loyal E. Smith, Sherwood, Oreg., in place of W. P. Fisk, tranferred.

PENNSYLVANIA

Thomas J. Zimmerlink, Allison, Pa., in place of Steve Latsko, Jr., removed.

Robert N. Eisenhart, Aspers, Pa., in place of C. A. Plank, resigned.

Eugene W. Collins, Atglen, Pa., in place of J. H. Baldwin, retired.

Harry E. Grim, Boyertown, Pa., in place of H. L. Breidenbach, resigned.
Chester J. Kukleski, Braddock, Pa., in place of Jennie Moran, retired.
John F. Nally, Carbondale, Pa., in place of F. P. Kelly, retired.
J. Albert Vail, Chester Springs, Pa., in place of K. H. Vail, deceased.
Claude B. Maurer, Colmar, Pa., in place of L. C. Rosenberger, retired.
Clarence R. Tobin, Cresson, Pa., in place of E. C. Bishop, resigned.
Robert A. McNaul, Curwensville, Pa., in place of W. K. Wrigley, resigned.
Ruth B. Nyquist, Dagus Mines, Pa., in place of S. P. Veoni, transferred.
Emerson K. Musser, East Earl, Pa., in place of C. P. Shirk, resigned.
A. Chester Dietrich, East Petersburgh, Pa., in place of E. S. Harry, resigned.
William E. Zediker, Eightyfour, Pa., in place of W. A. Johnston, resigned.
Wilma S. Walker, Emeigh, Pa., in place of E. M. Krug, resigned.
Leonard R. Devilbiss, Fawn Grove, Pa., in place of L. E. Devilbiss, deceased.
Woodrow W. S. Lehr, Fogelsville, Pa., in place of J. J. Mohr, retired.
Douglas James McHenry, Fort Washington, Pa., M. M. Kavanagh, resigned.
John Allen Habel, Garrett, Pa., in place of L. B. Habel, resigned.
Herbert C. Klinger, Herndon, Pa., in place of J. P. Garrett, transferred.
Frank W. Coughanour, Jr., Hopwood, Pa., in place of A. L. P. Lieb, resigned.
Harry T. Ritchey, Hyndman, Pa., in place of M. D. Rees, resigned.
Richard F. Albright, Kulpsville, Pa., in place of E. M. Stover, retired.
Victor Lescovitz, Midway, Pa., in place of Rebecca Campbell, resigned.
Malcolm A. Young, Monroeton, Pa., in place of E. J. Roof, resigned.
Clarence R. Miller, Mont Clare, Pa., in place of M. H. Wahl, resigned.
Anna L. Splain, Mountville, Pa., in place of J. W. Hoover, retired.
Luther E. Kunkle, Mount Wolf, Pa., in place of L. A. Strayer, deceased.
Steve J. Vrotny, Natrona Heights, Pa., in place of J. J. Roll, retired.
Michael J. Pagani, New Galilee, Pa., in place of Rose Guzzetti, resigned.
Raymond T. Stuckey, Newport, Pa., in place of W. G. Loy, deceased.
Anna V. Eichlin, Ottsville, Pa., in place of H. M. Fabian, resigned.
Kenneth W. Hoag, Ralston, Pa., in place of L. S. Mansuy, resigned.
Winifred C. Brendel, Reinholds, Pa., in place of S. E. Hornberger, retired.
William Debreczeni, Richeyville, Pa., in place of M. B. Williams, resigned.
Wiley C. Hamby, Salona, Pa., in place of C. B. Herr, retired.
George H. Davis, Saxonburg, Pa., in place of A. G. Lassinger, resigned.
William H. Rufe, Jr., Sellersville, Pa., in place of Alexander Alexander, deceased.
George L. Strausbaugh, Seven Valleys, Pa., in place of S. E. Henry, resigned.
Mildred E. Thomas, Shelocta, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Frank W. Thomas, Skytop, Pa., in place of Thornton Raney, resigned.
Walter F. Walsh, Spangler, Pa., in place of M. F. Doran, resigned.
Willis C. Latshaw, Spring City, Pa., in place of R. E. Walley, resigned.
Ida M. Christie, Starford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Leon D. Kingsley, Townville, Pa., in place of L. L. Childs, deceased.
Robert A. Lanzendorfer, Twin Rocks, Pa., in place of M. E. Ford, resigned.
Grant M. Barrall, Wapwallopen, Pa., in place of C. D. Everard, transferred.
Benjamin F. Sherick, Washington Boro, Pa., in place of R. E. Funk, deceased.
Eugene Patrick J. McMahon, Waymart, Pa., in place of M. L. McMahon, declined.
Eaton T. Hartman, Windsor, Pa., in place of E. C. Smith, deceased.
Thurlow C. Brenneman, York Haven, Pa., in place of M. E. M. Busser, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Domingo Lopez, Maricao, P. R., in place of L. B. Lopez, retired.
Georgina M. Lamas, Roosevelt, P. R. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Roberto Ortiz Colon, Vega Baja, P. R., in place of V. C. Aviles, transferred.
Josefa G. Lorenzi, Yauco, P. R., in place of L. M. Diaz, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Jerome R. Rueschenberg, Doland, S. Dak., in place of H. J. Gross, resigned.
George A. Curry, Elk Point, S. Dak., in place of T. H. Ryan, retired.
Joseph F. Krizan, Jr., Gregory, S. Dak., in place of W. J. Gassen, resigned.
Herby J. Bakkehaug, McIntosh, S. Dak., in place of M. W. Funk, resigned.
Wilbur E. Prann, Timber Lake, S. Dak., in place of Agnes Schirber, resigned.
Dayton C. Sebade, Wall, S. Dak., in place of L. T. Dartt, resigned.
Robert R. Davis, White, S. Dak., in place of C. F. Barg, resigned.

TENNESSEE

D. Naomi Anderson, Madison College, Tenn., in place of R. B. King, resigned.
Lewis E. Moore, Sr., Nashville, Tenn., in place of William Gupton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.
Edgar W. Marshall, Surgoinsville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.
Russell E. Rankin, Union City, Tenn., in place of E. A. Jones, resigned.

TEXAS

Benjamin F. Sullivan, Jr., Bangs, Tex., in place of L. G. Porter, resigned.
Napoleon B. Ballard, Baytown, Tex., in place of E. M. Thomas, resigned.
Robert A. Smith, Decatur, Tex., in place of R. T. Rieger, resigned.
Granville W. Elder, Houston, Tex., in place of John Dunlop, retired.
Thomas G. Sandel, Huntsville, Tex., in place of L. B. Baldwin, resigned.
Robert J. Quinlivan, Idalou, Tex., in place of Baxter Orr, deceased.
Albert N. Pike, Iredell, Tex., in place of C. R. Conley, resigned.
Lance A. Leggitt, Lakeview, Tex., in place of J. D. Durham, transferred.
Jesse B. Strickland, Novice, Tex., in place of M. R. Howard, resigned.
Irvin L. Hergert, Perryton, Tex., in place of M. R. Coffee, resigned.
John O. Bier, Plainview, Tex., in place of J. C. Terry, retired.
Harold Voss, Post, Tex., in place of P. S. Bouchier, transferred.
Miller J. Sweeden, Sweetwater, Tex., in place of A. G. Lee, resigned.
Opal F. Roberson, Temple, Tex., in place of W. N. Roberson, retired.

UTAH

Riley W. Goodfellow, Bountiful, Utah, in place of J. H. Rampton, resigned.
C. Henry Nielsen, Brigham, Utah, in place of Nello Christofferson, resigned.
Ted R. Mower, Fairview, Utah, in place of N. S. Brady, transferred.
Claud M. Glazier, Kanab, Utah, in place of A. C. Ford, resigned.
Edward W. Vendell, Ogden, Utah, in place of R. B. Porter, retired.
John T. Adams, Tooele, Utah, in place of F. G. Eastman, resigned.

VERMONT

Bernard H. Lilley, Hyde Park, Vt., in place of O. N. Campbell, resigned.

VIRGINIA

George E. Mettauer, Annandale, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Carroll E. Burgess, Blairs, Va., in place of C. B. Roach, resigned.
Lemuel W. Houston, Fredericksburg, Va., in place of H. F. Crismond, deceased.
Lewis K. Gathright, Goochland, Va., in place of C. A. Gathright, transferred.
Grace F. Hiehle, Mount Vernon, Va., in place of E. J. Monroe, resigned.
Delia M. Lawson, White Stone, Va., in place of B. N. Hubbard, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Edward W. Schoenholz, Alderwood Manor, Wash., in place of H. L. Parker, resigned.
Charles O. Jackson, Auburn, Wash., in place of A. J. Kralowec, resigned.
Emanuel A. Anderson, Carnation, Wash., in place of J. B. Simons, retired.
Douglas P. Salisbury, Chewelah, Wash., in place of H. S. Storms, resigned.
Emanuel Lindberg, Custer, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.
Ernest W. Wendelin, Grays River, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Esther L. Coleman, Harper, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.
Virgel M. Newman, Kingston, Wash., in place of M. R. Joyce, resigned.
Rival S. Moore, Long Beach, Wash., in place of Q. D. Mitchell, transferred.
David N. Judson, Jr., Oak Harbor, Wash., in place of D. N. Judson, deceased.
William Lorin McClure, Oakesdale, Wash., in place of R. V. Browder, removed.
Gladys M. Pearson, Olalla, Wash., in place of M. C. Nelson, retired.
Ronald M. Hinton, Parkwater, Wash., in place of M. G. Rosauer, resigned.
Lonnie D. Leeper, Pasco, Wash., in place of A. A. Barnes, retired.
Clifford Lavender, Portage, Wash., in place of D. L. Armstrong, resigned.
Harley E. Chapman, Prosser, Wash., in place of Paul Hamilton, resigned.
Gerald A. Emerick, Snoqualmie, Wash., in place of O. F. Reinig, retired.
Daniel F. Coulter, South Bend, Wash., in place of H. M. Connor, removed.
Richard K. Morley, Stevenson, Wash., in place of W. H. Lamm, retired.
Lawrence C. Tompkins, Suquamish, Wash., in place of R. I. Matheson, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Frederick C. Page, Beechbottom, W. Va., in place of J. W. Thomas, resigned.
William G. Meredith, Dailey, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Maude L. Copeland, Elk Garden, W. Va., in place of H. T. Williams, resigned.
Clara Marie Hess, Farmington, W. Va., in place of R. B. Mapel, deceased.
Elizabeth L. Williams, Glen Rogers, W. Va., in place of Reuben Williams, retired.
Alice L. Maschal, Glen White, W. Va., in place of E. B. Wray, retired.
Charles H. Callison, Hillsboro, W. Va., in place of G. L. Carlisle, retired.
Hazel O. Harbert, Lumberport, W. Va., in place of W. C. Harbert, resigned.
Athaline H. King, Mabscott, W. Va., in place of E. L. Hedrick, deceased.
Vincent A. Johnson, Man, W. Va., in place of Dewey Ellis, removed.
Henry E. Chapman, New Martinsville, W. Va., in place of J. O. Eakin, resigned.
Andrew J. Nemeth, Osage, W. Va., in place of J. L. Badzek, deceased.
Marietta Walker, Peach Creek, W. Va., in place of A. O. Shelton, resigned.
Marie N. Fox, Prenter, W. Va., in place of M. J. Nutter, resigned.
Josephine G. Bryant, Raysal, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
May H. White, Roderfield, W. Va., in place of H. A. Hetherington, retired.
Jane B. Graham, Thurmond, W. Va., in place of B. M. Gwinn, resigned.

Troy R. Swecker, Valley Head, W. Va., in place of N. S. Wood, resigned.

Walter S. Bambrick, Weirton, W. Va., in place of S. P. Shlanta, removed.

Mary L. Vance, Whitmans, W. Va., in place of Nellie Nix, resigned.

WISCONSIN

Oswald L. Weber, Cedarburg, Wis., in place of G. J. Armbruster, resigned.

James W. Johnson, Chaseburg, Wis., in place of Sam Johnson, deceased.

Robert W. Howard, Cornell, Wis., in place of G. E. Shaw, resigned.

Clarence Keith Hammond, De Soto, Wis., in place of Anna Loftus, resigned.

Ruby C. Bahr, Fairchild, Wis., in place of R. R. Hoffman, deceased.

Claude A. Thomas, Forest Junction, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Hugo J. Quast, Granton, Wis., in place of O. A. Peterson, resigned.

Hazel M. Pfeil, Granville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

Rudolph C. Trauba, Greenville, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

Leone C. Mader, Gresham, Wis., in place of F. J. Mader, deceased.

Donald L. Schulz, Irma, Wis., in place of Henry Magnuson, resigned.

Robert S. Grogan, Kaukauna, Wis., in place of R. H. McCarty, resigned.

Edwin L. Saykally, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of R. H. Wirth, deceased.

Louis W. Kurth, Neillsville, Wis., in place of L. W. Kurth. Incumbent's commission expired April 26, 1942.

Joan T. Sullivan, Ojibwa, Wis. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

Gordon J. Hansen, Oregon, Wis., in place of C. A. E. Manion, removed.

August E. Mecikalski, Pelican Lake, Wis., in place of M. A. Whalen, removed.

John H. Hennessey, Roberts, Wis., in place of W. R. Johnston, declined.

Otis M. Rude, Viroqua, Wis., in place of R. L. Graves, resigned.

Otis L. Holman, Westby, Wis., in place of R. M. Grimsrud, resigned.

Hugo Van Winkle, Winter, Wis., in place of A. N. Donnellan, resigned.

WYOMING

Kenneth L. Wingo, Encampment, Wyo., in place of M. C. Corum, retired.

Roxanna M. Smith, Lingle, Wyo., in place of M. N. Hanna, transferred.

Silvio J. Pedri, Reliance, Wyo., in place of Naomi Grove, resigned.

---

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 17, 1949:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

John Theodore Koehler, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Frank C. Bingham to be United States attorney for division No. 2, district of Alaska.

Harry O. Arend to be United States attorney for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

George L. Grobe to be United States attorney for the western district of New York.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Alfred J. Plowden, Jr., to be United States marshal for the eastern district of South Carolina.

Kehoe C. Shannon to be United States marshal for the western district of Texas.

IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. Hubert Don Hoover, O7924, United States Army, retired, for appointment as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of title V, Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Robert M. Coats et al., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade and corps specified, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army under the provisions of Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress; Public Law 365, Eightieth Congress; and Public Law 381, Eightieth Congress; were confirmed today, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 7, 1949, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Robert M. Coats, which appears on page 867, and ending with the name of Gus A. Wolman, Jr., which appears on page 870.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

| | |
|---|---|
| Griswold T. Atkins | Peter H. Horn |
| Oscar M. Browne, Jr. | Frederick J. Ilsemann |
| John F. Delaney, Jr. | Leonard T. Morse |
| Harry B. Dodge | Stanley G. Nichols |
| Harry W. Englund | Robert E. Perkins |
| William B. Epps | Manley H. Simons, Jr. |
| James H. Hean | Paul B. Tuzo, Jr. |
| Harold M. Heiser | Frank I. Winant, Jr. |
| Wellington T. Hines | Sanford B. D. Wood |
| Ephraim P. Holmes | |

---

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1949

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Father Louis W. Cheatham, St. Stephen's Roman Catholic Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God of majesty, creator and sustainer of life, before whom we all bow in profound adoration, graciously accept our humble plea that this day we may obtain Thy enlightenment to discern truth and Thy inspiration to exercise good. Assist these Thy public servants, here assembled in noble body, to voice the sentiments of high-minded citizens, whose special office it is to safeguard this Nation's security and its people's high ideals.

As official representatives of these United States, impart to them, O Lord, in Thy bountiful goodness, the firm impression of their sacred duty to God, to man, and to country. Instill in their minds the lofty principles of Christian life, that they may shine as a beacon before men, governing all decisions by God-fearing prudence and wisdom.. Implant in their hearts an unswerving determination to serve the common good of their country with wise forethought, zealous care, and enduring loyalty.

With full acknowledgment of their dependence on Thee, O God of love, we invoke Thy holy name with reverence and awe, and beseech Thee to replenish their souls with Thy heavenly gifts, that in the pursuance of their grave tasks they may engender new hope in the hearts of all men who crave a world of peace and harmony.

Suppliantly, therefore, we look to Thee for divine strength and guidance to uphold Thy standards of justice and charity; and in so doing to counteract the despotic hand of atheism and tyranny that everywhere seems to threaten our democratic mode of life.

Almighty God, permeate this select group with the holy inspiration to seek the accomplishment of Thy will in all things, that through their stanch efforts our country might flourish with new vigor of spirit, as the champion of man's God-given freedom and human rights.

O Father of lights, these blessings we implore Thee to grant this august body through the mediation of Thy well-beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Hon. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., in Huntington, W. Va.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances, and in each case to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. POTTER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech by Gen. Omar Bradley.

Mr. HORAN (at the request of Mr. POTTER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

### A CITIZEN'S ARMY

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last evening I had the privilege of hearing Brig. Gen. C. T. Lanham speak at the small-business banquet. We, who as Americans, are interested in a citizen rather than a professional army and who have often been troubled over what we have felt to be the attitude of the brass-hats, shall be able to feel that there is a new spirit moving among them.

Many in the large audience agreed that they had never heard so fine a portrayal of the ideals and the imperative central force of an army from any Army man.

It is not the same kind of citizen's army as we had in the early days of our

national life, but an army that thinks of the men that compose it as citizens first and soldiers second. It should be the kind of an army that we, as Americans, can feel it is a citizen's army in the deepest sense of the term.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend General Lanham's speech in the Appendix of the RECORD, and hope every member of this House will read it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BATTLE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. YOUNG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter addressed by him to Mr. Charles E. Wilson, of the General Electric Co., in answer to an 18-item questionnaire.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and insert editorials from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the Paris Post-Intelligencer.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HUBER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news release from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. CHURCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech made by DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association.

LOS ALAMOS PROJECT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 54) to retrocede to the State of New Mexico exclusive jurisdiction held by the United States over lands within the boundaries of the Los Alamos project of the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I understand that this land was previously owned by the State of New Mexico.

Mr. MURDOCK. It is correct to say New Mexico had jurisdiction over the land.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Did the United States Government pay any money when it acquired that property?

Mr. MURDOCK. I think not, as it was probably public domain. However, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. FERNANDEZ] may be able to answer that better.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When the United States acquired this land, did they pay any money to the State of New Mexico for it?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. No. They paid no money to the State of New Mexico. The money was paid to the owners of the property.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then the Government actually did pay the money?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much is involved?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I do not know about the price of the land. It varied according to the land, I suppose, I do not know. I do not think that is involved here. I do not quite follow the gentleman's question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Well, if the United States Government is giving New Mexico land for which they paid a substantial sum of money, I simply wanted to know it.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Let me explain to the gentleman, we are not giving any land to the State of New Mexico. These are the particulars in the case: At the present time part of the land where the community of Los Alamos is located is under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. Part of the land is in the exclusive jurisdiction of the State government. That has created a good deal of confusion in the administration of the laws.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The title to the land does not change?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. The title to the land does not change at all.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. You are simply changing it back to New Mexico so that the civil law can prevail?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. That is correct, and in order that the legislature may have the right to legislate over that community. The reason for the haste is this: The State legislature is now in session. It will adjourn the first week in March——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, the consent calendar will be called on next Monday.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. But this has to go through the Senate as well. They are contemplating some legislation, I understand, which will permit the community of Los Alamos, a community of eight or ten thousand population, to organize as a municipality. Of course, there is the question of elective franchise and the right to vote and other privileges that attach to citizens, which they do not now have. But the main reason for haste is that the legislature is now in session, and we should have this bill passed before they adjourn. If the legislature wants to enact legislation to permit that community to incorporate as a municipality, it may do so only after the State acquires jurisdiction. At the present time it has no jurisdiction over part of the community.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is merely a jurisdictional proceeding?

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Purely that.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say further, this bill was reported out unanimously by the Committee on Public Lands. The ranking minority member has been consulted, and, of course, is agreeable to the presentation of this bill, as well as the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader. It was requested by the Atomic Energy Commission; it has the approval of the Members of Congress from New Mexico, and it does not involve any money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to find out if the Federal Government paid good hard cash for this land and it is going to be returned to your State. Certainly if that is the case, then the State of New Mexico will repay the Federal Government for the land if it is any way implicated that they take this land from the Federal Government.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no land going back to the State of New Mexico. The Federal Government owns the land and will own the land under this bill. This bill only places the civil jurisdiction of the laws of the State of New Mexico applicable to the inhabitants of this particular land. In other words, there was a case there of a person living on part of this land who had brought proceedings for a divorce under the State law. The Supreme Court of the State of New Mexico ruled that the State court had no jurisdiction, because it had no jurisdiction over this particular land that was owned by the Federal Government. I think we did the same thing in connection with the airport over here in Virginia, to allow the law of Virginia to become applicable to the airport. This is only to allow the civil law to apply there.

Mr. RICH. Would it not be a good thing in New Mexico if we let New Mexico buy a lot of this land that the Government owns so that they will have something they can operate and they can call their own, instead of the Federal Government doing it?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, the Federal Government needs this land itself.

Mr. RICH. Oh, we have got more land in New Mexico than the people have themselves.

Mr. McCORMACK. Not for this purpose.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, there is one question I should like to have answered. As I understand it this land was acquired for experiments with the atomic bomb.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is right; it is under the jurisdiction of the Atomic Energy Commission, and they have requested this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. The passage of this legislation will not in any way interfere with the Government carrying on future experiments there if they want to?

Mr. MURDOCK. In no way will it interfere; in fact, this legislation comes at the request of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article by Richard Luther.

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent.

THE LATE WENDELL WILLKIE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the birthday of Wendell Willkie. He was born on February 18, 1892. I am inserting in the RECORD which will appear tomorrow an editorial from the Indianapolis News about Wendell Willkie, entitled, "The Torch Still Burns."

Mr. Speaker, today when we are struggling with the problem of civil rights, social-welfare legislation, and the effort to keep the world from being divided by violent war into two worlds instead of the one world which he conceived, the words of Wendell Willkie take on the same permanent and universal significance that we associate with the words of Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Willkie said:

There are no distant points in the world any longer—our thinking in the future must be world-wide.

We must establish beyond all doubt the equality of men.

The world is awakening at last to the knowledge that the rule of people by other people is not freedom.

Freedom is an indivisible word—we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin.

The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people—we must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all—we must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law.

The editorial I refer to follows:

[From the Indianapolis News of October 1946]

THE TORCH STILL BURNS

Two years ago, in the bright beauty of an October afternoon, Wendell Willkie came home to Indiana, to return to the rich earth from which he sprang. On a green hillside over which flamed the tapestry of October, the man whom Indiana gave to the world was laid to rest. On the place where he slept the leaves came drifting down from the hackberry and linden sentinels for his eternal rest.

The great voice that had been raised for freedom was still. But even death cannot quench a dream, and a flaming spirit lives beyond mortality. Wendell Willkie had fired the thoughts of men and touched their hearts, and the world picked up his torch. His words live and his dream moves on toward realization. Greatness does not die.

Symbolic recognition of that truth is afforded, as fully as can be expressed in stone, by the memorial that has just been placed at his grave. This is truly a shrine to freedom. It has the idealism of the cross, the sword of the spirit, the torch of humanity, the book of inspiration, and the laurel of victory.

It is the torch and the book that will carry the message of Wendell Willkie to those who come in the years ahead to the East Hill Cemetery in Rushville, there to pay homage to one who was a friend to all mankind. There is no fire in the granite torch. Rather the flame is in the words graven on the book that all may read as they rest and meditate. They are the words that were Mr. Willkie's creed:

"I believe in America because in it we are free—free to choose our government, to speak our minds, to observe our different religions.

"Because we are generous with our freedom, we share our rights with those who disagree with us.

"Because we hate no people and covet no people's lands.

"Because we are blessed with a natural and varied abundance.

"Because we have great dreams and because we have the opportunity to make those dreams come true."

Mr. Willkie lived those words, as all Americans should live them. And his heritage to his fellow countrymen is contained in these other lines on the book, taken from his speeches and One World:

"There are no distant points in the world any longer—our thinking in the future must be world-wide.

"We must establish beyond all doubt the equality of men.

"The world is awakening at last to the knowledge that the rule of people by other peoples is not freedom.

"Freedom is an indivisible word—we must be prepared to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or the color of their skin.

"The only soil in which liberty can grow is that of a united people—we must have faith that the welfare of one is the welfare of all—we must acknowledge that all are equal before God and before the law.

"Only the productive are strong, only the strong are free.

"It is inescapably true that to raise the standard of living of any man anywhere in the world is to raise the standard of living by some slight degree of every man, everywhere in the world.

"Whenever we take away the liberties of those whom we hate we are opening the way to loss of liberty for those we love.

"The moral losses of expediency always far outweight the temporary gains.

"The test of a people is their aim and not their color."

Those words still speak to a world that has yet to know their full meaning. They are as true as the ages. And as long as there are living men to read them, and warm hearts to respond, the spirit of Wendell Willkie will endure. His torch still burns.

THE ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the President says we must have $4,000,000,000 in new taxes.

Yesterday's paper says:

Boost in tax levies a must, Speaker RAYBURN declares. Four-billion-dollar increase needed to keep Government our of red, he says.

Today the Secretary of the Treasury said we need $4,000,000,000 in taxes.

Is there not somebody in high Government places who is going to say we want to cut down Government spending? Let some one Democrat get some economy in his system. Or are you going to take on this Truman giveaway plan: Bigger old-age pensions, more pay for the idle, to have the Government pay the medicine bill, permanent pay for the sick, Federal aid for the schools, electric power at less than cost, new dams at less than cost, bigger Government aid in the West, bigger Government subsidies, higher wages, and lower prices. For goodness sake, let us get a little common sense into Government and cut the cost of Government.

Stop squandering, stop spending, stop giving our resources away and you will stop taxing. Our people are tired of taxes; our people want economy in Government; I want economy in Government. The way to get it is stop spending. Stop spending and you stop taxing, Mr. Speaker.

THE VETERANS' PENSION BILL

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I see a hideous cartoon of myself in this morning's Washington Post—the uptown edition of the Communist Daily Worker.

You will remember that we chased some of the Communists off the editorial staff of that publication; but they still have a Communist cartoonist.

This publication is doing more to stir race trouble here in Washington than all other forces combined, by its communistic propaganda for wiping out all race segregation and forcing Negroes into the white hotels and white schools of the District of Columbia. Of course they don't give a tinker's dam about the Negroes. They just want to harass the white gentiles of America and force their communistic program on them. But when you turn the spotlight on them they whine "race prejudice."

They do not want our aged veterans taken care of, as this bill provides, for fear it might cost them a few of their ill-gained dollars.

I filed a resolution for a rule on this bill, and I am going to press it as hard as I can. I want to bring this measure to

the floor of the House as quickly as possible.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] on yesterday got excited, and you would have thought from his speech that we were going to break the Government with this bill.

Why, the bill he voted for last year known as the Marshall plan, which was really the Bevin plan, would send to Europe tobacco alone costing ten times as much as this soldiers' pension bill would cost the first year.

The gentleman from Wisconsin can take that side of the question if he wants to—and any of the rest of you can do likewise; but I am not going to let these old veterans, who served their country in time of war, go to the poorhouse in their declining days if I can help it.

If we can spend untold billions of dollars on other countries—as I said, feeding and clothing every lazy lout from Tokyo to Timbuktu—then we can take care of our aged veterans when they get beyond the age of their earning capacity, and are unable to care for themselves.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. If we are going to legislate, let us have the Members present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Gathings | Pace |
| Allen, La. | Gwinn | Pfeifer, |
| Bates, Mass. | Heffernan | Joseph L. |
| Bennett, Fla | Herter | Powell |
| Bentsen | Hoffman, Ill. | Reed, Ill. |
| Blatnik | Hoffman, Mich. | Regan |
| Bolton, Md. | Jackson, Calif. | Scott, Hardie |
| Boykin | Jenkins | Scott, |
| Breen | Judd | Hugh D., Jr. |
| Bulwinkle | Karst | Short |
| Burdick | Klein | Sikes |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Lemke | Smith, Ohio |
| Colmer | Lesinski | Somers |
| Coudert | Linehan | Taylor |
| Cunningham | McMillan, S. C. | Thomas, N. J. |
| Curtis | Mack, Ill. | Thomas, Tex. |
| DeGraffenried | Macy | Towe |
| D'Ewart | Mahon | Wadsworth |
| Dingell | Marshall | Walter |
| Douglas | Mason | Werdel |
| Eberharter | Miles | Whitaker |
| Engel, Mich. | Norton | White, Idaho |
| Fulton | O'Hara, Minn. | Wickersham |
| Furcolo | O'Toole | |

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-two Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, by inadvertence, the bill (H. R. 1376) to provide assistance to farmers in securing farm housing and other farm buildings, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture. I have conferred with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered for this day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial from the Gary Post-Tribune.

Mr. THOMPSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address by the national president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association.

Mr. HÉBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an editorial and excerpts.

Mr. TRIMBLE asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article entitled "Annual Madison County Soil Conservation District," notwithstanding the fact that the Government Printing Office estimates the cost will be $230.75.

Mr. HARRISON asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include sundry editorials.

Mr. GARMATZ asked and was granted permission to include his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an article from the New York Times.

Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and were granted permission to extend their remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD regarding a bill he will today introduce.

Mr. POULSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SANBORN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am transmitting herewith the Sixty-fifth Annual Report of the United States Civil Service Commission. This report covers the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 17, 1949.*

EXPORT-CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 97 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved,* That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1661) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after I conclude my remarks I shall yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, several Members have accused me of being responsible for bringing them here this morning by making a point of order that a quorum was not present. I did not make the point of order, but it will not hurt the Members to remain here during the consideration of the bill, especially since it is being considered under the 5-minute rule.

The rule is an open one and provides for 2 hours general debate, after which the bill will be taken up and read under the 5-minute rule for the offering of amendments. It might be well for all of the Members to remain here at that time in order to gain information about the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is relative to the control of the exportation of products that are vital to the Nation's internal economy as well as to its external security. It provides for the continuation of the President's authority to control this vital link in the chain of the Nation's welfare.

The effect of the legislation will be to safeguard the supply of many of the materials needed by our own country. It is true that it controls the export of goods both to friendly and to so-called unfriendly nations. In this way, it serves a twofold purpose. In the first place, our domestic situation is strengthened, especially through the curbing of inflationary tendencies caused by foreign demand. And in regard to our security, the program will act as a two-edged sword; we can limit the flow of goods to nations that we suspect are unfriendly and we can see to it that the goods we send to the friendly nations do not find their ultimate destination in the hands of our potential enemies. In the past, many valuable materials that have been exported, and even donated, to our friends have found their way to countries that are not so friendly. Even some of the so-called friendly nations are not so friendly. At any rate, I hope that those countries that have engaged in unfair tactics in the past will cease doing so in the future. Nevertheless, the situation is such that our reliance should be placed at home. Thus, we are giving this power to the President.

The people of the country have confidence in the judgment of the President; they have confidence that he has the welfare of the United States uppermost in his mind, first, last, and always. They know that his sane, common sense will safeguard their interests and the interests of our country, seeing to it that scarce materials will not, by devious means, find their way to undesirable destinations. To those that decry the centralization of authority, it may be stated that the situation is a swiftly changing one, with the need for rapid action. Central authority is imperative. Furthermore, the President will be apprised of all the facts through his advisors in the various departments concerned. The action of the President will prove beneficial to American manufacturers, who, in the future, will not be faced with the severe shortages of the past. It may be noted that many manufacturers were obliged to suspend operations due to manipulations on the part of the trusts. They were not able to obtain steel and other necessary materials.

Of course this matter was exploited by my Republican friends. Yesterday, three of them arose and claimed, with a great deal of glee, that we are facing a recession. Well, my friends, that just isn't true. The country is prosperous and will continue to be prosperous and the people will continue to be employed.

Yes, we have a little unemployment. We know that from 8 to 10 percent of our employable people ordinarily are unemployed during peacetimes. Now we have over 58,000,000 people employed, and they will continue to be employed if we retain the raw materials that are needed for production, as contemplated in this bill. Some gentlemen say there are nearly 2,000,000 unemployed. Well, that is not even a quarter of what we ordinarily have in peacetimes, percentagewise. Actually, it may be said that there is no unemployment. Look at the newspapers here, in New York, in Chicago, and in every other city and you will find page after page of help wanted, labor wanted, manpower wanted. There is a demand for more labor, and everybody who desires to work may find employment, and I hope at good wages. Shortly, we will pass the minimum wage bill and that will encourage still greater employment.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I do not oppose the rule making in order the consideration of H. R. 1661, a bill introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to enact a law for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, under a 2-hour general debate clause.

I do not oppose the rule because I believe that some sort of legislation to continue export controls is absolutely necessary at this time.

A short time ago I spoke on the floor of the House and perhaps criticized just a little bit some of my friends on the majority side because, while they had been very loud and long in their criticisms of the Eightieth Congress, they had brought in a number of bills which extended legislation that had been passed by the Congress which they have criticized, the Republican Eightieth Congress. They had reenacted legislation which they had opposed and had criticized at the time the Eightieth Congress enacted it into law.

Seemingly my friends of the majority took that criticism of mine to heart, because they have evidently decided that they would not extend the Republican-sponsored law for export control but instead would attempt to write a bill of their own, a substitute measure, as it were.

I hope the Members of the House will listen very carefully to the debate on the bill H. R. 1661 and the explanation of what this new law actually contains, because it goes much further as far as conferring power on the President is concerned than any export-control legislation which has ever been enacted by any Congress in the past. It goes so far as to permit the President or any person he may designate to go into the matter of financing exports, of transporting exports, and of servicing the goods that are shipped overseas. It goes even further than that. It provides that the veil of secrecy can be thrown about these activities, or that, in the discretion of an official, if any particular business or industrial secret should be made public for the benefit of some individual or some group or some organization, it can be done.

It permits the officials in charge of export controls to bring in any individual in the United States, regardless of whether or not that person has any connection whatsoever with the goods being exported, and swear that person and get all the information they want from him about that particular matter or any other matter that he may know something about.

In other words, this legislation is another step in conferring practically—well, let me say not dictatorial, but very, very broad powers on the Chief Executive. It is just another chapter, if you please, in the story of centralizing all power and authority in the Government here in Washington.

Those of you who are interested in the welfare of your own industries and your own districts had better look at this piece of legislation rather carefully and listen to the explanations and give serious consideration to some of the amendments that will be offered during the consideration of the bill in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

May I also add that perhaps it might be wise for our friends of the majority to be giving just a little bit of consideration to import controls as well as to export control legislation, because if the present trend continues it will not be long until many of us here will be seriously concerned with the heavy flow of imports which are coming into this country. I know that in the report on this bill reference is made to the increase in production in foreign countries in many commodities.

I am not unmindful of something that happened in my own State in the last 2 weeks. Up in the great city of Cleveland bids were opened for the purchase of generating equipment to make electricity for that great city, a city of over one million souls.

The low bidder was a Swiss concern with a bid more than a half million dollars below the lowest bid made by any American manufacturer for the same identical equipment, with the result that the workers in the electrical factory in Switzerland will be employed while the workers in some of the electrical factories in America are being laid off. I have every respect and every regard for the distinguished Member from the State of Illinois, my chairman [Mr. SABATH]. Yet as I heard him speak, I could not help but wonder just where he has been recently. Certainly he has not been in the great State of Illinois. Certainly he has not been back home, or he would have found out very quickly that there is unemployment—growing unemployment in the city of Chicago to such an extent, by the way, that it is giving grave concern to his own city and State officials.

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SADLAK. I am positive that the gentleman from Illinois was not in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure that the gentleman has been in the never-never land if he still believes that we have expanding employment in this country and that there is a great shortage of workers. If the gentleman from Illinois has all these positions and jobs available that he has been talking about, I believe many Members of the House

could give him names of many, many individuals who have been writing, asking them to help them get employment.

We have even had much correspondence from our own State governments asking for help from the Government in the way of additional employees to process unemployment compensation applications. The House by a motion made by the majority on yesterday adopted an amendment to the deficiency appropriation bill to more than double, as I remember it, the funds to be used for the employment of additional workers in these unemployment compensation offices out in the States, just so that we can take care of the unemployed.

But the gentleman from Illinois insists here in a pious way that such unemployment does not exist at all. The statements made here by the gentleman from Illinois will not help to feed the families of the unemployed in this country or in his district.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is the gentleman from Ohio referring to the unemployed among Republicans who have been holding sinecure positions in the formerly Republican state governments? There is certainly unemployment there, of course.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, there is a rather strange thing about public employment. Whenever they do get a really difficult or knotty problem in government, whether it be in the States or in the national government, they always turn to some Republican to solve that problem for them. They have to go where they can to find the ability to do the job. I might add that that seems to apply at every point in our public service, even in the military and naval branches of the Government. I am simply amazed that the gentleman from Illinois would stand in the Well of the House and attempt to tell the Congress and the country that there is not a growing unemployment problem. It is a serious problem. It is one that gives grave concern to every thinking American. I am satisfied it is giving grave concern to the leaders of this Administration—to the President of the United States and to those who advise him—because I understand from rather reliable sources, I may say to the gentleman from Illinois, that plans are already rather well developed for a new type of WPA program. I hope it is not leaf raking. I hope, if we have to do something for the unemployed in this country as a result of the economic and Government mistakes in the past, that what we will do will be constructive. I hope we will not waste our substance on leaf raking and or doles, but instead that the men and women we must aid will have their efforts directed in a constructive way, so that they themselves may pay their own way and feel that they are contributing to the welfare of their Nation and of their community.

I hope that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] will understand that as unemployment grows—and it is growing in the State of Illinois and in the city of Chicago—we will have great sympathy for him and great concern for those individuals out there who have lost their jobs, and that we will join him in doing everything we can to help them, because he will find they are unable to eat speeches made on the floor of the House and they are unable to live on the statistics put out by prejudiced persons and individuals; that, instead, they will need actual help, not only from the Government, but from every other decent-thinking American citizen who wants to see this economy of ours remain strong and safe and sound so that America may be, after all, a strong influence in the world for peace and for prosperity. I hope the gentleman will let us know just what his solution is to continue such high employment in his State.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], relative to unemployment in Illinois, I have been requested to yield 5 minutes to a gentleman who is familiar with labor conditions in Chicago.

I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Illinois [Mr. BUCKLEY].

Mr. BUCKLEY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are catering to a program of fear. Illinois, as such, has no worry about unemployment. They have in the past and shall continue in the future to take care of their own problems. Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] should concern himself more with the problems in his own State.

I, for one, am getting tired of hearing this talk about a depression and the unemployment that usually follows. The Republican minority is attempting to drive a sense of fear and insecurity into the American people merely because the will of the mass of Americans manifested itself in the last election—and the Democrats were justifiably victorious. Of course, the only thing that the American people have to fear is fear itself. If certain Members of Congress, and others, continue harping on the coming of a depression, they will have their wish. They will succeed—if they continue—by striking fear into the hearts of the American people. The result will be a curtailment in buying, and the logical cutback in production that necessarily follows, with the end result leading to unemployment. When this occurs the Republicans will be exceedingly happy, because it was the Eightieth Republican Congress that attempted to start this vicious economic process.

I firmly believe that there is no reason for such talk today, because we are merely in the process of a peacetime adjustment to our hard-fought victory in the last war. I do not think that it is proper for a Member of Congress to stand up in the House of Representatives and alarm the people by telling them that they are facing a panic or depression. The only motive behind these unwarranted and unjustifiable cries of "slump and depression" is one of delay in order to hamper labor unions who will be seeking new contracts shortly. It is merely a scheme on the part of Republicans to preclude the laboring people from asking for a fourth round of wage increases.

The future outlook is bright. We have great employment in the United States today. Whatever slowing down happens to exist in the employment situation as it occurs today results normally when new labor contracts are being negotiated, and management acts cautiously.

Thank God that we in America are wise enough and courageous enough to have such a great administration and such a truly great leader as the President of the United States. We all have confidence in him. He will, with God's Providence and the aid of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress, dispel all fears of depression and unemployment, to the end that the people of America and their Nation will again be sound and solvent as they have been in the past under Democratic leadership.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAVALCANTE].

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, I have merely asked for this time in order to obtain information to clear my mind on the conditions of this bill and also to guide me in the manner that I should vote.

Some days ago we passed a bill pertaining to reciprocal trade agreements. I should like to have my mind cleared on the proposition of whether the provisions of those reciprocal trade agreements were excepted from the provisions of the bill which will be made in order by this rule? I may state that I agree with the principle of export control of short supply materials. I also believe in conferring the power to control upon the President. It is because of this that I am concerned in knowing whether the short supply materials that we are here trying to conserve by the provision of this bill may not be exported under the powers conferred a few days ago upon the President by the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is one that the individual Members of the House are going to regret very seriously if it is put on the statute books as it comes to us. It is one of the largest abdications of legislative responsibility since the Blue Eagle Act. I wish you would read the declaration of policy contained in section 2. It is so broad that it covers every piece of export business that can be done in the entire United States in any commodity whatever. Subsection (b) of section 2, the policy section, includes, as policy, the objective:

> To further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities—

That is just as broad as the world is wide. It covers everything without limit. Under the authority to carry out that

policy contained in section 2, under section 3 this can be done—

To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person—

In other words, in that sentence you do away with or make it possible to change or abolish practically all of the rules and regulations in the transporting and the financing agencies of the United States by giving the power to the President to assign even greater powers to other agencies or officials; and in the last phrase it grants the power to not only completely control the exporters but also to say who can do the exporting, the financing, the transporting, and the servicing, all of which can permit rank political favoritism in the granting of permits and licenses; and there is a penalty provision attached to this bill embracing imprisonment for 1 year, or a $10,000 fine, or both, for violation of a rule or regulation promulgated by an official of the Government.

In the concluding portion of the bill it is stated:

This act shall not supersede any other act.

We have of course a number of acts on the statute books today that are for the purpose of controlling exports; but what this bill means is that in negotiations under the present trade treaty acts you are going to give the President authority to agree with other countries to establish domestic export quotas, or they can just be established. That will mean a complete violation of the freedom in commerce which our country has enjoyed, except in war, since the beginning. It will give, at the same time, free rein to the President to engage in commercial warfare through the export quota system. This is the system applied by authoritarian countries. In other words, instead of this great freedom of trade we have been hearing about in the reciprocal trade agreements debates, we are now about to tie up trade so that nobody can operate except those favored by the administration. The reciprocal trade agreements will not mean anything. You will find that we are going to operate very much as the Nazi and some other European governments operated before the war. We had better be looking forward to freeing the channels of trade and not tying them up, if we want to uphold the great principles of our country.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Referring to the gentleman's statement concerning the declaration of policy, I may say to the gentleman that in the hearings before the committee evidence was produced that this bill was necessary, according to its proponents, to protect the domestic economy from excessive drain. The latter two provisions of the declaration were not given much consideration, whether or not it is necessary to further the foreign policy of the United States and whether it is necessary to conserve the security of the United States, so some of us have had great concern about the continuation of a permanent policy.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman that excessive drain can be stopped by cutting back on gifts to foreign countries, and that so far as the national defense is concerned, I believe it is adequately protected by other law at the present time in existing statutes which may be extended. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I know there is plenty of law in the Atomic Energy Act to protect the United States in those respects if it is properly exercised. But to put in this subsection (b), which says, "To further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibility," is to grant the most extraordinary power in words just as wide open for interpretation as anything that was ever written into any law or statute of the United States. You can interpret those words to cover any sin or any objective that anyone in authority may want to cover. It vitiates entirely any other limitations that there may be in the bill.

The last subsection, the words "to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security," no one will argue with; but that subsection (b) of the policy section is a dilly. May I tell the Members of the House of Representatives that after this act is passed you are going to have everybody in your district coming down here and asking you to go to the Export Control Office to assist them in getting licenses for exports. It will be reflected in less employment in the exporting industries as the direct result of the complicated red tape and licenses required which will disgust the producers of exportable products. It will stifle small producer exports. I am in favor of freeing the mechanics of foreign trade and not tying them up as this bill will do under the regulations that will be issued pursuant to it.

(Mr. SPENCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he will make in the Committee on the bill under consideration and include a report.)

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1661) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 1661, with Mr. HUBER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it seems that the prologue to every bill in the House continuing an authority that already exists is an acrimonious political discussion. It is true that the authority that is given the President under this bill was continued by the Eightieth Congress, but the authority originally was given to the President more than 8 years ago. On July 2, 1940, the President was given practically the same powers that are given to him under this bill, and he has retained those powers ever since. Why is it now, in this Democratic Congress, that they have great apprehension on the other side as to the use of these powers? I know the gentlemen on the other side have not really gotten over the effects of the last election, and I suppose that is natural. But the Bible says:

Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off.

And I think really there has been too much boasting on the other side, and that they could have foreseen what might have happened to them, for the prophets of old said that "Pride goeth before destruction, and the haughty spirit before the fall." The Prince of Peace said, "The meek shall inherit the earth." And, of course, it has been demonstrated that those that are not meek inherit nothing.

I hope my friends on the other side will read the Good Book and obtain lessons from it. Why should we not give the President these powers? We are not in normal times. Times have not been normal since 1940, when he was given these powers. I do not think it would be good policy for this Government to put shackles on the President in the exercise of these powers, with their international implications. He is dealing with the governments of the world. He is protecting the economy of the United States. In these highly important international affairs he ought to have the same powers granted him as the free elected Executive of a free nation, by free representatives elected by the people, as the executive or dictator has in representing the enslaved people in totalitarian governments. We have got to trust these powers to somebody, and to limit them and restrict them by unnecessary conditions would weaken the very purpose for which they are given to him.

We know what happened before the last war and before this war. I do not say that the great industrial people of the United States are willing to sacrifice their country for profit, but you know and I know that the scrap piles of America disappeared just before we went into the war with Japan. They disappeared because a profitable market was found in which to sell them. Those things were converted into munitions of war, and

caused the death of our boys, no doubt about that.

We do not want that to happen again. The only way we can do that is by restricting exports. There is a short supply of many essential materials, and unless these things that are essential to our own welfare and to our domestic economy are controlled, the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand might be destructive of our interests.

We must have authority to control the quantitative amount of exports and to control the destination of these things, and they can be controlled.

Why should you have any apprehension, why should you be so captious about a few words that are in this bill? The President can delegate these powers to any department, agency, or official. I have heard objections made to the word "official." The President has transferred them to an official. He has not transferred the powers to an agency or a department. He has transferred these powers and invested them in the Secretary of Commerce and that, it seems to me, is where they ought to go. He centralizes the responsibility, and he makes it incumbent upon one man to discharge the duties he has imposed upon him.

A great deal of criticism has been made about the word "financing." That does not apply to power that can regulate how exporters shall obtain their money, it merely is an enforcement provision. When an exporter wants a license to ship certain things abroad, the best information the Government can obtain in regard to that license is through him who finances the exporter. He usually knows the amount of the goods that are going to be sent, the consignee, and the ability of the exporter, and it is only to that extent that this word "financing" is placed in this bill. It is an enforcement power that is absolutely essential to carry out the act in the way it should be carried out.

There is a great deal of misapprehension as to the words "standards and criteria." Why should there not be standards and criteria, to give to the exporter knowledge of just what his rights are?

The administration itself has placed this limitation upon it by the formulation of standards and criteria, criteria as to price, destination, end use, and so forth.

In connection with enforcement I remember there was one case where an exporter received an export license to transport glass vials. They found after investigation that the vials contained very expensive drugs which were not mentioned in the application for export. You must have the information if you are going to properly administer this law and you have to get the information from every reliable source from which it can be obtained. You need not have any apprehension about the administration of this act because the President has had practically all these powers under the original act. So it is but a continuation for 2 years of the powers that are now vested in him for a most essential purpose, a purpose that affects not only our domestic economy, but our foreign relations and our national security because it is worked in connection with the foreign-aid plan.

Unless we have some such licensing control as this, we cannot effectively carry out that plan.

Under leave to insert the committee report on this bill, I herewith insert House Report No. 18:

EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

Mr. SPENCE, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1661) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

1. In section 2 strike out "fulfill" and insert in lieu thereof "to aid in fulfilling."

2. In section 3 (a) strike out "carriage" where it appears therein and insert in lieu thereof "transporting."

3. In section 4 (a) immediately following the word "department" strike out "or" and insert a comma; and immediately following the word "agency" insert ", or official."

4. In the last sentence of section 4 (b) immediately following the word "agency" insert ", or official."

5. In the second sentence of section 6 (a) immediately following the word "court" where such word first appears in said sentence insert "of the United States."

6. In the first line of section 6 (c) immediately following the word "department" strike out "or" and insert a comma; and immediately following "agency" in said line insert ", or official."

7. In section 8 immediately following the word "agency" insert ", or official"; and at the end of said section insert a period.

8. In the second sentence of section 11 immediately following "delegations," insert "rules."

GENERAL STATEMENT

Export controls are being used at the present time to accomplish three important objectives: cushioning the domestic economy from the inflationary impact of foreign demand; influencing the geographic distribution of such quantities of scarce materials as can reasonably be spared from our economy; and exercising the necessary vigilance of exports of industrial commodities significant from the standpoint of the security of the United States.

The bulk of our merchandise in export has not been in short-supply commodities. Only about one-fourth of these exports has been in commodities for which quantitative export control is deemed necessary. Within this relatively limited sphere it has been desirable to temper the inflationary impact of foreign demand. This has been accomplished by limiting the quantities of scarce materials permitted to leave this country and, where feasible, by disqualifying export transactions made at excessively high prices. The supplies of these materials available for domestic use have been sufficient to permit a steadily increasing level of output and consumption in the United States.

Through export controls geographic distribution of commodities has been affected to channel exports into friendly countries, notably those participating in the European recovery program. For instance, in the first 6 months of 1948 uncontrolled exports amounted to $4,850,328,000, of which only 25 percent, or $1,211,056,000, went to European recovery-program countries. However, in the same period, controlled exports amounted to $1,643,210,000, of which over 59 percent, or $977,484,000, went to European recovery-program countries. It is evident that export controls are acting as an effective instrument in assisting the European recovery program.

The imposition of strict controls over shipments to eastern Europe has reduced exports to that area from an annual rate of $400,000,000 in the second quarter of 1947 to an annual rate of only $125,000,000 in the third quarter of 1948. For purposes of export control to eastern Europe, commodities have been classified in descending order of importance from the viewpoint of national security—ranging from materials and equipment which are of direct military significance, or basic importance in the manufactures of the nations, or of great strategic significance from an over-all industrial point of view, to the relatively nonessential commodities which are in abundant supply in this country and which are of slight significance either to the basic industries or to the general economy of eastern Europe. In general, export licensing to eastern Europe has been most restrictive at the top of this scale and least restrictive at the bottom.

The Department of Commerce, under existing law, has been given the principal responsibility in the administration of export controls. In the administration of such controls the Department through its Office of International Trade obtains the counsel and assistance of other Government agencies through the mechanism of formal interdepartmental committees. This mechanism has been used to assure policy coordination of these controls. The Advisory Committee on Requirements has the general function of assuring a coordinated supply-requirements operation by relating estimates of material requirements to estimates of supply available from foreign and domestic sources, by formulating measures necessary to bring supply and demand more closely into balance, and by advising the Secretary of Commerce as to the relative importance of programs and projects competing for materials in short supply.

The rules and regulations governing export controls are published in the Federal Register, including the so-called positive list—the list of commodities requiring specific export licenses for all destinations. It is the practice of the Department of Commerce to publish the quotas for all controlled commodities to which they apply so that exporters may have, in advance, a general idea of the quantities they might individually be allowed to export. Such information, with detailed explanations for the use of the export trade, is published by the Department of Commerce in a quarterly, comprehensive export schedule, supplemented by current export bulletins. To assist in formulating procedures for the various commodities under control, the Department has accelerated and extended its trade-consultation activities. During the past quarter, formal conferences have been held with many different groups of businessmen concerned with the export of various commodities. In order to secure broad representation, the membership includes small, medium, and large firms; merchant exporters as well as producers; exporters in various regions of the country; and trade-association members as well as independents.

These commodity advisory committees have proved helpful in determining the most equitable methods of distributing limited quotas among exporters. These groups have concerned themselves with the following questions relating to quota distribution: The extent to which price criteria should be used; the proportion of the quota to be allotted between traditional exporters and newcomers; administrative techniques for identifying and eliminating applicants whose interest is purely speculative; and the extent to

which foreign government recommendations should be followed in granting export licenses.

These trade advisory activities have yielded immediate and substantial benefits to the export trade community, and the Department has been assisted in the improvement of licensing procedures to meet the varying practical problems involved in the export of different commodities. The result has been not only to facilitate export transactions and shipments of commodities, but also to reduce substantially the administrative burden of licensing control.

At the beginning of 1948, there were 386 separate commodity classifications under export control. This compares with the more than 3,000 such classifications under export control during the war years. For the first 6 months of 1948 exports of commodities on the positive list amounted to $1,643,210,000, or approximately 25 percent of the total value of commodities exported amounting to $6,493,539,000. Major commodities under export control for supply reasons are discussed in the following paragraphs.

*Steel*

Because of the continuing steel shortages, virtually all steel products are under export control, a significant change from the situation in 1947, when less than half of the steel tonnage exported was under control. Shipments abroad hit a postwar peak in the second quarter of 1947, when they reached an annual rate of 6,900,000 tons or 10.7 percent of the supply. For the year 1947 as a whole, exports totaled 6,500,000 tons or 10.3 percent of the supply. In each quarter of 1948, the downward trend has continued. In the first quarter, exports were at an annual rate of 5,400,000 tons, or 8.3 percent of the supply; in the second quarter, 4,300,000 tons, or 6.7 percent of supply; in the third quarter, the annual rate of exports was down to less than 3,700,000 tons; and by the fourth quarter, the annual rate of exports was 3,300,000 tons, or 4.8 percent of the supply. For purposes of comparison, it may be noted that in the immediate prewar period, exports accounted for 7.6 percent of the supply.

The sharp increases in steel production abroad in 1948 contributed importantly to the reduction of foreign demand upon the United States. This is particularly true of the European recovery-program countries where most of the production increase was concentrated, and which before the war required little steel from the United States. For the most part, increased output abroad was used to satisfy indigenous needs, but a part was also used to fill demands in other countries. Exports of steel from the United Kingdom in 1948 were back to prewar levels, and exports from Belgium and Luxemburg, the chief competitors of the United States in the steel export field, were substantially above prewar.

Aside from the extension of export controls during 1948 to cover almost every form of steel exported from the United States, export licensing restrictions were tightened by reducing the validity period of outstanding licenses from 12 months to 6 months, and by requiring the use of an individual license application for each shipment of each steel product to each country of destination. In addition, the total export quotas established for each steel item under control were divided into fairly rigid subquotas for each country. These country quotas were determined after careful screening of requirements statements submitted by foreign governments and supplemented by United States embassies abroad. Some country quotas for some items were heavily oversubscribed, particularly, as in the case of Venezuela or South Africa, where ample dollar exchange was available and long-term market prospects are good; in no other cases, notably those involving countries of western Europe, the total volume of applications was smaller than the established quotas. The country quota system assists needy countries to obtain steel from United States suppliers by restricting exports to those markets which might otherwise tend to monopolize export tonnages.

An increased share of the steel exported from the United States in 1948 was destined for special-projects operations and activities abroad of such high importance to the United States as to merit special attention to their requirements for steel and other scarce materials. Roughly one-fourth of the total steel quotas were earmarked for these projects, most of which are owned or controlled by American interests. The bulk of the steel moving under special project license was used for petroleum operations abroad, in Venezuela and other countries of Latin America, and in the Middle and Far East. Smaller quantities were licensed for a number of mining operations engaged in the production of strategic and critical materials needed in the United States. Practically all of the casing and oil-line pipe and large portions of the unlined storage tanks, seamless black pipe, structural shapes, and reinforcing bars which were permitted for export were needed to maintain and expand these special-projects activities abroad.

*Nonferrous metals*

The nonferrous metals—copper, zinc, lead, tin, and aluminum—currently offer the most serious supply problems to the United States. The world-wide scarcity, the immediate needs of the strategic stock pile, the expanded military programs, the high level of domestic industrial activity, and continued foreign demands indicate that the shortage of nonferrous metals will not be overcome in the near future.

The United States has long been dependent on foreign sources to meet a large portion of its non-ferrous-metal requirements. The high level of consumption during the war and in the postwar period has increased this dependence. In recognition of our reliance on imports for these basic metals, the Department of Commerce has made special efforts to stimulate foreign production and increase the volume of shipments to the United States. The non-ferrous-mining operations in the Western Hemisphere are classified as special projects, and receive preference in the allocation for export of short-supply materials from the United States. Virtually all of the requirements of these operations for maintenance, repair, and operating supplies, as well as materials for new development and facilities, come from the United States.

The increasing pressure on non-ferrous-metal supplies during 1948 was reflected in a tightening of export controls. Aluminum plate, sheet, and strip were added to the positive list in August 1948 because of rapidly expanding domestic demand and a relatively high level of exports. The quotas which have been established for aluminum will result in a sharp decrease in the rate of exports. Quotas for other nonferrous metals were also reduced during the year.

The bulk of the exports of copper and zinc have consisted of refined copper and slab zinc produced from imported ores. Much of this material entered the United States for processing and reexport. Although licenses are required for these reexports, it has been the practice to permit comparatively free exports of products processed from imported ore. This policy has been adopted in order to stimulate the movement of ores to this country and to keep United States smelters operating at capacity.

*Food*

World supplies of cereals are becoming more adequate to meet the minimum requirements of all countries provided they would move into the channels of trade at the proper time and in fair proportions. Because of dollar shortages in most importing countries and price considerations in the exporting countries, these conditions would not be met without certain Government controls. Cereal grains and their products, excluding rice, are not presently controlled for export to the Western Hemisphere countries and the Philippines, licensing requirements having been suspended in the last half of 1948 after good harvests were assured and supplies from the new crops began to come to market. Shipments of wheat, wheat flour, oats, barley, and grain sorghums to Western Hemisphere countries and the Philippines were removed from export restrictions in August 1948. Export-license requirements for corn to these countries were continued until December 1948 in order to protect supplies from the poor crop of 1947 and until grain from the bumper crop of 1948 began to appear on the market. Export-license requirements for rye and rye flour were also continued until December because of the limited supplies of that crop in this country.

While world supplies of meat are only slightly below prewar, the decline has been substantial in the importing countries, and much of the increase in the exporting countries has been retained for domestic consumption. World requirements for meat are far in excess of available supplies, and the pressure of rising populations and the desirability of better living standards point to a continuation of the world shortage of meats for some time to come. In view of the tight meat situation, reflected in record prices in 1948, the Department of Commerce has controlled the exports of meat very carefully. Only token amounts have been allocated for export, and only a fraction of 1 percent of our supply was exported in 1948. A large share of the total allocations have been licensed to special projects, many of which produce critical materials which augment United States supplies. Latin America and the Philippines have been allotted the remainder, and the bulk of the shipments has consisted of pork.

The outlook for fats and oils supplies in 1949 is favorable. Indications are that large oilseed plantings will be made again this spring, and the spring pig crop is reported as 10 percent over the previous season's crop. With favorable weather conditions, a further easing of the fat situation can be expected, although supplies do not appear sufficient to meet total potential demand for both domestic and foreign needs. The improving fat situation in the United States is part of a general easing in the world shortage of fats and oils.

*Textiles*

Only a few textile items are under export control. Since output of raw cotton and cotton goods is ample to meet all domestic demands, and to provide a substantial surplus for export, these products are free of positive list control. Rayon and other synthetics are exempt from control for the same basic reason. In the case of wool, where the United States is dependent upon imports to meet a major part of its needs, controls are likewise unnecessary because of the general adequacy of world supply and because of the traditionally low level of export demand.

Positive list controls over textiles, are limited to fibers not produced in the United States—jute, manila, and sisal—and to their products, including binder and baler twine. In general, exports of these commodities were higher during 1948 than in the prewar period. As before the war, however, exports have been relatively unimportant in comparison with domestic consumption.

*Building materials*

Few building materials normally enter the export market to an appreciable extent. Controls, therefore, have been exercised on a selective basis, and materials have been removed from export control as rapidly as permitted by the underlying supply-demand situation. An important action in this field recently was the decontrol of gypsum board and lath, the interior wall materials most widely used in residential construction.

At the present time only a few building materials items remain under export control. These are the items presently in shortest supply, such as water-closet sets, metal window and door frames, cast-iron soil pipe, iron and steel conduit, and woven-wire screen cloth. Exports of prefabricated houses also are subject to individual licensing. Continued selective control is essential in this field in order to prevent excessive drains on the domestic supply which might impede needed construction.

*Coal*

The coal situation improved materially in 1948, both in the United States and abroad. Increased production in western Europe, as well as the scarcity of dollars, has eased the pressure of demand upon the United States, and domestic production has been adequate to supply both domestic needs and reduced foreign requirements.

The decline in foreign requirements, coupled with continued high levels of production and rising stocks, have permitted a relaxation of export restrictions. Since September 1948, coal has been under open-end quota, and applications have been licensed freely. Controls have been maintained chiefly because of continued shortages of high grades of low-volatile coal. If production continues to increase in Europe and is maintained near current levels in this country, it may be possible to delete coal from the positive list in 1949.

*Petroleum*

The petroleum-supply position this year has proved adequate not only to meet the seasonally high summertime demands for gasoline, but also to permit the build-up of substantial inventories of heating oils to meet the needs of winter consumption. A careful check has had to be maintained on the volume of exports, however, because petroleum continues to be in seriously tight world supply.

The balance in supply and demand was achieved in this country in 1948 by importing more petroleum than was exported. This is a basic change from prewar when, in 1939 for example, exports were five times as much as was imported. In recognition of the increased dependence of the United States and western Europe upon petroleum supplies from the Middle East and Latin America, the Government has followed a policy of supporting petroleum projects in those areas with such materials as could be made available. About 80 percent of the steel allocated for export for all project purposes—petroleum, mining, transportation, food, and so forth—is being used for petroleum operations.

*Chemicals and drugs*

The year 1948 was, in general, a peak-production year for chemicals and drugs, by the end of which many of the more acute supply shortages had been overcome. A major factor in the postwar world shortage in this field has been the disruption of the European industry. The increased production in the United Kingdom and Germany during the past year and the expansion of output in Italy, Switzerland, South Africa, Canada, and Australia have lessened the pressure on United States supplies.

The pattern of United States export controls has followed closely the changes in the supply situation and outlook. During the year such important products as soda ash, caustic soda, lauryl alcohol, phenol formaldehyde resins, creosote, insulin, and streptomycin were removed from the positive list. On the other hand, for a few other products it was necessary to tighten controls because of growing shortages of the basic nonferrous metals from which they are derived. These include antimony oxide, the lead chemicals, and the chromates.

*Coal chemicals*

One of the immediate byproducts of the coking of coal is crude coal tar which, when further distilled, is a source of a large number of chemical products, including benzene, toluene, cresols, creosote oil, and naphthalene. From these in turn are derived such finished products as plastics, dyes, synthetic fibers, pharmaceuticals, insecticides, and explosives. Of the coal chemicals, those still in short supply in the United States—cresols, cresylic acid, benzol, and phenol—are subject to export controls.

*Chromium chemicals*

Most important of the chromium chemicals is sodium bichromate, which is used directly in the textile and tanning industries, and is also the base from which chromic acid, potassium bichromate, and chromium tanning mixtures are produced. United States supplies are inadequate to meet both the present high level of domestic consumption and unrestricted foreign requirements, and accordingly, reduced export quotas have been imposed.

*Caustic soda and soda ash*

The alkalies afford excellent examples of the need to keep export control authority flexible to meet changing supply conditions. At the beginning of 1948, the world shortage of these materials was acute and foreign requirements far exceeded established export quotas. During the year, however, increased domestic production and a sharp decline in foreign demands made possible, first, an easing of quota restrictions, and finally, the removal of soda ash and caustic soda from the positive list.

*Drugs*

The most important recent export control development in this field has been the decontrol of streptomycin. As United States supplies increased it was possible to liberalize the amounts authorized for export. In the third quarter of 1947, the export quota was 825,000 grams; by the second quarter 1948 the quota had been raised to 6,000,000 grams, and for the remainder of the year, streptomycin was licensed under an open-end quota. A review of the situation at the close of the year indicated domestic requirements of less than half of expected supply so that export controls were no longer necessary on that account.

*Fertilizers*

Fertilizers are composed of three types of primary materials, nitrogenous, phosphatic, and potassic. There is a world shortage of fertilizer material which is particularly serious in the case of the nitrogenous.

Current United States supplies of phosphatic fertilizers are adequate to permit free exports without adverse effect, so they are no longer on the positive list.

Prewar, Germany was the world's major supplier of potash. Approximately 60 percent of Germany's resources are located in the Soviet zones. Potash supplies for western Europe now come mainly from France, Spain, and Palestine, and some from Russia. Shipments of potash from the United States to Western Hemisphere destinations and the Philippines are not subject to export licensing, but exports to all other areas are tightly controlled.

Nitrogenous fertilizers are subject to strict export controls to all destinations. Most of the western European countries produce these fertilizers, but, except for Belgium, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom, imports are required to supplement indigenous production. The only other exporting countries, in addition to the United States, are Canada and Chile.

*Machinery and equipment*

The major machinery items whose exports are controlled in order to protect the domestic supply are railway freight cars and parts. To conserve steel and insure increased domestic freight-car parts, freight cars were placed on the positive list on July 1, 1947. Production has been steadily increasing since the beginning of 1947; but the total of cars in operation has not increased appreciably because of the large number of retirements. To prevent the assembly abroad of complete cars from United States parts, freight-car parts, and air-brake equipment were added to the positive list in February 1948.

While some commodities in the machinery category are still in tight supply, the producers themselves have limited exports, thus obviating the necessity for Government controls. Production of motor vehicles, for example, is still short of demand, but exports in 1948, in the absence of controls, represented a little over 6 percent of production, compared with 7 percent in 1947 and 8 percent prewar. The situation with respect to farm machinery and tractors is essentially the same.

*Lumber*

The high level of lumber production reached in 1947 has been maintained throughout 1948. While domestic demand for lumber has been large, all requirements including a high volume for housing construction have been met. Imports of lumber, which come chiefly from Canada, have increased even more sharply than domestic production. With these increases in supply, shortages in the common grades of lumber have eased considerably during the past year.

Exports in 1948 represented 1.4 percent of the total new supply as against 3 percent in 1947, and 5 percent before the war. The sharp drop in lumber exports stems chiefly from the contraction of foreign demand. Supplies were ample, but foreign orders were not forthcoming in sufficient quantity to absorb even the limited export quotas established by the Department of Commerce. In line with the policy to retain export controls only so long as there is a clear need for their continuation, virtually all lumber was removed from the positive list as of January 1, 1949. The only lumber items remaining under control are Port Orford cedar (a speciality product used to make separators for storage batteries), railroad ties, and millwork.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

In general the bill would provide for the continuation of the existing export control authority. The scope of the export control program proposed by this bill is for most purposes identical with the scope of the program under existing law. The principal differences proposed by the new bill are concerned with provision for a more effective enforcement program, and making mandatory the requirement (1) for interdepartmental consultation as to specific items to be controlled and the extent of the control, and (2) for consultation with representatives of the export trade concerning licensing criteria and related matters.

*Section 1*

Section 1 would provide that this act may be cited as the "Export Control Act of 1949."

This section also sets forth findings which justify the necessity for the continuation of export controls.

*Section 2*

This section would provide that the control of exports shall be used to the extent necessary to effect certain policies of the United States, namely: (1) To protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (2) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (3) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

*Section 3*

This section would authorize the President to prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions, any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe in order to effectuate the policy set forth in section 2. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, exporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

Subsection (b) would provide that the President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

*Section 4*

Subsection (a) of this section would provide for consultation by the department, agency, or official determining which articles, materials, or supplies shall be controlled and the extent to which exports thereof shall be limited, and the several executive departments and individual agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having important bearing upon exports. These provisions requiring such consultation, while not contained in existing law, are presently being used to correlate to the fullest extent possible the activities of the departments and agencies responsible for determining export quotas with those departments and agencies concerned with other aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports. The provisions of this subsection would make such consultation mandatory.

Subsection (b) would provide that in authorizing exports full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters. To effect this purpose this subsection would require that provision shall be made for representative trade consultation.

This subsection would also provide that in addition to utilizing competitive trade channels insofar as practicable in the authorization of exports there may be applied such other standards or criteria, such as destination, end-use, or price criteria, as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department or agency, or official to carry out the policies of this act. Destination, end-use, and price criteria are presently applied with respect to the control of exports under provisions of existing law.

*Section 5*

This section would provide for the civil and criminal penalties, which, upon conviction may be imposed for violation of any provision of the act or any regulation, order, or license issued thereunder.

*Section 6*

Subsection (a) of this section would provide for certain authority which may be exercised by the head of any department, agency, or official exercising any functions under the act with respect to the making of investigations of, the keeping of records by, and the inspection of books, records, and other writings of, any person affected by the provisions of the act to the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of the act. Subpena powers would be authorized to require the appearance of persons or the production of books, records, and other writings, or both, to the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of the act.

Subsection (b) of this section would provide for the application of the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893, with respect to individuals who specifically claim such privilege.

Subsection (c) of this section would provide that no department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained thereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department, agency, or official determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the public interest.

*Section 7*

This section would provide for the exemption of functions exercised under this act from the Administrative Procedure Act, except as to the public information requirements of section 3 of such act.

*Section 8*

This section would provide for the making of a quarterly report to the President and the Congress by the head of any department or agency or official exercising any functions under the act.

*Section 9*

This section would define the term "person."

*Section 10*

This section would provide that the act of February 15, 1936, relating to the licensing of exports in tin-plate scrap is superseded by the provisions of this act. This section further provides that nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of any other laws authorizing control over exports of any commodity. Some of the commodities presently under export control pursuant to the provisions of other laws and not affected by the provisions of this act are narcotics and gold, ammunition, arms and implements of war, tobacco seed, and atomic energy materials.

*Section 11*

This section would provide that the act will take effect on February 28, 1949, upon the expiration of the existing export-control law and also would provide that all outstanding delegations, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under the existing export-control authority shall remain in full force and effect, until amended or revoked, the same as promulgated under this act.

*Section 12*

This section would provide that the authority granted under this act will terminate on June 30, 1951, or upon any prior date upon which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 17 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, it is my judgment that world economic and political conditions make it imperative that our export-control program be extended for two basic reasons:

First, to protect our domestic economy against the inflationary effects of unrestricted foreign purchases of commodities which are still in short supply; and

Second, to channel exports to countries where the need is greatest and where our foreign policy and national security interests will be served best.

I have supported this program since it was introduced in 1940. But I have done so with the understanding that controls would be lifted and normal exporting practices resumed as soon as the supply situation and the national security position permitted.

Consequently, it has been a matter of increasingly grave concern to me that controls have not been removed more promptly when circumstances have warranted such action. Consider for instance, agricultural commodities, and particularly fats and oils. Despite enormous surpluses, controls were not relaxed at all until mounting pressure forced belated action by the Department of Commerce several days ago.

The fats and oils situation, Mr. Chairman, is nothing short of tragic. In the face of tremendous shortages throughout the world, huge surpluses have been permitted to accumulate here in the United States. These huge surpluses have demoralized our domestic markets. I shall discuss briefly a few of the more serious aspects of this unfortunate situation:

First. Lard is selling below cost of production. The present price is from 12 to 15 cents per pound, while the price of the live hog is about 20 cents. The surplus of lard is constantly increasing, and last year's enormous corn crop assures continued high production of hogs this year. Furthermore, the thousands of animals killed in the recent western blizzards will be fit only for rendering. This will add large quantities of fats to the surpluses already on hand.

Second. During the past decade the production of soybeans in the United States increased from approximately 60,000,000 bushels in 1938 to 220,000,000 bushels in 1948. Perhaps no other factor is more responsible for our present self-sufficient position in edible fats and oils. This is in direct contrast to our position 10 years ago, when we were importers of fats and oils and relied on other parts of the world for our supplies. Unfortunately, however, this tremendous increase in soybean production has had a most depressing effect upon the prices of fats and oils. Not only are we now self-sufficient but our surplus is immense. During the past year soybean prices dropped from about $4 per bushel to less than $2.30 per bushel, and soybean oil declined from well above 30 cents per pound to 13 cents per pound.

Third. In May of last year cottonseed oil sold for more than 40 cents a pound at the mills. Less than 6 months later—last November—at the peak of cottonseed marketing, cottonseed oil sold at 20 cents per pound. Currently the price is, I believe, under 14 cents per pound. On January 1 of this year the Bureau of the Census reported 500,000 tons of cottonseed had not yet been marketed. Both the processors, who have bought the bulk of the crop on the basis of 19-cent—not 14-cent—oil, and the cotton farmers, who have not yet marketed their cottonseed, are now faced with ruinous losses. In this connection I may say that my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN], during the course of the hearings on this legislation, brought out the point that Brazil is presently selling cottonseed oil and other oils to Canada and to Italy at 20 cents per pound, and more, whereas the price paid to farmers in the United States for the same oil is 14 cents per pound, or less. And please bear in mind that the American taxpayer is paying for the oil which Canada and Italy are buying from Brazil at the higher price.

Mr. Chairman, top officials from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce testified that fats and oils are in short world supply. And yet huge surpluses have been permitted to pile up in our country, resulting in complete demoralization of our fats and oils markets. The surpluses are so great that we do not even have sufficient tank facilities for storing the oils. During the next 6 months alone, the best available estimates indicate we will have a surplus of edible fats and oils for export in excess of 500,000,000 pounds.

The testimony given in committee throws considerable light on the reasons for this confusion. The export quotas for the various commodities are determined by what is called the interagency committee. This, it seems, consists of so-called "experts" from the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the Department of Agriculture, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and numerous other agencies. I refer you to pages 16–19 and 121–123 of the committee hearings where you will find pertinent information brought out in replies to my questioning of several witnesses. In other words, even though the Secretary of Agriculture may recommend increased exports of a commodity in surplus, many months may elapse while the various agencies consider what to do, first individually, then collectively. Meanwhile, surpluses pile up and prices collapse. For example, as far back as last November the Department of Agriculture recommended increased exports of edible fats and oils. The harvests were completed; the existence of huge surpluses was evident; world supply statistics were available—and yet actual lifting of controls which prevented the export of these domestic surpluses was withheld by the Department of Commerce until a few days ago, and even then the relaxation was piecemeal.

Then, too, it appears that the production estimates of the Department of Agriculture have been inaccurate. Predicting harvests, supplies, and surpluses is of course a risky and difficult business at best, but it does seem the experts, despite our marvelous past performances in food production, are always inclined to take an overly pessimistic outlook. Be that as it may, officials of the Department of Agriculture have demonstrated a timidity or hesitancy—even when crops have been harvested and surpluses piled up—in acting promptly and forcefully to keep the domestic supply-demand situation in normal balance. This particular problem is, of course, administrative rather than legislative, and I am hopeful that the Department will profit from the current disastrous experience in fats and oils. In all fairness, it must be admitted that the unreasonably long delays which brought on the present crisis in fats and oils is attributable primarily to the slow motion of the so-called interagency setup rather than to inaction by the Department of Agriculture.

All of these facts were brought out in detail in the committee hearings on this bill. Consequently, I offered two amendments in committee: One, proposing that the Secretary of Agriculture should have full jurisdiction over agricultural exports, without review authority by the Secretary of Commerce; the other, proposing to remove fats and oils from export control. Although no one challenged the facts on which my amendments were based, they failed to get majority approval.

I, therefore, decided to offer these amendments on the floor of the House. However, two recent developments have caused me to change my plan somewhat; in the first place, the Department of Commerce has, because of mounting criticism and pressure, at long last placed fats and oils under general license. This action, belated though it be, has the effect of removing them from export control except as to destination; secondly, the Senate has now approved a bill which contains an amendment purporting to provide decontrol of agricultural commodities when in surplus.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the Senate amendment could be improved materially by rephrasing. Roughly, it provides for decontrol when the Secretary of Agriculture makes an affirmative finding that there exists a surplus of an agricultural commodity. In my opinion it would be more satisfactory if the amendment provided that the controls would be imposed only when the Secretary of Agriculture made a finding that there was a shortage of a given commodity.

Nevertheless, because I have come to the reluctant conclusion that it may be the best amendment which it is possible to enact at this time in this Chamber and in order to expedite action on this urgently needed legislation, I propose to offer, at the appropriate time, the Senate amendment, which reads as follows:

The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

If this amendment is not enacted, there is nothing to prevent the reimposition of controls at the whim of the Department of Commerce. Legislative action is necessary to assure our producers that abnormal surpluses shall not be permitted to demoralize domestic food markets while world food supplies are pitifully inadequate.

Mr. Chairman, it is my conviction that the Secretary of Agriculture should be given final responsibility and full authority for determining the quantities of agricultural commodities, including fats and oils, which are in excess of our own needs and thus available for export. The Congress cannot, of course, insure that the Secretary will exercise this power well. But, by centering the authority and the responsibility in the Secretary of Agriculture, the Congress will remove some of the cooks who may have spoiled the broth up to now. The enactment of this amendment should serve notice that the Congress will no longer tolerate indecision, inaction, and long delays which impair our national economy. The costly fats and oils tragedy must not be repeated.

Accordingly, I urge Members on both sides of the aisle to support the amendment which I will offer at the proper time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sorry I was not present when the gentleman started, but is it a fact that the Department of Commerce has removed the restrictions on the exports of fats and oils?

Mr. TALLE. The Department took such action first on inedible fats after hearings on the pending bill were under way. A few days ago controls were relaxed on edible fats. The Department was under great pressure to do so—but of course under present law the controls can be reimposed.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just for a moment?

Mr. TALLE. I cannot resist yielding to my distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The gentleman from Iowa is a splendid member of our committee. He understands the subject which he is now discussing. He has been in attendance every minute at the committee meetings.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia very much.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I expect to offer this amendment on page 3 after line 2:

Page 3, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess

of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof."

That is practically the same amendment, I think, that was adopted by the Senate.

Mr. TALLE. I propose to offer the Senate amendment, so we are in agreement on that.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. First of all, let me congratulate my colleague on his splendid presentation. I understood my colleague to say that unless this amendment was adopted, the authority would still rest in the Secretary of Commerce to determine whether or not these controls should be imposed or removed.

Mr. TALLE. The gentleman is right.

Mr. HOEVEN. It is further my understanding, gathered from reading news reports some days ago, that the White House had assured the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency that hereafter jurisdiction would be lodged in the Secretary of Agriculture and not in the Secretary of Commerce. Would the gentleman care to comment on that? It is my understanding this is one of the reasons why an amendment such as now proposed, was not adopted in the committee.

Mr. TALLE. I may say to my colleague that that was stated at the time I introduced my amendments in the committee for the purpose of doing what I am trying to do now in one amendment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I want to compliment the gentleman on the very fine exposition he has made of this matter, and would like to ask this question: In your opinion, was the break in the price of livestock in the markets, beginning along last fall some time, brought about by the surplus of animal fats and other kinds of fats in this country?

Mr. TALLE. Oh, there is no doubt but that there was a very direct connection.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Would the gentleman explain the connection, please?

Mr. TALLE. Well, I will merely repeat what I said earlier, that the price of lard really determines the price of hogs. Obviously, if you have a stopper to the normal outlet for lard supply that is bound to back up and influence the price of the hogs. The result is the farmer gets a lower price for his hogs. But the packer must get a higher price for the meat on the hog when he fails to get the normal price for lard.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TALLE. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to compliment the gentleman on his able presentation, and ask this question: Has anyone in America or in the whole wide world benefited by the piling up of fats and oils in America except the soap manufacturer? Can the gentleman think of anyone, except the soap manufacturers, who has profited?

Mr. TALLE. I will answer that by saying that it certainly has been very harmful to the people who should get the money; that is, the cotton farmers who bring their seed to the crushers, the hog farmers who bring their hogs to market, the soybean people who bring their soybeans to the crushing mills. They are the people who do the hard work. Certainly they should have a just reward for their arduous toil.

Mr. JENSEN. The low price of lard and fats and oils raised the price of meat, did it not, naturally, in order for the packer to make a profit?

Mr. TALLE. He had to, otherwise he could not come out even on his operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] is in favor of the amendment which I shall offer at the appropriate time. I am glad our minds are together on this amendment. It makes me more sure that I am correct in offering it.

Some time ago the people representing the growers of agricultural commodities and the processors came to my office and told me what they wanted. They wanted the authority in the Department of Agriculture instead of the Department of Commerce to say how much surplus we had, and then to say how much of the surplus we could afford to export to other countries. This is the principal thing they complained about. In the committee it appeared as if most of the members of the committee were in sympathy with the proposal that the Department of Agriculture should have this authority. The President called up our chairman and then called me and said that he hoped I would not offer the amendment. I read him the amendment and he had no objection to it and said I could assure the committee that he would delegate this authority to the Department of Agriculture. Therefore, I did not offer the amendment in the committee.

Since that time the growers and processors have decided that agricultural commodities should be decontrolled when in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2. That is the amendment I shall offer later and is the amendment referred to by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Commerce or his assistant appearing for him at the hearing in behalf of H. R. 1661, said that—

> Generally speaking, the purposes to be accomplished by this bill are to protect the domestic economy by limiting exports of scarce materials, and to channel exports to countries where need is greatest and where our foreign policy and national security interests would be best served.

If this policy is adhered to, there would be little or no objection to it. Generally speaking, export controls do not promote trade and commerce for our products here, and we should have controls only under certain emergency situations. I do not believe that it was ever the intention of Congress to have surplus commodities under controls.

Our policy for years has been to do away with all restrictions which impede commerce, especially with reference to surplus commodities we have to sell.

No one should oppose the export control of critical and strategic metals and minerals.

The testimony at the hearing made it clear there are a number of commodities still in short supply in this country and in the world, such as steel, petroleum, and electrical goods. There are also a number of commodities of high strategic value, particularly special metals, which are in limited supply here and abroad.

I agree that this Government should have the power to control the exports of these items in short supply in order to control inflation at home. For our national security I also believe we should not permit unlimited export of our limited supply of strategic commodities.

Furthermore, it appears prudent from the standpoint of our national security to vest in the administration the power to control the destination of certain strategic and critical items. Also, we are committed to a policy of rehabilitating and assisting the countries participating in the European recovery program. I think the people of this country are in accord with these broad objectives. At least we in the committee have heard no objections to this policy.

In granting such powers, the authority must obviously be rather broad and must contain considerable discretion. The Congress clearly is not in a position to determine which individual commodities should be controlled, to what destination, when, and for how long. For this reason the over-all power is given to the President and he, in turn, is given the right to delegate this authority.

It is the administration of the export-control program that has concerned me. I have not been satisfied with the way the program has been administered in the past. We have endeavored to see to it that the administration will be improved in the future.

The particular complaint in the past has been that controls have been retained longer than necessary. In the case of fats and oils, for instance, strict allocations and individual licenses were still required long after the supply situation had completely changed from one of shortage to one of surplus. This year, for instance, the production of edible fats and oils was about 550,000,000 pounds larger than last. Crop reports indicated this surplus months ago. The market reflected the surplus months ago. Crude cottonseed oil, for instance, dropped from about 40 cents per pound in May of 1948 to 20 cents in November, to 14 cents in January of 1949 and to about 11¼ cents last week, several cents under OPA prices. The storage tanks were overflowing with oil, crushers were refusing

to buy the farmers' seed. Cottonseed prices were halved in a period of weeks from $80 per ton to $40 last week. At the same time, foreign countries still very short of edible fats and oils were clamoring to buy our oils. Our competitors were selling edible fats and oils in world markets for dollars at 30 to 50 percent above our domestic prices. In face of the of the obvious the administration did too little too late.

Upon investigation we found the procedure for making allocations and administering controls cumbersome. Export policies on agricultural commodities were being considered by large, unwieldly interagency committees of such uninterested parties as the Atomic Energy Commission. The bottleneck we found was the Department of Commerce, which had the final authority over all commodities, even agricultural commodities. Many of us felt the Secretary of Agriculture was the only person qualified to determine the exportable surplus of agricultural commodities, and that he, not the Secretary of Commerce, should have the final authority in controlling exports of any agricultural commodities.

To implement the program and improve the administration, I prepared an amendment to the bill to transfer the authority over agricultural commodities from the Secretary of Commerce to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The President called and talked to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and to me about the amendment, and assured us that he would make such a delegation of authority to the Secretary of Agriculture under the general power conferred upon him by this proposed legislation. I therefore did not offer my amendment.

There was another development that had important influence on the action of the administration on export control of fats and oils. The Senate passed a companion bill on export control, S. 548, with an amendment requiring decontrol of agricultural commodities during any period in which they are determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in surplus, provided such action does not interfere with our international obligations and our national security. This amendment was intended as a guide for the Secretary of Agriculture in controlling exports of agricultural commodities.

Following Senate action and further prodding by Congressmen, the Secretary of Agriculture agreed to the decontrol of edible fats and oils. Commerce supported the position and announced the decontrol under the terms of which allocations are discontinued and individual licenses are discontinued to all countries outside Europe and the U. S. S. R. There individual licenses are still required on fats and oils as they are on all commodities.

I am convinced the transfer of authority over agricultural commodities from Commerce to Agriculture, as the President has assured us he will do, will improve the administration of the program. At the same time, it may also be well to write into the bill a guide for the Secretary of Agriculture to follow, namely, that he will decontrol agricultural commodities when they are in surplus. Writing such a standard into the legislation should prevent the delay in decontrolling other agricultural commodities as was experienced in inedible and edible fats and oils by making decontrol automatic while the surplus exists. This would not interfere with the authority to control shipments to Europe under license.

In this manner the objectives of the bill—controlling exports of scarce and strategic commodities—can be assured and the danger of controls thwarting trade in general commodities can be minimized.

Some people believe that the reason edible fats and oils are selling for much higher prices in Europe than here is because our surplus of oils and fats is being held back.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Did your committee find out why the Department of Commerce would not issue export licenses, in view of the domestic and world situation with reference to fats and oils?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I did my best to find out. I took up about two-thirds of the time of the committee. I practiced law a great many years before I came to Congress. Sometimes a lawyer has to do a little testifying with an unwilling witness. I had to do it in this instance. I think if the gentleman will read the hearings he will find what he wants.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in 1940 the Congress enacted legislation which gave the President authority to control exports. That power has been continued periodically. Last year the power was continued until February 28, 1949. The powers which the President has had have not been materially changed since their inception in 1940. The only change that I recall that has been made was when the extension was enacted last year, the Congress provided that the President might take into consideration price criteria in determining to whom these licenses should be granted. I never quite knew why we gave him that authority. I argued that to give him the authority would perhaps result in certain discriminatory practices which would not be conducive to stability either in the foreign market or the domestic market. Some were unkind enough to charge that under the price criteria provisions the President could invoke control of the prices of commodities of domestic production. I bring that out only to show that during the time that this export control authority has been in existence, from 1940 down to date, covering the period of preparedness, covering the period of the war, covering the 3 years of postwar economic adjustment throughout the world, the President has not asked for any additional authority than that granted him in the original 1940 act, until this relatively inconsequential change was made last year.

We reenacted this legislation last year as an aid to inflation control. There were two basic reasons why we had inflation: One was the loose money policies of the Government; the other was the unusually heavy demand by foreign countries for American goods in short supply. In order that he might balance foreign demand against domestic stability we gave the President almost carte blanche authority to control exports; we gave him the authority to prevent all exports from the United States if he saw fit to do so and if it were necessary to protect the domestic economy. We gave him authority to do anything short of this total embargo against any exports, and for 7 years there has been adequate, there has been sufficient, power to enforce export controls.

This bill is probably the first of a very important series of bills which might be presented to this Congress. This bill and the action which you take on this bill sets the pattern. Here is the importance of it: You build the framework of government for years to come; this is the pattern that you cut out for the future of America. I say that because it is now indicative of a change in policy, indicative of the fact that there are still two forces at work in America; one which prides itself on its zeal, desire, and almost insane ambition to perpetuate all of those things which have made America great and strong and potent in world affairs—we call it the American way of life. As opposed to the American way of life there is a large and ever-growing group in America which teaches that we should abandon the American way of life, which teaches that we should adopt totalitarianism and the socialistic state if America is going to expand economically, socially, and politically in its influences. They teach that we must borrow from the works of Marx in order to perpetuate the prosperity which we have enjoyed throughout the last one-hundred-and-fifty-odd years. The issues are clearly drawn between those who would perpetuate the American system and maintain America as a strong economic, social, and political influence and those who would appeal to radicalism, totalitarianism, collectivism, socialism, communism—whatever you may call it—in any form. That is the basic problem before the American people, and let me repeat, this bill determines what the superstructure of government will be, whether the American system of government is going to be changed from one of free enterprise to one of a managed economy.

It has been asked, Why are these new powers—when production is increasing in western Europe, in the face of the fact that in western Germany production has increased over 100 percent during the last year and when production in the other western democracies has increased anywhere from 25 to 80 percent—necessary to expand the power which the Executive has in respect to export controls if it is not a desire to effectuate

the purposes of those who would destroy the fundamentals of American democracy and substitute therefor totalitarianism or socialism?

It is a serious question and one in which you will have to explore the depths of your own conscience to find the answer.

I do not think anyone will contend that the world economic situation is as bad today as it was 6 months or a year ago. We all like to feel that the help which we have given to foreign countries has resulted in increasing production and a very, very long step toward economic stability in many of the foreign countries. So attention should be given to our own economy and the stabilization of our own economy.

My very honored and dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for whom all of us have great respect, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], asks, "Why be so captious about a few words?" Well, a few words have changed the destiny of the world and the few words he refers to in this bill can cause a change in the very form of government here in America.

He says we should not have any apprehension about the administration or operation of the plan. Well, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] and the gentleman from Georgia have pointed out that because of the failure of the administration to balance foreign demand against domestic stability, the bottom has dropped out from under the domestic market for fats and oils. So, we must take legislative action to correct the deficiencies in administration in the law already.

The same man who is to administer this law is the man whom this Congress once voted out of office, and is now the subject of a controversy as to whether he leans more favorably toward the American system, or the totalitarian system. He is the man in the Department of Commerce who administers this law. We should have some apprehension about the administration of this law, especially when it presumes to give such broad and unusual powers which are not needed any more than they ever have been needed since 1940 to do an effective job in respect to export controls.

Let us point to one or two of them by way of example.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. I would like to know who the gentleman is speaking about. Is the gentleman speaking about the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Oh, no.

Mr. SPENCE. Or the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No. William W. Remington.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself five additional minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if you will refer to the bill on page 2, line 19, you will find this language:

To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

Now, they are to be given under this bill, if this language remains in here, the authority to regulate the financing and transporting of goods for export; and the purpose of the controls of exports found in the declaration of policy is so broad that when you tie that language in with the declaration of policy, you give the administration the power to manage the domestic economy of the United States. Do we now, 3½ years after the cessation of hostilities, in peacetime, even though it is a de facto peace, desire to enlarge the powers, expand the powers, the war powers, which the Government had? Those are the important questions and those are the problems which this Congress, in this bill, have got to solve because, as I said, this is the pattern you are making today. This is the pattern: Do you want to give authority that the Administrator will be able to control over which railroads commodities being sent from the Midwest and the far West to the Atlantic seaboard shall be shipped?

The broad interpretations by the courts on what constitutes interstate commerce are to the effect that anything which affects interstate commerce is subject to the commerce clause of the Constitution. Applying that same logic to export controls, this administration under this act can go into any banking house, any financial institution, and explore into the actions of individuals in respect to financing, the manner in which exports shall be financed. We do not set up any standards limiting the control of the financing, and when we do not set up any standards with respect to control of financing or transporting, of course we give them carte blanche authority—it is very doubtful whether it is constitutional or not—to do what they please in respect to financing and transporting and other servicing. What do they mean by that? Do you know? I do not. What do they mean by "other servicing" of exports? I do not know.

That language, Mr. Chairman, coupled with the declaration of policy, gives the administration the power to control the domestic economy of the United States. Can you now think of giving them the authority to control the economy of the United States or manage the economy of the United States, when you have on such frequent occasions during the cessation of hostilities denied them these powers?

Any official may be designated to administer this act, not any official named by the President and confirmed by the Senate, as we have always written into these laws wherein we transfer and delegate broad executive powers to an official. We have always compelled them to be officials that at least Congress has something to say about appointing. But an official in this instance might be a section head, because they are left to interpret the act as they see fit. It may be a clerk or a stenographer, who becomes an official upon being designated.

In addition to all the other powers they are given under this act, regulations and orders and licenses may be granted under such standards, such criteria, as may be deemed necessary to carry out the policies of the act. Standards or criteria deemed necessary by whom, and within what limitations? No limitations whatsoever, but standards and criteria established by some department, some agency, or some official, without restraint so long as that official holds that a standard is necessary and a criterion is necessary to effect the purposes of this act, which might include the management of the domestic economy. He can make such standards and criteria effective, and effective how? By providing in the act that if any of your constituents being subject to the provisions of any of these regulations set up to control exports or the domestic economy violate any of these standards or criteria promulgated under regulations issued by any official of the Government, they can be sent to prison for 1 year and fined $10,000.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. LYLE. Will the gentleman take a moment to clear up a couple of points? In the hearings and investigation before the committee on this bill did they go into the past history of the administration of this act?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes, there was a good deal of testimony with respect to that.

Mr. LYLE. Did you find any reason then to anticipate that it might be poorly administered and that they might take liberties, as you suggest they can under this act?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, because the act was so limited that they could not take these liberties. They could not establish standards. The only criteria that they could establish was the one having to do with prices which we provided for last year. Therefore, unless we give them this authority that they are asking for, they have no authority to set up these standards and criteria other than on prices.

I am sorry I cannot yield to the gentleman further.

If you turn to page 4, line 13, you will note that these departments and officials may make investigations and obtain information and require reports for the keeping of records and they may make such inspections of books and records and of other writings or of the property or premises of "any person," and they can take the sworn testimony of "any person." Surely I think that that should be confined to any person who makes an application for an export license because if this provision is enacted into law, then it would apply to any business which is doing a purely domestic business, which might be in competition with another concern doing an export business or another concern doing both export and do-

mestic business because it affects exports. The administration would have the authority under such a law to go into any industry or any business establishment or farm and inspect the property and premises and take the sworn testimony of those persons. This is a new and unusual power which has never been given to the Government even in time of war.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. Before the gentleman leaves that point with respect to "any person," would that include, let us say, the books and papers of the gentleman from Michigan who is now in the well of the House, whose records might be necessary or appropriate in connection with the administration of this act? I see no exception so far as Members of Congress are concerned.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume that under the Constitution we might have certain immunities which our constituents who are fortunate enough to be in the business, the professions, or agriculture, might not have.

You will recall that throughout the years we have discussed what has been called the snooping clause in bills before us. We have always protected our farmers, wage earners, businessmen, and industrialists from abuses with respect to the power to gather information which has been vested in various departments of the Government. But there is no such protection in subsection (c) on page 5. That section reads:

No department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder—

That is fine up to that point. Now, reading that hurriedly, one might say, "Well, they are given protection because the departments cannot publish any of this information." But it goes on to say, "which is deemed confidential." Deemed confidential by whom? The person seeking the information? The agency or official seeking the information? Whether one of those deems it confidential?

Now, it goes on with what looks like further protection:

with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information—

If you stop there, they are given protection. If the person from whom the information is sought wants the matter to be treated as confidential, up to that point the matter is treated as confidential. But the following qualifies this language:

unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

There are no standards with respect to what constitutes the national interest, in this act. It is left wholly to the discretion of the official or department or agency as to whether information, trade information, information in respect to competitors, information in respect to patents, trade practices, farm practices, industrial practices, which may be of great value to a competitor—that information is not protected.

Now, the sensible thing to do, in the light of the changes which are now taking place in our economic conditions—and regardless of the details, we all do know that something is happening to our domestic economy now—the sensible thing to do is to continue these controls for a year as is; and then in another year or later in the term, if we have to, we will determine what controls are further necessary to fit them into the new pattern which will be cut after we know what is happening to the American economy.

I am going to offer as a substitute for this bill, at the proper time, a bill to continue these controls as they exist in the present law, for 1 year. I hope that the committee will consider it as a very sensible request and will support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] has again expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is a very valuable member of our committee, and who was chairman of the committee during the Eightieth Congress, state that this bill sets a pattern; that the American way of life is involved; that we are determining by our votes now whether we will have a socialistic state or that our vote on this bill will determine whether or not we are changing from a free enterprise system to a managed economy or to a totalitarian government. I do not share his views.

After saying all those things about this bill, the distinguished gentleman finished his speech by saying that he was for it for 1 more year.

CRITERIA USED IN EXPORT LICENSING

There is no single criterion which can be used to divide export quotas among all exporters with perfect equity. To carry out the purposes of export controls as authorized by Congress, a number of criteria or standards have had to be established for the approval or disapproval of export applications. The problem varies almost with each important commodity. Experience has also shown that there must be permitted administrative flexibility in determining proper criteria to meet changing supply and market conditions as well as current foreign policy and national security objectives.

The following are the criteria most regularly applied, and the reasons therefor:

ELIGIBILITY OF APPLICATIONS

Except for the requirement that a license applicant must be subject to the jurisdiction of the United States—a requirement of obvious enforcement significance—everyone is eligible to apply for an export license.

However, certain criteria have had to be established in order to make sure that licenses will be properly used, after issuance. An illustration of such criteria is the requirement that applicants must have valid orders for export or contracts or other satisfactory arrangements for the delivery of the goods involved. Another illustration is the requirement with respect to some commodities that the applicant present proof that the goods are available to him for shipment if the license is granted. Criteria of this nature also serve enforcement purposes in that they help to prevent trafficking in licenses and speculation by license holders, as well as waste through failure to use all of the limited export quotas.

To carry out the objectives of export controls, other standards or criteria must be applied in selecting applications for consideration. These include, for example, the intended foreign consignee or destination, and the end-use involved. The pertinence of these criteria in terms of foreign policy or national security is self-evident.

To a limited extent and as an anti-inflationary measure, for which export controls are also intended, some applications may be disqualified for exports proposed to be made at obviously excessive prices.

The last sentence of section 4 (b) of H. R. 1661 provides for authority to employ the foregoing standards or criteria and such others as may be deemed necessary to carry out the policies of the act.

DISTRIBUTION OF EXPORT QUOTAS AMONG QUALIFIED APPLICANTS

This problem arises only when the total quantity of a commodity which can be spared for export is substantially less than the total of qualified applications therefor. Prorating limited export quotas equally among all applicants is not a practical or equitable solution to this problem. It would result in alloting to each applicant very small amounts which could not usually be shipped economically. It would also be manifestly unfair to established firms with long records of supplying a major portion of foreign markets. Therefore, the qualifications of the exporter are taken into account. While licenses cannot be approved for all applicants, each class of applicant—merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters—is given a share of the export quota. The extent of such shares may vary with the commodity involved and the nature of the trading therein. Accordingly, committees of representative businessmen in each major commodity field have been established to advise the Office of International Trade for this purpose. In this connection, attention is directed to the first part of section 4 (b) of H. R. 1661, providing for the application of such criteria and further requiring that there shall be representative trade consultation in determining the proper distribution of licenses.

I would like to call your attention to the difference between the present law and the bill that we have before us.

First, the policies set forth in this bill are practically the same as the policies set forth in the law that was passed by the Eightieth Congress, when the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] was chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the

House, and sponsored the bill in the House. There is no substantial difference in the policies.

Next, may I invite your attention to the fact that this bill is not opposed by the trade. Further, especially, I desire to invite your attention to the fact that no one has criticized the administration of this law, either present laws or the laws before it. We have had no charges of unfairness in the past, since 1940. Why should we assume that we will not have good administration in the future?

May I invite your attention further to the amazing fact that nine-tenths of the commodities under control during the war have been decontrolled? Putting it another way, only one-tenth the number of commodities formerly under control are now under control, and it is absolutely necessary that some restraints or control be placed over these scarce and vitally essential articles and commodities.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. During the war there were something over 3,000 items under control. Today a little less than 386 commodities are under control.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; about 10 percent.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Did the gentleman say there has been no criticism of the administration of this act?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; no criticism has been urged. That is, I mean, no charges of unfair administration. The trade is in favor of it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. None of the exporting or importing companies have criticized the administration of it?

Mr. PATMAN. No; not one.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I have heard and I have received quite a few protests about the administration of the law.

Mr. PATMAN. I am just talking about the testimony before our committee. That is all I have to go by.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I have received and I believe other Members of Congress have received, protests about the administration of the export-import controls.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is giving me the first information I have had on it. I am talking about the information we had before the Committee, the only information I had to rely upon.

Mr. SADOWSKI. I could cite to the gentleman one particular instance.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to yield for that purpose right now, if you please; because I am talking about the testimony before the committee and we had a number of witnesses. The trade did not oppose it. There was no criticism of the administration.

REA

There is one group in this country that is vitally interested in the passage of this bill; they are the REA's. More than 600 Rural Electrification Administration cooperatives are vitally interested in the passage of this law. They know that if there is not some control their opportunity to get valuable conductor for electricity will be greatly limited. With proper export control and screening the applications that only permit that to go out of the country that is absolutely necessary, the REA's will get more conductor for electricity. So every REA in this Nation, every one, is vitally interested in the passage of this law.

SMALL BUSINESS

Another group is a small business group. They know that if too much of these scarce items, articles of trade, go outside of the country that the opportunity for small business to get an adequate share of these items will be greatly reduced. The big man can look after himself; he will get plenty through reciprocal trading with the other big concerns of the Nation; he does not want for scarce materials or items; each supplies the other. But it is different with the small businessman. He is the fellow who is first hit when we send out of the country these scarce materials that are needed here to supply the needs of small business. So there are two groups vitally interested in the passage of this law, not weakened like the gentleman from Michigan said, but with good enforcement provisions in it as well. Let me give you an illustration of a law that was passed by the Eightieth Congress that will demonstrate to you why no weak law should ever be passed. If you are going to do anything, do it right with the right kind of provisions for enforcement: The Rent Control Act of 1947, passed during the Eightieth Congress. It gave the tenants no security at all. Oh, the tenant had the right to sue for treble damages, but if he did the landlord had many ways he could evict him; so the result was that the tenant would not dare sue for treble damages, the tenants would not dare resist the landlords if they demanded an increase of 25 or 50 percent. They gladly and willingly paid because they knew they could be evicted under that law. Tenants all over the Nation have paid these illegal rents and the landlords have accepted them. I believe it runs into millions of cases. The law has been generally disregarded for the reason that the tenant has no adequate security if he refused to pay the rent or if he attempted to sue for damages to get it back. He would be put out instantly.

If we vote for a strict and rigid rent-control law it will have the effect not only of rolling rents back but protecting the tenants. You will remember in those illegal cases the awful time we had in the old OPA days. There was no satisfactory way of doing it. So by reason of that weak rent control law we are now called upon to vote not only to roll the rents back in those millions of cases but to arm that tenant with security. He will go to the courts of the country and sue the landlords for treble damages for the past year. He will then be secure. At the present time he is not. That is the result of a weak law not enforced and no adequate means to enforce it. If we are going to have a law let us have one that can be enforced and enforced right.

Much has been said here that the Secretary of Commerce should not be the one to enforce the law. Why, the Eighteith Congress wrote that into the act. It was never there before. Under the law passed by the Eightieth Congress the enforcement of the act was not restricted as it is in this bill to one designated by the President, a department, agency, or official of the Government. Under the old law he could even appoint a clerk or a citizen, one who had never taken the oath and probably would not be required to take it. This restricts it to officials of our Government. So this is a restriction rather than a loose phrase as appears in the existing law.

There are three main provisions in this new bill that will amend existing law which I think are vital.

First, it provides for consultation with industry. When the first OPA bill came up we spent 4 months examining witnesses and interrogating witnesses about price control, four long months, sometimes in the night as well as in the day. At that time I had the privilege of offering the first amendment requiring consultation with industry and that went into the original OPA act. Heretofore, we have not had a compulsory consultation with industry and trade in this law, but our committee in bringing this bill out this time requires it by a provisional on page 3. It is a good one and will protect your REA's and your small businesses and other people who are not a part of the big business interests of our Nation. It protects small business.

The second concerns violations. Heretofore it has been difficult to enforce the law because the penalty was such that a grand jury indictment was necessary before you could proceed in the courts. This changes the penalty so that an information can be filed by the United States district attorney and therefore there should be no delay in the enforcement of the provisions of this act.

Those two provisions are vital—consultation with industry and the penalty provisions changed so that the law can be enforced without being cumbersome as has been the case in the past.

The third is permitting enforcement. They have been hamstrung in the enforcement of this act because they did not have power to go behind the fronts and see who was really making the application for permit. They could not go back and see the people behind him, they could not examine books and papers. This bill, if enacted into law, will give them the enforcement weapons and vehicles that any law-enforcement officer needs in order to adequately enforce a law. It is the usual and customary provision in a law that you really want to enforce. Now, if you want to do it like the Rent Control Act and just make it so weak that it cannot be enforced, just take the teeth out of this provision as stated by the gentleman from Michigan. But, I do not believe that the Members of this House want to do that.

You want a law that can be enforced, and adequately and properly enforced.

The steel situation in this country is still a critical one. We do not have enough steel. We lack 10,000,000 tons of steel this year for maximum employment and production. Do you not think that we should have somebody to carefully screen these applications for export of steel to make sure that it is absolutely necessary that it be exported or that it not be exported at all?

The same is true as to copper, zinc, lead, tin, and aluminum, and especially aluminum that the REA is using now as a conductor.

Then there are certain items of food.

Textiles, I believe, have been taken off the positive list. An item on the positive list is one where it can be exported without a permit to all countries in the world except the R countries, the Russian countries; that is, Russia, her satellites and European countries. They remain on the R list after they have been taken off the positive list, and they should remain there, depending whether or not they can be used for military purposes. That is the object of it.

Some building materials are still critical and we should carefully screen certain items before we permit them to be exported.

The next is petroleum. We have plenty of petroleum now, and that is not a problem, but with certain chemicals and drugs and fertilizers there is. We have some fertilizer that is in supply, but most of the fertilizer generally used in this country is scarce. Certainly we should screen the exportation of fertilizer.

Machinery and equipment and other vital items should be screened in the same way and manner.

Insofar as this bill being a pattern for a socialist state, I notice that the main lobbying organizations now, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, and the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., and those big groups that spend more money, each one of them, for propaganda, than either the Democratic or the Republican Parties spend, are trying to sell the slogan to the American people, "socialism, socialist government, trying to change our form of Government under Mr. Truman." Well, you know, it is an old trick to use a slogan or word like "socialism" or "communism" or "end of free enterprise" when they know it will take some time and logic and reason to answer such a slogan and word as used.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. That is an old trick. There is no socialism in this administration. It is in the direction against socialism. I will tell you the direction of socialism in this country, and that is monopoly, concentration of wealth, getting units of an industry all in one package. That is a sure step to Government ownership. They are your socialists. This Government is trying to save our country from socialism, and it is strange that the people who are crying out socialism against this administration never raise their voices to the extent of saying that they are against monopoly. They are not fighting monopoly or concentration of wealth; never a word from them along that line.

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WHITE of California. I want to make what appears to me a helpful observation in that philosophy, if I may. I notice the gentlemen who cry "Regulated economy" all the while never object when they have a regulation enacted that suits them. For instance, I refer to regulation W of the Federal Reserve Board, which regulates the credit of the little man in this country to suit big business.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of California. Regulation W regulates the credit of the country in a way, which suits those gentlemen who ordinarily do not like regulation. They do not complain about that.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. WHITE of California. They do not call that regulation.

Mr. PATMAN. And that same Federal Reserve Board has almost wrecked our country two or three times.

Mr. WHITE of California. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PATMAN. In 1932, when the banks and the railroads and the insurance companies convinced the then Administration that an RFC should be passed, it was confined only to those three. Remember that. Banks, railroads and insurance companies; and when the RFC opened its doors the first morning, who was down there with hat in hand to get the first money? The biggest bankers and managers of industry and commerce in our Nation. When we put out billions of dollars to them it was all right, there was no socialism there then, no, not at all, but when you come around helping the little fellows, as we did after the Democrats came into power, we changed that RFC act, we enlarged it, and we changed its powers to help the little fellow. Then they began to say socialism.

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LYLE. As I understand the gentleman, the main purpose of this legislation and the necessity for it is to protect the American consumer and American business against the shortages that might result from an unregulated export because of high prices and various other things.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. LYLE. Second, the purpose is to protect our foreign policy so that we may have some control over the geographic distribution of our exports.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is correct. That policy was stated in the bill passed by the Eightieth Congress and it is the policy that is stated in this bill.

Mr. LYLE. Have the investigations of the gentleman's committee convinced him that these restrictions are necessary?

Mr. PATMAN. They are necessary as long as materials are in short supply, like the materials needed by the Rural Electrification Administration and small business groups generally.

Mr. LYLE. Do you automatically decontrol those items when they are no longer in short supply?

Mr. PATMAN. They will be decontrolled by the President, as heretofore. As evidence, he has decontrolled nine-tenths of them. Only one-tenth remains.

Mr. LYLE. It may then be that long before this statute has expired there will be no controls at all?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right; it is possible.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the bill is passed as is, and that none of these devastating, destructive amendments are adopted.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. NICHOLSON. The Secretary of Commerce did not decontrol fats and oils, did he?

Mr. PATMAN. He was getting to it as rapidly as possible. Does not the gentleman believe he would have been doing the owners of fats and oils and the producers a great injustice to decontrol them if they did not have a market for them? They had to release the supplies as the ECA money was available to the countries that would take them. Suppose he had thrown all that supply on the market at one time, there is no way of telling how far the market would have gone down and ruined the producers. It would have hurt them much more. They were looking at it from that standpoint all the time, too. They were decontrolling it just as fast as the market could take it, which was in the interest of the producers in this country. When they reach the point where they can take the controls off entirely, as they have done with nine-tenths of the commodities, they take them off.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Is it not true that when they did not do it it cost every householder in this country a great deal more money for pork and beef, because of the fact that they had to sell their fats and oils half again as cheap as they could produce them?

Mr. PATMAN. I would have to study that statement a little bit before I would agree or disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Will the gentleman comment upon his statement about monopolies, with reference to the application of this bill, because this bill does permit a Government monopoly, giving certain individuals a privilege to export, a privilege to do business, when other individuals are denied that privilege.

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly, that is right, just as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932 had the power to deal with certain individuals—individuals who made application. The Department here will deal with individuals

who make application, just like under the administration of every law. Certainly there will be no discrimination because none has been pointed out so far.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. There is a decided discrimination between individuals who apply.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the bill is passed as it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the membership of the House should recognize the splendid talents of the chairman of our committee. I have never observed any individual who is fairer to witnesses and who makes a greater effort to hear all of the evidence, as was true during the hearings on this legislation.

The reason I take this time is to point out that I feel not enough time was given to one very important feature involved in this particular legislation during the hearings, and that concerns export controls on critical and strategic materials which we must try to bring together in this country for stock piling for our national defense.

I shall extend my remarks bearing upon these critical materials that we are trying to stock pile in this country. I call briefly to the attention of the House that among the mining operations being supported at the present time under this particular program is a Chilean copper mine, the largest mine in the world, where virtually all of the production from that mine moves into the United States because of the extreme shortage in this country. There are bauxite operations in Trinidad, the entire output of which comes into the United States.

There is a chrome ore concentrating plant in Turkey, the output of which is under contract to the Federal Bureau of Supply. The stock-pile reserve of these materials is still critically short, and unless this legislation is passed without crippling amendments we can render a great disservice to our country.

The Department of Commerce, through its administration of export controls, is very much concerned with protecting the United States position with respect to critical and strategic materials. In general, export controls are used in two ways for this purpose; in the first place, they are used to limit exports of such materials from the United States; and secondly, they are used to channel exports of other essential supplies to certain mining and production operations in foreign countries upon which the United States depends for imports of critical and strategic materials.

The nonferrous metals—copper, zinc, lead, tin, and aluminum—all of which are in short supply in the United States, are subject to individual export licensing control to all destinations. The worldwide scarcity, the immediate needs of the strategic stock pile, the expanded military programs, the high level of domestic industrial activity, and continued foreign demands, all indicate that the shortage of these materials will not be overcome in the near future and will have to be controlled for export.

The increasing pressure on our supplies of these metals during 1948 was reflected in a tightening of export controls. Aluminum plate, sheet and strip were all added to the list of items controlled for export—so-called positive list—in August 1948 because of rapidly expanding domestic demand and a relatively high level of exports. The quotas which have been established for aluminum will result in a sharp decrease in the rate of exports during this year. Quotas for other nonferrous metals are also being reduced.

The United States has become increasingly dependent on foreign sources to meet a large portion of its nonferrous metal requirements. The high level of consumption during the war and in the postwar period has increased this dependence. In recognition of our reliance on imports for these basic metals, the Department of Commerce has made special efforts to stimulate foreign production and increase the volume of shipments to the United States.

Some special operations and activities in foreign countries are directly or indirectly of such high importance to the United States that they receive special attention in the licensing of scarce materials. In many of these cases, supplies obtained from the United States are used for production of strategic, critical, and essential materials for export to this country, or to other countries which would otherwise require such materials from the United States. In others, such as the maintenance of certain railway systems or power-generating plants, the purpose is to provide at least a minimum degree of support to the basic utilities and facilities of countries chiefly or entirely dependent upon us for needed supplies. In still others we are supporting various construction programs essential to public health in the countries involved.

The issuance of a special project license for such operations and activities does not constitute a commitment to meet all of their requirements for controlled materials. What it does mean is that, in view of the special nature of the projects, applicants submit their requirements for all materials under export control on a single form. This eases the administrative burden on the operating companies as well as on the Government, and permits a unified review of these requirements by licensing officials.

Among the mining operations being supported at the present time are a Chilean copper mine, the largest in the world, virtually all the production of which moves to the United States; bauxite operations in Surinam and Trinidad, the entire output of which comes to the United States; and a chrome-ore concentrating plant in Turkey, the output of which is under contract to the Federal Bureau of Supply, the stock-pile purchasing agency of the United States Government.

Much of the copper, lead, and zinc reaching this country from abroad is produced in mines which depend upon the United States for most or all of their material requirements. Tin production in Bolivia, which accounts for about one-third of our total imports, is also supported by materials received under project licenses. Other important metals, produced for shipment to the United States in approved projects abroad, include vanadium, cadmium, tantalum, tungsten, silver, fluorspar, chrome, high-grade iron ore, and bauxite. United States requirements for these metals, both to meet domestic demands and to add to our strategic stock pile, are at record levels. Imports furnish approximately one-third of our primary supplies of copper, lead, and zinc, and 100 percent of our primary tin supply.

In the case of bauxite, imports account for about 60 percent of United States supply. There are two large bauxite production operations in Surinam, and one in the Netherlands East Indies, which are being supported by the United States. The Federal Bureau of Supply has placed orders with these three projects calling for delivery of large quantities for the bauxite stock pile.

As an auxiliary to the bauxite production in Surinam, a recently qualified project covers the installation of an ore transfer station at Trinidad. This project will permit adequate transfer of ore from shallow draft to seagoing vessels.

Another major project under way involves the mining, transportation, and loading of high-grade iron ore in Venezuela. This ore will have an iron content of about 65 percent compared to 51 percent for the ore now being shipped from the Mesabi-Great Lakes region of the United States. This project will require large quantities of steel products in the next three quarters. If these requirements can be met, it is expected that iron ore will begin moving to the United States from Venezuela by mid-1949 at the rate of 2,000,000 tons a year, representing a substantial increase in the United States supply.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Can the gentleman tell us how export controls and exports would have anything to do with imports of copper from Chile?

Mr. DEANE. As I understand the program, the advisory boards advising with the departmental organizations directing the program enter into conference to determine the extent to which it is necessary to control the export of critical materials in short supply.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. The gentleman is speaking of imports of copper and other strategic metals from foreign countries, particularly South America. I cannot understand and I wish he would explain how export controls on exports from this country would have anything to do with the importation of these critical materials from those foreign countries.

Mr. DEANE. The gentleman is asking a good question and it is involved in this discussion. We are in the import business to the extent indicated because we simply do not have these critical materials. But I contend this legislation will protect the important stockpile of these critical materials which are necessary for our national defense program, and the bill should pass without amendments.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee; I am sure that in the remarks made by the gentleman from Michigan, the former chairman of this committee, there are a number of items that certainly ought to be clarified before we go into the reading of the bill and the discussion of the amendments that he has suggested he may offer.

In regard to that phase, in carrying out the purposes of export controls, a number of criteria or standards have had to be established for the approval or disapproval of export applications. The problem varies completely with each important commodity. Experience has shown that there must be permitted certain administrative flexibility in determining the proper criteria to meet the changing supply and market conditions, as well as the current foreign policy and national security objectives. So it is not too easy to lay down a rule.

Experiences in carrying out the provisions of this act by the Department have led us to the point where, in asking for a continuation of this act, certain specific language should be inserted, not with the object of putting the clamps down, but to spell out a little more clearly so that everyone who is an applicant, everyone who is eligible to apply for an export license, may know more clearly just what the rules are and whether or not he is getting a fair deal under the provisions of the act. An illustration to this effect is the requirement in respect to some commodities, that the applicant present proof that the goods are available to him for shipment, if the license is granted. They should be in the nature of certain enforecement purposes, so that they may help to prevent trafficking in licenses, and speculation by license holders. That experience, the Department has had some dealings with. There have been charges and accusations made that the end-use provisions were not being carried out, as well as waste through failure to use all of the limited export quotas because a great many of these allocations were not being taken up. So it has been necessary, in presenting a continuation of this measure, to spell out and clarify, and to write into the act a new section, section 4, dealing with the enforcement provisions; dealing with the provisions of consultation and standards, so that the Department may have a basis or objective other than that which has been in the act at the present time. These matters are very pertinent to a successful operation of a control act of this character.

Another is in the distribution of export quotas among the eligible or qualified applicants. This problem arises when the total quantity of a commodity which can be spared for export is substantially less than the total of qualified applications therefor. Prorating limited export quotas equally among all applicants is not a practical or equitable solution to this problem. It would result in allotting to each applicant very small amounts, which could not usually be shipped economically. It would also be manifestly unfair to establish firms with long records of supplying a major portion of the markets, to deny them export quotas. So it is necessary to carry out the language in that respect.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is not that the very thing that creates a market and creates prices? If there is competition by these exporters, and one bids above the other, does that not make the price?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of course, bidding in foreign exchange is different than that insofar as the domestic economy is concerned. I am speaking with reference to large-scale exports.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Does not the scheme that the gentleman has outlined operate as a price-fixing control?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In some instances it might get down to that particular point, where it will have some effect upon the price.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. If we deny one applicant this license, naturally he is eliminated from the market, and his price does not establish the price of the goods.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Of course, as the gentleman understands, the quotas are set and applications are administered in an attempt to be fair and equitable to all concerned.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Is the gentleman cognizant of the press reports of the discriminations and frauds that have been practiced under the provisions of this act in the export business?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is why we are asking for a spelling out of clarifying language as far as the enforcement provisions of the act are concerned. That is why there may be some objections and some amendments, because the administration is concerned to see to it that the provisions are carried out and the end use of the product reaches the destination which it was intended to.

(Mr. BUCHANAN asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an inquiry?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. May I preface my inquiry by stating that I am in full accord with export control of materials in short supply. I am also in full accord with conferring the power on the President. With this in mind, I am concerned in knowing whether the materials that we are here trying to conserve may not be exported under the power which we some days ago conferred upon the President by the provisions of the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may answer the gentleman by saying that there is no direct relationship between the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the Export Control Act. The reciprocal trade agreements are entered into on a bilateral basis. In the case of the enforcement of the Trade Agreements Act, if it concerns goods in scarce supply they would be regulated under the terms and provisions of the Export Control Act. Cognizance is taken of the existing scarce materials at the time these trade agreements are entered into. In this connection it is interesting to note that in the next 2 or 3 months hearings will be held in continuation of previously existing agreements; and of course at that time, at the time of those hearings, at the time of the consultations for further agreements, these items listed on which export controls are necessary will be taken into consideration.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. To the extent that export controls are used, is it not in direct opposition to the intent of the reciprocal trade agreements program which is principally to lessen the barriers to international trade?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; I may say to the gentleman, it will augment, supplement, and carry through the successful negotiation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The State Department approved the bill. It will not interfere with the reciprocal trade agreements in any way. We cleared everything through the State Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on our side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Export Control Act of 1949."

FINDINGS

(a) Certain materials continue in short supply at home and abroad so that the quantity of United States exports and their distribution among importing countries affect the welfare of the domestic economy and have an important bearing upon the fulfillment of the foreign policy of the United States.

(b) The unrestricted export of materials without regard to their potential military significance may affect the national security.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"Section 6 (d) of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, is amended by striking out 'February 28, 1949,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 28, 1950.'

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President in the exercise of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, is authorized to use price criteria in the licensing of exports, either by giving preference among otherwise comparable applications to those which provide for the lowest prices, or, in exceptional circumstances, by fixing reasonable mark-ups in export prices over domestic prices."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this is offered in substitution of the whole bill and, if adopted, will continue for 1 year export controls exactly as they are at the present time. It will also be noted that in the substitute provision is made for continuance of the authority to use price criteria in determining to whom these licenses should be granted.

Let me reiterate that this law has been in effect since 1940. An export-control program has been necessary and I believe it is desirable to continue export controls as they now exist for what might be considered a reasonable length of time. Probably a year is a reasonable length of time. I wish we might make that shorter because it is our intention, as expressed in a great many acts of Congress, to remove controls just as rapidly as they can be removed and with as little shock to the domestic economy as is possible. So it is advisable to continue export controls until the international situation adjusts itself and we have more stability in international markets than we have at the present time.

If the controls which are requested in the pending bill were necessary to the effective enforcement of the act, of course, someone during the last 7 years would have asked the Congress to expand the export-control powers, during these years. The war is over. It has been 3½ years now since cessation of hostilities. We have expended $5,000,000,000 or will have expended $5,000,000,000 to aid in the rehabilitation of western European countries. We have invested over $2,800,000,000 in a stabilization program for Great Britain and we see a great many favorable results from the investment of those funds in world stability. So we should be thinking of terminating export controls instead of expanding them, the same as we have been thinking since cessation of hostilities that it is better to take these controls off if we are going to preserve the American free-enterprise system than to add to them and add to the uncertainty of the situation.

Already we are catching up with demand in many fields in the United States. We are told that in the leather industry, in the textile industry, in the radio industry, and in certain branches of agriculture we have virtually saturated the markets. Let me make this statement to provoke thought, that with our tremendous capacity to produce in America, were it not for our exports we could not long preserve the American standard of living.

So we must readjust our sights and think in terms of expanding markets for American goods abroad above the normal demand, and we should give encouragement to the production of American goods to meet foreign demands, and there should be no unusual restrictions upon domestic production. It is necessary to meet foreign demands, it is necessary to find new markets abroad for American goods if we are to maintain the American standard of living.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the purpose of this amendment in striking out all after the enacting clause is to destroy the careful work of the Committee on Banking and Currency in trying to rewrite an old wartime law which has been many, many times amended and changed during the course of years that it was on the books to deal with varied degrees of national emergency and circumstance.

I think the committee did a very good job in bringing out a rewrite of this bill to protect the security and the economy of the United States of America against danger of over exportation of scarce items. It provides a modern version of what is needed in an export control law in the light of postwar experience, based carefully on hearings by the Committee on Banking and Currency and on testimony before us by all interested parties who cared to appear.

The gentleman from Michigan, whose committee under his chairmanship reported a bill designed to effectuate largely the same purposes which this bill seeks to accomplish, does not like the product of this committee's work.

On that he is entitled to have his say, but I think it would be much fairer to the House, it would increase the understanding more of the House, if he would take the bill, as I am sure he intends to do when his amendment this time to strike all after the enacting clause is defeated, and then introduce his separate and individual amendment, to change the specific and individual portions of this bill which he has objection to.

I think the House can vote much clearer upon these specific individual objections of the gentleman from Michigan than we can in taking a wrapped-up package containing six or eight important changes.

I tried to follow during the course of his argument here under general debate the extent of his amendments but I am not certain, even with the experience of the hearings that I have had, that I clearly understand them all.

So, in the interest of good legislative procedure, in the interest of the House being well informed, I think we should vote down this catch-all amendment to strike everything after the enacting clause. We want to enact a bill with due regard to whether it contains the necessary improvements that are dictated by the light of experience and trial and error that I believe this bill provides.

I do not think anyone can question the value that export controls, properly operated and properly handled in an administrative way, have to the security, and to the economy of the United States.

One of the greatest problems we had when we had the Marshall plan before us was the fear largely by many members of the gentleman's own party that we would ruin this Nation's economy because of unregulated exportation of goods in short supply.

Constantly I have heard on the floor of this House the fears that we will export to Russia or to Communist-dominated countries matériel which would be helpful to them in making war against the democracy of this Nation.

Members of the House, the sole purpose of this bill is to protect the security and economy of the United States of America. It seeks to help make the Marshall plan work in the recovery of Europe without devastating our own economy by exporting materials in short supply. We cannot afford to turn to a haphazard system where the highest bidder can withdraw from our American market goods in extremely scarce supply and remain on an even economic keel.

So until we get greater production and a greater abundance of those scarce materials—and this bill applies only to materials in scarce supply—I think you will need adequate export controls.

I think it would be a shame indeed to waste the time of the great Committee on Banking and Currency and the time of the men who have handled this export control so satisfactorily that there were no witnesses appearing before the committee to challenge their work.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman state that this bill can apply only to materials in short supply?

Mr. MONRONEY. It certainly does apply to materials only in short supply or to a war-making end use.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman state that if we have a long supply of any given product in this country the administration cannot impose an export control thereon?

Mr. MONRONEY. It cannot under the terms of this bill. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find that it is properly guarded in the terms of this bill. No amount of seeing ghosts under the bed, no amount of casting suspicion, can remove the fact that this bill is designed to apply only to items in scarce supply or those which might be useful for war purposes in Communist-dominated countries.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this bill does give the administration the power, based upon the findings of the President, to impose export quotas not alone upon materials which are necessary to our national defense, not alone upon materials in which we are in short supply, but upon any other exportable commodities or products of our industries, regardless of their nonstrategic importance, and even though in great oversupply.

I have read the bill, and certainly do not accord with the interpretation of the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma. I find nothing in the bill which puts a limitation upon the findings of the President. Any findings he makes would justify within the terms of this bill export quotas upon any product of our industry.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is absolutely correct. There is nothing in the bill which limits the control of exports to goods in short supply. The gentleman from Iowa in committee offered

an amendment to the bill restricting the operation of these controls in cases where goods are in surplus. I think probably the gentleman from Oklahoma is confusing the debate on that amendment with the general provisions of this bill, because at no time since 1940 have there been any restrictions whatsoever upon the commodities upon which the President could levy export controls.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. Certainly, it seems to me that in this day of our expanding production at home we should not, 3½ years after the close of the war, grant new and greater powers to the Executive, to control our industries' sales.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. If the law had been administered in such a manner as to prevent the piling up of surpluses of exportable goods in this country, I would not have gone to the trouble of preparing a speech on that very point. The law has not been so administered. That was the burden of my message in general debate, and that is why I stated I would offer an amendment which is identical with an amendment enacted in the Senate. The House bill and the Senate bill are identical, except that the latter contains an amendment which I stated at the outset of general debate I would offer, so that agricultural products including fats and oils, might get proper consideration.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. The gentleman's answer is indeed complete. We do have an exportable surplus of fats and oils, yet the quota is applied today, thereby contradicting the gentleman from Oklahoma's interpretation.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Although fats and oils are taken off the positive list, they remain on the R list, that is, they cannot be exported to Russia or any of her satellite countries without a permit under this law. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. It is. For strategic and military reasons. Last week we saw fit to endorse the activities of our State Department and our Government under the so-called reciprocal-trade-agreements policy with respect to international trade. The principal purpose of that bill, as it has been described to us repeatedly in years past, has been to break down the barriers to trade that exist between the many nations of the world.

After these 14 or 15 years of so-called progress under the reciprocal-trade-agreements program we find ourselves today in a situation where among all the nations of the world there are more restrictions by way of quotas and all kinds of artificial procedures to limit the free interchange of trade. We have more restrictions today than we ever had when the old tariff laws were in effect.

Now the United States Government, which has been the leader of reciprocity in foreign trade, at a time when the war is over, seeks to impose a new barrier against free trade. We find ourselves passing a law today which gives our Government the power to stop the export of any and all products of our industries to any and all nations of the world. Gentlemen, that is not consistent with what we did last week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIMPSON] has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stated by the gentleman from Texas that edible oils are now on the R list. The restrictions have been taken off as far as the positive list is concerned. That means that edible oils may be sent to the so-called satellite countries, providing certain conditions are met. Just how does that work? Let us see what happens. Last summer Poland was short of cotton. The Polish mills at Lodz were standing idle for 6 weeks. They could not get American cotton. They had to shop all over the world to get some cotton. We had cotton in great supply. The Polish Nation finally obtained American cotton from England. How? By paying 30 percent more than they should have paid if they could have purchased it directly from us and as they should have been able to purchase that cotton directly, since the cotton was used to make overalls and make clothing for children and the people generally. Oil is going to be placed on the same list. Sure, they will be able to buy it. They will need oil, say, in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Yugoslavia. They are behind the iron curtain. They are satellite countries. These products are on the R list, but before you can get an export license here to get even those things that are in short supply and which are not commodities that would be used in war, those restrictions are so great that it is impossible for you to get them in the normal and natural course of business.

So those countries will just have to go to our European brokers, England, Italy, and Belgium. They will have to go to these European countries. They will have to go to our brokers to buy these commodities. What a silly situation for America to be in. It is repugnant to me to see our business being carried on on that sort of basis. I voted for these controls and supported them all the way through during the war. I thought they were necessary. But now the war is over. Sometime we are going to do business on a business basis. Sometime we are going to go out in the world to recapture our own markets and we are not going to be dependent upon England or any other country to say, "You cannot do business with this or that country directly, but I will act as your broker."

I have a great suspicion that somebody is making a lot of money when you have an overage of 30 percent commission that is being paid by these countries in eastern Europe, to buy our goods. Someone is making an awful lot of profit and I think it is an illegitimate profit. I think that business could be carried on directly between the United States and the other countries of Europe which need these commodities.

Let me mention the matter of streptomycin, which is used in the cure of tuberculosis. There is a terrible amount of tuberculosis in Poland which was caused by the war. Poland has seven times as much tuberculosis as they normally have or seven times as great as we have in this country. They need that medicine. I was amazed to find that you must get a permit to ship streptomycin to the people in Poland in order to help them combat the dread disease of tuberculosis.

Some of these restrictions are cruel and inhuman. It is all right to have controls in wartime. It is all right to have controls to protect the national security, but to have such silly controls as we are now permitting the Department to use does not make any sense.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman would not think of sending munitions of war to Russia?

Mr. SADOWSKI. No.

Mr. PATMAN. Cotton is used to make gunpowder. Gunpowder is used in war.

Mr. SADOWSKI. They wanted this cotton to make overalls and to make clothes for the people of Poland to wear. Their textile mills were closed for 6 weeks.

Mr. PATMAN. But they could make gunpowder out of it.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Well, they did get the cotton. They got it from South America, from Argentina, and from Mexico, and they did not make gunpowder with it. I was told that they will keep on buying cotton there, and we can keep on selling our cotton to England and a few ECA countries in the future. That is not good business for the United States and we cannot do business forever on taxpayers' dollars, with ECA countries only. We should be able to sell our cotton wherever we want to, without using Great Britain as our broker, or any other foreign country.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SADOWSKI. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Is not the gentleman pointing out the very difficulties that are attendant on peacetime economy controls?

Mr. SADOWSKI. Yes. I say we should have controls for the national security, but controls over normal business to be used for the purpose of giving an advantage to foreign brokers and speculators as a result of those controls is un-American. We are subsidizing international thievery and bringing discredit to American business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI] has expired.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I can well understand the necessity for some export controls at the present time, but it does seem to me that this bill should give us some concern.

I must say I am not altogether clear as to why a bill of this kind emanates

from the Committee on Banking and Currency, because it relates primarily to exports. Certainly, I should think that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce might have something to say about legislation of this kind. I refer to rule XI (k), which gives that committee jurisdiction over foreign commerce generally and over bills relating to the Department of Commerce. The only justification for the reference of this bill appears to be the error in the reference of preceding bills.

Last year the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce did hold some hearings on the actual operation of export control legislation. I can assure you that no more interesting hearings were held before that committee or more revealing, or I might say more disturbing. It seems to me quite apparent that export controls can be very arbitrarily and tyranically employed in two ways. First, internally, with respect to individual American exporting corporations, or corporations that would like to export: It is possible for a governmental agent, the Secretary of Commerce, to play favorites in all kinds of most subtle ways, and to do great mischief without any relief being afforded to the injured parties.

It is also perfectly possible to employ export controls to nations which are singularly dependent upon our economy, in such a way as to coerce them to do this, that, or the other thing, even in the General Assembly of the United Nations. I have even heard whispers of something of that sort having occurred.

When you get to such very broad powers as are found in section 6 of this act and section 7, which I do not understand—I do not understand why the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act should be excepted from this bill—I am very troubled. I would not vote for a bill which had in it any such sections as 6 and 7.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I yield.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. The gentleman touched upon the subject I was going to mention in asking the gentleman to yield; that is, the provision in this bill which calls for the exemption from these controls of the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act. With that paragraph in this bill it seems to me that we have done nothing more than give practically an unlimited blanket authority for the control of exports. But if the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, as was so clearly brought out in the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, if those provisions were followed, if the Administrative Procedure Act were followed, then many of the objections that we find to the pending bill might be removed. The paragraph exempting a perfectly good law passed in 1946 completely removes the restrictions from the administration of this particular act.

Mr. HALE. I think the gentleman is entirely correct.

I was quite amazed by the statement earlier this afternoon of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that he had heard no criticism of the actual operation of the present law. I should be very glad indeed to show him a copy of the hearings last spring before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Section 6 relates to enforcement. I cannot understand why the gentleman would be opposed to the effective enforcement of the law. This provision deals with black marketeers. If you want a good law and want to abolish the black market and punish the black marketeers, the only way to do it is through the provisions of section 6, according to my mind.

Mr. HALE. If the gentleman thinks that the powers contained in the last sentence of section 6 (a), in subsection (b), and subsection (c) are normal and salutary powers, I just cannot follow him in any degree. On the contrary, they are sections which confer arbitrary and oppressive power on any department, agency, or official exercising functions under the act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 73, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to use export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and fulfill its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, strike out the word "fulfill" and insert in lieu thereof "to aid in fulfilling."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word in reference to the shortage of nitrogenous fertilizers in the southwestern part of the United States. I dare say there is not a Representative from any rural area who does not have similar problems to what confront us in the southwestern part of this country.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of the early winter, I received many appeals from farmers for help in obtaining the customary allocations of nitrogen fertilizers needed on the farm. These appeals came from many sources, but I can recall that one appeal came from the Department of Agriculture's Production and Marketing Administration committee. This appeal is so strongly worded that I am setting it forth in detail at this point in my remarks:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
*Shreveport, La., December 21, 1948.*

The Caddo Parish Agricultural Conservation Association Committee at a meeting on December 12, 1948, made the following resolution:

"Whereas the shortage of nitrogen fertilizer in this area is more acute than at any time in the history of this part of the country;

"Whereas in cooperation with Congressman OVERTON BROOKS we have canvassed the distributors and fertilizer manufacturers in this area with reference to the nitrogen fertilizer available: Therefore be it

*"Resolved by the Agricultural Conservation Association Committee of Caddo Parish, La.,* That we ask both public and private manufacturers of fertilizer to increase the supply of nitrogen fertilizer to at least the extent of giving the farmers in this area the supply normally available for crop production and that this fertilizer be made available immediately or in ample time for the spring crop, work on which has already begun."

BEN J. HAYGOOD, Jr.,
*County Committeeman.*
J. C. WILLIAMS,
*County Committeeman.*
NORMAN D. STEWART,
*County Committeeman.*
R. L. DURHAM,
*Caddo Parish Administrative Officer.*

Some time following this, I received a strong letter from the Caddo Parish police jury signed by T. D. Connell, Jr., making a similar appeal.

With these appeals before me, I immediately took this matter up with the Secretary of Agriculture, asking him for this study of the problem and his assistance. In due course, I received from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable A. J. Loveland, a courteous reply. I reproduce this letter herein:

FEBRUARY 3, 1949.

HON OVERTON BROOKS,
*House of Representatives.*

DEAR MR. BROOKS: This is in reply to your letter of January 28, enclosing a letter from Mr. T. D. Connell, Jr., of Shreveport, La., and a resolution from farmers in Caddo Parish pertaining to supplies of ammonium nitrate in northern Louisiana. We also have your second letter of the same date enclosing a telegram from Lion Oil Co. on the subject.

With respect to steps which might be taken to divert supplies to the area in question, there are no governmental control or directive powers applicable to the domestic distribution of nitrogen fertilizers produced at private commercial plants. Proprietors of these plants have the responsibility for choice of market areas they serve, selection of trade channels, and quantities supplied to their customers.

Under the provisions of Public Law 793, a limited tonnage of anhydrous ammonia produced at plants operated by the Army is being distributed by the Department of Commerce to eligible producers of nitrogen materials for conversion to nitrogenous fertilizers suitable for direct application. This arrangement was effected with a view toward increasing the 1948-49 domestic supply of nitrogen for farmers.

The enclosed press release of the Department of Commerce gives details of this program for the first 3 months of 1949. Among the nitrogen producers participating in the

current distribution of the Army ammonia are the Lion Oil Co. at El Dorado, Ark., Commercial Solvents Corp. at Sterlington, La., and Mathieson Chemical Corp. at Lake Charles, La.

Sincerely yours,

A. J. LOVELAND,
*Under Secretary.*

In due course, I received a telegram from the Lion Oil Co., by N. H. Eason, and I set forth this telegram in detail herein:

ELDORADO, ARK., *January 25, 1949.*

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
*Member of Congress:*

Retel our production ammonium nitrate fertilizer 1948-49 curtailed approximately 15 percent under last year and approximately 30 percent under 1946-47. Supplies this material insufficient to satisfy demands throughout the southeastern and southwestern territories. We are making allotments to our customers as fairly and equitably as we know how, considering our reduced production. We regret exceedingly our inability to adequately supply your good constituents.

LION OIL CO.,
N. H. EASON.

It is obvious that this company, which normally supplies north Louisiana with much of its nitrogen fertilizer, is not producing the normal amount of ammonium nitrate. According to the telegram, the amount produced is 15 percent under last year and 30 percent under production of 1946-47. I have made similar appeals for more fertilizer for our farmers to the Phillips Fertilizer Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., and to the Spencer Fertilizer Co. The Spencer Co. has apparently withdrawn from serving its normal area in north Louisiana due to the fac' that it cannot adequately take care of its customers closer home and my appeal to the Phillips Fertilizer Co. has produced no results.

While I am continuing to work upon this matter, the spring-planting season moves rapidly to an early close. Soon most of the planting will have been completed and the size and type of farm production will have been seriously affected by the failure of an adequate supply of ammonium nitrate fertilizer. I am not unmindful that this country is very short of fertilizers. I, in fact, am informed that the world is short of plant food. I know the problem of the Secretary of Agriculture is not an easy one in this emergency, and I feel that private manufacturers are producing to the limit. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, a serious shortage exists. In north Louisiana, it is much worse than it was last year.

This bill will soon pass this House and will go to the Senate on its way to become the law of the land. It will give our Government power to control exports of nitrates and thereby make them available for our own people. In this event, the Department of Agriculture and Department of Commerce will have power to help, and I hope will lose no time in helping our farmers solve one of their greatest present problems.

Mr. Chairman, as far as nitrogen fertilizer in the southwest farm country is concerned our farmers are on starvation rations. They need assistance. If this legislation will help prevent the export of fertilizer to foreign countries at a time when we need it so desperately, it could really help our farmers in the southwestern part of the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I concur in what the gentleman has said with reference to the shortage of nitrogenous fertilizer, not only in the southwest but throughout the country. The gentleman has referred to the production of nitrogen fertilizer in my own district, in my own home town, as a matter of fact, by the Lion Chemical Co., and indicated that the production of nitrogen has been reduced during the present year by 15 to 30 percent; but he failed to say that the reason for this reduction in production this year is because there is an expansion program going on at this plant; consequently it is necessary to curtail production until this expansion program is completed. At the end of this year, perhaps in September, this expansion program will be completed and it will then increase production of nitrogen fertilizer by some 35 percent at this plant.

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman has made a very valuable contribution. I might add, too, that the Lion Oil Co. is doing whatever it can to relieve this situation. As the gentleman has indicated one of the plants of the Lion Oil Co. situated in his district is undergoing extensive repairs and is closed down temporarily.

Mr. HARRIS. Not necessary repairs; it is an expansion program adding to the production of the plant.

Mr. BROOKS. I will accept the suggestion of the gentleman. It also operates a plant in my particular district which is working to capacity, and I think the Lion Co. is doing what it can to relieve the situation. The fact is, however, during this planting season the shortage in ammonium nitrate is most acute.

I have a letter here from the Phillips Chemical Co., of Bartlesville, Okla., in which it indicates it is able to do nothing to relieve this situation either.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) To effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 hereof, the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions, of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, carriage, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

(b) The President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 21, strike out "carriage" and insert "transporting."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 2, line 19, after the word "prescribe", strike out the remainder of lines 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair believes that that is not a proper substitute for the committee amendment. The gentleman may offer that amendment separately.

The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROWN of Georgia: Page 3, after line 2, insert the following new subsection:

"(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. The committee will accept that amendment.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. I followed the reading of the gentleman's amendment as closely as I could when the Clerk read it, and I find that it is identical with the amendment which I proposed in connection with my remarks in general debate and which I stated I would introduce at the proper time. It appears to me, therefore, that there is unanimous agreement and that the Brown-Talle amendment should be agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOEVEN. Do I understand that the committee has accepted the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Yes, the amendment I offered. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] stated he expected to offer the same amendment. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] and I fully agree on the amendment.

Mr. HOEVEN. It is the same amendment that was proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE].

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The same amendment as adopted by the Senate.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to learn that the Committee on Banking and Currency has agreed to accept the amendment just proposed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN]. It is the same amendment heretofore referred to in general debate, which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] was ready to present. No doubt the Banking and Currency Committee agreed to accept the amendment for fear that a failure to do so might jeopardize the passage of the bill.

The Committee on Agriculture, of which the gentleman from Iowa now addressing you is a member, did much to help create the favorable sentiment for the amendment in question. Taking immediate notice of the critical oil and fats situation some weeks ago, the Committee on Agriculture conferred with representatives of the Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, the office of Mr. Paul Hoffman, Director of ECA, and the chairman of the Inter-Agency Committee on Fats and Oils. The net result of these conferences was a resolution unanimously adopted by the Committee on Agriculture on February 8, 1949, requesting the Secretary of Commerce to immediately remove all requirements for individual licenses for exportation of edible fats and oils to any approved foreign destination. A few days later the Secretary of Commerce announced that all export controls had been removed on edible fats and oils. I think Members of Congress should know of the important part taken by the Committee on Agriculture in bringing this matter to a successful conclusion.

The farmers of Iowa have been very much concerned over the decline of lard prices, which, of course, reflects on the price of live hogs. The reason for this decline in the price of lard is the supply. The supplies of lard in cold storage on January 1, 1949, were 112,000,000 pounds as compared with a 5-year average of 105,000,000 pounds on that date. Revised Department of Agriculture estimates indicate that we will produce 683,000,000 pounds for this current quarter. Lard is a cheap source of food and is one of the best commodities the Europeans could purchase since they have a great need for animal fats. The farmers of Iowa and the country will be pleased to learn that the critical situation as it involves fats and oils has been somewhat alleviated by the action of the committee taken today in accepting the Brown-Talle amendment to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 2, line 19, after "prescribe." strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of lines 20, 21, 22, and 23.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the spelling of the word "precribe" in line 19 be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was discussed in the general debate. Attention was called to the fact that this language gives the administrators of the act some very new and unusual powers, powers that they have not had since the inception of the authority to control exports was granted to the administration in 1940.

For example, they have never had the authority heretofore to regulate the financing of exports or the transporting of exports or the servicing of exports. Understand that this authority is so broad that the participation in the financing, participation in the transporting, and participation in the servicing of exports may be controlled. I do not think as a matter of sound policy and in keeping with the American system we should at this time, any more than we did back in 1940, grant this unusual power. Servicing of exports? Servicing of financing of exports? Servicing of the transporting of exports? Very new, very far-reaching powers.

Are not you gentlemen on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce interested in the power which is being granted to this administration to service the transporting of exports carried on the railroads, the motor trucks, and in the air? I think you should be.

I think this amendment goes right to the heart of the American system. Surely if these controls were not found necessary during the war, during the preparedness period before the war, and during the 3½ years of the postwar adjustment period, they cannot by any stretch of the imagination be justified at this particular time. Herein lies the core of the argument, that we decide today whether we carry through with the American system, whether we perpetuate the system which has made America as great as it is, or whether we delegate again to the Administration, not in war but in peace, new and unusual powers such as the Chief Executive was not given even in a time of raging war. Powers by which he can control our economy. Why do you want this power? Is it to satisfy a lust, or is it necessary? Well, that question is easily answered. Surely it is not necessary or the administration would have asked for it in the 7 years during which this law has been in effect.

The gentleman from Oklahoma was just a little bit wrong when he said that this law has been amended and reamended, and so forth. This law has not been amended except once since 1940 and that was to add the provision that price criteria might be taken into consideration in the granting of export licenses. These powers are new and unusual and go to the heart of the question as to whether the American system is going to be perpetuated.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency was serious when he intimated that the majority members of the committee are lustful or seeking power or attempting to vest power where it ought not to be. The purpose of this amendment, like that which was rejected a few moments ago, is to reject export controls. If you adopt this amendment you might just as well forget about the bill. The present bill is a codification of all of the provisions now existing in various sections of the law applying to export controls. Instead of amending the various bills, we have simply taken, with but one exception, all of that and put it into one law, which you now have before you.

The policy is very plainly stated in section 2 and the authority in section 3 says in so many words "to effectuate the purposes" as set forth in section 2, which says "the President may prohibit, and curtail the exportation" of goods.

Then you come to these important words "to the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports."

If you are not going to have the power to make rules and regulations so that you can enforce this act, then let us not pass it. If we are going to pass it, and I think we are, then we must have rules and regulations which will apply to every phase of exports.

In the hearings before both Houses it was brought out that the purpose of these rules and regulations will be limited to the enforcement of this act and the policy of the act is "to protect the domestic economy," "to further the foreign policy of the country," and, more important, "to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to national security."

When Mr. Bell, Acting Director of the Office of International Trade, was before our committee, he was asked this question:

Do you not think it might be sufficient at this time to extend these controls, limiting them to security purposes?

Mr. Bell responded:

In our judgment we could not. There are many items in such short supply that we could not do so. In fact, the trend right here in Congress is to insist that we have been too liberal in the shipment of many items, such as steel, and so forth. The complaint has been that we have been too liberal on allocations, and that some things should be on the positive list that are not on the positive list, and there is equal pressure from domestic interests, particularly, to add things to the positive list.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that if this language is stricken, it will encourage the black market and encourage black marketeers?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, not only will it do that, but it will make the enforcement

of the act utterly impossible. If you cannot call upon the banks to give you information as to how these exports are being financed and as to whether or not the declarations on which they are borrowing money to make the shipment are in accordance with the license, how can you enforce the act? The same with transport and the same with servicing of the exports.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman will recall that a specific instance was given to our committee, in which an export license was given for the exporting of empty bottles, and because they were unable to get the letters of credit and find out what the true transaction was, valuable material that was not proper to export was contained in the empty bottles. That is one illustration of how this new provision will be effective in carrying out the purposes of the act.

Mr. MULTER. I thank the gentleman for that valuable contribution. That is typical of why we need regulations that will apply to the financing, transporting, and servicing of these export items. The Department must be able to get all of the information relative to these transactions.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. With reference to the word "financing," of course we realize that rules and regulations are necessary but it says, "to the financing of exports." Does not the gentleman believe that is a little broad?

Mr. MULTER. It is not broad if you read together with it the beginning of the sentence, which is, "To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act the rule may apply to financing."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 66, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSULTATION AND STANDARDS

SEC. 4. (a) In determining which articles, materials, or supplies shall be controlled hereunder, and in determining the extent to which exports thereof shall be limited, any department or agency making these determinations shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports.

(b) In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters, and provision shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end. In addition, there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department or agency to carry out the policies of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 7, strike out the word "or" after the word "department" and after the word "agency" insert "or official."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 20, after the word "agency" insert "or official."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 3, line 17, after the word "end", strike out the remainder of line 17 and all of lines 18, 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out the language on page 3, line 17, which reads as follows:

In addition there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of any department, or agency, or official, to carry out the policies of this act.

I know how useless it is for me to stand up and argue under this situation, but what we are doing here today might create such uncertainty as to add to the economic dilemma in which we might find ourselves shortly. This Congress can bring on a depression; this Congress, by the creation and maintenance of uncertainty in respect to policy, can discourage the production of goods. You on the left have the responsibility. Historically, this language has been controversial since the act was first passed; historically, you have kept it out, and we helped you keep it out. By the offering of this amendment those of us on this side are merely being consistent with what this Congress has been doing under your leadership for 5 years and under Republican leadership for 2 years since 1940. Now, are you going to reverse your policy of 7 years?

Why do you ask for this power? May I propound that inquiry again? To what use are you going to put this new power? What standards are you going to set up for exports? You never asked for this authority before; what criteria are you going to say should be applied to the export of goods? What standards are you setting up in respect to the standards which the head of a department, or an agency, or an official must set up in his regulations before an export license may be granted? What standards are you setting up for the criteria which must be applied to the granting of export controls?

You have the votes. What is happening here today is almost nostalgic. From 1935 on I have been standing up here getting hoarse, pounding my head against the stone wall now for 13 years to restore to the American people the rights which are constitutionally theirs, and to prevent legislation which would deny them the freedom for which millions of young Americans have fought, and bled, and died. I am willing to carry on the fight. From the day when you tried to get control of the lifeblood of the American economy in the so-called Banking Act of 1935, we have been fighting and fighting and fighting against the socalizing of any segment of American industry; and, as far as I am concerned, the fight has just begun.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, our admiration on this side for the gentleman from Michigan is so great that no member of the committee enjoys taking issue with him, but his amendment would do great damage to the bill. I think the thing he has in mind is to knock out price criteria.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, I do not, because I have left that in my motion. It is in my motion to substitute.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. That is, everything but price criteria?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have adopted all of those except price criteria and continue existing law.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am glad to have that clarification, of course, but the gentleman will recall that in the debate last year it was made very clear that price criteria is a proper element to be considered along with other considerations. The thing I want to point out is that to adopt the language proposed by the gentleman from Michigan is to also knock out other criteria, such as the end use of the exportable commodity, the country of destination, and matters of that kind. These two criteria are just as important as price, therefore it would be fatal in many respects for his language to be adopted.

The fact of the matter is that we continue in an emergency. The gentleman from Michigan speaks as if we are adopting a permanent policy of export controls. It is sometimes said on the floor in opposition to such controls that in peacetime controls such as this should not be exerted; in other words, drawing a sharp line between war and peace, when, actually, it is not a matter of war and peace so much as a question of normalcy and emergency. Sometimes in a peace period there are emergencies which require just as drastic controls as in a war period and it is because we are determined to protect this Nation's safety that we are willing to adopt controls of this kind.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I concur in what my distinguished colleague from Arkansas has said. Further, may I point out

that this same paragraph that the gentleman from Michigan is seeking to amend provides for representative trade consultation.

In considering exports and the licensing of scarce materials you find many varying degrees and problems in each different line. If we were to limit the bill as his amendment would do only to those criteria which are spelled out definitely in the bill, then we would absolutely vacate and have for no purpose these trade consultations for which the bill provides.

Industrial help and suggestions in the proper methods and procedures for allocation of export licenses will help to prevent disastrous effects on varying lines of trade. The amendment would seriously limit any effective use of other proper criteria so suggested.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Can they do it now? Can they vitiate the criteria that the gentleman from Oklahoma speaks of now? Can they do it at this time? Of course, they can; therefore this language is not necessary unless they expect to expand it. Those are not standards they are talking about and to which the gentleman from Oklahoma referred. If anything, it is in the law now. They are using the law now in that respect and they can use it in that respect without this language.

Mr. MONRONEY. The gentleman overlooks the fact that this is an entirely rewritten law and we are trying to make it workable and make it say what we mean and provide for criteria such as these various trade organizations suggest.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. And the adoption of the gentleman's amendment would put a cloud over the exercise of those criteria.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. To demonstrate the necessity for the end-use provision that the gentleman mentioned, may I refer to cotton, which was referred to a while ago. It would be possible to export cotton for the purposes mentioned by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SADOWSKI], but unless you have the end-use provision there they could make gunpowder out of that cotton instead of using it for making overalls.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. A perfect illustration of the point that you need a combination of criteria at times. Cotton can be put to legitimate uses; it can also be used for the manufacture of things that conflict with our security policy.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. It says that there may be applied "such other standards"—in other words, any other standard. That is what we object to. Why do we not limit it to the standards we are talking abount; for instance, end use?

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. For the reason that we must in the final analysis leave the determination of specific export requests to an administrative agency. We must leave as broad discretion as possible.

Mr. COLE of Kansas. In other words, the gentleman wants to leave it as broad as possible, but we want to restrict it.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. We must have powers that are not too broad, but not too limited, as I fear the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan would give us.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, just to show how broad the powers are that the Department now possesses, I want to bring to your attention one little incident. I could mention many more, but I do want to bring this one out because it illustrates positively just how great are the powers of the controlling body now on commerce and trade. They not only control exports to the greatest extent but they also control imports to an unreasonable extent.

There was a firm in Michigan last year which had purchased some obsolete rifles in England. These rifles had been sold by the British Government to some private company in England. They were war surplus, in other words. They were rifles used in the First World War. Now, this firm developed the idea whereby they could use these old rifles, rebore them, and put another sight on them and make some other improvements on this old rifle, and it could be used as a hunting rifle, such as a deer rifle, for instance. It was a splendid idea. They applied for an import license. They located a bunch of these rifles and had made a contract, and the rifles were to be shipped here. All of a sudden the import license was canceled. The firm wrote to me and asked me to intercede and find out what happened to their import license. So I went down to the Department. They said, "Well, somebody in the War Department has told us that there may be some need for these rifles, and therefore we had to cancel this import license for this firm." Lo and behold, about 4 months later I got a half page ad out of a Detroit paper that was sent to me by this same firm advertising these same rifles as deer rifles, and who do you think had the rifles? Who got them? Sears, Roebuck & Co. Well, the Michigan firm was doggone sore. They had a right to be angry.

Now, some of these manipulations are not just right. These controls just have not been exercised properly. There are so many selfish people in the world, and we have a few of them in this country, who are using these controls to their own particular advantage in order to make a profit for themselves. There is always the suspicion that by making combinations with certain people in our Government they are able to obtain export and import licenses to do business and make money at the expense of other firms. This way of doing business is not the American way, and sooner or later we are going to cut out this foolishness, and we might as well start doing it right now. It was all right to have controls during the war, when we needed it, but when we carry controls on through in peacetime and it affects legitimate business to a point where it becomes repugnant, I say it should be stopped.

I am a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. I sat on that committee during long hearings last year, and we heard a great deal of testimony from business people all over the United States on exports and imports, and we have seen how these controls have worked. They have not worked right. Always came that question of somebody making a great deal of money at the expense of other people. The sooner we get rid of these controls the better off the business of the Nation will be.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 62, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of clarification, I should like to inquire about the provisions of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] with respect to rice. Rice is a commodity that was formerly controlled under the provisions of existing law. If I may, I will direct my interrogation to the gentleman from Georgia, a member of the committee, sponsor of the amendment, with respect to the question I had in mind. It is not clear just what this amendment that was adopted, sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia, does with respect to rice. I should like to confirm from the sponsor of the amendment, or from some member of the committee, that rice is included under the provisions of the Brown amendment, and therefore will be decontrolled.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Rice is an agricultural product. It will have the same status as other agricultural commodities. The amendment refers to agricultural commodities and includes fats and oils.

Mr. LARCADE. The gentleman takes the position that in addition to the authority given under the terms of the act for the decontrol of any commodity this specifically takes rice out of the bill, and rice is decontrolled?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I repeat that rice is treated like any other agricultural commodity under my amendment.

Mr. LARCADE. I am trying to get a definite statement from the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think that is a definite statement.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. There is an international agreement on rice, is there not? How would this affect, if at all, the international agreement?

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The amendment is subject to subsections (b) and (c) of section 2 of the bill, but rice still is treated like any other agricultural commodity.

Mr. HARRIS. I agree with the gentleman in his interpretation. I think he is absolutely correct. But we should not overlook the fact that it is subject to the international agreement, in which the Department of Agriculture participated, and, of course, it has the authority to make this determination.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. The amendment speaks for itself just as plainly as it can. It is subject to subsections (b) and (c) of section 2.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARCADE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WILLIS. Answering the inquiry of the gentleman, I call his attention to the language of the amendment, which, after the decontrolling language, provides "except to the extent required to effectuate the policy stated in clauses (b) and (c) of section 2." Those clauses have to do with foreign policy and national security. Therefore, whereas rice, which I understand to be in surplus, would be decontrolled, it would not be so far as national security and foreign policy are concerned. That is my understanding of the amendment. If the gentleman from Georgia disagrees, I should like him so to state.

Mr. LARCADE. I think this clears the matter up.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I think you have the same protection as the others, and I am sure you would not want any more.

Mr. LARCADE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time merely to ask a question with respect to the provision of section 3 of this bill. I regret I was not able to be here during all of the debate, due to hearings of the Committee on Appropriations. But I would like to know the meaning of the language in section 3 with respect to the effectuation of policies which reads:

> To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

For a number of years my attention has been called by people in the export field in my congressional district who have found difficulty in competition with exporters from foreign governments because of their inability to convert exchange in competition with such foreign governments because in the case of some governments they have accepted their exports by agreeing to convert into the currency or exchange of the exporter's country the currency of the country to which the exports are sent. A concern selling motors, for example, to the European Mediterrean area, for example, is to be paid in pounds sterling within the sterling area. That is all right for the British manufacturer selling motors in that area, but the motor manufacturer in America in my district has opportunities also to sell motors, but he finds he cannot sell in competition with the British manufacturer of motors due to the inability to make the conversion or exchange from pounds sterling into dollars.

In other cases it is found that the exporting country assists the exporter by converting and making good the trade accounts accepted by the exporter in doing business with foreign countries, thus giving a further advantage to the foreign exporter as against the American exporter. I wonder whether or not under the broad language contained in this authority a regulation could be issued by the President that would authorize the export-import bank, or some other department of Federal finance, to discount bills of lading to provide for the exchange of currency to provide dollars for the American exporter?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will try to answer his question.

Mr. KEEFE. I shall be very happy to yield. I am seeking information.

Mr. MULTER. I am certain that the rules and regulations that are intended to be promulgated under this section, and which will be promulgated under this section, will lead to the stopping of the kind of complaints that you and I and others have been getting, so that there can be no unfair advantage taken over our merchants because of exchange or by reason of any of the other manipulations that are presently resorted to by some unscrupulous exporters. It is necessary to have permission to make regulations with reference to financing and transporting and servicing only to enforce the act, so that if you call the banks and ask them to reveal to the department what is the story about their exchange, is it going to be against our own merchants, or is it a fair way of exporting these items? They cannot hide behind the foreign exchange, or they cannot send out a declaration which calls for one thing and ship something else.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand that, but that does not answer the question that I have in mind. For example, suppose a British exporter ships manufactured products to an importer in the Mediterranean area, which is a sterling area——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for four additional minutes, in order to get an answer to this question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. That British exporter is doing business with a concern in one of the Mediterranean areas. In certain countries—I do not know whether it is actually true in Britain or not, but in some countries the nation itself, in order to stimulate exports of its own citizens, will guarantee, under certain circumstances, to that exporter that he is going to be paid for the material that he ships; whereas the American exporter, who is going directly into that country, has to carry that account, and due to the operation of exchange problems his funds are actually tied up and he does not get payment for his goods. Payment being guaranteed by the government of the foreign country puts that exporter in that country in a very favorable competitive position. Now it has long been suggested that some agency of government should be set up that could provide dollars to the American exporter and assure him that he is in a competitive position with those foreign countries. I simply want to know, as a matter of information in order that I can intelligently appraise this section, whether it is possible to set up such an arrangement by Government action that would assist the American exporter in promoting his business.

Mr. MULTER. It is not the intent of this bill to regulate finances. This is merely to regulate the enforcement features of the Control Act; not to interfere in any way with the banking situation. That must be a matter of other legislation.

Mr. KEEFE. Then, I think the answer is clear, and I am asking this so that the discussion on the floor, in the interpretation of that clause may be made known, a mere reading of the act itself without the explanation, would not seem to delimit it in the manner in which the gentleman has stated; but I gather from the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, in his opening statement, and on other statements which I have heard, that it is the pure intent and purpose of that language in the bill to enable inquiries into financing in order to carry out the enforcement provisions that are contained in the bill, and to enable the Government agency in charge to police the export trade. Is that right?

Mr. MULTER. The reports of the committees of both Houses so indicate. These are enforcement provisions.

Mr. KEEFE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

VIOLATIONS

SEC. 5. In case of the violation of any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or license issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this act, the head of any department or agency exercising any functions hereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person. In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a

subpena issued to, any such person, the district court for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(b) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (27 Stat. 443), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(c) No department, or agency, exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 4, line 19, after the word "court" insert "of the United States."

Page 5, line 7, strike out the word "or" and after "agency," insert "or official."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 4, line 13, after the word "person" strike out the period and insert the words "applying for an export license."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, as presently worded, the language of section 6 (a) is altogether too broad and far-reaching. It reads:

To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this act, the head of any department or agency exercising any functions hereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person.

Any person! Any person!

I do not know of any law that has been enacted that is so far-reaching in respect to investigations, reports, and statements incident to its enforcement, there may have been, but I do not think so. I am merely going to propound the inquiry and let it go at that: Do you want to put every citizen of the United States in a position where notwithstanding the fact that he has not made application for an export license he may be subjected to the pains and penalties of this act? Are you going to give any department or agency the authority, on the pretense that it has something to do with exports, to go into any business house, any bank, or onto any farm, or into any factory, examine the premises, examine the records, without any more restraint than the finding on the part of the head that it might be necessary in the interests of enforcing the provisions of this act? It is, of course, fundamental. If you were voting to protect and defend the constitutional rights of the American people against unreasonable searches and seizures; if you were not voting to deny them certain freedoms which in spirit at least are guaranteed by the American Constitution, you would never vote such language as that into any law. All I am asking you to do by this amendment is to at least restrict the language in the application to persons who are applying for an export license, which it seems to me is very, very reasonable.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, this language on page 4, line 13, at the end of the sentence, adding the words "applicant applying for an export license" would restrict the enforcement provisions of this act to the extent I do not believe it could be adequately enforced. In other words, it would prohibit the department enforcing this law from going to the banker and getting the information, because he is not the applicant; it would prohibit the department from going to the steamship company transporting the goods because the steamship company would not be an applicant; it would prohibit the department from going to any person and requiring any testimony except from the applicant himself. And then, of course, when the applicant was confronted with the enforcement authorities he would refuse to testify on the constitutional ground that it might incriminate him. There would, therefore, be no enforcement of any kind whatsoever. We either want a law with enforcement teeth in it, or we do not want any law at all.

Under the administration of this law we have a voluntary agreement now for enforcement. If this voluntary agreement continues a large part of this law will be unnecessary, but if it does not continue and if it breaks down, then this is the shotgun in the corner that will compel enforcement of the act. I submit the gentleman's amendment restricts the language to the extent where the law could not be enforced.

This section is vital. It is an enforcement provision. It is not in existing law. If the amendment is adopted this will cripple the whole bill and put it back to where the existing law is now, which is entirely too weak at the present time.

One of the greatest evils we have had in this country in recent years has been the black market—people who would buy goods and commodities at the fixed price, then go into the black market and sell them at a much higher price, sometimes several times as much. We will have the same kind of black market probably in this export business if it is not Government supervised and if we do not carefully protect against it in the law. I know that is not intended by the gentleman from Michigan because he does not want to help any black marketeer, but at the same time it will weaken the law to the extent that the black market will be aided and encouraged and will tend to break down entirely the enforcement of the act.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I am amazed in looking over the enforcement provisions of this bill to know how far they go. Of course, I can see a general pattern in what the administration wants to do. The administration that has been in power for some 20 years has been enlarging its activities and becoming larger and larger and getting more and more control over the freedoms of the American people. I say to you gentlemen on my right that when the Government becomes so large, larger year by year through the development of bureaus and governmental powers, then you and I and the folks back home will become smaller and smaller. This bill infringes on the rights and liberties of the American people. I question its constitutionality. It goes much further than any Congress adopted during the war.

We are giving entirely too much power to a Government agency, and I think it will amount to sending out a horde of bureaucrats and snoopers over the land to pry into the affairs of the American people. It is a mistake you are making in this bill to vote such wide powers to any agency of government. I do not think the gentleman from Michigan and the Republicans on the left side of the aisle are going to get very far. You are bumping your heads against a stone wall, because orders have apparently come down from on high to increase the powers of the Federal agencies.

In the Byrd report you read that the number of new Federal employees have increased 289 every day this last year. Why, 20 years ago when you came into power there were about 570,000 Federal employees. Today there are over 2,000,000. At that time it cost less than $4,000,000,000 to run the Government of the United States, and today you are asking for a budget of about $42,000,000,000. You had at that time about 350 Federal agencies. Today there are 1,833 Federal agencies, and growing all the time.

I am saying to you who are supporting this administration bill for a larger and bigger and stronger Federal Government, that it will take from you and those you represent many liberties and rights that should be theirs. My position is that the Federal Government should merely be an umpire, guaranteeing fair play. The rewards or failures should go to the individual. The Government is becoming too powerful, all too powerful at this time. Bills are coming to this Congress for a cradle to the grave security. Bills that give the Federal Government more and more power. I say to you my colleagues that the best government is that which is kept close to home and governs less. I say to you it is time to call a halt on big government, big business, and the authority of government to control the lives of all of us. If we do not we drift to a socialism in which the individual loses both freedom and security.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 53, noes 93.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Florida: Page 4, line 23, after the comma following the word "both", strike out the balance of section 6 (a) and insert "after a hearing in which the judge of said district court determines that the books, records, and other writings are material and pertinent to such investigation, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment does only this: It provides that before a contempt order can be issued against any person upon the complaint of the party who is investigating the exports a hearing must be had. Let me give you my interpretation of the bill, and if I am wrong I ask the gentleman from Texas to correct me.

Under the bill, if the investigator approaches any person and says, "I want your books, I want your records, I want every writing you have," and the man says, "It is not pertinent, it is not material, and I do not want you to have it," then the investigator can issue a subpena to him and if he does not comply with the subpena, then, upon the investigator's merely making application to the Federal court, without any hearing, without determining whether or not there is any merit to his contention, or without determining whether the books or writings are material or pertinent, the man can be held in contempt of court.

I think it should not be permitted that a bureaucratic agency of this Government can go into a man's business and, relying solely on its own discretion, take that man before a judge and say, "I need the books," and get an order against him without even a hearing. That is not American.

Let us see what the language is in the bill:

In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any such person, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides or transacts business, upon application, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

My amendment adds "after a hearing in which the judge of said district court determines that the books and records and other writings are material and pertinent to such investigation."

When the court determines that, then they ought to be produced, but a contempt order ought never be issued against the man if the books for which the investigator calls are not pertinent and material. I think the Congress ought to protect the American people, to some extent, at least, from such proceedings and actions as this. But how much more time would it take for this agency to go to a judge, after making the application, and show that the books were material and pertinent? Certainly the man who is being investigated ought to have some hearing before he is held in contempt of court.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The provision in this bill requires that in the event a person refuses to obey a subpena the agent must go before a court. That is the provision the gentleman is attempting to amend. Can we not leave it to a United States district judge to determine whether or not this man complained against should have a minute's hearing or an hour's hearing or 2 weeks' hearing? It is up to the judge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has expired.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas this question. Is it the purpose of this committee in reporting this bill to say that before an order of contempt is issued, that the party against whom the contempt is issued shall have a hearing as to the materiality?

Mr. PATMAN. It says so in the language of the bill. It says they must appear before a United States court, and that carries with it the authority and jurisdiction of the judge to determine for himself whether he will have a hearing or not.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Then why is there any objection to putting this language in the bill if that is the intention of the committee?

You know that any judge, though he be inexperienced, can interpret it that way.

Mr. PATMAN. I believe we must assume that a United States district judge will act as he should act. Why should we help a man who wants to use the district judge just for delaying purposes? You would require it in every case, and every case will not need that.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. But you only say "upon application." You do not say "a hearing shall be had." If you put the notice hearing in, then I say it is all right. But let us not give these people that power. You know how some of them act.

Mr. PATMAN. This is only a temporary law.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not care how temporary it is. We have no right to barter away the right of the American people to be heard before a contempt order is issued against them.

Mr. PATMAN. As the gentleman from Georgia pointed out, you will harm the people that we are attempting to help.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I do not think that I am harming a person if I ask that he be given a hearing before a contempt order is issued against him. I do not think that is harming anyone. I hope the Congress will afford Americans an opportunity to be heard before a contempt order is issued against them.

You know how some of these bureaucratic inspectors go out and gather up these records in evidence and then they act as prosecutor and judge and in every other capacity possible. I think you have to give the American people some rights. This is not an amendment which is contrary to the purposes of the bill. I hope the Congress will adopt this amendment so that we know it is spelled out in black and white and we will know that before a contempt order can be issued, that the man has had a hearing. That is all I want.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. You want a hearing provided for here, otherwise a bureaucrat will go to a man and read these five lines to him and will say to him, "You do not get a hearing, and you had better behave yourself and produce your books."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. That is possible.

Mr. CHURCH. That bureaucrat will say to him, "You do not get a hearing, sir, and you had better behave."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I think that is possible.

Mr. CHURCH. That is the bureaucratic way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] has expired.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, those of us who are supporting this amendment fear that this section seeks to punish contempt of a bureaucrat rather than contempt of court. If there is no hearing, no appearance of the citizen whose books or records are to be examined and produced under compulsion, then how can the judge constitutionally exercise the power to punish for contempt when there is no contempt other than contempt of the bureaucrat who issues the subpena for the books to be produced? It seems to me that the gentleman's amendment particularly, since he says that to write in the word "hearing" is all he wants, is a most reasonable amendment, and necessary to give the section validity. I hope the committee will accept it. Why? The committee should welcome any improving amendment. If you mean what this section says, any district court of the United States "for any district in which such person is found," "upon application"—though by whom is not stated—"shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and produce books, records, and other writings," although the case in which the bureaucrat's subpena was

issued is pending 3,000 miles away, and the subpena never was served on anyone, and the man "found" in the new State never heard of the case, without specifying what books, records, or other writings, nor whose, nor where. And any failure to obey such order—even if the man "found" never saw it, never was in that court, or knew any such order had been issued, nevertheless, the man could be punished "by such court as a contempt thereof."

Mr. PATMAN. According to Federal Court Rules of Procedure, could not a litigant get that same relief right now? In other words, if he asked for a hearing under Federal procedure, would not the court give him a hearing?

Mr. HOBBS. Not at all. Under this law, as it reads, and if it means what you contend it means, then there can be no harm done by the pending amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. No harm done?

Mr. HOBBS. Not a bit.

Mr. PATMAN. Except that it will just delay the procedure, and that is what most people have objected to.

They do not want any delay in procedure. They want action such as on fats and oils.

The only criticism we have had against the Department was delay in decontrolling fats and oils. If you adopt this amendment it will be delayed longer and longer, whereas, under existing law, it will be up to the judge, and if he believes they are just using him, he can just say, "It is obvious. I am not going to be a party to this black-marketing. I am going to make these fellows bring these books and records in." Otherwise they could have a delaying action, like they have right now in New York, and perishable products would be destroyed.

Mr. HOBBS. I appreciate the explanation of the gentleman, but to my mind it is simply a misconception of the fact. I have seen 18 contempt cases tried in an hour. There is no delay. All that this amendment asks for is that before you send an American citizen to jail for contempt, you give him notice and a hearing on the merits, whereas your law says that a bureaucrat can insist upon the production of books, or records, or other writings, whether they belong to the man in the toils of the bureaucrat, or not, and if the man fails to obey the bureaucrat he goes to jail for contempt, not of the bureaucrat, but of court, without knowledge, notice, or hearing.

Mr. PATMAN. No. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. HOBBS. Then, if we are mistaken, why does the committee object to inserting those words?

Mr. PATMAN. It says, "when the Department calls upon him to produce information and he refuses," then the Department head must go to the court himself and get an order from the United States District Court himself to produce these books and papers. Then, and then only, can he be cited for contempt. The gentleman evidently has not read this language.

Mr. HOBBS. I beg your pardon. I have read it and I have read it very carefully. You do not provide for any hearing as to the contempt of the bureaucrat or of any court. It is made obligatory upon the court to issue an order without notice or hearing—right or wrong—when there has been no contempt, nor even opportunity for contempt, the victim "may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof."

Mr. SPENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SPENCE. The citizen has his rights under the law, and stating it in this act would not have any effect. A court certainly would not send a man to jail without a hearing.

Mr. HOBBS. Your bill says that he could do so, sir.

Mr. SPENCE. If it does that it would be clearly unconstitutional.

Mr. HOBBS. I think so too, and that is the reason I am supporting this amendment.

Mr. SPENCE. There is no intention of that kind in the act. A judge would not send a man to jail for contempt of some other administrative agency. The judge would only send a man to jail for contempt of court. The judge could not try that.

Mr. HOBBS. That is exactly the position that I am taking here.

Mr. SPENCE. That is the position I take, and it is not in this bill.

Mr. HOBBS. It is to save your bill from unconstitutionality that we are supporting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama, [Mr. HOBBS], has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I desire to point out on page 4, commencing with line 14, the officers are employees of the department enforcing this act, and they would have a right to subpena any person to appear and testify and bring books. Then if he refuses, if the party refuses, then and only then, commencing in line 17 and in line 18, will the department through its officers and agents go into the United States District Court in the district where the person resides, into his home district where he resides, and upon application the judge is not required to do anything. But the judge shall have jurisdiction to issue an order, and we must assume that a United States district judge is going to know what he is doing before he issues any such order; then, if the judge issues the order and the party who resides in the United States district represented by the court refuses to obey the judge, he can be cited for contempt. Is not that the way of enforcing law in the United States? It is the way that ordinary laws are enforced. Why should we make an exception?

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. We all know that if an applicant said he was being abused by the agency that the United States district judge—imagine that—the district judge—in fact there is no doubt in my mind that he would take that into consideration.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Would the gentleman object adding the phrase "after application and hearing"?

Mr. PATMAN. The language of this bill has been carefully considered. Now the gentleman wants to come in here and without consideration add different language to that which has been so carefully written. That is possibly throwing a monkey wrench into the machinery.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Why, if the gentleman in his own words says that "we must assume" does he, then, object to inserting the assumption?

Mr. PATMAN. Because the judge might know they are just using him for a delaying action and he would not want to be used; therefore he would say "no hearing is necessary in this case"; so we leave it to the United States district judge.

Mr. HOBBS. That is exactly the purpose of the amendment, to leave it up to the judge.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Has the time on this amendment been limited?

The CHAIRMAN. The time has not been limited.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Members should read this section very, very carefully. There are a great many lawyers in this House who have had experience in court. What happens under this language ought to be clear to every lawyer in Congress: First, the person whose books and records are sought by an administrative agent of the Government refuses to produce those books at the request of the administrative agent; that agent then goes to a United States district judge and in an ex parte proceeding when the person involved is not present asks that judge for an ex parte order compelling the citizen to produce those books. There is not a lawyer in this Congress who has ever had experience who does not know that such orders are usually signed not only by United States district judges but also by other judges as a pure perfunctory matter. He issues the order in accordance with the language of this legislation directing this citizen to produce those books. Listen to what it states. It states that he "may issue that order upon application."

Not after hearing of the citizen but upon mere application of the administrative officer. After that order has been issued and the citizen still refuses to produce the books and records it states:

> Any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

After he fails to comply with the ex parte order issued by the court in which he has had no opportunity to be heard,

the court may issue a contempt citation and bring him before the court for contempt of the court, and punish him as the law prescribes.

At no place in that procedure is there any opportunity for the citizen to be heard except at the whim or caprice of the Federal judge who may or may not say: "Sir, I am going to let you give an explanation to me before I send you to jail for your contempt of this court." He clearly is in contempt under this law if he fails to comply with the order of the judge that has been issued ex parte.

It would seem to me it is asking only very little to say to the citizen under those circumstances, "You shall be entitled to a hearing before an adjudication of contempt is entered and before punishment is inflicted."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it not reasonable to assume, in fact, that the Federal judge would accord the citizen an opportunity to explain why he had in the first instance failed to comply with the order of the administrator?

Mr. KEEFE. My dear sir, I would say I have such a deep and abiding respect for the Federal judiciary as such generally and for the judiciary as such generally, I would think most judges would take that position; however, the situation is well known of flagrant abuses of rights by Federal judges and other judges in matters of this character When he has once issued his order directing the production of those books as an ex parte matter in which the citizen has not been heard, then it would seem to me it is only fair to accept the suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Florida and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama, who is a very highly respected Member of the House Judiciary Committee, and simply assure the citizen by writing the language in there and giving him assurance which you say we ought to assume so that the citizen will have this protection.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the committee I would like to offer a substitute that on page 4, line 21, after the word "order" there be inserted "after hearing."

Mr. SPENCE. The committee, I am sure, will accept that amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman to withdraw his amendment, with the understanding that the committee will offer an amendment, after the word "order" in line 21, page 4, to read "shall have jurisdiction to issue an order after hearing." In other words, put in the words "after hearing" requiring such person to appear.

Mr. PHILBIN. He could be heard before a member of the district attorney's office. I would suggest "after hearing and notice to the aggrieved party."

Mr. PATMAN. On application after hearing?

Mr. PHILBIN. Hearing and notice to the aggrieved party.

Mr. KEEFE. Surely what the gentleman is seeking to accomplish, as I understand, by his amendment, is to provide for a hearing.

Mr. PATMAN. Before the judge.

Mr. KEEFE. Before the judge?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. At which the aggrieved party or the citizen may have notice of the hearing and the right to appear and be heard. If you simply insert, as suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the words "after hearing" that could be accomplished by merely having the administrative officer come before the judge. That would be a hearing. We want to assure the citizen the right to a hearing.

Mr. PATMAN. The Committee has gotten along so well today, and we want to try to satisfy the people that do not understand what we are trying to do in this provision, and if we can do it by a simple amendment, we would like to do it. I have no objection to putting that in, if it is all right with the chairman, "after notice and hearing."

Mr. SPENCE. We will accept that.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. What is the purport of the gentleman's amendment at the present time?

Mr. PATMAN. The judge can issue this order only after notice and hearing to the aggrieved person.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Would the gentleman mind putting in there, "after notice to the aggrieved party"?

Mr. PATMAN. That is all right.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. All right, I will accept that.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, it may be involved in that respect. We will not do that.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. The amendment offered by the gentleman recognizes the fact that the rights of a citizen should not necessarily rest upon an assumption, no matter how reasonable it might be. I think the amendment that the gentleman has offered meets the objection raised to the original language.

Mr. PATMAN. I offer the amendment which reads, "after notice and hearing."

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Why do you not say, "after notice of hearing to any such person"?

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that would be a little involved there.

Mr. COOLEY. In line 18 you use the language "any such person."

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. Then why not put in "after notice of hearing"?

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman mean after the word "application" on line 21, "after notice and hearing to any such person"?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. PATMAN. Now I ask that the amendment be voted on, with the assumption that the gentleman of Florida will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Will the gentleman repeat his amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. After the word "application", in line 21 insert "after notice to any such person and hearing."

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: Page 4, line 21, after the word "application", insert "after notice to any such person and hearing."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. You surely have got this thing all mixed up now.

Mr. PATMAN. Of course, we want a comma there.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Who do you give it to?

Mr. PATMAN. We can change the punctuation, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not see how you can change the punctuation and make sense out of it.

Mr. PATMAN. I think it makes sense, and others think so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. "Application after notice." Notice to whom, for whom, for what?

Mr. PATMAN. "Application, after notice to any such person and hearing shall have jurisdiction to issue an order." The judge shall have jurisdiction.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, could we correct it if we put the word "and" in?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Of course, you could correct it by recommtting it to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PATMAN. We have three other bills yet, and if we agree on this, we will get through and adjourn until Monday. If we do not get through here now, we will have to come back tomorrow, and in the interest of trying to get through, I suggest that we adopt this amendment.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I suggest that after the word "application" you insert "and", making it read "and after notice to any such person and hearing." The word "and" would take care of it, I think.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that after the comma in line 21 there be inserted these words: "and after notice to any such person and hearing."

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 4, line 21, after the comma insert "and after notice to any such person and hearing."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 5, line 11, after "information" insert a period, and strike out all of lines 12, 13, and 14.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think this has been covered in the general debate. It is very obvious that the person disclosing the information would have no protection whatsoever in respect to confidential treatment of that information except as the head of the department or the official might determine that it was confidential. It is very apparent from the language that whether or not the information is deemed confidential and whether or not it is treated as confidential is wholly within the discretion of the department or official administering the law.

I do think we should be just a little bit careful. This has never been done before. There are four or five precedents in this bill in respect to the delegation of very unusual powers and the denial to individuals of liberties which heretofore seemingly have been guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States. If you do not delete this language, it will probably establish a precedent which might come back to bother you for a long time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is obvious at this stage of the game that the devious purpose is to compound confusion here by attempting to quibble about phrases and to delete proposals in the bill, which have been carefully discussed in committee. This amendment would insert a period at the end of line 11 on page 5 and strike out qualifying language which reads "unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest."

I believe that that language should stay in because it qualifies the statement and clarifies it. The experience of the Department in carrying out the provisions of the Export Control Act since its enactment in 1940 and its continuance in 1947 indicates that language of this character is essential.

I do not think that we should concern ourselves too much about a phrase of this sort. I ask that this amendment be voted down and that the language be permitted to remain as is.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] for the remarks he made on this same bill in a speech on December 15, 1947, when he so eloquently said, and I now want to read what he said:

We have likewise exended export controls in such manner that the President may be given broad authority, broad discretion as to this second reason why we have high prices and inflation. This second reason is the unusually heavy demand of foreign countries for American goods which are in short supply. The President is authorized under this bill so to adjust our exports as to safeguard and stabilize the American economy. We have given the power in this bill to start the job which has got to be done if we are going to have economic stability and lower prices in the United States.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution in referring to the remarks of the then chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency in December 1947 when an extension of this particular section of Public Law 395 involving export controls was up for consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that this section remain as is and ask that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 85, noes 101.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXEMPTION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 7. The functions exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELLSWORTH: page 5, line 15, strike out all of section 7.

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, in 1946 we passed an excellent piece of legislation, which has proven its worth time and time again since its enactment. The law to which I refer is known as the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, which requires administrative agencies to give notice, hold hearings, and give due publication to any rules, orders, or regulations promulgated by such agencies.

I can see no reason why the Congress, after enacting a very fine piece of legislation of that kind, which has proven its worth through years of operation, should today enact a law exempting an agency typical in all respects of the agencies which the Administrative Procedure Act was supposed to cover.

I feel that is particularly strange in view of some of the debate we have heard today. It seems to me there are many features of the bill now before us which take us farther down the road toward government by whim and caprice rather than government by law.

I call attention to the fact that the Administrative Procedure Act would only require the Office of International Trade to hear and take testimony from and consult with the various people with whom they deal, various private individuals in our country. The bill attempts to do that very same thing, and all in the world we would do by eliminating section 7 would be to further clarify the language which appears on page 3 and which authorizes "utilization of private competitive trade channels insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business." The Administrative Procedure Act, referred to in section 7, not only gives consideration to business people, small and large, but sets up the procedure as to how that consideration is to be given. I think that is a practical principle that has been written out in the law. It can and should be applied to the Office of International Trade the same as any other agency, so that the small merchant and everybody else can know just how he is going to be treated. Otherwise this bill is a wide-open blank-check authority, of the type which would even make the rubber-stamp days of the New Deal look conservative.

All I suggest is that the section which would exempt the Office of International Trade from the Administrative Procedure Act, be eliminated from the bill, and let the law now on the books apply. That does not in any way hamper or hamstring or cripple or defeat the purposes of this bill. It has nothing to do with the intent of the proposed legislation. It merely replaces the possibility of whim and caprice with orderly procedure, as previously spelled out by this Congress.

I would suggest, although I feel certain I will get little support for the idea, that the Committee give serious consideration to accepting this amendment for the reasons I have stated, and because the Administrative Procedure Act does give the common citizen some needed protection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. The provision suspends certain sections of the Administrative Procedure Act as far as this bill is concerned. All the temporary bills heretofore have had it. The Price Control Act, the Veterans' Emergency Housing Act—all of the temporary legislation has that provision. It is a standard provision in temporary legislation, and it is written into this act.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the Senate report on this bill, on page 6, wherein, in referring to this amendment, it says:

This is in accord with the policy expressed in section 2 of the Administrative Procedure Act itself. Other temporary regulatory activities authorized since that act have been granted comparable exemption. Examples of such are contained in the Sugar Control Exemption, and the Housing and Rent Act of 1947, the Veterans' Emergency Housing Program, and the War Housing Insurance Act.

Mr. SPENCE. Section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act is applicable to the act, and that requires the publication of all the rules and regulations in the Federal Register.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

QUARTERLY REPORT

SEC. 8. The head of any department or agency, exercising any functions under this act shall make a quarterly report within

45 days after each quarter to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 21, after "agency", insert the words "or official."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFINITION

SEC. 9. The term "person" as used herein shall include the singular and the plural and any individual, partnership, corporation, or other form of association, including any government or agency thereof.

EFFECT ON OTHER ACTS

SEC. 10. The act of February 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1140), relating to the licensing of exports of tin-plate scrap, is hereby superseded; but nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of any other laws authorizing control over exports of any commodity.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect February 28, 1949, upon the expiration of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended. All outstanding delegations, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under said section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, shall, until amended or revoked, remain in full force and effect, the same as if promulgated under this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 6, line 17, before the word "regulations", insert the word "rules."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 12. The authority granted herein shall terminate on June 30, 1951, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: Page 6, line 3, strike out "1951" and insert in lieu thereof "1950."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of discussion this afternoon about the power and the authority which is delegated, and the statement has been made—and I believe it has not been successfully contradicted—that the provisions of this bill can give to the Administrator of the bill control over our domestic economy.

It has been said here also that we should not be apprehensive of the powers of this bill, because it is temporary; that we are continuing it for only a temporary period. On almost all occasions that I can recall, where we were dealing with temporary legislation, 1 year was the longest for which we would grant these powers without review by the Congress. If we do not change this date from June 30, 1951, to June 30, 1950, we will establish as a matter of permanent policy, permanent and effective at least for 2 years, these new and very unusual powers and controls over our economy.

I wish that you would think what you are doing, and determine if you as a matter of congressional policy want to establish these powers permanently, because if they can be justified for the next years they can be justified to continue for 5½ years after the cessation of hostilities, then, of course, they can be justified to run 10, 15, 20, or 50 years after the cessation of hostilities. You are in effect setting up this program as a program of permanent Government policy which I do not think you want to do or intend to do.

At the proper time a motion to recommit will be offered to continue export controls for 1 year as they now exist, which means that all of the powers and authority which the President and the Government have in respect to export controls will be continued for 1 year, including the power and the authority to use price criteria in determining to whom the license shall be granted.

In addition to that, the motion to recommit will include the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TALLE] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] to exempt from the operation of the law insofar as specific licenses are concerned agricultural commodities in surplus. So that by adopting the motion to recommit we will continue all of the powers which the Government has had since 1940 to control exports and, in addition, we will protect agriculture from the exercise of these controls in the case of agricultural surpluses.

Let me remind the Members, Mr. Chairman, if we continue this power for 2 years it will take a two-thirds vote of this Congress to ever get the powers back. It will take a two-thirds vote of this Congress to restore to the American people the constitutional rights and freedoms which you are delegating to the administration today under this bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact it is not for merely 2 years. It is 2 years and a third of another year.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. Chairman, this apparently is the last of a deluge of amendments that have been attempted to be placed on a bill which I think most of the Members who sat through the hearings regarded as rather noncontroversial.

We have had more bogeymen raised to scare the Congress in connection with a program that has been operating for a great many years, particularly in protecting our national economy and security against the overexport of scarce materials, than I have ever heard raised on the floor of this House.

The pending amendment would seek to reduce the time by 1 year on these export controls which under the bill will go for 28 months.

Mr. Chairman, export controls are a very vital arm of the Marshall plan or the European recovery program. You cannot operate the Marshall plan without export controls. If you want to sabotage the European recovery program which will run for several more years, just extend these controls for 1 year or 16 months, and you will cast a serious doubt on the success of the recovery program.

What has been the record of these export controls? They started out with more than 3,000 items under control. We are down to slightly over 300 at this time. Does that sound like a bureaucracy which is continually grasping and trying to expand its hold on the American economy or destroy the standards of American business or to put the farmers out of business or the little manufacturers out of business? Of course not.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. I have not the time.

Mr. TABER. I have a factory that closed up on account of these controls.

Mr. MONRONEY. This agency has attempted to decontrol wherever possible and not extend their coverage and are certainly not expanding their power.

One point has been overlooked in this extension of time. If you extend it only for a short period of time—because these are export controls and the export control business must be done about 6 months in advance of the shipment of these goods; it is not an instantaneous process like local domestic sales—then you are actually going to end this program, in reality, 6 months before the termination date provided for in the act.

Congress can, under this bill, by concurrent resolution—and it is a process that has been put in many bills that have gone through the House—terminate export controls at an earlier date. Now, the law has never been satisfactorily settled whether it requires a Presidential signature or not, but it is the feeling of the members that it does not require a Presidential signature, so the will of a bare majority of this Congress can be respected.

This program has safeguarded the economy of this country, and has stopped the shipment of high-octane gasoline, steel, and other vital war potential supplies to Russia itself.

You relied on this act at that time when you stopped the ships in the California harbors from taking high-octane gasoline to Russia. Without this act, exporters can ship anything excepting actual munitions to any country behind the iron curtain. No screening can be done of these exports—nor no question raised as to their intended use—if this act is killed.

I believe we can extend this act to protect this Nation's safety for 2 years' time, and you will find that with the program under which we are safeguarding American economy and security we will be better off.

I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma is about right. There was not

much controversy before the committee. But at the same time, Mr. Chairman, we could have used the same law that we had from 1940 up to the present time. Somebody, evidently, wanted a little more power. So, they stuck a few of these little provisions in the bill, and that is why we have been talking all the afternoon. Regardless of what anybody might say, we are giving too much power to the Federal Government. I heard a gentleman here yesterday say what they did for New England, or what would happen if we needed something. Well, let me say for New England, and especially Massachusetts, that if the Federal Government, and the bureaus that are running the Federal Government, will stay out of Massachusetts, we will be just about ten or fifteen times better off.

Mr. Chairman, I think that the exchairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has made a fair proposition in asking that this only go into effect for a year, or a year and a couple of months, because the Department of Commerce has already decontrolled about 90 percent of the exports that they had when this thing started. So, there are only about 10 percent left. And, if they will let the people of the country produce and keep producing, you will not need that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes 97, noes 118.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HUBER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1661) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 97, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment in the nature of a substitute: Strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"SECTION 1. (a) Section 6 (d) of the Act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended, is amended by striking out 'February 28, 1949' and inserting in lieu thereof 'February 28, 1950'.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President in the exercise of the powers, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by such act of July 2, 1940, as amended, is authorized to use price criteria in the licensing of exports, either by giving preference among otherwise comparable applications to those which provide for the lowest prices, or, in exceptional circumstances, by fixing reasonable mark ups in export prices over domestic prices.

"(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. WOLCOTT. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken, and there were—yeas 139, nays 222, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—139

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Hagen | Miller, Nebr. |
| Allen, Ill. | Hale | Morton |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Hall, Edwin Arthur | Murray, Wis. |
| Anderson, Calif. | Hall, Leonard W. | Nelson |
| Angell | Halleck | Nicholson |
| Arends | Hand | Nixon |
| Auchincloss | Harden | O'Konski |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Harvey | Patterson |
| Bates, Mass. | Herter | Pfeiffer, William L. |
| Beall | Heselton | Phillips, Calif. |
| Bishop | Hill | Poulson |
| Blackney | Hinshaw | Reed, Ill. |
| Boggs, Del. | Hoeven | Reed, N. Y. |
| Bolton, Ohio | Holmes | Rees |
| Bramblett | Hope | Rich |
| Brehm | Horan | Riehlman |
| Brown, Ohio | Hull | Rogers, Mass. |
| Burdick | James | Sadlak |
| Byrnes, Wis. | Jenison | Sadowski |
| Canfield | Jensen | St. George |
| Case, N. J. | Johnson | Sanborn |
| Case, S. Dak. | Kean | Scrivner |
| Chiperfield | Kearney | Scudder |
| Church | Kearns | Shafer |
| Clevenger | Keating | Short |
| Cole, Kans. | Keefe | Simpson, Ill. |
| Cole, N. Y. | Kilburn | Simpson, Pa. |
| Corbett | Kunkel | Smith, Kans. |
| Cotton | LeCompte | Smith, Wis. |
| Dague | LeFevre | Stefan |
| Davis, Wis. | Lemke | Stockman |
| D'Ewart | Lichtenwalter | Taber |
| Dolliver | Lodge | Talle |
| Eaton | Lovre | Tollefson |
| Ellsworth | McConnell | Van Zandt |
| Elston | McCulloch | Velde |
| Engel, Mich. | McDonough | Vorys |
| Fenton | McGregor | Vursell |
| Ford | McMillen, Ill. | Wadsworth |
| Gamble | Mack, Wash. | Werdel |
| Gavin | Martin, Iowa | Wigglesworth |
| Gillette | Martin, Mass. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Golden | Merrow | Withrow |
| Goodwin | Meyer | Wolcott |
| Graham | Michener | Wolverton |
| Gross | Miller, Md. | Woodruff |
| Gwinn | | |

NAYS—222

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Gary | Noland |
| Addonizio | Gathings | Norrell |
| Albert | Gilmer | Norton |
| Andrews | Gordon | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Aspinall | Gore | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Barden | Gorski, Ill. | O'Hara, Ill. |
| Baring | Gorski, N. Y. | O'Sullivan |
| Barrett, Pa. | Gossett | Pace |
| Bates, Ky. | Granahan | Passman |
| Battle | Granger | Patman |
| Beckworth | Grant | Patten |
| Biemiller | Green | Perkins |
| Bland | Gregory | Peterson |
| Blatnik | Hardy | Philbin |
| Bloom | Hare | Pickett |
| Boggs, La. | Harris | Poage |
| Bolling | Harrison | Polk |
| Bolton, Md. | Hart | Preston |
| Bonner | Havenner | Price |
| Bosone | Hays, Ark. | Priest |
| Boykin | Hays, Ohio | Rabaut |
| Brooks | Hébert | Rains |
| Brown, Ga. | Hedrick | Ramsay |
| Bryson | Herlong | Rankin |
| Buchanan | Hobbs | Redden |
| Buckley, Ill. | Holifield | Regan |
| Burleson | Howell | Rhodes |
| Burnside | Huber | Ribicoff |
| Burton | Jackson, Wash. | Richards |
| Camp | Javits | Rivers |
| Cannon | Jones, Ala. | Rodino |
| Carlyle | Jones, Mo. | Rogers, Fla. |
| Carnahan | Jones, N. C. | Rooney |
| Carroll | Karst | Sabath |
| Cavalcante | Karsten | Sasscer |
| Chatham | Kee | Secrest |
| Chelf | Kennedy | Sims |
| Chesney | Kerr | Smathers |
| Chudoff | Kilday | Smith, Va. |
| Coffey | King | Spence |
| Colmer | Kirwan | Staggers |
| Combs | Kruse | Stanley |
| Cooley | Lane | Steed |
| Cooper | Lanham | Stigler |
| Cox | Larcade | Sullivan |
| Crook | Lesinski | Sutton |
| Crosser | Lind | Tackett |
| Davenport | Lucas | Tauriello |
| Davies, N. Y. | Lyle | Teague |
| Davis, Ga. | McCarthy | Thomas, Tex. |
| Davis, Tenn. | McCormack | Thompson |
| Dawson | McGrath | Thornberry |
| Deane | McGuire | Trimble |
| Delaney | McKinnon | Underwood |
| Denton | McSweeney | Wagner |
| Dollinger | Mack, Ill. | Walsh |
| Donohue | Madden | Welch, Calif. |
| Doughton | Magee | Welch, Mo. |
| Douglas | Mahon | Wheeler |
| Doyle | Mansfield | White, Calif. |
| Durham | Marcantonio | White, Idaho |
| Eberharter | Marsalis | Whitten |
| Elliott | Marshall | Whittington |
| Engle, Calif. | Miller, Calif. | Williams |
| Evins | Mills | Willis |
| Fallon | Mitchell | Wilson, Okla. |
| Feighan | Monroney | Wilson, Tex. |
| Fernandez | Morgan | Winstead |
| Fisher | Morris | Wood |
| Fogarty | Morrison | Woodhouse |
| Forand | Moulder | Worley |
| Frazier | Multer | Yates |
| Fugate | Murdock | Young |
| Garmatz | Murray, Tenn. | Zablocki |

NOT VOTING—72

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Fulton | O'Neill |
| Allen, La. | Furcolo | O'Toole |
| Andresen, August H. | Heffernan | Pfeifer, Joseph L. |
| Bailey | Hoffman, Ill. | Phillips, Tenn. |
| Bennett, Fla. | Hoffman, Mich. | Plumley |
| Bennett, Mich. | Irving | Potter |
| Bentsen | Jackson, Calif. | Powell |
| Breen | Jacobs | Quinn |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Jenkins | Scott, Hardie |
| Bulwinkle | Jennings | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. |
| Burke | Jonas | Sheppard |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Judd | Sikes |
| Celler | Kelley | Smith, Ohio |
| Christopher | Keogh | Somers |
| Clemente | Klein | Taylor |
| Coudert | Latham | Thomas, N. J. |
| Crawford | Linehan | Towe |
| Cunningham | Lynch | Vinson |
| Curtis | McMillan, S. C. | Walter |
| DeGraffenried | Macy | Weichel |
| Dingell | Mason | Whitaker |
| Dondero | Miles | Wickersham |
| Fellows | Murphy | Wier |
| Flood | Norblad | |
| | O'Hara, Minn. | |

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Latham for, with Mr. Clemente against.
Mr. Dondero for, with Mr. Judd against.
Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Vinson against.
Mr. August H. Andresen for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota for, with Mr. Kelley against.
Mr. Crawford for, with Mr. Klein against.
Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Murphy against.
Mr. Cunningham for, with Mr. deGraffenried against.
Mr. Towe for, with Mr. McMillan of South Carolina against.
Mr. Coudert for, Mr. Keogh against.
Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Sikes against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Furcolo against.
Mr. Jenkins for, with Mr. Bailey against.
Mr. Macy for, with Mr. Quinn against.
Mr. Hoffman of Michigan for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Jacobs against.
Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Irving against.
Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Jonas for, with Mr. Burke against.
Mr. Jackson of California for, with Mr. Wier against.
Mr. Norblad for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. Linehan with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SPENCE. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 260, nays, 102, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—260

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abernethy | Carlyle | Evins |
| Addonizio | Carnahan | Fallon |
| Albert | Case, N. J. | Feighan |
| Andrews | Cavalcante | Fernandez |
| Aspinall | Chatham | Fisher |
| Auchincloss | Chelf | Fogarty |
| Barden | Chesney | Forand |
| Baring | Chudoff | Frazier |
| Barrett, Pa. | Coffey | Fugate |
| Bates, Ky. | Cole, N. Y. | Garmatz |
| Battle | Colmer | Gary |
| Beckworth | Combs | Gathings |
| Biemiller | Cooley | Gilmer |
| Blackney | Cooper | Golden |
| Bland | Corbett | Gordon |
| Blatnik | Cox | Gore |
| Bloom | Crook | Gorski, Ill. |
| Boggs, La. | Crosser | Gorski, N. Y. |
| Bolling | Davenport | Gossett |
| Bolton, Md. | Davies, N. Y. | Granahan |
| Bolton, Ohio | Davis, Ga. | Granger |
| Bonner | Davis, Tenn. | Grant |
| Bosone | Davis, Wis. | Green |
| Boykin | Dawson | Gregory |
| Brooks | Deane | Gross |
| Brown, Ga. | Delaney | Hardy |
| Bryson | Denton | Hare |
| Buchanan | Dollinger | Harris |
| Buckley, Ill. | Dolliver | Harrison |
| Burdick | Donohue | Hart |
| Burke | Doughton | Havenner |
| Burleson | Douglas | Hays, Ark. |
| Burnside | Doyle | Hays, Ohio |
| Burton | Durham | Hébert |
| Camp | Eberharter | Hedrick |
| Canfield | Elliott | Herlong |
| Cannon | Engle, Calif. | Herter |
| Hobbs | Meyer | Rooney |
| Holifield | Michener | Sabath |
| Holmes | Miller, Calif. | Sasscer |
| Howell | Mills | Secrest |
| Huber | Mitchell | Shafer |
| Hull | Monroney | Sheppard |
| Irving | Morgan | Sims |
| Jackson, Wash. | Morris | Smathers |
| Jacobs | Morrison | Smith, Va. |
| Javits | Morton | Spence |
| Johnson | Moulder | Staggers |
| Jones, Ala. | Multer | Stanley |
| Jones, Mo. | Murdock | Steed |
| Jones, N. C. | Murray, Tenn. | Stigler |
| Karst | Nixon | Sullivan |
| Karsten | Noland | Sutton |
| Kearney | Norrell | Tackett |
| Keating | Norton | Talle |
| Kee | O'Brien, Ill. | Tauriello |
| Kennedy | O'Brien, Mich. | Teague |
| Kerr | O'Hara, Ill. | Thomas, Tex. |
| Kilday | O'Sullivan | Thompson |
| King | Pace | Thornberry |
| Kirwan | Passman | Tollefson |
| Kruse | Patman | Trimble |
| Lane | Patten | Underwood |
| Larcade | Perkins | Van Zandt |
| Lesinski | Peterson | Velde |
| Lind | Pfeiffer, William L. | Wagner |
| Lodge | Philbin | Walsh |
| Lovre | Pickett | Welch, Calif. |
| Lucas | Poage | Welch, Mo. |
| Lyle | Polk | Wheeler |
| McCarthy | Preston | White, Calif. |
| McCormack | Price | Whitten |
| McGrath | Priest | Whittington |
| McGregor | Rabaut | Wier |
| McGuire | Rains | Williams |
| McKinnon | Ramsay | Willis |
| McMillen, Ill. | Rankin | Wilson, Okla. |
| McSweeney | Redden | Wilson, Tex. |
| Mack, Ill. | Regan | Winstead |
| Mack, Wash. | Rhodes | Withrow |
| Madden | Ribicoff | Wolverton |
| Magee | Richards | Wood |
| Mahon | Riehlman | Woodhouse |
| Mansfield | Rivers | Worley |
| Marcantonio | Rodino | Yates |
| Marsalis | Rogers, Fla. | Young |
| Merrow | | Zablocki |

NAYS—102

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Allen, Calif. | Hagen | Nelson |
| Allen, Ill. | Hale | Nicholson |
| Andersen, H. Carl | Hall, Edwin Arthur | O'Konski |
| Anderson, Calif. | Hall, Leonard W. | Patterson |
| Angell | Halleck | Phillips, Calif. |
| Arends | Hand | Plumley |
| Barrett, Wyo. | Harden | Poulson |
| Bates, Mass. | Harvey | Reed, Ill. |
| Beall | Heselton | Reed, N. Y. |
| Bishop | Hill | Rees |
| Boggs, Del. | Hinshaw | Rich |
| Bramblett | Hoeven | Rogers, Mass. |
| Brehm | Hope | Sadlak |
| Brown, Ohio | Horan | Sadowski |
| Byrnes, Wis. | James | St. George |
| Chiperfield | Jenison | Sanborn |
| Church | Jensen | Scrivner |
| Clevenger | Kean | Scudder |
| Cole, Kans. | Kearns | Short |
| Cotton | Keefe | Simpson, Ill. |
| Dague | Kilburn | Simpson, Pa. |
| D'Ewart | Kunkel | Smith, Kans. |
| Eaton | LeCompte | Smith, Wis. |
| Ellsworth | LeFevre | Stefan |
| Elston | Lemke | Stockman |
| Engel, Mich. | McConnell | Taber |
| Fenton | McCulloch | Vorys |
| Ford | McDonough | Vursell |
| Gamble | Martin, Iowa | Wadsworth |
| Gavin | Martin, Mass. | Werdel |
| Gillette | Miller, Md. | White, Idaho |
| Goodwin | Miller, Nebr. | Wigglesworth |
| Graham | Murray, Wis. | Wilson, Ind. |
| Gwinn | | Wolcott |
| | | Woodruff |

NOT VOTING—71

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abbitt | Clemente | Jenkins |
| Allen, La. | Coudert | Jennings |
| Andresen, August H. | Crawford | Jonas |
| Bailey | Cunningham | Judd |
| Bennett, Fla. | Curtis | Kelley |
| Bennett, Mich. | DeGraffenried | Keogh |
| Bentsen | Dingell | Klein |
| Breen | Dondero | Lanham |
| Buckley, N. Y. | Fellows | Latham |
| Bulwinkle | Flood | Lichtenwalter |
| Byrne, N. Y. | Fulton | Linehan |
| Carroll | Furcolo | Lynch |
| Case, S. Dak. | Heffernan | McMillan, S. C. |
| Celler | Hoffman, Ill. | Macy |
| Christopher | Hoffman, Mich. | Marshall |
| | Jackson, Calif. | Mason |
| Miles | Potter | Taylor |
| Murphy | Powell | Thomas, N. J. |
| Norblad | Quinn | Towe |
| O'Hara, Minn. | Scott, Hardie | Vinson |
| O'Neill | Scott, Hugh D., Jr. | Walter |
| O'Toole | Sikes | Weichel |
| Pfeifer, Joseph L. | Smith, Ohio | Whitaker |
| Phillips, Tenn. | Somers | Wickersham |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Clemente for, with Mr. Latham against.
Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Dondero against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Towe against.
Mr. McMillan of South Carolina for, with Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., against.
Mr. Sikes for, with Mr. August H. Andresen against.
Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Macy against.
Mr. Furcolo for, with Mr. O'Hara of Minnesota against.
Mr. Klein for, with Mr. Hardie Scott, against.
Mr. Carroll for, with Mr. Taylor against.
Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Fellows against.
Mr. Vinson for, with Mr. Coudert against.
Mr. Keogh for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.
Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Cunningham against.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.
Mr. Kelley for, with Mr. Jonas against.
Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Jenkins against.
Mr. Murphy for, with Mr. Crawford against.
Mr. Bailey for, with Mr. Norblad against.
Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Potter against.
Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. Jackson of California against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Dingell with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Flood with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Whitaker with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.
Mr. Linehan with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Bentsen with Mr. Weichel.
Mr. Bennett of Florida with Mr. Jennings.
Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Fulton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 548) to provide for continuation of authority for the regulation of exports, and for other purposes, a similar bill to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Export Control Act of 1949."

FINDINGS

(a) Certain materials continue in short supply at home and abroad so that the quantity of United States exports and their distribution among importing countries affect the welfare of the domestic economy and have an important bearing upon the fulfillment of the foreign policy of the United States.

(b) The unrestricted export of materials without regard to their potential military significance may affect the national security.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States to use

export controls to the extent necessary (a) to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand; (b) to further the foreign policy of the United States and to aid in fulfilling its international responsibilities; and (c) to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security.

AUTHORITY

SEC. 3. (a) To effectuate the policies set forth in section 2 hereof, the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation from the United States, its Territories, and possessions, of any articles, materials, or supplies, including technical data, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. To the extent necessary to achieve effective enforcement of this act, such rules and regulations may apply to the financing, transporting, and other servicing of exports and the participation therein by any person.

(b) The President may delegate the power, authority, and discretion conferred upon him by this act to such departments, agencies, or officials of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

(c) The authority conferred by this section shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity, including fats and oils, during any period for which the supply of such commodity is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the requirements of the domestic economy, except to the extent required to effectuate the policies set forth in clause (b) or clause (c) of section 2 hereof.

CONSULTATION AND STANDARDS

SEC. 4. (a) In determining which articles, materials, or supplies shall be controlled hereunder, and in determining the extent to which exports thereof shall be limited, any department, agency, or official making these determinations shall seek information and advice from the several executive departments and independent agencies concerned with aspects of our domestic and foreign policies and operations having an important bearing on exports.

(b) In authorizing exports, full utilization of private competitive trade channels shall be encouraged insofar as practicable, giving consideration to the interests of small business, merchant exporters as well as producers, and established and new exporters, and provisions shall be made for representative trade consultation to that end. In addition, there may be applied such other standards or criteria as may be deemed necessary by the head of such department or agency, or official to carry out the policies of this act.

VIOLATIONS

SEC. 5. In case of the violation of any provision of this act or any regulation, order, or license issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) To the extent necessary or appropriate to the enforcement of this act, the head of any department or agency exercising any functions hereunder (and officers or employees of such department or agency specifically designated by the head thereof) may make such investigations and obtain such information from, require such reports or the keeping of such records by, make such inspection of the books, records, and other writings, premises, or property of, and take the sworn testimony of, any person. In addition, such officers or employees may administer oaths or affirmations, and may by subpena require any person to appear and testify or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and in case of contumacy by, or refusal to obey a subpena issued to, any such person, the district court of the United States for any district in which such person is found or resides in or transacts business, upon application, shall have jurisdiction to issue an order requiring such person to appear and give testimony or to appear and produce books, records, and other writings, or both, and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by such court as a contempt thereof.

(b) No person shall be excused from complying with any requirements under this section because of his privilege against self-incrimination, but the immunity provisions of the Compulsory Testimony Act of February 11, 1893 (27 Stat. 443), shall apply with respect to any individual who specifically claims such privilege.

(c) No department, agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall publish or disclose information obtained hereunder which is deemed confidential or with reference to which a request for confidential treatment is made by the person furnishing such information unless the head of such department or agency determines that the withholding thereof is contrary to the national interest.

EXEMPTION FROM ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

SEC. 7. The functions exercised under this act shall be excluded from the operation of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 237), except as to the requirements of section 3 thereof.

QUARTERLY REPORT

SEC. 8. The head of any department or agency, or official exercising any functions under this act shall make a quarterly report, within 45 days after each quarter, to the President and to the Congress of his operations hereunder.

DEFINITION

SEC. 9. The term "person" as used herein shall include the singular and the plural and any individual, partnership, corporation, or other form of association, including any government or agency thereof.

EFFECT ON OTHER ACTS

SEC. 10. The act of February 15, 1936 (49 Stat. 1140), relating to the licensing of exports of tin-plate scrap, is hereby superseded; but nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify, repeal, supersede, or otherwise affect the provisions of any other laws authorizing control over exports of any commodity.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 11. This act shall take effect February 28, 1949, upon the expiration of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714), as amended. All outstanding delegations, rules, regulations, orders, licenses, or other forms of administrative action under said section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, shall, until amended or revoked, remain in full force and effect, the same as if promulgated under this act.

TERMINATION DATE

SEC. 12. The authority granted herein shall terminate on June 30, 1951, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE: Page 5, line 6, after the comma insert the following: "and after notice to any such person and hearing."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this makes the Senate bill identical with the one just passed.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 1661, was passed will be vacated and the bill laid on the table.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2402. An act to extend the Office of the War Assets Administrator and the War Assets Administration from February 28, 1949, until June 30, 1949.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committe on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Army.
2. Department of the Air Force.
3. Departments of the Army and the Air Force.
4. Department of Commerce.
5. Department of the Interior.
6. Department of State.
7. Department of the Treasury.
8. Civil Service Commission.
9. Federal Security Agency.
10. National Archives.
11. Tennessee Valley Authority.
12. Veterans' Administration.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 66 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Lands (now comprised of the six former Committees on Insular Affairs, Territories, Public Lands, Irrigation and Reclamation, Mines and Mining, and Indian Affairs) may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction. For the purpose of making such investigations the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within or outside the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems neces-

sary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARITIME COMMISSION

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 92) to continue the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to have the gentleman explain very briefly the resolution he has offered.

Mr. BLAND. The resolution carries into effect the right to charter and operate vessels until June 30, 1949. It was agreed to by all of the members of the committee.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to say that the minority have directed me to say that they are in wholehearted accord with the chairman of the committee and the members of the committee on this bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, is it the purpose of the gentleman to bring in new legislation before the 4 months expire, or does he think this will wind it up?

Mr. BLAND. We are considering a bill now, but we thought it needed to be considered a little further in the light of changing conditions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not think then that we could wind this operation up in 4 months?

Mr. BLAND. No, not now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That (a) the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to continue until March 1, 1949, the authority of the Maritime Commission to sell, charter, and operate vessels, and for other purposes", approved February 27, 1948 (Public Law 423, Eightieth Congress), is amended by striking out the date "March 1, 1949" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the date "March 1, 1950." That joint resolution is further amended by inserting at the end of subparagraph (b) thereof the words ": *Provided, however*, That vessels may be chartered to the Republic of the Philippines, or citizens thereof, for use in the interisland commerce of the Philippines in accordance with section 306 of the Philippine Rehabilitation Act of April 30, 1946 (60 Stat. 137; U. S. C., 1946 ed., title 50, sec. 1786)."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "March 1, 1950" and insert "June 30, 1949."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 102 was laid on the table.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, Congress enacted the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, which contained in section 111 (a) a provision that—

The Administrator shall, in providing for the procurement of commodities under authority of this title, take such steps as may be necessary to assure, so far as practicable, that, at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities procured within the United States out of funds made available under this title and transported abroad on ocean vessels is so transported on United States flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at market rates.

In passing this act we believed that Congress intended that at least 50 percent of such traffic should be transported on United States vessels at market rates for United States vessels. The sponsors of this provision in both the Senate and House have stated that such was their understanding, and we believe that this was the understanding of a very large majority of the Members of Congress when they voted its approval. Last autumn the ECA Administrator announced that, based upon the opinion of the general counsel of the ECA, he proposed to interpret this provision so as to limit it with respect to bulk cargoes to instances where United States flag ships are available at world-wide competitive tramp rates.

When Congress enacted the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948, it had before it large amounts of dependable data concerning the higher operating costs of American ships.

The Administrator has expressed the desire that Congress should clarify the provision referred to so that there might be no question as to his administering the act in accordance with the desires of Congress and that he is in no manner exceeding his authority thereunder. There is pending before the Merchant Marine Committee of Congress a bill—H. R. 1340—which in our opinion amply clarifies the congressional intent and will. Hearings have been held on that bill, but it is being considered further by the committee and will require additional time for complete consideration and report.

We believe that the Administrator was also motivated by a desire to administer the act in a more efficient and economical manner, and a very substantial amount of misunderstanding has arisen concerning the financial effect of the higher ocean freight rates paid to American ships. Some differences of interpretation exist, and the committee feels that more careful consideration is required to write into law clarification that will carry out the intent of Congress, and provide that efficient and economical administration that is wished by all concerned with this problem.

We suggest that the right of American shipping to participate in the carriage of these cargoes to the extent of at least 50 percent thereof is the minimum consideration which can be afforded this important industry. To suggest that this industry should perform these services at a rate level comparable with low-wage foreign competition would be a great injustice. We hear no suggestion that the producers of other commodities should be required to adjust similarly their prices. Every other industry supplying commodities or services is receiving their full American price. This includes wheat at the guarantied Government price level, coal, and freight charges to the railroads to bring these commodities to seaboard. Until other industries supplying commodities or services to the ECA program reduce their prices to approximately foreign production cost levels, we see no justification for this discrimination against American shipping.

It is unnecessary to point out the importance of the American merchant marine to transport our commerce to and from our national defenses.

Attention should be called to a statement by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce who recently pointed out the inconsistency of expending appropriately $15,000,000,000 per year upon national defense while at the same time, under the contention of a minor economy, opposing or weakening one of the very important elements of national defense, the American merchant marine.

We submit that the participation of United States ships in the European recovery program is no more an additional subsidy to American shipping than the higher American cost paid to other American industries for commodities or services over and above the price level therefor at a European or world market level based upon the use of cheap labor and low living standards. Unless such a philosophy is adopted as to all other American industries furnishing commodities to the ECA program, we very strongly protest against such discriminatory treatment of United States ships and the creation of a false public impression that an American industry, rather than the Marshall-plan nations is the recipient of substantial portions of the funds appropriated for European recovery.

At the time of a meeting which representatives of the United States Maritime Commission, the United States Senate, our committee of Congress and other interested parties had with the ECA Administrator, he indicated to those present that because of world conditions he would withhold his order for probably another 60 days after February 1, and it is vitally important to act quickly, before another order comes out of ECA.

Senator MAGNUSON said it was thought in the Senate that the provision of the ECA bill was clear but that 50 percent was too little, and that it should have

been 75 or 80 percent, but that it was a compromise then.

Correlated with the same problem of clarification involved in H. R. 1340, for which there is pending a similar proposal in the Senate, there is need to extend the time for chartering ships.

It is necessary to increase American ships available to carry the goods, for if no American ships were available foreign rates would increase to a rate about equal to American rates today, if there were no American ships available to compete for part of the business.

Testimony before the committee was to the effect that the American merchant marine could carry more of the cargoes, but it was somewhat agreed that if we could get 50 percent participation we would be content. We said that we would be content if we got 50 percent of all the cargoes financed by Government aid programs in both directions.

The Administrator for ECA announced in a letter to Hon. STYLES BRIDGES, chairman, Joint Committee on Foreign Economic Cooperation, that not later than January 1, 1949, he would no longer require that 50 percent of the ECA bulk cargoes be required to be carried in United States flag ships unless such ships are available at competitive rates.

On December 22, 1948, it was announced that the change of policy would be postponed until February 1, 1949, and later it was postponed for an additional 60 days.

In his letter, the Administrator stated that he was advised by the general counsel of the Economic Cooperation Administration that the provision in question—the second sentence of paragraph 2 of section 111 (a)—did not require the Administrator to insist that 50 percent of ECA bulk cargoes should be carried in United States flag ships unless such are available at world-wide competitive tramp rates.

The Maritime Commission reported to the House committee that it was convinced that the action proposed by the Administrator would not be in accord with the provisions of the intent of the law, is not in accord with the economic factors involved in the administration of the 50 percent minimum participation provisions, and will be detrimental to the national commerce and the national security of the United States.

The Maritime Commission reported that the Commission was convinced that the participation in question was a considered decision of policy by the Congress in favor of giving overriding consideration of protecting and promoting the American merchant marine over the making available of dollar credits to the nations participating in the ECA program.

The Commission said:

The legislative history of the provision contains several statements recognizing that enactment of the 50-percent participation provision would involve increased cost of shipment. The subsidy argument was advanced in opposition to the enactment of the provision. Congress obviously intended to adopt the provision notwithstanding that its effect might be an indirect subsidy to American-flag operation. There are other provisions in the act which evidence an intention to minimize as far as possible the effect of the program upon channels of trade forming a part of the domestic economy of the United States.

The Maritime Commission has examined the economic effects of the participation provision and has given careful attention to the probable effects of a suspension or waiver of the provision as proposed by the Administrator for Economic Cooperation. It has explored the extent of the differential between market rates for United States flag vessels and the world-wide competitive tramp rates. It is clear that the differential is smaller and involves much less cost to the taxpayer than has been alleged. The Commission is convinced that the participation provision is a fair and reasonable requirement in connection with the economic cooperation program. It is beyond question that the relatively minor monetary consideration involved is more than outweighed by advantages to the domestic economy and the national security of the United States. In considering the employment of United States flag vessels at market rates for such vessels, it should be obvious that keeping a substantial portion of United States Government-owned vessels employed and maintained in class at the expense of the charterer is preferable to lay-up of such vessels with the attendant expense and loss of employment together with the loss of taxes on the income from such operations and taxes on the earnings of personnel employed in such operation.

With reference to the matter of contribution by the United States shipping industry to the economic rehabilitation of Europe, attention is called to the extent of the United States assistance in rehabilitating the merchant fleets of ECA nations through sales of Government war-built vessels at low prices, enabling foreign nations competing with the United States in shipping to place their fleets in competitive operation rapidly and under conditions of competition which involve continued detriment to the American shipping industry. There is no doubt that if the proposed ECA policy of using foreign-flag vessels to carry bulk cargoes is carried out, it will, in effect, wipe out operation of an American tramp fleet. This proposed policy means the elimination of American ships, seamen, operators, and shore establishments which are essential to a balanced American merchant marine commensurate with the needs of the United States and adequate for its national security. The lesson of two world wars with respect to the shipping industry is a mandate to avoid in the future the extraordinary expense and the dangerous delays of building a merchant marine in time of war or national danger. In a letter from Charles E. Dewey, general agent of the committee of the House and Senate known as the watchdog committee on this ECA program, he says that he believes that the legislative history of the act, Public Law 472, is such as to establish a "clear congressional intent to assure that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodities procured in the United States be transported abroad on United States flag vessels."

He said:

While the cost of operating United States flag vessels is generally recognized as higher than that of foreign-flag vessels, the adoption of a market rate determined by the world rate would preclude the attainment of objectives sought to be accomplished by the provision. It must be assumed that in providing this protection for United States flag vessels the Congress was aware of this price differential between United States and nonflag vessels.

It would appear from conversations that in determining the proceedings essential in achieving a workable solution to section 111 (a) (2) the following points require careful attention:

1. At present large numbers of United States maritime chartered vessels are being returned to the Commission for the lack of cargo and the nonprofit rate offered. The rate at which these vessels are being returned indicates that the cargo supply may soon reach a point where the present available United States flag ships will not be in such force as to provide capacity for 50-percent total gross tonnage envisioned by the act.

2. There are not sufficient United States flag privately owned vessels to move 50 percent of the gross tonnage, therefore requiring continued bare-boat charters by the Maritime Commission.

3. National security depends to a degree upon an available maritime industry. Therefore, one of the objectives of section 111 (a) (2) was to provide by this provision maximum employment in this industry. This accomplishment necessarily requires the operation of a maximum practicable number of United States flag ships.

4. It is evident, in view of the world supply of cargo space that as the United States cargo space is diminished, the rate for foreign cargo space will be increased, with the end result that the total transportation cost of this program may increase to an amount in excess of the amount that would be necessary even though the 50 percent tonnage shipped on United States vessels were provided at a rate higher than that prevailing for foreign-flag vessels.

I am sure you will find the facilities of the Maritime Commission available to you to the fullest extent in resolving these problems so that the protection intended for the United States flag vessels may be provided and at the same time rates established so as to protect to the greatest extent possible the expenditures of American dollars.

The necessity for the enactment of House Joint Resolution 92 at once is evident because the Chairman of the Maritime Commission testified that there are not at the present time enough privately owned ships to carry 50 percent of the cargoes required to be carried, and as Admiral Smith said:

With our authority expiring on the 28th of February 1949, operators are reluctant to charter from the Commission more ships because they have to pay the cost of taking the ship out of lay-up. Ships must be preserved and they are preserved, and the cost of taking them out of lay-up is considerable, and they would have only one voyage and they cannot get their money back. It is very important that it be determined whether or not our chartering authority is going to be extended beyond February 28 of this year.

In answer to a question by Mr. BOYKIN, Admiral Smith, Chairman of the United

States Maritime Commission, said that we do have enough vessels to charter to have the entire 100 percent of ECA shipments. He said in answer to a question that if we carried 100 percent, each country would carry 100 percent of its cargoes, and each nation would have its ships going one way in full load and going back in ballast, including ourselves and with a 50 percent rate they will get cargo both ways.

This extension for 4 months of the powers of the Maritime Commission is for the purpose of permitting the committee to examine closely the many and varied problems involved in the extension of the ship sales, charter, and operating authority. In view of the fact that the expiration date of the presently existing authority is February 28, 1949, the committee felt that it did not have sufficient time to permit the necessary consideration of the many questions involved. It is our thought that during this 4-month period the Maritime Commission shall carry on its activities for the sale, charter, and operation of vessels in the same manner as they have been doing and that no changes in policies which might affect sale and charter shall be instituted until the Congress has reached a final decision on the long-range program. In other words, we feel that the status quo should be maintained without the imposition of any restrictions over those which have been in effect for the past several years. Nothing should be done which would adversely affect the power of the Congress to make decisions on the basic questions of sale and charter policy. We have discussed this matter with Admiral Smith, chairman of the Maritime Commission, and have been assured that it is the intent of that body not to impose such restrictions during the period in which this resolution would be in effect, and that changes in chartering policy which had been proposed by his agency will be held in abeyance. Our thought is that during this 4-month period no action should be taken by the Commission which might do irreparable harm to the small operators presently chartering ships. It is our distinct understanding and agreement that the present practices will continue as at present and that no new practices, policies, and regulations shall be put in effect.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. TOLLEFSON], may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the committee report on House Joint Resolution 92, I should like to add a few comments with particular reference to conditions on the west coast.

The Maritime Commission's suggested program of September 22 and 24, 1948, and certain exceptions already made by the Commission in the administration thereof adequately provide for many companies on the west coast, but they do not make adequate provision for many small companies which are prominently identified with the Pacific coastwise trade. I have particular reference to Coastwise Line, Olympic Steamship Co., W. R. Chamberlin Co., James Griffith Co., and others. The reasons why these companies, whose prewar operation was so important to the economy of the west coast as well as to the merchant marine, have failed to purchase tonnage under the Merchant Ship Sales Act, are shown in the record of the hearings. They are based on the fact that under the existing competitive rail-rate structure, it would be impossible for these companies to operate profitably. The Interstate Commerce Commission has been looking into this problem for some time, and hearings on the subject are about to commence. It is to be hoped that within the near future the situation will be adjusted to permit these companies to return to their prewar status as important vessel owners and operators on the west coast.

It would be most unfortunate if the Merchant Marine Committee or the Maritime Commision should impose a death sentence on these companies prior to such time as they could reasonably be expected to purchase vessels and rehabilitate the coastwise trade. In the meantime the companies must be permitted to operate in the offshore trades in order that they may maintain their valuable experience and efficient organizations intact, pending rehabilitation of the coastwise trade. The 4-month extension provided for by House Joint Resolution 92 will give the Merchant Marine Committee a further opportunity to consider the problems of these carriers. I hope that the Maritime Commission will also give the matter further consideration, and suggest to the committee ways and means by which the peculiar needs and requirements of these carriers are to be recognized in the Commission's administrative policy. Meantime we understand the status quo will be maintained, and these companies will continue to operate to the extent of their present scope, pending final action by the committee.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 110, Rept. No. 145), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2101) to authorize the regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement he made in connection with the introduction of H. R. 2811 today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KIRWAN (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Hon. James A. Farley.

Mr. RHODES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include articles on national health insurance and the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. BROOKS (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made earlier today and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DONOHUE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address he made before the American Road Builders Association.

Mr. KEATING (at the request of Mr. HAND) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend in the RECORD the joint remarks of Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, Mr. POTTER, and himself, and include a letter and a table.

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial published in the San Francisco News.

Mr. GWINN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on rent control.

Mr. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article on Dr. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J., vice president of Georgetown University.

Mr. HAGEN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from a Minneapolis newspaper.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, I was called off the floor during the roll call a few moments ago on the passage of the bill H. R. 1661. I should like the RECORD to show that had I been present I would have voted "yea."

SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House today the Speaker may be authorized to sign any enrolled bills or joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute for the purpose of announcing the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was the intention to bring up today House Resolution 75, but this will be brought up on Monday next. It will not appear on the program for next week, but since I have been informed that there is some opposition to it, rather than bring it up tonight I am putting it on the program for Monday.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is House Resolution 75 the resolution that deals with investigative powers for the Committee on Education and Labor?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is correct.

This is the program for next week:

On Monday there will be the call of the Consent Calendar. There will also be a suspension on the bill H. R. 2626, if the bill is not passed by unanimous consent. That is the authorization of the General Accounting Office Building. There will also be taken up the bill H. R. 858, known as the overtime on overtime bill, and the bill H. R. 2102, which authorizes the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation to make disaster loans.

Tuesday is Washington's Birthday. There will be no session on Wednesday. We will adjourn from Tuesday to Thursday, and there is no business scheduled for Thursday. There will be no business brought up after Monday of next week, with the exception of that which is brought up by unanimous consent. We know such matters, and there probably will be none, are very carefully screened by both sides before unanimous consent can be obtained.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The majority leader mentioned the bill relating to overtime on overtime and also the bill relating to the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Are those coming up under suspension of the rules?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; they will come up under the regular rules of the House.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 20 minutes.

GOVERNMENT FINANCES GO INTO THE RED WITH TRUMAN—WE SCATTER OUR TAXPAYERS' DOLLARS ALL OVER THE WORLD

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, on many occasions I have risen in this Chamber to plead with the Members of this House to cut down on the huge appropriations, so that we can balance the budget, bring our financial house in order, and commence to pay off the huge national debt accumulated under the New Deal and the recent World War.

At the close of 1932 the national debt was approximately $19,500,000,000, and a great portion of this debt was incurred by loans to foreign governments during and after World War I, which for the most part never have been paid.

On Thursday, February 10, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] warned the Members that the President's budget request for 1950 exceeds the budget submitted for 1948 by $4,400,000,000 and is $6,800,000,000 larger than the budget for 1947.

Well can I remember, Mr. Speaker, how the people of this Nation reacted to the spendings of the Fifty-second Congress. This was our first billion-dollar Congress. The older Members of this body will perhaps recall the depression, the unemployment and the labor disorders of 1893 and 1894. The country was in a turmoil.

Yet the Fifty-second Congress voted appropriations totaling $507,376,397 during the first session and $519,535,293 during the second session, a total of more than a billion dollars in the 2-year period.

Every succeeding Congress, except the Fifty-third has voted bigger and bigger appropriations which have helped to build up our national debt.

Back in 1893 and 1894 the debt was less than one billion dollars. It averaged about $15 per capita. It did not vary very much even during the period of the Spanish-American War, when it rose to $19.33 per capita. However, by 1916 the debt had ben reduced to $11.96 per capita.

Today with the debt standing at more than $250,000,000,000 it is approximately $1,738 per capita. So I say the Members of this Congress ought to stop, look, and listen, long and carefully, before they vote the full $41,857,777,869 our President has asked for. Now I do not impugn the motives of our President, who has to take his advice from many sources, but I do wish to point out that we have got to cut down on the spending if this Nation is to remain solvent. We cannot continue to scatter our taxpayers' dollars all over the world indefinitely. We have plenty of places for every dollar right here in the United States. And surely no honorable course will lead to foisting our present national debt upon the shoulders and the backs of generations as yet unborn. Now, some will ask how can we cut down on the spending and keep this Nation out of another war.

THE FIRST STEP TO ECONOMY

The first and the prime step, in my opinion, will be the putting into immediate operation the recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, created by the Eightieth Congress.

If we can lift, in part only, the load of Federal bureaucrats who have affixed themselves to the Government pay rolls, from the backs of the American taxpayer we will not only move toward economy in Government, but at the same time go a long way toward saving our Republic from the advance of State socialism.

Just think, as recently as 1941 we had 1,292,000 employees on the civilian pay rolls. Last year the number was 2,021,000 and growing rapidly.

As our Federal bureaucracy grew, so did Federal control over taxing. There has been a great change in the tax pattern since 1932. Where the Federal Government used to collect about one-fourth of all taxes in 1932, today the Federal Government collects three-fourths.

The pattern is shown by the table which follows:

TABLE 1.—*Percent of taxes collected by Federal, State and local taxing authorities*

| | |
|---|---|
| 1932: | |
| Federal, percent | 24.0 |
| State, percent | 22.6 |
| Cities, percent | 24.7 |
| Others, percent | 28.7 |
| Total | 100.0 |
| 1947: | |
| Federal percent | 74.7 |
| State, percent | 13.6 |
| Cities, percent | 5.7 |
| Others, percent | 6.0 |
| Total | 100.0 |

Dollar-wise the collections compare as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| 1932: | |
| Federal taxes | $1,790,000,000 |
| State taxes | 1,890,000,000 |
| All other taxes | 4,468,000,000 |
| Total | 8,148,000,000 |
| 1947: | |
| Federal taxes | 35,117,000,000 |
| State taxes | 5,776,000,000 |
| All other taxes | 5,795,000,000 |
| Total | 45,688,000,000 |

In 1948 the Federal Government collected $42,431,000,000 in taxes; the State governments, $7,798,000,000; and the local taxing authorities collected $7,122,000,000. This total taken by the tax collector of $57,351,000,000 is more than one-fourth of the national income at its peak point in 1948.

The Federal Government is siphoning off the peoples earnings by the billions for purposes and enterprises that were never dreamed of in the days of Jefferson and Jackson, the great leaders of the party now in power.

Jefferson foresaw some of the difficulties which confront us now. In a letter to M. Pictet, written during his first term, he said:

> We are endeavoring to reduce the Government to the practice of a rigorous economy, to avoid burthening the people, and arming the magistrate with a patronage of money which might be used to corrupt and undermine the principles of our Government.

In a letter written May 14, 1801, to Mr. Macon, Jefferson outlined his program for economy as follows:

> Levees are done away.
>
> The first communication to the next Congress will be, like subsequent ones, by message, to which no answer will be expected.
>
> The diplomatic establishment in Europe will be reduced to three Ministers.
>
> The compensation to collectors depends on you (Congress) and not on me.
>
> The Army is undergoing a chaste reformation.
>
> The Navy will be reduced to the legal establishment by the last of this month.
>
> Agencies in every department will be revised.
>
> We shall push you to the utmost in economy.
>
> A very early recommendation had been given to the Postmaster General to employ no printer, foreigner, or revolutionary Tory in any of his offices. This Department is still untouched.
>
> The arrival of Mr. Gallatin yesterday, completed the organization of our administration.

Jefferson also said:

> I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtues, and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared.

Members of the Congress, let us heed the wise advice of Jefferson and start economizing before it is too late.

We ought to be able to make a good start on our international-relief programs. The bipartisan foreign policies which we adopted during the late war have now drifted into bipartisan worldwide relief policies.

Our present policies, if long continued, will bring disaster to any political party and to the Nation.

We should realize now that we can never buy peace with American dollars. We tried that approach to world problems before. Our best defense against war with any nation is a strong and solvent America where the citizen supports the Government and does not look to Government for his substance.

During the period we were at war with Germany, Italy, and Japan, our Government made loans, grants, and other relief payments to foreign governments, many who were not in the war, in the amount of over $48,600,000,000. That was before July 1, 1945.

Since July 1945, we have authorized additional loans, grants, and credits to implement our international policies as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation | $2,700,000,000 |
| United Nations Organization | 41,426,162 |
| Lend-lease (postwar) | 2,163,000,000 |
| International Monetary Fund (authorization) | 2,750,000,000 |
| International Bank | 635,000,000 |
| Export-Import Bank (loans authorized) | 2,258,300,000 |
| Loans to Great Britain and Philippines | 4,390,000,000 |
| War Department, grants for relief | 1,771,926,293 |
| Surplus property sales (credits extended) | 1,148,000,000 |
| Greek-Turkish loan (authorized amount) | 400,000,000 |
| Relief in occupied areas (Army) | 2,230,000,000 |
| International Relief Organization | 71,073,000 |
| International Refugee Organization | 182,327,468 |
| European Cooperative Administration | 4,754,000,000 |
| Other appropriations for foreign or international objectives by Eightieth Congress | 300,000,000 |
| Total | 25,495,052,923 |

Although we have obligated our taxpayers to the extent of more than $25,000,000,000 since July 1, 1945, the President now asks for $6,709,000,000 for international affairs in the fiscal year 1950. This request taken alone means an additional tax burden of $46 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Money that for the most part will be gone with the wind, insofar as any good it will ever do the average taxpaying family. To many families $46 is still a sizable sum of money, even in these days of high prices, and high wages. Forty-six dollars to the average family means shoes for the kiddies, and lots of little things that will have to be done without if we go through with this program as the one-worlders want us to.

The big brain trust that helps operate our Government here in Washington has solutions for all the ills of the world and all its peoples.

I sometimes wonder what will happen when we run out of money, and cannot take care of our own people by providing them with honest employment in all the lines of human endeavor. Who will then come to our rescue? Who will make us loans and grants, and supply our people with food, clothing, and shelter? I wonder.

When that day comes, the planners will take over and have the Government provide us with every social need from womb to tomb. The Government will operate the farms and the factories, give everyone free medical and dental care, old-age pensions, and what not. This is the bait that has been held out to people in other countries for hundreds of years, and it has never worked and never will.

But to get back to the President's request for $6,709,000,000 for international affairs and finance for 1950.

BULK OF MONEY GOES TO ECA

The bulk of the request, that is $4,500,000,000, is scheduled for the Economic Cooperative Administration. Mr. Paul Hoffman, the Administrator, is honest enough to admit that even this huge sum may not be enough for 1950, and he said he might have to come back for more.

Last year after we appropriated funds for the ECA program, the recipient governments got together and signed agreements with our country and each other agreeing to stabilize their currencies and balance their budgets. They have not done so, and we ought to find out why. Britain alone had a budget deficit last year of over $800,000,000. But still her socialization plans go merrily on, and this country and her dominions will have to continue to contribute. Stabilized currencies in Europe are far from being a fact. There are black markets of all kinds, and I am convinced that these black-market deals will persist as long as American dollars flow to Europe.

THE TRADE FACTOR

Some of our businessmen argue that we have to help Europe get on her feet if we ever expect to do business there. Now I want Europe to get on her feet as bad as anyone. However, as one businessman, I want our trade with Europe to be down a two-way street in which European dollars are used for European purchases and American dollars for American purchases. As it is now nearly all of our foreign trade is subsidized with our taxpayers' dollars.

Some claim that ECA is stopping the advance of communism in the European countries outside the iron curtain. But is it stopping the advent of socialism? After all both the Socialists and the Communists believe in the philosophies of Marx and Engels. The only difference seemingly is the approach to the dictatorial state as we know it.

The one-worlders and the free-traders who have been boosting for bigger appropriations for ECA sometimes have something more than sentiment to sell.

For example: A study of the cotton shipments authorized by ECA for the month of August 1948 revealed that the firm of Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex., received 71.2 percent of the total cotton authorizations for that month, while 65 other cotton firms received the remainder of the authorizations. Mr. William L. Clayton, chairman of the board of directors of Anderson, Clayton & Co., and a former Under Secretary of State, appeared on January 25, 1949, before the Ways and Means Committee, as

an endorser of the then pending reciprocal trade bill, H. R. 1211. Mr. Clayton at that time stated that under the law as passed by the Eightieth Congress "no worth-while trade agreements would be negotiated" and he added "I still feel that that statement was correct." So Mr. Clayton wants reciprocal trade. Remember his firm got 71.2 percent of the cotton business under ECA in August. A measly 147,639 bales.

TOBACCO AUTHORIZATIONS FOR ECA

To December 31, 1948, European Cooperative Administration approved purchase of tobacco in the amount of $106,400,000. The bulk of the tobacco going to the United Kingdom, Ireland, Bizonia, Denmark and Norway. Forty-nine percent of all the tobacco authorizations were for the United Kingdom, where cigarettes sell for 70 cents a pack. Made principally of American tobacco, supplied by American dollars, the British Labor government ought to be cleaning up in the tobacco business. But are they? Their budgets do not show it. Here in the United States if it were not for the tax a 10-cent pack of cigarettes would be on the market right now. That is the difference between free enterprise and a regimented economy. In a study of the tobacco authorizations for the 6-week period from August 1, 1948, through September 15, 1948, it was found that 34 firms received authorizations for shipments totaling $13,075,101. Imperial Tobacco Co., a British-owned corporation received nearly 81 percent of the business, practically a monopoly, I would say.

COAL

During the summer of 1948, coal was being shipped by the producers and brokers in this country in huge quantities. In fact in one 6-week period 248 cargoes, averaging more than 9,000 tons each left American ports for European destinations. Here again 4 huge corporations supplied 57 percent of the business, while 26 other firms supplied the remaining tonnages.

ALUMINUM

At the very time last fall, when the shortage of aluminum in this country was most severely felt, ECA authorized purchases from the Aluminum Union Limited, Montreal, Canada, of aluminum ingots in huge quantities for the Ministry of Supply, England. From September 16 to 30, 1948, the authorization amounted to more than 72,000,000 pounds, or about 36,000 tons.

At that very time, aluminum was backing up in England, in France, and in Italy, and so-called scrap in sizable quantities was being shipped to the United States where it was grabbed up by hungry purchasers for as high a price as 32 cents per pound. The aluminum which was sold to the British Ministry of Supply cost but 11½ cents per pound on the average. But, remember, our taxpayers paid the freight. There used to be a saying that "Competition is the life of trade." But there can never be any competition in a deal where our taxpayers furnish the funds to buy commodities like aluminum to be shipped to Europe, and where the Europeans can take their gift aluminum for their own uses, and ship their scrap aluminum back to the United States, and sell it in the gray markets for a fancy price. Only the shortages here at home, and the failure of our producers to anticipate the market demand during the past year could have made the aluminum deals possible.

OTHER NONFERROUS METALS

Besides the aluminum shipments financed by our taxpayers, we have been shipping large quantities of brass, copper, lead, and zinc, all for free. These are items which we are supposed to be stocking for strategic purposes. But it seems that strategic purposes and national defense have been temporarily sidetracked so that ECA can help Europe to her feet again.

BRINGING HOME THE BACON

Every now and then the Economic Cooperation Administration issues a report called the commodity supplier data. For October 1–15 this report shows that the British Ministry of Food received authorizations for shipments of more than 120,000,000 pounds of bacon from Canadian packing firms. This is what I call bringing home the bacon, the bacon paid for by the toil and sweat of American labor. Bringing home the bacon for John Bull.

Now I have not much confidence in any figures released by ECA. I think they are all rigged up, and I expect some of Mr. Hoffman's assistants will be quick in explaining that these figures were in error.

However it may be, we will be in error if we do not start watching these appropriations and cutting them down sharply. It is a certainty that 145,000,000 Americans cannot go on indefinitely attempting to feed and clothe people in other parts of this world that cannot do these things for themselves.

Let us start now and pledge ourselves to economy in spending both at home and abroad.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 25 minutes.

RELIEF FROM HEAVY EXCISE TAXES

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to provide some relief from the heavy excise tax burdens imposed during the war. In my speech of last year, in regard to the income tax, I pointed out that rates of tax in themselves do not bring in revenue to the Government. Too high rates may actually decrease the revenue. The soundness of this position was amply demonstrated by the increased revenues from income taxes in the calendar year 1948 after the adoption of the Income Tax Reduction Act of 1948. This position is equally true in the case of excise taxes. Now that we are entering a stage where we have a buyer's market instead of a seller's market, and competition becomes keener between businessmen, it is very important that the tax laws do not hamper or obstruct the production and sale of goods and commodities which are essential to the well-being and comfort of our people.

There are on the statute books today a great many types of selective excise taxes. Some are the backbone of our internal revenue system; for example, the taxes on liquor and tobacco. Others are of a temporary nature which were either imposed during the war period or had wartime rates added to the peacetime rates. It is indisputable that some of these new taxes and increased rates were purposely adopted during the war to discourage civilian production from competing with the war program.

I recall very clearly the testimony of Leon Henderson, Administrator of the Office of Price Administration and Civilian Supply, before our committee in 1941. In speaking of excise taxes, he said, and I quote:

> Turning first to the proposals for excise taxes, the only case which may be made out for such additional taxation at the present time from a total defense point of view must rest upon its effectiveness in discouraging civilian production which competes with the defense program for men, materials, and machines.

We are now in the fourth year following the end of the war and our efforts, if we desire to make our economy strong and efficient, should be directed toward encouraging civilian production and not discouraging it.

My bill is only a step toward relief from the war excise taxes. It is estimated that the bill will result in a loss in revenue of approximately $440,000,000 for the year 1950. I wish it could provide for greater relief. However, larger reductions, in my opinion, will have to await the action of the Congress in reducing the enormous budget proposed by the President for the fiscal year 1950, which, when figured on the same basis as other budgets, is approximately $44,000,000,000. This is the greatest peacetime budget in the history of our country. If we are ever to get our taxes down to a fair and reasonable level, we must reduce the cost of Government and not continue to increase it. As budget expenditures for fiscal 1950 are estimated at approximately $44,000,000,000, a reduction in expenditures of only 1 percent will take care of the loss in revenue under my bill, and relieve taxpayers of these war burdens.

In the last Congress, the Republcans, with the help of statesmanlike Democrats, succeeded in making important reductions in the budget for the fiscal year 1949.

Former President Hoover has recently made a study of Government reorganization which, if adopted, will result in reducing expenditures by $3,000,000,000. Reductions such as these are essential for tax relief. What the country needs is not tax increase but tax reduction. I hope the budget for the fiscal year 1950 is substantially reduced so that we can provide further tax relief to the country.

I will now discuss the reductions under my bill in accordance with its arrangement.

The first section, dealing with tax reduction, relates to luggage. Under the existing law, the luggage tax includes ladies' handbags, pocketbooks, billfolds, and key cases. These items fall more in the class of necessities rather than luxuries, and impose an undue burden on the

ladies. My bill eliminates the tax on these articles.

With respect to the remaining articles, the retail tax on luggage is reduced from 20 to 15 percent.

Our committee has had quite a bit of complaint about the retail tax on jewelry. There are certain articles which have been construed by the Treasury as coming under the definition of jewelry which are really necessities. I refer to fountain pen gold points and rhinestone buttons permanently attached to articles of wearing apparel. The bill removes such articles from the jewelry tax. It also reduces the rate of tax on jewelry from 20 to 15 percent of the retail sales price.

Another retail tax which is bearing heavily on our economy is the tax on furs. Testimony before our committee has shown that this tax has had a disastrous effect on the fur market. My bill reduces the rate of tax on furs from 20 to 15 percent on the retail price.

Another tax which has been particularly burdensome upon the ladies is the tax on toilet preparations and cosmetics. Testimony before our committee indicated that baby oils, baby lotions, and baby powders have been classed as toilet preparations by the Treasury. My bill completely exempts these items from tax. It also reduces the retail tax on other toilet articles from 20 to 15 percent. We also had considerable complaint about taxing toilet articles sold to barber shops or beauty parlors for use in the operation thereof. A bill passed the House last year exempting from the tax such articles when sold to barber shops or beauty parlors for their own use. This bill was not considered by the Senate. Under my bill, the same exemption is provided.

Under the existing law, the tax on tires has been construed to apply to tires used on children's toys, ordinary lawn mowers and bicycles. I do not believe that the Congress ever desired to collect a tax on articles of this type. My bill remedies this situation by exempting from the tax on tires, tires manufactured, produced or imported to retail at not more than $5 each.

Many witnesses appeared before our committee and protested against the automobile tax applying to house trailers. It was pointed out that to tax such trailers adds to the present housing shortage, discriminates against one type of housing as compared with another, and places a severe hardship on veterans, who purchase for housing a large number of trailer coaches. My bill corrects this inequity by exempting trailer coaches from the automobile tax.

In connection with the tax on automotive parts and accessories, the Treasury rulings have been very conflicting with respect to the taxation of rebuilt, reconditioned, and repaired parts or accessories. These rebuilt, reconditioned, or repaired parts should not be subjected to the tax which is intended to apply only to new parts. The bill corrects this inequity by exempting from the tax on automotive parts or accessories, rebuilt, reconditioned, or repaired parts.

Another wartime tax which has been particularly harmful with respect to schools, churches, and juvenile clubs is the tax on musical instruments. The revenue from this source is not large and musical instruments are used in many cases for educational, religious, and character-building purposes. My bill repeals the tax on musical instruments.

Our committee had brought to our attention an inequity existing in the case of the tax applying to electrical appliances. Under existing law, if a farmer buys a direct motor-driven fan for use in a barn or poultry house or for the ventilation of potato storage, apple storage, or other types of storage, he is required to pay the 10-percent tax applicable to electrical appliances. On the other hand, if he buys a belt-driven fan for the same purposes, no excise tax is applicable. Electric direct motor-driven fans are not luxury items but are used in industry, on the farm, and in commercial establishments for the protection, health, and comfort of workers. My bill corrects this inequity by amending the law to confine the tax to electric direct motor-driven fans of the ceiling, wall-bracket, desk, pedestal, and air-circulator types.

Testimony before our committee disclosed the heavy tax burden on photographic apparatus which is now 25 percent. My bill reduces the tax on cameras and lenses, photographic apparatus, and equipment and any apparatus designed for use in the taking of photographs or motion pictures or in developing, printing, or enlarging photographs or motion pictures from 25 percent to 10 percent. The tax on photographic plates and sensitized paper is reduced from 15 percent to 10 percent. These taxes are typical of those adopted during the war to discourage civilian production.

The war tax on electric light bulbs is extremely burdensome. It is now 20 percent of the manufacturers' price. My bill reduces the rate to 10 percent. Electric light bulbs are a necessity and are used in practically every American home.

The present law imposes a tax of 6 cents per gallon on lubricating oils. Lubricating oil has been construed by the Treasury and the courts to apply to cutting oils, a much cheaper grade of oil than motor oils and which is not used primarily as a lubricant but to carry away chips and cuttings, and to cool cutting machine tools. My bill removes from the tax on lubricating oils, oils designed primarily for use in cutting and machining operations on metals and known commercially as cutting oils.

During the war the exemption from the admissions tax to religious, educational, or charitable entertainments, county fairs and concerts conducted by civilian or community membership associations was removed. The admissions tax from these sources results in very little revenue and is a constant source of irritation to those worth-while and deserving groups. My bill restores the exemptions existing before the war to these groups.

The tax on telephone, telegraph, and radio facilities have been greatly increased during the war period and such high rates are having a very deterrent effect on this type of business. My bill reduces the war rate from 25 to 20 percent for telephone toll and domestic telegraph, cable, and radio messages. It also reduces the rate on wire and equipment service from 8 to 5 percent.

One of the most troublesome taxes imposed during the war is that relating to the transportation of persons. I regret, because of the large revenue yield from this tax, that I am unable to recommend at this time its complete elimination. The tax interferes with travel by rail or bus which are now in competition with automobile travel. My bill reduces the rate of tax from 15 to 10 percent. This should eliminate, to some extent, the poor man's cost of travel and lessen the expenses of the businessman who is compelled to travel.

Another tax which was imposed during the war and which unjustly discriminates against the farmer and the businessman is the tax on the transportation of property. This tax is at the rate of 3 percent upon the price paid for the transportation of the property except in the case of the transportation of coal where the rate is 4 cents per short ton. This is another tax which I would like to see immediately repealed because it is a distinct burden on the farmer, the businessman, and the shipper. However, since the tax yields a very large amount of revenue, it is only possible at this time to reduce the rate. My bill will cut the rate from 3 percent to 1½ percent and in the case of coal, from 4 cents per short ton to 2 cents per short ton.

The relief provided in my bill is made effective on the first day following its enactment. I regard this as important. If the effective date of the bill was postponed until later, buyers might delay seasonable purchases until after the date the tax reduction becomes effective.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

## WHY I AM OPPOSED TO THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I want to explain in some detail why I am in favor of the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law. I believe this law should be repealed because it is bad for labor, bad for industry, and bad for the general public.

The Taft-Hartley Act has been presented to us, most cleverly, as a safe middle-of-the-road approach to labor problems. It is represented as a compromise between the so-called management excesses of the days before Roosevelt and the so-called labor excesses of the Wagner Act.

It is my conviction that this is not a true picture of the act. It is not a middle-of-the-road bill at all; it undermines the fundamental principles of collective bargaining established by the Wagner Act and returns us to the period of potential management dictatorship which existed prior to 1934. And we can all remember that during that period management, unrestrained by vigorous unions, led us straight into the depression of the early thirties. That period, we will all agree, was bad for labor, bad

for management, and bad for the general public.

The labor laws of the 1930's, beginning with the Norris-LaGuardia Act under President Hoover, were designed to permit organized labor and industry to exercise their natural powers under our social system. They forbade industry to use certain unfair powers which prevented the unions from carrying out their legitimate role in our economy. Some of such illegitimate practices of industry in the field of labor relations were dismissal for union affiliation, yellow-dog contracts, use of professional strike breakers, the company spy and agent provocateur, labor injunctions, use of company gunmen, black list of union members, use of State and Federal troops to break strikes, and other such measures.

Of course, Taft-Hartley proponents say that they would never dream of returning to such nefarious practices. If they did not intend to use these provisions of the act, we may be assured they would never have included them. If you legalize roulette, it need not surprise you to find that somebody wants to operate a wheel.

Some people who were skeptical about the Taft-Hartley Act in the beginning have been lulled into acceptance because they feel that no spectacular harm has been done to labor in the past 2 years. This is true in the main, though there have been a few outstanding examples of hardship, such as the Chicago printers, whose long strike has cost over 11 million dollars. And little organizing has been undertaken for fear of the complications of the law.

One of my constituents has written me a series of specific questions about the Taft-Hartley Act based on the experience of the few months of its existence. He asks what specific harm the law has done to labor, to industry, and to the general public, and what specific good it has done to the same three groups.

I can give my friend answers to these questions, but they will not be answers to the main question, Why do I believe the Taft-Hartley law must be repealed? For the real objection to the act lies, not in what it has done so far, but in what it has the power to do in the future, when it will pay management to invoke its destructive clauses. While there is a shortage of labor, particularly of skilled labor, management will not risk antagonizing it by making full use of the powers given by the act. But when management is more anxious to get rid of workers than to keep them, the picture will be entirely different.

The Taft-Hartley Act is based on the labor views of the National Association of Manufacturers. One might almost say it is legislation of the NAM, by the NAM, for the NAM. Its principal proponents have always known this, and given it support on that basis. They agree heartily with the NAM philosophy that the only good union is a dead union.

Loud protests are made that the act does not seek to weaken or destroy unions or restrict their "legitimate objectives." In fact, a great deal is said about how much the proponents of the act love the unions; all they ask is to correct a few little injustices to employers.

But let us remember that when the NAM says it is in favor of unions, it means just what Stalin means when he says he is in favor of democracy. The unions favored by the NAM are without power, without national connections, without influence, without funds and without freedom. Unions of this type, we are assured, will be protected under the act. But this is not what the American people mean when they speak of unions.

One of the most effective opponents of communism in American unions is James B. Carey, secretary-treasurer of the CIO. Jim Carey declared at a recent hearing on the new labor bill that unions of workers in Russia are today being operated under a Communist version of the Taft-Hartley law.

My opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act is based on the conviction that the only good union is a live union, one with power to bargain collectively for its members, to win better conditions through that bargaining, and to see that the employers live up to the conditions agreed upon. Anything less than this is a company-dominated union and not a free association of workers.

Supporters of the Taft-Hartley Act insist that the law during its less than 2 years of operation has by no means wrecked the union movement; that there have been strikes and organizing campaigns and every other manifestation of life and liberty. But the act so far has not been tested by depression conditions. Today labor is in demand and it has not paid industry to crack down on the unions and incur labor's ill-will. But when the demand for labor slacks off, then those who supported the act will use its provisions as a weapon to crush the unions and force their destruction.

This view is not merely that of labor. The conservative and authoritative industry publication, Business Week, made this statement in an editorial a few weeks ago. The editorial said the Taft-Hartley Act must go because it destroyed the equality between labor and management which it considered of major importance. It admitted in its very frank editorial, that in time of depression the Taft-Hartley Act could and would be used to destroy labor.

Let me read you what Business Week, probably the foremost business publication in the country, had to say. The editorial is entitled "Why the Taft-Hartley Act Failed." It appeared in the issue for December 18. This is what this realistic employer organ says:

> Most businessmen are realistic. Few are wasting time deploring the imminent doom of the Taft-Hartley Act. To be sure they worry about the statute which will replace it. But most businessmen are getting ready to work with a new set of labor-relations rules.
>
> A change of rules will bring a host of practical problems. Before that happens, there is some point in considering why the Taft-Hartley Act failed, and what may be the lesson of that experience.
>
> For the Taft-Hartley Act did fail—on one of the most important grounds by which a law must be judged in a democratic society. That ground is consent. Only the police state can enforce a law which is believed to be unjust by the people it affects.
>
> What was wrong was that the Taft-Hartley Act went too far. It crossed the narrow line separating a law which aims only to regulate, from one which could destroy.
>
> Given a few million unemployed in America, given an administration in Washington which was not prounion—and the Taft-Hartley Act conceivably could wreck the labor movement.
>
> These are the provisions that could do it: (1) picketing can be restrained by injunction; (2) employers can petition for a collective bargaining election; (3) strikers can be held ineligible to vote—while the strike replacements cast the only ballots; and (4) if the outcome of this is a no-union vote, the Government must certify and enforce it.
>
> Any time there is a surplus labor pool from which an employer can hire at least token strike replacements, these four provisions, linked together, presumably can destroy a union.
>
> By going that far, the law defeated itself.

I have quoted this statement from Business Week at some length because it comes from a source known to be usually hostile to labor, yet it opposes the act as fundamentally a menace to business and the public as well as to labor.

There are other sources of criticism of the Taft-Hartley Act not from a labor viewpoint. A few days ago I received a copy of a resolution passed by the Common Council of Milwaukee. Since we have nonpartisan election of city officials in Milwaukee, this cannot be construed to be in any sense a labor statement. It reads as follows:

> Whereas in 1935 the Congress of the United States enacted the Wagner Act which gave the workingman the right to organize into free labor unions and to collectively bargain with his employer; and
>
> Whereas this law based upon the American principal of equality of opportunity was thereafter hailed as the Magna Carta of Labor; and
>
> Whereas the enactment of the Eightieth Congress of the Taft-Hartley Act because of its inequities and inequalities tended to disturb if not actually destroy the fundamental gains made by workingmen in their quest for economic justice: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved by the Major and Common Council of the City of Milwaukee,* That we call upon the Congress of the United States now in session to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act, and in its place reenact the Wagner Act as originally enacted; and be it further
>
> *Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the two United States Senators representing the State of Wisconsin, and the Congressmen from the Fourth and Fifth Districts, and to the clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Another approach to the issue is found in an excellent book by the Reverend George A. Kelly, called The Taft-Hartley Act, a Moral Analysis. Father Kelly develops a moral and ethical argument against the act as class legislation based upon interest and prejudice. He established the moral right of workers to strike or work in other ways for higher wages and better working conditions, and argues that the Taft-Hartley Act is immoral in opposing those rights. And he makes clear that conscious reflection upon basic moral or ethical principles would have, or should have, prevented the adoption of many of the most objec-

tionable provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Many other religious leaders have arrived independently at Father Kelly's conclusions. A group of 642 prominent religious leaders of Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faith have united in condemning it. They stated that the Taft-Hartley Act was a measure calculated to destroy the real strength of a free labor movement by undermining basic principles of collective bargaining, making the Government of the United States a ready instrument of employer resistance to legitimate needs of workers, and subjecting unions to a process of decimation and frustration under Government control.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference has attacked the Taft-Hartley Act as disruptive and called for the elimination of its cumbersome and obstructive provisions.

Let us return for a few moments to the dangerous objections to the act raised by Business Week. First, picketing can be restrained by use of the injunction. Picketing, of a kind which does not lead to violence, is a primary right of unions in calling attention of nonstrikers and the public to their strike. The use of the injunction in this and other labor situations is a reversion to the bad old days. In the 1920's the injunction was freely used in labor disputes and used invariably to restrain labor from organizing, picketing, striking, or carrying on other legitimate acts of a trade union. Injunctions were issued right and left by the labor-baiting judges under the thumb of local employers.

The Taft-Hartley Act not merely revives the use of the injunction, but actually requires the Government to secure injunctions on behalf of employers where there are alleged violations of the prohibitions against jurisdictional strikes and boycotts.

There are also vague and dangerous provisions for the use of the injunction to protect the right of individuals not to join the union; it is impossible under this provision that many ordinary organizational activities may be restrained. There is also a loose phrase about not causing the employer to pay money for services which are not performed; this may be used to restrain a union from demanding paid vacations and holidays, shifts in work loads, and other perfectly normal demands.

The provision for the use of the injunction in emergency situations is one which has had a good deal of popular appeal. However, the definition of emergency is so wide and so open to interpretations in local situations, that it may be used in practically any strike. If the weapon of the injunction is to be used in protecting the public against strikes which seriously affect the public welfare, then the workers and the public must have better safeguards against misuse of this weapon than the Taft-Hartley Act gives them.

Point two in the indictment by Business Week is that employers can petition for a collective-bargaining election. This means that employers may choose a time convenient to them, or may supplant union men with strike breakers for the mere purpose of holding an election to declare in favor of a company union. Those of us whose memories in the labor movement go back to pre-Wagner Act days know that this can very easily happen. It opens the door for those vicious appendages of the open-shop system, the labor detective agency, and the phony employment bureau which hires out thugs and strike breakers. Such practices invariably lead to violence, loss of life, limb, and property and demoralization of the community, which we should all deplore.

The third point raised by Business Week is that strikers can be held ineligible to vote, while the strike replacements cast the only ballots. This is a further invitation for the development of employer tactics of a nature to injure the unions and the community. I cannot warn too strongly against the development of a class of professional strike breakers, under the protection of the law, to beat down wages and beat up workers. Such a development, which is sure to come sooner or later should the Taft-Hartley Act be permitted to continue, would put labor relations back 20 to 30 years. It would turn us back from the theory of "talk it out" to the discarded idea of slug it out.

The fourth point is that a no-union vote, won on the votes of strike breakers, or in the neat phrase of Business Week, "token replacements," would be enforced by the Government, thus making the Government a party to a strong-arm agreement dictated by the employers. This, of course, is not collective bargaining at all. It removes all basis of equality between the two parties. It knocks labor out on a foul and then certifies industry as the new heavyweight champion.

In addition to these four points raised by the editorial in Business Week, there are a number of other provisions in the Taft-Hartley Act which are fraught with danger.

Unions are made suable for the acts of their so-called agents, even though the union had not approved or ratified the acts in question. What could be easier than for an employer to hire a labor spy, place him in the union to win a position of trust, then have him set off an explosion in a struck plant. The amount of the damage would easily bankrupt the union, as well as arousing the public against the strikers.

The legal complications, requirements, prohibitions, and general confusion established by the Taft-Hartley Act have earned it the epithet of the lawyers' paradise. It is, in my opinion, a very bad thing to remove labor-management relations from the hands of labor and management and turn them over to the lawyers. The delays and expense of continuous litigation, the removal of grievances from the field of prompt and direct action by the interested parties to an uninformed and uninterested court, can only result in deterioration of relations. And the delay and expense is, of course, far more important to the union than to management. That was undoubtedly in the minds of those who drew up the law.

One of the foremost experts on labor law in the country, Dr. William Leiserson, has said that the one thing above all others that rendered the Taft-Hartley Act unworkable and chaotic was its maze of legal rules over every conceivable happening in labor relations.

The law against secondary boycotts is an effort to break down the solidarity of labor. It was part of a definite theory of former Congressman Hartley and a number of other extremists to "break the unions down to the local level." The phrase is Mr. Hartley's, not mine. The idea of separating unions from each other and from their own industry in various parts of the country is, of course, quite in keeping with their general desire to make the unions too weak to be effective. Divide and conquer is as effective a rule in labor relations as it is in the international field.

I have a good deal of experience with the "runaway" shop in a number of fields, and I know that this phenomenon is a bad thing for labor, for industry, and for the community. If those employers working under satisfactory agreements, paying good wages, and having good working relations are to be protected the union must be free to operate wherever competition arises. Many a town has suffered serious economic loss because open-shop competition started up out of range of union activity and drained off their orders. This condition has been lessening recently, however, as would-be sweat-shop operators become convinced that the union will follow them north, south, east, or west, and force them to keep wages up and hours down. This is for the benefit of industries and communities as well as for the benefit of labor.

Many industries are organized on a Nation-wide basis. It is absurd to consider the possibility of operating the steel industry or the auto industry on a plant-by-plant basis. It is equally absurd to propose to conduct labor negotiations on a single-shop basis. The steel worker today is not to be treated as a blacksmith's helper, free to bargain as an individual with the individual boss. He is part of a vast and complicated human organization, every part of which is related to every other part. Only a strong Nation-wide union can establish his rights.

One of the worst provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act is the one which outlaws agreements mutually satisfactory to workers and employers if such agreements call for the closed shop. Much nonsense has been written and spoken against the closed shop. Actually it is a condition which thousands of employers as well as unions voluntarily wrote into their contracts because it was not only beneficial to them but also to the consuming public.

Closed-shop agreements, voluntarily entered into, helped to make America the greatest industrial nation in the world. During the last war the highest records for production were made by plants operating under such contracts, which are advantageous to the employer as well as to labor. The employer derives the advantages of stability, efficiency, and

friendly relations with labor. Where there is a closed shop the workers give their very best because they know that the employer has accepted unionism, wants to live and work in harmony with his employees, and is not scheming to destroy the union at the first opportunity.

Furthermore, it is very difficult to explain to the average union member of long standing why the Government should take such tender care of the nonunion man who is looking for a free ride. The old-time unionist reasons like this: "I joined this union 20 years ago, when pay was low and conditions terrible. I paid my dues all those years, when the dues were a much bigger bite out of the pay check than they are today. I gave up my evenings for meetings and union work, and walked the picket line and went hungry when we were on strike. Now we are doing well, thanks to the work of the union; our pay is good and we have vacations, sick leave, Saturdays off. I helped the union win all these things. Why do I have to share them with some newcomer who is too stingy to spare a few dollars from the good pay I won for him? Why does the Government say it has to protect his right to a free ride on my carfare?" I support the old-timers' contention that he has a right to insist that the newcomers join the union and pay their share of the carfare through closed-shop agreements.

Labor relations, as many a wise employer has discovered, are really human relations. The problem cannot be solved by passing a one-sided punitive law at the behest of the selfish and discredited National Association of Manufacturers. Only by good will, square dealing, and a sincere compliance with a just labor-relations law like the administration's new labor bill can equality in collective bargaining be reestablished and genuine progress be made in the important realm of labor-management relations.

The Taft-Hartley bill must and will be repealed. This is the will of the American people, clearly expressed at the ballot boxes last November 2. I am sure that there are few, if any, Members of this House who could be at ease with their consciences if they failed to carry out such an unmistakable and mighty mandate of the American people.

When we have removed this blot from the statute books, we may rest assured that both the workers and the fair-minded employers of this country will go forward as never before, each recognizing the rights of the other, both dealing with each other as equals, living and working in harmony for their own welfare and for the welfare of the Nation and the world.

Before I conclude, there is just one final point which I should like to impress upon the House. When the Taft-Hartley Act was jammed through the Eightieth Congress and passed over the veto of the President, our friends in Europe—the democratic, freedom-loving peoples of France, Great Britain, and the other countries where human liberty is still prized—were shocked.

The enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1947 gave a tremendous impetus to the Communist propaganda machine. To the peoples of Europe and the whole world, the Kremlin pointed to the Taft-Hartley Act and said, in effect, "Well, if you wanted proof, here is the proof that America is the reactionary country we have been telling you it is—a country that squeezes its workers and throws them into chains."

And then last November, when the news went flashing across the oceans that the people of America had overwhelmingly spoken out for the prompt repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, our democratic friends in western Europe were heartened. They were given new courage to resist the Communists. All this is on the record. It has been fully confirmed in dispatches appearing in the most conservative newspapers of our country. Moreover, it has been fully confirmed by leading American businessmen who have been in Europe and know whereof they speak—such men as Paul Hoffman and Averell Harriman.

There are many, many additional reasons why the removal of the Taft-Hartley Act must receive top priority in the Eighty-first Congress. Within the confines of a single speech it is impossible, of course, to discuss all the dangerous characteristics of this destructive act.

I have indicated some of the major flaws of this vicious law. The facts are known. The Taft-Hartley Act is bad for labor, bad for industry, bad for everyone. We have a mandate from the electorate, and I hope that the Members of this House will act with the utmost promptness to carry out this mandate and put an end to one of the most unfortunate experiments in American history.

### A FREE LITHUANIA

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people throughout America are today commemorating with heartfelt gratitude the fact that the United States has not recognized Russia's usurpation of the Lithuanian people.

Lithuania for centuries has fought for independence and self-government—for civic liberty and religious freedom. This fight will continue in the hearts and minds of all loyal Lithuanians regardless of the present power of a gigantic oppressor nation. Freedom cannot be exterminated permanently from a nation whose peoples have for centuries refused to submit to religious oppression or slavery.

The people of this great country are fighting every hour, through various organizations, underground and otherwise, and they will eventually be rewarded with victory and the reestablishment of freedom within their borders.

Lithuania is a tragic victim of Soviet aggression. The people have been deprived of their property rights, human rights, and fundamental freedoms. Over a half million people of Lithuania have been slain or transferred away from their native country. The crimes committed against these people have been condemned by the United States and other democratic countries which continue to recognize independent Lithuania and its lawful representatives.

It is the honest desire of the Lithuanian people everywhere that our great country and all free democracies of the world continue to stand by the principles of right and justice and that they will continue to fight for the cause of sovereign rights and self-government for the people of Lithuania.

I want to extend my sincere congratulations to the brave Lithuanian people who are engaging in this fight for freedom to restore their independence and throw off the shackles of a ruthless tyrant.

I know that our President, the Congress, and the Department of State, and all the powers behind our great Republic will be marshaled in the future to aid the Lithuanian people in this battle for righteousness.

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 21, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

---

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

229. A letter from the president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a report of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1948; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

230. A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting the Commission's report on the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 76); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

231. A letter from the chairman, Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, transmitting a study on management, organization, and administration of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

232. A letter from the acting president, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act to regulate the practice of podiatry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

233. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on its own behalf and on behalf of American nationals against foreign governments"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

234. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal, and lists or schedules, or parts of lists or schedules, covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies; to the Committee on House Administration.

235. A letter from the President, United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled "A bill to provide for payment of salaries covering periods of separation and suspension from the Government service in the case of persons improperly removed or suspended from such

service"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

236. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of June 18, 1929"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

237. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3552 of the Revised Statutes relating to the covering into the Treasury of all moneys arising from charges and deductions"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 2101. A bill to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHORT: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2216. A bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense; with an amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 2660. A bill to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LYLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 110. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2101, a bill to authorize the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, D. C., to make certain disaster or emergency loans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 111. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 858, a bill to clarify the overtime-compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in the stevedoring and building-construction industries, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIAMS: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 20. A bill to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 2363. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) to the Gulf coast and creating the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 668. A bill for the relief of Alex Bail; without amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 711. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margaret Gregg Dilnot; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1035. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ada M. Ryan; with an amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1041. A bill for the relief of Jeannette and Jesus Esteva and their four children; with amendments (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1079. A bill for the relief of Maria Veltri Magnone; with an amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1460. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Silvia Mapelli; with an amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1508. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1629. A bill for the relief of Kira and Nina Grigorieff; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 2811. A bill to provide homes for city and farm families of average income, particularly those of World War II veterans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 2812. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. GORSKI of Illinois:

H. R. 2813. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional circuit judge for the seventh circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2814. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2815. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Bureau of the Mint, Treasury Department, for overtime work performed and rates of pay authorized but not granted; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2816. A bill providing for the conveyance to the town of Nahant, Mass., of the Fort Ruckman Military Reservation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. LUCAS:

H. R. 2817. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of the work of the soil-conservation districts of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 2818. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, entitled "Judicial Code and Judiciary," by adding a new section thereto known as section 1732-b to permit the photographing, microfilming, or photostating of original business records and the introduction of the same in evidence after the destruction of the originals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of California:

H. R. 2819. A bill to authorize the appointment of two additional district judges for northern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. R. 2820. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for home and other sites," approved June 1, 1938 (52 Stat. 609), as amended; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 2821. A bill to amend the act approved June 14, 1926 (44 Stat. 741; 43 U. S. C., sec. 869), entitled "An act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes," to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. RAINS:

H. R. 2822. A bill to amend Public Law 289, Eightieth Congress, with respect to surplus airport property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 2823. A bill to provide additional compensation for widows and other dependents of certain veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 2824. A bill to provide for the construction, rehabilitation, expansion, conversion, and joint utilization of buildings, structures, utilities, and other facilities, including the acquisition of land, for the Reserve components of the National Military Establishment of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 2825. A bill to provide compensatory time for services performed on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays by clerks in third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2826. A bill to provide for the construction of flood-control improvements at the city of Quincy, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 2827. A bill to provide for the construction of flood-control improvements at the town of Beardstown, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 2828. A bill to provide for the creation, organization, administration, and maintenance of a Naval Reserve and a Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 2829. A bill to make retroactive section 6 (b) (2) of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), as amended, dealing with the restoration to Government service of persons improperly discharged, suspended, or furloughed without pay under section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 2830. A bill to provide for the payment by the United States of premiums on bonds of Government officers or employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:
H. R. 2831. A bill to provide for payment to certain retired Naval and Marine Corps Reserve officers of a lump sum equal to their active-duty pay and allowances for the period during which such officers remained in an inactive status without pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GILLETTE:
H. R. 2832. A bill authorizing the construction of flood-control work on the Dyberry River, Wayne County, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POLK:
H. R. 2833. A bill to amend and supplement the act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 653); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McKINNON:
H. R. 2834. A bill to authorize the appointment of one additional district judge for the southern district of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:
H. R. 2835. A bill to provide additional compensation for postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WITHROW:
H. R. 2836. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS:
H. R. 2837. A bill to equalize the physical requirements for admission of a cadet or a midshipman to the Military or Naval Academies; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 2838. A bill to amend section 1705 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:
H. R. 2839. A bill to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. NORTON:
H. R. 2840. A bill to provide for the investigation of discriminations against women on the basis of sex, to establish policies for the removal of such discriminations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:
H. R. 2841. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Post Office Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana:
H. R. 2842. A bill to provide that certain persons who served in the merchant marine shall not be liable for induction into the armed services under the Selective Service Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FISHER:
H. R. 2843. A bill to amend section 2402 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, and to repeal section 2402 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:
H. R. 2844. A bill to provide for determination through judicial proceedings of claims for compensation on account of disability or death resulting from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty while serving in the active military or naval service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REED of New York:
H. R. 2845. A bill to eliminate or reduce certain excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RICHARDS:
H. R. 2846. A bill to establish the Cowpens Battleground National Military Park; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:
H. J. Res. 169. Joint resolution to provide for a 3-month extension of Federal rent controls in order to give the States time to take such action as they may deem appropriate with respect to rent control in their respective jurisdictions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SANBORN:
H. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing, as a House document, 30,000 copies of the document entitled "Money Makes the Mare Go"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VINSON:
H. Res. 109. Resolution making H. R. 2216, a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947 to provide for an Under Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes, a special order of business; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to use all possible means to secure the release of Cardinal Mindszenty, of the Roman Catholic faith, and Bishop Ordass, of the Lutheran faith; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact effective legislation providing for flood control in the Wabash River watershed area and tributaries thereto; to the Committee on Public Works.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to further consider and make an appropriation in the amount of $462,000 available to the United States Corps of Engineers for the completion of the authorized Depoe Bay improvement project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for the construction of a dam across the Mora River at La Cueva, Mora County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALBERT:
H. R. 2847. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Mildred H. Gibbons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:
H. R. 2848. A bill for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLE of New York:
H. R. 2849. A bill for the relief of Constantinos Dardas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVENPORT:
H. R. 2850. A bill for the relief of Denise Simeon Boutant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McSWEENEY:
H. R. 2851. A bill for the relief of Carl L. Sexauer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NORTON:
H. R. 2852. A bill for the relief of the estate of Priscilla Crowley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:
H. R. 2853. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicates of William Gerard's script certificates No. 2, subdivisions 11 and 12, to Blanche H. Weedon and Mattie Ward H. Harris jointly; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. REDDEN:
H. R. 2854. A bill for the relief of Wade H. Noland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:
H. R. 2855. A bill for the relief of Jacobus Van Gangelen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:
H. R. 2856. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:
H. R. 2857. A bill for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:
H. R. 2858. A bill for the relief of M. L. Brewer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

87. By Mr. CARROLL: Memorial of Colorado State Legislature, memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to assist local lending agencies in financing disaster-stricken livestock producers and feeders in the blizzard areas of the Western States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

88. By Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER: Resolution adopted by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo on February 8, urging the Congress of the United States to strengthen the rent-control laws by declaring a moratorium for 1 year upon all evictions for any cause except nonpayment of rent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

89. By Mr. HART: Petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J., urging that our Federal Government use its good offices through diplomatic channels to the end that the unjust punishment inflicted upon Cardinal Mindszenty be revoked; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

90. Also, memorial of the New Jersey House of Assembly, memorializing the President and the Secretary of State of the United States to exercise every power at their command to bring about the release of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty and Bishop Lajos Ordaff; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

91. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Cream City Lodge, No. 1061, International Association of Machinists, Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the Eighty-first Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley law and reenact the provisions of the Wagner Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

92. Also, petition of city clerk, Scranton, Pa., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to requesting the Congress to pass the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.